MAR 18 1957

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 102—PART 4

MARCH 8, 1956, TO MARCH 27, 1956
(PAGES 4255 TO 5706)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1956

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1956

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 6, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God over all, blessed forevermore. Amid the seething strife that mars the earth which could be so fair, and contentions which sadly separate the sundered peoples of the world—whatever the vexatious problems Thy servants here face, this white altar of prayer our fathers builded speaks ever to our fevered spirits of our final reliance on those supreme spiritual verities which abide forever and cannot be shaken, and on which our very salvation in the end depends. We beseech Thee, so tune our hearts this day to the infinite that all perplexing meanings may be linked into one perfect melody of peace.

And, as deeply concerned, the thought of this body, which plans for the well-being of all the people of this commonwealth, is focused especially these days on tillers of the soil to whom we owe the very sustenance of life and in whose toil Thou dost answer our daily prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread," we thank Thee for the unmeasured and unpayable service of those who bend to the sacrament of the good earth and for amber waves of grain across the fruited plain. We ask it in the name of that Holy One, who saw divine significance in a sower who went forth to sow. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. THEODORE F. GREEN, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GREEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 7, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 6, 1956, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 97) for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst, Pedro P. Dagamac, and Edith Kahler.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7201) relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2128. An act to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls; and

H. R. 9739. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 2128. An act to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9739. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for action on the nomination on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar under "New Reports."

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Col. John L. Person, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that I had anticipated the two nominations to the United States Tariff Commission, which have been held up for some time, would be brought up before now; but my absence from the city has prevented my talking to Senators who are interested in those nominations. I note that the request that the nominations go over is still pending. I say to the minority leader and to the administration, who are interested in the nominations, that I shall very promptly confer with the Senator who has made the request, and attempt to set a firm date very shortly for action on the nominations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator from Texas will yield, I should like to say I appreciate his statement. As he

has pointed out, one of the nominations has been on the Executive Calendar since February 12 and the other since February 16. We have had 3 or 4 discussions on the floor with the majority leader, and with the acting majority leader in the absence of the Senator from Texas, concerning them. I think, in fairness to the nominees, if there are any objections to the nominations they should be presented on the floor, and I hope the majority leader can arrange for the Senate to take action on the nominations at the very earliest opportunity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from California is agreeable to the suggestion I think we may let the RECORD show that we plan to take them up on Monday next. The Senator knows I have no desire to delay the consideration of the nominations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am informed the Senator who is interested in the nominations will be present Monday. I believe that, if we set a definite date, we can proceed to the consideration of the nominations of William E. Dowling and James Weldon Jones on Monday next.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator. He has shown the same graciousness and cooperation he usually exhibits in these matters.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be the usual morning hour, with statements limited to 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

EXTENSION OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938, RELATING TO WAR RISK INSURANCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, relating to war risk insurance for an additional 5 years (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce, on the activities and transactions of that Administration under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period October 1 through December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted at a meeting of citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., descendants of different nationalities, under the sponsorship of the Moslem Association of America, relating to the liberation of Moslems in Russia and other Soviet-enslaved countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA CROP IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, two resolutions adopted by the Minnesota Crop Improvement Association. One resolution urges the appropriation of adequate funds for construction and continued maintenance of a national seed storage facility, and the second endorses increased appropriations for research on forage crops in the fiscal year 1957, under the Forage and Range Section of the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL SEED STORAGE FACILITY INITIATED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS, MINNESOTA CROP IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION, JANUARY 13, 1956

Whereas plant breeding has been one of the most important tools at the hands of the plant scientists in improving the abundance, efficiency, and stability of crop production in the United States; and

Whereas basic genetic and breeding stocks as represented by material collected from many countries of the world, and from various parts of the United States, by old varieties of important crops that are in danger of extinction because of the increased usage of new varieties, and by some of the special breeding materials developed in plant breeding programs, are the foundation of successful plant breeding programs of the future; and

Whereas many of these basic stocks have already been lost and others are in danger of being lost because of lack of adequate facilities for their maintenance and perpetuation: Be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota crop Improvement Association urge the appropriation of adequate funds for the construction and continued maintenance of a national seed storage facility.

RESOLUTION ON FORAGE CROPS RESEARCH APPROPRIATION INITIATED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS, MINNESOTA CROP IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION, JANUARY 13, 1956

Whereas forage crops are basic to a prosperous and permanent agriculture, essential in cropping systems devised for maximum soil conservation and improvement, and the most important and economical source of feed nutrients for livestock; and

Whereas the importance of research has been demonstrated again and again in enhancing the value of particular crops on farms of the United States, in increasing the economy of crop production, and in reducing the risks of crop production through resistance to diseases, insects, and weather hazards; and

Whereas the amount of financial support from Federal and State appropriations for research in forage crops is still substantially below the level of support for research in several other farm crops, and particularly substantially less than needed in the best interests of American agriculture; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States provided at its last session a substantial increase in the appropriations of the Forage and Range Section, Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture: Be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota Crop Improvement Association (1) express its appreciation to the Congress for this increased support for research in forage crops, and (2) urge members of the Congress to support the increased item for research on forage crops in the fiscal year 1957 budget request for the Forage and Range Section, Field Crops Research Branch, Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CAPEHART—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter and resolution from the United States Savings and Loan League expressing thanks to Senator HOMER CAPEHART. This resolution pays tribute to Senator CAPEHART for his leadership in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in connection with the legislation to reconstitute the Federal Home Loan Bank Board as an independent agency.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE,
Chicago, Ill., February 13, 1956.

Hon. HOMER CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: The United States Savings and Loan League convention last November gave the member institutions their opportunity to thank you officially for what you did to make the Federal Home Loan Bank Board independent in the last session. A formal resolution was adopted and a copy especially inscribed to you is enclosed. This represents, in effect, the sentiment of nearly 3,000 of our people.

All of us who did staff work in connection with the legislative program certainly felt this resolution to be most appropriate.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN SLIPHER,
Staff Vice President.

RESOLUTION APPROVED AND ADOPTED BY THE UNITED STATES SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE AT THE 63D ANNUAL CONVENTION, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., NOVEMBER 8, 1955

THANKS TO SENATOR HOMER CAPEHART

Whereas the 84th Congress in its 1st session approved legislation to reconstitute the Federal Home Loan Bank Board as an independent agency in the executive department of the Government; and

Whereas the Banking and Currency Committees of the two Houses were primarily responsible for this enactment so gratifying to the savings and loan institutions; and

Whereas the willingness of the committee members to give attention to this question was indispensable to the success of this legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Savings and Loan League assembled in its 63d annual convention at Miami Beach, Fla., November 8, 1955, express its thanks to the members of the Banking and Currency Committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate in the 84th Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That a personalized copy of this resolution be sent to Senator HOMER CAPEHART, ranking Republican member of the Senate Banking Committee, noting his leadership in steering the measure through that committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1555. A bill authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1639); and

H. R. 8607. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to David Peters, or to his heirs or assigns, title to land held by the United States in trust for him (Rept. No. 1640).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 6625. A bill to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo of Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1641).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 3237. A bill to provide for continuance of life-insurance coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, in the case of employees receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (Rept. No. 1642); and

S. 3315. A bill to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (Rept. No. 1643).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 3388. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the port of Port Townsend, Wash.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 3389. A bill to repeal certain excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3390. A bill for the relief of Jelena Simicevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BRICKER) (by request):

S. 3391. A bill to provide for the regulation of the interstate transportation of migrant farm workers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 3392. A bill authorizing a comprehensive project for control and progressive eradication of obnoxious aquatic plant growths from navigable waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 3393. A bill to provide for the utilization of the Colorado River development fund in the States of the lower division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. GOLDWATER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 3393) to provide for the utilization of the Colorado River development fund in the States of the lower division, introduced earlier today by me, may lie on the table for 3 days so that Senators who so desire may join me in sponsoring the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 3394. A bill to provide the rank of rear admiral for the person assigned to duty as the Chief of the Reserve Division, United States Coast Guard; and

S. 3395. A bill to provide the rank of major general for the person assigned to duty as the Director of the Marine Corps Reserve, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3396. A bill to provide certain allowances and benefits to personnel of the Veterans' Administration who are United States citizens and are assigned to the Veterans' Administration office in the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 3397. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102), as amended, for the purpose of extending the time in which payments are to be made to members of the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3398. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1946, in order retroactively to advance in grade, time in grade, and compensation certain employees in the postal field service who are veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 3399. A bill to increase the equipment-maintenance allowance payable to rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3400. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 3401. A bill for the relief of Exapet Pilibossian, Eghia Pilibossian, Akabe Pilibossian, and Yeghis Pilibossian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. DANIEL):

S. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution to provide for the construction of certain water-conservation projects for irrigation purposes in the Pecos River Basin, New Mexico and Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO PORT TOWNSEND, WASH.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent to speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Washington may proceed.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which directs the Administrator of General Services to sell to the port of Port Townsend, Wash., at fair market value, a surplus Federal property known as Hudson Point. Before doing so, however, I wish to briefly explain the background of this proposal.

Two years ago the town of Port Townsend suffered a calamity which threatened to destroy the community. In one sudden stroke, the major industry—a Federal installation—was closed and a $6 million annual payroll was thereby eliminated.

The Federal facility was an old Army post called Fort Worden. It had been used continuously for many years until 1947, but expanded greatly when the Army decided to use it for amphibious training purposes. Then, thousands of servicemen, civilian employees, and their families were moved into Port Townsend. The Army appealed to local citizens to provide housing and other services required by the new residents. The people of Port Townsend responded, and through 1948 to 1954 they invested large sums of money to build not only homes but stores, schools, utilities, and all the other requirements of the increased population. All of this was done because the Federal Government needed it and requested it.

However, in 1954, the Federal Government decided it was not needed any more. The fort was abandoned; the service personnel, civilian employees, and their families were moved away. As a result, the people of Port Townsend were stuck with investments now worthless and debts which could not be repaid; they faced a devastating economic depression while the rest of the Nation prospered.

The plight of the community was called to the attention of the President and the country by a now-famous letter written to the Chief Executive by Mrs. Jean Foster of Port Townsend. Mrs. Foster told the President how the Government's action had deprived her of the savings of a lifetime and had ruined the economy of the community. The President replied sympathetically and promised that he would do everything possible to assist Port Townsend. He sent

his representatives to the community to see what could be done.

Newspapers across the country carried the story and millions of people must have read about Port Townsend and sympathized with its problem. However, I am afraid that as far as the Federal Government was concerned Port Townsend was forgotten, for it has received no Federal help.

Many people predicted that Port Townsend would become a ghost town. But the people of Port Townsend have never given up hope. They have organized their efforts to improve community facilities and bring in new industry. They are determined to pull the town up by its bootstraps even if the Federal Government ignores the problems it created for the community.

This rehabilitation program is designed to develop Port Townsend's natural assets. The town is situated at the mouth of Admiralty Inlet, the main gateway from the Pacific Ocean to Puget Sound and Seattle.

It has one of the finest natural harbors in the world and its economy has long been associated with the sea. Part of the community effort is directed toward providing adequate harbor facilities for the fishing fleet and pleasure craft of the area.

To aid in the development of harbor facilities, the port of Port Townsend wishes to acquire surplus property which was formerly the Hudson Point Military Reservation. This property includes a dredged boat basin, a small pier and some structures formerly used as a quarantine station and Navy minesweeper school.

The port offered to purchase this property at the fair market value established by an independent private appraisal contracted for by the General Services Administration in July of 1954. However, this proposed negotiated sale never took place because of allegations that the appraised price was too low.

A second appraisal was made in October of 1955 and resulted in a higher evaluation. By this time, however, GSA authority to negotiate sales of surplus property had expired and, furthermore, the port of Port Townsend indicated it could not purchase the property at the inflated price.

The General Services Administration then went forward with plans for disposing of the property by public sale. At my request, however, GSA agreed to postpone the sale until the question of this property's disposition could be brought before the Congress.

Mr. President, some people have said the only interest of the Federal Government in this matter is to milk the last dollar of value from this property regardless of the effect on this community. Others have claimed the port should receive the property only if it pays the highest appraisal price.

I do not sympathize with these points of view. I believe it is time for the Federal Government to be fair with the people of Port Townsend. It is time that the efforts of the community to rebuild its economy were encouraged rather than downtrodden.

The bill I am introducing will not provide a dole for Port Townsend. The community has already indicated it will pay a fair price for the property—they have not asked for a dole. This bill establishes the fair value of this property as an amount equal to the average of the two appraisals which have already been conducted.

As further justification for this proposal, I wish to point out that most of the property on which this installation now stands was deeded to the Federal Government by citizens of Port Townsend for a remuneration of $1. This land was donated by the community to the Government for patriotic reasons.

Passage of the bill I am introducing will not only set a fair price for the property; it will also insure that the community acquires the boat basin so it can be fitted into overall planning for development of the port and rehabilitation of the community, and not exploited for some other purpose which might not benefit the town.

Mr. President, I hope this bill receives early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3388) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the port of Port Townsend, Wash., introduced by Mr. JACKSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services (herein referred to as the "Administrator") is authorized and directed to convey to the port of Port Townsend, Wash., subject to the provisions of section 2 and 3 of this act, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property consisting of thirty and sixty-two hundreds acres, more or less, located in Jefferson County, Wash., comprising a part of the real property commonly known as Hudson Point, formerly used by the Department of the Army for amphibious training purposes, the exact legal description of which shall be determined by the Administrator.

SEC. 2. (a) The Administrator shall determine, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the fair market value of the real property subject to conveyance under this act and if the port of Port Townsend fails to tender to the Administrator an amount equal to such fair market value on or before the 120th day after the date such fair market value is made known to the port of Port Townsend by the Administrator, this act shall cease to be in effect after such 120th day.

(b) Fair market value as used in this section means an amount equal to the average of the two appraisals of such land which were made July 1954 and October 1955 at the request of the Administrator.

SEC. 3. There shall be reserved to the United States all minerals, including oil and gas, in the real property authorized to be conveyed by the first section of this act, and the deed of conveyance shall contain such additional terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as the Administrator determines to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 4. The Administrator shall cover into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts all proceeds under this act.

REPEAL OF HIDDEN OR WARTIME EXCISE TAXES—INCREASE EMPLOYMENT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal the so-called hidden or wartime excise taxes. This bill would amend the 1954 Internal Revenue Code by repealing the sections placing Federal taxes on food and drink in establishments where live entertainment is provided, as well as Federal taxes on luggage, handbags, electric light bulbs, communications, transportation of persons, safe deposit boxes, and jewelry retailing under $50. These taxes were rushed through to enactment several years ago, under the guise of special wartime emergency taxes, only to become a permanent burden.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3389) to repeal certain excise taxes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are repealed:

(1) subchapter D of chapter 31 (retailers' tax on luggage, handbags, etc.);

(2) part III of subchapter B of chapter 32 (manufacturers' tax on electric light bulbs);

(3) subchapter B of chapter 33 (tax on communications);

(4) part I of subchapter C of chapter 33 (tax on transportation of persons); and

(5) subchapter D of chapter 33 (tax on safe deposit boxes).

SEC. 2. Section 4001 of such code (relating to retailers' tax on jewelry and related items) is amended by inserting after "articles sold at retail" the following: "for a price of $50 or more."

SEC. 3. (a) The second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 4231 of such code (relating to exceptions to the admissions tax) is amended by striking out "or" at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof ", or", and by adding after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

"(C) to a roof garden, cabaret, or other similar place."

(b) Paragraph (6) of section 4231 (relating to tax with respect to roof gardens, cabarets, and other similar places), and subsection (c) of section 4232 of such code (relating to definition of performance for profit) are repealed.

SEC. 4. Paragraphs (1) and (2) of the first section and section 2 shall apply only with respect to articles sold on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this act. Paragraph (3) of the first section shall apply only with respect to amounts paid on or after such day for services rendered on or after such day. Paragraph (4) of the first section shall apply

only with respect to amounts paid on or after such day for transportation which begins on or after such day. Paragraph (5) of the first section shall apply only with respect to amounts paid on or after such day. Section 3 shall apply only with respect to periods after 10 o'clock antemeridian on such day.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the present tax of 20 percent levied on food and drink consumed at places where entertainment or dancing is provided constitutes a decided disadvantage to hotel and cabaret owners, entertainers, and musicians.

In many instances it has caused hotel and cabaret owners to discontinue live entertainment, with the resulting effect of unemployment to musicians and entertainers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks four communications relating to the repeal of excise taxes.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL No. 368,
RENO MUSICIANS PROTECTIVE UNION,
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS,
Reno, Nev., November 8, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senator from Nevada,
Reno, Nev.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As you are undoubtedly aware, management and labor are engaged in a mutual effort to obtain repeal of the so-called 20-percent amusement tax, a highly pernicious and discriminatory tax that has proved injurious, not only to labor and management, but to the Government as well. Removal of this tax would result in increased revenue to the Government in the amount of $11 million, through income tax returns by musicians who would either be reemployed or through added hours of employment by those presently employed. This estimate is impartial and comes from the American Research Co. presently conducting a survey of this tax.

United States Treasury receipts from the 20-percent so-called cabaret tax during its peak year reached $72 million. During the past 5 years this revenue has not reached the sum of $50 million in any 1 year. Last year, lowest in history, the revenue from this tax trickled down to a mere $38 million. Tax experts have stated that when 300,000 more people go to work in the amusement industry, the United States Treasury will realize more revenue from income taxes and operators' profits than the receipts mentioned above. It is really a tax of no return.

For our purposes, we would appreciate an expression from you as to your attitude toward this tax, as the huge expenditures for entertainment by the various establishments in Nevada are directly affected by the 20-percent amusement tax.

It would be appreciated if I could have your usual prompt reply.

Very sincerely yours,
PAULA DAY,
Secretary-Treasurer.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS,
San Francisco, Calif., November 10, 1955.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: The American Federation of Musicians seeks to repeal the wartime emergency 20-percent amusement tax, which statistics show has reached the point of diminishing returns.

We feel this tax is extremely unfair for many reasons, among which are:

1. It singles out a particular group of citizens and penalizes their employers for providing them employment upon which their livelihood and capacity to support the Government depend.

2. The amount of the tax is virtually confiscatory and is beyond reason when compared to other means and rates of taxation.

Many Senators have announced their position in favor of the repeal of this legislation, for which we are grateful.

We sincerely urge you to give this important matter your close attention. If you agree with us and wish to give us your support, a card or letter to that effect will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,
J. J. RICHARD,
Secretary, California-Arizona-Nevada Conference, American Federation of Musicians.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF MUSICIANS,
New York, N. Y., November 5, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Reno, Nev.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: May I thank you for your response to my letter of June 24, last, in which I pointed out the dire necessity of obtaining relief from the discriminatory and wholly uneconomic 20-percent tax on amusement—the so-called cabaret tax—and at the same time fulfill my promise to give you the pertinent facts of our nationwide survey of the impact of this tax upon the national economy?

This study has now been completed by Research Company of America which for 20 years has been serving the factfinding needs of American business. It enlisted two outstanding economists, Dr. Robert Shook and A. W. Zelomek, the latter currently an excise-tax consultant to the Mills Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Report. The report fills a fat volume, but here are the salient facts:

1. This wartime emergency tax which has continued since right after World War I, is costing the Treasury revenue. We are prepared to prove to the Congress that if it is repealed, the Treasury will gain by at least $11 million in excess of the nearly $39 million which this tax brought in during the last fiscal year. Our economists compute this gain on the basis of increased revenue from presently operating entertainment places now subject to the tax, plus personal tax accruals from more musicians working longer hours in these places. They do not take into account additional accruals certain to result from reopening of places now closed to entertainment because of the tax. (I cite you the American Hotel Association's report that two-thirds of its dining-with-entertainment rooms have been discontinued since 1946 as a direct result of this tax.) Nor do our economists attempt to compute the large additional accruals that would result from the employment of entertainers other than musicians, as well as service help.

2. Musicians alone have lost, conservatively, 50 percent of their employment in these taxed places since 1943. For every musician so displaced there have been an equal number of job losses by other entertainers and substantial losses among waiters, waitresses, culinary and other service help. All this adds up to tens of thousands of job losses in a time of generally high employment.

3. The national cultural recession has now become a national depression, particularly in music. Unsound economics as well as the trend toward mechanized music are to blame. Our survey shows that only 32.8 percent of our 252,512 instrumentalists can now earn all or most of their livelihood in their profession. Fully 35 percent of our membership can no longer follow their profession to any degree. Half of our total job potential is denied by an unsound Federal tax policy. Great musicians to sustain our cultural heritage come from masses of working instrumentalists. If large employment reservoirs dry up, as is now happening, music will disappear from our national scene.

We are prepared to document these facts to the Treasury and to the tax committees of the next Congress. I hope you will give us your support and I solicit an expression from you.

Sincerely,
JAMES C. PETRILLO,
President, American Federation of Musicians, AFL.

P. S.—So that you may be sure to see this communication promptly, I am sending a duplicate letter to your Washington office.
J. C. P.

HOTEL SAHARA,
Las Vegas, Nev., November 29, 1955.

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have recently been advised that the musicians' union, and other related groups, have instituted their combined efforts toward removing the burdensome 20-percent entertainment tax.

The Hotel Sahara is definitely in favor of abolishing this tax for many reasons. High on the list, from the standpoint of our guests, is their reluctance to pay out additional sums of money without benefit to themselves. They measure the cost of an evening's entertainment on the basis of the total of their check, and not the price of the meal, which is all the hotel derives.

Abolishment of this tax is certain to increase revenue for the many establishments in Las Vegas and the entire State of Nevada. This, in turn, must increase the availability of jobs to handle the added revenue.

I would appreciate hearing your views on the subject, and the stand you would initiate in assisting us to accomplish our aims.

Sincerely,
MILTON PRELL,
Executive Director.

Mr. MALONE. A significant part of my State's economy is based on the tourist industry, and the present excise tax operates as a detriment to businesses which either directly or indirectly are based upon tourist revenue.

Repealing this tax would serve to stimulate private enterprises to provide more attractive entertainment facilities, would increase the number of out-of-State visitors, would provide increased job opportunities for entertainers and musicians, and would result in increased regular income and taxes.

Mr. President, during the past 20 years the people of our country have been subjected to increasing taxes which in many cases have reached the point of confiscation.

Income taxes immediately take approximately 20 percent of the average income, but whatever amount is left is by no means immune to further diminution through the hidden and emergency passed taxes which are confronted at every turn.

I have almost continuously had a bill before the Senate to repeal the wartime emergency taxes, which are unfair from a peacetime basis. Some have been reduced, notably the motion-picture tax—it is time to repeal the remainder of what

are actually nuisance taxes as well as an unfair burden.

Mr. President, the time is long overdue for a return to "good faith" taxing.

ERADICATION OF OBNOXIOUS AQUATIC PLANT GROWTHS FROM NAVIGABLE WATERS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, back in 1945, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, by resolution, requested the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the water hyacinth situation and submit a report to Congress. That report has now been prepared, and the Chief of Engineers has recommended that, in addition to the regular maintenance work being done to keep traffic flowing in growth-infested waters, a separate comprehensive project be authorized to provide for control and progressive eradication of the water hyacinth, alligator weed, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the eight States concerned. This project would be in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, and public health. It is estimated it would take 5 years, at an annual cost of $1,350,000, to accomplish the job. Twenty-five percent of this amount would be contributed by local interests. This expenditure would be in addition to the approximately $300,000 now being spent yearly to keep the streams open.

Mr. President, at this time, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an accompanying statement, relating to the bill, prepared by me, may be printed in the RECORD. The bill, if enacted, will carry out the purposes of the study which has been made.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3392) authorizing a comprehensive project for control and progressive eradication of obnoxious aquatic plant growths from navigable waters, introduced by Mr. LONG, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized a comprehensive project to provide for control and progressive eradication of the water hyacinth, alligator weed, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, at an estimated total cost of $1,350,000 annually for 5 years, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies, all generally in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, Subject: Water Hyacinth Obstructions.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The statement, presented by Mr. LONG, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LONG

The bill I have just introduced would authorize a Federal project that, over a period of 5 years, would eradicate aquatic growths that block our navigable streams.

The menace offered by these growths to our waterways is not a new one. It dates back to before the turn of the century, and for many years the Federal Government has been at work on a limited basis, trying to combat it and stop it from spreading.

It is generally believed that the chief offender among these growths—the water hyacinth—was brought here from South America during the New Orleans Cotton Exposition in 1884. The beautiful purple bloom of the hyacinth made quite a hit at this fair and the people brought samples of it back home with them and planted them in the ponds and bayous of Louisiana. It has flourished and spread ever since.

The water hyacinth grows rapidly and floats on top of the water. The wind blows the plants together to form mats that in time will obstruct navigation. The alligator weed in recent years has been vying with the hyacinth as an obstructor of waterborne traffic.

Congress put the Corps of Engineers on the job back in 1897 to eliminate the marine growth menace. Since that time they have used pitchforks, conveyors, arsenic, crushing machines, flamethrowers, saw boats and modern chemicals in an effort to stem the tide. So far, the combined efforts of all of these things, while successful in keeping the water traffic moving, have represented a losing battle from the standpoint of confining and destroying the growths.

At first, the hyacinths were limited to Louisiana. They now can be found in seven other States: Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Texas. At first they could not live in brackish water; they have now acclimated themselves and are prepared to go anywhere. It is high time to do something of sufficient magnitude before this local problem grown into a sectional problem becomes national.

Back in 1945 the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, by resolution, requested the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the water hyacinth situation and submit a report to Congress. That report has now been prepared and the Chief of Engineers has recommended that, in addition to the regular maintenance work being done to keep traffic floating in growth infested waters, a separate comprehensive project be authorized to provide for control and progressive eradication of the water hyacinth, alligator weed, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the eight States I have already mentioned. This project would be in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation and public health. It is estimated it would take 5 years at an annual cost of $1,350,000 to accomplish the job. Twenty-five percent of this amount would be contributed by local interests. This expenditure would be in addition to the approximate $300,000 now being spent yearly to keep the streams open.

While up to this time the engineers have been fighting a losing battle as far as eradication is concerned, it has been due to the fact that, because of limited authority, they were not able to go after the plants wherever they grew. This bill will give them the authority to go into the feeder streams as well as the main streams and permit them to tackle the job on an all-out basis.

It is imperative that we approach this job on an all-out basis without further delay. The annual average damage caused by the growths in Louisiana has increased until it is now $37,993,000. In Florida, Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi it is already up to $5 million. The longer we delay a full-scale program of eradication, the more expensive and difficult it will become.

Operating on limited facilities, the Corps of Engineers has made great strides in developing both mechanical and chemical means to fight the marine growth menace. It is my feeling that, with sufficient authority and funds, they can complete the job.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENT

Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. HUMPHREY) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. YOUNG submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability-insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 7225, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit two amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend the Social Security Act.

The first is very simple. It would permit the States, if they wished to do so, to disregard earned income up to the amount of $50 per month in determining need for old-age assistance. Last year, the Legislature of Illinois passed an act, which was signed by Governor Stratton, which authorized the Illinois Commission to disregard earned income up to $50 per month, in the event Federal law or regulations permit such exemption. This amendment would enable the act of the State of Illinois to go into effect.

It is surely desirable to leave in the law some incentive to older workers to earn as much of their livelihoods as possible—or, at least, to permit the States to do so if they believe it wise.

In view of the generally low levels of assistance payments, this provision will allow some increase in the meager living standards of recipients of such aid where they are willing to work for it.

The second amendment may seem more complex but it also is in fact rather

simple. It would permit an individual, either man or woman, to retire at any age from 60 to 72, receiving old age and survivors insurance benefits based on a percentage of the existing benefit at age 65; a smaller percentage if retirement took place prior to age 65; and a larger percentage if retirement took place after age 65.

This seems to me a fundamental improvement in the law which I hope the Senate may consider with great care.

I believe that this amendment would provide greater flexibility in the Social Security Act by permitting persons in poor health, but not totally and permanently disabled, to retire before reaching age 65 and, at the same time, it would encourage persons who are able and willing to do so, to work beyond the age of 65, by providing larger pensions upon later retirement.

There would be little or no increase in the total cost of the system to the Federal Government by the adoption of this amendment. The percentages of the benefits at age 65 provided in the amendment are based upon actuarial tables of life expectancy, as determined by the National Office of Vital Statistics and the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. Each retired individual would receive approximately the same total amount of benefits as he or she would have received if retirement had taken place at age 65. In fact, there might be a small saving to the Government over the long run because I have drafted the amendment so that the percentages are based on even and identical increments for each year. This results in benefits that are at a slightly lower percentage at some ages than would be the case if the actuarial tables were followed exactly, but it obviously makes for simpler administration.

My amendment is drafted as an amendment to the Social Security Act as it now stands, and assumes a retirement age of 65 for both men and women. However, if the Senate sees fit to adopt the House provision to lower the retirement age for women to 62, the amendment could be readily adapted to conform to that provision.

At the other side of the dividing line of age, 65, it holds out a positive incentive to older persons to extend the period of their working life and postpone retirement. This, I believe, is good for the individual and of value to the Nation which strives for higher levels of production and standards of living.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CONSTRUCTION OF DRAINAGE WORKS ON FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECTS—HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on July 22 last year, the Senate approved S. 1534, a measure I sponsored, to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation projects. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had carefully considered this measure, and the committee action in reporting it was unanimous.

When Senate bill 1534 reached the House of Representatives it was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, although the bill contained no appropriation authorization. It is still pending before the House Appropriations Committee, and I am informed that no action is scheduled on it.

Meanwhile, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had considered and favorably reported a companion bill, House bill 6268. This measure was approved by the House of Representatives on March 5, and is now on the table in this body.

Mr. President, in view of the consideration already given to the subject matter and the principal provisions of H. R. 6268 by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, when it considered S. 1534, and in view of the favorable action of the Senate on it, I ask unanimous consent that H. R. 6268 be placed on the Senate Calendar without reference to a committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6268) to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects, was read twice by its title, and placed on the Calendar.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. JENNER:

Address delivered by him before the Abraham Lincoln Republican Club, at Chicago, Ill., on February 11, 1956.

Address entitled "Our Drift Toward World Government," delivered by him at patriotic rally under the auspices of For America, at New York City, on February 22, 1956.

Address delivered by Senator MCCARTHY at pro-America rally in New York City on February 22, 1956.

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from address delivered by him to the Wisconsin Young Republicans, at the University of Wisconsin, on March 6, 1956.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by Senator KEFAUVER, at Sigourney, Iowa, on February 27, 1956.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

Testimony by him on March 7, 1956, before Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Statement issued by him on March 8, 1956, advocating the nomination of Adlai Stevenson on the Democratic ticket to be President of the United States.

NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN & HARTFORD RAILROAD

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, various reports have come to my attention commenting on conditions existing in connection with the affairs of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad which I think are a source of some concern. They involve the question of whether the reductions in expenditures for maintenance have been too great, and whether they may have some effect upon the safety of transportation on the railroad. They also involve the question of whether the earnings of the railroad are overstated, and also whether a certain transaction in connection with the company's preferred stock entered into last November has had an unfortunate, deleterious effect upon the financial position of the railroad.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, a copy of a letter dated March 5, 1956, which I wrote to the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
March 5, 1956.

HON. ANTHONY F. ARPAIA,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ARPAIA: Certain conditions in the affairs of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad have been brought to my attention, and are the source of serious concern.

In brief, these conditions are:

1. There is an impression generally prevailing that for some time there has been a deficiency in the maintenance of the railroad and its equipment, which in turn is the result of reductions in expenditures for maintenance made by the company.

2. It has been suggested that the accounting procedures of the railroad, particularly during the last year, have permitted an overstatement in reported earnings, and in general have been inadequate to insure full disclosure to investors and the public concerning the financial conditions of the railroad and the results of its operations. In this connection, I enclose a copy of an article appearing in the February 13 issue of Barren's Weekly which discusses critically the accounting procedures followed by the railroad since the beginning of 1955.

3. From public announcements and otherwise I have been advised that since about the middle of 1954 the railroad has entered into certain agreements granting to purchasers of its outstanding preferred stock and its outstanding certificates of beneficial interest, the option to require the railroad to purchase such securities from them at prices in excess of the present market price of the securities in question. I have specific reference to the agreement announced November 21 by which a group headed by Union Securities Corp., which had acquired 131,385 shares of preferred stock from the Dumaine interests, acquired the right to require the railroad to repurchase such shares in the latter part of 1957 at a price of $70 per share. There is grave doubt as to the propriety of such an arrangement, which might involve an expenditure by the railroad of over $9 million, at a time when the railroad was seeking Government guaranty of a $10 million loan for flood repair.

The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad is a principal artery of the economy of the New England States. Any developments which might weaken either the physical or financial condition of that railroad must be a cause of serious concern to the people of New England and your Commission. Public concern with respect to the maintenance of railroad property and equipment is, of course, intensified by the unfortunate accidents on other railroad systems which have occurred recently.

I would therefore greatly appreciate it if you would give me a report with respect

to the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, with particular reference to the circumstances outlined above, to the extent of the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission with regard to these matters, the nature and extent of the investigations which you have made or are making in this connection, and the facts disclosed by such investigations, together with advice of any action which your Commission is taking with respect thereto.

Sincerely yours,

PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senate.

THE LARGEST POWERPLANT

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the Oil City Derrick of March 7, 1956, contained a very interesting editorial on the subject of the largest powerplant ever erected. The cost of the plant when it is completed will be $400 million. It is the largest plant for the production of electricity ever erected at one time. It will produce more electricity than is used in the entire city of New York. It is being built by private funds.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIGGEST POWERPLANT

Work is in the finishing stages on an electric power project on the Ohio River. And certain facts about this project are newsworthy by any standard.

It has but one customer—an Atomic Energy Commission plant.

It is the largest power project ever built at one time.

It is producing more electricity than is used by the entire city of New York.

Its cost, when completed, will be in the neighborhood of $400 million.

Those who hear of this for the first time might well believe that it is being built by the Government. For over the long years we have been told that only Government is capable of undertaking the biggest and costliest power systems.

But truth and propaganda are not always the same. This project is being built by a group of business-managed, investor-owned electric companies. All of the money is private money, voluntarily invested. There are no taxpayer subsidies. And the project will pay heavy taxes on whatever earnings it makes—where, by contrast, Government plants are either wholly tax-free or largely so.

The moral? No job is too big for taxpaying private enterprise in the power field.

ONE THOUSAND YEARS OF CHRISTIANITY IN UKRAINE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this period of observance of the 38th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, declared on January 22, 1918, is a most fitting occasion for us to observe, too, the 1,000-year existence of Christianity in this great non-Russian country, now held captive in the empire of the Soviet Union. With its beginnings in the 10th century, Christianity in Ukraine has been the major spiritual force binding the courageous people of this nation in periods of both independence and alien captivity. It continues relentlessly as the paramount force welding the lives of over 40 million Ukrainians in their heroic struggle against atheistic Communist tyranny and for the national independence of their country.

This momentous event of 1,000 years of Christianity in Ukraine was appropriately celebrated in this country on September 5 last, in Stamford, Conn. Arranged by the Most Reverend Archbishop Constantine Bohachevsky, of Philadelphia, and under the direct supervision of the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn, O. S. B. M., of Stamford, this glorious celebration of a national tradition, founded by the holy baptism of St. Olga, princess of Ukraine, at Kiev in A. D. 955, was greatly inspired by the prayers and hopeful messages of numerous eminent personages in the Catholic hierarchy of America.

It is my happy privilege to introduce into the RECORD a number of these wonderful messages of Christian hope and charity for a people whose enduring faith will unquestionably overcome their present state of imperialist and colonial captivity under the foreign yoke of Moscow. I should like to include, too, an introductory statement to these messages prepared by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Soviet economics in the Graduate School of Georgetown University, and also chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

This statement by Dr. Dobriansky emphasizes the need for the adoption of Senate Resolution 189, submitted by my esteemed colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. The measure calls for Senate disapproval and condemnation of Russian Communist acts of religious persecution and genocide in Ukraine. It provides also that the Senate request the President of the United States to take proper action, through our delegation in the United Nations, for the placement of this matter on the agenda of the U. N. Assembly. I heartily join in the support of this measure, and am sure that other Senators will do likewise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following the statement I have just made, a statement by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky and a memorandum in regard to the independence of the Ukraine, together with certain telegrams and letters to the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn, in regard to the 38th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine and the Christian tradition of the Ukraine.

There being no objection, the statement, memorandum, and communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT BY DR. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY

The impressive messages that were received on the occasion of the solemn observance of 1,000 years of Christianity in Ukraine furnish eloquent testimony to the superlative thoughts of the eminent Catholic scholar and philosopher of history, Father Don Luigi Sturzo. In his classic work on nationalism and internationalism, this world renowned scholar conclusively observes that the three great ideas which have shaped the history of mankind are religion, national independence, and liberty. These three majestic ideas constitute a veritable trinity of thought predicating moral and political action that necessarily must encompass the manifestation of all three in the harmonious existence of societies, nations, and peoples. To contemplate and act upon one embraces correlative contemplation and action upon the others—in the natural spirit of Amor Dei et Patriae.

In Ukraine, which today in its state of captivity is the largest non-Russian nation not only in the primary empire constituted by the Soviet Union, but also behind the European Iron Curtain, these fundamental ideas and natural drives have cast the very foundations of the sovereign existence of this nation. In their fixed interrelationship they have formed the essential source of strength and hope to the liberation movements of this freedom-loving people in different periods of enslavement under some imperialist foreign yoke. The contemporary struggle of the Ukrainian nation against the colonial and imperialist domination of Russian communism—highlighted by the gallant military defense of its independent state following World War I, the brave opposition of its intellectuals to the strangling centralization of colonial control by Moscow in the 1920's, the stern resistance of its hardy peasantry to the politico-economic collectivist measures of the foreign oppressor in the 1930's, the heroic battles of the famous patriotic and nationalist forces of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army against both Nazi German and Russian Communist totalitarianism in the 1940's, and the underground operations in political warfare against alien Moscow by all sections of its populace in this decade—draws its chief inspiration from the undying faith that Deo adjuvante, non timendum.

In the light of all this, is it little wonder that the religious institutions and clergies of Ukraine were the first and prime objects of attack and liquidation by Russian Communist totalitarianism This sordid story of our times is well described in summary form in the following memorandum which based a petition leading to Senate Resolution 189, submitted by the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. The many messages following this, received from the highest authorities in the Catholic Church here and abroad, were written in the intimate knowledge of this background on current Russian Communist policy of religious persecution and genocide.

The Ukrainian Catholic Church survives in the underground of Ukraine today. Its existence and free emergence are dependent on the reality of the three great ideas of history—religion, national independence and liberty. Priest and patriot are but one. In this country, hope and encouragement for the eventual liberation and freedom of Church, nation and people in Ukraine are steadfastly sustained by the prayers and work of the Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate of the United States of America. Under the great spiritual leadership and guidance of the Most Reverend Archbishop Constantine Bohachevsky and the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn, O. S. B. M., the faithful pursue this work in the certitude of its value to the basic national interests of our own country, the United States of America, and in the certain knowledge that for all nations, including Ukraine, Beata gens, cujus est Dominus Deus eorum.

MEMORANDUM

Christianity has been existing in Ukraine for more than 1,000 years. It has fostered a profound faith in God among the people, and has begotten abiding moral principles, and nourished a new culture and erudition.

In December 1917, Communist Russia invaded Ukraine and in 1919–20 occupied the eastern provinces of this country. The Soviets were bent on extirpating Christianity from these regions. In their coup d'etat they published aggressive antireligious propaganda and terrorized the people with threats of exile, torture, and death.

First, Communists attacked the church in eastern Ukraine. Within 10 years, from 1921 to 1931, they unjustly arrested and ruthlessly murdered 34 Ukrainian Orthodox bishops and more than 3,000 priests. Hundreds of thousands of the faithful were inhumanly tortured in prisons or deported to concentration camps in Siberia; a greater part of these innocent people died martyrs to their faith; the remainder still endures the appalling trials and hardships of imprisonment.

The Reds destroyed 80 percent of the churches (many of these churches contained precious historical relics, as for example the golden domed Michalivsky Monastery in Kiev from the 12th century); other churches were despicably converted into warehouses, theaters and convention halls; monasteries were outraged and cemeteries profaned.

By 1930 the Communists had completely liquidated the entire Ukrainian Orthodox Church, barring it from all public activity. Though article 123 of the Soviet Constitution, which is binding in Ukraine as well as the U. S. S. R., explicitly recognizes freedom of religion, yet, during the first Red occupation of western Ukraine (1939–41), the Communist regime overtly persecuted the church, arresting many Ukrainian priests and ruthlessly murdering 27 of them.

This antichristian terror adopted more hideous means of exterminating Christianity in Ukraine during the second occupation of this country beginning in 1945. On April 11, 1946, the Soviets arrested the Metropolitan of Halych and archbishop of Lvov, Joseph Slipyj, 80-year-old Bishop Gregory Khomyshyn, Bishop John Latyshevskyj, Bishop Nicholas Charnetsky, C. S. S. R., and Bishop Nykyta Budka. On June 25, 1946, Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovskyj, O. S. B. M., and Bishop Gregory Lakota were imprisoned. All these bishops were condemned to forced labor for 8 to 10 years and even life; the imputation was lawfully unjust. Some of these bishops (for instance Bishop Gregory Khomyshyn and Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovskyj) later died from maltreatment in prison. Still more, when Archbishop Joseph Slipyj's or other bishops's terms expired, the Reds would not release them from prison.

In the autumn of 1947, the Communists murdered Bishop Theodore Romza, Uzhorod, Carpathian Ukraine, and in 1950, the Bishops Paul Gojdich, O. S. B. M., and Basil Hopko, Pryashiv, Czechoslovakia, were imprisoned. On January 15, 1951, Bishop Paul Gojdich was tried and unjustly condemned to forced labor for life. Bishop Basil Hopko is now in a concentration camp.

Altogether, 10 Ukrainian Catholic bishops have been liquidated by the Reds.

In 1946, the Soviets enjoined the legal continuance of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine. Thus, in our own 20th century, it has been reduced to the sorrowful plight of the "Church of the Catacombs," as was the primitive church during the Neronian persecution.

Two thousand secular priests and monks, for rightfully refusing to acknowledge the patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church as their head—the church is now subservient to the Communists—were arrested and deported to slave labor camps. The Reds exterminated all five dioceses of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, desecrated 4,400 of its churches and chapels together with 195 religious houses. The Communists continue to oppress mercilessly the Ukrainian laity for remaining steadfast to its Christian heritage, church and faith.

VATICAN CITY, *August 21, 1955.*

Archbishop BOHACHEVSKY,
Philadelphia, Pa.:

Auspicious occasion 10th centenary baptism St. Olga, Holy Father again expresses paternal affection beloved Ukrainian Catholics sends cordial felicitations lovingly imparts your excellency clergy faithful attending centenary ceremonies special apostolic benediction.

DELLACQUA,
Substitute.

BRIGHTON, MASS., *August 15, 1955.*

Most. Rev. AMBROSE SENYSHYN, O. S. B. M.,
Stamford, Conn.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: The 1,000th anniversary of the introduction of Catholic Christianity into the Ukraine by Olga, Saint and Princess, should surely be an occasion for rejoicing.

Yet there are countless Ukrainians in our day who cannot rejoice. They are not free to participate in any observance of this anniversary. They have seen their churches destroyed. Bishops, priests, and lay people have been subjected to oppression, imprisonment, persecution, and martyrdom. And the reason for all the inhuman barbarity on the part of their enemies, is this: The passionate devotion of the Ukrainian people to Jesus Christ and to His church.

To the Ukrainians gathered in Stamford for the observance of this anniversary, in a land where all may freely worship God, I send my congratulations. And at the same time I exhort them to pray—constantly and fervently, that God will give their persecuted brothers and sisters the strength to sustain them in this tragic hour of trial.

To the Ukrainians in lands where they now suffer and die for their faith—if in some way my words may reach them—I send a message of hope. The struggle in which you are engaged is bitter. As members of Christ's mystical body you are being scourged and crucified. But have confidence in Him who has overcome the world. Never surrender to evil, nor compromise the truth. As with Jesus Christ, the glory of the Resurrection followed the agony of the crucifixion, so too the day will surely come in God's good time when your crown of thorns will be transformed into a crown of glory.

With best personal wishes to Your Excellency, I remain,

Fraternally yours in Christ,
RICHARD J. CUSHING,
Archbishop of Boston.

AUGUST 20 1955.

Most Rev. AMBROSE SENYSHYN, O. S. B. M.,
Stamford, Conn.

MY DEAR BISHOP SENYSHYN: I thank you for you letter of the 11th of August in which you tell me about the celebration on September 5, 1955, in Stamford, Conn., under the patronage and auspices of the Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate of the United States of America, of the millennium which has passed since Saint Olga, Princess of Ukraine, received holy baptism in the year 955 at Kiev and became the instrument in the hands of Almighty God for the conversion of her people to holy church. When we look back over this millennium our hearts are filled with gratitude, and we are thankful to our Ukrainian Catholics for the edification which they have given in their devotion to holy church and in their Catholic lives.

Today we are fortunate in having 400,000 of these good Catholic Ukrainians in the United States, who worship God in their own historical Byzantine Slavonic Rite. Here they are enriching the church in our country. A certain sadness comes over all of us when we celebrate this millennium. Back of the Iron Curtain, on Ukrainian soil, the church is persecuted, and thousands of Ukrainian Catholics will not enjoy the opportunity of celebrating as they would like to celebrate this important millennium in their history. If here in the United States we enjoy freedom in the practice of our religion and have, with the grace of God, been a loyal Catholic people, we realize our duty to our brothers in the Ukraine who today are being persecuted and denied their native right to practice their religion according to the dictates of their conscience.

When you sing in your solemn pontifical mass on the 5th of September the beautiful prayers of your liturgy and give thanks to God for His blessings and favors, you will also sing a plaintive prayer begging God in His mercy and goodness to bless our brothers with their bishops and priests of the Ukraine and to hasten the day when they once again will be able in all the glory and majesty of their liturgy to pray and worship in freedom and be a challenge in their Catholic lives to all the world. We must not forget that our suffering brothers who are so near to us today in the church in their steadfastness in their devotion to holy church are really enriching the church as the martyrs enriched the church. As we thank Almighty God for the gifts which He has given us, we must not forget that these gifts come to us, at least in great part, in answer to the prayers of our suffering brothers in the Ukraine. The church always must have Calvaries, and out of Calvaries there come Easter Sundays. In the communion of saints these suffering brothers of ours are contributing richly to us, and as we pray for an Easter Sunday for them we thank God for the contribution which they are making to all of us in the communion of saints.

May I thank you and Archbishop Bohachevsky for arranging this celebration and calling to our minds this important millennium? I shall be with you in spirit, and as you sing your beautiful liturgical prayers I am sure that God will continue to bless you and your people and to shower down His precious gifts on our suffering brothers in the Ukraine.

Sincerely yours in Christ,
SAMUEL CARDINAL STRITCH,
Archbishop of Chicago.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *August 16, 1955.*

His Excellency the Most Reverend AMBROSE SENYSHYN, O. S. B. M.,
Auxiliary Bishop, Vicar General, Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate, United States of America, Stamford, Conn.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: I note that the faithful of the Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate of the United States are prepared to commemorate in fitting fashion the 1,000th anniversary of the conversion of St. Olga to the Faith.

The conversion of St. Olga from paganism to Christianity marks a significant date in the history of the Ukrainian people. She embraced the faith in the year 955 at a time when Christianity was characterized by unbroken unity under the supreme authority of the Holy Father.

Particularly now since the Ukrainian nation is unable to celebrate this memorable anniversary as it would wish to do, it is inspiring to know that the faithful of Ukrainian descent in the United States plan to observe it with fitting solemnity.

I join with you in spirit and pray that the pristine faith received by St. Olga may be restored speedily to the entire Ukrainian nation.

Sincerely yours in Christ,
JOHN F. DEARDEN,
Bishop of Pittsburgh.

DETROIT, MICH., *August 25, 1955.*

Most Rev. AMBROSE SENYSHYN, D. D.
Auxiliary Bishop of the Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate,
Stamford, Conn.

MY DEAR BISHOP SENYSHYN: I am very happy to join in spirit with Archbishop Bohachevsky, yourself, and your devoted Ukrainian Catholics in commemorating the 1,000th anniversary of the baptism of St. Olga and the beginnings of Christianity in the Ukraine.

This anniversary will give occasion to recall with joy the agelong devotion of your forefathers to the Catholic faith and the Byzantine Slavonic rite. It also affords an

opportunity of citing with pride the endurance of persecution, even unto death, on the part of those who are near and dear to you. With admiration for the heroic fidelity of your brethren in the homeland, bishops, priests, and the laity, under the most protracted and brutal attempt in history to rob them of their faith, I join with you in prayer that, through the mercy of God and the intercession of St. Olga, right may, in the end, triumph over might in the only kind of peace that can endure.

Cordially yours in Christ,

EDWARD CARL MOONEY,
Archbishop of Detroit.

NEW YORK, *August 22, 1955.*

His Excellency, Most Rev. AMBROSE SENYSHYN, O. S. B. M.,
Auxiliary Bishop, Vicar General, Stamford, Conn.

DEAR BISHOP SENYSHYN: I thank you very much for the notice which you give me that under the leadership of your Exarch, the Most Reverend Archbishop Constantine Bohachevsky, the people of Ukrainian nationality will observe the 1,000th year anniversary of the beginning of the spread of Catholic Christianity in the Ukraine.

I am pleased to assure you of my participation with you in union of prayers of thanksgiving for the blessing that is ours in the United States of freedom to practice our religion, and at the same time I pray that the same freedom will be available to all peoples throughout the world.

With best wishes and kindest regards, I am

Very sincerely yours in Christ,

CARDINAL SPELLMAN,
Archbishop of New York.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *August 30, 1955.*

The Most Reverend AMBROSE SENYSHYN, O. S. B. M.,
Stamford, Conn.

DEAR BISHOP SENYSHYN: In reply to your letter of August 11, I am happy to assure your excellency that we join with you in your prayer of thanksgiving commemorating the 1,000th year anniversary of the conversion of the Ukrainian people. We unite with you particularly in thanksgiving for the great spirit of loyalty and devotion to the one true faith practiced according to the Byzantine Slavonic Rite which St. Olga introduced with her baptism into the Ukraine. May our prayer of thanksgiving help to alleviate, and in God's good time bring to an end the inhuman persecution being perpetrated today on Ukraine soil.

With renewed best wishes and congratulations on this significant anniversary and with kindest personal greetings and best wishes, I beg to remain

Very sincerely yours in Christ,

ALBERT G. MEYER,
Archbishop of Milwaukee.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 27, 1955.*

His Excellency, the Most Reverend AMBROSE SENYSHYN, O. S. B. M.,
Auxiliary Bishop, Vicar General, Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate, U. S. A., Stamford, Conn.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: It is a privilege to be associated with our fellow Catholics of the Byzantine Slavonic Rite and to extend to them, in the name of the clergy and laity of the Archdiocese of Washington, fraternal greetings on the occasion of the one thousandth anniversary of the conversion of St. Olga of the Ukraine.

For a thousand years, the Catholics of the Byzantine Slavonic Rite have given an inspiring example to the Christian world of heroic devotion to the cause of Christ despite the most inhuman type of persecution. This example has never been more inspiring than during these days when the clergy and laity have literally been identified with our crucified Savior during the persecution by the atheistic Communists.

While expressing our unbounded admiration of these glorious confessors of the faith in the midst of a godless power, we join with you in prayer begging the almighty and merciful God to continue to pour forth his consolations and blessings on all the members of the Byzantine Slavonic Rite especially those who are suffering for their profession of His Name.

With sentiments of deep respect and esteem, I am

Sincerely yours in Christ,

PATRICK A. O'BOYLE,
Archbishop of Washington.

AUGUST 15, 1955.

His Excellency, Most Rev. AMBROSE SENYSHYN, O. S. B. M.,
Auxiliary Bishop, Vicar General, Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate, U. S. A., Stamford, Conn.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: Yesterday I had the great happiness of presiding at an open air Mass in the Ukrainian parish in Boston. Priests of several different Oriental rites gathered with the Ukrainian priests to sing the praises of God and to return thanks for the mercies which He has given your people here in our part of the world.

It is therefore with the more lively understanding of the sentiments of gratitude which prompt the forthcoming plans for the celebration in Stamford that I write you these few lines of greeting and prayerful best wishes. What a great blessing it is that we should be free, as we are here, to unite with one another in prayer and in thanksgiving to God! But also, what a responsibility it imposes upon us to use our freedom and to offer our prayers to the end that we may help our kinsmen in other parts of the world who are less favored than we so far as freedom is concerned but no less attached to the ancient faith which has been the strength of the Ukrainian people across these thousand years.

In union of prayer and with kindest personal remembrance, I am

Faithfully yours in Christ,

JOHN J. WRIGHT,
Bishop of Worcester.

One thousand years ago, St. Olga, Princess of Ukraine, embraced the cross and the faith of Christ in the city of Kiev.

To the Ukraine people, in their long history, has come the lot of having the glory of its faith proclaimed throughout the land before it had its Good Friday under the Bolshevik persecution. Nevertheless, we know that in the rhythm of the life of the church, Good Fridays and Easter Sundays oscillate, but there never is a cross without a crown.

Four hundred thousand descendants of the Ukraine people now live in this land of liberty. Though they rejoice in the independence which America gives them, may they never break that sweet dependence on their fatherland which has preserved the faith through these 10 centuries and 10,000 crucifixions.

I join with you in prayer that the Communist sickle which has cut Ukrainian young life like wheat, and the Communist hammer which has beaten down icons from their tabernacles, may through our prayers, be transfigured so that the sickle will look like the moon under the lady's feet and the hammer will look like the cross from which Christ will forgive His persecutors.

Most Reverend FULTON J. SHEEN,
National Director, the Society for the Propagation of the Faith.

PROGRESS OF THE SOVIETS IN AIR ATOMIC POWER

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have on many occasions on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere drawn attention to the great and ever-growing superiority of the Soviets over us in the matter of air atomic power. The relative strength of Soviet air atomic power as compared to ours has now, from all reports, reached startling proportions. I understand that the testimony presented to the congressional Armed Forces Committees by the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of the Air Staff pinpoints how great is the gap now existing between Soviet and United States atomic air power; and it appears that we are doing very little, if, indeed, anything, to narrow the gap.

The disturbing and dangerous situation now unhappily confronting us has been vividly and forcefully described by the distinguished columnists, Joseph and Stewart Alsop, in a highly important article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Wednesday, March 7. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks. The article deserves the careful thought and consideration of every Member of Congress and of the whole American public.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

THEY ADMIT IT

WASHINGTON.—In recent testimony before executive sessions of both the Congressional Armed Services Committees, the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of the Air Staff have now officially confirmed all the darkest unofficial reports about the relative status of American and Soviet air-atomic power.

The following items from this sworn testimony of Air Force Secretary Donald Quarles and Gen. Nathan Twining, will be enough to give the general picture.

Item: It has long been reported that this country was lagging far behind the Soviet Union in production of long-range jet bombers; but Quarles and Twining at last revealed how enormous the lag really is. It can be stated on undoubted authority that they gave our current output of B–52 bombers as only 4 per month, and in contrast stated that Soviet output of the comparable Bison bombers was almost certainly 3 times as large.

These current monthly output rates of 4 B–52's against 12 Bisons, do not tell the whole story either. Quarles and Twining further admitted that we would not reach our planned peak output of 17 B–52's per month for at least another year and a half. The Soviets are working toward a peak output of 25 Bisons per month, and they will reach their high peak considerably sooner than we shall reach our much lower peak.

Item: It has also been reported, for the first time in this space, that the Soviets were already flight testing a ballistic missile of 1,500-mile range. No comparable ballistic missile has as yet passed the drawing-board stage in this country. Once again, on undoubted authority, it can now be stated that Secretary Quarles and General Twining admitted these facts, stating they had sure evidence that the Soviets were, indeed, testing a 1,500-mile ballistic missile.

Item: It has also been reported that the Soviets' Farmer day fighter and Flashlight night fighter were advanced designs of high quality; that these Farmers and Flashlights were already being produced in substantial quantities; and that no comparable advanced American fighter aircraft had yet entered

the stage of serious quantity production. Again on undoubted authority, it can be stated that Quarles and Twining admitted these facts, too.

Our really superior F-104 day fighter is not in production at all. Our only good night fighter, the F-102, is being produced in tiny trickles. Our rather unsatisfactory F-100 day fighter, which may well not offer adequate opposition to the Soviet "Bison," is officially in quantity production, but the quantities being produced are still trivial. Meanwhile, the Soviets' output of "Farmers" and "Flashlights" will shortly be counted in many scores per month.

Our stock of nuclear weapons remains far greater than the Soviet stock, and will no doubt always remain far greater. But their nuclear stockpile is now approching decisive proportions. Meanwhile, they are presently well ahead of us in the best type of bombers that must deliver the bombs, in the fighters that must intercept the bombers, and in the medium range ballistic missiles which foreshadow the ultimate weapon, the missile of intercontinental range. That is the present picture, as officially outlined.

In these circumstances, Air Secretary Quarles' testimony about the Air Force budget itself was truly remarkable. The Air Force General Staff, he admitted, had originally proposed a minimum budget of $20 billion. He had himself cut the Air Staff request to $18,500,000,000, which he seemed personally to have regarded as rockbottom. But Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson nonetheless ordered a further slash, to $16,-500,000,000. And Quarles yielded to Wilson, although he said this final concession to the Treasury and Budget Bureau really did make the Air Force budget "very austere indeed."

Quarles still further admitted that this "austere budget" was crowded with "one-shot savings" which could not be repeated next year. Because of this heavy borrowing from next year's Peter to pay election year's Paul, Quarles testified that the Air Force budget would have to be massively increased next year unless the strength of the Air Force was instead heavily reduced.

Meanwhile, there was no talk whatever, except from the shocked Senators and Representatives, about a great emergency effort to overcome the air lead the Soviets have now achieved. Secretary Quarles took refuge in a cloud of technicalities. The unhappy General Twining contented himself with saying we still retained greater air atomic power than the Soviet Union as of now, with melancholy emphasis on the "as of now."

But what about 2 years, or 3 years, or 4 years from now, when it will be too late to catch up, and the Soviet air lead really begins to produce decisive results?

RETURN TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES IN REGULATION OF FOREIGN TRADE AND NATIONAL ECONOMY—NO HIGH OR LOW TARIFF

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Washington News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, published in its issue of March 6 an editorial which should not go unchallenged.

I know Mr. Roy Howard and several members of the Scripps family, including a son, Edward W. Scripps II, who is a resident of my State. I know that they would want their editorials to reflect accurate reporting.

The editorial reads in part as follows:

It might seem strange, therefore, that spokesmen for the high tariff movement should be urging Congress to oppose United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. The OTC is nothing more than the administrative agency in which we work with other countries to carry out our reciprocal agreements.

Mr. President, this body should know that the Office of Trade Cooperation—OTC—is presented in very cleverly worded proposed legislation.

If the Congress approves this proposed legislation, the Congress approves the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, under which the constitutional responsibility of Congress was transferred to Geneva in 1947 by the President. If it is not approved by the Congress then the operation goes on in Geneva under the auspices of GATT.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act not only transferred the constitutional responsibility of Congress to regulate foreign trade and the national economy to the President—but carried full authority for the President to transfer such responsibility to any nation on earth under the auspices of any organization which he may cause to be organized. The Secretary of State testified to that fact before the Senate Finance Committee in 1955—and further, that the regulation of any foreign trade through the adjustment of tariffs has been accomplished through GATT at Geneva since 1947—and would continue regardless of any action or lack of action on the legislation creating the Office of Trade Cooperation—OTC. The State Department spearheaded the organization of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in 1947; and under that organization the authority to regulate our foreign trade was transferred to Geneva, Switzerland.

It could just as well have been transferred to Peiping, China, or Moscow, and could still be transferred there under the provisions of that bill, or under the OTC if passed by Congress.

NO DELIBERATE MISREPRESENTATION

Mr. President, I am sure it is not a deliberate misrepresentation, but it is a "trick" bill, since if the OTC is approved, it means that Congress will approve what is now being done, and has been done for 24 years.

If Congress does not approve it, GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, will continue in exactly the same manner as it has operated since 1947. The Secretary of State has so testified before the Senate Finance Committee.

At this time—under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva—deliberately organized and placed there by a President of the United States in 1947—35 nations, of which we are one, are dividing our markets between them through the simple expedient of continued multilateral agreements to continued lowering of our tariffs.

REVERT TO CONSTITUTION

On January 12, I introduced a bill (S. 2926) which would revert to the Constitution of the United States the regulation of foreign trade and the national economy, under article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

NO HIGH OR LOW TARIFF

Those of us who believe in the regulation of foreign trade in accordance with the Constitution, by the Congress through its agent, the United States Tariff Commission, are not for high tariffs or low tariffs.

We are for a duty or tariff which represents the difference between the wage-standard of living, the taxes and cost of doing business here, as compared with the costs in the competitive nation, on each product.

The Tariff Commission is equipped to do the job. The bill which I introduced on January 12 would accomplish that purpose in accordance with the Constitution.

DETERMINING FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the bill (S. 2926) to which I have referred printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the bill (S. 2926) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DELARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress—

(a) to facilitate and encourage trade with foreign nations on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

(b) to maintain an investment climate through the principle applying equally to the whole country.

(c) to provide necessary flexibility of import duties thereby making possible appropriate adjustments in response to changing economic conditions;

(d) to assure the accomplishment of these objectives by returning to the provisions of the Constitution (art. 1, sec. 8) in the control over American import duties now subject to international agreements.

RESTATEMENT OF EXISTING IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 2. Title I, paragraphs 1 to 1559, inclusive, of the Tariff Act of 1930 are hereby amended by repealing the classifications and rates therein contained and substituting therefor the classifications and rates obtaining and in effect on the expiration of 90 days after the date of enactment of this act, by reason of proclamations of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or otherwise; and all other acts and parts of acts inconsistent with any of the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

ADMINISTRATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

SEC. 3. Title III, part II, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by adding after section 331 the following new section:

"SEC. 331a. Administration of trade agreements.

"(a) All powers vested in, delegated to, or otherwise properly exercisable by the President or any other officer or agency of the United States in respect to the foreign trade agreements entered into pursuant to section 350 of this act are hereby transferred to (and shall be exercisable by the Commission, including, but not limited to, the right to invoke the various escape clauses, reservations, and options therein contained, and to exercise on behalf of the United States any rights or privileges therein provided for the protection of the interests of the United States.

"(b) The Commission is hereby authorized and directed—

"(1) to terminate as of the next earliest date therein provided, and in accordance with the terms thereof, all the foreign trade agreements entered into by the United States pursuant to section 350 of this act;

"(2) to prescribe, upon termination of any foreign trade agreement, that the import duties established therein shall remain the

same as existed prior to such termination, and such import duties shall not thereafter be increased or reduced except in accordance with this act."

PERIODIC ADJUSTMENT OF IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 4. Title III, part II, section 336, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 336. Periodic adjustment of import duties.

"(a) The Commission is authorized and directed from time to time, and subject to the limitations hereinafter provided, to prescribe and establish import duties which will, within equitable limits, provide for fair and reasonable competition between domestic articles and like or similar foreign articles in the principal market or markets of the United States. A foreign article shall be considered as providing fair and reasonable competition to United States producers of a like or similar article if the Commission finds as a fact that the landed duty paid price of the foreign article in the principal market or markets in the United States is a fair price, including a reasonable profit to the importers, and is not substantially below the price, including a reasonable profit for the domestic producers, at which the like or similar domestic articles can be offered to consumers of the same class by the domestic industry in the principal market or markets in the United States.

"(b) In determining whether the landed duty paid price of a foreign article, including a fair profit for the importers, is, and may continue to be, a fair price under subdivision (a) of this section, the Commission shall take into consideration, insofar as it finds it practicable—

"(1) The lowest, highest, average, and median landed duty paid price of the article from foreign countries offering substantial competition;

"(2) Any change that may occur or may reasonably be expected in the exchange rates of foreign countries either by reason of devaluation or because of a serious unbalance of international payments;

"(3) The policy of foreign countries designed substantially to increase exports to the United States by selling at unreasonably low and uneconomic prices to secure additional dollar credits;

"(4) Increases or decreases of domestic production and of imports on the basis of both unit volume of articles produced and articles imported, and the respective percentages of each;

"(5) The actual and potential future ratio of volume and value of imports to volume and value of production, respectively;

"(6) The probable extent and duration of changes in production costs and practices;

"(7) The degree to which normal cost relationships may be affected by grants, subsidies (effected through multiple rates of export exchange, or otherwise), excises, export taxes, or other taxes, or otherwise, in the country of origin and any other factors either in the United States or in other countries which appear likely to affect production costs and competitive relationships.

"(c) Decreases or increases in import duties designed to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign and domestic articles may be made by the Commission either upon its own motion or upon application of any person or group showing adequate and proper interest in the import duties in question: *Provided, however,* That no change in any import duty shall be ordered by the Commission until after it shall have first conducted a full investigation and presented tentative proposals followed by a public hearing at which interested parties have an opportunity to be heard.

"(d) The Commission, in setting import duties so as to establish fair and reasonable competition as herein provided, may, in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, prescribe specific duties or ad valorem rates of duty upon the foreign value or export value as defined in sections 402 (c) and 402 (d) of this act or upon the United States value as defined in section 402 (e) of this act.

"(e) In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Commission is authorized to transfer any article from the dutiable list to the free list, or from the free list to the dutiable list.

"(f) Any increase or decrease in import duties ordered by the Commission shall become effective 90 days after such order is announced: *Provided,* That any such order is first submitted to Congress by the Commission and is not disapproved, in whole or in part, by concurrent resolution of Congress within 60 days thereafter.

"(g) No order shall be announced by the Commission under the section which increases existing import duties on foreign articles if the Commission finds as a fact that the domestic industry operates, or the domestic article is produced, in a wasteful, inefficient, or extravagant manner.

"(h) The Commission, in the manner provided for in subdivisions (c) and (f) in this section, may impose quantitative limits on the importation of any foreign article, in such amounts, and for such periods, as it finds necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided, however,* That no such quantitative limit shall be imposed contrary to the provisions of any foreign trade agreement in effect pursuant to section 350 of this act.

"(i) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) the term 'domestic article' means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States; and the term 'foreign article' means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of a foreign country;

"(2) the term 'United States' includes the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia;

"(3) the term 'foreign country' means any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision or subdivisions thereof (other than the United States and its possessions);

"(4) the term 'landed duty paid price' means the price of any foreign article after payment of the applicable customs or import duties and other necessary charges, as represented by the acquisition cost to an importing consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, or the offering price to a consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, if imported by an agent.

"(j) The Commission is authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for carrying out its functions under the provisions of this section.

"(k) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the entry and declaration of foreign articles with respect to which a change in basis of value has been made under the provisions of subdivision (d) of this section, and for the form of invoice required at time of entry."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 337

SEC. 5. Title III, part II, section 337, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Subdivision (a) thereof by striking out the word "President" and substituting therefor the words "Tariff Commission."

(b) Subdivision (b) thereof is hereby repealed.

(c) Subdivision (d) thereof is hereby repealed.

(d) Subdivision (e) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) Exclusion of articles from entry: Whenever the existence of any such unfair method or act shall be established to the satisfaction of the Commission, it shall direct that the articles concerned in such unfair methods or acts, imported by any person violating the provisions of this act, shall be excluded from entry into the United States, and upon information of such action by the Commission, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, through the proper officers, refuse such entry."

(e) Subdivision (f) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Entry under bond: Whenever the Commission has reason to believe that any article is offered or sought to be offered for entry into the United States in violation of this section, but has not information sufficient to satisfy it thereof, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon its request in writing, forbid entry thereof until such investigation as the Commission may deem necessary shall be completed; except that such articles shall be entitled to entry under bond prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury."

(f) Subdivision (g) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(g) Continuance of exclusion: Any refusal of entry under this section shall continue in effect until the Commission shall find and advise the Secretary of the Treasury that the conditions which led to such refusal of entry no longer exist."

STATISTICAL ENUMERATION

SEC. 6. Title IV, part III, section 484 (e), of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) Statistical enumeration: The Chairman of the Tariff Commission is authorized and directed to establish from time to time, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, a statistical enumeration of imported articles in such detail as he may consider necessary and desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act. As a part of each entry there shall be attached thereto or included therein an accurate statement giving details required for such statistical enumeration. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to make such reasonable and proper digests from, and compilations of, such statistical data as the Chairman requests. In the event of a disagreement between the Chairman and the Secretary of Commerce as to the reasonable and proper nature of any request the matter shall be referred to the President, whose decision shall be final."

REVISED TEXT OF TARIFF ACT

SEC. 7. The Tariff Commission, as soon as practicable, shall prepare and cause to be printed as a public document available for public distribution a complete revised text of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended: *Provided,* That all acts or parts of acts conflicting herewith are hereby repealed.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 8. This act shall take effect upon the expiration of 90 days after the date of its enactment; but no foreign trade agreement shall be entered into under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, after the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. MALONE. Today 35 nations, of which we are one, sit around the table in Geneva regulating our foreign trade and our national economy in direct contravention to the Constitution of the United States.

EQUAL ACCESS FOR AMERICANS TO OUR OWN AMERICAN MARKETS

The 1930 Tariff Act specifically established a flexible duty or tariff principle—to be adjusted on the principle of fair and reasonable competition—to give Americans equal access to American markets.

Such duties or tariffs to be adjusted to represent the difference in wage-living standards and costs of doing business here and abroad—to be lowered as the standard of living rises in the competitive countries.

On this principle no foreign nation should have any tariff at all on imports from this country. However, all foreign nations have raised their own duties or tariffs to fully protect their own investors and workingmen.

PROCEDURE IN CONSIDERATION OF TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, under the rules of the Senate, an appropriation bill is supposed to lie over for three calendar days. However, I note that yesterday, without first having a quorum call, the Senate proceeded to consider House bill 9064, providing for an appropriation of $3,618,699,000 for the Treasury and Post Office Department.

At the time the bill was considered, the printed bill had been before the Senate for only a few minutes. It had not been available to the membership of the Senate for examination.

I consider that an irresponsible manner for the Senate to discharge its duties. In order that it may not happen again, I file notice that I shall object to any future action of this kind. I call my objection to the attention of both the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and ask that in the consideration of any appropriation bills in the future they be allowed to lie over for 3 days in accordance with the rule.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent was given yesterday for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I recognize that; but I also recognize that unanimous consent was given without a previous quorum call. Therefore, Members of the Senate were not put on notice. The bill was not available to Members of the Senate. We had a situation in which the Senate was approving an appropriation bill containing appropriations of $3½ billion, with respect to which the membership knew nothing. I consider it an irresponsible manner for us to discharge our duties; and, as one Member of the Senate, I am filing a permanent objection to any future consideration of appropriation bills which are not allowed to lie over in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

THE COTTON EXPORT PROGRAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, recently I have been reading in the press about a letter which the Secretary of Agriculture is supposed to have written me, relative to a cotton program which the Department of Agriculture hopes will be put into effect.

I did receive such a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, under date of March 2, 1956. In order that there may be no further guesswork as to what was said in that letter, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, *March 2, 1956.*

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate.

DEAR GEORGE: As you know, I announced a cotton export program on February 28 which we are hoping will be helpful in moving more American cotton into export markets. I want to thank you and the Senators from the Cotton States, with whom we have discussed this question, for your assistance in helping to work out this program.

I understand there is some concern regarding the Department's position on S. 3183 and possible action we might take with respect to the level of price support for cotton in 1956.

The action of the Department naturally will be contingent upon the provisions of any bill that is passed by the Congress and enacted into law affecting 1956 and subsequent years. As you know, S. 3183, as reported by the committee to the Senate, provides for basing the support price of cotton on the average of the grade and staple which places cotton on the same basis as are other mandatory price supported commodities. We think this is a desirable improvement and should be retained in the bill.

On the other hand, there is provision for requiring support prices to be set at 90 percent of parity for the 1956 and 1957 crops, as well as requiring that the calculation of parity be based upon the higher of the two different formulae. We are opposed to both of these latter provisions.

The bill also contains provision for a soil bank under which much could be done to assist in bringing supplies into line with demand.

In the event satisfactory legislation were to be passed with respect to these items, i. e., the soil bank, new parity, and change in the staple length, it would appear desirable to set the support level for cotton for 1956 at about 86 or 87 percent of parity.

There has been some discussion regarding the substitution of a minimum acreage allotment for the minimum bailage provision now in the law. As you know, any change of this kind would have to be passed by the Congress. My own feeling is that circumstances are such that the Department should not object to the Congress establishing a minimum national cotton acreage allotment for 1957 at the same acreage as was established for 1956, if the above-mentioned problems concerning S. 3183 are worked out satisfactorily. This will provide us with an opportunity to observe what we can accomplish through the export program and the soil bank which may make further acreage cuts unnecessary.

It is my hope that with the enactment of a proper soil-bank plan we will be able to bring supplies more in line with demand. By making American cotton more competitive with other foreign growths and synthetics both at home and abroad, we should be able to regain a substantial market for American cotton.

Very sincerely,

EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

THOMAS MASARYK

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared with reference to Thomas Masaryk. It was my intention to offer it yesterday, on his birthday. He was one of the great patriots of Czechoslovakia and was a great lover of freedom.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Thomas Masaryk was born 106 years ago today. His life stands as a testament to the impact that one individual can exert in stirring the spirit of freedom and independence in the hearts and minds of his fellow men. From humble origins Thomas Masaryk grew in intellect and in spiritual stature until he stood as a symbol of democracy, not only to the people of his own nation, but to the world.

Through his leadership the Czechoslovakian nation emerged as a republic in 1918. It was his dedication to democratic principles that infused the new nation with a respect for justice and liberty. It was Thomas Masaryk's own sympathy for and understanding of the United States that created the great friendship between our country and the Republic of Czechoslovakia.

The death of this wise and good man in 1937 saved him from seeing his beloved people overrun and the freedom that he cherished blotted out. It is doubtful that even his stout heart and masterful leadership could have helped the Czechoslovakian people withstand the treachery that swept away their liberty. First the Nazi conquest and then the Communist coup d'etat destroyed those independent parliamentary institutions that Thomas Masaryk had helped the Czechoslovakians to build.

Police state methods have replaced justice in Czechoslovakia. The Communist rulers have sought to stifle free thought and to frustrate the hopes of the Czechoslovakian people. But those who remember Thomas Masaryk know that his spirit lives on in his people. The flame which he lit can never be completely extinguished, no matter how ferocious the methods of totalitarianism may be.

It is fitting that on the anniversary of Thomas Masaryk's birth we should restate our conviction that Czechoslovakia will rise again and take its place beside the freedom-loving nations of the world. That is our conviction as we commemorate the memory of Thomas Masaryk today. Captive though they are, the people of Czechoslovakia are doubtless—in their hearts—commemorating his memory as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Is there further morning business?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dirksen	Jenner
Allott	Douglas	Johnson, Tex.
Anderson	Duff	Johnston, S. C.
Barkley	Dworshak	Kefauver
Barrett	Eastland	Kennedy
Beall	Ellender	Kerr
Bender	Ervin	Knowland
Bennett	Flanders	Kuchel
Bible	Frear	Langer
Bricker	Fulbright	Lehman
Bridges	George	Long
Bush	Goldwater	Magnuson
Butler	Gore	Malone
Byrd	Green	Mansfield
Capehart	Hayden	Martin, Iowa
Carlson	Hennings	Martin, Pa.
Case, N. J.	Hickenlooper	McCarthy
Case, S. Dak.	Hill	McClellan
Chavez	Holland	McNamara
Clements	Hruska	Millikin
Cotton	Humphrey	Monroney
Curtis	Ives	Morse
Daniel	Jackson	Mundt

Murray	Russell	Symington
Neely	Saltonstall	Thurmond
Neuberger	Schoeppel	Thye
O'Mahoney	Scott	Watkins
Pastore	Smathers	Welker
Payne	Smith, Maine	Wiley
Potter	Smith, N. J.	Williams
Purtell	Sparkman	Young
Robertson	Stennis	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. GORE obtained the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE CREATED BY SENATE RESOLUTION 219

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have sufficient time to make a 4½-page statement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would have no objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee, provided that an equal amount of time be available if desired by those Senators who may wish to speak on the same matter.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I would have no objection to that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator might specify the time he needs.

Mr. GORE. I have a statement of 4½ pages. I think it will take me approximately 20 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If an equal amount of time may be available to this side of the aisle, I would have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ELLENDER. Reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that not more than 20 minutes on each side will be allotted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is according to the request.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, knowing the nature of the subject which is to be discussed, I think the Senator from Tennessee is a little overoptimistic if he thinks 20 minutes will enable him to cover this question. Undoubtedly there will be questions, and I think the Senator should ask for not less than 30 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would have no objection, if it is understood that the same amount of time will be available on this side of the aisle.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is not for me to advise the Senator from Tennessee, but I would suggest to him that since the Senator from California has been good enough to say that he has no objection to having the time limited by whatever time the Senator from Tennessee takes, that would be a very good settlement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I did not say quite that. The Senator from Tennessee stated that he had 4½ pages, and I asked him what amount of time would be consumed, and he indicated 20 minutes. Then, in response to the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming, I said I would not object to having the time extended to 30 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I think I shall be able to complete my statement in 20 minutes. If some other Senator wishes to extend the time limitation, he himself can ask for such extension of time. I ask now for only 20 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for an equal amount of time on this side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the two requests?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not know what questions will be asked, but I can foresee that if they involve matters concerning the special committee we who might be confronted with questions propounded to us would desire to answer them. For that reason, unless I could be assured that sufficient time would be allowed in which to reply or to discuss the matter, I should have to object to the unanimous-consent request. I would want at least 15 minutes for myself, if necessary, if I correctly anticipate what may be coming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears objection to the request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any member of the so-called special committee may have not to exceed 20 minutes, if he desires that amount of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I point out that every day's delay in enacting farm legislation will cost the farmers of America a good many million dollars. Do I correctly understand that the unanimous-consent request is for 15 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have asked unanimous consent that any member of the special committee who may feel that, because of previous statements, he would like to say something may have 20 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. That would mean 3 hours if every member of the committee took advantage of his time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no idea that every member of the committee will take that much time. Perhaps only the Senator from Tennessee and some member of the committee from the other side of the aisle will take their allotted time; but I think each member of the committee should be allowed 20 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] indicates that he does not think the committee will use the time excessively and thus take advantage of the unanimous-consent agreement. Therefore, I shall not object to the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas that each member of the special committee be given 20 minutes? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on February 22, the Senate approved Senate Resolution 219. This resolution provided for the creation of a special committee which was "authorized and directed to investigate the subject of attempt to influence improperly or illegally the Senate or any Member thereof, or any candidate therefor, or any officer or employee of the executive branch of the Government, through campaign contributions, political activities, lobbying, or any and all other activities or practices."

Pursuant to the terms of the resolution, 8 Members of the Senate, 4 from the majority and 4 from the minority, were appointed members of the committee. The resolution provided that the committee "shall, at its first meeting, to be called by the Vice President, select a chairman and vice chairman."

Upon convening the committee, the Vice President stated that his sole function was to preside during the organization of the committee and that a motion for election of a chairman was in order.

I shall give a brief summary of the meeting, as I recall it.

Thereupon, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] proceeded to make some remarks. The senior Senator from New Hampshire suggested that it was necessary to reach some agreements before the committee should proceed to elect a chairman and vice chairman. He further suggested that, in the event a member of the majority party in the Senate should be selected as chairman, the members of the minority party in the Senate should name the chief counsel. This provoked some considerable discussion with almost all, if not all, Members giving expression to their views.

Subsequently, the senior Senator from New Hampshire suggested that meetings of the committee should only be called by joint action of the chairman and the vice chairman and that subpenas be issued only by joint action of the chairman and the vice chairman.

The junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] commented that a Senator who would accept the chairmanship under the proposed conditions would need his head examined.

After more than an hour and a half, the meeting concluded with the Vice President still presiding, with no action on organization taken, but with the suggestion that the senior Senator from New Hampshire and I serve as a subcommittee to undertake to reach agreement.

The senior Senator from New Hampshire and I met the next day. After another long discussion, it seemed that we had made substantial progress toward agreement. The Senator from New Hampshire left with me certain written suggestions which I agreed to consider and we agreed to meet further. We did meet further a day or two later in the office of the Vice President in the Capitol.

Meanwhile, I had obtained a copy of the rules of procedure of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. I stated to the senior Senator from New Hampshire that these rules had been forged under fire and had served well under difficult circumstances and that I thought they could be the basis for an agreement on rules of procedure for the special committee.

I prepared marked copies of these rules, making such changes as seemed appropriate for the functions of the

special committee, and submitted them to the Senator from New Hampshire, after having submitted them to my Democratic colleagues on the committee and having obtained their approval.

The Senator from New Hampshire and I discussed these proposed rules at some length and it seemed to me that we had reached substantial agreement on all points, save that of the power of subpena, although in all fairness I should say that the Senator from New Hampshire said that all understandings were to be regarded as tentative since he did not undertake to speak for other members of the committee until he had conferred with them.

On yesterday, the Senator from New Hampshire and I met again in the office of the Vice President. To my surprise he submitted a large sheaf of proposed amendments and revisions of the proposed rules of procedure, including not only all of his original demands, but several more, and stated that minority members of the committee were not only unanimous, but strong in these demands.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the proposed set of rules of procedure for the Senate special committee created by Senate Resolution 219, and submitted by me, which is a revision of the rules of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, and also the proposed revisions submitted by the senior Senator from New Hampshire.

There being no objection, the proposed rules and suggested revisions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE CREATED BY SENATE RESOLUTION 219

1. No major investigation shall be initiated without approval of, or a majority of, the committee. However, preliminary inquiries may be initiated by the committee staff with the approval of the chairman of the committee.

2. Subpenas for attendance of witnesses and the production of memoranda, documents, and records shall be issued by the committee chairman or by any other member of the committee designated by him.

3. The chairman shall have the authority to call meetings of the committee. This authority may be delegated by the chairman to any other member of the committee when necessary. The chairman shall not schedule any hearings or series of hearings outside the District of Columbia without giving at least 48 hours' notice thereof to the members of the committee.

4. Should a majority of the membership of the committee request the chairman in writing to call a meeting of the committee, then in the event the chairman should fail, neglect, or refuse to call such meeting within 10 days thereafter, such majority of the committee may call such meeting by filing a written notice thereof with the counsel of the subcommittee, who shall promptly notify in writing each member of the committee.

5. All witnesses at public or executive hearings who testify to matters of fact shall be sworn.

6. Counsel retained by any witness and accompanying such witness shall be permitted to be present during the testimony of such witness at any public or executive hearing, and to advise such witness while he is testifying, of his legal rights; but this shall not be construed to excuse a witness from testifying in the event his counsel is ejected from contumacy or disorderly conduct; nor shall this rule be construed as authorizing counsel to coach the witness, answer for the witness, or put words in the witness' mouth. The failure of any witness to secure counsel shall not excuse such witness from attendance in response to subpena.

7. Any witness desiring to read a prepared or written statement in executive or public hearings shall file a copy of such statement with the counsel or chairman of the committee 24 hours in advance of the hearings at which the statement is to be presented. The committee shall determine whether such statement may be read or placed in the record of the hearing.

8. A witness may request, on grounds of distraction, harassment, or physical discomfort, that during his testimony, television, motion picture, and other cameras and lights shall not be directed at him, such request to be ruled on by the committee members present at the hearing.

9. An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of all witnesses in executive and public hearings. The record of his own testimony whether in public or executive session shall be made available for inspection by witness or his counsel under committee supervision; a copy of any testimony given in public session or that part of the testimony given by the witness in executive session and subsequently quoted or made part of the record in a public session shall be made available to any witness at his expense if he so requests.

10. Interrogation of witnesses at committee hearings shall be conducted on behalf of the committee by members and authorized committee staff personnel only.

11. Any person who is the subject of an investigation in public hearings may submit to the chairman of the committee questions in writing for the cross-examination of other witnesses called by the committee. With the consent of a majority of the members of the committee present and voting, these questions shall be put to the witness by the chairman, by a member of the committee, or by counsel of the committee.

12. Any person whose name is mentioned or who is specifically identified, and who believes that testimony or other evidence presented at a public hearing, or comment made by a committee member or counsel, tends to defame him or otherwise adversely affect his reputation, may (a) request to appear personally before the committee to testify in his own behalf, or, in the alternative, (b) file a sworn statement of facts relevant to the testimony or other evidence or comment complained of. Such request and such statement shall be submitted to the committee for its consideration and action.

13. All testimony taken in executive session shall be kept secret and will not be released for public information without the approval of a majority of the committee.

14. No committee report shall be released to the public without the approval of a majority of the committee.

15. A chief counsel and such other staff members as may be required shall be nominated by the chairman, subject to confirmation by a mapority of the committee. After confirmation, the chairman shall certify staff appointments to the financial clerk of the Senate, in writing. If at any time members of the committee affiliated with a political party other than that with which the chairman is affiliated, should desire appointment of an assistant counsel to be responsible directly to such members, the vice chairman shall nominate an individual as assistant counsel.

16. When not inconsistent with these rules, the standing rules of the Senate shall apply.

17. These rules may be amended by a vote of a majority of the committee.

REVISION FOR SPECIAL COMMITTEE UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 219 OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS AS REVISED BY SENATOR GORE

I. Move to amend rule 1 by striking out the word "major" in the first line and striking out all after the word "committee" in line 3.

II. Move to amend rule 2 by striking out all of the same and inserting in place thereof the following:

"Subpenas for attendance of witnesses and the protection of memoranda, documents, and records shall be issued jointly over the signatures of the chairman and vice chairman or their designees; if after 24 hours there is unresolvable disagreement then the committee shall be called jointly by the chairman and the vice chairman and the matter of the issuance of the subpena shall be decided by the majority vote of the whole committee."

III. Move to amend rules 3 and 4 by striking out all of the same and inserting in place thereof all of the following:

"Meetings shall be called jointly by the chairman and vice chairman. In the event of the failure, for any reason, of the chairman and vice chairman to call a meeting, a majority of the committee may call a meeting at any time. Any meeting thus called shall not be held until after a notice in writing of at least 24 hours is given to all committee members, 48 hours if outside the District of Columbia. In the case of all other meetings, committee members shall be notified in writing reasonably in advance of said meetings, at least 48 hours if outside the District of Columbia."

Addition to rule 4: "The interrogation of witnesses will normally be conducted by the chief counsel, but may be conducted by the associate chief counsel or any other staff member by designation of the chief counsel or by the request of a majority of the committee."

IV. Move to amend rule 5 and rule 10 by striking out the same and inserting the following which covers the same subject matter as well as the last sentence of rule 1 which was also stricken:

"The determination of whether any particular hearing shall be open or in executive session shall be by a majority vote of the committee. All examination of witnesses at hearings shall be conducted by members of the committee or duly designated staff members, and the witnesses shall be sworn. The examination of witnesses at hearings does not preclude preliminary interviews and conferences with witnesses and the examination of any papers, documents or records by the staff in the preparation of hearings."

V. Move the adoption of rule 6.

VI. Move the adoption of rule 7.

VII. Move the adoption of rule 8.

VIII. Move the adoption of rule 9.

IX. Move the adoption of rule 11.

X. Move the adoption of rule 12.

XI. Move to strike out rules 13 and 14 and insert the following:

"No confidential testimony taken or confidential material presented at an executive hearing, or matters taken up or discussed at an executive meeting of the committee or any report of the proceedings of such an executive hearing or meeting, nor any committee reports or documents of any sort, shall be made public, either in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless authorized by a majority of the committee."

XII. Move to strike out rule 15 and insert in place thereof the following:

"The committee staff shall be under the direction of a chief counsel and an associate counsel. The chief counsel shall be nominated by the chairman and the associate chief counsel shall be nominated by the vice chairman and all other staff members shall be nominated in like fashion to

the end that the committee staff may as nearly as possible be bipartisan in nature in accordance with the membership of the committee. All nominations shall be confirmed for appointment by a majority of the whole committee which shall also determine the time of entry on the payroll. The chairman shall certify all staff appointments to the financial clerk of the Senate in writing. Staff members shall be discharged by a majority vote of the whole committee upon the request of two or more members of the committee. It is the intention of the committee that the chief counsel and associate chief counsel shall be as coequal as possible in their duties and authority consistent with the orderly conduct of committee hearings and staff affairs."

XIII. Move adoption of rule 16.

XIV. Move adoption of rule 17.

XV. Move the following motion and its adoption:

"All vouchers for the expenditure of money as provided in this resolution (S. Res. 219) shall be certified as to correctness by the vice chairman."

XVI. Move the folowing motion and its adoption:

"Whenever in the foregoing rules the words 'majority of the committee' are used the same shall mean majority of the whole committee unless specifically provided otherwise."

Mr. GORE. I should like to state briefly the principal provisions of the rules of procedure which I, with the approval of my Democratic colleagues, submitted to the Senator from New Hampshire, and compare them with proposals of the Senator from New Hampshire.

1. No major investigation shall be initiated without approval of a majority of the committee. However, preliminary inquiries may be initiated by the committee staff with the approval of the chairman of the committee.

I submit, Mr. President, that this is a reasonable rule.

So far as I know, it is agreed by all members of the committee—and certainly it is my view—that the scope of such inquiry as may be made and the areas to be investigated by the committee, should be subject to the will of the committee as expressed by majority vote. This is as it should be. On the other hand, it seems obvious to me that it will be necessary for preliminary inquiries to be made by the staff on authority of the chairman, in order to ascertain whether a suggested subject of investigation is of sufficient importance to justify a public investigation. Without such preliminary inquiries, the committee will lack sufficient information to permit it to act intelligently.

The senior Senator from New Hampshire has suggested that this be changed entirely. He suggests that no investigation whatsoever shall be initiated except by a majority vote of the committee with no leeway permitted for the making of preliminary investigations by the staff upon approval of the chairman.

The unworkability of this provision should be apparent. The staff would be immobilized and forbidden to follow leads, to make inquiries, or initiate any inquiry whatsoever unless and until the full committee shall have been convened and a formal vote taken.

It is not difficult for one to imagine the endless debate and delays involved before the committee by a formal vote of its entire membership could finally determine even so much as to write a letter to some individual or organization in quest of information.

2. Subpenas for attendance of witnesses and the production of memorandums, documents, and records shall be issued by the committee chairman or by any other member of the committee designated by him.

The senior Senator from New Hampshire suggests that subpenas should not be issued by the chairman, but instead shall be issued jointly over the signature of the chairman and the vice chairman, or their designees.

He further suggests that if, after 24 hours, there is unresolved disagreement, "then the committee shall be called jointly by the chairman and the vice chairman and the matter of the issuance of subpenas shall be decided by the majority vote of the whole committee."

It is my considered opinion, Mr. President, that the chairman of the special committee, whosoever he may be, should have authority to issue subpenas in the same manner as such authority is conferred upon and exercised by the chairmen of all other committees of the Senate.

I wish to take note here of suggestions in the press that I might be selected as chairman of the special committee, and I should like to make it emphatically clear that my views on this question are not in any way related to the identity of the Senator who may be chosen as chairman. Rather, it is, as I see it, a matter vital to the orderly conduct of business by a committee of the Senate. I wish to make it clear that I have not at any time, and do not now, seek the heavy responsibility which the chairmanship of this special committee entails. I do feel, however, that if the investigation is to be effective and in accordance with the mandate of Senate Resolution 219, it is essential that the power of subpena be definitely vested in such manner as to permit its timely use, and, moreover, that it be subject to delegation. I hold firm to the view that the chairman of any Senate committee should use the authority conferred upon him for the execution and for the furtherance of the committee business.

Further, I hold it to be the duty of the chairman of any committee to keep members of the committee fully and currently advised of any action taken in carrying out the committee's directives or mandates. But any committee, if it is to function, must have a head. Unless its chairman is granted the tools with which to conduct the detailed work necessary to implement the decisions of the committee, and, in this case, to satisfy the mandate of Senate Resolution 219, there will simply be no direction. A committee so hamstrung would be doomed to failure before it started.

Let us examine further this proposed restriction on the power of subpena. Suppose that after the committee had by majority vote determined to initiate some particular investigation, and its chief counsel, provided the committee could find someone who would accept the position of chief counsel under the conditions proposed, suggested to the chairman of the committee that, in his opinion, some witness was about to abscond, or some record was about to be destroyed. In short, suppose the chief counsel should request the immediate issuance of a subpena. Such a subpena could not be issued until the chairman could locate, confer with, and convince the vice chairman that such a subpena should be issued in the public interest. Now, should the vice chairman be out of his office or out of town, this procedure might become difficult. Suppose, on the other hand, that the vice chairman did not agree with the chief counsel and the chairman. If this disagreement continued after 24 hours, it would be necessary for the chairman and vice chairman to join in a call for a committee meeting to consider the issuance of a subpena. The witness might have long since absconded, or a record might have long since been destroyed.

This suggested procedure, Mr. President is unreasonable and unworkable. If the committee is to succeed, it must move with orderly procedure, with the power of subpena definitely vested and subject to delegation in order to promote timely action and to facilitate committee functions.

3. The chairman shall have the authority to call meetings of the committee. This authority may be delegated by the chairman to any other member of the committee when necessary. The chairman shall not schedule any hearings or series of hearings outside the District of Columbia without giving at least 48 hours' notice thereof to the members of the committee.

Instead of this, the senior Senator from New Hampshire proposes:

Meetings shall be called jointly by the chairman and vice chairman. In the event of the failure, for any reason, of the chairman and vice chairman to call a meeting, a majority of the committee may call a meeting at any time. Any meeting thus called shall not be held until after a notice in writing of at least 24 hours is given to all committee members, 48 hours if outside the District of Columbia. In the case of all other meetings, committee members shall be notified in writing reasonably in advance of said meetings, at least 48 hours if outside the District of Columbia.

Thus, it will be seen, Mr. President, that the senior Senator from New Hampshire has proposed that the chairman of the committee cannot even so much as call a meeting of the committee.

With approval of my Democratic colleagues, I suggested that a chief counsel and such other staff members as may be required shall be nominated by the chairman, subject to confirmation by a majority of the committee. We further suggested, however, that if at any time members of the minority party should desire appointment of an assistant counsel to be responsible directly to such members, the vice chairman shall nominate an individual as assistant counsel.

We considered this to be customary procedure, established rules of committee conduct; but the senior Senator from New Hampshire proposes that the committee staff shall be under the direction of a chief counsel and an associate counsel who shall be as coequal as possible in their duties and authority.

The senior Senator from New Hampshire proposes to concede to the chairman of the committee the privilege of

nominating the chief counsel, but only if the vice chairman can nominate a "coequal" associate counsel. The senior Senator from New Hampshire further provides that the chairman and vice chairman shall thereafter alternate in the selection of the remainder of the staff, to the end, as he proposes, of true bipartisanship.

Thus, Mr. President, it is proposed that the special committee would have two chairmen—a chief counsel and a coequal associate counsel, a Republican staff and a Democratic staff. It is proposed that we have a committee that could not meet except by unanimity between the chairman and vice chairman, or upon petition by 5 of its 8 members—a committee that could not, except by formal vote, initiate even the most preliminary inquiry, write a questionnaire, or propound a question to a witness, actual or prospective. This, it is said, Mr. President, is bipartisanship.

I submit that a committee so organized with rules of procedure as suggested by the senior Senator from New Hampshire, could not possibly follow a bipartisan approach in the conduct of an investigation. Rather, such organization would generate rank partisanship.

If the special committee is organized as proposed by the senior Senator from New Hampshire, it would not, in fact, be a committee at all; but rather a group of eight Senators divided into two subgroups of four each, each subgroup having a chairman, its own chief counsel, and its own staff.

I hope that these disagreements may be resolved. The public interest requires the proposed inquiry and corrective action.

I have carefully avoided the making of statements which might prejudice the successful organization and operation of the committee.

I have now reached the conclusion that the prospects of such an inquiry might be enhanced by the making of this report and by eliminating myself from consideration as prospective chairman of the special committee. I shall be willing to continue to work with my colleagues as a member of the committee, subject to the will of the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have listened to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] regarding the proposed rules for the special committee.

So the picture will be complete, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have printed in the RECORD the suggested amendments offered by the four members of my party to the rules suggested by the Senator from Tennessee and his associates.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVISION FOR SPECIAL COMMITTEE UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 219 OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS AS REVISED BY SENATOR GORE

I. Move to amend rule 1 by striking out the word "major" in the first line and striking out all after the word "committee" in line 3.

II. Move to amend rule 2 by striking out all of the same and inserting in place thereof the following:

"Subpenas for attendance of witnesses and the protection of memorandums, documents, and records shall be issued jointly over the signatures of the chairman and vice chairman or their designees; if after 24 hours there is unresolvable disagreement then the committee shall be called jointly by the chairman and the vice chairman and the matter of the issuance of the subpena shall be decided by the majority vote of the whole committee."

III. Move to amend rules 3 and 4 by striking out all of the same and inserting in place thereof all of the following:

"Meetings shall be called jointly by the chairman and vice chairman. In the event of the failure, for any reason, of the chairman and vice chairman to call a meeting, a majority of the committee may call a meeting at any time. Any meeting thus called shall not be held until after a notice in writing of at least 24 hours is given to all committee members, 48 hours if outside the District of Columbia. In the case of all other meetings, committee members shall be notified in writing reasonably in advance of said meetings, at least 48 hours if outside the District of Columbia.

IV. Move to amend rule 5 and rule 10 by striking out the same and inserting the following which covers the same subject matter as well as the last sentence of rule 1 which was also stricken:

"The determination of whether any particular hearing shall be open or in executive session shall be by a majority vote of the committee. All examination of witnesses at hearings shall be conducted by members of the committee or duly designated staff members, and the witnesses shall be sworn. The examination of witnesses at hearings does not preclude preliminary interviews and conferences with witnesses and the examination of any papers, documents or records by the staff in the preparation of hearings."

V. Move the adoption of rule 6.

VI. Move the adoption of rule 7.

VII. Move the adoption of rule 8.

VIII. Move the adoption of rule 9.

IX. Move the adoption of rule 11.

X. Move the adoption of rule 12.

XI. Move to strike out rules 13 and 14 and insert the following:

"No confidential testimony taken or confidential material presented at an executive hearing, or matters taken up or discussed at an executive meeting of the committee or any report of the proceedings of such an executive hearing or meeting, nor any committee reports or documents of any sort, shall be made public, either in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless authorized by a majority of the committee."

XII. Move to strike out rule 15 and insert in place thereof the following:

"The committee staff shall be under the direction of a chief counsel and an associate counsel. The chief counsel shall be nominated by the chairman and the associate chief counsel shall be nominated by the vice chairman and all other staff members shall be nominated in like fashion to the end that the committee staff may as nearly as possible be bipartisan in nature in accordance with the membership of the committee. All nominations shall be confirmed for appointment by a majority of the whole committee which shall also determine the time of entry on the payroll. The chairman shall certify all staff appointments to the financial clerk of the Senate in writing. Staff members shall be discharged by a majority vote of the whole committee upon the request of two or more members of the committee. It is the intention of the committee that the chief counsel and associate chief counsel shall be as coequal as possible in their duties and authority consistent with the orderly conduct of committee hearings and staff affairs."

XIII. Move adoption of rule 16.

XIV. Move adoption of rule 17.

XV. Move the following motion and its adoption:

"All vouchers for the expenditure of money as provided in this resolution (S. Res. 219) shall be certified as to correctness by the vice chairman."

XVI. Move the following motion and its adoption:

"Whenever in the foregoing rules the words 'majority of the committee' are used the same shall mean majority of the whole committee unless specifically provided otherwise."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Tennessee takes a very pessimistic and somber view of this matter, and perhaps puts a gloomy interpretation, from his point of view, of each of the proposals we make.

We must remember that this is a special committee, composed of four members from each of the two political parties. The committee was so established. The rules we suggest would result in sharing the responsibility—in short, in dual or joint responsibility and dual direction. The committee is not a standing committee, and is not to operate in the way standing committees have operated in the past, each such committee having a majority and a minority. Instead, the special committee is composed of a group of eight Senators, equally divided between the two parties, selected for the purpose of making the designated investigation and recommendations.

Here let me refer to 1 or 2 of the points the Senator from Tennessee has made.

He has said that we suggested amendments to the rules he proposed. One of our amendments provides that no investigation shall be initiated without the approval of a majority of the committee. That seems reasonable to us—namely, that the committee, being equally divided, should pass by majority vote on the question of proceeding with any investigation.

The Senator from Tennessee referred to the question of subpenas. He has said subpenas should be issued by the chairman of the special committee. That would be true in the case of a standing committee, but this committee is a special committee. So, Mr. President, the amendment we suggest, provides that subpenas shall be issued over the signatures of the chairman and the vice chairman; and we propose that if there is disagreement, lasting over 24 hours it be resolved by majority vote of the committee. Therefore, again the question would be resolved by action of the whole committee.

The Senator from Tennessee proposed that meetings be called only by the chairman of the committee. It is our suggestion that the meetings be called jointly by the chairman and the vice chairman. We also suggest that in the event of failure—for any reason—of the chairman and the vice chairman to call a meeting, a majority of the committee may call a meeting at any time.

For the reasons I have stated, it is true that the rules we propose would not

be those customarily followed in connection with the procedure of a standing committee; the Senator from Tennessee is quite correct in that respect. However, we believe that the rules we have proposed provide for reasonable procedure for a special committee composed of an equal number of Senators from each side of the aisle in this Chamber, and that our proposal will enable the special committee to proceed with dual responsibility and dual direction. Our amendments were drawn up on that basis.

The Senator from Tennessee said that we insist on having both a chief counsel and an associate counsel, with coequal powers; and the Senator from Tennessee has inferred that such an arrangement would provide for a minority counsel. We have kept away from any such suggestion. We have proposed that the chairman nominate the chief counsel and that the vice chairman nominate the associate counsel, and that both counsel be confirmed by a majority of the committee. That seems to us to be a reasonable proposal.

Most of the other amendments we have proposed, which deal with purely mechanical details, do not vary a great deal, it seems to me, from the rules suggested by the Senator from Tennessee. I have stated the principal differences.

In our proposals we define the phrase "majority of the committee," so there can be no question about what will constitute a majority of the committee. We suggest, in effect, that a majority of the committee shall mean a majority of the whole committee, unless otherwise specifically provided.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that we have not been unreasonable in regard to this matter. We have suggested a very fair set of amendments to the proposals made by the Members from the other side.

I can remember very definitely that Members of this body, in speaking on this floor, and members of the general public and members of the press have on various occasions in the past taken very strong stands against runaway committees in the case of standing committees. Certainly in this case, inasmuch as the committee is a special committee with an equal number of members from the two political parties, dual responsibility, dual controls, and dual authority should, I believe, constitute a fair basis of procedure.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I desire to assume as much responsibility as any other member of the special committee in connection with this matter; I do not want the RECORD to indicate that the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is alone responsible for whatever decision those on our side, among the membership of the committee, reached. On the contrary, we arrived at the decision as a group.

The special committee assembled at the call of the Vice President, in accordance with the provisions of the resolution. We went there as eight Members, not as either a minority or a majority. Four of us were from each side of the aisle in this Chamber—4 Democratic Senators and 4 Republican Senators.

The question before us now is not in regard to the investigation of any particular person. The question which arose on this floor related to whether undue influence had been exercised by anyone or by any group of persons in such a way as to be detrimental to sound procedure in connection with the enactment of legislation on any subject, whether today or yesterday or in the future.

In the special committee, the 8 members endeavored, as a group, meeting at the call of the Vice President, subject to the provisions of the resolution, to organize the special committee in such a manner that the committee would not be operated in accordance with the discretion of only 1 member or in accordance with the discretion of the members from only 1 political party.

If the time had come for me, as 1 member of the committee, to indicate my best judgment in regard to the selection of a chairman for the special committee, of course I would have proceeded to vote on that question, along with the other 7 members, and by means of such a vote a chairman would have been selected. Anyone of the 8 members is eligible to be chairman of the special committee. However, we have not yet endeavored to determine who shall be the chairman.

Up to this point we have endeavored to decide upon the rules to govern the procedure of this group of Senators in their investigational activities. Once the rules are established, we can proceed to vote on the question of who shall be chairman of the special committee. However, to date, no member of the group has been chosen as its spokesman or chairman.

The resolution states what the responsibilities and endeavors of the special committee shall be. The special committee designated 2 of its members to try to resolve the question and to arrive at agreement on a set of rules. Those members were the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. They met, but they did not resolve the differences which seemed to exist between the two sides.

We had previously met in conference, in an endeavor to arrive at agreement on the rules.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly that no one member of the special committee should have the right to issue subpenas, inasmuch as the committee is composed of an equal number of members from the two political parties, from the two sides of the aisle in this legislative Chamber.

Of course, if it were a regular standing committee, the rights of the majority and the rights of the minority would be clearly defined by the rules of this legislative body. But it is a special committee, and it is endeavoring to organize under the special provisions of a Senate resolution. We have endeavored to embody in the rules a provision safeguarding us from any runaway action such as the Senator from New Hampshire suggested.

We have endeavored to assume responsibility as a political party on this side of the aisle, just as we are endeavoring to place responsibility on the party on the other side of the aisle. If a subpena is to be issued, the chairman and the vice chairman should agree. If they cannot agree, the question should go back to the majority of the committee for action. That is not an unreasonable request. It is not an unreasonable rule, in my opinion.

I do not wish to sit on the special committee as a mere figurehead. In the event there is a deadlock, I want to be certain that the majority will act, and that a majority rule, adopted by the committee, will be the governing factor. I do not believe that position to be unreasonable. We have not yet selected a chairman. Anyone assuming to speak as chairman for that group is merely assuming.

I have been as disturbed as anyone could possibly be because we have not been able to reach an agreement. If any Senator should examine the proposed rules which have now been submitted for the RECORD by the distinguished senior member of the committee—senior in terms of years of service—[Mr. BRIDGES], he can see that those proposed rules are fair. Anyone who wishes to be fairminded will find, I believe, from an examination of the proposed rules inserted in the RECORD by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the rules proposed by the Republican members, as submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire, that the proposed rules submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire are reasonable. I believe it will be found that the members of the committee will endeavor to resolve the question set forth in the resolution, and determine whether there has been any undue or unethical action on the part of anyone in an effore to influence any Member of this legislative body.

I believe that the proposed rules are such that the committee can properly function. I think there is ample safeguard against any one individual taking the committee into an investigational activity which would not be desired by this legislative body or by the citizens whom we represent.

The proposed rules are before us. Let Senators examine them and determine for themselves whether we have been unreasonable in our attempts to organize the special committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me? We are operating under controlled time.

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield any time I have remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time have we now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous consent agreement each member of the special committee has been allowed 20 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I asked the Senator from Minnesota to yield some of his time to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from California is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I recall to the minds of Senators that this resolution was passed by an overwhelming vote of the Senate, there being only one dissenting vote.

As has been pointed out, the committee is a special committee, representing the Senate of the United States as an institution.

It seems to me that the committee has been proceeding in a perfectly normal and equitable manner in trying to outline certain rules of procedure. I do not believe that the committee will divide in the manner suggested by the Senator from Tennessee.

We have an excellent example in the existing select committee under the able leadership of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. The committee has functioned. So far as I know, none of the problems over which the Senator from Tennessee is so concerned has arisen. On that committee this side of the aisle is represented by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. The other side is represented by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. That committee has not divided into two committees. It is not functioning as two committees of two members each.

In my judgment, with the situation prevailing, with all 8 members recognizing a sense of responsibility to the Senate, they will not divide in any such manner.

It seems to me entirely proper that in a matter of this kind the majority of the committee should reach an agreement relative to its rules and procedures. I see nothing unreasonable in that.

As has been pointed out, theoretically any one of the eight members might be selected to be chairman of the committee. The rules would apply, whoever the chairman might be. The procedures would apply, whoever the chairman might be. I express the hope, as one Member on this side of the aisle, that the committee will proceed to agree upon the details of organization and the rules of procedure.

It seems to me that members of the committee from both sides of the aisle have been proceeding diligently. One group has submitted certain proposed rules. The other group has suggested certain changes in those proposals. That is normal procedure. It seems to me that it does not in any sense indicate that a stalemate condition has been reached, in which the committee cannot function.

Obviously, the reason for a special committee of this kind is that one group shall not impose its will upon the other group. I think that is proper in connection with a subject which affects the Senate as an institution. This is an area in which I believe reasonable men can sit down together and, in a reasonable way, arrive at rules which will meet the approval of the overwhelming majority of this body.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I think it should be made clear that the Senator from Tennessee has been speaking the wishes of his Democratic colleagues on the committee. He was selected to represent us in conversations with the Senator from New Hampshire. What he has stated, I think, represents the opinion of all the Democrats on the committee. He has stated that he could not accept the chairmanship of the committee under the rules suggested. I think it is the unanimous opinion of his colleagues that none of them could accept the chairmanship under those rules.

Therefore, it seems to me that, in fairness to the Senate, the members of the special committee should meet this afternoon or tomorrow and reach a final decision. It may be that it will be impossible for us to proceed, in which case I think we should unanimously report that fact to the Senate. The Senate can then have the choice of either appointing eight new members, who could perhaps agree on rules, or follow the suggestion put forward by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] to appoint a committee consisting of 5 Democrats and 4 Republicans; or return the subject matter to the standing committees, the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Government Operations, and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Only four times in the past 24 years have we had bipartisan select committees. Those four times have all been in the past 2 years. In each case the select committee had to deal with a narrow set of facts. One select committee was headed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], another dealt with the mail cover case concerning the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], a third involved a proposal to increase the pay of Members of Congress. That committee was headed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. The fourth such committee is that operating today under the chairmanship of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

I am not sure that such committees, which have operated successfully, can serve as a precedent for the action of the majority and minority leaders in setting up this committee. The other committees to which I have referred dealt with a narrow state of facts, and were intended to deal with single issues on an equitable basis, representing the will of the Senate.

But in this case we are dealing with a problem which is infinitely broader and more complicated. Therefore I am not convinced that it would be possible for any eight Members of the Senate to agree on procedure and to give the chairman the power which we believe any chairman should have. Therefore it may be necessary, as I have said, to come back to the Senate and ask that a special committee with different members be appointed. Perhaps the members of such new committee could reach an agreement, although I doubt it. Or a committee consisting of 5 Democrats and 4 Republicans could be appointed, giving to the chairman the power which the Senator from Tennessee has suggested. Otherwise the standing committees should look into the problem.

Speaking as a member of the Committee on Government Operations, I believe that committee is prepared to look into the question of lobbying, which is its special responsibility.

In any case, I believe we should meet this afternoon to resolve the issue and report back to the Senate by tomorrow.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator will remember that on the day of the vote on the gas bill, expressions were made by both the majority leader and the minority leader that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections should have jurisdiction over the subject matter relating to payments of moneys and attempts to influence votes, and other related matters.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to review the long and tortuous course which ultimately resulted in the appointment of the special commitee. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has expressed many of the views I have long held with regard to this subject.

There are presently in existence subcommittees of standing committees, which are, with relation to the representation of the respective political parties in the Senate, so composed in balance as to give the responsible party, namely, the majority party, the opportunity for leadership. On the day the matter was brought up, the majority leader stated that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections had jurisdiction and that the majority leader had confidence in its chairman, meaning at that time the Senator from Missouri. I am sure he also has confidence in the subcommittee under its present chairmanship. The majority leader stated that the subcommittee could proceed with the exercise of its assigned legal function as a creature of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Getting down to the point I have in mind, would the Senator from Massachusetts, whose subcommittee would have jurisdiction over the general subject matter of so-called lobbying, be satisfied to undertake such an investigation.

Mr. KENNEDY. If it should be the decision of the Senate to proceed with such an investigation, our subcommittee would be prepared to go ahead and function. One reason why the special committee was set up was that in four previous instances such special committees had worked successfully. Because the subject was of equal interest to the majority and to the minority, perhaps it was worthwhile to try to proceed along the line suggested by the appointment of a special committee. Perhaps we can succeed; perhaps we can not. As I said, I believe we should try to come to a decision. If we cannot succeed within the next 24 hours, speaking as chairman of my subcommittee, I believe our subcommittee is fully prepared to do whatever the Senate may decide we should do.

Mr. HENNINGS. If I may do so through the Senator from Massachusetts, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, which undertook early in these proceedings, some 3 or 4 weeks ago, to proceed promptly, believing that speed and promptness and vigor and sincerity were the very essence of this kind of investigation under the circumstances

which confronted us, whether the distinguished Senator from Tennessee does not believe that the duly authorized Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections is prepared to proceed in the domain over which it has jurisdiction.

Mr. GORE. I wish first to make it very plain on the RECORD that there is no personal clash between the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the junior Senator from Tennessee. Our personal relations have been very pleasant, not only throughout this trying episode, but throughout our long tenure in Congress. I intended no personal reference, and I made no personal reference. I merely felt it to be my duty, since all Senators were involved, to make my report to the Senate on the floor of the Senate.

If the Senator from Massachusetts will yield to me further, I should like to say, in reply to the distinguished Senator from Missouri—and I say this in all frankness—I have not yet given consideration to the possibility which he suggests. I have not had an opportunity to confer with the other members of the subcommittee. I should like to defer comment on the suggestion for the moment.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. KENNEDY. I promised to yield first to the Senator from New York. Then I shall yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts yields to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. My colleagues will recall that when the question of the appointment of a special committee came up on February 22, I protested vigorously against the selection of a select committee and the displacement of a standing committee which already had adequate powers. I felt at the time that to do so was bad government. I felt it was bad procedure, and that it would not in any way satisfy the people of the country. I will read a very brief part of what I said at that time:

> I hope the Senator from Texas will not take offense when I say the committee will be a hand-selected committee, and will displace a legally constituted subcommittee of a standing committee. I do not believe that will satisfy the people of the United States; I believe that the doubts and suspicions regarding what has happened will continue.

I repeated that statement time after time in my remarks. I believe more strongly than ever that the people of the United States are not satisfied by that procedure. We have appointed a special committee over my strong protest. That is water over the dam. But the committee has done nothing. They have not even elected a chairman. I say with all the vigor at my command that unless we do something promptly to carry on an investigation, particularly an investigation of the oil and gas lobby, we will not satisfy the people of the United States, and we will encourage the suspicion that this great body, of which I am deeply proud to be a Member, has abdicated its duties and responsibilities. They will believe that we will not carry on a vigorous and thorough investigation regardless of the consequences and regardless of where the chips may fall or who may be involved.

I urge with all the vigor at my command that the investigation be carried on without fear or favor, and without any impediment whatever. It is the only way we can act if we want to satisfy the people of the United States. That is what we must do if we wish to satisfy them that the Senate means business and that their interests will be safeguarded. I am deeply convinced that a vigorous investigation must be pursued promptly. If the differences and disputes in the select committee cannot be resolved immediately, the investigation should be turned over to the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the only thing I wish to say is that it would have been a mistake for us to not set up the special committee and give that committee an opportunity to function. It may not be able to function, but the decision to set it up was a sound one, in my opinion. I believe in the next 24 hours we will know whether we will succeed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts wish to take the floor for the purpose of yielding to the Senator from California?

Mr. KENNEDY. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I yield the necessary time to the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the Senator from California may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that perhaps I misunderstood the implications of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I hope he was not indicating an ultimatum or deadline, or suggesting that the committee would have to report to the Senate by tomorrow or alternative action would be taken.

The special committee was set up by mandate of the Senate, by a vote of 79 to 1. Only one vote was cast against the creation of the special committee. At the time the committee was established expressions were made by various Senators, including the Senator from New York, who has just spoken. In any event, in the judgment of the Senate it was felt that setting up the special committee was the proper way to proceed. It seems to me there have been no dilatory delays. The committee has been going ahead in an orderly fashion in an attempt to prescribe its rules of procedure.

I do not believe that Senators on either side of the aisle, with the Senate so closely divided as it is, should have presented to them what might be interpreted to be an ultimatum that a deadline has been set, and that within a certain time the committee must do a certain thing or an alternative course of action would be taken. I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts did not mean to give that implication, but I wish the record to be clear on that point.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I will say to the Senator that it was not my intention, of course, to issue an ultimatum. But the special committee met a week ago last Wednesday, and it was assumed that we would be able at least to select a chairman, and that the adoption of rules would not take too long. Now almost 2 weeks have passed, and we have not selected a chairman or agreed on rules. So, while it may be premature to say we can report tomorrow, I think we can report to the Senate next week.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I had not intended to rise again, but because of the implication of the Senator's statement that the committee would report to the Senate tomorrow, I would not wish to see the Senate confronted with a situation wherein either the Senator, or the committee which was established by an overwhelming vote of the Senate, would be in the position of having to deal with a gun at its head.

Mr. KENNEDY. The committee selected the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Tennessee to negotiate. The Senator from Tennessee came to the floor because he felt that the members of the committee were further from any agreement than they were last week. The committee as a whole has an obligation to consider the matter of organization and, if we cannot agree, to come back and tell the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Hampshire. We are operating under a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, how much time have I used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to take a minute or so to point out that I am in agreement with what the Senator from Tennessee has said. Our relations have been most pleasant as always and there has been no ill feeling whatsoever.

May I also point out, in connection with the reference of the Senator from Massachusetts to the loss of time, that a tragic thing happened in the life of the Senator from Tennessee. He was called to his home in Tennessee by the death of his father the latter part of last week, and did not return, I think, until night before last. Yesterday was the first opportunity we had to discuss the matter. It was not the fault of the Senator from New Hampshire or his colleagues, and, certainly, it was not the fault of the Senator from Tennessee, with whom we all deeply sympathize, that this unavoidable delay took place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that we are operating under a unanimous-consent agreement,

and the agreement embraces only the members of the committee for a period of 20 minutes each.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues from Minnesota and New Hampshire.

We set out to follow the spirit and the letter of the resolution. There is, of course, a standing committee which has majority and minority members. We felt and still feel that what we were to do was to cary out the spirit of the resolution in a committee composed of 4 Members from this side of the aisle and 4 Members from the other side of the aisle.

I am very much amazed, Mr. President, and, I might say, disappointed, to find so much pessimism expressed by members of the committee as to the probability of getting together and adopting a code of rules and doing what we are charged with doing as Members of this body. I have no such pessimistic approach to the question. We have had only one meeting of the committee. Yet there is talk about discharging it and turning its duties over to some other committee.

To my mind, that does not indicate a complete desire to see that the rules are ultimately agreed to, and then that the members will ultimately work together. The first important step we had to take was to adopt rules under which this rather unusual special committee should operate. The first suggestion made was that in order to make sure there would be no question about procedure, if the members of one party had the right to nominate the chairman, the members of the other party might have the right to nominate the chief counsel. That seemed to be a nonpartisan or bypartisan approach.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I shall be happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this matter was brought to my attention night before last. I heard there was a rumor in the press gallery to the effect that the Democratic members were prepared to resign from the special committee. I immediately asked if the Senator from Tennessee were available, and I was told that he was attending the funeral of his father. I then called the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and asked him if there was any truth to the rumor, and he assured me there was not.

The statement which the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] made to the Senate a short time ago was essentially the same statement he made to me late yesterday afternoon when I returned to the city. At that time I asked him to give me an opportunity to discuss the situation and the differences with the distinguished minority leader and with the majority and minority members of the committee. Late last night I talked to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], but I have not had a chance to reach the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], because he was in a committee meeting where Secretary Weeks was testifying.

I asked the minority leader to meet with me as soon as the Senate assembled today, and he told me he would as soon as we had finished the morning hour.

I hope the decision of the Senator from Tennessee is not an irrevocable decision. I am not one who attends 1 or 2 meetings and gets so discouraged that I throw up my hands. I sometimes have as much difficulty consulting and finding an area of agreement on this side of the aisle as I have on the other side.

Mr. President, I am a great believer in the 133d Psalm, which says:

> Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.

The Senator from New York is correct; he did warn against the pitfalls and the dangers, but he voted for the resolution when 79 Members of the Senate voted for the appointment of the special committee, and I selected the very best man I knew.

We already have the George committee functioning. I would express the hope that the Senator from Tennessee will not make his decision final. I said that to him yesterday. I also express the hope that the minority members will carefully consider and reevaluate their decision. Perhaps there is some meeting ground.

For many years I have been chairman of a subcommittee, and I never found it necessary to have unusual powers vested in the chairman. I have usually found that most of the members of my committee were as anxious to get the facts as I was. I believe that will be the case in this instance.

If, however, the committee cannot select a chairman and cannot organize, and must divide according to party lines, then another course of action will have to be followed.

I should like to urge the Senate, however, to wait until the committee can have further meetings, and wait until the George committee can get additional authority and time, which I understand they were prepared to request this morning, and only deferred at my request. If it cannot, then we can have the 2 to 1 Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections take over. The junior Senator from Tennessee is chairman of that subcommittee. I have no doubt about that subcommittee's jurisdiction over a large part of the field covered by the resolution.

I made it abundantly clear to the Senate, to the press, and to the country that there was not one word in the resolution creating the special committee which deprived that subcommittee of any authority. I made that clear to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

If we are unable to approach the matter from the standpoint of equal representation, when the Senate today is operating on the basis of a division of 48 to 47, then the majority party will assume its full responsibilities; and there are appropriate committees—the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Committee on Government Operations—which can take over from there.

But I am not one who is willing to admit that it is necessary to decide that question this afternoon or tomorrow morning. As a matter of fact, I think it would be somewhat inappropriate anyway to have two special or select committees operating at the same time. All of us had hoped that the committee headed by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] would by now have concluded its work. That committee first asked for an additional 10 days of authority; this morning they have asked for a few more days. I have asked the members of the George committee to withhold their request until this discussion had taken place.

I appeal to the Senate to withhold judgment, to pursue the suggestion as reasonable men, a little further, and to give me an opportunity, at least, to talk with the members of the special committee on my side of the aisle and with the distinguished minority leader, whom I have always found to be willing to accord to me the same privileges he reserves for himself.

I think that if that be done, we shall perhaps come up with an answer which will meet with the general approbation of the American people. If we do not, we may divide into a party hassle, and stand here and tie the Senate in a knot, where our action would not be so constructive as I should like to see it.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for yielding to me, and I apologize to him for speaking as long as I have.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I agree with the majority leader that the situation is far from hopeless. I make the suggestion, before the committee has a second meeting, and we talk about turning the matter over to a standing committee which has authority to investigate any matters of this kind, that after one meeting on such an important issue there is no reason to believe that reasonable men cannot get together to draft a set of rules.

It appears to me that the suggestion that if the Members on this side of the aisle nominated a chairman, the Members on the other side of the aisle should have the right to nominate a chief counsel, or vice versa, is fair.

It appears to me that it was fair, in the nomination of the subcommittee, to make certain that we carried out the mandate of the Senate, and completed the work as charged by the Senate. It was suggested that we nominate alternately and that the selection should be made always by a majority of the committee.

I, as one member of the committee—and I think perhaps I express the views of all—did not seek this appointment. I wish I were not on the committee. But it is a duty which I, as a Member of the Senate, intend to perform in a complete manner. I am willing to believe that we can get together and devise a set of rules in order to complete the business assigned us by the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Louisiana

that the Senate is operating under a unanimous-consent agreement, by which each member of the special committee appointed under the authority of Senate Resolution 219 will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield 1 minute of his time to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I do not think my time has been completely exhausted.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I shall withhold my request until the Senate returns to the business of the morning hour.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing, if the other members of the special committee also are willing, to release the remainder of my time, so that the Senate may resume its normal business.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I so request.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] whatever time remains to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Missouri is recognized for the remainder of the time of the Senator from Massachusetts, which is 10 minutes.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, first, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his generosity and graciousness in enabling me to say a few words on the matter now before the Senate. We have had a number of committees so far undertaking the investigation into the subject referred to the special committee and related matters.

At the outset, the majority leader made the suggestion, under a unanimous-consent request, that there be a committee of four, a select committee, with limited authority. Of course, we all know that the present select committee has not been able to stay within the limits of its authority, which related only to the matter affecting the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. It has not stayed within the authority as to time, but has asked for additional time. For that, I do not criticize any member of the select committee, nor, indeed, the committee itself. I have the greatest sympathy for them and understanding of their problems, as I had at the outset, because I think many Senators knew full well that the committee could not stay within the bounds, limitations, and confines of the unanimous-consent request upon which the Senate voted. We knew at the outset that the select committee was doomed to failure in its efforts to stay within these limitations. The breadth and scope of the examination has indicated that the committee has gone into matters far beyond those relating to the junior Senator from South Dakota.

The regularly constituted Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections made an attempt to proceed with this matter, as had been suggested by the minority and majority leaders on the day of the voting of the resolution. I was the chairman of the subcommittee, and I announced, just before the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] made his motion to recommit the natural-gas bill, that I certainly thought the Senate was not prepared to vote on the question until the matters in controversy were thoroughly examined and explored. Indeed, I thought we, as the Senate of the United States, owed it to the country to conduct and promote a full and complete investigation. We were frustrated in that attempt that afternoon by the appointment of the select committee.

Now there is a third committee which has undertaken to explore the matter. I do not in the least wish to be critical of any member of that committee. I realize there are many problems connected with the formation of a committee, such as the formulating of rules and, indeed, the election of a chairman; and I might say——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. If I may complete my statement, then I shall yield.

Upon the suggestion of our distinguished majority leader, I, as one member of the policy committee, upon his representation that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] would be agreeable to having the present special committee, which is now in difficulty, assume responsibility, said that if the Senator from Tennessee wanted it that way, I certainly would not oppose him; indeed, I would be for him.

We have now a proliferation of committees. We have found that the committees have not been able to function. Those committees are composed of Senators who are sincere, and whose sincerity and integrity I do not in the least impugn. I do question the judgment and opinion that prompt results will be obtained.

The Senate is now a month, almost to the day, away from the Monday which was the date of the vote upon the natural-gas bill, and the select committee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], has been functioning, but certainly not within the limits suggested by the resolution.

Mr. President, there must be some terminal date. There has to be a time within which reasonable men can try to get together, or a time within which reasonable men must determine that it is impossible for them to get together and give full credit to both sides. Of course, it should be said that reasonable men do not always see things alike. But I should like to say that, if a week from today, which, according to my calculation, will be the 15th of March, the special committee has not organized, is not prepared to proceed with business, has not elected a chairman, has not come to an agreement on the basis of which it can function and operate, I shall move that the special committee be discharged and that its functions be returned to the regular standing committees of this body, in whom we also should and must have confidence, and that the matter be gone into by those committees, as some of us thought should have been done from the outset.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall be glad to yield to my distinguished friend from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the distinguished Senator from Missouri not recall that on the day he mentions, when the matter was before the Senate and it had been quite apparent that the Senate itself was to take action on the matter, the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who was then chairman of the subcommittee, called a meeting and summoned a witness before the subcommittee without the minority member being given advice of such a meeting, and the minority member of that subcommittee got his information from the news on the ticker-tape brought to him by a newspaperman? It is that type of situation which I think the Senate as a body has the right to make sure is not repeated in either a select committee or a special committee of the United States Senate.

Mr. HENNINGS. My time is running short. I shall only say that announcement was made the preceding day that the subcommittee would meet the next morning at 10 o'clock. The subcommittee met. There were various objections made by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. On noon that day, before the select committee had been appointed, the Senator from Tennessee and I looked for the Senator from Nebraska on the floor. It happened that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota was on the floor, and, by common agreement, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee verbally invited him to appear before our subcommittee at 2 o'clock that afternoon.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. CURTIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to complete this statement, if I may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri declines to yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall yield as soon as I have completed the statement I wish to make in this connection.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota then called my office and said he would like to have a letter. A letter was written and delivered to him. He later notified the subcommittee that he was precluded from appearing because of a ruling of the Vice President of the United States that he could not appear before any other committee. Indeed, as I recall, he was advised not to speak to any other person about the matter. As an added largess, he was told he might be represented by counsel.

Mr. CURTIS and Mr. CASE of South Dakota addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to complete my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri declines to yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. There was some indication that the committee proceeded improperly. As I was chairman of the subcommittee at that time, I want to make it perfectly plain it was our effort

to proceed expeditiously, it was our effort to proceed promptly, and it was our effort to proceed in an orderly fashion. I question the integrity and sincerity of nobody, but I do not want any question raised as to my own integrity and sincerity in my efforts to bring before the subcommittee that afternoon the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who later said he would appear, not as a witness before the committee, but would appear in conferences with us, which he did, as will appear in the record of the subcommittee meeting that afternoon.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. CURTIS addressed the Chair.

Mr. HENNINGS. The point is that we should have faith and confidence in each other in matters of integrity, even if we may differ in matters of procedure, as apparently is the case at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from California. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Missouri what he well knows, that the minority leader has not questioned his integrity, and I do not think anything the minority leader has said could have any such implication; but, since I am in the position of minority leader, I say I do not think that it is the proper procedure for a committee to call a meeting without due notice being given to the minority member. If I were sitting on the majority side instead of on the minority side, I would not want any Member on this side who might be chairman of a committee or subcommittee fail to give adequate notice to the minority. I say that as a general matter of principle and fairness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from California will yield 1 minute to me, I want to call attention to the fact that as soon as the Senator from California informed the majority leader, at the noon hour, that the committee meeting had been called without notice to the minority member, the majority leader said that such procedure was entirely unacceptable to him, and that he would take action to see it did not happen in the future, if he could.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The distinguished Senator from Texas is entirely correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on the day Senate Resolution 205 was adopted by the Senate, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections met in the morning in executive session. I believe that was on February 7. We spent the morning in executive session, discussing matters of jurisdiction and related questions.

The hour arrived for the Senate to begin its proceedings. We were notified, I believe by a telephone call, that the Senate was in session. The Senate was then voting on Senate Resolution 205. The meeting of the subcommittee broke up with an announcement by the chairman, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], that we would meet that afternoon at 2 o'clock.

At no time was I ever informed that there would be a public meeting at 2 o'clock. At no time was I ever informed that the press and radio and movies and television representatives would be there. At no time was I advised that we were going to begin an investigation of the incident relating to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] on that afternoon. And at no time was I informed that the Senator from South Dakota was asked to appear as a witness.

The information came to me from a member of the press. I suggested to him that, surely, he was mistaken. As I recall, somebody else mentioned it. Finally a member of the press sought me out in the Senate restaurant, shortly after 1 o'clock, and again brought me the news that there was to be a public meeting, that the subcommittee was going to undertake the investigation of the Case incident, and that it was going to have the Senator from South Dakota there, all three of which statements were news to me.

I called my office, had my assistants call the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections is a part, and I was notified that what had been reported was true. I immediately reported the matter to the leadership.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one observation?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I regret very much that the Senator was not notified. I take his word that that was the case.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator say I was notified?

Mr. HENNINGS. I say I take the Senator's word that he was not. I am very happy to take his word for it, but committee counsel was asked to notify members of the subcommittee that the subcommittee would meet that afternoon. The period between the morning meeting and the afternoon meeting was rather brief. An effort was made to reach the Senator. I believe the Senator was with some people from his State. At any rate, I assure the Senator that every effort was made to communicate with him, and no effort was made to be surreptitious or to be unfair. I did not invite the movie cameras, nor did others who happened to be there.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Well, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield additional time to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BRIDGES. How much time have I remaining, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to state, further, that my office was not notified of that meeting; and I was right here in the building all the time. Had those in my office been notified, they would have known where to find me.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will yield further in regard to this matter, let me state that I have just been handed an excerpt from the minutes of the subcommittee.

Let me say that I do not think we need get into a great deal of controversy about this matter, because I am sure the Senator from Nebraska is sincere and truthful in all he says, and I hope he will take my word for what I have to say.

The minutes of the meeting of that day, February 7, reflect this:

> Because of the time element, the chairman ordered that the meeting adjourn at this point—

That was when the Senate began its session at 11 a. m.—

> and reconvene this afternoon at 2 p. m.

As to the other elements, if the Senator from Nebraska was not notified—and I am sure he was not, if he says he was not—I can only say that sometimes, unfortunately we have to rely upon others to get word to Senators when meetings are being held.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska for yielding to me.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield that entire time to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, since reference was made to a ruling of the Vice President and to the notices given to me at that time, I think perhaps I should say that the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] did speak to me on the floor on the morning indicated, following adoption of the resolution creating the select committee. At that time they indicated that, if possible, they would like to have the meeting during the afternoon; and they asked whether I would be available. I said I would be, so far as I knew.

Later, upon thinking over the matter, I thought that if I were to appear before the Hennings committee, I should do so in response to an invitation in writing. So I informed the Senator that I would appreciate receiving a letter asking or inviting me to appear, if I were to appear there.

Prior to receipt of the letter, or at almost the same time, I received a telephone call from the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who advised me that the select committee had then gathered in the Vice President's room and, although they had not organized, it was the opinion of all of them

that they would like to have me appear at, I believe, 1:45 that afternoon. It was then about 1:30. I do not recall that I advised him that I had been invited to appear before the other committee at about 2 o'clock; but, in any event, since there was no conflict in regard to time, I did appear before the select committee at 1:45 p. m. Shortly afterward the Vice President came in.

The select committee proceeded to complete its organization while I was present, and then discussed the jurisdiction of the committee. It seemed to be the opinion of the committee members that inasmuch as the select committee had been created by practically a unanimous vote of the Senate, with special jurisdiction for a special matter, it should have the exclusive call on my testimony for the time being. A letter was thereupon written, and immediately handed to me by the Sergeant at Arms. The letter, signed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], as chairman of the select committee, advised me that they were going to have a hearing a few days later, and requested me in the meantime not to make a public statement and not to appear before any other committee on the matter involved. I think that was based upon an opinion expressed by the Vice President, although it was not the Vice President who gave me the notice.

As soon as the letter had been handed to me by the Sergeant at Arms, I asked, I believe it was, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] whether I would be violating its spirit if I merely informally made a special appearance before the members of the other committee, as individuals, to tell them why I could not keep the 2 o'clock appointment. No objection was indicated, so I did that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Inasmuch as I presume the Senate will take a recess or will adjourn about July 1 or thereabouts, I wonder whether it would be in order to move to lay on the table any and all matters relating to committees handling this matter, and to have those matters lie on the table until we adjourn, so that individual Senators may look into those matters in their own time, and in the meantime proceed with the regular business of the Senate. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a motion is not in order at this time.

Has all time under the agreement been yielded back by those in charge of the time? Do other Senators claim time under the agreement?

If not, morning business is still in order.

THE TASK OF PROMOTING ECONOMIC GROWTH AND STABILITY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on February 20, the National Planning Association held a dinner commemorating the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Full Employment Act, of which I had the honor of being author.

The present President of the United States joined with many others of both major political faiths in praise of the 10-year record of accomplishments under that act.

The principal speaker at the dinner, Dr. Alvin H. Hansen, did not stop at surveying the record of 10 years, but called for the establishment of new goals, both in terms of steady economic growth and in terms of social growth. Dr. Hansen said:

> Now, after 10 years of almost incredible output performance, we need to assess not merely the speed of our growth and progress, but also the direction in which we are going. What qualitative goals shall we set up? What kind of a country do we wish to build? These are matters that we dare not overlook lest we perish, as a great nation, in the midst of material plenty.

As has been true through the years I have known him, Dr. Hansen was looking forward to the new tasks that must be undertaken.

Within a short time, I shall introduce a bill to amend the Full Employment Act to strengthen it on the economic side; to establish some growth and employment goals; and to initiate the development of programs which can be automatically activated on the positive, economy-stimulating side, when employment falls below a dangerous point. Dr. Hansen has discussed the need for these changes, as well as new social goals.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the text of his address to the anniversary dinner.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TASK OF PROMOTING ECONOMIC GROWTH AND STABILITY

(Address by Alvin H. Hansen at a dinner commemorating the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Employment Act of 1946, February 20, 1956)

It would be quite possible to use profitably all of the time allotted to me in a critical survey of what has been done under the Full Employment Act. This I shall, however, not do. Instead I wish to center attention on the future. Where do we go from here? I trust that what I shall have to say will not prove to be altogether noncontroversial.

Let me first make one preliminary statement. The Employment Act of 1946 sets a high goal. We are hearing a good deal nowadays about the relative merits of low-pressure ecconomics versus high-pressure economics. Now the Employment Act fortunately takes about as definite a stand on this issue as could be asked for. It plumps for high-pressure economics. It sets up in plain language the goal of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. The Employment Act is not simply an antidepression act. It does not cast its glance down a deep abyss with the aim of finding footholds to prevent a collapse. The act looks toward growth and expansion. It declares for creating and maintaining conditions that will promote maximum employment and production. The policy of low-pressure economics is clearly inconsistent with the purposes of the act.

The Constitution, we are told, is what the Supreme Court says it is, and the Employment Act in the years ahead will be what the President and the Congress make it. But the plain language of this act will always be a rallying cry for those who are on the side of a strong positive program for growth and expansion.

OLD HIGH NOT GOOD ENOUGH

Some economists, Schumpeter and others, have stressed the view that growth inevitably produces instability. On the other side it is sometimes argued that instability is a stimulus to growth. No one argues any more, however, that deep depressions really play a useful role. Yet one still hears not infrequently the view expressed that a recession from time to time should be welcomed. About this let me say one or two things.

First we have a habit of measuring the depth of a recession from the previous high. This practice should, however, not be tolerated, and we ought to hit hard at it every time it is done. In a growing dynamic society the economy's performance should be measured from the growth trend. Any previous best year is not good enough. Equaling last year's high, represents in fact about a $15 billion decline from the growth trend.

Another point about growth and stability. The farther we drop below the growth trend the sharper must be the subsequent spurt required to catch up again. Any recovery after a considerable departure from the growth trend must necessarily entail an abnormal upsurge involving a rate that is not maintainable. This is the curse of every boom. It spells trouble later on. The unmaintainable spurts of growth, and the problems they give rise to can only be minimized by keeping the economy as close as possible on the growth track.

STEADY GROWTH NEEDED

Steady growth in the United States is not merely of domestic concern. It is as important, perhaps even more important, for international peace and security, as the foreign military and economic aid programs. The economic stability of the entire Western World hangs heavily upon the United States. Multilateral trade cannot flourish except on the solid basis of stable growth in the United States. More and more the problem of the business cycle throughout the free world is in essence that of cyclical fluctuations in the United States.

Steady growth is moreover of enormous importance in terms of capital-labor relations. The division of the product becomes no very serious matter so long as the aggregate to be distributed is growing steadily. Wage-price relations are manageable and easily reach a balance when income is growing. The so-called clash between full employment and price stability is not likely to become seriously acute in a steadily growing economy. Tolerance and social ease flourish in the soothing atmosphere of progress. Spot unemployment becomes manageable and basically curable only within the general pattern of expansion.

I have deliberately stressed the importance of steady growth. There are ways of promoting recovery which invite trouble. I believe we have witnessed this in some measure in the last year or two. There are many people who believe that some part of the great housing and automobile spurt of 1955 was unsound and may well cause trouble. I refer of course to the fantastically easy credit terms. There are other and better ways of promoting recovery. What worries me is not so much the possibility of defaults and repossession (on this score we are in a much stronger position than in 1929) but rather the fact that we have been borrowing against the future. The recent percentage rates of increase of consumer and mortgage credit cannot continue. Consumer credit sprees and spurts do not contribute to stable growth. We ought not to load the full employment program with the heavy burden of providing offsets against the seesaw of these "stop and go" credit spurts. Increasing consumer income by appropriate tax policy is a sounder way of promoting recovery than excessive increase in consumer credit.

No one wants a minutely planned economy with rationing and wage and price controls. The free world everywhere, even in countries

governed by Labor and Socialist Parties, has shown a strong desire to get rid of these controls as soon as it is possible to do so. But selective controls are something different. Selective controls are needed on a permanent basis to police practices which may, if pursued for long, build a private debt instability into our economy.

GOVERNMENT AIDS THE ECONOMY

This matter is however a detail, and let us get on to broader considerations. We now need to find ways and means of strengthening the machinery for insuring steady growth. We are not likely, I fear, to make much headway if we slip back part way toward the older practice of leaving private enterprise to shift for itself. Left to itself alone, private enterprise is probably not much more capable of giving us balanced economic growth today than it was in the 1920's. Our success in checking the recessions of 1949 and 1954 is due in no small measure to the new partnership which has been developed between Government and enterprise. We no longer have a purely private-enterprise economy. We have developed a mixed public-private economy, and we do well continually to stress this fact. To take one case for illustration, where would housing be today did not the loans insured or guaranteed by the Federal Government now represent two-fifths of the entire home-mortgage debt? I read statements almost every day which, surveying the American economic scene, blandly proclaim: Look at the performance of private enterprise when you give it a chance to show what it can do on its own, overlooking altogether the vast role played by Government in our mixed public-private economy.

We have indeed developed a private-enterprise system which performs magnificently under the pressures of adequate aggregate demand, and all the world marvels at its efficiency and driving power, its innovational genius and the all-pervading spirit of enterprise. But the American economy is stronger and more stable today than ever before largely because of important reforms in our economic structure and the new responsibilities which the Government has assumed—a responsibility which has become a firm bipartisan commitment.

We are fortunately done with many of the controversies which raged not many years ago. Large and influential groups are now, broadly speaking, happy over our system of built-in stabilizers—the income tax, social security, farm program, deposit insurance, and the widespread holdings of liquid assets. All this constitutes, indeed, an important milestone in the building of a strong economy. Many of those who strongly opposed all or most of these reforms a few years ago now hail them as sound and helpful. I can recall, and so can all of you, many a conference and many a controversy in which it was argued that these devices would at best be unworkable, and at the worst disastrous to the economy. All this has changed. We have reached by now a heartening measure of agreement on the built-in stabilizers, on the use of fiscal operations to even out the cycle, and on the lending and guaranteeing devices to promote balanced economic growth.

THE NEXT STEP

Now we need to go one important step farther. The built-in stabilizers can, indeed, cushion the decline and in some measure put a brake on the boom, but they cannot bring about an actual rise in income and employment. They cannot pull the economy back on the growth track. For this positive countermeasures automatically applied are needed.

We need a system which will exert a strong upward pull on the economy when it is down below the growth trend and equally a strong downward pull if it should bounce up into an inflationary boom. Our built-in stabilizers apply brakes, but no pull. We need pulls, not merely restraining devices. The beauty of the positive automatic mechanism is that if the pull should prove to be too strong, it is self-correcting. It is always at work to promote buoyant yet stable growth.

This positive automatic mechanism involves a schedule of changes in tax rates and perhaps changes in expenditures which automatically go into effect whenever the economy moves beyond the signposts set up as norms. We have had widespread discussion over some years about different procedures the comparative merits of which I shall not here try to assess. What I want to stress is that we should now introduce a new model. The old model is good and we should preserve and strengthen it, but it should be supplemented by a positive automatic mechanism.

SIGNALS FOR ACTION

The first signal for an automatic reduction in tax rates and an increase in expenditures might possibly be an unemployment rate of, say, 3.5 percent for 3 successive months. At the opposite pole, moving from full employment into inflationary pressures, the first alert might be unemployment rates of less than 2.5 percent, but with the first signal for an increase in rates and a reduction in expenditures when wholesale prices begin to rise by, say, one-half of 1 percent per month for each of 4 successive months. I hold no brief for these figures. They are only suggestions for discussion and further research.

Countermeasures implemented in an automatic manner would help to insure that at least some positive stimulus would be offered early, after a change in the cycle amount has occurred. But I do not suggest that we sit back with folded hands relying solely on automatic devices. The flow of economic events is far too complex to permit that kind of simple solution. Congress and the Executive must continually be on the job. One of the most encouraging things that has happened in this country, in my judgment, is the development of a high degree of political sensitivity to the problem of unemployment. Here the work of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report is playing a vital role, alerting the country when danger signals appear on the horizon. This is of the utmost importance. No amount of automatic machinery can take the place of discretionary action by the Executive and by an alert and informed Congress. Indeed I regard this development as even more important than any automatic device.

In the field of taxation there are 1 or 2 things I should like to say. The joint committee, under the able leadership of Senator DOUGLAS and Congressman MILLS, has produced two remarkable volumes of papers and hearings on tax policy. These volumes show unmistakably that we are confronted with serious unfinished business. A few years ago the National Bureau of Economic Research issued a notable study which disclosed a trend toward a somewhat more equal income distribution in the United States. This finding was acclaimed on all sides as indicative of a healthy condition in our economy. This development was, of course, no accident. It was the hard-earned result of important reforms in our system—a more progressive income tax, social security, farm program, collective bargaining, minimum-wage laws, and full-employment opportunities. But the studies and hearings of the joint committee to which I have just referred make it abundantly clear that we are slipping back. The progressivity of the income tax is being whittled away bit by bit. Randolph Paul (whose death we all mourn) said in the hearings 2 weeks ago that our tax system, to an alarming extent, lacks the progressivity it pretends to have. Eighty-two percent of the total yield of the individual income tax comes from the first bracket. Tax avoidance techniques multiply.

MORE PROGRESSIVE TAXATION

I have myself believed, and still do, that the 25 percent capital-gains tax has been a highly useful instrument to draw investment funds into venture capital. But the umbrella of the differential rate is being spread to areas that cannot be justified. We need to root out the tax-evasion gadgets that have crept in and also, on the other side, to make a reasonable reduction in the artificially high top bracket rates. Above all the effective progressivity of the income tax must be strengthened. There are today powerful forces hard at work trying to make our tax structure more regressive, partly by sales-tax proposals and partly chopping away at the individual income tax. It is perhaps no exaggeration to say that the most important single battleground confronting American politics today is this issue of progressivity in our tax structure.

Those who contend that it is a question of the rich against the poor are quite mistaken. It is a battle the outcome of which will determine in no small measure the strength and stability of the American economy. The more advanced the economy, the greater its accumulation of capital and wealth, the more important is a wide distribution of income.

Notwithstanding some progress toward a more equitable income distribution, we still have with us the serious problem of low-income families. Were Jacob Riis living today, he would indeed not call his book How the Other Half Lives, but he might well use the title "How the Submerged Decile or Quintile Lives." Our much heralded high average income is indeed the envy of even high standard countries, but astonishment is often the reaction one gets to the incredibly wide spread between the median income in the United States and the income of the lowest decile. Not only have we been historically the country with the widest cyclical savings; we have also exhibited the widest spread between income classes, especially at the bottom of the scale.

OUR SHORTCOMINGS

This spread holds not only with respect to income but also with respect to education and physical fitness. No other advanced country has so high a rate of illiteracy or near illiteracy; no other advanced country has so high a proportion of its youth physically and mentally unfit for military service. Nor does any other advanced country have so high a rate of crime (our homicide rate per capita is nearly 15 times per capita that of England); and no other advanced country has so high a juvenile-delinquency rate. Our slums persist in the midst of a $400 billion GNP. Our great cities lack the amenities of adequate public buildings, parks and playgrounds. Compare the city hall of Stockholm with that of Boston or the parks of Aarhus with those of Cambridge, Mass., or the quality of schooling received by the children of low-income groups in Holland with that received by comparable groups in Philadelphia or Chicago, not to mention the rural schools in our poorer States. It is not only the personal incomes and the physical and mental status of the submerged tenth which is seriously deficient; it is also their opportunity to share in the amenities of life which only the community can offer. This is a job for government. And if we hide behind the doctrine that all this is no affair of the Federal Government, we become in practice pure defeatists. I can, however, not leave this subject without paying tribute to the splendid work of the joint committee on the problems of low-income families and ways and means of dealing with these problems at the Federal level.

The more we emphasize steady, long-term growth in disposable income and consumption, the more we broaden the consumption base, the less we need to worry about cyclical variations in private investment outlays.

Yet here also something can and has been done. We have heard a great deal about the long-term investment plans of private corporations. This new development is highly important and it can be strengthened the more Government gives business a firm assurance that it will not shirk the task of promoting steady economic growth. And while we applaud long-range capital planning for private enterprise, should not the Federal Government itself undertakes in a more systematic manner than achieved thus far, long-range public-investment planning? We should have a McGraw-Hill report, so to speak, on public-investment plans.

WELFARE BUDGETS INADEQUATE

When I say "public investment" I mean not merely public works and resource development projects. I include investment in human resources as well—schools, scholarship programs, medical research, recreational facilities, etc.

The problem of long-range public investment planning is all the more important in view of our large and now again increasing defense and foreign aid budgets. The national security budgets compete with the growing urgent need for much larger long-range social welfare budgets. I think we should all agree that national security comes first. Indeed I have never been able to understand why we continually debate the question whether our military strength is more or less equal to that of the Soviet when we in fact have ample resources to ensure our superiority by a wide margin. Our military program should be adequate to guarantee without question the peace of the world for the visible future. I am not, therefore, suggesting that we should reduce our military program. But I do nonetheless say that we should increase now by a substantial amount our long-range public welfare budgets. That may involve a reappraisal of tax cuts. We are in a situation in which the marginal tax dollar can clearly yield a much higher social utility than the marginal pay envelope dollar.

A $550 BILLION GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT IN 1965

The Employment Act sets up the targets of maximum employment and production. It was rightly stressed by many, when the act was being formulated, that employment alone is not enough. People might be employed at make-work jobs. Production of useful goods should be the goal. Full employment is but an end to that goal. Quantitative targets are all right as far as they go but we can't stop there. Wise management of our economy involves not merely full use of productive resources, but also the best allocation of our resources. We can produce a gross national product of $550 billion by 1965. That is $150 billion more than now. Out of that $150 billion we can well afford the needed services in public investment and social welfare budgets. Only so, can we ensure the highest social utility.

Not infrequently I hear people say, "Of course, but let the market take care of that." Superficially that sounds good, but in fact that answer will not do. The market cannot decide how much we shall spend on a military program. It cannot decide how much we shall spend on a foreign aid program. It cannot be allowed to decide how much shall be spent on schools or on social security. We have reached a point in our economic and social evolution where social value judgments, not the market, must control the uses to which we put something like one-fourth of our productive resources. Our economy is a mixed public-private economy. It is no longer wholly a market economy.

And how are these social value judgments to be determined? Do we leave it to chance, to nature, to the elemental uneducated instincts of people? That indeed is the rule among savages. But civilized countries follow another rule, and it is this: "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is a man he will not depart therefrom." Civilized countries mold their people into civilized ways of thinking, guided by values that experience and knowledge have laid down. We educate, draw out, bring up. The Anglo-Saxon root words suggest the true meaning. We don't leave it to the market; we educate. Only in this way can we achieve the great goals of a civilized society.

Here I come upon a critical point. Our schools and churches can no longer be said to constitute the main educational media in this country. Modern technology has largely supplanted these older media. Children, young people and grownups devote more hours per day the year around to the radio, television, and the movies than they do to school, church, or the reading of magazines and books. These mechanical media have become an important element in our entire educational process. And what worries me is this. This powerful educational media is controlled, not by educators, but by advertisers whose primary purpose is profit, not education. Is it any wonder that we prefer longer and longer cars with more and more chrome to good schools and reasonably well paid teachers? At the very least, advertisers should not, I suggest, be allowed to sponsor or select the programs, apart from their own commercials.

SOCIAL PRIORITIES

Thus the problem of social priorities is hard upon us. It is not enough to achieve maximum employment and production. It is not enough to have quantitative goals. We cannot allow the Employment Act to become merely a device to make our economy an efficient treadmill.

This is an area in which economists have been, I feel, neglectful of their duty. We need more study of social priorities.

Yet with all our distorted values, there is happily a growing realization that we have accumulated a large backlog of long-range public welfare projects. This means larger and larger Federal budgets, not only absolutely, but also in relation to the gross national production.

Let it be noted that the growing ratio of Government purchases of goods and services—a trend which has been going on throughout our history—does indeed point up the unmistakable fact that our economy is becoming more and more a mixed public-private economy. But Government ownership and operation of the means of production—the classical definition of socialism—is not noticeably on the increase. The recent massive volume by the 20th Century Fund on America's Needs and Resources discloses the interesting fact that employment in public enterprises has increased only slightly from 1.3 percent in 1929 to 1.8 percent in 1950. It is the "welfare state" that is growing, not the Government as owner or operator. The welfare state is primarily a redistributor of income, and a colossal purchaser of the products of private enterprise.

The growth of public budgets means that the public finance method of paying for goods and services will grow in relation to the market-price method. It does not mean that private enterprise is shrinking or that the tax base is shrinking. The goods are purchased from private enterprise. Thus private enterprise continues to grow in much the same proportion as the gross national production. The "welfare state" does not in any appreciable degree operate to supplant the system of private enterprise. Instead it makes it stronger and more workable.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

The budget settled, how is it to be financed? This involves decisions of the utmost importance for steady economic growth. First there is the matter of the tax structure, paying proper regard to the principle of progressivity. And next there is the matter of tax versus loan financing, as the case may be, depending upon the requirements of full employment and stability.

In this connection I will only mention in passing matters about which I have written and spoken, I fear, ad nauseam. I refer to the important role of a growing supply of liquid assets—money and "near money"—and the relation of this to the public debt. The widespread holdings of the public debt by individuals, savings institutions, corporations and commercial banks act as a cushion against recession. This is indeed a part of our built-in stabilizing machinery. We have witnessed during and since the war the far-reaching reciprocal relation between private debt and public debt, and more recently the shifts in commercial bank holdings of United States Government securities which has helped to stabilize the money supply. Experience has taught us the importance of ample holdings of liquid wealth by the private sector of the economy as an impelling force for buoyant economic growth. Yet the growth of liquid wealth during the last 20 to 25 years, is largely an accident, and we hear from time to time loud voices in high places demanding policies that would destroy it.

By now the shock of new ideas is pretty well over. Public opinion is in a more receptive mood. Have we not now reached a point at which it might be politically feasible to discuss the public debt and its role in the modern community on a more adult plane than seems to have been possible in the 10 years of the Employment Act. The record of the economic reports with respect to this matter does not, I fear, stand up well under scrutiny. The joint committee has, however, offered, it should be noted, a forum for public discussion of these matters which has been, I believe, of major educational value.

QUALITATIVE GOALS

We have had 20 years of vigorous discussion of compensatory tax policy resulting in virtually complete agreement among professional economists. Indeed I would be hard put to name any other policy measure about which there is so much unanimity of opinion. Yet in the current budget message and in the state of the Union message a tax principle is advocated wholly at variance with the principle of a compensatory tax policy. This point was effectively discussed by a number of distinguished participants, including Randolph Paul, in the current hearings of Senator DOUGLAS' committee.

And now to conclude, 10 years ago, the Employment Act rightly emphasized the quantitative goals of maximum employment and production. Now, after 10 years of almost incredible output performance, we need to assess not merely the speed of our growth and progress, but also the direction in which we are going. What qualitative goals shall we set up? What kind of a country do we wish to build? These are matters that we dare not overlook lest we perish, as a great Nation, in the midst of material plenty.

FAITH, HOPE, AND PARITY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, agriculture is a postwar casualty. Along the way, to meet the challenges of a global conflict, we expanded the farm business in America by more than 30 million acres, or an amount equal to the tillable land of Wisconsin and Illinois combined. After the war our rehabilitation program continued to call for gigantic production. Until about 1948, 14 percent of our total American farm production was going abroad. When our former allies and some of our former enemies got on their feet, they no longer needed our farm products. In fact they were soon trying to compete with us.

Although our own population is increasing about 2½ million each year, we cannot possibly consume the production that was geared to a world war situation.

Under our bipartisan national farm policy flexible price supports were conceived as a means of encouraging production, when needed, and as a means of discouraging production, when not needed. That policy also provided for the ever-normal granary known as the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is an excess supply tank designed to take surpluses off the market and send them back when needed. Fixed supports at 90 percent of all parity—based on 1909–1914 relationships—were invoked to meet the Korean situation, when greater production was needed. But when the Korean situation ended the politicians insisted on keeping up the wartime incentive during a peacetime era. Likewise, the changeover from old horse-and-buggy parity to modern parity was also stymied. Meanwhile this excess production, primarily in wheat, cotton, and rice, at prices which will not move the products in world markets, continued to pile up in the Commodity Credit Corporation. We have run out of storage space. We are storing wheat in more than 300 ships and on the ground in tents larger than Ringling Brothers' Big Top. Meanwhile, the politicians insist on 90 percent fixed parity, based on the 1909–14 relationship, even though mechanization has completely changed the picture, particularly in the case of wheat. For example, during the base parity period, 1909–14, 1 man-hour produced 26 bushels of wheat. Today, 1 man-hour produces more than 120 bushels of wheat.

The hog situation is bad because in the past year we produced 73,900,000 pigs, as compared with 61 million 2 years ago. Meat is perishable. There simply is not enough cold-storage space. At a lower price, however, pork is moving consistently into the channels of consumption. The same was true of eggs a year ago. The amount of dairy products in excess of current consumption is not serious. Although production is up, consumption is up, also.

Mr. President, in this situation we need facts, not fantasy; we need statesmanship, rather than politicians. Also the cost-price squeeze is the farmer's greatest puzzle. The prices of the things we buy bear no direct relationship to the price schedule of the things we sell. Labor-management policies are of just as great concern to the farmers as are national farm policies.

Mr. President, unfortunately, I have not been able to read all the material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in relation to the farm bill. However, I have given much consideration to this subject, and have prepared a statement on it. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARM BILL

(Statement by Senator WILEY)

We all recognize that the eyes of the Nation are on the vote today in the Senate.

We recognize that the bill which we are going to vote on today will have to go to conference, where the conflicting Senate and House versions will have to be worked out.

We have, of course, had extensive debate in the Senate on this subject. My colleagues have for many days now submitted to the Senate—data showing the impact of the new bill on various segments of American agriculture.

It is not my intention to try to repeat now what they have already said in great detail. The record will, of course, speak for itself.

It is, however, my intention to present comments with regard to the impact of this bill, or any other similar bill, on agriculture in my own State—America's Dairyland—Wisconsin, and in other dairy States.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DAIRY WAY OF LIFE

In stressing the dairy aspects of this bill, I am not, I assure you, taking a narrow view of the farm picture.

After all, dairying is not simply one of many types of farming, rather, it is the greatest single source of cash income to all United States farmers.

It is the most vital single source of health and nutrition for every man, woman, and child in the United States population.

Whether for example, tobacco consumption goes up or down is of interest to the tobacco farmer, the cigarette, pipe, and cigar companies. But if dairying suffers that is a matter of major moment to our entire society.

CONTRAST BETWEEN DAIRYING AND OTHER COMMODITIES

I want to draw a clear distinction between the problems faced by dairying and those faced by some of the other agricultural commodities.

We, of the dairy region of our country, are as troubled about mounting surpluses, as is virtually any group in our country. Fortunately, great progress has been made in reducing at least the dairy surplus, through sales, donations, etc.

Meanwhile, however, the surpluses of other farm products have continued at a terrifically high level: Cotton, tobacco, wheat, corn, etc.

I, for one, want to see higher milk checks for Wisconsin farmers.

As regards other commodities, I shall vote so as to prevent higher cotton and related surpluses. I want it clearly understood that so far as I am concerned, there is a tremendous distinction to be drawn between the dairy problem, and the problem faced by other commodities.

Moreover, I want it clearly understood that the method for computing dairy parity is one of the most crucial aspects of the problem, in addition to the question of the level of dairy parity.

GIVE FARMERS COST OF PRODUCTION AND PROFIT

In speech after speech in my State, people have always asked me, "Senator, what specific figure do you favor for dairy parity?"

I have stated that my answer is very simple: I want that figure—that level—that price—which will give the dairyman his cost of production, plus a reasonable profit.

If you compute dairy parity soundly, then at least you take a major step forward in giving the dairyman a fair break, and that is what I am urging today.

THERE MUST BE PARITY SUPPORT

There may be some Americans who think that there should be no dairy parity supports at all for the milk farmer. They may not realize some of the facts concerning dairying's crucial importance, and it is for this reason that I am setting forth a detailed description of the severe problem faced by dairying.

Remember the whole history of many past societies reflects too often the tragic pattern of dairying's decline—resulting in a decline of nutrition, a decline of fertilizer for the soil and consequently, the utter depletion of the soil.

That must not happen here. Dairying is not a job; it is a way of life.

Dairying is essential in every respect to America.

Other types of farming rob the soil. Dairying enriches the soil. Thus, as we survey this bill, we hope that the proposed soil bank provisions will work to enrich America's soil, but regardless of how well they succeed, we can ill afford a decline in United States dairying.

THE GRIM FARM FACTS IN WISCONSIN

My own State of Wisconsin has, of course, the greatest number of milk cows—2,311,000—in the Nation, with the highest milk production (in 1955, amounting to 16.5 billion pounds).

The farm picture in Wisconsin is inevitably a reflection of the national agricultural scene. And I say in all frankness, it is a grim reflection indeed. For those Wisconsin farmers distant from the major metropolitan milksheds and from high fluid milk sales, the picture is particularly grim.

Milk checks have shrunk and dairy purchasing power is down, down, down. For all Wisconsin dairy farmers the cost of production has gone up and the prices received for products have skidded downward. In January of 1956, the purchasing power of our Wisconsin farm products hit the lowest level of any January since 1939.

The latest farm census shows that the number of farms in Wisconsin has dropped from 168,561 in 1950 to 153,558—a drop of over 15,000 farms, or nearly 9 percent. Incidentally, 10,725 of these were the small ones—from 10 to 99 acres. Now is the lowest number of farms in Wisconsin since 1890.

Approximately 40 percent of our Wisconsin farmers have had to become part-time farmers, to supplement their incomes. They have had to go out and find other jobs, so that they can meet expenses and support their families.

THE PITTANCE RETURN FOR THE FARMER

The average wage of the Wisconsin farmer is computed at only 41 cents an hour—I repeat "average;" it gets as low as 11 cents an hour.

What kind of a return is that when the average wage in United States manufacturing is well over $2 an hour for a 40 hour week? So, the farmer earns little, and the farm laborer, despite wage increases, still gets a very modest return.

I AM TALKING FOR THE LITTLE FELLOW

Remember, I am talking basically of the family-sized farm in Wisconsin and in all America.

Badger farms now average only 146 acres. That is a bit larger than before, 9 acres more on the average than in 1950. But it is tiny compared to the giant farms of thousands and thousands of acres in parts of the Corn and Wheat and Cotton Belts.

The big fellows will fare well, particularly if they get rigid supports; but what about the little fellow? What about the family-sized farmer who faces the problem of huge surpluses in warehouses?

SOME FARM AUCTION NOTICES

Obviously, the President's remedial 9 point farm program must be acted upon. Time is short. City people must understand that the farmer must get parity support.

I have in my hand some farm auction notices from Wisconsin newspapers. Is that the type of future we want our farmers to look forward to—selling out, quitting the land of their fathers and forefathers? Is that the way we expect America to prosper? Is that the way we expect to nurture new American leadership? Do some city people forget that often in the past, great leaders have grown up from the farms to the helm of mighty corporations, cities, and States? Do we want farming to die out as a source of America's growth and strength?

Of course not.

The farm is the true laboratory of all life—where nature's mysteries—birth, growth and decline—rhythmically unfold with the seasons.

Springtime will soon be here, and with it the first buds, the first shoots. Where in the cities can we see so awesome and inspiring a drama as on the farm?

THE BACKBREAKING LOAD ON FARMER

But farming is no easy task. It is backbreaking. It is long and complex. The dairy farmer must be a plant and an insect expert, an amateur veterinarian, a mechanic, accountant, economist, and a dozen other specialties rolled into one—7 days a week, virtually 52 weeks a year.

I repeat I mention these facts so that the city man or woman may better appreciate the farmers' problems.

I mention them so that some city people may not say: "Oh, listen to those farm Senators, just talking about parity supports for the farm people, as if the farmer were the only one involved."

ALL AMERICANS AFFECTED BY DAIRY SITUATION

The consumer is very definitely involved in the farm question. He doesn't want to see huge cotton or tobacco surpluses. He does want to see dairy items produced for the stomach, not for the warehouse.

Thus, in trying to arrive at my decision on this bill, I have asked myself not just the question, "What is the best possible policy for United States farming?" Rather, I have asked: "What is the best policy for the public interest?" The interest of the consumer, who should increase his consumption of vitamin-rich dairy products—milk, butter, cheese, ice cream, dry milk solids? The interest of the laboring man, the businessman, the white collar worker, the dealer (who wants to sell, say, farm implements), the retailer, who wants to sell the farmer various items in stores in towns and villages; the automobile manufacturer, who wants to sell the farmer a new car?

So, although I speak now principally of the farmer's problems as such, I have certainly not thought of him exclusively.

In taking my stand, I have thought of the welfare of all of us—165 million of us.

I base my action on the indisputable premises that we can neither permit huge increases nor surpluses of the so-called six basic commodities nor can we afford to allow the vital dairy farm segment of our population to suffer further.

PROSPERITY EVERYWHERE BUT IN FARMING

Everywhere in our country we are enjoying record prosperity—everywhere but in farming. How long can we permit this ironic contrast to continue? Let us therefore take action on the President's nine-point program.

CURRENT BILL NO CURE-ALL

I do not say that the pending bill in its final form when it emerges from a conference committee—I do not say that it will automatically correct all phases of the situation.

But I do say that the present situation—the status quo—cannot and must not continue.

Of course, we will have new problems under the new law. But I doubt if they will be anywhere like as severe as those arising under the status quo, prior to the President's nine-point program and prior to recomputation of the base period used in the dairy parity index.

DAIRYING PUSHING SELF-HELP PROGRAM

Let me say that although I have been speaking necessarily about legislation this afternoon, I recognize full well that legislation is no "magic wand" for improving the farmer's position.

Comprehensive self-help must be undertaken, and fortunately, it has been undertaken by the dairy industry.

The dairy farmer is definitely not leaving "everything up to Uncle Sam." He has been taking ever increasing steps in his own behalf. We have just been celebrating Wisconsin Cheese Week for example, so as to raise cheese consumption.

Traditionally, the farmer is self-reliant. He does not lean on the Government.

All that he asks is that he get minimum protection as under this bill. He asks for it, just as the laboring man gets protection in his minimum wage, the businessman gets protection in his minimum tariff, the airline gets protection against disastrous losses by getting mail subsidies, the railroads get protection by having received right-of-way from the Federal Government, various business interests are assured inexpensive service from the postal department by modest postal rates.

The farmer looks about him and sees all of these protective instances.

THE FARMER'S SPECIAL VULNERABILITY TO LOSS

He wonders, therefore, why he should be the only one to whom some city people would deny minimal protection.

Why should it be he, of all people, the only economic group in the entire population, which has to sell at wholesale and buy at retail, the only economic group which is almost at the absolute mercy, not only of avalanche supplies from other producers, but at the mercy, possibly, of the weather, insects, livestock disease, competition from synthetics, and from a wide range of other factors.

AN ESSENTIAL DAIRY PROVISION

Now, of all this 49-page, multiclaused committee bill, a "heart," so far as the dairy farmer is concerned is the section providing a new base period for determining the parity equivalent of manufactured milk—the period to be the 30-month span between July 1946 and December 1948.

This 30-month period represents a relative "free" market—that is, free of both price controls and price supports. The market—both before and since—has been held at somewhat artificial levels, by either OPS price ceilings or CCC inventories.

PARITY EQUIVALENT AMENDMENT

The basic purpose of the section is, of course, to provide stability in dairy price relationships in place of the present downward trend due to what I frankly feel were unwise administrative actions. The background is slightly technical, but let me briefly summarize it.

In 1949, to support the price of dairy products, the Department of Agriculture devised a formula to be used in determining the dollars and cents support price. This formula represents the ratio between (1) the price of all milk sold wholesale and (2) the price of milk used for butter, cheese, and other manufactured dairy products, during the period of July 1946 and December 1948, or a ratio of 88.5.

In 1954, the Department used a broader base, resulting in a new ratio of 84.1.

In 1955, the Department used a still broader base, resulting in a ratio of 83.7.

In 1956, a new base will result in a ratio of only 83.3.

At the present time, the support price for dairy products is $3.15 per hundredweight. This actually represents approximately only 77 percent of parity, based upon the 88.5 ratio.

However, based upon the 83.7 ratio, the $3.15 would appear to represent 80.2 percent parity.

In other words, the Department shows continuing so-called improvements to dairy farmers, but only through a lower and lower ratio on a constant support price.

BENEFITS OF NEW FORMULA

According to estimates, the new formula would increase the price of manufactured milk 11 cents per hundredweight—from $3.15 to $3.26.

This provision will protect dairy farmers against a reduction that could be made, under present parity computation, to $2.88 per hundredweight.

For the consumer, there will be little change in the retail price of dairy products—perhaps 1 cent per pound on cheese, butter, and other items. This is a small amount in comparison to the ill effects on the economy of further price-depression in the dairy industry.

LETTERS FROM WISCONSIN URGE DAIRY RELIEF

Recently, I have had a flood of letters from my State, stressing the importance of equitable dairy provisions in the farm bill.

I now include a few excerpts from these messages in the RECORD at this point.

May I state that just within the past 24 hours, I have received a great many messages from Wisconsin dairymen. They include my friends in the National Milk Producers' Federation, the American Farm Bureau Federation, members of the National Grange, members of the National Farmers Union.

A great many farmers' union members, for example, have taken the time and the effort to phone to me here in Washington. I appreciate getting their views.

I have weighed all of their opinions most carefully.

Now, let Wisconsin farmers and their wives speak for themselves:

ROBERTS, WIS., *March 4, 1956.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As the wife of a St. Croix County farmer, I am writing to request you to favor the Eisenhower farm program with flexible price support features. We hope you will support it in the Senate debate and in voting for it.

We earn our living on this 160-acre Wisconsin dairy farm with a hog enterprise as a sideline. A sound market for our milk and hogs, we believe, will come when the burdensome surplus discontinues holding down the natural return on a normal market.

There are many of our neighbors who favor flexible price supports and the other features of the Eisenhower farm program.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. GARDINER GRAHAM.

FEBRUARY 26, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: With respect to the farm bill which will be voted on in the Senate this week, I would like to see the restoration of high, 90 percent price supports removed and the remainder of the bill passed. I am in favor of the "soil bank" in principle and also the remainder of the administration's nine-point program.

As a farmer in St. Croix County, I am emphatically opposed to the restoration of high rigid price supports. This policy of high, rigid price supports has demonstrated during the past 4 years that it is bankrupt as a means to maintain farm income and a return to it could only continue to build up the surpluses which are driving down prices. Further, high rigid supports can only lead to such regimentation of our business that we will be, in effect, hired hands of the Government. Senator, I can run my farm better from here than anyone, whomsoever, can from Washington.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD F. LEWINSKI.

RIVER FALLS, WIS.

ELMWOOD, WIS., *February 24, 1956.*

SENATOR WILEY: We want no more rigid price supports to add to the surplus in farm products.

Make no mistake about it, the farmers and businessmen in this area are really in trouble.

Yours truly,

Mrs. BYRDIE DODGE,
CHARLES F. DODGE.

OFFICE OF COUNTY TREASURER,
Neillsville, Wis., February 28, 1956.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: I am in favor of the Eisenhower farm program. I am asking you to be sure to be there to vote for this bill and work for its passage. I believe this bill will help the farmers all over the United States because it will be a direct payment to the farmer and not to some warehouse company as in the past.

Let's get it passed before spring planting time so we can start getting our prices and income up this crop year, for us farmers.

A supporter,

DONALD H. BRAATZ.

BRULE, WIS., *March 2.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a family-size dairy farmer for 40 years, I would like to have you vote for the soil-bank plan without the 90-percent supports. Those 90-percent support laws have been no benefit for the last 10 years to Wisconsin farmers. They have actually been only useful to large corporation farmers and hobby farmers. Secretary Brannan had to destroy potatoes by kerosene and bulldozers to hold up the price. The consumer ate No. 2 potatoes and the family-size farmer is no longer in the potato business. If you want 1,000 farmers around the trading centers with gross income of $8 million instead of 50 farmers on same income probably living in Florida and California at this season, don't legislate competition by high rigid price supports.

Sincerely,

BIRGER W. EKE.

TONY, WIS., *February 29, 1956.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY:

Yes, I am in favor of the Eisenhower farm program. Let's get it passed before spring planting time so we can start getting our prices and income up this crop year.

GEORGE VANDER LOOP.

KILLSNAKE CREEK FARM,
Chilton, Wis., February 29, 1956.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have great concern over the farm bill S. 3183 now pending in the Senate. I am very much against the bill as it now stands. Surely you can see that setting up the new high rigid price supports would defeat every phase of the soil-bank program.

It has no real relief or help for the Wisconsin dairy farmer, or any livestock farmer for that matter. There are no restrictions for diverted acres going into livestock production.

I am for a program of bringing supply and demand to the marketplace and get the Government out.

Truly yours,

ELMER FEDERWITZ.

This, then, I believe, is the authentic voice of grassroots Wisconsin.

I do not say these are the only sentiments, because, as we well know, there is still considerable difference of opinion among worthy farmers and farm groups.

But I feel that these messages reflect a good sample of Wisconsin judgment, one which has been confirmed by messages from many prominent Wisconsin farm leaders to me.

STEP UP VOLUNTARY CONSUMPTION

One of many things on which all farmers agree is, however, the need for Americans voluntarily to eat more cheese, butter, ice cream, and drink more fluid milk.

I have urged down through the years, as I urge today, that the real answer to the dairy problem in America is to increase voluntary consumption.

Time after time, it has been pointed out by myself and others, that a genuine middle-class diet for the American people would tremendously raise present consumption totals.

Before World War II, families making more than $5,000 per year, purchased 1,036 pounds of dairy foods per person.

Today, almost an economic revolution has occurred in America. We are becoming, in effect, a middle-class nation. There are fortunately fewer and fewer families in the lowest income brackets, and more and more people have reached middle-class standards and tastes.

Yet, as our people have gone up the income ladder, they have very definitely not yet acquired the middle-class standard of eating dairy foods.

But note this fact: If those families which have moved up in spending power were educated to take on the same milk consumption habits of the prewar middle-income families, then it is estimated that the demand for dairy food products would expand to an annual figure of 40 percent above the 1955 level within 5 to 10 years.

So, the problem is not overproduction; it is underconsumption. Underconsumption not simply by the needy, by low-income people, by youngsters, but underconsumption by those who assuredly can afford to buy but, unfortunately, do not buy sufficient dairy products.

A BRIGHT SPOT—THE SCHOOL-MILK PICTURE

Fortunately, we are taking steps through this pending legislation to step up school-milk consumption.

That is one of the bright spots in the past, present, and future.

Already, it is our national good fortune that 16 million youngsters are drinking milk under the school lunch and special school milk programs. They are consuming about 18 million half pints of milk every school day.

And it is expected that these two programs will use the equivalent of around 3 billion pounds of milk in fluid form and as manufactured products this year. That figure equals 2½ percent of the annual United States milk production.

I have been delighted to work every single inch of the way with the Department of Agriculture on the special school milk program, and down through the years, I have sponsored a good deal of legislation along these lines.

CONCLUSION—NO CURE-ALL IN RIGID OR FLEXIBLE PARITY

I want to say just a final word with regard to the pending bill. I believe that the President of the United States has followed very closely this agricultural situation. From his own deep appreciation of agriculture, from his own experience on his Gettysburg farm, he knows full well the problems faced by our farmers.

I know that in the months and years up ahead, he will continue to give dairy problems his deepest attention, and I, for one, pledge my continued contact with him and with the Department of Agriculture, toward this objective.

Yes, I am determined to assure a fair break for the dairyman. I don't believe, however, we can get a fair break for the dairyman by piling up still more cotton and tobacco surpluses in Government warehouses.

Rigid parity is no cure-all for the farm problem, as some groups have contended. Nor even is flexible parity. Rather, comprehensive action is essential, including self-help.

And such action should be directed not to enrich a few huge corporation-size farms. Already such huge farms are filling the CCC warehouses with more surpluses.

Rather, our goal should be to help the family-sized farm. The dairyman wants to produce to fill stomachs, not to fill warehouses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have taken a very definite position in connection with the farm bill. In order that Senators may have the benefit of my opinion, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

Approximately five-sixths of all the farms in this Nation are 260 acres or less in size. These farms, in most instances, are family projects, in which the entire family participates. The income derived from these farms, and I must say it is exceedingly small, provides the family with the food, clothing, farm machinery, seed, and the necessities to sustain them throughout the year.

I think it is extremely important that we keep this in mind when we debate the present farm bill. I think we should keep in mind the fact that the legislation we pass in this body will affect the very existence of approximately 6 million farm families. It will determine whether these millions of families will begin to enjoy the present period of "prosperity" or whether they will continue to feel the hard pinch of declining farm prices.

S. 3183, the new farm bill submitted to the Senate by the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, embodies many attempts to solve the problems facing the farmer. I want to take this opportnnity to express my appreciation to all the members of this committee, and particularly to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for his untiring efforts to hear the many hundreds of witnesses who offered their proposals to improve the farm program.

This bill offers many beneficial proposals, but I think several modifications are needed to make it more helpful to the farm family. On Wednesday, February 22, I offered several amendments to the farm bill, and I hope they will be given favorable consideration. I want to offer some information which will give an idea of just what the farm family is up against under the present ill-advised and incompetent practices of the Department of Agriculture.

As Senators probably know, the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar as of December of 1955 was about 39 cents.

If we use the years 1947 to 1949 as a base, the following percentage figures indicate a great dislocation in our farm economy:

	Percent of base
Corporate income	157
Payrolls (factory)	160
Net farm income	72

As we well know, the farmer's share of the national income is disproportionately low. He is experiencing no prosperity. Actually, the farmer was fortunate if he met one-half

of his obligations last fall. The family-sized farm is facing bankruptcy.

I insert at this point the gross and net incomes per farm for the different regions in the United States for the years 1951 and 1954:

Region	Average realized gross income per farm		Average total net income per farm	
	1951	1954	1951	1954
Total United States	$6,714	$6,666	$2,919	$2,413
North Atlantic	7,635	7,812	2,455	1,860
East North Central	7,541	7,718	3,229	3,004
West North Central	8,980	8,717	3,742	3,344
South Atlantic	4,322	4,363	2,169	1,674
South Central	4,133	4,089	2,007	1,600
Western	13,854	12,993	5,873	4,137
North Atlantic:				
New York	7,913	8,061	2,665	1,829
New Jersey	14,827	14,813	5,108	3,886
Pennsylvania	6,310	6,373	1,976	1,430
East North Central:				
Ohio	6,153	6,709	2,351	2,794
Indiana	7,303	7,799	3,231	3,345
Illinois	10,895	11,099	4,489	4,308
Michigan	5,475	5,411	2,372	1,612
Wisconsin	7,428	7,015	3,596	2,666
West North Central:				
Minnesota	7,843	8,008	3,632	3,117
Iowa	12,295	12,251	4,957	5,235
Missouri	5,551	5,399	2,482	2,176
North Dakota	9,235	7,913	3,808	2,171
South Dakota	9,652	9,390	5,160	3,390
Nebraska	11,644	10,848	4,216	3,970
Kansas	8,888	8,077	3,133	2,718
South Atlantic:				
Virginia	$4,032	$3,945	$1,882	$1,538
West Virginia	2,490	2,493	1,130	1,056
South Central:				
Kentucky	3,403	3,335	1,791	1,714
Tennessee	2,832	2,805	1,468	1,172
Alabama	2,799	2,906	1,443	1,094
Mississippi	2,671	2,856	1,374	1,329
Arkansas	3,770	4,202	1,926	1,700
Louisiana	3,635	3,699	2,086	1,580
Oklahoma	5,059	4,932	2,105	1,504
Texas	7,472	6,870	3,334	2,325
Western:				
Montana	12,747	11,762	6,724	4,500
Idaho	9,617	8,614	3,671	2,516
Wyoming	15,995	12,240	8,180	2,432
Colorado	13,370	11,300	4,654	1,964
New Mexico	10,478	8,884	4,717	2,849
Arizona	33,742	37,336	19,607	16,104
Utah	8,166	8,884	3,543	2,148
Nevada	20,243	13,922	9,753	4,298
Washington	8,901	8,816	3,509	3,565
Oregon	7,958	7,384	3,303	2,265
California	20,390	18,986	8,277	6,190

The accompanying chart shows a comparison of national income and income from agricultural sources to persons living on farms for the period 1910 to 1954:

TABLE 101.—*National income and income from agricultural sources of persons living on farms, United States, 1910–54*

Year	National income		Farm income [1]	
	Amount	1947–49=100	Amount	1947–49=100
	Million dollars	*Percent*	*Million dollars*	*Percent*
1910	33,252	16.7	4,703	27.3
1911	32,393	16.2	3,888	22.5
1912	35,022	17.5	4,975	28.8
1913	37,552	18.8	4,253	24.7
1914	36,454	18.3	4,677	27.1
1915	38,574	19.3	4,797	27.8
1916	45,174	22.6	5,103	29.6
1917	54,749	27.4	9,001	52.2
1918	59,301	29.7	9,736	56.5
1919	67,608	33.9	10,061	58.3
1920	75,730	37.9	9,009	52.2
1921	59,272	29.7	4,138	24.0
1922	60,970	30.5	5,081	29.5
1923	71,686	35.9	5,895	34.2
1924	71,251	35.7	5,681	32.9
1925	76,304	38.2	7,575	43.9
1926	80,937	40.5	6,810	39.5
1927	79,123	39.6	6,569	38.1
1928	81,467	40.8	6,844	39.7
1929	87,122	43.6	7,024	40.7
1930	75,501	37.8	5,060	29.3
1931	60,046	30.1	3,981	23.1
1932	43,049	21.6	2,510	14.6
1933	40,572	20.3	3,012	17.5
1934	49,405	24.7	3,428	19.9
1935	57,052	28.6	5,858	34.0
1936	64,250	32.2	4,954	28.7
1937	71,941	36.0	6,754	39.2
1938	65,671	32.9	5,101	29.6
1939	70,336	35.2	5,189	30.1
1940	77,638	38.9	5,299	30.7
1941	95,406	47.8	7,455	43.2
1942	124,105	62.2	11,074	64.2
1943	153,950	77.1	13,248	76.8
1944	167,648	84.0	13,352	77.4
1945	168,590	84.4	14,021	81.3
1946	169,730	85.0	16,721	97.8
1947	185,296	92.8	17,383	100.0
1948	208,980	104.7	19,704	114.3
1949	204,641	102.5	14,651	85.0
1950	220,151	110.3	15,459	89.6
1951	250,779	125.6	18,003	104.4
1952	266,214	133.3	16,955	98.3
1953	279,007	139.8	14,833	86.0
1954	278,159	139.3	14,296	82.9

[1] Includes Government payments, 1933–55.

Data published currently in Farm Income Situation (AMS).

During 1955 the farm price index dropped 20 points in the State of North Dakota, and it is expected that this downward trend will continue in 1956. This is an 8-percent decrease for 1955, and the farm price index is expected to drop about 5 to 6 percent again in 1956. In 1955 the average price of wheat was down 15 cents less than in 1954; corn and oats were down 17 cents; barley, down 13 cents; rye, down 30 cents; and flax, down 24 cents, as compared to 1954.

This is the kind of prosperity the farmers are experiencing. They are faced with the alternative of leaving the farm and seeking employment in the urban labor market or continuing in a pursuit which they, their grandparents and great-grandparents have engaged, and which will result in greater indebtedness in 1956. Owners of family-sized farms are confronted with the decision of making another stab at seeding a crop. They want legislation which will give them a fair profit for their labor.

One might wonder how the farmer is doing as a worker or as a businessman. The attached two charts give a good idea of what the average Midwest farmer is receiving in the way of hourly pay or in return for his labor.

How the average Midwest farmer is doing as a worker

[All figures from 1954 operations]

	Average total income from farming	Average farm investment	5 percent return on farm investment	Hourly pay, with no return on investment	Hourly pay with 5 percent return on investment
				Cents	*Cents*
Wisconsin	$1,995	$29,885	$1,494	54	14
Minnesota	2,175	38,596	1,930	62	7
North Dakota	2,165	37,111	1,856	68	10
South Dakota	2,562	48,509	2,425	75	4
Montana	5,023	67,914	3,396	167	54
5-State average	2,531	41,648	2,082	77	14

How the average Midwest farmer is doing as a businessman

[All figures from 1954 operations]

	Hours worked per family (a)	Average factory wage (b)	Labor return (a×b)	Net loss on investment if family paid factory wages	
				In dollars	In percent
Wisconsin	3,700	$1.83	$6,771	−$4,776	−16
Minnesota	3,500	1.82	6,370	−4,195	−11
North Dakota	3,200	1.52	4,864	−2,699	−7
South Dakota	3,400	1.54	5,236	−2,674	−6
Montana	3,000	1.99	5,970	−947	−1
Five-State average	3,300	1.74	5,742	−3,211	−8

From: GTA Family Farm Survey.

PROSPERITY

We hear a great deal of talk today about the period of prosperity and well-being that we are now experiencing. Corporation profits are at a peak never before experienced in our history. Weekly earnings for manufacturing workers have been on a constant rise for a number of years.

But I assure Senators, that the farmer is not drifting with the tide. Let's compare some figures for the price of grain the farmers receive today with those that were received by farmers during the great depression of 1933. The national average price for wheat in 1933 was 70 percent of parity; today, it is 76 percent of parity. The national average price of barley in 1933 was 58 percent; today, it is 50 percent of parity. Rye was 73 percent of parity in 1933; today it is 43 percent of parity. In 1933, corn was

68 percent of parity; today, it is about the same.

There is certainly something wrong when prosperity reigns in one sector of our economy, and depression in another.

In 1948, it required about 40 hogs to buy a good tractor. Today, within a span of about 7 years, the same farmer must sell about 140 hogs to buy a tractor of the same quality.

Our prosperity is not all it is supposed to be. The farmer is not receiving parity with the rest of the country until we can get the farm family's net income on a par with the income of people in other walks of life, we will not have true prosperity. Until the owner of a family-sized farm receives a net income enabling him to provide his family with conveniences and educational opportunities enjoyed by urban families, we will not have true prosperity. And I might add that such low farm incomes will eventually, if such is not already the case, hurt the businessman, the worker, and the consumer.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

Another problem which has confronted the owner of the family-sized farm is our present policy of export and import of agricultural products. Our foreign economic and political policies have cut exports of agricultural products under the guise of improving international relations or bettering national defense. Farm exports have dropped about 25 percent since 1951. This has added greatly to the surplus in wheat which we have carried over from year to year.

We consume on an average of about 600 million bushels of wheat per year. Since 1951, we have produced annually about an average of 1 billion bushels of wheat per year. If this is the case, we would normally have a surplus of about 400 million bushels of wheat each year. The reduction in exports of farm products has added to the surplus on hand and, as of July 1, 1955, we had about 1 billion bushels of old wheat on hand. On July 1, 1951, before farm exports were curtailed, we had a total of about 300 million bushels of wheat on hand.

In 1951, we exported 422,670,035 bushels of wheat. In 10 months of 1955, we exported only 190,099,588 bushels of wheat. Is it any wonder that the surplus in wheat on hand is increasing with each year?

The accompanying figures show exports and imports of wheat, corn, oats, barley, rye, wool, pork and beef products.

Wheat: United States imports and exports, Canada and all sources, 1950 to date

IMPORTS

[Bushels]

Calendar year	Wheat, other, full duty		Wheat, unfit for human consumption	
	From Canada	All sources	From Canada	All sources
1950	1,001,435	1,001,435	3,235,045	3,235,163
1951	1,086,753	1,086,783	26,247,942	26,247,942
1952	1,096,545	1,096,711	30,602,327	30,606,918
1953	878,224	878,256	4,399,542	4,399,556
1954	999,364	999,625	3,621,083	3,621,873
1955 (10 months)	997,072	1,002,000	3,735,040	3,735,872

EXPORTS

Calendar year	All wheat	
	To Canada	All sources
1950	1,868,399	206,063,811
1951	1,229,377	422,670,035
1952	346,676	369,487,070
1953	2,523	235,573,421
1954	1,900	192,148,261
1955 (10 months)	1,296,036	190,099,588

Prepared in Import Division, FAS.
Source: Bureau of Census Reports (FT 110-FT 410).

United States imports and exports of agricultural commodities, Canada and all sources, 1946 to date

IMPORTS

Calendar year	Corn [1]		Oats		Barley [2]		Rye		Wool		Pork products		Beef and veal	
	From Canada	Total, all sources	From Canada	Total, all sources	From Canada	Total, all sources	From Canada	Total, all sources	From Canada	Total, all sources	From Canada	Total, all sources	From Canada	Total, all sources
	Thousand bushels	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*
1946	94	720	4,199	4,199	4,509	4,509	992	992	2,702	638,901	179	460	85	17,734
1947	83	622	723	736	306	319	818	818	1,176	398,512	250	318	34	34,479
1948	56	624	12,852	13,229	7,330	7,342	2,040	2,040	1,379	478,569	593	849	79,753	208,021
1949	50	742	17,020	17,020	15,007	15,419	12,190	12,190	1,084	272,324	683	2,889	88,237	157,301
1950	35	717	16,368	19,712	15,349	15,556	3,890	3,890	1,596	466,261	14,781	31,630	73,369	198,895
1951	57	729	51,464	51,517	15,188	15,204	1,561	1,561	1,027	555,175	22,427	48,952	91,613	312,817
1952	62	973	67,771	67,812	17,938	18,514	2,145	2,145	1,455	366,447	18,515	62,011	2,027	252,571
1953	47	936	87,304	88,753	36,555	36,699	15,867	15,867	1,137	294,196	65,083	146,027	17,495	140,033
1954	33	1,175	31,609	34,462	29,248	29,766	4,972	4,973	735	205,856	66,923	170,327	7,693	125,693
1955 (10 months)	24	1,046	9,569	15,012	12,450	12,523	3,332	3,333	331	213,904	55,084	135,731	6,033	99,435

EXPORTS

Calendar year	Corn [1]		Oats		Barley [2]		Rye		Wool		Pork products		Beef and veal	
	To Canada	Total, al. sources	To Canada	Total, all sources	To Canada	Total, all sources	To Canada	Total, all sources	To Canada	Total, all sources	To Canada	Total. all sources	To Canada	Total, all sources
	Thousand bushels	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*
1946	2,379	15,573	1,063	25,507	----------	1,407	----------	3,176	402	8,084	851	282,103	335	424,967
1947	8,048	127,563	.3	13,077	72	32,957	1,385	1,764	92	12,621	1,832	59,457	611	159,108
1948	10,431	23,604	352	14,349	66	18,925	2	1,110	1,340	11,071	2,023	28,640	48	15,406
1949	16,918	133,908	836	20,769	2,658	32,870	2	8,460	215	14,886	3,218	59,649	1,169	19,604
1950	24,932	96,280	175	1,548	243	19,704	----------	3,358	3	6,683	4,861	58,258	10,448	16,519
1951	11,741	100,083	----------	3,437	3,635	43,038	39	5,516	213	218	21,882	82,250	8,287	11,608
1952	6,392	99,498	----------	1,415	2,518	41,004	8	4,480	6	8	4,454	96,755	9,318	14,734
1953	5,729	131,383	6	1,214	288	21,907	----------	4	153	1,447	102	79,408	11,712	38,730
1954	11,433	76,549	11	991	9	25,707	.7	1,075	84	1,182	97	52,893	12,187	33,824
1955 (10 months)	3,025	79,584	24	16,177	14	56,131	1	3,129	101	202	45	54,144	11,309	34,571

[1] Includes seed corn.
[2] Includes malt.

Source: Foreign Agricultural Trade 1946 to 1954; FT 110-FT 410 Bureau of Census

FARM MACHINERY

Probably the greatest profits made by any manufacturer in recent years were those which came to the farm machinery manufacturers.

If we use the period from 1947 to 1949 as a base, we will find that the cost of farm machinery rose 30 percent in 1955.

Most farm machinery manufacturers appear to have settled on a 7-percent price increase during the year 1955. The Ford Motor Co. led the profiteering parade in 1955 with a boost in its prices for farm machinery from 3¼ to 8½ percent.

On January 5 of this year, I stated in a speech given before this body, that it would be well for all of us to examine the issues of the Wall Street Journal of several years ago and notice the quotations for the stock of some of the machinery manufacturers and compare those quotations of several years ago with those quotations for the stock of these companies as of today. As you will notice from the figures quoted below, the prices of some of those stocks have doubled or tripled.

I include in the RECORD at this point the quotations on common and preferred stock over a period of several years for the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., J. I. Case, John Deere Co., and International Harvester Co.

ALLIS-CHALMERS MANUFACTURING CO.

Capital changes: Split in 1929 of common stock. August 26, 1946, 500,000 new serial preferred shares ($100 par) authorized, 359,373 of which designated 3¼ percent convertible series.

May 6, 1953, authorized common increased from 3,750,000 to 5 million shares and par value was changed from no par to $20, share for share.

May 5, 1954, authorized serial preferred stock increased to 618,854 shares, and a second issue (350,000 shares) established as 4.08 percent series. At same time, stockholders approved a change in the articles of incorporation which eliminated existing preemptive rights of common stockholders. Stockholders, December 31, 1954: Preferred, 3,001; common, 35,465.

Year at New York Stock Exchange	Preferred	Common
1940	None	41⅞–21¾
1945	None	56⅛–38½
1954	147⅞–93¼	74⅞–45⅛
Feb. 29, 1956	142	71⅞

J. I. CASE

Capital changes: December 9, 1943, authorized common was changed from 300,000 shares ($100 par) to 1,200,000 shares ($25 par) for a 4-for-1 split. April 17, 1952, authorized common was changed to 4 million shares ($12.50 par) for a 2-for-1 split.

Stockholders: Preferred, about 1, 235; common, about 7,770.

Year at New York Stock Exchange	Preferred	Common
1940	120 –100	[1] 75 –39¼
1945	175 –152	43¾–35⅞
1954	129½–113	193¾–137⅞
Feb. 29, 1956	118	161½

[1] 1943 split.

JOHN DEERE & CO.

Capital changes—one split in 1930. Another split on July 8, 1952, authorized common changed from 5 million no par shares to 10 million of $5 par, for a 2-for-1 split of 3,004,362 shares. Authorized preferred reduced from 2 million to 1,543,000 shares. Stockholders: preferred, 4,900; common, 16,700, as of October 31, 1954.

Year at New York Stock Exchange	Preferred	Common
1940	28½–21	23⅞–13⅜
1945	40½–34½	[1] 47½–39⅝
1954	35½–32⅝	35¼–24¾
Feb. 29, 1956	34⅜	34⅛

[1] 1952 split.

INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER CO.

Capital changes: In June 1948, no-par common shares were split 3 for 1. Relative voting rights of the preferred were maintained in both cases.

November 1, 1952, company canceled 6,601 preferred and 490,458 common shares previously held in treasury, thereby reducing authorized amount of preferred and common from 1 million and 18 million shares, respectively, to 993,399 and 17,509,542. Stockholders, December 31, 1954: Preferred, 10,015; common, 93,205.

Year at New York Stock Exchange	Preferred	Common
1940	173 –145	62¾–38
1945	193 –178½	[1] 100¾–74¼
1954	176½–159	38½–27⅜
Feb. 28, 1956	174	38

[1] 1948 split.

As I have stated many times, it is most discouraging to any young veteran who wishes to begin farming to see the price of farm machinery. In many, many instances, veterans have borrowed money and invested in land and machinery and today find themselves so deeply in debt due to declining farm prices that they are contemplating selling out everything and are heading for the urban labor market. I can assure Senators that such practices are going to have a profound effect on our economy if they are permitted to continue without remedial legislation.

CREDIT

I have received hundreds of letters from farm families who are concerned about where they will get the money for seed, oil, gas, and feed in order to put in this year's crop. Most of these farm families made little, if any, profit on their 1955 crop.

There are many farmers with whom I have talked who already have their farm machinery, their homes, their land, and in many instances, even their livestock mortgaged to the hilt. And this has come about during a period, we are told, of great prosperity.

During this period of declining farm prices, access to credit is the most important privilege a farmer can enjoy. This is especially true for our young veterans who have started farming within recent years. It is the duty of this Congress to insure that the administration of credit to farmers is closely monitored to provide an adequate supply of credit at all times during the ensuing year.

PRICE SUPPORTS

The administration and this Congress are again playing politics with the farmer's well-being. Last May, when the House passed a rigid price-support bill by a majority of six votes, I immediately wrote the chairman of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, requesting that the committee promptly report out the bill so that the Senate could take action on it before we adjourned last July 31. We Senators from the Northwest pressed hard for the same bill that the House passed—namely, the one giving 90 percent of parity— but we were unable to force the bill out of the committee. I am not a member of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, but I have learned since then that the measure was defeated in the committee by a vote of 8 to 7. That committee had all of the rest of May and all of June and July of 1955 to report the bill to the floor of the Senate, but they failed to do so.

Now, the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee has submitted a new farm bill to the Senate. This bill takes only half the giant step that is needed. We need firm and adequate price-support legislation for all, and I repeat all agriculture commodities, and firm and adequate price-support legislation administration.

And how is the President playing politics with the farmer? Let me read you a portion of the speech Mr. Eisenhower gave at Kasson, Minn., on September 6, 1952, before he became President:

"And here and now, without any ifs or buts I say to you that I stand behind * * * the price-support laws now on the books. This includes the amendment to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity.

"I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income. * * * A fair share is not merely 90 percent * * * but full parity."

And again at Brookings, S. Dak., on October 4, 1952, 1 month before the presidential election, Mr. Eisenhower said:

"The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90-percent parity price supports and it is pledged ever more than that to helping the farmer to obtain his full parity, 100 percent parity."

What is the President saying today? A nationwide advertising and public-relations campaign has just been announced in an effort not only to repudiate the work of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee but also to defeat price supports. Glancing at some of these advertisements sponsored by the Republican senatorial and congressional committee, it appears that the farmers' worries will be over if we can just get passage of the soil-bank plan. I can assure you, Mr. President, that the soil-bank plan is of little benefit to the owner of the family-sized farm. How can we expect this type of farmer to set aside land in any acreage reserve when he can barely sustain himself with the land he has under cultivation during current declining farm prices?

On February 22, I submitted several amendments to S. 3183 in an effort to provide an improved farm program. One amendment would substitute a comprehensive full parity farm-income program for the partial-parity provision of the Senate bill. This amendment establishes: (1) Parity income for farmers, (2) equitable relationships between the parity price of the various farm commodities, and (3) fair levels of income for farmers equivalent to people in other walks of life. These conditions are absolutely essential in any legislation passed by this Congress to aid the owner of the family-sized farm.

The following tabulation shows a comparison of prices received by farmers for commodities with firm price supports, with sliding-scale price supports, and without price supports.

Sliding-scale advocates say firm price supports are not effective—Facts are: price supports cushion drop in net farm income

	Without price-support program	
	Farm operators net farm income	Percent change
	(*Billions*)	
1920	$6.9	
1921	3.7	Down 46 percent.
	With partial price-support program	
	Farm operators net farm income	Percent change
	(*Billions*)	
1952	$14.9	Down 17 percent.
1954	12.3	Down 16 percent.
1955 (3d quarter)	10.6	Down 29 percent.

FARM PRICES ARE MADE IN WASHINGTON

Percent change from 1952 to 1954 in prices received by farmers for commodities (based on prices as of Oct. 15, 1952 and 1955)

I. WITH FIRM, ADEQUATE PRICE SUPPORTS

Cotton	Down 11 percent.
Peanuts	Up 6 percent.
Tobacco, burley	Up 8 percent.
Wool	Up 17 percent.

II. WITH SLIDING-SCALE PRICE SUPPORTS

Barley	Down 36 percent.
Beans, dry edible	Down 17 percent.
Butterfat	Down 23 percent.
Corn	Down 25 percent.
Cottonseed	Down 38 percent.
Flaxseed	Down 26 percent.
Grain sorghum	Down 43 percent.
Milk (manufactured)	Down 18 percent.
Oats	Down 29 percent.
Rice	Down 20 percent.
Rye	Down 47 percent.
Soybeans	Down 23 percent.
Wheat	Down 6 percent.

III. WITHOUT PRICE SUPPORTS

Calves	Down 23 percent.
Chickens, all	Down 17 percent.
Beef cattle	Down 29 percent.
Eggs	Down 15 percent.
Hay	Down 20 percent.
Hogs	Down 22 percent.
Lambs	Down 21 percent.
Potatoes	Down 66 percent.
Sweetpotatoes	Down 51 percent.
Turkeys	Down 4 percent.

Percent change from 1952 to 1954 in prices received by farmers for commodities (based on prices as of Oct. 15, 1952 and 1954)

I. WITH FIRM, ADEQUATE PRICE SUPPORTS

Corn	Down 5 percent.
Cotton	Down 6 percent.
Peanuts	Up 3 percent.
Rice	Down 22 percent.
Tobacco, burley	Up 5 percent.
Wheat	No change.
Wool	Up 4 percent.

II. WITH SLIDING-SCALE PRICE SUPPORTS

Barley	Down 24 percent.
Beans, dry edible	Down 8 percent.
Butterfat	Down 23 percent.
Cottonseed	Down 15 percent.
Flaxseed	Down 18 percent.
Grain sorghum	Down 26 percent.
Milk (manufactured)	Down 22 percent.

Percent change from 1952 to 1954 in prices received by farmers for commodities (based on prices as of Oct. 15, 1952 and 1954)—Continued

II. WITH SLIDING-SCALE PRICE SUPPORTS—con.

Oats	Down 12 percent.
Rye	Down 31 percent.
Soybeans	Down 6 percent.

III. WITHOUT PRICE SUPPORTS

Beef cattle	Down 28 percent.
Calves	Down 34 percent.
Chickens, all	Down 28 percent.
Eggs	Down 36 percent.
Hay	Down 14 percent.
Hogs	Down 1 percent.
Lambs	Down 21 percent.
Potatoes	Down 56 percent.
Sweet potatoes	Down 28 percent.
Turkeys	Down 17.5 percent.

Sliding scale has not reduced farm production

[When support levels were reduced, production increased, except where marketing quotas were put into effect]

Commodity	Level of support			Production (millions of units)		
	1952, per unit	1955, per unit	Percent change	1952	1955	Percent change
Wheat, bushel	$2.20	$2.06	−6	1,299	[1] 917	1−29
Rice, hundredweight	$5.04	$4.66	−8	48	[1] 49	1−2
Cotton, pounds and bales	$0.31	$0.31	0	15.1	[1] 12.9	1−15
Corn, bushel	$1.60	$1.58	−1	2,977	[2] 3,113	2+5
Oats, bushel	$0.78	$0.61	−22	1,260	1,636	+30
Sorghum grain, hundredweight	$2.38	$1.78	−25	83	227	+173
Soybeans, bushel	$2.56	$2.04	−20	298	388	+30
Milk, percent	[3] 90	[3] 75	−17	80,812	87,773	+9
Barley, bushel	$1.22	$0.94	−23	226	387	+71
Flaxseed, bushel	$3.77	$2.91	−23	30	43	+42
Rye, bushel	$1.42	$1.18	−17	16	28	+75

[1] Marketing quotas in operation in 1955 but not in 1952.
[2] Acreage allotments in operation in 1955 but not in 1952.
[3] Percent.

Passage of price-support legislation on corn would give a price of $1.64 per bushel, as compared to $1.40 which we now have. Passage of the price-support bill would mean a price of $2.25 a bushel for wheat, as compared to $1.81 which we now have. This represents 24 cents difference in the case of corn and 44 cents difference in the case of wheat. These few cents per bushel can go far to raising the income of the farmer.

I urge the Members of this distinguished body to take the farm problem in hand at this 11th hour and give the owners of family-sized farms the legislation they need to make this a period of true prosperity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will proceed with the consideration of the farm bill.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], striking out section 101.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is under the control of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield for that purpose?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, may we not agree that the time consumed by the quorum call be taken equally from both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call, and that the time be taken equally from both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in view of the limitation of 1 hour to each side in connection with each amendment, why would it not be better to have a quorum call and not take any time from either side?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would prefer to have it that way. I therefore modify my request. I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call, at the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and that the time be not charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The first amendment which I have offered on behalf of myself and many other members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry poses at the very beginning the whole question which will arise steadily in the farm bill discussion. If we are to renew the 90 percent price supports, then we ought to know it at the very outset, because that question affects the votes on many other questions to follow. If we are to place 90 percent price supports back into our agricultural economy, there is not much point in voting for a soil bank. We should not be placed in the position of reducing production with one hand, through the soil bank, and stimulating it with the other, through rigid, high price supports. It makes absolutely no sense. I am sure every Member of the Senate recognizes that fact. Therefore, we ought to vote, in the very beginning, on the question of whether or not we shall return to a system of high, rigid, 90 percent price supports

I think every Member of the Senate should ask himself how far he wants agricultural income to drop. All he has to do is realize that at the end of World War II net farm income was at a level of $17 billion. Gross farm income was at a much higher figure.

We had 90 percent price supports in 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954. A great many commodities have been supported at that high level during 1955. In all those years we have watched farm income go down. Net farm income dropped from $17 billion to $14 billion, $13 billion, $12 billion, $11 billion, and finally $10½ billion.

I ask those who want to put back high rigid price supports, without controls—because apparently we are not to have controls—how far down they will drive farm income before they are satisfied. Net farm income has gone down from $16¾ billion to $10.2 billion.

An announcement was made a few days ago that gross farm income was down another billion for this year. We realize that it will continue to go down. How far do we want to drive it down by insistence upon high price supports without production controls?

I hope very much that the very first thing we shall settle is whether or not we are to try to saddle the American farmer again with the production of large surpluses. I think the thing we must settle by our very first vote is which way the entire debate is going. If it is going in the direction of high stimulating supports, everything else ought to be tied to that principle. There is no reason to turn down various amendments which have been offered if we are to start with a high level on one particular commodity.

There is no reason why we should throw away any money on the soil bank—and that is what we would be doing—under high, rigid price supports. As a matter of fact, I believe the soil bank is not workable under high, rigid supports. I say that because I believe farmers will continue to plant the crop they believe is most satisfactory from a money standpoint, and there will be no reason for them to use the soil bank.

Mr. President, I wish to review briefly the economic developments which, in my opinion, have created the present serious situation.

Inevitably, when the price of a commodity is fixed at an attractive level by Government action, this provides a powerful and cumulative stimulus for farmers to produce more than they otherwise would. We have been providing this stimulus continually since the end of

World War II, during a period in which a realistic policy would have suggested a reduction of incentives to overproduction.

The second thing that happens when Government holds the price at a high, fixed level is that domestic consumption is reduced below the level at which it would otherwise be. Demand is not constant. It varies with price. A price which is held higher than would prevail in a free market assuredly and inevitably reduces domestic consumption below what it would otherwise be. In some instances a substitute product is in effect guaranteed a growing market by our program, as has happened to a considerable extent and is still happening so far as the substitution of rayon for cotton is concerned.

The third thing that happens is that we lose export markets. We provide a mechanism whereby every other producing country can and does take our export markets. The United States becomes the residual supplier.

The fourth thing that happens when we hold prices at a fixed level is that we encourage production in other countries. We have been holding an umbrella over producers of wheat and cotton in other countries. They have responded in the most natural way in the world, by tremendous increases in foreign production. The world is using more cotton than at any time in history. But it is not American cotton. American cotton is rapidly fading out of the world cotton market.

Put these four things together—artificial incentives to production in this country, stimulus to production in other countries, a reduction in domestic markets, and a loss of foreign markets—and what do you get? Surpluses, of course. It is not accidental that the big surpluses in this country are all of commodities for which 90-percent price supports have been provided without regard to supply-demand relationships.

The creation of surpluses as a result of price policy must be followed by production controls. Otherwise our surpluses would be far larger than they are.

These production controls reduce farm incomes for a number of reasons, among which two are of major consequence:

First, farm incomes are reduced because farmers must plant fewer acres of controlled crops. They are denied the opportunity of producing and selling to markets they might have retained but which have been lost.

Second, acreage diverted from controlled commodities does not remain idle. It goes into the production of other commodities—vegetables, beans, flax, soybeans, barley, grain sorghums, oats, and others—and indirectly into all livestock products. The prices and incomes of farmers producing these commodities are adversely affected by the acreage diverted from production of controlled commodities.

This is where we are today. This is the fruit of unwise national policy. The economic consequences of our mistakes of the past have caught up with us.

I do not believe we are going to help the farmer by giving him another dose of the medicine that has made him sick.

Reinstitution of 90-percent price supports is not the answer. It is not even a little piece of the answer. This is a sure-fire formula to insure that the problem will be bigger and more critical next year and the year after that.

I submit that it is time we began some down-to-earth economic thinking about the character of this problem, about its economic causes and the long-run implications and consequences of what we may do. I hope we will vote in favor of striking 90-percent price supports from the bill.

Mr. President, let me say that we have been dealing with this problem year after year. In 1947, after a long study, the Department of Agriculture got together with all the great farm organizations, the economists of the schools, and Members of Congress who deal with this subject, and discussed all aspects of it very thoroughly. We decided that we needed very quickly to shape a program of flexible or variable price supports, or we would be in very serious trouble when World War II ended. It involved not only a transition to flexible price supports, but also a modernized parity.

That recommendation was given to Congress in 1947. The House committee at least traveled around the United States and held meetings with farmers. The farm organizations approved it. All four great farm organizations endorsed it in its original presentation.

Then what happened? We came to Congress in 1948. I was happy to submit to the President of the United States the message which with some of his additions and editing, he finally sent to Congress. We asked for the passage of that type of bill. It was a Republican-controlled Congress. The request came from a Democratic President. It was not a partisan issue. The Senate of the United States passed the Aiken bill which would have given a realistic support to the agricultural commodities of this country.

Senators who are Members of the Senate today voted for that bill. Some of them subsequently changed their position. They did so not because they changed their convictions, but because conditions forced them to a different view. That is not the fault of the program. I wish it had been administered the way it should have been administered. Instead, we patched it for 1 year. Then we patched it for another year. Then we patched it for 2 years. We have been patching and patching and patching it. All that time, during those years, the income of the American farmer has gone steadily downward.

I hope that finally we will come to the point where we will not continue to bicker over a farm program every year, and that we will adopt the amendment to strike that section from the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Louisiana acting as majority leader?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have before me a copy of the Department of Agriculture's latest report on farm income. This study, which was issued on March 6, documents the drastic decline in farm prices to which our farmers have been subjected for the past 5 years. It states:

> Farmers realized net income in 1955 is now estimated at $10.8 billion, down a billion dollars or 9 percent from 1954. The decline was due to lower average prices of farm products, accompanied by a slight increase in farm expenses.

Per capita farm income has declined 6 percent since 1954, Mr. President; the per capita income of our farm population now stands at $860 per year; the comparable income of nonfarm workers is $1,922.

In addition, this report shows that farmers retained as net income last year only 32½ percent of their realized gross farm income. Except for 1932, Mr. President, this is the smallest percentage on record.

Mr. President, how low must the economic status of our farmers drop before they receive relief? By the Department of Agriculture's own admission, our farm economy is now depressed to the levels prevailing in the 1930's. Even as other segments of our population enjoy a booming prosperity, even as our gross national product reaches new levels, even as consumer incomes and consumer prices continue to rise, the farmer finds himself squeezed, beaten, and bludgeoned by falling farm prices and increasing operating expenses.

I urge Senators to join with us in assuring our farmers at least a semblance of economic health during the 2-year period which must elapse before the beneficial effects of the soil bank can reach down to the grassroots of our agricultural economy. I am convinced, Mr. President, that there is not a Senator in this Chamber who does not desire to be of assistance to our farmers. Our differences are not founded on inability to agree on the objective we desire, but rather, on the methods that should be used to achieve that objective.

Mr. President, let me lay at rest some of the objections raised to the 90 percent of parity provisions of this bill during the recent debate.

First, 90 percent of parity price supports for the 5 basics, as outlined in the pending bill, will not stimulate production. Whether supports are set at 75 percent of parity or 90 percent of parity, the Secretary of Agriculture, under the law, must control production to the same extent and in the same manner. With our present burdensome carryovers of the basic farm commodities, these controls will be imposed for at least 2 more years—1956 and 1957. As long as these controls are in effect—and there is every reason to believe that they will be continued for the duration of the 2-year period during which 90 percent of parity price supports are contemplated in the pending bill—there can be no additional acreages planted to these supported crops. Thus, there can be and will be no additional production attributable to higher support levels. All statements to the contrary have no basis in fact, Mr. President.

The sole effect of 90 percent of parity price supports in this bill will be to increase farm income now, immediately, and keep farm income at bare subsistence levels until such time as the soil-bank provisions have an opportunity to come into full operation. Let us be realistic, Mr. President. Even if the soil bank is effective during this crop year, it will not begin to make a dent in our surpluses of the basic commodities. Its immediate effect on farm prices will be slight. It will be 2 years, at least, until the full effect of the soil bank is felt, and until its operation is reflected in higher farm prices. Ninety percent of parity price supports in this bill, to be effective for only 2 years, are designed to bridge that gap. Unless the Senate wants to invite further decreases in farm income during the transition period before the soil bank becomes effective—unless the Senate wants to push farmers further along the road to bankruptcy—the 90-percent-of-parity provision of this bill is a must. Mr. President, I do not believe we should gamble with the livelihood of our farmers. I have already demonstrated the extent to which falling farm prices have brought our agriculture to the brink of disaster. If the Senate desires now to push our small farmers over the brink and into bankruptcy, then here is the opportunity. All Senators have to do is vote against this 90-percent-of-parity provision and the deed will have been done.

On the other hand, Mr. President, a vote in favor of this provision would permit an immediate increase in farm income from the basic crops alone of over $800 million. Wheat producers could look forward this year to an increase in their income of $322 million; cotton could receive an additional $300 million; corn, an estimated $139 million; and peanuts, $34 million. Rice farmers, should price supports on the full crop be restored to 90 percent of parity, could receive an additional $34 million.

This total increase in farm income of $829 million would not even bring our farm families up to the same levels of income they were receiving only a year ago—but the additional income would help. We can here and now halt the decline in agricultural income and start our farm economy back toward its rightful share of the national income. These farm problems are so severe, Mr. President—the plight of our small farmers is so pressing—that to deny this relief would be, in my opinion, compounding an economic felony.

I know the arguments advanced by the Secretary of Agriculture; I am familiar with his timeworn, ragged, discredited economic theories. Mr. Benson is dead wrong; he has been wrong, and he will continue to be wrong. I do not deny the Secretary of Agriculture the right to be wrong, his privilege to be mule-stubborn, but I do believe, most fervently, that we cannot afford to let the stubbornness of one man continue to drive our small farmers toward economic oblivion.

Mr. President, flexible price supports do not bring relief, they bring disaster. It follows as the day the night, that lower prices result in lower farm income. They do not reduce the carryover, because they do not lower production, as the facts well show. Farmers are going to plant their full acreage allotments even if their support prices fall to the very bottom of the Benson sliding scale—to 75 percent of parity. The record so shows, Mr. President. Wheat farmers did not underplant their acreage allotments as their support price dropped, neither did rice nor corn farmers.

Higher support prices, designed to bring higher prices for the products farmers can grow on their acreage allotments, will not hurt the soil bank. Under the terms of the bill now before us the Secretary of Agriculture is given full authority to fix the level of payments for acreage reserve participation, at whatever amounts may be required to offer farmers an incentive to place their allotted acres in the acreage reserve. There is no basis whatsoever to the claim that 90 percent of parity price supports will drive farmers away from soil-bank participation.

Mr. President, this 90 percent of parity provision of the bill, this meager increase in farm income for years 1956 and 1957 which our farmers so urgently need, and which they most assuredly deserve, is not a windfall. It is an urgent necessity. It is something that we must have if our farm economy is to avoid complete depression; increased farm income is a national necessity if the economic paralysis brought about by flexible price supports is to be kept from infecting our total economy.

I urge the Senate to vote for this provision. Let us not be misled by the unfounded rantings of our Secretary of Agriculture. We need remember only two things:

First, this provision, this 2-year return to 90 percent of parity, cannot and will not increase production. It will only increase farm income by up to $829 million per year.

Second, this provision will not frustrate the soil bank. It will only give our farm economy a quick, sure, shot in the arm until the time when the soil bank has become fully effective.

We have our choice, Mr. President. I ask Senators to vote for economic solvency for our farmers and against agricultural paralysis.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico asked me to control the time in his absence. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wonder if some other Senator would like to speak at this time. I should prefer to delay my remarks.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from New Mexico has now entered the Chamber, and I turn the question over to him.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I strongly hope that the amendment will be adopted. Without its adoption the bill will become the most inconsistent measure ever to be passed on the floor of the Senate, because it will put us in the position of adopting a long and expensive program for basic commodities in an effort to reduce surpluses, and, at the same time, restore the greatest inducement and incentive for the creation of surpluses which we have had in times past. To place us in that position, it seems to me, would be intolerable, unwise, and would leave the Senate and the Congress in the position of passing a bill with its tongue in its cheek, proclaiming that we were trying to reduce the surpluses and, at the same time, adopting a program which, above all others, had created, and would continue to create, surpluses.

Mr. President, particularly do I object to the rigid 90 percent of parity price-support provision of this measure, in its application to 2 basic crops—cotton and corn—and this amendment would strike out that provision.

In the case of cotton, the two Members of the Senate who know most about the cotton industry are the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. Senators will recall that the Senator from Mississippi has not always taken the position on farm measures which he now assumes. But he takes it now after mature reflection and deliberation, because he has seen how the cotton industry has deliberately been committing suicide by making itself a party to such high price supports that it has banned itself from customary and traditional participation in foreign markets, and it has likewise brought great impetus to the production of synthetics, which constitute the next largest competition our domestic cotton production has to meet.

In the position so ably taken by the two Senators I have mentioned they are backed, I believe, by every constructive group of any size in the cotton industry. I know of nothing to the contrary in that regard.

What a ridiculous thing it would be for us, as we endeavor through the soil bank and other measures to aid that great industry, which is so nearly prostrate, to include in the bill a provision to restore 90 percent of parity price supports, under which the cotton industry has come to the surplus position, to the depressed position, to the distressed position which it now occupies. It simply would not make good sense.

The next industry I mention which will be affected with particularly disastrous results, unless the amendment shall be adopted, is the corn industry. That is our largest grain industry. It is the industry upon which the livestock and meat industries peculiarly base their economies. The corn industry is the most widespread among the grain industries. Every Senator knows that the 90-percent price support provision applied to corn under the old law; and unless the amendment shall be adopted, the same program will be restored, and the corn fiasco will be renewed. What was that fiasco? It was the imposition of allotments from year to year which were not compulsory, which did not have to be accepted by the corn producers unless they wanted to accept them.

Those of us who serve on the committee, as we went out into the Corn Belt, heard not from one witness but from many witnesses this sort of disastrous story, to which I ask Senators to listen. Yes; they had accepted their particular allotment of acreage, because they knew that would give them the right to seal their corn and eventually to sell it to the Government at the high rigid price support figure. They did so, knowing they could have an ample supply of corn at a much lower price than they were sealing their production for, from their neighbors who were not staying within their own allotments, and were, instead, raising all the corn their land could produce, and were selling the corn at something like $1 or $1.05 a bushel.

To me it was amazing that good Americans should confess to us, admit to us, that they were doing just that—accepting an allotment for themselves in order to raise corn to sell to Uncle Sam, with the full knowledge that they could buy all the corn they needed, and more, from their neighbors, who had not accepted their allotments, who produced corn, and who sold it much more cheaply, so that it would be available for all the consumer uses of the farmers who accepted allotments.

Mr. President, if that be commonsense, then I have not the slightest conception of the meaning of that term. Unless the amendment shall be adopted, in those two industries—and here I cease to mention particular industries—there will be renewed and extended the program which has contributed most to the disaster and the debacle we have seen in the past. Instead of bringing relief, renewed disaster will be brought to the two great industries of cotton and corn.

There is something else I wish to mention, and that is the wholesome public opinion in connection with this matter. I want Senators to understand that the public, for once, understands that what is sought to be done is to run at full speed in opposite directions at the same time. The public understands that with perfect clarity. I have with me editorials from several Florida papers. Florida is a little bit removed from this picture, so the editors of those papers can look at the matter with some degree of clarity and objectivity, and with better perspective, perhaps, than some others could. Three or four of the editorials, I think, give a pretty clear picture of what the people, some of them in agricultural areas—and all of these newspapers are published in agricultural areas—think about the pending bill.

First, I wish to quote from the Miami Herald of February 22, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE CAN'T BLAME EZRA IF HE DOES

Reports out of Washington show a strange alliance of Republicans and Democrats shaping up to support an even stranger compromise farm bill.

The Republicans are said to be willing to accept a Democratic proposal to return to 90 percent parity payments for certain farm products if the Democrats will accept the administration's soil-bank conservation plan.

The soil bank, of course, was conceived with the idea of reducing farm surpluses by taking millions of acres out of production.

But the effect of 90-percent parity payments will be to put back in the granaries the very crops which the soil bank is trying to reduce.

It would be an amusing contradiction if it weren't so tragic and costly to taxpayers.

No wonder Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson has thrown up his hands and is considering resigning if this sample of election-year follies comes to pass.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I quote from the editorial as follows:

The soil bank, of course, was conceived with the idea of reducing farm surpluses by taking millions of acres out of production.

But the effect of 90-percent parity payments will be to put back in the granaries the very crops which the soil bank is trying to reduce.

It would be an amusing contradiction if it weren't so tragic and costly to taxpayers.

Mr. President, not only would it be tragic and costly to taxpayers, but also to farmers, in particular. I cannot repeat the arguments I made last night, but I found in those areas of the country where there has been the greatest depression, where there has been the greatest debacle from the use of the 90-percent price-support program, that farmers are being destroyed in the sanity of their thinking and are being reduced to the bringing forth of projects and ideas which are not at all a credit to them or a credit to the conservatism and soundness of agricultural thinking as it has always existed in this Nation.

Mr. President, I shall next read from an editorial published in the Tampa Morning Tribune of February 29, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVITATION TO A VETO

President Eisenhower once again has given firm notice that there will be no retreating from his sound position on farm policy.

Republican congressional leaders, emerging from a weekly legislative conference at the White House yesterday which was mainly devoted to the farm bill, said flatly that Mr. Eisenhower "has not changed his position" against rigid, 90 percent of parity farm price supports. The farm bill now being debated in the Senate calls for a return to the high-level, mandatory supports tied in with the administration's soil-bank plan.

Some Senators have been saying the President wouldn't dare veto the bill, implying he is so eager to get the soil-bank program into operation he would swallow the unpalatable, rigid price-prop system. In view of yesterday's reaffirmation, however, they will be wise not to gamble on it.

They should realize from his action on the natural gas bill that Mr. Eisenhower takes his veto powers seriously. The plain fact is that, from a strictly economic standpoint, there would be more justification for a veto of a farm bill providing for 90-percent supports than there was for vetoing the natural-gas bill. For a soil-bank program loaded with a high-level, fixed-support plan would be a self-contradiction.

The reason is perfectly obvious. The whole idea of the soil bank is to get farmers to "deposit" part of their cropland in a "bank"—to withdraw it from cultivation—and thus not only reduce present surpluses but also prevent new surpluses. But this purpose would be defeated should the Nation return to the rigid support system that created the present scandalous situation in which the Government has more than $8 billion invested in surplus farm commodities.

There is no doubt what would happen if rigid price supports were reimposed. Encouraged by the prospect of guaranteed prices at 90 percent of parity, farmers would pour on the fertilizer and add enough new production to offset reductions made possible by soil-bank deposits. Indeed, it is conceivable that soil-bank payments might be used to pay for the fertilizer.

It is most heartening that President Eisenhower has made it crystal clear he will not be a party to any such insane and inconsistent scheme. Although there has been no official statement that he will veto the farm bill if it should reach him calling for abandonment of the administration's flexible price-support system, there would be every reason to do it.

We recognize that some Democratic congressional leaders who are plugging for 90 percent supports have a political interest in passing a bill the President most likely would veto. They should set their sights higher, even if this is an election year.

The interest to which their attention ought to be devoted is how they can best serve the Nation in general and the farmer in particular. Since passage of the soil-bank bill is urgent if it is to become applicable to this year's crop, they can render the best service and, at the same time, make a record they can carry into the election campaigns, by separating the fixed price supports provision from the soil-bank program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Miami Herald is one of the greatest newspapers in the southeastern part of the United States in point of circulation. The Tampa Morning Tribune is a prominent newspaper published on the gulf coast of my State. I read only this part of the editorial from the Tampa Morning Tribune:

There is no doubt what would happen if rigid price supports were reimposed. Encouraged by the prospect of guranteed prices at 90 percent of parity, farmers would pour on the fertilizer and add enough new production to offset reductions made possible by soil-bank deposits.

Mr. President, listen to this. This is what a newspaper standing off on the sidelines, and which has often gone to great lengths to show its appreciation of and sympathy for agriculture, says on this point:

Indeed, it is conceivable that soil-bank payments might be used to pay for the fertilizer.

Mr. President, that is the comment of an observer who is watching the agricultural gyrations in the farm bill.

The next editorial from which I wish to quote is an editorial published in the Pensacola Journal of February 13, 1956. Pensacola is in the western part of Florida, in a section of the State where basic crops are produced. I shall not read the entire editorial, but I ask

unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INCONSISTENT FARM BILL PUTS ISSUE IN POLITICS

For once full approval may be voiced with Agriculture Secretary Benson's lashing out at the farm bill approved by the Senate Agriculture Committee. It is, as he said, undeniably "inconsistent" and emphatically would create a new surplus problem after solving the present one. Worse than that, it is the most abject attempt at politics.

The bill combines the President's soil bank plan with high, rigid price supports which he contends, correctly, would nullify it. For example, committee members voted 8 to 7 to support wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and peanuts at 90 percent of parity. That is ridiculous. It presents the farm bill as a boat which, through opposing efforts of port and starboard rowers, is going around in crazy circles.

While on one hand the soil bank plan would cut down on production of surplus stocks, a return to high, rigid price supports would spur production anew. That is so obvious as to be completely elementary even to a kindergarten debutante.

According to Senator ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman of the committee, "We will have strong support from some farm belt Republicans." No doubt they will, especially on the vote to allow farmers to use the higher of either an old parity system or a new one in determining the level of Government price supports. As Benson pointed out, wheat price supports at 90 percent of the old parity would be equivalent to 103 percent of the modernized formula which became the basis for setting price supports this year. Who wouldn't bite at that one?

Despite every warning, the farm problem has been dragged into politics. It remains to be seen now whether the President will make use of his veto powers or whether he will allow the issue to go by default as appears probable with the controversial natural-gas bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall not read the entire editorial, but only a part of it. After stating the purpose of the bill, the editor uses these words:

That is ridiculous. It presents the farm bill as a boat which, through opposing efforts of port and starboard rowers, is going around in crazy circles.

Mr. President, that is a careful, intelligent appraisal of the meaning of the bill—unless this provision shall be stricken out—by a newspaper which has always been noted for its friendship to agriculture, which is published in a part of our State where basic farming is carried on.

The last of the editorials from which I shall read is in the Tampa Morning Tribune of February 11, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRICK THAT WON'T WORK

If you want a prime example of an attempt to turn the clock in both directions at the same time, take a good look at the election year farm bill approved by the Senate Agriculture Committee.

Committee members, in one desirable move, adopted the soil-bank plan proposed by the administration. The plan is designed to bring the output of basic farm crops down to a better balance with needs by persuading farmers through a new form of Government handouts to take part of their land out of competitive production.

But, by an 8–7, a majority of committee members turned in exactly the opposite direction and approved the restoration of mandatory price supports pegged at 90 percent of parity.

These rigid supports, too long continued after the war, encouraged overproduction. They led farmers to plant wheat, cotton, corn, and other basic crops, not for the market, but for the Government. The result is out in the open for everyone to see—urban voters as well as those living on farms.

The Government now has some $8 billion tied up in surplus-farm commodities. The Department of Agriculture has been forced to rent ships in which to keep wheat, for example, because grain elevators and other storage bins are filled to overflowing. The tremendous oversupply forced down prices.

These high, mandatory price supports were dropped by Congress in 1954 at the urging of the administration and replaced by a program of flexible supports keyed to supply.

The flexible program, it is true, did not arrest a decline in farm prices. Perhaps too much store was laid upon the system as a short-term measure. It takes time to dispose of surpluses and check overproduction. But just at a time when there were many indications that a start toward needed adjustments had been made, howls arose from the farm belt that agricultural income was sharply declining while the rest of the economy was booming.

So now a majority of the Senate committee seeks to exploit the situation by offering an absurd bill which, on one hand, suggests that farmers should decrease production and, on the other, would encourage them to pile up additional surpluses—and troubles—for the entire Nation as well as the farmers.

In a letter the other day to Senator AIKEN, Republican of Vermont, President Eisenhower said it would be "inconsistent to enact a soil-bank program and, at the same time, reestablish production incentives that would again fill Government warehouses, again depress prices, and thus defeat the main object of the soil bank."

"Inconsistent" is a pretty fair word to describe any such action. "Delirious" is a far better one.

We realize there are political implications in the move to restore 90 percent of parity price supports. Many Democrats in Congress are hoping to harvest a crop of votes by saying to farmers, "See, we're trying to guarantee prosperity for you. Give us your votes." Those Democrats are joined by a number of farm-bloc Republicans who fear defeat unless they promise as much.

But President Eisenhower, we're pleased to note, recognizes that a high support system is wrong economically. He also realizes it will guarantee, not prosperity, but that in time the Government will be compelled to nationalize farming, at least to the extent of applying rigid compulsions on the farmer's actions. Moreover, there are indications that if Congress finally approves a bill coupling the soil-bank plan with a return to a rigid support system, it will run into a Presidential veto.

The President's stand is sound and courageous. He won't be a party to political illusion. Unlike some politicians in Congress, he knows that trying to turn the clock in both directions is an unworkable trick which even magicians would not care to attempt.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the editorial reads, in part:

In a letter the other day to Senator AIKEN, Republican of Vermont, President Eisenhower said it would be "inconsistent to enact a soil-bank program and, at the same time, reestablish production incentives that would again fill Government warehouses, again depress prices, and thus defeat the main object of the soil bank."

"Inconsistent" is a pretty fair word to describe any such action. "Delirious" is a far better one.

These are but a few of the many comments of observers expressing the point of view of the general public in important sections of Florida. They can be duplicated by hundreds of observations from other parts of my State and the Nation, with reference to the wholly inconsistent, the wholly extravagant, and the wholly meaningless provisions of the bill which, on the one hand, would say we are going to cut down the production of surpluses by the magnificent soil bank effort, and, on the other hand, would say we are going to have our fingers crossed for 2 years while we replenish the surpluses by restoring 90 percent of parity. Mr. President, that simply does not make sense.

I ask the Senate to adopt the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, an amendment of which I am a cosponsor, in the hope that we can bring the bill back to sanity and enact it in such a way that it will move in 1 direction, instead of in 2 different directions at the same time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 12 minutes to my friend, the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment sponsored by the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Florida, and other Senators associated with them in their amendment which would knock out 90-percent price supports for our basic crops.

I should like to say, first of all, it seems to me at this stage of the game we should be able to get down to some pretty logical principles and bases of understanding. We have had a tremendous amount of verbiage for a long time concerning this bill. We have had hearings. We have had charts, tables, and statistics.

It seems to me certain things stand out almost irrefutably at this stage of the game. The first is that we have tremendous agricultural surpluses in the country, which have made it impossible, by the ordinary operation of economic laws, to provide the farmer with the fair share of the national income, to which he is entitled.

We differ as to why the surpluses were created, but, basically and fundamentally, we must realize that the surpluses were connected with the war and the peace that followed the war, and one way or another, and in many ways, war stimulated the demand for farm products, and peace reduced the demand for

farm products. Since millions of farmers had to act individually and arrive at their own individual analysis, they did not have the capacity to curtail peacetime production to meet the economic needs, such as would be possible in the field of industry, where a board of directors could meet and decide to hold down production and reduce the amount of goods going into the economy.

So we have a problem, created not by farmers, created not by act of Congress, but created by the fact that we were involved in war and, luckily, we achieved an unexpectedly early peace. This is one of the great reconstructive peacetime problems we have to solve.

I think two other things stand out. For a while we had in this country programs for high, rigid, or inflexible price supports. I have supported such programs. As a supporter of such a program, I am prepared to say they did not solve the farm problem. Had they solved the farm problem, we woud not be wrestling with the situation today. They did not solve the problem because imbedded in the legislation which provided for inflexible, rigid, high supports was a formula which required reduction of acreage when there was a visible surplus at hand.

While we continued to hold price supports at fairly high levels under rigid supports, we continued to receive reductions of acreage. When the two are added together, we see why the farmer could not make both ends meet.

Much has been said about flexible price supports. The Senator from New Mexico, when he was Secretary of Agriculture, was one of the fathers of that idea. He believed in it. Secretary Brannan came along, in the series of Secretaries of Agriculture who followed, and he believed in flexible price supports and advocated them to Congress. Some great farm organizations have supported them; others opposed them. But I am prepared to say from the record that flexible price supports have also failed. Just as rigid price supports, of and by themselves, did not solve the farm problem, neither did the so-called flexible price supports. They failed because imbedded in the same basic piece of legislation is a requirement for reduction of acreage at high price supports and also at lower price supports, if a determination is made on the basis of visible supply that surpluses are in existence. Obviously, when farmers need more money, they are not going to be helped by providing for flexible price supports on a basis that gives them less money per unit for the products they produce than would be available to them under the terms of our committee bill.

So we come to the basic argument of the Senator from Florida and the Senator from New Mexico. They contend we would be going in the two directions at the same time if there is retained in the same bill a provision for a soil bank and high price supports. Our opponents contend they will work against each other.

I believe those generalizations are fallacious.

I believe the intriguing phrasemaking of the swivel-chair farmers who sit at editorial desks in Florida, and turn out this sort of mumbo-jumbo procedure, are sincere, but they are entirely ignorant of the general agricultural problems of the country. I think they are looking at this situation from the point of view of fruit and vegetable production in Florida and assuming that what is true in Florida is true elsewhere. It is not true in the Middle West. It is not true in the Deep South. It is not true in many different sections of the country. Farmers today in many areas of the country need higher prices and expanded margins of net income.

Let us analyze the argument. Is there any validity to be found in the statement that a soil bank and price supports work against each other? I cannot find a scintilla of basis or evidence in that prevailing argument, which continues to be presented by those opposing 90-percent price supports.

Let me point out that the evidence is abundant that the annual production of farm products in this country is tied to a great many other factors other than the price level for the products.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a series of charts which point out that there is no real, stable relationship whatsoever between the total annual production of wheat, corn, oats, and barley, and the particular price level that may obtain.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Does the level of price have a significant effect on total planted acreage? That is the contention of those favoring flexible price supports. If the contention is unfounded this mistake will force many of our farmers out of business.

Wheat: Planted acreage and price received by farmers, United States

Crop years	Average planted acreage (thousand acres)	Average price received by farmers
1930–35	67,373	$0.641
1930–41	68,959	.727
1942–47	65,709	1.59

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service.

Corn: Planted acreage and price received by farmers, United States

Crop years	Average planted acreage (thousand acres)	Average price received by farmers
1930–35	106,112	$0.536
1930–41	99,787	.601
1942–46	90,306	1.353

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service.

Barley: Planted acreage and price received by farmers, United States

Crop years	Average planted acreage (thousand acres)	Average price received by farmers
1930–35	13,689	$0.409
1930–41	13,889	.457
1942–46	14,451	1.121

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service.

Oats: Planted acreage and price received by farmers, United States

Crop years	Average planted acreage (thousand acres)	Average price received by farmers
1930–35	43,415	$0.365
1930–41	41,749	.350
1942–46	44,204	.741

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service.

SUMMATION

Wheat and corn: Total planted acres lower during years of high prices.

Oats and barley: Total planted acres somewhat higher during periods of higher prices.

Point: What does it prove? Nothing. Farm statistics do not support theories that a cause-and-effect relationship exists in connection with the planting habits of farmers and the price which they receive for their farm product.

There is even doubt on the part of those who propose that flexible price supports be retained that you can induce farmers to curb production by lowering prices.

This fact was brought home to members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last autumn when that committee took to the field for hearings. A farm leader; an active and intelligent farmer; who came before our committee proposing that flexible-price supports be allowed to continue in effect confessed that insofar as his own farming operations were concerned that he planted every acre of his farm he could—regardless of price—and went on to opine that nearly all farmers do the same thing.

Thus it cannot be said that lower price supports will have an appreciable effect on the accumulation of surpluses by Commodity Credit Corporation. The only sure and certain result is lower income to farmers.

Wheat: Acreage allotment and price reduction

Year	Acreage allotment (acres)	Support price	Percent support	Parity
1954	62,000,000	$2.24	90	2.49
1955	55,000,000	2.08	87½	2.52
1956	55,000,000	1.81	76	2.38

Source: Commodity Stabilization Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

A system of flexible-price supports coupled with severe acreage reductions signal failure to many of our Nation's farmers; especially young veteran farmers who entered the business after the close of World War II.

Corn: Acreage allotment and price reduction

[In millions]

Year	Acreage allotment (acres)	Planted acreage commercial area (acres)	Total planted acreage (acres)	Support	
					Percent
1954	46.9	56.9	82.4	1.62	90
1955	49.8	56.0	81.6	1.58	87
1956	43.3	[1] 56.0	[1] 81.5	1.40	81

[1] Transitional parity.

Source: Commodity Stabilization Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

In 1953 wheat farmers planted 78 million acres. The next year under acreage allotments they were restricted to 62 million acres and during the past 2 years to an allotment of 55 million acres. At the same time supports were dropped from $2.24 per

bushel to the announced support price for 1956 of $1.81 per bushel.

The situation with regard to corn is the same except for the fact that farmers have not been required to abide by acreage allotments, although the support price for corn has shown a drop from $1.62 to $1.40 per bushel.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, there is another reason why their argument falls when they tell us the soil bank and 90-percent price supports will not work well together. Actually from the standpoint of farmers deciding whether to enter the soil bank, it does not make much difference, from the standpoint of whether the farmer is going to go into the soil bank, whether the price of his product is supported at this level or some other level. The basic law provides that, as an incentive to induce the farmer to go into the soil bank, he shall receive slightly more in net income than he would have received had he cropped his land and sold his products.

We should all remember that the soil bank payment is tied to price supports.

So, for the sake of argument, for the sake of showing whether or not the two programs will work consistently together, it does not make any great difference whether the farmer gets $1 for a certain product or, assuming this price for the sake of argument, 50 cents for a certain product. Either way, to induce the farmer to go into the soil bank, the Government will have to give him in net returns more than he would have received, whether he would have sold his product for a dollar, under a program of high-price supports, or for 50 cents, which might be the price under a flexible price-suport level. The inducement is there just the same. The soil bank can work as effectively with high-price supports as it can with flexible price supports.

So all our friends contrive to do if they succeed in reducing the price levels is to reduce the prices farmers will receive for that portion of the land which they actually do crop. It has nothing to do with the totality of production. It has nothing to do with how much they are going to retire. They propose to induce the farmers to reduce the total amount of land available to them by paying more than they would have received as net income by producing on the land. We propose the same.

On this side of the argument, we also propose to pay them for the crops they do raise a price high enough to enable them to solve their problems and meet the costs caused by the present price squeeze.

There is the difference.

There is no basis for saying the two cannot operate together. As a matter of fact, I believe, and I have as much right to my hypothesis as they have to theirs, because we are both taking a look into the future, I believe with high-price supports there would be wider participation in the soil bank than there would be with the low-price supports that our opponents advocate.

I believe that for two reasons. In the first place, automatically, the farmer would receive more per acre for his retired acreage in the acreage reserve under high price supports than he would receive under low price supports. Because we are a price tag conscious people, the fact that farmers would get a bigger average rental per acre under a high price support program I think would attract more of them to go into the program than if they were forced to take a lower price for the same acres.

In addition to that, if we make it possible for farmers to operate profitably by having high price supports on this basis, if we make it possible for them to operate profitably on the acreage they do farm, there will be more inducement for them to go into the soil bank and play the law of averages instead of trying to farm the whole land in the hope that they will hit the jackpot every year.

Without reasonably high prices for the products raised on the acres they do farm, we force farmers to overwork their total acres, in the hope that everything will be optimum—the right amount of rain, the proper temperature, a comparative lack of surpluses in the market, good prices, and that everything will work out—absence of insect and absence of plagues. Mr. President, a farmer is forced to resort to such tactics of desperation, when prices get too low. I have already referred to tables, which show dramatically that when prices are lower, the farmers produce from a larger or greater number of acres than they do when prices are higher. That is true because the cost of maintaining a family—including the cost of clothes and food and educating children—and also the cost of machinery and insurance and repairs, remain relatively constant. Those costs either are stable or they are increasing. So when the price per unit is reduced, ultimately the farmer is compelled to mine the soil and to contribute to the totality of the great surplus which plagues us and perplexes us as we try to find the solution to the farm problem.

In addition, Mr. President, other factors have contributed to our national surpluses. The farmer is not alone responsible for the current burdensome surpluses. They are partly the result of national wartime policies and objectives, and individual farmers invested heavily in machinery and other improvements to meet those objectives.

First. At the request of his Government the farmer increased his production of wheat to feed our wartime military services and our Allies.

Second. In 1948, the second highest wheat producing year—1,295,000,000 bushels—we exported 504 million bushels, a great portion of which went into foreign aid channels to allies and former enemies whose productive potential had suffered wartime damages.

Third. After 1948 the Government's need for wheat for foreign-aid programs decreased—1949, 299 million bushels—and domestic production tapered off.

Fourth. In June 1950, we became involved in the Korean war. Farmers were again asked to increase production to meet known domestic and foreign requirements and to provide additional production for requirements which cannot be clearly anticipated in a war which at any time could have erupted into a global conflict. In 1951 our exports of wheat reached a post-World War II high of 475 million bushels. Asked by the Government to increase production even further, wheat farmers planted 1,299,000,000 acres in 1952—318 million acres more than the previous year.

Wheat: Supply and disappearance, United States, 1935–55 [1]

[Million bushels]

Year beginning July	Supply				Disappearance							
					Used in United States					Exports[5]	Shipments	Total
	Carryover	Production	Imports[2]	Total	Food[3]	Seed	Industrial	Feed[4]	Total			
1935	146	628	35	809	490	87	(6)	85	662	4	3	669
1936	140	630	35	805	492	96	(6)	101	689	10	3	702
1937	83	874	1	958	494	93	(6)	115	702	100	3	805
1938	153	920	(6)	1,073	497	74	(6)	142	713	107	3	823
1939	250	741	1	992	488	73	(6)	102	663	45	4	712
1940	280	815	3	1,098	489	74	(6)	112	675	34	4	713
1941	385	942	4	1,331	487	62	2	117	668	28	4	700
1942	631	969	1	1,601	523	65	54	306	948	28	6	982
1943	619	844	136	1,599	533	77	108	518	1,236	43	3	1,282
1944	317	1,060	42	1,419	533	80	83	296	992	144	4	1,140
1945	279	1,108	2	1,389	494	82	21	297	894	391	4	1,289
1946	100	1,152	(6)	1,252	504	87	(6)	176	767	397	4	1,168
1947	84	1,359	(6)	1,443	484	91	1	181	757	486	4	1,247
1948	196	1,295	1	1,492	477	95	(6)	105	677	504	4	1,185
1949	307	1,099	2	1,408	488	81	(6)	111	680	299	4	983
1950	425	1,019	12	1,456	489	87	(6)	114	690	366	4	1,060
1951	396	981	32	1,409	492	87	1	94	674	475	4	1,153
1952	256	1,299	21	1,576	485	88	(6)	119	692	318	4	1,014
1953	562	1,169	6	1,737	484	69	(6)	61	614	217	4	835
1954[7]	902	970	4	1,876	483	63	(6)	32	578	274	4	885
1955[8]	1,021	[9] 916	4	1,941	481	63	(6)	75	619	275	4	986

[1] Includes flour and other products in terms of wheat.
[2] Excludes imports of wheat for milling in bond and exports as flour.
[3] Includes military food use at home and abroad.
[4] This is the residual figure, after all other disappearance is accounted for. It has been assumed roughly to represent feed, but in 1953–54 the residual at 61 million was less than the 69 million represented as fed on farms where grown, and in 1954–55 the 32 million was below the 56 million represented as fed on farms where grown.
[5] Actual exports, including exports for civilian feeding under the military supply program.
[6] Less than 500,000 bushels.
[7] Preliminary.
[8] Tentative estimates.
[9] October estimate.

Source: Agriculture Outlook Charts, November 1955, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

America can be proud it had the productive capacity to assume so much of the world's needs for food and fiber during troublesome times. But, how were

the increased production goals accomplished? Not by mysterious mumbo-jumbo. Rather, by hard work and by increased capital expenditures for land and machinery. More units of production for each farmer became the national goal and the individual farmer's pledge.

In 1940 each farmer was producing food and fiber for 10.81 persons. By 1952 he was producing for over 18.

Persons supported by production of 1 farm-worker, United States, 1820–1954

Year	Persons supported per farm worker			Total farm employment	Total United States population July 1 [1]
	Total	At home	Abroad		
	Number	*Number*	*Number*	*Millions*	*Millions*
1820	4.12	3.84	0.28	2.4	9.6
1830	4.00	3.76	.24	3.3	12.9
1840	3.95	3.72	.23	4.4	17.1
1850	4.18	3.97	.21	5.7	23.3
1860	4.53	4.06	.47	7.3	31.5
1870	5.14	4.64	.50	8.0	39.9
1880	5.57	4.48	1.09	10.1	50.3
1890	5.77	4.69	1.08	11.7	63.1
1900	6.95	5.23	1.72	12.8	76.1
1910	7.07	6.05	1.02	13.6	92.4
1920	8.27	6.84	1.43	13.4	106.5
1930	9.75	8.77	.98	12.5	123.1
1940	10.81	10.45	.36	11.0	132.1
1941	12.09	11.10	.99	10.7	133.4
1942	12.96	11.80	1.16	10.5	134.9
1943	13.54	12.09	1.45	10.4	136.7
1944	13.98	12.62	1.36	10.2	138.4
1945	14.69	12.87	1.82	10.0	139.9
1946	14.28	12.36	1.92	10.3	141.4
1947	14.13	12.61	1.52	10.4	144.1
1948	14.52	12.83	1.69	10.4	146.6
1949	14.91	13.42	1.49	10.0	149.2
1950	15.49	13.70	1.79	9.3	151.7
1951	16.81	14.93	1.88	9.0	154.4
1952	17.32	15.88	1.44	8.7	157.0
1953	17.82	16.34	1.48	8.6	159.7
1954	18.53	16.81	1.72	8.5	162.4

[1] Includes persons in our military forces in this country and abroad. Data published currently in Changes in Farm Production and Efficiency (ARS).

The farmer had to increase his use of machinery to meet production requirements. In 1949 farmers had 1.5 million tractors in use; by 1953, 4.4 million. The farmer increased his use of trucks from a little over a million in 1940 to 2.6 million in 1954. During the same period the use of grain combines grew from 190,000 to nearly a million and corn pickers from 110,000 to 660,000.

Specified machines on farms, United States, Jan. 1, 1940–55 [1]

[In thousands]

Year	Tractors (exclusive of steam)	Automobiles	Motortrucks	Farms with milking machines	Grain combines	Corn pickers
1940	1,545	[2] 4,144	[2] 1,047	175	190	110
1941	1,675	4,330	1,095	210	225	120
1942	1,885	4,670	1,160	255	275	130
1943	2,100	4,350	1,280	275	320	138
1944	2,215	4,185	1,385	300	345	146
1945	[2] 2,422	[2] 4,148	[2] 1,490	[2] 365	[2] 375	168
1946	2,560	4,260	1,550	440	420	203
1947	2,735	4,350	1,700	525	465	236
1948	2,980	4,225	1,900	575	535	299
1949	3,315	4,290	2,065	610	620	372
1950	[2] 3,609	[2] 4,199	[2] 2,207	[2] 636	[2] 714	[2] 456
1951	3,940	4,280	2,310	655	810	522
1952	4,170	4,350	2,410	686	887	588
1953	4,400	4,400	2,550	715	918	615
1954	4,600	4,450	2,650	730	950	640
1955 [3]	4,750	4,500	2,750	740	960	660

[1] Facts for Industry reports of the Bureau of the Census, annual registrations of motor vehicles, and results of surveys were used in developing estimates for years and machines not covered by census reports.
[2] Census of Agriculture. Census dates Jan. 1, 1945; Apr. 1, 1940, and 1950.
[3] Preliminary.

Source: Data published currently in Changes in Farm Production and Efficiency (ARS).

In the period from 1940 to 1954 the average value of machinery per farm worker grew from $229 to $1,881.

Average real estate investment per farm worker during the same period went from $2,461 to $9,253.

Average value per worker of assets used in production [1]

Year	Machinery	Real estate	Other	Total
1940	$229	$2,461	$820	$3,510
1941	273	2,614	911	3,798
1942	356	2,971	1,228	4,555
1943	447	3,370	1,667	5,484
1944	488	3,935	1,819	6,242
1945	558	4,531	1,878	6,967
1946	570	5,230	1,970	7,770
1947	612	5,673	2,253	8,538
1948	799	6,030	2,630	9,459
1949	1,033	6,282	2,750	10,065
1950	1,285	6,383	2,599	10,267
1951	1,466	7,825	3,267	12,558
1952	1,747	8,881	3,896	14,524
1953	1,890	9,067	3,541	14,488
1954	1,911	8,869	3,229	14,009
1955	1,881	9,253	3,255	14,389

[1] Assets include farm real estate less value of dwelling, crops on hand, livestock, machinery and equipment less 60 percent of the value of automobiles, and demand deposits used for production.

Source: Agriculture Outlook Charts, November 1955, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I think the soil-bank provision is the great new contribution and the great new addition that we have needed to add either to flexible price supports or to rigid price supports, in order to give the farmer a reasonable income during this adjustment period following the period of war, and leading back to a period of peace. In my opinion, during that period, rigid supports will work better than flexible supports. I urge the defeat of the Anderson-Holland amendment. I urge support of the full 2-year continuation of 90 percent price supports as provided in our committee bill.

In addition, if the soil bank works as well as all of us hope it will, the matter of price supports will shrink into comparative insignificance, because then there will be received in the market place, as a result of the various provisions included in the bill, sufficient income for the farm family to place that family in a parity position. But if, during the first few years of operation of the soil-bank plan—during the first 2 years, as provided in the bill—it does not operate as well for some segments of the country or for some crop or for some group of farmers as its most enthusiastic advocates envision, then we shall have provided for farm income, in the form of 90 percent price supports, to keep the farmer and his family from plunging upon the disastrous shoals of insolvency. We need as a minimum these 2 full years of continued 90 percent price supports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The time yielded to the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, once again we are discussing the question of rigid, high price supports as contrasted with flexible price supports. I wish to discuss this question from the angle of the wheat growers of the Nation.

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not think it will make a bushel's difference in the amount of production of winter wheat this year, whether we have high, rigid price supports or whether we have flexible price supports. In my opinion, enactment of the bill today, including the soil-bank provisions, will not reduce the production of wheat in the winter-wheat area; and that is one of the problems we are facing.

Mr. President, the winter wheat has already been planted. Based on the historic production, we shall raise as much wheat this year as we did last year; and our surplus has increased to a billion bushels.

It is a very serious problem. I believe that we need, not necessarily 2 years, as provided in the Senate bill, but some period of transition from the present flexible price-support program to the soil-bank program.

If the proponents of the soil bank, who are so enthusiastically in favor of it, have confidence that it will do what they say it will do, then in my opinion we should have a period of 1 year in which to make the transition from rigid or high price supports, so that the farmers in the wheat-growing sections can obtain some benefit.

I challenge any Member of the Senate to stand on this floor and say that the farmers in the winter-wheat belt of the Nation will receive any benefit from the soil-bank program this year, unless they plow under their growing-wheat crop. I live in a wheat-growing section, and I simply do not believe that the farmers who have a prospective wheat crop will plow it under in order to obtain benefits which will amount to 60 or 70 percent of the productive value of the crop.

So, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Senate will give favorable consideration to the amendment I have offered, when that amendment comes before the Senate, namely, the amendment proposing that wheat be handled on a commodity-by-commodity basis. That is a solution to which we shall have to come, in connection with this program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to register strong objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the so-called flexible price-support amendment, versus the provisions of title I.

In the beginning, let me say that I have great respect for the Senator from New Mexico; and in regard to many areas of the bill, he and I are in full agreement. However, I am in sharp disagreement with what has been proposed in terms of striking out title I.

First of all, I wish to correct the record in regard to certain terminology. I hear it said that 90 percent of parity price supports are firm and rigid. Mr. President, they are no more firm and rigid than are 75-percent price supports. A price-support level is established for a crop year. I should like to have those who are proponents of lower price supports—and that is what Senators favor or advocate when they propose to strike out title I—explain to other Senators how 75-percent price supports can be less rigid than 90-percent price supports. The only difference between the two is 15 percentage points in the income of the farmers, 15 percentage points in the parity-index income.

As the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has said, to adopt the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico will mean a substantial drop in cash income for the farmers this crop year. If there is any year during which the farmers need help, it is this year, this immediate period.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think the issue can be boiled down to the question of whether we want effective price supports or whether we want ineffective price supports. I think the issue is whether we want workable price supports of 90 percent, or whether we want collapsible price supports, under the Benson formula. The supports under the Benson formula are not flexible price supports; instead, they are collapsible. The sooner we label them for what they are, the better off we shall be.

I would say that some of the statements which have been made are not exactly in line with the facts in connection with the agricultural price-support program. For example, it has been stated here that if we have a 90 percent price-support program, along with the soil bank, we shall be running in opposite directions.

Mr. President, the truth of the matter is that the benefit payments under a soil bank program, as that program is requested by the administration, are to be on a voluntary basis. The whole idea is that we would have benefits sufficiently large to encourage participation in the soil bank. In the bill, there is no provision of compulsion insofar as the soil bank is concerned. The benefit payment will be designed, according to the Agricultural Marketing Service—and let me say that I hold in my hand a bulletin published only a day or so ago, for advance notice to the county agricultural committees—to be 50 percent of the loan level. So when a Senator votes to cut price supports, he votes to cut the benefits under the soil bank provisions; and when he votes to cut the benefits under the soil bank provisions, he votes to cut participation; and when he votes to cut participation, he votes to increase acreage; and when he votes to increase acreage, he votes to increase production; and when he votes to increase production, he votes to lower prices. That is the sequence.

Mr. President, the bulletin to which I refer comes from the Department of Agriculture, and in the bulletin the benefits of the soil bank are explained as follows:

> Based on approximately 90 percent supports and optional parity.

The Department of Agriculture's own bulletin bases its information to the farmer committees on 90 percent of parity, because this Government does not dare go to the farmers and say that it is going to give soil bank benefits on the basis of 75 percent of parity.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at this time. My time is limited.

The reason we need 90 percent price supports is to have income for what is produced, so that there will be benefit payments under the soil bank when many acres are taken out of production, to the point where benefit payments will really be meaningful and encourage participation.

Some further points need to be made. The Senator from Florida has said, with respect to corn, that all the corn farmers have been doing is selling their corn to the Government. There is only slightly more than a 3-months' corn supply. Representatives of the Department of Agriculture testified before our committee that the supply of corn was so short that they could not put it under a set-aside. There is no surplus of corn that is meaningful. If there is, the Department representatives lied to us in the committee. Let us call it by the proper name. It is a bald-faced lie if corn cannot be put under a set-aside. It is a bald-faced lie if one says there is a monstrous surplus. As a matter of fact, the Government is not overloaded with corn. In 1952 there was less than 1½ months' supply of corn left, under 90 percent support.

I listened with considerable interest to quotations from newspapers in Miami—a great agricultural center. Those statements said that there was inconsistency. There was a letter from the President to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], in which the President said it was inconsistent to expect production incentives when adopting a soil bank. What production incentives? Under 90 percent of parity there are acreage allotments. We have cut back wheat acreage almost 23 million acres; cotton almost 10 million acres; corn almost 13 million acres. When we have 90 percent of parity we have production controls, and when we have 75 percent of parity there are the same production controls. The difference between lower price support and 90 percent price support is price, or income. In either case there are the same production controls. No one can prove to the contrary. I challenge anyone to prove that with lower price supports there is less production control.

We find that under firm, adequate price supports from 1952 to 1955, the price of peanuts was up 6 percent; burley tobacco, up 8 percent; wool, up 17 percent. The only one down was cotton, at 11 percent.

With sliding scale price supports, barley was down 36 percent, cottonseed down 38 percent, flaxseed down 26 percent, grain sorghums down 43 percent. The record is replete with examples showing that when we have collapsible price supports—and let us call them what they are—the price goes down. The word "flexible" is too nice a word to be used for the kind of propaganda which is being sent out. The Benson price support schedule is collapsible.

I heard one Senator suggest that fertilizer might be included in the program as a possible basis for soil bank payments. Fertilizer can be included, no matter what the price support level is. The truth is that the lower the price is, the more fertilizer is used, to obtain more production, in order to obtain more income.

The record is perfectly clear. When we reduced price supports on oats by 22 percent, from 1952 to 1955, production went up 30 percent. When we reduced price supports on soybeans by 20 percent, production went up 30 percent.

When the support level for flaxseed went down 23 percent, production went up by 42 percent. If the programs worked as they should, much of the talk about support levels would be unnecessary.

The whole objective of the flexible support program, supposedly, was 100 percent in the market place. If the producer gets 100 percent in the market place under flexible price supports, how does that help our world trade position, as compared with 90 percent? The price of the commodity at 100 percent in the market place is the same, whether it is under 75 percent or 90 percent price supports. The administration says it is for 100 percent in the market place. If we have 100 percent in the market place, is that not an incentive for production? Are there not the same problems in international trade? These trade arguments are beyond the point, if we really believe in 100 percent in the market place.

I understand why the public is of the mind that was indicated earlier by reference to editorial columns. The public has been misled. It has been propagandized. The Secretary of Agriculture has been sending letters to Senators. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] made public a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, offering to freeze cotton acreage for 2 years and keep supports at high levels if the mandatory 90 percent provision were dropped from the farm bill. In other words, there would be no acreage reduction,

even though the program requires acreage reduction. If only we vote against 90 percent price supports, the price support on cotton will be 85 to 87 percent.

Any little deal to divide our ranks. I charge that the Secretary of Agriculture has been lobbying Members of Congress. He has been making deal after deal on commodity after commodity, including cotton and corn.

I charge him with being guilty of unprincipled action. He talks about wanting to control production, but he is willing to freeze acreage allotments this year in order to attract some Senators away from the 90 percent support schedule.

This question involves the difference between money in the pocket and a collapsing farm economy. I am opposed to collapsible price supports. I am for fair, effective, 90 percent supports.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, this is not an easy question. It is a difficult question. I presume that one can take a given set of facts and prove one thing, and someone else can take the same set of facts and prove something else.

One of the things I have never been able quite to understand is why we do not take the position that the farmer ought to have 100 percent of parity instead of 90 percent. If the farmer is entitled to parity, why should it not be 100 percent instead of 90 percent? Why is 90 percent so sacred? Why do we select the figure 90 percent? My position is that the farmer ought to have 100 percent of parity or more, but he ought to have it in the free market place.

If we are to enact legislation guaranteeing the farmer parity, or making certain by legislation that he has it, it seems to me that we ought to be talking about 100 percent.

Let us review for a moment the history of this legislation. The first act was passed in 1938. At that time parity was set at from 52 to 75 percent. That was under a Democratic administration, and a Democratic President.

Then World War II came along, and the act was changed to 90 percent of parity, to remain at 90 percent during the entire war period and 2 years thereafter. The purpose during the 2 years thereafter, as well as during the war, was to increase production.

I do not think there is any question that production was increased, but the law was written on the basis that automatically, 2 years after the end of the war, the price-support level would go back to from 52 to 75 percent of parity.

We have been operating under 90 percent of parity since about 1941, except for last year, with respect to the crops which were harvested last year. Of the 6 basics, all were at 90 percent except 3, I think. I believe wheat was 82 percent; corn was at 87 percent; and peanuts at 88 percent. Cotton and tobacco were at 90 percent. No one can make me believe that the difference between 82 percent and 90 percent on corn and the difference between 87 percent and 90 percent on wheat has much to do with the whole subject. The answer is that we have huge surpluses. Not only do we have huge surpluses, but also the prospect of huge farm production in the future. That is what has pressed down prices.

The able Senator from Minnesota said a moment ago that there was on hand only a 3-months' supply of corn. I am sure he was talking about what the Government owns and not about the hundreds of millions of bushels owned by the farmers which are now on hand with the farmers in their granaries. I am sure he was talking about the corn the Government owns.

Mr. ELLENDER. All of it.

Mr. CAPEHART. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana says all of it. I rather doubt that, though. In any event, the purpose of the 90-percent provision was to increase production. I am sure all of us are agreed that we have too much production. If that is so, how can anyone say that we do not have too much production and at the same time say we must have a soil bank, which will reduce production? How can anyone have his cake and eat it, too?

How can anyone out of one corner of the mouth say we do not have too great a surplus, that the production is not too big, and that we must have 90 percent of parity or 100 percent of parity, or whatever it is, and out of the other corner of his mouth say that we will have to reduce production by adopting the soil-bank provision which everyone seems to favor. I do not believe we have the solution to this problem at all. The solution to the problem is in more production, in more uses for agricultural products. That is what we will eventually have to have if we are to solve the problem.

As a result of World War II and the Korean war and high supports, we have built up huge surpluses. We have a machine capable of producing huge supplies. We must find some way to protect the farmer in his income.

My best judgment is that we ought to give the so-called flexible plan a chance to work. The other plan has not worked. It has resulted in low prices. We have had 90-percent supports since 1941, except on the 2 crops I named, and that was true only last year. One of them is off 2 percent and the other is off 8 or 9 percent. The other plan has not worked. Therefore, we should give the flexible plan a chance to work, and adopt the soil bank, which will reduce production. It certainly can be put into effect on corn this year, and on many other products.

Let us give the flexible plan a chance to work. I am a farmer. I farm. I know how destructive low prices are. I talked to the man in charge of my farm a few minutes ago. He sold 51 hogs this week. I know what prices he obtained.

I cannot quite make up my mind that we should adopt a plan under which the farmer will be selling to the Government. I would like to see us do something to bring about an increase of price in the market place, because it is not sound economy to have a plan, either for the farmer or the manufacturer, or the candlestickmaker, under which taxpayers are going to buy the surplus.

In all fairness to the farmers it should be said that they borrow on their crops—that is on the six basics, at least—at whatever the parity is. That is the basis on which they borrow their money. They either pay the loans off or deliver the grains to the Government. They are really not getting something for nothing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, may I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Government does not lose anything except when the surpluses are accumulated by the Government and the Government has to sell them at a lesser price than it cost the Government when it took the commodities over from the farmer. Then of course it costs the taxpayer money, but only then. The present plan has worked fairly well. I shall vote for the flexible plan because I believe we ought to give it a chance. I believe the problem is one of cutting production and eliminating the huge surpluses. In that way the farmer will have 100 percent or more in the market place.

Another thing we must do, if we wish to do something worth while, is to find new ways and means of using farm products in industry. We need greater consumption at higher prices. The farmer does not particularly care about the price. He want dollars. It takes an X amount of dollars to run a farm and to show a profit, just as it does in business.

Therefore the farmer is interested in dollars. He is interested in enough to pay all expenses and have a little profit left over. That is what he wants. He would like to get it in the free market. I am not allwise. I do not believe any other Member of the Senate is, either. We have tried 90 percent since 1941, and we have created huge surpluses. Now let us try the flexible plan. Let us try to get the farmers to cooperate in any governmental action we take, by way of reducing their production until we can get the farmers on a sound basis. That is what I want. Let us do that until we can get them a price in the market place that is 100 percent or more of parity. Then let us do something which I am sure we can do and that is to find new uses for farm products, other than for food purposes. Then we will be doing something constructive for the farmers. Let us not do something for political reasons. The farmers of Indiana are divided on this question, as I know farmers are divided in other States. I know we are all sincere and conscientious about it, but let us not hurt the farmer.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am sure we all agree that on occasions in this great body a sort of sense of futility in debate tends to muzzle many of us, no matter how important the issue may be.

In spite of that fact, I have a few observations I wish to make in regard

to the whole subject of farm legislation, and in particular with reference to the 90 percent support program contrasted with the flexible program, which is being advocated by the administration, spearheaded by the Secretary of Agriculture.

I do not suppose any one of us would contend that we have the last word on the farm problem. I do not know the Secretary of Agriculture. So far as I recall, I have never met him. I certainly have no prejudice against him as a human being. Nothwithstanding his persistent advocacy of a program of flexibility, I doubt whether he would contend that he himself has the last word on the farm problem. I have been a Member of this body for many years when agricultural legislation has been before it for consideration. I was in the Senate when the original McNary-Haugen bill was under consideration. It was adopted by Congress, only to be vetoed by President Coolidge. I then did not regard the McNary-Haugen bill as a perfect measure, or the final solution of the farm problem. I voted for it because it was the best thing offered at that time, and because we had a choice between that and nothing. We got nothing, because of a Presidential veto.

I have supported the 90 percent of parity basis for farm supports whenever I have had an opportunity or choice between that and flexibility, although I voted in the beginning for a measure which contained the flexible theory, because it was the best thing offered then, and the only thing we had offered to us.

Reference has been made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] a former distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, for whom I have the greatest respect and affection and personal regard, about the results of the 80th Congress.

I recall that Congress and I recall the election of 1948. I happened to be the nominee for Vice President of the United States in 1948, and in all my speeches throughout the Middle West, the entire farm belt, and everywhere else, I favored the program of 90 percent of parity. There are Members of this body who heard me make that statement over and over again in the campaign of 1948.

To the surprise of a great many persons in the United States the Democratic ticket was elected that year, and I became Vice President. Shortly thereafter, I believe in 1949, or possibly it was 1950—I have not looked up the date—I was called on to vote in a case of a tie, and I untied the tie vote in behalf of 90 percent of parity and stated at the time my reasons therefor. I had campaigned all over the country in behalf of 90 percent of parity, and while I did not enter into any argument about it in my brief statement when I untied the tie vote, I did refer to the fact that I had espoused that principle and program and that, of course, I would vote for it, having been elected.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico. I am opposed to it because, if we are going to have a program, if there is to be held out to the farmers of the Nation any inducement or any program, the farmer is entitled to know what the program is when he plants his crop, rather than to wait until the crop is harvested.

The farmer has been described as the greatest gambler in the world. That term is not used in any opprobrious sense; it is used because he is a victim of the seasons and the elements, over which he has no control whatever. He never knows when he plants his crop, whether it be tobacco, wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, or anything else, what he will reap at harvesttime. He never knows, until he gathers his crop and puts it into the granary or the loft or the bin, whether he has a surplus or a deficit.

If he is uncertain when he plants his crop as to what his income is going to be, having a certain goal in income to achieve, his very uncertainty will impel him to increase his planting, because he must meet his financial goal. If he is uncertain as to the price, he will plant more in that uncertainty than he will if he knows what his price will be.

The 90 percent program enables him to know in advance upon what he may rely. He knows that whether there is a deficit or a surplus he will be able to borrow money from the Commodity Credit Corporation at a 90-percent basis of parity, whereas, if he does not have that program, he will not know until he garners his crop, and the Secretary of Agriculture determines his surplus. He will not know whether it is 90 percent, 82½ percent, or 75 percent. That very uncertainty will induce him to plant more in order that he may meet the goal which he has in mind at the time of his planting.

So, Mr. President, in view of the uncertainty of agriculture, which is the most uncertain thing in the entire range of human activity, I think the farmer should know what the program is.

When a steel mill digs ore out of the ground and runs it through the mill, the management knows how much steel will be produced.

When an automobile manufacturer runs his cars through the line he knows how many there are.

When a manufacturer of agriculture implements starts the process of manufacture, he knows how many tractors, how many reapers, how many mowers, how many plows and harrows he will produce. There is no uncertainty about it. And he usually knows how much he will get for them when they have been produced and sent out over the country to the farmers. Only the farmer is uncertain about his prices and his profits.

Mr. President, I do not agree with distinguished Senators who say that our surpluses are solely due to the 90 percent of parity program which has been in vogue on some crops and at some times, not universally as to crops or as to time.

We have a 90-percent program on tobacco. That is the only crop, I think, on which we have a 90-percent program. All the other crops are on a flexible program. We have been under that program during 1955. We are now under a flexible program, and yet, day before yesterday, the Secretary of Agriculture announced that under his flexible program the income of the farmer went down more than $1 billion in 1955. Unless something is done to halt the decline the farmer's income will go down still further in 1956. I have no hesitancy in predicting that unless there is some stopgap adopted—that is not a very good word for it, but probably it is as good as any other—to halt the decline in farm income, it will go down even more in 1956 and probably more in 1957.

What are we going to do about it? I am for the soil bank. I am for it because I believe it inaugurates a long-range program by which we can reduce whatever surpluses there are or may be. Yet, there is no immediate relief for the farmer in the soil-bank program, even in 1956 or 1957.

I do not think the two programs are inconsistent. In my opinion they complement each other. While we are reducing the surpluses under a soil-bank program over a long period of years we will also enable the farmer to bolster his income this year and next year so that he will be prepared for a reduction in surpluses as the years roll around. There is not only nothing inconsistent between the two programs, but they are complementary to each other.

Mr. President, I realize that our farm population has been declining percentagewise for a long time. The farm population of the United States is now approximately 21½ million; yet, the farmers buy far and away out of all proportion to their numbers.

I should like my colleagues from the industrial regions of the Nation to keep that in mind when they vote on this 90-percent program. The decline of a billion dollars in farm income means a decline in the purchasing power of the farmers of the United States by more than a billion dollars. It means a decline in the purchasing of agricultural machinery. Due, in part, to the decline, the Moline Co. went out of business in the latter part of 1955. That meant that skilled workers in the city of Louisville were thrown out of employment. That meant a decline in the economic position of workers in this country.

The adoption of the farm program, the increase in farm income, the long-range program of soil conservation, rural electrification, the improvement of our highways, and all the other things which have been done in the last two decades to improve the welfare of the American farmer have resulted in widespread employment in the great industrial centers of the United States.

Who makes refrigerators? Not farmhands in a fence corner. Who makes automobiles? Not unskilled workers in the field between two corn rows. Who makes washing machines? Who makes radios and televisions? Who makes all the electrical appliances which have enabled farmers and their families to enjoy life more abundantly? It is the skilled workers in the cities of the Nation.

Those who make these products, those whose labor depends upon the purchasing power of the American farmer, have made these things; and as farm income declines, the jobs and the income of the industrial workers decline; and

sooner or later there will be a disastrous reflection in the economic position of every city in the United States, no matter how large or where located.

So not only do I support the 90-percent program because I believe intrinsically it is right——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much more time would the Senator like to have?

Mr. BARKLEY. A few more minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will 5 minutes be enough?

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me try 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I support the 90-percent program because I believe intrinsically it is right; because, of all the segments of our population, the farmer is the greatest victim of the seasons and the uncertainties of the situation; because I believe that as agriculture declines, ultimately our entire economy will decline; because I believe the farmer is always the first to suffer when any economic difficulty begins, and the last to go up the hill when it ends; because I believe the millions of industrial workers throughout the Nation rely upon the purchasing power of agriculture; because I believe that 90 percent of parity will be in harmony with the effort to reduce acreage; because if there is uncertainty as to price, the farmer will be less inclined to join in the voluntary cooperative program to reduce his acreage; because if he is required to meet a certain financial goal at the end of the year, he will strain himself in production and in acreage in order to meet that goal; he will be less inclined to cooperate because of his sheer economic necessity.

There are many other reasons why I oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and why I believe its adoption will practically scuttle the entire bill.

The soil bank program by itself, in my judgment, will not aid the farmer now. He cannot afford to wait 5, 10, or 15 years for the soil bank loan to solve his problem.

I think the two proposals go along together; they dovetail into each other as if by design. I think the committee was wise in reporting both provisions.

As one who was reared on a farm all his life, and who now lives on one, I shall be very much discouraged if the amendment shall be agreed to, because the farmers of the Nation, notwithstanding the crop they grow, will become again the victims of uncertainty, which they themselves cannot control, and for which they have no remedy.

For these reasons I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico will be defeated, and that we may send the bill back to the House with both provisions included—90 percent of parity and the soil bank—so that those provisions may work together to bring about a permanent remedy, if one is attainable at all, of the distressing farm problem which faces our country today, and with which we have to contend not only in the Senate but with which every farmer in the Nation has to contend every year.

I am not speaking of tobacco. Tobacco is now under a 90-percent support program. But I am speaking for the farmers who produce wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, and other commodities. I am speaking for the farmers who produce hogs and cattle of all kinds. There is in the bill a provision to help them, although it is not under the 90-percent proviso.

I am not, I hope, provincial or sectional in my advocacy of this program. I shall vote for it for Kansas, Nebraska, Montana, and Missouri with as much conviction as I shall vote for it for my own State.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be disagreed to, and that the 90 percent of parity provision will be retained in the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the debate. I only wish to say that as the bill came from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and as it now stands under existing law, it offers the greatest disturbance to the Grain Belt of any piece of proposed legislation which has been presented in the Senate. The bill makes it practically impossible for the Corn Belt to take advantage of any parity price or to participate in the soil bank program.

With respect to the 90 percent of parity provision, I am as anxious as anyone else to reduce farm surpluses and to have the farmer receive a fully adequate and proper price for his products. I am working to that end, and I shall continue to do so.

But if one is sick—and agriculture is sick, and has been sick for several years—and the doctor keeps feeding him medicine which puts him further and further away from health, he does not continue to be treated by that doctor or with the same medicine.

All the agricultural decline, for all practical purposes, has been under the mandatory 90 percent of parity formula for basic commodities. Every bit of the decline has occurred under that formula.

There is no support whatsoever for the statement that a further continuance of a program under which the sickness of agriculture has steadily progressed will make the patient well. I think it is apparent, and I call attention to the fact, that since the war every Secretary of Agriculture has advocated the abolishment of 90 percent of parity. Every President—and that, too, has been since the war—has advocated the abolishment of 90 percent of parity. They said it had to be done.

It is true that Mr. Truman, in the face of an election, after having supported the abolishment of 90 percent of parity, and Mr. Brannan, after having supported the abolishment of 90 percent of parity, also on the eve of an election, switched their positions and asked for 90 percent of parity. But Mr. Truman and Mr. Eisenhower have advocated the abolishment of 90 percent of parity.

The distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], when he was the Secretary of Agriculture, worked for the abolishment, as war measures, of high price inducements, and sought the adoption of peacetime operations.

Mr. Brannan advocated the flexible price support theory, but changed his mind on the eve of an election.

Mr. President, I do not want to see continued the medicine which has been contributing to the illness and almost to the demise of agriculture.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am not too much impressed with the quotations from newspaper editorials on farm matters which were read by my good friend, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If the people always followed the views expressed in newspaper editorials, we Republicans would have been in power for the last 20 or 30 years, or for as long as I can remember.

In the election of 1948, a major issue in the farming areas of the Nation was flexible versus rigid price supports. There can be no denying that fact. Our good friend, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who was formerly the Vice President, said he campaigned on the basis of 90 percent price supports.

The decision was clear. We Republicans, under Dewey, who campaigned for flexible supports, were defeated in the farming areas of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, and as far West as California. The people of America voted for President Truman. Apparently they approved of 90-percent supports.

Again in 1952 President Eisenhower was very emphatic in his support of 90-percent supports, much more so than the Democratic candidate for President, Adlai Stevenson. Again the people of this Nation made a decision. They favored 90-percent supports.

Are we now going to advocate flexible supports? It seems to me this would be the worst time to do so. It would wreck agriculture completely. I do not think we shall want to get ourselves into that kind of situation. At least, I hope not.

Mr. President, much has been said about what 90-percent supports have done with regard to surpluses; 90-percent supports are blamed for our surpluses. For the last 5 years straight, since February 1951, farm prices have taken a nosedive. They are now down to 81 percent of parity.

If lower prices would result in decreased production, one would think that after a 28 or 29 percent drop there would have been a rather small crop this last year. That was not the case. In 1955 we witnessed the greatest overall agricultural production in the history of the Nation.

Today hundreds of thousands of American farmers are going broke. That is particularly true of the younger farmers. I think the most tragic thing that could happen to the American farmer would be to reduce his farm income further by lowering price supports for 1956.

I certainly oppose the amendment of my friend from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, my position on the amendment pending before the Senate at this time, which was offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and others of our colleagues in the Senate, can be stated very briefly, and, I think, rather plainly. My support is fully in behalf of the amendment which has been offered to strike from the bill rigid price supports, and the position I take reflects practically the entire, if not the entirely unanimous, opinion of the agriculturalist interests of my State.

Mr. President, there is no need to prolong my remarks further. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in connection with this matter may be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that five representative letters and telegrams which I received from agricultural groups in my State may likewise be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement, letters, and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

Agriculture in the United States is more than our Nation's basic industry—it is a way of life. Throughout our entire history the farm family has given strength and stability to our social order. A healthy and vigorous agricultural community is absolutely essential to the well-being of our Nation's economy and society.

No single factor on the national scene today is more disturbing than the decline in farm income. The continuation of wartime production incentives after the end of World War II is the primary cause of the present farm depression. Those production incentives have created mountainous surpluses which continue to pile up at alarming rates. Yet, we are now being asked by some to return to a system of production incentives which can only result in the accumulation of further surpluses and the negation of the soil bank provisions of S. 3183.

When the Eisenhower administration took office in January 1953, it inherited a steadily deteriorating farm situation. In his agriculture message to Congress on January 9, 1956, President Eisenhower summarized the work which his administration has done on the farm problem as follows:

"Many new foundations of permanent value to all farm families have been laid in the past 3 years. Two years ago a new farm law was enacted, designed to gear agricultural production incentives to potential markets, thereby giving promise to our farm people of a stable and dependable future once the wartime inheritance of surpluses is removed from the farm economy. Loan programs have been substantially improved, enabling many more farmers to acquire family-sized farms and to improve their farms and homes. The benefits of social-security protection have been extended to farm families. The return of the Farm Credit Administration to farmer control, expansion of soil-conservation assistance and rural electrification and telephone programs, increased funds for research and extension work, initiation of new programs to aid low-income farm families, adoption of tax provisions of benefit to farm people, increased storage facilities, upstream soil conservation programs, greatly expanded disposal activities for surplus farm products, strengthening our Department of Agriculture representation overseas in the interest of expanded markets—these and other advances have permanently reinforced the foundations of all agriculture."

The cooperative efforts of President Eisenhower, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, and an enlightened bipartisan congressional majority under the leadership of Senators GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, and CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, have since 1953 started the Nation on the road to a long range and realistic solution to its agricultural problems. These leaders have joined in supporting further steps to help put American agriculture back on a sound and prosperous basis. Some of their recommendations have been incorporated in S. 3183; those provisions of this bill will have my wholehearted support.

I am strongly opposed, however, to those provisions of the pending bill which would restore rigid price supports and shall support amendments to delete those provisions from the bill. Restoration of rigid price supports for so-called basic commodities would serve as an incentive to increase agricultural production and would, therefore, defeat the other sections of the bill which are designed to reduce production. Rigid price supports also conflict with the interest of farmers who do not produce the so-called basic commodities which are supported. These producers of nonsupported commodities are also a vital and integral part of the agricultural community and their interest should not be ignored by the Congress.

The poultry farmers of Maine are a typical example of a group which is injured by rigid price supports of the so-called basic commodities.

Agriculture in Maine is not conducted on the same scale as it is in some of the wheat and corn and cotton producing States, but in terms of importance to the welfare of the New England economy, Maine agriculture is of vital concern and the poultry industry now constitutes the largest single segment of Maine agriculture. The poultry industry would not be supported by the Government under the 90 percent parity formulas, contained in S. 3183, nor has it been supported under the present flexible price support system. It is particularly noteworthy that the representatives of this industry have not and are not asking for inclusion in these programs. They have no desire to receive support from the Government for production which is, to their way of thinking, unjustified in terms of what the economy will consume.

If the Maine poultry farmers were still faced with only the problems of free market, I am sure that we would hear no complaints from them. But because of the rigid price supports of the past few years, the poultry farmers of Maine are no longer in a position to complete freely for the products they must buy to continue their production. Poultry farmers are constantly faced with the problem of high grain costs. Poultry farmers must buy grain that costs more because of Government support, but at the same time must sell their products in an unsupported market. As a result, the relationship between costs of production and price is out of proportion.

Let me emphasize again that the poultry farmers in Maine are not asking for a supported market for their products as the best means to obtain a fair profit for their industry. They ask only that the Federal Government refrain from raising their costs of production by rigid high price supports on the feed grains which they must purchase.

The poultry industry, however, is not just a Maine industry. It is spread over the entire Nation. Poultry farmers are usually small operators who have only a narrow profit margin. Before we vote on this question of rigid price supports, I hope every Member of the Senate will consider the effect of restoring rigid price supports on our Nation's poultry and other grain consuming farmers.

Sections 101, 102, and 105 of S. 3183 should be deleted. Restoration of rigid price supports would defeat the purposes of the soil bank proposal; would do incalculable injury to other segments of the farm economy; and would result in the accumulation of even greater Government held surpluses.

WAYNE, MAINE, *February 22, 1956.*

The Honorable FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
Senator From Maine,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PAYNE: It is the mind of our local farm bureau group to notify you that we are definitely opposed to a return to fixed 90 percent price supports on basic commodities and any dual parity formula. Also, we wish to retain the present 75–90 percent parity range for dairy supports in view of the increase in dairy production at present level.

We approve the administration farm plan's soil bank program if the problem of diverted acres can be met in direct terms with those receiving subsidies, and the terms are enforced. It would seem that enforcement could be accomplished, in any event, at less expense than the country is now bearing—and the step taken toward removal of stored and current surpluses would be in the right direction.

It is obvious that rigid supports, dual parities, and a dairy percentage hike would invite more basic commodity surpluses and indirectly, perform a disservice to bona fide farmers, and to taxpayers.

The basic unfairness of discriminatory subsidies and the inefficiency of any subsidies this long after the war emergency, leave a bitter taste indeed. Farmers lose the goodwill of the general public, and still have not attacked the real farm problem—higher costs.

Can we justify a program of continuing subsidized surpluses on the grounds of future population increases or readiness for war? Present farm methods and research promise an adequate and abundant agriculture, easily and quickly enlarged, if necessary. Oversized stockpiles, expensive and perishable, are sitting-duck targets, isolated by transportation failure in modern war. Most other disasters are acts of God.

As small farmers, dairymen, poultrymen, potatomen, orchardists, and market gardeners, we want to make our livings in a free farm economy and we therefore urge you to influence the Senate toward a furthering program to reduce farm dependence on Government. Let the chips fall where they may.

Yours faithfully,

T. DOUGLAS O. STEVENSON,
President, Farm Bureau Group of Readfield, Mount Vernon, Vienna, Fayette, and Wayne.

CAMBRIDGE, MAINE, *February 21, 1956.*

Senator FREDERICK PAYNE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PAYNE: I am greatly concerned about the outcome of the bill, S. 3183, Agricultural Act of 1956. I urgently request that you will do all in your power to see that this bill is not passed as now written.

Sections 101, 102, and 105 deal with fixing a rigid price support on commodities which in turn automatically encourages overproduction. This would be defeating the very principle of the soil-bank proposal, and certainly has no regard concerning the surpluses of various commodities now in storage. Selective disposition of the surpluses is considered a much sounder approach to this mountainous problem than the proposed processing tax now written into this bill.

Also title V, the two-price certificate plan for rice should be eliminated. Section 106 reinstating a dual parity price is not desirable.

Please give careful consideration to this bill as written by the American Farm Bureau Association.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER L. FOLSOM,
Secretary and Treasurer, Somerset County Farm Bureau Association.

WASHBURN, MAINE, *February 22, 1956.*
Senator FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Believe rigid farm price supports undesirable. Control diverted acres essential. Difficult administer but important to Northeast.

SMITH MCINTIRE.

WATERVILLE, MAINE, *February 20, 1956.*
Senator FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PAYNE: I am very much opposed to S. 3183 as it now stands. Hope you see fit to vote to strike out sections 101, 102, 105, and 106.

Sincerely yours,
Representative WALLACE WOODWORTH.

TURNER, MAINE, *February 19, 1956.*
Hon. FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your opposition to S. 3183, Agricultural Act of 1956 in its present form. Sections 101, 102, 105, 106, and title V should be changed or struck from the act. Agriculture can never get out of its depressed condition if laws are passed which add to our present surpluses. We favor an agricultural program such as outlined in the President's message to Congress.

A. B. RICKER,
President, Androscoggin County Farm Bureau.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think each one of us should stop for a minute or so and try to figure out how we can get more money into the pocket of the farmer. If we do that, I think we will all agree that 90 percent of parity supports for the farmer will come nearer guaranteeing more money in his pocket than anything else.

Why do I say that? Because it will be found that the prices farmers receive are to a very large extent regulated by the support prices Congress fixes.

We are all conscious of the fact that during the last year a billion dollars in net income has been taken away from the farmers of this Nation. A few short years ago, farmers had an income of $17,200,000,000. By the last quarter of 1955 it had dropped to $10,200,000,000, which represented a $7 billion drop for the farmers, while every other group in the United States was getting an increase.

We in Congress raised the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 an hour. I was in favor of that. At the same time we were saying to the farmer, "The cost of everything you buy will be based on $1 an hour instead of 75 cents an hour."

Then in 1955 we put into effect a sliding scale of support prices. Remember that the flexible-support prices were put into effect only in 1955. Do not let anyone tell us anything to the contrary. Some will say that 90 percent of parity supports were in effect. That was so, but only because under the sliding-scale formula, the Secretary of Agriculture kept prices at 90 percent. If supports had been allowed to go lower, we know what would have happened at the elections. There is no question about that.

Let us see how Mr. Eisenhower changed. We hear that other persons changed, but Mr. Eisenhower came to South Carolina and spoke on the Statehouse steps. This is what Mr. Houston Manning said:

Gentleman, in 1952 a candidate for President of the United States, Ike Eisenhower, spoke on our Statehouse steps right over there. I don't pretend to tell you what the President said in Dakota or Minnesota. I read about it. I heard with my own ears. He spoke of his attitude toward the farming situation. These are his words, not part of what he said. He said:

"There are no ifs, ands, or buts about it. I am for 90-percent parity for our farmers, and more too, if necessary, to give them their just share of our national income."

Those are his words. And the saddest thing of my life, gentlemen, except I was sending our boys to Korea, but with that exception the saddest thing is to see a fine man like Ike Eisenhower, a man I put up $750 to elect—

Yes; he is disgusted.

Let us see what Mr. Benson is doing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask for 1 additional minute.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Secretary of Agriculture Benson has said he will be willing to forego scheduled cuts in cotton acreage the next year if Congress votes for flexible supports ranging from 75 to 90 percent of parity.

If that is not an offer to try to buy votes on the Senate floor, I do not know what it is. What I have just read has come over the news ticker. We have heard recently of persons offering money to campaign funds of Senators to have them vote a certain way. The Secretary of Agriculture comes along and offers not to cut acreage if the price supports on products of the farmers of the Nation are kept at a certain level. We all know that if acreage is not cut, there will be more production. It has been shown by the record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not think I need to say much to advise the Members of the Senate today where I stand on the question of rigid price supports. I spoke at some length last week. I have not changed my mind in the meantime. I said at that time I think we put altogether too much emphasis on the maintenance of farm prosperity through dependence on price supports, flexible or rigid, which is dependency on government.

I believe firmly the farmers of this country will never achieve a permanent high level of income and prosperity until they take things into their own hands and handle their own affairs.

The matter before the Senate today is very important. How we vote on this question may determine how we go from now on. It could conceivably indicate how our Nation will be moving and where it will be going from now on.

The proponents of section 101 of the bill contend that a restoration of high, rigid price supports would make the farmers of the United States prosperous and happy. Mr. President, that line of reasoning is completely false. High, rigid price supports never have brought prosperity to the American farmer, and they never will. High, rigid price supports are primarily responsible for the difficulties the American farmer finds himself in today.

I heard the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] lament because he said the American farmer is being brought to the verge of bankruptcy. Today, the income of the American farmer is not what it should be; since the spring and summer of 1952, farm market prices have dropped from 113 percent of parity to 80 percent of parity, in January, and has risen to 81 percent last month—a drop of 32 parity points over a period of only 3 or 4 years. But during that time, 30 of those points came under high, rigid price supports, and only 3—in fact, I do not think it has been more than 2 of those points—have come since last summer. That is what has happened to market prices under high, rigid price supports and under flexible supports.

Let us see what has caused the drop in net farm income during the last 2 years. It is true that farmers have received lower prices. On the other hand, they have had good crops, and crops of good quality. In most cases they have been sold for fair prices. In some instances they have been sold for high prices. In other instances—as in the case of the price of hogs this fall—they have sold for very low prices.

But, Mr. President, the net farm income is the difference between the gross farm income and the costs of production. The gross farm income is very little below what it was in the all-time peak net income year of 1947—only $1 billion less, or approximately $33 billion, as compared with $34 billion.

Net farm income has dropped down because of higher production costs. What has been responsible for those higher costs? I wish to point out, first, that the sharpest increase in farm production costs has come in connection with the depreciation of buildings and equipment. In the banner year of 1947, depreciation on buildings and equipment amounted to only $1,616,000,000. Then in 1954 it rose to $3,645,000,000— an increase of $2 billion alone.

Mr. President, in the summer of 1954, a tax bill was before the Senate. We put into that bill some provisions which were good for the farmer. We gave the farmer a rapid write-off on his buildings and on the equipment he had bought. Instead of taking 40 years to amortize the cost of a new barn, he could amortize his cost in approximately 19 or 20 years. Instead of taking 10 years to amortize the cost

of a tractor, he could amortize its cost in 5 or 6 years. In short, we just about halved the period of time previously required. We doubled the depreciation of buildings and equipment, and that is chargeable against production costs. It is my opinion that that item, alone, accounts for at least two-thirds of the drop in net farm income over the last 2 years.

What we did for the benefit of the farmer reduced his income, at least on paper.

We did one other thing. Previous to 1954, when the farmer built a new pond or drained some land, and when that cost him, let us say, $400 or $500, he had to add that amount on the capital-gains side of his books. But in 1954 we passed good legislation permitting the farmer to charge the cost of that permanent soil-conservation work against crop-production expense. I have been unable to find out how much that amounted to. I have asked the Treasury, but the Treasury have not yet found out what it amounts to, although they know it amounts to quite a great deal. I have asked the Department of Agriculture, but the Department of Agriculture does not know. But assuming that we took $200 million from one side of the farmer's books and put it on the other side of his books, that makes a difference of $400 million.

I am not trying to say that today the farmer is prosperous. He is not now getting anywhere near his share of the unprecedented prosperity of the Nation, and we should not rest until we see to it that the farmer does receive a more equitable share, his proper share, of the national income.

But I wish to say that the tax legislation we passed in 1954 makes the farmers' net income appear much smaller than it really is.

To get back to the rigid support program, let us consider what high, rigid price supports have done for the basic commodity producers of the United States during a period of only a few years. Let us consider wheatgrowers first.

The wheatgrower of the Great Plains has seen millions of acres of his normal production transferred to other States. He has seen a compulsory reduction of 24 million acres in the planting of wheat. He has seen nation after nation apply subsidies to the production of wheat in their own countries in order to be self-sufficient and in order to be independent of American sources of supply. The cottongrower has seen the production of synthetic fibers increase until today the world is using synthetic textiles which are the equivalent of 13 million bales of cotton. The small cottongrower has seen his allotment cut and cut and cut until his acreage has been reduced to an uneconomic size, on which he can never expect to support his family in decency. The cottongrower has seen the American umbrella of rigid support prices induce production in foreign countries in almost direct proportion to the reduction in planting required in the United States.

Our foreign markets for cotton are almost gone; and if we continue to price American cotton out of the world market, the rest of the world will be completely self-sufficient in another 2 years.

American textile manufacturers have been put to a disadvantage and now are clamoring for trade barriers to protect them.

Cotton production in the United States has been frozen in uneconomic producing areas, simply because the producer is trying to protect his production allotment. The total production of cotton in the United States has arbitrarily been cut 10 million acres.

Mr. President, what have high, rigid price supports done for the tobacco grower? Because of the nature of that commodity, the tobacco grower's prices have been maintained, but he is rapidly losing his normal market.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Vermont whatever further time he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont may proceed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to repeat what I said the other day, when I showed how high, rigid price supports have been harmful to the corn grower, how they have been harmful to the hog raiser, and how they have hurt the dairyman. In fact, our dairymen have not yet recovered from what happened to them during the years when they lost 14 percent of their market.

I wish to repeat that the blame for virtually all the drop in farm income since 1947 can be laid at the door of high, rigid price supports. Do we wish to continue on that course? Do we wish to price the rest of our exportable farm commodities out of the world market? Do we wish to force an increased use of substitutes and synthetics?

Do we wish to deprive the American farmer of freedom of choice in managing his own farm? Shall we insist that the American farmer come on bended knee to the seat of Government and, with bowed head, petition the Government to support his family in decency?

If that is what we want, Mr. President, then we should vote to continue the rigid support program. We must make up our minds which way we want to go.

Mr. President, I wish every Member of the Senate could have heard the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], when he spoke last night on this subject. He showed where we are headed if we force our farmers to depend solely upon the Government for their income and their welfare.

We must make up our minds whether we want to continue to worship this totem pole representing a political philosophy, or whether we want to establish a real farm prosperity in America under control of the farmers themselves.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am very much opposed to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and other Sentors. I am not impressed by the remarks of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] who comes from a State which, so far as I know, does not produce a boll of cotton, a peanut, a grain of rice, or any wheat, corn, or tobacco, so far as the markets of the country are concerned.

I come from a State which is engaged in the production of many of those products. I have listened to Senators read editorials from the metropolitan press as to what is good for the farmers. I heard one distinguished Senator say, in tribute to two of our colleagues, that they were the greatest living experts on this question, and that they favored flexible price supports. He also stated that he knew of no group with any standing which opposed them.

Mr. President, there are 160,000 farm families in Oklahoma. I challenge anyone to find 1 out of 20 who agree with the position taken by the proponents of the amendment. I challenge anyone to go to the little farmers across the Nation and find 5 percent of them who agree with it.

Mr. President, this is the most important economic measure on which we shall vote this year. The fate of more American people, from the standpoint of their economic welfare, depends upon the outcome of the vote on this amendment than is the case with respect to any other measure on which we shall vote this year.

The fate of the lowest income group in our Nation depends on the vote on this measure. One-fourth of the farm families in our country have an average annual income of less than $1,000 per family. Three-fourths of all the farm families in the country have an average annual income of less than $2,500 per family. It is their fate which rides on the outcome of the vote on this particular amendment.

This bill purports to be a farm bill. Let me say to the chairman of the committee and the other members of the committee who brought this measure to the floor that it constitutes a vast improvement over the present law. I am grateful for them for having done so, and for giving us an opportunity to vote on the bill.

I challenge any Senator to deny the statement that if this amendment is adopted, we tear the very guts out of the bill, so far as concerns any benefits from it for the average farmer. The soil bank is a wonderful thing, if and when it gets to work. However, the provision for 90 percent of parity on the basic crops is the only provision in the bill which would add to the income of the small farmer this year. It is the only provision in the bill which would put an additional dollar into the pocket of the average farmer.

There are millions of small farmers. They have small farms. They are not in a position, for the sake of a meager incentive, to take a portion of their limited acreage out of production. The only way they can be helped is by giving them a higher price for what they sell; and the only way they can bet a higher price for what they sell is through legislation which increases the percentage of parity at which the prices of their products will be supported.

We talk a great deal about surpluses. It is said that high price supports created the surpluses. That is plain tommyrot. There is no support price under beef cattle or hogs, yet we have a greater surplus of those two commodities than of any other commodities on the farm. Today cattle are selling under 60 percent of parity, and hogs are selling under 50 percent of parity. Was that surplus created by high price supports? There are no price supports on those commodities.

The surpluses were created during the war, in response to the call of the Government upon the farmers of the country to produce for security. The Government called upon industry to produce planes, tanks, ships, and guns; and when the Korean war was over we had a $145 billion surplus in planes, tanks, ships, and guns. We still have $120 billion of that surplus, which was produced for the security of our country.

Is anyone asking industry to carry that burden around its neck, and hold down the price of everything it produces until the surplus is used up?

The surplus of agricultural commodities was produced by the farm families of our country in response to the call of our Government to produce to insure our chances for survival. There was about $6 billion of surplus when the Korean war was over. Many people in this country have wanted it to be an albatross around the neck of the farmers themselves until it is dissolved. Many people want the burden to be placed upon the backs of those who already carry the heaviest burden. It is the desire of some to burden them with the weight of that which they produced for the security of their country in time of war, at the call of their country to produce for freedom, for security, and for survival.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, may I have two more minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield two additional minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. The farmers are before the Congress today asking for help. If we do not give it to them, to whom shall they go? Are we to throw them back on Benson, and on the market place? I would just as soon be in hell with my back broken as to be a farmer standing before Benson, or in the market place, expecting to get either sympathy, charity, or assistance.

Congress has the responsibility of meeting this issue. The farmers of the country stand before us today asking us for relief. The only relief in this bill, in the form of additional cash in the pocket of the average farmer, is in the provision for 90 percent of parity. If we eliminate that provision from the bill, we are in the position of him who, when asked for bread, gave a stone. We cannot face the farmers of the country on the basis of any claims of meeting our responsibility unless we bring forth a bill which helps them now. This provision is the only one in the bill that will do it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to identify myself with the arguments which have been made in favor of a 90 percent of parity price on all the basic commodities. I believe that comparable legislation should be enacted in behalf of the perishable crops, so that under some sort of measure we can give to the producers of even perishable crops a reasonable price for their products.

Mr. President, it is passing strange that in a country like ours, where we are supporting our Armed Forces—our Air Force, our Navy, and our ground forces—to the extent of $34 billion or $35 billion a year, we haggle, as it were, over a decent price to the producers of foodstuffs and fibers, which are as absolutely necessary to the defense of this country as are guns, ships, and planes. They may not be so vital at a given moment, but the safety of the Nation depends upon a prosperous agriculture. It is shortsighted for anyone to take a contrary view.

For 20 years and more the entire farm program, following the giving of any kind of price support, involved a loss of only about $53 million a year. An unprecedented crop was made for 2 years in succession throughout the Nation. That probably would not happen again in the lifetime of any American farmer who is engaged in the making of those crops.

Mr. President, nations have gone down and civilizations have perished at the hands of an invading army because of the depletion and impoverishment of their soil. Yet because 5 or 6 billion dollars have been involved in the past few years, with unprecedented events occurring within that period, we hesitate to incur the very reasonable cost of a farm program which might make a prosperous agriculture, while spending $35 billion annually to keep up the Army and Navy.

Food and fiber are just as essential and just as necessary for the defense of our Nation as the Army and the Navy.

Certainly when any man or any agency of Government can fix farm prices at a lower point and can flex that price up or down, the whole tendency of that sort of legislation is to drive farm prices down.

I have always voted for high parity price supports. I have no apology to make for it. I know that in the bill there is not anything to help the farmer now, in 1956, although he has lost money and although the price of his product is going down. There is not anything in the bill to help him, except a high parity price.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. It proposes to strike from the bill the provision for 90 percent supports for the next 2 years.

Mr. President, the proposed soil-bank program is the first realistic approach we have made which is designed to achieve a solution of the agricultural surpluses that are today destroying the farmers' markets. Surpluses have weakened farm prices at the market place, and that is basically why the farmer is suffering a loss in his income.

All we need do is examine agricultural statistics and we find that farm income has dropped from $17,200,000,000 in 1947, to $10,200,000,000 at this present time.

There is only one positive way of giving strength to the farmers' markets, and that is to restore temporarily 90-percent price supports until such time as the soil bank becomes fully operative and removes the burden of surpluses now depressing the farm economy. The Secretary of Agriculture has announced the support price for wheat for the calendar year 1956. It will be down 27 cents a bushel—down from $2.08 to $1.81. The Secretary has also announced that the support price on corn will be down 18 cents a bushel. Reduced support prices on wheat and corn will reflect reduced prices on feed grains. They will reflect lower prices on sorghum grains of the Southwest. Reducing support prices on wheat and corn will also affect adversely prices on the oils, whether cottonseed, soybean, or flaxseed. In short, such price reductions on these two basics will directly affect adversely all farm prices. How can we justify this? We cannot.

We cannot impose further price reductions upon agriculture without threatening to destroy what the young men, who fought for this great country in World War II and in the Korean war, have worked to build up. These young men came out of military service and assumed heavy financial obligations in order to establish a farm home and to begin their farming operations.

Such a young man is today faced with a further reduction in his income. He is faced with burdensome interest rates on his obligations. If we reduce the income of that young family, we will threaten its liquidation. Yet, if we callously put that young farmer out of business, we still will not reduce the production on the land. All we will be doing is to take the property out of his hands under a forced sale and put it into the hands of someone who is financially able to reap the benefit.

Those are some of the personal factors that are involved in the pending amendment. They also should not be disregarded.

Mr. President, the soil bank is the first realistic approach toward solving the surplus problem. It is the first intelligent approach we have taken. It is the first time we promise a man, that if he will not cultivate an acre, he will be compensated for putting that acre into soil-building and conservation practices. Such compensation will enable him to meet his taxes, his overhead, and his general farm operating expenses. Heretofore we have diverted acres from wheat to corn or to cotton or to some of the other basic crops. All we have done is to transfer production of one kind of crop to another crop. We have diverted acreage from wheat and it

has gone into the production of sorghum grains in the Southwest; in the Northwest former wheat acreage has gone into the production of barley and of other feed grains. In the South, we have diverted from cotton to either corn or soybeans, or some kind of feed crop. In other words, the land was never taken out of production. We have never reduced our total farm plant. That is why I say that the soil bank program is the first intelligent approach we have ever undertaken to reduce total acreage under production.

I urged with the Secretary of Agriculture over 2 years ago to take this same approach. I received an unsympathetic response. Today we are aproaching the problem intelligently. However, we shall not get sufficient compliance this year to materially reduce the surpluses. It will be well into 1957 before that will be accomplished. Therefore until we are able to reduce the total acres under production, we shall not reduce the surpluses, and the farm economy will continue to be in jeopardy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, may I have 1 more minute?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as I have said, until we reduce the number of acres harvested, the surpluses will continue to pose a serious threat to the stability of the farmers' markets. In the meantime, if we reduce price supports the farmer's income will decline further, just as was the case with milk when the price support was administratively reduced. The price of milk dropped 59 cents a hundredweight on the very day the Secretary of Agriculture announced the reductions.

This is far more serious than is indicated by mere words spoken on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. I have received a telegram today which reads as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 7, 1956.*

Senator EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Today's Minneapolis paper states 1,100 of Minneapolis Moline 1,300 employees temporarily laid off. This is a real indication as to the effect of falling farm prices. Use every effort to push through 90 percent of parity as a stopgap measure. Congratulations on your wonderful stand on this issue.

P. B. O'SHEA.

Could this be a prophecy of the future? I sincerely hope not, but I shall not take the hazardous course of action of accepting, without objection, lower price supports which will mean reduced farm income this crop year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as a Senator from New York, I try to represent the interests of both the consumers and the farmers of my State. I yield to no one in my defense of the interests of the 16 million consumers of New York. At the same time I feel deeply the vital importance of advocating and supporting the legitimate and proper interests of the dairy and other farmers who are so vital a factor in the economy of New York and of the Nation. In fact, I have always felt that the interests of the farmers and of the consumers are not only reconcilable, but indivisible, and I am convinced that the economic stability of the farmer is essential to the stability of our national economy.

In regard to the pending bill, I have weighed most carefully the facts as they have been given me in regard to the situation in which the dairy producers of New York find themselves. I have studied the effect which Secretary Benson's policies, under the present law, have had upon New York dairy farmers and the economy of New York State.

I am aware that New York dairy farmers are not as directly and immediately affected by the price-support program as the dairy producers of other States. We market most of our milk in fluid form. I regret very much that this administration, consistent with its approach in other fields, has sought to divide the dairy producers of New York from the dairy producers of other States, and to give our dairy producers the feeling that their interests are different from those of other dairy producers. We were told, and are still being told, that the level of dairy price supports is of no real concern to us, since most of our production finds its way into the fluid-milk market. I judge this to be the old device of divide and conquer.

I feel that the interests of our dairy farmers are inseparable from the interests of farmers of other parts of the country. The level of dairy support does affect the dairy farmers of New York. It has affected them most seriously and adversely.

The welfare of the dairy farmers of New York State requires that the price-support program for dairy products be made consistent with the price-support program for all the other farm products. As long as New York dairy farmers have to buy price-supported grain and feed, it is to our vital interest to have a comparable price floor under dairy products. I believe that price supports alone may not be the final answer to our problem. But I know that the alleged solutions proposed by Secretary Benson have been even less acceptable. They have served only to drag the dairy farmer down.

Mr. President, the Benson experiment has failed. Unfortunately that experiment involved people—human beings. The experiment was launched by this administration on April 1, 1954, when Secretary Benson undertook to see what would happen to dairy farmers in this country if he dropped the price support level for dairy products from 90 to 75 percent.

Mr. Benson's "flexing" of the dairy farmers, Mr. President, has almost broken them, and will be recorded as a dismal and tragic failure.

When Mr. Benson decided on this grim experiment, he publicly laid down two criteria by which he would judge its success or failure. The first of these was a decrease in the production of milk. The second was an increase in the per capita consumption of milk and dairy products. Now that the experiment has run for almost 2 years, let us judge, on the basis of the experimenter's own findings, the progress made toward the attainment of its objectives.

First, Mr. President, let us see what Mr. Benson's statisticians report on the effect the experiment has had on production.

In 1953, the year before the experiment started, and at a time when milk and its products were under a 90 percent support level, the dairy farmers of this country produced slightly over 120 billion pounds of milk, and now, Mr. President, we are told by Mr. Benson that he estimates 1956 production at 126 billion pounds. It should be painfully obvious to Mr. Benson, the experimenter, that his experiment has failed on this point.

Now let us examine the results of the experiment on the per capita sales of milk and dairy products. It will be recalled, Mr. President, that when Mr. Benson started this experiment he justified it on the ground that the dairy farmers were pricing themselves out of the market. He argued that by lowering their prices, with the aid of his experiment, they could expect increased income from greater sales, and we would eat our way to better days.

Again, let us refer to the statistical information on consumption issued by Mr. Benson. We find that the per capita sales of dairy products from commercial sources actually have decreased from 688 pounds in 1952 to 682 pounds in 1955.

It is clear, Mr. President, that Mr. Benson's experiment has failed on all counts, and must be recorded as a tragic error.

The dollars-and-cents cost of this experiment is an inadequate basis on which to evaluate its effect. However, it does indicate the extent of its failure. Mr. Benson's experiment on the dairy farmers of this country has cost them over $1 billion.

Mr. President, I do not have the figures to show exactly what this ill-fated tinkering with the welfare of the dairy farmers of the Nation has cost the dairy farmers of New York. Perhaps our farmers have not suffered quite as much as the farmers of other States. But that is no consolation. They have suffered. Their income has decreased. The price of milk has gone down. The returns received by the dairy farmers of New York from milk products other than fluid milk have fallen even more.

I have received convincing evidence that the dairy farmers of New York State have suffered an unsupportable loss in the returns they get for their labors. They were already among the lowest paid, per hour of work, in our entire population. Today they are even more so. They earn less than 62 cents an hour.

Whatever doubts I may have concerning the long-range wisdom of the price-support program—and I have very

grave doubts indeed—I am thoroughly convinced that there is no other solution pending before us in legislative form that can rescue the farmers of my State and of the Nation from the plight into which they have been forced by the policies of this administration.

I must vote in favor of the program set forth in the bill as reported by the committee, including the provision for fixed price supports and in favor of the considerable improvements which are made in the committee bill for the protection of the welfare of the dairy farmers of the Nation and of New York State.

I firmly believe that the votes I shall cast on the farm bill, in support of the committee measure, will benefit the consumers of New York, as well as the farmers. No one will ever convince me, Mr. President, that the consumers can truly benefit from the distress of the farmers.

I shall vote against the administration's amendments. I shall vote for the interests of the farmers of New York and of the Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that an amendment in the nature of a substitute may be offered. Before it is offered, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the Anderson amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield back to the Senator from New Mexico the short time remaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McNamara
Allott	George	Millikin
Anderson	Goldwater	Monroney
Barkley	Gore	Morse
Barrett	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Murray
Bender	Hennings	Neely
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Butler	Ives	Purtell
Byrd	Jackson	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Scott
Chavez	Kennedy	Smathers
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Kuchel	Sparkman
Daniel	Langer	Stennis
Dirksen	Lehman	Symington
Douglas	Long	Thurmond
Duff	Magnuson	Thye
Dworshak	Malone	Watkins
Eastland	Mansfield	Welker
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Flanders	McCarthy	Young
Frear	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the vote will be on the Anderson amendment to provide for flexible supports instead of a high fixed parity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is correct. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], for himself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, beginning with line 6, it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 2 on page 2, as follows:

PRICE SUPPORT LEVELS—BASIC COMMODITIES

SEC. 101. Section 101 (d) (6) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(6) except as provided in section 402, the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 per centum of the parity price for the 1956 and 1957 crops of any basic agricultural commodity other than wheat if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas therefor."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—54

Aiken	Dirksen	Martin, Iowa
Allott	Duff	Martin, Pa.
Anderson	Dworshak	Millikin
Barrett	Eastland	Pastore
Beall	Flanders	Payne
Bender	Frear	Potter
Bennett	Goldwater	Purtell
Bible	Green	Robertson
Bricker	Hayden	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bush	Holland	Smathers
Butler	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Jenner	Stennis
Carlson	Kennedy	Watkins
Case, N. J.	Knowland	Welker
Cotton	Kuchel	Wiley
Curtis	Malone	Williams

NAYS—41

Barkley	Jackson	Morse
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Mundt
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Clements	Kefauver	Neely
Daniel	Kerr	Neuberger
Douglas	Langer	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Lehman	Russell
Ervin	Long	Scott
Fulbright	Magnuson	Sparkman
George	Mansfield	Symington
Gore	McCarthy	Thurmond
Hennings	McClellan	Thye
Hill	McNamara	Young
Humphrey	Monroney	

So Mr. ANDERSON'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CASE of South Dakota addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, identified as "3-6-56—G."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is aware that his amendment is a lengthy one. Does the Senator desire that the amendment be read by the clerk?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is not necessary that the clerk read the amendment; I shall comment on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment offered by Mr. HICKENLOOPER, for himself, and Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. JENNER, and Mr. CAPEHART is as follows:

On page 7, line 5, immediately following "SEC. 203.", insert "(a)."

Page 7, line 15, insert before the period the language ", or in the case of corn, below their farm acreage allotments or their farm base acreages established as provided under subsection (b) of this section 203, whichever is in effect."

Page 7, line 16, change "(a)" to "(1)."

Page 7, line 17, insert after the words "acreage allotment," the following: "or, in the case of corn, his farm acreage allotment or farm base acreage, whichever is in effect."

Page 7, line 18, change "(b)" to "(2)."

Page 7, line 21, change "(c)" to "(3)."

Page 8, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

"(b) (1) Not later than February 1 of each calendar year in which an acreage reserve program will be in effect for corn, the Secretary shall, subject to paragraph (2) hereof, ascertain and proclaim (i) the commercial corn-producing area provided for in section 301 (b) (4) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301 (b) (4)), and (ii) the total base acreage of corn for the commercial corn-producing area for such calendar year. For 1956 the commercial corn-producing area previously proclaimed shall remain in effect, and the total base acreage of corn for the commercial corn-producing area shall be proclaimed as soon as practicable after the effective date of this act. Such total base acreage shall be the average acreage planted to corn in the commercial corn-producing area during the 3 years 1953, 1954, and 1955. The total base acreage of corn for the commercial corn-producing area shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties in such area on the basis of the acreage of corn in such counties during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the apportionment is made (plus, in applicable years, the acreage diverted under previous agricultural adjustment, conservation, and soil-bank programs), with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions, for trends in acreage during such period and for the promotion of soil-conservation practices: *Provided*, That any downward adjustment for the promotion of soil-conservation practices shall not exceed 2 percent of the total base acreage that would otherwise be apportioned to such county. The base acreage for the county shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on the basis of past acreage of corn (planted and diverted), tillable acreage, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and topography.

"(2) This subsection (b) shall become inoperative after 1956 if in the referendum conducted pursuant to section 406 hereof, producers do not vote in favor of the program provided in subsection (c) of such section."

Page 9, line 8, insert after the words "as amended" the following: "or, in the case of corn, their acreage allotments or farm base acreages, whichever is in effect."

Page 9, line 13, beginning with the word "Producers" strike down through the word "upon" in line 14, on page 10, and substitute therefor the following: "Producers shall be compensated for participating in the acreage reserve program through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary—(1) in cash upon presentation by the producer or by any holder in due course or (2) at the option of the producer in the case of certificates issued with respect to grains and upon presentation by him, in grains (such grains to be valued by the Secretary at such levels as he determines will not materially impair the market price for such grain yet will, to the maximum extent practicable encourage acceptance of payment in grains in lieu of cash): *Provided*, That disposition of quantities of stocks hereunder in any one year shall be limited to not more than two-thirds of such quantities of such commodities as the Secretary determines would be a reasonable estimate of what would have been produced for marketing during such marketing year on the acreage withheld from production under the provisions of this act: *And provided further*, That such stocks shall not be released prior to the end of the normal harvesting season for the particular commodity being released."

Page 10, line 21, after the period insert the following sentence: "The rates of payment offered under this section shall be such as to encourage producers to underplant their allotments more than 1 year."

Page 21, line 14, revise the first sentence of section 215 to read as follows: "No person shall be eligible for payments of compensation under this act with respect to any farm for any year in which the acreage of any basic agricultural commodity other than wheat or corn on the farm exceeds the farm acreage allotment for the commodity under title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or 15 acres, or the corn acreage on the farm exceeds the farm base acreage for corn."

Page 21, line 23, following the word "allotment," insert the following: "or farm base acreage for corn."

Page 36, between lines 14 and 15, insert:

"SEC. 406. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and in lieu of corn acreage allotments for 1956 (which shall be inoperative for 1956), the Secretary shall require as a condition of eligibility for price support on corn, that the producer agree to devote an acreage of cropland (tilled in normal rotation), at the option of the producer, to either the acreage reserve program or the conservation reserve program, equal to 15 percent of such producer's farm base acreage for corn. The producer by electing to participate in the acreage reserve program, underplanting his farm base acreage for corn, and otherwise complying with the provisions of section 203 hereof, shall earn a payment under subtitle A of this title. The producer by electing to participate in the conservation reserve program and otherwise complying with the provisions of section 207 hereof shall earn a conservation reserve payment under subtitle B of this title.

"(b) Not later than December 15, 1956, the Secretary shall conduct a referendum of producers of corn in 1956 in the commercial corn-producing area to determine whether such producers favor a price-support program as provided in subsection (c) of this section for the 1957 and subsequent crops in lieu of acreage allotments as provided in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and price support as provided in section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if two-thirds or more of the producers voting in the referendum conducted pursuant to subsection (b) hereof favor a price-support program as provided in this subsection (c), no acreage allotment of corn shall be established for the commercial corn-producing area, for any county, or for any farm, with respect to the 1957 and subsequent crops, and price support made available for such crops by Commodity Credit Corporation shall be at such level as the Secretary determines will assist producers in marketing corn in the normal channels of trade but not encourage the uneconomic production of corn."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes or such portion of that time as may be necessary to make the presentation of the amendment.

Yesterday evening I spoke on the amendment, and I shall be very brief today. There is an explanation of it in the RECORD, which is on the desk of Senators.

Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered is solely and entirely designed to fit corn into the bill as it came from the Senate committee, and make it practicable and workable to include corn in the soil bank, conservation reserve, and acreage reserve programs.

As the bill came from the committee, leaving in the law, as it does, the formula by which the commercial corn area acreage of this country must be reduced or fixed according to a formula, it is impossible, from a practical standpoint, for farmers in the Corn Belt to participate. I shall try, in a few words, to explain why.

Under the formula presently existing in the law, which would not be charged by the bill as it came from the Senate committee, it is necessary for the Secretary of Agriculture to announce each year, after applying that formula, the number of acres necessary to have a normal supply of a particular commodity for the ensuing year.

With respect to wheat, cotton, peanuts, and rice, a floor has been written into the law below which the Secretary cannot go in establishing the number of supportable acres. With respect to corn, there is no such floor. Consistently and traditionally, those in the commercial corn area have planted slightly more than 56 million acres of corn. Last year supportable acres numbered a little more than 49 million, under this formula, and less than 50 percent of the farm acres could comply, because the farmers were cut down to such a point that they could not operate their units advantageously.

Under the formula, which had to be announced by the Secretary of Agriculture prior to February 1 of this year, the corn acreage had to be further reduced to 43 million acres.

The corn farmers in the commercial corn area simply could not live and participate when the acreage allocations were reduced to 49 million acres. They have far less ability and inclination to accept a reduced acreage allotment of 43 million.

What the question amounts to is this: A farmer who, in his normal rotation practices, has, for instance, a 100-acre corn base, in order to participate last year, under the 49-million-acre allotment, had to reduce that 100-acre base to approximately 87 acres. If he reduced it to 87 acres, he was in compliance and was eligible for price supports. Still, in my own State of Iowa, which is the greatest corn-growing State in the Union, only 23 percent of the farmers received the benefits of price supports, because they were the only ones who put their corn to seal in my State. So, 77 percent of the farmers got no support prices at all except through feeding operations or in the free market.

The price of corn in the commercial corn area, under the supports as they existed last year, was not materially benefited by the 90-percent supports, because the price of corn on the market ran from as low as 80 cents a bushel in Indiana and 85 cents a bushel in Illinois to $1.10 or $1.15 in Iowa. One of the reasons for the high price in Iowa was that there was a drought there last year.

But the price of corn was roughly from 70 to 72 percent of parity. Ninety percent of parity did not apply to the corn produced by the corn farmers, because it was not applicable. The corn farmers simply could not exist under those circumstances. They cannot comply when the acreage is further reduced, this year, under the formula, to 43 million acres. Therefore there will be no opportunity for the corn farmers to participate in the soil bank and in the conservation reserve, because under present law they must be in compliance before they can place any acres in the soil bank. So, Mr. President, to all intents and purposes we are eliminating at least 75 percent of the corn farmers in the commercial corn area from the possibility of participating in the soil bank, and thereby we defeat the very purpose of the soil bank.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. What supports will the corn farmers receive under the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. First, Mr. President, I wish to complete my statement. Thereafter, if sufficient time remains, I shall be glad to answer the question the Senator from Minnesota has asked.

Mr. President, my amendment proposes this: In the commercial corn area we have had consistently, year in and year out, approximately 56 million acres—or, to be more exact, 56,400,000 acres—planted to corn. Only a small fraction of the corn from that corn acreage was put under seal and received the benefits of the support price.

I propose to be realistic. In these amendments, I propose that, roughly, we establish a farm base acreage, which is the average acreage planted for the past 3 years in the commercial corn area. Let us make that the corn base acreage. Every farmer in the commercial corn area who stays within his farm base acreage will be eligible to receive the supports. Being in compliance on his

farm base acreage—which is, in effect, an allotment, but is a realistic one, recognizing the traditional planted acres—he is eligible to receive the supports. Furthermore—and this is unique, insofar as the situation today is concerned—while we have permitted cotton farmers, wheat farmers, peanut farmers, and rice farmers voluntarily to put acres into the soil bank, I propose that, as a part of the procedure in return for the receipt of price supports by a corn farmer who stays within his farm base acreage, he must put 15 percent of his available acres into the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve—for which, of course, he will receive ample pay.

The Senator from Minnesota has asked me what the support price would be. As the situation now stands, and with elimination of 90 percent of parity, the support price has been announced by the Secretary of Agriculture as 81 percent of parity—which will be approximately $1.40 a bushel, or slightly more than that, in the case of corn.

What will happen is this—and I shall use this illustration, as I did yesterday evening: Consider, for instance, a farm in the commercial corn area which has an historic acreage base, considering rotation, of 100 acres. If the farmer operating that farm were to comply with the law as it would be under the bill as reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and if he were to meet the requirement of the 43 million acres allocation, he would have to cut his acreage below 75, this year. Inasmuch as he could not live with the 88 acres he was allowed last year, how could he live with less than 75 acres, in the case of a diversified farming operation?

Mr. President, bear in mind that he must be in compliance, or else he cannot get supports or put acres in the soil bank. The same farm has a base of 100 acres. If the farmer overplants that base, he will not be eligible to receive price supports, or will not be eligible to contribute to the soil bank. But if he stays within his farm base acreage, he will receive price supports at $1.40 a bushel, or slightly more. That situation will extend throughout the commercial corn area, and will apply to every farmer who keeps within this average, normal, historic base.

In effect, that will make available to the corn farmer approximately from 25 percent to 28 percent more actual cash support value than he possibly could receive under the present law or if the bill as reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry became law without the inclusion of my amendments.

Mr. THYE. Madam President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am glad to yield, Madam President.

Mr. THYE. What percentage of support would a producer who complied with the provisions of the amendment of the Senator from Iowa receive?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. He would receive 81 percent.

Mr. THYE. That is, as announced for the calendar year 1956 and this year?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. For 1956.

Mr. THYE. So he would receive 81 percent on his quota; and his quota would be how many acres of the 100 acres?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. His quota would be the entire farm base acreage.

Mr. THYE. That would be 100 acres?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; 100 acres. Bear in mind that he would have to put 15 percent of the tillable acres or the crop-producing acres into either the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That would be 15 percent of the 100 acres.

As I stated last night, for that purpose he could take 5 acres out of corn production and 10 acres out of the production of beans; or he could decide not to take any acres out of the production of corn, and he could take the entire 15 acres out of the production of soil-depleting crops. My amendment would allow him to plan his operations. If he wished to plant 100 acres to corn, he could do so; but then he would have to take 15 acres out of the production of other grain-producing or feed-producing crops.

Mr. THYE. That proposal, Madam President, is a realistic approach to solving the problem as regards corn acreage, and also to get more acres into the soil bank.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. And the farmer would receive the identical supports, namely, 81 percent——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Absolutely.

Mr. THYE. That has been announced by the Secretary of Agriculture for the calendar year 1956; and the 81 percent would be only on the farmer's proportionate share of the 43 million acres.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; without the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. THYE. Yes; without the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. THYE. But if the amendment of the Senator from Iowa is adopted, the farmer will be able to increase to his historical corn base.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. And then he will comply with the 15 percent retirement of acres to the soil bank.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Madam President, the amendment of the Senator from Iowa is a good one.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The object is to take out of production feed-producing acres. As I have pointed out, this is the only area where the amendment will be compulsory. It will be voluntary—and, of course, there is a good reason for that provision—in the case of cotton; we do not compel the cotton farmers to put any acres in the soil bank. We do not compel the wheat farmers to put any acres in the soil bank. The same applies to the farmers who produce the other basics.

The reason for that provision is that when those farmers voted their own quotas, last year, in the case of these products the question of a mandatory contribution was not included in the question at issue; and the committee was unanimous in saying that one does not change the rules when a runner is between second base and third base. So we do not now attempt to impose compulsion on those farmers, inasmuch as compulsion was not a part of what they voted on last year.

I hope that next year we can have a mandatory contribution in the case of all these crops. However, the corn farmers are willing "to take it" this year; and we are willing to impose that upon them.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator from Iowa has a very intriguing and appealing amendment. It was discussed at great length in committee. Even before the time when we knew what was going to be the fate of the 90 percent price support, there were arguments both pro and con with respect to the Hickenlooper amendment. The 90 percent feature having been defeated, it seems to me that the adoption of the Hickenlooper amendment becomes almost mandatory if we are to protect the corn farmer under the prevailing situation. There is no future for him if he must take acreage control with the reduction of price supports. As a consequence there will be noncompliance, and more acres of corn will be produced, in my opinion, than would now be the case without the Hickenlooper amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Madam President, I yield myself five more minutes.

I agree in general with the Senator from South Dakota. However, whether the 90 percent feature was defeated or rejected would make no difference. This amendment would be necessary because of the acreage reduction in the present law, which would bring the acreage down to 43 million acres, and make it impossible to live with in the Corn Belt.

Mr. MUNDT. The difference being that without the Hickenlooper amendment, had the 90 percent remained in the bill, he would have received 90 percent, whereas now he will receive only 81 percent.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Less than 20 percent of the farmers would have received it.

Mr. MUNDT. Those who complied would receive it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Those who sealed would receive it. In the Senator's own State, only about 18 percent of the corn in the commercial corn area actually went to seal, and in my State only 23 percent of the corn in the commercial corn area actually went to seal. Those producers were the only ones who got the benefit of 90 percent, or any other support price.

Mr. MUNDT. On page 6 of the Senator's amendment there is a provision with respect to a referendum among the farmers at the end of the year.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe that for this year the 81 percent price support, without the acreage reduction, may prove of great benefit to the corn farming areas in comparison with our other alternative. What disturbs me is what will happen after this year's crop. Will the Senator explain briefly the choices which will confront the farmer at that time?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I propose a referendum not later than December 15, 1956. If in that referendum, two-thirds of the corn farmers approve the so-called farm base acreage proposal, it will continue. If they do not approve—which means that they disapprove of the farm base acreage, which I do not think they will do; and I believe they will approve it wholeheartedly—but if they do not approve, that will mean that they are disapproving allocations and allotments.

Mr. MUNDT. At what price would they have their corn supported in the event they should disapprove in the referendum of the Hickenlooper plan?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If they approve the corn base acreage allotments, the supports will remain at from 75 to 90 percent, discretionary on the part of the Secretary. If they disapprove allotments, it means that they disapprove of the program, and then price supports will be completely discretionary on the part of the Secretary, without limit or without ceiling.

Mr. MUNDT. But still from 75 to 90 percent?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No. It would not be from 75 to 90 percent. It would be at any figure the Secretary might choose.

As the amendment provides, it is to be at such a level as the Secretary determines will assist producers in marketing corn in the normal channels of trade, but not encourage the uneconomic production of corn—that is, if they approve allocated acres, or farm base acres.

There will be a session of the Senate beginning in January. By that time we shall know more about how this plan will work. The farmers will have an opportunity to vote. This is the first time there has been any kind of referendum. It follows the general pattern of the referendums with relation to the other basic crops, with respect to which the farmers have an opportunity to approve or disapprove the principle of base allotments.

Mr. MUNDT. Under the circumstances which now prevail in view of the recent roll call vote it seems to me that any Senator representing a corn producer must by necessity now vote for this amendment, to give the corn producer a fair break for this year and an opportunity for expanded income in 1956.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am glad to yield for a question. My time has almost expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think this amendment is excellent. I shall vote for it. I think it is the one answer to the corn situation. I know that our farmers in Indiana will be enthusiastic about it. My best judgment, as a corn farmer, is that it will do the job of reducing the surplus and bringing the price of corn in the open market up to where it belongs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Madam President I yield myself one more minute.

This amendment would not tend to increase the average corn acreage planted in the commercial corn area by a single acre, because it fixes the corn base at what we calculate on the basis of the average of the past 3 years, or approximately 56,400,000 acres. That cannot be exceeded. No farmer can exceed his farm base acreage and receive support. So it would not tend to increase the corn acreage.

Mr. CURTIS rose.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think my minute is about up. If I have time, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Take the case of a corn farmer——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I merely wish to ask a question.

Take the case of a corn farmer who planted within his allotment in 1955, and assume that the Senator's amendment is agreed to and the farmer plants within his allotment in 1956.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator mean his farm base acreage?

Mr. CURTIS. Will he receive more money for his crop under the Senator's amendment at the flexible rate than he would by planting within his allotment under the bill as it came from the committee?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. He will receive between 20 and 28 percent more under the price support than he possibly could under the unrealistic situation which would exist if my amendment were not adopted, because if my amendment is not approved only about one-fourth of the farmers can live within their allotments, so they will disregard them. If my amendment is adopted, more nearly 100 percent of the farmers in the Corn Belt can live within their base acreage, which they will have anyway on their farms.

Mr. CURTIS. I am talking about the farmer who lives within his allotment, under the Senator's proposal, with the same production per acre. Would he receive more money than if he operated under the bill as it came from the committee?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Indeed.

Mr. CURTIS. With that number of acres and with the support price provided by the committee——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With the bill as it comes from the committee, he would have to operate with further reduced acreage this year. Assuming a 100-acre base, he would have to cut to 75 acres. If he received 90 percent on 75 acres, he would not get as much money as he would get if he received 81 percent on 90 acres, if he elected to put 10 acres in the acreage reserve.

Mr. CURTIS. The corn acreage for this year has already been announced.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Should the Senator's proposal become law before the time to plant corn, it will mean an increase in the acreage allotment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Madam President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

If a farmer should accept the further reduced acreage and this amendment should be adopted, it would mean that he would go back to his normal average farm base acreage, so he would have more acres.

Mr. CURTIS. Would he have more acres than he would have under the present acreage announcement?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; but the farmer on the family farm who had overplanted would be brought down to the normal farm acreage base.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I yield myself 10 minutes. As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I am opposed to the pending amendment in its present form. Several amendments relating to corn were presented to the committee during its deliberations, and every time a proposal of this or similar nature was offered the committee voted it down. A proposal was made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to maintain feasible corn acreage allotments so as to place corn in a category similar to cotton, wheat, peanuts, and other basic crops. In the case of corn, the farmers do not vote on whether or not they should have acreage allotments. The Secretary of Agriculture fixes the number of acres to be planted within the commercial corn area, without referring the matter to the corn producers for approval by referendum vote.

Last year the Secretary fixed a minimum of forty-nine-million-plus acres to be planted to corn. As I recall, if a farmer in the Corn Belt complied with his acreage allotments, he would receive, by virtue of that compliance, a price-support loan at 87 percent of parity.

This year, in accordance with the law, as it is written, the Secretary of Agriculture announced an acreage allotment for corn of about forty-three-million-plus acres, with a support price of 81 percent of parity.

What would the pending amendment do? Instead of establishing the acreage allotment for corn at a realistic level, the amendment seeks to permit the commercial corn area to be allotted a minimum of about 57 million acres. That amount of acreage represents no reduction whatsoever from prior plantings—it is about the average that has been planted in the corn area for the past 5 years.

What else would the amendment do? The support price that was announced for this year, 81 percent of parity, would remain available for all of the corn to be produced from the 57 million acres.

My friend from Iowa states that the amendment would give an opportunity to the corngrower to get into the soil-bank program by forcing him to put 15

percent of his acres either into the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve.

What the amendment does is to permit the corn farmers in the commercial area of the United States to plant 57 million acres of corn if they desire, and to take their 15-percent reduction by participating in the conservation reserve program. It does not guarantee any reduction in the corn acres, because the portion of the farmer's land he can utilize and put into the soil bank need not be his allotted corn acres.

Therefore, as I see it, the corngrower will get a bonanza. He will be able to plant as many acres of corn as he has planted in the past, and the average for the last 7 or 8 or 10 years has been 56 million to 57 million acres per year.

Not only does the amendment cancel out the allotment made by the Secretary for this year, not only does it increase it by 13 million acres, but it also gives to the corngrowers the opportunity to continue the program indefinitely if they see fit to do so. If the amendment fails, they then go back to the present law, which would mean a return to the present program, about which they are complaining.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I merely call attention to the fact that as the situation exists, corn is being definitely discriminated against. If the formula for supported acres were applied to wheat, for instance, which has a protected floor in the law of 55 million acres, wheat would have 18,580,000 acres.

If it were applied to upland cotton, which is protected at 17,391,000 acres in the law, there would be 6,690,000 acres of cotton.

Mr. ELLENDER. I beg the Senator's pardon. The base cotton limitation is not figured on an acreage basis, but on a minimum number of bales. So far as wheat is concerned, there is a limitation of 55 million acres, but the acreage that has been planted by the farmers in the commercial wheat area in the past has been as high as 82 million acres. The overall average has been about 65 million to 66 million acres per year. Today, the total national wheat allotment is 55 million acres. Insofar as the wheat farmer is concerned, if he is to come into the acreage-reserve program, he must take the acres put into that phase of the soil bank from the 55 million acres. In the corn area, under this amendment, acres put in the acreage reserve would be deducted from a historic planting of 56 to 57 million acres—which is about the total acreage allotment for the commercial corn area envisioned by the amendment. The commercial corn area would be able to have its cake and eat it too, so to speak.

I cannot see anything fair in that. I go back to what I said when I was interrupted—and I do not mind being interrupted—that, under the pending amendment, if the corn farmers in the commercial corn area of this Nation are desirous of having discretionary price supports without acreage allotments for 1957, they can vote for such a program in a referendum to be conducted by the Secretary. If they fail to vote for such a program next year, under the amendment, as I understand the situation, they would go back to the same law that is now on the statute books, and which they say does not permit them to take advantage of the soil-bank program.

When the matter was voted on in committee I told my good friend from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and my good friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that if it were possible to get a realistic number of acres as a base, not the historical plantings, we might be able to get together on something. However, if the corn people are to be permitted to plant as many acres as they have had in the past and then receive a support price on production from that acreage for this year at 81 percent of parity, I do not believe it is right.

The program called for in this amendment is an injustice to the wheat grower; as a matter of fact, it is an injustice to every producer of the basic commodities, other than corn.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Madam President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The corn farmer is being discriminated against now, and the wheat farmer is getting support for 36 million acres more than is necessary under the formula. The cotton farmer is getting support for 10,700,000 acres more than the formula. The corn farmer is asking only for support for the normally usable nonsurplus corn. The corn farmers are not producing great surpluses of corn.

Mr. ELLENDER. The minimum acreage for the commercial corn area called for in the Senator's amendment is the average annual acreage planted during the past 10 years, is it not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, with respect to the wheatgrower, he must start with a national acreage allotment of 55 million acres and take some of those allotted acres and put them into the acreage reserve. Meanwhile, the pending amendment would permit the corngrower to start out with the average amount of acreage he has planted each year over the past 10 years—55 million acres. Then, he makes his contribution to the soil bank from that amount of acreage. We say to the corngrower, "If you want to put up to 15 percent of that amount into the acreage reserve, you may do so, but you do not have to do it."

The amendment provides that an acreage equal to 15 percent of his base acreage must go into the soil bank. He still has an option of putting either corn-allotment acreage in the acreage reserve or other tilled land in the conservation reserve.

It strikes me that if the Senator would propose a minimum acreage allotment which is reasonable, say, 50 million acres, and start from there and require the placing of allotted corn acres into the acreage reserve, that might be reasonable. Yet, even if we did that, we would still be giving to the corn farmer a better deal than has been given to the wheatgrower, the peanutgrower, or in fact, any producers of the other basic commodities.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The program did not work. The farmers could not live with the situation. They are seeding 56½ million acres of corn. We do not have a great surplus. I should like to make them eligible to put 15 percent of their acreage into the soil bank.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am willing to do so, and I want to help the corn producers to do so; but let me suggest to the Senator that he not place an acreage floor on corn which is the equivalent of the normal annual planted acreage in the commercial corn area.

The percentage of allotted acres in compliance last year was 54.2.

Mr. YOUNG. Madam President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not true that last year the wheat farmers brought their production down to approximately the amount of our domestic needs plus exports? The surplus wheat over these needs was 10 million or 15 million bushels.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The issue I am trying to place before the Senate is that there should be a provision in the amendment to force a certain percentage of the allotted corn acreage to go into the acreage reserve.

Mr. YOUNG. I think any wheat farmer would be very happy to have his normal wheat acreage restored as is proposed here for corn and in addition a raise in price support levels.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Am I correct in my recollection that corn is the only basic commodity which has never been under marketing quotas?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. There was a provision in the law relating to it, but that was eliminated.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. Corn has always had a high standing in the price-support program. This is an effort to make them stand even higher.

Mr. RUSSELL. One farmer can plant corn under loan and his neighbor can plant all he wants to, and suffer no penalty whatever for it, whereas the producers of other basic commodities are subjected to very severe penalties if they overplant by as much as half an acre.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think this is a very unfair proposition. It means taking money away from the producers of other basic commodities who have already been cut to the bone on their marketing quotas and are severely penalized if they exceed them.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I intended to emphasize in the statement I have just made.

Madam President, I wish to reiterate that I believe the majority of the members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would cheerfully join Senators from the corn-producing States in permitting their farmers to participate in the soil bank if they should offer a reasonable amendment. If we

could make the minimum acreage 50 million acres, or even 51 million or 52 million, and then require that a certain percentage of it be put into the acreage reserve, that might be reasonable. But I do not think it is equitable to offer an amendment providing that corn producers can plant the same number of acres they have been planting for the past 10 years, on an average, and receive the same support price—81 percent of parity—as if they reduced their acreage to 43 million acres and then in addition let them get by without being required to put an acre into the acreage-reserve program.

I shall oppose the amendment, and I believe the majority of the members of the Agriculture Committee will oppose it, as well. I do believe that if an effort were made to make the base acreage realistic, the amendment would have wide support. Forty-nine million acres, or even 51 million acres, would be all right in my opinion. But it would be unfair to allow the corn producer to plant the same acreage they have been planting for the past 10 years, on an average, and then not force them to go into the acreage reserve phase of the soil-bank program. I do not believe that would be fair.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator agree that the 43 million acres proposed for this year is not realistic?

Mr. ELLENDER. I so stated in committee. I believe the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] proposed an amendment to cancel out the 43-million acre allotment and make it 49 million acres-plus.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Last year's quota.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I may say that in my State the corn program simply is not working. There has been almost an even 3 million acres planted every year, regardless of what the support has been. To go down to 2,200,000, which would be our share under the 43 million figure, would simply mean that we would not have compliance by the corn farmers this year. I think the Senator quoted a figure of 54 percent; did he not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That was for the commercial areas.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In my State the compliance was about 40 percent 2 years ago and possibly 44 percent last year. But the program is not working and the result is that there is just as much corn being planted every year in South Dakota as there has been in the past 5 years. They try to break up the acreage, but nothing is being accomplished in the way of reduction of production.

All the Secretary has to do is to announce the acreage allotment of so many acres, and the farmer must comply with that acreage allotment in order to borrow the support price previously fixed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, as the Senator from Louisiana, who is the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has said, this proposal was discussed in considerable detail in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It is a very tempting amendment, particularly to Senators who are from corn States. But also it is the key to Pandora's box of trouble.

I wish the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] were here at this moment—he had to step off the floor—because in his comments he put his finger upon what can happen if we proceed in this kind of expedient manner.

If we are to take allotments off corn, and if we are to let corn farmers seal any amount of corn they want to seal, and, at the same time, if we impose allotments upon other producers, then there is no reason at all why we should not take the props off every allotment in the bill.

I say to Senators from the cotton States if the amendment be agreed to, there will be no reason why allotments should not be removed from cotton, and no reason why they should not be removed from wheat.

Let us consider the amendment a little. Where did the amendment come from? How did it get administration support? A few weeks ago the administration was not sure it was in support of the proposal. But now letters have been revealed indicating that the administration supports the proposal.

I want my colleagues to take note of one thing. This is a 1-year amendment, for the year 1956. Not only will corn be harvested in some parts of our country around September and October, but also votes will be harvested in 1956. This is an election-package amendment. Let us call it what it is. After 1956 the whole roof can fall in on our corn farmers, because the amendment provides that for 1956 there will be 56 million acres of corn, which is the national historical base.

Each farmer has his historical base of corn acreage, provided he puts 15 percent of his total cultivated acreage into a conservation reserve or acreage reserve. This is the goal for any farmer under the acreage-conservation reserve.

So what is being said in the amendment, very frankly, is this: "Mr. Corn Farmer, plant your corn, fertilize your fields, double your production, and you will be given $1.40 a bushel on all the acreage you have ever had as an historical base for corn."

As a Senator from Minnesota, I suppose I ought to say this is a wonderful idea. It will mean that the corn farmers in southern Minnesota will be able to plant all they can get on their acres, fertilize the land, use the best seeds, and be able to seal all of it, if they want to do so, at $1.40 a bushel. If this is the way it is desired to run a farm program, I want to know it.

Madam President, the amendment is nothing more or less than an actual taking of money out of the Federal Treasury in an election year in an effort to do what a bill introduced by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] proposes to do, except that the amendment is not a bipartisan one. The bill introduced by the Senator from Oregon provides that a certain amount of money shall be taken from the Treasury for the benefit of each political party. The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] provides that the money shall be taken out of the Treasury for the benefit of one political party.

I have quit being a milquetoast about discussing amendments. If this amendment shall be agreed to, we shall open up and complete the destruction of the farm price-support program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I rose a moment ago when the Senator said the amendment would benefit the farmers of his State.

Mr. HUMPHREY. For 1 year.

Mr. RUSSELL. In 1956. But over the long range, it not only would destroy any productive farm program; it would magnify all the errors which have been committed with respect to all the other commodities. A farm program could not possibly be maintained in this country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct, because the section on page 6 reads:

(b) Not later than December 15, 1956, the Secretary shall conduct a referendum of producers of corn in 1956 in the commercial corn-producing area to determine whether such producers favor a price-support program as provided in subsection (c) of this section for the 1957 and subsequent crops in lieu of acreage allotments as provided in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and price support as provided in section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if two-thirds or more of the producers voting in the referendum conducted pursuant to subsection (b) hereof favor a price-support program as provided in this subsection (c), no acreage allotment of corn shall be established for the commercial corn-producing area, for any county, or for any farm, with respect to the 1957 and subsequent crops, and price support made available for such crops by Commodity Credit Corporation shall be at such level as the Secretary determines will assist producers in marketing corn in the normal channels of trade but not encourage the uneconomic production of corn.

What is the meaning of all that legislative gobbledygook? It means that in 1956, by December 15, a farmer will have to decide whether he wants to continue for the crop year 1957 on a 75 percent to 90 percent of parity basis under allotments, or whether he wants to have the range from 0 to 90.

There will be built up under this amendment such confounded surpluses that there will be only one choice in 1957, even if allotments are given, and that is to cut the corn acreage back to 30 million acres. The Secretary will have to cut it back. It is not easy to talk about this amendment in the light of the bonanza it offers for 1 year.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In connection with the possible cut, would the corn farmers have to cut the quota, or would they simply be cut back by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. HUMPHREY. They would simply be cut back. It is interesting to note that the Secretary of Agriculture this year announced the corn allotment acreage of 43 million acres at just about the time the amendment came up for discussion. That is what I call rigging the deck or stacking the deck. In other words, the corn allotment program has been made so stringent at 43 million acres under allotments that of course it will not work.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know what the Senator means by "rigging the deck." I am not familiar with that language.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That language is just as confusing as the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whatever it means, it means the farmer is rigged without his own consent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; it means there is a joker in the deck.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe I now get the meaning of the Senator's statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to be able to explain it in more definite and precise terms. If I was not able to explain it to the Senator a moment ago—indeed, my explanation was very poor—I apologize.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree that a 43 million-acre allotment simply will not work?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know it will not work. I know it is not justified. I know the Secretary of Agriculture announced 43 million acres, because he did not want it to work.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then, what is the purpose of the proposal?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The answer is that there should be 90 percent for corn, which the Senate just rejected. Second, there should be at least 49 million acres of corn, which is a reasonable allotment. I took down the words of the Senator from Iowa when he said, "We are not producing surpluses." That is true; we are not. We are not producing surpluses of corn. We cannot have it both ways.

The Secretary of Agriculture says in public that we have a monstrous surplus of corn. But his agents came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and said we did not have enough corn, even, for a 350-million bushel set-aside.

The Senator from Iowa said we are not producing surpluses. He said further that 56 million acres will produce normal, usable quantities of corn. If 56 million acres will produce normal, usable quantities of corn, why did the Secretary of Agriculture cut back the acres for corn production, except for reasons of politics?

I do not mind the administration buying the election; but if they are going to buy it, I want them to do it on all commodities. Let them stop discriminating.

Mr. President, this is an election amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from Minnesota see any reason why corn should receive the treatment advocated by the Senator from Iowa, without similar treatment being given to the feed grains, such as grain sorghum?

Mr. HUMPHREY. None at all. I am hoping the Senator from Texas will offer his amendment, which includes some controls, as a substitute amendment, and which includes the word "corn."

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Minnesota knows that on behalf of myself, my colleague from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I have offered an amendment with respect to feed grains, which would provide for 90-percent supports. I suppose, in view of what has already happened, the support price will have to be lowered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest the Senator make it 75 to 90.

Mr. DANIEL. Or 80 percent for this year at least. Our amendment provides that farmers who participate in this program must lay out at least 20 percent of their cultivated acreage.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. If the same thing applied to corn, does not the Senator think that would accomplish what we are working for?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Insofar as a workable proposal is concerned, the proposal of the Senator from Texas is much better. I think the soundest proposal was the one we started off with, but once we chop off the head of the bill, and we start chipping off parts of the body, we are not going to make the torso look better by chopping off an arm.

Let me state what we have before us. The Senator from Iowa has said the corn program did not work well last year. One of the main reasons why the corn program did not work well last year was that there were so many bushels of feed corn produced, because we did not have a sensible farm program, and there was competition from cheap feed grains, which lowered the price of corn. Furthermore, if we make corn production unlimited, we shall drive feed grain prices down even more, and there will be corn and feed grains available for expanded hog and livestock production, and there will be a greater supply of many perishable commodities, hogs, and other livestock.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. If the amendment on corn is defeated, I wish to say to the Senator that I intend, inasmuch as the cosponsors of the proposal are willing, to include the word "corn" in the amendment with respect to feed grains, and to write into the amendment language which will provide a program to enable farmers voluntarily to retire additional acreage in order to make the program work as to oats, rye, barley, and feed grains.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is an amendment which I shoud be pleased to support, and one which I hope the Senator will offer, because I think we ought to vote the pending amendment down, unless we want to see commodity after commodity destroyed insofar as effective production controls and an effective price support program are concerned.

Mr. President, I am utterly shocked by the unprincipled methods being used by the administration on the farm bill. I want to review very briefly what the administration has been saying. It has been talking about great surpluses. It has been saying that we need to bring supply into balance with demand. Administration spokesmen have accused everybody in the country of doing something wrong except themselves. I suggest one improvement in this administration: "Go take a look in the mirror and see who the culprit is."

This particular administration simply says the historical base of 56 million acres shall be available for planting corn, and the acreage reserve sections of the soil bank shall be available to the 56 million acres.

The pending amendment simply provides that farmers shall be given open invitation to plant, plant, and plant for 1 year, and fertilize, fertilize, and fertilize for 1 year, and after the 1 year, after certain persons have gotten back into the White House and into the Congress, then, Mr. Farmer, beware. Beware of these—well, I like the Greeks too well, so I cannot use that quotation—beware of these Republicans bearing gifts. Beware of this Trojan horse. Beware of the effort to mutilate a farm program. It has already been hacked into small bits—at least a part of the program has been—and if we want to destroy the whole program, all we have to do is to do it commodity by commodity. I have worked too hard for a farm program, and believe in it too strongly, to let that happen.

In committee, while some of us disagreed on price support levels—and we had our arguments—the same ones who disagreed on price-support levels surely recognized that, if we were to have a price support program, there had to be controls unless we were going to provide supports ranging from 0 to 90. But when support levels are set at between 75 and 90 percent, especially if one believes that 90 percent support prices are incentives for production, then without controls we shall only invite economic trouble and production surpluses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield to me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned that we find ourselves trying to legislate on commodities year by year. I considered a 2-year extension in title I as a basic minimum. No farmer can plan the use of his land on a year-by-year basis. No farmer can plan long-term operations of his farm on a year-by-year basis. He buys

machinery, constructs buildings, and takes long-term loans. He has to be able to look ahead a little and see what the price structure may be.

The particular amendment now before the Senate simply says that for 1956 certain farmers are to be treated in what appears to be a rather generous way. Of course, what it really says is that we are going to lower price support from 90 percent by 10 or 9 percent, but the farmers are going to be given more acreage to plant.

Mr. President, that will only redouble and only aggravate what this administration says is the No. 1 problem—surpluses.

I want to say to my friends of the fourth estate that this administration stands guilty of duplicity, hypocrisy, and political connivery of the worst kind. The administration has told the American people for years that we have surpluses, and that surpluses are destroying agriculture and making the agricultural situation unbearable. Then the administration backs a proposal that will make surpluses mount up like the Alps. Anyone who can vote for the amendment can do so for only one reason, namely, that he believes that for 1 year, in order to get over the election hump, anything goes—anything goes.

I conclude by saying if there is one lobby that needs to be investigated by the Congress, it is the executive branch. Indeed it needs to be investigated. I have never seen such deals, such slick deals. Flexible-price-supports price supports are slippery deals.

Mr. President, I protest this kind of politics on the floor of the Senate, and this kind of an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does any Senator yield time to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in our committee we discussed this particular amendment, and we came to the conclusion that it would not be a good thing to have the farmers concerned turned absolutely loose so far as acreage is concerned, and then receive all the benefits. That would be the effect of the amendment.

Remember, we have already voted so far as 90 percent of parity is concerned, but I wish to call attention to one matter in regard to the cotton. With the gadgets contained in the bill, the price supports will not go from 90 to 85 percent, but from 85 down to 80 percent, in reality. That is what is being done to the cotton farmers of the Nation. We say to the corn farmers, "Do not agree to any quotas. Do not come in and play the game as farmers of other commodities play it, but we give to you additional benefits that no other commodity has." If we are to start doing that in our farm program, we shall find that there will be a great many headaches. There will be headaches because production will go to extremes.

I hold in my hand a letter calling this particular amendment to my attention. We are not fooling the people of this Nation with amendments such as this. What does the letter say?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the letter from Mr. E. H. Agnew, president of the South Carolina Farm Bureau, reads as follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA FARM BUREAU, INC.,
Columbia, S. C., February 29, 1956.
Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is a copy of the February 27 issue of the American Farm Bureau Official News Letter. We are proud that your picture is not on the front page among the seven leaders listed as fighting for American Farm Bureau legislative proposals at present in the Senate.

Your attention is invited specifically to the front-page lead article, "Illinois Farmers' Rally Brings 11,000 to Protest Farm Bill." Your particular attention is invited to page 34 where this article is marked with reference to the remarks of President Otto Steffey, of the Illinois Farm Bureau, as to what he said to this vast 11,000 throng.

Mr. Steffey says, "There is a provision in the law for a minimum allotment below which acreage of wheat and cotton cannot be cut but there is no such provision regarding corn acreages." Since the law provides only for voluntary acreage allotments, there is no need for minimum allotments because farmers are not compelled to comply. As a matter of fact, corn farmers for the most part disregard allotments any year.

With this in mind, you should ever be conscious of the fact that this whole American Farm Bureau proposed legislative program with respect to support prices and the soil bank is purely a Republican-Farm Bureau coalition deal primarily in the corn belt to the almost total disregard of farmers in other sections of the country.

You will note also that Mr. Steffey says "corn farmers will not participate in such a program"—meaning a marketing quota program.

If the lifting of the corn allotments for 1956 will help to decrease corn surpluses then it is by reason of the fact that corn farmers have traditionally paid no attention to allotments. The real purpose of this deal would be to make every acre of a farm in the corn belt eligible for high payments in the soil bank plan and every other acre not put into the soil bank eligible for the production of corn under support price. If this isn't just about a perfect set-up, I cannot well imagine one. Can you picture every southern cotton farm without acreage allotments for 1956, every acre eligible for high payments under the first provision of the soil bank plan, and cotton eligible for a minimum 75 percent of parity support price with a prospective pledge by the president and the administration of income at least as high as the income from cotton in 1955? This would be a comparable deal to what is proposed by the Republicans and the American Farm Bureau Federation for corn.

Any effort to control the use of diverted acres would not affect corn growers in the commercial corn area for the very reason that they don't have any. If corn farmers, Republicans, and the American Farm Bureau could have their way under their proposed legislative program, any acre put into the soil bank in the commercial corn area would carry the same weight as acres taken from our small acreage allotments in the cotton belt. It is preposterous to make taking of acres from out little cotton allotments and putting them into the soil bank a prerequisite to eligibility for support price on cotton.

By way of comparison, let us take a 100 acre corn belt farm and a 100 acre cotton farm. In the corn belt, this mandatory provision for 10 percent of the acreage to be put into the soil bank—this would mean 10 acres on a 100-acre farm—then the other 90 acres would be eligible for planting in corn and at the same time having support price. As applied to a 100-acre cotton farm—and the average cotton allotment in South Carolina on a 100-acre farm would be 10 acres or less—under American Farm Bureau proposals 1 acre of our 10-acre cotton allotment would be required to be put in the soil bank in order to qualify for support price. Any other acres on cotton farm put into the soil bank would receive payment at a lesser rate because of a lesser estimated productive value. Cotton allotments are so small now that it is hardly possible to live under existing conditions with small allotment. To be forced to give some of the farm's allotment away as a further condition of eligibility for support price is perfectly preposterous.

Under the provisions of the present law, corn growers have exactly the kind of program that they want. Addition of the soil-bank provisions of the Senate committee bill would round out for them a perfect program. They simply are not satisfied to run their own business and let other peoples business alone, they are determined to run the whole show.

Anything being thrown out as bait for some kind of a compromise to weaken the position of the supporters of the Senate committee bill does not stand to cost the corn belt farmer anything at all. Whatever voting strength, if any, that they may gain by such side-swapping and so-called bait is just so much victory for them because they have nothing whatever to lose and actually they are not giving anything at all to win a vote if they can find one in the Senate.

This is further clear-cut evidence of the facts that I have been relating to you all along—that this whole thing is a Republican midwest corn-farmer deal. If this battle is lost in the Senate, then there is no hope. If supporters of the Senate committee bill win without crippling amendments, then the chance is afforded for this bill, if and when passed by the Senate, to be referred to a Senate-House conference committee for ironing out the differences.

If the Senate committee bill is sucessfully amended to provide for the type charges being demanded by the Republicans and the American Farm Bureau, then there would be no chance for a conference action but the bill would have to go to the House. Then the chance for any constructive legislation in this field would be out as far as 1956 is concerned—and the Republicans would have won a major victory and sewed up the Midwest vote in 1956 elections.

This would definitely put Democrats on the defensive. I am not one who fears a veto by the President of 90-percent support prices as contained in provisions of the Senate committee bill. All the talk about a Presidential veto, in my humble opinion is no more or not less than plain bluff. If the President should veto such a bill, then the Republicans could rightfully be charged with having blocked enactment of any constructive farm legislation at this session in time for 1956. Therefore, the only chance that the Democrats have to put the Republicans

on the defensive is to pass in the Senate this Senate committee version of the bill.

South Carolina Farm Bureau members and South Carolina farmers in general are counting upon you standing to the rack and fighting to the last ditch on this deal because it holds the only hope for any decent support prices and farm income from our major cash crop in 1956. Our cotton allotments are already cut to the legal minimum with no hope for any additional and we must live with them. We are simply not in position to live with these allotted acres plus a drastic cut in the price of cotton which would come certainly with a reduction in support prices.

Kindest regards.

Yours sincerely,

E. H. AGNEW,
President.

Mr. President, they realize what is taking place here. The people of the Nation are not fooled when an amendment such as the pending one is pulled out. In my opinion the amendment, if adopted, will open the door for cotton to be turned loose and for wheat to be turned loose and for all the other commodities to be turned loose; and it will also provide for them the various and sundry things provided in the bill at the present time. But as to all the other commodities, those who produce them will be required to abide by their allotments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement printed at this point in the RECORD; and then I yield back the remainder of the time yielded to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BEALL

We in Maryland are proud to have our State known as the Free State.

We are also proud of the way in which our citizens live up to the great traditions reflected in that inspiring title.

When we have been threatened with regulations which would stifle our free spirit, we have fought.

We are fighting now.

From all parts of the Free State of Maryland I have received letters and telegrams stating that our freedom-loving farmers want the right to till their own lands without burdensome regulations, restrictions, and red tape.

Every communication has included the same general sentiment—"eliminate the 90 percent rigid support provision from the farm bill."

To date I have not received one single communication from any Free Stater who expressed approval of high, rigid supports.

Many arguments have been offered before this body on both sides of the price-supports issue, but the most eloquent comments on the subject come from the farmers themselves—the practical landowners whose business it is to make a living within the system of free enterprise which they feel is their American birthright.

Here, then, are samples of what the farmers of the Maryland Free State are saying:

W. A. Cooksey, president, and C. E. Wise, Jr., secretary-treasurer, of the Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.: "We are opposed to section 101 and section 102 that reinstate rigid 90-percent supports on the basic crops. This wartime program, carried through years of peace, stimulated overproduction and built up the huge surpluses that now depress farm prices."

Herbert R. Hoopes, master of the Maryland State Grange: "Even though I can see the need for something to correct the constantly falling level of farm income, it doesn't make sense to me to go back to the old policy which was at least partly responsible for the mess we are in now."

George C. Slagle, manager-secretary of the Frederick Chamber of Commerce: "The enclosed resolution * * * was unanimously endorsed by the board of directors of the Frederick Chamber of Commerce, Inc. * * * 'That we adhere strictly to a policy of flexible price supports that is dependent upon the supply on hand. Our excess stockpile of commodities on hand at present is a direct result of rigid 90-percent support in the past that was left in effect too long by zealous politicians in a futile effort to help farmers.' "

Ralph W. Ferguson, president, and Robert P. Heavner, secretary-treasurer, of the Allegany County Farm Bureau: "We of the Allegany County Farm Bureau, representing the farmers of our county, ask you to oppose a bill now before you to continue 90 percent rigid price supports."

Edgar A. Kalb, of Woodlawn, Md.: "As chairman of the legislative committee of the Baltimore County Farm Bureau, I have been requested by the members to contact you and ask your support to vote for the elimination of the 90 percent of parity control."

T. Reid Hutchins, president of the Calvert County Farm Bureau: "Calvert County Farm Bureau urges you oppose the 90-percent rigid support provision in new Senate farm bill."

Glenn C. Dudrow, legislative chairman of the Talbot County Farm Bureau: "341 members of the Talbot County Farm Bureau want the 90-percent-parity clause stricken out of the farm bill."

Stanley E. Lankford, Jr., president of the Somerset County Farm Bureau: "Our county farm bureau is unanimously opposed to 90-percent rigid price supports for the next 2 years as proposed in a new farm bill."

J. Herbert Carter, president of the Queen Annes County Farm Bureau: "Request elimination of 90 percent parity from farm bill."

Florence V. Riggs, president of the Associated Women of the Queen Annes County Farm Bureau: "We want flexible supports."

J. H. Shockley, president of the Worcester County Farm Bureau: "We oppose 90 percent of rigid support."

John B. Astle, member of the legislative committee of the Cecil County Farm Bureau: "We urge the elimination of 90 percent parity."

Floyd Buser, chairman of the executive committee of the Allegany County Farm Bureau: "Please vote to eliminate rigid price supports at 90 percent of parity."

George E. Wright, president of the Wicomico County Farm Bureau: "Would appreciate your support for elimination of 90 percent parity."

G. Emerson Bishoff, president of the Garrett County Farm Bureau: "We hope you will vote against rigid price support at 90 percent of parity for farm products."

Edward N. Derr, chairman of the legislative committee of the Carroll County Farm Bureau: "The Carroll County Farm Bureau asks your assistance in opposing the passage of the 90 percent rigid price-support bill."

William O. Coxon, president of the Kent County Farm Bureau, Inc.: "We favor flexible supports."

Philip R. Hogue, chairman of the legislative committee of the Queen Annes Farm Bureau: "Request elimination of 90 percent parity from farm bill."

Norman Fike, president of the Talbot County Farm Bureau: "Please eliminate the 90-percent clause in the farm bill."

H. Jones Baker, Jr., president of the Howard County Farm Bureau: "Vote for elimination of 90 percent rigid price supports."

Mrs. O. C. Glotfelty, president of the Associated Women of the Garrett County Farm Bureau: "We would like to go on record as favoring flexible price supports."

George A. Stiles, president of the Washington County Farm Bureau: "Please vote against 90 percent rigid price support."

Maxwell Hankins, chairman of the legislative committee of the Harford County Farm Bureau: "Harford County Farm Bureau opposed to rigid price support."

William V. Riggs, president of the Queen Annes County Republican Club: "Eliminate 90 percent of parity from the farm bill."

Letcher L. Colona, vice president of the Maryland State Farm Bureau: "We don't want 90 percent rigid support."

Lloyd Balderston, of Colora: "I am a farmer and realize the economic unsoundness of the continuation or reenactment of a rigid 90 percent parity support price on the three main agricultural crops."

Earl D. Beard, president of the Carroll County Farm Bureau: "Carroll County farmers believe that much of the difficulty farmers face today is due to too high support prices over the past years, and continuing such supports will only make things worse, rather than improving them."

William N. Ensor, Jr., of Manchester: "The 90 percent support program will put all farmers at the mercy of the Government and will certainly eliminate the initiative of free enterprise."

John E. Schell, Jr., of Frederick: "Most of the farmers with whom I have talked now realize that flexibility in support of farm income is essential to a program to successfully reduce the enormous and costly surplus hanging over the market."

Amos E. Reeder, of Boonsboro: "We farmers feel that the rigid price supports of the past are the cause of the mess we are in today."

W. H. Hovermale, of Rohrersville: "I believe as a farmer and citizen that flexible price supports are more beneficial and economical for all the people."

Richard S. Bilger, of Baltimore County: "I, for one of many, disapprove the 90-percent parity bill. No one other than a vote seeker will vote for more surpluses and greater cost to the taxpayer."

Mary A. Burr, of North East: "There seems to be a lot of clamoring for a return to 90 percent of parity. This may be politically expedient, but certainly high price supports will not solve the farmers' problems."

G. William England, of Rising Sun: "Please eliminate high parity."

F. D. Ziegler, Sr., of Denton: "Oppose 90-percent parity coming up with farm bill."

C. Frank Boyle, of Hillsboro: "Request elimination of 90 percent price supports."

N. E. Kefauver, Jr., of Frederick: "Request vote for elimination of 90 percent rigid price support."

N. B. Wilkinson: "I am very much opposed to high rigid farm support. Obviously, if that was the answer, we would not have a farm problem."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the artistic ire and the classic indignation of my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, never cease to entrance me. But I am a little distressed that it would appear that suddenly this bill is to be

a political measure. I hope not. There has never been anything partisan about a bushel of corn or a bushel of wheat. I think Senators on both sides of the aisle are in all earnestness and all sincerity interested in finding a solution to the problem. If we are not, and if we are going to put a political tag on the bill, I suppose we can just cease our labors now, because then I would be rather dubious about the result.

I think it is interesting to consider for a little the genesis of the amendment. I recall that when I came back after a brief, but necessary, absence, I conferred with a number of members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. They indicated to me—certainly it was not in confidence—that the bill, as reported, was deficient insofar as corn was concerned. If any member of the committee with whom I talked would like to disclaim that, I am willing to retract the statement. But I think it was rather well agreed. I recall my conversations with the chairman of the committee. He said, "We shall see if something can be done about corn, because that is a weakness in the bill."

Mr. President, if it is a weakness, by confession, then certainly we are in court and in good order and with clean hands in asking for something for the corn crop and the Corn Belt. No cotton can be raised there, as you, Mr. President, well know, for you live in the Corn Belt, too. No tobacco can be raised there. No peanuts are raised there. Our great problem is the competition we get from feed which is raised on diverted acres in probably 30 States of the Union. That is the reason why we have a corn-hog problem today, and we might as well be realistic about it. Altogether, on both sides of the aisle, we hope to find a solution for the problem.

When I came back, I conferred with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. I talked casually, as I recall, with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. I talked with the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. We hoped that together we could find an answer to this problem.

Mr. President, what is the problem? First, let me say that all of us are interested in the soil bank. I do not know very much about banking, but I know it is not possible to run a bank unless deposits of money are made in it now and then. The operations begin with some capital and surplus; but there must be deposits in the bank, in order to keep it going, because everyone knows that there will be withdrawals.

In the case of the soil bank, dollars are not deposited. Instead, a farmer is told, "Deposit your acres and we will pay you a little interest on them; we will pay you a little sum for depositing your acres in the soil bank." The farmer must be given a little starting point as an incentive. The real problem has been, and the reason why the farmers in the Corn Belt have not complied on many occasions is, that the corn farmer's base was too small as a starting base. I think the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will agree to that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to be entirely fair. He felt that 43 million acres was too low. He talked about 50 million acres. The amendment provides for the historic acreage, which is 56 million acres. The chairman of the committee is exactly right about that.

I make this suggestion: This amendment could be taken to conference and could be modified there, if that became necessary. But since we have had so small a compliance, it is obvious from the record that our corn farmers have not been willing, thus far, to deposit acres in the soil bank. So, Mr. President, in this bill we seek to give them an incentive.

How shall we do that? If we say to the corn farmer, "You begin with 43 million acres," he cannot do it; he has to have something on which to live. This is a matter of the survival of the farmers, because their taxes are high. So if we say to them, "We will have you begin with an allotment of 43 million acres," they will rebel; they will say, "We cannot make it."

Then, Mr. President, whence are the acres to be deposited in the soil bank to come? As a matter of fact, we would insure the failure of the soil bank and its insolvency from the very word "go," unless we were to give the corn farmers in the 10 or 11 corn-producing States something of an incentive.

I do not know whether they are wedded to 56 million acres. I have not discussed with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], whether that amount of acreage should be reduced somewhat. But we do know that if the heart of this bill, which is the soil bank, is going to succeed, and if it not going to die by the spectral hand of insolvency, even before the bill can be signed, there must be some incentive.

So we find the members of the committee agreeing that something must be done.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, let us not quarrel too sharply about the 56 million acres. If the conference committee wishes to reduce that amount, perhaps it should be reduced. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], said that 56 million acres might be too high. I remember that when we discussed the matter at the dinner table, rather recently, we talked about 50 million acres or 51 million acres. I am not wedded to any particular figure.

But if the soil bank is not to go into foreclosure even before it gets underway, then we must be realistic about the matter, and we must have a better starting point, and we must have some incentive for the farmer.

That incentive is all the more necessary because of the feed competition. The departmental figures will show that the cheap feeds—grain sorghums, barley, and oats—are the equivalent of 800 million bushels of corn. We cannot compete with cheap feed. If we can fatten a hog on grain sorghum, we do not need corn. If we can fatten him on barley, we displace corn. If we can fatten him on ground oats, we displace corn, and the corn remains. When the corn remains, and the price goes down, we shatter the hog market.

It was said here today that there is no price support on livestock. That is correct. Corn determines what is going to happen to hogs. Anyone familiar with the problem knows that 10 or 11 bushels of corn equals 100 pounds of hog meat. That formula is as old as the Nation. So we get back to corn. It is the largest crop. It is the biggest money crop. It runs more than 3 billion bushels a year. Billions of bushels of corn are fed as grain. To be sure, a little of it gets into industry. A little is used for corn sweeteners in some of the distilleries in the Corn Belt. But corn is essentially a grain crop, to be fed.

So the livestock structure is predicated on corn. And so we get back to where we started—an admitted weakness in the bill, which the committee admitted—rightly so, and in good grace.

I admire the chairman for the candor with which we were able to discuss this question informally, and I salute him for the diligent job he has done on the bill. I know that he sees some benefits for corn, as distinguished from other crops, but I should point out, I think, in all candor, that we have not been on the advantageous end, because by law we set a minimum of 55 million acres for wheat. If wheat had been treated under allotments as corn was treated, wheat would be down to 18 million acres.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Is the Senator speaking of domestic needs, or does he include the average export?

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is the entire crop. Minimums were established for rice, cotton, peanuts, and other commodities. There were minimums beyond which we could not go, but we did not set such a minimum for corn.

I ask Senators to be fair. Let us look at the entire problem, and not start pulling it apart in one direction or another, to see whether this commodity or some other commodity is going to get an advantage. I seek only to do the fair thing. Some of these commodities have not been nearly as distressed as corn. That is where most of the protests are coming from.

This is certainly not a political bill. I wish the Senator from Minnesota had not intruded those particular sentiments and continued an attack upon the Secretary of Agriculture. I know of no man in my acquaintance who has greater moral stamina, integrity, and impeccable honor than has the Secretary of Agriculture. He is charged with actions which have a political motif and a sinister political design. I cannot imagine anything that is further from the heart and mind of Ezra Benson than that.

His entire lifetime has been dedicated to agriculture. He started as a youngster. He was a farmer, a farm adviser, and a farm economist at the University of Idaho and in his own State of Utah. He has conferred all over the world with the leading agricultural economists. He

became an expert in agricultural extension work. I have yet to hear a word fall from the lips of the Secretary of Agriculture that would indicate that he was trying to put this great segment of the public upon the political block. I simply do not believe it. Moreover, I think it is entirely unfair to make such charges.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have stated on many occasions, it is not my purpose now, nor was it my purpose when the bill was before the committee for consideration, or during the hearings, to involve this legislation in politics. I want only to do the best thing for our farmers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator says that he is not wedded to the acreage designated, that is, to the 57 million acre base. It is my belief that we might get somewhere if it were possible for us to agree on a reasonable base and, in addition, instead of having the 15 percent to be placed on the soil bank consist of any tilled acreage on the farm, that percentage going into the acreage reserve could be fixed at 8 or 10 percent of that acreage which is planted in corn with any remainder going into the conservation reserve. But I cannot agree to the system of attempting to make it possible for the corn farmers in the commercial corn area to plant the full measure of their historical acreage, and then say to them, "We will support your production at 81 percent of parity, and all you have to do is to put other acreage equal to 15 percent of your base acreage into the conservation reserve." I believe that would discriminate against the producer of other basics. I am hopeful that any corn amendment we may adopt will require that a certain percentage of the base acreage be placed in the acreage reserve, and a certain percentage in the conservation reserve.

Mr. DIRKSEN. On the basis of the overall historic acreage, I presume some figure could be arrived at which would be agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 minutes of my time to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That difference might be adjusted; but so far as the mandatory inclusion of acres is concerned, frankly I think the whole desire has been to get away from the mandate, from compulsion. The soil bank will never be worth a nickel unless it represents acres voluntarily contributed by the farmer. To be sure, there is a fine provision for corn, and for a referendum. That will give the farmer an opportunity to get himself out from under Government control. The farmer wants to stand on his own feet, without feeling the repressive and heavy hand of Government upon him.

So far as the basic figure is concerned, I suppose a figure could be agreed upon. However, I would not wish to be in the position of compelling the farmer to make a deposit in the soil bank, because if we undertake to compel him, perhaps he will forget to do it, on the ground that he does not like compulsion.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Iowa will be adopted, because the acreage level can still be modified in conference if it becomes necessary.

Mr. President, I yield back any unused time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Louisiana wish to yield to any other Senator?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield 3 minutes, or as much time as he may require, to my colleague from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, the amendment now being considered by the Senate is most important to the farmers of my State. Before commenting on the important provisions of this amendment I would like to say a word of praise for the work done by the Senate Committee on Agriculture. Traditionally the farmer is noted for his hard-working and conscientious qualities. He appreciates those same capabilities demonstrated by the Agriculture Committee of the Senate. After conducting extensive hearings in Washington this committee took to the road to obtain the first-hand opinions of the farmers themselves. Conducting hearings in 17 different cities across the length and breadth of our land they heard witnesses from 47 different States. On the 26th of October last year the committee held hearings in Des Moines, the capital city of Iowa. I am certain the farmers of Iowa were deeply appreciative of the opportunity to appear in front of the distinguished members of the Agriculture Committee. Some of us do not agree with all portions of the bill that was recommended by the Senate committee but certainly none of us will dispute the great industry and devotion to duty displayed by the members of the committee.

In this respect, I am sure my colleagues in the Senate will pardon my understandable pride in the work done on the Agriculture Committee by the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. We are extremely proud of him in Iowa. We are fortunate indeed to have a man so dedicated to serving the farmer, represent Iowa on the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

The amendment offered by my distinguished colleague is, in fact, not a complicated one. The result of the amendment is simply this: in 1956 instead of having the so-called acreage allotments in the Corn Belt for corn acres, we substitute for it a farm-base acreage. This farm-base acreage for the Nation will be the average acreage which has been planted in corn in 1953, 1954, 1955. It will be allotted to counties of the commercial Corn Belt. The county allotment will be distributed to the individual farmers of each county by giving consideration to good land-use practices and to the individual farmer's actual record of acres planted to corn over the last 5 years. It means we will base participation in the soil bank on the traditional planting base of something over 56 million acres, instead of the allotment base of approximately 43 million acres.

As I shall indicate, the 43-million-acre allotment base is totally unrealistic as evidenced by the fact that a very small percentage of farmers complied with the allotments last year. With a farm-base acreage of something over 56 million acres as provided in this amendment we will have a plan that can and will be workable and successful. If this amendment is adopted the corn farmer will be required to do two things in order to qualify for price supports in 1956. He must stay within the farm-base acreage and he must put into the soil bank an acreage of tillable cropland equal to 15 percent of his farm-base acreage.

One of the most important provisions of the farm bill now being debated is that portion that deals with the creation of a soil bank. I was particularly happy to see this attack on the farm problem incorporated into the bill. If I may look back for a few moments, I have a vivid recollection of a hasty trip I made from Iowa to Washington on the 7th of May 1954. I was campaigning in Iowa at the time, but I made this special trip to Washington to appear as a witness before the House Committee on Agriculture. I was supporting H. R. 8858, a bill I had introduced in the House providing for the creation of a soil bank. At those hearings I made the following statement:

> I believe that this approach to the problem of adjusting farm production to effective demand holds much promise. Certainly it is far better to store fertility in the soil than to produce crops beyond market needs including necessary carryover and then have such surpluses hang over the market as a price-depressing factor that limits farmers' opportunities to get a better income.

I was in favor of the general principles of a soil bank at that time. I am still in favor of these principles. At that time I felt that a soil bank held much promise for the future welfare of the farmer. I feel the same way today. To borrow a few lines from one of the classics of literature I come to praise the soil bank, not to bury it. But at the same time I sincerely believe that if we pass S. 3183 without the vitally important amendments introduced by my distinguished colleague from Iowa, Senator HICKENLOOPER, we will be preaching the funeral sermon for the soil bank as it applies to the midwestern and corn farmer.

We must be extremely careful in constructing the final pattern of the farm bill. From the support that the general outlines of the soil bank plan has received from both sides of the aisle it is very clear that the support is bipartisan and almost uncontested. I think that is a true reflection of the feeling of the Nation's farmers. The overwhelming majority of farmers with whom I have talked in the last several months are in favor of the general provisions. From the day we adjourned last August until we reconvened in January I spent my time traveling the crossroads and paths of Iowa. I found great support of a soil bank. But I am desperately afraid that the present plan as it was recommended by the Senate committee will not and cannot be effective in the Midwest. In

turn this could reflect on the whole idea of a soil bank and the final result might well be the complete repudiation of an idea that many of us believe holds great promise for the American farmer.

I was particularly glad to hear the statement the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] delivered on the floor of the Senate referring to the special problems of the corn farmer. This is not an instance of a particular industry requesting special consideration because of a difficult situation. Corn is not a marketing crop and it should not be treated in the precise manner that the marketing crops are handled. No feasible, working method for enforcing quotas on corn has been developed because corn is largely consumed on the farm itself. As the senior Senator from Iowa recalled, Congress recognized that quotas would not work on corn when it repealed the authority for corn quotas in the Agriculture Act of 1954, passed 2 years ago.

The corn farmer has been through a trying period during the last several years. From 1953 to 1955 millions of acres—17 million of them—were taken out of wheat and cotton production. A lion's share of these acres went into the production of other crops that compete with corn. The result of this development has had most unfortunate effects on the corn farmer. Less corn was used as a feed and corn supplies reached unprecedented heights. Under the formula in the production-adjustment laws for determining the acreage of corn, allotments were forced down from approximately 57 million acres to approximately 50 million acres in 1955. The outlook for this year is even more foreboding. The allotment for 1956 will be approximately 43 million acres.

For several years the acreage planted to corn in the commercial corn producing area has remained relatively stable. I refer to the following table to show how close the total acreage conforms to the traditional 57 million acre corn planting base:

Acreage planted to corn in the 840 counties in the 1956 commercial corn-producing area

Year:	
1946	57,679,000
1947	55,885,000
1948	56,937,000
1949	58,426,000
1950	53,204,000
1951	55,992,000
1952	56,059,000
1953	57,497,000
1954	57,173,000
1955	57,209,000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield 1 more minute to my colleague.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, these acreage allotments have been in effect in the corn area for the last 2 years. Compliance with the allotments has been very low, however. Approximately 60 percent of the corn produced in the Corn Belt last year was produced without regard to the price-support program. This is not surprising. As I have indicated corn is produced largely for feed so the farmer does not look to market price support when he figures the number of acres he will plant in corn. Also, the farmer realizes that a drastic reduction of corn acreage would mean that corn would surrender its feed market to other crops produced in other areas.

This is a serious problem. The severity of it is increased, however, by the provisions of the soil-bank bill as it was recommended by the Senate committee. Section 215 of S. 3183 provides that no person shall be eligible for payments under the soil-bank program with respect to any farm for any year in which the acreage of any basic agricultural commodity other than wheat on the farm exceeds the farm acreage allotment under title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as amended, or the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat under such title or 15 acres. That means the corn farmer must comply with the 43 million total acreage allotment for 1956 in order to qualify for the soil-bank payments. It also means the soil-bank program is doomed to failure in the commercial corn producing area, just as many of the farmers did not comply with the 50 million acreage allotment in 1955. Many more of them will not comply with the estimated acreage allotment for 1956.

A cut from 57 million acres to 43 million acres in 2 years is bad enough. But it is even more severe than it appears on the surface. Thirty-seven counties have been added to the commercial corn producing area and only 2 counties dropped. This means the 43 million acres is not only 13 million less than 2 years ago but it also has to cover an additional 35 counties. The Department of Agriculture tells me that 21,600 acres were dropped but 1,236,750 were added.

I believe the soil bank program will work in Iowa. I believe it will go a long way toward stabilizing farm economy. But it must be given the chance to work. It must be given the opportunity to function. Hinging participation on the compliance to the severely reduced corn acreage allotments in the commercial Corn Belt imposes such a burden on the corn farmer that he will not comply. I sincerely hope the Senate adopts the amendments introduced by my senior colleague, and that the corn farmer of the commercial corn producing area is given the chance he so richly deserves—the chance to be a part of the soil bank program.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the junior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, it seems to me that what has been said indicates that the bill is inadequate so far as the corn situation is concerned. The chairman of the committee has said that he agrees that the base of 43 million acres is unrealistic. Therefore, the responsibility rests upon the Senate, and possibly upon the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to propose something which will meet the situation.

So far as my own State is concerned, I have the figures for 1951 through 1955. During that period of time there have been planted, almost uniformly, 3 million acres of corn each year, regardless of what the allotment has been. Last year the allotment for South Dakota was 2,726,000 acres. Nevertheless, there were planted 3,069,000 acres. That 3-million-acre figure runs right through the years. The corngrowers have planted that number of acres each year. They have an investment in the machinery, such as corn pickers, and they must try to meet expenses. If they get a reduction to 2,319,000, as they would under the 43 million total for the country, it would mean that there would be less compliance than there has been.

Last year the compliance was about 44 percent. The point the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] has just made is one that is worth keeping in mind. If these farmers are forced out of compliance by being unable to live with their corn allotments, they will be denied the benefits of the soil bank program, and the soil bank will be denied the benefit of their compliance. It will mean that at least 70 percent of the corn farmers, and perhaps 80 percent of them, in South Dakota, will not be in compliance and will be subject to whatever additional penalties may be imposed upon them because of that.

I have a host of letters on this subject. The one thought which runs through all of them is that they must have an income of at least $5,000 a year in order to meet fixed costs and living expenses. They cannot do it if they have a corn acreage reduction such as the 43 million acre allotment which has been indicated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The facts are simple. The only constructive proposal we have before the Senate to meet the situation is the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

If the committee has something else to suggest, such as a 56-million or 50-million-acre base for the entire country, let them bring it forward. However, in the absence of anything else, the Senate has the responsibility of providing a corn picture with which the farmers can live. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be adopted since nothing else is before us to meet what is admitted to be a real problem by the chairman of the committee. For the solution of the problem we have before us only the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to concur in the statement made by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] regarding the corn situation. Kansas State is not a great corn-growing State. Its corn acreage is only 2 or 2½ million.

In the situation which confronts us we need to work out a program that will be fair and just. I was very much pleased to hear the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] make the statement that he felt 43 million acres do not constitute a proper base, and that we should get together on a figure which will be fair

and which will be beneficial not only to the soil bank but also to the agricultural program as a whole. I hope something will be worked out, if not on the floor of the Senate, then in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT.]

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as I stated to the senior Senator from Iowa when he was presenting his amendment in his initial speech, this is an amendment which has been evolved through the thinking of the Corn Belt and through the deliberations of our committee for well over a month.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] presented it in various forms and at different times on the occasion of the committee's consideration of the farm bill. At one time it was defeated by a tie vote in committee. At other times it was defeated by bigger margins. I voted against the alternative corn proposal, and in favor of the 90 percent price supports for corn, although I did it with some reservations, and with the statement that if, on final analysis, and after exploring the situation as it related to the farming of carn in the corn area, it could be shown that the corn farmer would get a bigger net income from the Hickenlooper approach than from the language of the bill as we had it incorporated in section 101, before it was eliminated by the recent yea and nay vote, I reserved my right to change my mind.

I went out to South Dakota and consulted with a great many farmers on what was then the issue, which was largely the question of whether they would prefer to have corn supported as we had it in section 101, at 90 percent, with the necessary acreage reductions, or whether, as an alternative, they would prefer to have the 81 percent price support, with the right to farm their full historic corn acreage, which, as I understand, would be about 56 million acres, divided upon the usual basis among the various counties in the various States in the commercial corn area.

I found at that time that there was considerable indecision on the part of the farmers back home on this particular point. We are now, however, confronted with quite a different decision. We are confronted with the fact that by a rollcall vote, which I strenuously opposed and which I continue to think was unwise, section 101 has been deleted from the bill. We no longer have as an alternative to a price-support program at 81 percent on a restricted number of acres the other proposal of 90 percent on a far smaller number of acres than that. We are now confronted with the fact that the restrictions on acres in the proposed legislation would hold with 81 percent price supports unless we adopt the Hickenlooper amendment, which would expand the corn acreage available to this country to an average of the average of normal corn farming before we began a process of reduction of corn acres.

On that basis it seems to me that every Senator coming from an area which raises corn at all should be interested in supporting the amendment now before us. I certainly expect to support it.

It appears that we are approaching the whole farm program with the elimination of section 101 on a sort of guerrila warfare basis. It was on that basis, I suppose, that some of our cotton friends left us on the recent vote. At least, we are talking about corn now, and this is a guerrilla warfare approach to the problem of corn. It figures out a method by which I believe corn farmers throughout the commercial area will be assured of at least as much cash income their crop this year as they would have received even though we had been able to keep in the bill the overall 90 percent program.

Perhaps it will be more in the current crop year.

I am still disturbed about where we will be after the current crop year is over. I would much prefer a referendum if it would provide that the farmer would be given a choice at the end of 1956 between the Hickenlooper 81 percent unlimited production program and the 90 percent price supports with some kind of acreage control. But since that is not incorporated in the bill, I cannot contrive any very good method by which we could give the farmer that particular choice by referendum. However, at the worst, the corn farmer would be no worse off if we give him the benefit of the Hickenlooper amendment during 1956 than he would be if we compel him to accept both a reduction in acres and a reduction of price support below 90-percent levels.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the Hickenlooper amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has 13 minutes and the Senator from Louisiana has 9 minutes.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I will relinquish my time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I will yield back my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I sent to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 35, between lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

MINIMUM NATIONAL ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR 1956 AND 1957 CORN CROPS

SEC. 405. Section 328 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The acreage allotment of corn for the 1956 and 1957 crops shall not be less than 49 million acres in the commercial corn-producing area."

On page 35, line 16, strike out "405" and insert "406."

Mr. HUMPRHEY. Mr. President, I wish to modify my amendment by striking out on line 8 "and 1957", changing "crops" to "crop", and then adding the referendum provision which was provided for in the Hickenlooper amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is offered as a substitute for the Hickenlooper amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am modifying my amendment in the nature of a substitute by adding a section providing for a referendum at the end of the crop year of 1956.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Has all time expired on the Hickenlooper amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remaining time has been relinquished by both sides.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is this a new substitute with an hour to each side allowed for debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There seems to be some confusion as to whether the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is pertinent to the language of the Hickenlooper amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is this an amendment in the nature of a substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands it has been modified.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not being changed, Mr. President. The truth is the other part of the amendment did not get to the desk, so I sent up the remainder of it and merely added an amendment which is in the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is now being offered as a substitute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what it is, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 35, between lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

MINIMUM NATIONAL ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR 1956 CORN CROP

SEC. 405. (a) Section 328 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence as follow: "The acreage allotment of corn for the 1956 crop shall not be less than 50 million acres in the commercial corn-producing area."

(b) Not later than December 15, 1956, the Secretary shall conduct a referendum of producers of corn in 1956 in the commercial corn-producing area to determine whether such producers favor a price-support program as provided in subsection (c) of this section for the 1957 and subsequent crops in lieu of acreage allotments as provided in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and price support as provided in section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if two-thirds or more of the producers voting in the referendum conducted pursuant to subsection (b) hereof favor a price-support program as provided in this subsection (c), no acreage allotment of corn shall be established for the commercial corn-producing area, for any county, or for any farm,

with respect to the 1957 and subsequent crops, and price support made available for such crops by Commodity Credit Corporation shall be at such level as the Secretary determines will assist producers in marketing corn in the normal channels of trade but not encourage the uneconomic production of corn.

On page 35, line 16, strike out "405" and insert "406."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to considering the substitute amendments en bloc?

The Chair hears none, and the substitute amendments will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I raise a point of order as to the applicability of this amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that a point of order will not be in order until the expiration of the time on the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in order to simplify the matter, so that we will not waste our time, I ask unanimous consent for a ruling by the Chair on the question which was raised as a point of order, as to whether the amendment is in order. It is not an amendment as such; it is an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will submit the proposed amendment of the Senator from Minnesota to the Senate, and will let the Senate determine whether it is germane.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the amendment relates to the very subject matter under discussion. I speak to the issue. It relates to corn. The amendment does two simple things. First, it provides for this year an allotment of 50 million acres for corn; second, it provides for the crop year 1957 merely referendum proceedings, which were included in the Hickenlooper amendment. I have taken a section from the Hickenlooper amendment and attached it to the allotment, so as to make one amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho will state it.

Mr. WELKER. Did I understand correctly that a unanimous-consent request had been proposed by the Senator from Minnesota?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He had done so at one point. The Chair thinks he has progressed further than that position at this time.

Mr. WELKER. I wish to object to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest that we have already gone beyond that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WELKER. No Senator had a chance to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the amendments are germane, and that the Senate should vote en bloc since the amendments are both offered as separate parts of one amendment. The first vote would be on the amendments offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I now understand correctly that the Chair has withdrawn his recommendation that the question be decided by the Senate, and has ruled on the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So the question now comes on whether the amendments offered by the Senator from Minnesota shall be substituted for the Hickenlooper amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is corect, after whatever time may be taken for debate by the Senator from Minnesota, who now has the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does each side now have 1 hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. Is there objection to considering the amendments en bloc? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

How much time does the Senator from Minnesota yield to himself?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The issue posed by the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is whether to continue with the allotment system on the basic crops when there are mandatory price supports, or whether to retreat to the so-called historical base of the fixed parity of 81 percent, with the production of corn on the basis of the acreage which has historically been used on each farm.

To put the matter in another way, the question is whether we want to take control over production under allotments when there are mandatory price supports, or whether we do not want to have control over production when there are mandatory price supports.

I said earlier today that the amendment of the Senator from Iowa is very tempting to the junior Senator from Minnesota, because, frankly, I say to my colleagues, it means that for 1 year, at least, in the State of Minnesota, in the commercial grain-producing area we could take advantage of the maximum amount of acreage, at least under the historical base which our State has always had for corn production. At approximately $1.40 a bushel, this means that all corn would be eligible for sealing and crop loans.

The Humphrey amendment, which is not new—it has been discussed in the committee—merely provides that instead of 43 million allotted acres this year, a limit of 50 million acres will be established. Last year's allotment was 49 million acres. I have taken the figure of 50 million acres because it is a plausible figure, in the light of the debate as to the quantities of corn available.

The Senator from Iowa said that no surplus was indicated; that 56 million acres provided a normally usable amount of corn. So my amendment places the corn commodity in the traditional pattern of price support legislation. It keeps it with the allotments for cotton, tobacco, wheat, rice, and other commodities. The amendment does not treat corn as a special-privilege commodity; it treats it equally, under the same principles of price support legislation applicable to other commodities.

Frankly, I feel that my colleagues can vote for the amendment, because, first, it provides for a reasonable allotment. Forty-three million acres was an unreasonable allotment. Second, with 50 million allotted acres, the acreage reserve section of the soil bank becomes available to any and all parts of the 50 million acres. If a farmer has, let us say, 100 allotted acres of corn, and he wishes to take out 15 acres, he will be required to reduce his acreage of allotted acres under the acreage reserve section of the bill. This will be for the first year. For the second year there will be a referendum to determine whether he wishes to continue under the allotment system with the acreage reserve benefits, or whether he wishes to go into what are called discretionary levels.

There is no need for debating over the amendment any longer, except to point out that the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa, I believe, opens up a great deal of trouble, as I indicated before, with respect to many other commodities. I have felt that as we deal with the program, we should try to deal with it as equitably as possible, commodity by commodity; otherwise, we will not be able to have a price-support program which will be workable anywhere.

I think it is fair to say that unless we have production controls or mandatory supports, production will get out of hand. That will affect the price level of other crops. Corn is a basic food commodity. If corn is produced greatly in excess of the actual needs, the tendency will be to weaken the cash-grain market. When corn weakens the cash-grain market, it weakens also the markets for grain, sorghum, and all other feed grains.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are we to understand that the amendment suggested by the Senator from Minnesota is somewhat along the line of the one he submitted in the committee?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is, except for the referendum provision.

Mr. ELLENDER. And also for the amount of the acreage allotment which is raised from 49 million acres to 50 million acres?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I hope Senators who believe in a farm program based upon mandatory price-supports, even though the schedule now is flexible, will accept for corn what they have accepted for other commodities, namely, the acreage allotment principle.

In good conscience, I simply cannot see how we can treat one commodity so differently from another, particularly when we consider the principle of production control and allotments.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Has the total acreage to be allotted for corn this year now been fixed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was announced as 43 million acres.

Mr. HOLLAND. Was 43 million acres the figure last year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; it was 49 million acres last year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that even with the 49-million-acre allotment, the number of corn producers in the commercial area who accepted their allotments and operated under them was only about half the total number of corn producers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is about right. I believe the percentage, according to the information I have just received, is 54.2 percent.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator know on what theory the controlled acreage was diminished from the 49 million acres last year to 43 million acres this year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I really do not know. I do not recall any explanation of it. There seems to be a general consensus that the allotted number of acres at 43 million was below what the allotment should be.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator recall, and can he state for the RECORD, substantially the amount of corn now held by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I can. There is held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, under ownership as well as under crop loans, which means farmer holding, a supply of corn for approximately 3¼ months. I think it is approximately 1,020,000,000 bushels.

Mr. HOLLAND. What is the Senator's understanding of the amount of acreage which would be allowed as the base plantings under the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HUMPHREY. From 56 million to 57 million acres.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does that represent the amount of acreage which has been planted by those who heretofore have accepted acreage allotments and have operated under it, plus the acreage of those who have declined to accept their acreage allotments and have largely exceeded them?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from Minnesota understand that the purpose of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, now being offered, is to recognize the fact that the allotment for this year is unreasonable, and that nevertheless it would be even more unreasonable to allow full 100-percent participation to those who have declined in every way to accept their allotment and to cooperate, with those who have accepted and have cooperated with the price support program conducted under law?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely right. In other words, what the Hickenlooper amendment would do is say to those who have not cooperated at all under the acreage-allotment programs, "Now you are going to get all the benefits of the price-support program without any necessity to cooperate at all, except, for sending and putting your corn under loan, you get 21 percent of the historical base of the corn-producing area."

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator feel that a sufficient number of corn producers would accept allotments under the 50 million acre base to the point where the possibilities of voluntary compliance by the particular producers accepting participation in the acreage reserve portion of the soil-bank program would be sizable and substantial, and would constitute a real contribution to the decrease of production, such as is contemplated by the soil-bank program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do, and I want to say to the Senator I think one of the reasons we did not have too much compliance was that there was no real incentive for compliance with the conservation reserve, on the one hand, and the acreage reserve, on the other hand. With a 50-million-acre allotment, there would be a program much more conducive to compliance than there was last year or the year before.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not entirely sure that the figure of 50 million acres the Senator has advanced, which is more or less a generous figure, as I understand, should be held to be the proper figure; but I want to say I approve of the approach made by the Senator in his amendment, and I disapprove of the approach made in the amendment which has recognized with equal validity the acreage of those who have accepted their allotments heretofore, and have played ball with the Government and each other, and those who have declined to accept their allotments and have overplanted greatly and have contributed to the completely unsatisfactory situation which we have had in the corn program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Florida. I want to say now that if we, in preparing farm legislation, are unwilling to establish, within the legislation, controls which are necessary or desirable to make it work, we are going to have such public reaction to farm legislation that that will be the end of it.

I remind my colleagues of the old potato program. When that program got out of hand it almost wrecked all farm programs. When we ask the farmer to play a role in the farm price situation, we also ask him to be willing, if the supply seems to exceed the demand, to accept production controls.

While the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Minnesota have disagreed very heatedly on price supports, the Senator from Minnesota has not disagreed with the Senator from Florida, or vice versa, as to the matter of controls.

The Senator may recall that I offered a feed-grain amendment in the committee, and when the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Florida pointed out that my feed-grain amendment had, for all practical purposes, a mandatory provision, even though the word "mandatory" was not spelled out as such, and there were no production controls involved in it, I withdrew the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the comment of the distinguished Senator. I should like to ask him one additional question. Is it the understanding of the distinguished Senator that if his amendment as submitted is adopted, the rest of the acreage—that is, the difference between the 50 million acres and the 56 to 57 million acres—will be available for the conservation-reserve program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, it will be.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is an excellent program, though somewhat less generous than the acreage reserve.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, it would be available for the conservation reserve.

I want to say again to those who have been deeply concerned about the effect of surpluses on cash market prices, I think we in the Senate have a moral obligation, in light of the problems that face the Government and the farmers, to try to write a farm program which will not open up a Pandora's box of excess production.

Regardless of our differences over 90 percent of parity and 75 to 90 percent of parity price supports—and I say those differences have been overplayed somewhat in terms of their inducements—all of us accept responsibility for acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and controls, depending on which one would be used on the crop.

I do not think we can write farm legislation along this line unless we are willing to accept some of that responsibility.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have been trying to analyze in my own mind the result of the Senator's amendment, which, if I interpret it correctly—and it is not in print, so I do not have it before me—would pretty much perpetuate for this year approximately the same acreage controls we had in the year 1955, which was 49 million. The Senator proposes to make it only 50 million for 1956.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me, from the standpoint of the best interests of the farmers of North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, and other typical States, 50 million is too tight an acreage to impose, because the experience in South Dakota was, even with the provision of 87 percent of parity, on approximately the same acreage allotment, 50 million acres, only 30 percent took the allotment, because they said it was too severe an acreage cut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes, so that the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MUNDT. Consequently, does the Senator not feel that if we cut it down to 50 million instead of 56 million acres, we will be doing an injustice to the farmers of the Senator's State and mine?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. I think we would be doing an injustice, if not in 1956, then in 1957, if we permitted un-

limited production under a fixed price-support program. I thought we had argued that point and that that was the view of those who were for flexible supports and those who were for fixed supports. What I say must be apparent to the Senator from South Dakota, who has done a tremendous job, and has worked diligently and ably in the committee. This proposal also includes the conservation reserve features of the bill and its acreage reserve features, both of which will provide additional incentives and inducements for cooperation.

I am convinced that with those inducements—with acreage reserves and conservation reserves—plus some cutback, the market price will rise considerably and also will constitute an inducement for compliance.

Mr. MUNDT. The difficulty is that the 50-million-acre lid the Senator proposes—and I grant that there cannot be unlimited production—is just about what we had in 1955 when acreage allotments were just short of 50 million acres. I know that in South Dakota there was considerable complaint about the fact that that 1955 allotment was too tight. As a consequence, although the corn farmers would have received price supports at 87 percent of parity by accepting the allotments, only a small percentage of them accepted the allotments.

The Hickenlooper amendment has a ceiling, but it is a ceiling based on the historic base of the 3-year average of corn production acreages.

If the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota would call for 55 million acres, instead of 50 million acres, I think he would achieve what he has in mind; at least he would be realistic without hurting the farmers of the commercial corn area. I understand his objective—namely, to keep from having corn simply run out of our ears, and to avoid that without doing injury to the small farmer. In Minnesota and South Dakota the farmer found that if he did not have a larger corn base he could not operate effectively in 1955.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say that I think the matter of participation in the farm program involves more than just the level of allotments and even the level of price supports. In Minnesota, the lack of participation in farm programs is considerable; the amount of participation has decreased approximately 35 percent from what it was in 1950, 1951, and 1952. I can state why that is so. When I was in Minnesota recently, many persons told me voluntarily that no one tries to work with them or to educate them, to get them to participate. The Senator from South Dakota knows very well practically every farm family in his State, I am sure; and I am sure that from talking with those farm families he finds that whenever there has been an allotment program or a support program, generally the county committeemen and the community committeemen have gone from farm to farm to obtain participation.

In the case of almost every such program, I say there has been a drop in participation. The reason for that is, first of all, the farmers lost faith, in many instances, with the county committees, because of the tampering with those committeemen; second, because many of the fine committeemen have been relegated to advisory capacities; third, the committeemen have not had sufficient time even to sell the program.

Recently, I attended a meeting in western Minnesota; and after the meeting I spoke to the county committeemen from 12 counties, who had come there to see me. I do not know all those men by name; most of them are new, because all of those with 3 years or more service have had to retire from the program. They said to me, "Senator, how can we do a good job for the program when we are limited to so few hours per week or per month?"

So we have cut down the activities of the farm committee system to a point where the committeemen no longer have an opportunity to sign up the farmers. It is necessary for the committeemen to talk to the farmers. When the program is handled in that way, it works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself additional time.

Mr. President, I think the record of 54.2 percent participation, on a national average, is not bad, in the case of the corn program.

I should like to add that as a result of the acreage reserve benefits and the conservation reserve benefits, and as we dispose of the surplus and bolster the normal market, it seems to me we shall have a better compliance record.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. In the substitute amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, does he include the portion of the Hickenlooper amendment that requires compulsory participation in the acreage reserves, insofar as some phases of the farming operations are concerned?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not, because that was part of the cutback which was provided in the Hickenlooper amendment. The cutback provided in my amendment is from the historic basis, as well as we know it—in other words, from around 56 million or 57 million acres to 50 million acres.

This amendment recognizes the principle of production control through acreage allotments. Then, the next year, we give the farmers an opportunity to vote as to whether they wish to continue under allotments and a mandatory support schedule, or under a discretionary schedule.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish the Senator from Minnesota would, in his amendment, increase the figure "50 million" to "55 million," because it may be there is a difference between Minnesota and South Dakota as to the major reason why there has not been more widespread participation in the program. But on my desk there are stacked high the letters from farmers who complain about the program in connection with corn, under the allotments. They could not carry on their operations in 1955 on the allowed level; and they were aghast at the allotments for 1956. The Humphrey amendment would again deprive our corn farmers of justice.

I think an allotment of 50 million acres would be just about what they had in 1955. It may be that in Minnesota there is a different reaction to this proposal. But the experience I had on the Lincoln Day weekend, in talking to farmers in South Dakota, convinced me that the weak point was that the farmers have found that a reduction to 43 million acres is too drastic. They said, "Last year we could not get by with 49 million acres."

So 55 million acres would give them a little breathing space, but 50 million acres would cripple their farm operations and reduce their income.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But this amendment will give them 7 million acres more than the allotment for this year.

Mr. MUNDT. But it will be less than a million acres more than what they had in 1955.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The allotment this year threw a cold chill into every farmer; there is no doubt of that. I say it was an unrealistic figure, and was not related to the available supply, because the so-called corn surplus is not as large as some persons think it is.

Furthermore, if we set the figure at 55 million acres this year—which, from a very selfish point of view, for 1 year would be very desirable, I am sure, to many of the farmers in my State—I am afraid that if the figure is put at 55 million acres for this year, we are apt to open up the possibility of further accumulation of supply and further weakening of price.

Mr. MUNDT. That would depend on how well the basic theory of the Hickenlooper amendment works. No one will know until we try it. Until it is tried, no one will know whether the farmers will use the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve, and thus will raise less corn than they otherwise would.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My feeling is that if we have an allotment program as a part of the price support mechanism for production control, we should continue the allotment program. I feel that unrealistic allotment cuts will destroy any program. I also feel that unrealistic production expansion will destroy any program. I am trying to get a balance between the two.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I fully realize what the able Senator from Minnesota is attempting to do; but I honestly believe that the 56 million acres, with an automatic 15-percent cutback for soil conservation and acreage control, which almost automatically will cut back the acreage to 50 million——

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not automatic in the case of corn. It is automatic in the case of cultivated acres. Under the Hickenlooper amendment, it is automatic in the case of all cultivated acres.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; for corn and for other things.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; for all cultivated acres.

Mr. CAPEHART. But then this year they will get only 81 percent, as compared to the 90 percent the Senator from Minnesota was talking about.

What I am interested in, and what I am certain the able Senator from Minnesota is interested in, is the number of dollars to be put in the pockets of the farmers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. I know the Senator does not want to take any dollars away from the farmer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. In my opinion, the Hickenlooper amendment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield additional time.

Mr. CAPEHART. In my opinion, the Hickenlooper amendment would put more dollars in the pocket of the corn farmer. He and the hog producer are the ones who are suffering most under low prices. There is a great deal of corn in Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. We also have a great deal of oats, barley, grain sorghums, rye, and soybeans.

Mr. CAPEHART. Minnesota is a great corn State.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not worried about whether we are a great corn State or a small one. I think this is a matter of equity and justice. My feeling is that if we let the corn program go to the point where, in order to participate, a farmer must reduce his cultivated acreage by 15 percent, and we give the corn grower 81 percent price support on his base acres, we shall actually be playing off one producer against another. What will happen to the sorghum grain producer who must be cut out?

Mr. CAPEHART. In 1955, only 46.4 percent of the farmers in Minnesota cut back their acreage of corn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not have the figures with respect to those who, even after they cut their acreage, borrowed money at the parity price. In Indiana, 46 percent of them cut their acreage back, but only about half of those who cut their acreage back borrowed at the support price. So we ended up in Indiana with only 27 percent of our farmers receiving any benefit whatsoever from the so-called parity price. They fed their corn, or they had no place to store it, or they did not feel that they wanted to participate, even after they had cut back their acreage. I notice that Indiana and Minnesota are in just about the same situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator like to have me explain the situation?

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator mean to explain why they are in the same situation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to explain why more farmers did not participate under the allotment program. A large number of our corn farmers fed their corn. They did not sell it. Two-thirds of the corn is fed. Less than a third is sold.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The reason we do not have active participation under an allotment program is that the corn is fed. The man who wants to conduct a cash operation, the man who is not feeding his corn to hogs, livestock, or poultry, will come under the program. That is why the figures we use for compliance or participation are often misleading. It is because the corn producer, as such, is essentially producing for himself. He is a feeder.

I repeat that under the proposal of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], considered in terms of an acreage of 56 million acres and 81 percent of parity, or about $1.40 a bushel, in order to come under such a program the farmer must cut about 15 percent from his cultivated acres. That means cutting out some other kind of crop.

Mr. CAPEHART. Not necessarily. He could cut it all from corn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He could.

Mr. CAPEHART. Or soybeans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator think a farmer is going to cut corn at 81 percent of parity, when soybeans are at 70 or 75 percent, and oats are at 65 percent? Of course not.

Mr. CAPEHART. I can see now that the Senator is not a farmer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Corn is the most profitable of all the crops.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course. That is exactly what I am saying. The corn producer is going to produce corn, which will compete with grain sorghums, rye, barley, and other feed grains. He is going to produce corn because, with 56 million acres, and with 81 percent price supports under crop loans, the other feed grains will be placed in a disadvantageous position.

If the Senator would be willing to include in this amendment a provision that all feed grains shall be treated the same as corn——

Mr. DANIEL. Or comparably.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Or comparably—then we would have a fair program.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. A couple of hours ago the Senator told us that there was only about a 3-month supply of corn on hand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I heard the Senator say that he wanted the farmer to get more money.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Exactly.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why is the Senator singling out the corn farmers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Since this is on my time, I shall reply, and then allow the time to be charged to the other side. I am not singling out the corn farmers. I am their friend. I am not their Saturday night friend. I like to go to church with them, and to live with them all week. I do not believe in an economic binge over the weekend. I believe in living the whole week with them, and leading the good life.

The proposal offered was a 1-year shot, which I think would aggravate the production problem, the supply problem. At a later date, it would compel the Secretary to cut the acreage, to the detriment of the corn farmer. Furthermore, it might be all right in a State which is primarily a 1-crop State or a 2-crop State—strictly a corn-hog State—to have the Hickenlooper proposal. But where other feed grains, such as wheat, oats, barley, grain sorghums, rye, flaxseed, soybeans, and other similar crops are involved, I suggest that we have an allotment program, so as to keep the feed supply in balance. Otherwise, we shall find the situation almost out of hand.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have listened to the Senator's statements with respect to what the corn situation would be under this amendment in relationship to the other feed grains. I say to the Senator most earnestly that in my area, in the western third of my State—perhaps a little more, but certainly the western third of my State, which is practically the upland area—the principal crops are wheat and sorghum grains.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. My people are disturbed. I recognize that the corn producers are up against a problem, because they feed a great deal of that corn. But what is going to happen to areas in which the principal crops are wheat and grain sorghums? What is this proposal likely to do to the grain sorghum producers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is likely to drive them out of business.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. That is what I am fearful about. I am disturbed about the situation from that angle. I think, in all fairness, those of us in those areas must take that situation into consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. While my amendment, with the acreage allotments, plus the benefits of acreage reserve and conservation reserve, would do a great deal less to aggravate the problem of the feed grain producers, I am afraid that the Hickenlooper amendment, with the possibility of 56 million acres, would do a great deal more to aggravate the feed grain dilemma, the feed grain situation.

The Senator from Kansas is correct. In his State and in other States there are two basic crops, such as wheat and grain sorghums. Grain sorghums are used as feed. In relation to corn, they have an equivalent feed value ratio of 99.58 percent.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Grain sorghums are as good as corn for feed. Sorghums are not supported at the same level as is corn. Sorghums are going to be placed in a disadvantageous position; and with the bulk of corn on the market the farmer will feed the corn. If it is put into the market, we shall be in trouble.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Minnesota pointed out that we should try to take care of the feed-grain problem, along with anything that is done with

reference to grains in the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope my amendment will be agreed to. I have discussed briefly with the Senator from Texas a proposal which I hope he will offer, relating to corn and wheat in the event my amendment is not agreed to. I should be delighted to support his proposal in that event.

I have but one purpose. I am trying to preserve the farm program. If we start treating each commodity separately, with special deals, there is no limit to what may happen. If we are going to jump on the gravy train as it goes by we shall never arrive at a satisfactory solution.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thought the Senator was making a great argument about putting money in the pockets of the farmer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senate had that opportunity when it voted on the 90-percent-of-parity feature.

Mr. CAPEHART. We have the opportunity now to help the farmer. I am an experienced farmer. We ought to handle each of the individual items, such as wheat, corn, and so forth, on its own merits, and not try to place them all together and handle them in one package, as the Senator is trying to do.

Let us be consistent about this matter. We are either for the farmers or against them. Let us not be for 1 group 1 minute and against another group the next minute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am rather intrigued by the Senator from Indiana——

Mr. CAPEHART. And I am intrigued by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

I am rather intrigued by the Senator from Indiana saying that we should be consistent. He now wants to put some money into the pockets of the farmers, but an hour and a half ago he voted to take money out of the farmers' pockets. He voted for an amendment which reduced the farm income by about $850 million. He can argue why he voted as he did. For instance, he can say that in the long run perhaps it will do so. However, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry pointed out what title I meant. Title I went down the drain. Title I was Bensonized. It went down the chute.

Now we are at another point. We are discussing one commodity. The reason title I was defeated was that we have been having a nice time playing around with one commodity at a time.

The proposal of the Senator from Minnesota offers the same price-support level as does the proposal of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. The only difference is that my proposal offers the price support on 50 million allotted acres. As I said earlier, generally the farmer who participates under the allotted-acre program is the farmer who wants to sell some of his corn. He is generally the one who participates.

We are hopeful we can get more farmers to participate. I believe if we were to assure them that we were working toward their long-term good, instead of dealing with the subject on the basis of politics, we could convince the farmers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at this time. Corn farmers are very intelligent. They are able and frugal and fine people. I do not think they will be fooled. I have talked to farmers in Minnesota. If there is one thing I can do, it is count. I believe I know what their political and economic attitudes are. I have done pretty well along that line. I have been home in Minnesota talking to the farmers of of my State. They are not being fooled. I have talked to some of the largest corn growers in our State. I have talked to some hog raisers, and I have talked to some feed producers. Do Senators know what they told me about the amendment before us? They said, "Senator, if you vote for that amendment, you are voting for a weekend binge and a long hangover." I do not intend to vote for a weekend binge.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I cannot think of any subject that has more relevance to a binge than the subject of corn. [Laughter.] I do not intend to go off on a political lark and then find out on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of the coming week that we have been opening a Pandora's box of trouble.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Three or four hours ago the Senator said we had only a 3-months' supply of corn on hand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Indiana did not believe me.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator not fearful that we may have a drought and, as a consequence, a real shortage of corn, and in that way run out of corn? Under the Senator's amendment, providing for 50 million acres, is there not the danger that that might happen? Two or three hours ago, he was making the argument that there was a surplus of only 2 or 3 months' supply of corn on hand. Under those circumstances would he not think that we ought to make certain that we have a sufficient amount of corn on hand?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Indiana indicate that he would like to change his vote on title I?

Mr. CAPEHART. No; I am asking the Senator a direct question, because he is the one who has raised the point that we have on hand only about a 3 months' supply of corn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am so very much pleased that the Senator has been persuaded. The Senator's reactions, apparently, are a little slow, but he has finally arrived. Apparently he is convinced that the Senator from Minnesota was right in what he said a few minutes ago. If there were any way of moving for a reconsideration of the vote on title I, I should like to so move. However, I understand that the rules of the Senate prevent our doing so, because the motion to reconsider was tabled.

However, I wish the record to be perfectly clear that at long last the argument of the Senator from Minnesota has penetrated and moved in on and encircled and encompassed and saturated the Senator from Indiana, and that the Senator from Indiana now believes that my argument about the surplus of corn was right.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The record should show that the Senator from Indiana now believes it would have been well indeed if we had a much better support program.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the Senator from Indiana. I should like to remind him that there is great rejoicing in heaven on the repentance of any one who finally comes back to the fold.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. My warm heart goes out to him. Of course, I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I merely wanted to see how consistent the Senator is willing to be.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator——

Mr. CAPEHART. I say that because 2 hours ago he said we had only about a 3 months' supply of corn on hand. Yet now, 3 hours later, he wishes to reduce the acreage of corn.

I want the RECORD to show how 100-percent consistent the Senator is. He is about the most consistent man I have ever listened to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Indiana that if I am to take instructions in consistency, I should have the privilege of selecting my own professor. [Laughter.]

Furthermore, I may say to the good Senator from Indiana that all I am trying to do is to take the Secretary's figure of 43 million acres, which he said is what we need for the 1956 crop year, and make that a realistic figure by making it 50 million acres. The Secretary is supposed to know what he is doing. The Senator from Indiana now says the Secretary does not know what he is doing. On that point we agree. It is very delightful indeed that we can get together on one more point.

The Senator from Minnesota has tried to help out in the situation. He does not feel, however, that because a thirsty man wants a glass of water, we should drown him in a bathtub. What the Senator from Indiana is saying to the corn farmer is that the way to get him out of his trouble is to inundate him. I say the way to get him out of his trouble is to give him an opportunity to produce at a fair price.

I regret that the Senator from Indiana voted against 90 percent of parity. He could have helped the corn farmers of his State. I am sure they will remind him of his vote when he goes home, as all other Senators will be reminded. Now he has an opportunity to stand by the principle which has been discussed for years; namely, that in a fixed parity

there are always included production controls.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a principle which has been in the law since 1933. I am shocked to hear supporters of the administration stand on the floor of the Senate and literally throw away that principle of regulated production under fixed schedules.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I would much rather have 80 percent of 56 million than 90 percent of 43 million. The 43 million formula is a formula set up under the law, and the Secretary must follow it. That is not his own idea at all. It is a formula set up under the law.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I rather felt that if I kept after this point long enough I would bait someone into this argument. I am delighted. This is a subject I have been working on for a few months. I have read a few books on it too. I do know something about the subject of agriculture.

I should like to read from the Compilation of Statutes Relating to Soil Conservation, Marketing Quotas and Allotments, Crop Insurance, Sugar Payments and Quotas, and so forth, issued as of January 1, 1955, by the Department of Agriculture as Agriculture Handbook No. 79. I read from the middle of page 25, as follows:

(10) (A) "Normal supply" in the case of corn, rice, wheat, and peanuts for any marketing year shall be (i) the estimated domestic consumption of the commodity for the marketing year ending immediately prior to the marketing year for which normal supply is being determined, plus (ii) the estimated exports of the commodity for the marketing year for which normal supply is being determined, plus (iii) an allowance for carryover. The allowance for carryover shall be the following percentage of the sum of the consumption and exports used in computing normal supply: 15 percent in the case of corn; 10 percent in the case of rice; 20 percent in the case of wheat; and 15 percent in the case of peanuts. In determining normal supply the Secretary shall make such adjustments for current trends in consumption and for unusual conditions as he may deem necessary.

That law states that the Secretary may make an adjustment if he finds unusual conditions to prevail. He can decrease or increase the allotment. Therefore the 43 million acres have no relevancy whatever to the 3 factors I have listed.

In conclusion, I merely point out that the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority under the regulations and under this statute to establish a much higher allotment than was established, and he is not compelled at all to establish the base of 43 million acres; not at all.

At this late hour, Mr. President, it is always pleasant to see our colleagues ask for forgiveness, so to speak, for their earlier transgressions. I wish to be charitable about it. I wish we could change the vote on title I, because apparently at long last there is a deep concern in the hearts and minds and breasts of some of our colleagues about the cash income of the farmers. One certain way to have given the farmers a cash income in 1956 would have been by title I.

Mr. President, my amendment will provide cash income for corn farmers just as will the Hickenlooper amendment. What is more, Mr. President, my amendment will provide a better cash income in the years to come than will the Hickenlooper amendment.

I think, on that basis, Senators should vote for it, and I am hoping it will receive a majority vote.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendmment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANGER in the chair). Is there a second?

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have been listening to the discussion, and I gather the idea that some people feel that corn is somewhat discriminated against in the matter of price supports. I wish to point out that grain sorghum, which is practically all grown outside the commercial corn area, has a support price of $1 a bushel as compared with the support price of $1.05 per bushel for corn in the noncommercial area. If the relative feed value of sorghum is used as a base, the support price for sorghum should average just a shade higher than the support price for corn.

I see the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is present. I understand the feed value of sorghum for dairying is the equal to that of corn. For feeding sheep and cattle it is less than that of corn.

I point that out to show that the present support prices are fairly equitable. I understand that sorghum is not grown in the commercial corn area.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Would the Senator from Vermont be willing to vote for an amendment which would provide that the support on sorghum would be comparable to the support on corn?

Mr. AIKEN. I will say to the Senator from Texas that I will consider such an amendment. I want to see it in print. Perhaps it has been already printed. I shall look it over.

Mr. DANIEL. We have such an amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. When we tried to support feed grains on a comparable feed value level, we got into trouble because of the commercial and noncommercial areas of corn. It has been difficult to apply it. If, however, after a referendum, the corn growers should vote to abandon the mandatory supports and Government controls, it would be a fairly simple matter to support them on an even basis and according to their feed values.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have been extremely interested in the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Minnesota. The Senator comes from a great corn-growing State. I believe the record shows that 58 out of the 87 counties in Minnesota are in the commercial corn area. The Senator from Minnesota proposes an amendment which will destroy the benefits to the corn farmer in the commercial corn area, whether it stands as 81 percent of parity or 90 percent of parity. Last year there was a corn allocation acreage of approximately 49 million acres. It did not work; it did not function. Less than a quarter of the corn in the commercial corn area went to seal. Less than a quarter of the farmers got the benefit of support prices, but the Senator from Minnesota proposes to go this year to exactly the same figure which failed last year, and without participation in the soil bank or in the conservation reserve.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator be kind enough to tell the Senate how many farmers produce cash corn?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not have the figures here.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator the number is less than 20 percent. I may say further to the Senator that I thought the soil bank program this year was supposed to remove some of the other acres so that there would be a greater incentive to comply.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will come to that in a moment.

I understood the Senator from Minnesota to say, in reply to a question by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] as to whether the acres over and above the 50 million acres in the commercial corn area could participate in the conservation reserve, that they might. I wish to invite attention to the fact that as the bill now stands they could not. Only those who are in compliance can participate in either the conservation reserve or the acreage reserve. So, only those who are in compliance, which would be not over 50 percent of the corn acreage in general, could participate in the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve.

I invite attention to section 215 of the bill which reads as follows:

No person shall be eligible for payments of compensation under this act with respect to any farm for any year in which the acreage of any basic agricultural commodity other than wheat on the farm exceeds the farm acreage allotment for the commodity—

And so forth. They must be in compliance before they can participate in the conservation reserve or the acreage reserve.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is aware of the fact, of course, that the land of farmers who are in compliance is eligible for the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If they are in compliance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If they are not in compliance they are planting, and if they are planting they will get more than if they were under compliance. If they are

not in compliance they will be planting corn and be getting more for their corn than they would if they put the land into the conservation reserve.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Oh, not at all. That is not correct at all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Iowa say for the RECORD that a farmer in Minnesota or in Iowa who is not in compliance and who is planting corn, if he receives $1.05 or $1.10 or $1.15 a bushel, will get more benefits under the conservation reserve?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I say, indeed, he will get more benefits than if he got $1.15 cash. In my opinion, under the formula, he will get a greater benefit than if he got $1.15 a bushel for his corn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Even under the acreage reserve, the highest benefit he will get is only one-half of the 81 percent of parity supports, which would be approximately 70 cents a bushel. Under acreage reserve and under conservation reserve his benefits are much less. The farmer who is in compliance gets the benefit of acreage reserve and conservation reserve. The farmer who is not in compliance gets an opportunity to plant more corn.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I notice the Senator from Minnesota assumes the payments on the acreage reserve will be 50 percent of the support price. That has not been determined yet.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, it has.

Mr. AIKEN. That will be such as to get 5 million acres out of the corn acreage.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder if the Senator knows that the bulletin issued by the Agricultural Marketing Service, released only the day before yesterday, and which was signed by Walter C. Berger, and is called general notice 348, states on page 3 as the suggestions to the county committee, as to how the acreage reserve program will work:

> Corn, national yield per acre, 44.2 bushels. "Rate of payment based upon normal yield, 50 percent of loan level."

Mr. AIKEN. That has been sent to the county committees to determine whether 50 percent is a figure which would get the desired reduction in planting.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will it be more, or less? The Senator has an inside line to the Department of Agriculture. Does the Senator think the amount of payments will be more, or less?

Mr. AIKEN. It will be whatever the county committees report will be necessary to get the desired reduction in acreage. The 50 percent was thrown out as a guide to determine whether it should be 60 percent, 55 percent, 68 percent, or some other figure. I cannot say what it will be. I do not know of anyone who can say now, because the field men are supposed to determine whether they can get acreage placed in the soil bank, and on what basis. That has been made very clear to me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wondered if the Senator would be kind enough to discuss the conservation reserve, since it is the conservation reserve around which the question directed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] centered.

Suggestions have been made as to the conservation reserve, and this is what is in our report. This is the material upon which we were basing our discretionary authority to the Secretary. This was supposed to be generous compared to what was being paid.

> Conservation reserve incentives:
>
> 1. Annual incentive payments in terms of contract.
>
> (a) $10 per acre, per year average rental for the United States for 3- to 15-year period. Rental rates established on basis of land productivity, agricultural value of land and other factors. Rental rates would encourage farmers to take out their marginal crop land.
>
> (b) County rental rates would vary on the basis of such factors as county yields and value of farmland.
>
> (c) Rates would be established by areas and be based on relative productivity of the land in the area. Farm rental rates would be established on the basis of the rating of the area in which the specified acreage place in "conservation reserve" is located.

It is clearly understood that the conservation reserve benefits are much less than the acreage reserve, particularly since the amount of money provided in the bill for all the conservation reserve, which runs into millions and millions of acres, is $350 million. Yet the acreage reserve is $750 million. It is virtually obvious, is it not, that the conservation reserve benefits are less?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; they will be less; and they will be based upon the land value.

If the Senator has a case which is presented as a guide, and the rental will be $10 an acre a year, that would probably indicate that the particular land would be valued at $100 an acre, because, as I understand, the guide issued contemplated the payment of 10 percent for the value of the land.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is about correct.

Mr. AIKEN. In my State it will run to only about $85 an acre. In some of the southern counties of the Senator's State of Minnesota, it will run, I presume, between $200 and $250 an acre because of the black soil in the lower tier of counties. In Iowa, the payments will probably run more. But I think the guide which has been sent to the field men suggests 10 percent of the value of the land.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. We have in our report conservation reserve rental rates. We have, for example, not to exceed $25 an acre for acreage planting of trees. In no county shall the rate exceed $20 an acre. That seems to be the guide line we have. I can only work from that.

Mr. AIKEN. I gather it is not contemplated that the best land in the country will be retired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. My point was that where a corn farmer placed land under acreage allotments, he would be eligible for the acreage reserve. Where he did not comply, he would obviously be planting. I am certain that where he planted, especially where he planted corn, the land would be good, productive land, and he would be getting a yield from what he planted which would be greater than the conservation reserve.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is expected that most farmers would put into the conservation reserve some submarginal land, land which is over across the creek and is hard to get at.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It would be land which might be detached from the farm proper. It might be planted to trees. It was proposed—and here again it was just a proposal thrown out—that the Federal Government would pay 80 percent of the cost of putting a soil-conserving crop or trees on the land, with a maximum payment of $25 an acre. I believe that is the maximum which is used in most States by the ACP committees.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would say that is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. But the guides which have been sent out, as I understand, are for the committees to use in determining how nearly they will come to finding a basis on which to achieve the desired results.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not think there is any great disagreement between us on this question. The point I was trying to make was that under my amendment, providing for 50 million acres, the acreage would be eligible for all the benefits under the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], parity payments plus acreage reserve benefits.

The other acreage, over the normal corn base, would be eligible if the farmer wanted it for planting. That acreage would be eligible if the farmer wanted it for planting. It would be eligible if the farmer wished it to be, for the conservation reserve. It would be eligible, if he wished it to be, for other crops.

Mr. AIKEN. If under the Senator's amendment a man decided to take 5 acres out of corn production, he would be paid $35 or $40 an acre, if it is decided that 50 percent of the support price times the average production is a proper incentive. If he took it out of oats or hay land, he would get, presumably 10 percent of the value of the land, if we go according to the guide. We do not know what the percentage will be. If it were $200 land, and the farmer took it out of production for 3 years, he would receive $20 an acre. How that would compare with the profit he might make on oats or hay, I do not know; but it would not pay him as well, in my opinion, as it would pay him to take the acreage out of his corn land and get $40 an acre.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for allowing me to interrupt his discussion.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, whether my amendment shall be rejected or agreed to, the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota is a destructive, wrecking amendment to

the farm bill, and is harmful to participation or any kind of cooperation by the Corn Belt.

So whether my amendment be accepted or rejected, certainly the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota should be defeated, because it is not a good amendment; it is not a workable amendment.

To go, as the Senator from Minnesota would go, to 50 million acres is exactly where we were last year, as I pointed out a while ago. We had 49,800,000 acres. The plan would not work then; it will not work this year at 50 million acres, because that is no appreciable increase in the allocated acres.

The purpose of the soil bank and acreage reserve is to take productive acres out of production; to retire acres from production. If we set the acreage at 50 million, which is the same acreage as last year, there will not be any more compliance this year than there was last year, when it was approximately 50 percent. That would be approximately 25 million acres in original compliance at the outset, and only 25 million acres would be eligible for retirement into the acreage reserve or the soil bank. There would be 25 million acres plus the other 6,500,000 acres which will be planted next year. All that land would be outside and would be ineligible to participate in the soil bank or acreage reserve. That is the fallacy of the situation.

The Senator from Minnesota and other Senators have said that a large amount of corn acreage is going wild. Of course, nothing is further from what the situation would be. This is, in fact, an acreage allocation, except that it realizes the facts of life; it is a realistic allocation of the average plantings of the past 3 years, and we will continue to have them anyway.

In 1953 there were no acreage allocations. About 56,300,000 acres were in the commercial corn acreage, without any corn allocation. A farmer can plant all the acreage he wants and still have 300 or 400 acres.

So it is not the allocations in the corn situation that make the difference. Corn is essential to a diversified feeding operation and farming operation, and it is going to take just so much corn in a diversified activity to operate the farm plant.

In a normal rotation system, the farmer will have so many acres of corn, and perhaps so many acres of oats, so many acres of alfalfa, so many acres of beans, and he will rotate them under a program. He may have a 2-year rotation program. He may have a 3-year rotation program. Some farmers may have a 4-year rotation program. But farmers rotate their crops, keeping them in general balance, so far as each crop is concerned. The farmer will have his feeding operations.

Senators can thus rest assured that if acreage allocations are put at 43 million this year, there will be fifty-three-plus-million acres in the commercial corn area. If the allocations are put at 53 million, there will be between 56 and 57 million acres of corn in the commercial corn area.

If allocations are put on a realistic basis, at the average of the last 3 years, it will be 56,300,000 acres. That is the acreage of corn there will be in the commercial corn area.

I have covered the reasons why we should be realistic, and permit acres which will actually be planted for feeding operations to participate in the soil bank and be eligible. There is a limitation provided, Mr. President, there is no permission to the Corn Belt to go wild and encourage farmers there to grow all the corn they can. There is a limitation on the number of acres which will be supported. There will be a certain number of acres that can be supported. Farmers who stay within the farm base acreage will be eligible for supports. A farmer will be required to put 15 percent of his productive acres into the soil bank, either into the acreage reserve or into the conservation reserve. It probably would be more profitable for him to put some of his corn acreage into the acreage reserve, because it would pay him more. It is better paying crop, and the formula will probably make it more advantageous for him to do that. But if he exceeds his farm base acreage, he is not eligible for price supports. So there is an inducement for him to stay at the historic base.

So far as concerns punishing farmers who have complied with allocations in the past, and rewarding those who have failed to come into the allocation program in the past, there is nothing to that argument, either, because under the amendment, the 56,400,000 acres, or whatever the correct figure may be, will be divided among the counties in the commercial corn area. Then the formula, going back over the past 5 years planting, will be such that the farmer who has accepted his allocations in the past will be graded up in his farm base, and the man who has overplanted in the past will be graded down, because of his excess, to the point within his farm base acreage. So the farmer who has overplanted will have to come down. He will not need the benefits of the program. The farmer who has underplanted will come up and be able to enjoy benefits of his farm base acreage.

My amendment is thoroughly sound, and the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota would return us to the conditions which were in effect last year, and which did not work at all. Last year we had 90 percent of parity, involving approximately 50 million acres, and it did not work.

If we have 81 percent of parity, how much less will it work?

The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, whether it is so intended or not, is a blow at the soil bank program and the program for reduction of surpluses. I do not say it is deliberately intended to be that, but it is a blow at the very heart of the surplus reduction program which is so essential if we are to reduce the total overall supply of feed and bring feed and animals into balance, so that the prices farmers receive for both grains and meat animals will be good and substantial.

Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is only a waving of the hands of the hypnotist in order to distract attention from the real purpose. I say to you, Mr. President, it should be apparent on its face that to return this year to a system that did not work last year is not only the height of folly, but reasonably intelligent men should not be caught in that kind of trap, if they expect the acreage-reduction program to work in the Corn Belt, and if they expect the soil bank and the conservation reserve to be given a chance to operate. If we realistically look at the proposal, if we realistically examine it, if we have the 56-million-plus acres, under the program, we shall get a 15-percent reduction in the crop-producing acres, and we shall have some real progress toward reduction of the total overall feed supplies, to the price benefit not only of feed, but of all products which come from it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. How was the figure of 57 million acres reached? I understand the amendment the Senator has offered would apply that figure as the minimum base acreage for the commercial corn area.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is the average of the past 3 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have the figures for the past 3 years. The acreage for 1953 was 56,342,000. In 1954 the acreage was 55,902,000, and in 1955 it was 55,994,000.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. My figures are a little different. They are 56-million-plus in each year. The figure I have proposed is the average of the three.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume the figures have been taken from the same source. Mine were supplied by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In 1953 we had allocations of 56 million——

Mr. ELLENDER. 56,342,000 acres. Is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. In 1955 it was 56,342,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was in 1953.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The figures apply to the same counties which had the plantings in 1955. In 1953 the figure was 56,342,000 acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. And in 1955 it was almost 56 million acres.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In 1955 the plantings were 56,047,000 acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. The average is just about 56 million acres.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is slightly over that. I have tended to use the figure of 56-million-plus acres, because I think that is the way it will work out.

Mr. ELLENDER. But it is my understanding that the amendment has the effect of fixing the base acreage at 57 million acres.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Not my amendment.

For the average of the 3 years, my amendment will work out at slightly over 56 million acres—somewhere between 56 million and 57 million, and probably nearer 56 million. But we might just as well be realistic about it and make these farmers eligible to comply and to reduce this acreage.

At any rate, Mr. President, I shall conclude.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for a point of information?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Do I correctly understand that the amendment of the Senator from Iowa requires that a corn farmer, who is to be a participant in the program, must set aside 15 percent of his cultivated acres in order that——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. First, he must stay within the farm base acreage.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As applied under the 56 million acre formula.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the historic base for each farm; is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is right.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. First, he must do that. Then he is eligible for supports, provided he puts 15 percent of his available acres—which can be partly from corn or partly from other crops, or all from corn; but all of it must be from his feed-producing acres——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; he must put aside 15 percent of the equivalent of his cultivated acres——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So, under the proposal of the Senator from Iowa, the compliance test is every bit as severe as the compliance test under my proposal, for acreage allotments. In other words, I want the record to show clearly that, regardless of what may be the result of the vote which is soon to be taken, under the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, in order for a farmer to be eligible to sell his corn at 81 percent of parity or to be eligible for the acreage benefits, first he must put aside 15 percent of his historic average for his farm, or of his cultivated acres.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; the historical base of his corn acreage; not 15 percent of his total acreage, but 15 percent of the acreage which is devoted to the basic crop he grows.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, he must put aside 15 percent of his corn acreage; is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me give the Senator an illustration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what I wish to understand clearly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We may assume that the farmer has 240 acres, although that would not be quite realistic.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Or let us say the corn farmer has 100 acres as his historic corn base, and that he has 200 acres of other land. The 100-acre corn base is to determine the number of acres that 15 percent will amount to. That will be 15 acres.

Mr. HUMPHREY. From the corn acreage?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; from his cultivated acres.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is only a factor to determine the amount; and it is 15 percent of the amount of his base acres normally devoted to the production of corn. So he takes out 15 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa read that part of his amendment to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. It is on page 5 of the amendment, beginning in line 15.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator from Iowa read it, please?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

SEC. 406. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and in lieu of corn acreage allotments for 1956 (which shall be inoperative for 1956), the Secretary shall require as a condition of eligibility for price support on corn, that the producer agree to devote an acreage of cropland (tilled in normal rotation), at the option of the producer, to either the acreage reserve program—

If he takes the 15 percent out of his corn acreage, it will have to go into the acreage reserve program—

or the conservation reserve program equal to 15 percent of such producer's farm base acreage for corn.

We referred to corn in order to get a factor with which to determine what the 15 percent is based on.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So the Senator from Iowa is saying that in order to qualify for the benefits of this program, if a farmer has 100 acres of corn——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is his farm base.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then he has to take 15 acres out, somewhere.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. He has to take 15 acres out of his tillable land; and those 15 acres can be taken entirely out of his corn acreage or partly out of his corn acreage and partly out of his other crop-producing land, or entirely out of other crop-producing land.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If he takes the 15 acres out of his corn acreage, he will be eligible for participation in the acreage reserve, will he not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And if he takes the 15 acres out of his other acreage, he will be eligible for participation in the conservation reserve, will he?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the point is that in order to be eligible, he must take out 15 percent of his historical corn base acreage. In other words, that is a test he has to meet.

I wish to make this point clear, because a few minutes ago the Senator was saying that under my amendment, farmers would not be eligible for participation in the conservation reserve or the acreage reserve unless they complied with the acreage allotments.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And the same principle applies under the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The same principle applies; but if we apply a realistic allocation system which goes back to the average farm acreage base, we have a basis for inducing farmers to come into compliance—an adequate corn base; and in that way the farmer can take out the 15 acres.

But if the figure is put at 55 million acres, in this connection we consider the experience of last year. Only approximately 50 percent agreed to come into compliance, last year; and 50 percent of 50 million acres is only 25 million acres. That would be the total acreage that would be in compliance, and all the acres that would be eligible to come into the soil bank. Instead, I want to get 100 percent of these acres eligible.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator from Iowa that under the soil-bank provisions, as now attached to the allotment program, there is a greater inducement or incentive for compliance; and I do not believe it is exactly fair and proper to compare the compliance figures of last year with the possibility of compliance this year.

Furthermore, in order to keep the record clear, I must say that, in the main, the corn producers are corn feeders. Most of the corn producers feed their corn to animals. A very small number of the total number of corn producers are producing for what they call the cash grain market. Is not that a fair statement?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is no question about that. Eighty-five percent of the corn is fed on the place.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then the compliance figure under acreage allotments is not exactly a true and proper figure in terms of the willingness of farmers to comply.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me say that perhaps not quite 85 percent of the corn is fed on the farmer's own place, but it is fed to animals in the feeding operations on the farms. In other words, the farmer's neighbor may take some of the corn—or something of that kind.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Assuming that the entire acreage under the Senator's amendment is, let us say, 56 million, would it be possible for the farmers in the commercial corn area to plant the 56 million acres of cornland and still make themselves eligible for the 81 percent price supports by merely putting into the conservation reserve portion of the soil bank a portion of their remaining acreage which would equal 15 percent of their base acreage?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is right; they could put all of it into the conservation reserve if they wanted to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But I am very certain that it is more profitable for them to underplant their corn base.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the idea is to reduce corn production.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. What I have been trying to point out to the Senator is that under his amendment a farmer can get 81-percent price support on his base corn acreage without reducing his corn acreage by even 1 acre.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is why there is in the amendment a provision to

make it attractive to them so as to induce them to underplant their base.

Mr. ELLENDER. I note that in 1955, with an acreage of 49 million——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Forty-nine million eight hundred and some thousand.

Mr. ELLENDER. Forty-nine million eight hundred and forty-three thousand acres—there was a compliance of 42.7 percent.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is right—less than half.

Mr. ELLENDER. With the added inducements of the conservation reserve and acreage reserve programs, does not the Senator feel that there would be greater compliance?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; not at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The reason farmers did not go into compliance at 49,843,000 acres was that it did not give them enough corn on their places for their operations. They said, "We will forego the benefits of sealing this corn, because it cuts us below the reasonable operation of our plant." That is the secret. If we restore them to the historic farm acreage base, they will be given an opportunity, first, to have enough corn for their operations, and second, to reduce somewhat. But a farmer with a 100-acre base, assuming a total acreage allotment of 49 million acres, would have to cut to 87 acres to be in compliance. On the basis of 43 million acres he would have to cut to about 74 acres. He could not operate under such an arrangement. He is not going to operate under it in most cases. The corn sealing program under that situation is of benefit only, in great measure, to the landlord who has a tenant on his farm. It is not much benefit to the tenant.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator realizes that the argument he is advancing could be advanced in the case of cotton, as well as wheat.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Not at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. The acreage of the cotton and wheat farmer has been cut to the point where it hurts, and hurts badly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Not at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. Only 4 or 5 years ago cotton acreage was around 28 million acres. It is now down to 17,391,000 acres. To participate in the acreage reserve, the cotton farmers must take their cuts from the 17,391,000 acres this year.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is very true. However, in a diversified farming operation, if we cut down the feed stocks, we close the farms.

Mr. President, I do not think anything would be accomplished by prolonging this argument. Who has control of the time on the other side?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to yield back the remainder of my time, if the Senator from Iowa is willing to do the same.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both sides yield back all the remaining time. Therefore, all time is exhausted.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe the yeas and nays have been ordered on this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	McCarthy
Allott	Fulbright	McClellan
Anderson	Goldwater	McNamara
Barkley	Gore	Monroney
Barrett	Green	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bender	Hennings	Murray
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bible	Hill	Neuberger
Bricker	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hruska	Pastore
Bush	Humphrey	Payne
Butler	Ives	Potter
Capehart	Jackson	Purtell
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Clements	Kennedy	Scott
Cotton	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Knowland	Sparkman
Daniel	Kuchel	Stennis
Dirksen	Langer	Symington
Douglas	Lehman	Thurmond
Duff	Long	Thye
Dworshak	Magnuson	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], on behalf of himself and other Senators, as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 35, after line 14, it is proposed to insert:

MINIMUM NATIONAL ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR 1956 AND 1957 CORN CROPS

SEC. 405. (a) Section 328 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The acreage allotment of corn for the 1956 crops shall not be less than 50 million acres in the commercial corn-producing area."

(b) Not later than December 15, 1956, the Secretary shall conduct a referendum of producers of corn in 1956 in the commercial corn-producing area to determine whether such producers favor a price-support program as provided in subsection (c) of this section for the 1957 and subsequent crops in lieu of acreage allotments as provided in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and price support as provided in section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if two-thirds or more of the producers voting in the referendum conducted pursuant to subsection (b) hereof favor a price-support program as provided in this subsection (c), no acreage allotment of corn shall be established for the commercial corn-producing area, for any county, or for any farm, with respect to the 1957 and subsequent crops, and price support made available for such crops by Commodity Credit Corporation shall be at such level as the Secretary determines will assist producers in marketing corn in the normal channels of trade but not encourage the uneconomic production of corn.

On page 35, line 16, strike out "405" and insert "406."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is detained on official business, and if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

The vote was recapitulated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, am I recorded on this vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—44

Anderson	Hill	McNamara
Barkley	Holland	Monroney
Bible	Humphrey	Morse
Chavez	Jackson	Murray
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Neuberger
Douglas	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kennedy	Pastore
Ervin	Kerr	Scott
Frear	Langer	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lehman	Stennis
Gore	Long	Symington
Green	Magnuson	Thurmond
Hayden	Mansfield	Young
Hennings	McClellan	

NAYS—46

Aiken	Dirksen	Mundt
Allott	Duff	Payne
Barrett	Dworshak	Potter
Beall	Eastland	Purtell
Bender	Flanders	Robertson
Bennett	Goldwater	Russell
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hruska	Schoeppel
Bush	Ives	Smith, Maine
Butler	Jenner	Thye
Capehart	Knowland	Watkins
Carlson	Kuchel	Welker
Case, N. J.	Malone	Wiley
Case, S. Dak.	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Cotton	Martin, Pa.	
Curtis	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—5

Byrd	Millikin	Smith, N. J.
George	Smathers	

So Mr. HUMPHREY's amendment in the nature of a substitute for Mr. HICKENLOOPER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the substitute amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the motion of the Senator from Iowa be laid on the table.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Iowa. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

I further anounce that if present and voting the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent, and on this vote he is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—47

Aiken	Beall	Bricker
Allott	Bender	Bridges
Barrett	Bennett	Bush
Butler	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Capehart	Hruska	Robertson
Carlson	Ives	Russell
Case, N. J.	Jenner	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Schoeppel
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Malone	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Martin, Iowa	Thye
Duff	Martin, Pa.	Watkins
Dworshak	McCarthy	Welker
Eastland	Mundt	Wiley
Flanders	Payne	Williams
Goldwater	Potter	

NAYS—44

Anderson	Hill	McNamara
Barkley	Holland	Monroney
Bible	Humphrey	Morse
Chavez	Jackson	Murray
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Neuberger
Douglas	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kennedy	Pastore
Ervin	Kerr	Scott
Frear	Langer	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lehman	Stennis
Gore	Long	Symington
Green	Magnuson	Thurmond
Hayden	Mansfield	Young
Hennings	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—4

Byrd	Millikin	Smathers
George		

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], I offer an amendment which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] it is proposed to add the following:

(d) The price of grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye, respectively, shall be supported through loans, purchases, or other operations at a price determined by the Secretary to bear the same ratio to the support price of corn in the commercial corn-producing area as the feed value equivalents of such grains bear to the feed value of corn: *Provided*, That the producer of such commodities, to be eligible for such price supports, shall have entered into contracts with the Secretary to place into the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve a portion of the tillable acres equivalent to 15 percent of the acres devoted to production of such commodities.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the amendment of the Senator from Texas offered as a substitute for the Hickenlooper amendment or as an amendment to the Hickenlooper amendment?

Mr. DANIEL. It is offered as an amendment to the Hickenlooper amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas will come at the end of the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa and is not in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I understand, the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas is an amendment to my amendment. As such, what is the ruling of the Chair as to whether it is eligible to be offered? Is the amendment of the Senator from Texas an amendment in the second or third degree?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa is an amendment in the first degree; the amendment of the Senator from Texas is an amendment in the second degree; consequently the amendment of the Senator from Texas is in order.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, my amendment simply provides that for grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to determine a price support to be given to those crops which will bear the same ratio to the price support on corn in the commercial corn-producing area as the fair value equivalent of such grain bears to the feed value of corn.

My amendment contains the same provision as is contained in the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, in that, to be eligible, the producers of these grains must put into one of the reserve programs at least 15 percent of their tillable acreage, which has been devoted to the commodity concerned.

It has already been pointed out in the debate tonight that corn, grain sorghums, and the other feeds are competitive with one another. If we do not provide some support for the other grains, comparatively speaking, as we do for corn, a great injustice will be worked on the producers of the other feed grains.

I placed in the RECORD several days ago, and had placed on the desks of Senators tonight, a list of the States concerned and the acreages which the various States have in feed grains. Most of the States have as much acreage in feed grains, and as many farmers interested in them, as is the case with corn.

It seems to me it is only fair to those farmers that a similar provision be made for them in the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, if it is to be adopted, so as to take care of feed grains.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico. How much time does he request?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I merely wish to ask the Senator to explain something he has said. I have submitted an amendment designated 3–5–56–E which has not been called up, but which takes care of this particular problem. I was simply wondering whether what the Senator was talking about had reference to that particular amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. Yes; I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that my amendment would accomplish the same purpose as his amendment would accomplish. I have simply offered it now because we are dealing with corn. The two products are very similar, and I

think we should not deal with one without dealing with the other at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The amendment I have submitted for myself and on behalf of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] has to do with this particular problem.

Mr. DANIEL. It relates to the same matter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to have it treated in the same way. Can the Senator from Texas tell me why we should tie this matter to the Hickenlooper amendment?

Mr. DANIEL. It appears from the last vote that the Hickenlooper amendment might be agreed to. If it is agreed to, and if it is to be so liberal to corn producers, it seemed to me that the same consideration should be given to the producers of other feed grains, and that the Senate should act on both matters at the same time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have told the Senator from Texas that I will not only not resist his amendment, but that I would be very willing to have a proper solution of, for instance, the grain sorghum problem on a comparable support basis, provided acreage limitations could be worked out. But as I read it, what the Senator's amendment does is, for instance, raise the price of grain sorghums and the support price higher than the price of corn in the noncommercial corn area, because corn outside the commercial area is supported at a portion of the support price effective in the commercial area.

The amendment proposes to raise support prices of grain sorghums, oats, and barley, which are supported at a differential price now to the support price effective within the commercial corn area. Then the amendment leaves the corn that is outside the commercial corn area at a lower level, and the other grains at a higher level. As I understand, that is exactly what the Senator's amendment will do.

If the Senator would want to tie the support levels of these products to corn outside the commercial corn area, that might have a different effect, but I am afraid the amendment will throw the whole grain support program and the differentials out of gear.

Mr. DANIEL. As I understand, the amendment gives the Secretary the power to set the support price in the various areas comparable to the equivalent feed value in those areas. It would not accomplish the result that the Senator says——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If I may interrupt, as I read the amendment, it says that the price support of these various grains shall be placed on the basis of their comparable feed value with corn, and the price support shall be the same in comparison to the feed value as the price support of corn in the commercial area.

Mr. DANIEL. That is right.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That would raise the price of those grains in the noncommercial area away above the price of corn in the noncommercial area.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Iowa is now worried about throwing the feed grains out of gear. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa did throw the feed grains out of gear by giving special treatment to corn. May I point out that if this kind of treatment is going to be given to corn, then it should be given to all feed grains which are competitive with other feed grains. It is a sound principle to say that there should be acreage controls when there are support prices, but if there is going to be put into effect a program for a commodity that is a feed grain which does not have acreage allotments, then all the feed grains should be included.

Insofar as grain sorghums are concerned, they have a feed equivalent ratio to corn of about 99.5 percent. There is no reason why grain sorghums should not have a good support price. The Senator's amendment merely provides that the price support level for other feed grains shall be directly related to those of other feed grains. They are all competitive feeds, and they should be treated alike if they are going to be treated at all.

The truth is that they should be subject to allotments and acreage control programs, but if that is not going to be done, then I am going to cast my vote to treat them all alike.

I think it ought to be made crystal clear that the Senator from Texas is trying to do exactly that.

I was a cosponsor of his amendment relating to feed grains, which I think had stricter controls over acreage, but provision is being made for a competitive feed grain, and since one commodity is being singled out for special treatment, the proposal now is to treat all those grains alike.

Since we are dealing with a most unusual and confusing situation, the Senator from Texas has at least brought some semblance of order into a confused pattern.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to tell the Senate what the amendment would do, and then let the Members draw their own conclusions.

It would interfere with the discretion which the Secretary now has to consider factors other than feed values in establishing rates. These include such factors as supply in relation to demand, ability to dispose of stocks, and so forth.

It would raise substantially the 1956 support level, as well as support levels in future years.

For instance, oats are to be supported at 70 percent of parity, which amounts to 59 cents a bushel.

Under the proposed amendment, oats would be supported at 83 percent of parity, or 70 cents a bushel.

Barley, which is now supported at 70 percent of parity, or 93 cents a bushel, would be supported at 81 percent of parity, or $1.08 a bushel.

Rye, which is now supported at 70 percent of parity, or $1.16 a bushel, would be supported at 72 percent of parity, or $1.19 a bushel.

Grain sorghums, which are now supported at 70 percent of parity, or $1.80 a hundredweight, would have their support prices, by this amendment, raised to 93 percent of parity, or $2.38 a hundredweight.

I repeat, under the amendment as proposed, grain sorghums would receive 93 percent of parity. This is way above the support for corn in the commercial area, and way, way above the support for corn in the noncommercial area.

The largest increase in cents and percent would be in grain sorghums, where the level would be above the 90 percent maximum now provided by law. Corn could not be supported as high as it is proposed to support grain sorghums under the amendment. The amendment would encourage further increases in this crop, where there already are surpluses.

The amendment would require feed grains to be treated the same as corn, even though there are certain basic differences between the commodities.

Corn producers must comply with allotments, which, for 1956, are 15 percent below 1955 allotments, in order to obtain support. There are no allotments for other feed grains.

Corn producers outside the commercial area receive support at 75 percent of that in the commercial area, whereas the producers of these other feed grains in noncommercial areas, where they are mostly produced, would receive supports based on the full corn rate.

The amendment would make it more difficult to get the farmers of these crops to participate in the conservation reserve.

Furthermore, the amendment would base the support price for rye on feed value, even though it is not a feed grain.

The amendment would tend to encourage increased production, less feeding, and increased acquisition by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

If Senators want support prices for grain sorghums 12 percent above the price of corn in the commercial area and 30 or 40 percent in the noncommercial area, all they have to do is support the amendment.

If I lived in a part of the country which did not produce anything but grain sorghums, I might be for the amendment, but I do not think anyone else could logically vote for it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it true that the adoption of the amendment, if the amendment to which it is attached should later be adopted, would mean that four new mandatory price-support structures would be created?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think I understand the Senator's question. Probably he can answer his own question better than I can.

Mr. HOLLAND. There are several versions of the amendment which have been called to my attention; but the one I see here reads, in part, as follows:

The price of grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye, respectively—

These four different commodities——

Mr. AIKEN. That is right.

Mr. HOLLAND. Shall be supported——

Mr. AIKEN. That is right; mandatory support for feed grains.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then is it not true that four new mandatory price-support structures would be added?

Mr. AIKEN. Absolutely; I did not understand the Senator's question the first time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont another question: Does he recall, offhand, what percentage of rye is used for feed and what percentage is used for more pleasant purposes?

Mr. AIKEN. I suppose that all that is used for feed is what is swept off the floor after they finish preparing the main crop for more vivacious purposes. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Is the able Senator able to tell me what proportion of the barley crop is used for more pleasant purposes than for feed?

Mr. AIKEN. Well, I am not familiar with those uses, myself. [Laughter.] But I understand that a large percentage of the barley crop is used for purposes other than feed, although I know that in years when corn has been in short supply, barley has been used as a substitute.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that, considering the fact that the mandatory price supports which would be required to be extended to grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye are to be measured against the support price of corn in the commercial corn-producing area "at a price determined by the Secretary to bear the same ratio to the support price of corn in the commercial corn-producing area as the feed value equivalents of such grains bear to the feed value of corn," such an arrangement would completely upset the grain producing structure of the Nation, outside of the commercial corn-producing belt?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I cannot imagine a more effective way to upset the grain-producing structure.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that under this structure, for instance, oats, when produced throughout the South in the noncommercial corn area, would be given a support price based upon the support price of corn in the commercial corn-producing area?

Mr. AIKEN. That is entirely correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. And therefore that would be completely out of line with the support price for the supply of corn in the commercial corn-producing area?

Mr. AIKEN. That is true; oats would be supported at 70 cents a bushel. I do not know how many pounds there are to the bushel—32 pounds to the bushel—against $1.05 a bushel for 56 pounds of corn.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for another question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then is it not true that instead of stabilizing agriculture, in a large part of the Nation this particular procedure, if it becomes law, would revolutionize a large part of agriculture and would do as much as unstabilize it as it would be possible to imagine?

Mr. AIKEN. I think "demoralize" would be a better word to use in that case, rather than "revolutionize."

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Vermont for suggesting that better word.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No, Mr. President; I do not want the Senator to yield to me. I wish to speak in my own time.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to have about 10 minutes in which to make a statement. Grain sorghums are just as important to New Mexico as citrus fruits are to Florida.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I shall begin by calling attention to a very famous case, the so-called Dartmouth College case, in which Daniel Webster participated. In that case Daniel Webster said, "Yes, we are small, we are little, but we love our State."

Mr. President, the farmers in New Mexico may not raise as much corn as the amount of corn that is grown in Iowa and fed to pigs in Iowa; but in New Mexico we do produce a little sorghum. I maintain that my vote here and my oath here are as important as are those of the Senator from Iowa—and they are. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, there is very little to the amendment that I have in mind. Senators may laugh all they wish, but this is a serious matter.

I have tried to be fair with every State in the Union, and I wish to be fair now. But I do not think it is fair to say that great care must be taken because there are so many million pigs in Iowa, but not much attention need be paid to the sorghum which is raised in Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Arizona. I do not think the Senator has that situation in mind, and probably he was a little embarrassed that we could not take care of our own little problems in New Mexico.

Mr. President, let us consider equity and fair play. Why should the pig raisers of Iowa be taken care of, and not the poor sorghum growers in New Mexico? We in New Mexico do not make as many millions as do the folk in Iowa; but our farmers pay taxes just as the farmers in other States do.

I believe this proposal is completely unfair; I actually feel that the amendment of the Senator from Texas should be considered in connection with my amendment, which reads in part as follows:

SEC. 304. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this title, price support shall be made available to producers of barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums at a price determined—

Not by New Mexico, not by Texas, not by Arizona, not by Oklahoma, but—

by the Secretary to bear the same ratio to the support price of corn in the commercial corn-producing area—

And so forth. Mr. President, is this the United States, or is it just Iowa and Iowa pigs? [Laughter.]

Is this the United States, where everyone should have fair play; or is it only the Iowa pigs that should be protected? In all sincerity, Mr. President, I ask, Is that fair?

I think I can complete, within the time which has been allotted to me, my remarks on the amendments which I desire to submit on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

A little sorghum is grown in Oklahoma, although I do not know how many pigs are raised in Oklahoma, as compared to the number of pigs raised in Iowa; I suppose there are not so many.

But, Mr. President, the purpose of our amendment is to provide for a more realistic price-support level for sorghum grain to be calculated at the commodity's feed-value ratio to corn. We are simply proposing to bring two important feed grains into a more fair adjustment. That is to say, we in the commercial-sorghum area of the West want to have sorghum treated fairly by the Secretary of Agriculture. Of course, I do not know whether he will do so; but we would like to have that done. According to the newspaper stories and the reports on the radio, the television, and elsewhere, the Secretary of Agriculture does not seem to be treating very many people right. But we see that attempts are being made to have the pigs in Iowa treated all right, on account of what will happen in November.

However, we wish to have the Secretary of Agriculture and the Republican national administration in power treat the commercial sorghum area of the West on a par with the Corn Belt.

Of course, Mr. President, the two Senators from Iowa do not have any more votes in this body than do my colleague from New Mexico and I.

It has been determined by the Department of Agriculture, through very carefully conducted studies, that the feed value of one bushel of sorghum grain is almost equal to that of a bushel of corn. But we do not want only corn to be considered in this connection. In New Mexico very little corn is raised, but a little sorghum is raised there.

As a matter of fact, the feed value of sorghum grains to corn varies from about

90 percent to 105 percent, depending upon the particular animal to which it is fed. However, the average is almost 100 percent. If it is fed to a pig in Iowa, that is one thing. If it is fed to a lamb in New Mexico—a lamb that will be sent to Fort Worth, Kansas City, or Omaha—that is a different matter. This means that the price of one is out of relationship with the price of the other. I am referring now to the imbalance of sorghum grains in relation to corn. Changes in the utilization of one or the other occur with financial disadvantage to one producer or the other. Under the doctrine of equality before the law, why should the corn producer of Iowa be treated better than the sorghum producer of Oklahoma or New Mexico? All we are asking, and all we are entitled to, is equality under the law. We in the commercial sorghum grain area of the West have suffered a financial beating. Is that good for the Treasury Department?

So far as I know, sorghum grain is the only commodity with respect to which Secretary Benson—the popular Secretary Benson, of the Department of Agriculture—abruptly dropped the support price to the minimum of 70 percent, with one stroke of the pen. I believe it is now 70 percent.

Any effort to stabilize the feed grain production in the interest of all—not Iowa alone, not New Mexico alone, but in the interest of the American people, as it should be—must take into account the feed value ratio when setting the price-support levels.

In the past the establishment of price-support levels for the secondary feed grains has not been mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture, as has been the case with respect to the basic crops. Instead, the establishment of such levels was left to the discretion of the Secretary.

Secretary Benson's use of this discretion has been such that I now feel it is incumbent upon the Congress to act. I took the same oath of office as did all other Senators. In fairness to the agricultural producers of the country, the Congress of the United States should instruct the Secretary of Agriculture.

Suppose nothing were involved but corn from Iowa. Suppose there were no wheat from Kansas or North Dakota, or tobacco from Connecticut. What would we do? Would we quit? I do not think so.

The Congress should act to instruct the Secretary of Agriculture specifically as to how to arrive at a price support level for these important feed grains. The support price of the sorghum grains was dropped by the popular Secretary of Agriculture from $2.38 a hundredweight in 1952 to $1.78 a hundredweight in 1955, or a reduction of 25 percent.

I leave it to the conscience of Senators. Is that fair? Was the same action taken with respect to the potatoes of Maine or Idaho, or the particular products of the home States of other Senators? I do not think so.

The support price for sorghum grain is not set at a mandatory level by Congress. Congress never did pass judgment upon support prices for sorghum. That was left to the discretion of the popular Secretary of Agriculture.

I have in my hand a table showing production of the principal Southwestern sorghum-grain-producing States.

In New Mexico in 1952 we produced 903,000 bushels, a small item in the scheme of things; but in 1955 we produced 4,356,000 bushels.

Texas, so ably represented by the Senator who offered the amendment, in 1952 had 48,236,000 bushels; in 1955, 144,711,000 bushels.

I invite the attention of Oklahoma Senators to the next item. In 1952 Oklahoma had 4,248,000 bushels; in 1955, 13,375,000 bushels. This increase in production, in a period when the support prices were reduced 25 percent by the popular Secretary of Agriculture, was made in the face of repeated assertions that when the price of an agricultural commodity is reduced, production is also reduced in automatic response.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I ask for 5 additional minutes?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Texas.

In the United States as a whole the total production of sorghum grains increased from 83,024,000 bushels in 1952 to 232,638,000 bushels in 1955. In the same period, from 1952 to 1955, the season average market prices received by farmers for sorghum grain, per bushel, were as follows:

New Mexico, in 1952, $1.56; in 1955, 95 cents, or a reduction of 39 percent.

In Texas, so ably represented by the Senator who offered the amendment, the value in 1952 was $1.58; in 1955, 95 cents—down 40 percent.

In Oklahoma the value in 1952 was $1.60; in 1955, 95 cents, down 41 percent.

For the United States as a whole the price of sorghum grain throughout the country in 1952 was $1.57. Do Senators know what the price is now, in every one of the States? It is 99 cents.

If feed grains were supported at the feed value equivalent of corn, at 90 percent of old parity, the support price for grain sorghums would be 108 percent of the January 15 parity figures, or $2.78 a hundredweight, $1.56 a bushel. The support price for corn would be $1.64. Sorghum grains are still low—$1.56 for sorghum grains, and $1.60 for corn.

The Secretary of Agriculture has set the support prices for the sorghum grains at $1.80 a hundredweight for 1956. This is $1 a bushel.

With respect to State production in 1955, the production in New Mexico was 4 million bushels plus. The income, at the Department of Agriculture's support prices, would be $4,390,000 plus. The income based upon feed value equivalent would be $6,782,392.

In Texas the 1955 production was 144,711,000 bushels. The income at the support prices suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture would be $145,868,688. The income on the basis of feed value equivalent, using old parity, would be $225,315,027. There is a difference as between $145 million plus and $225 million plus.

In Oklahoma the production in 1955 was 13 million bushels plus. The income, at the Agriculture Department prices, would be $13,482,000. On the basis of feed value equivalent, the income would be $20 million plus. Do Senators not believe that the difference between $13 million, the figure of the Department of Agriculture, and $20 million, based upon feed value equivalent, means something to Oklahoma? Is Oklahoma not a part of the Union?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sorry, Mr. President. I should like to have 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That applies to the United States as a whole. That includes Delaware and Connecticut and New Jersey, and all the other States in the United States of America. The Senators are from a particular State, but they represent all the United States.

I continue to read from the table before me. Nineteen fifty-five production, 232 million bushels-plus. The income at the Benson support price—I have not been using his name before, I have been saying Secretary of Agriculture. The United States production in 1955, by bushels, was 232 million bushels-plus The income at the Benson support price would be $234,499,104. The income at feed value equivalent, using the old parity, would be $362,217,366. That is for the United States as a whole.

Do Senators believe that Uncle Sam is not interested, or that the people of the United States of America are not interested, in a difference in the support price under Mr. Benson, of $234,499,000, and in the income feed value of $362,217,366? That is a simple matter of 2 and 2 making 4.

Mr. President, I should like to read to the Senate a resolution adopted by the New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau. It reads as follows:

> Whereas the grain sorghum producers have been discriminated against because of uncontrolled diverted acres and Government regulations; and
>
> Whereas due to the comparable feed value of grain sorghum and corn as feed grains in industrial uses—

They are referring here to Mr. Benson—

> *Be it resolved*, That the Secretary of Agriculture designate as commercial grain sorghum areas, those areas having produced grain sorghums commercially prior to 1951, and that the same formula for marketing loans be applied to grain sorghum as corn marketing loans are based on. Marketing loan rates on grain sorghum produced in noncommercial areas should be reduced in the same proportion as loan rates on corn, produced in noncommercial corn areas.

I had a letter a few days ago from a gentleman living at Clovis, N. Mex., who said that while corngrowers in the Midwest have lamented their difficulties in realizing any profit even with their price advantage, someone should realize that in the Southwest and New Mexico, the

cost of production is equal to, and usually greater than that of corn, yet the consumptive value is still the same.

Let me read to the Senate only two sentences from this letter:

It is needless to say that the grain sorghum farmer is facing an impossibility with the present status of his business. These facts have become so obvious a threat that the banks in this area are refusing loans to many farmers for the coming year. We can furnish documentary evidence of this should it be of any benefit to the cause.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not believe I will need 5 minutes, but I thank the Senator from California very much.

If we are going to support the corn farmer—and I am for the corn farmer, and I want to support the corn farmer and the wheat farmer and the cotton farmer, and of course, we should not forget, under our system of government, the other growers as well—let us be fair to the sorghum grain growers of the Southwest and West.

The sorghum grains are grown in California—that is the State represented so ably by the Senator who has just now yielded me 5 additional minutes—in Arizona, Colorado, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, and in New Mexico.

I am not asking for any special privilege. We are all for the farmer, and we are dependent on what he raises. A farmer is a farmer. He goes through the same trials and tribulations that the producer of wheat and corn goes through, whether he produces sorghum in California or in New Mexico. All we want is a fair deal. I believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] should be agreed to.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the acreage and production of feed grain in the United States for 1955.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Acreage and production of feed grains in the United States, 1955

State	Oats		Barley		Rye		Sorghum grain		Total feed grains	
	Acreage	Production	Acreage	Production	Acreage	Production	Acreage	Production	Acreage	Production
	Thousand acres	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand acres*	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand acres*	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand acres*	*Thousand bushels*	*Thousand acres*	*Thousand bushels*
Maine	83	2,490	2	52					85	2,542
New Hampshire	2	70							2	70
Vermont	21	735							21	735
Massachusetts	2	78							2	78
Connecticut	3	99							3	99
New York	710	29,820	88	3,168	12	252			810	33,240
New Jersey	41	1,681	23	851	12	252			76	2,784
Pennsylvania	793	34,099	222	8,426	22	462			1,037	42,997
Ohio	1,365	70,980	65	2,502	32	656			1,462	74,138
Indiana	1,315	68,380	82	2,542	96	1,584	1	35	1,494	72,541
Illinois	3,168	177,408	140	4,760	105	1,785			3,413	183,953
Michigan	1,466	67,436	129	4,580	40	600			1,635	72,616
Wisconsin	2,807	138,946	63	2,205	44	550			2,914	141,701
Minnesota	4,828	197,948	1,155	28,298	112	1,680			6,095	227,926
Iowa	5,738	258,210	20	660	22	374			5,780	259,244
Missouri	1,511	60,440	436	11,554	70	980	93	2,325	2,110	75,299
North Dakota	1,968	55,104	3,568	82,064	585	9,360			6,121	146,528
South Dakota	3,872	100,672	503	9,306	321	4,012	65	1,008	4,761	114,998
Nebraska	2,095	54,470	200	4,000	164	1,886	713	7,843	3,172	68,199
Kansas	1,171	32,202	688	12,384	69	690	2,772	31,878	4,700	77,154
Delaware	10	375	12	396	15	270			37	1,041
Maryland	73	2,993	86	3,354	15	292			174	6,639
Virginia	183	6,954	110	3,850	22	385			315	11,189
West Virginia	57	2,080	14	462	2	28			73	2,570
North Carolina	528	18,480	56	1,652	18	252	108	3,024	710	23,408
South Carolina	780	21,450	18	369	15	165	16	304	829	22,288
Georgia	644	16,744	9	162	10	95			663	17,001
Florida	40	960							40	960
Kentucky	164	4,592	125	2,875	20	270			309	7,737
Tennessee	327	9,483	80	1,440	21	220			428	11,143
Alabama	300	7,800					46	874	346	8,674
Mississippi	512	15,360							512	15,360
Arkansas	456	15,960	30	600			61	1,372	547	17,932
Louisiana	107	3,852					5	100	112	3,952
Oklahoma	706	12,002	224	2,912	70	490	1,070	13,375	2,070	28,779
Texas	1,492	26,110	148	2,072	17	110	6,297	144,711	7,954	173,003
Montana	375	13,875	1,397	41,910	19	304			1,791	56,089
Idaho	209	10,032	576	18,432	5	75			790	28,539
Wyoming	145	4,205	129	3,612	8	88			282	7,905
Colorado	146	4,526	355	8,875	34	238	660	4,950	1,195	18,589
New Mexico	21	567	28	700	7	70	363	4,356	419	5,693
Arizona	11	550	188	11,280			133	6,783	332	18,613
Utah	39	1,677	190	7,790	8	80			237	9,547
Nevada	6	246	16	560					22	806
Washington	166	7,636	732	18,300	31	326			929	26,262
Oregon	301	10,327	559	17,888	15	218			875	28,433
California	176	5,632	1,781	64,116	8	88	194	9,700	2,159	79,536
Total	40,933	1,575,736	14,247	390,969	2,066	29,187	12,597	232,638	69,843	2,228,530

Source: Crop Production, 1955 Annual Summary, published by Agricultural Marketing Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to tell the Senate something about the record of previous feed-grain supports. In 1952 corn was supported at 90 percent of parity, barley at 80 percent of parity, grain sorghums at 80 percent of parity, and oats at 80 percent of parity.

In 1953, corn was supported at 90 percent of parity; barley, at 85 percent of parity; grain sorghums, at 85 percent of parity; and rye at 85 percent of parity.

What the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas would do would be to restore the situation which existed 2 or 3 years ago. It has been customary to support the feed grains on a feed ratio basis with corn. That practice was dropped some 2 years ago when oats, barley, rye, and sorghum were dropped from 80 to 85 percent down to 70 percent of parity. These levels of support in years gone by did not disrupt the production of those commodities. I do not know why it would do it now.

If we are going to adopt a new theory of flexible price supports, basing it on political expediency instead of on surpluses, then, of course, the amendment should not be adopted.

I was amazed the other day to hear the Secretary of Agriculture say what he was going to do for cotton. He went on to brag about how many additional votes he would get in the Senate by the adoption of that kind of program.

Now it appears that a similar program has been agreed upon for the corn farmer.

I know that the corn farmers need some help, and I was willing to go along with the 52 million acre basis. However, when we are restoring the corn acreage to the historic level of the past 5 years and giving the corn producers a higher support than the wheat producer

and the producers of other commodities, we are doing a grave injustice not only to the wheat farmer, but to the dairy farmer as well. It is the most unheard of thing since I have come to the Senate.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I supported the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. I did it with the thought that there were provisions in it of which I did not approve but which offered an opportunity of adjustment in conference; and certainly some of these matters will have to be worked out in conference.

There are several areas in the United States which produce grain sorghums, and those areas are just as much commercial areas as the commercial corn areas of Iowa and Illinois, for example. In several States in the West the feeding ratio and the feeding value of the sorghums are practically the same as corn.

In the past few years and at the present time we have been getting a parity price support of 70 percent. I fail to see how the Senate can this evening vote to do anything for corn on a loan basis and a parity price basis, and not do something for the sorghums, when their comparable feed basis is the same as corn and the area is just as commercial as the corn area.

Therefore, I say that if we wish to be fair, we should support the amendment.

I should also like to say that I would be very much opposed to the sorghum grains of the country securing anything more than commercial corn secures. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] thought it might go to 93 percent. I would be opposed to that. But I think that they should be on a fair basis, and the 70 percent we have been operating under and are at the present time, is unfair and not realistic. I therefore sincerely hope that the Senate will adopt the amendment and let it go to conference. After all, that is where the bill will be written, not only with respect to this amendment, but with respect to many others as well.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Kansas to be referring to corn grown in the commercial area?

Mr. CARLSON. I believe I stated that there are commercial areas for corn, and that the sorghum-growing areas are in a similar situation.

Mr. THYE. If the amendment relates to corn, rather than to corn in the commercial area, I think the amendment is a very good amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. I think the Senator from Minnesota and I are in accord. The only problem is that we cannot work these things out on the Senate floor; we have to work them out in conference. Possibly in a conference we can get a bill which is fair to all these farm commodities.

Mr. DANIEL. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that if the words "corn in a commercial area" were stricken, it would be a good amendment?

Mr. THYE. If it is related to corn as a nationwide commodity, then I think it would be a fair and just amendment, but if it has reference to corn tied strictly to the commercial area and under the quota system in that area, then I think it is an unfair amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified by striking out the words "in the commercial corn-producing areas." The amendment would then apply to corn, generally, over the Nation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator interpret that to mean that in applicable areas it would apply to corn and not be tied in solely and only to corn in the commercial areas?

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct. I think the modification would meet one of the objections which has been raised.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico 1 minute.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I agree to the modification. I was willing to agree with the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Iowa to strike out the language to which objection was made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the modification is agreed to. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], as modified.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it seems to me the amendment is now in such shape that we can all vote for it. It makes sound economic sense. It provides for the comparative prices of grain at the price level at which corn is supported. I appreciate the changes which have been made, and I suggest that the request for the yeas and nays be withdrawn.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The only thing I had in mind was the sorghum grains.

Mr. MUNDT. That has been attended to by the modification of the amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to find out what the effect of the amendment is and what it does. I wish thoroughly to understand it before there is a vote on it, and I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have an agreement that the time taken by the quorum call shall not come out of the time allotted to either side.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not care about a quorum call, but I want a few minutes to find out the effect of the change in the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call without the time being taken out of either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes, or such additional time as he may need, to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as the amendment is now worded, it is rather ambiguous. It reads:

> The price of grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye, respectively, shall be supported through loans, purchases, or other operations at a price determined by the Secretary to bear the same ratio to the support price of corn in the commercial corn-producing area as the feed-value equivalents of such grains bear to the feed value of corn.

I explained that if the words "in the commercial corn-producing area" were used, support prices would be thrown out of line. If we tied the amendment to corn in noncommercial areas, it would be found that the support prices for other commodities would be thrown out of line somewhat the other way.

For instance, the support for barley now is 93 cents. It would drop to 81 cents. The support for oats now is 59 cents. It would drop to 52 cents. The support for sorghum now is $1.80. It would increase to $1.88.

I will have to confess that I do not know the answer. I would not want to undertake tonight to put the amendment into proper form. It has been said that we should agree to some amendment and send it to conference. I am not sure that that would be the best way to handle the matter. It might be adjusted in conference; it might not be. It might make just so much extra work in conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the Senator from Vermont able to state to what extent the price of oats in the noncommercial corn areas would be dropped by the amendment as it is now worded?

Mr. AIKEN. It would be dropped 7 cents a bushel. Barley would be dropped 12 cents a bushel. Sorghum would be increased 8 cents a hundred pounds.

Mr. HOLLAND. But so far as oats and barley are concerned, the support prices of both commodities would be reduced, which should not occasion any trouble.

Mr. AIKEN. There would be a drop if the support price for corn in the noncommercial area were used as a base. There would be distortion, as I pointed out before, and as the Senator from Florida ably pointed out, if the commercial area were used.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then, under the amendment as reworded now, the farmers who produced oats and barley in the

noncommercial corn area would be asked to go along with an appreciable reduction from their present pricing, in order to be neighborly to some persons elsewhere who produced grain sorghum.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. I am not certain they would be glad to do so. If the price support were tied to the commercial areas in the commercial States, there would be one price for oats in Iowa, and a price 25 percent less for the support of oats in North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. How much would the amendment raise the present support price for oats, barely, and rye in the commercial area?

Mr. AIKEN. This is somewhat ambiguous. In the commercial area, oats would go up from 59 to 70 cents, and barley from 93 cents to $1.08 in the commercial area.

Mr. YOUNG. If it did that, it would naturally raise the cash price in the commercial area, and the feed producers in the noncommercial area would benefit. I think it is the wrong way of doing it, but they would be better off than they are now.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not sure that interpretation is correct. There may be some way to work that out. I do not feel equal to making a suggestion tonight.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for an inquiry?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Since there seems to be some difference of opinion as to what the amendment does, perhaps, if some study of it could be made overnight, facts might be presented to the Senate so that the amendment would do what the sponsors hope it will do, rather than do something else. Since it is now 10 o'clock, I was wondering how much longer the Senator from Louisiana expected to continue the session this evening.

Mr. ELLENDER. Earlier today I gave notice that the Senate would remain in session until 9:30 p. m. It is now 10 o'clock. So far as I am concerned——

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is not the intention of the minority leader to suggest when the Senate should adjourn, because it is the function of the majority leader to determine the hour of adjournment, but I did raise the point in view of the apparent misunderstanding that exists about the amendment, with the various changes which have been made in it. I thought we might legislate better if we could have an opportunity to develop some facts as to what the various versions of the amendment mean.

Mr. ELLENDER. It would be agreeable to me to have the Senate recess until tomorrow at 10 or 10:30 a. m.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota out of my time on the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to make a few comments in view of the apparent confusion. The argument was made earlier that if the price supports of the feed grains were tied to those of corn in the commercial area, and there were a price differential relating to the feed grains, that would be very hard upon the noncommercial areas. So the language relating to the commercial area was deleted, leaving it to the Secretary to relate the price of feed grains in the commercial areas to commercial area corn prices, and to relate the price of feed grains in the noncommercial areas to noncommercial area corn prices.

That is not confusing. Where there exists a noncommercial area corn price, we relate the feed price to that particular area on the feed equivalent basis. Where there is a commercial area corn price, we relate the feed price to the commercial area corn prices.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In relating the feed price to the noncommercial area corn price, will that result in a reduction in the present prices of corn? Mine is a noncommercial area. If I voted for the amendment, would I be voting to lower the prices of barley, and such commodities, in Arkansas?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Secretary at the present time can reduce the price at any time he wants to under the discretionary formula. We would be relating the feed grain prices in each area to the corn price in that area. When there is a noncommercial area for corn, the feed grain price would be related to that particular price structure.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder if the Senator from Minnesota will check the figures as I give them.

In the case of oats, the feeding value of oats is approximately 88 percent of that of corn. Adjusting that for a 32-pound bushel of oats, comparative to a 56-pound bushel of corn, this would give a factor of .0529 times the price of a bushel of oats. With corn at $1.40, this would mean the equivalent price of oats would be 70 cents a bushel.

If we take 25 percent off that, in the noncommercial area the support level of oats will be one-fourth off 70 cents, and therefore will be far below the present support price.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator tell us what the price of corn is in the noncommercial area?

Mr. ANDERSON. Twenty-five percent below $1.40.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Our purpose is to keep the feed grains in balance. The problem is that they are not in balance.

Mr. ANDERSON. All I seek to point out to the Senator from Texas, who is the sponsor of the amendment, is that now that he has taken out the word "commercial," he would drop the support level on grain sorghums from $1.78 to a figure which is one-fourth below $2.37; $2.37 is about $2.40. Taking 25 percent of that, which is 60 cents, that is $1.80. We come out about even. So why adopt the amendment?

Mr. DANIEL. As I understood the figures quoted by the Senator from Vermont, the price of sorghum would be raised from $1.80 to $1.88.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator from Vermont will give us the authority for the increase, that is all right, but the Senator from Vermont will agree that the value of sorghum is .95 that of corn. Against a price of $1.40, that gives a price of $2.30 per hundredweight for grain sorghums. If it comes 25 percent below that, it comes down to about $1.78, and the present support price is $1.78.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The present support price is that, but, under the law, the Secretary can lower the support price to any point he desires. Under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas the support price must be related to the feed equivalent value of corn, and there is a great deal of difference.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. My understanding is that while the Senator is correct in his statement that the Secretary of Agriculture can adjust the support price, I do not believe he can make an arbitrary 25-percent differential between the oat support price in a county in the commercial corn area and that in an adjoining county outside the commercial corn area. I think the Senator will find that the support price for oats is identical in the commercial and noncommercial area, and that a real penalty will be imposed upon the producers of oats and barley in the noncommercial corn area if their price is supported at a lower level than that in the commercial area. We are all ill-informed tonight. I think it is a good time to recess so we can get the actual facts on this very important matter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As the Senator from Florida knows, there is a problem involved in feed grains. We have worked on that problem very much in the committee. It is a complicated problem. No one can deny that. I want to say very frankly——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that I may have 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the minority leader.

I agree that the task before us, particularly in the light of the Hickenlooper amendment, which relates to the most basic feed grain of all, namely, corn, is to try to bring into reasonable balance, prices for other feed grains as related to corn, and as they relate to the feed equivalent. That is the purpose of the Daniel amendment, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor.

This is a job that needs to be done, and the Senator from Florida pointed out that the commercial corn areas would have some discriminatory effect on noncommercial areas as compared with commercial areas. We are trying

to bring feed prices into their proper relationship.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is true that the first suggested form of the amendment would have worked a hardship in the noncommercial corn areas, by lifting the price structure for grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye to a level to compare with the price of corn in the commercial corn-producing area. But now the reverse has been accomplished by the wording of the amendment, unless I have been misinformed.

So, again, I suggest that it is desirable for the Senate to take a recess at this time until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, it appears that approximately 1 hour is still available on the amendment. For that reason, and because it is my understanding that Senators on both sides of the amendment will consume the remaining 25 minutes and 35 minutes, respectively, the acting majority leader is about to make a motion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would prefer to have this amendment rejected tonight, rather than to continue to take what I have been taking in this case.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I do not wish to see the Senator's amendment rejected.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well.

Mr. CLEMENTS. But there has been a reasonable understanding between the leadership that the Senate would not continue in session beyond 9:30 or 10 o'clock tonight.

For that reason, I think we should keep faith with the membership; and this matter can be taken up again, following the convening of the Senate at 10 a. m. tomorrow.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask about the program for tomorrow. I understand that it is the intent of the Senator from Kentucky to have the Senate take a recess from tonight until 10 a. m. tomorrow, and then, I assume, to continue in session into the evening, to approximately the same hour we have remained in session tonight, or perhaps a little later. I should like to have the Senator from Kentucky state his intention in that respect.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is the intention of the acting majority leader to have the Senate take a recess from this evening until 10 a. m. tomorrow. The acting majority leader is very hopeful that the membership will remain on the floor during the session tomorrow, and that it will be possible for us to dispose of a number of amendments, with the session to continue into the evening.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me ask what the majority leadership has determined in regard to a Saturday session.

Mr. CLEMENTS. At this time there has not been a decision about a Saturday session. I believe that matter will be determined by the progress we make on tomorrow.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In other words, the Senator from Kentucky is suggesting that Senators on both sides of the aisle hold themselves in readiness for a Saturday session, if necessary; is that correct? If by a remote possibility we were to complete our action on the farm bill tomorrow, then there would not be a Saturday session; but I understand there has not been a final determination as to whether, if the farm bill is not finished on tomorrow, there will be a Saturday session.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator from California has correctly stated the intent of the acting majority leader, except he would add that if the Senate should not complete action on the farm bill on Friday, and if there appeared to be an excellent chance that action on the bill could be completed on Saturday, the acting majority leader would be very hopeful that there would be a Saturday session.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for a question?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it the understanding that on tomorrow the Senate will proceed with the pending amendment, as it may be modified after our discussions? Is that correct?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then shall we proceed with the bill title by title, or shall we proceed to consider whatever amendments may be called up from time to time?

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is my belief that we shall proceed in the way we have proceeded today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. From section to section of the bill?

Mr. CLEMENTS. From section to section of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The Chair suggests that, under the rule, a Senator who was recognized for the purpose of calling up an amendment, would be able to call it up; and the consideration of such an amendment would have priority, in the absence of an agreement to take up the bill section by section.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Let me say to the distinguished Presiding Officer that he has stated the understanding of the acting majority leader.

Mr. President, to Senators who have committee meetings scheduled for tomorrow between the hours of 10 a. m. and 12 noon, I would say that in the case of committees which have witnesses scheduled to appear on tomorrow, the leadership on both sides of the aisle—and, I take it, the entire membership—would be reasonable in respect to agreeing to unanimous-consent requests that such committees be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

I should like to have my friend across the aisle, the distinguished senior Senator from California, state his viewpoint in that connection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am sure that the acting majority leader will find that the same cooperation which usually is extended in such cases will be extended to any committee which finds it essential to meet on tomorrow, during the session of the Senate. I think generally we should discourage the meeting of committees during the session of the Senate when this bill is before us. But I think a few committees have scheduled the appearance of witnesses on tomorrow; and the swearing of witnesses, and so forth, must be taken care of. Certainly I would be prepared to agree to any reasonable request which might be made in such a connection.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader is, as usual, most generous. He knows very well that some committees have scheduled hearings for tomorrow, and that some of the witnesses have come from considerable distances So it is only right and proper that such committees be permitted to sit at that time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course we shall be glad to cooperate in any reasonable cases.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 3402) for the relief of Roberto C. Bargas and Rosenda C. Bargas, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. HOLLAND) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BARRETT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

RECESS TO 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until tomorrow, at 10 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, March 9, 1956, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 8 (legislative day of March 6), 1956:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Edgar Bernard Brossard, of Utah, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1962. (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Henry Irving Hodes, O12845, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), in the rank of general.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 8 (legislative day of March 6), 1956:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Col. John L. Person, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1956

The Right Reverend Ambrose Ondrak, O. S. B., abbot of St. Procopius Abbey, Lisle, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Lord God, ruler of heaven and earth, giver of every perfect gift, who has so loved the world that Thou hast given Thy only begotten Son in order that whosoever believeth in Him may have life everlasting, on this day, as we pray before and with this august assembly of elected Representatives of the great American Nation—we beg Thee especially for Thy servants of all walks of life who are heroically suffering imprisonment, slavery, and all manner of persecution for Thy name's sake.

In a special way we pray for Archbishop Beran, primate of Bohemia, who, 5 years ago, was forcibly taken from his see and is being subjected to privations and humiliations; as also we pray for his fellow shepherds, Archbishop Matocha, Bishops Trochta, Hlouch, Zela, Skoupy, Vojtassak, Godic, Buzalka, Pobozny, Barnas, Hopko, Tomasek, Picha, Nescey, and all others who suffer similar cruelties in Thy name.

Grant freedom, we beseech Thee, Lord, for imprisoned abbots, for the thousands of priests, religious, and laymen in concentration camps. Grant that the sufferings of Thy servants may be associated with the merits of the redeeming blood of Thy Son, and obtain for all freedom from all slavery, physical as well as spiritual; grant that prisons may be opened as once the prison was opened to deliver Thy holy Apostle Peter; give freedom to all people of Czechoslovakia and all captive nations, especially to the numberless who suffer in Christ's name for justice; break the gates of concentration camps and lead Thy people of Czechoslovakia and all other enslaved countries to lasting freedom as Thou hast led Thy chosen people from the Babylonian captivity.

May the peace which Thy Son brought into the world fill the hearts of all men so that all Thy children in every corner of the globe may praise Thy holy name under the light of freedom and liberty.

Grant abundance of Thy spirit to this assembly, which in the past has stood firmly for the preservation of right order; grant that it may ever serve as an instrument and champion of Thy holy will, through which the blessings of peace, prosperity, and freedom may come to all nations.

This we ask for the glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 9064) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes," in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. DIRKSEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Chair giving me this opportunity to announce the program for next week. We are going to ask to go over until Monday.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next and the following Wednesday it may be in order to dispense with business in order on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the House ought to know what the program will be for next week before we grant these requests.

Mr. ALBERT. I will advise the gentleman that we have no program ready to announce. We will announce any program as soon as the Rules Committee grants the necessary rules.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF THE HOUSE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ISSUE DETENTION ORDERS ON CERTAIN MAIL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to authorize the Postmaster General to issue a temporary impounding order for the detention of mail addressed to persons who are found to be using United States mails for the distribution of obscene matter, gambling devices, and other unfit material.

This legislation has one purpose and one purpose only. That is to protect the American people. It has been made necessary by the development of a wide and dangerous loophole in the laws which Congress has enacted to keep this revolting traffic out of the United States mails.

My bill will restore to the Postmaster General the means which he once had, and to some extent lost under the Administrative Procedure Act of 1949, of protecting the public against use of the mails to defraud or debase morals.

I want it clearly understood that my bill creates no new crime or penalty. It merely closes a gap in the historical safeguards against use of the mails for illegal purposes.

Since the start of the postal service our Postmasters General have been charged with the responsibility of preventing use of the mails for illegal or immoral purposes. There are long-established safeguards which for scores of

years have been enforced carefully and judiciously in the public interest, without fear or prejudice to any person or group of persons.

These laws authorize the Postmaster General to issue fraud orders and unlawful business orders against persons or firms who obtain or attempt to obtain moneys through the mails in exchange for obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, or vile matters or devices, or through false or fraudulent pretense, or to conduct any lottery or gambling scheme or contrivance.

When any such schemes are found operating, mail addressed to the operators may be returned to the senders. This cuts off the fruits of the illegal ventures which, of course, is the most positive method of stopping them.

This system of protecting the public was developed to an exact but equitable science over the years. During the past 50 years the Postmaster General has not been found in error in over 5 or 6 instances out of the many thousands of orders issued under this law.

Serious impediments were thrown in the Postmaster General's way when it was learned by the clan of purveyors of filth and certain gambling interests that the way was open, under the Administrative Procedure Act, for delay and procrastination. Quickly seizing on every opening, these men and women have been successful in many cases in completely nullifying the best efforts of the postal service to stop their illicit traffic before they can milk the public and depart with their ill-gotten gains.

Postal inspectors and others have testified before our committee that these delays may run as high as 6 to 9 months. It is common for the old hand at the obscenity business gleefully to announce, through advertising and other media, that his wares are barred from the mails. Thus, laws enacted for protection of the public are turned against the public by skillful perversion to suit the ends of a greedy few.

Make no mistake, the people in question calculate to a nicety just how far they can go, based on their long experience. When the procedures have been completed, they generally have gouged the greatest possible return from the public, ceased operations, and transferred their activity to other, greener fields under different assumed names. The protectors of the public are left literally holding the bag—an empty mail bag—from which a handsome profit has been reaped by these public enemies.

It is like waiting until the ball game is over before the umpire can call a player out at home plate in the first inning.

My chief concern, which I know is shared by every other Member of the House, is with the effect of this repulsive traffic on the youth of America. The Post Office Department has thousands upon thousands of examples of the most horrible kind of filth that right now is going through the mails to children and adolescents because the Postmaster General is without adequate means to put a stop to it. Leaders in church, school, civic, and youth organizations—qualified experts in the field—informed our committee that the marked increase in juvenile delinquency goes hand in hand with the increase in distribution of such materials, and that it is no coincidence.

Last year saw the greatest increase in history in arrests for postal crimes. No one should be surprised that the highest increase was in arrests for mailing obscene and unfit material—a 54-percent increase in just 1 year. Punchcards, pushcards, and similar gaming devices undoubtedly have contributed an unfortunate share toward the wrong path for unnumbered thousands of our youth.

I am not particularly an alarmist or one who is so old that he believes the youth of today is going to pot or is worse than the youth of my day. I do say that in my day we had a better measure of protection against having immorality crammed down our throats, at least through the United States mails. We owe our children of today and tomorrow nothing less than the restoration of this same measure of protection—a measure which will be provided by my bill.

Again, I repeat that this bill creates no new crime or penalty. It very carefully spells out full and adequate remedies, through the United States courts, for anyone whose mail may be impounded and who feels that this is unjust.

The Postmaster General is authorized to issue a temporary order, which is good for 20 days, to detain mail addressed to anyone who is found to be using the mails illegally. The order will expire unless continued by a United States court upon petition by the Postmaster General. Immediate notice of the order and petition is furnished the adverse party, who may appear and show cause for lifting the order. The court will decide on the basis of the evidence.

The person whose mail is detained may examine his mail and receive any part of it that is not related to the question of illegal use of the mails.

This certainly provides full protection of the rights of any mailer against arbitrary, discriminatory, or unjust detention of his mail. There is no hardship imposed on anyone. There is very needed protection for the public.

I believe that this legislation has the wholehearted support of every father and mother, of every clear-thinking American. It has the concurrence of the American Bar Association. I intend to press for early action on my bill, and sincerely trust that the membership will give its approval when it is considered.

AMENDMENT TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT TO REGULATE TRANSPORTATION OF MIGRATORY FARM LABOR

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to regulate interstate transportation of migratory farm labor.

One of the abuses frequently accompanying the interstate recruitment of workers is the transportation of farm workers for long distances by private motor carriers under conditions so crowded as to be unsafe, unhealthful, and insanitary. The President's Committee on Migratory Labor has prepared model regulations for recommended adoption by the States to control the intrastate transportation of migrant farmworkers. There is no existing authority, however, for the adoption of similar regulations designed to control the interstate transportation of workers by private carriers. The transportation of migrant workers by their employers, or by labor contractors engaged in the business of recruiting and furnishing workers and who furnish transportation as an incident to their main business of recruiting workers, is construed to be the private carriage of passengers and not subject to regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act. This is true whether the worker pays a fee for the transportation or not.

The draft bill would amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to give the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to regulate the equipment and operation of vehicles used in interstate transportation of migrant farmworkers. As in the case of common carriers and others presently subject to ICC control, the bill does not set forth specific standards to be observed but leaves such matters to the promulgation of regulations by the Commission. The definition of a "carrier of migrant workers by motor vehicle" is modeled after the definition of a "private carrier" in the regulations proposed by the President's Committee on Migratory Labor. The definition of the term "migrant worker" in the draft bill is based on the concept of workers employed in agriculture under the Mexican farm labor program.

In addition to granting the Commission authority to act, the draft bill would exclude transportation of migrant workers from the scope of any exemption contained in section 203 (b) of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act. However, the bill would not apply to workers transporting their immediate families or to the transportation of migrant workers in passenger automobiles or station wagons. The limitation of the definition of a "carrier of migrant workers" to one who transports three or more passengers is designed to prevent the bill's application to a truck operator who transports one or two neighbors or an occasional hitchhiker in the cab of his truck.

Section 3 of the bill would preserve existing overtime benefits under the Fair Labor Standards Act for employees made subject by the bill to the Commission's power to establish qualifications and maximum hours of service.

A CORPORATE TAX BILL FOR SMALL AND INDEPENDENT BUSINESS

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great deterrents to the growth and survival of small and independent business is the heavy tax burden which such business has had to bear in the past. In the 83d Congress, it was my privilege to serve as chairman of the subcommittee on taxation of the Select Committee on Small Business. Several of our recommendations, which were based on the hearings and testimony of small-business men who appeared before our committee, were incorporated in the internal revenue revision of 1954. However, it was recognized by our subcommittee that a formula should be found which would permanently provide incentives for the entry of new small and independent businesses in the market place, and also provide an opportunity for expansion and growth of all types of small enterprises.

Recently the Small Defense Industries Association forwarded me a proposed plan which, in my opinion, has much merit. I commend it to all Members of Congress who are sincerely interested in the welfare of small business.

Today I have introduced a bill designed to revise our corporate tax structure in conformance with the suggested plan of this association. In addition, I shall request the members of the tax subcommittee who served with me in the 83d Congress to consider the introduction of companion bills. In fact, I would welcome the sponsorship of all members who are inclined to go along with the principles outlined in this bill. I am confident that businessmen in Connecticut and New England will also find much merit in the proposal which I shall set forth below. The Smaller Business Association of New England has shown a great deal of interest in all pending, as well as past, tax proposals in the interest of small business. I commend my bill to them for study and comment.

In the bill which I have introduced, there would be no so-called normal and surtax rates. All corporations would pay income taxes on the following basis:

Taxable net income	*Corporate rates*
Up to $5,000	10 percent of the taxable income
Over $5,000 and up to and including $25,000	$500, plus 20 percent of excess over $5,000
Over $25,000 and up to and including $100,000	$4,500, plus 40 percent of excess over $25,000
Over $100,000	$34,500, plus 54 percent of excess over $100,000

Although my bill, as introduced, provides that the above rates will prevail on a continuing basis after March 31, 1956, it is realized that a time will come when it will be not only possible but highly desirable to reduce all corporate tax rates. The present 30 percent normal rate, of course, was increased several years ago from 25 percent. The 30 percent normal rate, with a 22 percent surtax rate, has been continued from year to year because of defense requirements. It is to be hoped that after this year it will be possible to proportionately reduce the schedule of rates set out in my bill. As pointed out in the Summary of the Small Defense Industries Association, the additional 2 percent—54 percent instead of the present 52 percent—would affect corporations earning in excess of $700,000. However, the benefits to be derived from the general impetus given to small-business concerns by properly graduated tax rates should, in our considerations, outweigh the small increase to be charged against corporations in the top earning brackets. At this point I desire to include some of the pertinent points set out by the Small Defense Industries Association in making their tax proposal to me. They are as follows:

A revised corporate tax structure, with a minimum rate of 10 percent applying to the first $5,000 of earnings and a temporary increase of 2 percent to be paid by companies earning in excess of $700,000 per year.

The association is taking the stand that a major adjustment is needed to restore incentive for investment in smaller companies and to give small and medium-sized firms an opportunity to use earnings for growth and stability.

Under the proposal (1) total Federal revenue from corporate taxes would remain at present levels, (2) all companies earning less than $700,000 would enjoy some amount of tax saving, with greatest savings concentrated in the smallest brackets, and (3) less than 1 percent of all corporations would pay even a temporary increase.

The stimulus to new business, creating new taxpayers and more revenue, will quickly offset the temporary losses in Federal revenue caused by the reductions in the lower brackets, it is believed. Thus, the top rate increase is merely a stopgap to assure that currently needed revenue will not be lost.

Here are a few comparisons of tax payments for given levels of earnings at current rates and the proposal of the Small Defense Industries Association:

	Would pay at current rates—	Would pay at SDIA proposed rates—
"A company earning:		
$4,000	$1,200	$400
$22,000	6,600	3,900
$40,000	15,300	10,500
$90,000	41,300	30,500
$250,000	124,500	115,500
$700,000	358,500	358,500
$1,000,000	513,500	520,500
$5,000,000	2,594,500	2,680,500"

Incidentally, based on reports secured from the United States Treasury, the Small Defense Industries Association points out that companies in the income class of $0 to $25,000 constitute 79 percent of the whole, although the earnings of these corporations are only 4 percent of the total corporate income. Companies in the income class of $25,000 to $100,000 constitute 13.6 percent of the whole, with earnings of 8 percent of the total corporate income. The income class of $100,000 and over includes only 7.4 percent of all corporations, but they enjoy 88 percent of all corporate income. Therefore, it is apparent that the greatest tax relief is needed in the income class of $0 to $25,000, but that all corporations with as much as $100,000 earnings are in critical need of tax reduction.

The figures just given do not include 213,000 companies which had deficits in the year 1951. They constituted about one-third of the total corporate entities.

To continue the comment of the Small Defense Industries Association:

The reason such good incentive reductions can be made to the small and medium firms, without a drastic increase in rates applied to the very large firms, stems from the odd distribution of total corporate income, a distribution which is just the reverse of the personal income picture.

LARGEST COMPANIES HAVE LION'S SHARE OF CORPORATE EARNINGS

Treasury Department figures show that 85 percent of all personal income is earned by people who make less than $10,000 and this represents 97 percent of all individual taxpayers. But 85 to 90 percent of all corporate income is earned by a relative handful of companies, the 7 to 8 percent of all corporations which make over $100,000 per year.

Even in this latter group, there are 6 out of 7 in the small- and medium-sized category, companies which have a difficult time providing for adequate working capital and sufficient cushion to carry over lean years. Out of 652,376 active corporations in 1951, there were only 8,215 (approximately 1.2 percent) which made over $500,000. Yet the combined earnings of this group amounted to $35.2 billion out of the total corporate earnings for all companies of $45.3 billion.

PUNITIVE TAXATION WOULD BE DISASTROUS

In spite of the great disparity in the distribution of corporate earnings, it is felt that nothing would be more harmful than to impose punitive rates on these largest companies.

Strangely, United States Treasury records show the biggest shift of corporate income (from the smalls and mediums to the ultra-large) took place when excess profits taxes were in effect.

What appears to happen is a dangerous shift in psychology. When the largest companies are faced with payment to the Treasury of the greatest portion of their earnings, they place no limits on risktaking or waste. Each advertising campaign, each new competitive venture is weighed on the basis that the worst mistake can only cost a fraction of its price—the Government would get the rest of the money, anyhow.

The present maximum is 52 percent. In fairness, we would like to see it remain at that level, or be reduced. But a temporary increase of 2 percent, which amounts to a net increase only on those firms earning over $700,000, is not likely to bring a mass change in policies. Neither can it be considered punitive.

Much more important, we believe, is the tremendous boost to the entire economy which can be obtained by the benefits to the 99 percent of other corporations which constitute the great part of our free-enterprise system.

BENEFITS TO THE ECONOMY

Investment counselors have pointed out that an investor considering whether to put money in General Motors, or in a small firm, now has little reason to choose the small. The current rates of taxation on large and small firms are so close that there is no hope for a relatively better return from the small firm—no chance for extra return to offset the increase in risk.

The opportunity for growth in small firms is equally limited. For example, a No. 5 turret lathe, a standard piece of equipment required by most machine shops, costs between $16,000 and $20,000, depending on tooling. Yet, a small manufacturer who makes a profit of $25,000 does not have enough left after taxes to purchase a single machine.

It is obvious that any minor reduction in low-income bracket taxes will not solve this problem. The need is for a shift of sufficient impact to stop the trend in which the big get bigger, the small smaller.

Most of us are convinced that no kind of antitrust legislation or action can bring about the change. We believe the smalls cannot be helped by striking at the large. And we also believe that the punitive approach can be carried to the danger point of imposing statism on our economy.

By contrast, the tax approach is the incentive approach. Minimum taxes on small and growing firms place a premium on independence and defeat the attractions of merger.

Some may question the proposed minimum rate of 10 percent on the first $5,000 of earnings. We feel it should be kept in mind that earnings returned to an investor in a company of this size are still taxed twice—first, as corporate earnings, second, when they reach the investor in the form of personal income.

Many smaller operations have avoided the corporate form of organization merely because of this double taxation. With a rate of 10 percent, the incentive to form new corporations is greatly increased. There will be more corporations and more total taxes.

GROWTH IS FOSTERED

Many small-business men have commented on what they call the critical years—the period in which a small firm has demonstrated its skill, has attracted new business, but lacks the money to finance the handling of this new business. It is this time when small firms are most likely to succumb to the inducements of merger—the time when they lose their independence.

A review of many recent mergers indicates two basic types which take place. One is the sale of a company that has been losing money. The other is most likely to be the absorption of a company which has reached an earnings level in the $25,000 to $100,000 bracket, but has not enough left after taxes to stay independent.

Only the opportunity to retain enough out of these earnings to provide adequate working capital can give these small and medium companies the chance to survive.

It is the increased incentive to start new companies—providing more jobs—plus the increased opportunity to remain independent, which we see as the major benefits to the economy if this proposal is adopted.

SUMMARY

Most SDIA members who have expressed themselves on the tax problem agree there is nothing to be gained through punitive taxes on the large companies, but they see an extreme need for a major shift in incentives.

It is felt this shift can only be accomplished by a graduated tax scale with high incentive supplied by much lower rates on the smallest companies, plus health-giving reductions for those firms in the median range.

Four things seem to be outstanding in our proposal:

1. The reductions to the smallest firms are sufficiently great to provide incentives which are most needed to offset the tendency for the smalls to get smaller.

2. Firms earning less than $700,000 per year will have some amount of tax reduction, but the concentrated area of saving applies in the smaller brackets where retention of earnings is most important to provide for growth.

3. The yields to the Federal Treasury are adequate without punitive rates being imposed on any corporation.

4. Less than 1 percent of all corporations will face an actual tax increase—and the maximum increase is only 2 percent on those earnings in excess of $700,000 per year.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the debate on the farm bill is on in the Senate and one Senator informed me this morning that terrific pressure is being exerted by the White House to eliminate the 90 percent of parity which the Senate Agricultural Committee had inserted in the bill. It is apparent, therefore, that President Eisenhower is determined to let the family-type farmers in North Dakota and elsewhere in the West shift for themselves. Many Republican Members of Congress thought that if Eisenhower consented to run again it would help them in the Farm Belt. In my judgment, the final result will be that, in States like North Dakota, Montana, South Dakota, and Iowa, Republican Congressmen will have a rough time in their campaigns for reelection.

The administration is responsible for the renting of Indian reservations to large corporate interests whose fields of wheat extend for miles. This kind of farming operations is responsible for surpluses. While the sky is the limit on these Government-leased farms, the small farmer in North Dakota who lives on his farm is so curtailed in acreage that even with abnormally large yields, he has not acres enough from which he can make a living.

The soil bank, heralded as a lifesaver, means just this. The small acreage allotment meted out to the farmer will be further reduced by taking some of these scarce acres out of production. That limits the crop acreage more. Of course, the plan carries with it the promise to pay the farmer for not growing wheat at the rate of 70 percent of parity on what he could have raised. That argument runs around in a circle and gets nowhere for the net result will be that in the end the total money received will not be enough to support a family of five, no matter what the yield is.

The farmers, small-business merchants, in fact all businesses in North Dakota, which depend entirely on agriculture, do not want the family-type farm to disappear. I am also sure that the State Republican party does not want this situation to develop. With the President hammering hard today to eliminate the 90 percent of parity from the Senate bill, you can see at once that the candidacy of Eisenhower in North Dakota will hurt and not help Republican Members in Congress who are up for reelection.

TAXATION OF INCOME OF INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7201) relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "of" and insert "for."

Page 6, line 5, strike out "(g)" and insert "(d)."

Page 7, line 7, strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)."

Page 7, line 11, strike out "(g)" and insert "(d)."

Page 8, line 17, strike out "(g)" and insert "(d)."

Page 8, line 18, strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)."

Page 8, line 25, strike out "(g)" and insert "(d)."

Page 9, lines 8 and 9, strike out "this paragraph" and insert "paragraph (1) of this subsection."

Page 14, strike out lines 3 to 22, inclusive, and insert:

"'(a) General rule: Except as provided in subsection (b), for purposes of this subpart the term "reserve and other policy liability deduction" means the sum of the amounts determined by applying the following percentages to the excess of the net investment income over the net investment income allocable to nonlife insurance reserves (determined under subsection (d)):

"'(1) 87.5 percent of so much of such excess as does not exceed $1 million; and

"'(2) 85 percent of so much of such excess as exceeds $1 million."

Page 14, strike out all after line 22 over to and including line 7 on page 15.

Page 15, line 8, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)."

Page 15, line 20, strike out "and."

Page 16, line 3, strike out "section 804 (g) (2) (A)," and insert "subsection (d) (2) (A)); and."

"'(E) in the case of a mutual assessment life insurance company or association, the amount equal to 2 times whichever of the following is the lesser: (i) the amount of the net investment income on life insurance reserves described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 801 (b) (3), or (ii) 3 percent of the life insurance reserves so described."

Page 16, lines 24 and 25, strike out "of the means described in" and insert "obtained under."

Page 18, line 4, strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)."

Page 18, line 11, strike out "(g)" and insert "(d)."

Page 19, line 8, strike out "subsection, or in applying subsection (a)," and insert "subsection."

Page 19, strike out all after line 13 over to and including line 12 on page 23.

Page 23, line 13, strike out "(g)" and insert "(d)."

Page 27, line 5, strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)."

Page 28, lines 6 and 7, strike out "other than taxable years with respect to which a tax is imposed by section 802."

Page 29, line 6, strike out all after "this" down to and including line 12 and insert "section—

"'(1) in lieu of the reduction of the net investment income provided in paragraphs (3) (A) and (4) (A) of section 805 (a), the net investment income shall be reduced by the amount of the adjustment for certain reserves provided in section 813, and

"'(2) in lieu of subtracting the amount provided in paragraph (2) of section 805 (b), subtract 50 percent of the amount of the adjustment for certain reserves provided in section 813.

Page 30, line 16, strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)."

Page 31, line 13, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)."

Page 33, line 5, strike out all after "If" down to and including "if" in line 7.

Page 33, line 8, strike out "4" and insert "9."

Page 33, line 9, strike out "such"

Page 33, line 9, after "business", insert "as an insurance company."

Page 33, line 13, after "(B)", insert "(i)."

Page 33, line 14, after "reserves", insert "and (ii) the special reduction for dividends received provided by subsection (c)."

Page 33, line 16, after "exceed", insert "(A)."

Page 33, line 18, after "holders", insert, "reduced by (B) the special reduction for dividends received provided by subsection (c)."

Page 34, line 6, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)."

Page 34, strike out lines 7 to 12, inclusive, and insert:

"(c) Special rule for dividends received: The reduction referred to in paragraph (1) (B) (ii) and in paragraph (2) (B) of subsection (a) shall be an amount computed under section 804 (b) (3), except that, for purposes of such computation, the maximum limitation referred to in section 804 (b) (3) (B) (ii) shall be—"

Page 34, line 18, after "come" insert "(computed without regard to the reduction provided by this subsection)."

Page 34, line 24, after "income" insert "(computed without regard to the reduction provided by this subsection)."

Page 41, after line 6, insert:

"SEC. 7. Savings provisions.

"In the case of any taxpayer subject to tax under section 802 or 807 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as such sections were in effect before the enactment of this act), no addition to the tax shall be made under section 6655 of such Code (relating to failure by corporation to pay estimated tax) with respect to estimated tax for a taxable year beginning in 1955. In the case of any taxpayer subject to tax under section 821 of such Code (imposing a tax on certain mutual insurance companies), any addition to the tax under section 6655 of such Code with respect to estimated tax for a taxable year beginning in 1955 shall in no case be larger than such addition would have been if this act had not been enacted."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as you will recall, H. R. 7201 is designed to provide a new formula for the taxation of life-insurance companies.

The House bill would have continued to tax life-insurance companies on their investment income only and, as in the past, would have allowed life-insurance companies a flat deduction against investment income in computing taxable income, in lieu of specific deductions for interest paid and interest credited to life-insurance reserves. The reserve and other policy liability deduction permitted under the House bill would have been computed as 85 percent of net investment income allocable to regular life-insurance business, but, for the first time, H. R. 7201 would have permitted the deduction to vary with the type of life-insurance business for which the reserves were held by the life-insurance company. Thus, the House bill would have amended section 804 of the 1954 code to provide a reserve and other policy liability deduction against investment income of 92½ percent of the net investment income allocable to pension-plan reserves and 90 percent of such income allocable to reserves for annuity contracts and deposits, plus 85 percent of so much of the balance of investment income not allocable to non-life-insurance reserves.

These formula provisions would have applied only to the taxable year 1955 under the House bill. However, the bill contained provisions which would have raised the reserve and other policy liability deduction allocable to pension-plan reserves and to annuity reserves to 100 percent and 95 percent, respectively, in the taxable year 1960. Extension of such treatment to taxable years beginning after 1955 would have required additional legislation.

The Senate amendment to this provision of the House bill eliminates all references to taxable years after 1955 and deletes the special deductions allocable to pension and annuity business. This amendment also provides a larger reserve and other policy liability deduction largely beneficent to small life-insurance companies which will be computed at 87½ percent of the first $1 million of net investment income allocable to life insurance reserves and 85 percent of the balance allocable to such reserves.

The House bill amended sections 801 and 804 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to improve the definition of "life insurance taxable income" and to prevent abuse of the life insurance provisions by companies which are not entirely life insurance companies. This was accomplished by providing a maximum limitation upon the reserve and other policy liability deduction. This limitation is computed as equal to two times the reserve interest requirements shown on the company's books in connection with reserves held on policies involving life contingencies, plus the amount of certain other interest obligations and dividends to policyholders. The Senate has amended this provision to allow a statutory presumption of reserve interest up to 3 percent in the case of certain mutual assessment life insurance companies which do not have formal reserve interest obligations.

As passed by the House, H. R. 7201 would add a new section 818 to the 1954 code to allow an alternative tax base, relating to total income, for the first 5 years of the operation of a life insurance company, first authorized to do life insurance business before July 1, 1955. This relief device was intended to permit new life insurance companies to take into account any excess of life insurance expenses over premiums in computing taxable income. This would automatically give relief to a new and expanding life insurance company because excess investment income would be taxable only to the extent that it was not used to cover deficits incurred in establishing itself in the life insurance business. The Senate has amended this provision to make it applicable to the first 10 years of the operation of a life insurance company whenever organized.

Because of the time factors involved, life insurance companies were in doubt as to the applicable tax formula to be applied at the time when their estimated tax was payable in September and December of 1955. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue extended the time for filing such declarations of estimated tax until March 15, 1956. However, the Commissioner did not release life insurance companies from the additions to tax provided in the code for failure to pay estimated tax. The Senate has added a new section 7 to the House bill to provide that no additions to tax should be made in this situation.

In addition to the amendments discussed above, the Senate has made several technical and clarifying amendments.

The Treasury Department has given its approval to the amendments made by the Senate. I urge the House to accept the Senate amendments.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7201 in the form passed by the other body provides a tax on life-insurance companies for the year 1955. It incorporates the basic principles of the bill which passed the House in the last session. However, the House bill was permanent in nature while the bill as amended applies only to the year 1955.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has explained in detail the technical provisions of the bill as well as the Senate amendments. I shall not endeavor to repeat his explanation and simply wish to state that we have no objection to the Senate amendments.

I would like to point out that this legislation is the outgrowth of a subcommittee which I appointed in 1954, as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, to make a thorough study of the problems involved in developing a permanent method for the taxation of life-insurance companies. Representative CURTIS of Missouri was chairman of that subcommittee, and under his leadership that group made a tremendous contribution toward the solution of this very difficult problem. The ranking minority member of the subcommittee at that time was Representative MILLS, and the two of them have continued to work together on this matter. I believe that they in particular, as well as the other members of the subcommittee, deserve great recognition for their work in this field.

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I am today dropping in the hopper a bill which would improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers and amend the Bankhead-Jomes Farm Tenant Act.

I hope the Members who are interested in using the facilities of the Farmers' Home Administration to assist their farmers to secure immediate and necessary credit, so that they may continue their farming operations, will read this bill carefully and give the Committee on Agriculture every assistance possible in bringing this legislation out on the floor and passing it just as quickly as possible.

Copies of the bill will be available immediately.

This bill will directly affect the loans on family-type farms and will enable the farmers to carry on successful farming of a type which the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary.

I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a detailed explanation of the provisions of the bill and I hope you will study it carefully.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, if there is one requisite to the preservation of our republican form of government it is the integrity of our electoral process.

Taint or abuse that process and you will help to split asunder the bedrock which supports our most cherished institutions.

By and large we have had honest elections. This fact is attributable, however, to the basic probity of the American people and to the personal integrity of most candidates rather than to Federal laws governing campaign contributions and expenditures—for these are so loosely drawn as to permit, if not encourage, deception, and dishonesty.

It is not my purpose to catalog here all of the shortcomings and inherent weaknesses of these statutes for the American people as well as Members of Congress know and are rightly concerned about them.

I do, however, have a proposal which in my judgment would eliminate certain basic weaknesses and advance us in some degree at least in the direction of a higher political morality. Of this proposal I shall speak later and in some detail.

No one familiar with them can deny that modern political campaigns are extremely expensive or that campaign contributions are necessary. The costs involved in radio, television, and all the other essentials of a campaign simply cannot be assumed by most candidates.

Unless we adhere to the ugly and outworn creed that one's pocketbook should be the key to his political success we are forced to recognize the need for campaign contributions.

However, the character and nature of such contributions is a matter for genuine public concern. It would be ideal of course if all who made political contributions were motivated either by a desire to espouse a philosophy of government or because of admiration and respect for the qualities and abilities of individual candidates.

But if we are to be realistic we should recognize that until we become a society of altruists some contributions are going to be made on a purely quid pro quo basis and it is with this that we must be primarily concerned.

A Senator or Member of the House owes his election to the suffrage of his constituents. By them and by his conscience he is called to answer for his word and acts. This has been the design of our political fabric for over 150 years.

However, certain influences have tended to alter that pattern. Not content with limiting their representation in Congress to Senators and Members of the House from their own State, as the Constitution intended, they have participated, directly or indirectly, in the choice and election of candidates in nearby and distant States.

In many instances these influences have been well intentioned and have not been motivated by any thought of specific advantages which might accrue to them. In others, however, a willingness to exchange coin for the promise or in the hope that a candidate would advance or protect their own special interests has been clearly evident.

The latter cannot be justified on any grounds and with respect to the former it is my sincere conviction that citizens of one State should not be permitted to influence the nomination or election of candidates in another State.

Neither do I believe that an individual or group should have the right to make political contributions through a second party. For not only does this conceal the identity of the real contributor, it also affords an opportunity for circumventing the statutory limitations relating to such contributions.

It is for these and other reasons that I have introduced a bill to amend some of the laws relating to political contributions and expenditures. This is not a cure-all but it appears to me to be more practical and realistic in its approach to certain major aspects of the question than are some other proposals presently being considered.

This proposal would prohibit any person from making a political contribution to or on behalf of any candidate seeking nomination or election outside the contributor's own State for the office of United States Senator or Representative in Congress. The same prohibition would apply with respect to candidates for office of presidential elector in States other than that of the contributor. There would be no prohibition, however, against contributing to presidential and vice presidential candidates since the proposal specifically permits contributions to or on behalf of candidates with respect to which elections are conducted within the State in which the person making the contribution resides.

Although under the electoral college system of choosing the President and Vice President, the voters throughout the States do not vote directly for the President but rather vote for electors, the office of President is an office with respect to which elections are conducted within, say, every State. Hence the candidates for office of President and Vice President would be the only candidates for Federal office to whom a person could make a contribution other than to the candidates for Senator and Representative from his own State.

Likewise the proposal would prohibit various committees formed but not associated with one of our national parties throughout the country from making contributions to influence the nomination or election of Senators and Representatives in States other than where the committee is located. There, of course, would be no prohibition against activities of a local organized committee in a State making contributions so long as its activities are confined to elections within the State and are in conformity with the provisions of existing law.

My proposal would exempt National, State, and local committees which are adjuncts of a national political party from the prohibitions against interstate political donations. This exemption can be fully justified for several reasons.

First, no national political party organization or any adjunct thereof contributes financially or otherwise to those seeking the party nominations in the several States.

Moreover, this would result in a more extensive channeling of campaign funds through legitimate political committees. Such committees are required under the law to file reports of their contributions and expenditures while other committees professing to be educational and nonpolitical in nature sometimes do not consider themselves so obligated.

"Who gave it" is a question often asked with respect to campaign money and all too frequently unanswered. The second major feature of my proposal would make it a violation of law for any person to make a political contribution out of funds made available to him for that purpose without disclosing at the time the contribution is made the name of the person who made such funds so available.

Recent events which transpired in connection with the natural gas bill indicate the great need for such a provision in order to protect candidates for Federal office as well as the public at large.

The "who gave it" provision will be applicable to contributions made to national political parties and adjuncts thereof, but will not apply to contributions made by them. The House committee having jurisdiction over this proposal may, after study, conclude that this exemption should be further extended to cover other groups and organizations.

An important ethical question facing the American people today involves the financing of political campaigns. I sincerely believe that the proposal which I have outlined will partially answer this important question.

I am sorry the House rules will not permit me to include at this point the text of provisions of existing law which would be amended by various provisions of my bill accompanied by new matter underscored for emphasis.

Any Member of the House who so desires may obtain this in mimeographed form from my office.

ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF THE EXISTING CORPORATE NORMAL TAX RATE

Mr. COOPER, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 9166) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates (Rept. No. 1860), which was read a first and second time, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

EQUAL PAY FOR COMPARABLE WORK

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. Similar bills were introduced earlier this week in the Senate by the Honorable IRVING IVES, of New York, and in the House by the Honorable CARROLL KEARNS, of Pennsylvania.

As many of you know, I have been working on "equal pay" legislation for many years. But this year there is a renewed emphasis on this subject. President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message stated:

> Legislation to apply the principle of equal pay for equal work without discrimination because of sex is a matter of simple justice.

The bill I am introducing today is designed to carry out this recommendation of the President.

From my experience in this field—and I introduced my first equal pay bill in January 1954 after an extensive nationwide survey of expert opinion—this bill seems the most realistic and practical way to approach the problem.

It is eminently fair and will be of great benefit to all concerned: employees—both men and women, employers, and the general consumers.

This legislation could:

First, eliminate many labor disputes caused by discriminatory wage practices—a benefit that should be of special interest to employers.

Second, lessen unfair competition among employers. Many employers are now paying women equal rates with men, through their own choice or because of State equal pay laws. These employers are now at a disadvantage when trying to compete with employers who pay women less.

Third, raise living standards of all workers and their dependents.

Fourth, contribute to maximum labor force efficiency and flexibility.

Fifth, increase the prestige of the United States among the nations of the world.

Sixth, but above all else, grant justice to women workers who represent about a third of the Nation's labor force.

This legislation should gain the support of both parties, since both the Republican and Democratic Parties have had equal pay planks in their platforms for many years. I am hoping also that it will get the full support of the National Equal Pay Committee, and organizations, representing women labor, and civic groups which are devoted to the principle of equal pay for women.

Let me set forth briefly the provisions of my bill, the overall purpose of which is to provide a means within the scope of the Federal regulatory power to eliminate discrimination in wage rates based on sex where men and women are performing comparable work for the same employers.

Briefly, this bill—

First. Authorizes the Secretary of Labor to determine standards to measure work of a comparable nature, prescribe rules and regulations, make investigations regarding compliance with the act, issue subpenas, and restrain violations.

Second. Provides that employers who violate the act shall be liable for wages for which an employee is deprived and for not more than an additional equal amount as liquidated damages.

Third. Permits employees to bring suit to recover any wages deprived of by reason of such discrimination, or authorizes the Secretary of Labor to bring suit in behalf of such employee or employees.

Fourth. Requires employers to post copy of act or official poster explaining its provisions in each place of employment where act applies.

Fifth. Makes it unlawful to discharge or discriminate against any employee assisting in the enforcement of the act.

Sixth. Provides that United States district courts will have jurisdiction to restrain violations of the act.

Although 16 States and the Territory of Alaska have adopted equal pay laws, experience has shown that the limited orbit of these State laws cannot right a wrong that is nationwide in its extent. Today, practically all American business and industry touches on interstate commerce. As very few businesses or industries operate on a strictly intrastate basis, broad, uniform, countrywide legislation would seem to be needed.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Education and Labor and the House of Representatives will take action on this legislation without delay.

THE GALLUP POLL

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I note the current exuberance of the Republican Party is reflected in Dr. George Gallup's poll on the relative standing of President Eisenhower and Governor Stevenson. I fact, I doubt the poll would have shown much greater optimism for the Republican cause had it been taken by the Republican National Committee.

Before the readers get completely carried away, however, Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully refer to an earlier poll, at one time a respected poll, conducted by the Literary Digest. That organization predicted a Republican victory in 1936, when that party actually carried only two States. In a little more than a year the Literary Digest was out of business.

Dr. Gallup does not count the votes of the American people. He only guesses at them. His guesses have not heretofore been infallible.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. For the information of the House, will the gentleman tell us what the poll is about, and what it shows as between the two candidates?

Mr. SIKES. I am sure the gentleman has read the poll and is familiar with it.

Mr. MARTIN. However, some people may not have read it.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE BENSON

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I noticed a story in the New York Times of recent date to the effect that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, had called in some Members of Congress and offered to raise the support price of cotton if they would vote against the 90-percent plan and support his flexible plan.

May I point out that there are laws on the statute books against any employee of the Federal Government, and that includes cabinet members, offering any Member of Congress anything for his vote. That law carries a penalty clause. I suggest that that report would be a proper subject for investigation by the Committee on the Judiciary with a view towards impeachment if it is true.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I would suggest that the gentleman send the names of the men who he thinks have been influenced by the offer of additional revenue for cotton to the proper authorities.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I will send the article.

Mr. MARTIN. Send the names, not the article.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. It has the names in it.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I do not believe the gentleman stated they were influenced. He said the Secretary attempted to influence them.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is right, attempted; and an attempt is just as much a violation of the law as if he succeeds.

REVISION OF CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I observed this morning that we are already warming up for the campaign. I think this is an appropriate time to suggest that we do something this year about revising our Corrupt Practices Act—the ground rules governing Federal elections. It has not been changed since 1925, as all of you gentlemen know, and it is really meaningless as far as regulation of our elections is concerned. Too, it is an election code which is wholly outmoded and takes no account of the impact of radio and television on present-day campaigning.

On the Senate side, the majority and minority leaders, Senator JOHNSON and Senator KNOWLAND, and 63 other Members of the Senate have joined in cosponsoring a bipartisan bill to modernize our Corrupt Practices Act. I introduced this bipartisan bill on the House side last week—H. R. 9668. And last year I sponsored an earlier measure—H. R. 3139—that has almost identical provisions.

I hope the House bill this year will not be neglectful, and that if our brethren on the Senate side act we, too, will act to modernize our election rules so that we can have a good, clean, hard-fought campaign this fall.

NATIONAL HOLIDAY ON PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION DAY

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, with all these remarks about the coming campaign, I would like to inform my colleagues that I am about to drop into the hopper a resolution providing that the day on which the presidential election is held shall be a legal holiday. I do that after having some reaction to an earlier resolution providing that Inauguration Day be a legal holiday. Some of this reaction has been that "we would be delighted to celebrate the inauguration but we would like to have time off from work to be sure to vote in the election."

With that in mind I am offering this resolution so that every American citizen will find time to participate in the coming presidential election. I hope my colleagues will respond with help before the Committee on the Judiciary in getting this bill passed.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield.

Mr. AYRES. In connection with the election and in answer to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] I do not think he should be too concerned about the polls going on. Having been wrong in 1952, he is likely to be just as wrong in 1956, but I am quite certain that Gallup will prove to be correct in the present prognostication.

Mr. SADLAK. I thank the gentleman for his observation and I join in his prognostication.

SUSPENSION OF THE RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on Tuesday for the Speaker to recognize the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to move to suspend the rules and consider the bill H. R. 9166.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRIME MINISTER OF IRELAND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the membership that on Thursday next, March 15, the Prime Minister of Ireland will be the guest of the House.

GENERAL AGREEMENTS ON TRADES AND TARIFFS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 or 3 weeks I have, through the medium of special orders, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a complete explanation of the general agreement on trades and tariffs and the proposed new organization known as the Organization for Trade Cooperation. I still have one of the articles before the series is completed, which I desire to place in the RECORD today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the special order of today my brief before the Ways and Means Committee of yesterday objecting to H. R. 5550, which would take the United States definitely into the general agreement on tariffs and trades.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, GATT—the international General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—is the present culmination of the State Department's trade-agreements program. Dramatic figures are often cited to demonstrate the supposed success of this program in opening foreign markets to American producers. The facts behind the figures discredit this claim.

An astonishing survey, showing selected figures for exports in 1937, before the trade-agreements program was well under way, and in 1953, 16 years and two wars later, was recently prepared for the House Ways and Means Committee. It appears as appendix C to that committee's recent report on H. R. 1, the bill extending the Trade Agreements Act for 3 more years. It cites, as evidence of success of the trade-agreements program, an increase of 7,500 percent in exports to Iceland, 1,800 percent to Austria, 1,000 percent to Venezuela, and so on.

Many other forces, however, vastly more important than the trade-agreements program, were at work during this period. Indeed, read in the light of these other developments, the figures show that trade agreements had little or nothing to do with changes in the value of United States exports. They reveal instead that the trade-agreements program has been accompanied by a substantial net decline in exports to key markets like Great Britain.

First. Change in value of the dollar: The figures refer only to the dollar value of exports. Between 1937 and 1953, however, the purchasing power of the dollar dropped by 40 percent—National Industrial Conference Board, Consumer's Prices, 1914–53. Thus discounted, for example, the value of exports to the United Kingdom dropped from $579 million in 1937 to $418 million in 1953. Yet the survey, comparing 1937 and 1953 dollars as equal, reported an increase of 20.5 percent.

Exports to three other countries cited in the survey also, when measured in standard dollars, show a net decline. These are: Argentina, from $94 million to $63 million; New Zealand, from $23 million to $19 million; Sweden, from $64 million to $61 million.

Second. Rise in gross national product: Gross national product, expressed in standard dollars—1939 equals 100—rose from $87 billion in 1937 to $200 billion in 1953, an increase of approximately 125 percent. Measured likewise in standard dollars, exports to 10 of the countries cited in the survey, while showing some increase, lagged behind this increase in gross national product.

These are: Australia, from $73 million to $80 million, or plus only 10 percent; Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg and dependencies, reported together, from $245 million to $382 million, or plus only 69 percent; Denmark, from $17 to $23 million, or plus only 35 percent; Finland, from $12 million to $13 million, or plus less than 9 percent; France and dependencies, from $174 million to $235 million, or plus only 36 per-

cent; Germany, from $122 to $209 million, or plus only 73 percent; Norway, from $22 million to $39 million, or plus only 80 percent; and Union of South Africa, from $88 million to $124 million, or plus only 81 percent.

Third. Foreign aid: Where there was any real increase in exports it was in most instances financed not by trade but by the American taxpayer.

Thus, in the case of Iceland, the prize 7,500-percent example, the United States has spent $160 million on Iceland's economic infrastructure, and pledged $200 million more for a naval base—C. L. Sulzberger, New York Times, August 3, 1955. No wonder United States exports to Iceland jumped from $174,000 in 1937 to $13 million—$7.8 million in standard dollars—in 1953.

To trace the precise connection between American aid and the change in the value of exports, country by country, taking into account the declining value of the dollar each year, would be a prodigious statistical undertaking. But total grants and loans to countries listed in the survey amounted to at least $35 billion by the end of 1953. This money could, in the last analysis, be spent for nothing but goods and services from the United States. It was an enormously more potent factor in stimulating exports than any passing concessions in tariff rates wrung out of these countries by trade agreement negotiations.

Fourth. Basic economic change: The survey shows an increase of 1,000 percent in exports to Venezuela, from $46 million in 1937 to $510 million—$306 million in standard dollars—in 1953. But the fact that during this period Venezuela developed a flood of oil, most of which was sold in the United States, is ignored. Yet the dollars earned by this oil, not the State Department's trade agreement program, truly explain the increase in purchases from the United States.

Even more astonishing are the specific commodity examples cited. These are so-called concession items—that is, items for which the United States is supposed to have received a concession in the tariff rates of the other country. In each case, presumably because of the concession, United States exports to the country in question show a big jump.

It turns out, however, that (a) measured in standard dollars the jump is not so big. For example, the survey reports an increase in the value of automobiles exported to Iran from $2.9 in 1937 to $3.2 million in 1953. This increase, not particularly impressive to begin with, drops to a decrease of $1 million when measured in standard dollars—$3.2 million 1953 dollars were worth only $1.9 1937 dollars; (b) in many cases, the concession was, at best, simply a promise not to raise the existing rate, and in some cases actually represented an increase over existing or just previous rates.

Example 1: The survey cites an increase in exports of raw cotton to Austria from $36,000 in 1937 to $12,465,000 in 1953. But in both 1937 and 1953 raw cotton was on Austria's free list. Basic economic and political factors, including foreign aid, account for the change, not any so-called concession obtained by the State Department.

Example 2: The survey cites an increase in exports of leaf tobacco to Denmark from $670,000 in 1937 to $7,412,000 in 1953. But the only concession obtained by the State Department in negotiations with Denmark was a binding of the existing rate, 2.30 crowns per kilo. Exports apparently just increased on their own, with the help of foreign aid.

Example 3: The survey cites increases in exports to France of raw cotton, from $44 million to $84 million; machine tools from $3.6 to $10.8 million; and oranges from $38,000 to $858,000.

France presents an intriguing case. Raw cotton was on the free list both before and after negotiations. Prior to negotiations the rate on machine tools was 14.4 percent, and on oranges 34.3 percent. On the eve of negotiations, however, France raised these rates to 25 and 40 percent respectively. Then, as the result of hard bargaining by the State Department, she dropped them back to approximately what they were before, a range of 6, 14, and 18 percent on machine tools, mostly 14 and 18 percent on the kinds exported by the United States, and 35 percent on oranges, 25 percent in June, July, and August.

And, regardless of the tariff rate, France also imposes strict quotas on imports of any kind from the United States, taking only those she wants and feels she can pay for at the particular.

It is difficult to see in what respect the alleged concessions obtained by the State Department contributed to the results reported. The fact that by 1953 the United States had loaned or granted France some $5 billion in foreign aid affords a better explanation.

Example 4: The survey cites an increase in exports of automobiles to Peru from $3.3 to $18.7 million.

Prior to negotiations the peruvian rates on automobiles ranged from 4 percent on those valued at not more than $700 to 12 percent on those valued above $3,400. Like France, however, Peru raised her rates on the eve of negotiations. After negotiations the State Department reported:

> Most United States medium priced automobiles were made dutiable at 5 to 8 percent (assessed on CIF value) and, in addition, were to be made subject to the additional duty which was bound at 14.5 percent of the CIF value. Total duty charges will thus range from 19.5 to 22.5 percent.

A concession?

By contrast there are numerous cases in which the State Department has obtained a substantial real concession and, instead of increasing, exports have dropped.

Example A: In 1937 the United States exported $1.7 million worth of passenger cars to Norway. The Norwegian rate on passenger cars was then 50 percent. By GATT negotiations the rate was reduced to 30 percent. Result: export of passenger cars from the United States to Norway in 1953 amounted to only $1 million, worth about $600,000 in 1937 dollars.

Example B: In 1937 the United States exported $5.7 million worth of canned salmon to the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom rate on canned salmon was then 10 percent. By GATT negotiations the rate was cut in half, to 5 percent. Result: exports of canned salmon from the United States to the United Kingdom in 1953 amounted to $3,800, worth about $2,200 in 1937 dollars.

Usually omitted from the story of the trade-agreements program is the curious chapter concerning the course of negotiations with Mexico, a next-door neighbor:

The Mexican agreement was signed December 23, 1942. Our exports to Mexico were then running at about $150 million per year. By 1947 they had risen to more than $600 million per year. In that year, however, Mexico withdrew all concessions. During the next 2 years, while we were trying to work out a settlement, exports dropped to around $500 million per year. Then, on December 31, 1950, we gave up and terminated the agreement. In 1951 exports climbed to $713 million, and each year since have run around $650 million.

By these examples it is obvious that connection between the trade-agreement program and the volume of United States exports is thin indeed. There is simply no neat "cause and effect" relationship of the kind consistently claimed or implied in free-trade speeches and publications.

The truth is that the State Department is struggling with economic forces too powerful for the free trade tools it has chosen to use.

Where United States exports have grown they have grown regardless of, not because of, concessions obtained by the State Department.

Approximately one-third of our exports are still financed by the American taxpayer. Even with this massive aid exports in 1953 amounted to only 4.34 percent of gross national product, compared to 3.7 percent in 1937. Deducting military and mutual security shipments, the 1953 figure drops to 3.4 percent—three-tenths of one percent less than in 1937. Even this remainder includes many items directly or indirectly assisted by subsidies, grants, and loans.

No concession obtained by the State Department has relieved our biggest trade headache—how to dispose of the $7 billion worth of farm surpluses presently held by the Government.

Under GATT, in exchange for these so-called concessions, the State Department has granted deep cuts in United States tariffs. More than 200 leading business, farm, and labor organizations have testified, before Congress and various Government agencies, that these cuts are already hurting American producers. Competition by Japanese manufacturers paying wages only a fraction of the United States scale has, for example, played a large part in the recent loss of 200,000 jobs in the American textile industry.

Now the State Department has announced that it intends to negotiate 1,000 further cuts, with 25 nations, beginning early in 1956. It has also asked Congress, by a bill styled H. R. 5550, to approve participation by the United States in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, GATT's policing arm. If this bill passes it will in effect confirm and freeze all the cuts granted to date, plus

any new cuts granted in the coming 1,000 item negotiations. OTC will be specifically charged to see that the United States does nothing to impair such concessions.

It is claimed that GATT in return is helping expand United States exports. But, as demonstrated above, the figures cited in support of this claim do not hold water. There is little evidence that GATT has or can, or is truly disposed to, expand United States exports.

H. R. 5550

(Testimony of Representative CLEVELAND BAILEY, of West Virginia, before the House Committee on Ways and Means, March 7, 1956)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I made a request of you for time to make a statement on H. R. 5550 because it is the most important trade legislation that has come before you in many years. Not even the Trade Agreements Act itself was as important as the present bill. Let me tell you why.

If the present bill passes you may as well disband as a committee that considers tariff and trade legislation. There will be little or nothing left for you to consider. The State Department will be in charge and you and all of Congress will be on the sidelines.

I am not speaking facetiously when I say this; nor do I seek to reflect upon the chairman of this committee, for whose sincerity and integrity I have the highest regard. He has introduced H. R. 5550 but I know that he will not regard anything that I intend to say as having personal implications of any kind.

It happens that my district and my State have several industries that are affected directly and vitally by import competition. Therefore we are sensitive to tariff and trade legislation. The district represented by the distinguished chairman has little or no industry that is vulnerable to import competition.

It is a little like the person who does not appreciate the cost of medical attention and hospitalization until it strikes home. That too has happened to me; and I can see the difference in my feeling before and after.

Certain products produced in West Virginia, such as coal, pottery, glassware, textiles, toy marbles, spring clothespins, and chemicals, have long faced import competition in greater or lesser degree. Some of the competition has been severe and crippling to these industries, has led to distressful unemployment and to shrinking industrial activity. The question of imports is to us not an academic one. It is as vivid as a toothache and as real as physical illness. It is not something far away, something that we merely read about or that can be shrugged off. It is right at home and it is an inescapable part of our responsibility to deal with it.

The people who elected me have the right to look to me to help solve these problems. This is because they cannot solve them by themselves. There is nothing they can do about the cheapness of imports that come from other parts of the world. This is a matter for Congress. Congress is the logical branch of the Government to look after matters of this kind; and the framers of the Constitution thought so too.

That is why they placed the responsibility of regulating our foreign commerce squarely on the shoulders of Congress. They did not give this power to the executive for reasons that have made themselves very clear in recent years. Both the power and the responsibility of regulating foreign commerce belong to Congress and not the executive branch of the Government. Let us not forget that.

Members of Congress are elected every 2 years. It is the branch of the Government that is closest to the people and most responsive to their needs and their problems. The regulation of foreign commerce is something that is important to many of the people back home. The character of that regulation affects them. It affects their income, their employment and their future. Therefore they want to keep this regulation in the hands of that part of the Government that is most responsive to the sentiment of the people; and that is Congress; and, to repeat, that is where the Constitution wisely lodged this power.

In recent years we have seen this power of Congress slip away and I say to you that if United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation is approved, as provided in this bill, our authority will have been thrown away by ourselves and we will have broken faith with our constituents. This we must not do.

Let me tell you more specifically what this bill means.

Together with several other Members, I have introduced a general import quota bill. If H. R. 5550 should pass, Congress itself would be saying that the import quota bill must not be passed because it would be a violation of our international obligations as negotiated by the State Department under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT.

Approval of H. R. 5550 would be the same as a blank check to the Department of State and to the international secretariat sitting in Geneva, telling them both to go ahead and do as they please. Congress will have abdicated. It need then ask no further questions for it would not be able to answer questions coming from the people in the home districts.

The State Department, operating under an approved OTC, need not bother to report back to Congress at any time. It could offer amendments to the existing GATT, or accept amendments offered by other countries, to enlarge its power, to admit new countries, including Communist satellites or Russia herself—and there would be nothing that Congress could do about it. Article XXX of GATT provides the machinery. OTC would then administer the amended agreement without further ado.

Already the State Department has so completely forgotten the constitutional power of Congress that it has made agreements cutting us out of our power. It has agreed, as already stated, not to establish or maintain import quotas in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; and it has agreed to remove those that we have on dairy products, raw cotton, peanuts, wheat, wheat flour, sugar, and any others now in existence.

It has agreed that no subsidies on farm products will be used to expand our foreign market for farm crops beyond our historical share. It has bound numerous tariff rates against an increase and has promised to put no tariff on many free list items. In doing this it has spoken for Congress into the indefinite future. Regardless of what might happen in elections, the will of any new Congress is already recorded in the agreement. It is bound; it is frozen; it is spoken for.

In my judgment the State Department should be called to account, sharply and unmistakably, to explain such highhanded action. The Department has no shadow of a right to throw such international roadblocks across the path of Congress; and I may add that Congress itself has been remiss in allowing such steps to be taken by the Department.

The principal reason has been that the State Department is under no instructions to report to Congress what it does in these international conferences where it acts behind closed doors and in secrecy. It has been allowed to make agreements without submitting them to Congress; and it has gone hog wild.

Only after a lapse of time after any new conference does it become apparent what further handcuffs have been forged for Congress. In my estimation the record of the State Department in its contempt of Congress in this area of its activity is black indeed. That the Congress has stood for such contempt is itself almost incredible. I can only say that the full realization of what has happened had not fully dawned upon us until in one direction after another we ran into the Department's private enclosures fenced off by the State Department and then heavily posted against trespass by representatives of the people.

I had always thought that Congress was free to legislate its will in any field of its competence; and that no such field could be abridged or preempted. Any Congress, I was sure, could repeal any law on the statute books if it no longer suited the majority of the members; or could amend any law previously passed or leave it alone, or it could pass any new laws that in its judgment fell within the limits of the Constitution.

That has all been changed by our busy and busybody internationalists in the State Department—those economists who know better than you or I what is good for West Virginia, Massachusetts, Ohio, Kansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, Texas, California, or Wyoming. No longer are the representatives from these States, or of any other of the 48 States, free to legislate according to the needs of the people back home.

No. We must ask the State Department: May we pass a law? Please tell us whether it would violate one of the agreements that you have made in Geneva since 1948?

I goes without saying, the State Department people are much smarter than we are. They don't have to go back to their districts to be elected every 2 years. Some of them have been administering the trade-agreements program for years without having to bother about what anyone on the outside thinks. All the State Department bureaucrat in the tariff and trade field has to know is what is best for all the people; and he has no difficulty knowing that. It comes right out of his head. He just talks it over with his colleagues, listens to the professors and the prophets of internationalism and he is all set. He can back you and me right off the map—as indeed he has done.

How much longer are we who are elected to look after the affairs of the people as they are affected by tariffs and trade, going to stand for this State Department usurpation? They have used the very power that we have delegated to them under the Trade Agreements Act to stop us from legislating. That is not only preposterous, it is intolerable. And here we are asked in H. R. 5550 to confirm this intolerable situation. Instead of that we should be considering a resolution to inquire into the methods by which the State Department has used its trade agreements power to destroy the powers of Congress. I may say that I intend to introduce such legislation in the near future.

In my judgment the matter is so serious, the State Department has gone so far without authority and is so hellbent to go still farther, that we must call a halt and set things straight. A department that has conducted itself as has the State Department in its grasp for power cannot be trusted another year or two with the power it now has over tariffs and trade. Far from giving it further power as proposed under this bill, we should see to it that Congress regains its own authority. Then we can look our constituents in the eye once again as their representatives, instead of shrinking from them as political eunuchs.

Every member of this committee knows that the State Department did not come here with this bill for the purpose of continuing merely as they have in the past, although that was bad enough. They have come back to the well this time for what they regard as the last time. They want to be confirmed in the exercise of full power to make trade agreements, abolish import quotas, remove subsidies, kill the Buy American Act, the 50–50 Cargo Act and whatever in their minds will please our competitors overseas. They do not want us looking over their shoulders. They want to be placed in a position to be able to forget Congress once for all.

That is what this bill means and I hope that you will meet it with the overwhelming defeat that it deserves.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. What reaction did the gentleman receive at the hands of the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. BAILEY. Much more favorable reaction than I have received in any of the several years I have been before that committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then the gentleman is confident he is going to be successful?

Mr. BAILEY. I told the gentlemen if they did not keep that resolution in the Ways and Means Committee, we would see to it that it rested very definitely in a pigeonhole over in the Senate Finance Committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman has done a great deal in trying to improve the trade practices for this country.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. She has been quite helpful.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman is aware with reference to the Middle East that every time they are ready to bury the hatchet they strike oil with a resulting complication of the problems of peace. The gentleman, coming from a coal district or from an area where they have soft coal, can comment, I am sure, on the quota problem with reference to the importation of residual oil from Venezuela. Here again we have the oil problem dictating the relationships between nations, and how the executive, by administrative action, flies in the face of whatever the Congress does on quotas or anything else. I think the gentleman is particularly well aware of the residual fuel oil imports from Venezuela.

Mr. BAILEY. And I assume the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania is referring to the situation that has developed now in Saudi Arabia where American oil companies have the concessions and where we have a setup along with the Anglo-British oil companies, a world cartel to control the distribution of oil. I am sure that is what he has in mind, and it is a serious complication. We are getting down to a question of dollar diplomacy now.

Mr. FLOOD. There was a time when you would spread oil upon troubled waters. The reverse now seems to be true. The waters are not troubled until you spread oil on them.

Mr. BAILEY. I will say to the gentleman that we are already having oil spread over this country, and it is coming at the rate of about 740,000 barrels a day, most of it from Venezuela, to take the market away from our fuels in West Virginia, particularly our soft coal market.

PETITION TO ASSURE VOTE ON H. R. 11, HELPS SMALL AND INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, AT THIS SESSION OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOYLE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, when there is an unusual delay in getting consideration of a bill before a standing committee of the House of Representatives, there is a way to force an early vote on the bill, provided such a vote is desired by 218, or a majority, of the Members of the House. It is an orthodox parliamentary method of proceeding to be used in order to get early consideration of a bill or resolution.

H. R. 11 was introduced January 5, 1955, the 1st day of the 84th Congress.

PETITION READY MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1956, FOR SIGNATURES

Since the Committee on the Judiciary has not to date granted a hearing on the bill and has set it down for April 18–20 for a hearing before a subcommittee, which I believe is too late for effective action at this session of Congress, those of us who are authors of this proposal are filing a petition under the rules to force consideration. The petition will be available for signatures of the Members of the House Monday, March 12, 1956.

Clause 4, rule XXVII, of the rules of the House of Representatives, is as follows:

CALENDAR OF MOTIONS TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEES

4. A Member may present to the Clerk a motion in writing to discharge a committee from the consideration of a public bill or resolution which has been referred to it 30 days prior thereto (but only 1 motion may be presented for each bill or resolution). Under this rule it shall also be in order for a Member to file a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of any resolution providing either a special order of business, or a special rule for the consideration of any public bill or resolution favorably reported by a standing committee, or a special rule for the consideration of a public bill or resolution which has remained in a standing committee 30 or more days without action: *Provided*, That said resolution from which it is moved to discharge the Committee on Rules has been referred to that committee at least 7 days prior to the filing of the motion to discharge. The motion shall be placed in the custody of the Clerk who shall arrange some convenient place for the signature of Members. A signature may be withdrawn by a Member in writing at any time before the motion is entered on the Journal. When a majority of the total membership of the House shall have signed the motion, it shall be entered on the Journal, printed with the signatures thereto in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and referred to the Calendar of Motions To Discharge Committees.

On the second and fourth Mondays of each month, except during the last 6 days of any session of Congress, immediately after the approval of the Journal, any Member who has signed a motion to discharge which has been on the calendar at least 7 days prior thereto, and seeks recognition, shall be recognized for the purpose of calling up the motion, and the House shall proceed to its consideration in the manner herein provided without intervening motion except one motion to adjourn. Recognition for the motions shall be in the order in which they have been entered on the Journal.

When any motion under this rule shall be called up, the bill or resolution shall be read by title only. After 20 minutes' debate, one-half in favor of the proposition and one-half in opposition thereto, the House shall proceed to vote on the motion to discharge. If the motion prevails to discharge the Committee on Rules from any resolution pending before the committee, the House shall immediately vote on the adoption of said resolution, the Speaker not entertaining any dilatory or other intervening motion except one motion to adjourn, and, if said resolution is adopted, then the House shall immediately proceed to its execution. If the motion prevails to discharge one of the standing committees of the House from any public bill or resolution pending before the committee, it shall then be in order for any Member who signed the motion to move that the House proceed to the immediate consideration of such bill or resolution (such motion not being debatable), and such motion is hereby made of high privilege; and if shall be decided in the affirmative, the bill shall be immediately considered under the general rules of the House, and if unfinished before adjournment of the day on which it is called up, it shall remain the unfinished business until it is fully disposed of. Should the House by vote decide against the immediate consideration of such bill or resolution, it shall be referred to its proper calendar and be entitled to the same rights and privileges that it would have had, had the committee to which it was referred duly reported same to the House for its consideration: *Provided*, That when any perfected motion to discharge a committee from the consideration of any public bill or resolution has once been acted upon by the House it shall not be in order to entertain during the same session of Congress any other motion for the discharge from that committee of said measure, or from any other committee of any other bill or resolution substantially the same, relating in substance to or dealing with the same subject matter, or from the Committee on Rules of a resolution providing a special order of business for the consideration of any other such bill or resolution, in order that such action by the House on a motion to discharge shall be res adjudicata for the remainder of that session: *Provided further*, That if before any one motion to discharge a committee has been acted upon by the House there are on the Calendar of Motions To Discharge Committees other motions to discharge committees from the consideration of bills or resolutions substantially the same, relating in substance to or dealing with the same subject matter after the House shall have acted on one motion to discharge the remaining said motions shall be stricken from the Calendar of Motions To Discharge Committees and not acted on during the remainder of that session of Congress.

CERTAIN RULES CONCERNING SIGNATURES

Members of the House cannot sign the petition except when the House is in session. The petition cannot be carried around to the Members. The Clerk of

the House will have charge of the petition, which will be made available to any Member while the House is in session for signature, upon the request of the Member.

The petition is not available for publication until it has received 218 signatures and has been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, each Member signing the petition is at liberty to advise anyone of his action and also advise his number on the petition. In this way, it is usually known at all times who has signed the petition.

After the petition has been signed by 218 Members, it can be called up by any Member signing it on the next second or fourth Monday of the month after it has been on file 7 days before such second or fourth Monday. As stated in the rule, this does not apply the last 6 days in the session.

It is therefore important and imperative that the signatures be obtained as quickly as possible.

BELIEVE EFFORTS WILL BE SUCCESSFUL

During the last 10 Congresses, 293 petitions to discharge committees have been filed. Twenty-seven of these petitions were completely signed up by the required number of Members. In a number of instances, after a petition received a very substantial number of signers, the committee holding the bill reported it to the House for action. The sponsors receiving consideration had no incentive to further pursue the petition course. The discharge petition route for consideration is the hard way of getting consideration of a bill, but it is one effective way if a majority of the Members desire a bill considered. In view of the great and widespread interest in H. R. 11 I believe we will secure the 218 signatures.

This bill, H. R. 11, is strongly opposed by certain big, national chainstore corporations. These concerns want secret discounts and rebates that their small and independent competitors across the street do not receive. This bill is an amendment to the equality of opportunity law, known as the Robinson-Patman Act. It permits businesses, whether small or large, to buy from manufacturers and suppliers under the same terms and conditions. The law permits a different price to a concern that buys in such a quantity that there is a justifiable difference in price in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery. This law does not apply to sales made by a retail store. Such sales are within the State and not subject to the law. This law only applies to interstate commerce. It says in effect that a seller-manufacturer or supplier, is not compelled to select a retail dealer as his agent to distribute goods, wares, and merchandise, but having selected small concerns and big concerns as distributors, the seller must treat them fairly and not discriminate against either through secret discounts or rebates.

This bill has the unanimous endorsement of all genuine organizations and associations representing small and independent businesses affected by its provisions. All such organizations want H. R. 11 to become a law.

On February 28, I introduced H. R. 414. This provides for moving that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11. It has remained on file with the Committee on Rules seven legislative days, including today.

House Resolution calls for 2 hours of general debate on the bill. This bill is of urgent and vital importance to every one of the almost 4 million small businesses in the United States. The issue which the bill presents is a simple issue however, and we can explore ever facet of it in 2 hours of general debate. Most of the Members of the House, I think, are fully informed on H. R. 11, and what it would do, but I would like to explain again what the issue is and precisely what H. R. 11 is designed to do.

IN 1936 CONGRESS GAVE SMALL BUSINESS A CHANCE

How did this matter arise? In 1936, the Congress passed and the President signed a bill which has become known as the Robinson-Patman Act. This was an amendment to our antitrust laws which was intended to strengthen those laws. The act placed certain restraints on the practice of price discrimination. It had long been recognized what the effects of price discriminations are. Where manufacturers or other wholesalers discriminate in their prices, the result is that the big sellers destroy the smaller competing sellers, without respect to efficiency or other merits. Likewise, where the sellers discriminate in their prices big buyers get the unearned benefits of the discriminations and put the smaller competing buyers out of business. These are the results of the discriminations whether or not the sellers or the buyers deliberately intended any unfair destruction of their smaller competitors.

Therefore in 1936 we tightened the law on this practice of price discrimination. It has been a wonderful boon to small business. It has brought about real competition because it has gone a long way toward making competition a contest of efficiency rather than a contest in which the biggest contestant inevitably destroys the smaller contestants.

SINCE 1953 SMALL BUSINESS HAS NOT BEEN CONSIDERED—MINORITY OPINION OF SUPREME COURT INJURES SMALL BUSINESS

In the spring of 1951 however, the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision which created a huge loophole in the Robinson-Patman Act. That was the Court's divided opinion in the Standard Oil (Indiana) case. The Court divided 5 to 3; really 5 to 4 since one Justice who disqualified himself had written the opinion in favor of this law in the lower court. In this opinion the Court made an obvious mistake in interpreting the act and it rendered an opinion which largely nullifies what we did when we passed the Robinson-Patman Act. That opinion is still controlling today—the mistake has not been corrected.

REPUBLICAN-CONTROLLED CONGRESS

As soon as the meaning of the Standard Oil decision became clear, small business was greatly alarmed, and justly so. Small-business firms all over the United States looked forward and expected the 83d Congress which met January 3, 1953, to correct the Court's mistake. They wrote, they wired, and they spoke to their Senators and Representatives. I know this, because many of these small-business men told me, and they sent me many copies of their letters and telegrams. Early in the 1st session of the 83d Congress I introduced H. R. 5848 to correct the mistake of the Standard Oil decision. That bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. No hearings were ever held and the bill was not reported.

DEMOCRATIC-CONTROLLED CONGRESS

When the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress was elected, small business again expected action. They expected that even if the 84th Congress took no new steps to protect small business, it would at least move expeditiously to restore its previous protection.

Again small business all over the United States wrote, wired and spoke to their Members of Congress, urging prompt action to restore the anti-price-discrimination law.

On the opening day of the 84th Congress January 5, 1955, I again introduced a bill to close the loophole created by the Standard Oil (Indiana) opinion. This bill is H. R. 11. Members of the House joined me as cosponsors, and 3 Members introduced identical bills.

H. R. 11 was likewise referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Although 14 months have passed no hearings on the bill have yet been held by that committee. It is now clear moreover, that the Committee on the Judiciary cannot now proceed in its seasoned way to hold hearings, and make a report, in time to give the House an opportunity to vote on this bill during the present session of Congress.

Now this is how matters stand.

NOT A PARTISAN LAW

The Robinson-Patman Act is not a partisan law. When this act was passed it had overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle. The bill passed the House by a vote of 290 to 16, and it passed the Senate unanimously.

After the Supreme Court in the divided opinion knocked a loophole in the act, the Committee on the Judiciary in the Republican-controlled 83d Congress failed to give the House an opportunity to vote on closing that loophole.

SCORES BETWEEN REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS EVEN

During the present 84th Congress, the Committee on the Judiciary has failed to give the House an opportunity to vote on closing that loophole. It cannot be said therefore, that there is any partisan issue here. On this vital matter, the record of the Committee on the Judiciary under Republican leadership in the 83d Congress is precisely the same as under Democratic leadership in the 84th

Congress. The scores are even—neither side has treated small business fairly on this matter.

MORE THAN 50 JOINT AUTHORS

I intend, therefore, in cooperation with more than 50 of my colleagues who are joint authors of H. R. 11 to use the parliamentary safeguards which are available for giving the House an opportunity to vote on this issue. I will present it as a bipartisan issue and I know that small business will receive bipartisan support, which is as it should be.

WHAT H. R. 11 DOES

H. R. 11 presents no new issues. There are no angles or side issues that have not been exhaustively studied over and over again by congressional committees and debated repeatedly on the floors of both Houses, in connection with all the so-called basing-point bills which have been considered since 1948.

BASING POINTS NOT INVOLVED

I here and now assure the Members, however, that H. R. 11 in no way changes the present law as it relates to basing points; and it would in no way change any past Court decisions on basing points or other delivered-price systems.

NOT PRICE FIXING

This bill has not the slightest interest in price-fixing systems. It has one purpose and one purpose only, which is to protect small business from abuse of price discrimination and thus give small business a more equal chance to compete. This is what we thought we did when we amended the Clayton Act in 1936. Section 2 (a) of that act, as amended, makes it unlawful for a seller "to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or injure, destroy, or prevent competition."

That language is plain enough, and it provided a great protection to small business, up until the Court's decision in 1951. In the Standard Oil (Indiana) decision, however, the Court construed the section 2 (b) defense, which is the so-called good-faith defense, in such a way as to render the law largely a nullity. The Court declared that the so-called good-faith defense justifies price discriminations, irrespective of the effects of those discriminations.

This may seem absurd, but what the Court precisely held is that a seller is justified in resorting to a practice which is condemned by statute, when the practice is followed to meet the competition of a competitor who does not resort to the unlawful practice. In plain words, the Court declared, in effect, that one seller's lawful behavior justifies a competitor's unlawful behavior. Obviously, this ruling renders a part of the law a nullity.

All H. R. 11 says then, is simply this. If the effect of a price discrimination "may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly" then the discrimination is illegal. That settles the matter without further qualification except, of course, the other qualifications which are already provided in the law. There are other qualifications, of course, which are good and which we would not want to change. For example, there is a qualification with reference to costs. If the seller has a cost savings in supplying one buyer as against a competing buyer, then the seller is perfectly free to discriminate between the two buyers to the extent of the cost savings. We do not want to change that. If big buyers bring about any efficiencies in the economic system, then we want the big buyers to have the full advantage of those efficiencies.

Now so that there is no misunderstanding about the meaning of H. R. 11, I would like to repeat here the questions which have frequently been asked about the effects of H. R. 11, and set out direct simple answers to these questions.

First. Question: Does H. R. 11 make all price discriminations illegal?

Answer: No. The law is not concerned about small or inconsequential matters. H. R. 11 would make illegal only those price discriminations which substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. It is difficult to understand how anybody could be in favor of allowing big business to abuse its power to destroy small business to the extent that competition is substantially lessened.

Moreover, justifications for certain price discriminations are affirmatively permitted in the law. For example, discriminations which are justified by a seller's differences in costs are permitted without qualification.

Second. Question: Does H. R. 11 prohibit retailers from putting on sales?

Answer: No. There are several reasons for this. In the first place, the Robinson-Patman Act has never regulated prices, and it would not regulate prices under H. R. 11. The retailer, wholesaler, manufacturer, or anybody else can change his prices as often as he wants to, just so long as the changes made from time to time are not a cloak for concealing the seller's intention and practice of favoring particular buyers.

In the second place, the Robinson-Patman Act applies only to sellers who are in interstate commerce—in other words the big corporations. Very few retailers are in interstate commerce.

Third. Question: Would H. R. 11 create a brokerage monopoly?

Answer: H. R. 11 would in no way affect the brokerage provision of the Robinson-Patman Act. This provision is contained in section 2 (c) of the act. H. R. 11 amends subsection 2 (b) of the act.

The so-called brokerage monopoly which is said to have been created by the Robinson-Patman Act is precisely like the grass-cutting monopoly which grass-cutters have. Anybody can enter the business at any time and share in the monopoly.

There is nothing in the Robinson-Patman Act which prohibits a seller from selling through a broker to some buyers and, at the same time, selling direct to competing buyers and pocketing the brokerage fee. The Robinson-Patman Act does, however, prohibit the seller from discriminating in price among buyers—under the circumstances I have already mentioned—and the act thus prohibits the seller from giving the buyer a brokerage fee for purchases made for the buyer's account.

Fourth. Question: How would H. R. 11 affect the quantity limit rule in the rubber tire case?

Answer: H. R. 11 will in no way affect the quantity limit rule in the rubber tire case, nor will it in any way affect any quantity limit proceeding which may arise under the Robinson-Patman Act in the future. The issue with which H. R. 11 deals is in no way related to the powers which have been granted to the Federal Trade Commission to issue quantity limit rules, under certain circumstances, in subsection 2 (a) of the act.

TRIPLE DAMAGES MAY BE COLLECTED

Fifth. Question: Will H. R. 11 compel the Federal Trade Commission to enforce the Robinson-Patman Act?

Answer: No. The Federal Trade Commission will not be compelled to enforce the Robinson-Patman Act, but H. R. 11 will give the FTC the power to protect small business against the unwarranted abuse of big-business powers, if it wishes to provide such protection. Moreover, while the present Federal Trade Commission—or at least a majority of the Federal Trade Commission—has shown itself consistently unsympathetic to the Robinson-Patman Act, and has been making decisions which enlarge the loophole created by the Court's opinion in the Standard Oil (Indiana) case, small business is not entirely dependent upon the Federal Trade Commission for enforcement. Small business has rights under the law which are enforceable in the courts. As in the case of all the other antitrust laws, a small-business man, and any other businessman, can go to court and prove that the law has been violated, prove that he has been injured by the violation, prove the amount of the injury he has sustained, and, upon successful proof, collect damages amounting to threefold the amount of the injury sustained.

SMALL BUSINESS WANTS A SHOWDOWN

Now let me tell you how small business feels about H. R. 11.

Early last month, I was requested by a large number of small business organizations, and other organizations which have been active in supporting small business, to attend a joint meeting to discuss the things which small business needs and wants from this Congress. The meeting was held on February 7. When the time came for these organizations to state what they would like to have from the 84th Congress, the representatives of these organizations all said the same thing. They said that there are many things that small business needs and wants, and that there are several pieces of legislation which they strongly recommend. But they said that just to make things simple, they are

going to score the record of this Congress on one bill and one bill only. That bill is H. R. 11.

Allow me to read you the names of these organizations:

National Association of Retail Druggists representing 40,000 independent druggists.

National Association of Retail Grocers representing 65,000 retail grocers.

National Association of Wholesale Grocers representing 2,000 wholesale grocery firms.

National Food Brokers Association representing 1,700 food brokers.

National Congress of Petroleum Retailers representing 35,000 retail gasoline dealers.

National Association of Independent Tire Dealers representing 8,000 retail tire dealers and tire retreaders.

United States Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association representing 2,800 wholesale distributors of fresh fruits and vegetables.

National Council of Agricultural Co-ops whose membership is comprised of 3 million farmers.

The National Farmers Union with 700,000 members.

The International Association of Machinists with 700,000 members.

In addition, two other prominent organizations, although they could not be present at the meeting, have consistently urged and worked for the passage of H. R. 11. They are clearly on record as urging its passage. These are the United Auto Workers, AFL–CIO, and a very splendid small-business organization, the National Federation of Independent Businesses whom we all know through Mr. George Burger.

COMPETITION IS ESSENTIAL TO POLITICAL FREEDOM

Now why should we pass H. R. 11?

The reason is not merely that it would please and help every small business in the United States. There is another more fundamental reason. It goes not just to small business, or to all business, but the very practical and real question of how as a whole, society shall be organized. It is particularly for the protection of the consumers.

As we all know, there are several ways in which a society can be organized. Ours was organized originally, and our political institutions are built on the concept, of a system of free competitive enterprise. The historians have pointed out that it was no coincidence that the Declaration of Independence and Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations both appeared in 1776. Both struck a blow for freedom, one on the political side and one on the economic side. The two were inseparable then and they are inseparable now. Without economic freedom there can be no political freedom. There can neither be economic freedom nor political freedom without competition. There can be a free, competitive enterprise system; but there can be no free-enterprise system without competition. It is that essential element of competition which allocates resources into one use or another and makes the automatic decision as to what kind of jobs people will work at. When competition determines these things, then the determinations are made automatically and by democratic processes. When we have competition the cash register in the market place tallies up consumers' votes for the kinds of goods and services they want and determines how the Nation's resources—including the human resources—shall be employed. Without competition these things must be decided arbitrarily by the State.

We must therefore preserve such competition as we have left—even if we do not try to strengthen it.

Competition is no foreign "ism." It is an idea which is peculiar to the United States of America, insofar as any real attempt to put the idea in practice goes. But the people of this country learned a long time ago that competition is no natural state of affairs. What we commonly call "monopoly" is the natural condition, as the history of every civilized country shows. Actually, "oligopoly" is a more exact term. Rarely will you find in the history of any country that a single individual or a single cohesive group owned all the wealth of the country. The more usual pattern has been that substantially all of the wealth has gravitated into the hands of a few powerful groups—feudal lords, merchant princes, or what-have-you—leaving the great masses of the people owning only meager personal belongings.

Competition is an artificial state. It can be maintained only by affirmative laws. We learned that a long time ago. A number of business practices were universally recognized as defeating competition, and were condemned by common law, long before passage of the Sherman Act. Cornering markets, conspiracies to boycott or to fix prices are ancient examples of such practices. Then we have had legislation to maintain competition. We have had the Sherman Act condemning sin in general and we have had the Clayton Antitrust Act with various amendments condemning certain specific sins.

PRICE DISCRIMINATION IS THE EVIL TO BE STOPPED

Price discrimination is a practice of more recent vintage. Farmers and traders in farm products never discriminated in the prices for the simple reason that it was never practical to do so, in the traders' self-interest. There were too many sellers for any one trader to have a monopoly market to exploit while waging a price war in another market. Nor was price discrimination a common practice among early traders in manufactured goods. It has been only in recent decades that, as business became concentrated in a relatively few firms, and in firms of greatly unequal size, that the practice has become a general problem. Under these conditions a big firm selling in many markets where there is little or no competition finds it entirely practical to cut prices in one particular market, to keep out a would-be competitor, to destroy a local competitor, or to force him to raise his price. Such sellers also find it in their self-interest to charge all the general run of buyers a high price, and cut prices only to the powerful buyer who threatens to create a new source of supply.

The practical question the House will have to face then, is this: Are we going to tolerate abuses of power by which big business destroys small business?

CANNOT TOLERATE ABUSE OF POWER

If competition is to work, then certainly the inefficient firms must be squeezed out. But, when we tolerate abuse of power, it is not the inefficient that are being squeezed out—for efficiency is not the test of survival. The test is bigness; the big will always win and the small will always lose.

This is one of the main reasons for the great wave of corporate mergers and consolidations which is going on today. We are allowing small business to be destroyed while we fiddle with bills to require merging companies to make a report and increase appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission so that it can hire more people to file the reports.

I believe that the almost 4 million small businesses in the United States are fully worthy of 2 hours of the House's time to debate a simple but fundamental problem which is threatening the continued existence of small business. I believe that most of the Members will agree with me.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SIKES, to postpone the special order granted him for today until Thursday of next week.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GROSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois (at the request of Mr. FLOOD).

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi (at the request of Mr. FLOOD) in connection with a speech made yesterday by Mr. GRANT.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 12, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1615. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration of this Department on the activities and transactions of the Administration under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from October 1 through December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 13 of the Merchant Ship

Sales Act of 1946, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 9166. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; without amendment (Rept. No. 1860). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3744. A bill to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to classified substitute clerks in the field service of the Post Office Department; with amendment (Rept. No. 1861). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4437. A bill relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard; without amendment (Rept. No. 1862). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7646. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, to incur expenses incident to the representation of their personnel before judicial tribunals and administrative agencies of any foreign nation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1863). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 422. Resolution for consideration of S. 1271, an act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1864). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 423. Resolution for consideration of S. 1272, an act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1865). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 376. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to investigate and study appeals for charitable contributions made in the name of the American veteran; without amendment (Rept. No. 1866). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 9836. A bill to provide for the regulation of the interstate transportation of migrant farmworkers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 9837. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 9838. A bill to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 9839. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 9840. A bill to provide that in determining annual income of a widow or child of a veteran for the purpose of establishing eligibility for pension, amounts spent in the year of death of the veteran for his burial shall be excluded from income for that year; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9841. A bill to provide that in determining eligibility of a widow or child of a deceased veteran for a pension the income limitations applicable to such widow or child shall be increased by $600 for the year in which the veteran's death occurs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H. R. 9842. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 9843. A bill to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 9844. A bill to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who are 60 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 9845. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1946, in order retroactively to advance in grade, time in grade, and compensation certain employees in the postal field service who are veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY of Illinois:

H. R. 9846. A bill declaring Good Friday in each year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROUTY:

H. R. 9847. A bill to prohibit persons from making campaign contributions to candidates for nomination or election to Federal office when the elections are held in States other than the State in which the person making the contribution resides, and to prohibit any person from making a campaign contribution from funds made available for that purpose by another person unless the identity of such other person is disclosed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 9848. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9849. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 9850. A bill to provide for the utilization of the Colorado River development fund in the States of the lower division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 9851. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to establish new corporate tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 9852. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 9853. A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act to make permanently effective the authority to insure home improvement loans thereunder, and to increase the maximum permissible amounts and maturities of such loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 9854. A bill to repeal certain excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 9855. A bill to designate the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Jones Point, Va., as the "George Mason Memorial Bridge"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. J. Res. 576. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of Alexander Hamilton," approved August 20, 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. J. Res. 577. Joint resolution providing that the day on which the presidential election is held shall be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 9856. A bill authorizing exchange of land with the Powder Mill Development Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PROUTY:

H. R. 9857. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 9858. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Grace Pisciotta Barbera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 9859. A bill for the relief of the Board of National Mission of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerks' desk and referred as follows:

628. By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York: Petition of signers from Herkimer, Mohawk, Ilion, and Frankfort, N. Y., in support of H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

629. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the executive secretary, Associated Equipment Distributors, Chicago, Ill., urging Congress to affirm its 1938 and 1949 determination that retail establishments be exempt and that retailing is local in character and has no material effect on interstate commerce by refusing to amend or alter the present retail exemption afforded by section 13 (a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, etc.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

630. Also, petition of the Clerk, Board of Supervisors, County of Westchester, White Plains, N. Y., requesting enactment of H. R. 9332, or legislation similar to such bill; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin, at For America Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] at the For America rally held at Carnegie Hall in New York on February 22, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans, as we come together tonight to honor the memory of George Washington, I cannot help but be reminded that America has always been blessed with great leaders in times of great trial. In the early days of our country a great general rose from the ranks of the people to lead his country in war, and thereafter pointed out the principles under which his country could live in peace, independence, and freedom. We are similarly blessed in our time: another great general has come along, who has led us brilliantly in war, has eloquently set forth the principles under which the independence and freedom of this country can be preserved, and has thus earned the undying affection and devotion of his countrymen. I refer, of course, to Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

I choose to make General MacArthur the focal point of my remarks tonight because, on the one hand, he proves that America is still capable of producing men in the great tradition of George Washington: MacArthur is the contemporary Washington; on the other hand, MacArthur's present exile is eloquent testimony to the fact that the reigning liberal bipartisan machine has also cast into exile the principles of national honor, national wisdom, and national freedom for which Washington stood.

You may be sure that neither Douglas MacArthur, nor Washington, if the decision had been his, would have extended the hand of friendship to the Soviet Union as was done last summer at Geneva. MacArthur knows, without having to find out the hard way, that free men cannot make friends with tyrants and murderers without abetting the cause of tyranny and murder.

And as we recall the bitter disgrace of Korea, we can say confidently that George Washington would have agreed with General MacArthur that American troops should not be committed to any war but an American war, fought under an American command—and that no assembly of foreign diplomats, such as the United Nations, should be permitted to repudiate the tradition that in an American war there is no substitute for victory.

General MacArthur's most valuable service—and I do not overlook his splendid war leadership or his brilliant supervision of our occupation of Japan, or, of course, his talent for keeping the little man from Missouri in his place—General MacArthur's most valuable service has been to put our fight against world communism in its proper strategic perspective.

General MacArthur has always insisted that the major present threat to the free world lies in the Communist attempt to conquer Asia. MacArthur knows that Communist strategy, from the day of Lenin to the present, has been to communize Asia as the first step in communizing the rest of the free world.

MacArthur, along with other right-wing Republicans, has been called by our liberal, Europe-oriented press, an Asia-firster. We are for America first, as regards the ends we serve, but as regards political and military strategy, the liberals are quite right. We do not believe the main Communist threat is in Europe; we are Asia-firsters precisely for the reason that the Communists are Asia-firsters, too.

General MacArthur has often said that to appreciate the effect of American policy on Asia, we must try to view our conduct through Asian eyes. As Asians see us, we are the world's leader in the fight to stave off Communist expansion. We are therefore expected to set the standard for maximum anti-communism; and the question I put to you tonight is: What kind of example have we set for the millions of Asiatics who we have been urging to become anti-Communists?

At the risk of covering some old ground that is surely familiar to most of you, let us review America's course on anticommunism, lesson by lesson, as it was taught to Asia; we thus may get a feel of the impact of our conduct upon our Asian pupils.

Lesson 1, July, 1945. Japan has been driven to her knees, and asks to discuss terms of surrender. But, since Roosevelt has agreed that Communist Russia should enter the Far Eastern war, America turns a deaf ear to Japanese offers until the Red armies have had a chance to grab a share of the plunder. Thus, as the Asian people see it, our first display of anticommunism has us sacrificing some 250,000 lives—most of them Asiatics during the unnecessary atom-bombing of Japan—in order to permit the world's chief Communist power to gain a military foothold in north China.

Lesson 2, September 1945: The war is over, and the Chinese people learn that 6 months earlier, at Yalta, America gave valuable portions of their country, if you please, to the Soviet Union. China, of course, had not been told that her territory was up for auction; she had fought, as America's stanchest friend, for eight agonizing years against the Japanese and the Communists, and probably expected a different kind of reward.

Lesson 3, October 1945: The American Government agrees to let the Russians occupy all of Korea north of the 38th Parallel. The Korean people thus wage a 35-year fight for independence, only to find that America has assigned half of their country to the Communist empire.

Lesson 4, December 1945: The American Government instructs the Chinese people that the only way to keep America's friendship is to take Communists into their government, and George Marshall is sent to China to convey what amounts to an American ultimatum to appease the Communists, or else.

Lesson 5, January 1947: We make good on our ultimatum. The Chinese Government refuses to embrace Communists, so the Truman administration deliberately cuts off military aid to Chiang. Free China is then routed on the battlefield, a victim of her own overly stubborn anticommunism.

Lesson 6, November 1950: American armies, fighting in Korea, are attacked by Communist China. The American Government orders its military commanders not to bomb Chinese bases and supply lines—even though American armies are in danger of destruction. The reason given: This might bring Red China into the war. Also we turn down Chiang Kai-shek's offer of 33,000 troops to help fight our common enemy. Also the American fleet is ordered to protect Red China against Nationalist raids on the mainland. So, as Asians see it, what started out as an American attempt to defend and liberate Korea, ends up an American effort, at the expense of American and South Korean lives, to guarantee the territorial integrity of Communist China.

Lesson 7, April 1951: General MacArthur is fired. The foremost symbol, in the eyes of Asiatics, of American strength and honor is summarily dismissed from his commands because he advocates winning an anti-Communist war. No American in history had ever enjoyed such universal Oriental respect. MacArthur stood for what Asiatics believed was good in America. When he went home, America's prestige went with him.

Lesson 8, June 1953: The Korean fiasco ends with a humiliating armistice. The country is physically destroyed; but there is no victory. Other Asian countries are henceforth on notice of the consequences of resisting Communist aggression.

Lesson 9, September 1953: The American people learn that hundreds of American servicemen, who should have been released under the Korean armistice agreement, are still languishing in Communist concentration camps. Asia watches to see what steps the most powerful nation on earth will take to rescue the young men who wear its uniform. And Asia sees the American Government commission a United Nations diplomat, to beg the Communists, over a spot of jasmine tea, to honor their obligations. Later, when 15 Americans are freed, Asians see the American Government conveniently forget that hundreds of prisoners are still unaccounted for.

Lesson 10, April 1954: Indochina is Communism's next target. President Eisenhower warns that if Indochina falls, all Southeast Asia will collapse "like falling dominoes"; the Vice President threatens to send troops; the Secretary of State promises "united action." But Asia is learning fast that American anti-communism is long on words, but short on deeds. And sure enough, the American Government accedes to a deal by which half of Vietnam and 12 million human beings are clamped behind the Iron Curtain.

Lesson 11, January 1955: Red China threatens the Tachen Islands, which are still held by Free China. The American Government orders Chiang Kai-shek to abandon the islands.

Lesson 12, May 1955: Red China threatens Quemoy and the Matsus, which President Eisenhower has secretly promised to help defend. But the American Government refuses to make a public commitment, and Mr. Dulles finally announces the islands will be defended only if they are attacked in conjunction with an attack on Formosa. Asians believe the Communists will not make a joint attack—and thus fully expect America to back down again.

Lesson 13, July 1955: The American Government announces that any attempt by South Koreans to liberate the northern half of their country, or by South Vietnamese to liberate the northern half of their country, or by Free Chinese to liberate their country, will be regarded as an "aggressive war." Asians thus learn that the United States will affirmatively oppose efforts to release enslaved countries from Communist tyranny.

Lesson 14, July 1955: The President of the United States, at Geneva, proclaims to the world his belief that Communist leaders sincerely desire peace. Asians are thus authoritatively instructed to forget their fears about Communist aggression.

Lesson 15, December 1955: The American Government promotes the infamous "package deal" for the admission of Communist satellites to the United Nations. President Eisenhower sends three personal messages to Chiang Kai-shek, demanding that Free China not veto the admission of a Soviet creature called Outer Mongolia.

Lesson 16, February 1956: Asia learns that the American Government allows allies on its payroll to ship strategic war tools to Communist nations, including high-powered motors used in the development of hydrogen bombs.

Such is the example we have set. In such manner have we encouraged the Asian people to be anti-Communist. I ask you: Have we inspired them to fight for freedom, and encouraged them to resist Soviet expansion? Even more important, have we taught them that following America's leadership pays off?

I maintain that we have not taught anti-communism at all—that from Roosevelt, through Truman, to Eisenhower, we have taught the Asian people how to appease communism, how to retreat from communism, how to sell out to communism—how to surrender to communism.

So let us not be aghast when we hear of millions of Indians wildly cheering Khrushchev and Bulganin—and when the loudest cheering occurs in a town being built with American money; for we are only seeing the harvest of the crop we planted. And I must add that more money will not change things. Handouts, my good friends, are no substitute for a foreign policy. A few more billions won't keep Asia afloat; but some displays of strength and determination and honor—and anticommunism—might.

Let me now sketch briefly four ways in which we might rehabilitate the anti-Communist cause—especially with regard to Asia.

Last fall, when 11 American fliers were released by the Communists, our Government apparently hoped the world would think American honor had at last been salvaged. But the world knows better. The world remembers that as late as last May, the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations reported, on the basis of questioning top State and Defense Department officials, that 481 American prisoners-of-war were still unaccounted for and were believed to be in Chinese prisons. In November of 1954 the Communists announced with great fanfare that they held 15 American fliers. Last year, with great fanfare, and by making who knows what concessions to the Reds, we obtained the release of the 15. Which leaves 466 American fighting men whom the mightiest Nation on earth is evidently not lifting a finger to protect. I can tell you that George Washington would never have tolerated such a betrayal of his troops. I can tell you that Douglas MacArthur would have done his duty.

I say the world will never respect us—will never acknowledge us as a worthy leader in the anti-Communist cause—until it learns that when an American soldier goes overseas, he packs on his shoulders the entire strength of the United States of America. The Nation owes the same duty to the soldier as the soldier owes to the Nation.

I repeat what I have urged a hundred times before: that we put Red China in an economic straitjacket; that so long as American boys remain in Communist prisons, we refuse to give a single cent of American money to nations that trade with Red China—in strategic supplies or otherwise.

Which brings me to the subject of trade with the Iron Curtain countries. As I mentioned earlier, one of the results of the Geneva "friendship meeting" is that we are now permitting our alleged allies to ship highly strategic war supplies to the Soviet Union. This policy, of course, affects the Far East, as well as other parts of the world, since Communist China gets what she needs from Communist Russia. Let me give you an idea of the shocking revelations that were made to our subcommittee last week. We learned that, by Executive fiat, the Soviet Union is now permitted to buy—and these are just a few examples—lead, zinc, aluminum, copper, machine tools, nickel, magnesium, railroad cars, electric generators, diesel engines, and steam turbines up to 60,000 kilowatts used for manufacture of atom and hydrogen bombs.

In other words, the American people are being taxed to send money to England so that England will be able to manufacture steam turbines which will be sold (at an English profit) to the Soviet Union for making Communist hydrogen bombs. I sometimes wonder if we deserve to win this struggle.

I suggest that you, my good friends, should bring pressure to bear on your Government—that you insist that American taxpayers be relieved of the obligation of helping to build a war machine that is designed to destroy them.

The third thing we must do and do immediately is renew efforts to expose Communist subversion. To give you an idea of the urgency of the problem, let me read a shocking passage from General MacArthur's reply, in Life magazine, to Harry Truman.

"What may well have triggered my removal was my recommendation, made in January shortly before my relief, that a treason trial be initiated to break up a spy ring responsible for the purloining of my top secret reports to Washington. My campaign plan, including those of the Eighth Army, were transmitted daily to Washington. General Walker complained constantly to me that the enemy was receiving prior information of his movements. We could find no leaks in Korea or Japan. Then suddenly one of my dispatches concerning the order of battle was published in a Washington paper within a few hours of its receipt. I insisted that those responsible be prosecuted in order that such subversive activity be stopped, but the case was never processed and I was shortly relieved of my command. It was not until the recent exposure of the British spies, Burgess and Maclean, that the true facts began to unfold. These men with access to secret files were undoubtedly links in the chain to our enemy in Korea through Peiping by way of Moscow. I myself have long been convinced that Red China's decision to commit its forces to the Korean peninsula was predicated upon assurances previously given through Moscow that such intervention would not precipitate retaliation against its attack bases."

Now if it is true—and we have it on the considered judgment of the most respected man in America today that it is true—that Communist spies in the State and Defense Departments knew of the political restrictions on General MacArthur, and conveyed this information to Moscow and Peiping before MacArthur received his orders, it follows that our Government is at the mercy of traitors to an extent never before imagined. These traitors who, in General MacArthur's judgment, caused the death of countless American boys, and caused us to lose the Korean war, have not been exposed. The presumption, then, is they are still at large, in high posts of our Government, and are every day doing their bit to expedite the Communist conquest of the world. It is too much to suggest that these still-hidden traitors are partially responsible for our disastrous foreign policy? This situation requires an immediate and thorough congressional investigation of every Government official who had, or might have had, knowledge of General MacArthur's orders. It might be an appropriate time to stop attacking those who would expose Communists in Government, and turn our attention to Communists in Government.

Finally, and most important, we must reshape the basic strategic concepts of our foreign policy. We must abandon the defensive, and go on to the offensive. Coexistence with communism is neither possible nor honorable, nor desirable.

Our long-term objective must be the eradication of Communism from the face of the earth. Our short-term objective must be to encourage free peoples—especially those in Asia with armed forces at their disposal—to attempt to liberate their Communist-held homelands. The Free Chinese are willing and able to start liberating their homeland by guerrilla action and raids against the Chinese mainland. The South Koreans are willing and eager to attempt to liberate North Korea. The South Vietnamese are willing and eager to attempt to liberate North Vietnam. It absolutely beggars belief that the United States of America—the leading anti-Communist power in the world—should forbid assaults against the Communist empire.

There is no guaranty that Asian wars of liberation will succeed. But the United States cannot afford to miss what may be our last opportunity to defeat communism without the commitment of American armed forces. The free Asiatic peoples want to fight. In justice to them, and in justice to the millions of American boys who will otherwise be called upon to sacrifice their lives in a total war against communism, we must permit our fighting allies, with our material and technical assistance, to carry the fight to the enemy.

Anti-Communist words come easy, my good friends—as Harry Truman can prove by pointing to his memoirs. But anti-Communist deeds present a sterner test—as General MacArthur can prove by pointing to his scars.

We are honoring our First President today because of the legacy of courage and honor and high principle that he has handed down to us. God willing, America will be worthy of that legacy, and our children shall have similar cause to honor us.

Announcement by Hon. John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, in Support of Nomination of Adlai Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I made this morning.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SENATOR KENNEDY, MARCH 8, 1956, IN SUPPORT OF NOMINATION OF ADLAI STEVENSON

We are about to begin, commencing in New Hampshire next Tuesday, a series of primary contests in several key States which will influence greatly the choice of the convention for Democratic nominee this summer.

Massachusetts will have no such primary. I therefore feel that now, not later, is the appropriate time for many of us to speak out on the candidate of our choice.

I supported Adlai Stevenson for the nomination in 1952. I shall support him again in 1956. No other candidate in 1952 possessed his unique combination of qualifications for that most arduous of offices. In the intervening years his intelligence, farsightedness,

and temperate approach to difficult problems have not diminished nor been matched by any other potential nominee.

Consequently, Adlai Stevenson remains, in my opinion, the most outstanding choice for the Presidency in 1956, and he is the most deserving contender for the favor of the American people in November.

Governor Stevenson, beholden to no group or section, belonging neither to a left wing nor a right wing, represents indeed the finest traditions of our party and Nation. He is well equipped to resolve the clash of opinions and interests which confront our Nation at home, and to deal successfully with the baffling problems abroad which have increased in intensity in recent months. Speaking for myself, I intend to exert every effort for his nomination at the convention and his election next November.

Tomorrow Is the 9th of March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a wholesome practice in sentiment to give observance to anniversary occasions. It is this practice of remembering the recurring birth anniversaries of members of a family that contributes so much to the weaving of the enduring affections of the home. We observe the anniversaries of the births of the great men of our own Nation and of the great champions of the rights of mankind whose field of service has chanced to be in foreign lands. From all of these we derive inspiration and from such observances we are strengthened in spirit and in will the better to serve mankind in the generation of which we are a part.

Tomorrow is the 9th of March and that was the day 100 years ago that my father was born. He has been gone from the activities of this life more than three decades, but I have never ceased to feel his presence. It was he, joining his counsels with those of my mother, who planted so strongly within me the concept of equality among men, without any discrimination on the basis of circumstances over which they had no control, that it has remained the guiding influence of my life and will continue so until the end.

I have spoken many times on the floor of this House on other anniversary occasions, but yesterday on the occasion of the 106th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Masaryk, the first President of Czechoslovakia. I trust that my colleagues will not think it amiss of me today, or think this a trespass upon privilege for purpose of personal sentiment, to remember that tomorrow, the 9th of March, is the 100th birthday of Thomas O'Hara, my father.

He was born in Newburgh, N. Y., of parents who had come in their youth from Ireland in sailing vessels. He was the greatest man that I have ever known. As orator I think in his day he had no equal. It was he who taught me my love of words, that words are as flowers, and properly gathered and placed in sentences and in paragraphs can come closer to giving expression to the sentiments of the heart than in any other way humanly open to us. His was a brilliant career on the bench, in the practice of his profession of law, in his contribution to literature, in his service to his country in times of great international tensions under President Grover Cleveland, and in his service with understanding and heart to the causes of the lonely and the friendless and neglected. Always he combatted discrimination among Americans, or among the peoples of any land, based on station, color, religion or other circumstances not related to worth and character. He and my mother, whose 100th birth anniversary follows 2 weeks from tomorrow, gave me the rich heritage of a mind that has never felt the corroding poison of prejudice. They could have left me no richer heritage, none that could have purchased the contentment that has been mine throughout a life exceeding the Biblical threescore and ten.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have had this opportunity of paying this tribute of affection and appreciation in the month of the 100th anniversaries of their birth to the memory of a father and a mother who gave me this priceless heritage.

Excerpts From Address by Senator Wiley at the University of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have just returned from Wisconsin. While there, I was privileged to speak at the university. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from my address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES ALL YOUNG PEOPLE TO CAMPAIGN FOR REPUBLICAN 1956 TICKET; STRESSES PROSPERITY, PEACE, PROGRESS, AS RALLYING THEMES; URGES APPEAL TO INDEPENDENT VOTERS

(Excerpts from address by Senator WILEY before University of Wisconsin Young Republicans, at Madison, Wis., on March 6, at the Modern Union Theater)

It is a joy to return to Madison to address your fine group.

I note with particular pleasure the progress which you have made in helping get across the Republican message here on the campus and throughout Dane County.

My theme tonight is simple: It is to urge you to redouble your fine efforts to help assure the victory of the Republican ticket in Federal, State, and local elections this coming November.

Under the leadership of our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, we will, I feel, assuredly be victorious this November.

But the results in almost all contests are very far from being in the bag; and there is no reason whatsoever for overconfidence on anyone's part.

We have strong faith, of course, in the victory of our presidential ticket, but even there, and especially in other races, we face hard battles.

WE NEED CANDIDATES WITH BROAD APPEAL

And so, one of the things which I urge you, most earnestly, to do is to act constructively in connection with the forthcoming State nominating primaries for congressional and State positions.

I urge you to help make sure that in these primaries we select the strongest possible candidates who will merit the voters' thundering approval in November.

They must be qualified, experienced nominees. They must appeal not to a narrow, isolated segment of our population, not just to extreme partisans, say, of the far right. Rather, they must be candidates with a broad appeal to all the thinking electorate. They must be candidates who will definitely not lose the faithful, regular Republican vote. But at the same time they must be able to win the allegiance of great numbers of independent voters.

Remember, every public opinion poll shows that American voters consider themselves as tending to be pro-Democratic Party in sentiment rather than pro-Republican.

The ratio of sentiment between parties tends to be at around 5 to 3 on the average. That means that the Republican Party must always attract independent voters, just as Dwight Eisenhower did so successfully in 1952 and as he will do again.

AVOID BITTER PRIMARIES IF POSSIBLE

Meanwhile, in other races—senatorial, representatives, gubernatorial—independents will eagerly join our fold if the Republican Party closes ranks in support of men with a broad popular appeal—yes; closes ranks even before primary time.

I emphasize "close ranks." That means attaining as much party unity as possible as early as possible. It means cutting down on intra-party squabbling—intra-party sniping—to the greatest possible extent.

Let's concentrate on defeating the Democrats and avoid defeating ourselves.

Only in that way can we assuredly win. Only in that way can GOP candidates—all along the line—conduct the most effective possible campaign.

Let me point out that bitter primary campaigns in which personalities get smeared and deep wounds are cut—can hardly help our party.

WE NEED PRO-IKE CANDIDATES

But if there must be primary battles, let them come. And out of them must come candidates who will rally the whole party as well as independents, so as to win in November.

As I have indicated many times, they should be candidates who believe heart and soul in the dynamic middle-of-the-road policy, represented by President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

It is a middle-of-the-road policy which will assure a prosperous, peaceful, forward moving America.

It is a policy which definitely does not try to turn the clock back, which does not try to erase the great social advances of the last several years.

I refer to such advances as liberalizing social security, liberalizing housing credit and small-business credit, improving the Nation's highways, protecting consumers, combating monopoly, expanding our country's health facilities, improving our services for the Nation's 14 million old people, advancing opportunities for our veterans (particularly our disabled veterans), and yes, continuing our

program of strong international leadership against communism in our enlightened self-interest.

This is the type of program which we Republicans need, and it is the type of program with which we will win in the 1956 election in Wisconsin and everywhere else.

OUR THREE BIG THEMES

What then should be our basic campaign themes? I suggest 3: Prosperity, peace, and progress.

Let's take each up in order.

GOP VICTORY ASSURES CONTINUED PROSPERITY

The facts of our national prosperity are so obviously abundant that even the most partisan Democrat must admit them.

In 1952, there were 61.3 million Americans employed. Today, there are 65 million. That includes employment in Wisconsin (over and above work on the farms), of 1.1 million Badgers.

Included in that 1.1 million, are more than 354,000 employees engaged in Wisconsin manufacturing. The weekly earnings of our production employees now average $85 per week, which represents a new high. Hourly production earnings have been $2.28 an hour here in Madison, on the average.

Our national income has gone up to $325 billion. Our gross national product—the total output of all goods and services—to the $390 billion mark.

Those are big figures, astronomical figures. When you get them down, however, into terms that the average American can see and feel, they become even more meaningful and inspiring.

Meanwhile, Government expenses have been cut by $10 billion and we will, with good fortune, get a balanced budget this year.

That spells good news for Mr. Average American.

PROSPERITY AND SECURITY FOR COMMON MAN

Consider this fact, too, for example: Today, 57 percent of the American people are homeowners—25 million of us, as compared to 22 million in 1952.

Fortunately, too, the cost of living has been evened out; the rise in the price index has been held to a minimum.

Meanwhile, more Americans have been given reasonable personal security.

At least 11 million more people are now covered by the Social Security Act. At the end of the Democratic administration in 1952, there was 46 million people with old-age pension coverage. Today, there are 57 million jobs included.

As you all know, we are fast approaching income-tax time in Wisconsin and throughout America. Let me remind you that individual taxes have been cut 10 percent, by more than $3 billion, and other tax reforms have saved the American people and American business $4 billion more.

ADMITTED PROBLEM OF FARM INCOME DECLINE

Of course, you and I are aware that the one big cloud on our economic horizon relates to the problem of our farmers.

This is not the time or the place to attempt a detailed review of the farm or particularly, our own dairy problem. Suffice it to say that regardless of present differences over some details of the farm parity issue, the President has launched a bold nine-point program (including added research and speeded-up disposal of surpluses) to help bolster farm income.

GOP VICTORY ASSURES PEACE

We turn to the second great issue of 1956. It is of course peace.

You young people know as well as I, what the resumption of war—even a so-called brush-fire war—could mean to you and to your families, because it is the young people who have to carry the brunt of overseas duty.

In January 1953 when Dwight Eisenhower took office, the guns were firing in Korea, but they are silent now.

We have made important advances on the path toward peace. We have strengthened our security pacts with our allies and our strategic bases.

Indeed, the Kremlin recently has had to shift its cunning tactics in order to cope with American diplomatic successes, now concentrating on trade and aid lures.

There is still danger, great danger, particularly in both the Middle East and the Far East. But fortunately, somewhat less danger exists than when Dwight D. Eisenhower took office.

Confirmation of Eisenhower policies in November will therefore mean a great victory for America's efforts for peace.

Republican victory will mean avoiding extremes. It will mean neither appeasement nor belligerence, neither starry-eyed giveaways nor arbitrarily turning our back and ignoring the world's needs. We will continue to take firm, bold steps for peace, particularly for the universal peaceful application of atomic energy. It is in this nuclear-peace objective that our own great university is pioneering in its laboratories.

THE TWO CONTESTING SYSTEMS

May I say now just a few paragraphs more on the matter of peace and liberty.

You and I must never forget that freedom can be lost. All history is replete with instances that those who fall asleep, as we did at Pearl Harbor, can lose their freedom.

When I went to Washington, in January 1939, Poland was free, the Baltic States were free, and many other now-enslaved nations were free.

Today the same evil that enslaved these nations—900 million people in all, including Russia and China—threatens our own American freedom. And so we face a crisis, and it is a continuing crisis. It arises from the basic fact that, as we are all aware, there are two political and economic systems contesting for the world.

The one, communism, still continues to seek to overcome by violence and subversion the other system—the system of free men. This latter system is based on immortal, noble ideas and concepts that have existed generally throughout the world for centuries.

They include ideas stemming back to the Old and New Testaments and ideas conceived from the Magna Carta and Plymouth Rock and the Wisconsin idea of good, dynamic government, protecting all the people.

Meanwhile, our system of free enterprise has demonstrated that it is able to produce more goods—more comforts and conveniences—of better quality and at better prices for the average man than the Communist system.

Freedom-loving people everywhere—in front of and behind the Iron Curtain—hate communism because of its vicious, dictatorial tactics—enslaving mankind. They despise it for its atheism and its antireligion. But when we consider how powerful is this evil, dynamic force—international communism—we know that the struggle must go on relentlessly—everywhere—to help save freedom for free men.

THE SHRUNKEN WORLD OF JET-ATOMIC AGE

I stress, too, this point at this time. Man's ingenuity has shrunken the world, so that every nation is today in every other nation's backyard.

Right here tonight we are only 5 hours away from bombing bases, located in Siberia. And up ahead, we are contemplating intercontinental missiles that would probably shrink the distance to 30 minutes.

Therefore, we cannot in the campaign up ahead so lose ourselves in possible partisan controversy, in bitter invective, that we lose the vision that is necessary so that this people does not perish.

In the battle of ideas that is before us, we must constantly show that we have a better system, a better bill of goods to sell than the Communists.

We have a better educational system, a better social system, a better system in every way.

The Reds have hurled down a redefined challenge at their 20th party congress. They expect to beat us at so-called competitive coexistence. They have changed their tactics. But we know the Communists have not changed their objectives.

Besides using violence whenever possible, and subversion almost everywhere, they are now seeking to try persuasion, to disarm fears and suspicions, to widen trading, cultural and diplomatic relations to further their plans for world conquest.

In a sense this makes them more dangerous and calls for more awareness, more competency, more adequacy on our part so as to meet this new campaign of the Communists.

If we are alert, if all the free peoples of the world remain alert, the outcome is clear. Even mighty dictatorships can disintegrate eventually. Not only will the people of the captive countries, but the people of Russia itself will rise up in due season and throw off this evil thing that has smothered them for so many years.

Every day is a day for greatness for us Americans, because we have been called unto a great responsibility—safeguarding freedom with all that those words imply.

THE THIRD PLANK—PROGRESS

Meanwhile here at home, campaigning on the two-fold platform of prosperity and peace, we can, I believe, again win the allegiance of the American people.

But there is another plank in our platform. And that is progress.

We Republicans, for too long, sat idly by, while we tended to be smeared as so-called "reactionaries." Far too long, we allowed the Democrats to get away with unfair charges to the effect that we were allegedly "the party of big business"; we were allegedly "uninterested" in the common man. We were told too, that the Republicans were wedded "to vested interests."

WHAT THE GAS BILL VETO SIGNIFIED

That charge has been debunked completely by recent events. Perhaps, the most significant of such events was the President's veto of the natural gas rate increase bill.

Admittedly, that bill had a good deal of Republican support—Republicans who earnestly felt that it represented a so-called free-enterprise bill.

Nevertheless a substantial number of Republicans, like myself, vigorously oppose it. We felt that the vast oil and gas industry could easily prosper and expand, even though there was some Federal control over it.

We felt that the interest of 30 million natural-gas consumers was superior to the interest of the handful of monopolistic oil and gas producers.

In any event, when Dwight D. Eisenhower vetoed the gas bill, he exploded once and for all the false giveaway charge which the Democrats had leveled against us.

We Republicans were supposed to be the party that gave away natural resources.

Let me point out, however, that I, for one, have always been strongly in favor of retaining our national resources—our parks and forests—in all the American people's hands.

THE DEMOCRATIC GIVEAWAY PARTY

But here in the gas bill we could very clearly see the utter falsity of the Democrats' giveaway charges.

Why? Because the natural gas (giveaway) bill was advanced by Democratic committee chairmen through Democratic-controlled Senate and House floors.

It was pushed by Democratic leadership on both sides of Capitol Hill. It was sponsored by Democrats for the benefit basically, of five Democratic-controlled States of the South and Southwest.

And it was vetoed by a Republican President.

As I have indicated, the issue was not completely sharply defined. A good many thinking Democrats valiantly fought against the bill, and I was glad to pay tribute to them publicly on the Senate floor. A Democratic President had also previously vetoed the gas bill.

But here, all could see that it was really the Democratic Party which was basically the giveaway party. For it, in both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations has been the moving force behind this dangerous legislation.

It was the Democratic Party which was ready, willing, and eager to see American consumers soaked to the tune of $800 million a year.

And it was now a Republican President (despite his openly expressed desire to protect what he genuinely felt is a free enterprise concept), who courageously vetoed the rate-increase bill.

He wisely did so, particularly because of the dark lobbying cloud over the bill.

He knew that this cloud could, if not cleared away promptly, tarnish the United States Senate's own integrity.

WE MUST NEVER BE BEHOLDEN TO ANYONE

That must never happen.

I say to you, too, that I believe that the Republican Party must never become wedded to any special interest, whether it be so-called big business, or by big labor. I believe that it must never be beholden to any one group in our population, or to several groups.

It must speak for all the people, must fight for all the people, must champion all the people's cause.

That is why I am so determined that the current lobby investigation to be conducted by the eight-man select Senate committee shall proceed all out.

Let the chips fall where they may.

If there has been influence peddling for the natural gas industry; if there has been an attempt to buy votes, then let the full facts be exposed.

And let the full facts be exposed, regarding lobbying from any other source. Those who have nothing to fear will welcome the investigation. Those who are afraid of their own shadows will run from it.

WISCONSIN'S FINE RECORD ON GAS BILL

This is the type of fearlessness, integrity, and progress which we of Wisconsin, with our great record of protecting the public interest, are particularly qualified to advance.

I am proud that a Republican governor of your State and mine—a Republican attorney general—and a great chairman of the Public Service Commission—worked night and day, with teamwork, to defeat the natural gas bill.

Every single Republican official in our State—mayors, board supervisors, councilmen, town chairmen, with but 1 or 2 isolated exceptions, supported me in this fight.

This is the type of Republican cooperation which is needed if the American people's confidence is to be maintained in the Republican Party.

THIS FAST-CHANGING WORLD

You young Republicans on this wide-awake campus can particularly well appreciate the need for cooperation which will meet the needs of today's fast-changing world.

All about us, as we look, there is flux and ferment. An earth satellite is to be flung into outer space.

Meanwhile, the Nations' cities are changing. The Nation's suburbs are booming.

The Nation's transportation and communications arteries are jammed.

Patterns of farming, patterns of industry are evolving under the impact of new techniques. There are constantly new developments in atomic energy and in electronics and automation.

Whole new occupations, particularly because of scientific research, are coming into being.

It is to fulfill the needs of this new America that we need a forward-looking, dynamic Eisenhower program.

JUDGE SENATOR BY VOTES ON MANY ISSUES

I want to conclude with this one thought: I have referred to only a few of the issues confronting our people.

I want to point out that, in any one session of the Senate, there may be as many as 250 individual votes on the Senate floor.

That means that the people of our State should try to scan as many of these votes as possible—should try at least to get an understanding of the principal votes. You, of the Young Republican movement, can help them in this task.

Sometimes our people may get the erroneous idea that a Senator should be judged, should be praised or condemned on the basis of a single vote.

I don't, however, believe in such a narrow stand. The gas bill was important, but it is definitely not the only important issue.

There are at least a score of key votes which should serve as a reasonable basis for your judgment. I refer to votes on issues like liberalizing social security, revising taxes, advancing conservation, strengthening defense, deepening the Great Lakes connecting channels, strengthening anti-Communist laws—all of these and others should serve as standards for judging your Senator—any Senator.

I hope that you will scan my own record, and that you will give me the benefit of your frank opinions on it.

Individuals in this audience and I may differ on this particular issue or that, but you can be sure that I will always welcome your candid judgment on the problems of our times.

YR'S ASSISTANCE IN PARTY NEEDED

On the Senate floor, I have emphasized time and time again that I want to secure the fullest possible contributions from our YR movement.

It is you who will be furnishing tomorrow's leadership in our party and in our country. Indeed, already, there are literally dozens of young men—in their late twenties and early thirties, serving well at highest echelons in our United States Government.

I welcome this trend. I don't believe in keeping young people "on the shelf." Let them contribute now—today—in every phase of party and governmental activity, rising up from the ranks, in accordance with their—your—ability and energy and devotion.

CONCLUSION

Dwight D. Eisenhower's program must be fulfilled by a party of youth. That doesn't mean that it is just a program for young people. But, rather it is a young-minded program, forward-looking, dynamic. It is not static, not backward-looking, not reactionary.

It is designed to meet the needs of our country in the jet-atomic age.

It has been a great privilege to meet again with the YR's here, and I hope that I will have another similar opportunity in the not too distant future.

Put None But Constitutionalists on Guard in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by me before the Abraham Lincoln Republican Club, Chicago, Ill., on February 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUT NONE BUT CONSTITUTIONALISTS ON GUARD IN CONGRESS

There are many reasons why it is a pleasure for me to come here, to the capital city of the American heartland, and discuss the strategy by which Republicans can help reestablish constitutional liberty throughout our country.

Most important of all, you love our country. Perhaps you do not believe it, but patriotism is rapidly going out of style, at the centers of power, like Washington, New York, and Hollywood. We are told that we live in some kind of a new era, and therefore the ideas which our people cherished for centuries are out of date, and must be replaced by global ideas.

Patriotism can no longer be taken for granted.

You and I still believe that love of country is a good thing. Devotion to their country makes men stronger and braver than they would be, in their own interest alone. Some of the most heroic deeds of fallible human beings have been inspired by love of country.

You and I know that patriotism is not out-dated. Love of one's nation does not change when transportation changes from horse-power to steam, or from electric power to atomic energy. Love of country rests on man's willingness to sacrifice himself for others. It arises from generations of mutual sacrifice for the land and the people we call "our country," because we are united with our fellow countrymen in a common bond of beliefs and purposes.

Sometimes we call ourselves Republicans, or conservative Republicans, or Constitutionalists. Sometimes we try other means, but the strongest bond which unites us is love of our country and loyalty to others who love it. We insist that patriotism is important. We work best with other people who have dedicated themselves loyally to our country and who could never change their minds because of specious arguments that the world is somehow more round than it was in the days of Columbus.

The second reason why I am happy to speak to you derives from the first. You have courage.

Perhaps you do not realize that, at the centers of power, courage is going out of style. The vested interests which profit by big spending, internationalism, and global welfare are powerful. They are ruthless. They do not like people who question their answers. They denounce those who tell the American people to look at the bargains which are offered them in the name of international welfare, and see what the score really amounts to. Power seekers remember who are their friends and who are their opponents. They practice the rule of rewarding one's friends and punishing one's enemies. They have over $65 billion a year of your

money, with which to teach people their importance.

There are men today who do not want to be internationalists or collectivists, but who do not have the courage to fight so gigantic a trust. They will always go along with the winning side. It is most important that you speak out and tell the waverers that you intend to hold fast to your ideas, no matter how powerful the people who seek to spend your money for globalism.

The third reason why I am glad to be here is that you are trying to think. That is most unusual.

Some of our people believe our Constitution is outmoded, for the silliest reasons. But they are not much more absurd than the good people who believe that we can preserve the American Constitution, in this world of change, demoralization, and hatred, merely by solemn appeals to the good old days.

You believe, and I believe, that our Constitution is still today the most revolutionary, the most nearly perfect, form of government which has yet appeared in all history. We wish to, and we intend to, live by the constitutional compact. But we must never imagine, for one moment, that it is any simple matter to preserve the grand design of our Constitution in a world in which material forces have changed as rapidly and as completely as the change from the horsepower of 1776 to the nuclear energy of 1956.

I like the story in the Bible, of Lot's wife, who kept looking over her shoulder to the city she had to leave, because she could not face the present, accept the fact of change, and free her mind of the past. You remember her punishment. The Lord turned her into a pillar of salt.

Many of our conservatives remind me of Lot's wife. They will not undertake the heavy burden of sorting out the best of the past, and adapting it to the present. Such people can contribute nothing to preserving our Constitution, for a simple reason. The men who hope to destroy our Nation and our liberty rely not on force but on guile. They hope to delude our minds. They tell us—quite truthfully—that changes are necessary to cope with a constantly changing world. They tell us about their "simple" changes, but they never tell us that those "simple" changes will undermine all that was good in our Constitution and our liberty.

The story of Lot's wife means, I believe, that we cannot rest on the past, like an infant resting on its mother's breast, without the need to think or to exert its will. We can preserve the past only if we take up the challenge of life—to think and to use our wills. Thinking is the only way by which we can know what is the true gold in the past, and refine it from its temporary circumstances, so it can be used again and again. Using our wills is the only way we can resist men with a firm determination to destroy our country for their own petty gains.

The collectivists work—much harder than we do. They study, they think, they learn—much faster than we do. We would not, if we could, imitate their methods of deceit and delusion. But we would do well to imitate their hard work and their readiness to learn.

You are meeting here to think. You are asking how we can use our minds to learn what our opponents are doing, why their moves are so successful, and where we can find equally effective moves for the restoration of constitutional liberty.

That is the third reason why I am happy to be here today, because you are seeking the strategy by which real Republicans can restore constitutional government.

Many able speakers are discussing this question with you. I will take up one aspect of the broad question of strategy, because it is the one most often neglected. I believe the most important single step in restoring the supremacy of our Constitution is to elect a strong Congress, whose Members are militant in their determination to restore constitutional liberty.

We constantly hear people say that 1956 will be a year of presidential elections. That is not true. It is a year of presidential and congressional elections. We must never forget that our vote for Members of Congress is at least as important as our vote for President. In fact, some people believe the vote for Congress is more important for the preservation of liberty than the presidential vote.

For years now we have been listening to attempts to glorify the Presidency and change it into an office never envisioned by the Constitutional Convention. This was obvious under President Franklin Roosevelt, but it continued under President Truman and President Eisenhower. The President is pictured as an indispensable man. He is credited with sole responsibility for decisions and achievements that a superman could not make. He is protected against criticism. He is surrounded by soldiers and guards, heralded by pomp and circumstance.

The office is being changed from the American constitutional office of first citizen of the Republic into a European office much more like the early Roman Emperors.

I do not hold our Presidents responsible for this transformation. I am not sure they realize the change or like what they see. This glamorizing of the Presidency is the work of that bureaucratic elite which wants to rule the United States in the protecting shadow of a loved and trusted symbol. Kings, emperors, and fuehrers are built up by ambitious power seekers who could not be elected to office themselves. Our power seekers try to make our Chief Executive into a monarch and our sober constitutional executive branch into a glamorous imperial household, in which they will wield the hidden powers.

What becomes of Congress while this glamorizing of the Chief Executive is going on? We know the answer to that. They dare not abolish the Congress. Instead, Congress is to be given every opportunity to make the unimportant decision with a great show of conferences and consultations, but all really important decisions are to be made secretly by the elite in the executive branch. This is the essence of the struggle over the Bricker amendment.

You remember the Senate was asked with a great show of consultation to pass the Formosa resolution permitting the President to decide how to defend Formosa. The resolution was, of course, meaningless. For the short run, the President already had the power to support our Armed Forces if they were attacked, and, for the long run, Congress could not delegate its constitutional duty to vote on any declaration of war. Congress was never told the important facts in the story. Did the resolution cover Quemoy and Matsu? We do not know. Did it mean we should adopt the only possible military strategy and bomb the staging areas of the Red Chinese on the mainland if they struck against the islands? We do not know. Congress was never told.

But we still have not answered our question, What is the Congress? What is its constitutional role?

We say lightly that Congress "makes the laws." But what does that mean? It means, I think, something quite simple. The executive branch spends billions of dollars. It has millions of employees. It has the power of arrest, and its own jails. These jails are controlled by the Executive—not by the courts. But what keeps the reign on the Executive? Who is to manage the managers?

The answer is this—under the Constitution, Congress doles out our tax money to the executive agencies, and it says that the executive branch can use that money if it spends the money not for what it likes to do but only for those things which the people want done. Most of the laws which Congress passes are concerned with saying what the Government may do and what it may not do, with your money. Laws on education or commerce or foreign aid or railroads, usually say what Government agencies can or cannot spend your money for. In all our history, the American people never permitted their Government to take their money, except as they spend it for what the people wanted done. Since the voters cannot come to Washington themselves, and say what the Government may do, they send their representatives to Washington to act as their agents. Congress is the council of these agents who represent the opinion of the citizens in one district.

The colonists expressed this demand in their insistence on "no taxation without representation." They meant that if they could not send representatives to decide in council how their tax-money was to be spent, they would not pay taxes. When the choice was forced on them, they were ready to die rather than to have their money taken from them for purposes they had not chosen. The colonists knew—what we forget—that their taxes were the fruit of their labor, and any government which could spend their earnings without their consent was imposing a species of slavery.

It is almost impossible for the Americans of today, after 175 years of freedom, to believe this simple fact. Any government which takes our money and spends it for anything except what we, the citizens, tell them to do, is reestablishing slavery. Any executive establishment which belittles or bypasses the Congress, which decides for itself what it will spend your money for, is reestablishing tyranny.

If our purpose is to preserve our liberty, it is not nearly so important to have a strong President as it is to have a strong Congress.

Congressional elections are a nationwide proxy battle. You remember the national interest that was aroused recently in the proxy battle for control of Montgomery Ward, and earlier of the New York Central. When important questions are at stake, the apparently indifferent stockholders suddenly care very greatly who are to be their managers.

What are the stakes in the nationwide proxy battle which we call the congressional elections of 1956?

I spoke at length in Congress last month to call attention to the collapse of American foreign policy.

I would like to remind you, at this point, of the frightening danger we face because, at one and the same time, the Soviet plotters are making fantastic gains in every quarter of the globe, while our foreign policymakers in the executive branch carry on with your money and mine, a vast nationwide propaganda, that all will be well. The Secretary of State says he has brought us to the brink, again and again, but by his masterly gymnastics, he has wheeled at just the right moment, and avoided going over the edge.

This picture of the Secretary of State of the United States, like the famous king of France, leading this country up the hill to the brink, and then down again, is supposed to reassure us. It is supposed to prove that the bureaucratic elite has some mysterious wisdom in dealing with the Communists which the rest of us do not share.

To me it is a shocking spectacle to think that an American Secretary of State would descend to explaining his foreign policy by giving a special interview to a magazine which has been called an administration house organ, and picturing himself as a great fellow because he has more gymnastic tricks than the leaders of the other side.

To me such a picture is nauseating. I think of the months and years our young men spent fighting, half way round the world, in the bitter cold, on the slopes of mountain crags, because we had a Secretary of State who was so smart he did not need to listen to the American people. I remember the daily casualty lists from the Korean War. I remember the days when I listened, at hearings of the Internal Security Subcommittee to the stories of brave men who spent 1 year, 2 years, nearly 3 years in Chinese prison camps, tortured by Chinese Communist experts in torture, because we had a Secretary of State who said Formosa was not important to American security, and the Secretary had an advisor named Owen Lattimore who said we should let Korea fall, but not let it look as if we pushed her.

You know, and I know, we are not playing tick-tack-toe with the leaders in the Kremlin. It is life or death for our country.

While our present Secretary of State says he was leading us to the brink, what were we really doing to halt the Communist offensive? I can give you a simple formula.

There are three kinds of nations in Europe—firm anti-Communist nations, soft anti-Communist nations, and anti-Communist nations which are captive satellites of the Communist empire. Our policy is to drag our feet in every effort to help the firm anti-Communist nations of Europe—Germany, Spain, Austria, Greece, Turkey. We have given vast sums of money and tailored our policies to help the soft anti-Communist nations like France, Italy, and, if you will, Yugoslavia. What did we tell the anti-Communist people of the satellites when we agreed to accept the status quo in Europe; that is, to do nothing? We told them there was no more hope for them. At the Geneva conferences our Government leaders appeared in the center of the world spotlight, shaking hands with the blood-stained leaders of communism. But that carefully stage-managed spectacle of surrender had a most sinister effect. The Communists and their allies stage-managed the conferences to show the firm anti-Communist leaders their fight was lost, because America had abandoned them.

Now let us test our formula on our Asia policy. What do we find? The same three policies. We are most kind and gentle to soft anti-Communist nations like India and Burma. We are harsh and unsympathetic to firm anti-Communist nations like Korea, which is wrestling with cruel postwar inflation. And our State Department has imposed on free China and free Korea terms for military aid which make it impossible for the patriots of either nation to free their enslaved people and regain their homeland. It is as if the French in our Revolutionary War had given us military aid, and said we could use it to hold Valley Forge but we must make no effort to recapture Boston or New York or Philadelphia.

In a series of articles which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, written by Joseph Harsch, we have another story of our State Department policy, which is a startling contrast to that in Life.

In the Monitor, Mr. Dulles is credited with a policy called disengagement. This is a term used by Owen Lattimore to indicate that we are to drop anti-Communist nations but not let it look as if we pushed them.

According to the Monitor, Mr. Dulles has disengaged himself from free China by tying China up in a mutual aid treaty. He is also disengaging himself from the rearmament of Germany, as he did from Austria. He is withdrawing American power from all the points on the frontier of freedom where we contact the Soviet Union.

At Geneva we promised not to engage the Soviet Union at the center of its power by promising not to use the atom bomb. At the same time we are disengaging ourselves from the periphery of Soviet power by a series of planned retirements around the world. What then do the Communists have to fear? They have stepped up their timetable of subversions all over the world.

Isn't it fantastic that our Secretary of State should be engaged in a policy of planned retreat to an ever-narrowing circle of influence, at the same time that the Soviet leaders are planning continuous expansions to ever-widening circles of influence over what was the free world? Could our fifth column have planned it that way?

Now, there is a world of difference between the Secretary Dulles of Life magazine, constantly galloping up to the brink, and the Secretary Dulles of the Monitor, constantly moving our forces backward as the Soviet power advances. But I wonder if the riddle can be explained this way. The Christian Science Monitor is a paper for the intellectuals. Life magazine is for the crowd. Could it be that Mr. Dulles intentionally set himself up as a martial figure leading the embattled legions of anticommunism to the brink, as a way to fool the people, while his real policy was revealed to the small group of intellectuals working for a great collectivist one world, in which we shall sink to the level of a despised and looted province?

Now we can turn back to the problem with which we started. How can patriots stop this planned retreat?

I say to you that no President and no one in the executive branch can end the power of this dual government of the United States which talks anticommunism but silently, secretly, carries on a planned retreat before the Communist advance.

Congress alone can save the Republic, because Congress has the ultimate power, the power of the purse. Congress can tell the executive branch it must amputate every person and every agency which serves this dual government, or Congress will not give it your money to spend.

But we have one more problem. Congress can restrain the executive branch but who can make Congress decide to do it, to safeguard America?

The answer is you, the people. You and only you can make Congress cut all collectivism and one-worldism out of the executive branch. But we are not quite finished yet.

You have no power over Congress here. You have no power over Congress in Washington. There is only one place where you have influence over Congress. That is in your congressional district.

It was the intention of the Founding Fathers that the legislative branch should speak for local, not centralized opinion. The king and his court spoke for the center. The lovers of liberty knew they had to preserve the interest and influence of every separate area of the Nation in policymaking.

This does not mean at all that the Congress speaks only for local interests. Quite the contrary. It means that every local citizen should have a voice in the making of national policy. It means national policy shall not be made by an elite, as the elite proposes.

I listen to many people who tell me we can restore constitutional government only if we elect this man or that man for President.

Some of them hope to reform the Republican Party between February and November of 1956. Some expect to reform the Democratic Party. Some dream of starting a new party with a few months work.

Remember just one fact. You cannot elect a President unless you can win over about 34 million votes. You can elect a Member of Congress if you can win over a few thousand votes. You can elect a Senator if you can win over a small fraction of the Presidential vote.

I say to you that we shall never restore the Constitution and make a firm wall of resistance to communism, unless we have a firm pro-American, anti-Communist Congress. But I say further that we shall never have a firm pro-American and anti-Communist Congress, until the pro-Americans of both parties are firmly in control of their own congressional districts and senatorial elections. Every gain we make in congressional elections counts. When the supporters of the Constitution are actively in control in half the congressional districts and senatorial elections, the victory is won.

You do not elect a Representative or a Senator on election day. You elect him every day in the year before he is elected and every day in the year after he is elected, and in the following years, until he comes up again for reelection.

I say to you that every congressional district, every senatorial election, is important to the collectivist one-world pro-Communists, for 365 days out of every year. If your congressional district, and your senatorial district, are not important to you, you have lost the war before you begin to fight.

I wish I could tell you simply that we can save the country by electing Republicans to Congress. But that is absurd. It is saying the Communists are not smart enough to borrow the Republican label to elect their best men or to seduce weak men on our side who cannot go it alone, or want to be on the winning side.

We cannot uphold the Constitution, unless we restore political power enough in the hands of constitutionalists. We can do that only if we recapture our congressional and senatorial districts. If the political power which believes in constitutional liberty, permits itself to grow weaker than the political power which is undermining the Constitution, then our Constitution will be only a memory.

I give you one slogan for 1956. It is not the whole strategy but it is the first step. I say to you, "Put none but constitutionalists on guard in Congress."

If you care about our country, you must go into your primary campaign armed with knowledge of your district and make sure only a true constitutionalist is nominated on your ticket.

Work with your Democratic friends to do the same in their primaries.

Then let the true constitutionalists in both parties work together to defeat any collectivist on either party. In districts where the collectivists are strong enough to nominate a leftwinger on both tickets, elect the weaker one. There can be no party loyalty which requires that you strengthen your party by electing a man indifferent to the Constitution because he carries your banner to hide his purpose.

Let us first of all recapture our congressional districts. Let us make our congressional districts and then our States into political fortresses in which collectivism cannot get or keep a foothold. Let these strong and vigorous districts send strong and vigorous pro-Americans to Congress and work to keep them there.

Then we shall have an instrument by which Congress can once again renew its ancient power to stand guard over the earnings of our people, and bar the ambitious in Government from using one dollar of tax money for any purposes except those which will make our country strong and great.

Put none but constitutionalists on guard in Congress and we shall have no difficulty in safeguarding our country against that dual government which has been so brilliantly successful in letting our strength leak away while the Communists advance.

Put none but constitutionalists on guard in Congress. Then the patriots in Congress can say as a patriot once said to the gangsters abroad, "You can have millions for

defense of our country but you cannot have a penny of our earnings to destroy that liberty which is the cherished possession of our people and the only hope of the world."

Archbishop Joseph Beran of Prague

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a basic policy of the Communists in their subjugation of the Iron Curtain countries has been the attempt to eliminate the worship of God and to replace it with the doctrines of Marxist-Leninist ideology. The Soviets recognized that communism and religion were incompatible and that complete control of the satellite countries was impossible unless the church was made subservient to the state. In an endeavor to accomplish these ends, campaigns of antireligious propaganda, and the liquidation of the clergy were initiated in these oppressed countries to assure complete sovietization.

Czechoslovakia offers an infamous example of the tactics employed by the Kremlin in its ruthless attempt to make the church servile to the state. The attack was concentrated on Archbishop Beran, the moral authority of the Catholic Church in Prague, Czechoslovakia. The archbishop had constantly fought for the maintenance of religious rights and freedom for the Czech people. He had previous experience with totalitarian terror tactics against religion when he resisted Nazi interference in church affairs. This struggle against Hitler culminated in his internment in the Dachau concentration camp in 1942 where he remained until liberated by American troops in 1945. After the war, he returned to Prague only to face still another tyranny beginning with the Communist coup in 1948. Since then he has continued his valiant struggle for religious and human rights against the atheistic Kremlin.

In an attempt to eliminate the church as a threat to Communist control of the country, the Reds instituted an intense policy of sovietization. All church property was confiscated and the clergy was made subservient to the state; the Catholic press, church-sponsored schools, and religious organizations were suppressed; and arrests and deportation of priests and religious leaders were numerous.

Despite these intolerable conditions, Archbishop Beran refused to sell his soul to the godless Communists. He resisted the Communist inroads on the Catholic Church and courageously announced that the Communists were attempting to undermine the church and supplement it with the atheistic ideology of Marxism. In a pastoral letter he demanded that the Communists discontinue their systematic attacks on the church.

The Communists, cognizant that the archbishop was an obstacle to complete control of the country, retaliated with a series of false accusations against him which resulted in his imprisonment in December of 1949 and eventually in his banishment from his diocese in March 1951. According to latest reports, his whereabouts is still unknown.

Archbishop Beran is a symbol of the courageuos struggle against atheistic bolshevism which still exists in the satellite countries. This persevering resistance is tangible proof that godless ideology which teaches devotion to the state will never supplant man's belief in the worship of God, and his innate concern for individual rights and the dignity of the human being.

Freedom of Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in Congress a bill (H. R. 4627) seeking to ban the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce. Hearings have already been held on the bill and I find that about the only serious objection to my bill appears to be based upon a fear of its possible infringement upon the freedom of speech guaranteed Americans by our Constitution.

Now freedom of speech is certainly a cherished and valued liberty that all of us would continuously preserve as a goodly heritage for ourselves and our children. But there is not, and never has been, any freedom of speech transcending the moral health and salutary climate of our sacred homes and growing families. I was quite interested to read recently what Blackstone, the great architect of English and American jurisprudence, had to say about liberty of the press, which is tantamount of course to freedom of speech, almost 2 centuries ago. He said, in defining what the forefathers meant by liberty of the press, that it did not consist of "laying no previous restraints upon publications, and not in freedom from censure for criminal matter when published. Every free man has an undoubted right to lay what sentiments he pleases before the public; but if he publishes what is improper, mischievous or illegal, he must take the consequences of his own temerity." In other words, says Blackstone, a person's oral or written speech is subject to undoubted restriction by the police power that exists for the constant protection of the moral health of the community, regardless of that outstanding and continuous basic freedom of speech vouchsafed to a free people under constitutional heritage and ancient tradition of the past.

Freedom of speech? Yes. Police power regulation, restriction and supervision? Always. The two go together under the Constitution. Neither is exclusive unto itself. This is the American way and the constitutional way. Do not be deceived or misled by the booze interests into believing that anyone whatsoever is trying to destroy the Constitution, for we have "come to fulfill, not to destroy the law."

Explanatory Statement of a Bill To Improve and Simplify Credit Facilities to Farmers, To Amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for Other Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, section 1 (a) of the bill will amend the last sentence of section 1 (a) of the existing law so that loans for improvements, including housing and other farm buildings, may be made to all eligible applicants rather than to only existing borrowers under title I of the act, as this section is now limited. This latter change will also make this section consistent with the proposed changes in the second part of the proviso of section 1 (c).

Section 1 (b) of the existing act will be amended so as to be consistent with the proposed changes in 1 (a) by including the present owners of farms among those eligible for assistance under this title and by requiring that the applicant has received a substantial portion of his income from farming instead of the major portion as now required.

The changes proposed in section 1 (c) will provide authority to make loans for repair and improvement on those farms which are less than family-type units which constitute the residence of the owner-operator, if income from outside sources, plus income from the farm, will warrant the making of such loans.

Section 2 (b) will replace the existing eligibility requirement that an applicant be unable to secure credit at rates not exceeding 5 percent per annum prevailing in the community with a requirement that he be unable to secure such loans at such reasonable rates and terms prevailing in the community. The other changes in this section, with respect to loans made under the proviso of section 1 (c), will establish as the maximum amount of such a loan the fair and reasonable value based on normal market value of the farms constituting less than family-type units. Loans on family-type farms would continue to be based on the earning capacity of the farm. For a unit that is less than a full-time farming operation, factors other than the earning capacity of the farm generally influence its value; therefore, a normal market value determination provides a better basis for appraising such a farm.

The changes which will be made in the first sentence of section 3 (a) are necessary to correlate this section with the proposed additional authority. It is also proposed to amend this section by eliminating the second sentence which

requires that no loan shall be made in excess of the average value of the efficient family-type farm units in the county. Loans will still be limited to farms that are not larger than family-size units and to an amount not exceeding the value certified by the county committee under section 2 (b).

Section 1 (f) of the bill will amend section 12 (b) of the act to increase from $100 million to $125 million the aggregate amount of mortgages or loans which may be insured under title I in any one fiscal year. This change is in anticipation of an increased volume of loans under the additional proposed authority.

The change proposed in section 1 (g) of the bill will eliminate the present limitation of insured loans to those not exceeding 90 percent of the fair and reasonable value of farms. The 90 percent limitation has operated to prevent assistance by means of insured loans to many applicants, otherwise eligible, who are unable to provide the balance of the cost of the farm and its improvements. Experience with direct loans has demonstrated that sound loans can be made up to 100 percent of the fair and reasonable value of the farm. The proposed language of the new section 12 (c) (5) will also make this provision consistent with the changes made in section 2 (b) relating to the determination of fair and reasonable value of less than family size units.

Section 1 (h) would modify section 12 (e) (2) in order to avoid the insertion of legislative language in the appropriation acts authorizing the use of one-half of 1 percent of insurance charges for any administrative expenses of the Farmers' Home Administration. As the act is now worded, funds so collected could be used only in connection with the provisions of the act relating to mortgage insurance. Without the modifications contained in appropriation acts in the past, it would have been necessary for each employee to keep track of the amount of his time spent on the mortgage insurance work so that it could be charged against this sum.

Section 1 (i) will amend section 16 (a) so as to add authority to insure loans which will be subordinate to an outstanding first lien. Second mortgages running to the Government for the benefit of the mortgage insurance fund would be taken in connection with such loans. An additional sentence is also proposed so that loans insured under section 16 (a) will be controlled by limits comparable to second mortgage direct loans as provided in the proposed section 3 (a).

Section 1 (j) will add a new section 17 which will provide the Secretary with temporary authority during the next 3 fiscal years to make and insure loans solely for refinancing existing indebtedness of farmers who qualify for assistance under the amended act. The total of such refinancing loans insured in any fiscal year would be limited to $50 million.

Section 2 of the bill will amend the title of title II of the act from "Production and Subsistence Loans" to "Operating Loans." The new title is believed to be more dscriptive and more understandable.

The proposed new section 21 (a) involves the following changes:

First. Loans will be authorized to operators of family-type farms, and to operators of less than family-type farms whose farms are of sufficient size to produce income which, with income from other sources, will enable the operators to pay necessary operating costs and the amounts which will become due on their loans. This change is proposed to permit the correlation of the operating loan program with other efforts being made to assist low-income farmers and to provide credit in designated rural development areas.

Second. Section 21 (b) will be amended to substitute a $10,000 limitation on the total outstanding principal indebtedness of a borrower under this section for the present $7,000 restriction on an initial operating loan to a borrower. In addition, a sum not to exceed 10 percent of the annual appropriation for loans under this section may be used for larger loans which would not exceed a total principal indebtedness at any one time of $20,000.

Third. The maximum term of loans, including renewals or extensions, would be changed by section 21 (c) from 7 years to 10 years.

Fourth. The following change will be made in the continuous indebtedness limitation of section 21 (d), which makes a borrower under this section ineligible for further loans unless he has liquidated his indebtedness within 7 years. In justifiable cases due to causes beyond the borrower's control, the loan could be renewed or extended for a total period of not longer than 10 years from the date it was made, and additional loans could be made during the extended period. Section 21 (d) also will eliminate the present requirement that debts incurred prior to November 1, 1946, must be included in the determination as to whether the borrower has liquidated his indebtedness under this section on and after November 1, 1953. Some persons who are still farming and who need further credit assistance have never been able to fully pay their indebtedness under the Resettlement and Farm Security Administration programs. The present language is ambiguous with respect to whether such persons have fully liquidated their indebtedness if such debts have been settled without payment of the entire principal and interest either before or after November 1, 1953.

Section 3 of the bill contains amendments to the authority of the Secretary with respect to making and servicing loans under titles I and II, including compromise powers, use of county committees, sale of surplus acquired security property, availability of other credit at 5 percent interest, and the authority to deal with security property.

First. Section 3 (a) will amend section 41 (g) of the act by extending the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, and reduce claims and modify the terms of contracts to those entered into or by the Farmers Home Administration under any of its programs. While most of the claims administered by this agency are covered by the present language, claims arising under the Water Facilities Act, the Wheeler-Case Act, the flood and windstorm appropriations, and the emergency loan provisions are not subject to the same administrative settlement authorities applicable to claims under this act.

The proposed change in section 41 (g) (1) will remove the $10,000 limit on claims that may be settled by the Secretary. This proposed change would expedite the settlement of claims in excess of $10,000, and provide a uniform basis for settling all claims arising out of transactions under any program administered by the Farmers' Home Administration. The factors affecting the settlement of larger claims are not sufficiently different from those of smaller claims to justify special treatment.

The provisions of section 41 (g) (2) do no permit the release from personal liability of those operating loan borrowers who transfer or convey their security property in satisfaction of their indebtedness to the Secretary. Under the revised language, releases of personal liability may be made to such borrowers. The changes in section 41 (g) (2) (B) are for the purpose of extending the provisions of that subsection to insured mortgage loans and to less than family-size farm units.

Section 3 (a) will also extend the Secretary's authority for cancellation and release of claims regardless of amount under certain restricted conditions. At present, claims of $100 or less may be canceled if those conditions exist. Under Public Law 518, the Secretary has concurrent authority to cancel these and certain similar debts not exceeding $1,000 principal balance. With the removal of the monetary limitation on the cancellation of debts where the debtor has no assets or apparent debt-paying ability, where the borrower is deceased and has left no estate, or where he has been absent from his last known address, is without known assets, and his whereabouts cannot be ascertained without undue expense, the bill will permit such action only after 5 years instead of the present 2- or 3-year limitations. It is also proposed that claims of $150 or less many be canceled if further collection efforts would be ineffectual or uneconomical. This change from $10 to $150 is prompted by comparison with the costs of litigation on such claims.

Second. Section 3 (b) of the bill will permit the establishment of county committees for areas not necessarily limited to county boundaries. Topography and means of communication between county seats and parts of some counties make it expensive and extremely difficult to limit uniformly the jurisdiction of the county committee exactly to county boundaries.

Third. Section 3 (c) of the bill will strike the words "as family-size farms" from section 43 (d) in order to authorize the Secretary to sell and acquire farm units of less than family type to persons who would be eligible for the less than the family-type farm loans proposed under section 1 on terms consistent with the modified loan authority.

Fourth. Section 3 (d) of the bill will substitute reasonable rates prevailing in

the community for the present limitation of rates not exceeding 5 percent per annum as a guide to determining whether credit from private or cooperative sources is available to the applicant at the time the loan is made or at the time the borrower should refinance his indebtedness to the Secretary by means of such other credit.

Fifth. Section 1 (c) of the act will amend section 51 to permit the Secretary to service mortgages taken in connection with insured loans in the same manner as he is now authorized to service security for direct loans and will extend the authority to preserve and protect the security, bid at foreclosure or other sale, and the other provisions of this section to property involved in loans under any of the acts administered by the Farmers' Home Administration. This section of the act now applies to all of the acts administered by the Farmers' Home Administration except the credit sales accounts on water conservation and utilization projects transferred to the agency by the Soil Conservation Service and property which might be acquired under the special emergency loans pursuant to Public Law 727.

Some difficulty has been encountered by the lack of authority to grant easements of rights-of-way for roads and utilities while the security property is in the possession of the Government. The amended section will provide that authority.

Iowa Farm Girl Honored as Promising Young Scientist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is with the utmost pride that I call attention to the accomplishments of an Iowa farm girl from my district who has been honored as one of the most promising young scientists in America's high schools.

Miss Margaret Ann Thorson, 17, has returned to her farm home near Floyd and Charles City, Iowa, after competing in the finals of the 15th annual science talent search here in Washington, March 1 through March 5. Designed to discover and develop scientific ability among high-school seniors, the science talent search is conducted annually for the Westinghouse science scholarships by science clubs of America and is administered by Science Service.

It is significant to note that this young lady from a rural area was selected as one of 40 finalists from among 20,828 contestants in every State in the Nation. She was the only Iowan to be so honored.

Miss Thorson is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Irvin B. Thorson, rural route 1, Charles City. She is a senior student at the Floyd, Iowa, Consolidated High School.

She is not interested in science alone, as a review of the varied activities in which she has participated will attest. One of the top students in her class, she plans to attend the University of Iowa to prepare for a career in medicine.

Miss Thorson has been active in 4–H work, and won the Floyd County 4–H achievement award in 1955. She was also honored last year by the Daughters of the American Revolution as the outstanding student in her American history class.

She is coeditor of the Floyd High School yearbook and is a feature writer and proofreader for the school newspaper. She has won the humorous reading title each of her 4 years in high school.

Miss Thorson can be justly proud of her achievements. She has demonstrated that a young person from a rural area is well equipped to compete with students from large schools in metropolitan areas. She has brought honor to her parents, her school, the State of Iowa, and to the youth of rural America.

Our Drift Toward World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech of mine entitled "Our Drift Toward World Government," delivered at the patriotic rally under the auspices of For America, at New York, February 22, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR DRIFT TOWARD WORLD GOVERNMENT

When the War of Independence was won, General Washington resigned his commission, bade his officers farewell, and retired to private life at Mount Vernon. Like the Roman General Cincinnatus, who returned to his plow, Washington left a standard of devotion to the Republic which has been held high by American military men ever since.

Washington was soon called back to public service in the new Government of the United States. He saw in civil life the same danger of too much power in a few hands. He knew the young Republic must learn to watch civilian officials step down at the height of their power, and return to private life, while other men carried on the work they had started.

Washington announced his decision not to accept a third term in words which have become immortal. In his Farewell Address to the American people, he gave his political ideals for the new nation, especially in the most hazardous of all decisions, its relation with other countries.

For over 125 years our people followed the testament George Washington left us. We grew strong and prosperous with each passing year.

WE HAVE SURRENDERED OUR INDEPENDENCE ABROAD

Today we have turned away from Washington's advice. We are deeply enmeshed in entangling alliances. We have quit our own, to stand on foreign ground. We have surrendered the decisions of life and death for our country, to officials who do not need to ask our approval, and to alien councils where the opinions and needs of other nations carry more weight than ours.

This change was not made by amending our Constitution. It was made chiefly by our foreign policy agencies, in the executive branch, under the court interpretations of treaty law and executive agreements. You remember, Mr. Dulles testified in 1953 that the State Department had already entered into 10,000 executive agreements under the North Atlantic Pact alone. How many agreements have been made by now, under all our pacts, we cannot guess.

WE HAVE SURRENDERED THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE

First, let us review, briefly, the machinery of government under which we enjoyed our great freedom and progress. The Constitution set up a national agency to carry out a few responsibilities, mostly those dealing with other countries. Executive authority was limited to legally established duties, and the laws were made by elected representatives answerable to the sovereign people.

Under our Constitution the American people were masters in their own house. Government officials could be removed from office, if necessary, by the following election day. When everything was going well, people were indifferent to election contests. But when the national security was involved, the American people could act, promptly and decisively, without asking anyone's leave. Our Government was no taller than the people, and the sky above us was open and clear.

That is what we mean by constitutional liberty. But that is not the governmental machinery we have today. We have kept the old forms, but we have superimposed new layers of government on top of them. It is time the American people looked clearly at the new governmental machinery which has grown up above and around our constitutional system.

NATO IS A LITTLE UNITED NATIONS

Let us look for example at our European defense system of NATO.

I am not going to talk about NATO's accomplishments in organizing military defense for the West. General Gruenther recently admitted that we still do not have enough military power in Western Europe to hold back a Soviet attack, though England, France, Germany and the other nations of Western Europe raised millions of fighting forces, in World War I and again in World War II.

I have never believed in the concept of regional defense. The Soviet forces are disposed by one grand strategy. Why should we divide our forces? It is folly. I have never believed the Soviet leaders intended to attack Europe. They have won most of Asia without large-scale war. They do not want to take over a Western Europe reduced to ruins by bombing. I even question whether we have not lost more, militarily, by applying ourselves with the colonial nations of Europe than we gained by NATO's armed forces. When five divisions of NATO troops appear in French Africa, to fight against Arabs who are asking for liberty, we lose military strength from Morocco to Pakistan. How much have the Communists gained in Asia, because we are allied with the European colonial powers? For all the billions we have spent on NATO, I see no proof that we are militarily stronger than we were 7 or 8 years ago.

But NATO is also political machinery. How much is it a threat to liberty here at home?

THE TWO FACES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

You are gradually beginning to see that the United Nations government has two faces. The benevolent face is sometimes

called the "Town-Meeting of the World." There, we are told, the nations of the world sit down together, and their spokesmen get ulcers instead of starting wars. The other face of the United Nations is the world sovereignty which is being put together by bits and pieces, through the U. N. Secretariat, the international civil service, the various councils, the affiliated agencies, and the voluntary agencies which revolve as satellites about the U. N. sun.

You are gradually learning by what skilful moves we are being led to accept U. N. policies instead of American policies on foreign affairs, finance, education, medical care, labor, and social welfare. You are beginning to see how deeply we have enmeshed our foreign relations, our economy, our political system, our schools, even our churches, with policies made somewhere far above the American Government. You know how decisions made high up in the firmament may, by treaty or executive agreement, bind our Supreme Court judges in deciding a case about a private cemetery in Iowa. We face the threat that treaties planned somewhere above our own Government may even put an end to the rights guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. We have already deprived our servicemen in foreign countries of their constitutional protection against arbitrary imprisonment.

We are just beginning to realize that the United Nations constitutes a threat to our Constitution and our liberties at home, as great as its threat to our independence as a nation in foreign affairs.

THE TWO FACES OF NATO

Do you know the governing machinery set up in NATO? And how it fits, or supersedes, our Constitution?

You will understand what is happening if you remember that NATO is a small U. N., set up to do everything U. N. does, but for one region only. Like U. N., NATO has two faces. Its familiar face is represented by the military commanders of the Western nations, under the chairmanship of American generals, like Eisenhower or Ridgeway or Gruenther, sitting down to plan a joint strategy for defense of the West. The second face of NATO is like the U. N.'s supergovernment. Its task is to help manufacture the parts of a world government, and condition the member nations quietly to give up their familiar independence and their unique political ideals. Thus the governmental machinery of the superstate grows stronger and stronger.

NATO is much more than a military alliance. Lord Ismay, the Secretary General, says, the treaty makes it crystal clear "that the member countries believe they belong to a community of nations within which cooperation should be developed, not only for defense, but in all fields." We now have political, economic, welfare, and propaganda organs in NATO, above our Government and our Constitution. This supergovernment operates far above the Supreme Commander, who, for show purposes, is an American. It operates far above the American fighting men in Europe whom President Truman made part of NATO's integrated military forces. You were told at the time that the Supreme Commander wore 2 hats, 1 for European forces, 1 for American, but did you know both hats were under NATO? But such a political community, with governmental organs, is a sovereignty, a supernational sovereignty.

NATO has a permanent executive and an international staff. It has a legislative body. But they do not represent you or me. They represent our executive branch only. Your State Department chooses the people who speak for foreign policy in NATO. They report to the State Department. The Defense Department and the Treasury chose some, but do not forget the State Department empire rules our spokesmen overseas. If you and I do not like our foreign policies, we the people may protest but the vast machinery of NATO is moved not at all. We, the people, may vote one party out of office and another party in, but the vast machinery of NATO is in fact changed not at all.

We cannot even find out what is going on. A 5-year report on NATO was compiled in November, 1954. When a few days ago, I asked for later information, I was told it was classified. That means—for executive agencies only.

NATO government agencies recommend the proper expenditures for Western defense, and the share of each member nation therein. They recommend policies on taxes, inflation, arms production, and economics. What the recommendations are, we in Congress do not know. They are classified.

That is not all. The NATO super government is very much interested in labor, especially the movement of immigrants from country to country. It has recommended that governments facilitate labor mobility between their countries. It praised President Eisenhower and the Congress for admitting 209,000 immigrants in addition to quotas, as a means of strengthening the Atlantic community. The one worlders believe nations have no right to decide who may be admitted or denied admittance to their cou try.

NATO is concerned with rules granting work permits to foreigners. It is interested in uniform social security for member countries.

NATO has a special consultant studying the best way for NATO to encourage cultural cooperation between countries. In the old days, Americans carried on cultural cooperation by buying a steamship ticket to Europe when they had enough money, or reading magazines like National Geographic, if they did not have much money. But in this epoch of cultural spoon-feeding, we must have a horde of international agencies working for cultural cooperation. Then we have a committee of NATO set up to find how NATO can get in the act by finding if there are any gaps in this supervision—and filling them.

NATO is making surveys to find out if you are interested in NATO, and if not, why not. It has its film programs, its tours for journalists, its Caravan of Peace, its NATO newsletter and its NATO West Point for training and indoctrination of the Armed Forces.

Politically NATO shows the means by which the one world superstate is being assembled from above through the U. N., and horizontally in NATO, SEATO, and the Organization of American States, which has replaced the Pan American Union and put the Monroe Doctrine firmly under the United Nations.

You remember Henry Ford's famous assembly line, with the chassis coming down from the ceiling, and the wheels and fenders coming in from the sides, all flowing together smoothly, by remote control, until the finished car rolled off the assembly line.

I do not say for a moment that the generals and admirals who are assigned to NATO take part in this carefully planned campaign to make us part of one world government by regional compacts. Quite the contrary. They are probably kept so busy they have no time to learn about it.

But some people—probably only a few people—in our Government do know about it, because they planned it that way.

ONLY CONGRESS CAN STOP WORLD GOVERNMENT

Do you seriously believe that, if another Korean-type war broke out, we the people, or the people's representatives in Congress, would be allowed by NATO or SEATO or U. N. to decide on a truly American policy to protect ourselves?

Let me ask you this. Do you like world government? Do you wish to lose forever the power of the American people and their Congress to choose our destiny as a Nation?

Do you like this governmental superstructure above your Constitution, above your Congress, your President, and your courts, controlling your fighting men, your economic life, your immigration, and your cultural cooperation with other nations, through thousands of agreements we never see? Do you really want global social welfare programs in place of the American Bill of Rights?

THE PEOPLE MUST FIGHT FOR A NATIONALIST CONGRESS

If you don't like this drift to world government, just remember one thing. You will have to stop it. It will not stop of itself. You will have to do something.

First let me tell you how not to end world government. In 1954, out of 100 million eligible voters, 58 million stayed at home. Probably the great majority of those who stayed home were constitutionalists. But I say to you that those Americans who stay home on election day, because they do not like the nominees, are helping internationalism. They are the best friends the one-worlders have.

What, then?

You know no president can solve this problem. Every President since 1933 has been the captive of the governmental elite. The Supreme Court will not do anything. The only political power left in this country which could stop the drift to world government is the Congress.

The reason is simple. You, the people, can get any kind of a Congress you decide to work for.

If you do nothing, Congress will become increasingly a rubber-stamp for one worldism. If you want an American Congress, you can get it.

You will have to tell your political leaders in both parties to nominate for Congress only those who will put America first. They will pay attention to you, if they think you mean business.

Don't tell me you don't know who your political leaders are. Find out. If you pay no attention to them, why should they pay attention to you?

Political party leaders, by controlling nominations, have power over who will draft your sons, how much of your money will be squandered by the welfare state, whether your country is going to remain free. The left-wingers, the Communists, and the One-Worlders know who are the party leaders. How much time is it worth to you to find out who they are?

Tell some one in your party you want no one nominated for Congress who does not put America first. Tell them internationalism, globalism, and one-worldism must go. Tell them you, the people, are going to stand watch, every day of the year, to make sure they put none but constitutionalists on guard in Congress.

If you do your part the Star-Spangled Banner, instead of waving over a province in a one world government, will once again proudly wave over the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Problems of the Southern Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity

to express my appreciation of the very careful analysis of the problems of the southern farmer made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT]. I am especially interested in the necessity for checking the drastic reductions in cotton acreage now in progress. If the Southeast has to accept another heavy reduction next year, many of our farmers must prepare to go out of business.

The gentleman from Alabama has been an outstanding leader in the fight to safeguard the interests of the southern cotton farmer. As a Representative of a major cotton producing area, I am deeply appreciative of the work that he has done for our cotton farmers.

Address by Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, at Sigourney, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], when speaking in Sigourney, Iowa, on Monday, February 27, made what I consider to be a very fine speech, which has been called to my attention by one of my constituents.

While I am not a supporter of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in his quest for the democratic presidential nomination, I have the highest personal regard for him, and feel that he is doing a fine public service in the way he is presenting issues.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech at Sigourney, Iowa, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEFAUVER AT PUBLIC RALLY AT SIGOURNEY, IOWA, ON FEBRUARY 27, 1956

It is a real privilege to be able to attend this meeting tonight. I always like to come to Iowa and the great Midwest.

You know, I have come here to talk to you. But it isn't a one-way street. I benefit greatly, in fulfilling the responsibilities which I have, from listening to you talk to me.

Right now we in the United States Senate are considering the farm bill. We do so in a welter of statistics and cost and price indexes. We do so in a flurry of claims and counterclaims. We talk in terms of millions and billions, and trends and, I suspect, of theory.

But to really appreciate the farm problem in this country, I believe you have to talk to the men who know the problem best—because they live with it too—farmers such as you.

The other day one of your numbers showed me his bank statement of 4 years ago and his bank statement of today.

Four years ago he had 70 cows valued at $21,000; 80 to 90 calves and young beef valued at $12,000; sows and pigs worth $5,300, and tractor and equipment worth $7,500. Therefore, his assets amounted to more than $46,000 and he showed debts of only $12,500.

This farmer was good for a bank loan any time. He was what the bankers call a good risk.

He is a good farmer, but today, through no fault of his own, he is in real trouble.

His 70 cows are now valued at $7,000; his calves have dropped to $6,400; his hogs and pigs to $2,800, and his equipment, depreciated through the years, is carried at $2,500. Therefore, his assets now—through no fault of his own—are down to $18,700. And his debts have now mounted to $15,000.

Instead of being a good risk for a bank loan, now he's a bad one. Instead of having assets of more than $48,000 he has assets of less than $19,000. He will have trouble putting in this year's crop.

And since he's a working farmer—a man who makes his livelihood from the farm—this man is in real trouble if he can't finance this new crop.

You and I know that when we talk about the farm problem, we just multiply this man's situation by thousands of others and that is the farm problem. You and I know that when we talk about the farm problem we're talking about the fact that there has been a tremendous slide in the ratio of the value of what you raise to what you buy. In 1947 it took the value of 468 bushels of corn to buy a two-row cornpicker. But today it takes 1,275 bushels. In 1947 it took the value of 31 hogs weighing 200 pounds to buy a 20–29 belt horsepower tractor. Today it takes 64.

Therefore, you and I know that the farm problem is no myth—it's a fact which demands attention now, if we are going to avert real trouble throughout our economy.

You can be sure that my friend whose bank statement I mentioned isn't painting many barns or fences this year. He isn't buying any new appliances. His wife is making do with last year's hat, and the kids are getting their shoes resoled once more instead of new ones.

This in turn cuts down the business in the retail stores, in the drug stores, and among the other corner merchants here in Sigourney and in the other Sigourneys across the land. When you merchants fail to reorder, some workingman, somewhere, engaged in the production and distribution of goods, is going to find himself out of a job.

Therefore, an economy such as ours is interrelated. We're all in the same boat. We might as well paddle in the same direction.

The farm bill as recommended by the administration or as reported by the Senate committee won't do the job that needs doing. Therefore, I want to talk with you tonight about a few amendments which I hope will be adopted by the Senate and made a part of the present farm law. All of these I have sponsored, or am supporting and they are now on the desks of Senators for their consideration.

In the first place, I am getting sick and tired of hearing the Secretary of Agriculture moan about the overburdening surpluses and blaming all the farmers woes on them.

An imaginative man—an imaginative administration—would consider the surplus not as something to cry about but as something to use.

I want to see it used.

Awhile back I announced that I would propose a food stamp plan. Under my plan the Secretary of Agriculture would make surplus foods available for distribution when requested to do so by a State or political subdivision. Food stamps, issued through regular State agencies, would be redeemable for foods or the surpluses list at any regular stores that participate in the plan.

Now who would be eligible to receive food stamps?

Any of those who are receiving benefits or assistance under the programs of old-age assistance, Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. Also eligible would be any of those receiving welfare assistance from State agencies or who in the opinion of those agencies are in need of welfare assistance.

We calculate that there are about 18 million persons in the United States who would qualify for use of the food stamp plan.

Not only would this help move the surpluses, but it would do so in a way that would improve the health of the Nation.

After I had mentioned my plans to file a food-stamp plan I was accosted by some of those people who have been taken in by the slogan "Everything's booming but the guns." They are the kind of people who believe the farmers are living in clover and riding in Cadillacs. Everybody knows that everyone in the country has plenty to eat, they said, and therefore there really isn't anyone to benefit under the plan.

Well, after listening to these readers of the Wall Street Journal, I was visited one day in my office in Washington by a very sincere young man.

He introduced himself and said that he was one of a group who gives his time in the operation of a center for assisting those who need a helping hand in Washington. He had heard of my food-stamp plan. He said that when he read of these "mounting surpluses" and "bulging warehouses" they tried to get some of the surplus to feed hungry people who come to their center.

They couldn't.

He brought along some of the letters that they receive daily—grubby, grimey, written on torn pieces of paper with pencil.

They were pitiful.

"Will you please send me some food for my three children and some milk for the baby please."

"Will you please send me a food order. My children haven't had anything to eat all day long and will you send some food please because I have five children."

"Will you please send me some food. I have six children. I will appreciate anything you can send me. Thank you."

He told me about a cute little blond girl, who comes by the center every morning to get a glass of milk before going to school.

The fact, my friends, is that while the mimeograph machines down at Republican National Headquarters a few blocks away are running off press releases about "Everything booming but the guns," there are children hungry right in the shadow of the Capitol dome.

The food-stamp plan, or food-allotment plan if you would rather call it that, would move some of that surplus out of the bulging warehouses Ezra Taft Benson talks about into the stomachs of those people.

The best thing about it is that we know it would work because it has worked. It worked wonderfully just prior to the war. The reports are on all the library shelves for anyone who doubts me. It moved surplus to the people who needed it; it improved diets; and it helped the farmer's income.

In times like these, it's worth another try.

Now this is not the only way the surplus ought to be used. This last fall I took a trip into the eastern part of the globe. There I visited those nations which are part of what is called the great neutralist bloc in the world. In particular, I spent some time in India. I talked with Prime Minister Nehru and with other leaders of India.

I came away convinced that while Nehru and the Indian Government aren't going to commit themselves irrevocably to the West, neither are they going to commit themselves to the Communist nations.

The reason they are neutralist, I think, is because they have just emerged from some 250 years of domination as a colonial possession. They are proud now in their new freedom. They are not unlike our own United States when we became free 180 years

ago. Like the newly formed United States, they are determined to maintain their freedom of action.

However, they are a key nation in Asia—one which has established a democratic government, one which the other newly awakened nations in Asia look to for leadership.

India is an example of a great market for much of our surplus foodstuffs. We talk about foreign aid, but with just a little assistance in foreign exchange, India could take a third of our wheat surplus.

Again, an imaginative Secretary of Agriculture, an imaginative administration, would be leaving no stone unturned to move this surplus to points of the world where it is needed, both in trade and in aid.

One of the major criticisms that I have had of this administration is that it waited so often before acting and then only reacted to the Communist bloc.

For instance, I'll bet that if the Soviets shipped a big movement of wheat into India, you would see great excitement at the State Department and about 3 months later a shipment of wheat out of the United States into India.

Let's act on our own at least once in a while—motivated by our own good common sense and our own good will.

Before leaving the subject of the surplus, there is one thing that I want to make clear. I don't consider everything in those warehouses as surplus, as does Ezra Benson. I happen to be a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I have, therefore, been impressed with the necessity for strategic reserves. I can tell you that large reserves of cotton, wheat, and corn are just as important strategically to this Nation as reserves of oil. Another war, God forbid, would show us the importance. I have an amendment to the agricultural bill to set aside quantities of these commodities as a strategic reserve. I hope it will prevail.

Now there's another thing that I intend to see added to the farm bill on the floor of the Senate.

I want to establish—clearly and unequivocally—that we in this country believe in the family-type farm, rather than the big corporate-type farm, absentee owned and absentee controlled.

We are constantly hearing from Ezra Benson about the great costs of price supports—and how they just add to the surplus. Well, I intend to propose that price supports be graduated—not according to Ezra's sliding to the bottom, but according to income derived from the farm.

I intend to propose that we have 100 percent price supports from those farms showing a gross revenue of $7,000 or less; 90 percent on income between $7,000 and $20,000; 75 percent up to $50,000. This graduative will give the major benefit to the family-type farmer instead of the big ones.

I don't want to try to oversell this proposal to you folks. I don't know how much this particular thing will increase your income this year. But it ought to help—and, above all, it will let the Secretary of Agriculture know that we in the United States believe in family-type farming and are determined to preserve it.

All of this, I am convinced, isn't enough to do to this farm bill that has come out of the committee.

It still doesn't take care of the livestock situation which is so important to you right here in Iowa. I have two proposals on that which go together, as they say in the song, just like the horse and carriage.

The first gives authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to use in the marketing of hogs at 200 pounds or less and of livestock at 1,000 pounds or less. The plan would come into operation whenever the price dropped below 90 percent of parity or whenever the annual crop exceeds the average for the past 10 years. Whenever that happened the Secretary would be authorized to pay from $1 to $3 per hundredweight premium for hogs or livestock marketed under 200 or 1,000 pounds.

The result would be a voluntary reduction of production in a way which the farmer would get more cash for his animal than if he had kept it and fattened it up another few hundred pounds. It would tend to prevent additions to the surplus.

And now, finally, there is another proposal which I have been considering. I believe that we've got to adopt a system of support on livestock. I have been studying methods of accomplishing this and have concluded that the only effective way is by production payments.

Those floors should be 90 percent of parity or on the basis graduated from full parity down outlined in my small-farm plan. If established at 90 percent of parity that would be in the neighborhood of $19 on hogs and $27 on beef cattle. These production payments will also be incentive payments to bring about the reduction of livestock numbers. A man signing up for the production payments will have to cut his production. I am working on the details of how much this cut should be. The main thing is to get money into this livestock farming region and get it here fast.

You know what that means. Right now hogs are selling, I believe, at around 53 percent. If we set the minimum level at 90 percent, then we would be saying, in very rough figures, that the income of hog farmers would be increased by around 30 percent.

I think that's the kind of vital assistance you need.

The cost of production payments in this instance would be limited by the graduated limitations I have already outlined which I have proposed be placed on the total support granted any individual farmer. In other words, there's a limit to how much an individual farmer could receive, so he would not be encouraged to overproduce. The cost also would be offset by lower consumer food costs, for the beef and pork would be moving onto the market at its own market level.

This same type of program has been put in effect by the Eisenhower administration for wool and it has long been in effect for sugar. Why not try it for livestock?

One of the most important features of this plan is that it will place a floor under the farmer's income so that he can get a loan on his new crop. Immediately the banker will see that your assets have risen in value.

Further more, this program certainly can't be called a prop for bad management, because one of its features is that the payment is based on the difference between the average market price and the support price. Therefore, there's no incentive for the farmer to dump his crop, thereby overloading the market. Instead there is an incentive for him to watch the market carefully, sell at the best possible price, and thereby have an additional premium.

And so, they say, this is a subsidy. Yes; it is—in a way—but what part of the country isn't subsidized in one way or another? The shippers and railroads and airlines get a subsidy. The post office gives a subsidy. Big oil is subsidized through tax provisions. Private power gets a whopping subsidy through rapid amortization provisions.

This Government has always been willing to assist that which it deems to be essential. I know of nothing more essential than the production of foodstuffs, and the maintenance of a stable economy on the farms.

And now one final word. As you know, I am campaigning for the Democratic presidential nomination in a number of States and I am anxious to see this program adopted not next year or the next—but this year. Therefore, whenever the point is reached where voting is about to begin on amendments to the farm bill, I will cancel out my engagements wherever they may be—here in Iowa, or Minnesota, or Wisconsin or New Hampshire—to return to Washington.

I will do my level best on the Senate floor to convince my fellow Senators that no matter what the Secretary may be telling them, there's a real emergency on the farms and bold action is necessary.

I have seen some of these notices that read: "Due to the fact that I am quitting farming, I offer for public sale a farm."

I don't like the notices.

Testimony of Senator Flanders Before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1956

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the testimony which I gave before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament yesterday. My reason for making the request is that I already have had a large number of requests for the testimony, and I think it will be useful for the other Members of the Senate as well.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR RALPH E. FLANDERS BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if this were to be a published book, as a foreword I might well use a quotation from the works of the great American strategist and philosopher, Admiral Mahan, who said: "The purpose of military power is to provide time for moral ideas to take root."

The objective of our moral ideas protected by military power, is complete, universal, and controlled disarmament.

To achieve this objective our military stength must be great, and must include the use of atomic weapons.

The use of these weapons must be regularized, in a way which advances the moral ideas.

Against the backstop of atomic strength we may persuade the Soviet to disarmament, by the policies of moral encirclement and moral penetration.

From these elements we can devise a progressive, effective program for disarmament.

COMPLETE, UNIVERSAL, AND CONTROLLED

Disarmament, of course, is no goal in itself. Our aim is security with a disarmament. The specific measures of arms control I shall advocate are those which do meet the test of enhanced security for our Nation and for freedom.

Disarmament must be complete, universal, and controlled. It must be universal because even though the great nations of the earth disarmed, a minor nation equipped with arms and having the will to use them could exercise a military power which would destroy the prospects for peace.

In every nation disarmament must be complete down to the minimum needed to maintain internal order.

The disarmament we seek must be controlled. It must be inspected to make sure that it is controlled and complete.

We must further recognize at this point that the attainment of an effective agree-

ment on universal, complete, and controlled disarmament is not enough. We would then be left with a vacuum so far as concerns the settling of differences between nations. We must therefore take into account the need for a world court, for a United Nations organization to administer decisions of that court, and for a United Nations police force to enforce them. I merely mention these developments as necessary if we arrive at disarmament, but that is not the subject of this presentation. Disarmament itself is the subject.

Let us take a realistic look at the difficulties we have met with our endeavor to attain disarmament.

After World War II there was first a dragging of the feet in our own Government which merged into a too obvious endeavor to use the move for disarmament as a means of putting the Soviet Government on the spot. This did not last long, however. There developed a serious desire to attain the goal so greatly hoped for by the people of the earth. When our endeavors became serious and earnest, they were defeated by the unwillingness of the Soviet Government to submit to the inventory and inspection which alone would give assurances either to them, or to the Western World, that any agreements were being kept. Inspection and control we must have.

With the later development of atomic warheads, and of missiles for delivering them, the problem of inspection and control has become increasingly difficult, particularly with respect to the location of stockpiles of fissionable material. We are therefore facing difficulties which did not exist at the beginning of our endeavors for disarmament. New approaches are necessary and some of these I propose to describe. But first may I define the proper limitations on our effort.

PROPER LIMITATIONS ON OUR EFFORT

Some of the old limitations remain. We must not disarm unilaterally. With regard to this, if any new lesson is needed, we can learn it from the results of the Summit Conference at Geneva.

At Geneva the frankness and evident good will of our President broke through the Soviet suspicion to that particular point where the Russian delegations became convinced that the United States was not planning aggressive war on the Communist nations. It has been said that the change in atmosphere was nothing more than a question of smiles and pleasant words. I think we will have to admit that important results came from this new understanding of our intentions.

Was it not a fact that the lightening of the Soviet fears stiffened their determinations and policies in the cold war? If they are not to be subject to attack by us, they could proceed with less hesitation on their program, particularly for East Germany. It will be remembered that at the second Geneva conference we were met with the outright statement that there would be no reuniting of East and West Germany except on terms which would in effect bring the reunited state under Communist control. In other words the removal of a threat from us resulted in their taking a stronger and more definite position than before. We must draw a moral from this in relation to disarmament plans. Unilateral disarmament is out.

Another old limitation is that disarmament and peace must not come by surrender. This we have been unwilling to accept in the past and we must not do so in the future.

We must not accept, for instance, tacitly or formally, the conquest of the satellite countries and the enslavement of their citizens. This position of ours is not one of inciting revolt. It is one of keeping before the Soviet Government and keeping before the world our willingness to compromise with evil.

NO COMPROMISE WITH EVIL—THE PRIMARY LIMITATION

There is a limited area in which we can compromise in economic or political matters but there is no room for compromise with evil.

What is the moral evil of communism? Abraham Lincoln long ago so clearly said that this Nation could not longer exist half slave and half free. Surely it is clear to us in this day that it is going to be impossible for the whole world to live in peace half slave and half free.

Slavery in our day is even more militant than it was a century ago. It rests not day nor night. It brings one people after another, one nation after another, under its dominion. There is no safety in waiting humbly until it chooses to overwhelm the rest of the world and us.

What we face is the old type of slavery of forced labor for millions, of heartless separation of families, of ripping whole peoples up by the roots and transferring them to alien scenes. This is old, but something new has been added. It is slavery of the personality and of the soul itself. Among all the peoples under the Soviet yoke, the destruction of individual thought and moral responsibility is a commonplace. It is practiced upon the plastic young as these millions come to the age of self-consciousness and even before. Their elders have already been seized and molded. Those who have determined to retain their individuality and moral responsibility are subjected to such psychological and physical tortures as history never before has witnessed.

The crime against outstanding individuals is great. The crime against whole peoples, with their innocent children, is incalculably greater.

We can never condone or acquiesce in this crime at home or abroad. This is the ultimate standard by which we must measure our compromises in all negotiations of differences.

We must then be very clear in our own minds as to whether we are compromising on different points of view in matters economic, social, and political, or whether we are compromising with evil. The one is justifiable; ultimately, the other is fatal.

At this point we have arrived at negative conclusions. Any arrangements arrived at with the Soviet power looking toward disarmament must not be unilateral and they must not involve surrender to evil.

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

As to positive policy, I would like to propose to this committee first a long-range program for disarmament and follow that with certain shorter-range proposals on which we can move immediately.

As to the long-range program, we must start with a recognition of the fact that our necessary military preparations and resulting military strength can be of use only as defensive measures. They cannot of themselves be used for preventive war, nor to bring about disarmament. All they can do is to protect us while we perfect and put into operation devices that are not in the material sphere at all, but which consist in bringing up spiritual strength and in operating through moral power.

The first item in this long-range program is that of a moral encirclement of the Communist powers. We have vigorously to bring to the attention of the nations of Asia and of Western Europe that they and we are dealing with evil—that we not merely must not, but cannot, surrender to evil practically or morally. Surrender to evil brings no practically useful results. That we have seen in the surrenders made to Japan, Mussolini, and Hitler in the period between the wars. This lack of practical benefit in the surrender to evil is fundamental to the nature of the spiritual universe, and we might as well become practical people and recognize it.

Moral encirclement means that there will be no neutral areas. We will so define and exemplify the eternal religious and democratic aspects of the world situation that the Communist powers will be left unsupported by world opinion or policy.

As compared with the encirclement by arms, it has immense advantages. The Soviet Government has no defense against it except by the tightening of its Iron Curtain; and if we are vigorous in presentation, the Soviets will lack defense in the countries outside of the Curtain which are trying to stay neutral.

The second element is moral penetration. This means getting around, under, over, or through the Iron Curtain to the people who are imprisoned within it. We are doing this in various ways at the present time. We are doing it with the Voice of America and with Radio Free Europe. We are doing it with balloons. We are doing it by numerous other means, some of which are doubtless of a classified nature. We must not be persuaded or bullied into giving up these means of communication.

Innumerable messages of the sort I have enclosed as an appendix can be devised. They can be free from hatred. They can be free from anger. They can be persuasive. If we pour this type of friendly suggestion into the Russian ears and bring it before the Russian eyes through the upper air, through evasions of the jamming and by any other means which patience, persistence, and ingenuity suggest, there is going to be an ultimate result on the Soviet Government itself. We can say this confidently because it has become clear that the pressures of dissatisfaction generated by the policies of Stalin evidently became so great that they could not be disregarded.

The present rulers of Russia climbed into power on the mass of those dissatisfactions. It is not too much to hope that future rulers will climb into power over dissatisfactions with the useless expenditures of labor and money with which the armament program of their government burdens them, if we persistently point out these burdens directly to the people who are burdened.

IMMEDIATE ACTION

Besides these long-range undertakings there are at the moment presented to us opportunities for immediate action which we must seize and organize. I refer to the mounting tension of the atomic arms race spreading out now into 1,500-mile guided missiles and in the near future to the ultimate of this development in the intercontinental ballistic missile with its range of thousands of miles and its accuracy sufficient to bring a hydrogen bomb to bear on the earth's great centers of population.

In this connection it is well to remember that the speed and intensity with which this ultimate missile is being developed has certain sinister effects on its capacity. It is probable that the crash program would develop very shortly a missile which could be placed only roughly within several miles of its target. To place it more accurately, say within a mile of the target, would take several years more. It is in the nature of the problem that the objective of accuracy must be lost in the present anxiously accelerated program. That such acceleration would lead to lack of accuracy is bad and is morally inconsistent with what our policy must be.

Neither the 1,500-mile guided missile nor the intercontinental one are military weapons in the old sense of the word. They are weapons of terror in which the effect on populations is primary and on military targets secondary.

The medium range guided missile is particularly adapted to holding the cities of Western Europe as hostages to impose the Soviet will. We have of course the same opportunity to hold as hostages the cities the other side of the curtain but with the disadvantage of having to extend the range beyond the friendly satellites if we are to

reach the Soviet cities, while the satellite countries are available as launching platforms for an attack on the West.

Into this balance so uneasy, so dangerous, we must project a new principle of practice and of negotiation. The new plan is one which has had much discussion in England and which was first set forth in an article by Colonel Leghorn of the Air Force Reserve in the United States News & World Report of January 28, 1955. The title of the article was "No Need To Bomb Cities To Win War." The title which has been given to the plan is that of graduated deterrence.

The essentials of the proposed United States policy of graduated deterrence are that we renounce unequivocally the use of hydrogen or atomic warheads for mass destruction in attacks on populations, unless such Soviet attacks are first made on the populations of the nations outside the curtain. In that event we must retaliate in kind against the Soviet.

Added to this is the retention of the announced decision to use whatever atomic tactical weapons may be considered necessary to repel military aggression. In other words, we would propose using these weapons and all weapons on a graduated scale, penalizing each military attack according to the intensity of that attack. If we make known that we are ready to do so and that we are not planning to extend the use of these weapons beyond the necessary precise target, then our possession of them becomes, or can be made to become, a graduated deterrent.

Our Secretary of State has used the phrase "graduated reprisals." But this scarcely expresses the possibilities. A reprisal is a sudden decision and action and goes into effect after the surprise injury has been suffered. A deterrent is the firm assurance made long prior to an attacking power that the weapons will be used in the event of an attack. That certain knowledge warns clearly and precisely of the risks to the opponent before he proceeds to the decision of an attack.

Now let us see what there is in this plan which leads toward disarmament and peace, for that is what your committee is concerned with.

It is now broadly recognized that reliable inspection for nuclear weapons is impractical. Although there is hope for substantial control to detect the diversion of peaceful nuclear materials for weapons fabrication, these controls cannot be perfect enough fully to prevent leakage of peaceful materials into military channels. These circumstances mean that nuclear weapons will be with us for a long time; perhaps forever. In facing these facts realistically, we are led to two conclusions; first, to concentrate on controls and reduction of delivery systems; second, to consider controls on the use of nuclear weapons, as a prelude and supplement to controls on their possession. Those who have been giving serious thought to graduated deterrence feel that it offers the opportunity to control the use of nuclear weapons and thus to proceed toward our objective by a series of steps which I commend to your consideration.

FIRST STEP

The first step is that of initiating public discussion and disseminating by all communications media an understanding of the conditions surrounding the use of atomic weapons. In the first place we should all realize that the real decision to brutalize was taken both by Germany and the allies when it was decided to seek victory through the terrifying and the destroying of civilian populations. The blitz on London and Coventry, the saturation bombing of Berlin and other German cities were outside the proper military sphere. So was our destruction of large sections of Tokyo by the dropping of napalm on that inflammable city. To kill old men, women, and children in an effort to win a war was pure savagery. This fatal step was taken before the atom bomb was developed.

The early atom bomb is in essence simply a more effective way of carrying out the policy of political savagery. As I just said, such use constitutes no part of proper military action. It is a barbarous political action of the worst sort.

Another thing which we likewise should all recognize is that armies, navies, and air forces of all the great powers of the world are now organized for and directed toward the efficient use of atomic weapons. While we have been praying that they might not be used, the necessities of the situation require that we be prepared to use them. The atom bomb, the atom rocket, the atom missile are with us now and the military forces of the world are being trained in their use.

This is inevitable because if we are to have Armed Forces at all they must be prepared to the highest pitch of effectiveness. This means that they must be supplied with, and be efficient in the use of, atomic weapons.

Further, we must accustom ourselves and educate the free world to the fact that there is a great difference between nuclear explosions with large radioactive effects and nuclear explosions with limited radioactive effects, whether they result from a bomb delivered from a plane, an atomic head in a rocket or an accurately aimed guided missile. The tactical weapons can be effectively discharged and used against military targets without the deadly fallout which results from the maximum use of the maximum weapons. The long series of experiments carried out in the deserts near Las Vegas have demonstrated the effectiveness and the safeguards of tactical use. Such weapons have now become a normal and effective aid in military armament.

On the other hand the radioactive effects of certain weapons used in certain ways are such that in an exchange of blows, the populations of both sides would be destroyed, and mankind itself imperiled. Therefore, the distinction between the relatively safe but effective and the barbarously and suicidally destructive must be made clear to all of us.

SECOND STEP

With these distinctions clear, the public of the Western World is prepared for the second step—a unilateral announcement by all the western powers that they will not use mass weapons for nonmilitary destruction in future military action unless first attacked in that manner. We do not have to wait to negotiate this proposal. For the United States, the West, to initiate warfare of that sort would be so morally reprehensible that we could not allow ourselves to consider it. We have the weapons for it, but we have the moral strength not to use them unless forced to do so. Note that this is not unilateral disarmament. We retain the arms and their deterrent effect.

THE THIRD STEP

The third step is the formal announcement, widely broadcast, that we are armed and are ready to use the new tactical weapons against any aggressive military action. If the attack were by massive conventional forces we would use nuclear weapons, if necessary, to reject aggression only defensively—that is, not across the preaggression political boundary. No more. We must always be ready to use such weapons defensively and any aggressor should be in no doubt as to that.

THE FOURTH STEP

The fourth step is to initiate negotiations among the great powers as to what constitutes open cities, what constitutes legitimate targets, what is the area or the set of conditions in which tactical atomic weapons may be freely used. This will be the specific content and agenda of legitimate and new negotiations. It strikes out into new territory. In this connection I wish to include, and will read, the concluding paragraph of an editorial in the Washington Post of January 27, 1956. The editorial was entitled "Illusion of Peace." I will now read the concluding words:

"Unhappily, the United States has seemed largely sterile and barren of ideas on disarmament since President Eisenhower put forth his aerial inspection plan. The drift, and the unconvincing explanations, respecting nuclear weapon tests are a case in point. Would it not now be possible to combine a restatement of the inspection proposal with a plan to control large nuclear tests through an international monitoring system that would detect and advertise violations? Would it not be possible indeed, to broaden such a plan to include tests of the intercontinental ballistic missile, about which so much is now heard? There are feasible means of monitoring large missile tests. Is it not worth an effort to control the ICBM, as the intercontinental missile is called, before one side or the other achieves one? Let us hope that Messrs. Eisenhower and Eden, if they can first agree on a common policy in the Middle East, will be able to devote some attention to positive joint steps on arms control."

This ends the quotation.

FIFTH STEP

Step No. 5 is suggested in the editorial. We should negotiate for the suspension of use and even of testing of the intercontinental ballistic missile, as an exemplary approach toward all future weapon development of a terroristic nature.

There are two reasons for doing this. The first is that at present it is an instrument of terror and does not belong in purely military armament. The second is that it has not yet been proved as a working weapon. In addition, there are no stockpiles of them. We are not too far from the beginning of its development to bring it under control, even while for the present we press forward its development.

We missed the opportunity to raise the warning signs at the beginning of the development of atomic energy, whether for peaceful or military uses. We again failed to raise the warning sign at the beginning of the development of the hydrogen bomb. Let us have one more try at controlling this latest instrument of savagery.

Let us promise not to test these weapons unless another nation does so first, and let us propose details of supervised, inspected banning of the testing of intercontinental ballistic missiles and international control of use of large rocket devices for peaceful purposes. Let us again ask for mutual inspection of launching sites.

There is now in the public domain information which suggests that such controls can be reliable and that a ban on tests would delay for a long time the existence of effective military weapons of this type. With the knowledge of the immense capacities for destruction on both sides of the curtain, perhaps inspection can be agreed upon. Whether openly by agreed-upon inspection or by classified means, we should endeavor to put a stop to this as yet uncompleted final assault on humanity. Yet, while we are negotiating, we must experiment, test, use, and stockpile.

FINAL STEPS

Our immediate attention to the critical problem of the intercontinental missile opens the way to the more general problem of conventional arms. If the unconventional can be solved, so can the other.

Mutual inspection and control extended to the conventional area are a simple extension of what is required to meet the unmitigated terror of the ICBM, as it has come to be called.

The final steps will be the negotiation for setting up the necessary political institutions—administrative, judicial, and military—for replacing war by cooperative judgment and for replacing the sanction of war as a means of settling international disputes. Along with that, for us at least, must go the economic measures required to redirect our defense effort into useful channels of human service.

As you will note, Mr. Chairman, this is an unusual approach to the problem of disarmament. It is a realistic approach to the extent that it recognizes the present situation and calls for the honest facing of it by our people. It does not depend on any sentimental aversion to war. It does not look forward to unimplemented agreements. It is based on the grim requirements of the situation we live in today.

We must at once intensify the program for the long pull. That is for moral encirclement and moral penetration. This will give us the background against which we can make a new try at negotiations which recognize the facts of the life in which we are living.

Mr. Chairman, I hope and expect that this committee will not end its deliberation in formal words but will instead frame definite proposals which it can bring effectively to the attention of the people and the Government.

APPENDIX TO DISARMAMENT TESTIMONY—PEACE FOR THE EARTH'S PEOPLE, INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, HELSINKI, FINLAND, AUGUST 25–SEPTEMBER 1, 1955

(By RALPH E. FLANDERS, United States Senator)

The place, the time, and the subject of this meeting combine to give it deep significance.

As to the place, we find ourselves gathered here on the doorstep of the Soviet empire, in a country which suffered from the first aggressive expansion of that empire. This fact demands a frankness in expression which would not be called for in a more remote gathering place.

As to the time, we meet in the afterglow of the friendly conference at Geneva in July, where for the first time in many years the heads of four great powers discussed sympathetically the stalemate in armament which has faced them and their people since the close of World War II. What we say here must support, not hinder, the continuance of that friendly, cooperative search for a means of dissolving that deadlock in the interests of all mankind.

As to our subject, which is the attainment of peace, it is appropriate to the place and the time and to the universal hopes of all people everywhere.

Let us speak in frankness. We talk much about tensions and the means of relieving them. On this matter it is necessary to say that, generally speaking, there were no tensions until the Soviet empire entered on its program of expansion. In absorbing the Baltic States, in retaining East Germany, in seizing control of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the Balkan States, that empire has added 392,000 square miles to its territory and 90 million people to its subject population. Austria alone has been relinquished.

While this was going on, my own country was releasing the Philippines; Great Britain accepted the freedom of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon, while the Netherlands agreed to the independence of Indonesia. Freedom thus came to 2,894,000 square miles of territory and 555 million people. When we consider the contrasts between these vast changes of a very few years, is there any wonder that tensions arose? Do we have to seek far for the cause of these tensions?

Of course, there remains hundreds of thousands of square miles of territory and hundreds of millions of people who do not yet enjoy self-government. Self-government comes easiest to those who have been prepared for it. It does not come automatically in every case when a colonial power simply walks out of its occupancy. That may result in nothing more than a change of masters. But who can doubt that the area of the free world is advancing, year by year? That all may achieve freedom is the deep desire of the American people.

Our people have no interests which conflict with those of the people of Russia. We do not need more land. What land we have raises an embarrassing abundance of grain and fiber, and of the flesh of beasts. We have great forests and rich deposits of ore. Our seas teem with fish. Everything we need we have, or can obtain by freely trading for it from our own abundance. What we do want is peace and freedom. When they are threatened, we arm.

That these things are true can easily be seen by anyone who visits our country with open eyes and open mind. Let such a one come to the United States and look for the worst in us. Let him search out our slums. Let him examine our race problems. Let him measure the extent of these evils against the past and as a proportion of our present general well-being. He will find them diminishing components of a self-governing society. He will assure himself that our people have no ambitions to hazard their own well-being by any projects of conquest. Nor would any American Government long endure which sought to persuade them otherwise.

To put it in a word, self-interest forbids that we should seek conquests, whether political or economic. I am here today to point out that the same self-interest, controlling the policies of the Soviet government, will dissolve tensions and lead to the abandonment of armies and armament as the main support of national policy.

Is it not reasonable to believe that the leaders of the Soviet Government who will most strongly establish themselves in the future will be the men who make the greatest contribution to the personal well-being of the Russian people? Can there be a more stable basis for power than a successful program for providing more and better food, better clothing and housing, and better educational opportunities for the people?

Dependence on military force wars against this well-being. The enormous military programs result in less and poorer food and clothing, inadequate housing, and lowered opportunities. Armies, supported in readiness for attack from without, are in the meantime opposing the happiness of the people within. Disarmament should be the great objective of the people everywhere.

It may be argued that for the Soviet Government armed forces are essential to hold the satellites in subjection. But if there is to be no attack from without, the ring of satellites is unnecessary Nor are the satellites economically profitable to Russia as virtual colonies. No people, formerly free, will be productive in subjection. Slave labor is uneconomical. A free people, benefiting from their own enterprise, is infinitely more profitable as a neighbor than is the most cowed and subjugated horde of conscripts. In the theory and practice of free enterprise, a continuously expanding commerce leads to growing benefits to those who buy and to those who sell. Again, in a word—the same word—self-interest decrees the freeing of the satellites.

Bountiful blessings for the peoples of the earth and for their rulers depend on the establishment of disarmament—complete, universal, and controlled—and on the acceptance of the kind and degree of supernational government required to administer it. The negotiations to this end now under way will be long and difficult. They must be pursued with faith and diligence. Above all, as a practical matter, these negotiations must be continued on the basis of long-range self-interest. Otherwise they will fail.

Self-interest is the approach but it is tied in to something deeper and more powerful. Self-interest, apparently so selfish and narrow, can be long-range and can be intelligent. When it is both long-range and intelligent, it leads to the sort of action which can best be described as being virtuous.

This relation between long-range self-interest and virtue covers a great area of human policy and action. Whether this correspondence between the two is universal is a question I am not raising at this time. I am only saying that, in the situation we have just been reviewing, self-interest and virtue coincide.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 1956

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 6, 1956)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Right Reverend Ambrose Ondrak, O. S. B., abbot of St. Procopius Abbey, Lisle, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, who has created man to Thine image and likeness and who endows Thy children with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, we thank Thee for blessing our land with an abundance of the good things of this life, and for guiding our forefathers in founding a government under which the citizens of this land have the assurance of the protection and enjoyment of Thy goodness in accordance with the highest human dignity. We pray that Thou wouldst bestow Thy richest blessings on the President of the United States and on all the members of this august assembly, and guide all their deliberations so that all their enactments and decrees redound to the preservation of peace, liberty, and the protection of the bounty which Thou bestowest on this Nation.

We pray Thee also for the countless thousands of Thy children who suffer need of the good things of this life, and for those who have fallen into the power of tyrannical governments and impious rulers and at their hands suffer persecution, prisons, and a most abject degradation of that dignity which Thou didst bestow upon man. Open Thy bounteous hand to all these who suffer need and persecution; give them in abundance the things necessary for life, and humble the cruel men who oppress their weaker brothers. Open the gates of prisons, and break the chains of slavery. Humble the haughty rulers whose deeds of violence cry to Thee for vengeance. If Thy children merit Thy anger, grant them the gift of repentance, that they may quickly return to their Father's house and enjoy the blessings of Thy peace.

In particular, on this day we beg Thee for Archbishop Beran, primate of Bohemia, who for 5 years now pines away, separated from his flock and crushed with the weight of humiliations. Look with compassion upon him and upon his fellow shepherds, Archbishop Matocha, Bishops Skoupy, Trochta, Hlouch, Zela, Vojtassak, Gojdic, Busalka, Pobosny, Barnas, Hopko, Tomasek, Picha, Nescey, and all their fellow countrymen who walk along the way of the cross with Archbishop Beran. Open the gates of their prisons as Thou didst open the gates to liberate Thy holy Apostle Peter, and lead them out of slavery as Thou didst lead Thy chosen people from the bondage of Egypt.

May all nations rejoice in the light of thy peace and freedom, that the glory of Thy name may resound among all nations from pole to pole. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 8, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MONRONEY, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which is investigating malpractice in the automobile industry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. ELLENDER, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee was authorized to meet until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be the usual morning hour, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ATTEMPT BY A CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION TO INFLUENCE THE VOTE OF A SENATOR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution which will be submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] may be reported at this time, and that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the select committee, I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 227), as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 205, agreed to on February 7, 1956, establishing a select committee to investigate circumstances involving alleged improper attempts through political contributions to influence the vote of Senator CASE of South Dakota on the so-called natural gas bill, as amended by Senate Resolution 218, agreed to February 21, 1956, be, and the same is hereby, further amended (1) by striking out in section 3 thereof "March 10, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1956," and (2) by striking out in section 5 thereof "$10,000" in inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of the Veterans' Administration, as of June 30, 1955, together with the report of the Veterans' Educational Appeals Board (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, LAKE MEAD NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, NEV.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit at the Willow Beach Site in Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nev. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT, MOUNT RAINIER NATIONAL PARK, WASH.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract within the Ohanapecosh Hot Springs Area of Mount Rainier National Park, Wash. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN DEFECTORS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the directors of the Southern Tulare County (Calif.) Sportsmen Association, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the immediate construction of Success and Terminus Dams on the Tule and Kaweah Rivers, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting in the Town Hall of New York City, N. Y., February 29, 1956, relating to the crisis in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by Sag Harbor Council 584, Knights of Columbus, Sag Harbor, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2151. A bill to provide for the segregation of certain funds of the Fort Berthold Indians on the basis of a membership roll prepared for such purpose (Rept. No. 1644);

H. R. 585. A bill to authorize the conveyance to Lake County, Calif., of the Lower Lake Rancheria, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1645);

H. R. 622. A bill to provide for the release by the United States of its rights and interests in certain land located in Saginaw County, Mich. (Rept. No. 1646); and

H. R. 4802. A bill to authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land (Rept. No. 1647).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1528. A bill to authorize enrolled members of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., to acquire trust interests in tribal lands of the reservation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1648).

NIAGARA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1956—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1408)

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 19, 1956,

Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, submitted a report, together with individual views and minority views, on the bill (S. 1823) to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes, which was ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. DANIEL, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James Warren McCarty, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Texas, vice Emmett Mitchell Smith, resigned.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3403. A bill for the relief of Boyana D. Boyovitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 3404. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army or his designee to convey an 11¼-acre tract of land situated in the vicinity of Williamsburg, Va., to the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 3405. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers of the Department of the Army to enter into certain contracts for the provision of water for agricultural, industrial, or municipal purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 3406. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; and

S. 3407. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 3408. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the State of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3409. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the Eastern and Western Districts of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina) (by request):

S. 3410. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3411. A bill to provide for the national defense, protect the foreign and interstate commerce, and to safeguard the interests, convenience, and necessity of the people of the United States, and promote the United States merchant marine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3412. A bill to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, relating to war-risk insurance for an additional 5 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was submitted, considered, and agreed to:

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. Res. 227. Resolution further amending Senate Resolution 205, relative to attempts to influence the vote of Senator CASE of South Dakota on the natural-gas bill.

(See the remarks of Mr. HAYDEN when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, RELATING TO WAR-RISK INSURANCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of Commerce, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend for 5 years the authority of the Department of Commerce to provide war-risk insurance for aircraft.

The usual commercial insurance policy does not insure aircraft against war risk in the event of outbreak of hostilities. Air carriers are, therefore, reluctant to permit their aircraft to venture into potential danger areas. Without such insurance the prompt mobilization of the country's air-transport facilities also would be jeopardized. For these reasons the Congress enacted in 1951, title XIII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 which authorized the Department to issue binders insuring United States aircraft against war risk in the event of outbreak of hostilities.

This authority will expire on June 14, 1956. The attached proposal would extend the war-risk insurance authority for an additional 5 years. If this legislation is approved, binder fees to be collected will more than cover expenses chargeable to the war-risk insurance fund under peacetime operations. If and when the program goes into operation in time of war, it is anticipated that premium receipts would keep the insurance fund self-sustaining.

Enactment of the legislation would therefore insure our civil air fleet against loss from war risks with little likelihood of any need for significant appropriation to the war-risk insurance fund. The Department of Commerce urges early enactment of this legislation in order that the civil air fleet may continue to be covered by war-risk insurance without danger of lapse.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3412) to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, relating to war-risk insurance for an additional 5 years, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. STENNIS (for himself and other Senators), to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program. I request that the amendment be received, printed, and lie on the table. I also ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, lie on the table, and be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. ALLOTT is as follows:

On page 18, line 9, strike out "$350,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$750,000,000."

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1956—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 3308) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, to permit deduction for Federal income tax purposes of certain political contributions, and for other purposes, the next time the bill is printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. ALLOTT:

Address on the farm program, delivered by Robert Lucas, editor of the Denver Post, before the Colorado ASC Conference of County Committeemen and Office Managers, at Denver, Colo., on November 3, 1955.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Statement by Raymond W. Houston, commissioner of the New York State Department of Social Welfare, before the Senate Committee on Finance on February 28, 1956, relating to social security amendments.

By Mr. SCOTT:

Statement entitled "The Story of the Winston-Salem to Karachi Food Crusade," cosponsored by the Winston-Salem Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Winston-Salem Junior Woman's Club, which will appear hereafter in the RECORD.

Editorial entitled "Postal Rates," published in the February 2, 1956, edition of the Pittsburg Sun Telegraph.

By Mr. WILEY:

Correspondence between Edwin Lutcher and Harvey Higley, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration in Wisconsin, relating to the offer by Edwin Lutcher of his German shepherd dog as a guide for a blind veteran.

Message from Hermann J. Abs to the president of the American Society of International

Law, relating to a magna charta to protect private investments.

Article entitled "Toward Mutual Understanding," published in the February 1956 issue of the National Council Outlook, relating to a visit to Russia by Protestant churchmen.

Article from the March 5, 1956, Washington Post and Times Herald, and one from the March 8, 1956, New York Times, relating to the natural gas bill.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Proclamation by the late Governor Paul L. Patterson, of Oregon, proclaiming Youth Temperance Education Week in the State of Oregon, from April 22 to April 28, 1956, inclusive.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Address by Dean Clarence A. Manion, former dean of the Law School at Notre Dame University, at a rally in Carnegie Hall, New York City, on February 22, 1956.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS OF JEFFERSON PATTERSON AND DEMPSTER McINTOSH BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, and as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to announce that the Senate received today the following nominations:

Jefferson Patterson, of Ohio, to be Ambassador of the United States to Uruguay.

Dempster McIntosh, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador of the United States to Venezuela.

Notice is given that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

PAYMENT TO CROW INDIAN TRIBE FOR CONSENT OF TRANSFER OF RIGHT-OF-WAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1648, Senate Joint Resolution 135.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not objecting to its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The amendment was to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") be authorized and directed to accept the offer of the Crow Tribal Council, acting on behalf of the Crow Indian Tribe, in its resolution No. 63 of January 11, 1956, as clarified with respect to recreational and related purposes by its resolution No. 70 of February 18, 1956, for the payment of $5 million for consent to and the transfer of right-of-way required for the construction and operation of Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, out of funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and allocated to the Missouri River Basin project: *Provided*, That the right of entry to the Yellowtail Dam site to permit the said Secretary, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to initiate and carry on construction, and operation and maintenance of the dam shall not be conditioned on the consummation of the transfer of the interest herein referred to in this joint resolution.

SEC. 2. The Crow Tribal Council, or the qualified individual members of the Crow Tribe, as the Secretary may determine is required, shall consent to the conveyance to the United States of all rights (except mineral, including oil and gas), title and interest in said lands required for the Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir right-of-way described in said tribal resolution No. 63: *Provided*, That in the exercise of such mineral rights and of the recreational and related purposes referred to in section 1 of this resolution there shall be no interference with the construction or operation of the dam and reservoir.

SEC. 3. There shall be transferred in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Crow Tribe of Indians, the sum of $5 million set forth in section 1 of this resolution as just compensation for the transfer to the United States as herein provided of the right, title, and interest of the Crow Tribe in and to the certain tribal lands required for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Yellowtail unit, Missouri River Basin project. The Secretary, with the cooperation of the Crow Tribe of Indians, shall proceed with all dispatch possible to carry out the provisions of this resolution to the end that construction of Yellowtail Dam shall be initiated promptly: *Provided*, That for the protection of the Crow Indians, fees and expenses of counsel for the Crow Indian Tribe in connection with the settlement of claims related to Yellowtail Dam right-of-way shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior and in no event shall exceed 1 percent of the net amount paid under authority of this resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEELY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it now in order for Senators to submit statements as in the morning hour, under a 2-minute limitation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has under consideration Calendar No. 1648, Senate Joint Resolution 135, and the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Nevertheless, Mr. President, notwithstanding that the joint resolution is pending, do not I correctly understand that at this time it is possible for Senators to be recognized for the purpose of making insertions in the RECORD.

I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry, in that connection: Is such procedure prohibited under the present circumstances?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that that can be done, either by unanimous consent, or by having Senators obtain recognition at this time, during the pendency of the joint resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That was the opinion of the majority leader. So, Mr. President, my understanding is that if any Senators desire to submit statements for the RECORD, as in the morning hour, this is an appropriate time for that to be done.

Of course, there is pending a joint resolution which was introduced by the Senator from Montana; and we are waiting for the arrival of a Senator who has an objection to the joint resolution, and who is trying to clear it up.

In the meantime, as I understand, Senators who may desire to submit sundry matters for printing in the RECORD may do so present them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

MEETING OF THE SOUTHEAST ASIA TREATY ORGANIZATION COUNCIL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization Council has been meeting in Karachi, Pakistan, for the last 3 days. The foreign ministers of the member nations, including our own Secretary of States Dulles, have been discussing matters of political, military, and economic cooperation. Yesterday the Council issued a very noteworthy communiqué, which I believe should be a part of our RECORD.

Among the various vital problems discussed was the question of promoting economic progress in southeast Asia. Because I think it is so important, I wish to read a short portion of the communiqué, which deals with this subject.

In referring to article 3 of the SEATO Treaty, the communiqué states:

The Council reviewed steps taken under article 3 to cooperate "in further development of economic measures to promote economic progress and social well-being."

They considered this a most important objective of the treaty, recognizing that economic and social welfare is essential to healthy political life. They were gratified to note the steady progress already made in promoting the economic development of the treaty area and emphasized the urgency of this problem.

They noted measures of economic assistance to countries of the area undertaken by member governments in addition to very considerable expenditures under aid programs for increasing the defensive capacity of the region.

They particularly welcomed the fact that United States allocations for economic aid to Asian SEATO members have increased

in total almost fourfold in the 2 fiscal years since the treaty was signed.

The Council members, while convinced of the necessity of adequate defense programs and cooperation to preserve the national independence and cultural traditions of their countries, are equally determined to press forward with national and international programs to raise standards of living in the treaty area which they consider basic to national security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire communique, as printed in the New York Times of Friday, March 9, be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks; and I also ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "SEATO Decisions," from the New York Times of Friday, March 9.

Mr. President, the steps taken by the SEATO powers represent real progress in our attempts with our allies to promote stability, economic progress, and self-determination in this vital part of the world.

There being no objection, the communique and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNIQUE ISSUED BY ASIA TREATY ALLIES

The Council of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization today concluded its second meeting, held in Karachi from March 6 to March 8, under the chairmanship of Hamidul Huq Choudhury, Foreign Minister of Pakistan. The meeting was attended by the Foreign Ministers of Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

The Council members reaffirmed their governments' support for the United Nations and their continued intention to conduct their policies in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

The Council also reaffirmed the dedication of member governments to the objectives of the treaty and of the Pacific Charter: To strengthen the fabric of peace and freedom, to coordinate efforts for collective defense for the preservation of peace and security, to uphold the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, to promote self-government and to secure the independence of all countries whose peoples desire it and are able to undertake its responsibilities, to promote higher living standards, economic progress and social well-being, and to prevent and counter attempts to subvert freedom or to destroy sovereignty or territorial integrity.

GAINS OF 18 MONTHS NOTED

The Council reviewed progress made toward these objectives in the 18 months since the treaty was signed in Manila, and especially in the year since the Council held its first meeting in Bangkok.

The Council agreed that the treaty and the progress of the treaty organization have made a noteworthy contribution to the maintenance of peace in southeast Asia and the southwest Pacific and have helped to deter armed aggression in the treaty area.

The Council hoped that the use of force would continue to be avoided in the settlement of international disputes and that particular disputes would be resolved amicably if peace was maintained. It recognized the necessity, however, of creating and maintaining powerful deterrents against aggression lest potential aggressors come to believe that aggression would not be effectively and immediately resisted.

The Council members severally affirmed that their countries will never commit aggression and that their cooperation under this treaty is directed toward mutual defense and the maintenance of peace.

Members of the Council noted with satisfaction healthy political developments of the past year within the treaty area. They noted that talks with delegations from Singapore were to take place in London in April and expressed their deep interest in the outcome of the discussions of such importance to the SEATO area.

PROGRESS BY MALAYA HAILED

They welcomed reports of steps taken toward establishing full self-government and independence for Malaya within the British Commonwealth. They noted further progress in the development of free political institutions in the region and, particularly, the further development of representative governments in the countries referred to in the protocol to the treaty—Cambodia, Laos, and the Republic of [South] Vietnam.

The Council agreed that steady economic progress had been registerde among members and in Cambodia, Laos, and the Republic of Vietnam. It was noted that assistance from members had contributed markedly to this desirable development.

The Council agreed that there had been useful progress in cooperation among member Governments in assisting each other to combat subversive activities. They observed that Communist tactics were placing increasing reliance on methods of political and economic infiltration.

They noted, however, that this shift in tactics, was unaccompanied by any convincing evidence of intent to abandon efforts to subvert, weaken and overthrow the political economic and social systems which have been freely chosen by the peoples of the area.

The Council attributed in large measure this seeming shift in tactics away from violence in some parts of the world to the collective security arrangements of the free nations.

They particularly deplored the statements and interventions by Soviet leaders in recent months designed to increase tension and promote division in Asian communities and among other nations of the free world.

Insofar as those statements referred to "Pushtunistan" [border area inhabited by Pushtu-speaking tribes that Afghanistan seeks to separate from Pakistan] the members of the council states generally declared that their governments recognized that the sovereignty of Pakistan extends up to the Durand Line, the international boundary between Pakistan and Afghanistan, and it was consequently affirmed that the treaty area referred to in articles 4 and 8 of the treaty includes an area up to that line.

KASHMIR SOLUTION URGED

Insofar as these statements concerned Kashmir, members of the Council, noting that United Nations resolutions remain in force, affirmed the need for an early settlement of the Kashmir question through the United Nations or by direct negotiations.

Assisted by reports from the Council representatives in Bangkok, from various committees under the Council representatives and from military advisers, the Council reviewed in detail the steps taken by member governments, individually and collectively, to carry out the articles of the treaty.

The Council reviewed steps taken by member Governments under article 2 to "maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack and to prevent and counter subversive activities directed from without."

They found that the defense forces of the member nations in Asia have been appreciably improved since the signing of the treaty and are better equipped and deployed to act in an emergency. Member Governments have assisted one another on an increasing scale in the training and equipping of these forces.

Through its military advisers SEATO has made a good beginning in planning for the coordinated use of the forces in collective self-defense. During the year a number of joint military exercises by some of the SEATO powers were held, including the "firm link" combined land, sea and air exercises held in and around Bangkok on February 15 to 18. These exercises pointed the way to further cooperative efforts for the common defense.

The Council welcomed the progress recorded in the past year in reducing dangers posed to the territorial integrity and political stability of the area by subversive activities directed from without. In considering the continuing threat, the Council noted that the members concerned have significantly improved the quality of their security forces and have moved ahead with other measures to reduce threats to democratic government and social progress.

SEATO Governments have initiated a number of mutual assistance programs in this field, and the organization's committee of security experts has provided an increasingly useful forum for cooperation in defense against such subversive activities.

The Council reviewed steps taken under article 3 to cooperate "in further development of economic measures to promote economic progress and social well-being."

They considered this a most important objective of the treaty, recognizing that economic and social welfare is essential to healthy political life. They were gratified to note the steady progress already made in promoting the economic development of the treaty area and emphasized the urgency of this problem.

They noted measures of economic assistance to countries of the area undertaken by member governments in addition to very considerable expenditures under aid programs for increasing the defensive capacity of the region.

They particularly welcomed the fact that United States allocations for economic aid to Asian SEATO members have increased in total almost fourfold in the 2 fiscal years since the treaty was signed.

The Council members, while convinced of the necessity of adequate defense programs and cooperation to preserve the national independence and cultural traditions of their countries, are equally determined to press forward with national and international programs to raise standards of living in the treaty area which they consider basic to national security.

The Council approved measures to strengthen the organization and facilitate the Council representatives' plan of work for the coming year.

They approved the plans of the committee of economic experts, working under the Council representatives, to continue their studies of the economic problems involved in treaty commitments and to undertake new studies.

They invited the Council representatives to pursue the study of the concrete problems resulting from the defense effort of member states as well as those existing in areas particularly susceptible to subversive activities.

They noted and approved the intention of the Council representatives, within the terms of their existing directives, to give a high priority in the coming year to regional cooperation and, where appropriate, joint action by member governments in the field of countering subversive activities.

The Council considered the work of the military advisers which would result in further developing the effectiveness of machinery for defense cooperation. The members considered the conclusions of the military advisers as to the defensive forces that would be required to meet aggression and agreed on the desirability of maintaining certain of

their military forces at levels of mobility and combat effectiveness which would be an effective deterrent to aggression.

A LIST OF DECISIONS

The following organizational decisions were taken:

(A) To assist the Council representatives and to provide a stronger central SEATO organization in Bangkok, the Council authorized the establishment of a permanent working group composed of an officer from the staff of each council representative and the establishment of a full-time executive secretariat to replace the provisional secretariat generously provided hitherto by the Government of Thailand.

(B) A research service center will be established in Bangkok under the Council representatives to produce, for the benefit of member governments and of bodies set up within the SEATO framework, reports on current development in Communist activities.

(C) The public relations office in Bangkok will be expanded and a cultural relations office established to carry out new programs in these fields.

(D) An economic officer will be appointed to facilitate the important work in the economic field. He will work closely with, and under the direction of, the Council representatives.

(E) Organizational costs will be met from a common budget.

The Council was convinced that the work accomplished at this meeting would give new and strong impetus to the promotion of security and welfare to the treaty area.

All the Foreign Ministers expressed the firm determination of their governments to press forward with their individual and collective efforts to safeguard the peace and well-being of the region as a whole.

SEATO DECISIONS

The meeting of representatives of the eight nations that are members of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, which has just been concluded in Karachi, produced no new line of policy. It did, however, come out with four major statements and decisions. They will help to clarify the international atmosphere.

It is recognized, first, that the pressures of the Soviet Union have not been abated. The campaign of attraction and compulsion continues and the Southeast Asian states must continue to be on their guard. This is the answer to the soft-words policy recently employed by the Communists in dealing with this sensitive area. The treaty nations are not deluded.

Second, it is agreed that further economic measures will be required to promote the essential stability that is the best offset to Communist subversion. This also is not new, and agreement in this field was to be expected. Moreover, the United States, in the most recent statement of President Eisenhower, has shown its awareness of this phase of the problem and will work, as the President indicated, toward a higher degree of flexibility and effectiveness.

In this connection it should be emphasized that one of the purposes of the organization from the beginning was the promotion of a closer integration, economically, among its members. Not enough has been done so far in this field. Obviously the United States, in its position of unusual wealth, can be expected to give assistance where it is needed. But this cannot be the right substitute for a genuinely cooperative effort among peoples who have thus far been bound to economic structures on the other side of the world, sometimes at the expense of their immediate neighbors. SEATO is not merely a military defensive alliance. It is a framework upon which can be built a genuine economic integration.

The delegates at Karachi met two immediate problems of their host nation, Pakistan, in headon fashion. Those were the questions of Afghanistan and Kashmir. In each case the agreements reached were sensible and to the point.

Friction between Afghanistan and Pakistan has centered about the Afghan-supported proposal that some of the border area of Pakistan in the northwest should be incorporated in a new Pushtu-speaking state, which would be nominally independent, but, of course, under special Afghan protection. The Pakistanis have vigorously resisted this proposal, since they regard it, naturally and rightly in our view, as an impingement upon Pakistan's sovereignty in the tribal areas. This might not have become of international import except for the fact that the Soviet Union recently espoused the causes of Afghanistan. Thus there is an international threat to the integrity of a member of SEATO by a Communist power and SEATO is right to take cognizance of this threat.

The case of Kashmir is more complex. The Indian occupation of part of Kashmir cannot, in itself, be said to be a direct external threat to Pakistan. SEATO could not, therefore, take any direct action. The ultimate political disposition of Kashmir, however, affects the peace and security of Pakistan and India, and, indeed, of the whole eastern world.

This is not merely a local problem. It is a United Nations problem and the United Nations has established instruments designed for its solution. The SEATO powers, accordingly, did the right and logical thing by insisting that this question be referred, with even more urgency, to the United Nations and that the envisaged solution, based on a free plebiscite, be earnestly sought.

This is in no sense an intervention. SEATO has made no promises and no threats. It has, on the other hand, served to emphasize that the right way to deal with the Kashmir question is already at hand. This is a case not for SEATO but for the United Nations.

The matter of troop commitments, with the corresponding question of the volume and allocation of military aid, is not laid before the public at this time. There is an indication that the planning will be precise and the commitments adequate.

This meeting appears to have served its purposes. Progress has been made. The decisions are conservative and sound.

THOMAS G. MASARYK

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, Thomas G. Masaryk was born on March 7, 1850. In marking his 106th birthday, we do more than pay tribute to the founder of the Republic of Czechoslovakia and its first president during the hesitant years following World War I. We also honor the memory of one of the truly great men of our century, a world renowned figure of deep meaning to all of humanity.

He was a true world figure, one of the rare figures of a century, when a really outstanding man arises on the crest of world history and plays his role nobly, honorably, and to a successful conclusion. This is no doubt why a world-famous author, when once asked who should be chosen as the head of the United States of Europe, if any such organization should be formed, answered without a moment's hesitation that only Thomas G. Masaryk, of all the men of Europe, could fill such a lofty position.

Even before World War I, he had attained an outstanding position as a renowned scholar, philosopher, and educator. During the World War I days, he launched, in London, his campaign, which served as the foundation for recognition of a new independent state, the Republic of Czechoslovakia. In his fight for its recognition, he came to America, where he enlisted and secured the interest and support of Woodrow Wilson. He was no stranger to America; years before, he came to this country for his bride and lifetime helpmate. He lectured at the University of Chicago in the early years of this century. He was a close student of American life and government.

After World War I, he returned to his native land, there to serve for 17 years as the first president of the Republic which he founded.

We honor him as one to whom biographers and writers have referred as "the finest intellect of the century." We honor him as the philosopher who became a statesman in spite of himself, as the father of a state who was also its simplest citizen, and as an unchallengably firm democrat who believed in the rule of tolerance.

On one occasion, shortly after his becoming president of his nation, he referred to the visit he made in 1918 to the Gettysburg battlefield. He stated, in part:

> It was there that I fully realized the profound foundation of the American democracy, yes, democracy in the army too, a democracy which remembers not only its generals, but all those who have lost their lives in defense of man's liberties. * * * I say American democracy because there are as many forms of democracy as there are states and nations. For myself, I feel nearest to and accept the principles of American democracy. At this time I can declare that these principles always were, are now, and ever shall be, the guiding principles of the political aspect of my life, because they are near to our nation, and because our people accept them for their own, and will ever be united by them with America, united in this spirit of freedom and democracy.

Masaryk died in 1937. Since then, his country has fallen under the harsh rule of totalitarian and alien forces on two occasions. It is still under such domination and in such subjection.

Yet, those who know well Czechoslovakia and its people have abiding faith that the spirit of liberty and freedom still lives in the hearts and in the minds of the people of that brave nation. There is every reason to believe that those people, even as Thomas Masaryk recited in 1918, still accept the principles of American democracy for their own, "and will ever be united by them with America, united in the spirit of freedom and democracy."

It is the sincere and fervent hope of champions of democracy and liberty everywhere that it will not be too long before the dreams and the longings of Masaryk's compatriots will be realized—that their liberties and independence will be fully restored and regained.

THE AL SARENA TIMBER AND MINING CASE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a most illuminating editorial on the Al Sarena timber and mining scandal appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for March 5, 1956, under the title "Profile of a Watchdog."

The editorial emphasizes the lack of knowledge which Secretary of the Interior McKay apparently labors under concerning important events and policies in his own department.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFILE OF A WATCHDOG

Secretary of Interior McKay, in a letter to the Post-Dispatch printed recently, declared testimony of Under Secretary Davis had provided "the facts regarding the unfounded charges that have been made" about the Al Sarena mining claim in the Rogue River National Forest, in Oregon, from which a valuable stand of timber is being cut. We reprinted a digest of Mr. Davis' statement under the cartoon on the day of publication of the Secretary's letter.

The testimony of his Under Secretary which Mr. McKay sent us set forth, by implication, a philosophy of government that is strange indeed. The first point Mr. Davis attempted to make was that Secretary McKay is not responsible for the Al Sarena decision.

We are well aware a Secretary of Interior cannot know everything that goes on in his Department. But whether he knows it or not, he is responsible for it. The doctrine of nonresponsibility for the conduct of public office by virtue of being uninformed is dangerous.

From here Mr. Davis went on to indicate still further his concept of Government service. He recited the charges of unfairness and prejudice which Charles and Herbert McDonald, owners of Al Sarena Mines, Inc., made to him against the Bureau of Land Management, an agency of the Interior Department, and the Forest Service.

"In view of the accusations that the McDonalds were making," Mr. Davis testified, "it seemed to me a certainty that to remand the claims to the same field office which made the original record would be a vain act. The same suspicions and hostile attitudes would be present."

If Mr. Davis did not trust his own agency of Government, whom did he trust? He trusted Representative ELLSWORTH, of Oregon, who long had been lobbying with the Interior Department in behalf of the McDonald interests. He trusted 4 private mining engineers whom Representative ELLSWORTH, at his request, recommended, though 1 of them was the McDonalds' own engineer, a second relied on information supplied him by the McDonalds' engineer, a third had taken no samples whatever, and the fourth had only made "general observations."

Senator SCOTT, of North Carolina, commented that making Members of Congress the chief sources of facts for executive decisions was "a shabby way for Government to operate."

From these 4 engineers, Mr. Davis testified, "I had secured what I felt was at least enough evidence to justify my regarding the patent application as having been made in good faith"—in other words, for rejecting the conclusion of 2 Government agencies that the McDonalds were only seeking the mineral rights in order to get the timber.

Under Secretary Davis testified that speed in the McDonalds' behalf was essential. He cited repeated pleas by Representative ELLSWORTH and Representative BOYKIN, of Alabama, the McDonalds' home State, that the applicants were being damaged by delay. Yet he was unimpressed by the fact that in the 2 years since he granted the McDonalds their claim they have not done a lick of mining but have cut $110,000 worth of timber, with $400,000 more waiting to be cut.

Finally, Mr. Davis' philosophy of Government service is rounded out by his indifference to whether there was any timber on the claim or not. The 1872 mining laws which applied make no reference to timber, he said.

President Eisenhower, far from sharing Mr. Davis's indifference, spoke out clearly when he signed legislation last year designed, finally, to stop the racket of acquiring valuable national timber stands under the false guise of mining claims. "One of the most important conservation measures affecting public lands that has been enacted in many years," he called it.

That reform came too late to apply to the Al Sarena case. It did not come too late to remind Under Secretary Davis, and others who need the reminder, that the public domain is secure from pillage today because through the years the Department of the Interior has stood like a rock against its would-be despoilers.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, ETC.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, ever since the Senate decided to set up a special eight-man committee to inquire into the broad problems of lobbying, of campaign expenditures, and their relationship, I have had serious misgivings about my vote in favor of the resolution creating the committee. I say this without any reflection on any of the Members who were appointed to the special committee, because they are outstanding Senators. I would have had the same misgivings no matter which Senators might serve on such a committee.

Now, after listening to the thoughtful and even-tempered explanation by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] of developments which have occurred since the appointment of the special committee, and the cogent remarks of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], I have concluded that I made a mistake when I voted for the resolution to turn over these crucial issues to a special committee of the Senate. A new Member must learn by experience, and there was not much time for thorough reflection before the vote. I believe now that the Senate should not have bypassed its regular standing committees in dealing with the aspects of these problems which fall within their normal legislative functions and responsibilities.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it is my firm conviction that the people of this country demand a thorough and impartial study of the whole matter of our methods of financing political campaigns and their relationship to lobbying—a matter which, because of recent events, is now getting the public attention it has long deserved. Already there have been heard suggestions that the Senate cannot investigate itself, any more than any other agency of government can investigate itself. In all candor, people wonder how Senators who were elected with substantial campaign funds raised by large, private contributions can inquire into other Senators' campaign exchequers. That question applies to all here, the junior Senator from Oregon included.

Speaking only for myself, Mr. President, I personally am ready to turn over to an outside commission, nonpartisan and broadly representative in character, this entire problem for a thorough airing and for a study of constructive alternatives to our present approach to political finances. As I have had occasion to say before, in the Senate and elsewhere, this question of political campaign financing is rapidly becoming the central problem of our democratic processes, increasingly so every year as the cost of modern methods of campaigning skyrocket.

Such a commission, Mr. President, should include members from many walks of life—after all, every American is intimately affected by the actions and decisions of his representatives in Congress, whether he be a businessman or a workingman, a teacher, a farmer, a writer, or a scientist. It might include some eminent political scientists; and I suggest that it be headed by a retired jurist whose ability and nonpartisanship were beyond question.

I would turn over to such a commission, Mr. President, the function of finding out the facts about our present methods of political financing, and about the related aspects of lobbying. I would give such a commission the authority, the personnel, and the money to enable it to make the proper inquiry, and to stay with it during the present election year so as to accumulate a meaningful body of information about the problem. There are many precedents for the use of special commissions to make thorough studies of specific areas of public concern, and I believe a special commission, removed from the political arena, is needed to restore the confidence of the American people that they are, in fact, being told the full truth about their processes of government and politics.

At the same time, Mr. President, I would leave to the regular, standing committees of Congress the responsibility for acting now on pending legislative proposals for constructive and long-overdue steps to improve the situation with respect to campaign financing—steps which can and should be taken before the political campaigns of this presidential election year. These standing committees and the Congress can act constructively on legislative reforms without getting bogged down in controversy which will inevitably accompany efforts at senatorial investigation of this problem.

CRITICISM OF THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BY DREW PEARSON—NEWSPAPER COMMENT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that remarks which I had prepared for delivery during the morning hour, together with certain letters and editorials, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement, letters, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

From time to time I have placed in the RECORD examples of misinformation and irresponsible journalism. The subjects and authors have varied, but recently the same

general topic and author have been more and more in evidence.

The subject is the Department of Interior and the writer is Drew Pearson, who has been called a "fiction writer" by one newspaper editor in the Northwest, whose editorial I shall include in my presentation.

The articles which I will place in the RECORD today deal with two phases of Mr. Pearson's unwarranted attack on the policies of the Interior Department under this administration. The first phase deals with the completely false charges by columnist Pearson, on February 9, that Lloyd Bohlke, of Prosser, Wash., had been fired from a job with the Kennewick Irrigation District, near Yakima, by the Bureau of Reclamation under Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay. The reason for the alleged firing was given that Mr. Bohlke had appeared on a television program and had spoken out against the policies of Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

This flat charge by Mr. Pearson was also a smear of Secretary McKay. Needless to say, subsequent inquiry proved it completely false. The facts on this, as opposed to Mr. Pearson's allegations, were placed in the RECORD of February 10 on page 2506 by Senator Watkins. I would like to add to this 2 news stories, 1 from the Columbia Basin News of February 11 and another from the Yakima Herald of February 12. Also, I would like to place in the RECORD a column by Glenn C. Lee, publisher of the Tri-City Herald, which appeared on February 24, and an editorial in the Herald on February 14, the title of which is "Fiction Writer."

The other phase of Mr. Pearson's unproven charges concerns an Oregon Democrat, Lew Wallace, of Portland, who served 3 terms as Oregon State senator and was also Democrat National Committeeman for Oregon. Senator Morse also made an insertion in the RECORD on this same subject on February 16 on page 2630.

Mr. Wallace, it will be recalled, was named by Mr. Pearson in a radio broadcast of January 21 as the author of the letter in the Al Sarena case, which Mr. Pearson charged was forwarded by President Eisenhower to Secretary McKay with a long-hand note scribbled on it. Mr. Pearson made an apology in his column of February 12, which evidently failed to satisfy Mr. Wallace.

I will let the facts speak for themselves in this matter. And to make the RECORD more complete, I would like to place in it an Associated Press dispatch of February 17 concerning Mr. Wallace's libel suit against Mr. Pearson, an editorial from the Seaside (Oreg.) Signal which aptly points out the important question of newspaper ethics which is involved, and a news story from the February 20 Portland Oregonian.

These two phases of the unwarranted attacks on Secretary McKay and the Department of the Interior point up two things:

One is that the basis for such attacks is purely political and is not a desire for the truth.

The other is that the journalistic profession, for most of which I have always had the highest regard, should reexamine its standards to determine whether sufficient emphasis is being placed on factual reporting.

No one need fear the truth, but the American public, which has always been able to learn the facts from the press, is in danger of being seriously misled through such politically-slanted distortions and falsities.

[From the Tri-City (Wash.) Herald of February 12, 1956]

ROZA FARMER THOUGHT KID JOB HIS, BUT IT WASN'T

PROSSER.—A Roza farmer, puzzled no end by the Kennewick Irrigation District giving a job which he'd been led to believe was his to another man, was even more surprised this weekend after his name appeared in Drew Pearson's nationally syndicated column.

Lloyd Bohlke, who farms 80 acres on the Roza north of Prosser, said he didn't know where Pearson got the information that he was "fired by Reclamation Bureau officials."

"After all, if I wasn't hired I couldn't be fired," Bohlke said.

KID officials and the Reclamation Bureau officials pooh-poohed the idea that Bohlke didn't get the job of KID manager because he didn't agree with the Benson farm policy. They've also labeled "untrue" the Pearson article which said Bohlke was hired, then fired, after being on a television program and expressing himself as against present administration farm programs.

Bohlke said Saturday that he had talked with KID Directors Jerome Clarke, Walter Crayne, and Orville Terrell in December about the job of KID manager, which would be vacant, with Malcolm J. Crawford accepting the job of manager of the Yakima-Tieton project. After two sessions with the board, and meeting W. K. Karrer, Kennewick division project engineer, Bohlke said he was told by the board that the manager job was his.

Clarke, present KID chairman, said Bohlke was one of several applicants for the job and that he had been told, like the others, that "after any decision of the board he would be notified."

Van E. Nutley, reclamation engineer for the Kennewick project, was given the manager job at a $10,000 yearly salary at a special meeting of the board January 12.

Clarke said he didn't know how the mixup came about and expressed concern because the Reclamation Bureau was being unjustly blamed for something it had nothing to do with.

Bohlke, however, said the KID directors told him his application was O. K. and led him to believe that it was being checked by Reclamation officials in Boise.

Bohlke added that he had talked with Crayne since the job was given to Nutley and explained that he felt the KID board had wronged him by not doing as it had indicated it would. He added that he did not plan to contest the board's decision. He previously had made plans to dispose of his Jersey cattle and lease his farm, but at the present time he's undecided as to what he will do.

[From the Columbia Basin News of February 11, 1956]

DREW PEARSON'S STORY ON KID FIRING LABELED AS "UNTRUE"

(By Bruce W. Kipp)

Local Reclamation Bureau and Kennewick irrigation district officials Friday labeled as untrue a national columnist's assertion that a Prosser man hired as KID manager was fired by the Bureau after commenting about the plight of the small farmer over television.

The implication in the February 10 column of Drew Pearson, which appeared in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, was that Lloyd Bohlke, 41, of Prosser, lost the job because he expressed his views about Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson's farm program.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION MAN QUIZZED

Contacted in Yakima, O. W. Lindgren, superintendent of the Yakima project, of which the KID's new works comprise the Kennewick division, denied the name of the Roza farmer had ever been submitted to his office for approval as Kennewick Irrigation District manager.

"It is so false," said Lindgren of the Pearson article, "it certainly ought to be corrected."

CLARKE DENIES HIRING

Jerome Clarke, chairman of the KID board, denied that this district hired Bohlke and that he was given any more encouragement than any other applicant for the job vacated last month by Malcolm J. Crawford, now manager of the Yakima-Tieton project.

The job, at a January 12 KID special board meeting, was given to Van E. Nutley, Bureau of Reclamation field engineer for the Kennewick project. Long with the Bureau, Nutley had been working on the Kennewick project since its start and had been on the Roza project previously. His pay, which starts Monday, is $10,000 a year.

No record of Bohlke's hiring appears in KID's minutes.

Bohlke, who farms 80 Roza acres near Grandview, had a few weeks ago complained of being informally hired by the KID board and subsequently discovering that Nutley had been given the job officially. Bohlke added that, on the strength of this informal hiring which he said occurred in Walter Crayne's greenhouse, he agreed to lease his farm out.

Walt Crayne is a KID director and had until recently been its chairman

WILL LEASE FARM

Bohlke also said he intended to keep his word by going through with the lease and also that he didn't plan to contest his job rights with KID. He said nothing at all about Reclamation Bureau intervention leading to his alleged outster. His salary with KID was to have been the same as Crawford's—$7,200 a year.

KID Chairman Clarke, after reading the Drew Pearson article, admitted that the three KID directors interviewed Bohlke twice—once at the district's downtown office and once at Walt's greenhouse.

At that time, Clarke said, he was asked to take Bohlke down to the local Reclamation Bureau office in the KID building in Kennewick and introduce him to W. K. Karrer, project engineer for the Kennewick division.

NOT ENCOURAGED

"A few questions were asked by Mr. Karrer and that was about all it amounted to," said Clarke of Bohlke's interview with that Bureau official. "Gosh, no," replied Clarke when asked whether KID directors gave Bohlke any encouragement about his acceptability as KID manager. "I do not know where he got the idea."

Clarke showed a copy of the district's repayment contract with the Bureau. It provides that until the Federal Government's works are paid off in full by the water users, the Bureau must approve of a manager.

It sets out that the person hired must be a competent irrigation engineer with at least 3 years' experience in the operation of works similar to the works the Government will eventually transfer to the irrigation district.

CAN'T QUALIFY

"Bohlke can't qualify," said Clarke.

According to Bohlke's December 12 letter of application, he had been with the Shell Oil Co. in various capacities for several years and, more recently, had gained experience in the farming of fruit, row crops, dairying, and raising of beef cattle.

He said he has had experience in accounting, typing, shorthand, operation and maintenance and purchasing and stores.

HIS QUALIFICATIONS

He listed himself as the master of the Rattlesnake grange, a member of the agriculture committee of the Benton County Pomona grange, leader of the Benton Busy Farmers 4-H Club, and director of the Yakima Valley Jersey Cattle Club.

At the district office, Mrs. Rosadell Hoppe, office secretary, said of the 10 applications for Crawford's job received, a half-dozen of the applicants showed themselves as having considerable irrigation experience.

Asked whether he recalled meeting Bohlke, project engineer Karrer behaved at first as though he wasn't acquainted with the Drew

Pearson article and went through the motions of scanning the P-I's editorial page in quest of the item.

DOESN'T REMEMBER HIM

"Whoever Bohlke is, he apparently doesn't like Benson," Karrer at first observed. He later mentioned that Clarke brought in 5 or 6 applicants and indicated he couldn't recall which one, if any, was Bohlke.

Lindgren, explaining the bureau's procedure, said Karrer is empowered only to counsel with district officials on managerial prospects, that his own office recommends and that the regional office in Boise makes the actual appointment.

"DEBUNKS" STATEMENT

Lindgren, terming the article the most false statement anybody ever made, said he wrote Bohlke after seeing the article that he, Bohlke, had never worked for the bureau, that he never was referred to him for recommendation as KID manager.

Clarke said his board is apprehensive lest the Drew Pearson story result in a final denial of the year's annual leave from the bureau asked by Van Nutley to afford him time to try out the KID job.

Nutley's application had already been turned down once, but subsequently W. A. Dexheimer, commissioner of reclamation, was asked about it when he was here February 1 to dedicate the Chandler power and pumping plant. Clarke also fired off a long telegram to Dexheimer asking for reconsideration of the denial.

So far, said Clarke, no answer has been received.

[From the Yakima (Wash.) Herald of February 12, 1956]

OFFICIALS DENY FARMER WAS PROMISED KID JOB

PROSSER.—An allegation by Columnist Drew Pearson that a Prosser farmer was fired as manager of the Kennewick Irrigation District's new project after he had spoken against the farm program of Ezra Taft Benson has brought denials from Valley reclamation officials.

"He could not have been fired," said Jerome Clark, chairman of the Kennewick Irrigation District Board. "He was never hired."

Lloyd Bohlke, however, said yesterday that he was about to be hired when he learned that someone else got the job.

PEARSON'S STATEMENT

Pearson wrote that Bohlke, 41, Prosser farmer, had been fired after he had spoken against Benson's policies on a Yakima television program January 2. The firing came January 3, Pearson said.

"Bohlke was considered along with about 10 other applicants, but he was never hired," said Clark. "In fact as far as I know he was never given any indication that he was going to be hired."

CONTRADICTION

"I was practically assured of the job verbally," Bohlke said. "I met with three members of the board in Kennewick including Clark who told me that I was to be hired. I was even making arrangements to lease my farm and dispose of my cattle.

"I was introduced to W. K. Karrar, project engineer for the United States Bureau of Reclamation, Kennewick project, who told me my qualifications for the job were satisfactory.

"Clark told me they were glad to be getting someone with practical experience. Walter Crayne, former chairman of the KID board, told me not to worry, that my application was on its way to the Boise office."

Later, Bohlke said, he learned that Van E. Nutley, former field engineer for the United States Bureau of Reclamation in the Kennewick project, had been employed for the job.

The job ultimately will involve management of 15,000 acres of land between Kiona and Kennewick to come under irrigation in 1957 and the rehabilitation of 400,000 acres already served by the Kennewick Highlands project.

How Pearson got the information for his column was puzzling to Bohlke.

"When I was in the Chinook Hotel in Yakima before the television broadcast," Bohlke said, "a strange man came up to me and asked if I was the person who was an applicant for the KID position. I told him 'yes.' We had no further conversation. He would be the only link with the matter in my recollection."

Bohlke said "I have no hard feelings toward the bureau and district officials but it is puzzling. I do have one objection. A Pasco newspaper Saturday carried a story about this matter which contained a number of personal facts about myself that I don't think were obtained from any source other than my job application. I do feel applications should be held in confidence and not made public."

Yesterday, Bohlke received the following letter from O. W. Lindgren, superintendent of the United Bureau of Reclamation's Yakima district:

"My attention was directed to the item 'Fired for Talking' in Drew Pearson's column February 10, 1956.

"Statements with reference to your having been an employee of the Bureau of Reclamation who was fired by officials of that agency are so absolutely false that in fairness to yourself and others you should see that they are corrected.

"I understand that you had applied for the manager's position of the Kennewick Irrigation District; however, that is not a Government agency. I doubt if anyone in administrative responsibility in the Bureau of Reclamation gave any serious consideration to your views about the Benson farm program.

"I did not see the television program referred to. Fortunately we in the Bureau of Reclamation do not hold our positions because of political affiliations nor is anyone hired or fired on that basis.

"You are probably not responsible for what Drew Pearson said but you may want to correct his false statement."

[From the Tri-City (Wash.) Herald of February 24, 1956]

THE WAY I SEE IT

(By Glenn Lee)

Recent national publicity has given millions of people incorrect information about two items here in the Pacific Northwest.

On a TV broadcast by Edward Murrow, Lloyd Bohlke, of Prosser, appeared on the program. On February 9, Drew Pearson, national columnist, wrote that Bohlke was fired from the Kennewick Irrigation District by the Bureau of Reclamation.

It was inferred that Bohlke's action in appearing on the TV program was frowned upon by the present administration, and that he got his walking papers from his job as a result.

That is not the case. Bohlke never had a job with the KID.

Bohlke had talked to KID directors recently about the possibility of being a candidate for the manager's job, which was then being vacated, but he never was hired for the position.

Mr. Pearson in far-off Washington, D. C., made a mistake. In the fast-moving news events of the day he never backed up to correct this mistake. The public got the wrong impression at the time, and they still have the incorrect information about this incident.

A further attempt to discredit the administration on the same Murrow broadcast concerned the visit to the State by Secretary Benson.

Over in Colfax in the heart of the wheat country, John H. Ottmar, who manages the bank for the Seattle First National, also was on TV.

Ottmar's remarks were "edited and cut" to suit the tastes of Murrow. Only a part of his statement was used. The part selected by Murrow was tailored to create a bad impression on farm policies.

When farmers in the Colfax area saw it on TV or heard about it from others, they hit the ceiling. So did Ottmar.

The full text of Ottmar's remarks did not give the kind of an impression as was seen by people watching the TV program.

Ottmar was a little upset and did not like to be put in a dishonest and unfair position.

So Mr. Ottmar took a ful-page advertisement in the newspaper at Colfax and explained his connection with the TV program and what he thinks about the farm situation as related to his bank and to the farmers with whom he has dealt for 20 years.

Here is what Ottmar said, that Murrow did not use on his program quote—"with unrestricted seeding, the use of modern power farming equipment, the use of commercial fertilizer, and high support prices, the farmer was encouraged to create a huge surplus—and farmers who had not previously raised wheat, were encouraged to drop other crops and turn to wheat because of the profit guaranteed by these conditions.

"With a sharp cut in acreage, a reduced support price, the higher cost of machinery, and increased operating expenses, the farmer is definitely in a squeeze.

"If the acreage is further reduced or the support price lowered, or both, the majority of farmers will definitely be in trouble," end of quote.

So it goes with national propaganda. Neither Murrow or Pearson will do any explaining. Their little hatchet job was done and there it is.

[From the Tri-City (Wash.) Herald of February 14, 1956]

FICTION WRITER

If memory serves us correct and we believe it does, columnist Drew Pearson has a local batting average of 1,000 for untruths about Tri-City situations.

The latest concerns a story of a Roza project farmer who supposedly was hired by the Kennewick Irrigation District as manager and then was promptly fired a day or two later after he had expressed views on a television program which were contrary to those held by the administration.

To which we say: "Hogwash."

As a newspaper in this community, we think the Tri-City Herald had a fair idea of who was being considered for KID manager. We also had a fair idea of who the manager might be, even before his election was announced.

To say the Roza farmer, because of views expressed on a television program, was fired from his job as KID manager is sheer fabrication.

Pearson, it seems to us, must deal in fabrications.

Back in 1949, former Senator Harry Cain met with some labor leaders in Pasco. The Tri-City Herald was present for the entire meeting.

Sometime later Pearson produced a column containing, among other things, several paragraphs of direct quotations of an exchange between Cain and a labor leader which purported to show that Cain had been slapped down for his Taft-Hartley views.

The column was pure fiction. The conversation never occurred, neither did the incident. Instead of the fight Pearson painted, the meeting was unusually cordial. Pearson's report on the meeting—he wasn't there, of course—amazed us.

The late President Roosevelt once called Pearson an inveterate liar. We couldn't go that strong but we're beginning to see what he meant.

[From the Associated Press]

WASHINGTON.—Lew Wallace, of Portland, Oreg., today filed a $250,000 libel suit against Columnist Drew Pearson.

The complaint filed in United States district court described Wallace as a three-term former State senator, and a former Democratic national committeeman.

The complaint alleged that Pearson "falsely and wrongfully published and broadcast" that Wallace had urged President Eisenhower to "exert pressure" on Secretary of the Interior McKay.

Wallace's complaint alleged Pearson said Wallace wrote the letter to the President to urge the Secretary of the Interior to award mining patents to the McDonald family, owners of the Al Sarena Mines, Inc.

Wallace said this was meant to convey the impression he was guilty of conduct "unbecoming a person who has held public office in the past."

Involved are 15 mining patents in Oregon's Rogue River National Forest. Some Democrats in Congress say the Sarena company has done no mining since 1943 but has cut an estimated $100,000 worth of timber off the lands involved.

The patents were issued in 1954 by the Interior Department. Previously, during the Truman administration, the Department's Bureau of Land Management had recommended, in 1951, against issuance of the patents.

[From the Seaside (Oreg.) Signal of February 16, 1956]

THIS IS A QUESTION OF NEWSPAPER ETHICS WHICH IS IMPORTANT

Drew Pearson, Washington correspondent, after having been called a liar by President Eisenhower's press secretary, has apologized to the President for publishing, and stating over the air, that the President had attempted to intervene in the Al Sarena case by writing a note on the margin of a letter from Lew Wallace, Portland Democrat, asking for favorable action in the case.

Pearson, however, did not say that the note had not been written. He merely said that a man had told him about the note, but had refused to let him see it.

This statement is a measure of Pearson's sense of responsibility as a journalist. He, simply on the basis of an unsupported statement, published through the country, and stated over a national radio hook-up, that President Eisenhower attempted to intervene in what was nothing more nor less than a legal question between a mineowner and the Department of the Interior.

On the face of this statement alone, Pearson convicts himself of subscribing to a level of journalistic ethics which cannot be supported by any reasonable standard of responsibility. At the same time, his implications in the Al Sarena case are, in our opinion, very wide of the mark. We are convinced that he has used this case simply for the purposes of sensational journalism, and that he has reflected unfairly on the characters of President Eisenhower, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, Representative Harrison Ellsworth, and a number of others.

In another column, Pearson charges President Eisenhower with inducing the late Governor Patterson to announce his candidacy for the Senate, the implication being that the President was, to an extent, indirectly responsible for Patterson's death. The President has denied that the question of Patterson's candidacy had even been discussed between them. And, in any event, the idea that Paul Patterson could not make up his own mind is certainly a reflection on him which Oregon people will resent for a long time.

This brings up a question which has concerned newspaper people for some time. To what extent is a newspaper responsible for the statements in a syndicated column? Most newspapers work on the theory that they avoid responsibility by publishing the column under the signature of its author.

We do not agree to this theory. We believe that a newspaper must be responsible for the facts, at least, of any statement which appears in its columns, regardless of whether it is signed or not. (Except for letters to the editor.) We believe that the Portland newspaper which publishes Pearson's column must bear a great deal of responsibility for any misstatement of fact, as contrasted with opinion, appearing in it.

Because its publishers felt that Pearson's column had completely misrepresented the Al Sarena case, one Oregon newspaper has discontinued its use. We believe that it was not only justified in doing so, but that it had a duty to its readers to eliminate any material which its publishers did not think was factual. We think that this constitutes an excellent example.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of February 20, 1956]

PEARSON'S APOLOGY TO WALLACE BRINGS CHARGE OF FURTHER MISREPRESENTATION

An expected apology-broadcast by Columnist Drew Pearson Sunday night was characterized by ex-State Senator Lew Wallace as a further misrepresentation to the public.

The Portland Democrat indicated the Washington newsman still has not righted the alleged wrong done him.

And, Wallace said, his $250,000 libel suit filed against Pearson Friday still stands.

The columnist had announced his regular Sunday broadcast—aired in Portland over KEX—would give his version of the imaginary "Dear Doug" letter.

Wallace, who Pearson said was author of the supposed letter, has demanded a complete retraction and personal apology to clear his good name and reputation.

The columnist was quoted as having said in a broadcast that the letter was sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower to influence the granting of mining patents in the controversial Al Sarena case.

Pearson last week apologized to the President for the inference made in his broadcast. To Wallace, he said via radio Sunday night:

"I mistakenly said Lew Wallace had written the letter * * * and I very much regret it."

By way of explanation, the columnist said he was in possession of another "Dear Doug" letter supposedly written by Wallace to Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay.

Pearson said he was unable to make sense of the letter in his hands and found it hard to understand.

The columnist repeated an earlier statement that he had telephoned Wallace in Portland to confirm the Al Sarena letter.

In part, Pearson said of his talk with Wallace:

"He did not quite remember it, but promised to consult his files and call me back.

"Wallace did call back to say he could not find the letter but still thought he might have written one."

Pearson ended his remarks about the "Dear Doug" letter he possessed with:

"Frankly, I'm not quite sure what he was writing about."

Wallace told the Oregonian he had listened to every word of Pearson's broadcast. His statement afterwards said:

"Drew Pearson has again tried to misrepresent me to the public."

The Portlander insisted he told Pearson emphatically that no such letter could be found in file.

"Now tonight he comes out over the radio," Wallace said, "and admits that there was no such letter but still insists I told him I had written such a letter."

Wallace said he has long been an ardent conservationist and the thought of his having anything to do with giving away timber was ridiculous.

The new "Dear Doug" letter Pearson mentioned, has "no bearing whatever on the subject matter," the Portland Democrat said.

Wallace explained:

"It had to do with an entirely different matter of a friend of mine and nothing to do with mines or lumber. It was a perfectly honorable transaction and I have no objections for the letter to be published.

"I want to say frankly that Drew Pearson is not telling the truth."

Wallace said Secretary McKay, himself, would verify that the letter mentioned Sunday was "open and above board about a friend I went to school with."

He challenged Pearson to take the trouble to prove the truth of it.

Wallace said Pearson's broadcasts could act to ruin his insurance business and reputation here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 135, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate resume consideration of the farm bill.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, does the Senator from Texas intend to discuss the amendment?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas has been in conference with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and several other interested Senators, including the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. We feel that we have reached the agreement which was contemplated last night at the time the Senate took a recess.

I ask unanimous consent that I may further modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an opportunity to find out if the amendment is completely contrary to what was previously offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, if I cannot ask a question, I object.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk state the amendment. I apologize to the junior Senator from New Mexico for not having discussed the amendment with him before sending it to the desk.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator does not need to discuss it with me. The question is whether or not the amendment changes the entire picture. Are we to have an opportunity to discuss it or must we proceed at once to vote upon it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modified amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of Mr. HICKENLOOPER'S amendment it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(d) The price of grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye, respectively, shall be supported in any area through loans, purchases, or other operations at a price determined by the Secretary to bear the same ratio to the support price of corn in such area as the feed value equivalents of such grains bear to the feed value of corn: *Provided*, That (1) the support price in any area for the 1956 crop of any such commodity shall not be lower than the support price therefor announced prior to the enactment of this subsection, and (2) the producers of such commodities, to be eligible for price support, shall have (a) entered into contracts with the Secretary to place into the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve a portion of the tillable acres equivalent to 15 percent of the acres devoted to production of such commodities, and (b) planted an acreage of such commodities not exceeding the average acreage, planted to such commodities on the farm during the preceding 3 years. After 1956 the support level on any such crop shall be 95 percent of the support level established for corn in the commercial area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is willing to accept the amendment. If there is no objection, perhaps we could withdraw the order for the yeas and nays. I will ask the Senator from Iowa if he is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am familiar with the amendment as read. I believe it to be a helpful amendment. It may contain 1 or 2 provisions which I would not have written if I had drawn the amendment. However, I believe we can live with it. It is a helpful amendment, and it is on the affirmative side. It will go a long way toward eliminating certain inequities which otherwise might exist in the feed-grain situation. So far as I am concerned, and so far as I have any authority in the matter, I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment, because I believe it is helpful. I have so informed the Senator from Texas.

For the sake of the record, perhaps I should say that it might help to clarify the record if the Senator from Texas would make a brief explanation of the amendment. That might be helpful. Otherwise, so far as I am concerned, I see no particular reason for having a yea-and-nay vote, although I would have no objection to such a vote. However, I accept the amendment so far as I am concerned. Unless there is objection to withdrawing the order for the yeas and nays, I will ask unanimous consent that the order be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understand, the objection by the Senator from New Mexico was to withdrawing the order for the yea-and-nay vote. My parliamentary inquiry is whether the language of the amendment as recently read by the clerk and presented by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is the pending question. Is the pending question now before the Senate the language of the amendment as read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Hickenlooper amendment, as modified, is the pending question. The pending question is the Hickenlooper amendment, as modified by the Daniel amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the modified Daniel amendment the present question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In connection with the Hickenlooper amendment; yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understood earlier that the modification might not be accepted. I wanted the record to be clear.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a point of order. How can the Senator from Texas modify his amendment at this time?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas could not modify his own amendment after a yea-and-nay vote was ordered, and no other Senator could accept such a modification. The Senate will have to vote on it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will first state the parliamentary situation. There having been no objection to the modification, the modification was accepted.

Mr. DANIEL. As I understand the parliamentary situation, unanimous consent for the Senator from Iowa to accept my amendment, as modified, has not been requested. If it were requested, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I believe, would object to it. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No unanimous consent was required for the Senator from Iowa to accept the amendment. He had a right to accept it, and did accept it.

Mr. DANIEL. Even after the yeas and nays had been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order for the yeas and nays to the Daniel amendment will fall when the Daniel amendment is accepted by the prime mover.

Mr. ANDERSON. Are we to understand that, the Senator from Iowa having accepted the amendment, the yea-and-nay vote on the Daniel amendment, which had been ordered, is now abandoned?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not correct to say that the yeas and nays now stand as an order on the Daniel amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the order falls because the Daniel amendment has been embraced in the Hickenlooper amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The vote now will be on the Hickenlooper amendment, as modified?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The vote will be on the Hickenlooper amendment, as modified.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As modified by the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The yeas and nays have not been ordered on the Hickenlooper amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in reading the amendment, I note it provides:

(d) The price of grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye, respectively, shall be supported in any area through loans, purchases, or other operations at a price determined by the Secretary to bear the same ratio to the support price of corn in such area as the feed-value equivalents of such grains bear to the feed value of corn.

I should like to inquire of the Senator from Iowa if he intends that the feed value shall be the composite value of such grains. If each grain is to be treated separately, the letter "s" should be stricken from the word "grains." The word "grain" should be in the singular. Otherwise, we will have an extremely difficult situation to deal with.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The intent of the verbiage—and I would like to have the Senator from Texas express himself on this point—is that each grain is to be valued on its own equivalent, and it is not the intention to have a mixed composite of grains. It may be an unfortunate use of the plural, but the intention is that each grain shall stand on its own feet.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought we were proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement with time allotted to each side. What is the situation in that respect? How much time is left to each side, and who controls the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the Hickenlooper amendment was yielded back on yesterday.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. How are we to have an opportunity to discuss the amendment, if no time is available? We thought we would have a chance to say something about it. I should like to say a few words, particularly to point out to the Senator from Texas that the people of his State would be worse off with the amendment than they were before.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has two options; he can obtain more time by unanimous consent, or he may have time on the bill yielded to him.

Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 10 minutes on the bill to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask whether we have exhausted all the time available both on the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and on the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired on the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa. When the Senator from Iowa accepted the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], it exhausted all time on that amendment.

The Senator from Louisiana has allocated 10 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas be modified by striking out all the language beginning with "(d)." The Senator from Iowa has accepted that language, and I move to strike it out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So far as I can determine, it seems to me that it is a pro forma amendment which has been offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are waiting for its receipt at the desk so that the clerk may state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Was the Daniel amendment accepted by the Senator from Iowa?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was accepted by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So there will then be 2 hours on the pro forma amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator from New Mexico will control 1 hour of the time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am not opposed to what the Senator from Texas is trying to do if his objective is to get price supports for grain sorghums and for oats, rye, and barley, but I think it is a very dangerous way to legislate. We have no copy of the amendment; we do not have a chance to study it and see what it does to grains outside the commercial area. The support price for corn is about $1.40 but the support level outside the commercial area is three-fourths of that. If we take the feed equivalent for grain sorghum in the commercial area, the support level would be $2.37 and three-fourths of that would be about $1.80 at Galveston, but if we take off 62 cents for a freight differential to Lubbock, Tex., and Clovis, N. Mex., it comes down to $1.12.

The present support price is about $1.55. I merely want to know if in 1956 the amendment will protect the situation, and what will happen thereafter. Will the support level on grain sorghums in the area represented by the able Senator from Texas be reduced? What will happen to oats? Are we to be compelled to take the oats support price which has been announced for 1956, and be permitted to apply the two factors against it and come out with a price below what we now have?

I think there should be an opportunity to study this kind of a proposal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the amendment which is presented by the Senator from Texas in behalf of some of us is an amendment which is a decided improvement. For 1956 the support levels on the feed grains—barley, rye, oats, and grain sorghums—shall be not less than the support levels announced for 1956. In 1957, they will be 95 percent of the support levels of corn in the commercial area. That will be the situation from 1957 on.

Mr. ANDERSON. Can the Senator find that in the amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I can; because I helped to write the amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. The amendment is being typed so that each Senator may have a copy as soon as possible.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only wish to say, for the benefit of the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Vermont, who has worked hard on this proposed legislation, and the Senator from Florida, who is as militant as he can be, that we have held a hearing and we have voted on the question, and now comes an amendment which affects grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye, in every State of the Union where they are grown, and it affects them one way in the commercial corn area and in another way outside that area.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; it does not. In 1956 the support level as announced will apply, and in 1957 the support level on these grains will be 95 percent of the support level for corn as established in the commercial area.

Mr. ANDERSON. Can the Senator from Minnesota assure the Senate of the United States that the support price of grain sorghums will be 95 percent of the support price of corn; namely, $2.37?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It will be 95 percent of the support level on corn in the commercial area.

Mr. ANDERSON. And it will apply to all the grain sorghums outside the commercial area?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. We tied it in because of the problem which the Senator from New Mexico has mentioned.

The reason why that section was placed in the amendment is because of the point raised by the Senator from New Mexico last evening, namely, the differential between the noncommercial area and the commercial area, and the effect on price supports affecting feed grains, considering the respective levels of support.

One other point is that in the noncommercial area, while the support level for corn may be considerably less, actually the price is considerably over the support level in the commercial area because the corn has to be shipped in from a definite feed-producing area, so that the price is frequently higher than the support level for corn in the commercial area.

Is not that a fair statement?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. But let us get back to grain sorghums. The feeding value of grain sorghums is about 95 percent that of corn. We come out with a figure of $2.37 a hundredweight on grain sorghums. This amendment puts a flat mandatory price support on grain sorghums of $2.37.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is my understanding that the 95 percent of the support level on corn is based on the commercial area support level for corn.

Mr. ANDERSON. I appreciate the statement of the Senator. I think it is interesting information, and certainly indicates that it is not a matter to be passed over very lightly.

The same thing applies to oats, does it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. The support price of oats is 70 cents a bushel.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. And for barley it would run to a little over $1 a bushel. So does this not raise prices for the 1957 crop, and take whatever can be gotten for the 1956 crop?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The support price cannot be less than the announced levels for the 1956 crop. We also have some limitation in the sense that 15 percent of the cultivated acreage must be taken out of production.

Mr. ANDERSON. All the cultivated acreage?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. It is the formula which the Senator from Iowa used on corn. If a farmer had 100 acres in grain sorghum, the 15 percent would be taken out of any and all cultivated acres.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is that the situation as to corn?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my understanding. The Senator from Iowa was discussing last night the 15-percent reduction in acreage as related to his formula for corn, and the same principle applies to the feed grains. Is not that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator was using as an example 100 acres of corn.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will permit me, the same illustration will apply. If a farmer has been consistent over the past 3 years, and if he has 100 acres of grain sorghum, he cannot overplant that 100 acres, and get support on his grain sorghums.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is his historical base, so to speak.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The same formula is applied to feed grain that ap-

plies to the 56-million acre limitation on corn. In other words, it would not be fair, in our judgment, to place a support on the grains and then give the growers unlimited production or unlimited acreage. Corn, of course, is not given unlimited acreage; there is a limitation on corn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us consider a farm of 600 acres, with 100 acres planted in grain sorghums. In order to get the benefit of the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve, at least 15 acres would have to be set aside for conservation reserve or acreage reserve.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct; they would have to go either into the conservation reserve or the acreage reserve, and the farmer could not overplant.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If he overplanted, he would not be eligible at all.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. He would be out, he would not be eligible. It is the same formula that is applicable to corn in my amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me to allow me to address a few questions to him. I realize that we are all operating under a great disadvantage, because we do not have before us a copy of the amendment in its last form.

I thoroughly approve of what the Senator from New Mexico said, namely, that to write on the floor so complex a measure as this farm bill is unwise. I think we are demonstrating the unwisdom of it in a very real way right now.

I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that we had the same subject matter before the committee at great length last year in connection with an amendment presented by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. The amendment was rejected in committee. This year we had a more thoroughly considered amendment, also presented by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and perhaps by other Senators, which again was voted down. I think both amendments were better in their design than the present amendment—at least, so far as I can understand it.

My question to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is this: Is it not an established fact that there is a real difference in value, based upon their potential characteristics for feed purposes, between the small grains, which are covered by the so-called Daniel amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. The feed value of oats is generally given as roughly 88 percent of that of corn; the feed value of barley is about 90 percent the feed value of corn; and the feed value of grain sorghum is about 95 percent the feed value of corn.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have one more question; then I will yield.

Is it not true that the provision of the amendment which fixes an arbitrary rate, 95 percent of the support price for corn in the commercial corn area, provides an arbitrary standard of equality between the small grains, which does not exist as a matter of reality?

Mr. ANDERSON. Surely. Let me read the language.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The equivalent feed value is the base upon which to start. It is a base of 95 percent.

Mr. ANDERSON. The language reads:

> After 1956 the support level on any such crop shall be 95 percent of the support level established for corn.

It does not provide for the equivalent values. The support price on oats will be 95 percent of the support price on corn. The same is true of barley. They will have no relationship whatever to feed values.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that such an arbitrary effort to bring about equality between products which are completely unequal will put into the bill something so extravagantly wrong that no one who is trying to write a fair bill could possibly support it with that provision included?

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder what the people in the corn area will think of it. I wonder what they will say. There will be a statement that the support level on oats, rye, and barley after 1956 will be 95 percent of the value established for corn. Can Senators imagine the expansion that will take place in acreage for oats, rye, barley, and even grain sorghums, under those circumstances?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield myself another 10 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator wants to take that interpretation of item B at the end of the amendment, he is privileged to do so, but the interpretation is inaccurate. At the beginning, the amendment provides:

> The price of grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye, respectively, shall be supported in any area through loans, purchases, or other operations at a price determined by the Secretary to bear the same ratio to the support price of corn in such area as the feed value equivalents of such grains bear to the feed value of corn.

That is the yardstick or guide. What we are saying at the end of the amendment is that in establishing price-support levels, taking into consideration the feed value equivalents of corn and feed grains related to corn, there shall be a price-support level 95 percent of that established on corn, with the feed equivalents taken into consideration.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only say that a law to be effective must be interpreted according to the language it contains. The Secretary of Agriculture could not possibly do otherwise than take the plain language of the amendment. The language says he shall do certain things in 1956. After 1956, the support level on any such crop shall be 95 percent of the support level established for corn in the commercial area.

I only point out, as I have said before, that it is dangerous to write legislation on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The States of Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas, especially east Texas, are not in the commercial corn-producing areas. They contain great oats-shipping areas. Will the support price on oats in Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas be supported at a lower figure than in Iowa?

Mr. ANDERSON. Exactly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, they will be in 1956. The answer depends on the interpretation. After 1956 they will be supported the same as elsewhere throughout the country.

Mr. EASTLAND. It has to be in 1956, because the announcement has already been made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In 1957 they will be supported at no less or no more. They will be supported at 95 percent of the support level of corn, based upon the feed value equivalent of the grains related to corn.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with what the Senator from Minnesota has just said as to 1956. After 1956 they will all be based upon another support level. I do not agree with him that the language in the proposed amendment says so.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the support price for oats in Mississippi and Texas be the same as the support price for oats in Iowa?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; in 1956. For 1956, the support prices have already been announced.

In 1957 the support prices will be the same, because they will be based upon the commercial area support price for corn. That will be universal throughout the country. In 1957 there will not be differences between the noncommercial area and the commercial area; there will be one yardstick.

Mr. EASTLAND. I understand that small grains, produced in noncommercial corn areas, will be supported at the same price at which they will be supported in commercial areas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct, both in 1956 and 1957.

Mr. EASTLAND. May I ask the Senator from New Mexico if that is his understanding?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is the purpose of the amendment and probably will be the actual result of it. I am a little dubious about what will happen in 1956; I know the Senator from Minnesota is correct as to 1957.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it correct to assume that oats will be on the same basis as corn in 1956, and also for 1957, but that there will be a different level in 1957 as compared with 1956?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, I think not. However, I think I would rather have one of the sponsors of the amendment answer the Senator's question. I do not think his understanding is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In 1956, the support level for oats will be as it has now been announced; it will not be less than that announced. It might be higher, but not lower.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the support price have any relationship to corn?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not in 1956. It could have relationship if the Secretary so deemed; but he cannot reduce the support level for rye, barley, oats, or grain sorghums in 1956 below the support level which is presently announced. He can raise it. The price has already been announced.

I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that I think his point is well taken. There is no use haggling or trying to save face, I may say to the principal sponsor of the amendment, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

The Senator from New Mexico, in reading those last few lines, reads a sentence and not a phrase. It is a separate sentence. Therefore his interpretation, insofar as the latter part is concerned, in all honesty, is one which can be justified by the terms.

Mr. DANIELS. But that was not the intent of the author.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was not the intention.

Mr. ANDERSON. I never tried to say that was the intention. I know the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] were just as anxious as they could be to have the amendment right. I asked for the extra time only so we might study it and see if it is right. I should like to vote for a grain sorghum amendment, because our farmers have been badly treated. I am not in favor of the Hickenlooper amendment, because the base is too high.

I think the motion made by the Senator from Minnesota in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with respect to setting the corn acreage at 49 million, was a fairly reasonable suggestion. If the amendment of the Senator from Iowa started at 50 million acres, I would feel pretty good about it. But I do not understand why, when the Department of Agriculture has announced corn quotas as low as 43 million acres for next year, we should add 13 million acres, and say that the farmers can then take out five or six million acres and put them in the soil bank at a cost to the Treasury of the United States of $168 million, as nearly as I can figure it out. I think that is too much.

I think it is worth something to get the corn growers of Iowa to go into the soil bank. Therefore, I would support, and do support, the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to bring the acreage down to 50 million. I think the Senate would be well advised to go over the figures and finally come out with some such figure as that.

If the Senate does not operate in that way, then all the work which has been done by the distinguished chairman of the committee, as he traveled over the country, holding hearings, and working in committee day after day, trying to prepare a farm bill, will, in my opinion, be thrown away. The able Senator from Louisiana kept us in session 14 hours one day, which is cruel and inhuman treatment, but he was determined that we should finally emerge with a bill which could come to the floor of the Senate.

If amendments are to be offered, I think it is desirable that we make extremely sure of what is being proposed.

I appreciate the way in which the Senator from Minnesota approaches the question, when he realizes a mistake may have been made. If the proposal were modified to cover the feed values of the grains, then there would be a wholly different amendment than the one now before the Senate. But an amendment which would fix the support value of oats, rye, and barley at 95 percent of corn prices would be ridiculous, and the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Texas realize that.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from New Mexico, is correct in his interpretation of the last sentence of the amendment as now written. In order to carry out the true purpose and intention of the amendment all that is needed to be done is to repeat within the last sentence the "feed equivalent" language appearing in the preceding part of the amendment. It is the "feed equivalent" language which assures producers of grain other than corn that they will receive equality of treatment with corn producers.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am expressing the hope that the Senator from Texas has his pencil handy and will do so.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to point out that all of us have an interest in the various grains produced in our States, but, analyzing the amendment as it is written, the first part of subparagraph (d), the first 4 or 5 lines, down to the proviso clause, does contain language relating to the ratio between corn and other sorghums——

Mr. ANDERSON. And other feed grains.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes; but by all rules of legal construction I know of, the effect of the last sentence, as it has been drawn, is completely to nullify that provision after the year 1956, with respect to the feed value of grains. The last sentence states that supports shall be thereafter established at 95 percent of the support level established for corn in the commercial area, and thereafter it will have no relationship to the feed value of corn.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think my friend from Colorado is a good lawyer and can pass judgment on what it might do. I am not a lawyer, but I have had interpreted a few laws. I know if I were in the position of the Secretary of Agriculture I would regard the last sentence as particularly binding.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. There was so much confusion a while ago, when we were discussing the interpretation of the amendment as it applied to the 15 percent, that I did not get very clearly in my mind whether the 15 percent, both in the corn and in the grain situation, is to come out of the 100 acres, if a farmer has that many acres, or whether it is to come out of some other land.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should not be interpreting this, but I believe in the case of oats, rye, and barley the farmer could add them all together and reduce the total acreage by 15 percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Could that 15 percent come out of the area which is now cultivated to those grains, or could it come out of some other land?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think my distinguished friend from Texas should interpret that. I think it would come out of the commodities mentioned, because the amendment reads:

Provided, * * * the producer of such commodities—

That is grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye which are previously mentioned—

to be eligible for such price supports, shall have (a) entered into contracts with the Secretary to place into the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve a portion of the tillable acres equivalent to 15 percent of the acres devoted to production of such commodities.

So it can come from tillable acres on the farm, and it cannot come from land devoted to pasture, in order to set aside 15 percent, no more and no less, of the total amount planted to grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, if the land devoted to those crops added up to 100 acres, the farmer would have to enter into an agreement that he would cultivate only 85 acres, and 15 acres would come out of the 100 acres.

Mr. ANDERSON. I point out again that I think the language may be a little indefinite, in that it says it will be 15 percent of the acres devoted "to production of such commodities." It does not say whether in the year 1910, 1915, 1920, 1940, or 1950. I do not know what the Secretary would do when he came to determine what the base should be. That is why I say trying to legislate on the floor, without previous study, is extremely dangerous.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I think the point raised by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] with regard to the acreage to be taken out of production is a good one. As I understand the language of the amendment, if a farmer has 100 acres devoted to grain sorghums, he need not take that land out. If he has 15 other acres, he may take that land out.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is right.

Mr. CARLSON. In that case there would be no reduction of the particular crop or any crop mentioned in the language. Our farmers are willing to take out some acreage.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think they are willing to take out acreage. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa deals with corn. The pending amendment deals with three commodities and refers to tillable acreage. If it referred to tillable acres devoted to the production of such commodities out of which

the farmer should take 15 percent, then we might understand it.

I am trying to point out that when an amendment is offered, I have found it advisable to refer it to counsel for the committee, and then send it to the Department of Agriculture, asking for their comments. They might find a loophole in it, such as I have been able to find.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana such time as he may desire.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think I can complete my statement in 10 minutes.

Mr. President, as I explained yesterday, I do not believe there was any one subject to which the Agriculture Committee, in its deliberations, gave more attention than the question of trying to arrive at a suitable formula for corn.

The treatment received by corn producers is vastly different from the treatment which producers of the other basic crops receive, with respect to acreage allotments. For instance, no referendum is necessary for the corn producers. There is no voting on whether acreage allotments will be accepted; there are no marketing quotas for corn. There are no penalties for overplanting allotted acres. The corn farmers are simply given a choice of complying with allotments, and receiving price support, or overplanting and receiving none. Corn is the only basic commodity so treated. It is the agricultural program's "fair-haired boy." It is under no compulsion and no rigid controls, as are the other basics. The Secretary of Agriculture merely fixes what acreage he determines should be planted in the commercial corn area so as to keep, as nearly as possible, the production of corn in line with consumption. That is all that is done. From that moment on, the corn farmer is a free agent; he can comply or not. There are no marketing penalties levied upon him.

During the committee's deliberations, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and, I believe, other members of the committee, attempted to place in the bill a provision similar to that now found in the Daniel amendment, namely, with corn as a base, fixing price supports for other feed grains in relation to the feed value of those grains as compared with corn.

I took the position—and others did, too—that if the committee could establish for corn a base acreage which was realistic—that is to say, from 49 million to 50 or 51 million acres in the commercial corn area—then the fact that we would be taking as many as 5 million to 6 million acres out of the historic plantings of corn, in itself would be of assistance to the producers of oats, barley, and these other feed grains. But when we failed to fix that reasonable base for corn, nothing was done with respect to feed grains.

Mr. President, insofar as I personally am concerned, I shall support the Daniel amendment. But I wish to say that if the Daniel amendment is attached to the Hickenlooper amendment, as it now stands, with a base acreage of 56 million acres, then I shall vote against the entire amendment. I shall do so for the simple reason—as I stated yesterday—that I think it is patently unfair to the producers of other basics to fix the acreage for corn at the historic plantings for the past 3 years. As a matter of fact, the amount fixed in the bill is about the average planting in the commercial corn area for the past 5 or 6 years. In only a few years during the last 10 years have they planted less than the minimum amount fixed in the bill.

In connection with the Hickenlooper amendment, another fact that adds insult to injury as far as the producers of other basics are concerned, is that the bill does not contain any provision which would in any manner force the corn producers to place any of their swollen acreage allotments as carried in this amendment into the acreage reserve. As the amendment has been presented, the corn producers in the commercial corn area could plant all 56 million of their allotted acres to corn, take their 15 percent for the soil bank from their other acreage, put that amount alone into the conservation reserve acreage, and be in compliance. If this is not discriminatory treatment, Mr. President, if this is not a bonanza, I do not know what it is.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Lousiana yield to me at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may be dumber than usual—which is going a long way [laughter]—but I still cannot understand what the Daniel amendment does to the 15 percent provision. Under the soil bank there are two different kinds of reserve—one, the acreage reserve; and the other, the conservation reserve.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The acreage reserve must come out of the allotment to the farmer for a particular crop.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; out of the allotted acres.

Mr. BARKLEY. And the other can come from any other acreage; is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand the amendment, there is a division into two different prongs; and, as I understand, the 15 percent might be taken from other acres, rather than from the acres allotted for these crops. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. And that applies to corn, does it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that is on a different basis from that of the soil bank, as covered in other provisions of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say that a corn producer could qualify for price support by planting within his allotted acres of the 56 million acres. But he would not have to so confine his plantings; it would be voluntary, whereas the producers of other basic crops would be subjected to marketing penalties if they did not comply with their acreage allotments. The corn producer only forgoes price-support loans if he exceeds his acreage allotments. Producers of other basics are in addition subjected to marketing penalties.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not only could the corn producer get a price support loan on all of his allotted acres—the support price amounting to 81 percent of parity—but he could also place some of his other land into the conservation reserve and thus comply with the 15 percent soil-bank requirement.

Mr. BARKLEY. But he could plant his full allotment of these crops and, theoretically, could reduce by 15 percent some of his other acreage.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So, again, no reduction of the crop is really provided for in the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true.

On yesterday I suggested that if the amendment were modified to include a provision forcing the corn producer to put into the reserve at least 15 percent of his base corn acres, that is, acreage he expects to plant in corn, we might be able to accept the new corn program. But the idea of the acreage-reserve program is to reduce the production of the basic crops, including corn, so as not further to aggravate the present surpluses of these crops; and I could not in good conscience support a program that does not call for a reduction in the base corn acreage.

I return to the view I expressed yesterday, namely, that so long as we provide a realistic base acreage for the corn producers, one that will bring about a reduction in corn production, we will materially assist the growers of the four other feed grains—sorghum, oats, rye, and barley—whom we are now trying to protect.

But inasmuch as the Hickenlooper amendment provides for a base acreage that represents the average of what the corn producers have planted in the past, and inasmuch as there will be no assurance that they will decrease their acreage of corn below the level of past plantings, I say that in all fairness the Daniel amendment to the Hickenlooper amendment should have been adopted. However, as I have just stated, even though that has been done, I am still opposed to the Hickenlooper amendment, as amended.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the Daniel amendment is already a part of the Hickenlooper amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So there will not be a separate vote on it.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. We shall have to vote on the Hickenlooper amendment, as amended, and in no other way.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I may state that I would have voted for the Daniel amendment, because I felt that since corn is to be given preferred treatment under the Hickenlooper amendment, which, in my humble judgment, will result in increasing the production of corn, and thus aggravating our present surpluses of grain, some relief, therefore, should be afforded the

producers of grain sorghums, oats, rye, and barley.

With respect to the formula in the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the committee has not studied it at all. There is considerable question as to what it means. I may state that if the Hickenlooper amendment, as amended by the Daniel amendment, is adopted by the Senate, it may be possible that we can arrive at some satisfactory adjustment in conference.

I repeat what I said yesterday. As chairman of the committee, I want to do something for the corn area. We received much testimony as to the surpluses which now exist in grains. There were few suggestions made at any of our meetings, except by American Farm Bureau Federation representatives, as to a solution of the corn problem. As I recall, the American Farm Bureau Federation proposed that acreage allotments be eliminated, and that support prices on a sliding scale be made available from 0 to 90 percent, as compared to the 75- to 90-percent provision of existing law. I repeat, before the amendment is voted upon, that I hope we can establish a realistic base acreage for corn. If that is done, I should like to support it, but in its present form, as I have said, I shall be compelled to vote against the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I completely support the position just stated by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. In amplifying the remarks he has just made, I invite attention to the fact that it seems to me that if the Hickenlooper amendment, as now presented, is accepted as a fair base for dealing with one feed commodity, namely, corn, there is certainly some reason for the producers of the small grains to feel that some such program should be applied to them.

The trouble, as I see it, is that we are completely wrong if we adopt the philosophy of the approach of the Hickenlooper amendment, because instead of sticking to the time-honored base of allotted acres, and instead of limiting the acreage reserve to an application to allotted acreage and an underplanting of allotted acres, the Hickenlooper amendment makes the base upon which it shall operate as follows:

> Such total base acreage shall be the average acreage planted to corn in the commercial corn-producing area during the 3 years 1953, 1954, and 1955.

All of us know perfectly well that during that period of time a very large number of producers of corn declined to accept their acreage allotments. We know that they have very substantially exceeded the allotted acres. We know that, as planted, the farm acreage went up to between fifty-six million and fifty-seven million acres in those years, whereas the allotted acreage was in the 40-million-acre bracket. To allow corn producers to take advantage of their refusal to accept allotted acreage would be a mistake. If we yield in that case, it is simply a matter of the camel getting his nose under the tent. That fact could not be more clearly shown than by the insistence of those who are concerned—and properly concerned—about the producers of the small grains, and who wish to place them on the same kind of unsound basis.

Let me read what is suggested as the base. It is slightly different in the small-grain amendment which has now been incorporated in the Hickenlooper amendment. This is the substantial part of the amendment which governs the base:

> The producers of such commodities, to be eligible for price support, shall have (a) entered into contracts with the Secretary to place into the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve a portion of the tillable acres equivalent to 15 percent of the acres devoted to production of such commodities, and (b) planted an acreage of such commodities not exceeding the average acreage, planted to such commodities on the farm during the preceding 3 years.

The producers of small grains could plant up to their average acreage for the 3 years, and still claim the right to participate in the soil bank or in the conservation reserve with other acreage which might be construed as acreage "devoted to the production of such commodities."

How in the world there could be any reasonable interpretation of that language which would make such a system at all comparable to the allotted acreage standard which is required of producers of the basic commodities other than corn, I do not see.

I think we would make a vital departure from the general philosophy of this program, so carefully worked out by the committee, if we were to allow a departure to be made from allotted acreage, by giving to corn in the first instance, and then to the lesser grains in the second instance, in a somewhat different way, the advantage of a much more generous program, for participation in the soil bank and also with respect to receiving price supports, than we allow with respect to basic commodities. I think we would make a tragic mistake if we were to depart to this degree from the philosophy of the original approach to this problem. Therefore I shall strongly oppose the Hickenlooper amendment, with the Daniel amendment attached to it, which has been accepted.

In closing, let me say that I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], that if the corn producers will come in with a realistic acreage figure, perhaps some agreement can be reached. I supported the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota yesterday, which provided a figure of 50 million acres, which is more than the allotment of the past. I think it should be more, because the failure to accept the allotments of the past indicated that they were not enough. Certainly I would not support this wide-open invitation to claim the advantage of overplantings which have been so heavy, and which have led to such abuses of the entire program in the corn area.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Would it not be very unfair to the wheat farmer, who must take a third cut in acreage, to require him to abide by the strictest quotas? He is haled into court if he increases his acreage. Would it not be unfair to apply such restrictions to the wheat farmer and then give the corn farmer the same acreage he has had historically for the past 5 years?

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly it would; and it would be equally unfair to the producers of other commodities. There is no fairness in imposing one standard for one kind of commodity, and another standard for another kind of commodity, especially when, in one instance, strict compliance with allotted acreage is required, and the producer is required to play ball with the Government and with the other members of the industry, while in the second instance there is offered a base which is made larger by reason of violation of the standard of allotted acreage which has been applied to both commodities.

Mr. YOUNG. In addition, the corn farmer gets a 5 percent higher price support this year, does he not?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe that is correct. However, that is not the feature to which I was addressing myself. It seems to me it is completely unfair to place the wheat farmer and the producers of other commodities covered under other aspects of the bill under one standard, which is dependent upon their having played ball with the Government, the Congress, and each other by accepting and faithfully adhering to their allotted acreage, and to give to corn producers the advantage of extra acres which they have overplanted by refusing to follow their allotted acreage, thus giving them a more advantageous base, a historic base, which would not only be a base for price supports, but which would allow them, in very large measure, to apply to the Government for generous soil bank payments, both under the acreage reserve and under the conservation reserve.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The point the Senator from North Dakota has raised is a very important one, and it is one to which I tried to call some attention last evening. It is the most important single phase of the whole situation. Only a few years ago 70 million acres of wheat were being planted. That was cut to 62 million acres. Then it was further cut to 55 million acres. The wheat farmer had to take that reduction. Now if he wishes to get into the soil bank, he has to come below that figure.

Mr. HOLLAND. His participation in the soil bank comes out of the 55 million acres, which is a perilously low acreage allotment.

Mr. ANDERSON. How a Senator from a wheat State can vote for the amendment, I do not know. I am sure he will have to explain his vote when he gets home.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I stated last evening that I supported the Hickenlooper

amendment. I said I thought it should go to conference for adjustment, and I said I thought other adjustments would have to be made in the bill. Inasmuch as we have the amendment of the Senator from Texas before us, if we are going to do something for corn and sorghum, I should like to know what action will be taken on the amendment affecting milling quality wheat, which will be before the Senate soon. If we do it for some commodities, we should do it for others also. I shall vote for the amendment, and can only trust that the Senate will go along on the same basis with other commodities.

Mr. HOLLAND. As I said before, it is the situation of the camel getting its nose under the tent. Once that happens, it will be quite reasonable to expect the representatives of the producers of small grains to insist that we continue breaking down the structure, which is designed to do a great deal of good, but which cannot be accomplished by the adoption of a variable standard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's argument, of course, is correct. It is the argument I was attempting to make last night.

Mr. HOLLAND. And I supported the Senator's argument last night.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I had two arguments to make against the Hickenlooper amendment. One was that it violated the principle of acreage allotments on basic crops. The second argument was that it put corn in such a production situation that it might completely wreck the feed-grain industry. While I am not particularly happy about what we are proposing to do, I believe it is better than the Hickenlooper amendment. I think it would have been desirable to have had acreage allotments provided, which the Senator from Florida supported, and to have proceeded on that basis.

As I said last night, I believe we are opening a Pandora's box of trouble. Certainly the wheat grower will have a right to say, "Let us have the historic basis for wheat."

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Minnesota could not be more correct than he is in his general argument. What he is suggesting is that we are proceeding in a fog on a highway by trying to write this complex provision on the floor of the Senate. On that highway, there is a wreck which has already happened by reason of the Hickenlooper amendment. What the Senator from Minnesota is suggesting—and I believe he is correct—is that the pileup of wrecks is going to become large, and that what we are doing will be a departure from sound philosophy if we include all feed grains.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As the Senator knows, I have been trying for some time to bring about a better relationship between feed grains and corn, insofar as the support levels are concerned.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I say that the Senator proposed a better amendment last night than the amendment before us to accomplish that objective.

Mr. ANDERSON. Amen.

Mr. HUMPHREY. With that compliment, I believe I had better cease my discussion.

Mr. HOLLAND. That still does not make me willing to support a harmful amendment which would wreck the purposes of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], because I desire to ask some questions for clarification of the record. What in his judgment would be the effect of the Daniel amendment insofar as increased production of competitive feed grains such as oats, barley, rye, and grain sorghums are concerned?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not believe the Daniel amendment as now drawn will have much effect. I believe it will have some effect on an increase, but I believe the failure is that the Daniel amendment at present does not require the elimination of acreage devoted to oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum. The sponsor of that amendment is now trying to remedy that defect.

Mr. DANIEL. It was the intention of the amendment—and we thought it was so worded—to require the same 15 percent reduction of acreage in the case of those commodities as is required in the Hickenlooper amendment with reference to corn. However, in order to make it absolutely clear we are at this time preparing language which will clarify that point and resolve any doubt about it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it true that in Government stocks the amount of the surplus of feed grains is 20 percent of what is held in corn at the present time? I have not seen the figure, but I have been told that that was correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. I cannot answer that question. I believe it is approximately right. However, I might be confronted with some evidence that I was wrong. I am not sure. I believe it is true.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator from New Mexico have an opinion on the basis of what this will do to prices, and whether it will invite the importation of grains from other countries like Canada?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it would have a great influence and would invite the importation of grains from Canada and from other countries of the world. We had such evidence presented before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Some people have tried to smuggle their good wheat from Canada as wheat unfit for human consumption in order to take advantage of a customs situation. To do that they are willing to sell their wheat at below what the price might otherwise be. I believe in this situation we would be inviting the importation of foreign grains.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask one other question. I note that since 1953 there has been a very substantial increase in the production of competitive feeds—oats, barley, and grain sorghums. From 1953 to 1955 I believe the figures are 360 million bushels of oats, 148 million bushels of barley, and 123 million bushels of grain sorghums.

Conversely, at the same time there has been a diminution in the production of corn for feed. If that trend continues, what we will be actually doing will be to add three basic commodities to the list and then for one grain, namely, feed grain, which has been in distress for so long a time, we will only be aggravating the difficulty. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to answer the Senator's question by saying that overall the production of corn did not drop very much. What happened was that the Corn Belt—the great States of Iowa, Indiana, Illinois, and others—shrank their production by something more than a million acres, and the areas outside the belt pushed it up a million and a half acres, by reducing cotton acreage and some other acreage. The result was that the production of corn as big as before so far as acreage was concerned.

The total overall production of corn last year was in the neighborhood of 3,800 million bushels. One year before that it was only 2,799 million bushels.

Of course there had been variations in weather conditions, and so forth. However, the important point I am trying to make is that the States of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, and to some extent Minnesota shrank their corn production, and in the fringe areas new corn production came into being.

I think the effect of this amendment might be that to bring about an enormous expansion in the quantity of oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums because of a stimulated price.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So that we have not improved the situation one bit thereby.

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. We would, under the amendment as it was modified, because it requires a certain acreage reduction by providing that the first 15 percent of the acreage planted to each of the crops shall be put into one of the reserve programs. Then the amendment further requires that the planted acreage shall not exceed the amount planted during the preceding 3 years. So the amount of feed grains planted in the future will be reduced, or else the farmers will not participate under this program. That is one of the main purposes of the amendment. Feed grains are now competing with corn.

All the corn farmers from whom I have heard think there should be something done about feed grains to reduce their acreage and put them nearer in line, because feed grains have been hurting corn. We think something would be accomplished by the reduction of acreage. My proposal requires the same reduction as is required under the Hickenlooper corn amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the point should be brought out that the great increase in the production of feed grains has come at the very time the support levels have gone down. They have been reduced, and as we reduce the support levels, we increase production. When we have no crop compliance with acres taken out in the wheat area, the only thing we could do, when there was a reduced price, was to go into any kind of a crop. So the only answer we know of is that so long as we are going to use allotments, we should try to provide a support level for feed grains which will not invite overproduction. We hold them for compliance purposes, conservation reserve, and price supports, to the established historical basis on these grains during the past 3 years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not been advised that the Department has had any difficulty in maintaining a reasonable balance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, may I say that the growth of Government supplies of feed grains has been rather substantial.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it has not gotten out of hand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Some 9 million tons have been grown in the past 3 years. Take, for example, the price-support level on grain sorghums. It went down 24 percent, and production went up 173 percent when the price-support level went down. In a situation like that, the farmers produce more. When there is a sharp acreage reduction and a drop in support price, the farmer, in order to pay his bills, plants feed grains which compete with wheat and corn and thereby make the situation all the more aggravated. If we are going to have allotments, we should have a fair support level for the feed grains related to corn. As one Senator, I have fought for several years for a feed-grain program related to corn on the basis of its feed value. With the soil bank, acreage reserve, and conservation reserve being available to feed grains and corn, we have a chance to cut back the production and not have it out of line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have just noticed a speech which was made at the Farm Institute, which points out that while we have reduced corn acreage 32 percent the rest of the world has reduced it 49 percent. While we have cut down on wheat production 29 percent, Canada has gone further than that, and while rice production has been cut 18 percent in this country, the production in the rest of the world is off 11 percent.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, let me say that we took out of production 15 million acres of wheatland and planted sorghum. The figures on production of oats, barley, and grain sorghums over the 10-year period 1944 to 1953 are 558 million bushels, or 11.1 million tons. I mention this because what has happened in the wheat area is that we have produced these crops to the detriment and harm of the corn-growing areas, and we must take those acres out.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It adds up to this, that if we have a balanced pattern which will supply the needs of the country with a reasonable carryover and a reasonable amount for export, what do we do with the acres in order to avoid trouble?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from New Mexico can advise me regarding the following matter which is of concern to the dairy farmers of my State. The State of New York is, of course, not a great producer of grain. On the other hand, it is a very great producer of dairy products, second only to Wisconsin. About 75 percent of the entire agricultural industry of New York State is dairying. I can see the justice of the contention that if special preferences are provided for corn, other feed grains should be treated with equal fairness. But I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from New Mexico can give me some information as to the extent of the increase in price which would almost inevitably result from the passage of the Hickenlooper amendment. That is of very great concern to the farm people of my State.

Mr. ANDERSON. I appreciate the courtesy shown by the Senator from New York in asking me that question. It is my impression that it would be more than 10 percent and less than 20 percent.

Mr. LEHMAN. It would be 15 percent, at least?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think so. The price of grain sorghums is now, roughly, $1.78, and it would go to $2.37, which is more than 20 percent, in fact, but I would not be able to calculate it quickly.

Mr. LEHMAN. But, in the opinion of the Senator from New Mexico, there would be a very substantial increase in the cost of feed grains.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The dairy products producer, the cattle producer, and the hog producer, have now at long last come to the conclusion that cheap feed is not the answer to their problem. In fact, it aggravates it.

If there was one line of testimony which was repeated throughout the hearings, it was to the effect that one of the reasons why we have had a problem in the dairy industry and a problem with reference to hogs and livestock was the depressed price of feed. The dairymen and their organizations are of that opinion.

Furthermore, I may point out that in the noncommercial areas the price of feed is almost always above the support price in the commercial areas. Because of the problems of transportation, freight-rate differentials, and other things in many of the areas in the Far West, the Northwest, and the Northeast, the price of corn will be far above what the support level of corn is in Minnesota and Iowa. Frequently this is the case with feed grains. The feed-grain prices are considerably higher in the feed-deficit areas than are the support prices in the feed-producing areas.

I say most respectfully that I do not think a modest improvement in the support price levels for feed grains will be any detriment at all to the dairy producers in areas such as New York, where there are feed deficits. It will actually be of some help to New York. It will provide, in a normal dairy State, where the dairy plant is already organized and established, where the blooded herds are to be found, where the expensive dairy equipment is on hand, that a reasonable price for feed grains, as compared with a cheap price, will keep other producers out, and thereby prevent an accumulation of excess supplies.

One of the great invitations to persons to get into the dairy business and the hog or cattle business overnight has been cheap feed-grain prices, which have thus aggravated the problems of the dairy producers.

My sentiments are expressed by none other than the National Milk Producers Federation and other great groups who are keenly interested, and who have as their main interest the protection and welfare of dairy producers.

Mr. LEHMAN. The milk producers of my State are in a very serious position. They are caught between the two jaws of a vise. They are caught in a squeeze. Their revenues have been very greatly curtailed over the past 2 years, to the extent of between 20 and 30 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Conversely, the prices which dairy producers have to pay for their feedstuffs, their equipment, and their general supplies for their farms and their households have not decreased. So, on the one hand, they have sustained a very great loss of revenue, while, on the other hand, they have incurred an increase in the cost of their living.

I cannot help but fear, although I am sorry I have not any statistics which are available to me, that if the Hickenlooper amendment shall be agreed to, the price of feed grains, which are so necessary to the farmers of New York, will increase, and in that way widen the losses which many of them are now suffering, or at least will wipe out such very, very slender and niggardly profits as they may still be making.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The amendment which has been attached to the Hickenlooper amendment on feed grains pegs the price of feed grains to the price-support level of corn, less 5 percent, taking into consideration the feed value equivalent of those grains. Actually, the dairy farmers will not be in so difficult a situation as they have been in the past. The Hickenlooper amendment, as modified by the proposal of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], will make certain that the feed grains will not be driven out of the market. That is what the modification will do. At best, it is an

effort to prevent a rout; to prevent a major collapse of the feed grains industry.

Frankly, one of the problems in recent days has been the disparity of relationship between the price of corn and the price of feed grains. This has aggravated the conditions in the livestock and dairy industries. The amendment will do nothing more or less than provide for a definite relationship of feed value equivalents between corn and feed grains. The price support for corn this year is 81 percent of parity, which, in my book, is 9 percent below what it ought to be. But that means that feed grain prices likewise are adjusted to the price-support level of corn, which is downward.

Mr. LEHMAN. It has frequently been pointed out on the floor of the Senate that an exceptional advantage is offered by the Hickenlooper amendment to corn as compared with other crops.

I am not opposed to the Daniel amendment, which it seems to me is fair; but I am opposed to the basic amendment to which it is intended to be attached—in other words, to the Hickenlooper amendment, which I think is unsound in the form now before the Senate.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask that I may be yielded 3 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to have the special attention of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], with whom sereval Senators have been working on language to clarify a part of the Hickenlooper amendment. The language has now been accepted by the Senator from Iowa.

The proposed modifications would simply clarify the amendment in line with the purpose of the authors under the requirement that producers, in order to be eligible for support, must comply with certain conditions. The language would read:

(2) The producers of such commodities, to be eligible for price supports, shall have (a) entered into contracts with the Secretary to place into the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve a portion of the tillable acres of grain sorghums, rye, oats, and barley equivalent to 15 percent of the average number of acres devoted to production of such commodities during the preceding 3 years.

At the end of the amendment, in the last sentence, to which there was objection, it is proposed to add these words:

With such adjustments on price-support levels for each such grain as determined by the feed equivalent that such grain bears to the feed value of corn.

I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico if I am correct in saying that this language accomplishes the clarification he had in mind.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not say it cures everything in the amendment; I say it clears up the point I had in mind completely.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I modify my amendment in accordance with the modification last made by the Senator from Texas, and as read by him. In other words, I have adopted the Daniel proposal as a modification of my amendment. I shall read the entire amendment, including the Daniel modification, which I have adopted, as follows:

At the end of the amendment add the following new subsection:

"(d) The price of grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye, respectively, shall be supported in any area through loans, purchases, or other operations during 1956 at a price determined by the Secretary to bear the same ratio to the support price of corn in such area as the feed value equivalents of such grains bear to the feed value of corn: *Provided*, That (1) the support price in any area for the 1956 crop of any such commodity shall not be lower than the support price therefor announced prior to the enactment of this subsection, and (2) the producers of such commodities, to be eligible for price support, shall have (a) entered into contracts with the Secretary to place into the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve a portion of the tillable acres of grain sorghums, rye, oats, and barley equivalent to 15 percent of the average number of acres devoted to production of such commodities during the preceding 3 years, and (b) planted an acreage of such commodities not exceeding the average acreage, planted to such commodities on the farm during the preceding 3 years. After 1956 the support level on any such crop shall be 95 percent of the support level established for corn in the commercial area, with such adjustments on price-support levels for each such grain as determined by the feed equivalent that such grain bears to the feed value of corn.

Mr. President, I modify my amendment as read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The Senator has the right to modify his amendment at this stage.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have asked for this time, not for the purpose of trying to impart information, but in order to obtain some. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Iowa and other Senators, in regard to some questions I should like to ask about the amendment as now proposed.

Mr. President, I would have voted for the Daniel amendment as offered yesterday, which has now been accepted in modified form as a part of the Hickenlooper amendment, because I did not think that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa were adopted, corn ought to stand alone among all the feed grains produced in the country, and the other grains should be left out of the picture.

There is provided in the bill a 90-percent support level for millable wheat, and the Senate will have to vote later as to whether it should be retained. If we are to take yesterday's vote as a criterion, it will probably be stricken out. But assuming the provision is left in the bill, then we would still have to consider the nonmillable grains which are used for feed.

Where will the amendment, if adopted, leave the nonmillable grains, which are in competition with corn, rye, barley, and grain sorghums? In what situation will the amendment leave the nonmillable grains which are in competition with corn for feed purposes?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The bill provides that the support price for nonmillable wheat for feed grain shall be at a level not less than 5 percent below the feed value equivalent of corn.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, it is tied in with the feed value of corn?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Just as the amendment now proposes to tie in rye, barley, and other grains?

Mr. YOUNG. That is to give corn protection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was wheat on the same basis?

Mr. YOUNG. No. Wheat would be at a disadvantage of 5 percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. It occurred to me that there would be a disadvantage of 5 percent.

Let me ask a question about the corn situation. Corn was designated one of the basic commodities in the original farm legislation, and the producers of corn had the same right to go into the program as did the producers of other crops, but they have not done so. As I understand, there has never been a vote among corngrowers of the country on marketing quotas and acreage allotments for corn. Am I right?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is right.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct, and there were no penalties.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Secretary of Agriculture has fixed allotments for corn which have not been observed, on the whole, as I understand. Some corngrowers have observed the allotments fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture; others have not. It depends on their own desires or wishes whether they observe them or not.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask if it is true, as I have been told is true of the amendment on which we are asked to vote, that it in effect accepts the historical corn production as the allotted basis, whereas wheat, cotton, tobacco, and other farmers have voted their own allotments and have been willing to vote their allotments. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the case of tobacco, which is not competitive with any commodity about which we are now talking, in 1956 the Secretary cut the quota 25 percent. Then Congress passed a bill authorizing tobacco growers to vote on a further 15 percent cut, which was adopted by the tobacco growers by a vote of 95 or 96 percent of those voting. So last year there was a cut of 40 percent in the acreage of tobacco. Then the Secretary imposed another cut of 15 percent, which would have made a 55-percent cut in acreage in 2 years, but Congress passed a bill restoring the 15-percent cut, and the President signed

it, so the additional cut does not go into effect this year.

If the amendment were to be adopted for corn, I see no reason why it should not be adopted for other grains. Yet I am not sure that the adoption of the amendment as it has now been modified——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not sure the combined amendment as offered, on which the Senate must vote, provides a fair level and a fair ratio and a fair distribution as between the growers of those grains who have tried to cooperate with the program and those who have not cooperated with it, and who are now seeking to enjoy the same benefits as those enjoyed by growers who did cooperate, if not greater benefits.

Am I correct about that or not? The Senator from North Dakota may answer that question, if he wishes.

Mr. YOUNG. Will the Senator repeat the question?

Mr. BARKLEY. The question is whether the amendment on which we are about to vote gives to corngrowers an advantage which growers of other grains who have cooperated would not receive?

Mr. YOUNG. I think that is true. To some extent it is justified, but I believe the supporters of the amendment are going too far. I think corn is in a somewhat different category in that it is mostly used as feed. I believe corngrowers are justified in getting an increased acreage allotment, but not to the extent proposed.

Mr. President, I should like to correct the statement I previously made about feed wheat. The bill provides that the price of feed wheat shall be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will preserve the competitive relationship between such wheat and corn on the basis of their respective feed values.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, the Secretary could establish the same price-support level for nonmillable wheat that is fixed for corn.

Mr. YOUNG. I wanted to correct my statement, because the amendment had been changed in a manner that had slipped my mind.

Mr. BARKLEY. My State is not a great corn producer, but corn is produced in the rich valleys of the Ohio, the Cumberland, and other rivers. There flow in Kentucky more navigable streams than in any other State, and there are always rich valleys which always seem to be devoted to the raising of corn. So my State is interested in corn as well as other crops. I cannot answer the question why corn producers have not come into the quota system, but they have not.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The reason why quotas have not been applicable to corn is that nobody in the Department of Agriculture in any administration has been able to figure out a way to make quotas applicable to corn. I think the former Secretary of Agriculture, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], will verify that statement. That is why corngrowers have not been able to come under quotas. The overwhelming supply of corn goes for feed for animals raised in the area. No one has been able to work out a practical quota system for corn. That is the reason why corn producers have not come under the program.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is true that a large part of the corn grown is feed corn, but there is a large corn area wherein corn might be sold on the basis of supply and demand, and the prices might be modified by an agricultural program. Regardless of that, those of us who would like to help corn producers are in the very embarrassing situation of trying to determine whether we should vote for the amendment in order to get recognition for smaller grains.

I am sorry we did not have an opportunity to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] on its own merits, as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. But now we have to vote on the two, combined—although it is rather difficult to understand just where we can draw the line between these grains and corn and the nonmillable wheat, all of which are in the same category, and to know whether we are doing justice to all of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to strike out certain language from the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to be heard, I am prepared to yield back the remaining time for our side.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I shall yield back all of that time except approximately 30 seconds, which I shall use in order to say that I would vote for the Daniel amendment if it were separately before us; but I will not vote for it and still keep all the 56 million acres for corn. I want that explanation to appear in the RECORD.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 30 seconds to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from New York the time he requests.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the statement which has been made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. I would gladly vote for the Daniel amendment if it were a separate amendment; but I cannot see any reason under the acreage control should be singled out sun why corn which is not subject to acreage control should be singled out for preferential treatment. I think that unfair to the other commodities which also are vital parts of American agriculture.

So I shall vote against the Hickenlooper amendment in its present form.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion.

Mr. RUSSELL rose.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, first, I wish to say that it was with great regret that I felt constrained to vote, last evening, against the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. Whatever differences of opinion we may have had on other matters, I have always saluted the Senator from Minnesota as a stalwart champion of the farmers of the United States, wherever they may live, and whatever they may produce.

I have been amazed at the record the Senator from Minnesota and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], have made on the pending bill. It is a veritable storehouse of information and facts, buttressed by strong arguments in favor of a farm program which would give some relief to the struggling farmers of the Nation, who today are continuing to lose ground, when their economy is considered in comparison with the economy of other groups.

Mr. President, I cannot in good conscience support any proposition which would continue to give to the corn farmers in the commercial corn areas the status of complete, free riders. From the first day when the program was written, corn has dominated it. With the exception of a very few years, corn has dominated the Department of Agriculture. Corn is the only one of the great basic commodities which has never been for 1 day under any real restrictions as to production. Corn has never been under any marketing quotas. There is not a corn farmer in the Nation who has ever been compelled to plow up 1, 2, or 3 acres of corn or to pay a penalty on the excess amount he produced over and above his marketing quotas. Half of the corn farmers usually go into the loan program and comply with their acreage allotments, because it was desirable for them to do so in their farming operations, and thus would hold an umbrella over the other half, in respect to the price of corn who planted as much as they wished, without regard to their acreage allotments.

I shall happily vote for up to 90 percent of parity supports on corn in the commercial corn-producing area, even preserving the discrimination against the noncommercial areas that produce corn, if all the producers of corn will submit themselves to the controls which have been imposed upon all the other basic commodities, as those controls have been spelled out in all farm legislation.

I say the corn farmers have occupied a privileged position ever since the inception of the program. If Senators will refer to the time when we began to provide benefits to farmers, Senators will find that the payments made to corn farmers were greater per acre than the payments made to the producers of any

other commodity. That situation has been frozen into the soil conservation program, and all through the years has enabled the corn farmers to get from the soil conservation program larger payments, for acres and practices, than the payments which were available to the producers of other commodities.

There is another situation which further indicates the privileged status the corn farmers have. Today, a corn farmer in the State of Alabama, let us say, might produce corn, and to all intents and purposes he would not have any support at all, although under the law he is supposed to have 75 percent of the supports provided in the commercial corn areas. But no storage facilities are available. In the small rural county in Georgia in which I live, last year good corn sold for 85 or 90 cents a bushel because there were no supports. We are not in the favored commercial area. No controls are needed when we differentiate in that way against the farmers outside the commercial area, because the corn produced at that price level is so small that it requires no law to control production.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. If the privilege of having price supports without being subjected to control is to be extended to the producers of one basic commodity, what would be the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Georgia in regard to extending the same privilege to the producers of the other basic agricultural commodities?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the question of the Senator from Tennessee would answer itself, were it not for the fact that corn has always occupied a privileged status, and the producers of corn expect it to continue to do so under this amendment.

Mr. President, I will say that if the producers of any other agricultural commodity had had brought before us, on the floor of the Senate, such an amendment to apply to the commodity they produce, that proposal would have been labeled as preposterous. If the wheat farmers or if the producers of other of our basic agricultural commodities which are under acreage controls had asked that they be allowed to step up their production to this extent and, even though heretofore they have always been subject to penalty for so doing, that in this case they be allowed to do so without the imposition of any penalties, and that they be allowed to participate in the soil bank—and I shall state without fear of successful contradiction that the payments to be made for the corn land placed in the soil bank will be the highest payments per acre made for any land in the Nation—such an amendment would have been bitterly opposed on the floor, and any Senators who made such a request would have been laughed off of the floor.

Mr. President, the producers of corn—different from the producers of our other agricultural commodities—have seized upon their lofty advantage, for under the law they have been able to produce as they saw fit, with or without loans, and through their leaders have been able to disembowel the programs for all the other agricultural commodity producers of the Nation. Personally, I am sick and tired of it.

I am willing to have the producers of corn given a square deal, and I am willing to vote for 90 percent of parity for them, if they will accept the limitations and controls and heartaches which are borne by the producers of cotton and the other basic commodities.

It is proposed that the production of wheat be fixed at 55 million acres. In the past it has been as high as eighty-odd-million acres. The wheat farmer will have to make further cuts, if he is to participate in the soil bank and to receive the payments.

The same applies to the producers of cotton. Cotton production has now been brought down to approximately 17 million acres.

In the case of corn this amendment gives them a free cushion, over and above the allotment this year, of 6 or 7 million acres to put in the soil bank at the very highest rate that will be paid. What will that do? There is not more than $750 million in that fund. It will take away most of the soil-bank funds from the wheat farmers, the cotton producers, and others who have already submitted to reduction after reduction in production.

So far as I am concerned, I could not support this amendment even if it had a provision in it to support cotton, for example, at 90 percent of parity, under the present acreage limitation. The difference between the acreage allowed by the Hickenlooper amendment and that which is allowed in the case of other basics which have been struggling for many years under reduced allotted acreage is that in the case of the other commodities the acreage allotments are enforced by drastic penalties. The discrimination is so great that I could not accept this proposal.

It may be that the amendment will be adopted. If so, the corn farmers and their leaders in the farm organizations will continue to dominate this program. I do not wish to take a dog-in-the-manger attitude toward the producers of corn or any other commodities. I have never done so. This is the first time I have ever complained against the preference and the advantage which the commercial corn producers have enjoyed. However, I have recognized it from the time the first bill dealing with all agricultural commodities was passed.

We have reached the stage where the producers of other commodities are getting into a bad condition. Apparently they are not going to get any relief from this bill. For my part, I shall vote against the pending amendment, on the theory that if agriculture must go down the drain, all components of it ought to go down together, and let the corn farmers feel what has been done to the producers of other commodities in other sections of the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I thank the Senator for his kind and considerate comments. I wonder if the Senator would feel that the cut in corn acreage which was suggested last evening, along with the feed grain amendment, would be an acceptable proposal.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would have grave doubt, because there is no compulsion on the corn farmers in the commercial corn area. They can comply or not, as they see fit, whereas the wheat farmers and the cotton farmers throughout the rest of the United States have no option whatever. Either they are under strict controls, with drastic penalties, or they have no support. This proposal gives what I consider to be very substantial support to corn, in view of the flexing that is going on throughout the Nation, without any control, and without penalties. I think such a proposal, with the modification suggested, would be infinitely preferable to the Hickenlooper amendment without such modification. I can see how a farmer who is vitally interested in the feed sorghums might support such a proposal, whereas he might not support the original Hickenlooper amendment with the Daniel modification.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have been as sick over this matter as has any other Senator, because of the manner in which we are dealing with commodity after commodity, and thereby tearing apart what constituted the beginnings of a workable program. Rather than weakening the program, we ought to be strengthening and improving it.

I have long felt that marketing quotas were desirable. I listened to the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] on this subject. I said last night that I felt we were opening up a Pandora's box of trouble. I heard the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] say a moment ago that perhaps we should do the same thing for wheat and cotton as has been proposed in the Hickenlooper amendment with respect to corn. It seems to me that the point should be made perfectly clear, that the sharp acreage reductions in wheat, cotton, and other basic crops, under the allotments of recent years, are not eligible for acreage reserve benefits. They are eligible, at the most, for conservation reserve benefits.

The great difference between the proposal which is now before us, and the way in which rice and cotton are treated is the fact that corn comes in for the "blue chip" treatment, the premium treatment of acreage reserve benefits for the total historical acreage base with respect to corn.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be as though we were to say, "For the purpose of the soil bank program we will give wheat an acreage allotment of 82 million acres and cotton 32 million acres, instead of the 17 million acres it now has." If that were done, it would equalize the situation. Otherwise, the preferred treatment in favor of producers in the corn area will be protected and extended.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one comment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator's comments and comparisons are good. However, I think the situation is even worse than he has suggested, because

in the case of corn, the larger acreage has been built up by noncompliance with an allotment program, whereas in the case of wheat, when the acreage went up to 82 million-plus, at least the wheat producers were complying with the program which was laid down.

Mr. RUSSELL. That statement is absolutely true.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa, if adopted, would have the effect of taking Mr. Benson off the hook. He has proclaimed an acreage of 43 million. Everyone knows that that is unrealistic. Everyone knows that there will be very little compliance, and therefore that there will be very little price support.

I think it might be well for the corn farmers of the Nation to have a little touch of the Bensonizing treatment to which the producers of every other commodity have been subjected. While corn farmers have been free of penalties, all other commodities have been trying to live with the program while taking reduction after reduction in their acreage. It is time to put all basic commodities in the same category and quit increasing the already favored position of the commercial Corn Belt.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to be heard, I yield back such time as may remain on our side. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield back his unused time?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is. on the motion to strike a certain section?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield back the unused time on our side on that question, and I send to the desk an additional amendment to the Hickenlooper amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, after line 5, it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 407. Notwithstanding any other provision of this law, the Secretary of Agriculture, in determining the farm base acreages for wheat, rice, cotton, and tobacco under the acreage-reserve program, shall calculate such wheat, rice, cotton, and tobacco acreages on the same basis as provided by section 203 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this is merely an effort to find out how we feel about applying to other commodities the treatment given to corn. I do not think it ought to be done to any of the commodities, but if we are going to say that corn acreage in the commercial areas shall be 56 million acres, even though last year the Secretary of Agriculture made an allotment of 49 million acres, I do not think we ought to punish the producers of rice, who took a 200,000-acre cut one year and a 400,000-acre cut another year. I do not think we ought to punish the farmer who grows wheat. I have had a difficult time explaining to wheat producers why their allotments are cut down. They say, "We have had 4 straight years of drought, and yet our allotments are cut more and more as the years go by."

I have been unable to understand why the corn producers are told that their base is to be 56 million acres. I understand that the allotment for 1956 is 43 million acres. So we add 13 million acres to the allotment, and come up with a figure of 56 million acres, and say, "If the farmers in the commercial corn areas will only play ball with the soil conservation program and cut their acreage back from 56 million acres, we will give them approximately $28 an acre for every acre they cut below 56 million acres." That is 13 million acres above what the Secretary of Agriculture said the allotment ought to be. We surely have no penalty on corn. I recognize that fact, but we lost the penalty not so much as a result of the desire of Congress but as the result of bad advice given to Congress. There was submitted to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry an amendment which tried to clear up the penalty provision. The Senate took the amendment as submitted by the Department of Agriculture and enacted it into law. Then the Department of Agriculture said, "You made a mistake. You left out the penalty on corn also."

I am not so sure it was a mistake. In any event, the Senate committee and the Senate acted innocently in trying to do the very best to find a way to bring this matter back into the picture.

We are told that we cannot put the penalty provision on corn, because the corn growers will not observe it. I agree that is correct. I believe it is very difficult indeed to control the production of corn. I believe we will have about 56 million acres of corn in the Corn Belt regardless of what we do, but this amendment will say to the farmer, "Even though you have a large production, you shall be paid for coming down from the 56 million instead of coming down from the 43 million figure, which the Department has said should be the corn acreage."

If we are to do that for corn, then, my amendment provides, in that section which we are modifying with the Hickenlooper amendment that the same treatment shall be accorded wheat.

What is wrong with that? The wheat farmers at least have carried out their contract with the Government. The able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] at one time came before the committee when we tried to bring wheat production down, to object that we were cutting the support price and the acreage at the same time. He hoped that we would not cut it so much, so that the blow would not be so heavy.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I understand, the Senator's amendment would apply the same formula to the basics straight through; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. If we are going to apply it to corn, yes. Of course I do not want to apply it to any basics. I am opposed to the whole idea.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The effect would be to cut cotton acreage from 17 million to about 6 million acres, if the same formula were applied, and to cut wheat from 55 million acres——

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not believe it would do anything of the kind.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thought the Senator wanted to apply to the other basics the same formula which would be applied to corn, or down to 43 million acres for wheat.

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I do not mean that it would apply to 43 million acres. We have a provision of 55 million acres for wheat. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has fought hard for wheat farmers, until one day he was bitter toward me because I was opposing him and because he thought I was trying to do something to hurt his wheat farmers.

Why should we say to him now, "Never mind the wheat farmer. He has been reduced from 77 million acres to 72 million acres to 61 million acres to 55 million acres, but now we will ask him to cut the production a little more." However, his neighbors in the adjoining States, corn farmers, can have an acreage of 56 million; no allotments will be imposed, and they can plant what they want to plant, and then will be given soil-bank payments.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I find myself persuaded by the compelling argument of the Senator from New Mexico. It happens that I have the privilege of, in part, representing a State which has some area in the commercial-corn area and a small area in the Wheat Belt. In my State there are also producers of corn, tobacco, cotton, and wheat. How can I vote to press controls upon the producers of cotton and wheat and tobacco and then vote for a bill containing an amendment which would give price support to the producers of corn without production controls?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know. I have offered an amendment which attempts to write into the law the soil-bank proposal the Farm Bureau had worked out. That proposal would eliminate acreage allotments for corn. I have no objection to that. However, in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry we tried time after time to bring it into some balance—and the Senator from Minnesota offered amendments to put it at 53 million acres, and suggested various other figures—but no figure was satisfactory. Later we found out that 56 million acres was satisfactory to the Department of Agriculture. Not one member of the committee will testify that the representatives of the Department of Agriculture, when appearing before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, said that 56 million acres would be satisfactory. They wanted 49 million acres, and finally 51 million acres. They did not want 56 million acres.

Why is it all right now? Has anything happened in the intervening weeks? If so, what is it?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have been rereading the latest version of the amendment relating to small grains. It seems rather disturbing in one respect. I should like

to quote to the Senator from New Mexico this portion of the amendment:

Provided, That (1) the support price in any area for the 1956 crop of any such commodity shall not be lower than the support price therefor announced prior to the enactment of this subsection, and (2) the producers of such commodities, to be eligible for price support, shall have (a) entered into contracts with the Secretary to place into the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve a portion of the tillable acres of grain sorghums, rye, oats, and barley equivalent to 15 percent of the average number of acres devoted to production of such commodities during the preceding 3 years, and (b) planted an acreage of such commodities not exceeding the average acreage, planted to such commodities on the farm during the preceding 3 years.

It looks to me that, although they are required to take out 15 percent of the acreage which they have planted during the 3 previous years, they are permitted to plant an equivalent number of new acres. Therefore, in effect, the producers of small grains would not be required to reduce their overall production of those commodities at all. Even if this amendment should be attached to the corn amendment, the corn producers would still be required to reduce their cropland acreage in an amount equal to 15 percent of the corn base acreage.

Mr. ANDERSON. I say that that only illustrates how difficult it is to write an agricultural bill on the floor of the Senate, scratched on the backs of envelopes and things like that. I agree that it is hard to interpret what the provision means. I am not sure that I have the right interpretation even now.

Mr. AIKEN. What it indicates to me is that what we are trying to do on the floor and have tried to do during these weeks and months illustrates how difficult it is to run everybody's business in detail from Washington. However, this particular wording looks to me as if feed grain producers were trying to reduce their own plantings 15 percent but were permitted to plant new acreage not exceeding the average of the last 3 years, in which case they would have an advantage over the corn grower.

Mr. ANDERSON. The sponsors of the proposed legislation understand that all the tillable acres would be considered and it would be necessary to reduce the tillable acres. If it does not say so, it again illustrates how difficult it is to try to write an agricultural bill on the floor of the Senate. I should like to have had this matter brought up in committee, so that we would have had a chance to study it. We had proposals made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and we had proposals made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and various others with reference to the question of grain sorghum and with reference to corn. The interesting thing is that the bill emerged from committee without any of these provisions in it. That illustrates how difficult it is to prevent loopholes in a bill of this kind.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I wish to say to the Senator from New Mexico that I realize why he has offered his amendment. It is because he believes in simple justice. I regret to say that the amendment which the Senator has offered will only aggravate an almost impossible situation, but, at least, it is based upon the principle of equal treatment.

The point has been well developed in the debate that a number of producers have had to take rather severe acreage cuts. I come from a State where there are 58 commercial corn councils. I do not think the people of my State want me to be here trying to wreck the farm program in order to give them a particular and special advantage, because we produce other things besides corn, and the farmers of the State of Minnesota want a workable program and not one which is going to lead to greater and greater trouble.

The acreage allotment of corn, 43 million acres, prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, was not only unworkable, but it was not even the recommendation of the people in the Grain Division of the Department of Agriculture.

I repeat that statement, Mr. President. The acreage allotment of 43 million acres for corn was not only unrealistic and unworkable, but it was not the recommendation of the trained experts in the Grain Division of the Department of Agriculture. Their recommendation was approximately 51 million acres.

I wish to know why the Secretary, just before the Hickenlooper amendment is proposed, comes out with this impossible figure of 43 million acres, except to make the program unworkable, and by making it unworkable, to make it so that farmers will not comply; then to come back later on, as the Senator has said, and offer a figure of 56 million acres, which not a single representative of the Department was willing to justify.

If the Senator's amendment is pushed to a vote, I shall feel bound, out of the simple principle of elemental justice, to support it. But if the Senator's amendment is not adopted, I shall offer an amendment to the Hickenlooper proposal, keeping in it what the proposal of the Senator from Iowa has in it, and keeping in the Daniel amendment which has been worked over with considerable care—a proposal to cut back 56 million acres on the basis of total acreage to 51 million acres. I can testify that that is a scientifically arrived at figure.

I wish to serve notice that the debate will not be over for some time.

Mr. ANDERSON. When the Senator offers an amendment to cut the acreage to 51 million acres I shall vote for it, because we have had testimony from officials of the Department of Agriculture that that is sufficient. The other 5 million acres, by any rule that can be applied, represent an effort to get $140 million from the soil bank.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. Only a few moments ago, he pointed out that there was some possibility that the language used in the Daniel amendment might require a reduction of 50 percent in planting, and yet, in the next sentence, allow the average for the past 3 years to be planted.

The Senator knows, because the amendment was drawn in his office this morning, that the intention is not to have the language conflict with that in the preceding sentence. As legislative history and for whatever purpose it may be used, I should like to say to the Senator from Vermont that the acreage referred to means less the 15 percent required to be put into one of the reserve programs.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. And I think it should be made clear for the record that the intent is to require a planting of feed grains 15 percent less than was planted on the average during the preceding 3 years.

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wish to invite attention to the fact that in the pending bill the soil-bank provision is not permitted to include peanuts. I have an amendment which I shall offer, giving to the peanut producer the right to come into the soil bank. The high production of peanuts in this country was in 1949, when it was 2,308,000 pounds. By law it cannot be reduced below 1.61 million pounds. We should be very happy indeed to put immediately into the soil bank the difference between 2,308,000 and 1.61 million pounds.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would not the Senator like to have a payment of $25 an acre for the difference between 1.61 million and 2.3 million?

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am disturbed over the word "tillable" in the reference to the allocation of tillable acres. It means any acreage which is capable of being tilled, does it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Maybe we should have used the words "cultivated acres."

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose a man has 200 acres capable of being tilled for the cultivation of one of these products, but he attempts to plant only 100 acres. Can he reduce his acreage from the noncultivated land?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would think not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In my State about half of the production is in the commercial corn area and we have had a uniform support price for feed grains throughout the State. I am wondering if this amendment will cause two different prices for feed grains in the State, one in the commercial corn area, and a different one in the noncommercial corn area. The amendment provides that the price shall be supported at a point determined by the Secretary to bear the same ratio to the support price of corn, and so forth.

Mr. ANDERSON. I still think that the effect of the Daniel amendment

would have been to differentiate between the commercial areas and the noncommercial areas. However, the authors have provided that the support level for 1956 shall be the one that is announced, and for 1957 there will not be a distinction between the commercial and noncommercial areas. By 1957 there will not be any because of the provisions of the law, and in 1956 there will not be any because of the provisions which have already been made.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I have a little interest in this matter from another standpoint. I am looking at the advertisement of President Eisenhower's program for wheat, corn, dairy products, soybeans, cotton, and rice. I do not think I need to tell the Members of the Senate that yesterday I tried to contribute something toward the President's program. The headline says "Ike" won a great victory. I was not trying to win victories for the candidates of either party. I was trying to do something for the American farmer. I do not think that what I have done makes me an enemy of the administration. I think they have made a mistake in going too far. I think 56 million acres is too much. I devoutly wish that the Senator from Iowa had proposed his amendment on a 51-million-acre basis.

Corn is not an easy product to handle.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, while the Senator may enjoy politics in some fields, during all the years I have worked with him, when he was Secretary of Agriculture and since he has been a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, I have never found any tendency on the part of the Senator from New Mexico to play politics with farm legislation. He has always based his actions upon the merits of the proposed legislation, and not in terms of votes. In my judgment, for what it is worth, that is what he has done.

Mr. ANDERSON. I deeply appreciate that expression from a man who holds the exalted position in the Senate which the Senator from Vermont holds.

I only say that in this particular instance I know I am not motivated by any political considerations. I think a bill which would provide for a 56-million acre base on corn would cause so much trouble in other States where other commodities are grown that the Department of Agriculture would never be able to explain the action.

How would one be able to go to the home State of the chairman of our committee, the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and say, "You people must reduce your cotton acreage. You must also reduce your rice acreage."

Too much rice had been grown in Louisiana, and the people of the Senator's State were quick to admit it.

Can we say to them, "You must cut your acreage below those figures if you come into the soil bank; but if you had only been fortunate enough to be in a commercial grain area, this would not have happened"? It is difficult to explain. I think we shall be putting on the Department of Agriculture a burden too great for it to carry.

I firmly believe there may be a reason for the special treatment of corn. The very able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who was in charge of the agricultural appropriation bill at a time when I was in the Department of Agriculture—and no one could have appreciated more than I did the fine background he has—has pointed out that corn has had this treatment for a long time. But there is no excuse for the treatment which will be given to corn under this proposal.

I, therefore, would like to have the people express themselves as to how they feel about it. If any Senator wishes to vote that corn shall have special consideration, but that wheat, cotton, and rice shall not, that is all right; let him go ahead. I do not include peanuts, because peanuts for the last 3 or 4 years have been stable.

Here sits the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who has asked me several times if I could help him on cotton. How could I face him? I have refused to help him every time on the cotton matter, and I have done so at some personal sacrifice to my good nature.

I think we should study the matter more closely. I think we ought to test the market a little, to see how the people who live in the wheat, tobacco, and cotton States feel about preferential treatment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To which side will the time for the quorum call be charged?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McNamara
Allott	George	Millikin
Anderson	Goldwater	Monroney
Barkley	Gore	Morse
Barrett	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Murray
Bender	Hennings	Neely
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Butler	Ives	Purtell
Byrd	Jackson	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Scott
Chavez	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Knowland	Sparkman
Curtis	Kuchel	Stennis
Daniel	Langer	Symington
Dirksen	Lehman	Thurmond
Douglas	Long	Thye
Duff	Magnuson	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Welker
Eastland	Mansfield	Wiley
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Young
Flanders	McCarthy	
Frear	McClellan	

Mr. JOHNSON. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). A quorum is present.

PROCEDURE PROGRAM ON FARM BILL—ORDER FOR RECESS TO 11 O'CLOCK A. M. ON MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry what his plans are for this week in connection with the pending bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I intended to make an announcement in a moment, but I shall do so now. Yesterday evening, before the Senate recessed, there was mention made of probably holding the Senate in session on Saturday, provided it was apparent that we would be able to complete work on the pending bill.

I am confident that there is no possibility of our completing work on the bill even if we sit until midnight tonight and until midnight tomorrow. Therefore I plan to work until 9:30 or 10 o'clock this evening, and then recess until Monday at 11 o'clock, if that is agreeable.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, that is agreeable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope, therefore, that Senators will be on notice that there will be no votes taken after 9:30 o'clock this evening. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is fair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And also that there will be no session on Saturday, tomorrow, and that when we leave this evening we will return on Monday.

Mr. KNOWLAND. At 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday.

Mr. ELLENDER. At 11 o'clock on Monday morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I did not understand the Senator's request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator for his explanation. I have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to suggest to the Senator from New Mexico that he withdraw his pending amendment. As he knows, the committee has worked very hard on the bill. It is my fear that if his amendment were adopted

and put into the bill, it would wreck the whole bill.

I understand the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is now ready to offer an amendment to cut the base corn acreage from 56 million to 51 million. If that is done, I wonder if the Senator will agree to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I think on that basis I would withdraw my amendment, and I so do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. That will give the Senator from Tennessee an opportunity to speak.

Mr. GORE. Reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the junior Senator from New Mexico if this means that the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa is likewise to be withdrawn, and the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas is likewise to be withdrawn?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Louisiana suggested that a modification making the amount 51 million acres might be adopted. Of course, I reserve the right to offer my amendment again if the proposal is not adopted. I think it will be. All things considered, I believe 51 million acres is a reasonable amount. The Senator from Minnesota offered a figure like that 2 or 3 times in the committee, but it was not adopted. I think the Senator from Minnesota has made a reasonable case. In view of that fact, I was perfectly agreeable to having the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas, and my colleague the Senator from New Mexico and 1 or 2 other Senators, added to the Hickenlooper amendment. That has been done. Under those circumstances I have agreed to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is unanimous consent necessary in order for a Senator to withdraw his own amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The original request of the Senator from New Mexico did not require unanimous consent, but he changed his request.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I intend to withdraw my amendment. I am trying not to cut off the Senator from Tennessee, who had a question to ask.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee reserved the right to object.

Mr. GORE. I wish to thank the junior Senator from New Mexico for his courtesy. Of course, it is his privilege to withdraw his amendment without consent. He asked unanimous consent in order to give me an opportunity to ask some questions in an attempt to clarify the situation, which I hope will be the case.

Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is the Senator satisfied that if the amendment proposed to be offered by the junior Senator from Minnesota should be adopted, we would then have an equitable situation with respect to, and as between, the basic commodities?

Mr. ANDERSON. "Equitable" is a tough word, but I will say I think it will be as equitable as it can be made, in view of the fact that there are no allotments on corn, and allotments on corn are almost impossible.

I think it is also equitable in view of the fact that the great bulk of corn is consumed on the farms and does not move in commerce. In view of those facts, I believe a fair solution of the problem would be to establish a figure in the neighborhood of 51 million acres. It is extremely important, if the soil bank is to work, to give the corn farmers an opportunity to participate in it, and I think the proposal would give them a reasonable basis for participating in it.

Mr. GORE. Having been persuaded by the very strong and powerful argument of the junior Senator from New Mexico that the adoption of the amendment as proposed would not bring about a highly inequitable and unfair situation, I wish now to withdraw any objection and to follow his leadership further.

Mr. ANDERSON. I appreciate that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement.

Mr. ANDERSON. First, Mr. President, I wish to withdraw my amendment, if the Senator from Iowa will allow me to do so at this time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Certainly; I thought the Senator from New Mexico had done so.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has a right to withdraw his amendment; and the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to offer, as an amendment——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota permit me to make a statement which will clarify a great many matters in this connection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state that no time remains on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to submit an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa; and in that way, I shall have some time available to me.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield some time on the bill to the Senator from Iowa in order that he may discuss for a few minutes the matter he has in mind, if that is agreeable to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish to make sure that, inasmuch as the Senator from New Mexico has withdrawn his amendment, some amendment be pending to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa. Therefore I offer the following amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa: On page 2, in line 21, of the amendment known as the Hickenlooper amendment, and identified as "3–6–56–G"——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Minnesota offering it as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. On page 2, in line 21, after the word "be", to strike out the remainder of line 21, all of line 22, and in line 23 through the figures "1955", and to insert in lieu thereof "51 million acres."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota offer that as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Now that that amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa is before the Senate I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question 1 hour is available to each side.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not intend to use all the time available to our side. We shall try to expedite the handling of this matter.

I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on yesterday and today there has been considerable discussion of the question of the acreage allocations for corn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Minnesota yielding a certain amount of time to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Iowa whatever time he may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa may proceed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, during the past 2 days there has been considerable discussion of the amount of acreage to be allowed for corn. I feel that there is still a great deal of misunderstanding about the situation regarding corn and its economic position and the necessity for a reasonable opportunity for corn to participate in the soil bank and the acreage reserve.

I feel that there should be a limitation on the corn acreage. My amendment proposes such a limitation, at the figure of approximately 56 million acres. I believe that is a realistic limitation, and one which represents the amount that must be available, year in and year out, in the Corn Belt, if the corn farmers are to be given a chance to participate in the program.

However, from the discussion which has occurred, I find there is considerable objection to the allowance of 56 million acres, on the average; and a great many of the Members of the Senate feel that the figure 51 million acres would be realistic.

Personally, I feel that the figure 51 million acres is not realistic. However, it is far better than 43 million acres, the amount presently announced, and with which the corn farmers cannot live and still participate in the program for reduction of the acres planted to feed crops.

Therefore, prior to the time when the Senator from Minnesota submitted his amendment, which now is pending

to my amendment, I was about to suggest that, in order to make some kind of a realistic approach to the solution of this problem, and in the hope that we can avoid having amendments submitted simply for the sake of obtaining time to argue the question, and in the further hope that we can soon reach a vote on the question, I am willing to modify my amendment—and I do so modify it—so that it will correspond exactly to the amendment the Senator from Minnesota proposed to my amendment just before I began to speak.

So I modify my amendment as follows: on page 2, in line 21, after the word "be", strike out the remainder of the line and all of line 22 and, in line 23, through "and 1955"; and insert in lieu of the words stricken, "51 million acres." That will mean that the supported acres in the commercial corn area will be fixed by the Secretary at 51 million for 1956. I regret that the figure is not larger. I feel that it is not sufficiently realistic. But I hope we can live with it, and I hope we can gain a substantial percentage of increased participation, as compared with what we otherwise would be able to have.

Therefore, Mr. President, I modify my amendment to that extent.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall go along with the proposal for 51 million acres, although I think it is wrong. I think we shall get more compliance and better administration——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The Chair is informed that in view of the fact that the Senator from Iowa has accepted, as a modification of his amendment, the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the question recurs on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Iowa; and on that question, all time has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Iowa is willing to modify his amendments so as to make them conform to the dimensions and terms of my amendment. Under the circumstances, I believe that the easiest way to enable us to reach a vote on this question is to have me withdraw my amendment. But before doing so, I wish to make very clear that what we are doing is literally returning to 51 million allotted acres, all subject to the soil-bank provisions, as contrasted to the 43 million acres which were prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture earlier this year—in February. I believe that by having this modicum of allotment—limited as it is—at least we shall maintain the principle of acreage allotments as a means of production controls, when we have a fixed parity support.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, evidently it is the consensus of opinion of the managers of the bill and the other members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that the Senate should accept 51 million acres. I shall go along with that proposal, although I wish to say I do not like it and I do not think it is right. In my judgment, the best interests of the farmer and the best interest of everyone else concerned call for the allowance of 56 million acres. My reason for taking that position is that it is almost impossible to control the number of acres planted to corn. Corn is primarily fed on the farm. Furthermore, there is hardly a farm in the United States, even in the Deep South where cotton is grown, that does not grown corn. A few minutes ago the Senator from Kentucky spoke of the river-bottom lands in Kentucky where corn is grown, and where floods are experienced in the spring—with the result that the farmers there do not know how much corn they can produce, although scarcely a farm there does not produce some corn.

The Hickenlooper amendment contains a provision that, in order to participate in the support price, a corn farmer will automatically have to reduce his acreage by 15 percent of his available acres. In my opinion, if we had proceeded on the basis of 56 million acres, we would have had almost 100 percent participation in the proposed reduction. That means that we reduced the acreage for corn, soybeans, oats, and other commodities. That was practicable; it was sensible.

Furthermore, we would be helping every small farmer in the land. When we reduce corn acreage from 56 million to 51 million acres, giving the corn producers only 81 percent of parity, we are hurting every little farmer. Go into Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, Mississippi, or Florida, and it will be found that they all grow a certain amount of corn. They grow at least sufficient corn to feed their animals. Here we have a situation in which, in my opinion, their acreage would be reduced by 15 percent of the tillable acres.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator know that this provision does not affect corn producers outside the corn-producing area? The Senator is talking about corn produced in Mississippi, Florida, and other States. Such producers are not remotely touched. They have never had any support at all. There has never been any support with respect to corn, except that accorded to the favored areas.

Mr. CAPEHART. The acreage in the commercial area would be reduced, and the farmers in the territory we are talking about could grow more corn if they desired to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds Senators that all time on the Hickenlooper amendment has been exhausted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Seantor will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I correct in understanding that the proposal offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], on behalf of himself and other Senators, is now a part of the Hickenlooper amendment, as modified?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the situation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think I have a good picture of the United States. I think I have a good picture of the corn situation. I think I have a good picture of all the little farms. I think I know exactly what happens. I think we are making a mistake in reducing the acreage allotment to 51 million. What we ought to do is to throw out all the acreage allotments and make new acreage allotments all over the United States. That is one of the weaknesses of the program at the moment. There ought to be a 100 percent new allotment of acres all over the United States, in my judgment.

I shall vote for the pending proposal, but I do not like it. I think it is a mistake.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may I have 1 minute?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I invite attention to one fact which I hope will be considered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] before this question comes to a vote. While he has imposed a reduction on the corn base to 51 million acres by accepting the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, no such limitation is imposed with respect to the acreage of the four small grain crops. Their base would be the total acreage, on an average, devoted to their production over the past 3 years. That provision certainly does not bring balance into this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], as modified by the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the modification to which the Senator from Iowa has just agreed.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and myself, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, between lines 13 and 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

PRICE SUPPORTS—HOGS, BEEF CATTLE

SEC. 106. Title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 204. The price of hogs and beef cattle shall be supported through loans, purchases, or other operations at (1) 75 percent of their respective parity prices, or (2) a percentage of their respective parity prices equal to the percentage of its parity price at which the price of corn is being supported, whichever is the higher."

On page 4, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "106" and insert "107"; and

in line 24, strike out "107" and insert "108."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator's amendment been printed?

Mr. KERR. In answer to that question, I will say to my friend that a previous amendment had been printed. The Senator from Georgia and I had submitted an amendment with reference to supporting the price of hogs and cattle at 90 percent of parity. That amendment had been printed. It lies on the table. However, this amendment is different from the previous amendment in that this amendment provides that the price of hogs and beef cattle shall be supported, through loans, purchases, or other operations, at either 75 percent of their respective parity prices or a percentage of their respective parity prices equal to the percentage of the parity price at which the price of corn is being supported, whichever is higher—either 75 percent of parity, or the price at which corn is supported, whichever is higher. This amendment would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of hogs and cattle at that same level.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand, at the time the Senator first proposed his amendment, the support level, as reported by the committee in the original bill, was 90 percent on the basics, including corn, which is a great feed grain.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Since that time the Senate has stricken out the 90 percent provision, and the Senator is undertaking to bring beef and pork in line with the supports which have just been provided for the grains which must be produced to feed those animals.

Mr. KERR. Both hogs and cattle. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Eighty percent of the agricultural products produced from the soil reach the market in the form of livestock. Therefore, in the final analysis, the value of the corn, the value of the grain sorghums, and the value of the other feed grains which have been the subject of legislation, and with reference to which a separate program is now in the bill, are reflected in the value of beef and pork.

It so happens that the value of both beef and pork, on the basis of the current prices for hogs and cattle, is at a lower level than that of any of the grains taken care of in the amendment which the Senate has just adopted. Hogs have been selling on the open market at less than 50 percent of parity, but the Secretary of Agriculture has had in effect for some months a program which he says was for the benefit of the hog producer. He has spent on that program close to $100 million.

A press release from the United States Department of Agriculture dated March 1 bears the following headline: "USDA Buys Record 19 Million Pounds of Pork This Week—Total Now 156 Million Pounds—Heavy Canned Pork Buying To Continue—Frozen Pork Purchases Discontinued."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Inasmuch as the Senator's amendment was not printed, merely for clarification I invite attention to the amendment which the Senator previously submitted on behalf of himself and the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. It is designated "2-17-56—H."

As I understand, the pending amendment changes the 90-percent figure in the printed amendment to 75 percent. Is there any other change?

Mr. KERR. There is this change: If corn is being supported at a higher percentage than 75 percent, then that would be the percentage at which the price of hogs and cattle would be supported. As I understand the amendment which the Senate has adopted, it provides a certain percentage of support for corn this year, but that the support level for next year is undetermined by the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, which the Senate has adopted. Under my amendment, the Secretary would be directed to support the price of hogs and cattle at not less than 75 percent, but if the price of corn is being supported at a higher level, then the price of hogs and cattle would have the benefit of the same level of support.

Reading further from the release of the United States Department of Agriculture:

> Purchases this week (week beginning February 27) include 10,235,550 pounds of pork and gravy at prices ranging from 68.48 to 68.50 cents per pound; 2,673,000 pounds of luncheon meat packed in 6-pound tins at 44.90 cents and 504,000 pounds packed in 12-ounce tins at 47.20 cents per pound; 2,268,000 pounds of canned hams at 66 cents per pound; 630,000 pounds of frozen hams at a range of 47.15 to 47.20 cents per pound, with one purchase of 30,000 pounds at 47.37 cents and one of 30,000 pounds at 47.67 cents because of a favorable location for distribution; 2,125,000 pounds of frozen shoulders at 32.25 to 34 cents; and 475,000 pounds of frozen loins at 47.75 to 47.76 cents per pound.

In other words, Mr. President, the Secretary has now purchased in excess of 156 million pounds of pork products.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Of that amount, a considerable percentage is canned pork gravy at a price of more than 68 cents a pound. Therefore, he has spent nearly $100 million in a program allegedly to support the value of the price of hogs, although we know that it has not had that result.

It is the purpose of my amendment to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of hogs and cattle on a basis which will benefit the producer, not the packer.

There is not one Senator on the floor today who does not know that in the long run the price of hogs and cattle must be at a parity level equal to that of the price of feed grains, or else the producer of hogs and cattle will be paying a penalty to the producers of feed grains.

We have determined that the feed grains will be supported at a certain level. The purpose of my amendment is to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of hogs and cattle at the same level, not by buying products from the packer in a manner which is calculated to reflect no benefit to the producers, but to handle the spending of his money for that purpose in a way which will benefit the producer, not the processor.

Therefore, in simple justice, we can do no less than to provide a support program for hogs and cattle on a level with that which we have now provided for corn and feed grains.

I said a little while ago that 80 percent of all the agricultural products of the soil find their way into the market, that the producer receives his compensation for them in the form of livestock, and that he is paid as he sells his livestock.

It is the purpose of my amendment to put the producer of hogs and cattle in an equal position with and on the same basis as we have now put the producers of corn and feed grains.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Louisiana opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am. I dislike to oppose my good friend from Oklahoma on his amendment. The committee has held hearings on several occasions with respect to price supports for hogs and beef cattle. During the hearings the committee recently held throughout the country, we had a few witnesses who proposed price supports on hogs and beef cattle—in fact, on all livestock, but they were in a definite minority. The great majority of our witnesses asked for assistance, but they were in agreement that price supports could not be successfully applied to livestock, since there is no feasible way to control production and since livestock products are not storable.

In 1938, when price supports for the basics were proposed, it was with the idea that if the price levels of the basics—that is, the commodities whose production could be easily controlled and could be stored—were stabilized, the producers of other commodities would also benefit.

In my humble judgment, the main reason why it is impossible to support the prices of hogs and beef cattle is that no reasonable way has been found to control production. As everyone knows, under a hog and beef price support program the production of pork and beef, unless controlled, would no doubt be increased in unprecedented amounts; it would be impossible for us to provide sufficient storage space in order to take care of the pork and beef that could be produced and which would be eligible for price support. For that reason, Mr. President, I am opposed to the pending amendment.

I realize that the hog producers as well as the cattle producers are in a sorry plight. The members of the committee,

realizing that fact, have written a provision into the bill which authorizes the expenditure of additional funds to supplement section 32 funds. As Senators know, there is at the moment a sum aggregating approximately $444 million of section 32 funds, of which 25 percent can be used to assist in stabilizing the prices on any one commodity. By the utilization of that money, it would be entirely possible for the Secretary of Agriculture to spend up to $111 million to purchase pork in order to alleviate the difficulties which now confront hog producers; the same amount could be used in order to alleviate the situation among cattle producers.

As we know, the Secretary of Agriculture has up to this moment set aside approximately $80 million for the purpose of relieving the situation as to hogs.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Has the Senator seen the latest report of the United States Department of Agriculture regarding the purchase of pork products?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know that I have seen the latest report.

Mr. KERR. It is disclosed that they have bought 156 million pounds of pork products at prices which very nearly, if not entirely, exhaust the sum of which the Senator has spoken.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was coming to that in a moment, and I would indicate to my good friend that in the bill there is a provision to supplement section 32 funds.

Mr. KERR. I know that, and I have an amendment to increase the figure which is in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I first proposed before the committee half a billion dollars for that purpose. So far as I am personally concerned, I still favor that amount. I do not suppose there will be too much objection on the Senate floor to that amount. But the bill now provides for an amount equal to $250 million for the purpose of supplementing section 32 funds. The only difference is that the $250 million can all be used for one product if the Secretary sees fit. In other words, there are no strings attached to it, as is the case with regard to regular section 32 funds.

Mr. KERR. Does not the Senator think that in using that money the Secretary should do it on a basis which will benefit the producer rather than the processor?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about that.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator think there is any chance of the Secretary doing it in the absence of direct instructions from the Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would not know how to force the Secretary to do it, but I made the statement some time ago that there are many cooperative establishments scattered throughout the Nation, and it strikes me that the Secretary of Agriculture could probably buy a quantity of beef and pork from those cooperatives which, I understand, buy the products conditioned on the cooperatives having paid the producers a fair price.

It strikes me that if the Secretary wanted to assist the beef and hog producers, with the section 32 money which is now available to him, and the money we are going to make available to him under the bill, he could carry on a program which would be of great assistance to the cattle and hog producers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. How would the Secretary accomplish it, other than by buying from someone dealing in hogs? The Secretary cannot buy live hogs and let them run loose.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am of the opinion that the Secretary of Agriculture could enter into a contract with a cooperative—there are cooperatives all over this country—and could arrange to buy hogs from that plant, provided that they are bought at a certain figure, and then utilize the pork so purchased in the school-lunch program; that pork could also be sold abroad, as was done recently when quite a few million pounds of beef were sold to Israel.

Mr. CAPEHART. It seems to me that the Secretary accomplishes that purpose when he buys hogs, or pork products, regardless of where he buys them.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 5 more minutes, Mr. President.

As the program is now operating, the packer probably sells to the Government meats which he has had on hand for 6 months or possibly a year.

Mr. CAPEHART. If he does, he has to replace them with hogs bought off the farm immediately.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would relieve the situation somewhat. But the point that my good friend from Oklahoma has been making is that such purchases do not give relief to the hog or cattle grower. There are a number of cooperatives throughout the country that buy hogs from producers, and I do not see why it should not be possible for the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a contract with cooperatives, or even with packing plants, to purchase so much beef and so much pork and pork products, provided a minimum price is paid to the farmers.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not have any particular objection to it, but I do not see how it helps the matter to say that we will take the hogs out of this pen as against hogs out of another pen over here. They are all hogs, and the Secretary is buying them for one purpose only, namely, to reduce surplus and take them off the market and create a bigger market at the moment for hogs. I do not see how it would help very much.

Mr. ELLENDER. It would result in greater purchases of hogs, thus reducing the supply.

Mr. CAPEHART. The same purpose could be accomplished by designating in the law that the Secretary must buy from a processor hogs which have been purchased off the farm within the past 30 days. I would be in favor of that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure that can be done. It would decrease the number of hogs, relieve the market and still insure that the producer will benefit.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am in favor of it if we can find some practical way to accomplish it.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is only a suggestion. I do not know whether such a program would be practical or not. But the Senator knows that in his own State there are many cooperatives which process hogs and cattle. Am I not right about that?

Mr. CAPEHART. No; I do not think they process livestock but they buy hogs and cattle from farmers. I do not think they actually process the livestock. In my opinion there is not a single cooperative livestock processor; but the cooperatives buy the livestock from the farmers and then sell it to the packers.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know there are cooperative processors in Iowa, and also in California.

It strikes me that the Secretary of Agriculture could at least get an agreement with the cooperatives or with the packers, in order to carry out a program whereby surplus meats could be removed from market channels, and also make it possible for those who own the livestock to get a better return for their product.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator trying to make it certain that the hogs which would be bought would come off the farms within a short time?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think it might be possible to write such a provision into the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not think it should be necessary to write it into the bill, because if the Secretary wishes to carry out the proposal as we intend it, he has ample authority already to proceed along the lines we are now discussing.

The criticism which has been made of the past program—I think the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] has criticized it, as have many other Senators—is that it has benefited the packers instead of the cattle growers and hog growers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the poor Secretary likewise must follow the law, which provides that he must ask for bids and buy from the lowest bidder.

Mr. ELLENDER. That could be accomplished by including in the proposals to bid the condition I have just stated, namely, that the processor must buy from the farmer and the processor must pay a fair price to the producer. The Secretary certainly could include that as a condition of a bid. I am certain that if the Secretary desired to carry out a meat-purchase program of this nature, some way could be found to assist the farmers who raise the livestock as well as those who will process them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not true that the Secretary could, under the amendment,

do exactly what the Senator is suggesting he could do?

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; it would be possible, but under the Senator's proposal it would be necessary to guarantee a fixed price, and that would have to be done not only for the hogs which were processed, but also for every head of cattle raised.

Mr. President, it has always been my judgment that any commodity whose production cannot be controlled or cannot be stored is unsuitable for a program based upon price-support loans. Such a program would be unworkable so far as this kind of commodity is concerned. The Senator knows the difficulties which have been experienced in attempting to support the price of milk and milk products by the use of Government loans and purchase agreements.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is there not in the bill a provision for a support price for milk and butter?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; and I am not too happy about it.

Mr. KERR. And cannot pork products be stored?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but enough storage facilities and plants could not be built to take care of the vast quantities of beef and pork which would be produced if the door were opened to hog and cattle growers for a guaranteed price.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 2 more minutes.

Mr. KERR. Is there not a provision for a soil bank, so as to reduce acreage and bring about the possibility of a reduction of acreage crops?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator's proposal would increase the price of cattle and hogs to producers.

Mr. KERR. Would not the Senator's argument be supported by the fact that it is hoped to bring up the supply of cattle and hogs?

Mr. ELLENDER. Perhaps so, but the main purpose of the acreage reserves phase of the soil bank, and it is a short-term program, is to prevent the further growth of surpluses of the basic crops, and to reduce them. In addition, the conservation-reserve phase of the soil bank will result in curtailing acreage devoted to the other feed grains. It is my judgment that by curtailing acreage, so that feed grains may not be grown in such quantities as they are now grown, the poultrymen, cattlemen, and hog raisers will in some measure be assisted by the resulting stabilization of the livestock and poultry industry.

The adoption of an amendment such as the Senator from Oklahoma has proposed would, in my judgment, not only be very costly, but I do not think it would work.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Oklahoma has offered an amendment which is of concern to every Senator who represents a State where cattle and hogs are raised. The price situation has been serious. Cattle numbers are at an all-time high. There are available 97 million hogs, which is an overabundance.

I was wondering if the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma would not encourage additional production of livestock. That seems to be the problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think that would be the logical result. As a matter of fact, that is what I tried to bring out awhile ago. If the price-support program were extended to livestock, or if hog and cattle producers were guaranteed a certain percentage of parity, as the amendment would do, without any production controls being provided, we would soon have pork and pork products and beef and beef products running out of our eyes, ears, mouths, and noses.

Mr. CARLSON. I wondered if the chairman of the committee, or the committee itself, had given any thought to paying a bonus for marketing lightweight livestock—100-pound or 200-pound hogs. I think that would be one way to raise the poundage of livestock.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my understanding that sometime during the consideration of this bill an amendment to that effect will be proposed. The committee considered such an amendment but found that it would involve many administrative problems, and hearings would be required to work them out. However, I understand the junior Senator from Minnesota will again propose such an amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Am I correct in understanding that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma is not the only amendment which we shall have which will deal with livestock?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. In fact, several such amendments already have been proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum; and I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma repeat his request?

Mr. KERR. I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. Was there any decision on my request for the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was no decision.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has 50 minutes remaining.

Mr. KERR. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have spoken to the Senator from Oklahoma with reference to the amendment, which I support, but I have also suggested to him that the scope of the language in his amendment, which would provide the means to the Secretary of Agriculture to support hogs and cattle, is rather limited. I have long believed we ought to provide to the Secretary of Agriculture authority to make incentive payments to producers who market cattle and hogs at lighter-than-normal weights.

The amendment I am about to offer will be offered as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma. This amendment has been discussed in the committee. As I recall, the vote in the committee was either 9 to 6 or 8 to 7 in opposition. I shall have to check the record to make sure, but it was a close vote.

As we study the so-called surplus market of hogs, we find that the problem is in the total poundage, and not just in the total numbers.

The purpose my amendment would fulfill would be to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize a payment system to farmers to market hogs when the hogs were of a lightweight character. That makes for a more marketable animal, because the consumer will get a better piece of pork from a lightweight hog, just as the consumer will receive a better piece of beef from a well-fed lightweight beef.

I also believe the Secretary of Agriculture ought to have a variety of means or tools with which to work. The Senator from Oklahoma has offered an amendment which provides that the Secretary may use loans or purchases for bringing hog prices up to 75 percent of parity, or to the equivalent of the parity of corn, as I understand.

I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if that is correct.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct; whichever is the higher.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Whichever is the higher.

The Senator from Minnesota would not disturb that parity ratio by his amendment, but would only provide to the Secretary other means of being able to arrive at that parity ratio for the market price of hogs.

I shall not go into considerable detail, but I wish only to point out that in the great State of Iowa, of all the public

opinion polls that have been taken, there is one that reveals an overwhelming majority of sentiment, and that is in favor of incentive payments on hogs. In other hog-producing States in the Union, when the question has been asked as to what kind of price-support program the farmers would like to have for hogs, they have indicated they all want incentive payments, or an incentive premium-payment program such as that suggested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KERR. I yield the Senator from Minnesota an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to offer as an amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma the following language:

(a) In order to encourage the marketing of cattle and hogs at lighter than normal weights, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make incentive payments to producers who market cattle and hogs at lighter than normal weights.

(b) Such payments shall be made from funds appropriated by section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress, as amended, and shall be in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purpose of this section.

I am convinced that this is a self-regulating device, because, under the limitations imposed in the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma the incentive payments which would be utilized would be at a very basic minimum. In other words, as the price structure of hogs at the cash market value goes up the amount of incentive payments goes down.

Since the price-support level to which we are directing our attention is very modest, namely, 75 percent of parity, or the equivalent of the corn parity, whichever is the highest—in this instance it would be at a maximum of 81 percent of parity—there would not be a very large outlay for premium payments.

I wish to say to my colleagues I have figured this matter out on another proposal, which I have discussed from time to time, and I find that if we desired to remove all the surplus poundage of pork in the market at the present time, in order to get hog prices at 90 percent of parity, it could actually be done, under my proposal, for $198 million. That is the estimate.

I wish to point out that the amount we are going to spend on purchases will be at least that amount, or substantially larger, without getting the same results. There are times when purchases could effectively be made, and the Government could step into the market when surpluses are going into the market.

The real trouble with the present purchase program is that it was delayed too long, and was entered into with timidity and a faltering spirit, and with no determination to make it work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of October 26, 1955, entitled "Costly Futility in Pork."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COSTLY FUTILITY IN PORK

Secretary of Agriculture Benson is going to spend $85 million over the next 10 months to buy pork, and the chances are that these purchases will have only the slightest effect, if any, on the price of hogs.

Why? Because Mr. Benson is using a thimble to catch a record-breaking rain. From the feedlots of the Corn Belt this fall the greatest volume of hogs in history is moving to the packinghouses. The pork Mr. Benson will buy over 10 months represents less than one-fifth of 1 month's hog slaughter. It will account for less than 1½ percent of this year's expected pork production.

By skillful timing, Mr. Benson might be able to prevent the market from going too far below its present level. But even that is problematical, and he does not pretend to hope that he can markedly improve hog prices. For the expenditure of $85 million of the taxpayers' money, very little is likely to be done to improve farm income.

Should Mr. Benson, then, be buying a lot more pork that he intends to buy, so as to affect the market more positively? We do not think so. If he bought much more, he would be unable to dispose of it through school lunches and relief. The surplus would have to be stored, and then pork would be on the same merry-go-round as butter and wheat, the surplus creating new problems of its own.

Mr. Benson is perfectly right in offering to buy only what can be consumed through the noncommercial channels open to him. But since that amount is a drop in the bucket, his purchase program, while politically necessary and socially justified, is likely to turn out, with respect to farm aid, to be an $85 million exercise in futility.

It does not follow that the Government should be doing nothing at all. When pork is in surplus, buying it for consumption by schoolchildren and the needy makes sense. When hog prices drop to their present level of 65 percent of parity, the Government cannot escape a responsibility to act. But it ought to act effectively.

Can anybody any longer doubt that we need a trial run of the production payment plan on hogs? Under this plan, a direct subsidy would be paid to hog producers to cover the difference between market prices and an agreed standard. At the present market, a subsidy of 5 cents a pound would bring the producer's return to 90 percent of parity, and 3 cents a pound would bring it to 80 percent of parity. At 3 cents a pound, Mr. Benson's $85 million would pay the subsidy on some 14 million hogs, or about one-third of the number that went to market in the first 9 months of this year.

It is impossible to know whether a subsidy of that amount would be sufficient to sustain a desirable level of farm income from hogs. Only a trial run can yield such knowledge. But as between spending $85 million on hog purchases that can have but a negligible effect on farm income, and spending $85 million on direct payments that go right into the farmer's pocket, surely the latter offers the taxpayer far more for his money.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this particular editorial points out the limitations of the purchase program as presently administered. I say that if a purchase program is to be authorized and, if need be, if a loan program is to be authorized, but, above all, if there is to be a premium incentive program for lightweight hogs and cattle, then we can do something about it; we can do something about bringing the prices of these hogs and cattle to reasonable figures. There is no area of agriculture that needs more help than this one.

I think the amendment will be self-regulating, because as prices rise, the premium payments will go down; and the full extent of the premium payments is limited by the ceiling which the Kerr amendment places—a ceiling of 75 percent of parity, or the parity for corn, whichever is higher. So we cannot be involved in any great expenditures, and we shall have the means of obtaining what we want.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Minnesota is offering his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and I am doing it right now.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. As I understand the Kerr amendment, it provides for 81 percent of parity, based on the present corn parity, for livestock.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Of course, everyone in the livestock-producing areas knows that livestock prices are, and have been, disastrously low. We want a program which will limit production. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, it will provide for earlier marketing of livestock.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. By the way, let me say that later I shall have, for discussion, a much more detailed amendment, if this one does not succeed.

But this particular amendment has within it a self-regulating mechanism. In other words, as the market prices of hogs and cattle go up, the lower will be the amount of the premium.

Mr. CARLSON. If that amendment were offered as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], would that vitiate or violate the 81 percent of parity payments?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. My amendment would place a limitation on the amount of incentive payments; it would limit them to 81 percent of parity. When we arrived at that point, we would not use any more incentive payments as a means of price supports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand that under my amendment, I have additional time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota cannot offer his amendment at this time; under the practice which has been followed, when there

is a limitation on the debate on a pending amendment, other amendments to it cannot be offered until the time on the original amendment has either been exhausted or relinquished. In other words, two limitations on debate cannot be in effect at the same time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Presiding Officer whether it is possible, if the Senator from Oklahoma is willing to accept my amendment to his proposal, that that be done?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the question of agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma. Therefore, the Senator from Oklahoma cannot modify his amendment at this time, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma will be willing to request unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. KERR. Yes, Mr. President; I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment by accepting the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in the Chamber before such a modification is made. For that purpose, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has not been recognized for that purpose. When there is a limitation on debate, a Senator cannot suggest the absence of a quorum unless he is yielded time for that purpose.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then, Mr. President, I object, although I had not necessarily intended to object.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes, if he wishes to proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then, Mr. President, I shall offer my amendment at a later time. I thought we might save time by including it as a part of the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], because my amendment is germane to his amendment, and seems to fit in very nicely with it.

If the problem is to make it possible to have a quorum call at this time, I shall be glad to request unanimous consent that whatever time is available to me to be used for the purpose of having a quorum call at this time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if we can have a quorum call at this time, I shall withdraw my objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call at this time, without having the time required for it charged to the time available to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous-consent request that the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] may become a part of the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall object—I wish to make it clear why I object to this request. In every group of organized cattlemen I know anything about in the United States, from the national organization down through every State organization about which I know anything—and I do not know about all of them, but certainly including my State organization, which has gone on record very strongly on this question—there has been apprehension, during the pendency of this bill, that an effort would be made to provide price supports on livestock.

Only last week a committee from the livestock association of my State, notwithstanding the fact that they knew that my colleague [Mr. SMATHERS] and I were greatly disinclined to support any such amendment as the pending amendment, came all the way to Washington again to urge very strong opposition to such a measure as this.

I very much desire the opportunity to vote upon this proposal. If it should be defeated, as I think it should be, by a large and substantial vote, we would bring back some degree of confidence to the livestock producers, at least in my own State, and in many other States from which I have heard indirectly, that they are not in danger of being included in a price-support structure.

To complete my comment, I noted that even in the area of the country where I attended hearings last year, and where there was very strong advocacy of high price supports from many groups of producers in agriculture, exactly the opposite was true with reference to the livestock growers.

In the hearings in Minnesota, Iowa, and the two Dakotas, we were given expressions not only from livestock producers in those States, but also from the surrounding States of Montana, Nebraska, Wyoming, and perhaps other States which I do not now recall, to the effect that under no circumstances did they wish to bring upon themselves the control and the regimentation which would necessarily go with price support. I think those people are entitled to have a clear, definite expression upon an amendment of this kind, and to know what the thinking of the Senate is in this field.

Because of that feeling, I object.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, before the Senator from Florida objects, will he permit me to say a word to him?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator. I thought he had yielded to me.

Mr. KERR. I did not yield for the remainder of the day. I should like to say something in response to the Senator's remarks.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very happy to listen to the Senator.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Florida is perfectly aware of the fact that upon the exhaustion of the time upon my amendment, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] proposes to offer his amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly. I have already voted on that amendment in committee, and I am prepared to vote on it here. I think the livestock producers are entitled to a clear-cut issue as to whether or not a general price-support structure for livestock is being seriously considered by the Senate.

Mr. KERR. I am interested in the same thing. The only effect of action upon the unanimous-consent request would be to provide an alternative method of supporting the prices. The Senator from Florida is perfectly aware that if the Senator from Minnesota and I cannot obtain a vote on his amendment at this time by unanimous consent, we can certainly do so later.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is entirely correct. I shall be very happy to vote upon that amendment at the proper time. However, I think there is validity to the point which I have just made, that the Senate is entitled to have an opportunity to express itself squarely on the question of an outright program of general price supports for livestock. I think the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma offers such an opportunity, and I wish to vote on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays upon my amendment be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLLAND. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, has all time expired?

Mr. KERR. I yielded 5 minutes to the Senator a while ago.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Earlier in the day, in connection with the Hickenlooper amendment, there were modifications. All sorts of changes were made, even though the yeas and nays had been ordered on the amendment itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the Senator that the yeas and nays had not been ordered on the Hickenlooper amendment. Otherwise such modifications could not have been made, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understood that the years and nays had been ordered on the Daniel amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays were ordered on the

Daniel amendment, but not on the Hickenlooper amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was the Daniel amendment which was modified; and the yeas and nays had been ordered on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was the Hickenlooper amendment which was modified, and not the Daniel amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My question is this: Once time is exhausted on the Kerr amendment, will it be possible for the Senator from Minnesota to offer his amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Senator may offer it at that time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Even though the yeas and nays have been ordered on the Kerr amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator from Oklahoma will relinquish his time, I shall be happy to offer it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, let me say, in response to the statement of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], that I wish to offer an amendment calling for 85-percent price support. I should be delighted to have an opportunity to vote upon that amendment at the appropriate time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am perfectly happy to have every Senator offer any amendment he desires to offer, and I shall be glad to listen courteously. However, I think I am entitled to vote upon an amendment which squarely presents the issue on a subject which has been of great concern to my people and to other people similarly situated in several other States. That will not be the case if the pending amendment is encumbered with modifications.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say for the benefit of Senators that any Senator who obtains recognition from the Chair may offer an amendment to the pending amendment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments cannot be considered concurrently, but each can be considered in turn.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have an amendment which I propose to offer, which would provide an incentive for the early marketing of hogs, and also, possibly, an incentive for the early marketing of beef. Would my amendment be germane as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot pass on that question until the amendment is offered. A perfecting amendment or a substitute may be offered, but the Chair cannot pass upon any such amendment until it is offered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am prepared to relinquish the remaining time on our side.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Time is available for the opposition, is it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Five minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the Senator is opposed to the amendment?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to see whether I correctly understand his amendment.

As I understand, the Senator from Oklahoma proposes to support hog and cattle prices at a certain percentage of parity, or at a related percentage of the parity price of corn, whichever is higher. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. The effect of the amendment would be to support the prices of hogs and cattle at not less than 75 percent of parity, but in the event the price of corn was being supported at a higher percentage of parity, that would become the level at which the prices of hogs and cattle would be supported.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If corn were supported at 81 percent, the prices of hogs and cattle would be supported at 81 percent.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma would bring about would be this: With corn supported at 81 percent of parity, and with hogs supported at $17 a hundredweight, with no control at the production point, hogs would be running out of the third story of the barn. They would be live hogs, too, and there would be no place to put them all.

What the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma would do would be to fix a ceiling price on hogs, and hogs would never break through that ceiling price, because there would be so many hogs produced that the law of supply and demand could not operate, and the Government would be looking for places to put the hogs. A price of $17 a hundred on hogs, while not as high as the price on hogs should be, nevertheless is a profitable figure, and the farmer, instead of raising a modest number of hogs, would double or triple the number he would raise.

Believe me, Mr. President, that can be done in 10 months' time. There are big farms in this country which can turn them out faster than phonograph needles can be turned out. If we put a support price on hogs without an adequate or satisfactory method of controlling production at the bottom, that is what will happen. I want the farmer to get $20 or $21 or $22. I do not want to put a lid on what he is to get.

All of us are interested in good prices for agriculture and livestock. However, what is now proposed is not the way to reach that objective. This is the way to wreck an adequate price for hogs. It is the way to wreck an adequate price for cattle. With a reasonably small but profitable price, the farmers will increase their production so that the per dollar profit on each one will eventually add up to a substantial amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have stated the great difficulty that could be encountered if the present proposal were adopted. Furthermore, pork is not a readily storable product, except for about 6 months. With great numbers of hogs produced at a modestly profitable price, the farmer surely will be in a straitjacket so far as a better price at any time in the future is concerned.

I said a moment ago that all of us are interested in reasonable prices for agricultural products. All of us are interested in profitable prices for those engaged in agriculture, in order to keep them prosperous.

There are many people who urge a support on farm products. However, unless there is a formula for a reasonable control at the point of production, so that the supply and demand can be kept more in balance, all we would do would be to produce unmanageable surpluses, and put an absolute ceiling above which the farmer's price could not break.

For that reason I am opposed, not only to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, but to all amendments which propose support on a cost-plus basis—although the amendments do not so state—or on a basis on which there would be a small profit. That is why I opposed amendments which would leave uncontrolled and unlimited the production end of the livestock business.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I relinquish the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has been relinquished. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I correct in understanding that the question before the Senate is the Kerr amendment, without any modification?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the way it is at the present time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is possible for the Senator from Minnesota to offer his amendment as a modification of the Kerr amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the Kerr amendment is now open to further amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I therefore offer my amendment, which I send to the desk, as an amendment to the Kerr amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the amendment offered by Mr. KERR it is proposed to insert the following:

LIGHTWEIGHT CATTLE AND HOGS

SEC. 106. (a) In order to encourage the marketing of cattle and hogs at lighter than normal weights, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make incentive payments to producers who market cattle and hogs at lighter than normal weights.

(b) Such payments shall be made from funds appropriated by section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress (49 Stat. 774; 7 U. S. C. 612c), as amended, and shall be in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purpose of this section.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I heard the remarks of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] with respect to the alleged stimulation of production which supposedly would be the result of the Kerr amendment and the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Minnesota.

The fact is that a premium-payment provision for lightweight hogs and lightweight cattle is itself a self-regulating program. As the market price of hogs or cattle goes up, the amount of the premium payment goes down. Under the Kerr amendment, when the market price reaches 81 percent of parity, which is the maximum which that amendment allows, there are no more premium payments.

My amendment permits the Secretary of Agriculture to draw up whatever regulations he may deem advisable to make a premium-payment-incentive system work.

Furthermore, if there is any one thing the farmers agree on with respect to hog and cattle production, and a way and means of getting a fair price, it is through a premium-payment program.

I am rather surprised to hear the Senator from Iowa discuss the program as he does, because the Senator from Iowa knows that there is overwhelming public support in his State, as well as in the border States, for premium-payment programs. More than 70 percent of the hog producers are in favor of it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that every time a hog weighing 200 pounds or 220 pounds is sold it means that that hog is taken off the market and, therefore, that much less meat is produced?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. What we are interested in is poundage. There are now about 800 million pounds of excess pork. To remove that poundage is the all-important thing.

I should like to point out that under the purchase program it would cost about $400 million to remove 800 million pounds of pork. Under direct supports, it might cost as much as a billion dollars. Under the incentive-premium-payment program, to reduce pork going onto the market by 800 million pounds, under the proposal which I offer, with even up to 90 percent of parity, the total cost would be $198 million.

Furthermore, the estimates are that under my incentive-premium-payment program, for the second and third years the maximum cost would not be over $98 million.

It seems to me it is about time that Congress took cognizance of the tremendous losses to our livestock and hog producers. We have insisted that the Secretary go into a purchase program. The simple truth is that the purchase program alone is not producing the results which are desired. The Government is going to spend millions and millions of dollars in the purchase of processed products. The trouble is that will benefit the processors rather than the producers.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator from Minnesota aware of the fact that only last week the Secretary of Agriculture bought 10,237,000 pounds of pork and pork gravy at 68½ cents a pound?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I think I am aware of it.

Mr. KERR. How many pounds of gravy does the Senator think the packer could make out of a pound of lard?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not know, but there seems to be more gravy in the hog-purchase program than there is pork.

Mr. KERR. And more than there are benefits to the producer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Definitely. I placed in the RECORD figures showing the purchases by the Department of Agriculture, and indicating that each time they contracted for the purchase of excess pork products, the contract price for the processed hogs went up and the price the farmer received went down. In other words, the gap continued to widen. What the Senator from Oklahoma wants and what I want is a program which will permit the benefit to go to the produce rather than to the processor.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] stated that a program for support of the price of hogs and cattle would wreck the business of hog and cattle producers, as I understood him. Is that the way the Senator from Minnesota understood him?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the way I understood him.

Mr. KERR. What does the Senator from Minnesota think has happened to the business of the producer of hogs and cattle under a program without any supports?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It appears to me that if there is any one group of producers in this country who have a just right to be complaining and to be critical of the present agricultural situation, it is the hog and livestock producers.

Mr. KERR. I believe the Senator from Minnesota made the statement that if the Secretary adopted this one alternative it would cost less than $200 million to bring the price of the hogs and cattle up to the parity level authorized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would cost less than $200 million to bring the price of hogs up to 90 percent of parity, I may say. The Senator's amendment, which I was privileged to modify with my proposal, asks for only 81 percent of parity.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator aware that the Secretary of Agriculture has already spent many million dollars in the past few months in the purchase of hogs and that hogs are selling in the market for less than they were selling when the Secretary started his program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. It appears to me that the Congress has an obligation to afford the Secretary of Agriculture every possible effective means of bringing about a better market price for the livestock, cattle, and hogs. The Secretary presently can say, "Well, all I can do is purchase." I want to say to the Secretary, "We want you to have not only the right to purchase, but the right to make loans and the right to make incentive premium payments for marketing lightweight cattle and hogs."

Furthermore, a lightweight hog, for example, is a much more marketable hog. It has much better consumer acceptance.

Moreover, it encourages a finer quality of production.

I think the responsibility rests upon the Congress to give some sense of direction to the Secretary in this very important field.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator feel that if Congress is going to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the program to support the prices of agricultural products he should be directed to do it in a way which will result in a benefit to the producer and not to the processor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, yes.

In section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which is still on the statute books, still in full force and effect, supposedly, the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to producers of corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco on the normal production of such commodities in amounts, together with the proceeds, which will make a fair return to the producer.

There is already in the law a parity-payment section which recognizes the goal of equality. What we are asking for in this particular amendment is the privilege of making parity payments for a high-grade type of beef cattle and pork products. We are saying that the Secretary should have authority to make premium payments for cattle and for hogs when they are lightweight or a weight lighter than the normal weight.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to compliment the Senator from Minnesota and the senior Senator from Oklahoma on this fine amendment.

May I ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who has always tried

to help the small farmer, what relationship the production of livestock bears to the overall farm income of the Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is a majority relationship, but I have forgotten the exact percentage.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. My information is, and I think it is correct, that 80 percent of the income received by farmers for products of the soil comes from the proceeds of the sale of livestock.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that is the figure. I could not remember for the moment the exact figure, so all I said was that it constitutes the majority of the agricultural income.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree that the figure mentioned is approximately the one I have always heard. Is it not also true that the cost of production of livestock, which, as my senior colleague has said, comprises 80 percent of the farm income, is pretty largely fixed by applying a high-level support for corn? We have placed a high-level support on small grains and for all the things the livestock producer must use in order to earn this 80 percent of the agricultural income, and it is fixed by law?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. The senior Senator from Oklahoma in his amendment recognizes the support level now established in the bill and says that there is an obligation to get livestock and hog prices up to at least 75 percent of parity.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not also true that even though 80 percent of the farm income is based on livestock, this bill does not do one thing for the livestock raiser, and that, instead, it rather tends to penalize the livestock raiser still further——

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is the hope that in balancing off feed grain prices it may act as a discouragement to excess production in the field of hogs and cattle. Let us face up to the fact that the sickest part of agriculture today, in terms of its economic structure, is the livestock and cattle and hog segment. What we are offering is a means and method to the Department of Agriculture to give some sensible assistance to the most important segment of our whole agricultural economy.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not also true that in this very bill we are providing for a set-aside of acreage and paying farmers to retire such acreage, which can be used as pasture land? It is about a 3-year cycle from row crops to good pasture. So, instead of helping the livestock farmer, we are building up a possible source of new production of livestock by paying the row-crop farmer, who also receives considerable benefit, to go into further competition and increase the number of livestock by new pastures which this bill will help to create. Yet, not $1 of help is given the livestock farmer. He is brushed aside when he asks to come into the soil bank. We say to him, "We mean only cultivated land. We cannot consider ranch land and grassland as being eligible for this annual payment."

So, step by step the livestock raiser is being ignored and prevented from receiving any degree of Federal relief.

The distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma proposes a 75 percent of parity purchasing program so that all the relief will not go to Armour, Wilson, and Swift, and he tries to get it down to the level of the farmers, but the proposition is opposed by Senators from livestock-producing States who think that somewhere around $17 is too high a price. The Government has engaged in a purchasing program, and the packers seem to be able to charge 65 or 68 cents for the processed material, but the $17 on live cattle is too high a price support.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

I think it is important to note that the request of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] in the first part of his amendment is most modest. It is exceedingly modest. It is for 75 percent of parity. Of course, that would seem like heaven to the hog farmer, who now gets 55 or 60 percent of parity.

I think it ought to be made crystal clear that the Senator from Oklahoma in his amendment is not advocating that the Government buy up every hog. What the Senator from Oklahoma is saying is that someone in the Department of Agriculture ought to use his head occasionally, to such a degree that the Department would come forth with a program which would make prices of cattle and hogs at least 75 percent of parity.

The junior Senator from Minnesota comes along and says that in order to make certain that there is some sense and direction to the ideas the Department may use, one idea we would like to present is the matter of premium payments for lightweight hogs and cattle. The premium payment program is well understood in the Department and well understood in the cattle and hog business. It is a program which has overwhelming support throughout the country.

Furthermore, if there has ever been a migration of Senators and Representatives to the White House, it has been on the hog problem. Every day I have picked up the newspapers for the last few days I have observed that delegations from Iowa, Illinois, or somewhere else have been going to the White House, hoping they would get a chance to talk about the price of hogs. But they have come back with nothing in hand. Each time, however, the delegations have returned from the White House, they have unloosed a blistering attack upon the Department of Agriculture, and they even got so courageous as to mention the name "White House" a couple of times.

What we are really trying to do is to say to the Secretary, "We have a problem, Mr. Secretary. We do not want to restrain or restrict you only to purchases. We want you to have the privilege of using loans, purchases, and premium payments as incentives for the marketing of lightweight cattle and hogs."

Every Member of the Senate knows that one of the determined efforts of the livestock industry is to get the farmers to market lightweight hogs and cattle. What we are saying temporarily to the Secretary is: "Here is an incentive system which you can offer to the farmers to reduce the poundage. You do not have to go around killing off little pigs or little calves. Let them be fed, so that they will become well fed, fine, finished products, at a weight, for example, on a hog of 100 or 200 pounds marketed."

When that has taken place, there will be a better product on the market. The poundage will have been reduced. The total available supply will be reduced as the poundage is reduced. The price will come up the normal market place, thereby reducing the amount of the premium payments. It is a built-in, self-regulatory device. It makes good sense. In fact, it makes mighty good sense to anyone who studies the problem. It has made good sense to the farmers of Iowa, so far as I have been able to find out, and also to the farmers of Minnesota.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the purpose of the Senator's amendment to reduce the hog surplus, and thereby raise the price in the market place, and then, also, to stop at a given time in the market place?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. How many hogs would be bought under this plan?

Mr. HUMPHREY. They would not be bought.

Mr. CAPEHART. For how long would the plan be continued?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under the plan, the hogs would not be bought at all—that is, under the Humphrey plan. The farmer would be permitted to market his own hogs wherever he has been marketing them. If the Secretary establishes a regulation that he wants 200-pound hogs, and the cash price in the market place is below 75 percent of parity or 81 percent of parity, the Secretary may offer $1 or $2 per hundredweight in order to get the farmer to market his lightweight hogs.

Mr. CAPEHART. The limitation is to be effective so long as hogs are below 75 percent of parity. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Whenever the price is above that figure, the Secretary would not buy hogs?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under the amendment, it would be 81 percent, because of the price support level on corn. There is a direct relationship between the price of hogs and the price of corn.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, when the parity price of hogs is 81 percent, the Secretary would no longer have to buy any hogs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He would not.

Mr. CAPEHART. Hog raising would then be on the free market.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is sought to be done is simply to try to reduce the surplus of hogs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The poundage.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is surplus. Farmers would be paid for selling their hogs at 200 pounds instead of 220 pounds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Secretary would be paying for 20 pounds. How much does the Senator estimate it would cost to accomplish what he is seeking to do?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The farmer would be paid not to market his hogs at 220 pounds.

Mr. CAPEHART. How much does the Senator estimate the program would cost in dollars?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The estimate will drop, because the Senate rejected the 90 percent support provision; but even under the present situation, the total amount, if we had 90 percent of parity, would have been $198 million a year. With the elimination of 90 percent of parity the amount will be reduced substantially.

For the succeeding year, if the program works as it is expected it will work—because as the weight of the hogs coming into the market place is reduced, the amount of the premium payments will be reduced—it was estimated there would be a cost to the Treasury of about $198 million next year. But that was at 90 percent of parity.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would it be possible to eliminate the present purchasing program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my idea. It would be desirable to do so. I think purchases are all right if they are made soon enough.

Mr. CAPEHART. How would the program work in the case of cattle?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would be the same system.

Mr. CAPEHART. What would be the weight of the cattle to be marketed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The weights would have to be determined by the Secretary.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would there be one weight for cows, one for bulls, one for steers, one for heifers, one for commercials, one for utilities, and one for primes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That would have to be determined by the Secretary, whose expert guidance would determine the desirable weights.

Mr. CAPEHART. I can see how the program might work in the case of hogs, but I do not quite understand how it will work with respect to cattle, because a cow weighing only 800 pounds may need to be marketed. Another one may be larger, but the farmer might want to market her, after milking her for a number of years. I do not see how the proposal would be practical at all in the case of cattle—that is, with any degree of equity to the farmers themselves.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My amendment would provide that the program could apply to cattle or to hogs. Personally, my amendment in the committee related primarily to hogs.

Mr. CAPEHART. Furthermore, will not the farmer with the good cattle, or cattle which I think would come within this category, get hurt? He will get hurt on the commercial and utility grades. I think it might be possible to work out a premium for commercial and utility grades of cattle, or on culled cows, so that the farmer would not get hurt on those grades. I do not see how such a program would work on cattle, although I can see how it might well work on hogs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not profess to be an expert on this subject at all. I have had persons come to me and talk primarily about hogs. I felt that a program which was designed for hogs would be workable and practical, as the Senator from Indiana feels. I felt, however, that the Secretary ought to have the option or the right, so to speak, to design the program, if he could.

Mr. CAPEHART. I would be inclined to vote for the hog program, and I might vote for the cattle program if it were withdrawn, examined over the weekend, and proposed separately on Monday. I might favor a program with respect to cattle if I could be shown how it would be practical or possible to operate it on cattle.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If it was not practical, the Secretary would not have to adopt it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think he would. I think if Congress passed a law relating to cattle marketing, the Secretary would have to do something about it.

I think the two provisions ought to be separated. For the life of me, I do not see how such a program will work in the case of cattle. Why not separate the hog provision from the cattle provision, submit the amendment as it relates to hogs, and then come back on Monday to see if there is a practical way to operate a program affecting cattle.

I think we will be helping the fellow who needs help the least. Those who need help on cattle at the moment are the farmers who raises utility and commercial cattle, or, in the Senator's State of Minnesota, dairy cows. How is it proposed to help the farmer particularly on dairy cattle?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It depends on whether he wants to sell them or cull them.

Mr. CAPEHART. He has to sell them. He culls them out. My best judgment is that there will not be much compliance with such a provision.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I have been rather surprised to learn that the Senator from Iowa is opposed to the pending amendment, because only a few weeks ago he announced to the press that he was in favor of the Secretary of Agriculture's doing what is proposed, provided it was confined to female hogs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He does not believe in equal rights.

Mr. LANGER. He suggested to the Iowa farmers that the Secretary of Agriculture be allowed to pay a premium on female hogs, in order to keep down production.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota that there is no greater interest anywhere in what is happening to the hog producers than there is in the Midwest, particularly in Iowa and southern Minnesota.

I think the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] made a very fruitful suggestion a moment ago, insofar as reserving my particular amendment to hogs was concerned, and including it in the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, which covers both cattle and hogs.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not see how it would work on cattle.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to join in supporting the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. I have pending at the desk an amendment designated as 2–24–56–G, an amendment sponsored by myself, with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], as cosponsors, which would establish the same program provided for in the more concise amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, covering incentive payments for early marketing or lighter weight marketing of hogs and beef.

If the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota shall be adopted, I feel that would take care of the situation, and I shall not offer the amendment on behalf of myself and the cosponsors.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that I have had an opportunity to talk with quite a number of hog and beef producers in my own State and elsewhere, and they feel that the pending amendment, which, as I have said, provides for the inauguration of the same program provided for in the amendment I had prepared, with other Senators for submission, will give some stability to the prices of pork and beef, and that, in the end, it will cost less, or not any more, than the present purchasing program, that it will eliminate the surpluses, and enable the Secretary of Agriculture to keep supply and demand in even balance.

This amendment proposes to increase the income received by cattle and hog producers, improve the quality of meat products purchased by consumers, thereby increasing consumption, and prevent wide fluctuations in supply and price such as have occurred in recent years. This proposal would accomplish its purposes without restricting livestock production and without imposing any controls or regimentation of farmers. It would require only a relatively small Government expenditure, with the maximum expenditure occurring in the present marketing year. In the ensuing

years the need for Government funds would decrease. Administration costs would be at a minimum as established agencies would be utilized. There would be no enforced compliance and no policing.

To explain the operation of livestock marketing premium payments, I shall discuss their application to hog production and marketing.

During the past year hogs came to market on the average at about 240 pounds. The premium payment plan proposed would seek to attract hogs to market at 200 pounds, which would mean a cut of 40 pounds of live weight or 24 pounds of dressed pork per animal, on the average.

If every hog came to market at 200 pounds instead of 240, it would be possible to cut the total pork production by 16 percent. However, a cut of that size is not necessary.

The 1955 dressed pork production was 10.8 billion pounds, only 2 percent above the 10-year average figure. Authorities have estimated that a cut of some 800 million pounds of dressed pork would have corrected the supply situation and prevented the price break.

In 1955 we had about 74 million hogs come to market from a total pig crop of 91 million. In 1956 we will have somewhere between 75 and 77 million hogs come to market from a potential pig crop of 94 million.

The hog numbers on farms as of January 1, 1956 were about 4½ million above the same date in 1955. With plentiful supplies of cheap feed available, there is no question that price trouble will continue in the raising and handling of hogs.

The Department of Agriculture in its outlook report predicted hog prices for 1956 at just slightly under 1955. That prediction appears very optimistic at the present time.

The Secretary of Agriculture and some of his advisers intend to leave hog producers in this situation. They say that any aid would encourage overproduction. In fact, although they seem finally to be recognizing that cheap feed has resulted in cheap livestock, they seem to be bent on policies which will result in still more cheap feed and more cheap livestock.

The low prices hogs and cattle are bringing in the markets today are the direct result of the cheap-feed policies of the administration.

These prices are not due to an unmanageable supply situation in the hog industry.

Compared with the previous 10-year period, 1955 hog numbers were up 7 percent and total marketings were up 6 percent. However, because the hogs were marketed at lighter weights than in previous years, the total dressed pork production was only about 2 percent above the 10-year average.

But it does not take a large surplus of hogs or any other farm product to break the market. We have had trouble with milk for several years, with only a 6 percent surplus, and we had trouble with eggs a year ago with a 4 percent overrun.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks a table showing hog cycles and price extremes.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hog cycles and price extremes

Year	National pork production	Percent above or below normal [1]	Price extremes in cycles	
			Month	Price
	Million pounds			
1945	10.6	+1	January	13.80
1946	11.1	+4	do	14.10
1947	10.5	−1	October	27.10
1948	10.0	−4	September	27.40
1949	10.2	−3	December	14.80
1950	10.7	+1	August	21.70
1951	11.4	+7	October	20.20
1952	11.5	+8	December	16.10
1953	10.0	−4	September	23.80
1954	9.9	−6	April	26.50
1945–54 average	10.6			
1955	10.8	+2	December	10.60

[1] 10-year average.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this table shows the hog cycles and and price extremes over the past 10 years. At no time has the production been more than 8 percent above normal nor more than 6 percent below normal. Yet the prices have swung in wide cycles below and above parity, in some cases as much as 27 percent above parity and 50 percent below parity.

These fluctuations are unnecessary and are a detriment to both the hog producer and the consuming public.

If in 1956 one-third of the 75 million hogs can be brought to market at 200 pounds instead of 240 pounds, the supply of pork can be cut back sufficiently to bring prices back to a range of 90- to 100-percent of parity.

The bill provides for premium payments of $1 to $3 per hundredweight to producers for marketing their hogs at the lighter weight.

The incentive payment plan would come into effect as a preventive measure at any time the pig crop was greater than the 10-year average or at any time that the farmer's price falls below 90 percent of parity. If the farmer's price is between 85 and 90 percent of parity, the premium payments would be $1 per hundredweight. If the price were between 80 and 85 percent of parity the premium payment would be $2. At any time the price would be below 80 percent of parity, the premium payment would be $3 per hundredweight.

These premiums payments would be sufficiently large to replace the farmer's net income from raising hogs to a heavier weight, and would therefore be large enough to attract participation by farmers.

It is a self-regulating plan which seeks to avoid surpluses rather than to try to cure them after they happen.

There are several points about this plan which it is important to emphasize:

First. It would encourage the raising and marketing of leaner, more desirable pork and thereby promote greater consumption of pork products. Pork consumption per capita in 1955 was about 66 pounds. If per capita consumption was at the 1952 rate of 71.6 pounds, that would mean a consumption gain of about 1 billion pounds of pork, or the equivalent of nearly 7 million hogs.

Second. This plan would enable farmers to keep up the hog number and the productive capacity of the hog industry. If demands were strong an increase in production could be easily made simply by putting a few extra pounds on each hog. But if the pork supply is reduced by marketing brood sows, as has been suggested, it would take a year or more to reexpand the hog population to meet the demand.

Third. This plan is a self-regulating program to aid farmers in helping themselves to keep supply in line with demand. Only the producer who cooperated in making the cutback in marketing weights would get any Government payment.

Fourth. The cost of the incentive payment plan would be moderate. In the first year, with the major adjustment to be made, the cost would run between $150 to $200 million. Once the cutback had been made, the premium payment plan would act as a preventive and cost would be less than half the first-year costs. In the average year, the premium payment plan would be less costly than surplus removal operations.

It is important to point out also what the plan does not do: It avoids pegging of the market prices; it avoids reducing the national hog plant by such methods as marketing brood sows; it avoids Government processing, packing, or storing of pork products; it imposes no quota controls or regimentation upon the individual hog producer.

Of course, this hog marketing premium payment plan must be contemplated as a part of a balanced farm program with 90-percent supports at least on the corn, proportionate supports on the feed grains, and improved supports on such alternative commodities as dairy products.

As a part of a balanced program, the hog plan will not create an incentive to a great increase in the pig crop.

The limit of $1,200 on the amount of payment for which any one farmer may qualify will also tend to discourage an overall increase in the number of hogs.

Further, the gain in per capita consumption which we can expect from a leaner pork product on the market will create a new demand.

Eventually, growers may be raising more hogs but it will be because of the new markets for better pork, not because of the incentive program.

This hog marketing premium payment plan should be put into effect at once, in order to prevent the serious price situation which is sure to prevail considering the hog numbers and the available feed supplies.

Between March 15 and August, about 25 million hogs will be coming to market. If this program could be put into effect on March 15 and if it is successful in bringing hogs to market at not more than 200 pounds, the necessary adjustment in pork supplies could be accomplished even before the fall run begins. And thereafter, the premium payment

plan would be ready on a stand-by basis at any time that supplies threatened to get unduly large.

While the payment plan is brought into effect at any time when prices drop to 90 percent of parity, it is estimated that once the adjustment is made, the market price plus the premium payment will give the farmer an average return in the neighborhood of full parity.

At the minimum, the operation of this plan in 1956 would result in a gain of at least $4 per hundredweight over the average that would prevail for the year in the open market.

Table 2 shows the probable program results in the 10 leading hog States if this plan can be put into operation at a very early date.

I ask unanimous consent that table 2 be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State	Probable marketings, 1956	Gain to farmers through increase of $4 per hundredweight in market prices	Hog marketing premium payments to farmers	Total gain for State
	Million head	*Million dollars*	*Million dollars*	*Million dollars*
Iowa	17.5	140	33	173
Illinois	9.1	72	18	90
Indiana	6.6	52	13	65
Minnesota	5.0	40	10	50
Missouri	5.0	40	10	50
Ohio	4.6	36	9	45
Nebraska	3.2	26	6	32
Wisconsin	2.5	20	4	24
South Dakota	1.9	15	3	18
Georgia	1.4	11	2	13
United States	75.0	600	150	750

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this table is based upon the probable marketings from the several States. Assuming, as predicted in the United States Department of Agriculture Outlook report, that hogs would average about $15 per hundred in the open market for 1946, farmers would have an income slightly lower than in 1955 from the hog marketings. However, under the hog marketing premium payment plan, it is estimated that if one-third of the Nation's hogs were attracted to market at 200 pounds instead of 240 pounds, we would have a sufficient cutback in pork volume to bring market prices at least up to $10 or 90 percent of parity.

In the table, column 2 shows the net gain to farmers in each State by having $19 average prices instead of $15 average prices. Column 3 shows the amount of premium payments going to each State assuming that such payments will be made upon about one-third of the hogs marketed.

Column 4 shows the total gains to farmers in the States through operation of the hog marketing premium payment plan in 1946 if it can be put into operation at once.

The application of this program to beef cattle marketing would operate in exactly the same manner and with the same economic effects and results. National beef production has increased from 9.4 million pounds in 1949 to 13.6 million pounds in 1955. The Department of Agriculture forecasts 1956 production at 13.6 million pounds. Cattle prices have steadily fallen.

I want to emphasize the simplicity of operation of this program. Purchasers of hogs and cattle for slaughter would supply the producer a ticket showing the number of head, weight class, and total weight. Farmers would file for their premium payments simply by submitting their sales tickets to the county ASC committees. Payment would be promptly completed. Inquiries made to marketing agencies and packer buyers indicate that they would be most cooperative in handling the sales to enable producers to qualify for the premium payments.

While the application of this simple and effective program will go far toward relieving the inequities suffered by cattle and hog producers, it must be kept in mind that maximum benefits will be realized only within the framework of an adequate overall farm program. The key to stability in the hog and cattle industries is to establish corn at 90 to 100 percent of old parity, keep the feed grains in proper relationship, retain the corn acreage allotments, and give the corn grower who complies an opportunity to put his diverted acres into the conservation reserve at a rental rate that will fully replace his potential net income from the diverted acres.

If we will take these measures to balance the feed supplies, then the beef and pork supplies can very easily be regulated at very nominal cost under the amendment now proposed.

Mr. President, I had intended to offer the amendment, which will accomplish the same thing. The amendment sets forth in more detail how it is to be approached, and also sets out in more detail the powers of the Secretary of Agriculture. But if the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is adopted, I shall not offer the amendment which is sponsored by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and myself.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much time remains available to the proponents of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents of the amendment have 25 minutes remaining. The opponents of the amendment have a full hour.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is under control.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this amendment is a vastly important one when it is considered in conjunction with the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], to which it is attached. This amendment applies to more than one-fourth of the total agricultural dollar value of the Nation. The amendment proposes to enlarge at one fell swoop, by more than half, all the price-support programs we have ever had.

Mr. President, in order that this particular amendment may be properly considered, it is important for us to realize what the Kerr amendment provides. The Kerr amendment provides a mandatory price-support program on hogs and beef cattle, through loans, purchases, or other operations, at either of two levels: either 75 percent of parity or the current parity price for corn, whichever is higher.

In this year that would mean an 81 percent of parity program for both cattle and hogs, which would mean a price-support program larger in size than anything of the sort we have ever before had for any one commodity, and much larger in size than anything suggested in the pending bill.

Mr. President, I have already called attention to the fact that, without exception, every livestock association about which I know anything—there may be some from which I have not heard; but certainly I have heard from the greatest ones in the country, including the national associations and the associations in the States where I personally went for hearings, and the associations in my own State and in the other Southern States—has gone on record as not being in favor of this kind of a price-support program, and as being very strongly against it.

I have already stated for the record that a committee of the livestock producers of Florida have made a request that we not allow them to become involved in any such program; and they also say that generally they are in accord with the present farm bill. The only change they request is an amendment sponsored by the two Senators from Wyoming—one of whom I see in the Chamber at this time—which will make it very certain and very sure—although I think it is already so provided—that the acreage in the soil bank shall not be grazed during the operation of the soil bank.

Mr. President, the scheme now proposed is entirely contrary to the program included in the original Kerr amendment. I wish to call attention to the fact that that is the case, and that the groups to which I have referred are asking the Congress not to include them within the terms of such a price-support program, before I proceed to a discussion of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

Mr. President, with reference to the Humphrey amendment, which now is submitted to the Kerr amendment, I wish to say that I do not think my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]—and I am sorry he is not in the Chamber at this time—has carefully thought through what he has proposed to encourage the marketing of cattle and hogs at lighter than normal weights, as an addition to a mandatory price-support program for cattle and

hogs. The Senator from Minnesota offered the amendment, or one like it, in the committee; and he has done that on several occasions. He did it in connection with the absence of a price-support program covering all cattle and hogs, and in the hope that by encouraging the marketing of the animals before the time when they otherwise would be marketed, that would take away from the total amount of meat being produced—both cattle and hogs—so as to bring, as a result of that operation, a better end result than the one now being accomplished by the purchase programs which have been invoked. At that time he did not submit his amendment in connection with, as a part of, or as a supplement to, a general price-support program for cattle and hogs. That is the point where the suggestion he now makes, or the amendment he now offers, becomes exceedingly inappropriate and a completely different thing from the thing which was suggested before the committee.

I do not believe the Senator from Minnesota has thought through the fact that the Kerr amendment which he now asks to have changed by the addition of his amendment—not to have his amendment substituted for it, but to have his amendment added to the Kerr amendment—already calls for a mandatory price-support program at 81 percent of parity, under present corn prices; and now the Senator from Minnesota is suggesting this purchase program at lighter than normal weights, in an effort to offer incentives to producers to market their cattle and hogs at lighter weights than otherwise they would.

Mr. President, what does that mean? It means that, as applied to the Kerr amendment, the Senator from Minnesota is suggesting that a change should be made, so as to allow the producer to get more than 81 percent of parity, and to get more when his animal is light than he would get when the animal is heavy. Under the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, the producer would get more than 81 percent, because the 81 percent price-support program applies to the full-grown animals and to all animals that may be offered for sale. As so applied, this particular remedy, as proposed, becomes almost a humorous thing, because in effect the Senator from Minnesota is asking the Secretary of Agriculture to buy the animals when they are light, and to buy them at prices which will induce the producers not to let their hogs and cattle reach full size, at which time they would be able to obtain an 81 percent price-support for them, under the provisions of the Kerr amendment.

Mr. President, I am sorry that not more Senators are in the Chamber at this time; but I wish to make that point perfectly clear, namely, that as applied to the Kerr amendment—which is not at all designed to deal with such a situation—the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota becomes a perfectly ridiculous one, because it would empower the Secretary of Agriculture to use for such purpose as much as he might choose to use of section 32 funds, which normally the Secretary would use for the purchase of animals when they had attained their full weight. Under the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota the Secretary would use those funds for the purchase of the animals before they reached full weight, and before the time when they could be sold at 81 percent of parity-price supports. Such a program is so completely different from anything he has ever previously suggested, and is so completely different from the program which was suggested to us at numerous points during our hearings—although at that time it was always suggested as an accompaniment of a nonsupported economy in the cattle and hog market—that I think that merely to call attention to that fact will be sufficient to show that the present proposal is thoroughly inapplicable to this situation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Would both programs be mandatory?

Mr. HOLLAND. The first would be mandatory, and the second one would be discretionary.

In other words, if used, the Secretary of Agriculture would use it despite his knowledge of the fact that he is already supporting, at 81 percent of parity, the livestock—both the beef and the hogs; and he would have to offer an inducement which would justify a producer of young cattle and of pigs in bringing them into the market at prices such as to enable the return on the animals to be greater than the return on them would be if they were sold after they had been allowed to reach maturity or to reach their full weight. If they do go to market at full weight, under the first part of the Kerr amendment they will be subject to mandatory price support at 81 percent.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator has answered my question. I was wondering if both provisions were mandatory.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Kerr provision is mandatory, and the other provision is a simple authorization, but it becomes a nullity when applied to such a program as this. It was never designed for such a program as this. Instead, it was intended to make more perfect and effective any purchase program with public funds which the Secretary of Agriculture might put to use.

Mr. YOUNG. As the Senator knows, I voted in the committee to authorize the Secretary to take such action.

Mr. HOLLAND. I merely wished to have the Senator understand that if it were attached to this bill in its present form it would be included in a program which would become mandatory, because the Kerr amendment, to which it is sought to be attached, is a mandatory price-support structure which, this year, would be at 81 percent of parity, since that is the current price support for corn.

I note that the Senator is nodding his head. I think the distinguished Senator has seen clearly the difference between the situation in which he supported in committee a discretionary amendment as a better method of purchasing surpluses of hogs or cattle, and the present situation, in which it is sought to be attached to a mandatory price-support program.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this morning I received a telegram from the president of the South Dakota Farmers' Union, Mr. Paul W. Opsahl, of Aberdeen, calling my attention to Midwest press reports dealing with a speech delivered by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, beginning on page 4199. I have not seen the press release which appeared in the South Dakota newspapers, and which I presume prompted this telegram, but I gather, from the tenor of the telegram, that the reading of the news has been interpreted in a way which I feel confident the distinguished Senator from Florida did not imply.

In order to keep the record straight, and in order that the Senator from Florida may have an opportunity to make clear exactly what he did imply, I wish to take a few minutes to set the framework of the Senator's remarks which apparently gave rise to this telegram.

In the course of his remarks, on page 4201, the Senator from Florida directed his attention to an old friend of mine, a member of the South Dakota Legislature, vice president of the South Dakota Farmers Union, Mr. Harold Golseth, of Irwin, South Dakota, one of our respected and responsible farmers.

The Senator from Florida said:

> I first call attention to the testimony of Harold Golseth, vice president of the South Dakota Farmers Union, Irwin, S. Dak., which appears at pages 951 and following of the printed hearings. This is part of his statement:
>
> "We urge the enactment into law of House Resolution 12 at the earliest possible time in this next session of Congress, as a short-range policy. But as a long-range farm policy, we recommend a farm program based on 100 percent parity price supports for family farm or ranch production."
>
> Mr. Golseth continues at great length to justify the case for 100 percent parity price supports. Dozens and dozens and dozens of witnesses throughout the whole area did the same thing. Their program was not confined to 100 percent price supports for the basics, but it included 100 percent price supports for all kinds of agricultural commodities, both perishable and otherwise.

Continuing on the following page, the distinguished Senator from Florida gives some additional unsolicited publicity to another constituent of mine, another able and responsible man, Mr. R. A. Englehorn, of Menno, S. Dak. The Senator from Florida says, quoting Mr. Englehorn:

> We feel that American agriculture is an important and necessary segment of the total American society and is, therefore, entitled to its fair share of the national wealth, demanding that in such a society all farm operators are entitled to 100 percent of parity.
>
> First and foremost is a Federal program operated and supervised at the grassroots

level by the farmers which has for its goal 100-percent parity.

The first step in attaining that goal, we ask for 100 percent of parity support prices on nonperishable farm products and on perishable goods, where possible.

The Senator from Florida then continues to cite other testimony which was given before the committee at various times by members of the Farmers Union in North Dakota and elsewhere, including the president of the National Farmers Union.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to complete the framework of the picture first.

Mr. HOLLAND. I merely would like to get this clear. Is there any contention that I have misquoted any witness in any way?

Mr. MUNDT. No such contention has been made by the Senator from South Dakota up to this point, and he does not intend to make any such contention during the remainder of his remarks.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. On page 4204 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the colloquy takes on a slightly different significance and a different connotation, however, perhaps because of the necessity of condensing a comparatively long speech into a comparatively short article. However, by juxtaposition or arrangement, it appears that an implication has crept out into South Dakota that the Senator from Florida was in one way or another attempting to identify or affiliate these gentlemen with the cause of communism.

I believe this is what gave rise to that implication. On page 4204 the Senator from Florida is reported as having said:

I have confidence that if we stand our ground and give agriculture a chance to regain the essential character of independence it has had, by tapering off some of these programs, and by giving the farmers a chance to determine what the market will take, as we do under the flexible program, we shall see speedy results and speedy resumption of sanity in agricultural thinking throughout the Nation.

We now come to the controversial point. The Senator from Florida stated:

Mr. President, there is one other thing I shall say. It is quite unpleasant for me to say it—

I might interpolate at this point to say that it was quite unpleasant also for these distinguished farmer friends of mine to read this—

but I think it should be said. Before I say it, I wish to state that I do not have the faintest idea that either the officers or the members of the National Farmers Union are Communists or communistic, or that they have the slightest idea that their program is as close to the program announced by the American Communist Party as it is.

That might come under the heading of damning with faint praise the program of the National Farmers Union.

The Senator from Florida continues:

But, Mr. President, the announced program of the American Communist Party happens to be pegged on exactly the same provision as that stated in the National Farmers Union program, and as testified to us at numerous times in our hearings, and as filed with us in resolutions, time after time, making as their first request 100 percent of parity on all agricultural commodities, whether perishable or storable.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the statement not factually correct that time after time during the hearings in the National Farmers Union area the witnesses predicated their first statement of policy—and the resolutions filed did the same—on 100 percent of parity, including both perishable and nonperishable commodities? Is that not correct?

Mr. MUNDT. It is correct that some Members, speaking for the Farmers Union, some other gentlemen speaking for the new National Farm Organization, and other farmers belonging to no farm organization, testified in favor of 100 percent of parity. It is not true, however, that that indicates any affinity or association of their thinking with what the Communist Party has advocated.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand.

Mr. MUNDT. I now continue with what the Senator from Florida has stated in developing his thesis, be it what it may:

Now I shall quote from the pamphlet issued by the national farm commission of the Communist Party of the United States of America, 832 Broadway, New York, published last year. It gives the Communist program for agriculture. It begins on page 9. I shall not quote all of it; but in justice to the Senators who now are on the floor, I think I should read the first plank in that platform or program, which is identical with that of the National Farmers Union. I doubt if more than 1 percent of the membership and officers of the National Farmers Union know that that is the case.

"1. Halt the drop in farm prices."

Mr. President, I am fairly certain that the Senator from Florida does not intend to imply that all farmers and all Senators who would like to halt the drop in farm prices are reading anything from the Communist Party platform or following any Communist precepts.

Guarantee full 100-percent parity for all farm products.

It may be that on that point there is identity of thinking on the part of members of the Farmers Union and on the part of some members of the Communist Party. It is a point of view held by a great many farmers throughout America.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It should be noted that the Communists are constantly proclaiming the fact that they are in favor of peace. That does not mean that someone else, like our President, or a Member of the Senate, who says he is in favor of peace is following the Communist Party line. It just so happens that in this instance the Communist Party is playing for this program in order to entice some people into their network. I believe it is to the credit of the Farmers Union that they have been able to advance a program which has been so meaningful to their people that the most diabolical force the world has ever known has tried to use it as an inducement to get people to join it.

Mr. MUNDT. It certainly does not follow that simply because the Communist Party believes in the law of gravitation, that anyone else who is subject to that law is influenced by Communist Party doctrine.

I continue to read what the Senator from Florida has quoted from the Communist pamphlet.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Communist Party platform.

Mr. MUNDT. The platform; yes.

The Senator from Florida quotes:

"Production payments should be made directly to the farmers, sharecroppers, and tenants to guarantee at least 100-percent parity on all farm commodities. Such payments would make up the difference between what the farmers get in the market and the full parity level, thereby benefiting both consumers and growers. Support levels to be announced well in advance of planting.

"To encourage small and family-type farming, payments under this program should be limited to $15,000 worth of production per year (equivalent to 1,000 units under the Brannan program of price supports)."

Then the Senator from Florida said:

That is the second plank in the Farmers' Union program.

"Every farm would be eligible for this coverage, but large-scale farms would not take the lion's share of payments, as at present.

"Under no circumstances should small and family-sized farms be required to reduce their production."

Then the Senator from Florida continues:

Not only is the idea similar, but that program is completely identical with the key program of the National Farmers Union. The RECORD should very clearly show that such is the case, because I think there are tens of thousands of good farmers throughout the country who are supporting the leadership of the National Farmers' Union and the program announced by that organization, who have not the faintest idea that they are treading as closely as they are to the Communist line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota such additional time as he may require.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Florida. We are trying to clarify a situation in the interest of both the Senator from Florida and of 2 good farmers in South Dakota and 1 of our 4 great farm organizations, the National Farmers Union.

I point out, in addition to what the Senator from Minnesota has said, another illustration of why it seems to me the references and implications and associations suggested by the Senator from Florida are totally inaccurate and unfortunate.

As a Republican, it gives me special pleasure to quote the following, because at this point in the debate yesterday the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] engaged in colloquy with the Senator from Florida. He said:

The distinguished Senator has been in this body long enough to know that about 80 percent of the progressive legislation advocated by the Democratic Party has been copied and aped by the Communist Party.

Certainly, Mr. President, no Republican would say that the Democratic

Party is a Communist party or is led by Communists or has Communist leanings because of that strange affinity between the two organizations which is attributed to them by the junior Senator from Oklahoma. I am a little happy, as a Republican, that the Communists have not aped or copied the Republican platform, but that does not imply any insinuation against the Democrats.

After I read the RECORD I felt that the Senator from Florida wanted no aspersions cast against these South Dakota members of the Farmers Union as to their loyalty and patriotism. He was simply disagreeing with their policies.

I want to take this opportunity to point out that because two organizations at some times and on some issues agree, it does not mean that one is necessarily the thought-parent of the other or that they are handmaidens or associates. It is not true, I am sure, so far as the National Farmers Union is concerned, and it is not true so far as the National Democratic Party is concerned. It is not true of farm programs. It is not true of the law of gravitation. It is not true when two different organizations both are adherents to the cause of peace. It simply does not mean that these chance associations necessarily impugn the patriotism or loyalty of those so associated.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I do not like to let this opportunity pass without mentioning the splendid leadership of our Kansas Farmers' Union. I am personally acquainted with the leaders and directors. I speak of such men as Mr. Martin Byrne, president, and Mr. Fred Meek, vice president and a member of the Kansas Legislature.

These men have the leadership and background which we in Kansas have come to know and respect. They are God-fearing, loyal, and patriotic Americans.

I feel we here must exercise much care and restraint in any accusations made for fear our remarks may be misinterpreted and thus do harm to the reputation of honorable and patriotic citizens. The Kansas Farmers' Union has always been interested in behalf of all our farmers but especially the small family-size farmer.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has brought up this matter this afternoon. At the time when the distinguished Senator from Florida made his statement, he mentioned five distinguished North Dakota citizens. One of them was Mr. Helgi Nygaard, who, for years was president of the State Electrical Cooperative Association. He is a member of the Farmers Union.

The Senator from Florida also mentioned Glenn Talbott, who has been president for over 20 years of the North Dakota Farmers Union with a membership of 37,000 and the distinguished president of the Towner County Farmers' Union, Mr. Elinar G. Grande, also the distinguished president of the Bowman County Farmers Union, Mr. Morris Nelson, and the distinguished legislative director of the Stutsman County Farmers Union, Mr. Rudolph A. Reinpold.

In addition to that, the Senator from Florida mentioned the president of the Nelson County Farmers Union, a distinguished citizen of North Dakota.

Those gentlemen are five of the most outstanding men of our State and not one has the slightest inclination to be other than a patriotic citizen.

Mr. President, in the State of Georgia the voting age is 18 years. Some Senator mentioned the fact that that was also the voting age in Russia. The fact that there is a similar law in the State of Georgia does not mean that there is any communistic affiliation implied.

In the last election the State of Kentucky voted upon the proposition as to whether youths of 18 years of age should vote. It is my understanding that the State of Kentucky has adopted such a law. Would the Senator from Florida allege that the two are communistically inclined?

Mr. President, I, myself, time and time again upon this floor have stated that I am in favor of 100 percent of parity. I am proud of that fact. I have made that statement publicly, and thousands of persons in North Dakota believe the same thing.

I exposed Harry Dexter White upon this floor, and I have consistently voted against communism. Certainly, I cannot be charged with being sympathetic any more than any one of the 37,000 farmers in North Dakota can be charged with being sympathetic to the Communists.

Having been associated with these men for many years, I can express my opinion as to their loyalty, their integrity, and honesty and the fact that they are patriotic American citizens, and that they have done a great job for the farmers all over this Nation for the rank and file of the people. They have for years, fought a good fight for clean government, for the small-type family home, and for enough income so that the small farmers might live decently. Mr. President, I salute Jim Patton, president of the National Farmers Union and Lynn Talbot, vice president, for forthright Americanism. They are great men. I only wish we had a million more like them fighting for the interests of the common man.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota has brought this matter to the floor of the Senate. I am sorry I was not on the floor night before last when the matter first came up, but I read it in the RECORD yesterday. While no farm officials in Montana were mentioned, other farm officials in nearby States were.

I wish the Senate to know that I think the Farmers Union in our part of the country, in the Dakotas, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Montana, have a deep interest in the small family-type farms. They are trying to do things for the good of people who belong to their particular organization. Each year from the State of Montana alone 3 or 4 busloads of them come to find out how this Government is working. They visit the Department of Agriculture, they ask questions, and they visit their Senators and Congressmen on the Hill. I respect them as being good, upright, decent Americans, and I certainly am not in accord with any kind of implication which would try to tie the Farmers Union to the Communist Party.

I have never seen the Communist Party's platform. I would not know where to look for it. But I have seen the Farmers Union platform. I know of their interest in good, sound farm legislation. I think they should be commended. I think they are doing a good job, and I hope they keep on doing the same kind of job in the future that they have during the years gone by. While I do not always agree with them, I respect their views and I am sure they respect mine.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I think this discussion will be helpful by clearing the atmosphere. I certainly appreciate the fact that my distinguished colleague has taken occasion to point out that similarity of goals is hardly proof of an association of ideas. It is said that even the devil can quote Scripture for his purposes.

I know many persons who are identified with the farmers' movement. When I was a Member of the House, I was at one time a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. At that particular time there was some publicity given to the suggestion that a leader of the Farmers Union had been identified in membership with a Communist-front organization. As a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities I asked the staff at that time to dig into the matter and find out if there was any basis for the suggestion. The only thing that could be found was that at one time there was a person in northeast Ohio who had been affiliated at some time with a Communist-front organization. Other than that, nothing could be found in the files or the records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to support the suggestion that the Farmers Union was in any sense led by persons who were members of or in any way identified with a Communist-front organization. I recall making a statement to that effect.

When it comes to personalities, Mr. President, I wish to say that I have known personally the officers of the South Dakota Farmers Union over a great many years, and I have never felt that they were in any sense Communist tainted; in fact, I recall that a couple of years ago someone pointed out that the majority of the directors of the Farmers Union were registered members of the Republican Party.

I might further state that the South Dakota State secretary of agriculture,

Hon. Charles Bruett, who has been in Washington within the past week, has been a member of the Farmers Union of South Dakota. Yet he is one of the most respected secretaries of agriculture South Dakota has ever had. He understands the farmers' problems. He certainly has a deep understanding of human values in establishing a farm program which will encourage the family-sized farmer, and help to make a sound place for young people in agriculture. I am certain the distinguished Senator from Florida meant no personal reflection upon any of those fine people in South Dakota, North Dakota, or the other States, who happen to be members of the Farmers Union.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I personally wish to thank the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for bringing up this matter today. As the Senator from South Dakota knows, it has been my privilege to know Paul Opahl, of the South Dakota Farmers Union, as an intimate, personal friend. He has been a friend of my family for many years. Men like Paul Opahl and Emil Loriks in South Dakota are among the finest citizens ever to have graced this land. The South Dakota Farmers Union has been a bulwark of strength for all that is good for that wonderful State.

The same is true of the Farmers Union of North Dakota. I know Glenn Talbott very well, and I know the work of the Farmers Union in North Dakota. Of all the organizations in that State which have done so much for the people, none can exceed what the Farmers Union has done in North Dakota. It has answered the call of this country in peace and in war, just as it has in South Dakota.

Speaking of my own State of Minnesota, while the Senator from Florida did not refer directly to it, the Minnesota Farmers Union is under the guidance and presidency of a truly magnificent, wonderful, moral, dedicated, patriotic man—Ed Christianson.

Mr. Christianson has done much to bring the message of sound farm programs and of wholesome American democracy to the farm families. He is respected by everyone in our State for his work. He is respected by the leaders of other farm organizations.

I know the officers—everyone of them—of the Minnesota Farmers Union. If there can be found better persons, I wish someone would produce them.

The Senator from South Dakota has pointed out that sometimes there is a seeming identity of program between, let us say, an organization which is thoroughly American and thoroughly patriotic and the Communist Party. The Communist Party is always trying to latch onto something in terms of a popular issue, in order to try to exploit that issue, to gain headway with it, and to gain adherents.

I think one of the finest tributes to the Farmers Union is the fact that it has kept its ranks clean; that it has kept its leadership clean, alert, and dedicated, and has never permitted in the Dakotas or Minnesota, or wherever else I can think of, the Communist Party ever to gain a foothold. Not a Communist can be found in the Dakotas. If they are found there they are such neurotic characters that everybody around knows there is something wrong with them. The same is true in Minnesota.

I think the Farmers Union has done as much good for American agriculture as any other organization I know of, if not more. I pay tribute to them.

The fact that the Farmers Union stands for 100 percent of parity is not unusual. I heard the President of the United States stand for that. The fact that the Farmers Union stands for the same kind of treatment for perishable commodities as for cereal grains is not unusual. I heard the President stand for that in Kasson, Minn. No one can ever tell me the President of the United States is not the most loyal man who ever occupied his office. I admired him for his statement. I only wish now that he would follow the Farmers Union program and put it into effect. If he will do that, we will have the blossoms of prosperity and the good life all over the great rural areas of America.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield, but I hope the speeches will get shorter instead of longer, because I am getting a lot of frowns from my colleagues who are anxious to return to the debate on the bill. I share their desire in that connection.

Mr. YOUNG. The leaders of the Farmers Union in North Dakota have opposed me in almost every election since 1932. Right now, two of their attorneys, Chris Nathan and Quintin Burdick, are associated with one of the most untruthful, scurrilous attacks that has ever been made upon me in my political career.

I know the Farmers Union leaders very well, and none of them are associated with any Communist programs. All of them, even though some of them may be my political enemies, are good Americans.

I have lived among members of the Farmers Union all my life. I was the president of a Farmers Union local at one time. I know of no member of that association who has at any time been even remotely sympathetic to any Communist movement.

Mr. MUNDT. Supplementing what my friend, the Senator from North Dakota, has said, I have been told by a number of members of the Farmers Union, who hold positions of high responsibility, that the national association has revoked the charter of the Farmers Union in Iowa on the basis that the Iowa group was too radical and too socialistic to continue its membership. I think it is clear that, as an organization, the National Farmers Union has no affinity or association with communism.

I point out, in relationship to what my good friend from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] said, that I have had somewhat the same experience he has had with the Farmers Union politically. I have run against most of the officials in the South Dakota Farmers Union at different times. They have been on the other side of the political argument. They have run as Democrats. We have had good, clean campaigns. No questions involving loyalty or patriotism were ever raised.

For some reason or other, Mr. James Patton, national chairman of the Farmers Union, usually alines himself with some Democratic organization and urges the farmers to vote Democratic, in our presidential elections.

Incidentally, I think that is a pretty good indication that there is nothing communistic about the farmers who are the rank-and-file members of the Farmers Union. One of the ways in which to identify a Communist cause is its affinity for complete leadership, always wanting to turn over to somebody on top the right to run the organization. The farmers do not do that. Despite the urging by Mr. Patton, when he gets away from farm legislation and goes into politics, the farmers of South Dakota keep on voting Republican and show their independence and dislike of outside influence.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am very glad the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has brought this matter to the attention of the Senate. I did not know that such remarks as those of the Senator from Florida had been made on the floor. Had I been present, I would have immediately challenged them, because I have many, many acquaintances in Minnesota who are members of the Farmers Union. They are among the most loyal citizens we have in Minnesota.

I know the president of the Minnesota Farmers Union, Edwin Christianson. I have not had the privilege of being acquainted with any finer citizen than he.

I have known members of the Farmers Union in South Dakota and North Dakota.

I think it unfortunate to involve an organization in such a way simply because its members may differ with my views on some legislative question. I believe we have ample room to argue and criticize and find fault legitimately without trying to imply that an organization comprised of members of family-farm units are communistically inclined. In my State there are many small family farm operators who are farming on 40- or 100-acre units. They constitute family farm operations in every sense of the word. Yet they are as loyal to their country as any Senator who stands upon this floor.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I shall not take very much time; I simply wish to say that I am well acquainted with the Farmers Union in my State. I was born in my State. Mrs. Neuberger's family are family-size farmers, who themselves are members of the Grange, but who have many friends in the Farmers Union.

The people whom I know in the Farmers Union are mainly family-sized, dirt

farmers. I have had the privilege of addressing their meetings. This week, shortly after the attack was made upon the Farmers Union on the floor of the Senate, I had breakfast in the Senate restaurant with my senior colleage and 11 members of the Farmers Union from my State, and their wives. It so happens that they are persons who are almost totally outside any farm-benefit program. They are small farmers, who receive hardly any governmental assistance. They are persons who have been beyond the scope of any farm program, either those proposed by my party or those advanced by the other party. This, I think, is hardly fair, in view of the very extensive benefits which have gone to other farmers. Yet the members of the Farmers Union of Oregon have made no complaints. They are interested only in farm programs which are fair, and which are in the best interests of a sound agricultural economy.

I think it was significant, in view of the criticism made of the Farmers Union that several of those families had with them their young sons in the uniform of the United States Army, sons who had come from nearby military camps to be with their parents while they were in Washington.

The Farmers Union of my State is an outstanding organization. There has never been the slightest taint attached to this organization or any criticism made of it in my State, so far as any disloyalty or lack of patriotism is concerned. That is furthest from the thoughts of the public of Oregon. The president of the Farmers Union of Oregon is Mr. Harley Libby, of Jefferson, Oreg., an outstanding citizen and an outstanding farmer.

I think it is particularly significant that on the day this criticism was made of the Farmers Union I received a letter from the able editor of the Oregon Farmers Union newspaper, Mr. Arthur Bone, of Salem, Oreg., in which he adjured me to look with favor upon President Eisenhower's foreign policies.

If there is any disloyalty connected with that, I believe it is very strange. The Farmers Union is an essentially American organization.

I appreciate the fact that the Senator from South Dakota has brought up the matter, and has given some of my colleagues and myself an opportunity to attest to the patriotism, the good sense, the civic interest, the fair play, and the outstanding role as citizens and as farmers played by the members of the Farmers Union.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall yield to both my colleagues on this point, but I think I should yield first to a representative of the prairies of Oklahoma before I yield to a representative of the sidewalks of New York.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator for having said what he has said about the matter on the floor of the Senate. I personally think the remarks of the Senator from Florida were not only uncalled for, but were very unfortunate. The Farmers Union has more than 50,000 members in Oklahoma. I myself am a member of that organization, and have been for 15 years. I wish to say that I favor 100 percent of parity and a farm program that protects the stability of the family-sized farm.

I notice that in one of the advertisements which the Republican National Committee is now paying a good deal of money to run, as the first element of the so-called Eisenhower farm program, their appears the following language:

> Protect family-type farms by limiting the size of price-support loans made to large corporate-type farms.

The Senator from Florida, among other things, in his remarks, said this to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] as appears on page 4205 of the RECORD of March 7:

> If the Senator wishes to say that this program, whether it be the same as that of the Communists or not, is not socialism, if he wishes to say that it is good sound Americanism, all I can say, with much respect, is that I differ completely with them.

I know of no man on this floor who is a better American citizen than is the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], but I want to say that he is not a bit better American than the average member of the Oklahoma Farmers Union. The members of that union yield to no man anywhere in their devotion to their country and its institutions and their loyalty and their patriotism. They have great leadership not only in Oklahoma, but they have great leadership nationally.

I think Jim Patton is one of the outstanding authorities on agriculture in America. Certainly there are those who disagree with him, but I know of no man who has ever before accused him of representing a status or being in a status that is not good Americanism. I think the statement was unfortunate.

I am glad to add my words to what the Senator from South Dakota has said in paying tribute to the Farmers Union for their patriotism and devotion to basic American ideals, and to that great American institution, the family-sized farm.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to say that although I realize the Farmers Union is probably more active in some of the Midwestern States than it is in New York, I have had the privilege of working closely with many of its representatives. I have gained a very high opinion of their loyalty, their vision, their soundness, and their devotion to the interests of the country.

They have fought for the interests of the farmer, but they have also realized that the interests of the farmer and the interest of the working consumer are identical. They are indivisible. What is good for one is good for the other; and if one suffers, they all suffer. If one is prosperous, then it is a pretty good bet that all will prosper.

For 2 years before I came to the Senate, I served, by appointment of the President, as a member of the Advisory Council of the Economic Cooperation Administration, under Paul Hoffman. One of the other members of the board was the president of the Farmers Union, Jim Patton. I do not think there was a more valuable man on the council than he. Throughout his service he demonstrated in every way his loyalty, patriotism, and a desire to be helpful to the people of this country and to the people of the free world. He was a tower of strength, and I gained a great admiration for him.

I thank the Senator for the opportunity of expressing my feelings in the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 5 more minutes to the Senator from South Dakota from my time remaining on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has asked that he be allowed to reserve 10 minutes of his time, and that is all the time remaining on that side.

Mr. HUMPHREY. How much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 20 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to be able to reserve some time, and if the Senator from Florida may wish to say a few words.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am very sure the distinguished chairman will allow me time on the bill to make a brief reply to the kind words of our friends.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois out of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Minnesota yielded me 5 minutes, and I am yielding to the Senator from Illinois so he may ask me a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In approaching the testimonial bench, I wish only to say that in the past few years I fancy that as many as 300 or 400 members of the Farmers Union have called on me, in small and in large delegations. I respect them highly. I have sometimes differed with them very sharply, but they have always been very respectful, well-demeaned, and, in my judgment, they are good citizens, who, like myself, are earnestly searching for some durable and sound solution for the farm problem. So I regard them as good, topflight, loyal, patriotic citizens.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me half a minute?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas, but I had no idea that I would be asked to yield to so many Senators.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall not delay the Senate. I know the president of the Farmers Union in Arkansas. I know the principal representatives, and I have for years. I regard them as fine citizens, who are making contributions to our efforts to find a solution to the farm problem.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. There are not a great many members of the Farmers Union in my State, but the members of the organization in my State are among its most progressive farmers. I have had the privilege of knowing Mr. Patton and other officers of the Farmers Union.

I happen to know that on 1 or 2 occasions when some members or groups showed extreme leanings, or were suspected of Communist leanings, the national organization either withdrew the charter or got those persons out of its organization. So I think it is a very fine farm organization.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I want to say, in conclusion, as I yield back the remainder of my time, that I took the floor simply to correct what I considered to be a false impression gathered by the people back home from what they read in the newspapers about what was said on the floor of the Senate. I did not construe those remarks to be an attack upon the patriotism of the people of my State or upon the farm organizations. But one who gives a speech cannot always control the kind of publicity which flows from the fact that two arguments are placed in juxtaposition.

I wish the record to be clear, and I wish my friend, the Senator from Florida, to know that at no time did I feel that he was casting aspersions at the patriotism of the people of my State or at the members of these organizations. I also wanted the record to be clear that any such aspersions would be completely unwarranted.

Mr. President, I am happy to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if all my brethren who wish to perch upon the Farmers Union bandwagon have now done so, I shall now have a word or two to say. [Laughter.]

In the first place, I wish to say that the power of the press is very great, indeed, and that I am delightfully pleased that the remarks I made the other evening—although in the absence of every one of the distinguished Senators who evidently found it their duty at that time to be elsewhere than on the floor of the Senate—have reached the areas which I hoped they would reach. I hope that the Senators who have not read my remarks on that occasion will read them; and I hope they will then find themselves in 100-percent agreement with what I said.

It is obvious that very few of them have read my remarks. I congratulate my friend the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for having read them, because he seems more familiar with them than are any of the other Senators who have commented.

But, first, let me say that I am distressed to hear that some of my good friends have not had the support of the Farmers Union in their previous campaigns. Several Senators have said so. I hope that situation may be corrected; and if the occasion referred to gives them a chance to reach a better understanding with that section of their constituents, no one will be better pleased than will the Senator from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG. I assure my friend that I am not apt to get their support.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to refer to one thing which the Senator from South Dakota did not reach in the course of his remarks, although I saw that he had it marked for presentation. Probably he failed to reach it because he was interrupted by so many of his distinguished colleagues. I refer to another quotation which I also placed in the RECORD—which was placed there with the same reservations which I applied to everything else I said in the course of my remarks about the fineness of the quality of the people who appeared before us, and, as we believed, who did so with complete ignorance of the fact that they were working for a program which I personally think was highly socialistic; and I said so then, and I say so now, and I shall say so at any other place or time. I do not believe they had any idea, either, although I think the publicity which since then has been given to the matter has given them a chance to get the idea now—that the program for which they were so earnestly working happens to be the program of the Communist Party.

The quotation I just mentioned that my distinguished friend, the Senator from South Dakota, did not quite reach, was a quotation from the book of directions of the Communist Party in 1954, giving its members directions as to what to do in various fields, or giving them recommendations, and containing the following statement, in particular, in reference to agricultural legislation—and this is the quotation which I am sure the Senator from South Dakota found:

> We urge support for the progressive farm demands of the National Farmers Union.

Mr. President, I began my remarks on this point after having stated repeatedly, in quoting the statements made by the very fine folk who appeared before us, that they are very fine people; that they have furnished boys to the armed services, just as have the good people of every other section of the Nation; and apparently they come from sturdy stock. I also referred to the fact that many of them come, I am sure, from very fine Scandinavian stock, than which there is none better. I also said that I decried greatly, and was distressed to find the loss of independence, the loss of self-confidence, the loss of any apparent willingness to stand on their own feet and face their own problems and shape their own production of agricultural commodities in accordance with the law of supply and demand, which had developed in their particular areas, where 90 percent price supports had, I thought, done very much to undermine the morale of those very fine people.

Senators will find that in each instance, and in every word I said, I was very careful to say that I had never been more kindly treated or more generously treated by finer or better people, and that I was distressed to find the existence of a condition which I felt it was my duty to discuss on the floor of the Senate, because I think it is very much the business of the American people to pay attention to the fact that our program has apparently been a large contributing cause to the destruction of the ruggedness and independence and fine character and fine qualities of some of the finest people we have, and has contributed to taking away from a large segment of the American people those fine qualities, for which American agriculturists have been noted throughout the history of our Nation.

The Senator from South Dakota read some of the things I said in regard to making sure that nothing that I should say would be regarded as a personal reflection. I shall read again some of those statements. I think I began by saying:

> It is quite unpleasant for me to say this, but I think it should be said here. But before I say it, I wish to state that I do not have the faintest idea that either the officers or the members of the National Farmers Union are Communists or communistic.

I think that all Senators who have spoken on this matter seem to be of the same impression. However, I am glad that my statement has come to the attention of the folk in the areas concerned, because I am very glad to have them consider the fact that they are making their bed with the Communists, in this particular regard; and I am very glad to have them consider again how socialistic their program is, because I do not think they can reach any conclusion whatever other than that a program or demand for 100 percent price supports from the United States Government for every storable product and for every nonstorable product—which is what their program is—and that the program be limited to family-size farms, and be predicated on the announced intention of forcing a redistribution of the land and a redivision of the products of the soil, as stated by them over and over again, is anything but socialism pure and simple.

If any Senator wishes to differ with me on that point, that is his privilege; but, Mr. President, that is my opinion of what socialism is, and that is my opinion of the result of what had been accomplished by giving to such good people a crutch which they have used for so long that they have forgotten even how to try to stand alone. It is that situation I regret; and it is that situation I want them to consider, and that I hope they have considered. I contrasted what I found in the price-support areas with what I found in New England, in areas where not a single witness who appeared took such a position, and where every witness who appeared wanted to be allowed to solve his own problems, and stood up like a good American and said, "We are able to face our own problems and to solve them in the traditional American way."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will permit me to complete my statement, then I shall be glad to yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, let me say that I know that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota is exactly correct in saying what he has said about the attitude of many members, at least, of the National Farmers Union toward himself. My respect for the distinguished Senator from North Dakota is as high as my respect for any person could be. I have seen him among his own people, and I have seen him here on the floor of the Senate. I have the highest respect and personal affection for him, and I think he knows that perfectly well. Not for anything would I say a word to hurt him with his people; and if I have done something here which has helped him help himself with a part of his people, that is a source of very great pleasure to me.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, there are some Senators, like myself, who are a little sensitive about what the Senator from Florida said the other day—and for a very good reason: About 2 years ago, a Washington farm newsletter associated the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and myself with the Communist movement because we were in favor of 90 percent price supports. I know the Senator from Florida did not mean that, at all. But, naturally, we were a little sensitive about that, when we saw that statement.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I can appreciate the fact that there must have been some supersensitive souls around here, because there was nothing in what the Senator from Florida said that should hurt anyone. If it has caused the good people in the field to reexamine their position and to realize that what they have been asking the Government for, in a very demanding way, is socialism, I shall be happy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I have 5 more minutes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. With reference to the various statements made by me, let me say that I made it very clear in those remarks—and I wish to make it clear again—that I would have felt that I was derelict in my own duty to Senators, to the public, and particularly to the membership of the particular organization about which we are speaking, the National Farmers Union, if I did not call attention to what I had seen and heard with distress in the course of the hearings, from people whom I knew to be good people, as I have stated time and time again—generous people, good American people, but people who, either because of bad leadership or because of having been told for so long a time to depend on Government support and Government handouts that they have lost their own character, their own independence, and their own self-reliance; people who have drifted into a situation in which I thought someone ought to say something to make them realize just exactly what had happened to them.

What I have said this afternoon has been said in a kindly spirit. What I said the other night was said in a kindly spirit. I was distressed that Senators were not present in greater numbers. I remained in the Chamber for 2 hours listening to the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] before I had an opportunity to take the floor. I do not believe any Senators who have mentioned this subject this afternoon were present on that occasion. I am sorry they were not present. My speech was not made under a bushel basket. My present speech is not so made. It is an American talk. Whether Senators like it or not, I am sure every one of them knows in his heart that there is too much softness, too much loss of morale, too much weakness and overdependence on Government. We are not happy about it. I have heard some of the Senators who have spoken this afternoon comment on that same subject.

I do not have to apologize to any Member of this body for my service to my country, either in time of peace or in time of war. The record is available to anyone. I do not have to apologize for the service of any of my sons or brother, or any other members of my family, in every war since the Revolution. I am a good American; and as a good American, I am not going to see things like this happening to good people in our Nation and not come here and say on the floor of the Senate what I have seen in the course of the performance of senatorial duties. I would be derelict in my duty if I did not say on the floor of the Senate that this situation is wrong, and that it ought to occasion serious thought on the part of every Senator and every other American, because it involves a weakening of character and a decadence in America which causes me the utmost of concern and the greatest of distress.

In conclusion, let me say that I recant not a single word I uttered the other night. I did not hear anyone say that I misquoted anything out of the record; and I did not. I did not hear anyone say that I had misstated a single thing, either from the record or outside the record; and I did not. I did not hear anyone say that I had made any false or unkind charge about anyone; and I did not. I was careful to call the attention of the public and of those affected to the fact that they were drifting, that the condition was not good, and that the American people ought to be concerned about it. I say it again, just as loudly as I can.

If as a result of the publicizing of those few remarks the other night among some thousands of good people they will be caused to examine their own attitudes, I shall be happy. I am sure that the great majority of the members of the organization in question are just as fine people as we have anywhere. If my remarks cause them to have occasion to reexamine their own programs, their own attitudes, their own requests, and to measure their own qualities and character against what I think is the standard American quality and character, I shall feel that my statement was very properly made and very timely made, and I shall be very happy, indeed, that it was called to their attention. I am sure that they are just as good people, just as good Americans, as any of us. I am sure they do not want to be found drifting into the spineless character which has so thoroughly manifested itself in some of these areas.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for half a minute?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wish to say that at some future time—I hope by Monday—I shall read the record of Senators who voted on the floor of the Senate for the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], providing for 100 percent parity in farm prices, so that we may find out who, in the opinion of the Senator from Florida, is a Socialist, and who is not.

I have the highest respect for the junior Senator from Georgia. I do not think there is any Member of this body who is more patriotic or honest. He offered an amendment providing for 100 percent of parity. Certainly that is not communistic. It is not socialistic. I intend to read the record.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity today to discuss the question which has caused some travail and concern among Members of the Senate.

Let me say most kindly that the comments which have been made in the Senate as to our concern are not nearly so important as the comments which have been made among the people as to their concern.

I constantly note in this body how much respect we have for one another. We address one another as "distinguished." We address one another as "able." We pay one another compliment after compliment. The people who deserve compliments are not confined to the membership of this body. They are the people out in the great American constituency.

I wish to say very frankly that the members of the Farmers Union are the kind of people who, year after year, have repudiated any form of socialism, any form of communism, any form of fascism, and have embraced by their labor, their love, their dedication, and their religion, the finest traditions of Americanism.

I am rather surprised to hear anyone say that if a farmer is for 100 percent of parity he is for socialism. The Dixon-Yates contract received 100 percent price support from the Government. No one accused that concern of being communistic. There was a 100-percent guaranty.

On virtually every American home, with few exceptions, there is a 90-percent guaranty. We in Congress passed housing bills to provide housing for family units, to build the family-sized home; and the Government of the United States underwrites 90 percent of the mortgage guaranty.

If this is to be described as socialism, I think we are paying far too much tribute to the regular socialists. The best way I know of to make people join the Socialist cause is to identify what we are doing in the United States as socialism. We are trying to make the private enterprise economy work, and we are trying to make it work within the system that is ours in the United States.

The farmers of America are more dedicated to private ownership than is any other group in the country. If there is any group in the country which really represents private enterprise, it is the family-sized farm. They are not corporations. The farmers own their own land, subject to a mortgage. They believe in private enterprise so much that they pay not only the principal but the interest. They pay their taxes. They contribute to their churches. Sociological studies have proved that the family-sized unit in this country is better for the normal community than any large aggregation of land. The Senator from Florida says he deplores the attitude of those who testified for 100-percent parity. He said it contributes to taking away the independence of the people.

I remind the Senator from Florida that there are no more independent people anywhere in the world than the farmers of Minnesota.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There are no more independent people in the world than farmers—period. They are truly independent people. The Senator from Florida said that he is worried——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will yield in a moment. The Senator from Florida said he is concerned about the loss of morale and about too much softness. The farmers I know are not soft. When you shake their hand you shake a hand hard and crusty from hard work. They have soft hearts, but they have keen and alert minds. There is no lack of morale in the countryside. Let us not be worrying about their morale. Their morale is good. It is good enough so that they are willing to fight for their rights. They are fighting for justice. They are fighting for equity. They are fighting for fair play. They are fighting for recognition. I regret that this Congress is unwilling to give them equity and unwilling to give them justice and unwilling to give them fair treatment.

We give all kinds of special privileges to other groups. We give all sorts of special treatment to large financial and corporate interests. We write tax laws to take care of special interests. However, when it comes to Mr. Farmer, when he asks for a modicum of support and when he asks for help, we tell him, "This is too much."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. We may disagree on the principle of 100 percent of parity. However, when a man asks for a 100-percent crop loan, he must put up collateral. Maybe it is his steer or hog or crop, his grain or his corn, or his cotton, or whatever it may be. That is just as good collateral as the collateral big business puts up. In fact, it is better. One can eat that collateral. One can eat it or wear it or use it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I conclude by saying that I am distressed when I hear the insinuation or implication that there may be something wrong with the farm people in terms of their morale and their general moral tone. There is something wrong in terms of their economics; and as they fall deeper into the economic mire, of course they will ask for aid from their Government.

At one time the American countryside was threatened by communism, and that was when American agriculture was at the bottom of the pit, in 1932 and 1933. Yes; the Communist movement was making converts. There were more Communists under Herbert Hoover than at any other time in the history of the United States. The records of the FBI show that the Communist Party had its largest membership under Herbert Hoover. It has had its smallest membership in the past 10 or 15 years. The one way to keep communism from growing in this country is to let farmers and workers and businessmen go on making a good living. They are only asking for an opportunity to make a living in cooperation with their Government. This is their Government. They have a right to ask for things from their Government. The Government does not belong to us. We are the hired men and the servants of the people.

If the farmers wish to testify for 150 percent of parity, that is their privilege. Indeed it is their privilege, although we do not have to comply. Senator after Senator has proposed bills for 100 percent of parity. I voted for a bill sponsored by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] for 100 percent of parity, for a bill introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for 100 percent of parity, and for a bill sponsored by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] for 100 percent of parity.

Some of us may say at times that that is going too far, but I point out that the administration has sponsored a program for wool, which gives wool producers 117 percent of parity. Apparently anyone who voted for that program is a Communist plus 17 percent. [Laughter.] Of course it does not mean that. It was a program which was designed to be of help to a group.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to the Senator from Florida—so that he may know it—there is no better American than the American farmer. I believe we ought to agree that we can argue about this issue without implying that other people who disagree with us may be following some kind of pattern which is inimical to the interests of the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that a price-support program calling for 100 percent Government price supports on all farm products, both perishable and storable, on a family-unit basis, with the announced purpose to force thereby a redistribution of land and a division of the profits of the land, is socialism, pure and simple?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator very much. We are in definite disagreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The announced policy of the Eisenhower administration and of the Truman administration is land redistribution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is——

Several Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state the question. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish first to modify my amendment on page 1, line 5, by striking out the words "and directed."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may so modify his amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] wishes to offer an addition to my amendment, which is acceptable to me. I would appreciate it if the Senator from Tennessee would state his proposed modification of my amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I would add on page 2 at the end of line 2, the following:

> No producer shall be eligible to receive incentive payments under this act totaling in excess of $1,200 in any calendar year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota modifies his amendment accordingly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understand, the modification of the Senator from Tennessee provides a $1,200 maximum premium payment for any one participant under the proposed price-support program.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. That is in response to the criticism made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. The language was contained in the original amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may we have the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The question is——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will first put the question. The question is on agreeing to the modified

amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McNamara
Allott	George	Millikin
Anderson	Goldwater	Monroney
Barkley	Gore	Morse
Barrett	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Murray
Bender	Hennings	Neely
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Butler	Ives	Purtell
Byrd	Jackson	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kefuaver	Scott
Chavez	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Knowland	Sparkman
Curtis	Kuchel	Stennis
Daniel	Langer	Symington
Dirksen	Lehman	Thurmond
Douglas	Long	Thye
Duff	Magnuson	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Welker
Eastland	Mansfield	Wiley
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Young
Flanders	McCarthy	
Frear	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the Kerr amendment as well as on the Humphrey amendment to the Kerr amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is my understanding that the Kerr amendment proposes price supports for livestock, while the Humphrey amendment would authorize incentive payments for cattle and hogs at light weights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They will be voted upon separately.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] the following:

LIGHTWEIGHT CATTLE AND HOGS

SEC. 106. (a) In order to encourage the marketing of cattle and hogs at lighter than normal weights, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make incentive payments to producers who market cattle and hogs at lighter than normal weights.

(b) Such payments shall be made from funds appropriated by section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress (49 Stat. 774; 7 U. S. C. 612c), as amended, and shall be in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purpose of this section. No producer shall be eligible to receive incentive payments under this act totaling in excess of $1,200 in any calendar year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—41

Barkley	Jackson	Mundt
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Clements	Kefauver	Neuberger
Douglas	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Langer	Russell
Ervin	Lehman	Scott
Frear	Long	Sparkman
Fulbright	Magnuson	Stennis
George	Mansfield	Symington
Gore	McCarthy	Thurmond
Hennings	McNamara	Wiley
Hill	Monroney	Young
Humphrey	Morse	

NAYS—53

Aiken	Daniel	Martin, Iowa
Allott	Dirksen	Martin, Pa.
Anderson	Duff	McClellan
Barrett	Dworshak	Millikin
Beall	Ellender	Pastore
Bender	Flanders	Payne
Bennett	Goldwater	Potter
Bible	Green	Purtell
Bricker	Hayden	Robertson
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bush	Holland	Schoeppel
Butler	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Jenner	Thye
Carlson	Kennedy	Watkins
Case, N. J.	Knowland	Welker
Cotton	Kuchel	Williams
Curtis	Malone	

NOT VOTING—1

Smathers

So the modified amendment offered by Mr. HUMPHREY to Mr. KERR's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 61, as follows:

YEAS—32

Barkley	Hennings	Langer
Chavez	Hill	Lehman
Clements	Humphrey	Long
Douglas	Jackson	Magnuson
Ervin	Johnson, Tex.	Mansfield
Frear	Johnston, S. C.	McNamara
Fulbright	Kefauver	Monroney
George	Kerr	Morse
Murray	Russell	Symington
Neuberger	Scott	Thurmond
O'Mahoney	Sparkman	

NAYS—61

Aiken	Duff	McClellan
Allott	Dworshak	Millikin
Anderson	Eastland	Mundt
Barrett	Ellender	Pastore
Beall	Flanders	Payne
Bender	Goldwater	Potter
Bennett	Gore	Purtell
Bible	Green	Robertson
Bricker	Hayden	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bush	Holland	Smith, Maine
Butler	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Ives	Stennis
Capehart	Jenner	Thye
Carlson	Kennedy	Watkins
Case, N. J.	Knowland	Welker
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Wiley
Cotton	Malone	Williams
Curtis	Martin, Iowa	Young
Daniel	Martin, Pa.	
Dirksen	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—2

Neely Smathers

So Mr. KERR's amendment was rejected.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR DOUGLAS McKAY OF HIS CANDIDACY FOR REPUBLICAN NOMINATION FOR SENATOR FROM OREGON

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Eisenhower administration is losing one of its most able and loyal team members. I understand that Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay has filed today in Oregon for the Republican nomination for Senator.

During this administration, Doug McKay has been one of the stalwarts in carrying forward the President's progressive program for all of the people. Under his guidance, the Department of the Interior has achieved a remarkable record of effective public service and at the same time has accomplished striking advances in the conservation and development of our natural resources.

Doug McKay is a symbol of integrity in Government. Throughout his public service career in Oregon and on the national level, he has adhered to the principles which have made America great.

His competence is reflected in the progress made by the Department of the Interior during the past 3 years.

With his leadership, the Department was able to add acres by the tens of thousands to our wildlife refuge and management areas. The Department succeeded in unlocking millions of acres to development, thus adding to our gross national product for an expanding economy. The Department encouraged Congress to tighten up certain laws, to minimize unwise, wasteful misuse of public areas.

Doug McKay recognized the necessity for planning for the future, and acted accordingly. He gave complete support to bold planning by the National Park Service, to effect improvements in the national park system so that generations of tomorrow might still possess areas of natural scenic beauty and historic significance.

Under his guidance, the Department has encouraged partnership with State and local groups both public and pri-

vate, to achieve maximum orderly development of our natural resources, consistent with sound conservation practices.

Achievements of the Department have been numerous. Not all of them have been spectatcular, but everyone has contributed to our Nation's well-being through proper management of our vast natural wealth.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I, too, have just learned that Douglas McKay is filing for the Republican nomination for Senator in Oregon.

I heard this news with mixed emotions.

I am sure that Doug McKay's comprehensive knowledge of this Nation's natural-resource problems will be of incalculable value when put to work from a Senate seat in the Congress of the United States. For this reason, I rejoice in his decision.

On the other hand, I regret exceedingly that Doug McKay's services as Secretary of the Interior are forfeited because of this same decision.

The 35th man to serve as Secretary of the Interior during the Department's 107-year history, Doug McKay has filled this position in an outstanding manner. His determination to serve all of the people affected by his Department with fairness and justice has been evident in his every action as Secretary.

Doug McKay's unswerving devotion to his job stands as a guidepost in public-service history. This dedication to the public good has been demonstrated again and again during his years in public office—as mayor of his hometown of Salem, Oreg., as a State senator in the Oregon Legislature, as Governor, and as Secretary of the Interior.

Since he has been Secretary, Doug McKay's Department has made rapid progress in every field of activity in which it is engaged. The Department has effected numerous improvements in operating procedures, all designed to serve the public efficiently and effectively, and at minimum cost to the taxpayers.

The integrity of public lands set aside for parks, monuments, wildlife refuges and similar areas has been preserved and strengthened under Doug McKay's guidance and leadership. He has stood firm against undue encroachment upon these areas, and with his encouragement the Department has moved to improve them.

An outstanding and recent example is his all-out support of Mission 66, a National Park Service program to develop a vastly improved national park system to accommodate the anticipated public use of the areas in the next decade.

Under Doug McKay's leadership, his Department has fulfilled its responsibilities admirably in the field of defense mobilization, and has performed with equal merit in resource management areas.

Despite persistent criticism—all of it very unjust—of his administration of the Department, Doug McKay has not deviated from his course in serving the American people equitably and fairly. He never has neglected the public interest in any of his actions.

His critics have dubbed him "Generous Doug" McKay. They are quite correct—but not in their derogatory sense of the word. Doug McKay has been very generous with his time and talents, in the service of the people of Oregon and the United States. I am certain that he will continue to be in the future.

I am sorry that we are losing him as Secretary of the Interior, but take comfort in the probability that he will return to Washington to serve as a United States Senator for Oregon.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Inasmuch as announcements are in order, I wish to announce, in case our colleagues in the Senate are not conscious of the fact, that the distinguished and able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has also filed for United States Senator from Oregon.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I call up my amendments identified as "2-27-56—E."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 7, line 9, after the word "corn", to insert the word "peanuts."

On page 8, line 24, after the word "corn", to insert the word "peanuts."

On page 11, line 8, after the word "corn", to insert the word "peanuts."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not think the amendments will occasion any debate or opposition. All they do is permit the farmer who produces peanuts to relinquish or release to the soil bank so much of his land allocated to him for peanuts as he may elect to do.

I have talked with the chairman of the committee, and he and other members of the committee advised me that there would be no real opposition to the amendments; that the provision was left out of the bill originally because it was not believed that many acres of peanut land would be allocated to the soil bank or would be released to the soil bank.

That may be true, but it is possible that some acreage may be released, because peanuts are a very soil-exhausting crop, and in the soil areas that are adapted to peanuts, timber will grow rather rapidly. It would be in the interest of many of our farmers to put some of their allocated peanut land into the soil bank, if they wish to do so.

That is all the amendments undertake to do. The proposal simply gives to the peanut growers the right to release their land to the soil bank, just as in the case of cotton, wheat, and other crops.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have discussed the matter with several members of the committee. There is no objection to the amendments proposed by the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield back his remaining time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I yield back all time remaining to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I call up for consideration my two amendments, identified as 3-6-56-A and 3-6-56-B.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendments, as modified, be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator requests that the amendments be considered en bloc.

Is there objection? Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The clerk will state the first amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, at the end of line 9, it is proposed to insert the following:

Before any producer is entitled to receive any compensation for participating in the acreage-reserve program, he must first enter into a contract with the Secretary, which contract shall, in addition to such other conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary, contain provisions by the terms of which such producer shall agree:

(b) In the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract at any stage during the time such producer has control of the farm and that such violation is of such a substantial nature as to warrant termination of the contract, to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract, to refund to the United States all payments and grants theretofore received by him thereunder during the crop year in which the violation occurred, and to forfeit all, none, or such part of such price-support benefits he may otherwise be entitled to receive for such year under the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and to refund to the United States all, none, or such part of such benefits theretofore received by him under the provisions of said act during the crop year in which such violations occurred, as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate.

(c) In the event that the Secretary determines that for any year there has been a violation of the contract but that such violation is of such a nature as not to require or warrant termination of the contract, to accept such payment adjustments and forfeit such benefits under the contract and under the price-support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and to make such refunds to the United States of payments and benefits already received by him during such year under the contract and under said act, as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of my amendment, identified as 3-6-56-B, be dispensed with. I may say that the amendments are identical in language. One applies to the reserve acre section and the other to the conservation acre provisions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment will be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I appeared before the committee during the hearings on this bill. I urged then that strong penalties be provided to prohibit grazing on the diverted acres under the soil bank section. Everyone agrees that nothing should be done by this legislation to make worse the situation presently confronting the cattlemen of this country. Our cattle population reached an all-time high of 97½ million as of January 1 last. It increased over 9 million head in the last 4 years. During that same period of time the total value of all cattle declined from $15 billion to $8 billion. The average value of cattle declined from $179 per head in 1952 to $88 per head on January 1, 1956. It is obvious that we would be in a terrible situation today were it not for the fact that the consumption of beef has increased from 61 pounds per person per year in 1952 to 82 pounds last year. It is estimated, Mr. President, that the 40 or 50 million acres in the soil bank could support an additional 15 million cows.

For that reason, Mr. President, we are simply asking here that the language in this bill make it clear beyond question that on both the reserve and the conservation acres of the soil bank that if the Secretary finds that the producer has substantially violated the contract and grazed the land that then the Secretary is authorized to withhold all benefits under the soil-bank provisions and, in addition, all, none, or part of the support-price benefits due the producer that year. In the event the Secretary determines the violation is of such a nature as not to warrant a termination of the contract he is authorized to impose lesser penalties.

I offered these amendments, Mr. President, in behalf of myself, my colleague the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the following Senators: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WELKER.

The second amendment offered by Mr. BARRETT, for himself and other Senators, is as follows:

On page 13, strike out lines 10 to 19, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(6) (a) In the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract at any stage during the time such producer has control of the farm and that such violation is of such a substantial nature as to warrant termination of the contract, to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract, to refund to the United States all payments and grants theretofore received by him thereunder during the crop year in which the violation occurred, and to forfeit all, none, or such part of such price-support benefits he may otherwise be entitled to receive for such year under the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and to refund to the United States all, none, or such part of such benefits theretofore received by him under the provisions of said act during the crop year in which such violation occurred, as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate.

"(b) In the event that the Secretary determines that for any year there has been a violation of the contract but that such violation is of such a nature as not to require or warrant termination of the contract, to accept such payment adjustments and forfeit such benefits under the contract and under the price-support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and to make such refunds to the United States of payments and benefits already received by him during such year under the contract and under said act, as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say these two amendments were intended to strengthen provisions which are already in the bill. So far as I am concerned, there is no objection to them.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator is correct. I may say, however, that no penalty is provided under the reserve-acre section of the bill and the penalties under the conservation section are in the alternative, and, consequently, we believe they should be strengthened in both particulars.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I desire to concur in the statement of the Senator from Vermont. The amendments simply expand on the language we now have in the bill.

Mr. President, the amendment marked "A," as modified, requires persons participating in the acreage-reserve program to enter into contracts containing such provisions as may be prescribed by the Secretary. The amendment requires that such contracts contain provisions prescribing penalties for violations thereof.

These penalties, where violations are such as to warrant termination of the contract, would consist of forfeiture of rights to receive further acreage-reserve payments and such future price-support benefits as the Secretary may deem appropriate, and the requirement that the producer refund such acreage-reserve and price-support benefits already received during the year in which the violation occurred, as the Secretary deems appropriate. Where the violation was not such as would warrant termination, the penalties would consist of such adjustment or forfeiture of future acreage-reserve and price-support benefits, and such refunds of acreage-reserve and price-support benefits already received for the year in which the violation occurred, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

The amendment marked "B," as modified, requires that contracts entered into under the conservation-reserve provisions of the bill contain provisions prescribing penalties for violations of such contracts.

These penalties, where violations are such as to warrant termination of the contract, would consist of forfeiture of rights to receive further conservation-reserve payments, forfeiture of such price-support benefits to which the producer might be entitled for the year in which the violation occurred as the Secretary deems appropriate, and the requirement that the producer refund such conservation-reserve and price-support benefits already received during such year as the Secretary deems appropriate. Where the violation was not such as would warrant termination, the penalties would consist of such adjustment or forfeiture of future conservation-reserve and price-support benefits, and such refunds of conservation-reserve and price-support benefits already received for the year in which the violation occurred, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Do the Senators in charge of the time on the amendments yield back the remainder of the time?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do the same, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All the remaining time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

The amendments, as modified, were agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning with line 15, on page 36, it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 5 on page 46.

On page 46, in line 6, it is proposed to strike out "VI" and insert "V."

On page 46, in line 9, it is proposed to strike out "601" and to insert "501."

On page 48, in line 4, it is proposed to strike out "602" and to insert "502."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not labor the amendment very long. It will strike out the entire rice title of the bill.

I think the reason for the amendment is rather obvious.

Mr. President, in the interest of the schedule which the chairman of the committee [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] are trying to pursue, I am willing to withdraw the amendment at this time, if it is set for first consideration on Monday, when we resume.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, that will be agreeable, unless at that time we have failed to complete action on some amendment which had been taken up today; in which case, I am glad to agree to have consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois follow our action on such an amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, Mr. President. With that understanding, I withdraw my amendment, and shall resubmit it on Monday.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest that the amendment be submitted now, so that it may be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. However, the amendment merely strikes out the rice title of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think it advisable for notice of the

amendment to be given, and for the amendment to be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is agreeable to me, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and will lie on the table. At this time, the amendment is withdrawn from consideration.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "3-8-56-I", which I submit on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. This is the amendment which will strike out the mandatory supports for millable wheat at 90 percent of parity. The amendment is as follows: On page 2, beginning with line 3, to strike out down to and including line 14, on page 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, beginning with line 3, it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 14, on page 3.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as I have stated, the amendment is identified as "3-8-56-I."

I think the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who is interested in this matter, should be on the floor. I wonder whether at this time we may have a quorum call, until the Senator from North Dakota can have time to return to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That may be done by unanimous consent.

Is there objection to giving unanimous consent for that purpose? The Chair hears none.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum; and I request that the time required for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, the time required for the quorum call will not be charged to either side.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, inasmuch as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is now in the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. As I have stated, Mr. President, the amendment will strike out the provision for mandatory supports for millable wheat at 90 percent of parity. The reason for striking that out is that this provision really requires 90 percent of parity for almost all wheat of the 1956 and 1957 crops. As stated in the committee report, the Department of Agriculture is presently discounting support prices for 23 undesirable varieties of wheat; but these 23 undesirable varieties account for only 31 million bushels of the production, out of a total of 985 million bushels produced in 1954—that is to say, only 3.1 percent.

Therefore, the real question is whether wheat shall be supported at a mandatory level of 90 percent of parity—since virtually all other varieties would be considered millable wheat.

Yesterday the Senate declined to continue 90 percent mandatory supports for three other basic commodities. Unless this amendment is agreed to, so that this provision is taken from the bill, wheat will be the only one of the five basic commodities we have been discussing for which 90-percent supports will be mandatory.

Basing eligibility for price support at 90 percent of parity on the variety of the seed used, rather than on the actual output of a crop, does not constitute a sound basis for determining support levels.

Mr. President, I may say that the Department has labored for many, many years to find a method by which higher supports could be given to wheat according to quality. The Department, however, has not been able to work out a feasible plan for that, other than to adjust the support price downward 20 cents a bushel in the case of a few undesirable varieties. It would not be feasible to check the seed actually used for planting.

Also, the quality of a variety is affected by climatic and other factors. So a variety which might be good millable wheat in one area, might not be good millable wheat if grown in some other section of the country.

Neither is it possible to make all the chemical and other tests which are required in order to determine the baking quality and the cooking quality of wheat. The Secretary now presumably has authority to provide discounts in support prices, based on quality factors; and he has done so to the extent feasible. That is to say, on the 23 varieties he has announced that he will discount the support price 20 cents a bushel, I believe.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, Mr. President, presently owns 805 million bushels of wheat, and has outstanding loans on 316 million bushels more. As I have said, unless this provision is stricken from the bill, wheat will be the only commodity, aside from tobacco, on which supports will be mandatory at 90 percent.

It is true that possibly 3 percent of the crop could be supported at lower levels; but when we support 97 percent of the crop at the mandatory high level, we are in effect supporting the whole crop.

That, in brief, Mr. President, is the reason why it is proposed to strike from the bill the mandatory price supports for millable wheat.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, first, I move to amend the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] by striking out, on page 3 of the bill, in line 14, the words "and 1957 crops", and inserting in lieu thereof the word "crop", so as to make the amendment apply only to this year's crop.

The method of supports provided under this amendment is exactly what the Secretary of Agriculture is now doing, except on a more extensive scale. The Secretary is discounting some varieties of wheat now at 20 cents a bushel. I believe these varieties should be discounted more. Certain varieties of wheat now being processed are good only for feed purposes. To continue the program we have had for several years, that of providing as high a level of support for the poorest quality wheat the farmer can grow as for the top quality, would break any kind of price-support program.

There was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning a part of a letter from Secretary of Agriculture Benson to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], in which he stated, in part, that he would give the cotton farmers 86 or 87 percent of parity. I have no quarrel whatever with that. The surplus situations with respect to wheat and cotton are almost identical. We have on hand about a year's supply, enough to met our domestic requirements plus the anticipated or expected exports. Wheat producers have done a little better job this year in bringing the supply down to the level of our needs. Our wheat production this year has been about in line with our domestic needs plus exports. If the opponents of the amendment would be more likely to support it at 87 percent of parity, which the Secretary has promised for cotton, I might be willing to consider that figure. But I do not believe that would give as much to the wheat farmer as we are now giving to cotton producers, because the average support under this provision would be between 85 and 87 percent of parity.

The bill provides that the minimum support shall not average less than 75 percent of parity. That means that the Secretary can support some of the poorer quality of wheat at less than 75 percent if he so desires. So it is not giving more to wheat than to cotton, and I do not think it is as much as we are giving to corn.

Under the corn provision, the corn farmers will be given 6 million acres more than they would have had under the law on the statute books today. If we were to give wheat farmers 6 million additional acres, plus the 81 percent supports, which the corn farmers have, I think every wheat farmer would take it.

I think this provision is only fair. It would give to the wheat farmer only a part of what the cotton farmers and the corn farmers are now getting.

Most people look upon wheat farmers as being big farmers. Thirty percent of all the wheat grown is grown by farmers who have less than 25 acres of wheat. Fifty percent of the wheat grown in America today is grown by farmers who have a maximum of 50 acres of wheat. I know of no better way to help the smaller farmers of America.

Certainly, it is a step in the right direction to base price supports on quality.

I hope the amendment of my friend from Vermont will not prevail.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield myself as much of 5 minutes as I need to make one matter clear.

First, I wish to say that I have every sympathy with the desire of the wheat growers who produce high quality wheat to get better supports than those who produce low quality wheat. It is simply an administrative impossiblity to work out the problem along the lines which this section of the bill provides.

I should like to say a word about the comparison of the supports given the wheat growers with those which it is proposed to give the cotton producers.

In the first place, unless we can change the standard grade and staple for cotton for price support purposes, in all probability the Secretary cannot establish price supports for cotton at 86 or 87 percent of parity. That proposal is contingent on changing the base grade, which would have the probable effect of lowering the support price of cotton about 1.6 cents.

However, wheat growers do have an advantage over using a transitional parity, which is not enjoyed to the same extent by the cotton growers, under the old parity formula, which would be $2.51 a bushel. Under the new parity formula it would be $2.19 a bushel. Under the transitional parity formula which is being used this year, the parity price for wheat is $2.38 a bushel. While wheat is being supported at 76 percent of the transitional parity, that would be 82½ percent if the new parity were in effect.

It is true that wheat supports are dropping about 13 percent this year. If the change in the base grade of cotton is made, price supports for cotton will drop about 10 percent. In fact, they will probably drop about 10 percent anyway.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not true that wheat takes a harder rap under the modernized parity formula than any other commodity? It loses about 30 cents a bushel.

Mr. AIKEN. One can say that wheat suffers a greater letdown under the modern formula than the other basic commodities do; or one may say that wheat enjoyed greater benefits under the old formula than did other commodities. It depends on how one looks at it.

I point out that in the past 6 years, under the International Wheat Agreement, wheat for export has been subsidized to the extent of about $800 million. Had half that amount been spent in subsidizing the export of cotton, there would be no surplus cotton left in the country. I do not think there has been any export subsidy on cotton since the early days of World War II, when, as I recall, an export subsidy was paid.

While it is true that the proposed supports for cotton are only 10 percent below those of last year, and the supports for wheat 13 percent below last year, it is also true that, had cotton, in the past, enjoyed the same benefits in the way of subsidies that wheat had, cotton would, beyond a doubt, be supported at 90 percent today.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I desire some time on the other side of the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] as much time as he desires.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What will the first vote be? Will it be on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] or on the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first vote will be on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. WILLIAMS. May we have that amendment stated? It is my understanding that the Senator from Vermont was moving to strike out all of section 102.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was wondering if the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota should be considered an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont, or an amendment to the bill itself. I have no objection to his offering his amendment, but I think it should be offered to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from North Dakota would perfect the language which the amendment of the Senator from Vermont would strike out.

Mr. WILLIAMS. May we have that paragraph read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from North Dakota takes precedence over the motion to strike out.

The amendment of the Senator from North Dakota to the amendment of the amendment of the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 14, it is proposed to strike out "and 1957" and change the word "crops" to "crop", so as to read:

This paragraph shall be applicable only to the 1956 crop.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not quite clear. The amendment of the Senator from North Dakota reads as though it were directed against the bill, whereas the amendment of the Senator from Vermont would merely strike out all the language. I wonder if the vote on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota should be considered a vote on an amendment to the bill, rather than an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if it is agreeable—and, of course, it must be—I ask unanimous consent, in accordance with the proposal of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] that the bill be amended by striking out the words "and 1957" on page 3, line 14, and changing the word "crops" to "crop." However, I do not wish to jeopardize the position of my own amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair state the parliamentary situation.

The reason why the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] takes precedence over the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is that the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota is a perfecting amendment to the text of the bill, whereas the amendment of the Senator from Vermont proposes to strike out the entire section.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota takes precedence, but I understand also that his amendment is an amendment to the bill, rather than an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the point I was raising.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe there is no objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota originally had stated that his amendment was an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont. The Senator from Delaware is correct. The amendment of the Senator from North Dakota is an amendment to the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. A point of order, Mr. President. Is it not appropriate to present the unanimous-consent request propounded by the Senator from Vermont, to permit the Senator from North Dakota to amend the bill in the manner he wants to amend it before we have a vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the Senate may vote on the Young amendment at this time. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, it is true that wheat exports have been subsidized for years. However, the subsidy of the United States is one of the lowest in the world. Wheat is probably the most international commodity of all commodities. It is produced in almost every country of the world. Our subsidy for the export of wheat is the third lowest in the world. Even Turkey provides a higher subsidy for export than does the United States, and we lend Turkey the

money with which to pay its subsidy on exports.

Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. YOUNG. No agricultural commodity is as much in demand as wheat. It has been the staff of life for 2,000 years or more. People can live on bread and water alone. Our country wisely undertook years ago to subsidize the export of wheat under an international wheat agreement. Wheat falls into an entirely different category from any other commodity.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota that I hope the provision he espoused in the committee will prevail. The 90 percent principle as it applies to cotton has been done to death on the floor of the Senate. Some of the votes against it were cast by Senators from wheat States. However, the Senator from North Dakota himself has always stood four-square for 90 percent supports. Although cotton has been eliminated from 90 percent supports, and stands in danger of being stricken further, I shall vote with the wheat farmers, even though the Senator's amendment, incorporated in the bill in committee, does not affect my State.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I deeply appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Georgia. He and I have stood shoulder to shoulder on the farm issue, to protect the cotton farmers and the wheat farmers. I intend to give them my support at all time. I appreciate the support he has given us.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG. I, too, thank the Senator.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I happened to be out of the Chamber when the Senator from North Dakota discussed his amendment, which is now in the bill. I would appreciate his explaining it briefly.

Mr. YOUNG. It would give 90 percent support to the best quality wheat. The support could not go below 75 percent. Therefore, we have more flexibility in the amendment than under the Anderson Act of 1949, and just about as much as we had under the Aiken Act of 1938. It would give 90 percent for top quality wheat. That is what the Secretary is doing at this time. The language accentuates the program in the right direction, and, as amended on the floor, provides only a 1-year program.

Mr. CARLSON. As I understand, the language provides 90 percent support for milling quality wheat for 1 year. Is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I dislike very much the use of the word "flexible." I have become somewhat allergic to the mere mention of that word. Nevertheless, I shall support the Senator's position if it is agreeable to the wheat farmers.

Mr. YOUNG. The language in the bill, section 102, would encourage farmers to plant good quality wheat. If they plant good quality wheat, they will get 90 percent support. If they do not plant that grade, they will not get it. I think that is as it should be.

Mr. RUSSELL. That makes it less likely that the Government will have considerable losses by virtue of accumulating inferior quality wheat.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is an incentive to plant better wheat. Is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG. It will create more markets domestically and abroad.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator agree with the suggestion offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that only about 3 percent of the wheat produced would be eligible for the 90-percent support?

Mr. YOUNG. I suppose this year all but about 3 or 5 percent would be eligible. The bill sets up an advisory commission—which would be advisory to the Secretary of Agriculture—to determine in the future what is millable quality wheat and what is not millable quality wheat, and to advise the Secretary of Agriculture in that regard.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Only a relatively small proportion of wheat would be eligible to 90-percent support. Is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG. No; almost all of it would be eligible.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It has been my understanding that most of the dark Northern wheat has been sold on the market at 90 percent of parity or better.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. Good quality wheat last fall sold at a premium as high as 60 cents a bushel over the support level. Much of the wheat has been sold for 40 to 50 cents a bushel below support. That indicates how badly this program is being operated under the present method. It indicates why we should embark upon a new program.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the advisory commission which is to be appointed makes the judgement I anticipate it will make with respect to wheat, I do not see how it could possibly cost the Government very much to maintain this incentive for growing good milling wheat.

Mr. YOUNG. I think it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico as much time as he may need.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the language in the bill sponsored by the Senator from North Dakota I am sure looks in the right direction. I know he wants to get good quality wheat. However, I do not believe there should be any misunderstanding as to what we are voting on. This is a 1-year 90 percent support provision for wheat. Ninety-six percent of the wheat produced is milling quality wheat or of a standard that produces milling quality wheat.

The bill does not provide that the wheat produced shall be of milling quality; it merely provides that so long as the farmer produces a grade that ordinarily produces milling quality wheat, it shall have 90 percent support.

I believe it is very difficult to work out exactly what the Senator from North Dakota is trying to achieve. I believe he would like the wheat farmers to receive premiums for very good wheat, and Congress made such provision in the case of durum wheat when that was brought to the attention of Congress by the Senator from North Dakota. Congress did say that there might be unlimited plantings of durum wheat, up to a reasonable amount. It gave an opportunity to expand the crop because the people who were using it had to pay premium prices for it.

If the same thing could be done for all varieties of wheat there could be very little objection to the amendment, but in view of the vote which was taken on 90 percent supports yesterday, it would be strange indeed if the Senate should reverse itself and say, "We will not have it for cotton, but we will grant a 90 percent support price for 1 year on wheat." One year carries it through an election year, but that is not a very effective way of handling the matter. I think it will complicate the whole structure, because someone will say, "We have done it 1 year for wheat. Why not do it 1 year for cotton, and 1 more year for corn"

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Am I correct in my understanding that we have a year's supply of wheat on hand?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the supply situation on cotton is a little worse. We have 13 million bales of cotton, and we have 800 million bushels of wheat. It takes about 225 million to 250 million bushels of wheat for us to have good housekeeping arrangements, so that it will go to the mills at the proper time. We have something like 800 million bushels of wheat at the present time, and it will be very difficult to dispose of it. As was pointed out the other day, the International Wheat Agreement was handled on such a basis that we were able to sell wheat at 50 or 60 cents a bushel. It is now up to 87 cents, and we are unable to move it. We shall subsequently have to make the price $1 a bushel.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I have a letter from Lloyd N. Case, Director of the Grain Division, in which he says the subsidy rate of the International Wheat Agreement presently is 61.80 cents a bushel, and for the fiscal year 1954 to 1955 the rate was 74.85 cents a bushel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to have it in the RECORD, because a statement was

given to us a short time ago that the present level was up to 87 cents.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 6, 1956.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: In accordance with your telephone request, the following are the average subsidy rates paid for wheat under the International Wheat Agreement and applicable subsidy rates recorded on Commodity Credit Corporation sales at IWA prices but outside of IWA quotas, based on records of our Fiscal Division, CSS:

International Wheat Agreement

	Cents per bushel
Fiscal year 1954–55	74.85
July 1, 1955, through Jan. 31, 1956	61.80

CCC subsidy not under IWA

	Cents per bushel
Fiscal year 1954–55	73.80
July 1, 1955, through Jan. 31, 1956	71.80

Very truly yours,

LLOYD N. CASE,
Director, Grain Division.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. They could possibly be some difference in the manner in which it is exported. I imagine we do not have subsidies that come out even and they probably vary from day to day.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it correct to say that the subsidy mentioned in the letter is in addition to the price supports, and, as a matter of fact, this particular industry has had about $800 million worth of subsidies by way of a two-price system under the International Wheat Agreement and otherwise, to enable it to keep up its export levels?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. The Senate has decided it will not support a 90-percent program. Even though it is called a milling-wheat program, about 96 percent of all wheat would qualify under this amendment. If the Senate wants to reverse itself and vote for 90 percent supports it has that privilege, but I think we should know what we are voting on when we do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not a fact that there is a year's supply of wheat on hand by way of surplus and that wheat growers, more than any other group of producers, have had very strong support in their export business under the International Wheat Agreement and otherwise, amounting to approximately $800 million? Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I am wondering if the Senator from New Mexico really believes that a price support of 90 percent would make any difference in the yield of winter wheat this year.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, I think not.

Mr. CARLSON. On that basis, then, it would not make much difference whether the support price were 90 percent or any other figure, so far as production is concerned. The only place it could have any effect would be in the spring wheat area. In the winter wheat belt, the only thing to do would be to plow up growing wheat.

Mr. ANDERSON. To plow under growing wheat. We have had a great deal of talk about plowing under every third row of cotton and killing little pigs.

Mr. CARLSON. I am sure the Senator from New Mexico does not think the farmers of Kansas or any other wheat-growing State are going to plow up a growing crop of wheat and receive in return under the acreage reserve 60 or 70 percent. I do not think they are going to do it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think so, either.

Mr. CARLSON. In fact, I think this is the most logical amendment that has been offered during the entire discussion, not because I represent a wheat section, but, in the first place, the soil bank will not be of any benefit to the winter-wheat section. Second, it will not reduce the surplus. Therefore, I hope the Senate will give some consideration to those two points.

Mr. ANDERSON. I say again, Mr. President, that I am not going to worry about what the Senate does with this amendment. I think it is a bad amendment only because it revives the question of 90-percent supports.

I am sure the purpose of the Senator from North Dakota is to try to get good quality wheat, but it is an extremely difficult problem. He has made the best approach to it that he could take. I do not question his motive, but, from my standpoint, it is only one more 90-percent amendment, and, therefore, I shall oppose it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from South Dakota 10 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will give careful consideration to the amendment which is now before it, because this is the only place in the entire bill that we can do anything positively of benefit to the vast number of wheat farmers scattered across the length and breadth of this land. If we were to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont, wheat would have the status of a Little Orphan Annie. It would be the only product condemned to be worse off in 1956 than it was in 1955.

On most of the farm products of the land the Congress has had to put on little patches of special legislation to meet the problem. That is being done with cotton. It was done with rice and tobacco. We have adopted the Hickenlooper amendment with reference to corn. We have done a little for the farmers who will get 81 percent of parity, but if we pass the Aiken amendment we shall have taken away not only the support prices, but we shall have compelled the farmer to suffer greater cuts and reductions in income than last year and a still greater disparity in the cost price of wheat which is already driving him to despair.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask what the amendment would take away from the wheatgrower which he already has today?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. It will take away an additional number of acres, and part of his present price support level.

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, no. It would take away something the Senator proposes to give him. It will not take away anything from what he now has. If there is to be no bill at all, he would still have exactly what he has today.

Mr. MUNDT. Except that he has a constant shrinkage of his acreage under the formula of the bill, and a lowered price support.

Mr. AIKEN. It would take away something of what the Senator from South Dakota proposes to give him, in addition to what he has today.

This morning we gave our wheat growers a boost of 50 cents a bushel in the support of sorghum. That will help tremendously those in the winter wheat area. I am told that; I have never raised sorghum. But the amendment the Senate is now considering does not take away a thing which the wheat grower has today. It simply takes away something from what the Senator from South Dakota thinks the farmer ought to have in addition to what he has today.

Mr. MUNDT. It takes away from him his comparable position with other producers, because, as was pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Kansas, the passage of the bill at this time will also preclude the farmer from enjoying the benefits of the soil bank in those areas where wheat has already been planted. Adoption of the provision in our committee bill would open the door of the soil bank to the wheat farmer, as under the corn amendment we have sought to open the doors of the soil bank to the corn farmer.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The distinguished Senator from Vermont asks what will be taken away from the farmer. It is true the amendment will not take away anything. It has been taken away. It will have that effect if the amendment applying the law to the wheat crop in the calendar year 1956 only shall be permitted to stand. There will be a 27-cent-a-bushel reduction on the commodity loan for the 1956 crop.

What is proposed by the provision is to reinstate, on what is recognized as acceptable milling quality wheat, 90 percent supports, but that which is not accepted as a millable quality of wheat will go into the feed values, or the 75 percent bracket.

That is what is proposed in the so-called wheat provision in the bill, which the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont proposes to strike from the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. President, I do not wish to yield any further at the moment, until I have

had an opportunity to develop my argument.

I point out further that even the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], with his vast information on agricultural matters, and despite the fact that he supports the Aiken amendment, stated that this proposal "looks in the right direction." I add that it looks in the same direction as the President's message on agriculture.

The President said he hoped Congress and our committee would try to find a way in which price supports could be geared to quality. This is a step in that direction. This will be a 1-year experiment, to see whether the program will work as well as the Senator from North Dakota hopes it will work, or as poorly as the Senator from New Mexico fears it will work.

But, in all events, in that year the wheat farmer will be provided with his sole chance, as a result of the agricultural bill passed this year, to get the benefits from the soil bank program and the benefits from the price supports, which will help to protect him against the cost-price squeeze.

As the Senator from Kansas has pointed out, the proposal certainly cannot increase the production of wheat in any area where wheat has already been planted; and in the areas where wheat has not been planted, there are two built-in gadgets which will help reduce production.

By planting the quality of wheat destined for production as milling wheat in the area in which it is planted, the farmer is required to upgrade his operation in order to qualify for the 90-percent support price.

That means that those who would try to grow quality wheat on land and in a climate which is not destined to grow it will not produce it. It means that those who would plant as many acres as they could in an area where a bountiful crop of poor grade wheat could be harvested will produce a smaller number of acres, but will get a higher quality wheat.

So the proposal moves in good directions. We provide the farmer with an opportunity to participate in the soil bank, and also to enable him to get price supports on quality production, plus the fact that the proposal will help to reduce the big surpluses which exist in the wheat areas.

I think we would be derelict in our duty to permit an agricultural bill to pass in 1956 which by one gadget or gimmick, or another does something for tobacco and rice, does something for cotton, does something for corn—and I hope we are going to be able to help the livestock producers—does something for the other feed grains, but says to the wheat farmer, "So far as you are concerned, we have picked you out to be the all-American sucker. You can go down the drain."

I do not believe Congress wants to do that. I do not believe the Senate wants to do it. I do not believe the administration wants to do it. I do not believe our friends from the South, where cotton is grown, want to launch that kind of attack on the wheat farmers. I do not believe the farmers who raise tobacco want to single out the wheat farmers and make them the whipping boys. I do not believe Senators from urban areas want to reject the fact that the wheat farmer is entitled to the same kind of justice and fair play, the same kind of protection, for at least 12 months, while we find out how the soil-bank procedure works, while we have an opportunity to study more efficient and effective methods to gear price supports to quality wheat, and at least enable the wheat farmer to meet the challenge of increasing costs in the year in which we are presently living.

So I implore Senators, on this particular measure, to give us a 12-month breathing spell; to give us an opportunity to bring the wheat farmer into the picture, whereby we are trying to do something to help the entire segment of American agriculture.

If we reject the proposal, we deprive the wheat farmer of a better parity formula; we deprive him of his price supports. We may find in July that the International Wheat Agreement has expired without being renewed, because the British are raising a considerable amount of opposition to the agreement.

I do not think the Senate or Congress or the administration wants to pick on the wheat farmer; but that is certainly what will happen if we do nothing.

I implore Senators to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], modified, as it has been, to cover a 12-month period, in order to afford an opportunity to give some element of justice for so short a time at least to so many farmers who raise wheat.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Is it not a fact that in 1954 wheat was supported at $2.24; and that under the 76 percent of parity it will be supported at $1.81 in this year, 1956? That would be the top price for milling quality wheat.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. If the percentage figures are to be reduced to the price per bushel, which the farmer receives for his product, it is a shocking thing, so shocking that I think no Senator who understands the facts will want to subscribe to it by his vote in a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I simply want to reenforce what has been said by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

I wish to make an argument for the small-business men who live in towns in the Wheat Belt of the country. First, I think all we are trying to do is to eliminate the nondiscriminatory features of the bill in relationship to the wheat producer. We are seeking to relate in principle the wheat producers to what we have already done for the corn producers and some of the other grain producers.

We cannot justify a discriminatory bill, a bill which discriminates against some farmers and gives benefits to others. I want all farmers to receive equal treatment. That is what the Senator from South Dakota was, in effect, saying. When we take into account the difference between the support price which milling wheat will get and the support price which nonmilling wheat will get, the final average support parity for wheat will be somewhere between 86 and 87 percent, in round numbers. I am not going to quibble over some slight difference. At least, under this amendment, we shall be doing for the wheat producers what, in effect, we have already done for the corn producers and some of the other grain producers. I think that is only fair and equitable.

As a member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate, I give Senators my word that the merchants in the small towns who rely for their income on the wheat areas are not doing so well. They are not doing so well because the wheat producers are not doing well. We may as well face the fact that the purchasing power of the wheat producers has dropped. Their purchases in turn have dropped. Many of them are buying on credit.

I also wish to say that in the last 10 minutes I have discussed with one of the wheat producer leaders of my own State, who is within the precincts of the Senate, the effect of the amendment on the wheat producers of my State. He said it would be of great help. Let me emphasize, it would be of great help to the merchants in the so-called wheat towns to have the purchasing power of the farmers brought back to somewhere near a decent level.

I think the arguments which have been made by the Senators I have mentioned make a clear-cut case for the amendment.

I wish to thank the Senator from South Dakota, who, in this instance, as in so many others, has risen on the floor to fight for justice and equity for the wheat producers. We are not asking for any advantage. We are asking for equal treatment. The amendment is aimed at that purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I think the matter now pending before the Senate deserves the earnest consideration of those who are responsible for the record of this Congress. I wish to direct my remarks to those who will be responsible for the record the Republican Party is going to make in this Congress, and to those who will be responsible for the record the Democratic Party is going to make in this Congress.

Last year wheat was supported at 82 percent of parity. This year it is going to be supported at 76 percent of parity, unless the section proposed to be eliminated shall be kept in the bill, or some other takes its place.

What is the record on the pending bill? We have already established a situation whereby cotton will be supported at 86 or 87 percent of parity. In

this connection I refer my colleagues to the letter which the very able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] read a few days ago. Cotton will be supported at 86 or 87 percent of parity. Under the Hickenlooper amendment as adopted, corn is going to be supported at 81 percent of parity. But, unless the section 102 on page 2 shall remain in the bill, wheat will be supported at 76 percent of parity in the absence of other action.

I doubt that that is the record the Democratic leadership or the Republican leadership wants to make. I do not believe the Senate or the Congress or the administration wants a record written that will say, "We give 87 percent to cotton for 1956 and 81 percent to corn for 1956, but when it comes to wheat, which is a basic commodity, we give it a 76-percent deal for this year."

It is not fair. It is not right. It smacks of special treatment for corn and cotton, and discrimination against wheat. I do not think Congress will want to write that kind of record.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The Senator from South Dakota seems to be considering this matter in terms of votes. If that be true, suppose we extend 90 percent of parity until the 1st of November.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute more.

Mr. KERR. Did I understand the Senator to say he wanted to cosponsor an amendment to give 90 percent of parity to the basic commodities?

Mr. AIKEN. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. KERR. I did not either, but I wished to assure him that if he did, some of us would join him.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Florida, and more time if he needs it.

Mr. HOLLAND. That will suffice. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I think the action of our distinguished friend, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] in the very beginning of this debate in asking to strike from the bill the second year during which the proposed increase to 90 percent would apply, and confining it to this year, the good election year of 1956, speaks rather loudly as to what it is that we have in mind in this particular amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I am only thinking that we should coincide wheat with what we are doing for cotton. The Secretary says he is going to support cotton at 86 or 87 percent of parity. That is a 1-year deal. I want wheat to be treated in the same way.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. I suppose it is a mere coincidence that the Senator from South Dakota has announced in the RECORD that he is ready to propose—as a matter of fact, it has already been printed, and is lying on the desks of each of us—an amendment to extend for 1 year 90 percent price supports for cotton, corn, peanuts, and anything else that was covered in the action which was taken yesterday.

Mr. President, what is proposed is just as clear as a bell. It is designed to undo, or begin to undo, the action we took yesterday, for the political year 1956, and no longer. I call the attention of my distinguished friend to this fact: If it is a good program, if it is a sellable program, if it is a defensible program for 1956. it certainly ought to be for 1957. If anything was needed——

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I am sure the Senator from Florida with his customary sense of fairness, will recognize that there is a difference between 1956 and 1957 which is not political, but economic, in that in many parts of the country the 1956 wheat crop has already been planted. This proposal will enable the farmers who have already planted to share in the benefits and bounties of agriculture in the year 1956.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. That brings me to another point. I noted a great inconsistency between the point made by the Senator from Kansas and the point just made by the Senator from South Dakota. The Senator from Kansas has said the soil bank cannot apply in 1956, because most of the wheat has been planted. The Senator from South Dakota now says what has been also said by one of my other distinguished friends who has just spoken, that if we put the program into effect, we can expect to see a material upsurge in quality by reason of plantings of other varieties.

It seems to me the Senators involved in the offering of the particular amendment now pending are grasping at every possible straw to make good political grist for the mills in this year of 1956, and have forgotten that by the very fact of the amendment of the bill, which was their bill, they have shown they are not willing to stand up and defend that program for the year which will follow, but they are hopeful that it will be enacted for the current year.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. MUNDT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Florida has misquoted me, and I think the RECORD ought to be corrected.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I desire to yield to no Senator at this time. I am speaking on limited time.

If there needed to be any announcement made of the fact that we have abandoned, by the offering of this particular amendment, the good old rampart which was based on sound and economic grounds, and have come instead to the political rampart of "Yes; we must have something for 1956, because that is the year when our constituents are voting," particularly when we note the degree of interest on the part of the distinguished Senators who are running for reelection in 1956, we must come to the conclusion that what is involved here now is a political retrenchment and a falling back on political ramparts. Do not think the farmers will not see that, and do not think the public will not understand it. This is a political step, and there is no way in the world to defend it.

I see some of my distinguished friends on the other side smiling. I am glad they have the good humor to do that. I expected it of them but we all know now that they are playing politics in a big way.

So far as we are concerned, the question we ought to consider seriously is this: If we decline to agree to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, if we leave in the 90 percent of parity for the good political year of 1956, let us remember that our good friend from South Dakota and other Senators have ready an amendment which they have had printed, and which they have announced, which would undo what we did yesterday for 1 year, that same political year, which would get the Senate into the indefensible position of doing two things: First, putting our case on the basis of playing good politics, instead of playing sound economics; and, second, getting ourselves in the position of doing more for wheat—which has received the greatest expenditure of public funds, by way of subsidy, that has ever been given to any commodity. Furthermore, wheat is in serious trouble because there are a billion bushels of wheat in surplus; and, as the distinguished Senator from North Dakota well knows, wheat is in trouble principally, not in his area, where quality wheat is produced, but, rather, in the areas where inferior wheat is produced, because I remember hearing the constituents of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, who testified before our committee, tell us that their wheat was selling above parity. Why? Because they were producing good, sound, hard wheat which all the millers wanted, and that wheat was not a drug on the market.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have not finished making my points, but I yield now to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Florida. Mr. President, while the Senator from Florida is reaching for straws and is misquoting my arguments by saying that I differed from the Senator from Kansas because, as the Senator from Florida says, I have alleged that in respect to the areas of the country where wheat has already been planted the adoption of the Young amendment would increase the quality of the wheat, let me say that I did not say any such thing. What I said was that in the case of the areas where wheat has already been planted, adoption of the Young provisions would increase the income the farmers would get from the wheat they have already planted, and there is no other avenue by which they can get any substantial benefit from the bill if we sabotage the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the Senator from South Dakota has made his point.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from Florida has implied that because the Senator from North Dakota proposes that the words "and 1957" be stricken out, so as thus to make the amendment applicable to 1956, he has suggested a purely political approach.

Let me say that I hope that before the Senate completes its action on the bill, it will consider the amendment which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has prepared. I am a cosponsor of the amendment, and it proposes a long-range approach to the wheat problem.

But at this time let us consider the 1956 situation, to see whether the arrangement proposed for cotton and the arrangement established for corn are such as to justify the remarks the Senator from Florida has made.

The so-called Hickenlooper amendment, dealing with corn, is for 1 year. I hold in my hand a copy of the Washington Post and Times Herald for March 9, and from it I read a paragraph from a letter which is said to have been made public by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], as addressed to him under date of March 7. That letter of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, reads in part, as follows:

> In the event satisfactory legislation passed with respect to these items, i. e., the soil bank, new parity, and change in the staple length, it would appear desirable to set the support level for cotton for 1956 at about 86 or 87 percent of parity.

That, it will be noted, is a 1-year deal as far as cotton is concerned, 86 or 87 percent for 1956.

I should like to ask the senior Senator from Florida how he can maintain that there is anything more political in the approach to wheat than there is in the approach to cotton and to corn. The corn amendment, which has been adopted, is for 1956. In the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the suggestion for cotton is for 1956.

The point I was trying to make is that by these means we have established an 86- or 87-percent approach for 1 year for cotton, based on the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture; and an 81-percent 1-year approach for corn, under the Hickenlooper amendment. So I said—and I think I was correct—that if we have an 87-percent approach for cotton for 1956, and if we have an 81-percent approach for corn for 1956—both limited to 1956—then certainly we are warranted in looking at the kind of record the Congress is making if we remove section 102 and leave wheat with only 76-percent support for 1956.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as I understand the argument of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, it is that he thinks politics has been played with reference to cotton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield further time to me?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Florida, if that will be sufficient for him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes additional.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as I was about to say, as I understand the argument of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], it is that he thinks politics has been played with reference to cotton—with which I do not agree; and he thinks politics has been played with reference to corn—with which I do not agree; and therefore he says, "Let us make it unanimous, and have a 1956 program for wheat"—which is, as clearly as can be, a political stratagem and a political maneuver.

Of course, Mr. President, Senators can vote as they see fit. However, so far as I am concerned, I was not affected by the cotton amendment and I was not affected by the corn amendment; and I am simply speaking from my conviction and the belief that the 90 percent price-support provision has been the bad root of our greatest trouble, and has, more than anything else, brought on the surplus, and that the possibility of enactment into law of the good provisions of the bill will be jeopardized by any restoration of 90 percent of parity in this case, because if the President has the self-respect which I think he has, he will not sign a bill providing for 90-percent price supports.

In concluding, insofar as I am concerned I wish to make it clear that if the Senate wishes to stand in the eyes of the country as considering—in connection with this bill, which has such tremendous economic implications—the primary question to be politics in 1956, then the adoption of the position taken by those who oppose the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] will certainly put us clearly and conclusively in that position.

I do not care to be in that position; but, so far as I am concerned, in that case, I think we would be in it just as clearly as if we were to state as a part of the provision itself, "This price support will expire after November 8, 1956."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator from Florida is being unfair in his inference. I would gladly have this arrangement made for 2 years; but since the administration has given cotton and corn a 1-year deal, it seems only proper to make a similar arrangement in the case of wheat. Of course, Mr. President, the wheat farmer would be tickled to death to have 5 million additional acres and to have price support at 81 percent of parity. Certainly the wheat farmer would be tickled to death to have that arrangement made.

But since the administration has made these two 1-year deals, is it wrong to make the wheat provision conform to them? I propose that reluctantly, but I thought it was the thing to do.

Mr. HOLLAND. The difference between cotton and wheat is that wheat has had the beneficent support of the Government to the tune of over $800 million, in sustaining its export program. Cotton has not had anything like that. If cotton had had anything of that sort, cotton would not be in trouble now.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Was wheat not in the greatest demand, and more seriously needed, during the war than anything else, except cotton—and also since the war—to keep the whole world alive?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, wheat has done a wonderful job; and if in this bill we can provide anything for wheat, I shall be happy to have that done. But in my judgment the Senator from North Dakota is not going about the matter in the right way in seeking to restore 90 percent of parity for wheat, and particularly when that is predicated on the year 1956, because I believe that, regardless of whether we wish it or not, such action will result in labeling all Senators who support it as thinking primarily of the fall of 1956.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, if the amendment provided for 98 percent support, I think the Senator from Florida would be correct. But I believe that under this provision, the average support for wheat would be around 86 percent or 87 percent of parity, and that is exactly what we are providing for cotton. If it were a straight 90 percent, I should say the Senator would be correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to have that statement from the Senator. I hope it will be remembered by the Senate when we come to consider the amendments to be offered by the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Kansas, providing for a straight 90 percent for 1956, for other commodities.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On what basis does the Senator pretend to say what amendment the Senator from Kansas or the Senator from South Dakota is going to offer?

Mr. HOLLAND. All I can say is that the amendment was printed and was lying on the desk. I talked with the Senator from South Dakota, and he told me he had prepared the amendment. Yesterday when it was not offered as a substitute I asked him why not. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota said he was going to hold it and offer it later.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota did not say he was going to offer it later.

Mr. HOLLAND. Just what was the statement of the Senator from South Dakota?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will yield 1 minute more, I should like to have the Senator from South Dakota given an opportunity to make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has 31 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to have the Senator from South Dakota state his recollection of what happened. As I recall, the Senator said he was not going to offer his amendment at that time. I had been advised that he had intended to offer it from the floor. The Senator stated that he intended to offer it later.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The printed amendments will show that the Senator from South Dakota did have an amendment printed, which would strike out the words "and 1957," which would have to be offered, were it to have been offered, before the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] was voted upon. The Senator from South Dakota decided not to offer the amendment, and had no other amendment printed.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator remembers my discussing the subject with him, does he not?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes. I said that the matter could be approached by a motion to reinstate the language with a substantive change but I was not sure I would offer it, that I would wait and see what happened. I saw what happened—a decisive vote for the Anderson amendment—and concluded not to offer a substitute amendment afterward.

Mr. HOLLAND. Did the Senator state that he was holding it for later in the debate?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. The Senator from South Dakota pointed out that that particular amendment would have had to have been offered before the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico was voted upon. The printed amendment of the Senator from South Dakota applied to section 101. That amendment would have had to be voted upon before the Senator from New Mexico offered his amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator from South Dakota state what he said about offering it later?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota said he would wait and see how things went, and that he might offer language which would restore the portion of the language relating to 1956; but the Senator from South Dakota saw what happened yesterday afternoon, and he concluded not to offer an amendment on that point.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is no great difference between the recollection of the Senator from South Dakota and my own. I am perfectly willing to let the statement of the Senator from South Dakota stand.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota did not have any amendment printed other than the one to which he has referred.

Mr. HOLLAND. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he is perfectly willing to accept the statement made by the Senator from South Dakota covering the discussion. It is clear that there is very little difference between our recollections.

Mr. HUMPHREY rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to be recognized in my own right.

Will the Senator from Louisiana yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to support the proposal of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. I think the Senator from North Dakota has made a good case. He has pointed out what is an obvious fact, but he is apparently in some difficulty because the plane of politics, when it comes from a source other than Mr. Benson, is illegal. If the Senator from North Dakota could get the Secretary of Agriculture on the telephone and get him to say that it would be all right to have this provision in the bill, it would have the aura of respectability.

The Secretary of Agriculture has been down to the Senate, wheeling and dealing for days. Thus far he has been able to split the Senate up into small segments, commodity by commodity.

Let us face the facts. The corn amendment was a special deal. The cotton proposal is a special deal. It does not help many of the cotton farmers, but it is a special deal.

The proposal of the Senator from North Dakota is a committee provision, considered in committee, duly arrived at in committee. It was discussed in committee and voted upon by the duly elected representatives of the Senate. It is no deal. It involves no politics. It is a legitimate legislative proposal.

However, I regret that apparently the only way we can get a majority vote for anything is to obtain for it a political blessing from the Department of Agriculture. I am perfectly willing to stall the debate long enough so that Mr. Benson can be consulted, to see whether or not he will put his seal of approval on it. If he puts his political seal on it, I suppose it will be accepted. It will be cleansed, purified, and adapted to the current political situation.

I intend to vote for the 90 percent on milling quality wheat. I think it is deserved. I think it is perfectly legitimate for the senior and junior Senators from South Dakota to argue that the wheat farmer is receiving a raw deal, 76 percent of parity under the most severe acreage allotments of any crop. Wheat farmers cannot survive under that kind of situation.

What the Senator from North Dakota has proposed relates to a particular variety of wheat, milling quality wheat. He took the testimony. He has done what the producers of the milling variety of wheat, which is not in surplus to any appreciable degree, have asked for.

Most of the wheat in storage today is not the milling variety of wheat, and the supports being offered here are upon a particular species, variety, or type.

There is no legitimacy to the argument that, after we have practically wrecked three-fourths of the farm bill, we should wreck the remainder of it. Apparently the argument that is being used is this: "We have taken the heart out of the cotton farmer; we have given the corn farmer a good beating over the head with a cornstalk with a lead pipe in it. We are about ready to operate on the peanut farmers, and all the rest of the farmers. We surely did not help the cattle raiser or the hog farmer."

The argument is, "Let us be logical; let us be consistent. We have been murdering all of them, except the wheat farmer. Let us get him."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it is time to call a halt on this kind of chipping away at a farm program which could be effective. I should like to know that at least on one commodity in this bill the Senate considered the interest of the farmer. The wheat farmer is just as deserving as anyone else.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] exhibited a kind and magnanimous treatment and consideration which I had hoped would prevail. If I correctly recall what the Senator from Georgia said, it was something to this effect: The cotton farmer got a bad deal, but he did not hold the Senator from North Dakota accountable. The Senator from North Dakota has been a true friend of the cotton farmer, the hog farmer, the wheat farmer, and all other farmers. I am here to rally to his defense. I will vote with him not only once, but 3 or 4 times, if I am permitted to do so. I think he deserves the kind of support for which he has worked. No Senator has worked more diligently for the people he represents than has the Senator from North Dakota.

I repeat, this is a committee proposal. This is not a synthetic proposal which came from the executive branch.

We are supposed to be legislating. If Mr. Benson wants a vote in the Senate, let him get himself elected to the Senate. I do not like the proxies he is exercising.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Minnesota has stated that the mere fact that nearly all the other elements of agriculture are about destroyed is no reason to destroy the wheat farmer. I agree with the Senator. Before we are through, we had better save one breed of farmer, so that future generations will know what farmers looked like. The wheat farmer happens to be in that category, which is his good fortune. There is no reason for exterminating them all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Georgia has again exhibited charity and compassion, as well as good judgment.

It is true that there will be very few farm families left; and if we keep a few on wheat farms, it will be very beneficial for future generations. At least it will be some guide as to what the past was like, and our children may know what kind of Americans once lived in this land.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not wish to repeat the argument of the Senator from Minnesota. He is doing a herculean job in the debate. I do wish

to point out that the price support on wheat is at 76 percent at the present time because the Secretary of Agriculture substantially reduced the set-aside on wheat to 429 million bushels. If he had left it at 529 million bushels, the price support would be around 83 percent.

It is very interesting that we should raise the acreage for corn. We raised it from 43 million acres to 51 million acres. I supported it. I do not intend to do an injustice to corn producers or to any other producers. However, I wish to point out that if the set-aside on wheat had been left at 500 million bushels, the parity-support price would be 83 percent of parity.

I wonder if we could get some of our friends who have been leading the fight against the wheat farmers to agree to raising the set-aside on wheat from 429 million to 500 million bushels, corresponding to what we have done for the corn producers. As the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, the amendment sponsored by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] in committee and incorporated in the bill, is a very sound provision, and it does equality of justice to the wheat producers.

The last point I wish to make is with reference to what has been said about politics having entered the farm debate. I hope there is politics in the debate. I hope this is still a political body. I believe this to be a body of politicians, using that word in the proper sense. I hope it is made up of politicians elected to represent their respective constituencies. I have no hesitancy in pointing out that when I am making my fight on the farm bill, in trying to return the purchasing power to the farmer and to provide him with a decent living, I am carrying out what is the desire of the people of my State. I am not at all frightened by the charge that some political considerations may be involved in the debate. I hope they are involved in the debate. I hope the Senate has political responsibility in seeking to carry out what I think is the clear wish of the constituencies of Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, the will of our constituencies is to return to the farmers a decent purchasing power so that they shall have a sound economic level, and so that big business shall not be the only industry to enjoy profits and prosperity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would it not be fair to characterize the three stages of the agricultural policy of this country as the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and the Sliding Deal?

Mr. MORSE. The Collapsible Deal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Sliding Deal, with collapsible supports.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment of my colleague [Mr. YOUNG]. I am entirely satisfied that some of the oldtimers in the Senate have forgotten what the wheat farmer did in World War I and World War II, and why some of our farmers find themselves in difficulty. They find themselves in difficulty because in World War I they were told to plant and to plant and to plant. All over Kansas and all over the great wheat area millions of acres were broken up for the planting of wheat. Wheat was planted on submarginal land, along railroad rights-of-way, and in parks in cities. Not only that, but farmers had to get seed loans from their Government. Canada canceled all its seed loans a year after the end of the war. However, in North Dakota, 40,000 out of 50,000 farmers got such loans, and all but 4,000 have repaid the loans. The 4,000 farmers are still paying 6 percent interest on their loans.

I support what has been said by the Senators from South Dakota, and by the Senators from Minnesota. The farmers are entitled to some income.

Not only are they entitled to support themselves, Mr. President, but they must have money to pay back the money they borrowed from the Government when they did everything they could to support the Government in time of war.

As I said, Canada canceled those loans, but the United States did not. Thousands of farmers are still paying 6-percent interest on them. In some cases the interest alone has amounted to 2 or 3 times what the original loan was when it was made. Certainly the wheat farmer is entitled to the same kind of deal as my distinguished colleague has said was accorded the corn farmer and the cotton farmer. I thank him for putting in this amendment in the committee and fighting for the rights of the wheat farmers all over the country.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

There has been much said about what the cotton farmer is going to receive in the way of special benefits. But where are those benefits? Are they real, or tangible? They are not, Mr. President. They are only conditional. Their enjoyment is conditioned upon three prerequisites. All the talk about special treatment for cotton is based on a letter dated March 2, addressed to the Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN, and signed by the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra T. Benson. This letter outlines what cotton farmers might expect, provided certain conditions precedent are met. Let me be frank, Mr. President. These benefits which may flow to the cotton industry are predicated on what Congress is going to do to S. 3183. As I interpret the letter, it will not only be necessary that the 90-percent provision be stricken, which was of course done yesterday, but at least two other matters will have to be attended to also. These are, first, the calculation of the support price based on the average grade and staple, instead of the present seven-eighths standard, and, second, the defeat of the dual parity formula. Both of these conditions are still to be met. Whether they will be remains to be seen.

Mr. President, I supported the amendment providing 90 percent of parity price supports for millable wheat, as written in the bill. I did this because, as it has been stated on several occasions, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry studied this provision carefully, and determined that it had great merit. As a matter of fact, last May, when the committee first voted to hold grass-roots hearings throughout the Nation, there was a feeling among some of us that if we could find a formula under which we could write into the bill a support price of 90 percent of parity for quality-grade, readily salable commodities, we might be able to help our farmers economically, stimulate the production of desirable, marketable commodities, and discourage the production of commodities for which no ready markets exist.

We elicited testimony as to how we might do so not only among the witnesses that we heard throughout the country, but soon after the hearings were concluded I, myself, wrote many letters to millers and spinners, and to attorneys in the Department of Agriculture. The committee staff and the legal staff of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress also joined in the search.

We learned that it would be a very difficult thing, a practically impossible task, for us to write into law a formula which would define what kind, grade, and type of the various commodities would be embraced within our projected standard of readily salable. It was only then that the committee voted and reinstated 90 percent of parity price supports as outlined in section 101. The only reason wheat was left out of section 101, which was voted down yesterday, was because we felt we had obtained a workable standard by which we could measure a readily salable type of wheat. That standard is millable. It is usable wheat for which a ready demand exists. For that reason, the committee felt it would be entitled to 90 percent of parity supports.

I am not here to debate whether this formula will work. I do not know. It might. I hope it will. I believe it would be a good idea for us to try it.

For that reason, Mr. President, although the 90 percent support provisions as found in section 401 has been stricken from the bill, I will cheerfully vote to retain in the bill the section which is now sought to be stricken.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] left me in charge of his time. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Vermont have stated the question accurately. This is the same vote that we had yesterday, namely, the decision on the question of whether we will retain 90-percent supports. This time it is whether we will retain 90-percent supports on wheat only. Yesterday we struck out the other 90-percent provision.

The point has been raised that all that the Senator from North Dakota proposes to do in the amendment that is now a

part of the bill, is to maintain the position on wheat as it was in 1955.

That is not quite true.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am not sure that I understood what the Senator from Delaware said, but is he under the impression that the amendment means 90 percent support for all wheat, or only for millable wheat. Does the Senator understand that for the wheat farmers as a whole—and they are the ones we must think about—since a part of the wheat is feed wheat and a part of it is millable, the average would be 87 percent?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that it refers to milling wheat only, but that represents, according to the Department of Agriculture, approximately 97 percent of all the wheat produced this year, which will be eligible for 90 percent supports.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think we should get it straightened out. My understanding is that when we take millable wheat and nonmillable wheat the total average would be from 86 to 87 percent for all wheat. If that be true, I respectfully say that the Senator from Delaware gives a false impression that there would be a 90 percent average for wheat.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think I am correct. The understanding I have as a member of the committee, is that under the Young amendment approximately 97 percent of the wheat would be eligible for the 90 percent support. I point out again that the question on which we are about to vote is whether we are going to continue 90 percent support for wheat for another year.

Furthermore, this is not a question of whether we maintain the status quo for wheat producers in 1956 as compared with 1955. In 1955 wheat was supported at a price of $2.08 a bushel. If the amendment sponsored by the Senator from North Dakota is left in the bill, it will not maintain a support price of $2.08, but it will give the wheat farmers a price of $2.26 or 18 cents per bushel above what they received last year.

Let there be no misunderstanding, this is an effort to raise the support level on this one commodity.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. If the provision for 90 percent of parity remains in the bill, it would be about 87 percent on the average.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the Senator going back to the old formula?

Mr. YOUNG. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then we have not voted upon that question yet. We are speaking of the bill as it is now before the Senate. If the amendment is rejected, it would mean that the wheat farmers would get 18 cents per bushel more this year than they received in 1955——

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator is assuming that all the wheat would qualify for 90-percent support, which is not the case. I think the Department of Agriculture estimates it at about 95 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. About 95 to 97 percent; that is correct.

We have the Department of Agriculture figures which were furnished on January 1. There is 1,960,000,000 bushels of wheat on hand now. We have enough wheat on hand to last 3 years at normal consumption without the production of another grain. Yet, Mr. President, we are being asked to support the price of wheat for another year at 80 cents per bushel more than the wartime price the farmers received and 18 cents per bushel above last year's price.

That is perfectly ridiculous. Unless we get our farm program on a more equitable basis, we shall end up with no farm program at all, because the American taxpayers are not going to continue to underwrite a program which is costing any such staggering sum.

The borrowing authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation is now $12 billion. They have used it up except $649 million. We were told by the Department of Agriculture that if this bill is passed in the form in which it was reported by the committee, they would be before us in a few days asking for at least 5 billion more with which to carry out its provision.

I think it is well for those who are continuing the agitation for 90 percent price supports to remember their votes today when they later express their interest in giving the taxpayers some relief. We cannot vote billions away in one program unless we are going to provide the means to pay for it. Many of those who are agitating for a continuation of price support in excess of wartime price supports are the strongest supporters of tax reduction.

That is inconsistency with a capital letter.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator mentioned $12 billion. That is exactly the amount we gave Russia; is it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not with my vote. The Senator from North Dakota was in the Senate then, I was not.

Mr. LANGER. But is not that true? Did not the United States give Russia $12 billion? Now we hear squawking about helping the farmers of the country who have paid taxes year in and year out, income taxes and taxes of all kinds, to the tune of nearly $300 billion. All the farmers are asking is that they be put on an equality with industry. We want the wheat farmer to be on an equality with the cotton farmer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The same argument can be used when we come to vote on the question of social security or any other measure. The same argument can be used many, many times, but I remember that the Senator from North Dakota advocates lower taxes. I remind him we cannot vote for these appropriations and authorizations and distribute money here and there unless we are willing to pay for it. It is hypocritical for any man to say he is for these things and is not willing to provide the money.

Mr. LANGER. We are not giving the money to the farmer; the farmer is earning it, every single penny of it. That poor farmer who is buying half a section is earning his money. It is not like giving money to Italy and practically every other country on the face of the globe.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is asking to have a 90-percent support price for wheat, 18 cents higher than they received last year and approximately 80 cents more than the wartime price. That is treatment which is not given to any other class of farmers.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator from Delaware that the wheatgrowers are greatly concerned about the surplus. They are the ones who are suffering from the surplus and from the price. But let us keep in mind that the differential between 76 percent and 90 percent for this year will not make a difference of 1 bushel in the surplus, so far as the winter wheat sections are concerned. There will be no less wheat. The wheat is already planted. We reduced the wheat acreage to 55 million, and under the soil bank proposal we are supposed to reduce it 12 million acres more. In Kansas we have cut back in 2 years to 10,800,000 acres, and now we are requested to cut 3 million more acres. If we could get the soil bank to assist us we could cut back the acreage, but this year we cannot get any benefit from that program, and it will not affect the surplus.

Therefore I say, in all sincerity, that if we are going to vote 86 percent support for cotton this year and 81 percent for corn, surely we should give the wheatgrowers the same advantage and the same opportunity.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, unless other Senators desire to be heard——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to be heard in opposition.

Mr. ELLENDER. For how many minutes?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. For 3 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I want to make my position clear with reference to the wheat provision in the bill as reported by the committee.

I am in complete sympathy with the objective announced by the wheat area farmers.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the Senator in favor of the Aiken amendment?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am in favor of it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Iowa 3 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am in complete sympathy with the announced objectives of the wheat provision of the bill as explained on the floor; but as it is contained in the bill, it does not give support on millable quality wheat; it gives support on millable varieties of wheat, which, as has been demonstrated, cover about 96 or 97 per-

cent of all the wheat produced. So the proposal is a 90-percent support for almost all the wheat produced in the United States.

If the sponsors of the provision will so amend it that it will be applicable to millable quality wheat, and not to millable varieties of wheat, I will support it. But the situation being as it is, the provision gives wheat the most favorable treatment it has ever had, while other commodities in comparison receive unfair treatment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Would not the Senater be willing to give the wheat farmer the treatment which the corn farmer now receives?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; because the wheat farmer today has almost 20 million extra acres of wheat over and above the national needs, while the corn farmer does not have an extra acre.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator knows that the wheat farmer has brought his production down this year to conform with expected domestic needs plus expected exports.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not know that that is correct.

Mr. YOUNG. It is correct. All the Senator has to do is check with the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The formula does not show it. The formula shows that if the wheat farmer brought his production down, there would be only about 18 million or 20 million acres. That is too low. It would be about 35 or 40 million acres too low. The wheat farmer had 55 million acres.

Mr. YOUNG. Is the Senator talking about human domestic needs, or is he talking about domestic needs and also exports?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am talking about the needs of this country, so far as the supply of wheat, in the consideration of the overhanging surpluses of wheat which have accrued, are concerned. I have heard it said on the floor today that the farmer in the Corn Belt is being unfairly treated. He has been going around for years producing real overflow acreages of corn.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have heard it said on the floor today that the cottongrowers are paragons of virtue, while the corngrowers are horrible folk. The fact is that cotton is now and has been given favored treatment, over and beyond the needs and demands of the country. Corn has not. Corn has been on a realistic basis.

I want to see the wheat farmers treated fairly. I have said that I will support the 90-percent protection on the millable-quality wheat, with a differential on the support price for the nonmillable wheat which is hanging over our heads, to discourage its production. This is a proposal which gives wheat a most unusual treatment. In fact, with a 90-percent treatment throughout the entire Wheat Belt, the wheat production will be so great that the surpluses of unsalable wheat will continue to pile up.

I shall support a 90-percent support price for millable wheat, but I think the price should be graduated downward, so that a proper differential can be given.

If the Senator from North Dakota will devise that kind of formula, I will support him.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the Senator from Iowa that I felt the same way about this question. If this were an amendment relating to millable-quality wheat, I would not be so worried. But this is not that kind of amendment. All a farmer has to do is to plant a variety which normally becomes millable quality.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct. When he buys from a feed dealer a variety which says, or in some cases alleges, that it will produce millable-quality wheat, he gets 90-percent support regardless of the resulting crop.

Mr. YOUNG. What the Secretary is doing is to discount 23 varieties 20 cents a bushel.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Not exactly. Would the Senator be willing to remain on the same basis?

Mr. YOUNG. No. We are doing exactly what the Secretary is doing now, only on a broader basis.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; I disagree with that statement.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; he must have read the bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from North Dakota now wants to apply his proposal to all the varieties which are designed or calculated to produce millable varieties of wheat.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not a fact that the Secretary of Agriculture is now making discounts for millable quality wheat; and if the amendment shall be agreed to, he will not be able to do that?

Mr. YOUNG. That is not correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. He has to allow 90 percent so long as it is planted, if it is to be of millable quality.

Mr. YOUNG. No. Certain varieties remain at a discount. That is in the committee report and in the bill itself.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not so read it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I believe the Senator is in error. I am convinced, as the Senator has said, that certain varieties of wheat are offered at a discount. They will continue to be offered at a discount. The winter wheat crop is already in. If a farmer has planted a variety wheat at a discount, he cannot change it between now and harvest time. I think the Senator from Iowa is completely in error.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 2 minutes additional to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The bill provides that varieties which will yield millable qualities of wheat will be supported. That means, according to the admission of the Senator from North Dakota and other Senators, that about 96 percent of the wheat will be supported at 90 percent of parity, regardless of whether that wheat, when it has grown and has matured, is millable wheat or not.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It will have 90-percent support. It does not make any difference what kind of quality is placed on it; it will receive 90-percent support, and that will apply to almost all the wheat grown in the United States. So our troubles will still continue to be with us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from North Dakota has pointed out that several varieties of wheat will be supported at a lower price; but all those varieties combined will be only 3 percent of the wheat produced. So the Senator is correct when he says that the amount which would be supported at 90 percent of parity would be 95 or 97 percent of all the wheat produced.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The explanation is as simple as that, because about 96 or 97 percent of the wheat planted is of milling variety. It is the variety which is supported; not the quality.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. When we vote on this amendment, we must understand that we are supporting the varieties of wheat that grow, not the quality of it.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that Indian squaw corn is covered by price supports?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not wish to yield more time for the opposition to use up. If the Senator from Iowa needs more time to complete his statement, I shall be glad to yield it to him.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No. My statement is completed. I merely wanted to answer the rather fantastic question of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

This is a rather fantastic situation. I fear that in the political atmosphere in which we are surrounded, some of our colleagues may have completely lost sight of the farmer. After all, this is an agricultural program designed to improve the level of farm prosperity.

When we undertook this work, I was under no illusions as to the difficulty of having any farm legislation which would be of benefit to the farm people passed this year. I had heard that there were those who would delay as much as possible any efforts to improve the level of farm prosperity this year. Although I have heard such statements, I do not

think any Member of the Senate would be willing to do such a thing.

However, it is important that every Senator who votes on the amendment should know exactly what he is doing. It is a long, uphill job to have farm legislation passed. It can be killed by a single vote. I am not sure that this is the time when the bill is going to be killed.

We are told we are not being fair to the wheat grower, that we are doing more for the producer of cotton or rice or corn or some other commodity. In this commodity conflict, with a political background, we just are not going to treat everybody exactly alike. One commodity may be treated a little better this year. Another one may be treated a little better next year.

Cotton has not been subsidized for export for years; $800 million was spent for the export of wheat in the last 6 years. If cotton had been subsidized for export to that extent, there would not be a bale of cotton in the United States today.

I do not think we have been treating wheat badly. For many years wheat has had the advantage of 30 to 40 cents being added to its price, because it was permitted to come under the old parity formula.

If no legislation is enacted, then the legislation which is on the books now will prevail. Wheat will have exactly what it has now. If we can enact good legislation, wheat will have exactly what it has now plus any benefits which it may derive from the soil bank program, plus any benefits which it may derive from increased support prices for feed grains, plus any benefits which it may derive from continued subsidization of wheat, which will probably amount to another $150 million or $200 million this year.

Now we can kill the bill. We can kill it by insisting on going back to the unsound program which got American agriculture in the place it is today. I am simply saying that because I am not sure how the vote which the Senate shall take in a few moments will go. It may be the vote which will kill the bill.

I want every Senator who votes on the amendment to do so with his eyes wide open, and be willing to accept the responsibility of killing the bill and thus depriving the farmer of a $2,000,000,000 increase in income this year.

Mr. President, I have nothing more to say, but I did not want the vote on the amendment to be taken without reminding the Members of the Senate that what they do now may determine whether or not we shall go ahead with the soil bank and other provisions which promise to be of benefit to the farmers.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired. Does he yield further time to himself?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to ask the Senator which vote he thought would kill the bill. Would a yea or a nay vote on the amendment kill the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the vote to restore 90-percent rigid supports for wheat would kill it.

Mr. DANIEL. That is the way the committee brought the bill to the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. That is right. I am trying to save the soil bank and other provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes, so I can make this statement. I have heard that it is the aim of some persons to see to it that there is sent to the President a bill so totally unsatisfactory that he cannot possibly maintain his self-respect and sign it.

Mr. WELKER and Mr. ERVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Is not the whole problem one of surpluses?

Mr. AIKEN. We have today almost 2 billion bushels of wheat on hand, enough to last us for 3 years. It is going to be a tremendous job to get rid of it.

In answer to the question of the Senator from Idaho, I wish to say "Yes." It is a problem of surpluses. We may find that the soil bank may materially reduce those surpluses. We believe our foreign trade program has now gotten under way so that it can be stepped up. The Department has done a beautiful job of selling over $200 million of our surpluses in the last week. The Commodity Credit Corporation is in need of several billion dollars more. It has been reluctant to ask for it while the bill has been before the Senate. It has a total borrowing power of $12 billion. Some 2 weeks ago there was only $600 million left uncommitted, with great crops still to be dealt with.

Whether this bill is the right one or not, the Commodity Credit Corporation has to have $3 billion more to take it through this year. We must devote all our thinking and energy to ridding ourselves of our present surpluses. As the Senator from Idaho has said, our big problem today is the problem of surpluses.

Mr. WELKER. Since the surpluses are the admitted reason for the farm problem, has the Senator from Vermont or any other member of the committee given 5 minutes' thought or any thought to the suggestion made by me in a speech on the floor of the Senate and which originated with the thoughts of the great Admiral Byrd to establish an international food bank in the Antarctic, which I called to the Senator's attention several weeks ago? Admiral Byrd's plan could do away with our food surplus in a matter of months, and would be cheaper than the cost of 1 year's storage of our vast commodities, which, as you know, costs the American taxpayer better than $1 million a day and we must build more storage next year—thus more expense. What folly. What a way to save money and dispose of farm surpluses. Study the matter please, and then come up with a better plan to dispose of the farm surpluses and I will be happy. Has anyone given that a thought? If not, why not?

Mr. AIKEN. I may say to the Senator from Idaho I have given it thought, and very serious thought. I think it is a very worthwhile suggestion. Whenever it is decided to store commodities in the Antarctic, I should like to help pick out the delegation to send down there. [Laughter.]

Mr. WELKER. I want to say it is not a laughing matter, in view of the fact that Admiral Byrd has used food which was buried in the Antarctic for 32 years and other food stored for 22 years. The admiral will be back in a few weeks. He will tell me more about that. He has written articles about the matter. We cry about our surpluses. Yet we gloss over the fact that he has given us the only sound, reasonable way of getting rid of our tremendous surpluses, which would amount to an insurance policy against hunger forever, and also enable us to get our surpluses out of this country and off the backs of the American farmer.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is entirely correct. Food stored in the Antarctic would undoubtedly keep for generations, and not merely years.

Mr. WELKER. I want someone to come up with a better plan. I do not claim any monopoly on the suggestion, but I have heard about the soil-bank proposition, and I do not think it is worth two bits, and it cannot and will not help my small family farms in Idaho as anyone well knows as long as the Bureau of Reclamation is trying to bring more and more new land into production.

Mr. AIKEN. Sometimes I think that if we in Congress ceased legislating and kept our Government from interfering in the farmers' business to any great extent, we would have a prosperous agriculture at the end of 10 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, South Carolina is a noncommercial area so far as wheat is concerned. The amendment would not affect my State in any way, but personally, I am for helping the wheat farmers. I believe that the bill, if amended as the Senator from North Dakota has suggested, would help the wheat farmers of the Nation.

The only question before the Senate at the present time is whether the parity supports should be adjusted up or down. If the Senate wants them adjusted downward, it should vote for the Aiken amendment. If the Senate wants them adjusted upward, it should vote for the committee amendment, as amended by the Young amendment.

I am in favor of high parity support prices and strict controls. We control wheat production. A few moments ago we raised the figures so far as corn is concerned. We have practically no control on corn acreage in the United States. I am glad to say the wheat farmers have abided by the quotas and cut their quotas down every time the House and the Senate have so provided.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not correct that the Department of Agriculture estimates that on July 1 of this year there will be 1 billion bushels of wheat on hand, or 1 year's supply?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is entirely correct.

I wish also to bring to the Senate's attention something that has been said about the soil bank. So far as wheatgrowers are concerned, the soil bank will not affect them to any appreciable extent this year. How many wheatgrowers are going to plow their wheat under?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 2 more minutes to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, since we do not give them anything more in regard to the soil-bank profits, I believe we should give them high parity, because they are being strictly controlled, and they will cut down the acreage, which will reduce the amount of production, normally speaking, if the same weather conditions exist throughout the wheat-growing area.

So I, personally, shall vote for the committee amendment as amended, because I think that will give the wheat growers a better opportunity to make a living.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, unless some other Senator desires to be heard, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time available to our side.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to say a brief word.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much time does the Senator from South Dakota require?

Mr. MUNDT. About 3 minutes, Mr. President.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as I said earlier, I think this will be an extremely important vote from the standpoint of doing justice for the wheat farmers. I hope Senators will not be dissuaded from voting in the way they think proper by any pitchfork-in-the-back tactics, because no Senator can tell us what will kill the bill or what will cause the bill to be signed. If Senators can tell us authoritatively about that, let them speak now. However, I hear nothing except hints and hunches and innunendoes. Mr. President, all of us can engage with equal validity in hints and hunches. If any Senator has a signed letter stating in so any words that such-and-such will result in killing the bill, let him produce it and tell us about it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say that I am advised that the Senator from South Dakota was looking at my back when he made his last statement.

Mr. MUNDT. No; I was not doing that.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say to the Senator from South Dakota and to other Senators who may be interested in this matter that those who kill the bill will have to take full responsibility for doing so. I do not know whether the soil bank means anything to South Dakota or not; but if the soil bank is killed by that State's own Senators, I hope they will take the responsibility for it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, if we are going to take the responsibility of seeing which Senator will vie with a well-known columnist in attempting to be the best prophet, I am willing to predict that if we adopt the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, the President will sign the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that I am not a member of the Republican conference who runs to that columnist and gives him his information. I am sure the Senator from South Dakota is better informed on those matters than I am.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I did not intend to get personal with the Senator from Vermont. I happen to belong to the Republican conference, but I do not run to any columnist with information.

I simply say that we should not be dissuaded from exercising our independent judgment as Senators because of innuendos or hints or hunches or crystal-ball predictions. No one has told me "cold" what the President will do about the bill.

However, if I am to prophesy, I will say that I believe the President will sign the bill with the Young amendment in it. It is apparent the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] believes otherwise. If he has anything in writing to persuade me to accept his view, I should like to see it. But so far as I know, neither of us can state with authority what the President would do. If the Senator from Vermont has any document or paper on that subject with the President's signature imprinted thereon, I should like to see it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 3 additional minutes to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I return to my original premise: In this bill we have done something for virtually every segment of the farm economy—although not as much as some of us had hoped would be done. But by one effort or another, by one administrative premise or another, or by one legislative provision or another, we have done something to increase the economic posture of the various agricultural products, from the standpoint of the money the farmers will receive in 1956. We have done that for cotton, and we have done it for tobacco, and we are going to do it for rice. The distinguished Senator from Georgia stated that we should do something about peanuts, and we agreed to include peanuts.

So I see no reason why we should not treat wheat farmers with equal justice, as compared to the treatment received by the other segments of the agricultural economy.

We are about in the position of considering that the farmers are a bunch of shipwrecked sailors, and all of them have fallen off the boat of prosperity, and we are trying to do something about it. So we throw life preservers of different sizes, types, and varieties to the different groups of farmers; but in the case of the wheat farmers, we throw them a cement block. Mr. President, that is not good. It is no way to rescue our wheat farmers.

I hope Senators will vote for adoption of the Young amendment, which at least for 12 months will give the wheat farmer a chance to adjust himself to the peacetime economy, and to protect himself against the prevailing cost-price squeeze.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I like the Senator's observation with respect to whether the Chief Executive will veto the bill. I do not think that subject should ever be discussed here. What do we care—if we have courage—about what the Chief Executive does in his branch of the Government. He has his duty to perform—we have ours—neither should be afraid of the other's duties. We are sent here by the American people. To the people of Idaho I owe the best that I can give.

But the Senator from South Dakota made a statement which I wish to contradict, and I wish him to show me where he is correct. He stated that the Congress has by this bill, will or has, done something for every segment of American agriculture. Will he tell me what the Congress has done for the potato growers of Idaho and Maine or for the alfalfa growers of Idaho or for the edible-bean growers of Idaho or for the pea growers or for vegetable growers in general or what has this bill done for the milk producers of Idaho, for the livestock growers. I might as well include the fruit and berry growers, the poultry raisers and small farmers in general. I should like to hear a little discourse on that subject, instead of so much discourse on the big operators. Idaho is full of small farmers and livestock growers who certainly are not aware that Congress has done something for them, and cannot help them under this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 2 more minutes to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am not prepared to respond in detail to the inquiry of the Senator from Idaho about the fruit and vegetable industry, because in our committee the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] always undertakes the burden of protecting that industry; and he has done a very commendable job there, insofar as our evidence is concerned.

I should like to say that my only objection to the pitchfork-in-the-back suggestion is that I agree with the Senator that all Senators should make up their own minds on these issues. But I also wish to say that I think we do something less than a service to any occupant of the White House if we are moved or persuaded by hunches or by hints. If any occupant of the White House wishes to send to the Congress a letter, certainly we should give it respectful attention.

But I want no prediction based on guesswork, and I do not think we should endeavor to force through a position by quoting someone on a subject on which he has not made up his mind, especially in the case of an amendment which has not yet been adopted. That is not the way to obtain good legislation.

In his message to the Congress on the agricultural program, the President said:

> I recommend that the Congress give consideration to authorizing the annual sale for feeding purposes, at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, of limited quantities of Commodit Credit Corporation wheat of less desirable milling quality.

At least we find there a recognition of the difference in the qualities of wheat; a difference recognized in the provisions of the committee bill on wheat.

And in his message asking for a change in the price-support legislation, again the President mentioned gearing the whole proposition to the quality factor.

I appeal to the Senate to give the wheat farmers a "break" for the next 12 months, and after that to find out whether we can find a better formula for gearing reasonable price-supports to reasonable qualities. I urge a vote against the Aiken amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has again expired.

The Senator from Louisiana has 7 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Vermont has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	McCarthy
Allott	Fulbright	McClellan
Anderson	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Monroney
Beall	Green	Morse
Bender	Hayden	Mundt
Bennett	Hennings	Murray
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Jenner	Russell
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kefauver	Scott
Clements	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Knowland	Sparkman
Daniel	Kuchel	Stennis
Dirksen	Langer	Symington
Douglas	Lehman	Thurmond
Duff	Long	Thye
Dworshak	Magnuson	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. During the discussion on the pending amendment reference has been made many times to the "Young amendment." The pending amendment, as the junior Senator from South Dakota understands, is the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], which would strike out section 102 of the text of the bill, as amended by the Young amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to strike out section 102 of the bill, as amended. The amendment will be stated by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 2, it is proposed to strike out the following:

PRICE SUPPORTS—MILLING QUALITY WHEAT

SEC. 102. Section 101 (d) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(8) if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for the crop, (A) the support price to cooperators for milling quality wheat shall be established upon the basis of a support level for the crop of 90 percent of the parity price for wheat, and (B) the support price to cooperators in any area for any other wheat shall be established, without regard to paragraph (7) of this subsection, at such level as the Secretary determines will preserve the competitive relationship between such wheat and corn on the basis of their respective feed values; but in no event shall the average support price to cooperators for all wheat (based upon anticipated production) be less than 75 percent of its parity price. For the purposes of this paragraph milling quality wheat shall be wheat produced in any area from seed of a variety which in such area normally produces wheat of a quality desired for milling purposes. In determining milling quality wheat, the Secretary shall consult with a committee appointed by him and composed of three representatives from each of the principal wheat-producing areas. Of the 3 representatives from each area, 1 shall be a wheat farmer, 1 shall be a wheat miller, and 1 shall be a person experienced in research on wheat varieties. At least one of the millers on the committee shall have had experience in producing semolina flour. Wheat of the 1956 crop planted in any area shall be milling quality wheat for the purposes of this paragraph, unless such wheat is of a variety which was designated as undesirable in such area by the Department of Agriculture prior to the time such wheat was planted. This paragraph shall be applicable only to the 1956 crop."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent, and his pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] has been announced previously.

The vote was recapitulated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont demands the regular order.

Mr. RUSSELL. If Senators are requesting to be informed as to how they are recorded, that is the regular order.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

Mr. RUSSELL. How am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, which is sometimes liberally interpreted, one recapitulation is generally all that is allowed. Of course the Chair is always desirous of being sure that all Senators are recorded as they expected to be recorded. Does the Senator feel that his vote may not have been recorded accurately?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no reason for making my inquiry other than that I did not hear the recapitulation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote "nay."

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest that the Senator from Rhode Island do his own voting.

Mr. GREEN. I have a pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were to vote, I would vote "nay." I vote "nay."

Mr. AIKEN. That is a peculiar pair, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not understand the Senator's vote. Does the Senator from Rhode Island desire to vote or change his vote?

Mr. GREEN. I change my vote. I vote "nay."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island votes "nay."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I demand the regular order. I also suggest that when a Senator votes, he do his own voting, and not let someone else suggest his vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order has been demanded.

The yeas and nays resulted as follows:

YEAS—45

Aiken	Duff	Martin, Iowa
Anderson	Dworshak	Martin, Pa.
Barrett	Eastland	McClellan
Beall	Flanders	Pastore
Bender	Frear	Payne
Bennett	Goldwater	Potter
Bible	Hayden	Purtell
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bridges	Holland	Saltonstall
Bush	Ives	Smith, Maine
Butler	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Kennedy	Stennis
Case, N. J.	Knowland	Watkins
Cotton	Kuchel	Welker
Dirksen	Malone	Williams

NAYS—45

Allott	Hennings	Monroney
Barkley	Hill	Morse
Carlson	Hruska	Mundt
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Murray
Chavez	Jackson	Neuberger
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Curtis	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Daniel	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kerr	Scott
Ellender	Langer	Sparkman
Ervin	Lehman	Symington
Fulbright	Long	Thurmond
George	Magnuson	Thye
Gore	Mansfield	Wiley
Green	McNamara	Young

NOT VOTING—5

Byrd	Millikin	Smathers
McCarthy	Neely	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the "yeas" are 46, and the "nays" are 45. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Vermont to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY (when his name was called). Mr. President, I have a pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. PASTORE (when his name was called). Mr. President, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." If he were voting, he would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent, and, if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—46

Aiken	Dirksen	McCarthy
Allott	Duff	Payne
Anderson	Dworshak	Potter
Barrett	Eastland	Purtell
Beall	Flanders	Robertson
Bender	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bible	Holland	Smith, Maine
Bricker	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Ives	Stennis
Bush	Jenner	Watkins
Butler	Knowland	Welker
Capehart	Kuchel	Wiley
Case, N. J.	Malone	Williams
Cotton	Martin, Iowa	
Curtis	Martin, Pa.	

NAYS—41

Barkley	Hennings	McNamara
Carlson	Hill	Monroney
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Morse
Chavez	Jackson	Mundt
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Neuberger
Douglas	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kerr	Russell
Ervin	Langer	Scott
Frear	Lehman	Sparkman
Fulbright	Long	Thurmond
Gore	Magnuson	Thye
Green	Mansfield	Young
Hayden	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—8

Byrd	Millikin	Smathers
George	Neely	Symington
Kennedy	Pastore	

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to announce that on the previous vote——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas would like to make the unanimous-consent request that in view of the record there be a recapitulation of the vote on the Aiken amendment, and that the name of each Senator be called. The record at the desk showed a majority of one vote one way, while the record of the teller at the table showed a majority of one vote the other way.

Therefore, I should like to ask unanimous consent that there be a recapitulation of the vote on the Aiken amendment, so that each Senator may know how he was recorded, and so that the RECORD may show the correct tabulation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if there is to be a recapitulation at this time, I am not certain as to the parliamentary situation with which the Senate would be confronted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the Senator from Texas is, in effect, asking that the Senate return to the vote on the Aiken amendment in order to have a recapitulation of that vote. The recapitulation, once it has been announced, will be, in effect, the vote which will be recorded in the records of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall take the responsibility for what I am about to say. Certainly no one wants the result in the Journal to be different from the votes which Senators of the United States cast. I would not interpose a parliamentary objection to a recapitulation in order to ascertain what the judgment of the Senate was at that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is characteristic of the minority leader. I appreciate his attitude very much. I have no doubt that the record is correct. I think every Senator who has a doubt should be able to have it resolved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair also wishes to make another parliamentary ruling, namely, that once the recapitulation has been made, no Senator may change his vote. The recapitulation will stand as it is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Chair announce that an error was made in the announcement of the vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will announce that the teller informed the Chair, after the vote on the motion to lay on the table had begun, that apparently an error had been made in the announcement of the vote on the Aiken amendment.

As a matter of fact, the error, according to the teller, as he has informed the Chair, was in the result the teller gave the Chair, when, as a matter of fact the

vote was a tie. So the Chair thinks a recapitulation would be well in order.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Do I understand correctly that no Senator may change his vote; that the RECORD will show how each Senator voted, and that the recapitulation relates purely to a matter of addition?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Each Senator will be on his honor to state how he voted.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. Do I understand correctly that no Senator may change his vote on recapitulation, and that a Senator who did not vote may not now vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There will be no new votes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know what the recapitulation will show; but if the recapitulation shall show a tie vote, will the parliamentary situation then be as it would have been at that point if a tie vote had been announced?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct; and the Vice President then would have one of those rare opportunities to break a tie.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should say for the information of the Senate that the tellers at the table on the majority side showed the vote to be 46 to 45 one way. The teller at the desk showed the vote to be 46 to 45 the other way.

A question was raised, and when the tellers at the desk examined their lists, they said the result was a tie, and they so informed the Vice President after the vote had begun on the motion to reconsider.

So I think every Senator would want the true results to be known.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not think there is any doubt about that. All of us want the judgment of the Senate to stand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and the teller will recapitulate the vote on the Aiken amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Senators voting in the affirmative: Messrs. AIKEN, ANDERSON, BARRETT, BEALL, BENDER, BENNETT, BIBLE, BRICKER, BRIDGES, BUSH, BUTLER, CAPEHART, CASE of New Jersey, COTTON, DIRKSEN, DUFF, DWORSHAK, EASTLAND, FLANDERS, FREAR, GOLDWATER, HAYDEN, HICKENLOOPER, HOLLAND, IVES, JENNER, KENNEDY, KNOWLAND, KUCHEL, MALONE, MARTIN of Iowa, MARTIN of Pennsylvania, McCLELLAN, PASTORE, PAYNE, POTTER, PURTELL, ROBERTSON, SALTONSTALL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Messrs. SMITH of New Jersey, STENNIS, WATKINS, WELKER, and WILLIAMS.

Senators voting in the negative: Messrs. ALLOTT, BARKLEY, CARLSON, CASE of South Dakota, CHAVEZ, CLEMENTS, CURTIS, DANIEL, DOUGLAS, ELLENDER, ERVIN, FULBRIGHT, GEORGE, GORE, GREEN, HENNINGS, HILL, HRUSKA, HUMPHREY, GREEN, JOHNSON of Texas, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, KEFAUVER, KERR, LANGER, LEHMAN, LONG, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, McNAMARA, MONRONEY, MORSE, MUNDT, MURRAY, NEUBERGER, O'MAHONEY, RUSSELL, SCHOEPPEL, SCOTT, SPARKMAN, SYMINGTON, THURMOND, THYE, WILEY, and YOUNG.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the recapitulation shows—yeas 45, nays 45. The Chair votes "yea."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee will state it.

Mr. GORE. The vote has been taken. No Senator may change his vote; neither may the Vice President now vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks if the Senator will read the Constitution, he will find that the Vice President can always break a tie in the Senate.

The Chair votes "yea"; and the precedents, according to the Parliamentarian, are to that effect.

So Mr. AIKEN's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the record as to the previous motion to reconsider, which was followed by a motion to lay on the table, stand as the judgment of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does that mean the RECORD will show how each Senator voted on the amendment and how he finally voted on the motion to reconsider?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Surely; instead of making a new motion to reconsider.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I call up the amendment identified as 3–5–56—D.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, between lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

GRADUATED PRICE SUPPORT LEVEL

SEC. 103. Section 101 (d) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(8) The support price available to any producer in any calendar year for any basic agricultural commodity, other than tobacco, shall be adjusted as provided in the following table as the gross income, including proceeds of price-support loans, of such farm from the disposition of agricultural commodities produced on such farm increases:

"If the loan or purchase would increase the gross income, including proceeds of price support loans, from the disposition during the calendar year of agricultural commodities produced on the farm to an amount—	The support price shall be the following percentage of parity:
Not exceeding $7,000	100
Exceeding $7,000 but not exceeding $20,000	90
Exceeding $20,000 but not exceeding $50,000	75"

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, may we have the number of the amendment which is now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENDER in the chair). It is identified as 3–5–56—D.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, I call up the amendment, realizing that since the Senate has rejected a 90 percent support program, the amendment may not be adopted, but I at least wanted to give the Members of the Senate an opportunity to take some affirmative action on behalf of the small farmers of the Nation.

Mr. President, in the beginning of this country, President Thomas Jefferson said that the most stabilizing influence in the Nation was the small farmer. President Abraham Lincoln said that he felt the Nation would be secure as long as most of the land was owned, operated, and farmed by the small farmers; that they were the stabilizing influence of this Nation.

Mr. President, it is reported that in the past 3½ years 1 million small farmers have had to go out of business because they were unable to make a financial success of farming.

We all know that on small parcels of land we have seen farm families of whom it was said that their children were going to leave the farm and go into industry or business, because it was impossible to make ends meet on a small family-sized farm.

Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to give some benefit and assistance to the small farmers. That would be done by establishing a graduated scale for determining the price-support eligibility of farm operators. My amendment provides that the first $7,000 of sales by any farm operator shall be supported at 100 percent of the parity price; additional marketings up to $20,000 would be supported at 90 percent of the parity price, and additional marketings up to $50,000 would be supported at 75 percent of the parity price.

I have made a study of this matter. I was encouraged when President Eisenhower sent up a recommendation for us to incorporate that principle in this year's farm bill. But when I heard that he had refused to back up his proposal with any suggested legislative language, I realized that this was just gesture, without real substance. It reminded me of the promise he made as a candidate for President in 1952 of full parity for farmers. I am afraid he allowed Mr. Benson to talk him out of both of them.

None of the economists I have talked with can say that a fully adequate family farm is just so much in acreage size and no more. I do know that the Bureau of Census figures show that only 6 percent of the commercial farms in Tennessee had gross sales of all products in 1954 of more than $7,000, and only 1 percent of Tennessee's commercial farms had gross sales in 1954 of more than $20,000. Nationwide, only 24 percent of commercial farms had gross sales of more than $7,000, and only 8 percent had sales of more than $20,000. Under my amendment, 117,942 Tennessee farms

and 2½ million farms in the United States would be eligible for 100 percent of parity protection, even if all commodities were under the program. Most of the rest would receive a blended average of 100 and 90 percent of parity. Under my amendment, only 1,500 farms in Tennessee and 284,000 over the entire Nation would not be eligible for 90 and 100 percent of parity, and all of them would receive 100 percent supports on the first $7,000 of sales, and 90 percent supports on additional sales, up to $20,000 in any one year.

Adoption of my amendment would remove the Federal subsidization of the huge industrial farms, and lessen the impact of their unfair competition against the family farm, whose income protection would be made more adequate. The Federal Government should not encourage the growth of factories-in-the-field. Family farms are conducive to the preservation of the American democratic free enterprise system. Industrialized agricultural units, whether corporate or individually owned or State-owned collectives, are basically inimical to the national well-being.

On the family farm, the family itself supplies most of the labor, management, financing, and capital ownership. Even on the largest family farms, the family supplies most of the manual labor. However, on industrialized agricultural units, most of the labor, and on State-owned collectives all of the labor, is provided by hired hands. Under the latter circumstances, the economic functions are split, and farming loses its integrated, cohesive nature. If such units were widespread within an economy, society would lose a major balancing force for political and social stability.

Government agricultural programs certainly should be designed and administered in such a way that the most precious ideals of free men in a free society are not damaged. This limitation on the size of price-support loans would remove one of the unfair items in the present agricultural situation, and would strengthen the whole.

Mr. President, if there are no other requests for time, I desire to state that I respectfully hope that this gesture, at least, may be seriously considered by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to say that I do not think this is a very good amendment. It would establish three sets of support prices in the same community. That could cause a great deal of confusion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is under control. Is time yielded to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there have been many suggestions about graduating price supports for producers; and this amendment is one of those proposals—namely, to give part of the producers in a county one support price, and to give another part another support price, and to give still another part a third support price. To say the least, that would cause confusion in the market in any community and in the Nation. I do not see how such an arrangement could possibly work.

So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. This amendment provides a graduated level of price support for basic commodities (other than tobacco) based on the gross income received from the farm during the calendar year.

If the proceeds of the price support loan or purchase would not cause the gross income for the calendar year to exceed $7,000, the support price would be 10C percent of the parity price. If it would cause gross income to be between $7,000 and $20,000, the support price would be 90 percent of the parity price. If it would cause gross income to exceed $20,000, support would be at 75 percent. Presumably, no price support would be made available if gross income exceeded $50,000.

This amendment could not be administered where the price support program operates through the purchase of processed commodities or other operationt than loans and purchases, and apparently is not so intended. The committee considered a number of proposals similar to this amendment, but felt that a limitation of this sort was not feasible. This amendment would tend to draw all of the production of small producers into Government loan, leaving the market to the larger producers. If sufficient commodities were put under loan, the withdrawal of such stocks from the market would tend to support the market price for all producers, both large and small, and this amendment would be ineffective. On the other hand, if this limitation so curtailed price support operations that they were not effective to support the market price to producers, the price support program would be rendered ineffective.

This amendment leaves in some doubt what the current support price would be at any time for the purpose of section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, which prescribes the price at which Commodity Credit Corporation may sell basic agricultural commodities.

Another difficulty the amendment presents is raised by the fact that the gross income for any farm for any year would not be known until after the end of the year, so that the support level could not be known at the time the price support loan or purchase would normally be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas], I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, in line 21, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

In determining past production of a commodity for such purposes in any area in which, because of flood, drought, or other natural disaster, the production of such commodity shall have fallen below 35 percent of the normal production thereof for 2 successive years, such years shall be excluded.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, this amendment simply provides that in determining past production of commodities under the acreage-reserve program of the Soil Bank Act, years in which production has fallen below 35 percent of normal, because of flood, drought, or other natural disasters, shall be excluded from consideration if such conditions prevailed for at least 2 successive years.

As presently written, the committee bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the rate of compensation for taking land out of production which "will provide producers with a fair and reasonable return," and several factors are listed for the Secretary to consider. According to the tentative plans for implementing the soil bank, as outlined on page 15 of the committee report, compensation would be based on a normal yield for each farm, adjusted for a community and county average. There is a fear that these figures—the county and community averages and the normal yield for each farm—might be based on production from 1951 to 1955, or over some such period.

As we all know, in great areas of the Southwest, including western Kansas, eastern Colorado, parts of Oklahoma, and a good portion of Texas, farmers have experienced a prolonged and severe drought. For them, "average production" over the past few years has been well below "normal production"; and their financial condition is even more precarious than that in other farming areas of the United States. At least some of these farmers would like to participate in the acreage-reserve program, but they will be penalized further if their return is figured on average production in recent years. This should not be done, and it may not be intended by the authors of the bill.

However, I do not find in the bill anything to exclude such drought or flood years from that consideration. For this reason, Mr. President, I think the matter should be clarified by means of this amendment; and that is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have read the amendment. I do not think it is really necessary. The Secretary of Agriculture would have the right to take into consideration the flood or drought conditions or any other natural

disaster which had substantially affected production.

Under the bill, the Secretary of Agriculture is given very broad authority to use his own judgment and to pay compensation which would retire allotted acres into the acreage reserve program. He would not have to take into consideration any specific period or number of years—2 or 3, for instance—during which there were floods or any periods in which there was drought, in determining the normal production from such acreage.

Mr. DANIEL. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana understands that what I should like to have is some assurance that drought years will not be figured in connection with the determination of normal production. Can the Senator give us some assurance in that respect?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I will say that when we were formulating the bill the matter was discussed in the committee with the officials of the Department of Agriculture. It is thoroughly understood that if a community suffers from drought or other disaster, and if it has a crop failure or almost a crop failure, full allowance will be made, and that year will not be counted in arriving at the average production over a period of years. Certainly the committee understands that such bad years of crop failure will not be used in computing the average yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Do I correctly understand that the officials of the Department of Agriculture so testified before the committee?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, before the committee; I will not say that testimony is on the record, however. I think it was testified when they were discussing these things with the committee in executive session.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Senator from Minnesota and I thoroughly understood that disaster conditions—flood years and drought years and short crops from similar causes—would not be considered in connection with this matter.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from Vermont understand that is the intent?

Mr. AIKEN. That is the intent of the proposed legislation, insofar as I am concerned.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that also the understanding of the chairman of the committee?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my understanding.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recall that in the committee that was discussed by the Senator from Vermont; and I think the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] also discussed it. It was our understanding—and I believe the Under Secretary or some other representative of the Department was there at the time—that the very provisions mentioned in the amendment of the Senator from Texas were the intent of the committee and the understanding of the Department.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course it would be very unjust to penalize a farmer because he had suffered disaster for 1 or more years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true.

Mr. DANIEL. Then the disaster years would not be taken into consideration in computing normal production.

Mr. AIKEN. That is my understanding.

Mr. DANIEL. In view of this colloquy and the clear understanding on the part of the chairman of the committee, the ranking minority member [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], that it is the intention of this legislation to exclude disaster years, I agree with them that probably the amendment is unnecessary, and I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "2–27–56–I."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is that a very long amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; and I do not intend to speak long on it.

Mr. AIKEN. I have a technical amendment to which I am sure there will be no objection. I should like to get rid of it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont, if I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is designated "2–27–56–C."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, line 13, it is proposed to strike all of the section after the words "per annum" and insert: "Whose duties shall include such responsibility for activities of the Department, including those of the Commodity Credit Corporation, relating to the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities as the Secretary may direct."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand this is merely a rewording of the section pertaining to the Surplus Disposal Administrator.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. We inadvertently left the Surplus Disposal Administrator outside the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Would this amendment affect the distribution of food by the Secretary for emergency relief?

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have an amendment dealing with the emergency relief program.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think this amendment has anything to do with the subject. I am familiar with the Senator's amendment. This amendment has nothing to do with it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understand the Aiken amendment, it is merely to bring the new position which we created under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We left him hanging on a limb by himself.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. We do not want the Congress dealing directly with the Surplus Disposal Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is designated "2–27–56—I."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

LIMIT ON PRICE SUPPORT

SEC. 107. The Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 421. The total amount of price support made available under this act to any person for any year through loans to such person, or through purchases made by Commodity Credit Corporation from such person, shall not exceed $25,000. The term 'person' shall mean any individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or agency of a State. In the event of any loan to, or purchase from, a cooperative marketing association, such limitation shall apply to the amount of price support made available through such cooperative association to each person. The limitation herein on the amount of price support made available to any person shall not apply if price support is extended by purchases of a product of an agricultural commodity from processors and the Secretary determines that it is impracticable to apply such limitations."

On page 4, line 24, it is proposed to strike out "107" and insert "108."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], if there is some understanding that there will be no more yea-and-nay votes tonight, and if for that reason, therefore, some of our colleagues have gone to their offices or left the Chamber for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. I did make such a statement. I thought that from this point on during the remainder of the evening, if there were any technical amendments or other amendments which could be disposed of without a record vote, we could take care of them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the Senator if we may come to an understanding that my amendment shall be the pending question beginning on Monday.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Two or three Senators have expressed a desire to vote

upon it. I now gather that they may have gone home.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. I may state that earlier in the day an amendment was offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to strike from the bill the provision with respect to a two-price program for rice. At my suggestion he withdrew that amendment, on condition that it would be placed before the Senate on Monday soon after the Senate convenes, provided no other amendment was then pending. So, under the agreement which we have, I suggest that the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota remain pending, and on Monday, as soon as we complete action on his amendment, we can proceed with the rice amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it the understanding of the Senator that there will be no further yea-and-nay votes this evening?

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the understanding I had with a number of Senators who desired to leave the Chamber.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then there is a gentlemen's agreement that we should refrain from bringing up amendments on which we would like to have a yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to respect the wishes and judgment of the Senator from Louisiana. I ask only that my amendment be the pending question on Monday.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to that amendment being the pending question on Monday, it is my understanding that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has been promised that his amendment will be the pending question on Monday.

Mr. ELLENDER. I told the Senator from Illinois that after we had completed action on any pending amendment upon which we did not complete action today, his amendment would be taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the pending question on Monday will be the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. ELLENDER. I had an understanding with the junior Senator from Illinois that his amendment would be taken up Monday after the Senate had completed action upon any amendment then pending.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has offered his amendment, and it is now the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the pending question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senate, pursuant to an order previously entered, should adjourn or recess until Monday, the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota would be the pending question, following the morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, if the leaders have agreed that there will be no further yea-and-nay votes tonight, if the Senator from Minnesota wishes the yeas and nays on his amendment, he can ask for them at this time, and the years and nays can be ordered on his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I assume, of course, that this arrangement is consonant with the understanding had today with the chairman of the committee, that if there were a pending amendment when the Senate convened on Monday, it would take precedence over my amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is correct; the junior Senator from Illinois is correct; and the Senator from Lousiana is correct. The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, that is a good note upon which to end the day. However, I should like to make another parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has certain amendments on which he will not ask for the yeas and nays. Would it be in order for him to ask unanimous consent temporarily to lay aside the pending amendment and consider his amendments, with the understanding that when his amendments are acted upon the Senate will resume consideration of the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a request would be in order.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "2-24-56-C."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the amendment just identified by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CAPEHART. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess——

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that motion?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Certainly. I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I was very anxious to offer two amendments. I wish the Senator from Indiana would withdraw his objection.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator merely wants to offer them. He does not want a yea-and-nay vote. He has no idea of having them adopted. He wants to take up space in the RECORD and time of the Senators, without any idea of getting the amendments adopted. It is very simple to me. I can see through it plainly. If the Senator wants to offer them and have a yea-and-nay vote on them, it is all right with me. I certainly cannot go along with the idea that we should permit him to offer them with no idea of having any vote on them. He has no idea of getting them adopted. He does not believe in them himself. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, with respect to the two amendments I was going to offer, I thought the chairman of the committee might accept them, because they are minor amendments and have to do with putting woodland together in connection with the soil bank program, so as to prevent the necessity of building separate fences. It is not in line with the suggestion of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator speak louder, please?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The amendments I was going to offer have considerable merit. I thought the chairman might agree to accept them, and then it might not be necessary to have a yea-and-nay vote on them. I am offering them in good faith, but if the Senator objects——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield time to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not understand the Chair's statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield time to the Senator from Tennessee? The Senator from Tennessee will have to obtain some time if he desires to speak on his amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be very happy to yield whatever time the Senator from Tennessee desires.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I only wanted time to say that I hope the Senator from Indiana will allow me to offer the two amendments. If he objects, that is that.

Then I shall merely take time to send two bills to the desk and ask that they be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

S. 3413. A bill for the relief of Radovan Mohorovicich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3414. A bill to provide for the advancement of Capt. Edward J. Steichen, United States Naval Reserve (retired), to the grade of rear admiral on the Naval Reserve retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The bill——

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand that the able Senator would like to offer his

amendments, knowing that he cannot have them adopted, so that he may get away to continue his campaigning. I withdraw my objection. He knows he cannot get them through, but we will vote on them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. KEFAUVER. Just a minute. The Senator from Indiana is assuming something he has no right to assume. I had hoped to offer the amendments, because I believe them to be meritorious amendments, and because I want to offer them. I resent the inference of the Senator from Indiana that I would take the time of the Senate with something I did not believe had merit. Therefore, I will not offer them on that basis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe this is most unfair. It is most unfair to cast such insinuations. If I can remedy the situation by withdrawing my amendment——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will not do that. We can get a unanimous-consent agreement, if the Senator will not do that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may consider the amendments of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assume we will have to take up the amendments on Monday, unless the Senator wants to——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe a matter of common courtesy is involved here. The Senator from Tennessee does not have to explain where he is going to be on Monday, on Saturday, or Sunday, or Tuesday. He can be away on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. He does not have to explain to the Senate. If he wants to excuse himself from attendance on the Senate, that is his privilege. I should like to accommodate the Senator from Tennessee. I do not have the slightest idea what his amendment proposes to do. I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw the amendment I have offered, which is the pending question, so that the Senator from Tennessee may proceed.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that the Senator from Minnesota may withdraw his amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I withdraw it.

Mr. ELLENDER. The yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I not permitted to withdraw the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may withdraw it by unanimous consent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennessee.

MODIFICATION OF EXISTING PROJECT FOR THE GREAT LAKES CHANNELS ABOVE LAKE ERIE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me briefly?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There is on the calendar H. R. 2552. The bill has been cleared with the distinguished minority leader and with the majority policy committee. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its present consideration. It will take only a moment. It is Calendar No. 1658.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2552) to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2552) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the majority leader for expeditious action on one of the truly great projects of our Nation. Every person in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan, and other parts of the great heartland of America will be deeply appreciative.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. The very able Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] brought the matter to our attention several times. I am glad the Senate in its wisdom decided to pass the bill.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I had previously asked permission to introduce two bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the appropriate committees.

Mr. KEFAUVER. One bill is in connection with——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is that the Senator from Tennessee has the floor for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask for the regular order, that the Senator offer his amendment. If he does not intend to do so, other Senators will offer amendments.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 2-24-56-C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) In order to promote best land utilization and conservation and permit good farm management, the Secretary may authorize the consolidation of acreages withheld from cultivation for purposes of participation in the acreage-reserve program, and he shall permit the transfer between any farm operated by a producer and any other farm operated by the same producer, either alone or together with one or more other producers (including a farm acquired for the sole purpose of effectuating such a consolidation), of all or any part of any acreage allotment of either such farm. No such transfer shall affect future acreage allotments for any farm from or to which any such transfer is made.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to enable a number of farmers who are eligible to participate in the acreage reserve to pool their reserve acreages, acquire an adjoining or nearby farm and establish their joint soil bank on that farm, on a cooperative basis.

The acreage reserve is not designed to be of any material assistance to farmers in helping to raise their incomes. The acreage reserve is just a means whereby farmers can assist the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the inventory of Commodity Credit Corporation by sales into the domestic United States market without completely destroying prices in such markets. I feel that farmers might be willing to cooperate to this end with the Secretary, if the payments involved are large enough per acre and if participation can be worked out without being too great a hardship upon the farming program of the individual farm family.

Acceptance of this amendment would mean that several neighbor farmers, each of whom are eligible to participate in the acreage reserve could join together into a cooperative, purchase or lease an adjoining farm or farms where the present operator desired to leave, and which farm has had assigned to it a certain acreage allotment of the covered crops. These farm families could then, under the proposed amendment, put all of their eligible acreage reserve acreage together and concentrate them upon the other farm and each would be enabled to participate in the acreage reserve to the extent of the limitation imposed by the acreage allotment on his own farm. Thus the individual farmer would not have to block off and specially fence an area of land in the middle of the farm he is now operating according to a planned rotation and land utilization program. The individual farmer could continue to operate on his own farm as he had planned to do, and could participate in the acreage reserve on the adjoining or nearby land, leased or bought in cooperation with other like-minded neighbors.

If this amendment were incorporated into the acreage reserve legislation, it would mean that in many areas of the Nation, the acreage reserve acreages would be set aside in large blocks, instead of many scattered small blocks, a little on each farm. The gains from a conservation standpoint are obvious. In the larger blocks, much better provision could be made for adequate wildlife cover. Prevention of grazing by commercial domestic livestock would be

made much easier. Such areas could be made more easily and more safely available for public hunting and fishing than if they are in little scattered blocks of acreage reserve on every farm.

Frankly, I do not believe that the soil bank acreage reserve proposal is very sound. I see no reason why the Nation should be paying out $750 million a year to reduce wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and tobacco acres to 30 percent less than annual needs for exports and domestic consumption. I do not believe that we should put on the shoulders of farmers, the public relations load for justifying the expenditure of the Federal Government of any such sum as this and its acceptance by farmers, when farmers themselves would not be getting any benefits whatsoever out of it. But if the acreage reserve is to be enacted, the least we can do is to make it contribute as much as we can to sensible conservation management and to be as little a burden as possible on farm people, whose incomes continue to drop below the disaster levels of last year.

Mr. President, we are told that no alternative use is planned whatsoever for the acreage reserve land that is taken out of production. Presumably it is supposed to just lie idle, with a provision that noxious weeds are to be controlled. Reputable State agricultural experiment station agronomists and soils specialists have told the House Committee on Agriculture that such a procedure is exceedingly dangerous. That to do so runs the risk that the Government will be the promoting partner in the development of that many acres of an American wasteland. The scientists tell us that our farmland will quickly destroy itself if it is left idle from year to year. This is a serious matter, Mr. President, and the blame will be on the doorstep of the Senate if we enact such a program. The reason that the administration must come up here with such a preposterous proposal is that some of its own chickens have come home to roost. There are not enough cover crop seed to plant the estimated acreage reserve lands because 3 years ago the administration abolished the price-stabilization program for cover-crop seed. Now we are so short of such seed that we must run the risk of making wasteland out of some of our best farmland. But that is not all. We cannot even have the acreage reserve planted to trees because there are not enough seedlings. And why are not there enough seedlings? Because the administration cut the Soil Conservation Service nurseries out of the budget several years ago. I have seen many of these abandoned nurseries in the different States. If these nurseries had been kept in operation we could be putting more land taken out of production into desirable conservation cover.

If the pending amendment is incorporated in the acreage reserve subtitle, it will not overcome the lack of cover crop seeds nor the shortage of tree seedlings, but it will at least enable a few neighbor farmers to block their acreage reserve into a single area where it can be better protected from destructive sheet erosion and where the land can be seeded to some kind of crops for which there is a supply of needed seed and then such crops can be turned under as a green manure crop even though the vegetative cover so used is not in the category of usual cover crops. It would be better to grow and plow down a crop of immature, thickly sown corn than to allow the land to lie bare. In the middle of many different farms such little blocks of acreage reserve would be nothing but a nuisance to the farm operator. But consolidated with the reserves of many neighbors such special management would become economical and feasible.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this amendment would permit producers to transfer acreage allotments between farms operated by them—either alone or with others—including farms acquired for that purpose.

This amendment would nullify to a considerable extent the effectiveness of the acreage allotment and acreage reserve programs by permitting farmers to transfer their allotments to more productive lands, even across State lines, as for example from dry lands to irrigated lands. It would also complicate administration of both these programs by greatly increasing the recordkeeping required and requiring determinations as to the identity of farms operated by various producers.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have a very brief amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 26, after line 21, it is proposed to add to section 302, the following:

(c) Food supplied by the Department to qualified private charitable agencies providing emergency relief may be without regard to whether the food is consumed on the premises of the administering agency.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, under the administrative rulings of the Department of Agriculture, food for charitable agencies must be consumed on the premises, which means that persons who are entitled to food under the program must bring their children to messhalls, and they are frequently put to a great deal of inconvenience to get to the place where they con obtain the food.

Furthermore, this program is operating effectively, or with any effect, only in the larger cities where messhalls can be established.

My amendment would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, under rules which he may establish and where the situation justifies it, to relax the rule with regard to consuming the food on the premises, so that in certain situations where children or distances are involved, persons may be entitled to receive food and take it home to feed the children without having to bring the children to the messhall.

I think it is a humanitarian effort. I think it is also an effort which will assure wider distribution in rural areas where no program has been established.

I think it will mean a wider distribution of food to be given to people who are deserving of it. Under the present program I am advised that the Secretary has felt that as the law is now written the food must be distributed and consumed on the premises. My amendment would merely authorize him, under certain circumstances, to give out food without its having to be eaten at the place where it is distributed.

I hope the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will accept my amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the amendment contrary to the present regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have been in conference with an agency here which distributes some food under the Secretary's orders, and I am told that the Secretary has ruled that under the law the food must be eaten on the premises.

Mr. ELLENDER. It must be consumed on the premises?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the Senator's amendment lend itself to the distribution of surplus food for needy families?

Mr. KEFAUVER. To those who are already entitled to it under the present program, if the situation is such that they cannot consume the food on the premises.

Mr. ELLENDER. How would it be administered and policed?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I suppose it would be policed by rules and regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Representatives of the Department have spoken of the great hardship in having to bring children of tender age who need food to the place where it is distributed, under certain rules. If the rule could be relaxed so as to enable mothers to take the food home to the children, it would be a much better program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would not the Department have to maintain some kind of a commissary in order to administer it?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not know. Of course, the Secretary would not have to give away any food unless he wanted to, but if he is going to give it to the people at the premises, it seems to me that if mothers might take the food home to the children it would be a much better charitable program.

I hope the Senator will take the amendment to conference and consider it. I think it has considerable merit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "3–5–56–B" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 25, between lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

PRODUCTION ON GOVERNMENT LANDS PROHIBITED

SEC. 225. No lease executed, renewed, or permitted to extend beyond its earliest termination or cancellation date by any agency of the United States as lessor after the enactment of this act shall permit the lessee to produce on any land subject to such lease any agricultural commodity (other than livestock or livestock products) determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for about 3 minutes?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to yield 3 minutes to the junior Senator from Tennessee so that he may raise a parliamentary question which I think is rather serious, so far as the Senate is concerned. I ask the minority leader to give it attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Members of the Senate will recall that the Senator from Tennessee raised a point of order earlier today. I now have the transcript of the official report, from which I read:

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the "yeas" are 46, and the "nays" are 45. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Vermont to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 41.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas would like to make the unanimous-consent request that in view of the record there be a recapitulation of the vote on the Aiken amendment, and that the name of each Senator be called.

Mr. President, after some discussion——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think, inasmuch as the Senator is attempting to build the record, I think he should go on and read the discussion, because it is quite pertinent to the Senate in bringing it back to its original parliamentary position.

Mr. GORE. It would be necessary for me to have a little more time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Delaware, I should like to yield additional time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. GORE. Continuing to read the remarks of the Senator from Texas:

The record at the desk showed a majority of one vote one way, while the record of the teller at the table showed a majority of one vote the other way.

Therefore, I should like to ask unanimous consent that there be a recapitulation of the vote on the Aiken amendment, so that each Senator may know how he was recorded, and so that the RECORD may show the correct tabulation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if there is to be a recapitulation at this time, I am not certain as to the parliamentary situation with which the Senate would be confronted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As the Chair understands, the Senator from Texas is, in effect, asking that the Senate return to the vote on the Aiken amendment in order to have a recapitulation of that vote.

I digress from a reading of the record to say that a recapitulation is not a reconsideration. A recapitulation is merely a recount.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him, I suggest that if he will proceed to read the rest of the record, I think the record will be clear that when unanimous consent was given, and the questions were asked, it was understood that the matter would revert to the parliamentary situation which would have existed at that point had the tellers at the desk announced the correct total.

The Vice President of the United States was in his Chair. It was not a situation in which the Vice President was in his office and had come to the Senate Chamber subsequently to cast a vote. He was presiding over the Senate of the United States. Had the correct tabulation been announced to him at that point by the teller at the desk, he had the constitutional power, which is greater than the power given under the Senate rules, to cast his vote.

So I submit that if the Senator from Tennessee will read the entire transcript of the proceedings, it will show that the parliamentary situation had reverted to precisely what it would have been had the tellers announced the correct vote to the Vice President.

Mr. GORE. I have read the transcript, and I shall be glad to accommodate the Senator from California by reading it into the RECORD. I may say, however, that the junior Senator from Tennessee does not understand the situation to be as the senior Senator from California has stated it. According to the record, which I shall later read, the only unanimous-consent request which was made and the only unanimous consent which was granted was for a recapitulation.

Prior to the recapitulation, a motion, which I have read, was made to reconsider. A motion to lay that motion on the table was made. A yea-and-nay vote was had upon that motion. It was then too late to be reconsidered by the consent of the Senate. No consent for reconsideration was requested; only a recount was requested.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will continue to read the discussion, he will find that that very question was raised. Prior to the granting of the unanimous consent, the minority leader asked what the parliamentary situation would be. He specifically asked the question as to whether the legislative procedure would be as it would have been prior to the vote having been announced.

Mr. GORE. I shall now read the statements by the senior Senator from California and the senior Senator from Texas, and shall then read the Vice President's answers in reply:

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall take the responsibility for what I am about to say. Certainly no one wants the result in the Journal to be different from the votes which Senators of the United States cast. I would not interpose a parliamentary objection to a recapitulation in order to ascertain what the judgment of the Senate was at that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is characteristic of the minority leader. I appreciate his attitude very much. I have no doubt that the record is correct. I think every Senator who has a doubt should be able to have it resolved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair also wishes to make another parliamentary ruling, namely, that once the recapitulation has been made, no Senator may change his vote. The recapitulation will stand as it is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Chair announce that an error was made in the announcement of the vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will announce that the teller informed the Chair, after the vote on the motion to lay on the table had begun, that apparently an error had been made in the announcement of the vote on the Aiken amendment.

I digress to point out that the error was noted only after the second yea-and-nay vote had been started.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senate was familiar with that fact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Tennessee make the point that the Chair and the minority leader made it abundantly clear that the recapitulation would not permit any Senator to change his vote, or would not permit any Senator who had not voted, to vote on the recapitulation, and that, therefore, the Vice President would be entitled to no more right to vote after the recapitulation than a Member of the Senate who had not voted, would have had to vote? Is that the Senator's point?

Mr. GORE. That is my point. I maintain, further, that the only condition under which the Vice President could even have voted would have been for the Senate to have granted a reconsideration of the vote. Were that not the case, the Vice President could return next week from some trip and untie a vote which had been cast last week. Parliamentary rules are made to be observed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I submit that the situation suggested by the Senator from Tennessee is not at all on a par with his last statement. The Vice Pres-

ident of the United States was in his chair. He has a constitutional power which is far greater than the power granted by the rules of the Senate. Article I, section 3, of the Constitution itself, provides:

> The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no vote, unless they be equally divided.

That is the constitutional power which the Vice President has.

I submit that the record clearly shows that when the unanimous-consent request to have a recapitulation was granted, it, in effect, vacated at that point the motion to lay on the table, because, if the Senator will continue to read from the transcript, after the Vice President of the United States had cast his vote and announced the result, I then asked unanimous consent that the yea-and-nay vote on the motion to reconsider be made the judgment of the Senate, and that request was granted by unanimous consent.

That, in and of itself, shows that the order had been vacated at that point and was reinstated after the announcement of the vote of the Senate by the Vice President, following which he cast the deciding vote.

Mr. GORE. The constitutional powers of the Vice President of the United States, like the constitutional powers of all officials of the United States, must be exercised at such time and place, and under such conditions, as those constitutional powers may prevail. I submit that after a vote has been taken, after a vote has been announced, after a motion has been made to reconsider that vote, and after a motion has been made to lay that motion on the table, and a yea and nay vote has been taken, it is then too late merely to ask for a recapitulation and thereby permit the vote to be changed by the Vice President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The fact of the matter is that as the vote was announced, due to an error by the teller at the desk, and had it not been for the unanimous-consent request which was granted, the record would have shown the vote as it was originally announced, based upon a majority for the Aiken amendment. The President of the Senate, who is the Vice President of the United States, obviously was not entitled to cast his vote.

It was only after the record had been corrected and made clear that, under the Constitution, the Vice President had a right to cast his vote.

What the Senator from Tennessee is arguing is that because of a mistake by a clerk at the desk, the Presiding Officer of this body, the Vice President of the United States, should be deprived of his constitutional right to vote, merely because of an error in an announcement. I do not think the Senator from Tennessee wishes to contend that because a mistake had been made in an announcement, and the Senate, by unanimous consent permitted the reopening of the record for the reasons I stated, namely, that no one wanted to take advantage of a situation in which an obvious error had been made, the Vice President should be deprived of his right under the Constitution.

Mr. GORE. I say to the distinguished Senator from California that this is not a moral question; it is a question of parliamentary procedure. The junior Senator from Tennessee is not undertaking to strip the Vice President of any constitutional power he has. What I am saying is that after a motion to reconsider has been made, and after a motion to reconsider a vote had been laid on the table by a yea-and-nay vote, the only way in which the Vice President could have cast his vote upon that question was for the Senate to grant its consent for reconsideration, and that had not been requested; only a request for recapitulation had been made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The argument I shall make now is merely a matter of constitutional law and not a matter of what may finally prevail as to justice in this situation. But the point has been made by the minority leader that the Vice President has power over and above the rules of the Senate because he has a constitutional power, namely, on the right to vote:

> The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no vote unless they be equally divided.

On the basis of that language, it is true that when there is a tie vote, the Vice President has the deciding vote. So the minority leader is saying that the Vice President has a constitutional power which is greater than the rules and regulations which pertain to the Senate. But section 3 of article 1 states:

> The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State * * * for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

Now, there is a constitutional power for Senators: "Shall have one vote."

We go back. The minority leader, in his colloquy, made it clear that any Senator who had not been here could not come in and vote on the recapitulation. He further made it clear that any Senator who had voted could not change his vote.

Mr. GORE. And, further, I have quoted from the record, the Vice President said:

> The recapitulation will stand as it is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

The point I want to make is that if we can say that to a Senator, who has more affirmative power to vote than has the Vice President, because the language pertaining to the Vice President is, "but shall have no vote unless they be equally divided," and the language pertaining to a Senator is "each Senator shall have one vote," and if we deny that Senator the right to vote on recapitulation, we deny that Senator the right to vote in case he comes in during the recapitulation of the vote. From the Constitution, and from the colloquy that has taken place, I would say the Vice President had been ruled out by the colloquy and the rulings which had been established.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the situation would be that if that Senator had not been in the Chamber at the time and had shown up later, after the vote had been taken, or had come in during the recapitulation, he could not vote, because he was not there during the original instance. I think if the Vice President had been at some other point and had later come in, he could not have voted; but he was here, performing his duty. The Constitution says the only time he has a right to vote is when there is a tie. He has a right to exercise that right, but he does not know whether he has a right to vote until the vote has been announced. In other words, if there is a vote of 46 to 45, he cannot vote to tie it, and, in this instance, lose it, because a tie loses. The only time he has an opportunity to vote is if there is an announcement that there is a tie, at which time he votes. By the error at the desk, he could not vote and exercise his responsibility, because, under the announcement of the vote, he was not entitled to vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Tennessee and the minority leader may have not to exceed 10 minutes each to pursue this question further, without charging the time to either side.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has control of the time. Since we are being so constitutional, I point out that 6 minutes were yielded, and 17 minutes have been taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have always known the Senator from Delaware to be willing, eager, and able to speak for himself, and if he does not want to indulge us, I know he will say so. I hope he will extend his usual courtesy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand that there are two precedents in the Senate directly on the point that has been raised tonight. I think it would be helpful, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Minnesota, if we pursue the discussion, to have before us the precedents of the Senate, where situations somewhat comparable to this took place.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator will permit a brief statement, I shall comply with his request and suggestion.

A motion to reconsider the vote was laid on the table. That procedure was followed by the Senate. No unanimous consent request was made to vacate that procedure. That stands in the record, as I have read it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I said earlier, beyond the argument on what I think is the constitutional law, I think there is involved the question of fair play and justice. I recognize that the Vice President was not out of the Chamber, but was in the chair. I recognize what the Vice President would have done, as he did do. I think the Senator from Tennessee has

made his point primarily on the basis of the rules and the law. I think that is the point which needs to be established. I think in the final disposition of the question there should be considered what I would call the matter of equity and comity among the Members of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it was the clear indication of the Senate that when we got back to that point, it was understood that in order to get back to that point we had to vacate the procedure whereby the motion to reconsider was laid on the table. I gave as supporting evidence of that, the fact that after the whole transaction was renewed, I in effect made a new motion to lay on the table the previous motion of the Senator from Vermont to reconsider. At that point the Senate had control of the situation, because it had to proceed by unanimous consent. As a matter of fact, the question was asked by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] as to whether the vote would be recorded at that point. So the Senate had control of the situation, had anyone desired to object then.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to say this, so my intentions in the matter may be abundantly clear. I must confess I was not aware that a situation like this would develop when I made my unanimous-consent request. I was informed the tally at the desk showed 46 to 45 for the amendment. and the tally at the table showed 46 to 45 against the amendment.

I said to the minority leader and to other Senators involved that I should like to have the correct vote of the Senators, and the only way I could do it was to ask for a recapitulation. The only way I could get a recapitulation was by unanimous consent, because we had already proceeded to the motion to reconsider. That consent was given.

It was not the intention of the majority leader to deprive the Vice President of any constitutional right or to permit any Senator to exercise a right he had not already exercised. The whole purpose was to determine the accurate count on the original vote on the Aiken amendment.

This is an interesting parliamentary question. I should like to hear the precedents on it, but I should not like the minority leader, the Senator from Tennessee, or anybody else, to think I was misleading them when I asked for a true count of the votes of the Senators on each side.

It certainly was not the majority leader's intent to deprive the Vice President of his right. Obviously, he could not vote if the vote was 46 to 45. Obviously, he could vote if the vote was 45 to 45. He was prepared and eager and willing to vote if there was a tie, and I assume he is going to pay a big enough price for that vote without our making him pay more here tonight.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Texas permit the Vice President to make a statement?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like him to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee, very properly, has obtained the original record.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to make this one point, and he knows the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California will agree, that a unanimous-consent request, when it is granted, is, of course, governed by the agreements made, which the record shows. That is all the Vice President wishes to say.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to add one other thing: The Vice President was attempting to make a statement when I asked for the unanimous consent, I think perhaps to point out the error that had been made.

I was insistent on proposing my unanimous-consent request. In courtesy to me, he permitted me to proceed with my statement. I do not know that that would change the situation any, but I know that did happen.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All that the Chair wishes to do is to state that the Chair has now read the complete transcript of the proceedings, and the Senator from California has that transcript. It seems to the Chair that in the transcript of the colloquy regarding the unanimous-consent request, we have a complete settlement of this issue.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I was just going to read the transcript of the proceedings, which appear to have been as follows:

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know what the recapitulation will show; but if the recapitulation shall show a tie vote, will the parliamentary situation then be as it would have been at that point if a tie vote had been announced?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct; and the Vice President then would have one of those rare opportunities to break a tie.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. That is a parliamentary ruling by the Chair, not an action by the Senate. The Senate had acted.

This is not a unanimous-consent request; this is not an action by the Senate.

I wish to make it plain that I do not desire to deprive the Vice President of the right to vote, in the event he has a constitutional right to do so. But the time when he had a right to do so passed.

I think the only fair thing, due to what I think was a mistaken ruling on the part of the Chair—the only fair thing for the Senate to do—is to reconsider, by unanimous consent, and to have the vote taken again, on Monday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think the statement the Senator has just read is extremely pertinent, because I think it was on the basis of that statement and the understanding that accompanied that statement on both sides of the aisle that the majority leader was given unanimous consent.

Mr. GORE. This was afterward.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No, this was before; the Senator did not read the whole. That is why I had a recollection——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator and I had some private conversation about the matter; and then the Senator publicly asked for a ruling. And on the basis of the ruling, he permitted unanimous consent to be granted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish the Senator would repeat reading the ruling and the request that he made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before that is done, let the Chair point out—because the Chair remembers the sequence of events—that the Senator from Texas had requested unanimous consent. The Senator from California reserved the right to object. After reserving the right to object, the Senator from California, as the Chair understood, made a statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me, since I was involved in that colloquy?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; but again I should like to read the transcript of the proceedings, because I think it is significant:

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know what the recapitulation will show; but if the recapitulation shall show a tie vote, will the parliamentary situation then be as it would have been at that point if a tie vote had been announced?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What would it have been at that point if a tie vote had been announced? The Vice President would have been at liberty to cast his vote.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; if a tie vote had been announced. But a tie vote would have had to be announced before the Vice President would have had the right to vote, in exercising his constitutional power.

I read further:

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct; and the Vice President then would have one of those rare opportunities to break a tie.

It was on this understanding that the entire sequence of the unanimous-consent requests went into effect; and I submit that that returned the parliamentary situation to precisely what it would have been if the error had not been made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator is right; and I also think there is the matter of elemental justice and fair play, even regardless of the letter of the agreements or the law, so to speak.

The point I was trying to raise earlier, for a matter of precedent, was whether the constitutional powers of the Vice President, in a situation so confused as this one became, are any greater than the constitutional powers of a Senator, in respect to voting. The truth is that the case of the minority leader has rested, as I recall, just on an understanding among those of us who were

participating in the call for a recapitulation.

I must confess that while I was very much upset by the nature of the vote, there is no use in trying to kid ourselves about it. There was a tie vote on the issue on the question of agreeing to the Aiken amendment. There was a vote by the Vice President to break that tie; and I think the whole reason that we—I know that I was one who felt in the beginning that it was a tie vote; and I went to the majority leader, and said, "This is a tie vote; the vote has not been counted accurately."

In fact, I was protesting privately to the Senator from Kentucky, the Senator from South Carolina, and, in fact, the Senator from New Mexico. I said, "This vote is a tie vote."

And when we came to the point of discovering it was a tie vote, it was perfectly obvious to me what the Vice President was about to do.

Let me say that I am glad that if he chose to take the responsibility of voting, he voted as he did, for I shall mention it to a few people in Minnesota and in other parts of the country. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the record, I wish to say that after the recapitulation was had, the transcript of the proceedings lists the names of the Senators who voted. Then the following appears:

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the recapitulation shows—yeas 45, nays 45. The Chair votes "yea."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee will state it.

Mr. GORE. The vote has been taken. No Senator may change his vote; neither may the Vice President now vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks, if the Senator will read the Constitution, he will find that the Vice President can always break a tie in the Senate.

The Chair votes "yea"; and the precedents, according to the Parliamentarian, are to that effect.

Mr. President, I submit that at that point if the Senator from Tennessee had wanted to appeal from the decision of the Chair, he would have been at liberty to do so.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Several of us have handled these pages, and I am not sure of the sequence they follow.

I submit that the parliamentary ruling rendered by the Chair in response to the first question the senior Senator from California raised was in error. However, even if it were correct, I now read another ruling the Vice President made, and this is on folio 787 of the transcript of the proceedings:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair also wishes to make another parliamentary ruling, namely, that once the recapitulation has been made, no Senator may change his vote. The recapitulation will stand as it is.

I submit to the senior Senator from California that perhaps the junior Senator from Tennessee, due to long service in the other body, may be a stickler for the rules. I raised the point of order. I thought it was a valid point of order. The Vice President made a ruling with which I disagreed. Perhaps the Senator is correct in saying that at that point the junior Senator from Tennessee should have appealed from the ruling of the Chair. I think he is correct in that. That was the time when I should have done it.

But I submit that the record still stands incorrect; and I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the Aiken amendment be reconsidered on Monday.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the distinguished minority leader yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The only point I wish to make—and I hope this does not seem like trying to split thin hairs here—is that I agree with the minority leader as to the right of the Vice President to rule; but I must say that the Vice President ruled, in his statement as to why he was ruling, for the wrong reasons. I think it is very important for the record to note that what was being said by the Vice President and the minority leader indicated that the right of the Vice President to rule and vote was based upon his constitutional power, rather than on the basis of the the unanimous-consent agreement. I think this is very important for precedent purposes. It was the unanimous-consent agreement that gave the Vice President the right to vote in that situation, because of the manner in which the roll call had been stated earlier. I point out that what the minority leader said in the colloquy with the Vice President which he read indicated that the Vice President had the constitutional power to break a tie vote. He has such a power if he exercises it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; but he cannot exercise it unless it is announced as a tie vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He has it if he exercises it. Furthermore, there had been a motion to reconsider the vote and the motion to reconsider was tabled, and two full roll calls had gone through without any objection until the very end of the second rollcall, after the result was announced, and someone discovered that there was something wrong with the vote. The only way the Vice President could be permitted to vote under those circumstances would be by a unanimous-consent agreement. He is not permitted to vote under such circumstances because of his constitutional powers. That is what I am trying to get across.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope we shall always be granted such consent when it is requested, just as the majority leader was granted that consent tonight. The distinguished minority leader had won his battle. He had the votes. The majority leader made a plea to him to see that each Senator was correctly recorded. The minority leader granted that request on the basis of an understanding. The understanding was that if a tie should develop, in effect, the Vice President could exercise his right.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is the way I interpret it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is the way I understood it, and I am sure that is the way all Members of the Senate understood it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the way the junior Senator from Minnesota understands it. I thoroughly agree with what has happened. I so stated earlier. But for the purpose of the record, I do not think we wish to leave the impression in the record that, without that kind of understanding among Members on both sides of the aisle, the Vice President, whoever he may be in years to come, would have any greater right because of his power under the Constitution, to break a tie when he did not exercise the right earlier, when the parliamentary situation permitted him to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. May I ask the President of the Senate to read the precedents, as was requested previously? I think Senators will find a great deal of pertinent information in them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests to the Senator from California that one of the precedents is lengthy. It could be printed in the RECORD at this point, if there were no objection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the lengthy precedent to which the Vice President refers may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to make a statement.

The so-called understandings which have been referred to, and which the senior Senator from California says all Members of the Senate understood, were not specific. They were not so understood by all Members of the Senate. The unanimous-consent request was specific. The action of the Senate was specific.

I do not wish to pursue this issue further tonight. By Monday, the record will be printed for all Senators to see. If it is pertinent to raise the issue again at that time, any Senator will be privileged to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe that the understanding which has been referred to was not merely an understanding between the two leaders, although we frequently have such understandings. Thank God, we have more understandings than misunderstandings. But it was confirmed by a parliamentary ruling of the Presiding Officer, on the advice of the Parliamentarian, namely, that after recapitulation we would be back in the same situation in which we were before.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, with the greatest respect, that I think the record is clear. I think the understanding of Members of the Senate was clear. I hope we shall never get into a situation in which we shall have to draft legal documents with relation to a situation which is thoroughly presented to the Senate, and with respect to which no person could reasonably misunderstand the intention.

The situation in which the ruling of the Vice President was asked for and

given was thoroughly understood. If we ever reach the point where we must draft legal documents and consult our lawyers, the Senate will not be able to function as it has been able to function, divided as we are, 49 to 47.

I hope the day will never come in this body when we shall be placed in the position in which understandings by honorable men on both sides of the aisle will be challenged in the face of a record which, as in this case, no one can challenge.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate the moral fervor of the able and distinguished senior Senator from California. However, I do not think he wishes to speak derisively of legal documents, of rules, or of the Constitution of the United States.

The Vice President ruled that, under the Constitution, the Vice President could at any time vote to break a tie in the Senate. That right has its limitations. The Vice President must vote at the proper time; and I submit to the able Senator that the record is not clear that there was an understanding, either between the two able leaders, or generally among Members of the Senate. I have read the record. What is that record? A vote was taken. The result was announced. A motion to reconsider was made. The senior Senator from California himself moved to lay that motion on the table. A vote was taken on that motion. His motion prevailed.

At that point, and only after that point, a unanimous-consent request was made to recapitulate.

What is recapitulation? It is not reconsideration. It is merely a recount. Had the senior Senator from Texas asked unanimous consent for reconsideration, I have no doubt it would have been given, but such request was not made. Such a request was not granted. The record stands incorrect.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope every Member of the Senate will follow me carefully as I read:

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The minority leader was seeking a ruling from the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know what the recapitulation will show; but if the recapitulation shall show a tie vote, will the parliamentary situation then be as it would have been at that point if a tie vote had been announced?

The Vice President then gave his ruling.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct; and the Vice President would then have one of those rare opportunities to break a tie.

Then the majority leader proceeded to give his reasons for the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question of the majority leader?

Mr. GORE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. I have listened very carefully to this debate. I think it is very important, and probably will be a precedent. But are we setting a precedent that any time the clerk may make a mistake in reporting a vote he can, by that mistake, unless there is a unanimous-consent agreement, deprive the Vice President of his right to break a tie?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That would be the effect of it.

Mr. MALONE. Let us not do that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I listened to what the Senator said with regard to the nature and purpose of a recapitulation. Of course, a recapitulation is not a reconsideration; but is it not for the purpose of verifying the record?

Mr. GORE. It is.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Suppose a recapitulation were to disclose, for example, that the Senator from Tennessee, who was known to have been on the floor and who was known to have voted, was not recorded. Would the recapitulation not offer the Senator from Tennessee an opportunity to be recorded?

Mr. GORE. It would not offer the junior Senator from Tennessee the right to be recorded if he had not exercised his right to be recorded. If he had voted, then the record would be corrected, but it would not accord him the right to vote.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It would afford an opportunity to have the correction recorded.

Mr. GORE. The opportunity for a correction of the record. I agree.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That would give him an opportunity to have his vote recorded.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then, similarly, if the recapitulation showed an error, did it not then create the right for the Vice President to have his vote recorded?

Mr. GORE. Not in the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In my opinion it did.

Mr. GORE. I shall not pursue the matter further at this time, but I shall examine further the precedents. I submit that an incorrect parliamentary ruling does not change an action of the Senate in this particular circumstance. I shall review the precedents, and perhaps make further reference to them on Monday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Chair care to state the precedent?

Mr. GORE. I withdraw the objection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I had asked unanimous consent that the longer precedent may be printed in the RECORD. I understood that the Presiding Officer was going to discuss the shorter precedent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee withdraws his objection. If there is no objection, the precedent will be printed in the RECORD.

The precedent was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOTING

Instances of errors made in tabulating votes on amendments, which caused the Vice President to make erroneous announcements of the result, and in each case the actual vote changed the result.

In one case the correct vote resulted in a tie, as subsequently discovered, and the Vice President was deprived of an opportunity to cast an effective vote.

The Vice President expressed the opinion that upon the discovery of the error it should be corrected, even though an amendment had been stated in the meantime.

Discussion as to recapitulation of a vote and the correction of same.

The vote in one of the above cases was corrected by the adoption of an amendment to the Senate Journal on the succeeding day.

On September 15, 1949, during the consideration of H. R. 1211, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949, an amendment proposed by Mr. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, was agreed to by a vote of 43 yeas, 40 nays. A motion to reconsider the vote was made, and a motion then made to lay that motion on the table, the vote on which was 41 yeas, 41 nays—a tie. The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President [Mr. BARKLEY] voted in the negative, although his vote was ineffective, as the motion lost on a tie vote.

A vote was then taken on the motion to reconsider, the result of which was handed by the reading clerk to the Vice President and announced as yeas, 41, nays 40, whereupon the Chair announced that the motion to reconsider was agreed to. The McCarthy amendment was then again voted upon and rejected by a vote of 40 yeas, 43 nays.

Subsequently, it developed that the vote on the motion to reconsider, announced as 41 yeas, 40 nays, was incorrect, and that the actual vote was a tie—41 yeas, 41 nays. In the discussion concerning the question of correcting the vote, the Vice President stated that, if the vote had been correctly announced, thus resulting in a tie, he would have voted in the affirmative, thereby adopting the motion to reconsider.

Prior to the discovery of the above error, a similar error had also been made by the reading clerk in tabulating the result of a vote on an amendment by Senator Thomas, of Oklahoma, limiting oil imports, which had first been announced as having been agreed to by a vote of yeas 42, nays 41, but shortly thereafter it was discovered that the vote as actually cast was 40 yeas, 41 nays. The Vice President then declared the amendment rejected.

In connection with the vote on the motion to reconsider, Mr. Wherry, of Nebraska, asked unanimous consent for a recapitulation of the vote when the error was discovered, an amendment in the meantime having been proposed by Mr. Butler, of Nebraska. No action was taken by the Senate that day toward correcting the error, but an order was submitted and agreed to on Friday the 16th instant, to correct the Senate Journal to conform to the facts (which appears hereafter).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair should point out, as all Members of the Senate know, that the Chair stated the precedents and made the ruling on the parliamentary inquiry on the basis of advice given him by the Parliamentarian. The Parliamentarian has studied the record. He has already submitted two precedents which he believes are on this point. The Chair shall state the precedent of September 15, 1949.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Chair speak louder?

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is the precedent of September 15, 1949. Without going into it in detail, because the record is rather involved, the Chair will state that in this instance the votes had been taken on the preceding day, and the error had not been discovered until the

following day, and a very distinguished parliamentarian, the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] was in the chair. This was the ruling.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee will state it.

Mr. GORE. Had a motion been made in the meantime to reconsider, and had such motion been laid on the table?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; not in this case. But other business had intervened.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I do not allege that the distinguished occupant of the chair did other than any occupant would have done on a quick ruling, namely, to take the advice of the Parliamentarian. I, too, have conferred with the Parliamentarian. The matter is not clear. I have said I shall not press the matter further this evening. However, with the Parliamentarian and, if I may have the distinct pleasure, with the Vice President, I shall review the matter further and, if necessary, will raise the question again on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood the Senator to say that previously. The Chair will now read the precedent, if the Senate has no objection:

Ordered, That the entry in the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 15, 1949, showing the result of the vote on reconsideration of the so-called McCarthy amendment to H. R. 1211, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949, as yeas 41, nays 40, and therefore the motion to reconsider having been announced by the Vice President as having been agreed to, be corrected to show the actual result, namely, yeas 41, nays 41.

Ordered further, in view of the subsequent statement of the Vice President, upon the discovery of the error, that if the vote had been correctly announced, thus showing the Senate to be equally divided, he would have voted in the affirmative, thereby making the vote 42 yeas, 41 nays, the motion to reconsider be deemed to have been agreed to.

As we know, precedents are not always on all fours, but the Parliamentarian has pointed out that here a day intervened and business intervened; and in this instance the precedent, except for the motion to lay on the table, to which the Senator from Tennessee has referred, is on all fours. The simple announcement of the Vice President on the following day that he would have voted "yea" had he had an opportunity to do so, was taken as sufficient to carry the motion to reconsider.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee will state it.

Mr. GORE. Has the Chair been advised of any precedent of a motion to reconsider having been made, and that motion laid on the table, and the question nevertheless reopened for a vote, or is this, indeed, a new precedent in the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Of course, the Parliamentarian has not had adequate time to check all the precedents. The Chair will reserve answering that question until he is able to give advice on it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to go back again to the amendment which was pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there is an amendment of mine at the desk which is already pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware had the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator from Delaware. I had forgotten about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It seems almost as though that happened last week. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. I had already called up my amendment, which I offered on behalf of myself and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I ask that the clerk state the amendment again.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 25, between lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

PRODUCTION ON GOVERNMENT LANDS PROHIBITED

SEC. 225. No lease executed, renewed, or permitted to extend beyond its earliest termination or cancelation date by any agency of the United States as lessor after the enactment of this act shall permit the lessee to produce on any land subject to such lease any agricultural commodity (other than livestock or livestock products) determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand it is agreeable to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] that we go over until Monday on the amendment. I understand the Senator desires a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 3091) to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 1207 at Louisville, Ky., reported it favorably, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 1649) thereon.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. KEFAUVER introduced the following bills, which were read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

S. 3413. A bill for the relief of Radovan Mohorovicich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3414. A bill to provide for the advancement of Capt. Edward J. Steichen, United States Naval Reserve (retired), to the grade of rear admiral on the Naval Reserve retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WELKER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. THYE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATION OF STANLEY N. BARNES TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, NINTH CIRCUIT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, March 16, 1956, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Stanley N. Barnes, of California, to be United States circuit judge, Ninth Circuit, vice William E. Orr, retired.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and myself, chairman.

TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, COMMERCE, AND NAVIGATION WITH NICARAGUA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive G, 84th Congress, 2d session, a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and Nicaragua, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Managua on January 21, 1956. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the treaty, and the treaty, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Republic of Nicaragua, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Managua on January 21, 1956.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Acting Secretary of State with respect to the treaty.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 9, 1956.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State. (2) Treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation, with protocol signed at Managua on January 21, 1956.)

RECESS TO 11 A. M. ON MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, March 12, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 9 (legislative day of March 6), 1956:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Jefferson Patterson, of Ohio, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uruguay.

Dempster McIntosh, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Venezuela.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

Line of the Air Force

Richards, Merwin Eugene, 27850A.
Nicoloan, Lenin Samuel, 27856A.
Snyder, James Alan, 27881A.
Carpenter, Donald Gilbert, 27127A.
Imker, Franz William, 27128A.
Schneider, James Richard, 27883A.
Sander, Elmer Mathias John, 27884A.
Roosma, John Siebe, Jr., 27129A.
Grant, Horace Russell, 27131A.
Tullett, Jack Edgar, 27135A.
Murphy, William Arch, 27134A.
Wadsworth, Dean Amick, 27132A.
Parnell, Henry Robert, Jr., 27130A.
Poston, John Charles, 27133A.
Hopingardner, Charles Otis, 27579A.
Weir, Charles Bernard, 27886A.
Whipple, Alvin Gerald, 27887A.
Turner, Jack Harriss, 27885A.
Miller, Hugh Melvin, 27890A.
Mattis, William Carroll, 27889A.
Smith, David Clayton, 27888A.
Strother, Byrne Elliott, 27891A.
Nielsen, Dale Grafton, 27892A.
Berthelot, Joseph Alfred, 27136A.
Gilbert, John Lawson, 27894A.
Richardson, Norman Neal, 27895A.
Davis, Ed D., 25047A.
Borum, Rodney Lee, 25006A.
Kloepper, Robert George, 25043A.
Mingledorff, Thomas Daniel, Jr., 25187A.
Bassett, Kimbrough Stone, 24990A.
Gilster, Herman Louis, 25089A.
Green, James Edward, 25097A.
Haydon, Robert Eugene, 25115A.
Klick, Donald Wayne, 25144A.
Hayes, Alvin Leo, 25116A.
Rumph, Harold Henry, 25239A.
Weinstein, Gerald Edward, 25317A.
Smith, Donald Damien, 25273A.
Alden, Frederick Alonzo, 3d, 24975A.
Aller, Robert Olen, 24978A.
Flaherty, James Carton, 25073A.
Oppermann, Edward Belz, 25202A.
Brown, Frank Markham, 25010A.
McCreery, Thomas Allan, 25178A.
Lavender, Charles Maurice, 25152A.
Harrison, Billy Ray, 25111A.
Gridley, Craig West, 25098A.
Foster, Robert Ashmore, 25076A.
Herndon, Stuart Brown, 25120A.
Rhude, Donald Preston, 25226A.
Schuessler, John Major, 25258A.
Giesy, Lloyd Henry, 25088A.
Deex, Arthur John, 25053A.
Garey, George Frye, 25082A.
Hazlebeck, John Beltz, 25117A.
Tatum, Lawrence Byron, 25296A.
Laird, Larry Harmon, 25148A.
Swan, John Wellington, 25291A.
Tracy, William Kenneth, 25301A.
Bowdish, Charles Griswold, 25007A.
Scott, Wallace Cooper, 3d, 25259A.
Bicknell, Robert Stanley, 25000A.
Charrier, George Orville, 25029A.
Brunson, Clarence Edgar, 3d, 25014A.
Morton, Leo Clare, 25191A.
Brown, Joseph Karl, 25011A.
Doyle, Edward Joseph, 25059A.
Conley, John Thomas, 25035A.
Foy, John Lydon, 25077A.
Quirk, William Jerome, 25219A.
Porter, Robert John, 25216A.
Wilson, Harris Flanigan, 25324A.
Brundage, James William, 25013A.
Chapman, John Frederick, 25028A.
VonHausen, William Walter, 25311A.
Davis, William Russell, 25049A.
Karns, Robert Clay, 25140A.
Hess, Robert William, 25121A.
Glenn, John Smith, 25090A.
Chambers, William Carl, 25027A.
Hopkins, Louie Baus, 25124A.
Tardiff, Albert Nelson, 25295A.
Jones, Fred Gilbert, 25133A.
Roberts, John Ansty, 3d, 25233A.
Russell, John Lowell, 25240A.
Laufman, Robert Franklin, 25151A.
Vernia, Thomas Joseph, Jr., 25306A.
Drew, Frank Morehead, 25060A.
Boeskool, Irvin Lewis, 25002A.
Stuart, William Henry, 25289A.
Adams, Henry William, 24974A.
Morgan, Larry Lee, 25190A.
Detweiler, Robert Milan, 25055A.
Saffer, Morton Robert, 25242A.
Egan, Douglas Schmelzel, Jr., 25065A.
Butler, Charles Morgan, 25017A.
Westermeier, James Taylor, 25319A.
Waller, Guy Ernest, Jr., 25314A.
Vogt, Donald Arthur, 25310A.
Spooner, Arthur Leroy, 25281A.
Shadburn, Theodore Hanby, 25261A.
Todd, Marion Alexander, Jr., 25299A.
Lewis, Charles Edward, 25154A.
Doty, Aultman, 25057A.
Axley, John Henry, 24981A.
Wheeler, Harold Peyton, Jr., 25320A.
Molnar, Lawrence Benedict, 25188A.
Camstra, Frank Anton, Jr., 25022A.
Remers, Richard Thomas, 25224A.
Gay, Francis Vernon, 25086A.
Jelinek, James John, 25127A.
Jones, John Powell, 25135A.
Hamilton, Jay Robert, Jr., 25107A.
Pochari, Thomas Richard, 25214A.
Phipps, Arthur Raymond, 25209A.
Miller, George David, 25186A.
Lodwick, David Idris, 25157A.
Davies, Owen Myrddin, 25046A.
Zander, Denell Delbert, 25326A.
Jones, David Buchanan, 25132A.
Gartrell, Harold Eugene, 25084A.
Turk, Charles William, 25302A.
Plank, Robert Victor, 25212A.
Ochs, Lamont Earl, 25198A.
Reid, Robert Eugene, 25223A.
McGinn, Charles Joseph, 25181A.
Farnsworth, Harold Cecil, 25069A.
Freeman, Theodore Cordy, 25080A.
Schroder, Raymond Ludwig William, 25255A.
Sammis, Donald Stuart, Jr., 25245A.
Salzman, Kenneth Maxwell, 25244A.
Welsh, James Carter, 25318A.
Ford, Robert Abbott, Jr., 25075A.
Beveridge, Robert Bruce, 24999A.
Eddington, Robert Barnes, 25063A.
Elliott, James Homer, 25066A.
Robbins, Gary Wayne, 25231A.
Sherman, Stuart Holmes, Jr., 25263A.
Clements, Henry Earl, 25030A.
Pringle, Homer George, Jr., 25218A.
Fisher, Donald Robert, 25072A.
Brachtenbach, Leo, 25009A.
Mann, Frederic Albert, 25164A.
Smith, Robert Lee, 25274A.
Sperling, Daniel Paul, 25280A.
McLean, Thomas John, 25183A.
McCarty, Dyke, 25174A.
Sutter, Bradley, 25290A.
Graff, John Alan, 25094A.
Mets, David Raymond, 25184A.
St. John, James Wilson, 25243A.
Grossman, Bernard, 25101A.
Lamb, Charles William, 25149A.
Cooke, Charles Maynard, Jr., 25038A.
Romer, James Joseph, 25236A.
Martella, Angelo Michael, Jr., 25167A.
Carter, Donald Leslie, 25026A.
Walters, Joseph Richardson, Jr., 25316A.
Borrell, Charles Mossi, 25005A.
Ritchie, William Hoke, Jr., 25230A.
Olson, James Russell, 25200A.
Hart, Jack William, 25114A.
Redmon, Evan Hayes, Jr., 25222A.
Marinaro, Frank Joseph, 25166A.
Hall, George Robert, 25106A.
Best, Charles Allan, 24998A.
Gorman, Robert Eugene, 25092A.
Rodda, Ronald John, 25234A.
Carmichael, John Brodie, Jr., 25023A.
Krobock, John Robert, 25147A.
Anderson, Thomas Eugene, 24979A.
Kotowski, Raymond Vincent, 25146A.
Stephens, James Ernest, 25286A.
Lindsay, James Robert, 3d, 25156A.
Hente, Donald Bruce, 25119A.
Bishop, Charles Emerson, 25001A.
Olsen, John Worth, 25199A.
Martin, Kenneth William, 25168A.
Day, Richard Donald, 25050A.
Frederick, George Andrew, 25078A.
Barrow, Floyd Phillip, Jr., 24989A.
Bornstein, Joseph Bernard, 25004A.
Gourlay, William, Jr., 25093A.
Sinnott, John Patrick Richard, 25267A.
Selbe, James Preston, 25260A.
Holmes, Donald Stone, Jr., 25122A.
Schaffrath, Henry George, Jr., 25249A.
Battle, Benjamin Ray, 24991A.
Schuerger, John Albert, 25257A.
Clements, Herdis French, 25031A.
Groshans, Russell Glen, 25099A.
Johnson, John Edsall, 25129A.
Malambri, Nicholas DeJean, 25162A.
McCauley, Reese Stephens, Jr., 25175A.
Taylor, Fred Sturtevant, 3d, 25297A.
Sollars, John Joseph, 25278A.
Jones, James Edgar, 25134A.
Potter, Robert Keith, 25217A.
Cole, Charles William, 25033A.
Plummer, William Arlington, 25213A.
Gallivan, John Patrick, 25081A.
Bell, William Reaves, 24996A.
Roth, William Leslie, 25238A.
Pelequin, Dale Bernard, 25206A.
Zellmer, Milton Edward Leonard, 25327A.
Sliger, Douglas Richard, 25269A.
Kane, Ira William, 25139A.
Belgau, Stephen Augustus, 24995A.
Myers, Jack Albert, 25192A.
Barrett, Sam Burge, 24988A.
Gavcus, Stanley, Jr., 25085A.
Thorpe, Thomas John Victor, 25298A.
Parks, John William, 25205A.
Cox, Samuel Steven, 25040A.
Sherwood, Glenn Graham, 25264A.
Robbins, Richard Eugene, 25232A.
McClean, John Howard, 25176A.
Wakitsch, Harold Eugene, 25312A.
Smitherman, John Alvis, 25275A.
Baker, John Daniel, 24984A.
Jones, Oakah L., Jr., 25136A.
Campbell, William John, 25021A.
Harrison, Richard Gary, 25112A.
Mathiasen, Alfred, Jr., 25170A.
Moore, Francis William, Jr., 25189A.
Cramer, Mercade Adonis, Jr., 25041A.
Stecker, George Raymond, Jr., 25285A.
Sykes, Donald Kunkel, 25293A.
Geer, Richard Paul, 25087A.
Bachman, Stanley Leon, 24982A.
Beiderbecke, Henry Adolph, 24994A.
Deale, William Walter Munnikhuysen, 25051A.
Sturges, John Bellows, Jr., 25448A.

Pickett, Thomas Oliver, 25210A.
Wilkerson, Frank Stanley, Jr., 25322A.
Andrews, Lewis Sutton, 3d., 24980A.
Jackson, Clay Bradford, 25126A.
Newsome, Ralph, Jr., 25196A.
Matson, John Hanthorn, 25171A.
Leland, James Wallace, 25153A.
Sieber, Charles Emerson, 25265A.
McGee, James Joseph, 25180A.
Shaw, Arthur Basil, Jr., 25262A.
Whittemore, Albert Burton, 25321A.
Schneider, Henry Oswald, Jr., 25252A.
Barchiesi, Chester August, 24987A.
Dunivant, Harry Edwin, 25062A.
Fredlund, William Arnold, 25079A.
deGeneres, Frederick Souvelle, Jr., 25054A.
King, Theodore Darwin, 25142A.
Connor, Robert Olin, 25037A.
Porter, Donald Jack, 25215A.
Phillips, Richard Wendell, Jr., 25208A.
Schaub, Jerry Edward, 25250A.
Wallner, Nicholas, 25315A.
Manuel, Robert Ralph, 25165A.
Villaret, Albert Louis, 25308A.
VanWyk, John Derek, 25305A.
Lucas, Robert James, 25159A.
May, John Edwin, 25173A.
Hanes, William Travis, Jr., 25109A.
Garretson, Richard Croyle, 25083A.
Dade, James Leonard, 25044A.
Hegarty, Roderick James, 25118A.
Gurski, John Marion, 25104A.
Sluss, Maurice Craig, 25270A.
Smith, Don Ray, 25272A.
Collins, Richard Bartholomae, 25034A.
McFaull, John Joseph, Jr., 25179A.
Richardson, William Joe, 25228A.
Jolin, William Augustine, 25131A.
Kergosien, Phil Joseph, 25141A.
Baker, Leonard Kelly, 24985A.
Butcher, Reginald William, Jr., 25016A.
Coggins, Edward Vaughan, Jr., 25032A.
Allen, David Edward, 24977A.
Waldron, David Lee, 25313A.
Englehart, John Robert, 25067A.
Stark, Daniel Morris, 25282A.
Stevens, Richard Paul, 25287A.
Doryland, Charles James, 25056A.
Cox, Robert Glen, 25039A.
Dritt, James Oliver, 25061A.
Rallis, Lee George, 25220A.
Sovern, Stanley Boyer, 25279A.
Schroder, Arthur Henry, 25254A.
Johnson, Harley Anthony, 25128A.
Boothby, Lloyd Warren, 25003A.
Starnes, Charles Campbell, Jr., 25283A.
Gross, Harold Eugene, 25100A.
Lynch, Edward Thomas, Jr., 25161A.
O'Malley, Jerome Francis, 25201A.
Schaeffer, Herbert Sylvester, Jr., 25248A.
Myers, Jack Walter, 25193A.
McIntyre, Paul Thomas, 25182A.
Vigee, Edward Erwin, 25307A.
Rindahl, Gilbert Ferbitz, 25229A.
Howell, David Warmington, 25125A.
Davis, Henry Wiliam, 25048A.
Unger, James Lenes, 25304A.
Johnson, Laurence Frost, 25130A.
Rich, Ralph Carling, 25227A.
Grubbs, Haydon Young, Jr., 25103A.
Lowell, Robert Earl, 25158A.
Schroeck, Frederick John, Jr., 25256A.
Silberg, Martin Irwin, 25266A.
Grover, David Beckham, 25102A.
Sammons, James Oliver, 25246A.
Tallmadge, Theodore, 25294A.
Lustig, Sheldon Jerome, 25160A.
Hall, Bruce Marshall, 25105A.
Epperson, Walter Ray, 25068A.
Dougherty, William Joseph, Jr., 25058A.
Townsend, Richard Allen, 25300A.
Stater, Nat Alan, 25284A.
Norris, Donald Wayne, 25197A.
Hammond, John Calhoun, 25108A.
McCravy, James Boyd, Jr., 25177A.
Vogel, Stephen Joseph, 25309A.
Mavis, Arthur LaVon, Jr., 25172A.
Calo, Carlo, 25018A.
Baker, Donald Glenn, 24983A.
Schmidt, Chauncey Everett, 25251A.
Smoak, Robert Vann, 25276A.
Ortiz-Benitez, Modesto, 25203A.
Sofis, Thomas George, 25277A.
Russell, Walter Clarence, Jr., 25241A.
Landreth, James Russell, Jr., 25150A.
Swanson, Hardy Lee, Jr., 25292A.
FioRito, William Arthur, 25071A.
Pfautz, James Coleman, 25207A.
Harshfield, Chancey Lee, 25113A.
Judd, Wallace Morton, 25138A.
Feaga, Roy Francis, Jr., 25070A.
Schoderbek, Stephen Ernest, 25253A.
Smith, Bertrand Dean, 25271A.
Beaucond, Robert Tyler, 24993A.
Bearman, Richard Silvers, 24992A.
Dardeau, Oscar Moise, Jr., 25045A.
Rhodes, Edward Lowe, Jr., 25225A.
Mang, Donald Lewis, 25163A.
Calvert, John William, Jr., 25019A.
Knighton, George William, Jr., 25145A.
Sawyer, Thomas Cushing, 25247A.
Nave, John Anthony, 25194A.
Sisco, Billy Joe, 25268A.
Yale, John Walker, 25325A.
Harmon, John Robert, 25110A.
Hosmer, William John, 25123A.
Jones, Robert Donovan, 25137A.
Osborn, Conrad Mansur, 25204A.
Tyler, George Edward, 25303A.
Carr, George Martin, Jr., 25024A.
Bennett, Charles Franklin, 24997A.
Flahive, James Connor, 25074A.
Bowling, Charles McKaughan, 25008A.
Baker, Robert Weaver, 24986A.
Burns, John Jay, 25015A.
Rohlman, Raymond Charles, 25235A.
Greaves, George Henry, 25096A.
Rote, Thomas Clifford, 25237A.
Carroll, David James, 25025A.
Cameron, Robert John, 25020A.
Dean, Robert Lee, Jr., 25052A.
Williams, Joe Cecil, 25323A.
Strickland, William Arthur, 25288A.
Brentnall, Burden, 25452A.
Fischle, Joseph, 25602A.
Winemiller, William Edgar, 27137A.
Presley, Donald Dean, 27896A.
Nolf, Ralph Edwin, 27897A.
Gipple, Richard James, 27138A.
Allen, Robert Henry, 27139A.
Thompson, Thomas Howard, 27143A.
Starn, Marvin Alfred, 27141A.
Davis, Owen C., Jr., 27140A.
Johnson, Allyn Clark, 27142A.
Derr, Richard Lee, 27898A.
Royer, Harvey John, 27899A.
Mongeon, Lee Allan, 27900A.
White, William Ray, 27145A.
Schumacher, Herman Edward, 27144A.
VanBuskirk, Vern Frank, 27146A.
Jones, Irving Wendell, 25449A.
Westberry, James Harrison, 27901A.
Hinckley, Fred Rolland, Jr., 27902A.
Burgess, John Tolford, 27904A.
Smith, Curtis Robert, 27903A.
Scotty, Leonard Raymond, 27905A.
Williams, Stuart Jay, 25451A.

Nurse Corps

Cavenaugh, Harriett Louise, 25353W.
James, Phyllis Murley, 25354W.
McNeel, Shirley Joanne, 25691W.
Wells, Lyndoll Louise, 25771W.
Corrigan, Jean Anne, 26670W.

NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE NAVY AND IN THE MARINE CORPS

IN THE NAVY

Loyde W. Hales (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John C. Dicus
Carlos J. Kelly
Edmund S. Wilkinson, Jr.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in lieu of ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Leland R. Dobler
John H. Haynes

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Lieutenant commander

Amos W. Cave, Jr.

Lieutenant

John J. Dunn

Lieutenant (junior grade)

John Koutrakos

Alfred F. VanBeck (civilian-college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the line in the Navy (special-duty officers), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Otto H. Bandemer	Gailen L. Keeling
Kenneth K. Bridges	Carl E. McAfee
Joseph G. Dail, Jr.	Arthur L. Morris
Lewis Deschler II	James Olds, Jr.
Peter J. Hiniker, Jr.	Theodore W. Shumway
Arthur J. Johns	Ralph D. Wood

Charles J. Langello, chief yeoman, United States Navy, to be appointed a temporary chief warrant officer in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Kenelm O. Dyches, United States Navy, retired, to be a lieutenant in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, pursuant to 37 United States Code 275, 276, 277, sections 403 (a), 406 (a), 407 (a).

The following-named officer candidates to be ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Ben L. Adams	Robert B. Cress
Wiliam E. Albright, Jr.	Daniel McC. Crissman
John D. Allemang	Walter A. Crossman
Laverne W. Ames	Reese E. Cruse
Robert H. Amos	Claud C. Crutchfield
Charles L. Anderson	Keith R. W. Curry
John A. Anderson	Joe C. Curtis, Jr.
Salvatore P. Aquilino	Raymond J. Czar
Harry P. Ayers, Jr.	Jack R. Dailey
Charles R. Barney	Victor Danin
James A. Baumgartner	Troy F. Davidson
Thomas J. Beall	Ronald I. Dean
Earl A. Beegle	Don J. Dennis
Walter R. Bergman	William J. Donlan
George D. Bess	Thomas J. Duval
Robert G. Bethel	Milo E. Emmerson
Paul I. Bledsoe	Albert P. Emsley, Jr.
John A. Blumie	Eugene J. Erner
Jack W. Boyd	Thomas F. Fallon, Jr.
Thomas B. Bright	William E. Faris
Chester F. Broton	Anderson H. Findley, Jr.
William McK. Brown	
John E. Bryan, Jr.	Dean M. Finley
Joseph S. Buggy, Jr.	William J. Fleming
Joseph S. Burke	James S. Fletcher
William L. Burris, Jr.	John A. Foster
Donald G. Campbell	Jerome J. Galinsky
Gus V. Cates	John K. Garvin
Ralph D. Catoe	John L. Giffin
Dean H. Chancellor	James C. Gilbert
Frederick W. Chapman	Edwin B. Gilchrest, Jr.
Charles C. Christensen	Edward E. Golden
	Charles N. Goodale
Cyrus R. Christensen	Richard O. Greene
George E. Clark	Albert E. Greer
Charles R. Collins	Webster Grewe
Scott E. Cooper	William H. Grimes
Richard C. Corkrum	Robert L. Grimmell
Charles S. Cornett, Jr.	Clyde Grossoehme
Robert R. Cosgrove	Dan H. Hall
Donald H. Costello	William H. Hannaford
George E. Cox	Robert K. Harriott
Charles A. Coyle	William J. Hart
Douglas R. Crandall	Charles E. Heiland
Earl D. Credland	Joseph Hochstrasser

Robert A. Hogan
Wallace R. Hunter
Dalton LeR. Ion
Charles R. Isaacs
Travis R. Ivy
Harry E. Jellison
Frederick J. Johler
Charles R. Keene
William E. Keller, Jr.
Francis P. Kelly
Richard A. Kenney
Robert J. Keough
Charles C. King
Glenn E. Kitzelman
Howard E. Knott, Jr.
Kenton K. Kraemer
John J. Kristof
Julius Kronnagel
James P. Kvederis
Billy C. Lamberth
Henry T. Lawson
John L. Lewis
Jerry L. Locke
David E. Logan
Rodney H. Lovdal
Albert W. Lumbert
James E. Lyons
Everett D. Marks
Leo S. Masterson
Albert L. Mayfield
Bernard J. McAlice
Kenneth S. McBurnett
James R. McCain
Kenneth W. McCarter
Thomas H. McCoy
Terrance O'D. McCune
Richard O. McGhinnis
Marvin "E" McGuire
Thomas W. McKinstry
Charles A. McLellan
Richard J. McNeill
George B. McQueen
Verne L. Meier
Virgil B. Melvin
Francis N. Meredith
Merle E. Miller
Wayne L. Milligan
Eugene D. Minkler
Kenneth Mitchell
John D. Morris
Joseph H. Morris
Gilbert E. Moyers
Howard E. Mulholland
James H. Mulvihill
Robert S. Munroe
Robert L. Nelson
Wilmer J. Niles
Richard J. Norris
Robert V. Novratil
Carroll A. Olson
Donald D. Onstott
DeWayne J. Papenbrook
Charles E. Parsons
Murray F. Pennock
Russell O. Perkins
Bob L. Peterson
Gerald F. Peterson
David E. Pinion
Thomas E. Poole
Thomas W. Poore
Clare E. Potter
Charles F. Raab
George E. Raab
Julius G. Raetz
George E. Rashley
Benton M. Read
Charles LeR. Rennaker
Jack F. Rothe
Francis M. Ryan
James F. Sabin
Richard S. Sandman
David L. Schaible
John J. Schutte
Melvin E. Seiler
LeRoy A. Short, Jr.
Lawrence "C" Sides
Donald W. Smith
Frederick H. Smith, Jr.
Howard J. Squires
Raymond B. Statham
Edwin McC. Stewart, Jr.
Joseph W. Streuli
Wayne B. Stroup
Thomas J. Sullivan, Jr.
John D. Taylor
Jack D. Thompson
James S. Tierney
Roy E. Tucker
James V. Tullis
Edward A. Vanderwagen
Alfred L. VanHorne
Julian Villalobos
Robert A. Villenave
James A. Walker
Turner P. Wallace, Jr.
Henry A. Watts
Robert A. Will
Donald C. Wilson
Merton J. Wishart
Robert F. Witt
Clarence W. Wood
Kenneth G. Young

Mary D. Burnside (woman officer candidate) to be an ensign in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officer candidates to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Andrew F. Barnett, Jr.
John H. Bohlen
Wallace M. Brandenburg
Douglas F. Coombs
Fred O. Cornett
John J. Corrigan, Jr.
William J. Dunning
Arthur Estes, Jr.
Carl K. Gaddis
Francis X. Gagner
James D. Goulette
Edward J. Griffin
Vernon L. Lubben
James R. Luther, Jr.
William T. Monaghan
Lloyd D. Moran
William McF. Morse, Jr.
Gene P. Olson
John F. Raffels
Donald E. Stolp
Richard E. Van Houten
Richard C. Walker, Jr.
Raymond Warren
Benjamin L. Young

Lt. Comdr. Margaret S. Linicome, Medical Service Corps, United States Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the Medical Service Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Lt. (jg.) William J. Ryan, Supply Corps, United States Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the Supply Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps indicated:

Line

Norman K. Donahoe
George E. R. Kinnear II
Russell G. Walden

Supply Corps

George I. Chegin
Leonard H. Benfell, Jr.

Civil Engineer Corps

Robert P. Woodworth

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Edwin M. Ackley
Carl C. Adams
Joseph B. Adams
William J. Addis
Robert H. Albert
Murrie G. Alcorn
George M. Alexander, Jr.
Bill H. Allen
John H. Allen, Jr.
Lacy J. Allen
Russell U. Allen
Robert G. Amend
Earl R. Andersen
Thomas E. Anderson
Wallace E. Anderson
Ben Anello
Leonard O. Armstrong
Daniel W. Arnold
Robert W. Arsenault
Robert O. Arthur
William H. Bailey
Benjamin H. Baldwin, Jr.
Walter J. Baranski
James L. Barnidge, Jr.
Joseph C. Bass
Monta G. Baxter
Paul C. Bean
Rolfe H. Beith
Norman J. Berg
Raymond R. Berling
Roy W. Bickley
Robert R. Blakslee
Robert L. Blalack
John F. Blandy
Douglas W. Bogue
Nicholas C. Bohonak, Jr.
Willard K. Bond
Gilbert H. Boreman
William P. Bormann
Robert M. Boudreaux
Richard T. Bourbeau
Jack W. Bouvy
Robert S. Box, Jr.
Bobbie B. Bradley
Harold D. Breece
John R. Breeze
Donald J. Brisbois
George H. Brown
John H. Brown
Robert M. Brown
Robert E. Buckler
Wallace B. Bunker
William J. Burk
Richard M. Burke
Floyd R. Burt
Henry W. Bushwitz
Arthur S. Butler
Melburn W. Cairns
Martin J. Calcagno
Charles H. Cameron
Orville G. Chandler, Jr.
Thomas Carcelli
Alton B. Chambers
Charles H. Chapin, Jr.
Robert R. Chapman, Jr.
Jack R. Christensen
Donald L. Clegg
James Cline, Jr.
Henry P. Cobbs
James E. Cole
Philip J. Cole
John G. Compton
Richard F. Connell
Clifton J. Cormier
Clarence C. Craig
Luther C. Craumer
Nick J. Cremonese
Rex W. Crook
Francis P. Cumiskey
Jesse T. Cutler
Leroy E. Dailey
Frederick H. Dale
John P. Dancy
Charles V. Davi
Harold R. Davis
Jules E. Davis
Francis L. Day
Curtis L. Deatrick
Walter E. Degener
Loomis L. Dement
Samuel A. Denyer, Jr.
Joseph C. Dero
Boyd W. Dick
Floyd A. Dickover
Robert J. Diamater
Melvin C. Dodson
William B. Does
Alfred V. Dorgan, Jr.
Weldon J. Dryden
Louis E. Duncan
Maurice F. Dwyer
Byron A. Eaton
Harvey M. Eaton
Phillip A. Edmondson
Merritt S. Edmunds
Robin R. Edwards
Harry R. Elliott
Harold H. Engelhardt
Ralph A. Engemann
Tom Faraklas, Jr.
Herbert L. Farmer
William D. Farris
Lawrence E. Fellows
Wayne R. Floyd
Robert E. Follendorf
Edward M. Forgash
Leslie L. Foster
Charles C. Fowler
Wilton K. Freeman
Eugene C. Frey
Victor S. Friend, Jr.
Robert A. Frye
Austin O. Gandy
Virgil R. Gant
Ewing D. Garlick
Willard D. Garrett
James M. Garvey
Louis E. Gerard, Jr.
Herbert S. Gibson
Joseph R. Giesel
Salvador Giovingo
Eli Girouard
John R. Gloshen
Ralph E. Graef
Edward V. Grattan
Frank E. Graves
Harold A. Green
Robert B. Greene
Leo Greenspan
Virgil C. Gregory
John G. Grine
Kenneth W. Gryder
Warren H. Gustafson
Oscar D. Gustafson
Paul Hajtun
Lowell N. Hall
Willis P. Hall, Jr.
Fairley A. Hancock
Sigmund P. Hansen, Jr.
John K. Hanson
James E. Hardway
Casper P. Hare
Robert A. Haring
Floyd E. Harnage
John E. Harrell, Jr.
Jesse R. Harris
Jerry W. Harris
Leonard R. Harvey
Charles B. Haslam
John A. Hathaway
Donald L. Hawbecker
Herman Hawks
Virgil B. Haws
Clark D. Hayden
Samuel Head
Leo Hendricks II
Ernest C. Henry
Howard G. Hensley
William K. Hodge
Robert C. Hoffman
Frederick L. Holl
John H. Holliday
William L. Holtz
Theordore Horstmann
James L. Houle
Howard L. Hubbs
Herman D. Hudson
William N. Humphrey
Marlow B. Hurtig
Raymond C. Jablonski
Joseph J. Jannik
Donald L. Jensen
Josse A. Jessen
Edward S. John
Roy K. Johnson
Roy M. Johnson
Herschel B. Jones
James F. A. Jones
Robert W. Jones
Howard V. Jordan, Jr.
Robert H. Jordan
Eric I. Jorgensen
Lewis C. Kasch
Matthew L. Keller
Clarence E. Kennedy
John Kerr, Jr.
John D. Kerr
Roy F. Kibbee
Carroll E. Kildruff
William J. Kniseley
Raymond A. Koste
Joseph Kouba
Lester W. Kuchler
Frank P. Kunkle, Jr.
Louis E. Labahn
Stanley W. Lamonte
Charles J. Laskowski
Jewel H. Lawson
Gerald J. Layne
James G. Leath
Levy P. Lemoine
Howard F. Leroy
Richard W. Levan
Paul L. Light
James W. Lilley
John F. Link
Joseph F. Lisicky
Prince L. Lockaby
Orville C. Locke
Robert J. Loesch
Carl R. Lueders
Alexander F. Luther
Clyde C. Lynn
Wilber L. MacDonald
Norman C. Madore
Victor Marafine
Evan H. Maranville
Howard E. K. Marohn
Jacob H. Marquette
Robert E. Martin
Lonnie M. Massey
Robert J. McArthur
Raymond F. McCloskey, Jr.
Robert J. McClure
William T. McCluskey
Charles A. McCormick, Jr.
John H. McDaniel
James E. McDonald
Charles E. McEwen, Jr.
Robert L. McFarland
Norman E. McKonly
Benjamine V. McLane, Jr.
Luther A. McLendon, Jr.
H. Clint McShane
William D. Mead
Donald L. Meek
Wendell A. Meek
Theodore Meinke
Nathan Mervish
George F. Metz
Ernest C. Michel
Stanley G. Millar
Edward A. Miller
Harold C. Miller
George H. Miller
Nicholas J. Miller, Jr.
Elmer W. Milless
Thomas R. Mitchell
Edward J. Monagle
Benton R. Montgomery, Jr.
Carl W. Moog
Lloyd H. Morgan
Floyd L. Morris
Vernon S. Munsell
Charles R. Nault
George B. Nelson
Charles O. Newton
Edsel W. Nicholson
Michael J. Niekowal
Grover H. Nix, Jr.
Arthur O'Donogue
Walter H. O'Grady III
Mark V. Okonek
Forrest A. Oldenburg
Milton P. Oliver
William M. Oliver
James H. Orr
Mario C. Osimo
Archie F. Owensby
Charles W. Palmer
Wayne G. Palmer
Norman E. Parker
Fred A. Parsels
Charles Erwen Patrick
Eric T. Pedersen
Burton O. Perkins
William M. Peterson
Julius B. Pierce
Edward J. Pierson
Earl A. Pike
William F. Pollak
Raymond A. Post
Robert L. Post
William T. Prater
Alexander Pressutti
James C. Price
Charley L. Pryor, Jr.
George D. Pullen, Jr.
Paul H. Rafi
Walter J. Reilly
Wylie W. Reogas
John T. Reville
Earl F. Rhoads
Keith M. Rice
James C. Richmond
Kenneth W. B. Riebe
George W. Ritchie
James A. Robinette
Frank C. Robinson, Jr.
John Ronsvalle
James A. Rook

Ferdinand J. Ross, Jr.
Robert G. Ross
Edmund V. Rozycki
Frank H. Russell
Howard A. Ruud
James E. Ryan
William A. Saucier
David K. Schwinn
James P. Sedinger
Leon Serkin
Dwight W. Seymour
William T. Sharp
Paul E. Shea
Melvin W. Shellhorn
Joe D. Shirley
Ned S. Skinner
John W. Slagle
Joseph Sieger, Jr.
Hubert A. Smiley
Calhoun Smith
Hugh L. Smith
Hulon C. Smith
Patrick D. Smith
Robert E. Smith
Thomas Sparks, Jr.
Hugh S. Spears
Justin A. Spencer
George D. Spencer
Kenneth R. Stewart
Robert F. Stewart
Hugh A. Stiles
John Strahan
Commadore Stutts
Vincent C. Sullivan
Clarence R. Swann
Gilson A. Tallentire
Albert L. Tate
James D. Tate
King D. Thatenhurst, Sr.
Robert L. Thomas
Arthur J. Thyrring
James G. Tillis
Robert C. Tilton
James W. Tobias, Jr.
James A. Tootle
Willis S. Travis
Dudley J. Troutman
Clyde A. Trowbridge
Frank C. Trumble
Joe N. Tusa
Willard J. Vanliew
Wallace E. Vickery
Robert W. Virden
Warren G. Wall
Charles N. Warner
Robert T. Watson
Willard K. Webester
Lawrence E. Weitekamp
Wilbur E. West
Robert H. Westmoreland
Robert L. Whitney
Deronda A. Wilkinson
Henry E. Wilkinson
William E. Willett
Maxey A. Willis
Warren L. Wilson
James E. Winters
George D. Woods
William J. Wright
Ira L. Wright, Jr.
Joseph A. Wyzykowski
Otto L. Yeater
Walter A. Yoder
Russell W. Yost
Henry H. Young
Leonard R. Young
Frank S. Zam
John P. Zimba

The following-named personnel for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Russell W. Adamczuk
William V. Bicknel
Joseph J. Bischoff
Frank H. Bruce, Jr.
George A. Candea
Robert L. Carlisle
Leroy R. Cates
Garrett L. Collins
William T. Evans
John G. Fifield
Donald R. Gerber
Clearence B. Grey
Donald P. Hill
Charles H. Houder, Jr.
Charles A. Markello
Andrew G. Marushok
James F. Newell
Robert P. O'Neal
John T. Rapp
Lawrence A. Schneider
Thomas H. Ullom
Harold E. Ultsch
Frank V. Weiler

The following-named personnel for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Lynde D. Blair
George Clark
Joseph F. Cody, Jr.
Dempsey B. Crudup
John A. Dixon
Fred L. Edwards, Jr.
John A. Eskam
William C. Fischer
Ronald R. Glaser
Cyril E. Gonzales
Charles T. Hampton
Harry A. Hunt, Jr.
Theodore E. Hunt
Ralph S. Huston
Gunnar A. Johnson
Ronald G. Kropp
Henry Stevenson Livingston
Charles W. F. McKellar
Delbert M. Martin
William H. Meitzler
George V. Memmer
Ralph L. Reed
James K. Reilly
John E. Schoon
Jack T. Schultz
Harry R. Shortt
Richard J. Skelton
William P. Slider
Richard T. Spooner
George H. Taylor III
Richard B. Taylor
Robert B. Throm

The following-named Reserve officers for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert L. Anderson, Jr.
Thomas G. Beers
Edward Johns, Jr.
Francis J. Kelly
Robert B. Mason
Sherwood F. Prescott, Jr.
Charles B. Robinson
Marcus B. Rogers
Ivan L. Scott, Jr.
Thomas Mc. Wheeler

The following-named Woman Reserve officer for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Frances B. Newman.

Howard W. Harrington from the temporary disability retired list for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer (W–2) in the Marine Corps subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

William P. Addington
Edmond E. Arant
Walter C. Bell
George H. Bigelow
Mark W. Billing
Philip Blazer
Kenneth C. Boston
Harry F. Bullock, Jr.
Billy Burks
John J. Buron
George H. Butler
Jesse E. Campbell
Roy A. Chyba
William J. Cinotti
Robert A. Clement
Lonice E. Coburn
Richard B. Colglazier
Terrance A. Conner
Leon A. Cooper
Robert B. Cotham, Jr.
Thomas C. Crawford
Charles H. Darr
Robert L. Dryden
Edward H. Dupre, Jr.
Kenneth J. Fagan
Roger K. Fensler
Thomas V. Ferguson
Edward C. Finkbohner
William E. Fouch
Frederick E. Franks
James S. Gill
Henry K. Goeke
Frederick A. Gonzalez, Jr.
George F. Gould
Lillian M. Hartley
Elmer D. Hill
Howard Holden
Charles J. W. Holland
Larry McK. Hollingshead
James R. Hollingsworth
Max O. Horton
Walter L. Huber
William R. Huntley
Thomas W. Huston
Luther E. Hyder
Lauris W. Jackson
J. T. Jenkins
Anton M. Johner
Franklin F. Judson
William O. Koontz
Martin Lachow
Paul H. Leahy
Henry F. Lesem, Jr.
Wellington B. Long, Jr.
Robert W. Lucht
Clyde C. Lynn
Glenn M. Matthieu
Bingham A. McMaster
William P. McMullen
Emmett L. Meadows
William R. Mercer
Harmon V. Mills
Max M. Morgan
Joseph G. Navolanic
Randolph E. Pasley
Frank L. Pearman
Walter F. Pettley
Robert P. Pitts, Jr.
Felix A. Polakiewicz
James H. Pollock
Thomas W. Purvis
Leo E. Reynolds
Elza L. Rice
George T. Ruhberg
Charles W. Servis
Floyd D. Schaeffer
Stewart J. Shaw, Jr.
Fred J. Shisler
Victor Shul
Patrick L. Slavin
Olen E. Smith
Joe W. Sparling
Emery Speer
William H. Stanaland
Albert W. Sue
William J. Sullivan
Arthur F. Terry
Thomas C. Vanover
Edwin M. Walter
John C. Westenberg
Rex G. Williams, Jr.
David P. Wilson
Leonard S. Wolford
Ruth L. Wood
Merlin D. Woodard

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1956

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 6, 1956)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou hast made us in Thine image and likeness and hast implanted within us desires which the material world can never satisfy. We are conscious that Thou needest no sacrifice our hands can bring nor any offering our lips can frame; but because we live in Thy world and share Thy bounty, because we breathe Thine air and Thy power sustains us, because Thy goodness preserves us and Thy love blesses us continually, we praise and magnify Thy glorious name.

Create within us a clean heart. Renew within us a right spirit. Lead us, in the stress and strain of this new day and of this new week, to the sources of strength and victory, to the green pastures and still waters of Thine enabling grace, to the paths of righteousness: For Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 9, 1956, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which is investigating the automobile industry, was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be the usual morning hour, subject to a limitation of 2 minutes on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN PYRETHRUM

A letter from the Acting Commissioner, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 75,000 pounds of pyrethrum (20 percent) extract now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of January 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SFC. HENRY F. FERRY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Sfc. Henry F. Ferry (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF A CERTAIN ALIEN

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a confidential order issued in the

case of Michael Isaac Mortimer Sanders, relating to his temporary admission into the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT, AS AMENDED, RELATING TO NOTICES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subdivision e of section 58—notices—of the Bankruptcy Act as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Attorney General of the United States to place the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the subversive list for reasons set forth herein

"Whereas the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee reveal records of affiliation with or participation in Communist, Communist-front, fellow-traveling or subversive organizations or activities on the part of the following officials of the NAACP—the president, the chairman of the board, the honorary chairman, 11 of 28 vice presidents, the treasurer, 28 of 47 directors, the chairman of the national legal committee, the executive secretary, the special counsel, the assistant special counsel, the southeast regional secretary, the west coast secretary, the director of the Washington bureau, the director of public relations and 2 field secretaries; and

"Whereas of the NAACP's 28 vice presidents, the following 11 have records of un-American activities: John Haynes Holmes, 23 citations; A. Philip Randolph, 20 citations; the late Mary McLeod Bethune (who still is listed as a vice president) and William Lloyd Imes, 16 citations each: Oscar Hammerstein, II, the composer, and Bishop W. J. Walls, 7 citations each; Ira W. Jayne and L. Pearl Mitchell, 2 citations each; and Willard S. Townsend, T. G. Nutter and Grace B. Fenderson, 1 citation each; and

"Whereas of the 47 members comprising the association's board of directors, the following 28 have records of the un-American activities: Earl B. Dickerson, 25 citations; Algernon D. Black, 18 citations; Lewis Gannett, 15 citations; Roscoe Dunjee, 13 citations; S. Ralph Harlow and Chairman Channing H. Tobias, 10 citations each; William H. Hastie, 9 citations; Hubert T. Delaney, 8 citations; Benjamin E. Mays, president of Atlanta's Morehouse College, 6 citations; Robert G. Weaver, 5 citations; Buell G. Gallagher, 4 citations; President Arthur B. Spingarn, Earl G. Harrison, James J. McClendon, Ralph Bunche, Allen Knight Chalmers and W. Montague Cobb, 3 citations each; J. M. Tinsley, Wesley W. Law of Savannah, Ga., Norman Cousins, Z. Alexander Looby, Harry J. Greene and Alfred Baker Lewis, 2 citations each; and H. Claude Hudson, Carl R. Johnson, A. Maceo Smith, James Hinton and Theodore M. Berry, 1 citation each; and

"Whereas other officers of the NAACP with un-American activity records are: Lloyd Garrison, chairman, national legal committee, 5 citations; Treasurer Allan Knight Chalmers and Branch Department Director Gloster B. Current, 3 citations each; Southeast Regional Secretary Ruby Hurley, West Coast Regional Secretary Franklin H. Williams, Field Secretary Madison S. Jones and Assistant Special Counsel Robert L. Carter, 2 citations each; and Field Secretary Tarea Hall Pittman, 1 citation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of South Carolina believes that for the reasons herein set forth that the NAACP should be classified as a subversive organization so that it may be kept under the proper surveillance and that all citizens of the United States may have ample warnings of the danger to our way of life which lurks in such an organization; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Attorney General, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 125

"Concurrent resolution condemning and protesting the usurpation and encroachment on the reserved powers of the States by the Supreme Court of the United States and declaring that its decisions of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, and all similar decisions are in violation of the Constitutions of the United States and the State of Mississippi, and are therefore unconstitutional and of no lawful effect within the territorial limits of the State of Mississippi; declaring that a contest of powers has arisen between the State of Mississippi and said Supreme Court, and invoking the historic doctrine of interposition to protect the sovereignty of this and the other States of the Union; and calling on our sister States and the Congress for redress of grievances as provided by law; and for other purposes

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Mississippi (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Legislature of Mississippi unequivocally expresses a firm determination to maintain and defend the Constitution of the United States, and the constitution of this State, against every attempt whether foreign or domestic, to undermine and destroy the fundamental principles embodied in our basic law by which this Government was established, and by which the liberty of the people and the sovereignty of the States, in their proper spheres, have been long protected and guaranteed;

"That the Legislature of Mississippi explicitly and peremptorily declares and maintains that the powers of the Federal Government emanate solely from the compact, to which the States are principals, as limited by the plain sense and long recognized intention of the instrument creating that compact;

"That the Legislature of Mississippi firmly asserts that the powers of the Federal Government are limited, and valid only to the extent that these powers have been conferred as enumerated in the compact to which the various States assented originally, and to which the States have consented in subsequent amendments validly ratified;

"That the inherent nature of this basic compact, apparent upon its face, is that the ratifying States, parties thereto, have agreed voluntarily to confer certain of their sovereign rights, but only specific sovereign rights, to a Federal Government thus constituted; and that all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, have been reserved to the States respectively, or to the people;

"That the State of Mississippi has at no time, through the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, or in any manner whatsoever, delegated to the Federal Government its right to educate and nurture its youth and its power and right of control over its schools, colleges, educational, and other public institutions and facilities, and to prescribe the rules, regulation, and conditions under which they shall be conducted;

"That the aggrandizement of powers by the Federal Government has grown far beyond that ever conceived by the authors of our Constitution, that the seizure and concentration therein of powers not granted by the compact under which the several States entered this Union, and particularly that by which Mississippi entered the Union on December 10, 1817, threaten to reduce these sovereign States to mere satellites, and to subject us to the tyranny of centralized government, so rightfully abhorred by the founders, and for the prevention of which they exercised their finest genius;

"That in late years the encroachment upon the reserved rights of the States and of the people has grown apace, and the proponents of the acts of encroachment have grown so emboldened that not one of the sister States and its people have escaped the oppressive hand thereof: In the destruction of their vested property rights; abridgements of their liberties; control of their institutions, habits, manners, and morals by centralized bureaucratic instrumentalities; and in fact by various wrongful and obtrusive acts, too numerous to be here documented, but so consistently characterized by an oppressive course of action so as to seriously threaten to completely destroy our constitutional processes and substitute in lieu thereof ideologies foreign to the soil of our beloved land;

"That one of the noblest characteristics of our people is the reverent respect for and obedience to the courts of law and justice, and that which more than any other has enobled our institutions of government, and ought to be challenged only with the most dreadful reluctance, still it should be solenmly and firmly declared that the hand of tyranny ought to be stayed from whatsoever source it might strike;

"That we profess an undying attachment to and a warm regard and respect for the sister States, and for this Union, which, through unwarranted and unconstitutional action of the Supreme Court, is fastly being dissolved by usurpation of powers reserved to the States and transferring them to an all-powerful centralized Government which, unless halted, will reduce the States to impotent vassals, sheared of all rights and powers except those received at the sufferance of the Federal Government;

"That a question of contested power has arisen; the Supreme Court of the United States asserts, for its part, that the States did in fact prohibit unto themselves the power to maintain racially separate public institutions, and the State of Mississippi, for its part, asserts that it and its sister States have never relegated such rights;

"That the flagrant assertion upon the part of the Supreme Court of the United States accompanied by the threats of coercion and compulsion against the sovereign States of this Union, constitutes a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous attempt by the Court to usurp the exercise of powers not granted to it:

"That the Legislature of Mississippi asserts that whenever the Federal Governments attempts to engage in the deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of powers not granted to it, the States who are parties to the compact have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining, within their respective limits, the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to them;

"That failure on the part of this State thus to assert its clear rights would be construed as acquiescence in the surrender thereof, and that such submissive acquiescence to the seizure of one right would in the end lead to the surrender of all rights, and inevitably to the consolidation of the States into one sovereignty, contrary to the sacred compact by which this union of States was created;

"That the question of contested power asserted in this resolution is not within the

province of the court to determine because the court itself seeks to usurp the powers which have been reserved to the States, and, therefore, under these circumstances, the judgment of all of the parties to the compact must be sought to resolve the question; that the Supreme Court is not a party to this compact, but a creature of the compact, and the question of contested power cannot be settled by the creature seeking to usurp the power, but by the parties to the compact who are the people of the respective States in whom ultimate sovereignty finally reposes; be it further

"*Resolved*, That:

"In order that relief be obtained and the wrongs and injuries inflicted be alleviated, we invite all of our sister States to join in taking such steps as are necessary to settle the grave question of contested sovereignty herein raised; the State of Mississippi declares that the Congress has the duty and authority to protect the rights of the States from the unwarranted encroachment upon their reserved powers to govern the internal and domestic affairs of the States; the State of Mississippi further asserts that the Congress has, on many occasions in the past, curbed the attempted encroachment by the judiciary upon the legislative and executive branches of government, and it is the responsibility of the Congress likewise to protect the States when their constitutional rights and privileges are endangered;

"The State of Mississippi declares emphatically that the sovereign States of the Nation have never surrendered their rights and powers to control their public schools, colleges, and other public institutions; therefore, when an attempt is made to usurp these powers, the people of Mississippi object and refuse to be so deprived, reminding the Congress that the preservation of this Union of States, as the compact intended it should be, depends upon the preservation of the sovereignty of the States;

"The compact intended ours to be a government of the people, for the people and, above all, a government by the people; if the right to govern and control the local affairs to decide questions of public health, morals, education, and safety are taken from the States, then a fatal blow has been dealt State sovereignty and the States are nothing more than vassal provinces, subject to a central government;

"The State of Mississippi declares that it is the duty and privilege of a State to object to the aforesaid invasion of its rights and does hereby interpose its sovereignty to protect these rights; it is the duty of the Congress to halt such practices and save these rights; and if such cannot be obtained other than by amendment to the Federal Constitution, we appeal to the Congress, in the exercise of the power granted under article 5 of the Constitution, to initiate and submit an appropriate amendment direct to the 48 States for ratification by three-fourths of the legislatures thereof, declaring that the States have never surrendered their rights and powers to control their public schools, colleges, and other public institutions and facilities to the Federal Government, or any department or agency thereof, but such powers are reserved to the States; and until such time as these wrongs are righted, we do hereby declare the decision and order of the Supreme Court of the United States of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, to be a usurpation of power reserved to the several States and do declare, as a matter of right, that said decisions are in violation of the Constitution of the United States and the State of Mississippi, and therefore, are considered unconstitutional, invalid, and of no lawful effect within the confines of the State of Mississippi;

"We declare further, our firm intention to take all appropriate measures honorably and constitutionally available to us, to void this illegal encroachment upon our rights, and we do hereby urge our sister States to take prompt and deliberate action to check further encroachment by the Federal Government, through judicial legislation, upon the reserved powers of all States.

"The Governor of Mississippi is respectfully requested to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Governor of each of the other States, and to the Members of Congress and the Supreme Court of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate February 29, 1956.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives February 29, 1956.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Virginia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

"House Joint Resolution 19

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act for the District of Columbia

"Whereas the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act has, in the short time since it was recommended for adoption, been adopted by a majority of the States of the United States, but has not been enacted by the Congress for the District of Columbia; and

"Whereas the beneficial effects of this statute have been amply demonstrated by experience in the adopting States, both as a means of providing for dependents abandoned by those legally responsible for their support; and

"Whereas the failure of an adjacent jurisdiction to adopt this statute results in a heavier burden on public funds for the support of such dependent: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Virginia (the Senate concurring), That the* Congress of the United States is memorialized to aid the authorities of the several States in securing, for their citizens, the benefits of support to which they are legally entitled from those legally and morally responsible therefor by enactment for the District of Columbia of the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the house of delegates is directed to send a copy of this resolution to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"E. GRIFFITH DODSON,
"Clerk of the House of Delegates."

Resolutions adopted by the Porterville Junior Chamber of Commerce, Porterville, and a mass meeting of the citizens of the Tule and Kaweah River area, County of Tulare, both in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient funds necessary for the construction of Success and Terminus Dams, in the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Kauai, T. H., favoring the appointment of Philip L. Rice as chief justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Associated Equipment Distributors, Chicago, Ill., relating to retail exemption in the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The memorial of Mrs. Quintin Daehler, of Mayview, Mo., remonstrating against the artificial fluoridation of the community water systems of the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The memorial of Elizabeth H. Hagerty, and sundry other citizens of Whittier, Calif., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 2905) and the bill (H. R. 7535), relating to Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the BMT division, Holy Name Society, New York City, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; ordered to lie on the table.

WHEAT PRICES—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from John E. Davis, acting secretary, Sheridan County Republican Convention, embodying a resolution adopted by that convention at McClusky, N. Dak., relating to wheat prices.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McCLUSKY, N. DAK., *March 7, 1956.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The Sheridan County Republican Convention was held March 6 in the courthouse in McClusky at which time a short resolution on wheat prices was adopted and as acting secretary, I was directed to transmit the resolution to you. The resolution is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Sheridan County Republican Convention shall go on record to support 90 percent of parity on quality wheat on the national program and copies thereof be sent to all Senators and Representatives in Congress from North Dakota."

Very truly yours,

JOHN E. DAVIS,
Acting Secretary, Sheridan County Republican Convention.

By the time this reaches you we may know what action was taken on the bill reported out of the committee. We all hope it will receive majority consideration.

RESOLUTIONS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, FARGO (N. DAK.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Fargo (N. Dak.) Chamber of Commerce, relating to a workable price support program and wheat production allotments.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the national affairs committee of the Chamber of Commerce of Fargo has studied Senate bill 3183 and discussed its possible effect on agricultural economy in North Dakota and the Nation; and

Whereas the committee unanimously agrees with the concept of acreage reserve; and

Whereas the committee wholeheartedly supports the Young amendment to Senate bill 3183 providing for price supports of wheat based on quality classification; and

Whereas the committee realizing that the farmer is caught in a serious cost-price squeeze believes a workable price support program is of absolute necessity at the present time, for the businessmen of North Dakota as well as the farmers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Fargo, N. Dak., do hereby respectfully urge that Senators LANGER and YOUNG and Representatives BURDICK and KRUEGER support Senate bill

3183, and do further urge that they support a workable price support program.

T. VICTOR DEFOREST,
Executive Vice President.

Whereas the national affairs committee of the Chamber of Commerce of Fargo supports the legislation recently passed by the United States Senate, which provides that domestic producers shall receive at least 55 percent of the increased production allotments based on increased consumption; and

Whereas this legislation will provide increased income for North Dakota farmers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Fargo, N. Dak., do hereby commend Senators LANGER and YOUNG for their support of this legislation and do hereby respectfully urge the support of Representatives BURDICK and KRUEGER.

T. VICTOR DEFOREST,
Executive Vice President.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. J. Res. 443. Joint resolution to increase the appropriation authorization for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 1650).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3415. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Civil Rights and Privileges; to promote observance of the civil rights of all individuals; and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. THYE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 3416. A bill relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 3417. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interest in, and the appointment of, the waters of the Little Missouri River and its tributaries as they affect such States, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 3418. A bill to authorize certain beach erosion control of the shore of the State of New York from Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. DOUGLAS:)

S. 3419. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Committee on the Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 3420. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain timber access roads, to permit maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3421. A bill to permit persons who were reciving annuities prior to January 1, 1954, to continue to compute the portion of annuity payments excludable from gross income in the manner provided by the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BYRD (by request):

S. 3422. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain amounts from unclaimed payments on United States Savings Bonds to the fund created for the payment of Government losses in shipment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 3423. A bill to amend section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to appeals by the United States;

S. 3424. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of certain corporate mergers; and

S. 3425. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 3426. A bill for the relief of Jose Sanchez Camano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 3427. A bill for the relief of Shirley Dorothy Brye; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. MCCLELLAN):

S. 3428. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing the Arkansas Post State Park as a national park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was submitted, and referred, as indicated:

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. Res. 228. Resolution to provide for electrical voting in the Senate Chamber; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

FEDERAL COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the 83d Congress, I introduced a bill to establish a Federal Commission on Civil Rights and Privileges. We had some hearings in the subcommittee and, as I recall, the bill was reported to the full Committee on the Judiciary. No further action was taken. I did not reintroduce the bill in the 84th Congress. I think, however, under all the circumstances and in view of the attention the bill had received heretofore, the bill ought to be reintroduced. So I introduce the bill now, for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3415) to establish a Federal Commission on Civil Rights and Privileges; to promote observance of the civil rights of all individuals; and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE ARTS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill proposing the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts. This bill is similar to several bills which have been introduced in the House, and on which hearings have recently been held. I hope that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee can schedule early hearings on this bill in order to expedite action on this important matter during the present session of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement I have prepared relating to the bill, be printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3419) to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. DOUGLAS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby finds and declares, and it is the policy of the Congress in enacting this act—

(1) that the growth and flourishing of the arts depend upon freedom, imagination, and individual initiative;

(2) that the encouragement of creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts, and of a widespread participation in and appreciation of the arts, is essential to the general welfare and the national interest;

(3) that as workdays shorten and life expectancy lengthens, the arts will play an ever more important role in the lives of our citizens; and

(4) that the encouragement of the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is an appropriate matter of concern to the United States Government.

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts (hereinafter in this act referred to as the "Commission"). The Commission shall be composed of 24 members appointed

by the President, from among private citizens of the United States who are widely recognized for their knowledge of or experience in, or for their profound interest in, one or more of the arts. Three of such members shall be representative of each of the following 7 major art fields: music, drama and dance; literature; architecture; painting, sculpture and graphic art; photography and motion pictures; and radio and television, and 3 members shall be persons with outstanding general interest in the arts. In making such appointments the President shall give due consideration to the recommendations for nomination submitted by the leading national organizations in these fields, and he shall determine at least every 6 years which of such organizations shall be invited to submit nominations. The term of office of each member of the Commission shall be 6 years; except that, of the 3 members first appointed to represent each of the 7 major art fields listed above, and general interest in the arts, 1 shall be appointed for a term of 2 years, 1 for a term of 4 years, and 1 for a term of 6 years. No member of the Commission shall be eligible for reappointment during the 2-year period following the expiration of his term.

The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), but not less often than twice each calendar year. The President shall from time to time, on the basis of the recommendations of the Commission, designate a member of the Commission to be Chairman.

(b) The Commission shall have an executive secretary who shall be appointed by the Secretary after consultation with the Commission. Within the limits of appropriations available therefor, the Secretary shall also provide the Commission, its executive secretary, and members of its special committees with necessary secretarial, clerical, and other staff assistance.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall undertake studies of, and make recommendations relating to, appropriate methods, consistent with the policy set forth in the first section of this act, for encouragement of creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts and of participation in and appreciation of the arts. Such studies shall be conducted by special committees of persons, expert in the field of art involved, appointed by the Secretary after consultation with the Commission, which shall give due consideration to recommendations for nomination submitted by the leading national organizations in such field of art. After considering reports on these studies, the Commission shall make recommendations in writing to the Secretary. In the selection of subjects to be studied and in the formulation of recommendations, the Commission may obtain the advice of any interested and qualified persons and organizations. The advisory services of the Commission shall also be available upon request to the head of any Federal department or agency which has in operation or under consideration a program in any field of the arts; and after conducting its studies pursuant to any such request the Commission may make its recommendations in writing directly to the Federal official who made the request.

SEC. 4. Members of the Commission and members of special committees appointed pursuant to section 3, while attending meetings of the Commission or while engaged in the conduct of studies hereunder, shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $50 per diem, and shall be paid travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C., sec. 734–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

SEC. 5. (a) Any member of the Commission or of a special committee, appointed under this act, and any other person appointed, employed, or utilized in an advisory or consultative capacity under this act is hereby exempted, with respect to such appointment, employment, or utilization, from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, except as otherwise specified in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) (1) The exemption granted by subsection (a) of this section shall not extend to the following acts performed as an officer or employee of the United States by any person so appointed, employed, or utilized: (A) The negotiation or execution of, or (B) the making of any recommendation with respect to, or (C) the taking of any other action with respect to, any individual contract or other arrangement under this act with the private employer of such person or any corporation, joint stock company, association, firm, partnership, or other business entity in the pecuniary profits or contracts of which such person has any direct or indirect interest.

(2) The exemption granted by subsection (a) of this section shall not, during the period of such appointment, employment, or utilization and the further period of 2 years after the termination thereof, extend to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, employed, or utilized, of any claim against the Government involving any individual contract or other arrangement entered into pursuant to this act concerning which the appointee had any responsibility during the period of such appointment, employment, or utilization.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act, including expenses of professional, clerical, and stenographic assistance. Such appropriations shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C., sec. 55a).

SEC. 7. This act shall not be deemed to invalidate any provision in any act of Congress or Executive order vesting authority in the Commission of Fine Arts.

The statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

The welfare of our Nation's arts has become an important matter for the concern of Congress. Since the end of World War II there has been a widening realization that the Federal Government of the United States gives less recognition to the role of the arts in our national life than any other major nation—or even many smaller nations. By the arts I mean to include all seven major arts: music, drama and dance; literature; architecture and its allied arts; painting, sculpture, and graphic and applied arts; motion pictures and photography; radio and television; and any subdivision of these arts.

It is self-evident that the rapid progress of automation and industrialized scientific farming will reduce the number of hours that man must spend in the factory or on the farm. This will leave more time for other pursuits, and an increasing number of our citizens will turn to the arts. It is also clear that the continuing and epoch-making discoveries of science and medicine will appreciably lengthen the life of the average citizen. The prerogatives of youth in the world of sports do not apply to the practice of some of the arts, and the appreciation of all of the arts is apt to become deeper with the richness of years.

Our artists have attained a very high level of accomplishment without the governmental support and promotion which they generally receive in other lands. They come from the plains, from mountain hamlets, from crowded cities. There is not a State which has not contributed to the flourishing of our arts. The foremost artists are the sons and daughters of our constituents. They are like the baseball heroes who develop on the sandlots and school playgrounds, who are later selected and trained on the ball farms of the professional leagues, until they are given the big chance before the grandstands of the world series. But the American people have not fully realized the international and enduring significance of the arts, and little attention has been paid to the development of the creative artist, and his rewards are few. The big collectors and patrons of the arts are rare. Recordings and reproductions have taken the place of live art in most American homes. Perfected mass communication has reduced attendance at concerts, symphonies, theaters, and operas. Live art performers suffer. Many thousands may listen to a single broadcast by a handful of performers. Many of our best artists, for lack of employment or patronage, have to turn from creative work in their art to other occupations, at least for a good share of their energies. It is from the broad base of hundreds of performers and practitioners that the few great artists have emerged in any country at any period of history.

The arts provide the wellspring and the pipelines for our Nation's cultural growth. I am a stanch exponent of the protection of the natural resources of our country for the benefit of all our people. Likewise, I believe that our cultural resources should be fostered and developed for the enrichment of all. Are we in America going to continue to be as profligate or as blindly inconsiderate about our cultural resources as we were in the past about our great forests and deep rich soil? The long drought of economic insecurity for the arts in America has spread an aesthetic dust bowl across many of our States. For instance, the theater and its people in smaller cities and towns have become as rare as our vanishing prairies. Plans need to be developed by far-sighted statesmen, with the assistance of professional advice, for the protection and nurturing of the arts. We must remember that the creative achievements of a nation's arts are the most enduring products of its civilization.

It is alarming that at a time of unprecedented nationwide prosperity the situation for some of the arts in the United States is more serious and their development more endangered, due to the insecurity of the creative artist in certain fields, than in most European countries today. Congress has established permanent departments or agencies for practically all other vital aspects of our economy. It is high time that Congress should recognize that the arts are essential to the general welfare and the national interest. Encouragement of the arts is a long-term process and depends principally upon local and individual initiative. However, this local initiative can be greatly stimulated at comparatively modest expense to the Federal Government, provided the methods used are judiciously devised and vigorously implemented. The question before Congress is not whether it should take action on this subject now, but rather, what action would be the most effective and sound.

The present international situation underscores another reason why Congress should give immediate attention to the arts. The new look in the policy of the Soviet Union might be said to be a shift in the continuing cold war from the arena of armaments and potential armed aggression to penetration into other lands by economic and cultural campaigns accompanied by propaganda against the United States for its laissez faire attitude toward the arts. This challenge must be met. This does not for a moment mean that we can risk slackening our preparations for meeting any threat of destruction by superior forces. Quite the contrary. A major purpose of this new policy of the U. S. S. R. may be the desire to catch us off guard.

During the past 2 years utilization of the arts has become an integral part of our foreign policy. My distinguished colleagues, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], have introduced two bills, S. 3116 and S. 3172, to the purposes of which I fully subscribe. They are for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals. The objective of the bill which I intend to place before the Senate for consideration is to strengthen and augment our cultural resources here at home. Unless this is done, by whatever means, unless the development of our arts is encouraged, the benefits we anticipate from the above international cultural exchanges may fall short of expectations sooner than we think, and some of our arts may eventually fail us on the cultural battlefields of the cold war.

Since I have referred to the international political aspects of the maintenance and strengthening of our cultural resources through legislation for the arts in the United States, may I remind the Senate that art legislation is and should always be kept beyond the pale of domestic and party politics. This same nonpartisan and nonpolitical approach applies equally to the implementation of art legislation and to the administering of any or all federally sponsored art programs.

President Eisenhower in his State of the Union message last year, before the extent and significance of the Communist cultural attack was widely recognized, stated that the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. He recommended the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

There are now before the House two parallel bills to do what the President requested. These are: H. R. 7973 (Thompson, Democrat, New Jersey), and H. R. 8291 (Wainwright, Republican, New York). The proposed Commission would establish special committees of experts from the various fields of the arts to study and recommend to it plans to encourage the performance, practice, and appreciation of the arts, and, upon request, to advise those Federal departments and agencies which have or may consider art programs in any field with the exception of those areas of responsibility of the present Commission of Fine Arts.

Permit me to call attention to a few features of this proposed legislation:

1. The present diversified system of federally sponsored art programs administered by many different Federal departments and agencies is retained as appropriate to our American desire for freedom and independence.

2. This proposed legislation is consequently not a step toward a department of art with concurrent danger of undesired bureaucratic or governmental control of the artist.

3. It does not propose any wholesale support of the arts or dole to the artist by the Federal Government. It recognizes that progress in the arts depends upon freedom, imagination, and individual initiative, and that support of the arts in America is primarily a matter of private and local action. Nevertheless, in certain art fields encouragement and temporary assistance by the Federal Government is urgently needed, but such undertakings as may be proposed would be considered separately on their own merits in due course by Congress.

4. This proposed legislation would provide a permanent reference agency with all the arts represented by the best professional knowledge, experience, and judgment in the various fields to which the administration and Congress may turn for impartial advice, and it would establish for the first time in our history the machinery whereby the many art programs sponsored by the Government may be assessed with professional competence as to their relative values in relation to the appropriations requested from Congress by different Federal departments and agencies.

The sponsors of this bill believe that it will stimulate artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation. It will serve the interests of the Nation as well as those of the arts it would promote. We are confident that this proposed legislation will have the broadest kind of support not only by cultural organizations and institutions throughout the country but also by the many thousands of Americans who are increasingly aware of the essential part of the arts in their pursuit of happiness.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, at this point, a document prepared by the National Council on the Arts and Government, an organization consisting of prominent representatives of each of the seven major arts. This document describes, by example, the plight of some of the arts in the United States today and also suggests some of the areas of study which the Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts might most usefully undertake.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUGGESTIONS FOR EARLY CONSIDERATION BY THE PROPOSED FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON THE ARTS

(Prepared by the National Council on the Arts and Government, Clarence Derwent, chairman; Harold Weston, vice chairman; 22 West 54th Street, New York, N. Y.)

MUSIC

There are many national problems in the field of music in the United States which might well have the attention of a special committee on music under the Commission. Foremost among these is the present economic situation of the performing musician. Although the country as a whole is enjoying an almost universal period of prosperity, the economic status of the performing musician seems to be greatly deteriorating. The cause of this may be sought partly, but not altogether, in the spread of mechanization of musical performances. Musical recordings and broadcasts over the radio and television have increased the scope of musical appreciation in the United States, but at the same time they have discouraged music lovers from concert attendance where live music can be heard.

The average income of a symphony orchestra musician is somewhere between $1,400 and $1,500 per annum. Musicians in our financially better-off major orchestras, of course, receive more than this, but we must take into consideration that there are now over 600 community orchestras in this country serving the smaller cities and towns. It is impossible for a symphony orchestra musician to support a family on such a meager income as that mentioned above. The result is that many talented young persons who would go into music if it offered a living wage are being forced into other occupations. The average age of the symphony orchestra musician is constantly growing older. The problem of keeping our great symphony orchestras alive becomes more acute with each season. As of now, they seem to arise, like the Phoenix, every year from their own ashes. Whether Government subsidy on a local, State, or Federal level is the answer to this dilemma is a question which remains to be solved.

OPERA

Opera in the United States is in a deplorable situation. There are now only 1 or 2 permanent opera companies with reasonably long seasons of activity. Practically all our larger cities are without opera houses and professional opera companies. This condition exists in hardly any other country of the Western World. There are about 50 opera companies in Germany today. Even our most gifted singers have to go abroad to acquire mature professional experience and the recognition from experts necessary for employment by our two opera companies. Conservatories of music and several universities have student opera workshops, but these do not provide professional experience or status. In the United States there is a great and growing appreciation for opera, but, here again, we come up against the economic problem of those who take part in operatic productions. Only a few outstanding singers can hope to make a livelihood through singing in opera on account of the very limited opportunities at present in the United States.

DRAMA

There are great stretches of the country which today do not have any professional theater. Distance and expense make such areas impractical for the commercial theater. The theaters and opera houses which once served traveling companies no longer exist. They have been torn down or converted to movie houses or other uses. The theater and its people in smaller cities and towns are now as remote and shadowy as the clipper ships that once sailed the seven seas. Yet the theater creates an emotional impact and depth of comment which motion pictures, television, and radio can never provide.

A special committee of the Commission could study and report on the following proposal which has been suggested as a partial solution.

Certain areas of our country have generally similar cultural standards, common attitudes on many problems, and speak a language whose accents and rhythms are understood by a majority of their people and to which they tend to respond. New England, the Deep South, the Midwest, and the Pacific coast are recognized as such and there are others. Each has an unofficial capital to which the region is bound by economic and cultural ties.

To bring the theater to people in these regions the Federal Government and the States in those regions should combine to set up competent professional companies in all or some of these regional capitals. These companies should be staffed, as far as possible, with playwrights, directors, and actors drawn from those regions. They should be charged with developing theaters concerned primarily with the problems, aspirations, and culture of their region, in language which its people use and understand. Each company should play a part of its season in its capital city. And then it should take to the road, playing in every city, town, and crossroads where an audience can be gotten together, at prices within reach of its audiences. That way a theater for the Nation would be brought to its people for a comparatively small outlay of money.

Almost every great civilized nation uses or has used such a system to provide theater for its people; to nourish its language at its best; to explain its audiences to themselves; to portray the history and ideals to its own people, its neighbors, and the world about it. Such programs have been fostered by countries far less wealthy and less culturally and spiritually alive than the United States, and they have felt that these programs were well worth what they cost. If the Congress of the United States can think of the theater only in terms of revenue or entertainment, it will fail in its duty to the people it represents,

deprive great sections of the country of a form of culture they once had, and continue a policy which has long since been abandoned by almost all civilized nations.

DANCE AND BALLET

There is not nearly enough activity on the professional stage (opera, theater, television, etc.) in the United States to give even part-time employment to the talented youth that is already prepared or is training for a career in the dance world. In New York City, when a choreographer needs from 4 to 15 dancers and holds an audition, anywhere from 200 to 400 dancers apply. Of this group, 75 or 80 percent may qualify when less than 10 percent may be needed.

Ballet companies are limited in number and they are forced to tour almost constantly to stay alive. In the past few years, the United States has been overrun with foreign dance companies, almost all government-sponsored: Sadler Wells Opera Ballet Co., Sadler Wells Ballet, Kabuki Theater, Yugoslavian Dance Co., Canadian National Ballet Co., Danish Ballet Co., and Spanish Ballet Co. The Soviet Union has suggested sending over the Russian Ballet Co. While all these tours of dance groups from other countries are part of a desirable international cultural exchange, the United States has only two groups in this field suitable for such exchanges: the Ballet Theater and the City Center Ballet Co. And these two have only been sent on limited trips abroad. Of course, there are the other dance groups like the Martha Graham group which has most successfully toured South America and is now in the Far East. In any case, the recent influx of foreign dance groups satisfies some of the public demand for dance or ballet performances and consequently militates against the forming of new professional dance groups in our own country.

The Commission should assign to a special committee on the dance the investigation of the following suggestion.

In different regional areas of the United States smaller dance groups, primarily ballet, might be formed. These groups would give concert performances at local universities, colleges, civic centers, and theaters. These groups could arrange for exchange performances from time to time in other sections of the country. Eventually, several groups or selections from them might be joined into larger units to be sent abroad. These groups should probably be composed of different schools of the dance—modern, classical ballet (the most serious lack in the United States today), and even what might be called modern jazz, which is the type of work we have mostly in musical comedies and television and which might be considered abroad as peculiarly American. A complete cross section of contemporary dance in America—not just one type—is what would be desired. These dance groups might or might not be fittingly associated with the proposed regional theater companies. At any rate, such a project would not be possible unless initial aid were forthcoming from Federal, State, or private sources, or a combination of these. The Federal Government should at least give encouragement to such an enterprise. It is perfectly obvious that the American people are dance conscious. It seems almost shameful that so little opportunity exists for American dancers to perform.

LITERATURE

Writers in America, conscious that words are the major vehicle of propaganda, are especially aware of the danger inherent in any system of Federal sponsorship of the arts that the artist so employed or assisted may be subject to some form of governmental control and political dictation, or at least restriction of esthetic freedom, necessary for creative art. When a concerted effort is made to harness the arts to serve a nation's government, as instanced in the Soviet Union, life ebbs from the arts, unless they are basically too abstract (music) or formalized (ballet) to be subject to dogmatic controls. But the possibility exists and should be kept in mind and resisted by all members of the Commission and its special committees, by the administrators of any Federal art program, and by Members of Congress when judging the value of these programs. Reasonable administrative controls are of course necessary and expected.

There is a phase of Federal assistance to writers which seems worthy of considerable expansion—fellowships for American writers to be sent abroad for research and creative work. The most important aspect of this program is careful selection of persons who might thereby give greatest cultural return for the investment. While this activity is part of the international educational exchange program administered by the Department of State, the small advisory committee of 10 members which the Department intends to establish to cover all the arts represented in this program would not be expected or competent to offer expert advice about the crucial question of the qualifications of writer candidates for such fellowships. It is therefore suggested that the Department of State might request the Commission to establish a special committee for literature, one of the duties of which could be advice concerning American writers for such fellowships.

ARCHITECTURE AND SISTER ARTS

The United States has lagged far behind European countries in the use of art in conjunction with public buildings. The current official term "embellishment of Federal buildings" clearly indicates that the art is not an integral part but stuck in as an afterthought. Cooperation between architect and sculptor and muralist should begin at the planning stage, which is rarely done here. It is just as reasonable to call in the artists who will contribute to the esthetic effect of the building as a whole work of art as it is to consult the engineer on stresses and strains. Frequently in the United States the architect assumes sole judgment whether the artist and the artist's designs are suitable for his building. Too often in the United States architects select subordinated examples of the sister arts, mere decoration which is not a work of art in its own right however accomplished the craftsmanship, and such embellishment adds nothing to mankind's need for spiritual nourishment.

Several governments abroad set aside by statute a proportion of the budget allocation for public buildings to be spent on murals, mosaic, sculpture, etc. They have regulations for open competitions, including protection of the artist's interests as well as the architect's. The municipalities make appropriations for statues in public parks. The plight of the sculptor in America today is the worst in these fields of art, additionally so due to the costs inherent in his art. A special committee of the Commission should study methods used abroad for closer cooperation between the architect and allied creative artists and recommend a system suitable for the United States which would not be under the dominance of any one art group. While federally sponsored art of this kind is almost exclusively the province of the Commission of Fine Arts, such a study would stimulate greater and more effective use of the sister arts with architecture by State, municipal, and private industry, and therefore this subject is a proper matter for the concern of the Commission.

PAINTING, SCULPTURE, AND GRAPHIC ART

The United States Information Agency is sponsoring a number of traveling exhibitions of American art which are sent abroad. The USIA has turned for advice and assistance to private art organizations or individuals concerning what kinds of exhibitions should be sent and the selection of the examples to be included. There should be a panel of experts to advise the USIA about such matters. It is suggested that the composition of such a panel should be subject to fairly frequent change and its members nominated by the leading national art organizations in the appropriate field. If the USIA so requested this could be a special committee established by the Commission.

It is also suggested that the Department of State might request the Commission to establish a special committee to advise it concerning the selection of artists from these fields who might be granted fellowships for study or creative work abroad—similar to the special committee suggested for writers.

One method by which the Federal Government can give more support and recognition to American artists in these fields is by providing suitable housing for the National Collection of Fine Arts and an adequate appropriation to expand its program of activities. Legislation for the construction of a museum for this purpose in Washington, D. C., has been introduced in Congress. The National Collection of Fine Arts has under consideration an ambitious outline of increased activities. The Smithsonian Institution, if so desired, could make use of the advisory services of the Commission for detail recommendations about aspects of these plans for the study of which the Smithsonian might not have the appropriate facilities.

MOTION PICTURES

No medium of artistic expression or mass communication has had greater impact on the world of the 20th century than the motion picture, and American films have from the beginning held a position of dominance in the world market. Yet it cannot be said that the wisest use of these films has always been made either in terms of "cold war" conflict or even in less dramatic terms of showing America as it really is to countries uncommitted in the "cold war." The Commission may very well be the agency to help to integrate Government activity with the productive genius of Hollywood to insure the proper use of the best films we make for the best interests of the country.

In the matter of international film festivals, for example, an impartial body such as this can be of service in the selection of films to be shown, thus removing the selection from the inevitable studio politics and commercial pressures that have forced such selections in the past. Also, it may be the proper agency to develop plans for an American film festival, which has long been talked about, but never put into effect because of these same politics and pressures.

As for educational and documentary films, the possibilities for their use both inside this country and abroad are so vast and so exciting that only an agency of this kind—divorced from special pleading—can take full advantage of them. As an example, the Commission could form a special committee consisting of the best talents of both the entertainment and documentary fields and request it to prepare recommendations for educational films, even as the Army and the Navy used such talents in the preparation for training films during World War II.

RADIO AND TELEVISION

In the fields of radio and television, the Commission can be of value in the general activity of raising programing standards, without in any way infringing on the basic commercial operation of networks and individual stations. It can cooperate with the Federal Communications Commission in the matter of public service programing, which the FCC requires of station licensees. In the matter of prize awards for fine programs, it may very well bring order out of the chaos in which the communication fields now find themselves. And in the development of educational broadcasting, which is both desirable and inevitable, it can bring the assistance and aptitude of professional talent into

an area which has already made remarkable strides, but which admittedly has a long way yet to go.

Certainly in the field of overseas activity the Commission could be of inestimable value. As foreign television stations and networks continue to expand, the best of American programing can be made available to them, as well as the best American talent and experience. The USIA recently announced the great popular acclaim and official interest aroused by the first demonstrations of television which it has conducted in the smaller countries of Europe and Asia. This field has almost unlimited possibilities. For instance, the use of closed-circuit telecasts in countries which face the problem of mass education with an appalling shortage of teachers and equipment. There are tremendous opportunities for the development of better international understanding through the use of television in a highly intelligent way. The Commission could assist the Voice of America, the USIA, and other agencies by providing a special committee of experts to recommend the best uses of these opportunities to develop a better understanding of America through this new media. It should be stressed that the Commission's function would not infringe upon the terms of reference of any agency, but would be complementary and as requested.

GENERAL

1. Art in education

No group has greater responsibility than teachers of art at all educational levels for developing a populace enlightened in art understanding. It is essential that art educators be kept closely informed on developments of Federal policy related to the arts. The teaching of art, unfortunately, often has to be assigned to persons who have not had adequate art training for this task or who lack the desired sensitivity and imagination. A study might be conducted by a special committee of the Commission to recommend improvements in the art education in the public schools of the District of Columbia. Such a pilot experiment would serve as an example for consideration by State and local school authorities.

During recent years there has developed a widespread exchange of artwork by schoolchildren of the United States with those of other countries. The propaganda value of these exchanges is incalculable. They should be given official support and encouragement. The assembling of the drawings and paintings has generally been under the auspices of the Junior Red Cross. The National Art Education Association has attended to the arrangements for the tours in conjunction with the UNESCO Relations Staff of the Department of State. Participation has not been on a nationwide basis for the selection. This program is comparatively inexpensive but needs coordination, if it is to be expanded. The Commission could establish a special committee to recommend how the most effective use of this project can best be achieved.

2. Appraisal of Federal art programs

The Commission might be requested by Congress to undertake a survey of all art programs under Federal sponsorship (exclusive of those under the guidance of the Commission of Fine Arts) in relation to their achievements, budgetary needs, efficiency of administration on general lines, whether impartial expert advice is available, and the validity of their claims for expansion. In doing so the Commission members would become acquainted with this rather complex situation of varied programs and also be able to provide valuable information to the administration and Congress. It is suggested that these surveys, which should later include all new or proposed programs for Federal assistance to encourage the arts, should be in the form of annual reports to the President and to Congress. Such annual reports could be a source for cultural information to the United States Information Agency and be used to counteract adverse propaganda by the Soviet Union.

3. Adjusting inequities to artists

There is a service which the Commission might perform for artists in all fields. Cases of injustice or inequity to the artist due to the necessities or circumstances of his profession should be studied. If the Commission concludes that these situations could be rectified without injury or unfairness to any other group of citizens, the Commission could make its recommendations to the appropriate authorities. An instance of inequity is the present income-tax regulations in relation to the highly irregular annual income of most artists. Several countries permit the artist to apportion his earnings over a span of years. Another area for study is the amusement tax as applied to musical and theatrical performances. This tax, imposed as an emergency wartime measure, has not yet been repealed. The United States is the only country which taxes music, for instance. Other countries subsidize music and the theater as cultural assets.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing gives evidence that Federal recognition of the value of the arts to our national welfare has been sadly lacking in America; that there is urgent need to establish such a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts; that there are many fields of art in a serious situation today in our country and that study should be made of ways to ameliorate these conditions; that the Commission could be of assistance to those agencies or departments charged with programs to make use of our arts to increase international understanding; that all these advisory services of the Commission would not in themselves be costly; and that this Commission would perform services of increasing usefulness both to the administration and to Congress.

The suggested immediate studies which might be undertaken by the Commission are only instances selected as examples and by no means a complete outline. The creation of this Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, if it receives adequate support from the administration and from Congress, will blaze the way toward greater achievements in and appreciation of the arts in America and will thus appreciably enrich the lives of a large and increasing number of our citizens.

TIMBER ACCESS ROADS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON], my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain timber access roads, to permit maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3420) to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain timber access roads, to permit maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, because of the fact that the Senate is now operating under a unanimous-consent agreement, I shall withhold until a later date a major speech which I intend to make in explanation of, and an argument in support of, the objectives of this bill.

Suffice it to say at this time, in my judgment the building of access roads happens to be absolutely essential if we are to have a sound conservation program in the handling of Federal timber.

I am a little at a loss to understand the point of view of some who seem to think that access roads might result in overcutting our timber. Apparently those people do not understand the meaning of cutting up to the allowable cut. It is necessary to have access roads into this timber so that we can conserve the timber, and avoid waste as a result of timber becoming overripe, diseased, wind-blown, or destroyed by the elements.

If this administration really means it when it talks about conservation, it will give support to my access roads bill.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO APPEALS BY THE UNITED STATES—ENFORCEMENT OF ANTITRUST PROVISIONS OF THE CODE

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference three bills. The first is a bill to amend section 3731 of title 18, United States Code, relating to appeals by the United States in criminal cases. The bill deals primarily with appeals from rulings on matters of procedure. However, the bill does specifically provide that no appeal under this provision shall lie where there has been a finding of not guilty on the merits by the jury, or by the court where a jury trial is waived or not recorded, or where the court has entered a judgment of acquittal for insufficiency of the evidence to sustain a conviction, pursuant to rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

The second bill is drawn to amend the Clayton Act by requiring prior notification of certain corporate mergers.

The third bill, to be called the "Antitrust Civil Progress Act of 1956," would authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigation for the enforcement of antitrust laws.

Both of these latter bills are designed to facilitate the continued efforts of the Justice Department in their stepped-up program of enforcement of the antitrust provisions of the code.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. WATKINS, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 3423. A bill to amend section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to appeals by the United States;

S. 3424. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of certain corporate mergers; and

S. 3425. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes.

SURVEY OF HISTORICAL AREA SURROUNDING ARKANSAS POST STATE PARK, ARK.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a survey of the historical area surrounding and including Arkansas Post State Park in Arkansas County, Ark. The bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior to investigate fully the historical significance of this area and report to the Congress on the feasibility of establishing it as a unit of the national park system.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, an article by Mr. Ted R. Worley, executive secretary of the Arkansas History Commission, which contains the historical background of Arkansas Post.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3428) to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing the Arkansas Post State Park as a national park, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. MCCLELLAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The article presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

ARKANSAS POST AS A HISTORIC SITE

(By Ted R. Worley)

Arkansas Post has the distinction of being not only the first settlement within the boundaries of the present State of Arkansas but also of being the first settlement within the bounds of the territory embraced in the Louisiana Purchase, which included all the vast region drained by the western tributaries of the Mississippi River. The Post was founded 32 years before New Orleans, and is older than Memphis and St. Louis.

The first Arkansas Post was set up by Henri De Tonti in 1686 on the north side of the Arkansas River, probably in section 20, Township 8 North, Range 2, West (Spanish Grant No. 2351), in the immediate vicinity of the Menard Mound. Overflows led to relocation of the fort several times.

In 1718 John Law's Compaigne d'Occident, better known as the Mississippi Bubble, settled a colony of Germans in the neighborhood of the post. The colony failed as a business venture and ended within 2 years.

When the French explorer, Bernard de la Harpe, visited the Post in 1721, John Law's Germans were gone but a French settlement of 47 people centered about the fort under a commandant named Menard.

The first white child of record born in Arkansas was born at Arkansas Post on December 5, 1742. She was Catherine Landrony, daughter of Joseph and Marie Landrony. The earliest Arkansas vital records known to be in existence are those of the Post, the originals of which are now located in Ottawa, Canada. The oldest records in the custody of the Arkansas History Commission are likewise records of the Post, dating from 1797 to 1819.

In 1748 the French garrison numbered 30 men, having been reduced by desertion and disease. In 1752 the Post was rebuilt a few hundred yards to the northwest of the location of 1686 and near the site of the present Lake Dumond, which was then a part of the channel of the Arkansas River. In 1756 the garrison was reinforced by the addition of 60 soldiers under Captain d'Ernville. In 1759 the settlement about the Post consisted of a half dozen houses.

By treaty in 1763 all Louisiana Territory was ceded by France to Spain, but Spain did not actually take command at the Post until 1768. During that year Captain Philip Pittman of the British army visited the Post. We sketched a map of it and described it as follows:

"The post is situated three leagues up the Arkansas, and is built with stockades, in a quadrangular form; the sides of the exterior polygon are about 180 feet, and one 3-pounder is mounted in the flanks and faces of each bastion. The buildings within the fort are: a barrack with three rooms for the soldiers, commanding officer's house, a powder magazine, and a magazine for provisions, and an apartment for the commissary, all of which are in a ruinous condition. The fort stands about 200 yards from the waterside, and is garrisoned by a captain, a lieutenant, and 30 French soldiers, including sergeants and corporals. There are eight houses without the fort, occupied by as many families, who have cleared the land about 900 yards in depth; but on account of the sandiness of the soil, and the lowness of the situation, which makes it subject to be overflowed, they do not raise their necessary provisions. These people subsist mostly by hunting, and every season send to New Orleans great quantities of bear's oil, tallow, and salted buffalo meat, and a few skins."

At its various locations the fort was overflowed and abandoned until in 1779 it was rebuilt at a site about one-half mile south of the present remains of the village of Arkansas Post. The Spanish were now in dominion and they named this fort Fort Carlos III. The village nearby retained its French name, Arkansas Post. In 1788 another rise came and tore away Fort Carlos III. The Spanish commandant ordered another built on higher ground, at the site of the present Arkansas Post State Park. This last of the European forts on the Arkansas River was completed in 1791. It was called by the Spanish "Fuerte San Estevan de Arkanzas." All that remains of this final bastion is a large brick-lined cistern, which must have been in the immediate vicinity of the fort.

In 1803 Spain surrendered control of Louisiana Territory to France, and in the same year, by the Louisiana Purchase, the United States acquired the Territory from France.

On December 31, 1813, the County of Arkansas was formed and "the village of Arkansas" was named the county seat. Arkansas Post was laid off as a town in 1820 by William O. Allen. Robert Crittenden, secretary of Arkansas Territory, and Elijah Morton donated to the county a square of land, on condition that the legislature of the newly established Territory of Arkansas (1819) would establish thereon the permanent seat of justice of Arkansas County. From the creation of Arkansas Territory in 1819 to 1821 the capital of the Territory was at Arkansas Post. The town continued to be the county seat until 1855, when the county seat was moved to Dewitt. Arkansas government began at Arkansas Post. The first legislature met there and the first court. The first newspaper in Arkansas, the Arkansas Gazette was started there by William E. Woodruff in 1819. In the cemetry adjacent to the post were buried several of the leading citizens of early Arkansas, including Henry W. Conway, Delegate to Congress. Conway's grave is marked only by some broken fragments of stone.

With removal of the capital to Little Rock a period of decline for Arkansas Post began. By 1830 the population had dwindled to 114 people. Steamboat traffic and the settlement of the country brought a brief rise in the fortunes of the town. A branch of the State Bank of Arkansas was established there in 1839, and the next year the Sisters of Charity of the Catholic Church established a school there.

One of the most important battles of the Civil War west of the Mississippi River was fought at Arkansas Post in January 1863, when a Union force consisting of gunboats and troops destroyed the fort and place of the town.

As railroads drew traffic from the river, Arkansas Post became a ghost town. The final blow came in 1903 when the shift of the river left the post high and dry.

Maps continued to mark the spot where the post had flourished while briars and weeds spread over the streets. The site of the old Spanish fort was swallowed in a jungle. The place was all but forgotten when the Arkansas Legislature in 1929 set up the Arkansas Post State Park Commission. The bill establishing the park was introduced by Ballard Deane of Arkansas County. The act set up a commission consisting of J. W. Burnett of DeWitt, chairman, Dallas T. Herndon, Little Rock, secretary, and the following members: Mrs. J. F. Weinmann, Mrs. Charles Miller, Miss Janie Woodruff, Mrs. M. F. Sigmon, Mrs. J. L. Rosencrantz, Mrs. George C. Lewis, Mrs. C. J. Brain, Mrs. W. W. Lowe, Fletcher Chenault, and S. G. Callett. Under the leadership of this commission the site of the park was cleared of brush and fenced, a log house for the caretaker was built, and other improvements made. The work was paid for in part by a $5,000 appropriation made by the State and in part by contributions made to a park fund sponsored by the Arkansas Federation of Women's Clubs and the club women of Arkansas County. The civilian conservation corps of the Federal Government worked on the grounds. The commission, which acquired 20 acres of land from Mr. and Mrs. Fred Quandt as a gift, added 21 acres by purchase. The commission perhaps did all it could with the money available but that amount was wholly inadequate to the job of making the site of Arkansas Post appear appropriate to its historical importance. No building was restored. Only dirt roads traverse the park. Small markers on the ground commemorate the following:

Establishment of the original French fort.

First capital of Arkansas Territory.

Battle of Arkansas Post, 1863.

First home of Arkansas Gazette.

Meeting place of the first Arkansas Legislature.

Site of the Arkansas Post branch of State bank.

The Arkansas Post State Park cannot be reached on hard-surfaced roads, although a hard-surfaced road does run within 3 miles of the site. The approach to the park must be made from Gillett over about 11 miles of gravel. Difficulty of access and the lack of adequate development of the park itself

have combined to make almost unknown, even to the people of Arkansas, one of the most important historic sites in the Mississippi Valley.

ELECTRIC VOTING-MACHINE SYSTEM IN THE SENATE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to provide for the installation of an electric voting-machine system in the Senate.

Last Friday night, on an issue affecting the livelihood and welfare of millions of America's wheat farmers, a mistake was made in tallying a rollcall—a mistake which resulted in a parliamentary snarl that actually could have altered the outcome of the question at stake.

Such a situation is intolerable in what has been referred to as the greatest parliamentary body on earth. Many State legislatures—I think 22 to be exact—have availed themselves of the foolproof device known as an electric voting machine. This machine makes it possible for a legislator to press a button at his desk, to either "yea" or "nay," and to be so recorded—speedily and efficiently and, above all, accurately. The time has come for the Senate of the United States to be no less progressive and up to date in its methods than many State legislatures. Furthermore, I am told that last Friday was not the first time that inaccuracies have occurred in the hand counting of rollcall votes. After all, under the tensions and strains frequently prevailing in the chamber, such mistakes are by no means strange, and they do not reflect on the able people at the desk.

The solution, Mr. President, is an electric voting system, and I hope my resolution will be favorably considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 228) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate is hereby directed to install in the Senate Chamber such devices and equipment as may be necessary electrically to record votes cast by Members of the Senate with respect to matters considered by the Senate. There are hereby authorized to be expended from the contingent fund of the Senate such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FEDERAL EQUAL PAY ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 5, 1956,

The name of the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3352) to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself and other Senators) on March 5, 1956.

UTILIZATION OF COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT FUND IN STATES OF LOWER DIVISION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 8, 1956,

The name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3393) to provide for the utilization of the Colorado River development fund in the States of the lower division, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER on March 8, 1956.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Radio address delivered by him discussing various important issues pending before Congress.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Address delivered by Senator SPARKMAN at meeting of the Amen Corner, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on March 3, 1956.

By Mr. BEALL:

Statement prepared by him with reference to the problems surrounding airports at Detroit, Mich.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2552. An act to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; and

H. R. 7201. An act relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies.

DEPORTATION BY BRITISH OF ARCHBISHOP MAKARIOS FROM CYPRUS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on last Saturday I released the following statement when news was received of the deportation of Archbishop Makarios, which reads as follows:

I have been shocked by the British deportation of Archbishop Makarios.

It is my belief that no advance notice of this serious and far-reaching development was available to our Government.

It is bound to cause a deterioration in Greek-British relations, and to disturb the association of others affiliated with the North Atlantic alliance.

Inevitably, the people of Cyprus will gain the right of determining their future status. This is no longer exclusively a domestic problem of either Great Britain or Greece.

That was the end of the statement.

Even under martial law or military government, the seizing of a leading citizen, in this case the ranking church dignitary, and sending him into exile without any semblance of trial or a chance to refute charges made, is hardly in keeping with what we like to believe are Anglo-Saxon traditions of justice.

I hope the British Government will reconsider the action and will return the archbishop to Cyprus. They are on weak legal and moral grounds for the abrupt action, and the longer they delay in rectifying the error, the more difficult the whole problem will become.

In the meantime, cool heads are needed in Greece, Turkey, and Great Britain, and on the island of Cyprus itself.

Communism's aim is to "divide and conquer." Free men everywhere are concerned by the developments and by the potentialities.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished leader of the minority for his statement, and to be associated with him. I am very proud of the fact that the Republican Party has taken this attitude in the matter. I am pleased to hear the views of the Republican leader.

RUSSIAN PROPAGANDA IN FOREIGN NATIONS—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the New York Times of yesterday, Sunday, March 11, there appeared a very interesting editorial entitled "Russia Did Not Invent Flies." The final paragraph of this editorial reads as follows:

If we are to defeat communism we must give up some childlish legends and concentrate on the easily available proof that a free society can do more to make mankind well and happy than anything the children of Marx and Lenin have to offer.

This editorial has a real bearing on our consideration of our foreign policy, especially in the Far East and because of its pertinency, I ask that the editorial in full be published in the body of the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA DIDN'T INVENT FLIES

The eight SEATO foreign ministers who were meeting at Karachi last week adjourned with the reluctant reminder that there was no convincing evidence that the Russians had abandoned their efforts to subvert, weaken, and overthrow other peoples' governments. We need to be so reminded. The Soviet purpose has not changed. If for one reason or another—including our concentrated efforts to defend ourselves by retaliatory measures—Moscow has abandoned the use of naked force, it is employing other methods for the same objective.

But the world is not so simple that we can save it by force of arms or by making faces at the Russians. The Russians are taking advantage of a period of majestic and confusing change, but in spite of the revolutionary aroma with which they have sur-

rounded themselves, they did not cause the change.

The world's trouble spots are almost exclusively inhabited by people with certain common characteristics: they have ceased, or are trying to cease, to be colonially exploited; God made them brown or yellow or black or red rather than white; they are poor; they are not well fed or well housed; they don't feel well, and they live a comparatively short time.

This is true in Iraq and Iran, in Lebanon, Jordan, and Syria, in Saudi Arabia and Egypt, and along the shore westward until we come to Tunis, Algeria, and Morocco; in the Far Eastern countries which SEATO cultivates, where the Colombo Plan flourishes and where liberty appears in an unaccustomed and inexperienced guise. There is a mixture of politics, of technological backwardness, of resources not fully used, of human labor wasted, of human vitality kept down by hunger and disease.

Wherever these conditions prevail there appears in some sort of clothes and with some form of face a little man from Moscow. We do not read about this little man as we do about Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev and their retinue, but he is there, lavashing sympathy, which does not cost anything in rubles, and offering steel mills or comparable tools which have to be paid back in fixed installments.

Wherever there is an unhealthful fly or a lethal type of mosquito or a flea hopping around with a disease in its little insides, wherever there is too little to eat, wherever there are too many persons in one room, the little man from Moscow appears. He does not tell his new friends what things are really like in Moscow or in the country districts of Russia or in the Siberian prison camps. He tells them how things are or will be in a mythical Communist heaven.

Words are not the final answer to such visitors. For people who don't speak English or Russian our words are no better than Russian words. It is deeds that count, and a real friendship behind the deeds. It will probably be necessary for us to work miracles in the underdeveloped parts of the world. To do this we may have to forget about Russia for an hour or so at a time and put our minds on the constructive work of helping people who need help and making friends of people who need friends—and whom we need for friends.

Let us undertake this task clear-eyed. Russia did not devise the evils we are trying to cure. Russia is not responsible for the retarded economic growth, the high death rates, the unfathomable and curable misery from which more than half the human race suffers. Russia did not invent typhoid, ophthalmia, cholera, and other diseases—afflictions born and spread by insects in conditions of poverty and filth. Russia didn't invent flies.

If we are to defeat communism we must give up some childish legends and concentrate on the easily available proof that a free society can do more to make mankind well and happy than anything the children of Marx and Lenin have to offer.

POPE PIUS XII

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, regardless of religious affiliations, the American people are as one in their respect for leaders of thought and action in various parts of the world, especially when these individuals are striving to advance the cause of international accord and of enduring peace.

Such a leader is Pope Pius XII, who is now observing his 80th birthday and also his 17th anniversary in the papacy. Editorials commenting on these observances have appeared in the Baltimore Evening Sun and in the Baltimore News-Post, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of March 2, 1956]

THE POPE AT 80

Today is the 80th birthday of Pius XII, an occasion that will have brought to the Vatican messages of rejoicing from points all over the world. These could be expected in any case; but, apart from his rank, the Pope is a man with such warmth of nature, nobility of character, and depth of spirit that he enjoys the personal liking and respect of people in every land, both inside and outside his church.

His birthday will be followed in 10 days by the 17th anniversary of his elevation to his church's highest office. Thus the celebration becomes a double one, and the general satisfaction will extend to his conduct of affairs through some of the stormier times so far met with in the Vatican's long history. This is true of matters both great and small—the pay raise, for example, today bestowed upon Vatican employees. On the serious side there is the courage of the church in its firm stand against communism behind the Iron Curtain and against racism in all countries, including the United States.

The statistically minded will report that Pius XII's many fruitful years continue a trend of recent papal centuries, that Leo XIII died at 90 and Pius IX ruled 32 years. Other persons will simply join in the hope that Pius XII, a true world figure, may have many more happy birthdays.

[From the Baltimore News-Post of March 2, 1956]

THE POPE AT 80

The hearts of untold millions throughout the world turn to Rome today to be with Pope Pius XII in observance of his 80th birthday and the 17th anniversary of his reign.

Far beyond the confines of the Roman Catholic Church of which he is the head on earth, this great "Pope of Peace," arch-foe of communism and of all forms of totalitarianism, is held in the deepest reverence.

The esteem and affection in which he is held as a person is in keeping with the admiration of him as a great religious leader and administrator.

That is partly because, although one of the world's most skilled diplomats, familiar with the inner workings of governments, a master of many languages, he ever remained a man of extraordinary gentleness, simplicity, friendliness, and piety. It has been evident to all that he "walked with God."

Born in the shadow of St. Peter's, his outstanding mentality and personality caused him to be named a monsignor at the early age of 28, an archbishop at 41, and a cardinal at 53.

He represented the Vatican at the coronation of King George V of Britain. He served as Papal Nuncio to Bavaria during part of World War I and narrowly escaped death during a "putsch" in Germany just after the war's end.

In 1917 he met the Kaiser and presented to him Pope Benedict XV's peace proposals.

After that conflict he was named Nuncio to Berlin and scored a great diplomatic victory with the concordat between Prussia and the Holy See.

He was made Vatican Secretary of State in 1930 and in 1936 visited the United States, met President Roosevelt, and made an 8,000-mile airplane tour to many cities.

Elected Pope on his 63d birthday, March 2, 1939, he labored with all his strength to avert World War II. After it broke out he built a vast mercy organization for its victims.

Pope Pius is a heroic figure in the struggle for lasting peace. He has been a champion of the well-being of the little man and of preservation of faith and freedom.

Cardinal Verdier of France once said that under modern world conditions, a Pope must be either a hero or a saint. Those familiar with the career of Pius XII consider him to be both.

THE VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, this morning it was my great pleasure and privilege to present to a regional winner of the Voice of Democracy contest, a flag which has flown atop our Capitol. As you may recall, this contest is sponsored jointly by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce; the Radio, Electronics, Television Manufacturers Association; and the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters. This winner, Gabriel G. Kajeckas, and his father, Joseph Kajeckas, both of Washington, D. C., made such wonderful statements of acceptance, that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY GABRIEL KAJECKAS

Senator BUTLER, I am greatly honored to receive this flag. I accept it with deep humility, being perfectly aware of its immense importance in that this flag stands for noble principles at a time when the world is starved for such principles. This flag flies over a free land—America, a land where today liberty is for everyone; for this reason, the American flag has become not just a sentinel of freedom, but a shining beacon of hope for all the enslaved and oppressed peoples of the world.

Senator, this flag which you have just presented to me flew over the Capitol of the United States on March 4, the feast day of St. Casimir, the patron saint of my native land, Lithuania, which has been overrun by men whose creed, principles, and flag stand for destruction. When the day comes, however, that Lithuania will again be free, the most fitting place for this flag will be beside the tomb of St. Casimir in Vilnius, the capital city of Lithuania. I feel especially gratified to receive this flag from you, Mr. BUTLER, as a Senator from the State of Maryland, since Lithuania is also, in a sense, Maryland. Her devotion to Mary the mother of God, is great indeed, and is exemplified in perhaps the most striking fashion by the famous shrine of Ausros Vartai, our lady of Vilnius.

A short time ago, Senator, I had the honor of being a national winner of the Voice of Democracy contest, in which I was proud to speak for the principles in which I believe. God grant that now I might cherish in my heart everything just, decent, and good that is symbolized by this banner, which all Americans proudly know as Old Glory.

STATEMENT BY JOSEPH KAJECKAS

Senator BUTLER, Mrs. Kajeckas and I feel extremely grateful to you for presenting to our son, Gabriel, this United States flag which flew over the Capitol on St. Casimir's day. We feel grateful still more because such a gesture has in all probability no precedents.

Only 2 weeks ago, Senator, you made public a very eloquent and forceful statement on Lithuania's independence day, stressing that America and the free world "will remain

true in our struggle to free Lithuania from the Communist yoke." You saluted the people of Lithuania on that occasion. You now salute them again today by this ceremony.

Lithuanians everywhere will feel gratified that the presentation of this flag has been made by you, a Senator from Maryland, in which State for about two decades now, Lithuania's independence day has been officially proclaimed each year as Republic of Lithuania Day.

Lithuanians in their homeland are forbidden by tyrannical forces to give honor to the Lithuanian flag and their patron saint, St. Casimir; whereas here, their country and their patron saint are being honored by this extraordinary ceremony.

Senator, once more, I sincerely thank you.

PREVENTION OF AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS COERCING AUTOMOBILE DEALERS TO PURCHASE UNWANTED MERCHANDISE—LETTER

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on February 1 I introduced S. 3110, a bill which would make it unlawful for automobile manufacturers to threaten to terminate or terminate the franchise of new-car dealers if the basic reason or primary cause of such threat or termination was the dealer's refusal or unwillingness to purchase unwanted merchandise from the manufacturer.

Thereafter I sent a copy of my introductory remarks, a copy of the bill, and a questionnaire concerning it to 472 franchised new-car dealers in the State of Maryland. I requested the questionnaire be filled out and returned to me, assuring the dealers that if they signed it I would keep their identity in confidence. Ninety-three dealers replied, 84 favoring my bill, 5 opposing, and 4 uncertain about it. Of the 93 dealers who returned the questionnaire, 16 did not sign it.

Many of the Maryland dealers, after reading my bill and my introductory remarks, have written me concerning the many problems which arise out of their relations with the automobile manufacturers. Although I received many outstanding and memorable letters, one, dated February 8, 1956, was so well written, and came from such a prominent and highly regarded Maryland dealer, that on February 15 I wrote to him and requested his permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD various portions of his letter, removing therefrom all remarks which might tend to identify him. On February 22 he replied, and stated:

> I have absolutely no objection to the verbatim use of my previous letter for any purpose you deem worthy. In fact, I am inclined to be less than sympathetic for those who cry to be covered with the cloak of anonymity. If one sincerely voices a conviction honestly derived, it follows that there should also be present sufficient moral courage to accept any of the consequences. That is the essence of our form of government.

In view of this fine sentiment on the part of this dealer, it is with a real feeling of public service and pride in the new-car dealers of my State that I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the entire letter to me, dated February 28, 1956, from Mr. Robert B. Livie, Jr.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DULANEY MOTOR CO., INC.,
Towson, Md., February 8, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: Your bill S. 3110 hits closer to the mark than any of the actions of Congress to date as regards to correcting the unsound condition of automobile retailing that is so apparent today. As you implied, this bill is not completely definitive but it does represent a positive and concrete step in the right direction.

There are certain economic-philosophical premises which, if accepted as true, point out the necessity of Federal regulation of the commerce between the manufacturer and the franchised dealer. No new car dealer desires legislation designed to subsidize or guarantee a profit for his business. Just as the Securities and Exchange Commission was created in the recognition of the social responsibility to the entire Nation of the stock market, so should Federal legislation recognize that the automobile industry affects vitally the livelihood of a considerable segment of our Nation. If a farmer in Nebraska could be adversely affected by the financial manipulation of selfish interests in the Chicago grain market; if economically sound utilities in the Midwest could be bankrupted by Samuel Insull and his pyramiding actions in 1930; then I feel that the selfish activities of an automobile manufacturer can and will cause a progressive economic disintegration in every part of this country of substantial business investments.

The automobile dealer operates under the delusion that he is an independent businessman. This is only true when gauged against the competitive market for customer sales and I hope this situation will never change. However, this feeling of "the survival of the fittest" is totally inadequate when applied to the dealer's relationship to his sole source of supply—the manufacturer. He has been unable to realize the consequences of this one statement about the manufacturer: Labor is most effectively organized and capable of protecting its own interests; management is organized by the very hierarchy of a business organization; the stockholders are presented well by the board of directors (the record of dividends by General Motors since 1946 is proof of this). The only unorganized group that the corporations deal with are the dealers and they, by virtue of their own philosophy, can never effectively unionize. It stands to reason that each of the above are selfish interests in the sense that their actions have been defined primarily to their own particular benefit and any benefit accruing to the public or the dealer has been definitely secondary.

This situation can change in only one fashion. When the dealer on the open market is no longer capable of negotiating his merchandise at a profit, then he ceases to buy from the manufacturer. Then the stockholder, labor and management are forced to examine the reasons why this happened. At present Chrysler Corp. is operating on a 4-day week; soon the pocketbook of all these above elements will suffer. Only at that time will stop gap or minimum action be taken by the factories, not because they want to, but, rather because they have to. This situation need not have occurred if Chrysler, for example, had not built cars on a 6-day week with 2 shifts and overtime for the last 60 days in 1955. But for their selfish interest of year-end production and consequent maximum earnings, they chose to produce to the limits of their capability. By gosh, when supply exceeds demand, the price of anything must drop. And here I should like to define price as being that sum of money the public is actually willing to pay on a competitive market for an automobile at that very moment. Actual price changes from week to week in our business—for example, 1 week we can negotiate for a $100 profit and the next week $50, and so forth.

My point, though somewhat long-winded, is this: The new car business today demands large capital investment on the retail level as well as on the manufacturing level. Yet the completely irresponsible actions of the manufacturer have steadily made this business one of greater risk and smaller returns. The manufacturer himself consists of three components which by the records have proven to be incapable of enlighted self-interest. If we are ever again to have a depression, it will be hastened by such selfish actions. When GM piles up over $1 billion in earnings after taxes, then sheer size becomes an evil. Had GM decided to reduce the wholesale price of their cars by $150 across the board, their earnings would have been pared to a mere one-half billion and probably put Ford and Chrysler completely out of business. When the manufacturer has so reduced the retailing of his products that we as dealers grub around for $50 and $100 gross profits per car, it should be recognized that broadly speaking the new-car dealer is approaching the economic point of no return.

That is why phantom freight, territory security, and bootlegging, are periphery phenomena, external symptoms of a far greater inequity that today exists. Your bill is at least aimed at a more vital spot—to place some value upon a man's lifelong endeavors to build his estate for the future—to encourage private venture capital in small business, the very heart of America's greatness.

The three evils mentioned above as of lesser importance can be corrected by the manufacturer as he is economically forced to do so. The basically weak and satellite nature of our relationship to the manufacturer never will be changed unless the Federal Government legislatively acknowledges the fact that the new-car franchise as it is presently constituted does not contribute to contained growth of the free-enterprise system.

The business ethics of automobile retailing are precisely what the manufacturer delineates. In the 1880's, the white man who sold liquor to the Indians had to share full moral responsibility for the nasty consequences that traditionally ensued. So let it be with General Motors—a billion in profit equals a billion in responsibility.

The cry of the manufacturer who bleats piously that the Government will penalize the efficient to the interests of the inefficeint is not in keeping with Federal legislation since the decade after the Civil War. The whole lesson of our Government has been to safeguard the right of existence to the less efficient. As the automobile manufacturer knows the UAW-CIO is not concerned with the most efficient worker, but rather, the less efficient. By effective organization, labor has forced the corporation to giving increasing recognition to this fact.

All we as dealers need can be gained through Federal legislation designed to remove the excess of power now held in Detroit. We can create our own future and solve our own problems that arise from year to year once an equitable franchise system is accepted, gracefully or otherwise, by the manufacturer.

I wish to congratulate you in your interest on our behalf. It is not the most popular as regards mass support; but it hits mighty close to the center of our continued national prosperity. You may be assured that I am most grateful and will tell anyone who listens what your help can mean to all of us.

Yours respectfully,

ROBERT B. LIVIE, Jr.

MORE THAN CORONETS—ARTICLE BY THE SENATE CHAPLAIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday there appeared in the Washington Sunday Star a very informative article written by our distinguished Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, entitled "More Than Coronets."

In view of the fact that in the coming months we shall indulge in a political campaign, for better or worse, it might be well for all of us to read this wonderful article.

I recall hearing that on one occasion when Lincoln was trying a lawsuit he said, "My opponent has been speaking in personalities, and damning me. I have noticed that when a man indulges in those tactics he has a damned poor case of his own." Personalities make for confused thinking not clarity.

I wish now to read from the wonderful article written by Dr. Harris; because the people of America are confused about many issues. They are confused because many people in position of leadership are confused, intentionally or otherwise. Brawling never makes for vision or judgment.

The article reads in part:

Courtesy, from its very derivation, is a royal word with the kingly grace of a coronet. Courtesy, according to the dictionary, is defined as "having such manners as befit the court of a prince—graciously polite and respectful in dealing with others." This might well be written at the top of the first page of the primer in any school of methods for the coming campaign.

In the article Dr. Harris quotes Thomas à Kempis:

Lord, let us be ever courteous and kind. Never let us fall into a peevish or contentious spirit, but follow peace with all men.

Such words make for the leadership that provides true direction and guidance.

Mr. President, as has been suggested many times on the floor of the Senate, the world is in a critical and serious situation. Calling names or indulging in personalities does not contribute to clarifying the issues or giving us the wisdom and direction we need in order that the constituency of this great Republic may be well informed.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD, following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE THAN CORONETS

(By Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U. S. Senate)

In this convulsive day when thrones are falling, crowns and coronets still hold their fascination, even in lands where the people rule. A lovely American girl who becomes the princess of a tiny, pin-pointed realm, basks in the romantic interest of the world. In all parts of the Union, charming representatives of winsome young womanhood are crowned as princesses of this and that domain. Surrounded by their glittering attendants in royal ceremonies they are adorned with coronets as multitudes applaud. The coronation of another queen in some realm, civic, state, national, or commercial, is a frequent announcement. It is all a rather surprising phenomenon in a democracy whose founder defied a crown and spurned one for himself.

But such spectacles appeal to a universal liking for dramatic pageantry. That is partly the explanation as to why men whose daily environment in the discharge of their callings is often dull and drab and monotonous revel in organizations which clothe their devotees in striking costumes and address their officers with most flattering appellations. All this has its salutary side. Democracy tends, in its setting, to become painfully practical and commonplace, and to utterly disregard the visual trappings of splendor associated with an age that has vanished. It is well that once in a while even the dull ruts of routine be lined with sparkling silver and that heads lifted to some pedestal of eminence should wear a crown of distinction.

But this meditation has to do, not with any excited miss, who tomorrow is to be Queen of the May, or a princess reigning in any temporary realm which makes her the cynosure of unnumbered eyes as she is crowned, perhaps by some prominent official. This has to do with a crown without which any life is sadly deficient and poor indeed. Longfellow was pointing to it as he sang, "Kind hearts are more than coronets." America boasts that here, where every man is a king and every woman a queen, there are no crown jewels—there are no coronets—except those worn just as ornaments in some passing festival. But here, in the simple statement of a loved poet is a truth which, in this election year, desperately needs to be lifted higher than the Capitol's white dome. It is an inspiring sight to witness the mightiest nation on earth prepare to register its will in a genuine election such as the Kremlin's despotic manipulators cannot even understand. What they call an election we call coercion.

But because in our free land elections are so free, there is necessarily included the right to be unfair and unkind. The temptation is to find a use for everything but kindness in forging thunderbolts for the opposition. But kindness and fairness and courtesy are not virtues that cannot be afforded in a political campaign. They are the very signs and fruits of a mature people who have learned how to use and not abuse the weapons of freedom. If a man's convictions and the goals he seeks are high and honorable, he need never, in all his contending, take from the brow the coronet of kindness. With any who differ and who sincerely hold other opinions from those he advances, he can disagree without being disagreeable. This any man will do if he is not to degrade himself and if he is to be loyal to the royal in himself. Disraeli fought without the coronet of kindness when, in the heat of political strife, he declared of his great contemporary, Gladstone, "He is nothing but a sophisticated rhetorician inebriated with the exuberance of his own verbosity." That is in sharp contrast to Gladstone's courtly courtesy, as he exemplified the ideal lifted up in the lines:

"Fierce for the right he bore his part
In strife with many a valiant foe,
But laughter winged his polished dart
And kindness tempered every blow."

Courtesy, from its very derivation, is a royal word with the kingly grace of a coronet. Courtesy, according to the dictionary, is defined as "having such manners as befit the court of a prince—graciously polite and respectful in dealing with others." This might well be written at the top of the first page of the primer in any school of methods for the coming campaign. For, alas, the aggressive attitude toward political goals which one believes to represent the best interests of his country often tempts one to question the integrity of others and to hurl epithets which boomerang. Oliver Wendell Holmes was aware of the danger of turning a contest into a brawl when he said of a certain man, "His acrid words turn the sweet milk of kindness into curds." Tongues are, of course, legitimate weapons in the coming battle of the polls, but blessed is the contender in whose tongue is the law of kindness. Grace, gracefulness, and graciousness are intimately related and no defender of his party should seek a divorce from them as he sallies forth to the campaign or comments upon candidates.

Thomas à Kempis is holding up, this Lent, shining ideals which are more than coronets in his prayer so old, yet so new: "Lord let us be ever courteous and kind. Never let fall into a peevish or contentious spirit, but follow peace with all men." As, convinced of the rectitude of their own governmental theories, millions of Americans fare forth to the fray, the lines of Hilaire Belloc offer a suggestion more golden than coronets:

"Of courtesy it is much less
That courage of heart or holiness,
Yet in my walks it seems to me
That the grace of God is in courtesy."

FUNDS FOR THE GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been pleased to write to the Acting Chief of the United States Corps of Engineers urging prompt consideration of the request of supplemental funds for the purpose of deepening and improving the connecting channels west of Lake Erie. The occasion of my request is, of course, the welcome action on the part of the Senate, which, last Friday night, approved the connecting channel bill, H. R. 2552, sending it to the White House for signature.

The Senate's action in so speedily approving the bill came as a welcome index of the Senate's appreciation of the significance of the channels in terms of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway.

I send to the desk now the text of a letter which I was pleased to send on Saturday to Maj. Gen. Charles K. Holle, Acting Chief of the United States Corps of Engineers, on behalf of additional channel funds.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this letter be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 10, 1956.

Gen. CHARLES K. HOLLE,
Major General United States Army, Acting Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL: As you of course know, last night, March 9, there was written on the Senate floor, in effect, what amounts to the final chapter in the long 30-year legislation battle for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway.

At that time, the Senate wisely took up H. R. 2552 to modify the existing project for the Great Lakes channels above Lake Erie. The bill was passed by unanimous consent, thus being cleared to the White House for signature.

Needless to say, as the author of the Wiley law of 1954 authorizing the Great Lakes Seaway itself, I, for one, am particularly gratified that the final green light has been given. It is the full-speed-ahead signal to you of the Corps of Engineers for finishing this mightly 2,300-mile deep-water project, in conjunction with the work already underway by the Seaway Development Corporation.

Of course, now, the necessary funds for the channel deepening must be appropriated.

As you are of course aware, there is included in the 1957 fiscal year budget request, the sum of $5 million, as recorded on page 651.

I would very much appreciate, General, if you, in consultation with your fellow officers and staff of the corps, would now review this channel subject, and determine how much additional funds should be immediately requested.

The $5 million request had of course been submitted by the executive branch prior to final action on the channel authorization bill. Now that such authorization has come, I think that the actual engineering work can be expedited by requesting supplemental funds over and above the $5 million.

As you know, it had been contemplated that the $5 million would be broken down in approximately the order of $1½ million for actual work. The latter figure can now be supplemented, so that commencing July 1, 1956, the start of the new fiscal year, more construction work can be commenced.

The reason I am in so much of a hurry is, of course, because of the serious lag which will occur between the time the seaway navigation work is completed and the time the upper channel work is completed. Thus, as you know, the seaway will be finished by the spring of 1959. On the other hand, the channel work above Lake Erie is still a 5-year project, and thus will not be ready until the spring of 1962.

To minimize this lag, we of the upper Midwest are most anxious to see all possible work inaugurated at the earliest possible date.

I am writing to Congressman FRED MARSHALL, of Minnesota, chairman of the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, to bring to his attention this matter.

Meanwhile, however, I am hoping that the corps will be in a position to contact the United States Bureau of the Budget, and that the Bureau in turn will make the necessary supplemental request of the House Appropriations Committee.

I pledge my continued efforts all along the line toward speeding the necessary funds.

Looking forward to hearing from you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the distinguished minority leader, I should like to have him state his feelings regarding the session of the Senate today. I have discussed this matter with several Senators on this side of the aisle, and all of us are very hopeful that we can finish our action on the bill, if not today, at least on tomorrow or the next day.

We also hope that, aside from minor insertions during the morning hour, any real debate today be confined to the pending bill. Of course, that is only a hope, and can be no more than that.

However, several Senators have asked me about the plan of the leadership. I have not had a chance to discuss the matter with my colleague, the distinguished minority leader; but I should like to say that if it is agreeable to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, after consultation, we plan to have the Senate convene at 11 o'clock a. m., and we hope it will be possible to complete our action on the bill either tomorrow or the next day. We believe that should be possible by having the Senate convene at 11 a. m., and continue in session until approximately 7 p. m. It is also our plan, insofar as we can control the situation, not to have yea-and-nay votes taken after 7 p. m.

I shall be glad to have the minority leader state his views regarding the matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I certainly think it desirable not to have the Senate continue in session too late each evening, after convening at 10 or 11 a. m. When the Senate convenes at 10 or 11 in the morning, it has a rather rugged schedule, not only for Senators, but also for the Official Reporters and other members of the staff. However, I hope the Members will hold themselves available.

Insofar as the exact time is concerned, it seems to me that if we found we were making progress, we might wish to continue in session until 8 p. m. or some other reasonable time, because we already have had the bill under consideration for several weeks and if it is to be enacted in time to be of benefit to the farmers, I believe we should conclude our action on it this week. I hope we may complete our action on it by Wednesday, although in view of the number of amendments which are still at the desk, it is obvious that if we take as much time upon them as we have taken on the amendments already acted on, we may be at work on the bill all of this week and into next week, as well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the distinguished minority leader yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader shares every hope the minority leader has expressed that we conclude our action on the bill this week; in other words, that we dispose of the bill as quickly as possible.

Of course, every Member has other bills which he wishes to have brought up and passed. Of course, each Senator is aware of the number of amendments to the pending bill which remain to be acted upon. If we continue in session beyond the hour of the evening meal, then, after Senators have arranged to have their evening meal at the Capitol, they generally are willing to have the Senate remain in session until 10 or 11 in the evening, if that is required. On the other hand, if we can say to them that the Senate will not remain in session later than 7 p. m., I believe it will be possible for us to make more progress. I have talked about the matter to various Senators; and they are of the opinion that at this point in the session, in the early part of March, it should not be necessary for the Senate to take votes late in the evening.

So I think the schedule I have indicated will be better for all of us. Let us try it for a day or two, and see whether we make satisfactory progress. If we do not, then perhaps we can arrange to meet later in the evening. Of course I would not wish to have any arrangement made unless it met with the pleasure of my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I am sorry that I could not discuss the matter with him before now. However, the morning hour is about over.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me discuss the matter shortly with some of the minority members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and then the Senator from Texas and I can discuss it further a little later.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that will be a very satisfactory solution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope all Senators will at least hold themselves prepared for the possibility of an evening session.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER], let me say to him that, of course, all of us have statements which we desire to make, and the best time to make them is during the morning hour, under the 2-minute rule. If it is not possible for them to be made under the 2-minute rule, the chairman has been very generous in agreeing to an extension of the time for 4 minutes or 8 minutes, or sometimes even longer. However, I now express the hope that during the further consideration of the pending bill, this week, inasmuch as both Senators are very anxious to have the bill finally acted upon, so that the bill will be enacted and will soon be available to the American farmers, all Senators will cooperate in confining the debate to the pending bill, itself. Both Senators are very anxious to have that done. I wonder whether my friend, the Senator from Louisiana, takes that view.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I do. Last week the Senate debated extraneous matters almost one-third of the time. If, from now on, we can devote our attention to the bill itself, and do not permit extraneous matters to be brought up, we should be able to take final action on the bill not later than Wednesday. If all of us work on the bill, and give it our utmost attention, and are available when the time comes to take votes, I believe it will be possible to do that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Of course, that is a matter which must be decided by each Senator. If the Senator from California and the Senator from Texas could refuse to permit extraneous matters to be brought up, we would find ourselves refusing several times a day. However, we do not have nor seek that privilege. Once a Senator is recognized, he can discuss any matter he wishes to discuss, and for as long as he wishes to discuss it.

I hope all Senators will cooperate in this respect with the leadership.

ALLOCATION TO STATES OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a letter which I have recently received from one of the school leaders in Oregon makes some interesting suggestions concerning a proper standard for the allocation to the different States of Federal aid to education, now under consideration in both Houses of Congress. I would like to take just a few moments to describe these suggestions, so as to bring them to

the attention of Senators on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare who are working on Federal school-aid legislation.

Mr. Marion B. Winslow, superintendent of schools of District 9 C, Coos Bay, Oreg., writes me that on the whole he prefers the Kelley school construction bill—reported by the House Committee on Labor and Education—to that proposed by the administration. He points out, however, that there are other factors besides the number of school age children in a State which determine the financial burden assumed by a State for the education of its children. To summarize his argument he believes that a formula of Federal assistance which reflects actual total days of school attendance in a State, rather than only the number of school-age children, will furnish an incentive to States to institute school years of adequate length to enforce truancy laws, and to encourage more children to stay in school until the completion of high school—in short, to improve the educational services offered to the children.

Such a formula might also be fair to children in States, such as Oregon, which already provide far more than average educational services, in terms of actual school attendance, and which as a result carry a disproportionate financial burden.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Winslow's letter printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I am sure that Mr. Winslow's letter will be of interest to members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and that that committee will want to give consideration to the point he makes in developing a formula for the allocation of Federal aid to education.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOS BAY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 9C, COOS COUNTY,
Coos Bay, Oreg., February 29, 1956.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: It was a real pleasure for our group of school superintendents to have breakfast at the House restaurant and to have an opportunity to get your point of view regarding the possibility of the citizens of the United States as a whole sharing in the cost of public education. We, as school superintendents, who are close to the school situation, facing critical housing problems and recognizing the mobility of people are almost unanimous in our belief that we as citizens of our great country should share on a national level in the cost of public education. The teaching profession has long recognized the importance of public education as the foundation for democratic Government. In a mobile population, ignorance knows no State boundary lines. The uneducated are susceptible to mob psychology and all kinds of damaging propaganda. We as citizens cannot afford to have weak spots in the support of public education.

You are in a strategic position to raise the standards of public education so necessary for the health, production, and happiness of all of the United States. We trust that you will do what you can to raise the standards of all of the United States by providing that we may all share in public education on the national level. The total amount that we shall share on the national level and the distribution of this fund to the several States is a significant problem. I, for one, believe the amount should be a sizable sum. We spend many dollars to improve roads and to remove some of the curves. This is important and highly desirable. More money is needed that the youth of America, our greatest national resource, should have a greater opportunity to grow straight.

I wish to make a suggestion in regard to distribution. In the first place I believe that the funds should be used to give equal opportunity to all for a basic education. This means that some States may get more money per pupil than other States. I do not believe that the school census is a sound basis for distributing funds to States for the following reasons:

1. Some States require only school attendance through the first 8 grades, or to age 16. Some States require attendance to 18 years, or through high-school graduation.
3. Some States have very lax attendance laws and poor enforcement of its attendance laws.
4. Some States have an effective attendance program.
5. Some States have a high percentage of private-school attendance.
6. Some States have few private or parochial schools.
7. Some States have a very short school year of 8½ months, while others may have a longer school year.

It is important that we should share on a national level in the support of educational service to pupils. I know of no reason for distributing educational funds purely on the basis of the number of educable pupils in a State. I believe that money on a national level should be distributed to the several States in proportions that the total days attendance in the public operated schools of a State bear to the total days attendance in the public schools of the United States. This will encourage:

1. A school year of adequate length.
2. Increase the number of years of educational service to high-school completion.
3. Greater attendance in the public schools.
4. A higher percentage of pupils to attend school.
5. A better attendance record.

Distribution on attendance is based on the actual educational service given to pupils. I notice in the report of Atlantic City schools that with a population of approximately 100,000 the school attendance is approximately 8,000, or 1 in 12¼ in school. Here in the Coos Bay school district we have a population of approximately 22,500 with a school attendance of 4,200, or 1 in 5.4 in school. It makes a big difference whether a district is providing for educational services for one-twelfth of its population or for one-sixth of its population.

Those States that have the greatest portion of their population in school face the greatest financial need. Those of us who have dedicated our lives to the teaching profession believe that all should be given a high quality of adequate education.

On the basis of census Oregon may rank reasonably high in wealth per census child. However, on the basis of school days of educational service given we may fall in an entirely different class.

If Federal funds were distributed to the States on the basis of actual days attendance at a public school, I believe this would encourage public-school attendance. States with lax attendance laws with large numbers of the school population attending private schools who thus carry a very light public-education program, would get Federal funds only on the basis of the actual public educational service given.

I believe in universal education for all and am much opposed to the segregation practice in the South. If funds are distributed on the basis of day attendance at a public school those States would receive funds only for the service given. I believe we should recognize the amount of public education actually given. $11.35 per school-census child in Oregon would be approximately 9½ cents per pupil-days attendance.

I believe the Kelley bill to be better for the Nation than the bill proposed by the administration. I wish to request that you do what you can to put the Kelley bill into operation.

I wish to again thank you for the privilege of having breakfast with you on Friday morning, February 24.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. WINSLOW,
Superintendent, 9C.

DEATH OF CARL BROGGI, OF MAINE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, this past Friday tragedy struck in Maine. One of Maine's outstanding citizens, Carl Broggi, died of a sudden heart attack.

I shall always remember the occasion of the last time that I saw and talked with Carl Broggi. It was in early January of this year. I introduced him to a Senate Labor Subcommittee considering legislation to help distressed areas such as those in Maine. In my introduction of him I paid tribute to what he had done and was doing.

After he made his impressive statement to the Senate committee, he went to the Senate gallery to watch a part of the session that day prior to having lunch with me in the Senate restaurant. I made a short statement on the Senate floor that day. At the time that I did several Senators were trying to get the recognition of the Presiding Officer of the Senate to speak. Senator HOLLAND, of Florida, was speaking and yielded the floor to me so that I could make my statement without further delay.

After making my statement, I went to the Senate gallery to meet Carl Broggi and from there we went to the Senate restaurant. During luncheon I remarked about the courtesy of Senator HOLLAND. Several days later Senator HOLLAND came to me and told me that he had received a very nice letter from Carl Broggi thanking him for the courtesy that had been given me—and sending him as a token of such appreciation a chest of Maine seafoods.

Senator HOLLAND said to me that Maine must have wonderful people if they were like Carl Broggi. Here was a personal example of how Carl Broggi made friends for Maine—of how he was a wonderful ambassador for Maine outside of Maine as well as being a man dedicated to his goal inside Maine.

We are all saddened when death takes a friend and a leading citizen of our State and community. But there is something different in this instance.

That difference is in what Carl Broggi was doing for his State and for the people of Maine—not merely what he had done. He had done much. He had led the way in his own community—Sanford, Maine—the "Town That Refused To Die" after it had lost the textile mill. Sanford had refused to die greatly because Carl Broggi and his fellow townsmen had the courage to fight back.

Carl Broggi and Sanford set the example and the pace for the rest of Maine. It was inevitable for Carl Broggi to become the first commissioner of industry and commerce for Maine.

What he was accomplishing—what he was doing for his State and the people of Maine—as commissioner of industry and commerce—is the difference in the normal sadness and shock we have when a leading citizen passes on. His was not only a record of past accomplishment for his State and people. His was a record of present accomplishment for his State and people. His was a future of great hope and confidence for his State and people.

He was a tremendous success because he put his whole heart into his work and efforts. He gave so much of his heart to his work for the State and the people of Maine that he died in the midst of that work.

Yes, Carl Broggi gave his heart and his life for Maine and her people. What greater tribute can be given a fallen friend than to speak this truth?

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, editorials which reflect the true feeling of Maine people for Carl Broggi.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of March 10–11, 1956]

A LASTING MEMORIAL

The death of Carl J. Broggi is a stunning loss to his family and friends. It is also a stunning loss to the State of Maine.

The former legislator assumed the commissionership of the new Department of Development of Industry and Commerce only 6 months ago, yet his work was already winning national attention at the time of his death.

He recognized that a successful industrial development program must have its base at the community level; that is, towns must be prepared to sell themselves to visiting industrialists. He was nearing the end of a series of community-area meetings to put over this idea to civic leaders when he was stricken with heart attacks at Lewiston Thursday.

Intense and dedicated to his job, Commissioner Broggi had toiled day and night, crisscrossing the State, to press the Broggi plan. The stress proved too great. He gave his life for the State.

The Broggi plan must be carried on, vigorously and successfully. This would be the finest memorial the people of Maine could give to is devoted creator.

[From the Portland (Maine) Evening Express of March 9, 1956]

HE GAVE HIS LIFE FOR MAINE

We happened to be chatting with Carl Broggi in the statehouse Wednesday evening, less than 24 hours before his death. Completing a hard day running one of his schools for amateur industrial promoters, he was smiling as usual, enthusiastic, confident. He was also modest.

When told that in his 6 months of organizing the new Department of Industry and Commerce for Maine he had impressed everyone, had made no noticeable mistakes, he quietly replied, "Well, we're trying, anyway."

That was Carl Broggi, the man who kept trying, anyway, even when he tackled an impossible job like resurrecting Sanford's economy from the grave. When he took over the State job everyone expected him to be adequate. After all, he had proved his ability and there wasn't much doubt that he could handle the bigger job satisfactorily. But few expected him to move as fast and as effectively as he did.

He hired top staff men. He acquainted Maine with what he was doing. He was, when death called yesterday afternoon, in the middle of a school program that had attracted attention all over the Nation.

In 6 months Carl Broggi had done more than anyone dreamed he could do in that time, and did it 10 times better than we had any reason to expect. That's only one of the reasons we miss Carl Broggi. We miss him because he was a fine man, because he was decent and humble. The life he gave to Maine was an unusual example of devoted citizenship.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of March 10, 1956]

MAINE HAS LOST A HUMBLE, EFFECTIVE SERVANT

Carl J. Broggi had not long been on the Maine government scene in a full-time capacity but in 6 short months he had become a commanding figure whose stature grew with each passing week.

He had set a new and vital state department on a sound and promising road and, what is more important, he had the people of Maine with him. No one, least of all the development commissioner himself, ever seriously entertained the notion that he would fail to make his department live up to its promise.

Carl Broggi was going someplace and he was going in a hurry, but a careful kind of hurry that made sure of foundations before building superstructures. And the construction he had in mind was sure to make a better Maine. His death Thursday was untimely in the largest sense of the word.

Nothing a newspaper can say will do much to bear up a bereaved family nor can it, of course, do more than hint at the sense of loss that now abides with the whole State. But it can try, which is why we say Carl Broggi was one of a special breed of whom there are not enough, in Maine or anywhere else.

SECRETARY McKAY'S DEFENSE OF NATURAL RESOURCE POLICIES

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is gratifying to me that the Washington Post and Times Herald provided space in its Saturday issue for Secretary Douglas McKay to reply at length to one of the many unsubstantiated charges directed against his administration of the Nation's public resources.

I believe that once this election year has passed and people take the opportunity to look at the whole record, that the conclusion will be reached by most fair and right-minded people that Douglas McKay has built a record as one of our great Secretaries of the Interior, and that many far-reaching contributions have been made during his administration to the preservation and supervision of our valuable natural resources.

At the least, I am sure that the American people believe in fair play and that they should have an opportunity to hear both sides of such controversies.

Secretary McKay was an outstanding governor of Oregon, he has been an outstanding Secretary of the Interior, and it is my confident prediction that he will make an outstanding contribution to any line of endeavor to which he applies himself after he leaves his present Cabinet post.

Inasmuch as the Secretary has been so misrepresented on the subject of natural resources in many areas of public opinion, I ask unanimous consent that the article published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 10, 1956, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICIES PRESERVE NATION'S NATURAL RESOURCES

(By Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay)

My attention has been called to a letter published February 25 in the Washington Post and Times Herald from Dr. Seymour E. Harris, professor of economics at Harvard University.

In his letter, touching on a broad range of economic subjects against the background of the policies of the Eisenhower administration, Dr. Harris makes the unsupported statement that * * * "on one major issue they (the Republican leaders) break with the New Deal completely; instead of preserving natural resources for all the people they seem determined to give them away."

My awareness of your frequent and commendable admonitions to other members of your calling that freedom of the press imposes a grave responsibility on the press not to mislead its readers prompts me to offer you this opportunity to set forth certain hard facts of record which refute the bald misstatement by Dr. Harris, the only reference in his letter which applies directly to the Department of the Interior.

As I have said, Dr. Harris fails to cite a single policy or action by the Eisenhower administration to support his allegation that the Republicans are not preserving natural resources for all the people. It is disappointing thus to discover the responsible chairman of the department of economics of Harvard University apparently willing to accept uncritically and without careful examination an irresponsible political slogan which has repeatedly been shown to be without substance.

I suggest to Dr. Harris and a great many others that they are being misled by a "big doubt" technique developed by the enemies of the Eisenhower administration to slander agencies and officials of that administration for lack of valid issues in this 1956 election year. I further suggest that a review of the actual record by any impartial authority would demonstrate the most significant advances in sound resource conservation and development by this administration in many years.

The giveaway slogan appears to have originated during the debate in the 83d Congress on legislation establishing the rights of the States to resources on offshore lands within their historic boundaries. Lately, we have heard little from Democratic sources about this matter for some rather obvious reasons.

First, of course, it was difficult for the Democratic leaders who promoted the submerged lands legislation over many years to join in a giveaway chorus on this issue and thus attack themselves.

Even more persuasive has been the fact that under the legislation which was supported by the Eisenhower administration the development of the outer Continental Shelf has proceeded in a manner which belies any suggestion of giveaway. Federal leasing to date of only a small fraction of the offshore lands on the shelf has already returned more than a quarter of a billion dollars to the Federal Treasury.

As leasing continues and royalty payments accrue, it can be estimated conservatively that development of the submerged lands will yield several billion dollars in additional revenue which will help ease the tax burden

of all our citizens. Title to the lands remains vested in the people.

The giveaway charge leveled at the administration of our national parks has also now been thoroughly discredited, again for some very excellent reasons. The fact is that the National Park System today is larger, more adequately staffed, and more efficiently administered than it ever has been.

Since January 1953 more than 400,000 acres have been added to the Park System, including an authorization to extend the boundaries of the Everglades National Park in Florida. The Park Service budget submitted to Congress this year more than doubles the amount appropriated 3 years ago.

I have said on many occasions that I am an ardent supporter of our national parks as an irreplaceable national asset, to be enjoyed by all of our people. Accordingly I have consistently sought to protect the integrity of the National Park System. During the past 3 years I have rejected a number of proposals which would have unjustifiably intruded on the natural beauty of park areas.

These proposals have ranged from requests to build tramways in five national parks to efforts to modify the boundaries of Olympic National Park and to open Joshua Tree National Monument to mineral prospecting and mining.

However, in the strange logic of those who are attempting to plaster the giveaway label on the administration, I find that the firm rejection of these proposals is never recognized, but the fact that the proposals have been made to the Department becomes in itself the basis for giveaway contentions.

When I became Secretary I quickly concluded that protection of the parks was only part of the action that was necessary. I determined that the 15-year trend of neglect of the parks that was touched off by World War II and prolonged by the Korean conflict must be reversed.

Mission 66, a comprehensive 10-year plan for protection, improvement, and development of the Park System, faces this problem squarely. Designed to equip the parks to accommodate adequately the 80 million park visitors expected by 1966, mission 66 will bring the Park System up to the standards which the American people want and have a right to expect. The very gratifying support which this program is receiving in Congress and throughout the country now makes it certain that we are beginning a new era of progress in park development.

Another part of our great natural heritage that I have vigorously protected is our national wildlife refuges. The facts show that 9 new wildlife refuges have been established in the past 3 years, that tens of thousands of additional acres have been acquired for wildlife preservation, and that refuges are now receiving the largest allocation for acquisition, development, and maintenance in history. The giveaway charge is still made, nevertheless, not on the basis of what the Department has done, but of what it might do in disposing of refuge lands.

The political attacks which have been made recently in connection with the handling of our wildlife refuges have been highlighted by an amazing bit of mental legerdemain. New regulations which the Department issued last December governing oil leasing on wildlife refuges actually provide the greatest protection to wildlife values since such leasing was authorized by Congress in 1920 and again in 1946. Yet the giveaway school is now attempting to promote the idea that these new regulations, developed with the assistance of career specialists of the Fish and Wildlife Service to provide maximum protection of the refuges, somehow spell the doom of the refuges.

Nothing, of course, could be further from the truth. The giveaway sloganeers are striving desperately to create the impression that the regulations issued last December opened the refuges for the first time to oil leasing. The fact is that not only were the refuges first opened to such activity by a previous administration but it issued leases without, in my opinion, proper safeguards.

My first consideration was to correct the loose regulations in existence when I took office, thereby assuring adequate safeguards for wildlife values. In the summer of 1953, I suspended the regulations which had been issued in 1947 and asked the specialists of the Fish and Wildlife Service to develop regulations to which they could give full support.

Thus the new regulations issued last December were the result of a careful study by men who have the welfare of our wildlife sanctuaries close to their hearts. One of the noteworthy improvements in the new regulations is that they provide, as the previous regulations did not, for approval by the Service and its career technicians over where, how, and by whom drilling will be permitted on the refuges. Another significant revision makes absolutely inviolate, for the first time in history, those areas which provide habitat for rare and endangered species of wildlife.

No man, in or out of Government, is better qualified to assay the degree of protection our wildlife refuges will receive under the new regulations than is J. Clark Salyer, Chief of the Branch of Refugees of the Fish and Wildlife Service. He is a career civil servant who came to Washington 22 years ago with the late "Ding" Darling to help build the great wildlife refuge system we have today. When he appeared before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he was asked:

"Do you feel that, under your regulations and working and operating plans, the wildlife will be protected adequately where an oil lease is entered into?"

"I do," Mr. Salyer replied, "or I would be up here screaming bloody murder right now."

In the final analysis the proof of whether the refuges are better protected will not be found either in my contention as to excellence of the new regulations, or in the disclaimers of the political opponents of the administration. Rather the proof will lie in the record of oil-leasing activity under the new procedures. And in this area I am content to rely upon the integrity of dedicated conservationists such as Mr. Salyer and his associates in the career service.

The early months of the administration were marked by a series of bitter attacks on the partnership power program as a "giveaway." It is interesting now to compare the weight of the facts of record with the sound and fury which were generated in the early stages by the political sloganeers.

The record shows that the partnership program is moving steadily to put kilowatts on the line through the cooperative efforts of the Federal Government and local groups. The very vital and comprehensive all-Federal upper Colorado project has been approved by both Houses of Congress and now awaits only final action on a conference report before going to the White House for the President's signature.

The development of the power resources of the Snake River in the Hells Canyon reach is going forward under private auspices. Projects such as Priest Rapids and John Day are making progress as partnership undertakings. At the same time, power rates of existing Federal projects have been held down wherever possible.

In the Pacific Northwest, for example, the rates of the Bonneville Power Administration have been kept at the same level for the past 3 years despite indications by the previous administration that the rates might have to be raised as much as 20 percent in 1954.

I suspect that this recital is already overly long, but since Dr. Harris did not mention any specifics in his allegation regarding natural resources conservation it has been necessary to cover at least the major publicized issues which may have led him to his sweeping and unfounded generalization.

Before concluding, however, I should like to mention the Al Sarena case, although charges surrounding this matter have also been exploded. The testimony of Under Secretary Clarence Davis made it indisputedly clear, I think, that the Department's action in the Al Sarena case was in full accord with the law, and that the objections which have been made against the Al Sarena decision could be valid only as they were directed against the law, rather than at the Department.

The fact that the Al Sarena case came into proper perspective only after the congressional committee permitted the responsible official involved to set forth all of the details should furnish a useful moral. It is important under our system of government that the people be given the facts necessary to reach sound decisions on public issues.

Before Mr. Davis testified, the only facts being publicized about the case were the sensational distortions and half-truths which comprised the bulk of the early testimony, plus the now admittedly false accusations of a syndicated propagandist for the New Deal Democrat Party.

Certainly, the honest reporting by the responsible press of Mr. Davis' testimony, which set at rest the misrepresentations that had been made in the Al Sarena case, could be emulated in the handling of the many other issues which we may expect to arise in the hectic emotionalism of this election year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT IN THE SCHOOL CASES—DECLARATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the increasing gravity of the situation following the decision of the Supreme Court in the so-called segregation cases, and the peculiar stress in sections of the country where this decision has created many difficulties, unknown and unappreciated, perhaps, by many people residing in other parts of the country, have led some Senators and some Members of the House of Representatives to prepare a statement of the position which they have felt and now feel to be imperative.

I now wish to present to the Senate a statement on behalf of 19 Senators, representing 11 States, and 77 House Members, representing a considerable number of States likewise.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia desire to have unanimous consent to proceed for more than a maximum of 2 minutes?

Mr. GEORGE. Perhaps I shall have to ask for a slight extension. For the present I shall proceed for 2 minutes only. I merely wish to add that I shall not speak to this declaration at this time.

However, at an early and more convenient time, when proposed legislation now before the Senate is out of the way, and perhaps some other important legislative matters which may be immediately considered shall have been disposed of, I shall address myself to the declaration.

This declaration has not been hastily taken. It has been carefully considered by many Members of the Senate for some 4 or 5 weeks. I now present the statement to the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. GEORGE. I present the declaration:

DECLARATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

The unwarranted decision of the Supreme Court in the public school cases is now bearing the fruit always produced when men substitute naked power for established law.

The Founding Fathers gave us a Constitution of checks and balances because they realized the inescapable lesson of history that no man or group of men can be safely entrusted with unlimited power. They framed this Constitution with its provisions for change by amendment in order to secure the fundamentals of government against the dangers of temporary popular passion or the personal predilections of public officeholders.

We regard the decision of the Supreme Court in the school cases as a clear abuse of judicial power. It climaxes a trend in the Federal Judiciary undertaking to legislate, in derogation of the authority of Congress, and to encroach upon the reserved rights of the States and the people.

The original Constitution does not mention education. Neither does the 14th amendment nor any other amendment. The debates preceding the submission of the 14th amendment clearly show that there was no intent that it should affect the system of education maintained by the States.

The very Congress which proposed the amendment subsequently provided for segregated schools in the District of Columbia.

When the amendment was adopted in 1868, there were 37 States of the Union. Every one of the 26 States that had any substantial racial differences among its people——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Georgia may have an additional 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object, of course—I merely wish to ask that on the conclusion of the remarks of the disinguished Senator from Georgia the Senator from New York may be recognized for not more than 3 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have assured the Senator from New York twice, and I assure him the third time, that he will be recognized before the morning hour is over, insofar as I can assure him, and that he will be allowed to speak for as long as he may choose.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has received an additional request for recognition after the Senator from Georgia has concluded his remarks. Accordingly, the Chair will recognize the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would not attempt to determine the priority, because that is a matter for the Chair to determine in his best judgment; but we are still in the morning hour. However, as I said to the Senator from New York, I am sure no Senator will object to any additional statements being made even if they should extend beyond 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize the Senator from New York on this question before the expiration of the morning hour.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if there is to be much speaking after my statement, I myself may have to ask for an extension of time.

But, Mr. President, completing the statement which I asked the privilege of placing in the RECORD this morning, and repeating a portion of the sentence I was reading when interrupted:

Every one of the 26 States that had any substantial racial differences among its people, either approved the operation of segregated schools already in existence or subsequently established such schools by action of the same law-making body which considered the 14th amendment.

As admitted by the Supreme Court in the public school case (*Brown* v. *Board of Education*), the doctrine of separate but equal schools "apparently originated in *Roberts* v. *City of Boston* (1849), upholding school segregation against attack as being violative of a State constitutional guarantee of equality." This constitutional doctrine began in the North, not in the South, and it was followed not only in Massachusetts, but in Connecticut, New York, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania and other northern States until they, exercising their rights as States through the constitutional processes of local self-government, changed their school systems.

In the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* in 1896 the Supreme Court expressly declared that under the 14th amendment no person was denied any of his rights if the States provided separate but equal public facilities. This decision has been followed in many other cases. It is notable that the Supreme Court, speaking through Chief Justice Taft, a former President of the United States, unanimously declared in 1927 in *Lum* v. *Rice* that the "separate but equal" principle is "within the discretion of the State in regulating its public schools and does not conflict with the 14th amendment."

This interpretation, restated time and again, became a part of the life of the people of many of the States and confirmed their habits, customs, traditions, and way of life. It is founded on elemental humanity and commonsense, for parents should not be deprived by Government of the right to direct the lives and education of their own children.

Though there has been no constitutional amendment or act of Congress changing this established legal principle almost a century old, the Supreme Court of the United States, with no legal basis for such action, undertook to exercise their naked judicial power and substituted their personal political and social ideas for the established law of the land.

This unwarranted exercise of power by the Court, contrary to the Constitution, is creating chaos and confusion in the States principally affected. It is destroying the amicable relations between the white and Negro races that have been created through 90 years of patient effort by the good people of both races. It has planted hatred and suspicion where there has been heretofore friendship and understanding.

Without regard to the consent of the governed, outside agitators are threatening immediate and revolutionary changes in our public-school systems. If done, this is certain to destroy the system of public education in some of the States.

With the gravest concern for the explosive and dangerous condition created by this decision and inflamed by outside meddlers:

We reaffirm our reliance on the Constitution as the fundamental law of the land.

We decry the Supreme Court's encroachments on rights reserved to the States and to the people, contrary to established law, and to the Constitution.

We commend the motives of those States which have declared the intention to resist forced integration by any lawful means.

We appeal to the States and people who are not directly affected by these decisions to consider the constitutional principles involved against the time when they too, on issues vital to them, may be the victims of judicial encroachment.

Even though we constitute a minority in the present Congress, we have full faith that a majority of the American people believe in the dual system of government which has enabled us to achieve our greatness and will in time demand that the reserved rights of the States and of the people be made secure against judicial usurpation.

We pledge ourselves to use all lawful means to bring about a reversal of this decision which is contrary to the Constitution and to prevent the use of force in its implementation.

In this trying period, as we all seek to right this wrong, we appeal to our people not to be provoked by the agitators and troublemakers invading our States and to scrupulously refrain from disorder and lawless acts.

Signed by:

MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

WALTER F. GEORGE, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, JOHN STENNIS, SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., STROM THURMOND, HARRY F. BYRD, A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, RUSSELL B. LONG, LISTER HILL, JAMES O. EASTLAND, W. KERR SCOTT, JOHN SPARKMAN, OLIN D. JOHNSTON, PRICE DANIEL, J. W. FULBRIGHT, GEORGE A. SMATHERS, SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Alabama: FRANK W. BOYKIN, GEORGE M. GRANT, GEORGE W. ANDREWS, KENNETH A. ROBERTS, ALBERT RAINS, ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, Jr., CARL ELLIOTT, ROBERT E. JONES, GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Jr.

Arkansas: E. C. GATHINGS, WILBUR D. MILLS, JAMES W. TRIMBLE, OREN HARRIS, BROOKS HAYS, W. F. NORRELL.

Florida: CHARLES E. BENNETT, ROBERT L. F. SIKES, A. S. HERLONG, Jr., PAUL G. ROGERS, JAMES A. HALEY, D. R. MATTHEWS.

Georgia: PRINCE H. PRESTON, JOHN L. PILCHER, E. L. FORRESTER, JOHN JAMES FLYNT, Jr., JAMES C. DAVIS, CARL VINSON, HENDERSON LANHAM, IRIS F. BLITCH, PHIL M. LANDRUM, PAUL BROWN.

Louisiana: F. EDWARD HÉBERT, HALE BOGGS, EDWIN E. WILLIS, OVERTON BROOKS, OTTO E. PASSMAN, JAMES H. MORRISON, T. ASHTON THOMPSON, GEORGE S. LONG.

Mississippi: THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, JAMIE L. WHITTEN, FRANK E. SMITH, JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, ARTHUR WINSTEAD, WILLIAM M. COLMER.

North Carolina: HERBERT C. BONNER, L. H. FOUNTAIN, GRAHAM A. BARDEN, CARL T. DURHAM, F. ERTEL CARLYLE, HUGH Q. ALEXANDER, WOODROW W. JONES, GEORGE A. SHUFORD.

South Carolina: L. MENDEL RIVERS, JOHN J. RILEY, W. J. BRYAN DORN, ROBERT T. ASHMORE, JAMES P. RICHARDS, JOHN L. MCMILLAN.

Tennessee: JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., TOM MURRAY, JERE COOPER, CLIFFORD DAVIS.

Texas: WRIGHT PATMAN, JOHN DOWDY, WALTER ROGERS, O. C. FISHER.

Virginia: EDWARD J. ROBESON, Jr., PORTER HARDY, Jr., J. VAUGHAN GARY, WATKINS M. ABBITT, WILLIAM M. TUCK, RICHARD H. POFF, BURR P. HARRISON, HOWARD W. SMITH, W. PAT JENNINGS, JOEL T. BROYHILL.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for approximately 10 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from South Carolina may proceed.

Mr. THURMOND. But, Mr. President, I yield, first, to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. I, of course, recognize and respect the right of any Member of Congress, as any other citizen of our country, to hold and express such views as he may approve. However, the distinguished Senator from Georgia has read a proclamation on the floor of the Senate, I wish no one to think that failure to make immediate reply to the proclamation issued by certain Senators and Representatives, assailing the decision of the Supreme Court outlawing segregation in public schools, indicates acceptance of the views expressed therein. I therefore want it known that I am wholly in disagreement with the position against the Supreme Court decision taken in the proclamation by those Members of the Congress who are signatories to it. I expect to have more to say on this subject at an early date.

I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am constrained to make a few remarks at this time because I believe a historic event has taken place today in the Senate.

The action of this group of Senators in signing and issuing a Declaration of Constitutional Principles with regard to the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, is most significant. The signers of this declaration represent a large area of this Nation and a great segment of its population. Solemnly and simply we have stated our position on a grave matter so as to make clear there are facts that opposing propagandists have neglected in their zeal to persuade the world there is but one side to this matter.

In suggesting that a meeting of like-minded Senators be held, it was my thought that we should formulate a statement of unity to present our views and the views of our constituents on this subject. My hope also was that the statement issued should be of such nature as to gain the support of all people who love the Constitution; that they would see in this instance the danger of other future encroachments by the Federal Government into fields reserved to the States and the people.

My people in South Carolina sought to avoid any disruption of the harmony which has existed for generations between the white and the Negro races. The effort by outside agitators to end segregation in the public schools has made it difficult to sustain the long-time harmony.

These agitators employed professional racist lawyers with funds contributed by persons who were permitted to deduct the contributions from their taxes. The organization established to receive the funds also enjoys the status of freedom from taxation.

Except for these troublemakers, I believe our people of both races in South Carolina would have continued to progress harmoniously together. Educational progress in South Carolina has been marked by $200 million worth of fine school buildings in the past 4 years, providing true equality, not only for white and Negro pupils, but also for urban and rural communities.

In the South Carolina school district where one of the segregation cases was instigated, the Negro schools are better than the schools for white children. Yet the Negroes continue to seek admission to schools for the white race.

This is sufficient proof that, while South Carolinians of both races are interested in the education of their children, the agitators who traveled a thousand miles to foment trouble are interested in something else. The "something else" they are interested in is the mixing of the races.

They may as well recognize that they cannot accomplish by judicial legislation what they could never succeed in doing by constitutional amendment.

Historical evidence positively refutes the decision of the Supreme Court in the school-segregation cases.

The 39th Congress, which in 1866 framed the 14th amendment to the Constitution—the amendment which contains the equal protection clause—also provided for the operation of segregated schools in the District of Columbia. This is positive evidence that the Congress did not intend to prohibit segregation by the 14th amendment.

The Supreme Court admitted in its opinion in the school cases that "education is perhaps the most important function of State and local governments." But the Court failed to observe the constitional guaranties, including the 10th amendment, which reserve control of such matters to the States.

If the Supreme Court could disregard the provisions of the Constitution which were specifically designed to safeguard the rights of the States, we might as well not have a written Constitution. Not only did the Court disregard the Constitution and the historical evidence supporting that revered document; it also disregarded previous decisions of the Court itself.

Between the decision in Plessy against Ferguson in 1896 and the reversal of that opinion on May 17, 1954, 157 cases were decided on the basis of the separate-but-equal doctrine. The United States Supreme Court rendered 11 opinions on that basis; the United States court of appeals 13; United states district courts 27; and State supreme courts, including the District of Columbia, 106.

Such disregard for established doctrine could be justified only if additional evidence were presented which was not available when the earlier decisions were rendered.

No additional evidence was presented to the Court to show the earlier decisions to be wrong. Therefore, the decision handed down on May 17, 1954, was contrary to the Constitution and to legal precedent.

If the Court can say that certain children shall go to certain schools, the Court might also soon attempt to direct the courses to be taught in those schools. It might undertake to establish qualifications for teachers.

I reject the philosophy of the sociologists that the Supreme Court has any authority over local public schools, supported in part by State funds.

The Court's segregation decision has set a dangerous precedent. If, in the school cases, the Court can by decree create a new constitutional provision, not in the written document, it might also disregard the Constitution in other matters. Other constitutional guaranties could be destroyed by new decrees.

I respect the Court as an institution and as an instrument of Government created by the Constitution. I do not and cannot have regard for the nine Justices who rendered a decision so clearly contrary to the Constitution.

The propagandists have tried to convince the world that the States and the people should bow meekly to the decree of the Supreme Court. I say it would be the submission of cowardice if we failed to use every lawful means to protect the rights of the people.

For more than a half a century the propagandists and the agitators applied every pressure of which they were capable to bring about a reversal of the separate-but-equal doctrine. They were successful, but they now contend that the very methods they used are unfair. They want the South to accept the dictation of the Court without seeking recourse. We shall not do so.

I hope all the people of this Nation who believe in the Constitution—North, South, East, and West—will support every lawful effort to have the decision reversed. The Court followed textbooks instead of the Constitution in arriving at the decision.

We are free, morally and legally, to fight the decision. We must oppose to the end every attempt to encroach on the rights of the people.

Legislation by judicial decree, if permitted to go unchallenged, could destroy the rights of the Congress, the rights of the States, and the rights of the people themselves.

When the Court handed down its decision in the school-segregation cases, it attempted to wipe out constitutional or statutory provisions in 17 States and the District of Columbia. Thus, the Court attempted to legislate in a field which even the Congress had no right to invade. A majority of the States affected would never enact such legislation through their legislatures. A vast majority of the people in these States would staunchly oppose such legislation.

The people and the States must find ways and means of preserving segregation in the schools. Each attempt to break down segregation must be fought with every legal weapon at our disposal.

At the same time, equal school facilities for the races must be maintained. The States are not seeking to avoid responsibility. They want to meet all due

responsibility, but not under Court decrees which are not based on law.

I hope a greater understanding of the problem which has been thrust upon the South and the Nation will be sought by our colleagues who do not face the segregation problem at home. Other problems of other areas require consideration and understanding. I shall try to give full consideration to them.

All of us have heard a great deal of talk about the persecution of minority groups. The white people of the South are the greatest minority in this Nation. They deserve consideration and understanding instead of the persecution of twisted propaganda.

The people of the South love this country. In all the wars in which this Nation has engaged, no truer American patriots have been found than the people from the South.

I, for one, shall seek to present the views of my people on the floor of the Senate. I shall fight for them in whatever lawful way I can. My hope is that consideration of our views will lead to understanding and that understanding will lead to a rejection of practices contrary to the Constitution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator may proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. The hour is indeed historic. It has some of the characteristics of previous historic hours in the Senate, when there was before this body the great constitutional question as to whether or not there was to be equality of justice for all Americans, irrespective of race, color, or creed.

If we will check into American history at the time of Marbury against Madison, we will find a great similarity between the arguments then made and the arguments made on the floor of the Senate today. But in Marbury against Madison, decided in 1803, there was established the authority and the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to determine for all Americans, irrespective of color, race, and creed, equality of rights under the Constitution. The supremacy of the Supreme Court in passing on constitutional questions was determined by that decision.

A unanimous Supreme Court has handed down a decision that makes it perfectly clear that under the Constitution of the United States there cannot be discrimination between white men and black men, so far as the Constitution is concerned.

I say again today that the doctrine of interposition means nothing but nullification, and it means really a determination on the part of certain forces in this country to put themselves above the Supreme Court and above the Constitution. If the gentlemen from the South really want to take such action, let them propose a constitutional amendment that will deny to the colored people of the country equality of rights under the Constitution, and see how far they will get with the American people.

Mr. President, I recognize the problems of the South. Unfortunately, I respectfully say, I think too many of our southern colleagues want to take the position that because some of us may live in the North, we have no appreciation of the problems of the South. That is contrary to the fact. But we have reached a point in our history when the great South once again will have to determine whether we are to be governed by law or whether we are to be governed or subverted by the interposition doctrine, which is the doctrine of nullification.

Mr. President, on the basis of the arguments of the proponents of the declaration of principles just submitted by a group of southern Senators you would think today Calhoun was walking and speaking on the floor of the Senate.

I think that, as patriots all, those of us representing areas outside the South, need to sit down with our brethren repsenting the South, and see what we can do to solve, by reasoned discussion, the great problem which the Supreme Court decision has created. But I first want to say I think it is a correct decision, a sound decision, and a decision that was long overdue.

I say, respectfully, the South has had all the time since the War Between the States to make this adjustment. That is why I am not greatly moved by these last-hour pleas of the South, "We need more time, more time, more time." How much more time is needed in order that equality of justice may be applied to the blacks as well as to the whites in America?

Mr. President, I regret that this declaration has been filed, because I respectfully say such a declaration will not bring about the unanimity of action we will need in order to help solve the school problem in the South.

I close by saying a unanimous Supreme Court, which includes in its membership men with the tradition of the South in their veins, has at long last declared that all Americans are equal, and that the flame of justice in America must burn as brightly in the homes of the blacks as in the homes of the whites.

A historic debate must take place on the floor of the Senate in the not too distant future, because in the weeks immediately ahead the Congress will have to determine whether or not we and the people of the United States shall follow the Supreme Court decision, and recognize, as was laid down in Marbury against Madison, the supremacy of the Court in protecting the American people in their constitutional rights.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this is a truly sad, bewildering, and difficult day in the Senate of the United States. This great body is sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States. To be sure, on every piece of legislation we make our own individual judgments, as to whether or not we believe it is within the spirit and the letter of our great document, the Constitution.

I do feel, Mr. President, once the Supreme Court of the United States has spoken, not merely upon statutory law, but upon constitutional law, that the presumption is, and should be, that the order of the Court and the rule of the Court is the law of the land—to be obeyed and upheld.

While I do not profess to be an expert in constitutional law, I am familiar with the development of the doctrine of the power and the right of the Supreme Court of the United States to encompass within its jurisdiction the responsibility for ruling upon the constitutionality of State statutes which may or may not be in conflict with the Constitution, the power and the responsibility and the right to rule upon Federal statutes which may or may not be in conflict with the Constitution, and finally the power of the Supreme Court to interpret and to apply the language of the Constitution itself.

Mr. President, the 14th amendment is a part of the Constitution of the United States. The fact that the 14th amendment has not been applied in some specific instances throughout the past decades does not in any way weaken or vitiate this power of law. That amendment is quite explicit in section 1. It reads:

> All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The 2 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator request 5 additional minutes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I continue to read from section 1 of the 14th amendment:

> No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Mr. President, this amendment is all important in our constitutional structure. For years it has been interpreted and primarily applied to the economic interests of our country, under the doctrine of what we call reasonableness, "due process of law" being interpreted as a reasonable rule of law. It was applied that way to economic matters and to large corporate interests.

The Supreme Court, in the case involving school segregation, applied the principle to citizens of the United States, to human beings rather than corporate beings, to people rather than property.

So, Mr. President, I must say with all due respect—and I certainly respect the knowledge and experience of my colleagues—that the Supreme Court did not write the law; it merely applied existing constitutional law. It applied the principle of human equality—equal treatment under the law—Mr. President, which, since July 4, 1776, has been declared as the fundamental tenet of our Republic.

Furthermore, Mr. President, in its ruling the Supreme Court took jurisdiction over one of the most complex, difficult, and trying questions of our time, namely,

segregation in our public schools. I reemphasize to my colleagues that the issue of segregation and desegregation is within the jurisdiction and the responsibility of the Supreme Court of the United States and the judicial process. I am pleased that it has been handled by the courts. I am displeased that it has become the subject of passion, emotion, bitterness, and antagonism.

Frankly, Mr. President, the principle of federalism leaves no room for nullification; and, as the Senator from Oregon has said, it leaves no room for interposition. Interposition fully developed becomes nullification, as the courts of our country have stated again and again, and as the great, historic leaders of the Nation have stated. Nullification is a violation of the Constitution. It cannot be condoned.

Mr. President, there are many of us in the Senate who have been deeply disturbed for a long time over the difficult, heart-rending issues of discrimination and inequality so evident in the fields of economic, educational, and social rights for many of our people. I had hoped the Members of the Congress might restrain themselves on this isue of segregation. I had hoped that we would leave this to the courts and to the people of the country. The judiciary as a separate and equal branch of our Government has the segregation issue under its jurisdiction. If there is one plea that I make here today, it is that we continue to reason with one another, rather than be the victims of passion or emotion.

I was pleased that in the document I heard read this morning there was emphasis upon law and order, upon lawful means; and of course I was pleased that there was an appeal to the people not to be provoked to irrational action. Mr. President, it is of the utmost importance that there be law and order. It is of the utmost importance to the safety of our Republic that there not be violence; and it is of the utmost importance that we, the elected representatives of the people, set a pattern of conduct that will yield the results of law and order, that will bring people together, rather than separate them.

Not only did the Supreme Court rule that segregation is unconstitutional, Mr. President; it also handed down an implementation order. That implementation order is based upon understanding of the various problems in the areas of our country. It is based upon proceeding as quickly as possible, however, with due consideration to the difficulties of the problems which are to be settled. It is a reasonable doctrine. It is an order based upon reason, knowledge, and understanding. Mr. President, if ever there was a time when every citizen of the United States needed to be guided by compassion, kindness, understanding, tolerance—yes—with love, it is now. Nothing could be worse for our Republic than to have a conflict between the races. Nothing could be worse than for North and South to become divided.

Let me say to our friends in the South, we in the North have problems that are difficult ones, too; and some of those problems relate, indeed, to discrimination. It is our duty—as has been said by others—to set those problems aright, to cure them, to correct them.

Mr. President, I am not here to admonish my colleagues. I am here to offer them the hand of friendship and of helpfulness. I only hope that the civic and political leaders throughout America will rally together to try to bring order, unity, and proper perspective to the solution of this grievous and difficult situation. Let us seek to comply with the law. Our duty is to lead toward fulfillment of the Court order.

Frankly, Mr. President, if ever there was a time when Senators and Members of the House of Representatives should be calling upon the people of their States to work together, to build together, to reason together, it is now. Once the Supreme Court has ruled, arguments over law will yield little or no results, except to arouse passions and encourage delay and obstruction.

The task is to plead for perservering patience to proceed to the fulfillment of human equality, to encourage compliance with the law. No man in his right mind wants violence or force. What we seek is orderly progress, systematic progress, in the spirit of friendship and helpfulness.

Mr. President, I know the thought has been expressed many times that some of us simply do not understand these problems. Perhaps we do not understand them in all their dimensions. But none of us is unmindful of their difficulty.

I have been pleased to see the great progress that was being made in the South toward equality amongst the peoples and the races. The Supreme Court decision should be a stimulant for further orderly progress. It requires that people of good will continue working together day after day. Mr. President, if Governors, Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives will take a stand for the fulfillment of equal rights under the law, progress will become orderly, steady, and certain. By holding back, we merely impede the fulfillment of what is inevitable, namely, the rule of law under the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution prescribes that there shall be no denial to citizens of the United States of equal privileges and rights under the law. This is the law. Our constitutional system is fixed, and can be changed only by alteration of the Constitution.

Therefore, Mr. President, my plea today is not one of resistance, nor is it one that those of us from other areas of the country move in pellmell, to try to aggravate or agitate. Mr. President, I will have no part in that. My plea is that those of us who work together in this Chamber day after day set the example for how people can work together in other parts of the United States. In the House of Representatives, men and women of different races, religions, and backgrounds work together day after day. If that can be done there, it can be done in every State, county, and every school district in America. It requires, however, that all citizens be treated and regarded as equals.

Mr. President, if we persist in the course of denying people in America equal rights, we shall bring down upon our Nation the wrath of the world. In this world there are more people who are non-Caucasian and more people who are colored than those who are white. Frankly, we are talking about a matter which goes to the safety and security of our Republic. No amount of atom bombs or thermonuclear weapons can prevent the forward movement of the people. The people throughout the world want equal justice under the law; they want recognition and equal status. They want to be God's people as just people.

If America ever hopes to give world leadership, we must set the pattern here in America. We have to set it unmistakably in a firm belief in humane quality and equal justice under the law.

This is the very heart and core of an effective foreign policy, Mr. President. No amount of appropriations, no amount of armaments, can be as important today as being right and being moral and being just. Citizenship in America must be first-class citizenship. There can be no second-class citizenship.

I plead with my colleagues that if we persist in antagonism and bitterness, or if we persist in trying to hold back the rule of law, we shall only persist in leading future generations to terrible catastrophe and conflict, not only in America, but throughout the world. Mr. President, this issue is far beyond the confines of our Republic.

Therefore, let us hope and pray that out of this body will come voices and out of the statehouses will come voices that will call upon the people as I have heard our majority leader do many times, in the words of Isaiah: "Come now, and let us reason together."

Mr. President, I add: Come, let us plan for forward progress together; come let us build together and live together. That is the only choice we have, Mr. President.

We cannot live apart. We must be as one.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I cannot help but think how we must look today to the world. We live in a world most of whose people are of a different color than white. What are they thinking when Members of the highest American parliamentary body announce themselves as against judicial decisions granting equality to colored people in America? How fares the Soviet Union in the propaganda war as a result of these developments?

This is such a grave crisis, Mr. President, that I believe the highest political authority in the land, meaning the President of the United States, must exercise some role in what is taking place.

I think the President should call a White House conference of all the Governors, Senators, and Representatives of the States in which the Supreme Court ruling is being defied. He should confront them firmly but considerately with the fact that the Nation now is faced with a choice between anarchy and the rule of law. If the Constitution can be flouted in one realm, what of all other realms?

In my opinion, the President of the United States must intrude into this situation his great influence and authority.

White House conferences have been called on matters of far less importance than the preservation of our country's prestige abroad and its unity and solidarity at home.

I should like to add one further comment. I have seen it reported in the press—I do not know whether the report is accurate—that the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the majority leader of the Senate, did not sign the document which has been read on the floor today. If that is true, Mr. President, it is one of the most courageous political acts of valor I have seen take place in my adult life.

It does not require any great amount of political courage for a person from the North—for example, from Oregon, New York, or Minnesota—to take the stand which has been taken on this floor by Senators from those States. But if the majority leader of the United States Senate did not sign the document which was read to the Senate, I think he deserves credit and commendation for a political act of the highest bravery and the highest courage.

THE SCHOOL MILK AND BRUCELLOSIS PROGRAMS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have the unhappy task of reporting to the Senate, and to the people of America, that congressional inaction is about to cripple two important programs: the special school milk program, for the health of our Nation's children; and the brucellosis eradication program, to complete the elimination of a dread disease from the dairy herds of the country.

It will be recalled that both the Senate and House have passed this legislation, H. R. 8320, in different version, earlier this year.

As yet, however—I am sad to report—the conferees have not even met to iron out the differences between the Senate and House bills, so that these programs—vital to the school children and the farmers of America—can continue uninterrupted, and at levels of peak effectiveness.

The conference committee's inaction to date is most regrettable, but it will, I trust, be remedied soon.

The proposed legislation authorizes supplemental funds to carry out vital programs, which—by fulfilling real, current needs—have expanded so rapidly that they require more money than was originally appropriated.

SPECIAL SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

The special school milk program, for example, increased almost 50 percent in the last 9½ months of 1955, bringing milk to over 16 million school children in more than 62,000 schools throughout America. Additional funds are urgently needed to avoid a slowdown in the distribution of milk to the schools.

Our whole Nation, of course, is deriving benefits from this program. The health of our school youngsters is vastly improved by the additional milk in their diet.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM DEPLETED SURPLUS STOCKPILES

In addition, the school milk program is a good, commonsense way to utilize our surplus milk—as well as other foods. As indicated by Senate votes on the farm bill last week, we have been attempting to resolve the problem of avoiding further surpluses and depleting our existing surplus stockpiles; for these are costly, and have adverse effects on farm prices.

There is no good reason why this legislation—which serves a two-fold purpose of getting rid of surpluses and improving the health of our children—should not be immediately expedited to fulfill an urgent need.

This legislation dovetails completely with the administration's current farm parity bill, on which we will complete action this week.

BRUCELLOSIS-ERADICATION PROGRAM VITAL TO FARMERS AND HEALTH OF NATION

The brucellosis-eradication program, too, is vital to the farmer, and to the welfare of the country. The completion of this fine effort to eradicate a dread disease from the dairying cattle of our Nation will not only eliminate a health hazard from all of us, but will free the farmers from a great economic loss resulting from the condemning of infected cattle in their herds.

ACTION, PLEASE

I cannot too greatly stress the need for action on these fine programs. I am informed that, unless funds are available by March 31—only 19 days away—the progress—resulting from years of work and expense—will be seriously impaired.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUDGET BEFORE THE ST. DAVID SOCIETY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD an address by Mr. Rowland R. Hughes, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, before the St. David's Society of the State of New York, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CITIZEN AND HIS GOVERNMENT

INTRODUCTION

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege and a pleasure to be with you tonight, and I am deeply appreciative of the action of the society in awarding the Hopkins medal to me. It is a most distinguished company of recipients whom I join, and I trust I may continue to prove worthy of the honor you have bestowed on me.

In a few weeks I shall be retiring as Director of the Bureau of the Budget after 3 years of service in Washington. In considering what I might say to you tonight I have thought back over those years, as well as earlier years of service as consultant to congressional committees in Washington. In such retrospection, it has been strikingly apparent to me how much our way of life—indeed, our very lives—may depend upon the response which we, as citizens, and through us our Government, may make to two of the great challenges of our time.

The role of Government

The first of the two challenges is a domestic one: Determination of the appropriate role of the Federal Government in our society. I am certain there is no disagreement with the fundamental American conviction that man was created to be free, that he can be trusted with freedom, and that governments have as a primary function the protection of that freedom and the defense of those things which insure personal dignity to the least of us and which permit each of us to believe himself important in the eyes of God. However, there have long been differing points of view as to the proper role of the Government in relation to this freedom. On the one hand we have the popular philosophy which calls for spirited Federal leadership in every area of our society. The contrary view holds that more limited government is the essence of our constitutional system.

Throughout our lifetimes, and those of our children and of our children's children, I venture to say, Americans will find themselves continually forced to choose between principal reliance on Government or principal reliance on individual initiative. The choices will arise in varied forms—perhaps with respect to tax rates or public works, perhaps with respect to Federal participation in education, labor relations, or medical affairs. In nearly all instances, however, we shall discover that an individual's answer will find its touchstone in one of these two broad philosophies of action, which tonight I would like to discuss in relation to our economy, to local government, and to our natural resources.

Economic policy

In opening these comments with a reference to the American economy, I find myself reminded of the character in David Copperfield named Mr. Dick, who passed most of his life in preparing a memorial address to the Lord Chancellor. He never finished the task, however, because he could not keep the head of King Charles I out of the memorial. Similarly, because I have devoted so much of my own life to economic matters, I must say I have them constantly in mind.

However, considering these contending philosophies as to the proper role of Government in relation to our economy, I am certain there is little question in anyone's mind as to the desirability of a strong and growing American economy, designed both to provide for our increasing population and to assure a higher standard of living for all. How this goal is to be achieved, however, has been the subject of virulent debate—which has been particularly apparent during our own lifetime.

We have had, on the one hand, the philosophy which favors direct Government intervention and, if need be, inflation constantly to spur increasing economic activity; which accepts increases in the price level as a necessary concomitant of higher wages; and which is not adverse to paying for all this through popular and appealing processes of adding to the national debt rather than collecting taxes. On the other hand, we have the school of thought which believes private initiative, rather than Government, should provide the basic stimulus for economic growth; which encourages stability in prices; and which rejects the opiate of passing today's bills on to succeeding generations to pay.

For 20 years beginning with 1933, in peace as in war, it was the policy of the Federal Government vigorously to project itself on the economic scene and to apply a forced draft to the economy, or, as it has been said, to encourage the country to run a slight fever as a means of staying well. During those two decades both our gross national product and our wage levels were substantially increased. In the same period, however, the national debt was increased almost tenfold and the value of the dollar was cut in half.

During the last 3 years we have seen the contrary philosophy in action, with the Government seeking to reduce its precedessor's emphasis on paternalism and pump-priming

and, instead, to lay stress on the resourcefulness of individual initiative and on fiscal stability. While emphasizing the steady growth of the economy, the Government has sought, by indirect, rather than direct means, to check the upward spiralling of prices, the swelling of the national debt, and the steady depreciation of the dollar. The overall result has been a stabilization of the cost of living and of the value of the dollar and, when coupled with the tax reductions in 1954, a very substantial increase in real wages.

Other actions during the past 3 years illustrative of this policy of reducing the impact of Government on our economy have included the removal of direct controls over prices and wages and the elimination of well over 250 Government commercial activities which could be better undertaken by private enterprise.

In reviewing the record of the last quarter of a century, therefore, I must say that I am personally convinced that we will progress fastest by relying on private initiative as the wellspring of economic development and a better life for all, and that, in encouraging economic growth, the Government should act on the basis of enabling private activity to expand and not on a basis of replacing private with public activity.

Lasting prosperity for our Nation as a whole would seem to depend far more on what individuals do for themselves than on what the Federal Government does, or can do, for them. Ten million centers of planning and decision, represented by our private businesses and farms, cannot help but contribute more energy, initiative, imagination, and creative force for economic growth than can a single center. The rate of our economic advance in the years ahead will depend largely on our ability as a people to preserve an environment that rewards individual initiative and encourages enterprise, innovation, and investment.

This point of view was extremely well expressed by President Eisenhower in his first budget message, when he said: "We are convinced that more progress and sounder progress will be made over the years as the largest possible share of our national income is left with individual citizens to make their own countless decisions as to what they will spend, what they will buy, and what they will save and invest. Government must play a vital role in maintaining economic growth and stability. But I believe that our development, since the early days of the Republic, has been based on the fact that we left a great share of our national income to be used by a provident people with a will to venture. Their actions have stimulated the American genius for creative initiative and thus multiplied our productivity."

Local government

A second broad area of concern to all of us must be the relationship between the Federal and other units of government. This, in turn, brings us to the problem of how much power should be concentrated in Washington. Some index of this problem is provided by the fact that in 1930 revenues and expenditures of all local governments were nearly three times those of the Federal Government. By 1953 the situation was precisely reversed; revenues and expenditures of the Federal Government were nearly three times those of all local governments.

Not long ago, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations completed a very thoughtful study of the evolution of the American Federal system and the appropriate roles of the National, State, and local governments—the first official effort to deal with these issues comprehensively since the Constitutional Convention of 1787. In developing its recommendations, the Commission was particularly conscious of the problem of undue reliance on the Federal Government. One warning in the Commission's fund report strikes me as remarkably cogent:

"If we are not willing," the Commission notes, "to leave some room for diversity of policy, to tolerate some lack of uniformity in standards, even in many matters which are of national concern, and about which we may feel strongly, the essence of federalism, even if not the legal fiction, will have been lost. We must also realize that it can be lost, or its vitality sapped, by nonuse of State and local initiative as well as by overuse of national authority. We have therefore as citizens a responsibility to see to it that those legitimate needs of society that could be met by timely State and local action do not by default have to be met by the National Government."

A further point of integral importance is the fact there are certain responsibilities, such as national security, which can be met only by the Federal Government. The larger the number of additional and subsidiary and transitory burdens we endeavor to shift from our States and cities onto Washington, the more difficult it becomes for the Federal Government to concentrate resources and efforts on those essential programs which only it can and must carry out.

My own conviction is that the interests of all our citizens are best advanced by encouraging State and local governments to strengthen themselves and thus keep as much government responsibility as possible in the States and communities, and that any national administration must have, as does the present one, a self-imposed caution against unnecessary and unwise interference in the private affairs of our people, of their communities, and of the several States.

Natural resources

Resource development is a third area in which, during our lifetime, we will continue to witness sharp divergences of opinion as to the appropriate role of the Federal Government. In the field of power, for example, the effect of the administration's current policies has been to reverse the Government's tendency during the past two decades to preempt strategic and important areas of opportunity for the eventual exclusive Federal development of power and other resources. Instead, we have sought to create a situation designed to encourage early action by local and private initiative.

The administration's position is based on the conclusion that resource development is the responsibility of everyone. In many cases, State, local, and private groups can best carry out needed programs. In other cases, Federal participation is the necessary element in accomplishing broad national aims, where projects are beyond the means or needs of local groups.

In the field of public works, this philosophy has come to be known as the partnership principle. The policy does not rule out Federal assistance, but it is grounded in the belief that to the greatest possible extent the responsibility for developmental projects should be borne by those who receive their benefits. Overall, this approach serves to multiply the effect of Federal expenditures in the stimulation of conservation and development. Furthermore, in all cases where the partnership principle applies there is automatically acquired a concern for economy and efficiency that is often lacking where no local contribution is required.

I could multiply these illustrations manyfold, but I am certain that my point is quite clear: That almost anywhere we turn in respect to our Government's domestic policies we shall find that over the years the ultimate decisions will be made by reference to one or the other of these two philosophies: basic reliance on the Federal Government or basic reliance on private and local initiative. For myself, insofar as this challenge as to the wisest method of conducting our domestic affairs is concerned, I have been convinced that the sheet anchor of the Republic should and must be the policy so well expressed by President Lincoln, who concluded that the legitimate object of Government is to do for a community of people what they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well; but that in all a people can individually do so well for themselves, Government ought not to interfere.

Safeguarded disarmament

The second of the 2 challenges of which I wish to speak tonight is an international one. It is not quite a decade and a half since Hitler and his totalitarian associates plunged us into a world war of unprecedented scope and violence. In that war, extending over 2 great oceans and their farthest shores, we and our allies achieved a tremendous victory. But the peace we sought has continued to elude us. The forces of communism, no less totalitarian than those of Hitler, ranged themselves against the free nations of the world. One country after another was swept into the Communist orbit, and today we face the continued threat of the Soviet conspiracy to dominate Europe and Asia. Opposed to us, cold and forbidding, is an ideological front which marshals every weapon in the arsenal of dictatorship.

How the relationship between the two great power systems will develop—the Iron Curtain countries on the one hand and the free nations of the world on the other—is undoubtedly the central issue of our times. The problem has been infinitely complicated in the last decade by the discovery of the awesome power of nuclear weapons, power such that today we are told that a single aircraft with a three-man crew can carry as much destructive energy as all the aircraft of all the nations of the world during the whole of World War II.

Today, no nation or individual can have assurance of absolute security, when for the first time in history weapons exist which are capable of destroying all mankind. As the fearful realities of modern warfare are recognized, we have become grimly aware that in a wide-scale war of the future the victor and the vanquished would be scarcely distinguishable victims of devastation on a scale never before witnessed or suffered by man.

Such, then, is the awful arithmetic of the atomic bomb that we know mankind must take every feasible step to avoid the valley of the shadow of nuclear death, since an arms race, pursued to the ultimate, could be practically race suicide. Here is the basis for the President's emphasis on safeguarded disarmament, designed to reduce bitter tensions and their resultant arms burden, to lift from the world its shroud of fear, and eventually to maximize availability for peaceful purposes of the infinite promise of the atom. Our country's purpose, he has said, is to "move out of the dark chamber of horrors into the light, to find a way by which the minds of men, the hopes of men, the souls of men everywhere, can move forward toward peace and happiness and well-being."

After reviewing the whole scope of all wars in history and all the attempts to limit war and what happened under them, we must recognize that there is no indication from any of the studies which have been made that any single mechanical formula has yet been found which automatically can guarantee a permanent peace.

On the one hand, all the lessons of history tell us that a long-sustained competitive buildup of armaments, or an anxious arms race, carry within themselves the dangers of war. On the other hand, we are equally aware that if one nation lets down its guard it invites aggression from a powerfully armed adversary. Unilateral disarmament on our

part would be foolhardy. Disarmament, if it is possible at all, must be a joint matter.

Although the United States has always disavowed the classical arms race as a basis of national policy, we are determined to maintain and, if necessary, increase our armed strength for as long a period as is necessary to safeguard peace and to maintain our security. But we know that a mutually dependable system for reduced armaments on the part of all nations, which would also provide protection against a surprise attack, would be a better way to safeguard peace and to maintain our security.

It would ease the fears of war in the anxious hearts of people everywhere. It would lighten the burdens on their backs. And it would make it possible for every nation, great and small, to advance the standards of living of its people. The Government is, therefore, determined to continue to make a dedicated attempt in the coming months to evolve a sound and safeguarded agreement for the future limitation of armaments in the interest of a just, durable, and secure peace for America and for the world.

The importance of a sound agreement cannot be overemphasized. All of our lessons show that an agreement that is not thoroughly supported by effective reciprocal inspection is worse than no agreement at all. Without thorough inspection and reporting, doubts and suspicions, rumors, charges and counter-charges arise, and soon the agreement itself becomes a source of discord and danger of war rather than an aid to peace. The agreement must be sound. It must be the kind of agreement in which the inspection itself can be trusted and not a matter of a word or treaty between nations.

In our own history, for example, the Rush-Bagot agreement between Great Britain and the United States after the War of 1812 was a conspicuous example of success in this field. In that agreement, in 1817, Great Britain and the United States agreed that each would keep just three war vessels on the Great Lakes and that the vessels would have certain limited characteristics. Each side could see visibly that the other was fulfilling the agreement.

Here was an agreement that was effective, and that agreement in 1817 proved the forerunner of our peaceful unarmed border with Canada, which for well over a century has been of such great benefit to both our countries.

As we are able to move from the crisis atmosphere of the past years we look forward to a time when it will be possible for the world as a whole to channel a much greater proportion of its resources into improvement of national living standards rather than into machines and devices for protection and destruction. Should we be successful in achieving a workable and mutually agreeable reduction in armaments, we will be enabled progressively to place more emphasis on programs such as "Atoms for Peace" designed, by calling on the constructive energy of the atom, to lift mankind to higher levels of well-being. We must reject the concept that mankind's greatest scientific achievement should be used primarily as a weapon. Our atomic hopes must be commensurate with the awful dimensions of our atomic fears. We must be determined, as the President has said, "to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death but consecrated to his life."

Here, to my mind, in our endeavors to persuade the nations of the world to join with us to achieve safeguarded disarmament and to turn the use of the atom to peaceful purposes, lies the great international challenge of our times, perhaps the last, best hope of earth. We must remain strong, both as a guaranty for our own security and as a deterrent to war. But the sum of our international effort, I am convinced, must be the waging of peace with as much resourcefulness, with as great a sense of dedication and urgency as we have ever mustered in defense of our country in time of war.

We have to find somehow the inspiration of new ideas, new approaches such as were exemplified by the program suggested by the President at Geneva. We must not forget to pray. There is no question about continuing to maintain at this stage of world affairs a suitably powerful posture of defense, but remembering that it needs to be based on the spiritual and moral strength of a nation of free people. With it we shall need to maintain an unswerving confidence and trust in the support of a higher power which has been a source of strength to our Nation in difficult times in the past and which can open our thought to new faith and inspiration and to the new ideas and new approaches we must find.

Conclusion

I have directed my remarks to these two great problems—1 domestic and 1 international—because of what appears to me to be their almost transcendental importance to each one of us. The actions of the American Government reflect the mood of the American people; the extent to which the Government can take vigorous and lasting actions is largely dependent upon a ground swell of public opinion which cannot be mistaken or denied. To the extent that any of us fail to clarify and express our judgments on these two great issues, to that extent will we fail to participate in decisions which will have the most profound effect on each of our lives.

Indeed, decisions reached with respect to the proper role of government in our society will determine how each of us will live; decisions reached with respect to disarmament and the atom could some day determine whether each of us will live or die.

ASSISTANCE TO THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I prepared pointing out a specific example of what can be done to assist the physically handicapped to become self-supporting members of the community.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a member of the Senate Small Business Committee, it is gratifying for me to be able to pay tribute to the sagacity, foresight, and humanitarianism of the Bendix Aviation Corp. assisting the physically handicapped. This company, within a relatively short period of time has awarded $1,350,000 of subcontract work to a small organization which possessed no prior manufacturing experience in any industrial sphere. As if this fact, in itself, were not sufficiently significant, the contracts awarded by the Bendix Corp. require the manufacture of exceedingly complex, synchronous motor components used in radar, aircraft instruments, and in other electronic circuitry where the most exacting control of elctrical impulse and power supply is required. Permit me to relate the highly unusual and most inspiring story of the manner in which a large corporation created a small electronics manufacturing plant within the organizational framework of a rehabilitation agency.

The Federation of the Handicapped at 211 West 14th Street, New York City, is a nonprofit social welfare organization created for the purpose of aiding and rehabilitating physically handicapped individuals. This organization contacted the Bendix Aviation Corp. to solicit subcontract work which would permit them to employ and train disabled people for job placement in regular industry. The Bendix Corp. was advised by the Federation that it could offer adequate manufacturing space, although this consisted solely of four walls and bare floor. It possessed a meager amount of working capital which could be utilized for a manufacturing project and it could provide a hitherto unused source of manpower composed of physically disabled individuals endowed with enthusiasm, tenacity of purpose, and the ability to work diligently, but who lacked the skills, knowledge, and judgment which can come only with experience.

Because the federation lacked equipment, experience, adequate working capital, and the essential engineering and manufacturing knowledge, the awarding of a subcontract by Bendix to this organization presented what seemed to be a group of insurmountable problems. Under ordinary circumstances the perplexity of such a situation would prompt any concern to withhold any offer of subcontract work. The Bendix Aviation Corp., however, expended considerable time and effort in order to devise a plan by means of which the Federation of the Handicapped could be provided with an opportunity to obtain the subcontractual business it was seeking. The Federation of the Handicapped was notified by Bendix that it would be provided with an opportunity to obtain subcontract work from Bendix—but, because of the complexity of the type of work to be subcontracted, it would be necessary for Bendix to provide engineering and manufacturing "know-how," and, on a loan basis, certain types of equipment, tooling, and all required raw materials. The federation gratefully accepted this most unusual opportunity and a team of Bendix personnel immediately undertook the task of providing all that was needed to create a small manufacturing unit capable of producing intricate, component parts under close competent supervision.

The skeleton plant in 60 days delivered the first shipment of finished parts to the Bendix Corp. Bendix purchased, on a subcontract basis, each of these components at a cost which was identical to Bendix' own cost of manufacture. This made it possible for the federation to establish the same job standards and rates of bonus compensation as those utilized by Bendix for its own employees.

Through the close cooperation and masterful guidance of Bendix personnel the federation workers as a group, were able to rapidly accelerate their production rate and were able as individuals to acquire new skills, financial independence, necessary experience, and considerable engineering and manufacturing comprehension. The quality and quantity of the work produced by the federation workers and their ability to meet delivery schedules induced Bendix to increase substantially the volume of subcontract work. This, in turn, permitted rapid expansion within the small electronics plant that Bendix created. The original barren room has become a two-story, manufacturing plant accommodating a maze of complicated electronic equipment, 80 percent of which is now owned by the federation itself. Thousands of component parts are currently being produced and shipped each week by a staff of 135 physically handicapped employees who have now become taxpayers—not tax consumers.

The contracts awarded by Bendix and the income realized from them has meant a great deal to the federation in terms of helping the disabled to help themselves. A considerable number of physically handicapped individuals have received job training and job experience and have not only learned how to perform a skilled task under standard working conditions but have been able to obtain positions in regular industry. Hundreds of other physically handicapped

men and women have received the benefits to be derived from medical treatment, psychological therapy and professional counseling.

It is a tribute to both the Bendix Aviation Corp. and the Federation electronics plant which it developed, that the latter is now capable of completely financing and managing its own operation and can successfully compete against other Bendix subcontractors for Bendix subcontract work. Outstanding among my experiences is this particular case history of what can be done to assist our physically handicapped to become self-supporting members of the community. I trust that many of us will follow this example thus making a great contribution to the welfare of our country.

THE REFUGEE RELIEF PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we have just had transmitted to Congress the semiannual report on the refugee relief program. On page 13 of that report is found the following sentence:

At the same time, the present imbalance of sponsors and applicants in certain categories and for certain areas of operation may cause 40,000 to 50,000 visas to go unused under the Refugee Relief Act.

This is not news. We have known for some time that the way in which the program was being administered would mean that it would fall far short of its goal. The first official admission of this came from the Director of the refugee relief program, Pierce J. Gerety, who said at the beginning of the year that about 44,000 refugees will be denied admission as a result of the administration's failure to carry out the program properly.

Many of us have been warning for some time that this would happen. Actually, the Refugee Relief Act never was a workable instrument for achieving the humanitarian purposes intended by this program. But, in addition, there has been indication in the way this program has been administered of a reluctance on the part of those charged with its administration to make it work.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. President, I would like to have appear an article from the New York Times of March 7, 1956, headlined "Refugees in United States Far Below Goal" and an editorial from the New York Times of March 8, 1956, titled "Refugee Program."

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 7, 1956]

REFUGEES IN UNITED STATES FAR BELOW GOAL—ONLY 68,000 OF AUTHORIZED 3-YEAR TOTAL OF 209,000 HAD BEEN SETTLED FEBRUARY 1

WASHINGTON, March 6.—Despite significant progress since mid-1955, the State Department reported today that the Refugee Relief Act was likely to fall considerably short of providing a haven for 209,000 immigrants as authorized by Congress.

As the second year of the 3-year program ended on December 31, 73,331 visas had been issued and 77,193 applications were still under consideration.

Since then, an additional 13,000 visas have been issued. About 68,000 refugees, including those who had escaped or been expelled, their relatives and orphans, actually had been admitted as of February 1.

The status of the program was reviewed by Pierce J. Gerety, Deputy Administrator, in his semiannual report to Congress.

Mr. Gerety said 49 percent of the entire 2-year total of 73,331 visas was issued in the last 6 months of 1955. He called this an encouraging stepup but added:

"It is evident that under existing circumstances and barring unforeseen changes, considerably less than the authorized 209,000 nonquota immigration visas will be issued by the termination of the refugee relief program on December 31, 1956."

He listed a shortage of United States sponsors as one of the greatest obstacles to success of the undertaking. He estimated that sponsors for 55,000 applicants would have to be obtained by July or August if the 209,000 authorizations were to be filled.

The 1953 act requires sponsor assurances of housing, support and employment for eligible applicants. President Eisenhower has urged Congress to relax that requirement, among others, to facilitate administration of the program.

Mr. Gerety said sponsors were needed for regugees in Germany, Austria, and the Netherlands, non-Asians stranded in the Far East and orphans. Assurances to cover as many as 39,500 applicants may be needed if the 90,000 German-Austrian allocations is to be filled, he reported.

On the other hand, he said, all the 60,000 visas authorized for refugees and relatives of United States citizens in Italy and Greece will have been issued well before the program's termination. No new Italian and Greek applications of refugees and relatives are being accepted.

Despite a pressing over-population problem, "hundreds of hopeful visa aspirants in Italy will be disappointed because the demand for visas has greatly exceeded the supply," Mr. Gerety said.

Mr. Gerety said Communist propagandists since last spring had "kept up a constant barrage to entice refugees and those who had escaped to return to their former homelands.

"Thus far the campaign has not been particularly successful" he commented. "A certain amount of redefection has taken place among the thousands of refugees from Eastern Europe but not in alarming numbers despite glowing promises."

Some of these, he added, have applied for admission to the United States under the Refugee Relief Act. Mr. Gerety said the campaign extended to persons who had arrived in this and other countries of the free world under emergency migration programs.

"Most of these persons who have fled from their countries of origin are bitter anti-Communists," he asserted, "and fully aware of the tragic situation in their homelands.

"However, many are discouraged and dissatisfied because of long delays in resettlement and may be unable to continue to resist pressures applied by the Communists."

[From the New York Times of March 8, 1856]

REFUGEE PROGRAM

The latest official report on the operations of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 confirms what has been evident for many months, namely, that there is almost no possibility that it will achieve its alleged goal of admitting 209,000 nonquota immigrants to the United States by the end of this year.

Indeed, 2 months ago we noted on this page that the question was no longer whether the act would be fully effective, but rather by how much it would fail. Statements of both Scott McLeod, administrator of the law, and his deputy, Pierce J. Gerety, indicate that the deficiency will be in the neighborhood of 20 percent, quite a percentage considering that the period of operation covers the better part of 3 years. Only 68,000 refugees, most of them relatives of American citizens rather than refugees in the strict sense, had been admitted under this law as of February 1, and to date visas have been issued for some 18,000 additional individuals.

The program has been speeded up, but speed is relative. The fact is that during the first year or so of the law's operation it was bogged down so badly that it had become hardly better than a cruel delusion for thousands upon thousands of genuine refugees, many of them victims of Communist persecution, patiently waiting for admission to the United States. Much of the fault lay, and still lies, in the law itself. Congressional enemies of real relief legislation wrote into this law such difficult and complex requirements as to make it almost the despair of those who wanted to continue the American tradition of extending a helping hand to our friends abroad.

But full of road blocks as the law may be, its early administration only made matters worse, whether because of lack of sympathy with the professed purposes of the law, fear of the extreme anti-immigration bloc in Congress, ineptness or some other reason. Most nongovernmental experts seem to agree with the criticisms of the administration of the act as expressed in a letter on this page yesterday from the executive director of one of the voluntary agencies concerned with refugee resettlement in the United States. There is little doubt that the situation has improved in recent months, but the improvement has probably come too late to redeem the program as a humanitarian gesture of first-rate importance in the eyes of the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, time is running out. We cannot allow this humanitarian program to fall so far short of its purpose that more than one-fifth of the visas authorized are wasted. Much needs to be done by Congress to improve the act in a legislative way. Legislation is pending in the appropriate committees to make these changes. We should certainly do our part. We should take action as soon as possible to make those changes which experience has proved to be necessary to make the Refugee Relief Act workable.

But something more immediate can be done and needs to be done. The President of the United States has it within his power to act now to prevent the refugee relief program from suffering a disastrous failure. What is needed now is leadership, rather than pious messages and good hope. I suggest that if this administration is not to stand charged with having deliberately failed in achieving the goal of the Refugee Relief Act, President Eisenhower must take those measures necessary to expedite the program.

The President of the United States and the Secretary of State have it within their power, now, administratively, to make changes that will eliminate some of the handicaps under which this program is laboring. I do not say this solely on my own authority. This is the considered judgment of a number of church and civic groups that have been working in face of serious obstacles in an attempt to make the refugee relief program work.

These groups joined in a plea to the President recently to take the administrative action necessary so that the full goals of the program may be achieved. There are probably no people who have a better acquaintance with the way this program has been functioning and the way in which it is being administered than those who have made these recommendations to President Eisenhower.

They have worked patiently in close cooperation with the refugee relief administrators in an attempt to help as many people as possible to come to the United States under this program. They have spent large amounts of their own funds and labored long and hard in an effort to make this program work. They have been up against not only the many unworkable provisions of the act itself but also up against the apparent lack of will on the part of the administration to make this program a success. That is my own charge, Mr. President. I do not speak for these groups.

Let me cite to the Senate two of the administrative changes that are immediately needed if the issuance of visas is to be expedited. These administrative changes are recommended in a letter to the President from members of the committee on the refugee relief program of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service. The letter was sent to President Eisenhower on February 16. I would just like to list here the groups signing this letter to make it clear that the recommendations come from organizations with close experience in the way the refugee relief program has been functioning. Signers include: American Federation of International Institutes, Inc., American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc., Catholic Relief Services-National Catholic Welfare Conference, Inc., Church World Service, Inc., International Rescue Committee, Inc., International Social Service, Inc., Lutheran Refugee Service, Tolstoy Foundation, Inc., United Friends of Needy and Displaced People of Yugoslavia, Inc., United Hias Service, Inc., United Ukrainian American Relief Committee, Inc.

In their letter to President Eisenhower these groups said:

May we respectfully call to your attention the present situation with reference to the refugee relief program? The present rate of security clearance and of visa issuance in some countries is not now sufficient to complete the processing of the registered applicants who now have assurances nor of those applicants who, we believe, will receive assurances through our agencies during 1956. In Germany, for example, the visa rate of 265 vias per week for the last 10 weeks needs to be increased immediately to more than 373 visas per week through December 31, 1956, to cover all refugees now in processing.

Among the proposals submitted to the President by these groups were the following:

First. Concerning the transportation of refugees: Under the Refugee Relief Act the Secretary of State is authorized to make arrangements for transporting refugees to this country by ship or plane. This has been done in Europe, but similar provisions have not been made for refugees coming from the Near and Far East. Let me read the recommendation of the committee on the refugee relief program of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service:

The same provisions for ocean transportation which have been made for refugees from Europe should also be made available to refugees, including orphans, from the Near and Far East. In the absence of such provision there is serious discrimination against such persons, causing difficult problems for agencies and sponsors of persons already visaed but for whom no Refugee Relief Act transportation arrangements are available. Fortunately, the law authorized the Secretary of State to make such arrangements (see sec. 8). The estimates of the number of persons who may need such transportation have been in the Department of State since August. The number of visa-ready cases awaiting the transportation arrangements as authorized in section 8 is growing daily; at this moment at least 125 orphans are in this most unfortunate position. We hope this increasingly urgent matter can be arranged without further delay. Several Government agencies have funds and interests which surely can be associated under the specific authorization given the Secretary of State. Transportation provisions for all persons qualifying under the Refugee Relief Act should and can be made uniform under section 8 of Public Law 203.

Here is one way in which the President and the Secretary of State could act, now, without any need for legislative changes, to expedite the flow of refugees to this country under the refugee relief program.

Second. Concerning the security measures that have been taken under the Refugee Relief Act, the Committee on the Refugee Relief program made two recommendations to President Eisenhower. The first one is as follows:

About section 11 (a) of Public Law 203:

This section requires that for all applicants there be thorough investigations and written reports prepared by such investigative agency or agencies of the United States as the President designates, regarding such persons' character, reputation, mental and physical health, history and eligibility under this act, and that such investigations in each case shall be conducted in a manner and in such time as the investigative agency or agencies shall determine to be necessary. The President has designated the Department of State as the agency of the Government which shall make the investigations and written reports in cooperation with the Department of the Army and any other agencies of the Government which the Department of State may request. We believe that the Administrator of the program has it within his authority, according to the wording of section 11 (a), to conduct these operations in a less cumbersome manner and in a much shorter time. As a matter of fact, in keeping with our recommendations on legislative amendments, we feel that these requirements, which are over and beyond the security and investigating requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act, are not necessary.

Third. The other security recommendation made to the President concerned section 11 (d) of Public Law 203:

This section of the law calls for complete information regarding the history of applicants covering a period of at least 2 years immediately preceding their application for a visa. This section has worked a great hardship on the more recent escapees who have not been out from behind the Iron Curtain for 2 years. In such cases the Department of State has indicated that it is difficult to obtain the 2-year histories and it is attempting to reconstruct them. The latest report on completion of such reconstructed histories, however, is discouraging and indicates that out of a total of over 900 such cases in the processing pipeline, only 68 have completed security clearance. We believe that the Administrator has the authority to overcome this problem, on the basis of the clause in the section which reads: *"Provided*, That this provision may be waived on the recommendation of the Secretaries of State and Defense when determined by them to be in the national interest." We, therefore, recommend that a procedure be initiated whereby the right to waive this requirement is utilized.

It is not here suggested—nor would I suggest—that there should not be proper security procedures followed before permitting entrance of any person into the United States. The fact is, however, that applicants seeking admission under the Refugee Relief Act are already subject to the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. I do not believe that there is anyone who would contend that the McCarran-Walter Act does not contain adequate provision for screening out any immigrant who might pose a threat as a subversive to this country. What has happened in the case of the Refugee Relief Act is that a whole additional apparatus of security trappings has been erected on top of the already adequate provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Those who have worked closely with this program know that the administration of its security procedures has raised one of the greatest obstacles to expediting the processing of applications for admission under the refugee-relief program.

The voluntary agencies most familiar with this program have indicated in their letter to the President the way in which this obstacle can, in part, be overcome by administrative changes. I think the President and Secretary of State should act immediately to accomplish these changes so that no additional time is lost in stepping up the number of applications processed between now and December 31.

Mr. President, there are a number of proposals for legislative changes urgently needed contained in the letter to the President from the committee on refugee-relief program of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service. I believe that they will be called to the attention of the appropriate committees of both Houses. However, as they are worthy of the consideration of all my colleagues, I would like to have appear at this point in my remarks both the letter to President Eisenhower and the accompanying statement entitled "Some Proposals by American Voluntary Agencies to the President of the United States for Facilitating the Refugee Relief Program."

The letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 16, 1956.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: As national voluntary agencies accredited by the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act who represent a large segment of the American population concerned with the implementation of the refugee relief program, we wish to thank you for your repeatedly expressed interest in this program and to solicit your further help in making it fully effective. We look upon the program as a desirable expression of our American foreign policy and of our humanitarian desire to assist the homeless and oppressed, and believe it is to the best interest of our country as well as to the best interests of the home-

less of the world that the terms of the act be fulfilled.

May we respectfully call to your attention the present situation with reference to the refugee relief program? The present rate of security clearance and of visa issuance in some countries is not now sufficient to complete the processing of the registered applicants who now have assurances nor of those applicants who, we believe, will receive assurances through our agencies during 1956. In Germany, for example, the visa rate of 265 visas per week for the last 10 weeks needs to be increased immediately to more than 373 visas per week through December 31, 1956, to cover all refugees now in processing. Also actual experience over the past 2½ years now clearly indicates that changes in some of the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act would be beneficial in carrying out the true intent of this legislation.

Therefore we are submitting in the attached statement some proposals which, in our judgment, merit your consideration. We hope that through administrative clarification and acceleration of the refugee relief program where it now lags and through your recommending as necessary to the leaders of both parties in Congress certain reasonable amendments, that the Refugee Relief Act can be fully implemented and its important objectives made possible.

To support you in this humanitarian task we are sending copies of this letter and statement to many of the leaders in both Houses of Congress.

Respectfully yours.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,
Chairman, Committee on Refugee Relief Program.

(Members of the committee on refugee relief program of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service: American Federation of International Institutes, Inc.; American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc.; Catholic Relief Services-National Catholic Welfare Conference, Inc.; Church World Service, Inc.; International Rescue Committee, Inc.; International Social Service, Inc.; Lutheran Refugee Service; Tolstoy Foundation, Inc.; United Friends of Needy and Displaced People of Yugoslavia, Inc.; United Hias Service, Inc.; United Ukrainian American Relief Committee, Inc.)

SOME PROPOSALS BY AMERICAN VOLUNTARY AGENCIES TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR FACILITATING THE REFUGEE RELIEF PROGRAM

I. LEGISLATIVE CHANGES URGENTLY NEEDED

1. Redefinition of the terms "refugee," "escapee," and "expellee"

The present definitions require that an escapee or German expellee in order to qualify must not be "firmly resettled," must be "out of his usual place of abode," and must be in "urgent need of assistance for the essentials of life and transportation." These phrases have been difficult to interpret: Even with administrative clarification and relaxation of the meanings of the term, they have resulted in the exclusion of large numbers of deserving refugees, particularly those who through diligence and hard work have made themselves economically independent in their present places of asylum even though they have never intended to remain permanently in such places. To overcome these difficulties, we recommend that the term "refugee" should apply to the Italian, Greek, and Dutch groups, and the term "escapee" and "expellee" should be redefined to read "any person" instead of "any refugee."

2. Provision for escapees in additional areas

We recommend that the areas to which special nonquota visa numbers for escapees are available be expanded to include Spain, North Africa, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Kuwait, and Jordan. Under the present provisions of the law, only those escapees residing in NATO countries, Turkey, Sweden, Iran, or Trieste are presently eligible. The additional number of escapees who would be eligible under the proposed amendment is small, but they are in great need and are as deserving as those presently covered.

3. Security and other investigations

Section 15 of the Refugee Relief Act, as amended, reads as follows: "Except as otherwise expressly provided by this act, all of the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163) shall be applicable under this act." In other words, each applicant for a special nonquota visa under the Refugee Relief Act is subject to the same security and other investigations as applicants for regular quota visas under the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

We believe that in view of the above, sections 11 (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of the Refugee Relief Act, as amended, are unnecessary and impose time-consuming and costly blocks to the expeditious processing of applicants and should, therefore, be eliminated.

4. Certificate of readmission

Although the majority of applicants for special nonquota visas under the Refugee Relief Act, as amended, are able to obtain certificates of readmission as required by section 7 (d) (2) of the act, nevertheless a small number of otherwise qualified applicants for purely technical reasons are not able to obtain these certificates. Therefore, we recommend that the Secretary of State be authorized to waive this requirement in cases where it is the only bar to the admission of persons otherwise eligible under the Refugee Relief Act.

5. Utilization of unused visas

Developments since the enactment of Public Law 203 indicate that the visa allotments for expellees and escapees in Germany and Austria are greater than will be required by the number of probably eligible applicants. Also the allocations for the probably eligible applicants in Greece, Italy, the Far East, and NATO countries are considerably less than the number of applicants. Therefore, it is recommended that the Administrator be authorized to reallocate surplus quotas to other categories where they are needed, after making proper provisions to safeguard the visas actually needed for eligible applicants from Germany, Austria, and the Netherlands. For practical purposes it is recommended that a partial reallocation of 30,000 be made immediately and that further allocations be made if the program warrants in the interest of the effectiveness of the act.

To insure the fullest utilization of visas unused by applicants in process as of December 31, 1956, and by beneficiaries of assurances received by the Department of State on or before December 31, 1956, and also for the benefit of orphan applicants, we recommend that the termination date of the Refugee Relief Act be extended by 6 months or as much as a year if, in the judgment of the Secretary of State, this extension is required.

In relation to the availability of quota numbers, we also wish to call attention to the fact that there is no provision in the law as written or in the proposed amendments, for taking care of escapees from behind the Iron Curtain who will have fled after December 31, 1956. We would suggest that provision be made in the basic immigration law to take care of these people.

6. Orphans

The 10-year age limit for orphans should be increased to 14 for a principal applicant coming to the United States for adoption by a United States citizen and spouse, and special provision should be made for the admission of siblings of such principal applicant up to the age of 16. The number of admissions under this special section should be increased by 1,000.

7. Admission of persons having tuberculosis to provide for reunion of refugee families

In view of the great desirability of maintaining or restoring family unity, it is recommended that under proper safeguards for care and medical treatment after arrival in the United States members of family groups who are excludable because of tuberculosis in any form but who otherwise qualify under the Refugee Relief Act be allowed to accompany or follow their families to the United States.

8. Adjustment of status

The words "lawfully entered" should be deleted under section 6 of Public Law 203, as amended. The requirement that the quota to which the alien is charged be oversubscribed should also be eliminated. The Secretary of State should be authorized to increase the number of aliens whose status can be readjusted under the provisions of this act if additional numbers are needed.

9. United States and the hard core

As an additional factor in resolving the refugee problems, we wish to bring to your attention the urgent need of some new provision for those among the refugees who are the so-called hard core—those thousands for whom no employment-centered resettlement is possible. These are the aged, the infirm, the amputees, the blind, and others for whom humanitarian care is the only answer. Through the United Nations Office of High Commissioner for Refugees and the United States escapee program, our Government is helping to provide for these people today. France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland are offering generous opportunities for some of them and for their families. It is our hope that Congress will make provision whereby a Government-sponsored plan can be achieved to bring 1,000 such persons to this country for permanent care in their declining years. In such a plan provision should be made whereby the families of these hard-core groups, voluntary agencies, and State or private institutions can work together with the Government in assisting these people. Refugees may make good labor, good citizens, good Americans. Also, they may be hard core. We believe we in the United States of America should help on this problem not by money only, but by offering homes in our own country to a fair share of the victims of oppression.

10. Mortgaging of quotas

Because of its value in the future, particularly for persons fleeing from Iron Curtain countries, we favor the cancellation of mortgages on quotas which became effective as a result of sections 3 (c) and 4 (a) of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, and the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 201 (e) (2).

II. ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES IMMEDIATELY NEEDED

It is believed that the following administrative changes in implementation of the Refugee Relief Act would greatly expedite the present operation of the program:

1. Transportation: A refugee relief program responsibility

The same provisions for ocean transportation which have been made for refugees from Europe should also be made available to refugees, including orphans, from the Near and Far East. In the absence of such provision there is serious discrimination against such persons, causing difficult problems for agencies and sponsors of persons already visaed but for whom no Refugee Relief Act transportation arrangements are available. Fortunately, the law authorized

the Secretary of State to make such arrangements (see sec. 8). The estimates of the number of persons who may need such transportation have been in the Department of State since August. The number of visa-ready cases awaiting the transportation arrangements as authorized in section 8 is growing daily; at this moment at least 125 orphans are in this most unfortunate position. We hope this increasingly urgent matter can be arranged without further delay. Several Government agencies have funds and interests which surely can be associated under the specific authorization given the Secretary of State. Transportation provisions for all persons qualifying under the Refugee Relief Act should and can be made uniform under section 8 of Public Law 203.

2. Section 11 (a)

This section requires that for all applicants there be thorough investigations and written reports prepared by such investigative agency or agencies of the United States as the President designates, regarding such persons' character, reputation, mental, and physical health, history and eligibility under this act, and that such investigations in each case shall be conducted in a manner and in such time as the investigative agency or agencies shall determine to be necessary. The President has designated the Department of State as the agency of the Government which shall make the investigations and written reports in cooperation with the Department of the Army and any other agencies of the Government which the Department of State may request.

We believe that the Administrator of the program has it within his authority, according to the wording of section 11 (a), to conduct these operations in a less cumbersome manner and in a much shorter time. As a matter of fact, in keeping with our recommendations on legislative amendments, we feel that these requirements, which are over and beyond the security and investigating requirement of the Immigration and Nationality Act, are not necessary.

3. Section 11 (d)

This section of the law calls for complete information regarding the history of applicants covering a period of at least 2 years immediately preceding their application for a visa. This section has worked a great hardship on the more recent escapees who have not been out from behind the Iron Curtain for 2 years. In such cases the Department of State has indicated that it is difficult to obtain the 2-year histories and it is attempting to reconstruct them. The latest report on completion of such reconstructed histories, however, is discouraging and indicates that out of a total of over 900 such cases in the processing pipeline, only 68 have completed security clearance.

We believe that the Administrator has the authority to overcome this problem, on the basis of a clause in the section which reads: "Provided, That this provision may be waived on the recommendation of the Secretaries of State and Defense when determined by them to be in the national interest." We therefore recommend that a procedure be initiated whereby the right to waive this requirement is utilized.

COMMITTEE ON REFUGEE RELIEF PROGRAM, AMERICAN COUNCIL OF VOLUNTARY AGENCIES FOR FOREIGN SERVICE, INC.
FEBRUARY 16, 1956.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier, on January 24, similar recommendations were made to the Deputy Administrator of the refugee relief program, Mr. Pierce Gerety. Mr. Roland Elliott, director of immigration services for the Church World Service of the National Council of Churches of Christ, sent a letter to Mr. Gerety proposing both administrative changes as well as certain simple legislative changes. I understand that the more than 30 Protestant and Eastern Orthodox churches which make up this organization are spending over a half-million dollars a year on the refugee program. Mr. Elliott, as director of immigration services for the National Council of Churches has staff members throughout the world in countries in which the refugee relief program is operating. He is, therefore, in close and constant touch with the way in which the program is being administered, not only here in Washington, but in those countries in which refugees are being processed. Mr. Elliott also wrote to Mr. Gerety as a member of the advisory group to the refugee relief program. I believe his recommendations on the changes that are needed in the program deserve our closest attention. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter from Mr. Elliott to Mr. Gerety of January 20, 1956.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 20, 1956.

The Honorable PIERCE J. GERETY,
Deputy Administrator, Refugee Relief Program, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PIERCE: I am glad to act on your suggestion, following the advisory group meeting on Monday, that I put in writing my suggestions for improving the refugee relief program both administratively and by legislation.

I do this at once because of your announcement of your plan to leave shortly for the Far East and since, before you leave, you naturally will want to initiate some of the crucial steps necessary; also, quite frankly, because my own executive director and some of the key leaders of our churches have made it clear to me that I would be remiss if I were to fail to put our position before you while there is time for you to act decisively on remedial matters which involve the Secretary of State, the President, and the Congress.

As you well know, I am writing critically and constructively as your friend; as a member of your advisory group and on behalf of Church World Service, which represents the refugee service of over 30 Protestant and Eastern Orthodox Churches. These Churches, which currently are investing over a half-million dollars a year in the refugee-relief program and have in their pipeline assurances for some 30,000 refugees, wish to be assured that the refugee-relief program is being administered in a way—and in time—to justify their continued participation. In their clear view both administrative changes, fully authorized under the present law, and certain simple legislative amendments, in line with experience in the program to date, are equally essential—and possible.

No one knows better than yourself that your present problem as administrator of this refugee-relief program has been occasioned by the following factors:

1. Certain difficulties inherent in the original legislation.

2. Serious delays in beginning the program in certain countries in Europe, and the Near East and in the Far East.

3. Delay in providing an assurance form (DSR–8) to facilitate the cooperation of voluntary agencies.

4. Lack of adequate coordination overseas to provide an efficient integrated operation including investigations, visa issuance, transportation, work of voluntary agencies, etc.

5. Disappointment and discouragement of applicants overseas and assurers in the United States of America due to length and uncertainties of the processing period.

6. Consequent slowness of assurance procurement by voluntary agencies.

7. Economic and political developments in Germany and Austria.

8. The earlier lack of clarity regarding the administrative intent for this program; was it permissive legislation only or was it a program to bring relief to refugees and others?

Since your own appointment as deputy administrator, there has been substantial progress in this important program as a result of your administrative and procedural improvements. Some further administrative changes can be effected and urgently need to be effected if visa issuance is to cover all eligible cases. The most crucial of these do not require new legislation. The present rate of security screening and visa issuance in all countries except Greece and Italy is substantially below the rate required to act upon assurances already verified by the State Department. In the Netherlands, the program is just now beginning so there, as elsewhere, the processing schedule requires early acceleration by your office. Otherwise assurances produced at great cost by agencies like our own will never produce visas for people who are fully eligible under the Refugee Relief Act.

While in some countries, as in Germany and Austria, the refugee problem has diminished since 1953, in some other areas (Greece, NATO countries, Hong Kong) it has become even more crucial. And the aggressive "come home" campaign of the Communist countries adds a new dimension to the imperative value of making the Refugee Relief Act the positive and quickly effective instrument it was designed to be. The answer to redefection is not protracted, multiple and discouraging screening but more simple American efficiency in coordinating and expediting our refugee relief program (including security screening) on behalf of those who have risked everything because of their love of freedom. At such a moment as this, it is our conviction that our United States of America program for the world's refugees—our allies in the struggle for a free world—should be given new momentum. To falter now in bringing this program to fullest effectiveness surely would be against our own self-interest and our democratic and humanitarian role in the world. Let me stress again the importance of closer coordination of the United States escapee program which is our welcoming service to those who defect to the West with the procedures of RRP. In this same connection you will want to note that with the suspension of the adjustment of status provision, there is now no way to give status to any of those escapees for whom the United States of America is the first country of asylum. This situation needs correction soon.

In our judgment the changes needed immediately in the refugee relief program should be considered apart from the basic immigration law. While it is our view that, in future legislation, provision for emergency immigration might well be made an integral part of our Immigration and Nationality law, it seems to us to be imperative that separate and immediate consideration be given by the Congress to the relatively few changes in Public Law 203 which experience has proved sound, feasible and wholly desirable in achieving the objectives of the special emergency legislation (Public Law 203).

Our plea, therefore, is not for a general expansion or extension of the Refugee Relief Act, but for changes like the following. Some of these can and should be made by

utilizing authorizations already in Public Law 203. Some may require legislative changes:

1. Who is eligible? The Administrator, with the help of voluntary agencies if requested, could quickly suggest changes in certain sections regarding eligibility where persons, clearly belonging within this program are excluded from it because of a fortuitous wording of the law.

For example: (1) An escapee from Communist China who moved from Hong Kong to Germany; because he did not escape from a Communist area of Europe he is not eligible under RRA.

(2) A Rumanian woman married to an Italian residing in Rumania escaped with her daughter to Italy when the Communists came into power in Rumania. Once back in Italy the husband deserted them. Now the mother is ineligible because of her Italian citizenship as spouse of an Italian citizen. Her daughter is RRA eligible, but mother and daughter wish to migrate together. Yet the husband could be eligible as a refugee, of Italian ethnic origin.

(3) Two Poles are refugees to France; one still in France is eligible, the other now in North Africa is not because he represents a French company operating in a French overseas territory.

(4) Iron Curtain refugees now in Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Kuwait, Egypt, and Jordan are not eligible; if they were in Iran or Turkey they could be eligible. These true refugees should be made eligible.

(5) Iron Curtain refugees in Spain and North Africa comprise only a relatively small number; they should be included in our refugee program and could be by expanding the section 4 (a) (3) of the act.

While, in the light of experience to date, certain amendments to eligibility requirements now can be made, it is our experience that no precise definition of eligibiltiy can be expected to cover all cases of merit which emerge in the course of a program to help people; therefore, we strongly urge that permissive authority be granted to the Secretary of State to authorize admissions to that limited number of refugees who clearly are within the intent of the Refugee Act but are excluded by the inflexibility of eligibility definitions.

2. Reallocate quotas: Since the law was enacted unforeseen developments have proved the original allocations of visas were, in some cases too high, in others too low; consequently we recommend that the German and Austria quota be reduced to provide for the reallocation of 10,000 visas for earthquake, flood, and guerrilla victims in Greece already registered under the RRA, for 10,000 more visas for refugees in Italy, 5,000 more visas for escapees in NATO and other countries and their overseas territories and, if needed, 5,000 more visas for Chinese refugees now waiting in Hong Kong. If these quotas are now increased it would be wise to give the Secretary of State authorization to extend the effective period of the act by 6 to 8 months for these specific categories if, before December 31, 1956, this should prove to be necessary. Also authorization should be given the Deputy Administrator to further reallocate quotas before December 31, 1956, as necessary in order to cover the maximum number of refugee applicants. It may be a wise provision also to authorize the Secretary of State to extend the terminal date of the act for cases covered by assurances still in process of investigation on December 31, 1956, providing such assurances had been verified by the State Department prior to a cutoff date established by the Deputy Administrator.

3. Transportation an RRP responsibility: The practical implementation of the provision for ocean transportation for cases visaed under RRA has resulted in serious discrimination against refugees including orphans—from the Near East and the Far East and present serious problems for agencies and sponsors with visas already granted but no RRA transportation arrangements are available. Fortunately, the law authorizes the Secretary of State to make such arrangements (see sec. 8). The estimates of the number of persons involved have been in the State Department since August. The number of visa-ready cases, awaiting the transportation arrangements authorized in section 8, is growing daily; at this moment at least 125 orphans are in this most unfortunate position. We hope this increasingly urgent matter can be arranged without further delay. Several Government agencies have funds and interests which surely can be associated under the specific authorization given the secretary. These provisions should and can be made uniform under section 8 of Public Law 203.

4. Keep families together: The high incidence of tuberculosis among refugees because of their long years of malnutrition and inadequate living conditions means that many families refuse to migrate because one family member is excluded. With modern methods of care and cure of tuberculosis in this country, a safe provision for such families to migrate as a unit is feasible providing there are proper safeguards under the control of the United States, State and local health authorities. The total number involved is not great; but the humanitarian service is beyond calculation. We believe that the United States Public Health Service could quickly draft the conditions under which such admissions might be permitted with full health safeguards to the families and communities in which such persons would live in the United States of America.

5. Make security procedures efficient: It now is clear that the security provisions under section 11, including 2-year history requirement is not resulting in better security screening than that already required under the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952 which is more specific, is equally thorough, is more expeditious, and is not limited to 2 years. The present RRA regulations for security screening are costly, time-consuming and at the present time constitute one of the most serious blocks to the program. In our experience they add no safeguard to United States security not already provided more specifically by Public Law 414. Furthermore, they are one major and correctable cause of redefection among those who escape to the West only to find that after their welcome they are subject to prolonged and multiple security screening. We, of course, make no request for relaxed screening requirements; we do earnestly propose that the President utilize the power specifically given him under Public Law 203, section 11, to provide for efficient security screening by qualified American personnel but to eliminate the present purely regulatory provisions which make for useless delay and cost. In the case of areas like Hong Kong, the 2-year history requirement almost completely nullifies the purpose of the act in a situation of most urgent need.

6. Discretion regarding readmission: In several areas (e. g., France, Sweden, Canada, and Hong Kong) which are carrying a very heavy responsibility for refugees—both stateless and refugee persons from Iron Curtain countries—the presently required certificate of readmission has proved to work against our own best interests. Since the number of possible deportations ever involved for the United States of America is so small, we recommend that the certificate of readmission be not required or that the Secretary of State be authorized to waive it as a requirement in cases where it is the only bar to the admission of a person otherwise eligible under RRA.

7. RRA consultation a way to good relations and results: From our own intimate experience in countries like Germany, Austria, the Netherlands, it is clear that administrative approaches to the responsible offices in the governments concerned will greatly expedite the completion phase of this program. (For example: Such consultation in Germany initiated by the Administrator might well facilitate the application of additional qualified escapees and expellees—chiefly among farm families. Up to now there has been no such direct consultation.)

8. United States of America and hard-core: As an additional factor in resolving the refugee problem we wish to bring most strongly to your attention for possible inclusion in the RRA program the urgent need of some new provision for those among the refugees who are the so-called hard core—those thousands for whom no employment-centered resettlement is possible. These are the aged, the infirm, the amputees, the blind, for whom humanitarian care is the only answer. Our Government has helped these people. Through the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the United States escapee program we are helping other countries to take these people today. France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland are offering generous opportunities for these people and for their families, many of whom are employable. It is our hope that Congress, soon, may make provision whereby the families of these people now in the United States of America and agencies like our own, together with Federal, State, or private institutions, may cooperate in a Government implemented plan to bring 1,000 such persons to this country for permanent care in their declining years. Refugees may make good labor, good citizens, good Americans. They also may be hard core. We believe we in the United States of America should help on this problem, not by its money only but by making homes for a fair share of these victims of oppression in our own country.

We believe we have a prior responsibility for making those practical adjustments in the administrations of the Refugee Relief Act which experience to date has proved essential if the real spirit and intent of the 1953 legislation is to be achieved.

In this present statement we are not seeking to deal with other long-range immigration questions which are indeed important; rather we stress the importance, and the feasibility, of making immediately such simple changes as the above which will enable the Administrator of the RRA—and all of us in the voluntary agencies to make this program effective in providing the maximum number of distressed people who apply and are eligible under this law. Permit me to emphasize the fact that we are not interested in soliciting immigration; however, we do want to see the act made effective fully before it expires.

At this late stage in the program, it, of course, is apparent that the quick action essential both administratively and legislatively will be possible only as there is the broadest nonpolitical initiative and backing in support of what is needed. I believe our own concern to make this program fully effective is representative of the voting public's desire to see the program succeed. I feel confident that if the President can invite Senator Langer, chairman of the Committee on Refugees and Escapees; Senator Kilgore and Congressman Walter as chairmen of the Immigration Subcommittees, together with a similar group of administration leaders in the House and Senate, and request them to prepare the essential minimum legislation required to complete the RRP, there will be complete cooperation. This is not political naivete; it is practical political realism in undergirding the improvements so urgently needed and earnestly desired in an election year. Any administration bill, however enlightened, is bound to be regarded as political; similarly any bill prepared by the majority. The time for nonpartisan action is in the actual preparation of the bill.

Church World Service is urgently concerned for some 30,000 people with assurances now being processed under the RRA; our churches are securing more assurances daily; we pledge our continued cooperation with you in working for the acceleration of this program under existing law and in bringing to the attention of the Congress the few, reasonable and practical recommendations for legislative changes which experience now indicates are essential to make the refugee-relief program the real success it deserves to be.

I am now sending this letter to you and to the officers of the general board of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America which next meets on February 1, 1956.

I believe you will take my suggestions as the friendly evidence of my regard for you which they are intended to be.

Ever cordially yours,

ROLAND ELLIOTT,
Director, Immigration Services.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there is one point that Mr. Elliott makes that I believe requires special emphasis at this time. It bears upon the significance the refugee-relief program has for United States foreign policy. Mr. Elliott wrote to Mr. Gerety:

While in some countries, as in Germany and Austria, the refugee problem has diminished since 1953, in some other areas (Greece, NATO countries, Hong Kong) it has become even more crucial. And the aggressive "Come Home" campaign of the Communist countries adds a new dimension to the imperative value of making the Refugee Relief Act the positive and quickly effective instrument it was designed to be. The answer to redefection is not protracted, multiple, and discouraging screening but more simple American efficiency in coordinating and expediting our refugee-relief program (including security screening) on behalf of those who have risked everything because of their love of freedom. At such a moment as this, it is our conviction that our United States program for the world's refugees—our allies in the struggle for a free world—should be given new momentum. To falter now in bringing this program to fullest effectiveness surely would be against our own self-interest and our democratic and humanitarian role in the world. Let me stress again the importance of closer coordination of the United States escapee program which is our welcoming service to those who defect to the West with procedures of R. R. P. In this same connection you will want to note that with the suspension of the adjustment of status provision, there is now no way to give status to any of those escapees for whom the United States of America is the first country of asylum. This situation needs correction soon.

I think most of us are familar with the redefection campaign about which Mr. Elliott warns. In recent month especially, the Communists have stepped up their campaign to woo and win back people who have escaped from countries behind the Iron Curtain. They have done this by declaring amnesties for such defectors. They have also resorted to uglier methods. Recently, for example, there were pictures in the news showing an Eastern German mother and her son—who had defected to West Berlin with the husband and daughter—being kidnapped and carried back into East Berlin. Fortunately the mother escaped and anti-Communists then succeeded in effecting the escape of the small boy. But the purpose of the Communists in this kidnapping was to use the mother and son in forcing the father and daughter to return. Another, and more frequent tactic of the Communists, has been a letter-writing campaign. They have had friends and relatives in the satellite countries write letters to the refugee or escapee urging him to return. While the good life that awaits him if he returns may be the outward content of the letters, the hidden implication is there that something might happen to the loved ones left behind if he does not return. This is not a new form of black-mail, but the Communists have stepped up its use in their redefection campaign.

Now, the principal purpose of this redefection campaign is obvious. Whenever the Communists can entice or intimidate an escapee to return to his country of origin, they achieve a real victory. The Communist propaganda machine goes to work exploiting this redefection. Pictures and news stories are circulated throughout the Soviet Union and the satellite countries showing how happy the redefector is to be back and describing how horrible conditions are on the other side of the Iron Curtain—our side. Cut off as they are from most other sources of information, the people in these captive countries are apt to be convinced by this propaganda. What better proof if there that things are not so bad in their own country and must be worse outside the Communist world? Why else would these escapees return? You can well understand that every success the Communists score in this redefection campaign serves a twofold purpose: First, it cuts down the desire of others in the satellite countries to take the dangerous course of attempting to escape to the West; second, it makes those living in the satellite countries less dissatisfied with their lot, since they come to believe that living conditions are not very enviable elsewhere either.

There are other purposes of this redefection campaign. The Communists succeed in causing a sense of insecurity among refugees and exile governments by having letters reach them from behind the Iron Curtain just when they think they have successfully escaped from Communist control and taken up new lives. The mere fact that the Communist conspiracy has followed their movements and knows of their new address is disconcerting. But I think the main purpose of this campaign is the one I have described—of getting a few defectors to return for propaganda purposes.

The significance of this campaign for our foreign policy is clear. An editorial in the New York Times of January 25 stated this quite well. The Times said, in part:

Some 220,000 refugees from Eastern Europe are now living in camps in West Germany. The problem of providing for their needs, of integrating as many of them as possible into a free society as productive members of that society, is a serious one. It is a challenge to the conscience of the free world. It is also a political problem, since the Soviet Union and its Eastern European satellites have chosen to make it one. They are now and have for over a year been conducting an intensive campaign to induce these refugees to return to their native lands. The objective of this campaign, of course, is to use these refugees as "proof" that the Soviet way of life is preferable to that in the free world. Any large-scale success for this Communist effort would be a propaganda defeat for us, as well as a sign that our implicit obligation to these people had not been fulfilled.

So, Mr. President, the importance of our programs to aid refugees and escapees is not merely humanitarian. The humanitarian purpose is sufficient for me and I am sure for most other people. We feel that we should help these uprooted people to find new homes and establish new lives. But for anyone who needs a further reason, I am sure he has it in this Communist redefection campaign. Liberating the satellite countries can be talked about and debated, but there is not apt to be much spark of hope left in the peoples of the satellite countries once they see those who have escaped to the West coming back again.

We must be concerned that the refugees presently waiting in refugee camps do not become so disheartened that they fall easy prey to the Communist campaign and redefect. Our refugee relief program is not just a gesture to be administered in a halfhearted manner until its time has expired at the end of this year. The spirit in which we try to aid these people who have sought asylum in the West will help determine how successful or unsuccessful the Communists are with their redefection campaign. Those who have the responsibility for administering this program must not lose sight of this larger implication of the effects of the refugee relief program.

To indicate just how far short the refugee relief program is presently failing of being carried out properly, I wish to read portions of a letter I have recently received. It is from a friend and is a personal letter. As the friend is in a position to state quite clearly just to what extent the program is failing to achieve its goals. I wish to withhold his name to avoid causing him any embarrassment. But I assure the Senate that he is well qualified by experience with the refugee relief program to pass judgment on it. On January 28 he wrote me:

Two years have elapsed and still only some 75,000 of the authorized 209,000 have been issued. * * * Well over half of the visas issued have come in Italy where, due to the Graham amendment, thousands of relatives had been waiting for regular quota visa numbers. Of the 45,000 visas originally tagged by Congress for Italian refugees only a little more than 3,000 have been issued to that category and perhaps the total number will not exceed 8,000 by the end of the act. In Greece the picture is pretty much the same except that a large number of relatives also qualified as refugees due to the guerrilla war and earthquakes. Yet less than half of the 11,000 visas issued have been to real Greek refugees, thanks again to the Graham amendment.

These are the areas on which the administration will base its contention that the act has been a success. However, this will bear up only in terms of visas issued and not in terms of helping to solve the refugee problem. You see, the refugees did not have contacts in the United States of America. Assurances for jobs and housing had to come through voluntary agencies and it has taken time and money to build the machinery nec-

essary for this work. Now that these assurances are beginning to come in we find that the refugees have lost out to the relatives.

The agencies feel that the answer to this problem is to reallocate some of the unused numbers in Germany and Austria to Italy and Greece. As it now appears only 35,000 (Germany) and 15,000 (Austria) will be used of the 90,000 authorized. To reallocate the 40,000 unused visas and to extend this portion of the act to December 1957, is the agency proposition and I believe that it makes sense.

The situation in Germany is difficult to assess. The easy answer is that the German economy is so good that the people do not wish to migrate * * * as in Italy and Greece, it takes time to get assurances for strangers. Many, many of the recent east zone refugees would like to get to the States but the 2-year history requirement of the act prevents them. The security (officers) have set up a reconstruction procedure but it just doesn't work. So as it stands now hundreds of these people will see the act expire before their residence requirement is met.

I believe that the agencies have a good point when they support the need for a special quota for escapee cases. Five thousand visas put at the disposal of the United States escapee program people would be a great help. Personally I think that the 10,000 visas authorized under section 4 (a) (3) for NATO countries will be filled and will just about serve the needs but some agencies feel that another 5,000 will completely resolve the old DP problem. (That and a liberalizing of the TB formula which I wrote you about some time ago.)

Those agencies involved in the orphan program feel that the 4,000 visas will be issued although just less than half had been issued up to December 1955. Another 4,000 might be the answer to this very humanitarian aspect of the program.

Those were only portions of a letter I received from a friend who is in an excellent position to know how the Refugee Relief Act is operating. Some of the points he raises are crucial—such as the need to reallocate the unused quotas from Germany and Austria to Italy and Greece which are oversubscribed.

As his letter is a few weeks old, I would like to bring the figures of the refugee relief program up to date. As of February 17, the number of visas issued totaled 84,607. However, I wish to point out that the fact that visas have been issued does not mean that the refugee has actually entered and been resettled in the United States as is the purpose of the act. For 32,361 of those who are ready to come do not have assurances.

In all, on February 17, there had been 208,104 applications filed for admission under the Refugee Relief Act. But, if we take the rate at which applications are presently being processed, it is soon seen that Mr. Gerety was right when he estimated that the program would fall 44,000 short of its goal of 209,000 entries by the end of this year, unless something drastic is done to step up the processing.

When Mr. Gerety made that announcement, Mr. President, I wrote to the able chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. I was concerned that if the goal of the refugee relief program could not be achieved by the cutoff date, December 31, 1956, it might be necessary to extend the time of the act. I would like to include at this point in my remarks my letter of January 4 to Chairman LANGER, of the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees, Escapees, and Expellees.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate.

DEAR BILL: I am sure you share my concern at the recent announcement by the Director of the refugee relief program, Mr. Pierce J. Gerety, that he will not be able to issue the 209,000 entry permits authorized under the present law by the cut-off date of December 31 this year. Mr. Gerety estimates that about 44,000 refugees will be denied admission because of the failure of the administration to administer the program properly.

As I stated in testifying before your committee last June on amendments to the Refugee Relief Act, the attitude of some of those administering the law seems to have been that the number of admissions authorized under the act is merely a permissive figure—that they can issue visas up to that number, but it is not necessary to make an effort to attain the goal of the maximum number of entries under the refugee relief program. That was surely not the intent of those of us who voted to support this program. When we consider how many refugees there are—numbers far beyond the help of this program—it seems clear that we should be concerned that every single person authorized may obtain the relief intended under the act.

As you know, one of the amendments contained in S. 1794, introduced by Senators LEHMAN, DOUGLAS, KEFAUVER, and myself would extend the expiration date of the refugee relief program to December 31, 1960. Under this amendment any visas not issued by the end of this year would be redistributed among those categories under section 4 of the act that have been filled but still have requests pending for visas. This reallocation and extension of the time would permit the refugee relief program to achieve its goal in permitting the maximum number of persons authorized under the act to enter the country.

I would, of course, desire most of all that your committee recommend the adoption of those amendments which I have already supported before your committee. But, in view of Mr. Gerety's admission that the administration will not be able to meet its obligation of issuing all visas authorized under the Refugee Relief Act, I hope that at the very least the committee will recommend an extension of the termination date of the act beyond December 31, 1956. I cannot know precisely how much additional time the Refugee Relief Administration may need to complete the issuance of all 209,000 authorized visas, but I am sure that the committee could ascertain this and make a recommendation for the necessary extension.

It would be a callous disregard of the misery in which many of these refugees have been living for long, weary years if we were to let more than one-fifth of the visas authorized by the Refugee Relief Act be wasted. That the administration could have administered the act in such a way that it now must threaten to close the door on the hopes of many of these suffering people is a shocking disregard of the humanitarian intent of the Congress in passing this act.

I trust that the subcommittee will take prompt action to insure that sufficient time will be allowed for the issuance of all visas authorized under the refugee relief program.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the news stories which carried an account of this letter indicated only that I had asked for an extension of the Refugee Relief Act. Some of those who have been working hard to help bring refugees to this country were concerned that I sought only this simple extension of time without any other changes in the program. Of course, I do not believe that the program can achieve its goals merely by extending the time for processing the applications. As I have indicated in the foregoing remarks, I think it is essential that measures be taken as soon as possible—both administratively and legislatively—to make this program workable. I would not settle for a mere extension of time. It might be misinterpreted as tacit approval of the way the program has been administered and is being administered. I hope I have made myself perfectly clear that I do not think the program has been or is being administered in a way that deserves any commendation. In fact, it took the unfortunate Corsi incident in the State Department last year to reveal the extent to which Secretary of State Dulles and the administrator of the program, Scott McLeod, were failing in any attempt to make this program succeed.

So that I will not be misunderstood, I wish to make quite clear the way in which I think this whole refugee relief program needs overhauling. There need be no surprise if a program drawn up to meet an unusual situation—such as the refugee situation—does not meet the need. But now that it has failed to meet the test of experience, we can take legislative action to modify the act so that it can work more expeditiously.

Mr. President, I would like to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the recommendations I made last June 1955 in testimony prepared for the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees, Escapees, and Expellees. My recommendations are directed primarily to Senate bill 1794, introduced by Senators LEHMAN, DOUGLAS, KEFAUVER, and myself, and to the Senate bill 2113, which includes the proposals recommended by the administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON REFUGEES, ESCAPEES, AND EXPELLEES ON S. 1794, CONTAINING AMENDMENTS TO THE REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have this opportunity to testify before your committee in support of S. 1794, a bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. The bill was introduced by Senators LEHMAN, DOUGLAS, KEFAUVER, and myself and contains amendments presently being considered by your subcommittee. I understand you are also considering S. 2113, the bill introduced by Senator WATKINS and others which includes proposals made by President Eisenhower, and S. 2149, which the chairman introduced this week. I will direct my remarks today primarily to the bill before the committee which I have cosponsored, S. 1794, but will also make some comparison of its amendments with those of the other two pending bills.

We all are gravely concerned by the situation that has brought about the need for these amendments. Our intention in passing the Refugee Relief Act 2 years ago was

to give new life to those people—displaced by war and in flight from oppression—who had no homes and little hope. Many of them had spent years in refugee camps. Others had fled from behind the Iron Curtain in hope of finding freedom and new lives. America stood as a symbol of hope to them, for they knew that we had always welcomed refugees from oppression.

It was in this humanitarian spirit that the refugee relief program was proposed to the Congress. We wished to give hope for a new life to some of these uprooted people. And we knew from our own experience that people could come to this country and, in building new lives, would help build the United States.

But the bill as it was finally passed had written into it many restrictions which pleased only those who do not welcome new Americans to our shores. Many of us warned at the time that the restrictions might make the refugee relief program nearly unworkable. In considering the history of this act, we cannot help but wonder whether a certain reluctance to make it work has not compounded the difficulties.

The unfortunate failure of the refugee program is a matter of record. The distinguished chairman of this subcommittee presented to the Senate last Monday the most recent figures of accomplishment under this act. In the nearly 2 years since its enactment, 31,919 visas have been issued. When we compare this to the number of 209,000 refugees and escapees that we finally authorized to be admitted we see just how badly the act and its administrators have failed in carrying out its humanitarian purpose.

I would like to point out that this failure does not only mean heartbreak and embitterment to the 209,000 who might have been admitted under this program and to the millions of others who had hoped that they might be among the 209,000. It has serious consequences for the position and prestige of the United States in the world. Here again—as in the Immigration and Naturalization Act—the United States presents itself to the world as a nation that holds itself above other peoples, that does not welcome people from other nations to our country even when they are displaced and homeless and in need of our assistance. Most of us do not feel that this is the true spirit of America. Quite the contrary. But such iniquitous restrictions as those written into the Immigration Act and the Refugee Act speak louder than any of our protestations of good will and good faith. We cannot convince others in the world that we, in our hearts, are friends and equals of all people, everywhere, when our legislation embodies xenophobia and racist discrimination that proclaim the opposite. I will not labor this point. But I think that this consequence of our immigration and relief programs is of such gravity for us in our relations with other peoples and other countries that it is of vital importance in any consideration of the Refugee Relief Act.

This failure of the Refugee Relief Act was taken with much complacency by the administration until the recent unpleasantness in the State Department. But we have at last gotten an admission from the President that all has not been going as it should with this program. I welcome those proposals that President Eisenhower sent to Congress on May 27 and am glad to see that he agrees with many of the recommendations made in the Lehman-Humphrey-Douglas-Kefauver amendments introduced more than a month earlier.

At this time, I would like to go over the amendments proposed in Senate bill 1794, and indicate how they would improve the Refugee Relief Act.

First, the administration of this program would be placed in an office within the Department of State to be known as the Office of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. This Administrator would be responsible directly to the Secretary of State. Surely this program is sufficiently important and certainly complex enough that it requires the attention of a full-time Administrator. If we are to achieve the humanitarian goal intended by the Refugee Relief Act it must be administered with greater vigor than has so far been the case. Continuing its administration as a part-time function of the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs will not allow such administration. There is no reason why the refugee-relief program should be administered as one function of an Administrator who has many other duties. To make the Refugee Relief Act a vigorous, effective means of bringing deserving people to our country it should receive the full attention of an Administrator responsible solely to the Secretary of State. The recent appointment of Mr. Gerety as Deputy Administrator of the refugee-relief program does not correct this basic defect. I urge most strongly that the subcommittee support amendment of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 along the lines stated in section 10 of S. 1794.

The attitude of some of those who have been administering this law seems to be that the number of admission authorized under this act is merely a permissive figure—that they can issue visas up to that number but it is not necessary to try to attain the goal of the maximum number of entries under the refugee relief program. That was surely not the intent of those of us who voted to support this program. When we consider how many refugees there are—numbers far beyond the help of this program—it seems clear that we should be striving to permit entry into the United States of every single person authorized under the act. Partly what is needed here is a change of attitude on the part of those dealing with this program—its administrators and the consular officials abroad charged with carrying out some of its functions. They should strive to achieve the maximum number of admissions allowable under this program and look to that number as a humanitarian goal to be sought and attained.

But, with only a year and a half left before the termination date of the Refugee Relief Act, the goal is far off. At the present rate it is doubtful that it will be reached by December 31, 1956. Even if we accept the present Administrator's analogy to an "assembly line"—and I do not care for the comparison of refugees to automobiles—it does not appear that the assembly line is going to pick up sufficient speed, now that the initial period of tooling is completed, to reach the full humanitarian goal within the time limit set by the law. For this reason, a way of extending the time for the effectiveness of this act should be sought. No one should be denied entry under the refugee relief program simply because of an arbitrary cutoff date. An attempt is made to utilize all of the authorizations for visas by an amendment proposed in our bill. This amendment provides that any visas not issued by December 31, 1956, shall be redistributed among those categories under section 4 of the act that have been filled but still have requests pending for visas. Under this provision, the termination date would be extended to December 31, 1960, to allow time for action on these reallocated visa authorizations. The reallocation and extension of time will permit the refugee relief program to achieve its goal in permitting the maximum number of persons authorized under the act to enter the country. I strongly urge the subcommittee that it adopt this proposal as one of the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

There are additional countries that should be added to the act since its passage in 1953. Refugees now residing in Spain and North Africa should be eligible for admission under the refugee relief program. There are refugees residing in both of these places, and to permit them entry under the act our bill would increase the quota for refugees now residing in North Atlantic Treaty countries by 15,000 so as to include these people. This additional number would raise the overall authorization from 209,000 to 224,000 refugees eligible for admission. But I point out that this is still considerably fewer than the number of 240,000 that the President proposed when he originally made recommendations for this program to the Congress.

Some of the requirements of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 have made it difficult and even impossible for otherwise highly qualified people to be admitted to this country under the program. One such requirement is the assurance that must be given by a citizen or citizens of the United States that the refugee will have employment and be able to support himself once he arrives in this country. The regulation provides that each such assurance shall be the personal obligation of the individual citizen or citizens making it. There is a further requirement that the employment and housing be listed with the Government so as to show that employment and housing is available to the refugee being considered for admission under the program. As negotiations for admission have nearly always been protracted, such a requirement has placed an impossible burden on those citizens who have sought to assist refugees in coming to this country. It is not surprising that this discouraging aspect of the program has become a real roadblock to its operation. I feel that it is asking entirely too much of our citizens to expect them to hold employment and housing open a year or longer while waiting for a refugee to be cleared and submitted under this act. Voluntary agencies—with whose fine work we are all familiar—have been ready and anxious to assist in helping people qualify under the program in coming to the United States. But the restrictions in the act that these assurances must be given by individual citizens has prevented the agencies from taking part. There is no reason why these groups should not help refugees find suitable employment and housing so they can qualify for admission under the Refugee Relief Act. They did just such work in connection with the displaced persons program and performed a most useful and humanitarian service. The amendment contained in our bill would permit them to participate in the present program in a similar way. These voluntary agencies should certainly be allowed to give assurances of employment and housing—as they are willing to do—and so assist refugees in qualifying under the refugee relief program.

There is a similar provision in the Watkins proposal, S. 2113, but I do not think it is spelled out quite so clearly as in S. 1794. I am glad to see that the bill of the chairman, Senator LANGER, Senate bill 2149, makes another recommendation along these lines. As I understand it, the chairman's bill would permit other responsible persons who have resided in the United States for at least 2 years to give such assurances. The amendment would also extend this act to include dependent parents, stepparents, and adoptive parents, I believe, and this is an equally worthy proposal that merits the consideration of the subcommittee. But I am sure the chairman is not unaware of the virtues of his own bill, so I shall not dwell on them at length.

To return to the Lehman-Humphrey-Douglas-Kefauver amendments, there are further requirements of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 that have made it difficult or impossible for some people to qualify for admission though their character and skills are such that we would surely be grateful to have

them as new citizens. The stipulation that a completely documented history of the past 2 years of the refugee's life must be supplied before issuance of a visa has proved a particularly onerous requirement. For those who somehow succeed in escaping from behind the Iron Curtain this regulation usually means that they must sit for 2 years in a refugee camp in order to provide themselves with a 2-year history.

Such a procedure defeats the purpose of the Refugee Relief Act and should be done away with. The present security requirements of the act, as well as of the Immigration Act which must also be met, are more than enough to insure that visas will not be granted any persons whose purpose in seeking admission might not be to the best interests of the United States. I note that the amendments proposed by Senator WATKINS, S. 2113, would also repeal this requirement of a 2-year history. I trust that the subcommittee will concur that this regulation should be removed from the law.

A similar requirement that has been almost impossible to fulfill for many of the refugees and especially those who have fled from behind the Iron Curtain is that of a valid, unexpired passport. The inclusion of such a requirement in a bill to aid refugees, many of whom are stateless, would be farcical, if it were not so tragic. Both the Watkins bill and our bill would relax this requirement.

A certificate guaranteeing readmission to the country in which the visa is obtained is coupled with this passport requirement. This is often impossible to obtain; some countries just do not give such certificates. Such an unrealistic provision should be eliminated from the law. The requirements of the Immigration Act covering necessary travel documents and clearances are more than sufficient to protect the interests of the United States.

There are some other changes that should be made in the Refugee Relief Act to make it more workable. As President Eisenhower said in his message to Congress urging many of these same changes in the law:

"The act limits the term refugee to those who have been firmly resettled. Experience has shown that this provision tends to exclude the hard working and the adjustable, the very people we want most as new citizens."

All three bills before the subcommittee attempt to improve upon this definition so as not to exclude those very emigrants we would welcome. Our bill would include both refugees and escapees under this term and avoid a distinction made in the present bill that has led to confusion in interpretation and delay.

Another simple change in terminology recommended in our bill, S. 1794, is the dropping of the modifying word "ethnic" wherever it appears in the bill, except where it is clearly needed—in the case of German expellees. There seems to be no purpose for its inclusion at other places in the bill and it has connotations that are not in keeping with our traditions.

The priorities set up under section 12 of the Refugee Relief Act turned out to be unworkable and have led to delay and confusion in the administration of the act. Apparently just what was intended by these priorities has never been clarified. Our bill would repeal the entire section 12, and I think that by so doing administration of the act would be accelerated.

The provision of the Refugee Relief Act permitting the admission of 4,000 orphans restricts this quota to orphans under 10 years of age. There does not seem to be any good reason why orphans older than 10 should not be admitted under this program. Senator LANGER's bill, Senator WATKINS' bill, and our bill would all raise this age limit. Senator LEHMAN in his testimony before this committee a few days ago suggested that 13 might be the oldest age limit that could be fixed for eligibility without necessitating full security clearance. I am sure that the committee will give every consideration to the desirability of raising the age limit to whatever age seems most feasible for best admitting orphans qualifying under this section of the program.

Under the Adjustment of Status section of the act, for persons already in the United States, both bills would amend the act to relax the present requirement that a person otherwise eligible must also have entered the country legally. President Eisenhower said in his message:

"I recommend to the Congress that the section be amended to permit the Attorney General to waive this requirement in meritorious cases where the person is otherwise qualified under this act. It is estimated that this would not involve more than a few hundred cases, but in the case of each individual human being such an amendment would satisfy the beneficent purposes of the Congress."

An additional liberalization of this section is suggested in the Watkins bill—that the number of people who might so have their status in this country adjusted be raised from 5,000 to 10,000. This is a most worthwhile proposal which I wish to support, though it is not in our original bill.

There are three other amendments in the Watkins bill not contained in S. 1794 that I consider worthy of adoption to improve the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. One would authorize admission of 1,000 persons who would otherwise be excluded as suffering from tuberculosis. These would be persons who are members of families and whose inability to be admitted to the United States might otherwise break up the family or prevent them from taking advantage of the act. As President Eisenhower said in making this same recommendation:

"We in the United States no longer regard tuberculosis with dread. Our treatment standards are high and modern treatment is increasingly effective. The United States, to its own benefit, could permit many of these families, within the existing numerical limitations, to enter under safeguards provided by the Attorney General and the Surgeon General of the United States assuring protection of the public health and adequate treatment of the afflicted individual and also assuring that such individual will not become a public charge. I urge that the Congress give consideration to amendments that would enable this to be done."

May I join with the President in support of this measure that might prevent the tragic separation of families that have already undergone the trials of being broken apart from relatives and friends. This is a proposal in keeping with the finest spirit in which the refugee relief program was originally conceived and suggest that we can still return to that spirit in carrying it out, though the time is late.

Another amendment of the Watkins bill that I wish to support is the change in wording recommended in section 2 of S. 2113. This relatively minor change would make a great deal of difference to refugee families granted admission under the refugee relief program. Under the statute as it now reads, wives, children, and others eligible to enter the country accompanying someone entering on a refugee relief visa, must all come together, accompanying the senior member of the family. The proposal contained in the Watkins bill, which simply adds the words "or following to join them," would allow members of a family to follow later when for one reason or another they could not yet accompany the head of the family being admitted under this program. I urge that this provision be included in any amendments that the subcommittee sees fit to recommend to improve the Refugee Relief Act. It is a most worthy modification.

There is one final proposal in the Watkins bill in support of which I wish to join. That is the addition made in subsection (c) of section 11, which provides that "* * * eligibility of an applicant under this act shall be the exclusive responsibility of the consular office." Presently this eligibility is subject to the review of the immigration officer whose responsibility should rest solely in the application of the Immigration Act to the applicant. This authority of review by the immigration officer has resulted in conflicting rulings by the separate officers charged with this responsibility and has been one of the sources of delay in administering the Refugee Relief Act. By so clarifying the act that the responsibility for administering the Refugee Relief Act resides solely in the consular officer, much of this confusion and delay should be eliminated. This will certainly improve the administration of the program. I strongly support this delimitation of authority and hope that it will be made a part of any recommendations for amending the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

May I come back again to a proposal which I just mentioned in passing, but which I wish to support as it embodies the humanitarian spirit of the Refugee Relief Act. I refer to the amendments of the chairman, contained in S. 2149, that would extend eligibility under this program to dependent parents, stepparents, and adoptive parents, as well as those who would be presently eligible for admission by accompanying the head of a family with a refugee relief visa. Here again, like the amendments we have discussed, these recommendations would in many cases mean the difference between a family being able to take advantage of the program and come to the United States or having to stay on in some dreary refugee camp or makeshift home in order to avoid parting from a loved member of the family.

These seem minor matters when we are drawing up a bill affecting hundreds of thousands, but we must never forget how much just such modifications as these can mean to the individuals whose whole lives turn upon them. I wish to support the amendments of the chairman, as they extend the benefits of this program in a way that should not have been overlooked.

In conclusion, I would just like to say that the amendments being considered by this subcommittee give new hope for the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and those who should be helped by it to come to the United States and become useful citizens. I shall not refer again to the way in which this program has been hampered and almost blocked by those who do not wish to see it work. I would like to reiterate, however, that the success of this program is important not only for what it means to the lives of those many thousand we hope to assist by it, but that its success is important in the world for the good name of the United States itself.

In part, we are already known to the rest of the world for the quota system upon which the Immigration and Naturalization Act is built. While we have yet to correct the inequities that are written into that law, here, in amending the Refugee Relief Act, we can present a better face to the world, our true face. Let us show the world the spirit that truly moves our people. Let us extend the hand of welcome to those whose lives have been disrupted and whose homes have been lost. I trust that the subcommittee will give careful consideration to the amendments before it. I hope you will agree with me that they are worthy of our support.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to stress that the refugee-relief program has a great humanitarian purpose—to hold out hope to those unfortunate people who have been driven from their homes by war or uprooted by fear of political reprisal.

Further, however, it is an essential part of our foreign policy in attempting to meet and counter the redefection campaign of the Communists. Our failure to our responsibility under the Refugee Relief Act could have unfortunate consequence for us in providing a Communist victory in this redefection campaign.

The Congress has legislation pending that would make those legislative changes necessary if we are to fulfill the goals of the refugee-relief program. But, as I stated at the outset and have spelled out with the recommendations of those groups best qualified to criticize administration of the program, the President and the Secretary of State have it within their means to make such administrative changes as need to be made to expedite this program.

I would not want to close without paying tribute to the voluntary agencies that have done so much in an effort to assist refugees in coming to this country under the Refugee Relief Act. They have given of their efforts selflessly and tirelessly in an attempt to help those who seek a haven from political oppression and a new home after years of being uprooted. They deserve the thanks not only of those they have helped but the thanks and commendation of us all for the fine, dedicated work they are doing.

We owe it to them as well as to the refugees who look to us for assistance to improve the refugee-relief program. I join with the voluntary agencies in urging President Eisenhower to take action now. The President should instruct the Secretary of State and the administrator of the refugee-relief program to make those administrative changes that are so urgently needed. The refugee-relief program must not fail in its mission of bringing to their new home all of the refugees we intended to welcome when we passed the Refugee Relief Act.

THIRTY-SEVENTH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, yesterday was the birthday of the American Legion, organized March 11, 1919, and later chartered by Congress. I want to congratulate this patriotic organization on its 37th birthday. As a charter member of my local post, I have always considered it a great honor and a high privilege to be a member of this the largest organization of wartime veterans in the history of mankind.

"For God and country" are we comrades associated. May the eternal principles enumerated in the preamble to our Constitution ever serve as guideposts in our lives so that in truth "right shall become the master of might" and "peace and good will" on earth shall ever be our goal.

To recount here the accomplishments of this great organization is a task beyond the time permitted me.

In support of the widow and orphan of our deceased comrades and the disabled, the Legion has a record of accomplishments that will ever be a tribute to a zealous devotion to worthy causes.

In the defense of our national institutions—our Americanism—unadulterated—few can equal its constant and unswerving guardianship.

It was quite a disappointment to some and a pleasure to me that here in Washington, during a recent National Convention of the American Legion, the bands and drum corps who led the parade concentrated on Onward Christian Soldiers and The Battle Hymn of the Republic. Soberness and maturity characterized its deliberations. It was imbued with a patriotism born in the crucible of service to God and country.

In its child welfare activities, junior baseball programs, its oratorical and other school contests, the American Legion is rendering services in the field of Americanism to the young men and women of our country which will ever redound to its credit. Think of it—over 50 percent of the baseball players in the big leagues today received their initial training under the auspices of the great organization—the American Legion.

The work of our Subcommittee on Internal Security has its counterpart in the Americanism commission of the American Legion.

Some detractors would have us think that the Legion is solely a pressure group. I will have none of that propaganda. If it is pressure, it is pressure for a greater, stronger and better America so that we may transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy. May the judge of us all give us more of such pressure organizations like the American Legion.

Someday, when more time is at our disposal, I shall recount for you the many blessings America has received from the organization which has honored me and for which I have such great respect and affection.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Morning business has been concluded.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 3183.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, for the purpose of the RECORD, I should like to state that, because of illness in my family, I was unable to be present on Friday when the vote was taken on the Aiken amendment to strike from the farm bill the 90 percent of parity provision on wheat. If I had been present, I would have voted in favor of the amendment, and against the 90 percent provision.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to call the request I am about to make to the attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I should like to request that the quorum call be had without the time being charged to either side, because I understand several Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle desired to have some indication given when the Senate resumed the consideration of the farm bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I had risen to suggest that that be done.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for the moment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to withhold it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to call this matter particularly to the attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the committee. Under the order, I understand that the amendments of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are now the order of business before the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Last week at my request action was deferred on an amendment which I had submitted, its consideration being made subject to whatever the pending business was, and with the understanding that it would become the next order of business after the pending amendment had been disposed of. If there is no objection, I should like to ask unanimous consent that action on my amendment be further deferred, and that its place be taken by the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], which is an amendment similar to my amendment, except that it deals with a different commodity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, under the previous request, I now suggest the absence of a quorum, without the time consumed being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I submit a modification of my amendment, which consolidates 3 other amendments. I noticed that when the Senate began the consideration of the farm bill last Thursday, 83 amendments to the bill were prepared. This morning there are 84 amendments. Unless greater progress than that already evidenced is made we shall not get anywhere.

All three amendments I have deal with one subject, namely, limitations on the bill. Therefore, I submit the modification and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the modification as proposed by the Senator from Delaware.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 11, line 5, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following: "The com-

pensation paid any producer for participating in the acreage reserve program with respect to land in any one State in any year shall not exceed $25,000."

On page 15, line 5, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following: "No annual payment to any person with respect to land in any one State shall exceed $7,500."

On page 4, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

"SEC. 107. The Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'SEC. 421. The total amount of price support made available under this act to any person for any year through loans to such person, or through purchases made by Commodity Credit Corporation from such person, shall not exceed $25,000. The term "person" shall mean any individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or agency of a State. In the event of any loan to, or purchase from, a cooperative marketing association, such limitation shall apply to the amount of price support made available through such cooperative association to each person. The limitation herein on the amount of price support made available to any person shall not apply if price support is extended by purchases of a product of an agricultural commodity from processors and the Secretary determines that it is impracticable to apply such limitations.' "

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendments being considered en bloc?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, do I not have the right to modify my own amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not heard objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I reserved the right to object.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as modified, would amend several portions of the bill. That is why it is necessary to get unanimous consent in order to consider the amendments en bloc.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But is it not true that I may modify my amendment as offered without unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator could modify one particular part of his amendment; but when he has asked for the consideration of the amendment of several parts of the bill in several places, it is necessary to have unanimous consent to consider the amendments en bloc.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Delaware that I called up last Friday, prior to the time the Senator from Delaware gained the floor, an amendment which relates to the limitation on price supports. In order to accommodate one of my colleagues, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] after there had been objection to his presenting several amendments, I temporarily withdrew my amendment. So I desire to present the amendment today. A part of the proposal of the Senator from Delaware is identical with my amendment. I intend to present the amendment in my own right.

I must say in all candor that it appears rather unusual that this has happened. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chairs hears objection to the consideration en bloc of the amendments offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, does that mean that I will have to offer the amendments as amendments to my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Because of the objection, the amendments will have to be considered separately.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Which amendment does the Chair hold should be considered first?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment on the list which the Senator submitted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The first amendment submitted was on page 11, line 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will call attention to the fact that there is one amendment before that, in the order in which the Senator has submitted them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment pending on Friday is the one which will be before the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I understand correctly that the Senate will vote on each one in its order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Am I to understand that, under the parliamentary situation, after the Senate has voted on the amendment which proposes to add section 225, the next amendment would be the one offered as a modification, as it comes in consecutive order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot guarantee that the Senator from Delaware will be recognized to offer his next amendment in order. The Chair can only guarantee that the Senator now has an opportunity to present whichever amendment he chooses as his first one.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Delaware has several amendments he intends to propose. Is this the amendment designated "2–22–56–B"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the amendment which was called up on last Friday.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are we not considering the amendment designated "3–5–56–B"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; unless the Chair hears objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the amendment which was called up on Friday.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it seems unusual that I cannot consolidate the amendments. That practice has been followed before in the Senate. Nevertheless, in the event that that cannot be done, as I understand, I may modify my amendment by offering a substitute for it, may I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may do that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer a substitute for the amendment which is now pending. The amendment in the nature of a substitute is the last part of the modification which I just submitted, which would amend section 107 of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Delaware.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 107. The Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 421. The total amount of price support made available under this act to any person for any year through loans to such person, or through purchases made by Commodity Credit Corporation from such person, shall not exceed $25,000. The term 'person' shall mean any individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or agency of a State. In the event of any loan to, or purchase from, a cooperative marketing association, such limitation shall apply to the amount of price support made available through such cooperative association to each person. The limitation herein on the amount of price support made available to any person shall not apply if price support is extended by purchases of a product of an agricultural commodity from processors and the Secretary determines that it is impracticable to apply such limitations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment to that particular section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Senator from Delaware has the floor, and the Senate is considering his amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. At the expiration of the time of the Senator from Delaware, may I offer an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment intended to be offered by the Senator from Minnesota may be offered only after the time allotted on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware has been exhausted or yielded back by both sides.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand. I shall offer an amendment at such time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to know what will become of the amendment previously pending if the amendment now offered to that amendment shall be adopted. The amendments deal with different subjects entirely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware is not before the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are we to understand that the amendment designated "3–5–56–B" is not now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not before the Senate; it was modified by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the Senate is not considering the amendment designated "3–5–56–B."

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, may we have order? Senators cannot hear the rulings of the Chair or the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, my reason for offering this amendment as a substitute for the other amendment at this time is that the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, who is now just outside the Senate Chamber, has raised a question that the first amendment offered may contain language which, as at present written, may cause undue hardship on a small farmer who is dependent solely on a small piece of land, leased from the Government, for his operations.

That was not the purpose of the original amendment and I want that point clarified bfore proceeding. If new language is needed we can modify the amendment accordingly.

I have asked the Solicitor to try to prepare suitable language by which the amendment could be modified so as to take care of hardship cases, and that is now being done. It was hoped the revision would be ready before the Senate resumed consideration of the bill. But it has not come in yet, so I thought it was useless to take of the time of the Senate to debate that particular phase until the proper language had been prepared.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, am I to understand that the Senator from Delaware now proposes to withdraw the amendment which was offered by him last Friday?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Only temporarily. That is why I have substituted the amendment now being considered.

I may say to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that it is true he has offered an amendment, and I think it is almost identical with mine. But the Senator from Utah also has a comparable amendment, as has the Senator from Indiana. As I understand, there are 12 or 14 amendments which have been submitted, all dealing with the same subject.

The proposal here is a consolidation of all these limitation features into one amendment for the purpose of conserving time.

As I pointed out before we started out last Friday with 83 amendments and after 2 days work we now have 84.

Unless we consolidate some of these proposals, we will never get the bill passed.

I think we are all trying to attain the same objective, namely, to keep the benefits for the smaller farmer. I am not trying to take anything away from the Senator from Minnesota, who, as I have said, has likewise drawn a comparable amendment. I think the Senate would have voted on the amendment last Friday evening, had it not gotten into a parliamentary dispute lasting for nearly 2 hours on another question. That forced the amendment to be carried over until today.

This morning I was requested to hold up the original amendment until the necessary changes in verbiage could be prepared. The changes have not as yet been made available. I thought the Senate could vote at one time on all three phrases of this other question. They are comparable amendments. The first phase would limit payments under the acreage reserve to $25,000. The second phase would limit payments under the conservation reserve to $7,500. The third phase would limit loans under the price support program to $25,000. The same principle is involved in all. I think the amendments could be considered en bloc, in order to conserve time. If the Senator from Minnesota wishes to join as a cosponsor, I shall be only too glad to have him do so. No question of pride of authorship is involved. The amendments have been pending several days.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not a matter of pride of authorship. It is a question of orderly procedure. The items involved are separate items. For instance, the Senator from Delaware proposes an amendment relating to acreage reserve, one relating to the conservation reserve, and one relating to production on Government-owned land. They should be considered separately.

It is my intention to offer an amendment on limitation of price supports. That amendment has been printed. I have withdrawn the amendment only to accommodate a colleague. When the Senator offers the amendment on limitation of price supports, I shall offer an amendment to that, because I should like to bring out another point.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection to that, and to accommodate the Senator will offer that portion first. I might support the language which the Senator from Minnesota will offer. As previously stated, the purpose of offering the amendment is to restrict to $25,000 the amount of price supports which any individual or corporation may obtain under the program.

Last year more than 1 million farmers participated in the support program, and less than 2,000 of them received loans in excess of $25,000. There will be less than 2,000 farmers affected by this amendment if it should be adopted.

I would be the first to protest on the floor of the Senate any legislation which would be against the right of any man in this country, whether he be a farmer or in business, to grow and make progress; but we certainly should not use a subsidy or assistance afforded by the United States Government to help him to make the progress.

The benefits of this farm program were intended by the administration and the Congress to go primarily to the family-sized farms, the bona fide farmers who are not able to assist themselves, and not to go to large corporations. To cite an example, I know of one unit which has over 340,000 acres of wheat under the program. It was not intended to use the taxpayers' money to assist such large farm operations.

Why should the American taxpayers underwrite these million-dollar operations?

My amendment proposes to limit the amounts to $25,000. The principle was recommended, although not the exact figure, by the President of the United States when he recommended that some action be taken on that question for the purpose of keeping the benefits of our farm program for the bona fide families.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator tell us how he arrived at the limitation of $25,000? In some types of farming that is all or more than a family can produce. In other types of farming a single family can produce forty, fifty, or sixty thousand dollars' worth of commodities on the farm. In certain types of farming if $50,000 worth of commodities were not produced, the farmers would not be able to engage in that type of farming.

If the Senator from Delaware thinks that a limitation of $25,000 would be enough to cover family farms, I point out that family farms are producing more each year. They have to get more equipment and make larger investments. As a consequence, the farmers must produce more to maintain an adequate return on their investment.

I think the Senator from Delaware has a good idea. A few years ago I think $25,000 would have been a good limitation. Former Secretary Brannan, I think, proposed that the limitation be $24,000 under the Brannan plan. But times have changed somewhat.

Frankly, I should think that if the figure were doubled, it would be more nearly applicable to farmers generally, and would at the same time have the effect of cutting out some of the million-dollar loans. While we do not have too many of those, they are an irritation to the public generally.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I might say to the Senator from Vermont that I am not wedded to the figure $25,000. The reason that figure was used was that in obtaining figures from the Department of Agriculture, the $25,000 figure was used in considering the effect it would have. I have not studied what the effect would be if the figure were increased to $40,000 or $50,000. It would not affect farmers in my area, but if it could be shown that in other areas $25,000 would cause undue hardship, and $50,000 would be more realistic, I would not have any objection to modifying my amendment. The principle involved is that the amount of the payments should stop at a point where corporate-type farming would not be carried on at the expense of the taxpayers.

Mr. AIKEN. If the figure of $25,000 were applicable to the net income of the family, it would be adequate. How-

ever, I can conceive of a single farm family producing $25,000 worth of commodities, and at the same time not netting more than $3,000.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. That amount could not be applicable to great family wheat operations, where one family may have several thousands acres in dry farming in our wheat region. A limitation of $25,000 should not preclude such operations from consideration, because the cost of the combines and other machinery is so high that the operations of farmers in that category necessarily must involve commodities worth at least $25,000 a year.

I suggest that the figure in the amendment be enlarged to at least $50,000, and I am not sure that even then it would cover some of our farm families. I am not talking about corporate wheat farmers but family wheat farmers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I certainly would not want to restrict the program so that it would not function in cases of family farming in Oregon or elsewhere. As I said before, since offering the amendment and having had it printed—suggestions were made that perhaps the amount was not sufficient. I said at that time that if Senators in areas which were affected felt that the amount should be higher, I would not oppose such a change in the amendment. I think we all want the program to protect bona fide family-type farms. I certainly am not trying to restrict the amount in such a way as to hamper them.

I understand the Senator from Utah has suggested that the amount be $50,000. I shall be very frank and say that since the amendment was printed further study has shown that the figure $25,000 might be a little low and unrealistic and I will not oppose any effort to raise it if it be decided that such action be necessary.

My only interest is to preserve the principle of keeping our farm program benefits for the farmers.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator realize that on February 22, 1956, I offered an amendment to make the restriction $50,000?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I so understand.

Mr. WATKINS. I have been waiting for a time to call up the amendment. I have had some study made of what that restriction would do to the family-size farm. As has been pointed out, $25,000 would be too restrictive for family-sized operations in the West. I think $50,000 would be more realistic. I wonder if the Senator from Delaware would accept, as an amendment to his amendment, the figure $50,000 rather than $25,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from Utah that if Senators from the areas affected believe that $50,000 would be more realistic, then I would have no objection to that figure, because what we are trying to do is stop the payment of several hundred thousand dollars to a few absentee farmers or to a few groups that are operating large, corporate-type farms.

If the larger figure be necessary in order to provide protection for the areas in the West where there are large farming operations I certainly shall not object to revising the figure as the Senator has suggested.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the Senator from Delaware be willing to have his amendment amended so as to provide for $50,000, instead of $25,000?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; or perhaps we could modify my amendment in that way.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I commend the Senator from Delaware for the principle of his amendment, which I believe needs careful attention and study. In connection with the amendment, I wish to raise a practical point. If a man feeds 100 head of steers at 1,000 pounds each, at $20 a hundred that would be $20,000. That is not a large operation, but there are many of that sort; and in connection with such operations, this proposal should have some study and some thought.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, that particular type of operation would not be affected by the amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. But that involves farm income. How would the amendment be limited?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The amendment applies only to loans to farmers, for support of the agricultural crops produced on the farm.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have several questions to ask. Under the bill, farmers are to be paid in connection with the soil bank and in connection with the acreage control and in connection with the conservation control, and then the farmer is going to be able to borrow money on his crops, under the price-support program. My first question is this: Does the limitation of the amendmnt apply to all 3, or to only 1, or to several?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The limitation before us applies only to loans made on supported crops. It was my intention, when I offered the amendment, to deal only with this question now.

Mr. CAPEHART. The amendment applies only to the loans made on the products themselves, does it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is right. Immediately after disposing of this amendment, I shall offer an amendment which will be applicable to the other two phases of the operations, namely, the acreage reserve and conservation reserve.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then let me ask this question: What we are talking about now is, is it not, a limitation on the amount which any one farmer can borrow—as the support price—on the agricultural commodities he raises?

Mr. WILLIAMS Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then I wish to ask another question. Of course, as the Senator from Delaware understands, no farmer can borrow at the support price unless he has paid the penalty by reducing his production.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. If he does not reduce his production or his acreage, he does not have a right to borrow at the support price.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. He must be in compliance to receive supports.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then does the farmer, in order to be able to borrow up to $25,000 on the grain he has grown—or up to $50,000, if the amendment is modified to that extent—have to comply with the acreage controls only to that amount, or does he have to comply with acreage controls in respect to his entire farm?

For example, suppose a farmer has 1,000 acres of corn, and suppose he would like to plant all those acres to corn. Suppose that under the acreage controls, in order to comply with the loan provisions of the act, he is allowed to plant only 800 acres. In that event, he can do nothing with the remaining 200 acres.

Then let us suppose that on the 800 acres he grows corn, and produces 60 bushels of corn to the acre—which in that event would be 48,000 bushels. At an average price of $1.50, which he might obtain as a loan under the existing policy, that would be approximately $80,000. I understand that the original amendment of the Senator from Delaware proposed a limit of $25,000, but I understand that now he proposes to increase the limit to $50,000. If it is to be limited to $50,000, and if the support price is going to be $1.50, that farmer would be able to receive the support price for only approximately 30,000 bushels. If he obtained an average of 60 bushels to the acre, under the circumstances he could obtain the price support for the production from only 500 acres. In other words, does the amendment limit him, in that case, to obtaining the support price for the production from only 500 of his 800 acres? In that event, what will be the situation as regards to the remaining 300 acres.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Under the amendment the farmer can grow crops on the full amount of his allotment; but he will be able to obtain support prices only up to the amount we specify.

Mr. CAPEHART. He still may grow crops on as many acres as he wants to farm?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. It is not possible to stop him from producing. But the Government will not support the excess production.

Mr. CAPEHART. Oh, yes; that can be provided in the bill. He cannot obtain a price-support loan unless he has complied with the acreage controls.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true. But if he complies with the acreage allotments, and assuming that he has enough production to obtain a $300,000 loan, the point is that under the amendment he can obtain from the Government only the amount of the loan for which we now provide. He could sell the rest of it on the free market.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am in accord with the purpose of the Senator's amendment, but I think we should make very clear just what we are dealing with. Let us say that the amendment is limited to $50,000, and that a farmer has 1,000 acres of corn, and grows 50 bushels to the acre, and the support price at the moment is $1.41—as I think it will be this year. That would amount to approximately $75,000 worth of corn. The amendment would permit him to obtain loans up to $50,000. My point is that, under the law, he would have to reduce his acreage or else he could not obtain the $50,000, or whatever may be the total amount. Under those circumstances, can the farmer plant all 800 of his acres, or must he limit his planting to 500 acres?

Mr. WILLIAMS. He must limit his planting to his allotted acres if he gets price support on any crop.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then we would be very unfair to the wheat farmer and to the corn farmer, and then we would prevent the accomplishment of the very thing we are trying to do, namely, to get the farmers to take some of their acreage out of production. I say that because if the amendment is to operate the way the Senator from Delaware has just explained—although I do not think it should operate that way; I think we should change the amendment—any farmer whose production amounted to more than $50,000 would not participate in the acreage reduction. If that happens there will be an increased production of corn and wheat, because the large farmers, who produce the greatest amounts, will not participate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If they are going to produce to that extent, let them do so without having the benefit of the Government's support price.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; I agree.

I have no objection to the proposed $50,000 limitation, but my question is whether the farmer has to comply with the acreage controls, even in order to get the $50,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then it simply will not work.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perhaps it will not; but the Department thinks it will, and the President has recommended it. If a farmer has an acreage allotment for 1,000 acres of corn, either he will comply to the extent of the 1,000 acres, or he will not comply.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let us say that a farmer is allotted 1,000 acres as his percentage of the total of 51 million acres of corn; and let us assume that normally he produces 60 bushels to the acre.

That would amount to 60,00 bushels, from the 1,000 acres. At the $1.40 support price, that would amount to $84,000, would it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Under the amendment, he would be permitted to obtain loans up to $50,000, would he?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Or whatever we agree upon here.

Mr. CAPEHART. What will happen to the remainder?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The remainder would be on the free market, just as if the farmer were not in compliance at all. I do not see how anything else can be done.

Mr. CAPEHART. My point is that then we would penalize him by making him reduce all his acreage in the same proportion as everyone else did if he wished to obtain the support price.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If he wishes to obtain the support price, he will have to be in compliance.

It would always be possible that he might completely disregard all compliance, plant all his acreage outside the program, and sell any amount of his crop he wished on the free market. I do not see how it could be otherwise. But the Government would not be underwriting the operation.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator proposes to compel him to reduce his acreage by about 25 percent on 1,000 acres in order to get the support price on 750,000 bushels, which would represent about 400 acres.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We do not propose to compel him, but we propose to tell him that if he wishes to get the benefit of the support price to the extent we agree upon, he will have to comply.

Mr. CAPEHART. In my opinion, he will not do it. He will continue to grow all the corn he can grow, even though he takes a lesser amount for it, and we shall defeat the very purpose we are trying to accomplish, and that is to control production.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think so; but experience will tell.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is difficult for me to see that this proposal would penalize very many farmers. I have before me a table showing the number of loans, the total loan value, and the average loan value, with respect to seven major 1953 grain crops. The table is dated January 24, 1956. It was supplied by the United States Department of Agriculture.

The table shows that in 1953, of practically 300,000 corn loans, there were only 104 with respect to which the total ran over $25,000.

Of approximately 600,000 wheat loans, there were only 1,468 that were over $25,000.

Of approximately 44,000 oats loans, there were only 10 that went over $25,000.

Of approximately 35,000 barley loans, only 66 went over $25,000. Of approximately 34,000 sorghum loans, only 25 were over $25,000.

Of approximately 60,000 soybean loans, only 5 were over $25,000.

Of approximately 58,000 flaxseed loans, only 18 were over $25,000.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the Senator is 100 percent correct in principle. The situation he has outlined is the reason why we have surpluses today. That is the reason we have low farm prices. The farmers did not comply. They grew as much as they wanted to grow, and we have surpluses which push prices down. Had everyone complied with acreage control on wheat, corn, and other crops, we would have no surplus today, and the prices of all those products would be 50 or 75 percent higher than they are today. What we are trying to do is to find a method of reducing production, so that prices of farm products will go up to where they belong in the market place. Let us make sure that we are not doing something which will increase production rather than decrease it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I point out to the Senator from Indiana that the President made this suggestion as a part of his recommendations.

Mr. CAPEHART. I know that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The larger growers can still do what the Senator suggests. They can plant without regard to the support program. All we are doing is saying that if they want the benefit of support prices, they must be in compliance.

Mr. CAPEHART. If they plant as much as they desire to plant, can they still borrow up to $50,000?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not unless they are in compliance on acreage allotments.

Mr. CAPEHART. If they cannot, and a producer must reduce his acreage by 25 percent—and that is about what it amounts to for corn this year—he cannot possibly afford to comply. He cannot comply with acreage control on anything. The result will be that there will be more production instead of less.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I point out to the Senator the impossibility of doing as he proposes, that is, allowing them to plant any amount, and to borrow up to $50,000. More than one million farmers participated in the program last year. Less than 2,000 would be affected by this amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. More than one million complied?

Mr. WILLIAMS. More than one million farmers had loans.

Mr. CAPEHART. On corn, soybeans, and wheat?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. One farmer might have had several loans.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What I am pointing out is that if we were to say that there shall be no rule for compliance with respect to the acreage planted in order to make a farmer eligible to borrow $50,000, we would be turning loose 998,000 farmers who could grow all they wished, up to $50,000 worth. That would be impossible.

Mr. CAPEHART. All I am trying to do is to make certain that we do not get more production rather than less, thereby further reducing the prices in the market place.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Department agreed that if the plan would work, perhaps this would be the best method. As to the exact figure, whether it should be $25,000, $50,000, or some other figure, the Department left that more or less to the discretion of Congress. I think we are all in agreement as to what we are trying to achieve, namely, to preserve the benefits of this program for the family-sized farm.

I think this is the method to achieve that goal.

Mr. CAPEHART. What we are trying to do is to reduce the surpluses, so that farm prices in the market place will be 100 percent of parity or more. We should not become confused as between the little farmer and the big farmer, and thereby defeat the object of the program. Whether the big farmer grows X number of bushels of corn, or whether the little farmer grows it, it is still X number of bushels, which creates a surplus. That is what governs the price. Let us not become confused over any factor except bushels. That is what will govern the price. If the big farmers withheld corn from the market, there would be a higher price in the market place, and the little farmer would be helped. It is the little farmer who does not have storage space, and must sell his corn.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is a matter of opinion. I am merely presenting my own opinion.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am in favor of the principle; but we must not lose sight of the objective.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] wishes to say anything on this amendment at this time.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I submitted an amendment to strike from the amendment of the Senator from Delaware the figure of $25,000, and substitute $50,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me say to the Senator from Utah that I will go along with his amendment. However, from the parliamentary standpoint, his amendment would not be in order until all time on my amendment had been exhausted or yielded back. So if the Senator will temporarily withhold his amendment until the appropriate time, I assure him that it will be acted upon before a vote is taken on my amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the light of the figures in the table which I read, I was about to suggest that if a change is made from $25,000 to $50,000, the $50,000 be applicable to multiple loans. A producer may be getting loans on more than one commodity. In the light of the table, if a small loan is being made for a single crop, the figure of $25,000 has merit. But if it is to apply to multiple loans, loans on more than one crop, the amount might better be $50,000.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does this amendment cover multiple loans?

Mr. WILLIAMS. A farmer can borrow up to the $25,000 or $50,000 amount agreed upon.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it limited to loans upon a single grain?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It could be all on one single crop but if the farmer has several supported crops then it would act as a ceiling on all.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

We have not been proceeding in too orderly a manner. I presume that all the time which has been consumed so far in this question-and-answer period has been charged to the proponent of the amendment. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to advise the Senate that the committee gave much study to the problem of limiting the amount which might be borrowed by a producer of a commodity under the price support program, or sold to the Government under a purchase agreement. As I recall during our executive sessions a very prominent representative of the Department of Agriculture specifically stated that the Department, too, had given much study to this problem, and that, up to that moment no conclusion had been reached.

Mr. President, the limitation contained in the amendment—$25,000—not only is unrealistic, but I believe my good friend from Delaware has overlooked the whole purpose of the price support program. It is not to be considered a subsidy. The purpose of the price support program is to give an opportunity to any producer of a supported commodity to withhold his commodity from the market when it would otherwise depress the market. This has worked well with the basic commodities and the storable nonbasics. Thus the price support program, from its inception, has benefited farmers greatly by making it possible for a farmer to hold his production during times of harvest, or otherwise when prices are seasonally low. This is done by lending a farmer money, with his crop as collateral. If the market rises, the farmer can pay back his loan, redeem his crop and sell it on the higher market. In no manner, Mr. President, is the price support program of loans and purchases a subsidy program. Now, as to those benefiting most from this program, I think the record will show that as to the larger producers—particularly those growing cotton, rice, and also wheat—the Commodity Credit Corporation had to take over only a relatively small amount of those commodities placed under loan. Most of them, I understand, repay their loans as they are able to market their commodities at a better price. I repeat, this amendment would tend to draw all production of small producers into Government stocks, leaving the market to the larger producers. If sufficient commodities were put under loan, the withdrawal of such stocks from the market would tend to support the market price for all producers, both large and small, and this amendment would be ineffective. On the other hand, if this amendment so curtailed price support operations that they were not effective to support the market price to producers, the price support program would be rendered ineffective.

I wish to emphasize again that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry gave considerable study to the possibility of limiting price support payments. Our committee received various methods and proposals for doing so. One method was to begin with a 90-percent support price to apply to the production of only a specific amount of basic commodities. For example, it, in effect, was proposed to support only the first 1,000 bushels of corn, or perhaps 25 bales of cotton, or 2,000 bushels of wheat, produced by a farmer. As the farmer produced more, it was proposed to lower the support level as the production per farm increased.

After studying that proposal, the committee decided that it would be impractical—that the Government would end up by taking into its possession practically all of the production from the smaller farms. We felt that, in practice, as the support price lowered, market prices would stabilize at or around the lower support levels. This, of course, would certainly do violence to the market, and would result in the small farmers producing almost entirely for Government warehouses, since the support level, as to their crops, would be higher than the market price.

This effect, Mr. President, would be demoralizing and it would result in the Government holding more high-priced wheat or high-priced cotton that it should.

Members of the Senate must remember that the price-support program is not a subsidy, The Government lends money to a producer and takes his crop as security in order to help the farmer protect his market. That is how and why it operates, and not for any other purpose.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Government does even lend the money. The Government guarantees the money at the farmer's local bank. It never puts up any money itself.

Mr. ELLENDER. It works that way, but the program's financing is actually handled through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. CAPEHART. The farmers borrow money from their local bank, and the Commodity Credit Corporation guarantees the repayment of the loans.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct with respect to the program of crop loans.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; and the loan is paid back to the bank, or the Government receives the wheat or whatever it is. That is how the Government has acquired its present surpluses.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to take the Senate's time by dwelling on the operation of the program. It has been discussed many times on the floor of the Senate.

I do, however, want the record to be perfectly clear on the point of how much the price-support program in the basics has cost the Government. As of November 1955, the Government has not lost a dime on its cotton loans. As to price support for all basics, from 1933 to November of last year the entire loss to the Government during that entire 23-year period was less than a half billion dollars—less than $22 million per year. It would be folly to defeat the operation of this program by limiting the amount that a farmer can borrow on the commodity he produces by, in effect, treating this program as a subsidy.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe the Senator from Louisiana has put the

matter in a logical light so far as the purpose of the provision is concerned. However, I believe there is one phase of the question which is being overlooked, and that is this: The purpose or the intent of the amendment is to encourage the family-sized farm, rather than the large corporate operation. That is another element, of which I am sure the Senator is aware.

Mr. ELLENDER. How would the amendment accomplish that?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let us take wheat, for example. It would tend to encourage operations within the size of the limit, rather than to encourage someone either to buy or to rent a number of acres, and then request a large loan. In that respect, many of the people of my State feel that some limitation would tend to encourage the family-sized farm, rather than the corporate operations.

Mr. ELLENDER. The mere fact that a small farmer knows he can borrow up to almost any amount should not discourage him from continuing his farming operations. In fact, it should encourage him by offering an incentive to increase his efficiency and scope of operations. The small farmer should not be doomed to remain a small operator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The amendment would not discourage the small farmer, but it might tend to discourage the large corporation operator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot see that at all, if I may say so to the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator from Louisiana admit that the provision would encourage a farmer to rent thousands and thousands of acres, perhaps Indian land, and raise enormous quantites of wheat, if he could secure a loan of $100,000 or $200,000 or $300,000?

Mr. ELLENDER. The total lands he can plant to the basics is limited by quota of allotted acres. If he had no acreage-allotment program, the argument of the Senator from North Dakota might apply. Let us not forget that, whether a farm is large or small, whether it is a corporate farm or individually owned, the acreage that can be planted to the basic commodities is limited to the farm's acreage allotment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator, I am sure, knows that some farms are as large as 60,000 acres.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The primary reason that the smaller farmers are going out of the picture is due to their inability to finance the purchase and operation of the modern-day farm machinery required to maintain an efficient output. The small farmer does not have enough volume to justify the investment in expensive labor-saving machines. That factor more than anything else has caused many of the smaller farmers to fall by the wayside. I can speak from personal experience. I used to farm before I came to the Senate, and continued for some years after I came to the Senate. Among other crops I planted sugarcane. My sugarcane operation was not large enough to justify my purchasing a mechanical caneloader or mechanical canecutter which, with two men, would eliminate the need for the services of 75 men. When I found that my brother, who had a fairly large sugarcane operation, could by use of a mechanical caneloader and canecutter, harvest sugarcane and deliver it to the factory at about 95 cents a ton, compared to my cost of $2 a ton, I realized that I could not remain in business unless I were prepared to substantially increase my farming operations. I chose to get out of farming.

To my way of thinking, that is one of the main reasons why many of the smaller farmers operating with a couple of mules or a few horses, as we have seen on the prairies in the Senator's State, have had to say, "I cannot afford to mechanize; I do not have enough funds for that purpose, and my operations are not large enough." Such farmers have had to lease their farms or sell them. I do not think price supports have had anything to do with it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think the Senator should make the record unequivocally clear at this point, so that no one could misunderstand it. I think there is a good deal of misunderstanding at the present time. No farmer can borrow at the support prices unless he has reduced his production. He must make a sacrifice in order to borrow.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. This year the corn acreage is going to be cut. Every farmer must grow 21 percent less acreage to qualify for the support price. He does not receive it free; he has to make a sacrifice. He has to cultivate a smaller number of acres. That applies on corn, oats, soybeans, and so forth. The farmer has to reduce the acreage he has been cultivating in the past. If every farmer had complied with the acreage control there would be no surpluses today. There would be no low prices in the market place. Prices would be 100 percent or more of parity. The farmer who is entitled to borrow—and that is what he does; and he has to pay the loan back—is the one who reduces his acreage and grows less production.

Mr. ELLENDER. My friend has anticipated my next point.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am sorry.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad the Senator brought it out. But that is exactly the point I was in process of explaining when my good friend from North Dakota asked a question.

Take the corngrower, for instance. What happens? The Secretary of Agriculture, under rules and regulations he proposes, states to the farmers who grow corn in the commercial area that if the acreage is reduced to 43 million acres plus, the Government will see to it that they may borrow at a certain percent of parity. It does not apply to all the corn that can be grown; it applies only to the corn produced by a farmer who stays within his allotted acreage. That is it, in a nutshell. If that provision is stricken from the RECORD I think we shall do violence to the whole farm program.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is very eloquent and very persuasive, but, unfortunately, he does not get the idea of either the Senator from North Dakota or the Senator from South Dakota.

Here is a farmer who has 50,000 acres. Certainly, under this amendment, he would not take advantage of it if the amount of the loan should be limited to $25,000.

As I understand the argument of the Senator from South Dakota, the purpose is to serve the small farmer, instead of the one farming 50,000 acres, of which we have illustrations in the West. If I am incorrect, I hope my friend from South Dakota will correct me. But I think that is the purpose of his question.

Mr. ELLENDER. It will not work that way, as I suggested to my good friend from South Dakota. The large wheat grower for example, cannot buy land tomorrow and plant it to wheat the next day and obtain price support on his new production. If the Secretary of Agriculture submits to the wheat growers, as he has done this year, a national acreage allotment permitting the planting of 55 million acres of wheat, there are certain conditions that the larger farmers must meet in order to make themselves eligible to obtain price support loans on their wheat crop. They must comply with acreage allotments, for one thing. Also, if a farmer overplants his land to wheat, beyond the acreage he is authorized, he is subject to marketing penalties.

The same thing applies to peanuts, cotton and the other basic commodities, except for corn, which has no marketing penalty in its program.

The committee has from time to time given study to the subject of price-support limitations, but they have come to naught. They are incompatible with the very nature of the price-support program. I can well understand that if this were a direct subsidy, it would be much easier to place and justify a limitation on it.

Mr. CAPEHART. And we should.

Mr. ELLENDER. We should, by all means. It has been done in the past, for example, with respect to payments for soil-conservation practices under the ACP program.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator will remember that it took 2 years to get that limitation under soil conservation.

Mr. ELLENDER. But we got it.

Mr. LANGER. And we are trying to get this limitation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know but as I said to my good friend, there is a basic difference between the types of programs involved. The price-support operation is not a subsidy, it is not in the same category as the ACP program.

Mr. LANGER. It would stop a man from farming 50,000, or 60,000, or 70,000 acres of land.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is useless to argue further. My eloquence has not done much good, so far as my friend from North Dakota is concerned, but I must bring up another point. Quite conceivably a corporation or a farmer who could incorporate would break his farming operations into separate farms to the point where the entire production would qualify for price support under the limitation now proposed. The committee realized the limitation would be very difficult to carry out.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] will yield me 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I had agreed to yield a few minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. I understand he desires to speak, but that can be done a little later.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the point which the able chairman of the committee has made with reference to the penalty brings up exactly the point I wish to make clear. The penalty for the large operations of the big operators does not fall upon the big operators with its most penalizing effect, but upon the small operators.

There is a county in my State known as Perkins County. When there were no restrictions during the war, wheat production blossomed out in that county as it did through a great part of the northern Great Plains area. It went to a national total of between 70 million and 80 million acres. When we returned to acreage allotments again a few years ago, a large percentage of acreage allotments applied to the little farmer who had not been able to expand as much as had the big farmer, and the little farmer was the one who was penalized. The able Senator from Louisiana has spoken about the necessity of doing something for the small operator so he can pay for his machinery and equipment.

That is exactly the problem about which I am concerned, because the small farmers were not able to expand their operations. They did not have the necessary capital. Many of them were GI's who came back after the war to try to take up farming again. They did not have the money, as some of the big operators had. They had to rent some land in Kansas; they had to rent land in Nebraska; they had to rent it in South Dakota and North Dakota.

It was the big operators who were the ones who plowed up land which ought not to have been plowed up again, except for a war emergency. But when we established crop limits again, we did not go back to the historical base of wheat acreage. We took acreage which had been planted in the war years. So when we applied a 15-percent reduction, we applied it to the 15-percent expanded operations of large operators and also to the stabilized operations of the small operators.

Some of the small farmers in Perkins County have had a reduction of 30 percent in their wheat acreage on a farm which was a small farm to begin with. Today they are at a point where they cannot, even if they grow a crop on every acre which is allotted to them, get enough return to take care of the investment they have in their machinery and equipment. They are the ones who are having difficulties as the result of the expansions by the large operators.

That is why I have some sympathy with the amendment. I should like to see the small farmers protected in some way. I should hate to see them pay for the expansion of the large operators, who come in and operate corporation type of farms. That is what I mean when I speak of the value of this operation.

If we should cut off 1,400 of the large operators from a total of 600,000, those operators could still plant within their allotment.

I want to save the little farmer from having to take a penalty as the result of the expansion on the part of the large farmer.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Some of the small farmers are the ones who have been practicing good soil conservation by planting legume crops. I know a farmer who has 160 acres of land. He used to grow 80 or 90 acres of wheat. His wheat allotment now is 31 acres. He has told me this will be the last year he will be able to farm.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. With 30 acres, he does not have enough yield to take care of his investment in his combine and other equipment which are necessary to plant and harvest wheat. So he is finally squeezed out, and the big operator comes along with a full fleet of combines. He can perhaps rent his equipment to other farmers and march up through the Wheat Belt according to the seasons.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The difficulty is that we are considering an amendment but are talking about an entirely different subject. I am in hearty accord with the difficulty in which the small farmers find themselves. But that is not covered by the amendment under discussion. The amendment we are now considering would not help the little farmer at all. It would not do anything to aid him. In my opinion, it would hurt him, because it would enable the big farmer to grow an unlimited amount of crops, thereby building up the surpluses and further depressing prices.

What we are trying to do in the bill—if we are not, then certainly we ought not to be considering a soil bank—is to try to reduce production, and thereby to raise prices in the market place.

If it is proposed to take away from the big farmer and give to the little farmer, that is something else again. But the amendment does not do that at all. The amendment, in my opinion, will hurt the little farmer, rather than help him.

As I said in the Senate the other day, what we ought to do is pass a law having a complete, 100-percent reallocation of acres in the United States, in order to take care of the very situation about which the able Senator from South Dakota has spoken. Over the years there has been no reallocation of acreage. There has been a lot of shifting. Some farmers have increased their acres; others have decreased them. There ought to be a fairer, more equitable allocation of acres. But that is not the purpose of the amendment at all. It has no relationship to the amendment.

What we are talking about is limiting the larger farmer in the amount of supports he may receive, thereby forcing him to harvest all his acres, and denying him the right to participate in the program at all, which means that he will grow more corn, instead of less, and more wheat instead of less, thereby further depressing the little farmer's economy, because under the amendment the little farmer will continue to get the same price, and at the same time will have the same number of acres which he has been allocated. Those acres may not be enough, and the allocation may not be equitable to the little farmer. But that is not what the amendment proposes at all. The amendment does not even touch that subject; it relates to an entirely different subject.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the able Senator from Indiana has put his finger upon what ought to be done, namely, to go back to the historical base which existed prior to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. We ought to return to a true base, rather than to use a base which developed as a result of the spurred production incident to the war.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is no question about that. I am in sympathy with the Senator's views, but I do not feel the amendment we are now considering relates to that subject.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I am preparing an amendment to apply the flexible concept, about which we hear so much, to the problem of price supports for the small farmer. There should be price supports on a stipulated number of bushels at a relatively high support price, and then we should graduate the support price downward as production increases. We should move in the direction in which the Senator from Indiana has spoken.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, if it is the desire to help the small farmer.

Mr. MUNDT. If it is desired to help the small farmer.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not see how the amendment can possibly help the small farmer. It may penalize the big farmer, but I am sure that, in doing so, the small farmer will be hurt, because as production is increased, the market price will be depressed.

Mr. MUNDT. If it is desired to penalize the big farmer, what should be done is to make added production and additional acreage unprofitable.

Mr. CAPEHART. If it is desired to limit the acreage of the big operator, we could provide that he shall be allotted 75 percent as many acres; if it is desired to aid the small farmer, we can say that he shall be allotted 90 percent. If it is desired to adopt an amendment which would discriminate between the small farmer and the big farmer on the number of acres, then the small farmer can be helped. That is what we ought to do, if we want to help the small farmer, but not do it on the basis of yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. The big producer, if he gets soil-bank income for retiring his acreage, will have to comply with the law, and he cannot increase his acreage. We are not limiting him in the amount of cash he can receive. But if he intends to get any soil-bank aid, he must comply with the law. He cannot go on expanding and increasing, as the Senator from Indiana has indicated.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am fearful that he will not do it. I think he will grow all his acres, if he is not permitted to participate. If it is desired to offer an amendment whereby he is allowed to plant a smaller percentage of his total acreage, and give to the little fellow a larger percentage of acres, that might help the little fellow.

For example, this year the acreage of all farmers is being cut about 20 percent. If we want to cut the farmer who plants 100 acres, 25 percent, and the farmer who has less than 100 acres, 15 percent, that will help the little farmer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield 18 minutes to the Senator from Utah. I believe I have 23 minutes left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 23 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield 18 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the chief beneficiaries of the farm price support program have been, and are, the upper one-third of our farmers who produce 85 percent of the annual marketable crop value and who likewise receive 80 percent of farm income.

The family and per capita income picture for these farmers and their families compares very well with those of nonfarm workers. The 1950 Census of Agriculture, published, for the first time, complete information on farm income received by an economic class of farm. The commercial farms are classified as follows:

Class I: Those farms which produce over $25,000 worth of crops.

Class II: Those farms which produce more than $10,000 worth, but less than $25,000 worth.

Class III: Those farms which produce more than $5,000 worth, but less than $10,000 worth.

Class IV: Those farms which produce more than $2,500 worth, but less than $5,000 worth.

Class V: Those farms which produce more than $1,200 worth, but less than $2,500 worth.

Class VI: Those farms which produce over $250 worth, but less than $1,200 worth.

Analysis of these data reveals that—

First. Nine percent, or 484,000 of the farms produced 51 percent of the total value of all farm products sold.

Second. The average family income provided by these farms was $6,585; nearly 2½ times the average of all farm families.

Third. The average per capita income of people living on these farms was $1,594; also about 2½ times the average of all people living on farms.

The owners or operators of these 484,000 farms are, and have been, receiving the largest subsidies under the price-support programs. One private research organization recently reported that 1.9 percent of our farmers received 25 percent of the price support subsidy in 1953.

The largest loans made under the price-support program are those made to corporation, not family, type farms. For example, in 1953 the largest wheat loans were made to—

First. The Harrigan farms of Prosser, Wash., which placed 152,840 bushels under loan in the amount of $354,339.

Second. The United States Wheat Corp., of Hardin, Mont., which placed 184,516 bushels under loan in the amount of $348,646.

I should also like to point out that 1,468 loans of over $25,000, with a total loan value of $63,437,759 were made on the 1953 wheat crop. Their average loan value was $43,214.

At the other end of the price support ladder, 554,058 loans under $5,000, but totaling $713,517,921 with an average loan value of $1,288 were made by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

With respect to corn, the largest loans on the 1953 crop went to—

First. Adams Bros. & Co., of Odebolt, Iowa, which placed 124,800 bushels of corn under loan at a face value of $190,944.

Second. Emil Sovich, of Rensselaer, Ind., who placed 102,648 bushels under loan in the amount of $166,289.76.

On this corn crop, the Commodity Credit Corporation made 104 loans of over $25,000, with a total loan value of $3,575,440. The average value of these 104 loans was $34,379. At the other end of the subsidy ladder, 283,605 loans under $5,000 in value, but totaling $503,449,500, were made. These loans average $1,775.

So that the Senate may see the magnitude of the subsidy program to large operators, I ask unanimous consent that table 3 of the United States Department of Agriculture's January 1956 publication, Summary of Sample Survey of Size of Major 1953 Crop-Grain Loans, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 3.—*Number of loans, total loan value and average loan value, 7 major 1953 grain crops*

Grain crop	Under $5,000	$5,000 to $10,000	$10,000 to $25,000	Over $25,000
Wheat:				
Number of loans	554,058	26,184	9,496	1,468
Total loan value	713,517,921	171,245,681	130,731,400	63,437,759
Average loan value	1,288	6,540	13,767	43,214
Corn:				
Number of loans	283,605	10,842	957	104
Total loan value	503,449,500	69,913,395	12,357,165	3,575,440
Average loan value	1,775	6,448	12,912	34,379
Oats:				
Number of loans	42,845	408	59	10
Total loan value	32,307,931	2,763,937	814,485	271,984
Average loan value	754	6,774	13,805	27,198
Barley:				
Number of loans	33,185	518	183	66
Total loan value	29,817,683	3,559,516	2,772,665	6,364,144
Average loan value	899	6,872	15,153	96,424
Sorghum:				
Number of loans	30,753	1,643	401	25
Total loan value	38,910,506	11,863,572	5,783,510	1,002,869
Average loan value	1,265	7,221	14,423	40,115
Soybeans:				
Number of loans	59,717	746	56	5
Total loan value	71,089,904	5,108,484	976,860	189,982
Average loan value	1,190	6,848	17,444	37,996
Flaxseed:				
Number of loans	56,907	562	56	18
Total loan value	52,781,564	3,362,395	762,966	520,361
Average loan value	928	5,983	13,624	28,909

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the lack of a limit upon the amount of price-support assistance a farmer can receive gives, in my opinion, unnecessary financial assistance to a great many of the 103,231 farms in the first economic class of farms, which, as defined by the Census Bureau, produces products valued at more than $25,000.

While it is clear that during certain periods even these farms may need some price-support assistance, it is equally clear that many of them simply do not need unlimited price-support assistance. Many of these farms will year in and year out return to their owners net incomes much higher than 90 percent of what our people ever hope to receive. This they would do even if they never received a dime in price-support subsidy.

This can be done by those who operate the more profitable farms by applying to their lands just the right amount of labor and machinery which will produce the largest possible volume at the lowest possible cost per unit of output.

This, of course, results in the highest gross income possible of achievement with that particular size of farm.

The American people are getting tired of seeing $350,000, $500,000, and $1,000,000 loans made to the farmers who already are the best off financially. My amendment, Mr. President, is designed to give full protection to efficiently operated family-type farms by setting the maximum limit at $50,000 with respect to the products of any one farm. On the other hand, it will stop unlimited assistance to those corporation farms which simply do not need it.

My reason for setting the maximum limit at $50,000 is that any lesser amount—$35,000 or $25,000, for example—would serve to force from the program too many of the large operators producing such a large volume of many commodities. Should such producers forego price support, due to such a low limitation, and throw their whole production upon the market, the result might well be to lower the market price and, thereby, operate directly against the purpose of price support, which is to raise the market price.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I submit that the figure $50,000 is realistic. It fits the situation, and will not tempt too many farmers to ignore the entire price-support program and produce unlimitedly, as they have a right to do; but will keep in the program practically all the production, and at the same time will place the emphasis where it is needed, namely, upon the small farmer.

That is why I prepared my amendment with the figure $50,000. It takes care of the average family-sized farm, it works no hardship on any one farmer, and does not give a premium to those who can make a profit even though they have no price supports.

At the proper time, when the parliamentary situation will make it possible to do so, I think the Senator from Delaware may accept the amendment I have offered as an amendment to his amendment. I think it is the general feeling that the figure should be placed at around $50,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there are personal reasons why I dislike to oppose the amendment. I vote with the Senator from Delaware a great deal, and I appreciate the attitude he has taken in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on questions coming before that committee, and on many other matters. I should like to be able to favor his amendment, but I cannot do it.

I think in this instance while the intention is good, the amendment would work very badly. I believe it would tend to bring down the very prices which it is intended should be held up.

Under the amendment, what will the farmer who has more than $25,000 or $50,000 worth of commodities do? He will proceed to market his products, outside the level of price supports, and that will result in the prices never getting above the price support levels.

Farmers have to have peaks as well as valleys. We discovered during the war that farm prices were held down by the Office of Price Administration, but once farmers came out from under the controls they received peak prices, which were above 90 or 100 percent. The farmer has to have such an opportunity. But if we say to the man who has large resources that he cannot hope to have price supports, he will proceed to move his products just under the prices at which another farmer may move his. Therefore the support level will become the highest price at all times. I think that would be bad for all farmers, large and small.

In my opinion, the amendment would further tend to divide farms artificially. The amendment provides that a farmer cannot get more than $25,000. If the farmer lives in a community property State, he will decide at once to have his wife own half of the farm, he will transfer half ownership to her in one way or another, so that the two of them will be able to divide the income. Furthermore, he may decide that his son might like to take his inheritance earlier than he ordinarily would get it, so he will proceed to divide the farm with his son.

Corporation farms will find it is easy to have their farms in $25,000 sizes. We have seen that happen in the subdivision business, where companies have 20 corporations handling their matters, because they have found circumstances to be favorable if they keep the income at $25,000. The same thing can be done with farms.

Not too long ago I visited a farm in the State represented by the able minority leader. That farm had been a long time in the process of being brought into productive cultivation. It was a very fine farm, containing more than 40,000 acres of irrigated land. When it was sold, it brought $7½ million. It was a cash transaction. Does anybody believe that the corporation which bought it for $7½ million cannot get all the money it wants without coming to the Commodity Credit Corporation?

But if we say, "You cannot have any price support; all you can do is stay within your acres, and then you cannot have any price support," the company could very easily apply the extra amount of fertilizer which results in the production of very large crops, and could drop those crops into the market at a price just below what the support price would be, and that price would tend to fix the price for the remainder.

After all, when we are considering this amendment, we must realize that some farmers have very large operations and are able to obtain large amounts of credit. One farmer got in 1 year a cotton loan of $3 million. It lasted only a few months. He moved all the cotton into the market, and disposed of every bit of it. He did not need to have all of it handled in that way. But there was a bank that was happy to make him a loan of $3 million; in fact, it gave him an open line of credit amounting to $5 million. Are we to think that by writing into the law a limitation of $25,000 or $50,000, we would make it impossible for that man to market his cotton?

If we go to Mississippi, and consider the Delta & Pine Land Co., we realize that that company will not be blocked from obtaining capital, by a $25,000 limitation. It will not be blocked by it at all. The only result of such a limitation would be that that company would put all its product into the market at just below the loan price.

I say that if the little farmers were squeezed out, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has pointed out, that happened before there were allotments. I concede that there is something to the argument the Senator from South Dakota has made; but that condition occurred when there were no allotments; and during that period, the big farmers "went to town."

If we wish to deal with that problem, we must proceed in an entirely different way, and not in the way proposed by this amendment.

I agree with the Senator from Delaware, insofar as the purpose of the amendment is concerned. He is correct in trying to make sure that these programs are not improperly used.

However, we are not dealing with a subsidy paid to a farmer. The purpose of this fund is to provide orderly marketing. The farmer gets a loan. I think it is wrong for us to consider that the farmer gets a subsidy. When the farmer puts his product on the market, we should have an agricultural program which will make his commodity sell at a sufficiently high price.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think it would be a mistake for the Senate to adopt this amendment. I find myself in complete sympathy with the position taken by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and I find myself in complete sympathy with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], in connection with the problem he has outlined. But I say this amendment will not cure that situation.

Mr. President, the amendment was carefully considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and was voted down by the committee. I hope the Senate as a whole will reject the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand from the distinguished Senator from Delaware that no other Senator on his side desires to be heard. Unless some Senator on this side wishes to speak against the amendment, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time, because I understand that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has an amendment which he wishes to offer at this time.

In reply to the Senator from New Mexico, I say there is not a Member of the Senate for whom I have greater respect; and his knowledge of the agricultural problem is such that none of us ever expects to equal. But I happen to think that perhaps the amendment would work. I point out that there have been precedents for such action. It is true that a farmer could divide his farm into multiple units or many corporate units, and that was pointed out in the committee. In the case of the Small Business Administration, we imposed a limitation on the amount in the case of any one

loan. At that time we recognized that theoretically it would be possible for a corporation to divide itself into multiple units or into several parts. If that happens, either by administrative action or by a correction of the law we can take care of that problem. Our limitations worked in that instance.

I think we are agreed that we wish to have the benefits of this program go to the family-type farm. I think the amendment will accomplish that objective.

There is no justification for asking the American taxpayers to extend this help to the $7,500,000 to $10 million corporate-types of farming operations.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. WATKINS rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah desire to have time yielded to him?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I desire to submit an amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I told the Senator from Utah that I would later modify my amendment so as to have it provide a $50,000 limitation. However, I understand that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] wishes to offer an amendment first. Or, Mr. President, if it is preferred that I do so, I shall modify my amendment now, so as to have it provide a limitation of $50,000.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, at this time I desire to submit an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, so as to strike out the $25,000 limitation set forth in the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, and provide for a $50,000 limitation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Delaware has modified his amendment to that extent?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Minnesota has said he desires to speak before I modify my amendment. That is why I have not yet modified it. If the Senator from Minnesota has no objection, I shall modify my amendment now, or we can modify it later.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since my amendment includes that provision, as well as others, I should like to submit my amendment at this time; and then we can return to the other amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware has been yielded back.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. My amendment is offered to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair inquire whether the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is offered as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, or as a substitute for it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Either as an amendment to it or as a substitute for all of it—whichever is in accordance with the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Senator from Minnesota knows, a substitute would take the place of the other amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I offer it as an amendment in the nature of a substitute, if that is the correct way to offer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota desire to add his amendment at the end of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. HUMPHREY. All I desire to do is to offer the amendment and have a vote taken on it. The clerks at the desk undoubtedly can determine exactly where the amendment should be written in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to cooperate in connection with this matter. Will the Senator from Minnesota state the section to which the amendment is offered?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is offered to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then will it come at the end of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware?

Without objection, the amendment will be considered as being offered to be inserted at the end of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota. If he later desires to have the amendment rewritten or to have it apply to another section, he will later be recognized for that purpose. Meanwhile, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, because of the peculiar parliamentary situation, in that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has, in order to modify his original amendment, offered as a substitute an amendment which was pending up to the time of the offering of my amendment, it is my understanding that I cannot offer my amendment as a substitute. If I can, however, I offer it as a substitute. It was my previous understanding that since the word "substitute" had been used in the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, it was not possible for my amendment to be offered as a substitute.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. Should the amendment not be read?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, Mr. President; I wish to have my amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of Mr. WILLIAMS' amendment, on page 4, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

LIMIT ON PRICE SUPPORT

SEC. 107. The Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 421. (a) Notwithstanding section 101 of this act, price supports made available under this act to any person for any year for basic agricultural commodities shall be made at 90 percent of parity, if the loans to such person, or the purchases made by the Commodity Credit Corporation from such person, do not exceed $5,000.

"(b) The total amount of price support made available under this act to any person for any year through loans to such person, or through purchases made by the Commodity Credit Corporation from such person, shall not exceed $50,000.

"(c) The term 'person' shall mean any individual, partnership, firm, joint stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or agency of a State. In the event of any loan to, or purchase from, a cooperative marketing association, such limitation shall apply to the amount of price support made available through such cooperative association to each person. The limitation herein on the amount of price support made available to any person shall not apply if price support is extended by purchase of a product of an agricultural commodity from processors and the Secretary determines that it is impracticable to apply such limitations."

On page 4, in line 24, strike out "107" and insert "108."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my amendment has two objectives. First, it has the objective of providing 90 percent of parity price support loans on basic agricultural commodities, up to a maximum loan or purchase amount of $5,000 per farm. This is designed to give economic assistance and support to the small family sized farm.

The second purpose of the amendment is to limit the total amount of price support loans or purchases to any one person, as defined in the amendment, the term "person" meaning any individual, partnership, firm, joint stock company, corporation, association, State, or agency of a State.

I would have my colleagues note that the 90 percent section of the bill is limited to the smaller farm production units. The $50,000 limitation is designed to get away from having a Government price support program encourage large corporation farm developments.

I think there has been far too little consideration in this body as to what is happening to one of the basic social and economic institutions of the country. The truth is that the family farm unit is being slowly but surely driven out of existence. There is more and more consolidation of large land holdings. There is more and more absentee land ownership. More and more rural communities are being literally dried up because of the economic pressures upon the family farm unit.

I recognize that on the basis of so-called production efficiency and sheer dollars and cents, it can be said that many of the so-called family units cannot meet the high standards of efficiency and double-entry bookkeeping stand-

ard of big business. I think the time has arrived to make a great decision, a decision as to whether we are interested only in production efficiency, or whether we are interested in a certain basic pattern of social organization.

If we want nothing more nor less than production efficiency, the thing to do is to group the large farms into huge corporate structures. Turn loose the big equipment, put the land under a general manager, with supervisors and straw bosses, and Russianize American agriculture.

Lest anyone have any doubts on the question, I am against State collectivism, and I am equally against private collectivism. I do not see much difference, except that possibly one might be a little worse than the other, in that, in private collectivism, one individual is exploiting his fellow men, and in State collectivism, the State exploits its citizens.

I am opposed to the socialization of American agriculture. I charge that this administration's policies tend to accelerate such a policy. I am opposed to the collectivization of American agriculture; and I charge that this administration's price support policies and other policies are leading in that direction. The fact that collectivization comes under some huge corporation does not make it much different than if it came under some large State agency. In fact, in America, we might have a vote in the State agency, but in a large corporation we would have no vote.

A number of reports have come to Members of Congress lately from some of our fine organizations. For example, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference has sent a communication to me. They are deeply concerned over what is happening in American agriculture. They are deeply concerned that the provisions in the bill before us, now that the 90 percent provisions are out, would encourage further large land holdings, and further dilution of the American family farm.

Mr. President, the purpose of the first section of my amendment is to give to the family farm operator the opportunity to get 90 percent of parity price support loans on his production, up to $5,000.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the Senator would like to have the yeas and nays requested now on his amendment, in order that Senators may be on notice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be very happy to have that done.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Humphrey substitute.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was brought to my attention the other day that in the 79th Congress the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business issued an extraordinarily fine report concerning the family farm unit. In particular, it made a study in the Central Valley of California on effects of scale of farm operations. The report is dated December 23, 1946, and is known as Senate Document No. 13. In the introduction to the report, I find some very moving language:

> The family farm is the classic example of the American small-business enterprise. For generations this institution and the community it supports have held the esteem of all who have known and understood the American heritage. Statesmen, historians, economists, and sociologists have generally agreed that the spread of the family farm over the land has laid the economic base for the liberties and the democratic institutions which this Nation counts as its greatest asset.
>
> The great declaration by Daniel Webster still stands as perhaps the clearest and most authentic expression of America's deep-rooted belief in the intimate and causal relations between the family farm and the distinctively popular character of our Government.
>
> "Our New England ancestors," he said, "brought thither no great capitals from Europe; and if they had, there was nothing productive in which they could have been invested. They left behind them the whole feudal policy of the other continent. * * * They came to a new country. There were as yet no lands yielding rent, and no tenants rendering service. The whole soil was unreclaimed from barbarism. They were themselves either from their original condition, or from the necessity of their common interest, nearly on a level in respect to property. Their situation demanded a parceling out and division of the land, and it may fairly be said that this necessary act fixed the future frame and form of their government. The character of their political institutions was determined by the fundamental laws respecting property. * * * The consequence of all these causes has been a great subdivision of the soil and a great equality of condition; the true basis, most certainly, of popular government."

The study goes on to show:

> The advances in technology during the past century have greatly benefited the farmers who, with their families, work the land. The industrial revolution has eased the burden of the farmer and rendered his labors more productive. Yet these technological advances have, at the same time, brought a threat to the very institutions to whose personnel they have brought so much aid. The threat is this: That with increased mechanization will come increased industrialization of the farm enterprise; that with industrialization will come an increasing concentration of economic power in the hands of fewer and fewer men at the head of great organizations, and an end to that broad diffusion of social and economic benefit that has long been characteristic of American rural communities.
>
> There is foundation for the belief that industrialization is on the increase. The United States census of agriculture has been recording the gradual increase in average farm size in America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the report from which I have read be placed in the RECORD at this point. I refer to pages 3 and 4 of the report, and the summary of findings on pages 5 and 6.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION

> The family farm is the classic example of the American small-business enterprise. For generations this institution and the community it supports have held the esteem of all who have known and understood the American heritage. Statesmen, historians, economists, and sociologists have generally agreed that the spread of the family farm over the land has laid the economic base for the liberties and the democratic institutions which this Nation counts as its greatest asset.
>
> The great declaration by Daniel Webster still stands as perhaps the clearest and most authentic expression of America's deep-rooted belief in the intimate and casual relation between the family farm and the distinctively popular character of our Government.
>
> "Our New England ancestors," he said, "brought thither no great capitals from Europe; and if they had, there was nothing productive in which they could have been invested. They left behind them the whole feudal policy of the other continent. * * * They came to a new country. There were as yet no lands yielding rent, and no tenants rendering service. The whole soil was unreclaimed from barbarism. They were themselves either from their original condition, or from the necessity of their common interest, nearly on a level in respect to property. Their situation demanded a parceling out and division of the land, and it may fairly be said that this necessary act fixed the future frame and form of their government. The character of their political institutions was determined by the fundamental laws respecting property. * * * The consequence of all these causes has been a great subdivision of the soil and a great equality of condition; the true basis, most certainly, of popular government."
>
> The advances in technology during the past century have greatly benefited farmers who, with their families, work the land. The industrial revolution has eased the burden of the farmer and rendered his labors more productive. Yet these technological advances have at the same time, brought a threat to the very institution to whose personnel they have brought so much aid. The threat is this: That with increased mechanization will come increased industrialization of the farm enterprise; that with industrialization will come an increasing concentration of economic power in the hands of fewer and fewer men at the head of great organizations, and an end to that broad diffusion of social and economic benefits that has long been characteristic of American rural communities.
>
> There is foundation for the belief that industrialization is on the increase. The United States Census of Agriculture has been recording the gradual increase in average farm size in America. This is not a result of the disappearance of undersized farms; family farmers on the better lands appear to be particularly vulnerable. Census statistics are supported by other information. In those areas particularly suitable to high-value specialty crops, the concentration of land and production into large units has been reported by various agencies and students of American agriculture. A committee of the United States Senate has pointed out that within the decade of the thirties the percentage of all farms in California which produce just over one-half the total agricultural production of that State fell from 10 to 6.8 percent, marking a growth in concentration of nearly one-third. It is not without significance as evidence of this trend that at least one group of specialty crop producers has so far changed its character away from that of family farmers and in the direction of becoming industrialists that it has found itself indicted for violation of the antitrust laws of the Nation.

The development of large-scale farming has been foremost in California. The influence of Spanish land policy, the monopolization of large areas by early comers after American statehood, the soil and climate favorable to the production of specialty crops, and congeries of other historic and economic circumstances have made California particularly amendable to industrialized agricultural production. But development of this pattern of agriculture, often operated like industry from urban centers and worked by wage labor, is not peculiar to any one part of the Nation. It has been reported in some degree from all sections.

Whether industrialization of farming is a threat not only to the family farm, but also to the rural society founded upon the family farm, is the specific subject of the present report. The purpose of this study is to test by contemporary field research the historic hypothesis that the institution of small independent farmers is indeed the agent which creates the homogeneous community, both socially and economically democratic.

The present inquiry consists of a detailed analysis and comparison of two communities, one where agricultural operations are on a modest scale, the other where large factory-like techniques are practiced. Both communities lie in the fertile southern San Joaquin Valley in the great Central Valley of California, where highly developed and richly productive agriculture is characteristic. Limitations of time and resources dictated that no more than two communities be studied. Numerous other pairs might have been chosen which doubtless would have yielded comparable results.

The two communities studied here naturally vary in some degree with respect to proportions of surrounding lands devoted to this or that crop, with respect to age, to depth of water lift for irrigation, etc., as well as with respect to the scale of the farm enterprises which surround them. Controls as perfect as are possible in the chemist's laboratory are not found in social organizations. Yet the approximation to complete control achieved by selection of the communities of Arvin and Dinuba is surprisingly high. Other factors, besides the difference in scale of farming, which might have produced or contributed to the striking contrasts of Arvin and Dinuba have been carefully examined. On this basis the conclusion has been reached that the primary, and by all odds the factor of greatest weight in producing the essential differences in these two communities, was the characteristic difference in the scale of farming—large or small—upon which each was founded. There is every reason to believe that the results obtained by this study are generally applicable wherever like economic conditions prevail.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Certain conclusions are particularly significant to the small-business man, and to an understanding of the importance of his place in a community. Not only does the small farm itself constitute small business, but it supports flourishing small commercial business.

Analysis of the business conditions in the communities of Arvin and Dinuba shows that—

(1) The small-farm community supported 62 separate business establishments, to but 35 in the large-farm community; a ratio in favor of the small-farm community of nearly 2 to 1.

(2) The volume of retail trade in the small-farm community during the 12-month period analyzed was $4,383,000 as against only $2,535,000 in the large-farm community. Retail trade in the small-farm community was greater by 61 percent. (See fig. and table, pp. 83–84.)

(3) The expenditure for household supplies and building equipment was over three times as great in the small-farm community as it was in the large-farm community.

The investigation disclosed other vast differences in the economic and social life of the two communities, and affords strong support for the belief that small farms provide the basis for a richer community life and a greater sum of those values for which America stands, than do industrialized farms of the usual type.

It was found that—

(4) The small farm supports in the local community a larger number of people per dollar volume of agricultural production than an area devoted to larger scale enterprises, a difference in its favor of about 20 percent.

(5) Notwithstanding their greater numbers, people in the small-farm community have a better average standard of living than those living in the community of large-scale farms.

(6) Over one-half the breadwinners in the small-farm community are independently employed businessmen, persons in white-collar employment, or farmers; in the large-farm community the proportion is less than one-fifth.

(7) Less than one-third of the breadwinners in the small-farm community are agricultural wage laborers—characteristically landless, and with low and insecure income—while the proportion of persons in this position reaches the astonishing figure of nearly two-thirds of all persons gainfully employed in the large-farm community.

(8) Physical facilities for community living—paved streets, sidewalks, garbage disposal, sewage disposal, and other public services—are far greater in the small-farm community; indeed, in the industrial-farm community some of these facilities are entirely wanting.

(9) Schools are more plentiful and offer broader services in the small-farm community, which is provided with 4 elementary schools and 1 high school; the large-farm community has but a single elementary school.

(10) The small-farm community is provided with three parks for recreation; the large-farm community has a single playground, loaned by a corporation.

(11) The small-farm town has more than twice the number of organizations for civic improvement and social recreation than its large-farm counterpart.

(12) Provision for public recreation centers, Boy Scout troops, and similar facilities for enriching the lives of the inhabitants is proportioned in the two communities in the same general way, favoring the small-farm community.

(13) The small-farm community supports two newspapers, each with many times the news space carried in the single paper of the industrialized-farm community.

(14) Churches bear the ratio of 2 to 1 between the communities, with the greater number of churches and churchgoers in the small-farm community.

(15) Facilities for making decisions on community welfare through local popular elections are available to people in the small-farm community; in the large-farm community such decisions are in the hands of officials of the country.

These differences are sufficiently great in number and degree to affirm the thesis that small farms bear a very important relation to the character of American rural society. It must be realized that the two communities of Arvin and Dmuba were carefully selected to reflect the different in size of enterprise, and not extraneous factors. The agricultural production in the two communities was virtually the same in volume—$2½ million per annum in each—so that the resource base was strictly comparable. Both communities produced specialized crops of high value and high cost of production, utilizing irrigation and large bodies of special harvest labor. The two communities are in the same climate zone, about equidistant from small cities and major urban centers, similarly served by highways and railroads, and without any significant advantages from nonagricultural resources or from manufacturing or processing. The reported differences in the communities may properly be assigned confidently and overwhelmingly to the scale-of-farming factor.

The reasons seem clear. The small-farm community is a population of middle-class persons with a high degree of stability in income and tenure, and a strong economic and social interest in their community. Differences in wealth among them are not great, and the people generally associate together in those organizations which serve the community. Where farms are large, on the other hand, the population consists of relatively few persons with economic stability, and of large numbers whose only tie to the community is their uncertain and relatively low-income job. Differences in wealth are great among members of this community, and social contacts between them are rare. Indeed, even the operators of large-scale farms frequently are absentees; and if they do live in Arvin, they as often seek their recreation in the nearby city. Their interest in the social life of the community is hardly greater than that of the laborer whose tenure is transitory. Even the businessmen of the large-farm community frequently express their own feelings of impermanence; and their financial investment in the community, kept usually at a minimum, reflects the same view. Attitudes such as these are not conducive to stability and the rich kind of rural community life which is properly associated with the traditional family farm.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the report submits the result of a special inquiry made into two communities in the fertile southern San Joaquin Valley of the great Central Valley of California. The two communities studied vary in degree with respect to proportions of surrounding lands, but the most important part of the study relates to the kind of civil activities which took place with respect to the corporate farm, on the one hand, and the number of small farmers, on the other. I believe it is very highly significant that the analysis showed the following:

The smaller farm community supported 62 separate business establishments, to but 35 in the large-farm community; a ratio in favor of the small-farm community of nearly 2 to 1.

The volume of retail trade in the small-farm community during the 12 months' period analyzed was $4,383,000 as against only $2,535,000 in the large-farm community. Retail trade in the small-farm community was greater by 61 percent.

The expenditure for household supplies and building equipment was over three times as great in the small-farm community as it was in the large-farm community.

The investigation disclosed other vast differences in the economic and social life of the two communities, and affords strong support for the belief that small farms provide the basis for a richer community life and a greater sum of those values for which America stands, than do industrialized farms of the usual type.

There was a much higher standard of living in the farm homes of the small-farm community, as compared with

those of the hired workers of the corporate farm.

Physical facilities for community living—paved streets, sidewalks, garbage disposal, sewage disposal, and other public services—are far greater in the small-farm community; indeed, in the industrial-farm community some of these facilities are entirely wanting.

Schools are more plentiful and offer broader services in the small-farm community, which is provided with 4 elementary schools and 1 high school; the large-farm community has but a single elementary school.

I could go on and on. I commend the report to the reading of every Member of the Senate. This is a case study of a corporate land operation and of some 60-family farms. Both of them are in the same valley of the same State. Both use the same forms of transportation. Both supposedly operate under similar conditions. The truth is that the family-farm unit was better for the businessman in town. The family-size farm community, with 62 farms, provided for a high school and four elementary schools and other good community facilities. The corporate-size farm community provided for one elementary school, and the people in it lived under very poor economic and social conditions.

This report has been cited from time to time by leading clergymen and by those who work in the field of social welfare. It goes to the base of the problem we are facing today. I believe every Senator must ask himself whether he will apply to agriculture the principles of big business or the principles of social equality, social welfare, and economic opportunity.

One of the troubles with the Department of Agriculture today is that it has been General Motorized. The Department looks upon everything in terms of the big approach. The Under Secretary of Agriculture has from time to time said, as have his associates, that agriculture is big business.

Mr. President, the total of all American agriculture may be big business, but agriculture in America is one of the last stands of small business. We must make up our minds whether we want to have happen to agriculture what has happened to manufacturing, or whether we wish to preserve in our society a social unit for the family on the farm, in order to preserve and maintain smaller rural communities.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator compare his amendment with the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Massachusetts asks me to make a comparison between my amendment and the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware. My amendment in its second part is the same as the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware, for, I believe we ought to put a limitation on how much the Government should offer in terms of loans for commodities under the loan program. However, my amendment permits a loan of up to $50,000, because I believe $50,000 is a more reasonable figure in light of the high cost of farm operations today. In other words, the Government would not be obligated to any producer for more than a loan of $50,000 on the commodities which might be offered. That is a principle, as the Senator from Delaware has pointed out, which is used time and time again in legislation.

We do not offer unlimited guaranties on housing, but have a cutoff point. We do not offer unlimited loan guaranties under the Small Business Administration. I believe the maximum is $150,000 at the present time. We are applying the same principle here. Some of the sharpest criticism of the price support program has been directed toward the large corporate farm units which have received as much as $300,000 in loans from the Government, and even as much as a million dollars in loans. To be sure, as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] said, they give as their collateral their crop, and that is proper. In fact, we could justify a loan of any amount so long as the collateral put up in the form of the commodity or the crop was adequate. However, we are working with a program which is not only a loan program, but also a program which is designed to do something for the economic and social pattern of the United States.

Some of the large farms do not need any price supports. All they do is to hire Mexican labor and pay 50 cents an hour, or Jamaican labor, and pay it 50 cents an hour, and take their profit right out of the backs of such labor. If they did that they would not need more than 60 percent of parity. If that is the kind of country anyone wishes to live it, we ought to let the people know about it.

I want to live in a country in which people on the farms look upon farming not only as an occupation and an economic pursuit, but as a way of life. If we want that kind of America we must design a legislative policy which will protect it. I might say that there would not be any small business today except for the Robinson-Patman Act, a Clayton Act, and a Sherman Antitrust Act. We have already by law designed the kind of economy we would like to have in America, so far as business is concerned. The weakness has been in enforcement and that possibly we have not kept up to date with new developments in the corporate structure.

I see on the floor of the Senate the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. Those two Senators have worked diligently in the field of small business and in combating the menace of huge conglomerations of economic power throughout the corporate structure. I submit to these two able Senators that the same thing is happening in agriculture—huge plants, huge farms running to thousands of acres, hired workers—instead of small farms and little communities, where people live in dignity and self-respect, and where workers are not hired by the hundreds and used as common labor, and then sent away.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if the able Senator from Minnesota happened to see an article in yesterday's Washington Post by the Alsop brothers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In it they discussed the plight of the small farmers of this country and related it to a similar situation preceding the fall of the Roman Empire.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I read it with great care. In fact, I was discussing it this morning in my office with my administrative assistant. He is here, and I believe he has the article in his folder.

I read the report to which I alluded a moment ago, and there is no doubt that every country in the world that is in trouble today got into trouble by permitting its agriculture to deteriorate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The last time we were in trouble in this country, from an economic standpoint, it had grown from the same beginning.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It had, indeed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am very much in sympathy with what the Senator is driving at, but here is a question which has been of some concern to me, and I should like to have it explained. This is not just a loan program; it is tied in with the control of acreage, is it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How would the Senator take care of acreage control of big farms raising crops which would exceed $50,000 limitation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I say that a $50,000 loan is no small potatoes? It is quite a concession on the part of the Government.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator knows that in this country, much as he believes and much as I believe in small farms, we have some big producers in every type of agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And a great deal of our production actually comes from those big producers. So long as it is tied in with production control, how are we going to control the big farmers, those whose production would exceed the limit of $50,000? If we turn them loose and let them sell in the free market, we shall be breaking down or threatening the price-support system itself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The acreage control also relates to the conservation reserve and the acreage reserve, all of which provide benefits to the farmers. The acreage control applies to the right or the ability of a farmer to utilize the Commodity Credit Corporation for loan purposes. But I must say there are only a very few producers in this country who would go above the $50,000 figure. I have the figures worked out, and if the Senator will tarry with me a moment I think I can give him a little help.

The Department made a survey on the basis of the $25,000 figure, that is, a $25,000 limitation, and stated that the census data reveals that only 3.7 percent of the farms in our country have gross sales above the $25,000 figure. The larger farming operations produce about

25 percent of the production, and 85 percent of the total commodity supply falls under the $25,000 price for price-support loans. If we have a price-support limitation of $25,000, approximately 85 percent of the supply will be eligible. If we raise it to $50,000 it will go up substantially higher. Of the 296,000 corn loans only 104, less than three-tenths of 1 percent, were larger than $25,000. If we put the figure at $50,000, the percentage will be less than as many fingers as there are on 2 hands.

Of the 35,000 barley loans only 6 were above the $25,000 figure.

It is true that putting a limitation of $50,000 as a maximum amount of loan which can be received from the Government, will cause some persons to be left outside the program, but there are some who are outside of it, anyway. Some of the large producers do not need or use commodity credit loans. So the argument which has been made that by a limitation we would permit some persons to go scot-free as to acreage reduction and production controls is true, whether we have a $50,000 limitation or not. We would not have 100 percent compliance under the farm program. The program last year had slightly more than 50 percent compliance, and it has been getting worse every year, since 1952. One of the reasons why it is getting worse is that it is so poorly administered and because the farm people no longer trust the Department of Agriculture. So, if we provide a $50,000 limitation we are going to place under that ceiling more than 95 percent of all the farm operations in the United States. The overwhelming bulk of them will be under that ceiling. Then we will not see in the editorial columns a continuous statement about some farmer getting $350,000, and the production all going into Government warehouses.

I am tired of that kind of publicity, and I am tired of the way the press and the periodicals have reacted to the program. If they were half as much concerned over what is happening to agriculture as they are concerning a national park or a gas well, we would not have this trouble.

I fought hard for our national parks and I voted against the gas bill. It is a crying shame that the press has not taken sufficient interest in what is happening to the American farmer. Apparently, he has not been pushed down low enough for some persons to become righteously indignant about it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was very much impressed by what the Senator quoted from a speech of Daniel Webster in which he described our country as one in which the basis of liberty and progress was the absence of great landed estates and opportunity afforded the small and penniless settler to take up land from the great expanse of the public domain and build a family-size farm upon it.

As I listened to those words, repeated by the Senator, it occurred to me that what is happening in this country is due to the growth of large farms, the absorption of small farms, and the mechanization of the large farms. We are reversing the condition which Daniel Webster described. We are now creating a class of gentleman farmers who occupy large farms, and we are driving the small farmer into the class of the peasant who lived in the countries from which our original settlers came. The great virtue of America was that here we established opportunities for every man; but because of the concentration of economic power through industrial organization, upon the one hand, and now through the present type of operation of agriculture upon the other hand, we are making what was once a classless society a class society. When that is done the America which the Founding Fathers saw and envisioned for the future will have vanished.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct. As we vote on this farm bill we shall be not only voting on dollars and cents, but on social patterns, social structures. We have been witnessing the erosion in the United States of a great social structure namely, the small family farm unit, with the family on the land taking care of it, rearing children, attending their church, attending their town meetings, and participating in township and local government.

I know there are a lot of experts around; they are all over the place these days. They know all about management. They know how to manage everybody's affairs but their own. They are the ones who say, "What we need today is to apply business efficiency principles to farming."

Mr. President, that is what has been tried in Russia. That does not belong in the United States. The Russian collectivized farm system will never work as the Russians intend it should. Their plan may produce. Oh, yes, it may produce goods, but it will not produce good people, happy people, or a happy society. The Russian system is organized wrong.

The present policies of this administration are leading to a breakdown in American agriculture. It is necessary to put a halt to them, just as we shall have to put a halt to the growth of any great monopoly or any great combine of economic forces. The time to call a halt is before it gets too big. The time to stop it is before it gets out of hand.

I noticed a headline the other day. It is one headline I intend to use a great deal. It says, "Ike Wins Senate Farm Fight." Whenever anybody wins, it is Ike who wins. Whenever anyone loses, it is Benson who loses.

But the headline reads "Ike Wins." Whom do you think Ike won over, Mr. President? He did not win over me. Ike won the fight over the farmers. If that is the kind of fight the President wants to win, let him win it. I am here to fight for the farm families.

I submit that the flexible price support program as now administered for the small family farmer spells his doom. Not only that, but the Department of Agriculture has admitted it will. The Secretary of Agriculture, his assistants, and his Under Secretary have said that farming today is big business. If a man cannot make good on the farm, let him go into the town; let him go to the city.

The administration talks about the so-called marginal farmer as if he were a subversive influence in American society. I ask my friends from the South a question: What will my friends south of the Mason-Dixon line do if more of the small tenants are driven off the land? What will they do when those tenant farmers move to Atlanta, to Birmingham, and to the other great cities of the South? Where will they be housed? Where will they find jobs? What about the social problems which will result?

In the rural communities today there is a sense of stability. What will be done about the farmer and his 6 or 10 acres? How will his family be affected by such a program as the one which we are about to adopt?

The Senators from Southern States do not expect this administration to protect the tenant farmer, do they? This administration wants so-called efficiency; and efficiency to them is synonymous with bigness; with wealth, with big men, with white shirts, with big clubs, with big cigars.

That is not the way to build the kind of America we would like to have. The Republican administrators always intrigue me. They worship the IBM machine. To them, it is more important than the Statue of Liberty. They are fascinated by the UNIVAC. In fact, it was the UNIVAC that gave them the first prediction of their success in 1952, and they have never forgotten it. This great electronic instrument does things for them and does things to them.

The Government of the United States is supposed to be dedicated to the people and to the general welfare of the American people. Mr. President, you can read the Constitution from beginning to end, and the word "efficiency" is not in it. As I have said on the floor of the Senate, one can read the Old Testament and the New Testament in any translation he wishes to read; he can read the Declaration of Independence, the Magna Charta, the Emancipation Proclamation, the Atlantic Charter, the Constitution of the United States, and the Charter of the United Nations; but he will not find in them the word "efficiency." He will find, as I have said a number of times before, the words "justice," "equality," "liberty," "compassion," "equity," "love," and "kindness." But "efficiency"? That has been brought in since January 1953. It has since become a national byword; it is a GOP household word. We are told to be efficient—it is the Republican success formula.

But the price of so-called efficiency, Mr. President, is sometimes the destruction of the people. Hitler was efficient—very efficient. Mussolini even got the trains to run on time. Stalin claimed a certain amount of efficiency. Khrushchev says he can be even more efficient. Even the Russians are beginning to buy this line. That is one part of our propaganda which has worked.

Mr. President, if we wish to preserve the family farm unit in this country, if we want a society that is not all metropolitan, if we want to have tilling the

soil people who love the land they live on, it will be necessary to provide an economic program under which they can live; because the sheer law of economic attrition will drive them off the land, and everyone knows it.

There is no doubt that if the program as presently outlined is adopted, the only farm people who will be able to live on the land will be those with large inheritances. The program will result in bigger and bigger farm units. Some persons say, "It is inevitable. Why not let them have it?"

Mr. President, it need not be inevitable if we have the will not to let it be so. I am arguing for the right of the individual farm family to be able to make a living. Ninety percent of parity-price supports is not high. I say that up to $5,000 the farmers are entitled to 90 percent of parity on their commodities. It may cost them a little more to produce each unit of their commodity, but they are entitled to a 90-percent loan. Above $5,000, they will have to go on the Bensonized formula. They will be the victims of slide and flex.

The big operators say the flexible price-support program is good. Let them try it. If they want it, let them have it. Some of them say they do not even want any Government supports. Those are the ones who do not need it. Above $5,000, they will not receive 90-percent price support. Let them have a chance to operate under the standards they want.

The Humphrey amendment provides one new thing which the Senator from Delaware did not offer. It provides, in its first subsection, that up to $5,000 they will be 90-percent price supports. That will take care of the vast majority of the small producers of American agriculture. They will be able to obtain loans. They will be getting loans on the crop they have produced.

I heard an argument a while ago—I could not help chuckling as I heard it—that the Government will have to buy everything from the farmers who get 90-percent price supports.

Mr. President, if that is a valid argument, then we are admitting on the floor of the Senate that the farmer is doomed to less than 90 percent of parity in the market place. If it is being said that the Government will have to buy everything which the small farmer produces under a 90-percent price-support schedule, we are frankly saying that every farmer, from here on out, will always receive in the cash market less than 90 percent of parity, although this administration said it was for 100 percent of parity in the market place.

I am for 100 percent of parity in the market place. Nor do I think that 90-percent crop loans will mean that the Government will have to buy everything. If the administration does not believe the farmer is going to get 100 percent of parity in the market place, why does it not say so? Why does it not give the public the truth? Why does it not tell the public that the farmer is not going to get anything more than 75 percent? Why does it not tell the public that the farmer is doomed?

Are we telling the farmer today by official policy of the Government, "You are supposed to be poor; you are supposed to have mortgages. You are supposed to have trouble; you are supposed to be losing your farm."

Are we saying, "If you are young, you are not supposed to stay on the farm. If you are old, we hope you will be able to live long enough to last it out."

Is this what we are saying? I hope not.

Mr. President, I am for the independent hardware store, the independent drugstore, the independent factory. I am for a Government policy which makes it possible for them to survive. I do not always like someone telling me what I have to do every 15 minutes, such as is done under the corporate structure. Mr. President, if corporate big-business farming is to be the new pattern, then one of these days the workers on such farms are going to be organized into a union and when that day comes, when we are debating a bill like this in the Congress, they are going to say, "If we don't get paid, you don't eat."

I have said repeatedly the farmers literally ought to be marching to their courthouses, demanding equity and justice.

If the farmers of America were as well organized as the unions and industry then they would have something to say about legislation affecting them. But the farmer is working 16 hours a day—trusting his elected representatives to do him justice.

I have put into the RECORD indisputable facts as to the hourly wage the farmers of Minnesota are receiving. What good does it do? The Senate just reduces their wages. Apparently the Senate thinks they are being paid too much. They receive something like 45 cents an hour. Apparently some feel they should get 30 cents an hour, so the Senate reduced price supports.

Has anybody thought for a minute what would happen if Mr. Farmer had an organization strong enough so he could say, "Those fellows in the city are getting by too easily. Let us hold up the pork supply. Let us hold back the beef supply. Let us hold back their fruits and vegetables." That is what is done in industry. That is what was done in the coal fields. That is what was done with respect to fuel oil. That is what is done in the case of every other commodity except food.

The farmer has asked only for justice. He does not want to restrict the food supply, and I pray to God he never will. But if American agriculture is "corporatized," that is exactly what he will do.

The most miserable living conditions on this continent are to be found where there are large corporate farms which exploit the wetbacks, the Mexicans, the Jamaicans, and the Bahamians. I do not want that sort of condition existing in this country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to point out to the Senator that he may have an ally, in the amendment which he is offering, of whom he is not yet informed. When the Secretary of Agriculture, about a week and a half ago, appeared before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I questioned him about certain probable amendments to the pending bill which would protect the family-sized farm, guaranteeing, through the 90-percent support program, the marketability of the farmer's crop, through the loan process, at the same time making it impossible for the big farmer to produce a surplus.

My suggestion was, as I expressed it afterward on the floor of the Senate, that perhaps we could offer 90 percent of parity for the small farmer and flexible supports for the farmer in the larger classification.

The Secretary did not like that suggestion, but he said in his letter to me, which I put in the RECORD on March 5, and which will be found on page 3911 of the RECORD, that the President had written an objective, which seems to me to be almost identical with the amendment which the Senator from Minnesota now offers.

If I am correct in this interpretation of the President's language, as transmitted to me by Secretary Benson, I think our Republican friends in the Senate ought to know that in supporting the Humphrey amendment they will be supporting the Eisenhower program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would even be willing to call it the George Humphrey amendment, naming it after the Secretary of the Treasury, if that would result in its getting any more votes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I now read the President's intent, according to Secretary Benson:

First of all, the President's intent was not identical with the objective you have indicated. The President said:

"The average size of farms in American agriculture, as measured by capital or by acres, has rapidly increased. To the degree that this trend is associated with the development of more economic and more efficient farm units it is in the interest of farm families and of the Nation."

Let me interpolate—because this efficiency seems to develop only when the farm has expanded beyond what we normally call a family-sized farm. To return to the President's language:

To the degree, however, that it has resulted in the removal of risk for large farm businesses by reasons of price supports, it is much less wholesome and constitutes a threat to the traditional family farm.

Under the price support machinery as it has been functioning, price-support loans of tremendous size have occasionally occurred. It is not sound Government policy to underwrite at public expense such formidable competition with family-operated farms, which are the bulwark of our agriculture.

I ask the Congress to consider placing a dollar limit on the size of price-support loans to any one individual or farming unit.

The Senator from Minnesota has done that. His limit is $5,000 and 90 percent supports for those making less than $5,000.

The limit should be sufficiently high to give full protection to efficiently operated family farms.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is a $50,000 limit.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So I take it the President has recommended precisely the program which the Senator from Minnesota has outlined in his amendment.

If I may address the Senator personally, what he is seeking to do, as I understand, is to limit the payment from the Government and the loans from the Government to those large farms which actually do not need it, in the belief that by this limitation they will be more efficient, in the national sense, in the fact that they will not produce a surplus which they must sell at a price which will destroy the whole basis of agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator for being most helpful. I am fully cognizant of the President's expression on limitation of the amount of price supports, or the total amount of price support loans.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I made my statement only in the hope that the Senator may get more support.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I wish to say, however, that a year ago the Junior Senator from Minnesota introduced a bill making the proposal I am now discussing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And the report was adverse.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The committee sent the bill to the department of Agriculture to get a report as to whether or not the department agreed with a proposal to limit the amount of loans to any one farmer; in other words, whether it recommended a cutoff, or limitation. I think the Senate should know that the Department said it was opposed to it. However, that has no relationship to what the President is for. There are several governments operating in Washington. There is one at the White House. There is one at the Bureau of the Budget. There is one at the Department of Agriculture. So no matter what side of the fence one is on, he can always find somebody in the administration who supports or opposes his position on the farm problem. But if I had a choice, I would rather have the President support me. I am sorry Mr. Benson does not support the President, and I am sorry the President does not support Mr. Benson, but perhaps we can get them together if we write this proposal into the law.

I should like to help President Eisenhower get the price-support limitation into the farm bill. I agree with that part of his farm program. He can have full credit for it. If the proposal should pass, I am perfectly willing that the Washington Post and Times Herald have another headline that reads, "Ike Wins Farm Fight." I noticed another headline which it carried, "Ike's Flexible Wheat Prop Saved by Nixon." They are working together. They saved the flexible wheat program.

I want every farmer in the Wheat Belt to know that the President and his Vice President were kind enough to lower the wheat supports to 76 percent of parity. I want that word to go abroad in the country. Ike likes to have headlines; and he can have this one, too. In fact, I shall take this paper over to the Library of Congress and have it treated like the Declaration of Independence. I do not want this paper crinkled. Instead, I want it preserved, because when the farmers in my section of the country find out that Ike won—the headline is, "Ike Wins Senate Farm Fight"—they will know who got licked, and they will know who got trampled upon—namely, the farmers themselves.

Mr. President, my proposal is twofold.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I rise to hasten to say that the letter read by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming seems to me to be a complete reversal of the administration policy—which must include the President; I presume that he confers with Secretary Benson on these matters. The Vice President must have conferred, too, the other evening.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a presumption based on theory.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This being the year 1956, I can understand why we have the letter.

But I desire to point out to the Senator from Minnesota—and I suppose he knows how apropos these figures are, in connection with what he has said today—that only last week the Department of Labor issued statistics from which it appears that under the so-called Benson flexible-parity plan, farm income now has dropped to approximately $860 per capita, as against almost $2,000 for people in all other lines of activity. In other words, today the farmer—even with his capital investment—receives for what he does less than one-half of the national income or national "take" per capita, or the average income per capita of all other classes of our working people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. In that connection, I wish to read from an article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, which appeared in yesterday's—March 11—edition of the Washington Post.

By the way, Mr. President, I wish to thank them for taking such an interest in this matter. There has been a dearth of such articles or columns. It is just as important that farmers be given economic justice as it is that city dwellers who use natural gas receive economic justice. In fact, the city dwellers are more able to pay for natural gas than the farmer is able to assist himself, under present prices. I was opposed to the natural gas bill, which is another one of the attempts to obtain privileges for special groups. And I am against the so-called flexible-price-support bill, because it does not work except to the advantage of those who already are at the top of the heap.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have said that under these circumstances I can see no advantage for the American farmers of the next generation unless they work for big corporations—and I mean really big—or for cooperatives or for the Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Washington is correct.

Mr. President, I now read a part of the article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, to which I have just referred:

> The warnings of history need to be remembered, at the moment, for the rather simple reason that there would be no really grave American farm problem if it were not for the plight of the family-sized farms. Not all the big farms are prosperous, of course. But almost all of them can take care of themselves, and a great many of them are still enormously prosperous, like the industrialized rice growers recently described in this space.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The people who are not prosperous are the folk on the family-sized farms. They are so unprosperous, in fact, that this Nation is virtually beginning to be divided into two nations. A single statistic tells the story. Per capita farm income has now declined to the level of $860 a year, whereas the per capita income of Americans off the farm now stands at the level of $1,922. Farm folk are much less than half as well off as other folk in America.

Mr. President, I emphasize the part of the article which states:

> The people who are not prosperous are the folk on the family-sized farms. They are so unprosperous, in fact, that this Nation is virtually beginning to be divided into two nations.

Mr. President, the great question before us is whether we want any people left on the farms, or whether we want the farms in Minnesota operated from Minneapolis, from the Foshay Tower, as the Twin City ordinances are operated, or whether we want the farms in New York State operated from the Chrysler Building or the Empire State Building. That could happen, Mr. President; workers could be hired to drive the tractors and perform the other mechanized farm operations. The farms could be operated in that way. But in that case, God help the people who now produce the food and fiber for our Nation. If such a development occurred, the farms would be operated like the feudal estates were operated in ancient days. Under such a principle, it would make little difference whether the ones in charge were called industrial managers or barons or dukes; the idea would be the same.

Mr. President, I want to see social justice done. I do not base my request solely on economics, even though the parity price-support program worked very well for 22 years.

The 90 percent of parity program worked all right, too, until those who got in charge of it did not believe in it. Surely, Mr. President, one does not put a fox in charge of a chicken coop, or an arsonist in charge of the police department; and we should not put in the Department of Agriculture people who do not believe in price supports. But that is what has been done.

I repeat that this program is being administered in a spirit which does not lend itself to effective administration and which does not lend itself to a pro-

gressing healthy American agricultural economy. The only way out is to try to enact legislation which will be in the interest of the farm families.

Mr. President, I shall yield the floor after saying that the proposed limitation to $50,000 has been generally supported in this body. If my amendment is not adopted, it is my intention to support the $50,000 limitation as provided in another amendment.

I want no more articles impugning the self-reliance and moral fiber of our farm families, because of a few large loans to a handful of big operators. The vast majority of our farmers—95 percent—can get by under less than a $50,000 limitation; but the $50,000 limitation may be a reasonable one in the case of the mechanized farm operations of today.

Finally, Mr. President, let me say that this administration stands guilty before the American people of permitting a cleavage in our society—as the Alsop brothers have said, a Nation divided—a Nation with one group composed of the poor and another group composed of those who are bordering on being well to do. Mr. President, it is not right. It is shameful for the Congress to dilly-dally regarding these great issues, when we see that today the per capita farm income is only $860 a year, as compared with a per capita income of $1,922 of Americans who are not on the farms.

This is not right. It is morally wrong. It is economically wrong. It is politically wrong. I am prepared to take whatever insults are hurled my way. When certain people run out of facts on which to debate the issues, they use attack, bluster, and propaganda. Mr. President, I shall stick to the facts. There are no facts available to prove that this administration has any program in mind whatever except a program to try to bail itself out for 1 year from its surpluses, which have been growing by leaps and bounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes in opposition to the pending amendment.

From here on I shall desist from prognosticating as to when the Senate may complete consideration of the pending bill. In early January I predicted hopefully that we would have a bill on the President's desk not later than February 15. At that time I did not take into consideration the customary recess which we afford our friends across the aisle during the week of Lincoln's Birthday. Since that time I stated that I hoped we would finish consideration of the bill by the 15th of March. We are only a few days away from that deadline and the end of debate is not in sight. As a matter of fact, we seem to be moving backward.

Today we started with an amendment which was proposed by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] dealing with a subject entirely foreign to the subject which is now being discussed. The Senator from Delaware first offered an amendment which had as its objective preventing the Government from leasing lands owned by the Government in order to grow crops now in surplus. Instead of proceeding with the consideration of that amendment, the Senator saw fit to offer as a substitute an amendment providing for a $25,000 limitation on the amount a farmer could borrow from the Government under the price-support program.

My good friend from Minnesota has now come forward with another substitute for that amendment which would provide for a modified 90 percent of parity price-support program.

For the past 3 weeks we have been debating as to whether or not we should retain in the bill 90 percent of parity price supports. Last week the Senate went on record against 90 percent price supports. Now we are confronted with the issue again, in a little different form. It places some of us in a peculiar position. In the past I have supported 90 percent price supports, and I am still for 90 percent price supports. However, this amendment would permit farmers to borrow up to $5,000 on the basic crops at the rate of 90 percent of parity. If this amendment is adopted, we shall have two sets of price supports, one applying to small farmers, whose production is not greater than $5,000, and the sliding scale applying to the rest of the farmers. All of this, according to the arguments advanced by my colleague from Minnesota, is to assist the small farmer.

Mr. President, I bow to no man in the fight to help our small farmers, but this amendment would not give to the small farmer an acre more of land to cultivate than is being allotted to him under the present law; and yet that seems to be the objective of most of those who are now sponsoring a limitation of $50,000 or $25,000. They insist that by limiting support payments, they will help the small farmer obtain more acres to plant. This, Mr. President, the amendment will not do.

It is a great pity that when this law was first placed on the statute books back in 1938, we could not have foreseen World War II and the Korean situation. We might have been able to provide ways and means by which we could better protect the interests of the small farmer. It is my considered judgment that the only way we can now protect them, insofar as acreage is concerned, and in giving them more to sell, is by ultimately increasing their acreage.

It is true that during the war many farmers sold or leased their farms. They saw greater returns in our factories, so they abandoned the small farms. In the meantime, those who were able to mechanize made their operations larger and larger through outright acquisition, as well as through leasing of smaller areas.

In order to accomplish what some Senators now advocate, we would have to change the entire law, because our farmers who produce basic crops are now operating under allotted acreages. These allotments are arrived at on a historic basis, depending upon how much of certain basic crops have been planted by cotton farmers, wheat farmers, tobacco farmers, rice farmers, and peanut farmers over a specified recent period of time. It is provided in the law how those acres shall be distributed. The Secretary of Agriculture must follow a certain formula. We cannot now take away from the large farmers acreage allotments which they have acquired under an established formula.

Mr. President, I hope that from now on we shall not be going back and debating issues which have been passed upon by the Senate, because if we do, we may be here until Christmas before this bill is passed.

For almost a week the Senate has been operating under a limitation of debate, yet we have considered and passed upon only 4 or 5 of the 80-odd amendments pending before us. There seems to be no end to the process of considering amendments, for amendments seem to spawn more amendments.

It is my hope that we shall make an effort to stick to the issues; let us leave politics out for a little while, Mr. President, and the number of amendments will dwindle and our progress will be hastened. That is my hope. Unless we enact legislation and have it on the President's desk sometime this month, we might as well abandon the soil bank plan, and we might as well abandon the bill as a whole, for it will be too late to help our farmers this year.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I might point out that even under the $5,000 proposal we would not be supporting every farmer at 90 percent, because one may have $5,000 worth of wheat but $105,000 worth of livestock, hogs, and other commodities. Therefore, it does not follow that what is anticipated would happen under the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is putting the case in a manner a little different from the way I have presented it. A cotton farmer in my State, for example, who grows only one basic crop, may have a total production of no more than 4 bales; he cannot get $5,000, of course. The proposal would not help this type of small farmer, if the market price is not supported by loans to the farmers who can afford to take advantage of them.

Mr. AIKEN. If he gets $400, he is doing well.

Mr. ELLENDER. The only way to help these farmers would be by giving them more land on which to plant basic crops. The only way that could be done would be by revising the entire acreage allotment program.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. I am quite sure that if in the State so ably represented by the Senator from Vermont, there were 1,000 cows, but if the average number of cows per farm was only 5 or 6, he would be advocating some measure of relief for the farmers who had 5 or 6 cows.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suppose all of us tend to look after our own State's interests. However, it seems to me that we should proceed to enact the bill as soon as is reasonably possible. I do not

object to amendments being offered, but every new amendment seems to spawn similar ones. As I said, every day there are brought before us issues on which we have previously voted. We discussed the subject of 90 percent of parity price supports many times. I am in favor of them. I have said many times on the floor that it was the only provision of the bill which would have given immediate relief to the farmer. I am still of that opinion.

However, to bring up the question again and again means that every Senator will want to be heard anew on it, and the first thing we know we will be debating all the controversial questions over and over again. If we do that, we might as well let our farmers know that it will be next year before we pass a farm bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for expressing the hope that we will not go over and over the same ground.

Almost every time an amendment is before the Senate, it becomes necessary to vote again on the 90 percent of parity provision. I commend the Senator for his insistence that we pass along to other subjects. He knows that he and I differ about the level of the price support. We also recognize the fact that unless a bill is passed, the only one who will really suffer will be the farmer. I join the Senator in the hope that we may not have to debate the same question over and over again, but may pass on to a new subject.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. ELLENDER. If no Senator desires to be heard against the amendment, I yield back the remainder of my time. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McNamara
Allott	George	Millikin
Anderson	Goldwater	Monroney
Barkley	Gore	Morse
Barrett	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Murray
Bender	Hennings	Neely
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Butler	Ives	Purtell
Byrd	Jackson	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Clements	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Kuchel	Sparkman
Daniel	Langer	Stennis
Dirksen	Lehman	Symington
Douglas	Long	Thurmond
Duff	Magnuson	Thye
Dworshak	Malone	Watkins
Eastland	Mansfield	Welker
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Flanders	McCarthy	Young
Frear	McClellan	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there any time remaining on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the vote to be on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota providing for 90-percent support to producers up to the amount of $5,000, and then providing price support at the prevailing rate up to $50,000 worth of commodities?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will not undertake to interpret the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. That is my interpretation of it, and I shall vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official business.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent, and, if present and voting, would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—36

Barkley	Jackson	Morse
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Mundt
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Daniel	Kennedy	Neely
Douglas	Kerr	Neuberger
Ervin	Langer	O'Mahoney
Frear	Lehman	Russell
George	Magnuson	Scott
Gore	Mansfield	Sparkman
Hennings	McCarthy	Symington
Hill	McNamara	Thurmond
Humphrey	Monroney	Young

NAYS—56

Aiken	Duff	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Dworshak	McClellan
Anderson	Eastland	Millikin
Barrett	Ellender	Pastore
Beall	Flanders	Payne
Bender	Fulbright	Potter
Bennett	Goldwater	Purtell
Bible	Green	Robertson
Bricker	Hayden	Schoeppel
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smathers
Bush	Holland	Smith, Maine
Butler	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Ives	Stennis
Capehart	Jenner	Thye
Carlson	Knowland	Watkins
Case, N. J.	Kuchel	Welker
Case, S. Dak.	Long	Wiley
Curtis	Malone	Williams
Dirksen	Martin, Iowa	

NOT VOTING—3

Cotton	Kefauver	Saltonstall

So Mr. HUMPHREY'S amendment to Mr. WILLIAMS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in accordance with a previous agreement with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and other Senators, I should like to modify my amendment at the desk by striking out "$25,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified accordingly. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated by the clerk for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

Compensation paid any producer for participating in the acreage-reserve program with respect to land in any one State in any year shall not exceed $25,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana if I may modify my amendment accordingly, unless Senators wish to have a vote on it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, as modified.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, the time on each side has been exhausted.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana seek recognition on his amendment?

Mr. JENNER. I do; and I yield 10 minutes of my time to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the question now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, as modified.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana is the same as the amendment I had offered, which is on the desk of Senators, and is designated "2–22–56–B." I am wholeheartedly in favor of its adoption.

The purpose of the amendment is to place a limitation of $25,000 on the amount which can be paid to any single participant in the acreage-reserve program.

As the bill is written, without some limitation, it provides that anyone can put up to 50 percent of his allotted acre-

age into the reserve program or the so-called soil-bank program.

Let me cite an extreme case. Let us consider an individual in the Montana area who has 340,000 acres allotment of wheat. Without some limitation, he could put one-half, or 170,000 acres, of his allotted acreage into the soil-bank plan and receive for it an average of approximately $20 an acre, or a total of $3,400,000 for taking one-half of his acreage out of cultivation.

I do not think it is the intention of Congress that the proposed law should be applied for any such purpose as that. Neither is it the intention of Congress to underwrite the farm operations of some of the larger insurance companies.

The bill, even with this limitation, would take care of over 98 percent of all the farms in the country with respect to the amount of acreage which could be set aside under the soil-bank plan.

Certainly, $25,000 would be a sizable check for any farmer to receive from the Government for not planting any specific crop or crops. Therefore, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

It was never intended that this soil-bank proposal be a bonanza for the absentee farmer. Unless some restriction is written in the law a small percentage of individuals will reap a major portion of the benefits.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It limits to $25,000 the amount which may be paid to any producer under the acreage-reserve program. The main purpose of the acreage-reserve provision in the soil-bank program is to curtail production of the basics so as not further to aggravate the present surpluses. The amendment, in my humble judgment, may prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from getting the desired number of allotted acres placed in the acreage reserve and thus may defeat the primary purpose of the farm bill—that is, to reduce the surpluses which now exist for all of the basic commodities.

In the bill we are now considering, the Secretary of Agriculture is given broad powers to accomplish the objective of relieving our markets of surpluses, by encouraging farmers to refrain from planting a portion of their allotted acres.

I have explained before how the plan would work, but for the benefit of Senators who were not present in the Senate at that time, I will explain it again. The reserve-acreage provision covers only the allotted acres for the basic crops. The Secretary of Agriculture has been given broad powers to go into the States which produce cotton, peanuts, wheat, corn, rice, and certain types of tobacco in order to try to have as many acres as possible diverted from the production of those basic crops. The only limitation that we have in the bill with respect to the acreage-reserve program is the amount of the appropriation authorized. The total amount that may be spent in any 1 year for the acreage-reserve phase of the soil-bank program is $750 million.

It strikes me, Mr. President, if we start tying the hands of the Secretary, in administering the program he might not be able to obtain the number of acres that ought to be set aside in order to bring the supply of basic commodities in balance with demand. I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator not have any fear that in the case of some large wheat acreages, such as the Senator from Delaware has suggested, the $20 payment per acre might actually result in paying to the operator more than the land could be sold for on the open market?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a possibility of that, but we tried to protect against such an eventuality by providing in the bill that the farm is to be operated in the same manner as it is now operated. The Secretary will have ample authority to set the level of payments so that abuses of this kind cannot occur. If the farmer has tenants, the tenants are to be protected and the Secretary can take steps to discourage their being put off the farm. I repeat—the objective of the acreage reserve provision of the soil bank program is to get farmers who have acreage allotments for the production of basic commodities, to refrain from planting some of their allotted acres and thus bring about a reduction of production.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the Senator has a very good point in that respect.

Mr. ELLENDER. Whether the acres are obtained from small farms or big farms, the objective is to reduce the plantings of allotted acreage.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think it is all right to provide a 100-percent crop insurance plus an incentive for a reasonable amount of one's cropland, but if that is going to be done for some of the very large wheat acreages I think the Government may find itself in a position of paying more than the land is worth.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Secretary has wide discretion to prevent such abuses. He does not have to enter into a contract unless he determines that such a contract will further the objectives of the acreage-reserve program. The point I desire to make is that the size of the farm should not make any difference—an allotted acre for wheat that is placed in the acreage reserve will contribute just as much to the reduction of surpluses, irrespective of the size of the farm operation from which it is diverted. This is not a handout to farmers—it is an incentive program designed to reduce production of the basic commodities.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware to strike out the last paragraph.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is not eligible, because the question is on the amendment of the Senator from Indiana to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. Therefore the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee would not be in order at this time.

Does the Senator from Indiana seek further recognition?

Mr. JENNER. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment to the Williams amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, while it is true that this amendment would restrict the authority of the Secretary to a certain extent, it seems to me it is hardly likely that anyone would be expected to put enough land from any one farm in the acreage reserve, which would require a payment of over $25,000. Assuming a payment of $50 an acre, that would permit 500 acres to be retired.

I doubt that there are many farms in the country which would be adversely affected by the amendment. I think it would be helpful to the Secretary to place limitations on the payments which could be made to any one person.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, I yield. I am speaking about payments made under the acreage reserve program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that, and I am in agreement. I think a limitation of $25,000 on such payments is adequate, but I am concerned about the proposition which undertakes to limit loans to $25,000. I wondered how the Senator from Vermont would feel about increasing the amount to $75,000.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that as the amendment reads the total of price support loans to any one farmer would be restricted to $50,000. I agree with the Senator from Georgia that there is a question as to whether that is adequate or not, because there are many families in the United States today who produce more than $50,000 worth of crops on one farm. Let us consider some nonbasic commodities, for example, the orchard business. If a farm family in the orchard business does not produce over $50,000 worth of commodities, it had better get out of the business completely, because it has to buy all the equipment which is necessary.

Personally, I think a limitation of $50,000 on loans for commodities would be rather small. However, I think the amendment which the Senate is now called to vote on, limiting payments under the acreage reserve to any one farm to $25,000, would be helpful.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand the parliamentary situation. I am not in any doubt as to the parliamentary situation——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may we have order? I cannot hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not understand the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana is to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. AIKEN. Maybe we are referring to two different amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Georgia, the original amendment, which, on the suggestion of the Senator from Utah and other Senators, was changed to provide for $50,000, is applicable only to crop loans. It has no relation to the acreage reserve payments. In other words, if both proposals are adopted, a farmer would be able to draw up to $25,000 under the acreage-reserve program, which in effect is for nonplanting, and on the land which was planted he would still be eligible to receive up to $50,000 for crop supports.

I point out to the Senator from Georgia that after the amendment is adopted the original amendment would be open to further amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will yield, I do not want to make the $50,000 proposition too attractive by adding a provision for a $25,000 soil-bank payment to it. I am perfectly willing to support the soil-bank payment limitation of $25,000, which I regard as reasonable, but I think the $50,000 limitation on loans is inadequate and is going to pinch some farmers. The margin of profit on some farm commodities is very low, and a man who raises $50,000 worth of commodities may not be earning more than $1,200 or $1,500 a year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There will be an opportunity to change the first figure. It could not be done now, however, since the yeas and nays have been ordered. Such an amendment would not be in order until after the disposition of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am aware of the parliamentary situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Putting the two proposals together was not done with any idea of trapping the Senator from Georgia or anyone else, but it was done for the purpose of saving time. I think if the Senate could vote on the proposal offered by the Senator from Indiana, which I think has much merit and as to which we are very much in agreement, certainly the Senator from Georgia would be in a position to offer his amendment later.

While I will not support his amendment I will say that its adoption would not destroy the principle which we are trying to establish here, namely writing in some restriction on these payments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to inquire what it is the Senate is being asked to vote on. It is my understanding that the Senator from Delaware could not modify his amendment by accepting the amendment of the Senator from Indiana without unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There was objection to the unanimous consent. Consequently, the amendment could not be modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I presume the Senate shall vote on the amendment of the Senator from Indiana as an entirely separate amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is a separate proposition in that it is separate now, but it has to be inseparable if it is adopted and added to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. I understand the situation perfectly. I shall vote for the $25,000 limitation. But I wish it definitely understood that if that amendment is agreed to, I shall vote against the amendment as amended, unless the limitation on the crop loans is substantially increased.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Georgia that after this amendment to my amendment is voted on, there will be an opportunity for him to offer an amendment providing the other figure.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think I understand the situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Under the parliamentary situation, I think that can be done without obtaining unanimous consent. However, if unanimous consent is required for that purpose, I shall support it. I have no intention of depriving the Senator from Georgia of the right to submit his proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. JENNER. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have already yielded back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have not yielded back all the time available to the opposition. There may be some other Senators who desire to speak against this amendment to the Williams amendment.

I simply wish to repeat, for the benefit of Senators who may not have been in the Chamber earlier, that insofar as the acreage reserve is concerned, if we impose any payment limitation, it may be entirely possible that the Secretary will fail to obtain the number of acres necessary in order to prevent the piling up of surpluses, as intended by the provision for the soil bank.

I am very hopeful that the Senate will reject this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield back the remainder of the time available to his side?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back the remainder of the time available to our side, Mr. President.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. In voting on the pending question, which is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], which would add a separate figure at the end of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], if the amendment of the Senator from Indiana to that amendment is agreed to, and if the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, as thus amended, thereafter is rejected, what will be the result?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senate adopts the amendment of the Senator from Indiana, so that it is added to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, and if the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, as thus amended, is subsequently rejected, both amendments will be rejected, in effect.

Mr. ALLOTT. Then, Mr. President, I misunderstood the Chair's previous announcement. As I now understand, the amendment of the Senator from Indiana is an amendment offered to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. On this question, all time has been yielded back.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official business.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 9, as follows:

YEAS—84

Aiken	Frear	Millikin
Allott	George	Monroney
Anderson	Goldwater	Morse
Barkley	Gore	Mundt
Barrett	Green	Murray
Beall	Hennings	Neely
Bender	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bennett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bible	Holland	Pastore
Bricker	Hruska	Payne
Bridges	Humphrey	Potter
Bush	Ives	Purtell
Butler	Jackson	Robertson
Byrd	Jenner	Russell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Langer	Sparkman
Curtis	Lehman	Symington
Daniel	Magnuson	Thurmond
Dirksen	Malone	Thye
Douglas	Mansfield	Watkins
Duff	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Dworshak	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Ervin	McCarthy	Williams
Flanders	McNamara	Young

NAYS—9

Eastland	Hayden	McClellan
Ellender	Kerr	Smathers
Fulbright	Long	Stennis

NOT VOTING—2

Cotton Kefauver

So Mr. JENNER'S amendment to Mr. WILLIAMS' amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], as amended.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move to amend the original amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware by striking out the figure $50,000 and inserting the figure $100,000.

This is the reason for my amendment: The amendment just adopted deals with moneys which are paid directly to the farmer. The $25,000 limitation on payments to any one farmer in any one State under the acreage reserve program is, in my opinion, a fair limitation; but we are dealing with a completely different subject in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware. We are there dealing with loans which are made to farmers.

There are many farmers who produce $50,000 worth of commodities but who make a very small margin of profit. Some of them even lose money when they produce $50,000 worth of commodities. The Government does not pay out that money. The Government has the commodity on hand, and it may lose something in some cases. However, the $50,000 limitation will catch a great many small farmers and many men who need this support program if it is to operate at all.

I hope Senators will vote for this much more realistic approach to the support program. Bear in mind, this figure does not refer to payments which are made. It refers merely to loans made on commodities. There is a very great difference between the two programs.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Has there been any limitation upon such loans heretofore?

Mr. RUSSELL. None to my knowledge. I do not think there has been any at all. Under the soil-conservation program, there have been limitations as to the amount paid certain farmers.

The limitation has been in the law at $10,000, although several years ago, in an appropriation bill, we got it back to $2,500. But there has been no limitation heretofore upon the amount of loans. I can understand the concern of Senators over loans of three or four million dollars. However, a gross production of $100,000 on a farm does not mean that we are dealing with a big, rich farmer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am not saying that the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia would not destroy what we are trying to accomplish, namely, to place in effect some limitation whereby the large farmer would not be eligible for price supports under this program. We debated the issue at length earlier this afternoon.

It is more or less a question as to whether the figure should be $50,000 or $100,000. I will admit that we are moving into a field into which we have had no previous experience when we place ceilings on these loans. If it is the judgment of the Senate at this time not to accept the amendment, we can still impose a lower limitation later if it is considered necessary.

The major feature of the amendment now before us is the establishment of the principle of placing a ceiling on the amount of crop support which a farmer may receive, and to restrict such support to bona fide farmers. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] provides a most constructive restriction on the operation of the acreage reserve program, and would prevent it from becoming a bonanza for absentee farmers.

I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote. However, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Georgia will be rejected but if not I still urge the Senate to adopt the final amendment as modified.

The amendment of the Senator from Georgia will not destroy the principle of what we are trying to do, namely, place some ceiling on these benefits and keep the Government assistance for bona fide farmers.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator remember the table which was placed in the RECORD, showing those who, in the past, had loans of more than $25,000? In the case of wheat, only 1,468 farmers in the past received loans of more than $25,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know whether that table has been incorporated in the RECORD, but if it has not been incorporated in the RECORD, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Utah, I shall ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. WATKINS. It has already been made a part of the RECORD. I did so when I discussed this particular topic.

When it comes to corn, only 104 farmers received loans of more than $25,000. That does not affect very many farmers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. Personally, I am not concerned with the figure of $50,000. I think it is adequate. The major objective is to establish some ceiling on the amount of crop supports a farmer can receive. At the same time, it is very important that we place a ceiling on the amount of payments under the acreage reserve program.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I merely wish to say, in answer to the able Senator from Utah, that his figures, I am sure, are correct. That is the very reason why we have low farm prices and why we have surpluses. It is because the farmers have not been complying with the acreage controls to entitle them to support prices. The reason we have low farm prices and surpluses is that farmers have not been complying with acreage controls. If we adopt this proposal we will defeat what we are trying to do with respect to reducing surpluses and raising farm prices in the market place. We will be defeating the very thing we are trying to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The time is under the control of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. Does the Senator from Georgia yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. RUSSELL. I reserve the remainder of my time. I shall be glad to yield back my time if the other side is willing to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. The chairman of the committee was so badly defeated a few minutes ago, that he hesitates to make any further suggestions.

However, the same argument which I made a short time ago in opposition to the $50,000 limitation on price supports applies also to the $100,000 limitation. Let us not forget that the loan program is not a subsidy. It permits a farmer who has complied with his allotted acres the right to go to the Commodity Credit Corporation and obtain loans on his crops. The purpose of the program is to prevent the farmer from being compelled to dump his production on the market and in that way force the price down.

If we limit the amount of price-support loans to $100,000 per person, it will mean that the large grower of any commodity, whose production is in excess of $100,000 will have to sell or dump his crop on the market and thereby break the market. That certainly would be injurious not only to the Government, but eventually to all farmers.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, it would work two ways: First, the producer could not keep his crop off the market by putting it into the soil bank; and, second, the commodities he would produce on those acres he would have to dump on the market.

Mr. ELLENDER. My distinguished colleague is eminently correct. That was the second point I was about to raise. So far as the $25,000 limitation on the acreage reserve is concerned, that, in my humble judgment, will tie the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture. As the bill is now written, the Secretary of Agriculture may go into a State where there are probably 2, 3, or 5 very large farmers who might be willing to underplant their acreage allotment, thereby reducing production of commodities now in surplus. It should not make any difference to the Government where the reduction is made. It will cost just as much per acre whether we take them from a wheatgrower who has 100,000 acres, or from 1 who has 10,000 acres, or from 1 who has 5,000 acres or 5 acres. Likewise, it will contribute just as much to our objective of reducing surpluses. The objective of the acreage reserve is to get production down, so as not to further aggravate our surpluses. That is the whole purpose of it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

Mr. ELLENDER. We would simply be tying the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, and possibly prevent him from obtaining full participation in the acreage-reserve program. We considered this subject in committee. There was only one limitation in the bill that was before the committee, and that was with

regard to the conservation reserve. My recollection is that the Senator from Florida objected to it. He made a motion to eliminate the limitation, and it was adopted by a vote of 10 to 2. The committee felt that it should not tie the hands of the Secretary in the operation of the two programs.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let us consider corn. Any farmer to be eligible for the support price on corn must this year reduce planted acreage by 21 percent, whether he has a big farm or a small farm. What we want is a reduction in the number of acres planted, so as to reduce production, and in that way have the farmer get a higher price. We would hurt the little farmer if we did what is proposed to be done. We would not hurt the big farmer, but only the little one, because we would be encouraging the big farmer to overproduce and thereby create surpluses, which will press down on the little farmer. Therefore, I cannot vote for the amendment, because I am trying to get rid of the surpluses, and I am trying to make certain that the surpluses do not accumulate again. I want to see the farmer get 100 percent of parity in the market place. This proposal would do just the opposite.

Mr. ELLENDER. In our discussions in committee we studied the problem very closely. The restriction would tie the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture and would defeat our objective. As my colleague has just stated, we would say to the farmer, "We are going to limit you to $25,000 in acreage reserve payments." It may be possible that there may be 4 or 5 large farmers in the State of Louisiana who might be willing to take such a cut in their allotted acres that it would require payments above $25,000. By doing so, they would not make it necessary for the Secretary to attempt to get acreage reductions of uneconomical proportions from smaller farmers. If the Secretary of Agriculture is denied the privilege of selecting the acres that he feels can best be taken out of production, in an area where he should be given the broadest discretion, we are simply tying his hands. In my humble judgment the restriction will result in making the soil bank—I will not say it will be rendered inoperative, but it will certainly hamper the Secretary and may prevent him from retiring from production the full number of acres established as an acreage-reserve goal.

Let us not forget that the purpose of the acreage reserve is to reduce production on the allotted acreage. That is the purpose of it. Whether the acreage is taken from a small farm or a large farm or a medium-sized farm should make no difference, because our purpose is to reduce the huge surpluses, and not further aggravate them. If discretion on the part of the Secretary and freedom of decision on the part of all farmers are curtailed, we may find that the soil bank will result in a lot of uneconomic production.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thoroughly agree with the statement just made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I wish the record clearly to state that the reason I voted for the preceding amendment was that the spokesman for the administration—and the soil-bank proposal, by the way, is an administration proposal—had stated publicly on the floor that the $25,000 limitation is adequate to take care of it. That is the only reason that I voted for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. When was that statement made? It was not made before the committee. There was no limitation before the committee on payments under the acreage reserve program. That was never mentioned.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand. If the distinguished chairman will allow me to continue, I should like to say that, while the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia is vastly preferable to the original form of the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I still think it is unrealistic. I will tell the Senate why I think it is unrealistic. It is coupled now with the $25,000 limitation on the acreage reserve. The acreage reserve is presumed to be, in general, about a 50-percent payment for what the production value would be if the acreage was actually used to produce. Therefore, the $25,000 acreage reserve limitation is about equal to $50,000 of total production.

If the $100,000 figure advanced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is adopted, it would mean that we would be applying a limitation which is completely out of line with what we have been planning, because I have not heard anyone suggest that it is hoped to retire in the soil bank one-third of the acreage of any sizable holdings. That puts the $50,000 productive value against the $100,000 productive value, and I believe it indicates very clearly that we are not adopting a limitation which is in line with the real program, that of retiring 10 or 15 percent of the acreage.

As the distinguished chairman of the committee well knows, the 2 figures would be hopelessly inconsistent with each other in the 2 phases of the program, and I would dislike to see even the more generous figure suggested by the Senator from Georgia adopted, although I greatly prefer his figure to the one originally suggested by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Therefore I completely agree with the Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the committee, in the argument he has made.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it correct to say that the bill as reported to the Senate includes as one of its principal features in the soil bank section a provision to secure the retirement from production of allotted acres?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Is the incentive provided in the bill whereby it is hoped to bring about a reduction of allotted acres the provision to which the chairman of the committee has referred as reserved acres?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. As stated, the Secretary of Agriculture is given full power to pay whatever incentive may be necessary to encourage the farmers to take their allotted acres out of production so as not further to aggravate our present surpluses.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it the principle of the bill that there be an incentive to retire allotted acres as reserve acres on a purely voluntary basis under the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. Then, as I have understood the chairman of the committee, he has stated to the Senate that his reliance upon this feature of the bill to bring about the retirement of adequate acres to bring production into balance with demand has been, first, that it is voluntary; second, that there is an added incentive to bring about a retirement of allotted acres; and, third, that if the incentive is held out, and possibly 25 or 50 or 75 percent of the farmers do not respond, the remaining percentage may respond to the extent that the overall program will be successful in bringing about the retirement of an adequate number of allotted acres to accomplish the result of a decrease in production to bring it in line with demand?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. Then, is it not a fact that the $25,000 limitation which we have placed on the reserve-acre-retirement program is a brake or a self-imposed limitation upon the opportunity of the farmers to make it successful?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; it is a brake that the Congress will have imposed, should the so-called Jenner amendment become law.

Mr. KERR. Having placed that limitation, if we place a $100,000 limitation on the loan available to a farmer who produces from his allotted acres which he does not retire from production, under the other phase of the soil-bank program, it is merely another limitation which will result, in many cases, in the production of an amount greater than the $100,000 would provide for, thereby creating production which would not be available for loans, and thereby creating a further weight on the overall market for the particular product?

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to the Senator from Oklahoma that the farmer, either large or small, would be limited in his production because of acreage allotments. In other words, he could not produce all he desired without incurring marketing penalties.

Mr. KERR. I am talking about his allotted acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. KERR. So if he has a large number of allotted acres under the existing law, then, under the amendment just adopted, he could not retire enough to get more than $25,000 of benefits with the limitation on his allotted acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I am complaining about. He may be 1 or 2

or 3 in the community who might be willing to retire a large proportion of his allotted acres, while the remaining farmers in the area refuse to participate in the acreage reserve.

Mr. KERR. Having done that, if he still has allotted acres sufficient to produce corn or wheat or rice or cotton, that would put him in a bracket where he would have a greater production than the $100,000 loan would provide for, and then his only other alternative would be to dump his entire production on the market, which would be a burden on everyone producing that commodity. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly correct. I misunderstood the Senator a moment ago.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I believe the conclusion of the Senator from Oklahoma is quite correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understood the Senator from Oklahoma, he was referring to production on allotted acres. There are many wheat producers who produce crops at present under their allotted acres valued at more than $100,000. Such a producer could place only $100,000 of his crop under price support loans, and if he could not find anyone to finance his retaining the rest of it until the market price firmed up, he would have to dump his product on the market and thereby ruin the market, not only for himself, but for all other farmers.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The wheat producer would have to have his certificate to qualify him to sell his wheat. If he were in excess of his allotted acres, of course he would be under penalty if he sold any wheat.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. So, we have a problem here. While we admit that only a few producers would be affected above $50,000, we would foreclose the retirement of possibly many acres from wheat, because that would put the farm operators in a position where they could not qualify one way or the other. Therefore, I think the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia might have more commonsense than is indicated simply by the figure $100,000 as against $50,000. Other factors must be considered. First, we must have compliance with acreage allotments, and if the farmer is growing more wheat than is represented by a loan of $100,000 or a loan of $50,000, we simply foreclose that man's farm operations, because we deny him the right to a commodity loan when he is in compliance in every other respect.

I believe the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia is sound. On the face of it, we might question the figure of $100,000, but when we study the precise aspects of the question, it is not unjust and it is not unreasonable to permit a farmer to remain in compliance and to qualify for a commodity loan. If we fail to do that, it seems to me we shall place the entire program in jeopardy.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I state to my good friend from Minnesota that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia is an improvement on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Utah. But the point I am making is that in the case of a farmer who produces cotton far in excess of $100,000 worth, we must ask what is he going to do with it if he cannot borrow on it to pay current expenses and things of that kind? The answer is obvious—he is going to dump the commodity on the market.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator from Louisiana will yield further, that is exactly the reason why I say that even though the farmer may be in complete compliance, he would be denied a loan, and the ultimate result would be noncompliance, which would jeopardize the entire program in a short period of time.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Minnesota is correct. As he knows, the Secretary of Agriculture has already established acreage allotments for the basic commodities. That was done on the assumption that the law then on the statute books would be the one by which he would be guided. But here we are changing the rules in the middle of the game.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is entirely correct. We have noted that a few commodity loans were in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, and no one would express approval of such a situation. However, if we prevent many farmers from qualifying for commodity loans, we shall place the entire program in jeopardy.

It is for that reason that I say to my friend that even though some of us are critical of allowing one individual producer a loan of $50,000, the entire program might well be jeopardized if we so restrict it that we make it impractical and impossible for producers to comply.

On wheat a double restriction is imposed. First, an acreage allotment; second, a marketing certificate is required to enable the farmer to market what he might produce in excess of the quota. Thereby, he will be denied the right to sell in excess of his quota.

On cotton, the producer might sell in excess of the amount permitted by the program, because we say he cannot get a commodity loan in excess of $50,000. He will say, "What is the use? That would be only a fraction of my crop; therefore, I will disregard the acreage allotment; I will disregard the program. I will try to sell on the open market for what I can get."

Then, without compliance, more cotton will be thrown onto the market than would have been the case if a higher commodity loan limit had been established, such as a $100,000 limit, thereby assuring a greater degree of compliance on the part of the producer.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, an effort is now being made, I am sure, by many Senators to carry out the suggestion made by the President in his message to Congress. His recommendation No. 4 is headed "Dollar Limit On Price Support," and reads as follows:

> The average size of American farms in American agriculture, as measured by capital or by acres, has rapidly increased. To the degree that this trend is associated with the development of more economic and more efficient farm units it is in the interest of farm families and of the Nation. To the degree, however, that it has resulted in the removal of risk for large farm business by reason of price supports, it is much less wholesome and constitutes a threat to the traditional family farm.

When that matter was discussed before our committee with the Under Secretary of Agriculture and his assistants, they realized the proposal was still in the process of being studied, and they were not ready to make specific recommendations as to what ought to be done.

All of us, as I said a while ago, are more than willing to try to keep the small-sized farm in operation. I favor that. But that objective will never be accomplished in the manner which is now being suggested.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. All of us want to help the small farmer. Under the soil bank program, the fundamental principle is that the acreage must be reduced if any production is to be taken away from the big farmer. The small farmer, the man farming 80, 90, 100, 160, or 200 acres, is the fellow we are trying to help.

The farmer who has only 30 or 40 acres of corn allocation is not going to take any of his acreage out of production. He cannot afford to do so. He farms his land by himself. He is not going to go through the field, farm 20 acres, and leave 2 acres lie idle. We know he will not do that.

So, if we are to secure any acreage reduction under the acreage reserve plan it will be necessary to reduce the acreage of the big operators. If we are for the small farmer and want to help him, then we should not place any restrictions in the bill. If we do, the big farmer will continue to grow as much as he ever did, perhaps more, and will run the prices down on the small farmer.

That is the fundamental principle of the soil bank. We simply cannot take any other meaning from it. We might as well face the issue that if we are for the small farmer and want to help him, then it will be necessary to impose the acreage reduction and the decrease in production on the big farmer, because the little farmer just cannot afford to do those things. He will not split a 10-acre or a 20-acre field in order to take out 1, 2, or 5 acres, and place them in the soil bank or the conservation bank. He simply will not do that.

I shall have to disqualify myself, possibly, because I operate a fairly large-sized farm. But I am pleading with Senators that if they want to reduce surpluses and to make certain that surpluses do not accrue in the future, and if they want to help the little farmer and to keep prices up, then we should not agree to this amendment. But if we do not

care, if we want more production instead of less production, then go ahead and place a limitation on the farmers.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 2 minutes to me, so that I may reply to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Would the Senator from Indiana object to a $100,000 loan limitation?

Mr. CAPEHART. I would object to any limitations.

Mr. THYE. The Senator would object to any limitation whatever?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, because any kind of limitation would defeat the very thing we were trying to accomplish.

Mr. THYE. That was my contention; but the $100,000 limitation would, in my opinion, meet the basic objectives sought.

In the case of cotton, if a farmer is disqualified from getting a commodity loan, then he may stay outside the program and produce all the cotton he can on his 100 acres, and sell it on the cash market for whatever it may bring.

On the other hand, if he were given an incentive to come under the program, he would retire a certain percentage of his land and remain in compliance. This would help to stabilize farm markets.

If the market is ruined, it will be ruined also for the family-sized farmers, whom the Senator so well champions.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is not a Senator on the floor who has not received complaints from small farmers that their acreage allocations for corn and other crops were so meager that they could not get along under them. Therefore, we know the small farmers are not going to turn over any of their acreage to the conservation or acreage reserve. We know that if we are going to help the small farmer, if we are going to reduce surpluses, and if we are to raise prices, it will be necessary to take the production away from the big farmers. By adopting the amendment, we shall be defeating the very thing that I know we are trying to do. We are moving in the wrong direction.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 3 minutes to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I promised to yield first for 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I cannot say I am in accordance with the views of the Senator from Indiana. It seems perfectly ridiculous to approach the farm problem by saying that we have to pay the absentee farmers, the multimillionaire farmers, to take their land out of production. It was never intended that we subsidize that type of dude farming.

Out of every 600,000 loans which went to the wheat farmers, 554,000 were under $5,000; 20,184 were between $5,000 and $10,000; 9,490 were between $10,000 and $25,000; and only 1,068 loans in the whole United States were over $25,000.

When the loan figure is raised to $100,000, as is proposed, or whether it be left at $50,000, the numbers would diminish substantially again.

On corn, there were 283,605 loans below $5,000; 10,842 loans between $5,000 and $10,000; 957 loans between $10,000 and $25,000; and only 104 loans in excess of $25,000 last year.

On oats, 42,845 loans were under $5,000; 4,800 were between $5,000 and $10,000; 59 loans were between $10,000 and $25,000; and only 10 loans in the entire United States in excess of $25,000.

On barley, 33,185 loans were under $5,000; 518 loans were between $5,000 and $10,000; 183 were between $10,000 and $25,000; and 66 were over $25,000.

On sorghum, 30,753 loans were under $5,000; 1,643 were between $5,000 and $10,000; 401 loans were between $10,000 and $25,000; and 25 loans were in excess of $25,000.

On soybeans, 59,717 loans were under $5,000; 746 were between $5,000 and $10,000; 56 loans were between $10,000 and $25,000; and only 5 loans were in excess of $25,000 for soybeans.

When the figure is raised to $50,000 or $100,000, a substantial number of those loans would be eliminated.

Less than 2,000 farmers would be affected, even by the $25,000 figure. Increasing the amount to $100,000 would reduce the number by at least half.

The amendment previously adopted, which was offered by the Senator from Indiana, is an essential part of the program. It would limit the payment which any single farmer could receive under the soil bank plan to $25,000.

As an example, there is one farmer in this country, if he can be called a farmer, who has a 340,000 wheat-acreage allotment. He would be eligible to receive a check from the United States Government in the amount of about $3,400,000 for doing nothing but letting one-half of his farm operations stay idle.

Certainly we are not trying to take care of that family, and I am not joining the Senator from Indiana in taking care of it.

I urge the Senate to adopt both these amendments, placing some safeguards on the expenditures, thereby limiting the benefits to real farmers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me, so that I may answer the Senator who answered?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I shall vote for the Russell amendment to the Williams amendment, but when and if it is adopted, or if it is adopted, I see no alternative but to vote against the Williams amendment.

I favor the limitation of loan benefits to the farmer. I favor that, however, in connection with a program of an adequate amount of incentive to bring about the retirement of allotted acres.

As I understand, the soil bank proposal as it came to the Senate, contained a section calculated to provide incentives to bring about retirement of allotted acreage.

It embodied a provision which was unrestricted, whereby if the Secretary could not secure retirement by operators of average sized farms, he could secure very substantial retirement of acreage from big farmers.

However, by the adoption of the Jenner amendment, we have limited the Secretary to such an extent that we do not know whether he will be able to bring about the retirement of an adequate number of allotted acres. Having done that, we then fix it so that if a man wants to plant all of his allotted acres, and have enough to produce more than $100,000 worth of products, he has no alternative except either to hold them out of production without compensation, or put them into production and dump his production on the market, regardless of price, although he may be in full compliance with the provisions of the law with reference to the allotment of acres.

As I see it, Mr. President, the Russell amendment should be adopted, but then I think the Williams amendment, as amended by the Jenner amendment, would have to be defeated, or we would have, by our own action, made it impossible for the soil bank to work.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware a moment ago read into the record the figures which illustrate why we are now considering this question, namely, the farmers have not been complying with acreage controls. Had they complied with acreage controls, there would not have been any surpluses. There would have been high prices for the farmer. That is the reason why we are considering the pending measure. The farmers have not complied with acreage reductions, and they have grown more than they should have.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Why would they not be taken care of by the $50,000 provision? According to the past history, only 104 corn farmers complied.

Mr. CAPEHART. Only 104 corn farmers who complied with acreage controls. A farmer has to comply with acreage controls before he can take advantage of the rest of the program. Corn farmers generally did not do that. Only 104 complied. That is why huge surpluses were piled up. That is why we have low prices.

Mr. WATKINS. With $50,000 it would take in practically every farmer, and with $100,000 there would be only 5 or 6 exceptions in the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART. Where does the Senator get his figures?

Mr. WATKINS. From the United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CAPEHART. Those are figures of farmers who complied with acreage controls and took advantage of support prices. Those few did. There must be hundreds and hundreds more who did not. That is why there are the huge surpluses. That is why we have low prices. That is the aspect the Senator is overlooking. The figures prove my point, because the Senator knows there are more than 104 farmers in the United States who are growing those quantities. The Senator would defeat the very thing he is trying to do, because the little farmer cannot reduce his acreage. He cannot put anything in the soil bank. He does

not have enough acreage now. If acreage reductions are not obtained from the big farmers, none will be obtained. If acreage reductions are not obtained, there will be more surpluses, and there will be lower farm prices rather than higher farm prices. I think I know what I am talking about.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I would not want to leave the record stand as it was made by the Senator from Indiana, in which he said farmers had not complied with acreage allotments.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the Senator will yield I did not say all of them had not; some of them had not.

Mr. YOUNG. Wheat farmers and cotton farmers have complied almost 100 percent. It is the corn farmers who have not complied.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is what I was talking about.

Mr. YOUNG. I thought the Senator was talking about cotton and wheat farmers.

Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. YOUNG. I do not think a $50,000 limitation would impose any hardship on the farmers of America. It would work this way: A farmer could take up to $50,000 in loans. Over and above that amount he would have to sell on the open market and take what he could get for his products. If the cash market was near support levels, he would keep on producing and selling for the market, but if it was not he would curtail production. There is a great incentive now for a farmer to pick up scattered pieces of land in order to increase the size of his farm. The bigger a farm is, the cheaper the cost of production usually is.

Anyone who has studied the proposal very carefully would have to admit that a provision of $50,000 would impose no hardship on the average farmer of America and do no harm to the program itself. Instead, it would help make it a better farm program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does any other Senator desire to be heard? If no other Senator desires to speak——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to strike out "$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, as amended by the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move to strike out the last paragraph of the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Delaware.

On Friday evening—may we have order, Mr. President? A point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber, please?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Tennessee that the amendment has been agreed to. Therefore, the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee would not be in order. If the Senator seeks recognition, he would have to propose another amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move to strike the first paragraph.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In view of the fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], dealing with one of the figures in the first paragraph, has just been voted on, would an amendment to strike out the entire paragraph be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ruled that the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee is in order. Therefore, the Senator from Tennessee may continue.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE ON VOTE ON AIKEN AMENDMENT ON MARCH 9

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator yield to me, for the purpose of permitting me to suggest the absence of a quorum, so that the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] may be notified? He desires to be present when the Senator from Tennessee makes his statement.

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Does the Senator from Tennessee now seek recognition?

Mr. GORE. Yes; Mr. President.

For the advice of other Senators, I do not expect to use more than 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Tennessee yield to me long enough to permit me to thank him for permitting me to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GORE. I thank the senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, on Friday the junior Senator from Tennessee made a point of order that after an issue had been settled, after a motion to reconsider had been laid on the table, no Senator then could change his vote upon recapitulation, nor could the Vice President then vote.

I rise today merely to advise the Senate that I, my staff, and to some extent the Parliamentarian, I am sure, have been studying the precedents over the weekend. Insofar as we can ascertain, a new situation was presented to the Senate. Within a narrow field it was an unprecedented action.

I do not rise today to attempt to reopen it. The distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] was eminently correct in his observation that whatever rights may have been available to the junior Senator from Tennessee or to any other Senator, expired for failure to challenge the parliamentary ruling, immediately after the ruling was made. So I rise today, not to reopen the issue or to debate its merits, but merely to advise the Senate that a new precedent was established; and that, therefore, the point of order was not idly made. Indeed, after examining the precedents in the other body, where the Speaker by custom many times votes only to untie an issue, we find that it is new there, too. I am not now undertaking, as I have said, to reopen the issue or to debate its merits or demerits, but I rise merely to advise the Senate that an unprecedented situation then faced the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Tennessee to say that in the House, the Speaker can vote to untie a tie vote?

Mr. GORE. By precedent and custom, that is generally the only time when the Speaker does vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. But if he had voted on a yea-and-nay vote, which he has a right to do, being a Member of the House, he could not thereafter vote to untie a tie vote in which he had participated.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. President, the situation before the Senate is this: If there is a parliamentary procedure by which an issue is closed, it is the making of a motion to reconsider, and then the laying of that motion on the table. Indeed, in this particular case the author of the amendment, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], moved to reconsider. The distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] moved to lay that motion on the table. The motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to. That is as final an act as the Senate can take to close and dispose of an issue. It operates with such finality that the issue can then be reconsidered only in two ways: first, by unanimous consent; second, by a motion to suspend the rule, which motion, if it to carry requires the favorable votes of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting.

I am prepared to concede that the moral suasion presented so eloquently and forcefully by the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] was strong. Certainly the Vice President should have been allowed to untie the issue. But the proper way to have done it, according to the parliamentary rules, was to reconsider the issue. Procedure by which to do that was open to the Senate. That procedure, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee, was not taken. For that reason, the junior Senator from Tennessee raised a point of order—not to deny the Vice President the right to vote, but to deny him the right to vote unless and until the parliamentary rules governing the procedure in the Senate were followed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the junior Senator from Tennessee aware of the fact that the error which occurred at the desk was not determined until the yea-and-nay vote on the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was well under way?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I merely wanted to ask the Senator whether he was aware of that fact.

Mr. GORE. Yes. I think that adds strength to the moral position taken by the senior Senator from California. However, conflicting parliamentary interpretations and views were rendered by the Chair at that time. I recognize fully what the distinguished Senator from Texas has said.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate, but I do not want the statements made by the Senator from Tennessee to stand unchallenged.

In the first place, I desire to call the attention of the Senate again to the debate which occurred in connection with this matter, as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 9, 1956, commencing at page 4427. The parliamentary situation which was presented the other evening—as Senators who then were present will recall—was that on the vote on the so-called Aiken amendment, the Vice President, who was then presiding, was misinformed as to the result, and announced it as 46 yeas to 45 nays.

The customary motion to reconsider was made by the Senator from Vermont, and I made the motion to lay that motion on the table. That motion was carried by a vote of 46 to 41. It was subsequent to that time that the colloquy and discussion to which I have referred took place.

As was pointed out the other evening, the Vice President was in the chair and presiding during this whole time. He has a constitutional right to break a tie. He has an opportunity to vote only when there is a tie. Had the vote been the other way, and had the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont been lost 46 to 45, obviously the Vice President would not have been able to vote. He was not able to vote on the basis of the announcement from the clerk that the motion had carried 46 to 45. It was only when the recapitulation took place and when it was determined that the vote was a tie, that the Vice President, under the Constitution, had the right to cast his vote.

As the minority leader stated the other night, the Senate having gone through the process of a vote, and announcement having been made based upon misinformation given to the Chair that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont had carried, and we having won a second victory—if the first announcement had been correct—by the motion to lay on the table, which carried by an even larger margin, at that time the distinguished majority leader rose and indicated that he understood there was some discrepancy, because one of the clerks had got one total and another a different total, and asked that there be a recapitulation.

Some discussion took place at that point, but before the question was finally decided the minority leader raised the question as to whether or not we would then be confronted with the same parliamentary situation which would have been presented had the correct total been given to the Chair. It was made very clear that at that point the Vice President would be able to vote.

It was only upon this parliamentary ruling that the minority leader then asked that Members on this side of the aisle join in the request of the majority leader that there be a recapitulation. Of course, the RECORD is very clear in that regard.

It is now the contention of the minority leader—and it was his contention at that time—that when that unanimous consent was given, when the parliamentary ruling was requested of the Chair, and when that ruling was not challenged by any Member, and when the Senate, in its wisdom, gave its unanimous consent, at that point it had the effect of rolling back the legislative process to what it would have been at the time the vote was announced, had it been correctly announced at that point. I believe that view is sustained by the fact that when this entire operation was concluded the minority leader then asked unanimous consent that the previous vote, by which the motion of the Senator from Vermont was laid upon the table, should be considered, without the necessity of having to make that motion all over again.

Some mention has been made of the precedents in the House. For the information of the Senate, I should like to read into the RECORD at this point two precedents which I think have some interest in this connection.

Hind's Precedents of the House of Representatives, section 5969, volume 5:

The Speaker has voted when a correction on the day after the rollcall has created a condition wherein his vote would be decisive.

Where a Member votes and the Journal fails to include his name among the yeas and nays, he may demand a correction as a matter of right before the approval of the Journal.

On December 4, 1876, the House, by a vote of 156 yeas to 78 nays—exactly the two-thirds vote required—suspended the rules and passed a resolution presented by Mr. Abram S. Hewitt, of New York, providing for special committees to investigate the recent presidential election in Louisiana, Florida, and South Carolina.

On the following day, December 5, Mr. Nathaniel P. Banks, of Massachusetts, moved that the Journal and RECORD be corrected so as to include the name of Mr. Harris M. Plaisted, of Maine, in the negative on the adoption of the resolution submitted the previous day by Mr. Abram S. Hewitt.

The Speaker decided that it was the right of the gentleman from Maine to have his vote recorded upon the said resolution upon the statement made by Mr. Plaisted that he did vote in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. Benoni S. Fuller, of Indiana, asked that the Journal and RECORD might be further corrected so as to show that he voted in the affirmative upon the aforesaid resolution, stating that he was present and so voted when his name was called.

The Speaker decided, as in the case of Mr. Plaisted, that the gentleman from Indiana was entitled to have his name recorded.

And therefore the names of Mr. Plaisted and Mr. Fuller were recorded, the first in the negative and the last-named Member in the affirmative, upon the adoption of the aforesaid resolution.

After the two votes had been recorded the Speaker said:

"The vote on the resolution offered by the gentleman from New York, Mr. Hewitt, as announced, was, ayes 156, noes 78. There seems to have been an omission on each side. The votes omitted, if correctly recorded, would have made the vote 157 to 79. The Speaker was ready on yesterday to have voted, as was his constitutional right, if his vote would have produced a result either way; and if the Journal had shown the vote to be 157 to 79 he would have voted in the affirmative, still making the two-thirds. * * * The Chair must insist upon his right to vote in the case that his vote would produce a result. * * * The Chair, then, exercises that right, and asks that his vote may be recorded in the affirmative."

The other House precedent is, from Hind's Precedents of the House of Representatives, section 5970:

In case of error, whereof the correction leaves decisive effect to the Speaker's vote, he may exercise his right even though the result has been announced.

The Speaker's name is not on the voting roll and is not ordinarily called.

On July 19, 1882, during the consideration of the contested election case of *Smalls* v. *Tillman*, the question was taken on the resolution declaring that Tillman was not elected, etc., and the announcement was made that there were yeas 145, nays 1, not voting 145.

The vote was next taken on the resolution declaring that Smalls was elected, etc., and there were yeas 140, nays 5, not voting 145. The Speaker thereupon voted, making yeas 141, nays 6, a total of 146—just a quorum.

The Speaker thereupon announced that on the vote preceding the last there had been an error in the tabulation and that in reality the result on the resolution declaring Tillman not elected had been yeas 144, nays 1, a total of 145—1 less than a quorum.

The Speaker declared that he would vote, and did so, making the result 145 yeas and 1 nay—a quorum voting.

Mr. Gibson Atherton, of Ohio, made the point of order that the Speaker might not vote in such a manner.

After debate, the Speaker (Samuel J. Randall, of Pennsylvania) cited precedents in 1803, 1849 to show that such a vote was proper. He further said:

"It has never been the rule or practice for the Speaker's name to be called in the regular rollcall, and therefore the Speaker does not respond to the rollcall as other Members do, nor does he come within the provision of the rule which is applicable to other Members whose names are upon the roll."

Therefore the Speaker held that, while a Member might not have his vote recorded after the conclusion of the rollcall, the Speaker might.

On the following day a resolution providing for an examination of this act of the Speaker was introduced and debated, but subsequently withdrawn after a full discussion of the matter.

Of course, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is eminently correct when he says that the Speaker has a right, as a Member of the House, to vote upon any issue. However, customarily his name does not appear on the rollcall, and apparently the custom in that body is for him not to cast his vote. The precedents I have cited indicate, however, that when errors had been found in the House, though he had passed his right so to speak, he did exercise it. The difference between the two Presiding Officers is that under the Constitution the Vice President has a right to vote only in case of a tie. Unless the vote is correctly announced as a tie, of course, he has no right to vote under the Constitution.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Over the weekend I have had an opportunity to examine both the precedents which the distinguished senior Senator from California cites, and other precedents. In neither of the precedents which he has cited is there involved the question of reopening an issue on which a motion to reconsider had been laid upon the table. It is that particular element which has not been, so far as I am able to find, or my staff has been able to find, before either the House or the Senate.

If the Senator from California will indulge me further, I should like to say it is true that the Vice President has a constitutional right to untie a vote in the Senate. Likewise, every Senator has a constitutional right to vote on any issue before the Senate. However, both a Senator and the Vice President must exercise their constitutional right of voting at such time and under such circumstances as that opportunity is available.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The vast difference is that a Member of the Senate has his opportunity and right and privilege and obligation to vote when the roll is called. The Vice President never gets his right to vote until the vote of the Senate has been tabulated, to determine whether it is a tie vote. It is only when it has been determined that it is a tie vote that the Vice President is able to exercise his constitutional responsibilities.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The question comes down to the ability of the Senate to close an issue before the Senate, and then abide by the rules to reopen that issue. The opportunity was available to the Senate in two ways. Indeed, the Senator from Tennessee submitted a unanimous-consent request that the vote be reconsidered in order to preserve orderly procedure in the Senate and to afford the Vice President the right to vote. That consent was objected to. I do not wish to go further into the argument, but merely to say that, rightly or wrongly, a precedent was set in the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the benefit of the Members of the Senate who were not present on Friday at the time this matter came up I should like to read from the RECORD of March 9, at page 4428, from the first column:

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know what the recapitulation will show; but if the recapitulation shall show a tie vote, will the parliamentary situation then be as it would have been at that point if a tie vote had been announced?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct; and the Vice President then would have one of those rare opportunities to break a tie.

Mr. President, it seems to me that that is a compelling factor in this situation. The facts were known to the Members of the Senate. Unanimous consent had been given. It was only after the several discussions had taken place on the floor of the Senate, and when Senators, understanding the situation, had had the facts presented to them, that unanimous consent was finally given. To that extent I believe that that had the legislative effect of rolling back the process to the point where it would have been had the correct announcement been given to the Chair by the clerk at the desk.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator's argument is persuasive. However, it must stand alongside of two other parliamentary rulings, or the giving of parliamentary advice. Neither the statement which the Senator has read nor the two statements which the junior Senator from Tennessee proposes to read are rulings which conclude or settle the issue. They constitute parliamentary advice by the Presiding Officer. What the Senator has read must be measured alongside of this statement:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the Senator from Texas is, in effect, asking that the Senate return to the vote on the Aiken amendment in order to have a recapitulation of that vote. The recapitulation, once it has been announced, will be, in effect, the vote which will be recorded in the records of the Senate.

Continuing, a little later in the RECORD:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair also wishes to make another parliamentary ruling, that once the recapitulation has been made, no Senator may change his vote. The recapitulation will stand as it is.

I respectfully say that all three rulings must be taken together, but that neither of them constitutes positive action, such as is involved in laying upon the table a motion to reconsider.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, where I believe the Senator from Tennessee falls into error in this situation—if I may be pardoned to say this most respectfully—is that had the Vice President not been in the chair and presiding, or had been out of town, for example, a tie vote would have lost the amendment under the rules of the Senate. Therefore, if that had occurred, and the Vice President had not been present, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would not have had the privilege of making a motion to reconsider and I would not have had the privilege of making a motion to lay his motion on the table, because to do so a Senator must have voted with the prevailing side.

In that case the prevailing side would have been the side of the opponents of the amendment, because we would have lost the vote, instead of having won it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In that event, even though the Vice President may have returned 2 days or a week later, if the issue was still unresolved before the Senate, he could have then voted. However, the Senate proceeded, not according to the set of circumstances which the able Senator from California has described, but proceeded to lay upon the table, by motion of the senior Senator from California, a motion to reconsider, thereby, so far as the parliamentary procedure available to the Senate was concerned, closing the door on that issue. There were two ways to reopen it, but neither way was used.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I respectfully differ. One way was used, and that was by unanimous consent given by the Senate to roll back the legislative process to that point. I think that was understood by all Senators.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. There is one point which I believe should be noted in the RECORD. I tried to get it into the RECORD the other night when the debate was under way. I should say that it was a very interesting debate indeed. The purpose of the rules of the Senate, it seems to me, as well as of the precedents of the Senate, is to bring out what the true sense of the Senate is in connection with any vote.

It seems perfectly clear from the RECORD, by virtue of the remarks of the majority leader, the remarks of the minority leader, and the remarks of the Vice President, on pages 4427 and 4428, that the whole purpose of the recapitulation was to find out what the true sense of the Senate was at that time. That was the purpose of the recapitulation.

If our good friend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee had had his way when he raised his point of order, then indeed the true sense of the Senate could not have been had, because the Vice

President would have been deprived of his vote. I believe the RECORD should show that the right of the Senator from Tennessee to raise that point of order would have been after the announcement of the Vice President:

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct; and the Vice President then would have one of those rare opportunities to break a tie.

If that parliamentary point was to have been raised, that was the time it should have been raised. Otherwise the purpose of raising it would only have been to defeat the opportunity to find out what the sense of the Senate was.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I agree. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one who has always been interested in parliamentary procedure and has studied the subject for a great many years, I think I was prouder last Friday night to be a Member of this body than I had ever been previously. I think the majority leader, the minority leader, and the Vice President, following parliamentary practice, acted quickly, accurately, and honorably to bring out the true result of the vote for the benefit of all the people of the United States.

As the Senator from Connecticut has said, parliamentary rules and precedents are built up as a result of deliberations of this body, conducted as accurately, as factually, and as honorably as they can be conducted. Parliamentary rules are based greatly on the honor of the Members of this body correctly following the procedures laid down in parliamentary practice over the years.

Mr. President, as soon as the error on Friday evening was discovered, the majority leader brought the matter to the attention of the Vice President and of the minority leader, and those men acted as honorable leaders of this body. Every Member of the Senate was put on his honor and lived up to that obligation by not trying to take any advantage of the extraordinary parliamentary procedure that came about because of a factual error in connection with a very close vote.

If we are going to carry forward the debates in this body and get the desired results, we could not do so on a more honorable basis or on a higher plane than was done on last Friday night. I told the majority leader, and I think I told the minority leader, that I was proud of their quick thinking and of the honorable way in which they acted.

The Senator from Tennessee, who brought this situation up, is an honorable man. He did not try to break a unanimous-consent request to get a correct record at that time.

The facts are perfectly simple and fundamental. As the minority leader has said, the Vice President cannot vote unless there is a tie, and he knows there is a tie.

Obviously, he would have voted as he did vote last Friday night after he knew there was a tie. There was a recapitulation, and on the recapitulation no Member of the Senate tried to take advantage of the fact that he could change his vote. So there was a tie vote and the Vice President voted. We all acted honorably, and the result was as has been brought out, and the whole country knows it today.

As I have said, Mr. President, I was proud to be a Member of the Senate on last Friday night when the matter suddenly came to the front. I was proud of the way in which it was handled on both sides of the aisle and by the Presiding Officer, the Vice President, on the advice of the Parliamentarian. I think we can be very well satisfied, on whichever side we are, that the true result was brought out by the final vote.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, we may be setting a precedent here. If so, I think it is a very good one. The situation was such that the majority had voted "Yea." The minority leader was with the prevailing side. The result was announced. There was a motion to reconsider and a motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider. The motion to lay on the table had carried.

Thereafter, a unanimous-consent request was made to recapitulate the vote. The minority leader agreed to that. It required unanimous consent to recapitulate. When the recapitulation was made it was found that the original vote was a tie, in which event the Vice President would have had the right to vote and break the tie. If anyone had urged at that time that the Vice President did not have a right to break the tie, the unanimous-consent request might well have been objected to unless the right of the Vice President had been protected. When Senators gave unanimous consent to recapitulate, they certainly did not intend to foreclose the Vice President from voting.

I think we have a correct ruling.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, of course at that time one of three things could have been done: Either that the announcement originally made was correct and that the motion had been agreed to by a vote of 46 to 45, or that it had been defeated 46 to 45, or that it was a tie vote. A motion for reconsideration would have been made just as I felt when the vote was originally made and it turned out the way it did, it was therefore again necessary to make a motion to reconsider which I did by unanimous consent, rather than taking another rollcall.

Mr. LONG. It seemed to me that no one had any idea of taking advantage of the situation. The minority leader was eminently correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his indulgence. I know it is very interesting to discuss precedents of the Senate and rules of the Senate. We have to have them. But, at the moment, Mr. President the cotton grower is getting ready to plant his cotton, and instead of worrying about the planter of cotton we are worrying about what precedent was established last week. Why can we not get busy? The cotton farmers will not know, until we pass this bill, what to expect this year. I think it is important, too.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was eating my dinner when on Friday night last this question arose.

I hope the Senator from Georgia will remain in the Chamber.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am honored. I shall remain in the Chamber.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I had been present at the time the question arose I would have participated in the discussion.

It seems to me there is one fundamental thing which we must keep in mind, namely, the constitutional right of the Vice President to vote in case of a tie. If he is against the proposal which is before the Senate, on a tie vote he would not have to vote, because it would not change the result. A tie vote defeats a proposition. Unless he wanted to be recorded on the question he would not vote. The only effective vote of the Vice President is an affirmative vote.

I doubt very much, Mr. President, whether the Vice President can be deprived of that right by anything that happens based upon an error in tallying a rollcall of the Senate.

As the Senator from California has indicated, the Vice President does not keep a tally of the votes. He can know there is a tie only when he is told so by the tally clerks, who rarely make a mistake. They are amazingly accurate. I remember John Crockett would take a rollcall and run his pencil up one side and down the other and come up with the result. The tally clerks are accurate, although they can make a mistake. If they make a mistake, of course, it is an honest mistake. If it turns out that it is not an accurate record, if a mistake is later discovered, it cannot deprive the Vice President of his constitutional right to vote in case of a tie.

Therefore, I think the Vice President had a right to vote. I am not sure that it required a unanimous-consent agreement to vacate the vote on the motion to reconsider in order that the Vice President could cast his vote, because if the vote had been 46 to 45 the other way, and the motion had been made by those who were in the minority but who would have been in the majority if the motion had carried, he would be deprived of his right to cast his vote if the proper rollcall result had been reported. I think there is no question that the Vice President had the right to vote.

The situation in the House of Representatives is different. The Speaker cannot untie a tie vote as Speaker. He has a fundamental right to vote as a Member of the House. By custom, the Speaker's name is not called, but he can always order that his name be called in order that he may exercise his vote as a Member of the House. But when he asks that his name be called, he is asking it as a Member of the House, which he has the right to do.

I have asked the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to remain in the Chamber for a moment, because I recall that when I was the majority leader a good many years ago, and the Senator from Oregon, Mr. McNary, was the minority leader, there had been a yea-

and-nay vote on which the Senator from Georgia voted, and after voting, but before recapitulation, had left the Chamber.

The next day, when the result of that vote was on our desks, it showed that the Senator from Georgia had not even voted. His name was not on the roll-call. I am not certain of this, but I think his vote would have decided the result.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is quite correct in all that he has stated. As a matter of fact, the bill was lost on a tie vote. As I recall, the vote was 38 to 38, although I am not certain of the figures.

The Senator from Kentucky will recall that every effort was made to find the then Vice President of the United States, Mr. Henry Wallace, in order to break the tie. The Vice President could not be located, and the bill was lost on a tie vote.

Upon reading the newspaper that evening, in which the vote was recorded, as the newspapers used to do quite regularly, the result of the vote was shown as 38 to 38. I happened to notice that my name was not listed.

The next morning I came to the Chamber early and consulted with the majority leader, with the Parliamentarian, and other persons. A resolution was prepared to vacate the entire proceedings and to amend the Journal, so as to make it reflect the truth that the bill had been passed by a majority of one vote, whatever the vote was.

I apprehended that a very violent debate might take place on the resolution; but as soon as the resolution was offered, the then minority leader, Mr. McNary, rose in his place and said that he had heard the Senator from Georgia vote, and knew how I had voted. He chided me, as I recall, because, as he claimed, I did not vote quite loud enough as a general proposition, and he thought also that I should have stayed in the Chamber during the recapitulation. But he admitted the facts as set forth in the resolution, and by unanimous consent the resolution to correct the Journal and make it show that the bill had passed was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Georgia for confirming my recollection of the incident. The action was taken by offering a resolution to correct the Journal and the RECORD and to enable the Senator from Georgia to vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. To make the Journal show the truth as to how I had voted.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct, even though the Senate had adjourned overnight and had come back the next day and discovered its error.

The point I wish to make is that the Senate cannot, under any circumstances, condone an error in a yea-and-nay vote, because it is the fundamental right of every Senator to vote and to be recorded as to how he votes. Therefore, I doubt very much that unanimous consent was necessary or was required in order to vacate the record of the vote, and to show that the Senator from Georgia voted and how he voted. As the Senator from Georgia said, the Senator from Oregon, Mr. McNary, rose and said he remembered that the Senator from Georgia had voted, and recalled how he had voted.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have read the precedent concerning the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia. It involved almost precisely the procedure which the junior Senator from Tennessee requested Friday evening, to wit, unanimous consent that the vote be reconsidered.

I agree with the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky that the Constitution—and I have read it a few times—is explicit that the Vice President has a right to vote in case of a tie. But does the Senator from Kentucky think the Constitution is any more explicit as to the right of the Vice President to vote than it is as to the right of a Senator to vote?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; except that the Constitution prescribes the only way in which the Vice President can vote; while a Senator can vote under any conditions in the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. To my mind, there is a great deal of difference between the right of the Vice President to vote in this body and the right of a Senator to vote. It is often said that the Senate can do anything by unanimous consent.

Mr. BARKLEY. That remark was made by a former Vice President, who is still living in Texas and is healthy at the age of 87.

Mr. RUSSELL. We know that, practically speaking, his statement is correct; because when a Senator acquiesces in unanimous consent, he waives his right. But I do not believe the Senate, even by unanimous consent, can deprive the Vice President of his right to vote. The Constitution says that the Vice President can vote in case of a tie. That is the only part he can take in the proceedings of the Senate.

If a Senator were to ask unanimous consent that the Vice President not be permitted to vote, the Vice President would have no right to object; but by that fact he could not be denied his constitutional right to vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator from Georgia about that.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is a great deal of difference between the right of a Senator to vote and depriving the Vice President of his constitutional right to vote in the one instance in which he may vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose that last Friday night, for instance, unanimous consent had been given with reference to the vote on the motion to reconsider. Was the Vice President to be denied his constitutional right to vote because some Senator objected to unanimous consent to vacate the vote or to change something in the RECORD? I do not think so, because the Vice President's right to vote is a constitutional, fundamental right.

If last Friday night the Senator from Tennessee, or any other Senator, had objected to unanimous consent, and it had been withheld, so that the vote on the motion to reconsider had stood, although the result might have been the reverse, which could happen at any time, based upon a falsity, an inaccurate record, or a mistake, do Senators mean to tell me that the right of the Vice President to vote, given him under the Constitution, whether the error had been discovered that afternoon or the next day, was to be denied, because some Senator rose and objected to unanimous consent to vacate the vote, or because some other proceeding had taken place since the original vote, which was a tie vote? I do not think so.

It may be that this is the first time this particular situation has arisen in this way in the history of the Senate.

I was prompted to make these remarks merely because we must be guided in the future by what happens today in the interpretation in this case, if a similar situation should again arise.

I shall lay down the fundamental principle as I believe it to be, that the Vice President of the United States cannot, either by indifference of the Senate, mistake of the Senate, or refusal by the Senate to grant unanimous consent to bring a proceeding back to the position in which it would have been before a tie vote had been announced, deprive the Vice President of his constitutional right to vote—because legislation may turn on such action, and frequently does.

Mr. BUSH. Or even an adverse vote of the Senate could not deprive him of the right to vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think it could.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to express my personal appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for the observations he has made. I had the feeling a little earlier that possibly this precedent might be left to rest upon a matter of courtesy or upon a matter of the granting or withholding of unanimous consent which, while sound in this case due to the foresighted question by the distinguished minority leader, Mr. KNOWLAND, might not always be in evidence.

Personally, I agree entirely with the point of view so ably expressed by the Senator from Kentucky, who is a distinguished former Vice President of this body, that the constitutional right of the Vice President to vote in case of a tie comes into operation at the moment the tie vote is determined and that no rule of the Senate and no agreement can destroy it if he is present then to exercise it.

I should like to make this further observation: During the time I was a Member of the House of Representatives, I took a great deal of interest in the rules of that body. I recall that recapitulations were not entirely uncommon. But a recapitulation was never an idle thing. That is, a recapitulation was not made simply for the purpose of having the names read over again; a recapitulation was made for the purpose of determining whether a vote had been accurately recorded and accurately reported.

If a recapitulation showed that an error had been made, then an opportunity

was given to correct the error, whether the error was an error in the addition of the votes cast or an error in a failure to record a vote which had been actually cast.

As has been pointed out, the Speaker of the House of Representatives is a duly elected Member of that body and may vote on any question if he so desires. His name is not called customarily, but only when he so requests.

Flowing from that fact, the Speaker of the House also enjoys one right which the Vice President does not have in the Senate. The Speaker may make a tie vote as well as break one. That is, if the yeas are ahead one vote, the Speaker may ask that his name be called and then vote in the negative to create the tie that loses the question. The Vice President, as we know, votes only when the vote is already tied.

That right of the Speaker to cast his vote would, I feel sure, be upheld if a recapitulation showed an error, which when discovered created a situation where the Speaker's vote could affect the result.

I have not taken the occasion to examine the precedents, but I am sure the precedents would show that when a recapitulation was made, if a Member was on the floor and actually voted, but his vote failed to be recorded, he would be accorded the opportunity to have his vote recorded, so that the error could be corrected, and the proper record and proper addition made.

In the matter presently before the Senate, the recapitulation, again, was not an idle thing. If there had been any Senator who had voted on Friday night, but whose vote failed to show in the recapitulation, the recapitulation would have let the Senator have his vote recorded, although he could not have changed his vote; and a Senator who had not voted, would not have been accorded the privilege of voting. But any Senator who had voted, and whose vote was either wrongly recorded or not recorded at all, could have had his vote recorded as he originally voted.

That was why in the discussion Friday night I posed the question to the Senator from Tennessee asking if he had voted, and his vote had not been properly recorded, if the recapitulation would not have given him the opportunity to have had it recorded and the addition for the total corrected. He agreed that was correct but disagreed with my conclusion that the establishment of a tie created the opportunity for the Vice President to vote. On that, I submit that condition for which the Constitution prescribes could not have been known to the Senate in the absence of the recapitulation which demonstrated the tie vote. Therefore, I was very happy to hear the former Vice President, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, point out the constitutional questions involved. I think he was eminently correct. I think the present Vice President ruled correctly when he responded to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader that if a tie vote was shown, he would have an opportunity of voting. That right would have existed, in my humble opinion, regardless of any unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings of reconsideration.

In the long years ahead for which we all hope this Senate may serve, it is well and good that this precedent should have had the mature opinion of the Senator from Kentucky, coming as it does from one who is of a political party other than that of the present Vice President. He has added to the rich heritages of this body.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I wish to make just a brief observation, because I am anxious that the cotton farmers get their plantings in before sundown as is any other Senator.

Recapitulation of a vote has two purposes. One is to make certain that every Senator is recorded as voting as he actually voted. Then there is the collective right of the Senate to see that the vote is accurate, in order to ascertain whether the vote on an amendment or other proposition has been carried or lost.

My position is that whenever a situation is discovered which, if discovered in time, would have given the Vice President the right to vote, then he has the right to vote nunc pro tunc. We lawyers know what that means—now as then. He has a right to vote regardless of what happened in the meantime.

I did not intend to say as much as I have, but since I received such a nice compliment from the Senator from South Dakota I thought I would say it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia observed that in his opinion the Senate could not deprive the Vice President of a vote even by the granting of unanimous consent, which constitutes a unanimous action. I suggest the Senate could not deprive a Senator of a vote by similar action. I must respectfully resist any interpretation of the Constitution that confers upon the Vice President a more positive right to vote in this body than that which is conferred upon a Member of this body. Both rights must be exercised at such time and under such circumstances as they may be available. Whether the precedent established is sound or unsound, the precedent is established. I accept it.

I rose to advise the Senate that the point of order was not made lightly, or maliciously, or with political intent. Insofar as the precedents as of that hour were concerned, the point of order was, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee, a valid point of order. Now that the ruling has been made and the precedent established, I wish to say that I shall therefore accept the precedent; but I do feel grateful that it has provoked an examination of the rules and precedents of the Senate.

I should like to conclude with this one observation, and I should particularly like to have the attention of the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader, I find that there is no printed volume of the precedents of the United States Senate. One must go to the Parliamentarian's office and turn through the files. Surely, so august a body as this, the greatest deliberative body on earth, as I believe it is, should hasten to have printed, in bound volume form, with indexes and annotations, the precedents of the Senate.

Mr. CASE of Scuth Dakota. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say I learned the other day that such a volume is in process of preparation. I think the point made by the Senator is an excellent one. I happened to be sitting in the chair of the Presiding Officer the other evening when a question arose, and the Parliamentarian at that time showed me pages of a volume on which they are working.

Mr. GORE. That is fine.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to say to my delightful friend from Tennessee the Senate already has acted on a resolution authorizing the printing of the precedents. Last week the majority leader, with the concurrence of the minority leader, took steps to authorize the Parliamentarian to proceed with the preparation of an index of those precedents.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, almost at the end of the debate on last Friday, March 9, on the parliamentary question which is being discussed, I asked the Senator from Tennessee to yield. He did yield to me, and I then said:

> I have listened very carefully to this debate. I think it is very important, and probably will be a precedent. But are we setting a precedent that any time the clerk may make a mistake in reporting a vote he can, by that mistake, unless there is a unanimous-consent agreement, deprive the Vice President of his right to break a tie?
>
> Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That would be the effect of it.
>
> Mr. MALONE. Let us not do that.

I still say there should be a little horsesense in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and I withdraw my amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before the vote is taken, the Chair, for the purpose of the RECORD, should like to be permitted to make an observation with regard to the discussion which has just taken place.

The distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has very well stated the rules of the Senate, as he interprets them, with regard to the rights of the Vice President under the Constitution. When the rulings were made on last Friday, the rulings, as all Members of this body who sit in this chair from time to time may know, were made on the advice of the Parliamentarian. The Parliamentarian, of course, advises on the basis of precedents. It seems to the Chair most interesting and appropriate that the rulings which were made on Friday by the present occupant of this chair were based on precedents which were reasserted by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

There were two basic rulings: First, that on recapitulation no Senator may change his vote; and, second, that on recapitulation the Vice President has the right to vote.

If we read from the RECORD the proceedings on a precedent previously referred to, the reconsideration of the

Thomas amendment, I think we can see how the Senator from Kentucky, who was then Vice President of the United States, had ruled on that occasion and the reasons for the Parliamentarian's advising the Chair to rule as he did on this occasion. The Chair reads only two brief portions—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 15, 1949, volume 95, part 10, page 12931.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Do I correctly understand the Chair's ruling on the recapitulation of the vote on the oil amendment to be that the recapitulation would consist merely of accurately counting the vote and announcing the result, and that Senators who were not present at the time of the vote or Senators who did not vote at that time could not vote on the recapitulation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. The recapitulation is merely for the purpose of seeing whether any Senator has been recorded incorrectly on the rollcall—not for the purpose of giving Senators a right to change their vote or other Senators an opportunity to vote.

And then, further on:

Mr. MCCARTHY. Do I correctly understand that the position of the President of the Senate is that even though business has transpired since the vote was had on the motion to reconsider the vote on the fur amendment, and even though another vote has been taken since then, the President of the Senate could now go back and cast his vote on the motion to reconsider? Is that the ruling of the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the vote on the motion to reconsider were recapitulated so as to create a situation which would give the Vice President a right to vote—as would have been the case if the result had been correctly announced—the Chair feels that he would not be deprived of the right to vote by reason of those circumstances.

Those were the precedents upon which the rulings on Friday were made; and the Chair feels that having the matter spelled out, as it has been, very persuasively and articulately today in the course of this discussion will aid in seeing to it that the precedents in connection with this matter are better understood.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennesese [Mr. GORE]. Does the Senator from Tennessee withdraw his amendment?

Mr. GORE. I do.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dirksen	Ives
Allott	Douglas	Jackson
Anderson	Duff	Jenner
Barkley	Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.
Barrett	Eastland	Johnston, S. C.
Beall	Ellender	Kennedy
Bender	Ervin	Kerr
Bennett	Flanders	Knowland
Bible	Frear	Kuchel
Bricker	Fulbright	Langer
Bridges	George	Lehman
Bush	Goldwater	Long
Butler	Gore	Magnuson
Byrd	Green	Malone
Carlson	Hayden	Mansfield
Case, N. J.	Hennings	Martin, Iowa
Case, S. Dak.	Hickenlooper	Martin, Pa.
Chavez	Hill	McCarthy
Clements	Holland	McClellan
Curtis	Hruska	McNamara
Daniel	Humphrey	Monroney
Morse	Purtell	Symington
Mundt	Saltonstall	Thurmond
Murray	Schoeppel	Thye
Neely	Scott	Watkins
Neuberger	Smathers	Welker
O'Mahoney	Smith, Maine	Wiley
Pastore	Smith, N. J.	Williams
Payne	Sparkman	Young
Potter	Stennis	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], as amended.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 11, as follows:

YEAS—78

Aiken	Frear	Monroney
Allott	George	Morse
Barkley	Goldwater	Mundt
Barrett	Gore	Murray
Beall	Green	Neely
Bender	Hennings	Neuberger
Bennett	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bible	Hill	Pastore
Bricker	Hruska	Payne
Bridges	Humphrey	Potter
Bush	Ives	Purtell
Butler	Jackson	Saltonstall
Byrd	Jenner	Schoeppel
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Langer	Sparkman
Curtis	Lehman	Symington
Daniel	Magnuson	Thurmond
Dirksen	Malone	Thye
Douglas	Mansfield	Watkins
Duff	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Dworshak	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Ervin	McCarthy	Williams
Flanders	McNamara	Young

NAYS—11

Anderson	Hayden	Long
Eastland	Holland	McClellan
Ellender	Kerr	Stennis
Fulbright	Knowland	

NOT VOTING—6

Capehart	Kefauver	Robertson
Cotton	Millikin	Russell

So Mr. WILLIAMS' amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is designated "2-24-56-B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have the entire amendment read, or does he ask that it be printed in the RECORD without reading?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this amendment has been on the desks of Senators for several days. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. CARLSON, for himself and other Senators, is as follows:

On page 3, line 14, insert the following new section 102a, reading as follows:

"WHEAT—DOMESTIC PARITY

"SEC. 102a. Title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended (1) by changing the designation thereof to read as follows: "Title III—Loans, Parity Payments, Consumer Safeguards, Marketing Quotas, and Marketing Certificates"; (2) by changing the designation of subtitle D thereof to read as follows: "Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Provisions and Appropriations"; and (3) by inserting after subtitle C a new subtitle D, as follows:

"'SUBTITLE D—WHEAT MARKETING CERTIFICATES

"'LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS

"'SEC. 380a. Wheat, in addition to being a basic food, is one of the great export crops of American agriculture and its production for domestic consumption and for export is essential to the maintenance of a sound national economy and to the general welfare. The movement of wheat from producer to consumer, in the form of the commodity or any of the products thereof, is preponderantly in interstate and foreign commerce. That small percentage of wheat which is produced and consumed within the confines of any State is normally commingled with, and always bears a close and intimate commercial and competitive relationship to, that quantity of such commodity which moves in interstate and foreign commerce. For this reason, any regulation of intrastate commerce in wheat is a regulation of commerce which is in competion with, or which otherwise affects, obstructs, or burdens, interstate commerce in that commodity. In order to provide an adequate and balanced flow of wheat in interstate and foreign commerce and thereby assist farmers in obtaining parity of income by marketing wheat for domestic consumption at parity prices and by increased exports at world prices, and to assure consumers an adequate and steady supply of wheat at fair prices, it is necessary to regulate all commerce in wheat in the manner provided under the marketing certificate plan set forth in this subtitle.

"'DOMESTIC FOOD QUOTA

"'SEC. 380b. Not later than July 1 of each calendar year the Secretary shall determine and proclaim the domestic food quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning in the next calendar year. Such domestic food quota shall be that number of bushels of wheat which the Secretary determines will be consumed as human food in the continental United States during such marketing year.

"'APPORTIONMENT OF DOMESTIC FOOD QUOTA

"'SEC. 380c. (a) The domestic food quota for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 1 percent thereof for apportionment as provided in this subsection, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States on the basis of the total production of wheat in each State during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for adverse weather conditions and for trends in production during such period. The reserve quota set aside herein for apportionment by the Secretary shall be used to establish quotas for counties, in addition to the county quotas established under subsection (b) of this section, on the basis of the relative needs of counties for additional quota because of reclamation and other new areas coming into the production of wheat during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed.

"'(b) The State domestic food quota for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 3 percent thereof for apportionment as provided in subsection (c), shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties in the State on the basis of the total production of wheat in each county during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for adverse weather conditions and for trends in production during such period.

"'(c) The county domestic food quota for wheat shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on which wheat has been seeded for the production of wheat during any one or more of the 3 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the marketing year for which the quota is proclaimed begins, on the basis of the normal yield of the acreage planted to wheat during such 3-year period. The reserve provided under subsection (b) shall be used to adjust farm quotas which the county committee determines to be equitable on the basis of tillable acres, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and topography.

"'MARKETING CERTIFICATES

"'SEC. 380d. (a) The Secretary shall prepare for issuance in each county marketing certificates aggregating the amount of the county domestic food quota. Such certificates shall be issued to cooperators in an amount equal to the domestic food quota established for the farm pursuant to the applicable provisions of section 380c of this act. The marketing certificates for a farm shall be issued to the farm operator, but the Secretary may authorize the issuance of marketing certificates to individual producers on any farm on the basis of their respective shares in the wheat crop, or the proceeds thereof, produced on the farm. The Secretary shall also issue and sell marketing certificates in such quantities as may be required to persons processing wheat into food products. Marketing certificates shall be transferable only in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary.

"'(b) Whenever a domestic food quota is proclaimed for any marketing year pursuant to section 380b of this act, the Secretary shall determine and proclaim for such marketing year (1) the estimated parity price and the estimated farm price for wheat, and (2) the value of the marketing certificate. The value of the marketing certificate shall be equal to the amount by which the estimated parity price exceeds the estimated farm price as determined herein. The value of the marketing certificate shall be computed to the nearest cent. The proclamation required by this subsection shall be made during the month of June immediately preceding the marketing year for which such domestic food quota is proclaimed.

"'(c) The Secretary is authorized and directed through the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy and sell marketing certificates issued for any marketing year at the value proclaimed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. For the purpose of facilitating the purchase and sale of certificates, the Secretary may establish and operate a pool or pools and he may also authorize public and private agencies to act as his agents, either directly or through the pool or pools. Certificates shall be valid to cover sales and importations of products made during the marketing year with respect to which they are issued and after being once used to cover such sales and importations shall be canceled by the Secretary. Any unused certificates shall be redeemed by the Secretary at the price established for such certificates.

"'MARKETING RESTRICTIONS

"'SEC. 380e. (a) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, all persons engaged in the processing of wheat into food products composed wholly or partly of wheat are hereby prohibited from marketing any such product for domestic food consumption or export containing wheat in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 380 of this act have been acquired by such person.

"'(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, all persons are hereby prohibited from importing or bringing into the continental United States any food products containing wheat in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 380d of this act have been acquired by such person.

"'(c) Upon the exportation from the continental United States of any food product containing wheat, with respect to which marketing certificates as required herein have been acquired, the Secretary shall pay to the exporter an amount equal to the value of the certificates for the quantity of wheat so exported in the food product. For the purposes of this subsection, the consignor named in the bill of lading, under which the article is exported, shall be considered the exporter: *Provided, however,* That any other person may be considered to be the exporter if the consignor named in the bill of lading waives claim in favor of such other person.

"'(d) Upon the giving of a bond satisfactory to the Secretary under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe to secure the purchase of and payment for such marketing certificates as may be required, any person required to have a marketing certificate in order to market or import a food product composed wholly or partly of wheat may market or import any such commodity without having first acquired a marketing certificate.

"'(e) As used in section 380e of this title, the term "marketing" means the sale and the delivery of the food product composed wholly or partly of wheat.

"'CONVERSION FACTORS

"'SEC. 380f. The Secretary shall ascertain and establish conversion factors showing the amount of wheat contained in food products processed wholly or partly from wheat. The conversion factor for any such product shall be determined upon the basis of the weight of wheat used in the processing of such product.

"'CIVIL PENALTIES

"'SEC. 380g. Any person who violates or attempts to violate, or who participates or aids in the violation of, any of the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of section 380e of this act shall forfeit to the United States a sum equal to three times the market value, at the time of the commission of such act, of the product involved in such violation. Such forfeiture shall be recoverable in a civil suit brought in the name of the United States.

"'ADJUSTMENTS IN DOMESTIC FOOD QUOTAS

"'SEC. 380h. If the Secretary has reason to believe that because of a national emergency or because of a material increase in demand for wheat, the domestic food quota for wheat should be increased or suspended, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine whether the increase or suspension is necessary in order to meet such emergency or increase in the demand for wheat. If, on the basis of such investigation, the Secretary finds that such increase or suspension is necessary, he shall immediately proclaim such finding (and if he finds an increase is necessary, the amount of the increase found by him to be necessary) and thereupon such quotas shall be increased or shall be suspended, as the case may be. In case any domestic food quota for wheat is increased under this section, each farm quota for wheat shall be increased in the same ratio and marketing certificates shall be issued therefor in accordance with section 280d of this act. In case any domestic food quota for wheat is suspended under this section, the Secretary may redetermine the value of marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 380d of this act.

"'REPORTS AND RECORDS

"'SEC. 380i. (a) The provisions of section 373 of this act shall apply to all persons, except wheat producers, who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle, except that any such person failing to make any report or keep any record as required by this section or making any false report or record shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000 for each such violation.

"'(b) The provisions of section 373 (b) of the act shall apply to all wheat farmers who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle.

"'REFERENDUM

"'SEC. 380j. In the referendum held pursuant to section 336 of this act on the national marketing quota proclaimed for the 1957 crop of wheat, the Secretary shall also submit the question whether farmers favor a marketing certificate program under this subtitle in lieu of marketing quotas under subtitle B. If more than one-half of the farmers voting in the referendum favor such marketing certificate program, the Secretary shall, prior to the effective date of the national marketing quota proclaimed under subtitle B, suspend the operation of such quota and a marketing certificate program shall be in effect for the 1957 and subsequent wheat crops under the provisions of this subtitle and marketing quotas and acreage allotments shall not be in effect for wheat under subtitle B. If the marketing certificate program authorized by this act is approved for the 1957 crop by farmers voting in a referendum as provided herein, the provisions of section 101 (d) (8) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, shall have no applicability to the 1957 crop of wheat.

"'PRICE SUPPORT

"'SEC. 380k. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"'(a) Whenever a wheat marketing certificate program under this subtitle is in effect, price support for wheat shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

"'(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make available through loans, purchases, or other operations, price support to producers of wheat who are cooperators. The amount, terms, conditions, and extent of such price-support operations shall be determined by the Secretary, except that the level of such support shall be determined after taking into consideration the following

factors: (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which corn and other feed grains are being supported and the feed value of such grains in relation to wheat, (3) the provisions of any international agreement relating to wheat to which the United States is a party, (4) foreign-trade policies of friendly wheat-exporting countries, and (5) other factors affecting international trade in wheat including exchange rates and currency regulations.

"'(c) Compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices (excluding marketing quotas) may be prescribed and required by the Secretary as a condition of eligibility for price support and for the receipt of wheat-marketing certificates.'"

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a. m., tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR REMAINDER OF THE EVENING AND TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, after conferring with the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], I announce that it is planned to consider this evening Senate bill 3091, a bill to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act, as heretofore amended. The bill permits the disposal of the plant at Louisville, Ky. It is our plan to dispose of the bill before we adjourn. We do not expect to have any more yea-and-nay votes this evening. I hope we can expedite action on the farm bill tomorrow. We will plan to stay in session tomorrow evening until 7 o'clock.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say for the information of the Senate that the bill referred to by the majority leader has a time limit on it, because the Commission which would make the disposal under the bill expires on March 22, if I am not mistaken. The bill was reported by the committee unanimously, by both the majority and minority members.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. Tomorrow, after the Senate convenes at 11 o'clock, we shall proceed to the consideration of the Executive Calendar during the morning hour. At that time, I may say to the distinguished minority leader, we will consider the nominations which have previously been passed over, namely, those of Mr. William E. Dowling and Mr. James Weldon Jones to be members of the United States Tariff Commission. I understand the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is interested in the nominations, and that he has been notified. I should like to have him present when the nominations are taken up. We plan to dispose of them before we consider the amendments of the Senator from Kansas to the pending farm bill.

Mr. President, I now have a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is my understanding that before the conclusion of the morning hour, tomorrow, the Senator from Kansas will be recognized on his amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. I am ready to proceed with the amendment, but I would prefer to be given some time tomorrow, instead of using it this evening. It will require 2 full hours of debate. I should appreciate it very much if the majority leader would permit us to begin the debate tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is why I made the request, so that the distinguished Senator from Kansas would have that opportunity tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Kansas will not proceed tonight with the consideration of the amendments, because I should like to have some time on the amendments too. I understand that we will proceed tomorrow with the debate. I do not want to use any time now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We will dispose of S. 3091 this evening and then adjourn until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow. We will have a morning hour tomorrow, and probably consume 45 minutes on the nominations to the Tariff Commission; then we will proceed to take up the amendments of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] to the unfinished business. I assure the Senate that we will have a quorum call.

AMENDMENT OF RUBBER-PRODUCING FACILITIES DISPOSAL ACT OF 1953

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1673 (S. 3091).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S 3091) to amend the Rubber Producing Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 1297 at Louisville, Ky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, this is the last of the Government-owned rubber-producing plants, which the Government built during the war. It is presently under lease for a period which extends to 1958. The bill authorizes the present Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, or such other agency as may take over the plant under the direction of the President, following the expiration of the life of the present Commission, either to grant a long-term lease for this property or to enter into a sales agreement if a satisfactory bid is made on it. The terms of the bill are similar to legislation under which all other plants of this kind have been disposed of. The urgency, as stated by the distinguished majority leader, is based upon the expiration date of the Rubber Commission.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the purpose of the bill to consummate a sale or to authorize negotiations?

Mr. CLEMENTS. To authorize negotiations for a sale.

Mr. CURTIS. At the present time the plant is producing synthetic rubber made from alcohol; is that correct?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. For what purpose can it be sold under the bill as written?

Mr. CLEMENTS. For what purpose?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It may be sold for use in making the same product.

Mr. CURTIS. Could it be sold for any other use?

Mr. CLEMENTS. No. There is a security clause in the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. It must be sold for a synthetic rubber plant. Is that correct?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. It must be sold for a plant that produces rubber from alcohol. Is that correct?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the matter come back to Congress after the sale?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes; it must come back to Congress for review.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It must come back either in the form of a lease or of a sale.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, who is a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe the Senator has already mentioned the fact that there is a time limit with reference to the present arrangement in Louisville, and that it is necessary that the bill be passed promptly, in order that the time limit may not extend beyond the point where it would be more embarrassing and difficult to carry on negotiations or consummate a sale. Is that correct?

Mr. CLEMENTS. My colleague is correct. The expiration date of the commission is the 22d day of March. It is necessary to get action in the House before that time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under those conditions, I do not wish to delay the passage of the bill; therefore I will take no further time of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] desire to have the floor?

Mr. FREAR. I have nothing to say, because I believe the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] has very well stated the situation. I hope that favorable action on the bill will be taken by the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am delighted to have the observation of the Senator from Delaware, who is the chairman of the subcommittee which handled the bill in committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that there are several committee amendments before the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. There are several committee amendments, in which the sponsors of the bill concur, and which had the unanimous support of all members of the subcommittee and of the full committee.

Mr. FREAR. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

The committee amendments were on page 2, line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "forty-five" and insert "thirty"; on page 4, line 4, after the numeral "4", to insert "(a)"; after line 14, to insert a new subparagraph, as follows:

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 8 (a) (3) and 9 (f) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 relating to the period for review by the Attorney General, the Commission, before submission to the Congress of a lease or lease extension relative to the Louisville plant, shall submit it to the Attorney General, who shall, within 7 days after receiving the lease or lease extension, advise the Commission whether the proposed lease or lease extension would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws.

At the top of page 5, to insert a new subparagraph, as follows:

(c) Within 10 days after the termination of the lease negotiations authorized in subsection (a) of this section, or, if Congress is not then in session, within 10 days after Congress next convenes, the Commission shall report to the Congress the lease or lease extension negotiated pursuant to this section. The Commission shall submit at the same time the statement of the Attorney General approving the proposed lease or lease extension in accordance with the standard set forth in subsection (b) of this section, and the names of the persons who have represented the Government or lessee in conducting negotiations for the lease or lease extension on the Louisville plant. Unless the lease or lease extension is disapproved by either House of the Congress by resolution prior to the expiration of 30 days of continuous session (as defined in section 9 (c) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953) of the Congress following the date upon which the lease or lease extension is submitted to it, upon the expiration of such 30-day period the lease or lease extension shall become fully effective and the Commission shall proceed to carry it out in accordance with its terms.

And, on page 6, after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 6. (a) Notwithstanding any provision of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as amended, or of this act, the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission may enter into contracts of sale and may from time to time enter into leases for all or any part of the catalyst manufacturing equipment now situated in Baltimore, Md., and generally described in the Commission's brochure M–2 dated March 1954.

(b) Except as provided in this paragraph, each such lease or contract may be made on such terms and conditions including type of use and duration (up to 15 years) of any lease, as the Commission deems advisable in the public interest. Before making such sale or lease, the Commission shall secure the advice of the Attorney General as to whether the proposed sale or lease would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. Each such lease or contract of sale shall contain a national security clause, containing such terms and for such duration (10 years or less) as the Commission deems desirable in the public interest, and any such lease shall provide for the recapture of the equipment thereby leased and the termination of the lease, if the President determines that the national interest so requires.

The price for any part or all of such equipment shall be an amount which the Commission determines to be the maximum amount obtainable in the public interest, but not less than fair value as determined by the Commission.

(c) Any of such equipment not sold or leased under subsection (a) shall be placed and maintained in adequate standby condition pursuant to, and be otherwise subject to, the provisions of section 8 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 (other than the provision prohibiting leases).

(d) All the powers and authority conferred by this section upon the Commission may, after the termination of the existence of the Commission, be exercised by such agency of the Government as the President may designate for the purpose, and for this purpose such successor agency may exercise all the authority conferred in the Rubber Producing Facilities Dispostal Act of 1953 upon the Commission.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 27. (a) Notwithstanding the second sentence of section 7 (a), the period for receipt of proposals for the purchase of the Government-owned rubber-producing facility at Louisville, Ky., known as Plancor No. 1207 and hereinafter referred to as the 'Louisville plant', shall not expire until the end of the 30-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this section.

"(b) If one or more proposals are received for the purchase of the Louisville plant within the time period specified in subsection (a), the Commission, notwithstanding the expiration of the period for negotiation specified in section 7 (f), shall negotiate with those submitting the proposals for a period of not to exceed 30 days for the purpose of entering into a contract of sale.

"(c) Within 10 days after the termination of the actual negotiation period referred to in subsection (b), or, if Congress is not then in session, within 10 days after Congress next convenes, the Commission shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report containing, with respect to the disposal under this section of the Louisville plant, the information described in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8 of section 9 (a). Unless the contract is disapproved by either House of the Congress by a resolution prior to the expiration of 30 days of continuous session (as defined in section 9 (c)) of the Congress following the date upon which the report is submitted to it, upon the expiration of such 30-day period the contract shall become fully effective and the Commission shall proceed to carry it out, and transfer of possession of the facility sold shall be made as soon as practicable but in any event within 30 days after the expiration or termination of the existing lease on the Louisville plant. The failure to complete transfer of possession within 30 days after expiration or termination of the existing lease shall not give rise to or be the basis of rescission of the contract of sale."

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 (d) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), before submission to the Congress of its report relative to the Louisville plant, shall submit it to the Attorney General, who shall, within 7 days after receiving the report, advise the Commission whether, in his opinion, the proposed disposition, if carried out, will violate the antitrust laws.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 336, 84th Congress, approved August 9, 1955, of section 4 of Public Law 19, 84th Congress, approved March 31, 1955, and section 20 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, the Commission established by the last-mentioned act shall cease to exist at the close of the 90th day following the termination of the review period provided for in section 27 (c) of that act, unless no sale of the Louisville plant is recommended by the Commission pursuant to section 27 (c) of that act, in which event the Commission shall cease to exist at the close of the 90th day following the termination of the maximum period allowed for negotiation in section 27 (b).

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 9 (d) and notwithstanding the period of lease limitation in section 9 (f) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, the Commission or its successor may, provided the period for receipt of proposals for the purchase of the Louisville plant has expired as provided in section 27 (a) of that act and no proposal or contract for the purchase of the Louisville plant is then pending or in effect, extend the existing lease or enter into a new lease on the Louisville plant for a term of not less than 5 years nor more than 15 years from the date of termination of said existing lease.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 8 (a) (3) and 9 (f) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 relating to the period for review by the Attorney General, the Commission, before submission to the Congress of a lease or lease extension relative to the Louisville plant, shall submit it to the Attorney General, who shall, within 7 days after receiving the lease or lease extension, advise the Commission whether the proposed lease or lease extension would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws.

(c) Within 10 days after the termination of the lease negotiations authorized in subsection (a) of this section, or, if Congress is not then in session, within 10 days after Congress next convenes, the Commission shall report to the Congress the lease or lease extension negotiated pursuant to this section. The Commission shall submit at the same time the statement of the Attorney General approving the proposed lease or lease extension in accordance with the standard set forth in subsection (b) of this section, and the names of the persons who have represented the Government or lessee in conducting negotiations for the lease or lease extension on the Louisville plant. Unless the lease or lease extension is disapproved by either House of the Congress by resolution prior to the expiration of 30 days of continuous session (as defined in section 9 (c) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953) of the Congress following the date upon which the lease or lease extension is submitted to it, upon the expiration of such 30-day period the

lease or lease extension shall become fully effective and the Commission shall proceed to carry it out in accordance with its terms.

SEC. 5. Except as otherwise provided in this act, the disposal or lease of the Louisville plant shall be fully subject to all the provisions of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 and such criteria as have been established by the Commission in handling disposal of other Government-owned rubber producing facilities under that act: *Provided*, That the provisions of sections 7 (j), 7 (k), 10, 15, and 24 of that act shall not apply to the disposal or lease of the Louisville plant.

SEC. 6. (a) Notwithstanding any provision of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as amended, or of this act, the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission may enter into contracts of sale and may from time to time enter into leases for all or any part of the catalyst manufacturing equipment now situated in Baltimore, Md., and generally described in the Commission's brochure M-2 dated March 1954.

(b) Except as provided in this paragraph, each such lease or contract may be made on such terms and conditions, including type of use and duration (up to 15 years) of any lease, as the Commission deems advisable in the public interest. Before making such sale or lease, the Commission shall secure the advice of the Attorney General as to whether the proposed sale or lease would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. Each such lease or contract of sale shall contain a national-security clause, containing such terms and for such duration (10 years or less) as the Commission deems desirable in the public interest, and any such lease shall provide for the recapture of the equipment thereby leased and the termination of the lease, if the President determines that the national interest so requires.

The price for any part or all of such equipment shall be an amount which the Commission determines to be the maximum amount obtainable in the public interest, but not less than fair value as determined by the Commission.

(c) Any of such equipment not sold or leased under subsection (a) shall be placed and maintained in adequate standby condition pursuant to, and be otherwise subject to, the provisions of section 8 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 (other than the provision prohibiting leases).

(d) All the powers and authority conferred by this section upon the Commission may, after the termination of the existence of the Commission, be exercised by such agency of the Government as the President may designate for the purpose, and for this purpose such successor agency may exercise all the authority conferred in the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 upon the Commission.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was orderded to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NEED FOR REALISTIC ELECTION LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 3 minutes, and without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, one of the most encouraging signs of recent weeks has been the widespread recognition of the need for early action on a realistic elections bill.

This need has been emphasized by the comments of observers on both sides of the political fence. It is being met by the nonpartisan support that has been granted to the election bill which was drafted by leaders on both sides of the Senate aisle.

At the present time, this bill is before the Senate Rules Committee with 83 sponsors—39 from the majority and 44 from the minority. This is a strong indication that action will be taken in this session when it is needed to bring realism into the approaching elections.

I am hopeful that the Rules Committee will act at an early date so the measure can be considered on the floor within the next few weeks.

Those of us who are sponsoring this measure do not claim that it is the final answer to all the problems of honest elections. We are aware of the fact that the Senate may desire to take further steps in the light of investigations which are forthcoming.

But the measure does represent an honest effort to act realistically within the framework of information that is available to us now.

This bill is based upon the assumption that the American people can best exercise their right to select their representatives when they can act as fully informed citizens. As our country has expanded, our need for information has expanded and we are trying to meet that need.

Therefore, the measure would provide full and complete reporting on campaign contributions and expenditures. It would also set realistic ceilings on spending—ceilings which are low enough to be meaningful but high enough to remove the invitation to evasion that now exists.

In these respects, the measure is somewhat similar to the bill sponsored by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. In view of the need for early action, I do not believe the differences between the two bills should delay action.

S. 3308, our bill, would also permit radio and television broadcasters to accord some equal, free time, if they choose, to the nominated candidates for President and Vice President. They could do so without the threat—which is now present—of being bombarded by requests for similar time from "fringe" candidates of minor parties.

I point out, Mr. President, that only this week the candidate of the America First Party, in the Midwest, asked the networks to grant time equal to the amount given to the President of the United States. I think this bill will cure such a defect.

To obtain early action, we may have to delete temporarily from the bill those sections which would allow income-tax deductions for political contributions. This type of legislation must originate in the House.

It is my intention to press for enactment of this section this year, but I would not object to a temporary postponement of Senate action if such postponement would expedite consideration of the whole measure.

Mr. President, it is my belief that election laws are not matters for partisan presentation or action. All public servants—regardless of their political creed—have an equal interest in good, honest, and realistic election laws.

None of us has a mortgage on wishing to see this brought about.

The American people want no partisanship in such issues. The bipartisan sponsorship of this measure is the best guaranty that they will have their desire.

Mr. President, I have collected a few of the articles and editorials which have appeared throughout the country in support of this bill. They have appeared in the Scripps-Howard Alliance, the Washington Post and Times Herald, the Washington Evening Star, the Washington Daily News, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, the New York World-Telegram, the Dallas Times-Herald, the San Angelo Standard-Times, the Shreveport (La.) Journal, the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American News, and in Broadcasting and Telecasting magazine.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD some of the editorials and articles which have appeared in these publications.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of March 8, 1956]

GOOD BIPARTISAN CAUSE

The bipartisan support pledged to the Johnson bill to revise the law regulating campaign expenditures is an encouraging development in an election year. For present restrictions not only are unrealistic in terms of current campaign costs; they also are ineffective because of their many loopholes. Perhaps no legislation with a chance for adoption would close all of the latter, but the Johnson bill—cosponsored by a bipartisan majority of the Senate—at least would establish some more practical ceilings for election spending and would provide for more complete and informative reporting on the source of funds. One result may be to reveal for the first time the approximate total cost of a presidential campaign.

Among the important liberalizations provided in the bill are the following: To increase from $3 million to approximately $12 million the limitation on spending by national political committees; to raise the ceiling for senatorial candidates from $25,000 to $75,000 or even higher on a formula of 20 cents per vote cast during the preceding 4 years; and to raise the ceiling for House candidates from $5,000 to $15,000 or higher on the 20-cents-per-vote formula. In addition, as an incentive to small contributions, income tax deduction would be allowed up to $100 per individual contributor. Since tax legislation must originate in the House, a bill to implement this deduction provision already has been reported out by the Ways and Means Committee.

Some criticism of the pending measure already has been voiced on grounds it does not go far enough toward controlling primary contributions and expenditures. It attacks this problem only to the extent of requiring that candidates for Federal office must file with the House or Senate the same statements required in their individual States. Some States do not nominate by primary at all, and the reporting requirements differ widely. For this reason, it was recognized that there would be opposition to more stringent Federal requirements, but the thought

is that the possibility of national publicity through the filing of reports in Washington would tend to discourage local campaign excesses.

It has been recognized that both reform and liberalization on campaign fund regulations are long overdue. The pending bill makes a substantial start, at least, and it should be enacted in time to be effective this year.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 5, 1956]

EMERGENCY MEASURE

Senator HENNINGS' unwillingness to support the Johnson-Knowland "honest elections" bill is a reminder that it does not reach all the problems related to the use of money in political campaigns. Mr. HENNINGS, the former chairman of the Senate Elections Subcommittee, prefers his own bill because it would apply to primaries as well as elections. That is a reasonable point of view. In about one-third of the States the primary elections are the crucial contests. They ought to be subjected to the same rules in regard to campaign spending as are the final elections. There is much opposition in Congress, however, to the inclusion of primary elections in the bill. In deference to that view the authors of the bill provided only that candidates for Federal office should file in Washington whatever reports may be required by their States in primary contests.

The important objective at the moment is to pass a bill that can be made effective this year. With 49 signatures, the Johnson-Knowland bill already has support enough for passage through the Senate. It has attracted widespread approval because it would permit the deduction of political contributions up to $100 from taxable income; it would enable major party candidates to obtain more free time on radio and television; it would raise the limits on campaign spending and provide for full reporting of both campaign gifts and expenditures. These are major gains. They should be made effective for this year's contests. In our opinion, it is far more important to modernize the law in these particulars than to seek a complete overhauling of the Corrupt Practices Act in the short time before the campaigns formally get under way.

One of the duties of the Select Committee To Investigate Lobbying and Campaign Contributions will be to recommend improvements in the Corrupt Practices Act. If the committee suceeds in getting off the dead center that has frustrated its organization efforts, it will have an opportunity to take a long look at our electoral system. The reasoning behind the Johnson-Knowland bill is that Congress should not wait that long to correct obvious and glaring defects. Let the emergency bill go forward with whatever improvements the Rules Committee can make promptly. Certainly it would be better to have an incomplete bill enacted than to have a more comprehensive bill set aside for future consideration.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 5, 1956]

ELECTION CLEANUP

Led by the party leaders, LYNDON JOHNSON and WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, a start has been made in the Senate to clean up the money end of political campaigns.

We hope this becomes a vigorous movement, not merely a timely drift.

The two leaders have introduced a bill designed to throw the spotlight on campaign contributions. Forty-eight other Senators have joined in sponsoring the bill.

The Johnson-Knowland measure doesn't include primaries—for the practical reason, Senator JOHNSON says, that no such bill can get through this Senate. Just the same, Senators MUNDT and HENNINGS are pressing for their own bills which do include primaries.

Attorney General Brownell indicates the weight of the administration will be thrown behind legislation of this type.

Out of all these proposals and the debate on them, plus the upcoming Senate investigation of campaign contributions and lobbying, there ought to come a constructive law. The conscience of Congress has been challenged by recent developments in this field. A good, workable law, along with the proposed inquiry, is the only proper answer.

"If the American people knew the facts and the conditions surrounding public men, there would be a sympathetic attitude toward remedial legislation."

This from Senator ALBERT GORE, probable head of the investigating committee.

The most expensive political campaign in our history is getting under way. The time is ripe for an airing of the inside facts, and a law which will meet the facts head on.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of March 5, 1956]

NO MAN'S COLLAR

Why do political candidates accept aid from fatcats, the well-heeled individuals or organizations who make the big campaign contributions? From time to time, Americans work themselves into a lather of righteous indignation over this question. Usually after they read of the 4 and 5-figure sums put into political war chests by lobbyists, or the special interest they represent.

And there are many special interests that do contribute. Organized labor is one of the biggest. So are the oil and gas interests.

But the plain fact of the matter is that they merely fill a void that the man in the street creates. Political parties are a vital cog in our machinery of Government. And it costs money to run them.

Neither party gets its postage free, its stationery on the cuff, or its radio or TV time for nothing. Both have overhead and bills that have to be met.

The citizen benefits immensely by the role that the two-party system plays in our democratic form of government. And there is no logical reason why he should expect them to be able to perform that function for him, for free.

The American voter should be glad to dig down in his pocket to help support the party of his choice. In fact, he does so indirectly already.

For when you get right down to it, the money that is given by corporations or labor unions eventually comes from him anyway. That is true whether he pays in the form of a contribution solicited by his shop steward, or as one of the items of cost that goes into price of the product he buys.

Not long ago, a survey showed that millions of Americans would be willing to give a sum as high as $5 to help pay the expenses of the party to which they belong. This poll indicated strongly that the parties themselves have been derelict in their duty in not shaking this tree.

For then they would be free of the obligations, real or imagined, that arise when they depend on a few big contributors for their campaign funds. They would wear no man's collar.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Texas Democrat, and Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, California Republican, have introduced a clean politics bill that will encourage individual contributions. It will permit individuals, but not corporatons, to deduct political contributions in the amount up to $100 when figuring their income tax.

In addition, the Johnson-Knowland bill incorporates other worth-while reforms. They include a more realistic ceiling for campaign chests, and stricter accounting of where the money comes from and how it is spent.

The bill deserves a high priority on the Senate's calendar.

[From the New York World-Telegram of March 5, 1956]

TOWARD AN ELECTION CLEANUP

Led by the party leaders, LYNDON JOHNSON and WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, a start has been made in the Senate to clean up the money end of political campaigns.

We hope this becomes a vigorous movement, not merely a timely drift.

The two leaders have introduced a bill designed to throw the spotlight on campaign contributions. Forty-eight other Senators have joined in sponsoring the bill.

Out of all these proposals and the debate on them, plus the upcoming Senate investigation of campaign contributions and lobbying, there ought to come a constructive law. The conscience of Congress has been challenged by recent developments in this field. A good, workable law, along with the proposed inquiry, is the only proper answer.

"If the American people knew the facts and the conditions surrounding public men, there would be a sympathetic attitude toward remedial legislation."

This from Senator ALBERT GORE, probable head of the investigation committee.

The most expensive political campaign in our history is getting under way. The time is ripe for an airing of the inside facts, and a law which will meet the facts head-on.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 27, 1956]

HONEST ELECTIONS BILL

The drive for enactment of the so-called honest elections bill is a necessary concomitant to the investigation into lobbying and use of money to influence legislators. One effect of the furor over Senator CASE'S disclosures and the forthcoming inquiry is likely to be a drying up of contributions for the 1956 campaigns from donors interested in getting bills through Congress. Even regular contributors are likely to think twice before offering any substantial sum to a Senator or Representative while the investigation is under way. It becomes especially important, therefore, to encourage campaign contributions from other sources.

The evil that has come sharply into focus as a result of the natural gas lobby's activities is not the spending of money in political campaigns. The people must be informed about issues and candidates if they are to vote intelligently. Our democratic system is admittedly expensive to operate. The real danger arises when special interests contribute heavily to political campaigns in the expectation that the legislators elected with such help will pass bills the special interests want. The Senate concluded, largely on the basis of the CASE incident, that this danger demands thorough investigation.

At the same time the Senate leaders are keenly aware of the fact that campaign contributions do not grow on bushes. While striking a blow at gifts from special interests, they see the need for encouraging more numerous donations from the rank and file of citizens interested in good government. Consequently, the plan that seems to be emerging from conferences by Majority Leader JOHNSON, Minority Leader KNOWLAND and other Members of the Senate and House emphasizes three important steps:

First, it would permit taxpayers to deduct from their taxable income political contributions up to $100. This would be a substantial incentive to taxpayers to aid the party or candidates of their choice. Contributions on this level would not be large enough to create any sense of obligation on the part of the candidate to the donor. For some legislators, this proposal may well become a declaration of independence.

Second, it would permit radio and television networks to give free time to major candidates without extending similar favors to every fringe or splinter officeseeker. This

would notably ease the high cost of campaigns.

Third, expenditure limits would be lifted to make the law meaningful, and reporting requirements would be drastically tightened. Means should also be found, in our opinion, of extending the safeguards of the bill to campaigns for nomination, which, in about one-third of the States, are equivalent to elections. Senator MUNDT's proposal that congressional candidates be required to file in Washington duplicates of their reports to the States on campaign contributions and expenditures appears to have a good deal of merit in this connection.

The important objectives are to stimulate a flow of contributions from the right sources, to discourage gifts that tend to sway legislative judgment and to expose all transactions bearing upon nomination and election to public office to the fullest public scrutiny.

[From the Scripps-Howard papers]

AN ELECTION-MONEY LAW

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON says Congress will be pressed at this session to pass a law which will encourage the "fullest public participation and the fullest public review" of all elections.

That is an apt description of the principle on which the proposed law should be written.

How to write an enforceable law which will be realistically effective is another matter.

This is where the new lobby-campaign fund investigation comes in.

There isn't any reason, as Senators JOHNSON and KNOWLAND suggest, Congress can't pass a new election-money law at this session, even if the investigation is incomplete. There are ample defects in the present law which are obvious to any practical observer.

But before it is ended the Senate probe ought to give the lawmakers an abundance of useful guides on tightening up the law. Certainly, that will be the result if the committee runs a hard-hitting inquiry as promised.

A foremost purpose of this investigation to give the public a full review of how campaign funds are raised, how they are accounted for, or not accounted for, and what influences they exert on the candidates who benefit from them.

Public opinion often needs to be backed up by a stiff law, to make itself truly effective. But the public itself can be a decisive influence on public policies, once it has an opportunity to make its views heard.

[From the Dallas Times-Herald of March 9, 1956]

JOHNSON BILL IS MERITORIOUS

The bill which Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, has prepared in response to the need of better regulations of campaign expenditures and donations seems likely to prove helpful if enacted.

One feature of the measure would require candidates and campaign managers to make public the sources of all donations above $100. This disclosure would let the voters know definitely the chief supporters of the candidates or parties.

In most instances the public can guess with reasonable accuracy who is supporting a candidate, but, in the heat of a campaign, when charges are being made and denied, many voters can be confused. This is particularly true when accusations come so late in the proceedings that a candidate has not time enough to prove that they are false.

Since the cost of running for office is steadily rising, the proposals to raise the limitations on campaign expenditures are in order. However, costs vary from State to State and from congressional district to congressional district. This makes it difficult to apply a blanket limit to the whole country.

The public accepts the fact that modern campaigning is expensive and that few candidates for seats in Congress can make strong bids for election without accepting monetary aid from supporters. But why should the public not know the sources of this aid?

However, even though the laws relating to campaigning for seats in Congress are greatly strengthened, they are not likely to prove a guaranty against corruption. Methods of evading them will be found. It will still be possible for a situation to arise like the one that caused the President to veto the natural gas bill. It may be more risky for a lobbyist to offer a candidate a campaign "donation," but there are always men who will take chances when the stakes are high.

[From the San Angelo Standard-Times of March 9, 1956]

SENATE LEADERS WHO KEPT THEIR HEADS DUE HONORS

Periodic concern for the integrity of the Federal Government, especially the legislative branch, has been both frequently and consistently nonproductive. This record is both good and bad.

No legislative assembly in the world has investigated itself more often than Congress. That is good. It is good, also, that after 170 years, the number of Senators and Representatives found deserving of censure for allowing improper influences to control their actions can be counted on the fingers of both hands. Bribery, vote selling, under-the-counter moneychanging are incompatible with representative government, and the long absence of such practices from Congress is by no means the least of our blessings.

What is bad about the record of frequent self-examination in Congress, however, is that only rarely has the leadership of either party had the initiative or the courage to press for corrective legislation to prevent future abuses.

The problem brought into focus by the celebrated attempted campaign contribution from Howard Keck, California oil magnate, to Senator CASE of South Dakota was the problem of an out-of-date, unrealistic law. The existing statute, passed decades ago, limited campaign expenditures for Senate races to $25,000 and for House races to $2,500.

No Member of either House can or has conducted a seriously contested race within those limits in modern times. All manner of circumvention has been devised to evade the spirit of the law, while abiding by the letter of the law. Every Member of Congress—including the breast-beaters who have been hysterically crying for punitive exploitation of the CASE incident—has been a party to much calculated evasion.

If Senator LYNDON JOHNSON or Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, as Senate leaders for the two parties, had been swayed by the hysterical fringe after disclosure of the CASE incident, one man or one company or one industry might have been punished for the sins of many. The public would have been led to believe that an evil had been cured, but violations of the law would have continued unabated. The only serious error would have been to get caught.

Senators JOHNSON and KNOWLAND met this situation by offering a goldfish bowl election spending law. Realistic and modern, it requires candidates to report all contributions received through various committees set up to finance campaign activity, requires candidates to file in Washington copies of all reports of spending which various State laws require regarding primaries, permits networks to donate free radio and television time to major parties, and encourages the general public to share in the election of candidates by authorizing tax deductions for political contributions up to $100.

Under the JOHNSON-KNOWLAND approach, hypocrisy and dignified deceit no longer need characterize election spending reports.

More importantly, we think, Senators JOHNSON and KNOWLAND have imbedded in their bill a sound and tested principle of honest Government: Reliance upon public disclosure of the truth. The high level of integrity in American Government has been achieved not by laws alone but by the ever-present knowledge that the powers of investigation—abetted by the initiative and courage of a free press—assured no wrong-doer the secrecy indispensable to corruption.

Whenever we allow a corner of Government to remain dark, we harbor a breeding place for misconduct. Those who seek to influence the National Legislature improperly will be far more effectively thwarted by the light of publicity which the Johnson-Knowland bill turns on them than by headline-making investigations or even by threats of punishment. We expect public officials, once in office, to live in a goldfish bowl.

At last report, more than two-thirds of the Senators had joined in sponsorship of this elections spending bill. This clearly indicates early and easy passage. Certainly the House is to be expected to move as promptly and decisively. If this reform measure becomes law, as it should, the Nation will be grateful to the two Senators for keeping their heads when others about them were losing theirs, and a potential black mark on the Senate record will stand instead as a lasting credit.

[From the Shreveport (La.) Journal of March 2, 1956]

GOLDFISH CAMPAIGN

Contributions to the presidential campaigns this year would be put in a goldfish bowl for all to see, if plans made by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democratic leader of the Senate, and concurred in by Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, the Republican leader, materialize. They would rush through for immediate enactment an election reform bill that would apply to the campaign this fall.

This announcement was made 2 days after the appointment of a select committee of 4 Democrat and 4 Republican Senators to police the campaign and report next January, with recommendations for a comprehensive election reform bill. However, it is thought some measure of reform can be passed now while the issue is hot, whereas apathy might set in after the election and a more ambitious bill then might fail to get wide support.

JOHNSON would encourage small contributions by allowing tax deductions on gifts of up to $100 a person; permit television and radio networks to give free and equal time to major parties without commitment to lesser parties; require stringent reporting of all contributions to a general election campaign, and impose realistic limits on campaign spending, perhaps based on the size of each State's electorate. It would not include primary elections—for fear of raising the issue of States' rights.

[From the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News of March 3, 1956]

NEW ELECTION BILL OUTLOOK GOOD

Favorable action on a new elections bill at this session of Congress has been predicted by Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON JOHNSON regardless of investigation and recommendations by the special bipartisan committee of eight conducting an inquiry into campaign contributions, lobbying, and influence peddling.

The new bill, a revision of the Hennings bill, would permit individual senatorial candidates and their backers to spend from $100,000 up to a maximum of $1,910,000 in their campaigns. The latter figure is based on formula determined by the number of votes in a State.

Senator JOHNSON said cooperation from both parties is expected in getting approval of the legislation.

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of February 29, 1956]

REALISTIC REFORM MEASURE

What the Democrat leader in the Senate is preparing to sponsor is described by him as a "complete realistic measure encouraging the fullest public participation and the fullest public review of all elections." It is intimated that the Republican Senate leader will be a cosponsor.

In view of the complexities of campaign financing and of public attitudes toward the parties and the individual candidates a complete realistic measure may not be actually attainable. But certainly some constructive changes are possible within the practical limits.

At present no nominee for the United States Senate can legally make personal expenditures totaling more than $10,000. Sentor LYNDON JOHNSON, Texas Democrat, is introducing a bill that would permit personal spending equivalent to 30 cents for each vote cast in the previous senatorial election.

The personal-expenditures classification would include not only what the senatorial nominee spent himself but also whatever spending he authorized others to do for him. A minimum ceiling of $100,000 on such expenditures is projected in the Johnson bill.

Each nominee for a seat in the House of Representatives is currently under a $2,500 restriction where personal campaign expenditures are concerned. If the Johnson bill were enacted in its present form each could spend $25,000 or, if the 30 cents-a-vote formula were applied, even more in the most populous congressional districts.

Under this bill all campaign expenditures over $100 would have to be reported to the Senate, the House, and to the United States district court in the nominee's home area.

Expenditures in primary campaigns are not covered by this bill. If legal limitations also were to be put on them the statutory ceilings projected in the measure would be unrealistic, at least in the States and districts where the popular voting is heaviest.

If this bill were enacted the present $3 million limit on spending by each party's national committee would be scrapped. Each national committee could spend the equivalent of 30 cents per vote cast in the previous election. That would mean $12,310,000 this year for each committee on the basis of the total national vote in 1952.

The Johnson bill projects Federal tax exemption on the first $100 of each contribution for political campaigning. This presumably would not cause a sensational increase in the number of really big campaign contributions. It might, however, stimulate a remarkable increase in the number of smaller contributions.

Revision of the Federal elections laws to put them more in line with the increased costs of campaigning is long overdue. In principle and to some extent in detail the JOHNSON proposals, which may be approved by the Republican leader in the Senate, Senator KNOWLAND, have sensible reform import.

Enactment of this measure in its present form is not clearly indicated, but it looks as if some corrective action will be taken by Congress in the current session.

[From Broadcasting-Telecasting magazine of March 12, 1956]

STUCK WITH A SPLINTER

With a heavy majority of Senators already committed to support it, the Johnson bill to amend the laws governing political broadcasting and campaign spending seems set for prompt action.

It cannot be passed a moment too soon.

It's too bad it wasn't passed early last week—before Lar Daly, who says he is running for the Republican presidential nomination as an America Firster, put the arm on all networks for equal time to answer President Eisenhower's February 29 appearance. The lunacies of the present political broadcasting law could not have been made more apparent.

In our view Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S bill is a good one, in the sense that it is probably the best broadcasters can hope to see enacted before the campaigns of 1956 begin in earnest and the splinter parties begin coming out of the woodwork in force.

The Johnson bill would modify the law to permit broadcasters to forget about giving equal time to unimportant candidates. It would increase the legal limits of campaign expenditures in recognition of contemporary costs of television time. These are desirable objectives.

But there have been behind-the-scenes maneuvers connected with the bill that are somewhat unsettling.

Some of the bill's supporters have unofficially let it be known that their support would intensify if networks volunteered substantial gifts of free time to political candidates. It would be very wrong if networks yielded to such pressure.

To deserve the support of broadcasters, any bill modifying the political broadcasting section 315 of the Communications Act must have as its purpose the freeing of restrictions on radio and television, not the freeing of time for canned oratory by politicians.

Broadcasters must be given more latitude in news coverage of political candidates and campaigns.

This news coverage may take many forms—straight news shows, panel discussions, interview programs like Meet the Press and Face the Nation. These are programs whose format and content are controlled by the broadcaster—not by the candidate or his party. They are journalism, not political rallies staged by partisan groups.

Under present regulations, radio and television are prevented from living up to the standards of good journalism in presenting politics. No responsible newspaper in the country would give a candidate with so little future as Lar Daly more than a few inches of type. Prospects at the time this was written were that if he proved to be qualified, radio and television would be obliged by an archaic law to give him a valuable block of prime time.

A good way for politicians to defeat their own attempts to obtain more exposure on radio and television is to continue to keep section 315 on the books in its present ungainly form.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1956—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 3308) to revise the Federal elections laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, to permit deduction for Federal income tax purposes of certain political contributions, and for other purposes, the next time the bill is printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Senate will sit tomorrow until approximately 7 o'clock in the evening. We anticipate no rollcalls after that time. After the morning hour it will probably be 12 o'clock before we return to the consideration of the farm bill, but I hope we can expedite consideration of the bill and confine our remarks to the bill tomorrow and conclude our work on it.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 13, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art always graciously guarding and guiding us, may we daily commit ourselves resolutely and gladly to the wise and beneficent dispensations of Thy divine providence.

We penitently confess that we are frequently so easily daunted and frightened in the search and struggle to make our way through the darkness and uncertainties of this mortal life.

Grant that it may be the goal of all our aspirations to give ourselves unreservedly to the glorious task of doing Thy will.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 8, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2552. An act to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON, members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 56–8.

DENTAL RESEARCH AND THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, the National Institute of Dental Research, established by Congress in 1948, is charged with the responsibility of stimulating and supporting through research grants an expansion of dental research activities in the Nation's dental schools and other private dental research centers. The institute is also charged with the responsibility of coordinating this program through a program of dental research conducted by its own staff of trained scientists. A continued lack of adequate support, however, has impeded the institute in its effort to achieve the objectives we have set for it.

The need for a sweeping inquiry into the causes and nature of dental disease is even more urgent today than it was in 1948 when we established the Dental Institute. Dental disease afflicts over 125 million of our citizens each year. The cost is staggering; our citizens spend over $1½ billion a year for private dental care. The Nation loses over 45,000 man-days of labor each day as a result of dental ills. As we all know, dental disease is one of the chief causes of the rejection of our young men in the military draft. A disease of this magnitude and of these ramifications is worthy of our constant concern and helpful attention.

Unfortunately, however, dental research is inadequately supported. Since its establishment, we have given the Dental Institute only token appropriations in relation to the need for research into dental disease. Perhaps we do not realize that aside from the quarter million dollars that the American Dental Association spends, few private organizations contribute to dental research. In order to rectify this situation, I propose that this body take two actions designed to stimulate anew a needed expansion in dental research. These actions are: First, an increase of $3,055,000 in the proposed budget for dental research grants; and, second, the enactment of legislation increasing the amount presently authorized for a dental research center to $5 million.

The $800,000 proposed in the budget for dental research grants does not take into account the pressing need for dental research or the capacity of the dental schools to conduct purposeful investigations into the causes of dental disease. The proposed appropriation will support a total of only 80 dental research projects. It will allow each of the 50 non-Federal research centers an average of $16,000 a year for research purposes. This is in sharp contrast to the present capacity of these institutions in staff and facilities to undertake 390 planned projects next year. To utilize this available and trained manpower, an additional $3,055,000 is required. Unless we make these additional funds available many important investigations which promise to advance dental health significantly will be postponed indefinitely. A cure for pyorrhea and the discovery of a sugar which does not cause decay are not so far distant if we are willing to support a realistic program of dental research.

The second action I recommend is the enactment of a bill—H. R. 9688—which I have introduced to increase the amount presently authorized for a dental research center in Bethesda, Md., to $5 million. This building and its facilities are desperately needed. At present, the Dental Institute occupies space assigned to it in several of the buildings of the other institutes. This space is not adequate for a coordinated and effective dental research program. We authorized this building in 1948, but owing to the Korean emergency it was not constructed. Now the amount originally authorized is insufficient to build the planned structure. Therefore, I have introduced H. R. 9688 to increase the authorization to cover the present cost of this research center and I ask every Member of this House to give this bill his full support.

DEVIATION FROM FUNDAMENTALS OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include certain matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in the life of a nation there come times when it behooves her people to pause and consider how far she may have drifted from her moorings, and in prayerful contemplation review the consequences that may ensue from a continued deviation from the course charted by the founders of that nation.

The framework of this Nation, designed in the inspired genius of our forefathers, was set forth in a Constitution, born of tyranny and oppression in a background of bitter strife and anguish and resting upon two fundamental principles:

First, that this was a Government of three separate and independent departments, legislative, executive, and judicial, each supreme in, but limited to, the functions ascribed to it.

Second, that the component parts should consist of independent sovereign States enjoying every attribute and power of autonomous sovereignty save only those specific powers enumerated in the Constitution and surrendered to the Central Government for the better government and security of all.

When repeated deviation from these fundamentals by one of the three departments threatens the liberties of the people and the destruction of the reserved powers of the respective States, in contravention of the principles of that Constitution which all officials of all the three departments are sworn to uphold, it is meet, and the sacred obligation of those devoted to the preservation of the basic limitations on the power of the Central Government to apprise their associates of their alarm and the specific deviations that threaten to change our form of government, without the consent of the governed, in the manner provided by the Constitution.

Assumed power exercised in one field today become a precedent and an invitation to indulge in further assumption of powers in other fields tomorrow.

Therefore, when the temporary occupants of high office in the judicial branch deviate from the limitations imposed by the Constitution, some members of the legislative branch feel impelled to call the attention of their colleagues and the country to the dangers inherent in interpretations of the Constitution reversing long established and accepted law and based on expediency at the sacrifice of consistency.

The sentiments here expressed are solely my own, but there is being presented at this hour in the other body by Senator GEORGE on behalf of 19 Members of that body, and in this body by myself on behalf of 81 Members of this body, a joint declaration of constitutional principles, which, on behalf of the signatory Members of the House, I ask to be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Should other Members desire to associate themselves with the sentiments therein expressed, I will be happy to revise my remarks during the day to include their names on the list of House Members attached, if they will get in touch with me or Representative WILLIAM COLMER, who has headed the movement to see that the Members were given the opportunity to sign.

DECLARATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

The unwarranted decision of the Supreme Court in the public school cases is now bearing the fruit always produced when men substitute naked power for established law.

The Founding Fathers gave us a Constitution of checks and balances because they realized the inescapable lesson of history that no man or group of men can be safely entrusted with unlimited power. They framed this Constitution with its provisions for change by amendment in order to secure the fundamentals of government against the dangers of temporary popular passion or the personal predilections of public officeholders.

We regard the decision of the Supreme Court in the school cases as a clear abuse of judicial power. It climaxes a trend in the Federal judiciary undertaking to legislate, in derogation of the authority of Congress, and to encroach upon the reserved rights of the States and the people.

The original Constitution does not mention education. Neither does the 14th amendment nor any other amendment. The debates preceding the submission of the 14th amendment clearly show that there was no intent that it should affect the systems of education maintained by the States.

The very Congress which proposed the amendment subsequently provided for segregated schools in the District of Columbia.

When the amendment was adopted, in 1868, there were 37 States of the Union. Every one of the 26 States that had any substantial racial differences among its people either approved the operation of segregated schools already in existence or subsequently established such schools by action of the

same lawmaking body which considered the 14th amendment.

As admitted by the Supreme Court in the public school case (*Brown* v. *Board of Education*), the doctrine of separate but equal schools "apparently originated in *Roberts* v. *City of Boston* * * * (1849), upholding school segregation against attack as being violative of a State constitutional guarantee of equality." This constitutional doctrine began in the North—not in the South, and it was followed not only in Massachusetts, but in Connecticut, New York, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and other northern States until they, exercising their rights as States through the constitutional processes of local self-government, changed their school systems.

In the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, in 1896, the Supreme Court expressly declared that under the 14th amendment no person was denied any of his rights if the States provided separate but equal public facilities. This decision has been followed in many other cases. It is notable that the Supreme Court, speaking through Chief Justice Taft, a former President of the United States, unanimously declared, in 1927, in *Lum* v. *Rice*, that the "separate but equal" principle is "within the discretion of the State in regulating its public schools and does not conflict with the 14th amendment."

This interpretation, restated time and again, became a part of the life of the people of many of the States and confirmed their habits, customs, traditions, and way of life. It is founded on elemental humanity and commonsense, for parents should not be deprived by Government of the right to direct the lives and education of their own children.

Though there has been no constitutional amendment or act of Congress changing this established legal principle almost a century old, the Supreme Court of the United States, with no legal basis for such action, undertook to exercise their naked judicial power and substituted their personal political and social ideas for the established law of the land.

This unwarranted exercise of power by the Court, contrary to the Constitution, is creating chaos and confusion in the States principally affected. It is destroying the amicable relations between the white and Negro races that have been created through 90 years of patient effort by the good people of both races. It has planted hatred and suspicion where there has been heretofore friendship and understanding.

Without regard to the consent of the governed, outside agitators are threatening immediate and revolutionary changes in our public-school systems. If done, this is certain to destroy the system of public education in some of the States.

With the gravest concern for the explosive and dangerous condition created by this decision and inflamed by outside meddlers:

We reaffirm our reliance on the Constitution as the fundamental law of the land.

We decry the Supreme Court's encroachments on rights reserved to the States and to the people, contrary to established law and to the Constitution.

We commend the motives of those States which have declared the intention to resist forced integration by any lawful means.

We appeal to the States and people who are not directly affected by these decisions to consider the constitutional principles involved against the time when they, too, on issues vital to them, may be the victims of judicial encroachment.

Even though we constitute a minority in the present Congress, we have full faith that a majority of the American people believe in the dual system of Government which has enabled us to achieve our greatness and will in time demand that the reserved rights of the State and of the people be made secure against judicial usurpation.

We pledge ourselves to use all lawful means to bring about a reversal of this decision which is contrary to the Constitution and to prevent the use of force in its implementation.

In this trying period, as we all seek to right this wrong, we appeal to our people not to be provoked by the agitators and troublemakers invading our States and to scrupulously refrain from disorders and lawless acts.

Signed by:

Members of the United States Senate: WALTER F. GEORGE; RICHARD B. RUSSELL; JOHN STENNIS; SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.; STROM THURMOND; HARRY F. BYRD; A. WILLIS ROBERTSON; JOHN L. MCCLELLAN; ALLEN J. ELLENDER; RUSSELL B. LONG; LISTER HILL; JAMES O. EASTLAND; W. KERR SCOTT; JOHN SPARKMAN; OLIN D. JOHNSTON; PRICE DANIEL; J. W. FULBRIGHT; GEORGE A. SMATHERS; SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

Members of the United States House of Representatives:

Alabama: FRANK W. BOYKIN; GEORGE M. GRANT; GEORGE W. ANDREWS; KENNETH A. ROBERTS; ALBERT RAINS; ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, Jr.; CARL ELLIOTT; ROBERT E. JONES; GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Jr.

Arkansas: E. C. GATHINGS; WILBUR D. MILLS; JAMES W. TRIMBLE; OREN HARRIS; BROOKS HAYS; W. F. NORRELL.

Florida: CHARLES E. BENNETT; ROBERT L. F. SIKES; A. S. HERLONG, Jr.; PAUL G. ROGERS; JAMES A. HALEY; D. R. MATTHEWS; WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

Georgia: PRINCE H. PRESTON; JOHN L. PILCHER; E. L. FORRESTER; JOHN JAMES FLYNT, Jr.; JAMES C. DAVIS; CARL VINSON; HENDERSON LANHAM; IRIS F. BLITCH; PHIL M. LANDRUM; PAUL BROWN.

Louisiana: F. EDWARD HÉBERT; HALE BOGGS; EDWIN E. WILLIS; OVERTON BROOKS; OTTO E. PASSMAN; JAMES H. MORRISON; T. ASHTON THOMPSON; GEORGE S. LONG.

Mississippi: THOMAS G. ABERNETHY; JAMIE L. WHITTEN; FRANK E. SMITH; JOHN BELL WILLIAMS; ARTHUR WINSTEAD; WILLIAM M. COLMER.

North Carolina: HERBERT C. BONNER; L. H. FOUNTAIN; GRAHAM A. BARDEN; CARL T. DURHAM; F. ERTEL CARLYLE; HUGH Q. ALEXANDER; WOODROW W. JONES; GEORGE A. SHUFORD; CHARLES R. JONAS.

South Carolina: L. MENDEL RIVERS; JOHN J. RILEY; W. J. BRYAN DORN; ROBERT T. ASHMORE; JAMES P. RICHARDS; JOHN L. MCMILLAN.

Tennessee: JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr.; TOM MURRAY; JERE COOPER; CLIFFORD DAVIS; ROSS BASS; JOE L. EVINS.

Texas: WRIGHT PATMAN; JOHN DOWDY; WALTER ROGERS; O. C. FISHER; MARTIN DIES.

Virginia: EDWARD J. ROBESON, Jr.; PORTER HARDY, Jr.; J. VAUGHAN GARY; WATKINS M. ABBITT; WILLIAM M. TUCK; RICHARD H. POFF; BURR P. HARRISON; HOWARD W. SMITH; W. PAT JENNINGS; JOEL T. BROYHILL.

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Mr. RICHARDS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1287) to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

NORTH AMERICAN AIRLINES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to address my colleagues on certain matters mentioned here on Thursday, March 1. At that time some remarks were made here which might well lead some of you to believe that the Civil Aeronautics Board is a tyrannical body which has been unjustly picking on a group of nonscheduled carriers which call themselves North American, and you might well believe from what was said here that it is all being done just to prevent the public from getting good air service.

I can't help doubting that some of those who spoke on this subject the other day have been fully informed about this matter.

In none of the remarks which were made is there any discussion of just what the North American group has been doing for 10 years. I would like to take just a few minutes to tell you.

The Civil Aeronautics Act was passed in 1938. It says you cannot conduct scheduled airline service until you receive a certificate of public convenience and necessity from the CAB. The Board grants certificates of that nature after full hearings in which the applicant has to prove that there is a public need for the route, and that he is fit, willing, and able to provide the needed service. That is the basis on which all the scheduled airlines with which all of us are familiar operate in this country and abroad. It applies to Eastern, to Capital, to National, to Piedmont, and to other local service airlines and to all the other scheduled operators.

North American has never received a certificate permitting scheduled operations. The only authority that it has now, or has ever had, from the CAB is to conduct nonscheduled operations. It is perfectly obvious that if a carrier with that kind of authority just goes ahead and operates a scheduled airline anyway, it is undercutting the principles upon which the whole Civil Aeronautics Act is based. That is exactly what North American has been doing and that is exactly why North American is in trouble with the Civil Aeronautics Board. There are more than 40 other nonscheduled carriers, and you never hear about them for the simple reason that practically every one of them is obeying the law, is flying on a nonscheduled basis, as it is supposed to do, and, therefore, is in no trouble with the CAB and has no ax to grind.

There are four men who regard themselves as the principals behind the North American group. In the late forties they owned and controlled three other nonscheduled carriers, every one of which was revoked by the Board for flying a scheduled service without authority. No sooner were those 3 revoked than these four men formed what they call the North American group and thereby continued to conduct scheduled operations. They have made no bones about this and have admitted on several occasions to

congressional committees that they fly a regular scheduled service. This frequently amounts to as many as 3 or 4 flights a day on a given route. This is what some of my colleagues chose to refer to as "technical violations." That is about the equivalent of saying that somebody who does not pay his income tax is technically violating the law. The Board has the following in its decision revoking North American:

Viewed in their proper perspective, these claims (which we do not concede as correct) demonstrate, from a different aspect, the respondents' disregard, indeed contempt, for the law—whether it be a statute of Congress, or regulations adopted pursuant thereto. Since respondents disagree with the policies heretofore adopted by the Board, and embodied in regulations and decisions of the Board, they apparently feel free to ignore the enactments of Congress and the regulations thereunder in order to vindicate their own conceptions of sound air transport policy. * * *

Even if we were to assume that the Board's policies have been unsound (and we make no such concession) it would be unthinkable to allow these respondents, or any other private parties, to take matters into their own hands, and have us condone such action. The plain fact is that Congress has enjoined anyone from engaging in air transportation without a certificate of public convenience and necessity or other appropriate operating authority from the Board. Respondents have flagrantly and wilfully ignored the statutory plan. * * * After all, Congress has delegated to this Board, and not to respondents, the administration of the Civil Aeronautics Act.

* * * If the respondents herein are permitted to ignore the Board's regulations with impunity, it will be difficult to expect that other air carriers will not follow suit, and the inevitable result will be a weakening of the whole regulatory structure which has taken years to build. Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that the regulations of the Board extend not only to economic matters, but to safety as well. And while the current proceeding does not involve safety violations, it must be apparent that disregard of the Board's economic regulations cannot be condoned without running the risk that general respect for the Board's safety regulations also will be placed in jeopardy. In these circumstances, we feel compelled to take the firm action embodied in this decision. On this record, the Board finds that no sanction short of revocation would be sufficient to assure compliance with the law.

Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to make this statement for the simple reason that I come from a part of the United States where we have found it impossible to secure any air service other than from the National, Eastern, Southern, Piedmont and Delta Air Lines. I further understand that there is very little profit in airline service except in the long haul, nonstop, transportation. I certainly have nothing personal against North American Airlines except that it seems they are only interested in the long haul, nonstop flights, and we people in South Carolina are unable to benefit in any manner from this type of airline service. Hence, I could not sit by and hear the North American Airlines praised and not hear a word of praise for the small lines that stop in small towns in my State at very little profit, if any. My constituents greatly appreciate the service rendered by the airlines that serve our State and especially Eastern Airlines, which serves my hometown, Florence, S. C. I think it is unfair to permit one or two airlines to make 50 percent of the long haul, nonstop flight profits and not be required to take some losses on the short-line service that serves the individual communities.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, emergency legislation is being help up by dilatory tactics. I refer to H. R. 8320, which provides critically needed funds for the operation of the school milk program for this fiscal year.

The House passed this bill unanimously on February 1. It was described correctly by you at that time, Mr. Speaker, as an emergency measure, and it was speedily acted upon by the Senate and passed that body with minor amendments and again unanimously on February 8. The bill should have been accepted at that time, but instead was sent to conference, and conferees were appointed on February 21, 3 long weeks ago, and nothing has been done. As of this moment, Mr. Speaker, the conferees have not met a single time. What is the reason for this delay? I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that if tobacco were involved this bill would have been acted upon a long time ago.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand there is also a sugar bill that is receiving no consideration, although desperately needed by many farmers and others.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The will of the Congress in this instance is being thwarted. Legislation that has passed both Houses unanimously is being held up. The responsibility for this continuing delay rests solely on those in control of the conference. The situation, Mr. Speaker, demands your personal attention.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, using the gentleman's language, there has been nothing "shocking" about what has happened. The facts are that the bill to which he refers went to the other body and the amendments which they inserted were not minor, as he stated. The amendments were highly important and of a permanent character. The legislation which passed the House was purely of an emergency character. It is not for me to criticize the other body on what was done, but it did tack on amendments far beyond an emergency character.

Now as to the conference, the facts are that the conferees were appointed. It is not for me to criticize the other body as to why a conference has not taken place, but it is known to all Members of the House that the other body has been constantly engaged in debate on a very important bill relating to agriculture The conferees have necessarily been engaged in that debate.

Also, it is well known or should be known and could have been determined, if the gentleman from Wisconsin had inquired, that a conference was set and, unfortunately, for reasons I would be happy to explain to the gentleman and all Members of the House, but for the sake of time I will not go into detail here, the conference had to be canceled. A conference was set for a second time and it also had to be canceled for reasons which were suitable to the Members of the other body.

There is nothing "shocking" about this as the gentleman suggests. There is no effort on the part of anyone, as the gentleman from Wisconsin and the minority leader indicate, to bury or scuttle the legislation. The bill happened to be my bill. I was for it. My State would not get one 10 cents' worth of benefit from it. We have sufficient funds for our program; but the gentleman from Wisconsin and his State would get benefits from the bill. Still, I am for the bill. I want to help them out and will do so if he will just cooperate and convey his messages and complaints to me instead of conveying them by surprise speeches on the floor of the House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman knows there was a conference called for by March 2.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes; I know that.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The Senate asked for a conference on Saturday the 3d and Monday the 5th, and they were turned down.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And they cancelled the conference on Saturday the 3d. None was set for the 5th. If so, I never heard of it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There has never been a request for a conference.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I regret that the gentleman made that statement. He knows nothing about what I have done to have a conference. I personally have requested such and have done my best to get the conferees together.

The chairman and other members of the House Committee on Agriculture were engaged on March 2 in hearing witnesses from the National Grange and the National Farmers Union and possibly the Farm Bureau on the then very important matter before the Committee on Agriculture, the overall bill on agriculture. They did not feel they could walk out

on the presidents of these farm organizations. We endeavored to reschedule the conference for Saturday, March 3.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman knows there is no bill before the Committee on Agriculture and there has not been on this. We have just been getting an overall picture of the problems of agriculture. There is no bill before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has a bill there, does he not?

Mr. HILL. I certainly have, but there is no bill before our committee.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But you did think the subject matter was important enough to be present? You were there.

Mr. HILL. But I am telling you that you do not have any bill before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thought you had your own bill there. Do we not have an overall agriculture bill pending before the committee? Also the President's farm recommendations upon which he was pleading for hasty action.

Mr. HILL. You have never had as much as one meeting on my bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Have you asked for one?

Mr. HILL. These dilatory tactics certainly should be stopped.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You were sitting there. I thought we were hearing testimony on the gentleman's bill, the President's recommendation, and other pending farm proposals. I did not know the gentleman had no bill.

Mr. HILL. There is no bill before the Committee on Agriculture. That is what I am trying to get you to admit.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman explain the delay on the sugar bill?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not have a thing in the world to do with the sugar bill except as an average member of the committee. I certainly want to say that tobacco is not involved, as has been intimated. The tobacco people do not get any benefit from either the school milk or sugar bills as has been intimated—I am very sorry that the gentleman from Wisconsin inserted that matter into this discussion. I am trying to be helpful to the Wisconsin dairy farmers, as well as all other farmers.

Mr. MARTIN. How about trying to give the sugar people a little help? They seem to need some help too.

Mr. ABERNETHY. We might do so if we can get the Republicans to cooperate. I believe that is about what the gentleman told the gas people down at Houston after the President's veto—that you Republicans would still get the gas bill by if you could get the Democrats to cooperate.

Mr. MARTIN. If the gentleman will yield a little further on this unexpired time, may I say that the Republicans will cooperate on all farm legislation with the Democrats at any time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman is very kind and we are delighted to hear of your change of heart.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I do not believe they cooperated with us on the 90 percent of parity bill in the Senate the other day?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No; they have their own views on it.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] said no bill was before our committee. That may be true, but the Secretary of Agriculture has a program. I do not know whether it deserves the dignity of being referred to as a bill or not.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think everybody knows that both committees of the Senate and House on agriculture have been terribly busy for the past several weeks. It may be that no particular bill is pending, although personally I think the gentleman from Colorado is mistaken about that. Certainly the overall subject matter and the President's program are pending: If we have really been working on nothing all this time, it seems quite silly and ridiculous that the gentleman from Colorado has been so regular in attendance and such an attentive listener.

HOUSING FOR ELDERLY CITIZENS

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill—sponsored by myself, Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, Mr. ADDONIZIO of New Jersey, Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ASHLEY of Ohio—to provide decent housing at a low cost for our elderly citizens.

I have been concerned with this problem for a long time. I have been deeply disturbed by the statistics which show the low income status of many elderly persons and families, and by the pitiful housing conditions which many of these people face. I think the time for governmental help on this problem is long overdue, and I believe that this bill will offer a very real benefit to our elderly citizens.

The bill would set up in the Housing and Home Finance Agency a new program to provide low-cost financing on liberal terms to nonprofit corporations interested in building decent housing for the elderly. The program called for in the bill is substantially similar to the college housing loan program, which has been so successful in providing needed financing to our colleges and universities for housing and related facilities for students and faculty members.

Under this bill financing would be made available at an interest rate not to exceed 3½ percent per annum and for a 50-year term. The availability of financing on such liberal terms should go far toward attracting charitable, civic, fraternal, and other public-spirited groups, to build the housing so greatly needed by many of our elderly citizens.

One of the special features of the bill is the hope that in many cases the sponsoring nonprofit group will be willing to charge less than economic rents to their elderly tenants. By subsidizing the difference between the rents to be charged and the economic rent, the sponsoring organization could offer dwelling units to elderly citizens at rent levels more in keeping with their ability to pay.

Recognizing that the payment of such a subsidy would naturally place an economic burden on the funds of the sponsoring nonprofit organization, I think it is vital that financing be made available to such groups at the least possible cost and most liberal terms. In this way any rent subsidy which they may pay could be kept to a minimum.

Lest there be any misunderstanding, I want to state as emphatically as I can, that this bill is in no way to supplant or compete with low-rent public housing for the elderly. I am entirely in sympathy with proposals to include elderly single persons in the low-rent public housing program.

This bill would provide another vehicle—supplementing the public-housing proposals—to make available decent low-cost housing to additional groups of elderly citizens.

The administration housing bill proposes a program which on the surface has a resemblance to the program proposed in this bill. The administration proposal would set up a program within the FHA for insured mortgage loans to provide financing for nonprofit corporations to build housing for the elderly. I do not know precisely what financing terms this would involve, but it is clear that in order to get participation from mortgage lenders, the administration proposal would have to call for an interest rate of at least 4¼ percent, and when you add the one-half of 1 percent insurance premium which the corporation would have to pay to the FHA, you get a gross financing cost of 4¾ percent. Moreover, the maximum permissible loan term would probably be limited to 40 years which is the maximum term which FHA permits for all its multifamily housing operations.

In contrast this bill would provide 50-year loans at a gross financing cost of 3½ percent. Such a loan would require a debt service payment of $4.17 a month per thousand dollars of mortgage, whereas the administration proposal would require a debt service of $5.61 a month per thousand.

Now let us see what the tangible significance of the difference of these cost factors is. It is hoped that the per unit cost of the typical type of housing which would be built for elderly citizens under my bill would be in the neighborhood of $7,000. In this connection, I am informed that apartments of good quality have been built for married students and their families under the college housing program at a cost of approximately $7,000 per unit. The probable economic rent for such a unit, if you use the FHA program such as the administration proposes, would be around $60 per month. Under this bill the economic rent for the same unit would be approximately $10 less per month, thereby reducing the probable rent from $60 to $50 per month.

Bear in mind I am now speaking of the economic rent. The actual rent charged to elderly tenants could be reduced further to the extent of the sub-

sidy which the sponsoring institution would be willing to absorb.

There is no question in my mind that the enactment of the program called for in this bill would provide an effective and workable means of building the type of housing which our elderly citizens so vitally need. The combination of the efforts and resources of public spirited groups and the providing of financing by Government auspices on low-cost, liberal terms, should provide an effective formula for coming to grips with this most pressing problem.

This bill proposes an initial fund of $250 million to get this program started. Assuming a $7,000 per unit cost, that sum would permit the construction of approximately 35,000 dwelling units for elderly citizens.

The interest rate proposed in my bill is 3½ percent per annum. Because the social objectives of providing much needed housing for elderly citizens is so laudable, there is a natural temptation to extend the most liberal possible Federal aid without regard for other considerations. But in order to induce at least some participation on the part of private lenders, the realities of the money market must be taken into account. The present 2¾-percent rate prescribed under the college housing loan program is apparently producing no private lender participation. It is my hope that the 3½-percent rate proposed for housing for the elderly projects will enable some participation on the part of private investors at least for bonds of a shorter maturity of the serial bonds which would be issued to finance the project.

I would like to point out that the general outlines of my proposal were approved in a recent report of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee, a subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman. The specifics of the proposal, however, are mine.

I deeply hope that this bill will enlist the support of all those interested in relieving the housing problems of our elderly citizens, and that the bill will receive prompt and sympathetic consideration by the Banking and Currency Committee.

HENRY C. LUCKEY, A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the book 85 American Years by Henry C. Luckey, a former Member of this House, was compiled and written when Mr. Luckey was 85 years old. It is a fascinating story of the life of a pioneer family and a boy born on a farm in the Midwest. The book summarizes the struggles that Henry Luckey himself underwent to climb from a struggling farm boy to become a Member of Congress from Nebraska.

Not only is the book a fascinating story of Mr. Luckey's life, but it contains much of his economic, social, and political philosophy gained through experience and keen observation. The book in expressing Mr. Luckey's philosophy is a logical indictment and a sincere criticism of the so-called New Deal, and the international policies of the Roosevelt administration.

Mr. Speaker, 85 American Years was written by a great American, one of the best informed men in public life I have ever had the privilege of being associated with, a man who was too big to be confined within party lines, a man who placed America first and party second in all his thinking and in all the votes he cast in this House.

I recommend the book 85 American Years as both interesting and informative, a book that every Member of Congress should read.

THE SECOND ROUND IN THE SENATE ON 90 PERCENT OF PARITY

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the second round on 90-percent parity—covering milling wheat—came out a tie vote 45 for and 45 against. This gave Vice President NIXON a chance to get in on the proceedings and he voted against parity so the second round was carried by the Eisenhower administration, with the help of Democrats.

I think this was pretty sour medicine for NIXON, as he was personally for parity, but he is also a candidate for Vice President again, and of course did not think much of bucking the President. I could have told you how he would vote before he voted. This vote may endear him to the delegates at the national convention, and it may not. His vote will at least keep his candidacy alive for awhile, but in the end he will probably be overlooked. I presume it is a great honor to be Vice President—guess there is no doubt about it, but I would have had a different notion if I had been Vice President. I would not desert the small family type farmers for any office. I would have voted to keep parity in the bill if that was my judgment and let Eisenhower and Benson howl. They could not do any more than sidetrack NIXON and that may be done anyway. It takes plenty of nerve to stick with your convictions, and brother NIXON does not have it when the chips are down.

There seems to be much rejoicing in some of the newspapers and conversations in Washington over the defeat of parity. All believe now that the price of bread will go down and "those rich farmers" will have to go out and work for a living. Well, when bread goes down I hope some bread eater will give me due notice. Those who hold this belief had better celebrate now, for when the depression gets going in the farm belt, it will put a lot of people in this now prosperous East in the soup line. This happened 26 years ago and the way legislation is going here in Congress, it is altogether likely that will happen again. Benson showed he is a politician par excellence. When it looked as though parity would be sustained all along the line, he lined up the Democrats—from the Cotton Belt—and promised them 87 percent of parity and that did the business.

When brother Benson gets out in the Wheat Belt and the farmers find out that Benson soil-bank acres will be taken out of the already meager allotted acres for wheat, there will be a roar go up that will probably last until election day. But the trouble is Benson is not running for reelection and anyway the farmers should not fasten all the blame on him, for, after all, Benson is simply the servant of President Eisenhower and he is not a servant of the people who vote. The voters did not put Mr. Benson in the office he holds; he was put there by the President's appointment, and for the purpose for which he was appointed, he has no doubt served the President well. Some day it may come to pass that a Secretary of Agriculture can be found who will serve the people. If such a Secretary can be found, he will not serve long if he does not please the President.

In all our history we have had only one Secretary who would not follow the President and that was William Jennings Byran. He said, "No, I will not be a party to putting this country in a world war." President Wilson said in substance, "you will bend your will to mine or get out." Bryan got out and we got into the war. Each day we are becoming more mired down in foreign entanglements.

Of course this fight has not yet been lost. When the bill comes back to a conference between both Houses I am sure the House Members will stick to 90 percent of parity, especially on milling wheat. The surplus argument cannot be made on hard spring wheat, for the reason there is no surplus, if the same kind of wheat were not imported from Canada.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a declaration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, March 8 was the Communists' International Women's Day. We can expect a great flood of propaganda to be released throughout the world to win over women to the Communist conspiracy.

The Women for Freedom of Europe, a private organization affiliated with the General Federation of Women's Clubs, has issued a declaration designed to

counteract this strong Communist appeal. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting this declaration:

WOMEN FOR FREEDOM OF EUROPE, INC.,
New York City.

DECLARATION ON INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY, MARCH 8

Today the Communist regimes use all the channels of communication to speak to women. They are extolling the importance of women to the Communist state, the rights and privileges and happiness they enjoy in the people's democracies.

The women behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains are addressed as the "carriers of peace" who are helping the Communist regimes in their drive for the brotherhood of man and for peace in the world.

While the Communist leaders and speakers call upon the spirit of the Geneva Conference to extoll their achievements for peaceful coexistence, the women of the free world must speak out for all women to hear.

We, too, pray and work for peace, but not for the Communist concept of peace. Their peace means only the absence of war. Their "peaceful coexistence" means the continuance of diplomatic, economic, and cultural relations, while stealthy subversion works for the final Communist victory: Subjugation of nations and individuals.

Our concept of peace is indivisible from freedom. We cannot conceive of peaceful coexistence with governments unless they serve their people instead of oppressing and exploiting them. We cannot conceive of peace and the brotherhood of man unless the bodies and the minds of individual citizens are free.

Living in peace means to us daily practice of individual rights. We worship God with our men and children in our own way at a place of worship of our own choice. We read any book, magazine, or paper we choose and discuss freely highly divergent opinions they present. Our right to assemble makes it easy to meet for any purpose we feel we should talk over. We enjoy our right to move about freely at home and abroad. It gives our husbands great opportunities in their work and their earning power. It gives us great choice to establish our homes in the part of the country we like best and to visit any other part of the world we wish to see. We treasure these personal rights which allow us to establish our unique identity, the prerequisite of every human being. We can be what God made us, without hindrance.

Our social security and happiness are founded on justice and served by the protective rights of each individual. We have the right to petition for the relief of grievances without the fear of retaliation by the men in power, which is evident in all Communist states.

The right of habeas corpus without excessive bail protects all citizen from being held without trial for months and years in dungeons and slave camps such as the ill-famed Vorkuta, Mislea, Jachymov, Csolnoky Szebanya, and Belene. We are held innocent until proved guilty in trial by jury, without advance confessions obtained by torture and brainwashing.

Our families enjoy fully the rights to ownership. Our homes, fields, businesses and all the other possessions that help make our life comfortable and secure are our very own. We help our men in earning them and caring for them, and share with them the feeling of joy and security they give us and our children. We give hospitality to our friends in the complete privacy of our homes; we manage our property and make contracts about our affairs without Government interference.

Perhaps the privilege we enjoy most for ourselves and our children is the full freedom to express our individuality through creative work and to translate our work into enterprise. We are free to select and to go into business, compete and make profit. No nationalization threatens us if our business should grow. We share in the abundance of national goods and services by our right to bargain for them in a free market, providing food and clothing and other family needs of highest standard for the least expense.

As workers we have the right to bargain with our employers and to call upon the Government to protect this right, without plaguing us by norms which have to be surpassed if we and our families are to live. Our men come home with their pay, their health, pension, and vacation benefits, and even with the profit-sharing stocks in their company to help us get the enjoyment we have been planning for together. Thus we are partners with millions of shareowners in Wall Street and have no fear of its sinister influence on our people's capitalism.

But living together in harmony, permitting the creative spirit to seek its own destiny, we serve our fellow men in freedom. This is our way of living in peace.

It is this indivisible unity of peace and freedom which can help sustain the spirit of women behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, and which the women of the free world uphold.

PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the membership on tomorrow on H. R. 9166, the Tax Extension Act of 1956, a rollcall vote will be requested.

I also desire to advise the membership that on Thursday next, House Resolution 376, providing for Investigations Committee on Veterans' Affairs, has been programed.

WITHDRAWAL OF REMARKS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, on March 7 I inserted an extension of remarks in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it may be withdrawn from the permanent RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LIBERALIZATION OF LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I note with a great deal of satisfaction that the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee has appointed a subcommittee to study the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

I am the author of H. R. 7237, calling for the liberalization of this act, which is substantially the same as the bill S. 2280, which was passed by the Senate last July, and it is my hope that the subcommittee will act on this legislation as speedily as possible.

Improvements in the benefit features of the act are long overdue. When the act was first passed in 1927 it provided the average disabled longshoreman with benefits equal to two-thirds of his weekly earnings. Today, under the act, the average longshoreman can only obtain little more than one-third of his weekly wages.

With the exception of a moderate revision of benefits in 1948 and technical amendments in preceding years, the act remains as written in 1927. This not only accounts for the failure of the act to carry out its original intent; it also points up the need for action by this Congress.

The Longshoremen's Act covers workers who are engaged in employments within the exclusive Federal admiralty and maritime jurisdiction in the United States, in Hawaii, and in Alaska. The principal categories of workers are as follows: Longshoremen or stevedores, ship repairmen, ship servicemen, harbor workers, and other workers on the navigable waters of the United States, but excluding seamen.

The Longshoremen's Act is also the basic workmen's compensation law for employees privately employed in the District of Columbia, it having been extended to those employees by the act of May 17, 1928, as amended—title 36, District of Columbia Code, page 501; and it is the basic law covering employees of contractors with the United States engaged in manifold employments outside continental United States, it having been extended to them by the Defense Base Act of August 16, 1941—title 42, United States Code, page 1651. Whatever changes are made in the Longshoremen's Act will, without further legislative action, bring about equivalent changes in the two laws mentioned.

The benefits payable under these laws are provided by private insurance or self-insurance arranged by private employers in the same manner as in any typical State workmen's compensation law. The Government does not pay the benefits under the Longshoremen's Act.

The basic purpose of the act is to provide most covered workers with substantially two-thirds of their wages when totally incapacitated by industrial accident. Unless the maximum and minimum compensation rate levels are adjusted by legislative action as circumstances require, the security of the workers becomes impaired and the workmen's compensation law loses its effectiveness. This is not only an inequitable result, but the situation tends to lead to industrial disputes by triggering demands for nonstatutory supplementary benefits from employers to make up the deficit. The redressing of benefit levels is accordingly a necessary function of government designed to carry out the basic purposes of the act.

Liberalization of the indemnity schedule world bring the present act more in line with modern concepts of workmen's compensation. On this subject I agree,

and I believe the majority of the Members will agree, with the Secretary of Labor when he recently stated:

> We should attempt not only to compensate the injured worker, but to restore him to his former producing capacity. We no longer think of workmen's compensation as a private contest between employer and employee but as a type of income insurance. No longer do we think of workmen's compensation as a cash payoff but instead as a means of restoring not only the worker's wages but the worker himself.

It is my hope that the House will have an opportunity to approve such legislation in the course of the present session.

ADEQUATE HEALTH INSURANCE FOR OLDER CITIZENS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the introduction of a bill which is aimed at helping the great need of our older citizens for adequate health insurance. Our older people are more prone to illness, a weakness which increases for them with each passing day. This problem is most acute to those over 65. Today there is no adequate low-priced hospitalization available to our senior citizens. Indeed, only 1 in 3 of the people over 65 has health insurance of any sort. The national average, however, is that 2 in every 3 persons has such coverage.

Now we know that almost to a man our people over 65 have small incomes, usually limited to only social-security benefits on which the average retired worker gets about $62 a month. A retired worker and his wife get about $100 per month. Only 1 couple in 4 over 65 has an income of more than $50 per month over and above their social-security benefits and fewer have even small savings. To people like this, sickness and its attendant expense are disastrous. Private health-insurance plans offer relatively little to the older citizens of this country. Adequate coverage for persons over 60 is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain. Private health-insurance plans usually refuse to issue such coverage. It is also difficult for such persons to retain coverage which they already had. Many insurance companies find compelling reasons to purge their lists of insured to remove the more costly risks, outstanding among whom are our older people.

Where coverage is offered to such older citizens, it is at such a high price as to be outside the reach of those who most need it, or undesirable by reason of the extremely limited nature offered to the advanced-age brackets.

The cure for this need is simple, and is not the old discredited reinsurance program proposed by the administration for the benefit of the insurance companies.

My bill extends the social-security system to offer to everyone over 65 receiving social-security benefits 60 days of hospitalization in a semiprivate room, the cost of which would be paid from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. The dependents of insured aged persons and the survivors of deceased insured persons would also be covered by my bill. No doctor bills will be paid under this proposal except as incident to hospitalization. The cost today for such a proposal would be a maximum of $300 million a year. Over the long-range, the average cost would rise to $500 million.

My bill offers this with no advance in premium rates already scheduled, and without impairing the financial integrity of the fund, because under the schedule of taxation of existing law income grows faster than payments from the fund in periods of rising income, as we have had since the founding of the system. The primary monthly cash benefit is 55 percent of the first $100 of average income plus 20 percent of the next $240. As earnings rise a larger part of wages results in benefits at the 20-percent rate than at the 55-percent rate.

In the same bill I propose to increase the income of the fund by another feature, by raising the interest rate from about 2.3 percent to a full 3 percent, as is paid on other retirement funds, administered by the Federal Government, such as the railroad-retirement account and the civil-service retirement fund. Since the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund is presently about $22 billion, a 0.7 percent increase will mean up to $154 million per year in additional income, which in good conscience should be paid to the fund.

I want to make it clear that there is no necessary connection between the increase in the existing benefits by offering hospitalization to those covered by the law and the raising of the interest rate. As a matter of fact the raising of the interest rate was requested by the trustees and included in the President's budget message.

This bill will benefit all who are recipients of social-security benefits, and in addition it will benefit hospitals and charitable agencies by reducing their cost burden for handling such cases. Both of the features of the bill have already been requested by the administration.

The wise humanitarian features of this bill are such as to commend themselves to all but the most callous. I am sure they will commend themselves to the great Ways and Means Committee and to the membership of this Congress.

RESOURCES OF THE CONTINENTAL SHELF

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 15 there will convene at Ciudad Trujillo in the Dominican Republic an important hemispheric Conference on Conservation of Natural Resources, the Continental Shelf, and Oceanic Waters. Representatives of all the 21 American Republics are expected to attend this Conference, which, among other matters, will discuss the problem of the limits of territorial waters, high seas fisheries conservation, and economic as well as scientific problems related to the exploitation of the resources of the Continental Shelf.

Of particular interest to the United States will be the discussion of the legal limits of territorial waters. As many of us know, a rather hasty and, in the opinion of our Government, ill-considered resolution on this subject was approved at Mexico City last month by a number of Latin American countries. The resolution to which I refer was brought up at a meeting of the Inter-American Council of Jurists, which had met for the purpose of making preparatory studies for the Ciudad Trujillo Conference. It went far beyond its province in attempting to give the character of a declaration to this resolution, which asserted the sovereignty of nations to large bodies of the ocean off their coast. Indeed, some of its proponents laid claim to waters off their coasts up to a distance of 200 miles out to sea.

The United States, of course, was forced to vote against this resolution, which in our opinion not only violates many established principles of international law, but also the long-cherished doctrine of freedom of the seas, which our country has defended for many years.

I am confident that more considered views on this subject will prevail at the Ciudad Trujillo Conference, now that the nations concerned have had time to contemplate the implications of this action.

The United States for its part should enter into the discussions at Ciudad Trujillo with a determination to seek answers to these complicated questions which are legally just and morally sound. To be sure, it probably will not be possible to reach final solutions to the problems on the agenda for this Conference. It should be remembered that this is the first meeting of its kind which has been convoked by the American Republics. But at the very least, the discussions should lead to a better definition of the subjects under consideration, particularly in the complex field of fisheries conservation in this hemisphere. It is to be hoped also that a sound basis will be found for strengthening international cooperation in this field.

As you know, the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House heard Assistant Secretary of State Henry F. Holland discuss both the Mexico City meeting and the forthcoming conference at Ciudad Trujillo at its meeting on February 29. Afterward Chairman Thomas S. Gordon made public a statement urging the State Department to defend vigorously the United States position in regard to freedom of the seas which is so important to the interests of the United States, other nations of our hemisphere and to the rest of the free world.

As a Representative of one of our country's great fishing States, I would like to make a matter of record my strong support for the views expressed by the chairman of the subcommittee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PILLION.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RILEY (at the request of Mr. PRICE), for Monday and Tuesday, March 12 and 13, 1956, on account of official business.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. PRICE), for Monday and Tuesday, March 12 and 13, 1956, on account of official business.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. PRICE), for Monday and Tuesday, March 12 and 13, 1956, on account of official business.

Mr. FORD (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for Monday and Tuesday, March 12 and 13, 1956, on account of official business.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for Monday and Tuesday, March 12 and 13, 1956, on account of official business.

Mr. RAY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for 1 week, on account of death in family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2552. An act to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; and

H. R. 7201. An act relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday, March 13, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1616. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, in the amount of $1,614,562, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs and to cover increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency (H. Doc. No. 355); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1617. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting the report of activities of the Veterans' Administration as of June 30, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 536, 71st Congress, and Public Law 346, 78th Congress, also included is the annual report of the Veterans' Educational Appeals Board established by section 2 of Public Law 610, 81st Congress (H. Doc. No. 248); to the Committee on Veterans Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1618. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, General Services Administration, transmitting a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 75,000 pounds of pyrethrum (20 percent) extract now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to section 3 (e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (60 Stat. 597, 50 U. S. C. 98b (e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1619. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380) as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1620. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of January 31, 1956, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1621. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with E. H. Flother, which, when executed by the Superintendent, Lake Mead National Recreation Area, will authorize the concessioner to continue to provide accommodations, facilities, and services at the Willow Beach site in Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nev., during a 3-year period beginning January 1, 1956, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1622. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with Martin Kilian, which, when executed by the Superintendent, Mount Rainier National Park, will authorize the concessioner to provide accommodations, facilities, and services within the Ohanapecosh Hot Springs area of Mount Rainier National Park, Wash., for a 1-year period beginning January 1, 1956, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1623. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Sfc. Henry F. Ferry"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1624. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend subdivision (e) of section 58—Notices—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1625. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1626. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissable into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1627. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 6, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on New Creek, Staten Island, N. Y., in the interest of navigation, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

1628. A letter from the Adjutant General, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the stated convention of the 57th National Encampment, United Spanish War Veterans, held in Long Beach, Calif., September 18 to 22, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 356); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1629. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to a letter dated February 16, 1956, enclosing copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, and submitting a copy of a classified order relating to Michael Isaac Mortimer Sanders as an additional case in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee of conference. S. 1287. A bill to make certain increase in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system (Rept. No. 1869). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 553. Joint resolution waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1867). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 565. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1868). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1271. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1870). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1272. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H.

Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1871). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):

H. R. 9860. A bill to provide for examination, licensing, registration, and regulation of professional and practical nurses, and for nursing education in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 9861. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, to provide that the level of price supports for certain basic agricultural commodities shall be related to the units of production produced on the farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 9862. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain widows and widowers of retired employees and certain widows of employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9863. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to eliminate certain deductions from a spouse's annuity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 9864. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 9865. A bill to provide for the consolidation of the existing Veterans' Administration hospital and regional office at Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 9866. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to provide that a discharge in bankruptcy will release a bankrupt from liability from certain debts if the creditor fails to object to such discharge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9867. A bill to provide that certain Federal surplus property may be donated to youth camps and centers not organized for profit; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 9868. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide insurance thereunder against the cost of hospitalization for insured aged persons and their dependents and for the survivors of deceased insured persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 9869. A bill to provide in certain additional cases for the granting of the status of regular substitute in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 9870. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 9871. A bill to extend until June 30, 1959, the effective period of the increases made by the Social Security Act Amendments of 1952 in the proportion of certain State public-assistance expenditures to be borne from Federal funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 9872. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 9873. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a building for the United States Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 9874. A bill to authorize Canadian vessels to be employed in the coastwise transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 9875. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall apply only with respect to that portion of the amount paid for any admission which is in excess of $1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 9876. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interest in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Little Missouri River and its tributaries as they affect such States; and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 9877. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly families and persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 9878. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly families and persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 9879. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly families and persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 9880. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly families and persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 9881. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly families and persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 9882. A bill to amend and clarify section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to confirm jurisdiction in the Federal courts to enforce section 9 (g) (3); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 9883. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an import tax on natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9884. A bill to provide that certain voluntary employees' beneficiary associations shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 9885. A bill to authorize a project for the Buchanan Reservoir on the Chowchilla River, San Joaquin Valley, Calif., for flood control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 9886. A bill to authorize the project for the Hidden Reservoir on the Fresno River, San Joaquin Valley, Calif., for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 9887. A bill to increase the monthly rates of disability compensation payable to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9888. A bill to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 9889. A bill to provide for averaging taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9890. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 9891. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 9892. A bill to amend the provisions of the Revised Statutes relating to physical examinations preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9893. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 9894. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 220. Concurrent resolution to commemorate the quadricentennial anniversary of the establishment of the first settlement in Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 424. Resolution providing for employment of four additional laborers, office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to condemning and protesting the usurpation and encroachment on the reserved powers of the States by the Supreme Court of the United States, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 9895. For the relief of Willie H. Tennison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. Res. 425. Resolution for the relief of the Northern Pacific Railroad Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

631. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of members of WCTU and men's Bible class, First Baptist Church, Emporium, Pa., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

632. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution adopted by the Jacob Dineson Lodge No. 422, Independent Order of Brith Abraham, urging that Israel be permitted to purchase arms from the United States for the defense of her established borders and that the United States, England, and France enter into a security pact with Israel guaranteeing its present established borders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

633. By Mr. HOSMER: Petition of certain residents of the 18th Congressional District of California, who request enactment by Congress of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

634. Also, petition of certain residents of the 18th Congressional District of California, who petition adoption by Congress of the Townsend plan, defined in H. R. 4471 and H. R. 4472, as an amendment to the Social Security Act in place of the present programs of old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance, stating (1) this legislation would provide adequate social security for the aged, for the physically handicapped, and for widowed mothers with dependent children; and (2) under this legislation monthly benefits would be of great economic value to the Nation, providing additional consumer buying power, stabilizing production on the farms and in the factories, thus maintaining employment at steady high levels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

635. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Mrs. Maude Morlan and 14 other citizens of Marion County, Oreg., urging that the Townsend plan, as defined in H. R. 4471, be enacted into law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

636. Also, petition of Willis E. Brown and 7 other citizens of Washington County, urging that the Townsend plan, as defined in H. R. 4471, be enacted into law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

637. Also petition of Mrs. S. L. Mullan and 7 other citizens of Washington County, Oreg., urging that the Townsend plan, as defined in H. R. 4471, be enacted into law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

638. By Mr. SILER: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. W. C. Thornton and 1,038 other residents of Erie, York, Red Lion, Dover, and Mifflinburg, Pa., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage avertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

639. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the trustee, Palo Verde Union School District, Tule and Kaweah River area, in the county of Tulare, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the immediate appropriation of the initial funds necessary for the commencement and construction of Success and Terminus Dams, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

640. Also, petition of the executive vice chairman, Committee to Save the Middle East from Communism, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to perpetuating the high principles and ideals of our country, and in preserving world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

641. Also, petition of the secretary, American Bar Association, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to approving the principle set forth in Senate bill 748, 84th Congress, etc; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

642. Also, petition of the grand knight, Sag Harbor Council, No. 584, Knights of Columbus, Sag Harbor, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

643. Also, petition of the chief clerk, Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging passage of H. R. 8836 or other similar legislation now pending before the Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

644. Also, petition of the president, the Porterville Junior Chamber of Commerce, Porterville, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to supporting and urging the early completion of the Success and Terminus Dams in Tulare County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. John J. Sparkman, of Alabama, at Meeting of the Amen Corner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on March 3, 1956, in Pittsburgh, Pa., at a meeting of the Amen Corner, four Senators addressed that historical association, my colleague the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], my colleague the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], my colleague the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and myself.

The only one of the four who had prepared an address was the Senator from Alabama. Since he delivered a very interesting address on the present situation as it relates to Communist Russia, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN AT A MEETING OF THE AMEN CORNER, HOTEL WILLIAM PENN, PITTSBURGH, PA., MARCH 3, 1956

I am profoundly honored to have been invited to address this distinguished gathering of the membership of the Amen Corner.

It is my understanding that the stated purpose of this meeting is to enable "men of many minds, without regard to race, creed, politics, or previous condition, to gather nocturnally, quite haphazardly, at some place of convenient rendezvous, to discuss as the spirit moves them, any subject under the rising or the setting sun, and, without let or hindrance, apply to the arts forensic any system of logic or reason which the individual, in his sovereign right, might elect."

I assume that these prerogatives apply equally in the case of guest speakers. Accordingly, I shall speak tonight—since the spirit has moved me—on new problems which the American Nation faces in the present-day world. I shall endeavor to apply to this subject arts forensic and some semblance of logic or reason.

Our basic policy is to do what we can to keep peace in the world. As a corollary, our policy must be designed to prevent the Soviet nation and its Communist satellites from attaining their aim of world domination by war or means other than war. And we must, in addition, strengthen the free nations of the world and expand our alliances and security arrangements with them so as to prevent their defeat from external aggression or from efforts of Communist forces inside their borders.

It has become apparent recently that the Soviet line is changing. The cold war is still on, but the emphasis has been altered. I hope that I am wrong when I say that I fear the present initiative in this redirection is with the Communists. I should like to be able to agree with Secretary Dulles that the Soviet shift indicates a failure of Stalinist-Leninist policy; that the Soviets have abandoned a program of intolerance and violence. My feeling—to paraphrase Homer—is: Beware the Soviets bearing gifts.

Tonight I propose to discuss new developments within the stated framework of our world aims—that is, preservation of peace, prevention of Soviet aggrandizement by war or means short of war, and strengthening of the free nations. I shall confine my remarks to four developments, and the problems which they create:

1. Redirection of our competition with the Soviets in the area of economic and scientific aid to underdeveloped countries;

2. Altered posture in the field of nuclear defense;

3. Similar changes in the field of guided missiles; and

4. Intensified need for more and better trained and educated personnel, particularly in the field of science.

Obviously, I have not attempted to cover all major facets of our foreign and military policies. I will not consider questions of military aid and defensive alliances. Their omission does not, however, imply that they are not vastly important. But we must realize that military alliances alone will not successfully counteract the new Soviet economic and political offensive which is in full swing in the Middle East and Asia.

I have chosen, instead, these topics because they involve areas of immense challenge in this mid-20th century. Moreover, these are the areas in which we are entering the most intense competition with the Soviets.

Communists are on the move throughout the underdeveloped countries of the world with aid, trade, arms, good will missions, technical missions, student exchanges, and neutrality propaganda.

The Communist economic offensive is under way in the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and South America. Moreover, offers of aid usually accompany trade proposals. These we know have been made to India, Burma, Indonesia, Iran, and Afghanistan.

In the Middle East, Russian trade overtures have been tendered to Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia, and in recent days, Lebanon. There, a team of Russian experts has arrived wtih offers to the Lebanese Government of assistance in the development of the country. The immediate Soviet offer is reported to concern highways and communications, but general cooperation in broad areas of technical and agricultural activities are thought to be involved also.

Closer to home, the Russians have made generous offers of trade and economic assistance to Latin America through the medium of a statement by Premier Bulganin to the Latin American publication Vision.

Russia has sponsored a million-ton steel plant for India, and a $20-million road and development program in Africa. We know that the Russians offered to build the Aswan Dam project for Egypt.

The Soviets have extended offers of trade and economic assistance even to Liberia, Libya, and the Sudan.

These Russian overtures threaten our relationship with the nations of Asia and the Middle East. Specifically, this economic offensive may transform many of these nations from partisans on our side to neutrals. As Walter Lippmann stated recently, "This means the progressive dissolution of the ring of containing states, which was put together by Mr. Acheson and following him by Mr. Dulles, in the preceding phase of the cold war."

Mr. Dulles, in a recent appearance before the Senate Foregn Relations Committee expressed confidence that the leaders of these friendly states would not be wooed by Soviet blandishments. Moreover, he eschewed a United States policy of attempting to outbid, or outpromise, the Soviets in each country to which they offered aid and technical assistance.

But, surely, this redirection of Russian policy dictates imaginative countermeasures on our part. I do not propose tonight to debate the question of whether an expanded point 4 foreign-aid program to the underdeveloped nations is required. But, unquestionably, we must revitalize and extend economic and technical assistance projects; plans for the extension of capital to these areas; and programs designed to give technical, scientific, and medical assistance to the countries involved.

It is imperative that our Government swiftly chart an imaginative course of action to compete successfully in this new phase of the cold war. Unless we do this on a broad scale, long-range basis, we will, indeed, be forced either to out-promise the Soviets on a case-by-case basis or leave the economic and technical assistance field entirely to them.

We can no more afford to lose this phase of the cold war than the last.

Our position vis-a-vis Russia has changed in the area of nuclear weapons. Once we had a monopoly. Now we must assume that Russia has nuclear weapons at her command which can be directed to targets far beyond her borders.

We also find ourselves in active competition with the Soviets in the field of intercontinental ballistic missiles. These missiles are fired like artillery shells and have no guidance in flight. The goal is, of course, a missile which will cross oceans and cover long distances.

There has been much public debate recently about whether we are ahead of the Russians or behind them. Mr. Trevor Gardner, who recently resigned as Air Force Research Chief, maintains that the Soviets are already ahead of us in this field.[1] He thinks that original budgeting for research and development in the ballistic missile category was too low, and that budget cuts worsened the situation. He warned that this cut[2] "guarantees this Nation the second-best Air Force in the world."

General Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff, told a Senate committee that regardless of who was presently ahead, Soviet research efforts surpassed ours, and possibly could result[3] "in the Soviets obtaining better missiles sooner than we." General Twining also stated that Russia had thousands more planes than the United States, although their performance had not matched that of United States aircraft.

It was recently reported that the Russians have test fired long-range ballistic missiles hundreds of miles further than the United States has tested them.

Scientists have set the goal for ballistic missiles at a range of 5,000 miles. This goal is still unattained. Our present Redstone missile ranges 200 miles, though we hope to develop an intermediate-range ballistic missile which will travel 1,500 miles.

Dr. Walter R. Dornberger, former commanding general at the German rocket center and now a rocket expert for the United States,[4] recently predicted that certain defensive weapons could be developed which would neutralize the effect of these missiles. But both the missile and its deterrent would have a hydrogen-bomb warhead and the use of either would result in race suicide.

The foregoing facts are sobering in the extreme. We are obviously entering a vastly altered phase in our international struggle against world Communist aggression.

Clearly, bold new strategy is indicated in the competitive areas which I have outlined. The task is difficult and its magnitude requires intelligence and foresight on the part of our policymakers, and patience for those of us who have a proper role as critics of foreign policy.

It is not difficult to perceive an underlying need for an increasingly greater supply of well-educated scientific personnel. Scientists obviously must implement foreign aid and technical assistance programs, and the development of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles. Accordingly, I propose to examine our position in this vital matter.

It is not encouraging to read reports from eminent persons such as Rear Adm. H. G. Rickover, the builder of the atomic submarine, the *Nautilus*, who stated:

"On the engineering side some experts believe the United States is not even graduating enough trained people to sustain, to fertilize, its present rate of technical expansion beyond the year 1970. To maintain present living standards in the face of rapid population growth, industry must produce 10 years from now 40 percent more than it does today.

"It is well known that the Soviet Union is going to pass the United States in scientific and engineering education unless something is done. The United States today has about 800,000 engineers; the U. S. S. R. has about 650,000. Between 1950 and 1960 the Soviet Union will have graduated 1,200,000 engineers and natural scientists; the United States 900,000 as presently programed. The Soviet engineers will be as expert in their fields as the Americans are. The Russians are educating as many women as men in the professions; far fewer American women enter the great professions.

"Perhaps the most insidious weakness a nation can have is the belief * * * that it can do everything better than other people. We are subjected to this kind of propaganda in various media, such as the slick advertisements in our magazines * * *.

"The United States is spending about 2½ percent of its national income on education. In contrast it spends more than 4 percent on recreation. In 1951 the amount spent for advertising was $199 for every family in the United States, but the amount spent for primary education was only $152 per household. The national outlay for educating citizens is substantially less than the outlay for educating customers.

"It is more important to have better teachers than better school buildings. The main, the fundamental problem is that teachers' salaries are desperately low—hence do not attract enough highly qualified men and women. It will profit us very little to spend millions of dollars on scholarships and then place the students under incompetent teachers. Niggardly teaching salaries—to those upon whom we depend to transmit our culture and our civilization—commit a fraud upon our children."

Unquestionably, our ability to maintain superiority over the Soviet Union—and, therefore, our ability to maintain world peace and the integrity of the free nations of the world—depends in largest measure upon the ability and training of our manpower.

In fields which I have discussed this evening, our posture will depend upon the advance scientific training and general intellectual ability of those persons of superior mental caliber.

It was discouraging to read a recent report[5] from the conference of the American Association of School Administrators decrying the neglect of talented students and urging improved educational facilities for gifted children. This conference concluded that schools no longer attract superior persons as teachers. Most gifted young people enter other professions. This is so because salaries are better elsewhere, and the climate surrounding other professions more attractive.

On the other hand, at precisely the same moment, our newspapers reported that in the Soviet Union special programs and plans were under way designed to facilitate the education and training of superior young people and to make their lot more attractive and rewarding.

The Atomic Energy Commission has expressed concern of long standing[6] "with the shortage of engineers, particularly of nuclear engineers, and with the adverse effect the accumulated shortage will have on the development of large nuclear power industry in the United States."

A recent Washington Post and Times Herald[7] survey observed that the Nation's scientists were seriously concerned over the failure of our educational system to provide enough scientists and engineers to man today's scientific and technical age.

The survey showed that less than half of the students of college caliber ever entered college, and that 60 percent of the best students in the country's high schools graduating classes do not go to college. Over half of the students who do go to college do not graduate, and for every high-school graduate who eventually earns a doctoral degree, 25 others with the intellectual ability to do so do not acquire degrees.

The observation of the Conference on Nationwide Problems of Science Teaching, held at Harvard University in 1953, is pertinent today.[8]

"The words 'atomic age' no longer belong to science fiction, nor are they merely a cliché; they describe a reality. In the scientific and technological culture of our present-day society, every citizen needs a realistic understanding and appreciation of the part that science, both physical and biological, plays in everyday life. Of comparable importance are also the development of understandings and skills which function in a wide variety of occupations, and the identification and encouragement of scientific abilities needed in engineering, research, teaching and other scientific professions.

"Among [our] children are the scientists of the future. Surveyors of the country's youth have found that the intellectual resources of the United States are not being exploited to anywhere near their full potential."

These conclusions are valid today. A recent survey of scientific personnel resources

[1] New York Times, February 20, 1956, p. 9.
[2] New York Times, February 20, 1956, p. 9.
[3] New York Times, February 22, 1956.
[4] New York Times, February 22, 1956.
[5] New York Times, February 22, 1956.
[6] Nineteenth Semiannual Report of the Atomic Energy Commission, 84th Cong., 2d sess., S. Doc. No. 91, p. 55, (January 1956).
[7] Washington Post and Times Herald, February 23, 1956, p. 24.
[8] Critical Years Ahead in Science Teaching, report of the Conference on Nationwide Problems of Science Teaching in the Secondary Schools, Harvard University Printing Office (1953), pp. 7 and 8.

of the National Science Foundation observes: [9]

"It has become apparent that the scientific and technical personnel resources of certain countries are rapidly approaching ours in numbers, with the indication that we may be surpassed within the next few years. In our effort to maintain superiority we must give attention not only to the training of adequate numbers of scientists and engineers, but, of even greater importance, we must place heavy emphasis on quality."

What a tragic waste of manpower these studies reveal.

I am certain that we will bring to bear on these formidable problems which face us, the courage and resourcefulness which have always characterized our approach to natural and human obstacles. Indeed, these new frontiers are more formidable than any which our forebears assayed.

Our aim is constant—peace in the world; containment of Communist aggrandizement; and maintenance of the integrity of other free nations.

The Communist line has shifted. Danger is increased. Burdens are greater. But I am confident that this Nation, as it has in the past, will rise to the occasion and do what must be done to achieve our just goals.

Results of 1956 Questionnaire Poll, 42d District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, in the early part of February, I mailed 105,000 questionnaires, one to each household in the 42d Congressional District of New York.

The questionnaire was accompanied by a nonpartisan, pro-and-con summary of the facts and issues involved. The background memorandum and questionnaire were confined to the following five pending legislative proposals: Niagara power development, the 1957 budget and taxes, the highway program, Federal aid for school construction, and the farm issue.

The purpose of the survey was twofold:

First, to give the public a concise summary of the facts involved in these issues and to stimulate public interest toward solving them.

Second, to determine in broad terms the attitudes of the people in this congressional district and establish a mutual appreciation of the problems as they are, in essence, presented to Members of Congress.

Three thousand seven hundred and eighty-two questionnaires have been returned to this date. In addition to the questionnaires, we have received hundreds of worthwhile comments and suggestions. The returned questionnaires and letters indicate a sincere good will and desire to participate in solving this Nation's problems.

I invite the attention of the distinguished Members of both Houses of this Congress to the results of this poll. The tabulated results are:

NIAGARA POWER PROJECT

1. In this apparent impasse, which course would you prefer for the development of the Niagara Power?

(Please indicate order of preference by figure, 1, 2, 3, etc.)	*Only first preference tabulated*
(a) Development by the investment owned group of 5 utilities (private enterprise)	2,081
(b) Development by the New York State Power Authority (public power)	314
(c) Development by the U. S. Government	218
(d) Immediate construction by the U. S. Army engineers and subsequent transfer to the New York State Power Authority or to the private utilities upon final choice by the U. S. Congress	281
(e) Submission to the people of the State of New York in an advisory referendum as to their views between public and private development	395

THE 1957 BUDGET, NATIONAL DEBT, TAXES

1. Here are some of the larger expense items of the budget. Which would you reduce?

Fiscal 1956 (billions)	*Proposed 1957 (billions)*	*Expense item*				
19.1	19.9	Defense Department, pay and maintenance	Yes..	806	No..	2,232
10.5	11.7	Aircraft, ships, guided missiles, weapons, and ammunition	Yes..	348	No..	2,676
3.0	3.3	Atomic energy, research and development	Yes..	243	No..	2,774
2.5	3.0	Foreign military aid	Yes..	2,251	No..	965
5.1	5.1	Gross farm support programs, net cost is $2.1 for 1956 and $1.6 for 1957	Yes..	1,887	No..	1,213
1.9	1.9	Foreign economic aid	Yes..	2,239	No..	986
4.8	4.9	Veterans' service and benefits	Yes..	1,274	No..	1,791
1.6	1.7	General government, executive, legislative, judicial	Yes..	1,858	No..	1,210
6.2	6.3	Commerce and housing	Yes..	1,917	No..	1,089
6.8	7.0	Interest on debt	(Unchangeable)			

2. If next June, there appears a surplus sufficient to balance the budget, pay off from ½ to 1 billion dollars on the debt and leave enough to pay for the tax cut, which type of tax cut would you prefer?

(a) No tax cut. Apply surplus to reduce national debt and improve United States credit for future contingencies	Yes..	1,760	No..	1,031
(b) Corporate tax rate 52 percent to drop to 47 percent (about $1.7 billion)	Yes..	424	No..	1,913
(c) Wartime excise taxes on liquors, cigarettes, gasoline (about $1 billion)	Yes...	636	No..	1,739
(d) A flat 5 to 8 percent reduction in income tax rates (cost $1.5 to $2.5 billion)	Yes..	1,104	No..	1,418
(e) An increase of $100 in personal exemptions (cost $2.5 billion)	Yes..	1,796	No..	885

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

1. After balancing the benefits against the costs, do you favor any type of Federal interstate highway bill which allows New York State 659 miles out of 40,000 (1.6 percent), bearing in mind that New York State has 10 percent of the population and pays 14 percent of all Federal taxes?	Yes..	1,135	No..	1,981
2. On the basis of financing the cost by an increase in Federal taxes by 1 cent a gallon on gas or 2 cents for diesel fuel or by some other combination of automotive taxes, do you favor a $1 billion to $2 billion annual Federal interstate highway aid program?	Yes..	1,740	No..	1,346
3. If, in your opinion, a Federal interstate highway program is needed, do you favor a program of:				
(a) about $1 billion a year for 5 years	Yes..	1,354	No..	699
(b) about $2 billion a year for 10 years	Yes..	1,209	No..	742
4. Which ratio of Federal interstate highway aid to States do you favor (the present law is 60–Federal and 40–State)?				
(a) 60 Federal–40 State	Yes..	2,253	No..	310
(b) 75 Federal–25 State	Yes..	603	No..	773
(c) 90 Federal–10 State	Yes..	261	No..	878
5. Do you favor financing the interstate system by tolls, wherever practicable, with the United States underwriting the deficit?	Yes..	1,931	No..	1,189
6. Assuming that a delay of 1 to 3 years may result, would you favor a restudy of the interstate highway system for the purpose of giving top priority to about 20,000 miles which have prime national, defense, and economic interest?	Yes..	2,251	No..	869

FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

1. Do you favor Federal aid for school construction as provided for in either the Smith or Kelley bills? If "Yes," then please state how you would prefer to pay the costs?				
(a) Are you in favor of extending Federal aid to States for school construction as provided in either the Smith or Kelley bills?	Yes..	1,756	No..	1,415
(b) Should the costs be paid out of the general Federal taxes and thus postpone and reduce the amount of a possible tax cut?	Yes..	1,496	No..	1,101
(c) Should the costs be paid by either increasing Federal taxes or by continuing Federal spending in excess of revenues?	Yes..	386	No..	1,570
2. Which plan would you prefer?				
(a) Smith bill costing $1.25 billion over 5 years?	Yes..	1,198	No..	1,002
(b) Kelley bill costing $1.6 billion over 4 years?	Yes..	791	No..	1,126
3. Are you in favor of the Powell amendment to bar Federal aid for construction in school districts which do not conform to nonsegregation?	Yes..	1,419	No..	1,592

THE FARM ISSUE

1. In general, after balancing the benefits against the costs, do you approve the soil bank program?	Yes..	1,997	No..	980
2. Do you approve the present flexible 75 to 90 percent parity price program over the proposed 90 percent parity price?	Yes..	2,084	No..	748
3. Do you favor no agricultural program and thus allow farm prices to seek their own market level?	Yes..	1,692	No..	1,402

Problems Surrounding Airports at Detroit, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I have prepared with reference to the problems surrounding Detroit's airports.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BEALL

An article which inadvertently had a double timeliness appeared in the March 5 issue of Aviation Week. The story dealt with problems surrounding Detroit's airports, and included a reference to Representative GEORGE MEADER'S request that a

[9] Scientific Personnel Resources, National Science Foundation, (1955), p. 1.

congressional investigation be made of the Federal airport aid program.

At issue in the Detroit case is a proposal the major airlines shift their operations from the Willow Run Airport to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport.

To equip Wayne Major for the additional traffic would cost $30 million, which would give the airlines a facility about 15 minutes closer to the city they serve. But the airlines are opposed to the plan. Their reason, according to Aviation Week, is as follows, and I quote from the article:

"The airlines argue that a saving of 10 to 15 minutes in travel time to the airport doesn't justify the expenditure of $30 million."

It is easy to see why Representative MEADER wants to look into the scheme and see why public funds are being asked for a plan which is so obviously uneconomical.

It is even easier to imagine how certain Members of this Congress will react to any proposals that more than $50 million be spent in the Washington-Baltimore area for the same purpose—to save an insignificant quarter of an hour of ground travel time.

I am speaking, of course, of the persistent attempts to promote construction of a new airport at Burke, Va. The only so-called advantage of such an installation as compared with the utilization of Friendship International Airport to serve the Capital area would be the saving of a small amount of ground travel time.

If the proposed spending of $30 million for such an irresponsible scheme in Detroit has prompted calls for a congressional investigation, think what the reaction should be to a far more needless expenditure of $50 million right in Congress' backyard.

I said at the beginning of these remarks that the article Aviation Week had a double timeliness. You can surely see that it does. Not only does it show the folly of the Detroit scheme, which is being opposed by the airlines themselves, but it also provides a lesson on how to deal with any proposition that Burke be built up while a modern airport is ready and willing to handle flights in the same region and that is exactly what Friendship is prepared to do.

Radio Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Broadcast Over Wisconsin Radio Stations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of a radio address which I have been pleased to deliver by transcription over many stations of my States, discussing the various important issues pending before the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY SUMMARIZES CURRENT STATUS OF MAJOR LEGISLATION AND ISSUES IN CONGRESS; URGES PROMPT ACTION ON SEAWAY, SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND OTHER FORWARD-LOOKING BILLS

We are now about a third of the way through the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

As you know, a tremendous amount of news is occurring in Washington on the Senate and House floors, and in Senate and House committees. Legislation is being taken up which vitally affects you, the people of our State.

I am glad, then, to report to you on the matters affecting your welfare, your income, your homes, health, taxes, defense, transportation, costs of living, and many other subjects of deep interest to you.

We are going to run down a whole series of questions touching briefly on these various issues.

When you have heard our summary, I hope that you will drop a note to me in Washington with your reactions. Let me have any questions which you may have in mind on any of the topics discussed.

Later on in this broadcast, too, I will mention some free publications which you may be interested in writing in for.

CHANNEL BILL AND SEAWAY ROUTE

Announcer: Senator WILEY, first off, I think that we might discuss some of the matters affecting Wisconsin's economic future. What is the status of the very important Great Lakes channel bill, Senator WILEY?

Answer. We are expecting that the channel-deepening bill to improve the channels west of Lake Erie, and thus complete the 2,300-mile waterway, will soon be taken up favorably in the Senate.

Meanwhile, related big news is that the United States Maritime Commission has wisely taken action to designate the St. Lawrence route as an essential route to Europe.

That means fortunately that American flag shipping will be given necessary financial support, so that it can compete with foreign shipping.

In other words, while we welcome foreign shipping lines—Norwegian, German, and others along the seaway route—we are particularly anxious that American-owned shipping proceed through what is now known as Essential Route No. 32—the seaway route.

Question. Is there any other action to report on the lakes?

Answer. Very definitely. A number of us Senators are proposing that Congress help the Great Lakes shipbuilding industry to expand and modernize the present lake fleet which is now pretty old and obsolete.

Expanded shipping is of course vital to Wisconsin's economic future.

PASS ROAD BILL

Question. Now, Senator, turning to some of the major legislative issues, would you run down the list of just what the status is of the principal bills now pending before the Congress?

Answer. I am delighted. We have been discussing transportation, and that naturally brings up the question of roads. Very soon, the Senate and House will go into conference to figure out a final version of the multi-billion-dollar highway improvement bill.

Regrettably, this bill has been held up for more than a year because of the controversy as to how it is to be financed.

But so far as you and I and 55 million American motorists are concerned, the important thing is to get the modernized roads and get them fast.

Not only do we need an improved Federal-State highway system, but we need an improvement in urban, that is, in big city roads as well. (The latter program for city roads had unfortunately been dropped previously.) But everyone knows that in driving through our major cities, there are terrific traffic jams. This results not only in needless delays and high costs, but often severe accident rates as well.

LIBERALIZED PENSIONS NECESSARY

Question. Now, turning to another phase, what is the status of the social-security legislation?

Answer. It will be coming up in the Senate from the Finance Committee fairly soon.

Fortunately, it is certain that there are going to be liberalizing of the old-age pension laws. More hundreds of thousands of Americans are going to have the opportunity to be included at long last under the law. And there will be liberalized pension treatment for elderly women and for the permanently and totally disabled.

BETTER CREDIT FOR HOME REPAIRS

Question. That is certainly good news for old folks. Now, what is the outlook on United States housing?

Answer. The outlook is quite bright. There will be almost as many new American homes started this year, as in the peak past years.

And, too, it seems quite clear that there is going to be an increase in the Federal Housing Administration credit available for millions of Americans to repair and modernize their old homes. In other words, there will be better terms available through the FHA, if you want a loan, through your bank, to improve your present home.

VETERANS' LAW CHANGES

Question. For veterans and their wives who are listening in, Senator, what can you report by way of legislation affecting them?

Answer. The House Veterans' Affairs Committee has been taking up American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars proposals for a greatly liberalized pension program for veterans reaching the age of 65. This legislation naturally particularly affects our 4 million veterans of World War I. But, of course, over a period of time, it will affect our millions of younger ex-servicemen from the World War II and Korean conflicts. So, watch the House Veterans' Affairs Committee for important developments on that front.

VARIOUS ISSUES DISCUSSED THUS FAR

Question. Senator WILEY, thus far you have discussed such topics as Great Lakes shipping, road improvement, social-security changes, home repair, veterans' pensions, and related items. Earlier, you had mentioned that various congressional publications are available on request from your listeners. May we hear about them now?

THREE PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE

Answer. Yes; here they are. If my listeners would like any of these items, just drop a note to me in Washington.

First, there is the latest yearly report of the House Un-American Activities Committee—another important document analyzing Communist infiltration into various segments of American life.

Second, on a different subject, there is the report of the Senate Agriculture Committee presenting its ideas on farm parity and the soil bank. If you would like to see an analysis of agricultural legislation affecting America's dairyland, just write for that committee report.

Third, there is a significant report from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. It analyzes the health of our overall American economy—our price level, employment, income, production and other helpful statistics affecting all 165 million of us.

Those, then, are three important publications on communism, farming, and the United States economy.

If you would like any or all of these three reports, just drop a note to me in the Senate Office Building in Washington.

Question. I know that many of our listeners will indeed be writing to you for those reports, Senator, as they have for other helpful publications.

Now, in the short time remaining to us, would you run down the status of some of the other miscellaneous issues before the Congress?

Answer. Glad to. Here they are: Let's start with these five—the diverse fields of health, milk, taxes, civil rights, and autos.

First, health. Congress will certainly give favorable attention to President Eisenhower's broad health program. That means expanded research into various diseases, improved insurance against the costs of illness, and it means more medical facilities for our people.

Second, school milk. Congress is giving the green light to this vital program. Already it is estimated that 16 million youngsters in school are consuming 3 billion pounds of milk every single year. That adds up to 2½ percent of our total milk production. This school milk program spells better health for the children, and it spells added economic health for the dairy industry.

Third, taxes. There should be and probably will be some tax revision this year. That means changes to iron out inequities in tax laws, end tax discrimination against small business and curb certain nuisance excise taxes.

Fourth, civil rights. The President is wisely proposing a national commission to explore the difficult matter of relations between races, particularly in the South. Such a commission could come up with constructive recommendations to help eliminate frictions and misunderstandings between Negro and white—over the segregation and related issues.

Fifth, the automobile industry. Two Senate committees have been studying the problems faced by automobile dealers in your town and throughout the land. This is part of a broader study of small business in relation to certain problems in the field of monopoly and antitrust laws. I think we will see improved relations between the auto companies and their franchised dealers. And we will see important changes in United States antitrust laws, designed to strengthen free competition. That is an indispensable part of a forward-looking national program.

Question. Those are five phases of Congress' study, Senator. Now, how about five more?

FIVE ADDITIONAL KEY FIELDS

Answer. Here they are: In the fields of defense, conservation, lobbies, labor, and atomic energy.

Defense: A Senate subcommittee is analyzing the very important guided missile program which is so vital to America's defense against possible Soviet long-range attack.

Next, conservation: You can expect continued exploration of the needs of our outdoor heritage—our national parks, our forests, our streams. Wisconsin conservationists are, of course, determined, as I am, that we preserve these outdoor resources for ourselves and the future generations. That means preserving them against the menaces of pollution, the menace of overgrazing of cattle, the menace of possibly unsound construction or leasing activities. Our national heritage belongs to all of us and not just a chosen few.

Next, lobbies: We are all hoping that our people will get the facts—the full facts—on precisely what the various powerful lobbies are doing in Washington, how they are trying to influence votes, what campaign contributions they are making, etc. In other words, let's throw the spotlight on lobbies and see what they are really up to. An investigation by an eight-man Senate committee is now under way on this front.

Fourth, labor: We are all hoping that before the end of this Congress, definite action will have been taken to protect the integrity of union welfare funds. All honest laboring men are especially anxious that the miserable handful of crooks and leeches who have been chiseling into labor's pension and health funds be cleaned out. Safeguard these funds for the workingman. End the scandal of these welfare funds.

Fifth, atomic energy: It is clear that we must step up peaceful application of atomic energy in the fields of industry, medicine, and agriculture. Soviet Russia is working all-out in both military and civilian application of the atom, and we have no alternative but to do likewise. Time is precious. We need to bear down in our national scientific efforts, expand scientific personnel so as to speed progress.

SUMMARY

Question. Well, Senator, I know that our listeners have enjoyed this rapid rundown.

Looking back, you've touched on these important fields: Health, school milk, taxes, civil rights, and autos.

Then, you mentioned congressional consideration of defense, conservation, exposing lobbies, protecting welfare funds and speedier applying of the miracles of the atom.

Earlier in the program you pointed out that three publications, among many others, are available to your listeners, the House Un-American Activities Committee report on communism; the Senate Agriculture Committee's report of farm parity; and the latest study by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

To obtain these or any other items, all that your listeners need do is drop a note to Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Answer. It will be a pleasure to hear from you. And while you're writing, let me know what your thinking is on Congress' actions. Let me have your judgment on problems like business, farm, labor, defense, anticommunism or any other matter affecting our Nation.

Your views will be most welcome.

This is your senior Senator, ALEX WILEY, signing off from Washington.

The National Gallery, a World Art Center With 24 Million Visitors in 15 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the National Gallery of Art will celebrate its 15th birthday this week, a birthday made resplendent by an exhibition of potential and outright gifts acquired by Samuel H. Kress, Rush H. Kress, and the Samuel H. Kress Foundation. In 1936, Andrew W. Mellon wrote to President Franklin D. Roosevelt offering his collection and a great building to house it to the Nation. Mr. Mellon never lived to see the gallery completed. He died in August 1937, just 3 months after construction of the gallery began.

Under David E. Findley, its Director from the very beginning, the National Gallery has grown from a half-empty museum to a world-renowned gallery whose exhibit rooms are filled with the works of the greatest masters of the Western World. The National Gallery in 15 short years has become one of the greatest cultural monuments in the entire world.

The National Gallery of Art has fulfilled the hope of its founder, as expressed by his son, Paul Mellon, at its dedication that—

It would become not a static but a living institution, growing in usefulness and importance to artists, scholars and the general public.

Two dissimilar men, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, "the most intelligent President about art since Jefferson," and Andrew W. Mellon, have, through this gallery, made enduring contributions to the artistic life of our country. While Mellon's original contribution was large it will be equaled and surpassed before long by the equally impressive contribution by the Congress of more than $1 million a year to the gallery's maintenance. So, while the gallery is an enduring monument to Andrew W. Mellon, it is an equally enduring monument to a great Nation struggling for cultural maturity.

I would like to be able to say today that the Federal Government was proudly spending, at the very least, an amount equal to what it appropriates to maintain this single building for the purchase of the creative works of our own authors, composers, playwrights, painters, sculptors, and one day we surely will.

The Federal Government has assisted other countries since the end of World War II to restore their cultural monuments, build new art centers and opera houses, and support flourishing cultural programs for the benefit of their own citizens and the delight of American tourists.

Certainly we should be doing at least as much at home as we are doing abroad. In any event, we should have a national program for the advancement of American art. Paying the maintenance costs of the National Gallery of Art does not constitute by itself a national arts program by any stretch of the imagination.

We must put our own great cultural leaders to work developing a national cultural program for our own country, a program that makes sense and has an eye for the political realities. Particularly is this true now that the Congress is appropriating money to send our leading cultural groups abroad to show the world that we are not the cultural barbarians the Russians say we are.

There are ways to advance our own arts that will not lead to the kind of political domination and control that has destroyed the great cultural traditions of the Russians and the other Communist bloc nations. Our allies, the Scandinavian countries, England, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan could teach us much about how to do it if we were willing to take the time to study their methods.

In an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 11, 1956, which I include here, it is pointed out that under Richard Bales, conductor of the National Gallery Orchestra, the free Sunday evening concerts have given American composers a sounding board for new compositions. The concern with American music contrasts strongly the gallery's lack of interest in contemporary work in the field of painting, sculpture, and the graphic and applied arts. The New York Times reported in 1953 that "under its own charter the National Gallery cannot concern itself with work by artists less than 20 years dead."

Perhaps, in view of the enormous subsidy which the Congress gives the gallery, the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery should rethink their position in regard to American art. This 15th birthday of the gallery would be an excellent time to do this.

I would like to suggest at this time that some exhibit rooms be set aside in this gallery for the exclusive use of the National Collection of Fine Arts, which like the National Gallery, is a branch of the Smithsonian Institution. These exhibit rooms should remain under the exclusive management of the National Collection of Fine Arts until its own gallery, authorized by act of the Congress in 1938, is built.

The 75th Congress, which accepted the Mellon gift, authorized the building of the Smithsonian Gallery of Art to house the National Collection of Fine Arts which is currently valued at $10 million. Since the Smithsonian Gallery of Art has not yet been built I have introduced legislation, H. R. 7974, which would amend the 1938 act to bring about the early establishment of the new gallery which, I have been assured by Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, has the very highest priority.

What I am proposing today is that exhibit rooms be set aside in the federally maintained National Gallery of Art for the exclusive use of the National Collection of Fine Arts until the Smithsonian Gallery of Art is established, be it 1 year, 10 years, or a century from now.

Secondly, I would like to see a plan jointly developed by the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, to carry out section 4 of the joint resolution of May 17, 1938. This is the joint resolution which authorized the establishment of the Smithsonian Gallery of Art.

For the information of my colleagues I include here the text of the joint resolution, Public Resolution No. 95, 75th Congress, which authorized the Smithsonian Gallery of Art:

Resolved, etc., That for the purpose of providing a site for a suitable building for properly housing and displaying the national collections of fine arts, comprising paintings, sculptures, bronzes, glass, porcelain, tapestry, furniture, jewelry, and other types of art; to display portraits of eminent American men and women; and to exhibit the works of artists deserving of recognition, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission shall designate and the President shall assign a suitable tract of public land in the District of Columbia between Fourth and Fourteenth Streets and Constitution and Independence Avenues.

SEC. 2. (a) A Commission, to be called the Smithsonian Gallery of Art Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), comprising a member to be designated by the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; a member to be designated by the Secretary of the Treasury; the chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission; the chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts; the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library; the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House; and the chairman of the Art Commission of the Smithsonian Institution, is hereby created and authorized to make all preliminary investigations and to secure appropriate designs, by competition or otherwise, preferably by competition, for a building to be constructed on the site above described, said building to be so designed as to permit of future expansion, parking arrangements, and for landscaping its surroundings. The Commission shall choose a chairman from its own membership.

(b) The members of the Commission shall serve as such members without compensation and the Commission shall terminate upon the submission to and approval by the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (hereinafter referred to as the "Regents") of the said design for the building and grounds.

(c) The Commission may employ such technical, clerical, and other assistants and make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services at the seat of Government and elsewhere) as may be necessary for the performance of the duties vested in the Commission: *Provided*, That architectural, engineering, and other necessary consultants may be employed without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. All expenditures of the Commission, including the cost of any design which may be accepted, and the compensation of a jury of award in the event a competition is held, shall be allowed and paid upon presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by its chairman. To carry out the provisions of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $40,000.

SEC. 3. (a) The Regents are hereby authorized to solicit and receive subscriptions of funds from private sources for the purposes specified in this subsection. Funds so received shall be placed in a special deposit account with the Treasurer of the United States, and may be expended by the Regents to meet the cost of the construction of the building, including furnishings and equipment thereof, to obtain necessary drawings and specifications, make necessary surveys and estimates of cost, defray necessary administrative expenses and secure other needful services.

(b) The Regents may, subject to the approval of the President, authorize the preparation of the site and the construction of the building, including approaches and landscaping of the grounds: *Provided*, That the Director of Procurement, Treasury Department, shall supervise the preparation of the plans and specifications, make all necessary contracts, and supervise construction.

(c) The name of the building shall be the Smithsonian Gallery of Art (hereinafter referred to as the "Gallery"), and it shall be under the supervision and control of the Regents and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be the policy of the Regents to maintain a worthy standard for the acceptance of art objects for exhibition in the Gallery, and to foster by public exhibitions from time to time in Washington, and other parts of the United States a growing appreciation of art, both of past and contemporary time; and the Regents are hereby authorized to solicit and receive private donations of works of art and contributions of funds from private sources for the purchase of works of art. Funds so received shall be placed in a special deposit account with the Treasurer of the United States and may be expended by the Regents for the purchase of works of art.

(b) In order to encourage the development of contemporary art and to effect the widest distribution and cultivation in matters of such art, the Regents are hereby authorized to solicit and receive funds from private sources, to acquire (by purchase or otherwise) and sell contemporary works of art or copies thereof, to employ artists and other personnel, award scholarships, conduct exhibitions, and generally do such things and have such other powers as will effectuate the purposes of this subsection. Funds received by the Regents under this subsection shall be placed in a special deposit account with the Treasurer of the United States and may be expended by the Regents for the purposes enumerated in this subsection and for no other purposes: *Provided*, That the Regents shall not incur any obligations under this subsection in excess of the funds available therefor.

SEC. 5. The Director of Procurement, the Administrator of the Public Works Administration, and other agencies of the Government are authorized to donate to the Gallery any work of arts now or hereafter under their control.

SEC. 6. Such objects of art as the Government or the Smithsonian Institution now possess, or such as may hereafter be acquired, may be housed or exhibited in the Gallery, with the approval of and under such regulations as the Regents and Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution may prescribe.

SEC. 7. The Regents may appoint and fix the compensation and duties of a Director of the Gallery and may employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for the efficient operation and administration of the Gallery.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually such sums as may be necessary to maintain and administer the Gallery, including the salaries of the Director and of other necessary officers and employees, and for special public exhibitions at Washington and elsewhere.

Approved, May 17, 1938.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 11, 1956]

NATIONAL GALLERY, A WORLD ART CENTER ON ITS 15TH YEAR—TREASURES OF KRESS COLLECTION TO BE EXHIBITED ON ANNIVERSARY

(By Jean White)

The National Gallery of Art will be 15 years old this Saturday. It is now one of the five or six great art centers of the world.

Behind these two simple statements of fact lies an incredible achievement.

To celebrate this accomplishment and its 15th anniversary, the gallery will open an exhibit that is another incredible achievement—a treasury of 113 paintings and sculpture pieces assembled in just 5 years by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation. These masterpieces will go on public display here for the first time on March 18 after the private presentation Saturday evening.

In a field where time is measured in centuries of great traditions, an upstart newcomer has achieved a first-rank position in the short span of a decade and a half.

LAUNCHED BY FORTUNES

The story behind this comes complete with some rather fabulous personalities and bizarre twists of fortune and, more important, fortunes.

There is, for instance, the story of the art dealer who rented a Washington apartment for the art treasures he hoped to sell the millionaire collector on the floor above. It ends with one of the biggest deals in the history of the art world.

Behind the gallery's great collection also lies the background of political, social, and economic events. These, in the end, govern the movements of great works of art.

There are many threads—dissolving European fortunes and royalty, wealthy Americans searching for masterpieces and immortality, wars, dictators, and shifting regimes.

Hitler traded off an Italian masterpiece now in the gallery in his craving for pure "German" art. Several other treasures came

there from the Hermitage Gallery in Leningrad, sold off by the Russians to help finance a 5-year plan in the early 1930's.

In just 15 years, the National Gallery has assembled for the American public one of the world's greatest art collections.

Not one of the 1,108 paintings and 327 pieces of sculpture in the permanent collection was bought with public funds. Private collectors gave these masterpieces and also contributed the more than 650 additional paintings on loan.

These private collectors are bankers, industrialists, and merchants who turned from amassing fortunes to amassing art with the same zeal and acumen they brought to their business.

The monument to this feat of art collecting is the long, low pink-marble building that sprawls 785 feet along Constitution Avenue from Fourth to Seventh Streets NW.

MEMORIAL TO MELLON

Thirty years ago even the idea had not shaped up in the mind of one of those private collectors. He was Andrew W. Mellon, the fabulous financier from Pittsburgh, who came to Washington to be Secretary of the Treasury under Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover.

Mr. Mellon built the $15 million marble palace to house the $50 million art collection that he gave the American public.

Mellon's art treasures became a magnet, as he had hoped, to "attract gifts from other citizens who may in the future desire to contribute works of art * * * to form a great national collection."

Even before the gallery opened March 17, 1941, Samuel H. Kress, merchant millionaire, followed through with a princely largesse of 375 paintings and 18 sculpture pieces. Chester Dale also contributed a fine group of paintings by American artists.

It was an impressive start. The National Gallery in London opened in 1824 with only 38 pictures.

Since then the gallery still has come a long way. The collection has doubled in quantity, with later benefactors filling gaps to round out the collections. In quality, the standards are those of the masters themselves. Visitors walk amid the beauty of Titians, Rembrandts, El Grecos, Raphaels, Gainsboroughs, Holbeins, Fragonards.

"If it hadn't happened when it did," David E. Finley, gallery Director, muses now, "it couldn't have happened at all. Without Mr. Mellon's gift to attract other gifts, the private collections would have gone elsewhere.

It was back in 1927 that Mr. Mellon first mentioned the idea of a national gallery to Finley, then his special assistant in the Treasury.

The financier then had been in Washington 6 years. He was a reticent, slight man, who walked back and forth every day to the Treasury from his apartment at 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, NW. There he often dined alone, happy in the silent company of a Romoney or Raeburn portrait.

Mr. Mellon soon came to the conclusion it was time for the seat of Government to have a gallery worthy of the Nation's Capital. He turned this over in his mind and often walked along the Mall, mulling over a site.

But it wasn't until Christmas, 1936, that the Pittsburgh financier wrote to President Franklin D. Roosevelt to offer his collection and a gallery to the Nation.

Mr. Mellon never lived to see it completed. He died in August, 1937, just 3 months after the building was started.

Less than 12 months before his death, Mr. Mellon bought in one fabulous acquisition of 26 paintings and 18 pieces of sculpture.

Finley went to New York to see Lord Duveen, the spectacular art dealer, with directions to bring back all things that might be worthy of the proposed national gallery. Finley came back with 30 paintings and 21 sculptures.

DUVEEN MOVES IN

Duveen rented an apartment underneath Mellon quarters. He gave the wealthy art collector the key to look at the pictures at his leisure to decide what to buy.

It took Mr. Mellon only a month. He bought 26 paintings and 18 pieces of sculpture. Among the latter was Giovanni Bologna's bronze Mercury, which now balances in the gallery's rotunda fountain.

Mr. Mellon once told Finley that he bought his first painting for $1,000. Others told Finley later that this was "considered by his friends in Pittsburgh an unaccountable aberration in a young man of such sound judgment in matters relating to business."

There is no record of their reaction when Mr. Mellon paid $1,166,000 for the Alba Madonna, now one of the prizes at the National Gallery.

Mr. Mellon's dream touched other private collectors.

Mr. Kress opened his apartment and priceless private collection to Finley and John Walker, the gallery's chief curator, for their pick of masterpieces for the gallery's opening. They went to New York and came back with 375 paintings, leaving only "nail holes in the walls."

Since then, the Kress family has remembered the gallery splendidly three other times before sending the 113 paintings and sculpture pieces for the 15th anniversary exhibit. Mr. and Mrs. Dale have sent from their home a great collection of paintings by 19th and 20th century French artists.

Another treasury came from the Widener family, the work of two generations of connoisseurs, Peter A. B. and his son, Joseph E. Also, Lessing Rosenwald has given a collection of rare and finely selected prints.

A genial man with great charm, Finley has presided over this treasury and made the gallery a cultural center of the Nation's Capital.

He organized free Sunday evening concerts in the garden courts during World War II. Under Richard Bales, conductor of the National Gallery Orchestra, the concerts have given American composers a sounding board for new compositions.

For the 24 million persons who have visited the gallery since its opening, Finley has made culture as comfortable and pleasant as possible. Soft sofas are spotted in the exhibit rooms.

Under Finley, who will retire in July, the National Gallery has grown from a half-empty museum to one whose exhibit rooms are filled with the greatest of masters of the Western World.

It has fulfilled the hope of its founder, as expressed by his son, Paul Mellon, at the gallery dedication, that "It would become not a static but a living institution, growing in usefulness and importance to artists, scholars and the general public."

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 1956

The Reverend Donald J. Davis, assistant rector, the Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art the holy governor of all nations and the healthful strengthener of every man, look upon and touch the lives of these our Senators. Grant that as servants of the people they may not be servile to the people, but in the myriad pressures of decision may affirm their integrity in every choice. Then of Thy mercy grant to each one a quiet mind, that having worked from the day into the night, their hours of sleep may be undisturbed.

Bless the families and loved ones of each Senator. And grant that the times in which they live may not rob them of the time they need to love, that the tensions of the nations may not bring torment into their homes.

Unto Thee, Almighty God, we therefore commit the Members of the Senate, knowing that Thou wilt be to them more than we or they can desire. For Thou art our God. And unto Thee be all glory and praise this day and forevermore. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Monday, March 12, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISIT BY PRIME MINISTER OF IRELAND, HON. JOHN A. COSTELLO

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to announce that on Thursday, March 15, 1956, at 2:30 o'clock p. m., the Prime Minister of Ireland, Hon. John A. Costello, will visit the Senate and will be requested to address the Senate.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

MEMBERSHIP OF DEMOCRATIC SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief announcement for the information of the Senate.

The majority leader has named the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to be chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to be vice chairman; the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] to be a member; the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] to be a member; the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] to be a member; the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] to be a member;

and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] to be a member.

Mr. President, it may be that we shall add 2 additional members at a later date, but at the present time the committee will be made up of 7 members under the chairmanship of the distinguished former Vice President [Mr. BARKLEY].

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation of 2 minutes on statements made during the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, MICHAUD FLATS PROJECT, IDAHO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, certifying, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands to be served by the Michaud Flats project under the change in development plan, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of either gravity or sprinkler irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Department of the Interior during the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the lower Tule River Irrigation District, California, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for the construction of the Success and Terminus Dams, on the Tule and Kaweah Rivers, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Porter Slough Ditch Co., Inc., county of Tulare, State of California, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds necessary for the construction of Success Dam, on the Tule River, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the board of supervisions, county of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the construction and improvement of the Federal highway system; to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTIONS OF FARGO (N. DAK.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two resolutions adopted by the chamber of commerce of Fargo, N. Dak., in support of the 90 percent quality wheat amendment and the pending sugar bill.

It is encouraging to note the interest and support of the chamber of commerce of the largest city in North Dakota for these important agricultural programs.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the national affairs committee of the Chamber of Commerce of Fargo has studied Senate bill 3183 and discussed its possible affect on agricultural economy in North Dakota and the Nation; and

Whereas the committee unanimously agrees with the concept of acreage reserve; and

Whereas the committee wholeheartedly supports the Young amendment to Senate bill 3183 providing for price supports of wheat based on quality classification; and

Whereas the committee realizing that the farmer is caught in a serious cost-price squeeze believes a workable price-support program is of absolute necessity at the present time, for the businessmen of North Dakota as well as the farmers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Fargo, N. Dak., do hereby respectfully urge that Senators LANGER and YOUNG and Representatives BURDICK and KRUEGER support Senate bill 3183, and do further urge that they support a workable price-support program.

T. VIC DEFOREST,
Executive Vice President.

Whereas the national affairs committee of the Chamber of Commerce of Fargo supports the legislation recently passed by the United States Senate, which provides that domestic producers shall receive at least 55 percent of the increased production allotments based on increased consumption; and

Whereas this legislation will provide increased income for North Dakota farmers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Fargo, N. Dak., do hereby commend Senators LANGER and YOUNG for their support of this legislation and do hereby respectfully urge the support of Representatives BURDICK and KRUEGER.

T. VIC DEFOREST,
Executive Vice President.

LOWER LABOR COST AND HIGHER PRICES OF FARM EQUIPMENT—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition signed by sundry citizens of the State of Illinois, praying for an investigation of the spread between lower per unit labor cost and higher prices of farm equipment.

There being no objection, the petition, without the signatures attached, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Honorable Senators PAUL H. DOUGLAS and WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas propagandists have blamed higher prices of farm equipment to high labor costs and thus tried to turn farmers against town and city workers; and

Whereas the per unit labor cost of making farm equipment is decreasing due to the increased productivity of farm equipment workers; and

Whereas in spite of lower per-unit costs, John Deere & Co. and other companies have steadily raised prices of farm equipment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the undersigned, respectfully urge that the Congress of the United States investigate the spread between lower per unit labor cost and higher prices of farm equipment:

(Signed by Kenneth C. Peterson and 72 other citizens of the State of Illinois.)

FEDERAL AID TO HIGHWAYS—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the American Society of Civil Engineers, Northwestern Section, St. Paul, Minn., signed by F. W. Thorstenson, president, together with the enclosed resolution, adopted by that organization, relating to a long-range Federal aid program for highway construction.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHWESTERN SECTION,
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS,
St. Paul, Minn., February 20, 1956.

Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
Senator from North Dakota,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Northwest Chapter of the American Society of Civil Engineers, representing 575 civil engineers in Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota, feels that establishment of a long-range Federal aid program for highway construction by this session of Congress is imperative. Since our membership are familiar with planning and execution of engineering works we also felt that you would like to have an expression of opinion from our organization.

Attached you will find a resolution passed at our regular meeting on February 6, 1956, in Minneapolis on the subject of a national highway program.

Very truly yours,
F. W. THORSTENSON,
President.

To Members of the Congress from Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota:

Whereas the President, the Congress, and the majority of the people of this Nation are agreed that the condition of our highways is inadequate and demands immediate attention in order to protect the lives of road users and to avoid further great economic losses; and

Whereas an adequate highway system is vital to the national defense; and

Whereas it is essential that early action be taken by the Congress, not only to permit the States to develop their plans and get the work underway, but also for the reason that delay will cause greatly increased expense in obtaining rights of way; and

Whereas the present highway construction level throughout the Nation clearly has

been proven insufficient in general for making significant reduction in the accumulated highway deficiencies; and

Whereas the Congress which is now resuming consideration of Federal highway legislation and is entitled to know what organizations such as ours, which are in a position to know the overall situation, do recommend as general policy in the matter: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Northwestern Section, American Society of Civil Engineers, having a membership of 575 civil engineers in Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota, at regular meeting in Minneapolis, Minn., on February 6, 1956:

1. That the Congress of the United States enact legislation for an expanded long-range highway program, covering a period between 10 and 15 years, including provisions for complete construction of the National System of Interstate Highways.

2. That, in determining the details of this program and its financing, the problem be weighed in terms of the broad public interest, without regard to partisanship or self-seeking special interests, but rather boldly and with the knowledge that a direct and far-seeing approach is vital if a fair and equitable solution is to be found in the interest of all.

3. That a definite program of financing be enacted to permit orderly advanced planning, preparation of necessary rights of way and construction.

4. That on determining the Federal highway program, special emphasis be given to the necessity of developing the National System of Interstate Highways to the highest engineering standards with full control of access to insure utmost transportation efficiency.

5. That in addition to the construction of the Interstate System, increased aid be provided for improvement of the primary systems of the States, which are so important to the economy of the country and so woefully inadequate; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be supplied to Members of the Congress from Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota; be it further

Resolved, That the officials and members of the Northwestern Section, American Society of Civil Engineers, be urged to further the purpose of this resolution by informing the people of the respective States represented by this organization of the importance of this legislation and its early enactment.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of American citizens of Estonian descent, held under the auspices of the Estonian National Committee in the United States, in New York City, N. Y., relating to the independence of the Republic of Estonia.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the occasion of the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of Estonia on February 24, 1918, we the Americans of Estonian descent and the Estonians residing in this country have gathered here in New York in order to pay tribute to this supreme achievement of the Estonian people, for which it had tenaciously struggled and fought for centuries.

The 38th Day of Estonian Independence is being commemorated at a time when the country itself, and its people are suffocating in the stranglehold of unprecedented Communist terrorism following the forcible occupation of the country by the Soviet Union in 1940, in violation of all existing international treaties.

At this anniversary of the Estonian independence, we are gravely concerned by the international developments of the past year and the strongly reemerged Soviet quest for world domination. The speech by Nikita Khrushchev at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and the resolutions the Congress itself cannot be bypassed as mere bragging, they do mean strongest determination to work doggedly toward the achievemenet of this ultimate goal.

The Estonians know, out of their own experience what the Soviet world domination would be like, if achieved. It certainly would not mean just some slight hegemony in the world, or just domination, but total extinction of the Western civilization and physical destruction of hundreds of millions of people, the living pillars of the free world.

We feel, therefore, dutybound to sound the warning to the peoples yet free, that the expansion of the ever-aggressive communism cannot be stemmed by just erecting defensive dams, or by patchwork. If once the balance of power in the world has become favorable to the Soviets, the free world and this country of freedom and human rights will be doomed.

It is, likewise, our deepest conviction, grown out of our experiences with the Soviet communism, that the self-defense of the free world against the Soviets cannot remain just passive, intended on their contention, but can be effective only, if it is actively and determinedly directed towards rolling back the Soviet power.

It's in the free world's awareness of the necessity to meet the Soviet quest for world domination actively, that we see hope for the liberation of the Estonians and the other East European captive peoples from the deadly grasp of Communist terrorism.

Our greatest trust lies in the generosity and enlightened self-interest of this free and powerful country, the United States of America.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 1871. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reimburse the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government mail matter," approved August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 614), and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1651); and

H. R. 5856. A bill to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year (Rept. No. 1659).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:

S. 1542. A bill to authorize an allowance for civilian officers and employees of the Government who are notaries public (Rept. No. 1652).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1161. A bill to abolish the Fossil Cycad National Monument, South Dakota, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1653);

H. R. 4680. A bill affirming that title to a certain tract of land in California vested in the State of California on January 21, 1897 (Rept. No. 1654); and

H. R. 6772. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain federally owned land under his jurisdiction to the school district No. 24 of Lake County, Oreg. (Rept. No. 1655).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 4391. A bill to abolish the Castle Pickney National Monument, in the State of South Carolina, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1656);

H. R. 5280. A bill to authorize land exchanges for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia; to authorize the transfer of certain lands of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia, to the Commonwealth of Virginia; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1657); and

H. R. 7097. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of oil and gas and mineral interests in a portion of the lands acquired for the Demopolis lock and dam project, to the former owners thereof, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1658).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. THYE, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. DUFF, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. FREAR, Mr. WELKER, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. FLANDERS):

S. 3429. A bill to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. AIKEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 3430. A bill to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 3431. A bill to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 3432. A bill for the relief of Gillian Allison Hackler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 3433. A bill to amend the Federal Highway Act to provide for the inclusion in the Federal-aid highway system of certain parkways, notwithstanding tolls are collected for use thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 3434. A bill for the relief of Hsin-Kuan Liu and Esther T. C. Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 3435. A bill for the relief of Jubencio Lucero, Sr., and his wife, Adela R. Lucero; and

S. 3436. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of,

disability pension awards; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3437. A bill for the relief of Mary K. Ryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3438. A bill for the relief of Joanne Lea (Buffington) Lybarger; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 3439. A bill to authorize and direct the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa, C. Z.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3440. A bill for the relief of Vincent Lee Lao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 3441. A bill to create a United States Department of Mineral Resources and to prescribe the functions thereof; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 3442. A bill to increase the authorization for an Air Force construction project; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 3443. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow attorneys' fees incurred in suits defending or perfecting title to real property to be deducted as expenses; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3444. A bill to provide for the establishment of Federal-State Land Study Commissions in the several States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

EXPRESSION OF FRIENDSHIP FOR THE PEOPLE OF ITALY

Mr. BUSH submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 71) which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas a history of friendship between the people of the United States and the people of Italy has long existed; and

Whereas the ties of ancestry and of a common heritage have united many of the people of the United States with many of the people of Italy; and

Whereas these bonds of friendship and ties of ancestry and heritage caused the people of the United States to demand the liberation and rehabilitation of Italy during and subsequent to World War II despite the fact that the people of Italy had involuntarily been drawn into the conflict; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has pursued a continuing policy of aid and friendship to the people of Italy, through such means as assisting Italy to become a member of the United Nations, and to participate in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

Whereas this policy of friendship of the United States for the people of Italy has been opposed strenuously by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its agencies; and

Whereas the policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, with respect to Italy, if successful, would reduce Italy to a state of vassalage comparable to that to which the once free people of Poland have been reduced; and

Whereas the Italian people should support those democratic elements in Italy which place the interests of Italy above those of any other country; and

Whereas the Italian people should, behind such leadership, press for the legal dissolution of all political elements in Italy whose true interests are not the interests of Italy but rather the interests of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the hope of Congress and of the people of the United States that the common cultural, political, economic, and military bonds which have united the American people and the Italian people and which have resulted in a deep and abiding friendship between them will continue to sustain the people of Italy in their determination to continue to adhere to the principles of freedom and democracy and to take all action necessary to stand with all the democratic nations of the free world in the common struggle against world communism which is seeking the enslavement of all the people of the world, including those of Italy; and further it is the sense of Congress that, in order to assist in exposing to the people of Italy the fact that the true aims and purposes of the Communists in Italy are to lead the people of Italy into the same kind of enslavement as the people of Poland and the Iron Curtain countries have been led into, all possible moral and material aid and assistance should be given to the people of Italy in their struggle to remain a free and democratic nation by the people of the United States and of the rest of the free world, acting as private persons and acting through their governments.

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was submitted and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and other Senators):

S. Res. 229. Resolution favoring self rule by the people of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

SIMPLIFICATION OF CREDIT FACILITIES AVAILABLE TO FARMERS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and my colleague, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes. I wish to make it clear I have not had an opportunity to contact all the Members of the Senate who might wish to cooperate in cosponsoring and in enacting the proposed legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with the explanatory statement accompanying it, may be printed in the RECORD. If other Members of the Senate desire to join in cosponsorship, I shall be glad to reintroduce it or take care of it in some other way, because I am sorry I have not had time to see all the Members who I feel would like to cooperate in connection with this proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3429) to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) The following sections of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, are further amended as follows:

Section 1 (a) is amended by striking from the second sentence thereof the words "to assist borrowers under this title in making the" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "or insured for" and by striking the word "their" preceding the words "farming operations."

(b) Section 1 (b) is amended by inserting after the word "only" in the first sentence of the words "farm owners", by striking the words "(including owners of inadequate or underimproved farm units)" and by inserting in lieu of the words "the major portion" the words "a substantial portion."

(c) Section 1 (c) is amended to read as follows:

"No loan shall be made, or mortgage insured, unless the farm is a family-type unit of such size as the Secretary determines to be sufficient to enable the family to carry on successful farming of a type which the Secretary deems can be carried on successfully in the locality in which the farm is situated: *Provided, however*, That (1) loans may be made to veterans or mortgages insured for veterans, as defined in section 1 (b) (2) hereof, who have pensionable disabilities, with respect to farm units of sufficient size to meet the farming capabilities of such veterans and afford them income which, together with their pensions, will enable them to meet living and operating expenses and the amounts to become due on their loans; and

"(2) loans may be made or mortgages insured to owner-operators who live on units which are less than family-type units, to repair or improve such farm units and to refinance indebtedness against such farm units if such farms are of sufficient size to produce income which, together with income from other sources, will enable them to meet living and operating expenses and the amounts to become due on their loans."

(d) Section 2 (b) is amended by striking from the first sentence thereof the word "the" preceding the word "rates" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "reasonable" and by striking the words "(but not exceeding the rate of 5 percent per annum)." The second sentence of said subsection is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting a comma and the following "except that, for loans under either part of the proviso in section 1 (c) of this title, the certification shall be based on the normal market value of the farm."

(e) Section 3 (a) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3 (a). Loans made under this title shall not be in excess of the amount certified by the county committee to be the value of the farm less any prior lien indebtedness,

and shall be secured by a first or second mortgage or deed of trust on the farm."

(f) Section 12 (b) is amended by striking the figures "$100,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$125,000,000."

(g) Section 12 (c) is amended by striking item (5) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a new item (5) reading as follows:

"(5) Loans insured under this section shall not be in excess of the amount certified by the county committee to be the fair and reasonable value of the farm."

(h) Section 12 (e) is amended by striking from the last sentence of item (2) the words "to carry out the provisions of this title, relating to mortgage insurance" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "of the Farmers' Home Administration and may be transferred annually to that administrative expense account and become merged therewith."

(i) Section 16 (a) is amended by inserting in the first sentence thereof before the word "mortgages" the words "or second" and by adding the following sentence at the end of said subsection: "Loans insured under this section shall not be in excess of the amount certified by the county committee to be the value of the farm, less any prior lien indebtedness."

(j) The following new section 17 is added:

"SEC. 17. Until June 30, 1959, the purposes for which loans may be made or insured under this title shall include the advance of funds for refinancing secured or unsecured indebtedness of eligible farmers who are presently unable to meet the terms and conditions of their outstanding indebtedness and are unable to refinance such debts with commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or other responsible credit sources at rates and terms which they could reasonably be expected to fulfill. The total amount of loans insured in any 1 fiscal year under this section shall not exceed $50 million."

SEC. 2. Title II, of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is further amended by striking the words "Production and Subsistence Loans" in the title and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Operating Loans," and by the amendment of section 21 to read as follows:

"SEC. 21. (a) The Secretary may make loans to farmers and stockmen who are operators of family-type farms and who are citizens of the United States for the purchase of livestock, seed, feed, fertilizer, farm equipment, supplies, and other farm needs, the cost of reorganizing the farming enterprise or changing farming practices to accomplish more diversified or more profitable farming operations, the refinancing of existing indebtedness, and for family subsistence: *Provided, however,* That loans may be made to operators of less than family-type units if the farm unit is of sufficient size to produce income which, together with the income from other sources, including pensions in the case of disabled veterans, will enable them to meet living and operating expenses and the amounts due on their loans.

"(b) No loan shall be made under this section for the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program. No loan may be made to any 1 borrower under this section which would cause the total principal amount outstanding to exceed $10,000: *Provided, however,* That an amount not to exceed 10 percent of the sum made available by annual appropriation for loans under this title may be used for making loans to borrowers which would cause such indebtedness to exceed $10,000 but in no event may any loan be made which would cause such indebtedness to exceed $20,000.

"(c) The terms of loans under this section, including any renewal or extension of any such loan except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, shall not exceed 7 years from the date the original loan was made.

"(d) No person who has failed to liquidate his indebtedness under this section for 7 consecutive years shall be eligible for loans hereunder: *Provided, however,* That in justifiable cases where the Secretary finds that the inability of a borrower to repay his indebtedness under this section within 7 years is due to causes beyond the control of the borrower, the Secretary may extend or renew such loans to be repayable in not to exceed 10 years from the date the original loan was made, and during such extended term may make additional loans to such persons, if necessary."

SEC. 3. Except insofar as they affect title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, the following sections of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, are further amended as follows:

(a) Section 41 (g) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Compromise, adjust, or reduce claims and adjust and modify the terms of mortgages, leases, contracts, and agreements entered into or administered by the Farmers' Home Administration under any of its programs, as circumstances may require: *Provided, however,* That (1) compromise, adjustment or reduction of claims shall be based on a reasonable determination by the Secretary of the debtor's ability to pay and the value of the security and with or without the payment of any consideration at the time of such adjustment or reduction.

"(2) Releases from personal liability may also be made with or without the payment of any consideration at the time of adjustment of claims against

"(A) Borrowers who have transferred the security property to other approved applicants under agreements assuming the outstanding secured indebtedness; and

"(B) Borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants under agreements assuming that portion of their outstanding indebtedness against the farm which is equal to the value of the farm at the time of the transfer, and borrowers whose farms have been acquired by the Secretary, in cases where the county committees certify and the Secretary determines that the borrowers have cooperated in good faith with the Secretary, have farmed in a workmanlike manner, used due diligence to maintain the security against loss, and otherwise fulfilled the covenants incident to their loans, to the best of their abilities.

"(3) No compromise, adjustment, or reduction of claims shall be made upon terms more favorable than recommended by the appropriate county committee established pursuant to section 42 of this act.

"(4) Any claim which has been due and payable for 5 years or more, and where the debtor has no assets from which the claim could be collected and has no apparent future debt payment ability, or is deceased and has left no estate, or has been absent from his last known address for a period of at least 5 years, has no known assets, and his whereabouts cannot be ascertained without undue expense, may be charged off or released by the Secretary upon a report and favorable recommendation of the employee of the Administration having charge of the claim: *Provided, however,* That claims involving a principal balance of $150 or less may be charged off or released whenever it appears to the Secretary that further collection efforts would be ineffectual or likely to prove uneconomical."

(b) The first sentence of section 42 (a) is amended by inserting after the word "county" in each of three places the words "or area."

(c) Section 43 (d) is amended by striking the words "as family-size farms."

(d) Section 44 (a) (3) is amended by striking the word "the" as it appears before the word "rates" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "reasonable" and by striking the words "(but not exceeding the rate of 5 percent per annum)," and section 44 (c) is amended by inserting before the word "rates" the word "reasonable" and by striking the words "(but not exceeding the rate of 5 percent per annum)."

(e) Section 51 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 51. The Secretary is authorized and empowered to make advances to preserve and protect the security for, or the lien or priority of the lien securing, any loan or other indebtedness owing to, insured by or acquired by the Secretary under any programs administered by the Farmers' Home Administration; to bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or other sale or otherwise acquire property pledged, mortgaged, conveyed, attached, or levied upon to secure the payment of any such indebtedness; to accept title to any property so purchased or acquired; to operate for a period not in excess of 1 year from the date of acquisition, or lease such property for such period as may be deemed necessary to protect the investment therein; to sell or grant rights-of-way or easements over such property; and to sell or otherwise dispose of such property in a manner consistent with the provisions of section 43 of this act. Any advances or expenditures under this section with respect to any insured loan or insured mortgage shall be paid out of the mortgage insurance fund."

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. AIKEN is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF A BILL TO IMPROVE AND SIMPLIFY CREDIT FACILITIES TO FARMERS TO AMEND THE BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section 1 (a) of the bill will amend the last sentence of section 1 (a) of the existing law so that loans for improvements, including housing and other farm buildings, may be made to all eligible applicants rather than to only existing borrowers under title I of the act, as this section is now limited. This latter change will also make this section consistent with the proposed changes in the second part of the proviso of Section 1 (c).

Section 1 (b) of the existing act will be amended so as to be consistent with the proposed changes in 1 (a) by including the present owners of farms among those eligible for assistance under this title and by requiring that the applicant have received a substantial portion of his income from farming instead of the major portion as now required.

The changes proposed in section 1 (c) will provide authority to make loans for repair and improvement on those farms which are less than family-type units which constitute the residence of the owner-operator, if income from outside sources, plus income from the farm, will warrant the making of such loans.

Section 2 (b) will replace the existing eligibility requirement that an applicant be unable to secure credit at rates not exceeding 5 percent per annum prevailing in the community with a requirement that he be unable to secure such loans at such reasonable rates and terms prevailing in the community. The other changes in this section, with respect to loans made under the proviso of section 1 (c), will establish as the maximum amount of such a loan the fair and reasonable value based on normal market value of the farms constituting less than family-type units. Loans on family-type farms would continue to be based on the earning capacity of the farm. For a unit that is less than a full-time farming operation, factors other than the earning capacity of the farm generally influence its value; therefore, a normal market value determination provides a better basis for appraising such a farm.

The changes which will be made in the first sentence of section 3 (a) are necessary

to correlate this section with the proposed additional authority. It is also proposed to amend this section by eliminating the second sentence which requires that no loan shall be made in excess of the average value of the efficient family-type farm units in the county. Loans will still be limited to farms that are not larger than family-size units and to an amount not exceeding the value certified by the county committee under section 2 (b).

Section 1 (f) of the bill will amend section 12 (b) of the act to increase from $100 million to $125 million the aggregate amount of mortgages or loans which may be insured under title I in any 1 fiscal year. This change is in anticipation of an increased volume of loans under the additional proposed authority.

The change proposed in section 1 (g) of the bill will eliminate the present limitation of insured loans to those not exceeding 90 percent of the fair and reasonable value of farms. The 90 percent limitation has operated to prevent assistance by means of insured loans to many applicants, otherwise eligible, who are unable to provide the balance of the cost of the farm and its improvements. Experience with direct loans has demonstrated that sound loans can be made up to 100 percent of the fair and reasonable value of the farm. The proposed language of the new section 12 (c) (5) will also make this provision consistent with the changes made in section 2 (b) relating to the determination of fair and reasonable value of less than family-size units.

Section 1 (h) would modify section 12 (e) (2) in order to avoid the insertion of legislative language in the appropriation acts authorizing the use of one-half of 1 percent of insurance charges for any administrative expenses of the Farmers Home Administration. As the act is now worded, funds so collected could be used only in connection with the provisions of the act relating to mortgage insurance. Without the modifications contained in appropriation acts in the past, it would have been necessay for each employee to keep track of the amount of his time spent on the mortgage insurance work so that it could be charged against this sum.

Section 1 (i) will amend section 16 (a) so as to add authority to insure loans which will be subordinate to an outstanding first lien. Second mortgages running to the Government for the benefit of the mortgage insurance fund would be taken in connection with such loans. An additional sentence is also proposed so that loans insured under section 16 (a) will be controlled by limits comparable to second mortgage direct loans as provided in the proposed section 3 (a).

Section 1 (j) will add a new section 17 which will provide the Secretary with temporary authority during the next 3 fiscal years to make and insure loans solely for refinancing existing indebtedness of farmers who qualify for assistance under the amended act. The total of such refinancing loans insured in any fiscal year would be limited to $50 million.

Section 2 of the bill will amend the title of title II of the act from "Production and Subsistence Loans" to "Operating Loans." The new title is believed to be more descriptive and more understandable.

The proposed new section 21 (a) involves the following changes:

1. Loans will be authorized to operators of family-type farms, and to operators of less than family-type farms whose farms are of sufficient size to produce income which, with income from other sources, will enable the operators to pay necessary operating costs and the amounts which will become due on their loans. This change is proposed to permit the correlation of the operating loan program with other efforts being made to assist low-income farmers and to provide credit in designated rural development areas.

2. Section 21 (b) will be amended to substitute a $10,000 limitation on the total outstanding principal indebtedness of a borrower under this section for the present $7,000 restriction on an initial operating loan to a borrower. In adddition, a sum not to exceed 10 percent of the annual appropriation for loans under this section may be used for larger loans which would not exceed a total principal indebtedness at any one time of $20,000.

3. The maximum term of loans, including renewals or extensions, would be changed by section 21 (c) from 7 years to 10 years.

4. The following change will be made in the continuous indebtedness limitation of section 21 (d), which makes a borrower under this section ineligible for further loans unless he has liquidated his indebtedness within 7 years. In justifiable cases due to causes beyond the borrower's control, the loan could be renewed or extended for a total period of not longer than 10 years from the date it was made, and additional loans could be made during the extended period. Section 21 (d) also will eliminate the present requirement that debts incurred prior to November 1, 1946, must be included in the determination as to whether the borrower has liquidated his indebtedness under this section on and after November 1, 1953. Some persons who are still farming and who need further credit assistance have never been able to fully pay their indebtedness under the Resettlement and Farm Security Administration programs. The present language is ambiguous with respect to whether such persons have fully liquidated their indebtedness if such debts have been settled without payment of the entire principal and interest either before or after November 1, 1953.

Section 3 of the bill contains amendments to the authority of the Secretary with respect to making and servicing loans under titles I and II, including compromise powers, use of county committees, sale of surplus acquired security property, availability of other credit at 5 percent interest, and the authority to deal with security property.

1. Section 3 (a) will amend section 41 (g) of the act by extending the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, and reduce claims and modify the terms of contracts to those entered into or by the Farmers' Home Administration under any of its programs. While most of the claims administered by this Agency are covered by the present language, claims arising under the Water Facilities Act, the Wheeler-Case Act, the flood and windstorm appropriations, and the emergency-loan provisions are not subject to the same administrative settlement authorities applicable to claims under this act.

The proposed change in section 41 (g) (1) will remove the $10,000 limit on claims that may be settled by the Secretary. This proposed change would expedite the settlement of claims in excess of $10,000, and provide a uniform basis for settling all claims arising out of transactions under any program administered by the Farmers' Home Administration. The factors affecting the settlement of larger claims are not sufficiently different from those of smaller claims to justify special treatment.

The provisions of section 41 (g) (2) do not permit the reletse from personal liability of those operating loan borrowers who transfer or convey their security property in satisfaction of their indebtedness to the Secretary. Under the revised language, releases of personal liability may be made to such borrowers. The changes in section 41 (g) (2) (B) are for the purpose of extending the provisions of that subsection to insured mortgage loans and to less than family-size farm units.

Section 3 (a) will also extend the Secretary's authority for cancellation and release of claims regardless of amount under certain restricted conditions. At present, claims of $100 or less may be canceled if those conditions exist. Under Public Law 518, the Secretary has concurrent authority to cancel these and certain similar debts not exceeding $1,000 principal balance. With the removal of the monetary limitation on the cancellation of debts where the debtor has no assets or apparent debt-paying ability, where the borrower is deceased and has left no estate, or where he has been absent from his last known address, is without known assets, and his whereabouts cannot be ascertained without undue expense, the bill will permit such action only after 5 years instead of the present 2- or 3-year limitations. It is also proposed that claims of $150 or less may be canceled if further collection efforts would be ineffectual or uneconomical. This change from $10 to $150 is prompted by comparison with the costs of litigation on such claims.

2. Section 3 (b) of the bill will permit the establishment of county committees for areas not necessarily limited to county boundaries. Topography and means of communication between county seats and parts of some counties make it expensive and extremely difficult to limit uniformly the jurisdiction of the county committee exactly to county boundaries.

3. Section 3 (c) of the bill will strike the words "as family-size farm" from section 43 (d) in order to authorize the Secretary to sell and acquire farm units of less than family-type to persons who would be eligible for the less than the family-type farm loans proposed under section 1 on terms consistent with the modified loan authority.

4. Section 3 (d) of the bill will substitute reasonable rates prevailing in the community for the present limitation of rates not exceeding 5 percent per annum as a guide to determining whether credit from private or cooperative sources is available to the applicant at the time the loan is made or at the time the borrower should refinance his indebtedness to the Secretary by means of such other credit.

5. Section 1 (c) of the act will amend section 51 to permit the Secretary to service mortgages taken in connection with insured loans in the same manner as he is now authorized to service security for direct loans and will extend the authority to preserve and protect the security, bid at foreclosure or other sale, and the other provisions of this section to property involved in loans under any of the acts administered by the Farmers Home Administration. This section of the act now applies to all of the acts administered by the Farmers' Home Administration except the credit sales accounts on water conservation and utilization projects transferred to the agency by the Soil Conservation Service and property which might be acquired under the special emergency loans pursuant to Public Law 727.

Some difficulty has been encountered by the lack of authority to grant easements of rights-of-way for roads and utilities while the security property is in the possession of the Government. The amended section will provide that authority.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Alabama may proceed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare

by creating a National Library of Medicine.

Mr. President, we introduce this bill at the urgent behest of dedicated men and women identified with the medical sciences whose major objective in life is to contribute to improving the health of their fellow men. These are men and women who know whereof they speak, Mr. President, and many of them believe that the passage of this legislation is a most important and urgent step in the health field which can be taken by this session of the Congress.

That is strong language to accompany the introduction of a bill, which has as its sole and undramatic objective, the establishing of a National Library of Medicine decently housed, efficiently staffed, properly located, and adequately financed. Those phrases may seem so now, Mr. President, but they will seem like great understatements when we realize that the enactment of this legislation will correct a situation of which the Congress and our people are generally unaware but which, so long as it continues, can at any moment result in the destruction of the greatest collection of medical literature in the entire world. I refer to what is now called the Armed Forces Medical Library.

Mr. President, the disaster to which I referred can happen at any moment. Continued neglect can rob us and the world of this treasure. And once destroyed, not all the gold in Fort Knox could recreate it. Should the library of medicine be destroyed, we would lose the ideas, the wisdom, the knowledge, the experience, the thoughtful analysis, the idea-provoking, solution-inspiring collection of different ways of thinking about man's health and well-being that our men of medicine now have at their service. These books and charts and manuscripts of incalculable value are now housed—if indeed that word can be used—some of them in a warehouse in Cleveland and some in a building constructed in 1837 just a few blocks from here, which was condemned 30 years ago as inadequate for library services and which is so antiquated that its iron columns have actually buckled. I have been informed that, unless we in the Congress act promptly and insist that construction of a building fit to house this collection of over 650,000 bound volumes gets under way immediately, a large number of these volumes, in a matter of months, will have to be moved to a highly flammable, temporary barracks which is in danger of falling apart in the next high wind.

WHOSE FAULT?

Mr. President, Members of the Congress, quite understandably, will want to know who is at fault if, having acquired a priceless treasure of medical literature, we have housed it so poorly that, not only can it not function as it should, but its contents are actually in danger.

I should like to answer that question clearly and unequivocally. The blame does not lie with any particular agency or on any specific person. Certainly it is not the fault of the Congress. This Congress authorized the expenditure of $350,000 to be used to draw up plans for a proper building to house the Armed Forces Medical Library, and in so doing we committed ourselves to appropriating the necessary funds for its erection. This Congress recognized its responsibilities in this respect and so, too, did earlier Congresses. In 1919, in 1938, and in 1941, the Congress took similar actions designed to properly house this great library.

Nor is it the fault of those most immediately responsible for its operation. Certainly Colonel Rogers, who serves as its librarian and who has done a magnificent job of administering it under the most trying circumstances, is not at fault. He has spent years working day and night in the attempt to secure a proper home for the institution to which he is devoted. The same can also be said of the Surgeons General of the Army, the Navy and the Air Force. They, too, are fully aware of the value of the library and of the urgent need to house it properly.

Is it then the fault of the Secretary of Defense, who, last December, decided not to ask for the apportionment of the $350,000 the Congress had authorized, and who decided not to include funds for the construction of the library in his 1957 budget? I do not believe so. Neither he, nor his predecessors, should ever have been called upon to make such decisions. The Secretary of Defense should not be required to turn his attention from critical questions of the gravest military import in order to consider how best to house, maintain and operate what is, in fact, a national library of medicine, regardless of the importance of that library to our medical progress.

The fault, if there is fault in this situation, is a fault of history. The situation with which we are now confronted came about simply because that which started out as the small library of the Surgeon General of the Army 120 years ago has become, through a combination of accident and the devotion, imaginative brilliance and tenacity of a handful of men, a truly national institution. The present situation finds the library without any proper legislative authorization and as part of the Military Establishment, where it does not belong, and within which it cannot hope to compete for the funds it must have.

THE ARMED FORCES MEDICAL LIBRARY

The Armed Forces Medical Library is 1 of 3 large research libraries operated by the Federal Government. Originally organized in 1836 by Surgeon General Lovell, as the Surgeon General's Library, and later known as the Army Medical Library, it was given its present title in 1952. Initially almost unknown, it became a truly great institution during the librarianship of Col. John Shaw Billings, which began in 1865 and lasted 30 years. It was during Colonel Billings' tenure, in 1887, that it was installed in the building where it is still housed.

Today this library holds over 650,000 bound volumes, containing well over a million titles. It currently receives over 5,000 medical periodicals. It has been adding to its collection over 25,000 volumes a year. For over 75 years now, the Library of Congress and the Library of the Department of Agriculture have relinquished to it the primary responsibility for developing a collection of medical books and periodicals. It is now one of the largest research libraries in a special discipline in the entire world.

FUNCTION AND VALUE OF THE LIBRARY

The Armed Forces Medical Library, as I have said, contains a priceless and irreplaceable collection of literature and of periodicals drawn from all the world. But the Library is not at all a place where these items are entombed for the benefit of antiquarians. Far from it. This medical library is a living, vibrantly functioning institution, serving members of the health professions daily and in a myriad of ways. It serves and, of course, will always continue to serve, members of the Medical Corps of each of our armed services. It keeps them abreast of medical literature. It keeps them informed of new developments and discoveries. It advises them of health conditions in, and the precautions needed for, any of the farflung parts of the world to which the services may be called.

Far more important than the role it plays in our Armed Forces, however, is the function it serves in civilian life. Since the Congress authorized it so to do in 1892, and again in 1901, the Library has served the needs of civilians in all of the health professions. Today the value of the service it renders physicians, dentists, and hospital administrators, public-health physicians, educators and sanitarians, research workers in every field pertaining to health, is vastly more important and of far greater value than that which it renders to the armed services.

And how valuable is that service? Years ago the great Sir William Osler answered that question when he said of this same Library—

> For the teacher and the worker a great library such as this is indispensable. They must know the world's best work and know it at once. They mint and make current coin the ore so widely scattered in journals, transactions, and monographs.

Later, one of my own father's great teachers, Dr. William H. Welch, of Johns Hopkins fame, declared that this same Library and its publications constituted America's greatest contribution to the entire world of medicine. Our own Hoover Commission's task force on Federal medical services stated that—

> Today the largest and most important medical library in the world is the Armed Forces Medical Library. No other medical agency of the Federal Government serves the future of medical research so intimately and so widely as does this unequaled collection of books, journals, and bibliographic services.

To this library, material of clinical importance flows in from nearly every country in the world. German publications, French periodicals, English, Icelandic, Turkish, Russian, Chinese, Hungarian, Portuguese, Dutch, Swedish, and Spanish monographs and journals, just to name a few, all make their contribution to the library's collection. Over 10,000 serial titles are regularly recorded. Each year it acquires 15,000 monographs and 100,000 journal pieces, the housing of

which requires over half a mile of linear shelf footage. Each year its interlibrary loan service places 133,000 volumes in the hands of medical research workers throughout this country. Over 1,000 reference questions are answered by the library staff each month, in the course of which many long medical bibliographies are prepared. The library is carefully cataloging all of its acquisitions, and issues each year a printed record of this work for all to see and use. The library publishes a monthly index to the current periodical literature of medicine in which over 100,000 articles a year are listed by author and subject. Interlibrary loans, bibliographical, and photoduplication services make it possible for the doctor, civilian or military, to have at his beck and call all of the library's resources. It is difficult to exaggerate the important influence this library has had on the advances in the medical sciences throughout the world. It is impossible to gage its value in dollars.

TRANSFER FROM ARMED FORCES

Members of Congress will agree with me as to the importance of properly housing and adequately supporting the administration of this great institution. Some may ask, "Why not do that without removing the library from the Department of Defense?"

Perhaps the best answer to that lies in the fact that the Congress on several occasions has attempted to do just that, but it has never worked. As I have explained above, only last year we authorized the Department of Defense to get on with the task of properly housing this magnificent operation, but the Secretary of Defense has decided not to use that authority.

More important, however, is the fact that the library is truly a national library of medicine in fact, and as such it does not belong in the Department of Defense at all. As a part of the Military Establishment, it is unable to command from top officials of the Department the attention and thought it deserves. Their responsibilities in other fields are far too heavy to permit it. Moreover, to permit the library to remain in Defense means a continuation of constant difficulty with the Bureau of the Budget, which has for years found it difficult to understand why military appropriations should be spent to operate a national library of medicine. This difficulty has been compounded by the further fact that the librarian of the Armed Forces Medical Library has no direct contact with the Bureau of the Budget. Such matters are handled by the Adjutant General's Office, and Senators can well understand what little time and inclination that Office has had to spend on problems of medical librarianship. Search as you will, you'll find no provision for financing the library in the Armed Forces budgets. Its expenses are buried in some 18 different categories. This is true, because the Department of Defense has no legal authorization to operate a national institution primarily for civilian purposes.

I think it is clear, Mr. President, that this library cannot be expected to properly discharge its mission so long as it remains part of the Military Establishment. While it is true that its resources are used by military medical personnel in the conduct of day-to-day military programs throughout the world, the fact remains that this constitutes but a small part of the library's activities. Its major and predominant function lies in the service it provides civilian medical science. Moreover, if it is properly housed and adequately financed, as it cannot hope to be so long as it must compete for a share of the armed services dollar, then it will be far more able to better serve our military medical personnel.

Those, Mr. President, are the reasons why, in the interest both of military and civilian medicine, I believe the library should become The National Library of Medicine. Other and quite cogent and compelling reasons have been set forth in the Hoover Commission's Task Force Report to which I alluded earlier. I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that an excerpt from the report be set forth at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM REPORT ON FEDERAL MEDICAL SERVICES

(Prepared for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government by the Task Force on Federal Medical Services, February 1955)

Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, Task Force on Federal Medical Services: Chauncey McCormick, chairman; Edwin L. Crosby, M. D., assistant chairman; Francis J. Braceland, M. D., Otto W. Brandhorst, D. D. S., Edward D. Churchill, M. D., Michael DeBakey, M. D., Evarts A. Graham, M. D., Alan Gregg, M. D., Paul R. Hawley, M. D., Theodore G. Klumpp, M. D., Hugh R. Leavell, M. D., Basil C. MacLean, M. D., Walter B. Martin, M. D., James Roscoe Miller, M. D., Dwight L. Wilbur, M. D., Milton C. Winternitz, M. D., members; James P. Dixon, M. D., staff director; John T. Kelly, assistant staff director; Margaret D. West, study coordinator.

A NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

One of the cardinal necessities of competent health research is access to books, monographs, and journals in medical and related fields. Unless workers have access to such materials, research and the dissemination of scientific information are seriously handicapped and research grants are wastefully spent.

Today the largest and most important medical library in the world is the Armed Forces Medical Library. No other medical agency of the Federal Government serves the future of medical research so intimately and so widely as does this unequalled collection of books, journals, and bibliographic services. Originally organized for military use in 1836, this library has become a great national research institution far surpassing the nature, size, and level of activities required by the Armed Forces. It is in fact the National Library of Medicine of the United States.

While every credit should be given to the Surgeons General of the Army who, in the past, created and maintained the library, today neither its name nor its placement in the Department of Defense suggests the degree to which it serves the needs of national medical research and teaching. The character of this library has changed with the passage of time. It has gained in value, importance, and potential usefulness.

There is no clear statutory authority for the functions which it now serves. The library is ineffectively placed in point of administration, inadequately housed, and too poorly supported to permit effective conduct of its pertinent functions.

For over 30 years the library has needed a new building. It now requires an annual increase of a mile of shelf space. Its collections are constantly threatened by loss from fire and have undergone actual damage through exposure to weather and improper storage.

Continued financial support is a problem. No newly created library could even hope to duplicate the present matchless collections. But the cost of maintaining them is not a fair or defensible charge on any one or all of the Military Establishments. As it is presently situated the financial need of the library competes in peacetime with the needs of the military to maintain the skeleton of an effective fighting force. In time of war it becomes naive to expect the preoccupation of the military to include the proper maintenance and continuing development of a National Library of Medicine.

The needs of a National Library of Medicine are neither in theory nor practice familiar to, or a natural concern of, the Department of Defense. What is needed to enable the library to function properly as a truly national institution is legal status with an administrative organization appropriate to a National Library of Medicine, an effective building and an adequate budget. Its present irrational administrative status has created a history of friction and misunderstandings regarding its work. Hospital buildings, scientific instruments, or medical stores deteriorate with the passage of time; books and journals if well housed do not deteriorate; indeed they become more valuable. In the light of the sums now spent by the Federal Government on medical services and research, it would be folly to ignore the means of spreading as well as accumulating and safely storing the facts already known and those awaiting discovery.

Mr. HILL. The task force report, Mr. President, went on to suggest that the national library of medicine might be set up as an all but autonomous division of the Smithsonian Institution as is the National Gallery of Art. While I am in complete agreement with the report up to that point, I must say here that the bill which Senator KENNEDY and I have introduced does not accept that suggestion. The Bureau of the Budget has said:

> There would seem to be serious question as to the advisability of placing a specialized activity such as this library within the Smithsonian Institution.

I agree. I do so especially since many men of eminence in the fields of medicine, dentistry, hospitalization, public health and research have written me to say that, while they might not as yet be in complete agreement as to whether this library should be an independent entity or a unit in some governmental agency or other, they are unanimous in their belief that, if it is to be placed in an existing department, it must be so placed that it will be in a climate of medical opinion where the primary concern of those in charge is the physical and mental health of the Nation.

I would like to add just one more reason why I believe this national library of medicine should be placed elsewhere than in the Department of Defense.

As you know, I am chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which has jurisdiction over most substantive legislation in the field of

health. I am also chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Health, Education, and Welfare. In both capacities I have, over the years, been impressed by the fact that whenever our Government has given recognition to the importance of a particular need or endeavor in the field of health, the lay public, individual philanthropists and foundations have hastened to give additional momentum to such projects through financial contributions. Our American people are eager to support worthwhile endeavors aimed at benefiting mankind. They regard Federal support of any such endeavor as a seal of approval—as an action which warrants their joining in the endeavor. That is why, Mr. President, the American people now contribute five, six, and even ten dollars for each Federal dollar spent in the attempt to find the cause, prevention and cure of killing and crippling diseases.

That is what I hope and expect will happen with respect to the national library of medicine which would be created by this bill. I believe that foundations, professional groups and individual citizens will contribute to its support and enhancement. They will—if it is a national library of medicine. They will not, so long as the Nation's library of medicine remains lost and hidden in the Department of Defense.

NEED FOR PROMPT ACTION

Mr. President, almost 2 years ago, in June of 1954, the American Medical Association advised each of us that its house of delegates had found that—

> The irreplaceable collections of the Armed Forces Medical Library are now housed in a 67-year-old building totally unsuitable for the purpose by reason of its inadequate size, poor state of repair, susceptibility to fire hazard, and general inadaptability to efficient operations; and the Armed Forces Medical Library serves not only all Government departments but also the entire medical profession of the United States, and without its help much of the research and clinical work now being carried on by our profession would be impracticable.

They therefore resolved—

> That the house of delegates of the American Medical Association in convention assembled reiterate its belief that a new building for the Armed Forces Medical Library is of paramount importance to the best interests of American medicine and health of our country, and calls on the appropriate agencies of our Government to give immediate priority to this most important project.

The American Medical Association took that position with the understanding that the Department of Defense was prepared to go ahead with the construction of a proper building for the library if the Congress would authorize it to do so and appropriate the necessary funds. They so memorialized the Congress.

Mr. President, the situation as regards a proper building remains the same; the need for it is just as great; the danger to the library and its contents is more imminent; the cost of building such a library has gone up. This is true despite the fact that the Congress listened and agreed with the strongly worded representation made to it by America's doctors. We authorized the project. We authorized the expenditure. The Department of Defense changed its mind, and the project remains a dream—its noncompletion a nightmare to men of science.

The time for action on this project was 36 years ago when the Congress first authorized it. It would have been woefully belated had it been carried out in 1938 or in 1941 or in 1955 when again and again the Congress authorized its construction. Let us see to it that the expressed will of the Congress is carried out and that this treasure is properly housed before it is too late.

The American Medical Association believes it urgent. So, too, does the American Dental Association, the American Hospital Association, our Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, the American College of Surgeons, the Hoover Commission, and every man engaged in research on problems of health from whom I have heard. These outstanding organizations may or may not agree on all the details of the bill which Senator KENNEDY and I have introduced. As a matter of fact, whereas the bill calls for the creation of the national library of medicine as an independent agency, I know that some of these gentlemen and some of these organizations believe it might well be strengthened if it were identified with an agency already known for its outstanding leadership and activity in the world of health sciences—an agency such as the United States Public Health Service. Others favor an independent status for the library. Neither Senator KENNEDY nor I are wedded to the details of the bill. We know that such is the unanimity of opinion as to the necessity for immediate action on proper housing and support for the library and such is the objectivity and intelligence of the groups and individuals most concerned, that when our hearings have been held and when all the evidence is in I am confident we shall come to the floor of the Senate with a bill supported by everyone who is seriously concerned with advancing the health of the Nation.

Mr. President, permit me to make one more point and then conclude.

We in the Congress will, I am certain, appropriate more than a hundred and thirty million dollars to be spent under the aegis of the Public Health Service in fiscal 1957 for medical research. Considerably more than a hundred and thirty million, I hope. In addition, we shall appropriate still more millions for medical research projects carried on at the behest or under the direction of other agencies of Government.

The effectiveness of that research is greatly dependent on the proper maintenance and functioning of the library with which we are here concerned. Will the Congress appropriate some $200 million a year—year after year—for medical research and yet withhold the $6 million to $7 million needed once in a generation to properly house the materials and make possible the bibliographical services upon which much of that research must depend? I think not. I know it will not when Members of the Congress realize that just one 3-by-5 card, mailed out by the national library of medicine at a cost of some 10 cents, can and will save us tens of thousands of dollars and years of wasted effort on the part of our all too few men of medical research. One such card notifying the reader of the report of a completed experiment can keep a dozen institutions from spending tens of thousands of dollars duplicating that same experiment. More important still, it may mean that a dozen scientists who might otherwise have spent wasted time repeating that experiment may, instead, leap years ahead in reaching the solution to the problem with which they and we are concerned.

That one simple example of the meaning of but one of the scores of services which the library can provide should be enough to convince the most economy-minded that here truly is an expenditure which means not a spending but a saving—a saving of dollars, and time and lives.

Let me sum this up, Mr. President, by quoting the words of one who is ranked amongst the most wise and knowledgeable and dedicated of men of medical research in the world—the vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation in charge of medical affairs, Dr. Alan Gregg. Dr. Gregg has written me, "No defense for the amounts being spent on medical research by all the Government agencies can be made if we continue to neglect the need for one adequate library, such as this library could be made."

My father, if I may be permitted a personal reference, was a pupil and a devout disciple of that history-making man of medicine, Joseph Lister. Like so many of us today, many of the surgeons of his time found it impossible—or perhaps I should say "inconvenient"—to accept and apply the great principles of aseptic and antiseptic treatment of wounds. Addressing the doctors of Montgomery, Ala. in 1931 and reminiscing with them of those earlier and decisive days in surgery, my revered father, reared in the traditions of the South with its respect for the proper and the richly rounded word, phrased it this way as he spoke of Lord Lister's experience: "Though his turret torch was blazing high, like Leander's, the surgeons would not see and could not hear." Happily for us, the surgeons did come to see and to hear and to apply—nor did it take 30 years for the truth to sink in. It has been more than 30 years, Mr. President, since we have been told how much it could mean to America were we to establish a truly national library of medicine. There are men who have carried that torch high for all those years. It is time for the Congress to see the light, to listen to the voices of wisdom and—above all—to act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3430) to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor, together with the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, of the bill to create a National Library of Medicine. I should like to add briefly to the remarks already made by the Senator from Alabama on this most important subject.

One of the most interesting and important Hoover Commission reports concerns the Government's handling of medical information, books, treatises, journals, periodicals, and unpublished research papers. Presently, the single greatest collection of these materials in this country is in the Armed Forces Medical Library, reputedly the largest and most important medical library in the world. Originally created in 1836, for military use, it has become a great national research institution, far surpassing the nature, size, and level of medical activities required by the Armed Forces. For many years it has been regarded, in fact if not in name, as the Nation's Library of Medicine.

The Hoover Commission, supported completely by its Medical Services Task Force composed of some of the Nation's leading medical figures, has pointed out that the interests of this country will be better served if the Armed Forces Medical Library is reestablished as an independent institution serving the needs of all governmental departments and agencies, both civilian and defense. The basic principle of this bill has the full support of the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Drug Manufacturers Association, and the American Hospital Association. It merits immediate study by Congress. I am certain, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Alabama, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will consider the proposal promptly.

The basis of this recommendation and of the bill which we have introduced today is not a simple paper reorganizational move, but rather it is intended to accomplish the following important substantive changes:

First. Provide express statutory authority—presently lacking—for the functions performed by the Library for the various departments and agencies of the Government.

Second. Remove the operating expenses of the Library from the military budget, thereby eliminating a present charge upon the military which cannot justifiably be assessed against it.

Third. Eliminate any possible competition among the various departments and agencies for a position of dominance in this field.

Fourth. Eliminate or drastically reduce the duplication of facilities by Government departments and agencies.

Fifth. Permit an operation directed by a board reflecting the interests of the public and the many departments and agencies concerned with medical research and practice, as opposed to the present organizational structure in which control is exercised solely by the Armed Forces.

Sixth. Authorize a physical plant providing adequate protection for the irreplaceable and unequaled collection of books, journals, and bibliographic services of the Library, and at the same time making these materials more accessible.

It is apparent that the total efforts and funds expended for medical research in this country—and particularly those of the Federal Government—should be coordinated so that the most beneficial results will be achieved. Medical research leaders have expressed concern over the fact that in many instances the absence of satisfactory bibliographic materials has resulted in wasteful duplication of efforts by medical researchers. Certainly there is enough to be done in the important fields of medical research without the repetition of experiments successfully undertaken. A National Library of Medicine is essential to the efficiency and coordination of effort necessary in medical research.

At the time that this bill was first considered, there was reason to believe that perhaps there had been a change of outlook by the Department of Defense toward the Medical Library. Steps had been taken to provide land and funds for an adequate building in the defense budget. However, pressure for a stringent defense budget began to be felt and, as has happened so frequently in the past, the Medical Library was squeezed and no building funds appear in the request ultimately made by the President. It must be obvious that the library simply cannot compete for funds in the Defense Department against the needs and demands of those activities directly related to our national defense.

Mr. President, enactment of this bill is essential if medical research is to continue to progress in an orderly and efficient manner.

WAR ORPHANS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war.

Mr. President, this bill will be known as the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956. The purpose is to grant eligibility for up to 36 months of education to the children of armed services personnel who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict, either from a combat wound or from an instrumentality of war. This bill would provide a scholarship grant of up to $110 per month, payable at the end of each month of education satisfactorily completed by the eligible person.

The bill provides that the eligibility shall begin on the 18th birthday, or on the successful completion of secondary schooling, whichever occurs first, and shall end on the 23d birthday, with a few exceptions for the purpose of flexibility. A child eligible under this act may select college or vocational training.

In addition to providing education at the college level or in vocational schools the bill would provide for special restorative training for the purpose of overcoming or lessening the effects of a manifest physical or mental disability which would handicap the eligible person in the pursuit of a program of education.

The bill is patterned after the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, which I introduced in the Senate in the 82d Congress. Many of the safeguards written into the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 are written into this proposed legislation to prevent abuse and exploitation.

Although the information will have to be fully developed at hearings, it is my best information, at the present time, that there are approximately 100,000 children who lost a parent during World War II or the Korean conflict who may be eligible for the benefits of this bill.

This bill is a companion bill to H. R. 9824, which was introduced last week in the House of Representatives by Representative TEAGUE, of Texas.

It is my hope that the Congress will enact this legislation at this session. I firmly believe that the Government owes a duty to educate the children of men who lost their lives as a result of disability incurred in line of duty during World War II, or the Korean service period, so that such children may compete on equal terms with those who were more fortunate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3431) to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FEDERAL-STATE LAND STUDY COMMISSIONS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of Federal-State Land Study Commissions in the several States. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, in connection with the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3444) to provide for the establishment of Federal-State Land Study Commissions in the several States, introduced by Mr. LONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The statement presented by Mr. LONG is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LONG

I am introducing a bill today which provides for the establishment of Federal-State commissions to examine the problems of

public land ownership. The land which is owned by the Federal Government is tremendous in its area and includes every type of property. Within recent years it has become increasingly clear that this problem requires some basic reexamination.

There are many ideas as to what should be done with these federally owned lands. A good many people would like to see all of it retained and more acquired. A lot of other people would like to see most of it disposed of immediately.

The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, headed by Mr. Meyer Kestenbaum, recommended last year that a Federal Lands Commission be established. It was proposed that this Commission study the present situation and current trends with respect to Federal ownership and administration of nonurban lands and make recommendations for appropriate legislation or other action. The Senate was represented on this Commission by three of our able colleagues, Senators MORSE, HUMPHREY, and SCHOEPPEL.

In addition, last year the Hoover Commission Task Force on Real Property Management recommended that the President appoint a Commisison on this subject. This proposed Commission would study and submit recommendations as to the pattern of Federal land ownership which would provide maximum benefits to the national economy. It was specifically recommended that transfers of lands to State or private ownership should be accomplished where such transfers were found to be in the public interest.

In both of these recommendations, however, the emphasis was entirely on a single Federal Commission. It is my feeling that the States in which these lands are located should have a voice in determining policies with regard to public ownership of land in the particular State. Accordingly, the bill which I have today introduced provides that a 5-man commisison could be established to study and make recommendations with respect to public ownership of land in any State where the governor or the legislature of the State so requests.

Two members of this Commission would be selected from a list of nominees by the governor of the State in question. Two other members would be appointed from the executive branch of the Federal Government, with the fifth member to be selected entirely at the discretion of the President.

Presumably, the two members from the executive branch would be selected from the agencies which are most directly concerned with the Federal land in a particular State. I am confident that it would be found desirable to have the same Federal officials appointed to a number of these State commissions thus providing a strong element of consistency insofar as Federal policies and considerations are concerned.

A period of no more than 3 years is provided for each commission to submit recommendations. This report will be expected to propose any legislation or administrative actions which, in its judgment, may be needed to carry out its recommendations.

With regard to any disposals of public land which the Commission may recommend, the bill would require the President to prepare a plan for disposal of the lands recommended for disposition. It is provided, however, that the President may exclude from his disposal plan any lands the retention of which he deems necessary in the public interest. But in that event, he must give in detail the reasons for these exclusions.

The disposal plan would be submitted to both Houses of Congress, and it is provided that a period of 60 days of continuous session of the Congress must pass before the executive agencies concerned proceed to implement the disposal plan. The plan or any part of it may be disapproved at any time within this 60-day period, but the disapproval must be resolution adopted by both the Senate and the House.

It is required that disposal plans of this nature shall—

1. Contain a list of the lands to be disposed of;

2. Set out the procedure to be followed by the Federal agency or agencies having jurisdiction over such lands in the disposition thereof;

3. Prescribe an operating procedure for offering such lands for sale in fee;

4. Provide that, in the case of sales to any State or other Government agency, such lands shall be sold at their appraised fair market value, and, in the case of sales to private purchasers, such lands shall be sold to the highest bidder or at their appraised fair market value, as determined by the Federal agency having jurisdiction over such land.

5. Provide that, so far as practicable, such lands shall be disposed of in tracts of such size and number and under such terms and conditions as will best serve the purposes of the Federal Government, the State, and the general public, taking into consideration the predominant land needs, if such exist, of present landowners in the vicinity of such lands and the need of potential purchasers for a long-term, low-interest rate purchase program to enable them to purchase such lands; and

6. Provide for a system of payments to the States out of receipts from the sale of such lands consistent with existing statutes which recognize the principle of receipts sharing with the State and which provide for systems of payment for the several classes of property involved.

With particular reference to subparagraph 5 above, I personally feel very strongly that there are likely to be many situations in which preference should be given to local citizens and former owners of land to be disposed of.

There are many situations in which former owners who sold their land, possibly at a sacrifice or under some compulsion, should be given priority with reference to purchase of land not needed by the Federal Government. Some of them may not be able to offer the full purchase price, and I believe that discretion should be provided to permit them to offer a down payment with a number of years to pay off the balance through installments.

The extent of Federal ownership of property in the United States has been further revealed in a recent inventory published by the General Services Administration. This inventory follows one issued as of April 1953 which was the first such inventory to be issued in 15 years. Some of the highlights of this report are:

1. Overall the Federal Government owns just over one-fifth of continental United States, holding 407.9 million acres, which is just about equal to the area included in 22 of the 26 States east of the Mississippi River. The Government owns 2.8 million acres more than the inventory issued in 1953. A total of 354 million acres is used for grazing wildlife, and forest reserves.

2. The Government has acquired real estate since 1789 which has cost $32½ billion. Two and four-tenths billion dollars were spent for land, $14½ billion for buildings, and another $15.6 billion for other structures such as dams. The Government holds title to 384,916 buildings which are on 11,777 separate installations.

3. The greatest extent of land ownership is in Nevada where 87.1 percent of the entire land surface is owned by the Federal Government. In my own State of Louisiana, 3.7 percent of the lend is federally owned. Even though this is a small percentage compared to some other States, there is one parish (Grant) in Louisiana of which 34.2 percent of the area is under Federal ownership. Another one (Vernon) is 23.6 percent federally owned, and several others are more than 10 percent federally owned. Of the acreages owned in Louisiana, more than one-half were purchased by the Government during the depression of the thirties at an average price of only $3 an acre.

4. The Defense Department owns property valued at $20 billion; Interior holdings are valued at $3 billion, and the Atomic Energy Commission has moved up into third place with holding of $2.7 billion.

The following table shows the percentage of Federal land ownership in each of the States:

Percent of land acreage owned by the Federal Government in the various States (excludes trust properties)[1]

11 Western States:	
Nevada	87.1
Utah	70.2
Idaho	65.2
Oregon	51.3
Wyoming	47.8
California	47.0
Arizona	44.5
Colorado	36.3
New Mexico	33.7
Montana	29.9
Washington	29.9
21 Northeast and North Central States:	
New Hampshire	12.0
Michigan	7.8
South Dakota	6.2
Minnesota	6.0
Wisconsin	5.3
North Dakota	4.2
Vermont	3.9
Missouri	3.7
Massachusetts	2.2
New Jersey	2.0
Pennsylvania	1.9
Indiana	1.5
Nebraska	1.4
Illinois	1.2
Rhode Island	1.2
Ohio	.9
New York	.9
Kansas	.6
Maine	.6
Iowa	.3
Connecticut	.2
16 South-Atlantic and South-Central States and District of Columbia:	
District of Columbia	29.8
Florida	10.1
Arkansas	9.2
Virginia	8.3
Tennessee	6.2
West Virginia	6.0
North Carolina	6.0
South Carolina	5.4
Georgia	5.2
Mississippi	5.0
Kentucky	3.8
Louisiana	3.7
Alabama	3.4
Maryland	2.8
Delaware	2.5
Oklahoma	2.3
Texas	1.5

[1] As of June 30, 1955.

Although the legislation I am proposing does not presume to make any determinations with regard to either increasing or decreasing Federal ownership of land, I would certainly like to express my own opinion to Senators that I believe the Federal Government owns too much of our land and it is my hope that the study commissions, if established, would propose appropriate dispositions. The American economy is a private-enterprise economy and it should operate as such within the limits of necessary governmental functions.

Local governmental units, including counties, municipalities, and school districts, are dependent primarily upon property taxes for

their revenues. As a result many communities have found themselves without tax resources, in severe financial conditions, or without further capacity to grow and expand their services to their citizens where the Federal Government has a substantial or predominant ownership of the real property within their political jurisdiction.

Congress has long recognized the problem. Out of it have evolved a number of Federal laws providing that the Federal Government shall share with local governmental units revenues derived from its holdings. These are familiarly known as shared revenue or payment in lieu of taxes laws. In some instances Congress has allowed local governments to tax Federal real property the same as privately-owned property.

These laws apply to several major Federal departments and independent agencies covering all types of real property, ownership, including industrial, commercial, urban, defense, agricultural, grazing, and forested holdings. They vary in detail and lack uniformity but provide that anywhere from 5 to 75 percent of the money derived by the Federal Government from the sale of land, timber, minerals, power, or other resources from such holdings shall be paid to the State or local government wherein the real property is located.

While shared revenue or in lieu statutes have developed as a means of offsetting the tax-exempt status of Federal property, they have a more fundamental justification which recognizes the inherent relationship of Federal lands within a State to State sovereignty. The receipts from the sale of Federal lands and resources should be shared with the States and local governments on the same basis, therefore, as are receipts from the sale of resources as at present.

In the 167 years of our existence as a nation there is no showing, so far as I know, that the Federal Government has realized substantial revenue from holding Government lands. On the contrary, it has always been found necessary to invest more money than the Government ever receives.

In the main these vast holdings have been a burden to the taxpayers rather than an asset. The Government agencies having jurisdiction over them have almost constantly been criticized because of the amount of public moneys which are spent on the administration of these public lands.

On the other hand, lands in private ownership have been developed into major revenue-producing sources, thus contributing greatly to economic activity and returning large tax receipts to all our local, State, and Federal Governments.

It is my intention to hold hearings in the near future on this proposed legislation. I hope that the Federal agencies involved will be prepared soon to present their views. They were furnished with a preliminary draft of this bill last November 17, with a request that they give it immediate attention. They have had, therefore, 4 months to make up their minds what their attitude toward it will be. It is my hope that the bill can be passed and sent to the White House before the end of the current session.

THE CYPRUS DILEMMA

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for approximately 5 minutes during the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States Government use its good offices with the British Government to urge that the people of the island of Cyprus be consulted in regard to their political status in accordance with the honored principle of self-determination.

I submit this resolution on behalf of myself, and Senators BARRETT, BENDER, BUSH, CHAVEZ, DOUGLAS, GREEN, HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, KENNEDY, IVES, LANGER, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MURRAY, NEELY, NEUBERGER, O'MAHONEY, PURTELL, and PASTORE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have not had an opportunity to discuss the subject with the Senator from New York, but I assure him that I am in full sympathy with the objectives of the resolution, and would consider it a great honor to be permitted to join in sponsorship of the resolution.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad indeed to add the name of the senior Senator from Oregon to the list of cosponsors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie on the desk until the close of business tomorrow, so that Senators who may wish to add their names to the list of cosponsors may do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Since I framed this resolution, which was some weeks ago, and since I began to consult with my colleagues of the Senate in regard to it, the situation to which it has reference has taken the gravest possible turn.

What is referred to in the language of resolution as ferment has become turmoil. Tension has become crisis. Undue restraint has given way to naked repression.

Two of our partners in NATO, Great Britain and Greece, confront each other angrily. The Balkan alliance between Greece and Turkey is placed under new strain.

In this situation, the United States Government cannot stand aloof or wring its hands in anxious indecision, or merely express itself in round generalities about impartiality and utter pious hopes that all will be well—as we seem to be doing in the Arab-Israel situation.

Here is another situation that calls for positive leadership—for the discharge of that heavy and difficult responsibility that falls to leadership.

We may wish to stand silent, and to avoid intervention in an admittedly difficult and delicate situation, but we cannot and dare not. We will not win the regard of either contending side if we do.

Here is a situation in which we can and should take a stand on principle, and advise our British friends of the situation as we see it. We do not serve our British allies well if we do not.

The small nations of the world, from Europe through the length and breadth of Asia and Africa, watch us now, in regard to Cyprus, as in regard to other analogous matters in the Near East and elsewhere.

We must express ourselves, both publicly and through normal diplomatic channels, urging upon our British friends the right, honorable, and farsighted course of action in regard to Cyprus. The price must be paid; the sacrifice must be made. The people of Cyprus cannot be ground under the heavy heel of repression. Their will must be taken into account.

We must not permit, without the sternest rebuke, the emulation of Soviet tactics in repressing and tyrannizing an entire people.

I know there is a Turkish minority on Cyprus. I know that Cyprus has not, in recorded history, belonged to the political entity known as Greece. But this does not change the fact that four-fifths of the people of Cyprus are Greeks by language, culture, church, tradition, and affection. Cyprus is just as Greek as Greece, itself.

But above and beyond that, the people of Cyprus have a right to have a voice in the determination of their future. The British have, in the recent past, conceded this. The resolution we are introducing today no more than affirms as the sense of the Senate that which has been more than tacitly conceded by the British in the past.

No country has done more for Greece than the United States. We helped to save Greece from Communist domination. The American taxpayers have poured millions of dollars into Greece. Shall we forfeit the good will we deservedly acquired in Greece by standing aside in the present situation, as we did when we voted in the United Nations against putting the question of Cyprus on the U. N. agenda?

Will we be a true ally to Britain by doing nothing, or will we do Britain a better turn by insisting, as best we can, that Britain's present policy in Cyprus is shortsighted and doomed to failure?

I ask, Mr. President, that the Foreign Relations Committee give prompt and thoughtful consideration to this resolution, and report it back to the Senate at the earliest possible time.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution and a lengthy historical and political review and analysis of the Cyprus dilemma, prepared for me, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 229) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the overwhelming majority of the people of the island of Cyprus are in ferment with regard to their political status and are demanding an end to their present colonial position in the British Empire; and

Whereas tension is building up in the eastern Mediterranean area over Cyprus between our ally, Britain, which has legitimate security interests in this area, and our ally, Greece, which has close ties of kinship and culture with the people of Cyprus; and

Whereas the United States fought a great world war under the banner of the principle of self-determination: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that:

(a) The British Government should be urged by our Government to see the wisdom of seeking to maintain its influence in this area by the exercise of leadership in the cause of freedom rather than by the use of force for the sake of repression; and

(b) Free world security considerations and the legitimate security interests of Britain should be given due weight but should not be used as an excuse for the frustration of the legitimate aspirations of the people of Cyprus; and

(c) The people of Cyprus should be consulted concerning their future political status consistent with that principle of self-determination to which the United States has historically subscribed.

The analysis presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

THE CYPRUS DILEMMA

The British Crown colony, Cyprus, is quite small by physical standards. It covers 3,584 square miles, about the size of Puerto Rico. The population, estimated to be 520,000, is less than a quarter of Puerto Rico's. The importance of Cyprus, however, cannot be measured by its size, for Cyprus at the beginning of 1956 had turned into one of the West's major problem spots.

The imbroglio on Cyprus can be summarized in a single Greek word, "Enosis," meaning union. On Cyprus "Enosis" stands for union with Greece. Four-fifths of the population of the island speak Greek, attend the Greek Orthodox Church, and have a deep emotional attachment to Greece. The remaining fifth of the population are mostly Moslem Turks, with a scattering of Armenians and others. The majority Greek sector of the population has been violently agitating for the right to determine their own political status, which would be tantamount to union with Greece. Their demands meet with sympathetic reception in Athens, while the Turkish minority on Cyprus has turned in defense to Ankara. Thus the Cyprus situation is having repercussions far beyond the shores of the island. It shakes the foundations of NATO by straining relations between NATO partners Greece and Britain; it endangers the Balkan pact by embittering relations between Greece and Turkey; it provides fuel for the Communist propaganda mills by stigmatizing Great Britain as a colonial power among the hypersensitive anti-colonial nations of Asia and the Middle East.

Today's dispute has it roots deep in the past. Cyprus has never been its own master. In ancient times Phoenicians, Assyrians, Persians, Egyptians, Romans, and Byzantines, all held sway over the island for considerable periods of time. Richard the Lion Hearted, on his way to the Holy Land in 1191, occupied Cyprus after a brief campaign, later selling it to a French nobleman. It was occupied by the Venetians in 1489 who in turn lost it to the Ottoman Turks in 1571.[1] At the time of the Turkish conquest about 30,000 Turkish soldiers were given land on the island, thus introducing the seed of the present Turkish minority.[2] Under the Ottoman Empire the Cypriots were permitted to practice their religion in exchange for a tax. In 1660, the Turkish Government appointed the orthodox bishops as guardians of the peasants in an effort to limit the extortions of Turkish officials and tax collectors. Under this system in the ensuing years the influence of the bishops steadily increased until they became representatives of the Hellenic population of the island in temporal as well as religious matters.[3]

In 1875 parts of the Ottoman Empire revolted against Turkish rule. Britain, worried by the specter of a Russian march to the Mediterranean at the expense of an Ottoman Empire weakened by internal rebellions, in 1878 undertook an agreement with the sultan to protect Turkish territory from further losses.[4] British interest in the eastern Mediterranean had been intensified by the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869[5] and by the projected railway from the Syrian coast to the Persian Gulf.[6] As part of the agreement England wanted control of Cyprus. Lord Salisbury, British Foreign Minister, argued at the time:

"It is impossible for England to exercise the necessary vigilance over Syria and Asia Minor, and to accumulate, when required, troops and material of war in time to be of use in repelling invasion or frustrating foreign attempts to excite rebellion in Asia Minor or Syria, unless she possesses a stronghold near the coast. Presence of English in Cyprus will enable them to strengthen sultan's authority in Syria and Mesopotamia, where, after late events, it will probably be much shaken."[7]

In the final agreement administration of Cyprus was handed over to England, while Cyprus remained legally a part of the Ottoman Empire, to which an annual tribute was paid.[8]

British rule was at first greeted cheerfully by the islanders. The Cypriots would probably have welcomed any change from the real and fancied oppression suffered under Ottoman rule, but they regarded the coming of English administration as particularly beneficial. In the first place Britain was Christian, a serious recommendation to a Christian population dominated for 300 years by Moslem rule. Secondly, Britain had ceded the Ionian Islands to Greece in 1867, an act regarded by Cypriots as a hopeful precedent.[9] The Archbishop of Cyprus, in a welcoming address delivered at the arrival of the first British High Commissioner, clearly voiced the aspirations of the Greek portion of the Cypriots. Said the archbishop: "We trust that Great Britain will help Cyprus, as it did the Ionian Isles, to be united with mother Greece with which it is nationally connected.[10]

Cyprus remained in an anomalous position, administered by Britain but paying tribute to the Ottoman Empire, until the outbreak of World War I. The island never became a British citadel against Russian designs in the Middle East as envisoned in the Anglo-Turkish Convention of 1878, because 4 years after the agreement Egypt became a British protectorate and Great Britain developed her defense plans in the region with Egypt instead of Cyprus as base of operations. In 1882 Britain granted a constitution to Cyprus based on the liberal ideas of the period. It provided for a legislative council elected on the basis of communal representation (9 elected Greek members and 3 elected Turkish members), plus 6 appointed English officials and the High Commisisoner, who had an absolute veto. Unfortunately, although there was political freedom in theory, the legislative council type of government did not function well; the 3 Turkish members united with the 6 British officials on almost all important issues, thus frequently frustrating the Greek-Cypriot majority.[11] Another source of trouble was the grave burden on the finances of the island imposed by the yearly tribute to Turkey.

During the period of the Convention of 1878, the movement for Enosis never abated. Countless memorials and appeals urging union with Greece were directed to the British Government by Cypriot organizations and representatives. In 1907 in answer to a typical memorial, Winston Churchill, then Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, stated the British position on Enosis:

"I think it is only natural that the Cypriot people, who are of Greek descent, should regard their incorporation with what may be called their mother country as an ideal to be earnestly, devoutly and fervently cherished. * * * I say that the views which have been put forward are opinions which His Majesty's Government do not refuse to regard with respect. On the other hand, the opinion held by the Moslem population of the island, that the British occupation of Cyprus should not lead to the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire, and that the mission of Great Britain in the Levant should not be to impair sovereignty of the Sultan, is one which His Majesty's Government are equally bound to regard with respect."[12]

The outbreak of World War I gave new hope to the supporters of Enosis. When Turkey joined the Eastern European powers against the Allies in 1914, Great Britain annexed Cyprus outright. With the abrogation of the Anglo-Turkish Convention of 1878, British obligations to the Turks disappeared. In 1915 Britain offered Cyprus to Greece on the condition that Greece join the Allies. Greek-Cypriots were jubilant, but the offer was refused.[13] The following year the British Government agreed in a secret protocol not to open any negotiations for the alienation of Cyprus without the prior consent of the French Government. Finally, by article 20 of the Peace Treaty of Lausanne (1923), Turkey recognized the British annexation of Cyprus; Greece was also a signatory of the Treaty.[14] In 1925 Cyprus was made a Crown Colony.

During the first 13 years after the signing of the armistice, agitation for Enosis, although incessant, was carried out by pacific and constitutional methods. Particularly active in urging secession from the British Empire and union with Greece were the hierarchy of the Autocephalous Orthodox Church of Cyprus, who were the recognized leaders of the Greek-Cypriots.[15] The British, meanwhile, maintained that the Enosis movement was not spontaneous or genuine among the Greek peasantry and, moreover, that the Cypriots were not yet ready for self-government.[16] In 1925 the number of Greek representatives of the Legislative Council was increased from 9 to 12, while the Turkish representation remained at its former level of 3. The number of British official members was also increased, from 6 to 9. In other words, the combination of British and Turkish votes on the council still counterbalanced the number of Greek votes, with deadlocks constantly being resolved by the Governor against the Greek majority.[17] Another major grievance against Britain during this period concerned the tribute tax which the British continued to impose on the Cypriots even after the abrogation of the Anglo-Turkish agreement; the tax was not abolished until 1927.[18]

In 1929 the Greeks elected members of the Legislative Council, thinking to encounter a more sympathetic attitude on the part of the newly elected Labor government, sent a memorial to the Secretary of State for the

[1] Emilianides, Achilles C. Hellenic Cyprus. Nicosia, Cyprus, the Ethnarchic Council of Cyprus, 1946, pp. 9–12.

[2] The Middle East 1955. Fourth ed. London, Europa Publications Limited, 1955, p. 56.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Alastos, Doros. Cyprus : Past and Future. London, Committee for Cyprus Affairs, 1943, p. 5.

[5] The Middle East 1955, op. cit., p. 56.

[6] Hoskins, Halford L. and Mary A. Fulton. The Contemporary Cyprus Question. Washington, Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service. Mimeograph, 1954, p. 2.

[7] Alastos, op. cit., pp. 5–6.

[8] The Middle East 1955, op. cit., p. 56.

[9] Alastos, op. cit., p. 37.

[10] Emilianides, op. cit., p. 17.

[11] The Middle East 1955, op. cit., p. 56.

[12] Alastos, op. cit., p. 42.

[13] Cyprus, Background to Enosis. London, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, October 1955, p. 2.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Cyprus, Background to Enosis, op. cit., p. 2.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Alastos, op. cit., p. 13.

[18] Fabian Colonial Bureau. Strategic Colonies and Their Future. London, Fabian Publications Ltd., 1945, pp. 29–30.

Colonies. It set out with a plea for union with Greece, followed by a list of grievances.[19] Shortly thereafter the Moslem members of the Legislative Council, on behalf of the whole Moslem Community, protested the Greek memorial in one of their own.[20] In reply to the Greek Cypriots, the Secretary of State stated unequivocally with regard to Enosis, "This subject * * * is definitely closed and cannot be further discussed." [21] To the request that responsible government be introduced on Cyprus, the Secretary replied, "The time has not yet come when it would be to the general advantage of the people of Cyprus to make a trial of a constitutional experiment in this direction. Those institutions already established in the island which are subject in varying degrees to popular control cannot be said to have attained that reasonable measure of efficiency which should be looked for before any extension of the principle is approved." [22]

The same year the British sought to prevent the use of elementary schools for the propagation of Greek nationalist propaganda. By the Elementary Education Law of 1929 control over the schoolteachers in Cyprus was transferred from the hands of local Greek and Turkish committees to the British authorities.[23] It was alleged that the Cypriot Greek nationalists put pressure on the schoolteachers to emphasize union with Greece in the children's lessons. The problem of education on the island had been recognized early in the British administration; in 1881 the High Commissioner had urged that education be based on the English language.[24] He was, however, overruled by the Government in London and Cypriot schoolchildren continued to study the Greek curriculum, from Greek textbooks which emphasized Greek heroes and Greek glories.[25] The passage of the Elementary Education Law of 1929, although supported by three Greek votes on the Legislative Council, was generally met with pained outcry by Greek Cypriots. Deeply proud of their culture, Greek Cypriots viewed with alarm what they considered a British plan to denationalize their children.[26]

About the same time, the worldwide economic crisis began to show marked effects in Cyprus. Unemployment mounted, the value of agricultural products dropped sharply, and expropriations from the poorer peasants for debt began to assume dangerous proportions.[27] In 1930 matters came to a boiling point in discussions regarding the Cyprus budget for 1931. The British Government proposed to meet a deficit in the budget by increased taxation; the Greek members of the Legislative Council favored cutting officials' salaries and initiating other economies in administration.[28] A budget containing new taxes was rejected by the Legislative Council when, for the first time since the British occupation, a Turkish delegate joined his 12 Greek colleagues in voting against the official British members and the 2 other Turkish representatives.[29] On August 11, 1931, the British Government resolved the dilemma by issuing a Royal Order in Council in London. It provided for a budget measure which both cut official salaries and introduced new taxes.[30]

Although the decree represented a compromise, when the news reached Cyprus that the vote of the Legislative Council had been overriden by an order in council, feelings, already raw, reached the breaking point. Leaders of the Cypriot Creek National Movement met on September 12 and on several other occasions to decide a course of action, but could not agree.[31] Finally, on October 18, the Bishop of Kitium precipitated action by simultaneously reading a manifesto which he himself had prepared and sending his resignation from the Legislative Council to the Governor. The same day he delivered a speech at Larnace in which he is reported to have said: "For the benefit of this country we must not obey their laws. Do not be afraid because England has a fleet. We must all try for union and if necessary let our blood flow." [32] Two days later he delivered an inflamatory address at Limassol to a crowd of about 3,000 that had been summoned by ringing church bells. When the news reached the capital the next day, the other Greek members of the Legislative Council resigned too. Church bells were rung to summon the people. The resigning members spoke to a crowd of 3,000 that gathered. The chief priest of the most important church in Nicosia is said to have then stepped forward and "declared revolution." At that moment a Greek flag was handed to him and he swore the people to defend it. The demonstrators marched to Government House singing the Greek national anthem and shouting for union with Greece. The mob attacked the Governor's house and set it on fire. The next day at Limassol the District Commissioner's house was burned to the ground. Numerous minor acts of sabotage occurred all over the island. The British Government quickly dispatched troops, warships, and airplanes to the rebellious colony.

The Cyprus riots brought repressive measures in their wake.[33] The Governor was given power to make laws. The Constitution was abolished, as were all elective bodies. Thereafter the Governor was to appoint village headmen who had formerly been elected. Clubs and other organizations were suspended; unauthorized political and social meetings of more than five people were banned; press censorship was imposed; no flags could be displayed without permission from the Governor; bells could not be rung without permission of the District Commissioner.[34] The Greek-Cypriot leaders were exiled from the island for life.

The Cyprus riots and their aftermath engendered sympathetic reaction in Greece. Prime Minister Venizelos of Greece cautioned against pro-Cypriot and anti-British sentiments. In a statement in the press, he said:

"As I have declared many times there is no Cypriot question between the Greek Government and the British Government. That question is between the British Government and the people of Cyprus." [35]

The Greek Orthodox Church, however, as well as many Greek newspapers, strongly supported the Greek Cypriots and Venizelos had difficulty restraining public reaction.[36]

Cyprus remained under tight control after the riots of 1931, although certain relaxations were subsequently introduced. In 1933 an Advisory Council was established consisting of 4 official and 10 nonofficial members appointed by the Governor. The Advisory Council, according to an official statement, "has no legislative powers but is consulted by Government on legislative and other measures, and so functions as a means whereby persons fitted by character and attainments for the task may formally advise the Government on the Colony's requirements.[37] In 1936 trade unionization was legalized.[38] In 1937 Britain abrogated the Order in Council which abolished the Constitution, but the laws issued under it remained in force.[39]

In 1937, with political activities still tightly controlled in the Colony, a Committee for Cyprus Autonomy was forced in London. In 1939 the committee presented the Governor with a plan for constitutional reform which it claimed to have previously circulated to about 200 interested people and organizations for their opinions and suggestions.[40] Although no action was forthcoming on the committee's constitutional demands, the committee was successful in bringing Parliament's attention to the colony. The Colonial Secretary, called upon to answer questions put to him in the House of Commons regarding Cyprus, expressed his doubt as to the authenticity of the Greek-Cypriot demands as follows:

"One of the principal means by which an agitation has been conducted has been the circulation amongst the people of petitions asking for changes in the Constitution. The methods by which those responsible have sought to obtain signatures have not in all cases been proper. Thus the Acting-Governor has represented that petitions have been placed in front of villagers by persons upon whose favour they are dependent, and that signatures have been obtained by false suggestions. It was stated, for instance, that a measure of self-government was to be granted to the islanders in the near future; and suggested that those who refused to sign would suffer when self-government came." [41]

Britain's entry into the European War was at first greeted apathetically by the Cypriots whose futile struggle for their own liberties had embittered them. However, when Greece was invaded by Italy many Cypriots joined the British in battle.[42] In 1941 hopes for Enosis were rekindled among Greek Cypriots when the Greek Prime Minister was quoted as saying at a luncheon in London: "I visualize great Greece as including North Epirus, the Dodecanese, Macedonia, Cyprus." [43] The British Government authorized the Governor to deny that the question of the postwar status of Cyprus was even under consideration by the Greek and British Governments.[44]

Late in 1942 the British Government took the first step to restoring representative gov-

---

[19] Great Britain. Colonial Office. Cmd. 3447, London, His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1930.

[20] Hill, Sir George. A History of Cyprus. Cambridge, University Press, 1952, p. 543.

[21] Cmd. 3447, op. cit., p. 16.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Toynbee, Arnold J. Survey of International Affairs 1931. London, Oxford University Press, 1932, pp. 375–376.

[24] Cyprus: The Closed Issue? The World Today, vol. 10, No. 9, September 1954, p. 375.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Toynbee, op. cit., p. 376.

[27] Alastos, op. cit., p. 49.

[28] Toynbee, op. cit., p. 377.

[29] Cyprus, Background to Enosis, op. cit., p. 3.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Account of events in 1931 riots in: Great Britain. Colonial Office. Cmd. 4045. Disturbances in Cyprus in October 1931. London, His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1932, 42 p.

[32] Ibid., p. 7.

[33] Ibid., p. 386.

[34] Ibid., p. 387. The ringing of the church bells had special significance for the Cypriot Christians. According to Toynbee, "Under the Ottoman order, the silencing of the Christian church bells had been one of the symbols of the subjection of the Christian ra'iyeh to their Muslim masters; and, since the beginning of the end of the Ottoman Empire, the restoration of the belfries had been one of the outward and visible signs of liberation in one liberated Christian province after another."

[35] Ibid., p. 388.

[36] Ibid., pp. 389–390.

[37] Great Britain. Colonial Office, Annual Reports. Cyprus. London, His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1938, pp. 9–10.

[38] Fabian Colonial Bureau, op. cit., p. 33.

[39] Cyprus, Background to Enosis, op. cit., p. 4.

[40] Alastos, op. cit., p. 61.

[41] Kirk, George. Survey of International Affairs: The Middle East 1945–50. London, Oxford University Press, 1954, p. 161.

[42] Cyprus, Background to Enosis, op. cit., p. 4.

[43] Hill, op. cit., p. 560.

[44] Ibid.

ernment in Cyprus by allowing municipal elections to be held. There were two leading parties on the island, the leftwing Progressive Party of the working people (commonly known by the abbreviation AKEL) and the rightwing National Party (mostly middle class with church support). In 1943 and 1944 AKEL supported a number of strikes protesting the lack of popularly elected bodies, the cost of living, and the refusal of the visiting Under Secretary of the Colonies to discuss Enosis with them.[45] But both right- and left-wing parties harassed the government.

Agitation for Enosis continued through the war. In the summer of 1946 the acting Ethnarch of Cyprus sent cables to Bevin and the Greek Prime Minister, asking that the question of union with Greece be raised at the Paris Conference.[46] Meanwhile, a rumor that a new British military and air base would be established on Cyprus (sparked by the British tentative offer to Egypt to withdraw their troops) caused consternation on the island.[47] In October 1946 the British Government outlined a comprehensive plan for political and economic reforms in the colony: a 10-year development plan, the return to Cyprus of the persons deported in 1931, the calling together of a consultative assembly to frame proposals for constitutional reform including the reestablishment of a central legislature.[48] The response of the Ethnarchic Council (an unofficial Enosist organization headed by the acting Ethnarch) was an immediate cable to the British Government rejecting "categorically and with indignation any solution of the Cyprus question not granting national liberty by union with Greece."[49]

In the 10 years since the war the British Government has had numerous occasions to reiterate its policy, "no change in the sovereignty of the island is contemplated." Early in 1947 a delegation consisting of the mayor of Nicosia, representing the leftwing organizations, the chairman of the chamber of commerce representing the rightwing National Front, and the Ethnarch went to London to plead for Enosis.[50] The delegation met with the same failure as its predecessors.

The Ethnarchic Council and the political parties responded with instructions to boycott the new governor on his arrival in March 1947. Greek Cypriots, including four members of the advisory council, remained aloof from the reception to which they had been invited. The advisory council members were forthwith dropped from office.[51]

In October the election of a new archbishop elevated the Bishop of Kyrenia, Makarios, to the office of Ethnarch of the Cypriot Orthodox. From the start he opposed cooperation with the British on any plan that was not based on the premise of eventual union with Greece. According to the then Governor, Lord Winston:

"He used every power the church possessed to proclaim a boycott of everything that His Majesty's Government was offering and to preach a doctrine of subversion and disobedience. That was what the Secretary of State got for his offer to restore the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the island. He got an uncompromising opposition to British rule, the archbishop using every influence he had to defeat the aims and objects of the British Government. As for the development program, there again we met with a complete blank refusal to cooperate in any way whatever. Whatever plan we proposed for the development of their industries and so on we could find no help or support for it."[53]

The Consultative Assembly, called to frame proposals for constitutional reform, turned into a fiasco.[53] Due to the boycott of the church, only 18 of the 40 invited members accepted. These included 8 left-wing Greeks, 6 Turks, 2 nonparty Greeks, and 1 Maronite, plus the Chief Justice of Cyprus as chairman. The subject of Enosis was ruled out. The Consultative Assembly convened on November 7, 1947. The left-wing members immediately requested full self-government similar to that of Ceylon or Malta, with a legislature consisting entirely of elected members and the Governor's powers restricted to defense, foreign affairs, and the special interest of minorities. The meeting became deadlocked when the chairman ruled that discussion of self-government was not within the terms of reference of the assembly. Thereupon the question was referred to London.

London's reply came 6 months later in the form of new constitutional proposals for limited self-government. It was a compromise measure. The new legislature would consist of 4 official and 22 elected members (18 Greeks and 4 Turks). Thus a combination of British and Turkish votes could not frustrate the Greek majority. The Governor would no longer be chairman of the legislature. Only the status of the colony was excluded from the competence of the legislature, although the Governor would have the veto power. The British proposals included several other fundamental points, but a considerable berth was left open for discussion by the assembly.

On the 20th of May the assembly voted 11 to 7 to accept the proposals. The majority consisted of 6 Turks, 1 Maronite, and 4 independent Greeks; the 5 left-wing Greek mayors and 2 Greek trade-union representatives voted against. (The other Greeks had withdrawn earlier.) Meanwhile the right-wing and the church were adamantly demanding "Enosis or nothing." The Communists concentrated on embarrassing and undermining the British by demanding full self-government, since in 1948 even ardent Enosists among the Communists could not urge union with Greece's strongly anti-Communist government.

Under the prevailing circumstances, the proposals, even though accepted by the assembly, were doomed to defeat. Faced with the futile attempt of imposing the new constitution on an unwilling populace, the government decided instead to dissolve the assembly (August 12), but leave open the offer of a new constitution.

The period after the dissolution of the assembly was punctuated with strikes and violence. The British went ahead with plans to build military installations on Cyprus and to evacuate troops to the island from Palestine where the British mandate had expired. On October 31, 1948, 25,000 people participated in an AKEL demonstration in Nicosia in protest against the building of British and American war bases on Cyprus.[54] In May 1949 municipal elections were held after an electoral campaign marked with extreme violence.[55] The rightwing block, supported by the archbishop, captured 11 of the 15 municipalties, leaving only the ports of Limassol, Famagustas and Larnaca in AKEL control. The swing from Communist to rightwing control, however, was not hailed in Britain at the time as any great victory, since the British were more fearful of large-scale Enosis demands than of Communist machinations.[56]

During the last few months of the year, the Ethnarchic Council prepared to hold a plebiscite on Enosis. The archbishop asked the Government of Cyprus to supervise the plebiscite, a request which was turned down with the statement that the Enosis issue was closed.[57] Nevertheless, the church went ahead with its plans and from January 15 to 22, about 600 Orthodox churches participated in the plebiscite, in which everyone over 18 could vote. The Ethnarchic Council announced on January 29 that of an estimated 224,000 eligible voters, 215,000 (95.7 percent) had voted for union with Greece.[59] In Greece, special prayers were said on January 15 for the emancipation of Cyprus.[59] In June the archbishop died and was replaced by an equally ardent Enosist, the young (37 years), vigorous Makarios III. The following month a delegation of the Cypriot Church headed by the Bishop of Kyrenia went to Athens to present the plebiscite papers to the Greek Chamber of Deputies. On that occasion the Greek prime minister appealed to the deputies to let the government handle the matter. From Greece the delegation went to London but was refused an interview with the colonial secretary.[60]

The following year Greece abandoned its policy of careful neutrality in the Cyprus-British dispute. Prime Minister Sophocles Venizelos in a speech in Parliament on February 15, 1951 called on Britain to surrender her island colony to Greeece.[61] Britain steadfastly refused to enter bilateral discussions with Greece regarding the future of Cyprus on the grounds that the matter was purely internal policy.

In July 1954 the situation came to a head. The British Government decided that, having waited 6 years for Cypriots to advance some moderate views as to constitutional reform, it was now time to take action. The Government proposed a new constitution, providing for a legislature with both official and nominated members—together forming a majority—and elected members. In the debate that followed in the House of Commons, Mr. Lyttelton, the Colonial Secretary, replied to questions regarding Enosis:

"We cannot now, in the interests of Cyprus or in the interests of Eastern Mediterranean security, think for 1 minute about her junction with Greece. We do not admit the right of any foreign power, however friendly, to discuss or interfere with the sovereignty of the British Crown. There could be no more disastrous policy for the people of Cyprus than to hand them over to an unstable though friendly power, an action which would have the effect of undermining the eastern bastion of NATO."[62]

Lyttelton's reference to an "unstable power" provoked indignation and violent reaction throughout Greece. Three thousand students of the University of Athens, led by the rector, marched to the tomb of the Greek unknown soldier, where they took an oath to "liberate their enslaved Cypriot breathren."[63] On August 20 the Greek representative at the United Nations asked that the forthcoming session of the General Assembly put the

[45] Kirk, op. cit., pp. 163–165.
[46] Hill, op. cit., p. 562.
[47] Kirk, op. cit., p. 169.
[48] Ibid., pp. 562–563.
[49] Kirk, op. cit., p. 171.
[50] Cyprus, Background to Enosis, op. cit., p. 6.
[51] Hill, op. cit., pp. 565–566.
[52] Kirk, op. cit., p. 177.
[53] Full discussion of Consultative Assembly and constitutional proposals in Kirk, op. cit., pp. 177–181.
[54] Cyprus, Background to Enosis, op. cit., p. 8.
[55] Christian Science Monitor, June 6, 1949, p. 11.
[56] Ibid.
[57] Rosenberger, Dr. Walter, and Herbert C. Tobin, eds. Keesing's Contemporary Archives, vol. VII, 1948–50. Keesing's Publications Limited, Bristol, England, p. 10628.
[58] Ibid.
[59] Ibid.
[60] Cyprus, Background to Enosis, op. cit., p. 8.
[61] New York Times, February 16, 1951, p. 25.
[62] Keesing's Contemporary Archives, vol. IX, 1952–54. Keesing's Publications, Ltd., Bristol, England, p. 13775.
[63] Ibid.

Cyprus question on its agenda; on that day in Athens some 100,000 demonstrated in favor of Enosis, while similar demonstrations occurred throughout the country.[64] At the U. N. Britain officially reiterated its position that the question of Cyprus was within the domestic jurisdiction of the United Kingdom.[65]

Meanwhile in Cyprus itself the Government took stern measures to suppress Enosis. Declaring that the agitation for union with Greece would no longer be tolerated, the Government stated that henceforth the existing rigid antisedition laws would be strictly enforced. On August 12 about 90 percent of the population went on a 24-hour general strike in protest against the antisedition laws.[66] Ten days later, in defiance of the antisedition laws, the Archbishop delivered a fiery speech to one of the largest crowds ever to have gathered in Nicosia. Thousands of Cypriots converged on the capital from all parts of the island, prominently displaying Greek flags on the sides of cars and buses. In his speech, the Archbishop declared:

"We shall remain faithful unto death to our national claim. * * * We shall rise above the obstacles in our way, aiming at Enosis, and only Enosis. * * * We have received the offer of a constitution with indignation, and our protest is unanimous. If our right is ignored by the U. N., which I do not believe, we shall regroup our forces and continue our struggle." [67]

In spite of tensions in the colony, on December 1, 1954, the British went ahead with their plans to move the general headquarters of the British Middle East Command to Cyprus. It was temporarily housed in Nicosia until work on a permanent establishment near Limassol could be completed.[68]

The General Assembly's Political and Security Committee began debate December 14 on the Greek resolution calling for a plebiscite on Cyprus. The United States and Great Britain, along with Turkey, Denmark, and Sweden, immediately announced support of a New Zealand resolution to scrap the Greek resolution.[69] The next day a compromise resolution, postponing consideration of self-determination for Cyprus "for the time being," passed by a 40 to 0 vote, both Britain and Greece voting for it.[70] (The Soviet Union abstained.) Greek Premier Papagos declared that Greece had been "betrayed" by its allies, including the United States.[71]

Refusal of the U. N. to take action on the Cyprus question led to serious rioting in Greece of anti-American as well as anti-British character. In Athens 59 persons were reported injured when 5,000 demonstrators surrounded buildings housing United States offices and tried to march on the United States Embassy.[72] In Salonika Greek rioters publicly burned British and American flags, smashed windows in the United States and British Consulates, and damaged the United States Information Agency in that city.[73]

On Cyprus the U. N. vote signalized intensified resistance to British rule. The Nationalists and the Communists joined in a 24-hour protest strike call that degenerated into a serious riot.[74] Violence, formerly spontaneous, became more carefully organized with the development of EOKA, a secret terrorist organization. In January 1955, a Greek motorboat carrying 27 cases of dynamite was captured near Cyprus.[75] On March 31, and for 2 nights thereafter, dynamite explosions occurred in Nicosia, Limassol, Larnaca, and Famagusta, aimed at police, military, and government installations.[76] Numerous minor incidents plagued the British police, especially demonstrations by schoolchildren. In March and again in April violent, vituperous pro-Enosis broadcasts beamed to Cyprus from Athens led the British to protest to the Greek Government.[77]

A series of bombing and hand-grenade attacks late in June determined the British to take stringent measures. The Governor was given power to detain any person "who he is satisfied has belonged to, or is a member of, an organization which has been responsible for acts of violence." [78] Once again the Nationalists and the Communists united in a protest strike, and once again demonstrators attacked British property.[79] To cope with the mounting terrorist activities, the British reinforced their garrison on Cyprus with an additional 1,500 marine commandos and several other companies.[80]

At the end of June Britain invited the Turkish and Greek Governments to send representatives to confer in London on questions affecting the eastern Mediterranean, including Cyprus.[81] Both governments accepted the invitation, but before the conference convened on August 29 the Greek Government again appealed to the U. N. to consider the question of Cyprus. At the conference, the British presented a novel proposal as a possible solution to the Cyprus dilemma, aimed at resolving both the problem of self-government for the Cypriots and the problem of Cyprus' international status. The British Foreign Minister proposed a new constitution providing for an assembly with an elected majority; all departments of the government would be progressively transferred to Cypriot ministers responsible to the assembly, with the exception of Foreign Affairs, Defense and Public Security, which would be responsible to the Governor. The British Government also proposed a special Tripartite Committee to work out the details of the constitutional proposals and to remain in being afterward to act as a center for discussing problems or differences which might arise. As for the future status of Cyprus, the British representative proposed that after the new constitution had begun to work in Cyprus, the three interested governments could again meet, this time with Cypriot representatives also, to renew discussion of Cyprus' international status.

In the course of discussion, the positions of the three governments were clearly stated. Greece stuck to its demand for self-determination for Cyprus, the Greek Foreign Minister pointing out that while Greece recognized the need for British forces on the island, the defensive value of the base would be enhanced "were the present ill-feeling among Cypriot population to be changed into a spirit of spontaneous and unqualified cooperation." [82] Turkish fears of Enosis were apparent in the statement of the Turkish Foreign Minister who pointed out that in the event of war, Turkey could only be supplied through her southern ports whose entrances could be controlled by Cyprus. He declared that the principle of self-determination was a noble one, but it should not prevail over historical, geographical, strategic, and security requirements. The British Minister shared the Turkish view regarding self-determination. In reply to a question about self-determination for Cyprus, he said: "We do not accept the principle of self-determination as one of universal application. We think that exceptions must be made in view of geographical, traditional, historical, strategical, and other considerations." [83] The Tripartite Conference adjourned on September 7.

Tensions rose to a feverish pitch during the Tripartite Conference. A bomb explosion in the Turkish Consulate in Salonica set off a chain of anti-Greek riots in Instanbul and Izmir. Mobs burned down the Greek consulate at Izmir and attacked and insulted Greek officers attached to NATO. Three fourths of the Greek Orthodox Churches in Istanbul were either destroyed by fire or damaged beyond use.[84] The Turkish Government apologized to the Greek Government and promised to pay compensation. In Cyprus a secret Turkish Cypriot organization, "Volkan," circulated leaflets threatening reprisals against attacks upon members of the Turkish community.[85]

On the heels of the failure of the London Conference, the U. N. voted not to put Cyprus on its agenda. The United States representative, in voting against consideration of the Cyprus question, stated that "quiet diplomacy" would be better than "open debate." [86] Nationalist and Communist trade unions on Cyprus went out on a 24-hour strike in protest against the U. N. decision and violence throughout the island continued unabated.

On October 3 the new Governor, Sir John Harding, arrived to assume his duties.[87] His first act was to call a meeting with Archbishop Makarios. Three such meetings were held, with the archbishop insisting that the British recognize the right of self-determination before he would cooperate further. The Governor regretfully announced the breakdown of the discussions and added that he was always ready to meet with the archbishop again. Then he cautioned the Cypriots: "Meanwhile, the life of the people of Cyprus must go on under peaceful conditions. It is my duty as Governor to maintain law and order, and this I intend to do." [88]

Sir John's task proved difficult. Since he assumed office, he has had to deal with a constant campaign of violence. Explosions, attacks on Cypriot police and British soldiers, and mob defiance of curfew and assembly regulations have occurred with frequency. The police and military have tried to use restraint in dispersing mobs, especially since on many occasions the demonstrators are school children; they rely, for the most part, on tear gas and fire hoses rather than on weapons.[89] But during October 1955, the British garrison in Cyprus was brought up to about 12,000, in addition to 2,000 RAF personnel.[90]

The disorders, bordering on anarchy, induced the Governor to declare a state of emergency in November. The emergency law made it an offense to declare a strike

[64] Ibid.
[65] Ibid.
[66] Ibid.
[67] Ibid.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Facts on File, vol. XIV, No. 737, December 10–16, 1954, p. 414.
[70] Ibid.
[71] Ibid., December 17–23, 1954, p. 426.
[72] Ibid., December 10–16, 1954, p. 414.
[73] Keesing's Contemporary Archives, vol. X, May 21–28, 1955, p. 14221.
[74] Ibid.
[75] Ibid.
[76] Ibid.
[77] Ibid.
[78] Ibid., vol. X, August 27–September 3, 1955, p. 14394.
[79] Ibid.
[80] Ibid., vol. X, September 10–17, 1955, p. 14414.
[81] Accounts of the London Tripartite Conference in Keesing's, September 10–17, 1955, pp. 14413–14414, and Cyprus, Background to Enosis, op. cit., pp. 12–14.
[82] Keesing's, vol. X, September 10–17, 1955, p. 14413.
[83] Ibid., p. 140414.
[84] Ibid., vol. X, December 10–17, 1955, p. 14582.
[85] Ibid., vol. X, November 5–12, 1955, p. 14513.
[86] Ibid., vol. X, October 8–15, 1955, p. 14465.
[87] Full report of meetings in Keesing's, op. cit., vol. X, November 5–12, 1955, p. 14513.
[88] Ibid.
[89] Ibid.
[90] Ibid.

not connected with a labor dispute. It imposed the death penalty for carrying firearms, ammunition, or other explosives without authority, and life imprisonment for acts of sabotage against communications or public utilities.[91] Meanwhile, British troops in Cyprus were placed on a wartime footing, making them responsible to military instead of civilian courts.[92]

The declaration of a state of emergency precipitated debate in the House of Commons on the question of Cyprus. The debate on December 5 revealed that secret talks were in process simultaneously between Britain and Greece in Athens, and between the governor and the archbishop in Cyprus. The foreign secretary, for that reason, begged off going into detail, but he did inform Commons that Britain had modified its position with regard to self-determination for Cyprus by conceding the right to the colony providing certain conditions are met.[93] Two days after the debate, Archbishop Makarios announced his rejection of the British proposals because the offer was "made dependent" on "certain prerequisites that rendered self-determination unattainable."[94] But by the end of the month hope of reaching a British-Cypriot modus vivendi revived when it was reported that the archbishop and the governor would renew talks.[95]

The two men resumed secret discussion on January 9.[96] Shortly thereafter, Sir John Harding flew to London for consultation, then returned to meet again with the archbishop on January 27.[97] Although the British formula for ending the violence on Cyprus remained confidential, a New York Times correspondent listed three points as its essential parts: [98]

1. Britain offers immediate self-government with a progressive transfer of administration from British to elected Cypriot representatives. Only departments of defense, foreign affairs, and internal security would be reserved for British.

2. Britain concedes the principle of self-determination for Cyprus, but for political and military reasons, not at this time.

3. Once self-government is functioning, the British will discuss self-determination with the elected Cypriot leaders.

The United States Consul General on Cyprus visited the Ethnarch on several occasions to urge him to accept the British formula as a first step.[99] Archbishop Makarios' reply came on February 2. The text has not been published but one London source describes the archbishop's answer as, "not a 'yes' and not a 'no,' but rather a 'yes, but.'"[1] The Ethnarch was said to object to the British retention of police power. Latest reports indicate that the archbishop is now willing to concede police power to the British who argue that internal security and defense are inseparable in the present circumstances.[2]

While violence continues to plague the British administration of Cyprus, competent observers hold an optimistic opinion regarding the outcome of the negotiations. It is pointed out that the British have come a long way from a flat refusal to grant self-determination to the Cypriots to an express recognition of their right; on the other hand, the archbishop too has moved toward compromise from his obstinate demand for "Enosis, and only Enosis," to a recognition of British sovereignty, for the time being at least, in matters of foreign affairs and defense. There is, however, much disappointment in the archbishop's refusal to make a plea to his people to end their terrorism until he is assured of a constitution acceptable to the Greek Cypriots.[3]

Sympathy in the United States has gone out to the Cypriots in their struggle for self-determination. In December 1954, a full-page ad appeared in leading newspapers throughout the country warmly urging support of self-determination for Cyprus; it was signed by 26 Congressmen, 4 governors, and 117 other distinguished Americans.[4]

The question naturally arises why Britain, in view of its postwar record in India, Pakistan, Burma, and the Gold Coast, should wish to hang on to the island which is proving both costly and embarrassing. Whatever the reasons in the past, today Cyprus is the only spot of strategic value in the Middle East in the cold war which is held under terms of sovereignty by any of the Western Powers. The former British mandates, Iraq, Palestine, and Transjordan, are now independent. Sudan and Libya are also free. Britain has surrendered its valuable bases in the Suez Canal Zone to Egypt. The withdrawal of Britain from one area after another in the Middle East has made Cyprus, in spite of its drawbacks of a hostile population and bad ports, the only position in the Middle East in which the West's strategic reserves can be stationed. True, the British still hold bases in Aden, Libya, Iraq, and Jordan by treaty arrangement, but relations with Jordan have deteriorated, and it is none too certain how durable treaty privileges may be anywhere in the Middle East. The same can be said for American treaty agreements with Libya and Saudi Arabia, which has already restricted the former base to observation and training activities.[5] Turkey, while a full-fledged partner of the West, has been reluctant to grant bases for NATO purposes in order not to provoke the Soviet Union. Greek and Greek-Cypriot arguments that they would welcome a British base once union with Greece had been accomplished are met with natural skepticism by the British who have had much experience with fading treaty arrangements.

An end to the dispute can come none too quickly to repair the damage already done to Western unity, and to help recover harmony among three key members in Western defense.

[91] New York Times, November 27, 1955, p. 1.
[92] London Times, November 29, 1955, p. 8.
[93] Christian Science Monitor, December 6, 1955, p. 8.
[94] New York Times, December 8, 1955, p. L6.
[95] The London Times, December 31, 1955, p. 6.
[96] New York Times, January 10, 1956, p. 5.
[97] Ibid., January 28, 1956, p. 3.
[98] Ibid., February 1, 1956, p. 6.
[99] Ibid., February 3, 1956, p. 4.
[1] Ibid., February 4, 1956, p. 4.
[2] Ibid, p. 1.
[3] Ibid., p. 4.
[4] Washington Star, December 15, 1954.
[5] Hoskins, op. cit., p. 5.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, and Mr. BENDER) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LEHMAN) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them jointly to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared in explanation of amendments to the pending farm bill which it will be my purpose to offer later in its consideration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follow:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

AMENDMENT TO PLACE SOIL-BANK EXPENDITURES UNDER SUPERVISION OF CONGRESS

In order to enable Congress through its constitutional power of appropriation to supervise soil-bank expenditures before they are made, I am offering an amendment on behalf of Senator RUSSELL of Georgia, Senator HAYDEN of Arizona, Senator BYRD of Virginia, Senator HUMPHREY of Minnesota, Senator MCCLELLAN of Arkansas, Senator CHAVEZ of New Mexico, and myself, to require the Secretary to file his program of expenditures prior to July 1, 1956, and thereafter to obtain annual appropriations from Congress in accordance with the regular procedure.

Although the President's budget for 1957 shows that the Commodity Credit Corporation is in the red in the sum of $929,287,187 and that he has asked Congress to restore this capital impairment in the current Appropriation bill, the soil-bank measure authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the facilities, services, authorization and funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation in carrying out the act.

This involves an annual expenditure not to exceed $1,100 million in each of the 4 years 1956, '57, '58, and '59, for which the program is to be prepared.

The bill contains two soil-bank proposals—first, the acreage reserve program; and second, the conservation reserve program. An annual limit of $750 million is placed on the first, and of $350 million for the second, but in each case the Secretary has the full and exclusive authority to determine what the rates and the amounts of the expenditures are to be, except that under the acreage reserve program no producer of tobacco may receive more than $100 per acre.

The only protection Congress may give the well-known taxpayers is a provision in section 221 (a) which allows it to close the barn door after the horse is stolen. This is the provision:

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to make payments to the Corporation for its actual costs incurred under this section."

Not only does the Secretary of Agriculture have the full and exclusive authority to make all the rates of payment and to distribute the payments as he personally pleases among the States, regions, areas, counties, and individual farms but in the words of section 221 (b), he may pay before the payments have been earned. In the words of the bill, he may make such payments in advance of determination of performance.

Of course, nobody would suspect that the Secretary would make these payments with any intent to influence the election, but the provision I have just quoted gives him the authority to distribute the payments as he pleases in any State or any area where the issue might be close.

How broad the authority contemplated is may be realized when it is understood that the Secretary himself is the chairman of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit

Corporation, and the President of the Corporation is Under Secretary True D. Morse.

Farmers, particularly small farmers who are looking for relief, will be interested to remember that Mr. Morse has frequently been quoted as believing that the small-size family farm is outmoded.

Only last year, on July 27, 1955, Under Secretary Morse, writing to Chairman Cooley, of the House Committee on Agriculture, objected to a soil-bank proposal on the ground, among others, that the payments provided in that bill would not be sufficient to "secure participation of those (larger) farms which are more likely to contribute to surplus supplies."

The estimated cost of the Marshall bill, which Under Secretary Morse was then condemning, amounted to $490 million. The present soil-bank proposal sponsored by the administration may cost $1,100,000,000 a year for 4 years.

Later, on September 30, 1955, writing in opposition to the Humphrey bill (S. 1396), Under Secretary Morse wrote, "We do not believe it would be an effective means of obtaining (production) adjustments."

Secretary Benson is credited with entertaining the same views, but whether or not he has abandoned them, he is authorized, by the present bill, as Secretary of Agriculture, to spend the nonexistent funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, of which he is in fact the head, in the confidence that later on after the election, Congress will make another huge appropriation such as it is being requested to do this year to restore the capital destroyed by the red ink poured out under this bill.

The measure is a complete abandonment of all thought of a balanced budget for 1956 or 1957. It is a repudiation of the intent and purpose of the provision of the Constitution that "no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

The amendment which I shall offer for my colleagues and myself will direct the Secretary to submit his detailed program to Congress by July 1, 1956, for immediate reference to the Committees on Appropriations of each House, and it will provide that after July 1, 1956, the expenditures necessary to carry out the purposes of the act shall be made not by secretarial drafts written in red ink on the Commodity Credit Corporation but by appropriation made by law out of the Treasury of the United States.

The text of the proposed amendment is hereto attached.

On page 23, before the period in line 22, insert a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the Secretary shall, prior to July 1, 1956, or such earlier date as may be practicable, submit to the Congress for immediate reference to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives a full program of all operations under this act which will require the making of expenditures prior to July 1, 1957; and, after July 1, 1956, no funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be utilized for carrying out the purposes of this act."

On page 23, line 23, after "necessary to" insert the following: "carry out the purposes of this act, including such amounts as may be required to."

Subsequently, Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. CHAVEZ) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1956—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 3308) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, to permit deduction for Federal income-tax purposes of certain political contributions, and for other purposes, the next time that bill is printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL EQUAL PAY ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3352) to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination, introduced by my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] (for himself and other Senators) on March 5, 1956, the next time the bill is printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as followings:

By Mr. WILEY:

Radio address delivered by him over station WGN, Chicago, with reference to reforming our Federal tax program.

NEW JERSEY FOOD AND DRUG LAW WEEK—PROCLAMATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, this year, 1956, marks the 50th anniversary of the Food and Drugs Act of 1906 and the Meat Inspection Act of the same year. Both these historic laws were signed on June 30, 1906, by President Theodore Roosevelt.

They have touched the lives of millions of Americans during the last half century through their wise enforcement by the Food and Drug Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

To pay proper honor to both of these laws Governor Robert B. Meyner of my State of New Jersey issued a proclamation proclaiming a "New Jersey Food and Drug Law Week," and invited all citizens of the State individually or through their organizations, to observe this anniversary during 1956 with appropriate ceremonies and observances.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have this proclamation printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the year 1956 marks the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the Federal Pure Food and Drug Law; and the splendid achievements of the American food processing industry under that law are to be celebrated nationally and by the peoples of each State; and

Whereas throughout the past five decades the canners and other food processors of New Jersey, with the guidance of the Department of Health of the State of New Jersey, have played an important role in the development of higher food standards in the interest of the consumers; and

Whereas there will be held during the week of January 20 to 26, 1956, at Atlantic City in this State, the 49th annual convention of the National Canners Association, the organization that originally sponsored the enactment of the Federal Pure Food and Drug Law of 1906, as well as the complementary New Jersey Pure Food Act.

Now, therefore, I, Robert B. Meyner, Governor of the State of New Jersey, do hereby proclaim the week of January 20–26, 1956, as New Jersey Food and Drug Law Week, and I direct that the Department of Health of the State of New Jersey and other State agencies join with the National Canners Association and all other professional, scientific, industrial, agricultural, labor, and civic organizations in the commemoration of the enactment of the Federal Pure Food and Drug Law, and of the achievements of the food processing industry of this State and all other States in the development of the present high levels of safety and quality of all processed foods.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of New Jersey, this 16th day of January in the year of Our Lord 1956, and in the independence of the United States the 180th.

ROBERT B. MEYNER,
Governor.

By the Governor:

EDWARD J. PATTEN,
Secretary of State.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment the bill (S. 3091) to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 1207, at Louisville, Ky.

SPEECH BY SENATOR SMATHERS—SPIRITUAL STATESMANSHIP

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech entitled "Spiritual Statesmanship," delivered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] at Miami, Fla., on February 16, before the Jewish Theological Seminary of America's seminar. It is an excellent and enlightening speech, and I commend its reading to the Members of this body.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Rabbi Finkelstein has stated that you people will have my speech instead of your dessert. I sincerely trust you were not expecting crepe suzette or cherries jubilee, for the only dessert in speech form which

I will be able to give you is the old-fashioned brand of meat and potatoes.

The good doctor made much of the fact that his father used to attend his speeches and the doctor was always amazed at the fact that at the end of his speech his father could remember every word which he had spoken. Well, I must say in defense of my father that several years ago he used to be able to remember every word I had spoken in my speeches—for the reason was, he wrote the speeches.

The world I come from, ladies and gentlemen, is the world of political science, practically applied. You cannot, out of consideration for my limitations, wish me to involve myself in subtle ecclesiastical discussion. That would only expose my amateur standing in theology. But I think Dr. Finkelstein's assignment to talk upon "Opportunities of Spiritual Statesmanship" was well aimed at me for the purposes of this seminar, because of the relationship of government to religion. And particularly because of the relationship of government to religion and religion to government in the United States of America. For I would be abdicating not only my faith but my basic duty as a Senator if I were to think of my function in the Senate of the United States as a job isolated from religion.

It is my firmest conviction that the Government of the United States is the most religious of all governments in the history of man's varied efforts at organizing his society. This passionate intermingling of religion and government in the basic law of the United States takes on a very special form of drama because of the fact that the very first stipulation on the Bill of Rights enjoins with compelling clarity the separation of church and state. My next point is that while religion can and has survived without the state, the state cannot survive without religion. Tyranny is deeply discommoded by religious ethics, but even tyranny needs religion to help it govern, and so tyranny turns to false gods: to nazism under Hitler, to fascism under Mussolini, to the Shintoistic deification of the Emperor, in Japan, and—now hammering I think vainly and hopelessly at the door of the free world—tyranny turns to the false and terrifying gods of communism.

With this past and this prospect before it what can be the role of spiritual statesmanship?

We know that we cannot tomorrow, even if our survival depended upon it, join all the free world into one ideal government for the common good. The human race—even for peoples so identical as, for instance, the British and the Americans—is far from ready for any such process of collaboration. There is some solid doubt probably in the best religio-ethical quarters that this amalgamation of governments is desirable. So that the proposition of one-free-world government is, as now, impossible, and, secondly, even if it were feasible there are grim questions as to its efficacy and acceptance. Our problem is what can we do with what we have? How can we use the materials that are malleable, that are here, that can be worked with, that can produce fruitful results now? How can we at this hour put into practice our faith that "except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it?"

I believe that the opportunity is wide open and crying for statesmanship—uniquely spiritual statesmanship.

For what I believe we can do at this hour and to some degree have been doing since the days of the exodus is build a moral canopy over the world—over all the world—and that this moral canopy will indeed bring into our house the indispensable craftsmanship of God. It is, of course, possible for spirituality to work in a vacuum, for a handful of servants to cloister themselves in a monastery, or a learned circle, or a rabbinate, and indulge themselves in erudite discourse and the aesthetic life. But that, I fear, is not giving the Lord much help in building the house. When I say as a layman, build a moral canopy, an ethical roof over the divisive heads of mankind, center it upon the ark of the covenant, and build its staves of principles in practice, my goal, I insist, is not an intellectual dream, not an illusion.

To an extraordinary degree this very thing has been done here on this very soil—and much of it right in our own time.

When I said that the Government of the United States is the most religious of all governments in history I did not mean that we have a preponderance of churches and synagogues, however vital these are to our national life as a God-fearing people. I mean that here in these States we implemented the teachings of the Old and the New Testaments, and we made them workable. The words "dignity of the individual," the words "sacredness of human personality," the words "equal justice under law," the words "all men are created equal," the principle "equality of opportunity"—all of them are poetic beatitudes and no more, until they are reduced to operation in everyday life, and as common to our way of existence as the washing machine and the lawn mower.

In our justly devout respect for the ancients, let us not overlook our own prophets. We had them, you know. They took heavily from the prophets of old and they builded a house in which, to say the least, the Lord was indeed the principal architect. These are the prophets who, steeped in the faith of Israel, in the Sermon on the Mount, and in the vast respect for the law that so profoundly invests the Jewish people, gave us the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights. Am I being merely figurative when I say that this thinking comes right out of the ark of the covenant? Our prophets were, of course, Jefferson and Madison and Washington and Monroe and Franklin and Mason and Tom Paine.

What these men had done was to transpose the ideals of religious ethics into actual government and the rules of life giving us in democracy the greatest of all experiments in essentially religious government. Until you provide me, as indeed the Constitution of the United States does provide me, with trial by jury, with habeas corpus, with due process, with freedom of religion, speech, press, assembly and petition, with protection against cruel and unusual punishments, the words "dignity of the individual" are without meaning. With these rights, I move out of slavery into the air of the freemen. And here on this soil, through the work of our own prophets, turned political scientists, Holy Scripture was put to everyday use, so much so that we are wont to call the great instruments of American freedom the American Scriptures. It is this we live under today in the United States of America.

So that we had the opportunity for spiritual statesmanship concomitant with the Israelites' exodus from Egypt. We had the opportunity for spiritual statesmanship concomitant with the discovery of this continent. And today we have the third of the great opportunities for spiritual statesmanship, the era in which communication is unifying and diminishing the world, the atom bomb is threatening life on this planet, and communism is soaking up one-fourth of the earth's surface and one-third of the world's population.

I ask you to balance in terms of relative importance each of these massive historical opportunities for spiritual statesmanship with each other and determine for yourselves which you think is of the greatest consequence.

We cannot decide great issues in a seminar—as we can in a constitutional convention, or in the Congress of the United States—we can only elucidate them.

When Thomas Jefferson thundered in Philadelphia—"We hold these truths to be self-evident"—some of us can still hear in that phrase, even in the historic circumstances that gave it birth, certain resemblances to an echo from Mount Sinai. But do you know what for me gave it the greatest import of all? It was the conscious knowledge of the total risk. "And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence," runs this pronouncement, "we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

The element of risk—life, fortune, and honor—must be encompassed, must be accepted, must be ventured. Not only that but boldly you put it in a petition and sent it to the King. What a valiant lesson the Jewish people have taught mankind in the noble acceptance of risk. Whether it was 40 years in the desert, or 2,000 years of persecution, they mutually pledged to each other for the sacredness of their beliefs, their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. The sacrifices and the losses were prodigious, the sufferings from the Colosseum in Rome to the murder factories of Dachau, appall the imagination of mankind. But where is Titus and the legions of Rome? I ask: Where is Hitler today and the Gestapo and the endless divisions of the Wehrmacht? But here in front of me now are the scholars and thinkers of Judaism under the aegis of the Jewish Theological Seminary, and under the canopy of a free government that implemented the teachings of the faith, discussing the opportunities of spiritual statesmanship.

I ask you to discover in these simple facts the indestructibility of spiritual ideals. And I ask you to draw from these facts a chart for the future.

To begin with when we speak of spiritual statesmanship we imply both resoluteness and patience; for we are talking in moral terms, and that means long-range planning, not short-term gains.

We cannot be unmindful of our enlightened self-interest, but we must show mankind that we have a moral horizon which transcends any gain to ourselves.

Our job is to take the teachings of religion and apply them under the moral canopy of which I speak so that we can do for the world what our Founding Fathers did for us: Human dignity came to mean equal justice under law. What religion laid down as a general principle, our Founding Fathers spelled out into specific statutes.

If today I could command all religion, what is it I would ask? I would ask the spiritual leaders of mankind everywhere to subordinate their theological differences and accentuate the areas within which they agree. I would ask it in the name of spiritual statesmanship. I would ask them not to forego their special religious expression nor would I, of course, ask for any amalgamation of faiths. That is neither necessary, desirable, nor acceptable. We can each contribute the most by emphasizing our own individual religious traditions and freely exercising and living up to them. But there is a marked area of agreement—if in some instances it be merely and only in the idea of the one God. Under that religious roof let us unite that we may prevail against the forces of tyranny and godlessness.

If the spiritual world—the world of all the great religions—cannot give the merely diplomatic and secular world an example of solidarity under God against the common foe—then what hope is there?

There is the specific area of your leadership in the current crisis. We cannot have spiritual statesmanship, Dr. Finkelstein and ladies and gentlemen, until we have first spiritual statesmen. That is the career to which you here in this seminar have dedicated yourselves. The work of the secular statesmen will broaden into the great and enduring

moral values as you teach us in government what the moral values are by your word and your example. We will then follow you, as the Founding Fathers of this country followed the teachings of the prophets of Israel in the days of this Nation's beginnings.

FUNDS FOR BUILDING AND FACILITIES FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to S. 3246, a bill which I have cosponsored, together with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and eight other Senators, including Senators from both sides of the aisle. The bill would provide funds for the construction of a suitable building and facilities for the National Institute of Dental Research. The Congress in adopting the National Dental Research Act of 1948 appropriated $2 million for the construction of an adequate building for the Institute of Dental Research. However, because of the intervention of the Korean conflict, the construction was delayed; and now it becomes necessary to spend considerably more money to construct a similar structure. The purpose of the bill, therefore, is to appropriate the necessary additional funds. It is essential that the construction of the physical plant for the Institute of Dental Research be commenced as quickly as possible, to enable dental research to progress and to permit the fullest development and utilization by practicing dentists of the latest improvements in dental knowledge and technology.

I am glad to note that this proposal has the unqualified endorsement of the American Dental Association, and that it has the enthusiastic support of many Massachusetts dentists. Dr. Harry Lyons, of Richmond, Va., president-elect of the American Dental Association, has prepared a most informative and persuasive statement on the need of the National Institute of Dental Research for adequate centralized facilities and the advantages which would flow to the public and the Nation's practicing dentists from such facilities. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Dr. Lyons' statement be included in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the continuing interest of the dentists of America in developing the latest dental techniques and in furthering the profession's understanding of the science of dentistry has resulted in our Nation's having the finest dental care available anywhere in the world. Their great contribution to our national health is noteworthy, and I hope we shall make possible even greater efforts by them.

Passage of the bill is of importance, not only to the dentists of this country, but to every person in the United States. Construction of adequate facilities for the Institute of Dental Research will, in the words of Dr. Lyons, lead to the following results:

The dental profession would be more effective in its services to the public and our population would profit tremendously in terms of improved health.

There is every reason to believe that under the able leadership of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, whose dedication to the advancement of medical science is known throughout the Nation, the bill will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

EXHIBIT A

THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH: ITS NEED FOR ADEQUATE CENTRALIZED FACILITIES AND ITS ADVANTAGES TO THE PUBLIC AND DENTAL PRACTITIONERS

The National Institute of Dental Research was created to meet a critical need in the realm of dental health. The dental diseases are now recognized as very important health factors in the totality of human welfare. Despite the many achievements of the dental profession the ravages of dental diseases are essentially unabated in this country.

The dental diseases have not been dramatized in a manner comparable to cancer, heart disease, arthritis, and crippled children. Nevertheless, they account for a tremendous toll in human suffering and depreciation of health status, and even bear important relationships to the ability of thousands of persons to gain and hold employment.

Assuming full life expectancy, all persons are afflicted by one dental disease or another at some time during their lives. For example, more than 95 percent of our population suffer dental caries (tooth decay). Most adults and many children are at some time afflicted by periodontal disease (gum disease). Seventy-five percent of those who lose their teeth lose them because of these diseases. Approximately 20 percent of our children suffer severe, deforming irregularities of their teeth. One out of every 800 children born alive suffer the horrible deformities of cleft palate and harelip. Approximately 9 percent of all cancers occur in the mouth and are related to dental structures. Relationships exist between dental infections and heart disease, among many systemic ailments. Viewed in terms of human welfare, no one can deny that these dental diseases constitute an ominous drain on the national health.

In terms of cost to the Nation, the problem is also of tremendous proportions. The Nation's yearly civilian dental bill is approximately $1½ billion, almost 13 percent of the national expenditure for all private health services. The Federal Government spends many millions more for the dental health care of its beneficiaries. The Department of Defense, for example, spends about $100 million annually for the dental health care of military personnel and uses the services of nearly 6,000 dentists in the Armed Forces. In spite of these very large outlays, less than one-half of the population receives dental care. It is simply not reasonable to say that this pattern of dental disease and its cost should continue without effective intervention by the only available weapon—dental research.

The National Institute of Dental Research now conducts an intramural research program and also a grant program to support research in non-Federal institutions, such as the dental schools. An adequate building, equipment, and staff for the National Institute of Dental Research is sought by the American Dental Association in order that its intramural program may be expanded to meet the prevailing critical needs for dental research. As well as this program has been conducted to date and as devoted to duty as is its personnel, it is interesting to note that of all dental research reports presented to the International Association for Dental Research during the past 7 years only 60 out of the 1,040 contributed have come from the National Institute of Dental Research. This figure is not cited in criticism of the presently employed personnel but to indicate the limited scope of the current intramural program of the National Institute of Dental Research.

Here are some of the dental diseases on which there are critical needs for dental research to establish thier causes and thereby to enable development of prevention and control measures:

1. Cleft palate and harelip developmental difficulties afflicting 1 out of 800 live births in this country: While there are many treatment programs being developed for these crippled children, very little has been done to establish the causes of these deformities and nothing is yet available in terms of prevention in this area of human affliction.

2. Facial deformities related to malocclusion (crooked teeth): Here, again we have corrective or remedial programs but very little has been done toward the preventive solution of a problem which bears important relationships to nutrition, gastric disorders, personal esthetics, mental well-being, etc., etc.

3. Dental caries (tooth decay) and dental infections as its sequela: These are problems so vast and complex that the only hope for their solution rests on the broadest possible approach involving many areas of basic and clinical research.

4. Periodontal diseases (the so-called gum diseases): These are complete mysteries as concerns their causes. There are vitally important relationhips between these diseases and general health. Given a long enough life everyone suffers some type of gum disease which accounts for the loss of approximately 75 percent of all teeth.

5. Dental geriatric problems: The dental problems of the aged constitute an ever-growing challenge and have now reached tremendous proportions in both our civilian and military populations.

6. Virus infections: These are known to have a profound effect on dental health and are essentially an unexplained problem.

7. Oral cancers: These constitute 9 percent of all human malignancies. This problem in its relation to dental structures presents one of our most critical challenges in the realm of health.

8. Relationship between dental infections and heart disease, such as subacute bacterial endocarditis and rheumatic heart disease: This presents another critical challenge to dental research.

These enumerated items constitute the major dental problems calling for the broadest possible type of research assault in an effort to establish their causes and effective preventive programs.

The dental diseases are so complex in their causation that successful research on these problems requires the combined and coordinated knowledge and skills of many scientists of varied education and training—dentists, anatomists, histologists, histochemists, biochemists, physiologists, bacteriologists, nutritionists, pathologists, pharmacologists, physicists, roentgenologists, physicians, statisticians, and others. Only in an adequately housed, equipped, and staffed National Institute of Dental Research can all of these workers and their efforts be coordinated in an effective assault on major dental problems. Their solution is currently beyond the scope of research programs in the dental schools and other non-Federal agencies.

It would appear that our Federal Government should respond to the urgent appeals of the dental profession to support and engage in research which may lead to the preventive solution of diseases afflicting our entire population. This is within the purview of public health. A magnificent contribution which may be cited as an example of what may be accomplished at this level is public water fluoridation as an anticaries measure. Experiments on water fluoridation

have demonstrated an approximate 60-percent reduction in tooth decay in children 6 to 9 years of age at a per capita cost in the range of 8 to 12 cents.

The total cost of a new central building for the National Institute of Dental Research, together with an expanded extramural research program, is extremely limited by comparison to the cost of present-day dental care, limited in coverage and scope as it is. It appears reasonable, therefore, to urge our Federal Government to make the expenditures necessary to obtain the research findings necessary for their ultimate solution. The dental profession would be more effective in its services to the public and our population would profit tremendously in terms of improved health.

HARRY LYONS,
President-Elect,
American Dental Association.

MARCH 6, 1956.

THE DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT IN THE SCHOOL CASES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 5 minutes, during the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, under our American system of government, the Supreme Court was established to settle disagreements over the interpretation of the basic law and the Constitution.

On the question of segregation in public education the Court has ruled unanimously—and it was the ruling of all members of the Court, regardless of the sections of the country from which they have come, and regardless of their political affiliations—that such segregation denies equality of opportunity in education and violates the 14th amendment. For that amendment provides that no State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. The Court properly recognized that when schoolchildren are segregated on the basis of race, a deep stigma is imposed upon the children of the Negro and Mexican races which will last through life.

I believe, moreover, such segregation is a violation of the basic principles of Christianity, which teaches fellowship and brotherhood and which emphasizes that God hath made of one blood all the races of the earth. Such segregation, moreover, violates the historic American principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal" and "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The Court at the same time has recognized that the law must be applied with due consideration for the changes it will bring in the educational procedures in various States and with a reasonable time period therefore allowed for this adjustment.

I had hoped that this decision would be accepted by all of our people, and that every effort would be made in all sections of the country to apply the law constructively and in good temper. I am glad that in most areas of the country, including many where the decision has meant major changes, the adjustment to the law has gone forward cooperatively, with good will, and with success.

No doubt it is the legal right of those who disapprove the law as thus interpreted to seek by lawful means, such as a constitutional amendment, to change it. This stated objective of those who have joined in the Declaration of Constitutional Principles, therefore, is wholly within their rights, and I do not criticise them for this portion of their action, although I disagree with this objective.

But I deeply regret the action—which will have the effect of encouraging resistance to the Court's orders—to which their convictions have impelled them. I welcome their repeated insistence that such resistance be carried on within the framework of the law. But I fear its effect will be to encourage those who will not be so meticulous about law and order, to discourage those who were willing to cooperate in making the adjustments to the law in reason and friendliness, and to turn the attention of many persons backwards to the old debate before the Court, rather than forward to the complex but essential job of learning to live with the law as interpreted.

Criticism of the Court and its decisions is of course both legal and proper, although in this instance I do not agree with the criticism and instead believe that the decision was correct. But as long as the decisions of the Court represent the law of the land, they should be obeyed.

The rigid adherence to earlier legal positions does not seem to me to contribute much to the solving of this problem. I hope that we can find a way, through the deep emotions and long-held traditions, to the mood of friendly and understanding and reasonable discussion, in which people of differing views work out the essential adjustments of life without breaking the fabric of law and order. And I hope that those who urge resistance to the Court's order will recognize that others of us with equal conviction and sincerity believe that the law of the land and the basic principles of our religion and our democracy, as well as the clear needs of our foreign policy, require strong support of the Court's rulings.

I hope America will never go backward in its march towards equality of opportunity.

SEGREGATION IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Abraham Lincoln-Theodore Roosevelt-Robert La Follette, Sr.-George Norris faction of the Republican Party, I am authorized to say that we accept the challenge issued yesterday by 19 Senators and 77 Members of the House who issued a manifesto on the subject of the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the segregation-in-public-education cases.

COLUMBIA RIVER RESOURCES AND PLANS OF HARVEY CO. FOR ALUMINUM PROCESSING

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the importance of the Columbia River in the industrial growth of the Pacific Northwest becomes more apparent as new plans are unveiled for expansion of America's aluminum production facilities. It is plain that our Nation's supply of this vital light metal would have been critically short during times of national peril if it were not for the vast supply of low-cost electricity which comes from Columbia river powerhouses as its waters drain to the sea.

But the Columbia is also a workhorse in another respect. Its broad sweep forms the only waterway on our continent to penetrate a major mountain range. In cutting through the Cascade Mountains, the Columbia provides a low-cost mode of transportation which taps the great inland empire of the Pacific Northwest.

The contributions of the Columbia River to the material advancement of the Nation—through its kilowatts and through cheap water transportation—have not been accomplished without man-made improvements. The series of federally financed dams on the river has made it possible to reap the harvest of benefits from the Columbia's natural assets.

A few days ago the Harvey Aluminum Co. announced plans to bring South American bauxite to its soon-to-be constructed plant near The Dalles, Oreg., where the bauxite will be processed into alumina. This development marks a new chapter in growth of the light-metals industry in the Pacific Northwest, because previously the alumina smeltered in the Northwest's electric-furnaces had been shipped from southern points. The Harvey plan would result in a complete extractive process-reduction of the bauxite into alumina by utilizing natural gas, which is being piped into the Northwest region, and finishing the alumina ore into aluminum ingots, bars, and sheets. Thus, the Pacific Northwest aluminum industry may become more fully integrated, providing greater stability in year-round payrolls.

Harvey's plans for bringing bauxite to the Northwest will be dependent on further improvements of navigation on the Columbia. Minor channel adjustments must be made in the channel between Vancouver and Bonneville Dam, and rock obstructions must be removed between Bonneville and The Dalles. The Army Corps of Engineers has made a thorough study of these needs, and I believe that the Congress will support these improvements because of the great national benefits which will be derived from permitting fully loaded ocean vessels to bring raw bauxite from South American ore deposits directly to the processing plants along the Columbia.

Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed with my remarks, a story from the Oregonian of March 7, 1956, regarding the bold and hopeful plans of the Harvey Aluminum Co. to process bauxite in the Northwest; and an editorial from the Oregonian of March 8, 1956, commenting on this development.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian of March 7, 1956]

FIRM PLANS IMPORTING OF BAUXITE—HARVEY SAYS WORK ON OREGON PLANT TO BEGIN IN MAY

Harvey Aluminum Co. disclosed to the Oregonian Tuesday its plans for The Dalles contemplate shipping South American bauxite up the Columbia for making alumina from which its projected aluminum reduction operation would produce ingots of the light metal.

The process would utilize natural gas expected to be delivered in Oregon later in the summer but the bauxite to alumina project would not be undertaken until after completion of the $44 million reduction mill.

Construction of the aluminum facility is scheduled to get under way in the mid-Columbia gorge city by May and L. A. Harvey, vice president of the company, reported at Torrance, Calif., headquarters, it would require about 2 years to complete.

RIVER DRAWS STUDY

Harvey's bauxite plans would mean the first fully integrated processing of ore to metal ingots in the Pacific Northwest if it is achieved. Harvey said problems relating to the Columbia shipping channel beyond Portland to The Dalles are under study. He said deepening of the channel to the inland city, 60 miles up river from Portland—Vancouver would likely be required. This was once authorized at a depth sufficient to handle small oceangoing vessels, Harvey reported, but was allowed to lapse for lack of tonnage to warrant the expenditure.

Details on the amount of natural gas which might be available from the line now being built from Colorado and later from Canada for processing of bauxite also are under study, Harvey revealed. The method is the Alcoa-Bayer process, the most efficient, and utilizes thermal heat, principally gas, in United States plants. The Northwest now obtains most of its bauxite from Arkansas ore pits, shipped by rail. Some has been shipped by coastal routes from Carribean islands in recent years, however.

The aluminum company executive reported his company has interests in South American deposits of bauxite and our studies involve these sources.

ANACONDA TO BUILD

Referring to the Salem facility which Harvey acquired at the time the war-built alumina-from-clay plant was disposed of by the Government, Harvey said: "We have kept a group at Salem investigating the prospects of Pacific Northwest laterites. Technically, it is possible to produce alumina from these laterites, but the economics are the big hurdle." He added Harvey was keenly interested in the announcement by Anaconda Aluminum Co. that the newest Pacific Northwest aluminum producer would build a pilot plant in northern Idaho or northeastern Washington to investigate the kaolin clays as a source of alumina. So far, the Salem investigations have concentrated on laterites of Washington County, or Cowlitz County, Wash., and those of Marion County.

Commenting on a report by a trade journal that Harvey had just floated a $40 million loan with Bank of America for its project at The Dalles, Harvey said this was not true. "We had our financing all lined up 2 years ago, and it is still firm."

[From the Oregonian of March 8, 1956]

HARVEY'S UP-RIVER PLANS

The Harvey Aluminum Co.'s announcement that plans for its reduction plant at The Dalles include eventual construction of facilities for producing alumina from bauxite calls attention again to the dependence of the aluminum industry not only on low-cost hydroelectric power but also on low-cost sources of thermal energy and water transportation.

Production of aluminum in great quantities in the Pacific Northwest is possible because of the availability here of inexpensive electric power, which is used to reduce alumina to aluminum. But the alumina, which is an oxide of aluminum, has had to be produced elsewhere, chiefly in the South, where low-priced natural gas is available in large quantities.

The South has the advantage, too, of being comparatively close to the sources of bauxite, from which alumina is produced, in South America and the Caribbean. Since bauxite is approximately twice as bulky as alumina, water transportation between the source and the alumina plants is important.

In the Alcoa-Bayer process, which the Harvey Co. has indicated it would use at The Dalles, the bauxite is ground and cooked at high pressure under intense heat in a sodium hydroxide liquor. The liquor dissolves the aluminum oxide but not the other ingredients of bauxite and thus the aluminum oxide or alumina is separated. Natural gas provides the vital thermal energy to accomplish this process and also to evaporate the liquor so that it may be reconcentrated and reused.

The piping of natural gas to this region opens the possibility that production of alumina could be combined with the electric power-based reduction of aluminum. That possibility has been considered by other aluminum companies. Adequate supply and low cost are important factors, of course.

Alumina from the South is shipped at present to the Northwest by rail. To ship bauxite in that manner would be much more expensive due to its 2-to-1 weight ratio to alumina. So the Harvey plans apparently include water transportation of bauxite direct from South America to The Dalles.

This raises the question of what needs to be done in the Columbia Channel to permit oceangoing vessels to reach the inland port. Only once, in 1938, has such a craft called at The Dalles. The 290-foot, 3,800-ton steamer *Charles L. Wheeler, Jr.*, visited the Wasco County community with 1,420 tons of cargo as part of the ceremony dedicating the Bonneville locks. Its pilot found the entrance to the locks difficult to navigate, and its topmasts had to be lowered to negotiate the Hood River Bridge. Height of the pool behind Bonneville Dam had to be varied to ease the current and to permit passage under the bridge.

A channel of 27-foot depth from Portland-Vancouver to The Dalles has been authorized by Congress, but it has been maintained only to 15 feet by the Army engineers since 1949, when it became apparent the greater depth was not justified by the traffic, which consists of lower-draft barges. Dredging and removal of some rocks, such as at Eagle Creek Point and in Cascade Rapids, would provide a 27-foot channel fairly free of hazards. Cost of such work is not estimated. There has been some consideration given to modification of the Bonneville locks, but their 76-foot width and 500-foot length should be adequate to pass most smaller oceangoing ships.

The Harvey plan has interesting possibilities. However, it is not in the immediate picture. The bauxite-to-alumina project would not be undertaken until after completion of the aluminum-reduction plant, which the Harvey firm estimates will require 2 years. By then cost and other factors may be more definite.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN D. BOWMAN

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the University of Pittsburgh has honored Dr. John G. Bowman by naming the Cathedral of Learning, the tallest educational building in the world, in his honor. This edifice is a towering spike more than 40 stories in height, and was constructed through the determination and enthusiasm of Dr. Bowman. He was made chancellor of the university in 1921, and served for 24 years. During his reign he built a spectacular group of buildings costing $32 million. The 42-story cathedral, Dr. Bowman said, "symbolizes some of the power that is in good teaching."

He acquired two other important buildings—the pure Gothic Heinz Memorial Chapel and the world's foremost monument to a composer—the Stephen Foster Memorial. When Dr. Bowman took charge of the University of Pittsburgh, it had an enrollment of 2,300, and reached a peak of over 25,000 following World War II. The university is now the center of a great cultural group, including the Carnegie Technical School, the Carnegie Library, the Mellon Institute, a great medical center, and many other outstanding institutions. All of these accomplishments began through donation of the campus site by Andrew W. Mellon and Richard B. Mellon.

On the occasion of the tribute to Dr. Bowman, Dr. Alan M. Scaife, president of Pitt's board of trustees unveiled the stone panel carrying the dedication message esteeming the cathedral as "a symbol of his vision, a sign of his faith that youth will find here moments of high victory."

Tributes to Dr. Bowman's contributions to the development of the university were spoken by Dr. Edward Weidlein, president of Mellon Institute, and Dr. Leon Falk, Jr., a vice president of the board.

The tablet, Dr. Bowman said in response, "is a record of the kindness and nobility of the board of trustees." "Out of my heart," he said, "I want to say thanks."

Dr. Bowman's work at the university will live years into the future. He is now in retirement in Bedford County, Pa.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF TITLE I OF FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a telegram which I have received from Fargo, N. Dak., on the subject of the proposed revision of title I of the Federal Housing Administration Act. Identical telegrams were received from a number of persons. I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram, together with the list of names of those sending such telegrams, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram, together with the list of names, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARGO, N. DAK., *February 23, 1956.*

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

I am vitally interested in FHA title 1 revisioned. This will come to your attention

shortly. I feel that title 1 should be given permanent status and that monthly payments should be extended from 36 to 60 months with a $3,580 minimum. Thanks for your personal attention and consideration in this matter.

Harold Fischer, Moorhead, Minn.; Harold Holton, Fargo, N. Dak.; Ray Schritz, Rothsay, Minn.; John Oberg, Moorhead, Minn.; James Fails, Fargo, N. Dak.; Harold Fischer, Moorhead, Minn.; Mrs. Mary Belonger, Wally Erdmann, Garrett E. Smith, Fargo, N. Dak.

OPPOSITION IN OREGON TO LICENSING OF PROJECTS WHICH IMPERIL FISHERIES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, recent action of the Federal Power Commission in licensing hydroelectric projects affecting the State of Oregon has brought widespread objections from various interests within my home State. The licenses to the Idaho Power Co. for its Hells Canyon low dams, to Portland General Electric for its Pelton Dam, and to the Eugene water and electric board for its Beaver Marsh Dam project, have highlighted the jurisdictional conflict between States and the Federal Government over use of water.

The Idaho Power Co. has taken the position that, because it has a Federal Power Commission license, it need not comply with State licensing requirements governing water rights. The Portland General Electric Co. has taken a similar position in regard to the veto power of the State over dams regarded as inimical to fisheries. The Beaver Marsh project near Eugene has aroused opposition because of its commercial intrusion into a unique scenic, recreational, and wildlife area.

Various aspects of the FPC's licensing action are being discussed by newspaper editors throughout the State of Oregon. They reflect a grave concern for the authority of the State to control its water resources. Mr. President, I ask consent to include with my remarks an editorial from the Oregonian of March 9, 1956, and an editorial from the Oregon Statesman of March 8, 1956, commenting on these projects.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian of March 9, 1955]

VALUES OF BEAVER MARSH

On March 27 Eugene voters will consider in a special election an $8,500,000 bond issue for construction of a municipal hydroelectric plant on the upper McKenzie River at Beaver Marsh. Federal and State permission for the project already has been obtained.

We do not presume to advise Eugene folk on how to handle their own fiscal affairs. But inasmuch as the area chosen for this development is one of the State's major beauty and recreation spots, part of a United States national forest, and that much of its value as such admittedly would be impaired, the project for which the money is sought is one of general public interest.

Always there is disagreement on the proper way to utilize publicly owned natural resources. On the one hand there are those who see industries, payrolls and economic growth as the only really important things, and that if damming the rivers and digging up the minerals and chopping down the trees contribute to these, they are sensible things to do. Principles of conservation, which means the practice of restraint today so that some resource values may be preserved for the citizens of tomorrow, mean little to those to whom the present is everything.

On the other hand there are some who call themselves conservationists, who wish to preserve almost everything in its wild, natural, unspoiled state. This is not conservation, either. It is just plain hoarding.

Our feeling is that each proposal for use of natural resources ought to be considered as part of the overall picture of what we now have, what we need now, and what we will need in the future. Admittedly it is sometimes necessary, in using one resource, to harm or destroy another. This is regrettable, but if a pressing need for the one overbalances the loss of the other, it must be accepted. For this reason we have indorsed construction of great multipurpose dams on the Columbia River despite their injury to valuable fish runs. The need of the region for a big supply of low-cost power is paramount.

With the same reasoning we have opposed such projects as Pelton Dam on the Deschutes River. This dam suits the personal interests of the Portland General Electric Co., which would like to be more independent of Federal power generation, and taxpayers of Jefferson County, who want a new taxable property to help them carry the burden of county services. But the puny power output of this project, considered against the hydro potential of the main Columbia River, will not benefit the public as much as the public would lose through strangulation of a river essential to the rehabilitation program for salmon and steelhead in the lower Columbia watershed.

The Beaver Marsh project falls into this same category. The city of Eugene does not need the 30,000 kilowatts it will produce, because the preference clause in the Bonneville Power Act assures its municipally owned electric utility of priority in the purchase of federally generated power. And that Eugene can build a small plant at today's prices and generate power cheaper than it can buy BPA power from Bonneville, Grand Coulee, McNary and the other big dams hardly can be believed.

Here is a case where the recreational resource of the Beaver Marsh area should be considered paramount. A great many Oregonians will be hoping the people of Eugene will reflect on the conflict of ideas about resource utilization before they vote on March 27.

[From the Oregon Statesman of March 8, 1956]

EFFECT OF PELTON DAM DECISION

At the instigation of Attorney General Thornton the district attorney of Baker County is doing some detective work to see if Idaho Power has begun construction work on its proposed Snake River dams in violation of Oregon's hydroelectric law. We doubt very much if anyone goes to jail as a result of this proceeding. Idaho Power might elect to depend on its Federal license already granted. Also its application for State permits is now before the Oregon hydroelectric commission. Presumably, the decision of the commission will be forthcoming shortly. It seems a little bit hasty to threaten criminal action pending that decision.

What is of concern is another provision of the Oregon Hydroelectric Act. That is the one which authorizes the commission to specify the amount of the annual fee which the licensee shall pay to the State. The law does not fix the amount save the maximum at $1 per horsepower. Under this law the California Oregon Power Co., for instance, will pay the State $22,495 this year on its four plants in Douglas County which were licensed by the State (310.210 horsepower). In the 1960's the payment will reach $46,531 per annum.

But here is Pelton Dam on the Deschutes which PGE is building under an FPC license, in spite of the denial of a State license. How can the State collect any fee there?

Idaho Power filed its application for a license at Oxbow site on Snake River several years ago but processing it was suspended pending settlement at the Federal level. If the State commission should deny the application, then Idaho Power might elect to go ahead as has the PGE at Pelton site. If the commission issues a State license then the State will be able to collect fees. Presumably, since the Snake River is an interstate stream, the rate would be only one-half of what it would be for a project on an intrastate stream. The theoretical capacity of the three dams will be 1,430,000 horsepower, so a reasonable expectation is that after the plants come into full production the State may derive over $100,000 a year as license fees. In addition the company would pay property and other taxes like other private utilities.

The State of Idaho has a much stiffer tax, imposing a levy of one-half mill per kilowatt-hour on power produced in that State.

Our purpose in this editorial is not to comment on the merits of the Idaho Power application but to point out the complications that threaten as a result of the Pelton Dam decision of the United States Supreme Court. The validity of the State act as applying to streams where the lands involved are Federal reservations is certainly impaired. The result then is for the State to lose the authority outlined in the hydroelectric act, including right to collect license fees and right of recapture. State's rights surely suffered a blow under that Pelton Dam decision.

THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber on late Wednesday evening of last week when the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] implied by innuendo that the National Farmers Union was unpatriotic. I cannot let this debate come to a close, however, without saying that I have seen no evidence of this alleged fact, and that all my observations have been to the exact contrary.

For 3 years, the Farmers Union of Illinois has organized seminars here in Washington, where its members have discussed farm policies. I have met with them on each of these occasions, and have never heard any remark which was in the slightest degree subversive. In fact, the whole discussion was in the best American tradition. I have been deeply impressed by the devotion of the members of the Farmers Union and of its officers to the idea of the family-sized farm, which furnishes the economic basis in the countryside for true American democracy.

I have come to know Mr. Ralph Bradley, the president of the Illinois Farmers Union; and everything that I have seen of him has been favorable. I have had a similar experience with the representatives of the Washington office of the Farmers Union. I have not agreed with every feature of their program, but I have found them to be alert to the interests of the farmers, particularly of the smaller farmers; to be trustworthy in their choice of facts; and to make a good case for their proposals.

It is easy in these days to stir up bitterness by reflecting on the motives of men who differ from us. This is at once unjust, and it weakens the unity of our Nation. My views on price supports differ in many respects from those of my fellow Illinoisan, Mr. Charles B. Shuman, the president of the American Farm Bureau. But I have always said both publicly and privately that I regarded Mr. Shuman as a sincere and devoted man with the finest of personal qualities. I believe that Mr. Bradley and Mr. Patton of the Farmers Union are worthy of equal respect.

We should thrash these issues out on their merits, without resorting to improper reflections on men's characters.

THE FARMERS UNION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Senator from Orgeon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comment on the statements made last Wednesday afternoon by my friend from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] with respect to the Farmers Union. I wish to say at the outset that I am completely impersonal about it. I not only have a high regard for the Senator from Florida, but I like to consider him one of my personal friends in the Senate. He is a man who never hesitates to express his convictions, and, as I have said to some of my friends in the Senate, the Senator from Florida would walk through flame to protect a conviction if he thought it was necessary by so doing to protect it.

Therefore, Mr. President, in rising to defend the good name of the Farmers Union I cast no reflection upon the senior Senator from Florida as an individual. I shall not take the time to read those portions of his speech in the RECORD to which I take exception other than to call attention to page 4204 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at which he said:

> Mr. President, there is one other thing I shall say. It is quite unpleasant for me to say it, but I think it should be said here. Before I say it, I wish to state that I do not have the faintest idea that either the officers or the members of the National Farmers Union are Communists or communistic, or that they have the slightest idea that their program is as close to the program announced by the American Communist Party as it is. But, Mr. President, the announced program of the American Communist Party happens to be pegged on exactly the same provision as that stated in the National Farmers Union program and as testified to us at numerous times in our hearings, and as filed with us in resolutions, time after time, making as their first request 100 percent of parity on all agricultural commodities, whether perishable or storable.

On page 4205 of the RECORD the Senator from Florida proceeded to discuss the matter further, and said:

> I do not think it is any diminution of the proof of that statement when we find the Communist Party announcing it as the first plank in its farm program. To me it is the essence of socialism, and the exact contradiction of sound Americanism, to talk about a program under which the Government is held to owe its people who happen to be farmers 100 percent price support for everything they raise, whether storable or perishable. Also, there is the proviso that the farm must not exceed the value of a 1-family farm.

Mr. President, the attempt of the Senator from Florida to link Farmers Union defenders of the family farm with the platform and purposes of the Communist Party was most unfortunate and unjustified. The Senator from Florida charges National Farmers Union with a position also occupied by President Eisenhower and the Republican Party, the Democratic Party and former President Truman, and many other honorable and estimable persons and institutions of our land who have risen to the defense of the American family farm. Defending the family farm is defending the basic principle of private enterprise—a principle of rugged individualism, work, sweat, and love of land—that made this country great.

Defending the family farm is defending people, and the long history of our country demonstrates—if nothing else—that the rights of the people are the basic purpose of our form of government. The fact that the Communist Party platform calls for defense of the family farm certainly does not cast into disrepute all other organizations which defend the family farm. To impute such a connection is an absurd example of nonsequitur reasoning.

I have noticed from advertisements in the farm press that the Republican senatorial and congressional committees are spending some quarter of a million dollars to "help Eisenhower pass the new farm program." What are some of the points of this program? First, it would, "protect family-type farms by limiting the size of price support loans made to large corporation-type farms." Now this limit is also favored by the Communist Party. Is this only a coincidence, or have the members of the Republican senatorial and congressional committees become unwitting dupes of a sinister foreign power? Knowing the learned gentlemen who compose these committees, I would say "No"—emphatically "No."

But last week the Senator from Florida alleged that the widely respected National Farmers Union was following the Communist Party line because it favored the family farm, 100 percent of parity, and a limitation on the amount of price supports any one farm could receive. Have we become so unreasoning that simply because the Communist Party is for something we must automatically be against it? If the Communist Party come out for motherhood, would the Senator from Florida feel he must oppose it?

The "cutoff" idea that drew the charge of "communism" from the Senator from Florida is as American as apple pie. Even the President's farm message contains this philosophy. If National Farmers Union's fight for a farm program is "communistic," then I presume by all the rules of logic that President Eisenhower, Secretary Benson, and all the policymakers of the Administration are also "communistic." The charge of the Senator from Florida is simply, in my judgment, a name calling tactic which should be rejected by farmers generally. I am sure the Senator from Florida did not intend it to be so interpreted by the Farmers Union.

In my State, we have as president of the Farmers Union a great citizen by the name of Harley Libly. If the Senator from Florida knew him as well as I know him, I am certain the Senator from Florida would share my opinion that Harley Libly certainly would not countenance communism of any sort. The same is true of every other officer of the Farmers Union in my State of Oregon. I am sure it is true in other States as well. The Senator from Florida, as he indicated in the quotation I read, made very clear that he does not charge the leaders of the Farmers Union with being Communist-inclined. But the sad thing is that when he charges their program as being of the Communist Party line, his charge brushes off on to the leaders of the Farmers Union as individuals. I think it is unfortunate that this charge should be made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that is why I rise to answer it today, because I know the Senator from Florida, so far as the individuals are concerned, does not intend to do them any individual damage.

But the Harley Liblys, the Jim Pattons, the Bakers, and all the other officials of the Farmers Union are, because of the charges made by the Senator from Florida, bound to be damaged by the speech of the Senator from Florida. The fact is that the Farmers Union program has many of the aspects, as I have said, of the Eisenhower program, the Democratic Party program, and, as the result of action on the floor of the Senate yesterday, the program of the majority of the Senate of the United States, so far as the cutoff feature is concerned. It is unfair to leave the impression that the Farmers Union may be Communist inclined because some of its recommendations for farm legislation are similar to those recommended by the Communist Party as well as by the Eisenhower administration, the Republican and Democratic platforms, and for that matter by action taken in the Senate itself.

Let us examine the goals of the National Farmers Union, a farm organization with a half-century of distinguished service to agriculture. The Farmers Union is for the preservation of the family farm; it is for 100 percent of parity farm income; it is for a dollar cutoff on the amount of Federal aid any one farm may receive. These are some of the objectives of this great farm organization. Only by coincidence does the President of the United States agree with Farmers Union, for he, too, seeks the preservation of the family farm; he, too, is for the dollar cutoff in farm aid; and at Kasson, Minn., and numerous other places, he said he was for full parity—that means 100 percent of parity. To this extent I would say that President Eisenhower and members of the National Farmers Union are seeking the same goals.

About 2 weeks ago I spoke to the Oregon State Farmers Union convention in Salem, Oreg. I sat down at a luncheon

following the meeting and had a long talk with the officials of the Farmers Union of my State. I have never talked with any group of men who, in my judgment, are more patriotic, more throughly American, more devoted to the ideals of a republican form of government, than are the officials of the Farmers Union of my State.

So I rise today to answer what I consider to be a non sequitur argument, namely, the Farmers Union is Communist inclined because we may find some points in the Farmers Union program, in the Republican program, in the Democratic program, in the Eisenhower program, in the previous program of the Democratic Party when it was in control of the Department of Agriculture, which coincide with certain points which the Communist Party has recommended. Mr. President it does not make the proponents of common recommendations on farm legislation communistic or subject, in my judgment, to the charge that there should be any reflection upon them, simply because of the fact that there is a coincidence between a legislative point or two which they recommend, and a point or two which the Communist Party recommends.

As I said at the beginning, I am completely impersonal about this matter. I simply completely disagree with the conclusions reached by the Senator from Florida. Therefore, I rose this morning to defend the good name of the Farmers Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in closing, to have printed in the RECORD the records of Jim Patton and the various positions he has held, many of which required security clearance before he could hold those positions.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public boards to which Mr. James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, has been appointed and on which he served:

National Advisory Board, National Youth Administration. President Roosevelt appointed.

Economic Stabilization Board. Appointed by President Roosevelt.

Adviser, United States of America delegation, Second Inter-American Conference on Agriculture, Mexico City, 1942. Appointed by President Roosevelt and Secretary of State.

Public Advisory Board, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. Appointed by President Roosevelt, confirmed by United States Senate.

Adviser to United States delegation, Inter-American Conference on War and Peace (Chapultepec Conference), Mexico City, March 1945. Appointed by President Roosevelt and Secretary of State.

Consultant, United States of America delegation, United Nations Conference on International Organization, founding meeting of United Nations, San Francisco, 1945. Appointed by President Roosevelt and Secretary of State.

Adviser, delegation United States of America, founding meeting Food and Agriculture Organization, Quebec, Canada, October 1945. Appointed by President Truman and Secretary of State.

Adviser, United States of America delegation, FAO, Copenhagen, Denmark, 1946; Geneva, Switzerland, 1947; 1948–49–50, Washington, D. C.; 1951, Rome, Italy. Appointed by President Truman and Secretary of State.

1948: Public Advisory Board, Economic Cooperation Administration and later Mutual Security Administration. Appointed by President Truman, confirmed by United States Senate.

Member, National Security Resources Board. Appointed by President Truman.

Member, Mobilization Policy Board. Charles E. Wilson, Chairman. Appointed by President Truman.

Public Advisory Board, Foreign Operations Administration. Appointed by President Eisenhower 1953. Still serving.

All of these positions were cleared for handling security information.

In 1941, a member of Committee To Defend America by Aiding the Allies, Chairman William Allen White. This committee was fought as a war device by Communists and isolationists—Russia was an ally of Germany at that time. The records show that Mr. Patton strongly supported Marshall plan and U. N. action in stopping aggression in Korea.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry I was not here when the distinguished Senator from Oregon began his statement. I am not fully advised of what he has said. I came into the Chamber when he was in the middle of his statement, and because I wish to be understood very clearly by the Senate and the Senator from Oregon, I ask leave at this time to speak for 5 minutes in response to some of the matters which were mentioned by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield briefly, I wish to join in his request, and also to say that he was on the floor of the Senate, and I tried to get the floor when he was here. When I observed that he had left the Chamber, I immediately sent a messenger to seek him, because I wanted him to know that I intended to make these few remarks. I am sorry the Senator was not in the Chamber to hear my opening remarks, because I made clear at that time that I was rising to speak completely impersonally. The Senator can read for himself in the RECORD what I said about him. I would rather not repeat it, because I prefer to have him reply without my doing so.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very sure that what the Senator from Oregon said was spoken with courtesy and with full adherence to the customary rules of the Senate. The statement of the Senator from Florida now will be couched in accordance with those rules. The statement of the Senator from Florida in speaking relative to his distress at the position taken by witnesses of the Farmers Union at the hearings in the Dakotas and in Minnesota was likewise couched in conformity with the rules of courtesy and respect, and his remarks in the future will be so couched.

I made it fully clear that, under no circumstances would I ascribe to or charge those witnesses with communism, Communist intent, or Communist leanings. The Senator from Florida made the statement that he was generously and kindly treated by them, and that the thing which distressed him, and which still distresses him, is that people who came from good, sturdy stock, who had to be sturdy to reclaim the rather rugged terrain of that area and make of it a highly developed agricultural region, should evidence a deterioration in stature, a deterioration in independence, and a loss of the ruggedness which has heretofore characterized them.

The Senator from Florida felt that it was his duty to call the attention of the Senate and the public to the fact that that very great weakening of morale did exist and does exist there. It exists only in the area where a reliance upon the high price support has been found. It was not found by the Senator from Florida in other areas; and the Senator from Florida spoke particularly of the fact that in the hearings in the New England area, not a single witness advanced thoughts which, so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, are extremely socialistic.

The Senator from Florida took that position the other night; he takes it again; and he welcomes the fact that the Senator from Oregon has brought it up in the Senate today. The Senator from Florida thinks that every time the matter can be discussed it will be discussed to advantage, in that the people of the United States will have a fresh chance to hear what is the fact, namely, that some of our finest, heretofore most rugged and independent farm people, in that area of the Northwest at least, have completely succumbed to the destructive force of high rigid price supports. Apparently they have shown a complete unwillingness to try to stand now upon their own planning, upon their own independence, and their own resources in facing what is undoubtedly a difficult situation. What were the facts which developed there, Mr. President?

The witnesses from this organization were asking, and, as a matter of fact, demanding, because some of the telegrams used the word "demand," 100-percent price supports from the Federal Government, not only for their storable commodities, but for their perishable commodities, and for all commodities which are produced by agriculture.

They went so far as to demand 100-percent price supports, not only for themselves, but for all others in the United States, in spite of the fact that it was clearly shown at the hearings time and time again that many agricultural industries in the United States are now prosperous, and they attribute their prosperity in part to the fact that they have not relied upon Government price supports, and do not want to have to do so now or in the future.

Mr. President, the case did not end with the demand for 100-percent price supports for both storables and perishables. It also included the factor, repeated time and again, that price supports would be available only for the family unit farms. Time and again was it stated that a deliberate objective behind the price support program was the forcing of a redistribution of the land and a redivision, and a fairer division, of the profits of the land.

In my opinion that is socialism pure and simple, and the Senator from Florida is thoroughly within his rights in mak-

ing that statement. He believes it is a matter of grave concern, not only to the agriculturalists of the United States, but to the general public, to stop a course of governmental coddling which results in loss of independence and loss of stature on the part of people who have been the finest examples of independence, of conservatism, of frugality, of handling their own problems, and of retaining with pride the right to manage their own affairs.

The Senator from Florida did not stop there, because he showed by the statements of the vice president of the Farmers Union—Mr. Talbott, as I recall his name, who had testified before the committee specifically and at some length—that it was an objective of the Farmers Union to force a redistribution of the land and a better division of the profits of the land.

The Senator from Florida also showed that there appeared before our committee the present president of the Farmers Union—I believe his name is Mr. Patton—who testified that he felt 100-percent price supports should be made available retroactively, back to the year 1955, and he stated—and they were his words, and not mine—that that would cost the Government somewhere between 4 and 5 billion dollars.

When questioned about that stand by the Senator from Florida, Mr. Patton very staunchly stood by it, and stated that in his judgment that was the thing to do, and that it was quite all right to force a greater imbalance in our governmental structure and to force our budget that much out of balance for a purpose of that kind.

Mr. President, the Senator from Florida considers the proposals embraced in that sort of program to be socialism pure and simple, and socialism of the rankest sort. It is not accurate for any Senator on the floor of the Senate to say the Senator from Florida based his statement purely on the request for 100 percent price supports, or 100 percent price supports for storables, or for any limited part of the recommended program. The whole statement of the Senator from Florida speaks for itself. The Senator from Florida thinks it is a matter which critically addresses itself, and which should address itself, to the conscience of the Congress and the Nation. Therefore he welcomes the chance to discuss the matter again.

Now with respect to the communism feature of the statement in question, the Senator from Florida made it very clear before he started that not in the slightest way did he question the patriotism of the members of the Farmers Union or its officials. I think the Senator from Oregon may have quoted that portion of my statement, although I was not present to hear it. But the Senator from Florida said he thought it was important for the members and officials of the Farmers Union to realize the company they were keeping. The Senator from Florida thought it was worthwhile to call that to their attention, and he is glad he did so, because he thinks many of them will have serious misgivings and many of them will want to reexamaine their position when they realize that, from the first to the end of the main part of their program, they are taking the same position which the Communist Party in their platform is taking, and likewise they are in the invidious situation of backing the platform recommended by the Communist Party of the United States to every member of that party throughout the United States as the program which he should support.

Mr. President, there is no doubt about these being the facts. There is no doubt that the Senator from Florida has not made charges, and he will not do so, against persons who are good Americans, many of whom he believes do not have knowledge of the facts he has stated. I believe the Senator from Florida said he thought not one out of a hundred of the members of the Farmers Union knew of these facts, and he hoped they would address themselves to a reexamination of their position.

It is for that reason that the Senator from Florida welcomes so gladly the bringing up of this matter by his distinguished friend from Oregon, and by other distinguished friends, because the Senator from Florida thinks every time this subject matter can be discussed it will be helpful to the people of the Nation and the farmers of the Nation, and particularly the officers and the members of the National Farmers Union, because he thinks they have gone to bed with bad company, and he thinks they will realize that fact when they reexamine the record.

Everything the Senator from Florida has said on the subject has been said in extreme kindness and, he hopes, in perfect courtesy. He stands very staunchly upon the ground that here is something which he thinks is of great concern to the people of the United States and to all agriculture in the United States, but more particularly to the officials and the members of the National Farmers Union, who the Senator from Florida thinks are quite comparable to other people in the farming community throughout the Nation. Apparently they have drifted into this program they now demand, which is certainly socialism of the rankest sort, and they have placed themselves in such close communion with certain elements in this cause that the Senator from Florida wanted them to realize that that is the case, so they might have a chance to reexamine the situation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall take only a few minutes to point out that if we followed the kind of reasoning set forth by the Senator from Florida, then the Communist Party could sabotage any worthwhile program in this country by seeking to endorse some of the same principles of that program. If we accept the major premise advanced by the Senator from Florida then the Communist Party would be able to sabotage the recommendations of President Eisenhower and the Republican Party and the Democratic Party all of which have gone on record, in their platforms, as favoring some of the principles of the Farmers Union. The Senate went on record in favor of the so-called cutoff amendment to the farm bill, which is one of the proposals of the Farmers Union.

The Senator from Florida has been very fair to make it clear that he is making no personal charges, but the danger in his argument is that the charge brushes off onto individuals because of its unfortunate implication with regard to a great farm organization. I speak as a Granger. I wish to say that within the Grange we endorse some of the legislative proposals which the Senator from Florida apparently believes are communistic or socialistic. As a Granger, I think it would be very unfortunate to charge us with socialism when we are trying to protect the family farm.

Let me say to the Senator from Florida that it is just as "socialistic," to use his phrase, to give hundreds of millions of dollars by way of Government aid to industry. The subsidy which industry gets is far in excess of the subsidy which farmers have received in the past 22 years. In fact, the farm program has cost us about $2⅓ billion, but the subsidization of industry, by way of one subsidy and another, has cost us many times that amount.

I say to my conservative friends they cannot have their cake and eat it, too. A subsidy for industry is just as socialistic as is a subsidy for farmers. The fact is, however, that subsidies are not socialistic.

What is the obligation of government, Mr. President, in this field of subsidies? In my judgment, the obligation of government is to come to the economic aid of any segment of our economy that needs to be protected, in order to protect the economy as a whole.

That is why I sit in the Senate and vote, for example, for what amounts to a subsidy for the merchant marine and the shipping industry. That is why I vote for a subsidy for the aircraft industry and a subsidy for the railroads; and that is why we think that the issuance of certificates of convenience and necessity are necessary in tax amortization cases. Many times I have voted for a subsidy, by way of interest-free loans amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars, for industries, by means of what is known as the accelerated tax amortization program when I have been convinced in a given case that the facts warranted it. Mr. President, those are subsidies; and they cost the taxpayers of the country much more than the subsidy to the farmers costs.

Therefore, Mr. President, I say that my reply, in part, to the Senator from Florida—because of the time limitation, my reply can only be in part—is that when one makes by way of a broad brush stroke a charge of socialism against the Farmers Union, one had better look at the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce and every other employer group and business group that seeks a subsidy to protect the economic interest of business. Where they can

be justified economically, I shall support them, just as I shall support subsidies for farmers as recommended by the Farmers Union, which I rose to defend this morning.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as a preface to my question, I wish to say that I have appreciated the fact that not only the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], but every other Senator who has brought up this matter, has very specifically stated that the quotations and facts I advanced were accurate, and that there was no departure from the record in my comments.

Mr. MORSE. I repeat that assertion; it is true.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate that. Based on that, I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon one question: Is or is not a program of Federal agricultural price support requiring 100 percent price support for all farm commodities, both storable and perishable, announced with and accompanied by a specific declaration of principle that the purpose behind it is to force redistribution of the land and a fairer division of the profits from the land, a socialistic program?

Mr. MORSE. Absolutely not, Mr. President.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I differ with him so completely on that point, that I think in good humor I shall relinquish the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I repeat, Mr. President, absolutely not, because under the program, the Government is not taking over, and operating, American agriculture, but is doing for a segment of our economy only what needs to be done to promote the general welfare of all of us. Under the farm-support program the Government leaves undisturbed private farm ownership. The farmers of America are a very rugged group of individualists who abhor, and rightly so, the socialistic principle of Government ownership or farm collectivism.

If one is to make the argument the Senator from Florida has made, then I ask whether, if one comes to the economic assistance of any segment of our economy, the charge can be made that it is socialistic.

I wish to say most respectfully I think the charge of socialism is one of the great glittering generalities which is being tossed about in the United States these days, by way of a broad charge that needs to be specified in terms of the meaning of socialism.

Mr. President, farm aid by Government is not socialistic. A socialistic program on the other hand goes to the essence of ownership. The question of who retains the ownership of the particular segment of our economy which is aided by Government determines whether a given program is socialistic. When the Government seeks to promote the general welfare by a subsidy it does not take over the farm, or the factory or the railroad or other enterprise. The powers and right of management and ownership are not taken over by the Government.

I wish to say that the officials of the Farmers Union and the Grange and the Farm Bureau and the farmers themselves would rise up as they should, en masse, against any proposal to collectivize the farmers of America.

Mr. President, why are they fighting for the family farm? They are fighting for it because they want to stop the trend toward corporate farming, which will take on the form, let me say, of a totalitarian economy, if it is not stopped. Large-scale corporate farming takes on the form of a type of collectivism. It takes the ownership of the farms away from the individual farmers, and puts it in an inanimate corporation that does not have the soul of the family farm.

So, Mr. President, I close by saying to my friend, the Senator from Florida, that I do not think there is the slightest tinge of socialism in a farm-subsidy program, as recommended by the Farmers Union. Rather, the high subsidy program is the carrying out of what a government should do in promoting the general welfare of not only our farmers but our people as a whole. American agriculture is in a depression and the Farmers Union recommends that our Government come to the assistance of the farmers of the country with a legislative program that is aimed at restoring the purchasing power of the farm family so that our private enterprise system will maintain a decent standard of living for all of us.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as the Senator from Oregon takes his seat, I want to say that I appreciate his frankness. He is always frank and he is always courteous.

With equal frankness, and I am sure he will feel with equal courtesy, I wish to say that I could not differ more completely with the distinguished Senator from Oregon in his statement that he does not regard as socialism and socialistic the program which I specified in my question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes, during the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senator from Florida is still in the Chamber. I shall not labor the argument which has been going on between the Senator from Florida and other Senators. I want the record to be clear that in my comments about the matter, I am merely expressing a disagreement with some of the conclusions drawn by the Senator from Florida. He has been a diligent member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and speaks his mind, and speaks it with clarity and with considerable information, and background of experience.

But, Mr. President, on the subject of the role of the Farmers Union, I must say, again, that it is very distressing to me to hear the matter referred to discussed so often, because I think there remains an impression which should not be left.

I should like to point out, first, one of the reasons why our farm groups are asking for high price supports—90 percent of parity, as some Farmers Union groups requested, and 100 percent of parity, as requested by others. It is the reality of the situation in which they live. First, as I have tried to argue throughout this debate, a vast number of our farmers are in trouble. In my office this morning there was a gentleman from the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota. He told me that next year he would personally have to farm three farms, because the families on two other farms have been driven from the land. He has no intention of continuing to farm those farms, but for a period of time, in order to be of some help to his neighbors who were forced off the land because of the decline in agricultural income, he is extending help through his machinery and equipment.

These farm families are sorely pressed; and as they become more and more economically pressed they seek more and more legislative solutions. This is a part of the background.

As I said the other day, the idea of 100 percent of parity price supports is not unique. It is not solely the idea of the Farmers Union. It was unique in Minnesota for the first time to the President of the United States. Also I must say that Harold Stassen, special assistant to the President, campaigned in Minnesota on the basis of 100 percent of parity. Members of the Senate have campaigned on the basis of 100 percent of parity. They believe in it. They vote for it. Some may disagree; but the point is that I do not think we try to draw deductions as to why various Senators may be for it, or to impugn their motives, or to say that they are socialistic.

One of the greatest accomplishments of the Farmers Union is its cooperatives. If there is anything that is free enterprise, it is a cooperative. People pool their income, and no matter how many shares an individual may own, he has only one vote. In Minnesota we have more cooperatives than in any other State in the Union. We are proud of them. We consider that we have a free private enterprise State. We have a few big corporate interests, such as the mining companies and various other industries. The corporations have shown a fine spirit of cooperation in the program for the resource development in the State. The mining companies are doing a tremendous job in taconite development. But I point out that our farmer cooperatives are the finest type of free enterprise. They exist by the thousands. The people belong to those cooperatives, including the Farmers Union, the Farmers Union Central Exchange, the Midland Cooperative, the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, and the

Land O' Lakes Cooperative. Surely those cooperatives are free enterprises. They have asked for effective price supports. The most recent resolution of the Land O' Lakes Cooperative was directed to the proposal for price supports relating to dairy products.

Why do those farmer groups come out so strongly for price-support systems? First of all, because they live in an economy in which everyone else is protected except themselves. The railroads go to the Interstate Commerce Commission and ask for a 15-percent rate increase. They get 7 percent. They return and ask for an increase of 15 percent. They get 8 percent. They come back again and ask for an increase of 10 percent, and they get 5 percent.

Railroad rates are regulated by the Government. No farmer has any tax concessions. He receives no depletion allowance. He receives no benefits from fast tax writeoffs. He pays the ordinary income taxes. He is a most unusual individual if he gets the benefit of even the capital gains tax rate. However, many an industry receives tremendous tax benefits. The other day I read that the Superior Oil Co., which seems to have been in the news frequently, has had tax benefits which are almost unconscionable. No wonder it has money to play around with.

Most of the prices which farmers pay for manufactured goods are administered prices. Does the price of an Oldsmobile go down when Oldsmobiles are overproduced by General Motors? Not on your life. The next year the price goes up. Automobile prices went up this year, although there was the greatest carryover of automobiles at the end of 1955 that there had been in more than a decade. There was a surplus of automobiles, but the price of automobiles went up.

As the Senator from Oregon pointed out, subsidies are paid to aviation concerns, particularly those engaged in overseas aviation. How about Pan American? Does it receive price supports? It is a fine airline. What about TWA? Name any of them. They are all good airlines. I am for them. I am for a modern, efficient transportation system. However, I think the record ought to be clear that while they do not get the publicity, they get the benefit of price supports. This is one time where they get the game instead of the blame. The farmer gets the blame and not the game.

How about interest rates? Who sets those? The Government of the United States, along with the bankers. The bankers have received more price supports from this administration in 1 week than the farmers have been able to get in three and a half years. The very first thing that happened in 1953 was an increase in interest rates. Was there any need of it? I should say not. As a matter of fact, there was a surplus of money. One would have thought that interest rates would have gone down, but they were kept high. There was even an increase of one-half of 1 percent in the interest rates on Commodity Credit Corporation loans. The interest rate was increased on GI housing loans, on consumer credit—yes; all along the line.

There are no cost-plus contracts for farmers. There are no tax concessions for farmers. There are no fixed rates of return for farmers, except in connection with price supports, with respect to which they put up collateral.

The family farm is the basis of American free economy. Wherever we have family farmers on the soil, owning their own equipment, owning and tilling their own land, and marketing their own products at reasonable prices, we have a healthy economy and a stable political society.

The House Committee on Agriculture has done a great service for the United States and for the people. It has published a report entitled "Government Subsidy Historical Review." I shall not have time to read it to the Senate, but I ask unanimous consent that the entire review be printed at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The subsidy is the oldest economic principle written in the laws of the United States. It has been used from time to time since the inception of this Government to influence the direction of economic development and to moderate the impact of the normal workings of supply and demand. The principle has been employed to promote science, the arts, research, and for other Government aims and purposes.

When the First Congress convened in 1789 its first act was to devise a system for administering oaths.

The next business was the enactment of a tariff bill. Significantly, this legislation set up the subsidy principle to encourage the development of an American merchant fleet. It stipulated that goods imported into the United States on American vessels should have a 10 percent reduction in customs duties, and a tonnage tax also was imposed in favor of American shipping.

Subsidies through the years have taken various forms, such as:

Water carriers: The Government granted 6,340,339 acres of public lands to private interests, between 1827 and 1866, to encourage canal building and river improvement, in addition to rights-of-way grants. Moreover, the Government made other contributions by direct appropriations, stock subscriptions, and loans to private canal companies.

Railroads: Approximately 183 million acres of Federal and State lands were granted to railroads between 1850 and 1871.

Shipping and air carriers: Many millions have been assigned by the Federal Government in ocean and airmail subsidies, to foster the development of transportation, as was the case in the special considerations for railroads and waterways. The first mail subsidy was paid in 1845, according to available records.

Many other millions have subsidized the building of ships on American ways. Just recently the press carried a report that the United States Government had paid in subsidy approximately $40 million on the superliner *United States*, a private luxury ship that plies between the United States and Europe. The total cost of the liner was given at $76,800,000.

Any study of the subsidy principle and its history and place in the Nation's economy is confused by definition. Nearly everyone who looks into the subject has his own concept of what constitutes a subsidy.

Some contend the tariff is a subsidy, since it involves Government action that enables protected industries to charge more for their goods. Moreover, some consider that accelerated tax amortization for defense plants subsidizes the owners of these plants, that sale of Federal surplus property at a loss is a subsidy to the purchasers, and that the postal deficit on second-class mail is a subsidy to business. Others confine their definition to direct Government payments or remission of charges and to supplying commodities or services at less than cost or market price.

Currently the subsidy principle is thrust into public attention by the arguments over farm price-support legislation. This has brought about a wide demand for figures comparing subsidies received by agriculture, industry and business, and labor.

In any discussion of subsidies one of the most commonly quoted sources is the Bureau of the Budget which in recent years has put into the annual Federal budget message a statement, "Current expenses for aids and special services" for agriculture, business, labor, veterans, and general aids.

By this limited definition, such Government expenditures in the fiscal years 1949 to 1955, inclusive, have totaled $3,773,000,000 for agriculture, $5,873,000,000 for business, $1,435,000,000 for labor, $32,687,000,000 for veterans, and $9,980,000,000 in general aids, as set forth by years in the following table:

Aids and special services

[In million dollars]

Fiscal year	Agriculture	Business	Labor	Veterans	General aids
1949	341	773	175	5,549	1,091
1950	601	789	228	5,583	1,264
1951	905	809	197	4,515	1,327
1952	463	1,041	200	4,710	1,364
1953	305	934	215	4,178	1,506
1954 (estimated)	609	918	204	4,057	1,672
1955 (estimated)	549	609	216	4,095	1,656
Total	3,773	5,873	1,435	32,687	9,880

In the case of agriculture these aids and special services are predominantly losses realized on price-support programs, expenses of the International Wheat Agreement, payments for removal of surplus commodities, and administrative expenses of loan programs and other aids to farmers. (Not included are expenditures for aids to farmers through loans at favorable interest rates, soil-conservation payments, reclamation aids and other developmental aids.)

In the case of business the aids and special services included in this summary are primarily portions of the postal deficit; maritime operation subsidies and navigation and other aids to the shipping industry; various aid to air navigation; and the net losses accruing on defense production aids. (Not included are business benefits by expenditures such as those to stimulate housing construction, to provide more economical sources of electric power, and to control floods. Numerous tax advantages also accrue.)

In the aids to labor the largest Federal expenditure is for the Federal-State program of unemployment insurance and public employment offices. The Federal Department of Labor makes grants to the States to cover the full cost of administering these services.

In "General aids" the largest items are for public-assistance grants to States and for the school-lunch program.

The following figures for fiscal 1952 illustrate how the Budget Bureau breaks down

"Current expenses for aids and special services," generally referred to as subsidies:

Agriculture

Total	$463,000,000
CCC losses in price supports	184,000,000
International Wheat Agreement	77,000,000
Sugar Act	60,000,000
Grants and aids, in such areas as the Extension Service and experiment station operations	49,000,000
Other Department of Agriculture operations	94,000,000

(From the total of these components the Bureau deducts approximately $2 million which represents the surplus in the farm-labor revolving fund. It should be noted, too, that while $60 million is listed as a subsidy under the Sugar Act, this act in fact puts considerably more into the general fund of the Treasury than is paid out.)

Business

Total	$1,041,000,000
Post Office Department deficit in favor of business mail	670,000,000
Navigation aids	137,000,000
Air navigation aid	93,000,000
Ship operation subsidies	50,000,000
Aids to business through the Department of Commerce other than water and air navigation aids and ship operating subsidies	19,000,000
RFC	56,000,000
Corps of Engineers maintenance of rivers and harbors	61,000,000
All other special aids and services	2,000,000

(The total of these figures amounts to $1,088,000,000, but from this the Budget office subtracts approximately $47 million of profit made in operation of the Panama Canal and through the Defense Production Act, to arrive at the $1,041,000,000 actual subsidies for business in 1952.)

Labor

Total	$200,000,000

(Practically all of this amount represents grants to States for operation of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs.)

The House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture in January 1954 published figures indicating subsidies amounting to $45,662,835,506 for business compared to farm price-support costs amounting to $1,194,839,023, as represented by Commodity Credit Corporation losses in the price-support program. The table printed by the subcommittee, including also figures on Government emergency investment, follows:

Comparison of CCC farm price-support costs with subsidies and emergency investment

1. Losses under CCC price-support program:	
Basics	$53,299,009
Nonbasics	1,141,540,014
Total	[1] 1,194,839,023
2. Federal expenditures for—	
Consumer subsidies (losses):	
CCC	[2] 2,102,067,121
DSC and RFC	[3] 2,143,281,385
Subtotal	4,245,348,506
Business reconversion payments (including tax amortization)	40,787,864,000
Subsidies to maritime organizations	[4] 327,500,000
Subsidies to airlines	[5] 302,123,000
Total	45,662,835,506

Comparison of CCC farm price-support costs with subsidies and emergency investment—Continued

3. Federal investment in—	
Military materiel	[6] $129,000,000,000
Food and fiber (CCC inventories)	[7] 2,687,103,365
National stockpile of materiel	5,700,000,000

[1] From beginning of program in 1933 through Nov. 30, 1953.

[2] From July 1941 through Nov. 30, 1953. The last CCC subsidy program was ended on Oct. 31, 1947, although claims, refunds, and adjustments continued to be processed after that date.

[3] From July 1, 1943, through June 30, 1949. All DSC and RFC subsidy programs were ended by Oct. 14, 1946, but claims, refunds, and adjustments continued to be processed after that date.

[4] Estimated operating subsidies payable through calendar year 1954.

[5] Airmail subsidies through fiscal year 1954.

[6] Deliveries since Korea total $50 million; balance in pipelines.

[7] As of Nov. 30, 1953. Includes price support, supply and foreign purchase, and emergency feed programs.

Most of the costs in the farm price-support operations have occurred in the postwar readjustments, during the time that business reconversion payments, according to the table published by the Appropriations Subcommittee, amounted to approximately $40 billion.

The story of Government agricultural price-support operations over the last 20 years, in profits and losses, is set forth in the following table:

Cumulative net results[1] of price-support operations by commodities, Oct. 17 to Nov. 30, 1953

[Millions of dollars]

Commodities on which there were net gains:	
Cotton, upland	237.9
Cottonseed and products	10.2
Soybeans	3.9
Tobacco	1.7
Other (less than $100,000)	-------
Total	253.7
Commodities on which there were net losses:	
Potatoes, Irish	478.1
Eggs	189.6
Wheat	104.2
Peanuts	99.4
Wool	92.2
Corn	87.6
Dried milk	75.2
Flaxseed and linseed oil	67.5
Butter	61.2
Beans, dry edible	40.5
Grain sorghums	35.5
Cheese	27.9
Hemp and hemp fiber	21.5
Sugar beets	16.5
Fruit, dried	14.9
Seeds	14.2
Barley	10.2
Oats	3.9
Grapefruit juice	1.7
Rice	1.5
Naval stores	1.4
All other (less than $1 million each)	3.8
Total	1,448.5
Net loss	1,194.8

[1] Realized gains and losses, excluding general income and expense. Before charge of $500 million to the reserve for postwar price support of agriculture and recovery of $56,239,432 from the Secretary of the Treasury under Public Laws 389 and 393, 80th Cong.

At the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Ezra Taft Benson, the Director of Budget and Finance of the Department of Agriculture made a special study of farm-program costs, including expenditures for other than direct price-support operations. Mr. Benson informed the House Committee on Agriculture on March 10, 1954 (long-range farm program hearings—serial R, pt. 18, pp. 2558 to 2573, inclusive) that, if all the programs for stabilization of prices and farm income 1932 to 1953, inclusive, are considered, then the cost to the Government is $7,510,400,000.

Mr. Benson included in the $7,510,400,000 the following items:

Commodity Credit Corporation:	
Price-support programs	$1,110,100,000
Supply, foreign purchase, commodity export, and other CCC activities (representing profit of this amount)	319,300,000
Administrative and other general costs	299,600,000
Total CCC	1,089,900,000
International Wheat Agreement	558,100,000
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	1,567,600,000
Sugar Act (profit on this program)	296,100,000
Federal Crop Insurance	157,800,000
Acreage allotment payments under the agricultural conservation program	2,354,800,000
Agricultural production programs (principally acreage allotments and marketing quotas—exclusive of cash payments for school-lunch programs)	47,000,000
Parity payments	1,016,600,000
Retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates	1,400,000
Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and related acts	571,100,000
Removal of surplus cattle and dairy products	76,600,000
Agricultural Marketing Act revolving fund, and payments to stabilization corporations for losses incurred	381,300,000
Other functions (profit)	15,700,000

NOTE.—The $1,089,900,000 (CCC total above) represents the actual losses in the direct farm price-support program, operated by the Commodity Credit Corporation, through 1953. The use of the $7,510,400,000 figure, in any discussion of price-support costs, is often challenged by sponsors of the support program.

The Budget Bureau recognizes that the term "subsidy" has become surrounded with connotations which the dictionaries never intended but which cause the Bureau to hesitate to make use of the term wherever possible. Therefore, there is no officially recognized definition of a subsidy as such, and no unchallengeable compilation can be made of the costs of subsidies down through the years.

It can be said, however, that the subsidy is not new, but is as old as our Government; and its dispensation has been confined to no segment of the economy nor to any group of people in the social structure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wrote to the Post Office Department under date of February 2. I asked the Postmaster General to give me figures as to the cost of handling magazines, periodicals, and other publications in second class mail. A number of editors have gotten after me because I said there

was a subsidy in connection with second class mail. I have the report in my files for 1951. That is old. When I was working from the 1951 report, some of my editor friends said, "Stop talking like that, because you do not have the facts."

Here are the facts, from a Republican Postmaster General. What are the figures with respect to revenues and expenses in connection with second-class mail? The total revenues are $65,700,000. The total cost for handling second-class mail is $298,700,000. In other words, that represents a subsidy of $233 million in 1 year. No single crop in American agriculture receives that much subsidy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do the larger subsidies not go to the newspapers and magazines which denounce subsidies in the strongest terms?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed. Also, when they discuss subsidies, they talk about other people's moral fiber. Subsidies do not seem to affect their moral fiber.

I am not opposed to second-class mail receiving certain privileges from the Government. I believe in free speech and a free press. I believe that the Post Office Department has a responsibility, as an agency of the Government, to bring to the people newspapers, periodicals, bulletins, and all other news media. But when someone points a finger at Mr. Farmer and says, "You are a subsidized individual; you are a socialist"—all I ask is, "examine thyself."

When some people examine what goes on in other segments of our economy, they will learn that all the farmer is doing is coming in late. They will learn that he has only recently begun to ask for assistance from his Government, and that all others have been receiving it heretofore. Every young boy and girl who graduates from college has received a subsidy. Every man and woman who goes to a park or a playground or other recreational facility has received some kind of benefit. There is nothing wrong with it. This is our Government, and our Government has a responsibility to our people. We ought to be proud of it, rather than critical. I wish to say one final word.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent that I may have further time, so that I may yield to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator from Minnesota not familiar with the fact that the administration has urged a change in the postal rates to meet some of the problems raised by the Senator from Minnesota, and has been very anxious to have legislation reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service which will meet that problem?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the minority leader for having raised that point. The administration wishes to raise the postal rate primarily on first-class mail, which is the only class of mail that is showing a profit. The amount of the increase the administration is asking on second- and third-class mail is so small that it is almost beyond computation. It is a very modest amount, and it would not come anywhere near to meeting the great discrepancy. I do not believe it should. I am not saying it should. I believe that newspapers, periodicals, publications, books, and agricultural journals are entitled to this kind of consideration. All I am saying is that we should be fair about it. I say let us be fair.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the distinguished Senator from Minnesota does not feel the administration's proposal for a change in the postal rates on the several classifications of mail is sound and correct, does he know of any alternative proposal from the Democratic side of the aisle which will be reported from committee with a schedule of rates which will help meet the problem?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy to inform the distinguished minority leader that the last postal rate increase was ordered in the Democratic 81st Congress. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] handled the bill. I was a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service at the time. I attended the hearings on the rate increase proposals. We did present a substantial bill and we did augment the revenues of the Post Office Department. Senator OLIN JOHNSTON was our chairman and gave his support in this endeavor.

I have never been among those who say that the Post Office Department is just a business. Every time the administration wishes to bless something, it says it ought to be operated on a business basis. I do not agree that such is the greatest blessing that can be bestowed on someone or something.

I believe that the Post Office Department is a service institution. What I am pointing out is that other people in our society have received many benefits from the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Post Office Department of February 15, 1956, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1956.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The Postmaster General has asked me to reply to your letter dated February 2, 1956, concerning the cost of handling magazines, periodicals and other publications as second-class mail.

Under the Cost Ascertainment procedures employed by the Post Office Department, second-class publications are classified into 8 different groups or types. Statistics for each group of publications are developed, based on average factors for the group in terms of postage, handling cost, pieces, weight, and average length of haul.

The table below shows the weight of mailings, postage paid and the cost of handling for each group of second-class publications, for the fiscal year 1955.

Second-class mail, fiscal year 1955

[Amounts in millions]

Type of publication	Weight (pounds)	Revenue	Expenditures
Exempt from zone rates	259.6	$4.5	$48.8
5 percent or less advertising	70.6	1.6	13.2
Daily newspapers	654.2	14.7	75.3
Newspapers other than dailies	122.1	2.4	22.8
Magazines and periodicals of general interest	1,116.8	28.3	85.6
Agriculture, business, professional, etc., publications	231.3	6.9	30.3
Religious, educational, and welfare publications	8.4	.2	2.1
Classroom publications, special rates	21.5	.4	2.2
Total	2,484.5	59.0	280.3
Free-in-county	75.4	------	13.3
Total publishers paid and free	2,559.9	------	------
Miscellaneous items	22.4	6.7	5.1
Total	2,582.3	65.7	298.7

Free-in-county mailings are shown above as a total, since we do not have a breakdown of costs of handling free-in-county mailings by groups of publications.

The total revenues from second-class mail for the fiscal year 1955 were $65.7 million and the total costs allocated to second-class mail were $298.7 million, leaving an excess of allocated expenditures over revenues of $233 million. The average revenue was about 2.5 cents per pound and the average expense was about 11.5 cents per pound.

In view of increases in wages and other costs which were in effect for only a part of the fiscal year 1955, it is estimated that about 5 percent should be added to 1955 cost figures to place them on a current annual basis.

I trust that this information will be helpful to you. Please call on us at any time we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT J. ROBERTSON,
Assistant Postmaster General and Controller.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have been advised that at the present time the deficit on second-class matter is $230 million, and that the administration's proposal would result in a return of only an additional $17 million. Therefore there would still be, in round figures, a deficit of $213 million on second-class mail.

The proposal for an increase in first-class mail rates would result in an increased cost to the users of the postal service of $290 million.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. That is how the administration intends to take care of the public. The Senator from California asks what we propose. I will tell him. In the first place, we do not propose to deny to the people of the United States the opportunity to receive information by the distribution of newspapers and periodicals and pamphlets. In that regard we propose to carry out the sound Jeffersonian principle of keeping the people enlightened. I say, watch out for

the people's rights, if the people do not know the facts.

It happens to be one of the duties of Government to pay a part of the cost of distributing facts to the people, through the medium of second-class mail.

Therefore, I say to my editor friends, who try to jump all over me when I make a defense of the farmer's subsidy, that I think a certain amount of subsidy ought to go to the newspapers so as to enable them to distribute the facts to the people, in order to keep an enlightened public opinion. What I do not like is the charge that when we stand for that kind of service to the general welfare, we are condemned as advocating socialism, creeping or galloping.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I concur in the Senator's statement. That has been my philosophy, which I have stated on many occasions as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The difference between the postal subsidy and the so-called farm subsidy is that when the farmer gets some help, he puts up collateral. He puts up his corn, his cotton, or his wheat, or he puts up his tobacco. In other words, he puts up collateral. I do not call that a subsidy. Very frankly, I do not think it is a subsidy. It is a loan. Many a man has made a bad loan. The world is filled with reports of bad loans. In the main, over some 20 years, the Commodity Credit Corporation has made very few bad loans. As a matter of fact, its record is outstanding.

I believe another point which needs to be emphasized is this: Shortly a dairy amendment will be offered to the pending farm bill. I see on the floor my good friend, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. He represents one of the great dairy States of the Union, and he is a fine representative of that great State. The total cost to the Government of a dairy-support program would never equal at any one time the cost which is involved in the second-class mail subsidy for 1 year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a telegram which I received from the Nebraska Farmers Union.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OMAHA, NEBR., *March 8, 1956.*

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.:

The following are four important resolutions adopted by the 43d annual convention of Nebraska Farmers Union. Due to the urgency of these particular measures, we are forwarding these resolutions by telegram to Fred Seaton, Presidential Assistant; Secretary of Agriculture Benson; Nebraska congressional delegation; House Agriculture Committee members; Senate Agriculture Committee members, and to all the Members of the Senate:

No. 4: "We endorse the objectives of 100 percent of parity for agriculture as a fair basis for comparing the relative economic position of agriculture with other groups, and also as a basis for determining commodity loans, probable domestic requirements, and the necessity for imports.

"An arbitrarily lower price level for any major farm crop, or group of crops is neither an effective or desirable method for attempting production limitation. The pressure on farmers to produce and sell in order to get dollars can cause increased production in the face of falling prices.

"For the welfare of both the farm population and America as a whole, we recommend continued 90 percent of parity loans on storable farm commodities, with rigid acreage controls, if necessary. As a positive approach to getting land out of soil-depleting surplus-producing crops, we recommend liberal congressional appropriations for soil conservation. This method of paying this generation of farmers to rebuild the fertility of idle acres will create a storehouse for increased production later when our growing population will need it."

No. 4-A: "If the 1956 farm program is adopted with a 90 percent of parity loan, we believe it is a step in the right direction. A less attractive program or a program that lowers the parity price as does this so-called modern parity formula will not induce farmer participation and may result in national economic disaster.

"We do wish to restate our position that adequate reserves of food and fiber are necessary for the safety and high-living standard to which America is accustomed. We wish further to emphasize the fact that these adequate reserves must be held at a firm, fair price, at a level very close to a parity price, or they will always depress the current farm market. If we are to have a parity price on the farm, a storage program at 90 percent of parity will be of no added incentive to produce, but only a guaranty that the current price will not be depressed below 90 percent by reserve stocks.

"No farm program can work without close control of agricultural imports, for agricultural imports may replace all domestic cuts in production. In the past we have lost our foreign markets by holding our exportable production above world prices. The Department of State and the Department of Agriculture must have a common program for American agriculture. We have, so far, not had this common program and so have had no honest chance to solve the problem of the American market for the American farmer."

No. 5: "As a more permanent solution to many farmer problems, we recommend a more intensive effort by farmers themselves and by farmer-owned cooperatives to process and merchandise farm products. The industrial processor competes strongly for farm products only when he has an unlimited outlet as in a time of war. The farmer cooperative processor would make competition that might create an outlet for farm-produced food and fiber which would help maintain prices in times of a buyer's market, and help lessen the spread between the farm and over-the-counter price. This price spread is still widening, and is now referred to as the cost-price squeeze on agriculture, with farmers getting less for what they sell and both farmers and consumers paying more for what they buy."

No. 6: "We recommend a continuance of Federal crop insurance and further study until a satisfactory crop insurance program can be developed for all farmers. We consider the storage and loan program as insurance for plenty for our city population, and as such, a good investment for both city and farm taxpayers."

No. 30: "*Resolved,* That we request that fall and winter grazing be permitted on crop acres converted to grass under the 1956 farm program."

These adopted resolutions are forwarded at the direction of the delegates of the 43d annual meeting, representing 16,150 Nebraska farm families. The complete adopted program will be forwarded to you under separate cover.

JAMES E. KAMAS,
State Secretary, Nebraska Farmers Union.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like the RECORD to note that the Nebraska Farmers Union, which on some prior occasions has not been an active supporter of so-called high parity, has this year resolved strongly in its support. At times it has been considered to be one of the organizations that did not follow the National Farmers Union policy.

I conclude with the comment that the National Farmers Union is an American organization. Its president is a great American. Its officers have worked for the interests of this country. I can speak in that regard with particular knowledge of the Minnesota Farmers Union and of the great cooperatives associated with it.

Let me say, Mr. President, that the people of Minnesota know that in that organization and in the other farm organizations there is responsible leadership. Those organizations have a program which is thoroughly within the traditions of our great Republic.

I have received a great many letters during the past week recording resentment toward any insinuation of anyone anywhere that the Farmers Union is anything but a thoroughly American organization which believes in free enterprise, in free political institutions, and in freedom of opportunity. That is what it stands for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say to my distinguished friend from Minnesota that if he meant by his opening statement that it was distressing to him to have this subject discussed as it has been on the floor, I believe he has used the same word the Senator from Florida used the other evening in going into this subject. It is distressing. However, it is a matter of vital business and of great importance to the people of our Nation, particularly to agriculture.

If the program of the National Farmers Union is defensible as American, and not socialistic, I should think that my friends who support that organization would be pleased to have its program discussed and heralded just as widely as it could be heralded on the floor of the Senate.

My own feeling is that a good bit of the feeling of distress stems from the fact that the Farmers Union itself knows perfectly well that the voice the Senator from Florida has raised several times on the floor of the Senate on this subject is not a single voice crying in the wilderness by any means, but that the fact is that, by and large, groups of Americans will support the finding that any program is certainly a socialistic program which demands 100-percent price sup-

ports from the Government for all agricultural commodities, both storable and nonstorable, limited to the amount of family-farm production and based on the definite statement and objective that the design is to force a redistribution of land and a redivision of the profits of the land.

Mr. President, if the program is good, certainly no harm can come from discussing it, and, certainly, there has been no charge by anyone that I have misstated the program. I restate my position that I think it is of tremendous importance to the American people to realize how far from the traditional independence and sturdiness of character which has always characterized American farmers this particular group has drifted. I am sorry it has drifted in that direction, and I shall not refrain from discussing the program. I think it is as clear as a bell that it is a socialistic program. I believe the general conclusion and verdict of the people of the United States will be the same as my own.

It is distressing to discuss it, yes; it is distressing to see this kind of development among a fine group of sturdy people who 10 years ago would not have thought or dreamed of supporting a program of this kind. It is a subject of great distress, national distress, that we see a drifting toward such socialistic thinking on the part of such fine people, and when we see it developing only in those areas where rigid, high price supports are destroying the independence and initiative of some of our finest people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, when I said it was distressing to discuss it, I mean it is distressing to have repeated in the Senate comments which will go out to the public indicating that a farm organization is bent upon a socialistic program, because that is not the case.

I ask only, Mr. President, that every American take a look at a farm as he drives down the road and say to himself, "Is this Russia? Is this socialism?"

I think his answer will be that the farmers represent the finest of America. The farmers I know in the State of Minnesota represent the finest social and family institutions in the State. The leading farm organizations in my State are the Farmers Union and the Farm Bureau. Then we have the National Grange. These are all good, splendid organizations. They represent great people.

I know the Senator from Florida recognizes the fact that the people who belong to those organizations are men and women who contribute to their churches and make churches possible. They are men and women who build schools and send their children to both public schools and parochial schools. They operate the local government. They shop in the business establishments along Main Street. They want to pay their taxes. They believe so much in the free-enterprise system that they go to auction sales. If there is anything more competitive than an auction sales, I should like to know what it is.

Mr. President, I think it is unfair and unkind, and I wish it were not said, to make it appear that organizations which seek an opportunity to work for their Government are bent upon a program of socialism. It is not a fact.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I note that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has not made any comment with reference to that part of the program of the National Farmers Union which is designed to force a redistribution of the land and a better, fairer division of the profits of the land. Would the Senator from Minesota care to defend that as not being socialism?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not believe in answering loaded questions, but I believe in replying and stating facts.

The policy of the Government of the United States, when it comes to public lands which are reclaimed, is to fix a maximum of 160 acres. Is that socialism, or is that what we call preserving the family-farm-unit pattern in the economy of the United States?

What the Farmers Union is worried about is what everyone should be worried about—the growth of the large corporate farms, the large plantation farms. They would like to see smaller farm units. When they came out for the price-support program they said there should be 100-percent price support up to a maximum gross income of $15,000, in an effort to find help for that segment of our population—the smaller farmers—which finds itself in a difficult competitive situation. The Farmers Union advocates a land system which is based upon individual ownership of family-farm units.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Is it not true that farmers receive less than do those in other segments of our population?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is not a question of doubt about it. The per capita farm income is $860 a unit. The nonfarm income per capita figure is $1,922 for the year 1955.

Mr. THURMOND. Is it not true that unless something is done to raise per capita income of the farm population, our family-size farms will be destroyed and that will destroy a great segment of the most patriotic people of the Nation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. It seems to me that if something is not done to stop this movement toward greater and greater land accumulation, more and more of the large holdings and fewer and fewer of the family-size farms, we shall entirely change the economic pattern of this country.

Mr. THURMOND. Is there anything more important than an effort to preserve the individual farmer and the family-size farm because of what farmers stand for in our American way of life?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that is one of our most important assignments. I have never devoted so much time in my life to any one area of legislative activity as I have to the farm situation. My parents and grandparents were farm people. I live in a State where the economy depends upon the rural areas. The great potential purchasing power of our farm families is one of the most important economic facts in our entire economy, and that purchasing power should be sustained.

Mr. President, I wish to yield the floor, and I conclude by saying that every depression we have ever had has been farm-led and farm-fed. I see signs of the times which are strangely familiar, which are similar to the signs in the 1920's. I pray that another depression will never occur, because if it does, our leadership of other free nations will be at an end, and we shall be in great trouble at home and abroad.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, since the Senate adjourned last night, the Senate is still in the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning hour will be concluded at 1 o'clock.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate is operating under a unanimous-consent agreement on the farm bill, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. NEELY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

David Brewer Karrick, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia; and

James E. Colliflower for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest that the Executive Calendar be called beginning with "New Reports," and that then we return to the consideration of nominations passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The nomination under the heading "New Reports" will be stated.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Warren McCarty, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will immediately be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of William E. Dowling and James Weldon Jones, to be members of the Tariff Commission, previously passed over, may be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Illinois desires recognition at this time. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of William E. Dowling, of Michigan, and James Weldon Jones, of Texas, to be members of the United States Tariff Commission?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the nominations of William E. Dowling and James Weldon Jones to be members of the United States Tariff Commission, not so much to oppose the men in question, as to point out what I believe to have been the serious degeneration of the Tariff Commission under the administration of President Eisenhower.

First, let me point out a fact which all should know, namely, that the term of office of neither of these two men has expired. Mr. Dowling entered upon his present term on August 22, 1955, under a recess appointment, the term for which does not end until the end of this session, while the full term does not expire until June 16, 1961. Mr. Jones entered upon his present term on June 20, 1955. That term will not expire until June 16, 1957. Therefore, whatever delay has been occasioned by my request to hold these nominations in abeyance until such time as I was fully prepared to speak to them has in no way affected the work of the Commission, nor could it have caused any administrative difficulties.

These appointments, in which Mr. Jones is taking Mr. Dowling's long term and Mr. Dowling is taking Mr. Jones' short term, are unprecedented in the exchange of terms, to my knowledge, in the recent history of the Tariff Commission. I think there should be a full explanation of the real reasons for this shift in the terms of the two Democratic members.

For some time I have been disturbed about conditions at the Tariff Commission. To name only recent and well-known examples, there have been the decisions on watches, bicycles, and soil pipe, all of them highly protectionist in nature. We have seen an administration which says it is dedicated to freer trade appoint members of the Tariff Commission whose records and actions are diametrically opposed to the words of the administration. We have seen Democratic members of the Commission—and by law there must be at least three such members—either ousted on some minor pretext or not reappointed, even though their records have been excellent, and have followed far more closely the stated policy of the administration and the law of the land than have those of the administration's own Republican members.

Because of my concern with the Tariff Commission, its members and its policies, I wrote to the Commission on December 27 to ask for information which I had hoped to use when these nominations came to the floor.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter be made a part of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as I was concerned with the policies of the Commission in general rather than the personalities of the two men whose names are before the Senate today, I did not appear before the Finance Committee or register an objection to these nominations at that time. I had expected that the questions which I asked, which were simple questions, would be answered promptly.

When it became clear that the Commission was withholding the data I had asked for until these nominations had been approved, I had no alternative but to oppose them until the information I sought was received, until such time as I was able to seek other information, and until some of the information sent to me by the Tariff Commission could be clarified.

Now I wish to review in general the way in which the verbal declarations of the administration have been negatived by its actions on tariff matters. On a number of occasions, President Eisenhower has issued fine-sounding pronouncements in support of a liberal foreign trade policy: the elimination of trade barriers, and the extension of our reciprocal trade program.

On January 10, 1955, in a special message to Congress on foreign trade policy, the President said:

> For every country in the free world, economic strength is dependent upon high levels of economic activity internally and high levels of international trade. No nation can be economically self-sufficient.
>
> Nations must buy from other nations, and in order to pay for what they buy they must sell. It is essential for the security of the United States and the rest of the free world that the United States take the leadership in promoting the achievement of those high levels of trade that will bring to all the economic strength upon which the freedom and security of all depends.

So much for the message of January 10, 1955.

Again, in April 1955, in an address before the Committee for a National Trade Policy, the President made the following statement:

> As you know, the administration is dedicated in many ways not only through H. R. 1 but through other plans and methods to breaking down trade barriers—tiresome and burdensome customs procedures and all the rest of it around the world. The administration is dedicated not only to promote trade between ourselves and another country, but between those countries as among themselves, so as to increase our prosperity and make them better customers of ours.

These are very fine-sounding words, Mr. President. I could quote many more statements like those. But when it comes to action, this administration is found wanting.

It preaches free trade, but practices protectionism. It advocates the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act, but so hedges the laws with qualifying amendments that it becomes as much an instrumentality of protectionism as an instrumentality of freer trade. It says it stands foursquare for lowering trade barriers, but it supports protectionist policies every time the chips are down—as on bicycles, on watches, on soil pipe, and on foreign bids for machinery.

What has happened to the Tariff Commission itself by the appointments of this administration is still another example of its policy of saying one thing and doing quite another.

What we need is action, not talk; performance, not promises; and deeds, not words.

Because of the record of this administration in the field of tariffs and trade, I wish to take this opportunity to examine just one aspect of the trade program, namely, the Tariff Commission itself.

Pending before the Senate are two nominations for membership on the United States Tariff Commission. Mr. J. Weldon Jones, now a member of the Commission, whose term in his present post will expire on June 16, 1957, has been nominated for the post now occupied under a recess appointment by Mr. William E. Dowling, whose present term will run to June 16, 1961. Mr. Dowling has been nominated for the shorter term vacancy which would be created by the shift of Mr. Jones to the longer term.

In view of the fact that these pending appointments involve one-third of the entire membership of the Tariff Commission, and considering what has been happening to the other independent agencies of the Government under the Eisenhower administration, I wish to put before the Senate certain facts about the operation of the Tariff Commission.

Some of the information which I requested was finally transmitted by the Commission on January 13, but it required further explanation, and I therefore addressed a second communication to the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, under date of January 24, 1956, containing a number of additional inquiries.

I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my correspondence with the Tariff Commission, along with the exhibits, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask that my correspondence with the State Department also be included.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if there is any doubt that President Eisenhower, while preaching freer trade, has packed the Tariff Commission with protectionists, let me quote from Chemical Week, a trade journal for the chemical process industry, published weekly by the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. The quotation is from the issue of March 3, 1956. It is one of the leading items in the Business Newsletter section of the magazine, and it reads:

> Chemical industry segments that want more tariff protection will be assured of a sympathetic hearing for some years to come as a result of the week's developments. Democratic Senators have dropped their behind-the-scenes opposition to appointment of William Dowling and James Weldon Jones to the Tariff Commission. Their confirmations mean that 5 of the 6 commissioners are high-tariff men. And even if every forthcoming regular appointee were a "free trader," it would be at least 1958 before the Commissions members' high-low trade balance could be significantly changed.
>
> This balance is important when the Commission ponders escape clause and antidumping actions. A recommendation for a higher duty is effective even with a 3-to-3 tie vote.

That, Mr. President, is what Chemical Week has to say about the Tariff Commission. Without any ifs, ands, or buts, they acknowledge that 5 out of the 6 Commissioners are high-tariff men. Yet only 1 member of the Commission owes his appointment to previous administrations, which, with the redesignation of Commissioner Brossard this last week, now brings to 6 the number appointed by the present administration.

So it is clear that President Eisenhower, while preaching one thing, has in this case, as in so many others, given in to his own high-protectionist party and has appointed men whose points of view and actions are directly opposite to the fine statements of the administration's Madison Avenue publicity machine. If this is not an act of feigning to be what one is not, then words have no meaning.

Let us look at the recent history of the Tariff Commission—what its main functions are, what happened to it after the Democrats came into power in 1933, and, in contrast, what happened to it after the Republicans returned to power in 1953.

As the Senate well knows, the Tariff Commission was established as an independent fact-finding agency for the purpose of furnishing tariff information for the use of Congress and the Executive. Under certain provisions of existing law, the Commission is also authorized and required to make findings of fact. It is not a policy-making agency. The information which it assembles is supposed to be as free as possible from bias with regard to tariff policy.

The present law of the land and the declared policy of the United States Government is that of fostering a reciprocal trade program and policy. I believe that it is incumbent on every member of the Commission to keep that general policy clearly in mind, whatever his views are, and to act with the reciprocal trade program and policy as the main point of departure in making decisions and establishing facts.

At least, that should happen until the Congress and the Executive clearly repudiate the reciprocal trade policy. It is quite against this policy to decide each issue or make each recommendation de novo, as appears now to be the policy of too many of the Commission members.

The statute establishing the Tariff Commission has continuously provided, since the original establishment of the Commission in 1916, that not more than 3 of its 6 members shall be members of the same political party. The theory of the law has been that such an even balance in the membership as regards political affiliation affords a greater assurance that the Commission will select and administer its staff and, in general, conduct its operations in the unbiased manner contemplated by the original authors of the statute. It was also thought that the provision for rotation of appointments to the Commission, with one appointment each year for a 6-year term, would give continuity to the conduct of the Commission's affairs through changes of administration.

No one could have been naive enough to suppose that these safeguards would eliminate every trace of bias in the selection of commissioners, or that, consciously or unconsciously, the views of the individual commissioners about tariff policy would not influence their judgments. Such precautions could not prevent an administration holding low-tariff views from gradually manning the Commission with persons sympathetic to such views if it so chose, or prevent a high-tariff administration from accomplishing the reverse. Nevertheless, it was felt that these safeguards would in some degree serve to mitigate against extreme and violent changes in the functioning of the Commission in consequence of shifts in political control of the Government, and that they would, in general, make for better balance and stability in the conduct of the Commission's activities. Such was the theory. But it was never believed that an administration committed to a low-trade policy would pack the Commission with high-tariff men.

Now let us see what has happened with regard to appointments to the Commission when the Democrats came into power in 1933, and let us compare this with what has happened after the Republicans took over in 1953. The contrast is noteworthy.

When the Democrats came into office in 1933, there was no attempt to get rid of every Republican member of the Commission at the earliest possible moment. To be sure, two members of the Commission—Coulter, a Republican, and Ornburn, a Democrat, both of whom held tariff views completely at variance with those of the incoming administration—were eventually not reappointed. But President Roosevelt permitted the then Chairman, the late and highly esteemed Robert Lincoln O'Brien, not only to remain on the Commission, but to continue as its Chairman until his term expired several years later, at which time Mr. O'Brien elected to retire by his own request.

With one exception, namely, Mr. Coulter, President Roosevelt, and subsequently President Truman, regularly reappointed Republican members as their terms expired. Among these was one hold-over Republican from the previous administration, namely, Edgar B. Brossard, the present Chairman. Mr. Brossard was first appointed to the Commission by President Coolidge, in 1925. I have always understood that Senator Smoot, of Smoot-Hawley fame, was largely responsible for the appointment. Certainly the appointment was not without the Senator's blessing, and Mr. Brossard was well known to hold strong protectionist views.

By the time the Democrats came into power, in 1933, Mr. Brossard had earned for himself the reputation of being one of the highest-tariff protectionists ever to serve on the Commission.

If the Roosevelt administration had been intent on ridding itself of all Republican hold-overs, both Commissioners Brossard and O'Brien would eventually have gone the way of Mr. Coulter. And if it had been intent on getting rid of all Commissioners whose tariff views were flatly opposed to those of the administration, Mr. Brossard would have joined the company of both Mr. Coulter and Mr. Ornburn. Nevertheless, Mr. Brossard was continued on the Commission. He was reappointed by President Roosevelt in 1938, and again in 1944, and was reappointed by President Truman in 1950, for his present term of office, which expires next June. Whether his continuance in office was for the deliberate purpose of keeping on the Commission at least one high protectionist; whether it was the outcome of political compromise, in which the foregoing was a factor; or whether he simply leads a charmed life, I would not know. But there he was

when the Democrats came into power; and there he was when the Democrats went out of power; and there he still is; and now, with his new reappointment, and in view of the present temper of the Senate, there he will remain for at least 6 more years.

Mr. President, contrast with that what happened after the Republicans took over in 1953. With little delay, the Democratic Chairman, Oscar B. Ryder, was replaced in the chairmanship by the present Chairman, Mr. Brossard. Although Commissioner Ryder's term of office did not expire until June 16, 1957, he received notice in February of last year that he was being retired by reason of attaining the age of 70. There is serious doubt that the courts would have upheld such action, as applied to a person holding a Presidential appointment and confirmed by the Senate in the knowledge that the appointee would attain the age of 70 before the expiration of his term. Commissioner Ryder did not, however, elect to contest the directive. His notice to retire, however, was an unusual move, for ordinarily the retirement age of 70 applies only to permanent civil-service personnel; and it is obvious that the decision in that instance was a partisan political attempt to clear the way for another Eisenhower appointment.

Other Democratic members were treated in a manner similar, if not identical, to the way Commissioner Ryder was treated. In contrast, Commissioner E. Dana Durand, a Republican, had been continued on the Commission by the Democratic administration long after he reached the age of 70.

It is interesting to speculate about this situation. This administration gave notice to Commissioner Ryder that because he had attained the age of 70, he could no longer serve on the Tariff Commission. Without detracting from the position of a Tariff Commissioner, it is not unfair to point out that the responsibilities of the post are only a tiny fraction of those of the President of the United States.

Is it not curious that the policy of this administration is to retire Tariff Commissioners when they attain the age of 70, while almost every responsible member of the Republican Party has insisted that President Eisenhower should run for reelection, even though he would attain the age of 70 before the end of his second term of office? Why is there one policy for the Tariff Commission, and another policy for the head of the administration? Are we to infer from this that a Republican President will retire on reaching the age of 70?

Is it not an extraordinary contradiction that a President of the United States who will reach the age of 70 during his second term of office, and who has suffered a serious coronary attack, should feel physically able to announce that he will serve for a second term, knowing full well that he may be faced with the gravest international problems which may tax his strength and his energy; but that a Member of the Tariff Commission, who is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, should be called upon to resign on reaching the age of 70? Do we have one standard of physical fitness for a Tariff Commissioner and a less severe standard for a President of the United States? Is it less of a physical and mental hardship to wield the powers and responsibilities of the greatest office in the world than it is to sit on the Tariff Commission to make decisions on watches, bicycles, tree nuts, and soil pipe?

The answer is that this administration talks and acts without a consistent policy on this matter, as on so many others, and that it selects its policies to fit whatever ends it has in mind? When it wishes to pack the independent agencies with its own people, it applies one rule; and when it wishes to run a candidate for the Presidency of the United States, it applies another rule.

What else happened when the Republicans came into power? Earlier, on June 16, 1954, the term of George McGill, a Democrat, expired, and he was not reappointed. On June 16, last, the term of Lynn R. Edminster, a Democrat, expired; and he was not reappointed. Two of these Commissioners—Mr. Ryder and Mr. Edminster—were professional economists and career men whose lifework had been in the field of tariffs and international trade. They had never been active in political party work. The other Democrat, Commissioner McGill—a lawyer by profession—had previously been an esteemed Member of the Senate, from the State of Kansas. All three of these men had acquired a close familiarity with the Commission's work, based on experience extending over long periods of service on the Commission. All three were known as persons holding low-tariff policy views.

It might have been supposed, therefore, that a Republican administration purporting to be a strong advocate of these same views, and compelled under the law to appoint Democrats, or, at least, persons wearing the Democratic label, to those posts, would have been disposed to avail itself of this experience by retaining some, at least, of these Commissioners. Such action would have been in keeping with the spirit of the Tariff Commission statute and the professed trade objectives of the new administration. But these men had all been guilty of one unforgivable sin. They had been appointed by a Democratic President and they were, therefore, marked for slaughter.

When the present administration came into power, there were two Republican vacancies on the Commission. Commissioner Durand had retired in June of 1952, and later in that year Commissioner Gregg died. No successors had been appointed to these posts. Thus, the new administration had a free hand to make immediate appointments to these two Republican vacancies.

In June 1953 one of these posts was filled by the appointment of Joseph E. Talbot, a former Republican Representative in Congress from Connecticut, now Vice Chairman of the Commission. Mr. Talbot had long been known as an outspoken supporter of old-line protectionist tariff policy, and while a Member of Congress had regularly voted against trade-agreements legislation. I distinctly recall that at the time of his appointment there were widespread expressions of surprise, and even amazement, in the press and elsewhere, that a man with this record and these views should have been appointed by a President who was committed, at least in words, to the opposite course.

This appointment was followed later in the same year, in September 1953, by the designation of Walter R. Schreiber to the other Republican vacancy. Concerning him, little was generally known at that time. It appears, however, that he had been an employee of the Department of Agriculture, heading a division concerned with tree nuts and, one supposes, having close contacts with the tree-nut industry and trade. There were reports in the press at the time that he was on a list of potential nominees for the post, having the approval of the American Tariff League, that well-known lobbying organization for high tariffs with which we are all familiar. Whether this was true or not, subsequent developments demonstrate, as I shall presently show, that he might well have been on such a list.

The three Democratic members of the Commission, now serving in the posts formerly occupied by Commissioners McGill, Ryder, and Edminster, are, respectively, Commissioners Glenn W. Sutton and two members whose nominations are pending, J. Weldon Jones and William E. Dowling. About them I shall also have more to say in due course.

Thus, we have the following situation: Of the 6 present members of the Commission, 5 were appointed by this administration—3 as Democrats and 2 as Republicans. Now the Chairman has been reappointed by the administration. It may be safely assumed that one and perhaps both of the Democrats are "Eisenhower Democrats." Three of these appointees have been in office long enough to establish significant records—2 Republicans—Talbot and Schreiber—and 1 Democrat, Sutton.

The single member of the Commission not appointed by this administration, and the only holdover, is Commissioner Brossard. Throughout his career of more than 30 years as a member of the Commission, he has been known as an uncompromising supporter of a high-tariff policy. Nevertheless, as previously stated, this administration, while espousing a liberal tariff policy, almost immediately designated him as Chairman of the Commission. Now, as I have said, he has been reappointed. Mr. Talbot, whose protectionist record in Congress was well known and quite extreme, I may say, was made Vice Chairman.

Let us look at the record of these Commissioners in office. To get the complete story, one would have to have access to the confidential files of the Commission. For example, as the Commission points out in its letter to me, the findings of the

Commission in peril-point investigations, under section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, are submitted to the President in confidence and are not later made available to the public. Were this information available, I would be greatly interested in the voting records of the present members of the Commission. A mere inspection of the lists of items on which the Commission has recently been making peril-point findings would suggest that there would inevitably be unanimity on many items, these being items which on their face involve no real question of peril to any domestic industry. But it would be interesting and revealing to know how individual Commissioners have voted in cases in which the vote was divided.

Fortunately, we are not left in such a state of ignorance with respect to much that the Commission has passed upon in recent years. The best indication is the record of individual Commissioners with respect to action under the escape clause, section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1951, as extended. These records are set forth in exhibit II–A of the Commission's reply to my letter of December 27, 1955. It is not, however, until one further analyzes this material that the significant facts stand out. This I have done; and the results are highly informative.

I have analyzed the voting records of seven Commissioners under the escape-clause provisions since January 1, 1953, for such periods as each man has served on the Commission after that date. Included are the 3 Democratic Commissioners whom this administration did not see fit to continue in office, and 4 of the present members of the Commission—Brossard, Talbot, Schreiber, and Sutton. I have not included the names of the two most recent members of the Commission, Jones and Dowling, whose nominations are now before the Senate, owing to the limited number of cases in which they have participated during their short tenure. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the results of this analysis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the table may be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

Voting records of the named individual Tariff Commissioners in escape-clause cases passed upon by the Commission between Jan. 1, 1953, and Jan. 1, 1956

Commissioner	Total number of cases in which Commissioner participated	Split-decision cases	
		Number in which individual Commissioner participated	Number in which individual Commissioner voted for increased restrictions on imports
Brossard (R)	27	10	10
Ryder (D)	22	9	0
Edminster (D)	25	10	2
McGill (D)	15	5	1
Talbot (R)	22	8	7
Schreiber (R)	20	8	7
Sutton (D)	10	4	0

Mr. DOUGLAS. It will be noted that I have separated out from the total of cases voted upon, those in which there were split decisions. The reason for this is that no real guidance with respect to a commissioner's tariff predelictions, as reflected in his voting record, can be obtained in those cases in which the applicant's claims were so poorly supported by the evidence in the investigation that even the most convinced protectionist commissioner could not persuade himself to recommend a tariff increase. Most of the unanimous decisions, with three possible exceptions, were of this character.

The figures largely speak for themselves. They show that the three present Republican members of the Commission, Brossard, Talbot, and Schreiber, almost invariably voted for tariff increases in the split-decision cases; that the three former Democratic members, Ryder, Edminster, and McGill, preponderantly voted against such increases, and that one present Democratic member of the Commission, Sutton, included in the list, also has voted against such increases.

The figures show that Mr. Brossard took part in 10 split-decision cases, and in 10 instances, that is, in every instance, voted for increased restrictions on imports. Mr. Talbot took part in 8 split-decision cases, and in 7 of those voted for increased restrictions on imports. Mr. Schreiber took part in 8 split-decision cases, and in 7 of those voted for increased restrictions on imports.

On the other hand, the records of the 3 former Democratic members, Ryder, Edminister, and McGill, show that Mr. Ryder took part in 9 split-decision cases, and in no instance did he vote for an increased restriction on imports. Mr. Edminster took part in 10 split-decision eases, and in only 2 voted for further restrictions. Mr. McGill took part in 5 split-decision cases, and in only 1 did he vote for further restrictions.

It is also true that the 1 present member of the Commission, Mr. Sutton, whose name I have included in the list, also voted against such increases in the 4 cases on which he passed, involving split decisions.

I wish to say now that, from all I can learn, Mr. Sutton has been and is a good commissioner.

Some of the new provisions of the Trade Agreements Act, as passed by Congress and signed by the President last year, increase the power of even a "protectionist" equality on the Tariff Commission. That is to say, even a 3-to-3 split between protectionists and low-tariff men favors the protectionist position.

Under the new law, in escape clause action, the Tariff Commission is now required to make public immediately its findings and recommendations to the President. This allows for interested industries to bring public pressure on the President in such situations. Therefore, three protectionists whose views are made public and are used by the affected industry, certainly can be used to promote their position.

Another new power which gives a dominant protectionist group on the Commission greater influence is that which states that in determining injury under the peril point and escape clause procedures, the Commission shall now distinguish or separate the operations of a particular industry or business enterprise from the industry as a whole for the purpose of determining injury. This allows the Commission to select a single product of a particular firm, or a single firm in an otherwise profitable and uninjured industry, and determine a finding of injury for the particular product or firm.

I take some pride in the fact that I opposed this provision very vigorously on the floor of the Senate when it came up before us last year.

In addition, under the new act, increased imports, either actual or relative, shall be considered as the cause or threat of serious injury to a domestic industry. Thus, the Commission now has the power to say that a relative increase in imports which causes a threat of injury or serious injury to a single product of a firm which is otherwise highly profitable, is enough to cause a finding of injury. It then may invoke the escape clause provision of the law. This, I submit, Mr. President, opens up a field day for protectionists, and with a "protectionist" Commission, there is little hope for either freer trade or for keeping the great gains which we have made over 20 years.

If I may be pardoned a personal reference here, I also take pride in having opposed that provision on the floor of the Senate.

With the provisions that a recommendation of injury is effective with a 3 to 3 tie, there appears to be little hope for even small gains in the foreign trade policies of the United States over which the Tariff Commission has jurisdiction. This is all the more reason why we should scrutinize the composition and acts of the Tariff Commission more closely than ever before.

The information which I have obtained from the Commission is highly disturbing in still other aspects. From the tables—and, also, organization charts which I shall include at the end of my remarks—it would appear that a proper balancing of the Tariff Commission staff as between commodity specialists and economists is not being maintained. Not only that, but it would appear also that the role of economists in the Commission's activities has been reduced to the point where they are not being assigned to tasks for which they are preeminently qualified and in which they should obviously participate.

It is important that the Tariff Commission maintain a decent balance, in its staff and its activities, between commodity specialists and general economists.

Commodity specialists become experts in their fields—like footwear, bicycles,

tree nuts, watches, lumber, and so forth. They become absorbed in the technicalities of the particular industries they know. This makes for very useful men, indeed, in helping to establish facts and in measuring the impact of tariff policy in a particular industry.

But their expertness in one field is also their limitation in another. In general, they are not competent to judge the overall impact of tariff decisions and negotiations. Because of the narrowness of their activity, they tend to be concerned with the protection of the industry they know about. Thus they have a natural bias toward high tariff and a protectionist policy. They are frequently unable to see the forest for the trees.

To make use of their special knowledge but yet to counteract their limitations, it is necessary to have economists who can stand back and take a general look at policy and negotiations. A well-balanced commission will include both commodity specialists and general economists. The economists will understand the value of freer trade. They generally know the implications of specific decisions. They understand such concepts as the law of comparative advantage. They know the fallacies in the infant industry arguments and the other popular arguments which will not stand the test of economic analysis.

Economists are vital, too, in negotiations with other countries, for without them the trained economists of other nations will outargue and pull the wool over the eyes of our commodity specialists, whose expertness is limited.

The orientation of the present Commission's internal organization has been in the direction of generally lessening the participation of economists and increasing that of commodity experts. During the past 3 years, the size of the Commission has risen from 196 to 203 employees. During this period the total number in the commodity divisions rose by about 15 percent. But there are about one-quarter fewer economists on the Commission's staff now than there were 3 years ago.

A confirmation of the Commission's reorientation of its internal affairs is especially reflected in the composition of the delegation which the Commission has selected to attend the Trade Agreements Conference which is now in progress in Geneva. The story of this is implicitly stated in the material contained in exhibit IV. This material reveals a truly amazing situation. To fully comprehend it, Senators must realize that the services of competent economists, having a special familiarity with tariff problems, are essential along with those of commodity specialists, customs lawyers, and others to the proper conduct of trade negotiations. In country-by-country negotiations, it is necessary to utilize personnel whose training is such as to enable them to cover a wide range of commodities and to employ the available technical information to the best advantage in the product-by-product negotiations with each country. Some of this technical information can be supplied by attending commodity experts. But with hundreds of commodities under negotiation, it would be impossible to have in attendance all of the commodity experts of the Commission whose products are involved. Hence the selection of commodity specialists to attend previous trade conferences has been largely confined to those whose products were of outstanding importance in the negotiations.

The end result of all this is that, in the nature of things, one would expect that a substantial number of economists would be included in the Tariff Commission contingent attending each trade conference.

The information contained in exhibit IV discloses that at the previous trade conferences at Geneva in 1947, Annecy in 1949, and Torquay, England, in 1950–1951, the Tariff Commission contingent included a substantial number of economists and also, except at Annecy, always one or more members of the Commission. At the 1947 Geneva Conference, 4 of the members of the Commission were in attendance at one time or another. The professional personnel also included 7 commodity specialists, including 3 chiefs of commodity divisions; the chief of the technical service—indicated in the Commission's organization chart as heading up all the commodity divisions; the chief of the accounting division; the assistant general counsel; and 7 economists, including the chief of the economics division.

At the 1949 Annecy Conference, which was rather limited in scope, 4 economists, including the chief economists, 2 commodity specialists, and the general counsel comprised the professional contingent. At the 1950–51 Torquay Conference, in addition to 1 Tariff Commissioner, the delegation from the Commission included 11 from the economics division, including the chief economist, 3 commodity specialists, and the general counsel.

Let us turn to the present Geneva Conference. An examination of the list of Tariff Commission personnel attending the trade conference which has been going on in Geneva—a major conference, but unlike that held in Geneva in 1947—discloses that not a single economist has been included. The list includes, in addition to the general counsel and the assistant chief of the technical service, 9 commodity specialists, including 1 division chief and 1 assistant chief of a division. No Commissioner's name was included in exhibit IV as furnished to me by the Tariff Commission, but the State Department has announced that Chairman Brossard will attend. At previous conferences all the agencies represented, including the Tariff Commission, have included a substantial number of economists in their delegation; and all but the Tariff Commission have done so this time. Apparently the Tariff Commission is the only agency which now operates on the assumption that the preparation for and conduct of these negotiations require little or no assistance from its economic staff.

In a follow-up letter to the Commission on January 25, I inquired as to why, contrary to all precedent, no economist was being sent to the Geneva Conference, and also as to the reason why the Tariff Commission list included no Tariff Commissioner, whereas the State Department list included Chairman Brossard's name.

In its reply of January 31, which I shall include in the RECORD following my remarks, the Commission makes what I believe are feeble replies to the questions I asked. As to the omission of all staff economists from the delegation, the relevant portions of the Commission's reply are an attempt to gloss over the whole matter, not only with respect to exclusion of economists from the delegation, but also, and more generally, as regards the deemphasis of the economic side of the Commission staff work to which I have already referred. The figures I have given regarding the recent trends in the number of economists and of commodity experts employed, respectively, and the complete omission of economists from the Geneva delegation, completely contradict the Commission's statement concerning this matter.

The omission of all economists from the Tariff Commission representation at this conference cannot have been mere accident or oversight. The kind of job to be performed and the previous experience of the Commission completely rule out any such assumption.

The plain fact is that the regime now in control at the Commission is, as I have already suggested, bent on reducing the economic staff of the Commission, in importance if not in numbers, to a distinctly subordinate position in the conduct of the Commission's work. This has been carried to the point where it amounts, in effect, to serious impairment of the Commission's potential usefulness in international trade negotiations. I do not mean for one moment to reflect on the competence of those Members of the Commission staff who are attending the conference at Geneva. In their several specialized fields they may be, and probably are, highly competent. But they cannot be expected to fulfill the requirements for which experienced tariff economists are needed in such negotiations. Although I must assume, from what was transmitted to me, that this selection of names had the approval of the Commission, I would be interested in knowing whether this was by unanimous action of the Commission. I would be especially interested in knowing whether it had the approval of the two Commissioners whose names are before the Senate for confirmation.

What then is the general setting in which the Senate is asked to confirm these nominations? Is it not plain that we now have a Tariff Commission which is under the domination of high-tariff advocates who have no real liking for the tariff programs espoused by this admin-

istration, and the reciprocal trade program which is the law of the land, and that it will be found opposing the administration's fine words and the clear language of the Reciprocal Trade Act whenever it can?

It is surely not the intent of the Tariff Commission statute that the Commission should become a rallying center for all of the protectionist-minded interests of this country. But, under an administration which claims to be a strong advocate of a low-tariff program, and under a President who has made such fine policy statements on trade and tariffs, one would think that this sort of thing would not be tolerated. Yet there are indications that it has been happening and will continue to happen unless these two men, together with their other Democratic associate, Commissioner Sutton, neutralize it.

It may be that, if continued in office, these two men will rise to their responsibilities and perform well. But they will have to be men of strong wills and high courage who learn rapidly from experience, for they are serving in a Commission in which there is only one experienced Commissioner, the Chairman. No other Commissioner has served so long in that office—over 30 years—and it is doubtful if any other Commissioner has ever rivaled his record as a high protectionist. His retention on the Commission through 20 years of Democratic administrations which were actively pursuing a low-tariff policy is, to say the least, a tribute to the fair-mindedness of the Democratic Party. His position as Chairman, backed by his two high-tariff Republican associates inevitably insures great opportunity for influencing the internal policies of the Commission, with respect both to personnel and to other matters, in the direction of his own predilections and prejudices. How much influence he has exerted on the other less experienced Commissioners is not known to me, but I would expect it to be considerable.

Commissioners Jones and Dowling have not been members of the Commission long enough to establish much of a voting record. But such record as they have established raises a question as to whether they have offered much resistance to the high-protectionist Republican Commissioners. I was especially disturbed, for example, to find that Commissioner Dowling voted with his three Republican associates for a finding of injury under the antidumping statute in respect to cast-iron soil pipe. This decision has followed a line of reasoning which if applied universally could negate much of the reciprocal trade program which, I must again point out, is the law of the land.

Other doubts arise. Do these two Commissioners condone the increased role of commodity experts and the diminished role of economists in the work of the Commission? Did they assent to the exclusion of economists from the Commission's delegation to the Geneva conference?

Why the switch between them whereby the man with the shorter term gets the longer one and vice versa? How well do they comprehend the duties and responsibilities of the post they now hold? Will they stand up to these responsibilities, or will they just be "nice fellows" and go along with the ruling regime? I do not pretend to have the answers to these questions, but I must, in all frankness, say that I have very serious misgivings.

I have no personal animus toward either nominee. I would be the last man to wish to do an injustice to either. But, in considering these nominations, I think it is the duty of the Senate to look beyond the kind of tariff legislation we enact, to the kind of men who are selected to carry it out. Members of the Tariff Commission have an important part in this. They should be selected with great care. They should be fully cognizant of the importance of our tariff policy—psychological as well as economic—in our relations with the rest of the world. They should be men of vision and of courage. They must know how to live in the midst of controversy and how to stand up to pressure of all kinds.

I can only hope that by bringing to the attention of the Senate and the public the great gulf between the words and the deeds of President Eisenhower and the Republican administration, some fresh breezes may blow and that it may have a healthy influence on the Commission, its members, and the policy of President Eisenhower which is so much at odds with his statements and promises.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
December 27, 1956.

The Honorable EDGAR B. BROSSARD,
The Tariff Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish to ask for the following information which I hope you may be able to send to me at your very earliest convenience. I would appreciate receiving the information as you have it available.

1. The names of the present Commissioners, the dates of their appointments, the nature of the term they fill, and the dates when each term expires.

2. The voting records of each commissioner during the past 3 years on investigations:

(a) Conducted by the Commission under provisions of the Tariff Act.

(b) Under section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act.

I desire the records not only of existing Commissioners but also of their predecessors in this period.

3. What changes, if any, have occurred in the size and internal organization of the Commission during the past 3 years. In particular, I am concerned to know of changes in the size and functions, if any, of each of the major divisions of the Commission as of today compared with December 1952.

4. The names and positions of persons in the Commission's representation to the past trade conferences at Geneva, Annecy, and Torquay, and the names and positions of the Commission's representatives to the next trade conference to be held in Geneva in 1956.

Thank you very much. With best wishes,
Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

JANUARY 13, 1956.

The Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: I am glad to furnish the following information, as requested in your letter of December 27, 1955.

1. Exhibit I, attached, sets forth the information requested in paragraph 1 of your letter concerning the present members of the Commission.

2. The information requested in paragraph 2 of your letter concerning the voting records of the Commission members during the past 3 years is set forth in the attached series of tables, designated as Exhibit II, A–E.

The voting records in two types of investigations are not included, for the following reasons:

In "peril point" investigations (sec. 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended), the findings of the Commission are submitted in confidence to the President, and are not later made public.

In investigations under section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, the Commission's reports consist of the presentation of factual information, without recommendations or conclusions.

We are also enclosing for your information a series of reports on the outcome or current status of investigations under the several statutory provisions administered by the Commission.

3. With reference to the information requested in paragraph 3 of your letter, there are attached the following exhibits: III–A, organization and personnel chart of December 31, 1952; III–B, organization and personnel chart as of December 31, 1955; III–C, comparative table showing unit personnel strength as of December 31, 1952, and December 31, 1955; III–D, list of staff separations and additions, 1953, 1954, and 1955; III–E, tentative list of proposed staff increases for 1955–56, approved October 11, 1955.

From the foregoing exhibits, it will be noted that the Commission's total employment increased from 196 in December 1952 to 203 in December 1955. Organizational adjustments in the grouping and size of the various units, in accordance with changing needs and conditions, are reflected in Exhibits III–A, B, and C. These adjustments have not, however, affected the functions of the divisions and sections involved.

4. The information concerning Commission employees attending the trade conferences referred to in paragraph 4 of your letter is set forth in Exhibit IV, attached.

We hope this information will meet your needs.

Sincerely yours,
EDGAR B. BROSSARD, *Chairman.*

EXHIBIT I.—*Members of Tariff Commission, Jan. 12, 1956*

Name	Date of entrance on duty in present term	Term expires
Brossard, Edgar B., Chairman (R)	Sept. 20, 1950	June 16, 1956
Jones, J. Weldon (D)	June 20, 1955	June 16, 1957
Schreiber, Walter R. (R)	Aug. 5, 1953	June 16, 1958
Talbot, Joseph E., Vice Chairman (R)	June 17, 1953	June 16, 1959
Sutton, Glenn W. (D)	Sept. 1, 1954	June 16, 1960
Dowling, William E. (D)	Aug. 22, 1955[1]	June 16, 1961

[1] Recess appointment.

EXHIBIT II–A

U. S. Tariff Commission—Summary of votes of Commission members, 1953, 1954, and 1955—Investigations under sec. 7, Trade Agreements Extension Act

Investigation title	Date of completion	Investigation No.	Brossard	Ryde	Edminster	McGill	Talbot	Schreiber	Sutton	Jones	Dowling
Household china tableware.	Feb. 6, 1953	11	Modification not recommended.	Modification not recommended.	Modification not recommended.	Modification not recommended.	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1).
Wood screws of iron or steel.	Mar. 27, 1953	13	Modification recommended.	do	do	do	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1).
Pregnant mare's urine and estrogens obtained therefrom.	Apr. 2, 1953	14	Modification not recommended.	do	do	do	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1).
Chalk whiting	Apr. 9, 1953	15	Modification recommended.	do	do	do	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1).
Screen-printed silk scarves.	Apr. 13, 1953	19	Modification not recommended.	Modification not recommended.	Modification not recommended.	Modification not recommended.	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1).
Woodwind musical instruments and parts thereof.	Apr. 28, 1953	16	do	do	do	do	Modification not recommended.	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1).
Cotton-carding machinery and parts thereof.	July 29, 1953	18	do	do	do	do	do	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1).
Metal watch bracelets and parts thereof.	Aug. 20, 1953	21	do	do	do	do	do	Modification not recommended.	(1)	(1)	(1).
Rosaries	Aug. 21, 1953	20	do	do	do	do	do	do	(1)	(1)	(1).
Hand-blown glassware.	Sept. 22, 1953	22	Modification recommended.	do	do	do	Modification recommended.	Modification recommended.	(1)	(1)	(1).
Mustard seeds (whole).	Dec. 10, 1953	23	Modification not recommended.	do	do	do	Modification not recommended.	Modification not recommended.	(1)	(1)	(1).
Scissors and shears, and manicure and pedicure nippers, and parts thereof.	Mar. 12, 1954	24	Modification recommended (part).[2]	do	do	Modification recommended (part).[2]	Modification recommended (part).[2]	Modification recommended (part).	(1)	(1)	(1).
Groundfish fillets	May 7, 1954	25	Modification recommended.	do	do	(3)	Modification recommended.	Modification recommended.	(1)	(1)	(1).
Watches, movements, and parts.	May 21, 1954	26	Modification recommended (part).[4]	do	Modification recommended (part).[4]	Modification not recommended.	Modification recommended (part).[4]	Modification recommended (part).[4]	(1)	(1)	(1).
Lead and zinc	do	27	Modification recommended.	Modification recommended.	Modification recommended.	Modification recommended.	Modification recommended.	Modification recommended.	(1)	(1)	(1).
Alsike clover seed	do	31	do	do	do	do	do	do	(1)	(1)	(1).
Straight pins	June 22, 1954	28	(5)	(5)	(5)	(6)	(5)	(5)	(1)	(1)	(1).
Safety pins	do	29	(5)	(5)	(5)	(6)	(5)	(5)	(1)	(1)	(1).
Chicory, ground or otherwise prepared.	Sept. 7, 1954	33	Modification not recommended.	Modification not recommended.	Modification not recommended.	(6)	Modification not recommended.	Modification not recommended.	(1)	(1)	(1).
Spring clothespins	Oct. 6, 1954	32	Modification recommended.	do	do	(6)	Modification recommended.	Modification recommended.	Modification not recommended.	(1)	(1).
Coconuts in the shell.	Oct. 25, 1954	38	Modification not recommended.	do	do	(6)	Modification not recommended.	Modification not recommended.	do	(1)	(1).
Wood screws of iron or steel.	Oct. 28, 1954	34	Modification recommended.	do	do	(6)	Modification recommended.	Modification recommended.	do	(1)	(1).
Wool gloves and mittens and glove and mitten linings of wool.	Dec. 28, 1954	35	do	do	do	(6)	Modification not recommended.	Modification not recommended.	do	(1)	(1).
Inedible gelatin and glue of animal origin.	Jan. 7, 1955	36	Modification not recommended.	do	do	(6)	do	do	do	(1)	(1).
Bicycles	Mar. 14, 1955	37	Modification recommended.	(7)	Modification recommended.	(6)	Modification recommended.	Modification recommended.	do	(1)	(1).
Alsike clover seed (supplementary).	Apr. 28, 1955	31	Continuation of modification recommended.	(7)	Continuation of modification recommended.	(6)	Continuation of modification recommended.	Continuation of modification recommended.	Continuation of modification recommended.	(1)	(1)
Hardwood plywood.	June 2, 1955	39	Modification not recommended.	(7)	Modification not recommended.	(6)	Modification not recommended.	Modification not recommended.	Modification not recommended.	(1)	(1).
Red fescue seed	June 22, 1955	40	do	(7)	(8)	(6)	do	do	do	(10)	(1).
Bicycles (supplementary).[9]	July 14, 1955	37	Modification recommended.	(7)	(8)	(6)	Modification recommended.	Modification recommended.	do	(10)	(1).
Ferrocerium (lighter flints) and all other cerium alloys.	Dec. 21, 1955	41	do	(7)	(8)	(6)	do	do	Modification recommended.	Modification recommended.	Modification recommended.

[1] Mr. Talbot joined the Commission on Apr. 15, 1953; Mr. Schreiber on Aug. 5, 1953; Mr. Sutton on Sept. 1, 1954; Mr. Jones on June 20, 1955; and Mr. Dowling on Aug. 22, 1955 (recess appointment).

[2] The modification recommended by Commissioners Brossard, McGill, Talbot, and Schreiber applied only to scissors and shears valued over $1.75 per dozen. No modification was recommended with reference to scissors and shears valued at not over $1.75 per dozen and manicure and pedicure nippers.

[3] Commissioner McGill was absent at the time of the Commission's decision on groundfish fillets and did not participate in the Commission's decision or in the preparation of the report.

[4] The recommendation for modification by Commissioners Brossard, Talbot, Edminster, and Schreiber applied only to articles subject to duty under subdivisions (1), (2), (3), and (5) of par. 367 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930. No recommendation for modification was made with reference to articles provided for in subdivision (4) of par. 367 (a) nor those provided for in subdivision (6) of par. 367 (a) or in par. 367 (c) of the Tariff Act of 1930.

[5] The Commission terminated the investigation without formal findings on the merits, because of the applicant's refusal to supply pertinent information to the Commission.

[6] Commissioner McGill's term expired on June 16, 1954. However, he did participate in the findings of the Commission with reference to investigations Nos. 28 and 29.

[7] Commissioner Ryder retired on Feb. 28, 1955.

[8] Commissioner Edminster's term expired on June 16, 1955. However, he did participate in investigation No. 40, and concurred in the Commission's finding.

[9] This report was supplementary to the original report on investigation No. 37 in response to the President's request for additional information.

[10] Commissioner Jones joined the Commission on June 20, 1955, but did not participate in investigations nor the findings with reference to investigations Nos. 40 and 37 (supplementary)

EXHIBIT II–B

U. S. Tariff Commission—Summary of votes of Commission members, 1953, 1954, and 1955—Investigations under sec. 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act

Investigation title	Date of completion	Brossard	Ryder	Edminster	McGill	Talbot	Schreiber	Sutton	Jones	Dowling
Certain dairy and other products (1953).	June 1, 1953	Modification recommended.	----------	Modification recommended.[1]	Modification recommended.	Modification recommended.	----------	----------	----------	
Edible tree nuts (supplemental investigation) (1953).	Sept. 21, 1953	do.[2]	Modification recommended.[2]	do.[2]	do.[2]	do.[2]	Modification recommended.[2]	----------	----------	
Oats, hulled or unhulled, and unhulled ground oats (1953).	Oct. 9, 1953	do	Modification not recommended.	Modification not recommended.	do	do	do	----------	----------	
Wool, wool tops, and carbonized wool (1954).	Feb. 19, 1954	do	do	do	do	do	do	----------	----------	
Rye, rye flour, and rye meal.	Mar. 8, 1954	do	Modification recommended.	Modification recommended.	do	do	do	----------	----------	
Edible tree nuts (supplemental investigation) (1954).	Sept. 24, 1954	do.[3]	do.[3]	do.[3]	----------	do.[3]	do.[3]	Modification recommended.[3]	----------	
Oats, hulled or unhulled, and unhulled ground oats (1954).	Sept. 27, 1954	do	do	do	----------	do	do	do	----------	
Tung nuts and tung oil (1954).	Sept. 30, 1954	do	do	do	----------	do	do	do	----------	
Barley, hulled, or unhulled, including rolled barley and ground barley and barley malt (1954).	do	do	do	do	----------	do	do	do	----------	
Peanuts, supplemental investigation (1955).	Feb. 18, 1955	Quota enlarged.	Quota enlarged.	Quota enlarged.	----------	Quota enlarged.[4]	Quota enlarged.[4]	Quota enlarged.	----------	
Peanuts, 2d supplemental investigation (1955).	----------	Quota further enlarged.	----------	Quota further enlarged.	----------	Quota further enlarged.	Quota further enlarged.	Quota further enlarged.	----------	
Rye, rye flour, and rye meal.	June 24, 1955	Modification recommended.	----------	----------	----------	Modification recommended.	Modification recommended.	Modification recommended.	----------	
Shelled filberts	July 1, 1955	Quota enlarged.	----------	----------	----------	Quota enlarged.	Quota enlarged.	Quota enlarged.[5]	Quota enlarged.	

[1] Commissioner Edminster concurred in the findings and recommendations except with respect to the size of the annual quotas which should be imposed on certain of the articles.

[2] Modification restricted to shelled almonds and blanched, roasted, and otherwise prepared or preserved almonds (not including almond paste). Modification not recommended for shelled filberts, walnuts, brazil nuts, cashews, or unshelled almonds.

[3] Modification restricted to shelled almonds and blanched, roasted and otherwise prepared or preserved almonds (not including almond paste) and shelled filberts, whether or not blanched. Modification not recommended on walnuts. Investigation did not include brazil nuts and cashews.

[4] Commissioners Talbot and Schreiber concurred in the findings and recommendations except with respect to the size of the quota and fees.

[5] Commissioner Sutton concurred in the finding and recommendation except with respect to the size of enlarged quota.

EXHIBIT II–C

U. S. Tariff Commission—Summary of votes of Commission members, 1953, 1954, and 1955—Investigations under sec. 336, Tariff Act of 1930

Investigation title	Date of completion	Brossard	Ryder	Edminster	McGill	Talbot	Schreiber	Sutton	Jones	Dowling
Household china tableware	June 24, 1954 recom-	Modification recommended.	Modification not recommended.	Modification not recommended.	(1)	Modification recommended.	Modification not recommended.	(2)	(2)	(2).
Knit or crocheted cotton gloves and mittens.	Feb. 1, 1955	Application denied and dismissed.	Application denied and dismissed.	Application denied and dismissed.	(1)	Application denied and dismissed.	Application denied and dismissed.	Application denied and dismissed.	(2)	(2).
Photographic shutters	Mar. 29, 1955	do	(3)	do	(1)	do	do	do	(2)	(2).
Cork insulation	May 12, 1955	Application discontinued and dismissed.[4]	(3)	Application discontinued and dismissed.[4]	(1)	Application discontinued and dismissed.[4]	Application discontinued and dismissed.[4]	Application discontinued and dismissed.[4]	(2)	(2).

[1] Commissioner McGill's term expired on June 16, 1954. However, he did participate in the investigation on household china tableware and concurred in the finding of the majority of the Commission.

[2] Mr. Sutton joined the Commiss on on Sept. 1, 1954; Mr. Jones on June 20, 1955; and Mr. Dowling on Aug. 22, 1955 (recess appointment).

[3] Commissioner Ryder retired Feb. 28, 1955.

[4] This action was taken by the Commission after consideration of representations made by the applicants, and of other pertinent factors.

EXHIBIT II–D

United States Tariff Commission—Summary of votes of Commission members, 1953, 1954, and 1955—Investigations under sec. 337, Tariff Act of 1939

Investigation title	Date of completion	Brossard	Ryder	Edminster	McGill	Talbot	Schreiber	Sutton	Jones	Dowling
Multiple-compartment cooking pans.	July 1, 1953	Full investigation recommended.	Complaint dismissed.	Complaint dismissed.	Complaint dismissed.	Complaint dismissed.				
Combination spray and spout plumbing fixtures.	Jan. 11, 1954	Complaint dismissed.	do	do	do	do	Complaint dismissed.	----------	----------	
Synthetic star sapphires and synthetic star rubies.	Sept. 20, 1954	Exclusion recommended.	Exclusion not recommended.	Exclusion not recommended.	----------	Exclusion recommended.	Exclusion recommended.	----------	----------	
Pocket combination tool	Sept. 28, 1954	Complaint dismissed.	Complaint dismissed.	Complaint dismissed.	----------	Complaint dismissed.	Complaint dismissed.	Complaint dismissed.	----------	
Apparatus for electrolytically treating metal surfaces.	Dec. 21, 1955	do	----------	----------	----------	do	do	do	Complaint dismissed.	Complaint dismissed.

EXHIBIT II–E

United States Tariff Commission—Summary of votes of Commission members, 1953, 1954, and 1955—Investigations under the Antidumping Act of 1921, as amended, sec. 201 (a)

Investigation title	Date of completion	Brossard	Ryder	Edminister	Talbot	Schreiber	Sutton	Jones	Dowling
Muriate of potash from the Soviet Zone of Germany.	Feb. 25, 1955	Finding of injury.	No finding of injury.	No finding of injury.	Finding of injury.	Finding of injury.	No finding of injury.		
Muriate of potash from the Federal Republic of Germany and France.	Mar. 2, 1955	No finding of injury.	do	do	No finding of injury.	No finding of injury.	do		
Pocket pencil sharpeners from West Germany.	Aug. 11, 1955	do			do	do	No finding of injury.	No finding of injury.	
Nicotine sulphate from the Netherlands.	Aug. 25, 1955	do			do	do	Absent	do	(1).
Cast-iron soil pipe from the United Kingdom.	Oct. 25, 1955	Finding of injury.			Finding of injury.	Finding of injury.	No finding of injury.	do	Finding of injury.

[1] Did not participate in investigation.

EXHIBIT III–A

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—PERSONNEL REPORT AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1952

Total employees, 194; total salaries, $1,198,088.80.

THE COMMISSION

Ryder, Oscar B.; Edminster, Lynn Ramsay; Brossard, Edgar B.; McGill, George; Close, Ruth Kaye, GS–7; O'Neill, Agnes M., GS–7; Baden, M. Minerva, GS–7; Hill, Viola A., GS–7.

Total employees, 8.

THE SECRETARY

Bent, Donn N. (see Administrative Service).

GENERAL COUNSEL

Legal division

Kaplowitz, Paul, GS–15; Shewmaker, Russell N., GS–13; McCauley, Alfred R., GS–11; Stabe, Rose I., GS–6.

Total employees, 4.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE

Bent, Donn N., GS–15; Wetzig, Mary L., GS–9; Finch, Edith L., GS–7.

Total employees, 3.

PERSONNEL SECTION

Simon, Frances H., GS–9; Emery, Dorothy Jean, GS–5; Lickteig, Lucy H., GS–4; Hudson, Coletta A., GS–4; Shaw, Vada T., GS–3.

Total employees, 5.

STENOGRAPHIC SECTION

Riddle, Mae M., GS–6; Garland, Catherine M., GS–4; Spart, Dorothy F., GS–4; Wright, Lillian J., GS–4; Taylor, Madelaine A., GS–4; McGowan, Lillian F., GS–3; Allen, Mary E., GS–3.

Total employees, 7.

MAILS AND FILES SECTION

Mahoney, Edna B., GS–6; Maguire, Edward A., GS–6; Wilson, Lillian L., GS–4; Flournoy, Rebecca C., GS–3; Moxley, Evleyn E., GS–3; Griffis, Edward L., GS–2; [1] Scully, Frank E., GS–2.

Total employees, 6.

DOCKET AND PUBLIC INFORMATION SECTION

Connolly, Edna V., GS–9; Musgrove, Bertha C., GS–5; Johnston, Leona F., GS–4.

Total employees, 3.

FINANCE SECTION

Ruge, Agnes M., GS–9; Starr, Irene W., GS–6; Gibbons, Dorothy A., GS–5; Quimby, Grace E., GS–4; Sherwood, Gertrude M., GS–4; Buehler, Jeannette H., GS–3; Camper, Thelma B. M., GS–3.

Total employees, 7.

GRAPHIC AND MESSENGER SECTION

Clifton, Sidney T., GS–6; Herbert, James, GS–3; Stokes, Bryan T., WB–13; Jensen, Robert F., WB–12; Martin, Richard B., WB–12; Carpenter, Henry E., WB–10; Evans, Jessie L., WB–8; McClain, Henry W., WB–8; Woodward, John J., CPC–5; [1] Strothers, Harold W., CPC–3; James, Lester, CPC–3; Jones, Cecil, CPC–3.

Total employees, 11.

PLANNING AND REVIEWING COMMITTEE

Director of Investigation (chairman), Morrison, Loyle A.; Chief, Technical Service (vice chairman), Ballif, Louis S. (see Tech. Service); Chief Economist and Chief, Economics Division, Dorfman, Ben D. (see Econ. Service); General Counsel, Kaplowitz, Paul (see Legal Division); Special Adviser, Kiessling, Oscar E., GS–15; the Secretary, Bent, Donn N. (see Admin. Service); Secretary to P. and R. Committee, Glenn, Mary S., GS–7; Secretary to Special Adviser, Hartje, Juel L., GS–6.

Total employees (not included elsewhere), 4.

TECHNICAL SERVICE

Ballif, Louis S., GS–15; Morgan, Albert L., GS–13; Cox, Laura K., GS–6.

Total employees, 3.

AGRICULTURE DIVISION

Lewis, Carleton K., GS–14; Gates, Philip W., GS–13; Shelledy, Frederick H., GS–13; Corey, Will H., GS–12; Kurtz, William J., GS–12; Klein, John W., GS–12; Law, Dana K., GS–12; Leikind, Hyman, GS–12; Robinson, Leslie A., GS–9; Compton, Esther G., GS–5; Brodie, Catharine J., GS–5; Brown, Elizabeth J., GS–4.

Total employees, 12.

CERAMICS DIVISION

Albertson, J. Mark, GS–14; Watkins, Ray T., GS–13; Meyer, William W., GS–13; Santmyers, Reigart M., GS–13; Smith, Kenneth B., GS–13; Welch, Edward T., GS–11; Wright, William E., GS–11; Kotyk, Eva M., GS–5; Brown, Franklin W., GS–5.

Total employees, 9.

CHEMICAL DIVISION

Hibben, James, GS–14; Cragg, Rollin H., GS–13; Webb, G. Raymond, GS–13; Gonet, Frank, GS–13; Bell, Donald W., GS–13; Adams, Leason B., GS–12; Parsons, Henry O., GS–12; Scott, Thomas J., GS–12; McCarthy, Daniel F., GS–12; Fletcher, John C., GS–11; Emory, Deborah K., GS–11; Eno, Pauline T., GS–7; Anderson, Loretta O., GS–5; Halpern, Ethel, GS–5; Twyman, Helen H., GS–5; James, Laura O., GS–5; Burrhus, Jessie, GS–4; McLawhorn, Mildred O., GS–4.

Total employees, 18.

INVOICE ANALYSIS SERVICE

Ogg, Floyd L., GS–7; Hamilton, Mabel G., GS–5.

Total employees, 2.

LUMBER AND PAPER DIVISION

Donohoe, Joseph M. P., GS–14; Meese, Norman S., GS–13; Riddle, Lester C., GS–11; Smith, Chester C., GS–5; Bell, Sue R., GS–5.

Total employees, 5.

METALS DIVISION

Leonard, F. Morton, GS–14; Yaworski, Nicholas, GS–13; Burritt, James C., GS–13; McBrian, Joe, GS–13; Settle, Cooke, GS–13; Strand, Carlyle H., GS–13; Wilber, M. Margaret, GS–11; Daiker,[1] Charles W., GS–11; Allen, James S., GS–7; Peck, Daisy G., GS–5; Slaughter, Evelyn P., GS–5.

Total employees, 10.

SUNDRIES DIVISION

Barker, Howard F., GS–14; Sanders, Walter L., Jr., GS–13; Wells, Ralph A., GS–13; Howard, John B., GS–13; Jones, Walter K., GS–12; Travis, Joe D., GS–11; Hart, William Thomas, GS–11; Howell, George F., GS–11; Hausler, Charles J., GS–5; York, Ethel C., GS–5; Wilson, June U., GS–3.

Total employees, 11.

TEXTILE DIVISION

Lee, Roland L., Jr., GS–14; Southworth, Evelina K., GS–13; Peterson, Ruth E. K., GS–13; Kane, Willard W., GS–13; Mercier, Alfred A., GS–13; Shore, Francis M., Jr., GS–13; Shipley, Ernest S., GS–12; Gregg, Robert M., GS–12; Dexter, Lois Howe, GS–5; Rawlings, Mary C., GS–5 Smith,[2] Jessie B., GS–5.

NEW YORK OFFICE

Flynn, Vincent A., GS–9; Hughes, John J., GS–7; Minnion, Nathaniel H., GS–7; Rooney, Frank J., GS–7; Mauser, William M., GS–7; Stutz, George A., GS–4; Carpenter, Sheldon B., Jr., GS–4.

Total employees, 7.

ECONOMICS SERVICE

Dorfman, Ben D., GS–16; Gaulin, Lea M., GS–6.

Total employees, 2.

ECONOMICS DIVISION

Jacobs, John M., GS–14; Loosley, Allyn C., GS–14; Lynch, David B., GS–14; Armstrong, William E., GS–13; Barton, Bernard, GS–13; Kenkel, Anthony B., GS–13; Whelan, Carl J., GS–13; Winslow, Earle M., GS–13; Lovass, Leslie, GS–13; Peirce, Wentworth W., GS–13; Watrous, George D., Jr., GS–12; Wolff, Ernest, GS–12; Henry, G. Patrick, GS–12; Reeves, George C., GS–11; Rovner, Louise M., GS–11; Munro, Alan P., GS–9; Arrill, Daniel, GS–9; Davis, Edna C., GS–9; Goodman, Hilliard H., GS–9; Martin, Edward E., GS–9; Bohn,[2] Grace Roper, GS–7; Emrick, Maurine E., GS–7; Wyman, Charles M., GS–6.

Total employees, 22.

STATISTICAL DIVISION

Woody, Arthur E., GS–11; Robbins, Myrtle O., GS–9; Cavanaugh, Rita M., GS–6; Fox, Leah R., GS–5; Poston, Alice B., GS–5; DeButts, Ruth E., GS–5; Berry, Catherine L., GS–5; Mason, Claire A., GS–4; Quinn, Margaret E., GS–4; Schafer, Gladys V., GS–4; Old, Rena B., GS–4; Collins, Virginia R., GS–4; McIntyre, Martha G., GS–4; Sparling,[1] Joe W., GS–3; Greenstreet, Stewart, GS–3.

Total employees, 14.

THE LIBRARY

Notz, Cornelia, GS–11; McLean, Dorothy Rogers, GS–9; Calia, Margaret E., GS–7; Mar-

[1] In military service. Not included in totals.

[1] In military service. Not included in totals.

[2] On extended leave of absence. Not included in totals.

tin, Clara H., GS–7; Rockwell, Winnona T., GS–7; Riley, Doris M., GS–5; Gram, Ethel C., GS–4; Ellerbe, Edmond, GS–3.

Total employees, 8.

EDITORIAL SECTION

Lewellen, Flo., GS–8; Beal, Janet F., GS–6; Westby, Gladys R., GS–5.

Total employees, 3.

EXHIBIT III–B

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION—PERSONNEL REPORT AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1955

THE COMMISSION

Commissioners: Brossard, Edgar B., Talbot, Joseph E., Schreiber, Walter R., Sutton, Glenn W., Jones, J. Weldon, Dowling, William E.

Total, 6; August 27, 1955.

Commissioners' offices: O'Neill, Agnes M., GS–9; Close, Ruth Kaye, GS–9; Garland, Catherine M., GS–9; Baden, M. Minerva, GS–9; Hill, Viola A., GS–9; Farr, Mary Catherine, GS–9.

Total, 6; December 31, 1955.

STAFF COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Staff coordinating committee: Morrison, Loyle A., Ballif, Louis S., Dorfman, Den D., Kaplowitz, Paul.

Economics Division: Dorfman, Ben D., GS–16; Loosley, Allyn C., GS–14; Lynch, David B., GS–14; Barton, Bernard, GS–13; Kenkel, Anthony B., GS–13; Whelan, Carl J., GS–13; Winslow, Earle M., GS–13; Lovass, Leslie, GS–13; Peirce, Wentworth W., GS–13; Wolff, Ernest, GS–13; Henry, G. Patrick, GS–12; Rovner, Louise M., GS–12; Reeves, George C., GS–11; Davis, Edna C., GS–11; Goodman, Hilliard H., GS–11; Gaulin, Lea M., GS–7; Gray, Paul M., GS–5; Worthington, Howard Leslie, Jr., GS–5.

Total, 18; December 31, 1955.

Office of Director of Investigation: Morrison, Loyle A., GS–16; Kiessling, Oscar E., GS–15; Glenn, Mary S., GS–7; Parker, Juel H., GS–6.

Total, 4; October 22, 1955.

Editorial Section: Lewellen, Flo, GS–9; Westby, Gladys R., GS–5.

Total, 2; October 22, 1955.

Legal Division: Kaplowitz, Paul, GS–16; Shewmaker, Russell N., GS–14; McCauley, Alfred R., GS–12; Crown, George L., GS–11; Martin, Clara H., GS–7; Stabe, Rose I., GS–7; Glenn, James T., GS–7; Capron, Margaret B., GS–5.

Total, 8; December 31, 1955.

Chief, Technical Service: Ballif, Louis S., GS–16; Albertson, J. Mark, GS–15; Cox, Laura K., GS–7.

Total, 3; December 31, 1955.

Lumber and Paper Division: Donohoe, Joseph M. P., GS–14; Riddle, Lester C., GS–12; Morgan, Howard H., GS–11; McWilliams, James P., GS–9; Furlow, Edward P., GS–9; Bell, Sue R., GS–6; Smith, Chester C., GS–5.

Total 7; November 5, 1955.

Metals Division: Leonard, F. Morton, GS–14; Yaworski, Nicholas, GS–13; Burritt, James C., GS–13; McBrian, Joe, GS–13; Settle, Cooke, GS–13; Strand, Carlyle H., GS–13; Huber, Godfrey J., GS–12; Wilbar, M. Margaret, GS–12; Daiker, Charles W., GS–12; Allen, James S., GS–9; Slaughter, Evelyn P., GS–5; Collins, Virginia R., GS–5; Unrik, Josephine M., GS–5.

Total, 13; November 5, 1955.

Sundries Division: Sanders, Walter L., Jr., GS–14; Wells, Ralph A., GS–13; Howard, John B., GS–13; Jones, Walter K., GS–12; Dedicott, William J., GS–12; Travis, Joe D., GS–12; Hart, William Thomas, GS–12; Howell, James W., GS–12; Emrick, Maurine E., GS–9; Holman, Benjamin A., GS–7; Mason, Claire A., GS–5; Spart, Dorothy F., GS–5; Wilson, June U., GS–3.

Total 13; November 5, 1955.

Agriculture Division: Gates, Philip W., GS–14; Corey, Will H., GS–13; Klein, John W., GS–13; Kurtz, William J., GS–13; Law, Dana K., GS–13; Leikind, Hyman, GS–13; Porter, Alton M., GS–11; Robinson, Leslie A., GS–11; Lopp, Thomas G., GS–7; Brodie, Catherine J., GS–5; Stepanek, Alice S., GS–5; Brown, Elizabeth J., GS–5; McKinley, Elizabeth H., GS–4.

Total, 13; November 19, 1955.

Ceramics Division: Watkins, Ray T., GS–14; Meyer, William W., GS–13; Santmyers, Peigart M., GS–13; Smith, Kenneth B., GS–13; Welch, Edward T., GS–12; Wright, William E., GS–12; Kotyk, Eva M., GS–6; Smith, Jessie B., GS–5.

Total 8; November 5, 1955.

Chemical Division: Hibben, James H., GS–14; Cragg, Rollin H., GS–13; Webb, G. Raymond, GS–13; Conet, Frank, GS–13; Parson, Henry O., GS–13; Scott, Thomas J., GS–13; Adams, Leason B., GS–12; McCarthy, Daniel F., GS–12; Emory, Deborah K., GS–12; Fletcher, John G., GS–12; Tremearne, Miriam G., GS–11; Eno, Pauline T., GS–8; Nickolson, Joseph S., Jr., GS–7; Anderson, Loretta O., GS–6; Halpern, Ethel, GS–5; James, Laura O., GS–5; Twyman, Helen H., GS–5; Quinn, Margaret E., GS–5; Burrhus, Jessie, GS–4; Torrillo, Patrick J., Jr., GS–4.

Total 20; February 17, 1955.

Textiles division: Lee, Boland L., Jr., GS–14; Southworth, Evelina K., GS–13; Miller, Ruth Peterson, GS–13; Kane, Willard W., GS–13; Mercier, Alfred A., GS–13; Schoffstall, Charles W., GS–13; Shore, Francis M., Jr., GS–13; Shipley, Ernest S., GS–13; Gregg, Robert M., GS–12; Dexter, Lois Howe, GS–5; Weaver, Lulu, GS–5; Taylor, Madelaine A., GS–5; Greenstreet, Stewart W., GS–4.

Total, 13; November 5, 1955.

Statistical division: Woody, Arthur E., GS–11; Robbins, Myrtle O., GS–10; Fox, Leah R., GS–5; Poston, Alice B., GS–5; Berry, Catherine L., GS–5; DeButts, Ruth E., GS–5; Schafer, Gladys V., GS–5; Levin, Freida, GS–4; Diller, Elizabeth, GS–4; McIntyre, Martha G., GS–4; Stebbins, Maxine H., GS–4; Sparling, Joe W., GS–3.

Total, 11; November 5, 1955.

Invoice analysis section: Ogg, Floyd I., GS–9; Old, Rena B., GS–5.

Total, 2; July 2, 1955.

New York office: Hughes, John J., GS–7; Rooney, Frank J., GS–7; Mauser, William M., GS–7; Carpenter, Sheldon B., Jr., GS–7; Theil, Frank, GS–5; Stutz, George A., GS–4; Gallagher, John F., GS–4.

Total, 7; October 22, 1955.

Secretary's office: Bent, Donn N., GS–15; Armstrong, William E., GS–13; Wetsig, Mary L., GS–9; Finch, Edith L., GS–9; Compton, Esther G., GS–9; Musgrove, Bertha C., GS–6; Casells, Vincent J., GS–6; Johnston, Leona F., GS–4; Tickson, Haywood, J., GS–2.

Total, 9; December 31, 1955.

Personnel section: Simon, Frances H., GS–11; Emery, Dorothy Jean, GS–5; Lickteig, Lucy H., GS–5; Hudson, Coletta A., GS–3.

Total, 4; December 17, 1955.

Finance section: Ruge, Agnes M., GS–9; Starr, Irene W., GS–7; Gibbons, Dorothy A., GS–6; Buehler, Jeannette H., GS–4; Camper, Thelma B. M., GS–3; Field, Irene M., GS–3.

Total, 6; October 22, 1955.

Library: McLean, Dorothy R., GS–11; Rockwell, Winnona T., GS–9; Calia, Margaret E., GS–7; Riley, Doris M., GS–7; Sandford, Olive S., GS–4; Ellerbe, Edmond, GS–3.

Total, 6; October 22, 1955.

Messenger section: Woodward, John J., GS–3; Strothers, Harold, GS–1; Gaines, Haskell, GS–1; Taylor, James W., GS–1.

Total, 3; November 19, 1955.

Stenographic section: York, Ethel C., GS–6; Singer, Sylvia S., GS–4; George, Dorothy G., GS–4; Spencer, Carolyn L., GS–4; Orndorff, Mary A., GS–3; Phillips, Amy I., GS–3; Norwood, Joyce L., GS–3.

Total, 7; December 31, 1955.

Mail and files section: Rawlings, Mary C., GS–7; Barley, Evelyn E., GS–5; Moxley, Evelyn E., GS–4; Griffis, Edward L., GS–3; Scully, Frank E., GS–2.

Total, 4; July 2, 1955.

Graphic section: Clifton, Sidney T., WB–15; Stokes, Bryan T., WB–13; Carpenter, Henry E., WB–10; Jensen, Robert F., WB–9; Martin, Richard B., WB–9; Herbert, James, WB–8; Evans, Jessie L., WB–8; McClain, Henry W., WB–8; Wynn, Eddie P., WB–7; Cates, Lorance B., Jr., GS–3.

Total, 10; December 3, 1955.

EXHIBIT III–C

Organizational units	Dec. 31, 1952	Dec. 31, 1955
Commissioners' offices	8	12
Professional and technical group	111	121
Executive and advisory	10	10
Legal Division	3	7
Economics Division	22	17
Commodity Divisions	76	87
Agriculture	12	13
Ceramics	9	8
Chemical	18	20
Lumber and paper	5	7
Metals	10	13
Sundries	11	13
Textiles	11	13
Administrative and supporting group	70	63
Office of Secretary	7	8
Statistical Division	14	11
Library	8	6
Editorial Section	3	2
Invoice Analysis Section	2	2
Personnel Section	5	4
Finance Section	7	6
Stenographic Section	7	7
Mail and Files Section	6	4
Graphic and Messenger Section	11	13
Total departmental	189	196
New York office (field)	7	7
Grand total	196	203

EXHIBIT III–D

List of all separations and additions for the calendar years 1953, 1954, and 1955

Name	Position and grade	Division	Date	Nature of action
Watson, G. Raymond	Commercial-industrial analyst, GS–11	Metals	Jan. 5, 1953	Appointment.
Bohn, Grace Roper	Economist, GS–7	Economics	Jan. 31, 1953	Retirement.
Meese, Norman S.	Commercial-industrial analyst, GS–13	Lumber and Paper	Feb. 28, 1953	Do.
Maguire, Edward A	Assistant Chief, Mails and Files, GS–6	Mail and Files	Mar. 13, 1953	Resignation.
Talbot, Joseph E.	Commissioner		Apr. 15, 1953	Appointment.
Schoffstall, Charles W	Commercial-industrial analyst, GS–13	Textiles	Apr. 27, 1953	Do.
Morgan, Albert L.	Assistant to the Chief, Technical Service, GS–13	Office of Chief, Technical Service	Apr. 30, 1953	Retirement.
Munro, Alan P.	Economist, GS–9	Economics	May 19, 1953	Death.
Dedicott, William J.	Commercial-industrial analyst, GS–11	Sundries	June 1, 1953	Appointment.
Mousley, Joseph C.	Assistant Chief, Mail and File, GS–5	Mail and Files	June 4, 1953	Do.
Wright, Lillian J.	Clerk-stenographer, GS–4	Stenographic	June 5, 1953	Resignation.
Stepanek, Alice S.	do	do	June 8, 1953	Appointment.
Shaw, Vada T.	Clerk, GS–3	Personnel	July 3, 1953	Resignation.
Lloyd, Theodore B.	Messenger, CPC–3	Graphic and Messenger	July 6, 1953	Appointment.

List of all separations and additions for the calendar years 1953, 1954, and 1955—Continued

Name	Position and grade	Division	Date	Nature of action
Shelledy, Frederick H	Commercial-industrial analyst, GS-13	Agriculture	July 31, 1953	Retirement.
Wilson, Lillian L	Mail and file clerk, GS-4	Mail and Files	do	Do.
Daiker, Charles W	Commercial-industrial analyst, GS-11	Metals	Aug. 4, 1953	Appointment.
Schreiber, Walter R	Commissioner		Aug. 5, 1953	Do.
Farr, Mary Catherine	Administrative assistant (secretary to Commissioner), GS-7.	Commissioner's Office	Aug. 6, 1953	Do.
James, Lester	Messenger, CPC-3	Graphic and Messenger	Aug. 28, 1953	Resignation.
Mousley, Joseph C	Assistant Chief, Mail and Files Section, GS-5	Mail and Files	Aug. 30, 1953	Transfer.
Tuckson, Haywood J	Messenger, CPC-3	Graphic and Messenger	Sept. 22, 1953	Appointment.
Connolly, Edna V	Chief, Docket and Public Information Section, GS-9.	Docket and Public Information	Oct. 31, 1953	Retirement.
Watrous, George D., Jr	Economist, GS-12	Economics	Nov. 30, 1953	Do.
Brown, Franklin W	Statistical clerk, GS-5	Ceramics	Dec. 23, 1953	Removed (convicted of theft).
Jones, Cecil	Messenger, CPC-3	Graphic and Messenger	Feb. 17, 1954	Resignation.
Notz, Cornelia	Librarian, GS-11	Library	Feb. 28, 1954	Retirement.
Matthews, Joseph D., Jr	Messenger, CPC-3	Graphic and Messenger	Mar. 8, 1954	Appointment.
Allen, Mildred L	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4	Stenographic	Mar. 10, 1954	Do.
Reichmann, Miriam G	Commercial-industrial analyst, GS-11	Chemicals	Mar. 15, 1954	Do.
Fletcher, John G	do	do	Mar. 31, 1954	Displacement.
Quimby, Grace E	Fiscal clerk, GS-4	Finance	do	Retirement.
McWilliams, James P	Commercial-industrial analyst, GS-9	Lumber and paper	Apr. 5, 1954	Appointment.
Bell, Donald W	Commercial-industrial analyst, GS-13	Chemicals	Apr. 18, 1954	Death.
Morgan, Howard H	Commercial-industrial analyst, GS-11	Lumber and paper	May 4, 1954	Appointment.
Lloyd, Theodore B	Messenger, CPC-3	Graphic and Messenger	May 9, 1954	Transfer.
Gaines, Haskell	do	do	May 10, 1954	Appointment.
Capron, Margaret B	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4	Stenographic	May 17, 1954	Do.
Arrill, Daniel	Economist, GS-9	Economics	May 23, 1954	Displacement.
Simms, Regina Harkin	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4	Stenographic	May 24, 1954	Appointment.
Mahoney, Edna B	Mail and file supervisor, GS-6	Mail and Files	May 31, 1954	Retirement.
Watson, G. Raymond	Commercial-industrial analyst, GS-11	Metals	do	Displacement.
Barley, Evelyn E	Mail and file clerk, GS-4	Mail and Files	June 1, 1954	Appointment.
McGill, George	Commissioner		June 16, 1954	Expiration of term.
Riddle, Mae M	Chief, Stenographic Section, GS-6	Stenographic	June 30, 1954	Retirement.
Porter, Alton M	Commercial-industrialist analyst, GS-11	Agriculture	July 12, 1954	Appointment.
Wyman, Eddie P	Messenger, CPC-3	Graphic and Messenger	July 26, 1954	Do.
Peck, Daisy G	Secretary, GS-5	Metals	Aug. 1, 1954	Transfer.
Weaver, Lulu	Statistical clerk, GS-4	Statistical	Aug. 2, 1954	Appointment.
Huber, Godfrey J	Commercial-industrialist analyst, GS-12	Metals	Aug. 10, 1954	Do.
Uhrick, Josephine M	Stenographer, GS-3	Stenographic	Aug. 16, 1954	Do.
Holman, Benjamin A	Statistical clerk, GS-5	Ceramics	Aug. 30, 1954	Do.
Singer, Sylvia S	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4	Stenographic	do	Do.
Lewis, Carleton K	Chief, Agriculture Division, GS-14	Agriculture	Aug. 31, 1954	Retirement.
Sutton, Glenn W	Commissioner		Sept. 1, 1954	Appointment.
Lopp, Thomas G	Commercial-industrialist analyst, GS-5	Agriculture	Sept. 7, 1954	Do.
Beal, Janet F	Publications editor, GS-7	Editorial	Oct. 10, 1954	Transfer.
Simms, Regina Harkins	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4	Stenographic	Oct. 17, 1954	Do.
Crown, George L	Attorney-adviser, GS-11	Legal	Oct. 25, 1954	Appointment.
Barker, Howard F	Chief, Sundries Division, GS-14	Sundries	Oct. 31, 1954	Retirement.
Cavanaugh, Rita M	Supervisory statistical clerk, GS-6	Statistical	do	Do.
Shanholtz, Barbara E	Clerk-typist, GS-3	Stenographic	Dec. 20, 1954	Appointment.
Do	do	do	Dec. 29, 1954	Transfer.
Fletcher, John G	Commercial-industrial analyst, GS-11	Chemicals	Jan. 3, 1955	Appointment.
Norwood, Joyce L	Clerk-typist, GS-3	Stenographic	Jan. 10, 1955	Do.
Weber, Arnold I	Attorney-adviser, GS-9	Legal	do	Do.
Hamilton, Mabel G	Statistical clerk, GS-5	Invoice analysis	Jan. 31, 1955	Retirement.
Carter, Renee M	Clerk-typist, GS-3	Stenographic	Feb. 1, 1955	Appointment.
Allen, Mildred L	Secretary, GS-5	Metals	Feb. 13, 1955	Transfer.
Phillips, Amy I	Clerk-typist, GS-3	Stenographic	Feb. 14, 1955	Appointment.
Flournoy, Rebecca C	Statistical clerk, GS-3	Textiles	Feb. 16, 1955	Resignation.
Ryder, Oscar B	Commissioner		Feb. 28, 1955	Retirement.
Theil, Frank	Clerk, GS-4	New York office	Mar. 1, 1955	Appointment.
Spencer, Carolyn L	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4	Stenographic	Mar. 7, 1955	Do.
McLawhorn, Mildred O	Statistical clerk, GS-5	Chemicals	Apr. 3, 1955	Transfer.
Levin, Freida	Statistical clerk, GS-4	Statistical	Apr. 14, 1955	Appointment.
Richards, Alice E	do	do	Apr. 18, 1955	Do.
Minnion, Nathaniel H	Customs records analyst, GS-7	New York office	Apr. 30, 1955	Retirement.
Furlow, Edward P	Commercial-industrial analyst, GS-9	Lumber and paper	May 2, 1955	Appointment.
Wright, Lillian J	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4	Stenographic	June 6, 1955	Do.
Edminster, Lynn Ramsay	Commissioner		June 16, 1955	Expiration of term.
Richards, Alice E	Statistical clerk, GS-4	Statistical	June 19, 1955	Transfer.
Jones, J. Weldon	Commissioner		June 20, 1955	Appointment.
Hausler, Charles J	Statistical clerk, GS-5	Sundries	June 30, 1955	Retirement.
Sherwood, Gertrude M	Supply clerk and GS-4 telephone supervisor	Finance	do	Do.
Weber, Arnold I	Attorney-adviser, GS-9	Legal	July 10, 1955	Transfer.
Brodsky, Barbara S	Clerk-typist, GS-3	Stenographic	July 11, 1955	Appointment.
Field, Irene M	Telephone operator, GS-3	Finance	July 18, 1955	Do.
Glenn, James T	Attorney-adviser, GS-7	Legal	July 28, 1955	Do.
Dowling, William E	Commissioner		Aug. 22, 1955	Do.
George, Dorothy G	Clerk-typist, GS-3	Stenographic	Aug. 29, 1955	Do.
Gram, Ethel C	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4	Library	Aug. 31, 1955	Retirement.
Cates, Lorance B., Jr	File clerk, GS-3	Graphic and messenger	Sept. 6, 1955	Appointment.
McKinley, Elizabeth H	Statistical clerk, GS-4	Statistical	Sept. 12, 1955	Do.
Stebbins, Maxine H	do	do	do	Do.
Brodsky, Barbara S	Clerk-typist, GS-3	Stenographic	Sept. 16, 1955	Resignation.
Diller, Elizabeth	Statistical clerk, GS-4	Statistical	Sept. 19, 1955	Appointment.
Matthews, Joseph D., Jr	Messenger, GS-1	Graphic and messenger	Sept. 21, 1955	Resignation.
Torrilla, Patrick J., Jr	Statistical clerk, GS-4	Chemicals	Sept. 26, 1955	Appointment.
Worthington, Howard Leslie, Jr	Economist, GS-5	Economics	do	Do.
Flynn, Vincent A	Chief, New York office, GS-9	New York office	Sept. 30, 1955	Retirement.
Jacobs, John M	Adviser on market and production analyses, GS-14	Economics	do	Do.
Taylor, James W	Messenger, GS-1	Graphic and Messenger	Oct. 4, 1955	Appointment.
Orndorff, Mary A	Clerk-typist, GS-3	Stenographic	Oct. 6, 1955	Do.
Wright, Lillian J	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4	do	Oct. 8, 1955	Termination of temporary appointment.
Gallagher, John F	Clerk, GS-4	New York office	Oct. 10, 1955	Appointment.
Sandford, Olive S	Library assistant, GS-4	Library	do	Do.
Carter, Renee M	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4	Stenographic	Oct. 21, 1955	Resignation.
Martin, Edward E	Economist, GS-11	Economics	do	Do.
Stewart, Mary A	Clerk-typist, GS-3	Stenographic	Nov. 13, 1955	Do.
Gray, Paul M	Economist, GS-5	Economics	Nov. 14, 1955	Appointment.
Wyman, Charles M	Communication analyst, GS-6	Office of the Secretary	Nov. 18, 1955	Resignation.
McGowan, Lillian F	Stenographer, GS-3	Stenographic	Nov. 30, 1955	Retirement.
Nicholson, Joseph S., Jr	Commercial-industrial analyst, GS-7	Chemicals	Dec. 12, 1955	Appointment.
Casella, Vincent J	Administrative assistant, GS-6	Office of the Secretary	Dec. 19, 1955	Do.

Total separations, 54. Total additions, 61.

EXHIBIT III–E.—*United States Tariff Commission—Tentative list of recommended staff increases, 1955–56*

[Approved, Oct. 11, 1955]

Organizational unit	Number of—		Total number
	Professional	Clerical	
Agricultural Division	2	1	3
Ceramics Division	1		1
Chemicals Division		1	1
Lumber and Paper Division			
Metals Division	1	1	2
Sundries Division	2	1	3
Textiles Division		1	1
New York office		1	1
Economics Division	2		2
Statistical Division		3	3
Library	1		1
Editorial Section	1		1
Stenographic Section			
Graphic and Messenger Section		2	2
Total	10	11	21

EXHIBIT IV.—*Tariff Commission personnel attending trade conferences at Geneva, Annecy, and Torquay*

1. GENEVA CONFERENCE, 1947

Albertson, J. Mark, Chief, Ceramics Division.

Baden, M. Minerva, secretary to Director of Investigation.

Ballif, Louis S., Chief, Technical Service.

Barker, Howard F., Chief, Accounting Division.

Brossard, Edgar B., Commissioner.

Clark, W. A. Graham, Chief, Textiles Division.

Cragg, Rollin H., Assistant Chief, Chemicals Division.

Dean, Prentice N., economist, Economics Division.

Durand, E. Dana, Commissioner.

Edminster, Lynn R., Commissioner (Vice Chairman).

Garland, Catherine M., secretary to Commissioner Gregg.

Gregg, John P., Commissioner.

Howard, John B., commodity specialist, Sundries Division.

Kane, Willard W., commodity specialist, Textile Division.

Kaplowitz, Paul, Assistant General Counsel, Legal Division.

Kenkel, Anthony B., economist, Economics Division.

Leonard, F. Morton, Chief, Metals Division.

Loosley, Allyn C., economist, Economics Division.

Lynch, David B., economist, Economics Division.

Morrison, Loyle A., Chief, Economics Division.

Peirce, Wentworth W., economist, Economics Division.

Rawlings, Mary, stenographer.

Ryder, Oscar B., Commissioner (Chairman).

Sanders, Walter L., Jr., commodity specialist, Sundries Division.

Whelan, Carl J., economist, Economics Division.

2. ANNECY CONFERENCE, 1949

Dorfman, Ben D., Chief Economist.

Glenn, Mary S., Secretary to Chief Economics Division.

Henry, G. Patrick, Economist, Economics Division.

Kane, Willard W., Commodity Specialist, Textile Division.

Leikind, Hyman, Commodity Specialist, Agriculture Division.

Loosley, Allyn C., Economist, Economics Division.

Lynch, David B., Economist, Economics Division.

Martin, Edwin G., General Counsel, Legal Division.

3. TORQUAY CONFERENCE, 1950–51

Davis, Edna C., Economist, Economics Division.

Dorfman, Ben D., Chief Economist, Economics Division.

Durand, E. Dana, Commissioner.

Gaulin, Lea M., Secretary to Chief, Economics Division.

Gonet, Frank, Commodity Specialist, Chemical Division.

Kane, Willard W., Commodity Specialist, Textile Division.

Kaplowitz, Paul, General Counsel, Legal Division.

Kenkel, Anthony B., Economist, Economics Division.

Leikind, Hyman, Commodity Specialist, Agriculture Division.

Loosley, Allyn C., Adviser, Economics Division.

Lynch, David B., Adviser, Economics Division.

Peirce, Wentworth W., Economist, Economics Division.

Reeves, George C., Economist, Economics Division.

Rovner, Louise M., Economist, Economics Division.

Whelan, Carl J., Economist, Economics Division.

Winslow, Earle M., Economist, Economics Division.

Wolff, Ernest, Economist, Economics Division.

4. GENEVA CONFERENCE, 1956

Albertson, J. Mark, Assistant Chief, Technical Service.

Close, Ruth Kaye, Secretary to Chairman Brossard.

Cragg, Rollin H., Assistant Chief, Chemicals Division.

Furlow, Edward P., Commodity Specialist, Lumber and Paper Division.

Gates, Philip W., Chief, Agricultural Division.

Hart, William T., Commodity Specialist, Sundries Division.

Kane, Willard W., Commodity Specialist, Textiles Division.

Kaplowitz, Paul, General Counsel, Legal Division.

McBrian, Joe, Commodity Specialist, Metals Division.

Shipley, Ernest S., Commodity Specialist, Textiles Division.

Smith, Kenneth B., Commodity Specialist, Ceramics Division.

Stabe, Rose, Secretary to General Counsel, Legal.

Wright, William E., Commodity Specialist, Ceramics Division.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 24, 1956.

The Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: In reply to your request of December 27, 1955, for information on the composition of the United States delegation to the 1956 tariff negotiations at Geneva we sent you on January 16 a list of persons who had been tentatively selected for membership on the delegation. All persons on that list have now been officially designated by the Secretary of State, except that the Chairman and Vice Chairman were designated by the President, and are included in the attached press release No. 27 issued by the Department on January 17, together with the names of the 4 nongovernmental advisers.

The press release also includes the name of Mr. Gray Bream who was not listed as a member of the delegation in the enclosure to our letter of January 16. Mr. Bream is a Foreign Service officer, attached to the American Consulate General at Amsterdam.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

[Press release No. 27]

UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO GATT

The Department of State announced today that Herbert V. Prochnow, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, has been designated by the President as Chairman of the United States delegation to the multilateral tariff negotiations beginning January 18 at Geneva, Switzerland.

Carl D. Corse, Chief of the Trade Agreements and Treaties Division, Department of State, was designated by the President as Vice Chairman of the delegation.

Under the authority in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, the United States expects to negotiate reciprocal tariff concessions with about 20 other countries, all of which are contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. These other countries will also be negotiating among themselves, with the United States receiving the benefit of the concessions they grant to one another.

As announced in press release No. 6 issued January 4, the United States delegation will be assisted by four prominent citizens who have agreed to serve as nongovernmental advisers. These four men are listed below, followed by the governmental members of the delegation other than the Chairman and Vice Chairman.

Nongovernmental advisers:

Elliott V. Bell, editor and publisher of Business Week, New York City.

Homer L. Brinkley, executive vice president, National Council of Farm Cooperatives, Washington, D. C.

Bryant Essick, president, Essick Manufacturing Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

Stanley Ruttenberg, research and education director, American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C.

Governmental members:

Forest E. Abbuhl, Trade Agreements and Treaties Division, Department of State.

Charles W. Adair, Jr., American Embassy, Brussels.

J. Mark Albertson, Office of Technical Services, United States Tariff Commission.

Deane M. Black, Office of Economic Affairs, Department of Commerce.

Gray Bream, American Consulate General, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Edgar B. Brossard, Chairman, United States Tariff Commission.

Walter Buchdahl, Office of Economic Affairs, Department of Commerce.

S. Bertha Burnett, Economic Defense Division, Department of State.

Frank P. Butler, American Embassy, Vienna.

Bernard J. Cahill, Chemical Division, Department of Commerce.

Edward G. Cale, Office of Regional American Affairs, Department of State.

Joseph A. Camelio, Office of Economic Affairs, Department of Commerce.

Rollin H. Cragg, Chemical Division, United States Tariff Commission.

John Czyzak, Office of the Assistant Legal Adviser for Economic Affairs, Department of State.

Prentice N. Dean, Office of Foreign Military Affairs, Department of Defense.

Edgar I. Eaton, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

George T. Elliman, Business and Defense Services Administration, Department of Commerce.

David Fellman, Office of Economic Affairs, Department of Commerce.

Morris J. Fields, Office of International Finance, Department of the Treasury.

William A. Fowler, American Embassy, Stockholm.

A. Eugene Frank, Business and Defense Services Administration, Department of Commerce.

Edward P. Furlow, United States Tariff Commission.

James W. Gantenbein, American Embassy, Copenhagen.

Allen H. Garland, Office of Economic Affairs, Department of Commerce.

Philip W. Gates, United States Tariff Commission.

William F. Gray, American Consulate General, Düsseldorf, Germany.

Joseph Greenwald, Trade Agreements and Treaties Division, Department of State.

Robert Hamerschlag, Office of Economic Affairs, Department of Commerce.

William T. Hart, United States Tariff Commission.

Amelia Hood, Office of Middle American Affairs, Department of State.

Borrie I. Hyman, Foreign Service Officer, Department of State.

Katherine Jacobson, Trade Investment and Monetary Affairs, International Cooperation Administration.

Willard W. Kane, Textiles Division, United States Tariff Commission.

Paul Kaplowitz, United States Tariff Commission.

Lowell B. Kilgore, Business and Defense Services Administration, Department of Commerce.

James H. Lewis, American Embassy, London.

Francis F. Lincoln, Office of Greek, Turkish and Iranian Affairs, Department of State.

Joe McBrian, United States Tariff Commission.

Harold P. Macgowan, Bureau of Foreign Commerce, Department of Commerce.

Edward I. Mullins, Office of Foreign Military Affairs, Department of Defense.

Charles P. O'Donnell, American Embassy, Belgrade.

Albert E. Pappano, Trade Agreements and Treaties Division, Department of State.

Weber H. Peterson, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture.

Vernon L. Phelps, American Embassy, Bonn.

Loubert O. Sanderhoff, American Embassy, Bonn.

M. Louise Schaffner, American Embassy, Ottawa.

Robert B. Sarich, Office of Economic Affairs, Department of Commerce.

Enoch W. Skartvedt, Office of Economic Affairs, Department of Commerce.

Howard F. Shepston, Office of Economic Affairs, Department of Commerce.

Ernest S. Shipley, Textiles Division, United States Tariff Commission.

William O. Shofner, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture.

Harry Shooshan, Technical Review Staff, Department of the Interior.

Kenneth B. Smith, United States Tariff Commission.

Constant Southworth, Office of British Commonwealth and Northern European Affairs, Department of State.

Sidney Weintraub, Office of Northeast Asian Affairs, Department of State.

Jean Mary Wilkowski, American Embassy, Paris.

William E. Wright, United States Tariff Commission.

Boris S. Yane, Division of Foreign Labor, Department of Labor.

Secretary of Delegation: Allen F. Manning, Office of International Conferences, Department of State.

Technical Secretary: Helen Brewster, Trade Agreements and Treaties Division, Department of State.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 25, 1956.

Mr. EDGAR B. BROSSARD,
Chairman, United States Tariff Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your response to my inquiry of December 27. I appreciate what you have sent but I should like some further information.

The material which you transmitted shows that the Tariff Commission sent a number of economists and commodity experts to the earlier trade conferences in which it participated (Geneva, Annecy, and Torquay). The Commission also sent Democratic and Republican Commissioners to the first Geneva Conference and a Republican Commissioner to the Torquay Conference. To present Geneva Conference, however, you report that the Commission is sending no economists or Commissioners. Is there some explanation for this departure from the Commission's past practice?

Also, according to the State Department, in answer to a request from me similar to the one I sent to the Tariff Commission, the chairman of the Tariff Commission is scheduled to participate in the Geneva Conference. As there appears to be a conflicting list, I wonder if you could say which advice is correct?

The charts and other material you sent, to show the changes that have occurred in the Tariff Commission's organization during the past 3 years, suggest that the change have been substantial. They give the impression that the Tariff Commission now puts more emphasis on commodity analysis rather than economic analysis. The composition of the delegation to Geneva supports this impression as does also the Commission's program for recruiting additional personnel. I wonder if you could say whether or not this impression is right, as I believe it is; whether it is a policy decision of the Commission, and, if so, on what possible grounds it can be justified?

I do find it difficult to reconcile the above observations with the statement that the "organization adjustments in the grouping and size of the various units * * * have not affected the functions of the divisions and the sections involved." Your explanations that these adjustments have been made "in accordance with changing needs and conditions" is unclear to me. To what specific changes do you refer?

An early response to the questions I have raised above would be greatly appreciated.

With best wishes,

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
January 31, 1956.

The Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: We have your letter of January 25, 1956, asking for further information with regard to matters pertaining to the internal operation of the Tariff Commission.

The questions you ask regarding Tariff Commission representation at international trade conferences relate to matters which involve the operation of the trade-agreements program, in which the Commission participates for such purposes as the President may deem appropriate. The presence of Tariff Commissioners at foreign-trade conferences is related to the Commission's representation on the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements, which was established by the President by Executive order. Whether or not one or more Commissioners attend such conferences is, it seems to us, a matter of concern to the President. The Commission has had no complaint from any President with regard to the attendance of Commissioners at foreign-trade conferences.

As to the apparent conflict between the statement in our letter of January 13, 1956 and information you have received from the State Department with regard to whether a Tariff Commissioner would be present at the current conference at Geneva, we believe the explanation is that at the time we wrote to you it was not officially announced that any Tariff Commissioner would attend the conference. Since then the attendance at this conference of two Tariff Commissioners—myself and Commissioner Sutton, has been approved.

The function of the Commission's commodity specialists at the Geneva Conference is to furnish factual data and technical advice on the many commodities that will be under consideration. (They may not participate in the actual negotiations involving changes in tariff rates.) Of the commodity specialists the Commission sent to Geneva, the senior specialist served as my alternate on the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements and the others served on various subcommittees known as country committees. In these capacities they furnished factual data and technical advice on commodities from the very inception of the work leading up to the present negotiations.

You state that the charts and other material sent to you give the impression that the Commission now puts more emphasis on commodity analysis rather than economic analysis, and you ask whether this impression is right, whether it is the policy of the Commission, and if so on what possible grounds it can be justified. We can only say, in response to your question, that such changes as may have occurred in the Commission's organization during the past 3 years do not reflect any purpose of placing more emphasis on commodity analysis than on economic analysis. Whatever the difference in the meaning of these terms may be—and we are not sure just what the difference is—the fact remains that the changes that have been made reflect the considered judgment of the Commission as to its staff requirements so as to enable it, considering its budgetary limitations, to best serve the Congress, the President, and the public. We believe that whether, at any given time, more or fewer specialists of one kind or another are necessary for the efficient operations of an agency is a matter which is best left to the judgment of those responsible for the operation of the agency. The Commission is short of both commodity specialists and economists and efforts to recruit personnel of both kinds are being made, subject, as indicated above, to the Commission's budgetary limitations.

We think the statement previously made that the organization adjustments in the grouping and size of various units within the Commission have not affected the functions of the divisions and sections involved is correct. As stated above, the needs of the Commission at the staff level is a matter which necessarily must be left to the judgment of those responsible for carrying out the functions and duties of the Commission. Every agency undergoes changes in its internal organization from time to time in accordance with changing needs and conditions. For example, at one time when the Commission had a considerable amount of work under the flexible-tariff provision (section 336 of the Tariff Act) a large staff of accountants was maintained in the Commission. For a number of years the Commission has had no separate accounting staff—such accounting work as has been needed being done by former members of the accounting unit now assigned primarily to other duties.

The Tariff Commission's contribution of technical assistance to the trade agreements authorities has been extensive. The only interest the Commission has in designating personnel for trade-agreements work is to render the best possible service of the kind called for. We have always in mind the statement of the Finance Committee in its report on H. R. 1612, 82d Congress, in which it emphasizes the role of the Commission in the trade-agreements program as being a fact-supplying function. You are assured that there is no hidden meaning behind such

changes as have occurred in the last 3 years in staff composition and assignments.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

EDGAR B. BROSSARD,
Chairman.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the confirmation of the nominations of Mr. Dowling and Mr. Jones.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly for the two nominees for membership on the United States Tariff Commission, Mr. William E. Dowling, of Michigan, and Mr. James W. Jones, of Texas.

I speak primarily concerning the appointment of Mr. Dowling, who has been selected to fill a Democratic appointment on the Commission. Mr. Dowling is one of the respected Democratic citizens of the city of Detroit. He is a distinguished lawyer and has served as assistant prosecuting attorney, as a special assistant to the attorney general of the State of Michigan, and in many other responsible political and civic positions.

As to whether Mr. Dowling is a high-tariff or a low-tariff man, I only say that Mr. Dowling was recommended for the appointment. He was questioned by high-tariff persons from my State who claimed that he was a low-tariff man. In my discussion with Mr. Dowling, he said he felt that, as a member of the Commission, irrespective of any philosophical position of his own, it was his duty and responsibility to make his decisions on cases based upon the laws passed by Congress, which serve as guideposts to the members of the Commission.

Upon that basis, the opposition to Mr. Dowling by persons in Michigan who were concerned as to whether he was a low-tariff or a free-tariff man was lessened. I assure the Senate that Mr. Dowling will perform his duties and responsibilities as a member of the Commission with high integrity, according to the laws which Congress gives to the Commission as its guide.

I am certain that the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], who is a close friend of Mr. Dowling's, will concur in my remarks as to Mr. Dowling's integrity and ability. Therefore, I beseech the Senate to confirm these two nominations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think both of these nominees, James Waldon Jones and William E. Dowling, are entitled to have their nominations overwhelmingly approved by the United States Senate. I listened very carefully to the entire statement of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], but I heard nothing which reflected upon the character, the integrity, the patriotism, or the ability of either of these gentlemen.

Their nominations have been reported favorably to the Senate by the Committee on Finance, and I hope that at this time the nominations will be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to have a quorum call before the yea-and-nay vote is taken. If there is to be no further discussion on the nominations, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Millikin
Allott	Goldwater	Monroney
Anderson	Gore	Morse
Barkley	Green	Mundt
Barrett	Hayden	Murray
Beall	Hennings	Neely
Bender	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bennett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bible	Holland	Pastore
Bricker	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Butler	Ives	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Jenner	Russell
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kennedy	Scott
Clements	Kerr	Smathers
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Langer	Sparkman
Dirksen	Lehman	Stennis
Douglas	Long	Symington
Duff	Magnuson	Thurmond
Dworshak	Malone	Thye
Eastland	Mansfield	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Flanders	McCarthy	Williams
Frear	McClellan	Young
Fulbright	McNamara	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent in his State of New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The nominations of Mr. William E. Dowling and Mr. James Weldon Jones are being considered en bloc, are they not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay a vote on the pending nominations. It might be well, however, to remark that these nominations came before the Committee on Finance. No opposition was registered to them before the committee. No request was made for any hearings on the nominations. The committee reported both nominations unanimously.

While I think the Senator from Illinois has rendered a service in bringing to the attention of the Senate the thoughts which he had upon the subject, I myself, having been a member of the Committee on Finance and having voted to report the nominations favorably, do not feel I can vote against the nominations. I think the Committee on Finance feels the same way about it. That is all I have to say. I am ready for the vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I took the floor this afternoon to point out that the way in which the members of the Tariff Commission in general were appointed by President Eisenhower was, in practice, negativing the announced policy of the administration for freer trade. I did not oppose Mr. Dowling or Mr. Jones as individuals, nor did I oppose their appointment, but by bringing to the attention of the Senate the history of the appointments to the Commission, the rulings of the Commission, and the general protectionist bias of the Commission, I hope I have served in some small measure to alert the Members of this body and the country to the fact that the announced policy of the Eisenhower administration for freer trade is not being carried out in practice, but it is being opposed by the men whom President Eisenhower is himself appointing and giving high office on the Tariff Commission.

I am not going to vote against confirming these nominations, because I have nothing against the nominees personally. But I believe that the country should be aware of what is happening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of William E. Dowling, of Michigan, and James Weldon Jones, of Texas, to be members of the United States Tariff Commission?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent in his State. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 0, as follows

YEAS—92

Aiken	George	Millikin
Allott	Goldwater	Monroney
Anderson	Gore	Morse
Barkley	Green	Mundt
Barrett	Hayden	Murray
Beall	Hennings	Neely
Bender	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bennett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bible	Holland	Pastore
Bricker	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Butler	Ives	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Jenner	Russell
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kennedy	Scott
Clements	Kerr	Smathers
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Langer	Sparkman
Dirksen	Lehman	Stennis
Douglas	Long	Symington
Duff	Magnuson	Thurmond
Dworshak	Malone	Thye
Eastland	Mansfield	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Flanders	McCarthy	Williams
Frear	McClellan	Young
Fulbright	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—3

Bridges Byrd Kefauver

So the nominations of William E. Dowling, of Michigan, and James Weldon Jones, of Texas, to be members of the United States Tariff Commission were confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last week I spent considerable time on the floor of the Senate discussing my amendment, which is designated "2–24–56–B." It has been on the desks of Senators for several days.

The amendment which I am proposing provides for domestic parity for wheat and is sometimes called a two-price program for wheat. The fact is, this is not a two-price system, but is actually a one-price program for wheat, which gives the farmer additional income for the amount of wheat that is produced for home consumption.

We have had extended debate on the plight of the wheat farmer. Through application of controls, wheat acreage has been cut from 78 million acres in 1953, to 55 million acres in 1955, which is the minimum permitted by law. This represents a reduction of 30 percent in 2 years.

The price-support level for wheat has been reduced from 90 percent of old parity, the rate in effect for 1954 and preceding years, to 82½ percent of old parity in 1955. It is to be further reduced to 76 percent of transitional parity for 1956. This shows that the wheat farmers have not only been complying with the program, but have been keeping within the program recommended by the Department of Agriculture and the Congress.

This continued decline in income to farmers, when everything else is booming, should cause all of us to pause and take a good look to see if there is not some other solution to the wheat problem. Bear in mind, Mr. President, that I am discussing only the wheat program today.

I, for one, believe that a sound program for American agriculture must be built upon a commodity-by-commodity approach; and this amendment does provide for that type of a program for wheat.

I am perfectly convinced that if we do not act favorably upon this amendment in this Congress, we shall have to come to it eventually, for the very definite reason that we cannot ask the wheat farmers of the Nation to produce and sell wheat based upon a corn price. That is what we are doing, as the years go by. We are headed downward continually. Parity is already down to 76 percent. If we follow the transitional parity, it will be down 5 percent next year, and 5 percent the following year.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Senator from Kansas has not quite accurately stated the terms. It is not a total drop of 5 percent. It is 5 percent based upon the maximum from year to year.

Mr. CARLSON. "Transitional parity" is the expression.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The maximum drop is 5 percent. It was 5 percent this year, or 12 cents a bushel. Next year the maximum may be 12 cents a bushel, or 5 percent. The year after, or 1958, the drop would be about 10 cents a bushel, or about 4 percent.

Mr. CARLSON. I am sure the Senator is correct.

The domestic parity plan is actually nothing but a system of marketing, which enables producers to obtain a return equal to "parity" for that portion of the crop which is consumed domestically for human food and to receive competitive market prices for the portion used for feed or for export. Under this proposal, there would not be any Government subsidy or price support in the market place, after the plan becomes fully operative.

The plan would be self-financing through the use of marketing certificates. Consumers of bread and other wheat-food products would continue to pay in the market place, as they do now, only a fair price. But once the plan is fully operative, unlike the present program, there would no longer be any necessity for consumers and taxpayers making a second payment in the form of taxes for export subsidies or for storage costs or for losses because of spoilage.

The domestic parity plan is simple in its administration and would be easy to place in operation. I would like to review it briefly because there apparently has been some confusion or lack of understanding as to its operation, particularly in high places of Government and by some farm leaders. There is very little time to go into the subject in detail today.

First. At the beginning of each marketing year, the Secretary of Agriculture would determine the portion of the wheat crop which would go into consumption as human food. This amount, which for years has been about 500 million bushels, would be the domestic food quota.

Second. The domestic food quota would then be allotted among the wheat farms of the Nation, substantially on the same basis as acreage allotments are now made, except that in this case the acreage would be translated into bushels and the share of each farm would be in bushels.

This is not a new program. We already have the program, except that in this case acreage would be translated into bushels.

Third. Each farmer would receive a certificate stating in bushels his share of the estimated domestic consumption of wheat for food.

Fourth. The certificate would have a value in dollars and cents representing the difference between the average market price of wheat, as estimated in advance by the Secretary of Agriculture, and 100 percent of parity.

Fifth. The value of the certificate received by the farmer, plus the price received in the market place for his wheat will return to the grower the equivalent of full parity on that portion of the crop consumed domestically as food, and the competitive market price for that portion of the crop used for feed or export.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Are we to understand, then, that the Senator's amendment provides that, on the portion of the wheat crop used domestically for food, the support will be 100 percent of parity?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct; full parity.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is 100 percent.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. If that occurred, the portion of wheat consumed domestically for food would be the only crop supported on a basis of 100 percent of parity.

Mr. CARLSON. Only that portion of it used domestically for food.

Mr. BARKLEY. No other crop, or no portion of any other crop, is supported on that basis.

Mr. CARLSON. I think the Senator will find that wool is supported on that basis.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course to determine what the net to the farmer would be it would be necessary to know how much would be sold at the export price or at the feed price, and then average it to determine what the average parity return would be. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from South Dakota is correct. There would be one price for wheat, which would be set by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The final result might be 90 percent, as in the case of tobacco, or 80 percent, as in the case of corn. The rate could not be ascertained until there had been some experience to determine how much wheat was sold in the export market for a fair price and how much was sold at the domestic parity price.

Mr. CARLSON. As a matter of fact, some of the figures I have studied show that the farmer might not, at the present time, get any more for the wheat than he is now getting, and that wheat would sell for between 85 percent and 90 percent of parity.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I understood the distinguished Senator from Kansas to say that he estimates that there are 500 million bushels of wheat used domestically. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. What is the estimate of the amount of wheat exported?

Mr. CARLSON. We have exported as much as 500 million bushels of wheat. That was in 1951. Last year I believe it was 212 million or 225 million bushels of wheat. I hope this year we can export from 250 million to 275 million bushels of wheat, although I have grave doubts about it.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I am very much interested in my distinguished colleague's amendment, which embodies a domestic parity plan. It is certainly a new and a meritorious approach to a very perplexing problem. I am one who feels that neither the high nor the flexible parity plan is the solution, although the latter, in my opinion, is the preferable plan.

I wonder whether the Senator from Kansas will be kind enough, based on his vest experience and knowledge of agricultural subjects, and as a fine representative of his great State of Kansas, to answer a few questions.

Mr. CARLSON. I shall be pleased to answer them if I possibly can.

Mr. WELKER. Will the farmer get more or less control under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. CARLSON. If the program is adopted, there will be a continuation of acreage allotments. Until we remove some of the surpluses, we will have to continue acreage allotments. Once the program is in operation, the farmer should be free from control.

Mr. WELKER. I have talked to my distinguished colleague about the vast group of Idaho wheat farmers in the vicinity of Moscow, Idaho, and in other areas, and I have been very much interested in the Senator's amendment. I wonder whether the Senator can tell us whether the small farmer will get an equal break under his plan.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to say, first, that the distinguished Senator from Idaho has discussed the program with me and he has expressed a keen interest, not only in the wheat growers, but in agriculture as a whole in Idaho, and he is doing a fine job representing that great State.

The wheatgrowers would receive a bushel allotment, instead of an acreage allotment, which in my opinion would be of great advantage to the wheatgrower. A farmer who received a bushel allotment would not need to raise the whole crop in 1 year, but could hold it over to the next year. That, I believe, would be a great advantage to the wheatgrower.

Mr. WELKER. I should like to ask one further question, if I may, of the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

My attention has been called to this situation, and I should like to ask the Senator a question about it. Would the plan tend to bring more or less land under cultivation?

Mr. CARLSON. Of course I shoud say that it would not at the present time in connection with wheat or anything else, so long as there are allotments. Of course we will have to operate under allotments until we get the surpluses down. However, I cannot conceive of a farmer not trying to adjust his acreage when he finds that he can get the advantages which are provided by the plan. I believe he will wish to adjust his acreage.

Mr. WELKER. I know that the farmer will adjust his acreage. It is only human nature, as I see it. Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. CARLSON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator contend, if his plan is adopted, that it will operate at very little cost to the Government?

Mr. CARLSON. As a matter of fact, if the plan should operate as the McNary-Haugen bill was planned to operate—and this is a part of the same old type of program—the Government would not be storing great quantities of grain, and would not be paying a great subsidy for exports. In fact, the wheat farmer would take care of the program without cost to the taxpayer. I hope that can be done.

Mr. WELKER. I wish to pay my respects to the distinguished Senator from Kansas. He has done a service to the wheat farmer and to the whole agricultural economy of our country generally. I commend him for it very highly.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand the Senator's amendment, it really affords three categories of prices. One is the world price for that which is expected. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. Not quite, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky. The Secretary of Agriculture would determine on a certain day the price to be established for wheat in this Nation. Then he would determine how much of it would be used for domestic consumption. That one price would be the prevailing price for wheat. There is really only one price.

Mr. BARKLEY. That part of the wheat crop in this country which is consumed for feed, in competition with corn, has as its basis the comparative price which would be competitive with corn. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct. I should like to say to those who are interested particularly in corn that under no circumstances would I favor legislation which would be detrimental to the corn producing States. I refer particularly to section 380 (b). There are four conditions which the Secretary of Agriculture must consider. One of them, for example, is the price level at which corn and feed grains are being supported, and the relation they bear to wheat.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the bill and under the Senator's amendment, the Secretary of Agriculture would have to determine what portion of the wheat crop was used for feed in competition with corn, and fix a parity price which would be comparative with corn based upon the feed value of wheat as compared with corn. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator is correct with respect to one factor, but not with respect to all factors.

Mr. BARKLEY. The other day we voted down an amendment to provide 90 percent of parity for millable wheat. The Senate defeated that amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's proposal would take all the wheat in the country which is consumed domestically for food and put it on a 100 percent parity base. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. What would happen to the portion which went abroad, whether it was for food or feed? Would that not be sold at the world price?

Mr. CARLSON. At the market price, that is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So there would be three prices for wheat, one for human consumption, one for animal consumption, on the basis of feed, and another based on the world market, whether for feed or food. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator may break it down into three classes. The fact is that the Secretary of Agriculture would set one price for wheat in this Nation. Then everyone would sell the wheat based on certificates. The only additional income to the farmer would be from the certificates.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is the good of setting one price for all the wheat and then have it divided into three parts, depending on whether it is for food or feed or foreign use?

Mr. CARLSON. It all sells for one price.

Mr. BARKLEY. Who buys it at one price?

Mr. CARLSON. The Secretary of Agriculture takes it and it is sold on the market at the one price he has set.

Mr. BARKLEY. Apparently I do not understand all I know about the Senator's amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The wheat would be sold on the open market, and the price would be what the market would bring, and the payment would depend on what the Secretary set as parity. The payment would be the difference between the actual selling price and the parity price, or 100 percent as established by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BARKLEY. The farmer who produced human consumable wheat for food would get 100 percent, on which he could borrow from the Commodity Credit Corporation on certificate. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. That is not quite right. Assume that a farmer has a thousand bushels as his quota, and assume that the Federal Government decided that 500 bushels of that would be for domestic consumption. He would be permitted to get the increased price for that through certificates, but the rest

of it would be at food price set by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would be also determinative of whether it would be consumed in this country for feed or other purposes, or be exported.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. So, we have three categories.

Mr. CARLSON. I think that is correct, but one price has been set.

Mr. President, I wish to say in conclusion——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My understanding is that, first of all, so far as the Nation is concerned, there is a domestic need divided among the States, the States to the counties, and the counties to the farms. It will be expressed in terms of the average wheat produced on acres which have a history of wheat production.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The wheat farmer will be given a marketing quota, and on that basis he will be entitled to receive certificates. The value of the certificates will be the difference between the estimated farm price of wheat, the estimated market price of wheat, and the estimated parity price. The certificate will be cashed, and the market price of wheat will be determined.

Mr. CARLSON. I think the Senator is absolutely correct. At least, that is my understanding.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. So we do not think in terms of support prices but in terms of the market price. It involves the difference between the wheat which goes into the manufacture of food products for domestic consumption and that which is disposed of otherwise.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. As the distinguished Senator from Kansas knows, I have been very much interested in studying this bill. There are 2 or 3 questions I should like to address to my friend from Kansas, because, in my opinion, they are very determinative of whether this amendment has ultimate merit.

The first question is this: The Senator from Kansas has described how the Secretary of Agriculture is to set a price on wheat. Let us take a specific farmer, A, who has a specific allotment and a specific quota. He complies with his allotment, but exceeds his quota. He, therefore, has wheat to sell. From a practical standpoint, no one, of course, can guess whether he will exceed his quota. He may think he is going to get only 10 bushels to the acre, and may get 35 bushels to the acre. There is nothing I can see that would prevent him from selling wheat to Farmer B for seed and stock feed at less than the prevailing price.

Mr. CARLSON. I suppose the wheat market would determine the price. The farmer could give wheat away, I assume, but we will not find a wheat grower doing that.

Mr. ALLOTT. I draw a parallel between that situation and the situation we found in the Corn Belt where there were corn allotments, but 76 percent of the farmers paid no attention to them, and were selling their corn at a price which was under the support price for corn.

Mr. CARLSON. That would not happen under this amendment, because it contains a provision that the price cannot be set below the support price of corn.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Secretary cannot set the wheat price below the support price of corn, but that does not prevent the farmer from selling his wheat at a price less than that.

Mr. CARLSON. I cannot conceive of any wheat farmer doing that. I know it is not my intention to permit that to be done.

Mr. ALLOTT. I realize that. That is the reason why I am asking these questions.

What was the production of wheat last year, for example, over the 550 million bushels which were used in domestic consumption?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I think it was 900 million bushels. It was close to a billion bushels.

Mr. YOUNG. The production for domestic consumption was approximately 500 million bushels.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am speaking of the total production.

Mr. CARLSON. I think the amount over the 550 million bushels used in domestic consumption was about 430 million bushels.

Mr. ALLOTT. The 430 million bushels would have to find its way to the domestic market by way of stock feed, or into the international market.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Or for industrial uses.

Mr. CARLSON. We could dispose of 400 million bushels of wheat in this Nation if it were not for the surpluses hanging over our heads.

Mr. ALLOTT. There being no Government support—and I am not advocating that there should be in this instance, because the plan would not have any merit, for I do not think it is built that way—what would happen would be that the 430 million bushels of wheat would be thrown on the market and would glut the market in competition with corn and other feed grains, such as sorghums and small grains. So we would eventually be taking the cat off the back of the wheatfarmer and putting it on the back of the stockman. That is what I am concerned about.

Mr. CARLSON. I can appreciate the Senator's concern. But if 23 million acres had not been taken out of wheat production and put into feed crops this year, there would not be the present prices for livestock. If some farmers would produce 20 bushels an acre instead of 40 bushels an acre, the stockmen could be helped.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that, historically, a certain portion of the wheat went into the market because of the support straight across the board; wheat feeds were not available, and the result was that it was necessary to haul other feeds from great distances to places where wheat would be available except for the high price?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Half of it goes into export, anyway.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is a provision on page 11 of the Carlson amendment which reads as follows:

(a) Whenever a wheat marketing certificate program under this subtitle is in effect, price support for wheat shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make available through loans, purchases, or other operations, price support to producers of wheat who are cooperators. The amount, terms, conditions, and extent of such price-support operations shall be determined by the Secretary, except that the level of such support shall be determined after taking into consideration the following factors: (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which corn and other feed grains are being supported and the feed value of such grains in relation to wheat, (3) the provisions of any international agreement relating to wheat to which the United States is a party, (4) foreign trade policies of friendly wheat exporting countries, and (5) other factors affecting international trade in wheat including exchange rates and currency regulations.

So a part of the answer to the question of the Senator from Colorado is that those who are cooperators, instead of getting certificates which will entitle them to parity on their marketing quota, can get price-support loans from the Secretary, the value of which will be determined according to the guideposts set forth in the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield so that I may make a brief statement?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have been undertaking to study the whole question of farm legislation since I first became a Member of the Senate in 1933. We have gone the full cycle on various forms of farm legislation. Unless I sadly misread the times, the farmers, at least, are on their way back to a situation which could parallel that of 1933, when we consider the disparity between the farmer and all other segments of our population and economy.

I see no other answer to the problem of the great export commodities of times past than to adopt what is now termed the domestic parity system.

I introduced earlier this year a bill which seeks to apply to cotton the identical principle which the Senator from Kansas and his associates desire to apply to wheat. I think we shall be compelled to adopt that system before the agricultural problem ever will be solved. We simply must not keep the Government up to its neck in all these farm programs indefinitely. We cannot do that and at the

same time do justice to the farmers and all the other interests which are involved.

For my part, I intend to support as earnestly as I know how the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas. I shall, without regard to the legislative fate of the Senator's amendment here today, offer a similar amendment dealing with cotton on the same basis, because I am completely convinced that before the farm problem will have been solved, we shall be compelled to adopt a program similar to this, at least with respect to the two commodities which this Nation has exported for so many years, namely, wheat and cotton.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Georgia for his statement. I have the firm and serious conviction that we shall be temporizing the farm problem until we adopt programs which are practical for individual commodities, such as wheat, cotton, and other products of the soil.

At present we are going through much labor, travail, and trial in order to write farm legislation. If we study the history of the past 20 or 30 years, as the Senator from Georgia has suggested, we will find that the only time the farmer had prosperity was during wartime—and the farmer does not want war.

I remind the Senate that what is proposed is a referendum; we shall not be enacting legislation except when it shall be voted by the farmers. I cannot conceive of the Senate's not letting the farmers vote on their program. They must vote every year on whether they will continue the present price-support programs.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I, too, intend to support this program. We talked of a two-price system away back in the twenties. We have been talking about various programs since that time. We have tried various programs throughout the years.

What is now proposed bears some similarity to the old McNary-Haugen program, but what is proposed is a vastly improved program, and, I might add, a better program than the flexible-support program we have at present.

Surely, anyone analyzing the present farm program in its application to farmers would have to admit that few wheat farmers can take a one-third cut in acreage and a one-third cut in price and still survive. If we cannot get 90-percent price supports we shall have to try a program like what is suggested. I think the Senator from Kansas is entitled to have his proposal considered by the Senate. I hope the Senate will give it a sufficiently large vote so that the amendment will be taken to conference and given a trial.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I shall yield a little time to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I wish the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] were in the Chamber, because he raised a line of questioning a little while ago which I considered interesting. He spoke about a two-price system as a result of the pending proposal, if it were adopted. In my judgment, it would apply the principle of the 4-price system rather than the 2-price system.

First of all, by the terms of the amendment a price would be set for the farmer on that portion of his wheat which was produced for domestic consumption. That price would actually go along with a certificate of 100 percent of parity. There would be 500 million bushels left——

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator is incorrect. The price would not be set on wheat for human consumption. The price set would be the open market. In addition, the Secretary could set a minimum price-support level.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. I am sorry if I left a wrong impression. If the certificate were added to the price, that would be what the farmer would get on his wheat produced for domestic consumption.

So, on 500 million bushels of wheat, the farmer would get 100 percent of parity.

To take another outside figure, if the crop ran to a billion bushels, there would be 500 million bushels of all kinds of wheat to dispose of—winter wheat, spring wheat, and durum wheat.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me continue for a while; then I shall be glad to answer questions.

So, first, with the certificate, there would be a guaranteed market, really, and a guaranteed price on half the wheat crop. The other half of the wheat crop would be left over, and it could either be dumped into export or into the feed market of the country. That would make a two-price system.

Incidentally, I may say, when the market price is set, it will be the feed market price. I think my friends will bear me out in that statement. The price level will be the feed-market level; and to that, of course, will be added the amount of the certificate for that portion which goes for food and domestic consumption purposes.

There is a third price, and that is the price which is being received in the market today by way of export, under Public Law 480, under the International Cooperation Administration, and under every one of the proposals under which the Government operates in this field today. Actually, I think that 87 million bushels of wheat left the country last year, under Public Law 480. I do not recall what the price was; but the price which is received is commensurate with the price in the market of the country to which the wheat goes, the capacity of a country to pay it, and any other circumstances which enter into the question. So that will be the third price market.

There will be one more market, the international wheat market, because the United States is a party to the International Wheat Agreement. This Government has exported wheat throughout the world for quite some time under that agreement. Since 1949 we have exported a little more than 1,250,000,000 bushels under the International Wheat Agreement. Some of it was exported with a premium or subsidy of 84 cents a bushel; some of it with a subsidy of 66 cents a bushel. If it left this country in the form of flour, the premium price may have been a little higher. But for a period of 7 or 8 years, the average subsidy on wheat which was exported under the International Wheat Agreement was 62 cents a bushel. We have now spent $755 million of the taxpayers' money for that subsidy.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Does the Senator think that if the United States withdrew from the International Wheat Agreement program, we could eliminate $771 million of expenditures?

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is as good a time as any to answer that question. The logical end of the theory of the two-price system would be to get the Government out of the wheat market entirely. The Government would be up to its ears in price supports under this program. We would not get the Government out, as a matter of fact. The Government would still be in the wheat market, as my friend disclosed a moment ago. There would still be half a billion bushels, 500 million bushels, fit for human consumption, which could be dumped into the feed market, and on which the farmer could still get a loan. He could put it in a can and hope to God that sometime somewhere it could be sold.

So the Government would still be facing this problem and its solution, and would be involved in the wheat market up to its very ears.

Mr. CARLSON. Does the Senator know of any way by which the Government can be expected to get out of the wheat business in the future, except by such a program as that now proposed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Conditions being what they are at present the world over, I should say we should make use of the International Wheat Agreement by sending wheat to any country for whatever we can get for it. With conditions as they are at present, centainly we cannot get the Government out of the program now. Under the amendment, the Government will still be in the program. It will still be doing business under Public Law 480. It will still be doing business with foreign countries. It will still be negotiating arrangements to cover wheat, wheat flour, and other products of wheat. . So I think there is real merit in the contention I made that if we adopt this amendment we shall have a four-price program, not a two-price program.

The other point I should like to bring out is—and make no mistake about this—when we get to 100 percent, adding the market value to the price of wheat, plus the certificate, it is going to come out of the consumer, and not out

of the Federal Treasury. If I am wrong, I ask to be corrected.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator have any objection to the price of bread coming out of the consumer rather than out of the Federal Treasury?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If it were a consistent program I would not, but we still have the Government in it.

Mr. CURTIS. Is not that true of the sugar program? It operates the same way.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Probably so, but I say that bread is the great staple in the diet of the average American family.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I know the Senator from Illinois, partially at least, got his start in life as a baker.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And he should know better than anybody else on the floor that the price of wheat has very little relationship to the price of bread; that the amount of wheat which goes into a one-pound loaf of bread does not cost more than from about 1½ cents to 3 cents. I think the Senator from Illinois and I were members of the Appropriations Committee when this question came up, and we found that, although the price of wheat had declined from $3 a bushel to a couple of dollars a bushel, the price of bread had gone up from 16 cents to 24 or 25 cents a loaf.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us see whether the price of wheat does have a little relationship to the price of bread. When I was a baker we were selling 1-pound loaves for 10 cents, retail and we got 300 1-pound loaves out of a barrel of flour. If the cost of flour went up 1 cent and a loaf of bread were being sold for 8 cents, there would be a 12½-percent increase. If that is not a substantial increase, I never saw one. One can rationalize the argument on the basis of a penny, one can make the argument, but percentagewise an increase of 12½ percent means something. One of the distressing things in Great Britain at this moment is that the cost of living has gone up 10 percent. Six percent of that increase has occurred since 1955. Such an increase is about to blow the fiscal lid off that country. When we put the increase on the basis of percentages and get it in the right perspective, it becomes very important indeed.

Mr. CURTIS. Let us take it out of percentages. I recall returning to my State in 1937, when wheat was $3 a bushel and bread was 14 cents a loaf. One year later I returned, and wheat was about $2 a bushel and bread was selling for 17 cents a loaf.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I have figures from the Bureau of Labor statistics which show that between 1947 and 1953 the cost of wheat to the miller of a 1-pound loaf of bread declined from 3 cents to 2.8 cents, whereas in the same period the retail price of bread went up from 12.5 cents to 16.4 cents or more than 30 percent. So I do not think the price of wheat makes any difference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have made my case percentagewise, and I shall stand on it.

I go to the next item. What happens to the feed market? We just put an amendment into the bill sponsored by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]. It was jockeyed around so as to put it in more palatable form. But I call attention to the fact that we are merely aggravating the agricultural problem more, because cheap feed, such as grain sorghums, oats, and barley, raised on diverted acres, can only plummet the corn market.

I am not wanting in selfishness. I think a little in terms of the price of corn, soybeans, and hogs which are raised in the Midwest. I point no accusing finger at anyone who rises to contend for the major crop in his section. I think it is only fair.

I see the Senator from Arkansas is smiling. I suppose he is doing so because I have an amendment to strike out the rice title, because it is a two-price provision also. So my principle is consistent. I am against the two-price proposal, because I do not think it would do any good. I think it would aggravate the feed picture. It would invite administrative complexities of all kinds. In my judgment, it would not increase the export of wheat. Finally, it would leave us with a great quantity of wheat seeking some kind of outlet. Either it would go into the Government account or become competitive with the feed we are producing now. If it should, the alternate result would be that the Commodity Credit Corporation, with public funds, or the pledging of public credit, would have to take an equivalent amount of other feed grain out of the market to support the price and put it in some kind of can and leave it there until, by the grace of the Almighty, there was an outlet or it had spoiled and, out of compulsion and necessity, it would have to be moved out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think the Senator is contending that there will be more wheat grown than will be the case under the present situation. The wheat will be there anyway. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. What about the other acres?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think more wheat will be produced under the two-price system than is being produced now, so even if the argument of the Senator were correct, the wheat would still be there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What happens to the 500 million bushels?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Right now we export 200 million bushels of wheat. Wheat competes with corn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The proposal is designed to feed the wheat into the export market at whatever the feed level in America will be. What does the Senator think the Argentine, Canada, Australia, and the other wheat producing areas will be saying about that? Does the Senator think they will accept such exports without retaliation? Does the Senator think those countries will permit us to break down their economy?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That wheat would be sold on the world market.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That would be the feed price in America.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are bound by the International Wheat Agreement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Our exporters will want to ship wheat wherever they can, quite aside from the International Wheat Agreement. My friend shakes his head. If that is not the case, why have the amendment?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I am sure the Senator is as wrong as he can be as concerns getting the wheat into the International Wheat Agreement countries and spoiling their markets. Our national representative at the international wheat conference, Herbert G. Hughes, has just returned from Geneva, where a conference was held. I received a letter from him, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 12, 1956.*

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: In view of the current farm legislation, I thought you might be interested in the report on a recent meeting I had with 8 representatives of the farm organizations in Canada, and 2 representatives of the farm organizations in Australia.

On Thursday, March 8, I met with these wheat producer representatives in Geneva, Switzerland, where all of us were attending an international wheat conference relative to renewal of the International Wheat Agreement. This meeting was attended by only producer representatives and we thoroughly discussed not only the current IWA negotiations, but domestic wheat program policies in the three major exporting countries.

I had the opportunity to explain in detail our own proposed domestic parity program, and after satisfying their many questions on details of operation, they expressed the opinion that they would prefer competition in international trade with us under this program to the present type of program under which we are now operating.

They said further that they would like very much to have the same program in Canada.

I had been requested by Secretary Benson to discuss this particular subject with the Canadian wheat producer representatives because of his concern that they might be worried by our change in domestic policy.

This report should reassure those in this country who are worried about the reaction of Canadian wheat producers to the enactment of the domestic parity program in the United States.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT J. HUGHES,
President, National Association of Wheat Growers.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I should like to read 1 or 2 paragraphs from that letter.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator read it all?

Mr. CARLSON. It would take too much time, although I would not mind reading it. It is signed by our repre-

sentative at the International Wheat Agreement and reads in part, as follows:

On Thursday, March 8, I met with these wheat-producer representatives in Geneva, Switzerland, where all of us were attending an International Wheat Conference relative to renewal of the International Wheat Agreement. This meeting was attended by only producer representatives, and we thoroughly discussed not only the current IWA negotiations but domestic wheat program policies in the three major exporting countries.

I had the opportunity to explain in detail all our own proposed domestic parity program, and after satisfying their many questions on details of operation they expressed the opinion that they would prefer—

And I call the Senator's attention to this—

competition in international trade with us under this program to the present type of program under which we are now operating.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Meaning what?

Mr. CARLSON. The domestic parity program we are discussing now.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The present program is one subsidizing exports at about 85 cents a bushel, paid out of the Treasury.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If we are operating under a wheat agreement, then certainly the highest agricultural official in this Government, the Secretary of Agriculture, ought to be in line with that kind of concept. But the Secretary of Agriculture is opposed to this proposal.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield; if I am in error, I should like to be corrected.

First, though, let me ask my friend the Senator from Vermont, who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, whether or not the Department of Agriculture is opposed to this proposal.

Mr. MORSE. No.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I got different information only a little more than 3 hours ago from the Department of Agriculture. So let us keep the record straight, because I am not talking with my tongue in my cheek.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me, so that we can keep the record straight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MORSE. It is my understanding—I shall paraphrase the statement, but I think I shall give an accurate paraphrase of what the Secretary of Agriculture said—that, as the Senator from Illinois knows, the Secretary of Agriculture had been opposed to the so-called two-price domestic parity program for wheat, until a few months ago, when he was at Portland, Oreg., and made a speech to the Oregon Wheat League. At that time he said he thought another year was needed in order really to prepare the country for the program, but that he—and I think I am now going to give a very accurate statement of what he said—had come to the conclusion that there was merit in the program, although they wanted another year to place it under consideration and study.

But he did not express the opposition to it that had characterized the previous attitude of the Department of Agriculture.

If Senators want my interpretation of what the Secretary of Agriculture means, it is that he thinks that in about another year they will be in a position to recommend the program; but they are not recommending against the program as of now. That is my understanding.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The estimate of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Oregon, reminds me of the man who rushed to a lawyer, and said to him, "I want to sue Bill Jones."

"What for?" asked the lawyer.

The man said, "Because he called me a rhinoceros."

The lawyer asked, "When did that happen?"

The man replied, "Thirteen years ago."

The lawyer asked, "Why didn't you come to see me about it before now?"

The man replied, "Because I never saw a rhinoceros until yesterday." [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think that is a very adequate description of the shift of position of the Department of Agriculture. I do not think there could be a better description of the shift in its position.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, my friend, the Senator from Oregon, prefaced his remarks by using the words "a few months ago." At this time it is 3 o'clock, or a little after; and 3 hours ago I heard that the Department of Agriculture was opposed to the program. If more recent testimony is produced, and if any point is to be made in regard to the currency of the testimony, then, of course, I shall recede from my position. But what may have been said 3 or 4 months ago, is one thing; and what was said at 12 o'clock today is another. If there is any Senator who wishes to impeach that position, I shall lend myself to enabling him to state his case.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my friend, the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not true that now we have three export programs?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Or probably more, to judge from what I know.

Mr. YOUNG. Three distinct export programs. One of them is under the International Wheat Agreement, which in the past 6 months has cost us approximately 60½ cents a bushel. Another one is outside of the wheat agreement, but it is in the Department of Agriculture; and it has cost us about 72 cents a bushel. Then there is the program under Public Law 480, under which we even give away some wheat.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes; that is correct. Depending on the kind of wheat, depending on whether it is hard wheat or soft wheat, and depending on whether it is shipped from the gulf coast to Latin America or whether it is shipped from east coast or from the west coast, the cost runs all the way from 64 cents to 84 cents; and we have spent a good deal of money on it. So now we are going to have a fourth price program; we are going to make it very complicated, and not even a Solomon will be able to administer it.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my very distinguished friend, the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Let me say that I have enjoyed the discourse in regard to the attitude of the Secretary of Agriculture. This afternoon I have been interrogating my friends on the floor—including the ranking member on the minority side of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—and I have not heard that the Secretary of Agriculture is adamant against the passage of this bill. I have heard it stated that there were some "bugs" in the bill. I was asked, "Why not let the bill go to conference, and work out those things there?" But they were afraid that the House conferees would put more "bugs" into the bill.

I should like to have the Senator from Illinois pursue his interrogation a little further, so that we can know exactly how the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, feels about the passage of this bill.

As the Senator from Illinois well knows, I have been rather close to the Secretary of Agriculture for the past 3 or 4 years, and I have not had any bullwhipping given to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say with the utmost of humility to the Senator from Idaho that there are 8 telephones in the Republican cloakroom and 8 telephones in the Democratic cloakroom, and another dozen telephones scattered throughout the Marble Room; and it is not a difficult chore for any Member of the Senate to talk to the Department of Agriculture on the telephone and find out for himself.

Mr. WELKER. Very well. Why does not the Senator from Illinois finish his question to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, so that we may have the benefit of his view of the matter? I wish to know whether the Secretary of Agriculture is so much opposed to it or not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am speaking for myself.

Mr. WELKER. A moment ago the Senator from Illinois began to ask a question of the Senator from Vermont. I wish the Senator would finish the question, so that we might hear from the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont is present, and can speak for himself.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall have to ask Senators to wait a minute; I am afraid that my time will run out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to ask only a brief question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well; I yield for a brief question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois was suggesting that the telephones on this side or the telephones on the other side be used.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am willing to telephone from the other side; there is nothing political about a telephone, Mr. President. [Laughter.]

Now I wish to ask my friend, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], a question: Is it correct that as we operate now, insofar as wheat is concerned, the small wheat grower can grow up to 15 acres of wheat and can market it without being subjected to the penalty?

Mr. CARLSON. That is a correct statement; and that is being done in many States of the Union outside the wheat area, to the detriment of the wheat area.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Under the certificate plan, what will happen to the small farmer who grows up to 15 acres of wheat?

Mr. CARLSON. I assume that he will be out of the program. He is now.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He will have to come in under the certificate program or plan, will he not?

Mr. CARLSON. I do not know that he will.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He will not receive any benefits unless he does.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes; but he does not receive any benefits now, under the 75 percent of parity. At the present time he sells his wheat, and he is free to sell it as he pleases.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What will happen under the amendment of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. CARLSON. I assume——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not wish to have the Senator state his assumptions. The small farmer will come under the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I assume the small farmer will sell it, under the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. All right. Well, we are going to let the price of wheat dribble down to the feed level. So if the small farmer has 15 acres of wheat, that is the price he will get. But if he wishes to receive the certificate value, he will have to reduce his acreage; in other words, if he now has 6 acres, he will be able to receive the benefits only if he reduces his acreage to perhaps 3. In arithmetic, that is about the way it will work out. If he now plants 10 acres, and if he wishes to receive the benefits, he will have to reduce his acreage to 5 or less. But how can a small farmer get along with so few acres?

If I am wrong in stating that this is what the plan will do to the small wheat grower, then of course I should like to be advised that I am wrong.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me, to permit me to ask a brief question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I seek information. It has been my assumption, from the limited knowledge I have, that the small wheat farmers who raise 15 acres of wheat or less, seldom sell their wheat in the market, but chiefly use it for feed in connection with their own operations. For example, my wife's folk happen to be farmers. They raise a little wheat, but they do not sell any of it. They feed it to their dairy cattle or chickens; they happen to have some poultry. How many of the small farmers actually put their wheat on the market? I am interested in obtaining that information.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In Illinois, a considerable quantity of wheat is produced, although not so much as is produced in Montana or Kansas, of course. However, very considerable quantities of wheat are produced in Illinois.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Are there not statistics in regard to this matter?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course there are. I do not have the outside figure in mind; but one who drives in Illinois any time during the June or July season will see wheat growing; in fact, he will see wheat growing both in Illinois and in the adjoining States. He will see little patches of wheat. Corn is grown there also. But that production will be cut in half, in the case of the small farmers, if this program is placed in effect.

Mr. NEUBERGER. But do I correctly understand that the Senator from Illinois claims that the small farmer who raises 15 acres or less of wheat, sells substantially all of it on the open market?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The best evidence I know of is the number of small mills one sees, which mill that wheat for cake flour, doughnut flour, and that sort of thing.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The mere fact that a mill is small does not mean the wheat comes from a small wheat acreage.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not particularly; but that happens to be the practice. That is not the hard wheat area. Those mills are not like the mills on the Mississippi River at St. Paul and Minneapolis, where bread flour is milled. The mills to which I refer are mainly soft wheat mills.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is quite clear that the so-called small wheat farmer produces more than the acreage indicated. I do not think there will be found many 8-, 10-, or 15-acre tracts of wheat, even in Illinois. I think the wheat farms in Illinois go beyond that acreage. But let us assume that the so-called small wheat producer is that small a producer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Outside the essentially wheat areas, where there are large farms, that is true of most wheat farms in the country.

Mr. MORSE. Let us consider the small producer. Under the present plan, if he complies with the acreage allotment, he gets a support price. Under the plan of the Senator from Kansas, if he complies with the certificate program, he will get his protection there. There would be no difference in the posture of the small producer, so far as Government assistance is concerned, under either plan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He has the present market price of wheat to go on, and he can produce 15 acres without penalty. But, as the Senator from Kansas said, under his amendment there would be one base price, which would be the feed price of wheat.

We would give the farmer the value of the certificate which would be issued to him, to bring him up to 100 percent. But, of course, he must reduce his acreage. The small producer must reduce his acreage and when he does, what is left of his little acreage? I think I am right about it. The question is important.

Mr. MORSE. Certainly it is.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If he puts the wheat on the market, he may receive more than 100 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He receives the feed price for it.

Mr. MORSE. Under the domestic consumption provision he would receive 100 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He would reduce his 15 acres to get the benefit. Would he not have to reduce his acreage?

Mr. CARLSON. If that is true, it is not the intention of the Senator from Kansas to eliminate the 15-acre provision. That is one reason why I think the legislation cannot be written on the floor of the Senate. It ought to go to conference for the correction of any injustices. Therefore I hope this bill will go to conference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me make this point: Rice is on a so-called two-price basis. The Senator from Louisiana, for whom I cherish a great affection, and of whose interest in that subject I am well aware, knows how I feel. My position has been consistent. I have an amendment pending to strike the rice title, and I would strike it if I could. But now a proposal with respect to wheat comes along. It is suggested that we should deal on the same basis with cotton. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] will propose an amendment to that effect.

What about other commodities? If that is the way it is to be, and, one by one, we are to write commodities into the bill on a two-price system, when the subject has not been adequately ventilated, what will finally happen to the farm bill? It will become confusion worse confounded; and when we are through, when the final roll call is intoned, no Member of this body will know what we have done, either for or to the farmers of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator not believe that the committee was wise? The committee felt that there was merit in the two-price system, and that probably we shall have to come to it. Does not the Senator feel that the committee was wise in selecting a relatively small and unimportant crop such as rice—speaking for the United States as a whole—and giving the principle a trial? I do not think there is anything wrong with it. But suppose there is difficulty in administration or otherwise. It would be very wise at least to put into effect a program on rice, as recommended by the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not quite share that sentiment. If we are to adopt such

a program, let us apply it to all commodities. If we have faith in the program, if there is conviction that it will work, let us go through with a two-price system with respect to all the export commodities, instead of trying to write items of such dimensions on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have faith in the program. I intend to support the wheat agreement. But when the Senator makes reference to rice, I think he proves the good faith of the committee, and its conviction that there is merit in the two-price program.

I presume that the committee felt that it was quite an undertaking suddenly to embark upon a program involving commodities so enormous in volume and so difficult to handle as wheat. I am not the judge of that; but certainly the committee accepted the principle, and included it in the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the rice title is defective, in that Cuba is brought in under the so-called primary market quota. Frankly, I do not understand how in the world Cuba could be brought into that picture without doing violence to the relationships we have created under our foreign-aid acts of one kind or another. The possibilities of bypassing would be enormous in that respect.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to go into that subject in detail later, but I do not care to do so now, in connection with the wheat agreement. The Senator mentioned rice, and I think there is a good excuse for rice being in the bill. I shall be glad to discuss the question when it arises.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to conclude these observations. Perhaps other Senators desire to speak.

I think it is an amazing thing that we go along in the consideration of a bill, and then suddenly try to clutter it up with an amendment of such proportions that no one can tell what it would do or how it would affect a crop involving a billion-bushel commodity which is probably worth normally in the market about $2 billion. I do not understand the idea of doing it so summarily and hastily upon the floor of the Senate, when it has not been adequately considered in committee, or by those whose counsel and guidance we should solicit, since they are giving guidance to the agricultural destiny of the country.

So I will not be a party to the inclusion in this bill of a provision which might have a terrific impact upon the entire economy of the country, and could very conceivably make such a deep dent in the feed market that the corn farmers of my own area would be deeply prejudiced thereby. I think it would be the better part of wisdom and discretion on the part of the Senate to vote down this amendment.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the domestic parity plan for wheat has my enthusiastic support.

I joined in cosponsoring this amendment in the sincere belief that the domestic parity plan will restore order to the wheat situation with a minimum of Government control and a maximum of benefit—both to farmer and consumer.

One of the most important aspects of this plan for my State is the fact that it will permit wheat to be used for feed.

Washington State is a feed deficit State. Our poultry farmers, for example, import two-thirds of the 300,000 tons of manufactured feed they use each year. They pay freight costs anywhere from $15 to $24 a ton on this feed. Both they and the consumer suffer because they cannot afford to feed wheat under present price support programs.

As a matter of fact, the Department of Agriculture tells me that Washington State poultry production is now declining because of high feed costs while, at the same time, consumers' needs continue to rise. The domestic parity plan, by permitting wheat to move into the feed market at competitive levels, will give the wheat farmer new markets, the poultry grower local feeds without heavy freight costs, and the consumer cheaper poultry.

Washington State is also a livestock deficit State and, again, cheaper feed is the key to the problem. Merely to supply local demand within the State we could double our sheep production and increase our hog production five times its present level. As things stand now, we import this deficit at great loss to our farmers and our consumers. But the chairman of the Department of Animal Husbandry at the University of Wisconsin has stated that "the great bulk of the pork consumed in Washington, 90 percent, is imported because you cannot feed price-supported wheat to hogs."

Mr. President, what I have said about Washington State applies to other States in the Pacific Northwest as well.

The domestic parity plan for wheat will be a great step in the direction of agricultural self-sufficiency for this region.

By making the all-important distinction between wheat for domestic human consumption and wheat sold for feed and export purposes, this plan could increase exports and sales of wheat for feed by over 200 million bushels.

I do not share the fears expressed by some that the domestic parity plan might have adverse effects on the prices of other feed grains. The estimated increase in use of wheat for feed under this plan represents about 3.5 percent of the total feed grain market. Furthermore, there is standby authority in this amendment to protect other feed grains.

Quite aside from this, however, the evidence indicates that if wheat acreage expands under the domestic parity plan, this will reduce rather than increase the available supply of feed grains. The feed value of an average acre of wheat is less than the value of that acre if sown in other feed grains. Thus in 1954 we produced over 35 percent more feed grains on the acres diverted from wheat than would have been grown had this acreage been used for feed-wheat production.

I might add, Mr. President, that the changing diet of the American people provides another sound reason for the enactment of the domestic parity plan. Our per capita consumption of wheat, as my colleagues know, has steadily decreased in the past three decades. Meat consumption has risen steadily. Obviously, as the cereal diet continues to give way to the meat diet, we will require more grains for feed. Of these grains, wheat is the most nutritious.

Mr. President, I have emphasized one benefit that will result from the domestic parity plan because it is of special significance to my State. There are, of course, other aspects of the plan of equal merit which deserve the serious consideration of the Senate. These features have been clearly set forth already by several of the Senators whom I joined in offering the amendment. I hope the Senate will support our confidence in the domestic parity plan for wheat and adopt the pending amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield 3 mintues to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on the 7th of March I spoke at some length on this subject. Today I wish to confine my brief remarks to the surplus wheat problem in its relationship to the domestic parity amendment.

First. Section 380 (c) of the domestic parity amendment now under consideration provides for acreage controls at the descretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. This means that as long as the present surplus stocks are on hand in the United States, the controls may be proclaimed by the Secretary. It has been clearly brought out by the debate on the floor of this Senate that wheat acreage controls are effective in controlling production. The latest United States Department of Agriculture estimates of the 1956 wheat crop, indicates that the total production will be very close to total disappearance for this crop year. The wheat farmers of my State have a fine record of compliance and I am sure that wheat farmers throughout the Nation will cooperate in making the acreage allotment program work.

Second. With the domestic parity program, wheat will be offered on the market at competitive prices. This will allow additional wheat to be marketed for feed, export and industrial uses, which cannot be accomplished, under the present Government program without a subsidized disposal program. Also, the incentives for the production of quality wheat, that would result from the operation of this program, will reduce overall production because high quality wheat will not produce as many bushels per acre as feed-type wheat.

It has been less desirable wheat that has filled the storage bins of the Commodity Credit Corporation under the present program.

Third. It must also be recognized that present price support programs contribute nothing toward the solution of the surplus problem. Despite acreage allotments at the minimum level permissible under legislation, despite price supports at 76 percent of parity in effect for this year's crop, and despite all out efforts on the part of the administration

to reduce carryover stocks through vigorous export programs and other disposal measures including foreign assistance programs, no reduction in stocks below the unprecedented all-time record of more than 1 billion bushels estimated to be carired over on July 1, 1956 is indicated for the end of the 1956–57 marketing year. Clearly, present price support programs are not the answer to the wheat surplus problem.

In closing I should like to say that it is only fair and right that we should include in the pending bill the proposed wheat provision so that we may get into conference the problem with regard to wheat. There are already in the bill provisions with regard to corn and other major crops. The wheat producers are entitled to have the conferees go into the program the Senator from Kansas has proposed. I wish to commend him for it. If there are any "bugs" in it, they can be taken out in conference.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has an amendment, of which I am a cosponsor, which amendment, I am sure, will remove some of the objections we have heard with respect to the program which is now being debated.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there are four reasons why it seems to me it would be the part of wisdom for the Senate to add to the pending farm bill the domestic parity plan.

First, it would return the sale and purchase of wheat to the open market, where the price is determined by factors of quality and demand.

Second, the resulting lower market price would make it possible for more wheat to move into export and industrial uses, and thus increase the total overall use of wheat.

Third, it would guarantee wheat farmers full parity on that part of the annual crop which goes into domestic human consumption.

Fourth—and perhaps this is the most important reason—it should ultimately get the Government out of the business of buying, storing, and trying to dispose of wheat.

Mr. President, we have heard a great deal said on the floor of the Senate regarding some fears about the proposal expressed on the part of corngrowers. I should like to quote a statement made last year by one of the leading farm spokesmen of the Nation, Mr. Herschel D. Newsom, the master of the National Grange, who certainly has at heart the welfare of corngrowers as well as of wheatgrowers. I quote him directly as follows:

> Some corngrowers argue against this program. Actually, they have little to worry about. The stop-loss price floor would take care of this. Besides, wheat never was, and never will be, a serious feed-grain competitor of King Corn.

So spoke the master of the National Grange.

Mr. President, I believe that the wheatgrowers of the Nation, who have taken the lead in urging the adoption of the proposed program, deserve credit for making an effort to get the Government out of the business of buying and supporting and storing wheat, and for trying eventually to bring about a program which will make wheat stand on its own.

I feel that the wheatgrowers of the United States—certainly those of my State—owe a debt of gratitude to the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who has so ably and capably sponsored the pending amendment on the floor of the Senate. I am greatly pleased to be associated with him in his public-spirited effort.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] asked the question if we do this for wheat and then take another approach for cotton and then take this approach for rice and then take still another approach for sugar, where will we be going with the farm program?

Mr. President, perhaps we are exercising very good judgment in connection with the whole farm program when we do start prescribing a specific remedy for a specific ill. Perhaps one of the difficulties in the past has been that we have been too much inclined to prescribe one remedy and assume that it would automatically cure all the ills to which agriculture is heir.

As I said the other evening, I believe in connection with the wheat situation we have reached the point in the debate of the farm bill where more must be done for this product than has been done up to now, by some device or tactic. Most of the other farm products have been given a nudge in the right direction, by some gimmick or gadget in the legislation. With respect to wheat, however, we still face a discouraging situation. Unless we adopt the amendment before the Senate or some other amendment we will find that insofar as Senate action is concerned we will have done nothing to improve the status of the wheat farmer.

I am very hopeful that as this legislation comes back from conference, as the result of the tie vote in the Senate, and as the result of the clear demonstration that half of the Members of the Senate feel that something better must be done for wheat than has been done up to now, there will come something out of conference, if not very closely resembling or completely resembling the Young provision in the bill, something that will go substantially in that direction, and thus reflect the compromise position which a conference has the responsibility of endeavoring to create. That compromise position could well incorporate provisions of real and substantial benefit to our wheat farmers.

I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas affords us an additional leverage which we can use in that connection and in that direction when we get to conference. It will give us a position in conference to argue emphatically and persuasively that the Senate does desire to do something better for the wheat farmers than we have as yet provided.

While the weakness of the amendment as it is before us is that it does not and cannot do anything to help the situation in 1956 by making it available in the next crop year, we would by our adoption of it have the expression of the Senate that we recognize that the problem of wheat has not been solved, and it will make it easier for the conferees to know what to do about the House position, and to come back with something more nearly resembling what I thought was a very constructive proposal as written into the proposed legislation by the Senator from North Dakota in the language approved by our committee.

So, Mr. President, I think we can vote for this amendment for a number of reasons. In the first place, if all the arguments of the distinguished Senator from Illinois be valid, the farmers will reject the program by voting "no" in the referendum. However, if they believe that in spite of the difficulties which he paints their future is best preserved by trying the two-price system, the farmers will vote for it.

I think the Senate can well afford, after we have discussed the two-price system these many years, to give the farmers who raise wheat an opportunity by way of a referendum by saying, "Yes, you may try it out for a year or 2 years," or to say, "No; after studying the matter carefully we prefer the existing wheat program"—whatever it may be at that time.

That is all the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas now provides.

I think, Mr. President, we are where we were with respect to the Hickenlooper amendment after the 90 percent price-support provision was stricken from the bill. We are at about that point in reference to wheat. This amendment will help to bring about that improved legislation which we hope will flow out of the conference.

So, Mr. President, I urge the Members of the Senate, on balance, to vote for this amendment and thus give additional evidence that this body does wish to do something constructive for the wheat farmers of America.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have carefully listened to the debate on the pending amendment, and I may say, very frankly, that as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, when, after a long series of hearings, the various proposals were being discussed, the committee had some very serious misgivings about incorporating the principle of the amendment into the pending farm bill. However, in the present stage of the proceedings the amendment sponsored by my junior colleague and a number of cosponsors is the question before the Senate.

About 2½ or 3 years ago I was privileged to be a member of a conference committee on a farm bill when the question of a referendum on the two-price system came before the conferees. I say very candidly, Mr. President, that I took the position at that time that a referendum on the part of the farmers should be provided. It was the judgment of the conferees at that time that it should be

voted down, so it did not become a part of that measure.

I have some serious misgivings as to the operational effect of this type of approach. I am wondering about the long-term commitments, the contractual relations, and the contractual status of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture. But this bill, containing this and other amendments, will go to conference. Personally I feel somewhat as my colleague from South Dakota feels, that the wheat situation has as yet not been given its proper status with reference to readjustment. I shall offer, a little later on, an amendment with reference to changing certain parity situations, but I feel that the bill, when it goes to conference, will afford an opportunity for complete settlement of the problem.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield a few minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely wish to associate myself with this amendment, and to say that it was discussed, as I am sure has been pointed out, in the committee. It was felt at that time, in the light of the hearings we had upon it, that it might be better to proceed under the plans outlined in the original bill reported by the committee. I must say, however, that now, having struck down section 102 of the bill, the section which would have applied 90 percent of parity to wheat of milling quality, the proposal offered by the junior Senator from Kansas is the most desirable alternative which has been proposed.

Furthermore, I cannot help but believe it deserves a trial. It provides a referendum for the so-called two-price plan on wheat. It has been fully discussed with us by the Senators who are cosponsors of the amendment, the Senators from Oregon, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. They and other Senators have discussed it with us at length.

Moreover, Mr. President, the National Grange, one of the great farm organizations, has given active and wholehearted support to the so-called two-price system for wheat. This gives me an opportunity to pay tribute to that great farm organization. I have always respected the point of view of its members of it. I have the greatest regard and respect for Mr. Newsom, the head of the Grange, and its Washington representative. He is a man who gives us much advice and counsel, all of which is good.

So I wish to say to the Senator from Kansas that it will be my happy privilege to support his amendment, and I am hopeful that we may get sufficient votes to do something constructive. It will mean a great deal to the wheat-producing States, both in the Midwest and in the Northwest.

It seems to me that the amendment has rather broad sponsorship, representing all sections of the country.

So I welcome this opportunity to give the wheat producer at least a fighting chance in this farm bill. It is one of the better chances we have to get something desirable in farm legislation, rather than to continue to weaken it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Kansas, for himself and other Senators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the amendment and the two-price plan have not had the endorsement of the administration or the Department of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture believes that many dangers are contained within the proposed amendment. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself two minutes. I want to find out about the 15-acre proposal. It is my understanding that there are about 700,000 farmers who each produce in the neighborhood of 15 acres of wheat or less. That is a quite substantial number of farmers having small wheat farms.

If my estimate is correct, under existing law they can raise without penalty up to 15 acres, and they cannot share in the referendum for which provision is made. That is what I want to ascertain. Would the 700,000 small wheat farmers have to go out of existence?

Mr. CARLSON. So far as I can see, they would be in the same situation they are in under the present farm program. I have checked this with the clerk of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that is his understanding. I may be in error, but it is also my understanding.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The problem before us is, what will be their position under the amendment?

Mr. CARLSON. If their position is as I think it is as present, I am sure they will be taken care of in conference. I have every reason to believe that that is the situation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in a matter so vital, affecting more than 700,000 farmers who do not produce in excess of 15 acres of wheat, I am a little astonished that their interest should rest in such a vague, amorphous state, trusting to Providence and the good grace of another body to look with kindliness upon their supplications when the amendment goes to conference. Frankly, there is no assurance that when the amendment goes to conference it will ever come out.

That leads me to observe that every Member of the Senate is concerned about the farm bill. I certainly hope so. There have been rumors and allegations that perhaps a rather polite and not too aggressive filibuster was going on to prevent the bill from finally eventuating. I should be very reluctant to believe that; but we cannot finally reach our objective if we encumber the bill with items which are so at variance with the basic program of the administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

If the bill shall be encumbered with so many items which are at variance with the basic program of the administration, we shall be affording little more than an opportunity, perhaps, to look with disfavor upon the handiwork of both the Senate and the House conferees, such as it may be. That might mean no bill at all.

That, by implication, does not mean that I am speaking for the President. I do not know what the President would do. But I think I know what I would do if I were sitting in the President's place and had before me a bill so complicated, so difficult of administration, and constituting such radical departure from the basic concepts of the administration.

So I become a little concerned and apprehensive as to whether we are going to get a program if an amendment of these proportions is to be included in the pending bill.

Mr. CARLSON. Under the present existing farm legislation, there are no marketing quotas for farmers who produce 15 acres or less. There are no marketing quotas in this bill for farmers who produce 15 acres or less. That means that if they come under the certificate plan they will have to cut their acreage in half. If they wanted to get the full benefits, they would have to market 50 percent, or whatever the figure might be, under the full parity clause.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a rather bitter alternative. I am a corn raiser and a hog raiser. I have 10 acres in wheat. I can plant 10 acres in wheat if the amendment becomes law, but I will be selling my wheat on a feed basis because wheat is going to find its own level. But if I want to cut the figure of 10 acres in half and plant only 5 acres of wheat, then I can get the benefit of the certificate plan provided in the bill. But, as to the remaining 5 acres, I will either have to find a market for the wheat in the form of feed or I must accept Government price supports, and we have not gotten away from the Government under this plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois some questions, if I may.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator's time has expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Iowa 5 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am very much concerned about the 15-acre farmers, because 50.9 percent of the farms in the United States which raise wheat have 15 acres or less of wheat, according to the figures which I have. Under the amendment which is proposed, 50.9 percent of the wheat farmers in the United States could not vote at all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Can we get an answer to the question which the Senator from Iowa has raised?

Mr. CARLSON. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that there are no marketing quotas under the present law, and no marketing quotas under the proposed law, for 15-acre wheatgrowers. How much farther can we go?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator from Iowa is a member of that committee. He has wrestled with this question for weeks and months. Certainly there must be an answer to a question involving more than 700,000 small farmers.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa repeat the figures he stated? Did he say 50 percent of the farmers?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Fifty and nine-tenths percent of the farms raising wheat in the United States are under 15 acres. I am very much concerned about that, because while Iowa is not considered a major wheat-raising State, still a large amount of wheat is produced there. I do not know whether the wheat farmers of Iowa will be completely and solely subjected to feed marketing at the competitive world price in determining the price for the wheat they raise.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not true that under the domestic parity plan or under the present plan—either one—the small, 15-acre farmer can stay out of the program if he wants to, and feed his grain, as most of them do; or he can sell in the market and take what he can get for it. The only difficulty is that the cash or market price will be a little lower. The Secretary, however, can establish a minimum loan support level.

But if he wanted to come in under the program, he could get 100-percent support for about half his wheat production.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Under the 1938 Agricultural Adjustment Act, section 335, subsection (7), is an amendment to the act by the 74th Congress, and reads as follows:

> A farm-marketing quota on corn or wheat shall not be applicable to any farm on which the acreage planted to the commodity is not in excess of 15 acres.

Section 336 provides for a referendum, and reads:

> The Secretary shall conduct a referendum, by secret ballot, of farmers who will be subject to the quota specified therein.

If they are not subject to quotas, they cannot vote; they must be subject to quotas in order to vote.

There are 49.1 percent who cannot vote because they are not subject to quotas; and unless they are subject to quotas, they cannot vote.

Mr. CARLSON. Under my amendment, there is a minimum provision for price supports. The Secretary can set the price at whatever he thinks it should be, based upon several factors, including competition of foreign and feed grains. Therefore, he would set the price which would go to the farmers on a fair market basis.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What would happen to a wheat raiser who grows 15½ acres of wheat at the present time? Would he not be subject to penalties? There have been a number of decisions by the Federal courts on that point. Would that situation be eliminated?

Mr. CARLSON. It is entirely possible that it might be eliminated. In the amendment, under the referendum provided for in section 308 (j), if more than one-half of the farmers voting in the referendum favored such a marketing provision, "the farmers shall," and so on. That sets up a program permanently. But under the law as it now exists, a two-thirds majority is required. That is a year by year program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am trying to get the matter straightened out. It is serious for my section of the country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am trying to ask questions myself.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Senator's figure of 50.9 percent of farms which grow less than 15 acres of wheat involves farms on which 5, 6, 7, or 10 acres, probably, are planted in wheat. Probably the same situation would be true as to farms which raise cotton. Their main crops would be something else.

The only reason for the exemption originally was that they were not mainly growing corn or wheat. There are hundreds of farms throughout the country which grow an acre or two of wheat. About 72 percent of such farms grow wheat for their own use, such as for feed for poultry.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That may be true, but there are many farmers in the Midwest with less than 15 acres.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But they are not planted to the main crop. Iowa does not have 15-acre wheat farms. The 15 acres may be a part of a 100-acre farm.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Who will benefit under the proposal, the little fellow, or the big fellow?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The little fellow is not touched.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I read it, the little fellow will operate under the competitive dump price, and he has no chance of getting the better support price.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then, by that logic, he is a free rider today. He does not submit himself to any acreage reductions or anything like that. He simply rides on whatever benefit price he may get, because somebody else may cut down on acreage.

Mr. BARRETT. Is it not true that under the amendment the small wheat farmer and the large wheat farmer will get the benefit of the marketing certificate on the amount to which they are entitled on the historical basis for the past 5 years? So, as to that portion of a farmer's production, they will get 100 percent of parity.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not read the proposal to mean that the farmer who has 15 acres will get it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the Senator from North Dakota has put his finger on the pertinent question. All the small wheat farmers have a choice. A small wheat farmer can come under the certificate plan, or, if he has a vote, he can continue as is; but—and this is in answer also to the Senator from South Dakota who speaks about free riders—if he can produce 15 acres of wheat without incurring a penalty, and sell it, he will sell it on a market where a feed wheat value has been established, because there has been eliminated from the proposal the guaranteed domestic consumption value of wheat, and it has been tagged on the certificate, so that the farmer will get 100 percent on that part of his production.

As the Senator from North Dakota said to me a moment ago, the drop could be as much as 75 cents a bushel. That is a heavy penalty to a little producer, even though it is only a portion of his entire operation. If he wants to benefit under the certificate plan, he has to cut his operation in two, because there are 500 million bushels of wheat in excess for export. I am taking the figures given to us today. There are 500 million bushels for domestic markets——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator is confused.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not confused.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have the floor. The Senator from Oregon has been asking for recognition.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What was the figure the Senator from Kansas used as to the domestic consumption?

Mr. CARLSON. Five hundred million bushels.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is the food consumption figure. The Senator from Illinois would not have wheat for seed or reserve.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The amendment is geared to wheat consumption.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator is assuming that 500 million bushels of wheat will disappear in a normal year's operation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I speak only about what is in the bill, which says "domestic wheat quota."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That refers to food.

Mr. BARRETT. Is it true that, under the amendment, the wheat farmers, large and small, get 100 percent of parity for that portion of the production which comes under the marketing certificate, and for the remainder of the production the price will be the same as it is at the present time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It will be whatever the price is at the moment.

Mr. BARRETT. There will still be support prices of 75 percent for the remainder.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. CARLSON. The price for the remainder will be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture based on five factors. The price of corn is $1.40 a

bushel. It cannot go below that. That is much more than the feed price.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But that can be altogether different from 75 percent.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have been trying to let the Senator from Oregon have his day in court, so he may ask questions. I yield to him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a few questions, in order to be sure I have the answers in my own mind.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I assure the Senator I do not know whether I have the answers to his questions.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator will have the answers to the questions I shall ask.

Under our present system a wheat farmer can produce to his heart's content on land up to 15 acres. He is subject to no marketing quota penalty, but he gets no supports under the present system. Under the bill, he can produce on up to 15 acres, and he does not have to come under the program if he does not desire; but if he does, then he has to get from the Secretary of Agriculture the allotment which will be due to him when the whole program is taken into account by the Secretary of Agriculture. The farmer will get 100 percent of parity on that part of his allotment which goes into the production of so-called human consumption wheat, but there is not necessarily a 50 percent cut in his acreage.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How much would it be?

Mr. MORSE. That will have to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture when he takes the whole program into account, and puts it into operation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How does the arithmetic work out?

Mr. MORSE. It depends on the number of 15-acre wheatgrowers who decide to come into the plan. I suspect farmers may find that they will be better off if they stay out of the program and do not take the support prices, because they are going to be the beneficiaries, under the plan, of a higher price for wheat than they are now getting. I think that will be the experience under the plan. But it is the assumption of the Secretary that the acreage is going to be cut in half that I say is wrong.

Mr. BARRETT. It seems to me the small wheat farmers and the large wheat farmers will try to conform to the provisions of the amendment, and get marketing certificates so they may obtain 100 percent of parity for the portion of the farms which can come under the program. However, is it not also true that a farmer will realize that it will be a little unprofitable if he produces for storage, let us say, and, consequently, will he not be susceptible to some measure of reason, and curtail production to such a point that the large production which will result under the amendment will go for human consumption, and the farmer will get 100 percent of parity? So the end result will be that the wheat farmers will be better off under the amendment than they are at the present time.

Mr. MORSE. And there will be a reduction of the surpluses.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator a question. On page 11, in section 380k (b) of the amendment, it says:

> The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make available through loans, purchases, or other operations, price support to producers of wheat who are cooperators.

How about the 15-acre farmer?

Mr. CARLSON. If he does not cooperate he does not come under the program. He does not come under the program now.

Mr. MORSE. He gets no supports now.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I call attention to a situation which is very difficult, and which I pointed out previously. If the same formula which applies to corn were applied to wheat, instead of an allotment of 55 million acres of wheat, it would be somewhere around 25 million acres.

I am not proposing to deny the wheat farmers the right to grow wheat. But I say the difficulty is the inequitable application of the formula. Manifestly, what is causing the difficulty in the case of wheat is that the acreage is tremendous, greatly in excess of the needs and demands.

Certainly I should like to find a formula by means of which a reasonable reward, by way of substantial encouragement, could be given for the production of wheat. But, today, much of the wheat is a drug on the market, and I do not think it will be handled by a program of the sort now proposed.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to ask a question. Under the Sugar Act, we have a program which prorates the consumptive needs to the producers of sugar beets and sugarcane throughout the country. It seems to me the pending amendment proposes a program which is comparable to that program, and sets aside the 500 million bushels of wheat which will be needed for human consumption in the coming year.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Of course, there are many kinds of wheat, whereas for all intents and purposes there is only one kind of sugar. In short, for practical purposes, sugar is sugar. But there are many different kinds of wheat.

Mr. BARRETT. I understand. But under the amendment, the wheat is to be of a quality which is suitable for human consumption.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But my friend, the Senator from Wyoming, forgets that, for all practical purposes, the American sugar bowl is in Cuba, whereas in the case of wheat we are trying to find a market for the wheat we produce—a completely different situation.

Mr. BARRETT. Yes; but in this case we are encouraging production for consumption, not for storage.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; but we do not have to find outlets for sugar; there is a regular market for all the sugar in the sugar bowl, in the case of Cuba.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I took the pains to read the history of the 15-acre provision. As I read it, the main reason for that provision was that the average farmer, not a wheat farmer, as such, who raised a small amount of wheat—15 acres or less—was raising it chiefly for his own consumption, rather than for sale on the market. That was the reason for the 15-acre provision.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That may be.

I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas a question: Under the certificate plan for domestic consumption, 100 percent of the wheat for domestic human consumption will be paid for at the parity price of wheat; is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes; it will be the parity price as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. In the case of the rest of the wheat, whether 50 percent or more or less, which is not for domestic usage—and let me ask whether the domestic use of the 50 percent includes the use of wheat for feed.

Mr. CARLSON. No, only the use of wheat for domestic human consumption.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Only for domestic human consumption?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Very well. Then, for the sake of the argument, let us suppose that 50 percent of the wheat is used for domestic human consumption.

Mr. CARLSON. That is approximately what that amount is; that is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In the case of the other 50 percent of the wheat, what is the lowest support price which could be received under the provisions of the Senator's amendment?

Mr. CARLSON. That would have to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, based on the 4 or 5 different provisions in the bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But in the bill is there a formula which will enable one to determine what the lowest support price will be?

Mr. CARLSON. The Secretary of Agriculture at that time will have to determine it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Could he determine a price below 5 cents a bushel?

Mr. CARLSON. The bill states that he cannot go below the support price for corn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

The Senator from Illinois has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall use that 1 minute to say to the Senate that I can think of no better reason for defeating the amendment than the confusion which now enshrouds it. No Senator has yet been able to make the meaning of the amendment clear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time available to the opponents of the amendment has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Pardon me, Mr. President; I thought all time had expired.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South

Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is a cosponsor of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if there is confusion in the Chamber because of the discussion, it grows out of the fact that some Senators have more experience with growing corn than they do with growing wheat.

Actually, 500 million bushels is the approximate amount of the need for domestic food consumption; but if the United States is to grow wheat, there must be some wheat for seed. If wheat is to be grown, there must be some in reserve, and there must be some for feed.

Actually in the United States we can use 500 million bushels of wheat for food. We need approximately from 100 million to 200 million bushels of wheat to take care of the seed requirements and the feed requirements. Then we have always understood that we should have from 100 million to 150 million bushels of wheat as a carryover, as sort of a reserve against crop years in which there may be a drastic decrease in the production.

From all of those, we arrive at the figure of 800 million bushels of wheat as a necessity or a desirable minimum annual production.

We have been exporting from 200 million to 350 million bushels of wheat a year, depending on whether we were selling the wheat under the International Wheat Agreement or under the Marshall plan. The International Wheat Agreement expires this year. Mr. McLean, of the Department of Agriculture, has just returned from a trip abroad, where they considered whether the International Wheat Agreement would be renewed. The United Kingdom has indicated that it might not participate in the International Wheat Agreement again.

So it now seems that our export wheat would have to go on the open, world market. That situation has to be taken into consideration.

The pending amendment, as a matter of fact, far from being complex or confusing, is the simplest proposal which has been put before the Congress for dealing with wheat. This amendment simply provides that for the portion of wheat that a wheatgrower produces and that goes into the domestic food production, he can receive a certificate in addition to the price he receives on the market; and the certificate will represent the difference the Secretary of Agriculture estimates between the market price and the parity price. That is all that part of the amendment amounts to.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the other Senators who have talked in a confusing way about the present plan and other matters in this connection, do not offer any solution to the problem of our surplus wheat supply, except to let the Treasury of the United States pick up the check in some way.

The amendment proposes a self-financing plan, a plan which will not cost the Secretary of the Treasury or the budget of the United States 1 cent, once the plan really gets into operation—aside from possibly a few initial administrative costs.

The processor of wheat for food for human consumption must purchase certificates from the Commodity Credit Corporation or from the Secretary of Agriculture, in an amount equal to the wheat he will process for human food consumption; and he will pay for those certificates the amount of money that the Government will need, in turn, to retire the certificates that are issued to the grower. So it is a self-financing plan, and it is the only plan that has been advanced, so far as I know, that will not cost the Government something to see to it that the producer of wheat gets a fair price for the wheat which goes into domestic food consumption.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The amount of wheat estimated to go into domestic consumption, for which the certificates are to be issued, is the present domestic consumption. Does that mean food?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; domestic food consumption.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Very well. What will happen to the remainder of it? Will it go into the domestic feed market?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. About 100 million bushels of it will be needed for seed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Will it be available for the domestic feed market? Will all of it be available in that way?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not all of it, no; certainly not, because we expect to export possibly 200 million bushels. Of course that will be on the world market basis, if we do not have an international wheat agreement.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. My question is this: Is it excluded from coming on the domestic feed market, or is it available for the domestic feed market? I know some of it may be sent abroad and some may be used for this or that or the other thing. Would this amendment prohibit such other use, aside from that used for feed?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No, it would not; but anyone who grows wheat will save some for seed; so that will not be available for the market.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, may I have 1 more minute?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Finally, it seems to me that we should take a look at the referendum feature in this amendment. It does not go into effect automatically. The present law would continue unless the farmers in the referendum with respect to the 1957 crop adopted this proposal. It seems to me that sound legislation requires that something be done for wheat in this bill. We have done something for corn. We have done something for cotton. Are we going to let the bill go to conference without giving the conferees an opportunity to make some provision for wheat? This is the best, most concrete, and cheapest proposal that has been offered to the Senate.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a modification of my amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, after line 10, in the Carlson amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 380J. In the referendum held pursuant to section 336 of this act, on the national marketing quota proclaimed for the 1957 crop of wheat, the Secretary shall also submit the question whether farmers favor the marketing certificate program under this subtitle in lieu of marketing quotas under subtitle B. If more than two-thirds of the farmers voting in the referendum favor such marketing certificate program the Secretary may, prior to the effective date of the national marketing quota proclaimed under subtitle B, suspend the operation of such quota and place into effect a marketing certificate program for the 1957 and subsequent wheat crops under the provisions of this subtitle, in which event the marketing quotas and acreage allotments shall not be in effect for wheat under subtitle B.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas has 2 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have been seeking recognition all afternoon. Will the Senator yield to me for one moment? Originally I had intended to offer a substitute. If the Senator will yield to me, I will not offer the substitute, but I should like to have 1 minute to make a brief statement.

Mr. CARLSON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Washington. I reserve 1 minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kansas be allowed an extra minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had intended to make a few brief remarks on the farm bill itself, and, of course, support the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] on behalf of himself and other cosponsors, which is a duplicate of my amendment.

This amendment had been offered by several of us previously. The one offered by the Senator from Kansas is somewhat of a modification and refinement of the original amendment offered by myself early in the session. All of us who were cosponsors are happy to join in an effort to accomplish this job.

I think we have sufficiently explained the merits of our proposal. After conference with other Senators, I have prepared a statement regarding it, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

I want to compliment the Agriculture Committee of the Senate on the fine job it has done in presenting this bill to the Senate. The complexities of the farm problem

are exceeded only by the urgent need for a solution—the complexities are exceeded only by the importance of a workable program—both from the viewpoint of the men and women on the farm and that of the general economic health of the Nation.

Generally speaking the committee has done a good job. I think the soil-bank provisions are a step forward. The committee recognizes that not only this generation, but posterity, is dependent for its very existence upon the 6 inches of topsoil covering the tillable acres of the Nation.

It is fitting and proper that the Federal Government should interest itself in maintaining the fertility of the soil—in insuring that the acres we bequeath to future generations are at least as productive as they were when we inherited them from our fathers.

The importance of this bill goes beyond the welfare of the individual man on the farm—it is closely related to the general prosperity of the Nation.

Since this administration took office, farm income has gone down about $6 billion. News stories appearing in the capital this week relate that farm income for 1955 was down $1 billion—that the average income of the 22 million people on the farms of the Nation has declined to less than $900 per year—in contrast to the overall national average of approximately $2,000; one-half the amount.

When you take $6 billion in purchasing power out of the hands of the farmers, you threaten the economic pyramid at its base.

This week I received a letter from Mr. E. C. Huntley, chairman of the Highway Commission of Washington State. Mr. Huntley puts it this way:

"Extended periods of low income to agriculture have always resulted in increased unemployment. The farmer with little or no net returns from his work is like the laborer without a job—he has very little with which to purchase even the bare necessities. As large segments of agriculture and labor lose purchasing power—additional unemployment develops and surpluses pile up not only in farm commodities but in all branches of trade. These surpluses are not caused by over production but—instead—by a lack of buying power by large groups of our population."

Prosperity on the farms is absolutely essential to prosperity on Main Street. This is particularly true in the heavy agriculture areas.

In my own State, for example, business houses on the main street of Walla Walla cannot be prosperous for long unless the wheat growers in Whitman County are able to buy. The firms along Main Street in Yakima cannot expect to operate in the black unless the soft fruit and apple growers are doing well.

The ramifications go even further—the manufacturers of farm equipment, automobiles, trucks, electrical appliances, overalls, and canvas gloves have already felt the impact of a $6 billion reduction in farm income. Again, I say it is fitting and proper that the Congress of the United States should concern itself with this problem, because—in so doing—we are helping not only the families on the farm but also those who supply this vast market.

I want specifically to speak in support of the so-called domestic parity or two-price plan amendment for wheat—but before getting into that subject—I want to call to the attention of the appropriate committees of the Senate a situation which I consider inequitable and unjust.

We heard criticism from some quarters of the cost of storing basic commodities—including wheat. To the best of my knowledge we have heard no criticism on purchases and storage of critical materials for the national and for the Defense Production Administration's stockpile.

Congress has established a stockpiling goal of some $10 billion. We have in the stockpile now over $6½ billion worth of critical materials. We have paid for stockpiling those materials over $250 million. The annual storage costs run over $25 million.

Congress established the stockpiling program and we pay for it in the name of national defense—in the name of national security. I voted for the program—I think it is a sound one. Most Senators did likewise.

Last year we—the Congress—set aside 500 million bushels of wheat as a strategic reserve. That wheat represents an initial cost of over $1 billion.

Annual storage charges run approximately $100 million.

I propose to the appropriate committees that these costs no longer be assessed against the farm program. If we meant what we said when we established the 500 million bushels strategic reserve—it is proper to charge these sums to national defense—to national security—to national preparedness.

Why should wheat be treated differently from tin, uranium, or any other material that has been determined by Congress and the administration to be an essential part of our preparedness effort?

Having turned down 90 percent—

I turn now to a specific discussion of the domestic parity amendment for wheat.

This amendment is supported by the National Grange, the National Wheat Growers Association, the Washington State Wheat Growers Association, many farm organizations, as well as millions of individual farmers across the country. The plan has been discussed in the Halls of Congress, on the farms of the country, and in farm conventions for the last 20 to 30 years.

It has been viewed and reviewed innumerable times by innumerable people.

It has been scrutinized and rescrutinized for defects.

It has been written and rewritten, polished, and perfected.

It has undergone every test except actual trial.

We propose in the amendment to give the farmers of the Nation a chance, by referendum, to put the plan into effect.

Here is how it would work:

Each year the Secretary would estimate the amount of wheat he anticipates would go into food for human consumption. Historically this is about 500 million bushels a year—out of the total crop of roughly 1 billion bushels.

Each farmer would receive his share of this wheat food quota.

All wheat would be sold in a free market—except that the Secretary would not permit the market price to go below 50 to 60 percent of parity.

Simultaneously the Secretary would estimate the selling price of wheat in the market place for the coming crop year. He would issue to each farmer a certificate covering his share of the wheat food quota—the dollar value of this certificate would represent the difference between the estimated market price of wheat and full parity.

Thus the price received by the wheat grower for his share of the food quota would be the market price—plus the dollar value of the food certificate—or full parity.

For the balance of his production the grower would receive only the market price.

The advantage of this plan is that it would insure full parity to the grower for that fair portion of his wheat going into human consumption and would move wheat at the market price into export and feed channels.

In effect it would put wheat back into the feed market—which it historically enjoyed.

In my own section of the country—the Pacific Northwest—wheat has been driven out of the feed market by artificial prices.

While wheat goes into storage, poultry, dairy, and stock men are importing corn from the Midwest.

Lars Nelson of the Washington State Grange, testified in Pendleton that in 1941, 43,139 tons of wheat were used for poultry feed—as compared to only 9,851 tons in 1955. In consequence he said—

"Our poultry men favor the two-price plan"—and later on—"Our beef men also favor the two-price plan. As realistic and as a benefit to increased beef feeder utilization."

Best estimates are that we are feeding less than 7 million bushels of wheat in an area that produced 88 million bushels in the crop year just passed.

Growers estimate that we will have a potential market in the Northwest for 50 million bushels of wheat for feed purposes.

The two-price plan we are proposing is the first long step toward tapping that potential—the first long step for taking the stock, dairy, and poultry men out of the price-cost squeeze—the first long step toward a truly workable program.

On October 31 last year the Senate Agriculture Committee—under the able leadership of the Senator from Louisiana—held hearings in Pendleton, Oreg. Among the witnesses was Harry J. Beerninck, general manager of the Washington Cooperative Farmers Association of Seattle. That cooperative is owned by—and is now serving—about 45,000 farm families.

He stated: "Normally, and prior to World War II, our principal grain ingredient for feed was wheat. * * *

"For feed purposes our organization alone is bringing into the State of Washington more than 5,500 tons of Midwest corn and southern milo per month—at a freight cost averaging $20 per ton—or $110,000 per month—totaling in excess of $1,350,000 per year.

"At the same time Northwest wheat growers are being cut back on acreage while millions of bushels of Northwest wheat are being stored."

I am sure that the stockmen of my State would tell you the same story.

At that same hearing, Mr. Edgar L. Smith, vice president of the Washington State Association of Wheat Growers, testified, in part, as follows:

"In the last 2 years Washington State income from wheat production, due to reduced acreage and lower prices, has declined 40 percent. In 1958 our wheat is scheduled—under the flexible plan—to be supported at only 73 percent of the present price."

The domestic parity amendment—the two-price plan on wheat—would also help consumers. I am sure the chairman of the committee will remember the two very fine representatives from the Washington State Wheat Growers' Asosciation, who appeared before him on Monday, January 23, Dwelley Jones and Ben Grote from Walla Walla, Wash.

Mr. Jones stated at one point in his testimony:

"Our State supports the National Wheat Association's position in the principle of a multiple pricing concept. We feel that full parity on 480 million bushels of our wheat—which is our present domestic consumption and has been maintained at approximately that level for a number of years—is a fair return for that portion of our crop.

"We do not feel that this would in any way affect the price of bread—since only 3 cents in a 20-cent loaf of bread is involved in the price of wheat."

I have been convinced from the beginning that the so-called flexible price support system would not work, that it was contrary to the laws of both human and mother nature.

The farmer—like other producers—faces certain fixed costs. When you cut his price he will try to make up in volume what he loses in income per bushel. In many sections of wheatgrowing country there are no

other crops to turn to except crops like barley, oats, and other feed grains—the production of which tend to push wheat further out of the feed market. On this point I want to quote again from the letter of the chairman of our State highway commission:

"Compliance with the wheat acreage allotment program in Whitman County has been near 100 percent during the period of high supports on wheat. Will that high percentage of compliance continue under a program that will bring lower and lower prices for wheat? I do not think it will. Production from the farm at a price is the only way to farm income. Volume of production can be cut if price received is sufficient to pay cost and keep the land and equipment in good state of repair. Price received can be cut if volume can be held up to pay costs and keep the plant in good working condition. But any program that cuts volume of production and price per unit (bushel) at the same time and also while costs of production are holding or still rising will accomplish only one thing—it will create an agricultural condition similar to the one that existed during the early 1930's."

I agree with his thesis.

The committee, in the bill it reported, has already taken 2 steps toward the 2 price plan. First, it has actually written into the bill a 2 price plan for rice, and second, it has included a provision for wheat that differentiates between milling varieties and varieties declared undesirable by the Department of Agriculture.

The committee proposes to support milling varieties at 90 percent of parity and the so-called undesirable varieties at a figure sufficient to produce an overall rate for all types at not less than 75 percent of parity.

Apparently the committee believes that by so doing part of our wheat production will move into feed channels.

The committee in its own bill is into the water up to its waist. I say to them—come on and join us by adopting this amendment to go all the way in establishing a truly domestic parity, a truly workable two price plan for wheat.

Let us give the wheat growers of the Nation an opportunity to vote by referendum on which plan they prefer. I am willing to abide by their decision. I believe they know the problem and the solution at least as well, or better, than we.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, before I take my seat, I should like to make one observation. There has been some suggestion to the effect that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has not been consulted on this subject, and that we are legislating on the floor of the Senate. This subject has been before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Hearings were held last year all over the country. One of the reasons why this amendment was not adopted earlier was that we had the 90-percent supports. Now that that has been defeated, there is all the more reason for this amendment. I wished to make that clear. Otherwise, the position of all of us might have been somewhat different. If the 90-percent supports had not been defeated, our position might have been different. This amendment offers a solid alternative.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say that I have offered this modification in lieu of the language contained in my original amendment on page 10. It would provide that the Secretary, even if he determined that the farmers had voted by two-thirds that the program should not go into effect, could so state, and order the program to go into effect.

I do not think it comes with good grace for Senators who represent the corn-producing sections of the Nation to come here this afternon, after we have given them a bonanza, so to speak, and oppose a wheat program. Frankly, we from the wheat-producing States regret it. I think it is most unfortunate that it should have happened.

I wish to state also that I did not like to hear the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the majority leader state that the Department of Agriculture was opposed to this proposal. I would not rise on the floor of the Senate and state that the Secretary would either favor or oppose it. It was with regret that I heard such statements made.

We are giving cotton 86 or 87 percent of parity. We are giving the corn grower not only 81 percent, but 8 million additional acres over the allotment which would be approved for this year had we not voted that increase. I wish Senators would allow wheatgrowers to have this benefit. If they do not, they will live to regret having treated wheatgrowers in this fashion.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment, as modified.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT obtained the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has been recognized. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from Colorado may yield to me briefly, without his losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

I have received today a very large number of telegrams in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and his cosponsors. I ask unanimous consent that the telegrams be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DULUTH, MINN., *March 13, 1956.*
Senator HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you support Carlson amendment providing two-price support. Let's not repeat the mistake made in defeating the McNary-Haugen bill made a few years ago.

GEORGE V. GIBBS.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 13, 1956.*
Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your support Carlson amendment.

R. W. BOLTON.

DULUTH, MINN., *March 13, 1956.*
Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you to vote for the Carlson amendment as a measure to put more wheat into full channels.

LYLE PATTERSON.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 13, 1956.*
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Please support Carlson two-price amendment vigorously. Farmers' best chance lies there.

R. L. SEARLE.

WAYZATA, MINN.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 13, 1956.*
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Believe a vote for Carlson amendment is the fairest way for all concerned including taxpayers.

J B. FISHWICK.

EDINA, MINN.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 13, 1956.*
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The Carlson amendment will materially help solve the wheat problem. Wish to urge your vote in its favor.

R. M. QUINN.

EDINA, MINN.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 13, 1956.*
Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your support on Carlson amendment two-price system for wheat. Let's not repeat mistake made in defeating McNary-Haugen bill years ago.

H. A. ULRING.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 13, 1956.*
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge voting for Carlson amendment. Believe it's the solution of wheat problem.

CHARLES H. MCCARTHY.

WAYZATA, MINN.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 13, 1956.*
Senator HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.:

Please support the Carlson two-price system.

LEW WORKMAN RICHFIELD.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 13, 1956.*
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge you support Carlson 2-price amendment.

EMORY C. ENSIGN.

HOPKINS, MINN.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 13, 1956.*
Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you will support Carlson amendment providing two-price system for wheat. Let's not repeat mistake made in defeating McNary-Haugen bill years ago.

J. A. BOLTON.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 13, 1956.*
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge you vote for Carlson amendment; feel best plan.
M. J. LAUREL.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 13, 1956.*
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Request your support Carlson two-price amendment.
MATT and SHELLY WALSH.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 13, 1956.*
Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Strongly urge support of Carlson amendment to the farm bill for the two-price system that is 100 percent parity on wheat used for domestic human consumption.
A. L. BURDICK.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 13.*
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
We urge your support of Senator CARLSON'S two-price plan as cure for farm problem.
MINNEAPOLIS GRAIN EXCHANGE.
ADRIAN HOWARD.
ROBERT HOWARD.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 13.*
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Strongly urge that you support CARLSON'S two-price amendment for benefit of both producer and consumer.
CHAS. E. RITTEN.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 13.*
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.:
Please support Carlson amendment to farm bill.
WALLACE ARNDT.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, with respect to the pending amendment, I desire to offer an amendment which contains four parts. The first is that in line 19, on page 3, the word "five" be changed to "ten."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am advised that what the Senator from Colorado desires to do is to suggest some changes in the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], which would change the period of years on which the base would be established from 5 years to 10 years, and the period on which the county base would be established——

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator from South Dakota does not mind, I would prefer to offer my amendment. Then I shall be happy to yield to him. The second portion of my amendment is on page 4, line 11, to strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "ten."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in what line is that?

Mr. ALLOTT. Page 4, line 11. The third part of the amendment is on page 4, line 19, to strike out the word "three" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "ten."

The fourth part is on page 4, line 22, to strike out the word "three-year" and insert in lieu thereof the word "ten-year."

I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I thought it would save time for everyone if it were understood that the amendment is agreeable to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who offered the original amendment. If that were understood, unanimous consent could be given that he accept the amendment as a modification of his amendment, notwithstanding the fact that the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I discussed the amendment previous to the closing of the debate on my amendment. I agreed to accept the amendment. If it is not in violation of parliamentary procedure, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the Senator's proposed changes in my amendment may be adopted as a part of the pending amendment

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] that he may accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] as a modification of the pending amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I understand that this suggested procedure would save time?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is modified accordingly. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment under consideration. All time for debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], as modified.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Curtis	Holland
Allott	Daniel	Hruska
Anderson	Dirksen	Humphrey
Barkley	Douglas	Ives
Barrett	Duff	Jackson
Beall	Dworshak	Jenner
Bender	Eastland	Johnson, Tex.
Bennett	Ellender	Johnston, S. C.
Bible	Ervin	Kennedy
Bricker	Flanders	Kerr
Bush	Frear	Knowland
Butler	Fulbright	Kuchel
Byrd	George	Langer
Capehart	Goldwater	Lehman
Carlson	Gore	Long
Case, N. J.	Green	Magnuson
Case, S. Dak.	Hayden	Malone
Chavez	Hennings	Mansfield
Clements	Hickenlooper	Martin, Iowa
Cotton	Hill	Martin, Pa.
McCarthy	Pastore	Smith, N. J.
McClellan	Payne	Sparkman
McNamara	Potter	Stennis
Millikin	Purtell	Symington
Monroney	Robertson	Thurmond
Morse	Russell	Thye
Mundt	Saltonstall	Watkins
Murray	Schoeppel	Welker
Neely	Scott	Wiley
Neuberger	Smathers	Williams
O'Mahoney	Smith, Maine	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, out of the time allotted to me on the bill I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Kansas to yield to me for several questions, if I may, because it seems to me that may be the quickest way to get the information into the RECORD.

The first question is, What happens to those farmers who plant 15 acres or less of wheat and, therefore, do not vote and are not cooperators under the terms of the 1938 act, as amended?

Mr. CARLSON. I would say to the Senator from Florida that they are in the same position under this proposal as they are under the pending agricultural bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. How do they obtain certificates? Under what provision of the bill? Will the Senator be good enough to point that out for the RECORD?

Mr. CARLSON. Under the pending amendment, the Secretary of Agriculture issues allocations to States, to counties, and to individual farmers, just as it is done at the present time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator knows that those who have less than 15 acres of wheat have no acreage allotment.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct; and they would not have an acreage allotment under the amendment, unless they wished to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Suppose they wanted to have a price support in the same proportion on their allotment as the other producers are allowed? How could they accomplish that under the proposed amendment?

Mr. CARLSON. They would have to get their allocations. They would not be entitled to any benefits unless they were under the program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the Senator telling us that, insofar as wheatgrowers who have 15 acres or less in wheat are not under the program and cannot receive a certificate, they would not, therefore, participate in the 100-percent support for the same percentage of their crops the larger growers would have?

Mr. CARLSON. I think I should invite the Senator's attention to paragraph (c) on page 4 of the amendment, from which I read:

(c) The county domestic food quota for wheat shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on which wheat has been seeded for the production of wheat during any 1 or more of the 3 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the marketing year for which the quota is proclaimed begins, on the basis of the normal yield of the acreage planted to wheat during such 3-year period.

The reserve provided under subsection (b)—

That is what we have under the present law—

shall be used to adjust farm quotas which the committee determines to be inequitable on the basis of tillable acres, crop rotation practices, type of soil, and topography.

Mr. HOLLAND. On looking at section 380 (d) I find no provision whatever which appears to me to include those who plant 15 acres of wheat or less. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator to point out in section 380 (d) any words which he thinks would permit the small growers to participate.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator does not contend that the 15-acre farmer at the present time is outside acreage allotments; does he? The only thing he is free from is penalty.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it the intention of the distinguished Senator to say that under section 380 (d) the small growers are given the same chance to get marketing certificates as are the large growers?

Mr. CARLSON. It is not only my understanding, but I think that is the way it is going to work.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not clear on this, but it appears to me on looking at the wording that it applies only to those growers who are under quota. My understanding is that it would not clearly permit the small growers to come under the marketing provision.

Mr. CARLSON. Under this amendment, marketing quotas are prohibited.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I go to the next point, although I am not fully satisfied on the point I have raised, I may say to my distinguished friend.

On the next point I should like to ask this question: Is it the understanding of the Senator from Kansas that the amendment would allow 100-percent price supports on all that portion of the domestic production of wheat by the cooperators which would be used for domestic food purposes?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it the Senator's understanding that that would constitute a little more than half of the normal average crop of wheat?

Mr. CARLSON. I understand that last year there was a production of some 983 million bushels of wheat——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then the Senator is of the opinion that slightly more than half of the total production of a normal year goes into domestic consumption as human food?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. At 100 percent?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it the Senator's intention to provide a support price for all the rest of the wheat crop not used for human food; namely, feed, seed, and for export, which could not be less than the support price for corn in that particular year? Is that the Senator's intention?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator knows, does he not, that the support price for corn this year is 81 percent?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I ask the distinguished Senator if this conclusion is not inescapable: Since slightly more than half of the entire crop will have a 100 percent price support under his amendment, and slightly less than half of it will have a price support in this year of 81 percent of parity, the average will be more than a 90 percent of parity support for the entire wheat crop this year?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am addressing my question to the distinguished Senator from Kansas. I shall be glad to yield later to the Senator from South Dakota if I have the time remaining.

It seems to me, Mr. President, inescapable that the program advanced by the able Senator from Kansas comprises a more than 90 percent price support this year—90½ percent, as the able Senator from Rhode Island suggests—and will be greater if we estimate that the amount of wheat for human food will exceed 50 percent of the total.

The Senator recalls, of course, that the Senate has already rejected a price-support program of 90 percent for this year. How does the Senator expect the Senate, in view of the philosophy it has followed, to adopt a program which confessedly supports wheat at more than 90 percent of parity for the entire production?

Mr. CARLSON. I think the Senator is absolutely incorrect in that statement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator explain just what price support for this particular year the Senator's amendment proposes to provide?

Mr. CARLSON. In the first place, the Secretary would set the figure. It would not go into effect until 1957, if two-thirds of the farmers voted for the amendment I have offered in lieu of the amendment in this particular section. Then the Secretary, even if two-thirds of the farmers of the Nation voted for this type of program, determined it should not be placed into effect, he could do so. That amendment was adopted as part of my amendment. No one knows what the corn parity price will be in 1957.

Mr. HOLLAND. We know what it is for this year. It is 81 percent.

Mr. CARLSON. It will not go into effect this year.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought it had already been announced this year as 81 percent.

Mr. CARLSON. For corn, probably; but this particular piece of proposed legislation will not go into effect this year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator from Kansas tell me what the amendment envisages?

Mr. CARLSON. The amendment provides only for a referendum among the wheatgrowers of the Nation for 1957. If they want to enter into this type of program, two-thirds of the wheat farmers of the Nation must vote for it. The Secretary of Agriculture then can place it into effect. But if he says it should not go into effect, it will not go into effect.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is this, then, a correct interpretation of the Senator's amendment, remembering that the support price this year for wheat is set at 76 percent——

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. That the growers would be asked whether they would prefer a continuance of the 76-percent program, under which they get 76 percent, or want a program under which they would get 81 or 91 percent, which is something new?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CARLSON. There is no possibility, in my opinion, of this program providing 90 percent of parity or more even for wheat used for human consumption for the reason that the feed price of grain today, on the average, is less than that. The farmers would be fortunate if they got 75 percent.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, the Senator feels, does he, that although the price support for corn is 81 percent this year, and although we are trying to provide a remedial measure under which the values of farm prices will increase instead of diminish, it is not proper to consider that for next year, 1957, 81 percent of parity or more would be the price support for corn?

Mr. CARLSON. Of course, I cannot anticipate that. I do not know what it would be. The farmers are now voting on this program. They voted in 1954 whether they wanted to go from 90 percent to 82 percent, and last year from 82 percent to 76 percent.

It is not easy to tell a wheat farmer, "Either you will take 50 percent, or else you will take what we are offering." Why is it not fair to let them vote whether they want to try this type of program?

Mr. HOLLAND. Without differing unequivocally with the Senator as to whether a referendum should be held or not, the referendum which was held last year, for example, was on the question of whether wheat was to have a 76 percent price support or, instead, cut off price support altogether.

Mr. CARLSON. Or to go back to 50 percent.

Mr. HOLLAND. Here it is proposed to have a referendum as to whether the farmers want to stay under the present system or change to a system under which they would be provided a 90 percent price support.

Mr. CARLSON. On page 11, line 20, the amendment provides:

(2) The price levels at which corn and other feed grains are being supported and the feed value of such grains in relation to wheat.

That provision must be taken into consideration by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think we understand that. The point I am getting at is

that if the price of corn did not go up, even if the program were not successful in any measure at all to raise the price of corn to the farmers, the corn farmers would still have an 81 percent support price. If that were made applicable under the program, I call attention to the fact that the present average price support would be above 90 percent. It seems to the Senator from Florida that the amendment is worse, even, than the one which the Senate already has rejected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think there might be a modification of the conclusion which the Senator has reached, when he recalls that corn is supported at different prices according to the area in which it is grown. The 81 percent applies only to the commercial corn area. Corn grown in the noncommercial corn areas is supported at a lower rate. I think it is 75 percent of the rate in the corn area.

Then, when the Daniel amendment is applied, it seems to me that the feed grain is a proportion of the corn. So I do not think one would get the full 81 percent figure for the comparison.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator for his comment. I think the Senator is also overlooking the fact that in the case of wheat, there is a noncommercial area; and under the bill it is proposed to be enlarged considerably above what it is now.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from South Dakota also, because I think what I am about to say will supplement the point he has just made.

I call to the attention of the Senator from Florida that, according to my understanding, the corn price at $1.40 as of now is comparable to 81 percent of parity for corn. But $1.40 for wheat, which is what the wheat producers would get under the existing formula, would be about 60 percent of parity for wheat. That is, $1.40 wheat compared with the $1.40 corn is a much lower parity for wheat than it is for corn.

One dollar and forty cent corn is about 81 percent of parity for corn; but $1.40 for wheat would be about 60 percent of parity for wheat.

I do not think that in his 90-percent figure the Senator from Florida has taken into account that the formula pegged to the price of corn is on the basis of dollars and cents per bushel.

Mr. HOLLAND. My understanding is that it is predicated upon the feed value; and the feed value of wheat is closely comparable with that of corn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas, as modified by the proposal of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. The clerk will read the amendment as modified.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 14, it is proposed to insert the following new section 102a:

"WHEAT—DOMESTIC PARITY

"SEC. 102a. Title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended (1) by changing the designation thereof to read as follows: 'Title III—Loans, Parity Payments, Consumer Safeguards, Marketing Quotas, and Marketing Certificates'; (2) by changing the designation of subtitle D thereof to read as follows: 'Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Provisions and Appropriations'; and (3) by inserting after subtitle C a new subtitle D, as follows:

" 'SUBTITLE D—WHEAT MARKETING CERTIFICATES

" 'LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS

" 'SEC. 380a. Wheat, in addition to being a basic food, is one of the great export crops of American agriculture and its production for domestic consumption and for export is essential to the maintenance of a sound national economy and to the general welfare. The movement of wheat from producer to consumer, in the form of the commodity or any of the products thereof, is preponderantly in interstate and foreign commerce. That small percentage of wheat which is produced and consumed within the confines of any State is normally comingled with, and always bears a close and intimate commercial and competitive relationship to, that quantity of such commodity which moves in interstate and foreign commerce. For this reason, any regulation of intrastate commerce in wheat is a regulation of commerce which is in competition with, or which otherwise affects, obstructs, or burdens, interstate commerce in that commodity. In order to provide an adequate and balanced flow of wheat in interstate and foreign commerce and thereby assist farmers in obtaining parity of income by marketing wheat for domestic consumption at parity prices and by increased exports at world prices, and to assure consumers an adequate and steady supply of wheat at fair prices, it is necessary to regulate all commerce in wheat in the manner provided under the marketing certificate plan set forth in this subtitle.

" 'DOMESTIC FOOD QUOTA

" 'SEC. 380b. Not later than July 1 of each calendar year the Secretary shall determine and proclaim the domestic food quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning in the next calendar year. Such domestic food quota shall be that number of bushels of wheat which the Secretary determines will be consumed as human food in the continental United States during such marketing year.

" 'APPORTIONMENT OF DOMESTIC FOOD QUOTA

" 'SEC. 380c. (a) The domestic food quota for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 1 percent thereof for apportionment as provided in this subsection, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States on the basis of the total production of wheat in each State during the 10 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for adverse weather conditions and for trends in production during such period. The reserve quota set aside herein for apportionment by the Secretary shall be used to establish quotas for counties, in addition to the county quotas established under subsection (b) of this section, on the basis of the relative needs of counties for additional quota because of reclamation and other new areas coming into the production of wheat during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed.

" '(b) The State domestic food quota for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 3 percent thereof for apportionment as provided in subsection (c), shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties in the State on the basis of the total production of wheat in each county during the 10 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for adverse weather conditions and for trends in production during such period.

" '(c) The county domestic food quota for wheat shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on which wheat has been seeded for the production of wheat during any one or more of the 10 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the marketing year for which the quota is proclaimed begins, on the basis of the normal yield of the acreage planted to wheat during such 10-year period. The reserve provided under subsection (b) shall be used to adjust farm quotas which the county committee determines to be inequitable on the basis of tillable acres, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and topography.

" 'MARKETING CERTIFICATES

" 'SEC. 380d. (a) The Secretary shall prepare for issuance in each county marketing certificates aggregating the amount of the county domestic food quota. Such certificates shall be issued to cooperators in an amount equal to the domestic food quota established for the farm pursuant to the applicable provisions of section 380c of this act. The marketing certificates for a farm shall be issued to the farm operator, but the Secretary may authorize the issuance of marketing certificates to individual producers on any farm on the basis of their respective shares in the wheat crop, or the proceeds thereof, produced on the farm. The Secretary shall also issue and sell marketing certificates in such quantities as may be required to persons processing wheat into food products. Marketing certificates shall be transferable only in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary.

" '(b) Whenever a domestic food quota is proclaimed for any marketing year pursuant to section 380b of this act, the Secretary shall determine and proclaim for such marketing year (1) the estimated parity price and the estimated farm price for wheat, and (2) the value of the marketing certificate. The value of the marketing certificate shall be equal to the amount by which the estimated parity price exceeds the estimated farm price as determined herein. The value of the marketing certificate shall be computed to the nearest cent. The proclamation required by this subsection shall be made during the month of June immediately preceding the marketing year for which such domestic food quota is proclaimed.

" '(c) The Secretary is authorized and directed through the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy and sell marketing certificates issued for any marketing year at the value proclaimed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. For the purpose of facilitating the purchase and sale of certificates, the Secretary may establish and operate a pool or pools and he may also authorize public and private agencies to act as his agents, either directly or through the pool or pools. Certificates shall be valid to cover sales and importations of products made during the marketing year with respect to which they are issued and after being once used to cover such sales and importations shall be canceled by the Secretary. Any unused certificates shall be redeemed by the Secretary at the price established for such certificates.

" 'MARKETING RESTRICTIONS

" 'SEC. 380e. (a) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, all persons engaged in the processing of wheat into food products composed wholly or partly of wheat are

hereby prohibited from marketing any such product for domestic food consumption or export containing wheat in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 380 of this act have been acquired by such person.

"'(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, all persons are hereby prohibited from importing or bringing into the continental United States any food products containing wheat in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 380d of this act have been acquired by such person.

"'(c) Upon the exportation from the continental United States of any food product containing wheat, with respect to which marketing certificates as required herein have been acquired, the Secretary shall pay to the exporter an amount equal to the value of the certificates for the quantity of wheat so exported in the food product. For the purposes of this subsection, the consignor named in the bill of lading, under which the article is exported, shall be considered the exporter: *Provided, however,* That any other person may be considered to be the exporter if the consignor named in the bill of lading waives claim in favor of such other person.

"'(d) Upon the giving of a bond satisfactory to the Secretary under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe to secure the purchase of and payment for such marketing certificates as may be required, any person required to have a marketing certificate in order to market or import a food product composed wholly or partly of wheat may market or import any such commodity without having first acquired a marketing certificate.

"'(e) As used in section 380e of this title, the term "marketing" means the sale and the delivery of the food product composed wholly or partly of wheat.

"'CONVERSION FACTORS

"'SEC. 380f. The Secretary shall ascertain and establish conversion factors showing the amount of wheat contained in food products processed wholly or partly from wheat. The conversion factor for any such product shall be determined upon the basis of the weight of wheat used in the processing of such product.

"'CIVIL PENALTIES

"'SEC. 380g. Any person who violates or attempts to violate, or who participates or aids in the violation of, any of the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of section 380e of this act shall forfeit to the United States a sum equal to three times the market value, at the time of the commission of such act, of the product involved in such violation. Such forfeiture shall be recoverable in a civil suit brought in the name of the United States.

"'ADJUSTMENTS IN DOMESTIC FOOD QUOTAS

"'SEC. 380h. If the Secretary has reason to believe that because of a national emergency or because of a material increase in demand for wheat, the domestic food quota for wheat should be increased or suspended, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine whether the increase or suspension is necessary in order to meet such emergency or increase in the demand for wheat. If, on the basis of such investigation, the Secretary finds that such increase or suspension is necessary, he shall immediately proclaim such finding (and if he finds an increase is necessary, the amount of the increase found by him to be necessary) and thereupon such quotas shall be increased or shall be suspended, as the case may be. In case any domestic food quota for wheat is increased under this section, each farm quota for wheat shall be increased in the same ratio and marketing certificates shall be issued therefor in accordance with section 380d of this act. In case any domestic food quota for wheat is suspended under this section, the Secretary may redetermine the value of marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 380d of this act.

"'REPORTS AND RECORDS

"'SEC. 380i. (a) The provisions of section 373 of this act shall apply to all persons, except wheat producers, who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle, except that any such person failing to make any report or keep any record as required by this section or making any false report or record shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000 for each such violation.

"'(b) The provisions of section 373 (b) of the act shall apply to all wheat farmers who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle.

"'REFERENDUM

"'SEC. 380j. In the referendum held pursuant to section 336 of this act on the national marketing quota proclaimed for the 1957 crop of wheat, the Secretary shall also submit the question whether farmers favor a marketing certificate program under this subtitle in lieu of marketing quotas under subtitle B. If more than two-thirds of the farmers voting in the referendum favor such marketing certificate program, the Secretary may, prior to the effective date of the national marketing quota proclaimed under subtitle B, suspend the operation of such quota and place into effect a marketing certificate program for the 1957 and subsequent wheat crops under the provisions of this subtitle, in which event marketing quotas and acreage allotments shall not be in effect for wheat under subtitle B.

"'PRICE SUPPORT

"'SEC. 380k. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"'(a) Whenever a wheat marketing certificate program under this subtitle is in effect, price support for wheat shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

"'(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make available through loans, purchases, or other operations, price support to producers of wheat who are cooperators. The amount, terms, conditions, and extent of such price-support operations shall be determined by the Secretary, except that the level of such support shall be determined after taking into consideration the following factors: (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which corn and other feed grains are being supported and the feed value of such grains in relation to wheat, (3) the provisions of any international agreement relating to wheat to which the United States is a party, (4) foreign trade policies of friendly wheat exporting countries, and (5) other factors affecting international trade in wheat including exchange rates and currency regulations.

"'(c) Compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices (excluding marketing quotas) may be prescribed and required by the Secretary as a condition of eligibility for price support and for the receipt of wheat marketing certificates.'"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent in the State, and, if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—54

Allott	Hayden	Monroney
Barkley	Hennings	Morse
Barrett	Hill	Mundt
Beall	Hruska	Murray
Bible	Humphrey	Neely
Carlson	Jackson	Neuberger
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Clements	Kerr	Schoeppel
Curtis	Langer	Scott
Daniel	Lehman	Sparkman
Douglas	Long	Stennis
Dworshak	Magnuson	Symington
Ellender	Mansfield	Thurmond
Ervin	McCarthy	Thye
Frear	McClellan	Welker
Fulbright	McNamara	Wiley
George	Millikin	Young

NAYS—39

Aiken	Eastland	Martin, Iowa
Anderson	Flanders	Martin, Pa.
Bender	Goldwater	Pastore
Bennett	Gore	Payne
Bricker	Green	Potter
Bush	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Butler	Holland	Robertson
Byrd	Ives	Saltonstall
Capehart	Jenner	Smathers
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kuchel	Watkins
Duff	Malone	Williams

NOT VOTING—2

Bridges Kefauver

So Mr. CARLSON'S amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

Mr. MORSE. I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Kansas to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia desire to have the amendment stated, or does he request that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no desire to have the amendment read in its entirety.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well; then, instead of having the amendment read, it will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The amendment submitted by Mr. RUSSELL is as follows:

On page 46, between lines 5 and 6, insert a new title as follows:

"TITLE VI—COTTON

"SEC. 601. Part IV of subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'PART IV—COTTON MARKETING CERTIFICATES

"'LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS

"'SEC. 341. American cotton is a basic source of clothing and industrial products used by every person in the United States

and by substantial numbers of people in foreign countries. American cotton is sold on a worldwide market and moves from the places of production almost entirely in interstate and foreign commerce to processing establishments located throughout the world.

"'Fluctuations in supplies of cotton and the marketing of excessive supplies of cotton in interstate and foreign commerce disrupt the orderly marketing of cotton in such commerce with consequent injury to and destruction of such commerce. Excessive supplies of cotton directly and materially affect the volume of cotton moving in interstate and foreign commerce with consequent diminution of the volume of such commerce in industrial products.

"'Conditions affecting the production and marketing of cotton are such that, without Federal assistance, farmers, individually or in cooperation, cannot effectively prevent the recurrence of excessive supplies and the resulting depression of prices. Existing programs of assistance to farmers have resulted in the accumulation of large surpluses in the hands of Government agencies.

"'It is in the interest of the general welfare and necessary to the free flow of interstate and foreign commerce that producers of cotton be assured a fair return for their product, and that disposition in world markets of existing surpluses as well as future production in excess of domestic requirements be encouraged.

"'In order to provide an adequate and balanced flow of cotton in interstate and foreign commerce and thereby assist farmers in obtaining parity of income by marketing cotton for domestic consumption at parity prices and by increased exports at world prices, and to assure consumers an adequate and steady supply of cotton at fair prices, it is necessary to regulate all commerce in cotton in the manner provided under the marketing certificate plan set forth in this subtitle.

"'DOMESTIC QUOTA

"'SEC. 342. Whenever during any calendar year the Secretary determines that the total supply of cotton for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year, the Secretary shall proclaim such fact and a national domestic quota shall be in effect for the crop of cotton produced in the next calendar year. The Secretary shall also determine and specify in such proclamation the amount of the domestic quota for cotton which shall be equal to the number of pounds of cotton which he determines will be processed in the United States during such marketing year for consumption in the United States, except that (1) for any year for which the Secretary determines that the amount of cotton owned by or pledged to the Commodity Credit Corporation exceeds 3,500,000 bales such domestic quota shall be equal to 90 percent of the number of pounds which he determines will be so processed, and (2) in no case shall such domestic quota be less than 5 billion pounds. Such proclamation shall be made not later than October 15 of the calendar year in which such determination is made.

"'REFERENDUM

"'SEC. 343. Not later than December 15 following the issuance of the proclamation provided for in section 342, the Secretary shall conduct a referendum, by secret ballot, of farmers engaged in the production of cotton in the calendar year in which the referendum is held, to determine whether such farmers are in favor of or opposed to the domestic quota so proclaimed. If more than one-third of the farmers voting in the referendum oppose the domestic quota, such quota shall become ineffective upon proclamation of the results of the referendum. The Secretary shall proclaim the results of any referendum held hereunder within 30 days after the date of such referendum.

"'APPORTIONMENT OF DOMESTIC QUOTA

"'SEC. 344. (a) The domestic quota for cotton shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States on the basis of the amount of cotton produced in such States during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the domestic quota is proclaimed, with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions during such period.

"'(b) The State domestic quota for cotton shall be apportioned to counties on the same basis as to years and conditions as is applicable to the State under subsection (a), except that the State committee may reserve not to exceed 10 percent of its State domestic quota (15 percent in the case of Oklahoma) which shall be used to make adjustments in county allotments for trends in production, for counties adversely affected by abnormal conditions affecting planting, or for small or new farms, or to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship.

"'(c) (1) The county domestic allotment, less not to exceed the percentage provided for in paragraph (2), shall be apportioned to farms on which cotton has been planted, or with respect to which notice has been given as provided in paragraph (3), in any 1 of the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined, on the basis of the highest amount of cotton produced on each such farm in any 1 of such 3 years, except that the domestic allotment for any farm on which cotton has been produced in each of the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined shall not be less than 1,000 pounds.

"'(2) The county committee may reserve not in excess of 15 percent of the county allotment which, in addition to the amount made available from the reserve established under subsection (b), shall be used for (A) establishing allotments for farms on which cotton was not produced, and with respect to which no notice was given in accordance with paragraph (3), during any of the 3 calendar years immediately preceding the year for which the domestic allotment is made, on the basis of land, labor, and equipment available for the production of cotton, crop rotation practices, and the soil and other physical facilities affecting the production of cotton; and (B) making adjustments of the farm domestic allotments established under paragraph (1) so as to establish allotments which are fair and reasonable in relation to the factors set forth in this paragraph and abnormal conditions of production on such farms, or in making adjustments in farm domestic allotments to correct inequities and to prevent hardships.

"'(3) In any case in which, during any year for which a domestic allotment is made under this subsection, no cotton is produced on a farm for which any such allotment is made and the owner and operator of such farm shall have given notice in writing thereof in such form and at such time as may be prescribed by the Secretary, there shall be deemed for the purposes of this section to have been produced during such year on such farms an amount of cotton equal to the amount produced on such farm in the most recent year in which cotton was actually produced on such farm. No part of the domestic allotment of any farm for any year with respect to which a notice is given under this paragraph shall be reassigned for such year to any other farm.

"'(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section no amount of cotton produced on any farm in excess of the domestic allotment for such farm shall be taken into account in establishing future State, county, and farm domestic allotments.

"'(e) State and county committees shall make available for inspection by owners or operators of farms receiving domestic allotments all records pertaining to cotton acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

"'MARKETING CERTIFICATES

"'SEC. 345. (a) The Secretary shall prepare for issuance in each county cotton marketing certificates aggregating the amount of the county domestic quota. Such certificates shall be issued for each farm in an amount equal to the domestic quota established for the farm pursuant to the applicable provisions of section 344 of this act. The marketing certificates for a farm shall be issued to the farm operator, but the Secretary may authorize the issuance of marketing certificates to individual producers on any farm on the basis of their respective shares in the cotton crop, or the proceeds thereof, produced on the farm. The Secretary shall also issue and sell marketing certificates in such quantities as may be required to importers of cotton products and persons processing cotton into cotton products. Marketing certificates shall be transferable only in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary.

"'(b) Whenever a domestic quota is proclaimed for any marketing year pursuant to section 342 of this act, the Secretary shall determine and proclaim for such marketing year (1) the estimated parity price and the estimated farm price for cotton, and (2) the value of the marketing certificate. The value of the marketing certificate shall be equal to the amount by which the estimated parity price exceeds the estimated farm price as determined herein. The value of the marketing certificate shall be computed to the nearest cent. The proclamation required by this subsection shall be made during the month of July immediately preceding the marketing year for which such domestic quota is proclaimed.

"'(c) The Secretary is authorized and directed through the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy and sell marketing certificates issued for any marketing year at the value proclaimed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. For the purpose of facilitating the purchase and sale of certificates, the Secretary may establish and operate a pool or pools and he may also authorize public and private agencies to act as his agents, either directly or through the pool or pools. Certificates shall be valid to cover sales and importations of products made during the marketing year with respect to which they are issued and after being once used to cover such sales and importations shall be canceled by the Secretary. Any unused certificates shall be redeemed by the Secretary at the face value thereof.

"'MARKETING RESTRICTIONS

"'SEC. 346. (a) All persons engaged in the processing of cotton into products composed wholly or partly of cotton are hereby prohibited from marketing any such product for domestic consumption or export containing cotton in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 345 of this act have been acquired by such person.

"'(b) All persons are hereby prohibited from importing or bringing into the continental United States any products containing cotton in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 345 of this act have been acquired by such person.

"'(c) Upon the exportation from the continental United States of any product containing cotton, the Secretary shall pay to the exporter an amount equal to the value of the certificates for the quantity of cotton so exported. For the purposes of this subsection, the consignor named in the bill of lading, under which the article is exported, shall be considered the exporter: *Provided,*

however, That any other person may be considered to be the exporter if the consignor named in the bill of lading waives claim in favor of such other person.

" 'CONVERSION FACTORS

" 'SEC. 347. The Secretary shall promulgate rules and regulations for determining the amount of cotton contained in products processed wholly or partly from cotton, and wherever practicable shall ascertain and establish conversion factors for such purposes based upon the weight of cotton used in the processing of such products.

" 'CIVIL PENALTIES

" 'SEC. 348. Any person who violates or attempts to violate, or who participates or aids in the violation of, any of the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of section 346 of this act shall forfeit to the United States a sum equal to three times the market value, at the time of the commission of such act, of the product involved in such violation. Such forfeiture shall be recoverable in a civil suit brought in the name of the United States.

" 'ADJUSTMENTS IN DOMESTIC QUOTAS

" 'SEC. 349. If the Secretary has reason to believe that because of a national emergency or because of a material increase in demand for cotton, the domestic quota for cotton should be increased or suspended, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine whether the increase or suspension is necessary in order to meet such emergency or increase in the demand for cotton. If, on the basis of such investigation, the Secretary finds that such increase or suspension is necessary, he shall immediately proclaim such finding (and if he finds an increase is necessary, the amount of the increase found by him to be necessary) and thereupon such quotas shall be increased or shall be suspended, as the case may be. In case any domestic quota for cotton is increased under this section, each farm quota for cotton shall be increased in the same ratio and marketing certificates shall be issued therefor in accordance with section 345 of this act. In case any domestic quota for cotton is suspended under this section, the Secretary may redetermine the value of marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 345 of this act.'

"SEC. 602. The foregoing provisions of this title shall be effective with respect to cotton marketed during the marketing year beginning in 1957 and subsequent marketing years.

"SEC. 603. The provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 relating to price support shall not be applicable with respect to cotton produced during any year in which domestic quotas are in effect under the provisions of part IV of subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

"INAPPLICABLE TO EXTRA LONG STAPLE COTTON

"SEC. 604. The foregoing provisions of this title shall not apply to extra long staple cotton which is produced from pure strain varieties of the Barbadense species, or any hybrid thereof, or other similar types of extra long staple cotton designated by the Secretary having characteristics needed for various end uses for which American upland cotton is not suitable, and grown in irrigated cotton-growing regions of the United States designated by the Secretary or other areas designated by the Secretary as suitable for the production of such varieties or types, and the existing provisions of part IV of subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, insofar as they relate to such extra long staple cotton, shall continue in effect as though this title had not been enacted.

"QUOTA FOR COTTON PRODUCTS

"SEC. 605. (a) In addition to any other tax or duty imposed by law, there is hereby imposed upon articles imported into the United States from any foreign country, which are manufactured in whole or in part from cotton, a tax of 12 cents per pound on the cotton contained in such articles.

"(b) The tax imposed by this section shall be collected only in the case of articles imported into the United States, from a foreign country during any calendar year beginning after December 31, 1956, after there shall have been imported into the United States from such country during such calendar year articles containing an amount of cotton equal in weight to the amount of cotton contained in articles manufactured in whole or in part from cotton and imported into the United States during the calendar year 1952.

"(c) The taxes imposed by this section shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid in the same manner as a duty imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930 and shall be treated for the purposes of all provisions of law relating to the customs revenue as a duty imposed by such act."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, instead of having the amendment read in its entirety, I can simply say that the amendment undertakes to apply to cotton the same wise and salutary provisions we have just voted to have applied to wheat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has 1 hour under his control on the amendment. How much time does he yield to himself?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield briefly to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the chairman of the committee, if in doing so I do not prejudice my right to the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week I submitted an amendment to strike out the rice title of the bill. However, in view of the vote today on the two-price system on wheat, I see no good purpose in striking the rice title from the bill, because we might just as well treat one commodity in the same way that we treat another. Under the circumstances, although I will vote against the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I shall certainly interpose no objection to the amendment; and so far as I am concerned, we can proceed to vote on the amendment without having very much discussion of it, because the Senate has fairly well indicated its feelings and its viewpoint with respect to the two-price system.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Georgia yield to himself?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall not take very much of the time of the Senate to discuss the gravity of the situation confronting the Senate as it deals with farm legislation.

Mr. President, regardless of whether Senators have favored rigid supports or flexible supports of the soil-bank plan, there is not a Member of this body who does not know that a very grave sickness is afflicting the agricultural economy of our Nation. That is the reason for the farm bill. The RECORD is full of statements and statistics which have been provided by Senators who have compiled them, showing the dire need for drastic remedial measures to restore the American farmer to the prosperity which the rest of the American people are enjoying today.

As I set forth in the brief statement I made in support of the wheat amendment, I am convinced that neither the 90 percent of parity system nor the flexible support system is the answer to the farm problem, because in time it will be necessary to get the Government out of the farming business, insofar as handling huge farm crops is concerned. The system we have voted to employ for wheat, and which I now propose be employed with respect to cotton, will accomplish that purpose.

Mr. President, my amendment proposes that the domestic parity program be applied to cotton. I supported the wheat amendment; but I say with all due deference that it is much simpler to apply the program to cotton than it is to apply it to wheat, because of the fact that in the case of cotton we do not have the complication of competing feed grains involved in the production, over and above the domestic consumption. I am satisfied that that problem can be eliminated with respect to wheat. I am glad that it does not exist with respect to cotton, because all the cotton consumed domestically in the United States must be processed. None of it is used for food, and none of it is consumed unless it has been processed by fabricators, who will be compelled to purchase certificates, just as certificates will be purchased in the case of wheat purchased for milling, which provides the main basis of support for the amendment which has just been adopted.

Mr. President, I can see no conceivable objection which can be raised with respect to this amendment, in view of the action the Senate has just taken on the wheat amendment. In fact, Mr. President, I go a little further than did my friend, the Senator from Kansas, in the case of the wheat amendment. In the case of this amendment, Mr. President, I provide that the domestic allotment shall be only 90 percent of the 10 million bales, so that the Government will be able to work off 1 million bales of the surplus at full parity in the domestic consumption, until the cotton carryover is reduced to 3½ million bales, which is below the average normal carryover in the United States.

By means of this amendment, I provide for the Government an opportunity to dispose of the surplus cotton at full parity under a reasonable program of 1 million bales a year, in addition to the amount which can be sold in export.

Mr. President, the time has passed when we should, by means of a bill passed by this body—and to the detriment of American wheat farmers and cotton farmers—hold over the heads of the producers in other lands—some of whom maintain their operations with Ameri-

can dollars which were wrung from the same American farmers—an umbrella which will enable the producers in foreign lands to increase their production, and to do so at the expense of the American farmers, and thus take away the foreign markets which for so long have been an integral part of our agricultural economy. Our cotton farmers have not enjoyed an agreement similar to the International Wheat Agreement, because we were never able to reach an international accord with respect to cotton.

But, Mr. President, this amendment, simply stated, guarantees to the farmer full parity for the domestic consumption of cotton. It takes the Government completely out of the loan and support fields, when dealing with cotton. The amendment will permit all the cotton to move in the domestic market at the world price level, without any let or hindrance or Government interference.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Would not it amount to holding an umbrella over the world market, if we set the price at 75 percent or 80 percent of parity?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, with respect to world production.

Mr. YOUNG. Once the price is set at 75 percent or 80 percent of parity—or at 87 percent of parity, as the Secretary of Agriculture proposes—that price becomes the world price.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; in the case of cotton the price of foreign cotton always runs slightly below the support price.

Mr. YOUNG. That will be the case, insofar as the foreign producers of cotton are concerned, because they can produce cotton so much more cheaply than cotton can be produced in the United States, can they not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; because their labor costs are so much lower.

Mr. President, when in our country a minimum wage of $1 an hour was fixed it greatly increased the cost of farm labor, and it doubled or tripled the wages which theretofore had been paid. I am glad to have that done, for the sake of the workers; but that increases the cost of producing cotton and reduces the revenue the farmers receive from the production of cotton; and at the same time the revenue the farmers receive from the sale of their other products has been decreasing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me for some questions?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have read the amendment of the Senator from Georgia. I wonder whether he will be willing to clear up some points about it which have caused me some uncertainty.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be happy to undertake to do so to the best of my ability.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that in effect the Senator from Georgia is proposing for cotton what the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] proposed for wheat?

Mr. RUSSELL. I propose essentially a referendum of the cotton farmers as to whether or not they desire to apply this system. Two-thirds of them must vote in the affirmative before the plan becomes applicable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And if they do vote in the affirmative, the domestic proportion of the consumption will be supported at 100 percent of parity.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct; through the certificate program, as in the case of wheat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. To be paid for by what would be, in effect, a processing tax.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Can the Senator from Georgia tell us what proportion of the cotton crop is consumed domestically?

Mr. RUSSELL. It varies with the years, but the average over the past few years has been 10 million bales.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that the annual production?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. That is the annual consumption.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Domestically?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. It has been as high as 12 million bales, and as low as 9 million bales, but the average is about 10 million bales.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the average amount exported?

Mr. RUSSELL. The export, prior to the time the Government started exporting the cotton it was holding, ran anywhere from 3 to 5 million bales.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So, in effect, we consume two-thirds, or probably closer to three-quarters, of the cotton we produce, whereas we consume only about one-half of the wheat we produce.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. I may say that historically, back in the 1920's, and for 80 years prior to 1930, we exported about half the cotton crop, but since that time we have lost our world markets because of the fact that cotton was produced in some of the lowest cost agricultural areas of the world.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I remember, last week the Senator from Vermont read a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture in which the Secretary of Agriculture declared that it would be his policy to support cotton at something like 86 or 87 percent of parity for the coming year. Did I hear that correctly?

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the amendment of the Senator from Georgia supersede that program?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would not for this year. My amendment would be applicable only in 1957. If the amendment is extended over a 2-year period, it will affect the crop for the next year, 1957.

Mr. DOUGLAS. For 1956 then, about three-fourths of the cotton production would be supported at 100 percent of parity. I suppose the foreign market would be supported at 86 percent of parity, so we would have an average support price of well over 90 percent.

Mr. RUSSELL. No. If this amendment goes into effect in 1957, the 86 percent to which the Senator refers will be completely eliminated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What about 1956?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would not be applicable in 1956. It would go into effect only if two-thirds of the farmers should vote favorably in a referendum to be held in the fall of this year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So there would be no change in the present act so far as the current crop is concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. We do not take as good care of the cotton farmer as we take of the wheat farmer. For his production in excess of domestic consumption, we do not give the cotton farmer any supports.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the Senator would allow the price in the foreign market to be settled at a competitive level.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. Cotton exported would be sold at the world market, if it is production over domestic needs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator any idea what the price would have to be to enable us to sell a quarter of our cotton in the foreign market, and work off some of the surplus?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not venture a guess. We shall soon know, if the Secretary of Agriculture puts into effect the program he has now. Heretofore, for the past several years, the world price has been 50 points, or half a cent a pound under the American support. Those who call this a dumping program should be violently opposed to the Secretary of Agriculture selling anything overseas now, because this new program of the Secretary's is a dumping program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The doubt in the mind of the Senator from Illinois is this: He feels that a 90 percent price support figure is approximately correct, but he is very dubious about percentages of support in excess of 90 percent, for this reason. In agriculture we have undoubtedly had a greater increase in productivity per man-hour in recent times than in manufacturing. We should consider the relative labor costs per unit of output rather than merely the relative exchange value, so to speak. In view of the great agricultural improvements and the great lowering of production costs, even with labor properly paid—and I want it to be properly paid—there is a real question in my mind as to whether we should peg the price in excess of 90 percent of parity.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the American cotton farmer is compelled to sell one-third of his cotton crop for as little as 15 to 18 cents a pound in world trade, he is certainly entitled to 100 percent of parity with respect to domestic consumption, just as the wheat farmer is.

Mr. DOUGLAS. After some uncertainty I voted for the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] in the case of wheat, because in that instance the crop is divided, roughly, 50–50. That means that although one-half the crop is supported above 90 percent, the average support price would not be above 90 percent of parity. But if, in the case of cotton, three-quarters of the crop is for domestic consumption and one-quarter for export, a price support of 100 percent for domestic consumption would have much greater influence than it would have in the case of wheat and the average support price would be above 90 percent of parity.

Mr. RUSSELL. If this amendment is agreed to, the American cotton farmer will recapture the foreign markets, and the ratio will soon be 50–50. There would be no acreage control.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the acreage control be eliminated completely?

Mr. RUSSELL. The acreage control would be completely eliminated. The cotton farmer would receive an allotment based upon poundage, with the provision that no small farmer shall have an allotment less than a thousand pounds, which is two bales. The allotment is based upon poundage. If he grows more than his domestic allotment, for consumption in this country, he does so at his peril, and must sell at the world price.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 more minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The proposal for bringing the element of poundage into the farm program as a means of control was recommended again and again in our hearings throughout the country. We found that no matter how much acreage control we tried to use, acreage restrictions did not necessarily translate themselves into restrictions of quantity of production, because of the use of fertilizer and modern farming practices. So the idea of using poundage is good, just as the idea of bushelage was good in terms of wheat. Furthermore, I think the fact should be made clear that under the Senator's program there would be no Government storage.

Mr. RUSSELL. There would be no Government storage at all. We would eliminate the charge of $1 million a day for storage, under this amendment, as soon as we worked off the surplus. The farmers would have to take a reduction in production amounting to 1 million bales a year to allow the Government to get 1 million bales into domestic consumption.

Mr. HUMPHREY. With a control on poundage, we would eliminate the necessity for storage, and the ultimate cost of storage.

Mr. RUSSELL. Also we would eliminate the purchase of vast quantities of cotton by the Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We would also liquidate certain specialized programs of the Government, such as that under Public Law 480, under which we are supposedly doing business in foreign markets, but in an unusual manner. We accept soft currencies, when we are not utilizing them to good advantage. Would this proposal not place foreign trade on a regular market basis, as between exporters and importers? Would it not get away from much of the Government-to-government business?

Mr. RUSSELL. Instead of the Government selling cotton in the markets of the world, the people who handle cotton would be selling it in the markets of the world. Let me say to those who talk about getting the Government out of business that this is an opportunity to do so.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. There is to be a referendum or election in the fall. Let us assume that this amendment is adopted. What will the election be in the fall of 1956?

Mr. RUSSELL. It will be as to whether or not the cotton farmers of the Nation wish to accept the domestic parity plan, which provides for supports on their domestically consumed cotton, and no supports on what they produce over and above their domestic allotments.

Mr. EASTLAND. What else will there be on the ballot? What will the other choice be?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the farmers vote it down, they will revert to the existing law. No; I was in error on that statement. It would be the same as if today they had voted down acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the farmers did not vote for this domestic parity plan, then what would be the support price?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be——

Mr. EASTLAND. Fifty-three percent?

Mr. RUSSELL. Anywhere between 52 and 75 percent of parity, depending on what the Secretary of Agriculture would wish to fix.

Mr. EASTLAND. According to my understanding of the amendment——

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand what the Senator is driving at. He wants to make possible an option in the election as between this program and the program which is now contained in the bill for cotton. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is what I thought the proposal was.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be glad to accept an amendment which would bring that about.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have such an amendment. I should like to ask this question of the Senator from Georgia. If the amendment is adopted, what will the support price of cotton be?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Mississippi knows more about what the parity is today than I do. What is the parity on cotton? The Senator is one of our great cotton experts.

Mr. EASTLAND. No, I am not an expert. I do not know. It is 36 or 37 cents a pound, as I understand.

Mr. RUSSELL. Thirty-six or 37 cents a pound; somewhere in that neighborhood.

Mr. EASTLAND. In the Senator's judgment, what effect would a domestic price level like that for cotton have on the synthetic fiber production in this country?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it would have any great effect. In my opinion, cotton has run the gamut, and the synthetic fiber field is very well established, as is the cotton field very well established. I do not share the view of those who hold that we must cut down the price of cotton in the market until all the small cotton farmers are eliminated, because of a fear of the synthetics.

Mr. EASTLAND. No one wants to do that. However, is it not correct to say that beginning on January 1, 1955, contracts were let totaling $155 million for new synthetic plant construction?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not aware of that. However, I do not hold with the fears of those who have raised that specter.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator know that scientists claim that a 2½- or 3-cent reduction in the price of cotton would prevent further synthetic production?

Mr. RUSSELL. I know that some Senators claim that a reduction in the price of cotton of from 2½ cents to 3 cents a pound would stop the onward march of synthetics. I shall not vote to cut the price of cotton by 2½ or 3 cents a pound merely because of the fear of the synthetics, when I know that the small farmer cannot produce enough cotton to exist at present prices.

The largest field for synthetics today is the tire field. Even if we cut the price of cotton by 15 cents, we could never recapture for cotton the tire field from the synthetics. Synthetic rayon, for instance, possess certain qualities, such as tensile strength, which are not possessed by cotton.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator from Georgia says is true. There are special properties of synthetic fibers with which cotton cannot compete. That is also true in the paper trade. There are certain uses for which paper has displaced cotton. However, in the fields in which they are competitive, does not the Senator agree with me that a price reduction of from 2½ cents to 3 cents a pound will prevent a tremendous expansion of synthetic fiber production?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not accept that philosophy at all. I know this much, that an increase of 3 cents a pound in the case of cotton, while it is large enough to benefit the little cotton grower, does not amount to more than a half cent in the price of a shirt or other garment. It amounts to very little in connection with most cotton wrappings.

Mr. EASTLAND. It may not amount to very much on the retail level, but does not the history of the textile industry show that it does make a difference in the spinning, for example, because the rayon fiber is mixed in with the cotton fiber, and that that is one of the reasons for the tremendous expansion of the rayon production?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course if we want to put all the cotton farmers below a certain size out of business, we might be able to recapture the market we have lost to the synthetics.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not believe that a 2½ to 3 cent price reduction will hurt any farmer.

Mr. RUSSELL. In the case of the little farmer who makes two bales, it would take away a considerable percentage of his total annual income.

Mr. EASTLAND. It seems to me the thing that has cut his throat has been the tremendous reduction in the acreage he has had each year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question from the standpoint of the New England textile industry. Some of the textile industry representatives have been in Washington and they have spoken unitedly on the problem of cotton going abroad and coming back in the form of cloth, which makes it utterly impossible for them to compete. Does not the Senator's amendment make that doubly difficult, because they must buy their cotton at the domestic price, whereas cotton is now going to go abroad at cheaper prices?

Mr. RUSSELL. I likewise have a textile industry in my State, and I have the responsibility of representing the interests of that industry on the floor of the Senate. The amendment completely takes care of the processor of cotton, whether he is in Massachusetts, in Georgia, or in North Carolina, because the amendment slaps an absolute embargo on the importation of the foreign products the Senator refers to, and rolls it back to the level of 1952. The cotton mill industry of this country would be greatly benefited by the adoption of the amendment, because it is guaranteed the primacy of the domestic market in the sale of its product.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator mean to say that his amendment puts a quota on the goods which are imported?

Mr. RUSSELL. Absolutely. It puts a limitation on imports, and it rolls them back to the volume of 1952.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When the Senator says it rolls them back, does he refer to the quantity that can come in as being rolled back?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. It is rolled back to what was imported in 1952.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that while the Senator's amendment would put the price at which the New England mill will buy the cotton at the domestic price, the amendment would place a quota on the import of cotton goods?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would prohibit the importation which our cotton processors so greatly fear. It also rolls the importation back to the level of 1952.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When the Senator says the imports are rolled back to 1952, does he know what the importation in 1952 was as compared with what it was in 1955?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not have the exact figure. I know the importations were much larger in 1955 than they were in 1952. I do not have the exact figures. However, there has been a tremendous increase during the past few years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. However, the amendment, if adopted, would put the cost of the domestic cloth up to a higher level because the raw materials would be more expensive. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would to a slight extent, just as in the case of wheat. However, it would completely protect the American textile industry. It would permit it to buy for the foreign market at the world price. Therefore, it would not interfere with its competitive power to sell in the world market.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. We consume in the United States 5 million bales of cotton domestically. Of that, between 500,000 and 600,000 bales are represented by exports of textiles. Has the Senator made any provision to protect those exports?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I just stated to the Senator from Massachusetts, there is a provision that if the American textile manufacturer spins cloth for the world market he does not have to pay the certificate price. He buys his cotton on the competitive level with the spinner in Manchester or Paris or Rouen, France.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A few minutes ago the question was put to the Senator as to what would happen if the elections were held and it was voted down. The farmer would be left in exactly the same shape he would be left in if the election were held last year or the year before. Is that not correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct, Mr. President, I modify my amendment on page 4, line 15, after the word "referendum", by striking out the period and adding the following language: "and the existing provisions of part IV of subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall continue in effect with respect to the ensuing crop as though this title had not been enacted."

That would put the cotton farmer back where he would be under the existing law.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I may not be an expert on agricultural commodities, certainly, not on cotton, but I have checked the figures and find there is an average of 36 acres, which has been set back to 29 acres this year.

I commend the Senator from Georgia for presenting this proposal to the Senate. I think this has been a historic day in the Senate of the United States, so far as agriculture is concerned. I am convinced that we shall have to start dealing with commodity after commodity. That may not be put into effect this year or the year following, but we must look forward to a program which is not based only on rigid price supports or flexible price supports. They are supposed to carry us through a depression or for a period of time. I think the Senator from Georgia is entitled to commendation for bringing his amendment before the Senate, and I shall be glad to support it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am interested in the Senator's remarks concerning the processor paying the world price for cotton. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. Only if he processes it to sell in the world market; yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator have the figures on the average certificate price?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. My amendment provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall fix the certificate price at whatever he thinks will be an adequate amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional 5 minutes of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield myself 10 more minutes, Mr. President.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator know the world price of cotton today?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not, but it will run at about whatever the support price is in this country, on the average.

Mr. GOLDWATER. What I am concerned about is who pays the difference?

Mr. RUSSELL. What difference?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The difference between the certificate price and the world price.

Mr. RUSSELL. The consumer of the cotton goods pays it. It goes into the cost that the miller charges for his goods, just as in the case of wheat. I would not try to deceive the Senator or the Senate on that point. On the average cotton garment, there would be absolutely no justification for any increase whatever.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If it is consumed in the United States the Senator would be correct. What I am concerned about is who pays the loss.

Mr. RUSSELL. What loss?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The difference between the certificate price and what the processor pays for the goods at the world price. I believe there is a difference of possibly 79 cents.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator mean on the export of the processed goods?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. I mean who pays the difference between the certificate price, or what the loan is on cotton, and the world price, which, today, is a difference of around 79 cents.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no loan system under the amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. What does the certificate price indicate?

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that if the world price of cotton were 5 or 6 cents under what it is today it would mean that the certificate cost would be a difference of 5 or 6 cents a pound.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Who would pay it?

Mr. RUSSELL. The processor who buys the certificate would pay it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. And the surplus cotton which the Government owns today——

Mr. RUSSELL. Would be worked off at the rate of a million bales a year, under this provision.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But someone has to take a loss on it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Who is taking the loss on the cotton, in the main, in Georgia

and Arizona which is sold overseas today at a loss? The taxpayer is taking it today, under the present system, and he will continue to take it if we do not adopt such an amendment as I have proposed, and pass an agricultural bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. So far as taking the loss is concerned, the Treasury of the United States is taking the loss when the price of cotton falls to 5 or 6 cents a pound.

Mr. RUSSELL. But this amendment assures that there will be no loss in the future.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. We have to grow cotton in competition with the world, and the situation which exists is that the United States has practically lost the foreign cotton market. We in the West and Southwest can compete in the foreign market, but we have been stuck with the high 90 percent of parity of which our cotton mills are not in favor. We see today the United States having lost its market. I know the intention of the Senator from Georgia is good. I know he is honestly concerned about the situation. I feel that until we get back to a competitive position not supported by the Government in any manner, shape, or form, we will never get the world market.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment would put us into the foreign market without any Government support. There is no limitation or restriction on planting. The cotton farmers in Arizona with whom I have talked—and it happens that I have two or three good farmer friends there—are much more concerned about the acreage reductions. This amendment would absolutely free them from any acreage reduction. It would take away from every cotton farmer anywhere in the United States any loan recourse on the Federal Government. The farmer could not put a pound of cotton under loan.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Someone must pay for it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The grower pays. From here on it does not cost the taxpayer one thin dime. When the Senator was talking about accumulated surpluses, I said that when they are disposed of, there will be a loss. But there is not a dime for the American taxpayer to pay except for the administration of the program. There is no restriction on acreage. The Arizona farmer can produce and sell in the world market as much cotton as he pleases in competition in the world market. The farmers of Georgia will not do it; they will stay within their domestic allotment; but the Arizona farmers can produce for the competitive market with no restrictions whatever on them. The program will not cost the taxpayers a dime.

I think the Senator from Arizona will agree that whether we pass this bill or some other bill, we are going to incur some losses in disposing of the surplus.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his explanation, although I am still a little bit in the dark as to who pays for it.

Mr. RUSSELL. No one pays for it. If the farmer produces more than his quota, he sells it at the world price.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not think there is any doubt that it would cause the cotton manufacturer in New England to pay more for his cotton, but my understanding is that the Senator's amendment seeks to protect him.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. I understand they feel that the way in which the quota provision is drawn it will not give them protection, because it is based on quantity. It will give protection to some of the cotton mills on quantity, but not on quality. I am speaking of quality manufacturers who feel they would pay more, on the one hand, and would not be protected, on the other hand. I am wondering if it is possible to redraw the amendment so as to provide for such a situation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment might have that effect. I do not know the details of that, and I do not know how to approach it, unless we say no more shirts can be imported.

Mr. KENNEDY. I have never been enthusiastic about a quota system, but if the amendment is agreed to we may have to pay more for our cotton, and I should like to see the manufacturers protected from the importation of cheaper goods.

Mr. RUSSELL. My amendment undertakes to do that. It will give them much more protection than they have at present. If some step along this line is not taken, with the price of cotton abroad as low as it is now, we have not seen anything yet in the way of imports compared with what we shall see.

Mr. KENNEDY. But will not the first part of the amendment cause the textile manufacturers to pay more for cotton?

Mr. RUSSELL. They will undoubtedly have to pay 5 or 6 cents a pound more, but they will have a monopoly of the American market.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the section dealing with quotas is not drawn so as to protect them. I can understand why they would be short-changed by the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not see how they can possibly be short-changed.

Mr. KENNEDY. It refers about quantity and rolls the imports back to the 1952 figure.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. But it does not mention the kinds of imported goods which will come into the United States from abroad. The New England manufacturers are, as of today, dealing in quality goods. They want to be given protection. If the quotas were put into classifications, it would give them protection. But they will not be afforded protection if all the classifications are lumped into one total, because the cheaper goods will then come into this country in quantity.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has the Senator from Massachusetts any suggestion to make as to how the amendment could be modified in that respect?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, since other Senators wish to speak, I shall not talk at length. However, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would it not be possible to have the amendment apply to the quotas of 1952, based upon the respective qualities of the goods which came in during that year, so that the imports would not be lumped on a quantity basis, but would be arranged on a selective basis, in the same ratio as the goods previously had come in?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would have to ascertain what effect that would have. I want to deal fairly with every segment of the country which is interested in the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I support what my colleague [Mr. KENNEDY] has said. It is my understanding that on a quantity basis, the industries of New England would not be helped.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to look into the matter as the debate continues. Of course, the amendment must go to conference with the House if it shall be adopted by the Senate. It can be considered there.

I have no purpose to inflict any injury on the New England textile industry, and I really do not think my amendment would do so. I think the fears of the New England textile industry are more imaginary than they are real. But I shall look into the question in an attempt to reassure Senators as to the effect of the amendment.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have been listening to the discussion about the possible effect of the amendment on the textile mills of New England and other parts of the country. I do not believe the amendment would make cotton cost much more for the mills of New England, because I think those mills would stop using cotton. Let us think back 6 or 7 years, to the time when cotton was still used to a greater extent, and the price went up to 36–38 cents a pound. At that time many of our mills shifted to rayon.

As I understand the proposal of the Senator from Georgia, there would be no restrictions upon the planting of cotton under his plan. That means the production of cotton could go from 17 million acres to 42 million acres, which is the amount that was planted some years ago. It means there would be production from those acres which largely would be placed upon the world market, because our own mills in the meantime would have shifted to substitutes.

It means that we would have to seek the markets which are now enjoyed by India, Mexico, Brazil, Egypt, Turkey, and other countries of the world. It means that retaliatory barriers would be set up against us. It means we would have to put up barriers so high that one could not possibly see or get over them, in order to protect the synthetic textile business of the United States.

But more than that, it would mean that when we undertook to destroy the economy of Egypt, of Costa Rica, of Guatemala, of Mexico, of India, and of other countries of the world, we would have to have armed forces greater than those ever dreamed of by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in order to protect the United States. We would disrupt the economy of the entire world.

I am surprised to see those who claim to be internationalists, and those who claim to be friends of foreign countries, take positions which would contribute to the destruction of the economy of the very countries of which they claim to be friends.

Mr. President, I think there should be a record vote on the amendment, and I therefore ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I'm still in doubt as to how I will cast my vote on the proposal of the Senator from Georgia. I am tempted to vote favorably because I happen to believe this may be the least undeserving of several undeserving alternatives.

I said some time ago, when a proposal was offered to have 56 million acres of corn, and when there was a separate proposal on cotton, that when we began to treat the farm people——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, the amendment provides for a tax on the importation of cotton goods into the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor. Does he wish to yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to complete my statement.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish to state that some time ago in the debate I pointed out that if we started to have special deals and special arrangements, commodity by commodity, we would open up a Pandora's box of trouble.

Mr. Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, began this activity, and the chickens are now coming home to roost. Some of those chickens may not look so good, but they are his. I hope the eggs are not all so bad as they sometimes appear to be. But the Secretary asked for this. This is exactly what can be expected, time after time, on commodity after commodity, in the light of what the Senate has started to do.

The committee reported a bill to the Senate. It is one thing to argue about flexible price supports versus rigid price supports. That is a difference of opinion about how the price-support program shall operate. I disagree with those who advocate flexible price supports, but I will say that, at least, they have a system; they have a program.

We have now reached a point where we will have, not a program, but a dozen programs. But Mr. Benson asked for this. I regret that he was so foolish as to ask for this kind of program; but he is about to get it—not with my blessing, I may say, but with his urging.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I first wish to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that all time on the amendment, on both sides of the question, must be used before the point of order can be discussed under the controlled time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I think ultimately we shall have to have some kind of two-price system. I feel kindly toward this proposal, but I really do not think it will work, because it places a support price of 100 percent of parity on cotton. Everyone wants to get as high a price as he can get for the commodity he produces. But it is fundamental that cotton must be competitive with synthetic fibers in the marketplace.

In 1955, alone, the increased consumption of rayon in the United States displaced 978,000 bales of cotton. In other words, in that single year practically one-ninth of the domestic cotton consumption was wiped out.

If we support the cotton prices at 100 percent of parity for 10 million bales, the Treasury of the United States is going to take a big loss right there, because domestic consumption hovers around 9 million bales.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. It will not take much of a loss, because 1 million bales of the Government's cotton is going to be put into this program.

Mr. EASTLAND. One million bales will go out at what price?

Mr. RUSSELL. It will go out at the certificated price.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, but it is going to decrease the consumption of cotton domestically, which is the greatest remaining market the American cotton-grower has.

If we are talking about supporting cotton domestically at 100 percent of parity, then we are talking about 9 million bales. Here we have 10 million bales. In the year 1954–1955 rayon imports into this country increased from 200,000 bales to 450,000 bales. They displaced that much cotton.

The argument is made, "A $5 shirt has just two bits' worth of cotton in it," but the fact remains that the big inroads synthetic fibers have made in the cotton industry have resulted in cotton goods being mixed with rayon. Rayon is cheaper, and a mill will mix it because the mill can make more money by mixing rayon with cotton.

I was amazed to learn that the Cannon Mills, a big towel manufacturer, today for the first time is mixing rayon in the towels it manufactures. That was something unheard of previously, but the mills do it because rayon is just a few cents cheaper.

We must get cotton prices down to the point where it will be competitive with rayon. I would certainly favor a form of two price system based on that objective.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think it is time that we recognized what we are doing to the farm program by the type of legislation which is before the Senate now, and that which was just approved.

I did not vote for the two price system on wheat because I believe if we start doing that for one commodity then we will have two price systems for all agricultural commodities. It is pretty hard, if we vote for 100 percent on wheat, to say we should not vote the same way for another commodity. Placing 100 percent supports on cotton would result in what the Senator from Mississippi has said. It would merely mean a steady chopping away of cotton consumption until there would be a drastic reduction in consumption.

I think it just happens that there is one section in the United States that can stand that sort of deal. That happens to be some of the irrigated sections of California, Arizona, Texas, and the Delta of the Mississippi. It is said that people can produce cotton there for 20 cents. Perhaps they can. If the price is put at 35 cents, it is very apt to result in farmers producing all sorts of free cotton and paying the 50 percent penalty and finding themselves a wide open market. If that is not done, then there will be invited the very thing that has taken place today with regard to rayon.

Consider what happens around the earth. We have almost trouble enough with our international relations without asking for the sort of trouble involved in this amendment. What are we going to do when we have serious problems, with a country like Egypt? Are we going to turn loose on the world several million bales of cotton? Does anybody think we are going to continue a production that tends toward 10 million bales in the United States? The acreage which was allocated last year resulted in a production of 14 or 15 million bales when it was designed to produce 10 million bales. The average production in the past 5 years was 308 pounds per planted acre. Yet last year the harvest was 416 pounds per harvested acre. That goes to show what happens when we turn things loose.

Not long ago there was a prediction made that with the proper use of fertilizer and proper care of the land 700 pounds of cotton to the acre could be produced. When that happens and we start turning loose the product of 15 or 16 million bales of cotton, putting millions of bales of cotton on the world market, what do my colleagues think will happen? I think we would tear down our international relationships pretty rapidly.

We have for a long time needed an export program. It should have been started 3 years ago. We have been told there will be 5 million bales of cotton moving in the next year. I think a program which would move 5 million bales of cotton, with domestic consumption running at 10 million bales, would be a very wonderful thing for the cotton growers of this country. But if 100 percent of parity price supports were put into effect, then the rayon mills could expand almost as rapidly as they wanted to, and take away the American cotton market.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad the Senator from New Mexico mentioned rayon. I entered the Chamber late, and probably missed the figures the Senator cited, but is not the difference enjoyed by rayon between 5 and 10 cents, as compared with the price of cotton?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not keep track of rayon prices, but the per capita consumption of rayon from 1935 to 1939 was 2.5 pounds. From 1940 to 1945 it was 6 pounds. From 1950 to 1954 it was 7 pounds. In 1953 it was 7.7 pounds.

What about the per capita consumption of cotton? That is different. Does the Senate want to accentuate that trend? I do not believe it does.

If the amendment suggested by the Senator is adopted, we will emerge with a bill with which we cannot live. I hope my colleagues will not do it. I think we have made a serious mistake in the matter of wheat. I hope we will not make a mistake in the matter of cotton.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is true that the price advantage enjoyed by rayon as compared with cotton is from 5 to 10 cents. If support prices of 100 percent were put in effect, it would raise that difference to between 9 and 14 cents. The junior Senator from Arizona does not feel that cotton could compete with rayon when there was an advantage of 9 to 14 cents in favor of rayon. I wonder if the Senator from New Mexico agrees with me.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator knows it could not compete. It is tough now to keep some of the cotton consumption going, but if we start putting in that kind of a differential, people are not going to buy cotton, and they cannot be blamed. If that results, we must recognize that cotton will be moving in competition with an industrial empire which has unlimited money for research, whereas in the various cotton bills passed the cotton farmers have never been able to get enough appropriated for research.

I am not singling out the Du Pont Co. particularly, but Du Pont can say, "We will put X million dollars into research." They have done that. They have produced a fine product, but they have done it at the expense of some of the historical cotton sections of the United States.

I believe adoption of the amendment would defeat the very thing Senators have been voting for.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. On the foreign aspects of the question, does the Senator believe that the present world-price market has been pretty much dictated by the domestic price of United States cotton, a price set by our 90 percent of parity supports?

Mr. ANDERSON. Ey American prices. That is surely correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is true that in the far West and in the Southwest we can grow cotton——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr GOLDWATER. The junior Senator from Arizona is informed that in some sections of the western United States cotton can be grown for as low as 13 cents. We can grow cotton in Arizona at from 19 to 21 cents. I am a little skeptical about the 13-cent figure. But the Senator knows that in our section of the country we can grow cotton for between 19 and 21 cents.

How long can our cotton growers compete with a foreign market which, in effect, becomes a free market? How long will our growers be able to compete with foreign cotton which is produced with the cheap labor such as is available in Mexico? In that connection, let me say that the Senator from New Mexico knows that our high parity put Mexico into the cotton-growing business. How long does the Senator from New Mexico think American cotton could compete in the free world market with cotton produced in countries where the labor costs are practically zero?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think we would have a very happy time competing under those circumstances. That is why I take the point of view of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. In the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry he has tried hard to have set up a plan whereby the American cotton farmer can share again in the export market. From 1935 to 1939 we exported from 3 million to 5 million bales of cotton annually. Last year our exports declined to 2 million bales. I say it is bad enough to see that market declining, let alone see the rest of it go shortly thereafter. I think we shall lose the export market if this amendment is adopted. I believe this amendment will call for a very dangerous experiment.

I can only say what I said the other day, namely, that the able Senator from Georgia was as fine a friend as agriculture had when I was in the Department of Agriculture. I am sure he is persuaded that his amendment proposes the best way to handle the problem. But I believe that to attempt to handle the problem by dealing with it on the basis of first one commodity and then another commodity will be disastrous.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I realize the Senator from New Mexico had great experience during his service in the Department of Agriculture. A little while ago I engaged in colloquy with our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Georgia. Let me ask the Senator from New Mexico whether we are correct in our understanding that if the amendment becomes law, it will result in an increase in the cost of the goods manufactured in the Massachusetts mills, because of the increased cost of cotton to them.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think I should say that I have not read the amendment carefully, but have skimmed through it hastily. However, from that hasty examination I think the amendment would increase the cost of cotton goods; but I do not believe it would do so for very long, because in a short time the New England mills would turn to the use of rayon, of course.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Georgia has proposed a quota for cotton and, as he has said, would roll quotas back to 1952. On page 13 of his amendment we find that no quotas shall be allowed on articles "containing an amount of cotton equal in weight to the amount of cotton contained in articles manufactured in whole or in part from cotton and imported into the United States during the calendar year 1952."

It is my understanding that that provision will not help New England to any great degree, because the goods which are imported by weight will go to the mills that are manufacturing lower quality goods. If the amendment is to be effective in the case of all mills, it must be qualified in some way as to quantity as well as quality. Can the Senator enlighten us on that point?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am unable to do so; I am not sufficiently familiar with the amendment. I would say that, on the basis of the statement the Senator from Massachusetts has made, his analysis of the amendment is correct; but I am not sufficiently familiar with the amendment to make that statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The time allotted the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to modify my amendment at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent would be required for that purpose, inasmuch as the yeas and nays have been ordered on the question of agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was going to request unanimous consent. However, I shall do so later.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I regret to state that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has not, to my knowledge, ever heard any testimony on a two-price system for cotton. We did hold extensive hearings during the last 2 or 3 years on a two-price system for wheat. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] was chairman of the subcommittee which held the extensive hearings. The issues involved in such a proposal had been fairly well explored. Therefore, I felt able to join other Senators in voting for an amendment establishing a two-price system for wheat.

Hearings were also had on a two-price plan for rice. As a result of our study, the committee voted to include in the pending bill a provision for a two-price system for rice. However, before the committee did so, we called upon those interested in the production of rice, as well as the millers, and obtained a wealth of information. We heard testimony on the plan from all those interested in rice production. As a matter of fact, the entire rice industry got together and drafted sample legislation, which the committee refined in the light of conclusions based on the abundance of data we had gathered. Our conclusions as to rice now are part of the pending bill.

At this time I would hesitate to support a two-price system for cotton. We have not studied such a program. We have not heard from all affected segments of the cotton industry. We do not know the effect such legislation would have on our farmers, both large and small. In a nutshell, Mr. President, we do not know too much about it.

I should like to address a few questions to my good friend, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], if he will kindly answer them.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to answer them if I can, Mr. President. I do not pretend to be an expert in this field, as others are.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, the cotton farmers of the country would be able to produce all the cotton they desire to produce; there would be no acreage allotments, no marketing quotas, no production restraints whatsoever. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct; there will be no acreage allotments, no loans, and no supports, under this amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well. Then, as I understand the amendment, all the cotton that is so produced would be sold at whatever price the market might bring.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Both for domestic and for export sales?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. The amendment would take the Government out of the cotton business. There would be a completely free flow of cotton within the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. As to the cotton used domestically, as I understand, the producers of the cotton would obtain certificates, with a specified amount equal to the difference between 100 percent of parity and the estimated market price.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; just as in the case of the wheat amendment which the Senate has just agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. How would the amount of cotton that might be used domestically be determined? What method would be used?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture, but would not be less than 10 million bales.

Mr. ELLENDER. What would become of the surplus we now have on hand? Is it the view of the Senator from Georgia that only 1 million bales of it would be included each year in the amount to be consumed domestically?

Mr. RUSSELL. Under the amendment, 1 million bales, each year, of the surplus the Government now holds would be put into the domestic consumption, because only 90 percent would be allotted, until the holdings reached 3½ million bales. Of course that is a discrimination against the cotton farmers; a similar provision is not included in the amendment relating to the wheat farmers. But that is done because the cotton farmers take the responsibility of reducing their production and of letting the surplus be consumed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then we are to understand that if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the domestic consumption of cotton aggregates 9 million bales, let us say, then 8,100,000 bales would be allocated among the cotton growers and 900,000 bales taken out of the surplus?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. Under the amendment, as it is drawn—and of course I realize that the amendment must go to conference and be studied there; and I had hoped that the Senator's committee would have time to study it——

Mr. ELLENDER. But we have not had time to study it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The amendment was submitted in February, but I realize that no hearings were held on it. Under the amendment, the Secretary of Agriculture could not reduce the allotment below 10 million bales.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes more.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from California.

I should like to ask a further question of the Senator from Georgia: In other words, are we to understand that the domestic producers of cotton will be allotted their pro rata share of a minimum of 10 million bales?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of 9 million bales.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of 9 million bales?

Mr. RUSSELL. Nine million bales.

Mr. ELLENDER. The extra million bales would come from the surplus?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would come from the surplus. I thought that proposal would appeal to Senators who are trying to find some way of disposing of the surplus without the Government losing money.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not a question of appealing to me; I would sincerely like to vote for the Senator's amendment, but I fear it has not had sufficient study. As a matter of fact, the Agriculture Committee has never studied it, as we have two price floors for wheat and rice.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was not referring specifically to the Senator from Louisiana. I was referring to all Senators. Here we are saying that the Government shall get full parity for 1 million bales of cotton each year, which it has in surplus, as it is put into domestic consumption.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator's amendment deal with the importation of finished goods from abroad?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The original provision which was drawn has been revised. I think the original provision is preferable, but I realize, of course, that under the Constitution a revenue measure cannot originate in the Senate, and I shall propose an amendment to provide for a straight import limitation, striking out the tax feature.

Mr. ELLENDER. How would that be handled?

Mr. RUSSELL. Any person who imported more than the 1952 imports, in weight, as allocated by the Secretary of Agriculture, would be subject to the criminal provisions of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the Senator's proposal permit the importation of a minimum amount of these goods?

Mr. RUSSELL. The provision of the amendment is in terms of the weight of cotton processed goods.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, we have had a great deal of difficulty in handling the importation of finished goods from Japan. Some effort is being made to cope with that problem. I think the Senator from Mississippi has presented bills which we have considered to some extent—we have not reported any—which would restrict the importation of cotton textiles from abroad, or limit them on a quota basis.

Mr. RUSSELL. This amendment would provide a quota limitation for each country, to the extent of the amount which was imported into this country in 1952.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would be the limitation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that the only limitation?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the only limitation, and that is adequate, because it has been only since 1952 that our processors have been crying about importations of foreign dresses, sport shirts, and things of that kind.

Mr. ELLENDER. As to the cotton produced in excess of domestic consumption, does the Senator make any provision for protecting the producer by way of a minimum price support level?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not the slightest. He produces at his own peril, and sells it in the world market. This amendment would get the Government out of the cotton business. It would dispose of the surplus at full parity, and get the Government out of the business. The producer who produced for the world market would take his chances on what he would get for the excess above his domestic allotment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the distinguished Senator from Georgia prepared to give an answer to the question asked awhile ago by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], I believe, as to the effect 100 percent of parity for cotton would have on the consumption of cotton, and also on further intrusion by rayon and other synthetics into the domestic cotton market?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Louisiana knows that this is not a new question. It has been raised every time we have considered the question of 90 percent of parity. Those who favored 75- to 80-percent parity said, "If you do not put the support price at a very low level, the synthetics will eat you up."

That argument has raged since 1938. That was the first time I heard discussion about the dangers of the synthetics. Cotton prices have varied over that period of time. A part of it was during a war period, when normal conditions did not obtain. It is my own view that it is not in the interest of the cotton farmer to say, "We are going to establish a support price to depress the price of cotton, in order that it may compete with rayon." I cannot accept that theory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield me 1 further minute?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, may I ask a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me finish.

As I stated a while ago, I feel, as the Senator from Mississippi feels, that ultimately we may have to go to some form of two-price system for cotton. I repeat that as long as I have been chairman of the committee—as a matter of fact, as long as I have been a member of the committee—the committee has not gone into the details of this subject. Personally I would hesitate to vote for an amendment on which we have not held hearings, about which we know so little, and the effect of which is based on only speculation and hope. I would be happy to have the committee study this question and take action on it if the Senator from Georgia would permit us to do so. His proposal appeals to me, but I do not wish to vote blindly on the program. I am speaking frankly to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator realizes that this is a proposal merely to submit the question to the cotton farmers in a referendum. If the Senator from Louisiana or the Senator from Mississippi were to advise the American cotton farmer to take a 3-cent reduction in his cotton price, he might favor some such proposal. It might be favored in Louisiana or Mississippi. I do not believe it would be favored in my State. This amendment would submit the question to the cotton farmers in a referendum.

The farmers should be permitted to vote upon the question. Why should the Senator from Louisiana deny to Louisiana cotton farmers, or why should the Senator from Mississippi deny to Mississippi cotton farmers, the right to vote on this question?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator from Mississippi desires is an opportunity to arrive at a proper conclusion.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator says he is opposed to the amendment, which merely provides for a referendum.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am opposed to 100 percent support prices on cotton.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let the Senator vote as a cotton producer, and not as a Senator. He should not prevent the farmers of his State from voting upon the question.

Mr. EASTLAND. There are other factors. It seems to me that when we go on a two-price system, we must have some form of acreage control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute in order to answer a question to be propounded by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, when reference is made to the price at which cotton would be sold, it is important to know that the farmer, on his production for domestic consumption, would need to get 100 percent parity on what he is producing for the domestic market, in many cases, to offset the low prices at which he would be forced to sell on the world market.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. While the American cotton farmer would, in some respects, be giving rayon an advantage in the competitive domestic market, on the other hand, he would have the advantage over rayon in the foreign market.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. He would give some advantage to rayon in the local market, but, on the other hand, he would take an advantage over rayon in the world market.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

I repeat that this amendment merely provides for a referendum among the cotton farmers of the Nation. They should have a right to vote on something other than the proposal contained in the bill. We may be experts on cotton, but many cotton farmers are pretty well versed in their own problems. I do not believe that we should constitute ourselves as their guardians, and say that we are not going to let them vote on the question of whether or not they are to get full parity on their domestic consumption.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to inquire of the Senator whether he has given consideration to the implications which the quota provision of his amendment would have upon our international trade policy, also with respect to the bill now before the Ways and Means Committee of the other body to approve agreements which this country has made, which agreements are contrary to the application of quotas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I have given considerable study to that entire question. I have seen the farm program manipulated. The Secretary of Agriculture should have had certain powers exercised by the State Department. I have seen an umbrella held over foreign production. I am convinced in my own mind that, of the $10 billion we have in agricultural surpluses, a large part of it should be charged up to the foreign aid program, because it was handled in such a way as to help producers in other countries.

We have no obligation to continue to tax the American people for a farm program such as we have today, under which vast surpluses have been accumulated, which penalize and impoverish our farmers, when they are willing, even with the disadvantages under which they struggle of high-cost labor and other high costs in this country, to compete with the farm producers of any other country in the world.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator realize that the quota system which he proposes would give rigid protection to the one segment of our economic life which has not only more than 95 percent of the American market, but also a thriving export trade? If we are to provide such rigid quota protection, which I doubt, it seems that we should begin with some industry for which such protection is more justified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, we have just voted a two-price system for wheat. On that question we held hearings in the committee. We also held hearings on the two-price system for rice. We did not hold any hearings on that subject with regard to cotton. I am vitally interested in cotton, and especially in the small cotton farmer. Let us see what the amendment would probably do to the farmers. Let us look at it for a minute with all controls off of cotton as this amendment would do. As I said, we have not held any hearings on two-price system for cotton. However, we must realize that if we take off all acreage controls, in the original cotton-growing States the small farmers will not plant any more cotton than they are planting at the present time. We would find that on the big farms, on the irrigated farms, the big farmers would plant just as much as they could plant. There they grow 2½ to 3 bales to the acre. On the small farms that I mentioned, the small farms,

the farmers will probably grow about half a bale or just a little more, on the average.

What we would be doing with this amendment then would be to turn loose the big farmers with 100-percent parity and no controls, and there would be built up a surplus of cotton much bigger than we have at the present time, and the little farmer would get no benefit. He would be strangled out by huge surpluses, regardless of the parity guaranteed.

Certainly I am for 90-percent parity and even 100-percent parity for cotton; but it must be coupled with rigid controls or the program would eventually collapse and the little farmers with it. Actually, this ticket or coupon system, once the surpluses had set in, would not work. A farmer could not get the difference between a sale price and 100-percent parity if he could not sell the cotton in the first place.

I should like to call attention to another fact. We have on our hands today a problem in connection with textiles. I believe the pending amendment would also hurt the textile industry. We would be selling cotton across the seas to foreign industry at a price greatly beneath what we would be selling it for to the manufacturers in the United States. Foreign countries would be at an even more distinct advantage. Therefore, the amendment would hurt us both ways. All those things would enter into the picture. I am for textile import quotas, but even if applied with this amendment, the purpose of the quotas would be defeated by the surpluses. We cannot justify one on the basis of the other.

It hurts me to go against my good friend from Georgia. I always like to go with him. He is a good leader, and as a rule one can almost shut one's eyes and go along with what he proposes. However, this is one time when I cannot do that. I say that because to go along with him this time would eventually hurt all the cotton farmers in this country and especially the little cotton farmers. It would build up the surplus, instead of cutting down the surplus. When we build up surpluses, we cut down the price the farmer receives. Even with 100 percent supports today we could not be assured of them tomorrow after the surpluses exist. That will hurt the cotton farmers of the Nation.

Personally, I believe we ought not to go into a matter that is as far-reaching as this without first holding extensive hearings on it.

I want high price supports. I want import quotas; but we cannot justify voting for this amendment solely on this basis and shut our eyes to the inevitable damage that would result and which would destroy our small cotton farmers. Without average controls I cannot vote for this amendment.

We should have, and we may yet get, 90 percent supports with rigid controls. This is the answer to the small farmer's problems.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield me half a minute?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I believe the proposal has considerable merit, but it should be worked out. The distinguished Senator from Georgia has performed a very great service in bringing it to the floor of the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia stated that when the farm bill was passed in 1938, the question of rayon consumption was raised. In 1938, rayon displaced about 300,000 bales of cotton. Today it displaces 4½ million bales of cotton a year in the United States. There has been a rapid expansion.

In 1955, it was reported that over a 3-year period $155 million had been invested in synthetic plants. Whether we like it or not, we must keep cotton prices competitive with the synthetic fiber. We can do it with a price reduction of 2½ to 3 cents a pound. By doing so, we can prevent further acreage reduction, and therein lies the income and standard of living for the little farmers all over America.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional minute. I realize that a tax bill cannot originate in the Senate. In drafting the measure I had hoped that the House would take it up. Mr. President, I move to strike out section 605 of the amendment and insert in lieu thereof a new section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment cannot be offered until all time has expired on each side on the pending amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was going to ask unanimous consent to do that. I ask unanimous consent that the text of section 605 as written be stricken and that there be inserted in lieu thereof the following language:

There shall not be imported into the United States from any foreign country during any calendar year commencing after December 31, 1956, articles containing an amount of cotton in excess of the amount of cotton contained in articles manufactured in whole or in part from cotton and imported into the United States from such countries during the calendar year 1952.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not believe the amendment is any more germane than the other was, but I have no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator so modifies his amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am not an expert on cotton or cotton markets, but I do have the honor of being one of the Senators representing a State which is second only to Texas in the production of cotton.

Mississippi has the highest percentage of total income from agricultural products of any State in the Nation. During a recent year, 69 percent of all agricultural income in Mississippi came from cotton.

We have the rich, fertile delta land, and we also have the small farms in the hills, and the medium-sized farms. So, as cotton goes, so goes the economy of Mississippi, and that is true of Mississippi more than of any other State.

I have been convinced for about a year now that some plan based on the two-price system, or the domestic allotment plan—whichever we wish to call it—would be necessary. I believe we are rapidly being forced to such a program. I know that the present system is gradually eliminating the very small farmer, not only in my State, but also in all other areas of the Cotton Belt. More than that, it is gradually eliminating the medium-sized cotton farmer, who is the farmer of from 10 to 40 acres. It is not so much the price level that is to blame, but the fact that he is losing his acreage. Once he has lost the acreage, it is gone forever. Once the small farmer moves away, even if the acres should be restored later, he does not come back to the farm. That is true even of the larger size farmer.

At the same time I am convinced that we cannot abandon our foreign market. There must be some kind of program which will get us back into the foreign markets. The two-price system offers an opportunity to develop a long-range program and at the same time keep us in the great foreign markets of the world.

One hundred percent of parity may be a litle too high on the domestic allotment. I do not know just what the optimum level should be. But I am fully convinced under the present program there will be no cotton growers left in America within from 5 to 10 years, except the very large growers on the very fertile land, unless we adopt some kind of a program which will give more acres and improve farm income.

Mr. President, I shall support the amendment, believing firmly in its soundness. I believe it will be applied in the course of time, even to the extent of some of the difference having to be paid out of the Public Treasury. The cotton farmer is faced with a situation whereby he has to buy all his agricultural machinery in a market protected by tariffs and by a floor for wages under the wage and hour law. Everything he buys is in a protected market. Some plan must be developed to keep the medium-size farmer and the family-size farmer and larger farmers on a profitable basis. He must also regain a fair share of our export market.

Mr. President, I shall support the amendment.

I believe there is little in the pending bill before the Senate that will lead to a long-range solution of the real problem of the cotton producer. Under present law he is beset by the uncertainty of the level of price support. He is now beset by the uncertainties of farm policy that change from election to election. He is already the victim of a cotton acreage reduction which has reached an unbearable low. This includes the small farmer, the medium size farmer, as well as the large producer. Many of the very small farmers have virtually been driven from their land. The medium size farmer has had repeated acreage reductions; he can bear no more. The large farmer has had his acreage reduced to the extent that he has had to dispose of a great number of his tenants; and at the

same time investments in farm machinery are hardly justified, to say nothing of expensive improvements for his land.

All in all, these problems increase from year to year rather than decrease and unless a sounder plan is reached, the cost to the Government will increase.

FUTURE PLANNING

I repeat, Mr. President, the need of the cotton producer is to establish a long range program that will lend some measure of certainty to the program in years to come. The farmer must have a fixed foundation on which he can plan his farm operations for the future years. This same degree of certainty is what the small town banker and other financing agencies need in the cotton producing areas. This is not a party matter, nor is it an election year matter. The question must be determined on an areawide basis. Certain fundamentals must be spelled out.

TWO PRICE SYSTEM

When the problem is fully considered, I believe the conditions and facts already developed compel us to go to the two-price system for cotton on a domestic allotment plan. Such a program will give each individual producer a certain stability and a guaranty of 100 percent of parity to the extent of cotton grown for home use. It will make acreage allotments for this purpose fairly definite year after year. At the same time, it will permit a producer to grow unlimited quantities of cotton beyond his domestic allotment acreage. He will sell the excess production in foreign markets at competitive prices. This will permit every producer to grow as much cotton as he may wish and at the same time it will keep the American cotton growing industry in the markets of the world at prices that the purchasers will pay.

Further, this eliminates long-time storage costs and long-time insurance costs on millions of bales of cotton.

NO GOVERNMENT LOANS

Under the provisions of the bill of the Senator from Georgia, the only cost to the Government would be the expense of issuing and collecting certificates of payment. Cotton grown by the producer from his domestic allotment acreage would be sold for what it would bring in the market. The producer would be given a certificate for the difference between that price and the parity price. The mills would purchase this certificate when they bought the cotton for domestic use.

Under the terms of this bill the mills would be protected by imposition of an import duty on foreign production of cotton products.

It could well be argued that instead of the sums represented by these certificates being paid by the consumers of the cotton goods, that the sum be paid from the Public Treasury as a direct subsidy. I would readily agree to this proposal; I think it is sound and I believe that we would rapidly come to this position once this program is initiated.

This is justified by the fact that we have a wage and hour law that puts a floor under wages; and the fact that we have the national tariff policy which puts an artificial floor under the price of the manufactured products.

My plea is for a sound, long-range, workable program. I do not believe that the rigid 90 percent price support program nor the sliding scale support program will solve our problems in the future. I voted for the sliding scale support price in this bill as a temporary proposition, not as a solution to the farm problem—it is not a solution—but merely in order to try to get some bill passed that will, at least temporarily, relieve the situation, especially as to cotton. We shall continue to be plagued by surpluses, acreage reductions, mounting costs of storage, insurance, and many uncertainties until we get a sounder long-range program.

In effect, we are already operating the cotton program under a two-price system. We now obtain cotton through the loan and sell it in foreign markets at world competitive prices. This two-price system should be recognized, made a firm and lasting policy, and the program made a fixed part of our economy. I am convinced this is the only way to bring stability to our farm program and the farm segment of our economy, and at the same time give us a long-range program that is sound. These fundamental and basic questions must be settled. It will then be possible to build a long-range program. Until this is done, I am firmly convinced that all programs will fall far short of their mission. Meanwhile, agriculture will continue to suffer.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, price supports may have been pretty well discredited in the eyes of most consumers. The system has been under vicious attack for a long while which is regretable. Flexible price supports have been emphatically disapproved by the producers of our basic commodities. We can no longer sell flexible price supports to our farmers. Thus a new way must be found whereby we can come to the assistance of farmers and protect our agricultural economy.

I do not profess to be an authority on all agricultural matters. I must look to other Members of the Senate who have made a study of the entire subject and who have lived with the problems of agriculture.

In the case of cotton, Mr. President, I think the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is one of the outstanding authorities in this country. I have listened with great interest to the arguments pro and con in connection with the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia, and I believe the Senator has made a good case for his amendment. I believe a two-price system for cotton would probably offer much more to the producer of cotton than would a flexible-price-support program.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia.

If I correctly understand the plan proposed, it would virtually place the producers on their own, and, actually, the cotton producer would have no further interest in a soil bank.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that the provisions of the soil-bank proposal would not start until 1957. I think my amendment would greatly encourage soil-bank participation. The farmers would cut their acres and produce cotton for sale in the world market below the present support level.

Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

I can understand how the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] can oppose the amendment, because he says it would increase the price of cotton consumed in the cotton mills of Massachusetts. It would, to a certain extent, increase the price; but I cannot see why a Senator from a cotton producing State should be afraid to let his farmers exercise their intelligence in stating their position on this program through a referendum, because it could not become operative until two-thirds of the farmers support it. They could take the program, or if they voted it down they would have what would be in the bill otherwise—the flexible program. Certainly, Mr. President, it seems to me that the cotton farmers are entitled to pass on the issue when the plan is much more easily applied to cotton than it is to wheat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will yield back the remainder of my time if the Senator from California will yield back the remainder of his time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining to me.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay" and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent in the State and, if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent. The

Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—33

Barkley	Hennings	Morse
Barrett	Hill	Neely
Bible	Jackson	Neuberger
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Russell
Chavez	Langer	Smathers
Clements	Long	Sparkman
Curtis	Magnuson	Stennis
Daniel	Mansfield	Symington
Fulbright	McClellan	Thurmond
George	McNamara	Young

NAYS—57

Aiken	Ervin	Martin, Iowa
Allott	Flanders	Martin, Pa.
Anderson	Frear	McCarthy
Beall	Goldwater	Monroney
Bender	Gore	Mundt
Bennett	Green	Pastore
Bricker	Hayden	Payne
Bush	Hickenlooper	Potter
Butler	Holland	Purtell
Byrd	Hruska	Robertson
Capehart	Humphrey	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Ives	Schoeppel
Cotton	Jenner	Scott
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Knowland	Thye
Dworshak	Kuchel	Watkins
Eastland	Lehman	Wiley
Ellender	Malone	Williams

NOT VOTING—5

Bridges	Millikin	Welker
Kefauver	Murray	

So Mr. RUSSELL's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as 3–2–56–C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 31, line 9, to strike out "two hundred and forty thousand" and insert in lieu thereof "one hundred and ninety thousand."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the amendment proposes to substitute the figure of 190,000 bushels of wheat for the figure 240,000 bushels of wheat, the latter figure being the one contained in the pending bill. It means that two States which have been taken out of the commercial wheat area can be returned to the commercial area.

The amendment has been discussed with the ranking minority member of the committee. It has been discussed with the chairman of the committee. It has been discussed with those who are considered authorities in the field of wheat legislation in the Senate, and I think it clearly speaks for itself. The figure of 240,000 which was put in the bill was an arbitrary one, and the amendment would merely change the figure to 190,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the purpose of the amendment, it is to restore Kentucky and Tennessee to the commercial wheat area?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct. It would put them back into the commercial area.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment was discussed with me by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, and I in turn discussed it with the distinguished Senator from Vermont and with Senators from the wheat States. There is no objection to the amendment, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I for one have no intention of imposing a noncommercial-area status on States that do not want it. I have no objection to an amendment to the bill which would take Kentucky and Tennessee out of the noncommercial wheat area. I think perhaps next year we might consider the establishment of noncommercial and commercial counties, which would work to the advantage of the States of Kentucky and Tennessee; but we do not want to write any more bills than we have to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I agree with the the Senator completely. His judgment is borne out by the fact that 85 or 90 percent of the wheat in our States is grown in 7 counties.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not want to undertake to write any bills on commercial and noncommercial areas on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator from Vermont has taken a sound position. It is a little late in the evening to do that.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. The junior Senator from North Dakota was the original sponsor of such legislation a few years ago. Certainly I see no objection to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, because, as the Senator from Vermont said awhile ago, we do not want to impose a noncommercial status on any wheat State that does not want it. I think no harm would be worked by accepting the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, the change as proposed by the amendment would apply only to the counties producing wheat?

Mr. CLEMENTS. It would apply to the whole State.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Can the Senator tell us how many States would be returned to the commercial wheat area?

Mr. CLEMENTS. It would return to the commercial area two States, which are not in the commercial area as provided in the bill before the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. It does not open it up to parts of States or counties?

Mr. CLEMENTS. It does not.

Mr. MUNDT. It would admit two States that are out of the commercial wheat area?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Actually there are two States in the noncommercial area that would be taken out of the noncommercial area.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a short explanation of the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER

This amendment would enlarge the commercial wheat area provided for by the bill to include all States having allotments in excess of 190,000 acres instead of only those having allotments in excess of 240,000 acres.

On the basis of 1956 allotments the only States affected by this amendment would be Kentucky and Tennessee. Under the bill they would be excluded, but under this amendment they would be included. If the amendment were adopted wheat growers in these two States would be subject to marketing quotas and entitled to full price support. Farmers in the noncommercial area are not subject to quotas or allotments and are entitled to price support at only 75 percent of the level provided in the commercial area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator from Kentucky gladly yields back the remainder of his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator in charge of the time for the opposition yield back his time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] on page 31, line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "2–21–56–B," which is now at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 7, line 10, after "burley tobacco," to insert the following: "dark air-cured tobacco, fire-cured tobacco, Virginia sun-cured tobacco."

On page 8, line 24, after "burley tobacco," to insert the following: "dark air-cured tobacco, fire-cured tobacco, Virginia sun-cured tobacco."

On page 11, line 9, after "burley tobacco," to insert the following: "dark air-cured tobacco, fire-cured tobacco, Virginia sun-cured tobacco."

MODIFICATION OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Kentucky will yield to me, before Senators leave the floor, so that I may propose a modification of the unanimous-consent agreement. I should like to have the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], and the former chairman of the committee, the former Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous consent agreement previously entered into, providing for 2 hours debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, be modified so as to limit debate to 1 hour instead of the 2 hours provided in the unanimous-consent

agreement under which the Senate is now operating.

Seventy-four amendments have been proposed. The Senate has been meeting at 11 o'clock in the morning and running until 7, and we are apt to become worn out. We wish to give every Senator ample opportunity to be heard.

On the other hand, if we are ever to pass the bill, it will be necessary to make some adjustments. With the time available on the bill, and after talking to the minority leader, the distinguished chairman of the committee, and my friend from Vermont, I believe the proposal I am presenting will give us ample time. If the Senate should agree to the modification, we could proceed more expeditiously.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I think the suggestion which has been made by the majority leader is a constructive one. I have had a chance to discuss it with a number of Senators on this side of the aisle. It seems to me, now that we have taken action on a good many of the major amendments, the modified unanimous-consent agreement will provide ample time for discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas? Hearing none, the unanimous-consent agreement is modified accordingly.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the amendment I have presented was offered by my colleague and myself to include dark air-cured tobacco, fire-cured tobacco, Virginia sun-cured tobacco in those types of tobacco eligible for participation under the acreage-reserve program. The bill as written makes eligible, under the acreage-reserve program, only flue-cured tobacco, burley tobacco, and cigar binder tobacco types 51, 52, 54, and 55.

This matter was discussed in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during the development of the bill; but at that time it was not known whether these growers as a group would wish to be brought in under the acreage-reserve program. That fact has now been ascertained. For that reason, this amendment is offered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the Senator's amendment simply adds other kinds of tobacco to those already provided for in the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and he has no objection to it.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement in explanation of the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER

This amendment would include dark air-cured tobacco, fire-cured tobacco, and Virginia sun-cured tobacco in the acreage-reserve program.

Tobacco was not included in the first drafts of the acreage reserve program because of the high cost per acre of an effective program, and because marketing quotas have been more effective in keeping tobacco supplies in line with demand than has been the case with other crops. Cigar binder tobacco was included because of special technological developments in the industry, and burley and flue-cured were added still later.

A normal supply of dark air-cured tobacco equals 2.6 years' domestic consumption and exports, whereas the supply on October 1, 1955, the beginning of the current marketing year, was equal to 4 years' consumption and exports. A normal supply of fire-cured tobacco equals 2.3 years' domestic consumption and exports, whereas the supply on October 1, 1955, the beginning of the current marketing year, was equal to a 3.4 years' consumption and exports. A normal supply of Virginia sun-cured tobacco equals 2.7 years' domestic consumption and exports, whereas the supply on October 1, 1955 was equal to only 2.6 years' consumption and exports.

It therefore appears that we have oversupplies of dark air-cured and fire-cured tobaccos of somewhat over a full year's needs, while we do not have any oversupply of Virginia sun-cured tobacco. These supply situations compare with oversupplies of slightly over a half-year's needs for flue-cured tobacco, and slightly over three-quarters of a year's needs for burley tobacco.

If these tobaccos should be included in the acreage reserve program, the amount of the national reserve acreage goal for each kind would, of course, be determined by the Secretary under section 204 of the bill at such acreage, if any, as might be appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield back the remainder of his time on the amendment?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield back his time on the amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. BARKLEY], I offer the amendment, which is at the desk, identified as "2–21–56–A."

Mr. President, before having the amendment read, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to my friend, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], so that he may call up an amendment of his which is directly in line with the amendment which has just been agreed to. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to him, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

I call up my amendment identified as "2–27–56–B," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Maryland will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, line 10, after the words "burley tobacco", it is proposed to insert "Maryland tobacco."

On page 8, line 24, after "burley tobacco", it is proposed to insert "Maryland tobacco."

On page 11, line 9, after "burley tobacco", it is proposed to insert "Maryland tobacco."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I understand that this amendment, being in line with the amendments submitted by the Senator from Kentucky, is entirely acceptable to both sides—to both the Senator in charge of the bill and to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I discussed this matter with the distinguished Senator from Maryland. The amendment merely brings in Maryland tobacco, in line, as the Senator from Maryland has stated, with the treatment given in the bill to other tobaccos.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief explanation of the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER

This amendment would include Maryland tobacco in the acreage reserve program.

Tobacco was not included in the first drafts of the acreage reserve program because of the high cost per acre of an effective program, and because marketing quotas have been more effective in keeping tobacco supplies in line with demand than has been the case with other crops. Cigar binder tobacco was included because of special technological developments in the industry, and burley and flue-cured were added still later. A normal supply of Maryland tobacco equals 2.64 years' domestic consumption and exports. The supply on January 1, 1956, the beginning of the current marketing year, was equal to a 3.2 years supply, an oversupply of 56 percent of a year's domestic consumption and exports. This compares with oversupplies of 59 percent for flue-cured tobacco and 77 percent for burley tobacco.

If Maryland tobacco should be included in the acreage reserve program, the amount of the national reserve acreage goal for it would, of course, be determined by the Secretary under section 204 of the bill, at such acreage as he should deem proper.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a memorandum I have prepared in connection with the amendment.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR BUTLER

Title II of S. 3183 presently before the Senate is separate and apart from the other provisions of this proposal, and calls for the establishment of a soil-bank program as recommended by President Eisenhower. It is my view that title II of this act constitutes a sound and realistic approach to the intensely difficult problem of mounting farm surpluses of such crops as wheat, corn, rice, and tobacco.

Aside from reducing these surpluses and providing adequate reimbursement to the farmer for the unused acreage, this program

would also be in keeping with our Nation's conservation efforts, and would foster the protection of our soil, water, forest and wildlife resources from waste and depletion.

In view of its comprehensive nature and the beneficial effect it would have to both the farmer and the Nation as a whole I am convinced that Maryland tobacco should be included in this program. Maryland tobacco is one of my State's most important agricultural products. Generally, the thousands of Maryland farmers who raise tobacco are faced with the same problems as farmers in other parts of the Nation. This program would be of equal benefit to the tobacco farmers of Maryland as it would to the tobacco farmers of Virginia, the Carolinas, and Kentucky. Flue-cured, burley, and cigar binder types of tobacco as raised in these other sections are included in title II as reported by the Agriculture Committee.

Accordingly, the amendment to title II of Senate bill 3184 which I have offered, providing for the inclusion of Maryland tobacco in the soil-bank program, should be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield back the remainder of the time available to him on the amendment?

Mr. BUTLER. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does then Senator from California yield back the time available to him on the amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for yielding to me.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, now I call up my amendment identified as "2-21-56-A," which is submitted by me on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. BARKLEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, beginning with the word "The," in line 2, it is proposed to strike out through line 5.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the amendment is one which may be recognized by my friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] as eliminating the $100 ceiling on the amount which can be paid through the reserve program for land taken out of tobacco production. Tobacco is the only commodity which, under the pending bill, would have a dollar limitation applied to it. Certainly $100 is not a realistic figure to apply in reference to tobacco.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me state that originally it was the committee's intention to include in the acreage reserve program certain types of tobacco grown in Connecticut and in Wisconsin. Those who proposed the amendment were willing to accept a maximum payment of $100 per acre for this type of tobacco. We were told this amount would be ample to induce these farmers to participate in the acreage reserve. Since other types of tobacco have subsequently been added, the cost of production as to these types of tobacco is much greater, and therefore, a payment of $100 per acre would not be sufficiently great to encourage many tobacco growers of these other types to reduce their allotted acreages.

Since the acreage reserve program is purely voluntary, it should be discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture to fix the payments at such rates as in his opinion would be advisable and would result in reducing the planting of tobacco from the allotted acres, just as he will be permitted to do with respect to cotton, corn, wheat, peanuts and rice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement in further explanation of the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER

This amendment would remove the $100 per acre limitation on tobacco acreage reserve payments. Retention of the $100 per acre limitation on payments would tend to make the program ineffective for tobacco, particularly for burley and flue-cured tobacco. The average loan rate on all tobacco is estimated at about 60 cents per pound. The average per acre yield of all tobacco in 1955 was nearly 1,500 pounds. Thus the potential average price-support return would be a total of $900 per acre, and it is doubtful that a $100 payment per acre would draw much tobacco acreage into the acreage reserve.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee has stated the case well. Certainly it would not be an incentive for the tobacco land to be taken out of production if the figure were left at $100.

I am sure that my friends, the Senators from Connecticut, who now are on the floor, will agree with that statement.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to compliment the Senator from Kentucky on offering the amendment, because it does only what is realistic, in recognizing that the value of the tobacco land in our area—and no doubt this is true of the tobacco land in his area, Mr. President—is very great indeed, as compared with the value of most other agricultural land; and the $100 limitation would not be realistic at all, and probably would thwart the accomplishment of the entire purpose of this part of the program.

So I hope very much that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a few days ago, when we were discussing the bill, in a colloquy between the Senator from Louisiana and myself, I called attention to the fact that in certain regions of the country where the farmers make many times more than $100 an acre from their tobacco, there would be no inducement to the farmers to withdraw the land from cultivation, if a $100 maximum were provided.

I appreciate very much the fact that we are going to eliminate that maximum, because it would be utterly ineffective in reducing the acreage—as is known by all of us who live in tobacco-growing areas; and I think that includes all the tobacco-growing counties in the Nation.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, as usual, my colleague has stated the situation very clearly.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague [Mr. BUSH]. The $100 figure is an unrealistic one.

I wish to compliment the Senator from Kentucky for submitting the amendment, and I hope it will prevail.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, let me state for the RECORD that both Senators from Connecticut have been interested in this subject from the earliest discussion of it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to say that I have no objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky, although it puts a little additional burden on the Secretary of Agriculture.

I would not want it to be assumed, however, that the tobacco grower would receive 50 percent of the value of his crop for not planting it, because in some counties that would amount to $400 or $500 an acre; and I am afraid that there would be a public rebellion if we made payments as high as would be required in some counties in that case.

Furthermore, in some counties, tobacco is selling for up to 90 percent of parity. I assume that those farmers would not be particularly interested in reducing their acreage, if they could get a good price for the tobacco they grow.

In the case of some types of tobacco, the farmers must reduce their acreage; and I assume that under the soil-bank provisions of the bill, we shall make it possible for them to reduce their acreage without reducing their income precipitantly.

But I do not want it assumed that the tobacco growers would receive $400 or $500 an acre. I do not assume they would receive that much.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I wish to say that, so far as I know, it has not been assumed that any particular figure would be suggested to the Secretary of Agriculture. He would make this evaluation along with the other evaluations he would make in connection with the other commodities he will have to consider under the reserve program.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no objection at all to the amendment, Mr. President. In fact, we would have saved ourselves a considerable amount of difficulty if we

had used the word "tobacco" in connection with other types, because now, by means of amendments to the bill, we have included practically all the other types.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I heartily agree with my distinguished friend. However, as he knows, the first tobacco that was considered was the cigar binder from Connecticut.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Then discussions were had with growers of other types of tobacco. That had to be done before any consideration could be given to this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no objection to including other types of tobacco, but up to that time the producers of such types of tobacco had not indicated any desire to be included.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I yield back any remaining time. I assume that those who control the time on the other side will be glad to yield back any unused time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield back the unused time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, Mr. President; I am glad to yield back the unused time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] for himself and his colleague [Mr. BARKLEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question in regard to long-filler tobacco types produced in my State. I have submitted an amendment, designated as "3–7–56–H," which would bring them under the soil-bank provisions of the bill, if the amendment is finally adopted. I think the chairman is willing to accept the amendment, which I have slightly modified.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am willing to accept the amendment. It brings three types of tobacco grown in Ohio into the acreage reserve program under the same terms and conditions as apply to the other types of tobacco we have just been discussing.

Mr. BRICKER. This provision has always been in previous bills but the committee neglected to place it in the bill this time because it did not appeal to the committee. Later it was thought to be desirable to include it in the bill.

I wish to thank the chairman of the committee for accepting the amendment, which I now offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 10, it is proposed to delete the word, "and." In line 11, after the number "55", it is proposed to insert "and Ohio cigar filler tobacco types 42, 43 and 44."

On page 8, line 24, it is proposed to delete the word "and." In line 25, after the number "55", it is proposed to insert "and Ohio cigar filler tobacco types 42, 43 and 44."

On page 11, line 9, it is proposed to delete th word "and." In line 10, after the number "55", it is proposed to insert "and Ohio cigar filler tobacco types 42, 43 and 44."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a brief explanation of the amendment and ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This amendment would permit producers of Ohio cigar filler tobacco types 42, 43, and 44 to participate in the acreage reserve program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware, for himself and other Senators, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 25, between lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

PRODUCTION ON GOVERNMENT LANDS PROHIBITED

SEC. 225. No lease executed, renewed, or permitted to extend beyond its earliest termination or cancellation date by any agency of the United States as lessor after the enactment of this act shall permit the lessee to produce on any land subject to such lease any agricultural commodity (other than livestock or livestock products) determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply; but this section shall not be applicable to lands leased to the persons from whom they were acquired by condemnation, or under threat of condemnation, or to the lands in wildlife refuges if the President determines that the application of this section would interfere with the effective administration of such wildlife refuges, or to lands acquired adjacent to flood-control reservoirs.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I may say that this is the same as the amendment designated "3–5–56–B," which is printed and lying on the desk, with a slight modification recommended by the Department.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think this is an excellent amendment. I have an amendment lying on the table which would do exactly the same thing, and I was happy to join with the Senator from Delaware and my colleague [Mr. JENNER] in offering this amendment.

I cannot make up my mind, when we are asking farmers to reduce their production on land which they own, to permit the Government to lease lands which it owns for the production of foodstuffs. It does not make sense to me.

So long as we have a surplus, as we have today, I think the Government ought not to compete with private enterprise, meaning the farmers themselves who farm their own land, and the farmers who lease land. I am in hearty accord with this amendment. I appreciate the concurrence of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the amendment was first presented I urged objections to it, but the distinguished Senator from Delaware agreed to insert language in the amendment whereby it would not be applicable to lands leased by the Government to the persons from whom they were originally acquired by condemnation, or under threat of condemnation.

A great deal of land has been taken over by the Government through eminent-domain proceedings. The owners were involuntarily deprived of that land. Since those lands have been exempted, as set out in the amendment by the language which the distinguished Senator has now added to the amendment, I have no objection to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall incorporate in the RECORD most of my comments with respect to this amendment.

The Government has involved in this provision about 1,400,000 acres of land. As the Senator from Indiana pointed out, the United States Government itself should be the first participant in the soil bank, by setting such land aside. The safeguards pointed out by the Senator from Louisiana are incorporated in the amendment. The point was called to our attention, and we held up the amendment until we could consult those in the Department. It appeared that extreme hardship would be worked in such cases unless this modification were made.

Inasmuch as the chairman accepts the amendment, I ask unanimous consent that the statement which I have prepared be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS

As of June 30, 1954, there were about 1,400,000 acres of Federal lands used for general farming purposes and suitable for crop production and 245,589,000 acres of federally owned grazing lands. These totals do not include 3,900,000 of arable Indian lands or 44,000,000 acres of grazing Indian lands. The 1,400,000 acres used for general farming purposes were divided among the various agencies as follows:

	Acres
Department of Defense	1,192,000
Bureau of Reclamation	80,000
Fish and Wildlife Service	80,000
Other agencies	69,000

Those lands shown to be under the jurisdiction of "other agencies" included approximately 3,000 acres used for experimental purposes, and prison and hospital farms. We are advised that the 80,000 acres leased by the Fish and Wildlife Service are leased primarily to produce feed for wildlife, the tenant taking the usual tenant's share in kind and leaving the balance unharvested for wildlife.

This amendment will prohibit the negotiation of new leases or the renewal of old leases upon their expiration date until such time as the Secretary of Agriculture should declare that the production of these crops were needed.

If we are to start a soil bank for the purpose of removing from production surplus acreage, then let the Government be the first landlord to place its acreage under this program.

The adoption of this amendment would save the Government millions of dollars.

While it is true that the Government will lose the rental on this land, that would be many times offset by the savings resulting from the addition of millions of acres to the soil bank without the necessity of further payments.

The removal of this acreage from production would also eliminate substantial amounts of agriculture products from the market and thereby reduce the cost of administering the support program.

Certainly the Government should lead the way toward placing its surplus acreage under a reserve bank program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief explanation of the amendment as originally presented, together with a letter from the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense pertaining to this subject; also a memorandum from James R. Anderson, agricultural economist in the Department of Agriculture, to Harker Stanton, the chief counsel of the committee, outlining where these lands are located.

There being no objection, the statement and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER

This amendment would prohibit the leasing of Government lands for the production of surplus agricultural commodities. It would not, however, prohibit permits or leases for grazing.

As of June 30, 1954, there were about 1,400,000 acres of Federal lands used for general farming purposes and suitable for crop production which were divided among the various agencies as follows:

	Acres
Department of Defense	1,192,000
Bureau of Reclamation	80,000
Fish and Wildlife Service	80,000
Other agencies	69,000

The 80,000 acres leased by the Fish and Wildlife Service are primarily lands in wildlife refuges leased to produce feed for wildlife, the tenant taking the usual tenant's share in kind and leaving the balance unharvested for wildlife. Possibly these lands could be used for crop production by contract rather than by lease, but if feed is to be provided in these refuges it would appear that these lands will have to be used. In the case of Reclamation Bureau lands it is probable that the lands leased are either lands that have been taken for project construction and which are leased to the former owners pending construction, or lands which are subject to flooding at times. In either event the rentals are used to reduce project costs repayable by the water users.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1956.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Sr.,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: In response to the request made by telephone by Mr. Harker T. Stanton, counsel for your committee, I am writing concerning the so-called Capehart and Williams amendment to S. 3183.

Department of Defense and executive branch studies are well advanced on this problem of use of Government-owned lands for agricultural production, but formal views and a Defense Department position cannot be transmitted at this time. However, the following comments are offered in the hope that they may be of some present assistance to you and your Senate associates.

A substantial amount of Government-owned property is out-leased for agricultural use. Approximately 1.1 million acres of such land are now out-leased for crop production. The Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force out-leased 436,000 acres of the 1.1 million acres for crop production. In addition, the Department of the Army out-leased 520,000 acres of Civil Works property for crop production.

The Williams amendment to S. 3183 would prohibit any Government department from leasing any Government-owned property for the production of any cultivated crop in surplus supply. You may wish to consider the advisability of establishing statutory prohibitions to accomplish what might also be effected by administrative action, inasmuch as the statutory prohibition would be more rigid and might impede the general land-management program.

The Capehart amendment to S. 3183 would prohibit leasing of Government-owned land for any agricultural purpose except grazing, and it would require all excess Government-owned agricultural land to be disposed of in accordance with existing law. In addition to the comment above on the Williams amendment, which applies also to this amendment, the enactment of this proposal would effect the withdrawal of thousands of acres from crop production, and might have a serious impact on the economy of certain communities.

There are two further observations that might be made at this time for your consideration.

First, any program for substantial reduction in crop production would not only reduce the income from Government-owned lands, but would require the spending of Federal funds for cover crops and other land conservation purposes.

Additionally, it would seem logical to consider whether in the event the soil-bank program is established, it is desirable to force disposal of Government-owned lands which can be better controlled as to production in Government hands, but would be available for crop production in the hands of other purchasers.

As quickly as current studies of this problem have been completed and cleared, we will be in a position to comment further should you so request.

Sincerely yours,

LORNE KENNEDY,
Deputy, Legislative Affairs.

MARCH 12, 1956.

To: Harker T. Stanton, Senate Agricultural Committee, Room 324, Senate Office Building.

From: James R. Anderson, Agricultural Economist, Land and Water Section, Production Economics Research Branch, Agricultural Research Service.

Subject: Regional distribution of land leased for agricultural purposes by Department of Defense and United States total for other agencies.

The attached tabulation gives the breakdown of land leased for agricultural purposes by the Department of Defense and United States totals for other Federal agencies. A regional breakdown of land leased for farming by other agencies is not readily available. Land leased for grazing is not included in these totals for agricultural land.

A list of States included in the farm production regions is attached.

JAMES R. ANDERSON.

Land leased for farming by Department of Defense, and other agencies, by regions, 1954

1. Department of Defense lands used for farming: [1]

Region:	Acres
Northeast	20,014
Corn Belt	143,430
Lake States	5,367
Northern Plains	357,775
Appalachian	87,727
Southeast	31,214
Delta	122,520
Southern Plains	181,303
Mountain	75,482
Pacific	166,988
Total	1,191,820

2. Other Federal lands used for farming:

Bureau of Reclamation [2]	80,000
Fish and Wildlife Service [3]	80,000
Other agencies [4]	69,000
Total	1,420,820

[1] As of June 30, 1954. Agricultural leases only; does not include land leased for grazing.

[2] Public lands in reclamation projects in Western States in process of development which are leased out temporarily for farming. When irrigation development is completed it is expected that these lands will be available for homesteading or sale to qualified persons.

[3] Wildlife refuge lands used primarily to produce feed for wildlife.

[4] Miscellaneous federally owned areas used for farming, including experimental farms, institutional lands, such as schools, hospitals, prisons, protective belts around reservoirs, and odd tracts of land.

STATE AND REGION

Northeast: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia.

Corn Belt: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri.

Lake States: Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota.

Appalachian: Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Southeast: South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama.

Delta States: Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana.

Southern Plains: Oklahoma, Texas.

Northern Plains: North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas.

Mountain: Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada,

Pacific: Washington, Oregon, California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators who control the time desire to yield back the unused time?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield back any unused time on my side.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back all unused time on our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from

Delaware on behalf of himself and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, line 5, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

No annual payment to any person with respect to land in any one State shall exceed $7,500.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Yesterday, the Senate, by an overwhelming vote, adopted certain restrictions in regard to the acreage reserve program, and also with respect to price support loans which would be available to any one individual. This amendment merely carries out that principle, which was applied in connection with the other programs, by establishing a ceiling of $7,500 on the amount which may be paid to any one individual in any one State in connection with the conservation reserve.

I have discussed the matter with the Department of Agriculture, and I understand this would be adequate in the opinion of the Department to take care of the needs of bona fide farmers. I understand again that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has no objection to accepting the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to state that when we originally considered the bill in committee there was a limitation placed in it of $5,000 for the conservation reserve program. I have been informed that the amount of $7,500 is a realistic one, and one that is recommended by the Department. As chairman of the committee I have no objection to the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time for debate has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for himself and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS DELIVERED BY GEORGE MEANY, PRESIDENT OF AFL–CIO

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the very able address delivered by President George Meany, president of AFL–CIO, at a dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel on March 6, on the occasion of his being awarded an honorary doctorate of laws degree by Long Island University. The address deals with America's foreign policy. I believe it is worthy of the attention of all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I deeply appreciate the honor your great institution of learning has conferred upon me. I interpret this action on your part as a tribute to American labor generally, rather than to me personally. I feel it indicates recognition of the AFL–CIO as a potent force for upholding the cherished traditions of justice and human freedom upon which our Nation is founded. In this light, I am all the more thankful.

Even in the days when organized labor in our country counted its strength in the thousands or hundreds and not in millions, as we do today, it was the champion of free public education. We were pioneers in this field because our movement has always been both democratic and humanitarian. We have always realized that man does not live by bread alone. The very character of our movement links us closely and firmly with education as a human need and social force.

As our movement has grown in stature and strength, it became more effective in helping every section of our national community. Organized labor has become an indispensable force for protecting and promoting our democratic way of life. We have the highest interest in the cultural enrichment of our Nation and the spiritual fulfillment of its citizenry.

At this crucial juncture of history, America can count on its labor movement to help our Nation fulfill its great responsibilities in meeting the most important and decisive challenge facing humanity today: The preservation and strengthening of human freedom and the attainment of just and lasting world peace. I stress this especially at this time because the recent 20th congress of the Soviet Communist Party has generated in some quarters dangerous illusions and false hopes.

Education, as such, is no sure source of humanitarianism, no guarantee for peace or freedom. The Nazi warlords did not treat the physical sciences and technical education as stepchildren. Hitler used with deadly effectiveness those educated in these fields for bolstering the despotic and destructive aims of nazism. Nor do Communist regimes treat their scientists and technicians as neglected orphans. They provide their scientists with every facility and full opportunity to develop their knowledge and capacities for building engines of vast destruction and organs for mass brutalization.

What is lacking in education under totalitarian regimes of the Communist-Nazis is a certain humane spirit, a certain faith, faith in the freedom of the human spirit and mind. Their fanaticism is intense. But this fanaticism is the very opposite of our moral faith and fervor. It lacks a human quality. This lack explains the degradation of art and literature under totalitarian regimes. This inhumanity inherent in the Communist way of life accounts for the stagnation and even deterioration of the conditions of the great mass of the people in the Soviet orbit.

Nor is education in the liberal arts, per se, the answer.

Divorced from the people and the democratic way of life, such education would lead only to a cloister of the mind—a cloister without human conscience or morals. The challenge and threat of our times demand that our country develop humanitarian scientists as well as scientific humanitarians. They must be realistic humanitarians and not prisoners of dogmas or clichés. These are only obstacles to clear, critical and constructive thinking. Our scientists should not be satisfied with merely enjoying freedom and facilities to pursue their physical and technical research. They should be dedicated to the service of the great mass of the people, to the well-being and the dignity of the individual as a human being. Unless we of the free world steadfastly adhere to these fundamental humanitarian values and moral standards, we will lose our struggle against international Communist tyranny, for we shall have failed to preserve and promote freedom at home.

In the fight between freedom and totalitarianism, the free university, like every other humane institution, dare not be neutral.

Our schools of learning cannot be merely mechanical reflectors—some sort of scientific mirrors—of the two forces in combat. They must be schools for humanitarian service and moral leadership—training centers for the basic values of life, for making life ever fuller in the spiritual as well as the material sense. Those who would make use of our fundamental democratic rights for the purpose of destroying democracy itself and replacing it with some form of totalitarian dictatorship—whether it be Nazi, Fascist, Communist, or Falangist—have no place in genuinely free academic institutions. That does not mean that everyone of us must think alike and must conform in his thoughts to orders from above. Our schools must be laboratories of thought and ideas, if they are to serve our free way of life and its free institutions.

Those who are in earnest about eliminating the evil of conformism, wherever it is manifested in our country, should be just as enthusiastic in commending the students at Georgia Tech for demonstrating in behalf of the right of a Negro to play on a college football team as they are in condemning racialist rowdyism against a Negro co-ed at the University of Alabama.

Today, the gravest threat to freedom of thought and all other basic human freedoms is to be found in the totalitarian philosophy and movement fostered and financed by the Soviet dictatorship. The genuine fighter against conformism must recognize that communism is its most perilous expression. In our opposition to even the slightest conformism in our own country, we must therefore guard against cooperating with Communists whose dogmas and deeds are the very negation of freedom of thought.

Our country plays a vital role in the international arena. The eyes of the world are on all our institutions. We must spare no effort and lose no time in eliminating any antidemocratic expressions in our way of life. In this connection, I can assure you that labor will yield to none in acting to eliminate from our country race prejudice in every form, in every field of human endeavor, in every part of the land.

Thank God that in our democracy no one has to conform even with the highest government official. Wishful thinking and leap-year political partisanship have caused some to paint a distorted picture of the last Congress of the CPSU. We have been asked to believe that the free world—in comparison with the Communist orbit—is today stronger than it was a year ago; that Moscow has been forced, as a result of our increased strength, to revise its strategy and go about the world seeking friends on a new basis. Frankly, I do not believe this is true. In addition, I find it hard to believe any one in official positions of responsibility in our Government really thinks this is true.

What are the facts? Despite all of the world-shaking noise made at the 20th Communist Congress, and, on many occasions before, about reforming the Soviet system, it remains the same—a monolithic one-party dictatorship in the hands of a narrow clique whose policies are always unanimously approved by those handpicked by the Communist ruling group to represent the people.

This system is maintained by a ruthless police state. It holds many millions in slave labor camps and prisons. It maintains its stranglehold through a continuing purge by firing squads and a complete denial of the democratic rights of labor and the fundamental human rights proclaimed in our country's Bill of Rights. For the people behind the Iron Curtain, the dictatorship is no less oppressive when it is run by 11 tyrants trained in the Stalinist school than when it was run by a single despot.

The Soviet system is today further away from ours than it ever was, because in our country democracy has been making headway. Hence, there is no basis whatsoever for

the conclusion that the Kremlin now realizes that it must bring its system closer to ours.

Surely we must realize this is not the first time that the Russian Communists have revised their strategy. Surely there are some of us who remember June 21, 1941, when Moscow changed its mind about Hitler being a great patriot defending the German people and world peace.

The Russian Communists have been constantly revising their strategy. But neither at the 20th, nor at any other, party congress have they changed their basic and ultimate aim—the conquest of the entire world and its transformation on the Soviet slave pattern.

If the present world crisis could be dealt with simply on the basis of diplomatic pacts between nations, it would not be so serious. We would then be dealing with paper perils and a pen-and-ink crisis. I do not belittle the value of pacts—especially if and when they are genuinely in the service of peace and freedom. But the mere conclusion of a pact is in itself no proof of its effectiveness as a force for peace. The Molotov project for a collective security pact as well as the Warsaw Pact do not mean that Moscow is copying our mutual-security program. NATO seeks peace and has helped preserve peace and security. Their mutual-security programs aim at strengthening the forces of Communist aggression and dividing the democratic world.

Russia, without doubt, has many serious weaknesses in agriculture, industry, and its relations with its satellites. Unfortunately, the leadership of the democratic world has not done enough to exploit these weaknesses and impair the prestige and power of the Communist warlords. Self-deception in regard to the 20th Communist Party Congress would only aggravate this failure on the part of the free world.

The recent congress under Khrushchev did not forswear a single one of its old basic policies of intolerance toward non-Communists and violence as a means of getting results. The anemic posthumous purge of Stalin does not constitute a repudiation of or a break with his basic policies for agriculture, the primacy of heavy industry, and secondary attention to consumers' goods. Furthermore, the congress has reasserted unanimously that the foreign policy of the U. S. S. R. has been continuously correct and for peace—during and after Stalin. This, of course, means Soviet policy in regard to disarmament, as well as its policy toward Germany, Korea, and Indochina.

Had the 20th Communist Congress decided on a genuine and serious purge of Stalin and Stalinism, it would have acted not merely against the dead despot but first of all against the leading surviving Stalinists. However, it is precisely these figures who constitute the present so-called collective leadership.

Make-believe rehabilitation of some of those assassinated by the Stalin regime does not eliminate the roots of the evil. But what else can one expect from those who have for decades been the sinister agents and servile accomplices of Stalin in his worst crimes against the peoples now behind the Iron Curtain in Europe and Asia and against the peace of the world?

These successors to Stalin know there is deep-going resentment and embitterment among the Russians and other peoples over the unbridled Communist terrorism. They are trying to fool the Soviet people by putting all blame on their dead leader whom they but yesterday worshipped as an infallible deity.

In typical Stalinist fashion, Khrushchev is now making a scapegoat of Beria—his comrade and partner in crime whom he had placed before the firing squad. Only when the Soviet peoples mete out full justice to these criminals, will the U. S. S. R. begin to have a system closer to ours.

If the Communist top leaders in the Kremlin have agreed, at least for a while, to stop shooting each other, it does not follow that they will stop shooting at us. To the extent they can really close their ranks, they are even more dangerous to world peace and freedom.

There is not the slightest reason for freedom-loving people anywhere to rejoice over Khrushchev and Mikoyan saying that, under special circumstances, the Communist revolution might be achieved through parliamentary means and without resorting to violence. Tomorrow, as yesterday in the case of Czechoslovakia, it will be the Kremlin that will decide what are such "peaceful" special circumstances.

Moreover, the so-called Khrushchev revision on the dogma does not mean that a "peaceful" Communist revolution will do anything else but destroy the democratic parliamentary system and replace it with a Soviet type of one-party totalitarian dictatorship. Yes, we can look at Czechoslovakia as an infamous example of a "peaceful" Communist revolution.

Only those free men who want to commit suicide should swallow this Khrushchev revision pill. These new tactics are only a new variant of the tactics of infiltration employed by Moscow. The aim of the new line is to fool the people—especially the workers—of the non-Communist countries into united fronts with Moscow's agencies abroad. Its aim is to get its Communist agents into cabinets of popular front governments.

The 20th Communist Congress boasted that socialism has triumphed in the U. S. S. R., and that it will triumph through the world.

If what they have in Russia today in socialism, then I am sure many of our friends in Britain, France, Italy and other free countries, who consider themselves democratic socialists, have no desire to attain such a "paradise" regardless of what road is offered to them—whether it be the Lenin road, the Stalin road or the Khrushchev road.

And now let me say a few words about the Tito road and where it is leading. In the last 7 years, this road has been paved not with Soviet gold bricks but with American gold. Since 1948, the Tito regime has received about a billion dollars of American economic and military aid.

Before the Khrushchev-Tito reunion in Belgrade last June, Tito was denouncing the Soviet Union as terroristic State capitalism. Tito then strutted as the model neutralist and opponent of all blocs. But since this reunion, Tito has moved very fast toward Moscow—so fast that he has dropped his mask.

On February 19, the 20th Russian Communist Congress received from Tito a heartwarming message—lavish in praise of the Soviet Union as a "Great Socialist Country" working "for the benefit of a further peaceful development of international relations and cooperation." This message emphasized that "the gradual and uninterrupted improvement in his relations with Moscow is the road which is the most healthy one for the restoration of mutual and firm trust and cooperation" between the Yugoslav and Russian Communist dictatorships.

On March 3, the Kremlin controlled World Federation of Trade Unions, which we of world free labor consider the most dangerous spearhead of the international Communist conspiracy, announced that Tito's so-called unions had been reaffiliated with it. This is most significant. It shows far more clearly where Tito is going than any pact he signs with Turkey and Greece or any promise he gives to Washington. Our overseas colleagues who had illusions about Tito's unions being free and different from Moscow's Communist labor fronts should now awaken to reality. I submit that the time has come for our State Department to reexamine thoroughly the entire problem of further American aid to the Tito regime. Let the American people be told just how the arming and feeding of the 1956 model of the Tito dictatorship with American dollars can help the cause of peace and freedom.

Some might argue that we should not criticize Tito, lest we push him into Moscow's corner or into Khrushchev's arms. In this regard, there is ample evidence that Tito does not need any pushing. He is already well on his way into the arms of Khrushchev.

The present enormous Soviet power makes this "new" line, all the more dangerous to the free world. The trade unionists of the free world, especially in Britain, where Khrushchev and Bulganin will soon visit, have no illusions about the 20th Communist Congress. They will never forget that in the very years when Britain helped liberate more than 500 million people from colonialism, Communist Russia has put under a new colonialist yoke more than half a billion people in Europe and Asia.

If there were the beginnings of a real change inside Russia and its relations with other peoples, the Moscow regime would begin to move in the following direction:

1. Abolish the one-party system in the U. S. S. R. and restore the right to organize free trade-unions and democratic political parties.

2. Agree to internationally supervised free elections in all areas of dispute and tension—Germany, Korea, the satellites, etc.

3. Release all political prisoners and close all concentration camps.

4. Agree to disarmament through international inspection and supervision of nuclear and all other weapons of mass destruction.

5. Cease all subversive and espionage activities through the Cominform and all its agencies.

6. Apply in the Middle East and elsewhere the five principles Kruschev and Bulganin hailed in their tour of India and at the 20th Congress.

7. Agree to withdraw Marshal Rokosovsky from control of the Polish Army.

8. Accept the proposals made by the West (which they rejected at Geneva) for free exchange of ideas and cultural material between the U. S. S. R. and the free countries.

Our free-labor movement and our democratic academic community can render a really great service to our country by helping it develop clarity and unity of purpose and much greater initiative in the struggle for peace and freedom. Our country has much more to sell than seeds, farm machinery and automobiles. We have very effective means with which to quarantine communism or any other despotism. We have the ideals and the ideas; the devotion to human dignity and liberty; the military potential and infinite capacity to help transform countries peacefully into areas of well-being and freedom for the great mass of people.

It is such aspirations and actions that have led to the very creation of our own country and its development into a great as well as powerful Nation. Working together, the men and women of learning and labor, in America and other liberty-loving countries, can and will build the road to a world free from spiritual, mental, and physical destitution—to a world free from the perils of poverty, dictatorship and war. I assure you American labor will do its parts.

ORDER FOR A RECESS TO 11 O'CLOCK A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business this evening, it stand in recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to announce that we will perhaps stay in session tomorrow until 7:30 or 8 o'clock in the evening. We have modified the unanimous-consent agreement, and consequently there will be only 1 hour of debate allowed on each amendment. If Members will cooperate, it is hoped that we will be able to dispose of a number of amendments tomorrow. Then the Senate will convene early on Thursday. It is hoped that we will be able to complete the consideration of the bill either on Thursday or Friday.

If we are unable to complete consideration of the bill on Friday, Mr. President, I wish to serve notice now, so that all Senators may be on notice, that we will have a Saturday session. I believe it is important that we pass the bill this week.

The distinguished chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member have worked long and hard on the bill; the Senate has been considering it now for weeks, and we still have seventy-odd amendments at the desk. Therefore the Senate must be on notice that we will meet at 11 o'clock a. m. and remain in session until 7:30 or 8 o'clock tomorrow evening. Then we will decide whether we will begin the next day at 10 or 11 o'clock in the morning. We will probably run late on Thursday evening, in the hope that we can finish the bill.

If we cannot finish the bill on Thursday, we will run late again on Friday. If we cannot complete the bill on Friday, we will have a Saturday session. I hope that meets with the approval of the distinguished chairman of the committee and with my good friend, the minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully agree with the announcement made by the majority leader. I hope we will be able to conclude consideration of the bill this week on Thursday, or on Friday, at the latest.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am very happy to hear my good friend, the distinguished majority leader, make that announcement. By the amendment to the unanimous-consent agreement obtained tonight, we have shortened the time for debate on each amendment. Therefore, it is entirely possible that we may get through with the bill in the next 2 days, if only we will work on it, and not get involved in discussing extraneous matters, as occurred today. Today the Senate spent at least 3 hours debating matters which, although important, were discussed in time taken from consideration of the farm bill.

It is my hope that, from now on, Senators will devote their full time and attention to the amendments to the farm bill that remain to be discussed and voted on, so that we will be able to get through with the farm bill in 2 days.

EASTER RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand that it has been customary in the other body to take a recess at Eastertime. I understand that this year the House will take a recess from the 29th of March, which is the day before Good Friday, until the morning of Monday, the 9th of April.

I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader whether he is prepared at this time to indicate what the policy of his steering committee and of the majority leadership is in regard to a similar Easter recess by the Senate.

We have had inquiries relating to this subject from both sides of the aisle, and I thought we might get some clarification of it in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to my distinguished friend, the minority leader, that I discussed the matter fully and thoroughly with the Democratic policy committee today at lunch.

If the minority is agreeable to it—and the majority leader learned a long time ago that we must operate from both sides of the aisle, particularly when the Senate is divided 48 to 47—if the minority is agreeable to it, it would please us to leave here on Thursday evening, the 29th of March, the day before Good Friday, and to return on Monday, April 9.

It is my understanding that that is the recess which has been set by the House. That would be agreeable to our side. On the other hand, if the minority leader has any better suggestions to offer, I shall be glad to consider them, as he knows, because we are coleaders, and if we ever get to the point where we are not, we will be in bad shape.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will say to my good friend from Texas that I am sure that would be agreeable to the minority. The only proviso I should like to attach to such an agreement—and I know the distinguished Senator from Texas has such a proviso in mind, as much the minority leader has—that we shall have completed consideration of the farm bill before that time. I should not want to see the Senate get into such a situation that the farm bill would be left hanging come the Easter recess.

Assuming that we will have disposed of the farm bill this week, as indicated, I am sure there will be no objection from this side of the aisle to the majority leader's suggestion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Following the policy of never putting off until tomorrow a decision which one can make today, I should like to announce so that the Senate may be on notice that about 5 or 5:30 o'clock on Thursday evening, March 29, the Senate will take a recess until Monday, April 9, on the recommendation of the majority and the minority leaders, the Senate being willing. All Senators can make their plans accordingly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator wish me to yield in connection with the announcement I have made?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I should like the floor on another matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be glad to yield in a few moments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well.

SENATOR McCLELLAN, OF ARKANSAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it was a great pleasure today to open the Washington Star and to read the editorial in that fine newspaper according deserved recognition of the character, the integrity and the ability of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN.]

By his conduct, by his dignity, and by his devotion to the rules of fair play, JOHN MCCLELLAN has reflected great credit upon the Senate. I am proud to serve with him and to work with him.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial from the Washington Star of March 13, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAKING ON TOUGH JOB

The bipartisan Senate committee set up to investigate lobbying and campaign contribution practices finally has agreed on one of its tested "workhorses"—Democratic Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas—as chairman. There is much about Mr. MCCLELLAN's record to indicate that he will do a good job—unless the evenly divided committee works itself into a partisan stalemate. The possibility of this is diminished perhaps by the fact that the Arkansan himself, as an experienced committee chairman and investigator, has succeeded in the past in avoiding the evils of stubborn partisanship.

This is, of course, an unusual inquiry in that it bears in a sense upon the integrity of the Senate itself. Lobbying is a legitimate and accepted practice in the process of considering and enacting legislation—not only in Washington, but in State capitals as well. Financial support for campaigns likewise is proper, within limitations set up by law. It is not surprising, however, that the temptation is great for "special interests" to stretch the bounds of propriety and the dividing line is not always a clearly defined one. There is a danger then that superficial examination of borderline cases, or their exploitation for partisan reasons, could lead to opinions of "guilt by association." No justice would be served by such a result.

Mr. MCCLELLAN is a lawyer by profession and was a prosecuting attorney before he entered politics. He has demonstrated his respect for the fair rules of evidence, while showing also that he is tough and forthright in his pursuit of facts. This committee already has had trouble getting organized and setting its ground rules. Its next job is to gather a staff competent to undertake an inquiry that will be both difficult and sometimes delicate. It will demand all of Mr. MCCLELLAN's skills then to keep the investigation on its proper road, and to make it constructive.

STORAGE AND HANDLING CHARGES PAID BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION TO CERTAIN FIRMS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the hearings on the farm bill one of the witnesses before the committee was Mr. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn. During the testimony questions were put to him relating to storage and handling charges paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association. It was at that time requested that the Department of Agriculture furnish a report as to the storage and handling charges paid to the GTA, as the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association is called, and also paid to other large warehouses or grain firms.

I am happy to have received a letter, dated March 12, 1956, from Mr. Thatcher, along with copies of letters from the United States Department of Agriculture, one of which is signed by Mr. Harold R. Lewis, Assistant Director of the Office of Information, and a statistical table from the Commodity Credit Corporation entitled "Approximate Cost for Storage for 1 Year of CCC-Owned Grains Stored by Largest Warehousemen in Minneapolis Commodity Office Area, Based on Quantities in Store on December 22, 1955."

Mr. President, the statistical information is an estimate. It is the only information available from the Department. The information speaks for itself. The firms which were covered are the Archer-Daniel Midland; Cargill, Inc.; Continental Grain Co.; and the Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association.

Those are the larger of the warehousemen in the Minneapolis Commodity Office area.

The facts speak for themselves, as I have said.

The total paid, of all charges, to the GTA was $1,604,069.

The aggregate to the Archer-Daniel Midland was $3,452,276.

The total paid to the Continental Grain Co. was $64,345.

This covers wheat, corn, barley, oats, rye, flax, and soybeans.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the letter to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD and also that a copy of the letter from the Department of Agriculture be printed, along with the statistical table to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the letters and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS UNION GRAIN
TERMINAL ASSOCIATION,
St. Paul, Minn., March 12, 1956.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: There have been many stories printed and reprinted about the large amount of money that has been paid to GTA for storage and handling charges in connection with the farmers' grain put under loan in the support programs. The American Farm Bureau Federation had featured this large amount of money paid to GTA by the Commodity Credit Corporation. It has been picked up by several of the newspapers, and there has also been a story in some of the farm magazines, more recently the Farm Journal.

We have made efforts to get information from the United States Department of Agriculture of the amount of such service fees paid to our competitors, but have been repeatedly informed that such information was not available. It has always been interesting to us that such information was available as to GTA from some source. Recently we have written again for such information and I am enclosing a copy of what has been sent to us by the United States Department of Agriculture—their letter of March 9, 1956, and a tabulation made by the United States Department of Agriculture showing Archer-Daniels-Midland Co. receiving the largest amount, Cargill, Inc., the second largest amount, and GTA the third largest amount. According to this statement, GTA received less than one-half as much as the Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.

When Senator AIKEN got into this field of discussing with me when I was a witness before the Senate Committee on Agriculture on January 20, I suggested and urged that the Senate Committee on Agriculture get a complete statement, not only as to the amount of service fees paid the large grain companies rendering storage service for the farmers' loan support program, but also to get the information about those large grain companies who had built a large amount of new grain storage. With respect to which, they were granted two incentives:

1. A fast write-off for depreciation.

2. A 2- or 3-year guaranteed amount of storage fees that the Government would pay to the builder in case the storage actually received did not come up to the guaranteed amount for storage services.

I stated to your committee, which includes Senator AIKEN, that GTA had none of these advantages; that they had no fast writeoff; that they had no guaranteed storage earnings; and that we were not the largest organization in this field of storage services. The reason these grain firms were given these special advantages was because the Government wanted more storage built. We spent many millions of dollars of GTA's funds to build such storage requested by the Commodity Credit Corporation—USDA, but entirely trusted to fortune as to what business might come our way. Another thing I pointed out to your committee was that our competitors keep their profits, but GTA returns patronage dividends to the farmers on such savings as we make.

If you will read the letter from the United States Department of Agriculture very carefully, you will find out that their statement of fees paid for storage and handling are an estimate. That is to say, as I understand it, they took the amount of grain in store on a given day and multiplied it by 365 days to get the amount of storage and handling services paid for.

I think all of this information properly belongs within the debate on the present farm bill, and I hope to see it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Senate's deliberations.

I want to take this occasion for thanking you for the terrific energy and time and study that you gave to this farm legislation, and for your very able presentation of it over a period of several days during the debate on the floor of the United States Senate. On behalf of all of our patrons, please accept our deep appreciation and lasting gratitude.

Sincerely and respectfully yours,
M. W. THATCHER,
General Manager.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, March 9, 1956.

Mr. GORDON ROTH,
Director of Public Relations, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association,
St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR MR. ROTH: This is in reply to your letter to Stanley Gaines requesting a list of storage firms receiving $500,000 or more in fees from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

On checking with the Commodity Stabilization Service, we find that such information is not available in Washington. In accordance with requests from congressional committees, CSS is currently gathering information which will show the volume of CCC storage operations with a number of larger firms, on a national basis. However, this information will not be available for a few days.

We understand that it would not be administratively possible, without disrupting the entire flow of work in field offices, to assemble data on the basis of the exact fees paid to individual firms at all facilities, as suggested in your letter. The storage operations are handled by eight CSS commodity offices in different parts of the country. One of these, as you know, is at Minneapolis. Larger firms may have storage facilities in several of the commodity office regions.

The current survey referred to above, therefore, is being undertaken on the basis of the inventory record of the quantities of CCC grain stored in all facilities of larger firms on a given date. An estimate can then be made of the annual rate of storage and handling fees, as of that date.

This was the basis upon which a limited administrative check was made in the Minneapolis CSS commodity office as of last December 22. The check showed the quantities of CCC grain in store in facilities of four larger operations at that time. Approximate handling and storage charges for 1 year were then calculated on the basis of these quantities.

On request, a copy of the listing of these estimates was made available to the correspondent to whom you referred in your letter. An exact copy of this list is enclosed.

We understand that another check is being made of the total amount of CCC grain in commercial storage, at a given time, on a State-by-State basis. This would not, however, include information about individual firms.

We hope this information, and the enclosed listing of the preliminary check which was made at the Minneapolis office, will help meet your needs.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD R. LEWIS,
Assistant Director.

Approximate cost for storage for 1 year of CCC-owned grains stored by largest warehousemen in Minneapolis Commodity Office area based on quantities in store on Dec. 22, 1955

	12 months storage only	In and out charge	Total
Archer-Daniel Midland:			
Wheat	$2,534,585	$376,175	$2,910,760
Corn	318,972	81,412	400,384
Barley	43,336	6,226	49,562
Oats	37,119	8,229	45,348
Rye	35,816	5,339	41,155
Flax	4,280	787	5,067
Total	2,974,108	478,168	3,452,276
Cargill, Inc.:			
Wheat	1,482,458	235,561	1,718,019
Corn	70,760	16,852	87,612
Barley	930	334	1,264
Oats	28,439	8,364	36,803
Rye	12,856	1,908	14,764
Flax	90	42	132
Soybeans	262	115	377
Total	1,595,795	263,176	1,858,971
Continental Grain Co.:			
Wheat	5,048	749	5,797
Corn	24,832	4,051	28,883
Oats	24,168	4,974	29,142
Rye	455	68	523
Total	54,503	9,842	64,345
FUGTA:			
Wheat	1,015,985	200,370	1,216,355
Corn	47,219	10,059	57,278
Barley	93,218	14,783	108,001
Oats	160,363	37,185	197,548
Rye	19,471	3,348	22,819
Flax	1,511	287	1,798
Soybeans	186	84	270
Total	1,337,953	266,116	1,604,069
Summary:			
Wheat	5,038,076	812,855	5,850,931
Corn	461,783	112,374	574,157
Barley	137,434	21,343	158,827
Oats	250,089	58,752	308,841
Rye	68,598	10,663	79,261
Flax	5,881	1,116	6,997
Soybeans	448	199	647
Total	5,962,359	1,017,302	6,797,661

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I note that the copy of the letter from the Department of Agriculture was directed

to Mr. Gordon Roth, Director of Public Relations, Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association.

I am pleased to see the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] present, because it was under his questioning that this information was sought, and I know he will be exceedingly interested in the results of the request, or the answer to the request, I should say, and the reply which I have personally received from the general manager of GTA.

RECESS TO 11 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 14, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 13 (legislative day of March 6), 1956:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Earl Barley, Normal, Ala., in place of M. L. Gill, removed.

Marie W. Nuss, Pine Hill, Ala., in place of C. O. Mason, Jr., transferred.

ALASKA

Frank W. Donalson, Galena, Alaska, in place of Marvella Kowalczyk, resigned.

Frances L. Nally, King Salmon, Alaska, in place of L. M. Wright, deceased.

ARIZONA

Donald L. Remm, Casa Grande, Ariz., in place of N. B. Prather, retired.

ARKANSAS

Nettie E. O'Roark, South Fort Smith, Ark., in place of K. L. Dooley, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

Elizabeth Waldron, Blue Jay, Calif., in place of J. L. DeMent, retired.

Eugene A. Guerrettaz, Orick, Calif., in place of M. E. Gross, resigned.

Donald P. Morrison, San Bruno, Calif., in place of L. E. Erbes, retired.

GEORGIA

Homer E. Cook, Alto, Ga., in place of T. W. Dalton, transferred.

Tommie C. Fenn, Rochelle, Ga., in place of W. T. Standard, deceased.

Benjamin M. Woodruff, Sandy Springs, Ga., in place of G. W. Adolphus, retired.

IDAHO

James M. Lyke, Caldwell, Idaho, in place of C. E. Bales, retired.

ILLINOIS

Frank Keistler, Jr., Anna, Ill., in place of R. C. Gurley, transferred.

Roland Horney, Beason, Ill., in place of J. H. Randolph, removed.

Viola Kinman, Hamburg, Ill., in place of E. F. Day, retired.

Justus A. Gibson, Mount Carmel, Ill., in place of Fay Moyer, removed.

Roger R. Boner, West Frankfort, Ill., in place of H. B. Wilkinson, removed.

INDIANA

William F. Reineke, Mount Vernon, Ind., in place of M. W. Smith, deceased.

Ernest E. Bushong, Syracuse, Ind., in place of L. B. Whitehead, retired.

Eura Annita Dillon, Williamsburg, Ind., in place of M. J. Frazer, retired.

Philip L. Laurien, Winona Lake, Ind., in place of R. G. Nusbaum, retired.

IOWA

Marvin R. Morgan, Anita, Iowa, in place of G. O. Smither, retired.

Irvin B. Walker, Early, Iowa, in place of C. E. Hinde, transferred.

Charles Harold Huff, Blakesburg, Iowa, in place of F. E. Barnes, removed.

William C. Kinney, Danbury, Iowa, in place of E. P. Patten, retired.

Walter H. Thomas, Green Mountain, Iowa, in place of R. W. Thomas, retired.

KANSAS

James J. Hiner, Belvue, Kans., in place of F. L. Weeks, retired.

Louis E. Shaw, Overland Park, Kans., in place of E. C. Turner, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Clara G. Kelly, Combs, Ky., in place of Emanuel Combs, resigned.

Lillian F. Lowe, Harold, Ky., in place of E. K. Sturgill, retired.

Mary Kevin Egan, Nazareth, Ky., in place of Sister James Haldeman, retired.

Miles M. Davis, Paris, Ky., in place of Vallette McClintock, removed.

Ralph P. Chaney, Pine Knot, Ky., in place of J. C. Ryan, retired.

Arnold D. Sprague, Jr., Sturgis, Ky., in place of L. D. Rose, retired.

Eugene Sammons, Worthington, Ky., in place of L. M. Oney, retired.

LOUISIANA

Otis G. Darbonne, Grand Coteau, La., in place of Ethel Barry, retired.

MAINE

John E. Sargent, Fryeburg, Maine, in place of W. G. Jordan, deceased.

Kellen R. Melanson, St. Francis, Maine, in place of C. P. Pelletier, deceased.

MINNESOTA

Carman J. Eeg, Gary, Minn., in place of R. E. Garden, transferred.

Harold J. Harris, Hanley Falls, Minn., in place of L. H. Lee, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Wiley Lee Williamson, Collins, Miss., in place of W. Y. Guilbert, declined.

Carl H. Parker, Sumrall, Miss., in place of O. J. Page, retired.

MISSOURI

Hobart C. Nicolay, Butler, Mo., in place of R. D. Holland, deceased.

MONTANA

Cecil J. Ranney, Alberton, Mont., in place of P. C. Flinders, resigned.

Donald W. Bell, Browning, Mont., in place of O. A. Tellifero, retired.

NEBRASKA

Edward A. Rodenburg, Deshler, Nebr., in place of Fred Ferguson, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Joseph S. Bird, Annandale, N. J., in place of C. R. McConnell, retired.

William T. Reedy, Iselin, N. J., in place of Frank Mastrangelo, retired.

Erma B. Moncrief, Newport, N. J., in place of C. J. Gaskill, deceased.

Ray W. Lingelbach, Port Republic, N. J., in place of F. W. Huntley, removed.

NEW YORK

Bruce E. Champlin, Andes, N. Y., in place of A. G. Pooley, deceased.

Patrick J. Foley, Bethpage, N. Y., in place of J. H. Klingehoefer, removed.

Beatrice L. Stevens, Bridgewater, N. Y., in place of E. F. Conte, retired.

Seward M. Dawes, Clinton, N. Y., in place of F. J. Burns, deceased.

Philip S. Levy, Newburgh, N. Y., in place of C. J. Brown, retired.

Kathryn D. Probert, New Hampton, N. Y., in place of H. H. Sly, transferred.

Reginald T. Stevenson, Sea Cliff, N. Y., in place of George Arata, resigned.

Kenneth D. Woods, Setauket, N. Y., in place of Anna Fallon, retired.

Wilbert J. Regnet, Swormville, N. Y., in place of W. H. Smith, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Robert W. Sharpe, Sharpsburg, N. C., in place of Estelle Eason, removed.

NORTH DAKOTA

Dora H. Loeppke, Heaton, N. Dak., in place of J. C. Stuart, resigned.

OHIO

George B. Lewis, Blue Creek, Ohio, in place of G. W. Miranda, retired.

William Edward Dornan, Canton, Ohio, in place of L. J. Elsaesser, deceased.

Charles H. Walters, Circleville, Ohio, in place of A. H. Hays, retired.

James W. Broad, Clyde, Ohio, in place of W. A. Drown, retired.

Dale R. Wyker, Grove City, Ohio, in place of E. W. Todd, transferred.

Carrie Elizabeth Copley, Helena, Ohio, in place of H. L. LaFountaine, resigned.

Gene F. Richards, Hollansburg, Ohio, in place of G. A. Irelan, retired.

James F. Church, Loudonville, Ohio, in place of W. A. Cowen, resigned.

Carey W. Hodson, Mowrystown, Ohio, in place of I. Q. Rhoten, resigned.

Edwin L. Seitz, Sebring, Ohio, in place of E. C. Windle, deceased.

James P. Emmitt, Tallmadge, Ohio, in place of Winifred Hine, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Nell E. Neville, Altus, Okla., in place of G. K. Stallings, retired.

OREGON

Lester W. Heise, Adams, Oreg., in place of A. J. Schatz, retired.

John Gordon Watts, Beavercreek, Oreg., in place of M. W. Havill, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Walter L. Stuart, Brownsville, Pa., in place of W. C. Storer, retired.

Gladys V. Lacey, Buena Vista, Pa., in place of I. P. Sandine, deceased.

James E. Sutton, Evans City, Pa., in place of E. A. Schoeffel, removed.

Robert A. Krieger, Greentown, Pa., in place of C. J. Daly, removed.

Blaine E. Moyer, Kreamer, Pa., in place of C. G. Hummel, removed.

Richard M. Bitner, Lansdale, Pa., in place of G. C. Albright, retired.

Edward F. Helsel, Newry, Pa., in place of Adam Hoover, retired.

Millard L. Kroh, Seven Valleys, Pa., in place of G. L. Strausbaugh, retired.

Ralph A. Pensyl, Shamokin, Pa., in place of J. E. Staniszewski, retired.

Grace G. Hendricks, Trexlertown, Pa., in place of J. B. Hendricks, removed.

Leslie E. Carlysle, Sr., Verona, Pa., in place of J. P. Caufield, deceased.

PUERTO RICO

Pablo Rivera, Jr., Salinas, P. R., in place of Jose Monserrate, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Marvin E. Kelley, Liberty, S. C., in place of W. A. Richbourg, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Clayton L. Gibbs, Groton, S. Dak., in place of E. P. A. Erdmann, retired.

Philip S. Aldrich, Milbank, S. Dak., in place of M. P. Garvey, retired.

Merton C. Matter, Orient, S. Dak., in place of J. C. Eggerling, resigned.

Eva K. Gayken, Worthing, S. Dak., in place of J. W. Woods, retired.

TENNESSEE

Charles Ray Winton, Coalmont, Tenn., in place of A. R. Curtis, retired.

Raymond B. Cox, Cottagegrove, Tenn., in place of G. T. Wilson, transferred.

Charles W. Meals, Gibson, Tenn., in place of J. C. Hunt, deceased.

TEXAS

Arthur E. Tarver (Mrs.), Cotulla, Tex., in place of J. B. Kerr, deceased.

Elias F. Crim, Jr., Henderson, Tex., in place of A. A. Gary, retired.

Raymond J. Hruska, West, Tex., in place of J. D. Wilkinson, removed.

VIRGINIA

Carl C. Mason, Bridgewater, Va., in place of C. P. Graham, retired.

Robert L. Via, Roanoke, Va., in place of V. K. Wright, retired.

Harry L. Buston, Jr., Tazewell, Va., in place of Lois Hurt, retired.

James L. Kinzie, Troutville, Va., in place of E. L. Boone, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Jack Doty, Greenacres, Wash., in place of V. V. Edwards, retired.

Alice L. Green, Medina, Wash., in place of W. M. Hagenstein, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Edward Russell Peveler, Bradshaw, W. Va., in place of C. W. Maloney, removed.

WISCONSIN

Raymond E. Feller, Antigo, Wis., in place of C. N. Cody, retired.

Percy E. Braatz, Shiocton, Wis., in place of G. R. Miller, transferred.

WYOMING

Joseph H. Whitmore, Wheatland, Wyo., in place of J. C. Clark, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 13 (legislative day of March 6), 1956:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

William E. Dowling, of Michigan, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 16, 1957.

James Weldon Jones, of Texas, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 16, 1961.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

James Warren McCarty, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Texas for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, in this moment of prayer we are again beseeching Thee to manifest Thy favor and grace unto all who have been entrusted with the responsibilities of leadership in the affairs of government.

Grant that we may always yield our finite minds to Thy divine mind and follow the ways which Thou hast marked out for us.

Inspire and constrain us to cleave with increasing tenacity of faith to the glorious assurances that Thou art our refuge and strength, a very present help in time of trouble.

May we daily grow in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour, whom to know aright is life eternal. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3091. An act to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 1207 at Louisville, Ky.

RUBBER PRODUCING FACILITIES DISPOSAL ACT OF 1953

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3091) to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 1207 at Louisville, Ky.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 27. (a) Notwithstanding the second sentence of section 7 (a), the period for receipt of proposals for the purchase of the Government-owned rubber-producing facility at Louisville, Ky., known as Plancor No. 1207 and hereinafter referred to as the 'Louisville plant,' shall not expire until the end of the 30-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this section.

"(b) If one or more proposals are received for the purchase of the Louisville plant within the time period specified in subsection (a), the Commission, notwithstanding the expiration of the period for negotiation specified in section 7 (f), shall negotiate with those submitting the proposals for a period of not to exceed 30 days for the purpose of entering into a contract of sale.

"(c) Within 10 days after the termination of the actual negotiation period referred to in subsection (b), or, if Congress is not then in session, within 10 days after Congress next convenes, the Commission shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report containing, with respect to the disposal under this section of the Louisville plant, the information described in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8 of section 9 (a). Unless the contract is disapproved by either House of the Congress by a resolution prior to the expiration of 30 days of continuous session (as defined in section 9 (c) of the Congress following the date upon which the report is submitted to it, upon the expiration of such 30-day period the contract shall become fully effective and the Commission shall proceed to carry it out, and transfer of possession of the facility sold shall be made as soon as practicable but in any event within 30 days after the expiration or termination of the existing lease on the Louisville plant. The failure to complete transfer of possession within 30 days after expiration or termination of the existing lease shall not give rise to or be the basis of rescission of the contract of sale."

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 (d) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), before submission to the Congress of its report relative to the Louisville plant, shall submit it to the Attorney General, who shall, within 7 days after receiving the report, advise the Commission whether, in his opinion, the proposed disposition, if carried out, will violate the antitrust laws.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 336, 84th Congress, approved August 9, 1955, of section 4 of Public Law 19, 84th Congress, approved March 31, 1955, and section 20 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, the Commission established by the last-mentioned act shall cease to exist at the close of the 90th day following the termination of the review period provided for in section 27 (c) of that act, unless no sale of the Louisville plant is recommended by the Commission pursuant to section 27 (c) of that act, in which event the Commission shall cease to exist at the close of the 90th day following the termination of the maximum period allowed for negotiation in section 27 (b).

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 9 (d) and notwithstanding the period of lease limitation in section 9 (f) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, the Commission or its successor may, provided the period for receipt of proposals for the purchase of the Louisville plant has expired as provided in section 27 (a) of that act and no proposal or contract for the purchase of the Louisville plant is then pending or in effect, extend the existing lease or enter into a new lease on the Louisville plant for a term of not less than 5 years nor more than 15 years from the date of termination of said existing lease.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 8 (a) (3) and 9 (f) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 relating to the period for review by the Attorney General, the Commission, before submission to the Congress of a lease or lease extension relative to the Louisville plant, shall submit it to the Attorney General, who shall, within 7 days after receiving the lease or lease extension, advise the Commission whether the proposed lease or lease extension would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws.

(c) Within 10 days after the termination of the lease negotiations authorized in subsection (a) of this section, or, if Congress is not then in session, within 10 days after Congress next convenes, the Commission shall report to the Congress the lease or lease extension negotiated pursuant to this section. The Commission shall submit at the same time the statement of the Attorney General approving the proposed lease or lease extension in accordance with the standard set forth in subsection (b) of this section, and the names of the persons who have represented the Government or lessee in conducting negotiations for the lease or lease extension on the Louisville plant. Unless the lease or lease extension is disapproved by either House of the Congress by resolution prior to the expiration of 30 days of continuous session (as defined in section 9 (c) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953) of the Congress following the date upon which the lease or lease extension is submitted to it, upon the expiration of such 30-day period the lease or lease extension shall become fully effective and the Commission shall proceed to carry it out in accordance with its terms.

SEC. 5. Except as otherwise provided in this act, the disposal or lease of the Louisville plant shall be fully subject to all the provisions of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 and such criteria as have

been established by the Commisison in handling disposal of other Government-owned rubber producing facilities under that act: *Provided*, That the provisions of sections 7 (j), 7 (k), 10, 15 and 24 of that act shall not apply to the disposal or lease of the Louisville plant.

SEC. 6. (a) Notwithstanding any provision of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as amended, or of this act, the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission may enter into contracts of sale and may from time to time enter into leases for all or any part of the catalyst manufacturing equipment now situated in Baltimore, Md., and generally described in the Commission's brochure M–2 dated March 1954.

(b) Except as provided in this paragraph, each such lease or contract may be made on such terms and conditions, including type of use and duration (up to 15 years) of any lease, as the Commission deems advisable in the public interest. Before making such sale or lease, the Commission shall secure the advice of the Attorney General as to whether the proposed sale or lease would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. Each such lease or contract of sale shall contain a national security clause, containing such terms and for such duration (10 years or less) as the Commission deems desirable in the public interest, and any such lease shall provide for the recapture of the equipment thereby leased and the termination of the lease, if the President determines that the national interest so requires.

The price for any part or all of such equipment shall be an amount which the Commission determines to be the maximum amount obtainable in the public interest, but not less than fair value as determined by the Commission.

(c) Any of such equipment not sold or leased under subsection (a) shall be placed and maintained in adequate standby condition pursuant to, and be otherwise subject to, the provisions of section 8 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 (other than the provision prohibiting leases).

(d) All the powers and authority conferred by this section upon the Commission may, after the termination of the existence of the Commission, be exercised by such agency of the Government as the President may designate for the purpose, and for this purpose such successor agency may exercise all the authority conferred in the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 upon the Commission.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING A STUDY LEADING TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR THE COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 400, Rept. No. 1872), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study on the possibilities of a research and development program for the coal industry of the United States. In particular, the committee or subcommittee shall seek to determine—

(1) whether or not there is a possibility of developing under existing law, a cooperative research venture in which the Federal Government, interested and affected State governments, as well as industry, labor organizations and private corporations might participate; and ascertain what part the agencies might play in a research and development program and in what fields Federal or State Governments might best cooperate;

(2) whether or not there is a possibility that an effective research program for coal might be developed in the same magnitude, and on the same general organizational basis, as those which have been and are now currently conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the National Science Foundation, and similar groups;

(3) and investigate fields of research into which such a program might delve in order to accomplish the best and most expeditious results for an economic revival of the bituminous coal industry. Such fields of research should cover the general categories of coal production, coal transportation, coal distribution (market studies, and so forth), coal utilization in conventional forms, development of new and expanded uses of coal, including gasification, chemical production and a general appraisal of all coal technology;

(4) what progress has heretofore been made in the production of synthetic liquid fuel in the overall energy program and what advances in our present knowledge and skills with respect to the production of synthetic liquid fuel may be reasonably anticipated in the future; and

(5) whether the public interest would be served by the construction of a plant for the conversion of coal into a synthetic fuel to permit more rapid development of techniques for the production of synthetic liquid fuels, since it is inevitable that the exhaustion or conservation of other fuels will require synthesis fuels to assume major importance in supplying the energy requirements of the Nation in time of war and peace.

Economic projections of future industrial requirements are in general accord that, so far as the energy supply is concerned, greater dependency must be placed on coal which has the largest reserve of any of our known fuel sources. Paradoxically, the Federal Government is appropriating billions of dollars for research and development projects in the field of new energy sources, but little or no consideration is given to a study of the possibilities for wider utilization of coal.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned and to hold such hearing as it deems necessary.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "and directed."
Page 3, strike lines 10 through 18.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 9166) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Tax Rate Extension Act of 1956."

SEC. 2. One-year extension of corporate normal-tax rate.

Section 11 (b) (relating to corporate normal tax), section 821 (a) (1) (A) (relating to mutual insurance companies other than interinsurers), and section 821 (b) (1) (relating to interinsurers) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended as follows:

(1) By striking out "April 1, 1956" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "April 1, 1957";

(2) By striking out "April 1, 1956" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "April 1, 1957";

(3) By striking out "March 31, 1956" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1957";

(4) By striking out "March 31, 1956" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1957."

SEC. 3. One-year extension of certain excise-tax rates.

(a) Extension of rates: The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended by striking out "April 1, 1956" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "April 1, 1957"—

(1) section 4041 (c) (relating to special fuels);

(2) section 4061 (relating to motor vehicles);

(3) section 4081 (relating to gasoline);

(4) section 5001 (a) (1) (relating to distilled spirits);

(5) section 5001 (a) (3) (relating to imported perfumes containing distilled spirits);

(6) section 5022 (relating to cordials and liqueurs containing wine);

(7) section 5041 (b) (relating to wines);

(8) section 5051 (a) (relating to beer); and

(9) section 5701 (c) (1) (relating to cigarettes).

(b) Technicial amendments: The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended as follows:

(1) Section 5063 (relating to floor stocks refunds on distilled spirits, wines, cordials, and beer) is amended by striking out "April 1, 1956" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "April 1, 1957", and by striking out "May 1, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "May 1, 1957."

(2) Section 5134 (a) (3) (relating to drawback in the case of distilled spirits) is amended by striking out "March 31, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1957."

(3) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 5707 (relating to floor stocks refunds on cigarettes) are amended by striking out "April 1, 1956" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "April 1, 1957", and by striking out "July 1, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1957."

(4) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 6412 (relating to floor stocks refunds on motor vehicles and gasoline) are amended by striking out "April 1, 1956" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "April 1, 1957", and by striking out "July 1, 1956" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1957."

Section 497 of the Revenue Act of 1951 (relating to refunds on articles from foreign trade zones), as amended, is amended by striking out "April 1, 1956" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "April 1, 1957."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9166 would extend for 1 year the existing corporate income tax rate and certain existing excise tax rates. I introduced the bill at the request of the President. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] introduced an identical bill, H. R. 9167.

The extensions provided by the bill cover the period April 1, 1956, through April 1, 1957. The existing 52-percent corporate income-tax rate would be extended by continuing the present normal-tax rate of 30 percent. A 5-percentage point reduction will occur on April 1, 1956, in the 30-percent normal-tax rate to which all corporate taxable income is subject unless the provisions of this bill become law. The present 22-percent surtax rate, which applies only to corporate income in excess of $25,000, is not affected by the bill.

The excise-tax rates which would be extended by this bill are scheduled to be reduced on April 1, 1956, and are applicable to certain alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, gasoline, automobiles, trucks, buses, trailers, automobile parts and accessories, diesel, and special motor fuels.

In ordering this bill favorably reported the Committee on Ways and Means was motivated primarily by the fiscal effects to be anticipated from the rate reductions scheduled to become effective on April 1 of this year. As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, the President requested the extension of the rates in question in his budget message where he stated:

> To reach a balanced budget in the fiscal year 1956 and in the fiscal year 1957 it will be necessary, in addition to continuing everyday efforts, to keep spending under control, to continue all the present excise taxes without any reduction, and the corporation income taxes at their present rates for another year beyond April 1, 1956.

The President's statement was amplified by the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable George M. Humphrey, at the time of his appearance before the Committee on Ways and Means in executive session urging the 1-year extension.

The revenue effects of the 1-year extension will be to increase revenues from the corporate tax by $2.020 billion and that of the continuation of the present excise-tax rates to increase revenues by $1.166 billion, making a total full-year revenue effect an increase of $3.186 billion. The revenue effect on fiscal year 1956 from the continuation will be to increase revenues by $204 million and the effect on fiscal year 1957 will be to increase revenues by $2.142 billion.

The details as to the effects of continuing the corporate normal tax rate and the excise tax rates involved are set forth on page 2 of the committee report.

I will now summarize the major revenue effects of the bill.

First. Fiscal year 1956: It is expected that only the extension of the excise tax rates will have an effect on budget receipts in the fiscal year 1956. This follows because, under existing law, the excise tax rate reductions would become effective for the months of April, May, and June of the fiscal year 1956. Collections from the excise taxes affected are estimated at $204 million for these months. The corporate normal-tax reduction which would become effective on April 1, 1956, under existing law will not be reflected in receipts for the fiscal year 1956 because of an anticipated lag in corporate tax collections.

Second. Fiscal year 1957: Extension of the excise tax rates scheduled to be reduced on April 1, 1956, will produce approximately $962 million in budgetary receipts for the fiscal year 1957. In addition, extension of these rates will postpone until fiscal 1958 expenditures of approximately $200 million which otherwise would have to be paid out as floor stock refunds to dealers with respect to their inventories of distilled spirits, wines and beer, cigarettes, gasoline, automobiles, trucks, buses, trailers, and automobile parts and accessories.

Most of the revenue effect to be expected from extending the present corporate normal-tax rate will be reflected in collections for the fiscal year 1957, however, some effects will carry over into the fiscal year 1958. It is anticipated that the extensions proposed in the bill will result in corporate income-tax collections of $1.180 billion for the fiscal year 1957.

Third. Full year effect:

Extension of the present corporate normal-tax rate will increase revenues by $2.020 billion and the excise taxes by $1.166 billion, making a total full-year effect under the bill of $3.186 billion.

The President's budget estimates revenue receipts for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 in the amounts of $64.5 billion and $66.3 billion, respectively. He estimates expenditures for those years as $64.3 billion and $65.9 billion. The surpluses thus reflected amount to $200 million for 1956 and $400 million for 1957. However, unless H. R. 9166 becomes law, a revenue loss of $204 million will result in the fiscal year 1956 and $2.342 billion in fiscal year 1957. In other words, the anticipated surplus for fiscal year 1956 would be wiped out and a deficit of over $2 billion would be created for the fiscal year 1957, a result that I am sure none of us wishes to contemplate.

The action of the Committee on Ways and Means in ordering H. R. 9166 reported was unanimous. I urge that the bill be passed.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 9166, extends for 1 year the present corporate income tax rate and the present tax on liquor and certain other excises. The rates of these taxes are otherwise scheduled for reduction on April 1.

If these taxes were permitted to go down on schedule, the Federal Government would lose over $3 billion in revenue when fully effective. President Eisenhower has recommended this extension in order to prevent such a substantial revenue loss at this time. I introduced a bill, H. R. 9167, to carry out his recommendation and I believe that the bill before us today should be approved immediately.

It would be unthinkable to permit a revenue loss of this magnitude at the present time. One of the greatest achievements of this administration has been the creation of a sound dollar. Inflation has been halted and the cost of living stabilized. This fact is of incalculable value to the average American and his family. We must at all costs prevent the resumption of an inflationary trend. The pending bill is necessary to the continued sound fiscal program of the Federal Government. It deserves the overwhelming support of the membership of this House.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I think this point is so important that even though the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee has already spoken about and you Mr. REED have spoken about it, I should like to make this observation: We do not in this legislation raise any new taxes. We do not exceed anything we have been doing. We simply by passing this legislation enable the Government through the proper authorities to collect exactly what they collected last year. There are no new taxes and no new kind of taxes involved.

Mr. REED. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, although I favor H. R. 9166, I am opposed in principle to the passage of any major legislative proposal without full and adequate debate.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on the question of passing the bill under suspension of the rules I shall vote "No" as a means of registering my opposition to this kind of procedure.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have always regarded the excise tax on amusements, travel, and the like, the activities that furnish relaxation to our people, as measures necessary in the sacrifice period when we are waging war, but not justified when we are on a peacetime basis. I hope that such taxes, which place, I think, an unfair burden upon the already heavily laden backs of our people, should be removed.

But under the circumstances I shall vote for this bill because it comes unanimously from certainly the hardest working committee of this body and one of the most conscientious. I know that many members of this committee probably share the thought that I have in this regard but they were in a position of listening to the testimony of everyone in knowledge and in interest, and theirs was the great responsibility of devising ways of raising the great sums of money that are needed for the conduct of our Government in this period of a most expensive peril. No matter whether we like it or not, no matter what sacrifices we are called upon to make,

we must keep this Republic strong to meet any dangers that an unfriendly hand may hurl at us.

I have great confidence in the distinguished chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee. I know that when that committee unanimously reports a bill of taxation it must be accepted as the best solution that can be worked out in fairness for all our people and in the well-being and security of our Republic. Hence I shall vote for the bill, but take this opportunity of expressing my hope, as I think it must be the hope of many of my colleagues, that come another year we can relieve the little people of our country, the ordinary men and women and children, of the excise taxes that restrict them in the enjoyment of the periods of relaxation that by their hard work they have earned.

THE AUTOMOBILE—TAXES: TIME TO TAKE A CLOSER LOOK

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, there is a motion before us today to provide for a 1-year extension of certain excise taxes. While we all realize the need for revenue to run a country of 165 million people, we should also not forget the old axiom, "The power to tax is the power to destroy."

It is my conviction that certain basic industries should be exempted from a continuation of this levy. The automobile industry, as a prime example, is going to be seriously impaired by passage of this measure in its present form. The situation we are faced with in the auto industry is this: Money is scarce—there have been slowdowns and cutbacks in Detroit recently that indicates the loose money is gone. People are tightening their belts; they are shopping very carefully these days—every dollar counts. This is especially true when it comes to buying a car. The average person investigates 5 or 6 dealers trying to reduce the purchase price just a few more dollars. To many, the additional expense of excise tax means no sale. A no sale in the dealer's showroom is felt in many segments of the Nation's economy. The auto industry is the biggest purchaser of steel, and steel is the economic yardstick. When the sale of steel falls off, the economists begin to worry.

I hope someday soon Congress will take a close look at the term "excise tax." The excise tax is designed to raise revenue from luxuries. Is the automobile a luxury today? It is not; it is an absolute necessity.

How much of the suburban growth of this country would we have without the automobile? Would you tell a man that his car which takes him to work—often the only way to get there—brings his children to school, takes his wife to the store, and does countless other chores is a luxury?

It is extremely difficult to get along without a car today and Congress should realistically consider removing automobiles from the luxury tax class.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. COOPER. On that question, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 366, nays 4, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—366

Abbitt	Davis, Tenn.	James
Abernethy	Davis, Wis.	Jarman
Adair	Dawson, Ill.	Jenkins
Addonizio	Dawson, Utah	Jennings
Albert	Deane	Jensen
Alexander	Delaney	Johansen
Alger	Dempsey	Johnson, Calif.
Allen, Calif.	Denton	Johnson, Wis.
Allen, Ill.	Derounian	Jonas
Andresen, August H.	Devereux	Jones, Ala.
	Dies	Jones, Mo.
Andrews	Diggs	Judd
Anfuso	Dingell	Karsten
Arends	Dixon	Kean
Ashley	Dollinger	Keating
Ashmore	Dolliver	Kelley, Pa.
Aspinall	Dondero	Kelly, N. Y.
Auchincloss	Dorn, N. Y.	Keogh
Avery	Dorn, S. C.	Kilburn
Ayres	Dowdy	Kilday
Bailey	Doyle	Kilgore
Baker	Durham	King, Calif.
Baldwin	Edmondson	Kirwan
Barden	Ellsworth	Klein
Barrett	Engle	Kluczynski
Bass, Tenn.	Fallon	Knox
Bates	Fascell	Krueger
Baumhart	Feighan	Laird
Beamer	Fenton	Landrum
Becker	Fernandez	Lankford
Belcher	Fino	Latham
Bell	Fisher	LeCompte
Bennett, Fla.	Fjare	Lesinski
Bennett, Mich.	Flynt	Lipscomb
Berry	Fogarty	Long
Betts	Forand	Lovre
Blatnik	Ford	McCarthy
Blitch	Forrester	McConnell
Boggs	Fountain	McCormack
Bolling	Frazier	McCulloch
Bolton, Francis P.	Frelinghuysen	McDonough
	Friedel	McDowell
Bolton, Oliver P.	Fulton	McGregor
	Garmatz	McIntire
Bonner	Gary	McMillan
Bosch	Gathings	McVey
Bow	Gavin	Macdonald
Boykin	Gentry	Mack, Ill.
Boyle	George	Mack, Wash.
Bray	Gordon	Madden
Brooks, La.	Gray	Magnuson
Brooks, Tex.	Green, Oreg.	Mahon
Brown, Ga.	Gregory	Mailliard
Brown, Ohio	Griffiths	Marshall
Brownson	Gross	Martin
Broyhill	Gubser	Matthews
Buckley	Gwinn	Meader
Budge	Hagen	Metcalf
Burdick	Hale	Miller, Calif.
Burleson	Haley	Miller, Nebr.
Burnside	Halleck	Mills
Bush	Hand	Minshall
Byrd	Harden	Morgan
Byrne, Pa.	Hardy	Moss
Byrnes, Wis.	Harrison, Nebr.	Moulder
Canfield	Harrison, Va.	Multer
Carlyle	Harvey	Mumma
Carnahan	Hays, Ark.	Murray, Ill.
Cederberg	Hays, Ohio	Murray, Tenn.
Celler	Hayworth	Natcher
Chase	Healey	Nicholson
Chatham	Hébert	Norblad
Chelf	Henderson	Norrell
Chenoweth	Herlong	O'Brien, Ill.
Christopher	Heselton	O'Brien, N. Y.
Chudoff	Hess	O'Hara, Ill.
Church	Hiestand	O'Hara, Minn.
Clark	Hill	O'Konski
Clevenger	Hinshaw	O'Neill
Colmer	Hoeven	Ostertag
Cooley	Holifield	Passman
Coon	Holmes	Patman
Cooper	Holtzman	Patterson
Corbett	Hope	Pelly
Coudert	Horan	Perkins
Cramer	Hosmer	Pfost
Cretella	Huddleston	Philbin
Cunningham	Hull	Phillips
Curtis, Mo.	Hyde	Pilcher
Dague	Ikard	Pillion
Davidson	Jackson	Poage
Poff	Schwengel	Tuck
Polk	Scott	Tumulty
Powell	Scrivner	Udall
Preston	Scudder	Utt
Price	Selden	Vanik
Priest	Sheppard	Van Zandt
Quigley	Shuford	Vinson
Rabaut	Sieminski	Vorys
Radwan	Siler	Vursell
Rains	Simpson, Ill.	Wainwright
Reed, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.	Weaver
Reuss	Sisk	Westland
Rhodes, Ariz.	Smith, Kans.	Wharton
Rhodes, Pa.	Smith, Miss.	Whitten
Richards	Smith, Va.	Wickersham
Riehlman	Smith, Wis.	Widnall
Rivers	Spence	Wigglesworth
Roberts	Springer	Williams, Miss.
Robeson, Va.	Staggers	Williams, N. J.
Robsion, Ky.	Steed	Williams, N. Y.
Rodino.	Sullivan	Wilson, Calif.
Rogers, Colo.	Taber	Wilson, Ind.
Rogers, Fla.	Talle	Winstead
Rogers, Mass.	Taylor	Withrow
Rogers, Tex.	Teague, Calif.	Wolverton
Rooney	Teague, Tex.	Wright
Roosevelt	Thomas	Yates
Rutherford	Thompson, Mich.	Young
Sadlak		Younger
St. George	Thompson, N. J.	Zablocki
Saylor	Thompson, Tex.	Zelenko
Schenck	Thomson, Wyo.	
Scherer	Thornberry	

NAYS—4

Crumpacker	Prouty	Wier
Mason		

NOT VOTING—63

Andersen, H. Carl	Green, Pa.	Nelson
	Harris	Osmers
Bass, N. H.	Hillings	Ray
Bentley	Hoffman, Ill.	Reece, Tenn.
Boland	Hoffman, Mich.	Rees, Kans.
Bowler	Holland	Riley
Cannon	Holt	Seely-Brown
Carrigg	Jones, N. C.	Sheehan
Chiperfield	Kearney	Sheeley
Cole	Kearns	Short
Curtis, Mass.	Kee	Sikes
Davis, Ga.	King, Pa.	Thompson, La.
Dodd	Knutson	Tollefson
Donohue	Lane	Trimble
Donovan	Lanham	Van Pelt
Eberharter	Machrowicz	Velde
Elliott	Merrow	Walter
Evins	Miller, Md.	Watts
Flood	Miller, N. Y.	Willis
Gamble	Mollohan	Wolcott
Granahan	Morano	
Grant	Morrison	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Holt.

Mr. Machrowicz with Mr. Sheehan.

Mr. Lanham with Mr. Seely-Brown.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Carrigg.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Miller of Maryland.

Mr. Bowler with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Hillings.

Mr. Donovan with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Ray.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Short.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Granahan with Mr. Cole.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. Watts and Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Grant with Mr. Kearns.

Mr. Riley with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Dodd with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Morano.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Nelson.

Mrs. Kee with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Boland with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Velde.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Rees of Kansas.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.

Mr. PROUTY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the enrolling clerk in engrossing the bill H. R. 9166 be instructed, on page 3, line 12, to strike out the comma after "1957."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed prior to the vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, when the rollcall on H. R. 9166 was called, I was unavoidably detained in another part of the Capitol. Had I been there, I would have voted for this bill. At that time, I was in conference with the offices of the distinguished Senators from Massachusetts, Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and JOHN F. KENNEDY, relative to a problem that seriously affects my area. The problem arises from the announced action of the Department of Defense in drastically reducing the number of employees at the Springfield Arsenal.

Mr. Speaker, the Springfield Arsenal has been the center of the production of small arms for our fighting forces for a long period of years. It has been the top research and development spot in the Nation for weapons manned by the foot soldier. The best of the infantry rifles have been developed and produced at this great armory. The firepower of our fighting men has been increased considerably because of the inventions conceived there.

The Garand rifle, commonly known as the M–1, is recognized by the military men as the best shoulder piece that has ever been developed. This rifle is the brainchild of a longtime, faithful employee of the Springfield Arsenal, Mr. John Garand. The number of years that the armory has been in western Massachusetts has given rise to a corps of exceptionally skilled workmen in the delicate and exacting job of rifle making. Their essentiality to the national defense is a conclusion that cannot be rebutted. In my opinion and in the judgment of more competent authorities, this Nation cannot afford to lose their services. This reservoir of highly skilled, efficient, capable Government personnel should not be allowed to shrink to a point that endangers any effort, which could easily arise in the face of the world situation, to hastily bring it into action.

The people of my district are very disturbed over the impact of reductions in force that are taking place, and the effect this will have on the community. A mass meeting protesting such action was held last Saturday, at which I was present, and the consensus of workers and citizens alike was that such workforce reductions at the armory not only threatens the livelihood and security of veteran employees, but poses an equally serious threat to national defense. I need not tell the Congressmen that New England has suffered from unemployment. It is our intention to get the Department of Defense to channel work there over and above the small arms work done at the Springfield Armory and Watertown Arsenal.

Great reductions in arsenal strengths occur in Massachusetts. Figures indicate that there is discrimination. A real all-out effort by the Department of Defense should result in different work being channeled to Springfield.

It is inconceivable that good, hardheaded businessmen would allow a plant, so well equipped by skilled men and good material, to deteriorate. The needs of the Armed Forces should be appraised and every effort made to direct work to the armory. I do not agree with the stated policy of the Secretary of the Army that Springfield Armory is to be utilized as a small arms center only. I am convinced that its mission should be broadened. The best interests of the Nation and the taxpayer would be served by enlarging its job. I am not in agreement with the policy of the Department of Defense to get the Government out of business—out of all business. In the field of armaments, the Government has a real, legitimate and moral interest. I am convinced that where there are going production facilities run by departments of the Federal Government and where these facilities have proved their worth, efficiency and price, they should be used to the utmost in the development and production of those weapons of war where the Federal Government is the only purchaser.

The Springfield Armory has proved its worth to the Nation. I ask that its past performance and future potentialities be recognized by the Department of Defense.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

TOWNSEND PLAN

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on July 18 of last year I obtained a special order at which time the need for enactment of legislation embodying the Townsend plan was discussed. The names of more than 60 cosponsors of H. R. 4471 and H. R. 4472 were listed. All have joined Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK and Representative CHARLES S. GUBSER, who introduced the two bills.

In my remarks last July I gave statistics to show the severe income squeeze which our aged people have been subjected to in recent years. Since then, a study by the Twentieth Century Fund has revealed the fact that about three-fourths of the people 65 years of age or over have less than $1,000 income a year. Over one-third of this group have no income whatsoever. The income status of the senior citizens of our Nation is growing steadily worse instead of better. Only 1 out of every 3 persons 65 years of age or older is covered by social security. Benefits are pitifully small in terms of modern costs and living standards. Many millions of these people are trying to exist on old-age assistance which averages only $52.50 a month throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this is a shocking record of shame and neglect of our old folks who gave the best years of their lives in helping to build our modern industrial and economic system, which has given this Nation a level of production and standard of living unsurpassed in the history of the world. It is tragic that these people have been denied a fair share of the abundance which they in their lifetimes have helped to create. That is why the supporters of the Townsend plan legislation have been urging that something more be done in this field of assistance to the senior citizens of this Nation.

A discharge petition on H. R. 4471 is being filed today by Representative BLATNIK. The need for action in doing something realistic to meet the needs of our elderly citizens is critical. Each year new inventions, new methods such as automation are being introduced into our factories. Everything points to a reduction in the workweek as new labor-saving machines are introduced. Many of our older workers will soon be retiring and joining the 14 million folks now over age 65.

Unless we can find a way to increase our consumption of goods commensurate with our ability to produce, we shall again be faced with a certain slowdown of production to prevent our being smothered by surpluses. The obvious and desirable way to prevent this log-jam of goods is to increase our ability to buy and consume. By increasing the purchasing power of our economically depressed elderly population, this objective can and must be reached. H. R. 4471, the Townsend plan, is designed to meet this problem directly. It is not a new plan but with each passing year it becomes increasingly apparent that it contains the answer to this most pressing social and economic problem. We must face up to this problem and our responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues who are sincerely concerned with the economic plight of our old folks to sign this discharge petition to bring H. R. 4471 to the House floor. Let us have open discussion and action by the members of this proposal. It will be the first step toward the realization of an adequate pension program and a more decent living standard for our retired citizens.

CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative in Congress from the First District of Pennsylvania, I am once again appealing for speedy enactment of legislation to insure a proper and just and workable civil-rights program.

The Attorney General of the United States is in the process of preparing a new civil-rights program for submission to the Congress in the immediate future and in view of the several unjust and unwarranted incidents that have occurred during the past year, I sincerely hope this membership will give careful consideration to Mr. Brownell's proposal and enact into law those points of the program that will be beneficial to our colored citizens.

As you know, I represent south Philadelphia, and for the past 10 years have devoted a major portion of my time and efforts to my Negro constituents. I have attended numerous meetings with my colored friends and have helped a great many of them with their personal problems. However, an individual Congressman can do only so much and although I have repeatedly supported all civil-rights legislation and have introduced numerous bills to safeguard and strengthen the rights of the Negro, I regret to say little has been done to accord them their rightful heritage.

Our Nation was founded on the principle that all men are created equal, but the vicious attacks made against the colored people in recent months breeds doubt.

We are known as a peaceful nation and have led other countries and peoples to believe this is so, but how can they be convinced and believe in our sincerity when animosity exists between our races. Our newspapers, magazines, and radio broadcasts, while reporting the truth, certainly must give our adversaries the chance they seek to deride our ideals.

During my many conversations with various Negro groups and individuals in Philadelphia during the past 2 weeks, I have attempted to explain why the Congress is so slow to act on the pending civil-rights proposals. The answer most of them give me is, "Why?" I am sorry to say here today that I cannot give them a plausible or satisfactory answer. Can you?

Mr. Speaker, I know you have the welfare of the Negro at heart and are as concerned as I am over the most recent clash. Surely a solution can be found to prevent a reoccurence of these shameful and disgusting episodes and I appeal to you and the Members present today for help and a solution.

I am pleased to say that great strides have been made in recent years to improve the living and working standards of the Negro people and for this they are grateful. However, this is not enough. They must be made to feel they belong to the human race and are wanted. After all, are not they as Americans entitled to the same rights and privileges we enjoy?

Without exception, the colored folk in my district are honest, hard working people who only want the chance to earn a decent living and enjoy the benefits they derive from their labors. They are law abiding citizens who live according to the word of God. If they are permitted to worship as they please and are accorded equal treatment by the Federal Government insofar as employment opportunities, promotions, and so forth are concerned, why is it so difficult to solve the other related problems. It seems to me their basic rights have been recognized and I sincerely believe it is high time we accord them their rightful place in our complex society.

During World War II and the Korean conflict, the Negroes fought side by side with the whites. Our colored soldiers laid down their lives without hesitation because they too believed in freedom. Surely God made no distinction when he beckoned. Our enemies did not discriminate and say, "Let's just shoot the white ones" or "Today we have orders to kill the colored ones." No indeed, the enemy was instructed to kill all Americans regardless of race. They recognized equality and so should we.

It has been said that we, as individuals, have been put on earth for a purpose and that each of us has a mission or appointed task to complete before death. What greater service could we, as representatives of the peoples of the United States, render than to bring about a harmony of the races.

In my opinion, to achieve this we must enact the perfect civil rights program. Of course, the one factor against such a program is time and I know the Negro race is well aware that a program of this magnitude cannot be enacted today—or tomorrow, but we at least can lay the basic groundwork now and steadily build a solid foundation.

Mr. Speaker, and Members of this body, I beg of you to read my message and in your own individual way support and work for the betterment of our minority races through a decent and just civil rights program.

TOWNSEND PLAN BILL

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Representative BLATNIK and Representative GUBSER, and their cosponsors, for their wise decision to file a discharge petition at this time on behalf of the Townsend plan bill, H. R. 4471.

It is my earnest conviction, Mr. Speaker, that we have been entirely too cautious in our approach to the problem of social security. We know today that social-security benefits financed through taxes collected for the purpose by the Federal Government are in no respect burdensome to the economy. In fact, quite the opposite has proven to be the case. Such benefits are clearly judged today as being essential in preventing the decline of our citizens' buying power upon reaching old age.

We have tremendous numbers of our citizens, however, whose buying power has been disastrously curtailed because we have not provided a social-security system which included them in its provisions. It would be a great harm to our national welfare, in my opinion, to continue this state of affairs.

Let us bring out this Townsend plan bill and get to work establishing a social-security system which will properly solve the problem for all of the American people alike. Then buying power would be stabilized at prosperous levels and every business and all labor in the Nation would be greatly benefited.

We cannot continue to shorten the working span of life and lengthen the old-age span of life unless we provide the means for our citizens to have fully adequate buying power in their old age.

We have no reason to delay longer. I hope the Members will forthwith complete Representative BLATNIK's petition and bring the Townsend bill to the floor.

ARMS FOR ISRAEL IN UNITED STATES SELF-INTEREST

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Great Britain feeds the Egyptians heavy arms, including Centurian tanks. Russia supplies jets to Egypt and Syria.

United States supplies arms to Saudi Arabia and Iraq.

Now Sweden sends arms to Egypt.

All these Arab countries are bent upon Israel's destruction. Israel stands alone, isolated, boycotted, surrounded by well-armed enemies. All we give is sympathy. But kind words will not resist tanks and jets.

U. N. aid is unrealistic and would be too late for a sneak attack and extermination.

U. N. is not a policeman to prevent, but a fireman called after the conflagration.

Israel wants to defend herself.

You may as well try to make a camel jump a ditch as to put sense into the administration, which refuses to allow Israel to wield her own weapons for her own survival.

It is patently plain that with Communist infiltration into that region of the world, the self-interest of the United

States and the free world demands that Israel be in the best position to defend herself. Arms and pacts have been an integral part of our foreign policy in the defense of the free world. How come the policy stops short at the borders of Israel, a free, democratic country?

In 1948 Israel, all alone, fought off seven hostile Arab nations who converged on her in all directions. U. N. looked on helplessly. The Arabs, defeated, came running to the U. N. which then intervened to bring about a truce. Had the Arabs won, the U. N. would have then washed its hands of the affair.

I do hope, indeed, that the pressure from this House and from other sources will cause sense to become the watchword of the administration so that arms will be sent to Israel by the United States.

TAKING CARE OF OUR ELDERLY PEOPLE

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are all thankful that we have done the things we have done in this country about the problem of social security. I, for one, cannot imagine how horrible the plight of our elderly people would be today if it were not for the support they are receiving because of these things we have done.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to face up to one very harsh fact. All efforts in the area of social security—including private systems as well as public ones—have failed to make an actual dent in the real problem of bettering the comparative economic position of our elderly people as a group. Statistics conclusively demonstrate that we have failed sadly, since the end of World War II, to increase the comparative share of income received by our older people as a total group. At the same time, the number of elderly folk is increasing at a rate between 3 and 4 times that of the younger adult population. This problem must be solved or the result will be catastrophic for our economic future by progressively destroying our people's buying power.

I see clearly that it will prove of no avail to increase our people's living and income standards during their working years if we permit this expanding deficiency during their older years to go on growing in its force. It is time we thought about bettering and improving their position. It is to this end that I introduced H. R. 4471, which embodies pay-as-you-go provisions. Today I filed a discharge petition in favor of H. R. 4471. I feel that it is a problem for full study by all of us. I sincerely hope that we will bring this bill speedily to the House floor for full consideration and action. It will enable us to make of our social-security system the great force for good and prosperity that it should be.

TOWNSEND PLAN BILL

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] may address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I completely approve of the decision by Representative BLATNIK, of Minnesota, and the sixty-odd cosponsors in the House of the Townsend plan bill to file a discharge petition to bring H. R. 4471 to the floor.

We have a social-security system in the form of old-age and survivors insurance and public assistance which has done a great deal of good, as far as it has been effective. However, Mr. Speaker, our system for the last 20 years has been a discriminatory one, and it remains a discriminatory one. OASI discriminated by denying coverage to countless millions of people both old and young. Many of these discriminations of coverage have been recognized as wrongs and corrected by extensions of OASI coverage for the future; but not in respect to the already elderly people who had no chance to qualify under covered employment. This has been a serious injustice; indeed, an indefensible injustice. Instead of being treated in the same way as others, these elderly people were consigned to the system of public assistance, made subject to all manner of restrictions and humiliations in order to qualify for any relief. On the other hand, those privileged to be qualified under OASI have benefit rights with no such restrictions or humiliations. Even a very wealthy person can qualify for OASI benefits, whereas the old-age assistance requires poverty for the individual as the very basis of its benefits. Oldsters under OASI can earn at least $1,200 a year with no curtailment of benefits; the OAA people must sacrifice benefits fully equal to every last penny they might earn. This, Mr. Speaker, constitutes a disgraceful picture of discrimination that has no place by any view in the United States of America, of all places.

We have no reason whatever to expect that these shameful discriminations can be remedied under the present system. Therefore, I believe that H. R. 4471, which completely abridges all discriminations between citizens, should be brought to the floor and given every consideration by the House.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] for the effort he is making to bring a little more sunshine into the lives of the aged men and women of our country. The number of the aged is increasing rapidly. We have done something to make their lives more endurable and more comfortable. But we have not done all that conscience and duty command. I think it is time that the matter should be brought to the floor of this House in order that we can examine more thoroughly and with a bolder approach into the problem of securing old age from the distresses that now encompass it.

To this end I have signed the discharge petition and I urge upon my colleagues to do likewise. The 84th Congress can go down in the history of our country as one of the greatest, and its memory beloved by succeeding generations, if from this Congress comes forth a bill giving to those approaching age an abiding sense of security and to those who have reached the western slopes a material and a spiritual enrichment such as never before have those burdened the years enjoyed.

H. R. 4471 presents to us a challenge. Let us, remembering the prayer for divine guidance of our beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, accept the challenge.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot close my remarks without paying a tribute of appreciation and affection to Dr. Townsend. I shall never forget how in a time of the distress of depression old men and women were rejuvenated by the suggestion of Dr. Townsend that in a rich country money could be provided for their every comfort and that their sole mission in life would be contributing to the buying power of the Nation by spending each month what they received in monthly payments sufficient for their comfortable sustenance. What we need is buying power, and what more Divine concept than that of leaving to the workers in youth and in prime the toils and giving to the aged the opportunity of spending money necessary for their comfort and thus supplying the buying power to keep going the basis of employment for the workers.

The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] has rendered many great services to his constituents, his State, and his country. None has been greater than the service he is rendering today. I imagine that tonight when what he is doing here today spreads throughout the Nation a million eyes of old men and women will light as though upon them had fallen the magic wand restoring youth.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, 16 million school children in over 63,000 schools in the United States are depending upon this Congress for immediate action on H. R. 8320. The school milk program will collapse unless this Congress insists upon immediate action on H. R. 8320. This legislation has unanimously passed both the House and Senate but is now in conference to settle the differences between the Senate-passed bill and the House-passed bill. The House should accept the Senate amendments and stop

the ridiculous stalling on this important program.

There are 19 States in which school milk program funds are running out at the present time. If the milk program is stopped in these 19 States, we will never be able to get it off the ground again. I have repeatedly brought this matter to the attention of the House Agriculture Committee and was informed only yesterday that not a single meeting has been held by the House and Senate conferees. It would only take the conference committee 5 minutes to meet in order to agree to the Senate amendments.

In this same bill, H. R. 8320, there are included funds for the brucellosis eradication program. These funds are immediately needed in 22 States for the remaining part of this fiscal year and in order to plan the program in each of the 48 States for fiscal year 1957. If the program of brucellosis eradication is curtailed, it will mean the waste of many millions of Federal tax dollars. The brucellosis program has started and this dreaded cattle disease is on the run. If this program is stopped, it will only mean that the funds thus far expended will have been in a large measure wasted. The program will be successful only by carrying it forward to completion and complete eradication.

The following States will have to stop the school milk program as of April 1 unless this bill is acted upon before that date: California, Delaware, District of Columbia, Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Washington, and Wisconsin. These States are in immediate need of funds. The following States will have to stop the program on May 1 unless this legislation is immediately acted upon: New York, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

These funds are absolutely needed and necessary now. Let us stop stalling and get this legislation passsed.

GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA: A PROUD AND GROWING ORGANIZATION

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, this week the Girl Scouts of the United States of America celebrate the 44th anniversary of their founding. What a proud heritage they have.

Since their founding in 1912 by Juliette Gordon Low, they have held fast to the ideal that this should be an organization where all girls could find a common ground which would help them prepare to live, work, and play happily and successfully with their neighbors.

Today the Girl Scouts stand 2 million strong with the active backing of more than 600,000 devoted men and women. They are a growing family, ever increasing their contribution to community life in America.

In my own State of Ohio, Girl Scouting has made exceptional progress. Membership rose to 123,000 in 1954, the latest year for which figures are available. This was an increase of 19 percent over the previous year, compared with a 14 percent increase for the country as a whole.

I have been told that Girl Scout interests last year reflected the growing importance of homemaking, always the most popular of the 11 program fields in which girls may work for proficiency badges. During 1955 Intermediate Girl Scouts, 10 through 13 years old, earned nearly 624,000 badges in the homemaking field. Of these, 177,000 were the cook badge, for which girls learn cookery, nutrition and preparation of sitdown or picnic meals. Second in popularity was the Homemaker Badge, for which 97,000 girls qualified by acquiring a broad range of housewifely skills. Third in popularity was the Hospitality Badge, earned by 91,000 girls who studied and practiced the varied skills of both hostess and guest, including the etiquette of informal social gatherings.

Throughout the year, more than 900,000 Intermediate Girl Scouts qualified for 2,200,000 badges. It has been estimated that it takes 3 months or more to complete work for a badge. And before it is awarded, the girl is in most cases required to use her new skills in some type of service for the welfare of others.

This is an organization which teaches each young woman that she is an individual and that respecting the rights of an individual is an American ideal. But she also learns the importance of accepting community responsibility and of sharing her experiences with others. I am proud to offer my congratulations to the Girl Scouts on their 44th anniversary.

HELP FOR THE AGED

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, nearly 170,000 needy Georgians on public assistance rolls can be better fed and clothed; farm surplus can be put to a beneficial use, and local stores can have more business. This is the objective of the bill H. R. 9896, which I am introducing today.

It is the purpose of my bill to provide supplementary benefits for individuals receiving assistance under the programs of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind and aid to the permanently and totally disabled provided for in titles I, IV, XI, and XIV of the Social Securtiy Act.

Provision is made also for assisting recipients of public assistance outside the Federal programs. Food-fiber certificates would be provided for needy individuals who received assistance from any State or political subdivision thereof. For this latter group all that is required is that the Secretary of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department enter into agreements with the welfare or public assistance agency, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Based on figures furnished to me by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Speaker, the approximate number of persons, nationally, who would be eligible under my bill are as follows:

Persons who receive Federal assistance under titles I, IV, XI, and XIV of the Social Security Act (December 1955)

Old-age assistance	2,552,832
Aid to dependent children	2,193,215
Aid to families caring for dependent children (only one member of family is assisted)	602,789
Aid to blind	104,858
Aid to other disabled	244,007
Total	5,729,000

PERSONS RECEIVING ASSISTANCE FROM STATES OR THEIR POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS

My estimate as to the number of persons who may be eligible for food certificates as provided under section 5 (a) (4) of my bill is 1 million; grand total, 6,729,000.

Mr. Speaker, the following individuals in the State of Georgia would be eligible for assistance under my bill. The total number is, of course, included in the national estimate.

Georgians receiving public welfare assistance (individuals) (December 1955)

Federal assistance involved:	
Old-age	98,519
Aid to dependent children (individuals, children, and adults)	53,936
Aid to blind	3,415
Aid to other disabled	11,154
State or local assistance (non-Federal participation)	2,505
Total	169,579

Number of persons in Eighth District who will be benefited by my bill:

Old-age assistance	7,545
Aid to dependent children (including the one adult)	6,287
Aid to blind	357
Aid to other disabled	1,063
General assistance (State and local funds—392 cases—based on 2.3 people to each case)	900
Total	16,152

All eligible individuals would be provided food-fiber certificates in addition to their current monthly assistance. Certainly, no member of the House of Representatives would want to cut present public assistance benefits now or in the future. Food-fiber certificates should always be supplemental to current levels of public assistance.

Enactment of my food-fiber certificate plan would increase the purchasing power of the approximately 6,250,000 persons eligible by $120 per year because each person would be entitled to certificates valued at $10 for each month. The certificates would be valid only with respect to purchases made during the month for which they are issued.

My food-fiber certificate bill would first give assistance to the Nation's and my own district's neediest families; second, it will help farmers because it paves

the way for expanded consumption of food and fiber. It probably will mean eliminating the need for further acreage reduction in such crops as cotton and peanuts. It will, I believe, aid materially in the utilization of our present food stocks. This will be using food in the right way and, coupled with the maintenance of existing levels of production, farm income will be increased.

A food-fiber certificate plan such as my bill provides for will also increase the volume of sales of mercantile establishments, food and fiber handlers, merchants, and their employees, both at wholesale and retail levels, will benefit because the food-fiber certificate plan specified in my bill will operate through normal marketing channels.

I want to call attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that this bill does provide for certificates to be expended for cotton articles. I believe that persons eligible under provisions of my bill have need for articles made from agricultural fiber such as cotton and wool, just as they do the various products processed from the food commodities which would be named by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 4.

Mr. Speaker, hearings have been held on a similar proposal, introduced by Senator ROBERT S. KERR, as an amendment to H. R. 7225, the social-security bill passed last year by the House of Representatives. I understand there is widespread support for a food-fiber certificate plan in the Senate. It is my hope that the members of the Senate Finance Committee will approve the amendment to H. R. 7225 and that this bill will be favorably reported to the Senate floor.

It is my hope, too, that hearings may be scheduled in the House Ways and Means Committee on my bill. Hearings were held last year on food-stamp proposals in a subcommittee of the House Agricultural Committee. Concern was expressed at that time over the cost of a food stamp or certificate plan being charged to the farmers' price-support program. Vesting the authority for administration in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department as in this bill will eliminate this concern on the part of members of the House Agriculture Committee.

Secretary Benson has used the matter of so-called surpluses to arous consumer resentment against adequate farm price supports. If he would do something to utilize the surpluses, maybe he will give us some cooperation to help get a food-fiber certificate plan passed by Congress.

Secretary Benson's sliding scale program has depressed prices. But of even more concern to me, his sliding scale program has actually increased production, as farmers have tried to raise more and more to make financial ends meet.

I strongly believe that the answer to helping farm families lies in firm adequate price supports and in other programs to put overproduction of agricultural commodities to good use. One of the best ways to use our blessed abundance is to provide additional benefit to our old people, helpless children, and others on assistance rolls who do not have sufficient purchasing power to buy adequate food and clothing.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after all other special orders today, I may address the House for 30 minutes and revise and extend my remarks and include therewith extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] had been present today he would have voted the same as I did on the excise-tax extension bill. Unfortunately, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] is grounded at the airport in Harrisburg, Pa., and I would like to have this noted for the RECORD.

DETROIT AIRPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the metropolitan area of Detroit, roughly, 4 million people, does not have an adequate air terminal.

It seems that, in spite of the present airport, action is being stopped to transfer airline activities from Willow Run to Wayne Major. A lot of reports of action to date have been misleading, and they have purposely been misconstrued. The result is that the plan has been held up, and at the present date no action is contemplated.

The military is seeking Willow Run—the Air Force, the Navy, and the Air National Guard.

Mr. Speaker, because of the influence of politics, our national defense is suffering for the lack of facilities, and because existing facilities are not being used properly as recommended to become effective to the maximum extent.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. Yes; I am glad to yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] reserve the right to object or ask the gentleman from Michigan to yield to him?

Mr. MEADER. Both.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] reserves the right to object.

Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEADER. I wish to know whether in the remarks the gentleman asked to insert in the RECORD there is any reference to any Member of Congress?

Mr. LESINSKI. I may state for the information of the gentleman from Michigan that there is no definite reference to any Member of Congress.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the remarks he has asked to insert in the RECORD makes any reference to the gentleman from Michigan who is now addressing him.

Mr. LESINSKI. I did not.

I shall read the remarks to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] withdraw his request to extend his remarks?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request to extend my remarks at this time.

I will read the remarks to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, last November the President's Airport Use Panel issued a report on airport conditions in the Detroit area in which it was recommended that commercial air activities be transferred from the Willow Run Airport at Ypsilanti to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport and that military air activities be centralized at Willow Run.

I have written to the Secretary of Defense requesting that he take immediate steps to implement the recommendations of the Airport Use Panel by exercising the Government's right by virtue of the present emergency to take possession of the Willow Run Airport so that the military services can have use of the field as their needs demand.

If no action in this regard is taken within a relatively short time, it will be obvious that some agency heads of the Federal Government are disregarding the President's own Airport Use Panel which is composed of experts for the express purpose of solving such problems.

It will be obvious that the heads of Capital Airlines can reach certain people and go over the heads of our various agencies that have unanimously recommended that commercial airlines move from Willow Run to Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. The collusion between Capital Airlines and the University of Michigan to hold up a matter which will benefit a metropolitan area of four million people is an affront to a community that pays into the national treasury above-average taxes.

Of course you can see why Capital Airlines is acting as it is. We, as taxpayers, have built Willow Run. And we, as taxpayers, are continuing to pay the larger portion for the airlines' use of Willow Run. Imagine the airlines presently paying only $38,000 for the use of Willow Run, whereas they should be paying out approximately $2 million annually for an air terminal which would be comparable to the one at San Francisco.

Capital Airlines bought from the Federal Government for a song the planes

that built Capital Airlines to what it is. Capital Airlines has been subsidized for many years by the Federal Government. Its officials are now trying to continue on the present gravy train and we, as taxpayers, are footing the bill. Mind you, we in America produce aircraft far superior to any, yet Capital Airlines goes to England to purchase new planes. Here we subsidize Capital, make it what it is, and its officials show total disregard for their benefactors.

Let us not allow misinformation or sanctimonious statements about honest intents sway us. Why will ANSCO not allow the mayor of Detroit, the Airport Use Panel, the common council, or the board of supervisors examine their financial records.

When one Congressman can say for 4 million people what airport they are to be served from, some definite action should be taken.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. May I ask the gentleman whether or not when he refers to one Congressman he is referring to the gentleman from Michigan who is now addressing the question?

Mr. LESINSKI. Not necessarily so. The gentleman will recall seeing in the papers recently about certain contradictions in reference to the transfer of the Air Force bases in Michigan from one place to another and to God knows where.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman is speaking about 4 million people in the metropolitan area of Detroit. I assume when he speaks about only 1 Congressman, he cannot have 2 in mind.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman evidently has a guilty conscience.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to take credit for advocating what 4 million people want to do, if the gentleman is referring to me. I think that is a very flattering observation.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman has taken upon himself the fact he is guilty. The gentleman has also been active in spite of the fact he serves a district that has very little to do with the surrounding area directly involved, Wayne County, and is endeavoring to be responsible.

Mr. MEADER. Will the gentleman answer the question whether he has me in mind?

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman has answered the question.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman does have me in mind?

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman has answered the question.

Mr. Speaker, I shall repeat. When one Congressman can say for 4 million people what airport they are to be served from, some definite action should be taken.

A similar example was when one Congressman was able to affect the national defense for political purposes by canceling the homestead site in Benzie County by simply being able to see and talk to the right individual in the administration and to convince a sufficient number of the members of a committee. When a Member of Congress can put in a word with the right person in this administration at the expense of the public and the national defense, this is getting to be a sad state of affairs.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman seems to be making a rather serious charge that a Congressman has put political purposes above the national defense. I think it is only fair to the 435 Members of the House of Representatives that he identify the Member he is referring to.

Mr. LESINSKI. Well, the gentleman admits he is fighting this move.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman is now speaking about something in Benzie County. Is he referring to me in that connection?

Mr. LESINSKI. No. I am talking about a parallel.

Mr. MEADER. Who is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. LESINSKI. I am talking about a parallel. I have no reference to any present Member of Congress.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman does have reference to a former Member of Congress?

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman evidently is trying to protect himself and is drawing on references of the past. Yes.

Mr. MEADER. In other words, the gentleman is referring to a Member of Congress who is no longer in the House of Representatives?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. MEADER. Could the gentleman identify what Member that is?

Mr. LESINSKI. If the gentleman so requests I should be most happy to but I would rather not.

Mr. MEADER. I do so request.

Mr. LESINSKI. Who was responsible for cutting out the Homestead site in Benzie County? The gentleman very well knows the answer. It was by the action of former Congressman Shafer.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman for identifying him.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Navy on Grosse Ile, the Air Force at Selfridge, and the Air National Guard are eager to get started with their vital programs, but are being held up because this problem has not been resolved.

Why do we, as Detroiters, have to travel an additional 25 million ground-passenger miles a year at an expense of approximately $2 million in addition to paying taxes when we could all be paying for a proper and modern airport such as those in Cleveland and other major cities. It is a shame that we of Detroit have to put up with a disgraceful looking air terminal to serve our area. Any city you may go to has at least something that resembles an air-passenger terminal. What we have is a converted hangar that could more properly and readily be used by the military for storage and repair of aircraft. We in Detroit need and should have a proper air-passenger terminal that we could be proud of and not have to put up with such a disgrace to the community as we now have because of the whims of one individual.

I understand that at the present time the Civil Aeronautics Administration has not included in its program for fiscal year 1956 any funds for the improvement or expansion of civil air facilities at Willow Run. This is certainly proper for under the Federal Airport Act of 1946 such funds are allocated for civil airports and Willow Run has been designated as a military airport.

The presently scheduled hearings before the Government Operations Committee will have no effect upon the problem. If action is not taken to implement the recommendations of the President's Airport Use Panel, I have prepared and am going to introduce a House resolution to investigate the whole procedure at Willow Run and to force Ansco and the University of Michigan to reveal their books so that we, the American people, can see what is going on behind the scenes.

DETROIT AIRPORT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reply to the gentleman who has just addressed the House on the matter of airports in the Detroit metropolitan area. Before I take up the references made to me personally and to a former Member of the House who is now deceased, I would like to give the House just a brief sketch of the problems involved here.

So far as I know, this is the first time that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] has seen fit to call the attention of the House to this airport controversy which has been raging in the Detroit area ever since World War II.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. I must admit that the gentleman raises a point that this is the first time I have been before the House. My position has been taken in Detroit originally, last year in Detroit and since then many times.

Mr. MEADER. Yes. I must say that the gentleman had a representative present although he was not personally present at the Airport Use hearings in Detroit in June of last year.

Mr. LESINSKI. And at that time the gentleman himself complimented the chairman of the Airport Use Panel on his recommendations.

Mr. MEADER. I do not recall complimenting the gentleman on the Airport Use Panel. However, how the gentleman would know I do not know, because he was not present.

At any rate, this is the situation. Willow Run was built as a war facility. There is no question about that. It was

built to fly off the B–24 bombers, and at the time it was built, in 1942, it was the best airport in the United States. The commercial airlines had as their terminal a little airport in the city of Detroit at Gratiot and Six Mile Road, with a big gas tank in the center of it. When four-engine aircraft were placed in use by the airlines immediately after World War II, that airport became inadequate, and the airlines had no place to go except to Willow Run Airport. They have been at Willow Run Airport since that time, and they have no intention of leaving there for another airport in the same general vicinity.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Is not the gentleman familiar with the existing Wayne Major Airport?

Mr. MEADER. Yes. Wayne Major was a small airport since, I believe, 1928. It was extended very rapidly after World War II; in fact, there has been a total, I believe, of about $13 million of State and local funds and some $4 million of Federal airport aid funds poured into that airport since 1946, and to complete the airport so that commercial airlines could use it would now require an additional sum of from $30 to $33 million. Wayne Major Airport is only 6 miles distant from border to border and 8 air miles from center to center from Willow Run Airport. Those airports, as a Detroit Free Press aviation writer said so aptly, are two airports on the ground but only one in the air. In fact, landings and take-offs at Wayne Major Airport are controlled from the Willow Run control tower in instrument flying weather. That is how close those airports are together.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that ought to be threshed out as a part of our interest in the Federal airport aid program, and I have requested the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee to make a thorough examination of the Federal airport aid program and to take into consideration the allocation of Federal funds to Wayne-Major Airport. I claim it is unwise to spend $33 million on an airport that, when you get through with it, will be in the same traffic pattern as the existing airport serving the airlines.

Now, what is the alternative? The alternative is to build an airport for the city of Detroit in a different air traffic pattern and to spend $30 million where you will have something when you get through. The traffic needs of the future envisage multiple air terminals at Detroit. That happened at Chicago, Los Angeles, and at New York City where there are multiple airports and split operations. There should be another airport at Detroit located on the north or east side of the city where it will serve a far larger population.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to debate the merits of this airport controversy in the limited time I have today. I have spoken on the subject before. In fact, there is a very complete recital of the whole matter, with considerations pro and con, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 23 on pages 3266 to 3280. I hope the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] will take the trouble to read that, because it includes a very enlightening series of articles by Detroit Free Press Aviation Writer Jan Pearson.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman has mentioned that local taxes were used to build up Wayne Major Airport. I appreciate that very much. The gentleman also mentioned that there was a difference of 7 air miles between the two airports. The gentleman realizes that there is a difference of almost 13 miles between these two airports and that it costs the taxpayers $2 million additional in travel expenses.

Does the gentleman realize the fact that the airlines are paying only $38,000 for a similar facility in San Francisco which handles 1,070,000 people?

The gentleman is fighting for ANTSCO.

Mr. MEADER. I think the gentleman has no right to say that I am fighting for ANTSCO. I am fighting for the taxpayers of the United States of America. I do not want to see $30 million go down a rat hole. That is my primary interest. But it is also a matter of interest to the people in my congressional district. I may say to the gentleman that the University of Michigan, a public body, accepted that airport when it was declared surplus after World War II and when the city of Detroit and the Wayne County Road Commission refused to accept it.

Mr. LESINSKI. That is true.

Mr. MEADER. And it has served adequately Detroit's need for an air terminal for the last 10 years and it has served at no expense to the taxpayers. I will say further that you have had in Wayne Major Airport over $4 million of Federal aid, which is 52 percent of all the aid that Michigan has received in the last 10 years. Willow Run has had something less than $200,000, a very small amount.

Mr. LESINSKI. Is it not true that one is a military base and one is not?

Mr. MEADER. Willow Run was not built as a military base. It was built to fly off bombers. It has served adequately as the commercial air terminal for Detroit for the past 10 years. It does not make sense to pay $30 million more for another airport in the same traffic pattern. The gentleman ought to be fighting for that $30 million to be spent over on the north or northeast side of Detroit where it will serve a larger population. But if you spend $30 million on Wayne Major, it is going to be a long, long day before you get any more airport money in the Detroit area.

I should like to refer now to the reference made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] to my part in this airport controversy and draw particular attention to this sentence:

> When 1 Congressman can say for 4 million people what airport they are to be served from some definite action should be taken.

The gentleman is very flattering to suggest that I—and it was obvious from his answer to me that he was referring to me—have sufficient power and influence to thwart the desires of 4 million people. He might better have said that the facts of the case indicate that the present arrangement for the airlines is the businesslike arrangement and it would be foolishness to pour $33 million into an airport which would not be in a different traffic pattern but in the same traffic pattern. At any rate, let me say that there is not unanimity among the residents of Wayne County over the development of this Wayne Major Airport and pouring money into an airport right next to an already existing airport.

There is very responsible and expert thinking which recommends another airport at Detroit but closer to the center of population than Wayne Major, in a different traffic pattern and in a different center of population.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to ask the gentleman if in connection with his request for an investigation of the operations at Wayne Major Airport the gentleman would care to expand that request to include the operations at Willow Run; and why the unanimous recommendations of the Airport Use Panel have not been accepted; and also to include why the airlines there only pay $38,000 for that particular installation, when other comparable installations cost around $2 million a year to rent.

Mr. MEADER. Wait just a moment. I cannot remember all of the gentleman's questions. He asks too many.

Let us take the last one first. That is certainly not the case. I do not have the operating figures of the airlines, so I cannot give the gentleman the accurate figures, but what he is talking about, $38,000, is what has been for some years the approximate net rental that the University of Michigan has received; but the operation of the airport has cost far more than that, well over $1 million.

I have forgotten the other questions. I wish the gentleman would ask them one at a time.

Mr. DINGELL. What I want to know is, Would the gentleman be willing to have his request for an investigation broadened to include one as to how the Willow Run operation is conducted, and also to include the opposition to this change?

Mr. MEADER. I do not have any objection to it, if the gentleman is asking me if I am objecting to looking into the contractual relations between the University of Michigan and the Terminal Corp. that actually operates the airfield. As a matter of fact, I think the record is pretty well public on everything, so far as I know, except possibly the revenues from some of the concessions. That is what Leroy Smith has been trying to get at. I know that.

Mr. DINGELL. Quite frankly, I would like to have an investigation, but I would like to have it investigate everybody. Then we can find all the dirty linen.

Mr. MEADER. I think it is trying to throw dust in the eyes of the public. To try to infer, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] stated, that there is

some kind of collusion between Capital Airlines and the University of Michigan. I do not think that is called for in any sense, and I think it is a reflection on the University of Michigan. As a graduate of that school, and as one who represents that community, I resent it.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. Why did not the gentleman insert the report of the airport use panel together with the article, so that the public could analyze the whole picture from both sides?

Mr. MEADER. The recommendations of the Airport Use Panel were inserted in the RECORD. If the gentleman means why did I not insert the entire report, it was too long. But there was nothing to prevent the gentleman from inserting it this afternoon when he had the 10-minute special order.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman's article took up 7½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that that report be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] yield for that purpose?

Mr. MEADER. I do not yield for that purpose. I suggest the gentleman insert it in his own time.

I would like to refer to the second reference made to a Member of Congress. I do not like these scattered shots which accuse people of improper motives as well as obstructing the national defense for political motives. It seems to me that it is bad enough when a man is here to defend himself, but when he is referring to our departed Congressman from Michigan, whom many of us loved and respected, the Honorable Paul Shafer, it seems to me that is going pretty low. I do not think any more need be said on that point at this time.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman is saying a few things here that might have some truth. Maybe I am hitting low, but the facts are the facts, and when a fact is a fact it is never low.

As to the Benzie County airbase, the airport and everyone else were for it completely, but due to the action of Mr. Shafer it was transferred to Cadillac. After all, we all know about other Members' remarks on this matter. It has been transferred from one place to the other. That is why I brought the fact out that when an individual does such a thing, I do not think it is proper.

Mr. MEADER. Well, I do not know why the gentleman had to bring that into the Wayne Major-Willow Run Airport controversy in any event. I do resent his attack on a former Member who is not here to defend himself, but who could do a very good job of defending himself if he were here.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MEADER. I believe I have yielded sufficiently to the gentleman.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point for one question?

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LESINSKI. I did not bring Mr. Shafer's name into this. You forced me to. You brought his name into it.

Mr. MEADER. No; you made a scattered shot.

Mr. LESINSKI. You forced me to bring his name into the picture. I did not request it. Indirectly, I was forced into it by you. So who is hitting below the belt? Presently I have no objection to the name going into the RECORD.

Mr. MEADER. I do not know anyone of the 434 Members of the Congress other than yourself that you were referring to by just naming blankly a Congressman and accusing him of improper motives and of obstructing the national defense for political purposes.

Mr. LESINSKI. I had no intention of bringing out the Member's name. It is through your insistence that the Member's name was brought out.

Mr. MEADER. It was perfectly clear, without the Member's name being mentioned, to those who are familiar with the circumstances, to whom you had reference. I do not know why you should just intimate who it might be. If you are going to attack a man, you ought to attack him openly and not slyly.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I decline to yield for the moment, but I will yield to the gentleman later on.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to one other part of the gentleman's remarks which may have slipped the notice of some, and that is the reference in his opening remarks that he had written the Secretary of Defense—mark this—that he had written the Secretary of Defense requesting that Mr. Wilson take immediate steps to implement the recommendations of the Airport Use Panel by exercising the Government's right by virtue of the present emergency to take possession of the Willow Run Airport. Now this controversy, I may say to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] I am fully aware is not one in which he has become engaged spontaneously without a little urging. There is a man down in Detroit, Leroy Smith, who fortunately is going to retire the first of next January, who has been plugging for this Wayne Major Airport bullheadedly and foolishly against all expert advice for 10 years and it is only natural that he should get some Congressman from Detroit to help him out in his fight when I got into it.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. Leroy Smith never saw me.

Mr. MEADER. Well, then, was it Glenn Richards?

Mr. LESINSKI. Well, wait a minute my dear friend. You are trying to force me again into the same box as you did before. You are the one who put Shafer's name in the RECORD—I did not. It was not Leroy Smith.

Mr. MEADER. Then was it Glenn Richards? I do not know whether John P. McElroy was down here the last time, but they had a luncheon for the Detroit Congressmen and enlisted their good services in this body.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I will yield to the gentleman just as soon as I have made this point. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] is asking the Secretary of Defense to seize this airport, if you please, under emergency power. I took the trouble to get out the RECORD of February 20, 1956, when we had before the House the bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, in which there was a good deal of discussion about the use of the emergency power for negotiating contracts instead of letting them on open bid. There was a good deal of discussion and I even asked the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] if he had some views on the propriety of declaring an end to the emergency of December 16, 1950, under which the Armed Forces were using that extraordinary power of negotiation rather than bidding. But, it is interesting to note that the philosophy of that act is that there was no such emergency which would justify negotiating contracts rather than letting them out on open bid—and lo and behold who voted for the bill but the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]. Now he comes in here 2 or 3 weeks later and asks the Department of Defense to exercise that emergency power, to do what? To take away from the University of Michigan something that they have operated successfully for 10 years at no cost to the taxpayers. Why? Solely because that will force the airlines to move to Wayne Major. That is the only way Leroy Smith knows how to get them over there.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I am very grateful to the gentleman for asking this question: The gentleman has said to me he would have no objection to asking that his requested probe of the operations at Willow Run be expanded. Would the gentleman be willing to support the request I have made to have this investigation expanded to include the operations of the airlines at Willow Run?

Mr. MEADER. May I say to the gentleman that there is no limitation upon the scope of the investigation. It does not need to be expanded. It is already there. The committee has full authority to go into the entire question of airport aid generally and in this location. There is no need to ask for an extension of the investigation.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman see to it that those other aspects are investigated?

Mr. MEADER. If they are important I think the committee will go into it.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman mentioned that I had impugned the University of Michigan. I think the gentleman mistakes my motives. What I said was that I thought we ought to have the fullest investigation possible.

Mr. MEADER. May I interrupt the gentleman to say I was referring to a remark made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], and not to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], because I quoted from his speech, some reference to collusion between the Capital Airlines and the University of Michigan. I thought that was out of order.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MEADER. I might say on this subject of national emergency that I wrote a letter to the President of the United States under date of March 2, 1956, in which, in 3½ pages, I set forth the reasons why I believed, first, that it would be appropriate to consider the termination of the emergency declared by President Truman in 1950; and, second, in the event there were some purposes for maintaining that emergency under present conditions that, at the very minimum, the Federal agencies should be instructed not to use that emergency power to seize Willow Run. What do they want to use Willow Run for? The Air Force and the Navy Reserve training facilities, which are weekend flights. The Air Force has already moved down there. The Navy would operate I think some 32,000 operations a year, and could be accommodated if they had to be, without causing the airlines to move.

That seizure of the entire facility which is requested by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], has only one purpose, and that is to drive the airlines out right now by strong-arm, tyrannical methods. I hope the Secretary of Defense will not be sucked in on any program of that kind.

I may assure the House of Representatives that the matter of terminating the emergency declared in 1950 is being given consideration at the White House. I have a letter of March 5, 1956, from Mr. Bryce N. Harlow, administrative assistant to the President, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point both letters may be inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER]?

There was no objection.

(The letters referred to are as follows:)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I urge you to consider the wisdom, at this time, of declaring at an end the emergency proclaimed by President Truman December 16, 1950, in Presidential Proclamation 2914.

Issued in the darkest days of the Korean war, the proclamation has now, after the passage of 5 years, it seems to me, outlived its usefulness and is out of harmony with domestic and foreign conditions of today.

A presidential emergency proclamation is a somewhat unusual governmental institution. In and of itself, aside from its appeal to the patriotism of all citizens, it has no effect upon property or personal liberty. It is only when others take legal action depending upon the duration of an emergency proclaimed by the President, that lives and property are affected.

The House of Representatives on February 20, 1956, adopted H. R. 8710, a bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 by restricting the power of the military services to enter into supply contracts through negotiation rather than through competitive bidding. That action necessarily proceeded from the conviction of the House that insofar as the need for negotiated procurement is concerned, the emergency declared by President Truman in 1950 is over.

Many other legal rights and powers depend on that emergency. Extraordinary powers granted executive agencies in legislation, provisions in legal documents entered into by citizens in their private capacities, clauses in conveyances, and other legal documents from the Government reserving or granting rights and powers during an emergency declared by the President, not intended to exist during normal peacetime conditions, now hang over the heads of those affected like a sword of Damocles.

For example, in a deed dated January 15, 1947, from the Federal Government to the regents of the University of Michigan conveying Willow Run Airport, declared surplus after World War II, appears the following provision:

"(2) That during the existence of any emergency declared by the President or the Congress of the United States, the Government shall have the right without charge except as indicated below, to the full unrestricted possession, control, and use of the landing area, building areas, and airport facilities, as such terms are defined in WAA regulation 16, as amended, or any part thereof, including any additions or improvements thereto made subsequent to the declaration of the airport property as surplus; *Provided, however*, That the Government shall be responsible during the period of such use for the entire cost of maintaining all such areas, facilities, and improvements, or the portions used, and shall pay a fair rental for the use of any installations or structures which have been added thereto without Federal aid."

Last year, the Airport Use Panel, an arm of the Air Coordinating Committee, recommended that Willow Run Airport be used by reserve military air units in the Detroit area, namely, the United States Navy Reserve, the United States Air Force Reserve, and the Michigan Air National Guard.

The panel also recommended that eight commercial airlines serving the Detroit metropolitan area transfer their operations from Willow Run Airport to Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, 6 air miles distant.

The report overlooked probable expenditures of from $28 million to $33 million of Federal, State, local, and private funds needed further to put Detroit-Wayne Major Airport into full-scale commercial operation. It also ignored problems of the use of airspace and the future congestion of air traffic in the already crowded air corridors of the Wayne-Major-Willow Run traffic pattern.

Even more important, the Airport Use Panel used as its basis for making such unusual recommendations the emergency proclamation of 1950, issued by President Truman, and the provision in the quit-claim deed to the University of Michigan which I previously cited.

The only military use of Willow Run Airport which has been suggested has been Reserve jet training operations of the Air Force and the Navy, largely weekend flying. The Air Force expects annual full strength operations (landing and take-off are regarded as separate operations) totaling 22,500, and the Navy estimates its annual operations at 32,000. Last year the total operations at Willow Run Airport were 141,000.

It is almost unthinkable that for this limited use the Government should avail itself of its technical legal right, under the above-quoted clause in the deed whereby the University of Michigan acquired Willow Run Airport, to assume possession and control of the entire field and the buildings now utilized for commercial scheduled airline operations. However, this seems to be the threat contained in the report of the Airport Use Panel. It would certainly be high-handed and arbitrary for the Government to take back Willow Run Airport after the University of Michigan has scrupulously performed its obligations under the deed, and the airport has served admirably for 10 years, both as a research center and as the air terminal for the Detroit metropolitan area, at almost no public expense and without a single accident.

The Executive emergency proclamation of 1950 seemed to be founded on two circumstances: (1) the Korean war, and (2) the cold war with communism.

The first reason for the emergency was dissipated when the Korean war was settled July 27, 1953. If the cold war with communism is the basis for an emeregency declaration, it would mean that we will be living under emergency conditions indefinitely.

I believe your administration has demonstrated that the American economy can thrive under peacetime conditions and that the Government can operate efficiently in peacetime without the extraordinary powers necessarily granted in a crisis.

There is a natural and understandable tendency in executive agencies to hold on to powers once granted and not turn them back either to the Congress or to the people. I do not believe you share this attitude. I believe it is your purpose in the interests of freedom and self-government to retain in the executive branch of the Government only those powers which are necessary to the proper discharge of executive responsibilities and to rely upon the support and cooperation of the Congress and the people to grant such additional authority as may be required in any future emergency.

I readily concede that there may be information of a classified nature to which I do not have access which may render our condition, both domestic and international, more grave than public statements of leading officials would indicate.

Unless there is such information, however, it would seem to me appropriate that serious thought be given to declaring the 1950 emergency at an end.

In any event, it would seem appropriate to instruct the executive agencies that the limited requirement for the use of Willow Run Airport for Reserve training activities would not justify the seizure of Willow Run Airport and all of its buildings simply for the purpose of driving the commercial scheduled airlines out of Willow Run.

Respectfully,

GEORGE MEADER.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 5, 1956.

The Honorable GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: It is a pleasure to acknowledge, on behalf of the President, your March 2 letter, in which you urge the President to declare an end to the emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950. I can assure you that a further reply will be forthcoming at an early date.

Sincerely,
With kind regard,

BRYCE,
Bryce N. Harlow,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, for the information of my colleagues from Michigan. I might say

that I have taken a leaf out of the Leroy Smith's book. So long as I thought it was a waste of money for the Federal Government to put $975,000 into Wayne Major, it is just as much a waste for the State of Michigan to put up half that amount to match it.

I have written identical letters, which I just mailed yesterday, to the chairman of the appropriations committee of the senate in the State of Michigan and the chairman of the ways and means committee of the Michigan House of Representatives calling their attention to this problem and urging that any appropriation of Michigan State funds for Wayne Major be withheld until the investigations, to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and I have been referring, have been completed, and until there is some assurance that, if they spend all of this money at Wayne Major, the airlines are going to use it.

(The letters referred to are as follows:)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C. March 12, 1956.

Hon. ELMER R. PORTER,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee,
Michigan Senate, Lansing, Mich.

DEAR ELMER: I am informed that the Wayne County Board of Supervisors has requested the State of Michigan to appropriate $413,149 to help match an allocation of $975,000 made recently by the Civil Aeronautics Administration for expansion of Detroit-Wayne Major Airport.

As you may know, I have asked the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the Federal airport aid program and to give particular attention to further waste of Federal funds in spending some thirty-odd million dollars to develop Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, which is in the same air traffic pattern as Willow Run Airport now in use by commercial airlines at Detroit. As you also know, Willow Run and Detroit-Wayne Major Airports are but 6 air miles apart. That huge expenditure is particularly wasteful in view of the declared intention of the airlines not to use Detroit-Wayne Major Airport.

It would seem wise to me to withhold further appropriations for Detroit-Wayne Major Airport until investigation of the airport-aid program is completed, and until the airlines give some assurance that they intend to make use of Detroit-Wayne Major Airport as the terminal for the Detroit metropolitan area.

For your information, and in support of my suggestion, I enclose tear sheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing remarks I made on February 23 and March 1, 1956, on the floor of the House of Representatives. They also include a series of articles on Detroit's airport problem by Jean Pearson, Detroit Free Press aviation writer. Those articles set forth rather comprehensively and in some detail considerations which seem to me to point conclusively to the desirability of withholding expenditures at Detroit-Wayne Major until such time as a definite, clear decision with reference to airports in the Detroit area has been made.

If there is any further information I can provide you, please do not hesitate to get in touch with me.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

(Same letter to Hon. Joseph E. Warner, chairman, ways and means committee, Michigan House of Representatives, Lansing, Mich.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. Would the gentleman object to having that letter expanded to include the expenditure of any State funds at Willow Run?

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman's colleague, Mr. Leroy Smith, very effectively took care of that by coming down here and going before the CAA to oppose a very modest request of $86,500 for Willow Run when Wayne Major was asking for over a million; but his representatives took it up with the officials in the Civil Aeronautics Administration and urged them not to give any money to Willow Run, and they did not give any. Talk about somebody talking to an official of the Government, it seems to me that people at Wayne Major Airport—I do not know who is doing it but I know some of them have been down here and their efforts to see Members of Congress and also members of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Under Secretary of Commerce have been very successful in getting the major part of Federal airport aid funds and in getting action they wanted. I say the decision of the Airport Use Panel was a sham because they knew what they were going to do before they did it. Yet they ignored two of the features most important to be considered; namely, How much it is going to cost? And, second, What are the air traffic problems that will be involved if this is done? They expressly ignored those two items.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. Is it not true that the military are seeking Willow Run?

Mr. MEADER. Is the gentleman asking me whether or not——

Mr. LESINSKI. They have all approved the move.

Mr. MEADER. No; wait a minute; let us get the record very clear on this. The Air National Guard is at Wayne Major and it has been there since 1928, I think.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentlemen is correct.

Mr. MEADER. It has a long-term lease with some 20 or 25 years to go and it has an investment of $3 million in that field.

It wants to stay at Wayne Major. I have talked with officers flying on that field. They want to fly from Wayne Major because the runways are newer and wider; they can take off in formation. They do not want to move. Furthermore, they are not going to move unless they are forced. I understand that Leroy Smith has given up trying to get the National Guard out.

Second, the Navy Department, in December, 1954, wrote to Wayne Major Airport and asked permission to transfer their operations from Grosse Ile to Wayne Major; and Leroy Smith turned them down, simply because he said the airlines were going to move over there and there would not be space enough for the Navy too. The airlines have always said they were not going to move to Wayne Major, that it does not make sense to do so.

Mr. LESINSKI. Is it not a fact that the 4 military members of the Airport Use Panel request the Government recommendations?

Mr. MEADER. I cannot tell you that. I can tell you about one of the members of the Airport Use Panel because I flew up to Detroit with him. I can say that the conclusion was that it was better for the Navy to go to Wayne Major, and their representatives have stated that publicly in the Detroit area.

May I also say for the gentleman's information when the 10th Air Force originally wanted to move a squadron from Selfridge Air Force base they said they preferred to go to Wayne Major Airport.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. First I want to say for the record that Mr. Leroy Smith is not a colleague of mine or even an acquaintance, but I would like to ask this gentleman if it is not a fact that the Airport Use Panel's recommendation is unanimous on the subject?

Mr. MEADER. The Airport Use Panel's recommendation was unanimous, but I say they knew what they were going to decide before they ever went up there. The CAA and the CAB were the 2 civilian agencies represented on the 6-man panel; the other 4 were from the Department of Defense. There is 1 from the Department of Defense itself, there is 1 from the Army, there is 1 from the Air Force and there is 1 from the Navy. They had kicked this question around within the Department of Defense and came up with a firm position on it, even though there had been disagreements along the line. So it was the Department of Defense policy that the request of the Air Force to go into Willow Run be granted. As far as the CAA is concerned, they have been sucked in on this deal by Leroy Smith as long as 10 years ago when he came down here and got a commitment to develop Wayne Major Airport. They spent $4 million developing it. No public official is likely without a good deal of prodding to admit he made a mistake.

Mr. DINGELL. Does the gentleman set himself up as an authority superior to the Airport Use Panel as to the Wayne Major Airport?

Mr. MEADER. The Airport Use Panel is a stacked deck, that is all.

Mr. DINGELL. Would the gentleman say that the economic and financial interests of his particular district do not in any way affect his interest in this particular controversy?

Mr. MEADER. Is the gentleman asking me if I try to represent my constituency? The answer is "Yes."

Mr. DINGELL. And does not the gentleman's desire to represent his constituency perhaps overwhelm his respect for the good judgment of this Airport Use Panel?

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman is asking me my processes of thinking. I will frankly say to him that I became interested in this problem initially because my constituents were interested in it and brought it to my attention. I

became convinced over a year's study that there is involved a tremendous waste of public-tax funds unless somebody does something about it. That to me outweighs the interest of my constituents.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. Is it not true that the Federal agencies of the Government that have been making this study are for this move and is it not also true that these commercial airline runways will be too short in the not too distant future because of a need for larger airports and that millions of dollars will have to be spent on Willow Run to make it adequate?

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman is asking me some questions that neither he nor I have an answer to; but I hope the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee will call before it real experts on the future of aviation in this country and will develop the best thinking on future airport construction. I will lay that alongside of the performance of the CAA and the other Federal agencies involved in this, like the Airport Use Panel, and see whether needs in the future of aviation are being properly taken care of.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman is saying then that the President used very poor judgment in selecting the members of the Airport Use Panel?

Mr. MEADER. I do not think the President had too much to do with selecting them. I think the whole thing ought to be looked into. We here in the Congress set up the CAA to determine where and how the funds are to be spent. What happens? There was an Air Coordinating Committee created in September, 1946 which takes away from the CAA the authority to make decisions that Congress vested in the CAA.

DEFENSE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, as the elected Representatives of the people of the United States, each of us present in this Chamber today, is directly responsible to our fellow American citizens for our national security and for wise frugality in the conduct of the fiscal affairs of our Nation.

Often times we are called upon to vote for national security measures that may offend our inclination to be frugal, but we vote for the legislation because we realize that a strong America is a necessary investment in our future. It is the only adequate safeguard in the great struggle against the evils of communism. The cost of national preparedness is almost as great as the urgency that must attend our attainment of a military posture which will render us immune to any Communist onslaught. It is because of that cost and because of that urgency, that I rise to address this distinguished body today.

I would like to discuss a matter with my colleagues concerning a possible action by the Congress of the United States that threatens to disregard the urgency of strengthening our defenses and that will violate every principle of economy that relates to our national security program. This proposed action will delay by over 1 year the beginning of a construction project deemed vital to our security by the Department of the Air Force. This action will cost the American taxpayer millions of dollars more in defense costs for less defense. The possible congressional action to which I refer may delay the completion of a defense project vital to our American security and would saddle the American taxpayer with added defense costs. The matter concerns the defense military construction bill for fiscal year 1957 with particular reference to the portion of that bill authorizing the appropriation of funds for the Kalkaska Air Force Base, Kalkaska, Mich.

Recently certain self-seeking individuals sought to have the site of this Air Force base transferred from the Kalkaska area to a location in the vicinity of Manistee, Mich. These persons have sought to accomplish this purpose in total disregard of defense considerations without concern for economy and in a selfish effort to further their own personal interests. It is inconceivable to me that the Congress of the United States would take favorable action on legislation that would advance the selfish interests of a few against the common good of the many.

So that the Members of the House of Representatives may be informed with respect to the facts in this matter, I would like to take a few moments to present a recitation of the events that led up to the recent tentative action of the House Committee on Armed Services that resulted in tentatively changing the site for the proposed airbase from Kalkaska, Mich., to Manistee, Mich.

On January 11, 1954, the then senior Senator from the State of Michigan, the Honorable Homer Ferguson, announced that the Air Force had decided that a jet-interceptor base would be located in the Traverse City area of northern Michigan. In the ensuing months, comprehensive studies were made in the area to assure the selection of a site that would be situated in the best possible strategic location that had acceptable characteristics from the engineering and construction standpoint and that would offer adequate community recreational facilities for troop morale purposes. This study was joined in by the interested committees of Congress and by the appropriate officials of the Air Force. The study resulted in the selection of a site in the vicinity of Kalkaska. Kalkaska met the operational criteria of the Air Force and Kalkaska and nearby Traverse City pledged complete support and cooperation in all aspects of community life to the Air Force if the jet base were located in the vicinity. A further feature of the Kalkaska site that made it desirable from the standpoint of the Air Force was that it offered a potential that was for all practical purposes, unlimited for future expansion of the base for multipurpose use.

Detailed engineering studies of the possible sites of the jet base in northern Michigan demonstrated that the Kalkaska site would cost less in original construction and would entail a lower annual cost for the operation of the SAGE project that would be located at the airbase. Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks, I would like to include a table prepared by the Department of the Air Force showing the costs that I have just alluded to for the Kalkaska site and the three possible sites in the Manistee area:

Department of the Air Force cost estimates for airbase construction in Traverse City area

Proposed sites	Construction cost of airbase including real estate and SAGE project	Annual communications cost for SAGE project
Kalkaska site	$16, 943, 650	$1, 040, 000
Manistee site I	19, 537, 247	1, 500, 000
Manistee site II	18, 532, 756	1, 500, 000
Manistee site III	17, 276, 061	1, 500, 000

In a letter addressed to the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee dated July 28, 1955, the Department of the Air Force in considering the Kalkaska site and the three possible sites in the Manistee area, had this to say:

Based upon construction costs, yearly operating costs, and community support, the development of the Kalkaska site would be in the best interest of the Air Force.

The immediate development of a new air base and the SAGE project at the Kalkaska site is necessary to meet an urgent air defense requirement. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that approval be granted by your committee with the least practical delay, for the development of an air base at this location.

The authorization and appropriation for the expenditure of $8,635,000 has already been favorably acted on by the Congress.

With the concurrence of the House Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services and the Senate Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services, the Department of the Air Force, and the communities affected began in the early fall of 1955 to prepare for the development of the jet interceptor base in the Kalkaska area. To change the location of the site from Kalkaska to some other location at this late date would delay construction on this vitally needed base according to Air Forces estimates, by approximately 1 year as well as fritter away approximately $500,000 that the Federal Government has already spent or committed to be spent in the development and completion of plans and working drawings for the Kalkaska site. The time lost and the one-half million dollars that I just referred to would be in addition to the increased construction costs and the higher annual operating costs which are indicated in the table that I presented earlier in my discussion of this matter.

The Air Force has substantially completed the process of land acquisition at

Kalkaska and it has a lease on some 7,000 acres of State land available for base development. The State of Michigan has already cleared over 100 acres of this land at State expense and loss of timber because of the decision to locate the base at Kalkaska and to move the base now would break faith with the State of Michigan and its great people.

In the words of an official of the Department of the Air Force testifying before the House Committee on Armed Services in regard to the Kalkaska base:

> It is a matter of importance that this go forward rapidly. Not only because of the need and desirability of establishing a base for our fighters as a protection to the central part of our country but in order to establish the SAGE installation which is a part of the network of projection for the whole northern border of our country.

This same official, again referring to the urgent need for the base at Kalkaska, stated as follows:

> The project of the SAGE installation is of the utmost importance. The plans are ready. We could go forward placing contracts within a matter of weeks if it were established that the installation will go at Kalkaska.

The Air Force has expressed the view that to shift the base from Kalkaska to the Manistee area leaves a gap in the defenses of the United States for an additional year and that the Manistee site would present difficult problems in connection with base expansion that are not found in the Kalkaska site.

Thus, we have expression of views by responsible officials of the Department of the Air Force that the Kalkaska site for the jet interceptor base in the Traverse City area is more desirable from the standpoint of construction, is more economical to build and maintain, and is already in substantial and significant progress. We have the view expressed by the Department of the Air Force that to change the site at this point would leave a gap in our border defenses against enemy attack. Mr. Speaker, the facts that I have recited provide more than sufficient reason for keeping the base at Kalkaska. Unfortunately, they are not the only reasons why the base must be retained there. I would like for a few minutes to discuss considerations involving the communities that would be affected by the proposed transfer of the air base from the Kalkaska area to the Manistee area.

In beginning this aspect of my discussion of this matter, I would like to quote from a letter dated January 19, 1955, that I received from the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the Honorable CARL VINSON, in which he says as follows:

> It has been the experience of the committee that unless there are obvious and compelling reasons for reconsideration of the site selected, and these reasons should, in the last analysis, relate directly to our defense, no useful purpose is served by engaging in action which could well be construed as substituting the judgment of the committee for qualified people in the military departments.

Thus, the chairman of the great Armed Services Committee has gone on record in favor of keeping the base at Kalkaska and thereby complying with the judgment of the Air Force.

When the people of Kalkaska and Traverse City learned of the desire on the part of the Department of the Air Force to create a jet interceptor base in the vicinity of their communities, they reacted with a spirit of cooperation and willingness that I like to think is typical of our American citizens. With their financial resources and their personal endeavors they wholeheartedly undertook to cooperate with the Department of the Air Force in the development of the base. On the part of the year-round residents of the communities, I think it may be stated that the community support for the project was without exception. The personal consideration of inconvenience that might result from operation of the base in their vicinity was subordinated to the realization that such a base was vital to the defense of our country. Communities facilities for education, worship, recreation, and living were made available to the Air Force and plans were made for the further development of these facilities. People realized that the communities of Kalkaska and Traverse City would have an important contribution to make to the morale of the troops who might be stationed at this new Air Force base. The people were determined that service at this base would be a bright spot in the career of any Air Force man or woman. Over 100 acres of timberland have already been cleared for the development of the base.

To assure that there was community cooperation with the Department of the Air Force in the development of the base, the citizens of Kalkaska and Traverse City organized the Kalkaska Air Base Committee, Inc. I stress the fact that this committee was organized for purposes of cooperating with the Air Force and not for the purpose of creating pressure in favor of the selection of the Kalkaska site. I have recently received a telegram from the president of the Kalkaska Air Base Committee, Mr. Merle Lutz, who is a distinguished year-round resident of the community of Traverse City, in which he succinctly highlights the efforts of the citizens of the two great communities in their endeavor to cooperate with the Department of the Air Force. Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks I will include in the telegram from Mr. Lutz:

TRAVERSE CITY, MICH., *March 5, 1956.*
Representative VICTOR A. KNOX,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The people of Kalkaska and Traverse City, Mich., have subscribed a total of $85,849, of which $74,279 is already paid in cash, for the purpose of acquiring privately owned properties in the Kalkaska jet airbase site. Over 405 individuals or firms contributed to the fund. This was done to keep our word to the Air Force that these lands would be turned over free and clear to them. Forty-eight individual parcels of land must be purchased, and we have already acquired 18 of them. Nineteen thousand two hundred and thirty-eight dollars has already been spent in acquiring these properties, and several thousand dollars additional has been spent for legal and appraisers' fees and other expenses. A contingent fund of several thousand dollars has been raised for eventual USO purposes. Additional properties are being purchased as fast as contact can be made. The counties of Kalkaska and Grand Traverse, with the State of Michigan, are formulating plans for highway construction to accommodate the jet airbase. Added school facilities are being planned to accommodate children of the jet base personnel. Both communities are working energetically to be ready to welcome and accommodate the jet airbase at Kalkaska.

MERLE LUTZ,
President, Kalkaska Air Base Committee, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, this community activity is significant not only with respect to the development of the airbase but in my opinion it is even more significant in revealing what the attitude of the people will be toward the Air Force personnel who will be stationed at the base when it becomes operational. Being familiar with the patriotism and civic mindedness of the people of these two communities, I am confident that the relationship that will exist between the airbase personnel and the citizens will be exemplary.

That community acceptance is an important morale factor with respect to our service personnel goes without saying. The quality of training that must be given to our fighting personnel in this day of scientific warfare makes it highly desirable that we have a high incidence of reenlistment in order to insure technically competent persons to man the complex machines of war.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I can best sum up my remarks on this subject by saying that Traverse City and Kalkaska want the Air Force and the Air Force wants Kalkaska and Traverse City.

I would not, Mr. Speaker, be totally objective with my colleagues in the House if I were to represent that there were not some residents of Kalkaska who oppose the location of the airbase in that vicinity. My remarks that follow should not be construed to be critical of these dissenters as individuals. I am confident that they are patriotic, loyal citizens who, Mr. Speaker, in their evaluation of this matter, may be unwittingly giving greater consideration to their personal convenience than they are to the welfare of our service personnel and our national security. From my correspondence I have concluded for the most part that those persons who object to the location of the airbase at Kalkaska are summertime residents of the area. They might be termed "fair weather friends."

One of the major weaknesses in the argument that these objectors present probably could be best demonstrated by a passage from a letter that I received from a citizen in Indianapolis, Ind., who sought my support in opposition to the airbase at Kalkaska. This Indiana "constituent" states as follows:

> The fact is, however, that there are other sections in northern Michigan not so heavily populated as a resort area where I think this airbase could be located.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that there is any airbase in the United States that could not be moved to a greater area of wilderness from its present location.

The Air Force has deliberately, and rightly so in my opinion, pursued a policy

of locating airbases near communities where proper recreational facilities can be available to its service personnel. As one Member of Congress, I think this Air Force policy is right. I would oppose the transfer of any of our airbases to wilderness locations for the convenience of certain selfish citizens. It is these same citizens who would in a time of national emergency look to America's fighting men whom they relegate to the wilderness, for the defense of our Nation.

A "constituent" from St. Louis, Mo., has also undertaken to oppose the location of the airbase at Kalkaska. He is another summertime resident of the community. This "constituent" from St. Louis recently appeared before the House Committee on Armed Services and testified that the peace and tranquility of his fabulous home on Torch Lake would be disturbed by the location of the airbase at Kalkaska. Upon investigation I have learned that this "fabulous home" is assessed for real-estate tax purposes at $3,800 on which he pays $100.70 a year in real-estate taxes to the local community. I would inquire of my colleagues in the House as to whether the peace and tranquility of this summertime resident of Kalkaska are to be considered as paramount to the morale of our Armed Forces personnel whom he too would relegate to the wilderness? This same constituent from St. Louis has circulated a communication urging the citizens to make contributions to the Chain of Lakes Protective Association which he states will be deductible under the internal-revenue laws. This gentleman has urged interested people to donate stocks that have appreciated in value to his cause so that they may claim as the income-tax deduction the full market value of the security. I presume that this St. Louis neighbor would have the citizens of Kalkaska and Traverse City take their life savings for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to inform my colleagues in the House that the majority of the summertime residents of the Traverse City-Kalkaska area have a patriotism and a concern for the welfare of our service personnel which transcends personal consideration, real or imaginary, and they are supporting the location of the airbase at Kalkaska in view of the decision of the Air Force that the base should be located there.

In the September 1, 1955, edition of the Antrim County News, there was published a letter from a Lt. Col. Joseph Godley, of the United States Army, retired, which deals with the subject about which I have been talking this afternoon. I request, Mr. Speaker, that this news article be printed at this point, in the RECORD, of my remarks:

WRITER IS AMAZED AT LACK OF PATRIOTISM IN OPPOSING KALKASKA JET BASE SITE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following letter was received regarding the Kalkaska jet base site:)

DEAR KEN: As you are probably well aware, I have no craving for publicity. However, upon my return from an absence of a week, one of the first things which caught my eye in going over your issue of the 25th was the headline "Alden Group Protests Kalkaska Base."

Reading over the article it amazed me that so many people in an American and purportedly patriotic community, people of presumably normal intelligence and patriotic feelings could have lent themselves to a purpose such as stated and have signed petitions opposing selection of the Kalkaska Base site. I want to say right now that had I known, and I know of others who feel the same, that the intent of certain people who attended this meeting, was to engineer such opposition, I should have made every effort in my power to attend and voiced my sentiments against such an expression emanating as the concensus of community opinion on the subject. By community, I mean the Chain O' Lakes area, and by the same token convey my feeling that the entire community is concerned, not merely Alden. I feel, too, that Alden is merely the innocent focal point in this situation, and that if a true canvass were taken it would be found that the folks there resent this slur on their patriotism in using the name of their village in this fashion.

The action opposing the establishment of the base was apparently taken by a relatively few persons, people who spend the relatively few weeks of the summer season at their resorts in the area. No question but what some regard the proposed base as an invasion of their peace and quiet. On the other hand it may equally well be the effort of others to inject this community into a well-publicized controversy between contenders for the site which has held up for over 18 months the construction of a defense installation that could well prove to be of paramount importance in a national emergency that could drop out of the skies more quickly and with more paralyzing and devastating effect than that which came to us at Pearl Harbor.

Be that as it may it is a pity that any group of our citizens should set their own ease and comfort, and their own private interests above the interests of this community, the State and our national security. It is understandable that many people will sign petitions on request and without giving full consideration to all the facts in the case. I can sympathize for those who feel that jets flying overhead create disturbance, but my own experience and that of our many comrades of the services, give assurance that we can accustom ourselves to these things just as we had to get used to the bombing and strafing, the shells and the other missiles of the enemy, not to mention the multiple discomforts of active service—the classic examples of which are the sufferings of our patriotic troops at Valley Forge, the bloody battles of the wilderness, the horrors of trench warfare, the Bataan march, the D-Day landings and the Bulge battle, and certain incidents of the Korean conflict still fresh in our memories. But what are these compared to having your relaxation disturbed for a few moments?

Further—who is so foolish that he fails to understand and appreciate the value to community of a military installation, like a large plant, with its large payrolls, its needs for housing, food, clothing, and recreational advantages for its personnel and their dependents?

Much has been said about the undesirable "hangers-on" at a military instllation. It is true that in time of war it is not always possible for the authorities to control such elements as much as might be desired, but I can assure my neighbors that every human effort is made to do so, and I will say also, that nowadays these installations and their environs are much better policed than the average community is by the civil enforcement authorities. Also, it is hardly necessary to point out, that the personnel of these installations may not be among the wealthy and most cultured in our midst, but they certainly, and as never before in our national existence, represent a segment of the best in our population, with educational and living standards of a high average order. Indeed, if such high standards were not insisted upon, our Armed Forces would be totally inadequate to protect the Nation with the complex weapons and equipment in our modern Arsenal.

It can be said without equivocation, that the community has nothing to fear—the prospects of problems arising from such hangerson are nothing to be alarmed about, and the noise of the jet planes are something we can get accustomed to. We all have to make some small sacrifices to attain the maximum security which cannot be perfect and total whatever we do, in this upset world of today. Many can very well be thankful that they are not called upon to make greater contribution of their personal services, their time and effort, in this troubled world, to the gigantic machine required to protect our leisure amidst the colossal uncertainties facing our national planners in their mission—the preservation of human rights and liberty, and the best political and economic systems known to mankind thus far.

A few words more anent my understanding of the reason for the selection of Kalkaska as the base site. These express my personal views, views based upon some 40 years of military and economic studies. The selection has been made on a consideration of the military values which has been given to far too few of such selections in our history as a Nation. Much has been printed on the subject—let me give you my understanding in a capsule. It appeared necessary to make the installation within a certain restricted area. As is well known, certain favored sites were objected to on one ground or another—Interlochen National Music Camp being one. Personally, I'll admit that the objection there would have had little weight with me had no equally good site been available, but I can see the point, and I love music, too.

Cadillac, alive to the advantages, has made a fine fight to get this base. However, anyone with an elementary knowledge of the requirements, would understand the rejection of this site. I have seen too many fine and promising young men cut off in their early useful lives, to subject them to the unnecessary, additional risks that site offers. Anyone who has seen that towering TV mast near Cadillac, with its many steel struts supporting it at various heights and angling to the ground at varying distances, can readily understand its menace to jet flyers going at a speed which allows no time to transmit vision to action reflexes, no matter how brilliantly lighted.

There are other objections which make Kalkaska stand out as the superior site, but let that one which has no equivalent as a mankiller prevail in my theme.

In short, it is my strong impression that the selection of Kalkaska was made principally because it offered the greatest advantages and strategic values.

It rests there with me, and I'm sure that nothing this group does will be allowed to upset the findings upon proper evaluation. We, my wife and I, have as great a stake in the outcome as any individuals owning property for their personal recreation, and there is no single property any place in the Chain O' Lakes area in my knowledge, that we would exchange it for. We are entirely satisfied that the selection of the Kalkaska Base site was made upon its merits and its value from a standpoint of its security value to the Nation. We are glad to have it that way.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH GODLEY,
Lieutenant Colonel, United States Army, Retired.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the House Committee on Armed

Services met this morning for the purpose of taking final action on the Defense Military Construction bill for fiscal year 1957. It was my hope that that distinguished committee would give heed to the urgings of the Department of the Air Force to permit continuation of the airbase at Kalkaska, Mich. It was my hope that that committee would give heed to the taxpayers' pocketbook and the need of our Nation of immediate maximum security and authorize continuation of the work on the Kalkaska base. It was my hope that that committee would have the compassion to be concerned with the welfare and morale of our Armed Forces personnel and direct the Air Force to continue with the Kalkaska Air Base.

Since the Kalkaska base was not included in the defense military construction bill as reported by the committee, I will be constrained to offer a floor amendment to the bill authorizing the continuation of the Kalkaska Jet Base project. My responsibility to the American people as well as my duty as a Congressman from the 11th Congressional District of the State of Michigan will leave me no other alternative. The urgency of the defense considerations involved in this matter, our responsibility to the American people to frugally guard the Federal purse strings, and the morale and welfare of the young men and young women who are required to serve in our Armed Forces provide compelling reasons for my colleagues in the House to join me in this endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, attached herewith is an editorial relative to the designation of a jet air base in northern Michigan. It is so well written and the fact presented in such a way that I feel sure the entire membership of the House would like to have this editorial from the Detroit Free Press for reading purposes:

POLITICAL PORK WINS—DEFENSE RUNS A BAD SECOND

When April 15 rolls around, and the average American mails in his income tax, he may ask, in the light of the Kalkaska Air Force jet-base squabble exactly how his tax money is spent.

A jet base, we were told, was needed in the northwest part of Michigan for the defense of vital industrial areas of the United States, including Detroit and Chicago.

From that point on, the public interest seems to have been completely overlooked.

First there was a row over which Michigan Congressman would benefit by having his base located in his district. It was offered to Representative THOMPSON, of Muskegon; then it was shifted to the district of Representative KNOX, of Sault Ste. Marie. It was a long, drawn out controversy, with chambers of commerce getting into the act, and it culminated with charges of attempted bribe offers which have never been fully dealt with.

Now the base is to be moved again, from Kalkaska in Representative KNOX's district, over to Manistee, which is in Representative THOMPSON'S district. This shift is being made by the House Armed Services Committee over the protests of the Air Force.

It is undoubtedly being done as a matter of congressional log rolling. But it will delay the availability of the field for 2 years, and it will cost the taxpayers $500,000, representing funds already poured into Kalkaska.

The question is whether the establishment of military defense installations is primarily for the purpose of protecting the United States or providing pork from the barrel for politicians.

When the Federal Government talks about the need for bigger budgets for defense, the people of Michigan are likely to remember Kalkaska and ask how their money is being spent—for the benefit of the Nation or the benefit of a few Congressmen and the pressure groups among their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House an editorial which appeared in the March 10, 1956, edition of the Ann Arbor News. It most certainly sets forth the confusion that has resulted in the selection of a site for a jet base in northern Michigan.

HASSLE OVER JET BASE SITE AN INCREDIBLE PERFORMANCE

Representative RUTH THOMPSON, Republican Congresswoman from Michigan, says she is glad the question of location for the proposed northern Michigan Air Force base is settled, but she may be a little premature. Why should she think that the jet-base-site issue which has been kicked around for more than 2 years is settled? Just because the House Armed Services Committee has voted to move the base from Kalkaska to Manistee? This is the fourth proposed location, and why should anyone think there won't be a fifth?

The controversy over a jet-base site would be funny if it weren't a matter linked to the country's defense system. How badly is such a base needed if it can be delayed year after year? It has been estimated that the latest change in site, from Kalkaska to Manistee, will hold up operations for another year.

Briefly, the history of the jet-base location fight is something like this:

Representative THOMPSON originally supported the Air Force's choice of a site in Benzie County. Dr. Joseph E. Maddy, director of the National Music Camp at Interlochen, led a campaign of opposition to the site on the grounds that it was too close to the camp and would interfere with its program. The House Armed Services Committee supported his stand, but businessmen in the Traverse City area were unhappy about it.

The Armed Services Committee then selected Cadillac as a site. Miss THOMPSON fought the decision because the proposed new site was outside of her district; later she charged that she had been offered a $1,000 bribe to support the Cadillac site. The House Appropriations Committee backed her by blocking funds for Cadillac.

The third location was chosen last August after Congress had adjourned. The Air Force selected the Kalkaska site, and that was believed to be the final choice until the Armed Services Committee upset the applecart again this week.

The switch to Manistee reportedly will mean another delay, and Representative Gerold Ford, Grand Rapids Republican, says it also will mean the loss of half a million dollars "already committed by the Air Force at Kalkaska."

The people of Michigan would like to know what is behind these on-again, off-again tactics. Is it more important that the jet base be in Representative THOMPSON'S district or that it be built quickly, as economically as possible and on a site that satisfies the Air Force, which after all should have something to say about it?

A member of the Armed Services Committee which made the latest and apparently least defensible change is Representative DEWEY SHORT, Missouri, Republican. SHORT, who happens to be from the same State as the leader of a group of Kalkaska summer residents opposing the Kalkaska site, supported the move for the sterling reason that the Air Force had not "kept faith" with Representative THOMPSON, who he said had assurances the base would be placed in her district.

And that, as far as we have been able to determine, is the compelling reason for this fourth change in site. We can only wonder if it is more important to keep faith with a Member of Congress than with the American people, who were to have been afforded a degree of security by the construction of this jet base.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain related material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HISTORY OF EFFORTS TO GIVE SMALL BUSINESS EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY PRIOR TO INTRODUCTION OF H. R. 11

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week, March 8, I spoke on the bill H. R. 11. I explained that on Monday, March 12, I would file a discharge petition to call this bill up. If a majority of the Members of the House sign the discharge petition, we will have 2 hours of general debate and then vote on H. R. 11.

H. R. 11 is a small-business bill. Almost every small-business man in the United States knows about H. R. 11 and fully understands H. R. 11. This bill goes to the very vitals of small business. It involves a direct question whether small business shall continue to exist.

H. R. 11 WILL RESTORE THE MAGNA CARTA OF SMALL BUSINESS

As I explained last Thursday, H. R. 11 amends the Robinson-Patman Act to close a gaping loophole which the Supreme Court has driven into that act. I know I need not tell the Members what the Robinson-Patman Act means to small business. It has been hailed as the Magna Carta of small business. Next to the tax law, this act is probably better known by small-business men all over the United States than any other law passed by Congress.

Everyone who is old enough to remember the wholesale destruction of small business which took place during the 1920's and the early 1930's knows how this law put a sharp check on that destruction and redirected the course of business. In the 15 years prior to passage of the act, small, independent businesses disappeared by the tens of thousands. Independent wholesalers and retailers all over the United States were swept away before the blitz march of a few giant chains. We were rapidly headed for a complete monopolization of the distribution business in this country, similar to if not worse than that which had already taken place in the manufacturing fields two decades earlier. Passage of the Robinson-Patman Act stopped that disastrous march. It is no exaggeration to say that without this law we very probably would not have any

small businesses left in the United States today. Our country would have been a very different country from what it is today, and it is probable that our political freedoms would have been very different from what they are today.

THE 74TH CONGRESS GAVE SMALL BUSINESS A CHANCE

I mention these things, not because I had a hand in drafting the Robinson-Patman Act and my name has become associated with it. I say to you plainly that the whole 74th Congress was the author of the Robinson-Patman Act. When this bill came before the House, it was passed by a vote of 290 to 16, and when it came before the Senate, the Senate passed it unanimously. In those days almost everybody wanted to give small business a fair break and we did it.

I know that today an overwhelming majority of the Members also want to give small business a fair break. Despite the public impression that today only big business can get help, and that this is an era for heaping more special advantages on big business, I am confident that Congress will pass H. R. 11. Most of the Members of the House will, I know, want to pass this bill without delay. Forty-seven Members joined me as cosponsors of the bill when it was introduced on the opening day of this Congress. Over on the Senate side, 31 Members of the Senate joined in introducing an identical bill. That bill is S. 11. More than that, I have seen letters from President Eisenhower to some of the small-business people which lead me to think that President Eisenhower will sign this bill. It is a very modest bill. It gives small business no more protection, but actually a little less protection, than small business had before the Supreme Court misinterpreted the law and created this loophole we are now concerned about. It gives no more protection to small business than I feel almost everyone will readily agree to, including even the more fairminded executives and lawyers for big business. This bill is clearly necessary to restore to small business equality of opportunity, and thus give small business a fair chance at survival. Small business depends upon this bill. It would be a monumental cruelty to refuse to pass it, and it would be a monumental folly.

JUSTICE DELAYED IS JUSTICE DENIED

I feel that the Members will agree that the issues involved in H. R. 11 are too serious, and fraught with dangers too grave, to permit delay or procrastination in acting on this bill. The Court opinion which drove a loophole in the law dates from 1951, and we have been lucky that the deterioration of small business has not followed more quickly than it has. We are lucky because the meaning of the decision has become only gradually understood. Coupled with the fact there was a seller's market for several years following the decision, this has meant that the deterioration in pricing practices has been delayed and gradual. But our luck has now run out, and we have already delayed too long.

We have all had desperate pleas from small-business people telling us of their plight. We have all seen the reports on small-business failures, and we are seeing the toll mount week after week.

I explained last Thursday what H. R. 11 does, and how the need for it arose. For the benefit of those Members who want to go into more details, however, I will today give a more complete statement. First, I would like to discuss the matter in a general way, then I will give a more formal analysis of the previous laws on this subject and the Court decisions which have made new legislation necessary. I made an exhaustive statement of this kind on May 10 of last year, in testimony before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary; and I would like, today, to draw heavily upon that earlier statement.

H. R. 11 CURBS ABUSE OF POWER

H. R. 11 strengthens our antitrust laws. Specifically, it amends and strengthens section 2 of the Clayton Antitrust Act of 1914, as previously amended by the Robinson-Patman Act of 1938. This act curbs a monopolistic practice which is, to small business, the most deadly of all monopolistic practices. This is the practice of price discrimination. This practice involves nothing more nor less than abuse of power. It inevitably results, therefore, in big business destroying small business, without respect to efficiency or other merits. Whether by intention or inadvertence, big suppliers destroy smaller suppliers, and big distributors destroy smaller distributors. By this practice big sellers, selling in many markets, or selling to many separate buyers, exercise an unfair and unjustified advantage over smaller competing suppliers who necessarily sell in fewer markets or to fewer separate buyers. The practice likewise results in big distributors'—that is, big wholesalers' and big retailers'—receiving unearned advantages with which they inevitably destroy smaller competing distributors. In brief, price discrimination is what makes the competitive contest unfair and oppressive. It is the great centralizing force in our business system which concentrates business more and more into the hands of the few and forecloses opportunity to the many. The practice inevitably results in monopoly, although our national policy is committed, theoretically at least, to preventing monopoly.

THE SHERMAN ACT DOES NOT GIVE SMALL BUSINESS A CHANCE

The practical effects of price discrimination have of course been long and widely understood. There is probably no businessman in the country, be he the smallest retail merchant, who does not know what the practice means and what the results are. Legislative attempts to curb and control the practice likewise have a long history.

In general, our antitrust legislation has taken two quite different approaches to the problem. The first, which many people believe to be the Sherman Act approach, and which for the most part has been the Sherman Act approach, is to do nothing about the problem. The theory of this approach is to make no interference with a variety of monopolistic practices, including discriminatory pricing, but wait until monopoly results, then dissolve the monopoly. In practice this has meant that part of the routine in suing to break up a monopoly is to introduce evidence on the company's record of discriminatory pricing, in order to show that the monopoly was attained through abuse of power and should therefore be condemned. But in practice the Sherman Act approach has also meant that very few monopolies were ever broken up. This of course gives great comfort to some of the spokesmen for monopoly industries, for they can praise the Sherman Act to the skies, knowing full well that any threat to monopoly from the Sherman Act is extremely remote and far distant.

Even if the Sherman Act approach accomplished what the theory holds for it, this approach would be unsound and barbaric. It rests on the proposition that it is perfectly all right to deny opportunity to one generation, on the assumption that opportunity will be restored to some later generation. It denies the public the protection of competition over the years when competition has been lost but the full flower of illegal monopoly has not yet been reached. It is an arrangement for special privilege, for it allows an equilibrium in which illegal monopoly is not reached, yet opportunity to the many is foreclosed.

H. R. 11 COMPLETES WORK STARTED IN 1914

The sound approach was that taken with passage of the Clayton Act in 1914. The idea of that legislation was to outlaw the practice from which monopoly results. The Clayton Act contained some defects, however, and these were soon enlarged by enforcement agencies and courts that preferred the Sherman Act method of dealing with monopoly.

Consequently, in 1936 we revised and strengthened the law. We thought we were passing a law which made it illegal for a firm engaged in interstate commerce to discriminate in the prices it charges different buyers, with certain notable exceptions. One of the unvarying exceptions is of course, that the seller may discriminate among his different buyers to the full extent of any differences in costs he may have in supplying the different buyers. Another unvarying exception is that a seller may change his prices as frequently as he likes, and by as much as he likes—just so his changes from time to time are not used as a cloak for concealing favoritism to particular buyers. The law does not dictate how high a price or how low a price a seller may charge, and it is not concerned with whether the seller charges the same or a different price from the price of other sellers. It is concerned only with a seller charging different buyers different prices at the same time.

When we passed the Robinson-Patman Act in 1936, we thought we had solved the problem which is before us today. That law was intended to correct the very same problem which now makes H. R. 11 necessary. But in 1951, the Supreme Court rendered a bad interpretation of the Robinson-Patman Act. In one stroke the Court canceled out much of the protection which we thought we had given small business by the 1936 legislation.

DISCRIMINATION INJURES BOTH SMALL SELLERS AND SMALL BUYERS

Now I would like to describe what we were trying to do, back in 1935 and 1936, when we were drafting the Robinson-Patman Act.

We were having literally thousands of complaints from small-business men about price discriminations, and as you will remember small firms and some pretty big firms were going out of business by the thousands. Well, we made a lot of investigations and held hearings over a period of about 2 years. And we got the Federal Trade Commission to make investigations. They sent investigators out and collected all kinds of price data and interviewed people and made reports. We went into this thing thoroughly—from every possible angle. One thing was certainly clear: We had to have a law on price discrimination and we had to have a really good one.

Now when we started to draft a bill, we found we had two problems. We had the problem of small suppliers trying to compete with big suppliers; and we had the problem of small customers—wholesalers and retailers, and people like that—trying to compete with big customers, like the chain stores.

The problem of small suppliers trying to compete with big suppliers was not new. It was the thing that was made famous by the old Standard Oil Co., and several other big companies about that time. It was the same kind of problem which the 1914 section 2 of the Clayton Act was passed to control, except that we learned a lot of new angles about the problem.

The old Standard Oil Co. started out as a small company. About 1860 or 1865 it was only one of about 30 refining companies then located in the vicinity of Cleveland, Ohio. When the Standard company set out to grow, the first thing it did was to merge with several of its competitors. This gave Standard a big size advantage over all the other competitors. Then what did it do? It would go out into the territory of one of its competitors and cut the price just in that territory, until the competitor was driven out of business. Then Standard would raise the price in that territory and move on to the territory of another competitor. The bigger it got, and the more business it had in high-priced markets, the easier it was to drive out the rest of the competitors. This company got control of more than 90 percent of all the petroleum business in the country before it was finally subdivided by the Supreme Court in 1912.

Well when we were investigating in 1935 and 1936, we found the same sort of thing still going on. Big suppliers were discriminating in their prices and putting smaller suppliers out of business. I will explain why this was when I finish telling you about the practical side of the problem.

Now practically everybody at that time, except some of the big companies, agreed that the kind of practice I have described was wrong. But a lot of people thought that the effects were bad only when a company discriminated to go below a competitor's price. We found out differently. The important thing is not just the price which a company receives for its product, it is also the volume of business it does at that price.

DISCRIMINATIONS TO MEET COMPETITION CAN DESTROY SMALL COMPETITORS

I can best illustrate, perhaps, by an investigation which the FTC made of the wholesale baking industry several years ago. There is a map in the FTC report which shows for example, the Illinois-Indiana area. It shows the truck routes over which the big baking companies were shipping bread out of Chicago to the towns in these States; and it shows the price charged for bread in each town. When the price in Chicago was, say 10 cents, the price at some town 50 miles away would be 9 cents; then at a place another 25 miles away it would be 10 cents again; then at another town, perhaps 100 miles away, it would be 8 cents; and so on. In most towns the price was 10 cents, but in many places it was 9 cents, 8 cents, and in some places 7 cents.

The investigators found that what was happening was this: The big Chicago baking companies were charging 10 cents in all towns where there was no local competition. But when they came to a town where there was a local baker they would drop the price to meet whatever price the local baker charged. The result was that when these big companies started distributing out of Chicago a great many small baking companies went out of business, and others were still going out of business. The point was that when a big bakery started sending trucks into a town and meeting the local baker's prices, the local baker lost a great percentage of his business. He had fixed costs, so with the loss of volume, his unit cost went up, and most likely he was soon in bankruptcy. Obviously, this is not a question of efficiency; it is a question of who is the biggest. Even if the local baker were greatly the more efficient, even if his unit cost for making and selling a loaf of bread were half that of the big baker, the effect would be the same. If the little baker reduced his price further, to try to get back his volume, the big baker would then meet that price, and he would not get his volume back. This is competition of size, not of efficiency. Efficiency would come into play only if, to meet the local baker's price, the big company had to reduce its price everywhere. Then the competition would be on equal terms.

PRICE DISCRIMINATION MAKES INEFFICIENCY

When we were investigating this practice we found the same thing going on in industry after industry. Big suppliers were discriminating in their prices, either to undercut the smaller companies or to meet the prices of the local companies. Sometimes the big companies would meet the price of local companies to put them out of business, and sometimes to make them raise their prices. Where a big company found that a local competitor was selling below its national price, it would meet the price in that area, and if the local company did not show signs of going out of business, then the game of raising prices would start. The big company would lower the boom for a while and then raise it again. If the local company failed to raise its price promptly, then the boom would be lowered again. Before long, after a few ups and downs, the local company would catch on to the fact that it had better raise up to the big competitor's price. Since the big competitor is not going to permit local companies to have more than a certain share of the local market, the only profitable thing they can do is to raise their prices up to the big supplier's price.

Thereafter the same proposition holds: No supplier has any real independence to reduce his price. Discrimination makes it so easy for the big competitors to meet his price, and he knows they will meet his price, and hence he knows he can only lose money and not gain any volume of business by reducing his price. There are only three or four or perhaps one or two big suppliers in each industry which have any independence to reduce prices. This is the thing that keeps prices to consumers high: the centralized control over prices which is maintained by discrimination. This is soft competition.

It is not much trouble to see why the big corporations do not like the anti-discrimination law. These corporations are at the top of the heap and have an unfair advantage over all of the smaller competitors. Many of these giant corporations are fat and lazy, and they would not like to have to compete with smaller companies on the basis of efficiency. Many of them know that if they did have to compete on equal terms the smaller companies would run rings around them.

Many of the big corporations are inefficient. They have a large number of high-priced vice presidents; they have huge advertising and political expenses; and, worst of all, they are snarled up in more bureaucratic redtape than the worst Government bureau we ever had. Many of the managements do not know who their own people are, and most of the underlings have to spend their time making up elaborate reports and reading regulations to find out what authority they have to do what. All of this takes time and money that might be spent in productive work.

HOMETOWN MERCHANTS WERE DESTROYED

Now that is only one side of the coin.

When we were drafting the amendments to section 2, we also had the problem of small customers, hometown merchants and wholesalers, trying to compete with big wholesalers and big chain retailers.

This was our greatest problem. It was a matter of grave concern, almost to the point of panic, all over the United States. A few giant chains were rapidly taking over all the distribution business and driving out the independent merchants by the tens of thousands. Most of the State legislatures had taken up this problem, and many of the States passed anti-chain-store legislation of one kind or another in an effort to cope with the problem.

It was easy to see why the big chains were driving the independents out. They were getting price concessions and

secret rebates far beyond anything that was justified by the suppliers' cost differences. Our investigations revealed, for example that prior to 1935 the A. & P. Co. had been receiving on an annual basis $6 million in off-the-invoice discounts and another $2 million a year in brokerage fees on its purchases.

In many instances the big chains were demanding special price concessions and coercing small suppliers into granting special concessions, with threats of putting up their own manufacturing plants. In other instances they were playing the suppliers off against one another, forcing suppliers of nationally advertised products to meet the prices of small, exclusive suppliers who could not, in practice, market to the independent trade. It was overwhelmingly obvious that something had to be done to check this abuse of power and return the competitive contest more to a contest of efficiency.

BOTH SMALL SUPPLIERS AND SMALL MERCHANTS WERE TO HAVE EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

When we drafted subsection (a) of section 2, we drafted it to meet both the problem of competition among suppliers and the problem of competition among customers. In some situations a supplier's discriminations injure another supplier without any effect on the customers. In other situations, a supplier's discriminations injure competition among his customers without affecting his competitors.

In other situations, a supplier's discriminations may injure both his competitors and his customers. Then, of course, there may be other situations where a supplier's discriminations injure neither competitors nor customers. If the customers are not in competition with one another, there is no injury there. And if the discriminations do not put a small competitor to a substantial disadvantage, there is no injury there.

Subsection (a), then, contains the general prohibition against price discrimination. We did not prohibit all price discriminations. And we did not prohibit discriminations which do only minor injuries. In other words, we did not want to trouble business about picayunish matters. But where the injury is substantial, the language is tight, and it was meant to be tight. I will quote the language as follows:

> Where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them.

On the other hand, we wrote into the bill a positive exemption for discriminations which are justified by differences in the supplier's costs. We did not want to be accused of interfering with efficiency anywhere in the economic system, and in fact we did not want to interfere with efficiency. We were not trying to make any advantage for small business, not even to offset the advantages which big business had enjoyed in the previous decades. We merely wanted to give small business an equal opportunity, or at least something approaching an equal opportunity.

OLD PROMISES TO SMALL BUSINESS

Why, we wondered, had this not been done before? What had happened to the promises made to small business in the political campaigns of 1912, and what had happened to the laws passed in 1914 which were supposed to fulfill these promises?

Certainly the promises had been made. There were strong "small business" and "antimonopoly" planks in the platforms of all three major parties participating in the 1912 presidential campaign—The Democratic Party, the regular Republican Party, and the "Bull Moose" Republican Party. Since the Democrats won the election in that year, I might read from its platform. It promised legislation for—and I am quoting—"the prevention of holding companies, of interlocking directorates, of stock-watering, of discriminations in price, and the control by any one corporation of so large a proportion of any industry as to make it a menace to competitive conditions"—Democratic platform of 1912.

Most of these promises were fulfilled, or were clearly intended to be fulfilled, by passage in 1914 of the Clayton Antitrust Act and the FTC Act. Section 2 of the Clayton Act dealt specifically with the practice of price discrimination.

I would like to read you what President Wilson wrote in a private letter shortly after he signed the Clayton and FTC bills:

> With similar purpose and in a like temper the Congress has sought, in the Trade Commission bill and in the Clayton bill, to make men in a small way of business as free to succeed as men in a big way, and to kill monopoly in the seed. * * * It is our purpose to destroy monopoly and maintain competition as an only effectual instrument of business liberty. * * * (Woodrow Wilson letter of October 17, 1914, the Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson, vol. III, pp. 189–190.)

"GOOD FAITH" PROVISO DESTROYED THE CLAYTON ACT

Certainly something had gone wrong with section 2 of the Clayton Act between 1914 and 1935. What had gone wrong? The fact is that section 2 of the Clayton bill contained a proviso which said that nothing contained in the law would prevent discriminations "made in good faith to meet competition."

As matters turned out, this harmless-sounding proviso meant that suppliers could do about anything they pleased. The "good faith" phrase of the proviso was interpreted by the courts in the same way the Sherman Act had been interpreted with respect to "attempting to monopolize." In short, the law on price discrimination, which was passed because the Sherman Act had failed, became no more than the Sherman Act. Lack of "good faith" could be proved only by proving an evil intent. In reality the new law provided some restraint against a big corporation's going on an open march to take over, perhaps, 90 percent or 100 percent of a whole industry. But for big corporations with a mere 10, 30, 50, or 80 percent of the market, it could rarely be proved that their discriminations were made with an intent to monopolize.

The courts could see no reason for inferring that a supplier might have some evil objective as to the distant future, when the supplier had immediately at hand the wholesome objective of getting more business and more profits. The point of the law, which was to outlaw a particular method for getting more business and more profits was lost sight of; all that counted was the corporation's intentions, its absence of any intent to monopolize. This deterioration in the law had become clear by the time of the depression following World War I. Congress did nothing about it, and the courts assumed, as they rightfully would, that they had interpreted the law the way Congress meant it to be interpreted. The law was largely a nullity.

MEANING OF THE NEW "GOOD FAITH" PROVISO

When we drafted the Robinson-Patman Act it was the "good faith" proviso above all else that we meant to correct. The legislative history of the act supports me in this statement in copious degree.

We certainly intended to eliminate the nullifying effects of this "good faith" proviso. We did however, write a new "good faith" proviso into the law—in a new subsection (b)—which was to operate as a self-defense justification. The Senate and House bills, as originally passed, differed on this point. There was a conference; the conference committee accepted the House version, and this is the version that passed.

The manager of the House conferees brought back a report which explained the meaning of this language at great length and with great clarity and precision. After that report there should never have been any misunderstanding or dispute as to what the "good faith" proviso of the Robinson-Patman Act means. I should like to read three small excerpts, if I may, from that report. Referring to the subsection 2 (b) proviso, the report said:

> This does not set up the meeting of competition as an absolute bar to a charge of discrimination under the bill. It merely permits it to be shown in evidence. This provision is entirely procedural. It does not determine substantive rights, liabilities, and duties. They are fixed in the other provisions of the bill. It leaves it a question of fact to be determined in each case, whether the competition to be met was such as to justify the discrimination given, as one lying within the limitations laid down by the bill, and whether the way in which the competition was met lies within the latitude allowed by those limitations. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 74th Cong., 2d sess., June 15, 1936, p. 9418.)

Furthermore, this report went on to point out some of the circumstances which would not be condoned by the proviso:

> This procedural provision cannot be construed as a carte blanche exemption to violate the bill so long as a competitor can be shown to have violated it first, nor so long as that competition cannot be met without the use of oppressive discriminations in violation of the obvious intent of the bill (op. cit.).

Then, conversely, the report points out one of the factual circumstances which must be present when the "good faith" defense might be found to justify a discrimination and thus serve as a bar to a cease and desist order. Now I hope that the Members will take careful note of these words, because in a few moments I will call attention to what the Supreme Court did with these words in a majority opinion in the Standard Oil (Indiana) case. The report states:

As in any case of self-defense, while the attack against which the defense is claimed may be shown in evidence, its competency as a bar depends also upon whether it was a legal or illegal attack (op. cit., p. 9413).

LAWFUL CONDUCT SHOULD NOT JUSTIFY UNLAWFUL CONDUCT

Now, what does this mean?

Let us suppose that I am walking along the street back home during a campaign and I meet my opponent and he attacks me in some unlawful way. Will I be justified in using an unlawful method to defend myself? Yes, of course, but this will depend upon all the circumstances. It will depend upon the nature of the attack, the methods of defense that are available to me, and the method I actually use. If my opponent were a big burly athlete, 7 feet all, I might be justified in hitting him with a club, although he attacked me only with his fists. But I would not be justified in continuing to rain blows on him after he is knocked out. In any case, I have the burden of proving my justification in court later. I will have to prove that he attacked me first, and that he attacked me unlawfully. And I would have to prove that I did nothing more than was necessary under the circumstances, to defend myself until such time as I could get the legal authorities to stop my opponent's unlawful attack.

Now let us suppose that I see my opponent coming along the street and he is unarmed, but I have a gun. He has not attacked me in any unlawful way, but I know that he has been trying to win over some of the voters who have supported me in past elections. So I pull out my gun and start shooting at him and I hit several innocent bystanders. Let us suppose further that my opponent takes cover behind a tree, and then I make myself comfortable and begin taking some leisurely potshots at that tree. I know that as long as I keep my opponent pinned behind that tree he cannot be out winning over more of the voters. So I continue taking potshots, and every now and again I hit an innocent bystander. I hit a lot of small children, particularly, who are not big enough to look out for themselves.

THE STANDARD OIL (INDIANA) OPINION

It might seem silly to ask if my conduct in this supposed situation would be justified, yet we cannot avoid these conclusions:

First, if I had been before the Supreme Court in place of Standard Oil (Indiana) in 1951, the Court would have told me that I was perfectly justified in using my unlawful method in attacking my opponent, just so long as my opponent had used no unlawful method in attacking me, and I was using this method for the purpose of retaining the support of voters who had supported me in the past.

Second, if the policemen who tried to stop me from shooting a lot of innocent bystanders had been before the Supreme Court in place of the FTC in 1951, the Court would have told those policemen that I was right, that they could not interfere with me until they first made a finding whether I was acting in self-defense, and that I would be acting in self-defense if I used this otherwise unlawful method to attack an opponent who had not used any unlawful method, but who was lawfully trying to take the support of voters that I wanted to retain.

These are almost precisely the things the Supreme Court told the Standard Oil Co., and the FTC in the Standard Oil (Indiana) decision. Now what were the facts?

The discriminations were taking place in Detroit, Mich. Standard was selling to certain of its retail dealers in Detroit at a much lower price than it sold to its other retail dealers in Detroit. Standard had no cost justification for making the different prices. The favored dealers naturally were able to reduce their prices to consumers, and Standard intended that they would reduce their prices to consumers. As a consequence, the favored dealers were taking trade away from Standard's other retail dealers and putting these dealers out of business. These were the innocent bystanders. Why was Standard commercially shooting innocent bystanders? It was meeting the prices of the Red Indian Co.

Red Indian is a small Michigan distributor of off-brand gasoline. The price of its gasoline to consumers was normally several cents below Standard's price. Standard was the principal marketer of gasoline in the Midwest, and its market covered 14 States. Standard was not reducing its price in all of these States, and it was not reducing its price throughout the city of Detroit; it was reducing its price just in those neighborhoods of Detroit where there were stations selling Red Indian gasoline. There was no evidence that Red Indian discriminated in its price; in fact, Standard's attorneys told the Supreme Court that Red Indian had not been making unlawful prices.

Now what happened? How did the law get into such a snarl?

THE SUPREME COURT CONFUSED SELF-DEFENSE

The Supreme Court's ruling on this question we already know. The Court ruled with Standard. It told the policemen that they could not interfere with Standard's activities until they made a finding whether or not Standard's discriminations were made in good faith. And it told us all what "good faith" means. It told us that "good faith" means "self-defense," and that "self-defense" means that a supplier is justified in resorting to the unlawful method of pricing to defend itself against a competitor who has used no unlawful method. Why did the Court think such a topsy-turvy notion of self-defense as this to be sound? Let the majority opinion speak:

It is enough to say that Congress did not seek by the Robinson-Patman Act either to abolish competition or so radically to curtail it that a seller would have no substantial right of self-defense against a price raid by a competitor. For example, if a large customer requests his seller to meet a temptingly lower price offered to him by one of his seller's competitors, the seller may well find it essential, as a matter of business survival, to meet that price rather than to lose the customer. It might be that this customer is the seller's only available market for the major portion of the seller's product, and that the loss of this customer would result in forcing a much higher unit cost and higher sales price upon the seller's other customers. (*Standard Oil (Indiana) Co. v. FTC.* (340 U. S. 231).)

Thus my analogy holds. Since we may assume that I may need the votes of those supporters down in my district, for reelection, then I am justified in attacking my opponent by a normally unlawful method, provided he has used no unlawful method to attack me, and the innocent bystanders I may shoot have no rights.

THE COURT CONFUSED VESTED INTEREST WITH COMPETITION

Now comes the bitterest pill of all. Here is the Court declaring that a supplier has a vested right in the continuing patronage of the people who have bought from him, so much so that he is justified in using the method of pricing we condemned as an instrument of monopoly. Here is the Court telling the innocent bystanders we sought to protect from abuses of monopoly power that their rights are secondary to the rights of a supplier who may need to use his monopoly power to retain customers.

Well this I can say: When we passed the Robinson-Patman Act, we thought we were passing a law for competition and against monopoly; and I have not heretofore known of any theory of competition which holds that a supplier has a vested right in the continuing patronage of his customers, so much so that he can resort to a method of competition by which the small competitors will always lose out and the big competitors will always win.

THE COURT MISREAD ITS STALEY OPINION

How did the Supreme Court arrive at the construction of self-defense it reached in the Standard Oil (Indiana) opinion? Its official sources were, for the most part, those I have cited—principally the report filed by the manager of the House conferees on the bill, Mr. Utterback. It also appears however, that the Court had been educating itself with some of the writings of propagandists working for a lobby which has been out to wreck the antitrust laws. And finally, it appears that the Court misread its 1945 opinion in the Staley case, a unanimous opinion written by the late Chief Justice Stone.

As I read part I of the Staley opinion, the Court rejected Staley's plea that this company was justified under the 2 (b) defense in adopting in toto a competitor's illegal basing-point system of pricing, for the reason that the Court clearly thought both Staley and its competitor

were merely making a simultaneous raid on the consumer's pocketbook. The facts before the Court did not suggest that Staley's discriminations were made for the purpose of defending itself against an unlawful attack by its competitor, nor against an attack of any kind. Nor did the facts suggest that Staley was attacking its competitor. Furthermore, the Court was presumably aware, as the briefs in the lower court had pointed out, that several years before this case was brought, Staley and its competitor had entered into a consent decree with the Department of Justice, agreeing to terminate an illegal combination and conspiracy among themselves to use this same basing-point pricing system. The Staley opinion held that although Staley's competitor had adopted an illegal pricing system first, that fact did not justify Staley in adopting the illegal pricing system. In short, all this opinion said was that I am not justified in burglarizing your house simply because someone else started burglarizing your house first. The Court said that the contrary argument with which it was presented was astonishing and pointed to the report of the manager of the House conferees on the Robinson-Patman bill where it is specifically stated that "one violation of law does not justify another."

When it came time to decide the Standard Oil (Indiana) case however, the Court apparently thought that it had held in Staley that an unlawful price is never justified to meet a competitor's unlawful price. Moreover, since the report on which the Court leaned had stated that self-defense depends upon whether the attack being met is "a legal or illegal attack," the Court apparently thought that the answer must be that a seller is justified in discriminating to meet a legal attack. But this of course tends to render the law a nullity. If the principle were to be adhered to completely, it would render the law a nullity; so at best the majority opinion in Standard Oil (Indiana) has created confusion and greatly weakened the law.

THE PROBLEM IS UP TO CONGRESS

Our problem now is what to do about the error in the Standard Oil (Indiana) decision.

H. R. 11 is to amend subsection 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act. The intent of the bill is to accept the Standard Oil (Indiana) opinion up to the point where the effects of a discriminatory price reach a certain degree of seriousness, but to put a limit on the good-faith defense, so that it will not be a bar to a cease-and-desist order where the effects of the discrimination go beyond this degree of seriousness. This degree of seriousness is at the point where, in the language of the bill:

> The effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce.

The bill does nothing more than that. The protection which this language would give falls far short of the protection which the language of the prohibition in subsection 2 (a) would offer. The language there refers to discriminations:

> Where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them.

In other words, H. R. 11 says that the supplier will be justified in shooting at his competitors who try to take his customers by lawful means, and in shooting a few innocent bystanders, but if he reaches the point where he is about to make a substantial reduction in the population, then he will no longer be justified.

Let us turn now to a more detailed history of the price-discrimination problem, the laws which have been passed to cope with this practice, and the key decisions in which the courts have sought to interpret and apply these laws.

FAILURES OF THE SHERMAN AND CLAYTON ACTS

Corporations were originally provided for under the State laws as a means whereby the towns and cities could carry on and finance municipal services. Shortly before the Civil War, a few business firms began incorporating themselves under these laws—to carry on profitmaking enterprises—and by the end of the Civil War several of them had amassed great wealth. By 1890 a few, such as in petroleum, tobacco, and sugar products, had come to have near-complete monopolies in their line of commerce.

This accidental use—or misuse—of the State laws would probably be universally applauded today. The corporate form of business permits the aggregation of much larger amounts of capital than could be gathered together by groups of closely associated individuals. There seems no question but that large aggregations of wealth are necessary to many types of undertakings, and to operations on a scale required for efficient production and distribution methods. At the same time, however, the corporate form lends itself to almost limitless possibilities for monopolization.

Since the rise of the big corporations, there has been more or less constant public concern over the growing tendency for economic activities outside the agricultural realm to become monopolized.

EARLY ATTEMPTS TO OUTLAW ABUSES

After a long history of notorious abuses, the railroads were put under a degree of public control in 1887 with the passage of the first Interstate Commerce Act. At the same time hopes began to take shape for Federal laws which would prevent monopoly in other industries, so that competition would perform the kind of natural and automatic regulation which had long been a national ideal. There were high hopes that passage of the Sherman Act of 1890 would accomplish this ideal.

By that time the most alarming development had been the so-called trust, an arrangement whereby rival companies pooled their stocks and placed themselves under the control of a single management. But there was by then also a wide public understanding of several of the commercial practices by which firms that preferred independence were destroyed or driven unwillingly into the trust. One of the most effective and notorious of these was the practice of price discrimination. Clearly this practice was an abuse of size. It was a practice by which the bigger manufacturers could and did destroy their smaller competitors without respect to their efficiency or other merits. The practice also took shape in disastrous consequences when big companies arranged with monopolistic suppliers of raw materials, or essential services, to receive price concessions, rebates, and so forth, which were not allowed their smaller competitors. Indeed, when the old Standard Oil trust let it be known that it had concluded arrangements to receive preferential freight rates from certain of the railroads, this news alone was sufficient to Standard's remaining independent competitors to capitulate and join in the trust.

When the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887 was passed, it was framed to prohibit a seller of common-carrier services from discriminating in the price of its services under circumstances and conditions, by granting shippers "any special rate, rebate, drawback, or other device," section 2, Twenty-fourth United States Statutes at Large, page 379.

And, by the amendment to this act of June 29, 1906, the customers of the railroads were likewise forbidden to receive or accept discriminations "by or through any means or device whatsoever, any sum of money or any other valuable consideration as a rebate or offset against the regular charge," Thirty-fourth United States Statutes at Large, page 587.

Moreover, this law has come to mean that the railroads were prohibited from discriminating between shippers similarly situated not just when the carrier had some reason for being partial to one shipper rather than another, but also when there is a competitive condition which would induce the carrier to discriminate between competing shippers. Thus in *Barringer & Co.* v. *United States* (319 U. S. 16, dec. 1942) Mr. Chief Justice Stone noted that the law not only prohibited differentiating between purchasers on the basis of their identity but that it prohibited differentiating on the basis of competitive conditions which may induce a carrier to offer a reduction in rate to one shipper while denying it to another similarly situated.

THE SHERMAN ACT WAS TOO VAGUE

The Sherman Act of 1890 made illegal "every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade." And it also made illegal to "monopolize, or attempt to monopolize, or combine or conspire with any other person or persons, to monopolize any part of the trade."

There was some basis therefore in the law, so a number of prominent writers have thought, for stopping those monopolistic practices which could be resorted to only in an attempt to monopolize. So, for example, might wholesale

price discriminations have been brought under this law but they were not. As late as 1927, long after the Clayton Act was passed, the Supreme Court invalidated a statute of the State of Minnesota which prohibited price discrimination on the ground that it interfered with the right of contract. Compare Wallace and Douglas, Antitrust Policies and the New Attack on the FTC, University of Chicago Law, Revised, volume 19, No. 4, 1952, page 719.

Following enactment of the Sherman Act there was much legislation in the States and many official investigations. Between 1906 and 1913, there were exhaustive investigations and reports by the Federal Bureau of Corporations into the petroleum, tobacco, steel, farm implement, and other industries. In addition the evidence that was made public in the exhaustive trials of Standard Oil and the American Tobacco Co. which culminated in the Supreme Court decisions of 1911, dramatically demonstrated the part which price discrimination had played in bringing about monopolies in these industries. The company which attracted the greatest popular attention was the old Standard Oil Co. This company had started out just prior to the Civil War as only 1 of some 30 or 35 refining companies located in Cleveland, Ohio. Between 1870 and 1882 it achieved a 90-percent monopoly of all the refined petroleum products distributed in the United States. Clearly the evidence showed that after this company had gained the substantial size advantage over its competitors—largely by merging with competitors—it had abused its size advantage by cutting prices in one area at a time until its independent competitors were either driven out of business or capitulated and merged with the Standard combine. Mr. Brandeis, later Justice Brandeis, testified in 1914 that discrimination was the most powerful weapon that the Standard Co. had had.

Be that as it may the Sherman Act was never interpreted as prohibiting the monopoly practice itself. And indeed the phrase "attempt to monopolize" was not interpreted to stop monopolistic practices until a monopoly had reached such a near stage of maturity that the intent of gaining a complete monopoly was unmistakable. Thus the Supreme Court reviewed the voluminous evidence of Standard's monopolistic practices and condemned not the practices themselves by drawing inferences from all of these practices taken together plus the fact that Standard had obtained a monopoly, condemned Standard's evil intent. Indeed Standard's attorneys argued that Standard had done what it had done in good faith, that—

> Defendent's control was but the result of lawful competitive methods, guided by economic genius of the highest order, sustained by courage, by a keen insight into commercial situations, resulting in the acquisition of great wealth, but at the same time serving to stimulate and increase production, to widely extend the distribution of the products of petroleum at a cost largely below that which would have otherwise prevailed, thus proving to be at one and the same time a benefaction to the general public as well as enormous advantage to individuals (221 U. S. 1, p. 84).

From the overwhelming evidence of Standard's activities and the results which were brought about by these activities the Supreme Court ruled that Standard had attempted to monopolize:

> All lead the mind up to a conviction of a purpose and intent which we think is so certain as practically to cause the subject not to be within the domain of reasonable contention (supra, 77).

DEMAND FOR LAWS AGAINST MONOPOLY PRACTICES

Following the Supreme Court decisions in the Standard Oil and other cases in 1911 public concern over the monopoly problem was heightened rather than lessened. There had grown up a great body of public opinion supporting the idea that the specific acts and practices which led to monopoly should be prohibited rather than waiting for monopoly to grow into full flower with the understanding that attempts would then be made to dissolve the monopoly. There was moreover a great popular demand for such legislation to outlaw specific unfair and monopolistic practices. In the presidential campaign of 1912 the platforms of the three major political parties of that year called for such legislation. It was in response to this demand that the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act of 1914 were passed. Congress wrote in a blanket clause against "unfair methods of competition" to cover other practices which had not yet been defined as those leading to monopoly.

On January 26, 1912, at the hearings on H. R. 11380, etc., before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, Mr. Louis D. Brandeis, who later became a Justice of the Supreme Court, testified as follows:

> Mr. BRANDEIS. * * * to get a monopoly by getting a competitor out of the way. That is not competition; that is destruction. It is not the purpose of competition at all; it is destruction. Now, it seems to me perfectly clear, as a general proposition, that what we must do in dealing with business, with the liberty of a business, is precisely the same as what we must do in liberty of the individual. Any one of us might be knocked down when we go through the streets by somebody who is a good deal stronger than we are. I am certain I might be so knocked down. The law undertakes to restrain the liberty of that physically strong individual by not allowing him to exercise his right to do as he pleases and prevent his knocking me down, unless it should be in self-defense or in some other justification or infringement of his rights. What is done there? That is the regulation, the restriction, of the liberty of one which is absolutely essential to the preservation of the liberty of the other. Now, that same principle applies, of course, in business. If a man who is strong, who has the endurance which comes with size and with wealth, is allowed to use that against an individual, that is not competition. Competition consists in being able to do the thing better—either cheaper or in quality better, in service better—than the other person; that is competition. The Standard Oil Co., did not compete with those individuals when it went in and destroyed them. They committed industrial murder just as much as the man who physically used his strength to put an end to the persons about him.

The Clayton Act of 1914 originated with the bill, H. R. 15657, introduced by Mr. Clayton on April 14, 1914, 51 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6714. Section 2 of this bill prohibited discrimination in price between different purchasers, with the purpose or intent to destroy or wrongfully injure the business of a competitor of either the purchaser or the seller. Section 2 did not contain any proviso excepting discriminations made in good faith to meet competition.

H. R. 15657 was reported out on May 6, 1914, and the report—House Report No. 627, 63d Congress, 2d session, pages 8–9—showed that the section 2 prohibition of price discrimination was confined to a well-known, common, particular form of discrimination. Thus, the report stated, in part:

> Section 2 of the bill is intended to prevent unfair discrimination. The necessity for legislation needs little argument to sustain the wisdom of it. In the past it has been a most common practice of great and powerful combinations engaged in commerce—notably the Standard Oil Co., and the American Tobacco Co., and others of less notoriety, but of great influence—to lower prices of their commodities, oftentimes below the cost of prices of production in certain communities and sections where they had competition, with the intent to destroy and make unprofitable the business of their competitors, and with the ultimate purpose in view of thereby acquiring a monopoly in the particular locality or section in which the discriminating price is made. Every concern that engages in this evil practice must of necessity recoup its losses in the particular communities or sections where their commodities are sold below cost or without a fair profit by raising the price of the same class of commodities above their fair market value in other sections or communties. Such a system or practice is so manifestly unfair and unjust, not only to competitors who are directly injured thereby but to the general public, that your committee is strongly of the opinion that the present antitrust laws ought to be supplemented by making this particular form of discrimination a specific offense under the law when practiced by those engaged in commerce.

Senate Document 583, made the same statement for the Senate Judiciary Committee in its report on H. R. 15657.

In its report upon the bill to enact the Clayton Act—Senate Report No. 695, 63d Congress, 2d session, July 22, 1914, to accompany H. R. 15657, page 1—the Senate Committee on the Judiciary said:

> Broadly stated, the bill, in its treatment of unlawful restraints and monopolies, seeks to prohibit and make unlawful certain trade practices which, as a rule, singly and in themselves are not covered by the act of July 2, 1890 (the Sherman Act) or other existing antitrust acts and thus, by making these practices illegal, to arrest the creation of trusts, conspiracies, and monopolies in their incipiency and before consummation.

During the debate on the bill in the Senate, the following identification was made of the particular form of discrimination to be prohibited by section 2:

> Mr. WALSH. * * * Section 2 refers to that form of unfair competition generally denominated as local price cutting. * * *
>
> Perhaps the most conspicuous offender in the matter of unfair competition by local price cutting has been the great Standard Oil Co. (51 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 14099).

"GOOD FAITH" DESTROYED THE CLAYTON ACT

With this evidence before us showing that the section 2 prohibition was confined to a "particular form of discrimination," the debates in the House and

the Senate make it clear that the "good faith meeting of competition" proviso, when it was later inserted in the bill by the Senate Judiciary Committee, was not understood or intended by Congress to legalize discriminations that were prohibited. Thus, the following colloquy occurred during the debate in the House:

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand it, the purpose here is to provide a uniform price for all persons and customers for the same quality of goods?

Mr. WEBB. And under like conditions.

Mr. STAFFORD. About which there cannot be any competition at all, so far as the seller is concerned, in meeting the competition of some other corporation?

Mr. WEBB. Oh, yes; if he meets the competition of some other person, he is not meeting that competition for the purpose of destroying or wrongfully injuring his competition (51 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9096).

* * * * *

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment * * * [The clerk read] after the word "shall," insert the words "except in lawfully meeting competition" * * * (ibid. 93899).

It has been held in some of the cases that have been tried that wherever prices are cut below cost that is unfair trade practice; but where a man meets another's price in protecting his business in a district with a price, it is his lawful right and privilege, and it is the object of competition that he should meet his price * * *(ibid. 9389).

* * * * *

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, we hope this amendment will not be adopted, because in our opinion it adds nothing to the section. We think under the provisions of the section any man who honestly meets competition is not thereby intending to destroy or wrongfully injure any other person. If that is his object, meeting honest competition, this section will not hurt him * * * (ibid. 9389).

* * * * *

Mr. GARDNER. Would the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Graham] open the door to the practices which you seek to prevent by section 2?

Mr. WEBB. It might be a suggestion to the parties that that could be done. * * * I oppose the amendment because, as I have said, I think the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is useless and unnecessary.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected (ibid. 3990).

The Senate Committee on the Judiciary added a good faith meeting of competition provision to section 2 of the House bill so that the section 2 prohibition would not prevent "discrimination in price in the same or different communities made in good faith to meet competition and not intended to create monopoly."

The Senate committee report—No. 698, 63d Congress, 2d session, pages 43–44—explained this addition as follows:

After full consideration it is deemed advisable to enlarge the exception in the first proviso to the section by adding * * * "discrimination in price made in good faith to meet competition and not intended to create monopoly" upon the ground that the enlargement will tend to foster wholesome competition.

The debate in the Senate on H. R. 15667 as amended by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, included the following regarding section 2:

Mr. CUMMINS * * *

Made in good faith to meet competition. * * *

Imagine the Government endeavoring to prove that a particular instance of price cutting was not made in good faith to meet competition * * *. (51 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 14228).

* * * * *

Mr. REED. * * * Manifestly, if two men are in competition at a given place— let us say the Standard Oil Co. and an independent company—and the independent company should drop the price of gasoline to 11 cents, and the Standard Oil Co. should meet it, that would be an act done in good faith to meet competition. If, however, the Standard Oil Co. were to drop the price of gasoline to 5 cents, a price less than the article could be produced for, and kept it up to 11 or 12 cents somewhere else, and carried it out and kept it up so that it drove the independent concern out of business, there would not be any difficulty at all in a jury finding that they did not do it in good faith. I will undertake, in any reasonably plain case, any outrageous case, to get a verdict every time under that section (Ibid, 14228).

Mr. CUMMINS. * * * but we are not making this law to arrest the progress of monopoly in outrageous cases only. We are making it to preserve competition (ibid 14228).

* * * * *

We might just as well have said * * * that the seller can do anything that he desires or pleases to meet competition that is not in violation of the antitrust laws; if it is in violation of the antitrust law, we need no further condemnation or penalty. We have wound up this section practically by saying that the seller can do whatsoever he pleases with regard to his business, provided he does not violate the antitrust law; and yet this is one of the sections that have been proposed to strengthen the antitrust law, to add to the antitrust law, to accomplish the purpose of the antitrust law by forbidding something that is not now forbidden by the States (Ibid 14250).

The conference report, Senate Document No. 585, eliminated from the good faith proviso the language "and not intended to create monopoly," volume 51, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 15637. During the debate on the conference report in the Senate, the following criticisms of the good faith proviso made:

Mr. STERLING. * * * Passing the paragraph or proviso which permits discrimination in price because of differences in grade, quality, or quantity, or differences in cost of selling or transportation, I come to this significant provision injected by the committee, namely, the provision which permits "discrimination in price in the same or different communities made in good faith to meet competition." It is easy to conceive of the multitude of sins that may be covered by that broad and generous cloak * * * (Ibid, 16115).

* * * * *

* * * Think of it. It can always be urged against the charge of unlawful discrimination that it was done for the purpose of meeting competition. "We found our competition charging a certain price for his goods. We cut the price of ours, below cost even, to meet his competition. What have you got to say about it under this law?"

PURPOSES OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

In the 20 years following passage of the Clayton Act, section 2 did indeed prove to be a failure. Discriminatory practices increased, if anything, and spread to new industries as these became more monopolistic. The prevalence of this evil and its destructive effects upon small business are set out in an overwhelming mass of evidence in some 30 volumes of factual studies submitted to Congress by the Federal Trade Commission and by the hearings on the Robinson-Patman bills. In one case brought by the FTC the record shows that over a period of 7 years the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. had sold tires to Sears, Roebuck at a price which averaged 40 percent less than Goodyear had charged Sears' competitors—compare House Report No. 2287, 74th Congress, 2d session, page 4. Evidence in the more recent Sherman Act suit against A. & P. shows a list of 300 manufacturers who, prior to 1935, were selling their products at prices ranging between 5 and 20 percent below those these suppliers received from A. & P.'s competitors—67th Federal Supplement, page 626, 1946; see Government exhibit 11.

Two provisos in section 2 of the old Clayton Act proved to render that section of the law almost a nullity. One of these was the proviso which exempted differences in prices on account of differences in quantities sold.

It had been assumed that this proviso was intended to permit price differences up to the amount of the seller's cost savings on quantity sales, and was generally so interpreted during most of the life of this statute. This interpretation had been seriously challenged shortly before passage of the Robinson-Patman Act, however, in *Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (304 U. S. 257), and shortly after passage the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit rendered its opinion in this case, holding that a seller may discriminate in prices between purchasers in different quantities without reference to his cost differences.

The other proviso which proved to make section 2 nugatory was that pertaining to the good faith meeting of competition.

THE OLD LAW APPLIED TO INJURY TO RESELLERS

It is now sometimes said by careless or intentionally misleading students of the antidiscrimination law, that section 2 of the Clayton Act of 1914 applied only to injury to the discriminating seller's competitors, and that a purpose of the Robinson-Patman amendment was to extend the law to cover injury among the seller's customers. This is completely erroneous.

It is true that the argument was at one time made that section 2 of the old Clayton Act ran only against the effects of discrimination upon competition of the discriminator and that it ignored effects upon competition at the resale level.

It is also true that the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit adopted this theory in 1923 and 1924 in the *Mennen Co.* (288 Fed. 774) and *National Biscuit* (299 Fed. 733) cases. This argument was completely dispelled in 1929, however, when the issue reached the Supreme Court in *Van Camp & Sons* v. *American Can Co.* (278 U. S. 235, decision January 2, 1929). In this case the Supreme Court unanimously held that

section 2 of the Clayton Act of 1914 was as much concerned with competition among customers of the seller making the discrimination as it was concerned with competition among the seller and his competitors. Thus this point was settled law 7 years prior to the Robinson-Patman Act, as the Court's opinion at page 254 unmistakably indicates:

These facts bring the case within the terms of the statute, unless the words "in any line of commerce" are given a narrower meaning than a literal reading of them conveys. * * * The contention is that the words must be confined to the particular line of commerce in which the discriminator is engaged, and that they do not include a different line of commerce in which purchasers from the discriminator are engaged in competition with one another. * * * The fundamental policy of the legislation [Clayton Act] is that, in respect of persons engaged in the same line of interstate commerce, competition is desirable and that whatever substantially lessens it or tends to create a monopoly in such line of commerce is an evil. Offense against this policy, by a discrimination in prices exacted by the seller from different purchasers of similar goods is no less clear when it produces the evil in respect of the line of commerce in which they are engaged than when it produces the evil in respect of the line of commerce in which the seller is engaged. In either case, a restraint is put upon the freedom of competition in the channels of interstate trade which it had been the purpose of all the antitrust acts to maintain *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Beech-Nut Co.* (257 U. S. 441, 454).

There is no question but what most of the congressional concern, and most of the factual investigation leading up to passage of the Robinson-Patman Act, pertained to competitive problems among wholesalers and retailers. This was the primary public concern. The monopoly movement which had taken place in the mining and manufacturing fields in the 2 or 3 previous decades was at that time rapidly advancing into the distribution fields. A few giant chains were taking over the functions of independent wholesalers and retailers at a spectacular rate, and with a great deal of popular concern. The States were enacting a variety of laws seeking to cope with this menacing trend, including special chain-store taxes of one kind or another. In 1928 the Senate passed a resolution—Senate Resolution 224, 79th Congress, 1st session—directing the Federal Trade Commission to make a full-scale investigation into the reasons for the rapid monopolization of the distribution field, and over the next 6 years the FTC submitted to Congress more than 3 factual studies on its chainstore investigation. These studies revealed price discrimination to be the principal evil behind the growing monopolization of the distribution fields, while the Commission's studies were centered upon resellers—wholesalers and retailers—its findings however, pointed to the chain store's discriminations as a weapon for destroying competing sellers, no less than they pointed to the chain's practice of extracting discriminatory prices from their suppliers.

With reference to the chains receiving an unearned advantage from discriminations of their suppliers, the Commission found—compare Senate Report No. 293, 72d Congress, 1st session, pages 8–9:

1. That it had been persistent policy of the chain stores to seek out and demand special and unwarranted price concessions on the goods they bought.

And with reference to the discriminations as a seller's weapon against competitors, the FTC found:

2. That the chains in many instances discriminated in the resale of merchandise by maintaining higher prices in localities where competition was absent or weak, and cutting prices aggressively in those localities where aggressive competition was encountered.

Moreover, the report of the House Committee on the Judiciary accompanying the Patman bill, after extensive hearings on discrimination problems, expressed equal concern with the plight of "independent" manufacturers as with "independent" merchants:

Your committee is of the opinion that the evidence is overwhelming that price discrimination practices exist to such an extent that the survival of independent merchants, manufacturers, and other businessmen is seriously imperiled and that remedial legislation is necessary. (H. Rept. No. 2287, 74th Cong., 2d sess., on H. R. 8442, p. 3.)

PURPOSES OF CHARGES IN SECTION 2 (A)

While there was no question such as is now sometimes imagined—that the old Clayton Act treated "injury" among customers in some way different from "injury" among competitors—entering into the considerations of the Robinson-Patman Act amendment, there were in fact several major reasons for this amendment. Taking up those effectuated by the language of subsections (a) and (b), they were as follows:

First. To eliminate the possible exemption for discriminations made "on account of" different "quantities sold," and substitute therefor an exemption for differences in the sellers' costs.

Second. Broaden the scope of the act to cover intrastate "injury" to competition, insofar as there is Federal jurisdiction.

Third. To broaden the scope of the act to cover "injuries" to individual competitors, in contrast to the requirement of the old Clayton Act that a general injury to competitive conditions in a line of commerce be shown.

Fourth. To give the FTC an additional weapon for coping with discriminations on quantity purchases, as is expressed in the quantity limit proviso and subsection (a).

Fifth. To eliminate the nullifying effects of the "good faith meeting of competition" proviso of the old act.

The two provisos of the old act providing exemptions for discrimination made on account of "quantities sold" and for "good faith meeting of competition" were considered to be the principal loophole of the old law. Speaking of the two provisos, the House report on the Patman bill said:

These provisos have so materially weakened section 2 of that act, which this bill proposes to amend, as to render it inadequate, if not almost a nullity. Some of the difficulties of enforcement of this section as its standards are pointed out in the annual report of the Federal Trade Commission above referred to, at pages 63 and following. (H. Rept. No. 2287, 74th Cong., 2d sess., on H. R. 8442, p. 7.)

And the Senate report on the Robinson bill said:

The weakness of present section 2 lies principally in the fact that: (1) It places no limit upon differentials permissible on account of differences in quantity; and (2) it permits discriminations to meet competition, and thus tends to substitute the remedies of retaliation for those of law, with destructive consequences to the central object of the bill Liberty to meet competition which can be met only by price cuts at the expense of customers elsewhere, is in its unmasked effect the liberty to destroy competition by selling locally below cost, a weapon progressively the more destructive in the hands of the more powerful, and most deadly to the competitor of limited resources, whatever his merit and efficiency. While the bill as now reported closes these dangerous loopholes, it leaves the fields of competition free and open to the most efficient, and thus in fact protects them the more securely against inundations of mere power and size. (S. Rept. No. 1502, 74th Cong., 2d sess., on S. 3154, p. 4.)

Then commenting on the effect of the good-faith proviso as it related to the chains as buyers, the FTC said:

Discriminatory price concessions given to prevent the loss of a chainstore's business to a competing manufacturer, to prevent it manufacturing its own goods, or to prevent it from discouraging in its stores the sale of a given manufacturer's goods, may be strongly urged by the manufacturer as "made in good faith to meet competition." (S. Rept. No. 293, 72d Cong., 1st sess., p. 90.)

Finally, commenting on the effect of the good-faith proviso as it related to the chains as sellers, the FTS said:

Variation in price between different branches of a chain would seem to be a discrimination, the effect of which may be to produce the forbidden results. It is one thing, however, to reach such a broad conclusion on the results of this practice by chains in general and quite another to prevent by legal means its use by some particular chain. The reason is that the Clayton Act itself specifically permits price discrimination "in the same or different communities made in good faith to meet competition." The Commission has no evidence which would establish that price discrimination by chainstores has not been in good faith to meet competition and there is good ground to conclude that in many cases it has been for that purpose (op. cit., p. 96).

Furthermore, with reference to the new language concerning exemptions for discriminations "which make only due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from the differing methods or quantities in which such commodities are sold," the House report said:

This proviso is of great importance, for while it leaves trade and industry free from any restriction or impediment to the adoption and use of more economic processes of manufacture, methods of sale, and modes of delivery, wheresoever they may be employed in streams of production or distribution; it also limits the use of quantity price differentials to the sphere of actual cost differences. Otherwise such differentials would become instruments of favor and privilege and weapons of competitive oppression.

The bill neither requires nor compels the granting of discriminations or differentials of any sort, and the words "or require" are

expressly inserted in both the above subparagraphs to make that clear. It leaves any who wish to do so entirely free to sell to all at the same price regardless of differences in cost, or to grant any differentials not in excess of such differences. It does not require the differential, if granted, to be the arithmetical equivalent of the difference. It is sufficient that it does not exceed it (op. cit. pp. 9 and 10).

And in much the same language the Senate report said:

This proviso is of greatest importance, for while it leaves trade and industry free from any restriction or impediment to the adoption and use of more economic processes, and to the translation of appropriate shares of any savings so effected up and down the stream of distribution to the original producer and to the ultimate consumer, it also strictly limits the use of quantity price differences to that sphere, since beyond it they become instruments of favor and privilege and weapons of competitive oppression (op. cit. p. 5).

INJURY TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE

On the matter of extending the scope of the law to cover injury to intrastate commerce, where the discriminating seller is in interstate commerce, the House report quoted the new phrase in subsection (a) "where either or any of the purchases involved in such discrimination are in commerce" and said that it "is of first importance in extending the protections of this bill against the full evil of price discrimination, whether immediately in interstate or intrastate commerce, wherever it is of such a character as tends directly to burden or affect interstate commerce"—opere citato page 8.

And the Senate report quoted the same phrase of the bill and said:

And this clause is designed to extend its scope to discriminations between interstate and intrastate customers, as well as between those purely interstate (op. cit. p. 4).

Coming now to a fourth major purpose of the changes in section 2, we find a clear record of intent to prohibit discriminations having a substantially injurious effect upon individual competitors. The House report quoted the following language on section 2 (a) of the Patman bill, which is the language of the present statute, except for omission of the word "knowingly," as follows:

Where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or receives the benefit of such discrimination or with customers of either of them (op. cit. p. 8).

Then the House report went on to explain what this language was intended to accomplish as follows:

This provision accomplishes a substantial broadening of a similar clause now contained in section 2 of the Clayton Act. The existing law has in practice been too restrictive in requiring a showing of general injury to competitive conditions in the line of commerce concerned, whereas the more immediately important concern is in injury to the competitor victimized by the discrimination. Only through such injury in fact can the larger, general injury result. Through this broadening of the jurisdiction of the act, a more effective suppression of such injuries is possible and the more effective protection of the public interest at the same time is achieved (op. cit., p. 8).

The Senate report quoted the same language as the House report and explained it as follows:

This clause represents a recommended addition to the bill as referred to your committee. It tends to exclude from the bill otherwise harmless violations of its letter, but accomplishes a substantial broadening of a similar clause now contained in section 2 of the Clayton Act. The latter has in practice been too restrictive, in requiring a showing of general injury to competitive conditions in the line of commerce concerned; whereas the more immediately important concern is in injury to the competitor victimized by the discrimination. Only through such injuries, in fact, can the larger general injury result, and to catch the weed in the seed will keep it from coming to flower (op. cit., p. 4).

BACKGROUND OF SECTION 2 (B)

Coming now to the subsection 2 (b) defense, the background recommendation for a solution of this problem came from the Federal Trade Commission in its final report on the chainstore investigation. The FTC report contained the following statement and recommendation:

A simple solution for the uncertainties and difficulties of enforcement would be to prohibit unfair and unjust discrimination in price and leave it to the enforcement agency, subject to review by the courts, to apply that principle to particular cases and situations. The soundness of and extent to which the present provisos would constitute valid defenses would thus become a judicial and not a legislative matter.

The Commission therefore recommends that section 2 of the Clayton Act be amended to read as follows:

It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in any transaction in or affecting such commerce, either directly or indirectly to discriminate unfairly or unjustly in price between different purchasers of commodities, which commodities are sold for use, consumption, or resale within the United States or any Territory thereof or the District of Columbia or any insular possession or other place under the jurisdiction of the United States. (Final report of the Federal Trade Commission on chainstore investigation, S. Doc. No. 4, Dec. 13, 1934, 74th Cong., 1st sess., p. 96).

The bill introduced in the Senate and reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary followed the FTC's recommendation literally in that it contained no reference whatever to "good faith" or to "meeting of competition." The House bill, on the other hand, contained the language of the statute today. The Senate bill was amended on the floor of the House by insertion of the "good faith" clause of the old Clayton Act. The conference committee agreed upon the language of the House bill and the statement of the managers on the part of the House accompanying the conference committee bill referred to the language of the Senate bill as follows:

The Senate bill contained a further proviso—That nothing herein contained shall prevent discrimination in price in the same or different communities made in good faith to meet competition.

This language is found in existing law, and in the opinion of the conferees is one of the obstacles to enforcement of the present Clayton Act. The Senate receded, and the language is stricken. A provision relating to the question of meeting competition, intended to operate only as a rule of evidence in a proceeding before the Federal Trade Commission, is included in subsection (b) * * *. (H. Rept. No. 2951, 74th Cong., 2d sess., on H. R. 8442, pp. 6 and 7.)

Further supplementing the conferee's report, the chairman of the House Conferees [Mr. Utterback] submitted a more detailed report explaining with considerable length and clarity the meaning of each subsection of the Robinson-Patman bill. Since the Supreme Court has looked to this report for the construction of section 2 (b) defense in each of the several cases—Corn Products Refining Co. against FTC, Stanley against FTC; FTC against Cement Institute et al., and Standard Oil, Indiana, against FTC—which have involved this issue, it may be well to consider in full the section of the report dealing with "meeting competition." It is as follows:

In connection with the above rule as to burden of proof, it is also provided that a seller may show that his lower price was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or that his furnishing of services or facilities was made in good faith to meet those furnished by a competitor. It is to be noted, however, that this does not set up the meeting of competition as an absolute bar to a charge of discrimination under the bill. It merely permits it to be shown in evidence. This provision is entirely procedural. It does not determine substantive rights, liabilities, and duties. They are fixed in the other provisions of the bill. It leaves it a question of fact to be determined in each case, whether the competition to be met was such as to justify the discrimination given, as one lying within the limitations laid down by the bill, and whether the way in which the competition was met lies within the latitude allowed by those limitations.

This procedural provision cannot be construed as a carte blanche exemption to violate the bill so long as a competitor can be shown to have violated it first, nor so long as that competition cannot be met without the use of oppressive discriminations in violation of the obvious intent of the bill.

To illustrate: The House committee hearings showed a discrimination of 15 cents a box granted by Colgate-Palmolive Peet Co. on sales of soap to the A. & P. chain. Upon a complaint and hearing before the Federal Trade Commission, this proviso would permit the Colgate Co. to show in rebuttal evidence, if such were the fact, an equally low price made by a local soap manufacturer in Des Moines, Iowa, to A. & P.'s retail outlets in that city; but this would not exonerate it from a discrimination granted to A. & P. everywhere, if otherwise in violation of the bill.

But the committee hearings show a similar discount of 15 cents a case granted by Procter & Gamble to the same chain. If this proviso were construed to permit the showing of a competing offer as an absolute bar to liability for discrimination, then it would nullify the act entirely at the very inception of its enforcement, for in nearly every case mass buyers receive similar discriminations from competing sellers of the same product. One violation of law cannot be permitted to justify another. As in any case of self-defense, while the attack against

which the defense is claimed may be shown in evidence, its competency as a bar depends also upon whether it was a legal or illegal attack. A discrimination in violation of this bill is in practical effect a commercial bribe to lure the business of the favored customer away from the competitor, and if one bribe were permitted to justify another the bill would be futile to achieve its plainly intended purposes. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 74th Cong., 2d sess., vol. 80, pt. 9, p. 9418.)

The conference report on the Robinson-Patman bill was agreed to by both Houses without any objection. It was passed by the Senate by an unanimous vote and was passed by the House by a vote of 290–16.

THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT IS A RETURN TO OUR HISTORIC ANTITRUST POLICIES

The Robinson-Patman Act was passed in the decade of the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Miller-Tydings Act, and other such legislation in the business field. Hence the philosophy of the Robinson-Patman Act is sometimes confused in the popular mind with these and other legislative enactments which were designed to impose regulations upon business or to restrict competition. Indeed, confusions of this sort are deliberately cultivated in some quarters. The notion that the Robinson-Patman Act was intended to impose regulations or maintain prices could not be farther from the facts. The act was intended to lay certain ground rules which would make it possible to return business to the regulation of competition, the kind of regulation which theretofore had largely failed.

More than half a century of experience with the growing practice of price discrimination in the business system had left it unmistakable that this practice, whether with good intent or evil, gives big sellers an uneconomic advantage over small sellers, and that it gives big buyers an unearned advantage over small competing buyers. It was equally clear, moreover, that the practical result of the practice is that small firms are either destroyed, or survive under a coercive force which forbids them to lower their prices but compels them to follow the price lead of their large, centralized competitors. Clearly, then, the effect of price discrimination is not a price competition, but a system of high, regimented prices. Furthermore, to continue to permit an undue abuse of bigness would inevitably result in the destruction and drying up of small firms, and a centralization of all business into the hands of a few giant corporations.

The idea of competition involves a whole system of thought, and this system of thought is deeply embedded in our national philosophy. It is closely associated with our historic idea of freedom, which demands that we maintain an open-door policy in economic affairs, so that new firms may always enter and stake their chances of success upon their ability to produce and sell at lower costs than their competitors, or upon the ability to produce and sell better products. This philosophy is also closely associated with a kind of Darwinism in our thinking. We like to think of competition as being a process by which the unfit and the inefficient are continually being weeded out, and the fittest survive. Competition of this kind, we think, spurs the inventiveness of man, resulting in new discoveries and increased efficiencies. Manifestly, however, competition cannot survive under the law of the jungle, wherein the strong perpetually devour the weak. We learned long ago that mere financial size cannot be the test which determines the outcome of the competitive struggle.

The legislative history of the Robinson-Patman Act, if it is clear on anything, is clear on this: It was designed, not to protect particular classes of competitors, but to adopt a rational test of fitness, and place the competitive struggle squarely upon these tests. In brief, the philosophy of the Robinson-Patman Act is to remove size as the determinant of who shall win out in the competitive struggle, and place competition squarely upon the question of who can perform his part in the production and distribution function at the lowest cost, and at the same time, to free the price making from coercive, centralized control, so that any business firm—not just the few top firms—may reduce its prices and take business away from its competitors.

This is another way of saying what is already said in the foregoing excerpts from the legislative history: The Robinson-Patman Act was intended to provide a system of genuine competition, and an equality of opportunity for all.

STATUS OF THE SECTION 2 (B) DEFENSE

In an unanimous opinion written by the late Chief Justice Stone, in *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Staley Co.* (324 U. S. 746, dec. 1945) the Supreme Court gave the fullest discussion of the section 2 (b) defense that had been made by the Court prior to its opinion in the Standard Oil, Indiana, case. The Court relied upon the Staley opinion, or so it said, in interpreting the defense in the Standard opinion.

THE STALEY AND CORN PRODUCTS DECISIONS

The Staley case involved two distinct types of price discriminations. The two types raise different problems under the 2 (b) defense and they were treated separately in parts I and II, respectively, of the Supreme Court's opinion.

Staley's discriminatory practices dealt with in part I of the opinion relate to its use of a basing-point system. As a general rule Staley sold its glucose at delivered prices which were computed as the base price for glucose announced at Chicago, plus the rail freight charges from Chicago to the buyer's destination. Staley's glucose was not manufactured at Chicago nor shipped from that point. The Commission held that this general system of pricing was discriminatory, and violated section 2 (a).

It had been Staley's practice on occasions, however, to make certain deviations from its general price formula, and the FTC held these deviations to be discriminatory in and of themselves. For example, while the majority of Staley's customers paid the formula price, Staley had certain favored customers to whom it sold at the carload price, although the purchases were made in less than carload lots. Similarly, at times when general price increases were made, the favored customers were booked far in advance at the older, lower price, and frequently without the customers' knowledge.

The Staley Co. plead the section 2 (b) defense, claiming that it was simply meeting its competitor's lower prices in good faith in both instances. The Supreme Court rejected Staley's claims to the 2 (b) defense as a justification for both types of discriminations. Here it may be noted that both Staley's general formula of pricing and its deviations from this formula were held to be illegal on the ground that each type of discrimination was assumed to have, in the factual situation of Staley's industry, substantially adverse effects upon competition. According to FTC's complaint and findings the competition affected was that of the buyers of glucose, among whom the discriminations resulted in substantial inequalities.

Thus it would appear hypothetically possible at least, that in other situations of this kind the discriminations involved in the general formula of pricing might not, in the factual situation, create such inequalities among competing buyers as to be found to violate section 2 (a), while deviations from the formula pricing might be found to do so; and conversely, it would seem hypothetically possible that in other factual situations the discriminations involved in the formula pricing might be held to violate section 2 (a) while deviations from the formula might not be so held.

The good-faith issue involved in Staley's general formula of pricing can best be understood by reference to the opinion in *Corn Products Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (324 U. S. 726). The Staley and Corn Products cases were companion cases, decided by the Supreme Court on the same day.

The basing-point system of pricing which both Staley and the Corn Products Co. followed, had been followed by the latter company before Staley came into business. The Corn Products Co. sold at delivered prices. Its delivered prices were computed as its base price for glucose announced at Chicago, plus rail freight charges for shipping from Chicago to the buyer's place of business. The Corn Products Co. had plants manufacturing glucose in both Chicago and Kansas City. Buyers in Kansas City were charged freight from Chicago, although they were supplied from Kansas City.

The Commission found that much of the glucose is sold to candy manufacturers who are in competition with one another in the sale of their candy; that glucose is the principal ingredient in many varieties of low-priced candy which is sold on narrow margins of profit; and that customers for such candy may be diverted from one manufacturer to another by differences in price of a small faction of a cent a pound. The Commission further found that candy manufacturers located at cities other than Chicago were at a substantial disadvantage in competing with candy manufacturers in Chicago, and that competition among the candy man-

ufacturers had been substantially injured. Some of the candy manufacturers at Kansas City, for example, had gone out of business or moved to Chicago. In the Corn Products decision the Court held this pricing system to be in violation of section 2 (a) of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Coming now to the Staley case, the essential facts are these. Staley priced its glucose on the same basing-point system. Staley's plant was located at Decatur, Ill., and the freight cost for shipping from Chicago to Decatur was 18 cents. Staley therefore charged its customers located in Decatur 18 cents more than it charged its customers in Chicago, although it incurred no freight charges in making delivery to these customers. Conversely, Staley charged buyers in Chicago 18 cents less than buyers in Decatur and, in addition, paid 18 cents in freight charges, thus making a discrimination of 36 cents in favor of Chicago as against Decatur, according to the Supreme Court's computation, "or 17 percent of the Chicago price."

To the extent that neither Staley nor the Corn Products Co. deviated from this general system of pricing the two companies quoted identical delivered prices to any particular buyer in the United States.

Staley claimed that its price discriminations were made in good faith to meet the lower price of a competitor, stipulating that this system of pricing was already in effect when it started in business some years earlier, and that it had merely adopted the Corn Products Co.'s pricing system.

The Court rejected Staley's claim in some rather strong language.

While neither the Staley nor the Corn Products cases involved any charge of conspiracy, the decision of the court of appeals in the Staley case took judicial note of the fact that the two companies had, prior to the FTC's complaint been charged with conspiring in violation of the Sherman Act to follow this same basing-point system, and that a final consent decree had been entered in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana—*United States* v. *Corn Derivatives Institute, et al.*, Equity 11634 (1932). Replying to Staley's claim that it had adopted its competitor's basing-point system in good faith to meet the lower prices of a competitor, the Supreme Court said:

> The Commission's conclusion seems inescapable that respondents' discriminations, such as those between purchasers in Chicago and Decatur, were established not to meet equally low Chicago prices of competitors there, but in order to establish elsewhere the artificially high prices whose discriminatory effect permeates respondents entire pricing system (supra, p. 756).
>
> * * * * *
>
> By adopting the price system of their competitors, respondents have succeeded in many instances in establishing an artificially high price and have thus secured the benefit of the high price levels of a competitor whose costs of delivery are greater (supra, p. 756, 757).
>
> * * * * *
>
> But respondents argue that they have sustained their burden of proof, as prescribed by section 2 (b), by showing that they have adopted and followed the basing-point system of their competitors * * *. Thus it is the contention that a seller may justify a basing point delivered price system, which is otherwise outlawed by section 2, because other competitors are in part violating the law by maintaining a like system (supra, p. 753).
>
> * * * * *
>
> This startling conclusion is admissible only upon the assumption that the statute permits a seller to maintain an otherwise unlawful system of discriminatory prices, merely because he had adopted it in its entirety, as a means of securing the benefits of a like unlawful system maintained by his competitors. * * * We think the conclusion is inadmissible, in view of the clear congressional purpose not to sanction by section 2 (b) the excuse that the person charged with a violation of the law was merely adopting a similarly unlawful practice of another (supra, pp. 753, 754).

Here it should be noted that the Staley opinion cites and leans heavily upon the report of the chairman of the House conferees, Mr. Utterback, in presenting the conference report on the Robinson-Patman bill. It thus appears further that insofar as the basing-point problem discussed in part I of the Staley decision is concerned, the Court did not consider that there was any question of attack, lawful or unlawful, by one competitor upon another, nor any question of self-defense, but rather that both competitors were violating the law for their mutual benefit.

The Court in part I said:

> The act thus places emphasis on individual competitive situations, rather than upon a general system of competition (supra, p. 753).

Coming now to part II of the Staley decision, the essential facts are as follows: Staley had stipulated the facts as to its booking practices and stipulated further that the discriminations involved were, in the Court's language:

> Made in response to verbal information received from salesmen, brokers, or intending purchasers, without supporting evidence, to the effect that in each case one or more competitors had granted or offered to grant like discriminations. It is stipulated that respondents, "believing such report to be true, has then granted similar" price discriminations (supra, p. 758).

Then the Court went on to point out:

> The record contains no statements by the persons making these reports and discloses no efforts by respondents to investigate or verify them, and no evidence of respondents' knowledge of their informants' character and reliability. It is admitted that in some instances respondents made sales upon bookings which they suspected had been made without knowledge of the buyers (supra, p. 758).

In view of the above recitation of facts and others of a similar nature, the Court then held that Staley had failed in its burden of showing that its discriminations made in the course of its deviations from its general pricing formula had been made in good faith to meet a competitor's price offers to those buyers. Here the Court said:

> Section 2 (b) does not require the seller to justify price discriminations by showing that in fact they met a competitive price. But it does place on the seller the burden of showing that the price was made in good faith to meet a competitor's. The good faith of the discrimination must be shown in the face of the fact that the seller is aware that his discrimination is unlawful, unless good faith is shown, and in circumstances which are peculiarly favorable to price discrimination abuses. We agree with the Commission that the statute at least requires the seller, who has knowingly discriminated in price, to show the existence of facts which would lead a reasonable and prudent person to believe that the granting of a lower price would in fact meet the equally low price of a competitor (supra, pp. 759, 760).

Taking the two parts of the Staley decision either together or separately, it thus appears clear that this opinion constructed the 2 (b) defense as a matter of self-defense. The Court emphasized that the defense applies to "individual competitive situations." The Court stopped short, however, of ruling on the question whether it was to be self-defense against an unlawful attack or a lawful attack. That question was not raised. The claim to self-defense with reference to the basing point system was rejected on the ground that Staley was emulating the unlawful conduct of its competitor for the purpose of gaining "like benefits." The plea of self-defense with reference to Staley's discriminations in favor of individual customers was rejected on the ground that Staley had been insufficiently diligent in satisfying itself that the lower price offer of a competitor existed.

There is some evidence, however, that the Court had in mind that a justifiable discrimination would involve self-defense against an unlawful price attack. Summarizing the pertinent facts treated in part II of its opinion the Court said, as previously quoted, "the facts as stipulated were only that discriminations were made in response to verbal information without supporting evidence, to the effect that in each case one or more competitors had granted or offered to grant like discriminations." Thus it would seem reasonable to expect that if the Court in the Staley opinion had in mind that justification was to involve self-defense against a nondiscriminatory price attack, rather than against a discriminatory price attack, it would have rejected Staley's plea on the ground that it failed to meet this elemental requirement. The Court did not do so. It accepted Staley's plea, as it understood it, as meeting "like discriminations" and rejected the plea only on the ground that Staley had insufficient evidence to convince a reasonable and prudent person that it had been attacked, either lawfully or unlawfully.

THE CEMENT DECISION

Unlike its complaint in the Staley and Corn Products cases, the FTC's complaint in the Cement case contained a charge which was, in effect, that the sellers had combined and conspired to fix prices, in violation of section 5 of the FTC Act. This was in addition to a charge that the sellers had made price discriminations in violation of section 2 (a) of the Robinson-Patman Act.

With reference to the price-fixing charge, the Commission held that the Cement Institute and its manufacturer members had taken collective action to maintain a multiple basing-point system of pricing, and to do other things which

resulted in any particular buyer receiving identical delivered prices, terms of sale, and so forth, from all sellers. All buyers did not receive the same delivered price, but any particular buyer received the same delivered price from all sellers caring to sell that buyer.

With reference to the charge that the cement companies had discriminated in prices in violation of section 2 (a) of the Robinson-Patman Act, the Commission held that respondents' basing-point system of pricing involved a particular seller collecting phantom freight on sales made to some locations, and in its absorbing freight charges on sales made to other locations. Thus, the varying amounts of phantom freight collected and freight charges absorbed resulted in varying net prices to the seller. The Commission charged that this system of pricing resulted in price discriminations within the definition of section 2 (a) of the Robinson-Patman Act and that the effect of these discriminations was to "substantially lessen competition" in violation of that act. The essence of the "lessening of competition" charged in this instance was not that the discriminations resulted in inequalities among buyers, or that competition among the sellers was injured in the sense that the larger sellers were abusing their economic power to injure or destroy smaller competing sellers, but that the "substantially lessening" referred to the elimination of competition among the sellers. The record shows that at earlier times in the history of this pricing system price discriminations had been made to injure and discipline recalcitrant sellers and to bring others into line with the general industrywide system of pricing, and the Court's opinion makes reference to this earlier history. But the state of affairs which had been reached by the time the Commission's order was issued was that of a general compliance with the system on the part of all members of the institute.

The Supreme Court reviewed this case and in April 1948 rendered a 6 to 1 decision sustaining the Commission's findings and order—*Federal Trade Commission* v. *Cement Institute et al.* (333 U. S. 683), Justices Douglas and Jackson taking no part in the decision, and Mr. Justice Burton dissenting.

With reference to the charge that respondents violated section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Court said:

> The core of the charge was that the respondents had restrained and hindered competition in the sale and distribution of cement by means of a combination among themselves made effective through mutual understanding or agreement to employ a multiple basing-point system of pricing. It was alleged that this system resulted in the quotation of identical terms of sale and identical prices for cement by the respondents at any given point in the United States. This system had worked so successfully, it was further charged, that for many years prior to the filing of the complaint, all cement buyers throughout the Nation, with rare exceptions, had been unable to purchase cement for delivery in any given locality from any one of the respondents at a lower price or on more favorable terms than from any of the other respondents (supra, p. 688).

Then in concluding upon this charge, the Court said:

> Thus we have a complaint which charged collective action by respondents designed to maintain a sales technique that restrained competition, detailed findings of collective activities by groups of respondents to achieve that end, then a general finding that respondents maintained the combination, and finally an order prohibiting the continuance of the combination. It seems impossible to conceive that anyone reading these findings in their entirety could doubt that the Commission found that respondents collectively maintained a multiple basing point delivered price system for the purpose of suppressing competition in cement sales. The findings are sufficient. The contention that they are not is without substance (supra, pp. 711–712).

Thereafter the Court's opinion reviews the evidence in the record which lead it to conclude that the evidence was sufficient to support the Commission's finding.

Coming to count 2 of the Commission's complaint, the Court said:

> The Commission found that respondents' combination to use the multiple basing point delivered price system had effected systematic price discrimination in violation of section 2 of the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act (supra, p. 721).

In light of this proposition the Court considered respondents' claim that their price discriminations had been "made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor," as provided in section 2 (b). Here the Court pointed out that the Commission had held "that the effect of this discrimination was the substantial lessening of competition between respondents"—supra, page 722—and it made no separate consideration of the evidence of the competitive effects apart from the consideration which it had already given this evidence under the conspiracy charge. On the contrary, the Court in this opinion took the position that section 2 (b) provides for the Commission to make out a prima facie case of violation of section 2 (a) merely upon proof that a discrimination in price has been made, and that respondents had failed in their burden of rebutting the prima facie case. Here the Court said:

> Section 2 (b) provides that proof of discrimination in price (selling the same kind of goods cheaper to one purchaser than to another) makes out a prima facie case of violation, but permits the seller to rebut "the prima-facie case thus made by showing that his lower price * * * was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor" (supra, p. 721, 722).

In this opinion, the Court did however take up respondents' arguments on the meaning of the section 2 (b) defense and declared that these arguments had already been answered in the Corn Products and Staley decisions. Amplifying further, however, on what it understood the Corn Products and Staley decisions to mean, the Court remarked, in part, as indicated below. With reference to the Staley decision, the Court said:

> This was a direct holding that a pricing system involving both phantom freight and freight absorption violates section 2 (a) if under that system prices are computed for products actually shipped from one locality on the fiction that they were shipped from another (supra, p. 724).

And, finally summarizing on the meaning of the 2 (b) defense, the Court said:

> Section 2 (b) permits a single company to sell one customer at a lower price than it sells to another if the price is "made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor." But this does not mean that section 2 (b) permits a seller to use a sales system which constantly results in his getting more money for like goods from some customers than he does from others. We held to the contrary in the Staley case. There we said that the act "speaks only of the seller's 'lower' price and of that only to the extent that it is made 'in good faith' to meet an equally low price of a competitor." The act thus places emphasis on individual competitive situations, rather than upon a general system of competition (opus cit., supra, p. 725).

While the Court did not consider the question whether it was to be a lawful or unlawful attack which could justify the seller in meeting the lower price of a competitor, it does appear that if adopted the proposition that "the act thus places emphasis on individual competitive situations rather than upon a general system of competition" and that section 2 (b) does not permit "a seller to use a sales system which constantly results in his getting more money for like goods from some customers than he does from others."

THE STANDARD OIL (INDIANA) DECISION

In 1950, the Supreme Court in *Standard Oil (Indiana)* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (340 U. S. 231), ruled in a 5-to-3 decision—Mr. Justice Minton not participating—that the section 2 (b) defense, when successfully made out, is a complete justification for a practice of price discrimination and that this defense thus serves as a bar to a cease-and-desist order against such practice. The Court also ruled upon a number of other things, but it may be important to consider first what the issue was and what arguments were made on it.

The charge against Standard was that its practice of selling gasoline to certain buyers in the Detroit area at 1½ cents less than it charged other buyers adversely affected competition among Standard's retail dealers to a degree prohibited by section 2 (a) of the statute. Furthermore, the proceedings before the FTC came to a conclusion with the Commission making a finding that Standard's discrimination in fact have the adverse effect prohibited by the statute. Standard had claimed, among other things, that its discriminations were "made in good faith to meet the lower price of a competitor."

It claimed, moreover, that this defense is a complete defense against the charge of violation of section 2 (a), barring the Commission from issuing a cease-and-desist order. The Commission accepted the evidence which Standard introduced in support of its claim that its discriminations were made in good faith to meet the lower price of a competitor, but the Commission refused to make a finding on the question whether or not Standard's evidence successfully supported this claim. The Commission took the position that at the stage of the proceedings which had then been reached, the question whether Standard had met competitors' prices in good faith was irrelevant—that a cease-and-desist order

should issue in either eventuality. More specifically, the Commission's position was that the 2 (b) defense was to be effective only in "rebutting its prima facie case" made out merely upon a showing that a price discrimination had been made. The Commission reasoned further that since it had already proceeded to the next step in the burden of proof, and shown the adverse effects of the discriminations in question, its cease-and-desist order should be issued whether or not Standard successfully made out the 2 (b) defense. In this position the Commissioner relied upon the language of the statute and statements in the legislative history, as well as statements in the Staley and Cement opinions, to support its contentions that section 2 (b) was intended as a procedural matter, governing the shifting of the burden of proof. For example, the Staley opinion had said:

It will be noted that the defense that the price discriminations were made in order to meet competition, is under the statute a matter of rebutting the Commission's prima facie case (supra, p. 752).

And in the same opinion Mr. Chief Justice Stone had said that the 2 (b) defense: "Is a matter of evidence in each case, raising a question of fact as to whether the competition justified the discrimination"—supra, page 746.

In the Standard Oil, Indiana, opinion, however, the Court held that the 2 (b) defense is not just a matter of rebutting the FTC's prima facie case, but that the defense is a complete justification for the discriminatory practice, irrespective of the effects of the discrimination. Consequently, this case was remanded to the FTC for a finding whether or not Standard's discrimination had been made in good faith to meet the lower price of a competitor.

In addition to the primary issue before the Court in this case, the Court also ruled or expressed opinions upon several other questions. Specifically, the majority opinion ruled, not only upon the question whether the (2) (b) defense is a complete justification, but on the question of how the defense is to be constructed. Further, it made quasi-legislative findings upon a number of economic questions pertaining to the practical effects of price discriminations and the social desirability of these practices.

It will perhaps lead to a clearer understanding of the Court's ruling upon the main question to consider its economic conclusions first. Here the Court not only entertained theoretical arguments about the effects and desirability of discriminatory practices, but during the course of the oral arguments it invited additional speculations in these fields. For example, in November 1950 Mr. William Simon, who argued the case as amicus curiae on the side of Standard told the Court:

We believe that there is never an injury to competition when a seller does no more than to in good faith meet the price at which his competitors are lawfully selling and which they offer to his customers. (See transcript of argument.)

It was perhaps relevant to the Court's ruling that section 2 (b) provides a complete defense of a discriminatory practice, irrespective of the effects of the practice, that the Court was proceeding upon the premise that a discrimination to meet a competitor's price does not in fact injure competition, but on the contrary, discriminations are essential to any competition at all. More precisely, the majority opinion seems clearly to think that discriminations are necessary to vigorous competition and that the Court's decision in limiting discrimination to a meeting of competitor's prices regrettably softens competition. Indeed, it is clear that the majority opinion regards the Robinson-Patman Act as a kind of price control by law calculated to lessen if not stop competition, and that the act expresses a philosophy which is contrary to the Sherman Act. The opinion contains a number of suggestions to these effects. For example, at the conclusion of his opinion, after he had succeeded in rationalizing away most, but not quite all, of the law against price discrimination, Mr. Justice Burton seems to apologize for the incompleteness of his labors. He says:

We need not now reconcile, in its entirety, the economic theory which underlies the Robinson-Patman Act with that of the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

The above remark is footnoted to explain that "it has been suggested that, in theory, the Robinson-Patman Act, as a whole, is inconsistent with the Sherman and Clayton Acts." And the reader is referred to the published writings of several economists and lawyers who have been unsympathetic to the Robinson-Patman Act, including two who have been particularly active in propagandizing against the act, and under circumstances which render their disinterestedness at least suspect.

Then again, earlier in this opinion where it is decided how the 2 (b) defense shall be constructed, there follows a triumphant assertion:

Actual competition, at least in this elemental form, is thus preserved.

There were other informal expressions by the Justices joining in the majority opinion which make their understanding of and predilection for discriminations unmistakable. For example:

Justice JACKSON. Do you think we have statutes of any consistent philosophy of business control?

Mr. SIMON. Well, I must confess that the philosophy of the Sherman Act is diametrically opposed to the philosophy of the Robinson-Patman Act, as the Federal Trade Commission construes it.

Justice JACKSON. We have vacillated and oscillated between the NRA theory, roughly, and the Sherman Antitrust Law theory ever since I can remember, and we are still wobbling.

"Mr. SIMON. This is the NRA theory" (cf. transcript of argument.)

The following is quoted from Mark H. Wooley, Fortune magazine, November 1950, page 184:

In a series of questions Justice Jackson showed the essential conflict between the Robinson-Patman Act and the antitrust laws: "Is it explained how a price reduction is an injury to competition?" "Is it your view that this section of the Robinson-Patman Act is consistent with the antitrust laws or are we trying to enforce two conflicting legislative policies?" "Suppose there were no Robinson-Patman Act. What would your clients (retail gasoline dealers) then do? Would they go to their suppliers and ask for a price cut?" That would help Justice Black and me who want to get our gasoline cheaper. The whole purpose of this is to avert competition from running its course.

There is considerable evidence in the expressions quoted above and in the majority opinion, however, that the Court was confused as between a price discrimination and a price reduction. For example, the key factor in the Court's reconciliation of its ruling with the legislative history of the act is to be found in the following:

It must have been obvious to Congress that any price reduction to any dealer may always affect competition at that dealer's level as well as at the dealer's resale level, whether or not the reduction to the dealer is discriminatory. Likewise, it must have been obvious to Congress that any price reductions initiated by a seller's competitor would, if not met by the seller, affect competition at the beneficiary's level or among the beneficiary's customers just as much as if those reductions had been met by the seller (supra, p. 250).

In other words, the Court missed the whole point of the law. It started out with the premise that in drafting the law Congress was trying to soften competition, but after discovering that there are some obvious loopholes, namely, that Congress did not prohibit nondiscriminatory price reductions, the Court concluded that the law could not successfully stop competition anyway.

The minority opinion in the Standard Oil case refrains, on the whole, from entering into a consideration of whether discrimination is economically desirable or undesirable, and at one point seems to offer a mild rebuke to the majority for doing so. Nevertheless, it, too, pronounces statutory restraints upon discrimination to be a fetter on competition. Here one of the newly popular views of the matter, according to which discrimination has both good and bad competitive effects, is adopted and asserted without qualification. This is the view which holds that discriminatory selling strengthens competition among sellers but weakens competition among buyers. The minority opinion asserts, moreover, that when it passed the Robinson-Patman Act, Congress, too, had recognized the supposedly conflicting effects arising from legal restraints upon discriminatory selling, but that Congress had obviously concluded that the greater advantage would accrue by fostering equal access to supplies by competing merchants. The pertinent passages in full are as follows:

The public policy of the United States fosters the free-enterprise system of unfettered competition. * * * There are, however, statutory exceptions to such unlimited competition. Nondiscriminatory pricing tends to weaken competition in that a seller, while otherwise maintaining his prices, cannot meet his antagonist's price to get a single order or customer. But Congress obviously concluded that the greater advantage would accrue by fostering equal access to supplies by competing merchants or other purchasers in the course of business.

The minority opinion further said:

The need to allow sellers to meet competition in price from other sellers while protecting the competitors of the buyers against the buyers' advantages gained from the price discrimination was a major cause of the enactment of the 1936 Robinson-Patman Act. The Clayton Act has failed to solve the problem.

Thus both the majority and minority views in the Standard Oil decision looked upon statutory restraints on discrimination to be an amelioration or lessening of competition, and the most charitable of these two views hold that, as against a loss of competition among sellers, there is some offsetting or overbalancing advantage to be gained by securing buyers against the destructive effects of discriminatory selling.

Unfortunately counsel who argued the case for the Federal Trade Commission was not prepared to make either practical or theoretical arguments.

Coming now to the Court's construction of the section 2 (b) defense, although the practical question had not been raised, it said that by passage of the Robinson-Patman Act Congress did not seek "either to abolish competition or so radically to curtail it that a seller would have no substantial right of self-defense against a price raid by a competitor"—supra, page 249.

Then more specifically the Court said of the 2 (b) defense:

That still consists of the provision that wherever a lawful lower price of a competitor threatens to deprive a seller of a customer, the seller, to retain that customer, may in good faith meet that lower price—supra, page 242.

Similar statements to the effect that the price to be met must be a lawful price, appear at approximately seven places in this opinion.

How did the Court decide that a violation of the law in self-defense is to consist of meeting a competitor's lawful price? The answer appears in several places. For example:

In the Staley case, supra, most of the Court's opinion is devoted to the consideration of the evidence introduced in support of the seller's defense under section 2 (b). The discussion proceeds upon the assumption, applicable here, that if a competitor's "lower price" is a lawful individual price offered to any of the seller's customers, then the seller is protected, under section 2 (b), in making a counteroffer provided the seller proves that its counteroffer is made to meet in good faith its competitor's equally low price—supra, page 244.

Then in a footnote the Court quotes a statement of two members of the FTC staff filed with the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1941, in part, as follows:

The right of self-defense against competitive price attacks is as vital in a competitive economy as the right of self-defense against personal attack—supra, page 247.

And the Court also said:

There is also a suggestion in the debates, as well as in the remarks of this Court in the Staley case, supra, that a competitor's lower price, which may be met by a seller under the protection of section 2 (b), must be a lawful price (supra, p. 248).

Unfortunately the Court's opinion does not specify where the suggestion is to be found in the debates that the price to be met must be a lawful price, but the remarks impinging upon this question to be found in the Staley decision cited as has been indicated, the report of the chairman of the House conferees, Mr. Utterback.

It thus appears that the basic difficulty, and the nullifying effect, of the Standard Oil of Indiana decision lies not in the fact that the Court held the section 2 (b) defense to be a complete defense, but in the fact that it constructed the defense to mean that a seller is justified in violating the law to meet a lawful attack rather than to meet an unlawful attack. As is to be expected, arguments are being made that since a seller is justified in making a discrimination to meet a competitor's lawful price, he may enjoy the presumption that his competitor's price is lawful, and proceed with immunity. For example, the report accompanying one of the bills which have been introduced "to conform statutory law to the interpretation of section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended, recently enunciated by the Supreme Court in Standard Oil Company against Federal Trade Commission," states:

Certainly a seller would not be held responsible, under normal conditions, to judge at his peril whether his competitor could justify the lower price that was being met. Competitors do not normally have ready access to one another's books of account. In the ordinary course the seller may safely start with the assumption that the lower price of a competitor which he is meeting is lawful. (Cf. S. Rept. No. 293, 82d Cong., 1st sess., to acompany S. 719, p. 6.)

Had the Court constructed the defense to mean self-defense in the normal sense of the term, with the burden of showing justification upon the defendant pleading this defense, the seller would be justified in his violations only where he could show that he was in dire peril, and where the circumstances were such that he could not prevail upon the policing authorities to make a timely intervention against his competitor's unlawful act. Moreover, there would normally be a reasonable limit on the time during which the seller could continue to meet a competitor's unlawful price without obtaining legal intervention. As the Court did construct the 2 (b) defense, however, it would appear to leave the law with no facility for terminating a discriminatory practice. Indeed, the sellers who make the lower nondiscriminatory prices which the Robinson-Patman Act sought to encourage lay themselves open to a practical penalty for doing so. And the sellers who make nondiscriminatory prices, whether lower or not—as is usually a practical necessity for smaller sellers—provide an unending justification for their competitors to violate the law.

The genesis of the Court's construction of the 2 (b) defense would be incomplete without some consideration of the alternative arguments with which the Court was presented.

The Department of Justice allowed the FTC to assign its own attorney to present its case to the Court. The FTC assigned a recently appointed associate general counsel. He did not argue either that the 2 (b) defense should involve meeting a lawful price or that it should involve meeting an unlawful price. He did not argue either that the defense should pertain to retaining a customer or that it should pertain to acquiring a new customer. He did not dispute counsel for Standard's position on these points. His argument touched upon none of these things; rather, his argument was in essence that a seller's price discriminations may enhance competition at the seller's level while injuring competition at the reseller's level, and that the 2 (b) defense should mean that the FTC would balance the benefits against the injury in individual situations and decide in each case where the greater social good lay. This argument appears to have struck the Court as being dangerously insufficient in provision for due process, for in rejecting the argument it said:

In the absence of more explicit requirements and more specific standards of comparison than we have here, it is difficult to see how an injury to competition at a level below that of the seller can thus be balanced fairly against a justification for meeting the competition at the seller's level. We hesitate to accept section 2 (b) as establishing such a dubious defense (supra, p. 251).

In 1953 the FTC issued a modified finding in the remanded Standard Oil, Indiana, case, declaring that Standard had failed to sustain the burden of proving the 2 (b) defense. Thus, after 2 years of considering the evidence, the FTC reached a conclusion that Standard's price discriminations had not been made "in good faith," stating, in part, as follows:

At all relevant times respondent (Standard Oil of Indiana) knew or had the means of knowing and should have known that the manner in which it priced and sold its gasoline continually created the probability of injury to competition between retail dealers who bought such gasoline at different prices and resold it in competition with one another.

* * * * * * * The Commission does not construe the words "in good faith" in section 2 (b) as permitting that result. (FTC's modified finding issued January 16, 1953.)

Thus the Commission appears to have reverted to a test enunciated in the Cement opinion, which is that the 2 (b) defense does not "permit a seller to use a sales system which constantly results in his getting more money for like goods from some customers than he does from others"—opinion cited—and in doing so the Commission would seem of necessity to have rejected the Court's construction of the defense in the Standard Oil, Indiana, opinion, which construction inherently embraces continual discrimination.

The FTC's modified finding is now pending review of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

PERSONNEL PROBLEMS OF THE AIR FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in our endeavors to bring about a condition of

lasting peace and security, we have been called upon to create and support powerful American military forces to stand as a bulwark against the diabolical schemes of the Kremlin. Technological military advancements by the Soviets during the past decade have had a profound effect on our efforts. We have been called upon to emphasize a military program adjusted both to this continuing threat to our national survival and to new military doctrinal concepts.

Mr. Speaker, the perimeters of the world have shrunk. No longer it is possible for us to depend complacently upon the luxury of time or the security of distance. A powerful military force in being is this Nation's only insurance against surprise attack.

It is only natural, therefore, that we have come to recognize the need for the rapid buildup toward a powerful defensive and deterrent Air Force. The United States Air Force must be made such an instrument, available to the American people for their common defense and for the advancement of their national interest. It can and should be the most potent assembly of organized military strength in history. It is the principal military means with which the American people can meet the perils of this age of danger.

Our efforts to create such a force have not been directed merely to the accumulation of masses of manpower. As a matter of fact, considerable emphasis has been given to the use of minimum manpower through the effective and maximum use of American scientific genius.

Nevertheless, there has been a tendency in all of our talk of military budgets to disregard the one principal element of a qualitative military force; the human element. The most effective weapons that science can produce are just so many nuts and bolts if we do not have the finest trained manpower to operate them.

Recently, I had the extreme pleasure of visiting both the headquarters, Strategic Air Command, and the headquarters, Continental Air Defense Command. I am hard put to describe the dedicated spirit of the many individuals that I met at both installations. Their spirit is magnificent, despite the many almost insurmountable problems that crop up daily in these two great commands.

Mr. Speaker, my talks with both Gen. Curtis LeMay at Strategic Air Command and Gen. Frederick H. Smith, Jr., vice commander, Air Defense Command, left me quite disturbed.

Of the many problems we discussed, the one that was paramount was that of personnel. The retention of personnel in these two organizations that provide us with the main deterrent against the Soviet Union is probably their most significant problem.

These two great military leaders are concerned about the situation. Continued loss of experienced personnel has had a most unfavorable impact on the combat effectiveness of their units. But what is even worse is that neither can predict an appreciable change in the present trend.

This problem involves more than just a matter of pay. It involves such issues as good and adequate housing, proper family medical care and survivors benefits. It involves the acceptance of the military man into the community family and an awareness by the community of the problems that are inherent only in the military.

Above all, it involves the regeneration of a respect for an honored vocation and the elimination of the too frequent concept of the second-class citizen.

There is all too often a willingness to chip away at the benefits that have been extended to military personnel.

Mr. Speaker, two points stood out in my discussions at SAC and ADC covering the personnel problem. First, the comparison of military pay rates versus civilian for flying and maintenance personnel. Second, the requirements placed upon human beings to provide a constant state of readiness within ADC.

Upon departing SAC and ADC headquarters, I asked both General LeMay and General Smith for a report outlining their major personnel problem areas. I have received them. I would like to quote portions from these reports. First is the SAC statement regarding pay differentials:

As a matter of information, we made a comparison of a SAC B–47 air division with General Motors and United Air Lines. For every $10,000 that General Motors has in asset value, they put the equivalent of $6,000 into payroll, or 60 percent of the asset value. For every $10,000 that United Airlines has in asset value, they put the equivalent of $5,000 or 50 percent into payroll. For every $10,000 that a SAC B–47 Air Division has in asset value, they put the equivalent of $735 or 7.3 percent into payroll.

If you took the total asset value of General Motors and divided it by the total number of General Motors employees, the asset value would be $11,000 per employee; if you did the same thing for United Airlines, the asset value would be $10,500 per employee. If you did the same for a B–47 Air Division, the asset value would be $55,000 per employee.

As to the Air Defense problem, this is what General Smith has to say:

The nature of the air defense mission dictates a constant state of readiness 24 hours a day on a 7 day per week basis. Geographically, it requires that our units be spread over the whole of the United States, with their location determined on the basis of military necessity, technical requirements, and defense capability rather than with regard to favorable climatic and living conditions. The net result of these two facts is that by and large our people are assigned to shift duty in units situated considerable distances from large Air Force installations and also from civilian communities where normal services and conveniences can be made available. For instance, 85 percent of our aircraft control and warning radar units are located from a minimum of 20 miles to a maximum of 485 miles from their parent organization. To a lesser degree they are isolated from even the most rural communities in the more thinly populated areas of the country. The people who man these organizations face much the same situation here as they do at isolated overseas areas. It is upon these people that the problems of housing, medical care, high rents, and the like have particular impact.

Mr. Speaker, both of these are exceptionally fine statements that clearly delineate the personnel problem that the entire Air Force is faced with. With the permission of my colleagues, I should like to insert in the RECORD the complete reports from which I have extracted these statements and suggest they be read by all:

PAY DIFFERENTIAL, AIR FORCE AND CIVILIAN ENTERPRISE

1. From a study of the agreements between an established airline and its employees an interesting comparison of rates of pay between the Air Force and the airline can be made.

2. The comparison is made between the exact jobs in each instance and with approximately the same length of service.

(a) An airline DC–7 pilot (captain on domestic flight) and an Air Force Captain flying a B–47, B–36, or B–52, both with over 8 years' service, will be compared. The airline pilot will receive for an 80-hour flying month (normal) $1,448.00. The Air Force pilot will receive $756.68.

(b) An airline captain on international flights, flying 82 hours, draws approximately $18,480.00 per year. He can be compared to one of our Wing Commanders with 20 years service who draws $13,767 per year and has 50 B–47's under his command.

(c) An airline flight dispatcher with 10 years service will draw a healthy $745 per month, while the Air Force Master Sergeant with the same service and the same duty will earn $375.40.

(d) An airline panel engineer with 2 years experience will receive $545 per month. An Air Force Airman First Class on a C–124 receives $194, which includes allowance equivalents. For the purpose of this comparison, both are unmarried.

(e) The Air Force Master Sergeant serving as a Line Chief will earn $375.40 per month, with an additional $55 per month as flying pay. The Line Chief will not receive flying pay each month, but possibly every other month. The airline lead mechanic will earn a basic wage of $97.20 for a 40-hour week. This figure does not include shift differential, overtime or test flight pay. If he were to work 8 hours overtime and have 8 hours of test flights the airline lead mechanic will draw over $150 per week, or $600 per month.

3. A comparison between mechanics in our combat wings and mechanics working for an airplane company is as follows:

(a) The skilled aircraft mechanic (bomb-navigation systems mechanic, aircraft engine mechanic or radar mechanic) in a B–47, B–36 or B–52 Wing is paid from $205 to $407 per month with the average in SAC being $243 a month due to the grades of airmen assigned. The pay listed above includes pay and allowances, or its equivalent and is the range for airmen second class (single) with over 2 years service up to and including a Master Sergeant (married with over 2 dependents) and over 12 years' service. The pay for these same specialties by Boeing Airplane Company ranges from $318 to $450 monthly, not including any overtime compensations. The fringe benefits for the military individual and the civilian employee are approximately equal in value.

(b) Some of our airmen technicians are qualified upon completing a 4-year enlistment in the Air Force to secure jobs as Contractor-Technicians in civilian industry, receiving pay that will normally range from $500 to over $800 per month, depending upon their seniority. In exceptional cases Contractor-Technicians can earn up to $1,100 per month.

4. As a matter of information, we made a comparison of a SAC B–47 Air Division with General Motors and United Air Lines. For every $10,000 that General Motors has in asset value, they put the equivalent of $6,000 into payroll, or 60 percent of the asset value. For every $10,000 that United Air

Lines has in asset value, they put the equivalent of $5,000 or 50 percent into payroll. For every $10,000 that a SAC B–47 Air Division has in asset value, they put the equivalent of $735 or 7.3 percent into payroll.

If you took the total asset value of General Motors and divided it by the total number of General Motors employees, the asset value would be $11,000 per employee; if you did the same thing for United Air Lines, the asset value would be $10,500 per employee. If you did the same for a B–47 Air Division, the asset value would be $55,000 per employee.

We point this out to show the cost of the equipment and property in a B–47 Air Division for which our people are responsible.

5. The present cost of a B–47, B–36, and B–52 is as follows:

(a) B–52—$10,402,765
(b) B–36—$4,138,125
(c) B–47—$2,449,456.

NOTE.—All pay for Air Force personnel listed includes basic pay and allowances or the allowance equivalent for single airmen who are furnished Government quarters and subsistence.

HEADQUARTERS,
AIR DEFENSE COMMAND,
ENT AIR FORCE BASE,
Colorado Springs, Colo., February 15, 1956.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Military Subcommittee,
House Government Operations Committe, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: During your recent visit here with the other members of your committee, you asked me to write you on the Air Defense Command situation with regard to the retention of our military personnel.

The retention of our trained people is probably the most significant problem which faces this command today. We are greatly concerned about the situation because of the impact it has on our effectiveness and also because we cannot at this time predict any appreciable change in the present trend. The Air Defense Command is not unique in this respect when compared with other commands in the Air Force but it does have certain characteristics which I consider worthy to bring again to your attention.

The nature of the air defense mission dictates a constant state of readiness 24 hours a day on a 7 day per week basis. Geographically it requires that our units be spread over the whole of the United States, with their location determined on the basis of military necessity, technical requirements and defense capability rather than with regard to favorable climatic and living conditions. The net result of these two facts is that by and large our people are assigned to shift duty in units situated considerable distances from large Air Force installations and also from civilian communities where normal services and conveniences can be made available. For instance, 85 percent of our Aircraft Control and Warning Radar Units are located from a minimum of 20 miles to a maximum of 485 miles from their parent organization. To a lesser degree they are isolated from even the most rural communities in the more thinly populated areas of the country. The people who man these organizations face much the same situation here as they do at isolated overseas areas. It is upon these people that the problems of housing, medical care, high rents and the like have particular impact.

The technical requirements of the mission assigned this command have a distinct bearing on the problem in two main categories. First, the extremely complicated equipment we must use requires us to train people for a considerable part of their service contract in the fields which make them a natural source for utilization in civilian industries. Secondly, use of this equipment to maximum capability requires such undesirable practices from a personnel standpoint as the positioning of radar units on mountain tops. For operational reasons, it has been necessary to restrict defense coverage of the northern, cold-weather areas to specific type of fighter units. Until recently therefore we find a situation whereby certain of our combat teams and their support personnel were limited to service in the northern area of this country and at far-reaching Air Defense complexes in Alaska, Canada, Newfoundland, and Iceland.

The above generalities have a cumulative and negative effect on the career intentions of our people and I think specific examples of this situation are appropriate.

(a) The fire control systems mechanic is an airman who maintains electronic components of the armament systems in our fighter aircraft. We are authorized over 2,000 of these men and have a reenlistment rate of only 20 percent in this category. We have now and anticipate for some time a manning of only 12 percent in the technician level of skill in this specialty. The radar repair mechanic on our aircraft control and warning systems is authorized this command in numbers of approximately 2,000; we have a reenlistment rate of only 17 percent and in the technician category we have only 26 percent manning.

(b) The officer picture is illustrated by our situation in fighter pilots and radar controllers. These are the men who make up the air and ground components of our operational team. We are currently short fighter pilots and of those now on hand, 661 become eligible for separation during the calendar year 1956. Based on our past experience only 152 of this number, or 23 percent, will extend their tours of active duty. In the controller category, the man who directs the air battle from the ground by means of radar, we presently have a critical shortage. Furthermore, of the controllers now assigned to this command, over 400 become eligible for separation during 1956 and of this number, only 10 percent are expected to extend their active duty tours.

From a military standpoint the loss of our skilled people described above constitutes a tremendous handicap. Although we receive replacements for those people who leave the service, we are constantly faced with the problem of a lack of skill and experience. For instance, 70 percent of our airmen are now in their first enlistment. The task of training these airmen to effectively use and maintain the highly technical machines and equipment which we must have is tremendous. Many of these men spend as much as 2 years of a 4-year enlistment in a training capacity. The average cost of training an airman in the Air Force is some $15,000 but in the categories in which we are primarily concerned, the training cost may be as high as $75,000.

I can assure you that in this command we are taking every internal action we can devise to increase the attractiveness of the service career and to retain our people. The simple fact remains that our people do not find the monetary remuneration or the other tangible benefits which are apparently available in other fields of endeavor. We are keenly aware of pending legislation as proposed by the Department of Defense to enhance service career benefits and to increase the attractiveness of the service career. We are convinced that only by providing our people with the pay, housing, medical care, survivor benefits and the like will we be able to compete with the present civilian economy in retaining the men necessary for adequate defense of this country.

Sincerely,

FREDERIC H. SMITH, Jr.,
Major General, United States
Air Force, Vice Commander.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRANT (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS), for Tuesday, March 13, 1956, on account of official business.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN (at the request of Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN), indefinitely, on account of death in the family.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN (at the request of Mr. SADLAK), on account of official business at Hartford, Conn.

Mr. HARRIS (at the request of Mr. HAYS of Arkansas), for an indefinite period, on account of death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered were granted to:

Mr. LESINSKI, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MEADER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, for 30 minutes on Monday next.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KNOX, for 45 minutes today and to revise and extend his remarks and include certain newspaper articles and other extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING, for 30 minutes on Thursday next and to revise and extend his remarks and include certain extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN and to include testimony she gave before the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. SELDEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAGUE.

Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. JACKSON.

Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. BURLESON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MATTHEWS.

Mr. PHILBIN in three instances.

Mr. YATES in four instances and to include copies of newsletters he sent to his constitutents.

Mr. WILLIS (at the request of Mr. METCALF).

Mr. MULTER in 3 instances and to include extraneous matter in one, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $400.

Mr. RODINO in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of California.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT and to include extraneous material.

Mr. BENTLEY (at the request of Mr. WAINWRIGHT) and to include extraneous material.

Mr. AVERY

Mr. LATHAM (at the request of Mr.

HALLECK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLYNT and include a statement.

Mr. PELLY (at the request of Mr. YOUNGER).

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 7, 1956:

H. R. 7588. An act granting the benefits of section 301 (a) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to certain children of United States citizens.

On March 12, 1956:

H. R. 2552. An act to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; and

H. R. 7201. An act relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, March 15, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1630. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report certifying that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands to be served by the Michaud Flats project under the change in development plan, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of either gravity or sprinkler irrigation, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1631. A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1632. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report covering all tort claims paid by this Department in the fiscal year 1955, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C., sec. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1633. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington September 10, 1954, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 400. Resolution to authorize a study leading to the establishment of a research and development program for the coal industry; with amendment (Rept. No. 1872), Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 9770. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1873), Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. S. 2364. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1874), Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTLEY: Committee on Foreign Affairs: House Resolution 370. Resolution to continue the policy of the United States concerning reunification of certain peoples, the admission of Japan into the United Nations, and regarding Communist enslavement; with amendment (Rept. No. 1877). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Interim Report of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on abandonment of Panama Railroad, pursuant to House Resolution 118 (84th Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 1878). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 8493. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1879). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 554. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1875). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 566. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1876). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BLITCH:

H. R. 9896. A bill to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance who are in need through the issuance of certificates to be used in the acquisition of surplus agricultural food and fiber products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 9897. A bill to amend and clarify section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to confirm jurisdiction in the Federal courts to enforce section 9 (g) (3); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 9898. A bill to provide particular designations for the highway bridges over the Potomac River at 14th Street in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 9899. A bill to provide particular designations for the highway bridges over the Potomac River at 14th Street in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 9900. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to increase the amounts payable thereunder by the Federal Government to States having approved plans for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 9901. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the income-tax exemption allowed a taxpayer for a dependent, and $1,800 for a dependent child (until said child reaches 21 years of age) while attending any business school, college, or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9902. A bill to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to passengers on aircraft in flight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 9903. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the benefits of section 1231 shall be available with respect to livestock held for any purpose by taxpayer for 6 months or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 9904. A bill to provide vocational training for adult Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 9905. A bill to provide for continuance of life-insurance coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, in the case of employees receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 9906. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 9907. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 9908. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 9909. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of mica in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 9910. A bill to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 9911. A bill to provide for the procurement by the Government of insurance against risk to civilian personnel of liability for personal injury or death, or for property damage, arising from the operation of motor vehicles in the performance of official Government duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 9912. A bill to exempt shipments of certain livestock, fish and agricultural commodities from the tax on the transportation

of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 9913. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from tax amounts paid for admission to certain rodeos; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 9914. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 9915. A bill relating to the tax treatment of chain stores operated at a loss; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 9916. A bill to permit the free marketing of newly mined gold; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 9917. A bill to create a United States Department of Mineral Resources and to prescribe the functions thereof; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 9918. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate and execute a contract with the Riverside Irrigation District, Idaho, relating to the rehabilitation of the district's works, and other matters; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 9919. A bill to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 9920. A bill to provide for the appointment of a Chief of Chaplains of the United States Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 9921. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly families and persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 9922. A bill to provide that certain veterans suffering from active pulmonary tuberculosis shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes while they are hospitalized; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 9923. A bill relating to the transfer of Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 9924. A bill to advance officers on the retired list of the Army to the highest officer grade for which they satisfactorily performed the duties in time of war; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 9925. A bill to provide for the soundproofing of two elementary-school buildings of the Rosen Heights Independent School District; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 9926. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9927. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to remove certain impediments to the processing of applications for Veterans' Administration direct loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9928. A bill to authorize the coinage of standard silver dollars in commemoration of the Nevada Silver Centenary and the 100th anniversiary of the discovery of the Comstock Lode at Virginia City, Nev.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 9929. A bill to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9930. A bill to provide for the maintenance of essential production of tungsten ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. J. Res. 578. Joint resolution to establish a joint committee to investigate the gold mining industry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. J. Res. 579. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. Res. 426. Resolution providing for the printing of certain proceedings in the House Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. Res. 427. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States take all possible and appropriate measures through negotiation to obtain maximum jurisdiction over members of the Armed Forces of the United States with respect to offenses committed against the laws of foreign nations in which United States Forces are stationed; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 9931. A bill to authorize the President to award posthumously to George Fox, Alexander Goode, Clark Poling, and John P. Washington Congressional Medals of Honor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 9932. A bill for the relief of Francesco Romano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 9933. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jerry A. Hackler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 9934. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hilkka Kaustinen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 9935. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Erika Katharina Fasser Kresge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 9936. A bill for the relief of Miss Mavis Louise Rhodes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 9937. A bill for the relief of Donata Di Girolamo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 9938. A bill for the relief of Hsin-Kuan Liu and Esther T. C. Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 9939. A bill for the relief of Steven Slota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9940. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Vadasz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 9941. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theresa K. Maschl Wellersdick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 9942. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Po-Ling Liu and minor son, George Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9943. A bill for the relief of Chih-Yee Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 9944. A bill for the relief of Hjalmar Johansen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 9945. A bill for the relief of Magallano Tiong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 9946. A bill to provide for the advancement of Capt. Edward J. Steichen, United States Naval Reserve (retired), to the grade of rear admiral on the Naval Reserve retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 9947. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Edward Wine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 9948. A bill for the relief of Josephine Shelby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 580. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 581. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Con. Res. 221. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

645. By Mr. BRAY: Petition of 18 persons of Greene County, Ind., in support of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

646. Also, petition of 21 persons of Monroe County, Ind., in support of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

647. Also, petition of 145 persons of Monroe County, Ind., in support of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

648. Also, petition of 17 persons of Monroe County, Ind., in support of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

649. Also, petition of 49 members of Frank Courtney Post No. 22, the American Legion, Linton, Ind., in support of H. R. 7886, a bill to increase veterans' pensions when given for nonservice connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

650. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Sid R. Stadler and other veterans of Columbia County, Pa., urging the immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

651. Also, petition of William R. Flood and other veterans of Lycoming County, Pa., urg-

ing the immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

652. By Mr. FOUNTAIN: Petition of Jesse M. Seaver, and 201 other citizens of Halifax County, N. C., protesting alcoholic beverage advertising on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

653. Also, petition of Rev. C. S. Grogan, and 75 other citizens, of Roanoke Rapids, N. C., in support of bills S. 923 and companion bill H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

654. Also, petition of Rev. Ben F. Musser, and 25 other citizens, of Seaboard, N. C., protesting the advertising of alcoholic beverages on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

655. Also, petition of Rev. Paul D. Early, and 39 other citizens, urging the support of S. 923 and companion bill H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

656. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

657. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. R. F. Hamilton and other citizens of Polk County, Mo., urging the passage of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

658. Also, petition of Joe Rountree and other citizens of Ozark County, Mo., urging support of bills, S. 923 and H. R. 4627, legislation prohibiting alcoholic beverage advertising on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

659. Also, petition of S. H. Johnson and other citizens of Jasper County, Mo., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

660. Also, petition of Joe Taylor and other citizens of Neosho, Mo., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

661. Also, petition of Amos A. Wynkoop and other citizens of Greene County, Mo., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

662. Also, petition of Oscar T. Williamson and other citizens of Lawrence County, Mo., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

663. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Lower Tule River Irrigation District, Porterville, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to recommending that funds be allocated for the immediate commencement of construction of Success Dam on the Tule River and Terminus Dam on the Kaweah River; to the Committee on Appropriations.

664. Also, petition of the secretary, Porter Slough Ditch Co., Porterville, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the immediate appriation of the initial funds necessary for the commencement of construction of Success Dam, and to make such additional appropriations necessary for the completion thereof; to the Committee on Appropriations.

665. Also, petition of the president, BMT Division, Holy Name Society, Brooklyn, N. Y. petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing their support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

666. Also, petition of the city clerk, Port Arthur, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging support of the pending legislation providing for Federal participation in the cost of right-of-way and relocating public utilities incidental to construction; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Golden Years Can Be Glorious Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, Congressmen were talking about children when I entered the cloakroom one day last week. One had remarked about how quickly children grow up today, when another Member interrupted to tell about the adolescent whose father decided that the time had come to educate him about some of the facts of life. After much hesitation, the father mustered enough courage to invite the boy into the living room, saying: "Son, you're getting on in years now. I'd like to have a good heart-to-heart talk with you about the facts of life." "Sure, dad," said the boy, "what do you want to know?"

Youth knows so much. Mark Twain used to describe his feelings toward his father in this way:

When I was 15—

He said—

I thought my father knew so little about so many things. When I became 21, however, my father suddenly became very bright. I was amazed by how much he had learned in the last 6 years.

We cherish youth in this country. We cherish youth so much that we are really quite immature in our attitudes toward our older people. We discard them, perhaps not in the same barbaric manner as some primitive tribes, which drive their older people out of the community, but our treatment is nearly as bad. Each year we consign healthy, alert men and women by the hundreds to the scrap heap and to an early physical and mental breakdown, because we refuse to recognize the fact that most of our older people want to work and can work, and that a job is the best guaranty of their self-respect and independence.

The sloughing off process begins early—at age 45 for men and 35 for women. At these early ages, according to a Department of Labor finding a few years ago, the odds are 6 to 1 against their getting new jobs even in a tight labor market. The Federal Government, which used to be one of the worst offenders in refusing employment because of age, no longer does so because of my amendment last year which prohibited the Civil Service Commission from using age as a qualification. For some time Secretary of Labor Mitchell has made a determined and worthy effort to persuade private industry to abandon its long-standing preference for young people only. I'll wager, however, that the 6 to 1 odds have not fallen very much.

At age 65 comes the culminating blow. If a person has been lucky enough to work until he reaches that age, compulsory retirement takes him out of his job, regardless of his capabilities. A few years ago I received a letter from a toolmaker in Detroit, in which he said:

I was getting along fine at my job, feeling good and doing my work well. I had worked there for 30 years and I was 64. Along came my birthday and I was out of work. I was good enough at 64; I was not good enough at 65. And yet I was the same man.

Older people are like other people in the respect that they need enough money to live on and to take care of themselves. Obviously this must come from work, savings, social security, or from some kind of public assistance. It is difficult to accumulate enough savings to retire. Most people who reach age 65 will live another 13 years, and if they want to retire on their savings, they will have to have accumulated about $17,000 in order to have an income of $100 a month for the rest of their lives. For most American families who are trying to get along on less than $3,000 per year, this amount is unattainable.

Social-security benefits, even with the increases in recent years, are still inadequate to provide a minimum standard of living. The law itself denies to beneficiaries the right to supplement their benefits by c nings of more than $100 per month, a provision which seems most unreasonable because it permits only a minimum standard of living. Until such time as social-security benefits allow a decent standard of living, beneficiaries should not be prohibited from supplementing their benefits with adequate earnings to permit them to live with independence and dignity.

Last week I filed a bill to establish a bureau of older persons in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to deal with the problems of people age 65 and over. The bill also sets up a program of grants-in-aid to the States to encourage them to undertake prompt measures to train needed personnel and to lay out a course of action in handling the problems of our older citizens. The bill recognizes that primary responsibility rests with the States and local communities and that the Federal Government can only help them to help themselves.

"Grow old with me," said Rabbi Ben Ezra in Robert Browning's poem; "grow old with me, the best is yet to be." The

golden years can be glorious years, if our older people have enough to live on, good housing accommodations, something to keep them active, and the feeling that they belong—that the community has not discarded them. We are still far from that goal, but it is one toward which we must strive.

Archbishop Beran, of Prague: Roman Catholic Primate of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, many are the heinous and dastardly deeds of Communists wherever they are in power. No matter how carefully and cleverly they try to conceal their nefarious activities, certain facts betraying their methods and machinations against humanity seep through the tightest curtains drawn between the lands of the workers' paradise and the free world. The few stray facts that do come through are repelling and revolting to the free minds of the West. Everywhere in the Communist world the people are not only regimented, but they are held under constant surveillance, being constantly spied upon by the secret security police. No one is free in any sense of the word. There is no freedom of movement, no freedom of assembly, no freedom of speech, no freedom of the press, nor freedom of conscience.

In recent times, freedom of conscience has taken an additional significance. All religious institutions, Christian churches in particular, have championed freedom of conscience, and especially in central and eastern Europe the Roman Catholic Church. Nowhere else in recent years has the struggle for freedom of conscience, freedom for one's soul, been more intense and bitter than in those parts of Europe where Communists hold the upper hand.

In Czechoslovakia, the home of Comenius and Masaryk, the struggle has been particularly bitter. There the Communists have nationalized all schools, have expropriated all church property, and have tried to silence and subdue all church leaders. In this task, they found in the leadership of the Roman Catholic Church their strongest opposition for right and justice. For several years the Communists tried to silence and suppress these leaders who were deprived of the means whereby their views were publicized. They were warned against the danger of harboring independent views. At the same time, they were also under constant threat of intimidation and even under threat of physical torture. But neither by bullying nor by blandishment could the Communists sway or silence the most outspoken critic of the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia, Archbishop Josef Beran, the Archbishop of Prague and the Roman Catholic primate of Czechoslovakia. On March 10, 1951, his enemies pounced upon him without warning. He was placed under arrest by the secret police; then he was fined by the authorities and banished from Prague to a place still unknown to us in the free world.

In recalling that sad day, March 10, the fifth anniversary of the imprisonment, we can only hope and pray that this devoted servant and leader of his people, this prince of peace, is still alive. We hope that the heroic manner in which he has endured the suffering which has been so unjustly inflicted upon him will serve to inspire free men everywhere to resist tyranny and devote themselves as resolutely and as unselfishly as he has done to the defense of the cause of freedom.

Nevadan's Views on 11 National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I have just conducted a statewide poll among Nevada citizens on 11 vital issues now facing Congress.

The questionnaire was submitted through the mails to well over 70 percent of Nevada families and appeared in nearly every newspaper in the State. The results have been tabulated by International Business Machines Corp.

May I call these views of Nevadans to the attention of the membership of the United States House of Representatives at this time.

In doing so may I stress my deep appreciation to the thousands of citizens in my State who took the time to consider these important matters and express their views upon them.

It has been said that the quality of public service depends upon the quality of public interest. The participation by Nevadans in these annual statewide polls is extremely gratifying to me as their elected Representative.

The poll results follow:

[Percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Is the present rate of expenditure for our national defense program (about $35 billion annually) adequate?	55.1	17.6	27.3
2. (a) Should taxes be cut before the budget is balanced?	14.6	79.9	5.5
(b) Should the national debt (about $280 billion) be reduced before taxes are cut?	68.8	19.1	12.1
3. With regard to farm policy:			
(a) Should the Government pay farmers for retiring acreage from production?	24.6	60.4	15.0
(b) Should we abandon flexible price supports and return to high rigid price supports?	8.9	76.9	14.2
4. Is the Federal Government spending enough money for civil defense (about $41½ million annually)?	51.9	22.7	25.4
5. Do you approve of membership by the United States in the Organization for Trade Cooperation which would help administer the vast international trade agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade?	56.0	15.3	28.7
6. Should Congress broaden coverage of Federal minimum wage legislation?	55.3	32.8	11.9
7. With regard to the Taft-Hartley Act, should it be:			
(a) Repealed?	8.9	31.4	59.7
(b) Strengthened?	33.7	8.5	57.8
(c) Left as is?	16.2	15.3	68.5
(d) Amended as recommended by the President?	41.4	7.4	51.2
8. Should the Federal Government sponsor a health reinsurance program to encourage expansion of private health insurance?	46.4	41.0	12.6
9. Should the Federal Government sponsor a flood damage insurance program?	59.7	30.6	9.7
10. Should the Federal Government help deal with economically depressed areas by technical and financial assistance loans?	67.0	20.3	12.7
11. What is your preference in financing a Federal highway program:			
(a) Bonds?	17.6	13.8	68.6
(b) Tax increase on road users?	36.5	9.9	53.6
(c) A compromise of bonds and taxes?	41.6	9.8	48.6

Statement in Favor of Protecting the Collective-Bargaining Rights of Supervisors—H. R. 9142

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, most friends of organized labor agree about the need to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. I hope that this will constitute one of the top priority items of a liberal and forward-looking Democratic administration, which I am sure the American people will elect come November.

Meanwhile, it is desirable that we eliminate some of the more objectionable provisions of the act. I find that the Labor-Management Relations Act is particularly shabby in the treatment of supervisors, and I have, therefore, introduced a bill which would restore to supervisors the right to collective bargaining. Under the Taft-Hartley Act supervisors are excluded from the protective provisions of the act. The Labor-Management Relations Act defines supervisors in the broadest terms and makes it possible for unscrupulous em-

ployers to clothe many employees with titles and thus exclude them from the protection provided by the act and evade collective-bargaining obligations.

Many employees who have traditionally been regarded as eligible for union membership are included as supervisors under the broad terms of the act, and thus deprived for all practical purposes of the rights to collective bargaining.

The basis for excluding supervisors from the protection of the act is a distortion of the Biblical maxim that no man can serve two masters. If supervisors were to belong to unions, the proponents of the restrictions claim, they might be faced with serving the interest of both unions and management. This is an old argument. Opponents of unions used the same shibboleths when they fought the original National Labor Relations Act. Unionization has not increased the conflict of interest between management and labor, but has equalized the strength of the two parties and has made true collective bargaining and its many benefits possible.

Passage of H. R. 9142 would represent a step in the right direction. It would eliminate one of the inequities of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Archbishop Josef Beran of Prague

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this March 10 marked the fifth anniversary of the Communists' imprisonment of Archbishop Josef Beran of Prague in some unknown place. In the name of those sacred rights of freedom and justice endowed by the Creator upon every human being, I proffer this plea: That the Red regime free this man, worthy of every respect and honor and, at least, give him the right to abandon his beloved native land and to seek asylum in another country willing to receive him.

The Czechoslovakian Communist Government's imprisonment of such an illustrious man follows the Marxist doctrine that no man can freely speak and express his views. In our democracy we invite and welcome a completely free exchange of ideas, no matter how controversial and agonistic the exchange. Although we reserve to ourselves the privilege of vigorous contradiction, nevertheless, we respect the right of our opponents to voice freely their views.

Archbishop Beran is not alone in his suffering today. Many others, laymen as well as churchmen, have been jailed for insisting upon their God-given right of freedom in the choice of religious practice. It is sad, therefore, that the Communists in Czechoslovakia fail to see that their end is not served by imprisoning such a well-known champion of religious freedom. His forced silence serves only to enkindle the fire of resistance in the hearts of the Czech people. Abroad it constitutes a manifestation that no freedom exists under any Communist form of government. Mass extermination methods used by some other Communist rulers, while entirely inhuman and abominable, are probably less indicative of the false and tyrannical Communist principles than the instant example of suppressing a single man's moral freedom. In the blind search for forceful application of their will, the Communists could not have chosen a weaker case against themselves.

Archbishop Beran has been known as a champion of freedom for many years. The Nazis had already tried for 3 years, unsuccessfully, to crush the spirit, the strength, and power of resistance of this courageous man. Early in 1949 the Czech Minister of Justice, so-called, visited the Prague Catholic archdiocese in an attempt to lay down the law to Archbishop Beran. When the official had uttered his first sentence to the effect that the archbishop had better support the national front or else, Archbishop Beran stopped him and with a smile walked over to the closet, a short distance from his desk, opened the door deliberately, took out a small bundle of rags, and turned to the official saying: "Here's my uniform from Dachau. Let's go." Only the shame of a silent retreat was left to the furious Czech Minister of Justice or, let us say, for the sake of truth, the minister of injustice.

If the Czech Communists want to prove that I am wrong in my accusation against them and in my indictment of their methods, they have only to set this man free or exile him. But will they dare to have their methods exposed to the judgment of the entire world? Unfortunately, I am hoping for the impossible. Although I can only pray that the Almighty will visit Archbishop Beran in his tortures, giving him the strength of Daniel, I take this opportunity to assure the good people of Czechoslovakia and free Czechs in other parts of the world, especially our Czech communities in the United States, that the suffering of Archbishop Beran will not be forgotten. His suffering constitutes the most vivid example of the holy fight dared by a few men against an entire regime in complete faith that one day Communist oppression will be defeated in the world.

Two Thousand Five Hundred and Sixty-five Residents of 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania Take Part in Newspaper Poll of Public Opinion on Current Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently I conducted a newspaper poll among the residents of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties comprising the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania which I have the honor to represent.

As of March 1, 1956, 2,565 questionnaires were returned and of this number 1,135 were from Blair County, 880 from Centre County, and 550 from Clearfield County.

A further breakdown of the 2,565 questionnaires by occupation is as follows: educators, 235; professionals—doctors, lawyers, and so forth, 165; students, 55; military, 15; retired, 410; railroaders, 210; skilled trades, 190; farmers, 140; businessmen, 415; laborers, 75; housewives, 270; miscellaneous, 385.

The tabulation of the 15 questions representing the views of the 2,565 residents of the three-county area follows:

	Yes	No
1. Do you favor reduction of taxes before balancing the budget?	425	2,140
2. Do you favor Federal grants to States to help build schools?	1,545	975
3. Do you favor increased social security benefits supported by larger deductions from pay envelopes?	1,345	950
4. Should foreign aid be increased?	610	1,955
5. Are Americans being fooled by Russia's attempt to pose as a peace-loving nation?	1,315	1,090
6. Which in your opinion represents the soundest agricultural program:		
(a) High, rigid price supports for basic crops coupled with production controls?	120	0
(b) Flexible price supports and the soil-bank program as advocated by the present administration?	870	300
(c) No price supports, permitting agricultural commodities to find their own level in the market?	1,040	175
7. Do you favor President Eisenhower's highway program, the cost of which is to be paid by bonds?	1,700	715
8. Do you favor more federally subsidized public housing?	855	1,500
9. What do you think Congress should do about the Taft-Hartley Act?		
(a) Should it be repealed?	285	35
(b) Let alone?	1,090	330
(c) Amended?	720	90
10. Should the electoral college be abolished and the President of the United States be elected by popular vote?	1,480	510
11. Do you favor reduction of Federal Government competition with privately owned business and industry?	2,020	540
12. Should England discontinue trading with Communist China?	1,610	775
13. Do you favor admission to the United States of more displaced persons?	995	1,515
14. Do you favor federally subsidized power projects?	735	1,630
15. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to meet Post Office Department deficits?	1,690	820

A study of the questionnaires discloses that about 15 percent of them were accompanied by explanatory letters either qualifying the vote on the various questions or commenting on other subjects of national importance.

Many of the letters also revealed that the conclusions reached followed a family conference or a discussion of the questions with neighbors. In one instance, a service club discussed the questions at its regular weekly meeting and after polling

its members sent me a tabulation of the views expressed.

A great many residents voiced their concern over the seriousness of world conditions and their effect on our standard of living and our future as a Nation.

It is significant that not a single letter or questionnaire revealed a belligerent attitude on the part of newspaper readers. While there was criticism of some governmental policies and agencies, it was of a constructive nature and revealed a desire to be helpful in my efforts to secure a cross section of sentiment on national issues.

I wish to thank all the newspaper publishers and their readers for their cooperation in making the newspaper poll a successful venture.

This method of sampling public opinion has proved mutually profitable because it has given my constituents an opportunity to voice their sentiments on the manner in which their Government is conducted and it affords me helpful information in carrying out my duties as a Representative in Congress of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Independence of Byelorussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in our concern over the fate of the countries which have come under the tyrannical domination of Soviet Russia since the end of World War II, we often tend to overlook those groups which have for many more years been subjected to the rule of the despots in the Kremlin. March 25 marked a significant day for one of these groups, the Byelorussians or White-ruthenians.

This group, which is now spread out over the face of several countries behind the Iron Curtain, is estimated to number about 15 million, making them the third largest group in the European part of the Soviet Union after the Russians and Ukranians.

Despite strong nationalistic feelings throughout their history, the Byelorussian people have, with a single exception, been prevented by geographical and other reasons from gaining their independence. The one exception came for a short period in 1918. At that time various groups within the Byelorussian people united their forces to form the Great National All Byelorussian Congress. The congress organized a group called the Rada, and it was this group which on March 25, 1918 proclaimed the independence of Byelorussia.

The new government set to work quickly to expand its activities in all fields of national life. Significant achievements were recorded in the fields of education, culture, and social protection. Diplomatic recognition was secured from a number of countries.

With the withdrawal of the German armies in November 1918, however, came the advance of the Russians into the new Republic. Unfortunately, the Byelorussians had not been able to build up their armed forces and they were soon overrun by the Red Army.

Since that time the Byelorussian people have been under the domination of the men from Moscow. But the people of this brave land have never knuckled down to the Communist government and have continued to work for their freedom. The dynamic growth of the national political consciousness of the Byelorussian people has caused the Russians to take severe retaliatory steps. A policy of calculated and open terror has been pursued. Mass arrests and deportations, deliberate murders, public hangings, and rigid systems of control have been the order of the day. Millions have perished under this regime.

The Reds have not limited themselves solely to physical anihilation of the people. They have also tried to liquidate the cultural achievements of Byelorussians as well. To this end they have removed from circulation and destroyed patriotic works and publications and have pushed vigorously a campaign of Russification in the schools of the land. The churches have been severely persecuted. It has been, truly, a campaign of cultural genocide.

All of these reprisals, rather than crushing the spirit of the people, have served to increase their efforts for national liberation. Over the years there have been armed revolts and constant passive resistance to the rulers in the Kremlin. We hear reports that there are numerous underground, patriotic organizations at work today in the country.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of this brave land have never accepted the domination of the Communists and have continued to work and hope for the day when freedom will again be theirs. We must sustain them in their endeavors. By observing, as we did Sunday, the occasion of their declaration of independence, we give encouragement to the people of Byelorussia and let them know that we are supporting their never-ending struggle for independence.

Let us continue these observances in the hope that some day soon the Byelorussian people—who have suffered so very long under the heavy yoke of Communist rule—will rejoin the ranks of the freemen of the world.

The Need for Housing for the Middle-Income Group: The Average Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, since I first took my seat in this Chamber, I have urged the passage of legislation designed to promote the general welfare of all of the groups who are a part of this truly democratic country of ours. Today, I rise in the hope that the facts I give you will impress upon you the urgent and continued need for legislation which will give the average citizen—the man in the middle-income bracket of our Nation—a chance to have the kind of home he deserves, at a price he can afford.

There are those who contend that we should not have legislation for public housing or for housing for the middle-income groups. They argue that this is socialism and that legislation of this nature hinders the production of the needed housing rather than increasing it, because it competes with private enterprise. They cite figures which purport to prove that the building and construction industry is producing the housing needed for these groups. Information which has come to my attention would indicate differently.

Most housing experts agree that an average of approximately 2 million new houses per year are needed to maintain a housing inventory sufficient to adequately supply our increasing population. In 1955 less than 1,330,000 dwelling units were started, and in 1954 only 1,220,400 units were begun. Yet, there are some 10 million substandard dwellings in this country which should be replaced by 1960 if every American is to have that decent home. I would say that this can only be accomplished with the cooperation of industry and government; we must work together.

In 1954 there was a gain in the number of 1-family building starts, according to data published by the United States Department of Commerce, but publicly owned units started were the lowest since 1948, and private units in 2-family and multifamily structures were the lowest since 1947. In 1955 relatively more 1-family houses were put under construction than in any previous year, but apartment buildings with 5 or more units were a much smaller portion of new housing in 1955 than in 1954. In the first 9 months of 1955, multifamily structures—of 5 or more units—accounted for about 10 percent of all nonfarm housing starts, or about one-half the proportion it represented in 1949.

At first glance, you might be inclined to conclude that the housing inventory has been increasing in the form of one-family structures, because of consumer preferences, thereby reducing the necessity for producing a larger number of multifamily structures. But let us review these facts in the light of the needs of middle-income families. Prices of the single-family houses started in the first quarter of 1955 averaged higher in all regions of the country than in the same period of 1954; the cost of building materials rose 8.4 percent over 1954 costs. In 1955 there was an 11-percent rise in the median selling prices of new 1-family houses, putting the dream of a "home of my own" beyond the reach of a still larger group of the middle-income families.

The definition of "middle income," as you know, varies from city to city and region to region. Taking that large section of our population—upward of 13

million families—whose income for 1955 ranged from $3,000 to $5,000, according to census data, between 20 and 25 percent of a family's income goes for housing. This figure is usually smaller for the higher income brackets. How many of these families do you think can find housing for less than $70 to $100 per month? How many of these families are able to save up for the large down-payment needed to buy when more than 50 percent of the new houses started in 1955 were in the $12,000 to $20,000 bracket?

A National Housing Conference study indicates that in order for a family to swing a $10,000 house, it must have an income of $126 a week, or $6,654 a year. If a gift of a new $10,000 house were made to a family, monthly expenses could easily total $57.50 for general upkeep, taxes, and utilities. These families should not be required to accept small, substandard dwellings, nor should they be required to go dangerously into debt.

We are in a position to help these middle-income families out of their dilemma by providing workable legislation which will encourage cooperative housing for these families. Little capital is available today for rental housing; there are more attractive investments elsewhere. But cooperative housing, with equity financing furnished, and eventual control of the project in the hands of the cooperators, can help meet this problem. It is still private enterprise and all of the segments of the building industry participate and benefit and the middle-income family gets a decent home. There is no question about the fact that we would serve the best interests of the general economy, the housing industry and the welfare of the Nation, if we assist in providing adequate, livable homes of sufficient size for the average family to live comfortably and economically at monthly payments within their means.

Before I close my remarks, I must pause to stress one important point. We have not lived up to our stated intention to provide guidance and technical assistance to consumer groups interested in forming housing cooperatives. To date the appropriations granted the Housing Agency have by no means been sufficient to furnish the technical assistance and guidance which we so grandly promised. The information brought forth during investigations which have been in progress on the Senate side underscore the necessity for adequate supervision and guidance in all phases of our housing program, and I call upon you to remember this when appropriations legislation is brought before this body.

Someone has said "In a democracy, when we come right down to it, everything begins with cooperation and self-help. Country, small town, suburb, or city—it's up to us." Let us cooperate with the middle-income families who are desirous of helping themselves to have a decent home in which to raise their children, by making available to them the capital and technical assistance necessary to accomplish this.

Slovakian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that 17 years ago, on March 14, 1939, the Diet of Slovakia proclaimed the Independence of Slovakia at Bratislava.

During the approximately 6 years that it was in existence the Republic of Slovakia was recognized by 27 states, including the Holy See, The Soviet Union, Spain, Switzerland, Sweden, Great Britain, and France. Its international individuality, therefore, was an accepted fact.

Mr. Speaker, in commenting upon the Slovak Republic itself, I should like to quote a few lines from Special Report No. 8 of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, as follows:

> Even though the Slovak State was largely the result of a tense international situation, it nevertheless corresponded to the aspirations of the Slovak people for freedom and the principle of self-determination and self-government. * * * The Slovak State was far from being a perfect democracy in the traditional sense. It reflected a compromise between the past and the present, between an old tradition and a temporarily determined political dynamism in central Europe. But, in general, it was an expression of the self-preservation instinct of the Slovak nation.

Ever since the end of World War II there has been carried on a lively and at times bitter controversy between those persons in this country who stand for a separate, independent Slovakia and those who endorse the idea of a united Czechoslovakia. It is not my purpose to take sides at this time in such a dispute but I do believe that the stated policy of our administration is the correct one: that is, not to commit this Government to any course of action except that of permitting the Czech and Slovak peoples themselves, following their liberation, to work out their own problems in the spirit of freedom and self-determination. Meanwhile, I urge both parties to recognize that the question of liberation from Communist tyranny is the immediate problem to be faced. There can be no political solution to this Czech-Slovak problem until liberation comes first. Nevertheless, on behalf of the thousands of people in this country of Slovak origin, many of them residents of my own congressional district, who are firmly committed to the idea of a free, independent Slovakia, I call the attention of the House to this, their independence day. I am sure that the desire for freedom and self-determination is just as strong in the hearts of the people of Slovakia who are today existing under Communist domination. And as long as that desire remains alive, the Soviets face an impossible task in their efforts to communize the Slovaks. I know we all join in the hope that soon liberation and the right of self-determination will again come to the Slovak people, as to all other peoples now behind the Iron Curtain. At that time, whatever form of government the Slovak people themselves choose, I am confident that free nations everywhere, including our own, will honor their election and their choice.

United for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Speaking before the Amalgamated Clothing Workers at Leominster last night Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN called for "more practical application in American government and American life of the spirit and ideals of Abraham Lincoln whose great work in preserving the Union and uniting the Nation," he said, "was one of the most illustrious features of history."

"More perhaps than any other President," declared PHILBIN, "Lincoln was a man of the people. He understood their problems and ever strived to better their condition. He believed in American principles and did everything in his power to guard them."

"Some of our problems today," said the Congressman, "are similar to those which Lincoln faced because there are bitter conflicts of opinion regarding constitutional questions which seriously threaten national unity and there is an insidious world conspiracy which menaces our freedom and security," he said.

Lauding the working people for their contributions, PHILBIN said: "On the other hand, the Nation as a whole is enjoying the greatest prosperity it has ever known with more people employed than ever before. We must see to it that this prosperity not only continues, but that it extends to every section and every class of the American people. We must insist that our great free-enterprise economy which is the one thing our potential enemy fears, and which is so essential to our national defense is encouraged to expanding productivity, high levels of employment, and social standards—health, housing, education, security, and civil rights.

"We pride ourselves on our free-enterprise system because it has given us greater material benefits and abundant living than men and women have ever experienced in the long struggle to establish civilization."

PHILBIN praised the flexibility of the American economy: "It must always be remembered that this free system which we prize and cherish cannot be merely static, and it cannot be purely material. It must move forward with the times in which we live. It must constantly adapt itself to the new social needs arising in this fabulous atomic age. It must never challenge human dignity or lose sight of great moral and spiritual truths from which it draws its very life. This system, like our Government itself, belongs to all the people and no economic oligarchy can be allowed to exploit it for selfish ends inimicable to public interest.

"Under our Constitution there must be opportunity for all and there must be equality before the law, opportunity for everyone

regardless of his racial derivation, his religious affiliation, his social or financial standing or his station in life to get ahead according to his ability and his ambition, to receive just compensation for his labor, to be protected in the conditions under which he works and lives and to be respected in his fundamental right as an individual and a human being. There can be no second-class citizens in this country."

Urging greater responsibility of citizenship PHILBIN said: "We may have the feeling sometimes that there is too much emphasis placed upon rights and not enough on responsibilities. If we hope to enjoy the fruits of a great free government which guards and protects our rights, it logically follows that we must willingly assume our share of responsibility for keeping the Government as well as the economic system sound, honest, well managed and responsive to the will of the people. The greatest danger to this Nation is not from foreign attack, not from foreign enemies, not from atomic or hydrogen bombs, not from communism, socialism, or any other ism. The greatest danger to this country comes from within, from complacency, from apathy, from indifference, from failure to accept and share responsibility for protecting the precious heritage of freedom."

Stressing obstruction of world peace as holding up human progress, the Congressman continued: "Not for one moment would I minimize the very grave dangers that confront us as the result of the present world situation. There are a host of very grave problems which, up to this time, have not been solved despite Geneva and all the other conferences. If it were not for the existing international threat against peace, order, and freedom, this Nation and the world, because of the astonishing advance of science, industrial know-how and economic technique, would be on the threshold of the greatest age in all history. Amazing scientific discoveries are being developed daily which hold the key to untold prosperity, progress, and happiness for the whole human race. The tragedy of it all is that up to this time these great new inventions are being implemented for war mostly rather than for peace. Thus a black shadow of fear, doubt, and skepticism hangs over the world and people everywhere are in constant dread that a great war waged with atomic-laden rockets and guided missiles will destroy the monuments of civilization.

"I cannot predict when these conditions will change, when peace will come to this disillusioned planet, but I do know that peace can never be based on further appeasement of those who are seeking to destroy us, or upon the surrender of our most cherished political and spiritual ideals. On the other hand, I believe very sincerely and with deep conviction that we would have secured peace long ago if real resolution, firmness, determination, and courage had been displayed by those charged with leadership of the free world. I am convinced that it is only through strength, not through weakness, timidity, and cowering fear, that peace can be established, and I may say that I also believe that peace may be closer at hand than many people think, because we can be sure that the potential enemy is just as anxious to avoid wholesale destruction as we of the free world are. It is for this reason that we must exert every effort to promote the cause of international disarmament and peace."

PHILBIN hailed recently adopted flood measures and plans for an atomic plant in this area as splendid signs for the future:

"I am optimistic, too, about the business and economic outlook for our State and for New England. Two things happened just this past week in Washington which are most encouraging: First, the passage by Congress of flood-control legislation which will enable a start to be made on projects to protect our area against these great natural disasters, and, secondly, the announcement by the Atomic Energy Commission that it is authorizing an atomic powerplant for our region. In my opinion both these measures, in time, will give tremendous inpetus to our prosperity, our economic and social well-being."

The Congressman closed his remarks with a plea for unity and toleration: "It is for us then as sovereign citizens of the greatest democracy on earth to look forward to the future with expectant minds and courageous hearts. If we keep our country united in freedom, if we preserve our great constitutional system with its safeguards of individual rights, if we nurture the true American spirit of toleration and fairness toward our own and other peoples, if we faithfully practice the principles of social justice, if we exercise eternal vigilance against the enemies of our country, foreign and domestic, if we insist upon honor, honesty, and integrity in our public affairs, if we individually and collectively discharge our responsibility as the proud inheritors of the lagacy of American liberty keeping our country strong against aggression, vigorous, and progressive in its economic life, resolute in its high purpose, we need have no fear of future events. Our Nation and the world under God will go on to enjoy the fruits and blessings of a glorious age of security, plenty, and peace."

The American Bar Association Fails the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received an invitation to join the American Bar Association.

I had been a member for many years but discontinued my membership because of the association's irreprehensible and utterly indefensible action in rejecting the application for membership of a very able and distinguished New York City jurist, for the sole reason that he is a Negro. Many times since I had been approached to rejoin and on each of these occasions I was told that the association's policy in this respect had been changed.

Upon examining the application form that I received a few days ago, I experienced once more the disappointing conviction that the association's policy has not undergone any substantial variation. The sixth line of the application form requires the applicant to indicate his race by making an appropriate mark after one of the following: "Caucasian," "Mongolian," "Indian," and "Negro." Why not go the rest of the way, and put in a request for the applicant to name his religion?

Is it conceivable that an association of lawyers, of advocates, of individuals who are supposed to be the paladins and praetorians of justice and who are supposed to dedicate their lives to the cause of justice, should forget the basic principles of justice upon which the supreme law of our land is founded "that all men are created equal."

In connection with its membership drive, the American Bar Association transmits to potential applicants a booklet descriptive of its achievements, present activities, its services, and objectives. Among its list of achievements, the association declares it "has consistently pursued, and is today carrying on with increased vigor, a campaign to instill in the public mind an understanding of the fundamental principles of the Constitution and a keener appreciation of the privileges of American citizenship."

I take this opportunity to remind the association that it abuses and destroys its right to exist if in recruiting members some persons are in fact considered less worthy than others—only because there is a difference in the color of their skin. The spirit of racial superiority is utterly in conflict with those basic principles that form the foundation of a true democratic way of life.

Here, indeed, we may apply the maxim that the association should practice what it preaches if it wants men to follow its preachments and to regard the organization as the protagonist of the principles of human justice. It is high time the American Bar Association changed its policy.

If it does not do so, then I suggest it drop the word "American" from its name. The simple words "bar association" will be more appropriate.

America's Achilles' Heel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, it has been clear for some time that we are way behind in our efforts to catch up with the Nation's ever-growing educational needs. A bill approved last year by the House Committee on Education and Labor to provide Federal funds for the construction of schools is only now being considered by the Rules Committee and is moving very slowly. A number of witnesses remain to be heard before the committee decides if and when it will grant a rule on the bill so that it may come to the floor of the House.

Many Members who favor the bill are pessimistic about its chances of final passage. The Supreme Court decision which outlawed segregation in public schools has engendered such deep feeling among southern Members that many of them are inclined to vote against the bill, regardless of whether or not it contains an antisegregation clause. Their argument is based on their traditional claim of States' rights: education is the business of the States and not the Federal Government.

Much is heard in support of that contention every day. More will be heard when the bill comes to the floor. The fact remains, however, that the Federal Government is interested in education

and will continue to be—as a matter of national security, if for no other reason, for the Russians are engaged in a massive crash program to educate scientists, engineers, and mathematicians.

A few weeks ago Adm. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Adm. H. G. Rickover, designer of the atomic submarine, expressed concern not so much with Russia's 300-division army, or with its more than 300-submarine navy, or with its ability to explode A-bombs and H-bombs although these did disturb them. They were worried about the dearth of scientific and engineering schools in this country and the decreasing number of engineers and scientists being graduated. They termed this gap in our educational system "America's Achilles' Heel," and called attention to the fact that the Soviets were training and graduating currently twice as many such professional people as we were.

In an article last October, Dr. Charles A. Thomas, president of Monsanto Chemical Co., pointed out that only 1 out of 11 American high-school students studies chemistry; that since 1900 the percentage of students studying algebra has declined from 56 percent to about 25 percent. In sample surveys, teen-agers voted mathematics and foreign languages the two most unpopular subjects in school. Many of them thought of scientists as "cold and calculating, without interest or moral standards." Science was described as "an occupation for queer geniuses." Dr. Thomas believed that the disinterest in science could very well be due in great measure to inadequately trained or uninspired and uninspiring science teachers, and that something should be done to correct this. But what should be done?

This week, the Appropriations Subcommittee of which I am a member, heard the testimony and the request for funds of the National Science Foundation. They confirmed the statements of Strauss and Rickover that our advantage over the Soviets in trained scientific and engineering personnel will not last very long unless we step up our own educational programs. This the National Science Foundation is attempting to do by grants of research projects to universities, by granting fellowships and scholarships in science to worthy students, and by reeducating high school and college science teachers in current scientific and educational developments. Teachers are given scholarships to improve their competence by additional courses of study. Efforts are being made to rewrite scientific textbooks to make them more interesting and attractive for students of all levels.

We do have some good teachers, like my good friend, Mrs. Annette Yancey, who is a teacher at Lane Technical High School. She told this story in a letter to me last week, and I thought you would like to hear it because I think it is appropriate:

A 10-year-old girl had a test in geography. One question, "In what State is St. Louis?" At home that evening she explained, "Daddy, I didn't know how to spell Minnesota and I didn't want to make a mistake in spelling so I wrote Missouri." I tell such stories to my classes believing a spontaneous reaction, indicating an alert sense of humor, is closely allied to high intelligence. The story got a loud laugh from one boy, then a few chuckles. At last one sober-faced lad muttered, "It's too bad no one has told her by this time it's in Kansas."

We want our sons and daughters to be well educated. And yet, fully half of our young people having the intellectual capacity to continue their education beyond high school do not do so, for one reason or another. Until this percentage is greatly improved, we will still have our Achilles' Heel.

Tightening Up Our Fraud Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General has recommended legislation to permit prosecution of fraudulent stock promoters who circumvent the present law by operating from foreign countries. I have today introduced a bill to carry out this suggestion with one modification.

This bill is designed to close a loophole in the present law which limits prosecution to frauds involving only interstate wire, radio, and television communication. It would extend this coverage to foreign communications as well.

This legislation was prompted by a case last year in which it was alleged that a fraudulent scheme was carried out by means of telephone communication from Mexico to Los Angeles. Because of the limitation of the present statutes, the culprits escaped prosecution.

This bill will eliminate this shortcoming. It will not only cover foreign communications by wire, radio, and television, but will also remove any doubt as to the applicability of the statute to communication between a State and a Territory or between a State and the District of Columbia.

The modification in the Attorney General's recommendation would raise the penalty for these interstate and foreign swindling crimes from $1,000 to $10,000. The alternative of 5 years in prison, or both a fine and prison term, remains.

It seems to me that the fine suggested by the Justice Department is not sufficiently severe. We must remember that in many instances these chiselers are playing for such high stakes that the $1,000 fine the Attorney General proposes will not deter them. Therefore, my bill will impose a fine of $10,000, which is more in line with the magnitude of the operations of these gyp artists.

The penalty of $10,000 or 5 years in prison, or both, will go a long way toward protecting segments of our population who have been duped in the past. In so many of these cases the victims have been newcomers to our shores, whose meager knowledge of our language was parlayed by swindlers for gain, or involved those who could least afford to lose their money to fraudulent manipulators. The threat of the increased penalties will, I hope, serve to deter many of these heinous promoters.

I hope for speedy action on this measure which will be another step forward in our never-ending crusade against the crooks and connivers who try to defraud the American people.

A copy of the bill follows:

A bill to amend section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud by wire, radio, or television

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1343. Fraud by wire, radio, or television: Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, transmits or causes to be transmitted by means of wire, radio, or television, communication in interstate or foreign commerce, any writings, signs, signals, pictures, or sounds for the purpose of executing such scheme or artifice, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

Racial Problem in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening, March 4, 1956, I appeared on Washington television station WMAL as the guest of news commentator Joe McCaffrey. In answer to his request that I present the viewpoint of the majority of Alabamians on my State's current racial problem, I made the following statement:

It is a pleasure for me to be here with you tonight, and I hope that in the next few minutes I can throw at least a little light on the problems that face the people of the South.

The friendly relations that have existed in Alabama between the white and Negro races have been badly strained in recent weeks.

In my State of Alabama, as in other sections of the South, we have always operated under a segregated system. The Negro race, under that system, has made great progress—perhaps greater progress than any race anywhere at any time in history. This progress had been made with the help of the southern white people, and I am happy to say that, at the same time, racial strife and hatred had been reduced to a minimum.

Under the separate-but-equal doctrine, promulgated by the Supreme Court more than 60 years ago and reaffirmed several times since, steady progress has been made in providing equal facilities of all sorts. Negroes had their own homes and their own businesses and their own jobs. Negro teachers taught their own children and Negro schools were—perhaps slowly—but surely being placed on a par with those of the whites. In the city of Tuscaloosa, for example, the Negro high school, recently completed at a cost of almost $2 million, is on a par or superior to many white high schools in the State. The rank and file of the Negroes

knew these things and most of them were satisfied with the progress that was being made.

Then, on May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States, disregarding all legal precedent, issued its decree banning segregation in the schools of the Nation. As a result of this decree, and as a result of the confusion and unrest agitated by the NAACP and other determined integrationists, tension between the two races in the South that heretofore had existed on an almost negligible scale has increased alarmingly.

As a result of the Supreme Court's decision, we have a problem in Alabama and the South that cannot be fully understood by those who live in other parts of the country. We are not dealing there with only a few members of the Negro race but with large masses. For example, in several counties of the congressional district I represent there are 3 to 5 times as many Negroes as there are whites. To upset by judicial decree in one fell swoop the customs and traditions under which the whites and Negroes in the South have lived and worked side by side for generations is to invite dissension and strife and hatred.

If left alone, the responsible leaders of the South, both white and Negro, will continue their efforts to work out in peace and harmony a solution satisfactory to both races. But prodded by the NAACP, an organization now bitterly resented by the people of Alabama and the South, it's highly likely the tension that now exists in my State will increase rather than diminish.

I hope you who are listening tonight will realize, if you have not already done so, that the problem now facing the people of the South is one that calls for the understanding and the prayers, rather than the criticism, of the people of the other sections of this great Nation.

Strange as it may seem to many who do not understand the problem now confronting the people of the South, many southern Negroes also resent the action that is being taken by the NAACP and other integrationists. As an illustration, I call your attention to the following letter, written by a Negro citizen of Alabama, that appeared on Saturday, March 10, 1956, in the Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald:

I would appreciate if you will give my version of integration in the South. I am a Negro plasterer. My grandparents were slaves to the grandest white people that ever lived, so I was told by my grandparents and father and mother.

They lived in west Alabama and moved to Birmingham where I was born 42 years ago. I attended school until I was 15 and then went to work as a helper and learned the plastering trade. I have worked all my life with the white people and have made as much or more than the average building tradesmen.

My association with the white people has been as a workingman only. After my day's work I went about my business and the white men went about theirs. In all my life my white friends outnumbered my Negro friends. I have been helped on many occasions by my white friends and I know during the depression they helped my parents to the extent of feeding and clothing us.

The worst thing that ever happened to the Negro race was the organization of the NAACP. It is not advancing the Negro race, but is creating hatred, distrust, economic pressure, and loss of friendship that existed between the white and black races, especially, here in the South.

The Supreme Court decision in my humble way of thinking was not to help the black man, but to help the greedy and selfish politicians, to get their votes and help them get elected.

The northerners are always blaming the southerners for mistreating us, but they are no friends of the Negroes, but are still trying to penalize the South as they did during Reconstruction days following the Civil War, when the carpetbaggers invaded the South.

The southern Negro has advanced faster in the South in the last 30 years than in any other part of the world, and it has been through the help and advantages given him by our southern white people. The Negro that complains of mistreatment brings it on himself and deserves it, but he is not persecuted for his act as the NAACP tries to infer.

The real southern Negroes do not want integration. They want to be left alone. The white people are as much segregated from the Negroes as the Negro is segregated from the white. We have everything they have and every advantage they have if we are smart enough to work for it. The NAACP, Autherine Lucy, Polly Ann Hudson, Arthur Shores, and others like them are tools of the Communists and, if not curbed, will set the Negro race back 100 years.

I love the South as my parents and grandparents did. I love the white people, who have been my friends and helped me. They respect and trust me, and I don't want to lose their friendship. I am not ashamed of being a Negro, but I am ashamed of what some of my race are doing.

I do not blame the southern white people for taking the stand they have. I do not blame them for organizing to keep segregation. We and the Supreme Court will have to answer for whatever comes of it.

The press, television, and radios are helping to create this fast-growing tension by so much publicity. If they would curb so much publicity, I believe it would gradually die.

To my race, I hope and pray that you will awaken and realize that you are a Negro and should be proud of it, that your way of life is not threatened by our white brothers and you should not threaten his way of life by integration, regardless of what you are told by fanatics, radicals, and Communists. The white southern people are our truest friends, so let's keep him our friend.

WILL JACKSON.

ZION CITY.

Exhibition of Sportsmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, how many people noticed that incredible exhibition of sportsmanship, which took place in Australia last Saturday? John Landy, world mile record holder, gave up the chance for cracking another world record and jeopardized his own berth on the Olympic team by helping a fallen teammate.

The great Australian athlete was way ahead to another 4-minute mile when a fellow competitor tripped and fell 600 yards from the finish line. Landy stopped and turned to help his fallen colleague. But the downed man urged him to go on. Ron Clarke shouted, "Get going, John. See you later. Don't worry about me."

Not only did Landy get going, but he made up the 30 yards he had lost and won the race in 4:04.2—still an incredible time. Roger Bannister's coach—Bannister being Landy's chief rival—said:

It was the most gallant action I have seen in a lifetime of athletics. Landy is the sort of man who would do that, an Olympic berth was at stake, but that did not matter to Landy. All that worried him was the man on the ground.

When Landy stepped to the rostrum to accept the winner's medal, pandemonium broke loose in Melbourne Olympic Park Arena. And well it might. Landy's action exemplified everything that is good and decent in our world today. None of us is too big or too important to learn a lesson from this fine Australian lad's actions.

Who's Against Nixon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have never withheld praise when I felt it was deserved, even from those for whom I have a political aversion; and in the present instance I must express my admiration, albeit somewhat grudgingly, for the masterful job the partisans of labor and the ADA have done on the Vice President, a job that far exceeds in its virulence the smear campaign directed at Herbert Hoover by Charlie Michaelson, the hireling hatchetman of the New Deal back in the thirties.

A recent survey clearly indicates that the majority of the Republican leaders are for RICHARD NIXON, and it is hard to see how they could be otherwise out of deference to the hard-hitting manner in which he carried the fight to the opposition in 1952 and 1954. Up in Pennsylvania where I come from we play the game of politics for keeps, asking for no quarter and giving none; and when the fight is over we harbor no grudges, nor do we criticize our opponents for having called their shots. And I can report that the precinct workers and the party faithful, the people who ring the doorbells and get out the vote, are enthusiastically for the Nixon type of forthright campaigning.

In any realistic estimate of the situation we can very well discount the opposition to Mr. NIXON that comes from the Democrat camp. They long ago recognized the futility, and indeed the political hazard, of criticizing President Eisenhower; hence it was only natural that they should center their fire on the one man who has enjoyed greater praise from the President than any other member of his team. But who are the ones in the Republican camp who find fault with the Vice President? Certainly it cannot be laid to top leaders in the Citizens for Eisenhower or among the follow-

ers of the late Senator Taft, most of whom are strongly for keeping Mr. NIXON on the ticket. As a matter of fact, the drop-NIXON group in the G. O. P. is made up principally of the nervous-nellies who unwittingly pay tribute to the ADA smear artists by expressing fear that NIXON may have been damaged to the point where he will be a liability in the campaign.

I can think of no greater tragedy that could befall our party in this election year than to drop the one man who has carried the fight to our political foes with vigor but with strict regard for the rules, and who at the same time has given the President his best in loyal and devoted service. And I have no patience with the thinking of those who in order to try to capture Democrat votes would take the step that would result in a host of regular Republicans sitting out the election, a point which columnist David Lawrence makes in these words:

Plainly the Republican managers will have to figure out a way to get a united party and a ticket that will persuade Republicans to go to the polls in 1956. They should be worrying far less about what will attract 'left wing' Democrats and more about winning regular Republicans. As one prominent Republican Senator put it to this correspondent the other day: "For every Democrat supposedly attracted by deserting NIXON we will lose two regular Republicans who will stay at home."

I think most of us are thoroughly in accord with the President's refusal to name his running-mate in advance of his own nomination, and we heartily applaud his recognition of the rules of the game. In the end, however, I am satisfied that he will give the nod to the hardest-working and the most loyal Vice President any Chief Executive ever had. On that point millions of Ike supporters are supremely confident.

National Campaign To Advertise Famed Louisiana Seafoods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, we in Louisiana are very proud of our seafoods. No State can offer more in fine fish, shrimp, crabs, oysters, crayfish, and other such delicacies, or better cooks who know so well how to prepare and serve these delightful dishes in such a variety of delicious and unusual ways.

To further increase the fame of our seafoods, a national campaign is under way through the use of postage meter advertising, sponsored by the Louisiana Wild Life and Fisheries Commission, which is headed by Director L. D. Young, Jr. On the mailings of several commercial and civic organizations appears the excellent advice, "Dining Out Tonight? Try Louisiana Seafood," accompanied by the picture of a chef emphasizing the matter with his exclamation of "C'est bon"—it is good.

According to the commission's Mr. Charles A. Murphy, industrial services, commercial seafoods division, this is the first of a series of postage ads designed to increase Louisiana seafood sales. It is hoped to sell the program to restaurants all over the country and have "Louisiana" on the menu when seafood is served.

Mr. Murphy states that the commission is indebted to the Louisiana Restaurant Association, Louisiana Hotel Association, New Orleans Hotel Association, New Orleans Area Chamber of Commerce, Houma Chamber of Commerce, New Orleans Dock Board, International House, and Diners Club for their cooperation.

Tax Equity for American DP's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I want to point out certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which I feel create inequities in their application. I introduced H. R. 9827 on March 7 to amend certain sections of the Code and thereby improve these unfair administrative requirements. This bill is now under consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The inequity of the existing statutes governing the Federal capital-gains tax is the subject at hand. It has become a matter of special concern to me because of the resumption of work on Tuttle Creek Dam, in the First District of Kansas.

I want to state again that my position on the Tuttle Creek project has not changed. I am unalterably opposed to its construction, as I have stated previously on the floor of the House.

However, since the 1st session of the 84th Congress saw fit to appropriate more money for construction of this project, even without the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, and since the actual transfer of property has begun, I think the property rights of persons displaced by the reservoir must now be given realistic consideration by the Congress.

Although my interest in this matter stems directly from the Tuttle Creek project, I know there are many persons in other sections of the Nation who are affected by other Federal projects and whose interest also would be protected by this bill.

The present statutes provide that a citizen, required through forced sale to dispose of his property because of the construction of a Federal project, has 12 months in which to reinvest the proceeds of this sale in a similar farm or business without paying a capital gains tax. If he does not elect to reinvest in a similar type of operation, he is required to pay a capital gains tax of approximately 25 percent on the proceeds of the sale.

But the law does not take into consideration the resulting hardship of a forced sale, especially to older persons involved.

One of the amendments which I have offered would eliminate the capital gains tax in instances where those persons who are forced to sell their property as a result of the construction of a Federal project are 60 years of age or over. Persons over 60 years of age are not inclined to start a new farming operation or business venture and they should not be penalized through tax payments for this perfectly natural attitude.

A second phase of my bill would reduce the capital gains tax on property taken by the Federal Government from the present 25 percent to a rate of 10 percent in cases where the owner is less than 60 years of age. In instances where persons are forced to sell their property to the Federal Government special consideration should be given. I do not feel they should be required to pay the same capital gains tax as would the willing seller or the land speculator.

Since the esteemed Members of Congress saw fit to authorize the resumption of construction on Tuttle Creek dam and reservoir, and I might add that authorization was made over my opposition, it would seem the Congress now should be willing to give early and favorable consideration to this bill, H. R. 9827, which would partially compensate the unwilling seller for the sacrifice he is making in what has been described as the public interest.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, across 15 centuries, St. Patrick speaks to men of today the world over, and after so long, his group of followers grows each March 17. It is Ireland's patron saint's wish that has found reality, for he wrote, "Yet, though I am imperfect, I wish my brethren and kinsfolk to know the kind of me." But how difficult it is to know the kind of him, for we possess only a dozen pages of Latin script handed down by St. Patrick summarizing his long, devoted, and illustrious life.

From these few documents, together with the many legends, it is known that St. Patrick was born in Britain about A. D. 389. While still a boy, he was forcibly taken from his homeland and bound into slavery by Irish pillagers. Patrick escaped from his captors and fled to the Continent where he became a priest. After taking his vows, St. Patrick's heart turned back to the country of his captivity. The deplorable conditions of these people, and their barbaric superstitions and religion so moved him that he determined to devote the

remainder of his life to their conversion. His efforts were blessed, and, surmounting all but impossible obstacles, he continued teaching until death overtook the aged saint on the day that is now set aside in his memory. We know that this saint was a lover of freedom so typical of the Irish people. And we know that he was an individualist, quick to anger and quick to humility. He shared these same emotions as do people of today, and perhaps for that reason he has won a timeless and worldwide place in Christian society.

St. Patrick's Day, and the spirit of the day, has followed the Irish immigrant all over the world. Its celebration takes the forms of religious devotions, parades, dinners, and special festivities not only in Irish circles but in all strata of social life. The parades in Dublin and in New York City are notable as are those in Boston, Savannah, and many other cities.

Until early in this century, too much of the celebration followed the false conceptions of the comic Irishman with a clay pipe which was the typical stage characterization. Several Irish writers and artists devoted themselves to communicating to the world, through their talents, the story of the real Ireland. This is the Ireland that means folklore, legend, poetry; the Ireland symbolizing tragedy of heart and passion; the Irish humor that is not slapstick but that of a different quality. So through the efforts of these few dedicated Irish artists, St. Patrick's Day now reflects the tradition and reality of Irish life to a greater degree.

St. Patrick's Day is now a day of Ireland's history, traditions, customs, folklore, and music. All of these elements are woven together with the traditional bits of green and shamrock to be shared by the people the world over.

To my many friends of Irish origin—a hearty and sincere Erin go Bragh.

Flood and Disaster Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House another bill providing for flood disaster insurance in addition to one I introduced some time ago. My new bill is similar to that recently introduced in the other body by the distinguished Senator from New York, Mr. LEHMAN, and my valued friend, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY.

I believe the objective of this bill is sound and I can support its provisions, even though I am convinced that my own original bill based on the principle of the War Damage Corporation is broader and would be more applicable to the needs of persons and businesses in disaster areas.

I am so anxious to see Congress enact a flood disaster insurance bill and make a start in this vital field that I am prepared to entertain and support compromise proposals, even though I might not regard them to be completely suitable to cope adequately with conditions arising from great disasters.

First, I believe that any really worthwhile bill should provide insurance against disaster and not merely against floods. There are a large variety of disasters, which come like a bolt from the blue against which our people and businessmen should be protected. In my opinion, it is not beyond the province or ability of the Government to undertake this protection. It may be costly, to be sure, but I think it would be less costly and more effective in the long run than providing direct relief after disaster strikes.

As I have stated before, any such measure should be predicated upon the participation of the private insurance companies. It should not seek to set up the Government in competition with any unit of our free enterprise system.

Our able House Banking and Currency Committee has been conducting hearings on this subject matter and I have presented my testimony before that body. It is my opinion that this committee will give the various bills pending the most mature and penetrating consideration, and it is my hope that the committee will finally draft and report to the House a bill which will satisfactorily solve this problem.

Archbishop Beran of Prague

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the persecution of organized religion and deportation are two favorite techniques used by the Soviets in the communization of captive countries. The Communists recognize that the worship of God is a powerful force in any nation and that absolute control is impossible unless worship is supplanted by obedience to the doctrines of Marxism-Leninism. Along with religious persecution the Communists concentrate on the mass deportation of other noncooperative groups. According to testimony received before the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives, approximately 15 million people have been interned in slave labor camps behind the Iron Curtain.

A tragic example of the methodical religious persecution practiced by the Communists was the campaign against the Roman Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia. Emphasis was placed on the Catholic Church because of its strength among the people of Czechoslovakia. To place the church under strict Communist control the attack was concentrated against the Catholic hierarchy, especially Archbishop Josef Beran.

Archbishop Beran fought hard against Communist control of church affairs. He fought desperately to prevent the atheistic Kremlin from interfering with the worship of God. He protested vigorously against Communist inroads on the Catholic Church and constantly opposed any measures that would limit the religious rights and freedoms of the Czechoslovakian people. Perceiving that Archbishop Beran was an instrumental force in preventing complete Red control of Czechoslovakia, the Communist government passed a series of laws and decrees in an attempt to destroy Czech Catholicism. The church was put under strict Government control and in effect all clergymen were made civil servants of the state. The Archbishop protested vehemently in defense of the rights of the church. In December of 1949 the Communist government retaliated and secretly imprisoned him, and in March of 1951 the official Prague radio stated:

> Archbishop of Prague Josef Beran, because of his negative attitude toward the church laws, was fired * * * and was directed to live outside the Prague diocese.

According to latest reports, the whereabouts of the archbishop is still unknown.

In other countries behind the Iron Curtain clergymen suffered the identical fate as Archbishop Beran as the Communist regimes set out to eliminate the church as a threat to their complete control over the peoples of the satellite countries. In February of 1952 the Vatican reported that in Europe 64 out of 130 diocese in Communist-controlled countries were without bishops. Perhaps the most famous of the clergymen who were imprisoned are Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Joszef Groesz, of Hungary; Cardinal Wyszynski, of Poland; and Cardinal Stepinac, of Yugoslavia.

The American people proclaim their admiration and their hearts are filled with grief for the clergymen and slave laborers who are being tortured by the godless Communists. Furthermore, they fervently pray that God grant them strength to endure the incessant oppression by the barbarous Communists. It is also essential that all the free nations of the world denounce the uncivilized tactics of the Communists and emphatically demand that these enslaved people be released from their bondage and be granted their full freedom.

Billy Graham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, we are all interested in the outstanding contributions made by Billy Graham to the cause of world peace and human brotherhood. Mr. Graham will be in the caucus room of the Senate on Monday, March 19, from 4 to 5 p. m., and will be delighted to see Members of Congress and members of their family and staff.

Dulles on the Brink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, it has been expected for some time that the policies of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles would be made a lively subject of review when Congress reconvened. The growing number of Russian diplomatic successes, coupled with the weakening of American influence in vital areas, has stimulated considerable congressional dissatisfaction. Speeches by Democratic leaders critical of administration foreign policy have become increasingly frequent, until the administration, much disturbed by the questioning, hastened to take refuge in the cry that the Democrats were violating the tradition of bipartisan cooperation in the field of foreign affairs. Then, not satisfied with the adequacy of this approach, Secretary Dulles resorted to the well-established sports maxim that "a good offense is the best defense," and gave an exclusive interview to Life magazine. The resulting article, which was published last week under the title "How Dulles Averted War," heaped lavish praise upon the Secretary and was the spark which touched off the long-anticipated argument on the administration's foreign policy.

The Democrats did not take seriously the Republican accusation that they were breaching the tradition of bipartisanship in foreign affairs. In the first place, they thought the charge should not be made by an administration which considered the tradition satisfied by occasional consultation with House and Senate Democratic leaders. In contrast to his two Democratic predecessors, who appointed such outstanding Republicans as Frank Knox, James Forrestal, Henry Stimson, Paul Hoffman, Harold Ickes, Robert Lovett, John J. McCloy, John Foster Dulles, and others to positions of high responsibility, President Eisenhower has made no such appointments. This administration seems to be allergic to Democrats.

Last summer Secretary Dulles suggested to the President that he thought it would be a good idea to appoint a Democrat to our United Nations delegation. They selected Benjamin V. Cohen, who had served with great distinction as a member of the U. N. delegation under President Truman. Mr. Eisenhower approved Dulles' suggestion and when Cohen was asked to accept the appointment, he agreed to do so if he could clear it with Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, and Senator GEORGE. When their blessing was obtained, it seemed the matter had been decided.

However, while the President and Mr. Dulles were in Geneva, Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams, fearful of the reaction of certain Republican leaders to the appointment, visited Cohen and asked him to withdraw his acceptance. He did so. When the President and Secretary Dulles returned from Geneva, they made no effort to overrule Adams or to renew their offer to Cohen. Thus ended, like so many good intentions, the administration's attempt toward realistic bipartisanship.

Second, the critics of Dulles were much upset by the low level to which American prestige had fallen throughout the world. When reputable, on-the-spot foreign correspondents, report that "United States influence hits new low in the United Nations"; or "Morocco a blot on the foreign policy of the United States"; or "Dulles' Goa statement termed outage by India"; or "Goodwill for United States ebbs in Cyprus"; or when Canada, our neighbor with whom we must maintain the best of relations, finds fault with our surplus dumping policy, what should Democrats do? Should they commend the Secretary of State? Should they say nothing? Or should they seek an explanation? The answer is obvious.

The article in Life magazine describes Mr. Dulles' work as "the greatest display of personal diplomacy since the great days of the Franklin-Adams-Jefferson triumvirate." It also gives credit to Mr. Dulles for having averted war on three different occasions, implying that Mr. Dulles was able to do so because of his special talent for getting only to the brink of war and stopping without getting into war itself. One has difficulty reconciling the article's glowing tribute to Mr. Dulles with the daily newspaper articles reporting new American diplomatic reverses.

When President Cleveland's second child was born, the doctor asked Cleveland to fetch a scale so that the baby's weight could be determined. Cleveland searched throughout the house without success. Finally he remembered that he had an old scale in the basement which he had used on his fishing trips. He got it and brought it upstairs. Carefully, the doctor placed the baby on the scale and was amazed to learn that the new born infant weighed 25 pounds.

It all depends on the scale you use. It seems to me that now is the time when we ought to use the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations as the scale to weigh Mr. Dulles' policies. Now is the time to find out where in the world we are and where in the world we are going.

From Drill Sergeant to Admiral—Adm. Murrey Royar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, "Murph" Royar literally stumbled into the Navy. As a student at the University of California, he was obliged to take military training under the Army's Reserve officer-training program. California was a land-grant college and every student was required to "left, right, hep, hep" as a part of the ROTC. Young Royar soon earned the wrath of a hard-boiled veteran Army drill sergeant stationed at the school.

One hot afternoon, after a particularly poor performance by Royar on the drill field, the sergeant became so incensed he bawled him out in front of the whole company. "Royar," he bellowed, "you've got two left feet. You'll never make an Army man."

At that precise moment in 1916 Murrey L. Royar decided that if he ever went into the Armed Forces it would not be the Army.

A few days after the United States entered World War I on April 6, 1917, Royar tried to enlist in the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps lost a foot soldier; the Navy gained a bright young man who was to become one of its top officers.

Royar was a rear admiral, Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Paymaster General of the Navy, and the head of the Navy's Supply Corps. Those were his titles. His job as Chief of BuSandA made him head man over the purchasing, fiscal, and transportation functions of the Navy.

He was responsible for seeing that every man and woman in the Navy was paid, fed, and clothed; he directed the procurement activities for all of the supply parts used by shore installations as well as ships and planes of the fleets; he paid the Navy's bills and, as head of transportation, the movement of all Navy material by commercial carrier in the continental United States came under his direction. Approximately 5,600 Navy Supply Corps officers on ships and the stations looked to him for management, supervision, and guidance in their assignments.

In his capacity as Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Admiral Royar was the Navy's No. 1 businessman. The Bureau's inventory of supplies is equal in value to the total of the Nation's nine largest corporations. Its annual transactions run into billions of dollars. Nearly 60,000 civilian workers were under his direction. He managed the buying, selling, storage, bookkeeping, and accounting, transportation, and the feeding and clothing of approximately 800,000 men and women. In addition, he directed the activities of a chain of stores—commissaries, exchanges, and ships' stores—with branches in every part of the world where there were shore installations and ships of the fleet.

As he himself once put it, "If I were wearing Army khaki instead of the Navy blue, I'd be wearing 3 hats, figuratively speaking, as Quartermaster General, Chief of Finance, and Chief of Transportation." His post incorporated the duties of all three. If any Navy officer could get a maximum of work out of his subordinates with a minimum of effort it was Admiral Royar. A commander, one of a number of officers who had served under Royar in various stations, went to him.

"Admiral Royar," he said, "I am not happy in this job. There simply isn't enough responsibility and enough work to keep me busy."

Admiral Royar listened sympathetically to his tale of woe. Then he said,

"Son, suppose you go back to the office and give this assignment another 2 months' trial." The commander went back to his office. As important new assignments came along, Admiral Royar saw to it that they were given to the commander. Finally, at the end of 2 months, the commander was back begging for a letup.

Royar was popular with his subordinates. Perhaps it was because the gray-haired Bureau chief was kind, patient, willing to listen to their explanations when things did not go as they should.

Through the years, Admiral Royar has not changed his philosophy to any great extent in dealing with his fellow members of the Navy—no matter whether they were officers or enlisted men. During World War II, while serving as Inspector General of the Supply Corps, Admiral Royar adopted a policy of correcting rather than commanding. If, on inspecting a supply depot, he found something wrong, he called it to the attention of the commanding officer for action, and he invariably got it immediately. If corrective action was not taken, it was time enough to report the laxity to headquarters in Washington. His thoughtful consideration and friendly approach has endeared him to subordinates, both officers and civilian employees, wherever he has been stationed.

Those who failed to respond to the friendly approach learned to their dismay that Royar could be hard boiled too if the need arose. As a Navy man for more than 36 years he demanded discipline and performance. However, he seldom lost his sense of humor and he found that a slight needling usually got action and quickly.

Born in Los Angeles, Calif., November 22, 1894, young Royar attended the public elementary schools. When he was 12, his father died. The family was not wealthy and "Murph" Royar carried papers to supplement the family income. As grammar school graduation approached, Royar, the boy, looked forward to entering high school. However, Los Angeles High School was already overcrowded and the number of freshmen who could matriculate was limited.

The Los Angeles Times announced a subscription-selling contest, with the winner to receive a scholarship to a California private high school.

Working day and night, "Murph" Royar sold subscriptions in Los Angeles and Redlands, Calif., then a growing young community near Los Angeles. Fortunately, the boy's uncle owned the Redlands Newspaper Distributing Agency, and Royar astutely decided to concentrate his campaign in the smaller town where there was less competition. When the campaign ended, "Murph" Royar was the winner. The Los Angeles Times called him the Redlands Rustler and carried his picture and a story of his accomplishments. Later, he was able to transfer to Los Angeles High School and was graduated from that institution.

In January 1914, Royar matriculated at the University of California at Berkeley, later graduating with a bachelor of science degree.

In the spring of 1917 and graduation approaching, the United States was already at war. Turned down by the Marines, Royar learned that the Navy was accepting applicants for its Pay Officers' School. Royar determined to apply and take the examination. Royar passed the examinations but was obliged to wait several weeks for appointment to the Pay Officers' School.

On June 29, 1917, he was appointed ensign in the Navy Supply Corps and assigned to the school.

By late September 1917, when he finished training at the Pay Officers' School, Ensign Royar was, in his own mind, as they say in the Supply Corps, ready for sea.

His first duty assignment was as supply officer aboard the U. S. S. *Columbia*, which was tied up in New York harbor in preparation for convoy duty when he reported to the captain.

Royar has only one surrender on his record and that was to the charms of a pretty nurse who was on duty with the Army at Vladivostok, Russia, shortly after World War I in 1919. Then a two-stripe lieutenant, Royar was aboard the U. S. S. *New Orleans*, which was station ship for the Asiatic area. Part of his duties included outfitting men for a newly organized Czech navy at Vladivostok. It was there he met and fell in love with Nurse Mabel L. McVey.

A few months later Mabel McVey was in Manila, en route to the United States. Lieutenant Royar also was on duty in the Philippine capital. Their days together passed swiftly and the day for her departure arrived. The ship was to sail on the evening of January 28. A few hours before sailing time "Murph" Royar and Mabel McVey were married.

Throughout his long naval career, Mabel Royar has been a source of encouragement and cooperation to her husband. Moving from station to station, the bane of a Navy wife's existence, waiting at home for her husband to return from sea duty and the long tough years of living on a junior officer's pay did not faze Mrs. Royar. The difficulties and worries of raising a family under those circumstances did not affect her looks either because Mrs. Royar is a beautiful woman today by any standards.

In 1927, Royar was transferred from the U. S. S. *Relief* and became assistant supply officer for the 12th Naval District with headquarters at San Francisco.

In 1931, Royar was assigned to the U. S. S. *Chicago*, a cruiser that was just commissioned. He served aboard the *Chicago* for 3 years. Then followed a tour of duty in Washington as assistant to the officer in charge of the stock division of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. From 1938 until 1940, he was supply officer on the aircraft carrier, the U. S. S. *Saratoga*. From 1940 until 1942, he was senior assistant to the supply officer at the Washington, D. C., Navy Yard. In May 1942 he reported once again to the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, serving consecutively as officer in charge of the maintenance division, responsible for plans and operation of the budget and overall administrative control over civilian personnel in the field. In 1944, he became officer in charge of 7 divisions of the Bureau's accounting group. He had already assumed charge of the Bureau's part in the lease-lend program and for all reciprocal aid activities.

He was appointed Inspector General of the Supply Corps on November 1, 1944. On April 3, 1945, he was promoted to rear admiral to the time of his retirement from June 16, 1943. He served in that capacity until January 4, 1946, when he took command of the Navy Supply Center at Norfolk, Va., where he served more than 2 years. In February 1948 Admiral Royar took over command of the huge Oakland Navy Supply Center. When the Korean hostilities started in June 1950, NSC Oakland was ready to start pouring out millions of tons of supplies to the Pacific fleet. On October 10, 1951, Admiral Royar was sworn in as Paymaster General of the Navy and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

A few months after becoming Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Admiral Royar launched a program of streamlining the Navy supply system. Called Operation Slim-Trim, the program provides for the elimination of thousands of items of Navy stocks, which no longer are useful to the Navy.

Admiral Royar, besides holding various campaign medals, has been decorated with the Legion of Merit, the Order of the British Empire (Commander), the Legion of Honor from the French Government, and the Haakon VII Liberation Medal from the Government of Norway.

This year Royar completed his tour of duty as Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. He and Mrs. Royar, who have 2 daughters and 3 grandchildren, plan to make their home at Walnut Creek, Calif., 10 miles from Oakland, where he will work on his valuable stamp collection. He specializes in first day covers, and has a cabinet full of well-filled stamp albums. Meanwhile, he will carry on with the motto which he has adopted for all of his activities in the Navy:

Nothing is impossible as long as nobody cares who gets the credit.

The most beautiful part of the day is the sunset. Admiral Royar has had a happy home life, the key to real happiness. His superb record is one of which he, his family, and his friends are very proud.

He is a free man and may do what he chooses. I predict that he, like the sunset, will find beauty and satisfaction to the day when the twilight of his life goes beyond the horizon.

First Guided-Missiles Conference Being Held by NATO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, according to an Associated Press dispatch from

Munich, Germany, the world's first international conference on guided-missile development is being held under the auspices of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Dr. Theodore von Karman, an expert in this field and chairman of NATO's scientific research, says, despite feverish activity in worldwide research, it is not likely—in fact, highly unlikely—an intercontinental rocket can be made accurate enough for "guaranteed" push-button warfare.

Meanwhile, certain Capitol Hill experts in partisan-guided political missiles have been firing potshots at the administration. It has been inferred that the long-range ballistic missile is the ultimate weapon and that our Defense Department has been sitting on its hands in the interest of economy. The partisan attack has been to the effect that the Defense Department is guilty of lagging behind and then, second, that an investigation is needed to find out the truth. The verdict is guilty before the trial by investigation is even held.

The technique of preelection frightening of voters with undocumented and irresponsible statements may not be new, but it calls for some rebuttal.

First, however, I should like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I do not rebut Soviet Leader Nikita Khrushchev's prediction that the Communists would have such a missile soon equipped with the H-bomb. My only comment to this would be to quote our own military men.

Admiral Radford, Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said it is not a matter of matching man for man or missile for missile; rather superiority is a combination of factors and we have, he says, an industry-science-military team which is unbeatable. General Gruenther says, "they would lose the war." Chief of our Air Force Staff, Gen. Nat Twining, has said we are well ahead in all fields. Air Force Secretary Quarles says retaliatory bombing is best, that even if the Soviets had a 1,500-mile guided missile, it would not upset the balance. Sir Frederick Brundrett, head of the British research in the guided missile field, has indicated England might be behind the Soviets, but the United States is definitely not.

One partisan charge has been made that the Nation will get a big defense bill right after election, implying the Republican administration will not be actually balancing the budget. This falls a little flat with the recent announcement that the budget surplus for the year ended June 30, 1956, may be $2 billion. It is becoming fashionable on both sides of the aisle to talk tax reduction but a postponement of costs is a bit fantastic.

However, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, there is real danger in the partisan misrepresentations and clamor of demogoguery emanating from the hard core of this ultimate-weapon cult. Our circle of bases in the world requires supply ships and a merchant marine. To maintain supply lines requires a Navy. Unfortunately, some ultimate-weapon leaders would scuttle our Navy. This is serious. This is the same loose and illogical reasoning that some years ago caused the same type of strategists—the very same in one instance—to try and move airplane manufacturers back of the protection, so-called, of the Rocky Mountains.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, every Boeing Airplane Co. worker who lives in my district, as well as navy yard employees, and all who believe in a strong Navy will view with great alarm inferences to be drawn from the statements on defense and known views of certain political figures who lately have been appearing on nationwide TV programs.

Recently, Secretary Quarles characterized certain public-scare statements and publicity as highly misleading and damaging. As President Eisenhower remarked on this subject, he was sometimes astonished at the amount of information that others get which he does not.

Now is the time for the American people to beware of the head and headline hunters. The scare technique is not new, but wider communication through TV programs when it comes to politics gives public wisdom and education a most intensive test. Also it requires that the people be given all the facts, not just a few partisan opinions.

Hungarian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1848, a new member was added to the family of free nations. That nation was Hungary. The gaining of that independence is celebrated today all over the world by Hungarians and by friends of those gallant people. However, this year the celebration is tempered with sadness, for the people of Hungary are once again under the rule of an oppressive power.

Just as the people of this brave land fought their way to freedom in 1848, so can we hope today that they will soon regain that treasured goal. In 1848, Hungary groaned under the rule of the Hapsburg monarchy and yearned for a return to their ancient liberties. In that year, under the inspired leadership of Louis Kossuth, they secured a number of political rights.

These rights were embodied in a charter which was adopted on March 15. Among other things this memorable document guaranteed freedom of the press, abolished feudal servitude and heavy taxes on peasants, and introduced a general tax system embracing all classes.

When a national government was set up, it was fitting that its president was Louis Kossuth. The memory of this champion of freedom is held dear by all lovers of democracy. A little over a hundred years ago he made a triumphal visit to this country and was hailed as the champion of world freedom. He is well known to Americans of all origins, as well as our million citizens of Hungarian ancestry.

As we know, the freedom secured by Kossuth and his followers did not last long. But the memory of those happy days is enshrined in the hearts of Hungarians the world over.

Today, as this noble country suffers under the wicked imperialism of Soviet rule, we can all hark back to the memory of Kossuth for inspiration to carry on the fight. Let us do more than applaud the unquenchable spirit of freedom which motivates these celebrations. Now is the time to intensify our efforts to renew the hope of those imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain.

We must not let our programs of information and education bog down. They must continue to pierce the wall of lies and deceit which surround all countries overrun by the Communists.

Freedom Day is a grim one in Hungary this year. But better days will come. Hungary will once again know the glory and pride it once had. Through all their trials and tribulations they have not given up hope. We shall continue our efforts to set them free. For them we pray, as did Kossuth, that Hungary will one day be free.

How Would You Vote?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following questionnaire mailed by me to my constituents:

DEAR FRIEND: I invite you to be Congressman for a day—to step into my shoes and indicate below by a check mark how you would vote on these current Federal issues.

Since I represent you in Congress and must vote in your behalf, your views will be of great interest and assistance to me. This is the best way I know to make Federal Government more responsive to the ideas of the individual American.

I have deliberately presented these proposals simply, so that they would be unbiased and not an indication of my own feelings.

I shall be very grateful for your cooperation on this project. Your individual opinion will be kept strictly confidential.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

1. Should economic aid to Europe be increased? ____ Decreased? ____ Discontinued? ____

2. Do you favor the repeal of the Status of Forces Agreement which makes American servicemen overseas subject to foreign laws? Yes ____ No ____

3. Do you favor the bill of Congressman BOSCH to establish a Foreign Service Academy to train personnel for future diplomatic service? Yes ____ No ____

COMMUNISM

4. Do you favor admission of Communist China to the United Nations? Yes ____ No ____

5. Do you believe Russia will make a military attack on the United States? Yes ____ No ____

6. Do you believe that active communism within the United States today is a real live

threat to American freedom? Yes ------ No ------

MILITARY

7. (a) Do you favor continued military aid to Europe? Yes ------ No ------

(b) Do you favor military aid to Israel? Yes ------ No ------

(c) Do you favor military aid to the Arabs? Yes ------ No------

8. Are you satisfied with the handling of our military defenses under the present administration? Yes ------ No ------

DOMESTIC

9. Do you favor the Latham plan to eliminate overlapping and duplication of taxes by Federal Government, States, and cities (i. e., gasoline, tobacco, income)? Yes ------ No ------

10. Do you favor the objectives of the Bricker amendment providing in substance that the provisions of a treaty which conflicts with any provision of the Constitution of the United States shall be of no force and effect? Yes ------ No ------

11. (a) Do you approve of Eisenhower's conduct of the Presidency? Yes ------ No ------

(b) Do you approve of Nixon's conduct of the Vice Presidency? Yes ------ No ------

(c) Would you like to see the administration more conservative? Yes ----- No-----

(d) Would you like to see the administration more liberal? Yes ------ No ------

(e) If you don't like Eisenhower, what opposing candidate would you prefer? ------

---

12. Do you favor the Latham bill providing that the sale of narcotic drugs to a minor shall be a criminal offense punishable by death? Yes ------ No ------

13. Do you favor development of Niagara waterpower by private capital? ------ New York State? ------ Federal Government? ------ (Check one.)

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

15. Do you favor any Federal aid for education? Yes------ No------

(a) If so, do you favor such aid for children attending nonpublic schools where the laws of the States of residence permit? Yes------ No------

(b) If so, should such aid be denied to States refusing to integrate their student bodies? Yes------ No------

16. Do you favor the bill of Congressman BOSCH providing for an increase in the minimum benefit payable under social security to $75 per month, reducing the age to 60 years, and eliminating the limitation on outside earnings after 60 years of age? Yes----- No------

17. Do you favor a national compulsory health insurance plan supported by additional payroll taxes? Yes------ No------

18. Do you favor more federally subsidized, tax-exempt public housing? Yes------ No------

AGRICULTURE

19. Do you favor elimination of the price-support program for farmers? Yes------ No------

VETERANS

20. Do you favor pensions of $100 per month for veterans of World War I? Yes---- No------

21. Should present veterans' benefits be further expanded? Yes------ No------

CIVIL RIGHTS

22. Do you favor Federal laws to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color? Yes------ No------

23. Do you favor Federal laws to prevent discrimination in employment of those over 45 years of age? Yes ------ No ------

IMMIGRATION

24. (a) Should the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act be repealed? Yes ------ No ------

(b) Do you approve the transfer of unused immigration quotas to countries where quotas are oversubscribed? Yes ------ No ------

(c) Do you favor the elimination of present restrictions on immigration which provide percentage quotas on the various national groups, in accordance with the census of 1920? Yes ------ No ------

GENERAL

25. Should 18-year-olds be given the right to vote? Yes ------ No ------

26. Which of the major political party policies most nearly meet with your own views? Republican ------ Democrat ------ Liberal ------ American Labor ------

Sign this, or not, as you wish. Please return to Congressman HENRY J. LATHAM, room 1118, House Office Building, Washington, D. C. Feel free to use reverse side for comments and remarks. Thanks for your cooperation.

Name----------

Address----------

Reforming Our Federal Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, virtually every day all of us receive various suggestions for tax revision. For example, I have noted with interest the program recommended by the National Association of Manufacturers designed to modify what it feels to be extremes in the surtax rates on individuals and corporations—a program geared to foster economic growth in our land.

And other groups, as well, have presented and will present their programs to the Congress.

On Saturday night, it was my pleasure to deliver a radio address by transcription over station WGN, Chicago.

In the course of the program I mentioned various possibilities for tax relief, assuming the revenue situation in our country will permit.

I send to the desk the prepared text of my broadcast, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY PRESENTS 12-POINT TAX REFORM PROGRAM—URGES CONSIDERATION OF LIBERALIZED DEDUCTIONS, RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESS—TAX AVERAGING—MORE DIVIDEND TAX RELIEF—SPURRING OF OVERSEAS INVESTMENT

It is a real pleasure to address you once more through the courtesy of station WGN.

I have selected as my topic this evening a subject which affects 55 million American taxpayers. It is the subject of taxes themselves.

You remember wise old Ben Franklin said that "Nothing is certain except death and taxes."

Yet, I know that you will agree with me that they are a necessary part of the price we pay for national survival.

Meanwhile, they should be as fair and equitable as possible.

So, during these next few minutes, I would like to talk to you about taxes and about tax reform. I would like to submit a few ideas about some necessary changes which I feel should be made in the tax laws—changes in taxes on income, on corporations, on dividends, in order to assure fairness for all our people.

After all, you know, on April 15 you and I are going to have to send in our Federal income-tax returns. In addition, there are sizable State and local returns to be paid.

And, so, this subject is of real importance to all of us.

Here, then, is my report to you, through a series of questions and answers on this very complex subject.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIX LAW STILL MONTHS AWAY

Question. Senator WILEY, the questions in most people's minds are: What is the actual long-range outlook for tax revision? Should there be tax relief now? And what is the real status of tax-relief legislation at this point in the current Congress?

Answer. Let's start with that last question first. A new tax law is still months away. In other words, it will probably be quite a while before the House of Representatives and the Senate have concluded hearings and have drawn up a definite program for tax changes.

Moreover, remember that most Federal appropriation bills are still to be enacted. So, at this early stage, it is difficult to try to anticipate the actual amount of tax reform we can expect.

What we do know is this: The tax burden on our people is very heavy. So, almost everyone is agreed that, at the first possible opportunity, the burden should be lightened.

THE HEAVY BURDENS OF THE UNITED STATES TREASURY

At the same time, we know that Uncle Sam still has very heavy obligations to pay. That means obligations of national defense against international communism. It means obligations of paying interest and principal on the $281 billion national debt, obligations of looking after the needs of our 22 million veterans, particularly the sick and wounded, as well as obligations for the overall expenses of running the Government. That all adds up to $65 billion or so.

Question. Obviously, then, the question of tax relief ties in with the question of balancing the huge national budget.

EISENHOWER STRIVING TO AVOID DEFICIT FINANCING

Answer. Of course. We Americans want a balanced budget. We don't like to mortgage still more the welfare of future generations. We want to avoid another Government deficit if it is at all possible. Remember, during the last quarter of a century, we have unfortunately had a deficit in all but 3 of the years.

A deficit is, of course, bad business. Borrowing, issuing more printing-press money represent inflationary steps. A deficit depreciates the value of every dollar in your pocket, in your savings bank, in your life insurance policy, in your pension.

Fortunately, President Eisenhower now anticipates a balanced budget for the 1957 fiscal year, provided the line can be held.

And, of course, if our economy is indeed held in high gear, if national income and gross national product continue to run high, if 65 million people are employed, then there should be ample revenue coming to Uncle Sam.

And, I firmly believe, that all these good things will indeed happen.

Question. You feel, however, Senator, that some form of tax revision is overdue?

Answer. Very definitely.

THREE PRINCIPLES OF FAIR TAXATION

Question. Well, what do you feel are the principles on which taxes should be levied—

the principles on which tax reforms should be effective?

Answer. Well, first taxes must still be based primarily on the ability to pay.

Second, taxes should as a matter of principle, provide reasonable incentive to earn, to grow, to expand.

You know, in these high-cost days, it takes more than $15,000 of risk capital to develop a single new American job. And in some modern industries, with high costs of machinery and plant, it may take double and triple that amount, $30,000–$45,000.

We can't expand America—we can't look after the needs of our growing population—unless there is adequate incentive to the free enterprise system.

Taxes which may be too high—excessive taxes which confiscate almost all profits or compensation—turn out to produce very little revenue, instead of a lot of revenue.

And third, of course taxes, insofar as possible, should be nondiscriminatory, should be fair and equitable, as between different groups.

Question. Senator Wiley, thus far you have discussed the possibility of tax relief and you have mentioned some of the fundamental American principles on which taxes should be based. Now, would you tell us some changes which should be considered in the tax laws? What specific proposals do you personally have in mind, for example, to encourage a more prosperous America?

CAUTION AS REGARDS WHEN TAXES CAN BE CUT

Answer. I'll be glad to spell out almost a dozen possible tax changes. I mention them however, only as possible for the immediate present, because obviously, until the expert committees—the House Ways and Means Committee, and the Senate Finance Committee, and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue have completed detailed studies of these proposals, it is hard to try to say which tax changes should come first.

In other words, it would be unsound for us at this early stage to assume that we can "wave a magic wand" and get all of these tax changes enacted at once. Instead, the various costs must be figured out, the various degrees of urgency. Then, those changes which are found to have the highest priority of need should be enacted.

So I would like you, my friends, to think over these various tax reform possibilities. I would like you to figure out which of these possible changes should come first, because they may be the most needed.

So far as I am concerned, there is real merit in the entire list that I am going to mention now. But the question is one of relative cost and of relative priority, and of Uncle Sam's own serious financial needs.

Question. Would you list, then, Senator, some of the specific changes which should be taken up as the revenue situation may permit?

END TAX DISCRIMINATION AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS

Answer. Yes. Let's start off with a tax affecting the group which is the backbone of America—small business.

I, for one, very definitely feel that smaller United States enterprise should not be hit by taxes which are so high and so heavy that the small business cannot possibly grow. Right now, if a business earns more than $25,000 per year, it gets hit immediately by so heavy a tax as to find expansion very difficult.

There have been many proposals, therefore, to raise the minimum floor at which small business will be taxed at high rates. To raise that floor to, says, $250,000 would provide a real break for millions of small enterprises.

DEDUCT LIFE INSURANCE PREMIUMS

Question. Now, what about taxes on the average man?

Answer. Well, let me refer to a tax change on an item which affects just about every American family. I am referring to life insurance.

Right now, you cannot, on your Federal return—deduct the cost of any life insurance premiums which you pay to protect your own family.

But, so far as I am concerned, if a man wisely invests his savings in a life insurance policy to protect his wife and children, that man should be encouraged. He should be permitted to make a reasonable deduction—say, at least the first $100 or $200 of those life insurance premiums. In that way, we will be encouraging thrift; we will be encouraging protection of the American home.

TAKE A NEW LOOK AT NUISANCE TAXES

Question. How about a third change?

Answer. Well, thirdly, there is the whole matter of the excise taxes—the so-called nuisance taxes—on everything from transportation to entertainment, telephone calls, jewelry, pens, club dues, cameras, restaurant checks, and a wide variety of other items.

We should take a whole new look at the excise tax structure, because there are definitely a great many inequities in it. We should make sure that excise, basically, affect luxuries—I emphasize—luxuries, instead of day-to-day necessities, as happens in far too many instances of excise taxes today.

DIVIDEND TAX RELIEF SOUND

Question. Now, how about a fourth subject for possible tax change? How about taxes, say affecting American stockholders?

Answer. I am glad you brought that up, because this is a most important area of the free enterprise system.

You know, back in 1954 when Congress enacted the first big change in the Internal Revenue Code in the last 75 years, Congress wisely decided that there should be some modest relief from the evil of double taxation of corporate dividends.

In other words, Congress felt that it is not fair to tax a corporation on money which it actually pays out in dividends, and then to put a double tax on the very same money as it enters the shareholder's pocket—that means the pocket of the man who owns the corporation in the first place. And so, Congress provided a minimum amount of dividend tax relief.

Unfortunately, there are some people who want to eliminate—wipe out—even this modest relief from dividend taxes—which covers only the first $50 and then 4 percent thereafter.

But I feel exactly to the contrary. I'm against eliminating this modest relief. I feel that when the fiscal situation permits, as I am hoping it will in the not too distant future, Congress should think over the possibility of still further dividend tax relief.

WIDEN STOCKOWNERSHIP IN AMERICA

Question. What would be your reason for taking that position?

Answer. Very simple. I want more and more Americans to invest soundly and wisely in their own free-enterprise system.

It gives them a real property stake in America. It gives them an understanding of the problems of industry. It gives them incentive to see an expanding America.

You know, there are fortunately 1.4 million stockholders in the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. There are 540,000 stockholders in General Motors, and around a third of a million Ford Motor Co., in General Electric and Standard Oil of New Jersey, plus millions of stockholders in other corporations.

To me that is a healthy characteristic of our free economy. We need more sound investment—I emphasize sound investment—not speculative fever, not a get-rich-quick psychology—but sound stockholding by people, even of modest means.

That is the principle being encouraged by good brokerage houses and by stock exchanges. It's the principle behind the very fine monthly investment plan for stock purchases. It's the principle behind the sound program of enacting new laws for stock gifts by parents to their children.

TAKE A LOOK AT CAPITAL GAINS TAX

And tied up, too, with this whole question of wider stock ownership is a fifth matter—reviewing the present capital gains tax. A great many folks feel that this tax serves to prevent turnover in investment and to limit expansion of our economy. They feel that we ought to look closely at other major countries' practice of avoiding this type of capital gains tax.

Question. We have covered five possible tax changes. How about a sixth, Senator?

STIMULATE SAVINGS BY SELF-EMPLOYED

Answer. Well, a sixth proposal which to me has very definite attractive features, is one which would permit various self-employed people temporarily to postpone paying taxes on a limited amount of money during their most productive years, so that they can build up some savings for their later years.

In other words, let them build up their nest egg for their retirement years. Right now, the House of Representatives has before it what is known as the Jenkins-Keogh bills. This sound legislation would affect up to 10 million self-employed Americans—doctors, lawyers, architects, engineers, accountants, shopkeepers, farmers, and workers who are not now covered under pension plans of employers.

I think that Congress should very definitely take action to help these self-employed people save up for their later years.

THE SOUND TAX AVERAGING CONCEPT

Question. That brings up a most interesting subject, Senator. It is the question of tax averaging for those few groups which have a relatively high income perhaps for just 1 or 2 or so years of their entire lives, perhaps in their early twenties or thirties and then, after their popularity is over, get only a low income. What do you think about that idea?

Answer. I think that a strong case can be made for the idea of tax averaging. In other words, take the situation of an athlete—a baseball player on the Milwaukee Braves or Chicago Cubs; a basketball star or any actor or acress or playwright or dancer or singer. That person—on the average—may have only a couple of years of high income. Then, for the rest of his or her life, he or she may have only a very modest income.

But in the 1 or 2 or 3 years of peak income, Uncle Sam may confiscate almost their entire earnings. Then, when the athlete is past his prime, or when the actor or actress or singer has been succeeded by new stars, they often find that their income has dropped disastrously to a very low level. And so, there is almost nothing left to show for their 1 or 2 years of high income.

Thus, there has been proposed a tax averaging concept. This would follow up on existing precedents in other fields. It would permit folks to average their income over a period of time so that they would be taxed at relatively reasonable rates in any 1 year.

Recently, I have been glad to note evidence that the various performing arts—as well as leaders in athletics and other fields—are becoming aware of their own problems and are getting together. They are forming an organization in Washington to present their case to the Congress and to the "Bar" of American public opinion.

I think that they have a good case in principle. And it should be considered

carefully in the interest of fairness and equity.

WORKING MOTHERS, EDUCATION, OVERSEAS INVESTMENT

Question. In the short time remaining, Senator WILEY, would you mention other real possibilities for tax reform—changes which have real merit?

Answer. Delighted. Here are a few:

1. Liberalize tax deductions for working mothers. They have to pay heavy expenses for baby sitters and boarding houses to look after their youngsters. The ceiling on the income of these working mothers, so far as deductions are concerned, is too low. It is only $4,500 per year for husband and wife. So, let's raise that ceiling.

2. Second, permit deductions of heavy costs incurred by parents in putting their youngsters through higher education—in colleges and universities.

3. Third, limit taxes on American earnings from private investments overseas. In that way, we can encourage more private investment abroad and reduce the necessity for Government economic aid as such.

4. Deduct the first $100 in election campaign contributions made by the average man. This will encourage wider participation in the financing of campaigns.

5. Consider permitting deductions for moving expenses when a man's job or location is changed. After all, new industries are rising all over America, and that requires moving.

Question. Senator WILEY, you have covered a broad range of tax reforms—reforms affecting not only individuals, but businesses and the free-enterprise system as a whole.

You indicated that it is a part of your philosophy that taxes be used to encourage our economy to grow, instead of freezing it, limiting it, preventing its expansion.

I know, too, that it is a part of your philosophy that Americans should be realistic and should not expect tax reforms overnight.

Answer. Absolutely right. I mentioned at the outset that we can't expect all these meritorious tax changes to be taken up immediately. I have mentioned that the ones with highest priority should come first. And, most important of all, the needs of the Federal budget, the need for preventing a deficit, should be weighed.

LOWERING TAXES MAY INCREASE REVENUE

Question. I know, too, Senator, that you feel that, sometimes, lowering taxes may actually result in increased revenue to Uncle Sam, because it helps to expand the tax base. In that way, more income will come in to the Federal Treasury.

Answer. Of course. We have luckily found in our history that sometimes, when you do lower the tax rates, you actually increase tax take, because you encourage an expanded America.

TAX CRIMINALS, PREVENT EVASION

Let me say, however, very realistically that most of the possible changes I have mentioned would involve losses to the Treasury of considerable amounts of revenue, unless there are some ways of making up the lost revenue. That is why, for example, I want to see certain taxes increased.

I am thinking, for example, about the taxes which are levied on that group of questionable Americans who evade and violate the law. You know, for example, that gambling in America is a $20 billion business. A lot of that gambling money escapes its fair share of paying taxes. In addition, I point out, as a former member of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, there are other criminal influences which have evaded their fair share of taxes. And of course there are always a certain amount of chiselers who may not be criminals in another sense; that is, robbers, thieves, gamblers—but who are not paying their fair share of taxes. I am for cracking down on those chiselers. Thus, I am for making up the revenue which might otherwise have to be paid by you, the honest man, the decent taxpayer, the man who comprises most of our citizenry.

CONCLUSION

Question. Well, Senator, you have spelled out how you feel the tax structure can be changed, so that the man who contributes to America gets a tax break, while the small minority which violates our laws is treated accordingly.

I know that our listeners have enjoyed your summary of the tax situation in our country. I know, too, that they will remember your word of caution, not to expect tax revision too fast, because the present situation in the Treasury is not an easy one.

Answer. That about sums it up. It has been a real pleasure to address you tonight through the courtesy of station WGN. I hope that I may have your comments on the views which I have expressed. This is Wisconsin's senior Senator, ALEX WILEY, signing off from Washington.

Insure Against Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made before the House Committee on Banking and Currency:

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, thank you very much for the privilege of appearing before you in behalf of the principles of my bill, H. R. 7944, and other similar bills to provide a national system of disaster insurance. My own bill which is based on the principles of the War Damage Corporation, which functioned so successfully during the war, recognizes our free enterprise and in general designates the insurance companies to place and service all the policies and establishes a revolving fund out of which losses can be paid upon a given contingency.

I appreciate the fact that there are far more sweeping proposals presented by Senator LEHMAN and others which cover man-made, as well as natural, disasters, and frankly I have no objections to them, because I think they all move in the right direction; namely, of providing for our fellow citizens, individuals, bodies corporate and public, appropriate insurance against disaster of whatever kind wherever it may strike.

Admittedly, this is a very broad question, and I think that Congress in providing this type of insurance, as now appears inevitable and imperative, will have to establish appropriate limitations to make such a program actuarily and fiscally sound and confine any inflationary effects that might otherwise appear. Members of Congress can all take judicial notice, I think, of the tremendous, horrible potentialities of nuclear and thermonuclear damage to the Nation in case of war or attack. And it can be demonstrated beyond question, based on our experiences over a long period of time and particularly of recent date, that natural disasters can inflict tremendous damage which should be recognized and anticipated by enacting indemnity legislation embracing the principles of insurance.

I first introduced my bill on this subject following the Worcester, Mass., tornado of 1953, which created such great havoc and dreadful loss of life in one of our great American cities represented in the Congress by our able and distinguished friend, Congressman DONOHUE, and when the ravaging floods of August 1955, and since that time, struck my district, State, and the Northeast and later the great State of California with such terrific impact and huge damage, my interest has naturally become all the more intensified. There can be no doubt, I think, that the time has come for action in this field, if we are to be prepared to cope with future disasters whether they emanate from war or nature.

There are many kinds of natural disasters which would and should be covered by this legislation—floods, tornadoes, earthquakes, forest fires, hurricanes, droughts, and other similar visitations of nature. It is estimated by a very eminent economist, Prof. Seymour E. Harris, head of the economic department at Harvard College and prominent public figure, that over 25 years the average cost of floods has been about $160 million per year and other qualified economists have estimated that these costs might be as high as $300 million per year or more. Actually, the latest available figures of the Army engineers appraise the damage done in New England prior to August 26, 1955, as $1.7 billion, or about 10 percent of the region's income for the year. And that does not include, of course, the severe damage of later floods which ravaged our area and caused untold damage.

Clearly, action by Congress is imperative and it must be on a broad front, it must embrace adequate relief, rehabilitation measures, effective protection, and insurance. While to some extent these remedies are mutually inclusive, and again they may not be, for example, if a widespread efficient system of flood control is speedily inaugurated and completed that would, in the opinion of engineering experts, insure against the repetition and reocurrence of periodic floods in given areas. However, nature's caprice is unpredictable and future floods could conceivably overcome or bypass technical protective projects and strike even at areas that have not been heretofore hit. This is one strong and sound reason for insurance against floods and other disasters because not even the wisest and most accomplished scientist can forecast with certainty when one or the other of these terrible natural disasters which visit us from time to time, will descend.

Most of us will agree, I think, that disaster-insurance coverage or even flood coverage cannot be provided by the private-insurance companies. Admittedly, the rates would be prohibitive without Government support. This principle was recognized in the war damage-insurance legislation and by President Truman in 1951 after the Missouri River floods when he proposed a Federal underwriting program of disaster policies up to a billion and a half dollars. This measure was not adopted at the time and, as an alternative, the Bureau of the Budget suggested that Congress enact a measure authorizing the Government to pay out $22 billion for disaster insurance, an amount that would involve about 2 percent of the current wealth of the Nation.

As the able members of this committee so well know, there are many broad pending proposals relating to risks and the apportionment of rates, incentive plans, rate differentials between and within States and the like.

Of all these proposals it seems to me that in principle at least the one I have suggested affords a ready answer to the problem, namely, a Federal reinsurance program with Government backing, limiting the total coverage to perhaps twenty or twenty-five billion dollars, entailing about an average rate of $1 per $10,000 value. This insurance would be cheap and attractive and would,

most experts agree, result in wide coverage. If the States were permitted to participate as suggested by Professor Harris, by committing the property tax to a certain limited amount of the rate, it is believed that each home owner would be charged something like 50 cents to $1.50 per year. Personally, I am of the opinion that the Federal Government should underwrite and support this program by itself, because I think the general property tax is already very heavily burdened in most States and communities. These damages are national in character and effect even though they strike at localities and areas and they greatly affect the national economy and I, therefore, believe the solution lies in the national field by enactments of this Congress.

It is undeniable that once the costs of disasters could be distributed over broad enough an area it would not only be general participation because of low rates and the need for coverage but also a more realistic contribution by the Federal Government from tax revenues collected from the States.

Of course, it does not seem to me that it should make any difference whether we call this protective legislation indemnity or insurance. It also seems to me that it will be desirable for us in the first instance to experiment with this new type of program in order to acquire sufficient experience to enable us in the long run to provide a mechanism that will be actuarily and financially sound. I do not believe that this program should entail matching contributions from the States at this time.

There will also be a problem of reconciling the new program with other types of personal property insurance and the crop insurance. It will be more beneficial in the long run, I think, to start with a broad support program excluding Government competition with private companies and preserving the principle of our free-enterprise system.

I also agree that whatever form this legislation takes it should provide, insofar as it is practicable, for the ultimate elimination of subsidies and for a self-sustaining program, although we can all envision situations involving manmade disasters when no program of this character which the Congress might adopt could possibly carry itself and stupendous Federal payments would be necessary. In fact, in that event, doubtless the entire taxing power of the Federal Government would have to be thrown into the breach. I agree with Professor Harris that the fund should be limited to about $20 billion or so, in order to cope with possible inflation.

I would suggest that the maximum coverage under any bill for any one corporation, individual, State, or municipality should not be limited to $250,000, as proposed by the administration bill, but extended to cover every possible loss. To illustrate the need for this provision, I may say that in my own district in the recent floods, one company sustained an actual loss of well over a million dollars and several companies sustained losses well over $250,000.

The principle of reinsurance of private companies underwriting disaster risks is a sound one, and I think it should be incorporated into any legislation, but here again I feel that the matter of limiting the amount of authorized reinsurance ought to be carefully studied so as to provide adequate funds to cover all contingencies.

Under the situation now confronting us, I believe that the Government, and the Government only, can feasibly inaugurate disaster insurance. I hope that in considering this legislation that this able committee will consider the principles of my bill, H. R. 7944.

I may add that under my bill payments for damages incurred would be made only upon a declaration by the President of a disaster area.

In my judgment the idea of disaster insurance is not only sound but economically feasible and imperatively demanded by existing conditions in order to safeguard our economy and spare many of our fellow citizens from ruin or great economic loss.

There are elements in the problem that are extremely challenging, I know, there are great complexities to be sure, but I have confidence in this able committee embracing in its membership so many outstanding Members of the Congress, will not only give the matter painstaking and thorough attention, but also be able to come up with effective solutions that will square with our free-enterprise system, protect the public interest, and save large numbers of our fellow citizens from virtually irreparable economic loss.

As chairman of the Massachusetts congressional delegation committee on flood prevention and relief, a body composed of several very able Members of the House, in behalf of my own constituents, our State, and area which suffered so greatly from past and recent floods and in the name of the very many people and communities throughout the Nation which have been and will be in the future confronted with the horrible conditions that arise from natural disasters I respectfully urge your continued careful, and expeditious, study and prompt action upon disaster-insurance legislation.

Let me express my deep appreciation, Mr. Chairman, to you and members of the committee for your great kindness in hearing me.

President Eisenhower's Announcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, this week the business on the floor was the upper Colorado River project, but it was the announcement by President Eisenhower of his willingness to run for reelection that captured the primary attention of the Members of Congress. "Now," said a Member from Minnesota jubilantly, "if we can only get rid of Secretary Benson, we are in."

Congressman LEON GAVIN, of Pennsylvania, was listening to the testimony of a witness before his armed services subcommittee when suddenly the chairman banged the gavel and declared:

Gentlemen, the President has just announced his candidacy for reelection.

GAVIN was startled. No one had entered the room—no phone had rung. Was the chairman psychic? Then he looked more closely at the chairman and saw the answer. In the chairman's pocket was a small transistor radio to which he had been listening.

Another Congressman told of the confidence of Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, that the President would run. "Why, he is a young man," said GREEN, who ran successfully for reelection to the Senate 2 years ago at age 87. A short time ago GREEN used to wrestle for exercise, but now limits himself to walking to and from the Capitol, which is approximately 4 miles from his place of residence. He said he expects to run for reelection even after he is 100, but he is bothered by one thought: "How would the people of Rhode Island accept the candidacy of a man who is 105 years of age?"

In a speech to the House immediately following the announcement, Minority Leader JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, expressed delight with the decision and said he knew the President would run again if he could. Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK wondered as to the wisdom of the decision in view of the grueling demands of the presidential office.

And so, at long last, the die has been cast. Millions of Americans—Democrats and Republicans alike—who prayed for the President's recovery at the time he suffered his heart attack 5 months ago, will continue to pray for his good health and for many more years of life for him. Obviously, Mr. Eisenhower must be much more careful and restrained than in the past. He must be wary of the advice of political strategists who may require him to flex his muscles and run through obstacle courses in order to prove his physical fitness. In 1944 President Roosevelt indicated that he was not going to make a strenuous campaign for reelection. However, when stories of his failing health began to crop up, his advisers suggested that it would be a good idea for him to show that he really was physically qualified to again be President. Thereupon, Mr. Roosevelt undertook an exhausting program of traveling, of meetings, of campaigning. He sat in an open car in cold, pouring rain. Presumably his health was excellent, and he was reelected. Yet, in a few months, at age 63, he was dead.

I hope that the heat of the coming campaign will not provoke Mr. Eisenhower's advisers to suggest comparable tests of physical endurance for him. After all, he is a candidate for the Presidency—not the Olympic team. The task of running the President's office is rigorous enough without having to undergo spectacular demonstrations of physical prowess. In his book The American President, Sidney Hyman states:

According to the Hoover Commission in 1951, the President is responsible in one way or another for the work of 9 major departments, 104 bureaus, 12 sections, 108 services, 51 branches, 460 offices, 631 divisions, 19 administrations, 6 agencies, 16 areas, 40 boards, 6 commands, 20 commissions, 19 corporations, 5 groups, 10 headquarters, 2 authorities, and 263 other miscellaneous and often overlapping bits of Government machinery.

If the President handles this job, he will be doing well.

During the Civil War, when he could no longer tolerate the seemingly endless "waiting campaign" of Gen. George B. McClellan, President Lincoln relieved him of command of the Army and replaced him with Gen. Joe Hooker. When Lincoln told Hooker he wanted action, Hooker tried to comply by creating the impression of tremendous activity. Even his dispatches from the field began with the heading, "Headquarters in the Saddle." But his futile efforts did not impress Lincoln. "The trouble with Hooker," Lincoln remarked sadly, "is that he has his headquarters where his hindquarters ought to be."

As an old military man himself, General Eisenhower must appreciate that political strategists frequently resemble military strategists in being unable to distinguish their headquarters from their hindquarters.

Economic Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 216, which proposes that the Congress urge the President to undertake a series of actions which would have the effect of, first, strengthening the Atlantic alliance; and second, suggesting a share-the-cost plan for providing much-needed development capital for the have-not nations. My resolution has been referred to the Department of State for comment.

The need for action along the lines suggested in my proposal is most urgent. While I recognize that in an election year the difficulties involved in facing up to the massive nonmilitary offensive which has been launched by the Soviet Union may be great, it is my belief that the necessity for continuing American leadership in the free world far transcends any supposed political advantage to be achieved by gambling on the Soviets making no further penetration until after the November election. While we equivocate, our NATO allies are almost unanimously urging additional emphasis on economic and cultural means of strengthening the Atlantic alliance and on economic means of cooperating with the uncommitted nations. Our allies are in effect suggesting that they are prepared to undertake a share-the-cost plan for meeting the need for development capital in the have-not nations—a plan which would greatly benefit free world foreign policy and would in the long run mean less cost to the American taxpayer.

The speech to Congress by Italy's President Gronchi, urging action along these lines, is fresh in our minds. This past weekend Prime Minister Eden, of England, and Premier Mollet, of France, jointly urged this course. I quote from the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 13:

> The emphasis they put on the necessity of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Manila and Baghdad pacts giving increased importance to economic action in the Far East, Middle East, and Africa, was set forth in a communique covering private talks Eden and Mollet held yesterday.

This emphasis is directly in line with part I of my resolution and in my view argues strongly for favorable action on the resolution at an early date. I believe the Congress should proceed with this action, recognizing, of course, that leadership must rest with the Executive. I urge Congress to move because I feel that part of the hesitancy of the Executive is based on fear of adverse congressional reaction. A favorable response to my resolution in the Congress would greatly strengthen the hand of the Executive in formulating proposals which would crystallize the thinking of our European allies on this subject. Delay will not only permit continued Soviet penetration of southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Africa, but will weaken United States leadership in the Atlantic alliance by leaving us in the ludicrous position of not taking advantage of our allies' offers to cooperate with us in assisting the have-not nations.

I wish to call the attention of the Congress to the complete newspaper account of the Eden-Mollet talks which I referred to above:

> EDEN, MOLLET STRESS ECONOMIC AID
> (By William J. Humphreys)
>
> LONDON, March 12.—Prime Minister Anthony Eden and French Premier Guy Mollet, falling in line with recent criticism of western diplomacy by French Foreign Minister Christian Pineau, today proposed that the whole network of free world alliances provide more economic help for underprivileged nations.
>
> The emphasis they put on the necessity of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Manila and Baghdad Pacts giving increased importance to economic action in the Far East, Middle East, and Africa was set forth in a communique covering private talks Eden and Mollet held yesterday.
>
> In a speech at Paris March 2 Pineau said the western powers were putting too much emphasis on security and not paying enough attention to the inroads the Soviet "peace" campaign and promises of economic aid were making in underdeveloped nations. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles seemed to be one of the main targets of the speech.
>
> Some diplomatic observers here were reading into today's communique implied criticism of American leadership of the western alliances and of Dulles, who directs American foreign policy. But British authorities were inclined to reject this view. They said Pineau's speech was also aimed at Britain.
>
> The Eden-Mollet talks consisted of exchanges of views rather than making decisions, hence no suggestions were made for implementing the call for greater economic assistance, according to officials.
>
> Observers here also attached importance to that part of the communique which recognizes that both Britain and France have worldwide responsibilities which they are seeking to carry out. Here it was indicated the two statesmen reached a clearer understanding of each other's actions in the Middle East and North Africa.

The Church of Silence in Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. MURRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday and Friday the Right Reverend Ambrose Ondrak, O. S. B., abbott of St. Procopius Abbey, in Lisle, Ill., offered the opening prayer in respectively the House and Senate. In his prayer he appealed for divine help for Archbishop Josef Beran, who has been separated from his flock for 5 years.

The whole free world cannot pass by with silence the sad fifth anniversary of the shameful banishment of the heroic primate of Bohemia, His Excellency Josef Beran, archbishop of Prague, from his see in this capital of Czechoslovakia. Archbishop Beran, like Cardinals Mindszenty, Stepinac, and Wyszynski, has become a symbol of the fight against communism in satellite countries in eastern and central Europe.

It was on March 10, 1946, during the turbulent postwar years in Czechoslovakia, that Pope Pius XII appointed the capable Msgr. Josef Beran as archbishop of Prague and primate of Bohemia. Coincidentally 5 years later, March 10, 1951, His Excellency was unlawfully deported from his see in Prague. According to the State Bureau of Church Affairs in Prague he was deported for "his negative stand toward new church laws in Czechoslovakia." This event climaxed the Calvary of the Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia; it marks the coup d'etat by which the State usurped power to dominate the affairs of the Catholic Church. And so masterfully and subtly was it effected that it became for other satellite countries the policy and pattern of Communist perfidy.

To speak of the Calvary of that country of which Archbishop Beran is the symbol of persecuted freedom is my honor today, and the overtones of sadness attending this dual anniversary are relieved in part by considering that I speak in the sanctuary, as it were, of the great American Constitution that safeguards freedom for its own people; that I speak to the legislative body of a nation dedicated by justice and its present position as world leader to protest the violation of that freedom in other nations as well.

I do not need to remind my esteemed audience that the present struggle in Czechoslovakia is not a new one. It is simply a contemporary revival of the conflict between good and evil that has been ever present in human history. As early as 1846 the spiritual leader of Christendom, Pope Pius IX, raised a prophetic voice against this evil, calling communism "that infamous doctrine which is absolutely contrary to the natural law itself, and if adopted would utterly destroy the rights, property, and possessions of all men, and even society itself"—Encyclical Qui Pluribus, November 9, 1846, Acta Pii IX, volume I, page 13. Later on, Pope Leo XIII defined communism as "the fatal plague which insinuates itself into the very marrow of human society only to bring about its ruin"—Encyclical Quod Apostolici Muneris, December 28, 1878, Acta Leonis XIII, volume I, page 46. With clear intuition His Holiness pointed out that the atheistic movements existing among the masses of the machine age had their origin in that school of philosophy which for centuries had sought to divorce science from the life of the faith and of the church. Even stronger condemnation of communism is found in the numerous encyclicals of Pius XI: the Allocution of December 18, 1924; Miserentissimus Redemptor of May 8, 1928, AAS,

volume XX, 1928; Quadragesimo Anno of May 15, 1931, AAS, volume XXIII, 1931, pages 177–228; Caritate Christi of May 3, 1932, AAS, volume XXIV, 1932, pages 177–194; Acorba Animi of September 18, 1932, AAS, volume XXIV, 1932, pages 321–332; Dilectissimo Nobis of June 3, 1933, AAS, volume XXV, 1933, pages 261–274.

These encyclicals were followed by another on March 19, 1937, Divini Redemptoris, in which Pope Pius XI presented an unmistakably clear and forceful exposition of the stand of the Catholic Church against atheistic communism. The present Pope Pius XII has proved himself a fervent executor of the policies of his predecessors by various declarations and decrees against communism in action. No one today can reasonably doubt that communism has moved from theory to practical reality. Its drastic applications are only too apparent: communism robs man of liberty, it despoils human personality of its dignity, and removes all restraint from human passion. No man has any natural rights. He is a cog in the Communist machine. It is at least a surprising fact that the voice of the Popes remained too long the "voice of one crying in the wilderness," unheard and unheeded until almost the 11th hour.

But Christians all over the world were alerted to the real dangers of communism. Especially were the American people informed on this pressing issue by statements and resolutions of the American hierarchy, November 15, 1950; November 19, 1951; November 21, 1953—see NCWC news release of these dates. These historical documents reveal the tragic situation of the church of silence behind the Iron Curtain. Information is likewise available in other mediums: Radio Free Europe, Voice of America, newspapers, periodicals, books, publications of universities, even CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS and releases of the State Department, such as the recent Moscow's European Satellites, published January 1956, which stresses again in résumé the plight of religion behind the Iron Curtain.

A man of prophetic vision and exceptional courage, Archbishop Beran from the very beginning assumed leadership on this pressing issue of communism in Czechoslovakia. Through pastoral letters, memorandums, protests, this man of small stature but great spirit, showed the whole world his uncompromising stand in the matter of the God-given rights of man, church laws, and the rights of the nation. In the critical days of the communistic coup d'etat of February 1948 he accepted the confidence reposed in him by all his people. All his actions and sufferings thereafter personalized the struggle of the Czech and Slovak bishops, priests, religious, and the faithful of Czechoslovakia. The free world will never forget the historic pronouncement made on June 18, 1948, in the Strahov Church of the Abbey of the Premonstratensians, in which he exposed the activities of Czechoslovak Communists:

Perhaps very soon you will hear on the radio all sorts of things concerning me. You may hear that I have made a confession, or other statements. I hope you will trust me. If one day you learn of the conclusion of an agreement between the church and the state, you should know that I would never conclude an agreement which would infringe on the rights of the church and of the bishops. It is possible that one day you will learn that I have concluded an agreement, or that I have given my consent. Maybe you will hear it from the wireless morning and night. But I declare before God and before the nation that nobody shall force me to do that. * * * No true Catholic can exist where the bishops are not with the church. You know I would like to talk to you from here, but I will not. I do not want you to be persecuted. I do not know how often I shall be allowed to speak from the pulpit in the future.

The following day, Sunday, June 19, 1949, a scandalous incident took place in the Cathedral of St. Vitus in Hradacany-Prague. On this day a celebration of the Corpus Christi holy days was to take place. The faithful were hindered by all means possible from assisting at the celebration, but the services were attended by secret police and some hundreds of hired men sent there as members of the civilian militia corps. At the beginning of the sermon by Archbishop Beran, when he condemned the fraudulent Catholic action, these men started to whistle and yell. Since the secret police made no attempt to restore order, Archbishop Beran, after making some effort to continue speaking, left the cathedral. Since that time, he was a prisoner under the watchful eye of Communist police, silenced and unable to perform his episcopal duties, and finally banished from his see on March 10, 1951.

This is the man, a great hero and a moral victor over the persecutors, whom we commemorate today. Undoubtedly he is the central figure in the defense of Catholics and the prime figure in the whole national resistance to communism. He fulfilled all the prerequisites for this role. He excelled in all departments of Catholic action, in the Catholic press, and in apostolic work. He lived a very modest and irreproachable life. Since 1933 he had educated young priests in modern pastoral work. A faithful cooperator with Cardinal Kaspar, he eventually became his successor. The maxim of his life was, "All for the greater glory of God," and he consequently carried out all the instructions of the Pope, the Vicar of Christ on earth. Born in Pizen in 1888 of a family of teachers, he prepared himself for the profession of teaching. He studied theology in Rome, was graduated in 1912 as a doctor of sacred theology, and thereafter acted as chaplain in various institutions. Later he was appointed rector of the Teachers Institute of St. Anne in Prague, and from 1934 he was rector of the major seminary there. In 1942 he was arrested by the gestapo and deported to the infamous concentration camp at Dachau, being known there as prisoner No. 35844. From there after liberation by the American Army he returned in 1945 to Prague. His freedom, however, was short lived; 3 years later he was imprisoned again, this time by the Communists, for refusing to render to Caesar the things that are God's. He continued to insist that the state had not the right to dominate the affairs of the Church of God. Specifically, he protested against the confiscation of church properties, March 1948; education law bypassing church authorities, April 21, 1948; ban on Catholic publications, 1948; right of the state to organize a false Catholic action, June 10, 1949; payment of priests' salaries directly by government rather than through hierarchy, October 1949; the establishment of a government office of church affairs, by which new church laws were formulated, October 1949; the expulsion of the papal representative, March 16, 1950. In other ways he protested Communist usurpation until his banishment, insisting always on rendering to Caesar the things that are Caesar's in the sense of Holy Scripture.

The good archbishop has been imprisoned outside his own archdiocese for 5 years—imprisoned without a trial after a 20-month restriction to his palace. He cannot speak and lead by word. But by his inspiring example he leads the entire Czech nation closer and closer to God, closer and closer to the truths of their holy Catholic faith.

The American Nation protests and condemns the Communist violence committed against the good Archbishop Beran and other bishops, priests, religions, and people of Czechoslovakia. On this the fifth anniversary of his banishment a request on their part for his freedom is most appropriate. Included in their request is freedom also for the bishops who signed the pastoral letters, documents, and letters defending church rights against the Communists. Altogether they form a unique picture of most courageous defense against Communist tyranny. Wherefore we request specifically that—

First. His Excellency Archbishop Josef Karel Matocha of Olomouc, primate of Moravia, be freed from imprisonment in his residence.

Second. His Excellency Josef Hlouch, bishop of Budejovice, deported from his see in 1952, be returned to his diocese and to his people.

Third. His Excellency Stepan Trocha, bishop of Litomerice, sentenced to 25 years at hard labor in prison, be freed and returned to his diocese.

Fourth. His Excellency Moric Picha, bishop of Hradec Kralove, regain his freedom.

Fifth. His Excellency Karel Skoupy, bishop of Brne, capital of Moravia, be returned from jail to diocese to perform there his episcopal duties.

Sixth. His Excellency Stanislav Zela, auxiliary bishop of Olomouc, sentenced by a fraudulent trial to 25 years in prison, be freed.

Seventh. His Excellency Jan Vejtassak, bishop of Spis in Slovakia, heroic aged defender of the faith, sentenced for 24 years, be freed from jail.

Eighth. His Excellency Eduard Nescey, bishop of Nitra in Slovakia, be released from imprisonment.

Ninth. His Excellency Robert Pobozny, bishop of Roznava in Slovakia, be freed from jail or domestic internment.

Tenth. His Excellency Pavel Gojdic, bishop of the Greek Catholic See in Presov in Slovakia, sentenced January 1951 for life imprisonment, be freed.

Eleventh. His Excellency Basil Hopke, auxiliary Greek Catholic bishop of Presov, be released from imprisonment in jail.

Twelfth. His Excellency Michal Buzalka, auxiliary bishop of Trnava in Slovakia, sentenced to life imprisonment, be freed.

Thirteenth. His Excellency Daniel Briedon, vicar capitular of Banska Bystrica in Slovakia, be freed.

Fourteenth. Other bishops, namely, their Excellencies Bishops Ambroze Lazik, bishop of Trnava, and Josef Carsky, bishop of Kosice in Slovakia, be no longer subjected to the vigilance and pressure of Communist police.

Fifteenth. All other bishops, abbots, priests, religious nuns, and all the thousands of faithful who suffer for their religious convictions and trust for freedom be freed.

Sixteenth. That the thousands of people confined in concentration camps and slave labor camps, suffering hardships from hunger and in desperation worse than that of galley slaves of ancient times, be liberated.

Seventeenth. Revocation of all anti-Christian laws and measures be effected, with the restoration of freedom of religious practice, the press, education, and assembly.

Eighteenth. Restoration of free and Christian Czechoslovakia.

Nineteenth. Finally, His Excellency Josef Beran, archbishop of Prague, be returned to lead this free and Christian Czechoslovakia. His influence has been worldwide; his inspiration, the source of hope that the Church of Silence is not suffering in vain.

We cannot overlook the example of Archbishop Beran. The means and opportunity to help the cause of justice and right to its final victory is for us a matter of conscience. The Church of Silence began with the passion of Christ, but it ended in His resurrection. St. Augustine reminds us that Jesus suffered, was buried, and arose from the dead. It is our fervent hope that a resurrection is in the immediate future for the persecuted people of Czechoslovakia.

A Plan To Meet the Financial Dilemma of Institutions of Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, everyone acknowledges that colleges, universities and professional schools in the United States are in serious financial difficulty. In recent addresses President A. Whitney Griswold, of Yale University, one of the acknowledged leaders of higher education in the United States today, has stated:

> It is a common occurrence these days for meetings of university presidents to open with exciting prospects of new educational worlds to conquer and to close with despairing prophecies of insolvency. While the doctors argue, the patient grows sicker, at all events fails to recover, and the prognosis remains gloomy. The universities must be provided the kind and quantity of resources they need: the lame cannot shoulder the halt. The whole complex must first be perceived by society and understood for what it is—the mind and spirit of American Democracy in danger of its life.

In this day and age of all-out war for the minds of men, with international competition for more and better trained engineers, doctors, and educated men and women in all walks of life, and with a tidal wave of students coming on to be educated, none of us can sit by and watch our educational system deteriorate for lack of finances. The financial problem facing these educational institutions largely arises from past inflation. They are in the unhappy position of all those who have a relatively fixed income. Their costs have been run up inordinately while their income from State legislatures, endowments, and private gifts has not been able to keep pace.

Faced with resulting deficits, both public and private institutions of higher learning have tried to meet the situation in four principal ways:

First. Faculty salaries have been kept at pitifully low levels. For example, Dr. Compton, president of the Council for Financial Aid to Education, recently reported that the average salaries of full professors in the colleges of this country were $4,860 a year in the smallest colleges, $5,067 a year in the medium sized colleges, and $6,064 a year in the largest. Another report shows that throughout the Nation at large, college teachers have suffered a further net reduction in living standards since 1940 of more than 25 percent. Apart from any question of fairness to the faculties, it can hardly be considered sound public policy to leave the teaching of our economic, political and social system in the hands of teachers who are not sharing in the material prosperity of our civilization and who must feel neglected and exploited. Furthermore, although we have a desperate need for an ever expanding number of teachers, able young people are not being attracted into the teaching profession in sufficient numbers because of the low economic rewards and the competition of higher salaries offered outside of the schools.

Second. All of the schools are necessarily neglecting the maintenance of their existing plant and equipment, while at the same time what we really need in this country is a great expansion of our educational facilities. There is not a college, university, or professional school that would dare show on its balance sheet a reserve for depreciation to replace its present plant when it wears out. The best they can do is to keep the roofs from leaking and keep the plumbing operating on a month-to-month basis.

Third. The cost of gaining an education has increased so much in room, board, books, fees, and everything else that, although more and more money is being channeled into scholarships, the percentage of students attending institutions of higher education on scholarships is not being maintained.

Fourth. The above effects are still with us even though the institutions have raised their charges to students as high as they feel they can go without placing too high a price tag on getting a higher education. Even the State universities on the average now get approximately 30 percent of their educational budgets from student charges, although these are called registration fees, laboratory fees, library fees, examination fees, and the like, rather than being called tuition. In its 500-page statistical report in 1952, the Commission on Financing Higher Education points out that from 1940 to 1950 the average increase in student fees at public institutions of higher learning was 2⅓ times per student and was still increasing. On this point the report concludes that "student charges were obviously much more important sources of income for public institutions in 1950 than in 1940. This was a major development in the financing of public higher education."

Great efforts have been made and are continuing to be made to increase donations by private individuals, foundations, and corporations to the support of higher education. These must and will be continued, but they will not fully answer the problem. The most logical and available solution is a further increase in the charges made to students, but unless some offsetting factor is provided this will pose an impossible burden to many.

The present proposal is that a partial tax credit be allowed to offset such increases in student charges and thereby accord to that part of the income of the institutions which comes from student charges a tax benefit similar to that which has always been accorded to their other forms of income. Donations to the institutions are deductible for income-tax purposes. Taxes paid to the State to support public institutions are deductible for income-tax purposes. It has been the policy of our Government from earliest times not to raise Government income out of the money that goes to educate the next generation. This policy is becoming less and less effective as a larger and larger proportion of the total income of the institutions comes from student fees which are not accorded similar tax relief.

There have been many proposals for making tuition a deductible expense for income-tax purposes, but these have been rejected for the reason that they would have a tendency to result in tax relief to those in the higher income-tax brackets rather than in additional financial support to the educational institutions. The present proposal, represented by H. R. 4621, H. R. 5429, H. R. 4444, H. R. 4568, and H. R. 6978, would provide for a partial tax credit equal to 30 percent of the tuition paid. It has been calculated that, on the average, the parents of college and university students are in about the 30 percent tax bracket, and therefore a 30 percent tax credit for the tuition paid would come to about the same loss of revenue as making tuition deductible, but the tax credit form would level

out the effect on all parents. Furthermore, the 30 percent tax credit is most adaptable to increases in tuition by the institution.

The mathematics of this proposal are such that an institution could increase its charges by 42 percent without placing any more burden on the parents. Such an increase would just absorb the 30 percent tax credit and is calculated as follows: First, if the present tuition is taken as 100, a 42-percent increase would give an index of 142; second, 30 percent of 142 equals 42; third, with such an increase, the parent who previously paid $100 to the institution and $42 to the Government would now pay the entire $142 to the institution.

At first, blush the query might be raised as to whether the tax credit proposal would not result in unfairness to those who are paying tuition but do not have any income taxes against which to take the tax credit. It is submitted that the children of those who do not have sufficient income to pay an income tax are, or should be, receiving a scholarship instead of paying tuition. With the increased income to the insitutions which this plan would provide, there is no question but what scholarships would be available for the children of these low income families. Of course, there would be the occasional case of a wealthy family which had no income tax for a particular year, but these unusual and sporadic cases do not detract from the fairness of the overall plan.

Some have raised the question as to whether adding this tax credit to the others already in the law would not give rise to requests for tax credit for many different expenses of taxpayers such as merical bills and the like. Such proposals are made to practically every Congress. The difference between such proposals and the present one is that the purpose and effect of the partial tax credit for tuition is to increase the income of the institutions rather than to give tax relief to the individuals. The proposed tax credit would appear on the tax returns of the individuals, as is the case with charitable and educational contributions generally, but the purpose and effect is to benefit the charity or the institution as the case may be.

It has been calculated that, assuming the institutions all raise their tuition the full amount, the loss in revenue to the Government would be approximately $175 million per year and the increase in the income of the colleges and universities would be a similar amount. These funds would flow into higher faculty salaries, maintenance and improvement of facilities, and the support of a larger scholarship program. It is submitted that, with the present national need for more and better education, the loss of this amount of tax revenue is a small price to pay for the enormous benefits to be derived. Maintaining the revenue as it is and appropriating a similar amount to educational institutions would have the same effect on the national budget, but would bring to an end the current balance between public and independent education which the vast majority of people in this country think is healthful and necessary to the maintenance of our institutions. Dr. Wilson Compton has recently written:

> Colleges and university enrollments are now divided almost equally between institutions financed and directed by the State and institutions financed and directed independent of the State. * * * I should think, however, that if we were to reach a point at which the American people had come to rely as much as three-fourths on higher education directed by the State and only one-fourth on higher education independent of the State we should then likely be well on the way toward State control of public education from top to bottom; and hence on the way toward an eventual "statism" which would modify or might even nullify what we know as the a"promise of American life."

The proposal for a 30 percent tax credit for tuition is sponsored by the American Council on Education, which represents the entire range of public and private, low tuition and high tuition institutions existing in this country. The proposal has been endorsed by the Association of State Universities, the Association of American Colleges, the American Alumni Council, the Higher Education Committee of the National Educational Association, the Council of the Section on Legal Education and Admission to the Bar of the American Bar Association, and many others.

While there is much talk about the increasing number of students and the necessity of helping the better students to gain a college education, it would be folly to overlook the welfare of the institutions which we expect to do the educating. We must feed the willing horse if we expect him to carry the burdens. A helping hand from Congress as this time will have far reaching beneficial results not only at the present time but also 5, 10, 15 and 20 years from now. As John Adams wrote into the 1780 Constitution of the then new State of Massachusetts:

> Wisdom and knowledge, as well as virtue, diffused generally among the body of the people, being necessary for the preservation of their rights and liberties * * * it shall be the duty of the legislators and magistrates, in all future periods of this commonwealth to cherish the interests of literature and the sciences, and all seminaries of them; * * * public schools and grammar schools in the towns; to encourage private societies and public institutions.

Opposition to Organization for Trade Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN. J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement which I made before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives expressing my opposition, and the reasons for such opposition to H. R. 5550, the bill now pending before the Congress which would authorize the entry of the United States into the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FOURTH DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 1956

Mr. Chairman, I am JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., Member of Congress from the Fourth District of Georgia. I appear before this committee in opposition to H. R. 5550.

Because of its threat to our farm program and cotton textile and other industries, we are vitally concerned with the possibility of the enactment of H. R. 5550. This measure, on which the House Ways and Means Committee is now holding hearings, superficially viewed, merely authorizes our membership and appropriations incidental to this membership in one more international organization, the Organization for Trade Cooperation. But critically examined the implications and potentialities of H. R. 5550 are frightening.

H. R. 5550 is a short bill. Aside from its appropriation authority, which, incidentally, commits us to pay the international Organization for Trade Cooperation such expenses as OTC itself fixes, this bill is expressed in only some 60 words. But its few words suffice to give an indication of its significance. For they incorporate, by reference, provisions both of the OTC charter and the GATT agreement—that sacred international agreement whose provisions have never been before Congress for approval.

Much of the significance of H. R. 5550 is indicated by what it fails to say. To make sense it necessarily omits a safeguard which Congress insisted upon in framing trade legislation last year and in previous years. In the extensions to the trade agreements acts it was specifically provided that their enactment "shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the Executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade." These were not idle words and they were hotly contested. They are as important now as they were last year. But they are not found in H. R. 5550. Indeed such a provision would be inconsistent with H. R. 5550 as it provides for our membership in OTC whose very purpose is to administer GATT. Our approval of H. R. 5550 would be taken—both nationally and internationally—as approval of GATT by the Congress. Thus it would reverse our repeated and specific refusal expressed in the trade extension acts to approve this multilateral trade agreement which has never been submitted to Congress for consideration.

Hard on the heels of such implications for our international policy lie our domestic programs. It is important to note that passage of H. R. 5550 could be construed to override safeguards to our agriculture and other segments of our economy embodied in legislation which is clearly inconsistent with GATT.

In brief, it cannot be maintained that this Congress can act on H. R. 5550 and yet avoid pronouncements on GATT. On the other hand, if we include a disclaimer of congressional approval or disapproval of GATT in H. R. 5550, we, in effect, authorize membership in a club but refuse to avow its principles. Clearly there is a fundamental inconsistency here. To put in a disclaimer would connote an absolute lack of legislative responsibility. Not to put one in would likewise be irresponsible, for we would, in effect, be approving GATT—an open-ended agreement we haven't even considered.

But allow me to go on to point out the threat which all this poses for the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia. In so doing, I am convinced that the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia is not unique, but is typical of the Nation. For other areas

throughout America would suffer comparable adverse effects through the passage of this bill, H. R. 5550.

As has already been brought out in the hearings on H. R. 5550, the bill's technical linkage with GATT are important for their practical results. There is an inescapable connection between our membership in the OTC and consequent adverse effects on our domestic interest. Such independence as we have so far preserved by refusal of Congress to approve GATT would be lost by enactment of the bill. Our commitments under the various related documents I have mentioned would universally be regarded as direct and clear. When this becomes known, it will become a proper basis for alarm among the people of the United States. For it will be found that Congress is, in effect, abrogating its constitutional functions of regulating our foreign trade.

We cannot shirk our congressional responsibility and pretend we are merely authorizing membership in an international administrative adjunct to foreign trade. Instead, our duty requires that we take the time to review the bill, OTC charter and GATT and at our peril determine the results of this combination on the problems of our industry and agriculture everywhere in our native land.

May I reemphasize that H. R. 5550, though it sparsely covers little more than a page in itself, incorporate the OTC charter consisting of 21 articles plus annexes. Also that the first of these articles specifically dedicates the OTC to achievement of the purposes and objectives of GATT. Other articles provide effective linkage with the voluminous documents of GATT—some 800 pages of text and miscellany including interpretations, waivers, etc.

May I also reemphasize that these 800 odd pages of GATT have not been submitted to us directly, despite their vital concern with our economic future. I am glad to observe that they have been given the attention of numerous good citizens who are concerned with the effect of GATT on the economic future of this country.

I have already alluded to the fact that H. R. 5550 is so framed and presented as to reduce to a minimum the apparent significance of the proposal. Great care has been used to make it difficult to find offense in the bill, although the charter of the OTC and the regulatory provisions of GATT contain plenty of offense. This strategy is designed to segregate in our minds the passage of the bill from the potential results on conflicts between GATT and our own domestic laws and policies which are in the best interests of the United States.

There are important conflicts between GATT and our American farm program. GATT principles are contrary to price supports for, and quotas on, imports of farm products. These restrictions enable our farmers to enjoy the fruits of their labor and live at a level which this country alone can afford to all of its citizens. GATT provisions merely tolerate these on a temporary basis—a concession reluctantly extended as bait for our participation. Our farm prices, thus maintained by our agricultural policy, are well above the world market prices for these products. To make our system of price supports work, we must have import quotas. Otherwise the support price would be undercut by cheaper imported products.

In many cases foreign manufacturers are able to gain an advantage over our own industry by purchasing the raw materials used in that industry under the levels of our supported prices. This is especially true in the case of cotton textiles. Thus, to protect our domestic market for our agricultural products, we must protect our domestic industry which utilizes these products.

GATT conflicts with the goals of this, our domestic policy, in that it opposes import quotas and favors further reduction in tariffs. Indeed, it provides the machinery for imposing compensatory penalties for these import restrictions, both in its rules and regulations and in their practical results. It invites and provides machinery for concerted international retaliation.

Here, then, is a fundamental inconsistency between our American farm program and the GATT program. GATT increasingly pressures toward compromises which seriously and directly hamper our farm price-support policy. It also reduces our own share in our domestic cotton market by its adverse effect on our splendid cotton textile industry.

In January of 1955, in connection with the debate on H. R. 1, I pointed out the grave threat that GATT poses to the entire economy of Georgia. The wage earner of that area, employed in the textile industry, faces competition from Japanese labor earning hourly wages which are only 10 percent of the hourly wages paid to workers in our textile industry.

As I indicated in January of 1955 before this House, it is virtually impossible to see how our workingmen can sustain their high standards of living in the face of such vicious foreign competition. This is particularly pertinent in our textile industry. Their labor costs constitute about 40 percent of the total cost of manufacturing cotton textile products. Nor is it possible to gain an advantage of efficiency of operation over these Japanese producers, since they already utilize the most modern machinery available. In fact, we, ourselves, supplied the Japanese with the latest machinery as well as the money to buy it. There is talk of our working out some kind of voluntary quota with Japan, but if we do, it will not be through GATT but, rather, will be despite GATT.

The obvious threat to our agriculture and industry—the case at hand is the growing of cotton and the manufacture of cotton textiles—is in the pledge of the OTC-GATT mechanism to reduce protection, quotas and tariffs both for farm and manufactured products.

In view of the general confusion on the subject of the conflict between GATT and American farm policy, let us briefly consider a specific conflict, which is in farm legislation currently before Congress—S. 3183. This legislation contains a cotton export provision taken from S. 2702. In spite of the fact that S. 2702 was introduced by Senator EASTLAND for himself and some 60 Senators—clearly a majority of the Senate—adverse comments from the Department of Agriculture assaulted it.

Now S. 2702 has two interrelated provisions:

The first requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage sales of cotton for export which would recapture the fair historical share of United States cotton in the world cotton market.

The second establishing a maximum annual import quota of manufactured products of 150 percent of average annual imports over a 2-year period.

The purpose of the import quota provision is recited in S. 2702:

"In order to prevent material interference of the sales program authorized under paragraph (1) of this section or with the cotton price-support program or to prevent loss of domestic markets for cotton or reduction in the amount of cotton products produced in the United States from United States cotton."

It is clear that the cotton export program would mean a further spread in the domestic price and world price. This would allow foreign cotton textile manufacturers to buy their raw material at prices much below those which our domestic industries pay. The foreign producers' advantage, in turn, would allow them to compete more advantageously in our domestic market. This process would tend to ruin both our raw cotton production through reducing our domestic production and our textile industry itself. Certainly it would tend to nullify the effect of our export program.

This was recognized by the Department of Agriculture when it reported on S. 2702:

"The sale of substantial quantities of all qualities of Government cotton for export at greatly reduced prices * * * would set the international price of cotton and make it possible for foreign mills to obtain their requirements at prices substantially below those paid by domestic mills."

The textile imports encouraged by actions in GATT last year would obviously be increased further.

It is all the more striking that the Secretary of Agriculture advanced as the key reason for opposing the bill that "import quotas on textiles would be in direct conflict with efforts by the United States to relax or remove impediments to world trade."

The objection was, of course, that the proposed quotas would be in violation of GATT. This is GATT—and nothing but GATT—striking at our industry. This Congress never authorized.

Yet, we are informed by the Secretary of Commerce in his recent memorandum for the Cabinet on, "The Facts About the OTC—The Organization for Trade Cooperation":

"The one major difference between the General Agreement and United States policy was eliminated in 1955 when the participating countries gave the United States broad waiver to import quotas unilaterally on agricultural products as required by our domestic agricultural laws."

He forgot to mention the apologetic nature of our State Department emissaries, and the generosity of our allies in letting us have this temporary waiver.

He also apparently forgot that this waiver of quotas prohibiting imports on agricultural production does not apply to quotas on textiles such as those proposed by S. 2702, which the majority of Senators evidently believe to be an essential part of this agricultural products legislation.

This import quota on textiles is crucial both to our domestic agriculture and our industry. For it preserves to our domestic producers and processors their rightful share of our own market.

This problem still faces Congress. The pending price-support bill, S. 3183, which is now under consideration by the Senate, has a provision in section 303 which is virtually identical with paragraph 1 of S. 2702. This section reads as follows:

"SEC. 303. In furtherance of the current policy of the Commodity Credit Corporation of offering surplus agricultural commodities for sale for export at competitive prices, the Commodity Credit Corporation is directed to use its existing powers and authorities (immediately upon the enactment of this act) to encourage sales for export of such quantities of cotton as will reestablish and maintain the fair historical share of the world market for United States cotton, said volume to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. [Cotton made available by the Commodity Credit Corporation under section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be sold at competitive world prices.]" (Added matter shown in brackets.)

But the import quota provision of S. 2702 is omitted even though there can be no doubt that without the import quota which is contrary to GATT commitments, the practical results of the export program provided for in S. 3183 are in serious doubt.

The Senate discussion of S. 3183 recently brought out that the 1955 GATT meeting in Geneva resulted in substantial cuts in a wide range of tariffs on textiles. These reductions took effect on September 10 and spurred a sharp increase in textile imports into this

country. Our domestic industry, already suffering from depressed conditions, faced even more serious injury.

At present our most serious competitor in this sphere is Japan. In this connection, the proposed export program obviously would intensify the situation described by Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 27, 1956, p. 3368):

"Furthermore, the Japanese buy their cotton for less than our manufacturers have to pay for the cotton they buy in the United States. The Japanese buy cotton on the world market; and the world market is usually from 5 to 6 cents a pound lower than the United States market, in which our manufacturers purchase the cotton they use. That situation makes it almost impossible for American manufacturers to meet the competition of Japanese manufacturers.

"Therefore, in my opinion, all we can do is have a quota which will protect American manufacturers, and make it possible for the Japanese to trade with the countries near Japan, and thereby not seriously affect our market. Of course, such trade will affect our market to some extent—but perhaps to only a small extent."

Senator THURMOND inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Feb. 27, 1956, p. 3369) a copy of his letter to the Secretary of State pointing out that:

"Government reports and trade reports out of Japan show that textile imports greatly increased during the last months of 1955. Based on the surge of imports since the negotiation of the GATT agreements started in Geneva last year, I believe it is no longer wise to judge the effect by comparing the total of 1955 textile imports with the 1954 total. Even that comparison shows a tremendous increase, but the data of the recent months should be recognized as a danger signal.

"Our domestic cotton producers and our textile manufacturers and the people they employ will all suffer unless adequate safeguards are established to protect against imported goods manufactured from cheap cotton and by low-wage labor in foreign countries."

Here is an incisive illustration of the fundamental inconsistency between the American farm program on the one hand and our international commitments under GATT and what would be the OTC on the other.

It is sheer folly to attempt to sustain domestic prices paid to our agriculture with price supports and production quotas while, at the same time, we import these products in processed form. The injury sustained is twofold. It hurts our industry as well as our agriculture.

These conflicts between domestic programs and GATT programs afford cogent reasons why Congress must assert its prerogatives and obligations over domestic and foreign trade—why it cannot be expected to support GATT through enacting H. R. 5550 without fully exploring GATT and the results of the bill. H. R. 5550 presents the first occasion that Congress can do so. Clearly we, acting on behalf of the American people, must regain full control over these vital issues. The necessary first step in this process is to reject any proposal for approval of H. R. 5550 without examining its potentialities.

In touching on the production of raw cotton and the manufacture of cotton textiles I have considered the interests of my constituents from the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia. In quoting from the remarks of our honorable colleagues in the Senate I believe I have shown that the concern for these products ranges far beyond the borders of that district.

And yet this is only a small part of the national picture. H. R. 5550, the OTC and GATT conflict with other worthy domestic interests. I hope and believe that some of these will be brought to the fore by other Members of the House.

Before I close let me call your attention to a matter brought to my attention by a constituent just this week. Many of us have long contended that other nations were not reciprocating and reducing tariffs to the same extent as the United States. I have seen figures that since the passage of the various reciprocal trade acts, many nations have increased instead of decreased tariffs. The matter brought to my attention by my constituent had to do with a used 1953 Studebaker automobile which my constituent had given to his daughter, an American citizen but the wife of an Argentine doctor. My constituent's daughter lives in Argentina with her husband and desires to import the car into Argentina. The Argentine Government has set an import duty on this car of approximately $6,000 or at least five times its market value in this country. I was told that on a heavy automobile such as a Cadillac the import duty would run approximately $25,000.

I was also told that in the event this car was to be used for business purposes the above figure would be increased 50 percent.

Gentlemen, I cite this example only to show that in too many instances other nations are not reciprocating in the free-trade program.

Let me thank the committee for giving me this opportunity to appear and express my views on this bill.

We Have the Opportunity To Outlaw Hunger in the United States—Testimony by Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan, of Missouri, Before Senate Committee on Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the opportunity of testifying before the Senate Finance Committee to urge amendment of the social-security program so as to provide for the establishment of a food stamp plan to distribute surplus food to needy Americans. As many of the Members know, I have been urging such a food stamp plan for 2 years here in the House; unfortunately, in that period of time, the House Committee on Agriculture has not seen fit to report out my bill.

A bill somewhat similar in spirit and in goal is also pending before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, sponsored by 23 Senators. This same bill was reintroduced by its sponsors in the Senate as a proposed amendment to the social-security bill, and that is how it happened to come before the Senate Finance Committee.

In the course of my testimony before the Senate committee, I was asked by Chairman BYRD how many Americans would be eligible for surplus foods under the kind of food-stamp plan I have proposed. I did not, at that time, have the exact figures on the number of Americans who would automatically be covered by my bill's definition of a "needy person," and so I asked permission to submit that information for the record of the Senate hearing.

Mr. Speaker, I know from the many conversations I have had with individual Members of the House on this plan for distributing surplus food by the use of food stamps that there is a tremendous amount of interest in the idea. I think there would also be widespread interest in the information I have received on the number of people who would be eligible for this help under H. R. 5105 and similar bills, including Senator KERR's amendment proposed to the social-security bill.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement which I delivered before the Senate Finance Committee and, following that, the letter which I filed with the committee giving the breakdown on the different groups which would be covered.

I call attention to the fact that 5,834,912 persons in this country would be immediately and automatically eligible for food stamps for surplus food by reason of the fact that they are on one or another type of welfare assistance—that is, on old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, or are on State general assistance rolls.

I am sure it is not necessary for me to point out to the Members of the House that people on public welfare, including those on the various programs to which the Federal Government contributes, just do not have enough income to afford enough of the right foods for minimum dietary standards. Many of them are actually hungry.

We must, therefore, stop procrastinating on this problem of getting to such impoverished Americans some of this surplus food piling up in our warehouses at a cost to the Government for storage alone of more than $1 million a day.

TESTIMONY BY HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1956, PROPOSING FOOD STAMP AMENDMENT TO SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

First, I would like to express my appreciation to the busy Senators on this important committee for setting up this special hearing on the idea of adding a food-stamp plan as an amendment to the social-security bill now pending before you. I have noticed in the daily schedule of congressional hearings that this committee has been at work for many weeks on the social-security bill, and I imagine you are all beginning to feel a little weary about H. R. 7225, the social-security bill. On the other hand, I am sure you also feel very acutely the importance of this bill to millions of our fellow citizens, particularly those who would become eligible for social-security benefits before they reach 65, if the bill becomes law in the form in which it passed the House last year.

Of course, in my coming here today to testify I am asking that you improve the bill even more than we did in the House last year, and particularly by adding a provision for the establishment of a food-stamp plan to distribute some of our vast stocks of surplus food to needy Americans.

IMPORTANT THING IS TO GET SURPLUS FOOD TO NEEDY

I think I should point out that in the 2 years or more in which I have been actively

seeking to have a food-stamp plan enacted I have introduced a bill which differs quite substantially from the one introduced by Senator KERR and his 22 cosponsors, including Senators FREAR, SMATHERS, and LONG, of this committee. The Kerr bill, of course, is the one which is officially before you today as a proposed amendment to H. R. 7225.

Since my bill is so very much different in details—although not in objective or spirit—I want to make clear that I am most anxious to see a bill enacted on this subject, and the sooner the better. The important thing is to move some of this gigantic mountain of surplus food out of warehouses and onto the tables and into the kitchens of American families not now receiving enough to eat, and certainly not enough of the right foods.

There is no reason for anyone in America to go hungry. And yet we know that the families on general assistance in our States and cities, and those on old-age assistance, or receiving aid for dependent children, are not provided with enough money to enable them to maintain even a minimum decent diet. I have received letters from many such families. Those letters tear at your heart. It is a little hard for such families to feel much concern about Secretary of Agriculture Benson's problems involving too much food when they are not getting enough food.

SULLIVAN BILL DIFFERS FROM KERR BILL

As I said, the bill I have written on this subject—and which, unfortunately, has been languishing in the House Committee on Agriculture—adopts a much different approach from the Kerr bill. My bill provides for the distribution by the Department of Agriculture of surplus foods, which it has on hand or which it purchases, under a variety of programs now in effect. The Kerr bill would not touch the surpluses as such—I mean those in Government possession—but would provide for distribution through the grocery stores of any food declared by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus. Naturally, that would offer a much wider variety. I am interested in the practical—in what can be accomplished. Therefore, if the Kerr bill were agreed to by this committee and by the Senate as an amendment to the Social Security bill, I would be delighted to support it and to urge House concurrence in your amendment to the House bill on social security.

At the same time, I would ask you to keep in mind that if the provisions of the Kerr bill do not win your acceptance on the grounds of cost to the Government—and believe me, I am not suggesting you turn it down on that basis or any other basis—but if it does not win your acceptance on grounds of cost, then I sincerely ask that you still adopt a food stamp plan for the distribution of Government held surpluses. In other words with the food already in Government possession in such tremendous volume—food already paid for and which could be distributed cheaply—cost would not be a serious obstacle. We must devise an intelligent plan for getting this food to Americans in need.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE HAS NARROW INTEREST

I just cannot imagine why the Department of Agriculture itself has not come forward with some practical plan—a nationwide plan—for distributing surplus foods to our poor. True, there is a surplus disposal plan in operation, but in my judgment it is a sorry excuse for the kind of plan we really need. The Department of Agriculture seems to feel that its only responsibility in this matter is to dump or get rid of as much food as possible in the quickest bulk distribution manner possible without actually dumping the food in the ocean.

In its work over the years on social-security legislation, this committee knows that we have in this country a hard core of poor—really impoverished—Americans. They are the people who benefit from various programs other than the old-age and survivors insurance program of social security. You are familiar with their plight. You know they are people who cannot get along on the grants they receive. You know also that those on general assistance in the States—for which no Federal funds are made available—are in even worse straits.

OPPORTUNITY TO OUTLAW HUNGER

These are the people who most need the added calories in their diet and the added nutrition which could come from a food-stamp plan for surplus foods. At present, we use a lot of this food in the school-lunch program, and that is just fine. We use some for grants to charitable institutions. We ship as much as half a billion pounds overseas in a 6-month period, that would be at the rate of a billion pounds a year, going to needy persons in 70 foreign countries. Wonderful. That is about four times as much as we distribute to needy persons in the United States under our present hit-and-miss, limited program now operating in certain areas of 37 States, ranging from the 462 eligible persons in Wyoming to the 877,512 eligible persons in Pennsylvania. Actually, millions of American families should be participating in such a plan—as they would if there were a nationwide, practical, well-organized food-stamp plan in effect.

For $1, through CARE, one can provide for the shipment of 22 pounds of surplus food to go abroad, packaged in 3 No. 10 cans. The wonderful CARE organization handles the repackaging into containers suitable for overseas shipment, but the food and much of the cost of shipping it is underwritten by the Government in those cases where the shipments go to countries participating in International Cooperation Administration programs. I am not here to say we should cut that sort of thing out. By no means.

But I do say that we must also attack hunger in the United States—we have the opportunity to outlaw hunger in the United States.

TECHNICAL DETAILS SECONDARY TO NEED FOR ACTION

I urge upon you then, aside from any of the technicalities of distribution, aside from whether it should include all surplus foods through the regular channels of trade or just Government held surpluses, aside from whether we include cotton or not as a surplus for food stamp distribution, aside from whether or not the Agriculture Department or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has primary responsibility in the program, aside from any of these technical considerations, that we enact legislation to create a food stamp plan which would automatically aid all families on old age assistance, all those on aid to dependent children, all those on aid to the blind, all those on general assistance, and any other impoverished Americans in need of this food which we have in such abundance and which they cannot afford to buy in proper amount and variety.

By adding such a provision to the social-security bill, this committee of the Senate would be giving a new dimension and a new significance to one of the greatest social programs in our civilization, that is, the social security program. The Senators on this committee already know what social security aid programs—aside from OASI—have meant in every community where they operate. The extreme poverty which leads to hunger and malnutrition, however, while obsolete and out of date and tragically unnecessary, still exists in our midst. Let us end it once and for all.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1956.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Finance,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: During the course of my testimony yesterday before the Senate Committee on Finance on the proposed food-stamp amendment to the social-security bill, you asked me for a figure on the number of persons who would be eligible for surplus food under the kind of food-stamp plan which I have suggested. I did not have the information for the country as a whole, but I did have the figure of 173,000 people on our welfare rolls in Missouri who would be eligible.

After returning to my office, I felt that the figure you requested should be available and should certainly be made a part of the record of your hearings. Consequently, I inquired of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to determine the approximate number of people in the United States who would be eligible for food stamps under the criteria in my own bill, H. R. 5105, and also under the criteria of Senator KERR's amendment to the social-security bill. I was given these figures:

1. Persons on old-age assistance	2,552,832
2. Persons receiving benefits under the aid to dependent children program	2,193,215
3. Persons receiving benefits under aid to the blind programs	104,858
4. Persons receiving aid to the permanently and totally disabled	244,007
5. Persons receiving general assistance—314,000 cases, with an estimated total of	740,000

The total of persons, then, automatically eligible for food stamps under the proposal now pending before your committee as of December 1955, according to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, would be 5,834,912.

In addition, under my bill, and also under Senator KERR's amendment to the social-security bill, an unknown but probably small additional group would be eligible consisting of persons in actual need of welfare assistance but ineligible for such assistance because of State or local law. For instance, in my own State of Missouri general assistance cannot be provided any person who is employable even if unable to obtain employment. There was a substantial number of unemployed in Missouri in 1954, including many persons who were quite destitute but, nevertheless, still ineligible for relief because of that provision of our law. The food-stamp bill, however, would make such persons eligible for surplus food upon proper certification of need.

Not included as such in the figure of 5,834,912 are the 7,900,000 persons receiving benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program. Unless they were also receiving welfare assistance under one of the five programs enumerated above, they would not be eligible for food stamps under the bill as written.

I would appreciate it very much if this letter could be made a part of the record, and I apologize for not having had the exact figures on eligible persons at my fingertips when I testified.

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Missouri.

Legislation Needed To Eliminate Unfair Practices in Automotive Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of our colleagues the testimony I gave on March 7, 1956, before the Subcommittee on Automobile Marketing Practices of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which is presently holding hearings with regard to automobile marketing practices. The testimony, including my prepared statement, follows:

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

I appreciate the remarks of the chairman. It was a great privilege for me to be able to serve with him when he was in the House. I appreciate the opportunity of coming here and testifying before you this morning.

I have a prepared statement which, if it is agreeable to the committee, may be made a part of the record. It is in large part, I am sure, cumulative, as far as many of the facts contained therein are concerned. So I think we might get along faster if, instead of my repeating many of the facts that you already have in your record, I give you my recommendations with reference to them and then, dilate upon the subject matter if you think it necessary.

Senator MONRONEY. You may proceed to develop it as you see fit. We will print the entire statement in the record at this point, and then whatever comments you would care to make, we would be glad to have you add.

Mr. MULTER. Fine.

(The prepared statement of Representative MULTER is as follows:)

"STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT, 13TH DISTRICT, NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AUTOMOBILE MARKETING PRACTICES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, MARCH 7, 1956

"Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before your committee. Permit me to preface my statement by commending the committee for its perseverance in conducting these hearings in a manner requiring a complete disclosure of the problems affecting the industry's relations with the public.

"THE PUBLIC INTEREST DEMANDS THIS INQUIRY

"The committee's approach in reaching the issues by receiving testimony from the manufacturers, dealers, and consumers has reassured the public that any resultant legislative action that might be undertaken by the Congress will be directed to curing the evils disclosed in the record made before this committee.

"In pointing up some of the unfair practices that demand your attention, I should like to specificate one underlying fact, namely, that in the automobile market both the consumer and the dealer have little choice in the selection of a manufacturer. As you well know, the year 1955 saw the disappearance of one more automobile manufacturer, Kaiser-Willys; today only six sources remain. It is an anomalism that as the market has grown, the number of companies in the market has lessened. The public was only amused upon reading in the press that the General Motors Corp., the biggest manufacturer in this country, which is at the same time the country's largest automobile manufacturer, in testifying before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee in December 1955, said that it 'is the servant of the dealer.' It is public knowledge that dealers have been forced into serf-like submission to the manufacturer. The dealer's plight is manifest in noting figures, such as those submitted by the General Motors Corp. last December, showing that the 1953 return on net worth for dealers averaged 14.40 percent, and was reduced in 1954 to 9.4 percent. Comparable figures show that the corporation earned 20 percent in 1953 after taxes and bonuses, and almost 24 percent in 1954.

"The mighty hand of the manufacturer has forced the dealer to 'take down his hair'—to the end that the industry reveals itself beset with problems on all sides.

"What is the situation today? The consumer may need a new automobile, but he dreads the purchase. Breaking in the car means running back and forth to the dealer to correct inherent mechanical failures that are uncovered long after the guaranty period has expired. The attitude of the consumer is aptly defined in two unsolicited letters I received a few weeks ago. These letters were printed in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—one appearing in the January 31, 1956, issue (pp. A993–A995); the other in the February 9, 1956, issue (p. A1331). The dealer, on the other hand, is called upon as a regular procedure to comply with, not his warranty, but a warranty the company requires him to make. What has been the dealer's redress? The answer the dealer receives from the manufacturer is to step up or maintain his sales volume—even if that means come-on advertising, bootlegging, price packing, and any other unfair trade practice. Even outright fraud is countenanced by the manufacturer.

"THE NATURE OF MANUFACTURER-DEALER RELATIONS

"Let us look at some of the problems. Many an inexplicable accident is caused by defective vehicles. The manufacturer upon whom the blame should rest passes the responsibility on to the dealers who cannot assume nor begin to fulfill the obligation. The automobile manufacturer today makes only a spot-check of one out of every 10 or 20 automobiles that leave the assembly line. The company's warranties are plainly worthless, and the dealer upon whom the responsibility falls gives a minimum of service until the guaranty period expires; after which, he charges the consumer.

"In testifying last December before a Senate committee a spokesman on behalf of one of the six manufacturers in the country stated: 'the manufacturer assumes the greater risks and bears the ultimate responsibility to the customer.' Should we not make certain, then, that this responsibility is firmly fixed? In this regard I am introducing a bill to prohibit the interstate sale, transportation, or use of a new automobile unless accompanied by a certificate of fitness from the manufacturer or assembler, showing that the automobile has been inspected and found in good working order and, further, that it has been road tested and found in good operating condition after at least 100 miles at each of the speeds of 15, 30, 45, 60, and 75 miles per hour.

"A substantial number of the problems facing the industry stem from the dealer agreement which is so drawn that the manufacturer may grant or withdraw the franchise at will. Within the past several days we have observed newspaper reports that the manufacturer's cancellation privilege will be superseded by a provision requiring the cancellation to be for cause. Will the manufacturer be compelled to define the term 'cause'? Admittedly, there is no uniformity among the court decisions construing automobile franchise agreements. The extent of legislative action should be determined after an analysis of the facts that have been uncovered in these hearings.

"The hearings conducted by this committee have revealed that the dealer must file each month several reports showing his sales and inventory volumes. The manufacturer bases his deliveries to the dealer upon these figures. Whether or not the dealer considers this quota salable is immaterial. Moreover, the dealer has no control over the various built-in accessories that are billed as extras. For instance, the automobile is listed as equipped with vacuum windshield wipers, but is later shipped in with an electric wiper billed as an extra. Every car comes with a hole in the dashboard for a cigarette lighter, but the lighter is an extra. It is the manufacturer, also, who determines the stock of parts and accessories that the dealer must purchase from the automobile manufacturer. The dealer could purchase these same parts and accessories directly from the parts manufacturer and much cheaper, too. The only way to abolish this practice is to prohibit lump-sum bills and to require of the manufacturer and of the dealer a complete itemization of all charges. No amount should be collectible by either for extras unless ordered in writing by the buyer.

"The dealers must pay for advertising literature they do not want and would not order. It is sent in to the dealer in such quantities as the manufacturer thinks he should distribute. The dealer is billed and must pay for that literature even though he throws most of it into the wastebasket. The dealers must pay a fixed sum per car to the manufacturers toward the cost of advertising. The dealer's name and address is never part of that advertising, only the product is mentioned. This policy would cease if the responsibility for exaggerated and fraudulent advertising were laid to the manufacturer and if the manufacturer were prohibited from requiring dealer contributions toward the cost of such advertising.

"I was pleased to learn that, as a result of testimony before this committee, the Federal Trade Commission has recently filed charges against the General Motors Corp. for false and deceptive advertising. Independent manufacturers have reported that General Motors use of the words 'genuine Chevrolet' to describe parts used in making repairs is diverting business from the independent manufacturers and small-repair shops. The parts manufacturers contend that the items, distributed and warranted by General Motors, actually are bought by General Motors from the independent manufacturers. The implication is that the 'genuine Chevrolet' parts are superior to the same parts sold by competitors without such label.

"For the first time in the history of the automotive industry the dealers have come forward, and through the efforts of this committee there has been full and complete disclosure of the automobile manufacturers' unfair and overreaching tactics.

"As long as the manufacturers want to have dealers under contract to handle only particular makes of cars, the manufacturers should be required to sell only to such dealers and to prohibit bootlegging. The manufacturers should be required to cancel the franchises of bootleggers.

"The need to eliminate the unfair practice on the part of some dealers in selling as new automobiles those which have been towed or driven from the factory or used as demonstrators has long been recognized but ignored. I wish to state that I have read with interest the proposal of the honorable

chairman to require the placing of windshield stickers on every new car to show each transfer of ownership as a new car. On this same point, I might state that I am introducing a bill which would make it a violation for any manufacturer or dealer to replace or disconnect the speedometer on an automobile or to change its reading in such a manner to mislead the public as to the mileage, condition, or usage of the automobile.

"Not to be overlooked in any compilation of unfair automobile marketing practices are the reports of substantial overcharges under the 'package' finance deals. Dealers complain, too, they are forced to grant 'wild credit' to consumers in order to satisfy quotas in the manufacturer's race for sales. At this point I should like to touch on a matter that involves the now well-known adage: 'What is good for General Motors is good for the country.' You will see in a moment that we can now change that to 'What is bad for the insurance companies is not bad for the automobile companies.'

"On September 8, 1955, I wrote to Secretary of Defense Wilson, calling his attention to a scheme by which armed services personnel returning to this country are being duped and mulcted of thousands of dollars in connection with the sale to them of new automobiles. I indicated that the matter had been called to the attention of the automobile manufacturers who have failed to do anything to prevent these practices. I further stated that the Secretary of Defense need not make any determination of whether these practices are fraudulent or merely unethical, but urged him to direct all commanding officers to alert their men to these practices to afford them an opportunity to protect themselves accordingly. My letter of September 8, 1955, is exhibit A, annexed. I received an answer dated September 23, 1955, a copy of which is annexed as exhibit B, in which the Department of Defense refused to take any action. I replied by letter of September 28, 1955, a copy of which is annexed as exhibit C, again indicating the need for departmental action. No answer has been received to my last letter.

"Now let us see what happened when the Department's attention was called to similar fradulent practices by insurance salesmen. No General Motors was involved. An investigation was instituted which confirmed the charges. A complete set of regulations was promulgated by the Defense Department, including a directive to commanders of all bases, making them responsible for protection of the men against such frauds. Another reason for different treatment of the phony automobile salesmen is that the fraudulent business is so profitable that the automobile manufacturers have sent their own 'direct' representatives overseas to grab this business.

"Dealers explain they are unable to pass on the factory price increase on 1956 cars to the consumers. The consumer may choose another dealer, but the dealer himself, however, has a single source. The consequence is the dealer must recoup his profit by volume sales. We learn that manufacturers are awarding bonuses and discounts for extra deliveries. Volume sales are encouraged, 'stimulator' dealers are established, and rebates to the dealers figured on their annual volume of business. The consequence is that dealers are finding themselves unable to compete in the car market.

"The manufacturer in selling to the dealer receives cash as the car leaves the assembly line. The dealer complains that sales to questionable credit risks and at terrific discounts are a necessary corollary of pressures exerted by manufacturers.

"MANUFACTURER REACTION TO THESE HEARINGS

"On the heels of the disclosure of so many unfair practices in the industry, we now see by the papers that the manufacturer pretends he is reforming. General Motors Corp. has predicted within the past several days 'the beginning of a new era—an era of good will—' in relations with its dealers. I say to you, gentlemen of the committee, that such overtures are too late.

"The public confidence can only be restored by the affirmative action of this committee. Let us recall that a similar false contrition permeated the atmosphere in 1938 after the Congress enacted House Joint Resolution 594, which directed the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the policies of motor vehicle manufacturers and dealers in their relation to the public interest. The Commission, 1 year later, made public its findings, which were not at all unlike the unfair practices that are now paraded before this committee. Unfortunately, the Congress took no action at that time, for the reason, among others, that the industry itself rejected any type of Federal legislation.

"THE MANUFACTURERS' WAY OF ELIMINATING AN UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICE

The elimination of acknowledged unfair practices in the automobile industry cannot be left to the discretion of the industry itself. Let me illustrate. The phantom freight charge has long been prevalent in the automobile industry. A similar practice among steel producers, known as Pittsburgh Plus, was eliminated in the thirties. Under this practice, the manufacturer ships the automobiles to dealers from nearby assembly plants and requires the dealer to pay for the transportation in an amount equivalent to, or even greater than, the rail freight rates from the factory to the dealers' delivery points.

"Let us examine the 1954 shipment record for motor vehicles as reported in the 35th edition of Automobile Facts and Figures, 1955. Of the 6,601,071 motor vehicles shipped, 80.5 percent or 5,314,842, left the factory by highway—on a big truck that hauls several other cars, or towed behind another new car. Shipment by boat accounted for 5.6 percent, or 370,044; while rail shipments accounted for only 13.9 percent. In other words, only 916,185 out of a total of 6,601,071 motor vehicles shipped went by rail. The phantom freight charges have amounted annually to over $280 million.

"In the hope of foreclosing any action by this committee, the industry has belatedly taken action.

"I urge that the public announcements now being flaunted in our faces by the manufacturers as to their amended ways is merely an attempt to becloud the issue.

"As of February 29, 1956, Chrysler Corp., General Motors Corp., and the Ford Motor Co. eliminated phantom freight charges. Those three manufacturers at the same time increased the wholesale price of their cars to their dealers. This in the face of the Chrysler testimony that they paid out more for freight charges than they collected. Mr. L. L. Colbert, president of Chrysler, in his testimony before this committee on March 1, 1956—2 days after the price-change announcements—stated that the industry should be permitted to deal with the so-called phantom freight on its own. Their testimony and their actions, in my opinion, indicate they cannot be trusted to solve these problems.

"I have heretofore referred to the report filed by the Federal Trade Commission in 1939, pursuant to its study of the automotive industry. It should be noted that, irrespective of whether or not legislative action was necessary, the Government controls of World War II, limiting production, obviated the need for positive action by the Congress at that time. Nevertheless, we find the same unfair practices prevalent in the industry today, and what is worse, on a larger scale. In these circumstances, our duty to the public is not discharged by a formal disclosure of their nature.

"In conclusion I should like to make this observation. The manufacturers representing the automotive industry can best be described as giant octopuses whose tentacles of economic power extend over every phase of the industry, as well as over many unrelated products.

"On the other side of the picture are the 42,340 dealers—90 percent of whom are small-business men, the very backbone of our free enterprise system. In most cases they are the civic and philanthropic leaders in their communities. In the past their position has been one of dignity among their fellow citizens. They are fast becoming the most despised members of their communities.

"There were 219 dealer bankruptcies in 1953, the highest number since 1938. Two hundred forty-one dealer mortalities occurred in 1954. We have every indication that these figures will rise. It is high time to put this house in order.

"Again, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, permit me to thank you for the opportunity to attend here and express my views on these very important matters."

EXHIBIT A

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 8, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For some time Members of Congress have been receiving complaints about the tactics being used by various dealers in selling new automobiles to members of the Armed Forces returning from posts outside of the country.

It seems that some of these retailers have sent representatives abroad who through fraud and deceit induce these men who are about to return to the United States to sign contracts, and to pay deposits for the delivery of new automobiles to them at the port of their arrival in this country. As part of this scheme these retailers have made exclusive rental agreements for offices in the hotels in this country at which these men and their families are temporarily lodged upon their arrival here. The deceptive practices are continued at those places until the delivery of a new automobile is made and payment obtained.

No purpose can be served by setting forth in this letter the nature of the fraudulent representations that are made, nor is it necessary for the purpose of this letter to determine whether or not these practices are actually fraudulent or merely unethical business practices. The result of all of these practices is that these men are being duped and taken advantage of. They are paying more for these automobiles than if they bought them in their hometowns, or, for that matter, if they bought them at the port of arrival. They are paying higher finance charges than they would pay if they took the opportunity of financing their automobiles is their hometowns or in the city in which they are discharged from the service, and they are being deprived of the inspection and service that ordinarily goes with a new car purchase when made in their hometowns.

The automobile manufacturers, when apprised of these practices, have taken the position that these retailing practices are no concern of theirs.

I believe you will agree with me that in the absence of the manufacturers undertaking to prevent these practices, something must be done to help these men.

My suggestion is that you immediately issue a directive requiring commanding officers in all stations outside of this country to alert the men under their command to this situation, and to advise those men that it is inadvisable for them to make such pur-

chases while abroad, or, for that matter, even at the place of arrival in this country, or the place of discharge from the service in this country, and that their best interests will be served by their making such purchases from dealers in their home communities. The hometown dealers, in almost every instance, can arrange for the delivery of a new automobile to them at their point of arrival or discharge in this country, which would then be available for them for transportation to their hometowns.

I hope you will agree with me that such a directive will serve a very useful purpose. As a matter of fact, the directive and the notice from the local commanding officer can be appropriately worded so that neither manufacturers nor retailers need be accused of any wrongdoing or impropriety, and yet provide some measure of protection to the members of our Armed Forces.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

EXHIBIT B

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., September 23, 1955.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MULTER: This is in reply to your letter of September 8 concerning certain practices of automobile dealers in selling to members of the Armed Forces returning from overseas posts.

You appreciate, I am sure, that no agency of the Department of Defense sponsors any plan of automobile sales such as you describe and the Department is therefore without jurisdiction to discontinue it. The selection of an automobile salesman or sales contract is a matter of individual choice.

Overseas representatives of the United States automobile dealers are not amenable to military control. So long as they comply with the laws of the locality in which they do business they can offer their merchandise for sale to both civilian and military. Control of this group like their contemporaries at the port would appear to rest with the automobile dealers, their trade associations, and perhaps the manufacturers.

I believe that the directive you suggest would be more restrictive than is appropriate for issuance by this Department and that it might affect the legitimate activities of firms and dealers who render real service to our personnel. I believe that the objective we seek, the use of caution and judgment by servicemen in their purchases from unknown vendors, can best be accomplished by a continuation of the present normal counseling given by commanders to their troops. I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of your letter to the military departments.

Your interest in the welfare of our Armed Forces personnel is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

CARTER L. BURGESS.

EXHIBIT C

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 28, 1955.

CARTER L. BURGESS,
Assistant Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURGESS: Receipt is acknowledged with thanks of yours of September 23.

I fail to understand how the directive as suggested by me is in any manner restrictive. It does not require the Department or any commanding officer to take a position on the matter, nor in any manner to interfere with automobile dealers in this country or abroad. It has always been proper for the Defense Department to alert the members of the Armed Forces against dangers that they may encounter, whether physical, moral or financial.

Alerting these men to these practices is in direct line with such procedure.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

Mr. MULTER. I think probably many of the facts in my statement will be found to be in accord with those adduced by some of your witnesses. Obviously, they are going to be contrary, in part, to the testimony of some of the other witnesses.

I think possibly the only point of agreement is where consumers have come forward. I believe they will be in complete agreement with what I say.

Now the matter that you have adduced here in connection with this investigation can be broken down into several subjects and I have followed that fairly closely in my prepared statement. They can be subdivided and placed under these main topics or headings: "Padding" of new and used car prices which sometimes has been referred to as "packing"; exclusive contracts; the unfair methods of motor vehicle manufacturers in their relations with their dealers, manufacturers' treatment of dealers, dealers' associations, pressure on dealers to buy parts, etc.; abuses of installment financing; the need for itemized invoices for consumer protection; deception in charges for transportation of motor vehicles; the sale of driven cars as new cars.

Now, you won't find those headings or subheadings in my prepared statement. I have just read those subheadings from the report to the Congress dated June 5, 1939, of the Federal Trade Commission, made pursuant to House Joint Resolution 594, which was approved on April 13, 1938. But you will find similar headings in my statement and the same subject matter covered by this committee in all its investigations. You will find, as I did upon reading this report of their recommendations and conclusions, that almost precisely the same things were wrong with the automobile industry in 1938 and 1939 as have been disclosed to your committee in its current hearings. So it gives me quite a laugh when I read the full page advertisements in the newspapers of General Motors and Chrysler and Ford about a new era and a new day, and how they have now reformed and they are going to do a better job and they are going to have good relations between themselves and their dealers and the public is going to be better served. As the Chrysler representative testified here the other day before you, leave this to us. Said he, in substance: "We will take care of the phantom freight and everything else and we will mend our ways."

Well, I, for one, am firmly convinced that unless this committee and its counterpart on the House side will bring forth an all-inclusive bill prohibiting all of these abuses and attempting to correct them, the industry will never do anything. They will talk about it. They will tell us, as they did in 1938 and 1939, that they are correcting their ways, and then the minute you stop investigating, unless there is a law on the books to make them behave, they will go back to their old ways.

It surprised me to find that there is an order outstanding since 1941, November 12, 1941, against the General Motors Corp., issued by the Federal Trade Commission, a unanimous order directing them to cease and desist from their practices of compelling their dealers to buy parts whether they needed them or not, to buy parts and only the parts that were labeled with their name. That was all they could buy and that was all they could use. I think you have heard considerable testimony about that abuse today.

I think you know about the new proceeding that was started against the General Motors Corp. because of their false advertising of "genuine Chevrolet" parts which are not genuine Chevrolet parts at all. They are bought from independent dealers, manufacturers, rather. They won't let their dealer go to the manufacturer or his jobber and buy that product. He must buy it from the auto manufacturer at a high price and, naturally, must pass it on to the consumer at that same high price, plus a fair profit to himself, plus his overhead. So, you see, that these same abuses continue today as they have all through the years since these giants took hold in the automobile industry.

Now I have recommended and I urge that this committee, after it has completed its hearings and analyzed all of the facts, bring forth a bill which should, in my opinion, cover several important matters. Every manufacturer and assembler, and I think, as well pointed out by the chairman again this morning, the manufacturers in large part today are assemblers—we will have to have all-inclusive language that will include every manufacturer and assembler of automobiles—shall be required to issue a certificate of fitness showing, among other things, that the vehicle has been road-tested at different speeds for a minimum of 500 miles. Today they deliver that automobile to the dealer. They place the responsibility on the dealer to deliver a car which he is supposed to service and put in good condition and deliver to the automobile owner, who has a right to take that car and take it out on the road and use it as though it were a safe vehicle. The situation is much worse today than when Judge Holmes wrote for the United States Supreme Court, in the *McPherson* v. *Buick* case, that an automobile is a potentially lethal weapon. That is what it is, unless it is properly tested and in good working condition. The dealer doesn't have the facilities or the ability to do that job.

They are putting a potentially lethal weapon in the hands of every automobile owner when he takes it out on the road. There is no way of telling after the driver has been killed in an accident as to whether his steering gear came off in his hand or there was some other defect in the mechanism which caused that automobile to be wrecked.

When we have an accident involving airplanes, our various agencies move in and have a thorough investigation and try to determine what caused the accident. We don't have those facilities, we never could have them, to determine those things as to automobiles. I say, from my experience as a lawyer, over many years, that there are accidents every day in the week involving automobiles that are caused by the inherent defects in the automobile that were there when it left the factory, were there when it left the dealer's place of business, and went into the hands of the purchaser. The only way you can make sure that the vehicle is safe for use is to require every one of these automobiles to be tested before they leave the last place of assembly.

I think the protection of our American public demands that.

Senator MONRONEY. I will say that the number of dealer complaints of bad-order cars arriving from the factory have been coming in with increasing amounts, that they allege that there has been a deterioration in the factory inspection system, and we have had testimony before this committee to the effect that oftentimes the factories think it is cheaper, instead of taking a car off the line and tying up their lines with bringing it out in good order, to ship it on to the dealer and have him do the work and then maybe make him share the cost of putting a car that was bad, ordered into proper running condition on a preservice or predelivery service charge with the factory paying only a part of it.

Mr. MULTER. That is right, and with the profit competition having it brought down

as low as it is today, the dealer is going to kid his customer as long as he can until his guarantee period has run out and then he will take care of those things. I have had that complaint made to me not only by purchasers of automobiles—incidentally, I have put into the RECORD, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and if you care to have it made a part of this record, two letters which came to me completely unsolicited, one from the purchaser of a Buick automobile telling about the difficulties that she had with this brand new automobile for which she paid cash upon purchase. I have submitted a copy of that to you with my formal statement. That letter appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 31, 1956. The second letter, which also came to me unsolicited, involved a Lincoln automobile, also bought for cash, and that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 9. In both those letters they tell how it is utterly impossible to get the dealer to make good on the defects or give him a good automobile, an automobile that is safe to drive. As a matter of fact, I think you have testimony from the manufacturers that they assume the burden and the responsibility of the car's being a good car. I think that is almost the verbatim testimony of the Chrysler president before this committee. Yet they evade that obligation constantly. The dealer must, because of the economic situation involved today, do as little work on that car as possible until he can make a charge for it. So whatever the guarantee period may be, whether mileage or time, when that has gone by, then the customer begins to get his big bills. But the public safety requires that that condition not be permitted to continue. Those defective cars on the road are a menace until they are put in good operating condition.

Senator MONRONEY. Well, on top of that, is it not a fact, Congressman MULTER, that the orphan cars, the bootleg cars that are sold off the used car lots as new and maybe have a lot of mileage, worn out brakes, scored cylinders, defective steering gear, rough handling from many, many miles on the road by people who have no interest in the car, also tends to give a bad service car to a customer thinking he has a new car, and plus the fact that the traditional maintenance that would be rendered on a new car is not there because the dealer hates to have to service a car that has been sold in unfair competition in his trade area.

Mr. MULTER. That is right, and although there may be a requirement in some of the manufacturers' contracts with their dealers that he take in such car for service, he will find a way of not servicing it.

Senator MONRONEY. It just destroys the good faith that should exist in the purchase of a new car.

Mr. MULTER. That is right. I think every member of this committee, and I, too, can remember when the new car dealer in our community was a very respected and respectable member of our community. He was one of the leaders in the civic and philanthropic endeavors of the community. He occupied a position of dignity in the community. Today he is fast becoming the most despised man in the community. Nobody trusts him anymore because of this situation, and it is a bad situation. Now your sticker idea as contained within—I don't know whether it is part of a bill you introduced——

Senator MONRONEY. It is a proposal we are considering here.

Mr. MULTER. It has been talked about favorably. I think it will help that situation. I go one step further in my recommendation and say that when the car leaves the place of assembly, the last place of assembly, the speedometer should be sealed. Then impose a criminal penalty for the breaking of that seal at any time before delivery to the new car purchaser. Then when you drive that car from Detroit to Brooklyn or anywhere else, to deliver a customer, whether it is driven by a paid driver, who is just driving one car or it is hooked onto the back of another car, both cars riding the road, whether it is a thousand miles or only a few hundred miles, when that car arrives at the dealer's place and he tries to deliver it, Mr. Customer can look at the speedometer and know that this car was driven over the road before it was delivered to him. He will know he is not getting a new car but is getting a used car.

Senator MONRONEY. When a customer pays $3,000 to $4,000 for the purchase of an automobile, it is a major investment in his life. He is entitled to know what he is buying, whether it is a piece of used merchandise that is beaten up by rough handling and maybe polished up to look good on the surface or whether it is a truly genuine, new, unused article, wouldn't you think?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, Senator, you are absolutely right. I drive that price car. I drive a $4,000 car. I do not know how many are in that group, numerically whether that is the greater percentage. I have an idea it is not.

Senator MONRONEY. I will say I cannot tell today what price car I am driving because of the fantastic packs that you are getting in a car. You think you have a $3,000 car, maybe, and then you find that the car is being advertised as a $4,000 car with a $1,500 trade-in for your old car, no matter what its condition. So you lost all contact with reality and values in this packing, which I know you are interested in.

Mr. MULTER. I think the greatest number of cars, however, are in the $2,000 price class and that fellow needs as much protection as you and I do. If we can afford the $4,000 car we probably can more readily afford the big maintenance bill, but that little fellow who is paying the $2,000 for his car is probably using it in his business. It is a necessity to him. It is not a luxury, and he is getting cheated. He must be protected, too. Along that same line, I recommend that every customer get a bill when he purchases the car, and the dealer, too, should get a bill, which completely itemizes every item that he is being charged for. In that connection I say you must prohibit, the law must prohibit, the manufacturer from putting anything on that new car that is not ordered in writing. I believe that every automobile that I have owned since 1939 has had a cigar lighter in the dashboard. During all that time I am sure that every automobile that comes through has a hole in the dashboard for the lighter but the lighter is an extra.

Senator MONRONEY. Is that a fact?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir.

Now every car comes through with windshield wipers, but if you can get to the itemization, you will find that a vacuum operated windshield wiper is standard equipment but that the car is delivered with an electrically operated windshield wiper—and that is an extra. Not all of the cars, but most of them. Yet the customer is never apprised of that. In that connection General Motors is violating, day after day, a 1941 order of the Federal Trade Commission against unfair practices as to accessories and parts. Nothing is being done about it. By the time you get through with the Federal Trade Commission, as happened in many instances, by the time they got their investigation completed the manufacturer came in and said, we have stopped doing that, we realized we should not do it and we are not doing it anymore. The result was that the Federal Trade Commission dismissed the complaint and the day after the complaint was dismissed the manufacturers started right over again. The only way you can stop these bad practices, in my opinion, is by writing into the law severe penalties, enforceable not through the Federal Trade Commission but either on behalf of the dealer or the consumer, or if neither of them takes action, then by the Attorney General.

Another recommendation that I make is with reference to the automobile franchises, the dealer franchises. I know that the dealers are split right down the middle on that problem. The men in the metropolitan communities, I think, by and large, want exclusive franchises. The fellows in the smaller communities are not sold on exclusive franchises. If, to keep his franchise, he must sell a hundred cars in a small community and his community can only take 50, 60, or 70. he wants the right to go out and dispose of those cars wherever he can get a customer. Where the competition is keener in the big cities they feel the exclusive franchise is going to protect them. Frankly, I do not know whether one is better than the other, whether you should have the exclusive franchise or you should not. I have not been able to resolve that in my own mind. But I do say that the manufacturer and the dealer should be permitted to negotiate and consummate whatever kind of contract he wants and the manufacturer should not be able to sit back as he does today and say to his dealer, we have an opinion from the Attorney General and we cannot do this, that, or the other thing with your franchise. For instance, canceling a franchise because of bootlegging activities. Everybody agrees that bootlegging activities are bad. I think there was one manufacturer who came in and said bootlegging is all right, it creates more competition and it is good to stir into action the salesman who is a little lazy. I think everybody else, with the exception of that one witness, agrees that bootlegging is very bad. If for no other reason, as you pointed out, it is bad because the buying public doesn't get the protection they need in buying a car which is supposed to be warranted as fit for use when they take delivery.

In that respect, in order to permit of a proper antibootlegging clause, the law requires change so as to permit the manufacturer to include that provision in his contract with a franchised dealer. Also, it should require him to live up to certain standards.

I think the law should set up the standards. These standards should include the prohibition of bootlegging and the prohibition of misleading and fraudulent advertising. The law should require cancellation of franchises in the event of violation of those standards.

In order to protect the dealer you must write into such a law that he will have a right to review his cancellation in one of two ways. There, again, you cannot say which way it shall be done, but you must give him his right of review. I say the right of review of the cancellation should be either by court or, if the manufacturer and the dealer agree to arbitration, then by arbitration; but then he must write in the law a provision that arbitration must be by three people, one of whom can be chosen by the manufacturer, another by the dealer, and the third must be somebody who is not connected with the industry. Today you have these so-called dealers' councils, and in some instances they are set up as review boards to determine whether or not the manufacturer had a right to cancel the contract, but they are controlled completely by the manufacturer, even though they represent dealers, even though a dealer might be on the board. In some instances the council is a council of dealers, and dealers only. That dealer dares not stand up against the factory, or he will lose his franchise.

Senator MONRONEY. The dealer may feel: there, but for the grace of God, go I, if I don't obey and salute the command of the summit.

Mr. MULTER. That is right. If this man is going to have a right of review, it must not

be by an arbitrator, who, in advance, must agree to pick the manufacturer's arbitrator.

Senator MONRONEY. Are you familiar with what used to be called the yellow-dog contract in labor?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. Tell us about what that did, as a distinguished lawyer, and a sincere advocate of liberal legislation in the labor field.

Mr. MULTER. It is the same thing as the manufacturer does today to his dealer without a contract. The contract was made with a union which was not a union at all. It was made up of workers selected by the employer and who would do the employer's bidding.

Senator MONRONEY. Who would agree not to belong to unions?

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. Who would waive as a condition of employment his legal and constitutional rights. Now, do you not have that same line of waiving a dealer's rights written in many automobile contracts today that, when he signs the contract to be a franchised dealer, he has signed away his rights to go into court to protest against what normally could be a court case for breach of good faith or loss of equity through arbitrary cancellation by the factory?

Mr. MULTER. And hardly a day goes by—well, that is a slight exaggeration—but hardly a week or month goes by, that a regional representative of the manufacturer doesn't call on his dealer and tell him: You have to do this, that, or the other thing.

You can walk in, either in your home city or anywhere in the District of Columbia here, walk into any dealer's shop and walk into his parts department and ask him to show you his inventory; ask him to show you the part of the inventory that never moves, that he never has any use for. You will find thousands and thousands of dollars worth of stuff either in his warehouse or on his shelves that the regional director of the manufacturer came in and said: You have got to buy so much of this today. And he had to order it and put it in, and he has no use for it.

The same way they will go in to a dealer and say: We don't like your plant. Your service station has deteriorated. You have to put in a new plant.

He may have to invest $100,000 or $150,000 in a new plant, and he will have no assurance when he is finished that he will still have the franchise. Those things must be covered by the legislation that comes out of this investigation so as to correct these abuses.

I was surprised to read the testimony given to you on behalf of the American Motors Co. here the other day in which the witness talked about a unique and new plan of stirring up business and helping his dealers by giving him volume discounts. Apparently the gentleman, neither he nor his lawyer, had ever read the Robinson-Patman Act. In almost every other instance the companies are giving volume discounts and hiding the fact. If you get the dealers to open their books you will see they are getting volume discounts directly in violation of the Robinson-Patman Act. He has a franchise which requires him to sell 100 cars a year, but if he sells 150 cars he gets an additional discount on every car he sold that year and it goes up by every 25 or 50 cars, depending upon the company. The additional discount that he gets is based solely on his volume sales.

Now, unless I misunderstand the Robinson-Patman Act, that is prohibited by that act, but nothing is being done about it except one company now bragging that it is a good thing to increase sales.

Senator MONRONEY. I think the Robinson-Patman Act, as I understand it, would permit greater discounts where economies in distribution can be shown as being warranted or merited and where there are publicly announced breaking points on quantity.

Mr. MULTER. But these are hidden discounts. Nobody knows about it. You won't find out about it unless you have a friend in the trade who will tell it to you. It is not based on any savings. It is not based on anything that can be saved either in transportation or in any other way whatsoever, because the dealer doesn't pay any more or any less commission or salary to his salesman that is selling the car, and the factory has no more sales expense or less sales expense on the volume distribution, and they ship them in just the same, either tow them in, drive them in, truck them in, or sometimes float them in by barges, and in rare instances by rail.

Senator MONRONEY. To keep the record straight, counsel for the committee, Mr. Busby, has called my attention to the fact that the American Motors plan departs from the normal volume discount you are making by basing the discount on sales of all dealers to some extent, rather than strictly on the individual dealer, the number of cars they sell, the greater discount all of the dealers will receive.

Mr. MULTER. Then I misread his testimony. That is quite different and I must apologize to that witness.

Senator MONRONEY. He was trying to bring out, as I remember the testimony, the point that if they could get their sales up in American Motors Co., that all dealers would profit by a greater share of the profits that the company would then be making.

Mr. MULTER. If the idea is greater sales by the manufacturer, and he can then give a greater discount to all dealers by virtue of the sales, then he has something different and unique.

Mr. BUSBY. I might comment there that they haven't gotten clear away from the individual discount in that all other manufacturers still give the discount strictly on the individual sales, as I understand it.

Mr. MULTER. That was my understanding, too. If they have a different plan, I have misread the testimony.

Senator MONRONEY. Their new plan was to base a return to all dealers as the company's volume increased.

Mr. BUSBY. Their new plan is to get half way in between the individual discount and the total discount for all dealers.

Mr. MULTER. In that connection, if the committee agrees that volume discounts are bad and should be stopped, we must by the legislation we bring out, do it without relying on the Robinson-Patman Act. You will have to write in severe penalties which will be almost automatic in their imposition, so that anyone can go in, either the customer or the dealer can go in and collect the penalty, rather than wait for a Robinson-Patman Act prosecution of the violator. No franchised dealer, as long as he still has hopes of keeping his franchise, would dare bring an action under the Robinson-Patman Act.

That brings me to the question of phantom freight that the chairman is so familiar with, as are the other members of the committee. I think you probably have already before you complete testimony on that subject. I can supplement your record with just this brief additional information on the subject of phantom freight. I give you these figures because of the testimony that you have had from some of the manufacturers indicating that they actually pay out more than they collect. Even though they charge this so-called phantom freight, they say we are abusing them when we say it is something they have no right to charge. They pretend that they actually pay out more in freight for all of their deliveries than they collect.

I don't believe that is so. Let me give you these figures. The 1954 shipment record for motor vehicles, as reported in the 35th edition of the "Automobile Facts and Figures for 1955" (that is the industry's own publication and I don't think they dare dispute it, these facts necessarily come from the manufacturers themselves) shows that of 6,601,071 motor vehicles shipped, 80.5 percent, or 5,314,841 left the factory by highway on a big truck that hauls several other cars, or towed behind another new car. Shipment by boat accounted for 5.6 percent, or 370,044 vehicles, while rail shipments accounted for only 13.9 percent. In other words, out of a total of 6,601,071 motor vehicles shipped, only 916,185 went by rail. The phantom freight charges have amounted annually to over $280 million.

Senator MONRONEY. You are reading from page 10 of your statement, and you have a typographical error. You say billion. I would suggest that be corrected on the prepared statement.

Mr. MULTER. Oh, yes. Thank you.

Now in the hope of foreclosing any action by this committee, the industry now is taking some action. They say they are not going to do it any more. At the same time they say that, they increase their prices. Now if they are not going to charge the phantom freight and the phantom freight was not giving them a complete return, why the need, when they take off the phantom freight, to push up the price to make up what they are not getting in the phantom freight?

Obviously the phantom freight was giving them a hidden profit, a profit—I am not saying they hid it from the income-tax authorities, but they certainly hid it from the public. They didn't want the public to know they were making not only a profit on the car and a profit on their parts, but also a profit on the delivery.

Senator MONRONEY. But if they can afford to sell a car without freight in Detroit or with a $5 or $10 delivery cost, then that is the price of the car, is it not?

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Senator MONRONEY. The freight component should be the component necessary to deliver that car from the Detroit factory or from another assembly point there. Then when they adjust their phantom freight, if they have a fair equitable price to their Detroit dealers, then should the price be adjusted upward as they move away from the phantom freight overcharge?

Mr. MULTER. No, I think that they should have a price which is a fair price which gives them a fair return for the item they are selling, for the vehicle they are selling, and they shouldn't be permitted to make any profit on anything else and they should collect only what the actual charge is, and the customer should pay only that. We can't stop them from raising their prices and making more profit; as legislators we can't. But if they boost the price unduly high and the public feels they are making profits they are not entitled to on a car, the public has a fine weapon.

They sit back and say: "We won't buy." But when the dealer delivers the car and says: "Here is your car; I am giving you a break and it is only costing you $50 or $100 over the cost to me from the factory, and the rest of this is actual cost"—and gives you an item for freight, I think the customer is entitled to know that he is not actually paying freight but he is paying freight plus, whether they call it a destination charge or a freight charge, they are still fooling the public when they try to collect as a charge a sum which is not in accordance with actual cost.

Senator MONRONEY. As you say, less than one-sixth of the cars shipped move by rail. Yet every time the Interstate Commerce

Commission gives one of its customary habitual freight increases to the railroads, the customer of an automobile gets clipped again for a 6-percent or an 8 or a 10-percent increase in freight when the freight is actually not running against the delivery of the car in fact.

Mr. MULTER. It is because we have permitted, or at least acquiesced, in the manufacturers' charging phantom freight, that General Motors and Ford wouldn't join with Chrysler in trying to get a reduced rail rate, and as I think you have indicated, they worked behind the scenes to see that the rate was not decreased.

Senator MONRONEY. To keep Detroit freight high.

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Senator MONRONEY. Although that was supposed to be the source of most cars. Contrary to most freight rate procedures, the greater the concentration of shipments out, the lower the rate. But they were enjoying lower freight rates out of their assembly plants for that distance than the big shipments were moving for out of Detroit. It is impossible to tell how many hundreds of millions of dollars were tacked on to the consumers' prices because of the maintenance of that high freight rate plateau for the movement of automobiles out of Detroit.

Mr. MULTER. You are absolutely right. No one can gainsay what you have said, Mr. Chairman. I believe, sir, that I have covered each of the recommendations that I sought to make to this committee. I hope that my testimony will be of some help to the committee.

If there are any other questions you care to address to me, I will try to answer them. I don't think I have all of the answers.

Senator MONRONEY. Permit the chairman to say that you are still the tireless worker in automobile and other little business problems that you were on Banking and Currency when we sat next to one another in the House.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MONRONEY. I appreciate the great help you have given this committee.

Senator THURMOND, do you have any questions?

Senator THURMOND. I don't believe so.

Senator MONRONEY. Senator PAYNE?

Senator PAYNE. No questions.

Senator MONRONEY. We appreciate very much your helpful interest in this.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 1956

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 13, 1956)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mercies, in a violent day swept by angry forces with which, unaided, we cannot cope, Thou only art our strength and refuge, amid mortal ills prevailing.

As citizens of a world that carries on its sagging shoulders problems of human relationships and burdens of suffering greater than humanity has ever borne, make us inwardly adequate to be Thy ministers of reconciliation.

In this day of crashing systems, save us from being prophets of gloom and of doom. As we peer at the fiery destruction of the old, may there be vouchsafed to us vistas of a richer, fairer earth to be.

Rising above all that is ignoble, teach us to work together in glad harmony for the honor, safety, and welfare of our Nation and of all peoples of this awakening earth who unite in mutual good will, determined to open the gates of life more abundantly for all mankind.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 13, 1956, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take up the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Kenneth K. Cowart, and sundry other officers, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the United States Coast Guard; and

Albert Larsen, Jr., and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment as ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. DUFF, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Donald P. McPherson, of Pennsylvania, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner, vice John Monroe Johnson.

By Mr. SMATHERS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Laurence Walrath, of Florida, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner, vice Martin Kelso Elliott, resigned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of David Brewer Karrick, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James E. Colliflower to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR McCLELLAN AT 2:30 P. M. TODAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at the request of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that, at 2:30 p. m. today, the senior Senator from Arkansas be recognized for 30 minutes, and that there be allocated to the minority leader, for use on his side of the aisle, an additional 30 minutes, notwithstanding the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the majority leader? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour, with a limitation of 2 minutes on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Operation and Maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration," for the fiscal year 1956, has been reapportioned on a basis

which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for "Readjustment Benefits" for the fiscal year 1956, had been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS

A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department on research and development contracts awarded during the period July 1 through December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK, WYO.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit in Yellowstone National Park, Wyo. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

GREAT LAKES FISHERY ACT OF 1956

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington, September 10, 1954, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the annual convention of National Sojourners, at El Paso, Tex., relating to the disbarment of attorneys disloyal to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the annual convention of National Sojourners, at El Paso, Tex., favoring denial of the use of the mails to communistic propaganda matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Resolutions adopted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at St. Louis, Mo., relating to the upper Colorado storage project, and so forth; to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at their annual meeting held in St. Louis, Mo., the last week of January of this year.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1956.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NIXON: At the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in St. Louis the last week of January 1956, a meeting attended by approximately 5,000 managers, directors, and other persons affiliated with our 929 member cooperatives and public power districts, a series of resolutions were passed calling upon the Congress for certain actions. A summary of these resolutions is attached, and copies of any full resolution are available upon request.

We are writing to you, however, to call to your attention the most urgent and important of the resolutions which relate to the work of the Congress, and we earnestly solicit immediate consideration be given to these requests. The page numbers following each comment below refer to the printed summary of the resolutions which is attached:

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association members urge that immediate attention be given to the following points:

1. The adoption of a capital budget for the Federal Government (p. 47).

2. Amendment of the internal revenue laws to prohibit the deduction of advertising costs from income before taxes, where such advertising is designed for purposes other than the legitimate promotion of sales and services (p. 48).

3. Urging the investigation of the Federal Power Commission for its handling of accelerated tax-amortization benefits (p. 47).

4. Urging the abolition of tax subsidies to utility companies (p. 47).

5. Urging passage of S. 2373 and H. R. 4445 (Jones bill), the TVA self-financing bills, and opposing all presently proposed amendments.

6. Urging transmission lines and integration of Federal power facilities in the Southeast (pp. 46–47).

7. Urging appropriation of necessary funds for construction and completion of all authorized multipurpose projects (p. 42).

8. That the Congress insist that the Department of the Interior follow committee instructions on the SPA contracts instead of following various evasive tactics injurious to the cooperatives (p. 46).

9. That we support the upper Colorado storage project provided that the Flaming Gorge Dam in Utah and Curecanti or some other power-producing dam in Colorado be included and that the authorization include the traditional preference clause and Government-owned transmission lines, as follows:

(1) Backbone transmission system connecting all the dams of the project;

(2) Lines to load centers within reasonable transmission distance of the dam and backbone grid; and

(3) Intertie lines, tying this project system to the Colorado-Big Thompson system and any other federally owned electric systems within reasonable tieline distance;

and otherwise oppose the authorization (p. 45).

10. That the Frying Pan-Arkansas project be authorized with preference and transmission lines to load centers of preference customers (p. 46).

11. That the Lehman-Davidson bill for development of Niagara be passed (p. 45).

12. That a Federal Hells Canyon project be authorized (p. 45).

13. That H. R. 6069 (Trimble bill) be passed to govern cost allocations of multiple-purpose projects (p. 42).

14. That Congress reject the proposals of the President's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy and instead authorize valley authorities similar to TVA (p. 42).

15. That Congress provide AEC with funds to enable rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, and public-utility districts to participate in the atomic-energy program (p. 44).

16. That Congress direct the REA to expand the rural telephone program (p. 48).

17. That Congress place a special counsel in charge of the investigation and prosecution of the Dixon-Yates case (p. 45).

18. That Congress launch a full-scale investigation of the private-power lobby's activities and expenditures (p. 47).

19. That Congress authorize and appropriate funds for from 6 to 10 full-scale atomic reactors to be owned and operated by the Federal Government as a yardstick and to hasten development (p. 44).

We would appreciate your attention to these recommendations and any comments you may have to make regarding them.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
General Manager.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 226. Resolution to print copies of the prayers by the Senate Chaplain; without amendment.

GEORGE JOSEPH VAUGHAN AND OTHERS

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 231) to pay a gratuity to George Joseph Vaughan and others, which was placed on the calendar:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to George Joseph Vaughan, brother of James Frederick Vaughan, an employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol at the time of his death, a sum equal to one-half of 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, and to Dudley J. Vaughan, Jr., Donald Vaughan, and George Vaughan, nephews of said James Frederick Vaughan, sums each equal to one-sixth of 6 months' compensation at the rate James Frederick Vaughan was receiving by law at the time of his death, all sums to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

EXTENSION OF TIME OF SENATE RESOLUTION 200, AGREED TO FEBRUARY 8, 1956—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution to extend the time of Senate Resolution 200, agreed to February 8, 1956, and submitted a report (No. 1661) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 232) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That section 1 of Senate Resolution 200, 84th Congress, 2d session, agreed to February 8, 1956 (authorizing an extension of time for investigation of welfare and pension plans by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare), is amended by striking out the date "March 15, 1956," and inserting in lieu thereof the date "April 15, 1956."

SEC. 2. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL WARNING SYSTEM—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed

Services, I report an original bill (S. 3452) to amend the act of July 15, 1955, Public Law 161, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 324), by increasing the appropriation authorization for the aircraft control and warning system, and I submit a report (No. 1660) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 3452) to amend the act of July 15, 1955, Public Law 161, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 324), by increasing the appropriation authorization for the aircraft control and warning system, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 3445. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a building for the United States Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3446. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide for optional retirement after 25 years of service, and so as to provide for corresponding adjustments in annuities of retired employees when salary adjustments are made for employees generally; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THYE (for himself, Mr. POTTER, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 3447. A bill to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington September 10, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 3448. A bill to amend sections 3526 and 3528 of the Revised Statutes relating to the coinage of subsidiary silver coins and minor coins of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 3449. A bill relating to the reinvestment by air carriers of the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 3450. A bill for the relief of Luigi Frione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3451. A bill for the relief of Ella Hoffmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 3452. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1955, Public Law 161, 84th Cong. (69 Stat. 324), by increasing the appropriation authorization for the aircraft control and warning system; placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he reported the above bill from the Committee on Armed Services, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to provide for the preservation of the historic Customhouse in Charleston, S. C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were reported, and placed on the calendar:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 231. Resolution to pay a gratuity to George Joseph Vaughan and others; and

S. Res. 232. Resolution to extend the time of Senate Resolution 200, agreed to February 8, 1956.

(See resolutions printed in full which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF INCREASES IN COFFEE PRICES

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 230) which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a study and investigation for the purpose of determining the reasons for the recent sharp increases in the price of coffee to American consumers and what legislative or other action may be taken for the purpose of assuring an adequate and stable supply of coffee to American consumers at a reasonable price. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, in no event later than June 30, 1956, the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDING FOR UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a building for the United States Court of Claims, and for other purposes. I call the bill to the attention of the distinguished minority leader, and express the hope that he will support it, and perhaps associate himself with me in an endeavor to have it passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3445) to provide for the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a building for the United States Court of Claims, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

GREAT LAKES FISHERY ACT OF 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to give effect to the Convention of Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington September 10, 1954, and ratified by the Senate on June 1, 1955.

Since other Members of the Senate may wish to join as cosponsors of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that it lie on the desk until the close of business next Friday so that Senators who may wish to add their names as cosponsors may do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 3447) to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington September 10, 1954, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THYE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the problem of the sea lamprey has developed into a serious one. The sea lamprey costs the United States and Canada upward of $5 million a year in the loss of valuable lake trout alone. Since it was first observed in the early 1930's in Lake Huron, the sea lamprey has destroyed the fisheries for trout and whitefish in Lake Huron and in Lake Michigan, and the increase in its number in Lake Superior seriously endangers the valuable fisheries there.

Present fishery research activities carried out by the United States and Canada, and by the eight Great Lakes States, as well as by the Province of Ontario, have been of great value in the effort to control and eventually eradicate the sea lamprey. However, invaluable and expedited work would result from the enactment of the bill I am introducing today which is designed specifically to promote and coordinate research activities on the sea lamprey.

With the enactment of this bill, a Commission is to be established composed of three members appointed by the respective Governments of the United States and Canada. The United States Commissioners are to be appointed by the President and will serve at his pleasure with no compensation for their services as such Commissioners. One Commissioner shall be an official of the United States Government, and two of the Commissioners shall be persons residing in the Great Lakes States who are duly qualified by reason of their knowledge of the fisheries of the Great Lakes.

The United States section of the Commission may appoint an advisory committee for each of the Great Lakes, the members of which shall be invited to attend all nonexecutive meetings of the United States section relating to that lake, and they shall be granted the opportunity to examine and to be heard on all proposed recommendations, programs, and activities relating to that lake. No more than four members of the advisory committee may represent each State bordering on the lake.

Mr. President, I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of early enactment of this legislation. Unless the predatory sea lamprey is eradicated, it will eventually destroy entirely the valuable food fishes such as trout and whitefish.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3447) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Great Lakes Fishery Act of 1956."

SEC. 2. As used in this act, the term—

(a) "Convention" means the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries between the United States of America and Canada signed at Washington September 10, 1954;

(b) "Commission" means the Great Lakes Fishery Commission provided for by article II of the Convention;

(c) "United States Section" means the United States Commissioners on the Commission;

(d) "Great Lakes State" means any of the following States: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, or Wisconsin;

(e) "Great Lake" means any of the following bodies of water: Lake Ontario (including the St. Lawrence River from Lake Ontario to the 45th parallel of latitude), Lake Erie, Lake Huron (including Lake St. Clair), Lake Michigan, or Lake Superior.

SEC. 3. The United States shall be represented on the Commission by three Commissioners to be appointed by the President, to serve as such during his pleasure, and to receive no compensation for their services as such Commissioners. Of such Commissioners—

(a) One shall be an official of the United States Government; and

(b) Two shall be persons residing in Great Lakes States, duly qualified by reason of knowledge of the fisheries of the Great Lakes: *Provided, however*, That the Commissioners appointed under this subsection shall not be residents of the same State.

SEC. 4. (a) The United States section may appoint an advisory committee for each of the Great Lakes, upon which committee each State bordering on the lake may be represented by not more than four members. In making such appointments, the United States section shall give due consideration to the interests of—

(1) State agencies having jurisdiction over fisheries;

(2) the commercial fishing industry of the lake;

(3) the sports fishing of the lake; and

(4) the public at large.

(b) A member of the advisory committee for one lake may also be a member of the advisory committee for one or more other lakes.

(c) The members of the advisory committees shall receive no compensation from the Government of the United States for their services as such members. Not more than five members of all the committees, designated by the committees and approved by the United States section, may be paid by the Government of the United States for transportation expenses and per diem incident to attendance at each meeting of the Commission or of the United States section.

(d) The members of the advisory committee for each lake shall be invited to attend all nonexecutive meetings of the United States section relating to that lake and at such meetings shall be granted opportunity to examine and be heard on all proposed recommendations, programs, and activities relating to that lake.

SEC. 5. Service of any individual appointed as a United States Commissioner pursuant to section 3 (b), or as a member of an advisory committee pursuant to section 4 (a), shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, and 434 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99) except insofar as such provisions of law may prohibit any such individual from acting or receiving compensation in respect to matters directly relating to the convention or this act.

SEC. 6. In order to carry out the obligations of the United States under the convention, the United States section is authorized:

(a) to acquire any real property, or any interest therein, by purchase, exchange, gift, dedication, condemnation, or otherwise;

(b) to construct, operate, and maintain any project or works designed to facilitate compliance with the provisions of the convention relating to the sea lamprey control program; and

(c) to enter into contract or agreement with any State or other public agency or private agency or individual for the construction, operation, or maintenance of any such project or works.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, upon the request of the United States section:

(a) to transfer to the United States section any lamprey control project or works under his jurisdiction now existing or now under construction; and

(b) to act for or on behalf of the United States section in the exercise of the powers granted by this act.

SEC. 8. The United States section shall, for the purposes of those provisions of title 28, United States Code, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure, relating to claims against the United States and tort claims procedure, be deemed to be an agency of the United States.

SEC. 9. At least 30 days before approving a proposal to utilize a lamprey control measure or install a device in any stream, the United States section shall cause notice of such proposal to be sent to the official agency having jurisdiction over fisheries in each of the States through which the stream flows.

SEC. 10. The Secretary of State shall upon the receipt from the Commission of any recommendation of a conservation measure made in accordance with article IV of the convention, transmit a copy of the recommendation with his comments thereon to the Governor of each Great Lakes State for consideration and such action as may be found to be appropriate. The Secretary of State shall also inform such other public agencies as he may deem appropriate.

SEC. 11. Any agency of the United States Government is authorized to cooperate with the United States section in the conduct of research programs and related activities and, on a reimbursable or other basis, to enter into agreements with the United States section for the purpose of assisting it in carrying out the program for the control of lamprey populations.

SEC. 12. Nothing in this act shall be construed as preventing any of the Great Lakes States from making or enforcing laws or regulations within their respective jurisdictions so far as such laws or regulations do not conflict with the convention or this act.

SEC. 13. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes and provisions of the convention and this act.

SEC. 14. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any circumstances or persons shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances or persons shall not be affected thereby.

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES, RELATING TO COINAGE OF SILVER AND MINOR COINS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend sections 3526 and 3528 of the Revised Statutes relating to the coinage of subsidiary silver coins and minor coins of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, requesting this proposed legislation, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3448) to amend sections 3526 and 3528 of the Revised Statutes relating to the coinage of subsidiary silver coins and minor coins of the United States, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

FEBRUARY 17, 1956.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill entitled "To amend sections 3526 and 3528 of the Revised Statutes relating to the coinage of subsidiary silver coins and minor coins of the United States."

The proposed legislation would (1) increase from $2 million to $3 million the so-called minor coinage metal fund, the revolving fund used for the purchase of metals needed for the manufacture of 1-cent and 5-cent coins; and (2) permit the use of the so-called silver profit fund for the purchase of copper alloy used in the coinage of the subsidiary silver coins.

The proposed legislation is made necessary because of the fluctuating demand for coins and because of increases in the cost of copper and other component metals. In view of this, the Treasury Department recommends the enactment of the proposed legislation. The attached memorandum sets forth in detail the Department's position on the need for the proposed legislation.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed legislation before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

DAVID W. KENDALL,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF A DRAFT BILL ENTITLED "TO AMEND SECTIONS 3526 AND 3528 OF THE REVISED STATUTES RELATING TO THE COINAGE OF SUBSIDIARY SILVER COINS AND MINOR COINS OF THE UNITED STATES"

Section 1 would amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 31, sec. 340) to increase from $2 million to $3 million the so-called minor-coinage metal fund, which is the revolving fund used for the purchase of metals needed for the manufacture of 1-cent and 5-cent coins. Section 2 of the proposed legislation would amend section 3526 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 31, sec. 335) to authorize the use of the silver-profit fund for the purchase of alloy copper used in the coinage of silver coins.

The proposed legislation is made necessary because of (1) the fluctuating demand for coins; and (2) increases in the cost of copper and other component metals.

The price of copper has increased considerably during recent years. Prior to World War II, copper cost about 12 cents per pound. After the war, the price began to rise, and by 1952 had reached 24 cents per pound; by 1954 the price was about 30 cents per pound; and during 1955, it was necessary for the mint to pay 50 cents per pound. During the same period, the cost of nickel,

zinc, and tin, which are also used in the coinage of the 1-cent and 5-cent coins, has also increased.

The experience of the mint indicates that the demand for coins changes drastically. The table below shows the fluctuations in coinage production for the fiscal years 1940 to 1955:

1940	768,090,830
1941	1,599,349,007
1942	2,114,890,662
1943	1,472,093,762
1944	2,578,640,270
1945	2,646,134,101
1946	1,658,127,100
1947	2,016,485,295
1948	802,922,066
1949	911,257,226
1950	497,271,759
1951	1,157,820,778
1952	1,551,096,448
1953	1,619,562,894
1954	1,451,654,402
1955	936,871,253

At the present time, the demand for coins is very heavy, particularly for 1-cent pieces, and approximately 683 million coins were produced during the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1956.

MINOR COINAGE METAL FUND

Section 1 of the proposed legislation would amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 31, sec. 340) to increase from $2 million to $3 million the so-called minor coinage metal fund which is the revolving fund used for the purchase of metals needed for the manufacture of 1-cent and 5-cent coins.

The minor coinage metal fund operates merely as a limitation upon the amount of cash which may be used for the purchase of metals for minor coinage. At the present time a $2 million limitation or checking credit, has been established and the fund operates on a revolving basis. For example, when $500,000 worth of copper is delivered to the mints, it is paid for by check, thus decreasing the checking credit and substituting in the accounts of the Treasury $500,000 worth of copper. In the Treasury accounts, the metal is carried as "cash," so that there is no change in the Treasury's balance. When the metal is formed into newly minted minor coins, the cost of the copper, $500,000, is redeposited, thereby replenishing the amount of the checking credit.

The amount of the minor coinage metal fund has been increased by Congress from time to time because of increases in the cost of copper. When section 3528 was originally enacted in 1873, the amount of the fund was $50,000. Subsequently, the amount was increased in 1906 to $200,000; in 1918 to $400,000; in 1937 to $600,000; in 1941 to $1 million; and in 1954 to $2 million. Section 1 of the draft bill which would further increase the amount of the fund, is made necessary by the continuing rise in the cost of copper and other component metals, as well as by changes in production methods and equipment which have been made in the manufacture of the minor coins. In 1954, the minor coinage metal fund was increased from $1 million to $2 million by the act of June 30, 1954 (ch. 427, 68 Stat. 336). Since that time, the price which the Bureau of the Mint has had to pay for copper has increased 67 percent; for nickel, 8 percent; for zinc, 29 percent; and for tin, 16 percent.

In 1954, the revolving fund of $2 million permitted the maintenance of a working inventory of approximately 6,896,552 pounds of copper, based on a cost of 29 cents per pound. At today's price of 50 cents per pound, the fund can maintain only an inventory of 4 million pounds of copper. The increase in the amount of the revolving fund is necessary so that the mint can maintain adequate inventories of the metals in order to meet a fluctuating demand for coins.

Changes in coinage manufacturing procedure in the mint also make it increasingly important that the minor coinage metal fund provide for an ample inventory of work in process. At the time of the previous increase in the the fund in 1954, there were two distinct types of equipment and operations in the mint service, as follows: (A) At the Denver Mint, all coinage materials were processed through two large rolling mills. In the event of a major breakdown in either of these mills, that mint would have to shut down all other coining processes unless an adequate supply of coinage blanks was on hand. (B) At the Philadelphia and San Francisco Mints, coinage materials were processed through a much larger number of small rolling mills. In the event of a major breakdown in one or more of these mills, no serious disruption to production would occur, as the work could be processed through the remaining mills. Therefore, it was not necessary to carry as large an inventory of work in process at those two plants as at the Denver Mint.

An equipment modernization program is now underway at the Philadelphia Mint which will greatly increase efficiency in coinage production at that plant. Upon completion of this program, all coinage materials at Philadelphia will be processed through three rolling mills. A breakdown in any one of these mills would seriously disrupt operations and provisions should be made for the carrying of a much larger work-in-process inventory at that location. (Coinage operations were discontinued at the San Francisco Mint in March 1955, and present plans call for no further production at that plant.)

SILVER PROFIT FUND

Section 2 of the proposed legislation would amend section 3526 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 31, sec. 335), to authorize the use of the silver profit fund for the purchase of alloy copper used in the coinage of silver coins.

Subsidiary silver coins of the United States include the 10-cent pieces, the 25-cent pieces and the 50-cent pieces. These coins are made of 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper. The silver used in these coins is purchased from the bullion fund, which was established by the Congress for the purpose of making payments for the deposits of gold and silver bullion (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 31, sec. 358), and the alloy copper is purchased with the annual appropriation of the Bureau of the Mint. Gains arising from the coinage of silver bullion are credited to the silver profit fund. Under existing law, the silver profit fund is charged with the wastage incurred in the coinage of subsidiary silver coins, with recoinage losses on silver coins and with the cost of distributing such coins. Other expenses relating to the manufacture of silver coins, including salaries, utilities, general supplies and materials, as well as the purchase of alloy copper are paid from the Bureau of the Mint's annual appropriation for salaries and expenses. Section 2 of the proposed legislation would authorize the use of the silver profit fund for the purchase of the copper alloy.

The enactment of section 2 would eliminate the severe strain which is often placed on the Bureau of the Mint's limited appropriation by changes in the coin demand and changes in the price of copper.

The major function of the Bureau of the Mint is to produce the coins which are required for the Nation's business transactions. As indicated above, the demand for coins is subject to extreme variations, and there have been many occasions during recent years when the mint did not have sufficient funds to produce all of the coins ordered by the Federal Reserve banks and branches. During periods of increased coin demand, it is necessary for the mint to purchase larger quantities of copper, from its operating appropriation, than had been anticipated in the appropriation requested for that period. Concomitantly, increased coinage demands require the diversion of all facilities for the production of extra coins and the hiring of temporary workers, thereby increasing the drain on the appropriation. Section 2, by permitting the purchase of copper from the silver profit fund, would allow the Bureau of the Mint more flexibility in connection with its problem of increasing production, since sufficient funds would be available for procurement of the required quantities of copper.

In view of the above, the Treasury Department urges the enactment of the proposed legislation.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LEHMAN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3139) to amend the public assistance and related provisions of the Social Security Act to provide separate matching of assistance expenditures for medical care, to provide gradually for equal matching of old-age assistance expenditures supplementing old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to make clear the purpose of encouraging States to provide assistance and services to help strengthen family life and to help needy families and individuals attain self-support or self-care, to assist in improving administration of public-assistance programs through research and training, to improve aid to dependent children, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

THE CYPRUS DILEMMA — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 13, 1956,

The names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] were added as additional cosponsors to the resolution (S. Res. 229) favoring self-rule by the people of Cyprus, submitted by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and other Senators) on March 13, 1956.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

Address delivered by him at the 71st meeting of the West Virginia Bar Association.

THE SUPREME COURT DECISION ON SEGREGATION — DECLARATION BY 19 SENATORS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, never before in my brief tenure in the Senate have I had occasion to be profoundly shocked by the actions of some of my colleagues. Defeats on certain legislative matters which I hold dear naturally have disturbed me, but I have recognized such defeats as an occasional result of parliamentary warfare.

But, Mr. President, the declaration of 19 Members of the United States Senate presented in this Chamber Monday is a matter so shameful that it will forever be a dark page in American history.

To fight for one's personal convictions in legislative debate; to argue one's position before the courts of this land; to disagree with the final outcome—is a basic right insured and guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

The use of the Senate by 19 Senators—many of whom I hold in the highest esteem—to proclaim and urge defiance of the decision of the Supreme Court in the public-school cases is an act that cries out for condemnation. This declaration may not be outright sedition, but it certainly is subversive in its intent to undermine the integrity of the judicial system of this Nation.

That the 19 Senators felt very strongly about their position to use the Senate chamber for a soundingboard for their prejudices—I have no doubt. But in the heat of their passion, I fear these Senators have begun a tunnel under the foundations of our Government. The ramifications of the move will go far beyond the question of segregation in public schools.

No amount of phrasing in this declaration—such as the pledge to use lawful means to reverse the Supreme Court decision—can dim the hatred and open defiance of law and order poorly hidden within. How will the people of these States react—when their representatives to the highest legislative body of this land set an example of this nature? These representatives cannot evade responsibility simply by inserting the phrase "lawful means" in their outrageous manifesto.

This document charges that the action of the Supreme Court is destroying amicable relations between the white and Negro races; that it is planting hatred and suspicion where there has been friendship and understanding. The Negro who is denied the right to vote; the Negro who is murdered by white men; the Negro who is barred from educational facilities because of the color of his skin—he understands the system, Mr. President, but he has no friendship. It is the system he seeks to destroy.

One of the Senators who put his name to this infamous declaration Monday said that a historic event had taken place in the Senate. He was right, Mr. President, but it was not the kind of history of which America can be proud.

SUGGESTED WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not to exceed 5 minutes in the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on March 12, during the course of the discussion in the Senate of the declaration on the segregation issue presented by several Senators, I proposed that the President of the United States should act in the constitutional crisis which is now in the process of developing in our Nation. I renew today my suggestion that the President call a White House conference to seek solutions of the issues of race relations raised by the decision of the United States Supreme Court, ruling that racial segregation in public schools violates the 14th amendment of our Constitution. Such a White House conference might be attended by Governors, Senators, Representatives, and other officials of the States which seek to perpetuate racial segregation in opposition to the ruling of the Supreme Court, as well as by other private community leaders drawn from the races which together constitute the American people.

The conference should go beyond the issue of segregation in public education to consider, also, the preservation of law and order and the protection of personal security and civil rights, which have been placed under great pressure by the strong feelings accompanying this issue.

Mr. President, I repeat what I told the Senate on March 12: This developing emergency in our democracy is so grave; it holds such danger to our country both at home and in the eyes of the world—there are hundreds of millions of people in the world whose skins are of colors other than white—that it is incumbent on the President to use the great resources of leadership inherent in his office to intervene to avoid this growing crisis before incalculable damage has been done. There have been White House conferences and similar meetings on far less important subjects, Mr. President. Can any issue demand the President's attention today more immediately and more urgently than the security and the civil rights of Americans, and the stature of our country as a true democracy in the eyes of the rest of the world?

PRESIDENT SHOULD APPOINT A COMMISSION AT ONCE

Moreover, Mr. President, there is another step the President can and should take at once, in addition to calling a White House conference on the immediate crisis. He should establish a commission on race relations and the constitutional rights of citizens of all races, whether they be the majority or a small and weak minority in the communities in which they live.

In his message on the state of the Union, President Eisenhower suggested to Congress the creation of a commission to investigate charges that colored citizens are being denied the right to vote and are being subjected to economic pressure. The President has the power to establish such a commission himself, at any time he really wants to do so. I urge the President to do so now, if he recognizes the gravity of the situation—which I believe to be plain to any responsible observer.

The terms of reference of such a commission need not be limited exclusively to the alleged violation of Negro rights, as the President suggested in his message on the state of the Union. They might well be broadened to give the commission freedom to range over the entire complex range of problems which necessarily arise in the course of the present historic adjustment to full democracy and individual equality, which we must achieve in the years immediately ahead.

Presidents in recent years have frequently appointed commissions for many different tasks of public concern—some large, some minor, but none more urgent than the one today involving civil rights and law and order, which calls for action now.

Let me cite only a few characteristic examples. President Truman created, by Executive orders, the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation, in 1951; and, in 1952, the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization. Earlier, he had set up, by letters, his Commission Higher Education, and the President's Materials Policy Commission. Most directly to the point, Mr. President, are two committees set up by President Truman by Executive orders to inquire into race relations: The President's Committee on Civil Rights, in 1946; and the President's Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Forces, in 1948.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER HAS APPOINTED OTHER COMMISSIONS

Instead of acting himself to forestall the present crisis, or to exercise leadership toward its solution, President Eisenhower has only sent his brief request to Congress to create a commission. Yet this is not because of any doubt on the President's part that he has the authority to act. President Eisenhower himself has used Presidential commissions when he has thought that a problem really deserved Executive study and action. Thus, we have had an Executive order, by President Eisenhower, creating the President's Water Resources Policy Commission; an Executive order for an Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs; a President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program; and a President's Committee on Veterans' Pensions.

I believe it is time for the President to act in the field of race segregation and civil rights. Surely no one can maintain that housing or roads or veterans' pensions or water policy—and no one is more conscious than the junior Senator from Oregon of the importance of our water-resources policy—are more urgent than the great constitutional controversy over the right of Americans not to be segregated by the color of their skins. This issue of the absolute equality of Americans of all races, under our laws, goes to the very heart of our democratic principles. That is what the great American experiment is all about, Mr. President. In our own lifetime, as events are developing around us, we can see that this issue is vital to the role of our Nation in world history.

Mr. President, President Eisenhower should both call a White House conference and create a Presidential commission in the area of race relations. There need be no unnecessary overlapping between the two. An immediate White House conference, attended by responsible leaders from the communities most

concerned with the present threat of danger to personal security could certainly help to reverse the apparent trend toward greater and greater intemperance in expression and action on race matters on both sides. It could seek means of reassuring the Nation that the authority of all of its legal institutions will be directed at the protection of the rights of every citizen, and that none shall be a victim of tacit lawlessness.

A commission, on the other hand, is needed for a longer-range study—by qualified private individuals not themselves responsible for immediate governmental decisions—of the problems accompanying adjustment to the end of racial segregation in this country. These problems will be with us for years to come, Mr. President. We all know and realize that segregation will not disappear overnight. The process of change will be difficult and will call for understanding on both sides. It will have to be a matter of continuous study and attention at every level of social responsibility. The sooner we start to organize this kind of study and give attention to it, the better. I hope President Eisenhower will use the great prestige of his high office at once toward leading the Nation in organizing this great effort to meet the developing crisis.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD an editorial dealing with this problem, entitled "Stop a Fire Before It Starts," from the Christian Science Monitor of February 29, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOP A FIRE BEFORE IT STARTS

Make no mistake; positions on the segregation issue are hardening, tensions are rising, temperatures are going up. The trouble at the moment centers in the Deep South, in the State of Alabama in the cities of Tuscaloosa and Montgomery. But rising tensions widen excitement. Higher temperatures can cause combustion. And fires spread.

For these reasons what Governor Folsom has proposed for Alabama and Adlai Stevenson has urged for the entire Nation bring notes of sanity into a situation fast becoming far too emotional. They both propose biracial commissions, that for Alabama to be appointed presumably by Governor Folsom himself. And Mr. Stevenson calls on President Eisenhower to name one for the whole country.

Such steps should receive the strongest possible support from every thinking person.

What might such commissions accomplish in today's situation? Study commissions are sometimes set up as devices to postpone definitive action. But these should not be primarily study commissions. They should provide concentrations of leadership for both races toward reasonable thinking, toward cooling tempers, and away from bitter resentments and frantic fears.

Some observers have asked whether there is time or room for compromise between hostile positions already so far advanced. There is more room but perhaps less time than one might think. Compromise, however, may not be the first business. The first necessity may be to agree to disagree for the time being.

Important as may be full abolition of segregation to some Negroes, as complete preservation of separateness may be to some whites, there is a greater value, greater to everyone, at stake. That is the unity of these United States and of the people who dwell within them.

The two races, now with some 144 million whites and 16 million Negroes, will have to continue living side by side, in North and South alike, for time out of mind. Are they going to live in peace and friendliness or in conflict and bitterness? Not so much how the segregation issue is finally worked out as how that working out is approached is likely to form the answer.

Respected and trusted commissions might do much to persuade the leadership of both races to compromise not on principles but on pressures, and that to push temporary advantages and win local skirmishes could lose for each the goals it seeks.

Those goals are no longer white supremacy in the sense some whites have meant nor racial integration as, no doubt, some Negroes have defined it. The goal for all is a modus vivendi in which races and individuals are neither kept apart nor forced together by law—in which voluntary association and disassociation both are given the freest play.

PROPOSED RECOGNITION BY THE UNITED NATIONS OF THE RED COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT OF CHINA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, some of us who are deeply interested in the future of the Far East have been very much perturbed by rumors that seem to be persistent. Those rumors are that at the next meeting of the Assembly of the United Nations there will be a strong movement, which has a chance of success, of recognizing the Red Communist Government of China as the representative of the Republic of China in the United Nations. This move would displace the Nationalist Government, now headquartered on Formosa, as the representative of the Republic of China. This has given some of us so much concern that we have felt it important to get the facts before the people of the United States, in order to make the situation clear and develop the support of public opinion before the matter comes up in the General Assembly.

In this connection, I recently made a broadcast on this subject, along with other Members of the House and Senate, and also some public-spirited citizens. These broadcasts were duly recorded and will subsequently be used on radios throughout the country.

Mr. President, because of the importance of the subject, I ask unanimous consent that the broadcast which I made last week be published in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROADCAST BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Ladies and gentlemen, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, and also the ranking Republican member of the Far Eastern Subcommittee, I am gravely concerned over a situation which will probably arise at the next session of the U. N. Assembly. The situation involves a proposal to unseat the Nationalist Government of China as representing the Republic of China in the U. N., and to substitute the credentials of the Red Communist Government in Peiping.

We cannot separate this vital issue from the general situation in Asia and from the menace of Russian communism throughout this entire area of the world. From my numerous visits to the Far East since the close of World War II, I have become aware of the causes of the turmoil there. All Asian countries, and especially the two key nations, China and India, are in turmoil because of the yearnings for freedom, independence and self-determination which all these countries properly share. There is definitely a revolt against colonialism and imperialism in any form, and especially a revolt against exploitation of these weaker nations by some of the stronger nations of the West.

We in the United States are neither imperialists, nor colonialists, and we are dedicated to a policy of aiding all countries to obtain freedom, independence, and self-determination to the extent that they are prepared to take over those responsibilities.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Chinese people today under the Red Communist leadership that dominates them, are a conquered people, and are living in terror on the one hand, but yet hope on the other hand, that they may yet find independence and be really free to govern themselves. They have resented external controls in the past, and yet now they do not fully realize that the present control over their lives and their future is the result of conquest by the Kremlin in Moscow—the foundations for which were laid a quarter of a century ago. These fine Chinese people with whom the United States has been on such close friendly terms in the past, are now being alienated from our concept of liberty and freedom by a hostile propaganda that is endeavoring to destroy the real love the Chinese people have had for us.

I am one of those who is definitely of the opinion that no compromise can possibly be made with a Red Communist Government in Peking while that Government is a part and parcel of the Kremlin's worldwide program to take over the peoples of the world. It is my strong conviction, therefore, that we must continue to have as one foundation of our foreign policy the ultimate freedom and independence of this Asian area. The key to that freedom and independence is a free and independent China. Any compromise with this principle will simply entrench the diabolical form of colonialism under which the hundreds of millions of Chinese people are now suffering. And let me note here that the importance of Chinese freedom from external controls has been fundamental in our American foreign policy since early in the 19th century. It was typified by the so-called open-door policy of Secretary Hay; by the doctrine of nonrecognition of occupation by a foreign power as laid down by Secretary Stimson; and in the reiteration of this later principle again in the middle thirties by Secretary Hull. There could be no worse time to abandon this historical policy than the present moment, and this policy is definitely involved in the proposal to admit to the U. N. the Red Communist Government of Peking.

Despite repeated declarations by two Presidents against the admission of Communist China to the United Nations; despite unanimous resolutions by both Houses of two successive Congresses to the same effect; in the face of continued Communist defiance of the United Nations itself, today the Red leaders are nearer than ever to their goal—namely, the control of Formosa and other strategic areas as steps in the conquest of Asia. To achieve this goal they know they must be given a place in the United Nations to build up their prestige in Asia and to frustrate permanently the U. N.'s ability to rally the public opinion of the free world in the fight for a just peace.

It is now clear that the Communists took advantage of the armistice in Korea to increase their attack on Indochina, and so win a great victory there. It is equally clear that they hope to take advantage of the armistice in Indochina to win a still greater victory in Formosa.

The President and Congress have reacted to this new challenge with firmness, making clear both their desire for peace and their refusal to be intimidated. Unhappily, however, the same cannot be said of some of the governments of other free nations, nor of some of the leaders of American opinion. Despite the Peking Government's indefensible defiance of the United Nations, influential voices are raised urging further negotiations outside the U. N., on the model of the Geneva Conference which resulted in the partition of Indochina. The ultimate hope of those who favor this kind of negotiation is to conciliate the Chinese Communists by admitting them to the United Nations, an aim which is more and more openly expressed. Such appeasement, under the guise of negotiation, can never preserve the peace, nor ultimately establish a free and independent China.

Our country has been involved in talks on the ambassadorial level with the Chinese Communists in Geneva since August 1, 1955. We entered these talks because of the pressures exerted by some of our allies overseas and because we in this country maintain a belief that discussions with the Communists should be held if there is any hope that they may prove productive. We also entered into such negotiations as one means of trying to free Americans, held and tortured in Red Chinese prisons and, in a larger sense, because our Nation as I have stated is dedicated to leaving no stone unturned which might lead the way to peace.

What has been the result of over 6 months' negotiations with the Chinese Communists in Geneva? After 37 meetings, and over 100 hours of talk, only 25 Americans have been released. There is definite knowledge that 13 Americans are still in Red China's prisons and hundreds of other American citizens are unaccounted for. In spite of the Chinese Communist pledge made on September 10, 1955, that they would free all Americans in China—a statement which was given worldwide publicity favorable to the Peking regime—we still find our fellow citizens incarcerated in the prisons of mainland China.

The bad faith displayed by the Peking regime in their talks with the United States at Geneva are still another indication of their inadmissibility to the United Nations.

The Chinese Communists have never observed, or even paid lipservice to, the U. N. Charter provision respecting the obligations of all nations to preserve peace and to fulfill their international agreements. The Peking Communist regime has sacrificed whatever integrity it might have had as a legitimate government by refusing to honor its signature at Panmunjon to release all the thousands of U. N. prisoners of war. The Chinese Communist regime has violated its commitment not to build up its armies or air force in Korea. The Communists have broken a similar pledge, made at Geneva, not to enlarge their forces in Vietnam, and their promise to allow all who wish freely to leave North Vietnam for the South.

Communist China is now openly and officially fostering the international drug traffic, which is used as a weapon to weaken the free world and to finance subversive international Communist activities in all the nations of the world. The United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs has a complete dossier of facts proving that the international drug traffic is directed by the highest government sources in Peking.

These are only the latest Chinese Communist acts of perfidy—acts which have followed their direct and indirect aggression in Korea, Indochina, Malaya, and Tibet. At the very time when the U. N. is urged to admit the Peking leaders, they are giving new proofs of why they cannot be admitted without tearing up the charter. For the charter specifically authorizes admission only of "peace-loving nations" whose record shows that they are prepared to fulfill their international obligations.

If the Chinese Communist aggressors are rewarded by having the Red Government of Peking obtain recognition by the U. N. as representing the Republic of China, and if our ally of many years, the Republic of China, is deposed, two things are certain:

1. Aggression in the Far East as evidenced in Korea and Indochina, and the threats in other areas, will certainly continue at an accelerated pace.

2. But in addition to this danger of renewed aggression by the Communists, both Russian and Chinese, we would be faced with the defection of other free nations that are watching which way the situation is going to move. It would be a sign that we have yielded to the pressures and have encouraged the buildup of those forces in Asia which will be in a position to compel the submission of other countries in the area. The concept of inevitability of Communist triumph will have been strengthened.

How can our policy of a free and independent China, and a free and independent Asia, be continued and made effective in any part of that vast area if we bow now to the demands of the Chinese Communists for admission to the U. N.?

What nation in the area will be able to remain free if its people have before them the specter of the fate of the Free Chinese who, for 14 years, fought both alone and with us against Japanese aggression, who placed their trust in us and in the United Nations, and who, in their hour of peril, were let down?

China today is a conquered country, and in my judgment if we recognize Red China and admit her to the United Nations we accept, finally, this conquest. The United States can never do this either morally or strategically. The immorality of recognizing a regime which has killed our boys fighting its aggression in Korea and which has enslaved its own people would be repugnant to all Americans. Strategically, Communist control of Asia—which could result from the recognition of the Communist power on mainland China—would place us in an impossible position and create great danger to our Nation. Our Pacific defenses, upon which we place so much faith, would be relatively useless. All that we would have between California and Communist aggression would be open water.

No country of Asia has chosen communism voluntarily. But Asia is in considerable danger of going Communist involuntarily, as I have indicated.

Who can blame the small and relatively weak nations if, under these circumstances, they accept whatever terms are offered them by the Reds?

In this broadcast I have endeavored to point out the critical issues that are involved in the movement to recognize the Red Chinese regime in Peking. It is vitally important that the American people see the danger and the threat not only to the security of the United States, but very definitely to the future peace of the world. I repeat again that the yearning for freedom, independence, and self-determination by the peoples of Asia must be recognized and that we must less we stand firm and continue that assist-assist any nation which desires our assistance in attaining these goals. We must face up to the danger that these masses may be brought under Communist domination, unance. The future safety of the world and a lasting peace depend on a free and independent Asia, and this in turn depends on a free and independent China. China can never be free and independent so long as the tragic Communist control dictated by the Kremlin in Moscow, has its hand on the throats of the freedom-loving Chinese. This issue is a challenge to our United States of America. We simply cannot fail the world in this crisis.

BACKFIRE OF THE AL SARENA CASE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, last fall, with a great braying, the Democrats entered into an investigation which was dubbed immediately "the Al Sarena case." Day after day this useless attempt to smear Secretary McKay and the present administration went through the inept motions of a case already lost. Many days have passed since the curtain came down on this sad play; but those who promoted it have not as yet made a report. I doubt that they will, Mr. President, after realizing that out of the investigation came only a reflection on their own administration's policy of putting the man above the law.

The investigation, which started with a great bray, now ends with a heehaw, with the donkey beating—as the News-Review, of Roseburg, Oreg., says—a "hasty retreat."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the editorial from the News-Review, of Roseburg, Oreg.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HASTY RETREAT

(By Charles V. Stanton)

The backfire surrounding the Al Sarena case seems to be getting out of control.

Democratic politicians apparently were sold an idea that they had a burning issue in this Oregon mining case. They started a great fire, expecting to smoke out Secretary of the Interior McKay and to scorch Congressman HARRIS ELLSWORTH.

But now the backfire is threatening to make things hot for the originators of the scheme.

Columnist Drew Pearson, who was charged with a scurrilous lie by White House Press Secretary Hagerty, when Pearson's column reported President Eisenhower had endorsed a letter to "Dear Doug" urging action on the Al Sarena case, now admits publicly that he was misinformed.

Senator NEUBERGER, prime instigator of the issue, tacitly surrenders, but mutters in his beard about "whitewash" and the failure of the company to operate its mines, instead of selling timber obtained through the patent.

It is true that there has been much abuse of the mining laws. But the mining laws, at the time patent was sought on the Al Sarena claims, made no mention of timber. Although attempts have frequently been made in past years to amend the laws and protect the Government's interest in surface rights, no change was obtained until Congressman ELLSWORTH and others succeeded in getting the amendment through the last Congress.

ISSUE WIDELY REPORTED

Consequently the Al Sarena case hung on proof of mineralization. Under the previous administration, the agencies disregarded the law and set up their own variable rules and regulations. The owners of the property were stalled off for several years in trying to get their patent and were subjected to heavy expense. Under the new administration, an impartial examination was made to

determine whether the property was mineralized. When this examination, which corresponded closely with former proofs submitted by the company, was reported, the patent was granted.

Politicians opposing the administration apparently were led to believe they could put a fire under Republican leadership by creating in the public mind a belief that the administration had engaged in a scandalous giveaway.

They schemed to take affirmative testimony during hearings in the Pacific Northwest, where thorough press coverage would be given, while rebuttal testimony would be taken in Washington. As press wires out of Washington carry a large volume of news, it was expected that the committee hearing would receive little attention, and people wouldn't hear the other side of the argument.

The issue, however, was quite thoroughly covered by the press. People learned the facts. Newspaper readers, writing letters to editors, are asking questions. Some of these questions are: Why did the committee duck so quickly when a former Federal employee admitted he had offered to clear the case through the Bureau of Land Management—for a fee? Why was the committee so reluctant to ascertain and expose the source of Columnist Drew Pearson's misinformation? What happened to assay reports and proof of mineralization filed by the mine owners prior to patent application?

ABUSE OF POWER

The investigation came to a quick end when the truth began to emerge from the political smokescreen. When it appeared that the public was to learn the true facts, the committee, which was so all-fired anxious to "expose" the scandal in Al Sarena, started scuttling into its shell, like a scared crab.

Congress is vested with authority to make investigations into all activities of government for the purpose of determining if legislation is needed. This is a valuable and important power. It should be carefully preserved and exercised.

In late years, however, we have seen these investigative powers flagrantly abused. They have been used for political jockeying in direct violation of the spirit of the laws granting investigative privilege.

The committee, which made mockery of congressional privilege in the Al Sarena case, still has responsibility for a report on the functioning of Federal agencies handling publicly owned timber in the Pacific Northwest. This is a report which could mean much to the economy of this area. It is indeed to be hoped that the committee takes a more responsible approach to its timber decisions than was shown in the Al Sarena fiasco.

SENATOR THURMOND, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have expressed their high regard for the able and distinguished Senator from South Carolina, STROM THURMOND. I do so with the most sincere appreciation of his patriotic Americanism, his brilliant career as a soldier, and his constructive statesmanship.

While we have not always agreed in our approach to the problems that have come before us, I have always been deeply impressed by his outstanding ability, his unfailing devotion to the public interest, and his loyalty to the principles for which he fights so courageously.

It has been my good fortune to be associated with Senator THURMOND on the Public Works Committee, and I cannot praise too highly his unselfish concept of public service that is not restricted by sectional limitations, but advances the welfare of the whole country.

Senator THURMOND works with all his splendid qualities of heart and mind to build the defensive strength and power of the United States. His stand for a strong America embraces not military strength alone, but also economic strength and a higher level of spiritual and cultural strength.

He is a dynamic leader in military affairs. He holds the rank of brigadier-general in the Army Reserve, and has served as president of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

He is an active participant in a long list of organizations dedicated to civic, philanthropic, educational, and patriotic purposes.

The many honors that have been bestowed upon him by the people of his native State are richly deserved. They reflect a proud career of achievement in civilian life, as well as a proud record of honor and distinction in defense of our country on the battlefield.

As an old soldier, I can recall with the highest admiration his service in World War II, when he stepped down from the circuit court bench to volunteer for active duty. From our own country and from our allies he received numerous decorations for extraordinary heroism and outstanding performance of duty in action against the enemy.

I am sure I voice the sentiments of every Member of the Senate when I say to our good friend and colleague that the announcement of his resignation, while not unexpected, brings us a feeling of sadness.

We wish him well. Our kindest thoughts will be with him as he goes back to South Carolina, which he so dearly loves.

EFFECT OF TITANIUM PRODUCTION ON DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN PLANES AND MISSILES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on August 19, 1955, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs issued a staff study on the progress of the titanium industry in the United States, a matter of the gravest import to our military airplane and guided-missile program. The Office of Defense Mobilization has set a target of 22,500 tons production of this vital metal for 1958, and the estimated production for 1956 is around 14,000 tons. There is an unconfirmed newspaper report that Russian production of titanium is 95,000 tons per year.

I consider Maj. Alexander de Seversky an outstanding authority on airpower; and I wrote to him, asking whether, in his opinion, the low target set by the Office of Defense Mobilization for titanium production is inhibiting its being designed into future American planes and missiles. Major de Seversky has not yet answered that question. He replied, "The question you raised may prove to be so crucial to our aeronautical leadership that I felt I should give the matter full study before sending you my views."

However, Mr. President, I consider the information in the reply by Major de Seversky to be so vital to our national defense that I ask unanimous consent to have his letter of March 7, 1956, together with attachments referred to in the letter, printed in the RECORD, following these remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 7, 1956.*

The Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: More than a year ago, on February 7, 1955, I mailed you an article, published December 12, 1954, in which I had warned the American people that "powerful Soviet long-range jet bombers—the T-37's—are being delivered to the Russian Air Force," and that we "must be aware that 'the great deterrent'—our atomic superiority—is passing into enemy hands, not because of the enemy's increasing stockpile of nuclear weapons but because he is acquiring superior means of delivery. Unless we make a supreme effort, we are doomed. Just run-of-the-mill research and development is not enough."

Last September, I addressed another message to my fellow citizens, via an article, published in This Week magazine, entitled "Don't Let Censorship Destroy Us." Though this publication has a circulation approaching 12 million and is distributed in 35 cities throughout the Nation, since the article appeared while Congress was in recess, it is quite possible that it escaped your attention at the time. However, because its contents have lost none of their original timeliness in the intervening months, I am enclosing a copy of that article for your reference.

In it, I state that "the whole military philosophy must be changed, or we shall forever trail the rest of the world, not only in conventional aircraft, but in intercontinental ballistic missiles." No such changes were made, and we are now faced with the alarming fact of Russia's emergence as a leader in intercontinental bomber and ballistic missile development.

To a student of the politico-military art, the consequences of the accelerated rate of enemy technological progress were clearly foreseeable. Thus I was able to warn, over a year ago, that " 'the great deterrent' * * * is passing into enemy hands." Today, that frightful prospect has become a reality, for with supersonic jet aircraft, even unaugmented by ballistic missiles, Russia can neutralize simultaneously all of our NATO and overseas chain of airbases and by such action emasculate the retaliatory power of our strategic air command.

As a result, the tables are now being turned. Unless we make a superhuman effort to regain technological leadership, it is Russia that will have the deterrent force. It is the Communists who will possess the power of persuasion over the free world through the threat of massive retaliation, should our foreign policy be contrary to their liking.

In spite of this drastic readjustment in the power relations between the United States and the U. S. S. R. during 1955, Secretary of Defense Wilson, commenting on the 1957 military budget, found it possible to state that, "Nothing has occurred in the international situation during the past year which would indicate the necessity for any major change in these policies and concepts."

Similarly unrealistic, in my opinion, is Secretary of State Dulles' recent contention, before a congressional committee, that the Soviet policy has failed and "today they are trying to figure out how they are going to get a better one." In actuality, however, Communist policy not only has not failed but has made fantastic progress, primarily through the default and errors of the Western Powers. Soviet leaders can now

afford to make internal and foreign policy changes and relax their iron grip on their people and satellites, since obedience through intimidation is being replaced by willing cooperation through healthy respect for Russia's rising industrial and military power vis-a-vis the free world. Because of this growing strength of the U. S. S. R., the nations of the world no longer know exactly on whose bandwagon it is more profitable to climb; and no amount of economic help alone can influence their decision.

As I explained in the enclosed article, the American people must be made aware of "the shocking condition of our national security." An immediate, full-scale debate on our defense and foreign policies is imperative if we are to meet the peril that faces us. Only through such debate can the citizenry effect the fundamental policy change that are essential to our national survival.

Very sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER P. DE SEVERSKY.

P. S.—Please forgive me for not yet answering your letter of February 17. However, the question you raised may prove to be so crucial to our aeronautical leadership that I felt I should give the matter full study before sending you my views. As it happened, in the interim I was asked to deliver a rather important lecture before the Air War College, the preparation of which taxed all my available time. I assure you that you will hear from me very shortly.

A. P. DE S.

DON'T LET CENSORSHIP DESTROY US!

(By Alexander P. de Seversky)

Question: Today's question comes from Mary Alice Applegate, of Glendale, Calif., and is in two parts:

First: "Major de Seversky, do you think the American people are being given a true picture of the relative strength of United States and Soviet air power?"

Second: "Does talking about our defense weaknesses make us stronger or weaker? Does it help us see how we can protect ourselves, or does it give valuable information to potential enemies?"

Answer: As to the first question, I am sorry to say the answer is an emphatic "No."

The true facts of our military position are being hidden from the American people. Whether by accident, thoughtlessness or design, we are being misled. As the enemy forges ahead with superior weapons, we witness an all-too-human tendency on the part of our officialdom to clamp down the lid of censorship, and divert public attention to other, pleasanter subjects.

For example, on July 7, at the height of the national consternation over the sudden revelation of Russia's recent leap to air superiority, a month-old confidential statement of Secretary of State Dulles before a congressional committee was resurrected and adroitly released to the press. The headlines on that day read, "Dulles Says Red System on Point of Collapse." It worked. America relaxed. Who's afraid of the big Red planes?

GRIM TRUTH

Such tactics are often rationalized in official circles as a safeguard to protect public morale. This is nonsense. The morale of the American people is at its height in the face of adversity. At such times, they are spurred to united and vigorous action, provided they know the facts and understand the predicament.

What, then, are the facts?

The grim truth is that the recent development of Russia's air might has, qualitatively, pushed America back to the position of a third-rate air-power nation. In size, too, our Air Force is trailing Russia's. We have now lost our once-vaunted capacity for "massive retaliation" by atomic air offensive. As this was the one and only bar to Soviet aggression, our country now lives prostrate and vulnerable to enemy attack.

I realize that these are frightening statements. But they are facts which no one should dare to hide from the American people. Here is some of the evidence on which they are based:

1. Intercontinental bombers: Most dramatic of the Soviet revelations at the recent Moscow air show was the new T-37 intercontinental jet bomber, the "Bison." The Soviet Bisons are true intercontinental bombers equipped with powerful "bypass" jet engines of revolutionary design which we failed to produce. They can attack the entire northern belt of the United States—Detroit, Pittsburgh, Chicago—directly from Siberian bases, and return without refueling. From data available, there is no doubt in my mind that this bomber—already operational with the Russian Air Force—is superior to anything we have in production.

Both our current operational model of the medium-range B-47 and the somewhat longer range B-52, on order for the Air Force, are dependent on either intermediary bases or cumbersome inflight refueling to reach the enemy targets.

Russia's air force, free from dependence on stepping-stone bases, can strike at us with "frightful surprise," whereas our intentions would be revealed to the enemy in advance as we poise our planes on overseas bases for attack.

2. Supersonic fighters: The second Russian surprise was a flock of supersonic fighter aircraft, excelling in performance our present service models.

These fighters cannot only defend their home skies by knocking out our current poorly armed bombers like so many clay pigeons but, striking with nuclear weapons, they can pick off our air bases on the Eurasian continent like so many sitting ducks.

3. Turboprop bombers: The third item if great significance at the Soviet air demonstration was a mass flight of turboprop bombers. Today, and for several years to come, this type can be regarded as the most efficient aircraft from the point of view of fuel consumption. It can carry the heaviest loads and achieve the greatest range. These new Soviet turboprop bombers can reach even farther than the Bison and strike at the very heart of our country.

WE MISSED THE BOAT

We in America have no such aircraft in service, because we could not get delivery on such engines. Our great industrial Nation completely missed the boat on that score, both militarily and commercially. American turboprop engines—only now beginning to come off the production line in limited, test quantities—have not yet been service-proven. United States airlines that want to use American-built turboprop planes are turning to England for engines. At best it will be 1957 before our own planes are in operation, while British airlines have already been flying turboprop aircraft for more than 2 years all over the world.

It may well come as a shock to many Americans, encouraged as we are to believe in our technological leadership, to learn that America thus lags behind both Russia and England in aeronautical development.

But I am not alone in this pessimistic opinion. In its August issue, "Flying," a magazine which is dedicated to the interests of aviation, describes Russia's newly revealed aircraft and comes to this significant conclusion:

"Only two vital advantages remain to American air supremacy—a proven skill to wage strategic air war, and a superior supply of hydrogen warheads."

Since a "superior supply of hydrogen warheads" is of little value without superior means of delivery, the fact is that only the skill of our airmen and their devotion to duty stand between us and the potential enemy. For a country of our vast industrial resources, the whole affair is tantamount to a national scandal.

That we are today outclassed in intercontinental air capabilities is not an accident. And that the full facts have been kept from us is perhaps understandable. It is the result of the stubborn adherence of our military leadership to "last-war thinking"—that is, to strategic methods and concepts valid in the last war but utterly obsolete today. In World War II a system of intermediary bases was necessary. But today, aircraft of intercontinental range exist.

Here Russia had an advantage, for with no inventory of overseas bases left from the last war it was intellectually free to develop a truly intercontinental air wallop. With singleminded purpose it concentrated its effort to bring such a force into being, and, as the recent Moscow air show demonstrated, it has succeeded.

Thus we are on the brink of total bankruptcy of the concept of "strategic-air-offensive-via-bases," which means that our huge inventory of limited-range aircraft to implement such strategy is useless and that billions of dollars spent on those aircraft and their overseas bases will now have to be written off as a total loss.

PUBLIC NEEDS FACTS

All this is a grim picture. But even this picture need not be hopeless—if the people and the Congress are given the facts so that we can correct our defense policy while there is still time.

But are we being given the facts? The best answer to that is to consider the recent Defense Department ruling sharply limiting the issuance of information. Under the new decree, information, to be released, must not only pass security rules, but also make a "constructive contribution" to the Defense Department's mission.

Representative FRANK E. SMITH spotlighted the danger of this policy when he said: "We will be in grave danger, however, if we allow restrictions and censorship * * * to cover up the mistakes and shortcomings of the people who administer the vast operations of our Government."

Representative JOHN E. MOSS echoed this thought when he expressed his belief that some Federal agencies are inclined to withhold information "to avoid criticism rather than for reasons of national safety."

FORESEES CENSORSHIP

In 1950, in my book, Air Power: Key to Survival. I warned the American people that such censorship might come about. "The terrific strains of modern total war," I predicted, "will bring censorships and regimentations beyond any we have known in the past. The kind of democratic criticism which in the last war forced vital revisions in the midst of the conflict may be curtailed. Those in command of erroneous strategy may proceed to carry it out to the bitter end."

For all the "sweet talk" that now abounds, it is my opinion that we are already in the beginning stages of a total war between two irreconcilable ideologies.

As the fallacy of our current strategy becomes apparent, and exposes the failings of our military planners, it is not surprising if they seek to keep the embarrassing facts from the American people.

THE LAST TO KNOW

That, I believe, is why the recent details of enemy air strength, released so widely abroad, were so hard to pry from the Pentagon.

As a result, says Robert Hotz, editor of Aviation Week, "only the American people remain in the dark, and it is apparently Defense Department policy to keep them there."

But withholding or supressing information is not the only danger. Equally great is the danger of presenting information in

such a way that the public receives a totally false impression.

A frightening example of what I mean are the recent descriptions, based on Defense Department sources of the Department's new tactics for limited warfare, stating that from now on it is possible to conduct little atomic wars in far corners of the globe.

Such little wars, it is claimed, would be carried on by conglomerations of submarines, naval vessels, light bombers, aerial tankers, swarms of hovering helicopters, and cargo planes carrying men and supplies, all approaching a hypothetical enemy coastline. Then, in the manner of a last-war combined operation, this creeping, unwieldy, vulnerable armada supposedly establishes successful atomic beachheads, bases, and forward airstrips along the coast.

NO SMALL WAR

Such a picture is, I believe, dangerous because it gives us a totally false sense of security. The plain truth of the matter is that, without intercontinental air supremacy, small nuclear wars are not feasible as an instrument of national policy. Before we could use our varigated array of limited weapons, the enemy's airpower—whose nuclear weapons could sink our armada and atomize our beachheads—would have to be destroyed; and only a major nuclear war could accomplish that.

CAN'T AFFORD APATHY

Nor can we rely on the horror of nuclear destruction to serve as a guaranty of permanent atomic stalemate.

Despite all the blandishments displayed at the Geneva Big Four Conference, we must keep in mind that the ruthless Soviet regime did not hesitate to liquidate 20 million of its own people to perpetuate itself in power. That same regime will not hesitate to kill off twice or thrice that number of both Russians and Americans to achieve, by force, its goal of world domination, should its present methods of infiltration and subversion fail.

Hence, as President Eisenhower said on his return from Geneva, "We cannot afford to be negligent or complacent."

Now let me turn briefly to the second part of Miss Applegate's question: "Does talking about our defense weaknesses make us stronger or weaker?"

My answer is: "Stronger, of course." In the past, things moved more slowly. But now we cannot rely on enemy action to spur us to last-minute, maximum effort. A future enemy would aim at the complete and immediate destruction of our industrial setup. There won't be any time for second-guessing on strategy.

In a democracy such as ours, enemy agents can move with comparative freedom. As a consequence, the enemy is even better informed than some of our top officials, who often get facts colored by political expediency.

Therefore, our strength must be inherent, and obvious to all. A free society cannot win a war by deception or surprise. That is why there must be no censorship, no twisting, no slanting, no covering up.

The shocking condition of our national security, no secret to the enemy, must be known by the American people as well, so that we can prepare while there is still time.

MORE THAN MONEY

The recent 35-percent increase in production of our B–52 bombers is a meaningless sop to the Nation's anxiety over Russia's expanding air power.

The appropriation of more money for the Air Force will not alone solve the problem. The whole military philosophy must be changed, or we shall forever trail the rest of the world, not only in conventional aircraft, but in intercontinental ballistic missiles (IBM) and even in man-made earth satellite development.

We must remove the curse of the outmoded strategy of balanced forces and free the American creative genius from the confines of this fallacious concept. We must recognize the Air Force, and its expert leadership in air war, as the dominant factor in our military establishment.

To accomplish all this, the Unification Act of 1947 must be repealed, since unification of the services has proven a failure. Neither fish, fowl, nor flesh, it is the basic obstacle to the development of sound and realistic strategy. In Winston Churchill's words, "Air mastery is today the supreme expression of military power, and fleets and armies, however necessary, must accept a subordinate rank." Only an invincible Air Force can achieve air mastery. And only air mastery, in our hands, can prevent the nuclear destruction of our Nation.

THE EVOLUTION THEORY

But old ideas die hard; and vested interests cling tenaciously to their accustomed position of power. Small wonder, therefore, that Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has publicly asserted that he is against fundamental changes in our military strategy and that if any such changes are to be made they should come gradually, as a process of evolution.

Time and again I have warned my countrymen that while we evolve thus comfortably, an inconsiderate enemy may overtake us and destroy us.

QUESTION OF SURVIVAL

I am compelled to warn them again that as a result of complacency in our defense establishment, plus failure to face or reveal the facts, Russia is already overtaking us.

We have no time left for gradual evolution. Fundamental changes must be made, and at once, if we are to survive.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FOOD AND DRUG LAW—PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR OF FLORIDA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the year 1956 marks the 50th anniversary of the Food and Drug Act of 1906, and the Meat Inspection Act of the same year. Both these historic laws were signed on June 30, 1906, by President Theodore Roosevelt.

Perhaps no other laws have reached into the homes more than these two. They have touched the lives of millions of Americans during the last half century through their wise enforcement by the Food and Drug Administration and the Department of Agriculture. These laws were enacted by the Congress through the assistance of the food, drug, and chemical industries. The leaders in these great industries sought to raise the standard of all the food manufacturers, canners, and so forth, bringing them to their high level and continuing to give the American people the safest and most plentiful food supply in the world.

One of these associations which has taken the lead in our pure food and drug laws is the National Agricultural Chemicals Association. This association is one of the pioneers in supporting the principles of Public Law 518 of the 83d Congress, better know in the agricultural industry as the Miller Act. This act provides for adequate pretesting of agricultural chemicals and for the establishment of tolerances of these chemicals in or on raw agricultural products.

As proper honor to both of these laws, the Governor of the State of Florida has issued a proclamation setting aside the week of March 19 to 25, 1956, as the Food and Drug Law Golden Anniversary Week in Florida, and has invited all citizens of our State, individually or through their organizations, to observe this anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and observances.

One of the observances and ceremonies will be the presentation of the Governor's proclamation by Dr. J. J. Taylor, chemist for the State of Florida, to the honorable George P. Larrick, Commissioner of Food and Drug Administration, United States Public Health Service. This proclamation will be presented on Friday, March 16, the last day of the spring meeting of the National Agricultural Chemicals Association, which is to be held at Hollywood, Fla.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have this proclamation printed in the RECORD in recognition of the action taken by Hon. LeRoy Collins, Governor of Florida.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas June 30, 1956, will mark the 50th anniversary of the signing, by President Theodore Roosevelt, of the first Federal Food and Drugs Act, amended and reenacted in 1938 as the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and the Federal Meat Inspection Act; and

Whereas 1956 will also mark the 60th annual convention of the organization today known as the Association of Food and Drug Officials of the United States; and

Whereas the purity, integrity, and abundance of our food, drug, cosmetic, and pesticide chemical supplies are unexcelled in the world today and stand as a tribute to the industries producing them; and

Whereas the maintenance and protection of the purity and integrity of our food, drug, cosmetic, and pesticide chemical supplies are essential elements of our national strength, safety, and economic welfare; and

Whereas for this protection we are indebted to Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, who, as crusader for the first Federal legislation, became known as the father of the pure food and drug law; to the distinguished and dedicated public servants at all levels of government who have administered these laws over the years; and to the leaders in industry who have supported the enactment and improvement of these laws and have cooperated in their enforcement; and

Whereas upon the passage of the Federal act of 1906, the Florida Legislature, at its next session in 1907, responded by passing the Florida Food and Drug Act which was patterned after the Federal act, and again when the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act was passed in 1938, the Florida Legislature responded by passing the Florida Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1939.

Now, therefore, I, LeRoy Collins, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida, do hereby proclaim the week of March 19–25, 1956, as Food and Drug Law Golden Anniversary Week in Florida.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Florida to be affixed at Tallahassee, the capital, this 20th day of January, A. D. 1956.

LEROY COLLINS,
Governor.

Attest:

R. A. GRAY,
Secretary of State.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES BY SOUTHERN SENATORS AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch entitled "A Milestone in the South's Fight," also an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal entitled "Statement From the South," and also an editorial from the Portland (Maine) Press Herald entitled "South Has No Monopoly on Thing Called Interposition."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch]

A MILESTONE IN THE SOUTH'S FIGHT

The declaration of constitutional principles, signed by 100 southern Members of Congress (19 Senators and 81 Representatives), including all those from Virginia, is a powerful and impressive document.

It is not a nullificationist defiance of the United States Supreme Court, but it sets forth in strong and unequivocal language why the South is overwhelmingly opposed to the Court's ruling against segregation in the public schools.

The signers, with distinguished lawyers and forum judges among them, declare solemnly that the Supreme Court justices "undertook to exercise their naked judicial power and substituted their personal, political, and social ideas for the established law of the land."

Whereas Thurgood Marshall, counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, says that the signers "are encouraging lawlessness and mob violence," they specifically appeal to the southern people to "scrupulously refrain from violence and lawless acts," and they declare that they will use "all lawful means to bring about a reversal of this decision."

The NAACP agitated ceaselessly for many years on behalf of a reversal of a long line of Supreme Court decisions upholding segregation in the schools, including a unanimous one handed down as recently as 1927. It is a bit difficult to understand, therefore, why its general counsel—who finally obtained the 1954 reversal of this 1927 decision—should now accuse the southern Senators and Congressmen who express an intention to seek a similar reversal, of encouraging lawlessness and violence. In view of the fact that the Court has reversed itself dozens of times in recent decades agitation for a reversal of this objectionable decision is altogether right and proper.

The mere fact that so many respected southern Members of Congress have signed this manifesto should carry weight with the Supreme Court and the lesser courts, and should have its impact on public opinion throughout the North and West. This is an action solemnly considered, and solemnly carried out, after due reflection. It marks a significant milestone in the efforts of the South to preserve the rights of the States to control their own affairs in the field of public education.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

STATEMENT FROM THE SOUTH

One hundred southern Members of Congress have signed a declaration of principles pledging to use "all lawful means" to upset the Supreme Court's 1954 decision which banned segregation in the public schools.

The declaration was severely critical of that decision. The High Court, the southerners wrote, had abused its judicial power, had legislated in an area reserved to the States, and had overthrown an "established legal principle almost a century old." Yet the words were not inflammatory; there was a tone of restraint throughout and a cautious admonition to extremists on both sides of the segregation question.

Some of the points the hundred Senators and Representatives make cannot be easily dismissed. There is, for example, no question that the Supreme Court did overrule former decisions of the same Court which said that "separate but equal" school facilities were lawful and that such schools did not conflict with the 14th amendment.

And there is no question that these 19 Senators and 81 Representatives have a right to believe that the Supreme Court was wrong, just as they had a duty as responsible men to announce that their efforts to avoid or to change the Court's rule would be limited to lawful means. Just what they propose to do they did not say and, indeed, quite probably they could not say. For the pattern is a different one in the different Southern States and in each of the States a different pattern can be found in different communities. In some of the States integration is already going ahead slowly; in others, it is a long way off.

So these 100 men could hardly have agreed on anything more than a statement of principles embodying use of lawful means; but the fact that they did agree on that makes their statement all the more serious. For among these men are men who would not put their names to any document in which they did not truly believe.

Among them are some of the ablest men in the United States Senate. Among them are men who are known as conservatives and some who are known as liberals. The signers number Republicans as well as Democrats. Many of them are held by their fellow Members in the House and Senate—even by some who think their views in this matter gravely wrong—in the highest esteem.

This is not the voice of any calloused demagog. The hundred men spoke for millions of people, some frustrated, some bewildered, some disheartened, and some fearful. Not all the people in the South will agree with these Senators and Representatives in opposing, even by lawful means, an end to segregation. But these people also know that demagogery on either side can cause great harm and undo much that has already been done to better relations between the races in the South.

The Congressmen pleaded for understanding of their case when they wrote of the decisions upholding the right to create dual school systems: "This interpretation, restated time and again, became a part of the life of the people of many of the States and confirmed their habits, customs, traditions, and way of life."

One may argue that the custom is wrong and still know that no court can change a people's thinking overnight; the Supreme Court recognized that when it handed down the ban on segregated schools. And it can be dangerous to try to force that change immediately on an unwilling people.

The statement of principles is a reminder of that danger, just as it is a reminder that the Supreme Court decision it attacks also called for understanding and restraint on both sides.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald]

SOUTH HAS NO MONOPOLY ON THING CALLED INTERPOSITION

When Southern States are charged with defying the Constitution by resorting to interposition against public school integration, they can retort that Northern States resorted to similar tactics in the decade preceding the Civil War. The Supreme Court ruled in 1842 that State authorities could not be compelled to help Federal authorities enforce the 1793 Federal act for return of fugitive slaves.

Thereupon various Northern States passed personal-liberty laws forbiding their authorities to help enforce the 1793 law. So the South put across a new Federal fugitive slave law, as part of the compromise of 1850.

The new law denied the right of jury trial in fugitive slave cases, forbade the fugitives to testify or to present witnesses, penalized any person aiding them, allowed escape and identity of the prisoner to be determined on very slim evidence, doubled the fees of United States commissioners enforcing the act if they decided for the slave owner. In the following decade new personal-liberty laws contravening the 1850 act were enacted by Connecticut, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wisconsin.

In Wisconsin a newspaper editor, Sherman M. Booth, was indicted in Federal court for helping a fugitive slave to escape. In 1855, the State supreme court declared the 1850 Federal act unconstitutional in upholding a writ of habeas corpus issued for Booth by a State court.

In January of 1857 the United States Supreme Court, reversing the State court, ordered the habeas corpus writ vacated. Thereupon the State legislature, in 1859, resolved that the Court had gone beyond its authority so that its order was void and without force.

The Federal Government, declared the legislature, is not exclusive and final judge of its own powers. As in all compacts between parties with no common judge between them, each party may judge for itself any infraction of the compact, and hence may defy any unauthorized action attempted under color of the Constitution. Sounds familiar; doesn't it?

EXTEND THE LIFE AND FUNDS OF THE DELINQUENCY SUBCOMMITTEE—FULFILL THE NATION'S RESPONSIBILITY IN THE FIELD OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Judiciary's Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, I have been most anxious to see the necessary appropriation of funds to carry on the invaluable work performed by our group. The amount of money which our subcommittee had originally requested, and which the full Senate Judiciary Committee had approved for transmittal to the Rules Committee, may unfortunately be scaled down once again. I hope, however, it will not be scaled down to such an extent as to prevent us from doing our broad-gauged job.

It may not be generally realized, but the cost to our country of a few individual teen-age gangs, doing damage in a single American city, may actually add up to a far higher total than the modest amount of money which our Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee will be getting to complete its work this year.

Of course, we realize that there must necessarily be limitations on the amount of spending for congressional committees. But I, for one, have always felt that it is sound economy to apply preventive expenditures in time, so as to avoid terrible losses later on.

Who can possibly estimate the cost of having 1 million American youngsters get into trouble with the law? Who can put a dollar figure on the cost of a single broken family—broken because a youngster has been put behind the bars of a juvenile home, or later in an adult

jail? Who can estimate the cost of the lost income which that youngster, himself, might otherwise have made in his later years, or the cost to society of tracking him down in the first place, and then keeping him behind bars?

At any rate, I am hoping that the Senate will shortly give its approval to a fair compromise figure which may be agreed upon, so as to complete the work of our subcommittee. I know that I speak for our distinguished and industrious chairman, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], in stating that the subcommittee's endeavors will indeed come to an end—with no further extension whatsoever—next January 31st, when we shall have rounded out our entire program. Pending right now are important subcommittee reports dealing with juvenile delinquency and religion, and juvenile delinquency and the terrible evil of pornography.

Meanwhile, throughout the Nation, editorials continue to back us up and to point out many phases of the juvenile delinquency problem. One such phase is the matter of parental responsibility. Recently, the Nation's greatest law enforcement official, the honored man in whom we have rightly entrusted most of the responsibility for apprehension of those who evade Federal laws in interstate commerce, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, emphasized how crucial a role parents may play in discharging or failing to discharge their responsibilities to their youngsters and to their communities. Mr. Hoover's frank and vigorous comments occasioned widespread editorial approval throughout the country. As Mr. Hoover and all the rest of us realize, it is, of course, exceedingly difficult to try to set up an enforcement and penalty system to make parents live up to all their responsibilities, because this is a matter of individual conscience and of community conscience in awakening parent interest.

I send to the desk a pertinent editorial from the Monroe Evening Times, of Monroe, Wis. It also raises a most important auxiliary issue, namely, the matter of parents' responsibility for the awful toll on the Nation's highways because of accidents committed by reckless youngsters who drive their parents' cars.

Finally, Mr. President, as a further grassroots expression, I submit another Wisconsin editorial—this one from the March 6 Janesville Gazette, and entitled "Teen-Age Boys on the Loose." It is a hard-hitting, factual, straight-shooting editorial on youth vandalism and parental responsibility and irresponsibility. I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Monroe (Wis.) Evening Times]

APATHY AND CONSCIENCE

FBI's J. Edgar Hoover placed his finger squarely on the principal cause of increasing juvenile problems, now lumped together under the general heading of "juvenile delinquency."

Mr. Hoover, in the FBI law-enforcement bulletin, declares the basic or common factor in causes of rising juvenile crime stem from two reasons: apathy on the part of parents and their failure to properly discharge responsibilities to their children.

He went on to observe: "This basic failure is appallingly prevalent; and the regrettable fact is that the irresponsible parents who neglect their duty continue to do so because they are not held accountable for their dereliction.

"It is my firm belief that juvenile crime could be abated if parents were made to face legal and financial responsibilities for the criminal acts of their children."

Such liability and such accountability, of course, on the part of parents long have been sought by legislators and judicial figures. It results from the growing tendency of parents in unfortunate situations to shrug their shoulders and confess inability to supervise the conduct of their children.

Mr. Hoover, of course, speaks only from the standpoint of crime in his remarks. That, naturally, is the only province of the FBI and its reports concern only those situations in which actual delinquency in the real sense of the word is involved.

There is another field, however, in which parental apathy and disinterest is glaringly apparent. That concerns the problem of defiant and thoughtless operation of motor vehicles by the younger drivers. Many of these cars are made available to the youngsters by parents without restraint or sense of obligation.

This parental disinterest in the traffic phase of juvenile conduct occasionally has tragic consequences, to the family involved and also to parties who had no degree of negligence in the unhappy accidents.

Mr. Hoover would apply penalties to parents in cases of juvenile crime where neglect of duty by the family was obvious. We doubt a general law could be set up to spread that accountability to all phases of the juvenile problem satisfactorily.

Just the same, it would be a wonderful thing if we could find an inspired method for reawakening parental conscience to the driving situation, as well as to other serious aspects of juvenile difficulty in which crime is not involved.

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette]

TEEN-AGE BOYS ON THE LOOSE

Unrestricted freedom for today's youth, so much the pattern these days, occasionally results in actions so bizarre as to jolt even the jaded attitudes of the overtolerant. Such are the cases of two Rockford 16-year-olds who took part in wrecking rural schools in southern Rock County a few days ago.

After their arrest, they admitted not only widespread vandalism, but thefts, burglaries, and check forgeries. Moreover, their activities extended throughout Rockford and the northern Illinois area and over into Wisconsin.

The two boys had as their companion a 22-year-old who did the check forgeries for them, and who carried a gun. The three of them ranged over a wide area looking for anything they could steal and convert into cash and took obvious enjoyment in wrecking anything they could not use, with a special dislike for schools. The two rural schools in Newark Township which fell victim to their ill-will were so badly wrecked that no classes could be held until they were repaired and cleaned at heavy cost. Furnishings were literally smashed to pieces.

Though neither of the boys—only 16, remember—had a job, one of them owned a convertible automobile which was used in their expeditions of pillage. Among their thefts, they admitted stealing 300 gallons of gasoline. Their attacks on the Newark schoolhouses took place at 2 o'clock on a Sunday morning.

One of the boys "lived" with his parents, and the other with his divorced mother. It is quite clear, however, that no real effort was made to keep any check on the boys. Any parent, it would seem, might wonder where the gasoline was coming from to keep a car on the road when the boys had no legitimate means of getting hold of any money. Neither does it seem that parents would find any reasonable explanation of nightly excursions which would keep 16-year-olds out until the early morning hours.

Unfortunately, the Rockford boys are not unique. We have many others nearer home. Three 17-year-olds, after a tavern visit attempted to escape deputies Sunday night after erratic driving attracted the attention of a patrol squad. Even the Janesville business district has its share of boys on the prowl, looking for trouble. Many of them are equipped with cars which will aid them in any harebrained scheme which they may conceive. Hitchhikers, so young that they ought to be in their beds, can be found on the highways at all hours of the night. Many of them are a long way from their hometowns with no way of getting back except by hitchhiking with anyone foolish enough to pick them up.

It is not necessary for parents to be spoilsports to put an end to this kind of idle driving about the country. Boys of school age need to have some freedom to attend sports events and other activities. They need companionship of those of their own age. But this sort of freedom need not be an every-night affair, and parents ought to know where the trail leads.

It is important also that there be some parental check on finances and where the money is going to come from to cover the inevitable expenses. Boys who have jobs not only have money for enjoyment, but are more discriminating about spending it. They are aware that it does not grow on bushes—and they have less time to engage in activities which could lead to trouble. Parents surely should be familiar enough with personal traits to know whether a job would be a stabilizing influence.

There are enough cases on record to make it certain that some parents are not meeting their responsibilities along these lines. Police and deputies on night duty have the right and duty to obtain identities of younger boys they find on the streets and highways at unseasonable hours. If parents were notified and required to take them into custody when no plausible explanations could be made, it might go a long way toward emphasizing parental responsibility.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9166) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 9166) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

PROPOSED STUDY OF FEDERAL MEAT GRADING SYSTEM

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on March 7, I put in the RECORD a statement containing my reasons for an amendment I submitted, whose purpose would be to require the Secretary to make a study of the Federal meat-grading system as applied to beef, veal, lamb, and mutton. This has been unfortunately interpreted by some to mean that I am opposed to any voluntary Federal meat-grading system and wish to see it destroyed.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. I believe Federal meat grading has rendered a service to our country. My only objective in recommending such a study is to make it possible for the Department to determine whether or not it would be possible to improve the present system of meat grading for the benefit of the consumer and the producer.

I believe that improvements can be made in the system which will meet some of the legitimate objections which have already been raised, and hope that this work can be quickly and thoroughly done.

It is for this purpose that I propose to call up the amendment which I have introduced.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is designated 2–17–56–B.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, beginning with line 23, it is proposed to strike out through line 4 on page 4.

On page 4, line 6, to strike out "105" and insert "104"; in line 15, strike out "106" and insert "105"; and in line 24, to strike out "107" and insert "106."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would remind Senators that the unanimous-consent agreement limiting the time for debate has been amended so as to provide 1 hour of debate on each amendment, with the time being equally divided. Therefore, 30 minutes is available to each side.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who joins me in sponsoring the amendment, as much time as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Senator from Oklahoma hear the Chair's announcement with respect to the amendment of the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. KERR. I did.

Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to continue the definition or specification of standard grade of cotton, as is now provided by law.

Senate bill 3183 as reported by the committee contained many commendable and valuable provisions. By action of the Senate the provision which, in the judgment of the Senator from Oklahoma, was the most valuable element in the bill, was stricken from it. That was the portion of the bill which would have provided 90 percent of parity for cotton, peanuts, rice, and wheat. When that provision was stricken from the bill, it lost most of what would have resulted in increased income to the average farmer in 1956.

The change sought by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Oklahoma—and also, I might say, by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] with reference to a similar amendment, and by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]—is to strike from the bill a provision which, if enacted into law, will reduce the income of every cotton farmer in the Nation.

If section 104 (A) beginning on page 3, line 23, and going through line 4 on page 4 remains in the bill, it will penalize every cotton producer in the Nation an average of from $10 to $12 a bale on his production for 1956.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, how did the Senator arrive at those figures?

Mr. KERR. I arrive at those figures on the basis of the estimate given me by the clerk of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as to the various methods of the application of the law under the language of the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me tell the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that the Department of Agriculutre and the farm organizations have figures which show that the amendment will reduce the price of cotton by 1 3/10 cents a pound, which would be about $7.50 or $8 a bale.

Mr. KERR. I say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that that is correct if one average is used. However, the Secretary of Agriculture, under the provisions of this bill is not limited to any single or individual or specific average formula, but has available to him quite a number of them.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the way they figure——

Mr. KERR. The way who figures?

Mr. EASTLAND. The way the Department figures it; and the testimony shows that will be the result.

Mr. KERR. Is that provided for in the bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. On the average grade and staple the price would be reduced 1.3 cents a pound.

Mr. KERR. To what average length of staple does the Senator refer?

Mr. EASTLAND. The average of the crop.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to point out that, as the Senator from Oklahoma has just stated, if the Secretary uses the schedule of premiums and discounts in the 14 designated spot markets for the first 4 months of this marketing year, it would lower the support level of each grade 215 points. Using the average of the first 6 months of the current marketing year in the 14 markets would lower the level of each grade 194 points, and using the average for the month of January 1956 would lower it 144 points.

Mr. KERR. Two hundred and fifteen points would be 2.15 cents a pound, and that alternative would be available to the Secretary, under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. By using the average of the first 6 months in the 14 markets he would lower the price support level for each grade 194 points.

Mr. KERR. That is practically 2 cents a pound.

Mr. ELLENDER. If he chose to use the average for the month of January 1956, he would lower it 144 points. I am informed by the Department that the Secretary has a right to take the average premiums and discounts of the first 6 months of the current marketing year, or the average of the first 4 months, or the average for the month of January 1956, or he could use the 1955 loan schedule. Thus he could vary the amount by which the price support level for each grade will be reduced, if the seven-eighths-inch standard is changed to average of the crop, by anywhere from 136 points to 215 points.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, at the close of the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma, a table prepared by the National Cotton Council.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have no objection to the Senator placing the table in the RECORD at any point other than during the course of my remarks.

Mr. EASTLAND. I said, at the close of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. KERR. The table is prepared by the National Cotton Council, but I invite attention to the fact that the Senate is not considering including the provisions of the estimate prepared by the National Cotton Council. The Senate has before it a provision in a bill which, if passed by the Congress, will become the law of the land, and under it the Secretary of Agriculture, in whom I have no more confidence than I have in the resurrection of Jesse James, would have the authority to use any one of the averages just read into the RECORD by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. On the basis of the record made by the Secretary of Agriculture, my expectation would be that he would use the least favorable average available to him under the law. As read by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the reduction would be 2.15 cents a pound, which, on a bale of cotton weighing 500 pounds, would be $10.75.

Mr. President, we could have estimates from every cotton council on this earth as to what could be the result if a certain formula were applied, but under the law the Senator from Mississippi cannot tell the American cotton farmer that that will be the average applied.

Mr. EASTLAND. Oh, yes.

Mr. KERR. I beg to differ, but if the Senator, on his own time later on, would

care to do so, I should like to have him show the Senator in this bill wherein that would be mandatory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi that the compilation to which he has referred be printed in the RECORD following the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. KERR. None whatever, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I again remind the Senate that it is an estimate made by the National Cotton Council of what would be the law if a certain average were applied as indicated by the National Cotton Council. I also remind the Senate that what we are considering is a positive provision in the bill under which, as stated by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Secretary of Agriculture could apply any number of averages, under one of which every bale of cotton would be lowered in price at the rate of 2.15 cents a pound. On a 500-pound bale of cotton that would amount to $10.75.

Mr. President, I think it is an uncontested fact that the average cotton farmer is either at the bottom of the economic totem pole among all farmers, or is very near the bottom.

Mr. President, of all those whose economic welfare will be determined by the provisions of this bill, there is no group which has a lower average income than has the average cotton farmer. I ask Senators why, in the name of heaven, would we pass a bill purporting to be for the benefit of the American farmer which, under one of its positive provisions, would in the matter of average annual income penalize one of the lowest groups of all the agricultural groups to the extent of $10.75 a bale for every bale of cotton which may be produced this year?

The farmers in that group already have suffered the most drastic reduction of acreage of any group. They have been given this year the allocation of their acreage, and I say to the Senate that it is drastically low.

Now they are confronted with a bill one provision of which would penalize them a definite amount on every bale of cotton, which, under one of the averages available to the Secretary of Agriculture, as stated by the chairman of the committee, could be as much as $10.75 a bale.

I ask my good friend from Mississippi, admitting for the sake of argument that it might be less than that, why in the guise of helping them should we penalize them to any extent? Wherein is the justification, in a bill calculated to improve the economic welfare of the average farmer, for a provision which would penalize them even $1, let alone $10.75 a bale?

Mr. President, the least the Senate can do in recognition of its responsibility to the American cotton farmers is to treat them in such a way that the Senate will not leave them in a lower economic position than it found them when the bill was brought to the floor. For that reason, this provision should be eliminated, and this amendment should be adopted, so that the support program can be carried forward on the basis of the present law which would save the cotton farmer, at least, from being penalized by the provisions of this bill.

I thank the Senator from Georgia for yielding me time to discuss the amendment.

EXHIBIT 1

If 7/8's stays in the law (sec. 104 stricken out), a 3-cent-per-pound reduction in the cotton price support in 1956 as compared with 1955 will give a percent of parity for 1956 as follows:

(a) Based on Middling 7/8-inch staple:

	Cents
1955 support level (7/8-inch Middling)	31.70
Less 3 cents	28.70
	Percent
Percent of March modernized parity (34.72)	82½
Percent of parity below 1955	7½

(b) Based on average of crop (93.8 percent of parity)

	Cents
1955 support level for 7/8's	31.70
Plus premium for average grade and staple	1.36
1955 support level for average grade and staple (93.8 percent of parity)	33.06
Less 3 cents	30.06
	Percent
Percent of March modernized parity (34.72)	86.5
1955 support	93.8
1956 support	86.5
Percent of parity below 1955	7.3

But a 3-cent reduction in the average of the crop will result in the following support for 7/8's:

	Cents
1956 support level for average of crop figured at 3 cents below 1955	30.06
Less 1956 discount for 7/8's (below average grade and staple based on differences in market for first 6 months)	—1.94
1956 support level for 7/8's	28.12
	Percent
Percent of March modernized parity (34.72)	81
Percent of parity below 1955	9

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Chair please advise me how much time I have remaining on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has 15 minutes of his time remaining. Does the Senator from Georgia yield time to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The amendment now before the Senate is similar to an amendment I have proposed. If this amendment shall be agreed to, cotton will be graded exactly as it has been graded in the past. If this amendment is adopted, no change will be made. The basis for parity will be the same that is being guaranteed the five other basic commodities.

We have already struck out 90 percent of parity, and given the Secretary of Agriculture the right to grade downward as much as he wishes. In other words, if this gadget shall be placed in the bill, what will happen will be that instead of having about 90 percent of parity, as was the case formerly, there will be a sliding scale from about 83 percent down to 68 percent instead of from 90 percent down to 75 percent. That is what it would amount to if everything were scaled down. It would be a double penalty against us cotton farmers. In other words, it would amount to a 2.15 cents reduction on every pound of cotton. Everyone of the grades based on the length of staple will be changed if the provision remains as it is in the bill at present. I am against that for many reasons. It would lower the price of cotton, so far as placing supports under cotton is concerned; and I think that would be wrong and disastrous.

We are already leaving it to the Secretary of Agriculture to slide the scale down. I do not believe the Senate at this time wants to provide another gadget which will make certain that the scale will have to be slid down to a certain percentage in addition to this other penalty.

Therefore, I am trying to show that if this amendment shall not be adopted, there will be a second reduction in the cotton-support price. The adoption of the amendment would help the cotton farmer.

Let us consider what has been happening. Heretofore we have had seven-eighths staple cotton as the average. That is where the start is made in establishing grades for the parity price to be placed upon cotton. What will the amendment do? It will slip out, so to speak, the seven-eighths staple cotton and turn it over to the Secretary of Agriculture. He could raise the length to fifteen-sixteenths, or he could go to 1 inch. If he went to an inch, it would change the price of cotton 4.30 cents. That could be done under the pending bill as it is now written.

Let no one think that parity has nothing to do with the market price of cotton, wheat, corn, or whatever else may be dealt with. The commodity has a tendency to fall to the parity price, whatever amount may be placed under it as a support. If that were not so, why should we be talking about reducing the amount in order to be able to compete with the world market? That argument would not be good if the price did not fall to the amount fixed as the parity price for the commodity.

We hear it said that we should meet the world market price by reducing the parities. If reducing the parities does not change the prices, how can a reduction enable farmers to meet the world market?

I maintain that, despite argument to the contrary, those who will listen for 1 minute will be convinced that the amount of parity placed under a commodity will have a tendency to set the price of that commodity, not only in the United States, but on the world market, also.

It is for these reasons, Mr. President, that I am arguing that this gadget should be removed from the bill, in order

that the parity basis will be advanced to its rightful former historic position.

I am certain the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] will acknowledge that if the gadget shall remain in the bill, it will reduce the amount of parity which will be offered. Anyone else would have to agree. That being so, I am asking for one-half fair treatment. I say "one-half" because the Senate has already rejected 90-percent supports over my protest.

I ask that the Senate attach my amendment to the bill in order that a double jeopardy will not be imposed on the cotton farmers of the Nation.

Sliding parity is bad enough, but to change the staple length upon which sliding parity is based will ruin every cotton farmer in the country.

If we pass this bill without my amendment, we will be selling the cotton farmer short.

Gentlemen, do not let us sell the cotton farmer short. No one in this Senate has plugged for and worked harder for 90 percent of parity than I. I believe it is the basis upon which any successful farm program must be built. But this bill not only guts 90 percent of parity for all the basic commodities but applies additional penalties against cotton.

I ask that the Senate be fair with the cotton farmers of this Nation and vote for my amendment. We would be doing the cotton farmers of this Nation a grave injustice if we do not pass this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

The Chair announces that the time in opposition to the amendment will be controlled by the minority leader, in view of the statement by the chairman of the committee that he is supporting the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from New Mexico desired some time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from New Mexico request?

Mr. ANDERSON. Five minutes, Mr. President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I was surprised to hear the statement made that the Secretary of Agriculture could use a whole series of average grades for cotton. I am frank to confess that I do not know under what theory that was announced. The Secretary of Agriculture takes an oath to observe the law. I believe he would do so. If so, he would have no trouble determining what the average grades of cotton were during a particular year.

It so happens that this proposal would amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1949.

It seems to me that if the cotton farmers in this country see themselves gradually losing their market, and feel that instead of continuing to lose their market, their cotton should be more realistically priced, they should have the opportunity to have it so priced.

I am not quarreling about what the price of cotton shall be. All I point out is that gradually, year by year, the domestic market has shrunk, and the foreign market has shrunk. We will not get it back by raising the price of cotton.

There is no question that in the preparation of this particular provision of the bill it was recognized that by it cotton prices would be reduced. It was stated frankly in the committee, and it was understood by every Senator who voted upon it, that the provision would effect a reduction in cotton prices. The present grade of seven-eighths of an inch is not what the average grades are throughout the Nation. Actually, cotton, when it was supported at 90 percent, with this provision in the law with respect to seven-eighth inch grades, was getting 94 or 95 percent price supports. That was understood, and I think it was understood thoroughly. The result of that operation was to put cotton too high.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. By changing the gadget, if the Secretary of Agriculture had made it one-eighth inch, what would he have given? If he had changed it to 1 inch, what would the farmer have received? By that calculation he would have obtained 100 percent, would he not?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I am sorry; the Senator did not follow what I said. I said the average grades were above seven-eighths of an inch. At the time the bill was passed the grades were about fifteen-sixteenths. I believe now they are——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They are about 1 inch.

Mr. ANDERSON. I started to say they were about fifteen-sixteenths of an inch at the time the bill was passed. At present, they are about thirty-one thirty-seconds, or close to 1 inch.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If that were changed to 1 inch, the parity would be changed to 100 percent, would it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, of course not. I hope the Senator recognizes the fact that if there is a 90-percent price support on cotton with 1 inch as the basis, there will be 90 percent supports. But if there is a 90-percent price support, and seven-eighths of an inch is used as a base, the support price will be 93, 94, or 95 percent; somewhere within that range. Everyone who has been dealing with the problem will understand that this particular language was included for that purpose. Certainly I know it best of all, because the provision is in a law that happens to bear my name as its sponsor.

In order to bring about a reduction in cotton acreage and to bring cotton under control, we arbitrarily included a provision which set the base at seven-eighths of an inch, recognizing that if the price levels were at 90 percent, the cotton producer would receive more than 90 percent. Everyone understood that thoroughly; there was no mystery about it.

I say now that if there is objection to changing the figure to a realistic factor, we shall only be trying to say that if the support level shall be brought down to 85 percent, the cotton farmer will still be getting 90 percent.

We might as well understand that if it is preferred that it be kept on the old basis, the Secretary can handle it administratively. However, he would have no difficulty about this provision. The Secretary of Agriculture has the right, if he wishes, to bring the support level on cotton down to 75 percent of parity. If Senators want it brought down to 75 percent of parity, it would not be difficult. The supply situation in regard to cotton is such that the Secretary can bring the price down to 75 percent of parity.

It was believed it would be a simpler process to move the grade up to the basis of the average grade. Thereafter, as the years went by, and the grade got to be an inch, and then an inch and one thirty-second, and so forth, it would be reflected, ordinarily, in prices paid across the country, and we would not have an arbitrary standard.

What is done is immaterial to me. If the Senate wants to change it back, and then ask the Secretary of Agriculture to drop the figure 5 percentage points, the action will not help a single cotton producer. The Secretary will have to put the level at such a point that he can move some of the cotton. With a 14 million bale surplus, with also a 14 million bale crop, and a supply of 25 million bales of cotton on hand, no Secretary would be expected not to recognize what the situation was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. May I have 1 or 2 minutes more?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope that when we vote on the pending proposal, we will not vote for it on the theory that we would be helping the cotton farmers of the country. I think cotton farmers, generally, have asked for elimination of the seven-eighths standard, and have asked that the average grade standard be adopted. Cotton organization after cotton organization has asked that that be done.

Perhaps there should not be evidence given of what the true support level is, but I do not believe we help matters by kidding farmers on the situation at all.

I further hope the language put in the bill, and put in the bill by majority vote, will be retained. It is true it will reduce cotton prices. The Senator from South Carolina heard me say it inside the committee. I repeat it now. Again, we must deal with the situation frankly, but I do not believe it is fair to say we can have a whole rainbow of prices, out of which the Secretary must make a selection. We must work on the theory that the Secretary understands what a provision calling for average price is. Having taken the oath of office to administer the law, we must assume he will administer the law. He knows what the average price is.

Therefore, if we want to take out that language, I hope we proceed to take it out by vote, knowing it cannot help the cotton farmer, that it runs contrary to the principle which cotton farmers have

been asking to have adopted, and that by changing it there might be obtained a different level of parity than that announced to the American public.

We must recognize that the seven-eights level is not realistic when the average is well above that, and we will be better off to take the language in the bill rather than to start to tamper with it by striking it out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further time to be used on the amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, do the proponents desire to use any more time?

Mr. GEORGE. No; not now. The proponents started the argument in favor of the amendment, and then the Senator from New Mexico spoke. I thought the opponents would want to use some time now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do both sides yield back the unused time?

Mr. GEORGE. No; we do not yield back anything. The Senator from Texas desires to be recognized at this time. I shall be glad to yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not see the Senator from Texas. The Chair suggests that if any other Senator desires to be heard on this matter, he be heard at this time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I believe the proponents have used 20 minutes and the opponents have used only 7 or 8 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well, Mr. President. I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes have been yielded to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The base used for fixing price supports for all basic commodities except cotton is the average grade. The committee voted to establish the average grade as the basis for fixing support prices for cotton. The pending amendment, proposed by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Oklahoma, would strike out that part of the bill which establishes the average grade as the base for cotton supports.

Mr. President, I see no reason why cotton should be especially favored in this respect over all the other basic commodities.

Furthermore, if we are to proceed with a good program to build up the use of cotton in this country, and to reestablish our cotton export business, bringing it up to 10 million bales, where it used to be, instead of 2 million bales, a figure which certainly will continue if we do not make any changes—then we should have a realistic base on which to fix price supports for cotton.

I think it would be very disastrous to the cotton growers, the cotton industry, and to the general economy of the country to adopt the amendment proposed by the Senators from Oklahoma and Georgia.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I do not want to underestimate the ability of the Senator from Vermont, but I should like to ask him how much cotton is produced in his State.

Mr. AIKEN. Vermont produces no cotton.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. And I am happy to say that Vermont is in a section of the country which is not constantly trying to see how much it can get from the Federal Government.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for that observation. So far as I am concerned, I am willing for him to have a child's part and at the same time pay for a parent's part.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont desire any more time?

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Texas, and if so, for how long?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Texas 1 or 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia yields 2 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to join in what has been said in favor of the adoption of the amendment. The Senate has already defeated the committee's proposal for 90 percent of parity, and now, if we do not adopt the pending amendment, we shall be cutting the price the cotton farmers will receive for the cotton they produce. That means not only those who produce seven-eighths staple, but all the cotton farmers of the country.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if that statement is not correct. If the amendment is not adopted, will the effect not be to cut the price received by cotton farmers all over the country?

Mr. ELLENDER. It will adversely affect every grade; that is, the support level for every grade of cotton will be reduced.

Mr. DANIEL. It will affect every grade of cotton?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. In the present conditions, so far as farmers are concerned, it does not seem to me, that we should start decreasing the amount of money the cotton farmers will receive.

I sincerely hope the Senate will adopt the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia and other Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further time to be used on the amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, do the proponents yield back their time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield back his time?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia yields 2 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the committee considered the amendment very seriously at the time the committee voted for 90 percent of parity price supports for cotton and other basics. I took the position then that I would support a proposal to strike from the present law the seven-eighths provision, and substitute therefor the average of the crop, provided the 90 percent of parity price support provision for cotton were retained. In addition to the reduction in the price of cotton which will result from the Senate having struck from the bill the 90 percent price support provision, our failure now to adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia, may mean a further decrease in the price received by the farmer for every grade of cotton, a reduction which may run as high as 215 points.

As the Senator from Mississippi stated a while ago, if the 1955 loan schedule is used, the support price for every grade of cotton will be 136 points lower than under the present system. But if the average premiums and discounts in the 14 designated spot markets for the first 4 months of this marketing year are considered, then the possible reduction for each grade will be 215 points; and if the average of the first 6 months in the 14 markets is used, that will lower it 194 points; and if the average for the month of January 1956 is used, that will mean a loss for each grade of 144 points.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Louisiana desire to have further time? If so, I yield further time to him.

Mr. ELLENDER. I simply wish to emphasize the fact, Mr. President, that unless this amendment is adopted, there will be further losses to the cotton producers. Now that the Senate has struck the mandatory 90 percent parity price-support provision from the bill, the Secretary can lower the support level for cotton to 75 percent of parity, which will mean a loss of from 5 to 6 cents a pound. In addition to this, our failure to adopt the pending amendment will cause a further loss of from 1.36 cents up to 2.15 cents, depending on the period the Secretary selects for his determination of premiums and discounts on the markets. As I pointed out, if he selects the period which was used last year, that will mean a loss of 1.36 cents. If he takes the first 4 months of the current marketing year that will mean a loss of 2.15 cents. As I understand the law, the Secretary has full discretion in selecting whatever period he desires.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana whether he shares my belief that if this amendment is not adopted, we shall have permanently reduced the price of cotton to the cotton producers of the Nation whatever farm program we may adopt hereafter by the amount involved, which would average around 2 cents a pound. Does not the Senator from Louisiana believe that if we change the system and base for the entire market and the entire cotton industry, including the milling and the purchase of cotton, it will be virtually impossible to get the market back, regardless of whatever farm pro-

gram we may adopt in the future, and to undertake to repair the fortunes of the cotton farmers?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Georgia is correct. The position stated a while ago by the Senator from Mississippi, as I recall, was that unless some effort is made to reduce the price of cotton, we shall continue to lose our markets abroad; and therefore it is necessary to use some device to decrease the price. Elimination of the 7/8-inch provision is one of the devices that is being used for that purpose.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an explanation of the effect of changing from middling 7/8-inch cotton to the average grade and staple for purposes of price support.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF MIDDLING 7/8 PROVISION

Under section 403 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, appropriate adjustments may be made in the support price for differences in grade, type, staple, quality, location, and other factors. These adjustments must be made in such manner that the average support price for the commodity will on basis of anticipated incidence of pertinent factors be equal to level of support determined as provided in the act. Upland cotton is now excluded from the provisions of the last sentence above, and in lieu thereof, the required level of support is applied directly to middling 7/8-inch cotton.

Section 104 of Senate bill 3183 would eliminate Middling 7/8-inch as a base quality of upland cotton for purposes of price support, and the level of support would be determined on the same basis as for other commodities; i. e., the average support price established at a level equal to the support level determined as provided in the act. Since the act does not specify exactly how this would be accomplished under this provision, exact procedures of how the program would be developed or exact computations in connection with future programs cannot be set forth at this time. However, certain facts pertaining to the provision can be stated as follows:

1. Extra long staple cotton is currently covered by the same provisions as would cover upland cotton if section 104 is enacted. Under the extra long staple program in recent years:

(a) the incidence of anticipated quantity in each quality (grade and staple combination) was determined on the basis of the average percentage of the cotton produced during each of the last 5 years that fell within each such quality;

(b) a schedule of support rates for the various qualities which reflected the desired differentials between such qualities was developed on the basis of the market values (with certain adjustments as indicated below) for such qualities for the various kinds of extra long staple cotton during that part of the marketing year that had elapsed; and

(c) the weighted average determined by multiplying the anticipated quantities as determined in (a) by the support rates as determined in (b) must equal the level of support determined as provided in the act. Sealand cotton of a specific grade and staple length does not command as high a price in the marketplace as the same grade and staple length of American-Egyptian cotton. An average difference of about 5 cents per pound in favor of American-Egyptian cotton is in effect under the 1955 loan program. Also, in certain cases where the quoted market prices failed to reflect normal relationships between adjacent qualities, support rates for such qualities were adjusted to a more normal relationship. After all necessary adjustments for qualities or kinds of cotton have been made, the weighted average of all support rates must equal the support level determined as provided in the act.

2. The enactment of section 104 would have the following effect with respect to upland cotton:

(a) It would lower the support level somewhat. If the 5-year average incidence of quantities by qualities are used (the same as has been used for extra long staple cotton under past programs), then the schedule of premiums and discounts used would determine the amount by which the average support is lowered. If the 1955 loan schedule were used, it would lower the level by 136 points. The average premiums and discounts in the 14 designated spot markets for the first 4 months of this marketing year would lower it 215 points. The average of the first 6 months in the 14 markets would lower it 194 points, and the average for the month of January 1956 would lower it 144 points.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Louisiana: Is it not also true that eventually the farmers will have a right to vote on the question of whether they will go into this program?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. And if we make it impossible for them to come out from under—which is the danger we face—then the cotton farmers will be in a terrible fix.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time; and I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Georgia has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time there may be a quorum call, without charging to either side the time required for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from Georgia has suggested the absence of a quorum, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] for himself and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute, and will be willing to yield back the remaining time, if that is agreeable to the opponents of the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, we will not yield back all our time, because we still have two speakers. We have used only 10 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well.

Mr. President, the provision of the bill which is sought to be stricken is a plain, direct effort to injure cotton, already the most poorly supported of all the basic crops. Whether the amount taken from each cotton producer is $8, $10, or $10.50 a bale, there is a direct effort to injure the small cotton producer, and for no purpose on earth except to favor the big producers of cotton in a certain area in the United States. The small producer does not export any cotton. This provision of the bill is an effort to make the small producers of cotton bear the entire burden, the total cost of exporting a crop.

I appeal to Senators for justice. I stood on this floor when cotton prices were first supported, and warned, in a 2-hour speech, that the final result would be the loss of the foreign market.

All that is sought to be accomplished is simply to continue the present standard for Middling seven-eighths cotton. If the cotton is less than seven-eighths Middling, of course, there is a penalty. If it is a little more than seven-eighths, there is a slight premium.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used his 1 minute.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I yield myself additional time.

The difference is sufficient to enable the small cotton farmer to make a modest profit on his cotton. Everything else we hear said by anyone is in behalf of the big cotton producer, or in behalf of placing the burden upon the small cotton farmer, to carry the cost of the cotton export program.

No increase has been given cotton. The 90 percent of parity provision is thrown out. If the 90 percent were in the bill, there would be some reason for changing the basis for classifying cotton. But that provision has been stricken from the bill.

This provision of the bill is definitely in behalf only of the large cotton producers and the rayon manufacturing group. It cannot help anyone else. I am not attacking the Secretary of Agriculture, but he has already shown that he is most eager to reduce the price of cotton in this country. I think no man can doubt that.

There is nothing else in the bill which would help the most distressed element in our agriculture. We are asking only that the present standard for the classification of cotton be continued.

That would help the small farmer, but not a great deal. However, it may represent the difference between his ability, on the one hand, to continue the production of cotton, and, on the other hand, bankruptcy and abandonment of cotton by the small cotton producer.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senate is now reaching the end of an effort which began more than a year ago in a careful study made by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to ascertain why American agriculture was losing its export markets. That subcommittee was headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. I have

watched him in action for more than a year. I was a member of the subcommittee, and also a member of the full committee. I think the Senator from Mississippi has a fuller grasp of the situation, and of the reason why American cotton has lost its export market, than has any other Senator. I exclude for that purpose the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who has almost as complete a grasp of the cotton situation in all its aspects as one man could have.

There has been traditional rivalry in the Senate committee, in the markets, and in the entire field of cotton, between the new West and the old South, in the production of cotton. In the development of the new program in the bill, I have seen complete cooperation between Representatives of the new West and the Senator from Mississippi and other Senators from cotton-producing States of the old South.

There is no doubt that cotton has lost its foreign market simply because the price-support program has been too high. Testimony of witnesses from the Cotton Council, the cotton cooperatives, the textile industry, and others, clearly showed that to be the case. Everyone realized that cotton had lost its foreign market simply because the price-support program had been too high. One of the unrealistic, unofficial features which has made it too high is the very thing which is involved in this particular provision of the bill, which is sought to be eliminated by the pending amendment.

Senators argue that the adoption of this amendment would bring temporary relief to some. Perhaps that is true; but it would bring temporary relief at terrific cost, namely, the continuance of artificial price supports at levels which would continue to ban our cotton from the export market.

This program has been carefully considered in its various aspects. This is only one of them. The standard by which cotton price support would be fixed is based not on the average of cotton production, but upon one of the lowest facets of cotton production, seven-eighths-inch staple, which is grown only in a relatively small area of our country.

Some of us have been accused of wanting to legislate against the area which produces the very short-staple cotton, notably central Texas. Nothing is further from the fact. This reduction would apply all the way through the scale.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. In a moment.

This provision would apply to cotton exactly the same average standard which is now applicable to wheat, rice, corn, tobacco, and oats. It is taken for granted as the fair way to begin to figure what the price supports should be.

I now yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I remind the Senator that ⅞-Middling cotton is nowhere near the lowest grade of cotton. It runs all the way down to lint.

I also remind the Senator that it is not Texas alone that makes ⅞-cotton in certain counties. It is every part of the Cotton Belt, during some years—and they come often—when the staple does not fully lengthen.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the distinguished Senator from Georgia is correct in that statement. It is true that appearing before our subcommittee and later before the full committee came representatives and spokesmen from the area in central Texas which I mentioned, claiming that this measure would be peculiarly hurtful to them. I believe the distinguished Senator from Georgia knows full well that it would not be peculiarly hurtful to anyone, but would apply to cotton production exactly the same standard, that is the average grade of cotton.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Georgia does not know anything of the sort. If he did know it, he would not oppose the provision in the bill. The Senator from Georgia, on the other hand, knows that the provision will cost every cotton producer, whatever his product, anywhere from $7 to $8 a bale, or even $10 to $12 a bale.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may I have a few more minutes?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot yield at this time. If I have some time remaining later, I shall be glad to yield. The Senator from Georgia is exactly right. This is a realistic statement of a standard similar to that which is applied to every other basic commodity. It is absolutely wrong to continue the application of a standard which is unfair to the other commodities and which puts cotton in such a class that what appears to be a 90 percent support price, as we had in the past, is in fact sizably larger than that, and will always keep the price support unrealistic as compared with what we must have by way of price in order to recapture the export markets.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the amendment the committee inserted in the bill to anchor the support price of cotton at the average grade and staple of the crop was requested by the vast majority of organizations of cotton farmers in the United States. It was requested by the vast majority of the cotton farm organizations from every area of the cotton belt.

They realized they had a problem. This is the first industry and the first group of farmers that have made the recommendation that the price support as it applies to the parity formula be slightly reduced. It is based on ⅞-inch cotton, one of the shortest and least desirable kinds of cotton produced.

In the year 1953 less than 3 percent of the American cotton production was ⅞-inch cotton. Every other farm commodity is supported on the basis of the average of the crop. Cotton used to be so supported at one time. Cotton was in the same position with every other commodity. However, during the war, because of the action of the Price Administrator, former Senator Bankhead had an amendment adopted—it was a gadget—which based the support price on the ⅞-inch cotton, for the reason that under the law the Price Administrator was required not to place a ceiling price on cotton below parity.

To evade the law, he based the ceiling price on textiles so low that the mills could not pay parity for cotton. This was a device to push the cotton price up.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Mississippi should know that ⅞-inch cotton has been the historic base of cotton for 100 years. It was changed by a regulation in the Department of Agriculture in about 1939. As soon as Congress got around to it, it put it back where it had been for 100 years.

Mr. EASTLAND. Seven-eighths middling used to be the standard for the crop. However, because of improved agricultural practices, that has come up to where trading in the futures exchanges is based on middling inch cotton, and less than 3 percent of the production is ⅞-inch.

In 1955 wheat had 95 percent support price. As a result for cotton being anchored at ⅞-inch, the support price for cotton in that year was 93.8 percent. In other words, cotton was supported cotton at prices above 90 percent. In voting against the amendment and in sustaining the action of the committee, we would be doing what the vast majority of the cotton farmers have requested us to do.

Mr. President, we cannot laugh off economics. As I said yesterday, cotton must be placed in a better competitive position with synthetic fibers. This is a part of the program which the Secretary of Agriculture has announced. In 1955, rayon displaced 978,000 bales of cotton. There are now under construction $155 million worth of new rayon plants. The vast majority of cotton farmers want to keep cotton competitive. They realize that they must meet the competition of the synthetics if they are to stay in business.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would the Senator be willing to support an amendment which would leave this matter to a vote of the cotton farmers?

Mr. EASTLAND. I know now what the organizations of farmers have requested.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; I know——

Mr. EASTLAND. Just a minute. I yielded for a question only. The record will sustain what I have said. The organizations of cotton farmers have requested it. What it will do is that it will tend to stop rayon expansion.

The argument is made that this provision will reduce the price of cotton by $10 or $12 a bale. As the distinguished

Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has stated, if the amendment is not adopted, under the sliding scale the Secretary of Agriculture can reduce the support price and make up the 136 points or $8 a bale. In my judgment, the price of cotton will not be increased or decreased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Every segment of the cotton industry—millers, shippers, farmers, and compressmen—believe it is a necessary provision for a prosperous cotton economy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, is the Senator from California willing to yield back the remainder of his time if the Senator from Georgia is willing to yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Georgia does not have any additional time remaining, but I am prepared to yield back my remaining time, if there are no further requests for time in opposition. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to withhold it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired or been yielded back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to correct the Senator from California. The Senator from Georgia could use some time on the bill, if he were so disposed to do. I hope we will have a yea-and-nay vote on the pending amendment. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has either been used up or has been yielded back. All time for debate on the amendment has expired. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the suggestion of the absence of a quorum has been withheld. As I understand, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will have to be in order, so that the Presiding Officer may hear what is said to the Chair. All time for debate on the amendment has been either used or returned. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, beginning with line 23, it is proposed to strike out through line 4 on page 4.

On page 4, line 6, strike out "105" and insert "104"; line 15, strike out "106" and insert "105"; and line 24, strike out "107" and insert "106."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. If he were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent in the State, and, if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is detained on official business, and his pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has been announced previously.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—42

Barkley	Humphrey	Morse
Bible	Jackson	Mundt
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Chavez	Kerr	Neuberger
Daniel	Langer	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Lehman	Russell
Ervin	Long	Scott
Frear	Magnuson	Smathers
Fulbright	Mansfield	Sparkman
George	McCarthy	Symington
Hayden	McClellan	Thurmond
Hennings	McNamara	Welker
Hill	Monroney	Young

NAYS—47

Aiken	Dworshak	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Eastland	Pastore
Anderson	Flanders	Payne
Barrett	Goldwater	Potter
Beall	Gore	Purtell
Bender	Green	Robertson
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bricker	Holland	Schoeppel
Bush	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Butler	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Jenner	Stennis
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	Thye
Cotton	Knowland	Watkins
Curtis	Kuchel	Wiley
Douglas	Malone	Williams
Duff	Martin, Iowa	

NOT VOTING—6

Bridges	Clements	Kefauver
Case, S. Dak.	Dirksen	Millikin

So the amendment offered by Mr. GEORGE, for himself and Mr. KERR, was rejected.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Vermont to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Vermont to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin desires to yield to the Senator from New Mexico, for the purpose of permitting the Senator from New Mexico to move to reconsider the vote on another amendment, with the understanding that the Senator from Wisconsin shall not lose the floor. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Mexico may proceed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] for himself and on behalf of the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], designated as A–2–21–56, was agreed to, and I ask that the motion lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be received and will lie on the table.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4 lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to strike out "not less than 80 percent nor more than 90 percent" and insert in lieu therof "not less than 90 percent."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, my amendment is very clear. It merely provides that the scale of "not less than 80 percent nor more than 90 percent" be stricken from the bill and that 90-percent supports on dairy products be made mandatory.

I shall state the reason for my amendment. I feel confident that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, if allowed discretion, will support dairy products at only 80 percent. I think that is discrimination against the dairy farmer. He is being treated as a second-class citizen. However, I talked at length on this amendment when it was submitted. Anything I would say now would be largely repetitious.

I am not going to ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment; I am merely going to ask for a voice vote.

If any Senator cares to address the Senate on the amendment, I shall be glad to yield time to him. Otherwise, I ask for an immediate vote on the amendment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the senior Senator from Wisconsin as much time as he desires.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I realize that there was quite a fight in the committee in relation to the milk section. I have spoken repeatedly before city groups and farm groups in relation to the milk situation in the State of Wisconsin. I myself have been a dairy farmer since 1916. There was a time when we could buy

machinery at 30 to 40 percent of what we have to pay now. There was a time when we could get labor at one-third of what we have to pay now.

The result is, Mr. President, that by and large, except in certain areas, the milk farmers in my State are not getting what might be called the cost of production plus a reasonable return for what they produce.

Or, putting it another way, the milk farmers are earning from 11 cents to 41 cents an hour, when they themselves can go into the cities and make from a dollar up to two and a half dollars an hour. The result is that there are foreclosures, and farmers are going out of business.

While I am speaking essentially on behalf of the small farmer, I want to say a few words about the national interest.

The national interest is primarily concerned in maintaining and preserving the productivity of this country. If we let the dairy business go haywire, so to speak, we shall let the soil of this country go to pieces. The best fertilizing agent is the dairy cow, and it preserves the productive condition of the soil.

We have heard a lot of talk on the floor of the Senate about the conditions which affect different segments of our society. We have protected labor by a minimum wage. We have increased the salaries of our public servants, our legislators, our administrators, and our judicial officers, in order that they may get a living wage. We have subsidized publishers of our newspapers and magazines by distributing their products at below the cost thereof. We have subsidized those who carry our mails out of the Treasury of the United States and made up the deficit of the Post Office Department. We have appropriated through the years millions of dollars for improving harbors on our coasts, which has resulted in the betterment of a certain class or group of cities. When floods or other acts of nature have destroyed property, the public purse has been called on to aid and assist. We have subsidized the shipping industry.

Yet, when it comes to sustaining the backbone of America—the American farmer, who is caught in a squeeze—we sometimes hear it called socialism.

I am interested primarily in seeing to it that that segment of America which has always been the backbone is not so depleted that, in the generations to come, we shall not be able to produce the food that is necessary.

COMMENDATION OF THE WISCONSIN FARMERS' UNION

On this subject of socialism which we have heard so much of on this floor recently, I should like to make just a few observations with regard to the issue of the National Farmers' Union which has been raised within the past week on the Senate floor. I am not going to refer to anyone inside the Senate who holds views contrary to my own on the National Farmers Union. But I want to say, in all fairness and frankness, that I do object most strenuously, and I dispute most vigorously, the criticism which is made of this organization. To my way of thinking, it is honest, it is patriotic, it is acting in accordance with its convictions—whether I happen to agree with all of its views or not.

Yes; I am glad to defend this organization, despite certain minor facts—

(a) I have on some occasions differed with both the national group and the group in my own State.

(b) Some few folks in the organization have in the past opposed me, particularly at time of election, which is their prerogative or any American's prerogative.

(c) At some times in the past there may have been in the organization some few individuals holding a questionable philosophy of Government; but the presence of such few individuals in a group is hardly unique. There is hardly an organization in America—a church, veterans' group, labor group, or professional group—which has not had some undesirables in it at one time or another.

But I say very emphatically that the National Farmers' Union is a law-abiding American organization; that its leaders and members are, to the best of my knowledge, patriotic citizens who believe in the Constitution, the American flag, and every other symbol of our national existence.

WISCONSIN FARMERS UNION

And I want to say a particular word about members of the Wisconsin Farmers Union.

They are good, honest, hard-working, grassroots farmers. I have seen them countless times—here in Washington or in my hometown, which is State headquarters. I have spoken at farmers' meetings, sent statements to Farm Union periodicals, reprinted Farm Union resolutions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I have written to members, telephoned to them, been in their houses, met them at county fairs, enjoyed contacts with them, as I have with the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, groups affiliated with the National Milk Producers Federation, and others.

These Wisconsin members of the Farmers Union are as American as folks in any of the other groups which I have mentioned. And I do not believe that it would be fair, in the slightest, if I were to let pass unnoticed any unfair criticism which reflects upon them or which compares some of their views in the same breath as views of the Communist Party.

If we are to judge American organizations solely by whether or not the Communist Party happens to parrot the same theme, then Heaven help us. For all I know, the Daily Worker may in its issue today have an appeal for contributions to the American Red Cross or to the Crippled Children's Fund. Would that fact reflect on the American Red Cross or on the Crippled Children's Fund? Of course not.

Let us, therefore, in fairness and frankness, follow policies which respect the rights of citizens to differ with us on farm parity or any other issue.

AGREEMENT ON MANY ISSUES

I, for one, am happy to have agreed with the Farmers Union on such vital issues as the St. Lawrence Seaway, rural electrification, rural phones, livestock disease research, and a great many other matters. We have, however, differed on some topics. But, all this aside, Americanism or un-Americanism is a wholly different matter, and no man's or no group's patriotism should ever be unfairly impugned.

Mr. President, I realize that we cannot, by legislation, turn a crook into an angel; and I also realize that, by legislation, we cannot correct a lot of our economic ills. All we can do is create a condition so that the individuals who are suffering may be given, for the time being, a palliative. That is what we are asking for the milk farmers, who are producing milk, in certain sections of our State, at 5 and 6 cents a quart. Milk cannot be produced profitably at that price.

What are the remedies? The remedies are to see to it that for the time being the farmers will at least be given a living wage. How will that be done? That is why I am speaking on behalf of the amendment. I am satisfied that a price of 5 and 6 cents a quart will not give them a living wage. As a result, the land will become vacant and unoccupied and unproductive.

I see the distinguished Senator from Florida has come on the floor. Let me tell him that down in the State of Florida the farmers are getting twice what the dairy farmers in Wisconsin are getting for their milk.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Wisconsin is not suggesting that Florida farmers are getting supports from the Government is he?

Mr. WILEY. That is not what I said. I am talking about what the farmers of Wisconsin are getting for their products.

Mr. HOLLAND. I simply wanted the RECORD to be clear that the Florida dairymen are not asking for supports and are not getting supports.

Mr. WILEY. Of course not. The reason they are not getting supports is that they do not need them. Yet the Wisconsin farmers are working every bit as hard as Florida dairy farmers are, and they are producing better milk than is produced in Florida.

What is the remedy? First, for the time being, when the patient is sick he should be given support, and the support should be at least an adequate amount. Ninety percent would, I believe, produce about $4.20 a hundred. $4.20 a hundred would be about 10 cents a quart.

Mr. President, in discussing this subject, we must remember that we cannot by mere legislation remedy an economic ill. Therefore, I suggest that we remove the barriers in the District of Columbia, so that Wisconsin milk can be shipped into the District of Columbia, which is the best market in the world for milk and milk products. But now that cannot be done, at present. We often complain about the creation of economic barriers between countries, what about the economic barrier that has been created by the District of Columbia?

Second, Mr. President, we do not produce what really is an excess amount of milk; it will not be excess if there is sufficient distribution. But barriers

are being built against the shipment of milk to various parts of our land—the land of the free and the home of the privileged. Who are the privileged? If we consider the price the farmers of Maryland and the farmers of Virginia receive for their milk, we find that they receive as much as 12 or 14 cents a quart.

In Wisconsin, the dairymen, in certain areas, are getting 5 or 6 cents a quart. The Wisconsin dairymen would like to ship milk to the District of Columbia, so that the school children in the District of Columbia can have plenty of milk, and so that the young people in the colleges in the District of Columbia can have three glasses of milk a day. Let us remove the barriers.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconson yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The milk producers who are in the Chicago milkshed are not getting the low prices the Senator from Wisconsin has mentioned.

Mr. WILEY. No; but they are getting about $3.65 a hundred, which is about 8 cents a quart net. That is what they are getting in that milkshed area, after the shipping costs are deducted.

However, I am referring to the great number of producers in our State who do not have the privilege of shipping milk into the isolated areas that are provided under the law.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to me?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then the Senator from Wisconsin recognizes, does he not, that, after all, economics and the law of supply and demand have some bearing even in Wisconsin, where the milk producers who are in the Chicago milkshed get a satisfactory price for their product.

Mr. WILEY. I realize that the law of economics applies. That is why we raised the salaries of Senators. But the Senator from Florida does not want to have the income of the poor farmers raised. We have established minimum wages, so that the workers can live, but the farmer should not be considered.

Mr. President, I realize that my good friend, the Senator from Virginia, will not agree to the removal of the barrier that gives Virginia a land of milk and honey in Washington, D. C. But the milk producers in Wisconsin are Americans, raise families, pay taxes, and want an opportunity to make a living wage.

Mr. President, I was referring to distribution of dairy products. Last year I took up with the Secretary of Agriculture the imperative need of getting milk into the schools of the country, because many of our young men who have gone into the armed services have been found to be physically defective, frequently because of malnutrition. Milk, butter, and cheese are the best foods in the world for the development of healthy bodies. As a result of our activities, more milk was supplied to the camps, and the schools. But at this time the conferees are delaying and are not reporting the bill for additional funds, so that more milk may be supplied to the schools. Mr. President, I am thinking of the children who need the great food that we in Wisconsin produce.

Mr. President, I also have suggested that there be established a laboratory which would have the specific assignment of engaging in research into other uses for milk, for food, and other uses.

In that connection, let me point out that, as was stated yesterday, nylon today is taking over the cotton market. Incidentally, Mr. President, I am now wearing a shirt made of nylon. If a shirt can be made from such synthetics, we should be able to use the constituent parts of milk for the production of other commodities than milk powder, butter, and cheese. The Government itself should be interested in the establishment of such a laboratory or institution. The place for it should be in Wisconsin.

The Secretary of Agriculture has done a fairly good job in the distribution of powdered milk and butter. As a consequence, the surplus supplies of those commodities have been diminished considerably. Our big problem is cheese. If we could educate some Senators and our people to eat as much cheese as they should—for cheese supplies the iron that everyone needs in his blood—we would begin a program which would mean that there would no longer be a surplus of cheese. And the result would be that the farmers who are producing this fine product would receive a living wage.

Mr. President, we must also consider the international field, in which there is very great need for these foodstuffs, including powdered milk. I myself frequently use Wisconsin powdered milk. If it is made into liquid milk, and then is placed under refrigeration, one cannot tell the difference between it and other kinds of milk, particularly some of the Virginia milk. [Laughter.]

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to inform my colleague that my time has almost expired. I do not know what arguments may be made against the amendment. I should like to reserve some time, so as to be able to answer any arguments which may be made against it. Therefore, if my colleague will do so, I shall appreciate it very much if he will terminate his remarks quite quickly.

Mr. WILEY. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILEY. Then, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, let me say to my colleague that I thought 1 hour was available to us.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; unfortunately not.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I hope with the two Senators from Wisconsin, that the time is not far off when our dairymen will get a good price, not only for milk that is used in fluid form for human consumption, but also for milk used for processing into dairy products.

However, Mr. President, we have had a rather unsatisfactory experience with 90-percent supports for dairy products. It will be recalled that for the several years prior to 1954, 90-percent supports for dairy products were in effect. But the dairymen did not receive the full 90 percent. Instead, they lost 14 percent of their per capita market for dairy products; and even now, that has not been recovered.

Then, in the spring of 1954, as Senators will recall, the support price for dairy products was dropped to 75 percent of parity. For the first few months, there was a sharp drop in the income of the dairymen; but then it began to pick up. It picked up more in some parts of the country than it did in others. Since then, we have recovered the market for approximately 300 million pounds of the 500 million pounds which were lost, in the case of butter. A year ago the Commodity Credit Corporation had on hand 266 million pounds of butter. Today, the Commodity Credit Corporation has on hand only about 10 million pounds of butter. Other surpluses of dairy products have been reduced accordingly.

As I have said, in the spring of 1954 the support price of milk was fixed at 75 percent of parity. But because of the increased consumption, it was possible in the spring of 1955 to increase the support price to 78 percent of parity. This year, because of still more favorable conditions, including the supply and demand factor, it has been possible for the Secretary of Agriculture to set the support price at 82 percent of parity.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I shall yield in just a minute, Mr. President.

However, in setting the support prices, we must set them on a national basis. Unfortunately some parts of the country, particularly the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota, and some of the adjacent areas, have not shared in the general improvement which some other parts of the country have experienced. I think they are on their way. The surpluses are getting out of the way. There is 61 percent less butter in storage today in the important storage centers of the country than there was a year ago.

Civilian per capita consumption of milk and other dairy products has gone up 21 pounds per capita in the past 18 or 20 months. Consumption has increased in the past 2 years about 8½ billion pounds, while production has been increasing about 3 billion pounds. So we are on the way.

We have a problem in the manufacturing areas which we have not yet been able to solve, because, regardless of the fact that manufacturing milk is supported at $3.14 a hundredweight, in Wisconsin today I find that the price which is being paid by the plants is $3 a hundredweight. The farmer is not getting the 14 cents additional which he ought to get under the support program. There are many reasons why he is not getting it. I suppose some of the plants cannot pass it back and continue in existence.

Others may not have the desire to pass it back.

The supply and demand situation is straightening out. I hope that by the coming fall the market price of all milk in this country will be averaging 90 percent of parity. It averaged 87 percent in February—97 percent for fluid milk and 82 percent for manufacturing milk, making the average for all milk 87 percent of parity. That is some improvement.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator is mistaken so far as my State is concerned. Milk has not averaged 87 percent of parity.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe it has, either; and it is unfortunate, in view of the fact that the State of Wisconsin has done a magnificent job in promoting the sale of fluid milk, which is what brings the higher price to the farmer. The New York City and Philadelphia areas have increased the consumption of milk only 2½ percent, barely keeping up with the increase in population. The State of Wisconsin has increased the consumption of milk 10 percent in the past few years. The Twin Cities have increased consumption by 12 percent, or even more. However, the producers are stuck with lower prices for manufacturing milk. That is one of the major problems of the dairy industry today. I do not believe that a return to the 90-percent program is the solution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall confine myself to 1 minute.

I am very happy that the Senator from Wisconsin has offered this amendment. I favor it. We have the same problem in South Dakota that exists in Wisconsin. Wherever reliance is placed upon the market for manufacturing milk, we find that a little gimmick in the bill, in lines 11 and 12 on page 4, weakens the effectiveness of the price supports, and prevents the farmer from getting the full price-support guaranty. The language is:

> Not less than 80 percent nor more than 90 percent of the parity price therefor using a parity equivalent for manufacturing milk based on the 30-month period, July 1946 to December 1948, both inclusive.

It is on the basis of a parity equivalent for manufacturing milk that we are shaved down.

The committee, in its reconstruction of section 105, took a strong step forward in the direction of accomplishing, to a degree, what the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin would accomplish to a greater degree—and I think a justifiable degree. By selecting the 30-month period and changing the formula, we have taken a step in the right direction. However, Senator McCARTHY's amendment would be a longer step in this same commendable direction.

Mr. President, I urge support of the pending amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. As has been stated, this amendment would require dairy products to be supported at not less than 90 percent of parity instead of between 80 and 90 percent, as is now provided in the bill.

On the basis of January 15 data, this would raise the minimum support price for manufacturing milk to $3.65 per hundredweight, or 40 cents above the level provided in the bill, and 50 cents above the current support price. No method of controlling production of dairy products has been devised; supporting these perishable commodities at the proposed 90 percent of parity level may build up stocks and price-support costs to such a point as to endanger the entire price-support program.

The committee voted to place in the bill, in section 105, a provision raising the support level of milk from its present range of 75 percent to 90 percent of parity, to the proposed new scale of 80 percent to 90 percent of parity. We also provided that the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk, based upon a 30-month period, from July 1946 to December 1948, both inclusive, would be used instead of the moving base period.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will yield in a moment.

The change in the formula means that, under the present law, if price support remains at from 75 to 90 percent of parity, the minimum support price on manufacturing milk will be raised from $2.88 to $3.25, a difference of 37 cents. If the amendment offered by my good friend from Wisconsin were adopted, it would mean that manufacturing milk would be supported at about $3.65 per hundredweight. My fear is, as I stated before the committee, that much of the milk which is now used in the raw state would find its way into manufactured products and, ultimately into CCC storage. As the record shows, in the past 2½ years, the losses to the Government on powdered milk, manufacturing milk, butter, and cheese aggregated almost $700 million.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. My good friend, the senior Senator from Wisconsin stated that the milk and brucellosis bill conferees on the Senate side were inactive. I should like to state that I have been sitting here for the past 3 or 4 weeks trying to get the pending bill through; nevertheless, I have, in the meantime, made a serious effort to get the conferees on the House side to sit with us on the milk and brucellosis bill, but to no avail. I tried to get them to meet a week ago last Friday, and they were unable to do so. They asked that we meet the next day, which was Saturday; I was available, but was unable to get a sufficient number of the other Senate conferees.

We are confronted with this problem: The House Members were unwilling to take the Senate bill as we approved it. They have no objection to providing funds for the milk program, as well as the brucellosis program, until June 30.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. They would like to have the Senate place in the pending farm bill an amendment which would take care of the situation from July 1 on. If we did that, the conferees could meet, and within 10 minutes we would have sufficient money to provide for the program during the remainder of this fiscal year.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield first to the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana a question. I have a great deal of respect for his knowledge of agricultural problems. I think he has been doing a tremendous job. Therefore I am sure he is aware of the situation.

The Senator from Louisiana has talked about increasing the price-support level to not less than 90 percent, instead of between 80 and 90 percent. Can we agree that if we leave it at from 80 to 90 percent, the present Secretary of Agriculture will certainly support milk at the lowest possible figure, namely, 80 percent, because at the present time he is supporting it at the lowest possible figure, namely, 75? For that reason, to give him the discretion of going up to 90 percent is meaningless, because he certainly will not do it, and the dairy farmer will still be discriminated against. Can we agree on that?

Mr. ELLENDER. Although the minimum is 75 percent, milk is now being supported at 82 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I might say that the Secretary is required to support the price of milk, between 75 and 90 percent, at such a level as will obtain the desired production. In view of the increased consumption of milk during the past 2 years, he has been able to raise the support price from the minimum to 78 percent last year, and to 83 percent this year. If consumption continues to improve—and I believe the consumption of milk and milk products will steadily increase—it should not be too long when the support price will be up higher than it is now.

I say again that the support must be fixed on the national basis. Unfortunately, the Senator's State, with a high percentage of manufacturing milk, does not come up to anywhere near the national average of the price. In fact, it is second or third from the bottom in price. Minnesota is the lowest.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator mentioned 82 percent. The support price for dairy products in Wisconsin is not anywhere near 82 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. No; as I said, they are getting $3 for manufacturing milk, although the support price is $3.15 for 1956.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to state to the junior Senator from Wisconsin that although in committee I voted against the section now in the bill, to which I have just

referred, so long as it is in the bill, I expect to vote for it. Under the provision in the bill as it now stands, the minimum support level for fluid milk is increased to 80 percent of parity. With the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk fixed on a 30-month period from July 1946 to December 1948, it will make possible even with the minimum support level of 75 percent of parity in effect, an increase in the support price from $2.88 to $3.25 for manufacturing milk.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has approximately 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Throughout the debate on the farm bill, which has been in progress for some time now, I have tried to evaluate the arguments from the standpoint of the interests of the individual farmer and also from the national interests. I should like to say to the Senator—and I should like to have his answer—that the average farm in Wisconsin is 140 acres, and the average income of the farmer ranges from 11 cents an hour to 41 cents an hour. The result is that the farm population has gone down and is continuing to go down. Acres which should be kept fertile—and that is the point—are not being kept fertile. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana what he thinks the effect of the low income has upon the general welfare, causing people to leave the farm and to go into the cities—people who should be building their homes and earning their livelihood and enjoying their lives in the country—where wages average $2 an hour. Under the circumstances, is it not of great interest and a challenge to us to see to it that the farm population remains on the farm and that that segment of our economy is kept economically healthy?

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to state to my good friend from Wisconsin that the situation to which he refers is not peculiar to Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I recognize that fact.

Mr. ELLENDER. The same conditions prevail in Louisiana and in Mississippi and in Alabama, and in other agricultural States.

What we tried to do in the bill in committee was to give immediate economic relief to the farmer. As I said, I voted against the inclusion in the bill of section 105, which was submitted by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, providing for an increase of 5 percent in price supports for milk, and also changing the period used for computing the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk to 30 months, instead of 10 years.

Let me say further to my good friend from Wisconsin that the committee held hearings all over the United States in connection with this proposed legislation. We found that, generally speaking, those who produced milk were in fair condition. They were not complaining too much, because the production of milk was somewhat in keeping with the consumption of milk in their respective localities. It was only in parts of North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Wisconsin—and only parts of those States—that we found there was quite a bit of complaint, and probably justified complaint.

However, I go back to the proposition that if we provide high price supports for manufacturing milk, the tendency will be, as it has been in the past, for the farmers to utilize raw milk in the manufacture of butter and cheese and dried milk. My fear is that so doing will further aggravate the production problem to the point where the Government will again have to take over much butter, much cheese, and much dried milk. As I have stated, the losses sustained on operations of that nature have been very great. I do not believe we should now vote an amendment which would further aggravate the situation.

Mr. WILEY. I do not believe the Senator from Louisiana has answered my question. I asked him whether there was a great public interest and challenge to see to it that the farm population of America remain on the farms and receive a wage at least sufficient to permit them to stay there.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator has answered that question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree.

Mr. WILEY. In listening to the arguments on the farm bill, I noticed that there was a diversity of opinion. For instance, a few minutes ago, we discussed cotton. Some Senators stated what they felt would be the right course to take in respect to that. Others said that was not the right course. I have listened to both sides of the argument during the debate, and I have had to form my opinion, not in the sense that I particularly favor one side or another side, but I do have, as I said, the interest of the farmer and the public interest in mind.

I say to the Senator that the same rule applies to the farmers in the South. However, there is a great difference. Cotton is not a food. We can get along without cotton. However, we cannot get along without food. If we paralyze the food industry of America by shortsightedness, in failing to give honest workers who work 14 or 15 hours a day a decent wage, we are challenging the life of the Nation. It was this group of people who, when the world wanted food, fed the world; when people wanted food, the farmers fed them and increased their production. Now at long last we are saying to them, "Starve, or get off the farm."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator for a question, not for a speech.

I wish to repeat that the same condition about which the Senator speaks prevails all over the South. There are many small farmers there who try to make a living from 25 percent of their total farm acreage. The thing to do is to give them immediate help by increasing the prices they receive, by raising support prices on that which they produce. But that battle has been lost, and I have nothing further to say about it. I wish to say to my good friend from Wisconsin that the conditions to which he refers are not peculiar to the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. President, this amendment would require dairy products to be supported at not less than 90 percent of parity, instead of between 80 and 90 percent as provided by the bill.

On the basis of January 15 data, this would raise the minimum support price for manufacturing milk to $3.65 per hundredweight, 40 cents above that provided by the bill and 50 cents above the current support price. No method of controlling production of dairy products has been devised and support of these perishable commodities at this level may build up stocks and price-support costs to such a point as to endanger the entire price-support program.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield myself half a minute of that time and will give the remainder to the senior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I am very happy to find the senior Senator from Wisconsin and myself in complete agreement. He and I have differed very often, and I am very happy to find that when the interests of the dairy farmer are considered the senior Senator and I are in complete agreement.

Mr. President, I yield the remaining 2½ minutes to my colleague.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, the farm is the true laboratory of all life—where nature's mysteries, birth, growth, and decline rhythmically unfold with the seasons.

Springtime will soon be here, and with it the first buds, the first shoots. Where in the cities can we see so awesome and inspiring a drama as on the farm?

But farming is no easy task. It is backbreaking. It is complex and requires long hours of work. The dairy farmer must be a plant and an insect expert, an amateur veterinarian, a mechanic, accountant, economist, and a dozen other specialists rolled into one—7 days a week, virtually 52 weeks a year.

I mention these facts so that the city man or woman may better appreciate the farmer's problems.

I mention them so that some city people may not say: "Oh, listen to those farm Senators talking about parity supports for the farmers, as if they were the only ones involved."

The consumer is very definitely involved in the farm question. He does not want to see huge cotton or tobacco surpluses. He does want to see dairy items produced for the stomach, not for the warehouse.

Mr. President, I sincerely feel that the few cents we are giving the farmer, approximately $3.65 a hundred pounds, or about 9 cents a quart, for milk for which we have to pay 24 or 25 cents a quart, is not treating the farmer properly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back such time as I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 35, between lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to insert:

PEANUT MARKETING PENALTIES

SEC. 405. Effective beginning with the 1956 crop, section 359 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by amending the first sentence thereof to read as follows: "The marketing of any peanuts in excess of the marketing quota for the farm on which such peanuts are produced, or the marketing of peanuts from any farm for which no acreage allotment was determined, shall be subject to a penalty at a rate equal to 75 percent of the support price for peanuts for the marketing year (August 1–July 31)."

SEC. 406. Section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding two new subsections as follows:

"(d) The person liable for payment or collection of the penalty provided by this section shall be liable also for interest thereon at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date the penalty becomes due until the date of payment of such penalty.

"(e) Until the amount of the penalty provided by this section is paid, a lien on the crop of peanuts with respect to which such penalty is incurred, and on any subsequent crop of peanuts subject to marketing quotas in which the person liable for payment of the penalty has an interest, shall be in effect in favor of the United States."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

This amendment differs slightly from the amendment which I offered a few days ago. Changes were made at the suggestion of the Department of Agriculture. All the amendment does is to change the present penalty of 50 percent of the support price to 75 percent of the support price, in order effectively to deter violations. Currently, violators with sizable excess acreages are mostly larger landowners with customary landlord-tenant arrangements whereby the landlord furnishes the land and fertilizer against the tenant's labor and machinery. Fertilizer costs for peanuts are relatively low. Hence, the landlord, who does not care about the soundness of the overall program can expect a return on excess peanuts comparable to other crops which have a lower support or no support.

The great majority of growers want the penalty increased so as to prevent the few who are not interested in the soundness of the program from endangering the program.

Also, the problem of administering and enforcing the penalty is most difficult where a farmer has more than one farm allotment and complies on one farm but is over on other farms. In such cases those who wish to avoid some of the penalty will market some of the peanuts from an excess farm on the marketing card for the within quota farm.

The proposed amendment does one thing: Increases the penalty for excess peanuts from 50 percent to 75 percent of support price.

Mr. President, so far as I am aware, there is no opposition to this amendment, and I ask that it be adopted and made a part of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Prior to the calling up of this amendment, the Senator from Virginia asked that the committee look over it, and I submitted the amendment to the Department of Agriculture. There was one objection to the original amendment, namely, to that portion which appeared at the bottom of page 2, wherein the Secretary was authorized to compromise any claim for penalty provided by that section at any time prior to the referral of such claim to the Department of Justice. The Department of Agriculture took the position that the provision might result in a great deal of pressure being brought on the Department, in certain cases.

With that provision deleted, and with a few minor changes, I, as chairman of the committee, have no objection to the amendment, for the simple reason that the only thing it does is to increase the penalty in connection with peanut marketing quotas from 50 percent to 75 percent of the support price; it also would require the payment of interest at 6 percent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. BYRD. I do, Mr. President.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am prepared to yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the time on the amendment is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], I call up my amendment 3–7–56–Q, and ask that it be read.

I also ask that the name of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the name of the senior Senator from Georgia will be added as a cosponsor.

The clerk will now state the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Mississippi, for himself and on behalf of other Senators.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR COTTON FOR 1957 AND 1958

SEC. 403. Section 342 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the national marketing quota for cotton for 1957 and 1958 shall be not less than the number of bales required to provide a national acreage allotment for 1957 and 1958 equal to the national acreage allotment for 1956."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I feel the amendment is noncontroversial and is fully understood by the membership of the Senate generally. It merely provides that the cotton acreage allotments for the years 1957 and 1958 shall not be reduced below the cotton acreage allotment applying for 1956.

The reason for offering the amendment is that the reduction in cotton acreage allotments has been so rapid and so severe during the past few years that the allotments have already reached a point where a great segment of the cotton farmers cannot stand any more acreage reductions and still continue to grow cotton.

In 1953, 28,330,000 acres of cotton were planted in the entire Nation. That acreage has steadily fallen, so that in 1956 the allotment for cotton was only 17,391,000 acres. From a national standpoint, that is a reduction of 37 percent in 3 years.

If the agriculture bill shall become law, and even though it may be successful with reference to surpluses and the operation of the soil bank according to best possible calculations we shall be faced with an additional national reduction in cotton acreage next year amounting to more than 1,500,000 acres.

The acreage reduction already has gone beyond that required in many cases to permit an income necessary to meet minimum family needs. The reductions at the State level are even much more severe than they are at the national level. Farmers in my own State of Mississippi, have suffered a reduction of 40.1 percent from the 1953 level. If the scheduled reduction for 1957 should occur, there will be another 11.4 percent statewide reduction. This will bring about a total reduction of 48 percent in acreage since 1953, and will result in an unbearable situation.

Furthermore, when reductions are applied at the county level, they are frequently much higher on a percentage basis than they are at the State level. In many of the counties of Mississippi the reductions for 1957 would run as high as 15 percent when applied at the county level, and even higher when applied at the farm level.

The reductions which have already been sustained have created hardships for all farmers but have been the hardest on what we call the homestead farmer.

A large operator may lose some of his acres, but if 3 or 4 years later he cares to come back under the plan, he is still

in business and can take advantage of the acreage. But the reductions which have been sustained by the homestead farmer have been putting him out of business. If the reductions go any further, he will have to suffer severe losses, or move away from his farm. When times get better or the acreage situation improves, he will not be able to benefit because he will have left the farm.

There are floors for wheat, corn, peanuts, and rice. In the amendment now being considered a floor is being sought for cotton, so as to meet conditions in the next 2 years only.

Another evidence of the acreage reductions is the fact that in 1955, throughout the cotton area, 55,000 rental families were caused to be displaced. Acreage has been reduced so often that the point has been reached where such reductions cannot be borne any longer. Additional reductions will fall the hardest on those who are least able to bear them.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator stated in his opening remarks, there seems to be no opposition to the amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Not so far as I know.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that the administration likewise has stated that it does not object to the amendment. There is a letter in the RECORD to that effect, dated March 2, 1956; it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 8, 1956, on page 4267.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Mississippi in urging the adoption of the amendment. The Senator from Mississippi has clearly presented the picture which confronts the cotton farmer today, particularly the cotton farmer who has a small acreage. The Senator made a very extended presentation on Wednesday night of last week, showing how necesssary it is that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I had to step outside the Chamber in order to answer a telephone call while the Senator from Mississippi was speaking. How much of an increase in acreage would the amendment provide?

Mr. STENNIS. It provides for no increase at all; it would merely carry the acreage at the 1956 level.

Mr. YOUNG. How much of a drop would the amendment prevent?

Mr. STENNIS. It is anticipated that next year there will be a reduction, on a nationwide basis, of 8.9 percent, or in round numbers, about 1,500,000 acres.

Mr. YOUNG. Will the amendment prevent a drop in acreage then?

Mr. STENNIS. It will prevent a drop in acreage for next year.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. It simply provides, for 2 years, a floor under cotton acreage similar to that which is now enjoyed by wheat and other commodities. We today placed the cotton support price on the same basis as that of wheat. The amendment would place a floor under acreage reductions for cotton at the same amount as now exists.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I will not oppose the amendment, but I do not think the statement is quite accurate, so far as wheat is concerned. The wheat farmers brought their production this year into line with domestic needs plus exports. Cotton producers raised a great deal more cotton than it was possible to consume domestically and to export abroad.

Mr. EASTLAND. What my friend says is true; but the amendment makes economic sense when considered together with the export program which has been announced.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. There have been very substantial subsidies for the export of wheat. If there had been similar subsidies in the past few years with respect to the export of cotton, there would not be any surplus cotton left in the country, and no acreage reduction would be necessary.

Ordinarily, I would not have favored the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi. If the soil bank program becomes effective, it is intended that it will take 3 million acres out of the cotton acreage allotment. That would mean a reduction, based upon last year's yield, of about 2,500,000 bales.

Under the soil bank proposal, the more realistic grade on which to base the support price for cotton would be reestablished.

The Government is also moving ahead with a very promising cotton export program. It may be recalled that the Secretary of Agriculture announced last fall that in January he would offer on the world market a million bales of the lowest grade cotton. That offer was supposed to have been good until August. The million bales were sold in about 6 weeks time; and in the seventh week the entire amount was disposed of.

It looks as if we can recover the world market for cotton which we had even a few years ago. If we couple the increased sales of 2½ million bales of cotton with another 2½ million bale reduction through the operation of the soil bank, there will be a 5 million bale difference in the situation as it exists this year.

It is true that there are about 14 million bales of cotton on hand, which is just about a year's domestic supply, plus what we hope will be a year's export.

In view of that, if those provisions remain in the bill and the bill becomes law, we might assume it will not be necessary to cut the acreage below what it is now, in order to reduce the surplus to manageable proportions.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I hardly agree with the statement of the Senator from Vermont. It is true that wheat has enjoyed a better export program, but wheat is in a completely different category. Wheat is grown in practically every State of the Union and in practically every country in the world, and every country in the world except three has a higher support level than we have in the United States. We would not be able to export very much wheat unless we had an export program.

I envy the cotton producers for getting such a favorable concession from the Department of Agriculture, but I would be the last one to stand in the way of the cotton producers from getting a better deal. I point out that the treatment accorded to cotton farmers is much better than that accorded to wheat farmers. I think it is the wrong way to do business, but I am not going to stand in the way of cotton farmers receiving what I think is a fair deal. We shall continue our fight in behalf of more equitable treatment for wheat farmers. I do not think the Congress will stand for the unfair treatment the Secretary of Agriculture is dealing the wheat farmers.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is very fair in his attitude, and I wish to assure him that anything we can do to make sure that his wheat farmers are treated properly we shall be glad to do.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the pending amendment so as to prevent a reduction in the national cotton acreage allotment for 1957 and 1958 below the allotment for this year.

I have joined in offering the amendment, and I cannot impress upon the Senate too strongly the urgency for its adoption.

The junior Senator from Mississippi has presented to the Senate the picture of the critical situation confronting cotton farmers in Mississippi and throughout the Cotton Belt, and the disastrous consequences that are resulting from continued reduction in cotton-acreage allotments.

In Alabama, as in Mississippi and other cotton-producing States, cotton is still the chief source of cash income for the overwhelming majority of our farmers. The farmers throughout the Cotton Belt have put forth herculean efforts and made unexcelled strides in the diversification of their crops and their sources of income. In no section of the Nation have farmers done more to carry out the policies of Congress which have declared diversification to be in the national interest. Our cotton farmers, and particularly those operating family size cotton farms, have for years, by practicing diversification, steadily and voluntarily reduced the extent of their reliance upon cotton as a source of cash income.

Now we come face to face with the anomalous situation of finding these same farmers who have done so much to

carry out the policies of Congress being penalized more than any others for having diverted cotton acres to other sources of farm income.

With the decline in the price of livestock and other crops to which the cotton farmer has diverted, he is now being subjected to severe hardship and even being driven from his farm for carrying out the very agricultural reforms Congress declared were essential to strengthen his economic position and that of the Nation.

The cotton acreage of small farmers in particular has been reduced to the point of virtually destroying their ability to get credit to carry on their farming operations. Thousands of such farmers throughout the Nation are being forced to leave the soil they love only to swell the rolls of the unemployed in our towns and cities. In addition, in the single year 1955, 55,348 tenants and their families in the Cotton Belt were forced to leave the farm because of reductions in cotton allotments. Seven thousand five hundred and fifty-four of these were in Alabama.

I wish to take a moment to describe the gravity of the situation in my State. In 1953 Alabama farmers planted 1,652,980 acres of cotton. Two years later Alabama farmers had suffered drastic acreage cuts amounting to almost 550,000 acres. This tremendous reduction in their No. 1 source of cash income was followed by a further reduction this year of approximately 76,000 acres. This amounts to a total reduction of some 38 percent in a 3-year period.

Let us keep in mind that these same cotton farmers have suffered large reductions in their profits from their other farming operations, and many have suffered great losses in these other farming operations. Add to this the 38-percent reduction in their cotton acreage, the decline in the price of cotton, and the rising cost of all farming operations, and we readily see why it has become impossible for thousands of our farmers to make ends meet, and why they have had to abandon their farms.

I am sure no Member of the Senate would contend that any businessman in America could long survive with such losses.

Ironically, while the cotton farmer is being driven out of business, corporation income and the income of nonfarm people have increased sharply.

During the past year corporation income increased by 26 percent; the average worker's income increased 7 percent, while the farmer's income in the same period dropped another 11 percent. The farmer's share of the consumer dollar has dropped to the lowest point in 15 years. Today the parity ratio stands 6 points below the 1935–39 average. The farmer's share of the national income is at the lowest point in the history of the United States. The Department of Agriculture announced on Tuesday a drop of a billion dollars in the net income of the farmers of America in the single year 1954–55.

The Nation simply cannot afford to permit such a situation to continue. Yet, unless the pending amendment is adopted the situation will not only continue as it is, certainly insofar as our cotton farmers are concerned, but will grow much worse next year, when the national acreage allotment will drop by another 1,549,720 acres, from 17,391,000 acres down to 15,842,000 acres. This will amount to a further acreage reduction nationally of 9.8 percent. The farmers of Alabama will suffer a further loss of 119,638 acres, or a loss of 11.6 percent. This would mean that the farmers of Alabama would suffer a total loss in their No. 1 source of cash income of 49.6 percent in the short span of 4 years.

To permit that to happen would be the sheerest national folly. We cannot afford the terrible economic consequences that would result—the further curtailed production of industry, the increase in unemployment, and the further weakening of the Nation's economy and the Nation's strength. And we cannot afford to ignore the social aspects associated with driving the small farmer and his family away from the farm.

It cannot be denied that the family size farms have through the decades been the wellsprings of the intellectual, the moral, and the spiritual strength of our country. Unless we are prepared to see them wiped out, the amendment before the Senate must be adopted.

The hour demands a return to the constructive thinking and positive action that did so much to lift the farmer from the depths of the great depression. We must extend to the American farmer understanding, not indifference; appreciation, not persecution; faith, not cynicism; action, not promises. The question is not whether we can afford to come to his rescue. The question is: Can we afford not to come to his rescue?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back any time remaining to me, if there are no Senators who wish to speak.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 31, between lines 10 and 11, offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, identified as "3–7–56–J."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 27, it is proposed to strike out lines 13 through 18, inclusive, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 304. (a) Hereafter the quota for cotton having a staple length of 1⅛ inches or more, established September 20, 1939, pursuant to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, shall apply to the same grades and staple lengths included in the quota when such quota was initially established.

(b) Effective not later than August 1, 1956, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation are directed to use their existing powers and authorities to encourage the sale for export at competitive world prices a quantity of domestically produced extra long staple cotton equal to the amount of such cotton acquired by and brought to the United States pursuant to the act of June 7, 1939, which acquisition was not limited by the quota established pursuant to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended. The amount offered and the price accepted by the Secretary and the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be such as to dispose of such quantity in an orderly manner and within a reasonable period of time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as Senators will observe, the amendment is in two parts. The first part deals with the quota on imported cotton. The present quota was initially established on September 20, 1939, at 95,118 bales for 1⅛-inch cotton or under.

That limitation on cotton imports remained in effect until December 1940, when, for defense purposes and needs, it was decided to bring in cotton of 1 11/16 inches in length, and eliminate it from the quota. The Department of Defense now states that there is no longer any urgent military need for that quality of cotton. Such cotton is produced only in Peru, and it involved twelve or fourteen thousand bales. The entire quota would remain at 95,118 bales, and would apply to all nations. The probable effect will be that supplies of Peruvian cotton will continue to come into this country at an annual rate of about 15,000 bales and that much less Egyptian cotton will be imported.

As to the second part of the amendment, it is a substitute for section 304 in the reported bill, and reads in part as follows:

To encourage the sale for export at competitive world prices a quantity of domestically produced extra long staple cotton equal to the amount of such cotton acquired by and brought to the United States pursuant to the act of June 7, 1939.

In 1951 and 1952 our Government bought and brought to the United States a quantity of Egyptian cotton reported in the trade to be between 150,000 and 175,000 bales which is now in the stockpile as a strategic reserve. In case we should become involved in war and needed the cotton to make thread or other products, that quantity of long-staple cotton will continue to be available for such purposes. No one proposes to disturb that strategic reserve, but there are on hand about 125,000 bales of 1⅛ inches or longer American-grown cotton which has been acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The proposed amendment contains a direction to sell that long-staple cotton in an orderly manner within a reasonable period of time on the world market.

The amendment strikes out the provision of the bill which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] offered in the committee, but he now thinks my amendment is better, and he is entirely willing that the following language be stricken from the bill:

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to provide sufficient incentive to domestic users of extra long staple cotton so as to assure domestic utilization of a minimum of 30,000 bales of such cotton annually——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the Senator's amendment, it strikes from the bill section 304, which directs the Secretary to provide sufficient incentive to get rid of 30,000 bales of long-staple cotton a year.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. In lieu thereof, my amendment would direct the Secretary to try to sell at the world price about 125,000 bales of American grown long-staple cotton.

Mr. ELLENDER. Without the incentive?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an explanation of the new language which is to take the place of the section which the committee adopted as section 304, on page 27 of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER

This amendment would (1) include cotton having a staple length of 1 1/16 inches or longer within the import quota under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 for cotton having a staple length of 1 1/8 inches and longer, and (2) direct the Secretary and the Commodity Credit Corporation to use their existing powers to encourage the exportation of a quantity of extra-long-staple cotton equal to the quantity which was acquired and imported under the strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act.

An annual import quota of 45,656,420 pounds of cotton 1 1/8 inches or longer was made effective September 20, 1939. This quota was suspended with respect to cotton 1 1/16 inches and longer December 16, 1940. The amendment would make the quota applicable again to cotton 1 1/16 inches and longer.

The quantity of extra-long-staple cotton under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act is classified information and is not available at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. There was a special provision written into the Agricultural Act, I think 2 years ago, with respect to long-staple cotton produced in Arizona. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Long-staple cotton is produced in Arizona, west Texas, New Mexico, and California.

Mr. YOUNG. To what did the provision pertain?

Mr. HAYDEN. To Puerto Rican cotton.

Mr. YOUNG. At that time, 2 years ago, we were importing the long-staple cotton, and we made a special concession to the producers of this type of cotton.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator will yield, I think he will recall that the legislation was to exclude Puerto Rican long-staple cotton from the totals. Twelve hundred bales was the figure, as I recall.

Mr. YOUNG. There was a change in the price support. I think I know what happened.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time if no Senator desires any time.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both sides have yielded back the remaining time. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] on page 27, lines 13 through 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "3-8-56-F." The amendment in modified form is submitted by me, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I send the modified amendment to the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair.) The amendment as modified will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 30, between lines 17 and 18, it is proposed to insert:

USE OF VOLUNTARY AGENCIES

SEC. 310. That the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 201 is amended by striking out "free on board vessels in United States ports."

(b) Section 202 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting: "*Provided further*, That such transfer may include delivery free on board vessels in United States ports and, upon a determination by the President that it is necessary to accomplish the purposes of this title, or section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, ocean freight charges from United States ports to designated ports of entry for such nations or populations, may be paid from funds available to carry out this title."

(c) Section 203 is amended by striking out "$300,000,000" and inserting "$500,000,000".

(d) The first sentence of section 203 is further amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "and for ocean freight charges authorized by this title."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Minnesota yield to himself?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the modifications of the amendment are designed to meet questions raised by the administration as to whether the original amendment would require duplicate bookkeeping on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the International Cooperation Administration. The modifications also separate processing authority from this amendment, so as to confine it entirely to the point of broader authority for the President in the payment of ocean freight on shipments handled by voluntary agencies. The processing authority previously included in the amendment is being offered alone in a separate amendment for that purpose, to be offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], with myself and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] as cosponsors.

PURPOSE

Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to facilitate the broader utilization of America's farm surpluses in overseas programs and disaster relief efforts of American religious and other voluntary relief agencies.

Under the provisions of Public Law 480, such voluntary agencies have made a substantial contribution to overseas relief and rehabilitation, distributing surplus foods and other commodities to the homeless and destitute in more than 70 countries.

During the fiscal year 1956, 18 agencies will distribute more than 800 million pounds of surpluses to needy people abroad.

NEED FOR THIS AMENDMENT

An editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald for Tuesday, March 13, pointed up the need for this amendment. The Post editorial said:

DISTRIBUTE THE SURPLUS

The Department of Agriculture and American church and welfare agencies have been supporting a highly commendable program of distributing farm surpluses to needy persons overseas. To make it possible to expand the program, Senators HUMPHREY and LEHMAN have proposed an amendment to the farm bill which clarifies the law and provides additional funds. Under the share-our-surplus program, surplus commodities are made available to Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish church groups and to such organizations as CARE for distribution where people are hungry because of floods, war, famine, earthquakes, and other misfortunes.

The United States Government pays for the cost of sea transportation. It is significant that the cost of transportation is some 40 percent less than the cost of storing these commodities in Government warehouses for 1 year. Here is an instance where we cannot afford not to be generous. At the same time, it is well to keep in mind that the real purpose of the program is to aid needy persons out of our own largesse. The program is not a large one and it is by no means a broad solution to the surplus problem or to the problem of hunger in the underdeveloped countries. But it has made humanitarian use of some surplus commodities to help relieve suffering; and it should be continued and expanded. Senate approval of the Humphrey-Lehman amendment would benefit both needy peoples abroad and the American taxpayer.

Recently, wheat, corn, rice, and dry beans have been added to the list of commodities available for distribution by these agencies. With the addition of these bulky commodities, ocean freight assumes increasing importance as a limiting factor in the ability of the voluntary agencies to use our surpluses.

For the current fiscal year, $12,500,000 has been authorized for ocean freight on surplus commodities delivered to the voluntary agencies. With the expanded list of available commodities, the voluntary agencies would move nearly four times the tonnage previously used, were it not for the limitations on money authorized for ocean-freight charges.

Estimates made within the last few weeks, based upon actual need abroad, indicate that the religious and other voluntary agencies could, during the fiscal year 1957 dispose of more than 3,200,000,000 pounds of our farm surpluses without displacing any normal sales or otherwise disrupting the economies of the areas in which the surplus would be distributed. For this, upward of $50 million would be required for ocean freight.

WHAT THE AMENDMENT WOULD DO

The amendment proposes that ocean-freight charges on commodities delivered to voluntary agencies under title III of Public Law 480 may be paid from funds available under title II of Public Law 480 upon a determination by the President that this is in the interest of the United States. It also provides that ocean freight may be similarly paid on commodities donated for disaster or other urgent relief under title II of Public Law 480.

The amendment increases the authority of the President to use surplus commodities for disaster, famine, and other urgent relief, from $300 million to $500 million, for the period ending June 30, 1957. As of February 29, 1956, $170 million of this amount had already been allocated. The increase is needed (a) to insure that the President can respond promptly and adequately to any major disaster abroad between now and June 30, 1957; (b) to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the additional volume of commodities which may be moved under title II; and (c) for the increased amounts required for ocean freight—including that on commodities distributed by voluntary agencies—under both title II and title III. The proposal continues the controls on expenditures presently exercised by the Administration through the International Cooperation Administration.

ADVANTAGES OF DISTRIBUTION ON PERSON-TO-PERSON BASIS BY VOLUNTARY AGENCIES

The country faces urgent need of disposing of its surplus commodities. Distribution through export trade and foreign governments is beset with limitations and obstacles. In many ways, distribution on a person-to-person basis—which is feasible only through the voluntary agencies—is the most satisfactory procedure. It cannot interfere with the agricultural economy of the recipient countries. It does not raise questions of competition with other friendly exporting countries. It avoids charges of "dumping." It provides continuous supervision of distribution abroad by American personnel, without interfering with the sovereignty of recipient countries. It assures support, within both host and recipient countries, which is not available to a government program. It mobilizes the voluntary financial and other support of American citizens in the distribution of our agricultural surpluses to meet human need in other parts of the world. It enlists the cooperation of foreign governments in the distribution to needy people. Indeed, the contributions of our citizens through the voluntary agencies, together with those obtained from foreign governments, are at least equal to the cost of ocean freight.

The amendment increases the effectiveness of the individual financial contributions of American people for foreign relief. It takes advantage of the sincere desire of religiously motivated peoples of all faiths to help feed the needy, wherever they may be, to speed up the disposal of our agricultural surpluses.

Eighteen voluntary agencies participated in freight reimbursement for the distribution of agricultural surpluses abroad during the fiscal year 1955. These organizations were American Friends of Austrian Children; American Friends Service Committee; American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee; American Mission to Greeks; Assemblies of God, Foreign Service Committee; Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference; Church World Service, National Council of Churches; CARE; Foster Parents' Plan for War Children; International Rescue Committee; Iran Foundation; Lutheran World Relief; Mennonite Central Committee; Romanian Federation; Save the Children Federation; Tolstoy Foundation; Unitarian Service Committee; United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America.

FREIGHT CHEAPER THAN STORAGE

Last, but not least, Mr. President, the cost per pound of doing this, through payment of ocean freight, is less than the commodities owned by the CCC, the annual cost of storing the commodities in this country. Thus, the payment of ocean freight does not represent a net increase in the expenditures of the Federal Government.

In the year ending June 30, 1955, the average inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation was $4,200,000,000. The storage, costs were $332 million. On the commodities owned by the CCC, the storage charges were approximately 7.9 percent, not counting in-and-out charges.

During the same period—the fiscal year 1955—the voluntary agencies shipped abroad surplus food commodities valued at $121,069,793.59, and were reimbursed for ocean freight in the amount of $8,899,002.28, or an ocean freight cost of 7.35 percent.

While the commodities available in the future will consist of a larger proportion of grain and grain products, yet we believe it is fair to say that the ocean freight charges will be less than the annual cost of storing these commodities in the United States. To the extent that these surpluses can be moved on this person-to-person basis, everyone benefits.

HUNGRY PEOPLE SHOULD BE FED

Mr. President, the farmers do not want food to be stored to rot. Instead, they want the abundance with which God has blessed our land and our labors to be used for needy people at home and abroad. The Government is not a market. It cannot consume this surplus. If the taxpayer is taxed to pay for this food, he wants it utilized for human welfare. What better program is there for a democracy than the feeding of hungry people?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the amendment, it increases the authority of the President to use surplus funds for relief, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, from $300 million to $500 million a year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes—the amount which has been set aside under the act.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. The amendment further provides that moneys out of the funds to which we are now referring may be used for the payment of the freight.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understood the Senator from Minnesota to say that a provision of the law did not permit the Secretary of Agriculture to use this money for the payment of freight.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The voluntary agencies feel this added authority is necessary in order to clarify the situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment, if adopted, would mean that all freight charges would be paid from these funds; is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And it would not be necessary for separate appropriations to be made for that purpose. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my understanding.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that in our experience on the Judiciary Committee, we have found that the voluntary organizations have been of very great help in connection with the Refugee Act. I have received from those organizations telegrams in regard to the amendment the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has offered; and I wish wholeheartedly to support his amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield again to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield again to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not hear all of the statement made by my good friend from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I had not quite completed it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator give us an estimate as to how much money out of this authorization, would be used for the purpose of paying ocean freight?

Mr. HUMPHREY. During the fiscal year 1955, to give an example, the voluntary agencies shipped abroad surplus food commodities valued at $121,069,793, and were reimbursed for ocean freight to the extent of $8,899,002, or an ocean freight cost of about 7½ percent. It is pretty difficult to estimate the amount for the coming year. It runs between 7 and 7½ percent of the cost.

Mr. ELLENDER. So if the entire $500 million is used, the amount for ocean freight will be about $35 million.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It could be as much as that. However, I seriously doubt if the entire amount will be used in this year.

Mr. President, I do not know whether or not there is any particular opposition to this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter dated Febru-

ary 22, 1956, which I have received from Albert W. Farmer, director of Christian Rural Overseas Program, Elkhart, Ind., and a letter which I have received from E. Raymond Wilson, of the Friends Committee on National Legislation, together with articles from the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 10, 1956, relating to the program of voluntary agencies and religious groups in the disposal and use of surplus commodities, in cooperation with the International Cooperation Administration.

There being no objection, the letters and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRISTIAN RURAL OVERSEAS PROGRAM,
Elkhart, Ind., February 22, 1956.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: Thanks to your help and guidance, to a very large degree, the administration at least made the grains available from surplus stocks to the voluntary agencies on last December 15. The annual staff conference of CROP, meeting at Elkhart early in February, took action instructing me to express the appreciation of all present to you for your past help and your continuing concern in this area.

I have been following with real interest your support and introduction of bills and resolutions dealing with the matter of a planned economy of agricultural abundance. The way in which you keep all of this in a world context for the benefit of all peoples is highly encouraging. While political action is outside our field, we can sometimes help as individuals by interpreting and informing people in the 19 States in which we have programs.

Please accept our appreciation and highest regards.

Yours sincerely,

ALBERT W. FARMER.

FRIENDS COMMITTEE
ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION,
Washington, D. C., March 11, 1956.

I am writing in behalf of an amendment which will be called up this week to the farm bill to provide adequate funds for ocean freight for the enlarged amount of surplus foods over last year now being made available by the Department of Agriculture to be distributed to needy persons overseas. This distribution is now being carried on by 18 national organizations—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and by agencies like CARE—in 70 countries.

This Sunday in Protestant churches is being observed as "one great hour of sharing." Similarly in Catholic churches contributions are being received for the Catholic Bishops' Relief Fund. The United Jewish Appeal is under way among Jewish groups. These are for funds for person-to-person services to people in need abroad. To reinforce these efforts and to make possible the increased use of surpluses under all the advantages of personal supervision, the Government has been reimbursing the cost of ocean freight on surplus commodities. The proposed amendment would merely continue and expand this reimbursement to make it possible to move the additional supplies which should be available. What better use of American surpluses than feeding hungry people?

I am enclosing a reprint of three stories from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Saturday, March 10, and a brief explanation of the proposed amendment. I trust this proposal may receive your favorable consideration and support.

Sincerely yours,

E. RAYMOND WILSON.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 10, 1956]

HOLLISTER GETS BLAME FOR CUT IN GIFT GRAINS

(By Louis Cassels)

Church leaders said yesterday their share-our-surplus program has been trimmed by more than 50 percent as a result of an unpublicized notice from Foreign Aid Chief John B. Hollister.

Hollister wrote Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish relief agencies that it was not possible for the International Cooperation Administration to provide more than $3 million to cover ocean freight on surplus grain shipments abroad. The agencies had requested $7.5 million.

The Reverend R. Norris Wilson, executive director of Church World Service, said about 300,000 tons of surplus American grain which they had hoped to distribute will remain piled up in Government warehouses as a result.

Agriculture Secretary Ezra T. Benson had announced on December 14 at a ceremony attended by religious leaders, that the Department would make available to relief agencies all of the surplus grains they could handle for distribution to needy families overseas. Congress had authorized Hollister's agency to pay for ocean freight on foreign relief shipments of surplus farm commodities.

The American Council of Volunteer Agencies, which represents all of the leading relief groups, said only 50,000 tons of surplus grains have been shipped abroad since Benson's announcement. Officials estimate that a maximum of 200,000 tons can be shipped by June 30 with the money made available by Hollister.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 10, 1956]

CATHOLICS PLAN AID FOR NEEDY

Washington area Catholics will contribute to the annual collection for the Catholic Bishops Relief Fund at all masses this Sunday. The archdiocesan goal is $100,000.

The Laetare Sunday collection will be used to bring food, clothing, medicines, and other necessities to millions of needy persons abroad, regardless of race or creed.

In a pastoral letter to the 220,000 Catholics under his spiritual jurisdiction, the Most Rev. Patrick A. O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington, has asked a generous response.

The spiritual and material response of Catholics to this Sunday's collection, he emphasized, "means truly a new hope, a new joy, indeed a new life" to countless thousands of wretched men, women, and children in 40 countries overseas.

The appeal is being conducted by Catholic Relief Services-National Catholic Welfare Conference. The Right Rev. Msgr. Joseph F. Denges, pastor of St. Stephen's Catholic Church here, is director of the Bishops' Fund for the Archdiocese of Washington.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 10, 1956]

PROTESTANTS WILL "SHARE" WITH NEEDY

Protestant churches in the Washington area, observing "one great hour of sharing," will join with thousands of others Sunday in receiving special offerings for overseas relief.

For the eighth year, major Protestant denominations are working through Church World Service-National Council of Churches in seeking funds to carry on relief work among homeless and destitute persons around the world.

The national goal is $11 million.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not know whether any Senator wishes to use time in opposition. If not, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time. If there is to be opposition, of course, I shall reserve what little time I have left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the chairman of the committee in opposition?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there is no opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the minority leader yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been consulted with respect to this amendment. It is my understanding that he has seen it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as I understand, the amendment would increase the amount available for foreign relief from $300 million to $500 million.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. That is an authorization.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It would not transfer to the Department of Agriculture functions which have been previously handled through the ICA?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. The Senator from Vermont brought that point to my attention earlier, and it has been cleared up in the modification of the amendment which was sent to the desk.

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment would give the President permission, in the event of a disaster overseas, or in some other country, to spend more for ocean freight.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. But it is not mandatory.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not mandatory.

Mr. AIKEN. No specific amount is authorized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I indicated, in reply to the chairman of the committee, that the cost of ocean freight had been approximately 7.3 percent. It runs between 6½ and 7½ percent.

Mr. AIKEN. With that understanding, I have no objection to the amendment. I merely wished to avoid transferring more functions to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, inasmuch as the amendment has been modified, I have no objection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call up another amendment. It is the amendment which I sent to the desk last evening, in reference to the brucellosis and milk funds.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Inasmuch as there will probably be some discussion with

respect to this amendment, and in view of the fact that it is now 20 minutes past 2, and there is a unanimous-consent agreement that at 2:30 p. m. the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] will be recognized for half an hour, I suggest that if the Senator wishes to send his amendment to the desk, he may do so. Then we might have a quorum call, the time not to be charged to either side. By that time we shall be ready for the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas under the previous order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it agreeable with the minority leader that I proceed with the amendment following the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, and, having done so, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota wish to have the amendment stated?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; but I wish first to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that 5 minutes remain before 2: 30, and that I have an amendment which I desire to offer on behalf of a group of Senators, including the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, an amendment which I understand has been agreed to by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and which, therefore, is a noncontroversial amendment, I wonder if I may not have unanimous consent to offer it and have it agreed to.

The purpose of the amendment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to do so, if I do not lose my place following the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to oblige the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, but I think perhaps there are other Senators to be satisfied besides the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Vermont in connection with the amendment which has been referred to. Because of the shortness of time, I think it would be better to have a quorum call. Then I am sure the Senator can bring up his amendment immediately following. I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call, the time to be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ATTEMPTS TO INFLUENCE, IMPROPERLY OR ILLEGALLY, THE SENATE, ETC.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 219, passed on February 22, 1956, established a special committee of the Senate composed of 8 members, 4 each from the majority and minority Members of the Senate. This special committee is authorized and directed to investigate the subject of attempts to influence, improperly or illegally, the Senate or any Member thereof or any candidate therefor, or any officer or employee of the executive branch of the Government, through campaign contributions, political activities, lobbying, or any and all other activities or practices.

The resolution further provided that the members of the committee shall be appointed by the Vice President, who shall also call the first meeting of the committee, at which time the committee itself should select a chairman and a vice chairman.

Mr. President, as chairman of this special committee, I wish to make a brief report to the Senate on its organization and a few comments respecting its duties and responsibilities.

At the first meeting of the committee, on February 29, with the Vice President presiding, and before the selection of a chairman and a vice chairman had been made, questions arose regarding rules of procedure, both with respect to organization of the committee and its operations. The committee was unable to agree upon rules at that time, and the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] were requested to confer and undertake to formulate rules upon which they could agree, and submit same to the committeee for its approval at the next meeting to be called by the Vice President.

Thereafter, on March 8, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], in a speech to the Senate reported at some length and in some detail regarding conferences he and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] had held in efforts to formulate rules of procedure for the committee's approval, which efforts had been unsuccessful. At that time other members of the special committee also expressed their views and discussed the matter on the floor of the Senate.

The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who had been regarded as the prospective chairman of the committee, in the concluding paragraph of his prepared address, stated:

> I have now reached the conclusion that the prospects of such an inquiry might be enhanced by the making of this report and by eliminating myself from consideration as prospective chairman of the special committee. I will be glad to continue to work with my colleagues as a member of the committee, subject to the will of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Arkansas is making an extremely important speech. I know the Senator's modesty, and I realize that he would prefer to continue his speech regardless of how many Senators were on the floor. However, it is the opinion of the majority leader that we should have a quorum call and ask the attendance of Senators. We had one quorum call, but it was lifted. It would not take very long to have a quorum call. The majority leader requests the Senator from Arkansas permit the Senator from Texas to suggest the absence of a quorum, and in that way notify all absent Senators. I hope the Senator will permit me to do that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will that mean that I shall have to start all over again with my speech?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; the Senator may resume his speech wherever he chooses. I should like to have the Senator's speech heard by as many Senators as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas may yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, without the time being charged to his alloted time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Monroney
Allott	Goldwater	Morse
Anderson	Gore	Mundt
Barkley	Green	Murray
Barrett	Hayden	Neely
Beall	Hennings	Neuberger
Bender	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Hill	Pastore
Bible	Holland	Payne
Bricker	Hruska	Potter
Bush	Humphrey	Purtell
Butler	Ives	Robertson
Byrd	Jackson	Russell
Capehart	Jenner	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Kuchel	Sparkman
Daniel	Langer	Stennis
Dirksen	Lehman	Symington
Douglas	Long	Thurmond
Duff	Magnuson	Thye
Dworshak	Malone	Watkins
Eastland	Mansfield	Welker
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Flanders	McCarthy	Young
Frear	McClellan	
Fulbright	McNamara	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present. The Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall resume my remarks where I left off when the quorum call began. I had quoted from the remarks of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] on March 8.

Subsequently the Vice President called a meeting of the committee for 11 a. m. on March 10. Thereupon it was tentatively suggested that the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] should be elected chairman and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] should be elected vice chairman, provided they could formulate rules of procedure upon which they could agree, subject to the approval of the committee. The meeting then was recessed until 3 o'clock in the afternoon. When the committee reconvened, the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Arkansas submitted for the com-

mittee's consideration a set of rules on which they had agreed.

Those rules, after some modifications by the committee, were then agreed to and unanimously adopted. Following their adoption, the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from New Hampshire were unanimously elected chairman and vice chairman, respectively.

Mr. President, in view of the initial difficulty in agreeing to rules, which delayed organization of the committee, apprehensions arose and fears were expressed regarding the ability of this special committee, as it is now composed, to function and carry out its mission. The action of the committee in agreeing to and unanimously adopting a set of rules to govern its operations should, in my opinion, serve to allay any fears or apprehensions which the initial disagreement and delay may have engendered.

Because I think it appropriate, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the rules adopted by the special committee be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the information of the Senate, immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the rules were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it may be factually stated that the rules adopted by the committee are the result of compromise; but a compromise that is fair and warranted, in my opinion.

The rules differ in 1 or 2 important respects from the rules of the Senate governing regular standing committees. But this is a special and not a regular standing committee of the Senate. The very nature of its composition—four members from each political party—clearly evidences the intent of the Senate that it was to function and operate in an atmosphere of bipartisanship with neither party as such dominating it nor having the primary responsibility for its success or the basic blame for its failure.

This committee is not a partisan group. It is a bipartisan committee. Therefore, no greater responsibility rests upon one political party than upon the other for its inception, creation, composition, and for its actions as it functions and undertakes the task assigned to it. As chairman, it is my view that responsibility for the success of its labors rests equally upon each political party and upon each individual member of the committee, irrespective of party.

I believe these rules are peculiarly adaptable to a committee so composed and empowered as is this special committee. We shall do our best to make them serve the committee's needs and purpose.

Mr. President, if I may be pardoned for a personal reference, I should like to make crystal clear for the record the circumstances and considerations attending my membership on the committee and my election and acceptance of the heavy responsibilities which the chairmanship entails.

I supported the adoption of Senate Resolution 219 because I believed it provided the right approach to the character of investigation, the subject matter, and study that the resolution authorized and directed to be made. I am of that opinion now. When I voted for the resolution, however, I did not do so in any expectation that I would be a member of the special committee.

When I was first approached by the Democratic leadership and asked to become a member, I respectfully and sincerely declined. When finally I was prevailed upon to accept, I did so with a firm understanding that I would be unable, because of my other duties and committee responsibilities, to serve as chairman. I was assured I would not be called on to fill that position.

However, after the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] eliminated himself as the prospective chairman, the leadership on both sides of the aisle, a number of other Senators from both political parties, and each member of the special committee, personally appealed to me and urged me to accept this tremendous, delicate, and unwanted responsibility. I continued to resist those appeals until I became convinced that I should accede out of a sense of obligation and duty to the United States Senate. The special committee simply could not be permitted to collapse and fail or refuse to carry out the responsibilities imposed upon it. For me to have refused the chairmanship under the conditions that prevailed would have been to shirk a duty that membership in this honorable body incurs. To say that I reluctantly accepted is an understatement of fact.

I am under no illusions whatsoever as to the nature and magnitude of the task I have undertaken. The work entailed adds tremendously to the responsibilities of my other committee assignments and senatorial duties. The job ahead for the committee, and for the chairman in particular, will be tedious, sensitive, difficult, and perhaps frequently unpleasant and disagreeable. The responsibilities involved, not only in the chairmanship but in each individual membership on the committee, greatly exceed any possible glory or credit that can come even from a job well done.

I am sure, Mr. President, you can appreciate that I am not prepared at this time to advise the Senate in any great detail as to what the committee's interpretation of the resolution is or will be with respect to specific areas that the committee, under the language of the resolution, may be required or find it necessary to inquire into. That matter the committee has not yet determined or discussed. So at this time I speak for myself only.

I should like to see the committee concentrate upon the substantial rather than the trivial; that it undertake to follow constructive rather than destructive paths. It is not my conception that the Senate intended that this committee should operate a scandal factory, a smear machine, or conduct a witch-hunting expedition. We are charged with the task of ferreting out activities in connection with campaign contributions, lobbying, and related activities that may be illegal, improper, or morally wrong. I am not among those who subscribe to the belief that every lobbyist is a criminal and that every campaign contribution is illegal.

The committee should seek to expose any specific corruption in those areas, but it should also further endeavor to establish any general pattern that has developed and that may now prevail, which either dictates or strongly indicates that corrective legislation is needed.

It should be obvious to all that this committee cannot possibly make a completely detailed and thorough inquiry into the activities of each and every individual lobbyist, group, or organization that may be engaged in lobbying activities. Nor can it possibly conduct to that extent an inquiry into all campaign contributions to all candidates in all elections, or cover in detail every action or activity calculated to influence election results, legislative actions, or executive decisions.

But we should—and I believe we can—develop and present to the Senate a background of information, both specific and general, with conclusions and recommendations that will enable the Congress to initiate and enact needed remedial legislation that will deal effectively with corruption, eliminate or prevent at least most improper and undesirable practices, and be conducive to a more wholesome climate in the body politic.

Mr. President, I am confident that each and every one of my colleagues in the Senate realizes that in no sense has their individual responsibility been lessened or diminished in this field by reason of the appointment of this special committee. To do this job as it should be done, the committee needs and invites unstinted support and cooperation of each and every Senator. If any Senator has personal knowledge of any wrongdoing of a nature embraced in Senate Resolution 219 and within the purview of the duties and responsibilities of this special committee, the committee not only invites, but urgently requests, that such information be promptly made available to it.

Furthermore, if any Senator has received information of such wrongdoing, although it may not be within his personal knowledge and he cannot testify to it factually under oath, but he sincerely believes it has substance, and the pursuit of it in this inquiry might well lead to a disclosure of facts to substantiate it, then he should also give the source and make that information available to the committee, and I earnestly invite and request him to do so.

In conclusion, I wish to leave this thought with my colleagues. This is going to be a long, tedious, and unglamorous job. If the inquiry is correctly conducted, it cannot be handled in haste. It will require a consecration to duty on the part of each member of the committee, and patience and understanding of the magnitude and delicacy of the task on the part of the United States Senate and the public. We cannot perform a real service by leaping to hasty and unsustained conclusions on the basis of inaccurate evidence. We cannot serve the United States Senate and the American

people by trying individuals, groups, or organizations through the process of undigested headlines; nor on rumors, innuendoes, and unsustained accusations.

I assure the Senate the committee will move and make progress as rapidly as it can, commensurate with the time the members can properly give to the committee work, taking into account their other multiple and important senatorial duties.

Before we can start, a staff must be assembled. A good staff is important, if not vital, to the success of our labors. We shall undertake to assemble a staff of the quality prescribed by rule 15 adopted by the special committee—a staff capable and competent, and selected solely on the basis of fitness to perform its assigned duties without regard to political preference or affiliation.

How soon such a staff can be assembled, organized, and preliminary investigations started, I am not today prepared to say; but I give assurance that the work of this committee will be expeditiously transacted and concluded as soon as practicable, with the hope that when we have finished, the committee will have performed a constructive service that will meet the Senate's approval and the approbation of the American people.

EXHIBIT A

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS, LOBBYING AND RELATED ACTIVITIES OR PRACTICES (S. RES. 219 PASSED FEBRUARY 22, 1956)

(Unanimously adopted by the special committee March 10, 1956)

1. No major investigation shall be initiated without approval of a majority of the committee. However, preliminary inquiries may be initiated by the committee staff with the approval of the chairman of the committee.

2. Subpenas for attendance of witnesses and the production of memorandums, documents, and records shall be issued by the committee chairman with prior notice to the vice chairman. In the event of disagreement between the chairman and vice chairman respecting the issuance of any subpena, the issue shall be presented promptly to the full committee for its determination.

3. The chairman shall have the authority to call meetings of the committee. This authority may be delegated by the chairman to the vice chairman, or to any other member of the committee when necessary. The chairman shall not schedule any hearings, or series of hearings, outside the District of Columbia without giving at least 48 hours' notice thereof to the members of the committee. Public hearings shall be ordered by a majority vote of the committee.

4. Should a majority of the membership of the committee request the chairman in writing to call a meeting of the committee, then, in the event the chairman should fail, neglect, or refuse to call such meeting within 5 days thereafter, such majority of the committee may call a meeting by filing a written notice thereof with the vice chairman of the committee, who shall promptly call a meeting of the committee notifying each member of the committee in writing.

5. All witnesses at public or executive hearings who testify to matters of fact shall be sworn.

6. Counsel retained by any witness and accompanying such witness shall be permitted to be present during the testimony of such witness at any public or executive hearing, and to advise such witness while he is testifying, of his legal rights; but this shall not be construed to excuse a witness from testifying in the event his counsel is ejected for contumacy or disorderly conduct; nor shall this rule be construed as authorizing counsel to coach the witness, answer for the witness, or put words in the witness' mouth. The failure of any witness to secure counsel shall not excuse such witness from attendance in response to subpena.

7. Any witness desiring to read a prepared or written statement in executive or public hearings shall file a copy of such statement with the counsel or chairman of the committee 24 hours in advance of the hearings at which the statement is to be presented. The committee shall determine whether such statement may be read or placed in the record of the hearing.

8. A witness may request, on grounds of distraction, harassment, or physical discomfort, that during his testimony, television, motion picture, and other cameras and lights shall not be directed at him, such request to be ruled on by the committee members present at the hearing.

9. An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of all witnesses in executive and public hearings. The record of his own testimony whether in public or executive session shall be made available for inspection by witness or his counsel under committee supervision; a copy of any testimony given in public session or that part of the testimony given by the witness in executive session and subsequently quoted or made part of the record in a public session shall be made available to any witness at his expense if he so requests.

10. Interrogation of witnesses at committee hearings shall be conducted on behalf of the committee by members and authorized committee staff personnel only.

11. Any person who is the subject of an investigation in public hearings may submit to the chairman of the committee questions in writing for the cross-examination of other witnesses called by the committee. With the consent of a majority of the members of the committee present and voting, these questions shall be put to the witness by the chairman, by a member of the committee, or by counsel of the committee.

12. Any person whose name is mentioned or who is specifically identified, and who believes that testimony or other evidence presented at a public hearing, or comment made by a committee member, or counsel, tends to defame him or otherwise adversely affect his reputation, may (a) request to appear personally before the committee to testify in his own behalf, or, in the alternative, (b) file a sworn statement of facts relevant to the testimony or other evidence or comment complained of. Such request and such statement shall be submitted to the committee for its consideration and action.

13. All testimony and actions taken in executive session shall be kept secret and will not be released for public information without the approval of a majority of the committee.

14. No committee report or document shall be released to the public in whole or in part without prior submission to and approval by a majority vote of the committee.

In case the committee is unable to reach a majority decision, separate views or reports may be presented and printed if approved for release and publication by the chairman or vice chairman of the committee.

15. Professional and clerical staff members shall be employed by a majority vote of the committee, without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office. Thereafter, the chairman shall certify staff appointments to the financial clerk of the Senate in writing.

The services of any professional or clerical staff member so employed may be terminated at any time by a majority vote of the committee.

Professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business, and no other duties may be assigned to them.

16. All vouchers for the expenditures of money as provided in this resolution shall be submitted to the vice chairman before approval by the chairman.

17. A quorum for the transaction of business, except as provided in subsection B of section 4 of Senate Resolution 219, shall consist of five members.

18. These rules may be modified, amended, or repealed by a majority vote of the committee, providing 3 days' written notice of such proposed change has been given to each member.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Arkansas has discussed with me both the question of his serving on the committee and the problem which was posed by the request that he head the committee. I know he hesitated for a long time before agreeing to serve on the committee, and that he was extremely reluctant to serve as chairman of the committee. That is easily understood, because the Senator from Arkansas carries a very heavy workload in other committees and in other fields at the present time. He shoulders more responsibility than does the average Member of this body, even if we do not include the very onerous task that lies before him and the other members of the committee in dealing with the complex and important subject committed to them in this instance.

I merely wish to say to the Senator from Arkansas that I commend his sense of duty which finally brought him to accept this job. I have great faith that he and the other members of the special committee will address themselves diligently to it, without fear or favor, to the end that the special committee will encompass the responsibilities which were envisioned in the resolution creating it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the able Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Every Senator wants to be as well informed as possible on every matter coming before the Senate. No Senator is willing to be improperly influenced. Every Senator desires that the people of the Nation have confidence in the integrity of the work done by this very important body.

These questions have arisen because of some unfortunate and unseemly actions in recent months.

Personally, I had great confidence in the original committee. I likewise have great confidence in the integrity and sincerity of the members of the new committee. I think we are very fortunate that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]—whom all of us trust, who has had great experience in conducting investigations, who has had long service in this body, and who is greatly respected by all the Members—is willing to undertake the chairmanship of this very important committee, which has so difficult a task to perform.

As one Member of the Senate on this side of the aisle, I wish to state that I felt very strongly that the special committee should be divided equally, because the subject of the investigation is not a partisan one. I was impressed by the character of the Senators chosen to serve on the special committee.

I congratulate the Senator from Arkansas upon his willingness to serve as chairman of the committee, because his acceptance of that responsibility not only shows that he is a patriotic citizen, but also shows that he is a good Senator in the highest sense of the word. We appreciate very much his willingness to embark on so difficult and unpleasant an undertaking, in addition to the tasks which may be more appealing and from which there may come more glory.

So I join with other Senators on this side of the aisle in congratulating the committee upon commencing its great and important work.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. setts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, first, as a member on the Republican side of the bipartisan committee—and let me say that I feel certain that I speak for my three colleagues on that side—I should like to compliment the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] upon what I consider to be an outstanding statement. I believe his remarks will inspire confidence on the part of the people of the United States, and will do much to restore confidence in the Members of this body.

As one Member on this side—and again I believe that I speak for the other three members of the committee on this side—I pledge full assistance to the Senator from Arkansas in his very arduous and difficult task in heading this special committee.

Mr. President, last Sunday it was my extreme pleasure to be in my State, visiting with a great many of my fellow Arizonans. During the course of the conversations that occurred, the subject of the special committee to investigate pressures on Congress and campaign practices naturally came up. From the tone of the remarks which I heard, I became convinced that many of my fellow citizens did not fully understand the reasons behind the delay in organizing this committee; and, when I associated the feelings of my fellow citizens with those that I had already gathered from letters written to me on the subject, I felt it my duty to explain to the Senate, and, through my colleagues, to the people of the Nation, just why the members on the Republican side of this committee proposed the rules that we did, originally.

First, Mr. President, let me make one point crystal clear: It has been publicly charged by some persons in this country—and these charges have been carried by some of the press—that the majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the minority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], have worked with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] to the end that the work of the special committee might not proceed.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. These four Members, along with all others connected with the investigation, have applied themselves diligently and constantly to the problems involved in starting an investigation of such importance to the Senate and to the Nation. At no time have those Senators placed any roadblocks in the path of the special committee. They are men of honor and integrity; and I resent the implications made by some persons, and reflected in some of the press, that these four Senators have not worked to the best interests of the announced intention of the Senate to go fully into the matters outlined in Senate Resolution 219.

We on the Republican side of this bipartisan group feel, as I know our colleagues on the other side must also feel, that the investigation will be one of a most sensitive nature, one which, if not carefully and meticulously handled, has the possibility of inflicting destructive consequences upon the lives and welfare of individuals and groups in the United States. Therefore, we set out to develop rules which would preclude such a possibility from becoming a reality.

We were concerned chiefly with the subpena power. We believed, and still believe, that this matter should not be the responsibility of any one person, regardless of who that person may be.

In order to determine whether there was precedent for our position, we delved into previous resolutions pertaining to changes in the rules of the Senate and of Senate committees. In Senate Resolution 15, submitted on January 6, 1955, by a Senator recognized to be an authority in this field—the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]—we found this language:

> 6. Subpenas shall be issued only with the approval of a majority of the full committee, unless the full committee by majority vote delegates such authority to the chairman and the ranking minority member acting jointly. Upon the request of any member of the committee the question of whether a subpena shall be issued or remain in force if already issued shall be decided by majority vote of the full committee.

We did not rely solely upon this one eminent source, however, but went back to Senate Resolution 256, which was submitted on May 27, 1954, by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], for himself and the following Senators: Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. GORE, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HILL, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HUNT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], in submitting that resolution, said among other things:

> The honor, the integrity, and the probity of this body are at stake, jeopardized by practices that have been allowed to flourish without procedural restraint.

Later he said:

> We have, however, devised a code of fair committee procedure on which all the sponsors can agree.

Section 5 of that resolution, to which all the sponsors agreed, pertains to subpenas, and it says:

> SEC. 5. Subpenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee only upon written notice to all members of the committee with a statement as to identity of the witness or material and the relevance to the investigation or hearing already authorized. Upon the request of any member of the committee the question of whether a subpena shall be issued or remain in force if already issued shall be decided by majority vote.

Mr. President, the Senate will recall that during the past two Congresses a great hue and cry has been raised against the rules which permit, in effect, a one-man committee. To correct this possibility, many Senators have submitted measures which would curb the dangers that would exist if one member had the power to conduct the business of a committee.

Knowing of the widespread interest of Senators in this matter, I have delved further into established precedent. I find that on February 10, 1953, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, section 5 of which says:

> No subpena to inquire into the private affairs of any individuals shall be issued by any committee except pursuant to the majority vote of the committee.

I wish to read briefly something which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee said at that time. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 6, page 7224:

> As the former chairman of an investigating committee, I can personally testify to the urgent need for rules of procedure for all committees. I can testify that power in the hands of a one-man committee to deal with the reputation and character of witnesses is too great without proper procedural restraint.

Senate resolution 303, submitted July 31, 1954, by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] states, in subparagraph E:

> Subpenas to require the attendance of witnesses, the giving of testimony and the production of books, papers, or other evidence shall be issued only by authority of the committee or subcommittee.

The distinguished former Senator from Michigan, Mr. Ferguson, stated in Senate Resolution 287, which he submitted July 19, 1954, in subsection C:

> Unless otherwise provided by a majority vote of the committee taken at a meeting called for such purpose, subpenas shall be issued only by authority of the committee.

The distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] who, I believe, has spent more time in the intelligent study of this problem than has any other Member on this side of the aisle, and whose conclusions are brilliantly set forth in Senate Resolution 253 of the 83d Congress, says on the subject of subpenas:

> Unless otherwise provided subpenas to require the attendance of witnesses, the giving of testimony and the production of

books, papers, or other evidence shall be issued only by authority of the committee.

These provisions were suggested during the 83d Congress; but to call the attention of the Senate to the consistency of the thinking on this subject, I should like to briefly point out that the senior Senator from Tennessee reintroduced in substance Senate Resolution 256 of the 83d Congress into this Congress, and it carries the designation of Senate Resolution 101. Among the Senators who joined with him were Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GORE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MORSE, all of whom, with the exception of the junior Senator from Tennessee, have at one time or another introduced suggested changes in the rules. I point out also that all of these Senators have been extremely vociferous in their demands that one-man Senate committees be made impossible by proper rules. These Senators again, by the submission of Senate Resolution 101, reaffirmed their position taken earlier that—

Subpenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee only upon written notice to all members of the committee, with a statement as to the identity of the witness or material or other matters relevant to the investigation or hearing, authorized upon the request of any member of the committee. The question of whether a subpena shall be issued or remain in force if already issued shall be decided by a majority vote.

We Republicans, after reading these two proposals to the Senate, one by the former chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, the other by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], in which two Democrat members of this select committee concurred, felt that we were certainly on the safe ground of precedent when we suggested that our rule on subpena provide that the vice chairman must concur with the chairman in the issuance of a subpena. We felt—and I think it was proper for us so to feel—that, if two resolutions offered to the Senate, both endorsed by Senators vitally interested in this subject, should recognize the dangers involved in one-man subpena power, we certainly could assume that we would receive backing for this proposal.

Another area of disagreement that rose when the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] discussed the question with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was the matter of calling the meetings. Again, we Republicans felt that we were on safe ground in offering our rule, because both Senator HENNING'S proposal in Senate Resolution 15 and Senator KEFAUVER'S proposal in Senate Resolution 256 concurred, in that the committee hearings should be called only upon the majority vote of the full committee. In fact, the language of the two proposals is identical. Senator GORE'S proposal was in complete opposition to this plan, which he once espoused, in that he suggested that "the chairman shall have the authority to call meetings of the committee." Our suggestion, while it did not go as far as the proposals submitted by both Senator HENNINGS and Senator KEFAUVER, did include the protection of having meetings called jointly by the chairman and the vice chairman. It went further to say that a majority of the committee could call a meeting at any time.

I could have stopped with these two precedents, but I preferred to go just a bit further, so I consulted Senate Resolution 83 of the 83d Congress, submitted by two Members of this body who have been most vociferous in their demands that the committees of Congress be conducted in a manner that would give the fullest protection to the American people. I refer to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. Resolution 83 provides, in paragraph B:

Committee hearings (whether public or in executive session) shall be held only upon the majority vote of the committee in a meeting at which a majority of the committee is actually present.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], in his thoughtful presentation, said:

No committee hearing shall be held unless specifically authorized by the committee.

Everything we found in our research preliminary to drafting our suggested rules supported us in the approach we took, namely, that we must offer the fullest protection to the reputations of the people and organizations who would come before us. No Senator can argue against that approach.

In his speech on the Senate floor on last Thursday, the junior Senator from Tennessee brought out another area in which disagreement existed between himself and the Republican side. That concerned the manner in which a staff was to be organized. Again, we Republicans felt that we were on a sound footing because Senator HENNINGS' proposal in this area was to this effect:

The composition and selection of, and changes in, the professional and clerical staff of a committee shall be subject to the vote of a majority of the members of the committee.

Senator KEFAUVER'S proposal, in which Senator GORE agreed at that time, provided, in section 6:

The composition and selection of, and changes in, the professional and clerical staff of a committee shall be subject to the vote of a majority of the members of the committee.

Here were identical proposals from two Senate resolutions whose texts were directed at the establishment of proper rules for the operation of committees of the Senate. After reading what the eminent authority from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] had to say on the general subject of rules, and in following what the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] proposed in the same field, in which the junior Senator from Tennessee concurred, we Republicans felt that there surely could be no argument about our proposals which, in effect, had been made previously by others interested in this investigation.

I propose to put the entire text of both Senate Resolution 15 and Senate Resolution 256 into the RECORD so that my colleagues in the Senate, the press, and the people of the United States may have the opportunity to read them and to make up their own minds as to where the roadblock was, which, finally, and happily, has been broken.

I have gone extensively into this presentation for two reasons: First, as a Member of this body, I have strong resentment against the implications which have been made against the leadership on both sides, to the effect that they were, in effect, hamstringing this investigation. This has not been true; and those in America, whether they be in this body, the press, or in the general citizenry, who say so have been playing a dangerous game on the fields of prevarication.

My second resentment stems from the fact that many of these same people have inferred that the Republicans have been holding up the progress of this investigation by their insistence upon rules not acceptable to the Democrats. This is not true. As I pointed out, our rules were drawn based on proposals already made to this body by both Democrats and Republicans, and were intended to offer full protection to the American people as we proceed into this very delicate investigation.

I think the people of the country will have to agree that we Republicans were proceeding on safe assumptions and that the proposals which we made had already been made by others and agreed to by the Junior Senator from Tennessee. He certainly has a right to change his mind, but we had no indication when we sat down to formulate our version of the rules that he had, after about 2 years, decided that what he thought was right then was not right or applicable at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of Senate Resolution 15 and Senate Resolution 256.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 15

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by deleting subsection 3, and inserting in lieu thereof, the following:

"3. (a) Committee meetings, other than regular meetings authorized by section 133 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 837), held within the District of Columbia, shall be called only upon a minimum of 16 hours' written notice to the office of each committee member. Committee meetings outside the District of Columbia shall be called only upon a minimum of 96 hours' written notice to the office of each committee member. These provisions may be waived by the assent of the majority of the members of the committee.

"(b) Each committee is authorized to fix the number of its members (but not less than one-third of the entire membership) who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of such business as may be considered by said committee, subject to the provisions of section 133 (d) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

"(c) Subcommittees, as required, shall be appointed by the committee chairman, subject to the approval of the majority of the committee, and shall ordinarily consist of no less than three members, a proportionate ratio of whom shall be members of the minority (the designation of the majority and minority members of a subcommittee shall be subject to the approval of the majority and minority members of the committee respectively in caucus assem-

bled). Subcommittees of less than three members may be designated by the chairman, subject to the approval of the majority of the committee.

"(d) Committee hearings (whether public or in executive session) and committee investigations shall be scheduled and conducted upon the majority vote of the full committee in a meeting at which a majority of the committee is actually present.

"(e) A resolution or motion scheduling hearings or ordering a particular investigation shall state clearly and with particularity the subject thereof, which resolution may be amended only upon a majority vote of the full committee in a meeting at which a majority of the committee is actually present. No hearing shall be initiated by a subcommittee without the approval of a majority of the members of the full parent committee.

"(f) The chairman, or a member designated by him, shall consult with appropriate Federal law-enforcement agencies with respect to any phase of an investigation which may result in evidence exposing the commission of Federal crimes, and the results of such consultation shall be reported to the committee before witnesses are called to testify therein.

"(g) No committee report shall be issued unless a draft of such report is submitted to the office of each committee member 24 hours in advance of the meeting at which it is to be considered and is adopted at a meeting at which a majority is actually present.

"(h) No testimony taken or material presented in an executive session shall be made public, either in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless authorized by a majority vote of the committee.

"4. (a) Witnesses at committee hearings (whether public or in executive session) shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel, of their own choosing, who shall have the right to advise witnesses of their legal rights and to make objections concerning the propriety of questions and to matters of procedure, as well as to submit legal memoranda in support of his objections.

"(b) Rulings on motions or objections shall be made by the member presiding, subject to appeal to the members present on motion of a member.

"(c) At least 24 hours prior to his testifying, a witness shall be given a copy of that portion of the motion or resolution scheduling the hearing stating the subject of the hearing; at the same time he shall be given a bill of particulars or a statement of the subject matters about which he is to be interrogated.

"(d) It is the policy of the Senate that only evidence and testimony which is reliable and of probative value shall be received and considered by a committee. The privileged character of communications between clergyman and parishioner, doctor and patient, lawyer and client, member of the press and confidential source of information, and husband and wife shall be scrupulously observed.

"(e) No testimony shall be taken in executive or public session unless at least two members of the committee are present. But the full committee, by majority vote, may authorize the taking of testimony by a single member.

"(f) Committee interrogation of witnesses shall be conducted only by members and authorized staff personnel of the committee.

"(g) All testimony shall be given under oath or affirmation.

"(h) (i) Every witness shall have the right to make complete and brief answers to questions and to make concise explanations of such answers.

"(ii) Every witness who testifies in a hearing shall have a right to make an oral statement and to file a sworn statement which shall be made part of the transcript of such hearing, but such oral or written statement shall be relevant to the subject of the hearing.

"(i) A stenographic verbatim transcript shall be made of all committee hearings. Copies of such transcript, so far as practicable, shall be available for inspection or purchase at regularly prescribed rates from the official reporter by any witness or person mentioned in a public hearing. Any witness and his counsel shall have the right to inspect only the complete transcript of his own testimony in executive session.

"5. (a) Insofar as practicable, any person whose activities are the subject of investigation by the committee, or about whom adverse information is proposed to be presented at a public hearing of the committee, shall be fully advised by the committee as to the matter into which the committee proposes to inquire and the adverse material which is proposed to be presented. Insofar as practicable, all material reflecting adversely on the character or reputation of any individual which is proposed to be presented at a public hearing of the committee shall be first reviewed in executive session to determine its reliability and probative value and shall not be presented at a public hearing except pursuant to majority vote of the full committee.

"(b) If a person is adversely affected by evidence or testimony given in a public hearing or in an executive hearing the transcript of which is to be released, in whole or in part, that person shall have the right to request that he be allowed to appear before the committee, upon subpena or otherwise, and testify in his own behalf. If allowed by the committee to appear, such person shall have the rights secured to witnesses under section 4 (above). If this request is not granted by the committee, such person shall be permitted to file with the committee a sworn statement concerning such testimony, which statement will be incorporated into the record of the hearing at which he was adversely mentioned, unless the full committee, by majority vote, decides to publish such statement elsewhere in the record.

"(c) Subject to the provisions of section 4 (d), any witness who gives testimony before the committee in an open hearing which reflects adversely on the character or reputation of another person may be required by the committee to disclose his sources of information, unless to do so would endanger the national security.

"6. Subpenas shall be issued only with the approval of a majority of the full committee, unless the full committee by majority vote delegates such authority to the chairman and the ranking minority member acting jointly. Upon the request of any member of the committee the question of whether a subpena shall be issued or remain in force if already issued shall be decided by majority vote of the full committee.

"7. The composition and selection of, and changes in, the professional and clerical staff of a committee shall be subject to the vote of a majority of the members of the committee.

"8. (a) Subject to the physical limitations of the hearing room and consideration of the physical comfort of committee members, staff, and witnesses, equal access for coverage of the hearings shall be provided to the various means of communications, including newspapers, magazines, radio, newsreels, and television. It shall be the duty of the committee chairman to see that the various communication devices and instruments do not unreasonably distract, harass, or confuse the witness and interfere with his presentation.

"(b) No witness shall be televised, filmed, or photographed during the hearing if he objects on the ground of distraction, harassment, or physical handicap.

"9. The application of this rule shall be supervised in the Senate by the presiding officer of the Senate and 4 Members selected by the Senate (not more than 2 of the Members selected shall be of the same party), who shall have authority (1) to receive and investigate complaints of alleged violations of this rule filed by persons claiming to be aggrieved or by Members, (2) to advise committee chairmen of their conclusions and their suggestions, and (3) to present their findings to the Senate, with such recommendations for remedial and disciplinary action, if any, they deem appropriate.

"10. As used in this rule:

" 'Committee' shall mean any standing, select, or special committee of the Senate (except the majority and minority policy committees) and any subcommittees of the foregoing.

" 'Person' includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society."

SEC. 2. Such rule XXV is further amended by redesignating subsection 4 thereof as subsection 11.

Senate Resolution 256

Whereas investigation of matters of public importance through committee hearings is of vital importance to the discharge of the constitutional functions of the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas the investigative power of Senate committees is derived from the power of the Congress to inquire into matters of public importance within its jurisdiction; and

Whereas article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States provides that "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the following be, and hereby are, adopted as the Code of Fair Committee Procedure of the Senate of the United States in connection with all investigations in which committees act as organs of inquiry and investigation as distinguished from their general roles in which they discharge normal legislative functions, including the holding of normal hearings incident to committee business.

SUBCOMMITTEE, MEETINGS, INVESTIGATIONS AND REPORTS

SEC. 2. (a) Subcommittees, as required, shall be appointed by the committee chairman, subject to the approval of the majority of the committee, and shall ordinarily consist of no less than three members, a proportionate ratio of whom shall be members of the minority (the designation of the majority and minority members of a subcommittee shall be subject to the approval of the majority and minority members of the committee respectively in caucus assembled). Subcommittees of less than three members may be designated by the chairman, subject to the approval of the majority of the committee.

(b) Committee meetings, other than regular meetings authorized by section 133 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 837), shall be called only upon a minimum of 16 hours' written notice to the office of each committee member. This provision may be waived by the assent of the majority of the members of the committee.

(c) Committee hearings (whether public or in executive session) and committee investigations shall be scheduled and conducted only upon the majority vote of the committee in a meeting at which a majority of the committee is actually present.

(d) A resolution or motion scheduling hearings or ordering a particular investigation shall state clearly and with particularity the subject thereof, which resolution may be amended only upon majority vote of the committee in a meeting at which a majority of the committee is actually present.

(e) The chairman or a member shall consult with appropriate Federal law-enforcement agencies with respect to any phase of

an investigation which may result in evidence exposing the commission of Federal crimes, and the results of such consultation shall be reported to the committee before witnesses are called to testify therein.

(f) No committee report shall be issued unless a draft of such report is submitted to the office of each committee member 24 hours in advance of the meeting at which it is to be considered and is adopted at a meeting at which a majority is actually present.

(g) No testimony given in executive session or part or summary thereof shall be released or disclosed orally or in writing by a member or employee of the Senate without the authorization of the committee by majority vote at a meeting at which a majority of members is present. No committee or staff report or news release or statement based upon evidence or testimony adversely affecting a person shall be released or disclosed by the committee or any member orally or in writing unless such evidence or testimony and the complete evidence or testimony offered in rebuttal thereto, if any, is published prior to or simultaneously with the issuance of the report, or news release, or statement.

(h) The rule as to the secrecy of executive sessions as set forth in subsection (g) of this section shall be applicable to Members and employees of the Senate for a reasonable period following an executive session until the committee has had a reasonable time to conclude the pertinent investigation and hearings and to issue a report, subject, however, to any decision by a committee majority for prior release in the manner set forth in subsection (g).

HEARINGS

SEC. 3. (a) Witnesses at committee hearings (whether public or in executive session) shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel, of their own choosing, who shall have the right to advise witnesses of their rights and to make brief objections to the relevancy of questions and to procedure.

(b) Rulings on motions or objections shall be made by the member presiding, subject to appeal to the members present on motion of a member.

(c) At least 24 hours prior to his testifying a witness shall be given a copy of that portion of the motion or resolution scheduling the hearing stating the subject of the hearing, at the same time he shall be given a statement of the subject matters about which he is to be interrogated.

(d) It is the policy of the Senate that only evidence and testimony which is reliable and of probative value shall be received and considered by a committee. The privileged character of communications between clergyman and parishioner, doctor and patient, lawyer and client, and husband and wife shall be scrupulously observed.

(e) No testimony shall be taken in executive session unless at least two members of the committee are present.

(f) (i) Every witness shall have the right to make complete and brief answers to questions and to make concise explanations of such answers.

(ii) Every witness who testifies in a hearing shall have a right to make an oral statement and to file a sworn statement which shall be made part of the transcript of such hearing, but such oral or written statement shall be relevant to the subject of the hearing.

(g) A stenographic verbatim transcript shall be made of all committee hearings. Copies of such transcript, so far as practicable, shall be available for inspection or purchase at regularly prescribed rates from the official reporter by any witness or person mentioned in a public hearing. Any witness and his counsel shall have the right to inspect only the complete transcript of his own testimony in executive session.

RIGHTS OF PERSONS ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY TESTIMONY

SEC. 4. (a) A person shall be considered to be adversely affected by evidence or testimony of a witness if the committee determines that: (i) The evidence or testimony would constitute libel or slander if not presented before a committee of the Senate, or (ii) the evidence or testimony alleges crime or misconduct or tends to disgrace or otherwise to expose the person to public contempt, hatred, or scorn.

(b) Insofar as practicable, any person whose activities are the subject of investigation by the committee, or about whom adverse information is proposed to be presented at a public hearing of the committee, shall be fully advised by the committee as to the matters into which the committee proposes to inquire and the adverse material which is proposed to be presented. Insofar as practicable, all material reflecting adversely on the character or reputation of any individual which is proposed to be presented at a public hearing of the committee shall be first reviewed in executive session to determine its reliability and probative value and shall not be presented at a public hearing except pursuant to majority vote of the committee.

(c) If a person is adversely affected by evidence or testimony given in a public hearing that person shall have the right: (i) To appear and testify or file a sworn statement in his own behalf, (ii) to have the adverse witness recalled upon application made within 30 days after introduction of such evidence or the termination of the adverse witness' testimony, (iii) to be represented by counsel (as in (2) (b) hereof), (iv) to cross-examine (in person or by counsel) such adverse witness, and (v) subject to the discretion of the committee, to obtain the issuance by the committee of subpenas for witnesses, documents, and other evidence in his defense. Such opportunity for rebuttal shall be afforded promptly and, so far as practicable, such hearing shall be condence or testimony given in executive sessame circumstances as the hearing at which adverse testimony was presented.

Cross-examination shall be limited to 1 hour for each witness, unless the committee by majority vote extends the time for each witness or group of witnesses.

(d) If a person is adversely affected by evidence or testimony given in executive session or by material in the committee files or records, and if public release of such evidence, testimony, or material is contemplated, such person shall have, prior to the public release of such evidence or testimony or material or any disclosure of or comment upon it by members of the committee or committee staff or taking of similar evidence or testimony in a public hearing, the rights conferred by subsection (3) (c) hereof and the right to inspect at least as much of the evidence or testimony of the adverse witness or material as will be made public or the subject of a public hearing.

(e) Any witness (except a member of the press who testifies in his professional capacity) who gives testimony before the committee in an open hearing which reflects adversely on the character or reputation of another person may be required by the committee to disclose his sources of information, unless to do so would endanger the national security.

SUBPENAS

SEC. 5. Subpenas shall be issued by the chairman of a committee only upon written notice to all members of the committee with a statement as to the identity of the witness or material and their relevancy to the investigation or hearing already authorized. Upon the request of any member of the committee the question of whether a subpena shall be issued or remain in force if already issued shall be decided by majority vote.

COMMITTEE STAFF

SEC. 6. The composition and selection of, and changes in, the professional and clerical staff of a committee shall be subject to the vote of a majority of the members of the committee.

TELEVISION AND OTHER MEANS OF COMMUNICATION AND REPORTING

SEC. 7. (a) Subject to the physical limitations of the hearing room and consideration of the physical comfort of committee members, staff and witnesses, equal access for coverage of the hearings shall be provided to the various means of communications, including newspapers, magazines, radio, news reels, and television. It shall be the duty of the committee chairman to see that the various communication devices and instruments do not unreasonably distract, harass, or confuse the witness and interfere with his presentation.

(b) No witness shall be televised, filmed, or photographed during the hearing if he objects on the ground of distraction, harassment, or physical handicap.

SUPERVISION, APPEALS, AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 8. The application of this code shall be supervised in the Senate by the Presiding Officer of the Senate and 4 members selected by the Senate (not more than 2 of the members selected shall be of the same party), who shall have authority (1) to receive and investigate complaints of alleged violations of this code filed by persons claiming to be aggrieved and by members, (2) to advise committee chairmen of their conclusions and their suggestions, and (3) to present their findings to the Senate, with such recommendations for remedial and disciplinary action, if any, they deem appropriate.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 9. As used in this act:

"Committee" shall mean any standing, select, or special committee of the Senate (except the majority and minority policy committees) and any subcommittees of the foregoing.

"Person" includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in keeping with the spirit of the letter which I received from the select committee headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the occupant of the chair, I have felt that, generally speaking, with respect to these related matters I should make no statement.

However, what I am about to say I say because I feel that possibly, all things considered, I am one person who should perhaps make a statement on three aspects of this subject.

First, I wish to say a word about the attitude of the leadership with respect to the whole problem, and about their attitude and remarks to me and about me.

I wish to say unqualifiedly that both the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], have been courteous and have been fair and spoke frankly with me on matters related to initiating the work of the select committee, headed by the senior Senator from Georgia. There was no occasion to talk to me particularly about the second or special committee. In any event, I feel their con-

duct in that regard by proposing the longer range study was certainly to be commended.

That brings me to the second point I wish to mention, which is that I think both distinguished leaders performed in the way the Senate would have wished them to have performed in the selection of the membership of both committees.

The Members from both parties who were appointed to both committees were well chosen. Consideration had to be given to many things, such as their relationship to personal campaigns this year, their balance, perhaps, with respect to legislation that has been before the Senate, their seniority, their standing in the Senate, their other duties, their health, and possibly other matters. Being somewhat familiar with those questions, I feel, all things considered, the leaders did an excellent job. Therefore, not only the leaders but the Senators who acceded to the request that they serve on these committees are to be commended.

Service on a select or special committee means that much more work for the Senators who serve on such a committee, plus the difficult situations which may arise because of the sensitivity of the problems with which they deal. On that point I speak from a little personal experience, having served on the select committee which was headed by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

Therefore, with that background, and with whatever other background I may have, I feel that the leadership of the Senate and the members of those two committees are to be commended for their sense of responsibility and for the action which they have taken in accepting their responsibilities.

The third point I wish to mention briefly has to do with rules of procedures. When the Watkins committee had referred to it certain resolutions, among them there was a resolution submitted by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], which recommended certain changes in rules of procedures for investigations.

I believe the members of the Watkins committee who are in the Chamber will agree when I recall that one of our recommendations to the Senate was that certain procedural changes be made in the rules of the Senate, although they were somewhat limited in character. We felt at the time that this was a broader subject than that particular select committee should deal with. Consequently, we limited the recommendations to the least controversial provisions of the Bush resolution. Even then, the Senate apparently thought the matter should receive further consideration by the regular committee since no action was taken at that time on that part of our recommendations.

In the course of the next few days, I presume the Senate will consider one related matter, the elections bill which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I believe that bill now is sponsored by more than two-thirds of the membership of the Senate. Other aspects will have further consideration as the new special committee goes into the problems outlined by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who is the chairman of that special committee.

Mr. President, I do feel that the leadership in the Senate should be commended on its handling of these matters, and on the selection of the membership of the committee. I also feel that the membership of the committee should be commended for their sense of responsibility in accepting service when called upon.

Finally, I have noted with interest that the rules of procedure which we hear the special committee has adopted unanimously follow the principles expressed in the several resolutions which the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has so explicitly and carefully set forth. That of itself is evidence of the good faith of the committee—their following the considered judgment of those who, in other days, have made recommendations for changes in the procedure of committees, particularly with regard to the handling of subpenas and the calling of witnesses.

Mr. President, that is all I wished to say at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am happy to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to express my deep appreciation to my good friend from South Dakota for his fair and very generous statement concerning the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

While I am on my feet, I should like to express my gratitude to the chairman of the special committee and to the members of that committee for their willingness to undertake this unpleasant task.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I join with the majority leader in expressing my appreciation of the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and also for the very able presentations made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

Certainly I can join in the assurances which have been given that there were no volunteers for appointment to the special committee. It was a matter of the leadership having to draft and to ask busy men, all of whom are carrying heavy and burdensome obligations as Senators, to serve on the committee. No man who is not serving as a Senator—with the grave problems, domestic and international, which daily come to the desk of each Senator—can appreciate how onerous those responsibilities are. Nevertheless, when the leadership on both sides of the aisle went to the eight Senators finally chosen, not as representatives of parties, but as representatives of the Senate as an institution, they all agreed to serve and to take on these extra obligations.

Before I conclude my remarks, I wish to express a particular note of appreciation, not only to all eight members of the special committee, but to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who is well and favorably known on both sides of the aisle in the Senate as a man of great ability, sterling integrity and high courage. I am sure he and his associates will carry out their responsibilities without fear or favor, and will submit recommendations which I hope will be helpful to the Senate and to the Nation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I would not wish to repeat all that I said yesterday about the distinguished chairman of the select committee, but I should like to associate myself with everything the minority leader has said regarding the members of the committee and to read again into the RECORD a statement I made yesterday:

> By his conduct, by his dignity, and by his devotion to the rules of fair play, JOHN MCCLELLAN has reflected great credit upon the Senate. I am proud to serve with him and to work with him.

I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have listened with careful attention to the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas. I rise to say that having served with the Senator on the Committee on Government Operations for approximately 7 years, with a little lapse of time when I had to leave that committee for a few months because of another committee assignment, I have the greatest respect for the Senator from Arkansas and the utmost confidence in his ability, his integrity, and, above all, in his fairness.

It is no secret in this Chamber that from time to time the Senator from Arkansas and the junior Senator from Minnesota have disagreed on substantive issues of legislation. Nor is it any secret that in the committee upon which I am proud to serve under his chairmanship we have disagreed. It should be no secret that at all times the Senator has been so considerate and so fair that he has been above reproach. I say this as one who has filed a certain number of minority reports, but at all times with his cooperation.

Mr. President, I know the Senator from Arkansas takes on a very difficult, time-consuming, exhausing, and, as he has well put it, unglamorous responsibility. But the work will be done well—make no mistake about that. It will be done fairly, thoroughly, and in a judicious and honorable manner.

I am delighted that the Senator from Arkansas has been willing to undertake this assignment. I have conveyed to him personally my good wishes and my thanks and appreciation for his undertaking this job, because it needs to be done, and done thoroughly and well. Under the chairmanship of the Senator from Arkansas, and with the distinguished members of the committee, it will be given the fullest and the best consideration and treatment.

I wish to express again my personal commendation to the Senator, for whatever it may be worth, and, above all, my faith and trust in him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to join with the Senator from Minnesota and the distinguished majority leader and minority leader in the remarks they have just made relative to our colleague, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. I have every confidence that the conduct of the committee will be, as my colleagues have already stated, based on integrity, honesty, and fairness. Knowing the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas as well and as favorably as I do, I am sure that the result of the committee's work will be a credit to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I had desired merely to express my appreciation to the Senator from Arkansas for the fine statement he made on the floor today. I talked to him when both of us were under consideration for membership on the committee, and the Senator from Arkansas told me he did not believe he would ever accept the appointment.

Among other things, he said that under no circumstances would he be chairman of the committee. I know that was a sincere expression of his feeling. I know he accepted the chairmanship only out of a fine sense of duty to the Senate of the United States, for which every member of the committee thanks him, and, I trust, every Member of the Senate thanks him.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I merely wish to express my thanks to my colleagues who have so generously manifested their confidence in me and my purpose, at least, to do this job as effectively and as constructively and at all times as fairly as it is within my power and capacity to do it.

I am grateful to all the Senators who have spoken so complimentary of me. I leave this thought with the Senate, that the committee is going to need the help of every Senator as it proceeds with its task.

Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 11 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Minnesota, may I be permitted to say that before he was called off the floor and before the recent interruption, he had stated that he would yield to me to call up an amendment which I believe to be noncontroversial. I had submitted the amendment to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who, I think, consulted the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I handed a copy of the amendment to the majority leader and the minority leader. I do not think there is any possible ground of disagreement to this amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wyoming will yield, without losing his right to the floor, I have several requests of Senators who wanted a quorum call when we finished the discussion of the matter of the special committee.

Without the time being charged to either side, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under a previous order, the junior Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "3-13-56-D" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, between lines 13 and 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

MILK AND BRUCELLOSIS PROGRAMS

SEC. 106. (a) The last sentence of section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "For the period beginning September 1, 1954, and ending June 30, 1955, not to exceed $50 million, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, not to exceed $60 million, and for each of the 2 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1958, not to exceed $75 million, of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be used to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children in (1) nonprofit schools of high-school grade and under; and (2) such nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions as are devoted to the care and training of underprivileged children on a public welfare or charitable basis."

(b) Section 204 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows: "As a means of stabilizing the dairy industry and further suppressing and eradicating brucellosis in cattle, the Secretary is authorized to transfer not to exceed $17 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and $20 million for each of the fiscal years 1957 and 1958, from funds available to the Commodity Credit Corporation to the appropriation item 'Plant and Animal Disease and Pest Control' in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act for such fiscal year for the purpose of accelerating the brucellosis eradiction program, for the purpose of increasing to not to exceed $50 per head of cattle the amount of the indemnities paid by the Federal Government for cattle destroyed because of brucellosis in connection with cooperative control and eradication programs for such disease in cattle entered into by the Secretary under the authority of the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, for the purpose of increasing the number of such indemnities, and for the purpose of defraying any additional administrative expenses in connection therewith. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for expenditures pursuant to this section."

(c) The first sentence of subsection (a) and the first sentence of subsection (b) of section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, are amended by striking out "1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "1958."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

This amendment to S. 3183 is the language of a bill relating to the brucellosis control program and the special milk fund, which was once passed by the Senate. I believe the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and later passed the Senate unanimously. However, there has not been agreement between the two Houses upon the particular language contained in the bill.

The House, apparently, desires to have a temporary extension of the milk fund and the brucellosis program. The amendment I have offered would authorize, for a 2-year period, the brucellosis control program and the milk fund. My only objective is to speed action on the urgently needed temporary extension to which the House is willing to agree now, and still preserve for future conference the longer extension the Senate has already approved.

The language of the amendment is self-explanatory. It is designed to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children in nonprofit schools of high-school grade and under; and such nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions as are devoted to the care and training of underprivileged children on a public welfare or charitable basis.

So far as the brucellosis feature of the amendment is concerned, it is a program to which Congress has been dedicated for many years. Substantial progress has been made in the brucellosis eradication program. This work means much to the States which are cooperating under the program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did not this proposal, presented as a separate bill, receive the unanimous support of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It did.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did not that committee report the bill to the Senate by a unanimous vote of its members?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It did.

Mr. ANDERSON. As I understand, the Senator is merely offering the amend-

ment to the bill now under consideration so that the proposal will be considered by the committee of conference.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to be certain that this particular proposal is not lost in the House because of the inability of the two Houses to agree upon a separate bill, or because the Senate failed to include it in the pending bill. In other words, I am trying to cover all possible areas of difficulty, to make certain that the special milk fund and the brucellosis control program are made matters of public law.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I yield to my colleague.

Mr. THYE. As I understand, my colleague is speaking about a bill which has heretofore passed the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. That bill related to the brucellosis-control program and the special school-milk program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is the bill which my colleague reported to the Senate on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. THYE. It is unfortunate that the bill has not yet been cleared for the President. The reason why it is so unfortunate is that some school districts are now running short of funds. Funds should promptly be made available to them; otherwise, the benefits of the program will not be realized fully. It is a good program. It should go forward, and it should not be hampered by inadequate funds.

The same situation exists with respect to the eradication of brucellosis. If a point should be reached where no funds are available, the brucellosis-eradication program would be retarded. Veterinarians and other specialists employed in the operations of the program, such as in the testing of cattle to determine whether they had the disease or not, would have to be discharged.

The delay which is being experienced will place these programs in jeopardy. For that reason, I am disappointed that the House has not taken action by meeting with the conferees named by the Senate in an attempt to resolve the differences between the two Houses and to reach a final agreement so that the bill can be cleared for the President.

There is no basic controversy involved so far as I know. It is possible that political strategy is involved by which the House is endeavoring to hold up agreement in order to have something to negotiate with when the Senate conferees meet with the House conferees on the farm bill. I think that is unfortunate. I am speaking frankly. The House had better take a look at the situation, and recognize that delay in the enactment of this bill will result in jeopardizing these programs. For that reason I am speaking frankly, because the House conferees must realize the results of delay.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is very unfortunate that some Members of the House should take the position which they have taken. As the Senator from Minnesota stated a while ago, the Senate did pass a bill several weeks ago providing for an additional $2 million for the brucellosis program, and $10 million for the school-lunch program for this fiscal year. In addition, the Senate provided authorizations for 2 more years for both projects.

If the pending amendment should be adopted, it is my belief that the Senate conferees could meet in conference with those from the House on the bills which both Houses have already passed and in just a few minutes the Senate could recede from its amendment and thereby make it possible to obtain $2 million for the brucellosis program and $10 million for the school-lunch program for the rest of this fiscal year. That can be done without in any manner interfering with the future 2-year program which is contemplated in the amendment being offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say that the House has before it both a temporary bill, which has been passed by the Senate, and a long-time, or 2-year proposal, and the Senate has a 2-year proposal.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What the House wants to do is to agree upon a temporary proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. There would not be any disagreement between the Senate and the House with respect to a continuation of the program up to June 30, because the House is willing to provide the $2 million for brucellosis control as well as the $10 million for the school milk program. The Senate conferees will not encounter a bit of trouble if we are in a position to accept the House bill providing a brucellosis and school-milk program for the balance of this year while receding from our amendment to the House bill authorizing a 2-year program.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. If the House would have its conferees meet with the Senate conferees and resolve the differences, in a matter of only a few hours agreement could probably be reached and the bill could be sent to the President shortly thereafter. If the farm bill is amended by the adoption of the pending amendment, the Senate must still pass the bill and it must go to conference with the House. There is much in the pending bill to which the House will want to give consideration and on which it will want to deliberate. It may be several weeks before the House and the Senate can agree upon what should be contained in this bill, S. 3183.

In short, delay would be most injurious to the school-milk program, and would most certainly be disastrous to continued progress of the brucellosis eradication program.

I want to be sure that I understand the legislative procedure suggested. I was forced to leave the floor to take a long-distance telephone call when the question was first discussed. If it is the intention to amend the farm bill with the text of a bill the Senate has already passed, and which is presently before a conference committee, then I think this approach would be the wrong one.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may state to my good friend from Minnesota that if the amendment were adopted, there is no question in my mind but that a conference could be held tomorrow or the next day on H. R. 8320, and that the Senate could recede from its amendments to that bill—that is, from the 2-year program the Senate has already voted—and that the House would agree with the Senate to provide the money to carry out the program for the remainder of this year. In my humble judgment, that is the only way by which it will be possible to get the funds with which to continue through June 30 of this year the brucellosis and school-milk programs. I have talked to several Members of the House. They seem to be adamant in their position not to extend this program for 2 years unless that extension is put in the pending bill. That means that if the legislation which is now in conference is not agreed upon immediately, we shall not be able to obtain sufficient money—$2 million for the brucellosis program and $10 million for the school-lunch program—to carry them through the remainder of the year. I am sure the Senator does not want to permit those programs to die.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I am in the unfortunate position of having come to the Senate floor when the present debate was well underway. I was not present at the time of the offering of the amendment. Therefore, possibly I do not have a complete understanding of what my colleague has proposed in his amendment. If I am in error, I should like to be corrected.

The situation is that the Senate has passed a bill which is now in conference, and the House conferees have not agreed to a conference meeting on it. I understand the Senate is willing to confer, but the House conferees have refused to sit down with the Senate conferees. If that is the status of the bill, then I do not see why we should approach the problem by putting the provision in the pending bill. I do not know what would be accomplished.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to my friend from Minnesota that if this amendment is adopted, it will mean the Senate conferees can go into conference with the House on the school milk and brucellosis bill. We can agree to strike from that bill the 2-year extension of these programs; we could obtain sufficient money to operate the existing programs through June 30. We would lose nothing, because the 2-year extension of the milk and brucellosis programs—which would be deleted from the legislation already approved by the Senate—would still remain in the pending bill. I

am confident that by following such a course there will be no objection on the part of the House to providing $2 million for the brucellosis program and $10 million for the school-lunch program, in order that those programs may be continued this year. When the bill which the Senate is presently considering is passed, we can then take up the programs for the 2 years after June 30. In my humble judgment, it is the only way in which we shall be able to get the money necessary to complete this year's program, if what I have been told is true.

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. If the objective is to take care of the remainder of this fiscal year, I would be perfectly willing to go along with the proposal. Of course, the 2-year provision could be considered later.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the purpose of the pending amendment.

Mr. THYE. The question is, however, Are the House conferees willing to agree on the proposed funds to carry out the programs through the end of the present fiscal year, June 30?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have the assurance that there will be no objection on reaching agreement on the bill now in conference, so as to make funds available to complete the programs for this year, provided the long-range program is included in the general farm bill.

Mr. THYE. Then, the amendment offered by my colleague proposes to provide in the bill sufficient funds to finance both the brucellosis and the school-milk programs for the remainder of this fiscal year, which would be from now until June 30. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. It would continue those programs on an expanded basis for 2 more years. In other words, what we are doing is taking two shots at this question. The Senate has already passed a bill providing for a 2-year extension of the milk and brucellosis program. That particular provision would be deleted in conference, but since it will also be contained in the pending bill, we would end up losing nothing. We would merely save these programs for the remainder of the fiscal year.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. So, Mr. President, when the pending bill goes to conference, if in the meantime we are able to get the House of Representatives to approve the $2 million for brucellosis and the $10 million for the school-milk program, to continue them through June 30, we shall be able to strike that provision from the pending bill and still have the 2-year extension proviso.

Mr. THYE. That seems to be going the long way around to achieve the desired result.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota, but it appears to be about the only way we can get the job done.

Mr. THYE. A great deal of hard work is necessary to accomplish what the House conferees could accomplish tomorrow morning if they would only sit down with the Senate conferees and resolve the differences between the two bills which both Houses already have passed. In other words, it would seem as if we were going 100 miles around the point to accomplish what is desired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota, but since the money is needed by April 1, if the brucellosis and school milk programs are to continue, it seems to me that what we propose is the shortest route by which to reach our goal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say that the procedure suggested is not at all unusual.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Last year, did not we pass a wool bill and send it to the House of Representatives? The House did not act on it; and later, when we had the Agricultural Act of 1954 before us, I proposed, as I recall, that the same provision be included in it as an amendment, since the House had not theretofore acted on the wool bill. In that way we carried that matter to the House of Representatives, did we not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the purpose of the amendment is good. Why not achieve something in connection with this program? I understand the Senator from Minnesota favors the brucellosis amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Furthermore, Mr. President, it is not a question of having happen just what we would like to have happen. If that were the case, I would be smiling a good deal more of the time than I have been, because many of the provisions which I favor including in the bill have been stricken from it.

The amendment relates to the extension of the program to eradicate brucellosis. The Senate has already passed a bill for that purpose, and the House has already passed the bill. Furthermore, the bill as passed by the House makes an extension for the remainder of the fiscal year.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have been told—and the chairman of the committee has reaffirmed it—that the House has agreed to provide the funds needed for the program to eradicate brucellosis, and also the funds needed for the program to provide school milk for the remainder of this year. But the House has said, in effect, "If you want an extension for 2 years, you must provide for it in the agricultural bill." I am sorry the House of Representatives is so stubborn, but that is the way it seems to be.

Inasmuch as Wisconsin, Minnesota, and other States will have exhausted the funds available for this work, I think we should proceed in the way proposed by the amendment.

Of course, if the House passes a bill providing for such an extension, and if we have already made such a provision in the bill now before us, then both Houses will have agreed about it—and that may be one of the few things to which both Houses agree readily.

So I cannot see that we shall lose anything by adopting this amendment. Of course, if we wished to be stubborn, we could say to the House, "We have passed a bill on this subject, and we shall rest there." In that event, we might not achieve the result we desire; and then the children of the country would be the victims. I see no other way for us to achieve success in this field.

It seems to me that anyone who believes that this amendment, if adopted, will result in stymieing the program, is laboring under a misapprehension. I have been told that the funds for the milk program are running out, and that some action must be taken immediately.

Of course the Senate cannot dictate to the House; neither can the House of Representatives dictate to the Senate. Time after time we have found that the way to end such a logjam as this is to proceed in the way now suggested. By this means we can have the program for eradicating brucellosis proceed. Even though the bill passed by the House of Representatives may become the law, I see no harm in including this provision in the pending agricultural bill, as well as in the separate bill. We cannot lose if we cover both fronts. In that event, we shall have handled the matter both by means of the House bill which was passed by the Senate several weeks ago—House bill 8320—and by means of this amendment to the agricultural bill. In that way we shall have handled the matter adequately, and shall have covered every eventuality, and shall have answered any complaints which might be made.

Mr. President, unless some other Senator wishes to discuss the amendment, I shall yield the floor, but shall wait to see whether there is further comment on the amendment, before I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment, to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senate has lost all interest in the care and welfare of the schoolchildren the Senate will adopt the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. President, what are the facts? On February 8, the Senate passed a bill providing funds not only with which to carry on the school-milk program for the remainder of this fiscal year, but also to carry on the brucellosis eradication program for the remainder of the year. Then the bill substantially increases the funds for carrying on both programs for the next 2 years. In the Senate there was not a vote against the bill.

The bill was passed in slightly different form by the House of Representatives; and a conference was requested. The conferees have been appointed since February 21—23 days ago. The House rules require conferees to report within 20 days. So far, the chairman of the House conferees has neither permitted a conference with the Senate conferees, nor, apparently, is he willing to report

anything on the subject to the House of Representatives itself.

As I understand, an arrangement was made with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for a conference. I understand that a few days ago on the floor of the House the Senator from Louisiana was criticized by inference, and the House was given to understand that he was the one who did not want to have the conference held. Mr. President, I do not believe that, because I know the Senator from Louisiana did want a conference held. But we were advised that the House conferees could not confer with us that day because they had an important meeting with Mr. Patton, of the Farmers Union, and Mr. Newsom, of the Grange. So the House conferees put off the meeting with the Senate conferees. I further understand that it was impossible to find a date which was acceptable to them for a meeting with the Senate conferees.

I know the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, one of the Senate conferees, would have been glad to meet with them. I was advised by a member of our staff that if we would agree to the House proposals—in other words, if we would agree to throw out the 2-year program for the control of brucellosis and the furnishing of school milk—the House conferees would send one of their members to us, to agree for all the other House conferees. This offer was, of course, rejected and we have not yet had a conference.

But now we are asked to include in the pending bill the text of that bill, which was unanimously passed by the Senate, and which I am sure would pass the House of Representatives if the Members of the House of Representatives had a chance to vote on it. If the chairman of the House conferees would permit the House to have an opportunity to vote on the bill, the House would accept the Senate amendments, I am sure, because the Members of the House do not wish to deprive the school children of the milk, and do not wish to stop the program which is aimed at stamping out the dread disease of brucellosis.

Mr. President, in case any Senator does not know what brucellosis is, let me say that in a human being it is undulant fever. Anyone who has ever seen the suffering, both mental and physical, on the part of persons who have contracted undulant fever, could not fail to favor the program to eradicate that disease. Yet the House conferees would throw out of H. R. 8320 the proposal of the Senate to extend the program for the eradication of this terrible disease for another 2 years.

Already, Mr. President, many States of the Union prohibit the sale within their borders of any milk except milk from brucellosis-free herds.

It is said, "Let us extend the program for 2 or 3 months more. Throw out the 2-year extension of the program. Throw that into the political maelstrom, so that it can be used as a political blackjack."

We have heard rumors to the effect that the only basis upon which some Members intend to approve the continuation of the school-lunch program and the brucellosis program is that it be tied to a 90 percent support program, or a multiple price wheat program. The dearest hope of some people is that Congress will send to President Eisenhower a bill which he will have to veto. Why do we allow these programs to become political footballs? It is bringing politics down to about the lower levels when we involve our school milk program, and the health of our children and adults as well.

I repeat that if the Senate is really concerned with milk for the school children of the country, or the eradication of brucellosis, it will not yield to those who insist that we can have those programs only if we consent to throw them into the political pot where they may be combined with other provisions which President Eisenhower cannot and will not accept.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment, in order that every Senator may be counted, on the question whether he wishes to put the health of our school children and people into the political maelstrom, or whether we ought to stand squarely on our feet and let the House, if it wishes to do so, permit its conferees to get away with this kind of thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the demand for the yeas and nays seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not know whether my time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am not sure which rule in the rule book should have been applied a moment ago, but because I have respect for my colleagues I did not call for its application.

I have never heard such talk on the floor of the Senate. We talk about politics. The politics lies in being stubborn. If we want milk for our schoolchildren, this amendment is the way to get it. If any politics lies behind the fact that the House conferees will not meet with the Senate conferees, as has been charged, it helps none for we Senators to say, "If you do not meet with us, we will not meet with you, and we will not have any milk program."

That is what it really boils down to. What is the amendment which is proposed? I offered the amendment in good faith. I consulted the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. I consulted the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. In fact, the Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of our committee, talked with me about the amendment, and stated that he felt that it ought to be in the bill. I said that I would be more than happy to offer the amendment, to make certain that milk would be provided for our schoolchildren.

I resent the comments which have been made on this floor. This is not an unusual performance. The price-support controversy is not involved. There has been no indication about 90 percent of parity or 60 percent of parity in this amendment. There has been no thought of such a thing.

This amendment does not subtract anything from the legislation we have already passed. The farm bill is still before us. The Senate has passed House bill 8320, with an amendment. This amendment would not weaken that measure. It is still in the status of a bill which has been passed. However, the House refuses to accept the Senate amendment. Can it be said that we are playing politics when we stand on the basis of a bill which has been passed, with respect to which no one will agree? I should like to see something done. That is the only reason why this amendment is offered.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The junior Senator from North Dakota was chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations when this administration took over in 1952. The subcommittee tried to get the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, to embark upon the present brucellosis campaign. It required a year or more to persuade him to embark upon it. Now it seems that there may be a little gap in the program. The fact that there might be a gap is supposed to be a terrible thing. I always thought this was a good program, but I cannot see why all the fuss.

Our committee had a difficult time in persuading the Secretary of Agriculture to proceed with this program. In fact, we failed at first to convince the Secretary of Agriculture that he should embark upon the brucellosis program.

I do not share the feeling of my friend from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] with respect to the House. The Members of that body were all elected by the people of the United States only 2 years ago. Some of us have served in this body for nearly 6 years, since being elected. The House is an independent body. We have no more right to try to tell the House what to do than the House has to tell the Senate how it should operate.

I do not believe that a few Members of the Senate have a right to say that we shall have this kind of bill or there will not be any at all. I was elected by the people of North Dakota to represent them, together with my colleague, in farm matters, as well as other things. I intend to do what I think is right, regardless of threats, and write the best possible agricultural bill. Whether or not the President vetoes it. That is his business. I think he will do the fair thing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, for the first time in my life I have felt unfair treatment in this body for an honorable purpose.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I saw the junior Senator from North Dakota working on the brucellosis program. If there ever was a time when he failed to work for it, I do not know when it was. He is an enthusiastic supporter of the program. We all follow his leadership in that direction.

I myself do not possess a dairy animal. Formerly I owned a great many. I had many of them slaughtered because of brucellosis. It is a very serious disease.

Apparently the discussion was partly aimed at me, as though I were playing politics in connection with this bill. I do not think I played politics in connection with the pending bill.

We took up the wool bill, an administration proposal, and passed it in July of 1954. At that time there was pending a grazing measure. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was kind enough to add the grazing measure to the proposed Agricultural Act of 1954, because it was not possible to get it through the Congress otherwise. It was taken to conference, and in conference it was decided to accept only the wool bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not on my time.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me take a minute of my time to advise the Senator from New Mexico that the wool bill, like the school-milk bill, had not passed both Houses of Congress and been sent to conference at the time it was attached to the agriculture bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know the details as to what happened. I say only that we did the same thing then that we are proposing to do now. We attached a certain measure to an agricultural bill.

We have reached the point where we have difficulty with the other House. My remarks are directed only to the point that if a bill is a good bill, and is unanimously approved by the committee, I cannot see what is wrong with it. There are so few things on which the committee is unanimous.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understand, this amendment would not prevent the other bill from going to conference. This amendment would merely assure that there would be a 2-year extension. House bill 12, which was passed by the House long before Senate bill 3183 came to this Chamber, includes a 2-year extension for the milk program and the brucellosis program. The House has wanted a milk program and a brucellosis program.

As the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] pointed out, all this amendment does is to assure the Senate that there will be agreement upon a temporary extension of the milk and brucellosis programs for the remainder of this fiscal year. There is no disagreement between the two Houses on the question of a 2-year extension. Let the record be clear. The House has already voted a 2-year extension. The Senate has voted a 2-year extension. What we have not agreed upon is a temporary extension from now until June 30.

When I hear it said that we propose to crawl on our knees to the House, I reply that we propose to use our heads, not our knees; to use our minds, not our arches, and agree upon a basic program for the extension of the brucellosis-control program and the milk program.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in order to have the record crystal clear, I still say that the House could well have acted and that we could have had the bill passed and at the White House for the President's signature several weeks ago.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It should have been done.

Mr. THYE. There is only one question involved between the Senate and the House, and that is the provision in the bill of which my colleague was the author.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. That is the 2-year extension.

Mr. THYE. That is correct. There is a slight difference between the two bills. In order that the record may be crystal clear, it should be stated that what we are confronted with is that if the apparent feud between the two legislative bodies continues, the schoolchildren will not have school milk.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. And the brucellosis program will come to a standstill, and the veterinarians will be discharged. The veterinarians will have to be rerecruited when the funds are made available. I do not intend to be a party to any such continuing feud. If an amendment can be adopted which will be acceptable to the House, and in that way we can break the stalemate and get some action, and make the funds available, I shall support such an amendment. Therefore, I shall support the amendment which has been offered, because it is the only way we can bring the feud to an end. Apparently it is because of the feud between the two legislative bodies that the conferees will not even sit down to confer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to say that no Senator has a greater interest in the bill than the senior Senator from Minnesota. He reported it from the committee. I am very much upset by the way this matter has been handled. My only purpose in speaking was to say, as the senior Senator from Minnesota has stated, that something should be done about milk for children and about brucellosis control. I wish we could bring the House to our view, but apparently we cannot do that. If anyone can suggest how they will cooperate, I should be delighted to be informed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Probably the difficulty is that the junior Senator from Minnesota proposed it in the Senate. At least that seems to be the only objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not wish to leave that implication in the RECORD. Certainly the remarks which were made a short time ago were rather disturbing to me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN.]

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it is perfectly obvious that if the amendment of the junior Senator from Minnesota is attached to the pending bill, the other bill (H. R. 8320) providing money for the school milk program and the brucellosis program for 2 more years will never be acted upon in conference or in any other way.

Mr. President, I think too highly of our school children and I think too highly of the health of our people to tie that amendment to a bill which may have very little chance of becoming law. If anyone wishes to kill the school milk program, and if they wish to kill the brucellosis program for the next 2 years, there is no better chance to do it. Our States must now plan their work for the period after the first of July, and there is no time to lose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I am shocked by that kind of language, impugning motives. Very frankly, it is because I respect the senior Senator from Vermont so much that I refuse to reply in kind.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if I had not heard the junior Senator from Minnesota impugning other people's motives and character so much on the floor of the Senate in the past few days, probably I would not have said what I did.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I withdraw my suggestion. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, we are in a rather ominous, even dangerous, situation at this moment. I do not believe there is a Member of the Senate who is not in favor of an extension of the brucellosis program and of the school milk program. We have shown that by our votes. The Senate has passed a bill providing for a 2-year extension. It has gone to the House with some slight amendment. For some unknown reason—I shall say, for the sake of the argument, and to give everyone the benefit of the doubt—the conferees on the part of the House have refused even to meet on that bill. The differences between the House and the Senate are so inconsequential as to be trivial. There is no disagreement on the main points of the bill as passed by both Houses of Congress.

If the House Members want a school milk program and a brucellosis program for the next 2 years, they can have it in 20 minutes. Yet for weeks and weeks they have refused even to confer. Those facts are apparent, patent, and available on their face. I want the responsibility for the failure of the brucellosis program and of the school milk program to rest exactly where it belongs, and that is with certain gentlemen in the other House of Congress, who refuse to meet and to cooperate with the Senate conferees.

I do not know what motives may lie behind their refusal. However, let me pose a set of circumstances. Of course this must be pure conjecture, because by not the slightest stretch of the imagination would I make any implication of political maneuvering with the health of the American people in connection with the brucellosis program or that of providing our schoolchildren with milk. No, I would make no implication or suggestion that the situation is being used for political manipulative purposes in the House of Representatives, or anywhere else. But it could be entirely possible, although unthinkable, that if we were to put the provisions of the bill which has been passed by both Houses into the pending bill, that bill, which could be enacted within 24 hours, would never see the light of day; and it would

be possible to use the health of the children of America and the health of the adults of America in connection with the brucellosis program as a club, if you please, Mr. President, to say, "You will not get that unless in conference you will agree to all our conditions and terms with respect to the farm bill."

I would not impute such a motive to any one Member of Congress, because, as we all know, the paragons of excellence and the repositories and the possessors in the highest degree of all human virtues are in the Congress of the United States, and no Member of Congress has any motives except of the most altruistic kind.

I understand that, Mr. President. I agree that that is true. I certainly do not think that any Member of either body would do such a thing, as to use the health of the children and the health of the adult population of the United States for political manipulation. Perish the thought, Mr. President. Perish the thought. There must be some other reason that the gentlemen of the other body will not sit down in conference to discuss a disagreement which is so trivial that, if the bill were returned to the Senate, the amendment could be so quickly withdrawn and the full terms of the House so quickly agreed to that hardly anyone would know that the bill had been passed.

However, there is no way of getting possession of that bill. There is no way by which we can recall the bill from conference.

I am exploring the possibility that we might ask unanimous consent to bring the bill back from the conference, discharge the conferees, eliminate the so-called objectionable amendment which the Senate attached to it, reconsider the bill, and pass it again exactly as it came from the House, and get the bill on its way. That could be done within 1 day; and I warn the Senate that I may request unanimous consent, if that be necessary, to discharge the conferees, to recall the bill, reconsider it, and eliminate the so-called objectionable amendment. Then I wish to see who will object, because we can get a brucellosis bill within 2 days, providing we can get the machinery properly arranged to discharge the conferees and bring the bill back and pass it in the same language in which the House passed it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am not opposed to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I know that. That is not what anyone in the House is objecting to. They are objecting to the 2-year extension.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am sure that if the bill were returned to the Senate, the Senator would not object to having his amendment eliminated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should be glad to cooperate. I have been a sponsor of legislation of this character for months and years.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would agree to a unanimous-consent request to discharge the conferees, because I think our conferees have suffered enough indignity already in this matter. I would not now consent to recalling the bill. I am satisfied that if the House itself had a chance to vote on the 2-year extension provision, it would agree to it, but the committee itself could sit on the bill indefinitely and not hold any conference meetings, and leave it lying on the shelf to be used as a political blackjack. Although, Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Iowa that no Member of the Congress would stoop that low or even think of doing so.

I should not want the bill to come back to the Senate, but I should be glad to have the conferees discharged.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me see if I correctly understand the situation.

The Senate has already passed a bill to do exactly what this amendment proposes to do. The House has likewise passed a bill. Will it do, for all practical purposes, exactly what this amendment will do? Is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is substantially correct. There is a slight difference.

Mr. CAPEHART. When did the Senate pass the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 4 more minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CAPEHART. My next question is, When did the Senate pass the bill?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The House passed the brucellosis bill on May 5, 1955, extending it for the next 2 years. The Senate acted on the House bill in February.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of this year?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator is not correct. In my own time I shall be glad to explain the situation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The clerk of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry just handed me the information as to dates, and it was on the basis of that information that I was responding to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. When did the Senate pass this bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill which is now in conference was passed by the Senate 3 weeks ago.

Mr. CAPEHART. A bill that will do exactly what the amendment offered by the able Senator from Minnesota will do?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the substance of his amendment in a bill now pending in conference between the two Houses?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why has there not been a conference on that bill? Why has not the question been settled?

Mr. ELLENDER. As chairman of the Senate conferees I made several attempts to obtain a conference. We fixed a date, but it was not agreeable to the House conferees. They suggested another date, which was not agreeable to us, because most of the Senate conferees were out of town. Since that time no effort has been made by either side.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will bear me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, how much time remains to those who are in opposition to the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes remain.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why is it not easier for the conferees to hold a conference on a bill already passed than to add this amendment to the pending farm bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me explain to the Senator what happened. As Senators know, House bill 12 came to the Senate on May 9, 1955——

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator repeat that, please?

Mr. ELLENDER. The House passed H. R. 12 on May 5, 1955, and it reached the Senate on May 9. In that bill the level of price supports on the basics was raised to 90 percent, and the price support for milk and milk products was fixed at a level of 80 to 90 percent. Extension of the brucellosis program through June 30, 1958, was in it; it also provided for an extension of the school milk program, but not exactly according to the way the Senate felt it should be handled, in that the school milk program was extended only through June 30, 1957. When we started hearings on the pending general farm bill it was my belief that we had delayed so long that we might not be able to obtain legislation in time to provide funds to complete this current fiscal year's program. So I suggested to Representative COOLEY and Representative POAGE that the House pass a bill providing funds to complete this year's program. The House did pass a bill—H. R. 8320—providing for $2 million to carry the brucellosis program through this fiscal year, and also providing $10 million to continue the school milk program for the remainder of this fiscal year.

When H. R. 8320 came before the Senate, we amended it to include a 2-year program for both brucellosis and school milk—which possibly we should not have done, because it was also in the bill H. R. 12 which had previously been approved by the House and which we expect to have in conference soon. The House refused to accept the Senate amendments to H. R. 8320, and sent the measure to conference, where it now rests.

I do not believe there is too much politics involved, about which the Senator from Vermont has been declaiming. I have been trying to keep the two programs out of politics. The point I tried to make a while ago was that if we desire to provide $2 million in order to complete this year's brucellosis program and provide $10 million to carry the school milk program through June 30 of this year, it seems to me we should agree to the provisions of H. R. 8320 in the form that the House has already passed, and let the matter of the 2 years' extension be considered in connection with H. R. 12.

Mr. CAPEHART. Can that be done through conference with the House?

Mr. ELLENDER. They refuse to do it in conference on H. R. 8320.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why?

Mr. ELLENDER. Because they say the long-range program is in the original bill, H. R. 12, which the House passed on May 5, 1955.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator mean the farm bill which we are now considering?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for 5 minutes on the bill.

I should like again to explain the situation. I should dislike to see the Senate reject the pending amendment, because if the amendment is not adopted, it will mean that the House will remain adamant. If that should happen, it would not be possible to make funds available to continue the brucellosis program for this year or to obtain $10 million for the milk program for the remainder of the year.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why?

Mr. ELLENDER. Because the House will not agree to include in H. R. 8320 an extension of 2 years. The House has suggested that the Senate place the 2-year extension in the general farm bill—H. R. 12—which the House sent to the Senate last year.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator mean to say the House is willing to have no legislation on the subject; that the House is not willing to provide free milk over a period of time, whether it be 2 years or some other period? Is that the position of the House?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall not endeavor to say what the position of the House is. But the point is that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] introduced a bill in the early part of this year providing funds for the brucellosis program, not only for the remainder of the present year, but also for 2 years hence.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In order to get money for this year's program, I suggested to the Members of the House that they send to the Senate a bill providing funds for the remainder of this fiscal year. That they did.

Instead of passing the House bill as it came to the Senate, the Senate added a 2-year program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from Louisiana realize that when the Senate substitutes its bill for H. R. 12, the 2-year extension will already be in the bill? Therefore, why all the maneuvering to include it twice in the same bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. The House version authorizes a lesser amount for brucellosis than that which the President suggested. If we adopt the language of H. R. 12, we could not go above that figure in conference. H. R. 12 provides $75 million for the school-milk program—the same as the Senate provided in H. R. 8320—but the program is extended only through June 30, 1957, whereas the Senate version of H. R. 8320 extends it through June 30, 1958. If we accept the language of H. R. 12, the conferees are limited to a 1-year extension and we would lose the 2-year extension.

Mr. AIKEN. Seventy-five million dollars annually was provided for 2 years in the Senate bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let the Senate act as it desires. Unless the Senate agrees to let the long-range program be settled in the future, as a part of the consideration of the general farm bill, we shall not, in my humble judgment, be able to get the House to provide funds for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Louisiana think, then, that if the Senate does not agree to do what the House wants, the House would deprive the schoolchildren of milk?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know the reasons the House might give for its action, and how far it might go, but there is no doubt that unless the Senate shall follow the procedure which is now proposed, and if the House continues to remain adamant, as I believe it will, the school-milk fund will be exhausted soon, and so will the brucellosis fund. I do not see any other way to proceed than in the manner suggested.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senate yields on this matter, will it not have to yield to all the other demands of the House?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know. I do not care to predict. That remains to be seen, when we are in conference on the pending bill.

I may say to my good friend from Vermont that the time is running short. Only 2 more weeks remain before many of the school lunch programs will have to stop. I do not want to be a party to that. I do not want to be so stubborn as not to be willing to adjust the matter in conference.

Mr. AIKEN. Let us see who is stubborn. The House says there will be no school milk program unless the Senate agrees to the House bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Just because the House is stubborn is no reason why the Senate should be stubborn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana on the bill itself has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for 1 more minute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Has the Department of Agriculture not recommended a temporary extension?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my recollection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that both Houses, in separate bills, have agreed upon a 2-year extension?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senate has already agreed to a 2-year extension of both programs; the House has already approved a 2-year extension of the brucellosis program, and a 1-year extension of the school milk program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So the 2-year extension is bound to come. The question at issue is whether or not we in Minnesota, 2 weeks from now, will have any school milk program.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the issue.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If I had known the amendment would cause all this trouble, I would not have brought it up in 50 years. I thought I was doing a favor by trying to help people. I regret that the House will not see the situation as the Senate sees it. I express the hope that it will be possible to have the matter settled.

I think the Senate conferees can meet with the House conferees and try to have the funds authorized with which to continue this year's program.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I reported to the Senate the bill which is now being discussed relative to increasing the funds for the brucellosis eradication program and also the school-lunch program. The bill was passed by the Senate and was sent to the House. What the House has done is something about which we can do nothing other than to criticize.

The Department of Agriculture has recommended that action be taken. If the Senate fails to act on this matter this afternoon, funds will not be available with which to continue the school milk and lunch program. Funds will not be available for a continuation of the work of the veterinarians in the brucellosis-eradication program, a program designed to stamp out the brucellosis disease in livestock across the Nation. The lives of humans will continue to be endangered so long as that disease exists.

For that reason I believe we should meet the issue of the 2-year extension of the program when that issue comes before the Senate. But let us this afternoon act favorably upon the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Minnesota in order to obtain the funds which are needed to carry on the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the senior Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 3 minutes to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes on the bill to the senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I regret that this difference of opinion has arisen concerning a matter in connection with which everyone is trying to do a particular thing, although we are merely taking somewhat different routes to reach the goal.

To refresh the minds of Senators who are members of the committee, it will be recalled that when it became evident that the Senate was going to spend so much time on the main farm bill, the omnibus bill, that we would be prevented from determining this question by April 1, the necessary date, I suggested, and other members of the committee, without exception, all followed the suggestion, that the Senate take separate action on this measure, in order to expedite settlement of the matter and to get it out of the way.

I thought the suggestion was good then; I think it is good now. I think the matter was handled in a completely

nonpolitical manner. I recall that the chairman of the committee, who happens to be of one party, directed that the report be made by the senior Senator from Minnesota, who happens to be of the other party. This clearly indicates the matter was being completely nonpolitically handled, as I hope it will be handled now.

I think the amendment should be agreed to. I am just as irritated as is any other Senator by the inaction of the House conferees. I remind the Members of the Senate that the conferees on the pending bill will be drawn from the same group. They will be sitting down together on a bill which is a temporary bill at the same time they probably will be sitting together in conference on the larger bill.

If the Senate wants to be stubborn, the Senate conferees have a perfect right to be stubborn, if they wish to be, until the 28th or 29th of March. Then, instead of our being the ones who have to act or have to recede from stubbornness, it seems to me the shoe will be on the other foot, and the House conferees will be the ones who will either have to recede from their stubbornness, or else be the ones who will be responsible, and will have to accept responsibility, for inaction on the extension of the brucellosis program and the school-lunch program for milk for the next 2 years.

The only difference between the House bill and the Senate bill on this matter, because both bills deal in exactly the same way with the interim period, is, as I understand, that the House bill extends the program for 1 year, while the Senate bill extends the program for 2 years.

We are all supporting both of these programs. It seems to me that eventually the Senate conferees will have it completely in their power to say, "Either we are going to consider both of these bills or take enough time on the big bill"——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 more minute on the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. But when the deadline is approaching, we can say to the House conferees, "Either join with us in extending the program for 2 years, or accept responsibility for possible defeat of the whole measure."

Mr. President, the objective is so worth while that I hope we will not jeopardize it. I hope to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the request for a yea and nay vote and proceed with a voice vote on the amendment to include in the bill the language now under discussion.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator have any reason to believe that the House will accept in its pending bill what it refused to accept in the other bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no reason to know what the House will do, but the subject will be before it in both bills. It is already covered in the House bill. It is not yet in our omnibus bill. It is in the small House bill the Senate amended.

The question of time will be in control of the joint conference committee. We are certainly within our rights in insisting on using the time up until the 28th or 29th of March in trying to get together on the big bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then the Senator from Florida cannot state whether or not the House will accept it if the provision is put in the pending bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator have any reason to believe that the House will accept it?

Mr. HOLLAND. The House has passed the 1-year feature and has passed everything the Senate has passed upon, except with minor differences of time and maybe small differences in amounts of money.

I should dislike to see the Senate divided on a program which we are all so eager to see extended, namely, the brucellosis and the school lunch programs, in connection with which the Senate has been generous to the milk producers and, at the same time, to the schoolchildren and those who get the benefit of the other program.

I am going to ask unanimous consent to rescind the order for a yea-and-nay vote and that a voice vote be taken.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I would object. I should like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. Does the chairman of the committee think that the House will accept in this bill what the House refused to accept in a separate bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do; yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Vermont has made the statement that the House would like to have something on which it could trade. I presume that may be a reason.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator indicate how the time is being charged?

Mr. ELLENDER. To the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I renew my request that the order for the yeas and nays be rescinded and that the Senate vote on the amendment by a voice vote.

Mr. ANDERSON. I object.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have listened to the argument. I am still not convinced. I think it would be very unwise to yield on a matter affecting the schoolchildren and the health of our people. I have listened to the chairman of the committee say the House will simply not extend the program if the 2-year extension is insisted upon. I want the school authorities, the dairy people, and everyone else in this country to know who is holding up their program.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, I realize that a record vote may be misunderstood and I am willing to have the order for the yeas and nays rescinded.

Mr. YOUNG. I object to rescinding the order for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield me some time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. This is one of the most diabolical situations I have seen in 12 years in the Senate. I have my own ideas as to what the motives behind it are, not on the part of any Senator, but on the part of some persons in some other place. This is a trifling on the part of some persons with the health of children and grownups. Perish the thought that Members of the Senate would be guilty of such an attitude. I say they would not—oh, no, not at all. But some persons for political, manipulative purposes, are doing this. I shall vote to adopt the amendment, because I do not propose to give anyone an opportunity to point only to the naked record and say, "HICKENLOOPER voted against the brucellosis program and the school lunch program." That is one of the diabolical aspects of the situation. So I shall vote to put the language in the bill, but I hope no one will think I am so naive that I cannot see through the transparent purposes of some persons in other places outside the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me half a minute?

Mr. AIKEN. I ask that the Senator take time on the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope my good friends withdraw their objections to the request of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, we have listened to the Senator from Minnesota practically being called a murderer. We have listened to my being denounced for taking part in politics. I have tried to stay out of politics. I have taken a stand against my party time after time after time. I voted against proposed cotton legislation. I do not think it is right to indulge in the sort of discussion which has taken place. I think it is too bad when we do that. As we go further into the farm bill, we seem to be getting further and further apart. We become tired and get angry with each other. I believe it could be possible that the Senator from Minnesota, who has offered the amendment time after time after time, might at this time have offered it for good purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute on the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, no one knows the nonpolitical nature of the services of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico better than I do. I started following him in this field when he was a very distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, before he came to this body, and I have not wavered in the slightest in supporting the same philosophy which is his.

I certainly realize that some unfriendly and unnecessary statements have been made here, but the point I remind all Senators of is that, after all, we are all

talking about a procedural matter, pure and simple. We are all for the school-lunch program. We are all for giving children more milk. We are all for extending that program. We are all for the brucellosis program. It seems to me it would be quite all right to have the language proposed both in the bill which the Senate passed, and which is now in conference, and in the omnibus bill. I say again the decision will be with the conferees, just prior to April 1, as to which bill the provisions will be put in.

I renew with hope and some confidence my request that the Senate vacate the order for a yea and nay vote on the amendment.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I shall not object to the unanimous-consent request. I think it is unfortunate that we have gotten into this kind of discussion. A Senator has impugned the motives and the good faith not only of our own Members, but of Members of the other House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has that been done?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it not in violation of the rule of the Senate to impugn the motives of a Senator, and is it not conduct unbecoming a Senator?

Mr. YOUNG. I think so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am sure that any Senator who has violated the rule will want to withdraw a statement in violation of the rule.

Mr. YOUNG. I have thought all along that we are going to have a farm bill; we should have one. We are not going to have a bill if we say to the House, "You take our bill, or else." I do not think we are going to have a bill if the House says to the Senate, "You take our bill, or else." I do not think the President of the United States is going to place himself in the position of asking the Congress to pass a bill word for word as he wants it, or else there will not be one.

I think Members of Congress on both sides are fair. I think the President will be fair. I think we can get a bill if we refrain from the kind of arguments we have witnessed for the past hour.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; if I have time to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The time of the Senator from Florida has expired; all time on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill itself to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in the light of what was said a moment ago, I desire to ask this question of the Senator from Florida: If the amendment is added to the pending agricultural bill, and if the bill as thus amended is passed, but subsequently is vetoed by the President for any reason whatever, would there then be a chance to have a conference held on the bill relating to the school milk and brucellosis eradication programs? I refer to the bill which the Senate passed several weeks ago.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; unless in the meantime the conferees had reported, and the conference report had been agreed to, and the bill had become law, and thus had left the custody of the conferees and the Congress. If the bill had in the meantime become law, without such a provision, then the only procedure would be for another bill on the subject to be introduced and acted upon by the Congress.

Mr. BUSH. So, regardless of the possibility of a veto, the chances of enacting at this session a provision for the school milk and brucellosis eradication program are very good, are they?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the chances are very good; yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

All time on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield an additional 4 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], to permit him to discuss the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 4 minutes on the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am very sorry if the Senator from New Mexico got any idea that I thought he was playing politics with agricultural legislation, because I have repeatedly stated that he would never play politics with the agricultural bill or with any measure dealing with the agricultural situation. I still do not know what he thinks I said, as applied to him.

However, Mr. President, I still say that if there is any parliamentary way by which we can straighten out this situation, I shall propose it. My suggestion is to discharge the conferees on the part of the Senate, and for the Senate to recede from its amendments to House bill 8320, and to accept the provision made by the House for extending the program to June 30, 1956. In that way we can provide for funds for the program for the next few months. I do not know whether it is parliamentarily possible for us to proceed in that way. I understand that the Senate does not now have the papers on that bill; and, of course, it would be necessary for us to have the papers before we could do what I have just suggested. However, if we can find a way in which to accomplish that result, that will make the funds available.

Would the course I have suggested satisfy the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if first the Senator from Vermont will yield to me, let me say that the result we desire can easily be achieved if the pending amendment is agreed to. Then we can have a conference tomorrow morning on H. R. 8320, and the conferees on the part of the Senate can simply agree to the version of the bill that has been passed by the House.

The Senator from Vermont knows that in the early part of the year I suggested to him, "Since the House provides for an extension of the school-milk program in House bill 12, let us let the House pass a separate bill on more funds for this year's program."

The House did pass a separate bill, providing only for completion of this year's program.

When House bill 8320 came to the Senate, the Senate adopted an amendment to provide for a 2-year program. To some extent, that was in violation of the understanding the chairman of the committee had with the House committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am willing now, if we may do so by unanimous consent, to have the Senate discharge its conferees from further service, and accept the language of H. R. 8320, as passed by the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not think that could be done under the rules, for the reason that conferees on that bill have been appointed by both Houses. It would be necessary for the conferees to meet and to return with their report. That could be done within the next 24 hours. I assure the Senator from Vermont that even though the Senate convenes at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, I shall make a move to have a meeting of the Senate conferees with the conferees on the part of the House on tomorrow morning between 9 and 11 o'clock.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, my unanimous-consent request is still pending. I hope the Chair will put that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Objection was heard.

Mr. HOLLAND. Not to the last request, Mr. President.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes, Mr. President; objection was made.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say that in my judgment the Senate could not at this moment take any action to withdraw the other bill from the conference with the conferees on the part of the House of Representatives, because the House of Representatives has possession of the papers on the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. In order to get the papers back into the possession of the Senate, the Senate would have to proceed by means of an agreement with the House.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that there are parliamentary difficulties in the way. I hope the Senator from Kentucky understands that the school milk program and the program for the eradication of brucellosis are very close to my heart. I hate to see those programs used as a pawn in a conference where other matters may have more political import.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the feeling of the Senator from Vermont about the matter, and I share his feeling completely. However, it seems to me that what we have to decide upon now is whether we shall punish someone in another body, by reason of something he is willing or perhaps is not willing to do, and thereby punish the children of the United States because of our unwillingness to take action on that measure. That is the way the question presents itself to me.

I wish to say that I congratulate the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] for saying that, despite his resentment for something which has taken place—something which I do not know anything about—he will vote for the amendment. I think that is a very broadminded way to look at the matter.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, despite my feeling on the subject, I much prefer to have the school milk program and the brucellosis eradication program continued to July 1, rather than be stopped now. Whether those programs shall continue beyond July 1 will remain to be seen.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 1 minute to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 1 minute, on the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me say that I deeply regret that this incident has occurred. I offered the amendment in good faith, after consultation with the chairman of the committee and with groups who are interested in this program.

I think the record is now perfectly clear that, no matter what happens, if this amendment is adopted we shall have the school-milk program and the brucellosis-eradication program, and both the House version of the bill and the bill as passed by the Senate will have in them provision for a 2-year extension. Therefore, since both Houses will be in agreement, we surely will have a 2-year extension.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, let me make a correction in the statement the Senator from Minnesota has made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. The House bill—H. R. 12—provides for only a 1-year extension of the special school-milk program, to June 30, 1957.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Whereas the bill, H. R. 8320, as amended by the Senate, provides for a 2-year extension. Should the Senate adopt the pending amendment, we can throw the long-range program into conference on H. R. 12, where it will be possible for the Senate conferees to have agreement reached for a 2-year extension of the program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My only point is that by adopting this amendment the provision will be included in the bill relating to the farm program which will be considered by the conferees. In this way the Senate will go on record as insisting that there be a 2-year extension. I believe that is important.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 1 minute, on the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the papers on H. R. 8320 returned from the House of Representatives. I believe that can be done by unanimous consent. When that is done, the Senate can accept the bill as passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. ELLENDER. That, of course, would forego a conference on the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. But in that way we could get the school milk program and the brucellosis eradication program going.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. In order to do that, will it not be necessary for the Senate to recede from its disagreement to the House proposal; or, rather, for the Senate to recede from its insistence upon the amendments adopted by the Senate, and to request the House of Representatives to return the papers to the Senate?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, whatever may be the proper parliamentary procedure, I am now requesting that it be followed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, did I not correctly understand the chairman of the committee to say there could be a meeting of the conferees tomorrow morning?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; and it seems to me that the shortest and best way to proceed is to have the conference on H. R. 8320. I am sure we can have the conference in the morning. Let us try that. If it fails, we can see what other steps will best accomplish the desired result.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have submitted a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not object to it——

Mr. AIKEN. I think what I suggest will be the quickest way for us to proceed.

Mr. ELLENDER. But I believe the safest and best way to proceed will be to have the conferees on H. R. 8320 meet tomorrow morning; and at the meeting the Senate conferees can recede from the amendments adopted by the Senate to the House bill.

Mr. AIKEN. There would be a delay of 3 or 4 days while the conference report was reaching the House of Representatives.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator from Vermont can find a quicker method of procedure than the one I have suggested, I shall cheerfully join him in proposing that it be adopted.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the method I have suggested will be the quickest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota has expired; and all time yielded on the bill has expired.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I object. I want a free conference to work this question out in the morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, from the time on the bill, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, inasmuch as there seems to be no way in which we can obtain a 2-year extension for the school milk and brucellosis programs under the provisions of H. R. 8320, so far as I can see, I have no objection to including the amendment in the bill, and will vote for it.

I had hoped that we could obtain early action on the brucellosis and school-milk programs, so that the States could organize their programs for the next year. However, I do not seem to be getting anywhere, so I will vote for the pending amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to my friend from Vermont that I share the view he has expressed. I look across the aisle at him in a spirit of friendship.

Mr. AIKEN. I have already informed the Senator from Minnesota that I intend to withdraw from the RECORD any rough words I may have sent across the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from

Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent in his State, and, if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent, and, if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], is detained on official business, and, if present and voting he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—89

Aiken	Fulbright	McClellan
Allott	George	McNamara
Anderson	Goldwater	Morse
Barkley	Gore	Mundt
Barrett	Green	Murray
Beall	Hayden	Neely
Bender	Hennings	Neuberger
Bennett	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bible	Hill	Pastore
Bricker	Holland	Payne
Bush	Hruska	Potter
Butler	Humphrey	Purtell
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Jackson	Russell
Carlson	Jenner	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Chavez	Kennedy	Smathers
Cotton	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dirksen	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lehman	Symington
Duff	Long	Thurmond
Dworshak	Magnuson	Thye
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Young
Frear	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—6

Bridges	Kefauver	Monroney
Clements	Millikin	Welker

So Mr. HUMPHREY'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Maine will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 6, line 23, after the comma, to insert "and production goals established by the Secretary."

On page 7, line 11, after the word "respectively", insert a comma and the following: "and of such other commodities as the Secretary may find to be in excessive supply and for which he shall have established production goals."

On page 7, line 15, after the word "amended", insert a comma and the following: "or production goals established by the Secretary."

On page 7, line 17, after "allotment", insert the following: "(or, in the case of commodities for which production goals have been established, below the acreage necessary to meet the production goal for such farm)."

On page 8, before the period at the end of line 25, insert a comma and the following: "and of any other commodities which may be included in the acreage reserve program."

On page 9, line 8, after the comma following the word "amended", insert "production goals."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire the number of the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. PAYNE. The amendment is not numbered. A mimeographed copy of it has been placed on the desk of each Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, the bill, S. 3183, which we are currently debating, is designed to encourage farm stability by controlling agricultural surpluses. One method of reducing surpluses, while insuring producers against losses of income, is through the withdrawal of acreage from production. President Eisenhower's recommendations to the Congress for farm legislation propose an extensive program of acreage withdrawal. Sections 203–206 of S. 3183 would provide what we all hope will be a workable program to eliminate burdensome agricultural surpluses in the basic commodities.

In acting upon this legislation we should consider the application of the acreage reserve programs to other commodities which are also in surplus supply throughout the country.

Last Friday, the Senate passed two amendments which will extend the soil bank coverage to feed grains and peanuts, neither of which are basic commodities. These two amendments represent a step in the right direction, but their scope has been limited to specific crops. There are various other commodities in surplus besides the basic crops, feed grains, and peanuts. For example, last fall in Maine we were faced with a surplus of 20 percent of our crop in potatoes. This, of course, has a price deflating effect on the price of potatoes. But the growers are not suggesting that the Government purchase such surpluses. They do not ask that the Government assist them in storing these surpluses. They do ask, however, that they receive the same opportunity as the producers of the basic commodities to receive compensation for voluntarily reducing their production, by removing some of their acreage from cultivation.

Surpluses owned by farmers engaged in the production of other than basic commodities are just as much of a problem to the individual farmer as the Commodity Credit Corporation's surpluses of basic crops are to the Government. Much of the surplus held by individual farmers is the result of overplanting stimulated during the Korean war and by the diversion of acreage formerly planted in basic crops. These surpluses are an integral part of the agricultural surplus problem which we are now trying to solve. If the soil bank program is to provide a successful long-range solution to the problem of surpluses, its terms should encompass all agricultural surpluses which are a part of the overall problem.

The amendment to S. 3183 which I have proposed on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and myself, would provide that commodities other than those basic commodities appearing under title I of the Agricultural Act of 1949 as amended would be afforded the opportunity of participating in the soil bank program, therefore introducing a note of equity into a program which has too long been inequitable. Only by placing nonbasic commodities on an equal plane with basic commodities, thereby permitting agricultural surpluses to be controlled in entirety, can there be any real hope that the soil bank program, as provided for in S. 3183, will function effectively.

Mr. President, I urge your favorable consideration of the amendment Senator SMITH and I have proposed in the hope that we may finally embark on a comprehensive surplus-control program which will work toward the simultaneous advantage of the entire agricultural community.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Maine has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield myself 5 more minutes, Mr. President.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Maine a question. He mentioned amendments which will extend soil bank coverage to certain crops. Those crops are what?

Mr. PAYNE. Those crops are feed grains and peanuts.

Mr. ALLOTT. In the Senator's State and in my own State the crops of potatoes were in surplus last fall.

Mr. PAYNE. That is correct; and we have had nationwide difficulties in the past few years.

Mr. ALLOTT. And the crop of beans has also been in surplus.

Mr. PAYNE. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. I call attention to the fact that under subtitle A of the bill $750 million would be appropriated for the soil bank provisions, which are related to what are called basic commodities. I, and I am certain many other Senators, disagree with the contention that crops such as peanuts are basic commodities. I believe rice was referred to by the Senator from Arkansas the other afternoon as being a small crop.

I now have pending an amendment to increase the amount appropriated under subtitle B to the same amount as that which is provided under subtitle A. It seems to me that if the farmers throughout the country are to get a uniform benefit from this provision, either an amendment such as that of the Senator from Maine must be adopted, or the amount provided under subtitle B must be increased to an amount equivalent to that under subtitle A.

I therefore urge the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. PAYNE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado, indeed.

Mr. President, I now yield a minute to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Maine a question about his amendment. As I understand, it will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make a determination as to any crops which might be in surplus, so that those crops could then be considered for eligibility under the soil-bank program.

Mr. PAYNE. That is correct. The Secretary would make a determination that surpluses exist, and then he would establish the production quotas.

I think the Senator from Michigan will agree with me that certainly there are no second-class farmers in this country. They are all endeavoring to earn a living, regardless of the particular commodity they are producing, and all are working in the interest of the welfare of America.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield so that I may make a brief announcement?

Mr. PAYNE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, many of my colleagues have asked me how long it is expected the Senate will remain in session this evening. I previously announced that the Senate would remain in session until about 7:30 or 8 o'clock. No yea-and-nay votes will be taken after 8 o'clock.

Under the order previously entered, the Senate will convene tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

I should like all Senators to be on notice that the majority leader and the minority leader have indicated that the Senate will continue in session tomorrow until as late as 11 or 11:30 in the evening.

Today the Senate has disposed of 5 amendments. There were 75 amendments when the session started this morning. While disposing of 5 amendments, we have picked up 5 new ones. So we are right back where we started.

Perhaps by convening at 11 o'clock in the morning and working until 11 o'clock in the evening, we will make progress tomorrow. If we do not make better progress tomorrow, Friday, and Saturday, and on Monday of next week, it may be that the entire farm season will be over before the Senate will have passed a farm bill.

I should like all Senators, who have been so cooperative with the leadership during the debate on the bill, to be on notice that if they have made engagements for tomorrow evening, they had better cancel them if they expect to be recorded on some of the votes which it is expected will be taken.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Maine for yielding to me.

Mr. POTTER. Michigan is a State similar to Maine, so far as agricultural economy is concerned. Michigan does not produce large quantities of the so-called basic crops.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. The amendment of the Senator from Maine would then accord first-class citizenship to the agricultural specialists who are not producers of the so-called basic commodities.

Mr. PAYNE. That is correct. There are many other States which are in the identical situation.

Mr. POTTER. For example, in Michigan potatoes are raised, as is true of the great State of Maine.

Mr. PAYNE. That is correct.

Mr. POTTER. Large quantities of beans are produced in Michigan. Michigan is one of the largest bean-producing States in the Nation. There are other commodities that are not considered to be basic commodities which would be eligible to participate in the soil-bank program under the Senator's amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator give a list of the commodities which would be covered by his amendment?

Mr. PAYNE. It is impossible to give a list. It covers many agricultural products grown by farmers. Potatoes are one; beans are another. One could go down through a list of crops of a similar nature.

Mr. WATKINS. What about fruit?

Mr. PAYNE. Fruit is covered, if it is in surplus.

Mr. GOLDWATER. We grow cactus in Arizona.

Mr. PAYNE. I doubt that cactus would come under the qualification. [Laughter.]

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I dislike to oppose the amendment, but, in my humble judgment, it would destroy the acreage reserve program. The amendment seeks to put under the acreage reserve program land on which any commodity in surplus is grown. It would mean that all the potato lands of Maine, if potatoes were in surplus, instead of going into the conservation reserve program, would be entitled to go into the acreage reserve program.

Let us not forget that the purpose of the acreage reserve program is to avoid further aggravating the present surpluses of basic commodities. The program is envisioned as a means of curtailing production on allotted acres. As I pointed out several times on the floor of the Senate, the cotton farmer and the wheat farmer have had their acreages cut back until they have been really hurt. The wheat farmer has had his acreage cut from 78 million to 55 million. The cotton farmer has had his acreage reduced from 28 or 30 million to 17 million.

The acreage reserve program is open to those subject to acreage allotments. It is open only to the producers of basic commodities. Bear in mind that they have already reduced their acreages substantially. The Government says to them: "If you will further decrease your acres, and thereby avoid further aggravating the surplus, we will pay you for possibly 50 percent of the value of what you would produce on those acres." By such procedure, it is hoped that it will be possible to reduce, or at least to avoid further aggravation of, the surpluses which now exist.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Maine seeks to apply the acreage reserve provisions to vegetables, potatoes, and every other crop grown in surplus. It strikes me that the Secretary of Agriculture certainly would be under pressure every day to put acres here and acres there under the program, simply because surpluses have been grown on them.

The amendment would apply to commodities which are not storable, such as potatoes and other vegetables.

I point out to my good friends from Maine that the farmers of that State, as well as the farmers of the entire northeastern part of the United States, can come into the conservation reserve program; they are not prohibited from putting their croplands into that program even though they grow crops not subject to allotment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the Senator from Louisiana be good enough to advise us whether peanuts and feed grains are considered as basic crops?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Congress has declared peanuts to be a basic crop.

Mr. PAYNE. The Senate the other day included in the bill peanuts and feed grains, and placed them under the program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Peanuts have been considered a basic commodity since before the war.

Mr. PAYNE. Were not potatoes considered a basic commodity at one time?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. They were included in the Steagall amendment, which applied to the production of vegetables and other nonbasic crops needed during the war. But potatoes never were declared to be a basic commodity.

Mr. PAYNE. Must we draw a distinction between the farmer who earns his living and develops his soil by the production of potatoes as against the farmer who grows peanuts, wheat, or some other commodity? I do not have to stop with potatoes; I could mention dried beans and many other items.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is not the issue. The main purpose of the acreage reserve program is to do away with or reduce the surpluses. That is why it is provided, and it applies only to allotted acres. In other words, we have today over 1 billion bushels of wheat. We have today over 14 million bales of cotton. We have peanuts in abundance. We have tobacco in abundance. We have other crops in abundance. Those

are basic crops. The acres devoted to their production have been reduced from year to year.

It is proposed to say to the farmer, "Although you have been allotted X number of acres, if you will deduct from the X number of acres 10 percent or 15 percent or 30 percent, so as not to further aggravate the surpluses of those commodities, the Government will compensate you to the extent of 50 percent of what you would produce on those acres."

The purpose is to make an effort to reduce the surpluses, and not further aggravate them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an outline of the reasons why the amendment should not be adopted.

There being no objection, the outline was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. No production goals as such are established. Guides are formulated for the benefit of producers of perishable commodities.
2. This would not require the Secretary to establish goals, which we understand to mean production-restriction measures in the nature of acreage allotments.
3. The provision would open the Secretary up to extreme pressures to place a wide variety of commodities under production controls and the acreage-reserve program.
4. The acreage-reserve program is designed to stop the accumulation of surpluses of storable commodities eligible for price support.
5. Section 32 funds are available for assisting in the removal of surpluses of perishable commodities and S. 3183 includes an authorization for additional section 32 fund appropriations of $250 million.
6. Establishment of base acreages and control measures on commodities covered by this amendment would be difficult and expensive:
   (a) Necessary data are not available.
   (b) Commodities are widely scattered over the United States.
   (c) Administration would be difficult.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 1 more minute.

Mr. PAYNE. I should like to say that this is a permissive, not a mandatory amendment. Again I say if we are going to reduce surpluses in one area, then, I think, we should be consistent and be willing to try to reduce surpluses in other areas.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Would the amendment apply to strawberries, raspberries, gooseberries, almonds, and such crops?

Mr. ELLENDER. It would apply to any crop in surplus.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I thought a few minutes ago I would not comment any further on any agricultural legislation at this session, but I believe I cannot help commenting on the pending amendment.

The proposal is an old subject to me. At one time I had on my doorstep the problem of trying to dispose of potatoes. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the language of the amendment is fairly broad. It provides that the Secretary shall consider applying the soil-bank provision to the producers of potatoes, tomatoes, stringbeans, lima beans, sweetpotatoes, dried edible beans. For some reason dried field peas are left out. I suppose there will have to be a particular act for that. Castor beans are also left out. But there are included tame hay, timothy, clover, and crops of that nature. If anyone can tell me how we can contribute to the cause of conservation by taking clover out, and putting something else in, then I shall yield. That is not what we are trying to do.

I see the senior Senator from Minnesota is smiling. He realizes how hard we worked to keep the bill a conservation program.

Sometime it might be a good thing to have a Be Kind To Benson Week. This amendment is not kind to him. Can anyone imagine the Secretary of Agriculture being called upon to administer a program which permits him to take tame hay out of cultivation and put in some sort of row crop? I understand there is available $250 million of section 32 funds for the disposition of surpluses.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is $442 million.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Louisiana says it is $442 million. I was trying to be conservative. I remember $250 million. I have forgotten the rest of it.

I think it would be exteremly unwise for us to put this sort of burden on the Secretary of Agriculture. I do not know whether potato acreage can be controlled. The Congress of the United States time after time after time has told potatogrowers that if they would accept a program for acreage control, Congress might be willing to give them price supports. Each time it was refused. To propose a program which would include sweetpotatoes, ordinary potatoes, tomatoes, and other such crops, would be a very bad thing, and would hurt the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator think that if the amendment were adopted it would break the bank before the doors were opened?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it would tie down the Department of Agriculture so that it could not operate. That is why I was opposed to the amendments agreed to last night. I recall that at one time the manager of a large group of chainstores came to the Department of Agriculture, when we were in the midst of the potato disposal program, and said, "I want you to know that our particular chain of stores at one time bought all our potatoes in Maine and Idaho. In the last year we bought all of our potatoes in Ohio and Indiana, due to the price-support program."

It has taken a while to start the trend to growing potatoes in what I think are extremely desirable potato sections. I think it would be bad to adopt the amendment and try to put in acreage reserve crops, which are already cared for, to a degree at least, by section 32 funds, and to add provisions which no Secretary could administer. I do not know how any Secretary could administer the retirement of sweet clover and timothy under this program.

I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so I may ask for the yeas and nays? This amendment is very important to my State.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. IVES. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Maine.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to my colleague, the senior Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, as my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] has so ably stated, the proposed legislation is designed to encourage farm stability by controlling agricultural commodity surpluses. The vehicle employed toward this end is compensation for acreage reductions, this compensation taking two forms: payments in cash and payments in kind.

S. 3183 is concerned exclusively with basic commodities, neglecting to recognize the fact that a surplus condition can exist in crops other than basic commodities. But other crops are in surplus, as is evidenced by the fact that, every year, the Department of Agriculture publishes production guides, which recommend to the farmer production figures which will keep his crop out of the area of surplus.

So, if control of excess production is considered to be a plausible approach to our farm problem, it then seems reasonable to deduce that, if such a program is to be effective, it must be designed to control surplus production in all commodities; that it must be comprehensive, and not selective.

This deficiency in S. 3183 can be corrected by effecting amendments that will afford other than basic crops—those crops for which production guides are used by the Department of Agriculture as an instrument to discourage excess production—the opportunity of participating in the soil-bank program.

The administration of such a program for nonbasics—those commodities not provided for in title I of the Agricultural Act of 1949—would require the establishment of a production base. Among other things, it has been proposed that the basic commodity, corn, which, through the Agricultural Act of 1954, is excused from marketing quotas, be extended the privilege of participating in the soil-bank program through the use of a historical-production base. This would permit corn to remain under title I and to receive the benefit of a price-supported basic commodity, to escape the severity associated with marketing quotas, and to harvest the benefits of participating in the soil-bank program through an allotment predicated on a historical rather than a current supply-demand base.

Thus, it would seem only fair that a similar consideration be applied to seed crops like oats and barley and till crops like potatoes—nonbasic crops that are in surplus production.

Of course, it may be argued that such a recommendation is not practicable, inasmuch as up-to-date production records are not available upon which to formulate a historical-production base. But this argument can be negated by advising that, in order to cure this shortcoming, some provision should be instituted to provide that this data would, through the county committees, be available for the crop year of 1957 and the following years.

If control of surplus production through a soil-bank program is considered to be a valid approach to today's farm problems, then such a program—if it is to be effective—must be applicable not only to basic agricultural commodities, but to all agricultural commodities that are in a state of excess production. The surplus in the farmer's barn is just as important an ingredient in our agricultural complex as is the surplus in Commodity Credit Corporation bins, and the farmer's full bin is no less a concern to him than is the bursting CCC bins to our Government.

Senate bill 3183 should be amended to provide that commodities other than those appearing under title I of the Agricultural Act of 1949—basic commodities—will be afforded the opportunity of participating in the soil-bank program, thereby introducing a note of equity into a program that has for too long been inequitable. Only by placing nonbasic commodities on an equal plane with basic commodities—thereby permitting agricultural surpluses to be controlled in their entirety—can there be any real hope that the soil-bank program, as provided for in Senate bill 3183, will function efficiently.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, is the Senator from Louisiana prepared to yield back the remainder of the time available on the amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. First, Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I always regret to oppose any measure in behalf of which the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is active; and I may say the same in regard to the other supporters of the amendment. However, it seems to me that the amendment is a very unwise one, in that, if adopted, it will very largely change the nature of the pending bill, insofar as the soil bank is concerned.

Under the philosophy of the bill, two phases or two kinds of agricultural operations are involved in connection with the soil bank. One is the acreage reserve, with respect to which the immediate project is to take out of production some of the acreage allotted for production of the basic agricultural commodities which have piled up to such an extent in our warehouses that we are spending nearly a million dollars a day for warehouse rentals, and which are destroying the value of what is being produced, because the immense surpluses hang as a threat over the market. Mr. President, let us remember that the acreage reserve is regarded as so necessary that there is not even a requirement for soil-building practices in connection with the acres placed in that reserve; but, instead, there is only a requirement that such acreage shall lie fallow.

If we adopt this amendment, Mr. President, we shall dry up most of the source of the other aspect of the soil bank, which is the conservation reserve. The conservation reserve is designed to take acreage out of the production of tomatoes, potatoes, and other nonbasic crops—just as would be done by means of this amendment—not merely to let those lands lie fallow, but, instead, to put them under soil-building practices, so there will be conservation of our natural resources, by rebuilding the fertility of the soil. The only reason for the use of the phrase "soil bank" in this regard is that the principal aspect of the program is to restore the fertility of the soil, rather than to mine the soil.

Again, I point out that if the pending amendment is adopted, it will dry up the source of the acreage which is supposed to go into the conservation reserve, under the very generous provisions of the bill. The conservation-reserve program is a long-range program; in some cases it can continue for as long as 15 years. It calls for continuity and for a program like the ACP program, except in certain cases it will be more extended, whereas the acreage-reserve program is temporary, is limited to 4 years at the most, on a year-to-year basis. It calls for putting the acreage taken out of the allotted acreage for the basic crops into acreage that will be in a fallow situation; or, for that matter, it could go under conservation practices, although that is not a condition; and no real soil bank, no real restoration of the fertility of the soil, will be had to any great degree from the acreage-reserve program.

I wish, along with the Senators from Maine, that we could treat all agricultural commodity producers as generously as we are treating the producers of the basic agricultural commodities. That applies in very large measure to my State; in fact, I suspect, in larger measure, than it does even to the great State which is so well represented by the distinguished Senators from Maine, because in Florida our principal crops, other than fruit, of course, are annual crops, such as tomatoes, beans, lettuce, okra, and other such crops which we produce to the amount of approximately $150 million worth each winter. But, Mr. President, I do not think we have a right to confuse that problem with the other one. Great surpluses of those crops are not in storage; surpluses of those crops are not piling up in the warehouses. Surpluses of those crops are not what are overhanging the market for the commodities to be produced from the acreage which is being tilled now, and which will be tilled this year, by the producers of the basic agricultural commodities.

Mr. President, if this amendment is adopted, it will divert this program from its present purpose, which looks in two directions: One, a short-range program to deal effectively with the basic agricultural commodities of which there are heavy surpluses; and, the other, the program looking toward building greater fertility in the soil, through the conservation-reserve program.

So, Mr. President, although I should like to have my State included in the fullest measure, I know that the producers in my State are not in the position in which the producers of the basic agricultural commodities find themselves, because our producers have become accustomed to destroying their surpluses from year to year. If they plant too many beans, not all of them are harvested. If they plant too much cabbage, some of it is plowed back—and so in the case of each of the other nonbasic crops.

Mr. President, I would hate to see the whole purpose of this very fine bill so greatly impaired as it would be if this particular amendment were included as a part of it, because I see no sizeable source of acreage to come under the conservation reserve or to remain in the conservation reserve if the amendment is adopted.

In conclusion, let me say that I cannot imagine anything more designed to bring heavy pressure upon the Secretary of Agriculture, and to require him to announce quotas on each of the crops I have mentioned and on a good many others, than this amendment. If the amendment is adopted, I can see Members of the Senate streaming in great numbers to the Secretary of Agriculture and pressurizing him to bring the particular crops grown in their States under the acreage reserve. It seems to me that is what would happen if this unwise amendment were to be adopted.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. First, Mr. President, let me say that the door has already been opened to acreage-reserve programs in the case of two items which have been specifically mentioned. Furthermore, only when crops were found by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply, and only when they were crops on which the imposition of acreage reduction would be considered feasible, would the amendment be applied.

In the first part of the wording of section 203, it is practically mandatory for the Secretary of Agriculture to go into this program with reference to the basic agricultural commodities; but the amendment my distinguished colleague and I have submitted is, in effect, permissive; namely, that if the Secretary of Agriculture finds there are surpluses in the case of these crops, he may then set up an acreage-reduction program for them, so that they can go into the reserve program.

Finally, Mr. President, let me say that surpluses in the farmers' bins are just as much a part of the problem as are surpluses in the bins of the Commodity Credit Corporation. In my opinion, we are very definitely bailing out the Commodity Credit Corporation by means of this program, and I wish to see the farmers who do not ask for any support at all

have some chance to have their surplus problems recognized.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana is agreeable, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be glad to yield back whatever time may be left to our side.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield back the unused time on our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] for himself and his colleague [Mrs. SMITH of Maine]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent in his State.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—29

Aiken	Ives	Neuberger
Allott	Jackson	Pastore
Beall	Jenner	Payne
Bender	Kuchel	Potter
Bricker	Langer	Purtell
Bush	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Magnuson	Symington
Chavez	Mansfield	Wiley
Duff	McCarthy	Young
Green	McNamara	

NAYS—58

Anderson	Daniel	Gore
Barkley	Douglas	Hayden
Barrett	Dworshak	Hennings
Bennett	Eastland	Hickenlooper
Bible	Ellender	Hill
Butler	Ervin	Holland
Carlson	Flanders	Hruska
Case, N. J.	Frear	Humphrey
Case, S. Dak.	Fulbright	Johnson, Tex.
Cotton	George	Johnston, S. C.
Curtis	Goldwater	Kerr
Knowland	Neely	Sparkman
Long	O'Mahoney	Stennis
Malone	Robertson	Thurmond
Martin, Iowa	Russell	Thye
Martin, Pa.	Saltonstall	Watkins
McClellan	Schoeppel	Welker
Morse	Scott	Williams
Mundt	Smathers	
Murray	Smith, N. J.	

NOT VOTING—8

Bridges	Dirksen	Millikin
Byrd	Kefauver	Monroney
Clements	Kennedy	

So the amendment offered by Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mrs. SMITH of Maine) was rejected.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I call up on amendment relating to section 221 (a) of the bill, offered on behalf to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and myself, and I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming for himself and other Senators will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 23, before the period in line 22, to insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That the Secretary shall, prior to July 1, 1956, or such earlier date as may be practicable, submit to the Congress for immediate reference to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives a full program of all operations under this act which will require the making of expenditures prior to July 1, 1957; and, after July 1, 1956, no funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be utilized for carrying out the purposes of this act.

On page 23, line 23, after "necessary to", insert the following: "carry out the purposes of this act, including such amounts as may be required to."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment, and it requires only a very brief explanation.

I invite the attention of the Members of the Senate to section 221 (a) on page 23 of the bill. That section is entitled "Finance." It provides:

The Secretary is authorized to utilize the facilities, services, authorities, and funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation in discharging his functions and responsibilities under this act, including payment of costs of administration for the programs authorized under this act.

That merely means that inasmuch as the act is to authorize a 4-year program, the Secretary of Agriculture shall finance the entire program out of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, without asking for a dollar of appropriations from the Congress of the United States until the time comes to ask for an appropriation to restore the impairment of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

When the President sent his budget message to Congress in January of this year he asked for an appropriation of $929 million plus for the purpose of restoring the impaired capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator if it is his porpose to require that the soil bank expenditures should be made out of general funds.

I wish by my question to bring out the point whether any support-price operations are covered by the amendment and transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation to the general fund.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was not my intention to have it cover anything except the soil bank expenditures. It may be that I have made a mistake, but I think not. It deals only with the soil bank.

Mr. HOLLAND. It applies only to that part of the pending measure which has reference to the Soil Bank Act, and the word "act" in the amendment refers to the act which is being amended by this particular title. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The purpose of the amendment is that, in order to facilitate the operation, the Secretary of Agriculture, prior to July 1, 1956, or such earlier date as may be practicable, shall submit to Congress for immediate reference to the Committees on Appropriations a full program of all the operations. That is merely asking that information with respect to the program and the type of expenditure to be made under it shall be given to the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it the purpose of the amendment to provide that the soil bank shall not be put into operation this year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no. I was saying that the language of the amendment is so designed as to make it possible to put it into operation as soon as may be possible.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator certain the effect would not be that the Secretary of Agriculture could not pay the soil bank expenses?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am absolutely certain of it.

Mr. CAPEHART. It will not in any way slow up the payments under the soil bank provision this year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Listen to the words of the amendment:

Provided, That the Secretary shall, prior to July 1, 1956, or such earlier date as may be practicable, submit to the Congress for immediate reference to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives a full program of all operations under this act which will require the making of expenditures prior to July 1, 1957.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does it also cover price-support programs?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; it does not. I answered that question just a moment ago when it was asked by the Senator from Florida. It refers to the Soil Bank Act, and to that act alone.

Mr. CAPEHART. But it still means that if Congress does not appropriate the money, there can be no soil bank payments this year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator did not allow me to finish reading the amendment:

After July 1, 1956——

Mr. CAPEHART. That is, after we have gone home.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. I continue reading:

After July 1, 1956, no funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be utilized for carrying out the purposes of this act.

Mr. CAPEHART. That would mean that if Congress does not appropriate the money between now and July 1, 1956, there will be no payments to the soil bank.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But Congress will appropriate the money.

Mr. CAPEHART. Where is there a provision for the budget in the amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The budget is submitted by the President to the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CAPEHART. The budget has already been submitted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is apparently unaware of the method by which requests are made for expenditures

Mr. CAPEHART. I may be out of order, but I want to be sure that we do not deny the money necessary to pay the soil-bank beneficiaries this year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would certainly have the same purpose as has the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The purpose of the colloquy is to make certain that the farmers understand that if they participate in the soil bank this year, there will be sufficient money to pay them immediately—not next year, but this year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me to make my statement, he will understand what I am trying to do.

The Secretary will have to make a thousand or two thousand contracts under the bill. When will he make them? He may not make them until September. They will not be made the minute the bill is signed.

Mr. CAPEHART. Those who want to come under the soil-bank program in the planting of corn will have to make their applications within the next 60 days; otherwise, all the corn will have been planted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the contracts will have to be written; and under the amendment it would be perfectly possible for the President, through the Bureau of the Budget, to submit an estimate and a request for an appropriation to carry out the program. I have no doubt in the world that the Committees on Appropriations would approve the request immediately. But they ought to supervise it. The Constitution of the United States provides, in very simple language, that no money shall be withdrawn from the Treasury except by appropriations made by law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not true that, under the language of the bill, between now and July 1, 1956, the Secretary could use capital funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for all expenses of the program, including administrative costs?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He could.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not true also that the language does not strike out any part of section 226?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. So this is a proviso which will go into effect afterward.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I read the amendment, it does three things. First, it permits the Secretary to proceed at once to use Commodity Credit Corporation funds until July 1, 1956.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But it provides that prior to July 1, 1956, the Secretary shall submit, for reference to the Committees on Appropriations, the full program or schedule of the funds which will be required after July 1, 1956.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. For all the corporation's operations.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it certain he will have time to do that; and will he have had sufficient facts, knowledge, and experience under the act?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If he does not, then the Senator from Indiana will have nothing to worry about.

Mr. CAPEHART. We do not know at the moment when the bill will be signed by the President.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No.

Mr. CAPEHART. We do not know when the Senate will be finished with the bill, or when the committee of conference will be finished with it. Why should we tie our hands and deny to the farmers, particularly the corn farmers, the right to have payments under the soil bank?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is mistaken. The amendment does nothing of the kind.

Mr. CAPEHART. I simply want to make certain that the corn farmers of Indiana, if they participate in the soil bank, will be paid for doing so this year. If the Senator from Wyoming can guarantee that under his amendment they will be paid, I shall be for it; otherwise, I shall have to be against it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that can be guaranteed; but if there were any doubt in the mind of any Senator, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona, who is chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and is also a cosponsor of the amendment, if he would have any objection to modifying the amendment on line 8 by changing the date when the use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds will be prohibited from July 1, 1956, to January 1, 1957, so that, in effect, the first appropriation under the bill would be for a half year, instead of for a full fiscal year. I think that would satisfy the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. That would be very fine, except that I would likewise want to modify the amendment so as to provide that if Congress should not get around to appropriating money for the corn farmers, because they are going to plant almost immediately, the Commodity Credit Corporation, out of its funds, could pay them. If the Senator will modify his amendment to that extent, I will support it to that extent.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the language is now written, Commodity Credit Corporation funds can be used up to June 30. Any contracts made from now until June 30 could be obligated for payment from Commodity Credit Corporation funds.

Mr. CAPEHART. For contracts made up to June 30?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. But if contracts are made after that date, Congress would not have appropriated money, and the farmers could not——

Mr. ELLENDER. The Commodity Credit Corporation will come to Congress for additional funds before final adjournment. Congress certainly can provide funds with which to operate the program.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming explain the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is to make certain that Congress will be appropriating the money of the taxpayers before it is spent, just as it does in the case of every department of the Government.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why not do that through an appropriation to the Commodity Credit Corporation, as is done in the case of support loans?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because this program involves an expenditure of about $1,100,000,000.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Senator from Wyoming will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do all the interruptions which have been made come out of my time, or should they not be assigned to the time of the opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair regrets to advise the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that the interruptions will come out of his time. The Senator has not yielded to himself any specific period of time. Does he wish to do so?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to know how much time I have left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not in control of the time on this side of the aisle. If I were, I would yield the Senator an extra 5 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall ask the distinguished minority leader if he will grant me 10 minutes, to compensate for the period absorbed by the questions.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the Senator has used 17 minutes, so I will split the figure and yield 8 minutes of the time allotted to me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very kind. I should like to yield a few minutes to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I beg the Senator's pardon. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If there is any doubt, I think it arises from the fact that possibly some Senators have

not recently read the pertinent paragraph in the bill. The paragraph in the bill clearly provides:

The Secretary is authorized to utilize the facilities, services, authorities, and funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation in discharging his functions and responsibilities under this act, including payment of costs of administration for the programs authorized under this act.

So I think the fears expressed by the able Senator from Indiana are met by the language in the bill. From an appropriation standpoint, I think the proposal offered by the amendment is clearly sound. Certainly we ought not indefinitely to require that the capital funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation be used for administrative expenses. Certainly such expenses should be subject to control by appropriations, as a part of the appropriating function of Congress.

Perhaps the date should be changed from July to January.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think I have a better suggestion. This I make off the cuff, as we say, for the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

I would modify the amendment by adding, in the last line, after the word "act," the following:

Unless the Congress has failed as of that date to provide funds for the continued operation, in which case, funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation may continue to be used until an appropriation is made.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Certainly something of that sort would be needed.

Mr. HAYDEN. That would make the amendment perfectly clear, it seems to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair correctly understand that the Senator from Wyoming has modified his amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I have made a suggestion of a modification, because I wanted the cosponsors of the amendment to understand what I was driving at. My modification was intended to meet the question raised by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to raise a question with the Senator. I have no particular objection to the theory that what is to be spent shall be provided through the normal appropriations channel. I think that is good fiscal practice. But because the problem is of such magnitude, I was wondering if the Senator would not agree to strike out, in line 3, "July 1, 1956," and insert in lieu thereof "February 1, 1957"; and in line 8, to strike out "July 1, 1956," and insert in lieu thereof "February 1, 1957."

That would give Congress an opportunity to be back in Washington, and would enable the Department to make its presentation without any likelihood of holding up the program. An appropriation could then be made in the normal way.

I think that would be perfectly sound procedure. We do not know when the bill will be cleared by the committee of conference and finally be cleared by the President.

Since the program is one of considerable magnitude, it seems to me that we would have established a principle, and at the same time we would not have placed upon the President an almost impossible burden.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to accept the suggestion made by the minority leader. Therefore, I modify my amendment in line 8 by striking out "July 1, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1957."

Mr. KNOWLAND. That change would also appear on line 3, would it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, also on line 3.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, the Senator from Wyoming is modifying his amendment to substitute for the date July 1, 1956, which appears on lines 3 and 8 of his amendment, the date February 1, 1957. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the change in the date, because I think it is advisable to have Federal expenditures brought out into the open as much as possible, so the people will know what is being spent. However, the Commodity Credit Corporation had advised me that if the date were left in the amendment, the effect would be that it would not get the program under way in time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I congratulate the author of the amendment, the Senator from Wyoming, and I wish to say it is a good amendment as it is now written.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time if no Senator desires to speak on the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my understanding there is a unanimous-consent agreement, so that the amendment may be acted on without a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I desire to understand this amendment clearly. I have been under a misapprehension, after reading the amendment. I do not know how the Senator has modified it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have modified my amendment by advancing the date.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator assure me it is the intention of his amendment that the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation can be used for the institution of the program?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. And, after the date mentioned, appropriations shall be made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am in thorough accord with the principle involved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The sentiment in favor of the amendment becomes more unanimous every minute.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I had read the amendment, it would have completely precluded the operation of the program.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Perhaps the Senator from Iowa thought it would do so.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I refer to the way the amendment read.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has not read the bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Oh, yes; I have read it very thoroughly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands all remaining time on the amendment has been yielded back.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, identified as 3–7–56–G.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to add the following:

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

SURVEY OF EXISTING SYSTEM OF GRADING MEAT

SEC. 701. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of the existing system of grading beef, veal, lamb, and mutton, with a view to determining whether such system serves the best interests of both consumers and producers. In making such study, the Secretary shall give due consideration to problems of consumers and producers in the various regions of the country, and in the course of such study he shall use the services and facilities of land grant colleges wherever practicable. The Secretary shall report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date the results of his study together with such recommendations as he may deem desirable for improvement in such system.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes, although I may not use that much time.

The amendment is a very simple one. It would authorize and direct the Secretary to make a full and complete study of the present voluntary Federal system of meat grading and to determine whether the present system actually serves the best interests of the consumer and the producer.

The Secretary would have the privilege of determining how the study would be made, but the amendment suggests that he give attention to the problems of the various regions in the country and, wherever practicable, to use the services of the land-grant colleges.

I suggest this because some of the land-grant colleges have already made a very substantial contribution to this basic problem.

As I have discussed the cattle problem with various producers, I have found there is a widespread feeling that our present system of beefgrading needs to be improved to aid our cattle producers. There are also indications that the present system does not fully reflect consumer preferences in meat.

I want to say I am not opposed to voluntary Federal grading. The Federal meatgrading program has rendered a service to our country. I merely feel that a study could result in improvements in the system. There are some indications that grading has become a market mechanism which often operates against the producer and does not give the consumers the type of meat they want. I do not pretend to know if this is true, but feel a study would help clarify the picture.

Studies which have been made indicate some interesting patterns and paradoxes. A University of Arizona survey in Phoenix found that consumers selected the Good and Commercial grades of beef because they preferred a limited amount of fat. Fifty-nine percent of the people selected the Commercial cuts of beef, the ones with the least marbling. The tests indicated that people were generally poorly acquainted with the United States grades of beef.

A University of Missouri survey found that St. Louis housewives were also relatively unacquainted with United States grade terms of beef. The same housewives picked Good or Commercial nearly half the time. As the Farm Journal for January 1956 noted, "The little woman just isn't picking out what we've long thought of as premium beef cuts." The Farm Journal reports a test in Denver in which 500 housewives expressed a decided preference for Good cuts, then Commercial, with Choice and Prime running last. Apparently, most people just are not interested in excessive fat.

An article in Successful Farming for March of 1956 discusses the trend to new meat types in beef. Already hog producers are striving for a leaner hog, in keeping with consumer trends.

Basically, the housewife or consumer wants leanness and tenderness more than anything else in meat. Most housewives would prefer boiling beef which comes from Good beef rather than from Choice, because of the higher proportion of lean to fat.

Since the housewife has just as much preference for the cuts from the lower grades, can she reflect this preference in terms of price? Is the housewife preference carried back to the wholesaler and to the live cattle markets? How much opportunity does she have to reflect her preferences back to the primary producer in dollars and cents? Does the producer get a fair price for the kind of beef that consumers really want to buy?

The Senator from Utah is not an authority on beef or lamb grading, but he is intrigued by the situation, and since he comes from a part of the country which produces basically grass-fed cattle and finds those cattle effectively shut out from any markets, because, being grass fed, they cannot accumulate the kind of fat required to put them in a higher choice grade, he feels this might be a practical way to help the producers of meat.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to complete my statement, Mr. President.

The Department of Agriculture has already taken some tentative steps in this direction. The Senator from Utah realizes that and appreciates it, but one of the purposes of the amendment is to encourage the Secretary not to make another temporary study of the problem, but to look at all of its facets, and give us now, after more than 20 years, another complete overall review of the problem.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This is, indeed, a good amendment. I hope it will be agreed to. I should like to ask 1 or 2 questions for the purpose of an interpretation of the amendment, should it become part of the bill.

I was wondering whether the term "producers" would include meatpacking establishments, as well as growers of livestock.

Mr. BENNETT. It was the thought of the Senator from Utah that it would not include anyone except those who were handling livestock as livestock, that it would not include the processors.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was asking the question because in parts of the West there are several small packing plants, and their output is not sufficient to enable them to use the services of a meat grader throughout the full week of their operations. At one point I have in mind, particularly, there is an inspector who grades meat and inspects it for the purpose of sale to the Veterans' Administration hospitals in that area. He is accredited insofar as the Veterans' Administration is concerned, and he buys meat for at least two Veterans' Administration hospitals. Yet, under the current regulations, he is not recognized by the Department of Agriculture for the grading of meat which is sold to the general public. Consequently, this relatively small packing plant finds it necessary, if it wishes to offer graded beef to the public, to bring an inspector from a distance of from 300 to 400 miles. The plant has a chance of going in 1 or 2 directions to obtain an inspector; and the inspector would go there for possibly 1 day's work a week. That would add as much as $7 to the cost of handling each carcass. There is a federally accredited inspector there, who grades and inspects meat for the Veterans' Administration facilities; and it always seemed to me that it was a little stuffy on the part of the Department of Agriculture to require that another grader be employed to grade the meat to be sold to the general public.

So I hope that the study of the regional problems will include a study of the regional problem faced by these isolated packing plants which do not have enough work to justify the employment of a meat grader full time. I hope that problem will be included in the survey.

Mr. BENNETT. In view of the legislative history the Senator from South Dakota has made, I am certain that the Department of Agriculture could take cognizance of that problem.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the Department of Agriculture would do so if the author of the amendment would say he hopes that would be done. But under the first answer the Senator from Utah gave to me, I am afraid the Department would not feel that it had such a responsibility.

Mr. BENNETT. I am anxious to keep the amendment within the framework of an agricultural bill. When we begin to deal with problems in regard to meatpackers, it seems to me——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But that situation affects the agricultural problem very much, because otherwise this particular plant—as its managers have indicated to me—probably will have to go out of the business of packing and processing beef. If that occurs, the regional market for the raisers of livestock will be weakened.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am not so skilled in phrasing legislative proposals as is my colleague, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. So I do not feel capable of developing the proper language for this purpose during the debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me, for a question?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Certainly this amendment applies to studying the methods of grading used by the processors, does it not?

Mr. BENNETT. I certainly would be willing to expand the amendment so as to have that included.

Mr. CAPEHART. I like the amendment, and I favor it 100 percent; and I think the amendment should be adopted. I had in mind offering just such an amendment. But I think the amendment must include processors, because the grading is really done after the animal is killed and becomes a carcass. That is when the grading is really done, insofar as the consumers are concerned.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. When the processor buys an animal, he buys it on the basis of his hope that when the animal is killed, when it is butchered, and after it has been cleaned, it will come within a certain grade. So I think the amendment must include both an investigation and study of the grading methods used by those who buy from the farmers and an investigation and study of the grading methods used by the processors after the animals are processed and become carcasses.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has suggested that the addition of the word "processors", before the words "and producers," in line 10, on page 1 of the amendment, would take care of that situation.

Mr. CAPEHART. So at that point in the amendment, the words "consumers, processors, and producers" will be used?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; "consumers, processors, and producers in the various regions of the country."

Mr. ELLENDER. Will that be in line 8?

Mr. BENNETT. No; in line 10, the bottom line on that page.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have often thought, and I still think, that the Congress should make an investigation and study of the methods of grading meat, because I have my doubts as to whether the processors and the buyers of live animals do not find themselves in a squeeze—I shall put it that way, in order to be kind—and are not hurting the farmer——

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; I think that is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. And are not cheating the farmer, if I may say so. For example, they buy 20 head of cattle, and say, "I think they will be 'prime'," whereas later it may be found that they are graded as "choice." Or the buyer may say, "I do not think these cattle will be 'prime'; I think they will be 'choice'." Then he buys them as "choice," but later they are graded as "prime"; or the buyer may buy cattle he thinks will be graded as "prime"; but when they are processed, the grader may say, "No, they are not 'prime'; they are 'choice'." So there is a twilight zone there.

Mr. BENNETT. And there always will be.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is a twilight zone in which I am not certain that the farmer is not being hurt.

Mr. BENNETT. One of the purposes of the amendment is to reduce the chances of such choices, so as to reduce the area of the twilight zone.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I favor that; and I understand that the Senator from Utah will add the word "processors," so as to include the grading of the carcass, after the animal is butchered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am delighted to modify my amendment by adding the word "processors," before the words "and producers," in line 10 of the amendment, on the first page.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has the right to modify his own amendment, and it will be so modified.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah is familiar with the price study recently made by the Department of Agriculture, is he not?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume that the proposed study will be made by the Department of Agriculture, and that it will use funds it now has; and that in obtaining—as required by the amendment—help from the land-grant colleges, expenditures in addition to those now provided for will not be entailed. Is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. It is my understanding that the Department does not feel that it is in a position at this moment—without having an opportunity to study the amendment—to say exactly how much this program would cost. But the largest estimate is that it might cost $50,000 more than the funds the Department now has available.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the amendment does not contain provision for funds, does it?

Mr. BENNETT. No; the amendment provides an authorization; and the Department would have to obtain additional funds from Congress, if the Department could not find the necessary funds in its present appropriations.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the studies which were made in regard to price squeezes were, as I understand, made by the Department with funds it had on hand, and no special appropriations were made.

Mr. BENNETT. I would hope the Department could do the same in this case; and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has called my attention to the fact that the funds for this purpose might properly be obtained under section 221.

Mr. ELLENDER. I, too, express that hope, and as chairman of the committee, I wish to say I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in my own time I should like to ask several questions of the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has no time, unless time is yielded to him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope to obtain some time from the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, again I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if we do not get good legislation here, at least we get amusement.

Will the Senator from Utah be kind enough to examine lines 5 and 6 of the amendment? From them he will find that the study which he is asking to have undertaken will be of the existing system of grading beef, veal, lamb, and mutton. I assume that he meant by that the inspection system of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah was not referring to the mechanical process by which individuals inspect the carcasses.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know that.

Mr. BENNETT. By the use of the word "system," he was referring to the standards.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To the standards prescribed by the Federal Government.

Mr. BENNETT. The standards prescribed by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Is it not a fact that there is some grading—if one is to believe the advertisements of the chain stores which sell meat—which is done by the chain stores?

Mr. BENNETT. It is the opinion of the Senator from Utah that we can legislate only with respect to Federal grading.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think we could ask the Secretary to make a study of the existing system of grading whether by public or private authority, and thus broaden his study.

Mr. BENNETT. Could that be accomplished by making the word "system" plural, without specifying them?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would rather say "by public or private authority."

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah has no objection to that modification.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the Senator will adopt that modification, so as to read "the existing system, by public or private authority, of grading beef," and so forth. The additional words would be inserted after the word "system." Will the Senator accept that modification?

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to discuss it briefly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then allow me to make one or two further observations within my 5 minutes.

I think the suggestion made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absolutely essential, namely, that the words "and processors" be inserted at the appropriate place, because this is a problem which affects the producer.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the man I was interested in.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He is affected by the manner in which his live meat is processed; and the consumer is affected also by the manner in which the processor acts. Therefore I think it is very important to insert the words "and processors."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. It affects the consumer, because he wants honesty. He wants to know that he is getting exactly what is specified. It affects the farmer, because he wants his animals graded in the right category, so that he will get the right price, based upon whether they are prime, choice, utility, or commercial. The consumer wants to know that he is getting exactly what is specified, no more no less. But the problem is, Are the processors, the packers, paying the farmers the proper price for the grade of cattle they are buying from them? That is the question I want investigated, above everything else.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Indiana is quite right. We are in agreement.

Mr. BENNETT. We agree on that.

Let me comment on the Senator's earlier suggestion. The thing that worries the Senator from Utah about extending this investigation to cover all systems of grading is, first, the cost; and, second, the difficulties the Department

might have in finding complete information. The language of the amendment is "a full and complete study." For example, what about a system used by a packer who does not use Federal grades, but who chooses to sell his meat under a private label? The Senator from Wyoming, in his comments, indicated that he has the impression that the chainstores do their own grading. It is the impression of the Senator from Utah that practically all the chainstores rely on Federal grading, and advertise that fact.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have seen several advertisements of some of the big chains which do not refer to the Department of Agriculture grading. They have their own system. It may be only a term of advertising, but I think if we are to do justice to the producer—and that is what the Senator wants to do—we must deal with the processor in everything he does, and with the distributor, who may have some system of grading.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the fear the Senator from Utah has. If he makes this investigation so broad that it covers all programs of grading livestock, the Department may say that it is impossible of administration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have yet to see an investigation resolution passed by either House of Congress that did not order a full and complete investigation. How extensive the investigation finally turns out to be depends upon what develops, and what time members of the committee can give to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the Senator from Utah will accept the suggested modifications.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Utah have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah would like to follow up the suggestion made by his colleague from South Dakota and modify his amendment so as to provide that—

> The Secretary is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of existing systems of grading beef, veal, lamb, and mutton, with a view to determining whether such systems serve the best interests of both consumers, processors, and producers.

I hope that will be satisfactory to my colleague from Wyoming. The word "processors" will be added at the appropriate places.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that will cover the situation, in view of the colloquy which has taken place.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a number of telegrams which I have received from producers and processors scattered around the country, indicating their support of this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALBANY, OREG., *March 14, 1956.*
Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Believe it vital to the livestock and meat industry and also to consumers interest that Secretary of Agriculture be authorized to make an objective study of the Federal Meat Grading Service. Strongly urge legislation to this effect.

D. E. NEBERGALL,
President, Nebergall Meat Co.

PICO, CALIF., *March 13, 1956.*
Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge a thorough study of the Federal meat grading system to determine if present system fills requirements. Believe it would be to the interest of producers and packers as well as consumers.

E. B. MANNING & SON.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *March 8, 1956.*
Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Believe your proposed study on beef grading is a step in the right direction for the industry. We support you in this study.

EDWARD S. CRAWFORD,
Executive Secretary, Utah Cattlemen's Association.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *March 8, 1956.*
Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Approve of your proposed study on meat grading. Believe it offers possibilities.

ELDON K. BARKER,
Chairman, Utah State Department of Agriculture.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *March 7, 1956.*
Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Senator, State of Utah,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

United States meat grading of lamb detriment both producer and consumer. Seasonal changes make grading specifications impractical. Consumers object overfat lambs. Chain stores use only graded choice lambs. Lambs of good quality are vulnerable. Uncertainty in grading means producer selling United States grades not lambs. We favor study meat grading careful division making survey.

JAS. A. HOOPER,
Secretary, Utah Woolgrowers.

WINNEMUCCA, NEV., *March 7, 1956.*
Senator WALLACE BENNETT,
Washintgon, D. C.:

Am in full accord with your bill relative beef grading. Believe revision very necessary.

RULON P. PETERSON.

MADERA, CALIF., *March 9, 1956.*
Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Extremely important that a study be made of Federal grading service particularly with reference to consumer acceptance and its effect on livestock producers and feeders. Strongly urge enactment of proposed legislation to this effect.

CORNELIOUS C. NOBLE,
President, Nobles Independent Meat Co.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on that basis I am ready to yield back the remaining time.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. CARLSON. One minute.

Mr. BENNETT. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I commend the Senator from Utah for bringing this question before the Senate this evening. I have received resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Kansas Livestock Association in Wichita last week, urging that the Congress enact legislation providing for such a study. The Kansas Livestock Association, as well as the farmers and livestock men of Kansas generally, not only favor legislation of this character, but stress the urgency of it. I sincerely hope the pending amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the unused time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the unused time of the opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

"TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

"SURVEY OF EXISTING SYSTEM OF GRADING MEAT

"SEC. 701. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of existing systems of grading beef, veal, lamb, and mutton, with a view to determining whether such systems serve the best interests of both consumers, processors, and producers. In making such study, the Secretary shall give due consideration to problems of consumers, processors, and producers in the various regions of the country, and in the course of such study he shall use the services and facilities of land grant colleges wherever practicable. The Secretary shall report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date the results of his study together with such recommendations as he may deem desirable for improvement in such systems."

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is designated "3-8-56-J."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to add a new title, as follows:

TITLE VII—IMPORT QUOTA ON WOOLEN FABRICS

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 701. The Congress hereby finds and declares that wool and woolen fabrics are strategic commodities, that it is important to the national welfare and security that a strong woolen manufacturing industry be maintained, and that for these reasons it is essential that a quota on imports of woolen fabrics be established for the protection of such industry.

ESTABLISHMENT OF QUOTA

SEC. 702. The quantity of woven fabrics, wholly or in chief value of wool, provided for in paragraphs 1108 and 1109 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during any calendar year shall not exceed on a square-yard basis 5 percent of the production of similar fabrics in the United States during the preceding calendar year, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. The purpose of the amendment is to provide an import quota on woolen fabrics. The situation at the present time is that over the period of the last 3 years more than 125 woolen mills in this country have been forced to close their doors. We find ourselves in a position where the imports of woolen fabrics have increased to such proportions that the producers of woolen fabrics in this country are unable to meet the competition from abroad.

I have before me a table showing the increases in imports, by square yards, from 1929 to 1955. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fabrics wholly or in chief value of wool—Pars. 1108 and 1109A

Year	Imports	Domestic production	Ratio
	Thousand square yards	*Thousand square yards*	
1929	18,775	432,211	4.34
1931	4,807	336,371	1.43
1939	12,092	481,509	2.51
1946	4,161	786,429	.53
1947	4,613	697,082	.66
1948	9,237	651,522	1.42
1949	8,917	526,758	1.69
1950	18,528	585,957	3.16
1951	18,698	508,647	3.68
1952	24,032	502,440	4.78
1953	24,275	437,000	5.55
1954	19,528	384,000	5.08
1955	[1] 29,532	443,000	[1] 6.66

[1] Estimated.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that since 1950 the imports have increased more than 100 percent. The purpose of the amendment is to provide that imports shall be limited to not to exceed 5 percent of the production, on a square yard basis, of the preceding year.

I call attention to the fact that for a long period of years prior to 1952 the imports ranged from less than one-half of 1 percent up to around 3½ percent. Therefore the 5-percent average is a fair and reasonable figure.

Furthermore I call attention to the fact that at the trade-agreement convention held in Geneva in 1948 this decision was arrived at:

> The right is reserved by the United States to increase to 45 percent the ad valorem part of the rate on any fabrics which are entered in any calendar year in excess of an aggregate quantity by weight of 5 percent of the average annual production of similar fabrics in the United States during the 3 immediately preceding years.

I submit that under the existing Trade Agreements Act 5 percent is considered to be a figure beyond which the imports should not go, and that some action should be taken to curtail the imports.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that the time has come when we must take some steps to protect not only the manufacturers of this country, over 100 of whom have been forced to close their doors, but also the skilled craftsmen employed in such factories, so that they will not be thrown out of employment. I do not know the exact number of employees in the woolen mills in the United States who have been thrown out of employment during the past 5 years, but I have been advised that it is in excess of 125,000.

It seems to me that the end result of the situation which exists at the present time is that we are exporting our jobs abroad, we are making employment for people in foreign lands, and we are suffering a terrific loss in this country.

Someone might inquire as to the interest of the Senator from Wyoming in this proposal. I must admit that we have no woolen manufacturers in Wyoming. However, the only customers we have for our raw wool are the American manufacturers. As a result, we must aline ourselves with them, so that we will have some customers to whom we can sell our raw wool. There is no other reason why I am interested in the proposal. Under the Wool Act, the United States undertakes to pay, from tariff receipts, the difference between the average price received by the wool producers of this country and 62 cents a pound. If much of the business continues to go abroad—that is, if our people buy more and more fabrics made in Japan and in other parts of the world—the price of wool will decline to the point where payments made by the Treasury out of tariff receipts will increase. Of course, it is to the best interests of our country that we reduce such payments as much as possible.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The able Senator from Wyoming of course knows the purpose of the Wool Act very well, because he had a leading part in its enactment. The question which I should like to ask the Senator has practically been answered by what he has said with reference to the Wool Act. I should like to pose this question directly to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. BARRETT. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator not feel that it would leave the Government in a very inconsistent position if, after the enactment of the Wool Act, which was passed by Congress under the recommendation of the administration, with very strong support in both Houses of Congress, and which set up a program for the domestic production of wool, it should turn around and permit the importation of wool to continue to the point where it would depress the market for raw wool?

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator from South Dakota is entirely correct. I may say that I have attempted to approach this matter on a fair and reasonable basis. I have not attempted to cut off the imports entirely. I have taken the figure which was accepted by the United States Government itself at the Trade Agreements Convention in Geneva in 1948. It seems to me that the time has come when the United States must step in and protect not only the producers of raw wool and the manufacturers, but also those who are employed in the plants which process the raw wool and manufacture fabrics from the raw wool.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And, if I may add, also to protect the policy of the Government itself in establishing the floor it has placed under the domestic wool price.

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct. Also to protect, as I said before, the Treasury of the United States, which also is concerned in this matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Is it not also true that wool and woolen goods are a critical war material?

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator from Pennsylvania is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. If we do not keep up the growing and manufacture of wool in the United States, in case of a worldwide war, our Army might not be properly clothed.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator is correct. As everyone knows, the Senator from Pennsylvania has had a long and distinguished career in the armed services of the Nation. As the Senator himself knows, one of the factors which lost the war for Hitler and for Germany was that the Germans had to rely on synthetics, instead of on woolen fabrics.

Congress has declared as its policy that wool is a strategic and critical material necessary for the defense of America.

Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming withdraws his amendment. Are there further amendments to be considered this evening?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment, to be discussed tomorrow. It is an amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and myself, which would eliminate the use of the dual parity formula permitted by the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont for himself and other Senators will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, it is proposed to strike out lines 14 through 22, as follows:

PARITY FORMULA

SEC. 106. Section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (providing for a dual parity formula), is amended by striking out the following: "as of any date during the 6-year

period beginning January 1, 1950." The Secretary shall make a thorough study of possible methods of improving the parity formula and report thereon, with his recommendations, to Congress within 6 months after the enactment of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment just offered by the Senator from Vermont will be the pending question tomorrow.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like again to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that it is planned to have the Senate meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning and remain in session as late as 11 o'clock or 11:30 tomorrow night. We are anxious to finish the consideration of the farm bill. We think it is imperative that it be finished this week, and the earlier the better.

NEEDED: A MISSION 66 FOR NATIONAL FOREST RECREATION FACILITIES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared about the need for a mission 66 for national-forest recreation facilities, and an editorial on the subject from the Salt Lake Tribune of March 5, 1956.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

NEEDED: A MISSION 66 FOR NATIONAL-FOREST RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Our national-forest recreation areas are in danger of becoming national slums unless Congress takes positive remedial action immediately.

Because of insufficient funds, coupled with the meteoric rise in public use, forest sanitation and recreation facilities are woefully inadequate to meet existing needs. The resulting unsanitary conditions, unsatisfactory water systems and toilets, worn-out fire grates, and increased fire hazards in the overcrowded recreation areas are imperiling the Nation's health and safety. Meanwhile, the $30 million Federal Government investment in national-forest campground and picnic facilities is falling to pieces at an alarming rate.

Forty-five million Americans visited and enjoyed forest-recreational facilities in 1955, according to preliminary estimates. This represents an increase of 5 million over 1954 and exceeds the 18 million visitors in 1946 by 2½ times, a jump of 153 percent in 9 years.

Few people realize that almost as many people use and visit our national-forest recreation areas as visit our national parks and monuments. In 1955, 50 million visitors were logged at the national parks and monuments while 45 million were tallied in forest-recreation areas during the same year exclusive of casual passers-by on forest highways.

I am sure the other Members of Congress share my pleasure at the emphasis which President Eisenhower's 10-year Mission 66 program has placed on the national parks and monuments, an emphasis which is well deserved and long overdue. A similar emphasis should now be placed on the development and modernization of our forest parks. We need a Mission 66 for our forests.

A national problem

There are 4,400 camp and picnic areas on the 151 national forests located in 39 States and Alaska. Some 700 of these are located near main United States and State highways and are convenient for overnight stops by tourists. The rest are located along secondary roads and are often many miles from main tourist routes and are ideal for campers.

Forests are national assets: Our forests are in every way priceless national assets. Even on a hard dollars-and-cents basis, our national forests turn into the Treasury more than it costs to operate them and this is true even though 25 percent of the forest receipts are appropriated to the States as payments in lieu of taxes. The year 1955 is a typical year in which forest receipts totaled $84,120,150 while expenditures on the forests came to only $74,647,903.

It is time to re-invest a modest portion of these funds to modernize and expand our present inadequate recreational and sanitary facilities.

Thirty-nine States directly affected: 39 States of the Union are intimately and directly affected by the recreational program of the Forest Service as shown by the following table:

Total recreation use of national forest areas in 1954 (other than highways)

Total	Total visits	Man-days
Alabama	103,380	59,090
Alaska	197,879	300,548
Arizona	1,669,482	2,003,033
Arkansas	546,813	489,634
California	6,955,576	17,295,687
Colorado	4,245,838	5,106,131
Florida	660,010	1,089,680
Georgia	552,900	435,625
Idaho	1,465,925	2,393,302
Illinois	312,300	146,100
Indiana	77,670	32,440
Kentucky	142,000	191,900
Louisiana	95,200	143,717
Maine	14,400	11,375
Michigan	1,027,753	1,497,445
Minnesota	623,423	1,374,428
Mississippi	238,900	145,000
Missouri	619,367	439,164
Montana	1,311,445	1,628,891
Nebraska	31,970	7,993
Nevada	247,930	311,322
New Hampshire	935,576	686,440
New Mexico	1,419,906	1,535,488
North Carolina	1,935,784	1,355,431
Ohio	117,600	49,180
Oklahoma	14,950	14,950
Oregon	2,804,041	3,731,543
Pennsylvania	890,000	604,500
Puerto Rico	146,475	131,358
South Carolina	277,680	90,542
South Dakota	1,432,330	1,682,105
Tennessee	1,111,500	504,445
Texas	199,300	148,525
Utah	3,750,400	3,553,702
Vermont	77,200	79,250
Virginia	580,700	742,710
Washington	1,913,486	2,757,049
West Virginia	374,053	322,998
Wisconsin	341,800	416,467
Wyoming	841,095	1,337,441
Total	40,304,037	54,846,629

It is startling to observe that the forest recreational areas of 13 States had over 1 million visitors in 1954 with the highest, California, reaching nearly 7 million. Moreover, 22 States had over 500,000 visitors. This is all the more remarkable since the number of visitors for 1955 will undoubtedly be from 10 to 15 percent higher in virtually every one of the 39 States.

Need for increased funds

The present sad state of recreation and sanitation facilities in the national forests arises from two basic factors, the first of which, the great expansion in public use, I have already referred to:

1. Expansion in public use: 45 million people in 1955 used the facilities of the national forests for recreation, facilities which were largely built during the 1930's by the CCC boys to accommodate only 10 million to 15 million visitors. The following table charts this remarkable growth in the number of visitors:

Number of visitors to the national forests for utilization of the recreation resources, calendar year 1924 to present

1924	4,660,389
1925	5,622,206
1926	6,044,267
1927	6,136,813
1928	6,550,317
1929	7,132,058
1930	6,910,924
1931	8,073,917
1932	7,895,843
1933	8,165,521
1934	8,580,806
1935	9,718,330
1936	10,781,094
1937	11,832,658
1938	14,495,274
1939	14,331,861
1940	16,162,967
1941	18,004,785
1942	10,407,120
1943	6,274,659
1944	7,151,953
1945	10,074,089
1946	18,240,677
1947	21,330,751
1948	24,010,964
1949	26,080,255
1950	27,367,797
1951	29,950,252
1952	33,006,885
1953	35,403,050
1954	40,304,037

The great expansion in the number of visitors has far outstripped the available facilities. The annual increase in use has averaged 10½ percent per year for the last 3 years, with all indications pointing to the same high continuing rate of growth in the future. By 1960, the number of visitors will be well over 60 million annually, and they will be using facilities designed for one-fourth that many people unless Congress takes action now.

2. Inadequate funds: The second factor is that insufficient money has been appropriated over the years, not even enough to merely maintain existing facilities. Virtually no money whatever has been spent for capital improvements or expansion since the 1930's. Consequently, there has been a sharp deterioration. To illustrate, 40 percent of the recreational facilities in the intermountain region are deteriorated so badly that they are beyond use. Repair and replacement have not kept up with wear and tear and increased use. Congestion itself has resulted in abuse to facilities and has hastened their deterioration.

Present appropriation picture: The House Interior Appropriation bill calls for a $470,000 increase over last year for "sanitation and care of public campgrounds," making a total of $2,194,500. However, $3,400,000 is needed during this coming year just to adequately maintain already existing facilities. If the House bill prevails, even with the welcome increase, we will have another year of going down hill on maintenance with nothing whatever being done on capital improvements to meet the greatly expanded need.

Capital improvements needed

The Forest Service estimates that a capital investment of $7,169,000 is needed to rehabilitate all essential existing public-use areas and facilities. However, as already pointed out, the existing facilities were devised to meet the need of the 1930's while visitor use has expanded threefold since that time.

The capital investment needed to expand the capacity of existing areas and to construct new areas necessary to accommodate present use in a safe and satisfactory manner amounts to $17,135,000. With the continuing

rise in use, it is probable that more will be needed to meet the needs for future use.

When we consider that $30 million is already invested in recreational facilities, coupled with the intense public demand for forest recreation, quite as much so as the demand upon our national parks, more money should be appropriated. This is particularly true since the benefit and value which our citizens receive from healthful outdoor activity is incalculable.

Proposed 8-year program: a "mission 1964"

Quite obviously all of the necessary improvements cannot be undertaken in a single year. Therefore, I propose an 8-year program for our national forest recreation areas which will proceed efficiently to meet this great national need. I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will join with me and at the end of the 8 years we will be able to point to our forest parks with national pride instead of avoiding them as national slums.

1. Program for maintenance: An additional $1.2 million should be added to the House recommendations of $2.2 million, making a total of $3.4 million, the amount needed to maintain existing facilities. This appropriation would have to be scaled upward over the 8 years reaching a total of $3.7 million by 1964. This is the amount the Forest Service estimates will be needed to maintain the expanded facilities.

2. Program for capital improvements: There is no money in the present budget for capital improvements and there hasn't been any since the 1930's. This year $1.5 million should be appropriated; next year, $3 million; and $4 million each year through fiscal year 1964, totaling $28.5 million over the 8 years to meet present and expanded needs during the next 8 years.

The total additional funds for maintenance and capital improvements during the next fiscal year if this program is adopted is $2.7 million, making a grand total of $4.9 million for sanitation and care of public campgrounds under the Forest Service appropriation.

Additional funds will be efficiently utilized: I am sure the Forest Service can adequately and efficiently utilize the increased funds to better our "forest parks." The House has approved a $9.8 million increase for construction alone to inaugurate the Mission 66 program for the Park Service. The Forest Service should be able to handle the more modest $2.7 million to inaugurate a "Mission 64" for forest recreation. The increase is even more necessary since Mission 66 will bring increased demands on the national forests for two reasons. First, most parks and monuments are largely surrounded by national forests, and, second, new campgrounds in the forests adjacent to the many parks are contemplated to serve park visitors.

Congress should support this program: My purpose in calling this serious problem to the attention of the Senate is that so few people realize the gravity of the situation facing our national forest recreation areas. Equally few know how extensively these areas are used by the American people. Because it is a little-known problem, I thought that all of my colleagues in the Senate would wish to have this material before them, since the Interior Appropriation bill will shortly be before the Senate. Hearings are even now being held.

I shall also, of course, present this proposed program in testifying before the Senate Interior Appropriations Subcommittee presided over by Senator HAYDEN, who has long been sympathetic to forest needs.

The need is urgent, and I sincerely hope that Congress will act this year to prevent our forests from becoming a national disgrace.

Situation in Utah typical of 39 forest States

Since I am from Utah, I am naturally best acquainted with forest recreational facilities in my own State. However, the situation in Utah is similar to that of most other States; so my referring to Utah conditions will, in large part, have general application.

It is virtually impossible to find a picnic spot or parking place in any of the canyons near Salt Lake City during July or August. A similar condition prevails in the canyons near Ogden and Logan. It is not surprising since the Wasatch Forest is the third most visited forest in the United States with 1,560,000 visits in 1954.

Overcrowding: The overcrowding is so severe that the lower parts of Mill Creek and the Cottonwood canyons have been trampled like the bedding grounds of a herd of sheep. This concentrated use of the forest picnic and camp grounds not only damages them as recreational places, but creates severe sanitation, safety and fire problems. This condition is doubly critical in Utah for practically every mountain stream in the State is some community's water supply. Further, congestion in the improved camp ground areas tends to push people in sections where sanitary and safety facilities are not provided, adding tremendously to the overall problem.

Twenty-five percent of visitors are from out of State: The visitors to Utah forest areas are by no means all from Utah. Fully one-fourth or 25 percent come from other States from all over the Union.

Expanded recreation use in Utah: Public use of the seven national forests of Utah for recreation has increased from 1.6 million in 1941 to 3.8 million visits in 1954. This does not include another 2,415,000 who traveled over the highways through the national forests to enjoy the scenery while passing through.

Three times more visitors than Yellowstone Park: Recreation use in Utah during 1955 will equal or exceed that of 1954 and is about equal to 3 times the annual number visiting Yellowstone National Park, and it is 3 times the number visiting all the national parks and monuments in Utah.

The total recreation use of the national forests in 1954 shows that Utah ranks third of the 39 States having national forests, and is exceeded only by California and Colorado.

It is estimated that use by 1960 will reach approximately 5 million visits according to present trends.

Forty percent of facilities deteriorated to worthlessness: The areas improved for public recreation in national forests in Utah now have approximately 7,200 family units and were installed during the CCC program at a cost of about $1,900,000. Forty percent of the facilities of the entire intermountain region, including Utah, have depreciated to a point where they can no longer be economically maintained. This means a loss in Utah of 1,800 family units at a time when use has more than doubled and will shortly be tripled.

Another 2,500 new family units are urgently needed. By 1960 it is estimated there will be needed another 3,000 units. The capacity of the improved areas is, therefore, shrinking against the growing trends for increased public use.

Present funds going only for sanitation and fire control: Since there hasn't been enough money appropriated since the 1930's even for maintenance, and since no money has been appropriated for capital improvements since then, the funds which are allocated to Utah can go only for sanitation control, public safety, and fire protection. No money can be channeled to campground improvements. Pit toilets still prevail in many canyons in Utah, including Logan Canyon and Big Cottonwood. There has been little or no expansion of camping or picnicking facilities since the 1930's.

Local cooperation: The local cities and counties are cooperating with the Forest Service to the extent of their means. For example, collection of garbage and human waste is done by Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County in adjacent canyons.

Summary of Utah needs: Because of a near-starvation diet imposed upon national forest recreational facilities in Utah, a great backlog of improvements has grown up. Moreover, expanded use has brought a need for expanded facilities. A summary of immediate needs and needs by 1960 follows:

1. Immediate:	
Administration and operation (annual)	$170,000
Maintenance (annual)	136,000
Restoration of existing facilities	945,000
Construction of 2,500 new units	1,411,000
2. By 1960:	
Administration and operation (annual)	233,000
Maintenance (annual)	190,000
Construction of an additional 3,000 units	1,800,000

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of March 5, 1956]

NEW FOREST RECREATION FACILITIES NEEDED

The 1956 appropriation for national forest recreational facilities amounted to $1,670,000, a mere pittance considering the fact that 44 million recreational visits were made to the forests last year and that camp and sanitation facilities are steadily deteriorating.

The House Appropriations Committee, after sharply increasing the national parks appropriation this month, approved an increase of $470,000 in funds for the Forest Service to step up a program for sanitation and care of public camp grounds. While the sum will be put to good use, it is only a third of the amount required to construct badly needed facilities in the national forests of the intermountain region alone.

Senator BENNETT of Utah is working to get funds increased for recreation, watershed protection and range reseeding on the national forests pointing out that deterioration of the vital natural resources is sheer waste and contrary to public good.

While more and more fugitives from smog, noise, congestion and tension take to the woods in search of relaxation and recreation, the woods themselves are seriously endangered. Some national forest areas have deteriorated to the point that public health and safety are in jeopardy. Since the Civilian Conservation Corps was abolished in the late 1930's, practically no new recreational facilities have been created or constructed. And meantime, the bridges, fireplaces, toilet facilities and other improvements constructed a quarter of a century ago are gradually breaking up.

A visitor to any of the congested canyons adjacent to Salt Lake City in summer can testify as to the condition of the dusty, congested picnic grounds, inadequate roads and parking areas. Despite conscientious efforts by forest and local employees, some camps have the appearance of a city dump at the end of a Sunday or holiday.

Recreational use of forests in the intermountain region jumped from 2,295,000 in 1941 to 6,105,000 last year. The same pattern holds for the national forests throughout Utah. Visits increased from 1,567,000 in 1941 to 3,918,000 in 1955. The total for the region is expected to go well over 7,500,000 by 1960. A study in 1954 showed that Utah ranks third highest in recreational use among the 39 States in which national forests are located, being exceeded only by California and Colorado.

There are 7,200 family units in the national forests of Utah and 11,300 in the 623 improved recreation areas in the intermountain region. The region boasts 35 winter-sports areas. Forty percent of the facilities of the region have depreciated to a point where they no longer can be maintained economically. The region is now underde-

veloped by more than 8,700 family picnic units in the forests and Utah needs 4,500 more at the present time, and by 1960 is expected to need another 2,000. Thus the capacity of improved areas is shrinking while the demand is increasing startlingly. Public use in the national forests carries with it a tremendous responsibility in safety and sanitation. Because the ponds and streams in practically every canyon of the area serve some community's culinary water needs, standards of the public health services must be met. This is absolutely essential in this semiarid country where water is so scarce. Because of this need and that of maintaining public safety and fire protection, funds received by the Forest Service for recreation are mostly channeled into these programs. This, of course, does not bring about the increase in the number of camp and recreation facilities so badly needed to accommodate the increased number of visitors.

Labor is the main item in operation and maintenance of recreation areas and wage rates have increased 13 percent in recent years. Because of this the increases in appropriations for recreational use up to this year have been wiped out.

Efforts are being made to spur favorable interest in Congress in a bill to set aside 10 percent of national-forest receipts, up to $5½ million annually for recreational areas and wildlife improvements. Some observers are not optimistic this bill will be adopted this year.

Whether it is or not, Congress has a grave responsibility to take prompt action to relieve the rundown and unsanitary conditions growing worse throughout the overused recreational areas of the national forests.

RECESS UNTIL 11 O'CLOCK A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, March 15, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 14 (legislative day of March 13), 1956:

COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

David Brewer Karrick, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

James E. Colliflower to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1956.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. William Langer, of North Dakota, Before West Virginia Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a short time ago I delivered an address at the 71st meeting of the West Virginia Bar Association. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

(By Hon. WILLIAM LANGER, United States Senator from North Dakota)

Mr. President, Senator Revercomb, and friends, I can't remember when I have had a more gracious welcome than I have had from your president, U. G. Young. He fixed up my room most beautifully, and in addition to the flowers and fruit, he had two bottles which apparently contained some kind of stuff that my friend Chappie Revercomb likes. [Laughter.]

When Mr. Revercomb came to the Senate, I had already been there for some years. I well recollect the first day he appeared in the Judiciary Committee, to which he was assigned. A bunch of us were sitting around, waiting for a quorum to appear, and we commenced to brag about the States from which we came. I told a little story about a man 90 years of age who married a woman 87, out at home, and then advertised they wanted to buy a farm. They specified just how large the farm was to be, and put in this clause, that this farm must be located near a schoolhouse. It didn't bother Chappie one bit—he said, "Out in West Virginia we had a fellow named John Jones. A lawyer appeared from England, looking for a fellow named John Jones, 80 years old, who had inherited $100,000, had inherited a title, and other property. The English lawyer finally located a John Jones, went to his home and said, "Does John Jones live here?" The man said, "Yes." The lawyer said, "How old are you?" The man answered, "I am 60 years old."

The lawyer said, "You are not the man I am looking for. I am looking for a John Jones who is 80 years old." He said, "That's my father; he lives up here about 2 blocks."

The English lawyer went over there; a lady came to the door, greeted him; he said, "Is John Jones here?" She said, "Yes, he lives here, but he isn't in the house now." The lawyer said, "Is he the John Jones that is 80 years old?" She said, "Yes, but he isn't home." "Where is he?" She said, "Well, he's over attending his father's marriage, over here about 4 or 5 blocks." The English lawyer said, "I am certainly surprised at that." The lady said, "You're not as surprised as I am; this is a shotgun marriage." [Laughter.] That is the kind of people Chappie said you have here in West Virginia.

I don't want you misled by the things my distinguished former colleague said about me—I want you to know I was up for disbarment twice—I was accused as county attorney and as attorney general twice; I was arrested as the Governor of North Dakota, tried, and sentenced to 18 months in the penitentiary, but I didn't serve the sentence, we had the right kind of a supreme court. After that I was elected to the supreme court, and to the United States Senate, and there it took me 15 months to get seated. Senator BARKLEY read 34 charges against me, and, of course, I had to hire lawyers to defend me against those charges, and every time you have to hire a lawyer you know what that means. Among the lawyers I hired was John W. Davis. Clarence Darrow had been one of my lawyers, but he had died, was not able to represent me in Washington.

Naturally, I beat those charges in Washington. In any event, I was also impeached one time—or rather, they tried to impeach me, when I was attorney general. They failed to impeach me by one vote.

Having told you that record, I want you to know I carried every county in the State of North Dakota in the last election. I mention that history to you because after I leave here you may run across some of my North Dakota constituents that may tell you my history anyhow, so I thought I would tell you myself.

In this matter of juvenile delinquency, I prepared a very fine speech. I showed it to your president, he looked at it, and said, "Why don't you just tell us about juvenile delinquency, and certain phases of it." So, I am going to do that, and I may read 1 or 2 quotes from my speech.

I want you to know, first of all, as Senator Revercomb said, I was on the parole board of North Dakota ex officio by virtue of being attorney general and governor. The most maligned group of people in the United States are the parole boards. You sit on that parole board, you do the best you can. You see a young lad come before you, you decide that he will do a whole lot better if he gets out of the penitentiary after he has been there a few months, and then report for a few years to a probation officer.

It is interesting to note, taking the State figures from my State, 99 out of 100 of those people whom we parole make a good record, Every once in a while one goes wrong, and that is the one the newspapers write about, that is the one the people all over the country hear about. If I could do nothing else here today I hope to impress on you the fact that the average parole board, particularly the Federal parole boards, go into the matter very, very carefully.

We have a splendid parole board in Washington, which interviews each applicant. I happen to be chairman of the committee—you see, when I was sentenced to Leavenworth for 18 months, I wanted to find out the best job there—and I was very, very much interested in that, and when I came to the Senate I had created the National Penitentiary Committee, of which I have been chairman. We visit and investigate every one of the penitentiaries—with me are Senator HENNINGS, of Missouri, O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, and WELKER, of Idaho. We go in about 3 o'clock in the morning, go over the food, especially the cereals—every once in a while we get complaints about that. We check into the matter of solitary confinement.

I want to call this to your attention today: Since the creation of this committee by the United States Senate there hasn't been one single riot in any Federal penitentiary. There was an incipient one, while we had the burning of buildings in State penitentiary after State penitentiary, in the Federal Reformatory in Chillicothe; but nothing like the millions of dollars worth of damages, hostages killed and prisoners killed—there hasn't been one, not one riot in any Federal prison.

One reason is we provided that every prisoner can write a letter to any member of the Supreme Court of the United States, or

Congressman, or Senator, or to the judge who sentenced him. And Justice Burton told me he received 265 letters last year. An investigation was made of all of them, and they found two innocent prisoners among them and promptly took steps to release them.

On this matter of juvenile delinquency, I don't know how many of you ever visited a reformatory. I visited one near Denver, at Englewood, Colo. I found 208 of the finest young men you ever saw in all your life. I have been to West Point and seen the West Pointers parade. You go to that penitentiary and it is something you are proud of. You find the boys have a haircut every 2 weeks, they are taught to stand up straight. I was told there by the warden that it very, very seldom occurs that any man ever makes a criminal record after he is released from there. They learn the different trades, and the result is they make a living after they are released, and do not return to crime.

While I am on that subject, may I say there is pending in the Senate now a bill to provide the warden with sufficient funds to furnish each man leaving the penitentiary with a suit of clothes, and to hand him a few dollars; the warden is authorized to give that going-out prisoner $200. And Jim Bennett, the Director of the Prisons of the United States Government, has recommended that bill, and we are in very great hopes that bill is passed.

Today we are short of penitentiary room. Every penitentiary is overcrowded, we have 1,500 men sentenced to penitentiaries that we just simply don't know what to do with.

Taking up the matter of juvenile delinquency, I shall mention various subjects in connection with it, so I think it is best to get the facts straight.

One phase that might be tied in with juvenile delinquency are the young, unwed mothers who have babies. There are more than 20,000 babies sold in the black market each year, at anywhere from $2,500 to $5,000 apiece. There isn't a reason in the world why a couple in the United States that wants to get a baby can't get it through a legalized agency in the State. Every State in the Union provides methods of adoption, and have proper institutions to provide babies for adoption.

You will be amazed at the trickery played on some of the unwed mothers in order to be able to obtain babies for the black-market operations. And to the people obtaining babies through these methods, many times after the money is paid, the baby is not delivered. Many times, when they do get the baby, the baby is found to be blind, or there is something else wrong with it physically.

We have cited four lawyers in Chicago engaged in that business, they will have considerable trouble before they get through. In the marketing of black-market babies, some people have made a profit of it. They have institutions where they take babies in, advertise in newspapers, and have couples come over and visit, show them different babies like you would show a horse or a cow, let them pick them out, tell you this baby is $2,500; this one $3,500.

If any of you know anyone who want to adopt a baby, we have a refugee committee, of which I am chairman, that provides for the coming in of 209,000 refugees from West Germany, from the satellite countries of Russia. At the present time there are 4 million refugees in West Germany. If anybody in West Virginia wants a boy or a girl, all they have to do is notify the refugee committee of the United States Senate. The law provides for the bringing in of 5,000 orphans, less than 800 have been brought in in a year and a half.

If any of you know a bachelor that can't find a girl, we can supply him with girls from 18 to 80 years of age. You can bring in a good hired girl or a hired man, you can bring in good farmers or tailors, you can bring in bakers. And you can tell your clients they are not legally responsible for one single dollar a month for those refugees, only morally responsible that they will get them a job and a house to live in.

Going back to juvenile delinquency, I will take up the matter of polygamy. Your president particularly asked me to discuss that today, because some time ago Senator KEFAUVER asked me to go to New Mexico and Arizona to investigate the juvenile delinquency among the Indians. If you want to see misery and want and starvation, you don't have to go to foreign countries in which we spend millions of dollars, we have them among the Indians of the United States.

Back when the Indian Bureau was organized by Congress, the first Director took it on himself to get as many people under his jurisdiction as possible. We then had 232,000 Indians. For some unknown reason, he decided to get everybody with any Indian blood at all under the rules, and he got graduates of Harvard, Yale, anybody with any Indian blood at all, on the enrolled lists, with the result that finally now we have 400,000 on the lists.

Now, I would say that of all those Indians, the number of those who need help are perhaps 150,000. Yet we are sending billions of dollars all over the world, and don't do anything for these Indians. You will find 800 children in Arizona that never saw a schoolhouse. Over in New Mexico you will find hundreds of children, even up to 16 years of age, who can't talk a word of English. You will find when you go to the schoolhouses—heavens knows you won't find many—you will find the children haven't got a baseball, a football, any sports equipment at all.

You will find that a GI who offered his life overseas, an Indian, who wants to make a living, you will find he can't get a loan like a white GI. He can't borrow money on cattle, on a farm, or on anything else. So that GI looks around for a job. Usually he gets married, and we have those Indian women appear before our committee, they say they want something done about their tribe. They say, "Our husbands go to Nogales, to Tucson, they go 2 weeks or more, then a month, then 2 months, then they never come back, the family is broken up, the children grow up without a father."

You will find some of the Indian women have to carry buckets of water perhaps half a mile or more from the creek—they have no well, no money available for a well. You will find that although the Indian Bureau has been in operation since 1834, 130 years, today the Indians are far worse off than when the Indian Bureau took over.

I was on the Indian Committee, Thomas of Oklahoma was the chairman, and I asked him one day if he could show me one treaty the white men kept with the Indians. He said, "You can't find a single one." North and South Dakota were assigned to the Indians for their own territory, but when gold was discovered in the Black Hills, the Indians were driven out by William Randolph Hearst.

The Indian can't get into the courts, and we created the Indian Claims Commission. There today millions and millions of dollars are spent. That Commission has been there a long, long time, and they tell us the situation is so complicated it is almost impossible after all these years to do justice both to the United States Government and to the Indian.

So when I was investigating the Indians in Arizona and New Mexico, one of the columnists came to me, said, "I wish you would come to Short Creek, investigate the matter of polygamy, we would appreciate it very much." I investigated that, had Governor MacFarland of Arizona with me—a friend of Chappie Revercomb's—we went over to try to make an investigation. The States had tried to make one and got nowhere. Finally they took it to court, and they finally took away 162 children of parents living in polygamy, and turned them over to the welfare board of the State of Arizona. They were in their custody a trifle over a year, then the judge had to run for reelection, he lost, a new judge came in, and the result was he issued an order turning all these children back to their parents over at Short Creek.

Naturally this interested me. I got out 89 subpenas to start my investigation. You see, the State authorities are up against this—these so-called colonies are generally on the edge of a State line, and when the sheriff comes to serve them with a subpena, they go over into Utah; or if they live in Utah, they go over into Arizona.

The governor told me, "Our legislature refuses to pass any legislation on this." Before Arizona was admitted to the Union, they had to have legislation against polygamy to be admitted into the Union. They said they would pass that, and became a State. But they haven't got it yet. The former governor tried to do a marvelous job, he tried to wipe out that situation, but he found a great many witnesses went over the Utah line, where he wouldn't have jurisdiction.

In the Federal court we had no such problem, our subpenas were not bothered by State lines, we just obliterated all State lines in our congressional investigation. I brought these people in, I found a situation there that I never dreamed could exist in my wildest imagination. I found men getting up testifying, "Sure, I have got five wives, my grandfather and grandmother went to the penitentiary, my father and mother went to the penitentiary, I haven't the least objection to going there." They say, "It's a part of our religion, we intend to obey our religion, even though it conflicts with State law."

When I got back to Washington, I proceeded to make an investigation, through Attorney General Brownell and Senator KEFAUVER—you would be amazed to learn how many States there are where polygamy existed. You would be distressed by the pathetic letters I get. For example, a lady and her husband writing you from California, saying, "My daughter is 13 years of age, and was visiting in Arizona—or some other State—now, she won't come home. We went to investigate, found she is the third wife, polygamous wife, of Mr. So and So."

Well, it is a matter, of course, that may be primarily the duty of the State; but when you go down there as a public official and investigate it, you are appalled—and I use that word advisedly. It is the problem of the Attorney General of the United States, as well as the attorney general of the various States. But as the county attorney told me, "As soon as my predecessor started to enforce the law, he was defeated for reelection."

Then I want to take up, if I may—because I promised your chairman I wouldn't talk more than 35 minutes—this matter of drugs, of marihuana. This situation is so indescribable you wouldn't believe it. The testimony given before our committee showed it is among the school children—not only in the high schools, but in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades, and even in the lower grades. Our committee decided to name a special subcommittee, and on that subcommittee were Senator Kilgore as chairman, PRICE DANIELS, of Texas. The Senate allowed them $50,000 for that purpose.

If I might digress a moment, we organized the Juvenile Delinquency Committee 4 years ago, when I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee. The subcommittees that we have created ever since are off-shoots of that original Juvenile Delinquency Committee. While still in the full committee, we went into the matter of drugs. We had the testi-

mony of J. Edgar Hoover and other enforcement officials; I can only say today we are taking excellent care of that situation through the special subcommittee headed by Senator PRICE DANIELS, of Texas; and working with the cooperation of the Food and Drug Department of the United States, I think the situation is coming along in pretty good shape.

From that I want to go into the matter of pornographic literature and pictures. I wish every one of you in this room could have been with us down at Palm Springs when the sheriff of San Diego, Calif., brought over great gripfuls of literature and pictures seized from teenagers that had gone over across the line into Mexico, over to Tijuana and south of Nogales, Ariz. Those pictures are so undescribably filthy and horrible that you wouldn't believe that any man or woman could possibly deal in them; yet our investigation shows it is a billion dollar a year business in the United States.

One outfit over there in Baltimore, we got hold of their books, they do $150 million in that one concern in that field in 1 year. There are several places in Los Angeles that do a million dollar a year business in that kind of literature and pictures.

Senator KEFAUVER and myself, presiding in the hearings of our committee in New York, saw the spectacle of four leaders in that line of filth claiming the fifth amendment, and the first amendment and the fourth amendment—every one they could think of, in order to keep from testifying before the committee. Of course, we reported them to the Senate, and they were cited for contempt. We wanted to find out how one man sent out 400,000 letters to teenagers, saying that for 50 cents, $1, $1.50, $2 $2.50, you can get some lewd, lascivious pictures.

That is one of the great problems, how they send their advertising literature. We find these people get lists of the graduating classes from the 8th and 9th grades, from junior high schools. We find there are outfits that make a practice of getting lists of all those graduating from junior high school to high school, then they apparently mail out that literature to them. We have fathers and mothers complain to us; we had the father and mother of that boy who was killed down in Florida by other teenagers—you remember, you saw it in the newspapers—because of some of the literature these teenagers had received.

You will find that they not only have the literature from Mexico, where they sneak it across the border, but from other countries, they bring it in in airplanes, they bring it in from Paris and other foreign countries. They have regular dealers, it is set up like you would set up a financial institution, with a head office and branch offices. We have a map there that is in evidence that they had showing where the headquarters are, with the red lines extending to every State in the Union to the branch offices. We found in Los Angeles there is a terrific traffic in that literature, we find it in every State, including my own State of North Dakota, where they have agencies set up, sending that filth to the youth of America.

Well, a little while ago Senator KEFAUVER appointed the Lions Club, at Bismarck, N. Dak., to give a verdict on a little over 1,000 exhibits. We have 25,000 or 30,000 letters sent in by parents that caught their children with this literature. Then we met this—a man comes up, he testifies that it is art, that there is nothing lewd or lascivious about it at all. So, you are met by the great problem of censorship. If you don't think that is a great problem, you face it. You see a movie, some organization may want to censor it, other organizations say it is all right. You find the same thing true about the lewd, lascivious literature. We get letters into the office from people who say they have been members of nudist camps, protesting most violently against our committee taking action on these pictures in certain magazines that are supposed to be sponsored by certain nudist organizations.

By far and large, the American people thoroughly understand what the traffic in these pictures and literature is doing to the youth of our country.

So, we have appointed a committee, we had before us the psychiatrists, the sociological workers—sometimes those fellows get confused, too—I get so confused I can't tell one from another. Sometimes I think the literature and pictures confuse them, when it comes to distinguishing one from another.

So, we asked this Lions Club, which is an outstanding organization in Bismarck, engaged now in putting on the Passion Play in the State of North Dakota—an outstanding organization, consisting of members of the supreme court, former attorneys general, a great many lawyers, bankers, insurance men, farmers, laborers—I think we are going to get a very good cross section—we are going to meet with them a week from Monday, get a jury of 160 men to not only pass upon the obscene literature and pictures, but to recommend legislation to the subcommittee, which in turn will recommend to the full committee, of which your distinguished Senator was formerly a member, to do everything we can to see it is wiped completely out.

J. Edgar Hoover thinks the only way to wipe it out is by education. The American Legion and all the other worthy organizations are working hand in glove with us. We have had the national officers of these various organizations in there, we have had their help and earnest cooperation, because they realize the terrific problems we are up against in this matter.

Now, finally, I don't want to be like WAYNE MORSE, who talked for 23 hours—it's wonderful how a fellow, even after he is out of the Senate, loves to talk and talk. The president is going to stop me—he said, "I stopped a fellow yesterday, I am going to stop you if you talk too long."

I want to say in closing that this matter of juvenile courts is one of the most important matters—it is one of the most important courts you can have in the State of West Virginia. There is a continuous fight in this—there are bills in to reduce the ages of those appearing before those courts, there is a fight to do away with the privacy—they want to have the reporters in there when a boy of 13 or 14 years of age is before the judge—they are continually trying to hamstring the juvenile courts.

Never let this happen in your State. The juvenile courts are doing a magnificent job all over America. Judge Ben Lindsey in Denver started us off right on that.

One of the more important witnesses we had before our committee was District Attorney Keating, of Denver. Due to him we passed a bill in the Senate, which provides that a father must support his dependents. Forty-nine fathers in Denver deserted their wives and children, went over into California, or the State of Washington, or over into Oregon, and then it was impossible to bring those men back. We have got a Federal law, already passed in the Senate, to bring those men who desert their family back and punish them. It is known as the "Run-away Fathers' Law." I don't think we will have any difficulty in getting it passed in the lower House—it has the backing of J. Edgar Hoover.

Some of the men marry again, without getting a divorce. Mr. Keating compiled a record to show how he tried to extradite the fellows, and how he failed. Another thing, though, because of the expense involved it is difficult. Then, sometimes they bring a fellow back, he and his wife become reconciled, and the wife wants to drop the prosecution.

We believe if we can enforce the Dyer Act, or if we can get convictions when a fellow sells a second-hand truck and it has a mortgage on it, you can enforce all the other laws which involve State lines. Most certainly the man that is a father and has a dependent wife, the Government should be able to take that man by the neck and say, "You have got to take care of those children."

I do want to, in closing, give you a statement by J. Edgar Hoover. As you perhaps have seen, he gives a number of cases. I know them almost by heart. During the year 1954 the FBI reported the arrest of 269,831 persons under the age of 21. These young people represent 72.6 percent of all persons arrested for auto theft, and 62.9 percent of all persons arrested for burglary. During 1954, 319 young people under the age of 21 were arrested for murder and manslaughter; 2,767 were arrested for aggravated assault, and 40,163 for larceny.

Mr. Hoover says, further, that only one-third of all cases involving those under 21 reach the courts, so you have got the record of nearly 1 million of them being arrested each year.

One more thing, I would like to give you the quotation of Charles Evans Hughes: "The Supreme Court of the United States and the courts of appeal will take care of themselves. Look after the courts of the poor, who stand most in need of justice. The security of the Republic will be found in the treatment of the poor and ignorant; in indifference to their misery and helplessness lies disaster."

I do want to say that applies to the juvenile courts—if you had made the investigations we have made, you would be battling for it, too.

I can't tell you how much I appreciate the splendid treatment given to me by your president, the pleasures he has afforded me. I remember when the Governor of Texas came to the State of North Dakota. I was going to give him a great, great welcome, so I got all of the service clubs together, we had perhaps 1,000 to greet him. Then I carried it to the extreme, I decided we ought to give him a governor's salute. President Roosevelt had changed that from 17 guns to 19 guns, and I thought that would make a nice welcome for the Governor of Texas. When the train rolled in, I instructed them to fire the cannon 19 times, I told them to "Make it a good one, let's show the Governor of Texas how much we appreciate his visit." Well, when the train rolled in the cannon went "boom," and broke all the plate glass windows on the main street of Bismarck, N. Dak. [Laughter.]

June Young, I want you all to know from the moment I arrived here you have made me feel completely at home, I feel I can talk to this group as if I were talking to the Bar Association of the State of North Dakota. Then when June got my old colleague to introduce me, that was the frosting on the cake.

I want to thank you for your graciousness and kindness, and I am going to take the phrase of the dean, and say to you that you are lawyers and gentlemen. Thank you. [Applause.]

President YOUNG. Senator LANGER, we are deeply grateful for your presence here today, and your address. I really have no apologies to make, I have been instructed by our executive council to streamline these meetings as much as possible. Truly, I didn't know what was in the bottles, they were sent up to you, if you could use them, fine. I want to tell you they haven't been touched yet. I hope they will be later. We can understand your success from your unlimited energy. I know from now on you will have many friends in West Virginia.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1956

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 13, 1956)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Frank Blackwelder, rector, All Souls Memorial Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Lift us, O Lord, to Thy presence, where we may be transformed by the renewing of our minds, that our thoughts may reflect Thy wisdom and our actions mirror Thy will.

Indwell in us today, enabling us to bring honor and glory to Thy holy name.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCNAMARA, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 14, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 13, 1956, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 578) for the relief of Edmund Lowe and Richard Lowe.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 253)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the United States Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 15, 1956.*

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. ELLENDER, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, and that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISIT BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF IRELAND, HON. JOHN A. COSTELLO

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I should like to announce that at 2:30 o'clock p. m., the Senate will take a recess to hear the Prime Minister of Ireland, the Honorable John A. Costello.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take up the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report a group of 47 nominations involving the promotion and assignment of general and flag officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force and ask that these nominations be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar, as requested by the Senator from Mississippi.

The nominations are as follows:

Brig. Gen. William E. Potter, Corps of Engineers, for appointment as Governor of the Canal Zone, vice Maj. Gen. John S. Seybold, United States Army, retired;

Maj. Gen. Edward Thomas Williams, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Earl Walter Barnes, and Maj. Gen. Frederic Harrison Smith, Jr., Regular Air Force, to be lieutenants generals, United States Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President;

Col. Francis William Billado, and sundry other officers, for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force for service as members of the Air National Guard of the United States;

Lt. Gen. Gerald C. Thomas, United States Marine Corps, to be lieutenant general on the retired list in the Marine Corps; and

Rear Adm. Walter F. Boone, and Rear Adm. Robert L. Dennison, United States Navy, for commands and other duties to be determined by the President.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I also report, from the Committee on Armed Services, a total of 1,167 routine nominations in grades from lieutenant to lieutenant colonel in the Army and Air Force. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk, for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Mississippi.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Laurence Walrath, of Florida, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Donald P. McPherson, of Pennsylvania, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Coast Guard be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the United States Coast Guard will be considered and confirmed en bloc.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey will be considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of all nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ENTITLED "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTION REPORT"

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report entitled "Research and Development Procure-

ment Action Report," for the period July 1 through December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT ON UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR IRAN

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on United States Assistance Program for Iran, International Cooperation Administration, Department of State, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS AND THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO RETAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES ARMORY IN SPRINGFIELD

Whereas the United States Department of Defense has announced that 799 employees of the United States Armory at Springfield will be dismissed from employment on or before June 30, 1956; and

Whereas these employees have devoted many years of faithful service to the production of material essential to the national defense; and

Whereas the skill of said employees in turning out implements of war cannot be duplicated elsewhere in any part of this Nation; and

Whereas said skill is of great importance in this critical period, and should not be permitted to be lost by the Department of Defense; and

Whereas the record of the Springfield Armory and its service to the country since its establishment as the first United States Arsenal has not been equalled by any other military-equipment installation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Department of Defense is hereby urged by the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts to conduct a survey of the needs of all military units, present and future, for the purpose of making every possible effort to retain all of the employees affected by this contemplated layoff, to the end that the defense of our country shall not be jeopardized by the loss of their important skills; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to each Member of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from Massachusetts, and to the Secretary of Defense.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 1702. A bill to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps; without amendment (Rept. No. 1662).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2267. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the city of Henderson, Nev.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1663).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. MALONE):

S. 3453. A bill to transfer certain Government-owned manganese ore facilities to the Secretary of the Interior, to provide for the erection of one or more beneficiation plants to treat manganese ores, to stimulate the production of certain strategic and critical minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 3454. A bill for the relief of Lampros Lazaridis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MALONE, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 3455. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of mica in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3456. A bill to establish a plan and appropriate procedures for the promotion of employees of the Government on the basis of merit; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3457. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey certain property to the county of Pierce, State of Washington; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3458. A bill to grant leaves of absence to homestead entrymen and to permit suspension of cultivation and improvement operations on homestead and desert land entries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

The following concurrent resolution was submitted and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. THYE):

S. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution favoring appropriate observance of National Hospital Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he submitted the above concurrent resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

TRANSFER TO SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MANGANESE ORE FACILITIES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "A bill to transfer certain Government-owned manganese ore facilities to the Secretary of the Interior, to provide for the erection of one or more beneficiation plants to treat manganese ores, to stimulate the production of certain strategic and critical minerals, and for other purposes." Joining with me in this measure are Senators ANDERSON, BIBLE, CASE of South Dakota, CHAVEZ, DIRKSEN, ERVIN, GOLDWATER, HAYDEN, HUMPHREY, JENNER, KEFAUVER, LANGER, MALONE, MANSFIELD, MAGNUSON, MARTIN of Iowa, MUNDT, SCOTT, and YOUNG.

Mr. President, this clearly is a bipartisan bill and one of the greatest importance to the Nation if we are to keep the domestic strategic minerals industry from closing down, and to keep an expanding mobilization base in these minerals as the President has indicated is desirable.

This bill takes a different approach from those previously introduced, its general principle being that of the Wool Act which has had White House approval.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief analysis of the bill be printed following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3453) to transfer certain Government-owned manganese ore facilities to the Secretary of the Interior, to provide for the erection of one or more beneficiation plants to treat manganese ores, to stimulate the production of certain strategic and critical minerals, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The analysis presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

ANALYSIS BY SENATOR MURRAY

This bill would—

1. Transfer title to stockpiled manganese ores (now unusable by reason of being subgrade in character) from the General Services Administration to the Department of the Interior;

2. Would direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue the purchase of manganese ores under existing General Services Administration promulgated regulations and specifications;

3. Would direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish two new manganese ore-purchasing depots to serve the Ozark-Cushman area and the southern Appalachian area;

4. Would direct the Secretary of the Interior, if in his opinion, there were no adequate private facilities for the beneficiation of manganese ores when available or under construction, to begin within 1 year after date of the enactment of this act, the construction of one or more beneficiation plants for the upgrading of all the forementioned ore stocks and purchases to make them suitable for the national stockpile or for sale on the open market; with proceeds from the sale or credits from transfer to the national stockpile being credited to the General Services Administration until such time as such Administration is recompensed for the ores which were in its possession at the time of the above-mentioned transfer of title;

5. Would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell under certain terms and conditions any beneficiation plant which may be established under provisions of the Act;

6. Would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the payment of a production bonus to any producer of tungsten, manganese, chromite, mica, asbestos, beryl, or columbium-tantalum-bearing ore or concentrate mined in the United States; such bonus to be equal to the difference between the market price at any given time and the price which has been prescribed by the ODM and GSA for each such mineral if, and when, any such purchase program of the ODM–GSA is terminated.

The provision that there be paid through the Department of the Interior the prescribed production bonus would be effective only if and when purchase programs affecting the seven listed minerals now covered by ODM–GSA purchase programs are terminated.

All authority conferred by the proposed bill would terminate at the close of June 30, 1961.

MERIT SYSTEM OF PROMOTION FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the record will show that I have long been a strong supporter of our career employees and the civil service merit system. Unfortunately, similar support has not been universal, for there has been a disposition in some quarters to discredit the civil service system and Government employees. We have noted, with great concern, efforts to wreck the merit system by adoption of procedures, issued from the White House, for the filling of positions by appointment or promotion on the basis of political endorsement.

I have waited and hoped that the Civil Service Commission, under its charter as chief architect and protector of the merit system, would step forward and offer a sensible, workable, and long overdue program for the promotion of Federal employees on the basis of merit. My hope has not been fulfilled, and the wait has been in vain, for no such move has been made, and it seems clear that none is to be expected.

However, I am hopeful the lack of attention by the Civil Service Commission to this very important matter is due to inertia, rather than opposition to a program for the promotion of employees on the basis of merit. I say that for the following good reason: no claim is being made that the program proposed, in the bill I am about to introduce, is complete or beyond improvement in every respect or minute detail. Therefore, should the Civil Service Commission recognize deficiencies in certain areas, I invite their cooperation to the end that they be overcome, and an acceptable program be developed and quickly enacted into law. I suggest on this occasion no useful purpose would be served by forwarding to the Congress a run-of-the-mine objection letter, in the event they are not in complete agreement with every little detail. Rather, it is hoped the Civil Service Commission will offer constructive suggestions.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a plan and appropriate procedures for the promotion of employees of the Government, on the basis of merit. An identical bill is being introduced today in the House by Representative JOHN E. MOSS, of California.

I am sending to the desk a statement explaining the provisions of the bill, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3456) to establish a plan and appropriate procedures for the promotion of employees of the Government on the basis of merit, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The explanation presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL

The purpose of this bill is to provide a plan and procedure for the promoting of Government employees to positions of increased responsibility on the basis of merit. While such a plan will in greater measure facilitate the placing of qualified employees in positions having greater responsibility, it will at the same time provide an appropriate incentive for employees to make the public service a career.

It is the normal desire of every employee to be accorded recognition for superior service, and after mastering the requirements of a particular position, to expect consideration for promotion to a higher position which will give him added responsibility and demand a higher degree of resourcefulness and competence. For the individual employee, this avenue of advancement is an incentive to do his job well and to make it possible to move on to another position in which he will be better paid and in which his capabilities will be better utilized. For the Government, a promotion program can produce the advantage of high employee morale and increased productivity.

In the absence of a well-defined policy and operating procedure under which all employees receive the consideration they deserve, promotions are too often made on the basis of political or personal favoritism. Opportunities for advancement are often awarded to those whose experience, training, or performance do not qualify them for more exacting assignments.

TITLE I

Title I is designed to establish a promotional system for positions in the executive branch of the Federal Government and of the government of the District of Columbia which are in the competitive civil service.

The bill provides for the creation of a Promotional Board in each Department and Agency to direct the operation of the promotional system. The Promotional Board will consist of a chairman designated by the Civil Service Commission and two other members selected jointly by the chairman and the head of the Agency in which the Board is to function.

It will be one of the responsibilities of each board to see to it that employees are informed of promotional opportunities. This feature of the program is of paramount importance, because it has been the unfortunate experience of many an employee that a position to which he might have aspired had been filled before he learned that a vacancy existed.

The examinations are, under terms of this bill, to be objective and give maximum weight to experience, length of service, and demonstrated ability. Written examinations will be required only to the extent that they may be necessary.

The bill sets forth in some detail the method to be used in grading examinations, and for appraising the education, experience, and other qualifications of persons who desire to be placed on promotional lists, and stipulates that the lists shall be established by grade or level of responsibility. The bill also describes the method of certification of eligibles from the promotional lists and of their selection for appointment.

A procedure is provided for appeal from the rating given in a promotional examination. An employee also may appeal if he feels that he has been prevented by a supervisor or a fellow employee from taking an examination or otherwise availing himself of the promotional procedure.

TITLE II

Title II is designed to establish a promotional system for positions in the Postal Field Service. The system is tailored to fit the special needs of the postal service just as title I is tailored to fit the needs of the Government exclusive of the postal service.

The Post Office Department now uses a form of examination for supervisory promotions. However, the system is not entirely satisfactory, first, because it is not compulsory that promotions be made according to the results of the examination, and, secondly, the examination fails to take into consideration some extremely vital factors.

The examination is concerned principally and primarily with the knowledge of regulations. This gives certain employees, who, through their daily work, are primarily concerned with studying the regulations, an advantage over other employees who are not required to keep constantly in touch with regulations. The examination fails to determine qualities of leadership which are the prime requisites of good supervisors. It also fails to give an employee credit for experience. Many junior employees who have recently come from school can, by a system of rote learning, secure better grades in this examination than experienced employees who over the years have developed many specific and particular skills.

A new type of examination which will have the force of law behind it is greatly needed in the postal service.

NATIONAL HOSPITAL WEEK

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution favoring appropriate observance of National Hospital Week. I ask unanimous consent to have a statement, prepared by me, explaining the concurrent resolution, printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 72) was received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas our Nation's hospitals are dedicated to the cause of protecting the lives and providing for the health needs of all our citizens; and

Whereas our National and State hospital associations have with diligence and unceasing efforts worked to provide the highest quality care for all Americans in the Nation's hospitals; and

Whereas American hospitals are the centers of community health services to our citizens; and

Whereas national recognition of the importance of hospitals in the American com-

munity has been celebrated annually since 1921 on the anniversary of Florence Nightingale's birth; and

Whereas our Nation's hospitals are vital to civil defense and natural disaster planning and efforts at all levels of government—Federal, State, and local; and

Whereas it is understood that the week beginning May 6th and ending May 12th will be observed as National Hospital Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby requests the people of the United States to join in proclaiming the importance of hospitals in the American community and their tradition of devoted service to the American people, and to cooperate in a voluntary effort to observe National Hospital Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The statement presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HILL

It is with some sense of personal pride that I am again privileged to say a few words about our Nation's hospitals. National Hospital Week, sponsored by the American Hospital Association, will be observed this year from May 6 through May 12. The sentiment awakened by our country's hospitals is a living force in the hearts of American men and women. It needs no awakening by fine writing or eloquence. This is as true today as it was almost 300 years ago when the first hospital was established in what was to become the United States. A traditional spirit of Christian devotion and service has ever been present in the development of this Nation's hospitals.

It is fitting and proper that the Nation should set aside a time in which to observe the importance to our people of the American hospital today. The chosen theme of this year's National Hospital Week is Your Hospital—For You and Your Community. During this week our hospitals will hold special observations emphasizing their role in community disaster planning. No one needs to belabor the importance of our community hospitals in meeting the challenges which come through unforeseen natural disasters. Whenever and wherever disaster has struck in our land, the American hospital has been at the center of action—providing shelter, medical, and nursing care for the injured.

Through the years our hospitals have developed community plans to cope with disaster problems. Too few of us, I am afraid, realize the important role played by our own hospitals in time of emergency. All too few of us recognize the debt we owe their people for the foresight and planning they have shown in preparing themselves to cope with emergency situations.

The hospital of today combines the skill and dedication of the physician, the tender care of the nurse and the devotion, training, and experience of pathologists, radiologists, and other medical specialists, and laboratory technicians, therapists, and all those others who devote themselves to the service of saving the lives of their fellowmen, and whose efforts are so skillfully coordinated through the modern hospital administrator.

Our hospitals have grown in number since 1658, from 1 to over 7,000. This in itself is remarkable. Yet we do not overlook the fact that 1 modern hospital of today is, to the people it serves, worth 7,000 of the hospitals which might have existed 300 years ago.

Too few realize that these complex centers, dedicated to fighting disease, to relieving human suffering and to preventing needless death, symbolize the new role which high quality patient care plays in the life of America. As hospitals in thousands of communities across the length and breadth of this land have improved and expanded in facility and function, they have become the heart and center of health activities in those communities.

It is fitting that the Nation grant recognition and express its gratitude to the institutions and to those men and women who devote themselves so faithfully and unselfishly to the health, the strength, and the happiness of the people of America.

I am today submitting, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] a concurrent resolution, whereby the Congress asks the people of the Nation to observe National Hospital Week by joining in proclaiming the importance of hospitals to the American community and in acclaiming their tradition of devoted service to our people.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—AMENDMENT

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators KEFAUVER, MUNDT, THURMOND, WILEY, DIRKSEN, MCCLELLAN, JENNER, IVES, ANDERSON, CHAVEZ, MURRAY, MANSFIELD, SPARKMAN, STENNIS, HILL, WILLIAMS, BYRD, BUTLER, WELKER, KNOWLAND, GEORGE, SMITH of New Jersey, FULBRIGHT, FLANDERS, MCCARTHY, KERR, GOLDWATER, THYE, ERVIN, CURTIS, CASE of South Dakota, SCHOEPPEL, HOLLAND, SMATHERS, BARRETT, YOUNG, HICKENLOOPER, CAPEHART, FREAR, DWORSHAK, HRUSKA, COTTON, MARTIN of Iowa, BIBLE, POTTER, BEALL, SCOTT, ALLOTT, BRICKER, BENNETT, ROBERTSON, MORSE, and WATKINS, I submit an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me in connection with the amendment may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement presented by Mr. DANIEL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DANIEL

On behalf of myself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. THURMOND, and 52 other Senators, I have submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 31, proposing an amendment to the Constitution, providing for the election of President and Vice President.

It is my understanding that Senate Joint Resolution 31 will be taken up early next week, and the proponents of this substitute are desirous that it be printed today in order that the other Members of the Senate will have an opportunity to study it.

Actually, the substitute conforms with the proposed changes in the electoral procedures recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, with certain changes which represent a compromise of the differences which have existed among several Members of the Senate who favor electoral reform.

For instance, for myself and 18 other Senators, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 31 as it was reported by the Judiciary Committee, and in that form it would provide that the electoral vote in each State would be divided among the candidates in proportion to the popular vote in each State. It was in exactly the same form as the Lodge-Gossett resolution which was approved by two-thirds of the Members of the Senate in 1950.

Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. THURMOND had introduced electoral reform resolutions which would accomplish practically the same result with slight changes in procedure. Mr. MUNDT introduced a resolution which would change the present electoral system by providing that the electors in each State shall be chosen in the same manner as its Senators and Representatives.

All of these proposals have a common purpose of improving the outmoded electoral system that we have today, under which the winner of the plurality vote receives the entire electoral vote of a State. This "winner-take-all" system means that hundreds of thousands of voters never have their votes represented or counted in the electoral vote of the States.

The authors of the various proposed changes have now composed their differences and hope that the intended substitute will receive the necessary two-thirds vote of the Senate.

In the course of the debate, we shall explain the proposed changes in Senate Joint Resolution 31 as reported by the committee, but briefly, they are as follows:

1. Senate Joint Resolution 31, providing for division of the electoral vote in each State in accordance with the popular vote, would be amended to provide that only the votes of the highest three candidates would be counted. This would help prevent splinter parties.

2. Any State which desired to do so could, by action of its legislature, provide for selection of electors in the same manner in which its Senators and Representatives are chosen, provided that they shall be required to vote for the candidate to whom they are pledged.

In other words, the present system of free and independent electors would be abolished, and the vote of the people would determine how each State's electoral vote is to be counted in the Electoral College. Under either of the alternative methods provided in the substitute, greater credit will be given to the individual voters in electing the President.

We hope that this amendment, in the nature of a substitute, will furnish common ground on which all Senators who are interested in electoral reform can join together and at least discharge the responsibility of the Senate in trying to improve our present outmoded system.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I merely wish to associate myself with the action taken by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] in submitting the amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 31; and I desire to join him in calling attention to this measure, and also to express our appreciation for the great number of Members of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, who in the past 24 hours have joined in sponsoring it.

I also desire to express a special word of appreciation of a new, hard-working recruit in this whole cause, in the person of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], who has expressed a great deal of interest in the matter and has done a great deal of work on it. It has been a pleasure to work with both Senator THURMOND and Senator DANIEL in the many long conferences on which we ultimately arrived at the substitute amendment introduced today. I hope and expect the Senate will adopt it by favorable floor action early next week.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the

RECORD an editorial in support of the proposed constitutional amendment. The editorial is entitled "A New Way," and was published in the Washington Daily News of today. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a very interesting explanatory story on electoral college reform, entitled "Electoral Reform Compromise Is Won," written by Charles Lucey, and also published in today's issue of the Washington Daily News. It provides much factual background on this whole important issue.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW WAY

Our hearty congratulations to Senators PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, and KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota.

Out of long labor and a spirit of constructive conciliation they have evolved a compromise proposal to change our antiquated system of electing the President and Vice President.

Neither Senator DANIEL nor Senator MUNDT will claim this is a perfect proposal. In fact, each sponsored a separate plan—both directed toward the laudable objective of making the choice of President and Vice President more responsive to the actual ballots cast by voters.

Senator DANIEL, with the backing of a large number of other Senators, favored a plan under which the electoral votes in each State would be divided in direct proportion to the popular votes cast in that State. Senator MUNDT, also backed by another formidable group, preferred a system by which electors would be chosen in the same way Members of Congress are chosen—two Senators for each State and one Representative for each congressional district.

The compromise they have worked out is one which would put the Daniel plan into effect in all States except those whose legislatures choose to adopt the Mundt formula.

From the beginning of this debate, which is now many years running, this newspaper has expressed the opinion that either plan would be preferable to the present system.

We believe the Daniel-Mundt compromise is also preferable to—and may be the only way to get rid of—our present system.

And get rid of it we should, for the health of our form of government.

For, under our present system, where the winner takes all electoral votes of a State, millions of voters never have their wishes recorded in the Electoral College. There is no incentive for a Republican in Georgia, or a Democrat in Vermont, to bother to go to the polls.

Under the present system, voters in less populous States are ignored and campaigns are weighed to gain pluralities in States with large electoral blocs. And too often, in those States, small pressure minorities can swing the balance.

That's why political party platforms so often neglect the Nation's larger interests in favor of vote-baiting promises offered to selfish groups. That's why no man from a small State, no matter how distinguished or superior he may be, is ever the nominee of either major political party.

If the Daniel-Mundt amendment is approved by two-thirds of the Senate and House and ratified by three-fourths of the States—and we earnestly hope something along this line will be—the vast majority of voters in all States, who belong to no ax-grinding clique, will have a much larger voice in choosing our President and Vice President.

It's too late to affect this year's election, but with proper action in Congress and the legislators, it could be operative 4 years from now.

ELECTORAL REFORM COMPROMISE IS WON

(By Charles Lucey)

Sponsors of reform of the antiquated electoral college system of choosing a President today announced agreement on a compromise measure to be introduced in the Senate in the next day or so.

Senators PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, Texas, and KARL MUNDT, Republican, South Dakota, chief proponents of the joint Senate-House resolution authorizing amendment of the Constitution, said they hoped it would be called up for action next week by Democratic Leader LYNDON JOHNSON. They predicted possage.

"None of the separate plans for electoral college reform could have mustered the two-thirds vote necessary for Senate passage," Senator DANIEL said, "so we all got together and composed our differences."

"I believe we now have a measure the Senate will accept," Senator MUNDT said.

ONE AMENDMENT

The agreed-upon measure brings together in one proposed amendment the two plans for electoral reform which heretofore have been opposed—the so-called Daniel-Kefauver bill, formerly the Lodge-Gossett amendment, and the Mundt-Coudert plan. Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Republican, New York, long-time advocate of modernizing the Presidential election, is the chief House sponsor.

The amendment would give the States a choice between the two chief plans as follows:

They could take the so-called Daniel-Kefauver plan, which would become the law in all States except where legislatures acted affirmatively to put the Mundt-Coudert plan into effect.

The Daniel-Kefauver plan says that each State's electoral vote "shall be apportioned among the three persons receiving the greatest number of votes of the voters of such State in the same ratio as the number of votes received by each person bears to the total number of votes received by such three persons."

SHARE

That is, each of the top three candidates seeking the Presidency would receive a share of every State's electoral vote in precise proportion to the share of his popular vote.

But if a State legislature so chooses, it may go to the Mundt-Coudert idea and provide for the choice of electors "in the same manner in which its Senators and Representatives are chosen."

There will be some opposition to the compromise, but Senators MUNDT and DANIEL already have lined up as cosponsors some of the most influential Members of the Senate.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, will offer as a substitute, when the measure reaches the floor, his own version of electoral reform. It provides for choice of a President by direct popular vote. But Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, South Carolina, author of still another electoral-reform proposal, is accepting the compromise and, with Senators MUNDT, DANIEL, and ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee, becoming one of its chief sponsors.

CONFERENCES

The compromise was achieved after weeks of conferences attended by Senators DANIEL, MUNDT, and THURMOND and legislative experts—and after many redrafts.

The new amendment would wipe out today's winner-take-all system in which a presidential candidate carrying any State, by no matter how narrow a margin, wins the total electoral vote of that State. Each State retains the same number of electoral votes it has today. But each State's electoral vote would be divided more nearly in accord with the popular will.

The amendment would not apply to the 1956 presidential election. To become part of the Constitution, it must receive a two-thirds vote in each House of Congress and ratification by 36 of the 48 States.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, in the statement I submitted a moment ago, for printing in the RECORD, I have said this—but I should like to state it on the floor at this time—namely, that the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I have just submitted and sent to the desk, has been worked out from the various versions of proposals for electoral-college reform, which have been introduced by myself and 18 other Senators, including the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. Our views have been composed; and we hope that two-thirds of the Members of the Senate will approve what we have worked out, in the way of much-needed electoral-college reform.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am delighted that we have been able to reconcile the differences in regard to the proposed legislation relating to the election of the President and the Vice President of the United States. I believe that 53 Senators are now cosponsors of the amendment in the nature of a substitute. We are very proud to feel that we have a chance to have this measure passed by the Senate at this session. It is one of the most important proposals that can come before the American people.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

Address by Senator SPARKMAN delivered over Mutual Broadcasting System on March 7, 1956, concerning recent announcement by the President of his availability as a candidate for reelection to the Presidency.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Statement by him on the struggle for freedom by the people of the Ukraine.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 3025, TO AMEND PARAGRAPH (2) OF SUBDIVISION (C) OF SECTION 77 OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 20, 1956, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 3025, to amend paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, at which time all interested persons may make such representations as are pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and myself, chairman.

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES P. NELSON

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I view the retirement of Representative CHARLES P. NELSON. He has served the Second Congressional District of Maine and the State of Maine in an outstanding and distinguished manner. He has served his country admirably, both in war and peace, with a brilliant military and congressional record. He has served his Republican Party well.

CHARLES NELSON has been a true friend to me. I knew that I could always count on him, for he never wavered in his proved friendship.

When he came to me several days ago and told me that he was planning to retire from Congress, because of his health, I was shocked. He asked me to keep his confidence until he had made his decision final and irrevocable, and told me that when he did, he would like to talk with me about his announcement. That he did today.

Possessed of a brilliant mind, he has been a pillar of strength and wisdom in the Maine congressional delegation, and I have been proud to have him as my successor in representing the Second District of Maine.

I wish for him a full recovery in his health and success and happiness in the future; and I hope that this will be only temporary retirement on his part, and that as soon as his health permits, he will return to public service and the political scene.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADMISSION OF MAINE INTO THE UNION

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, 136 years ago today Maine was admitted to the Union as a separate State. On March 3, 1820, President Monroe signed the Maine statehood bill, and on March 15 the Massachusetts Legislature effected the separation of the District of Maine from that State. This succession of events climaxed a long and concerted effort on the part of the citizens of Maine for recognized statehood.

During the past 136 years the State of Maine has risen to fulfill the hopes and expectations of her founding fathers. Her resources, natural beauty, fertile soil, and industrial potential have earned for her the right to be truly called the cornerstone of America. Her sons and daughters, imbued with the Yankee spirit of rugged individualism, have served the Union well in every institution of human endeavor.

Naturally I am proud of my home State, as is every Member of this great body; but my sentiments go much deeper than I can express here. If one could witness, as I have, the dawn breaking over our rocky coast, or the stillness of our snow-capped pine forests in winter, or the mighty sound of our rivers in spring, then one could just begin to realize how nature has favored the State of Maine.

Through the years millions of Americans have shared in the appreciation of Maine's natural beauty. They stand in awe and wonderment at the great diversities which lie between our mountains and the sea. And they come away having experienced the majesty of her lakes, her rolling farmlands, her tall forests, and the powerful drama of her coastline.

Today, Maine stands on the threshold of new and greater resource development. Her diversified industry is producing food and manufactured products which have long influenced the economy of New England. Her people are constantly seeking progressive ways to develop the State which they hold so dear in their hearts.

On this occasion of the 136th anniversary of the admission of the State of Maine into the Union, I salute her and commend her citizens, of whom I am truly proud to be one.

HUNGARIAN FREEDOM DAY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Saturday, March 17, Americans of Hungarian descent will be celebrating Freedom Day throughout our Nation.

The following statement which I have prepared in honor of this commemoration will be read Saturday at the patriotic exercises of the American Hungarians of the District of Columbia, and will be sent to my Hungarian friends in New Jersey:

It is indeed a real honor for me to be able to send these words of greetings to this fine group of Americans of Hungarian descent, who are celebrating this day as Freedom Day.

My personal interest in and affection for Hungary and its history go back many years. In 1928, I first had the privilege of visiting that country, and its capital city, Budapest. On that trip, I gained a real feeling of the spirit, the religious faith, and the love of freedom of the Hungarian people.

I did not visit Hungary again until 1947. The contrast was most tragic. The gay laughter, the open friendliness and happiness of the people had all but vanished as a result of World War II and the Communist occupation. I felt, nevertheless, that this tragedy had not caused any real change in the love that the people of Hungary have traditionally had for liberty.

Since 1947, the Communist hold on Hungary has become complete. The cruel suppression of freedom which exists in Hungary today is the result of Russian imperialism under the modern disguise of Soviet communism.

The George Washington of Hungary, Louis Kossuth, was not only a very great patriot and fighter for freedom; he also had an almost uncanny understanding of Hungary's powerful neighbor to the East, Russia.

Speaking in 1851 in Southampton, England, Louis Kossuth said:

"The principle of evil on the continent is the despotic and encroaching spirit of the Russian power * * * Russia is the rock which breaks every sigh for freedom."

Kossuth saw that the great struggle would be between freedom and tyranny, and how true his prophecy was. The tyranny he abhored is the very same tyranny we abhor today.

So today you are gathered to pay honor to the free Hungary of yesterday and to the Hungarian patriots who fought for freedom, not just in Hungary but also here in the United States.

It is my fervent hope that meetings such as this will help renew in Hungary the freedom and happiness which I saw there in 1928.

Here in America we have a hero, born in Hungary in 1724, who fought and died in our fight for freedom. I refer to Michael de Kovats, who fought under Washington. His motto was "Faithful Unto Death."

We must keep alive the spirit of free Hungary as represented in its heroes.

NAVY'S DECISION TO CALL GRADUATES OF STATE MARITIME ACADEMIES TO ACTIVE DUTY

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for approximately 4 or 5 minutes on a statement that I wish to make at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Maine may proceed.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on January 31, 1956, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee filed with the Senate a report on merchant marine training and education, pursuant to Senate Resolution 35. I had the honor to be a member of the special subcommittee which conducted the study.

As acting chairman of the subcommittee at the hearings held at various points along the east coast, I had the opportunity to become thoroughly informed concerning the need of the American merchant marine for new officers. The study clearly revealed that the merchant service annually requires 1,000 to 1,600 new officers. The merchant marine academies, both State and Federal, graduate about 450 officers a year, and the merchant marine can expect to get from 300 to 500 new officers from other sources each year.

From the foregoing, it is clear that the annual supply of trained merchant marine officers is not adequate to meet the demand. It goes without saying that the maintenance of an effective, efficient merchant service is a vital part of our national-defense program.

Last week it came to my attention that the Department of the Navy had decided to call all graduates of the State maritime academies, who were federally subsidized as students, to active duty for 3 years. The Navy has authority, under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, to take this action, but until now has not exercised the authority. For fiscal 1955 and 1956 the Navy was able to meet its requirements for new officers from normal sources, exclusive of the maritime academies. In looking into the reasons for the recent decision, I discovered that it was apparently based on a highly tentative estimate of requirements in fiscal 1957.

Of the 450 annual graduates of the maritime academies, somewhat over half are federally subsidized. So, by its recent decision the Navy would get about 225 officers yearly, except that the decision did not apply to Kings Point. As a result the number of officers the Navy could expect to receive from this source is under 200 men.

With regard to the Navy's decision, two significant facts should be mentioned. The first is that since the decision pertains only to the State academies and not to the Federal Academy at Kings Point, it appears to unfairly discriminate

against the State academies. Secondly, when the Navy takes State maritime academy graduates, it is taking officers whose education was financed largely by the State and from their own pockets, the Federal subsidy being somewhat less than half the cost of their training. On the other hand, the cost of training at Kings Point is fully paid by the Federal Government.

At the present time there is proposed legislation pending which might affect this subject. I refer to S. 1748, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], my colleague. The Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 abolished the midshipmen Merchant Marine Reserve of the Naval Reserve. Since that time the Navy has been appointing students at both the State and Federal academies as officer candidates, rather than as midshipmen. Apparently the Navy feels that it is obliged to call officer candidates to active duty, while it was not obliged to call midshipmen of the Merchant Marine Reserve. S. 1748 was passed by the Senate last July, and is presently pending before the House Armed Services Committee. It would reinstate the midshipmen Merchant Marine Reserve of the Naval Reserve, but the Navy would still have legal authority to call maritime academy graduates to active duty.

In view of the very damaging effect, the Navy's decision to call all graduates of State maritime academies for 3 years of active duty will have on the American merchant marine, it seems to me that it would be more appropriate for overall considerations of national defense for the Navy to continue to meets its officer needs from normal sources. In the Officer Candidate School at Newport, R. I., the Navy has a very flexible mechanism by which it can adjust its supply of officers to the demand on relatively short notice.

It has been my purpose to call to the attention of the Senate what I consider to be a very dangerous situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a letter of protest which I recently sent to the Chief of Naval Personnel be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 8, 1956.

Vice Adm. J. L. HOLLOWAY,
United States Navy,
Chief of Naval Personnel,
Department of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ADMIRAL HOLLOWAY: It has recently come to my attention that the Navy Department, in a letter from the Chief of Naval Personnel to the heads of the Departments of Naval Science at the four State maritime academies, dated February 27, 1956, serial Pers-B6262-raa, has announced its decision to exercise its legal authority to require all federally subsidized graduates of the State maritime academies to serve 3 years of active duty in the Navy immediately upon graduation.

The action of the Navy Department in this matter is directly contrary to the policy that has been followed in recent years. Until the letter referred to above was issued, State maritime academy graduates were going on active duty on a purely voluntary basis.

As a member of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction over the maritime academies, both State and Federal, I was appointed last year to a special subcommittee to make a thorough study of merchant marine training and education. As acting chairman of the subcommittee, I held extensive hearings at the east coast academies, and in Portland, Boston, and Washington. The subcommittee filed its report in January, which was adopted by the full committee and submitted to the Senate. A copy of this report is attached.

In consequence of the wealth of information gathered by the special subcommittee, I am very well informed as to the need of the American merchant marine for well-trained officers. The study clearly established that the merchant marine requires between 1,000 and 1,600 newly licensed officers each year. On the average, the four State maritime academies and the Federal academy graduate about 450 officers each year. On the basis of a highly optimistic estimate no more than 500 new officers come into the merchant marine each year from nonacademy sources. From this it can readily be seen that the supply of trained officers in the merchant marine is inadequate to meet the demand.

Of the 450 annual graduates of the maritime academies, somewhat over half are federally subsidized students and come under the authority of the Navy to serve on active duty. It would seem to go without saying that if the supply of trained officers is already inadequate to meet the needs of the merchant service, a further reduction in excess of 225 annually will have an extremely damaging effect.

I am advised that for fiscal 1955 the Navy required 10,488 new officers and that requirement was fully met from what might be termed normal sources, that is principally the Naval Academy, the NROTC, the OCS program, and the ROC program. The maritime academies were not a source of active duty naval officers beyond the voluntary service of individuals. For fiscal 1956, I am informed that the Navy expects to require about 11,668 new officers and that this need will be met from the normal sources exclusive of the maritime academies.

The present decision to call all maritime academy graduates under the Navy's jurisdiction to active duty appears to be based on the very tentative estimates of needs for fiscal 1957. In view of the severe damage that would be done to the merchant marine, it would seem that if the Navy expects to require a significantly greater number of new officers in fiscal 1957 and after, serious considerailon should be given to expanding the existing normal sources of naval officer supply, particularly the OCS program, since it appears to be the most flexible.

The fact that the recent letter did not apply to the Federal Maritime Academy at Kings Point is a cause of some concern to me. If it is necessary for the Navy to call up maritime academy graduates, it does not seem fair or appropriate that graduates of King's Point should be excluded.

In view of the foregoing, I wish to strongly urge that the Bureau of Naval Personnel carefully reconsider its decision to call maritime academy graduates to active duty. The need to maintain a strong, efficient merchant marine goes without saying and the recent decision of the Bureau of Naval Personnel will do incalculable harm to this vital segment of our National Defense Establishment.

It will be appreciated if the Bureau of Naval Personnel will review this matter at the earliest opportunity and advise me of its views.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
United States Senator.

INTEGRATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may speak for 5 or 6 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish with all my heart that the Senators and Members of the House had not felt impelled to issue their manifesto on the Supreme Court's decisions in regard to integration in the public schools. That it is responsive to the present feelings of many people in the Southern States, I do not doubt. That the feeling of the moment will pass, I am equally certain.

For it is inconceivable at this point in our history that the American people should refuse to accept the determination of our Supreme Court on a question involving the interpretation of the Constitution. And it is inconceivable also that the American people can fail to recognize the essential rightness of these decisions from the standpoint of simple justice and good conscience.

Yet, despite its expressed appeal for moderation, the effect of the manifesto can only be to incite further resistance and inflame a situation already difficult.

Like other Americans, I have been increasingly distressed by developments in some of our States since the Supreme Court decisions on public school integration. The decisions were indeed far-reaching, and would require great changes in many of our States. This was recognized by the Supreme Court in its unanimous decisions on the issue on May 17, 1954, and, a year later, in its implementation decree.

Some persons have interpreted the Supreme Court decision as requiring integration in our public schools immediately. But in truth, the Court has taken a reasonable position, recognizing fully the difficulties involved. It has asked only that a reasonable start be made with all deliberate speed. It has not asked for integration of our public schools overnight.

Obviously, the period of adjustment to the Court's decree is a time for all Americans to demonstrate the fullest measure of patience and understanding. Instead, this trying period has been made immeasurably more difficult by intemperate statements by persons on both sides of the argument and by extremist actions. Economic reprisals, job dismissals, work stoppages, and even threats of mob violence, have fed the fires of discord. Ours is a nation under law. There is no room for violence in our land.

My heart goes out to the decent, moderate men and women of good will who have recognized the magnitude of the problem and have endeavored to meet it in an earnest way. These people are being caught in a squeeze from both sides. And, if the pressures continue, if men of moderation are forced into silence while the extremists take over, the con-

sequences will be tragic for us all, white or Negro, North or South.

The achievement of better race relations is a problem not confined to a few States; it is a matter national in scope. The way in which integration of the public schools is handled in the South must inevitably affect the course of racial relations throughout the rest of the country; and, indeed, it will have a strong bearing on our drive to rally the nations of the world toward freedom and the democratic way of life.

Many of our States have made substantial strides despite the tremendous obstacles involved. Even in Southern States, where admittedly the obstacles are greatest, several States have made real progress. The leaders of the States of Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia should be commended for their progress.

Mr. President, it is particularly saddening that even in some of the other States where progress has been made toward integration, the pressures of extremists have pushed public figures into a position that spells retrogression in race relations throughout the country. This is most regrettable, since it is their very leadership that is so essential to the working out of this great problem.

Ahead of us lie many very difficult questions, of which the school-construction program is only one. Their resolution may become at least temporarily impossible if we cannot approach them in a spirit of reason and moderation. It will take a willingness, on the one hand, to accord the respect due the law of the land, and, on the other, an understanding of the special problems that are raised in some areas.

Those of us who have the high honor to sit in the Senate of the United States have a special responsibility and obligation.

Whatever our individual views, we are all agreed, I am sure, that nothing would be more harmful to the interests of the country as a whole, nothing more destructive of the whole fabric of our way of life, than for extremism to gain full sway. And I submit that there has been a dangerous trend in this direction.

The problems that preoccupy some of our Southern States are real. The answers will not be easy. But I do not believe the problems are inherently insoluble.

Our children, wherever they live, and whatever their color or race, take the same pledge of allegiance to "one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." Implicit in this, I believe, is our pledge not just to refrain from overt defiance of the law, but to accept in good faith the workings of our constitutional processes.

As a closing word, let me urge that we—on both sides of the aisle—give this problem the earnest, dispassionate attention which it deserves. Let us each, in every way open to us, make clear that the extremists will not have their way, that men of good will and moderate temper can and will work out the problems involved in complying with the law if they really want to do so.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from New Jersey upon his very fine statement, which is characteristic of him, because it shows his sensitivity to the human problems which he has discussed. I take pleasure in associating myself with the sentiments which are reflected in the very fine statement which the Senator has made today.

If it is agreeable to the Senator, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the text of the statement which President Eisenhower made yesterday. It was reprinted in full in the Washington Post and Times Herald. In a general way, it shows that the President is quite sympathetic toward the philosophy and views which our distinguished friend from New Jersey has expressed.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I thank my colleague. Of course, I am honored to have the President's statement printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF STATEMENT

President Eisenhower was asked at a White House press conference yesterday what he thought his executive responsibility is in connection with the manifesto issued by Southern Congressmen on the Supreme Court's desegregation decision. The text of his answer follows:

"Now, the first thing about the manifesto is this: That they say they are going to use every legal means. No one in any responsible position anywhere has talked nullification because—and there would be a place where we get to a very bad spot for the simple reason I am sworn to defend and uphold the Constitution of the United States and of course, I can never abandon or refuse to carry out my own duty.

"But, let us remember that the Supreme Court itself talked about emotionalism in this question, and it was for that reason that it said, 'Progress must be gradual.'

"Now, let us not forget there has been some progress. I believe there is something on the order of more than a quarter of a million of Negro children in the border and some Southern States who have been integrated in the schools, and except for a certain area in which the difficulties are greatest, there has been progress.

"As a matter of fact, there was not long ago a decision by the Supreme Court of Texas to the general effect that anything in the laws or in the constitution of the State of Texas that was in defiance of the Constitution of the United States was null and void.

"So, let us remember that there are people who are ready to approach this thing with the moderation, but with the determination to make progress that the Supreme Court asked for.

"If ever there was a time when we must be patient without being complacent, when we must be understanding of other people's deep emotions, as well as our own, this is it.

"Extremists on neither side are going to help this situation, and we can only believe that the good sense, the commonsense, of Americans, will bring this thing along, and the length of time I am not even going to talk about; I don't know anything about the length of time it will take.

"We are not talking here about coercing, using force to, in a general way; we are simply going to uphold the Constitution of the United States, see that the progress made as ordered by them is carried out.

"Now, let us remember this one thing, and it is very important: The people who have this deep emotional reaction on the other side were not acting over these past three generations in defiance of the law. They were acting in compliance with the law as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States under the decision of 1896.

"Now, that has been completely reversed, and it is going to take time for them to adjust their thinking and their progress to that. But I have never yet given up my belief that the American people, faced with a great problem like this, will approach it intelligently and with patience and with understanding, and we will get somewhere; and I do deplore any great extreme action on either side."

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL MEMORIAL PARK, N. DAK.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1529) to revise the boundaries of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes, which were, on page 4, line 6, after "meridian" insert *"Provided,* That the lands and improvements thereon located in block 6 in the village of Medora now administered and used by the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, shall not become a part of the park pursuant to this section until such time as they are transferred to the Department of the Interior by the Secretary of Agriculture"; on page 4, strike lines 7 through 16; and on page 5, line 11, strike out all after "be" down through and including "States" in line 13, and insert "transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture for administration or disposition in accordance with title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommends that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives, and I so move.

The motion was agreed to.

NATURAL GAS REGULATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, many persons recognize that the President's veto of the Harris-Fulbright bill has saved essential protections for natural gas consumers, at least in the immediate future. For this great public service we are most thankful.

It would be a grave error, however, for those who have defended the consumer interest to assume that they can now safely withdraw from the battle lines because their war is won.

Before the ink was even dry on the veto, there were signs that the battle would be renewed in the next Congress. The veto itself, endorsing the principles of the bill, seemed to invite another try. The President's repetition

of one of the oil industry's favorite—but exploded—public relations themes about regulation discouraging exploration, was also an encouragement to a future legislative effort, free from arrogant pressures or careless bobbles. And the statements of proponents confirmed the belief that new efforts will be made.

But the Oil and Gas Journal, a leading publication of the industry's point of view, in its issue of February 27, 1956, provides the clearest warning to those consumer defenders who may have believed they could now relax.

In its editorial of that date the Oil and Gas Journal stated:

Another gas bill will be enacted eventually. How favorable it is to producers will depend in large measure on how well the industry succeeds in living down the wild charges of its enemies and particularly in quieting the unjustified fears of its customers and their spokesmen.

The only thing we can do now is to start all over again, pick up the broken pieces, recast our strategy, and resolve to win next time.

In a round-up article it further revealed that the industry is already proceeding with its plans for a new bill, although it does not mention the President's suggestion of better consumer protections:

Industry leaders already have held at least one meeting to begin laying the groundwork for a new legislative attempt in the next Congress. Support for such a move will be sought immediately.

The two industrywide groups which have worked for the bill—the General Gas Committee and the Natural Gas and Oil Resources Committee—probably will be continued but may be reorganized and reoriented.

The new bill probably will be substantially the same as the one vetoed. Producers feel that they went as far as they can go in meeting consumer objections when they accepted the Harris bill.

The article also candidly reveals that the Federal Power Commission will probably now face extensive legal battles from gas producers and the harassment of the "devices for thwarting" utility rate regulation:

Producers will fight FPC with every means at their command. Already some 40 cases are pending in Federal courts, challenging specific FPC orders. These will be prosecuted and many more filed. The ensuing legal snarl may prove to be a further demonstration that the present law is unworkable.

Producers who have no alternative to selling gas in interstate commerce can do little but rely on their lawyers and accountants when their prices come under FPC review. The intricacies of utility rate fixing—and the devices for thwarting it—are a fine art.

The article suggests that producers may also find a way of throwing their costs of exploring for and producing oil into the rate base for gas.

Another ray of hope is that in two recent cases FPC hinted that it may consider the entire business of a producer in determining his costs as a basis for gas prices, instead of looking only at the costs in a single well or lease. This, if carried to its logical conclusion, would permit an operator to throw in his costs of exploring for and producing oil instead of having to separate the costs of his gas sales.

Obviously there will be plenty of work ahead to protect natural gas consumers from the resourceful and unremitting pressures of this powerful industry. For the information of Members and of Federal Power Commissioners, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and article from the Oil and Gas Journal of February 27, 1956, be printed in their entirety at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO FIGHT BACK UP FROM THE GAS DEFEAT

As a stunned industry begins to pick itself up from the floor, blind rage and frustration over veto of the gas bill gradually give way to reason and to coherent thought for the future.

We are like a football team that outplayed the opposition all through the game only to lose by a fumble on the goal line in the last minute of play. Now we must plan the next game to avoid fumbles and penalties and to pile up such an early lead that victory won't hinge on a single mistake.

We won a "moral victory" in that now the President agrees with the industry and with a majority of Congress that the present law will discourage production of gas. During the ensuing months we can do many things to impress that truth on people who have refused to believe it.

The veto was illogical and unfair. It endorsed the bill as in the public interest but killed it to punish the political methods of a few of its supporters. This emphasizes that in our future actions and legislative battles we must become more politically minded, more skilled in the fine art of winning the favor of masses of voters.

This can't be done by the old-style, heavy-handed, brass-knuckle political action of the type which caused this veto, and people who insist on playing this way must be kept off the team. Nor will a public-relations campaign of the purely propaganda type do the job.

To get the gas bill through again—and to win other legislative battles—we must build up greater public faith in and respect for our industry as a whole. This means we must live right and get credit for it.

Today the industry is more maligned and suspect than it has been for many years. The excesses, vulgarities, and foolish actions of a very few individuals make the public think that the industry is made up entirely of arrogant oil barons. This has more weight in influencing political action than all the right and justice on the credit side of the ledger.

Time will heal this some, but the curvative process can be speeded by vigorous industry action to demonstrate it is entitled to public trust, else an arsonist may again burn down the house to get rid of a few rats.

Another gas bill will be enacted eventually. How favorable it is to producers will depend in large measure on how well the industry succeeds in living down the wild charges of its enemies and particularly in quieting the unjustified fears of its customers and their spokesmen.

The only thing we can do now is to start all over again, pick up the broken pieces, recast our strategy, and resolve to win next time.

WHERE DO GAS PRODUCERS GO FROM HERE?

These things seem clear:

1. There will be no attempt to override the Presidential veto.

2. There is only the remotest chance of another attempt to enact legislation in this Congress.

3. Next year another bill quite likely will be passed, but it might be less favorable to producers.

4. Oil's public relations have been set back many years. More of the public will now believe that oilmen are arrogant, unprincipled, and filthy rich. There may be recriminations against the industry in other legislation, such as depletion.

5. The Federal Power Commission is not yet sure how the existing law will be applied. In the next few weeks it must decide many cases it has held up in anticipation of a new law. The Commission is divided as to what course to take.

6. Gas producers will press new legal arguments before FPC and the courts to stave off the more extreme forms of public-utility regulation. A number of approaches are being discussed.

7. Producing States may try to offset Federal control and keep gas out of interstate commerce.

Work already has begun toward another attempt to enact natural-gas legislation similar to the Harris-Fulbright bill.

But for at least a year the industry will:

Operate in a state of confusion and uncertainty.

Hold back on developing gas for interstate sale.

Grope for ways of living under FPC regulation.

Industry leaders already have held at least one meeting to begin laying the groundwork for a new legislative attempt in the next Congress. Support for such a move will be sought immediately.

The two industry-wide groups which have worked for the bill—the general gas committee and the natural gas and oil resources committee—probably will be continued but may be reorganized and reoriented.

The new bill probably will be substantially the same as the one vetoed. Producers feel that they went as far as they can go in meeting consumer objections when they accepted the Harris bill.

IT'S POSSIBLE IN 1956

There is a bare chance that a new bill may be brought up in Congress later this year—after the current congressional and grand jury investigations of lobbying and campaign contributions. But Members of Congress who supported the Harris-Fulbright measure say that the White House will have to do all the pushing for the bill next time.

Senators DOUGLAS and PASTORE have offered to work for early passage of their proposal to exempt smaller gas producers from Federal regulation.

Producers are encouraged by Eisenhower's statement that the present law will discourage incentives to explore and will limit supplies of gas. This vindicates the statement they have been making all along. But they are not considering pressing for reconsideration soon because, as one of them expressed it, no Government official wants to be seen talking to an oilman.

REPUTATION DAMAGED

It is the black eye given the entire industry that worries oilmen as much as loss of the decontrol bill.

They fear that the entire industry will be completely suspect in the public mind and that it will not be able to get favorable treatment or even a fair hearing in future legislation.

To offset this, some oilmen are suggesting that the industry take a new look at its whole approach to public relations.

The gas shortage which even the President foresees could be felt within the year. Some gasmen freely predict that interstate pipelines will find it extremely difficult to sign up new reserves.

It is understood that several substantial deals committing gas to interstate lines were

ready to be signed immediately after the Harris bill became law. Presumably these will now be suspended.

A number of producing companies are known to have arranged their 1956 drilling programs so that they would concentrate on exploration and development of gas if freed from Federal regulation, but to stick to oil development otherwise. Last year drilling for gas declined sharply while oil-well completions went up. This trend is likely to continue.

STATES MAY ACT

Many think the regulatory bodies of the producing States will use their conservation powers to throw roadblocks in the way of expansion of interstate gas sales.

The attorney general of Texas has suggested a special session of the legislature to enact "interposition"—a device of doubtful constitutionality by which the State presumes to assert its sovereignty against Federal encroachment.

Short of this, however, there are many things which State conservation commissions might do to reduce the supply of gas available to interstate markets or to protect producers against confiscatory low prices—at least temporarily.

One such is to require more cycling of gas—putting it back into the reservoir to aid in oil production and thus forestalling its sale until the oil is depleted.

One observer expects the chief producing States to require that not less than 50 percent of all casinghead gas be returned to the producing formation.

Now that interstate sales of gas threaten to penalize a producer, this man foresees a sudden big interest in repressuring on the part of many who formerly claimed this would injure the reservoir.

WHAT ABOUT THE FPC?

The veto catches the Federal Power Commission as short as the gas producers.

It has no definite program for proceeding with regulation of producers in the manner apparently envisioned by the Supreme Court's decision in the Phillips case.

One of the 5 Commissioners is inactive because of illness. Two of the others are convinced that public-utility regulation cannot be applied to gas producers as a practical matter. One of the others apparently takes the opposite view, and the remaining member seems to be undecided.

This puts the Commission under the influence of its staff, many of whom are steeped in the traditions of utility regulation and are unfamiliar with oil and gas production.

Hence there is little anticipation that the Commission will issue broad policy statements clarifying producers' position. Instead, there is general expectation that FPC will proceed hesitantly, case by case. Its forthcoming decisions may point toward complete regulation of producers' costs but be couched in language sufficiently ambiguous to permit the Commission to switch its direction later if expedient.

Producers will fight FPC with every means at their command. Already some 40 cases are pending in Federal courts, challenging specific FPC orders. These will be prosecuted and many more filed. The ensuing legal snarl may prove to be a further demonstration that the present law is unworkable.

Producers who have no alternative to selling gas in interstate commerce can do little but rely on their lawyers and accountants when their prices come under FPC review. The intricacies of utility-rate fixing—and the devices for thwarting it—are a fine art.

THERE'S STILL HOPE

But there is one possible way out. FPC seems eager to listen to suggestions for an alternative to the utility cost formula for determining producers' prices.

A utility's rates are based on wasting assets—a "disappearing rate base." FPC recognizes that oil and gas producers must necessarily have a return based on increasing assets—that the cost of staying in business is a big item and that they must plow back income to maintain the supply of gas.

How to write this into a price-fixing formula—how to cover exploration, dry-hole, and similar costs—is the big problem if the present law is to be applied.

A start toward a possible solution has been made by several producing companies working separately on an economic approach which would develop a "cost of service" formula. No such formula has yet been presented to FPC in a specific price case, but the idea is expected to pop up soon in some of the hundreds of cases now before the Commission. Those who have been working on the formula say it promises to give producers legally a much higher wellhead price than many now get.

FPC itself made a try at something like this in the Panhandle Eastern rate case when it allowed a fair field price for gas produced by a pipeline. But a Federal circuit court disapproved and sent the case back to FPC with instructions to try a different approach. FPC is preparing to ask reconsideration, and failing that may appeal to the Supreme Court.

Another ray of hope is that in two recent cases FPC hinted that it may consider the entire business of a producer in determining his costs as a basis for gas prices, instead of looking only at the costs in a single well or lease. This, if carried to its logical conclusion, would permit an operator to throw in his costs of exploring for and producing oil instead of having to separate the costs of his gas sales.

This would make every well a gas well, in a sense, and would bring Federal regulation closer to the oil business. But it might function to prevent some producers' gas sales being priced at zero—or less—under a strict utility formula, and thus save the neck of the industry until new legislation finally is enacted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Congress and consumers should also take warning about the possible failure of gas-rate regulation by the Federal Power Commission revealed in the very searching examination of the Commission by Representative SIDNEY R. YATES, of Illinois, on February 20, before the independent offices appropriations subcommittee and in his brief and able speech to the House on March 6.

Representative YATES points out that the Commission is dragging its feet on effective producer regulation, and that if the Commission applies the so-called field value ratemaking formula with which it is obviously flirting, it will give the gas producers substantially what they were seeking to obtain by the Kerr bill in 1950 and by the Harris-Fulbright bill, recently vetoed.

I ask unanimous consent that the comments on this development by that watchful columnist, Thomas L. Stokes, in the Washington Evening Star for March 8, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRANGE SEQUEL TO GAS BILL STORY—FPC ATTITUDE MAY VIRTUALLY NULLIFY EFFECT OF VETO BY EISENHOWER

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Even Presidents of the United States have their troubles in trying to protect the consumer.

We call up the case of President Eisenhower in another chapter of the fantastic natural-gas story. The effect of his veto of the natural-gas bill, which was in the interest of the consumer, is in danger of being virtually nullified as was the veto in the previous administration of a similar gas bill by President Truman.

At least this was the warning to the House of Representatives this week by Representative SIDNEY YATES, Democrat, of Illinois, who is very familiar with the subject. His warning was based on questions by himself and other members of the House Appropriations Committee directed at officials of the Federal Power Commission which is supposed to regulate natural-gas producers and protect the consumer. The FPC attitude was sought during the course of hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill which carries appropriations for the FPC, among other agencies.

The story is perhaps best told in chronological order to get the full futility of a merry-go-round of bureaucracy.

Let's begin back with President Truman who, you may recall, vetoed the Kerr bill which would have exempted producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission. Subsequently the FPC virtually put the bill into effect anyhow, despite the veto, by its decision in the now famous Phillips petroleum case in which it held, 4 to 1, that it did not have power to regulate producers of natural gas.

This case got into the courts and ultimately reached the Supreme Court, which held that the FPC was required to regulate producers under the 1938 Natural Gas Act. That was nearly 2 years ago. You would think that the FPC would then do something about regulating producers. But no, it has done practically nothing, according to Mr. YATES.

Now comes another chapter in this serial story of bureaucratic frustration of the consumer. Enter once more the same big oil interests that promoted the Kerr bill. They put their high-priced lobby in this Congress behind the Harris-Fulbright bill designed, as was the Kerr bill, to exempt natural gas producers from FPC regulation. You know how it was finally passed recently and how President Eisenhower vetoed it because of the "arrogant" attitude of the oil lobby and its failure to protect consumers. The lobby was dramatically brought to public attention, and to the President's, by the revelation by Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican of South Dakota, of operations of a peripatetic lobbyist for the Superior Oil Company of California.

Now along comes Mr. YATES to disrupt the complacency of natural gas consumers who, he said, are "sadly mistaken" if they think the President's veto of the natural gas bill has protected consumers. Said he to the House:

"Whatever good may have accrued from Mr. Eisenhower's rejection of that bill is being destroyed by either the inaction or refusal of the Federal Power Commission to regulate the natural gas companies. Perhaps the commission is waiting until next year, hoping for passage again of the Harris-Fulbright bill before it takes action it is required to take under the Natural Gas Act.

In fact, 4 of the 5 FPC commissioners testified in favor of the Harris-Fulbright bill when it was before Congress, which shows how the Commission is stacked against the consumer. This only illustrates once again what has been repeated by this reporter over and over: Federal commissions can administer laws passed by Congress in the public interest or they can in effect repeal them. That depends on the personnel. The FPC now is heavily weighted in favor of interests it is supposed to regulate, which explains why it is "dragging its feet," as Mr.

YATES put it, in regulation of the natural gas industry.

Mr. YATES tried in vain to find out why the FPC still has not worked out procedures to regulate the natural gas producers, for which it has had nearly 2 years since the Supreme Court decision. All he got was this reply from Commissioner Seaborn L. Digby:

"We have made no definite policy determination."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, while the President's veto of the Harris-Fulbright bill was widely acclaimed, editorials in many responsible newspapers expressed regret that he stated that he was in accord with its basic objectives. Others supported his earlier expressions of the need to protect consumers with only one source of supply, and the final sentence of the veto where he also stressed better consumer protections. A number hoped that he would study the dangers to consumers in any future bill more carefully. Such representative papers as the New York Times, the Washington Post and Times Herald, the Nashville Tennessean, the Philadelphia Inquirer, the Louisville Courier-Journal, the Chattanooga Times, the Hartford Courant, the Detroit News, the Milwaukee Journal, the Raleigh News and Observer, the Christian Science Monitor, and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, were among those expressing these views. For the information of Members of Congress and of the leaders in the executive branch, I ask unanimous consent that editorials from the papers named be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 18, 1956]

VETO ON NATURAL GAS

President Eisenhower's veto yesterday of the natural-gas bill was based on the highly questionable activities of proponents of the measure that have achieved wide attention in the last 2 weeks. The public conscience has been so shocked by what one brief senatorial inquiry has already brought out and so alarmed by what another and longer one gives promise of bringing out that the legislation had become tainted in the minds of many, and the case for a veto became stronger than ever.

The President himself was obviously disturbed by the revelations and the implications arising from the furious lobbying on behalf of this important and controversial piece of legislation. The efforts of some of the lobbyists, he said in unusually sharp language, "I deem to be so arrogant and so much in defiance of acceptable standards of propriety as to risk creating doubt among the American people concerning the integrity of governmental processes. Since the Department of Justice is now investigating the situation, he felt he could not sign the measure while it was still under this heavy cloud. We believe the President's decision was not only morally correct but also politically wise.

However, we regret that the President did not veto this bill on its merits as well. He specifically says that he is "in accord with its basic objectives," that it is needed, and that the present law is harmful both to individual initiative and to consumer interests. While recognizing that this is a matter of opinion, we believe the President is mistaken. Even in praising the bill he himself proposed one far-reaching amendment that would in fact greatly improve it from the consumers' viewpoint. But we would urge him, in the interval he has achieved by his veto, to reexamine the premises and the principles of this measure, and to reconsider his presently favorable opinion of the legislation as a whole.

Meanwhile the promised senatorial inquiry into the pressures that were exercised on behalf of the natural-gas bill should be pursued relentlessly, irrespective of where the trail may lead. We trust that Senator GORE, able chairman of the subcommittee, will spare no feelings and pull no punches.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 18, 1956]

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

By vetoing the natural-gas bill President Eisenhower has once more demonstrated his unusual sensitivity to the temperament of the country. Like a great majority of his fellow citizens, the President is indignant over the unscrupulous methods by which some sponsors of the gas bill sought to grease its way through the Senate. "These include efforts," he said, "that I deem to be so arrogant and so much in defiance of acceptable standards of propriety as to risk creating doubt among the American people concerning the integrity of governmental processes."

The Presidential veto is the more striking because the President approves of the basic objectives of the bill. In this matter we do not share the President's view. We have not been impressed by the argument of proponents of the bill that Federal regulation of gas production under the present law discourages initiative and incentive to develop new sources of supply. Some producers and millions of consumers believe that full Federal regulation is necessary to achieve the "fair prices" that the President favors. These arguments will have to be carefully analyzed when and if Congress takes up a new gas bill. For the moment interest centers in the fact that the President rejected the bill solely because of the taint it acquired from gift-giving lobbyists.

In one sense the veto is a rebuke to the Senate for passing the bill in haste after Senator FRANCIS CASE disclosed the $2,500 rejected contribution to his campaign funds. Yet the President was careful not to lecture or to castigate the Senate. Taking note of the investigations by two Senate committees and the Department of Justice, he put himself in the position of delaying action until the facts have been divulged. This, he suggested, is a service to Congress, and he is right. The veto saves the whole Government from the embarrassment of putting into effect a measure deeply immersed in scandal.

It is of much satisfaction to this newspaper that some of the reasoning of the veto message parallels our own. In our editorial of February 15, we noted:

"The President could reasonably veto the bill in order to give the Senate another opportunity to look at it afresh after full disclosure of the gas lobby's operations * * *.

"The President could not close his eyes to the methods used to get this bill through the Senate without seeming to be insensitive to the use of money to influence the legislative process."

The most important fact about the veto, however, is that it throws the full weight of the administration behind the investigation of the gas lobby. The Senate will now have to give its Elections Subcommittee ample funds and staff for a thorough inquiry or confess before the people that it is afraid to bring the facts to light.

[From the Nashville Tennessean of February 18, 1956]

JUST A VETO AMONG FRIENDS

President Eisenhower, in vetoing the reeking natural gas bill, did not actually say to offending industries and their lobbyists that "this hurts me more than it does you," but that is what it amounted to.

More than 20 million consumers would have been cheered to hear that the Republican Chief Executive was chiefly interested in protecting them from a colossal gouge that may approach a billion dollars. They would have welcomed any indication that the Washington administration had weakened in its belief that it was in the saddle as the representative of big business.

But President Eisenhower has gone out of his way to contend that the "great and vital industry" of oil and gas should not be condemned for the actions of "private persons, apparently representing a very small segment" of that avaricious group.

Unlike President Truman in 1950, the Republican Chief Executive has not vetoed the gas measure because he is opposed to the principle it represents. "I am in accord with the basic objectives (of the bill)," he asserts, and it is with real regret that he rejects it at this time.

In a word, the measure is too odoriferous to handle now but its backers are invited to try again when and if the pending lobby investigation is finished and perhaps forgotten.

Getting along with the oil interests is one of the best things the administration does, but it is not going to stand for the kind of arrogance to which the President refers. And, equally as clearly, it does not want to be embarrassed by stupidity.

The private persons who are castigated in the veto message are those connected with Superior Oil's $2,500 cash donation to Senator CASE, of South Dakota, on the assumption that he would stand hitched for the natural gas industry.

They have indeed been arrogant and, to use Mr. Eisenhower's words, "so much in defiance of acceptable standards of propriety as a risk creating doubt among the American people concerning the governmental processes."

Save for the danger of creating "long-term apprehension in the minds of the American people" and doing "a disservice to the people and their Congress," the message sets forth, the bill would be readily signed. But there is a refusal to accept the glaring truth that the apprehension mentioned already exists, and that it is not confined to Congress. It encompasses the oil-nourished Republican regime as well.

A scandal exists, and that calls for caution. But in addition, it is well worth disappointing the GOP's dearest friends in order to cross up Democratic Senate leadership and partly deprive the majority party of its big-business issue. * * *

The Congress definitely has been put on the spot by the message, but that is all the more reason why the Gore committee should demonstrate beyond all doubt whether only a small segment of the oil and gas group, so bound to the Eisenhower administration for favors done, has threatened governmental processes, all along the line, by reckless use of campaign contributions.

Private persons do not usually go around spending their own money to benefit the interests they represent, and there is no reason why they should be more partial to the legislative branch than the executive.

By the very tone of his veto message, President Eisenhower has made the broadest kind of investigation mandatory. To this extent, at least, it merits approbation. Otherwise it is a dismal disappointment.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 18, 1956]

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE NATURAL-GAS BILL

President Eisenhower's veto of the controversial natural-gas bill, despite his agreement with some of its underlying provisions, is

based on two overriding considerations: his conviction that the bill would not sufficiently protect consumers against unfair gas price rises, and the fact that investigation into the $2,500 campaign gift to Senator CASE has not been concluded. Under the law, the President had 10 days after passage of the measure to act upon it.

The divestment of consumer protection against price boosts was the main argument brought the Harris-Fulbright bill during its journey through Congress. It was contended that once Federal controls were lifted on prices charged by producers for gas sold to interstate pipelines, costs to gas users would skyrocket.

Supporters of the bill discounted talk of price increases, and insisted that continuance of Federal controls would discourage exploration and development of natural-gas sources and perhaps reduce supplies. The President in his veto message took cognizance of this viewpoint and of what he regards as a need for legislation that would work injury neither to the producers nor the consumers.

It is clear that Mr. Eisenhower has been stirred by the CASE disclosure. He refers sharply to "efforts so arrogant and so much in definance of acceptable standards of propriety as to risk creating doubt among the American people concerning the integrity of governmental processes."

The $2,500 was sent to Senator CASE as a campaign contribution from interests favorable to passage of the gas bill. CASE regarded it as a possible effort to influence his vote. He refused to accept it, made it public and voted against the bill in the Senate.

An inquiry into the CASE gift and into pressure otherwise exerted for and against the gas bill was shunted aside by the Democratic leadership in the Senate until after the vote. This may have seemed a smart maneuver at the time by proponents of the measure but it did not keep the President from taking the CASE matter into consideration as an impelling reason for his veto.

The many millions of household users of natural gas, including those in Pennsylvania, will approve of the President's action, because it removes a threat of higher costs. They will take heart also from Mr. Eisenhower's declaration that if and when new gas legislation is brought before Congress, it should help the consumers both by assuring plentiful supplies of the fuel and by specifically protecting their right to fair prices.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 18, 1956]

THE PRESIDENT'S NATURAL GAS VETO WAS ENTIRELY PROPER

President's Eisenhower's veto of the natural gas bill should have surprised nobody. For one thing, this bill to exempt independent producers of natural gas from Federal rate regulation had reached his desk smeared with scandal. It carried too many signs of lobby pressures so heavy as to approach an intent to corrupt. These signs were plain proof that the bill was not so innocent and righteous a defense of free enterprise as it was made out to be.

For another thing, even if it had been free of stain and moral doubt, there was the convincing practical argument that the business of supplying gas is a public utility. If the all-import original process in this business is free of the controls that apply to all subsequent processes, then there is no point or value in any control at all.

If the company that finds and extracts the gas and sells it to the pipeline company may charge what the traffic will bear, then the load at the consumer's end may be beyond relief, no matter what laws for regulation of distributors.

This is the point that President Eisenhower admitted was bothering him. He told his press conference last week that he couldn't get away from the thought that buying and selling gas is different from buying and selling wheat or coal. He reflected that a consumer who has "tied himself onto a gas line and bought his stove" is a captive of the system.

It was the same point that Harry S. Truman raised when he likewise vetoed a similar bill back in 1950. Exempting one part of the gas business while regulating other parts is not, he said, good public policy.

In the case of both Presidents, the veto took on a point of principle and of public concern. A large degree of courage was involved. The Truman veto came although the bill was sponsored by and bore the name of the Democratic President's most loyal and untiring personal and political friend, Senator KERR, of Oklahoma.

In President Eisenhower's case, not only was the bill tagged with the brand of free enterprise (less Government intervention, more reward for daring) to which the President is committed. It was also primarily a Republican venture, even though Democratic Congressmen were nominally its champions. In its final passage in the Senate February 6, Republicans voted 31 for it to 14 against; Democrats 22 for, 24 against. The total Senate vote was 53 to 38 in favor of the bill.

If the lines hold, this does not augur success for overriding the veto, which would take two-thirds of those voting. In the House the chance for passing the bill notwithstanding the veto is even slimmer. The bill carried in that body by a margin of only 6 votes—209 to 203. Thus by all prospects the matter is dead.

The Supreme Court's decision that regulation should properly apply to all agents in a public utility will stand. The Federal Trade Commission's timidity and vacillation on the subject is at an end. However, the identification of the pressures to pass the bill—their motives and their possible subversion of legislative action through the device of campaign contributions to "right-minded" Congressmen—will go on. A very doubtful cause must needs be thoroughly analyzed, and it looks as if the Gore committee will get at the job.

[From the Chattanooga Times of February 18, 1956]

A BLOW FOR INTEGRITY

Dramatically, from his fateful vacation retreat in Georgia, Dwight Eisenhower again has demonstrated his determination to uphold the right. Employing the strong words "arrogant" and "highly questionable" to tactics used in the natural gas fight, he yesterday vetoed the measure passed by Congress to exempt from direct control gas production for interstate commerce.

The Eisenhower administration was voted into office amid promises to dry up corruption in Washington. In the Talbott conflict-of-interest case, and in numbers of others, the President stood against compromise on ethical questions and for strict judgment of individuals in the highest tradition of American political life.

The offer of a $2,500 bribe to Senator FRANCIS CASE of South Dakota by a lawyer on a $12,000-a-year retainer fee from the Superior Oil Company of California as a registered lobbyist—and who charged his expenses for the trip to the company—was more than Mr. Eisenhower could bear.

The Eisenhower veto will add impetus to the Gore subcommittee pledged to uncover all such activities. The Senate has a chance of a lifetime to lay bare all shabby efforts to buy legislation.

FRANCIS CASE single-handedly killed the natural gas bill because he had the rare courage, and the sense of outrage, to stand up in the Senate and tell what had happened. A conservative veteran, he had leaned toward the bill but in the end voted against it. He deserved the praise of colleagues in every Senate chair. Instead, he actually was told to be careful if he wanted to continue in public life.

President Eisenhower's unassailable view of the matter should shake the "everybody does it, what's wrong with it?" spectators on the sidelines to their senses. And it should encourage every Senator with similar evidence to lay that information before the Gore subcommittee. The Senators can, if they will, push aside the cynical purveyors of the philosophy: "Wouldn't you like to know?"

The President's veto was accompanied by an invitation to Congress to pass another natural gas bill, but with "specific language protecting consumers in their rights to fair prices."

But the consumers' right to fair prices can only be protected, since they have no choice but to bear rate increases, through regulation of wellhead prices by the Federal Power Commission. The Supreme Court in the 1954 Phillips Petroleum case ruled in favor of this regulation and Mr. Eisenhower's position puts him in direct conflict with the Court's decision.

The President noted that the present law discourages individual initiative "and incentive to explore for and develop new sources of supply." We favor incentive but the oil companies now enjoy an incentive shared by no other American business: the 27.5 percent depletion tax deduction. Many big oil companies push this money around fast and furiously in political pursuits, with the Case episode a likely indicator of more such activity.

The Senators ran in bipartisan • • • flocks in passing the bill. In only 10 States was there a split in the senatorial delegation. After the President's veto yesterday the reaction was as expected, but more so. Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, was so happy he thought it meant the President had recovered. Senator KERR, whose previous gas bill was vetoed by President Truman, abandoned his oil-smooth dignity utterly to say: "I think if he lives this is his announcement for reelection."

Thus the project involving certain rises in consumer natural gas prices stands rejected both by a Democratic and a Republican President, though for basically different reasons. At the very bottom of the fight is the issue of the public interest as against the special and regional interests of a relative few. We hope the Senators will rethink the problem through and defeat any subsequent attempts.

[From the Hartford Courant of February 19, 1956]

THE PRESIDENT VETOES THE NATURAL GAS BILL

The firm way in which President Eisenhower has vetoed the natural-gas bill deserves warm applause. The bill was tainted. So long as one campaign contribution had been linked in the public mind with the bill, there would continue to be suspicion. The oil company that provided the money that was given to Senator CASE was guilty of crass stupidity, if nothing more. It had aroused Senator CASE to the point of voting against the bill because of the way he had interpreted the action. Some sophists had said this was voting for the wrong reason, that the bill should be decided on its merits. But it could not be, so long as the suspicion existed that all votes were not being cast by the same standards.

President Eisenhower's veto can be criticized similarly. His message says that he is in accord with its basic provisions. Granted that many feel the same way, there was still good cause to veto the bill as failing to provide adequate safeguards for the consumer. But the disclosure of what the President has termed arrogant efforts in behalf of the bill made the veto almost mandatory. And in view of the tremendous

pressure exerted for and against the bill, the President's action shows high political courage.

It was an open secret around Washington that lobbying for and against the Harris-Fulbright bill had gone beyond all bounds of propriety. Money was too available, in parties for Congressmen and even their assistants, in campaign contributions, in expenses for skilled advocates to approach doubtful voters, in airplane travel for favored legislators. The spirit, if not the letter, of laws controlling legislation was being violated. Yet it was only an exploitation of means that had been used before, in the contributions to campaign committees as elsewhere.

It was the particular arrogance of this attempt that stood out. After Mr. Neff had admitted that the $2,500 contribution came from an oil company, he was asked if he had made similar donations to other funds. Not to personal campaign funds, he qualified, and the investigating committee seemed willing to let it go at that. The press followed it up. Had contributions been made to other funds? "Wouldn't you like to know?" the attorney for Mr. Neff is quoted as retorting.

Yes, the American public would like to know. It supports President Eisenhower's veto as the only possible outcome of this outrageous incident. It should also support the sweeping inquiry planned by Senator ALBERT GORE and the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee. The climate in Washington was considered morally abysmal when executive aids took mink coats and deep freezes. The public is not likely to look with kindness on legislators who accept clouded favors, either. All the blame cannot fall on them; it takes an offer before the acceptance can be made, and both are equally at fault. But the American people have a right to expect that their elected representatives will withstand such pressures and spell out adequate penalties for those who carry them too far.

[From the Detroit News of February 20, 1956]

IS THE GAS BILL DEAD?

Relief over the President's veto of the Harris bill is necessarily qualified by doubt as to the future of this measure which would free $20 billion of natural-gas reserves from Federal price control.

Mr. Eisenhower in his message was reluctant to veto the bill whose basic objectives he approved. He refused to let it become law solely because of the moral atmosphere attending its passage.

History affords no guide to the congressional reaction to such a veto. Men of principle might be expected to respond with a desire at the earliest moment to vote again as they originally voted. So far, the word from Washington reflects no such yearning to insist on the rectitude of congressional motives. So far, it looks as though years might pass before majorities of Congress again would willingly touch a measure so tarred with the suspicion of service to arrogant special interests. On that theory the degree of relief to which gas consumers are entitled by the President's action may be considerable.

His estimate of the bill's basic objectives is readily understood in light of his philosophical aversion to centering more authority in Washington. This otherwise excellent philosophy conditioned him to give the Harris bill the benefit of doubts which, to us, seem overriding. He was persuaded that utility-type regulation of gas at the wellhead would discourage drilling to the ultimate detriment of consumers.

But this argument seemed sufficiently answered by the facts that gas is mainly a byproduct of oil drilling; that exploration already is excessively favored by tax incentives. It might have occurred to the President that a measure inspiring the kind of support this did could hardly be designed to benefit the gas industry's captive customers.

The character of that support explains why Detroit officials of all philosophies are so anxious to keep the services of James H. Lee, the city lawyer whose able work confirmed the Federal power to regulate wellhead gas.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of February 20, 1956]

GAS-OIL LOBBY TOO ARROGANT

In finding a veto of the natural gas bill mandatory, President Eisenhower spoke for the American people.

"Private persons * * * have been seeking to further their own interests by highly questionable activities. These include efforts that I deem to be so arrogant and so much in defiance of acceptable standards of propriety as to risk creating doubt among the American people concerning the integrity of governmental processes."

It may be said that by walking boldly into the office of a supporter of Senator CASE, Republican, South Dakota, with $2,500 in a blank envelope, a lobbyist of the gas interests wrote the death sentence of the bill that his bosses wanted written into law. CASE'S rejection and disclosure of that offer blew the lid off. It gave the Nation a peek at the sordid and tremendous drive that oil-gas forces had put behind the Harris-Fulbright bill.

The Senate rushed approval of the bill without a full investigation of either the CASE incident or the "hottest" lobby pressure in years. The President properly refused to go along—pointing out that to do so "under such conditions could well create long-term apprehension in the minds of the American people."

A Nation shocked by the arrogance of the gas-oil lobby will welcome the President's stand. His refusal to sign a bill that came to him under a cloud and his call for a thorough investigation by the Senate and the Department of Justice rescues the Senate from an embarrassing reflection on its integrity. The message, in addition, adds to the President's already great political capital—something not to be sneezed at in an election year.

For all this, the message is not completely reassuring to those who believe that to have meaning natural gas regulation must extend from the wellhead to the gas stove.

The President's "regret" over the veto stems, he said, from his accord with "the bill's basic objectives." He suggests new legislation to attain those objectives and, at the same time, to include "specific language protecting consumers in their right to fair prices."

So far no one has come up with a measure to satisfy both goals that is acceptable to the gas-oil forces and their legislative supporters. And it has not been for lack of trying. Proponents of the Harris-Fulbright bill rejected out of hand several amendments that would have given consumer protection. And, even more disturbing, they were joined by at least four Senators from consumer States who then voted against the bill for home consumption.

The President has given the consumer respite and upheld governmental integrity by his veto. But the gas fight is not over. The gas-oil forces are still strong, and perhaps next time they will also be wise enough not to let their arrogance defeat them.

[From the Raleigh (C. C.) News and Observer of February 18, 1956]

PRESIDENT SAVES PUBLIC INTEREST

President Eisenhower saved the public interest from a terrific blow which, without his intervention, would have been struck by the enactment into law of the natural gas bill.

The bill is now dead and likely to remain dead, despite the President's indication that he would sign some other type of bill on the same subject.

The veto is of such tremendous importance that other matters fade into insignificance when compared to it. That is true not only of the remote possibility that there will later be an undesirable "compromise" bill. It is also true of suggestions, which have already been made and which will multiply if he runs for reelection, that by the veto the President also served his personal interest by a shrewd political move.

Whatever the motives for the veto, it was a highly proper action. And the President's assigned reason was equally proper. When the President stated that segments of the oil and gas industry "have been seeking to further their own interest by highly questionable methods" he understated the case. He stated that case more adequately when he said:

"These include efforts that I deem to be so arrogant and so much in defiance of acceptable standards of propriety as to risk creating doubt among the American people concerning the integrity of governmental processes."

That is language the people can understand and it is language in the people's interests. And it is spoken about people who already enjoy (thanks to tax favors) far greater retained profits than any other industry. And those profits would have been enhanced by enactment into law of the bill the President has vetoed.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 18, 1956]

A WISE VETO

President Eisenhower did not have to search for grounds to support his veto of the Harris-Fulbright bill. It did not satisfy questions he had earlier raised about the protection of consumers who have only one source of supply and have invested heavily in equipment using gas.

Because of these facts Mr. Eisenhower had rejected the argument that natural gas was simply another product like corn or coal—and that regulation of it threatened an extension of Federal controls into every kind of business. Everyone knows that the President leans toward keeping the Federal Government out of business and out of local affairs wherever possible. But he could not leave 20 million gas-using families largely defenseless against price increases at the well-head.

The question was further complicated by the fact that most of the gas is produced by a relatively few big oil companies, some of which also own pipelines. There is dispute as to the effectiveness of competition. Also as to whether regulation endangers exploration for new supplies, since most of the gas is found in drilling for oil—which is already benefited by a 27½ percent depletion allowance on taxes.

Evidence of big money being spent on lobbying grew as the debate waxed. Finally, the bill was tainted—fairly or unfairly—by a campaign contribution of $2,500 to a Senator believed to be inclined to vote for it.

The President declares this, while apparently coming from a small segment of a great industry, risked the creation of "doubt among the American people concerning the integrity of governmental processes." It may be said that the veto is very good politics. For the bill was sponsored by Democrats—who have so often charged the Republicans with "give-aways" of natural resources and favoritism to big business. While the parties split in congressional voting, the veto presents the administration as defending consumer rights and the purity of governmental processes. But, politics or no politics, it stands on solid ground.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 18, 1956]

VETO AND REBUKE

President Eisenhower's veto of the natural gas bill is an outstanding service to millions of consumers and a rebuke to the Senate.

The Senate approached the gas grab by rashly passing the exemption bill before investigating the oil-smeared lobbying tactics used to promote it. Later a Senate committee traced the $2,500 cash offer disclosed by Senator CASE of South Dakota to an oil company executive. But the bill still would have become law had not the President blocked the way.

Mr. Eisenhower describes the lobbying efforts as "so arrogant and so much in defiance of acceptable standards of propriety as to risk creating doubt among the American people concerning the integrity of governmental processes."

This blunt message not only offers a lesson to the Senate but sets the President squarely against a majority of his own party's members in Congress. For while the gas bill was sponsored by Arkansas Democrats, the main voting support for it came from Republicans.

In the Senate, with Minority Leader KNOWLAND leading the way, the Republicans voted for the gas grab by 31 to 14 or better than 2 to 1. The Democratic Senators voted against it by 24 to 22. In the House, the Republicans accepted the bill by 2 to 1 while the Democrats were 3 to 2 against it.

In a short 6 years 2 Presidents have vetoed efforts to exempt natural gas producers from Federal utility regulation. Harry S. Truman did so because he believed the legislation was bad. The bill, he said, would leave gas consumers without defense against price increases, and would not be in the public interest.

Mr. Eisenhower, however, has applied the veto for different reasons. While excoriating the tactics used to promote the legislation, he says frankly that "I am in accord with its basic provisions." He believes that any new legislation should include specific language protecting consumers in their right to fair prices.

The President's intentions doubtless are good at this point but it is a serious question whether two parts of his veto message are not in irreconciliable conflict. He is right when he expresses the desire to include specific language protecting the consumer. But the problem is: How can the consumer be protected if the protection—Federal regulation of gas rates—is taken away in legislation whose avowed purpose is to remove regulation?

Fortunately there is little likelihood of any real action on gas measures this year. Congress cannot expect to pass the present bill over the veto, and it would be politically unwise to press the issue with elections coming up and voters aroused by the Case affair.

The Harris-Fulbright bill was considered a kind of last-ditch gas attack by the oil and gas lobby. The lobby expected Presidential approval. The CASE revelation blew that up, with the consequence that President Eisenhower has now performed what Senator DOUGLAS calls a great public service.

The Illinois Senator should know. He led the hard, uphill, painstaking, seemingly hopeless fight against this gas grab, just as he led the fight against the earlier Kerr gas grab. The little bipartisan rear guard of Senators with Senator DOUGLAS included Senators HENNINGS of Missouri, POTTER of Michigan, WILEY of Wisconsin, MORSE of OREGON, Lehman of New York—and Senator CASE.

To these men and to Dwight D. Eisenhower, 40 million gas consumers owe thankful recognition for public service.

PROTECTION OF CIVIL SERVICE FROM POLITICS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the body of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of March 14, 1956.

On March 9, Mr. Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, issued a call to the leaders of both political parties to stick to the facts when discussing the Federal career service and the Federal employees who are a part of it.

Any further comment on Mr. Young's statement other than that appearing in this editorial would be a waste of words.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PIETY IN THE SKYETY

The country is on the brink of an election campaign; and so it is now treated to the spectacle of Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, exhorting politicians to stay away from making a political football out of the career civil service during the campaign. Uninformed charges, said Mr. Young, impair the prestige and morale of the Federal work force. No doubt they do.

This is the same Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, you understand, during whose term of office an order went from the White House requiring appointments to be cleared with the Republican National Committee. This is the same Chairman of the Civil Service Commission during whose term of office a numbers racket, operated in the name of internal security, was allowed to devastate the prestige and morale of the Federal work force. Just a couple of months ago Mr. Young admitted to the Senate Civil Service Subcommittee that of the total number of Federal employees whom the administration boasted it had fired as security risks, more than 90 percent were actually fired under routine civil-service procedures without any proof of subversive activity whatsoever.

Mr. Young's pious plea for protection of the civil service from politicking puts us in mind of nothing so much as W. C. Fields' eloquent denunciation of the demon rum.

FORTY-FOURTH BIRTHDAY OF THE GIRL SCOUTS OF THE U. S. A.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, this week, as the Girl Scouts of the U. S. A. celebrate their 44th birthday, more than 2,600,000 members will be taking part in special observances—2 million girls, 7 through 17 years old, and 600,000 men and women.

A membership of 2 million girls sounds enormous; but it means that only 1 girl in 8, of the millions of Scout-age girls, has had a chance to become a Scout. Town after town, city after city, reports long waiting lists of girls who want to join, but who cannot until the necessary adult organization has been set up—leaders and assistant leaders, committees, and other volunteer workers.

The Scouts estimate that it takes 30 adult workers to make room in Scouting for 100 girls, and current membership statistics seem to bear out this figure. In my own State, Maine, there are 12,000 girls and more than 3,500 adults enrolled in the Girl Scouts—a slightly lower adult-girl ratio than the national average.

Girl Scout Week is, of course, for the girls in Scouting; but it offers an appropriate time for recognizing the essential contribution made by adults. The 600,000 men and women in Girl Scouting are merely those who pay national membership dues. The total does not include the countless friends who lend a hand where needed, without acquiring formal membership—parents who serve as volunteer chauffeurs and truckmen; doctors who examine campers; Red Cross trainers who teach swimming and water safety businessmen who advise local Girl Scout units on insurance and investments, fund raising, and camp development; specialists who help girls working for proficiency badges. If these Girl Scouts helpers were added to the count of adult membership, the number would be doubled, trebled, quadrupled.

Let me tell Senators how men in Portland, Maine, helped the Girl Scouts last year. I like the story, because it involved the whole community. The Greater Portland Girl Scouts decided that the time had come to stage a full-scale demonstration to show everybody in town just what girls do in scouting. They had held a jubilee in 1951, in which the Rotary Club had participated as guides, advisers, volunteer fathers. By 1954, the Scout program and membership had developed to a point where the Rotary Club felt it did not have the manpower needed to do justice to Girl Scout achievements.

The Rotarians called on the Portland Lions and Kiwanis clubs, for help. The three groups set up a steering committee and subcommittees to support and sponsor a 1955 Girl Scout jubilee. Committeemen persuaded local businesses to sponsor each of the 80 booths at the event. The city administration provided facilities in the Portland city hall. Suppliers of many kinds donated needed materials. And 110 Girl Scout troops—more than 2,000 girls—worked for a good part of a year, preparing exhibits and demonstrations.

Every Girl Scout troop in the greater Portland area took part in the 1955 jubilee. Girls sold 10,000 admission tackets to cover the Girl Scout's share of expenses. Girls served as check-room attendants, guides, ushers; they manned the booths and explained exhibits to the visitors; girls demonstrated arts and crafts, cookery, camp-craft, first aid and dozens of other interests. By the end of the final session practically everybody in the Portland area had come to city hall to see what the Girl Scouts were doing.

It never could have been done without the men who helped transform into an actuality the Girl Scouts' hopes for a full-scale fair. And without the chance to tell the public what they were doing, the Girl Scouts never could have shown the progress they have registered since their 1955 jubilee.

So I want to express appreciation, during Girl Scout Birthday Week, to the countless men and women throughout the country who through their contribution to the success of Girl Scout projects are helping shape tomorrow's mothers, teachers, community leaders,

voters—yes, and tomorrow's legislators too. And I hope that their number will increase fast enough to make room in scouting for every girl who is waiting for a chance to join.

THE UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR TO IRELAND

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have the great honor to have sitting beside me a citizen of my State whom I should like to present to the Senate at this time. His father was for many years a Senator of the United States. He was beloved by all Senators, of both parties, and by people all over the United States. His grandfather was a distinguished President of the United States and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

My friend, a distinguished citizen of Connecticut, is now the American Ambassador to Ireland, a post which he has held for the past few years. He is in this country today with Mr. Costello, the Irish Premier, who will address the Senate this afternoon.

I thought that Senators might like to have me introduce our distinguished Ambassador at this time, as perhaps it will not be possible to recognize him during this afternoon's proceedings. Therefore, it gives me a great deal of pleasure and honor to present to the Senate of the United States our distinguished Ambassador to Ireland, Mr. William Howard Taft III. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a personal friend of the Ambassador, I wish to echo the remarks made by the Senator from Connecticut, and to express on behalf of the State of New Jersey warm, cordial greetings to Ambassador Taft on this occasion.

THE ABSENT SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act I have been trying since December 9 of last year to get certain communications from the Secretary of State which will serve to delineate and interpret public statements made between representatives of our Government and the Government of the Republic of Western Germany relating to matters affecting seized assets of former enemies. To date I have not received the letters which the subcommittee requires.

I have been charitable in saying that the Department's failure to send these communications has been an oversight. I am trying again today to get the communications which I feel are essential to a better understanding of some of the problems involved.

No doubt if the Secretary of State would follow the admonition of Mr. Walter Lippmann, whom our friends on the other side of the aisle like to quote with such approval, the subcommittee might hope to receive the necessary information. In his column in the Washington Post today Mr. Lippmann criticizes the Secretary of State and calls him "the absent Secretary." I believe Mr. Lippmann's article is worthy of inclusion in the RECORD, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 15, 1956]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE ABSENT SECRETARY

As Mr. Dulles finishes his latest tour, it is more than ever necessary to ask him to consider whether these long absences from Washington permit him to carry out the real responsibilities of his office. While he has been traveling in South Asia and in the South Pacific, the situation in North Africa and the Middle East has been deteriorating rapidly. There is an almost desperate need of clarification and of decision about Western policy in North Africa, Cyprus, Palestine, and the Persian Gulf states. What Mr. Dulles has been doing is to argue the administration case—to be a kind of traveling Voice of America—in Karachi, New Delhi, Columbo, and Jakarta. That would be all very well if Mr. Dulles were two men, and if the more important one of the two were in Washington making policy about North Africa and the Middle East. As it is, Mr. Dulles has spent his time talking when he is most urgently needed in Washington for the grave business of deciding.

The visible evidence of all this is that in each of the disputed areas—in French North Africa, in Cyprus, Palestine, as regards Egypt and Saudi Arabia—we find ourselves antagonizing both sides. Our consulate in Tunis is wrecked by Frenchmen who suspect us of supporting the dissident Arabs. In Cyprus we have provoked the British and we have annoyed the Greeks. In Palestine we are distrusted by the Arab States and we are scolded by the Israelis.

It is true that in international affairs a great power cannot expect to please everybody, and at times to please anybody. But in the present situation the plight in which we find ourselves is not that we are in the moderate middle between two extreme factions. We are not in the middle. We are in a muddle. That is due to the fact that our central policy is no more than an attempt to avoid decisions and to get by without displeasing anybody at home or abroad too much.

Time has just about run out on the policy of drift and muddle. What can be done about it? What can be done about it is to make up our minds as to where we stand and what we can and what we will support.

In French North Africa, we and the British should consult seriously with France. We should then decide what we shall regard as a settlement that we mean to support wholeheartedly. We should give France our full support if France will offer the Arab population the full measure of freedom which liberal French opinion already favors.

In Palestine we should convert the 1950 declaration into a firm international guaranty against aggression by either side, and we might then take our stand for the neutralization of Israel within frontiers that have been modified and rectified by international arbitration.

We should face up to the tactics of Saudi Arabia in using the profits from oil for subversion by corruption and bribery and propaganda throughout the Middle East. In dealing with Saudi Arabia we should cease acting as if we were helplessly dependent upon its rulers, who must be appeased and placated lest they deprive us of our oil concessions. Saudi Arabia is more dependent upon us for the exploitation of its oil than we are on Saudi Arabia for the right to exploit it. If ever it was true that appeasement is an unworkable policy, it is true here.

Decisions of this kind are grave and momentous, and they cannot and should not be made except with the full attention of the highest responsible officials of the Government. The truth of it is that with Mr. Dulles away on his travels, there is no one in Washington who can and will take decisions of this magnitude. The President is certainly not fully at grips with the issues. Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., cannot take such decisions. If decisions are to be taken, they have to be taken by Mr. Dulles with the advice and consent of the President.

Mr. Dulles should come home, he should stay home for a considerable time, he should stop making so many speeches. He should stop trying to be the Voice of America, he should stop trying to produce a campaign platform for the Republicans, and he should put his main attention on the business of being the Secretary of State.

SEGREGATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Statement From the South," published in the Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, March 14, 1956. It is a very well-written article, and I commend its reading to everyone.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—STATEMENT FROM THE SOUTH

One hundred southern Members of Congress have signed a declaration of principles pledging to use "all lawful means" to upset the Supreme Court's 1954 decision which banned segregation in the public schools.

The declaration was severely critical of that decision. The High Court, the southerners wrote, had abused its judicial power, had legislated in an area reserved to the States, and had overthrown an "established legal principle almost a century old." Yet the words were not inflammatory; there was a tone of restraint throughout and a cautious admonition to extremists on both sides of the segregation question.

Some of the points the hundred Senators and Representatives make cannot be easily dismissed. There is, for example, no question that the Supreme Court did overrule former decisions of the same Court which said that "separate but equal" school facilities were lawful and that such schools did not conflict with the 14th amendment.

And there is no question that these 19 Senators and 81 Representatives have a right to believe that the Supreme Court was wrong, just as they had a duty as responsible men to announce that their efforts to avoid or to change the Court's rule would be limited to lawful means. Just what they propose to do they did not say and, indeed, quite probably they could not say. For the pattern is a different one in the different Southern States and in each of the States a different pattern can be found in different communities. In some of the States integration is already going ahead slowly; in others, it is a long way off.

So these hundred men could hardly have agreed on anything more than a statement of principles embodying use of lawful means; but the fact that they did agree on that makes their statement all the more serious. For among these men are men who would not put their names to any document in which they did not truly believe.

Among them are some of the ablest men in the United States Senate. Among them are men who are known as conservatives and some who are known as liberals. The signers

number Republicans as well as Democrats. Many of them are held by their fellow Members in the House and Senate—even by some who think their views in this matter gravely wrong—in the highest esteem.

This is not the voice of any calloused demagog. The hundred men spoke for millions of people, some frustrated, some bewildered, some disheartened, and some fearful. Not all the people in the South will agree with these Senators and Representatives in opposing, even by lawful means, an end to segregration. But these people also know that demagogery on either side can cause great harm and undo much that has already been done to better relations between the races in the South.

The Congressmen pleaded for understanding of their case when they wrote of the decisions upholding the right to create dual school systems: "This interpretation, restated time and again, became a part of the life of the people of many of the States and confirmed their habits, customs, traditions, and way of life."

One may argue that the custom is wrong and still know that no court can change a people's thinking overnight; the Supreme Court recognized that when it handed down the ban on segregated schools. And it can be dangerous to try to force that change immediately on an unwilling people.

The statement of principles is a reminder of that danger, just as it is a reminder that the Supreme Court decision it attacks also called for understanding and restraint on both sides.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I gave before the Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, on Wednesday, March 14, 1956.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, MARCH 14, 1956

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I would like to take just a moment of the subcommittee's time to pay tribute to the very fine job that the chairman, Senator CARL HAYDEN, has been doing for the Nation these many years. He came to Congress in 1911 when Arizona had just become a State. Our entire Nation has benefited from the type of service Senator HAYDEN has given. He is one of our most valued Members.

Senator HAYDEN, I just couldn't come down here today without having the record show how I feel about you and your fine work. Arizona can be proud of your achievements.

I appreciate this opportunity to come before the subcommittee to discuss the budgets of the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. At the conclusion of my remarks on these budgets, I intend to comment briefly upon a very important item relating to the budget of the National Park Service, because what I shall have to say on that item refers to our last opportunity to preserve and salvage certain Indian artifacts and petroglyphs of great historic and scientific interest.

OUR NATIONAL PARKS

A number of people who are interested in our national parks have written about the budget for this agency. I am very well satisfied with the House action which allows all of the funds requested. I am also glad to see a budget which more nearly reflects the needs of our national parks.

Senator HAYDEN, I know that you and many conservationists have urged the Department of the Interior to develop a real program for our national parks and this year's budget is in response to those requests. Therefore, I need not urge you to look upon it favorably but I do want to congratulate you on getting the Department to submit a good budget.

TIMBER AND RECREATION—OREGON'S TWO MOST IMPORTANT INDUSTRIES

Before discussing the budget, I would like to mention the timber situation out in Oregon. Timber is the No. 1 business in Oregon and recreation is the second ranking business. Oregon is a leader in the Nation in returns to the Treasury from our Federal forests. For example, on our national forests, after we consider all expense including in lieu payment, only four States return more money to the Treasury than was expended in them by the Forest Service.

These four States are Oregon, Washington, Arkansas, and Texas. In Oregon and Washington, income far outstripped expenses, and in Arkansas and Texas they were about even. In making this statement I am taking into account all of the work the Forest Service does including research and State and private forestry aids.

In Oregon $14,500,000 was the net profit that the Federal Treasury got from the national forests in 1955. The figures I cite illustrate the revenue Oregon's national forests are providing to help balance the budget. If you were just to consider timber sale activities, there are a number of other States and many individual forests that are more than paying their way.

While I was preparing this statement, I got to wondering what the value of our national forests is. Gentlemen, the 600 billion board feet of timber and the 180 million acres is conservatively worth around $8 billion. This is a real national asset. Much of the timberland is of relatively low productivity because it is generally in the more rugged country. I do think, however, we can look forward to at least a 2 percent return or $160 million a year in income. If we could make a few of the capital investments we should make in roads, housing facilities, and tree planting, and provide a little better operating budget, I think we could not only reach this goal but step up the annual return to an average of 3 percent. Oregon's forests are now proving this to be a fact.

The Bureau of Land Management's timber activities are concentrated on the O. and C. lands in Oregon. The income from these lands is over $18 million annually now, and the Federal Treasury receives one-fourth of this.

THE NEEDS OF THE INDIANS

Reservations present special problems because these lands belong to the Indian. The American Indian is entitled to the best possible management of his lands and every opportunity to participate and learn the art of self-government and management. Therefore, in the management of these lands, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, I feel, must take this into account. Since this money received from the sale of timber on Indian lands is payable to the Indian, there is no thought on the part of the Government in trying to make a profit for itself on the operation.

Rather than give you a lot of figures, I think it is sufficient to say that the lands managed by these various Government agencies provide minerals, grass, recreational use and watershed protection to many areas in the West. Their management is a public responsibility and the benefits flow to the public.

THE FOREST SERVICE BUDGET

I have had a chance to review both the budget and the Forest Service presentation over in the House, and in the light of that, I shall direct my remarks to the areas where critical needs exist.

SPEED UP INVENTORY AND CUT FULL ALLOWABLE CUT

The first item is timber resource management and on this I do not feel that the $9,807,000 is adequate for the job that the Forest Service has before it. The budget represents a $1.6-million increase with $400,000 for speeded-up inventories of our national forest resources, and the $1,200,000 balance is for increased timber sale activities which will result from these new inventories. I recommend that this item be increased to $10 million. Of the approximate $200,000 increase that I recommend, I think $50,000 more could very well be expended on inventories and the balance on timber sale work.

We must step up the inventory work even more and the timber sale work needs additional attention. The Forest Service has really, in my opinion, submitted a minimum budget. This $9.8 million item accounts for most of the direct operating expenditures that will develop a sales record of over $100 million. A dollar more spent here will bring in 5 to 6 dollars more very quickly.

SALVAGE

I am particularly interested in securing enough funds so the Forest Service can try assigning some special men to small sale processing. In our pine forests we suffer annual and endemic type losses which can be harvested under a small-sale program to the benefit, not only for the forest, but of small sawmill operations. In our fir country there is room for a lot of relogging of previous logged stands and for the salvage of individual trees where we have roads available. Those small sales more than pay for themselves. For example, Mr. Pagter, a lumberman at Prineville, Oreg., wrote to me pointing out that on two Forest Service salvage sales, which totaled 1 million board feet, the Government received $30,000 for an $800 investment in time and labor. I would like to see this program stepped up and a real effort made to develop small-sale specialists. I might mention here that I think it takes a particular type of man to deal with these small sales because he must be able to do a complete job or sale processing and management with a small operator. In the West, there are over 3,600 sawmills and almost 3,150 of them accounting for 27 percent of the production, are small operators. There are about 475 who account for 52 percent of the production in the medium class and only 49 big mills. Many of these small and medium mills are entirely dependent on national forest timber. If we can salvage what is now lost through insects and disease it will help keep many of these mills in operation, and it is these smaller firms that are admirably equipped to handle these salvage sales. I might add that the salvage is often not charged against the allowable cut, thus, we can expand this activity without compromising sustained yield management.

I might digress just briefly to point out that my State leads the Nation in unemployment at the present time and very frequently in recent years that has been true, because of our seasonal employment problem. When logging and lumber production goes down, employment goes down.

What we must keep in mind is that the small mills employ many more men than the combined employment of the big mills. If we can help these small mill operators, a

large percentage of which are dependent upon Federal timber, we really are bringing to my State employment stability, which means economic stability.

HOUSING

The second item which I wish to discuss is adequate housing for Forest Service personnel on Ranger Districts. This item is a capital expense and the money spent is recaptured by rentals. A great deal of the Forest Service housing precedes the CCC days and is often woefully inadequate. The condition of the housing has created many real problems in family morale and this in turn causes personnel turnover. I think that all of us as family men, can appreciate that no matter how appealing a job is if our wives and children are forced to live in remote areas where housing is inadequate, there is going to be a conflict.

I am here to plead for this program because I am rather proud of the fact that the lumber companies themselves are taking many of our Federal forestry men who have been trained by the Federal Government. I think that is a great compliment to the job the Forest Service is doing.

At the same time, we have to face the fact that as men leave Government service to work in the lumber companies, we create a serious problem for Uncle Sam. One of the reasons, they tell me, and I talked to these foresters in the woods, one of the reasons that they are induced away is because the lumber companies offer them much better living conditions, as well as better pay.

At least in this day and age I think that is true, though it was not so true of us when our folks went West. It would be a great help to modern personnel management if we could promptly solve this problem.

The Forest Service last year spent only $275,000 for housing. They are asking for $1 million more this year. They say that their total program to provide decent housing will cost them $13,700,000. Their testimony shows that they need 735 new dwellings on a nationwide basis, 252 of these are in the Northwest alone. Most of these houses will be built by private contractors under bids. The floor plans are standardized and the houses modest. I strongly recommend that the total amount for this item be raised to $3 million this year. I think that in a very few years it will pay big dividends on this investment.

The Forest Service has told the Congress what it needs are and if we approach it at the rate of only slightly over $1 million a year it will take 13 years to get the job done.

On March 6, the New York Times reported that the Defense Department rented some 177 apartments in New York for key antiaircraft personnel for $150 per month. The rental allowance is $75 per month, but the Defense Department will make up the difference. I am not criticizing the Defense Department, but here they are subsidizing key defense personnel housing to the tune of $75 a month. All the Forest Service is asking is for the Government to invest money for a total of 735 houses so they can properly house their people in isolated locations.

The Forest Service rental will recapture the cost of the house over its life, so there is no subsidy involved. This is a straight business proposition, but the situation is the same as the defense one, where privates have to live near these aircraft warning centers in high-rent areas. The Forest Service people have to live in the woods to perform their job.

SALARIES OF FORESTRY PERSONNEL

Closely linked to housing is the question of salaries that are paid by the Forest Service, and, I might add, by the Bureau of Land Management and Bureau of Indian Affairs, for their forestry personnel.

Many of our national forests are doing a large timber sale business which can be measured not only in terms of the receipts but also in terms of the expenditures of appropriated funds. For example, in my hometown of Eugene, the Willamette National Forest sold almost $7 million worth of timber last year and their outlays were something over $3 million for timber management and in lieu of payments to the county. The supervisor of this $10 million business gets about $9,000 a year, and the key timber sale and other management people under him get between $4,000 to $6,000 a year.

I would like to recommend that the Forest Service and the Civil Service Commission be instructed to get together and develop a pattern of salaries for the Forest Service which gives consideration to the volume of timber cut, its value, the number of sales, the complexity of management on each forest so that we can develop a more realistic pattern of payment than we are now using.

I know, for example, that forest industries pay up to $9,000 a year for scalers, cruisers, and timber-management technicians, while the Government pays only $4,000 to $5,000 a year. If we could provide a method of promotion which could advance a man from a less active forest to the more active one with commensurate increase in salary based upon skill and ability, we would accomplish three things:

We would encourage people to stay in the technical aspects of the job.

We would develop opportunities which would lessen personnel turnover.

We would place a premium on ability.

One of the major complaints that I get from people in the industry is that just when Federal agencies get their people trained they are transferred to a supervisory job or hired away by some company. I think that this is a subject that deserves serious attention, and I would like to suggest some action that could be taken this year by the Appropriations Committee. I think it ludicrous that we pay the Chief of the Forest Service only $14,800 a year to manage an $8 billion enterprise, all the Federal-State forestry programs and the forest research program of the Nation.

The Forest Service does not use grade 17 for its assistant chiefs, but holds them at grade 16. This in turn is felt all the way down through the organization. I think that we should at least make the Assistant Chiefs of the Forest Service grade 17, so that then the regional foresters could be raised, at least in part, to grade 16, and a grade 13, 14, and 15 could then be used for forest supervisors. This in turn would enable the Forest Service to grade some of the key technical positions on the forests so that their salaries become more commensurate with that which private industry pays.

ACCESS ROADS—THE KEY TO SUCCESSFUL TIMBER MANAGEMENT

The next item I wish to talk about is timber access roads. This year the full $24 million authorization has been requested and the Forest Service also has available to it $10,418,000 which will be available from the 10-percent fund. Comparing these 2 accounts, they plan to spend $25,118,500 for construction and $9,300,000 for maintenance.

I have introduced a bill designed to revise the Federal Highway Act which will raise the authorization for forest roads and trails to $32 million the first year, $40 million the second year, and then $50 million for the next 10 years. I would like to suggest that the committee recommend an additional $4 million this year for access-road construction. As presently set up, the appropriations for forest access roads equals only 30 cents per acre of commercial timberlands in our national forests. To illustrate it more dramatically, related to the 600 billion board-feet of timber in the national forests, the $25 million spent on construction is only four one-thousands of a cent per board-foot.

By comparison, we are spending 60 cents per acre per year for access roads to our national parks and at the current request level for the O. & C. lands of Oregon, we will be spending $2.25 per acre. In connection with the latter, I think I should point out that the 18 O. & C. counties of Oregon have petitioned that a full 33 percent of the receipts due them as in lieu of taxes—that is to say, 25 percent of gross receipts—be appropriated for access roads. The counties recognize this is a good sound investment that will pay dividends.

The total appropriation over the 12-year life of the program my bill proposes would only be about $1 per thousand board-feet for the commercial timber in our national forests. The money would be spent in areas where timber is now in low value because of inaccessibility.

We have national forests such as the Siskiyou on which the annual allowable cut is 153 million board-feet but the actual cut is only about half of that. On one working circle on that forest, there are only 12 miles of roads and, while the potential cut is 54 million feet on that working circle, only 12 million feet were cut from it last year. If we had an up-to-date inventory in that area the allowable cut might go up to 80 million board-feet.

I would like to insert in the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, a letter I received from the Gold Beach Chamber of Commerce, my letter to the Forest Service, and the reply which I just received.

Here is a good concrete example of problems facing communities such as Gold Beach and Powers in getting Federal timber. We have a great need for access roads and funds for proper timber management. We cannot expect to solve these programs overnight and get the best results. Unless the Forest Service has sufficient funds to sell its full allowable cut and develop areas, we will all suffer. This report, I think, furnishes a good case history of the need for funds now.

Senator CHAVEZ. That may be done.

(The information referred to follows:)

GOLD BEACH, OREG., *January 17, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The city of Gold Beach respectfully submits for your attention the enclosed resolution.

We realize fully that the locaton of main access roads into Government timber is an administrative decision to be made by the United States Forest Service. We do wish to point out to you, however, that of the 54 million sustained yield cut approved by the Forest Service in the Rogue River drainage proper, with the so-called Rogue River working circle, less than 20 percent was harvested during 1955.

This timber was not harvested because Government funds for access roads were not available. The obvious location of the first main access road and route chosen by the Forest Service lies up the Rogue River.

Forest Service officials advise us that funds for making a survey of this route are now available, but no survey has been made to date.

The common council of the city of Gold Beach will greatly appreciate anything you can do:

1. To increase the budget for access roads in the interest of economy to avoid further tragic waste of Government timber;

2. To urge the Forest Service to expend funds already on hand to complete a survey of the Rogue River Road at the earliest possible date, so that construction can be begun as soon as access road money is available.

With heartiest appreciation for your cooperation and kind attention.

Respectfully submitted,

RAY P. BLANKENHEIM,
City Recorder.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the city of Gold Beach, Oreg., is the county seat of Curry County, Oreg., is the headquarters for the Gold Beach ranger district of Siskiyou National Forest, and is the logical and practical outlet for timber from the Rogue River working circle of the Siskiyou National Forest; and

Whereas an access road is sorely needed up Rogue River to Agness, Oreg., for the purpose of gaining access to large and untapped timber resources of Siskiyou National Forest, and to provide access for recreational, health, and welfare purposes to a large area of scenic wilderness; and

Whereas the Agness area is a large and important part of Curry County, cut off from communication by direct or easy access to the county seat and the rest of Curry County, making the administration of county affairs difficult to the extreme; and

Whereas the Agness area in Curry County, Oreg., is believed to be rich in mineral deposits essential to the economic stability of the Nation; and

Whereas Gold Beach lies at the center of a 140 mile stretch of coastline that has no access to the interior portion of Oregon, and it is essential to the economic growth of the area that a highway be constructed in the near future from Gold Beach to Grants Pass; and

Whereas it is believed that the national welfare requires a suitable access road to Agness, and it is the desire of the citizens of the city of Gold Beach, and its common council that such road be constructed at the earliest possible time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Gold Beach, Oreg., That the United States Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture be, and it hereby is requested, to make an immediate survey of a forest access road from Gold Beach, Oreg., to Agness, Oreg., and that thereafter funds be obtained and said road be built with all possible speed.

Passed by the common council the 9th day of January 1956.

W. A. CARTWRIGHT,
Mayor.

Attest:

RAY P. BLANKENHEIM,
Recorder.

FEBRUARY 6, 1956.

Mr. HERBERT STONE,
Regional Forester, United States Forest Service, Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MR. STONE: Inclosed is a request from Gold Beach, Oreg., dated January 17, 1956, regarding an access road up the Rogue River. I desire information on the points raised in this letter.

Other information available to me indicates the following: The allowaable cut on the Rogue River working circle is 54 million board feet a year, but actual cut was 2.5 million board feet in 1954 and 12 million board feet in 1955. Timber sales have been virtually limited to one large sale of 33.6 million board feet. No access road money or increases in personnel are contemplated for this district. The present timber sale force is 1 man plus a nontechnical helper and current personnel needs are 4 more timber management men. Road development by means of large sales cutting off the face of the unit is the local plan of operation.

This undeveloped drainage of over 410,000 acres has only 12 miles of satisfactory roads. No long term plan has been developed for tapping the area for maximum forest and recreational management.

I understand that a real problem exists in opening this area in response to requests from Powers that consideration be given to a better route from Agness to Powers, as well as the current request relative to an Agness-Gold Beach route.

I desire a full and complete outline of the optimum means of full development for this area based upon securing funds sufficient to adequately manage this working circle.

I have been requested by constituents to present material to the Appropriation Committees and concrete examples which show overall needs are most helpful in describing the situation. In addition, I feel that in this area a real opportunity for planned development exists. Your prompt attention to this request is desired. When you reply, will you furnish a copy of your reply to the city of Gold Beach? Please return the enclosed material to me.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGION,
Portland, Oreg., March 8, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Reference is made to your letter of February 6, 1956.

The Siskiyou Forest is the least developed national forest in region 6 from a timber-management standpoint. This is especially true of the Rogue River and Chetco Working Circles, which are located on the coast side of the forest. The allowable annual cut of the forest was increased in 1953 from 78 million feet to 153 million feet. This increase in cut was not based on formal reinventory information, but rather on administrative adjustment using experience comparisons between volumes cut on sales and old cruise data together with information obtained in forest survey report No. 104 dated November 1951, for southwest Oregon. For this reason, the present allowable cut is a tentative figure that is subject to change when we can make a reinventory of the forest.

For your information, we are showing the actual cut for the Siskiyou Forest and for the Rogue River and Chetco Working Circles during the last 5 years:

[Million board-feet]

Siskiyou Forest:	
1955	74.9
1954	74.8
1953	61.4
1952	60.9
1951	70.9
Rogue River Working Circle:	
1955	12.0
1954	2.5
1953	2.6
1952	10.1
1951	8.8
Chetco Working Circle:	
1955	13.1
1954	13.0
1953	12.6
1952	7.1
1951	8.2

The principal reason that this forest has not made more progress in reaching the full allowable cut is that we nave not been allotting the forest sufficient timber use funds. During the past 5 years the region has not received enough money to finance the region's full allowable cut. For this reason it was necessary for us to allot funds to the forests on a priority basis. As you know, the Forest Service has an obligation to Congress to reach certain timber-cutting goals with the moneys appropriated. It was, therefore, imperative, as well as good business, to put our money where we would get the greatest returns and benefits. The Siskiyou Forest generally has less timber per acre, scattered, patchy stands, interspersed with brush fields, and more costly and difficult road-construction problems of development than most other westside forests. Also, in the Rogue River and Chetco Working Circles there has not been a strong demand for national forest sales until the last year or so. This was mostly due to the fact that because of transportation disadvantages, industry did not move into the Gold Beach and Brookings areas until recently. The lack of demand is illustrated by two sales in the Gold Beach area for 5 million and 3 million feet that were advertised last April without receiving any initial bids, but were subsequently sold on a negotiated basis under regulation S–12. For the above reasons, we have only financed the forest at a level of cutting from 40 million in 1951 to 115 million in 1955. Because of timber sale layout and right-of-way problems, the forest has not always been able to reach the cutting goals for which they were financed.

We wanted to give you the above background to have an understanding of why the Rogue River Working Circle is still largely an undeveloped unit.

We now wish to outline the current situation and our plans for development of the Rogue River Working Circle. Presently there is ample installed mill capacity to utilize the full production of tributary national forest and private lands. We have 3 sales under contract totaling some 42 million feet with a remaining uncut volume of 30 million feet. Presale work is approximately 50 percent completed on 4 new sales with a combined volume of 37 million feet. On 3 of these proposed sales we will have to resolve difficult right of way problems before the sales can be made. Cutting on the existing sale of 33 million feet to Evans Products Co. is being held up because of unanticipated mining claim problems. We are taking aggressive action to obtain rights of way across the claims, and we are prepared to recommend condemnation action if necessary. Past sales were largely located "on the face" of the working circle, but our present plan of operation is directed at opening the working circle as expediently as possible.

We estimate that it will require over 1,000 miles of access road to permanently develop the area. Presently there are 12 miles of existing satisfactory access roads, 10 miles of which were built last year. Thirteen and four-tenths miles of the Elk River road are under contract for construction at a cost of $802,000. When built, this road can be extended through timber sale procedure. The Hunter Creek road is being extended some 9 miles under the terms of the Evans Products Co. sale contract. We have had a meeting with United States Plywood Corp. relative to road development in the Lobster Creek drainage. As you know, this company is planning to construct utilization facilities including a plywood plant just east of Gold Beach on the south side of the Rogue. It appears that we will be able to work out a satisfactory cooperative road construction project with the company to build a road up the south side of the Rogue to the mouth of Lobster Creek and then bridge the Rogue and construct a road up Lobster Creek to the forest boundary. This proposed cooperative project will probably cost in the neighborhood of $1,700,000. The company has completed a road survey from Gold Beach to the bridge crossing and the Forest Service has a survey that was completed in 1953 for the road up Lobster Creek. It is anticipated that the company will commence construction of this road in 1956 and complete the job during 1957. Upon completion, we will be in a position to make sales in the Lobster Creek area.

As you recognize, the major and relevant problem is the development of roads to serve the inaccessible timber in the Agness area. There are at least four possible routes of access, as follows:

1. Betterment of the existing low-standard administrative road on the Agness-Powers route.

2. Relocation of the Agness-Powers route to obtain a more favorable grade and alinement.

3. Extension of the Hunters Creek road down Lawson Creek to Agness.

4. The Rogue River route from Gold Beach to Agness.

On the basis of a preliminary economic analysis, using our best estimates of probable costs, we have given first priority to making a survey of route No. 2 above. Last year we made arrangements with the Bureau of Public Roads to survey 10 miles of this route at a cost of $28,000. In order to complete this study an additional 3 miles will be surveyed this spring. Our second priority is route No. 4 from Agness to Gold Beach, utilizing the road that U. S. Plywood proposed to construct from Gold Beach to the mouth of Lobster Creek. We plan to make a reconnaissance of this route prior to July 1. If the reconnaissance proves that a satisfactory road location can be obtained at comparable cost in comparison with route No. 2, we plan to ask the Bureau of Public Roads to make a survey of the Agness-Gold Beach route. This will involve a survey of approximately 20 miles at a cost of about $40,000 and will take approximately 5 months. If the Agness-Gold Beach route is found to justify the making of a Bureau of Public Roads survey at this time, we will withhold making a decision as to which route should be developed first until the full survey information for both routes is available for analysis and comparison. If information obtained from the reconnaissance clearly indicates that route No. 2 is the most favorable route, we will plan to program construction of the Powers-Agness road as promptly as availability of appropriated funds will permit, and most likely will defer making a formal survey of the Gold Beach-Agness road until sometime in the future.

We wish to emphasize that eventually for full development of the working circle it will be necessary to construct roads on routes 2, 3, and 4 above. The main problem to determine at this time concerns the priority of development. Aside from a cost comparison of the two routes, the Powers-Agness route has the advantage of immediately developing timber along the route, whereas there is very little public timber directly tributary to the Gold Beach-Agness route. We also wish to give consideration to the Park Service recommendation contained in their June 1954 report entitled "Recreation Resources of the Rogue River Basin." They recommend on page 78 of their report that "it would be desirable to preserve that portion of the Rogue River Canyon between Lobster Creek and Agness as a natural recreation area accessible only by boat or trail." In line with the Park Service recommendation, the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management have taken steps to withdraw for recreational purposes, a strip approximately one-fourth mile on each side of the river. A temporary withdrawal is now in effect. The main purpose of the withdrawal is to prevent mineral entry and to manage the area primarily for recreational purposes. This does not mean that a road cannot be built in the reserved area, but the location of the road will be subordinated to recreation needs which may increase the construction cost of the road in order to reasonably protect the recreational resources.

We are not in position to give you reliable figures on access road funds needed for optimum development of the working circle, since we do not have completed road surveys, and we have not had an opportunity to study the best method of securing needed roads in the major tributaries to the Rogue River. Many of the roads can be constructed through sale procedure on a progressive development program. As a minimum to reach our allowable cut, the following roads should be constructed:

1. (a) Powers-Agness (from the summit to the mouth of Shasta-Costa Creek including a bridge across the Rogue River), 13 miles, estimated cost $1,200,000; or

(b) Gold Beach-Agness (from mouth of Lobster Creek to mouth of Shasta-Costa Creek), 20 miles, estimated cost $1,950,000.

2. Agness to mouth of Indigo Creek, 6 miles, estimated cost $200,000.

3. Gold Beach-Lobster Creek (from Gold Beach to Lobster Creek, up Lobster Creek to forest boundary, including bidge across Rogue River), 15 miles, estimate of the Government's share of cost $850,000.

4. Euchre Creek, 5 miles, estimated cost $160,000.

Roads Nos. 1 and 2 above should be constructed with appropriated funds. Item No. 3 is planned for financing by United States Plywood with the Government repaying them through sales allowance; however, there would be some advantage if appropriated funds were available to pay the Government's share. We have planned that a sale purchaser would build the Euchre Creek road. We have to resolve a difficult right-of-way problem before the Euchre Creek sale can be made. Once the above roads are constructed, it may be necessary in the future to construction additional roads with appropriated funds in order to maintain the allowable cut with a reasonable balance of large and small sales.

It will be necessary to increase the timber management staff on the Gold Beach ranger district before we will be in position to reach the allowable cut. We have two foresters on this district, but we lost one forester and the second one is scheduled for the Armed Forces this summer. The Siskiyou has requisitioned 9 additional foresters, 2 of whom will be assigned this district. We are not optimistic about being able to recruit the help needed, as last year we were short some 70 foresters of meeting our recruiting goal on a regional basis. We expect a similar shortage this year. To fully develop this working circle, we need 7 foresters and 2 engineers. Manpower needs in relation to volume cut is high on this district because of abnormal timber sale layout problems and difficult road location and construction conditions. It will require $50,000 a year of timber use funds to reach and maintain the allowable cut

We regret that we are unable to give you more specific details, but we trust that we have satisfactorily outlined the job that we face in developing the Rogue River working circle. If you have further question, we will be happy to hear from you. We are sending a copy of this letter to the city of Gold Beach. The material enclosed with your letter is returned herewith.

Very truly yours,

J. HERBERT STONE,
Regional Forester.
By R. F. GREFE, *Acting.*

Senator MORSE. The Malheur, Siuslaw, and Umpqua National Forests are others which are badly in need of funds for access roads. By way of contrast let us look at the Mount Hood National Forest where the Clackamas River drainage has been developed by an access road. This program started in 1942, and $6 million has been invested in this road to date. The Government has gotten back $9 million in cash from the sale of timber and from now on the timber in this drainage will bring in over $1 million annually because of the road development. And that is not all. The value of this timber when converted is $5 million, which means payrolls, business for the grocer and the butcher, bank accounts, and the ability to pay taxes. Recreational use on this road increased from 3,000 people per year to 112,000 last year, and by actual count 6,000 cars used this road on Labor Day weekend. On working days a loaded logging truck travels over this road every 3 minutes. Gentlemen, these roads are an investment that will bring back every penny spent on them.

RECREATION

Our national forests not only are called upon to supply large quantities of timber for commercial lumbering operations, but they also supply recreation to 45 million people. Almost as many people visit our national forests for recreation as visit our national parks. I do not think that we should overlook the recreational development of our forests and the multiple uses that are being made of them.

I would like to call the attention of Senator HAYDEN to what Allan L. Kelly, secretary of the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America, has written advising me that he sent a statement to you for inclusion in the record.

I will not burden the RECORD by inserting the same material, but I do want to say that I agree with the Izaak Walton League, and I am asking for increases in some of the items they suggest.

I also ask that special consideration be given their resolution to increase funds for both research and improvement of wildlife habitat on our national forests.

The budget calls for only $2,194,000 for recreational development or about 5 cents per user of our national forests. On a national population basis, this is 1.3 cents per person. Recreation is an important business all over the Nation. If we can supply adequate recreation facilities in our forests, we will benefit from their social value or recreation and the businesses dependent on recreation will also benefit. The amount we are currently spending is so low in relation to need for money that certainly some upward adjustment is in order. Our national forests supply wonderful hunting and camping opportunities. We should make them more usable.

TIMBER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Linked very closely to multiple use management of our national resources are the resource development program on the national forests, and the State and private forestry aid programs of the Forest Service. Every acre of public and private land that is not well covered with grass or timber hurts us two ways. It does not produce a crop for the future and adds to our erosion and land management problems today.

The recent timber resources review indicates the need we have to get not only more timber growing, but increase its quality. The Forest Service has 4 million acres of its own that should be planted to trees and at the current rate of expenditures it will take 200 years to do the job. They have over 3 million acres of range that need to be planted to grass and it will take 50 years to do this job at the current rate. This is a capital expenditure item which results from the misfortunes of the past. In a way it is a part of our national debt and a part that ought to be reduced. It is an investment that we ought to make in the future.

On this item of resource development I think the Forest Service ought to come in next year with a program geared to solve this problem in the next 20 years instead of 200. I would like to ask this committee to give serious consideration to increasing the amount for this item from $1,845,000 to $3 million this year. I think this money should be appropriated on an "until expended" basis and that the Forest Service should use part of it to get their nursery program in shape because it takes a couple of years to collect seed and grow trees before you can actually start replanting. Getting timberland back in production is vital to meeting future work needs and getting these national forest lands growing timber is another way of increasing the allowable cut.

There are 60 million acres of private land in need of replanting to trees. Based upon combined Federal and State funds currently being spent, it will take 2,000 years to do

this job. Under the State and private forestry programs, the Federal Government is expending as its share only $505,000 for what is known as section 4 of the Clarke-McNary Act.

As I recall, in 1950 the Congress authorized up to $2½ million a year as the Federal contribution to this program. I think that the States had every reason to expect that the Federal Government would do something toward getting that authorization and I believe that the amount of Federal participation in this program should be raised to $750,000 this year. In addition, I would like to recommend that the Forest Service and the Association of State Foresters be requested to get together, make use of the text of the Timber Resources Review, and come in here with a program of State and Federal cooperation that will get the job done in less than 2,000 years. Improved productivity of private land is an area where the Federal Government does have responsibilities, but the greatest bulk of the initiative should come from the State and local governments and from private owners themselves.

LAND ACQUISITION

Except perhaps for some special situations, there is no pressing need to appropriate large amounts of money to add additional lands to the national forest unless it is done in the framework of a program geared to placing certain submarginal timberlands in public ownership. I believe that as far as possible we should encourage private maintenance of private timberlands now in private ownership. There is so much work needed to get our public forests producing the most they can and there have been such strides in private timber management, that further acquisition of land by the Forest Service should be on a very selective basis.

However, there are small private tracts intermingled with national forest land which should be in public ownership, and I think it would be appropriate to make at least $100,000 available to the Forest Service for such purchases. It might be desirable to restrict the way in which the money can be spent so that only small and low value tracts can be purchased.

I do not think that we should overlook the effect that adjustments in land ownership pattern can have on promoting better management of both public and private land. We have a number of situations where land for land exchanges are desirable to expedite the management of public and private lands. In order that such exchanges will not conflict with timber sales work, I would like to suggest that $100,000 be made available and that no money allocated for any other purpose be used for land acquisition. This is another activity where I think the Forest Service should bring before the Congress a program outlining the areas, the reasons and the expected cost of blocking up ownership in the next 10 years.

In summary, I would like to suggest that we differentiate between the money spent in annual operating expense and the money spent on capital investments which increase the productivity use and revenue potential of our national forests.

Access roads, housing, and reforestation are capital investment programs, while inventory, timber sales work, and road maintenance are operating programs. The investments we make improve the earning capacity of the forest and the supplying of adequate operating funds insures sound management.

Before moving on I would like to just say that the Forest Service deserves special commendation for the outstanding manner in which it has discharged its responsibilities over the years. In a large measure, various Secretaries of Agriculture are also responsible for the excellence of the Forest Service, because ever since the time of Gifford Pinchot the spirit and intent of the civil-service laws as they relate to the Forest Service have been religiously observed by all of our Secretaries of Agriculture. I consider the Forest Service an outstanding example of the type of a public service which we can expect when a career agency is kept free from political interference.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

I would like to discuss briefly the Bureau of Land Management budget, and in particular the effect of the House action which resulted in a decrease of $778,000 from the budget estimate. You will recall, Senator HAYDEN, you and I called upon the Secretary of the Interior to make some radical and drastic changes in the level of the budget for the Bureau of Land Management. My major concern was in the management of the O. & C. lands in Oregon, and I know that your interest was broader and went to many of the other programs. I am worried that this $778,000 reduction will be largely made in the critical forestry functions if allowed to stand.

The forestry budget of the Bureau of Land Management is $4,087,800, which represents an increase of $1,392,700. Of this increase, $801,000 is programed for the O. & C. lands, and the balance for the public-domain lands which the Bureau of Land Management administers in our Western States. Receipts from the sale of timber in 1956 are estimated at $17,850,000, which is a handsome return based upon the expenditure, and under the increase requested it is anticipated that receipts will climb to $19 million. To allow the decreases in the budget to affect the receipts which can be taken in is to me a false economy. Therefore, I feel that the budget as requested should be allowed. The other Bureau of Land Management activities are also rather vital ones, because the Bureau has some broad responsibilities in public land disposal, gas and mineral leasing, and surveying our public lands, and in all these programs it has a tremendous backlog of work.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ACCESS ROADS

The access road program of the Bureau of Land Management is confined to the O. & C. lands in western Oregon, and the money being appropriated comes entirely out of in lieu payments that would normally be made to the 18 O. & C. counties. These counties have requested that 25 percent of the receipts be made available for the construction of access roads. And it is a cold hard fact that if the money is not allocated to access roads as requested by the counties, they are entitled to, and will receive, the money as in lieu payments.

The programs of the Bureau are money makers and it seems to be penny-wise and pound-foolish to try to save a dollar when, if that dollar was expended, it would bring you back several more. The Bureau of Land Management, in its operation of the O. & C. lands, conducts a program that is quite vital to the welfare of western Oregon. Most of its timber sales are small because of the location and nature of its land. The timber generally is of exceptionally good quality. It is also in areas which are at a somewhat lower elevation than much of our national forest timber, and it can be operated quite often in the winter months.

There are 2 million acres of O. & C. lands, and they are highly productive lands. In order to keep them that way, we need to step up the timber inventories, increase our reforestation efforts on these lands, complete the access road system and sell the full allowable cut. I want to urge the committee to give careful consideration to this program. Senator HAYDEN, I urge that you restore the full amount which the Department of the Interior asked for in response to the request which you and I made to Secretary McKay.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Finally, I would like to discuss the Bureau of Indian Affairs' budget, and in particular the resource management item. As a result of the House action the $16,100,000 requested was decreased by $100,000. The committee has increased from $250,000 to $350,000 that amount proposed by the budget for financing from the revolving fund for loans, and directs that the amount programed for soil and moisture conservation be increased by $100,000. Looking over the budget by activities and the House action calling for increases in other activities, I am concerned that a major part of this decrease will fall upon the forestry program.

I would like to call to the committee's attention that the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to deduct such amounts as are needed from the sale of timber to offset the appropriated funds used, in effect, he can and does charge the Indian for services rendered in connection with the sale of timber. By regulation the amount is set at 10 percent of timber sale receipt. On the Warm Springs Reservation in my State the 10 percent collection is now almost double the amount being provided by appropriated funds. I suggest that consideration be given to changing the approach. I think it is perfectly proper when Indian timber is sold for the Indian that they pay for the value of the services rendered including overhead cost. I do not think that it is proper to charge them more than the cost. I do feel that the Congress should appropriate sufficient money to offset the cost, and that we should not attempt to make money from the Indians. Since the Indians are paying for the timber sale work I think that we ought to make available, by one means or another, the funds necessary in order to get the type of timber sale program they need.

Our Indian reservations in the Pacific Northwest have an allowable cut of about 370 million board feet per year. On the Warm Springs Reservation for example, there is an allowable cut of 50 million board feet a year and those Indians are primarily dependent upon timber for their income.

INDIAN ACCESS ROADS

The Warm Springs Indians have discussed with me the desirability of their being able to borrow money in order to construct access roads to their timber so that they can get a better price for it. It is necessary that they do this because they cannot afford to make the capital investment in roads that they should. As I understand it these Indians are perfectly willing to pay back the money that is loaned to them from the receipts from the sale of their timber. Actually, when timber is sold if the purchaser has to build a road he takes that into account in his bidding, and if the road is already in the number of bidders is generally increased and because some of the risk has been taken out of the operation, a premium price is often paid for the timber.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to recommend the committee give consideration as to what could be done along these lines. I might add that I have included language in my bill which will amend the Federal Highway Act to allow this, but because of the urgency of the problem I am hopeful that the Appropriations Committee can take some action to alleviate the problem at once. As I said at the outset, I think that the American Indian is entitled to the best possible management of his lands and every opportunity to participate and learn the art of self-government and management in order that our relationship with the Indian can be changed from one of trustee to that of a full and independent citizen in our democracy.

Our public lands are vital to the development of the west. For many years, the Federal Government has handled them on a

custodial basis. It is now necessary that they contribute more fully to the economy of the country. These lands are capable of supplying basic raw material, water for industry, home use and power, and recreation in increasing amounts. Operation on a management basis is more costly than holding land on a custodial basis. However, I believe it is most important to recognize that when these lands are managed, and managed properly, they will return to the Treasury far more than the money appropriated for their management. They will also generate business which in turn will pay taxes and they will keep people employed so that our Nation can continue to grow. Our natural resources are one of our greatest national assets and the strength of our Nation to a large extent will depend upon how wisely we use this asset.

SALVAGE OF IRREPLACEABLE HISTORICAL MATERIALS IN THE DALLES DAM AREA

Now, as I said at the beginning, I want to make a very brief statement about the salvage of irreplaceable historical materials in the Dalles Dam area.

The University of Oregon had a representative in my office last week, Dr. L. S. Cressman, head of the anthropological department. He is one of the great anthropological experts, not only of the West but of the Nation, who has been doing remarkable research work in the Dalles Dam area and the other areas of the West where these great dams are going up.

What I have to say here, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, is based very much upon the representations made to me by Dr. Cressman, by The Dalles Chamber of Commerce manager, by other students of this problem in the West, and I want to plead strongly for the protection of this cultural value which is going to be lost, in my judgment, unless we make available to these experts the funds they need to save these artifacts and petroglyphs this year.

So, very briefly, I wish to say this:

I ask the committee to give serious consideration to increasing the amount allowed by the House on an item designed as "Salvage Archaeology" for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

As the situation now stands, only $50,000 was recommended by the House to cover the salvage of historical and scientific materials in the vicinity of multipurpose dam projects now being constructed outside the Missouri River Basin. This amount is wholly inadequate, as will be noted in a moment. Unless it can be increased by this committee, I fear that these irreplaceable materials will be lost for all time.

At present, there is an inter-agency archeological salvage program designed to salvage, preserve and interpret a minimum amount of the varied historical and archeological remains located in areas threatened with inundation by large Government-sponsored multipurpose dams and related projects. The program is sponsored and coordinated by the National Park Service. It is conducted in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Smithsonian Institution, and numerous local and State agencies.

Funds appropriated by the Congress are utilized by the National Park Service through cooperative agreements with the Smithsonian Institution and numerous State agencies for carrying out the actual salvage projects. During the earlier years of the program, modest sums averaging about $56,000 a year were appropriated but during fiscal year 1954 and fiscal year 1955, except for a small amount in the Table Rock area of Missouri, no such Federal funds were available. During this time, however, construction on Federal projects continued and there is, therefore, a large backlog of urgently needed salvage work and very little time left in which to accomplish it. It is a great credit to the many State agencies which have participated in this program that they did so with such willingness, often to the detriment of their own research programs.

Final reports are prepared on all phases of this work and published either by the Government or the local agency cooperating in the program. Materials recovered from the excavations are stored by the Smithsonian Institution and other agencies for exhibit and study purposes, and are available for display purposes in museums which may be built in connection with the completed water-control projects.

The material recovered by these excavations and surveys indicates how man lived in many areas of the United States over long periods of time.

One of the largest and most important river basins in the United States is that of the mighty Columbia River. In this basin the Dalles Reservoir area, which will be flooded by the waters of the Columbia River next year when the gates of the dam are closed, contains an archeological record of man's continuous use and habitation of this area which goes backward into the realms of prehistory as much as, and maybe more than, 10,000 years. Such a continuous occupation by mankind of one locality for such a long period of time is almost unparalleled in the Americas.

I digress to say that if the members of the committee could have sat with me and listened to Dr. Cressman the other day and recognized what a dedicated man I had before me, who devotes his life to the archeological program, I think you would agree with me that I should come here and make this plea this morning. There was a great education for me in what he unfolded in a 2½-hour conference. He described what is there and what is going to be lost for all of history if we in our time do not have the foresight to provide what, after all, is the very minimum amount of money that they need to really save this exhibit of history, because this is really an exhibit of the historical development of mankind in that area of our country.

Senator HOLLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Senator MORSE. I yield.

Senator HOLLAND. I believe both members of the committee who are here today had the pleasure of going to Celilo Falls, which is what will be the basin of the dam, and saw something of the matter that the Senator is referring to.

It is true, is it not that the use of those falls will be completely done away with?

Senator MORSE. That is correct.

Senator HOLLAND. And that the historic use of those falls by Indian tribes, going back since way before the dawn of history, will cease when the dam is completed?

Is that one of the matters that the Senator had in mind?

Senator MORSE. That is correct.

I am not an anthropologist or archeologist but I can learn, and I learned from Dr. Cressman about a very rich, really a very rich, resource that is available to us if we can get these artifacts and these petroglyphs out before we flood them. As the Senator from Florida has just pointed out, that will be the case if we do not provide these men with money.

May I say this about the scientists?

They do not think in big terms of money. They are a very economical group. As I sat there and listened to Dr. Cressman, he stated, "We need this much for this digging and this much for this digging." They were very small amounts, but future generations of Americans will deeply appreciate our spending thoses small amounts before it is too late.

The earliest man of whom we know arrived in the Columbia Basin area at a time when the river flowed much higher than today, and the climate was much cooler. Evidence of his living there has been found in what was then a gully near the river, not far from the present city of The Dalles.

In excavating at this site, Dr. Cressman, of the University of Oregon, has found many materials of great research value.

Some of the finest carved and ornamented stonework recovered in America comes from the area around The Dalles. Family groups of Indians clustered along the banks of the Columbia. Some lived in semisubterranean pit houses, others in fancier plank houses much like the ones seen by Lewis and Clark in 1805 when they made their famous portage over Celilo Falls and the Long Narrows.

Among the many artistic achievements of these people are the unique and spectacular petroglyphs, or carved drawings, and the pictographs, or paintings, which they made on many of the large boulders and on the faces of the basalt cliffs along the river's edge. Many of these drawings are fanciful and imaginary, and their exact meaning is now unknown, but others are representations of the Indian's way of life, or portray the animals upon which the Indians depended for their livelihood.

Several days ago Senator NEUBERGER and I asked this committee to recommend $30,000 for archeological salvage work in the river basin area above the Dalles Dam. However, since that time the Director of the National Park Service appeared before this committee and in answer to a question put by a member of the committee indicated that it would take $169,000 to do the archeological salvage job during fiscal 1957 if we are to save a minimum of the historical and scientific materials and information presently available in a number of multipurpose dam areas outside the Missouri River Basin, including the Dalles. In view of this testimony I feel that the amount recommended by the House should be increased to a total of $170,000. These priceless objects and sources of information will be lost through inundation if we do not act quickly.

PRESERVING PRICELESS ARCHEOLOGICAL RECORDS OF THE PAST

My attention has been directed to the very worthwhile suggestion of the Wasco-Dalles City Museum Commission that a museum of natural history be developed near the city of The Dalles. Such a museum would tell the truly magnificent story of the geological, archeological, and historical development of this part of the Columbia Basin. From the city of The Dalles one can readily see the great basalt cliffs rising on each side of the river several thousand feet high. Fifteen or twenty million years ago fissures opened in the earth and thousands of cubic miles of molten lava spewed forth, building up layer by layer. Much later, the Columbia River began to slowly cut a channel through the hardened lava. Helped by the erosional aspects of the Ice Age, an impressive gorge developed through which the Columbia now rushes on its way to the ocean.

Although the roaring river here will shortly be a tamed and quiet lake, a natural history museum in this area could tell with diagrams and models this fascinating story to each visitor. It could show to one and all how man learned to live with, and from, the river and how the early white settlers followed in the path of the Indians until today we not only can control the river but turn its forces to producing the power and products which make this country one of the outstanding nations of the world. Future generations of Americans should not be deprived the privilege of learning the vicissitudes and hardships suffered by their forefathers who made it possible for us to pass these blessings on to them.

In line with the suggested establishment of a museum at The Dalles, I believe it would be helpful if the report of this committee were to suggest the use of approximately $1,000 for a survey of the feasibility and

desirability of such a museum, including a determination of whether it would be possible for the Federal Government to render financial assistance on the museum project.

May I say that I talked to Dr. Lee and Dr. Corbett on this matter and they pointed out that we would have to find out whether or not they would have jurisdiction in the national forests to participate.

It is within their jurisdiction, I admit, to make a study as to the feasibility and the $1,000, it seems to me, is a small enough item to be favorably considered for authorizing such a study by the National Park Service.

In closing, I want to say with apology on my lips that I am sorry I took this much time but I felt that the factual material which I have inserted in the record this morning is due the committee and I thank the committee very much for the courtesy and the opportunity to present these views.

Senator CHAVEZ. The committee wants to thank the Senator for the instructive statement submitted this morning.

Senator MORSE. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7030) to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. POAGE, Mr. GATHINGS, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. HOPE, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and Mr. HILL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9064) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GARY, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. SIEMINSKI, Mr. MURRAY of Illinois, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CANFIELD, Mr. WILSON of Indiana, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3744) to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to substitute employees in the postal field service, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 582) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1956, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the bill (S. 3091) to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 1207 at Louisville, Ky., and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3744) to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to substitute employees in the postal field service was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 15, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3091) to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 1207 at Louisville, Ky.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the amendment which I proposed yesterday evening would strike out section 106 of the bill. This section provides that the basic commodities may have applied to them either the old or the new parity formula, whichever would result in the highest return in price supports for a particular year.

This provision of the bill, which we are undertaking to strike out, is inequitable, because it gives favored treatment to 2 or 3 basic commodities which are already in heavy Government ownership because of high supports given them during past years. We must remember this would favor only 2 or 3 commodities out of the more than 150 agricultural commodities grown in the country.

It would particularly affect the price of wheat. The transitional parity price of wheat this year is $2.38. Assuming that there are no changes in costs and other factors, the parity price of wheat could drop to $2.19 in 3 years under the modernized parity formula.

Mr. President, 2 days ago we approved a multiple-price system for wheat which guarantees to the wheatgrower 100 percent of parity for that part of the crop which is used domestically. If we also give to the producer of wheat the privilege of using the old parity formula based on costs and price relationships which prevailed from 1909 to 1914, 100 percent of parity for wheat would be $2.51 a bushel.

In other words, Mr. President, the wheat producer would be guaranteed, under the multiple-price system, $2.51 a bushel for that part of his crop which is used domestically, which would be, roughly, two-thirds of it, and that would amount to 70 cents a bushel above the present support price for wheat.

That would inevitably slow up the sale of wheat for domestic consumption. An increase of 30 percent or more in the price of wheat would undoubtedly turn some manufacturers of wheat products to the use of substitutes. It would mean, then, that there would be more wheat which would have to be sold on the feed market or on the foreign market. I think the result would be that, inasmuch as we are already selling all we can on the foreign market, the Government would still be the purchaser of a large percentage of our wheat crop.

It does not seem fair, Mr. President, to have a double standard of parity, the old parity formula for three commodities—although probably two of them would run together within the next 2 or 3 years—and another standard for all 150 other commodities, which are produced in this country.

The new parity formula is an improvement over the old one. It reflects the up-to-date supply and demand conditions. Certainly, up-to-date conditions should be reflected in fixing supports for the commodities which are causing our major surplus problems.

Mr. President, if we permit the use of the old parity formula in fixing the support price for wheat, it would be 103 percent of its parity price computed under the modernized parity formula which other commodities are required to use.

The law providing for the use of the modernized parity formula, including transitional parity based on the year 1949, was on the books when the 83d Congress met. When we formulated the Agricultural Act of 1954, we realized that a sharp drop in the effective parity prices for the basic commodities would be from the dual parity formula to the new parity formula. The drop was more than we should expect the wheatgrower for instance, to take in one year. So, Mr. President, in the 1954 act we provided that transitional parity under the modernized parity formula would be based on the year 1955, in the case of the basic commodities; in other words, that there should not be more than a 5-percent drop in any one year in the changeover to the new formula. Otherwise, transitional parity, as it was in the law, would have allowed the change to full modernized parity prices in one year.

Mr. President, I believe the 1954 amendment should be permitted to become effective. I do not think we are going to do the wheat grower or the bill any good by demanding mandatory supports of $2.51 a bushel for wheat when last year the supports were $2.06 and this year they are $1.81 a bushel. We have accumulated almost two billion bushels of wheat in this country, which is almost a 3-year domestic supply. I do not think we ought to encourage any further accumulation. I think the time has come when, even though we do not do it all in one year, all commodities should use the same parity formula for the purpose of determining support prices.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the producers of wheat have received more unfair treatment than have producers of any other farm commodity, both by way of unfair and inaccurate statements and

in the treatment which they have received in connection with price supports.

In 1955 the wheat producers brought their production in line with outlets, or nearly so. There was a difference of only about 15 million bushels. In return for doing that, the Secretary of Agriculture reduced their price support to 76 percent of parity, and they have to continue their greatly reduced acreage. That is in great contrast to what has been done for cotton.

The Secretary of Agriculture tells the cotton farmers he will give them supports at from 86 to 87 percent of parity; and that he will prevent a further drop of cotton acreage scheduled to be about 1,500,000 acres, and will give the cotton farmers a good export program.

I believe this should be done for cotton. I believe it is wrong to help the cotton producers and do nothing for wheat, particularly when cotton is in a worse surplus situation than is wheat.

The modernized parity formula is the most cockeyed formula ever enacted by Congress. It uses as its major provision, in determining what is parity or a fair price, the average price of the previous 10 years. Let us consider applying that formula to labor. If the average wage of labor for the past 10 years was $1.10 an hour, that, then, would have to be the fair price for labor in succeeding years.

Applying that formula to farm commodities, if the price of a commodity was low for a 10-year period—wheat is a good example now; then that average of low prices would have to be the parity or the fair price for future years. Wheat was not in a very favorable position pricewise during the war.

My friend, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who serves on the Committee on Appropriations, knows that in 1947 and 1948 a rider was attached to an appropriation bill providing that there should be no more exports of wheat when a minimum carryover of 150 million bushels was reached. Through one device or another, the price of wheat was held to about $3 a bushel or less. At that time the Argentine was selling wheat for $5 or $6 a bushel.

The very fact that the price of wheat was held down all during the war and afterward, and the fact that that depressed price supposed to be the fair price for wheat, is part of the reason why the modernized parity formula is so objectionable.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I congratulate the Senator from North Dakota. He is making a very sound, logical, economic statement in this connection. Would the Senator not agree with me that until at least we have had a series of peacetime years for the two forms of parity for wheat to adjust themselves, as they have for cotton, we should continue the dual program for all products?

Mr. YOUNG. I think so. When the modernized parity formula was first enacted, it was admitted by the sponsors that it was unfair to wheat and other commodities. They claimed that if we waited for only a few years, the two formulas would run together in price level; that is to say, parity as reflected under the modernized tariff formula and also under the old formula would be, in a few years, about the same. So we were asked to allow a little time. The House conferees at the time agreed to the proposal for dual parity—that is, to provide for the use of both parity formulas, whichever was higher, for a definite period of time, upon the assumption that the modernized parity formula in a few years would reflect a fairer price for wheat and other basic commodities.

Mr. MUNDT. There has been peace for only a very short time following the war in Korea. There has not been any period of sustained peacetime economics in which the two forms of parity could work toward each other or demonstrate themselves. It seems to me to be manifestly unfair now to deprive the farmer of the dual parity formula, at least until a peacetime record and tabulation can be developed to show where such a formula would lead.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. Cotton last year was under a 90 percent price-support program. This year it is supposed to be at 80 or 86 or 87 percent of parity. That would be the fair price or the average price in future years.

But wheat is at 76 percent of parity. That will become the average price or the fair price in future years. It is a completely unreasonable price.

Let me give another example. Potato farmers found it was possible to produce potatoes and make good money under a 60 percent of parity program. They made money under that program. Can Senators imagine a wheat farmer producing wheat at 60 percent of parity and making money?

I think the fair thing to do is to continue in effect the dual parity formula until the Secretary of Agriculture can establish a fair basis for determining parity.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. There is a similar parity situation relating to dairy products. If one takes the most recent 10 years, he will find that it will be many a year before the parity level will definitely increase the price of milk, because the price of milk is moving on a downward scale. That was true last year and the previous year, and it will be true this year. Several more years will have to pass before the so-called parity equivalent for dairy products can possibly be raised.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not true that practically every dairy organization in the Nation claims the parity formula is very unfair to it?

Mr. THYE. They need not claim it; we definitely know that to be so. The Secretary of Agriculture can announce higher parity equivalents or support prices in this calendar year; but even though he announces higher parity-support prices, he will not bring to the producer the returns which the producer received last year or the year before under a lower amount of parity equivalent. It is simply impossible to figure what will happen.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will be defeated.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether, if the amendment should be adopted, it would not affect the so-called dual parity on all maximum acreage commodities, and not merely wheat.

Mr. ELLENDER. It would lower the support price.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Section 106 proposes to strike from section 301 of the present law the following, "as of any date during the 6-year period beginning January 1, 1950."

If that provision were retained, the law would then read:

> Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity as of any date during the 6-year period beginning January 1, 1950, shall not be less than its parity price computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

So it seems to me that the amendment strikes not merely at dual parity for wheat; it strikes at dual parity for any basic agricultural commodity. Is that not correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct; and on my own time, I shall try to explain that.

Mr. President, I yield myself 7 minutes. When the so-called modernized parity formula was first considered by the Senate in 1948, there was doubt as to whether or not modernized parity would be as beneficial pricewise to the producers of basic crops as the proponents of the new formula contended. In order to be certain that no losses would be sustained by the producers of the basic commodities, I, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in 1949, did not object to allowing the so-called modernized parity formula to be put into effect provided that for a period of 4 years, the parity price of the basic commodities would be the higher under the old and new formulas.

It was contended by the proponents of the new formula that certainly within 4 years the new formula would catch up with the old, and therefore it would be unnecessary to retain the old formula. On that assumption, the committee, and the Senate, as well, adopted the so-called dual parity formula, under which the higher of either the old or modernized parity price would be operative.

At the end of 4 years, the predictions made by those who proposed the modernized parity formula did not materialize; the gap between parity prices as computed by the modernized and old parity formulas did not close.

So, in 1953, when the Congress again had farm legislation up for consideration, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry recommended a 2-year extension of the dual parity formula feature of the Agricultural Act. Our purpose was to

give the modernized formula more time to "catch up" with "old parity."

What is the situation now with respect to parity prices for the basics under both the old and the modernized formulas? Up to now they have not become equal. Modernized parity prices still lag behind. Particularly is that true with respect to wheat.

If the amendment should be adopted, it would mean another loss in income for producers of the basic commodities, wheatgrowers in particular. It would mean a small loss for cottongrowers. That might not be too harmful if the support level were high enough. Thus Mr. President, some members of the committee, including myself, would not raise too much objection to the elimination of the dual feature of the parity formula so long as the 90 percent of parity price support provision was in the bill. Since that 90 percent price support provision has been eliminated, the situation has vastly changed. As has been demonstrated during the course of this debate, because of the elimination of the 90 percent price support provision, cotton farmers would lose from 5 to 6 cents a pound, the wheat farmers as much as 46 cents a bushel, and producers of other commodities would also lose. If this amendment is not defeated, our farmers will only have more hardship heaped upon them.

Mr. YOUNG. Corn farmers will lose 16 cents. The growers of peanuts and other commodities will also lose. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I shall put those figures in the RECORD shortly. In fact, I believe the RECORD will show that the growers of every commodity except rice and tobacco will suffer a loss. We have already given a severe blow to the growers of most basic commodities by striking from the bill the 90 percent of parity price support provision.

Yesterday, during the course of the debate, we struck an additional blow at the cotton producers. Now again we are being asked to take a step that will reduce the income of our farmers, particularly the wheat farmers, to this extent: Under the modernized parity formula, the parity price for wheat would be $2.19. Under the old parity formula it would be $2.51, and under the transitional parity formula, which is in effect now for wheat, it is $2.38. Thus, if transitional parity is applied to wheat in 1956, instead of dual parity as recommended by the committee, there will be a reduction of 13 cents a bushel in the wheat parity price, as I arrive at the figure.

With respect to upland cotton, the new parity formula would reduce the parity price to 34.84 cents per pound; the old parity formula would permit the parity price to remain at 35.22 cents, so there is a reduction of 0.38 of a cent.

I think we are being asked to treat growers of these basic commodities unfairly; allowing full modernized parity to go into effect now would further reduce farm prices and farm income. I do not believe we should permit such drastic reductions all at once. I am very hopeful that the Senate will refuse to adopt the proposed amendment.

SENATOR FROM WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana may yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, and that there may be a quorum call, so that the new Senator from West Virginia may appear and be sworn in, without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the certificate of appointment of the new Senator from West Virginia is available, and that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is prepared to present the credentials at this time.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I present the certificate of appointment, signed by Governor Marland, of West Virginia, designating as Senator from West Virginia WILLIAM R. LAIRD III, to succeed the late Senator Kilgore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be read.

The credentials were read by the legislative clerk, and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Charleston, March 13, 1956.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of West Virginia, I, William C. Marland, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint WILLIAM R. LAIRD III, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Harley M. Kilgore, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His excellency our Gov. William C. Marland, and our seal hereto affixed at Charleston, W. Va., this 13th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1956.

[SEAL] WILLIAM C. MARLAND,
Governor.

By the Governor:

D. PITT O'BRIEN,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator-elect will present himself at the desk, the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. LAIRD, escorted by Mr. NEELY, advanced to the Vice President's desk; and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the President pro tempore, and was subscribed by the new Senator.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ATTEMPTS TO INFLUENCE, IMPROPERLY OR ILLEGALLY, THE SENATE, ETC.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, yesterday, when the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] outlined the program which he was planning to carry out as chairman of the special committee, I did not have an opportunity to comment on his statement. I should like to say the Senator from Arkansas took his appointment on the special committee only at the earnest request of the leadership. He accepted appointment as chairman most reluctantly, as a result of every member, including myself, asking him to do so. We are all in support of him as chairman and in support of the rules which he has placed in the RECORD. We are wholeheartedly in support of the program which he has outlined for the committee's future actions.

I think the Senate is fortunate to have him in that particular position on the special committee.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it was the expectation of the Congress, when the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1949 was passed, that modernized parity and old parity would come together in about 4 years.

On August 10, 1954, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] expressed the view that old parity and modernized parity should draw closer to the same level if modernized parity were allowed to work.

As a matter of fact, the two levels of parity have not come closer together. Unless section 106 remains in the pending bill, the disparity will never be corrected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] on August 10, 1954, which is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, on page 13937.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in connection with the passage of the Agricultural Act of 1949, Congress adopted for the first time a formula called the modernized parity formula. At the time the formula was adopted the experts in the Bureau of Agricultural

Economics testified before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that within a 4-year period the old parity and the new parity would coincide. In other words, they testified it would not matter after 4 years whether we used the old parity or the new parity, because the two prices would come together. It was said that it would become effective 4 years after the passage of the act. We said if it will take 4 years to accomplish it, we will wait 4 years from 1949, and let it become applicable 4 years later.

To show whether we tried to keep faith with the people, at a later date it was pointed out to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that these two prices were not moving together. Therefore Congress in June 1952 passed Public Law 585, which extended the parity for 2 more years. We said if they do not move together at the end of that time Congress will again take it up and try to make something out of it.

Therefore we do not have to act on it now. We can safely wait and trust Congress to find out what has taken place, because all during the year 1955 the present parity will be applicable, and the so-called double standard will also be applicable, whereby, if the modernized parity is more favorable, the farmer will get the benefit of it, and if the old parity is more favorable the farmer will get the benefit of that.

That goes on all through the year 1955. It is not until January 1, 1956, that the so-called modernized parity becomes effective, and then the transitional period takes over, and the amount is dropped only 5 percent a year.

Therefore I suggest that at this late hour we not spend time in a discussion of it, because it will be handled by the Senate and and House Committees on Agriculture and Forestry during 1955, if the predictions of the officials of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics are not borne out.

I recognize what the Senator from Minnesota has suggested. He has suggested that the predictions of the experts have not proved true thus far. However, I believe they are working closer together, and I believe it is desirable to have the modernized parity work out. If it can work out in a normal fashion, that will be fine. However, Congress did exactly what it said it would do. When it did not work out properly, Congress extended the law. We can trust both Committees on Agriculture and Forestry to do it again. Therefore, I hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the modernized parity formula takes into account the market price relationships of all agricultural commodities in determining the parity price for those commodities. Thus, whenever the market price of a commodity decreases in relationship to the market price of all others, this decrease is reflected in the parity price for that commodity. Since the price-support program affects the market prices received for the commodities being price supported, different levels of support for the basic commodities would tend to project this difference in the parity price for the basics. Thus, a lower level of price support for wheat, as compared to much higher levels of support for the other basic commodities, would tend to lower the modernized parity price for wheat, in comparison to the parity prices for the other basic commodities.

Mr. President, I have had some statistics prepared to show the effect of this amendment, if it were adopted, on some of the basic commodities. For example, it would have the effect of decreasing the farmer's cash price for 1956 on corn about 7 cents a bushel; wheat, about 10 cents a bushel; cotton, close to half a cent a pound; peanuts, almost seven-tenths of a cent a pound. In other words, the effect will be to reduce the prices of some of the basics, particularly in the case of wheat, and also in the case of corn, when we should be starting a program which will increase these prices, and thereby increase the purchasing power of the farmers for this year.

Hence, Mr. President, I think the amendment of the Senator from Vermont will have the effect of doing great injury to the farmers, insofar as their purchasing power is concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] whatever time he may require.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I rise to make a brief statement in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], on behalf of himself and other Senators.

It seems to me that if the bill is left in its present shape, without the adoption of this amendment, all of us will just be kidding ourselves, and no one else, with our oft-repeated protestations that we are trying to reduce surpluses and are trying to get agriculture back to some condition of normalcy under which it will again be producing in accordance with the demand.

Section 106 of the bill, which the pending amendment would strike gives to producers of the various commodities affected the right to choose the highest of two price supports, that is, the ancient price support, which was fixed on the basis of the level of the years 1910–14, or the modernized parity rate, which, of course, is based upon present conditions, not only with respect to the particular commodity, but with respect to all commodities in the agricultural field.

Anyone can oppose this amendment who wishes to kid himself or the public by protesting that under the bill as now drafted we are trying to reduce surpluses and trying to bring order to agriculture, because that is exactly what he would be doing.

Modernized parity is based on mechanized production of agricultural products. It is built on the situation of agriculture in general under its present state of mechanization. To inject the factor of price supports on the basis of 1910–14 is not only completely unrealistic, but it affects the present situation much more severely than it would be affected if the 90 percent rigid parity price-support program, which has already been rejected by the Senate, had been written into the bill.

In the case of wheat, for example, the ancient parity system, if applied to the present situation, would allow a price support of 103 percent of that which would be allowed under the modernized parity system. I do not believe Members of the Senate need to be reminded that not only would that not bring about any reduction in our surpluses, but, instead, it would encourage the fullest possible production.

It would tend to build up further surpluses; and, what is even worse, would tend to impose a fatal handicap on the Secretary of Agriculture as he tried to carry out the empty mandate of another portion of the bill, to dispose of surpluses as rapidly as possible. He would have to dispose of surpluses against a provision of law which would require him to fix a price 5 percent greater than the support price, which would be at 103 percent of modernized parity, if the provision in the bill sought to be eliminated by the pending amendment were to remain in the bill.

It seems to me that wheat is being fairly treated. It is treated on a transitional basis, under which there is a differential of only 13 cents in the application of transitional parity, rather than complete, modernized parity at this time. If we were to overlook the fact that this particular part of the bill would do greater violence to the entire program than would be the case if we had left the 90 percent rigid price supports in the bill, and if we were to leave this provision in the bill, it would be notice to the entire country, not only that we did not propose to set our house in order with respect to production, but, in addition, that we proposed to create such a handicap against disposal of the surplus on hand and its prompt movement into consumption that the Secretary of Agriculture would find it virtually impossible to reduce the surplus.

The provision sought to be eliminated by this amendment should be eliminated, and I strongly hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the parity formula, or parity equivalent, is a very technical question that is most difficult to understand. Unless a Senator has endeavored to learn something about it, I can easily see how he could be confused, and could very well cast his vote without knowing what the full effect would be.

Let us consider the question of the parity equivalent with relation to dairy products. First, how was parity arrived at in the first instance, when the parity equivalent was applied to dairy supports in 1949 or 1950? I shall try to outline, step by step, just how the parity equivalent was arrived at.

In 1949, to support the price of dairy products, the Department of Agriculture devised a formula to be used in determining the dollars-and-cents support price. This formula represents the ratio between the price of all milk sold wholesale and the price of milk used for butter, cheese, and other manufactured dairy products, during the time from July 1946 to December 1948, or a ratio of 88.5. That became the yardstick by which to measure, in trying to determine what the price should be for surplus milk, or milk which went into manufacturing.

In the year 1954, the Department used a broader base. In other words, it used 1949 and the 30-month period, or the base period which had been established by taking the period from July 1946 through December 1948. The next year,

the calendar year 1949, was also used in computing parity. The price in 1954, or the parity ratio, was 84.1. In other words, the yardstick used to measure parity had dropped 4.4.

In the year 1955, the Department added another calendar year, and that had the effect of dropping the ratio from 88½ down to 83.7.

In the calendar year 1956, the present year, the new base will result in a ratio of 83.3. Therefore, at the present time the support price for dairy products is $3.15 per hundredweight. This represents approximately 77 percent of parity based upon a ratio of 88.5. However, based upon the 83.7 ratio, the $3.15 represents 80.2 percent.

There is the misleading factor. It may be said that the dairy producer is receiving 80 percent, or 84.2 percent, but in reality he is not receiving the dollars and cents he received for milk 2 or 3 years ago.

I ask, Senators, has there been any reduction in the costs of the dairy producer who produces his own feed? Of course not. His costs of operation have increased. Therefore, it costs him more to produce 100 pounds of milk than ever before in history. Yet in the modernized parity ratio he is going down to a weaker position every year. That could continue until such time as we reached the point where the supply of milk would be inadequate to our domestic needs, and then the price would find its own level.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at the present time there are three kinds of parity formulas. We have the old parity, then we have the present modernized parity, and then we have the transitional parity. I have tried to study the proposals with respect to various parity formulas. I admit that they are very complicated and complex. I sincerely hope that Congress will sustain the committee's position and retain the section in the bill under which the Department of Agriculture is authorized to make a study and to report to Congress a modernized parity.

I shall not stand on the floor of the Senate this afternoon and say that the old parity formula is correct. I do not believe it is. However, I do believe there can be but one result from the transitional parity, and that is a complete downward trend in farm prices. We are placing the wheat, corn, and dairy farmers on a parity price support that will make the foreign export market the domestic price for these commodities. In all fairness to these groups it should not be done.

There are several things that are involved in figuring parity. It is not just a simple matter of saying that parity is 82½ percent or 76 percent. Under modernized parity there is no way in which wheat can go up in price. There are many factors involved in arriving at parity for wheat.

The modernized parity formula takes into account the market price relationships of all agricultural commodities in determining the parity price for those commodities. Thus, whenever the market price of a commodity decreases in relationship to the market price of all others, this decrease is reflected in the parity price for that commodity. Since the price support program affects the market prices received for the commodities being price supported, different levels of support for the basic commodities would tend to project this difference in the parity price for the basics. Thus, a lower level of price support for wheat as compared to much higher levels of support for the other basic commodities would tend to lower the modernized parity price for wheat in comparison to the parity prices for the other basic commodities.

The market price for wheat is further adversely affected by the law with respect to marketing quotas and acreage allotments. The normal supply for wheat is an amount equal to domestic consumption and exports plus 20 percent thereof. However, the national acreage allotment for wheat must be an acreage which will produce a quantity equal to the requirements for domestic consumption and exports plus 30 percent thereof. Therefore, under the present production control system for wheat, more than a normal supply will always be produced. In contrast, the national acreage allotments for corn, cotton, and rice must be an acreage which will produce, together with carryover and imports, an amount equal to the normal supply for those commodities. The effect of these production control programs therefore is to produce a normal supply which would tend to stabilize market prices. In addition, under the flexible price support system, whenever total supply does not exceed 108 percent of normal supply in the case of cotton and peanuts, and does not exceed normal supply in the case of wheat, corn, and rice, the minimum price-support level is 90 percent of parity.

All I need to say is that the market price for wheat is further adversely affected not only by parity, but also by marketing quotas and acreage allotments. All those things enter into the picture. I say we should give serious consideration to having a study made of these problems, and I am sure I shall be able to support the result.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield such time as the Senator from New Mexico may require.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, again I have very little to say on the attempt to restore a dual standard parity system in agricultural legislation. This system was adopted originally in 1949 when the House and Senate found themselves unable to agree in any other way. It was put in there after a long, long conference, in which we tried very hard to win approval for the bill the Senate had passed. The House had passed a 90 percent of parity bill. The House said, "Give us a chance to put these bills together within a reasonable period of time."

We adopted that suggestion. It was something that most people knew was wrong. It was a dual standard, which permitted either standard to be followed; that is, either the old or the new parity, whichever was desired. I should add that it was not nearly as serious then as it is now, in view of the provisions that have been added to the bill, and which, the Senate must assume, will likely remain in the bill.

I refer to the fact that a 2-price wheat system has been added to the bill, with a provision giving 100 percent support to wheat used domestically. If we are to have 100 percent support, plus the old parity scale, thereby wiping out the traditional steps in between, I believe we will come out with a rather high price, perhaps in the neighborhood of 50 cents a bushel more than would be the case by present laws.

Furthermore, I believe it will have an effect on our export programs. We have already been notified, in the discussions on international trade, that the British have announced they would not participate in another International Wheat Agreement. If Senators wish to know what the International Wheat Agreement means to us, they should begin counting up the 50 million to 100 million bushels that have been sold under that agreement.

Every time we add provisions like that, we make it just that much easier for the countries trying to move into our markets. We will not solve the problem by continually increasing the price of wheat at home. Wheat itself is in competition with many other products, and we have added to the bill now a two-price system on wheat, under the amendment of the Senator from Kansas. That was the judgment of the Senate. I did not vote for it, but that is now the judgment of the Senate, and we must assume that it will be carried forward in conference, and that the Senate conferees will insist on it.

The House has previously shown its enthusiasm for a two-price wheat system. Surely they will assume that the provision will stay in the bill. Therefore Senators who vote for the amendment should bear in mind that a return to the old parity system, without the transitional parity, coupled with 100 percent price supports, raises the price pretty high.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I concur in the statement of the Senator from New Mexico. Once the domestic parity is in effect, I will be the first to insist on removing it, but I think that until we get some further action we should be given some consideration.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure the Senator from Kansas must recognize the fact that the 100 percent parity provision is in the bill, and that we must go on the assumption that as long as it was also approved previously by the House, in the conference in 1954, and that the House has insisted for a long time upon the two-price wheat system, that the provision will be carried into the final bill. I believe it will be in the final bill.

I have tried to make some calculations on that point, here on the back of a copy of the bill. The Senator from Kansas may say these figures are not accurate, and he may be correct.

However, I took 550 million bushels, which is about the domestic consumption of wheat for food, and I multiplied that figure by 100 percent to get an average support. Then I took 450 million bushels for feed and export and multiplied that figure by 75 percent. I came

out with an average figure of 88¾ percent, which will be the wheat support level under the two-price system.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to state that I hope the figure is correct. I think it is. However, that could not go into effect until two-thirds of the wheat growers of the country by referendum put this program into effect.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am thinking of what the wheat growers will do about it. Personally, I think they will vote for it. I think they will go along with it. With the weather being good, and everything else working out, I hope one farm I operate will harvest 10,000 bushels of wheat this year. I felt a little bad for myself when I voted against the amendment of the Senator from Kansas. However, I do not believe we will help the wheat farmer permanently by adding to the bill a provision which will result in what I believe will be a price that is too high to move wheat.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. If the provision in the Senate bill prevails and the dual parity formula remains in the bill, there will be a rise in the price support of about 11 cents a bushel. Therefore, I believe that the only thing in the bill that would directly help the wheat growers this year would be a provision that would give the wheat farmer 11 cents more a bushel.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. To be fair I believe I should say that is the only thing which might help the wheat growers this year. However, I believe that if the domestic plan is adopted, and put into the bill to provide for 100 percent supports, this act will have an effect on the wheat market, and I believe the possibility of such action has had a noticeable effect within the last few days.

Mr. YOUNG. It could not go into effect until next year.

Mr. ANDERSON. That was not my meaning. I know the provision cannot go into effect until next year. However, the announcement that the country has gone on a domestic support program would have a bullish effect on wheat.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from North Dakota asked if there were anything else in the bill of benefit to the wheatgrower. There is the soil-bank provision in the bill. That is intended almost primarily to benefit the wheatgrower. He gets more benefit out of it than probably any other producer of agricultural crops. Then the Senator might recall also that we have raised the support price for oats, barley, and sorghums quite substantially. The price of sorghums has been raised by 50 cents a hundredweight.

Those are tremendous benefits for farmers who are planting small grains.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is true. I am trying to say to the Senate that I believe the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas did everything that should be done on the question of parity for wheat. We have already established a rather high parity for tobacco. That remains in the law year in and year out. We know cotton is likely to have a parity that will be 85 or 86 percent next year. We are now at a point of 88¾ percent for wheat. I think we should try to make the bill realistic so that we will not be asking the man in the White House to veto it. I imagine the President will sign the bill in its present form, but I am not sure that he will.

I have felt that the addition of a two-price system for rice was questionable. I did not object to its going into the bill, however, for it would give the Secretary a chance to test it in a very narrow area to see if it will work. We have a two-price system for wheat. I believe that those who have been contending for a long time that the two-price system will work should not now complicate the system by trying to change the parity base. I say that in all kindness to those individuals who have been trying to obtain a change in the parity ratio. I do not believe a dual system of parity is a good system. I did not believe it when it was put into the law. I yielded on the point in the last hours, when we were trying to reach an agreement. But that was in 1948.

Mr. President, I support the Senator from Vermont and other Senators in the belief that we should strike from the bill the dual parity feature.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I stated a while ago, the Senate has, during the consideration of this bill, whacked away bit by bit from the income of those producing basic commodities. First we struck from the bill the 90 percent of parity price supports, thereby reducing price support levels. As to cotton, we struck out the seven-eighths inch staple length as the standard grade, and substituted the average of the crop. As a result, the cotton growers will lose an additional $10 a bale in price supports. We are now being asked to strike out the dual parity formula.

Mr. President, as was admitted by my good friend the junior Senator from New Mexico, the only provision remaining in the bill that will give the farmers who produce basic crops immediate relief is the higher price-support levels for their commodities that will result from reinstating the dual parity formula. As was admitted by the proponents of this amendment, its adoption will mean a reduction in the parity price on wheat for this year of 13 cents a bushel and in the long run it will mean reduction of as much as 32 cents a bushel in the parity price for wheat. It will mean a reduction of thirty-eight one-hundredths of a cent in the parity price of cotton.

It is true that we have recently adopted the two-price system for wheat. I do not know whether the House will agree to this program for wheat, but if the House does agree, we can in conference modify the dual parity price formula, if that should be necessary to meet the situation. The entire bill will be in conference, Mr. President. It strikes me that we should not overlook any effort in order to provide some form of relief for those who produce the basic commodities.

Mr. President, the modernized parity formula about which my good friend from New Mexico spoke was supposed to turn the trick, as it were, in the last 6 years, but it did no such thing. On the contrary, it has in a measure depressed the prices of some commodities. The section which is now sought to be stricken from the bill includes a direction to the Secretary of Agriculture to make a thorough study of the possible methods of improving the parity formula and to present his report to us within 6 months. I think that opportunity to restudy the problem should be afforded the Secretary of Agriculture.

My hope is, Mr. President, that the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Vermont and other Senators will not be adopted.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Has the Senator computed the cost to the American farmer if the Aiken amendment should be adopted?

Mr. ELLENDER. On wheat consumed in this country alone, the reduction in the price to be received by producers will be 13 cents a bushel. That is assuming that the two-price plan is finally enacted into law. On cotton the reduction will be thirty-three one-hundredths of a cent a pound in the support price times the total production of cotton. On peanuts it will be whatever support level is announced times seven-tenths of a cent a pound, times production.

Mr. KERR. The figure of seven-tenths of a cent refers to the difference in parity prices for peanuts, does it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. KERR. And on corn the difference in parity price is 9 cents a bushel. Assuming that corn is supported at 81 percent of parity in 1956, the difference in support price for corn placed under loan would be about 7.3 cents per bushel. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Would these figures be approximately correct, that the change from transitional to modern parity would cost the wheat farmers $71.5 million, on that part of their crop consumed in the United States, assuming the two-price plan remains in the bill and that the loss to upland cotton farms would be over $24 million for this year?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not figured it out in that manner, but I am sure the Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a further explanation of the amendment, together with that part of the committee report dealing with the parity formula, and a memorandum on the same subject.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This amendment would restore the use of transitional or modernized parity, whichever is the higher. Section 106 of the bill provides for use of old parity or modernized parity, whichever is higher. On the basis of January 15 data, adoption of this amendment would drop the parity price for wheat 13 cents a year, until it had dropped a total of 32

cents. Corn would drop a total of 18 cents a bushel, peanuts 2.2 cents per pound, and cotton about four-tenths of 1 cent per pound. The effect of this amendment can be seen from examination of table 6 on page 7 of the committee report.

SECTION 106. PARITY FORMULA

Section 106 would require the Secretary in the case of the basic commodities to use the old parity price or the modernized parity, whichever is higher. This section also directs the Secretary to make a thorough study of possible methods of improving the parity formula and report thereon within 6 months after enactment of the act.

A brief description of "old," "new," and "transitional" parity prices, and a table illustrating the effect of this section is set out below:

"1. Old parity prices are calculated by multiplying base period prices by a parity index. In the case of the basic commodities, except tobacco, the base period is August 1909 to July 1914. Hence, the base period prices for the individual commodities are the average prices received by farmers for those commodities during that period. The parity index is the unrevised index of prices paid by farmers, including interest and taxes.

"2. Transitional parity prices are the old parity prices decreased by 5 percent for each calendar year since 1955 in the case of basic commodities and 5 percent for each calendar year since 1949 in the case of nonbasic commodities. For 1956 transitional parity prices are 95 percent of old parity prices for basic commodities and 65 percent of old parity prices for nonbasic commodities.

"3. New parity prices are computed in much the same manner as old parity prices, using the parity index based on 1910–14, but the pattern of price relationships among the various commodities that existed in the immediately preceding 10 calendar years is used to determine the pattern of relationships among the parity prices of the individual commodities.

TABLE 6.—*New, old, or transitional and effective parity prices for selected basic and nonbasic commodities, Jan. 15, 1956*

Commodity	Unit	New parity price	Old parity price	Transitional parity price [1]	Effective parity price [2]	Parity price prescribed by sec. 106 of S. 3183
Basic commodities:						
Corn	Bushel	$1.64	$1.82	$1.73	$1.73	$1.82
Cotton, American upland	Pound	.3484	.3522		.3484	.3522
Wheat	Bushel	2.19	2.51	2.38	2.38	2.51
Rice	Hundredweight	5.42	5.14		5.42	5.42
Tobacco:						
Flue cured, types 11–14	Pound	.534	.522		.534	.534
Burley, type 31	do	.520	.506		.520	.520
Peanuts	do	.114	.136	.129	.129	.136

[1] Transitional parity is not shown where the new parity price is the effective parity price. Transitional parity price in 1956 was 95 percent of the old parity price.
[2] The effective parity price is the new parity price or the transitional parity price, whichever is higher.

Attached is a table showing the old and new parity prices (1) for January 15, 1950, and (2) for February 15, 1956, for most of the commodities for which price supports are in effect.

What happens in the future with respect to the movement of old and new parity prices for any commodity will depend upon the changes in the relationship of the farm prices for that individual commodity as compared to prices received for all commodities for the 10-year period used to compute the new parity price. Each commodity will need to be analyzed separately to determine whether the spread between the old and new will increase or decrease over a period of years. For example, in the case of cotton it would appear the new parity price will, within a relatively short period of time (possibly 2 or 3 years), equal or exceed the old parity price. In the case of wheat, corn, and peanuts, during the next 4 or 5 years it does not appear that the new parity price will equal or exceed the old parity price. However, there is some probability that the difference may narrow.

Comparison of "old" and "new" parity for Jan. 15, 1950, and for Feb. 15, 1956

Commodity	Unit	Jan. 15, 1950		Feb. 15, 1956	
		New parity	Old parity	New parity	Old parity
Mandatory basics:					
Wheat	Bushel	$1.84	$2.13	$2.19	$2.50
Corn	do	1.43	1.55	1.64	1.82
Cotton:					
Upland	Pound	.2771	.2988	.3472	.3509
American-Egyptian	do	.5779	.6111		
Peanuts	do	.0931	.116	.113	.136
Rice	Hundredweight	4.93	4.36	5.40	5.12
Tobacco:					
Flue-cured (11–14)	Pound	.488	.463	.532	.520
Burley (31)	do	.488	.448	.518	.504
Mandatory nonbasics:					
Butterfat	do	.690	.634	.717	.744
Milk, manufacturing (parity equivalent)	Hundredweight	3.81	3.42	3.82	3.77
Honey, extracted	Pound	.165	.173	.152	.195
Tung nuts	Ton	100.00	None	80.40	None
Wool	Pound	.500	.441	.599	.518
Mohair	do	.660	.663	.781	.778
Nonmandatory nonbasics:					
Barley	Bushel	1.21	1.49	1.32	1.75
Oats	do	.809	.962	.843	1.13
Rye	do	1.47	1.74	1.65	2.04
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	2.32	2.92	2.56	3.42
Flaxseed	Bushel	4.26	4.07	4.40	4.78
Soybeans	do	2.49	2.31	2.86	2.72
Beans, dry, edible	Hundredweight	8.32	8.12	9.02	9.54
Cottonseed	Ton	65.50	54.30	69.20	63.80

A MEMORANDUM ON OPERATION OF MODERNIZED PARITY FORMULA AS IT AFFECTS WHEAT

The modernized parity formula takes into account the market price relationships of all agricultural commodities in determining the parity prices for those commodities. Thus, whenever the market price of a commodity decreases in relationship to the market price of all others, this decrease is reflected in the parity price for that commodity. Since the price-support program affects the market prices received for the commodities being price supported, different levels of support for the basic commodities would tend to project this difference in the parity price for the basics. Thus, a lower level of price support for wheat as compared to much higher levels of support for the other basic commodities would tend to lower the modernized parity price for wheat in comparison to the parity prices for the other basic commodities.

The market price for wheat is further adversely affected by the law with respect to marketing quotas and acreage allotments. The normal supply for wheat is an amount equal to domestic consumption and exports plus 20 percent thereof. However, the national acreage allotment for wheat must be an acreage which will make available a quantity equal to the requirements for domestic consumption and exports plus 30 percent thereof. Therefore, under the present production control system for wheat, more than a normal supply will always be available. In contrast the national acreage allotments for corn, cotton, and rice must be an acreage which will produce, together with carryover and imports, an amount equal to the normal supply for those commodities. The effect of these production control programs therefore is to produce a normal supply which would tend to stabilize market prices. In addition, under the flexible price support system, whenever total supply does not exceed 108 percent of normal supply in the case of cotton and peanuts, and does not exceed normal supply in the case of wheat, corn, and rice, the minimum price support level is 90 percent of parity.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

I yield myself another minute on the bill, Mr. President.

Mr. LANGER. Was the amendment discussed in the committee?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Language to reinstate the dual parity formula is in the bill.

Mr. LANGER. And this amendment is to strike it out?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the point.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce for the information of the Senate that there is at the desk House Joint Resolution 582, making additional appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1956, and for other purposes. The distinguished chairman of the committee has urged me to bring this matter before the Senate at the earliest possible date, and has assured me that he knows of no controversy in connection with it. I talked to the distinguished minority leader, and later in the day I shall ask permission to call up the joint resolution, with the understanding that whatever time it takes shall not be charged to either side.

In addition, Mr. President, there is an urgent matter involving an increase in

the appropriation authorization for the aircraft control and warning system, in which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is interested. There is a deadline of March 15. So far as I know, there is no controversy about it. Later today, after Senators have received due notice, we will ask unanimous consent to bring it up.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Aiken amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have not used all my time.

I wish to say that in spite of the discussion on the floor of the Senate, the retention of the dual-parity formula does not help in the cases of 150 of our farm commodities. It provides additional benefits for only approximately three of them, because the parity price for cotton is almost exactly the same under the old and under the new parity formula. Under the new formula, it will receive a little increase next year.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that the provision of the bill which we are seeking to strike out and which would be tied to the multiple-price program for wheat would give to the wheatgrowers of this country $2.51 a bushel for that part of the crop which is used domestically.

That means the Commodity Credit Corporation could not sell one bushel of wheat in its possession for less than about $2.51, plus 5 percent, plus carrying charges. That would price wheat right straight out of our domestic market.

Then what would we do? Would we dump it into the feed market? Would we dump it into the foreign market? Where would it go?

If we combine these two provisions, we shall practically be eliminating 1 million, or 51 percent of all the wheatgrowers of this country, from the benefits of the law. They would have to sell their 136 million bushels of wheat on the feed market. One of our troubles now is the depressed feed market, due to the fact that the acres taken out of wheat and corn have been put into fed grains, which have just swamped the market.

If we should add 100 million bushels more of wheat—and no one knows how much more than that—to the already depressing surplus of feeds which we now have; if we should break the feed price even more, and also break the price of cattle and hogs, those results would be the worst thing that could happen to the beef producers of Colorado or the pork producers of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois.

Do we want to do that? Do we want to guarantee the wheat grower an increase of 70 cents a bushel on his production, which the Federal Government would have to own, because it could not sell the wheat at that price? The Government is having trouble now selling wheat at $1.75 a bushel.

That is what the provision of the bill would do when coupled with the provision which was adopted day before yesterday.

The million small wheat producers who have 15 acres or less and who produce wheat in rotation would not be permitted to vote on what happened to them. They would not be permitted to vote on whether they were to be exterminated from the wheat market or not. They would have to rely solely on the feed market to dispose of their production.

This, Mr. President, would be a fatal blow to our hopes for a good farm bill this year. We simply cannot allow such undue benefits to accrue to 1 group, which has already received $800 million in subsidies in exports alone in the last 6 years. We have spent $800 million to help unload wheat abroad; and while we have spent that sum, we have run up our total supply to 1,900,000,000 bushels. Why? Because to produce wheat for the Government pays better than anything else.

The corngrower is going to take it on the chin; the hog raiser is going to take it on the chin; the cattle raiser will find himself in a box. So will the producers of all the other commodities who are not the beneficiaries of high support prices. They have lowered their cost, and they are in a pretty healthy condition today as a result of that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, my patience with the Senator from Vermont is about running out, his statements are often so inaccurate.

A moment ago a former Secretary of Agriculture, the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], said that the domestic parity program would mean about an 88-percent price support for wheat. Eighty-eight percent of $2.50 a bushel, which the Senator from Vermont admits to be the parity price, or $2.51 a bushel. This would mean, under the dual parity formula, a price support of about $2.21 a bushel. That is lower than the price was 2 years ago. It is a far cry from what the Senator from Vermont said.

I know the Senator from Vermont decries the fact that under the International Wheat Agreement the cost of the wheat disposal was something like $800 million. But we have given away hundreds of millions, yes billions, of dollars' worth of other commodities under the Marshall plan. The International Wheat Agreement is a diffreent program. Much of it took the place of the ECA and Marshall plan. Eight hundred million dollars does not seem so much when it is considered that this was over a 6- or 8-year period. In the last year, we spent more than $700 million getting rid of dairy surpluses. I think it was proper that we did so. I think it was equally necessary to spend the money we have under the International Wheat Agreement.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, no further time remains on either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak again on the amendment, but I was surprised to hear the statement which was just made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont. After all, I am accustomed to reading statements made in the press and elsewhere by persons who are not familiar with the farm programs and especially the wheat program. But when the Senator from Vermont complains about a wheat price which will destroy the wheat exports of this Nation under a domestic parity plan, it is simply contrary to what we heard said the other day. It was claimed the other day that if we adopted domestic parity for wheat there would be such a low price that wheat would be "dumped" on the world market and thus destroy our international trade on wheat and other farm commodities.

The statement made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] that under domestic parity for wheat we should have an average support price of 88 percent of parity is about right.

I sincerely hope that no Senator will be misled by the fact that this program would bring the price of wheat up to a price that would prevent export. That is an amazing statement to be made on the floor of the Senate. The domestic parity plan would again let wheat be sold at competitive market. This will once again give the wheatgrowers a chance at former markets and reduce surpluses.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall not take even that long. I simply say that this is an income-reducing amendment. It appears to me that if the desires is to reduce the farmer's income, the amendment should be adopted. But if it is desired to sustain his income, then we should retain the present language in the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I have prepared in connection with section 106, the parity-formula section, together with tables connected therewith, which explain what the section will do, not only this year, but also at the end of the so-called transitional parity period.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM DEBATE, 1956—PARITY FORMULA
SECTION 106

Mr. President, we come now to the other half of the committee's action to stop the sliding scale of price supports. This section will continue the use of full parity as farmers have known it for nearly a quarter of a century, on the great basic crops of corn, wheat, and cotton, as well as on peanuts. This section also instructs the Secretary to make a thorough study of possible methods of improving the parity formula and report thereon, with his recommendations, to Congress within 6 months after the enactment of this act.

Mr. President, those who believed that the answer to the farmers' problems was the sliding scale of lower and lower prices did

not stop with abolishing supports on some products and hoping to abolish them on still more.

They did not stop with just a vicious campaign to vilify the farmer before his city customers.

They did not stop with the sliding scale of supports which deliberately hurts farmers just when they need help, and which forces farmers to produce more to make ends meet.

They did not stop with all these measures. They went beyond them to tamper with the parity formula itself, in the effort to still further depress prices. By lowering parity for corn, wheat, and cotton, which are the backbone of our farm programs, the income for all of agriculture would be cut down.

Fortunately, this assault upon the whole principle of parity made by the 80th Congress was turned aside and postponed until this very year, by action of the 81st Congress. Efforts in the 83d Congress during consideration of the Agricultural Act of 1954 failed to extend the postponement beyond January 1, 1956.

If the so-called modernized parity for these great crops had taken effect when the 80th Congress leaders wanted it to, back in 1949 or 1950, the troubles of agriculture would be multiplied beyond what they are today, for reasons I will soon explain.

And if the 83d Congress, back in 1954, had listened to what we then said, farmers would not now be faced with this price cut which this section aims to retract and prevent.

The new, so-called modernized formula for wheat, corn, and cotton makes such a drastic cut in income that even the sponsors of this measure felt obliged to soften its terrible blow by providing for applying the reduction in smaller yearly installments. Thus they provided for an annual 5-percent reduction in parity and named this transitional parity, with this operation to begin with 1956.

This transitional parity is much like trimming a dog's tail inch by inch, instead of chopping it all off at once.

Just the drop in parity provided by this year's 5-percent cut amounts to around $450 million on the production of corn, wheat, cotton, and peanuts.

If loans are made at 90 percent as proposed by this bill, the loss under this 5-percent cut will be over $400 million directly to producers of these 4 crops.

But the indirect cost to agriculture will be far greater. The corn loan is a basic factor in the price of all feeds, and the support level for corn thus affects the prices received by other feed producers, regardless of their loan levels for their feeds. And still greater, the support level for feeds is the greatest influence upon the output of livestock, poultry, and dairy products and therefore affects the prices for those products.

Cheap feed based upon a loan rate for corn which is low, leads to cheap livestock, dairy, and poultry products. So the loss will be far greater than $400 million if parity is discarded and the 5-percent cut made actual this year.

That 5 percent represents 13 cents in the case of wheat, 9 cents for corn, $14 per ton on peanuts, and nearly $2 per bale on cotton. And with a 90-percent loan rate, the difference in loans would be 12 cents on every bushel of wheat, 8 cents on the corn crop, $12.20 per ton on peanuts, and one-third of a cent per pound on cotton. The cut in cotton is not so great the first year, but more will come later.

But this is not the end of the trouble that is in store for American farmers if section 106 does not prevail.

Next year will see another 5-percent cut for wheat and peanuts, nearly that much for corn, and the preparing for greater reductions for cotton. With 90-percent loans, the difference in 1957 will be 23 cents for wheat, 15 cents for corn, $25.20 per ton for peanuts, and one-fourth cent for cotton.

Assuming Congress has not yet acted, by 1958 these reductions in 90-percent loans will progress further, to 29 cents for wheat, 20 cents for corn, $34.20 a ton for peanuts, and over a half cent a pound on cotton.

If we look as far ahead as 1959, the results will be still worse, always assuming Congress has not acted to give farmers a full and fair parity.

In that year, the difference between 90-percent loans at the parity level farmers have been using since 1933 and the one now hanging over their heads, is 32 cents a bushel on wheat, 26 cents a bushel on corn, $34.20 a ton on peanuts, and nearly a cent a pound on cotton.

Mr. President, these drastic cuts in the income of our farmers must not be allowed to take place.

Consider what will happen to a corn grower with some 5,000 bushels for sale. Because of this 5-percent cut hanging over his head, in 1956 he stands to lose 8 cents per bushel or some $400, just at a time when he can stand to lose it least. The 15-cent lower rate for 1957 would mean $750 less, the 20-cent crop in 1958, a full $1,000 less, and the 26-cent cut by 1959 would mean $1,300 that year.

That would be a total loss for the 4 years of some $3,450, in many cases equal to a year or more of net income with today's conditions. That is what so-called "modernized" parity would do to the corn producer, even with 90-percent loans.

The wheat grower would lose, if he had 3,000 bushels for market, similar amounts. 1956 would see a cut of $360 due to the 12-cents-a-bushel lower rate. In 1957 the 23-cent cut would add up to $690 for that year. By 1958 the 29-cent lower support would mean $870 less, and in 1959, the 32-cent difference would come to $960. That would be a total of $2,880 for the 4 crops, again equal to a year or more of net income.

The loss for peanut growers would be as great, proportionately, as for the corn or wheat raiser. For the cotton grower, the losses would not be as heavy within this 4-year period but there could be much more to come later.

Mr. President, that is the sorriest aspect of this attempt to trim our farmers by shortening their parity yardstick. As if it were not enough to make drastic cuts in parity for these important crops that are at the very base of our farm program, this scheme may well lead to digging the grave of the whole parity idea, by continually lowering parity.

It would take more time and patience than we have at this hour to fully explain all the involved calculations upon which this misnamed "modernized" parity rests, but I must take time to indicate that it is a true "time-bomb" for farmers, and one which Secretary Benson should have been concerned about de-activating before it ever started to blow up.

This "modernized" formula does not put agriculture upon an up-to-date basis in measuring what is a fair prace, a parity price.

It actually still uses the 1910–14 basis, but tinkers with it in such a way as to have the result of cutting agriculture even below the levels of that period. It further does nothing to insure that present-day farming costs are accurately measured, such costs being still estimated on the basis of what farmers bought before World War II. All it really does is to "adjust" downward the principal products which are supported, and to provide a means whereby this downward adjustment might go on and on, if support prices on these products were kept at low levels. Thus eventually the parity yardstick for corn or wheat or cotton might be only 2 feet long or even only 18 inches long, and the income of agriculture could shrink accordingly.

This process of cutting price supports by cutting parity is based on using a 10-year moving average as the means for adjusting parity. Nothing is changed from the 1910–14 basis for figuring parity except that the relationship between the various farm products that has prevailed in the most recent 10 years is substituted for that which prevailed back in 1910–14.

Thus any product which has had a below-average return for the past 10 years, as measured by what all farm commodities have been bringing, gets a new lowered adjusted base and consequently a lower parity.

On January 15, the lower parity was substantial for most crops except tobacco, rice, soybeans, and cottonseed, which at present show a slightly higher parity. Parity was also lower for chickens, turkeys, eggs, butterfat, and most fruits and vegetables. There was a slightly higher parity for milk and hogs, but only for four products was there any really large increase: Beef cattle, veal calves, lambs, and wool.

The following table gives the percentage change from old parity to new parity as of January 15:

Commodity:	*Percent change*
Hay	−31
Potatoes	−30
Eggs	−26
Grain sorghums	−25
Oats	−25
Barley	−24
Rye	−19
Peanuts	−16
Wheat	−13
Chickens	−13
Turkeys	−12
Corn	−10
Flaxseed	−8
Dry beans	−5
Butterfat	−4
Cotton	−1
Milk	+2
Hogs	+2
Burley tobacco	+3
Rice	+5
Soybeans	+5
Cottonseed	+8
Wool	+15
Veal calves	+21
Beef cattle	+38
Lambs	+40

Mr. President, I want to repeat that this reshuffling for the different farm commodities does not result in anything more than the lowering of farm income.

The measurement of parity returns for agriculture are still made against the standard of 1910–14—the pie that agriculture is to divide is not made any larger than it was then. The pieces of pie, so to speak, going to the different commodities, are just altered in size, most being made smaller while a few are much bigger.

And it is because the cuts are made precisely in the products upon which our price-support programs rest, that this can spell progressive disaster for farmers. What good does it do if we, for instance, greatly increase parity for cattle or hogs but provide no price supports for them, while at the same time we lower parity for corn and thereby insure lower prices for livestock?

We could have parity on hogs at $50 a hundredweight, but if we do nothing to help hog producers directly it is the corn loan which counts.

And if the price of corn is lowered by lowering parity for corn, then what matters to the hog producer as well as the corn producer is what is done to parity for corn. The combination of sliding, flexible loans and modernized parity could have resulted in corn support prices dropping way below $1 per bushel. The modernized parity stands

today 18 cents lower than what farmers have had, at $1.64 instead of $1.82, and it can drop and drop below this figure.

Mr. President, we have had during these last few years mandatory supports on only a few key products, plus some that are less important. As our farm law stands today, supports are sure only on the six basic products, plus the manufactured milk and butterfat products, wool, mohair, tung nuts, and honey. Disregarding the last three, please note that the modernized parity is 16 percent lower for peanuts, 13 percent lower for wheat, 10 percent lower for corn, 4 percent lower for butterfat, 1 percent lower for cotton, 2 percent higher for milk, 3 percent higher for burley tobacco, 5 percent higher for rice and 15 percent higher for wool. Only for wool can it be said that a substantial gain is made.

For milk products another part of this bill aims to prevent further cuts in the comparable parity price at which products are actually supported, which cuts have far offset this trifling increase in the parity price.

For the corn crop, backbone of the entire livestock, dairy, and poultry industry, a 10 percent cut is provided. For wheat, the largest cash crop over the years, a 13 percent cut. For cotton, only a small cut to begin with, but the possibility of large cuts as years go by.

That is why we say that unless and until we have an adequate support price under all our livestock products, such a modernizing of parity actually can do nothing but lower income for American agriculture.

We are in a low-income period for agriculture, which, if not corrected, will continue to lower the parities of those products which we are supporting.

This becomes a vicious circle, in which a low price results in a lowering of parity, a lower support, a still lower price, and a still lower parity.

If uncorrected, this very means of tampering with parity could become a principal means for permanently keeping agriculture far below parity, while the shorter yardstick would make it appear to city people that farmers were doing all right.

Now is the time to stop this vicious circle, before it goes any further.

That is the purpose of this section 106, to prevent automatic cuts in prices of principal products which would in turn bring further automatic cuts in the years ahead.

We make it mandatory for the Secretary of Agriculture to renew the study of what should be done to provide a truly modern and fair parity formula. Such a formula, no doubt, would use a more recent relationship between farm and city industry than 1910–14, but it would not overlook the tremendous change in the requirements for farming, such as our present formula does with its weightings for things farmers buy still based on the 1937–41 period.

Thanks to action by Congress, the Department of Agriculture is now at work gathering the facts upon which an up-to-date weighting can be carried out. That in itself makes this a favorable time to review the whole question of the adequacy of the parity formula. We ask in this bill that the Secretary devote the next half year to study of this important factor in farm prosperity. After studying so many subjects over so many years, we think it high time that this key subject be properly studied by him, so that we can act before agriculture falls farther and farther behind the rest of the Nation.

I think we can be confident that Congress will not again adopt a new parity formula with as little knowledge of what it may do to harm farmers as was the case in 1948 when this so-called modernized formula was adopted.

Perhaps it was the natural result of a desire for cheap feed on the part of those dairy and poultrymen who buy most of their feed, after having gone through 1947 when a corn crop failure on top of emptying our evernormal granary to feed Europe brought the highest grain prices in history in early 1948.

That was a natural desire, although I should point out that those producers with the advantage of protected milksheds and firm Federal marketing orders suffered far less than farmers elsewhere from the corn crop failure.

But, whatever the reasons and hopes, it is a fact that not until long after it was passed was it recognized that a 10-year moving average could greatly depress agriculture, and to this hour no sponsor of this modernized parity has to my knowledge yet acknowledged this imminent danger. Maybe it is because they do not recognize that what makes for cheap food makes in the long run for cheap livestock, poultry, and dairy products.

Maybe that is why Governor Dewey, anticipating a great victory in November of 1948, cracked the whip and got this sliding-scale, cheapened-parity law passed in the first place in the early morning hours of Sunday before convention back in 1948. As a gentleman farmer in New York it no doubt appealed to him, but ever since then it has hung over the heads of farmers everywhere.

It is time we act decisively to remove this threat.

We have done so in this bill.

We have restored 90-percent supports.

We should not be taking back with one hand what the other gives, by using a cheapened parity on which to base the 90 percent.

This section will help to restore agriculture to its rightful position, and will prepare the ground for Congress to provide a new parity formula that is truly modern.

This section will put dollars into farmers' pockets that they should have, and it will aid in reducing surpluses by helping to eliminate cheap feed, the major cause of our present difficulty.

I for one do not want to have to answer to the voters this fall if Congress should decide to cut parity at the very time farmers are in such difficulties.

Let others take the responsibility for such a step, if it is taken.

Let others rise to explain how a farmer, caught as he is between low prices for what he sells and higher and higher prices for what he must buy, should be required by act of Congress to take a still lower price for his products.

If we mean parity for agriculture, we had better not shorten the yardstick by which we are measuring that parity, especially not in a time of distress.

This section is a necessary part of any effort that sincerely wants to go even part of the way to make good on the harm done farmers these past few years.

This section, along with the 90-percent supports, must have the full support of the Congress.

Let others tell farmers they should take less.

Mr. President, I would like the RECORD to show at this point what failure to pass this section can do to the corn and wheat grower during the next 4 years, in dollars and cents for a typical producer. I should also like the RECORD to show what happens to parity under this modernized formula for the basic products of corn, wheat, cotton and peanuts in the next 4 years.

These figures are based on today's costs, and on the assumption that the loan price will influence returns to farmers about as it has in the past.

They are based on the further assumption that 1956 prices for all farm products will decline no further but will average the same as 1955, and that in 1957 and 1958 we will see a 15 percent and 20 percent increase, respectively. These are generous asumptions to make regarding farm prices. Further, these calculations assume 90 percent loans during the next 3 years. If loan rates are lower, then parity will be lowered further than here indicated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the tabulations mentioned to appear at this point in my remarks:

Direct effect on gross receipts of reducing parity for typical corn and wheat growers, 1956–59

Year	Corn grower (5,000 bushels)			Wheat grower (3,000 bushels)		
	Loss per—		Cumulative loss	Loss per—		Cumulative loss
	Bushel	5,000 bushels		Bushel	5,000 bushels	
	Cents	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Cents*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
1956	−8	−400	−400	−12	−360	−360
1957	−15	−750	−1,150	−23	−690	−1,050
1958	−20	−1,000	−2,150	−29	−870	−1,920
1959	−26	−1,300	−3,450	−32	−960	−2,880

NOTE.—Assumes 90 percent of parity loans.

Estimated effect of using transitional and "modernized" parity for wheat and corn for 1956–59 [1]

I. PARITY PRICE

Year	Corn		Wheat	
	Old parity	New parity	Old parity	New parity
1956	$1.82	[2] $1.73	$2.51	[2] $2.38
1957	1.82	1.65	2.51	[2] 2.26
1958	1.82	1.60	2.51	2.19
1959	1.82	1.53	2.51	2.16

II. 90-PERCENT LOAN

Year	Corn		Wheat	
	Old parity	New parity	Old parity	New parity
1956	[3] $1.64	[3] $1.56	[3] $2.26	[3] $2.14
1957	1.64	1.49	2.26	2.03
1958	1.64	1.44	2.26	1.97
1959	1.64	1.38	2.26	1.94

III. DIFFERENCE IN LOANS

	Cents per bushel	*Percent*	*Cents per bushel*	*Percent*
1956	−8	−5	−12	−5
1957	−15	−9	−23	−10
1958	−20	−12	−29	−13
1959	−26	−16	−32	−14

[1] Assumes 90 percent loans for 1956–58; average farm prices for 1956 unchanged from 1955, up 15 percent for 1957, up 20 percent for 1958; and present parity index of costs.

[2] Transitional parity.

[3] Actual minimum loans already announced: Corn, $1.40; wheat, $1.81.

Estimated effect of using transitional and "modernized" parity for cotton and peanuts for 1956–59 [1]

I. PARITY PRICES

Year	Cotton		Peanuts			
			Per pound		Per ton	
	Old parity	New parity	Old parity	New parity	Old parity	New parity
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
1956	35.22	34.84	13.6	[2] 12.9	272.00	[2] 258.00
1957	35.22	34.96	13.6	[2] 12.2	272.00	[2] 244.00
1958	35.22	34.62	13.6	11.7	272.00	234.00
1959	35.22	34.31	13.6	11.7	272.00	234.00

[1] Assumes 90 percent loans for 1956–58; average farm prices for 1956 for all commodities unchanged from 1955, up 15 percent for 1957, up 20 percent for 1958; and present parity index of costs.

[2] Transitional parity.

Estimated effect of using transitional and "modernized" parity for cotton and peanuts for 1956–59—Continued

II. 90 PERCENT LOAN [3]

1956	29.58	29.24	12.24	11.63	244.80	232.60
1957	29.58	29.34	12.24	10.98	244.80	219.60
1958	29.58	29.04	12.24	10.53	244.80	210.60
1959	29.58	28.76	12.24	10.53	244.80	210.60

III. DIFFERENCE IN LOANS

	Cents	*Percent*	*Cents*	*Percent*	*Dollars*	*Percent*
1956	−0.34	−1	−0.61	−5	−12.20	−5
1957	−.24	−1	−1.26	−10	−25.20	−10
1958	−.54	−2	−1.71	−14	−34.20	−14
1959	−.82	−3	−1.71	−14	−34.20	−14

[3] Assumes change in loan to new basis as projected by bill, with 2½ cents lower loan due to this change, for cotton. If this change not made, difference in loan rates would be slightly different, with less drop in new parity.

Income significance of extending old parity formula

COMPARISON OF OLD FORMULA AND 1956 TRANSITIONAL PRICES

	Unit	Old formula	Basis Jan. 15, 1956	
			Transitional parity prices	Difference
Corn	Bushel	$1.82	$1.73	0.09
Wheat	do	2.51	2.38	.13
Peanuts	Pound	.136	.129	.007
Cotton, upland	do	.3522	.3484	.0038

The equivalent farm-income loss in 1956 resulting from application of transitional parity prices in 1956 for the several commodities is:

	Unit	Price cut per unit	Billion units, 1955 production	Equivalent income loss
				Million
Corn	Bushel	$0.09	3.2	$288
Wheat	do	.13	.9	122
Peanuts	Pound	.007	1.6	11
Cotton, upland	do	.0038	7.3	28
Total				449

DROP IN PARITY PRICES FROM OLD TO NEW FORMULA

	Unit	Drop		Old formula	New formula
		Dollars	Percent		
Wheat	Bushel	$0.32	13	$2.51	$2.19
Corn	do	.18	10	1.82	1.64
Peanuts	Pound	.022	16	.136	.114
Cotton, upland	do	.0038	1	.3522	.3484

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is a wish to reduce the total farm income in this country, I know of no one factor which would have more significance in doing so than the step which is being contemplated at the moment.

Furthermore, I think the amendment to section 106 of the bill, providing that the Secretary of Agriculture shall make a thorough study of possible means to improve the parity formula, meets with approval.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, can the Senator from Minnesota cite figures showing how the income would be reduced?

Mr. HUMPHREY. At the end of the transitional period, for example, parity prices for wheat would be down 13 percent, or 32 cents a bushel.

Corn would be down 18 cents a bushel.

Peanuts would be down a little more than 2 cents a pound.

Cotton would be down about three-tenths of a cent a pound, which is the full maximum.

In the first year, corn support levels would be down 7.3 cents; wheat, 10 cents; peanuts, about seven-tenths of a cent a pound; upland cotton would be down about three-one hundredths of a cent a pound.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

All time on the amendment has expired. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, it is proposed to strike out lines 14 through 22, as follows:

PARITY FORMULA

SEC. 106. Section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (providing for a dual parity formula), is amended by striking out the following: "as of any date during the 6-year period beginning January 1, 1950." The Secretary shall make a thorough study of possible methods of improving the parity formula and report thereon, with his recommendations, to Congress within 6 months after the enactment of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BIBLE (when his name was called). On the vote on this amendment, I have a pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." If the junior Senator from Louisiana were present and voting, he would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. BENNETT. I vote "yea."

Mr. GORE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. Were he present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. McCARTHY (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent in his State. His pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] has been announced previously.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 44, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—44

Aiken	Eastland	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Flanders	Pastore
Anderson	Frear	Payne
Barrett	Goldwater	Potter
Beall	Green	Purtell
Bender	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bennett	Holland	Smathers
Bricker	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Bush	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Butler	Jenner	Stennis
Capehart	Kennedy	Watkins
Case, N. J.	Knowland	Welker
Cotton	Kuchel	Wiley
Dirksen	Malone	Williams
Duff	Martin, Iowa	

NAYS—45

Barkley	Hill	Morse
Byrd	Humphrey	Mundt
Carlson	Jackson	Murray
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Neuberger
Clements	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Curtis	Laird	Robertson
Daniel	Langer	Russell
Douglas	Lehman	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Magnuson	Scott
Ellender	Mansfield	Sparkman
Ervin	McClellan	Symington
George	McNamara	Thurmond
Hayden	Millikin	Thye
Hennings	Monroney	Young

NOT VOTING—7

Bible	Gore	McCarthy
Bridges	Kefauver	
Fulbright	Long	

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have the regular order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will recapitulate the vote.

The legislative clerk recapitulated the vote.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have the regular order? I demand the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A few days ago, when a request for the regular order was made, the Chair said it was usually interpreted rather liberally. However, the regular order has been requested.

On the vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] the yeas are 44; the nays are 45. The amendment is rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been requested on the question of agreeing to the motion to lay on the table. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are detained on official business. On this vote the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Kansas are paired. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—49

Barkley	Hill	Mundt
Bible	Humphrey	Murray
Byrd	Jackson	Neely
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kennedy	Pastore
Clements	Kerr	Robertson
Daniel	Laird	Russell
Douglas	Langer	Scott
Ellender	Lehman	Smathers
Ervin	Magnuson	Sparkman
Frear	Mansfield	Symington
George	McClellan	Thurmond
Gore	McNamara	Thye
Green	Millikin	Young
Hayden	Monroney	
Hennings	Morse	

NAYS—42

Aiken	Curtis	Martin, Iowa
Allott	Dirksen	Martin, Pa.
Anderson	Dworshak	McCarthy
Barrett	Eastland	Payne
Beall	Flanders	Potter
Bender	Goldwater	Purtell
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bricker	Holland	Smith, Maine
Bridges	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Bush	Ives	Stennis
Butler	Jenner	Watkins
Capehart	Knowland	Welker
Case, N. J.	Kuchel	Wiley
Cotton	Malone	Williams

NOT VOTING—5

Duff	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Fulbright	Long	

So Mr. ELLENDER'S motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, when we recessed last evening there were 74 amendments pending. I asked the parliamentarian to find out how many of them were duplicates. He tells me that there are now some thirty-odd amendments at the desk. I should like to call that fact to the attention of individual Senators. In the event they decide not to call up their amendments, I hope they will withdraw them, so that we can plan our schedule accordingly. If many of the thirty-odd amendments are not to be called up, it may be that we will be able to avoid a session on Saturday.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I shall withdraw. Then I have another one, which I shall submit, which I shall take about 5 minutes to explain to the Senate. I hope that will help the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. If other Senators will emulate the very fine example set by the distinguished Senator from Indiana, I am sure we will make progress on the bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 3-9-56-E, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 30, between lines 17 and 18, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECTS

SEC. 310. (a) No agricultural commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with subsection (c) to be in surplus supply shall be produced on any lands within any Federal irrigation project hereafter authorized unless such lands were used for the production of such commodity prior to the construction of such project.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be included, in all reclamation contracts entered into with respect to Federal reclamation projects hereafter authorized, such provisions as he may deem necessary to provide for the enforcement of the provisions of this section.

(c) On or before October 1 of each year, the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine and proclaim the agricultural commodities the supplies of which are in excess of estimated requirements for domestic consumption and export plus adequate reserves for emergencies. The commodities so proclaimed shall be considered to be in surplus supply for the purposes of subsection (a) during the succeeding crop year.

(d) For the purposes of this section the term "Federal irrigation project" means any irrigation project subject to the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto).

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I appreciate the attendance of so many Senators. My amendment is a very short one. It is a commonsense amendment.

At the outset I should say that late yesterday afternoon I was recorded as not voting on the amendment designated "3-3-56-D" offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I was in my office on official business, holding a hearing, and for some reason the bells did not ring there. I came to the floor as soon as I could. If I had been able to vote, I would have been glad to join in the unanimous vote in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota. I desired to make this statement for the RECORD.

Mr. President, my amendment is a simple one. As most Senators know, I have had some distinct ideas as to whether the soil bank will work. I hope and pray that it will work. My amendment, in effect, asks why we should be taking land out of circulation in order to do away with farm surpluses and at the same time have the Bureau of Reclamation bring in more land, and in that way increase surpluses.

The problem is very simple. If we are permitted to continue to bring in new lands, the soil-bank provision cannot and will not work. I have nothing to say about the projects already authorized. It would be very serious indeed for me to ask the Senate to adopt an amendment that would affect that situation. The bill dealing with the upper Colorado storage basin is now in conference. Under any reasonable interpretation, the amendment cannot affect the upper Colorado River Basin with respect to bringing in new land. I am informed by most reliable sources, including distinguished colleagues of mine who have spent months and months working on the upper Colorado problem, that to bring in any new land there would take from 15 to 20 years, and that it would take at least 25 years to bring in all the productive land.

Certainly I have no objection to preparing for the day when we will need more farm products. However, while we are trying to cut surpluses and take land out of production, we should not at the same time bring in vast areas of new production land.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say that the Senator's amendment has a great deal of merit. I have no objection to its being added to the bill. In fact, the executive departments have been seriously considering the matter, and I see no reason why the Congress should not take action on the subject. I have consistently supported the development of new lands. However, that does not mean that every inch of new tillable land made available by irrigation should be promptly put to mass production during the first year. I realize that nearly all of the reclaimed land on which we are putting water will be needed within the near future for production. However, if we can develop our production program systematically, as the Senator suggests, undoubtedly it will have a much less depressing effect on the market than otherwise, and probably would have no depressing effect at all. I believe the amendment is a very good one.

Mr. WELKER. I appreciate very much the remarks of the distinguished ranking minority member of the Com-

mittee on Agriculture and Forestry. It is very fine of him to say what he has said.

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. WATKINS addressed the Chair.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Delaware, who has been on his feet some time. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to join the Senator from Idaho in urging that the amendment be incorporated in the bill. I agree with him fully that it does not make sense for one Government agency to bring into production new land for the production of agricultural crops, while at the same time we seek to adopt the soil-bank plan, by which the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to pay for the removal of other surplus land. The proposal certainly can be described, as the Senator said, as a commonsense amendment.

Mr. WELKER. I appreciate the statement of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Delaware, a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He is a commonsense man, and I am happy that he joins with me in this amendment.

Now, I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I did not hear distinctly the terms of the Senator's amendment. I call attention to the fact that in the House version of the Colorado storage bill, there is a provision which I believe the Senate conferees are willing to accept, and will accept.

This is the wording:

Provided further, That for a period of 10 years from the date of enactment of this act, no water from any participating project authorized by this act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301 (b) (10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

In what respect does the Senator's amendment differ from that? Is there a time limit in the amendment?

Mr. WELKER. No, there is not a time limit. It is left to the discretion of the Secretary. As a matter of fact, I think the rider attached to the upper Colorado Basin bill will answer every question involved, because as the senior Senator from Vermont said a few moments ago, we might not need new land within a period of 10 years. I am not worried about hurting the upper Colorado Basin people, because if that should happen I would be the first, when we needed additional agricultural products, to ask immediately that water be supplied to the productive land.

Mr. WATKINS. So far as the upper Colorado Basin land is concerned, I am quite sure it will not be producing any of the basic crops which are in surplus. It is expensive to produce that type of crops on irrigated land, particularly when we consider what we have to pay for reclamation project water. It is also a well-known fact that it takes many years to develop a reclamation project after water is once put on the land, particularly on new land.

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that there is not more than 132,000 acres of new land in the project that will be applied to cultivation. It was felt that at least for 10 years the land will not be productive. Considerable water will have to be used to aid farms which now have a limited supply of water. At one time the farmers thought they had enough, but now they do not have enough. The project would supply supplemental water for those farms.

For the most part, they do not produce crops which are in surplus. They produce hay, forage crops, and such things. They produce some small grains, such as barley and oats, and some wheat, but it is not the type of wheat that is manufactured into flour. We are in a section where feeder cattle are produced and we need these additional forage crops. We grow many vegetables and some fruits. But on the irrigated farms we do not produce any considerable quantity of wheat, and practically no corn. Of course we do not attempt to produce crops that are not of the type that are readily grown in that area.

I did not catch the complete terms of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I should like to have the clerk read my amendment again.

Mr. WATKINS. If it is in line with what has already been adopted on the House side, which I am sure the Senate conferees are willing to accept, I would not have any objection.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, may we have my amendment re-read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCARTHY in the chair). Does the Senator desire that the entire amendment be read?

Mr. WELKER. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be again stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 30, between lines 17 and 18, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECTS

SEC. 310. (a) No agricultural commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with subsection (c) to be in surplus supply shall be produced on any lands within any Federal irrigation project hereafter authorized unless such lands were used for the production of such commodity prior to the construction of such project.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be included, in all reclamation contracts entered into with respect to Federal reclamation projects hereafter authorized, such provisions as he may deem necessary to provide for the enforcement of the provisions of this section.

(c) On or before October 1 of each year, the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine and proclaim the agricultural commodities the supplies of which are in excess of estimated requirements for domestic consumption and export plus adequate reserves for emergencies. The commodities so proclaimed shall be considered to be in surplus supply for the purposes of subsection (a) during the succeeding crop year.

(d) For the purposes of this section the term "Federal irrigation project" means any irrigation project subject to the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto).

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is difficult to take snap judgment on an amendment of this type. In one sense it does not seem to be harmful; in another sense it might possibly be harmful. I might favor it if the amendment contained a time limit, the same as the House provision in the Colorado River storage project bill to which I have called attention.

Mr. WELKER. We just heard the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry say that we can soon have full production.

Mr. WATKINS. Of course, we hope the conference report will soon be before this body——

Mr. WELKER. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I had hoped we would have it before us today so that we could sit down and talk the matter over. Time is of the essence in this matter. In my opinion, the amendment is very simple, and I do not see how anyone can be hurt by it. My own State of Idaho is a great reclamation State, and I would hesitate to hurt that State as I would the neighboring State of Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I have no objection to the general purpose of the amendment. I do not know whether any hearings were held on it. There were hearings in the House committee. The bill placed rather sweeping powers in the hands of the Secretary with respect to this project.

Mr. WELKER. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Utah. Would it give him any comfort if I inserted after the word "hereafter", on line 5 of the first page, the words "after July 1, 1956."

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator refer to projects authorized after that date?

Mr. WELKER. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. I would not object to that. Would the Senator be willing to accept the amendment which is in the House bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This subject was discussed in the committee. It do not think it will be found that the Secretary has any objection to the amendment; at least, he did not indicate any when he was before the committee. I think that if we fix a time limit comparable to that which the Senator from Utah has suggested, it would not be objectionable. We do not know how long the provision will be in force. It will function only so long as there are surpluses. The legislative intent is very clear. If the matter goes to conference, the conference committee can write in whatever necessary change may be pointed out as being essential to safeguard the intention of the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from South Carolina is willing to ac-

cept the amendment on behalf of the committee.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. I have not had an opportunity to examine the amendment completely, but I am interested in some of the possible implications. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has pending before it a so-called Washoe project bill, which will be, roughly, a multiple-purpose project for power, flood control, and some irrigation. It will furnish an additional, supplemental water supply for some 50,000 acres. It will bring into cultivation an additional 5,000 acres, which is a very small amount of acreage.

The crops grown in the two valleys to be served by the Washoe project are very much comparable to the crops to be raised on the lands to be served by the upper Colorado project. None of these crops at present are in surplus; they are largely fodder—alfalfas, hays, and timothies, none of which, to the best of my knowledge, is now in surplus.

But I have some question about the proposed section 310, paragraph (b), which reads:

> The Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be included, in all reclamation contracts entered into with respect to Federal reclamation projects hereafter authorized, such provisions as he may deem necessary to provide for the enforcement of the provisions of this section.

I am wondering what that particular section might do as to the securing of satisfactory repayment contracts. It seems to me that a future condition precedent would be set, namely, that the Secretary of Agriculture must determine on October 1, each year, the particular crops which are in surplus; then the particular new land to be brought into cultivation would not be eligible. I feel the entire amendment needs more study and very careful analysis. I believe it has dangerous implications.

Mr. WELKER. The reason for the inclusion of paragraph (b) in section 301 was not only to provide some legislative history in regard to the matter, but also to show that we meant business; that, on the one hand, we did not want agricultural lands to be brought into production with the help of the Department of the Interior, while on the other hand we were removing from production lands that do not affect the Senator's State. Since I am from a State which is a neighbor of the Senator's State of Nevada, I cannot assure him what the effect will be on his State. But if there will be any harmful effect, then, as I said to the Senator from Utah in connection with his State, I shall be the first to help the Senator in alleviating any damage done to his State.

As I have said, this is a common-sense amendment. The American people are not going to stand for a so-called soil bank provision, which will take the land out of production at tremendous expense, and then, on the other hand, put land into production at tremendous expense.

I believe agriculture as a whole will grow as a result of this very simple amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think there is considerable significance and perhaps some merit in the general theory which the Senator from Idaho is bringing to the attention of the Senate. But I think also there are some far-reaching implications in the amendment. I do not know whether they have been sufficiently studied by the appropriate congressional committees.

As I read the Senator's amendment, it provides, in paragraph (a):

> No agricultural commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with subsection (c) to be in surplus supply shall be produced—

That does not merely provide for withholding any benefit payments, but it lays down a mandate that the commodities shall not be produced. It may be that some commodity will be in long supply this year and next, while it may be in short supply 3 years from now.

It seems to me that the proposal would be placing in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture vast additional powers which perhaps more properly belong in the hands of the Department of the Interior in dealing with the reclamation project phase of the situation. I think some dislocations of the economy of the country might occur, which I am certain the distinguished Senator from Idaho would not want to see brought about.

It was for that reason that I was merely raising the question—the Senator having brought this proposal to the attention of the Senate—whether in the bill at this time, without an adequate study having been made, any such broad power should be conferred, such as the Senator seems to be giving to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WELKER. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished minority leader. I believe, as was stated by the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware, that if an adequate study were made of the provision by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, there would not be any conflict, and both of them could agree upon the intent of the Senate.

I have gone along with the agricultural people, but I have serious doubts as to the effectiveness of the soil-bank plan unless we come to a commonsense realization of our problem.

I have received from my State one petition with several thousand names attached, objecting to the idea of a soil-bank plan, at the same time, new land is being brought into production.

I ask the distinguished minority leader to reflect upon the fact that this proposal would not take effect for 10, 15, yes, even 25 years; but it would be a safeguard, and would keep the idea of throwing away Federal funds from reaching right into the Halls of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The committee held hearings on this matter, both in the field and in Washington. A great many Senators had the idea of putting into effect a plan similar to that which the Senator from Idaho has covered in his amendment. As I understand the amendment "hereafter" projects also are authorized. That being so, if the building of dams is to be authorized, their construction will require a great deal of time in the future. We must realize that.

But we must bear in mind also that in the bill itself we are trying to provide for a reduction of some of the surplus commodities. In order to do that, we are saying to the farmers who grow certain commodities "If you will stop raising this commodity or that commodity, the Government will pay you an amount of money equivalent to the value of the crop which you would produce on that land."

The question arose in my mind, and in the minds of a great many other persons, as to how such a program could be carried out, while at the same time Congress might be authorizing the farmers elsewhere to raise the commodities which already were in surplus.

I think the Senator's amendment is a very good one.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to ask the author of the amendment how a situation like this would be handled. In Arizona we have the Salt River Valley project. Suppose it were desired to extend the Salt River Valley project by another 20,000 acres under its irrigation system. Would not the Senator's amendment prohibit that?

Mr. WELKER. That is very true. It would, I believe, and I think it should. If not, the amendment is not worth the paper on which it is printed. After all, a soil-bank program is under consideration; let us not forget that. I am not sold upon the soil bank because, on the other hand, other surpluses will be brought into existence, and it is the surpluses which are causing the dilemma in the farm economy.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Idaho knows as well as I know that the reason for the surpluses in this country is the high rigid parity-price supports; it is not the irrigated lands.

I strongly object to the language of this amendment. I agree with the minority leader that the general thought about the amendment is a good one, but it actually restricts the irrigated areas of the West to the sizes they are now.

The Senator used the word "hereafter." "Hereafter" is a long, long time. Most of our projects in Arizona are completed. We will probably have one more project completed in the State of Arizona, but we have been working on that project for almost 30 years.

I do not like to hear the Senator from Idaho suggesting that a neighboring State be penalized because of the actions of Congress, which for 10 long years, as I said before, has favored what I consider to be the stupid policy of high, rigid price supports.

Mr. WELKER. I appreciate the remarks made by my distinguished colleague from the State of Arizona and by other Senators. He is eminently right,

but again I say we are going to have to be realistic in order to get a sound farm program or a sound farm bill. The American people—even the people in Arizona—are not going to "buy" the idea that they are going to have to dig down into their pockets to raise tax money to expand irrigation projects by 20,000 or 50,000 more acres when, by like token, we are talking today about the soil bank and about paying out billions of dollars again.

We have the assurance from the ranking Senator on agriculture that this is a temporary matter. We have the assurance of the distinguished leader on the other side of the aisle, who is handling the measure for the chairman——

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have heard on this floor time and again, and before I came to this body I read and heard time and again, about these temporary measures. I have never seen Congress enact temporary measures. We have the Halls of Congress and the shelves of our libraries filled with temporary laws. The proposal uses the word "hereafter." "Hereafter" goes on and on and on. I say to the Senator from Idaho that I appreciate the thinking behind his proposal. I say I think the thinking has a lot of good to it. But why penalize the irrigated States of the West because of the mistakes made by the United States Congress? We are not adding to the surpluses. We are not producing crops in those States that are in competition with other crops, with the possible exception of cotton, and the Lord knows we do not grow the great amount of cotton which is grown in this country. But we would in effect be saying to Arizona, Utah, Colorado, California——

Mr. WELKER. And Idaho.

Mr. GOLDWATER. And Washington and Oregon and all of the western reclamation States—and there are 17 of them—"You fellows have done a good job of reclamation, but because Congress has been, in my judgment, a little careless with regard to high parity, you have to pay the penalty." I do not think the 17 Western States should be the whipping boy because of the mistakes made by the Congress.

Mr. WELKER. In answer to the statement of the Senator from Arizona, I do not believe he would want to leave the impression that I am trying to make the Western States the whipping boy of anybody. I think I love the West as much as anyone in the Senate. I certainly do not want to single out the Western States, whose citizens I know to be great people. They know the reason why we have these surpluses. They know the reason why we have this tremendous problem today. But I say if it is suggested that there be a time limit, I shall go along with that suggestion, so the citizens in the Senator's State will not be worried.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair). The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. As I said before, I am in general sympathy with the amendment. However, I should like to read the first part of the amendment to show how sweeping it is and how it might apply:

No agricultural commodity—

Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to make an inquiry of the majority leader. If he is against the amendment, he has control of the time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I am in control of the time for the opposition.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator in charge of the time for the opposition yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall yield to the Senator, but I have yielded 5 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WELKER. I thought we could limit debate if a definite time limit were fixed. I do not want the word "hereafter" to lose something for the people out in the West.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, what I wanted to point out is that a time limitation alone would not cure the defects in the amendment. The amendment reads:

No agricultural commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with subsection (c) to be in surplus supply shall be produced on any lands within any Federal irrigation project hereafter authorized unless such lands were used for the production of such commodity prior to the construction of such project.

That is sweeping. It provides that nothing could be produced on that land. A number of farmers may be raising turkeys as one of their major crops, and may wish to grow a little wheat and corn to help feed those birds. Under the amendment, they could not do even that. The amendment is too sweeping. I think it needs more study. In Idaho the same thing would apply. If new projects are authorized, farmers on those lands may want to raise some animals. They will want to feed the few products they produce on that land to their animals, because that is one way they would have of making a living. The amendment also provides that the repayment contracts are to be rewritten. In other words, the amendment would force farmers to buy on the market some corn and wheat to help feed the turkeys they would be raising on the same land on which they would grow those crops.

They will want to raise their animals and feed them so they can sell them on the market, particularly those that are feeders. Grain may be needed to carry them over the long, hard winter.

The amendment goes too far. If it could be kept within bounds, I would not oppose it at all, because we have the same idea in substance as far as the Colorado River project is concerned, as shown by the language I read a few moments ago. That goes as far as it ought to go.

I do not disagree with the general principle that no more crops that would be in competition with surplus commodities should be grown. However, the amendment states that the farmers cannot produce such crops, so that the farmers can use them to fatten sheep, and perhaps pork, although there is not much of that kind of meat grown. But the farmers on the lands we are discussing will want to use the products grown on the farms right on their own lands. They may be a long way from the market and may not be able to afford to pay the cost of shipping. It may be too expensive to transport by truck to a railroad station. I do not think the Senator realizes what the amendment would do to us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I point out to the Senator from Utah that the situation as he has described it is not quite accurate, for this reason: We are speaking now of lands that are not and will not be in production unless the United States Government, through the Interior Department, spends money to bring them into production. We are not speaking of farm families that will be deprived of producing crops. That land is not productive now. Why should we spend money to bring into production 20,000 acres in Utah, or some other State, that will produce crops which are in surplus, and then pay farmers in another State to take 20,000 acres out of production?

Mr. WATKINS. That is not what it does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the opposition yield me 2 or 3 minutes?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to yield some time to the Senator from Idaho, but I wanted also to yield time to the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Colorado.

I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I have tried to be reasonable in this matter, because, as I say, it is a commonsense amendment. A moment ago we heard the distinguished Senator from Utah describe the upper Colorado Basin bill, which proposes to bring new lands into production. There is a protective feature in that bill which covers a 10-year period. The turkeys to which reference has been made are going to get thirsty and the chickens are going to get hungry, some time within the next 10 years, so, in a spirit of compromise, I am willing to go overboard and cut in half the limitation provided in the Colorado River Basin bill, and limit the time which would be covered by my amendment to 5 years. Does that make sense?

Mr. WATKINS. Well, that would help.

Mr. WELKER. Ten years is the period provided in the bill of the Senator from Utah. For the last 2 years the Senator has dedicated his life to bringing the Colorado River project into existence. He agreed to a period of 10 years in his bill. I am offering the Senator a 5-year period. I hope that will

be satisfactory, because I hope and pray that when we have a sensible farm bill there will be no more surpluses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand that the Senator from Idaho is modifying his amendment?

Mr. WELKER. I am willing to modify it if the opposition is willing to take the amendment. Otherwise I want a yea-and-nay vote, and I want a knock-down and drag-out settlement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I shall not take that long.

I desire to supplement and approve entirely what has been said by my colleague from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

This amendment is utterly impractical; there is no way in the world to carry it into effect. It is simply a blanket prohibition that would interfere with any irrigation development of any kind, so long as the amendment remained on the statute books. The amendment would require that such a provision be written into contracts affecting the land, and so forth.

It is only commonsense to say that if there is any new land coming in, it will not come in during the life of this particular bill.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am stating a fact.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield on that point?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator from Arizona think any new land should come in when we are taking land across the fence out of production?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the land were producing a crop that would be in competition, that might be different. But the amount produced would be insignificant during the lifetime of this bill; and in ordinary circumstances there is no real competition between the irrigated lands in the West and the lands which produce the crops that are in surplus. The Senator from Idaho knows that.

Mr. WELKER. If the amendment is insignificant, why does the Senator from Arizona object to it?

Mr. HAYDEN. Because it is useless, and because it is utterly a waste of time, paper, and ink to print it. That is what I think about it.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator from Arizona, a candidate for reelection, to go back to Arizona and tell the taxpayers of Arizona that the amendment is useless and a waste of time, paper, and ink, because in that case the Senator has not read the amendment and has not studied it.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is my conclusion.

Mr. WELKER. Then the Senator has not studied the amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to rise in defense of my senior colleague, Mr. President. The senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is practically the father of western reclamation; and I resent the suggestion by the junior Senator from Idaho that my senior colleague does not know what he is talking about. We who represent Arizona know something about reclamation; Arizona had the first project in the United States.

Mr. WELKER. Is that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. And I do not think it is proper for the Senator from Idaho to use Arizona and the other irrigation States as a whipping boy—and I say it again—for the mistakes which have been made on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will any Senator yield to me time in which to reply?

Mr. YOUNG. I will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I simply wish to say calmly that there is no virtue in the amendment, because this bill is a 1-year measure; yet the amendment would include many restrictions which the Secretary of Agriculture would have to apply. However, we know we shall have another farm bill in another year. So it is a perfect waste of time to write such an amendment into this bill.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the father of reclamation yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, nowhere in the bill is there a statement that it is a 1-year bill; any Senator who has studied the bill knows that.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does not the Senator from Idaho know as well as anyone else that we pass one of these farm relief bills every year? Has not Congress done that every year since the Senator from Idaho has been a Member of this body?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, never before have I seen before the Senate a bill such as the pending one, which provides for the soil bank, and thus will cost the taxpayers large sums of money which will be spent to take land out of cultivation and pay the landowners therefor. My amendment simply will see to it that new land is not brought into cultivation under the reclamation law, at huge expense to the taxpayers, as against the opposite effect of the soil bank.

Where in the bill is there a 1-year limitation, Mr. President? I have proposed a 5-year limitation. I cannot see why the great State of Arizona is crying. I love Arizona, and I wish to see Arizona prosper. But I am not willing to see this plan applied to any particular State as a political issue when my State can be hurt just as much as Arizona or any other State in the Union.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let us vote on the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute, in which I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Idaho.

As I understand his amendment, it does not apply to any projects which previously have been authorized. Is that correct?

Mr. WELKER. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. So, before the amendment would go into application, the Congress would have to authorize new projects; is that correct?

Mr. WELKER. That is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question; the Senator has not yet cleared up one point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]; and then I shall yield to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, I simply wish to point out to the Senator from Louisiana that one of the things to which I am objecting, in the case of the pending amendment, is that under it, we would not be allowed to expand our present projects, some of which have been in authorization for 45 years.

I asked the Senator from Idaho whether his amendment precluded the expansion of, let us say, the Salt River project or the Welton-Mohawk project. He said, "Yes," that the amendment would preclude their expansion. The Welton-Mohawk project has been authorized, but the entire acreage has not been brought in, as yet.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator from Idaho answered in the affirmative, he is in error.

Mr. GOLDWATER. He did answer in the affirmative.

Mr. ELLENDER. Perhaps the amendment is not understood. But the first section applies to Federal irrigation projects hereafter authorized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield time to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, let me say, on the last point, that I did not understand the question which was propounded to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. WELKER. Will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield for a question.

Mr. WELKER. I do not wish to ask a question. Instead, I wish to say that if a project is authorized——

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Idaho will bear with me, I have only 3 minutes. I should like to use 2 of them. Then, if I have any time left, I shall not mind yielding 1 minute to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I should like to clear up the point which has been raised. However, if the Senator from Colorado does not wish to yield to me at this time, I shall wait; we shall be here all day, so far as I know.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on this matter, I should like to associate myself with my distinguished colleagues, the Senators from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. GOLDWATER], and with the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

It seems to me that if we were to adopt an amendment such as the one now pending, we would penalize the Western States—which are reclamation States and are irrigation States—so far as the future development of our country was concerned. All of us should keep in mind that even though the Western States are irrigation States, all the irrigation work has not been done at the expense of the Federal Government. The great majority of the work—particularly in my own State; in the case of Colorado, this is true of 85 percent of the work—has been done by individuals in their private capacity, by the men who dug the ditches with their own hands and their own teams of horses, and so forth.

We cannot sell out the West; and particularly in the case of future development, we cannot sell out those States in the way now proposed, and thus make those States—I do not like to say make them a whipping boy, but that is what we really would be doing if we were to adopt such an amendment. Then, in the future, we would penalize them for what has been a bad agricultural policy in the Congress; and in my opinion, that is the result of two things: First, high, rigid supports; second, support of what are called and designated by the Congress—but erroneously so—basic commodities. Mr. President, they are not basic commodities; and the sooner the Congress recognizes that fact, the sooner we shall have a sound farm program.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 3 minutes to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I come from a reclamation State. California gives grateful thanks to the United States for the assistance the Federal Government has given to the people of my State in various areas in the construction of great reclamation projects to promote the public good.

I cannot subscribe to an amendment which, insofar as future reclamation projects are concerned, would treat lands in new Federal projects on the basis of second-class citizenship. I vigorously object to this amendment which would penalize some farmlands, those in reclamation projects, but which would not at all affect other farmlands such as those benefiting by Federal flood-control assistance. To be fair, the amendment should operate on all lands in the same fashion.

But I wish particularly to talk to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—those from the Southern States, especially. I wish to have them recall that there is a bill now in the Congress—indeed, there is now such a bill before a conference committee of the Congress—providing for Federal assistance under reclamation law, not alone to the reclamation States of the West, but also to the States which my colleagues from the Southern States have the honor of representing—States in other sections of our land, as distinguished from the Western States alone.

Inasmuch as this legislation, embodying Federal assistance for small projects across the Nation, would be a part of the reclamation laws of the United States, the landholders of other States, as well as those of reclamation States, would bear this unjust burden were this amendment to be adopted. Before rising and speaking in favor of this amendment, and before voting for the amendment and tacking it onto the farm bill, I suggest that Senators take a sober second look at this proposal, and, observing its unjust implications, will join me in opposing it.

I am sure my friend from Lousiana knows that his able colleague from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is in large part responsible for the inclusion in the so-called small projects legislation now pending before the Congress of benefits for his State and its sister States, as well as for the western reclamation States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that there is strong opposition to that provision, and that it will be stricken from the bill. I hope it will remain in the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. I point to the fact that the Senate went on record in favor of that provision, and favored assistance to the Senator's State and other nonreclamation States as well as to the Western States, as a further reason why he, as well as I, should vote against this amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that there is strong opposition to the provision placed in the bill as a result of the efforts of my colleague. It may be stricken out. Perhaps I am in error. I hope it will remain in the bill.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I was one of the cosponsors in the Senate of the legislation to which reference has been made. I am on the conference committee. I wish to say to the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana that there is no objection from any member of the committee to the inclusion of the other 31 States. There is no opposition whatsoever from any member of the committee to the inclusion of the other 31 States in legislation which will be substantially the same as that with respect to the western reclamation States.

However, the fact is that there are no complementary laws on the books of most of the States whereby such legislation could be made applicable to those States at the present time. All the other members of the committee are concerned with is separating the two pieces of legislation and bringing forth legislation for the other 31 States when such legislation would be in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would it not be possible for the States to qualify later, even though the bill were passed?

Mr. BARRETT. That is an extremely difficult problem, because the water law which is applicable to the Western States is based upon the right of appropriation. The water law applicable to the other States is under the riparian theory of water law. It is extremely difficult to write legislation at this time, in the absence of appropriation-right law in the other States.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield 1 more minute to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield I minute to my colleague. I remind him that it is nearly time for the previously announced visit of the Prime Minister of Ireland.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President I ask the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] if he would consider withdrawing his amendment and permitting not only the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but also the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to consider in bill form what I am sure are the logical reasons which prompted the Senator to offer his amendment. I ask in complete good faith if he would consider withdrawing it so that our two committees may study the problem, and bring to the Senate a fair proposal on this difficult matter.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I can answer that question in 1 second. The answer is "No."

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF HIS EXCELLENCY JOHN ALOYSIUS COSTELLO, PRIME MINISTER OF IRELAND

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following a quorum call, the time for which shall be charged to neither side, the Senate may stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint a committee to escort our distinguished visitor, the Prime Minister of Ireland, to the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capehart	Ellender
Allott	Carlson	Ervin
Anderson	Case, N. J.	Flanders
Barkley	Case, S. Dak.	Frear
Barrett	Chavez	Fulbright
Beall	Clements	George
Bender	Cotton	Goldwater
Bennett	Curtis	Gore
Bible	Daniel	Green
Bricker	Dirksen	Hayden
Bridges	Douglas	Hennings
Bush	Duff	Hickenlooper
Butler	Dworshak	Hill
Byrd	Eastland	Holland

Hruska	Martin, Pa.	Saltonstall
Humphrey	McCarthy	Schoeppel
Ives	McClellan	Scott
Jackson	McNamara	Smathers
Jenner	Millikin	Smith, Maine
Johnson, Tex.	Monroney	Smith, N. J.
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Sparkman
Kennedy	Mundt	Stennis
Kerr	Murray	Symington
Knowland	Neely	Thurmond
Kuchel	Neuberger	Thye
Laird	O'Mahoney	Watkins
Langer	Pastore	Welker
Lehman	Payne	Wiley
Magnuson	Potter	Williams
Malone	Purtell	Young
Mansfield	Robertson	
Martin, Iowa	Russell	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The Chair appoints the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] the committee to escort our distinguished visitor into the Senate. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess,

His Excellency John Aloysius Costello, Prime Minister of Ireland, escorted by the the committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. KNOWLAND, entered the Senate Chamber, accompanied by the Honorable Joseph Hearne, Ambassador to the United States from Ireland; Alexis Fitzgerald, Special Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister; Charles Murray, Principal Officer of the Prime Minister's Department; William Howard Taft III, United States Ambassador to Ireland; and John F. Simmons, Chief of Protocol, Department of State.

The Prime Minister of Ireland took the place on the rostrum assigned him in front of the Vice President's desk, and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were escorted to places assigned to them on the floor of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate, it is a great honor to present to the Senate the Prime Minister of Ireland. [Applause, Senators rising.]

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY JOHN ALOYSIUS COSTELLO, PRIME MINISTER OF IRELAND

Mr. Vice President and Members of the Senate of the United States, I wish to express my appreciation of the honor you have done me and through me, my country, by inviting me to appear here and address you today. Your invitation is but another of the many friendly gestures which your great country has extended to mine, gestures which spring from, and go far to perpetuate, those close and intimate ties which bind our countries. It is my earnest desire—and my firm intention, insofar as any effort of mine can bring it about—that my short stay amongst you will help to nourish and foster those ties, so that in the future, as in the past, there may exist between our two countries full community of sympathy and interest notwithstanding the 3,000 miles of ocean that separate, but paradoxically unite us.

The ties which unite our countries spring from a common outlook and from common ideals, based on a Christian, democratic, and free way of life. This is not surprising, as Ireland's spiritual empire, consisting of many millions of persons of Irish birth or descent scattered in every corner of the globe, is nowhere so powerful as in your country. It is this sense of basic community of the spirit between our two countries which serves to keep alive today the older historical ties which for centuries past have constituted a bond between us.

In the United States of America, we see the mightiest upholder of the traditional values of the west. In the veins of this great people flows the blood of many European races, and the Irish have contributed a more than proportionate share. It is not long, in historical time, since America was created as a new nation, "conceived in liberty," but even than predestined to greatness. In her growth and in the achievements of her people, she has, however, far outstripped the older nations from which she drew her origins. She has become a giant among the nations of the world, splendid in her youth and majestic in her strength.

I bring to you the greetings of a very old nation, though one not long emerged into the light of freedom from centuries of darkness and near despair. We are proud to claim our place as a people who contributed not a little to the creation and development of your great country, and we gladly acknowledge that our contribution has been abundantly repaid in the sympathy and support which we have always received from you in time of need.

At a time when freedom seemed for us, at home, a dissolving dream, Ireland's sons played a significant part in the attainment of liberty in this land of yours. It is, I think, pardonable for us to feel some of the pride that gladdens a parent whose son has grown to manhood in strength and fame and good repute.

Ours is a small country, yours a mighty one. But we have much in common. We, like you, have a tradition of devotion to those principles of freedom, Christian justice and humanity which are facing, in the world of today, a challenge more powerful and menacing than any that has opposed them in the past. It can scarcely be doubted that the almost miraculous development of your country is a manifestation of God's providence, which never leaves His people without a defender strong enough to meet the evil forces of the time. We see in you a nation, magnificent in its youthful vigor, well fitted to bear the tremendous burden which, in the course of history, has fallen upon its shoulders. Yours is the power and yours, therefore, the responsibility, to insure that, in these days of great danger, freedom "shall not perish from the earth." [Applause.]

Ireland may claim to be qualified, better perhaps than any other nation, to serve as a link between the Old World and the New. She is herself an ancient European nation, and her people are steeped in the Christian traditions of European culture. Once situated at the edge of the known world, she now finds herself rather at its center, between Europe and America. Such influence as she possesses cannot, in view of her size, be founded in material strength. Rather is it a spiritual influence, which, though without the support of big battalions, has an importance which the Christian democracies of the world will not ignore. How fortunate these democracies are that in your great country they have found a happy alliance of the big battalions with that same spiritual strength.

Millions of our people have found here a second home. In the recent, as well as in the more distant past, many of her sons have fought and died for America. I want, however, to mention an Irishman who, nominally, at least, fought against your country. His name was Richard Fitzpatrick.

I seek through you the permission of Congress to present to the Library of Congress five unpublished letters which Fitzpatrick wrote to his brother, the second Earl of Upper Ossory, during your War of Independence. These letters are a small Irish contribution to the study of the history of the United States, but they have a wider significance, which is my excuse for bringing them to your attention today.

The outbreak of the War of Independence found Richard Fitzpatrick a captain in the British Army. As an intimate friend of Charles James Fox, the great Whig leader, his whole inclinations were against the attempt to subdue the American people, but when ordered abroad to war his sense of duty forbade him to resign his commission.

His letters do not concern themselves much with the incidents of the campaign. They are for the most part a series of reflections on the merits, conduct and probable issue of the war.

Fitzpatrick, as a member of parliament, must have many times listened to the rolling periods of his fellow Irishman Edmund Burke, the greatest mind of the age, and one of the greatest political thinkers of all time. [Applause.] Burke had not yet declared the age of chivalry to be gone, and it is not surprising that a man of feeling and intelligence who lived and moved in such an environment as did Fitzpatrick should detest a situation which made him the instrument of an ignoble cause, "a situation" says Fitzpatrick, "where I am obliged to be constantly acting in direct opposition to all my feelings, principles and opinions."

"I grow ever day," he cries, "more and more disgusted with the folly and iniquity of the cause in which I am condemned to serve."

Neither is it surprising that Fitzpatrick's experience of the American character and temper should lead him to the conclusion that the war could have only one outcome.

Shrewd though many of his judgments were, they pale into insignificance beside a remark which he made when Congress struck a medal of commemoration of the Convention of Saratoga. On that occasion, he said:

> There is a greatness and a dignity in all the proceedings of this people that makes us contemptible indeed. I am well convinced they will be the first and greatest people

there ever was an example of in the history of mankind.

I doubt if history holds a comparable instance of such prescience. It was this near prophecy on the part of a private and comparatively obscure observer of the scene 180 years ago that first prompted the Trustees of the National Library of Ireland and myself to feel that the proper custodian of these historic manuscripts should not be the National Library of Ireland, whence I am their bearer, but the Library of Congress. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, today the world looks to you as "the first and greatest people there ever was an example of in the history of mankind." May your actions always be worthy of the responsibility thus thrust upon you, and may there always be a "greatness and dignity in your proceedings" that will match those shown by your stouthearted forefathers in their critical hour.

That is my wish for you in presenting you with this gift from a small nation which is deeply in your debt but, you will permit me to say, whose sons and daughters have played their part in making you what you are—the greatest nation in the world.

[Prolonged applause; Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Mr. Prime Minister, there is not very much the Presiding Officer of this body can add to express our appreciation of the address which you have so generously prepared and delivered to us today.

Those of you who have known the Prime Minister's background will have recalled that he is not only the Prime Minister of his country, but, before becoming Prime Minister, he was, and still is, one of the outstanding lawyers of Ireland, known not only there, but throughout the world, for his great legal ability.

Further, we all know the tremendous contribution the Irish have made to America's greatness, and, as the Prime Minister has so generously referred to it today, to our culture. Particularly, those of us who deal in politics are aware of the very great ability of the Irish in that field.

Certainly, Mr. Prime Minister, after hearing you today, all we can say is that we now know what is meant when people talk about Irish eloquence, because certainly you have given us a wonderful demonstration of it.

Since you, sir, as I know from our conversation in riding from the airport yesterday, are a very practical man, I thought you would be interested in a little coincidence. As you will recall, one of the greatest influxes of the Irish into the United States occurred during the period of the potato famine in Ireland. As a result of there being too few potatoes in Ireland, the United States received a large number of the Irish people, and we have been very proud of that fact.

It is significant that today the Senate is debating a farm bill, in which the problem is not a shortage of potatoes, of wheat, or any other commodity, but, instead, the problem is one of surpluses. So conditions have changed since the Irish came to the United States in such large numbers during the potato famine in Ireland.

Finally, I may say that you have touched us deeply by bringing the letters from the national archives of Ireland to the Library of Congress. It was an amazing prophecy which was made by Richard Fitzpatrick 180 years ago, at a time when the population of the United States was less than 3 million. At that time, of course, the United States was not expected to endure long as a Nation, even if it maintained its independence. I know that the Members of the Senate will appreciate the opportunity to go to the Library of Congress to see the original letters which you have so kindly shown to the majority leader, the minority leader, and the others who have met you previously.

There are other guests whom I should like to present to the Senate briefly before Senators have the opportunity to meet the Prime Minister.

The first is a man who has made many friends for Ireland and for himself by his splendid participation in the activities of the United States, the Ambassador from Ireland to the United States, the Honorable John Joseph Hearne. [Applause.]

The second is an illustrious son of a most illustrious father, who once occupied the majority leader's place in the Senate. I refer to the Ambassador from the United States to Ireland, William Howard Taft III. [Applause.]

Mr. Prime Minister, the Senate has a custom which is very informal, but which I am certain you will enjoy, and which I know will give pleasure to the Members of the Senate. All of them would like to meet you. As you will notice, they are all wearing green today, a few days in advance of St. Patrick's Day, in honor of your visit.

The majority leader and the minority leader now would like to conduct you to the well of the Senate, so that the Senators may greet you individually. [Applause.]

The Prime Minister of Ireland was escorted to a position on the floor of the Senate in front of the Vice President's desk, and was there greeted by Members of the Senate, who were introduced to him by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. KNOWLAND.

Following the informal reception, the Prime Minister was escorted from the Chamber.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

At 3 o'clock and 1 minute p. m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair).

PRINTING OF SPEECH OF PRIME MINISTER OF IRELAND AND THE FITZPATRICK LETTERS (S. DOC. NO. 104)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the very able address delivered by the Prime Minister of Ireland, and the Fitzpatrick letters, be printed as a Senate document, and that they also be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART subsequently said: Mr. President, does the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas cover printing the Fitzpatrick letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The unanimous-consent request covers printing them as a Senate document.

Mr. CAPEHART. And also in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wanted to make certain that they would be printed as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The letter will be printed as a Senate document and as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as well.

The letters are as follows:

LETTERS FROM RICHARD FITZPATRICK, CAPTAIN IN THE BRITISH ARMY IN AMERICA, TO HIS BROTHER, THE SECOND EARL OF UPPER OSSORY, IN IRELAND, 1777–1778 [1]

PHILADELPHIA *March 3, 1777.*

MY DEAR BROTHER:

The Packets are at last arrived from New York, I received by them two letters from you, one of the 3d of September the other of the 29th of November for both of which I am much obliged to you; but all letters since the meeting of parliament were so much more interesting than those of an older date, that they in a manner engross our whole attention; the Determinations of Ministry to continue in their present wise course did not surprise me by any means; but I confess the extraordinary steadiness of the majority was more than I expected after the misfortunes of Burgoyne, I am glad however to observe that opposition seem rather more connected & vigorous, and I am confident that with perseverance they must succeed; I don't agree with you that Charles went too far, any otherwise, than too far for his audience, and I rejoice to find Ld. G. G. is marked out as the author of all mischief, for which I think he must inevitably soon be brought to condign punishment;

There are no letters here later than the 10th of December but from what I hear Genl. Howe is to expect a reinforcement of 20000 men (in Buckram coats I fancy) 9 British & 11 foreigners; There is not here any one man, who has the smallest pretence to common understanding, that thinks the reduction of America practicable, even with this additional force, and the most sanguine only are of opinion that with 20,000 men more Sir W. H. will be able to maintain a superiority over the enemy.

I suppose the Ministers depend upon Burgoyne & his army arriving in Europe, but if that is the case they may very likely be disappointed; for if the Americans think our preparations really alarming, I make no doubt they will find out pretexts for not adhering to the Convention.

Washington loses great numbers by desertion, and the hardships they suffer are prodigious, which some foolish people suppose favourable symptoms for us, whereas they are most certainly the reverse, for there is not the smallest appearance of their being

[1] The letters are printed herewith; they follow as closely as possible the originals, now in the Library of Congress. Errors in punctuation and spelling have not been corrected. Passages underscored by the writer are shown in italic type. Words followed by [?] were not readable in the original text.

The letters have been paragraphed to facilitate reading.

dispirited, nor the least mark of their doubting the certainty of their own success; if Ld. Chatham thinks their submission to the Act of Navigation would be a ground for reconciliation, I am afraid he sees things in too favourable a light. The Act of Navigation I am confident they never will submit to, and I much doubt whether they will be ever induced even to relinquish their independence.

I must now say something to you, my Dear Brother, relative to myself & my own situation; As I am extremely unwilling to quit the army, I was in hopes by the last accounts to have found I was likely to return to England by promotion, and I am still in hopes to find by the next packet that it will be the case, as you are so kind to me upon the subject of a purchase, for which I should think the continuation of the war will certainly produce an opportunity.

But should I be disappointed in this hope; I flatter myself that you will not disapprove of a resolution that I have taken of resigning my commission; I have the more reason to think you will not disapprove of this step, because I remember before I Left England you asked me if I had ever had any thoughts of it upon being ordered to America; at that time I certainly never doubted a moment upon the subject, from the obvious objection of quitting when ordered upon service;

But as I think that objection subsists no longer, and as my aversion to the war not only subsists, but subsists with much greater force, as the certain destruction it leads to, is every day more inevitable by its continuance, I think nobody who gives me the least degree of credit for the sincerity of my political opinions, (and I think I am not mistaken in being sure that you do, though perhaps many others will not) can be surprised at my being resolved no longer to continue in a situation, where I am obliged to be constantly acting in direct opposition to all my feelings, principles, & opinions.

This, My Dear Brother, is the real motive that has determined me, & I think you cannot disapprove of it; I have always (as I am apt to do upon all occasions) spoke very freely upon this subject here, & have repeatedly declared that no consideration whatever should induce me to serve a second campaign in the American War, & after the part I had the satisfaction of taking with you in England & these declarations here, I cannot help thinking I should make a very contemptible figure indeed, if I did not abide by them; on the other hand I feel the weight of many reasons both of inclination & interest that make me wish very much not to be reduced to the necessity of taking this step, & I have the greatest hopes that the next accounts from England will render it unnecessary;

At the same time, though quitting the army is a measure I shall be very sorry to be obliged to pursue, I shall be infinitely more so should I afterwards find that I had taken any step, My Dear Brother, disagreeable to you, or contrary to your wishes. As I have taken this resolution, I shall at any rate have the satisfaction of seeing you soon, & of hearing, I hope, that your sentiments upon this occasion coincide with my own. the next packet therefore, which must arrive in the course of a fortnight or three weeks, will decide whether my good luck & your kindness will recall me by promotion, or whether I shall be under a necessity of quitting a profession in which it is both my inclination & interest to continue.

The Gentleman who carries this letter from me, Col. Dyer, has just got a Company in the Coldstream regiment, he is a very good sort of man, with a good plain understanding, and consequently a very determined enemy to this war, he is the only man in the army that I know, who has any political principles whatever, which he has acquired I believe by being a friend of the Duke of Richmond's.

Genl. Howe has in a very flattering manner desired me to be one of three Commissioners he is going to send to treat with the enemy upon a cartel for an exchange of prisoners. he was so good as to say he wished me very much to undertake it, but that he thought perhaps my political sentiments might make me wish to decline it. I told him that I did not see that they were any objection, for though I disapproved of & detested the war, the being in any degree instrumental in making the method of carrying it on more liberal, and less cruel to the individuals employed in it would be very agreeable to me; the fact is they have reduced us to a necessity of proposing an exchange by retaliating upon ours all the bad treatment their prisoners received from us. by which means the prisoners of both parties are now suffering great hardship, it is not indeed in Genl. Howe's power to give those in his hands the same advantages that ours may receive from them, owing to the want of space, as our territories are very contracted.

if we can succeed in our negotiation, I think it will be very pleasant to have been employed in putting an end to the calamities of so many individuals, & perhaps the war will go on, since it must go on at all, rather more Liberally than it has done hitherto, Adieu, My Dear Brother, I have great pleasure in thinking how soon I shall see you, believe me yours most sincerely & affectionately

R. F.

P. S.—I find Genl. Lee is to be included in the Cartel. how foolish it is to dispute upon points one is obliged to give up at last.

CAMP UPON STATEN ISLAND,
July 5th, 1777.

MY DEAR BROTHER:

We are just preparing to embark from this place, after a very inauspicous opening of the campaign for a more particular account of which I must refer you to a very long Boar. I have just written to Charles upon the subject, we have abandoned the Jerseys, & left Genl. Washington to enjoy the satisfaction of having sent us *pour chercher fortune alleurs*. he was a little too much elated with his first tirumph in having obliged us to leave him behind us, & gave us an opportunity of giving him a little rap before we took our leaves by following us rather too close. the advantage we gained was however in reality of no consequence though I suppose they will endeavour to magnify it prodigiously.

Chewter had a horse wounded under him; & got a fall, but was not much hurt; he is most thoroughly sick of this war, as indeed is almost everybody else, of which all people now acknowledge the impracticability, except Sir. G. Osborne & our wise cousin Sir John, & even they begin to despond since our retreat from the Jerseys. the absurdity of these two gentlemen is really not unentertaining, they are so credulous that they bite at every report that is raised; though I believe they themselves are the authors of many of them. but this country is fruitful to an astonishing degree in the producing of lies, which they both swallow with the greatest eagerness. the army is discontented & exasperated to the most violent degree & seem to consider laying the whole country waste & extirpating the inhabitants as the only means of putting an end to the war.

declaring everywhere these sentiments, & permitting if not encouraging, all kinds of pillage, plunder, & barbarity, they are astonished to find they have not a single friend in the country. the stories of cruelty related on both sides are dreadful, but I assure you since I have been in this country I have heard many more instances of it amongst ourselves than ever I heard in England; & I could send you a collection of horrible examples of it that would make your blood run cold to read. upon the whole the war is really the most odious & detestable of which I believe history can produce an instance;

to talk a little of myself you know, My Dear Brother, my own affairs are so desperate that I have always hated & avoided the subject; for though I know how much I might depend upon your goodness to me, I was sure they were infinitely too bad to leave any hopes of their becoming better. I have even found debts on this [side] of the Atlantick, & have been obliged to draw for money to pay them. I imagine from what you told me remained of my fortune that my draught will not much exceed it. & there is at least one advantage in being in this country, which is that one really has hardly any occasion for money.

If my circumstances were not such as they are, I should have hopes of getting a company by the end of this campaign. & I need not tell you how much I wish to quit a scene like this, knowing my sentiments, as you do, upon these matters, can you conceive a situation more unpleasant or more disgusting? Captain Bailey tells me he has no thoughts of purchasing, and he is the only Lieutenant above me that has ever been at all likely to do it.

NEW YORK, *July 6.*

I have just received a large packet of letters from England from Lord Rawden who arrived the day before yesterday. & amongst them one from you; I wish you joy of your victories at Newmarket Ld. Thos. Clinton tells me Dominant is matched to run at York with Tuberose, I suppose you are not much afraid of that match. but I am afraid Poor Dr. Neal will be in great distress which side to chuse. Charles's letter was not ready to come by this opportunity, but I have one from Hawkener[?] which mentions his having spoke better than ever, I suppose upon the Kings debts.

You talk rather despondingly of opposition, but whatever they may do, I am very confident that the present situation of Ministry is far more desperate than theirs can be. their destruction (as well as that of the country they govern) is literally inevitable. Nothing can appear more ridiculous to everybody here than the letters they receive from England, talking of the miserable situation of the Rebels, & of the war being certain of coming to a conclusion immediately. you may depend upon it, from everything I have seen, from everything I now see, & from everything I have collected from the most reasonable men in this country, that our politicks have been perfectly well founded, & all the opinions we had formed upon these affairs are completely justified in every particular.

La Fayette's project surprised me very much, I should have not been at all so, if his cousin the vicomte de Noailles had done it for his own sake I am not sorry he was prevented, for I think he would not have found it the kind of army or the kind of service that he probably expected, though I suppose Washington would have treated him with the greatest distinction. however in the first action he must certainly have been either killed or taken. as he would probably not have conformed himself to their system of fighting, which they have very wisely adopted, but which would not have suited a young French hero by any means. in comparing the two men who wished to serve in the different causes, La Fayette & Genl. Bulkeley, we have very little reason to be vain.

Adieu my Dear Brother when I shall see you Heaven knows, but I assure you that though from as much as I have seen of it, I should not dislike le metier de la guerre at all, this service is really so very hateful to me, that I cannot bring myself to think with any degree of patience of a campaign after this. but whatever may be my fate believe me most sincerely & most affectionately yours

R. F.

Pray give my Love to Crawford when you see him.

PHILADELPHIA, *Octr. 28th 1777.*

MY DEAR BROTHER:

As a Packet is ordered to be in readiness to sail immediately I cannot defer writing any longer though very likely many things may happen that one would wish to mention before this letter really leaves America, I have been rather diverted lately with the thoughts of the anxious moments our Ministers and their tools must have experienced from the long silence of their friends on this side the Atlantick, and I think the account of all our successes which this Packet will bring them will convince them & all mankind who have been right & who wrong in their opinions upon these matters; In short their cause is at this moment is so desperate a condition that it is no longer a matter of dispute but that the wisest measure we can possibly adopt would be to return to England immediately.

This general despondency however I must inform you is principally owing to a report which is circulated here from the American Camp that Burgoyne & his whole army after having been defeated have been reduced by want of Provisions to the necessity of surrendering Prisoners of War, & laying down their arms. This they persist in asserting with the greatest confidence & there is all the reason in the world to believe it true, but probably that will be cleared up before this packet sails;

If that should be the case I think Sir D. Howe will find himself obliged to evacuate this place & get back to N. York, for Philadelphia certainly will not be tenable against the whole force of America, and indeed though we are here we cannot properly be said to be in possession of it yet, as the River is still theirs, nor are we in a more promising way of opening the communication with our shipping than we were on the 26th of last month when we arrived here.

The various events in the progress of the campaign seem to us so old at present that one can hardly prevail upon oneself to mention them, not considering that you have yet had no accounts of them, If I was to recapitulate them all instead of a letter I should write a history, But I really believe if the manoeuvres of this army were impartially considered (which I take it for granted they never will be, because they have ended in disappointment) they would really do General Howe great credit as an officer.

After several marches the object of which was to turn the Right Flank of the Enemy we came up with them upon the 11th of Septr. at the Brandywine, a creek which runs out of the Delaware & which you will find in the map; Our view was certainly always to attack him in such a manner as to be able to cut off his retreat towards the Susquehannah where he had reformed his magazines; my own opinion was I must confess that he would avoid a battle least this should happen to him, but in this I was mistaken, for he was certainly determined to risque an engagement & even a general one before he gave up Philadelphia,

By a very well conceived feint by which Washington for want of intelligence was completely deceived we contrived fairly to surprize him, he had taken post upon heights on the Banks of the Brandywine where he expected us to pass, about 5 in the morning part of our army, which he supposed to be the main body appeared before him on the opposite heighths and after skirmishing with his advanced corps, who retired across the river, remained on their ground without advancing, by which the enemy flattered themselves they had given us a check;

In the mean time Ld. Cornwallis with the real strength of the army marched & crossed the creek six miles higher by which means we came upon his right flank, and when he received intelligence of our approach he still imagined the main attack to be intended from the opposite side of the creek & that we were only a small detachment from their left. by this means the front he opposed to us soon gave way though in many parts they defended themselves pretty obstinately & at the moment of our attack the troops opposite to him (which were commanded by General Knip-hausen [?] pushing across the creek & attacking them vigorously in front they retreated on every side; as we (under Ld. Cornwallis) had made a very long of (sic) march of between 17 and 18 miles, the action did not begin till four o'clock in the afternoon, & the night coming on made it impossible to pursue them which otherwise would have made the day really very complete, & probably the whole of their cannon would have fallen into our hands, as it was we took only 11 pieces, out of about 30 which he was said, but I know not how truly, to have had in the field, this victory cost us about 400 men killed & wounded, the latter of which prevented our moving forwards to profit of our advantage for several days;

I do not know whether this account will give you an idea of the affair but it is difficult without being very prolix to explain it more particularly. some foolish people were much elated with this event and an insufferable torrent of nonsence was talked for some time afterwards, such as that the whole army must disperse, that it was impossible they should ever recover so severe a blow, etc. etc. but these silly fellows were soon convinced they had no foundation for their opinions, Washington still continued to talk high language, and their Principal Surgeon, a very clever fellow who was a member of Congress, & who came in with a flag of truce to visit the wounded prisoners, a few days after the engagement spoke with the greatest confidence, acknowledged the defeat to have been complete, but declared that all possibility of accommodation much less of submission was as remote the day after the battle as it ever had been since the declaration of independency; before which they all (both whigs and tories,) agree that a few concessions on our side would have put an end to the whole business.

After the affair of Brandywine we had still another River to pass, the Schuylkill, of which Washington prepared to dispute the passage with us; though he made some movements which inclined us to think he was endeavouring to retreat towards Lancaster & which we exerted ourselves prodigiously to prevent, for among many other advantages he has incontestibly that of moving infinitely more expeditiously than we can, as he has all the horses of the country at his disposal he had crossed the Schuylkill, it was conjectured only to collect his scattered forces, with which he then recrossed it, but upon our pushing on rapidly towards him he retired crossed it once more & took post on the other side, for two or three days we reconnoitred each other from the opposite shores, during which Genl. Howe got intelligence of a corps which Washington had left under the command of Genl. Wayne to fall upon our rear, the night before the army moved towards the Schuylkill he detached a corps under the command of Genl. Grey, to surprize Wayne, which he effected with all the success that could be wished; coming into their camp suddenly he attacked them with Bayonets only, and without firing a single shot killed & wounded between two & three hundred & effectively routed the whole corps which consisted of 900 or a thousand men.

The next day the army joined the advanced corps at the Schuylkill, & Washington either dispirited by the misfortune of Wayne, or fearing to risque his retreat to his magazines, moved up towards Reading and left us to pass the river without molestation; we accordingly passed the next day, & our rum (which is a very necessary article in this army) being nearly exhausted, & finding it impossible to march after Washington any longer who had his retreat now completely open to him, we marched forwards towards Philadelphia, & encamped at a place called German Town within five miles of the City of which Ld. Cornwallis took possession the day after our arrival. the next day the Delaware frigate was taken which they had sent up from their fleet to prevent our raising a battery towards the River;

But the Idea of our being really in possession of Philadelphia was soon found to be an error. the Chevaux de frise which is said to be the ingenious contrivance of Dr. Franklin, & a fort upon a place called Mud Island, which our engineers affected to hold in contempt but which seems almost impregnable, with a very strong work which they have since constructed upon some high ground on the Jersey coast called Red Bank, have hitherto made it impossible for our ships to get up the River; Ld. Cornwallis summoned the Commodore & Commander of the port to surrender upon pain of being all put to the sword, to which they returned the usual answer; & we have found a resistance which was little expected but which seems likely to prove very effectual;

We imagined that defeat of Brandywine had dispirited the enemy to such a degree that it would be utterly impossible for Washington to give us any further trouble, for some time at least, in consequence of which I believe we had not much considered the strength of the position we took at Germantown; In this notion however we found ourselves egregiously mistaken for on the 4th of October a week after we had been there & about 3 weeks after the defeat of Brandywine we were surprized by their army coming down upon us & making a most desperate attack, surprized indeed in every sense of the word, for we had not above two hours notice of their advancing, & then gave no credit to it; by this means the advanced corps (which we reckon the flower of our army) were for above two hours intirely unsupported, & obliged to give way, and the enemy made a considerable impression upon the center of our line where they directed their principal attack; & would have penetrated still further had it not been for the gallantry & quickness of Col. Musgrave (a brother of Sir William's) who threw himself with about a 100 men into a house in the village of German Town, which he defended near two hours, though attacked with the most desperate courage on every side, & though both the doors were broke open by cannon shot;

This however stopped the progress of the enemy's column & gave time for other troops to advance to his support, and soon after they obliged the enemy to retreat, the two flanks of our army were not attacked, by which means the Guards were not engaged, though we had a column of the enemy in our front who I suppose waited only for the success of their main attack, to begin theirs. Genl. Washington made a very good retreat & though we pursued as quick as we could carried off all his guns, we lost above 400 killed & wounded, & took about that number of prisoners; after this it became necessary to fall back to Philadelphia in order to enable us to detach, both to convoy our provisions from the shipping, & to get possession of Red Bank.

The first we have hitherto succeeded in having met with no interruption from the enemy, but in the second we have failed, & in the attempt have lost about 400 Hessians to whom it was entrusted under the command of Col. Domoss [?]; a very gallant & good officer; who is dangerously wounded & made prisoner; the attempt was very desperate & I believe certainly too rash, the Fort was defended only by 300 militia, but a French Engineer had constructed it & it was too strong to be stormed in the manner it was attempted, particularly as the ditch over which they were obliged to pass was exposed to the fire of one of their row galleys from the River.

Such is the present situation of affairs, a more unpleasant one is hardly to be conceived, for unless we are in possession of the River within a week, we must inevitably evacuate Philadelphia. If Sir D. Howe had been in possession of Philadelphia, even if the news of Burgoyne be true he would at least have been able to say that the object of his army was fulfilled, for I understand he had given fair notice both to Burgoyne & Ld. G. Germaine, that the northern army must expect no assistance from him;

What will be the consequence of all this? that England is undone is certain; but the turning out a Blundering Ministry or even cutting off a few blundering heads will not repair the mischief.

I see you have got Sir. Charles over to our side of the house; Captn. Bayly, I find has purchased a company, a Lieutenant has been put into our Regt. over the head of the Ensigns here upon service, should his Majesty do the same by me I really suppose I should have no chance of a company till doomsday. for if he will not let me have it while I am upon this favourite service he certainly never will, & I think it would be folly to continue in the army. & with your approbation in that case je prendrais mon parti la desuss.

The Packet is ordered to sail immediately, I must contrive to send this letter by the Aid de Camp for should it go in the Bag, I think you would never receive it, Adieu, My Dear Brother, I am very impatient to see you & hope it will not be long before we meet.

Yrs most sincerely & affectionately

R. F.

I have referred Charles to this letter.

P. S. I forgot to mention that we have lost two ships the Augusta a sixty four & the Merlin [?] a sloop of [?] guns which were both burned the first by accident the 2d by ourselves to prevent her falling into the hands of the perfidious foe. Commodore Harlewood (who was a Boatswain in our service) commands the American fleet and I think makes no very contemptible figure upon the occasion. Sir John is writing a desponding letter to Ld. Gower. God knows what measures we shall pursue. I hope Sir W. Howe will only think of securing his army for it will be a provoking thing to lose an arm or a leg after the game is up.

Adieu.

PHILADELPHIA, *January 31st 1778.*

MY DEAR BROTHER:

I write to you though I have nothing to say to make my letter worth sending, but as it is the only means of conversing with one's friends in absence I think there is always a certain degree of satisfaction in it; New York has one great advantage over this place for winter quarters, because one has opportunities of hearing from Europe the whole year, which is not the case here, we have not yet received our Octr. & Novr. letters; which we know are arrived at N. York, but which Sir H. Clinton did not think it safe to send here so early in the year; one ship has fallen into the enemy's hands already by means of the ice, in which there was a very valuable cargo of Stores, Baggage, & Clothing, there is always a little naval war going on in the River.

By land we are very quiet, our winter quarters are peaceble, & in some degree plentiful, at least in comparison with what might have been expected, provisions are dear, but the prices are so tempting that the enemy cannot prevent the people supplying the market, any more than we can prevent their getting supplies of all the things they want from the town, Govr. Johnstone's attack upon the jobs in allowing a partial trade to be carried on has had very little effect, for Philadelphia is now full of every kind of merchandize, so I suppose the tools keep all this trade in their own hands.

I grow every day more and more disgusted with the folly & iniquity of the cause in which I am condemned to serve, and if the disgraces and disappointments of this year do not somehow or other put an end to the war I really think I cannot bear to sacrifice every feeling and principle I have to it any longer; I should leave the profession now with much less regret, than I should have done formerly, though I should still for many reasons be sorry to be obliged to do it; but the principles and opinions of the whole army are in politicks so very opposite to mine, (if it can be said that they have any) that I am by far less attached to the metier de soldat that I was;

This war has given all the persons employed in it the most determined aversion to the name of Whig, and a strong disinclination to whatever they have heard called principles of Liberty, though they do not even pretend to understand the meaning either of the one or the other. and as I am grown a much greater enthusiast upon these subjects than I was when I left England you may easily imagine how much their facon de penser displeases me.

This winter must certainly be one of the most active and interesting that has been known for a long time in England, and I cannot bear with patience being shut up here to wait the event of it, and not being able to be present at so busy a scene; and where I think our triumps must be so complete over the miserable and vile politicians that have brought about all these enormous mischiefs; having been a witness to all the horrors of this war has made me ten times more violent than ever against it, and I hate the Ministry more cordially than ever for having obliged me to became a sort of instrument (though a feeble one indeed) of injustice, barbarity, and oppression; my present system of politicks would be to cry peccavi, and if possible at any rate procure the alliance of America, after cutting off the heads of those who have been the means of losing it, but I am afraid the People of England have not sense enough to adopt so wise a measure; and if once America is the ally of France I cannot conceive any salvation for us whatever.

Poor Burgoyne, I hear, is living with his disarmed army at Cambridge; the Congress has given Gates a Gold Medal struck in commemoration of the Convention of Saratoga; there is a greatness and dignity in all the proceedings of this people that makes us contemptible indeed; I am well convinced they will be the first and greatest people there ever was an example of in the history of mankind; Our only Consolation, as Patriots, must be that they are of English origin; you see I am a complete Enthusiast, notwithstanding which I am not a little impatient to see you again in your Old Corrupted World, where I have lived so long that I have virtue enough left to deserve to live in the New one.

R. F.

PHILADELPHIA, *March 25th 1778.*

MY DEAR BROTHER:

No Packet is arrived since I last wrote to you, & another is ordered to sail for England, I don't know what news the General can have to send, unless it is the resolutions of Congress with respect to Burgoyne. Their pretexts for detaining him are not very specious, Excepting one which I think justifiable. Burgoyne has rather hastily, & in my opinion very injudiciously accused them of having broke their faith with him with regard to the quartering of officers; what they have done certainly did not amount to a Breach of the Convention, but it has given them an opening, which they have availed themselves of, for detaining him.

As he considers the convention violated on their side, which they do not admit; they have a right to Conclude that he will not Consider himself as any longer bound by it, they have therefore resolved that the army shall not be permitted to embark till a formal ratification of the treaty is *properly* notified to Congress, by the Court of Great Britain. this demand I suppose they think will reduce that Court to a disagreeable aternative, and in the mean time totally deprives them of the use of Burgoyne's army; he himself has wrote for leave to go home alone, but whether they will consent or not I have not yet heard.

Congress have also passed several resolutions in order to delay, & I fancy intirely to put an end to the intended negotiation for an exchange of prisoners, which they have determined shall not take place till all the diffent states where the prisoners have been disposed have made up their accounts & are paid for the subsistence of them. the real fact is that we want the exchange far more than they do, which they know as well as ourselves. and are, I believe, determined to act accordingly; We may be better soldiers, (though that perhaps some infidels may question,) But I am sure we are not so good politicians as they are.

The *Gallant* Col. Marhood [?] is gone with a thousand men down the river towards the Capes, it is said with a view of destroying some saltworks, or magazines; It is not supposed that they have any force there, but it is a considerable distance, & there is no depending upon their militia not being more numerous than is suspected, witness Dan Burry [?].

People here are anxious for news from England, unless Ld G. G. sends 20000 men it is supposed he must get another Commander in Chief. *et ou trouver l'un ou l'autre?* Some talk here of Ld Amherst, but surely he can hardly be so insane as to undertake it; if he does, I am sure, he will deserve no compassion whatever may be his fate. I have wrote no letters but this because I expect so soon to see all my friends in England;

If you should happen to know if Moliere [?] is in England I should be obliged to you if you would let him know that I am returning. I really believe you did him injustice in suspecting him, the servant he recommended to me is the worst that ever was or can be, & had there been a possibility of getting any other I should have turned him off long since; Adieu My Dear Brother, remember me to all my friends

I am ever yours most affectionately

R. F.

March 26th.

P. S.—I have just been making a visit to Genl Lee, who arrived here yesterday & is to be exchanged, he seems in spirits, & brought a number of reports from N. York from which place he came by Land, where the January packet is arrived, this packet however is to sail tomorrow, so I must conclude, all his reports were of preparations for the next year, mais Robin revient a ses flutes where are the men to come from? Adieu My Dear Brother Burgoyne has leave to go to England.

NECESSITY FOR SPAIN'S ENTRY IN THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we were fortunate today in having an opportunity to welcome to our midst the Prime Minister of Eire. We listened to a very fine address by him.

On April 10 we shall welcome to our shores His Excellency, Senor Don Alberto Martin Artajo, the Foreign Minister of Spain.

We have recently been glad to be host to a great many distinguished leaders from foreign nations, and I know that the visit of this able official of Spain will constitute another important landmark in ever-improved relations between our two countries.

The importance of such friendship and strength to the anti-Communist world is underlined by news from many parts of the globe.

As we know, there is, unfortunately, a tendency among some of our friends in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to ease up on their program of military preparedness. There is a tendency in some quarters to give some heed to the sirupy line emanating from Moscow.

I have faith, of course, in our friends and allies, but I am particularly glad, nonetheless, that we have the strong military, naval, air agreement with vigorously anti-Communist Spain.

The recent troubles in North Africa underline particularly how important are the Spanish bases. Progress on construction of these bases has been excellent, according to high United States military authority. We know that in the years up ahead, these bases will constitute an even more significant bulwark of the anti-Communist world, and a deterrent against Red aggression.

As we all know, we have had a number of distinguished visitors from Spain, including the Ministers of Commerce and Agriculture, as well as Army, Navy, and Air Force leaders. And, of course, last November, our own Secretary of State visited in Madrid with the Spanish Chief of State, Generalissimo Franco, discussing matters of mutual interest.

Foreign Minister Artajo was most instrumental in the negotiation of the original base agreements, and he has been very active in the effective implementation of these agreements.

I know that the Government of the United States is gratified by the fine cooperation which has been extended to us by Spain. The four air facilities, the sizable naval facility, and the all-important pipeline, figure most significantly therefore, as a bulwark against Communist aggression.

WELCOME SPAIN INTO NATO

In the meanwhile, I am hoping that the Senate will complete steps to urge the entry of Spain into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Last year, on July 13, after a great many House Members had offered literally dozens of resolutions for this purpose, the House Foreign Affairs Committee approved a resolution unanimously, and on July 14, the House of Representatives approved the resolution without dissent. Now, I am hoping that my colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will give their approval.

I had earlier discussed this vital subject on June 21 of last year, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 7, page 8804, and subsequently on July 11, volume 101, part 8, pages 10128 and 10129, when I announced the names of numerous additional cosponsors of my resolution.

Among cosponsors of this resolution on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] as well as myself.

Among many other cosponsors are the Senators from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. KENNEDY], New York [Mr. IVES], Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and numerous others.

I will not attempt to set forth the complete list at this time because I may say that several Senators who are not now listed as cosponsors of the Bridges-Wiley resolutions have indicated to me their complete support of it and may ask to be cosponsors.

The position of the Department of State has, as we know, been that the United States, of course, definitely favors the membership of Spain in NATO.

The Department has, however, pointed out that it is, of course, a fact that membership in NATO requires unanimity of all the NATO powers. And it is a further fact that among these powers there still do linger some points of difference with Spain.

The Department has sought, wherever possible, to use its good offices to help resolve such differences.

It has sought to create a broad and ever-finer climate in which Spain, the other NATO powers, including ourselves, could cooperate on matters of mutual interest, so as to pave the way for eventual formal Spanish admission into NATO.

PRECIOUS TIME IS PASSING

Meanwhile, however, precious time, in my judgment, is passing. Spain is unfortunately still not in a position to make her fullest contribution to the Western family of nations so long as she is kept outside NATO.

She is now, however, a member of the United Nations organization, as well as having been a member over a period of time of U. N. specialized agencies. That makes it all the more paradoxical that she is still not a member of NATO, which is so vital a regional instrumentality under the U. N.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, we will shortly go into the Easter recess. I am looking forward to the visit of Foreign Minister Artajo on our return from the recess. I hope that sometime soon thereafter we may further cement our good relations with Spain by passage of this resolution, as well as by continuing favorable action on legislation involving friendship with Spain, both as regards mutual-security provisions and such other phases as sound disposal of agricultural surpluses and related matters.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to announce that there are 6 minutes remaining to the distinguished minority leader, who is in charge of the time in opposition to the Welker amendment.

What is the will of the Senate? The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there are 6 minutes remaining to me. I am willing to yield part of that time to the distinguished Senator from Idaho, because his time has expired, and I am prepared to yield 3 minutes to those in opposition.

Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I desire to thank the distinguished minority leader. Some of my colleagues were absent when we were debating my amendment, which is identified as "3–9–56–E." Let me say again that on the amendment, I already have received the blessing of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the distinguished ranking minority Member on the Republican side of the aisle. During the debate I have discovered that there are certain matters which, in fairness to my colleagues, certainly should be taken care of. I am happy and willing to do it.

Let me say again I think this is a fair amendment, and it is so simply stated that I should not repeat the arguments in favor of it. As I have said, as long as the farm bill encompasses a soil bank, under which the American taxpayer will be forced to pay tremendous sums of money to take land out of production, I think it is utterly unfair and ridiculous that the American taxpayer, through the Secretary of the Interior and the Reclamation Service and/or the Department of Agriculture, should have new land brought into cultivation under new projects, which would merely bring about an increase of the surpluses. I think we all agree that it is the surpluses that are the cause of our dilemma.

I do not know how a sensible farm bill can be enjoyed by the people of America, when, for some reason or another, with one hand they are going to have to pay huge sums of money to take land out of production, and with the other hand they are going to have to pay out huge sums of money to put land into production.

Mr. President, my amendment has nothing whatsoever to do with projects which are already authorized. I wish to say I misunderstood the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona, a short time ago, when he interrogated me with respect to whether or not projects already authorized could continue to exist and expand. Nothing in my amendment would preclude that.

I think now that I desire to yield back whatever portion of the 3 minutes remains to me, because later there will be offered an amendment on which I shall be able to speak more at length upon this matter. I had hoped the matter could be hurriedly taken care of, but there are some very serious questions which have been raised by my colleagues, and I wish to do the best I can to help them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, of course, not knowing what amendment the Senator is going to offer, I must speak to the amendment before the Senate, which is designated as "3–9–56–E." I am sorry all Members of the Senate were not present at the time the discussion was taking place, but, as was pointed out by the Senators from Utah, Colorado, Arizona, California, and other

States, while the general objective of the Senator from Idaho may be perfectly sound, the language in the amendment which the Senate is presently considering has such far-reaching implications that we believe it would do great damage to the Western States and, indeed, ultimately to a great many States of the Union which will in the future be affected by the reclamation laws.

It is a far-reaching doctrine which is enunciated in the amendment, because it says that "no agricultural commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with subsection (c) to be in surplus supply shall be produced," and the time period is unlimited. The amendment would prevent production of crops even for the farmers' own use, as was pointed out by the senior Senator from Utah.

The suggestion was made by my junior colleague from California that this is such a far-reaching matter that it might properly be withdrawn as an amendment and submitted as legislation for the consideration of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture. I believe that would be the more orderly procedure.

It seems to me a measure of this far-reaching consequence should not be added to the agricultural bill at this time, without an adequate opportunity to hear from representatives of the States and the areas which may be far more vitally affected than the Senator from Idaho intends they shall be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the amendment open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I submit an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, it is proposed to strike out all of line 10.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, my purpose in offering the amendment is in order to obtain time so that I can yield time to the Senator from Idaho to further explain his amendment, following which, at the appropriate time, the amendment will be withdrawn.

Before yielding to the Senator from Idaho, however, I should like to state to the Senator from Colorado——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state that the Senator from Delaware has 30 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, rather extensive hearings were held on this particular provision before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and the question has been considered by both of the Departments and by the committee. So we are not dealing with a project to which the Congress has not given careful study.

Now I shall yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Idaho.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware will first yield briefly to me, I shall be very grateful to him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 582, making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The joint resolution will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 582) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1956, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 582) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1956, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have discussed this measure with the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who is on the floor at the present time; and I shall appreciate it if he will make a brief explanation of this measure.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the joint resolution will provide the funds needed by the Department of Labor from this day on, because the Department is out of funds.

This measure was looked into very carefully by the Appropriations Committee's subcommittee headed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], as chairman; and a hearing was held by the subcommittee. I could see no advantage in calling a meeting of the full committee to consider the joint resolution, inasmuch as it is a simple one.

Therefore, I have suggested to the leadership that the joint resolution be passed at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 582) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASED AUTHORIZATION FOR THE AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 1684, Senate bill 3452; and I request that the time required for the consideration of this measure not be charged to either side, under the allocation of the time available for consideration of the farm bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3452) to amend the act of July 15, 1955, Public Law 161, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 324) by increasing the appropriation authorization for the aircraft control and warning system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have discussed this measure with the distinguished minority leader, and he is agreeable to having it brought up at this time.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is familiar with the bill, and will explain it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, everyone knows that we are constructing what is called the Distant Early Warning Line as far north as it is practicable to construct it. The authorization for that purpose is exhausted. This bill has been unanimously reported from the Committee on Armed Services, after a hearing before the Subcommittee on Military Construction.

It is necessary that the bill be passed today, if possible, in order that the work may go forward without interruption.

Mr. President, this is a matter of the highest priority. The bill has the endorsement of all parties concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3452) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 15, 1955, Public Law 161, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 324), is hereby amended as follows:

"(1) With respect to various locations under the heading 'Outside Continental United States' and subheading 'Aircraft Control and Warning System' in section 301, strike out '$98,552,000' and insert in place thereof '$170, 552, 000.'

"(2) In clause (3) of section 502 thereof strike out the amounts '$458,563,000' and '$1,207,902,000' and insert in place thereof '$530, 563,000' and '$1, 279,902,000' respectively."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by the staff be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CONTINUED CONSTRUCTION OF THE DISTANT EARLY WARNING SYSTEM

The purpose of this bill is to provide additional construction authorization in the

amount of $72 million in order to insure uninterrupted and continued construction of the distant early warning system, more commonly known as the DEW line.

The DEW line is a chain of radar stations located in an east-west line across the most northerly practicable parts of the North American continent. It is designed to detect possible enemy aircraft and to flash a warning to the Air Defense Command centers in Canada and the United States as rapidly as possible after the aircraft come into range.

This is a high priority project and actual construction was started early in the winter of 1955. Subject to climatic conditions and characteristics peculiar to the Arctic, construction has been proceeding since that time at the greatest possible speed.

Initial estimates indicated that the project would require approximately $104 million to complete the construction portions of the system; however, lack of cost experience data in the Arctic area caused errors in this estimate. As the work progressed, it became apparent that the initial figures would have to be revised upward. In addition, construction undertaken by the prime contractor has progressed much more rapidly than expected, consequently, the Department of the Air Force needs additional authorization to insure that the construction forces employed in the area can be kept busy.

Public Law 161, of the 84th Congress, contained authorization in the amount of $98,552,000 for the continued construction of the DEW line. At the time this act was approved it was contemplated that this authorization would be sufficient to continue construction of these facilities until new authorization could be provided in the military construction authorization for fiscal year 1957. Provisions for this authorization were included in the military public works bill for fiscal year 1957—S. 3122—currently under consideration by the Armed Services Committee. However, the committee has not yet completed its consideration of this bill and the authorization now available to the Air Force will be exhausted on or about March 15—today.

Consequently, this item in the amount of $72 million has been removed from S. 3122 and is being reported in this separate bill.

In view of the extremely short shipping and construction seasons in the Arctic region, plus the urgent need to adhere to the target date for completion of this project, June 1957, it is necessary that the obligation of essential funds be made as early as possible in order that the finished goods and services can be made available in sufficient time to meet the shipping schedules this coming summer.

It is hoped that the Senate will act favorably on this bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me for a question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. How much money is involved in this measure?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Seventy-two million dollars. However, the bill does not make an appropriation, but merely increases a previous authorization.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back my unused time.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I have debated this subject at length. Certain questions have been raised. I address my remarks now to the distinguished majority leader, who was obliged to be absent from the floor when we were debating the question of a time limitation.

Let me say again that the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], made the statement on the floor that this bill could not possibly last more than 2 years. Since the distinguished senior Senator from Utah has been very active in connection with the upper Colorado Basin bill, and since there is provision in that bill that no new lands can come in for a period of 10 years from the date of enactment of the bill, I have, in the spirit of compromise and fair play, cut that time in half. I am willing to make it 5 years, if there is to be a cut-off period. I hope and pray that we may not even have to use the 5 years, because as soon as the surpluses are done away with, nothing in the bill would preclude us from developing the arid areas.

The distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] made some very appropriate remarks a few moments ago. He said, in effect, that there were certain commodities raised in the West which would not be under the protection of the farm bill we are now discussing. I agree with him wholeheartedly. However, I do not believe that I am using the West as a whipping boy in this connection. I think the State of Idaho has grown and blossomed by virtue of reclamation to as great an extent as has any other State in the Union. That has been due to the fairness, honesty, and great integrity of every Member of Congress. The Congress has not seen fit to let us down when we have needed funds to develop the arid lands of the West.

Within a few moments, I shall have prepared a modified amendment, so as to remove the objections of the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr WATKINS], the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and his colleague the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I hope the entire question will be resolved so that the Senator in charge of the bill will accept my amendment without a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I compliment the Senator from Idaho on offering this amendment. I am in thorough agreement with the principle of the amendment, and the objective which he is trying to reach. I believe that from his standpoint it is a very fair approach indeed.

I think it is quite illogical to attempt to take productive land out of production and place it in the soil bank as a means of reducing surpluses, and permit other lands, which will contribute to surpluses, to be brought under cultivation in the immediate future. I think the Senator's limitation of 5 years will be very helpful. It will remove the objection based upon an indefinite time in the future.

I urge support of his amendment, as I understand it will be modified. I congratulate him for bringing this subject to the attention of the Senate, and for offering his amendment.

Mr. WELKER I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. May I inquire whether the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Idaho has been withdrawn, awaiting the offering of a modified amendment, or whether it still remains the order of business before the Senate?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I answer my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma by saying that it has not yet been withdrawn.

At this time I send to the desk a modification of my amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modified amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 30, after line 17, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

EFDERAL IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE PROJECTS

SEC. 310. (a) That for a period of 5 years from the date of enactment of this act no agricultural commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with subsection (c) to be in surplus supply shall be produced on any newly irrigated or drained lands within any Federal irrigation or drainage project hereafter authorized unless such lands were used for the production of such commodity prior to the construction of such project.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause to be included, in all irrigation or drainage contracts entered into with respect to Federal irrigation and drainage projects hereafter authorized, such provisions as he may deem necessary to provide for the enforcement of the provisions of this section.

(c) On or before October 1 of each year, the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine and proclaim the agricultural commodities the supplies of which are in excess of estimated requirements for domestic consumption and export plus adequate reserves for emergencies. The commodities so proclaimed shall be considered to be in surplus supply for the purposes of subsection (a) during the succeeding crop year.

(d) For the purposes of this section the term "Federal irrigation and drainage project" means any irrigation and drainage project subject to the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and act amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and to any Federal irrigation or drainage project subject to the laws relating to irrigation and drainage under the auspices of the Department of Agriculture or the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator tell the junior Senator from Arizona how, in this new version, he has taken care of the language to which the Senator from California and other Senators have objected? I refer to subparagraph (c) in line 4 of the original amendment which states: "to be in surplus supply

shall be produced" and so forth. Has he taken care of that situation with his new version?

Mr. WELKER. I believe the Senator has made a good point. I doubt seriously that we have done so. I believe the distinguished minority leader raised the point as to whether the farmer could raise grain to feed his chickens, for example. I am willing again to modify my amendment to provide that no surplus supplies shall be produced on any land other than for domestic use. I should like to have the attention of the minority leader, and I should like to ask whether that clarifies the point he has raised.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It clarifies it somewhat, but I do not believe it solves the problem. Whether the period of time should be 5 years or 3 years might be arguable. However it seems to me that in any event the amendment would have much more merit if instead of providing "shall be produced on any land," it provided that "no benefit payments shall be received," or something of that sort. However, we are going rather far when we say that certain people shall not be permitted even to produce on the land. It may have very far-reaching implications, perhaps even further than the distinguished Senator from Iowa intends. I know he is vitally interested in reclamation in the West, and he has had a distinguished career in that regard. However, I do wish to call attention to the fact that we do have many shifts in populations. Sometimes we have a great drought, and some people may have to leave one area and move to another.

Those are some of the conditions we must face. His amendment may have the effect of freezing benefit payments; and there may be considerable logic as to that, if we are taking land out of production, but when the Senator provides that the farmers may not produce anything on the land—which I believe they should have a right to do—he is going pretty far, constitutionally and otherwise.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. WELKER. I should like to yield first to the Senator from Delaware, who I believe wishes to answer the observation of the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. LANGER. Perhaps it would be well to add "shall not be produced for commercial purposes." That might solve the problem.

Mr. WELKER. I do not believe so. I offered to do that in the chicken-feed amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I believe I can explain it.

Mr. WELKER. Very well. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. We discussed this subject, and in reading over the version that was sent to the desk we noted that inadvertently the sentence to which the junior Senator from Arizona referred has been omitted. The Senator from Utah is trying to get it back into the copy, so that the amendment will make sense.

Mr. WELKER. May we hear it read?

Mr. WATKINS. The first sentence of the paragraph should read:

> That for a period of 5 years from the date of enactment of this act no agricultural commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with subsection (c) to be in surplus supply shall be produced on any newly irrigated or drained lands within any Federal irrigation or drainage projects—

And so forth. The addition I have read was inadvertently omitted when the amendment was typewritten.

Mr. GOLDWATER. There we get again to the objection the senior Senator from California has raised, that the amendment would in effect prohibit anyone from planting any crops on his land, even though they were for his personal consumption or for consumption by his animals. I do not believe the Senator from Idaho intends to do that. It would be wise indeed if we could develop language which would take out that objectionable feature.

Mr. WELKER. Certainly I have offered to do that no fewer than eight times this afternoon. I will make the offer again. It is a very meritorious and fair proposal. If we could find a way to remove the objection it would be fair to everyone.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I believe the Senator from Idaho has been very fair in his approach to this problem. I should like to point out that we are not proposing to remove acreage which is now in production or take it away from farmers who are now farming land. Instead, we are talking about new land which has never been cultivated, and which would not be cultivated unless we appropriated money to bring it into production. Why should one Department use taxpayers' money to bring into production new acreage, while at the same time we are authorizing another Department to pay farmers to remove from production some existing acres?

I believe the amendment is a very fair amendment. The Senator has been very fair about it. It would greatly improve the bill if the amendment were adopted.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator from Delaware. I believe we have now gotten to the meat of the coconut. We are not trying to take away any land that is now in production. I cannot see the concern of those who might oppose the amendment on that ground. If there is concern on that point, perhaps we should look at the soil bank and decide how much we should worry about that feature of the bill. I hope the explanation of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has convinced the distinguished minority leader that this is a meritorious amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to say to the Members of the Senate that during a period of 5 years it will be very difficult on any newly irrigated land to bring in any production.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WATKINS. There is no serious obstacle to limiting production there. In the House bill dealing with the Colorado storage project, from which I have read, there is a limitation of 10 years. We do not object to a brief limitation. This applies to drainage projects, as well as other projects built with Federal funds. There is not any likelihood that during the first 5 years there will be any kind of production. I do not see any serious objection to a limitation of a 5-year period within which the land cannot be used for any purpose, because it is not likely that in that period of time it will be used for any purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I notice that under the language of the amendment, the provision applies to Federal drainage projects. Is that correct?

Mr. WELKER. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Are there any Federal drainage projects, as such, or does the Senator mean lands that are drained in connection with flood control projects?

Mr. WELKER. No; there are Federal drainage projects, and others will hereafter be created. We have many of them in Idaho, and they have been of great assistance in bringing in new land. I am not interfering with that at all.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WELKER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator does not intend to apply his amendment to lands which are incidentally reclaimed through a flood control program, does he?

Mr. WELKER. Incidentally reclaimed? No, under no circumstances do I intend that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate that statement by the Senator, because the statement just made by the Senator from Utah probably applies correctly with reference to land reclaimed from the desert, and I have no knowledge what period of time must elapse before that land can become productive. Of course, that statement would not apply to land that is reclaimed by way of drainage, because on that kind of land production can start almost immediately.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I followed the colloquy, I became even more confused. According to the Senator's answer to the question, in the case of a flood control project in which the Federal Government puts up all the money, that money is not repaid at all. Those lands can be brought in under the Senator's amendment, and they can produce crops which are in long supply. In that way we would be building up a surplus. With respect to reclamation projects, which are repaid in 40 years, plus the 10-year development period, production would be foreclosed.

So that theoretically, at least—and I think this is the kind of a colloquy which is necessary and desirable, to see how

far we may be going with an amendment of this kind—we can bring in thousands of acres which are not now in production, by a Federal flood-control project, and they may be planted to cotton, corn, or wheat, even though those products are in long supply. But if it were a reclamation project, they would not be permitted to grow anything.

Mr. WELKER. The reason why I did not put flood control into it is that I cannot imagine a flood-control project, as I have said, bringing in vast acres of irrigable land. If it would better satisfy the distinguished minority leader, I should be glad to put that in, too. But I tell the Senate that if the soil-bank proposal goes through as it is, and we do not have some control over bringing in new land, this farm bill will not amount to two bits. I do not think our action should hinge on mere technicalities. I am offering all I can, and I wish the support of both sides. But here I am giving everything I can, but there always comes up some new, technical, fine-spun theory. I am sure we do not want it that way.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure no one is bringing up any technical theory. I think the argument which the Senator has made would be perfectly valid as to any irrigation project which might be before the country in the future to to be examined very closely in committee on the floor of the Senate to see whether, primarily, it would result in bringing in crops which are in long supply, and of which we have surpluses.

That would be something to which I am sure the Senate and the House of Representatives would give every consideration. But I think some of us, under our responsibilities—and I am not speaking now, as the minority leader, but as a Senator of the United States—would not consider it a problem local to the State of California, but it does, I believe, affect the whole arid West. I think it may have some far-reaching implications which the Senator himself does not intend to impose on that area of the country. We may be doing something which we shall regret doing.

It seemed to me that it was not an unreasonable suggestion of my junior colleague from California that a matter of this importance should have consideration in the proper legislative committee.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, once again I wish to answer the Senator and say that I am getting a little bit tired of hearing the statement made that the committee did not consider this matter. It has been stated on the floor of the Senate by members of the committee that they had the matter before the committee. I am sorry that I could not be a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. When the Democrats took over, I was bumped off. But I have done the best I could to present this matter in the limited time I have had. If the Senate desires a rollcall on my amendment, I want Senators to stand up and be counted, because I think I have been fair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Idaho yield while the first paragraph of the amendment is read by the clerk?

Mr. WELKER. Certainly, Mr. President.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 30, after line 17, insert:

"FEDERAL IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE PROJECTS

"SEC. 310. (a) That for a period of 5 years from the date of enactment of this act no agricultural commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with subsection (c) to be in surplus supply shall be produced on any newly irrigated or drained lands within any Federal irrigation or drainage project hereafter authorized unless such lands were used for the production of such commodity prior to the construction of such project."

Mr. WELKER. That is correct, Mr. President.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. WELKER. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. If I correctly understand the Senator's response, I think I am completely satisfied as to the point I have in mind. Do I correctly understand that his amendment has no relation at all to drainage which is incidental to flood-control projects?

Mr. WELKER. Not one iota.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wonder if my colleague will yield me a minute so that I may make a comment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. May I have the attention of both the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Idaho?

If I have a correct copy of the proposed amendment to the amendment, let me invite attention to what is called paragraph (d), which reads as follows:

(d) For the purposes of this section the term "Federal irrigation and drainage project" means any irrigation and drainage project subject to the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and to any Federal irrigation or drainage project subject to the laws relating to irrigation and drainage under the auspices of the Department of Agriculture or the Secretary of Agriculture.

I do not know what the situation is in the State of the Senator from Florida. I do know that in the State from which I come we do have from time to time flood-control projects in which the Department of Agriculture is interested. We do have public works on which the Department of Agriculture spends agricultural money and which presumably are under the control of the Secretary of Agriculture. Those projects, in at least one instance with which I am personally acquainted, are in areas where irrigable lands are located.

I am not going to vote to approve something which may be interpreted, under the verbiage used, to prevent a farmer in my State from utilizing his land as he desires to utilize it, merely because the Department of Agriculture is contributing in that area to any type of protection from erosion, floods, or anything else.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The matter which gave me concern does not pertain directly to my own State. We have only one flood-control project, and in connection with that, the State is paying 15 percent——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. My State is contributing 15 percent of the construction cost, all the cost of relocation of roads, and the like, and all the maintenance cost for stated portions of the project, amounting to a total of approximately 39 percent of the project costs. What I was thinking about was that in many States, where there is an abundance of water, projects are under way. There are lands which are cultivable that are made available. I want to be very sure, as I think I am sure now, in view of the answer of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, that this amendment does not pertain to them. If I heard the amendment read properly, it relates only to land under the Department of the Interior and under the Department of Agriculture.

Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. WELKER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think that statement may make clear the reasoning behind my questions in this colloquy, and the reason why I am completely satisfied, with reference to my interest in the matter, by the answers made by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield me a little time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Drainage projects connected with reclamation are now going into effect in some of the States. The pending bill refers to projects after the enactment of the act. We have a bill in conference today, and Part II provides for drainage as well as for irrigation, and applies, also, to all the area outside of the 17 reclamation States, which means all the rest of the United States. If the bill should be passed, it would apply to irrigated lands.

The Chief of the Army Engineers wrote me a letter in which he stated that under flood control over 8 million acres of land had been reclaimed and put back into cultivation. That makes a million more acres than have ever been reclaimed under Federal reclamation.

From the standpoint of justice, I think it should have included the others. But I am willing to settle simply for those which are in the Department of Agriculture; and those hereinafter enacted or hereinafter put into effect, when the lobby becomes effective, should be handled exactly as are projects for irrigation or reclamation purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator did not have in mind, did he, including flood control projects as to which the States or the local governmental units pay a substantial part of the cost of the program themselves?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; because reclamation is in a position identical with that of which we are speaking.

Mr. HOLLAND. Particularly where all or most of the lands are privately owned, and there would be no conceivable way under which the right could be taken from any land owner to produce.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator from Florida must remember that the amendment applies only to projects hereinafter provided for by law. The situation which the Senator mentions as to private lands, which already have their exemptions, and so forth, is exactly true under reclamation. Three-fourths of the reclamation projects these days provide water as supplemental to the lands already in private ownership and in private operation at the moment. But the amendment applies to those under reclamation and likewise those which are drainage projects.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The amendment is not limited to public lands; but applies also, as the Senator has pointed out, to lands which are in private ownership today, which would be getting only a supplemental water supply.

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct. Three-fourths of the land in reclamation projects today is privately owned. Under those circumstances, exactly the same situation would apply as the Senator from Florida has said exists in his own State. I know about the Lake Okeechobee project. I know that private lands are being taken care of there. They come under flood control. That project already is under way; there is no limitation on it. The amendment would apply only to projects hereinafter provided for by law. That is all the amendment would apply to.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thoroughly understand that the amendment applies only to projects enacted in the future. I am faced with the fact that there are many river valleys not yet covered by flood-control operations, and where I believe it to be in the public interest to have flood-control operations set up.

The question I wanted to ask the distinguished Senator is this: Considering that there will not be an application to the Federal Government for the use of water, there will be a question as to whether or not the people who now own private lands, which will be made more arable as a result of the flood-control operations, will be able to produce crops on that land. How would the Senator propose to deprive the private landowners of their right to produce anything they can on their privately owned land?

Mr. WATKINS. In exactly the same way as those under reclamation or irrigation projects are regulated.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I have very little time left.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Utah. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and then to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. MONRONEY. As the Senator from Utah knows, I have been tremendously interested in the upstream flood-control program, which is just getting under way. There are probably less than 50 small watershed projects now authorized and under construction.

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The additional land which would be brought into production in the smaller tributary valleys are subject to flooding 3 or 4 times each year. As I understand, the landowner who gives his land for the retention pool and reserves all of that water for his own irrigation purposes would find himself in serious trouble under the amendment, because the funds that come from the Department of Agriculture would apply, and practically none of these projects, which will number into the thousands, could, up to this time, be considered to be authorized in any way.

Mr. WATKINS. The projects can be authorized for such purposes. All I am saying is that that particular type of project brings into cultivation new lands, just as the reclamation part does.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is the Senator saying that the amendment would kill the upstream flood-control program?

Mr. WATKINS. No; it would not kill reclamation.

Mr. MONRONEY. This is not reclamation; it is title 608 land.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand; but in the broad, general sense of the term it is reclamation land; it has not heretofore been used. It is actually irrigated land; it is newly drained land. As it comes into use, it becomes competitive with other land, and contributes to the surpluses in the same way as any other lands do, particularly those under the 1902 Reclamation Act.

It is not possible to have one rule for lands which come under the Reclamation Act, and another rule for lands which come under drainage. For 5 years they would not be able to produce any of the so-called surplus products, but it would be possible to grow anything else on them.

Mr. MONRONEY. It would not be possible to raise cattle.

Mr. WATKINS. Oh, yes, it would.

Mr. MONRONEY. Milk is in surplus; beef is in surplus; alfalfa seed, corn, wheat, and other products are in surplus. In other words, we would be completely negating a bill which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry sponsored, which passed the Senate, and which gave so much hope to the little farmers of the land that we could at long last have upstream flood control and make that program work.

Mr. WATKINS. My amendment would operate in exactly the same way for those people as it would for the irrigators under the Reclamation Act. If a law is to be applied to one class of persons, the only fair thing to do is to have it apply to all classes of persons. What is sought to be done will be pointed up now. It will be seen what is proposed to be done for the irrigator under the Reclamation Act. But we are willing to take it, because we know that it will take 5 years before any crops worth mentioning actually can be produced on irrigated lands.

We know from experience that it is not possible to have desert lands brought into production, to amount to anything, for several years. It is possible to put in other crops which are surplus. Hay, fodder, and that type of product can be grown.

I maintain that if the bill is fair for one group, it is fair for all.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Idaho the purpose of his amendment.

Mr. WELKER. I assume that I am speaking on the time of the opposition. I am sorry the Senator from Nevada has not been present. I know he has been detained on other business.

THE PRECEDENT OF DELAYING STABILIZATION OF WATER SUPPLY ON WESTERN LANDS

Mr. MALONE. I am not detained on other business. I am here to debate the propriety of setting a precedent that further western development must wait on a synthetic midwestern surplus.

Mr. WELKER. Then the Senator will hear the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. MALONE. That is my purpose.

Mr. WELKER. The purpose of the amendment is to preclude, for a period of 5 years, the authorization of any new projects under the Reclamation or Department of the Interior Act which have not been heretofore authorized, projects which would cost the taxpayer money, and also thereby bring into production new crops of surplus commodities, while at the same time the taxpayer was being asked to shell out money from the other pocket to take other lands out of production, under the so-called soil-bank program.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I think that is very clear. I simply want to say for the purpose of the RECORD that where we live, west of the Rocky Mountains, we cannot pay the support price and ship corn from Illinois or Iowa to the intermountain States and break even feeding it to our livestock. Our stockmen must raise much of their own feed; otherwise they will go out of business.

We are trying to help the Corn and Wheat Belt farmers out of a bad situation and I shall vote for the flexible support price, but I shall not vote for a precedent under which the intermountain States must stop development while taxpayers' money is being utilized to increase the surplus in another area.

Our western problem is storing surplus water, to stabilize the water supply on lands already largely under cultivation, including some additional acreage to make a project feasible. The amendment will set a dangerous precedent and I shall vote against it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, how much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has 7 minutes remaining; 15 minutes remain on the other side.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield some time to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I take this opportunity to interrogate the junior Senator from Idaho on the purpose and objective of the amendment with respect to the Carey Act lands in the West. I understand the same situation prevails in other States of the West.

Will the Senator's amendment interfere in any way with the homesteaders who have settled on the lands, who have applied water to their lands at their own expense, and who in the next few years will be in a position to prove up the additional lands? Are they to be precluded from raising any of the crops which are in surplus?

Mr. WELKER. Under no construction of the act would that be so. The Carey Act homesteaders already have their land. They are not bringing in new land they did not all the time intend to have brought in.

Mr. BARRETT. It is on new land.

Mr. WELKER. I thought the Senator said the homesteaders had settled upon the land.

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct. The water will have to be applied to the lands for the first time when they prove up on their homestead land.

Mr. WELKER. It is certainly not my intention that the farmer who has been working and settling his land should not have the right to bring in his land at the right time. The whole intention of my amendment is that we shall not authorize vast projects. I am not worried about how many Carey Act people there are in the State of the Senator from Wyoming. There are no more of them in the Senator's State than there are in my State.

Mr. BARRETT. I do not think there are as many in my State as there are in the Senator's State.

Mr. WELKER. I do not think there are.

Mr. BARRETT. But there is a substantial acreage under the Carey Act in our State, and those people have complied with every provision of the law. They are expending their own money. They are putting water on the land at their own expense. When they prove up on their land, they hope to use the land for the purpose of growing crops, some of which or most of which crops will be in surplus.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield one additional minute to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Those farmers are working on projects which have been authorized previously, and will not in any way be affected by the amendment of the Senator from Idaho. The Senator from Idaho is speaking only about that which will happen in projects which will be authorized in the future, and would have no connection with the situation the Senator from Wyoming has just described, as I understand.

Mr. BARRETT. Is that the situation?

Mr. WELKER. That is the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am willing to yield back my time, if the proponent of the amendment is prepared to yield back the remainder of his time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator would be willing to allot 5 minutes to me, in order that I might address some questions to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. KNOWLAND. On this amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; on another matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would be glad to do so as a courtesy to the Senator, but since we have a good attendance at the present time, I was hopeful that the Senate might proceed to a vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for the purpose of clarifying the legislative intent of the bill before the Senate, as amended by the Hickenlooper amendment, I should like to address some questions to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER]. I am asking these questions because they are the ones which farmers from my own State have propounded, and the answers to them may well clarify this matter beyond doubt. I am also asking these questions, which I believe will clarify the legislative intent, rather than to offer an amendment, because of the great difficulties in writing an amendment which would cover all the variety of conditions on farms in the Corn Belt.

The language of the Hickenlooper amendment is as follows:

> The Secretary shall require as a condition of eligibility for price supports on corn, that the producer agrees to devote an acreage of cropland (tilled in normal rotation), at the option of the producer, to either the acreage reserve program or the conservation reserve program, equal to 15 percent of such producer's farm base acreage for corn.

My first question is: Is it not correct that the 15 percent requirement in this section is a minimum requirement in order to be eligible for price support?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the distinguished Senator.

The second question is: Under the amendment, is it not permissive for the producer to have an additional acreage in the acreage reserve program or the conservation reserve program, for which he will be paid in the same manner as for the initial 15 percent?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. It is up to the Secretary to decide that with the farmer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the answer of the distinguished Senator that under the Hickenlooper amendment farmers are not limited to the minimum requirement of 15 percent.

The third question is in several parts. Is there any maximum participation which is set under this amendment or in any other feature in the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is there any maximum participation as it pertains to the total tillable acres of any one farm?

Mr. ELLENDER. The only limitation pertains to the amount of authorization, and for the acreage reserve program the total amount is $750 million for each year's crop reduction, and for the conservation reserve program the amount is $350 million for each year.

Since the bill has been debated on the floor, there has been imposed a limitation of $25,000 to any person under the acreage reserve program, and a limitation of $7,500 to any person who participates in the conservation reserve program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also clear, therefore, that except for the limitations on dollar amounts for any one farm or the total amounts in the bill, a farmer could put up to, say, 25 percent of his tillable acres in the acreage reserve and/or the conservation reserve, under the Hickenlooper amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct, provided the Secretary agrees to it.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the Senator will yield, more than 25 percent could be put up.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no limitation in that respect.

Mr. CAPEHART. It could be 100 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Secretary so desires, it could be 100 percent, provided the $25,000 and $7,500 limitations are not exceeded.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the amendment which I have at the desk was offered solely for the purpose of giving the Senator from Idaho time to speak. Now that the amendment is going to be voted on, which amendment I think should be adopted, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. My amendment was merely to strike out line 10 on page 1 of the amendment of the Senator from Idaho. It was offered solely for the purpose of giving the Senator from Idaho time to explain his amendment. Now that the purpose has been accomplished, I withdraw my amendment, so the Senate can proceed to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WELKER. The order of business now is the modification of my original amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order of business is the amendment of the Senator from Idaho as modified.

Does the Senator from California yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. In answer to a previous inquiry, the Chair said "as modified." Does the Chair mean the amendment as modified by the amendment of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WATKINS. I did not offer it. The Senator from Idaho did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the amendment upon which time was sought was merely a technical amendment, in order to gain time.

Mr. KUCHEL. I understand that, but I wanted to be sure what the modification was which the Chair said was the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from California prepared to yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I take this time in an attempt to straighten out the situation with respect to the proposed modification of the amendment. I want to read it and ask the junior Senator from Idaho just what the amendment means:

> That for a period of 5 years from the date of enactment of this act no agricultural commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with subsection (c) to be in surplus supply shall be produced on any newly irrigated or drained lands within any Federal irrigation or drainage project hereafter authorized unless such lands were used for the production of such commodities prior to the construction of such project.

I should like to ask the Senator a question. There is in existence a conference committee on the Small Projects Act, which is working at the present time. I happen to be working on that conference committee. In our State there is a natural-resources board, which develops irrigation projects. We hope those projects are going to be authorized under the Small Projects Act and included as Federal irrigation projects. Do I correctly understand that the purpose of the amendment is to prohibit anybody who develops lands under the Small Projects Act from growing any crop which the Secretary of Agriculture declares to be in surplus at the present time?

Mr. WELKER. For a period of 5 years.

Mr. BARRETT. For a period of 5 years?

Mr. WELKER. Yes.

Mr. BARRETT. Then that means one of two things: either they could not develop the small projects; or, second, they could not grow anything on the small projects.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill itself to the Senator from Wyoming, so that he may yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator from California. Now I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. The 5 years will begin with the enactment of this bill. All projects thereafter authorized could begin using the water on their lands under drainage or irrigation within 5 years from the time of the enactment of the bill. But it will take 4 or 5 years to construct many of the projects. So many of them would not be affected.

Mr. BARRETT. No, Mr. President; I beg to differ with the Senator from Utah. Insofar as Wyoming is concerned, many of these projects are already under construction, and are waiting for the Small Projects Act to be placed on the statute books, so they can comply with that act. The lands can be put under irrigation in less than 1 year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why should the United States Government, when acting by means of one agency, authorize projects which will bring into production millions of acres of land to be used for the raising of agricultural products which already are in surplus supply, when at the same time we are approving a soil bank in connection with which we shall pay more than $40 or $50 an acre to farmers to take existing agricultural land out of production? Such a procedure simply does not make sense.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the population of the United States is increasing at the present time at a terrific rate, and the time may come in the very near future when we shall need to raise crops on this land.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That may be; but in that event his amendment will be nonoperative, because then we would not have a surplus of agricultural products.

Mr. BARRETT. But it is wholly inequitable to say to those who have been developing these lands, for the purpose of putting them into production——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

SUPPORT PRICE GRAIN CANNOT BE FED TO LIVESTOCK AND BREAK EVEN—BAD PRECEDENT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield time to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator that there is another feature to this situation that would establish a dangerous precedent: Our section of the country is 1,500 miles from the areas where the surplus crops are being produced.

We cannot buy those surplus grain crops and ship them to our Western States and feed the cattle, sheep, or hogs and break even. Surplus crops are not being produced in my State, for example.

I shall vote for Secretary Benson's flexible price-support bill, which he favors because he is buried under the surplus and is trying to do something about it.

The principle of guaranteeing a profit on something of which there is an annual surplus production is wrong, but World War II created a situation which must be met and I believe the Secretary is doing everything he knows how to meet it.

Mr. Benson says he is trying to sell at world prices and to give away large quantities of surplus crops. But when he gives it away to foreign countries he takes the market away from other foreign countries already furnishing such markets.

He trades the surplus grain for foreign minerals and closes the mines in this country. So he is just shifting the weight around.

Many Government officials do not understand that the western areas cannot pay the support price and feed the grain, neither could the Middle or Eastern States pay a support price for western grain and feed it to their livestock.

If this precedent is once established that no further western development may be undertaken as long as there is a surplus of grain in the Central States, that will be the end of such development—because there will be no end to the surplus at the support price.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The amendment applies to irrigation projects, which could be in Delaware or in any other State of the Union. In fact, the Senator from Nevada is wholly out of line when he says that Nevada is so far from the breadbasket in the Midwest that it cannot obtain the grain. When we are shipping grain thousands of miles across the oceans, and giving it away in foreign lands, of course, the grain can be shipped to any State in the Union.

Mr. MALONE. But we only give the grain to the foreigners—none is given to the cattle, sheep, or hog feeders in this country. The livestock men in the West cannot pay the support price for the grain, and feed it to their cattle, sheep, or hogs and break even. If they paid the support price for that grain, they would lose 50 cents a day on every steer in the feed lot.

The Department of Agriculture did say, in the fall of 1954, that grain would be sold in designated disaster areas at a reduced price—but after the ranchers had made such purchases they sent investigators there and in all cases when it was found that these men were able to borrow enough money to pay the full support price they sent them a bill for the difference. It developed they had to be broke as well as in a disaster area to get the reduced price.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I call for a division.

On a division, the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

SCHOOL MILK AND BRUCELLOSIS-ERADICATION PROGRAMS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CURTIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me? There is a privileged matter at the desk.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without losing the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there is a privileged matter at the desk; it is the conference report on H. R. 8320.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me ask about this matter, Mr. President.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is the conference report on H. R. 8320, the so-called school-milk and brucellosis bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a number of Senators have requested that the absence of a quorum be suggested when that conference report is ready for our consideration. So I now desire to suggest the absence of a quorum, and to request unanimous consent that the time required therefor not be charged to either side, in connection with our consideration of the farm bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. If it will take any great length of time for us to act on the conference report, I shall postpone my request that it be brought up.

Mr. KNOWLAND. However, a number of requests have been made of me to suggest the absence of a quorum before the conference report is considered by the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time there may be a quorum call, without charging to either side the time required for the call of the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the time required for the quorum call be charged to the time available to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I would not wish to have the Senator from Oklahoma taken from his feet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? Without objection——

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, has the Senator from Oklahoma been recognized for the purpose of submitting an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has been recognized; he has not yet stated his purpose in seeking recognition.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have not yet submitted an amendment. However, as I understand, I was recognized when I addressed the Chair as acting majority leader.

I was not aware that any other arrangement had been made; I was not aware that the Senator from Nebraska wished to submit an amendment at this time.

However, since I now understand that the Senator from Nebraska desires to submit an amendment at this time, I shall surrender the recognition the Chair has extended to me; and I request that I be recognized following the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], in submitting his amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I join in that request. I did not know the distinguished Senator from Nebraska was on his feet, seeking recognition.

However, Mr. President, I still ask unanimous consent that at this time there may be a quorum call, prior to the presentation of the privileged matter to which reference has been made; and I ask that the time required for the quorum call not be charged to either side, and, also, that the suggestion of the absence of a quorum at this time shall not cause the distinguished Senator from Nebraska to lose his right to the floor, but that, instead, after our action on the privileged matter has been completed, he then have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8320) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school milk program and the brucellosis eradication program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8320) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school milk program and the brucellosis eradication program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments to the text of the bill and to the title of the bill.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
T. S. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not care to engage in any extended debate on this subject. We had quite an extensive debate yesterday, and covered all phases of the subject most thoroughly.

The House and Senate conferees met, as I said I would try to have them meet, this afternoon instead of this morning at 11 o'clock. The Senate conferees receded from the amendments of the Senate, that is, to extend for 2 years the brucellosis eradication program and the special school milk program.

The approval of this conference report will mean that additional money, to the extent of $2 million will be provided to carry on the brucellosis eradication program, and $10 million additional for the school milk program, up to June 30, 1956. That is what the conferees agreed to. It is my sincere belief that the only procedure under which funds can be provided to carry out the two programs through the end of this fiscal year is through the adoption of this conference report, as I suggested yesterday. Failure to adopt the conference report will simply prolong the deadlock indefinitely, and may bring about a shutdown of both programs in the immediate future.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is my desire to make a motion to recommit the conference report to the conferees with instructions to the Senate conferees to insist on the Senate amendments. I am asking the advice of the Chair as to the propriety of such a motion, and whether the motion I am about to make would be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that such a motion would be in order.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then, Mr. President, I move that the conference report be recommitted to the conferees with instructions to the Senate conferees to insist on all Senate amendments.

Mr. President, this is an utterly simple problem. The Senate of the United States has, twice within the past 4 weeks, passed unanimously, so far as I know, on

the proposal for a 2-year extension of the brucellosis eradication program and the school milk program, and the provision of extra money, as provided by the Senate amendments.

Yesterday we had a long debate on the question of inserting that same provision in the farm bill. I am advised by Members of the House today that there was considerable discussion on the floor of the House, and, while, of course, I could not say absolutely, until the vote came, that such a thing would happen, the likelihood is that if the House ever had an opportunity to vote on the 2-year extension, it would be unanimously passed, and that the Senate amendments would be unanimously accepted.

The trouble is that the House has not had an opportunity to act upon the question because of the failure on the part of the House conferees to meet, until this afternoon at 3 o'clock.

I have no criticism of the Senate conferees. I disagree with them. They have their responsibilities and their attitudes. However, there have been two unanimous expressions on the part of the Senate. One was about 25 or 26 days ago, when we unanimously approved the 2-year extension of the brucellosis eradication program and the school milk program. No later than yesterday, by a vote of 89 to 0, as I recall—at least, it was unanimous consent so far as Senators who were present were concerned—we again approved the 2-year extension of these programs. If there is anything that makes assurance doubly sure that the Senate is unanimous in its determination to have a 2-year extension of the brucellosis program and the school milk program, with added money, it is those two votes.

I therefore am a little disturbed by the expedition with which the Senate conferees, or a majority of them, capitulated to the will of the majority of the House conferees. Two of them did not sign the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In a moment I shall be glad to yield. Especially when it is a matter of knowledge that if they will give the House a chance to vote, the House will accept the Senate amendment immediately. This is the time to do it. If we vote to recommit with instructions, as I have moved, and if it is submitted to the House, it will be passed within minutes after it is considered by the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. All that I am trying to do is to carry out the plan I outlined to the Senate yesterday. Frankly, I am surprised and I am disappointed that all of the House conferees did not sign this conference report, inasmuch as we are adopting their own bill. I shall ask the Senator from Iowa if he feels he can account for the refusal of two House conferees to embrace their own proposal? Those men have failed to sign this conference report, even though we are accepting their own bill. Talk about politics.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would as soon talk about politics, except that I shall not take the time of the Senate to do so. We talked a little about politics yesterday, and I do not believe we need to plow that ground again today. The fact is that the Senator from Louisiana did exactly what he said he would do yesterday. The Senator from Louisiana is a man of his word. I have the greatest respect for him. I knew he would make every attempt to call a conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I did.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. He did get a conference together.

Mr. ELLENDER. And if the Senator will look at the RECORD of yesterday he will note what I said would have to be done in order for us to obtain sufficient funds with which to carry on the brucellosis program and the school milk program through June 30 of this year. The identical proposal that I outlined to the Senate yesterday is what I proposed to the conferees this afternoon, and I am pleased to report that the majority of the Senate conferees voted in the affirmative. That is why we have the conference report before us today. I repeat that if the Senate desires to provide funds to carry on the brucellosis program and the school milk program until June 30, we had better vote for the conference report.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Although the Senator does not so intend it, that will be interpreted as a threat on the part of the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. As what?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As a threat on the part of the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator may interpret it as a threat if he wishes to do so. The point is that the Senate conferees voted to recede from the Senate amendments. I want to remind my good friend from Iowa that when this matter came up last January, soon after Congress met, the President of the United States sent us a message on farm legislation, and he suggested a 2-year extension of the brucellosis program, authorizing $20 million a year, and a 2-year extension of the school milk program, of $75 million a year. Immediately thereafter the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and others introduced bills to carry out this program, and the measures were referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I called the Senator from Vermont and told him that the House of Representatives had already acted upon a similar program, and that if we refused to act on their bill, but passed a Senate bill, the House would doubtless sit on our bill. So I told the Senator from Vermont—and I am sure he will recall this conversation—that I thought the best way to handle the matter, in an effort to carry the two programs forward through June 30, was for me to see the House Members and ask them to pass and send us a bill to extend the programs until June 30 of this year. That was done.

However, when the House bill came before the committee, instead of the committee taking the House bill as it came to us, and as I had suggested it be prepared on the House side, the Senator from Vermont and other Senators insisted that we add a 2-year program to the House bill. I will state that I did not have authority from the full committee to suggest to the House as I have just outlined, but I did it in good faith, and I did it with a view of trying to obtain approval of the funds necessary for a continued brucellosis program and a school milk program through June 30.

I wish to give assurance to my good friend from Iowa that if perchance the President of the United States makes the mistake of vetoing the omnibus farm bill, I shall be in the forefront of those endeavoring to get another bill passed to carry out the 2-year program, because I am as much in favor of the brucellosis program and of the school milk program as is my distinguished friend from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is no question about the Senator's being in favor of the program. There is no question about the Senator from Louisiana favoring the extension of 2 years. There is no question about all the Senators favoring the program of 2 years. It is a completely simple problem. All we have to do is to reject the report and instruct the conferees to insist on the Senate amendments, and let the House vote on it. I have every assurance that the House, regardless of what the Senate does, is going to reject the conference report and instruct the conferees to accept the Senate amendments.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senate approves the conference report, the House will then have a chance to vote on it. If the sentiment of the House is as the Senator from Iowa states, they can turn it down and send the bill back to conference. They can do that tomorrow. Nothing will be gained by adopting the proposal of the Senator from Iowa, but, on the contrary, much valuable time may be lost.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, apparently a good many House Members are regretful that they asked for a conference on the bill, because they really want to extend the brucellosis eradication and special school-milk programs for 2 years.

I understand that a conference was asked for in the first place because of amendment No. 2, which is an amendment added in the Senate committee on motion of the Senator from Minnesota. It would provide milk for settlement houses and summer camps operated on a charitable basis and for poor children and for kindergartens. With that amendment I was in full agreement.

It appears that some administrative difficulties would be involved. The House asked for a conference, hoping to modify and approve the amendment. However, three of their conferees insisted on striking out the 2-year extension of the brucellosis and school-milk programs, as well as the amendment which provided for continuing the disposal of dairy products to veterans' facilities and the armed services, where such products did not interfere with normal purchases.

Now I understand that, rather than lose the 2-year extension of the school milk and brucellosis programs, a large

number of Members of the House—I am told it is an overwhelming number—are willing to accept the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. I trust that some way will be worked out to put it into effect, even though it might not go into effect immediately. It appears that those who handle the school-milk program are not in a position to handle summer camps and the other groups involved.

It is also my understanding that a large number of Members of the House—and I am told that it is an overwhelming number, too—would like to have the 2-year extension of the school milk and brucellosis programs approved now, and not get them involved in the large omnibus bill, which has so many provisions in it that no one knows when, if ever, it may be enacted into law. It is my guess that it will be several weeks—possibly never. I do not wish to make any prediction on that at this time, because enough predictions have already been made.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that irrespective of the logjam facing the proposed legislation, April is just around the corner, and, in fact, St. Patrick's Day is almost here. We are celebrating it 2 days in advance. It has been announced, also, that the Senate will have an Easter recess. Under the circumstances, the children who depend on this program will suffer between the first of April and the end of the fiscal year. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. Milk for the schoolchildren for the next couple of months could be provided by accepting the conference report, but it would mean that State authorities would not know whether to plan on continuing the present brucellosis and special school-milk programs beyond June 30 of this year. They have to have some time to plan, particularly as to the brucellosis program. We do not want any breaks in the program. We want to be sure that it will continue and will not get tied up with legislation involving wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, peanuts, watermelons, and all such products which are area commodities, and on which there is a great difference of opinion. It seems to me that the people of the country would be very happy indeed if they could have assurance that the school-milk progam, the brucellosis program, the program for dairy products to Army camps and veterans hospitals will continue without disruption. We would also be able to start extending this program to summer camps for poor children and for kindergarten children, as proposed by the Senator from Minnesota.

I think, myself, that it is a very worthy amendment. The Department of Agriculture said it involved administrative difficulties, but I think the Department can find some way to handle it for the first season.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not know until last evening that it had even been a matter of controversy. I was for the amendment, and I think a majority of our committee was in favor of it. I think it is more important to get the milk where it has been going than to get it to some place where it has not been going. In other words, I have no bitter-end feeling with reference to extra language. What I think is important is the milk program per se. I do not think the Department would have too much difficulty in administering it, since it does administer surplus foods sent to camps.

I was upset when I heard it reported that the Department had stated that it would be difficult to administer, because I happen to know of certain settlement houses which get milk and food from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. As the Senate knows, I was one of the members of the conference committee, the second ranking Republican member, second to the Senator from Vermont. I do not like to get into any political brawl. Yesterday I thought the argument here in the Senate was as to whether we could get the milk and brucellosis money so that the program could continue until July 1. That is what the conference report accomplishes, and that is why I signed the conference report.

I realize that if we put the 2-year extension into the omnibus bill it might face a veto or a tieup between the two Houses because of other differences. If the bill should not become law it would be very simple to get a brucellosis and milk program through in a separate bill.

I think further consideration should be given to it for another reason. Presently the funds for these programs come from the Commodity Credit Corporation. I do not think the funds should be charged up as a price-support operation. The milk is as important to the children of America as it is important in disposing of surpluses.

I signed the conference report because I thought it was the right thing to do.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President there is a mechanism right now through which the bill can be passed and assure the brucellosis and milk program for 2 years. I am at an utter loss to know why all this monkey business has been going on in connection with the temporary continuance up to the first of July or June 30. When the tools are in our hands, all we have to do is to send the bill back to the conference with instructions, let the House take a vote on it, and I am as convinced as that I am standing here, because of positive statements which Members have given me, that the House will overwhelmingly take the Senate amendments, and we will have the program for 2 years. It will not be a matter of controversy or of hazard in the farm bill. It will be on the statute books. It is the same general provision on which the Senate voted 89 to 0 just yesterday.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. May I point out that if the House recedes at the next session of the conference, as the indications are it will do, the school milk provision, the brucellosis provision, and the provision concerning men in the armed services and veterans hospitals, will be made immediately available for the next 2 years.

If the House, by any far stretch of the imagination, should not agree to recede, we could, within 24 hours' time, get a measure through. Let us give them a chance. All they ask is a chance to recede. Why do we not give it to them?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Millikin
Allott	George	Monroney
Anderson	Goldwater	Morse
Barkley	Gore	Mundt
Barrett	Green	Murray
Beall	Hayden	Neely
Bender	Hennings	Neuberger
Bennett	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bible	Hill	Pastore
Bricker	Holland	Payne
Bridges	Hruska	Potter
Bush	Humphrey	Purtell
Butler	Ives	Robertson
Byrd	Jackson	Russell
Capehart	Jenner	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Clements	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparkman
Curtis	Laird	Stennis
Daniel	Langer	Symington
Dirksen	Lehman	Thurmond
Douglas	Magnuson	Thye
Duff	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	Mansfield	Welker
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Ervin	McCarthy	Young
Flanders	McClellan	
Frear	McNamara	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Iowa to recommit the conference report to the conferees with instructions that they insist on the Senate amendments.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall take only a moment. The situation is just simply this: I do not think there is any question, from an examination of the attitude of the House Members, that the House Members will take the bill with the Senate amendments on it if they get a chance to vote on it. All we have to do is reject the conference report, with instructions to our conferees to insist upon the Senate amendments. The House will have a chance to act on it, unless something blocks it there. Unless an insidious operation of some kind blocks it, the House will have a chance to act on it the first of next week. I am as confident as that I am standing here that the House will take the Senate amendments overwhelmingly and reject its own conferees. Then there will be an extension of the programs by a bill which will be

secure and which will not be mixed up in the agricultural bill, with its uncertain fate and future. If the House, by some chance, should not accept the conference report and not instruct its conferees to take the Senate version, then by the middle of next week the Senate could again take the matter up; and if the Senate desired, as the only method that was left to get the bill immediately passed, it could accept the conference report at that time. At the most, there would be involved only a matter of a few days' delay.

I am confident we shall have 2-year brucellosis, school lunch, and institutional lunch programs by the first of next week if we follow the method I have outlined. Otherwise there will be a continuance of the programs for only a couple of months, and the main bill—the permanent bill—with the 2-year programs, will still be wrapped up and carried along with the uncertain fate of the farm bill, and it will not become law until, if, as, and when the farm bill becomes law, with all the confusion and uncertainty that will go with it.

I think the course I have outlined is the only sound, practical way to get a 2-year bill, so there can be a brucellosis, a school lunch, and an institutional feeding program such as proposed in the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Following the course I have outlined would not in any event delay final action more than a few days, and would insure either a 2-year program, depending on the action of the House on the 2-year program which the Senate, as late as yesterday afternoon, approved by a vote of 89 to 0, or assure a temporary program by not later than about the middle of next week. I think the way I have outlined offers the best chance of getting a 2-year program, and taking it out of the confusion and the uncertainty of the farm bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me we are in somewhat the same situation we were in at about this time yesterday. All of us want the same legislation. All of us have the same objective, but we find we have different ways of getting to that objective.

I would like to have the one bill dispose of both the brucellosis and the milk school lunch programs at once. I voted that way in the conference, but when I found that a majority of the conferees preferred that, after this length of time, we get part of the objective out of the way, and that we were going to file that kind of report, I joined them in it, because I do not think it is a matter of great substance. The question is one of means and methods, and a matter of getting something done on which we are all agreed.

I am not sure my distinguished friend from Iowa and my equally distinguished friend from Vermont are on completely sound ground in anticipating and predicting what the House will do. I am not able to predict, with any certainty, what the House of Representatives will do on this or any other matter. I say it with some regret, but I am not able to predict what the Senate will do on any particular measure, particularly in connection with this very complex bill.

It seems to me we ought to confirm what the majority of the conferees have selected as the way to go. I think then, if the House feels so strongly about this matter as has been indicated by our distinguished friends from Vermont and Iowa and refuses to approve the act of the majority of our conferees, we shall have a different situation, in which we can retrench and start all over, if we want to do it.

My own feeling is that we are making headway very slowly on the main issue, the omnibus bill. My own feeling is that the bill has been so amended that not only is it very apt to have long and exhaustive conferences, but even if it should come out of conference in as good shape as it comes out of the Senate, it will be apt not to become law. I am not in touch with the President. I do not know what he is going to do. I base my own conclusion only on what he has done in the past and on what his Secretary of Agriculture has advised in the past. I do not think either of them could retain their self-respect and their objectives if they approved the bill with the provision in the bill which was adopted this morning providing for dual parity. That being the case, it seems to me that we should clear the desk of this small matter.

We have the assurance of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], that if the main bill becomes tied up in conference, he is agreeable to pushing for immediate consideration of a new measure which will extend these two important programs, in which all of us are interested.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall yield; but before yielding, Mr. President, let me say that I do not think any of us can predict with certainty what will happen to such a measure at the other end of the Capitol.

I should like to have us approve what is now before us, since the conference report has met with the approval of a majority of the conferees. I was not one of the majority, but I signed the conference report because I think the argument is simply over the ways and means of getting the job done at this stage.

So I hope the conference report will be approved.

Now I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not true that almost every Member of the Senate, if not every Member, is in favor of this program?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. The Senate voted unanimously for the program only yesterday.

Mr. YOUNG. That is also true in the House, too. So if we do not get the omnibus farm bill, we could easily legislate on this subject by means of a separate bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. That was the position of a majority of the conferees on the part of the Senate and a majority of the conferees on the part of the House. However, I do not think that is a controlling consideration. But the matter of the approach to be taken is of such minor consequence, that I think we should go along with the majority of our conferees and should finish the job now. We have the assurance of the distinguished chairman of our committee—who has meticulously lived up to every assurance he has ever given me—that he is willing to come back immediately with a separate bill in regard to both these programs, if the conferees become bogged down on the omnibus bill.

I am glad that my friend, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is smiling, for this is an occasion for smiling, for all of us are trying to accomplish the same thing.

But at this time I urge that the Senate agree to the conference report. Certainly the conference report should have some standing here on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I was smiling because we have an excellent chance right now to provide for a 2-year program. We can do that now by rejecting the conference report, requesting a further conference, and instructing our conferees to insist upon the amendments approved by the Senate, and then waiting to see what the House of Representatives does. If the conferees on the part of the House do not agree with the Senate conferees, then we can pass a separate bill on this subject.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa is very persuasive; but the one feature on which he is not conclusive is that the House has the power to refuse to agree to our request for a further conference, regardless of what we in the Senate may do.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is no question about that. But not later than yesterday the Senate voted 89 to 0 in favor of the Humphrey amendment, on the same subject as that now before us, by means of the conference report, and containing the same language as that of the Senate amendments. At that time we thought we were insisting on those provisions. That vote was taken yesterday, and there was not a vote against the amendment.

So what is the reason for not testing out the suggested arrangement, at least? If we do, there will be no disrespect to the conferees. Let us test it out. Let us reject the conference report, and request a further conference, and in that way express ourselves today as we did not 24 hours ago by unanimous vote. The delay will be only a few days.

So let us follow that course, instead of waiting for several months, and then perhaps having to go through the entire process, in connection with a new bill. To do that would not be worthwhile. Instead, we have an opportunity to proceed right now.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa knows there was deep division between the conferees. The Senate conferees were divided 3 to 2, and the House conferees were divided 3 to 2.

Inasmuch as only a question of procedure is now involved, it seems to me

that is too minor a matter for us to bicker about, as between the two Houses. If the House is as deeply rooted in its convictions in support of the position taken by two of its conferees—as opposed to the position taken by the other three of its conferees—as the distinguished Senator thinks is the case, we shall learn that a few minutes after the conference report as approved by us reaches the House of Representatives; and that will be the occasion for us really to reexamine our situation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What we would be doing today, in so easily succumbing and giving in on the Senate amendments, would be utterly a reversal of the very strong position the Senate took by unanimous action only yesterday.

I submit that we should give it a trial, and should give the House the encouragement of the unanimous position of the Senate. I have full faith in the outcome in the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I close by repeating my original statement: I was in the minority among the conferees. Yet we had no bitterness. We had no argument that would keep us from submitting to the Senate the position taken by a majority of the conferees on a question of procedure only, in the case of a report which expresses the will of a majority of the Senate conferees and a majority of the House conferees.

I think the Senate should at this time approve the conference report, and then proceed to the consideration of more important matters.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Yesterday, was not the whole argument in regard to the need to have the authorization made, so that the programs could continue until July 1? I thought that was the substance of the entire discussion on yesterday.

Mr. HOLLAND. No; the entire discussion on yesterday was about the question of procedure, about the way we should proceed, because we have voted unanimously in favor of the entire program.

I am as strongly in favor of the whole program now as I was then. But if we cannot do all of it at once, let us do part of it now, and then go on to the rest.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I, too, am strongly in favor of the whole program. So I think the question now is only one of procedure.

I do not think we can afford to antagonize the House conferees, inasmuch as the omnibus bill will soon be coming up.

If I were one of the House conferees, I think I would resent some of the present action on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course I may not be animated by exactly the same consideration as is the Senator from North Dakota; but certainly I subscribe to his feeling that the question before us is one of procedure. I think the Senator from North Dakota knows that I would not give up on what I regard as a matter of principle; if a matter of principle were involved, I would not sign a conference report which I had voted against—as I have in this case.

So I think we are dealing with a matter of procedure which is of such minor nature that we should get the job done now, and not delay.

Mr. President, I call for approval of the conference report.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I shall take only 1 minute: The question before us is whether we shall vote for a 90-day extension of the school-milk program and the brucellosis-eradication program, and then throw the whole matter of the future existence of the programs into the precarious political pot which we call the farm bill; or whether we shall here and now vote for a 2-year extension of the school-milk program and the brucellosis-eradication program.

Senators who are in opposition to a 2-year extension of the programs will vote against the motion of the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] to recommit the conference report, and request a further conference with the House of Representatives, with instructions to the Senate conferees to insist upon the Senate amendments.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—46

Aiken	Dirksen	Millikin
Allott	Duff	Mundt
Barrett	Dworshak	Payne
Beall	Flanders	Potter
Bender	Goldwater	Purtell
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bricker	Hruska	Schoeppel
Bridges	Ives	Smith, Maine
Bush	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Butler	Knowland	Thye
Capehart	Kuchel	Watkins
Carlson	Langer	Welker
Case, N. J.	Malone	Wiley
Case, S. Dak.	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Cotton	Martin, Pa.	
Curtis	McCarthy	

NAYS—48

Anderson	Ervin	Humphrey
Barkley	Frear	Jackson
Bible	Fulbright	Johnson, Tex.
Byrd	George	Johnston, S. C.
Chavez	Gore	Kennedy
Clements	Green	Kerr
Daniel	Hayden	Laird
Douglas	Hennings	Lehman
Eastland	Hill	Magnuson
Ellender	Holland	Mansfield
McClellan	Neuberger	Smathers
McNamara	O'Mahoney	Sparkman
Monroney	Pastore	Stennis
Morse	Robertson	Symington
Murray	Russell	Thurmond
Neely	Scott	Young

NOT VOTING 2

Kefauver Long

So Mr. HICKENLOOPER's motion to recommit was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. [Putting the question.]

The report was agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 3–9–56–B.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska desire to have his amendment read? It is a long amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. The amendment has been printed. It is not necessary to read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the text of the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] was, on page 30, between lines 17 and 18, to insert the following:

COMMISSION TO PREPARE LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR INCREASED INDUSTRIAL USE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

SEC. 310. (a) (1) There is hereby established a Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products (hereinafter referred to as the Commission). The Commission shall be composed of five members to be appointed by the President. In making such appointments the President shall give due consideration to the interests of various segments of agriculture. One of the members so appointed shall be designated as chairman by the President.

(2) Members of the Commission shall be paid compensation at the rate of $50 per day and shall be reimbursed for necessary traveling and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

(3) The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of an executive director and such chemists, engineers, agriculturists, attorneys, legislative draftsmen, and other assistants as it may deem necessary. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide the Commission with necessary office space, and may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any personnel of the Department of Agriculture to assist the Commission in carrying out its work.

(4) Upon request of the Commission, any other department or agency of the Government having information or data needed by the Commission in carrying out its duties under this section, shall make such information or data available to the Commission for such purposes. The Commission shall take such steps as may be necessary to protect against unauthorized disclosure any such information or data which may be classified for security purposes.

(5) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission in a technical or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual

within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

(b) It shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare and present to the Congress, not later than April 15, 1957, the necessary draft, or drafts, of legislation which in its opinion will bring about the greatest practical use for industrial purposes of agricultural products not needed for human or animal consumption, including, but not limited to, use in the manufacture of rubber, industrial alcohol, motor fuels, plastics, and other products.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum, not to exceed $150,000, as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions.

(d) Upon submission of the draft or drafts referred to in subsection (b), the Commission shall cease to exist.

(e) (1) Any bill or joint resolution embodying a draft or drafts of proposed legislation presented to the Congress under subsection (b) shall, upon introduction in the Senate or House of Representatives, be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate or the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, as the case may be. Such committee shall proceed as expeditiously as possible to consider such bill or joint resolution.

(2) This subsection is enacted by the Congress (A) as an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, and (B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as they relate to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 12 minutes.

The amendment is basically the same as the bill that I introduced, S. 2940, and about which I spoke on March 7. My remarks can be found on page 4131 of the RECORD. A copy of that bill was earlier placed on the desk of each Senator. However, I wish to call attention to the fact that some important changes have been made.

This amendment calls for a Commission to be appointed by the President to prepare legislation to promote the industrial uses of agricultural products not needed for human or animal consumption.

If there has been one central idea running through the length of this debate, it has been that the American farmers want and need to farm more of their acreage. There has been a demand for more cotton acreage, for more corn acreage, and the producers of wheat and rice and every other product would like to expand in their production. The doctrine of scarcity is not only expensive for our Government, but it curtails production to the point where the small family-sized farmer finds extreme difficulty in operating.

We need new markets. Where shall they be found?

We must agree that the day that we can expend our foreign trade has greatly disappeared. With our help, many of the nations of the earth that once were food deficit areas, are now not only self-sufficient, but are also producing a surplus. The greatest market that we can find any place in the world is right here at home.

We are living in an industrial age. Today, the American, regardless of where he lives, has more gadgets and machines and equipment than ever before. Almost all production is mechanical. Unless the farmers can share in this industrial market, they will be out of step with the rest of our economy and they cannot be a prosperous and self-supporting segment of our population.

There are many opportunities in the field of industrial uses. The production of our broad fertile acres can be used industrially. Let us take the case of motor fuel. It is estimated that in 1955, the motor cars of the country burned 55 billion gallons of gasoline. Were we to blend alcohol in that gasoline to the extent of 5 percent, it would require 1 billion bushels of grain. Do any of you know where you can find a market for a billion bushels of grain?

This is not idle dreaming. The United States Department of Agriculture, in its report based on research done at Peoria, Ill., said in 1954, and I quote:

> Because of extensive practical experience in the use of alcohol gasoline blends in foreign countries and laboratories and road studies made in this country, it is evident that the use of alcohol as a fuel for internal-combustion engines is practical from a technological standpoint.

Were we only to use a 3-percent alcohol blend in the gasoline burned in 1955, it would consume more than 630 million bushels of grain.

A bushel of grain will produce about 2½ gallons of alcohol. The residue constitutes a very high protein food for livestock, which will have a value that will equal the manufacturing cost.

There was a time when horses and mules provided the power, not only for farm operations, but for all local transportation. Millions of acres were used to produce the hay, alfalfa, and grain to feed the horses and mules. That market is gone. The farmers ought to be permitted to produce a portion of the motor fuel that they use in farming and transportation.

From a conservation standpoint it is better to use that which we can replace year after year than to use a depletable resource. Alcohol for motor fuel can be made from wheat and corn from the Middle West, from potatoes from Maine, from sorghum from Texas, from sweet potatoes from Georgia, or from any crop containing starch. Such a program will materially assist the farmers in every State in the Union.

I do not believe that such a program would be unfair to the petroleum industry. The wise leaders in that industry are concerned about the cost of government. The entire petroleum industry is benefited when we have prosperity in agriculture.

Every retailer, wholesaler, and distributor of gasoline would still handle the same volume of merchandise if a blend were used. Certainly the farmers of the country have as much right to a tiny portion of the motor fuel market of the United States as the importers of petroleum products, and we all know that these imports are considerable.

In addition to the potential market of alcohol for motor fuel, we have need for alcohol in our Government purchases. Alcohol is used in the airplane industry, for rockets, guided missiles, turbo jets and reciprocating engines. At the present time, that alcohol is being made largely from petroleum products and from imported black strap molasses. With the United States Government the owner of huge quantities of surplus grain, why shouldn't that grain be used to supply the Government's need for alcohol for defense establishments?

Our rubber needs also provide a potential market for farmers. If all of the synthetic rubber made in this country in 1955 had been made from alcohol made from grain, it would have required more than 307 million bushels. Had the natural rubber that we used in this country been displaced by a synthetic rubber made from alcohol made from surplus grain, it would have taken an additional 221 million bushels of grain.

We made great quantities of rubber from alcohol made from grain during World War II. We can do it again. These are just two of the potential markets in this country for surplus farm products. Plastics offer possibilities, too.

The domestic cotton producers face a shrinking market, due to the increased foreign production and increased domestic use of cotton substitutes. While cotton may not afford the wide opportunity for chemurgical research that is present in surplus grain, there are many important objectives to be studied.

Chemical additives to cotton fabrics resulted in materials that are flame-resistant, water-resistant, and wrinkle-proof. Cotton can conceivably be used in many end products now supplied by imported jute and hemp. Rug backing, twine, and bale coverings are ready examples.

Mr. President, these suggestions are not visionary. We have the benefit of more than a quarter century of research, proving that these things are possible. They just have not been applied by industry.

Unless we develop industrial uses for the products of our farms, we can expect to continue to spend huge sums, such as a million dollars a day, for storage. We can expect to continue to appropriate over a billion dollars a year to finance agriculture. We can also expect that the acreage that farmers are permitted to farm will continue to be cut and cut and cut. This means the disappearance of countless small and middle-sized farms, because only the large units will have enough acres left to farm efficiently. Let us, today, take the first step in launching out on a positive program of greater uses of the products of the farm.

It is necessary that we have Government action to start such a program. We must have one that has stability upon which farmers and businessmen can rely. I believe it can be accomplished under our system of private enterprise. It will have to have Government direction. It may mean some Government

help, such as has been extended to other infant industries. It will be cheaper in the end, however, and it will save the family-sized farm in America.

The time has come when we should say to our experts who believe that a greater market can be found here at home for the products of the farm to present their plan and then have it considered by the Congress. To support this amendment binds no one to support or approve whatever is proposed by the Commission.

This amendment calls for the creation of a commission of five. They must be representative of the various phases and segments of American agriculture. They would have until April 15, 1957, to study the various possibilities, and with the aid of technicians, draftsmen, chemists, engineers, lawyers and others, prepare the necessary draft, or drafts, of legislation for the Congress to consider. There is no way the adoption of this amendment can do any harm. I believe that it will do a great deal of good. It is not in conflict with any part of this bill, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to say that I have examined the last part of the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, and I hope very much that the committee will agree to accept it. In any event, I intend to support it. In the very dire emergency in which we find ourselves today we cannot fail to pursue any path which may lead us to a means of disposal of the products of American farms at prices profitable to the American farmer, and relieve the burden of the American taxpayer. The total amount which the amendment provides for the cost of the commission is only $150,000. That is completely insignificant considering the possibilities of even one development that would aid us to solve the problem which confronts us today.

I think the Senator from Nebraska is standing on completely sound ground, and I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment, and that something can be worked out that will open up a new avenue for disposing of the products of American farms. It will not only help the farmer, but it will certainly help the taxpayer, when we consider the large sum of money which it is now necessary to expend.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to commend my colleague for the patient work he has put into this amendment. It is a constructive piece of work. It is bottomed on a great deal of technical and educational research and will go a long way toward making progress in a very wholesome way in dealing with the problems which we have been debating for the past 3 weeks.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the approach which the Senator has used will result in a fresh approach, and have an impact on men who will be possessed of hope and faith in the future, and will bring their talents to bear on the solution of the problems, rather than to have it administered by those who would probably try to interpose obstacles which might be used as reasons why it cannot work.

It is my sincere hope that the Senate will adopt this amendment without delay.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, the formation of a commission as suggested by the Senator from Nebraska would be, I believe, a very real step in the right direction.

Mr. President, I am happy to cosponsor and support the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Nebraska. I have served with the Senator in the House of Representatives and the Senate for almost 18 years. I know how faithfully he represents his State and the people of Nebraska.

Today we are discussing the farm program for 1956. No one can study this problem, or even listen to the debate on the various amendments that have been proposed, without realization of the intricate and vital part that accumulated surpluses of farm products play in the overall farm picture. Many of the provisions of the farm program now being debated are aimed at minimizing the danger that surpluses hold for our farm economy. Much of the activity of the Agriculture Department is directed toward this problem. For example, we are concentrating on developing foreign markets for our agricultural surpluses. In fiscal 1954 exports went up 7 percent and in fiscal 1955 they went up another 4 percent.

Certainly I shall support the general outlines of the farm program that is directed toward correcting this problem. I appreciate the increased foreign markets program of the Department of Agriculture but the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska adds another ingredient in this formula for increased farm prosperity. It provides for the formation of a commission to study the problem of finding new and profitable uses for the products of the farm by the industrial genius of our economy. Its basic philosophy is good. It is an affirmative approach to a problem that needs constructive attack. It is aimed at using the full facilities of our varied and highly effective American economy.

The story of our individual development is one of the brightest pages in the saga of our American development. We have pioneered the world in developing the facilities of transportation and communication. The Commission To Study New Uses of our Farm Products by Industry will help to mobilize that same American genius in solving one of our most critical problems—the need for improvement of agriculture in our economy.

On the 7th of March the Senator from Nebraska made a speech on the floor of the Senate explaining the purposes and goals of this amendment. He outlined the problem in a clear manner. He explained the potentials of his amendment in concise terms. I was particularly happy to hear his detailed references to the part alcohol may play in helping to use constructively our surplus farm products.

One of the byproducts of the proposed commission should be the consolidation and correlation of the individual patterns of research that have already been developed. Many of the agriculture schools of the Nation, many private industries, and a number of foreign countries have been studying this problem. The commission that would be established under this amendment would serve as an agency of correlation. It would fit together the various pieces of this puzzle so that a complete picture of the problem might be formed. It would seem to me that putting the pieces of this puzzle together might indicate we are closer to the solution than we think.

Mr. President, I am happy to support this amendment. We must exhaust every possibility, survey the ground along every road to make certain we attack the farm problem from every angle. This amendment is eminently worthy of passage by the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I am agreeably surprised at this new approach, which I think is a proper approach to the solution of the problems which we are facing in the field of surpluses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The time allotted to the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in this atomic age, when we are delving into the mysteries of matter which we have never before thought of, I am satisfied that if the course suggested in the Senator's amendment is pursued by men of vision, we shall get away from trying to legislate with reference to all our economic questions.

I congratulate the Senator from Nebraska, and I shall be very happy to support his amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to say that this amendment may furnish the most constructive feature of the entire bill. It has that possibility. The Senator from Nebraska follows in the footsteps of his distinguished predecessor, the late Kenneth Wherry. I commend the Senator for his activity in this field.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish, likewise, to congratulate the Senator from Nebraska, because I think his amendment should be made a part of the bill. The only objection I would have is that we should do the job now, and I shall introduce next week a bill on which I think there should be hearings, and

which I think will go into the question a little more deeply than does the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

But I certainly congratulate the Senator, and I shall vote for his amendment. I think it proceeds in the right direction.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I now yield to the junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I was happy to join with my colleagues and neighbor from Nebraska in the introduction of S. 2940, a bill to establish a commission to prepare legislation providing for increased industrial use of agricultural products, which is similar to the purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska to the farm bill.

For years we have been discussing ways in which to dispose of our surplus crops. I believe every avenue has been explored, except the one proposed by the Senator from Nebraska. The amendment offers by far the greatest unknown, untrod avenue for the disposal of surplus agricultural crops that lies before us at the present time. For that reason I am happy to join with the Senator in urging the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. As one of the coauthors of the basic legislation which gave rise to the amendment, I assure the Senator from Nebraska that I shall support his amendment now.

Within the last 48 hours I had the privilege of appearing on a television program in which the Department of Agriculture demonstrated certain of the products which it is already producing as the result of the industrial uses of farm products. Included among the products were a very attractive looking raincoat made from farm products; a very attractive topcoat made primarily from corn mixed with hay; material from which to make dresses; and garden hose.

We already know that there is much that can be done, but we have just begun to scratch the surface.

I am certain that such a mechanism as the Senator from Nebraska proposes, once it is set in motion on a full scale and at full speed ahead, can do much to provide new markets for farm products, thus helping to whip the devastating problem of surplus commodities.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as part of my remarks, there may be printed in the RECORD the names of the 18 Senators who are the coauthors with me of S. 2940, which is similar to the amendment under consideration.

There being no objection, the names of the Senators were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. CURTIS, for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BENDER, Mr. JENNER, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. WELKER, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. CAPEHART.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am ready for a vote.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I do not think all the time which has been allotted to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be taken. We are probably ready to yield back our time; but I have agreed to yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, can we not take action on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So far as I am concerned, I favor the amendment; but I had already agreed to yield time to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has 30 minutes, which he can allot as he wishes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the junior Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, can we not vote on the amendment now?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana will save time if he will not interrupt the regular procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 15 minutes.

TAX REDUCTION FOR LOW INCOME CORPORATIONS — AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 9166

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on February 3, I introduced two bills, S. 3128, cosponsored by Senators SPARKMAN, CAPEHART, KENNEDY, FREAR, BEALL, DUFF, MORSE, SMATHERS, LEHMAN, DOUGLAS, and HUMPHREY, and S. 3129, cosponsored by Senators SPARKMAN, CAPEHART, HUMPHREY, KENNEDY, BEALL, DUFF, MORSE, SMATHERS, LEHMAN, and DOUGLAS. Both of these bills would reduce the impact of Federal income taxes on low-income corporations. Since that date the House of Representatives has passed a bill, H. R. 9166, which would extend present corporate tax rates for an additional year. The extension of these rates was recommended by the President in his Economic Report to the Congress. I now submit two alternative amendments to H. R. 9166, which amendments adopt the proposals contained in S. 3128 and S. 3129, and in which I am joined by the same cosponsors.

Under present law, which the President wishes to continue, corporations generally are subject to a normal tax rate on net earnings of 30 percent, plus a surtax rate of 22 percent on net earnings in excess of $25,000. The amendment patterned after S. 3129, which appears to be more compatible with current estimates of revenue requirements, provides a normal tax rate of 22 percent and a surtax rate of 31 percent. According to the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, this would result in an estimated increase in revenue of approximately $20 million.

The distribution of the benefits, or increased liabilities under this proposal are shown in exhibit 1 which I shall furnish for the record at the conclusion of these remarks. The effects can be illustrated by these examples taken from the table. Corporations with incomes of $25,000 and less would have their tax burden reduced by 26.7 percent. A corporation with income of $100,000 would be given tax relief of 2.7 percent. Corporations with incomes of $500,000 and over would have increased tax liabilities of from 1.1 percent, in the case of a corporation with that income, to 1.9 percent for a corporation with income of $100 million.

The break-even point under this amendment occurs at the $225,000 income level—all firms earning less than $225,000 would receive a tax reduction and all firms earning more than $225,000 would receive a tax increase. Obviously this redistribution of the impact of corporate taxes would benefit the low income corporations. While the tax relief afforded would be modest, I believe it would have a significant beneficial effect on the smaller businesses of the Nation.

Now, if it should be determined that a revenue loss is feasible, the Senate could adopt my other amendment which is patterned after S. 3128. This amendment would merely reverse the present tax rates by providing for a 22 percent normal tax upon net earnings and a 30 percent surtax on all earnings in excess of $25,000. The staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation advises me that the revenue loss from this proposal would be somewhere between $300 million and $400 million. The Senate must consider whether the budget outlook is such that the revenue loss can be afforded. The effect of this alternative amendment upon the various income levels is shown by the table which appears in exhibit 2 to this statement.

Mr. President, a healthy community of small businesses is essential to national growth, national prosperity, and political health. We must prevent the development of an economic no-man's land for small business. This means that some form of encouragement must be devised for the modest-sized enterprise to enable it to grow and to remain strong.

As I see it, the chief competitive handicaps of the small business are: First, great difficulty and expense in obtaining equity capital; second, high interest rates upon borrowed money; and third, insufficient funds for management personnel. Our tax structure emphasizes and compounds these discriminations against small business.

The small businesses have three principal sources for funds with which to maintain and expand production: first, new capital investment; second, borrowing; and third, business earnings.

Small business has difficulty in obtaining equity capital because it does not have the large financial resources which will guarantee stockholders against severe loss on their investment. A small-business man who needs equity capital usually is told that the expense of raising up to $300,000 in the securities mar-

ket averages almost 20 percent and may reach 25 percent or 30 percent. He may ask, "Why," and point to the recent Ford or General Motors issues where the expense was a small fraction of 1 percent. But he must face the uncomfortable fact that it will cost him 40 or 50 times as much to tap the capital markets as it costs the larger corporations.

Because of the difficulty in obtaining equity financing, the small-business man usually must borrow money for a short term from a bank or other lender to realize his capital needs. Long-term borrowings in the securities markets would be subject to the same difficulties as equity financing. Interest rates are commonly established at 6 percent or even higher for the small-business man. The large corporations may either float a debt issue of securities or borrow money at interest rates of 3½ percent or 4 percent for long terms. This gives larger corporations a competitive advantage which reduces their costs and, therefore, could result in lower prices to customers or higher returns on their stockholders' investments.

In this connection, however, it is interesting to note that the lower costs made possible by these competitive advantages are not necessarily passed on to consumers. The FTC–SEC Quarterly Financial Report for the second quarter of 1955 shows that corporate profits as a percentage of sales rise in proportion to the asset size of the corporation. For example, the smallest corporations—assets under $250,000—earned only 1.1 cents per dollar of sales, while the largest corporations—$100 million and over—were earning 7.4 cents per dollar of sales. This disparity in profits occurs while the largest manufacturing corporations increased their sales volume by 19 percent between the third quarter of 1954 and the third quarter of 1955, in contrast to a mere 3 percent increase in sales volume of the smallest manufacturing corporations. Thus, the small manufacturer is losing out in both volume of sales and percent of profit per dollar of sales.

The difficulties which the smaller corporation has in obtaining equity capital from stock issues or borrowings makes it much more dependent on retained earnings than are larger companies. Hence, unless its profits are greater, or its tax burden is less, the small company finds itself in a position of relative weakness compared to large companies with which it must often compete.

In terms of profits upon investment we find that corporations in the smallest category, as reported by the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission—those with under $250,000 in assets—sustained a net loss in the fourth quarter of 1954, returned 3.6 percent upon their equity in the first quarter of 1955, returned 5.3 percent upon their equity in the second quarter of 1955, and returned 10.4 percent upon their equity in the fourth quarter of 1955. Contrast this record with that of corporations with $100 million or over. During every quarter of the last year, they returned more than 13.5 pecent upon the equity investment of their stockholders. During the second quarter of 1955 the return reached 15.0 percent. Furthermore, total corporate profits after taxes in 1955 have been exceeded only by profits in 1950. However, as shown by the statistics above, the profit ratios of the largest corporations greatly exceed the ratios of their smaller brothers.

By nature, the small-business corporation involves more risk, less diversification of product, and a smaller financial cushion against initial reverses. This is illustrated most dramatically by the business failure statistics based on companies listed with Dun & Bradstreet. Very few, if any, failures are recorded for large corporations, but the rise in these dismal statistics for small businesses has been alarming in recent years. In 1945 there were only 809 failures. In 1953 there were approximately 8,862. In 1954 there were 11,086. The latest reports for 1955 indicate that there were almost as many, 10,969, in that boom year as there were in 1954.

Either one of my amendments will not only permit the retention of more capital in the small business, so that less high-cost financing is necessary; but this retained income will also serve as a countervailing pressure against mergers and consolidations. The more favorable tax treatment for small corporations will enable many of them to survive whereas they might otherwise end up among the failure statistics.

In addition to failures, statistics of the Federal Trade Commission show the following trend in the number of manufacturing and mining concerns acquired or merged during the last 30 years. Beginning in 1922, the number of mergers rose steadily from 297 to a peak of 1,216 in 1929. Thereafter, the number of mergers leveled off at less than 200 in 1932, and varied within a range from 87 to 419 throughout the 1940's. However, mergers rose rapidly in 1951, reached 822 in 1952, and stayed at a high level in 1953 and 1954.

While I do not pretend to be an expert on tax matters, it is very obvious to me that the ability to carry over business losses from one year, to offset profits in another year, is a strong factor in this merger movement. It is very difficult for the small corporation, suffering losses caused in many instances by its smallness alone, to resist the eager embrace of the profitable giant seeking a dowry of tax advantages to be derived from the prior losses of the unfortunate bride-to-be.

I do not have a solution to this problem. But until some solution is found, we must do whatever we can to strengthen small companies and thus make them less attractive to the rich suitor with a loss carryover gleam in his eye. My amendments will reduce the taxes on small companies, and the income retained thereby will contribute directly to this strength.

Mr. President, there are many others in this country who believe that the corporate tax structure favors the growth of large businesses as against small businesses. For instance, last December when testifying before the Subcommittee on Tax Policy of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, Mr. Dexter M. Keezer, vice president and director of the Economics Department of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., made the following statement:

> I think we have at the present time a high and satisfactory level of business investment. * * * But simply in terms of maintaining an adequate level of investment, I would not say that the present is an occasion to reduce the corporate tax rate. Except, may I give this qualification? Maintaining this rate means that you are going to have larger and larger corporate units at the expense of smaller units. This seems to be a matter of great social, political, and economic significance. Over a period with which we are concerned, the smaller corporations, as you well know, have not had the same rate of growth and capital acquisition.

Mr. President, that is exactly my position. Unless some action is taken to reverse the present trend, the growth of small businesses will continue to lag and their relative position in our economy will continue to worsen. And while on the general subject of "growth," we should expect that as population grows and as business activity expands, there should be an expansion of business opportunity and an increase in the number of business firms. But look at the record as shown on page 231 of the President's Economic Report. While there was an annual increase of almost 55,000 firms during the period between 1948 and 1952, the number of new operating firms increased by only 28,300 from June, 1954 to June, 1955. And this latter period has been characterized as a booming economy. If this is what happens in a boom, I submit that the small businesses of this country might be better off without it.

Now, Mr. President, I want to point out some specific and significant advantages which large corporations have under our present Federal tax laws. One example of existing big business bias in our corporate tax laws involves the accelerated depreciation of new machinery, while similar treatment is not available for used machinery. It is well known that small businesses are the principal purchasers of used machinery. Thus, the very significant benefit of the accelerated depreciation tax provisions are not available to many smaller corporations.

Now, some people advocate including secondhand machinery under the accelerated depreciation provisions, but I think that this action alone would merely accentuate the problem. For example, under present law a large corporation can, in a relatively short time, depreciate new machinery to a figure below its market value. The large corporation can then sell this machinery for more than its depreciated value and treat the income as a capital gain. If secondhand machinery had the benefit of accelerated depreciation, small businesses would be more eager to buy secondhand equipment. Then the giant corporations would realize even greater profits from the sales and greater capital gain windfalls.

The way to treat small businesses fairly would be to permit accelerated depreciation of both old and new machinery, and to tax income derived from

the sale of depreciated machinery at the regular rates for corporate income. But until such changes are made, this is one more factor contributing to the financial dilemma of small businesses.

Another advantage for large corporations is their ability to attract and hold highly skilled management and technical personnel by deferred compensation plans. These plans reduce the impact of individual income-tax rates and give a higher real income to such employees. For instance, a special bonus is given large corporations by those provisions of the tax laws which deal with stock options. All salaried employees must pay taxes upon their incomes at the regular income-tax rates. The fortunate recipient of a stock option, however, pays no tax, in most instances, when he receives the option; pays no tax when he exercises the option; and pays only a capital gains tax upon any profit he makes when he sells the stock.

To qualify for this preferred treatment, the corporation must be able to value its stock by some acceptable reference to market value at the time the option is granted. The small corporation, which is closely held, has great difficulty in meeting this requirement. As a result, it is the large publicly held corporations which benefit. Almost half the corporations listed on the New York Stock Exchange have such plans. The revenue loss to the Government cannot be estimated, but it is very substantial.

By this and similar devices, big business is able to attract and to hold the most able technical and executive talent. A small corporation must pay much higher salaries, if its employees who do not have stock options, are to be able to keep, after taxes, as much as the employees of the large corporation which does have a stock option plan in force. Naturally, in a competitive labor market, the most valuable employees will tend to enter the employ of the corporations paying them the highest net salaries, after taxes.

Even the owner of the small corporation may believe that he himself can find refuge against business risk, attain relative security, and provide a fund for his retirement by giving up his small business and going to work for a large corporation. The tax laws foster this trend by such provisions as restricted stock options.

Mr. President, I believe that the amendments I have offered will serve to relieve, to some extent, the constant drain of management personnel from small business. A growing, expanding enterprise presents a challenge to management, and good management will stay with the business so long as it can participate in its growth. If our tax policies militate against growth, there is little incentive to the personnel. In addition, higher retained earnings would enable the business to pay higher salaries, and this, too, would serve to keep good management from accepting positions with larger companies.

Still another advantage of the large corporations is their ability to adjust to tax rates with little effect upon their rates of earnings after taxes. This is possible because large corporations can, to a considerable extent, shift a large portion of their taxes to consumers in the form of higher prices. This is especially the case in industries which are dominated by one or a few corporate giants, and where competition does not operate to hold prices down.

Small corporations can rarely set prices to absorb taxes. There are too many of them, and generally no single one is in a position to exert substantial control over prices in its industry.

Actually, the small corporation gets hit from both sides under the present corporate tax structure. Its raw materials tend to be produced by giant concerns which can pass on a large share of their taxes to it. Thus, corporate taxes, for the small corporation, will generally result in higher costs. At the same time, it does not have the economic power to set prices to absorb its own taxes.

And finally, some very wise provisions in the tax law, designed to encourage research and experimental programs by industry, operate to the primary benefit of big business. These provisions offer favorable tax treatment of expenditures made for research. While these provisions have considerable merit, I think we should frankly admit that the benefits inure almost exclusively to big businesses.

Furthermore, the defense needs of the Nation require direct Federal expenditures for research for weapons and other items of military necessity. The size of these Federal expenditures amounts to over a billion dollars every year, and the contracts go primarily to our huge industrial corporations. It would seem that the law has compounded the advantage of big business in the field of research—or, as I have heard it said more colloquially, "them as has, gits."

This is just one more set of circumstances illustrating an economic bias in favor of big business. Tax relief for small businesses is the best way to offset some of this bias, and I think that such relief must be granted.

And while on the subject of Federal expenditures for the output of industrial concerns, we should remember that a very substantial part of the total business in this country is associated with the national defense. Defense contracts awarded in 1955 totaled over $15 billion. And in spite of congressional efforts to divert some of this spending to small firms, the major portion has gone to a few giant corporations.

The Senate Armed Services Committee recently reported that from June 1950, through June 1953, over 63 percent of the value of all defense contracts went to the 100 largest defense contractors. During the period of July 1953, through December 1954, this percentage rose to over 68 percent. It is no answer to pretend that such conditions are inevitable. The ability to accumulate capital and grow through more equitable corporate tax rates would be a very important factor in reversing this trend of defense buying from the largest corporations.

Mr. President, since the introduction of my bills, S. 3128 and S. 3129, I have been admonished that I should not forget those small businesses which are proprietorships or partnerships, and which do not choose to file a corporate tax return as permitted under the 1954 revenue act. I assure you, Mr. President, that I have not forgotten these businesses, and I urge the committees of Congress who study and draft our tax laws not to forget them. Some way should be found to relieve the tax burden of all those with low and middle incomes, whether their incomes are derived from wages, farms, professional services, proprietorships, or partnerships. However, it should be noted that any corporate income which is saved by my amendments, and which is not retained for corporate growth, will be taxed as individual income of the stockholders receiving it.

Although I could recommend other changes in the tax laws, including changes in the individual tax rates, I am forced to view the situation realistically and recognize that Rome was not built in a day. Frankly, here is the situation. The House of Representatives has passed a bill which will continue the corporate tax rate and certain excise-tax rates at their present levels. While diverse amendments on diverse subjects could be offered on such a bill, the practical approach and courteous approach to the committees of Congress is to limit amendments to the subject matter treated in the bill.

Under the circumstances, the most I can hope to accomplish is to obtain amendment of the corporate tax structure in the Finance Committee or on the floor of the Senate. I think that any more ambitious plan would be fruitless. However, I respectfully urge the committees of Congress with jurisdiction in the field of taxation to give early and earnest consideration to a revision of the individual income-tax rates in the interest of all our low and middle-income taxpayers.

Mr. President, I have tried to show that small businesses are in a bad way in this country. This is shown by business failures, by business mergers, and by profit ratios and sales volume of different size classes of corporations. I believe that conditions exist in our general economy, as well as in the tax law itself, which contribute to and aggravate this situation. In considering a bill to extend the present corporate tax rates, we have an opportunity to offset in a real way some of the disadvantages faced by the small-business man.

The present rate structure seems to have contributed to the decline in the relative importance of small business in recent years. To the extent that our tax laws foster larger and larger business units, our political democracy is weakened. I am sure that we all recognize the relationship between the survival of many thriving business units and the survival of our political democracy.

These amendments will assist those companies in the formative or development stage to overcome initial capital difficulties, and will assure a continuing supply of capital when it is needed to maintain the competitive position of the small-business enterprise. I can think of no action more vital to the maintenance of our system of free enterprise than the encouragement and develop-

ment of small businesses. They are the very foundation of our national economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two tables which were prepared in conjunction with the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. These 2 tables illustrate the effect of the 2 amendments which I shall offer to the bill to extend for another year, rates of a corporate nature. I wish to emphasize the fact that exhibit 1 is the table which pertains to the amendment which I shall press for in the committee on the legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous consent request?

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1.—*Effect of a normal tax rate of 22 percent and a surtax rate of 31 percent (proposal in S. 3129)*

Income subject to normal tax and surtax	Present tax liability (normal rate 30 percent, surtax rate 22 percent)	Proposed tax liability (normal rate 22 percent, surtax rate 31 percent)	Change	
			Amount	Percent
$5,000	$1,500	$1,100	−$400	−26.7
$10,000	3,000	2,200	−800	−26.7
$15,000	4,500	3,300	−1,200	−26.7
$20,000	6,000	4,400	−1,600	−26.7
$25,000	7,500	5,500	−2,000	−26.7
$50,000	20,500	18,750	−1,750	−8.5
$100,000	46,500	45,250	−1,250	−2.7
$225,000	111,500	111,500	(1)	(1)
$500,000	254,500	257,250	+2,750	+1.1
$1,000,000	514,500	522,250	+7,750	+1.5
$10,000,000	5,194,500	5,292,250	+97,750	+1.9
$100,000,000	51,994,500	52,992,250	+997,750	+1.9

[1] No change.

EXHIBIT 2.—*Effect of a normal tax rate of 22 percent and a surtax rate of 30 percent (proposal in S. 3128)*

Income subject to normal tax and surtax	Present tax liability (normal rate 30 percent, surtax rate 22 percent)	Proposed tax liability (normal rate 22 percent, surtax rate 30 percent)	Change	
			Amount	Percent
$5,000	$1,500	$1,100	−$400	−26.7
$10,000	3,000	2,200	−800	−26.7
$15,000	4,500	3,300	−1,200	−26.7
$20,000	6,000	4,400	−1,600	−26.7
$25,000	7,500	5,500	−2,000	−26.7
$50,000	20,500	18,500	−2,000	−9.8
$100,000	46,500	44,500	−2,000	−4.3
$225,000	111,500	109,500	−2,000	−1.8
$500,000	254,500	252,500	−2,000	−0.8
$1,000,000	514,500	512,500	−2,000	−.4
$10,000,000	5,194,500	5,192,500	−2,000	−.04
$100,000,000	51,994,500	51,992,500	−2,000	−.004

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that all time has not been yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that, as a matter of fact, the Senator from South Carolina did not have control of the time. Under the unanimous consent agreement, where the chairman of the committee is in favor of an amendment, the time in opposition is controlled by the minority leader. I am advised that there is no objection to the control of the time by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make some comments on the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. I have no objection to the majority's using its time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wyoming be allowed to speak for 10 minutes. I understand we have 15 minutes left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Wyoming may proceed.

SHALL CONGRESS CONTINUE TO DELEGATE ITS POWERS?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I confess that I did not have the opportunity to listen to the speech made by the Senator from Nebraska about this matter earlier in the week. There were other legislative duties which took my time, among them the preparation of an amendment of my own to the bill, which was adopted, and sitting in the conference on the Colorado River bill, which has passed both Houses, and which came to an agreement only this afternoon.

After having attended to some other transactions today, just a few moments ago I came on the floor and for the first time read the amendment. It strikes me that the amendment provides for a delegation to the appointees of the President of the legislative power of the Congress of the United States. I do not think there is anything more valuable, Mr. President, if we hope to preserve free, popular government, than to preserve the constitutional provisions set forth in article I of the Constitution, that all legislative power is vested in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed; I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I am sure the Senator is aware that the amendment does not delegate any legislative power. No program, no law, can become effective; no one can legislate but the Congress——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, let me state my views before he begins to try to tear them to pieces, because unless I am able to state my views, he will be talking against not what I say, but what he imagines I am going to say. So please let me make my statement first, for about 5 minutes.

I want to read the amendment. Mr. President, there is no better way to understand what legislation means than to read it. There used to be a time when it was the absolute rule of parliamentary bodies that proposed legislation should be read from the rostrum by the clerk, so that members would be apprised of the nature of the bills they were asked to pass. We now act so quickly that we have abandoned that very, very salutary traditional method of procedure. Now we are so busy asking somebody else to do the work of Congress, so busy to turn the power of Congress over to the executive departments, so involved in handling the special requests that come to us as Senators, day by day, to get favors done by the executive departments, that we do not take the time to study proposed legislation. Let me read section 310 (a) (1):

NOW A COMMISSION TO DRAFT BILLS

There is hereby established a Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products.

I do not suppose that there is an editor of a daily newspaper or a weekly newspaper or a magazine in the United States who has not at some time denounced the multiplicity of commissions which are established by government.

I remember very well when a former Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. Beck, wrote a book—which obtained very wide circulation—under the title "Our Wonderland of Bureaucracy." It was 25 years ago that Mr. Beck, a very able lawyer, wrote that book; but the wonderland of bureaucracy continues to grow. In every administration we find opponents of the administration in power denouncing the administration as a bureaucracy. Yet, when the power is changed, and a new President comes into office, Congress proceeds solemnly to delegate away more of its power and to create new boards and commissions.

So it is proposed that the Congress establish a new commission, to be called a Commission To Prepare Legislation Providing for Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products.

And the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska provides, beginning in line 4 on page 1:

SEC. 310. (a) (1) There is hereby established a Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products (hereafter referred to as "the Commission"). The Commission shall be composed of five members to be appointed by the President. In making such appointments the President shall give due consideration to the interests of various segments of agriculture. One of the members so appointed shall be designated as Chairman by the President.

WHY BURDEN THE PRESIDENT?

Mr. President, does anyone imagine that if the amendment were adopted and became law, the President would select the commissioners? There is not a chance in the world that that would be done. The present President of the United States only recently announced, on the television, to all the people of the United States that it was going to be his purpose to pass on to his associates some of the responsibilities of the Presidency. Yet in the amendment it is proposed that we give the President additional responsibility to do work that the Congress itself can do.

Why should Congress set up such a commission? If the commission is to have the power and authority to take some action, and if it is to be a commission to represent the people of the United States—the farmers of the United States, the agriculturists of Nebraska, of Wyoming, of Wisconsin, of Kansas, of Idaho, of Arizona, of South Carolina, of North Carolina, or of Florida—the members of the commission should be confirmed by the Senate, so we can be sure that the commissioners will actually represent farmers.

Who knows, Mr. President? Who in this Chamber at this moment can say who are the experts who make the reciprocal-trade agreements? The power to make those agreements is a power which the Congress has, under its power to fix duties and imposts. Yet Congress has delegated that power to the President; Congress did that long ago, in a Democratic administration. I said then the same thing I say now; namely, that the work would not be done by the President, but would be done by unknown, anonymous subordinates, experts selected the Lord knows how, to do some of the most important work that affects the economy of the Nation.

But now it is proposed that there be established a new commission, with members who necessarily would have to be selected by someone who would advise the President. That person would be in the Department of Agriculture, no doubt. If we want such work to be done, why do we not give such new responsibilities to the Department of Agriculture?

But, no, Mr. President; it is proposed that the work be done by a new commission, to be independent of the Department of Agriculture; and the proposed commissioners would come into office as a result of selection made by advisers to the President of the United States.

Now I read paragraph (2) of section 310 (a), of the amendment:

(2) Members of the Commission shall be paid compensation at the rate of $50 per day and shall be reimbursed for necessary traveling and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

Mr. President, where are we going to obtain, for $50 a day, capable and experienced men who will devote their time and their experience to this very, very important task of finding industrial uses for agricultural products? The proposed commissioners would be part-time commissioners. That is why the amendment does not contain a provision for paying them a salary, and that is why the amendment does not contain a provision for confirmation of the commissioners by the Senate.

Then we come to paragraph (3)—and listen to this, Mr. President:

(3) The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation, without regard to the civil-service laws—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and I shall take some time on that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming cannot make that motion until all time on the bill has been consumed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, Mr. President, I request a little additional time from the acting majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wyoming be given an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, I read now from paragraph (3) of section 310 of the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska:

SALARY LAW IS SUSPENDED

(3) The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of an executive director and such chemists, engineers, agriculturists, attorneys, legislative draftsmen—

Why legislative draftsmen, Mr. President? Legislative draftsmen have the duty and the responsibility of drawing up bills. Why should we delegate that power to five persons to be chosen by some subordinates in the executive branch of the Government, persons whose identity will not be known at all by the Senate? I read further from this paragraph of the amendment—

and other assistants as it may deem necessary.

Mr. President, here is the vice of bureaucracy. We set up a commission; and we give it authority to appoint its staff, without regard to the civil-service laws which Congress has passed, and without regard to the Classification Act which fixes their salaries. We would give the commission power to do everything which the Congress itself has authority and responsibility to do. Mr. President I think it is simply beyond imagination that such a suggestion should be made to us.

Now we come to the second sentence of paragraph (3):

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide the Commission with necessary office space, and may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any personnel of the Department of Agriculture to assist the Commission in carrying out its work.

Will that be 2 people, 3 people, 4 people, or 10 people? How many experts will be assigned? No limitation at all is made by the amendment in regard to the number. The amendment merely states that—

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide the Commission with necessary office space—

And Congress appropriates for the office space—

and may detail, on a reimbursable basis—

That is, to be paid out of the appropriations for the new Commission—

any personnel of the Department of Agriculture to assist the Commission in carrying out its work.

The amendment says "any personnel"; there is no limitation. This amendment does not say 50 personnel; it does not say 100 personnel, it does not say 1,000 personnel. In the present budget, the Department of Agriculture is requesting an appropriation of over $7 billion. What is meant by all the talk on the political stump about balancing the budget, when it is proposed that there be created new commissions with so broad a grant of power to employ an indefinite number of assistants? An appropriation for $150,000 is authorized for the Commission, but that will be only the beginning.

I read from paragraph (4):

(4) Upon request of the Commission, any other department or agency of the Government having information or data needed by the Commission in carrying out its duties under this section, shall make such information or data available to the Commission for such purposes.

I skip a few lines:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum, not to exceed $150,000, as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions.

With $150,000, if it is not going to be able to do the work planned for it, it will be back with a request for a larger appropriation, and for larger salaries.

Mr. President, I have no doubt that the time which was allotted to me has expired. I realize that most Senators are having a little late supper in preparation for a long night session, so that the details of this proposal have not been discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for a vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that the remaining time on both sides was to be yielded back.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much time have I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator for Louisiana has 7 minutes. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has 13 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wonder if that is a correct account of the time. The Senator from Arkansas used 15 minutes, and the Senator from Wyoming used 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He was speaking under a unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. CURTIS. My understanding of the unanimous consent agreement is this: The point was raised that there was no one on this side with authority to allot the time, and unanimous consent was granted that the Senator from South Carolina might have the usual time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that that was to be taken out of the time of the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. The opposition has used 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The Senator from Arkansas has had 15 minutes, and the Senator from Wyoming has had 15 minutes. The Senator from Nebraska still has 13 minutes left.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time and ask for a vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to have more Senators present if there is to be a vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has 13 minutes if he wishes to use it.

Mr. CURTIS. I yield back the remainder of my time, and ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senate well knows my position with respect to the organization of these special commissions and special committees of the Senate. I have consistently opposed the wasting of the taxpayers' money on useless investigations. In recent years we have spent substantial sums in that direction, and we have had very little to show for it. The record will show that the present administration has spent many millions of dollars in special studies and investigations; it seems that every time a problem arises, a commission is set up to investigate or study it, but up to the present time very little has come of these special studies.

I point out to the Senate that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has had before it many requests for studies of various kinds.

It will be recalled that one result of searches for new uses for agricultural products was the enactment by the Congress about 10 years ago of legislation establishing 4 regional research stations—1 in Peoria, 1 in New Orleans, 1 in New York, and 1 in the West.

What good will result from further studies by a special Commission? We have already provided ways and means by which scientific research into new uses for agricultural products in surplus can be carried on in the regional research laboratories. As my good friend from Wyoming has just stated, the $150,000 provided in the pending amendment is only a start. Experience has taught us that once these special commissions and special committees are established, there is no end to them. I believe that the best way to find additional uses for agricultural products that are in surplus is to let our four laboratories, which have been established and which each year are now spending millions of dollars for scientific research, continue that work. That is the most sound, constructive way to do it. A special commission appointed by the President to further study the problem would, in my opinion, result only in a waste of money. I am opposed to this proposal. I hope the Senate will vote it down, and save the $150,000 involved for something of more tangible benefit to American agriculture.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Senator from Nebraska yield back his remaining time?

Mr. CURTIS. I did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 8 of the Curtis amendment, after the word "President" and before the period, it is proposed to insert the words "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think it is important enough for Members of the Senate to hear the few words I wish to say on the subject to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the time be taken out of the time of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will take it out of my time. I do not wish to speak at great length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk continued the call of the roll.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum call is now going on.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask how many Senators have answered to their names?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum call should not be interrupted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How much time is left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no procedure that is in order while a quorum is being called. The Chair will not answer such questions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that all the time which is being consumed in assembling a quorum is being taken out of my time, by my consent, I think I am entitled to know how much time is left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot state until the quorum call is concluded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That cannot be done.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the quorum call, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Case, S. Dak.	Goldwater
Allott	Chavez	Gore
Anderson	Clements	Green
Barkley	Cotton	Hayden
Barrett	Curtis	Hennings
Beall	Daniel	Hickenlooper
Bender	Dirksen	Hill
Bennett	Douglas	Holland
Bible	Duff	Hruska
Bricker	Dworshak	Humphrey
Bridges	Eastland	Ives
Bush	Ellender	Jackson
Butler	Ervin	Jenner
Byrd	Flanders	Johnson, Tex.
Capehart	Frear	Johnston, S. C.
Carlson	Fulbright	Kennedy
Case, N. J.	George	Kerr
Knowland	Morse	Smathers
Kuchel	Mundt	Smith, Maine
Laird	Murray	Smith, N. J.
Langer	Neely	Sparkman
Lehman	Neuberger	Stennis
Magnuson	O'Mahoney	Symington
Malone	Pastore	Thurmond
Mansfield	Payne	Thye
Martin, Iowa	Potter	Watkins
Martin, Pa.	Purtell	Welker
McCarthy	Robertson	Wiley
McClellan	Russell	Williams
McNamara	Saltonstall	Young
Millikin	Schoeppel	
Monroney	Scott	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 10 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Presiding Officer; and may I compliment the Presiding Officer on the very excellent order that is being preserved by the Chair and on the dignity and ability with which he presides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thanks the Senator from Wyoming.

DOES THE COUNTRY NEED A NEW COMMISSION?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggested the absence of a quorum because I desired to bring to the attention of as many Senators as might be possible what seems to me to be a wholly unnecessary procedure which the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska would establish. It is an amendment to create a new commission which is to be entitled "Commission to Prepare Legislation Providing for Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products."

We have had all sorts of boards and commissions in the past, but this is the first commission, to my knowledge, attempted to be established for the express purpose of doing the work of Congress, namely, to prepare legislation.

The Constitution of the United States created Congress to legislate for the people and delegated to and vested in the Congress all the legislative powers granted under the Constitution. Note the word "all," not some but all legislative power belongs to Congress.

While the quorum was being called I had an examination made of the Congressional Directory. Each Senator has a copy of the Congressional Directory in his desk. There are 50 pages in this tightly bound and closely printed directory, given up to a listing of the independent offices, bureaus, and agencies of the Government. There are 71 such independent offices, agencies, and establishments. It is because we have these 71 agencies that we are accused of having established the most gigantic bureaucracy ever created outside of Soviet Russia or Hitler's Germany.

Experts on law, experts on government, those who desire to reduce the expenses of government, have written philippics against the Congress for creating so many boards and commissions, with expenditures to be made by them.

There are 10 pages in the Congressional Directory listing the congressional joint committees, commissions, and boards.

Now the Senator from Nebraska asks us to add as an amendment to the bill section 310 (a), which provides as follows:

SEC. 310. (a) (1) There is hereby established a Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products (hereafter referred to as the Commission). The Commission shall be composed of five members to be appointed by the President. In making such appointments the President shall give due consideration to the interests of various segments of agriculture. One of the members so appointed shall be designated as Chairman by the President.

So, Mr. President, here we have a purely executive commission appointed by the President, without reference to the Congress, without reference to the areas of the country, without reference to the Senate, and there is delegated to the President the power to name the chairman, so that the Executive office can run the Commission.

Mr. President, in order to modify this, after the time on the amendment has expired I shall offer an amendment to insert on line 8 of page 1, after the word "President" and before the period, the words "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." So if by any chance the amendment should become law, the Members of the Senate of the United States, and through them and the publicity which will be given to our proceedings, the farmers of the Nation may know who is being selected to work in their interest. I have known the farmers of the country to have men nominally working in their interest, who had no interest whatever in benefiting the farmers.

It is provided in the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, on page 2, line 8:

The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of an executive director and such chemists, engineers, agriculturalists, attorneys, legislative draftsmen, and other assistants as it may deem necessary.

Mr. President, who is to fix their salaries? The amendment does not say. What salary will the Executive Director receive? The bill does not say. In fact, the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949 are thrown into the wastebasket. Will Congress have anything to say about it? No. Will the Appropriations Committee have an opportunity to review the appointments? No.

The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation * * * of an executive director and such chemists, engineers, agriculturalists, attorneys, legislative draftsmen, and other assistants as it may deem necessary.

Does not Congress have enough legislative draftsmen? The Senate has a body of legislative draftsmen; the House has a body of legislative draftsmen. I have known Senators and Representatives who themselves are capable of preparing a bill upon occasion. There are legislative draftsmen right here in the Chamber who can do the work.

I continue to read from paragraph (3):

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide the Commission with necessary office space, and may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any personnel of the Department of Agriculture to assist the Commission in carrying out its work.

Talk about blank checks: Here is a very blank check to the Secretary of Agriculture to provide the Commission with personnel in addition to the personnel which the Commission itself may appoint. Yet the fact is that the Department of Agriculture has pending before Congress now a budget request for more than $7 billion from which to pay the personnel of the Department.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE HAS FOUR LABORATORIES

The chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has just announced that to his knowledge there are four laboratories within the Department of Agriculture, all of them created by law, which are working on this very problem.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of North Dakota. Does not the Senator from Wyoming feel that the reimbursability to the Secretary of Agriculture for any personnel he might assign would be payable out of the limited $150,000 authorized to be appropriated?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes, I think it would. But I may point out that the $150,000 ceiling will not enable 5 commissioners, including a chairman, who will receive $50 a day, to employ the type of expert assistants which are needed to do the job. The structure of this commission as provided in the amendment makes it inadequate to do the job given to it.

I think free enterprise has been doing a lot of work in developing the use of various commodities. I myself, when I was on a brief leave of absence from the Senate, represented as an attorney an inventor in Washington, Mr. Stanley Read, who has invented and is making, out of wheat, a substitute for the type of board that is used in the building of houses, at what seemed to me to be an economical cost.

CONFIRMATION ESSENTIAL

Why should we continue to delegate away our powers? I have made clear, it seems to me, the meat of the amendment. I do not wish to burden the Senate with a repetition of what I have already said; but certainly I believe that the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska should not be agreed to; but if it shall be adopted, the amendment which I have offered to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska should first be written into his amendment, so that the Senate may know on what basis the appointments will be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, as the one who offered the original amendment, do I have time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska yielded back the time on his amendment. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

If the Senator from California, the minority leader, wishes to use time or yield time, he may do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say to my distinguished friend from Wyoming that while I share his apprehension about the mechanical setup of the amendment, yet the idea and the principle behind the amendment are perfectly sound. The amendment of the Senator from Nebraska meets a shortcoming that I detected a long time ago in government. I have in mind, particularly, the processing of surplus farm products into anhydrous, water-free alcohol for admixture with gasoline, to make low-grade alcohols into premium fuel.

This matter is not new. I went down on the Memorial Highway in 1933, when Henry Wallace was the Secretary of Agriculture. We had demonstrations there. We had demonstrations in the Bureau of Standards. I discovered that the various agencies in the Department could go up to a point, but no further; they were circumscribed, so far as their appropriations were concerned. Mainly, their researches are conducted on a pilot-plant basis; they never could be articulated in the form of an overall practical test which could be carried to a definite conclusion. It became necessary, then to enlist a lot of private interest.

Finally, a distillery was erected in Muscatine, Iowa. There, alcohol was developed for admixture with gasoline. That process continued for quite a while. Actually, some 1,800 service stations were supplied; but the project needed some impetus to push it beyond that point. I think the real interest lay in the fact that there was a possibility, by means of admixing with motor fuels, to burn up surplus farm products, and to do it effectively, in farm tractors, in automobiles, and in other operations. The experiment went so far that the Department of Agriculture scientists had developed a special carburetor for this purpose.

I think there is great merit in the proposal, but I would be less than candid if I did not say the difficulty arose from the fact that in proportion as the cost of corn and wheat went up, the competitive cost factor came into play.

Notwithstanding all that, I think in this field we could well employ a little money, because something has been left undisclosed, and a great outlet might be developed for the processing of surplus commodities into moistureproof or moisture-free alcohol admixed with gasoline.

If that obstacle could be overcome, it would be one of the most practical solutions that could be found. Certainly I am the last person in the world who could go into a discussion of all academic and scientific curiosities that may come out of the test tube.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming mentioned four research laboratories. I was one who fathered the bill

which provided for those laboratories. I followed their progress carefully. One of the laboratories is located at Peoria, Ill. But the experiments can be taken only up to the pilot plant stage, where it can be demonstrated, on paper, at least, that the pilot operation is effective. It is necessary to move beyond that point in order to complete the research.

It seems to me, because of limitations on the time and money of the research agencies in the Department of Agriculture, that an agency over and above the Department, fortified with a little money, could do a very useful job in the field. If it failed, after a thoroughgoing effort, I would be ready to call it quits. I doubt, however, that we have gone far enough into the field; and because of its rich potentialities, I would support the amendment. If the amendment requires any additional language in order to provide for Senate confirmation of the nominations to be made by the President; if the amendment requires the inclusion of the nominees in the classification civil-service list, I would have no objection.

But with respect to the technical personnel, I would rather leave the matter in the hands of the Commission, because they would have to find the personnel especially suited for the job. I am not at certain, under the limitations of the civil-service act, that they will be found. But the possibilities encompassed within the amendment are good. I say very frankly to my friend from Nebraska that I intend to give him a vote, because I am very much interested in it.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. CURTIS addressed the Chair.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

BRUCELLOSIS AND SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, although our friends across the aisle were successful in defeating our effort to extend the brucellosis and school-lunch program for 2 years, I want to say to the public we have not given up the fight for a longtime extension of the two programs. The matter will now rest with the House which will consider the conference report next week. If there is a party line division there as there was here, we shall lose, but we on the Republican side of the aisle want to serve notice that we do intend to continue the fight to extend the school milk and brucellosis program for 2 full years or more, and hope it will not be long before our Democratic brethren will see the light and join us in trying to get the programs enacted into law. They may say they have incorporated the programs in what we still call the farm bill. Incorporating these provisions in the emasculated farm bill at this stage of the game is nothing but a joke on the schoolpeople and the farmers who hope to rid their herds of the dread disease of brucellosis. We are going to continue the fight, and we shall probably force a vote one way or another. I hope next time we vote on it, our friends across the aisle will not be so shortsighted as they were today.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, returning to a discussion of my amendment, I appreciated the words of the Senator from Illinois. He had a great part in having the laboratories set up. What is proposed in the amendment is not a duplication of that work, but a means for taking advantage of and using the fine research which has already taken place.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a preliminary report dated June 19, 1954, at Peoria, Ill., of the United States Department of Agriculture Agricultural Research Service, Northern Utilization Research Branch. Speaking of alcohol blends of motor fuels, this is what the report says in part:

> Because of extensive practical experience in the use of alcohol-gasoline blends in foreign countries and laboratory and road studies made in this country, it is evident that the use of alcohol as a fuel for internal combustion engines is practical from the technological standpoint.

A 5-percent blend of alcohol in gasoline used in this country would, in 1 year, cause the consumption of 1 billion bushels of grain. But there is a differential involved. It has to be adjusted to tariffs, taxes, and other matters. Unless we provide someone with the responsibility to utilize the research which has already been done, it will be a waste of time and the results of the research will never be used. I propose that we provide that the Commission should say how the research can be used, have it submit a plan to Congress, and have Congress vote on it. It is that simple.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that the third section of the Senator's amendment makes it the duty of the Commission to draft legislation, and is the Senator not thereafter authorizing an appropriation of $150,000 to do work which can be done by the Legislative Drafting Service of Congress?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Wyoming the amendment does call for an expenditure of $150,000—which cost is the equivalent of the cost of 3 hours' storage of grain in this country—to have a group which would bring in a plan to provide industrial use for that grain. The amendment does call for a commission to draft the legislation, but that legislation does not become effective unless it is introduced, committee hearings are held, and laws are enacted in the usual way. The amendment does not delegate legislative powers.

So far as the confirmation of members of the Commission is concerned, I have no objection to the suggestion. It is agreeable to me, if the amendment is agreed to. I think such a provision would be useless. I do not think it is necessary to consume the time of the Senate and other persons to confirm members of the Commission. The job of each Commissioner would be somewhat technical and would involve economic questions. The job has to be done by someone. But if the Senator from Wyoming will accept the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, I shall accept his amendment to my amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Nebraska accept my amendment. As I told him in the beginning, before there was a quorum call, my whole purpose in the matter was to point out that I feel very, very deeply that the character of the proposal which is being made is another instance of the continual surrender of legislative power by Congress. I think, in the turbulent world in which we live, with executive governments growing on both continents, the time has come for this Government to maintain its legislative power.

Mr. CURTIS. In that regard, I wish to say there is no one who is more jealous of the power of Congress than I am.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe that to be the truth.

Mr. CURTIS. My amendment does not grant any power to make regulations, to impose taxes, or to enact laws. That question is not in issue.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield at that point?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have just been discussing the matter with the Senator from Illinois. We wondered if it would be agreeable to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska if, following first the recommendation of the Senator from Wyoming, in line 8, page 1, after the words "by the President" there could be added the words "and confirmed by the Senate."

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Nebraska has no objection to that suggestion. I think we might want to move up a little the date by which a report would be made, if such language is to be added.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Secondly, I must say that I was somewhat impressed—considerably impressed, for that matter—by the argument made by the Senator from Wyoming relative to the language which appears on page 3, line 10. I think previously, in a private conversation with the Senator from Nebraska, I had raised some question with him with regard to whether or not his purposes would not be served if he would strike out the words "draft, or drafts, of legislation," and would insert in lieu thereof the word "recommendations."

The same change would be made in line 19, on page 3, where the words "draft or drafts referred to" appear, so the language would read: "Upon submission of the recommendations referred to."

Mr. CURTIS. Would the Senator have that read "recommendations for legislation"?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Well, I think "recommendations for legislation" would be included in the legislative history, but the commission might make other recommendations as well.

Perhaps we are leaning over a little backwards, but I do not want to have established a precedent whereby we would invite that a part of the legislative process be passed to the executive branch of the Government. I think, from the point of view of precedent, I would be personally much happier to have that power left with what I have always considered a coordinate and coequal arm, and not a subordinate arm, of the Government. If we left the word "recommendations" in the amendment and left out the words "draft or drafts of legislation," I think the commission could include that, if it wanted to. The commission might have other recommendations which the Congress, through its proper committees, would finally put into draft form.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska modifies his amendment in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming, on page 1, line 8; and the Senator modifies his amendment on page 3 in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the only other modification to be made would be on page 2, in line 12, merely to strike out the words "legislative draftsmen." Then the amendment at that point will provide for "attorneys and other assistants as it may deem necessary."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Nebraska modifies his amendment accordingly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, an additional modification will be required on page 3, in line 21, namely, at the end of the line to strike out the words "a draft or drafts of proposed legislation." As thus modified, that part of the amendment would provide that "any bill or joint resolution embodying the recommendations presented to the Congress" would be referred to the committee, and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska modify his amendment accordingly?

Mr. CURTIS. I do.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified on page 3, in line 9, where the date "April 15" appears——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska may modify his amendment without obtaining unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. CURTIS. Very well, Mr. President; then I modify my amendment on page 3, in line 9, by striking out the word "April" and inserting the word "June."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will either one side or the other yield 2 or 3 minutes to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, it is passing strange to have before us a proposal for the appointment of a new commission, inasmuch as when we read the Democratic Party's platform and the Republican Party's platform in 1932, we find that they called for abolishing boards, bureaus, and commissions.

Furthermore, the other evening I read the Democratic Party's platform and the Republican Party's platform in 1936; and they contained the same language about abolishing bureaus, boards, and commissions.

In addition, we find the same language in the 1940 platforms of both parties; and we find the same language in the 1944 platforms of both parties; and we find the same language in the 1948 platforms of both parties; and we find the same language in the 1952 platforms of both parties.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I have not the slightest doubt that when the Republican National Convention and the Democratic National Convention are held this year, again the platforms of the two parties will assure the American people that both parties are in favor of consolidating and eliminating many of the bureaus, boards, and commissions.

I remember that the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] stated only a short time ago that 82 agencies were making loans to farmers; and he said a great many of them should be abolished.

We have a Department of Agriculture. There is no reason why Mr. Benson, or whoever may succeed him—if someone does—cannot appoint a person who is in his Department. As a matter of fact, that has already been done; I understand that an extensive investigation has been made in regard to the possibility of using in industry some of these agricultural crops.

I remember that we created a board to deal with synthetic alcohol; and after the Government had made a profit of $6 billion in the production of synthetic alcohol, believe it or not, Mr. President, most of that development was turned over to private industry. Similarly, the Government spent $2 billion investigating the possibilities in the case of atomic energy; and when that work was completed, General Motors Corp., General Dynamics Corp., and other corporations got the benefit of that $2 billion expenditure.

So I call attention to the campaign promises. Both political parties have said there would be no additional bureaus, boards, or commissions; but, by golly, now we have a proposal to create another commission, one to be composed of lawyers, assistants, and all the rest—almost as many as anyone might wish to have appointed. In my opinion, it would make very little difference whether the appointments had to be confirmed by the Senate, in view of the short time the Senate usually takes in confirming the nominations upon which it has to act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Nebraska. [Putting the question.]

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

On page 30, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

"COMMISSION TO PREPARE LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR INCREASED INDUSTRIAL USE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

"SEC. 310. (a) (1) There is hereby established a Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products (hereafter referred to as 'the Commission'). The Commission shall be composed of five members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In making such appointments the President shall give due consideration to the interests of various segments of agriculture. One of the members so appointed shall be designated as Chairman by the President.

"(2) Members of the Commission shall be paid compensation at the rate of $50 per day and shall be reimbursed for necessary traveling and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

"(3) The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of an executive director and such chemists, engineers, agriculturists, attorneys, and other assistants as it may deem necessary. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide the Commission with necessary office space, and may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any personnel of the Department of Agriculture to assist the Commission in carrying out its work.

"(4) Upon request of the Commission, any other department or agency of the Government having information or data needed by the Commission in carrying out its duties under this section, shall make such information or data available to the Commission for such purposes. The Commission shall take such steps as may be necessary to protect against unauthorized disclosure any such information or data which may be classified for security purposes.

"(5) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission in a technical or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare and present to the Congress, not later than June 15, 1957, the necessary recommendations which in its opinion will bring about the greatest practical use for industrial purposes of agricultural products not needed for human or animal consumption, including, but not limited to, use in the manufacture of rubber, industrial alcohol, motor fuels, plastics, and other products.

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum, not to exceed $150,000, as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions.

"(d) Upon submission of the recommendations referred to in subsection (b), the Commission shall cease to exist.

"(e) (1) Any bill or joint resolution embodying the recommendations presented to the Congress under subsection (b) shall, upon introduction in the Senate or House of Representatives, be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate or the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, as the case

may be. Such committee shall proceed as expeditiously as possible to consider such bill or joint resolution.

"(2) This subsection is enacted by the Congress (A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, and (B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as they relate to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House."

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "3–13–56–C." I submit the amendment on behalf of myself, my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey, on behalf of himself and other Senators, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 31, it is proposed to strike out lines 1 through 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 402. That section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by adding a new subsection (f) after subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(f) The Secretary, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, shall exempt producers from any obligation under this act to pay the penalty on, deliver to the Secretary, or store the farm marketing excess with respect to any farm for any crop of wheat harvested in 1956 or subsequent years on the following conditions:

"(1) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm;

"(2) That such entire crop of wheat is used for food or seed on such farm, or is fed on such farm to livestock, including poultry, owned by any such producer, or a subsequent owner or operator of the farm;

"(3) That such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing conditions.

"(4) That such producers shall agree not to request price support on any feed grain produced on such farms in a crop year for which an exemption from wheat quotas is requested under the authority of this subsection.

"Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void, the provisions of this act shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to wheat in excess of the farm acreage allotment for a crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent wheat acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 30 minutes, or so much thereof as he may wish to have.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a starter, I yield myself 10 minutes. Later, I may request additional time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have taken care to take up the amendment with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]; with the ranking Republican member of the committee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]; with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]; and with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]; and I have also checked the amendment with the Department of Agriculture.

I am prepared merely to submit a statement in support of the amendment, if the chairman of the committee is willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference, to the end that the amendment can be considered there.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from New Jersey will recall that there was some question about paragraph (4), of subsection (f), of section 402. That paragraph appears on page 2 of the amendment. I suggested to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that the language concerned be submitted to our counsel, as well as to counsel for the Department of Agriculture. There seems to be some doubt as to what is meant by that paragraph.

Will the Senator from New Jersey agree to striking that paragraph from the amendment?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Could it be left in the amendment, and thus go to conference? Then, if adjustment were needed, and if it were found necessary to strike out that paragraph, that could be done. But some of the farmers in my State who are interested in this matter have asked that the paragraph be included in the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator from New Jersey knows, the Senate has already passed upon the language incorporated in the amendment, with the exception of paragraph (4).

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think paragraph (4) means that a farmer who has been accustomed to raising oats, barley, and wheat for feed, could not plant an extra amount of wheat, and feed it under exemption from marketing quotas, and then put all of his oats and barley under Government loan.

Mr. ELLENDER. By what time would application for exemption from marketing penalties have to be made? This paragraph of the amendment would open the door; as I read it, a farmer could make application after other feed crops were placed under support.

Mr. AIKEN. That would have to be determined under the regulations issued by the Secretary.

Let me say that I have no objection to having this paragraph deleted from the amendment; I think it could be deleted.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Personally, I do not object to deleting it from the amendment, if the Senator will liberalize——

Mr. ELLENDER. If the distinguished Senator from New Jersey will agree to delete this paragraph from the amendment, then all the language remaining in the amendment will be language which already has been passed upon by the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. My colleague [Mr. CASE of New Jersey] is present, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is present. If my colleague will agree to eliminate it, I shall be glad to do so, and send the remainder of the amendment to conference.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am glad to accept the suggestion. As the Senator from Vermont pointed out, those who suggested the provision proposed that it should not be made too liberal.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, does the Senator modify his amendment by striking out lines 12 to 15, both inclusive, on page 2?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator modifies his amendment accordingly. Does he yield back the unused time?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am prepared to yield back the unused time. First, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have had prepared explaining the amendment as modified in detail.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Under section 402 of the bill as amended, the commercial wheat area would be reduced to include only States which received wheat allotments of 190,000 acres or more rather than 25,000 acres at present. Under this provision some nine States—Arkansas, Delaware, Georgia, Iowa, Maryland, New Jersey, South Carolina, West Virginia, and Wisconsin—will be excluded from the commercial wheat area and become ineligible for price supports at the level prevailing in the commercial area and for participation in the acreage reserve of the soil bank.

One of the purposes of reducing the commercial wheat area is to permit more farmers to produce unlimited wheat for feed purposes on their own farms without incurring the penalties which are incumbent upon any farmer producing excess wheat in the commercial area. However, the elimination of the nine States from the commercial area under the bill as pending would possibly have even more injurious effects upon the commercial wheat producers not only in the States so excluded but also in the remaining commercial wheat States.

Everyone is agreed that it is undesirable to expand wheat production at the present time. By enlarging the size of the noncommercial wheat area we are increasing the number of acres of wheat which may be planted without regard to acreage allotments. The nine States which are to be excluded from the commercial area under the bill have an acreage allotment for wheat of about 800,000 acres and by releasing them from restrictions we may very well increase the production of wheat, particularly when market prices improve, at the same time that the wheat producers in the commercial areas remain under acreage restrictions. Some of the existing noncommercial States have

increased their wheat production under an absence of controls. Alabama with a record of harvesting only 14,000 acres from 1944 to 1953, jumped its acres of wheat production to 53,000 acres in 1955. If the wheat producers in the States which this bill would add to the noncommercial area should increase their production measurably under the absence of restrictions on production, it would seem unfair to the producers of wheat in the commercial area where acreage allotments will persist.

Furthermore, within the States which will become noncommercial wheat-producing States if the bill passes as it is presently written, there are numerous wheat producers who have been producing commercially who will be discriminated against through not being able to receive the same level of price supports as producers in the commercial area. In 1955 one-third of the wheat production in New Jersey was under loan to the Government. These producers should be able to receive the same measure of price support as producers in the commercial area, if they desire to put their crops into loan.

What our amendment will do is to retain the commercial area as it has been, including all States with an acreage allotment of 25,000 acres or over, but to provide that farmers may produce wheat for feed in excess of their allotment under an agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture that none of their wheat would leave the farm, but be used for food, feed, or seed purposes on the producer's farm.

In this manner, those wheat producers who produce only for feed purposes will be permitted to raise wheat beyond their acreage restrictions, for use on their own farms. At the same time, commercial wheat producers in these States will remain under acreage restrictions and be eligible for price supports and the acreage reserve of the soil bank on an equality with commercial wheat producers elsewhere in the commercial area.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As I understand, the Senator would strike out section 402, so as to restore the provision in existing law with respect to the limitation of 25,000 acres.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And the new language, which would increase the acreage to 240,000, and would require the Secretary of Agriculture to make that acreage possible in States with less than 240,000, is definitely out of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is definitely out of the bill. We go back to the figure of 25,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think we ought to make the record clear. It seems astounding to me that we should increase the acreage in the noncommercial wheat area by nearly 1,200,000 acres. In my judgment, that is completely out of pattern with the basic principle of the soil bank. I do not see how we get anywhere by taking wheat acreage out, and bringing other wheat acreage in. We meet ourselves going and coming.

Perhaps it has no significance whatever, because under the so-called domestic parity proposal which has been written into the bill, I understand that anyone who raised wheat as long ago as 10 years can qualify, because the language of section 380c (a) (c) says:

(c) The county domestic food quota for wheat shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on which wheat has been seeded for the production of wheat during any one or more of the 10 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the marketing year for which the quota is proclaimed begins, on the basis of the normal yield of the acreage planted to wheat during such 10-year period. The reserve provided under subsection (b) shall be used to adjust farm quotas which the county committee determines to be inequitable on the basis of tillable acres, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and topography.

To me that is a little astounding. People who have been raising wheat may have gone to soybeans or something else. Now this provision comes along. If a farmer raised wheat in any of the past 10 years, he comes under the provisions of the so-called domestic parity plan. My judgment is that we should strike the whole business out. I cannot find myself going along with a proposal, in the form of the soil bank principle, under which we are trying to adjust production by taking acres out of production, and in the same breath add 1¼ million acres under the provisions of section 402. I am delighted that the Senator seeks to strike out that portion of the bill. I am not at all sure that the Senator's substitute is an improvement, because I find it difficult to understand the substitute. So with great and consummate faith, I will accept it, in the hope that it will go to conference, where the conferees will be permitted to work their great and constructive will upon it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The points which the Senator from Illinois has made with regard to the 25,000-acre limitation are covered in the statement which I asked to have printed in the RECORD, so I think the situation will be clear.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation of the amendment which I have prepared be incorporated in the RECORD at at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This amendment, as modified, would:

1. Strike out the section of the bill restricting the commercial wheat area to States having allotments in excess of 190,000 acres (thereby including all States having allotments in excess of 25,000 acres);

2. Insert in the bill the provisions of S. 46 passed by the Senate last year which exempts from marketing quotas farms using their entire wheat crop on the farm for food, feed, or seed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield back his time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield back his unused time?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield back all my unused time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for himself and other Senators, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 25, between lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to add the following:

SEC. 225. Whenever management of family farms and/or optimum land use will be aided, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to permit farmers to pool their rights to participate in the Acreage Reserve program and to participate jointly in the Conservation Reserve program on property other than their home farms.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I shall take very little of the time of the Senate. I think the amendment is self-explanatory. I certainly do not anticipate that an hour will be spent on this amendment.

Mr. President, my amendment to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to permit farmers to pool acreage and conservation reserve rights, and participate in those programs with off-farm land, is intended to improve the pattern of conservation that will result from the soil-bank program.

There is need in this Nation to retire a great deal of cultivated land for conservation reasons, reasons entirely apart from the fact of surpluses and overproduction. Millions of cultivated acres need to be returned to grass and other millions of acres need to be reforested to halt their erosion and ruin.

Unfortunately, lands retired under the soil-bank provisions will not necessarily coincide with those which need to be retired for land use reasons. Under this act, whether a farmer is on level, black, Iowa prairie land, in the Great Plains blow lands where dust storms start, or on a southern Appalachian hillside, each of them will be encouraged to idle or establish conservation practices on a part of their holdings.

Similarly, small farmers, who need all the feed their limited acres will produce to maintain their livestock operations, will be urged under this act to idle or put a part of their acreage in one of the reserves.

The purpose of this amendment is to permit farmers within a small watershed or a large one, if the Secretary approves, to use their rights under the acreage reserve provisions and their opportunities under the conservation reserve provision to retire lands that most need to be retired from cultivation by pooling their soil-bank quotas and rights and applying them to off-farm acreage.

I am advised that in many small watersheds groups of farmers would probably take advantage of soil-bank provisions to acquire and retire lands

that are eroding and creating downstream problems.

The payments which are provided under this act might very well be the original financial stimulus, or seed, required for neighbors, watershed groups, or soil-conservation district groups to join together in achieving a conservation land use pattern in their area which would make a worthwhile contribution not just to surplus production, but also to desirable adjustment of land use.

The amendment is drawn to leave actual authorization of such pooling of rights up to the Secretary of Agriculture. He might, after study, either promulgate criteria under such pooling as will be allowed, or require approval of each such project by his Department.

It is my hope that the Department will agressively use the authority under the proposed provisions to maximize the conservation benefits of this program, which has been drafted primarily to reduce production.

What we really ought to do in the United States is adopt a program which will get back into trees and grass from 45 million to 85 million acres of land, now under plow, which should never have been plowed in the first place, or now needs to be retired. We would get the desired shrinkage of farm plant, and reduction in production of crops, as a by-product of the reestablishment of such good land use practices. Instead, we are going to get a measure—but not a full measure—of conservation out of an expensive crop reduction program.

If it were not for the emergency situation in agriculture, I would oppose the soil bank proposals. But it is an emergency situation, and I am therefore only offering this amendment to have at least adequate authority in the bill for the Department, in a less hurried period, to get as much sound conservation as they can out of the Government's soil bank dollars.

Before the Congress meets again, I think it would be extremely useful if our Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would prepare us a report on methods and relative merits of adopting the true conservation approach to this problem, based on land capability, instead of the approach of the present bill which is primarily reduction of production.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the amendment have anything to do with corporation property?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; that is not the intent of the amendment. The intent is to permit small farmers to pool their resources.

Mr. LANGER. I think it is a most desirable amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the amendment permit the owner of 2 farms to take 1 farm completely out of production during 1 year and let it lie fallow, and use the other farm, and by alternating in that way get the benefit of the fallowing? In other words, would it not permit such a farmer to get the benefits of the soil bank without having to pay for them?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is not the intention or the idea I have in mind.

Mr. AIKEN. I know the Senator does not intend that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The idea is to help small farmers to put into effect good conservation practices by pooling land which otherwise would not be of much use. The matter would be left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, who, I assume, would exercise discreet authority in the matter.

Mr. AIKEN. Would not the amendment benefit corporations which owned several farms?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; it would not be of particular benefit to them. The intention is that it shall benefit small farmers.

Mr. AIKEN. How much different is the amendment the Senator is offering from the one the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] brought up for consideration 3 or 4 days ago?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not recall the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. AIKEN. Would it permit the farmer participating in acreage reserve who owns more than one farm to consolidate the acreage taken out of cultivation under the acreage reserve, and take the entire consolidated acreage out of any one farm he fully or partly owns?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is not the intention of the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. I know the Senator would not intend that. I wonder whether it would not do so, however. I am sure the Senator knows the source of his proposed amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The amendment is offered by the senior Senator from Montana and myself.

Mr. AIKEN. Would not the amendment permit that to be done, even though a farm was acquired for the sole purpose of a consolidation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If that were done, it would be contrary to the intent of the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. I know. However, the Department feels that this would increase administrative difficulties, particularly where the farms might be located in several States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would be contrary to the intent of the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. They feel they would not be able to keep up with the persons who owned the farms.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Such a practice would be opposed to the intent of the amendment I am offering. My distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MURRAY] and I have no such intention in mind. What I have in mind is that farmers in a given locality shall be able to put into effect conservation practices under this arrangement.

Mr. AIKEN. I have a comment of the agricultural conservation program service on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. They feel that the amendment:

1. Would permit a farmer to transfer his acreage taken out to one farm which would then be kept idle.

That is agreeable, of course.

2. Would increase administrative difficulties, particularly where farms were located in several States.

3. Would give corporate farms special benefits.

4. Might provide loophole for evasion of landlord-tenant requirement.

I am not familiar with the Senator's amendment. It may not be the same, but we do not want to allow these things to be done and the effect of the soil bank nullified. I know the Senator from Montana does not want to do that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would be opposed to the last three provisions. I believe the first one is sound. I believe the amendment would bring about sound practices so far as the small farmers in my State are concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. I can understand how it would be helpful to a man who owned 2 or 3 small farms in a community. I can understand, too, how it might be useful to some of the larger farms, on which we have been trying to put some limitations.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to say to my good friend from Vermont that, as I understand the pending amendment, it is limited to small farms.

Mr. AIKEN. How small?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the question I was about to ask the Senator from Montana.

Mr. AIKEN. I am at a disadvantage by reason of the fact that the amendment has not been printed.

Mr. ELLENDER. In that respect, that is, in its application to small farms, it is different from the Kefauver amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to point out to the chairman of the committee and to the ranking minority member of the committee that the amendment would leave the actual authorization up to the Secretary of Agriculture. He would have authority to lay down sufficient criteria to govern it. No matter who would be in the position of Secretary of Agriculture, I am sure he would not do anything contrary to what we have in mind.

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment is authorization only.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. That is helpful.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The authority is entirely up to the Secretary.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Secretary has his hands full most of the time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder if the Senator would tell us what benefit would accrue to the small farmers by consolidating acreage in order to participate in the acreage-reserve program. I can well understand that benefits might so accrue to them with respect to participation in the conservation-reserve program. However, with respect to the acreage-reserve program, I am in doubt that any benefits would flow

to small farmers. Under the acreage-allotment provisions of the present law each farmer is allotted so many acres of wheat, so many acres of corn, and so many acres of cotton, and so on; an acreage-reserve contract will then be made with each farmer to the end that he will not plant a certain number of his allotted acres. With respect to this phase of the soil bank, I am unable to see what benefit the amendment would bring. It strikes me, if the Senator would limit his amendment to the consolidation of land for the purpose of participating in the conservation-reserve program, I would have no objection. It might then serve a most useful purpose.

Mr. AIKEN. I know the intent of the Senator from Montana is good. I know he intends to be helpful to the people he knows, who are small farmers. I was just simply pointing out the possibilities of its permitting things to be done which the Senator from Montana never would countenance. Therefore, I was seeking information. Not having had the amendment in printed form before me, I had not been able to get too accurate information on it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Although this amendment is not worded in the same manner as the Kefauver amendment, it would, in my belief, nullify, to a considerable extent, the effectiveness of the acreage-reserve program, in the same manner as the Kefauver amendment.

It would seem to me that the greatest benefit that might accrue to small farmers by pooling their land under the acreage-reserve program, would be that they could get their bad land out of production and good land in.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would be partly the result, particularly with respect to eroded land.

Mr. ELLENDER. If that were done, it would defeat the purpose of the acreage-reserve program, because under the acreage-reserve program as contemplated in this bill, our primary desire is not to take part of the bad land out of production, but the average land—the land a farmer would normally plant. Of course, when the acreage-reserve contract is entered into, it will have to be done upon the basis of inspection of the land involved by representatives of the Department of Agriculture, to make sure that whenever a farmer takes out land it is not poor land, but at least average land.

Mr. AIKEN. We do not want to permit anyone to take out conservation reserve type land and accept acreage-reserve payments for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. As far as I am concerned—and I call this to the particular attention of the Senator from Vermont——

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator from Montana would strike from his amendment its applicability to the acreage-reserve program and let the farmers pool the land only insofar as the conservation reserve is concerned, I would have no objection it it.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that would be all right.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator from Montana will modify his amendment to that extent, I will not urge any objection to it. At least we could take the amendment to conference.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, if there was any doubt about it, the conferees could undoubtedly correct it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that I may modify my amendment in lines 3 and 4 of the amendment, by striking out the words "participate in the acreage reserve program and", so as to make the amendment read:

SEC. 225. Whenever management of family farms and/or optimum land use will be aided, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to permit farmers to pool their rights to participate jointly in the conservation reserve program on property other than their home farms.

Mr. ELLENDER. With that change, I can see no reason why the amendment should not be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). The Senator has a right to modify his own amendment. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. AIKEN. At least we can take it to conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I relinquish the rest of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I relinquish my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the Senator's amendment printed?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Unfortunately, no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 28, after the period in line 5, it is proposed to add the following:

The Secretary shall institute purchase programs with funds appropriate pursuant to section 32, Public Law 320, 74th Congress, as amended, or pursuant to this section, whenever supply of a commodity causes it to drop below fair-price levels. In determining such fair levels the Secretary shall consider price necessary to give farmers a fair return, giving consideration to production costs and, in the case of animals and animal products, to an equitable relationship between the support level of feeds and the prices of animals and animal products. In the case of hogs, cattle, sheep, and lambs, chickens and eggs, purchase programs shall be instituted at least whenever price falls below 85 percent of parity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Montana yield himself?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield myself 5 minutes, Mr. President.

Mr. President, last fall the administration announced a 9-point agricultural program which included a pledge of effective purchase programs whenever market gluts unduly depressed the price of a farm commodity.

Since that announcement, the administration has watched cattle prices decline to 64 percent of parity without instituting any purchase program at all.

As hog prices were skidding down to 50 percent of parity, the administration announced that it would buy, over a 9- or 10-month period, about $85 million worth of pork products for established feeding programs such as school lunches. It was made completely clear that this was not a price-support operation. The program was so small that it failed entirely to halt the hog price decline.

Twice during the cattle price decline, which has brought economic hardship and ruin to many cattlemen in my State and others, I have joined with other Members of Congress to urge Secretary Benson to institute a beef-buying program. The first letter, sent on December 8, 1955, brought a reply dated December 22 from Assistant Secretary Earl Butz that "we are giving serious consideration" to measures to help the cattle industry, but he added:

Even if all such means as surplus removal, etc., are employed to the maximum extent, the effects would be only of limited value and would not have significant lasting results.

As you know * * * the real solution of our livestock price problems lies in producing right and marketing right.

On December 30, I joined with 12 other Senators in a letter again appealing to the Secretary for action to support cattle prices, which were then down around 64 percent of parity. That letter was not answered.

In both of these letters, we have pointed out to Secretary Benson that funds were available to him for purchase programs. In December there was available at least $115 million which could have been devoted to beef purchases.

These past events have demonstrated that it is useless to make funds, in addition to the section 32 funds, available to the present Secretary of Agriculture for removal of surplus agricultural commodities unless we are going to make the use of those funds mandatory at some point.

In my amendment I have proposed that the Secretary shall institute purchase programs when the price of a commodity falls below a fair level, and that the Secretary shall consider farmers' costs and a fair return in determining what a fair price level is. Further, the Secretary is instructed to consider equitable relationship between feed price supports and livestock prices in determining a fair price level on animals and animal products. Finally, in the case of hogs, cattle, sheep and lambs, and poultry and eggs, the Secretary is instructed to institute purchase programs when a commodity falls below 85 percent of parity.

This 85 percent of parity is too low. We should support farm prices at a higher level. But I have used the figure because purchase programs are not a system of support. They are only an emergency measure, and an emergency measure unlikely to be employed by the present administration unless we make its use mandatory at some price level.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Unfortunately, the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana has not been printed and I have not had much time to study it, but it strikes me

that the amendment would be unworkable. The Secretary of Agriculture now has authority to utilize section 32 funds principally in order to make purchases whenever the market gets an oversupply as to hogs, cattle, fresh fruits, and other commodities on which there are no mandatory price supports. Before the Secretary could use these funds he would have to make a determination, that the supply of a commodity has caused its market price to fall below a fair price level and if the price falls below this level, or with respect to hogs, cattle, sheep, lambs, chickens and eggs, it falls below 85 percent of parity, he would have to start purchasing. That purchasing, I presume, would have to continue until the price goes back up to the level provided in the amendment.

I wonder, Mr. President, how much the program would cost, because it would be an easy matter to make a determination that hogs as well as cattle are selling far below 85 percent of parity. As long as the market price stays below that level, the Secretary would have to continue to buy. I imagine that we would have to increase the authorization for additional section 32 funds that we now have in the bill by many hundreds of millions of dollars. Mr. President, section 32 funds have been used to some success up to this time to remove market gluts of perishable commodities. It may be that a better job could have been done, but I am not here to argue that. The point I want to emphasize is that section 32 funds are used principally in order to alleviate surpluses of certain commodities.

As we all know, the Secretary is not permitted to utilize more than one-fourth of the section 32 funds available in any one year in connection with any single commodity. As I have pointed out several times on the floor of the Senate, there is an authorization in the pending bill which provides for an additional quarter of a billion dollars in order to supplement section 32 funds, without any strings attached. If the Secretary desires to spend it all on supporting the price of one commodity, he may do so.

I understand that an amendment is now pending to increase the amount to one-half billion dollars. Personally, I would not object to that sum. But this amendment, to my way of thinking, would be unworkable. It would force the Secretary to make a determination, whenever the market price of a commodity falls below a certain level. With respect to hogs, cattle, sheep, lambs, chickens, and eggs, the level is 85 percent of parity. Once the determination has been made, there is no telling how much money will have to be spent in order to alleviate the surpluses and stabilize the market.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for the purpose of my asking the Senator from Montana a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I notice in the proposal that with respect to hogs, cattle, sheep, and lambs, the Senator sets an 85-percent-of-parity level below which the Secretary would be instructed to buy, using section 32 funds.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. I understand there is plenty of money left in the fund which has not been used for the purpose of buying.

Mr. ELLENDER. The exact figure up to a month or two ago was $444 million. Of that amount, one-fourth could be used, let us say, to buy hogs. Up until this time, the Secretary has used for hog purchases, as I remember, $80 million, so there would be only $31 million left for the hog-purchase program. The Senator can readily see it would not take long to use up that amount, and perhaps hundreds of millions more, if the Secretary is forced to engage in purchasing whenever the commodity falls below 85 percent of parity.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to see it high enough to have something by which to measure the range of prices. I think it ought to be brought out that the cattle industry for the past few years has been suffering a tremendous decline. In my State, I understand that very few cattlemen have even paid an income tax, because their profits have been declining steadily. I know that in the Midwest area, hog farmers have been having difficulty, and they are still not out of the woods. Something should be done to give them consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I notice in the first part of the amendment that the Senator referred to "commodity."

"Whenever the supply of a commodity causes it to drop below fair price levels."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is included in the word "commodity"?

Mr. MANSFIELD. A determination would have to be made by the Secretary of Agriculture so far as each particular product was concerned.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Am I correct in assuming that the sky is the limit?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not the sky, no; but the cost of feed, labor, transportation, and factors of that sort, would have to be considered for the given product.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. I am speaking of what is denoted by the word "commodity." The amendment reads: "Whenever the supply of a commodity."

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There are the basics and the nonbasics; and beyond them there is a whole range of commodities.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What I had reference to, as the Senator from Illinois knows, is the particular commodities or products listed in the remarks I made relative to the amendment and in the amendment which was offered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator puts upon the Secretary, also, the burden of determining what is a fair price level.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We know that on occasions when the Secretary thought a certain level was a fair price level, many other persons did not believe it was a fair price level. So the amendment offers a host of controversies.

It seems to me that it is so general in nature that the administration of the amendment would be difficult, indeed. It might prove frightfully expensive before we got through.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield myself 1 minute.

I think something must be done to help the cattlemen and hog producers, because the prices are still too low. What the cattlemen in my part of the country are doing is selling their stock at considerably less than it cost them to keep them. I hope the Department of Agriculture will take this matter into consideration, to see what can be done to give some relief to those who need it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I feel myself constrained to vote against the amendment because it is so nebulous and vague in its dimensions. It puts upon the Secretary of Agriculture a burden he would find difficult, indeed, to compress within the terms of the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, since the distinguished Senator from Montana has yielded back his time, I yield back the rest of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). All time on the amendment of the Senator from Montana has been yielded. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 30, between lines 17 and 18, it is proposed to insert the following:

DONATION TO PENAL AND CORRECTION INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 310. Notwithstanding any other limitations as to the disposal of surplus commodities acquired through price-support operations, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized on such terms and under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem in the public interest, and upon application, to donate commodities acquired through price-support operations to Federal penal and correctional institutions, other than food products to those in which food service is provided for inmates on a fee, contract, or concession basis.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and he is willing to take it to conference.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with the amendment, a letter I have received from Mr. James V. Bennett, Director of the Bureau of Prisons, United States Department of Justice.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
BUREAU OF PRISONS,
Washington, March 15, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Attached is a short suggested amendment to the pending

farm bill which would make it possible for Federal and State penal institutions to obtain some of the surplus commodities in the hands of the Government.

You will remember that we discussed the possibility of making this food available to us so that we could enrich the diet of prisoners and provide them with a little more diversified menu. The amendment provides that the Secretary of Agriculture would distribute the items under such regulations as he would promulgate and thus he can, if he thinks proper, require that making these available to institutions should not reduce the amount of similar commodities they purchase in the open market. Consequently there would be no reduction in the gross demand for such products.

Making these items available would have the incidental advantage of promoting the health of men in some institutions who as you know are not now receiving a balanced diet. It should go a long way also to reducing the complaints of inmates about food, which as you know is frequently the basic cause of prison disturbances.

If opportunity permits and you think well of the amendment I hope you will introduce it at the appropriate place.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES V. BENNETT, *Director.*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, since I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from Louisiana, and he is willing to take it to conference, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I discussed this amendment with the Senator from North Dakota before he introduced it. He agreed to modify the amendment by striking out the reference to State and county penal institutions, and to restrict the effect of the amendment to Federal institutions. With that modification, I have agreed, if there be no objection, to take the amendment to conference.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the amendment been modified in that respect?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, it was modified before the Senator from North Dakota introduced it. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated 3–7–56–N, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 48, beginning with line 3, it is proposed to strike out over through line 20 on page 49, as follows:

FOREST PRODUCTS; PRICE REPORTING; RESEARCH

SEC. 602. (a) For the purpose of improving the management and use of forest resources and in order to provide farmers and other owners of small forest properties with current information on markets and prices and to aid them in more efficiently and profitably marketing forest products, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to establish a price reporting service for basic forest products, including but not limited to standing timber and cut forest products such as sawlogs and pulpwood.

(b) The price reports made by the Secretary under subsection (a) shall be as to such species, grades, sizes, and other detail, and shall be made at such intervals, but at least quarterly, as he deems appropriate. Such reports shall be by State or forest regions or by such other areas as the Secretary considers advisable, and may, in his discretion, be made as to one or more areas in advance of other areas.

(c) In connection with the gathering of price information and the dissemination thereof, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the State foresters or other appropriate State officials or agencies, as well as with private agencies, and under such conditions and terms as he may deem appropriate.

(d) The Secretary of Agriculture shall make a study of price trends and relationships for basic forest products such as sawlogs and pulpwood and within 2 years from the date of enactment of this act shall submit a report thereon to the Congress.

(e) In the conduct of research activities under the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 699), and the act of August 14, 1946, title II (60 Stat. 1087), the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to conduct and stimulate research and investigations aimed at developing and demonstrating standards of quality, collecting and disseminating useful market information and developing methods for increasing the efficiency of the marketing and distribution processes for forest products as a means of increasing returns to farmers and other owners of forest properties.

(f) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this section.

(g) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section such sums as may be necessary.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I suggest, if it be possible to do so, that the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] be notified that my amendment is under consideration, because I know he is interested in opposing the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Minnesota will be so notified.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have sent for him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to himself?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield myself 15 minutes, although I do not think I will require that amount of time.

Mr. President, this amendment proposes to strike out all of section 602 of S. 3183, entitled "Forest Products; Price Reporting; Research."

Section 602 would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to—

First. Establish a system of price reporting on forest products and sales of standing timber;

Second. Provide for expansion of research in the marketing of such products; and

Third. Conduct a study of price trends and report to Congress within 2 years.

I oppose this section for two very fundamental reasons:

First, because none of these proposals will provide any immediate or long-term benefits to farmers.

Second, because section 602 is unnecessary, as Congress has already given the Secretary of Agriculture authority to perform the work provided in this section.

The Secretary of Agriculture has had this authority for years—in the Organic Act of the Department of Agriculture of 1862, in the McSweeney-McNary Forest Research Act of 1928, and the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. Section 602 implies that farmers and other sellers of forest products cannot get prices or price information on forestry products. This is not the case.

Many States already provide information on markets and prices for forest products. For the other States there is ample authority for cooperative agreements between such foresters and the Secretary of Agriculture to provide needed information.

Economic information regarding forest products, and research to develop methods for accumulating market information, is already being done. There is no useful purpose for duplicating authority or by compelling the Secretary of Agriculture to act when a more efficient action is being and can be taken by the States, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, if the States so desire.

I have in my hand more than two dozen references to reports and publications which represent a small sample of the coverage in this field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks, a listing of these publications and sources of information on the prices of forest products.

There being no objection, the listing was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LISTING OF SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON FOREST PRODUCTS PRICES

FROM THE FOREST PRODUCTS INDUSTRY

1. All farmers or other sellers of forest products may at any time learn the prices offered for forest products which they have to sell from any buyer, dealer, pulp mill, sawmill, or other user of forest products if the latter is in the market and within an economical shipping range. Many mills post their prices in newspapers, magazines, over the radio, mail out notices periodically, and otherwise make known to all who might be interested in their prices, specifications and needs as to volumes of forest products.

2. Prices for pulpwood, logs, and lumber are from time to time published in industrial trade journals which reach in turn many branches of the United States Forest Service, and State Forestry and Extension Services who have various publications or means of getting this information to farmers and other sellers of forest products.

3. Examples of articles or tables of prices printed in trade journals are as follows:

A. Page 98, Pulp and Paper magazine, May 1955: Pulpwood Prices in Lower Columbia River Area; Pulpwood Prices in Lake States; Trends in Price of Southeast Pine.

B. Page 172, the Lumberman, 1955 Forest Industries Yearbook number: Volume and Value of Timber Cut, According to Product, Southern Forest Region, July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954. Page 173, Volume and Value of National Forest Timber Cut, 1905–54. Page 176, Comparison of Average Stumpage Prices, 1954, Forest Service Region 6; Volume and Value of Timber Cut From Department of Interior Lands. Page 178, Comparison of Average Appraised and Bid Prices for Major Species, Region 5; Comparison of Average Stumpage Prices, 1954, Forest Service Region 1. Page 179, Comparison of Stumpage Prices, Eastern Forest Service Region, 1954.

Page 180, Average Stumpage Prices, Southwest Forest Region, 1954. Page 183, Southern Pine Stumpage Prices, 1953–54, for Forest

Service Region 8 (all species of southern pine timber included together). Page 184, Comparison of Average Stumpage Prices, 1954, Forest Service Region 3; Comparison of Average Stumpage Prices, 1954, Forest Service Region 4. Page 183, Southern Pine Stumpage Prices, 1953–54, for Forest Service Region 8 (all species of southern pine timber included together).

C. From compilations of Southern Pine Association, New Orleans, La. (source: U. S. Forest Service, Atlanta, Ga.); Southern Pine Stumpage Costs Based on National Forest Timber Sales—1953.

D. Page 98, the Timberman, February 1956, Log Prices Hold at Previous Levels.

E. Pages 134–135, the Lumberman, September 1955; Log and Lumber Prices.

FROM EXTENSION FORESTERS, STATE FORESTRY COLLEGES OR DEPARTMENTS

All State extension forestry departments, State forestry departments, forestry and agricultural schools and colleges have some of the most significant data on hand concerning prices of forest products or are in a position to advise farmers how to get prices. Some States issue periodic reports or occasional bulletins in this field, such as—

A. Wisconsin Forest Products Price Review; compiled in the extension forestry office, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin, under the supervision of Fred B. Trenk, extension forester, the district foresters of the Wisconsin Conservation Department, and the wood-using industries cooperating.

B. Forest Market Report, 1952; extension service in agriculture and home economics, University of New Hampshire, in cooperation with the State forestry and recreation commission.

C. Marketing Woodlot Products in the State of Washington; institute of forest products, department of conservation and development, 303 Anderson Hall, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.; Bulletin No. 15, 1954.

The United States forest experiment stations are constantly making studies, doing research and issuing reports, notes, and advice to farmers and other forest owners. Examples of some of their work in this field are:

A. Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, Asheville, N. C.; Trends in the Price of Southeastern Pine Pulpwood, 1938–52.

B. Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, Asheville, N. C.; Station Paper No. 57, Pine Sawtimber Stumpage Prices in South Carolina, 1948–54.

C. Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, Asheville, N. C.; Station Paper No. 43, Pine Sawmilling Costs by Log Size.

D. Pulpwood and Log Production Costs in 1945 as Compared With 1940; R. P. Reynolds, forest economist, Southern Forest Experiment Station.

E. Pulpwood Production Costs in Southeast Arkansas, 1950; Southern Forest Experiment Station.

F. Cost of Producing Pulpwood on Farm Woodlands of the Upper Connecticut River Valley, United States Department of Agriculture, Northeastern Forest Experiment Station Yale University).

FROM UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

For years the United States Forest Service has been making special studies and issuing technical bulletins such as TB No. 626, Stumpage Prices of Privately Owned Timber in the United States (July 1938).

It used to issue each year a statistical bulletin entitled "Stumpage and Log Prices." These were compiled from questionnaires sent to thousands of buyers of forest products and worked in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census. This series came out annually from 1928 to 1948 except for a few years. The Service still collects information of this type quarterly but it no longer publishes these bulletins which could in the past be obtained free or at a nominal charge by farmers or others interested. The Service does not need any authorization to publish these bulletins, and should resume this service to tree farmers, foresters, and all buyers and sellers of forest products.

FROM UNITED STATES BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Some figures on the prices paid or costs of pulpwood, sawlogs, and other forest products are collected and issued periodically in the United States Census of Manufacturers. These figures are, of course, available to all the previously listed sources of information that are in a position to get this to tree farmers, foresters, and others concerned.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the essentials of section 602 were contained in S. 2105, a bill introduced by my distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], in the first session of this Congress. Without public hearings having been held, we now find the terms of S. 2105 appearing as section 602 of S. 3183.

I am sure the matter was discussed in committee, but those who would object to section 602 have not been given an opportunity to be heard.

It is strongly suggested that the purpose of section 602 (d), calling for a study, is a prelude to "recommending to the Congress within 2 years an appropriate formula for the establishment of parity prices on such products."

Mr. President, we are all interested in farm legislation, and we should concentrate on a solution of the problem of farm products prices and the increasing farm surpluses. I am opposed to extending this to forest products.

I realize that the reference to parity prices is not in section 602 now, but the study contemplated is still called for.

We should see that this proposal, involving additional Federal expenditures and costly, unnecessary reports, in a field that has little bearing on the farm problem, should have a full and complete hearing.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did I understand the Senator to say the text of S. 2105 was in section 602 of the pending bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Yes. I think that is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is the Senator aware that S. 2105 was very drastically changed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that what the Senator has been talking about is something that is not in that bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I beg to disagree with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. It does call for making these reports.

Mr. ANDERSON. What is wrong with the making of a report?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Referring to my own State, half of Pennsylvania is covered with woodland. Owners are now cutting second growth timber for pulpwood and chemical wood, and those small owners do not want to be worried with having to make these quarterly reports.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Secretary is the one who is going to make the reports, is he not?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. How will he get the information if he does not get it from the owners?

Mr. ANDERSON. Subsection (d) of section 602 of the bill provides:

> The Secretary of Agriculture shall make a study of price trends and relationships for basic forest products and within 2 years thereafter he shall report thereon to the Congress.

Does the Senator object to that?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I have great confidence in the Senator from New Mexico, but I do not see how the making of such reports would be of any advantage to the owners of these small tracts of woodland which exist in many places in the United States. That is becoming quite an industry. In my own State farmers farm their land during the agricultural season, and in the wintertime they cut timber for pulpwood and chemical wood. It used to be done for pit posts, but such use has been supplanted by steel. I think the making of the reports is an unnecessary expense to such owners. I do not see how it will be of any advantage, as far as the farm bill is concerned.

Mr. ANDERSON. May I say to the able Senator that timber is still a crop in many areas, and, therefore, is part of a farm bill. The committee from which the bill has been reported is the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and it seems to me that forestry is a part of the activities of the committee and that it belongs in a farm bill.

I believe what the Senator has been objecting to is something that was in S. 2105, but it was eliminated from the bill when it was before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I have in my hand a copy of S. 2105, which the Senator has the privilege to examine, if he wishes. The language in it was that the Secretary of Agriculture should collect all that information, and make his recommendations as to an appropriate formula for the establishment of parity prices for such products.

That is what stirred up all the protests from the sawmill operators, but when the language was changed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry so it bore no relationship to that, I understand all those people withdrew their opposition to it.

I am not sure the Senator from Pennsylvania has the latest information on the bill, because when we eliminated the provision requiring the persons affected to submit a report, the forest people agreed to it. I know the able chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] had protests from his State, but when the forest people found out that language had been eliminated, they agreed that the bill was satisfactory.

I wondered if there are operators in Pennsylvania who object to the Secretary of Agriculture making the report. We have taken out of the language the provision that the sawmill operators, generally speaking, objected

to, and that was arriving at a parity formula.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I agree fully that this is a matter for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because forestry, particularly what we in our State call small woodlots, is a very important segment of agriculture. In my own State there is a payroll in the forestry industry which amounts to about a half million dollars. It has really become a big business. As I stated a moment ago, half of Pennsylvania is covered with woodland. With the exception of probably 10,000 acres, the timber is all second growth. Our people feel this is just a step for requiring a quarterly forestry report, which will require a great deal of effort. Farm people do not have the clerical help to make reports of this kind.

In addition to that, it seems to me it involves an additional expense. It probably means that the Secretary of Agriculture will have to have a payroll for additional employees.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think my good friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, has already made the point that—as has already been pointed out—the language to which we are now referring is not the language of the bill (S. 2105), to which there was objection. Instead, the Senator from Pennsylvania is speaking of the fear that these farmers will have to do considerable clerical work in making the reports.

However, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will note subsections (b), (c), and (e) of section 602 of Senate bill 3183, the pending bill, as those subsections appear on pages 48 and 49, he will note in subsection (b) a provision that—

> The price supports made by the Secretary * * * shall be as to such species, grades, sizes, and other detail, and shall be made at such intervals, but at least quarterly, as he deems appropriate—

And so forth. Then in subsection (c), we find that—

> (c) In connection with the gathering of price information and the dissemination thereof, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the State foresters or other appropriate State officials or agencies, as well as with private agencies, and under such conditions and terms as he may deem appropriate.

So the entire purpose here is, as has been stated by the Senator from Pennsylvania in the course of his own argument, to provide to the very large number of small timber farmers, accurate economic and statistical information in regard to current price trends. Throughout the Nation there are thousands and thousands of timber farmers who have no means at all of knowing what the overall market price for various types of timber is unless they obtain that information from the large timber companies. It seems to me that when statistical information is being presented by the Department of Agriculture in regard to practically every commodity one can think of, except timber——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 15 minutes yielded to himself by the Senator from Pennsylvania have expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee yield some time to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, it appears that, because of the very lack of such information, there is need for the compilation of such statistical and economic reports.

The language of Senate bill 2105, to which there was some objection, required that the Secretary set up a formula for a parity-price structure. But that language has been stricken from the pending bill, Senate bill 3183.

The only purpose at all in this case is to give timber farmers a chance to market their products under conditions under which they will know what the going market price is, rather than to have to have the big lumber companies say to them, "This is the price." No one in the world would want to operate on such a basis. The Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Commerce prepare statistical material on practically every conceivable subject, save timber.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator from Pennsylvania has described a forest situation which seems to me to be almost a duplicate of that existing in my own State.

What I do not understand is why that is not an argument for having price reports from the Department of Agriculture, for somewhat the reasons as those stated by the Senator from Minnesota. I do not know what the purchasers of lumber in my State think about the matter; but I feel very safe in saying that the producers of lumber from small tracts would strongly welcome such price reports, and would be grateful for them. I hope we shall not make it impossible for them to take advantage of such reports.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. In answer to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, let me say that before he entered the Chamber, I submitted a long list of places in various parts of the United States where that information can be obtained. I have not received any complaint from a single small woodlot owner in my State that he has not been able to secure this information. But I have received a considerable number of complaints that they are fearful that they may be required to make quarterly reports, and that this provision will be the first step in requiring them to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield further to me?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In view of the market quotations the Department of Agriculture issues on milk products, on cereal grains, and fruits and vegetables, and on practically every other commodity one can think of, I think it is fair to say that the farmers themselves are not required to make quarterly reports.

Generally, there is cooperation by the local State marketing services, along with whatever Federal agencies may be operating in the area—and with all of them directing their activities to the study of these particular commodities, and working in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture. I know that is the situation in our State, and I am sure it must be a rather universal situation—namely, that a State agency works with the Federal agency, in connection with these marketing reports.

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, yes. So far as I know, all the State agencies favor the issuance of this information. As I understand, the Forest Service now has authority to issue most of the reports contemplated by the section, but it never has had appropriations with which to do the work.

The original proposal of the Senator from Minnesota contained a proviso for establishing parity prices for forest products. I think it would be almost impossible to do so, because one stand of timber might be worth $25 a thousand, and an identical stand only a mile away might not be worth $10 a thousand on the stump, because of the terrain.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As in the case of many proposals, when we get them under the light of examination, we find their weaknesses.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So we withdrew that provision; and the bill does not now contain any direction at all for the establishment of parity prices for forest products. But the bill does contain a direction for the issuance of marketing reports, in the provision on page 49 that—

> The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to conduct and stimulate research and investigations aimed at developing and demonstrating standards of quality, collecting and disseminating useful market information, and developing methods for increasing the efficiency of the marketing and distribution processes for forest products as a means of increasing returns to farmers and other owners of forest properties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes more.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely say that we are here dealing with two features of the bill. One of them calls for the preparation and issuance of marketing reports; the other

relates to the stimulation of research and investigation—and I now read from the provision—"to conduct and stimulate research and investigations aimed at developing and demonstrating standards of quality, collecting and disseminating useful market information, and developing methods for increasing the efficiency of the marketing and distribution processes for forest products as a means of increasing returns to farmers and other owners of forest properties."

It seems to me that part of the bill has great economic value.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Minnesota is referring to section 601 and section 602 of the bill, in title VI, beginning on page 46—the section relating to reforestation programs, is he not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. That is the proposal the Senator from Vermont sponsored—a proposal which I believe is long overdue; and I believe it may amount to one of the greatest advances in forestry that has been made in years. I refer particularly to section 602, under the heading "Forest Products; Price Reporting; Research." It deals with the marketing of forest products.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. My amendment proposes that all of section 602 be stricken from the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania and I have had some personal conversations about this subject.

Let me say, in passing, that I have just left the Senate restaurant, to return to the floor; and I left at my table in the restaurant a platter of wonderful roast beef. It is unfortunate to have to do that.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am very sorry that occurred.

Mr. HUMPHREY. However, let me say that I think the Senator from Pennsylvania and I understand each other's positions now, particularly in light of the original proposal contained in Senate bill 2105, requiring the Secretary to set up a formula for a parity price structure. That provision of Senate bill 2105 has been deleted from the bill which now is before us; but the pending bill—S. 3183—still contains the provisions to which we have just referred, namely, those dealing with price reporting and research in the case of forest products.

I have received telegrams and letters on that subject; and I have replied that the language calling for a formula for a parity-price structure for forest products has been eliminated from this bill, and that in the pending bill we have included provision for the minimum which should be done, namely, bringing up to date the reporting services of the Department of Agriculture. I hope that provision will be left in the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I may say that the principal objection I have received to this part of the bill comes from our Pennsylvania Department of Forests and Waters. It claims that it already is giving this kind of service; and it says that this section of the bill will call for a duplication and for an additional payroll on the part of the Federal Government which will be unnecessary.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Pennsylvania to say that the Pennsylvania Department of Forests and Waters has been making a study of price trends and relationships for basic forest products, such as is mentioned in section 602 of the pending bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Has that department published anything on that subject?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. It has issued bulletins; and any citizen of the Commonwealth has a right to get in touch with our department of forests and waters. That department has been doing this work for several years.

Mr. ANDERSON. It has been issuing reports on price trends?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. It studies all such matters, including the matter of additional output for forest products.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania happen to have one of that department's reports with him?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I do not, I am sorry to say.

Mr. ANDERSON. It has been a well-kept secret.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. It has not been in Pennsylvania.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I desire to associate myself with him, in support of his amendment.

In my State we have a pulp and paper industry which has been struggling to hold its own for a long period of time. If section 602 means anything, if it has any force or effect, it will lead to the establishment of the kind of reporting service and the kind of investigating service which will mean the requirement of reports and statistics to satisfy every snooper who comes along to get statistics on everybody's business.

My people are extremely apprehensive, not with respect to what section 602 provides on the face of it today, in this measure, but what it may lead to. If it is as innocuous as I am sure it is believed by its proponents to be, the service and the information can readily be obtained by the Department of Agriculture without the authority proposed to be written into this farm bill. If it has any force or effect, it may lead to all kinds of reports.

My people would have desired to appear before the committee with regard to this section if they had been given the opportunity. While I am sure that this provision was placed in the bill with perfectly good intent, I must commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for his amendment.

I think section 601 is thoroughly justified. In view of the fact that section 602 was not placed in the bill as the result of hearings, and in view of what it may lead to, I think section 602 could well be deleted without unduly weakening the effect of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield so that I may ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Section 601 was also placed in the bill without hearings. Would the Senator not like to strike that too?

Mr. COTTON. No.

Mr. ANDERSON. That gives the State something.

Mr. COTTON. If something good is in the bill without hearings, I am for it. But if I am afraid of something in the bill, which has been placed there without hearings, I am against it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, with regard to the local sentiment with respect to the proposed operation, I think I can say confidently to the Senator from Pennsylvania that my own people in the State of Vermont have become increasingly interested in obtaining a better commercial return from their hardwoods. They have just awakened to the fact that they live in one of the finest hardwood producing regions in the country, and that they have never been accustomed to making a business out of the exploitation of those hardwoods. From conversations and correspondence which I have had, not directly with relation to section 602, but with relation to the problem of getting a substantial return from one great natural resource, I feel safe in saying that the people of our State would be thoroughly in favor of section 602.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much time have I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 20 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely wish to invite the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] to the fact that under the terms of the bill the Secretary is not only authorized to establish a price reporting service for basic forest products, but he is directed to do so.

The opposition which I have encountered with respect to this section comes from the lumber companies. I have received several letters and telegrams from that source. Some of the largest timber and lumber firms in America have their headquarters or their bases of operations in the State of Minnesota. I regret that they have not shown an interest in this reporting service, but I also say that the small timber farmer, who is an important part of the agricultural economy, is entitled to fair, prompt, accurate, economic information as to his market prices. Today he is at the mercy of the purchaser,

who will tell him what the price is, without any comparison whatever as to what is going on in other areas or other regions. It is not right.

The only purpose of this section is to bring economic information, on an area and regional basis, to the attention of the timber farmers, so that they can see whether or not they are getting a fair price for their commodity. It is strictly an informational service.

When we look at the basic law of the Department, we find that when the Department was established the first thing the Secretary was directed to do was to supply and disseminate information. In this particular section the single purpose, with the exception of improving the research in respect to the marketing of timber products, which surely is a desirable effect, is to see to it that information relating to quality and price of timber products, and all forms of forest products, is made available to the producers.

While I do not wish to pit one area against another, the commissioner of conservation in our State, and the State Forestry Service, have advised me this week that they are in support of a price-reporting system.

We have 22 million acres of forest land in the State of Minnesota, 11 million acres under State and Federal jurisdiction, and 11 million acres privately owned. That seems to me to be a substantial amount of territory.

If I thought this section would accomplish anything more than the provision of economic information, I would say that it would merit prolonged consideration. But why deny to one group in our economy information which another group receives? We have a Securities and Exchange Commission demanding information with respect to stocks and bonds—information as to price, and all other factors relating to stock certificates. Such information is made available to the public. That is a Government operation.

We have a Bureau of Labor Statistics, furnishing information with regard to labor problems.

We have a Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and a Marketing Service for agriculture. However, strange as it may seem, we have no information on forest products, yet forest products represent one of the great assets in the agricultural economy.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. If the Secretary is to have the authority, and is to be instructed to obtain this information, how does the Senator understand he is to obtain the information?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The language in subsection (c) is as follows:

> (c) In connection with the gathering of price information and the dissemination thereof, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the State foresters or other appropriate State officials or agencies, as well as with private agencies, and under such conditions and terms as he may deem appropriate.

The Secretary may seek the cooperation of State agencies and private groups, large holders of timber, and conservation groups. He may use such sources of information as he chooses, with respect to any marketing condition.

Mr. COTTON. Which impression does the Senator wish to leave in the RECORD—that the Secretary will require the information, or seek it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He is authorized to cooperate with State foresters. That is the language of the subsection.

Mr. COTTON. I assure the Senator that I am asking these questions for information, and not to be argumentative.

Does this section contemplate giving the Secretary authority to require from private industries periodic reports, statistics, and information about their business?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the language says:

> The Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the State foresters and other appropriate State officials or agencies as well as with private agencies, and under such conditions and terms as he may deem appropriate.

Mr. COTTON. May we understand——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. COTTON. May we understand, and may the RECORD so show, that it is not the intention of Congress in enacting section 602 to give the Secretary of Agriculture or anyone else authority arbitrarily to force private operators to make reports on their business.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would not want to say that. I do not know whether the Secretary would find it necessary to do so.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I believe I can answer that question. Perhaps I can be helpful to the Senator from New Hampshire on that point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. At the present time the Secretary of Agriculture has a right to gather current information on the markets and the prices of wheat. That does not give the Secretary authority to go to the Pillsbury Mills and say to them, "I want to know exactly how much money you are making every day of the year."

That is not the intention of the provision. It should be remembered that farm forests are becoming extremely important in this country. In great areas of the South efforts have been made recently by hundreds of people to retire some land and put it into slash pine. We are short of newsprint and other types of paper.

I believe it would be very helpful if we could get more information about that. The enactment of the provision would provide current information on markets and prices, and would aid in the more efficient marketing of farm products.

Mr. COTTON. If the section referred to becomes law, is the information, so far as private operations are concerned, to be furnished on a voluntary basis, or is it to be on a compulsory basis?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure it is purely voluntary. It would be a request by the Secretary of Agriculture. He can make the request, but there is no language in the provision which says that he can order anyone to do it. It says he shall cooperate. He is authorized to cooperate, but he cannot demand it.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, we are getting some very good information. I should like to comment on subsection (f) which provides:

> The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, the regulations would pertain to administrative procedures only, and would not compel a mill owner or timberland owner to do this or that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should say so. The Senator's explanation is correct. This is ordinary language. It would spell out the responsibility—and that language is always used—in order to authorize the Secretary to issue such regulations as he deems to be appropriate in carrying out the provision of the section. That is the only way in which the Secretary could operate.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I should like to make a little further comment on subsection (f). It has very much to do with the intentions of this section. I wish to read it again:

> The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this section.

Would that language not permit the Secretary to force every small timber owner in this country to make a report as to how much acreage he has, how much he has sold during the year, what price he received for it, and so forth? Could the Secretary of Agriculture not issue regulations of that character?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is not my understanding, because the language in subsection (c) provides that the Secretary is authorized to cooperate, not directed to cooperate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is a well-established practice of the Department of Agriculture that unless there is a penalty accompanying regulations for reporting, the Secretary cannot enforce it on anyone. That has been decided about five times. The question has been settled that unless there is a penalty provision attached, the Secretary cannot compel anyone to do it. If a smaller farmer does not wish to answer the inquiry of the Secretary, all he need do is to write back and say, "It is none of your business."

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, in answer to that I should like to say that the farmers of Pennsylvania wish to comply with the law. If they get a request from any department of Government they answer it to the best

of their ability. I do not want them to have the feeling that there is something being held over them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have received quite a number of communications relative to section 602 of the act. I have made reply to them. There has been some apprehension on the part of those engaged in the production of pulpwood and in the harvesting of pulpwood. They have had some concern in connection with this section. I can assure them that their fears are groundless. There is nothing in this section of the act that will make anything mandatory.

I have a message from an association which thought this would be a reestablishment of what was in the old NRA Act. Nothing could be further from the truth. I merely wish to say that crop reporting cards and livestock reporting cards are sent out through regular channels of mail to producers, and they fill in those cards to show what their livestock is and what they anticipate will be the number of cattle and the number of hogs, and so forth.

That is information which is of value to everyone in the production of agricultural products and in the processing and purchasing of agricultural commodities.

Therefore I would say that the timber price reporting we have provided for in the bill under section 602 will be a service to anyone engaged in forestry or pulpwood activities. It will be of benefit to the little farmer, who may have a few cords of pulpwood or a few posts or a few telephone poles. He will know about national market trends and about values.

For that reason I wish to say to those who have written to me, if they will read the RECORD, that they need have no fears. I believe it will be a valuable service to them. It will not be mandatory. It will not be a regulation which will compel them to fill out extensive questionnaires periodically.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely wish to point out to the Senators from Pennsylvania and New Hampshire, who have a perfectly sound reason to question this matter, that the soil-bank provisions, on which we will vote soon in connection with this bill, in section 224 of the bill, provides:

> The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

I express the hope that we will not strike that provision from the bill. The Secretary of Agriculture must have the power to prescribe such regulations. Other agricultural laws contain similar provisions. If we go back to the original Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1938, we find that it authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct surveys and investigations and research relating to the character of soil erosion and the preventive measures needed. The same provision is carried in other acts. I do not believe the Secretary of Agriculture will say to every farmer in the land, "You give me a detailed description as to exactly how much soil erosion exists on your land, or I will send you to jail."

The Department of Agriculture does not work that way. The Secretary of Agriculture does not work that way. The Department of Agriculture tries to be friendly to the farmers of this country, and tries to help them. The Department was established for the purpose of disseminating information, first to the agricultural colleges, then to the extension agencies, and then on to the actual people who serve the farmers.

I am glad we have had this discussion this evening, because I would not want the Secretary of Agriculture to take any advantage out of this provision and try to destroy what has been going on for years. I do believe that the committee, which considered this subject very carefully and which struck from it the language that we regarded as objectionable, has put the provision into such shape that we can safely adopt it, without doing any damage to anyone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, basically I share the solicitude of the Senator from Pennsylvania with regard to matters of this kind, but he will note that these functions cannot be exercised until a specific appropriation is made. If the Senator's people wish to come before the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations, while I cannot speak for the chairman, I think I can say that they will receive a very good hearing, and if there are any abuses, the appropriation can be denied.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Illinois was a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House when I was in the Department of Agriculture, and he recognized the power of the purse, and if there was a function which was going badly, he saw that it was trimmed down. That is what would happen under this provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that after he completed his assurance, all that I was interested in was having the record clearly show that it was not the purpose of the Congress to impose a compulsory reporting system upon the farmers.

I was a little bit disturbed by the remarks of the Senator from Illinois, because I do not like to have the record indicate that the people have recourse to the Appropriations Committees to stop appropriations before they are safe on this point. If the record clearly shows that nothing in the section is intended to make a compulsory reporting system incumbent upon the operators, I am perfectly satisfied, and I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. The purpose of a section of this character is to establish the legislative history, and I think that has been adequately done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Oklahoma and myself, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is identified as 3–12–56–A.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, for himself and his junior colleague, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, line 12, before the period, it is proposed to insert "or in the grazing of livestock."

On page 16, line 24, after the period, insert the following:

> The portion of the national conservation reserve goal for any year representing acreage regularly used in the grazing of livestock shall be (1) 4 million animal units less the number of animal units then in the conservation reserve program, or (2) the number of animal units determined by the Secretary to be necessary in order to bring supplies of livestock and livestock products into line with the demand therefor, whichever is lesser. For the purposes of this section, an animal unit shall be the acreage required in a particular area to graze 1 cow on an annual basis and 1 calf through the period prior to weaning.

On page 17, at the end of line 13, add the following:

> The portion of the national conservation reserve goal representing acreage regularly used in the grazing of livestock shall be distributed among the various States as nearly as practicable on the basis of the average number of animal units grazed in each such State during the 10 years preceding the year for which such distribution is made.

On page 18, line 9, strike out "$350 million" and insert "$425 million."

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this is a relatively simple amendment designed to allow the cattle raisers to set aside as a part of the acreage reserve enough acreage to bring their livestock into line with what the national consumption and demand require. While we provide for admission into the soil bank of any and all groups of agriculture, we completely ignore the producers of

livestock. We can take any amount of acreage out of production in order to bring production in line with national needs, and this amendment is designed to allow enough setaside acreage to bring the number of cattle down to approximately 4 million head during the course of 3 years. It is a voluntary setting aside of acreage in order to allow the cattlemen to build up their pastures, build up lands which have been overgrazed or damaged by drought or wind erosion, and at the same time receive a minimum amount of income the same as do the raisers of other types of agricultural commodities.

I should like to read from page 5 of the bill, under the heading "Declaration of Policy":

The Congress hereby finds that the production of excessive supplies of agricultural commodities depresses the prices and income of farm families; constitutes improper land use and brings about soil erosion, depletion of soil fertility, and too rapid release of water from lands where it falls, thereby adversely affecting the national welfare, impairing the productive facilities necessary for a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities, and endangering an adequate supply of water for agricultural and nonagricultural use; overtaxes the facilities of interstate and foreign transportation; congests terminal markets and handling and processing centers in the flow of commodities from producers to consumers; depresses prices in interstate and foreign commerce; disrupts the orderly marketing of commodities in such commerce; and otherwise affects, burdens, and obstructs interstate and foreign commerce.

Mr. President, this recognizes the danger of overproduction in every line excepting livestock. Yet, when we consider that livestock products are only about 50 to 60 percent of parity, while the national average of other crops is about 75 percent of parity, we would think that the great Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, when the livestock raisers, who have been in a dire depression since 1950, asked for bread, they would not be handed a stone by means of the farm bill.

There is nothing in the bill which helps the livestock raisers. In fact, we are building up through the bill, unless the Senate adopts the amendment of the senior Senator from Oklahoma and myself, $25 million worth of potential grasslands in the soil bank, but we do not permit the livestock raiser, who has customarily made his living off grasslands, a chance to rest his land, to fertilize it, and build it up. So it seems to me that in plain, simple justice, someone on the committee would recognize what has been going on in the livestock industry, and instead of helping Wilson, Cudahy, Armour, and Swift, do something effective for the benefit of the producer instead of for the benefit of the processor.

Since 1951 there has been a fall in price of beef animals in the neighborhood of 40 to 69 percent. I do not know why the cattlemen who make their living in a long 3-year cycle should be the forgotten men in the agricultural picture.

We have offered this amendment to allow them to set aside enough acreage to afford some proper treatment for these producers.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. How many acres per animal does the Senator have in mind retiring?

Mr. MONRONEY. That would depend altogether on the condition of the average grazing land in the farm or in the community. Out West from 6 to 10 acres are needed to graze an animal. Consequently, to determine the quota to which each State would be entitled would depend on the type of grazing land in the State.

In a lush area, having heavy rainfall and fertile acres, where 1 acre or 2 acres would graze an animal, that amount of land would be the quota. That is why the number of acres taken out of grazing would be commensurate with the reduction which is sought in cattle numbers. Otherwise no good would be done, and there would be a great disparity in the laying out of acreage in the various States.

Mr. THYE. Then, is it the Senator's thought that there would be a certain specific number of acres per animal head in one State as compared with another State?

Mr. MONRONEY. Not only in one State, but on one type of farm as against another, which the county or State PMA group, or whatever the new name is, could readily and accurately figure.

Mr. THYE. Then, on the Government-owned land, such as the national forests or public grazing lands, would the Senator plan to retire some of that land in order to lessen the number of head of cattle which could be grazed on a given area?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly would be strongly in favor of resting the overgrazed public lands. I think it is a crime the way the natural grasslands have been permitted to be overgrazed throughout the great western areas.

Mr. THYE. Has the Senator from Oklahoma conducted any survey among the livestock producers to ascertain whether they would approve of such an amendment? No hearing was conducted by the committee on this particular question.

In the travels of the committee, when it held hearings across the Nation, when we were in the western area, where there is a great percentage of female stock or cattle herds, no testimony was taken on this particular question. For that reason, I am wondering whether the Senator considers it wise to endeavor to legislate on such an important question, which involves ranchers and such a vast enterprise as the livestock industry.

Mr. MONRONEY. My colleague knows enough about the cattle industry and has spoken with enough cattlemen to know that they all feel that the number of livestock in this country is too great for the present market.

The cattle raisers have asked for several programs, and every one of them has been denied, including the right of the Secretary of Agriculture to find a way to make purchases in order to support cattle prices to the producer. Instead of supporting the price to the producer, the Secretary is supporting the profit under a $200 million cattle-buying program which only fattens the processor.

Mr. THYE. I do not wish to trespass on the Senator's time, but I want to reconstruct the general idea of what we are endeavoring to do. I think that under the so-called soil-bank provision of the bill, in which there would be retired from cultivation some of our productive acres, thereby curtailing the production of feed, and thus bringing down the feed supply, certainly by reducing the feed supply we would affect the livestock numbers because there are beginning to be more small beef herds in the eastern part of the United States than in the central part of the country. It is that attitude concerning the vast range area which has brought about the high cattle population.

I am wondering whether we would not accomplish the objective which the Senator seeks when the soil-bank program gets into operation. In that way, we would not disturb our best range livestock, where we expect and desire to have cattle, because that area is suited only for cattle or sheep.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator knows that the cattle population comes off the range and is fed into the grain-producing areas.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The more grazing lands we have and continue to build up, the greater will be the inflow from the range lands to the feed lots in the Senator's State and the Eastern States. I think the rather disgraceful corn program and the freedom over controls in most of the noncommercial corn areas will not lead to any curtailment in the cattle numbers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me read what is contained in page 12 of the bill, in the section which provides for the conservation reserve program:

(1) To establish and maintain for the contract period protective vegetative cover (including but not limited to grass and trees), water storage facilities, or other soil, water, wildlife, or forest conserving uses on a specifically designated acreage of land on the farm regularly used in the production of crops (including crops, such as tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers, which do not require annual tillage).

Believe me, a very fine line is being drawn when we see the native buffalo grass or blue stem, or any of the other grasses that support the ranges of the Middle West, being destroyed. Most of them have to be planted several times over in the course of a few years in order to maintain them in fertility and productivity. They will not be eligible for building up fertility in the soil bank. But such crops as tame hay, and clover are welcomes into the soil bank and may be laid out.

That is being done by paying the cropland farmers and the row-crop farmers money to build up 25 million additional

acres of pastureland at Government expense. But at the committee's action it denies to the habitual, traditional cattle raiser, who has had to live off the range, a chance to share in the program on a voluntary basis.

The farmer who has 150 acres in row crops and 40 acres of pasture can have his cropland laid out, and he can be paid by the Government. But he cannot retire a single acre of the 40 acres of pastureland. He still has to raise grass on it and grow cattle.

The bill is so drawn that no matter how it is construed, the cattleman is the fall guy; he is the one who has taken the biggest sock in the jaw in the decline of prices since 1951.

The bill speaks of every type of production except that of the man who must raise the cattle and furnish the meat for our great Nation.

Mr. THYE. My curiosity has been aroused. I do not wish to be argumentative; I am seeking information. Just how would the Senator confine a certain area of the range so that it would not be acreage where the cattle ran loose from one area to another?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator knows that if the Government is going to pay money for taking grazing lands out of production, the same as it is going to take out broad acres of 10 or 12 sections of wheat, we can be certain that the law will not be violated and that the producer will not be paid for something that the Government is not getting.

Mr. THYE. When an acre of wheat is taken out of production, that acre will not go wandering around; it will stay put.

Mr. MONRONEY. The cows will graze around on the wheatland. Winter grazing is done on wheatland. A lot of land will be taken out row-crop production and in 3 years turned into pasture and thus added to cattle production under the soil-bank provision. If pastureland is taken out under our amendment, it is taken out under regulations which would provide for adequate enforcement and make it possible for the Government to get what it pays for; that is, the layout of overgrazed land, land which is arid because the cattle have destroyed it.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator was in the Illinois area, where 1 acre of land would furnish grazing for perhaps 1 animal, so much fencing would not be required to close off that 1 acre. But in an area where 20 acres were required to graze 1 animal, the Senator could visualize the number of miles of fencing which would have to be built in order to protect 100 or 200 acres in order to permit the grazing of 10 cows.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am certain the Senator knows enough about the great West and the grazing lands of that region to know that no one out there, where 6 acres are needed to graze 1 animal, is going to lay out 20 acres of land. He is going to lay out a section or lay out land that could be easily allocated to the layout and protected against grazing.

Mr. THYE. I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. I desire to ask a few questions of the Senator from Oklahoma. Can the Senator tell us how many acres would be placed in the conservation reserve acreage under the pending amendment?

Mr. MONRONEY. The junior Senator from Oklahoma would estimate that somewhere in the neighborhood of 20 million acres would be placed in the conservation reserve. It would depend on whether the farmers who have lush grazing land, with 1 acre to an animal, would lay out a few acres, or whether farmers that require 10 acres for an animal would lay it out.

Mr. ELLENDER. The proposal would include any kind of pastureland, whether or not cultivated?

Mr. MONRONEY. It would include only land used and grazed in the production of livestock.

Mr. ELLENDER. Who would fence that part of the pasture on which cattle could not graze?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to answer that question?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. KERR. The same person who would fence the pasture referred to in lines 9 through 12 on page 12 of the bill. If the Senator will read page 12 of the bill, he will find that there is included in the bill a program to retire from production "acreage of land on the farm regularly used in the production of crops, including crops, such as tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers, which do not require annual tillage."

I submit to my good friend that it is not any more of a problem to arrange for taking cattle off blue-stem grass, buffalo grass, or other native grasses than it is to take them off timothy grass, clover, or other cultivated pastures.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say to my good friend that I was informed that in the State of Wyoming it might require as many as 15 acres to feed a cow. Suppose a farmer took advantage of the proposal the Senator is now making. Could the Senator tell us how much it would cost to fence in three or four hundred acres, to which a producer might be entitled under the amendment? I note that a unit basis is provided for, and that unit is defined as the number of acres required to sustain a cow and her calf.

Mr. KERR. But there is nothing in the amendment which would require a cattleman to fence off each unit separately.

Mr. ELLENDER. But he would have to fence it to prevent grazing.

Mr. KERR. Not at all. He would be just as able to enter into a contract with the Agriculture Department to take out a thousand acres or 500 acres. I say to my good friend that in Wyoming, where there are ranches almost as big as the State of the senior Senator from Vermont, they are cross-fenced and separated by the terrain, and it would be a very simple matter to agree that a certain number of acres represented a certain number of units, and take them out of production by fencing or eliminating——

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean to take the units out of grazing?

Mr. KERR. Out of grazing.

Mr. ELLENDER. I dislike to impose on my good friend from Oklahoma, and I realize that the cattle business is in a bad way. I have been hearing complaints for quite some time that one of the reasons why the cattlemen are in a bad way is that a good many of the diverted acres were used to grow feed, which in turn was used to raise more cattle and thereby flood the market.

It is my understanding that under the soil-bank program, it is proposed to put as much as 25 million acres in the conservation reserve, and in the neighborhood of 19 million acres in the acreage reserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 more minutes.

Those who would participate in those programs are prohibited from using anything that grows on those acres, in the way of hay or any other crops. Any time a farmer sets aside allotted acres for the purpose of not planting a crop on those acres, he must agree not to harvest any crop from those acres, and he must also agree not to graze them.

The same thing obtains as to the acreage which would be placed in the conservation reserve program. As Senators may know, the conservation reserve program provides that the contract is to be for not less than 3 years, and for as many as 15 years, depending on what conservation use is made of that land. If the land is under grass for the purpose of protecting and conserving and enriching the land, then the contract may be for 3 years, 4 years, or as long as 10 years.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall yield in just a moment. On the other hand, if trees are planted, then the period may be for as long as 15 years.

As I understand the purpose of the soil bank, it is to take out of cultivation land now used for the production of surplus crops, by way of the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve. It was never intended to include raw land or pastureland in those categories, because it was felt by reducing total plantings by 44 million acres under the conservation and the acreage reserve programs, that in itself would be of great assistance to the cattle industry.

In addition, as I have stated many times on the floor, there has been placed in the bill a provision authorizing one-quarter of a billion dollars to carry on section 32 purchase programs in order to assist the cattle raisers, the hog raisers, and other farmers. The committee felt that was the best and most realistic approach for assisting the cattle people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimons consent to place in the RECORD at this point a statement on the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER

This amendment would—

1. Require the inclusion of grazing lands in the conservation reserve to the extent of 4 million animal units or such smaller number as may be necessary to bring supply in line with demand;

2. Require apportionment of the grazing lands so included among the States as nearly as practicable on the basis of a 10-year average of the number of animal units grazed; and

3. Increase the amount authorized annually for the conservation reserve to $425 million (from $350 million).

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I realize how much the distinguished chairman of the committee has tried to help the livestock raisers, but has he thought that he is making the condition of the livestock raiser even more impossible as he takes away from him the present supply of feed he has had available? Consequently, he finds himself caught under this bill in the squeeze between low prices for his livestock and higher prices for his feed. This process has been going on to a degree for a long time.

In addition to the livestock raiser being placed in the untenable position of getting lower prices for his livestock, and making the feed for his animals more expensive, he finds a new type of competition from the row-crop planter in connection with the requirement of a 3-year contract on a pasture-building basis. Do not think that, once the row-crop farmer gets a nice pasture built up at Government expense, the pasture will not carry the animals that were literally frozen off the ranges of the livestock producer who was caught in the squeeze that has been created.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma may harm rather than help the cattle situation by taking thousands of acres out of grazing, and thus reducing the feed supply, just as has been referred to earlier in regard to reducing feed grain acreage.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is on the pasture lands and the grazing lands of the Nation that the feeder animals originate. If the farmer who raises them can be assured of a minimum amount of income from his grasslands, he will not have to be producing as many feeder cows that will find their way into the feed lots in the Middle West.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the program that is advocated by my good friends reduce the cattle population?

Mr. MONRONEY. It certainly will; and that will be a more humane way to do it, instead of starving them out. We should not treat in that way those who produce feeder cows, while giving a favored treatment to their competitors, the row-crop growers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not understand that the amendment would operate in that manner.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it seems to me that this amendment would be good for the big rancher, but not very good for the thousands and thousands of small farmers who happen to own 100 acres of land or 50 acres of tillage land, and then graze their animals on the public domain or in the national forests—as the Senator from Louisiana has seen done in all the Western States. Those farmers would not be able to share in the benefits provided by this amendment. They would have no land to turn into the conservation reserve. The only ones who would benefit from this amendment would be those rich enough to own hundreds or thousands of acres of their own. They are the ones who would benefit most from this amendment.

Suppose a farmer did undertake to cut his acreage of rangeland. Perhaps he would be fortunate enough to own 300 or 400 acres. The first result of the amendment would likely be the overgrazing of the land that he had left.

Furthermore, would the Government proceed to hire thousands of riders to ride the range and see that the animals did not get over the fence? We have seen hundreds of miles of fencing in the western areas on our committee trips. We know what a job it would be to patrol thousands of square miles of that land.

Furthermore, would those ranchers dispose of 4 million head of cattle at $18 a piece, as the Senator from Louisiana has stated? The amount of $75 million provided for this purpose appears too small.

Mr. President, the thing that bothers me most about the amendment is that it is a rich man's amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. In the first place, the Senator should know from reading the amendment that it calls for proration by States, and that the administration would be handled by the county committees. They would write the plan and the program and the regulations.

In the second place, I should like to say that those who will police the program would probably be the same ones who will be policing the 25 million acres and the additional 19 million acres of soil bank acres that are already provided for in the bill—to find out whether that land is grazed or used for production of any type.

Will the distinguished chairman of the committee tell us what kind of Sherlock Holmes he intends to employ to protect the 25 million acres and 19 million acres that he says cannot be grazed, or otherwise used for any productive purpose.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma can talk all night; but this is a big ranchers' and millionaires' amendment, and the Senator from Oklahoma cannot get away from that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much time remains available to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield that minute to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the North Dakota Stockmen's Association—and, by the way, it is one of the best of all the stockmen's associations in the United States, and perhaps the very best—is made up of thousands of small farmers and ranchers. They are vitally concerned with the success of the soil-bank program. Immediately after its adoption by the Senate, the other evening, the officers of the association telegraphed to me that they were almost unanimously in favor of it. They were gravely concerned that attempts would be made to graze cattle and sheep upon these reserved acres. They asked me to do everything possible to prevent that from happening.

Mr. President, I am satisfied that the pending amendment will be detrimental not only to these small farmers and ranchers in North Dakota, but also to the small farmers and ranchers all over the United States.

Therefore, I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. President, I submit that we should vote for the provision as prepared by the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield at this time to the Senator from Colorado. First, let me ask how much time I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I dislike to raise in opposition to the amendment proposed by my distinguished friends, the Senators from Oklahoma. In many ways, the agriculture of Oklahoma resembles that of my own State. But I desire to call the attention of the Senate to 2 or 3 or possibly 4 points which affect this matter very greatly.

First of all, the amendment as submitted here creates impossible admin-

istrative problems. Anyone who knows cattle, and anyone who knows the western country at all, knows that the language on page 2 of the amendment, that "for the purposes of this section, an animal unit shall be the acreage required in a particular area to graze one cow on an annual basis and one calf through the period prior to weaning," can be construed only in one way, namely, that there would almost have to be an individual determination for every cow, and at least for every piece of grass and every piece of land, to determine whether that was a unit. In the West, in my friends' country, which adjoins my own State, in my own State, and in the other parts of the West with which I am familiar, that area may differ so much within a distance of 2 miles, that although in one place it might be possible to graze a cow on 160 acres, in another place it might be possible to graze a cow on 10 acres. So the amendment is almost impossible of administration, because it would require the making of an individual determination in the case of each, individual, separate parcel of land, depending on the quality of the soil and the quality of the grass and the quality of the forage and the type of cattle being grazed at a particular time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 1 more minute to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. ALLOTT. Those who feed their cattle, the heavy feeders, are the ones who are hoping to get help, and who need it at this time.

Furthermore, I do not believe that the position taken by the Senator from Oklahoma is the position of the National Cattlemen's Association. Certainly it is not that of the Colorado Cattlemen's Association as it appears from my correspondence.

Furthermore, the soil-bank provisions of the Barrett amendment will strengthen the enforcement of the act and stop the abuses and will stop the building up of cattle, such as the Senator has suggested. There will not be 25 million acres in competition, because under the Barrett amendment, this acreage will come out and will tend to reduce the cattle population.

I am sorry that I do not have time yielded to enable me to discuss the amendment further.

I desire to thank my friend, the Senator from Louisiana, for yielding this time to me.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. In the first place, Mr. President, I wonder how the second part of the amendment would work out; I refer to the provision that "the portion of the national conservation reserve goal representing acreage regularly used in the grazing of livestock shall be distributed among the various States,"—and so forth.

The State of Nevada is 87 percent Government-owned. When these acres are retired, who will receive the payments? Will it not be the cattleman who at one time was using that land, and then would be shoved off of it? If he had a lease, the lease would simply be canceled.

That may be why the Senator from Colorado is correct in reporting the position taken by the livestock association in his State, in the case of an amendment of this nature. The livestock association in my State is not in favor of it. There may be someone who is in favor of the amendment, but I do not know who that would be.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand the Livestock and Meat Situation, a pamphlet issued by the Agricultural Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture; this is the issue for March 2, 1956. I read from it, under the heading "Outlook":

> Total cattle numbers are now 27 percent above 1949. Cow numbers are up 23 percent, as milk cows have decreased 2 percent, but beef cows have increased 62 percent.

If anyone wishes to know why that has happened, he has only to examine the income-tax provision which permits a beef cow, once she has gone into the breeding herd, to be sold on the capital-gains basis.

If we wish to reduce cattle numbers, all we have to do is to repeal that amendment. I am happy to say that it was introduced with good intentions. We all thought it would work very well. But in very recent times representatives of the Cattle Feeders' Association came to my office and said that they had decided they wanted to get rid of that amendment, because it was building up cattle numbers to the point where they could not stand it.

I do not think this amendment is the answer.

Wheat acreage will be down if the soil bank works. If the Great Plains program works, wheat areas there will be reduced again. Where, then, are the cattlemen going to look for pasture, if their own pasture is to be reduced?

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] put his finger on the point. He asked, "How is it to be administered?" How is one to go into a 100,000-acre ranch and pick out the particular acres which are to be rested for a year, 2 years, or 3 years? How is the acreage to be patrolled? The acres must be out of cultivation for 3 years.

I do not think this is a good amendment. I know that it would not reduce cattle numbers. I hope it will not be adopted.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for 3 minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. It seems to me that this amendment would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, of administration. I do not know just how anyone in the cattle business, particularly, could adapt his operations so as to conform to the requirements of such a provision.

I have talked to a number of representatives of livestock organizations, and I have yet to find one who believes that this plan is workable in any way.

In the first instance, if a man has even three or four hundred head of cattle, he certainly will have to make some arrangement to hold those cattle and carry on his operations until he can dispose of them. At the present time we have the highest cattle population in the history of America. As a matter of fact, we have 97½ million head of cattle. The cattle numbers have gone up nearly 10 million head in the past 4 years. We hardly have pasturage enough to take care of this large number of cattle. Certainly at the prices which are available at the present time, very few people would want to dispose of their cattle and cut down their herds. In the meantime, they certainly could not very well take any of their lands out of use and put them into the conservation acreage.

It seems to me that this amendment should call for long and detailed hearings before the committee. I am sure that if the committee were to hold hearings and listen to witnesses, it would not recommend legislation of this type.

I hope the Senate will not agree to the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

We may not get any relief by reason of having this amendment adopted. It may be that we would obtain very little relief from the adoption of any amendment to the bill. But this effort has not been fruitless. After having spent 50 years or more of my life in Oklahoma, much of it on its farms and cattle ranches, in the ignorant condition in which that leaves a man, it is a great privilege to come to the United States Senate and hear the Senator from Vermont give complete encyclopedic knowledge, facts, and statistics on any given subject relating to agriculture. So if we never have an amendment adopted, our efforts will not have been in vain, because, thanks to God, who reigns in heaven, throughout the rest of my life I shall be fortified with knowledge, facts, and information coming from the fount of all wisdom with reference to agriculture.

The distinguished Senator from Vermont jumped up and down 4 or 5 times and said, "This is a millionaire's amendment." He personally ramrodded down the throats of Senators yesterday an amendment to the soil bank provision which limits the amount any man may receive under it to $25,000 a year. So the most any one man, or any one party could receive under those provisions, as payments for the retirement of acreage in the conservation reserve program, would be $25,000 a year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. With all due respect, the Senator is in error. The $25,000 applies to payments under the acreage reserve. The $7,500 limitation is applicable to the conservation reserve.

Mr. KERR. Then the "millionaires' amendment" would permit a maximum of $7,500.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. I thank my good friend from Louisiana. I wish to thank him for the great effort he has made in connection with the pending bill. My highest hope would be that the bill could leave the Senate in as good condition as it was when he brought it to the Senate.

For the benefit of those who say that this amendment might be good, but would be impossible of administration, I read from section 207 (a) (1), under subtitle (b), as follows:

(1) To establish and maintain for the contract period protective vegetative cover (including but not limited to grass and trees), water storage facilities, or other soil, water, wildlife, or forest conserving uses on a specifically designated acreage of land on the farm regularly used in the production of crops (including crops, such as tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers, which do not require annual tillage).

It is difficult for me to conceive that it would be any harder to administer a program as applied to native grasses, which are oftentimes just as productive, and oftentimes of such quality that a few acres will support a cow—as is the case with tame hay or clovers—than it would be to operate under the provisions brought to the floor of the Senate in this bill with reference to crops of tame hay and clovers, which do not require annual tillage.

Certainly there would be difficulties in administration. I shudder to think what would happen to any program in the hands of the administrator who must administer it for the rest of this year, if he lives. However, I do not think it would be any more difficult to administer the law with this amendment in it than it would be to administer the law with the other provisions which are in the bill.

The distinguished Senator from Vermont stated that this amendment would not help the small farmer a bit. I challenge him to show a single provision in the bill, as it now stands, that would put a dollar into the pocket of the average small farmer in the United States this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The provisions which had been in the bill and which would have been of benefit to the small farmer, have been ripped out of it under the leadership of the Black Knight from Vermont. He has led his battalions of gladiators up and down and across the floor of the Senate and has torn the very guts out of the bill so far as its being worth a copper penny to the average small farmer is concerned. Then he gets up and sheds his crocodile tears, and says the amendment is no good and that it would not help the small farmer. Mr. President, he is allergic to benefiting the small farmer. If it helped the small farmer he would be against it, not for it. He has the most unbroken record of anyone in the Senate in that regard. If the bill is passed as now written it ought to be known as the Aiken bill No. 2. We had an Aiken bill back in late 1940. The average small farmer thought it was just named for the man who wrote it, until he had to live under it. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, we have offered amendments to support the price of cattle. The administration says they cannot be administered. The administration says it is impossible to control the production of cattle. They say the amendments must not be adopted because we do not have enough storage facilities to take care of the products we buy under the support program.

Well, Mr. President, after having been beaten on those amendments, we come now with an amendment to give the cattle producers the same opportunity under the bill that the other farmers have under it. The administration says it cannot be administered. I want to say that if Ezra Taft Benson has the kind of intellect and knowledge and wisdom that he is portrayed on this floor as having, he can administer the amendment and at the same time hold up one foot. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, they do not want to administer the amendment. They do not want any amendment, either for the small farmer or for the producer of cattle. I remind the Senate that this is the largest segment of the agricultural industry in this Nation. Cattle are selling at less than 60 percent of parity; nevertheless, the administration has steadfastly refused to accept any amendment from anyone which would benefit the cattle producer. Every other crop under the specifications of this bill is selling at a higher percentage of parity today than are cattle. Of course it would be hard to administer. What is not hard to administer?

The bill is calculated to benefit the American farmer. So far the small farmer—the cotton farmer and the cattle producer— has been excluded from it. The amendment would merely put the cattle producer in the same position under the law as will be the position of the operators of the 25 million acres that are proposed to be taken out of production and put into the soil bank.

We submit that in the name of justice and fairness and equity the amendment should be adopted for the benefit of the cattle producers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oklahoma yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator do so?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. KERR. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time for debate has been yielded back. All time has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	McClellan
Allott	Fulbright	McNamara
Anderson	George	Monroney
Barkley	Goldwater	Morse
Barrett	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Neely
Bender	Hennings	Neuberger
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bible	Hill	Payne
Bricker	Holland	Potter
Bridges	Hruska	Purtell
Bush	Humphrey	Robertson
Butler	Ives	Russell
Capehart	Jackson	Saltonstall
Carlson	Jenner	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Chavez	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Knowland	Sparkman
Curtis	Kuchel	Stennis
Dirksen	Laird	Symington
Douglas	Langer	Thurmond
Duff	Lehman	Thye
Dworshak	Malone	Watkins
Eastland	Mansfield	Welker
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Flanders	McCarthy	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] for himself and his colleague [Mr. MONRONEY], which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 12, line 12, before the period insert: "or in the grazing of livestock".

On page 16, line 24, after the period, insert the following: "The portion of the national conservation reserve goal for any year representing acreage regularly used in the grazing of livestock shall be (1) four million animal units less the number of animal units then in the conservation reserve program, or (2) the number of animal units determined by the Secretary to be necessary in order to bring supplies of livestock and livestock products into line with the demand therefor, whichever is lesser. For the purposes of this section, an animal unit shall be the acreage required in a particular area to graze one cow on an annual basis and one calf through the period prior to weaning".

On page 17, at the end of line 13, add the following: "The portion of the national conservation reserve goal representing acreage regularly used in the grazing of livestock shall be distributed among the various States as nearly as practicable on the basis of the average number of animal units grazed in each such State during the ten years preceding the year for which such distribution is made."

On page 18, line 9, strike out "$350,000,000" and insert "$425,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

I further announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay" and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 63, as follows:

YEAS—24

Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Douglas	Kerr	Neuberger
Fulbright	Laird	Scott
Hennings	Lehman	Smathers
Hill	Mansfield	Sparkman
Humphrey	McNamara	Symington
Jackson	Monroney	Thurmond

NAYS—63

Aiken	Dworshak	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Eastland	McCarthy
Anderson	Ellender	McClellan
Barkley	Ervin	Mundt
Barrett	Flanders	Pastore
Beall	Frear	Payne
Bender	George	Potter
Bennett	Goldwater	Purtell
Bible	Green	Robertson
Bricker	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bush	Holland	Schoeppel
Butler	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Jenner	Stennis
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	Thye
Clements	Knowland	Watkins
Cotton	Kuchel	Welker
Curtis	Langer	Wiley
Dirksen	Malone	Williams
Duff	Martin, Iowa	Young

NOT VOTING—9

Byrd	Kefauver	Millikin
Daniel	Long	Murray
Gore	Magnuson	O'Mahoney

So the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up the amendment designated "2-29-56-A," offered on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon for himself and on behalf of other Senators.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, beginning with line 17, it is proposed to strike out over through line 17 on page 30, as follows:

STATE CONTRIBUTION TO COST OF COMMODITIES FURNISHED TO DISASTER AREAS

SEC. 309. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no feed for livestock or seed for planting shall be furnished, after March 1, 1957, to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen pursuant to the act entitled "an act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes," approved September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1109; 42 U. S. C. 1855 and the following); section 2 of the act entitled "an act to abolish the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, District of Columbia, and transfer its functions to the Secretary of Agriculture, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make disaster loans, and for other purposes," approved April 6, 1949, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148); the provision under the heading "Disaster Loan Revolving Fund," Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954 (68 Stat. 88); the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454; 7 U. S. C. 1691 and the following), or pursuant to any other law as a disaster relief measure, unless, in addition to such administrative costs as may be assumed by the State, the State in which such feed or seed is furnished agrees to contribute an amount not less than 15 percent of the cost, including transportation, of such feed or seed which is not paid for by the recipients thereof.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall repeat in support of the amendment the very brief statement I made during my speech on the farm bill on March 7. I yield myself 5 minutes.

One section of the Senate farm bill that impresses me as being very unfair toward the States, such as my own State of Oregon, is section 309 of the present bill. If this section were to become law, it would require Oregon, beginning in March 1957, to contribute 15 percent of the cost of disaster feed and seed supplied by the Government to hard-pressed farmers.

At the present time the Federal Government is providing such feed and seed without the necessity for State contributions to the cost of the program.

It seems to me that if there is any occasion upon which a State should not be required to contribute to a Federal disaster relief program, it is when the State is in the throes of battling a disaster. When a disaster hits, the State has enormous problems and extremely heavy demands upon their treasuries, and this 15-percent contribution requirement would simply be an added burden.

Mr. President, let me make perfectly clear for the RECORD that I am not at all in favor of a State contribution program, because our States, on a State basis, spend a great amount of money for flood disaster relief on behalf of people who suffer from such disasters. I believe the Federal Government has a great responsibility in connection with these disasters, but I do not believe that we can work out a program of State contributions that is fair. It is certainly not fair to Connecticut and to the other States in the northeastern part of the country, who have suffered great disaster losses in recent months. It is not fair to my State, which also has suffered great losses from floods. Neither is it fair, I might add, to California. I believe the Federal contribution ought to be on a national basis, without the requirement of a contribution from the States.

Section 309 further complicates the issue because we have no assurance that the affected States will have funds on hand to contribute a 15-percent share of the cost of emergency feed and seed grants. Furthermore, since most State legislatures meet every 2 years for relatively short periods, a State not having emergency funds on hand would have to await the next meeting of the legislature or, if necessary, might have to call a special session to provide the requisite 15-percent contribution. This would be procedurally prohibitive and in many cases economically inadvisable, because a special session of the legislature might well cost more than the contribution the Federal Government might make to the feed and seed program within the State.

Therefore, I am opposed to section 309, and with the cosponsorship of Senators NEUBERGER, MAGNUSON, and MURRAY, I have offered the amendment to strike this section so as to relieve the States of an additional disaster burden.

Let me say in closing that we are not dealing with a very large matter, but I think we are dealing with a matter which involves the application of a great humanitarian principle. I do not care what State may be affected; it may be any 1 of the 48.

When a disaster hits a State, it is to be expected that Uncle Sam will try to come to the relief of the people to the extent there is Federal responsibility in the matter. He is a Dutch uncle; he is not an uncle, in my judgment, who ought to take the position that the Federal Government will extract from the disaster-stricken State itself a 15 percent contribution for feed and seed which is going to the farmers, or should go to the farmers, who have been flooded out in such States, or who, as the result of hurricane or some other great act of God, have suffered a disaster which requires the sending of feed and seed into the State.

If what is being proposed were something that involved a great sum of money, then there might be something that could be said in favor of asking for some kind of contribution, in that it would cover a long period of time. I think this is a case where we can strike that provision from the bill and help take Uncle Sam from the position of being a Dutch uncle in such disasters. But, from the standpoint of dollars and cents, if it should be necessary to call special sessions of the State legislatures to provide funds, the calling of the legislatures might cost more than the value of the feed and seed that would be sent into the States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes in opposition to the amendment. The provision in the bill simply provides that if disaster relief in the nature of feed and seed is furnished in a State, that State must contribute at least 15 percent of the cost. Senators will recall that this matter has been at issue in the Senate for quite some time. As a matter of fact, there are quite a few States which now contribute to the cost of feed and seed in relief programs.

The distinguished Senator from Delaware offered this proposal. As I recall, the Senator proposed that 25 or 39 percent of the cost be paid by the States. The committee prevailed upon him to reduce the amount he proposed originally. He agreed to reduce the requirement to 15 percent, which the committee

thought was reasonable. Thereafter, the 15 percent provision was incorporated into the bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an explanation of the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER

This amendment would strike out section 309 of the bill which requires a 15-percent State contribution to the cost of feed and seed furnished as disaster relief.

Section 309 was included in the bill for two purposes, first to provide for financial contribution by the State, and second, through the requirement for local contribution, to generate local pressure to discourage unreasonable claims and demands for relief. The following information is contained in the committee report on the bill:

"SECTION 309. STATE CONTRIBUTION IN DISASTER RELIEF

"Section 309 of the bill provides that after March 1, 1957, the States must contribute at least 15 percent of the cost of feed or seed made available for disaster relief.

"During the fiscal year 1955 there were two programs of this nature in effect. Under the 1955 emergency feed program, eligible farmers received purchase orders enabling them to buy from established dealers at reduced prices, certain designated surplus feed grains, such as barley, corn, wheat, grain sorghums and oats, or approved mixed feed containing a high percentage of the surplus feed grains. Dealers received a certificate representing the value of the reduction in the price of the feed and used it to buy replacement stocks which eventually came from CCC inventories. The cost of this program to the Government during the fiscal year 1955, represented by the value of CCC inventories released in satisfaction of dealers' certificates was approximately $61,200,000. Had the States been required to contribute 15 percent of the cost of this program during the fiscal year 1955 their contribution would have amounted to $9,180,000. The emergency feed program was operative as of January 31, 1956, in Colorado, Kansas, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming.

"A second program conducted during the fiscal year involved the execution of agreements with States to assist them in furnishing hay to eligible farmers. Under these agreements the Department contributed a definite sum to the State to defray one-half the cost of transportation of the hay (not to exceed $10 per ton). The total of such contributions during the fiscal year 1955 was $4,684,839. Since the States assumed at least half of the transportation costs for hay, as well as the costs incident to the purchase and distribution of such hay, they would not have to make any additional contributions in a program such as this. North Carolina is the only State with which the Department has a hay agreement at the present time."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I now yield 5 minutes to the disinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on several previous occasions it has been recommended that there be some form of State contributions in such relief program. The 15-percent contribution is very reasonable, and certainly will not penalize any State. The main purpose of the provision is not aimed at the amount of revenue involved. It is not a question of whether or not the Government should furnish relief. Last year the Federal Government contributed $68 million under this relief program. The effective date of this 15-percent formula was made on March 1 of next year, in order to give State legislatures, an opportunity to enact enabling legislation.

It was felt by the committee and the administration that if some form of State contribution were required, it would at least reduce claims, as they came in from the various areas, to bona fide claims. I have voted, and shall continue to vote, for relief funds for drought or other emergencies. I think the Government should provide funds for such disasters. However, at least a token contribution should be provided at the State level. We will then have those requests sifted down to bona fide claims.

Several complaints have been received that this program has been misused.

With State contributions there would be a greater opportunity at the local level, in administering the program, to see that the relief went where it was needed. If the States knew they were paying a portion of the cost they would see that the programs were administered properly. I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon should be rejected and the provision should be retained in the bill.

I sponsored this section when it was added to the bill and consider it an essential part of the program. We hear a lot from the Senator from Oregon about the Morse formula for State contributions, and I am surprised to see him trying to abandon that principle here.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

In each of the disaster cases the States spend millions of dollars from State funds, but when it comes to the matter of providing seed and feed to disaster-stricken areas, for the most part we would be taking the seed and feed out of surpluses.

I think the hearts of the people of America on most occasions are hearts that say very clearly, we ought to make this donation out of surpluses to people stricken in disaster areas.

If we have reached the point where we cannot help people in disaster areas and not relieve them of the suspicion that they are going to make false claims for commodities out of the surplus bins of our country, I think we are taking an absurd position.

I do not think we should go on record as insisting that we collect a pound of flesh out of people who have suffered a disaster by saying to them, "We are not going to ship you feed and seed unless your States enact legislation to contribute 15 percent of the cost of the feed and seed."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment. We have had a great many disasters in North Carolina, especially from hurricanes. When a disaster strikes, a State usually has to spend many times the amount it receives from the Federal Government to repair highways and make other repairs.

It seems to me that the amendment is a just one, and that we ought not to impose upon the States an additional burden to that which has been imposed on them for other forms of relief. This kind of relief requires comparatively small expenditures as compared with expenditures which States so often have to make.

I think the amendment is a meritorious one, and ought to be agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask for 1 minute. Then I shall be prepared to yield back the remaining time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wished to add one thought to what I have said. We hear a great deal on the floor of the Senate about States rights. If we are to have States rights, the States must also accept their responsibilities. There is not a single one of the 48 States that is not in better financial condition than is the Federal Government. Certainly, asking the States to contribute 15 percent toward the cost of relief programs is not an unreasonable request. It would not affect the relief which the people would receive.

I urge the rejection of the Morse amendment and the retention of the section in the bill which provides for 15 percent State contribution on these relief requests.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	McCarthy
Allott	Fulbright	McClellan
Anderson	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Monroney
Barrett	Green	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bender	Hennings	Neely
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	Pastore
Bricker	Holland	Payne
Bridges	Hruska	Potter
Bush	Humphrey	Purtell
Butler	Ives	Russell
Capehart	Jackson	Saltonstall
Carlson	Jenner	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Chavez	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Knowland	Sparkman
Curtis	Kuchel	Stennis
Dirksen	Laird	Symington
Douglas	Langer	Thurmond
Duff	Lehman	Thye
Dworshak	Magnuson	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). A quorum is present.

On the pending question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Chair identify the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to strike out certain language on page 29 of the bill.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. GORE and Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. GORE and Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], if present and voting, would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—42

Anderson	Hill	McClellan
Barkley	Holland	McNamara
Bible	Humphrey	Monroney
Chavez	Jackson	Morse
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Neuberger
Eastland	Kennedy	Pastore
Ervin	Kerr	Scott
Frear	Kuchel	Smathers
Fulbright	Laird	Sparkman
George	Langer	Stennis
Green	Lehman	Symington
Hayden	Magnuson	Thurmond
Hennings	Mansfield	Young

NAYS—43

Aiken	Bennett	Capehart
Allott	Bricker	Carlson
Barrett	Bridges	Case, N. J.
Beall	Bush	Case, S. Dak.
Bender	Butler	Cotton
Curtis	Knowland	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Malone	Smith, Maine
Duff	Martin, Iowa	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Martin, Pa.	Thye
Flanders	McCarthy	Watkins
Goldwater	Mundt	Welker
Hickenlooper	Payne	Wiley
Hruska	Potter	Williams
Ives	Purtell	
Jenner	Saltonstall	

NOT VOTING—11

Byrd	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Daniel	Long	Robertson
Ellender	Millikin	Russell
Gore	Murray	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I desire to call up my amendment 3-9-56—F.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "$350,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$750,000,000."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I modify my amendment in line 2 by striking out "$750,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$450,000,000."

At this time I realize that the bill has been discussed in so many ways and so many times that it is very difficult to add anything that has not been said about it by someone. I wish to go back to the original theory of the soil bank, and to discuss it very briefly. I hope we may have a decision on it very quickly. The original bill contains 2 provisions for a soil bank; 1 is called the acreage reserve and the other is called the conservation reserve. The acreage reserve refers to the so-called basic commodities, originally wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and tobacco, to which have been added other commodities. A fund of $750 million is provided to finance that reserve. I readily admit that that is probably where the most money is needed.

However, it has been said on the floor and in the reports of committees that only 23 percent of the farm income is affected by the basic commodities. If that is true—and I am sure it is—then the great number of farmers and the great amount of production in this country are not affected by the acreage reserve.

It is not so much the amount that I wish to see in the conservation reserve as the fact that I feel there should be more nearly an equalization of the amounts.

In analyzing the amounts that would be available, and in analyzing the data from the Department of Agriculture, it appears to me—at least with reference to the situation in my State—that the amount available for conservation reserve, would be less than enough to pay taxes and water assessments on the land. In Colorado, the great proportion of farmers would be eligible only for the conservation reserve program.

Therefore it seems to me that if we are to provide an incentive to take acres out of production and put them into the conservation reserve, we must exceed the estimate of the Department of Agriculture, which estimated 25 million acres at $10 an acre. It seems to me we must increase that number if we expect to take acreages into the conservation reserve and out of production.

Therefore, it is with that in mind that I feel there should be greater emphasis on and more impetus provided for the conservation reserve. I therefore propose an amendment to increase the amount to $450 million to more closely balance the amount already authorized for the acreage reserve.

That is all I have to say at this time, and I temporarily yield the floor so that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may speak on the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when the pending bill was being considered by the committee the question, of course, came up as to the amount of money necessary in order to pay on a yearly basis for the conservation-reserve program. The committee went into the question in detail; and on page 3296 of part VIII of the hearings the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, indicated that under the conservation reserve—and I quote his words:

> The estimate is that perhaps $350 million the first year and approximately $1 billion over the first 3 years would be sufficient.

In the proposals which were made as to how much would be required for each acre to be placed in the conservation-reserve program, the Secretary estimated that the overall average of the United States on leased land would not exceed $10. That being the average, in many States it would necessarily be much lower than $10.

Mr. President, we have written into the bill, on page 14, beginning with line 14, the yardstick which the Secretary of Agriculture must use in order to determine the amount of payment per acre to be allowed farmers under the conservation-reserve program.

The RECORD also shows that the number of acres the Secretary proposes to place in the conservation reserve is around 25 million. An average of $10 an acre would amount to $250 million; and the rest of it, as I understand from the testimony, is to be used to defray the initial cost of establishing conservation cover, such as planting trees and grass.

According to the tentative proposals made by the Secretary, the Government will pay approximately 80 percent of the cost of establishing conservation cover, and the cost is estimated at about $25 an acre. The bill gives to the Secretary of Agriculture broad powers in order to attain the goal, which he has set at 25 million acres.

At this point I should like to read the yardstick which the Secretary has used. It is written in the bill at page 14, line 14, to which I have just referred. It is as follows:

> The rate or rates of the annual payment to be provided for in the contracts shall be established on such basis as the Secretary determines will provide producers with a fair and reasonable annual return on the land established in protective vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil, water, wildlife, or forest conserving uses, taking into consideration the value of the land for the production of commodities customarily grown on such kind of land in the county or area, the prevailing rates for cash rentals for similar land in the county or area, the incentive necessary to obtain contracts

covering sufficient acreage for the substantial accomplishment of the purposes of the conservation reserve program, and such other factors as he deems appropriate.

Mr. President, we went into the matter in detail, and the Secretary assured us that an authorization for an annual appropriation of $350 million would be ample. I can see no reason to go beyond that figure. To do so certainly would not provide more money for the State of Colorado or any other State. With the yardstick proposed, and with the use of part of the $350 million in connection with the planting of trees, grass, and so forth, $350 million should be ample.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is true, is it not, that the funds for the contract authority would not be used unless there were some farmers who wanted to contract up to the full amount of $350 million or $450 million?

Mr. ELLENDER. It would be limited to $350 million.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not desirable to accomplish the purpose by having as much participation as may be possible?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then, what harm would there be in giving additional elbowroom for additional contracts?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not arguing against it; I am simply stating what the Secretary said would be sufficient to reach the goal. The bill provides the full amount which he said was necessary for the program. We are simply complying with his request. If the Senator from Colorado or any other Senator can show that more money is necessary to take out of cultivation the 25 million acres contemplated, the chairman of the committee would not object to increasing the authorization.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Chairman agrees, then, that it would not cost the Government anything unless it called for an additional appropriation?

Mr. ELLENDER. For the 25 million acres?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. It goes without saying that with a conservation reserve program of 25 million acres——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But the money would not be expended unless there were contracts to require it. It would not cost the Treasury anything.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; but I am saying to the Senator that there is authorized in the bill every dollar the Secretary requested. Personally, I see no reason for our going beyond that.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. This amendment probably would not have the implications it would have if it had been adopted yesterday, because, as the Senator will recall, last night an amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming called for a direct appropriation to be made after, I think, February 1, 1957. Therefore, the amount suggested by the Senator from Colorado would be more in the nature of an authorization.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It is a direct permission to contract for that amount. So it would not have the importance that it would have had two days ago, so far as the bill is concerned. Undoubtedly, that amount would not be contracted for before next February.

Mr. ELLENDER. We could raise the authorization to a billion dollars if the Senator's argument is carried to its logical conclusion. But what would be accomplished by doing so? We have followed the request made by the Secretary. The record is replete with suggestions from the Secretary and his associates that it was contemplated to take out of production and place in the conservation reserve not more than 25 million acres, and that the sum of $350 million would be ample. If the Senate desires to increase it to $500 million, I believe a better case should be made for it than has been presented so far. Since the Secretary has given to the committee a tentative program in which almost every contingency has been provided for, and has concluded that he will need but $350 million to accomplish it, I can see no reason to increase the authorization beyond $350 million.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I am fully mindful of the great amount of work that has been put on this bill, but I should like to call attention to the fact that page 14 of the bill provides that the Secretary, under the conservation reserve, shall determine the incentive necessary to obtain contracts covering sufficient acreage for the substantial accomplishment of the purposes of the conservation reserve program, and such other factors as he deems appropriate.

Subparagraph (c) provides:

In determining the lands in any area to be covered by contracts entered into under this section, the Secretary may use advertising and bid procedure if he determines that such action will contribute to the effective and equitable administration of the conservation reserve program.

We simply differ basically on the purposes of the reserve conservation program. If those who want to enter into the conservation reserve are going to be put under a bidding program—and the other day in a colloquy I asked the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry if that meant what it said, and he said it did mean what it said—if they are to be placed on a bidding basis, as to whether or not they can enter the conservation reserve—and as the Senator has pointed out, the Secretary does not have to require that—then we are indeed going to be in poor shape.

The idea is to get people to come into it. If the Secretary should offer it out on bids for those who will pull their acreage out for less, then we will not have accomplished what we want to accomplish with the conservation reserve.

I can hear some persons say, "Here is a Senator who offers to raise an amount from $350 million to $750 million." I do not do this lightly. It is not the amount that concerns me. My idea is that the sums should be more in balance, because the man who takes crops out under the acreage reserve can also take land out under the conservation reserve and get a double benefit.

But the man who does not produce basic crops—the so-called named basics—cannot, and probably will not—in a great many instances be able to come in under the conservation reserve and take his acreage out.

As I have already pointed out, in the irrigation areas of my own State the amount which probably would be paid and appropriated for that purpose would not pay the taxes or other assessments on the land.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? I should like to enter into a colloquy with him on the subject.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the proposal of the Senator from Colorado is sound. There has been far too little emphasis placed upon the conservation reserve feature of the bill. The acreage reserve is for allotted crops and allotted acres. The allotted acres are supposed to relate to the domestic need, to domestic consumption.

The conservation reserve is for what we call diverted acres—the arid, semiarid, or marginal lands. It is a long-term program.

I think what the Senator from Colorado is trying to do is to emphasize the purpose of the soil bank—that is, the use of the soil bank—is the conservation reserve. He is right in that assumption, from my point of view.

Therefore, I think it is important that there be sufficient funds, in the terms of the authorization, to develop that program over a long period of time. The point has been made that if the funds are not expended or appropriated, the $450 million authorization which the Senator from Colorado is suggesting surely cannot mean additional expenditures. It would simply mean that the Secretary of Agriculture would be given the additional flexibility which he needs to contract for whatever number of acres may be desirable under the program.

This question was discussed in the committee. $350 million was recommended by the Department in their estimates. On that basis, the committee agreed to the request of the Department.

If the Senator from Colorado presses his amendment for a vote, I shall feel disposed to vote for it, because I think it is a constructive amendment and places the emphasis on the soil bank, where it belongs.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the able Senator for his words.

Mr. President, if no other Senator desires time, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

THE LATE SENATOR HARLEY M. KILGORE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield half a minute on the bill to the

distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a brief letter of appreciation written by Mrs. Harley M. Kilgore to the United States Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

The family of Harley Martin Kilgore will forever remember your great kindness to us in our dark hour. In pardonable pride I can say "your dark hour, too," for there never lived a greater patriot than Harley Kilgore.

LOIS LILLY KILGORE.

MARCH 14, 1956.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, unless other Senators wish to be heard on the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado, I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COOPERATION AGAINST CANADIAN STOCK FRAUDS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, my colleagues in the Senate will recall that on numerous occasions, I have called attention to the problem which had arisen because of the entry into the United States of certain illegal security offerings on the part of a relatively handful of unscrupulous dealers in Canada.

I will not at the present time elaborate on the extensive background of this subject which has been explored, both on the Senate and House side by the Banking Committees, and by myself.

I did, however, make earlier reference to this problem in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 11, 1955, volume 101, part 5, page 6046, and on June 17, 1955, volume 101, part 7, page 8578.

I have, of course, been in continued close touch with the executive agencies which are necessarily most active in this connection. Those agencies are, of course, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Department of State, and the Department of Justice.

Recently I was glad to meet again with the distinguished Chairman of SEC, the Honorable J. Sinclair Armstrong, and with Deputy Assistant Secretary of State T. V. Kalijarvi, who discussed United States-Canadian progress in this important connection.

I am glad to advise my colleagues that the executive agencies have been definitely following up on this matter with close attention. And, in turn, I, for one, will continue to note this matter closely.

Of course, as I have pointed out on many occasions, our relations with our good neighbor to the north are so excellent on so many fronts that are of infinitely more significance, that I would not want this relatively small stock offering to be magnified out of proportion.

Nevertheless, as our good friends to the north are aware and as we are aware, the matter should be effectively settled, so that never again does it arise to bother either of our two governments or peoples, or Canadian Provinces or our States.

I am satisfied, however, that, thanks to important action which has been taken, we are well on our way to a final solution of protecting investors, so that we can turn our attention to more important problems of deep mutual interest.

I ask unanimous consent the text of a letter which I have just received from Commissioner Armstrong be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1956.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, and I appreciated the opportunity of meeting with you in order to report the progress being made in dealing with the problem of illegal offerings of Canadian securities in the United States. We know of your deep interest in this subject and your concern about protecting American citizens. We should like to confirm, and perhaps to amplify, our conversation concerning this matter.

As we all know, Canada has recently experienced a rapid growth and development, which has in turn afforded many attractive opportunities to American investors. According to the latest available Government figures, the value of Canadian securities held by American investors at the end of 1954 amounted to over three and a quarter billion dollars, of which over $300 million was acquired in 1954. Unfortunately, as you are quite aware, the interest of American investors has been exploited by a small group of unscrupulous persons whose illegal and often fraudulent activities have for many years been a source of grave concern, not only to this Commission, but also to provincial and State securities administrators, other agencies of both governments, Members of the Congress, and indeed the securities industry itself.

The problem has no easy solution. Not only the violators, but also much of the evidence, is beyond the jurisdiction of law enforcement authorities in the United States. Because of this, the voluntary cooperation of Canadian authorities is usually necessary, not only to apply effective sanctions to offenders, but also to collect the necessary evidence concerning the nature of their activities and the truth or falsity of their representations.

Canadian authorities also have their problems in dealing with these activities. The powers of provincial securities administrators with respect to illegal sales into the United States are not altogether clear, and they are under handicaps in dealing with persons who migrate from province to province. I am sure you realize that any direct intervention by the Government of Canada raises delicate questions of Federal-provincial relationships.

The Commission and other Federal agencies have made vigorous efforts to deal with this problem. Hundreds of investigations have been made, injunctions have been secured whenever jurisdiction over the violator could be obtained, a substantial number of criminal indictments have been entered, and over 80 postal fraud orders have been issued. A central clearing house for information concerning violators has been established within the Commission, whereby information in the possession of numerous law enforcement agencies is compiled and exchanged. A so-called "restricted list" of Canadian securities which appear to be the subject of illegal offerings has been created. This list is circulated to brokers and dealers in the United States with warnings against trading in such securities. It is presently proposed to revise and improve the list after consultation with Canadian authorities. Following lengthy and often difficult negotiations, a revised extradiction treaty with Canada was entered into in 1952, which was intended to cover fraudulent securities transactions. Although this treaty was, unfortunately, given a very narrow interpretation by a Canadian court in 1955, we still hope that it may prove a useful instrument. Particular efforts are being made to establish and maintain cooperative relations with the provincial securities administrators. We are fortunate in the fact that the Province of Quebec, from which many illegal offerings formerly emanated, has within the past year established an able and vigorous Securities Commission.

Although the problem persists, we are encouraged by the progress being made. According to all information available to us, fraudulent offerings from Canada have decreased very substantially since the peak of 1949–52, both in number and in magnitude. This progress is the more encouraging because the past year or two have been a period of activity in the securities market and relatively high public interest in speculative securities, with the result that an increase rather than a decrease in fraudulent offerings from Canada might reasonably have been anticipated. It is our feeling that our relations with provincial authorities in the various provinces of Canada have never been better. We also feel that there is now no province which is disposed to tolerate fraud, where fraud can be shown and power to deal with it is available. During the last 13 months, provincial authorities have cancelled the registrations, or otherwise stopped the offerings, of 13 persons or firms concerning whose activities we had complained. These included a number of promotions which bore all the signs of an old-fashioned high pressure scheme to defraud American investors.

I wish to assure you that, in conjunction with other agencies of the Government, we are making every effort to meet the problem and to preserve and extend the progress being made toward a solution. We deeply appreciate the continuing and vigorous support which you have given to us and other law enforcement agencies in our efforts to protect American investors. Mr. Kalijarvi is in complete agreement with the foregoing, and has asked me to reaffirm his Department's continuing desire to cooperate fully in our efforts to deal with this problem.

Sincerely yours,

J. SINCLAIR ARMSTRONG,
Chairman.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I do not ask to have read, except by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to add a new title.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

TITLE VII—INTERNATIONAL FOOD COMMUNITY BOARD

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 701. This title may be cited as the "International Food Community Board Act of 1956."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSES

SEC. 702. It is the purpose of this title to distribute Government-owned stocks of surplus agricultural commodities by an orderly system of disposition of such commodities through private nonprofit organizations, and to needy peoples at home and in free foreign nations, and thus to relieve the agricultural economy of the United States of the harmful effect to fair market prices of these surpluses hanging over the market and at the same time provide food and clothing for underprivileged peoples of the free world.

INTERNATIONAL FOOD COMMUNITY BOARD

SEC. 703. (a) There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an agency to be known as the International Food Community Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the President from among the heads of departments in the executive branch most concerned with the purposes of this title. One of the members shall be designated by the President as Chairman and one shall be designated by him as Vice Chairman. No member of the Board shall receive any additional compensation for his services on this Board. Members of the Board shall serve at the pleasure of the President.

(b) The Board is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, and to make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out its functions. The Board may delegate any of its functions to such of its officers and employees as it may designate.

(c) The Board shall, with the consent of the Government agency concerned, avail itself of the services and facilities of existing Government agencies in carrying out its functions under this title and may, with the approval of the President, delegate any of its powers to any Government agency.

(d) The Board is authorized to appoint without regard to the civil service laws and regulations such advisory committees as it deems necessary to assist it in carrying out its functions under this title. Persons so appointed may be compensated at rates not in excess of $50 per diem and may be reimbursed for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them while engaged in the business of the Board.

STATE LIAISON COMMITTEES

SEC. 704. The Board is authorized to appoint for any State or regional area, a State or regional liaison committee composed of three members. The Board shall perform its functions under this title in such States or regions with the advice and on the recommendations of such liaison committees. Members of such State or regional liaison committeees shall serve at the pleasure of the Board, may be compensated at the rate of not more than $50 per diem, and shall be reimbursed for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them while engaged in carrying out functions under this title. The Board shall provide each such liaison committee with such stenographic and other assistants as it may reasonably require. Such liaison committees shall be charged with the responsibility of assisting properly qualified applicants to avail themselves of the benefits of this program.

FUNCTIONS OF THE BOARD

SEC. 705. It shall be the duty of the Board to formulate and put into effect programs designed to carry out the purposes of this title. Such programs shall include, but shall not be limited to, plans for—

(1) the distribution over a period of approximately 3 years (or, in the case of perishable commodities, such shorter period as may be necessary to prevent spoilage) to needy peoples in the United States and in friendly foreign countries who would otherwise be unable to obtain such commodities or products, of all stocks of Government-owned surplus agricultural commodities, or products processed therefrom, less—

(i) such quantity of each commodity as the President may estimate is necessary to provide an adequate national reserve of such commodity for emergency purposes;

(ii) such quantity of each such commodity as the President may estimate can be sold or otherwise disposed of, from the stocks of Government-owned agricultural surpluses, during the period of this program, through previously authorized programs; and

(iii) the President may from time to time revise such estimates and thereupon this program shall be correspondingly revised;

(2) carrying out such distribution in a manner which will not materially displace, disrupt, or interrupt existing commercial markets;

(3) carrying out such distribution, to the maximum extent feasible, through the facilities of private nonprofit organizations in the United States and abroad and through locally sponsored or locally administered plans of operation;

(4) storing in foreign countries of commodities transported for ultimate distribution within, or in the areas of, such countries, and for the transportation abroad as soon as possible of the commodities proposed ultimately to be distributed abroad.

(5) transportation of commodities and products to be distributed to storage facilities in areas of distribution and the leasing, or where necessary the construction, of necessary storage space in such countries;

(6) processing of commodities into consumable goods wherever possible without cost to the Government; and

(7) reimbursement of costs incurred by the Board in processing commodities into consumable goods and in providing transportation from storage facilities to points of consumption.

POWERS OF BOARD

SEC. 706. In carrying out its functions under this title, the Board is authorized to—

(1) obtain Government-owned surplus agricultural commodities from the Commodity Credit Corporation, without reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation for such commodities, and the Commodity Credit Corporation is directed to deliver to the Board for the purposes of this title such commodities as the Board may request and which are to be disposed of under section 705 (1) of this title;

(2) enter into contracts for the processing into consumable goods and bulk packaging of such commodities, and for their transportation to storage facilities in areas of distribution (or, in exceptionable cases, to points of consumption);

(3) enter into agreements, as provided in section 707 of this title, with private nonprofit organizations in the United States and in foreign countries for the distribution of commodities and products processed therefrom to the ultimate consumers thereof;

(4) accept donations of transportation, processing, and other services.

AGREEMENTS WITH DISTRIBUTING ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 707. Agreements entered into pursuant to section 706 (3)—

(1) shall provide, except as provided in section 708, for payment to the Board for commodities or products furnished to the distributing organization, and reimbursement of the Board for costs incurred by it in the processing or transportation of such commodities or products, but such payment need bear no relation to the fair market value of the commodity or product, the purpose of this title being to distribute surplus goods to needy peoples;

(2) shall contain such provisions as the Board may deem necessary or appropriate to assure that the commodities and products to be distributed under such agreement will be delivered only to needy peoples not otherwise able to obtain such commodities, or to schools, hospitals, or other institutions for consumption or use by such peoples, all pursuant to the purposes stated in section 705, paragraphs 1 and 2, of this title;

(3) shall limit the charge made to recipients of such commodities or products to not more than actual cost to the nonprofit organization including processing and transportation (excluding local transportation in the country or area of distribution);

(4) may permit such nonprofit organization to contract with a processor to process any such commodities in exchange for byproducts thereof (provided that the fair value of the byproducts does not exceed the reasonable charge for such processing).

PAYMENT FOR COMMODITIES

SEC. 708. (a) The Board is authorized to distribute commodities and products under this title at such prices, not in excess of the fair value thereof, as recipients are able to pay, and as are consistent with the purposes of this title. Payment for such commodities and products may be in the form of—

(1) raw materials needed for stockpiling for national defense purposes;

(2) goods and services needed by Armed Forces personnel; or

(3) United States or foreign currencies. Any foreign currencies acquired under the provisions of this subsection shall be purchased from the Board by the Export-Import Bank of Washington at current rates of exchange.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Board may make commodities or products available for distribution under this title without any cost whatever to the distributing agency when the persons to whom ultimate distribution will be made are unable to make any payment therefor (or any payment in excess of transportation and processing costs).

(c) Amounts received by the Board under this section may be used to defray any proper costs of this program and any remaining funds shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 709. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Board to carry out its functions under this title.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 710. (a) As used in this title, the term "Government-owned surplus agricultural commodity" means agricultural commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation prior to the date of enactment of this act through price-support operations or pledged to the Commodity Credit Corporation under agreements entered into prior to such date,

and agricultural commodities acquired prior to such date through the use of funds made available under section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (Public Law 320, 74th Congress).

(b) The Board shall take such action as may be necessary in order to make known to prospective applicants the availability of agricultural commodities and products for distribution under this title.

(c) Agricultural commodities and products stored in accordance with section 705 (4), shall remain the sole property of the United States and subject to its exclusive control until distributed by the Board in accordance with a program promulgated under this title. No commodities or products so stored shall be returned to the United States except in case of national emergency.

(d) The President is authorized to transfer to the Board any functions or duties of any other agency of the Government relating to the disposition of surplus Government-owned agricultural commodities.

(e) The Board shall transmit to the Congress annually a report of its activities under this title.

SEC. 711. This title shall expire on June 30, 1960.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall not press for the adoption of the amendment, because it really should be considered as a separate bill. I only wish to say that I hope other Senators will join with me in requesting that the administration, in spite of the fact that I think it is doing a good job at the moment, and has been doing a good job, will do a better job in respect to the disposal of surplus food; and particularly that the administration will do a better job in respect to the disposal of surplus food to the poor people of the United States and of the world.

I hope some day to see the United States Congress pass a bill whereby the Government will attack intelligently, and will place under one authority, the matter of the distribution of surplus foodstuffs to the poor people of the United States and of the world. I think we need to do that, and I hope we shall do it.

I think my amendment should be introduced as a separate bill rather than to be included in the pending bill. But I hope it is the consensus of the Senate that the administration should accelerate and redouble its efforts to dispose of the farm surpluses at this time.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I had intended to propose this evening. I ask that it be printed and lie on the table until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico will be printed and will lie on the table.

HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 107 years ago today, March 15, 1849, Hungary first became independent from the rule of the Hapsburgs. This would be independence day in Hungary, but Hungary cannot be said to be independent today. Whatever the government that now governs Hungary might be called, "People's Republic" or otherwise, there is no question that the Hungarian people are now dominated by a foreign power as surely as they were under the Turks or the Austrians.

The Communist tyranny that has taken over Hungary would obliterate the independent spirit of the Hungarian people and absorb them into the orbit of the Communist sphere. We have seen in the past decade how the rulers of Hungary, like those of the other Eastern European nations, are subservient to the will of Moscow. We have seen them obey the whim of the Communist leaders in the Kremlin. All opposition to the political order has been stamped out.

Louis Kossuth stirred the spirit of independence in the Hungarian people and then kept it alive though he was forced to flee when the Hapsburgs again conquered the new nation. That spirit did not die. The spirit of Louis Kossuth and the patriots of 1848 lives on today in the Hungarian people. We must not allow it to die, though the Communists would seek to exterminate it.

On March 15, 1956, the Hungarian people should know that the American people share with them that love of independence. We fought for and gained our independence as a Nation from a foreign ruler. We can understand and sympathize with a people in their yearning to free from foreign oppression.

On this day of anniversary of their independence, the Hungarian people should know that the American people will never accept the obliteration of Hungary as an independent nation. We exhort them to look forward to the day when another patriot like Louis Kossuth will again stir the spirit of freedom in Hungary.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, earlier in the evening the Senate agreed to an amendment providing that the Commodity Credit Corporation would have permission, under certain circumstances, to give food in any amount to the Federal penitentiaries and reform schools.

I offered the amendment at the time it was considered. I did not mention that the cosponsor of the amendment was the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. The junior Senator from Maryland, back in January, introduced Senate bill 2819 on the same subject.

I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Maryland may join with me as a cosponsor of the amendment which was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday, by a voice vote, the Senate adopted an amendment to title VII of S. 3183, to provide for a miscellaneous survey of the existing system of grading meat.

Today I was interviewed by a representative of the so-called small packers, who explained to me that, in their opinion, the amendment amounts to a big packers' amendment; that it really is aimed at denying to the meat consumers of America the protection of Federal grading.

Because I think something ought to be in the RECORD in regard to the amendment, so that it can be considered in conference, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a very brief argument of two pages which I have prepared in opposition to the amendment which was agreed to yesterday afternoon, and based upon the information which was given to me today by a representative of the small packers.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

FACTS OPPOSING S. 3183

I. What is this amendment?

The overt intent of this seemingly innocuous amendment is to imply that no research is being done on the impact and effects of Federal grading and to give the impression that this is an important reason for the present low level of prices for cattle. A great deal of research is being done as is pointed out below. It is a problem, but it will not be resolved by placing a rider on a major piece of agricultural legislation. The real intent of the rider is to gain support for the abolishment of the Federal grading.

II. Economic pressure behind amendment

This bill is a part of the American Meat Institute program to kill Federal grading of meats. Roscoe Haney, Washington representative of Wilson & Co., was appointed by the big packers to lead the "Abolish Federal Grading" movement. Aled Davies, Washington staff representative of AMI, formerly WOC, served at a desk in Secretary Benson's office from 1952 to 1954 without pay in an advisory capacity on livestock and meats, is the coleader of the attack against the Federal grading of meat.

III. Economic opposition against this amendment

The two most vocal organizations against this amendment are NIMPA, National Independent Meat Packers Association and WSMPA, Western States Meat Packers Association. These associations represent small packers' interests as opposed to the interests of big packers. They are represented in Washington by Killick and Blaine Lillienquist, respectively.

IV. Divided interests

Livestock producer groups may be or may not be supporting this amendment. Many of them have been sold a bill of goods by the big packers, but there is no basis for believing that many producers or their leaders have a factual understanding of the impact of Federal grading on the pricing of livestock and the price structure of meats and meat products. However, the American National Cattleman's Association is favorable to Federal grades. At their last annual meeting in New Orleans they arranged for a debate at which Forbes of WSMPA put forth a strong prograding statement.

V. What research is being done

Under title II and other Federal grants, 11 land grant colleges are doing intensive research on consumer preferences for beef. Consumer preference studies can only be studies of consumer preference for different qualities of meat; i. e., Prime, Choice, Good, Commercial, etc. The amount being spent during 1955–56 will approximate $125,000. The amount should be substantially increased in fiscal 1956–57 because land-grant colleges in the South are developing projects

in this area. Some of the States which are now carrying on research are Texas, Arizona, California, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming, Colorado, Missouri, and Louisiana. AMS has planned an initial expenditure of $50,000 of marketing research funds on the economic impact of Federal beef grading on producers and consumers and the meat industry. As a part of this project a $15,000 contract has been negotiated with Babson Institute which awaits final signature. It may seem doubtful that much more additional money can effectively be spent for research on this subject until present efforts bear some fruit.

VI. Why this amendment?

The big packers have had knowledge for some time that the USDA is initiating a study of grading. It is plausible that they fear that unbiased professional opinion based upon a study of the available facts will conclude that Federal grading is beneficial to consumers and producers alike.

Why the clause "and in the course of such study shall use the services and facilities of land grant colleges wherever practicable."? It may be that it is the purpose of the sponsors of this amendment that the Secretary of Agriculture should make arrangements with a land grant college where they hope that some of the staff might be subject to the point of view of the big packers.

I fear that the real purpose of the amendment is to deny to the meat consumers of America the protection that goes along with Federal grading of meat. The Department of Agriculture owes it to the American people to support a Federal meat-grading program and I submit that it has all of the facts that it needs on the basis of research already done on this subject. The amendment was a mistake and I hope it will be eliminated in conference.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with and join in the statement which has just been made by the senior Senator from Oregon, concerning the so-called meat packers amendment, which was included as an amendment to the farm bill yesterday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate were unable to be present this afternoon when some important yea-and-nay votes were taken.

I wish to announce for the information of all Senators, so that they may make their plans accordingly, that it is planned to make every effort possible to complete action on the farm bill tomorrow. The Senate will convene at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning and will continue in session until at least 10 o'clock tomorrow evening, if there is any hope of finishing the bill by tomorrow night—and there appears to be some likelihood of doing so.

I hope Senators will make their plans so as to enable them to be present and to cast their votes on the important issues. There is no more important bill before Congress than the farm bill. The Senate has been debating it for several weeks. I hope we may complete action on it this week. If not, we shall continue the consideration of the bill next week and remain on the bill until action on it has been finished.

In an attempt to get the business of the Senate under way and concluded by tomorrow, we will convene tomorrow at an unusual hour in the morning. I hope Senators will restrain themselves from discussing at length every possible amendment that might be offered to the end that the Senate might finally come to the vote on final passage.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to join in the statement made by the majority leader, and express the hope that Senators on both sides who may wish to complete action on the bill tomorrow will remain in reasonably close proximity of the Senate Chamber, so that if there are quorum calls, we shall not use too much time in obtaining a quorum. I think, with the cooperation of all Senators, we should be able to complete action on the bill tomorrow. I certainly join in the hope of the majority leader that we may conclude action on it then.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate what the distinguished minority leader has just said. I meant absolutely no criticism of the minority Members for not being in close proximity to the Chamber. As a matter of fact, one of the things I am critical of is that they were in too close proximity to the Chamber. I had in mind that some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle should have been in closer proximity to the Chamber than they were.

Mr. President, if there is no further——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make an inquiry as to whether a motion to reconsider the vote by which there was rejected my amendment in regard to the elimination of a 15-percent State contribution for seed and feed would be in order tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the motion would be in order if the motion were made by a Senator who had voted on the prevailing side or who did not vote.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would a motion to lay that motion on the table be in order at that time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to reconsider is privileged, and a motion to lay on the table would not be in order until the motion to reconsider was made.

Mr. KNOWLAND. At the present time the Senator from Oregon is merely giving notice that he is going to move to reconsider, but at the time he moves to reconsider, a motion to lay on the table will be in order, will it not? In other words, the motion will have to be made by a Senator on the prevailing side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Or by a Senator who did not vote. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if such a motion were made, of course a motion to lay on the table would be in order, would it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point is, there would first have to be a motion to reconsider, before a motion to lay on the table would be in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We understand that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is a Senator who did not vote on the prevailing side required to give notice on the question of the motion to reconsider?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from California will yield to me for a moment, I merely wish to say I do not like to see my friend from California in error. I am sure he does not want to put words in my mouth. I have not given any notice of anything. I made a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There was a slight amount of confusion in the Chamber. I thought we would either compound the confusion or clarify the situation.

Mr. MORSE. All I did was make a parliamentary inquiry. I only wish to point out that what I tried to do by my amendment was put to work a principle of Christianity. After my colleagues sleep on it, I think they will be more in agreement with my view.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I do not have the floor. The Senator from California has the floor, I believe.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think our friend is going on the principle of "convince if you can; if you can't, confuse."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I express the hope we can complete action on the bill tomorrow. I do not know how many contentious amendments remain. As a matter of fact, about 2 or 3 hours ago I felt the Senate would conclude action on the bill tonight. I learned that one amendment which would have consumed much time and have required quite a bit of debate would not be called up. Of course, the Senators who told me that may change their minds.

The pending amendment may consume a little time.

Then, I understand my good friend from Florida has an amendment that may cause a little debate. A I understand his amendment, it is to make the soil-bank program more or less compulsory.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe we can complete consideration of that amendment in a fairly short period of time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know of any other controversial amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have the floor. I shall yield to the Senator from Florida as soon as the Senator from Louisiana concludes his statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know of any other contentious amendments. If the Senate meets at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, and if the Democrats will stay as close to base as have the Republicans this evening, we may be able to conclude action on the bill in a short time. I express the hope that we can get together and can conclude action on the bill tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Now I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the first place, so far as the amendment of the Senator from Florida is concerned, it will take but a few minutes to explain the amendment, and then I shall be perfectly willing to abide by the judgment of the Senate.

The Senator from Louisiana is a little in error in interpreting my amendment. It has no bearing on the acreage reserve. It relates solely to conservation acreage. It does not involve any reduction of allotted acreage. I think the amendment would help do the thing that has been mentioned several times tonight, that is, place greater emphasis on the conservation-reserve program. I simply wanted the Senator to know that my amendment does not propose to write compulsion into the acreage-reserve program.

Mr. ELLENDER. If I said acreage reserve, I meant conservation reserve.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator said soil-bank program. I was sure the Senator would not mind my correcting his statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, indeed. It was my error.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

LOWER LABOR COST AND HIGHER PRICES OF FARM EQUIPMENT—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition signed by sundry citizens of the State of Minnesota, praying for an investigation of the spread between lower per-unit labor cost and higher prices of farm equipment.

There being no objection, the petition, without the signatures attached, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the HONORABLE SENATORS PAUL H. DOUGLAS AND WILLIAM LANGER, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Whereas propagandists have blamed higher prices of farm equipment to high labor costs and thus tried to turn farmers against town and city workers; and

Whereas the per-unit labor costs of making farm equipment is decreasing due to the increased productivity of farm equipment workers; and

Whereas in spite of lower per-unit costs, John Deere & Co. and other companies have steadily raised prices of farm equipment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the undersigned, respectfully urge that the Congress of the United States investigate the spread between lower per-unit labor cost and higher prices of farm equipment.

(Signed by Lee G. Stevenson and 81 other citizens of the State of Minnesota.)

PREPAYMENT FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE DUE THE GOVERNMENT THROUGH BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition signed by sundry citizens of Stanton, N. Dak., favoring the postponement of the prepayment for operation and maintenance due the Government through the Bureau of Reclamation, in connection with the Fort Clark irrigation project.

There being no objection, the petition, without the signatures attached, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the undersigned landowners owning land and residing in the Fort Clark Irrigation District in Mercer and Oliver Counties, N. Dak., respectfully petition our delegates in Congress that every effort be made by our congressional delegates to postpone the prepayment for operation and maintenance due the Government through the Bureau of Reclamation in connection with the Fort Clark irrigation project. We further petition that the prepayment development period be extended for a 5-year period for the reason that the undersigned have not as yet had adequate benefit from the project to aid them in the prepayment of the operation and maintenance payments. That the undersigned petitioners further feel that they are unable to at this time make the payments that are due under the contract entered into by the United States Government through the Bureau of Reclamation and that they repectfully request that the operation and maintenance payments be extended until such time that the undersigned landowners receive benefits from the irrigation project which will make it possible for them to make the payments.

RESOLUTION OF FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE WAR VETERANS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the national convention of Federal Civil Service War Veterans, at Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to amend the Veterans' Preference Act to give the veteran the right to appeal a regional board's decision.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Veterans' Preference Act gives a veteran dismissed from the Federal civil service the right to appeal to the regional Civil Service Commission; and

Whereas the same act gives both the Government agency and the veteran the right to appeal the decision to the United States Civil Service Commission; and

Whereas the Post Office Department as a matter of policy is appealing all decisions not in their favor; and

Whereas most of these appeals are unwarranted and based on very weak and spurious evidence, and would not be permitted under civil law, as they constitute only vexatious delay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federal Civil Service War Veterans, in national convention assembled, in Chicago, Ill., January 20, 1956, petition the Congress of the United States to amend the Veterans' Preference Act to give only the veteran the right to appeal the regional board decision; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of the House and Senate, Post Office and Civil Service Committees for consideration and action.

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Minnesota Highway No. 2 Association urging that United States Highway No. 2 be included in the National System of Interstate Highways.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

MINNESOTA U. S. HIGHWAY NO. 2 ASSOCIATION,
Bemidji, Minn., February 29, 1956.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: Following is a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Minnesota Highway No. 2 Association at a meeting held at Bemidji, Minn., on February 27, 1956. The Minnesota Highway No. 2 Association represents 14 Minnesota cities situated on Highway 2 from Duluth on the east to East Grand Forks on the west:

"Whereas United States Highway No. 2 is a vital link between the port of Duluth-Superior and the timber, agricultural, and mineral resources of Minnesota, North Dakota, and Montana; and

"Whereas the projected St. Lawrence Seaway development will, in the near future, make United States Highway No. 2 an even more important artery of commerce; and

"Whereas a new bridge spanning the Straits of Mackinac, to be completed in 1957, will funnel increased traffic from United States Highways 31, 131, 27, and 23 to United States No. 2; and

"Whereas vital Air Force bases will soon be in operation at Duluth, Grand Forks, Minot and Glasgow, along with strategically located radar installations at numerous points on or adjacent to Highway 2; and

"Whereas United States Highway No. 2 is used most extensively by Canadians both for commercial purposes and for touring, with great profit accruing to United States towns and cities along the route; and

"Whereas United States Highway No. 2 is the northernmost highway spanning the United States from the vital ship canal at Sault St. Marie, Mich., to Everest, Wash., and thus is of great potential, strategic military importance: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That because of its importance to the upper Midwest economy, its importance as a vital link between airbases and other military installations and its potential as a military highway in time of war, its use by Canadians and the resulting furtherance of United States 'good neighbor' policy, its potential as a feeder highway to the Great Lakes ports when the St. Lawrence Seaway project is completed, United States Highway No. 2 should be included in the National System of Interstate Highways. We hereby petition the Bureau of Public Roads and the Congress of the United States to give serious consideration to the inclusion of Highway No. 2 into the interstate system."

Respectfully,

CHESTER T. BERG,
Secretary, Minnesota Highway No. 2 Association.

PRESERVATION OF ROADLESS AREA OF SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST—TELEGRAMS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, three telegrams that I have received from Harry Frank, vice president of the Minnesota division of the Izaak Walton League; the Minnehaha Chapter of the Izaak Walton League, and W. H. Rabe, chairman of the natural resources

committee of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, supporting S. 2967, the bill I have cosponsored to assure preservation of the roadless area of Superior National Forest.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

HIBBING, MINN., *March 7, 1956.*
Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office, Washington, D. C.:
Northern Minnesota area Izaak Walton League of America asks your support of Senate bill 2967.

HARRY FRANK,
Vice President, Minnesota Division.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 6, 1956.*
Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We strongly endorse passage of Senate bill 2967 and companion House bill 8785 for increasing funds and enlarging purchase area of remaining private lands in roadless area of Superior National Forest. This action imperative for continued protection in line with our long-established policy.

W. H. RABE,
Chairman, Natural Resources Committee, Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 6, 1956.*
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We strongly urge favorable action on Senate bill 2967 and the appropriation of $2,500,000 for acquisition of lands in the roadless area. We support this legislation to extend the Thye-Blatnick Act of 1948 to assure preservation of the roadless area of Superior National Forest.

MINNEHAHA CHAPTER, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE.
STAR HAY, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTIONS OF RED WING FARMERS UNION, LOCAL 160, RED WING, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a number of resolutions adopted by the Red Wing Farmers Union, Local No. 160, at a recent meeting, at Red Wing, Minn.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 2, 1956.
The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We the members and officers of the Red Wing Farmers Union, Local No. 160, ask you to consider the following resolutions adopted at a recent meeting:

"*Resolved*—

"1. That this group stands unanimously in favor of 90 percent of parity on most all farm products. The present farm bill (S. 3183) is inadequate to meet the needs of the farmer.

"2. That no imports be allowed on any farm commodity on which there is a surplus.

"3. That a system of crop allotments and acreage (or bushelage) control be set up with direct cash subsidy to the farmer.

"4. That we are in favor of a food-stamp plan for the underprivileged and low-income groups.

"5. That the Commodity Credit Corporation hire a sales manager and a sales force and put some of the accumulated surplus on the world market.

"6. That a 1- to 5-cent subsidy be paid on hogs of 150 to 200 pounds weight and that a scale be arranged whereby a higher subsidy be paid on the lighter hogs.

"7. That a similar subsidy (like that to be paid on hogs) be paid on lightweight cattle with a much higher rate on calves.

"8. That we favor 90 percent of parity on dairy products with the surplus being processed and distributed to all the schools.

"9. That we favor a world food pool wherein the world's starving millions may have access to our abundant food surplus.

"10. That all woolen clothing be made of new wool and that used wool, reprocessed, renovated, shoddy wool, dead wool, or a mixture of wool, rabbit hair, goat hair, or any other foreign substances be not allowed on the market.

"11. That the postage on newspapers, magazines, and advertising matter be raised high enough to pay the cost of delivery."

LAVERNE JARSLOW, *President.*
HENRY PUPPE, *Vice President.*
JAMES HALVERSON, *Secretary.*
CHAS. W. HAYMAN.
ERVIN FITSCHER.
Mrs. LORENA GROSSE.
HARRY GROSSE.

RESOLUTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF BOILERMAKERS, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, two resolutions adopted by the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers, Lodge No. 647, of Minneapolis, Minn.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Whereas, the purpose of the Davis-Bacon Act, passed in 1931, is to insure against the Federal Government becoming a party to the breaking down of established and prevailing wage rates in any locality, and

Whereas, it is a long-established principle that the Government should not use its tremendous purchasing and regulatory power in such a way as to undercut and depress wages anywhere, and

Whereas, in both direct and indirect spending, and through new forms of Federal guaranty and assistance, the Federal Government is underwriting the success of construction and therefore has the responsibility to see that taxpayer's money is not used to undermine existing labor standards arrived at through collective bargaining, and

Whereas, the Davis-Bacon Act is no longer adequate to accomplish the original purpose because of the emergence of payments other than direct wages, in the form of welfare and retirement plans, and other indirect benefits: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers, Lodge No. 647 of Minneapolis, Minn., in regular meeting assembled this 2d day of March 1956, go on record in favor of amending the Davis-Bacon Act in four major respects, as follows:

1. Insure that the Federal Government shall in no way—directly or indirectly—become a party to or lend itself toward the breaking down of existing and prevailing wages, hours of work, health, welfare, retirement benefits, overtime payments, or any other forms of remuneration or working conditions which have been privately negotiated between contractors and construction craft unions.

2. Correct existing inequities of the Davis-Bacon Act and the prevailing wage provisions of various Federal construction laws.

3. Confer full enforcement authority upon the Secretary of Labor.

4. Eliminate existing unfair bidding advantage of open-shop and nonunion contractors over fair contractors on direct Federal construction and federally assisted construction projects.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the Minnesota Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress, and to the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers of Kansas City, Kans.

Whereas the Taft-Hartley law has proved to be unworkable in the building and construction industry, especially in regard to the provisions of the law relating to secondary boycotts, certification elections, State open-shop laws, and mandatory injunctions; and

Whereas either a separate Federal law or a separate title to the Taft-Hartley Act is needed to govern labor-management relations in the building and construction industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers, and Helpers, Lodge No. 647, of Minneapolis, Minn., in regular meeting assembled this 2d day of March 1956, go on record as in favor of four major amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, as follows:

1. Make the present secondary boycott provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act inapplicable to building trades workers;

2. Give legality to the customary and long-established contractor-union prehire contracts and union employee referral practice on a nondiscriminatory basis, and permitting contract provisions relating to apprenticeship, experience qualifications, and employment seniority;

3. Repeal provisions which give precedence to State open-shop laws over Taft-Hartley permissive union shop provisions;

4. Eliminate the mandatory injunction provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the Minnesota Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress, and to the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers, and Helpers of Kansas City, Kans.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

The following additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 3459. A bill for the relief of Mary Barme and her two minor children, Steran Barme and Dinah Barme; and

S. 3460. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear and determine the claim of Richard C. Cleveland under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WELKER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to

the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ANDERSON submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF EXISTING CORPORATE NORMAL-TAX AND CERTAIN EXCISE-TAX RATES — AMENDMENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BEALL, Mr. DUFF, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. DOUGLAS) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 9166) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. FREAR, Mr. BEALL, Mr. DUFF, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. HUMPHREY) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them jointly to House bill 9166, supra, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, March 16, 1956, at 10 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 15 (legislative day of March 13, 1956):

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Laurence Walrath, of Florida, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1956.

Donald P. McPherson, of Pennsylvania, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1962.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following persons for promotions to the permanent rank, as indicated:

To be rear admirals

Kenneth K. Cowart
Harold C. Moore
Henry T. Jewell
Donald E. McKay
Edwin J. Roland

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named persons for permanent appointment to the grade indicated:

To be commissioned ensign

Albert Larsen, Jr., effective March 1, 1956.
Charles I. Harding.
Leroy W. Heilmann.
Oliver J. Weber.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, with a humble spirit and a contrite heart we are now imploring Thee for wisdom and guidance as we face the tasks of this new day.

Inspire us to believe that as our days so also shall be our strength and that no good thing wilt Thou withhold from those who walk uprightly.

Give us patience and perseverance, courage and confidence, and may we never turn coward before any of life's difficulties or recreant to any of its duties.

Bless our Congress and all councils and assemblies which are seeking to promote the spirit of concord and amity among the nations of the earth.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 13, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On February 18, 1956:

H. R. 5870. An act for the relief of Jesajahu Braun; and

H. R. 7197. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Christine Dowdy.

On February 20, 1956:

H. R. 2667. An act to amend section 208 (b) of the Technical Changes Act of 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6043. An act to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy;

H. R. 6790. An act for the relief of Anna K. McQuilkin;

H. R. 6857. An act to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to convey certain land to the city of Milwaukee, Wis.;

H. R. 7054. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers; and

H. R. 7156. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Board of County Commissioners of Lee County, Fla.

On February 25, 1956:

H. J. Res. 526. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove officers and committees from certain limitations, and for other purposes.

On February 27, 1956:

H. R. 8787. An act to provide for a prorated stationery allowance in the case of a Member of the House of Representatives elected for a portion of a term; and

H. R. 8796. An act to increase the amount of telephone and telegraph service furnished to Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

On March 1, 1956:

H. R. 1887. An act for the relief of Dr. Tsi Au Li (Tsi Gziou Li); and

H. R. 8101. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to give 25 World War II paintings to the Government of New Zealand.

On March 2, 1956:

H. R. 2430. An act to release certain restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, S. C., by the United States of America;

H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution relating to burley tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas;

H. J. Res. 518. Joint resolution relating to fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas; and

H. J. Res. 521. Joint resolution relating to Maryland tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

On March 13, 1956:

H. R. 7201. An act relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1956

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, by order of the Committee on Appropriations, I present a resolution (H. J. Res. 582) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1956, and for other purposes, with a report thereon (Rept. No. 1880), and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Rhode Island please explain what is involved in this resolution?

Mr. FOGARTY. This resolution appropriates $13 million additional to the Department of Labor for grants to States for unemployment compensation for Federal employees.

The Bureau of the Budget sent up an advance copy of the formal request yesterday and just today we received the signed copy which says the Department will be out of funds before the end of the month. I understand that it actually will be next week. So it is quite urgent that we take action now to make funds available to meet the Federal Government's obligations.

In order that the RECORD may be complete, I will insert the committee's rather brief report on this joint resolution at this point:

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred House Joint Resolution No. 582, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the joint resolution be agreed to.

This resolution provides $13 million for payment of claims of unemployed former Federal employees as provided for by Title XV of the Social Security Act. This amount is the exact amount of the requests contained in House Document 330 and the letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to the President reproduced below. The

amount recommended herein would bring to a total of $33 million the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1956. These funds are solely for the payment of claims; no funds are included for administrative expenses.

The necessity for bringing this matter before the House on an emergency basis is due to the fact that the Bureau of the Budget advised the committee only yesterday that funds for this purpose would be depleted shortly after the middle of March. The Director's letter to the President on this subject follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $3 million for the Department of Labor, as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

"Bureau of Employment Security

"Unemployment compensation for Federal employees

"For an additional amount for 'Unemployment compensation for Federal employees,' $3 million, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Unemployment compensation for veterans,' fiscal year 1956."

This sum is in addition to the earlier proposed supplemental appropriation of $10 million which was included in House Document 330, 84th Congress, to provide for unemployment compensation benefit payments for former Federal employees.

This added $3 million is needed because the recent increased level of benefit payments indicates that an additional $13 million, over the current appropriation of $20 million, will be required. Furthermore the current rate of benefit payments indicates the necessity for making additional funds available as soon as possible to avoid a gap in the payments to which former Federal employees are entitled by law. The existing funds will be exhausted shortly after the middle of March.

This proposed supplemental appropriation was not included in the budget because the increased level was not experienced until after the budget had been prepared.

I recommend that the foregoing proposed supplemental appropriation be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

ROWLAND HUGHES,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The estimate for this program has been thoroughly confused from the beginning. The President's budget contained an estimate that an additional amount of $13 million would be required. When the Secretary of Labor appeared before the committee late in January with regard to the 1957 budget requests, he made it a point to tell the committee that only $10 million additional will be required. On March 6, only 9 days ago, the Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor testified that $10 million would be sufficient as nearly as could be determined. Now after hearings have been concluded, the Bureau of the Budget has requested an additional $3 million, bringing the total right back where it started from.

While this confusion is disturbing, the committee is utterly amazed that it is not until this late date that those who should be the most expert budget people in the executive branch, have determined that these funds will be exhausted well before the end of the month. The fact remains, however, that these payments are required by law and so the committee is following the only logical course open to it and is recommending this emergency action in order that the legal responsibilities of the Federal Government may be met.

We were a little critical of the manner in which this has been handled, but to say there has been confusion is putting it mildly. I might call attention to the fact that the Bureau of the Budget was still confused when they wrote the letter that is quoted in our report. In the next to the last paragraph they say that the $13 million estimate was not in the budget because of developments since the budget was prepared. The fact is that the budget did include this exact amount of $13 million. It appears on page 866. But evidently in fooling around with this estimate during the last few months they forgot where they started from.

But, in a way, that is beside the point. It is a well-established fact that the States are going to be out of funds to pay legitimate claims, as provided by law, in a matter of days. So I think it is now up to us to provide these funds as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. TABER. And this money, as I understand, is taken from a previous appropriation that is not going to be used?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, the following sum:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Unemployment compensation for Federal employees

For an additional amount for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees", $13 million, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Unemployment compensation for veterans," fiscal year 1956.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the second supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1956.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 9064, an act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. GRAY, PASSMAN, SIEMINSKI, MURRAY of Illinois, CANNON, CANFIELD, WILSON of Indiana, JAMES, and TABER.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1957.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana reserved all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may be permitted to sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 428, Rept. No. 1881), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question

shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING SECTION 5420 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 429, Rept. No. 1882), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1188) to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING SECTION 5146 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 430, Rept. No. 1883), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1736) to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING SECTION 14 (b) OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 431, Rept. No. 1884), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9285) to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, so as to extend for 2 additional years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING ACT OF JULY 1, 1947, TO GRANT MILITARY LEAVE OF ABSENCE WITH PAY TO CLASSIFIED SUBSTITUTE CLERKS, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 432, Rept. No. 1885), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3744) to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to classified substitute clerks in the field service of the Post Office Department. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider today the rule just filed for the consideration of H. R. 3744.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7030) to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the same bill about which I called the gentleman yesterday and which the House passed last July?

Mr. COOLEY. It is.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And which the Senate passed on February 8. The Senate appointed conferees on February 8. Now as a result, I hope, of my telephone call of yesterday, the gentleman now is condescending to conferees being appointed so that we can consider this important legislation?

Mr. COOLEY. May I say to my friend that I am very grateful to him for his keen interest in this legislation and by way of explaining to the House the delay in appointing the conferees, I should like to say the fact is that the Senate and every member thereof has been constantly busy every day considering the farm bill which is now being debated in the Senate. While I am addressing myself to the gentleman's remarks and to the House may I observe, too, that we have another conference committee which was appointed some time ago dealing with another problem in which many Members of the House are intensely interested. That is, providing additional money for milk for the school-lunch program and for the brucellosis program, which bill was passed some time ago, and on which we expect to have a conference this afternoon.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am delighted to know that because when the legislation passed the House on July 30 last year the gentleman said:

> It is of far-reaching importance because it affects people in far distant places and it vitally affects every one of your constituents.

The people in my district have about reached the beet-planting time, and they are wondering whether they are going to get any legislation. I hope the gentleman will sort of yield a little bit to the other body and accept their amendments which are a little bit more liberal, and gives the domestic beetgrowers 55 percent instead of 50 percent, as did the House version.

Mr. COOLEY. The reason I mentioned the dairy situation was to indicate to the House that although we have been trying diligently to arrange a conference with the members of the Senate committee, we have not been able to do so. But, we will meet at 3 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I know they have been busy, but I have been in conference on another bill with Members of the other body, and they have been very diligent on naming conferees and holding meetings. I think really it is important, Mr. Speaker. Since February 8 a lot of water has run under the bridge.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, the gentleman is certainly aware of the fact that the House committee reported the sugar bill in the last session of the Congress and the House of Representatives passed the bill in the last session of the Congress. So, certainly we have been diligent.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But the other body passed on it February 8 and appointed conferees, and not until this morning did the gentleman take the notion to have conferees appointed.

Mr. COOLEY. Probably the gentleman from Nebraska used great persuasion with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And when the agriculture bill comes over from the other body, I hope the gentleman will

permit me to remind him that we are anxious to get a conference on this side of the aisle and sort of get going on the bill. Let us have less foot dragging on these bills affecting agriculture.

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words more to urge speed in completing action on the Sugar Act, H. R. 7030. It is important to the people in my district to have this legislation passed quickly. The Senate appointed conferees more than a month ago. The House has not named any yet. The House has already delayed action too long on this matter. I have had letters from the people in my district who plant sugar beets, wanting to know when the bill will be passed. We have a fine large sugar refinery plant in Nyssa, Oreg., one of the most modern ones in the country.

Sugar beet is one of the most important crops to the farmers of Malheur County in which it is located. In fairness to them, and to sugar beet growers in other counties in my district, we should settle this important matter at once, so that they can know what to plan on in the matter of increased plantings. April is planting time for them, so if this matter drags along much longer, it will be too late to do them any good this year. They can certainly use the extra income from the additional plantings to which they would be entitled under this bill. When we have important legislation like this before the House, we do not want to see anyone delaying; we want action and we want it quickly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am very glad to note that conferees will now be appointed on the sugar bill, but I do want to mention the so-called dairy or milk bill which our committee reported as an emergency measure and which went to the Senate and was amended and came back to the House, and now a conference will be held this afternoon at 3 o'clock on that bill. But, I would like the gentleman's opinion on the aspects of the Senate amendments. The gentleman will recollect that the bill which passed the House contained two provisions: one was to continue the surplus milk program for school lunches and the brucellosis program up to June 30. The Senate amended the bill, including the other provisions which are now contained in the bill for a period of 2 years. That took in the school milk program for school lunches, the continuation of the brucellosis program, providing the armed services with Government dairy surplus products and also veterans' hospitals, and also certain other provisions. Now, as the gentleman knows, when that bill came back from the Senate, I suggested to him that we in the House should concur in the Senate amendments, and that is still my opinion. But, the bill went to conference. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not the majority conferees, since he is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, would be willing to continue or agree in the conference that we should accept the Senate amendments on the provisions of law heretofore enacted.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's remarks, but I do want to observe that there is at least one amendment in the Senate version of this bill about which there is some controversy. I understand that the Department of Agriculture feels it would be almost impossible to administer the program for the purposes set forth in the Senate amendments. But, it is an important matter, and I am sure the gentleman realizes that it is necessary for the conferees to try to reach an agreement upon a bill which can be properly administered by the Department of Agriculture. I have particular reference to the section that provides for milk to be made available in nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions. You can see the difficulties that the administrators would have in administering a bill that is as broad and comprehensive as this.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with the gentleman on those provisions.

Mr. COOLEY. The provisions that were in the bill when it left the House, of course, would be acceptable to the House conferees, I am sure. I have been advised that the Senate will recede on these amendments to which I have just referred, so we should have an agreement soon.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to have that assurance from the chairman of our committee, who will be chairman of the conference committee, so that we may pass the word out here today that we will soon reach an agreement—I hope this afternoon—so that this bill can be enacted into law next week, and get it on the way to the White House.

Mr. COOLEY. We shall certainly consider the matter just as expeditiously as circumstances will permit and I hope we can reach an agreement very early.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman see any obstacles in the way, outside of the one he has mentioned?

Mr. COOLEY. Personally I do not see any, but I have no reason to try to bind my colleagues who will be with us at 3 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I shall be there at 3 and hope to do my part in the conference. There are many here in the House who are interested in this program. It is nationwide. The schoolchildren of the country are getting the benefit of it and we want it expanded to all American schoolchildren.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. When the gentleman refers to these two worthwhile provisions, the gentleman is talking about provisions that originated in the House Committee on Agriculture; that is the brucellosis program and fluid milk for the school-lunch program.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman will remember, too, that the gentleman who is now addressing him offered those amendments.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was just getting ready to compliment the gentleman for having such foresight and vision.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in order that we may understand the situation, I should like to address a question to the chairman of the managers on the part of the House on H. R. 8320. Do I understand that it is the gentleman's position that he now has no objection to retaining the Senate amendments in the bill relating to the 2-year extension of the milk program and of the brucellosis-eradication program?

Mr. COOLEY. No; the gentleman misunderstood me if he understood me to say that. We reported the bill, and it passed the House as an emergency measure. I understand the Senate, after reflection, will probably agree to recede and accept the House bill as it was presented to the Senate. It was an emergency measure.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. May I ask the gentleman if there is any reason to believe that there is any controversy over the question whether these two programs, the milk program for our schoolchildren, and the brucellosis-eradication program, should be extended for 2 years beyond June 30, 1956, when it expires? Is there any disagreement within the committee on that?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know about any disagreement within the committee on it, but the gentleman knows that this bill we are talking about was an emergency bill. I assume that the gentleman and all others interested are anxious to secure the passage of this bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I might say to the chairman of the conference committee that we are also anxious to have the extension of these two programs for 2 years which are important to our children and to the health of this country. We do not want this matter tied up in a bill whose future is most uncertain. We have got this issue before us. We have got it before the House in H. R. 8320. Why can we not accept the amendments that give the 2-year extensions for these two vital programs—that is what I want to ask the chairman—and not get involved in other legislation?

I could continue further, Mr. Speaker. I think an erroneous impression has been given to the Senate. I hope every Member of this House will read the Senate debate of yesterday afternoon on this matter. There the impression was given that the House of Representatives refuses to provide for the extension of these two programs at this time and will, in fact, even permit the emergency aspect of the program for this fiscal year to expire rather than grant the extension.

I would refer the gentleman to various remarks that were made; in fact, remarks made by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, where he says he had gained the impression from talking to somebody in this House that unless the Senate agrees to let the

long-range program, namely, the extension, be settled in the future as part of the consideration of the general farm bill, "we shall not, in my humble judgment, be able to get the House to provide funds for the remainder of this fiscal year."

I do not think that represents the views of the Members of this House. I think that if the question were put to this House as to whether they would want to vote for a 2-year extension of these programs they would practically unanimously vote for the extension. I know of very few Members who would say they want to kill these two very vital and important programs on June 30 of this year.

Mr. COOLEY. I assume the gentleman is anxious for money to be provided so that the needs may be met from now on to the end of the current fiscal year. This bill provides that. If the Senate will recede, we can reach an agreement very quickly. The long-range idea is in another bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am equally concerned that we pass legislation this year extending the brucellosis eradication program and the school milk program. We can do that very simply if the managers on the part of the House will yield to the Senate on this provision. That was put in the House bill on the Senate side.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman want to leave the impression in the House that he is more vitally interested in these two provisions than the members of the committee, which uanimously reported it, and the House, which I believe unanimously passed it?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Then why not accept them?

Mr. COOLEY. These Members from Minnesota and others initiated this program. Certainly the gentleman from Wisconsin could not be any more vitally interested in the success of the program than these gentlemen or the other members of our committee. If you want to delay the passage of this bill, this is a good way to do it, but if you want it to go to conference at 3 o'clock there is a great probability we may reach an agreement before twilight today.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, no one claims to have a monopoly of the interest in the provisions of these two bills, but I think the gentleman from Wisconsin understands it is an emergency measure. The action that took place in the other body, in my opinion, possibly reflected the position that the Members of the House of Representatives are not for the 2-year extension. As far as I am concerned, I am for the 2-year extension. It can all be handled before April 1, when this matter will be running out, if the conferees agree to take a 2-year extension.

As far as I am concerned, since 20 days have elapsed, it would be possible under the rules to offer a motion to instruct the conferees to take the Senate bill. On the other hand, if the extension is taken out, which would give some substance at least to the proposition that we are not interested in the 2-year extension, or are not in favor of it, then certainly that conference report could be voted down and a motion made to instruct the conferees to take the 2-year extension. That would get the matter to the White House very quickly.

Mr. COOLEY. I suppose the gentleman has stated the parliamentary situation accurately. The thing we are trying to do now is to go to conference as soon as possible. We have a conference set for 3 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. HALLECK. I am very happy the conference has been set for 3 o'clock. I hope the conferees will take the 2-year extension because, as far as I am concerned, before the matter is finally concluded, I would like to go on record as being for the 2-year extension.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would like to address a question to the gentleman from North Carolina. Of course I do not feel I have any monopoly of interest as far as this matter is concerned. Most Members are interested in these programs and want the programs extended. They are interested in the emergency matter. That is to provide funds to carry the program beyond the first of next month. There is no doubt about it. But, they are also interested in the 2-year extension of this program. I am asking the gentleman why there should be any reluctance to giving that 2-year extension by agreeing to the Senate amendments at this time. Certainly, the other body is not going to oppose the House if the House says that we will recede and concur in those Senate amendments.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think the gentleman should attempt to put words in my mouth or give an erroneous interpretation of my remarks. I am in favor of this program and have voted for it every time it has been before our committee and every time it has been before the House. Why should the gentleman put me in the position of trying to speak for the House conferees who, while they have been appointed, have not even had their first meeting?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Would the House conferees feel better about this if they received instructions from the House generally, because certainly under the rules we have the privilege of making a motion to instruct the conferees with respect to these amendments—if that is what the gentleman desires?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the conferees are well aware of the views of the House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is not the impression that the Members of the other body have. They have given the other body the idea that this House is against the extension for 2 years at this time. I was just reading the Senate debate of yesterday.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not see how anybody could have such a false impression. The House passed the bill approving the program. I do not know that the matter was even debated—everybody accepted it.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I know that the gentleman is aware of the fact that unless we do get this bill enacted and signed by the President before April 1 that 12 States will not be allowed to continue the school-lunch program.

Mr. COOLEY. That is exactly what I am trying to do if we may go ahead with the pending request. I just made the announcement that we were going to meet this afternoon so the Members of the House will know that we will not delay in the matter unduly. The only reason we have not met heretofore is that although we have tried, we could not arrange a convenient time to meet.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, just so the gentleman from North Carolina will not misunderstand me, I am not at this time making any complaint about the delay. I made a complaint last Monday of the delay. That is not now the issue—I appreciate the fact that the conferees are going to meet this afternoon. I think that is splendid, but my concern at this particular time is that the conferees recognize that it is the will of the House that we accept that part of the Senate amendments relating to the 2-year extension of the brucellosis and the school-milk program.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a motion which is a preferential motion which would bring before the House the question and instruct the conferees to accept certain Senate amendments. I refrain somewhat, Mr. Speaker, from making the motion because the membership of the House itself has not had notice that this question would come up. I think if it were to come up, there should be a roll call vote on it. Let me say this to the gentleman: That to the extent that I, as one Member of the House can, if the conference committee comes back without that 2-year extension in the bill I am going to make every effort to have the House turn down the conference report and recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly, I would not ask the gentleman to forego any of his great powers and prerogatives to make any motion as he may desire to make.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the chairman if, realizing the urgency of the situation, could he not report back to the House either by Monday or Tuesday? At that time if there is not an agreement, the House could instruct the conferees. We need the legislation at an early date or the school-lunch milk program will be jeopardized in six States.

Mr. COOLEY. We will meet at 3 o'clock this afternoon. I will be delighted to report to the House the progress that is made in composing the differences between the two Houses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOLEY, POAGE, GATHINGS, ABERNETHY, HOPE, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and HILL.

PASSPORT PROCEDURES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill designed to amend the Administrative Procedure Act so as to provide for a special review procedure in cases where a United States citizen has been refused a passport, and to provide for mandatory refusal of passports to persons under Communist discipline.

As one of the co-authors of the Administrative Procedure Act, I very strongly believe in effective and fair procedures designed to provide for a review of administrative decisions. I have always felt that hearings and review procedures are essential for the preservation of our system of government. They are absolutely necessary now, in view of the ever growing power of the bureaucrats.

The bill which I introduced today is partially patterned on a procedure spelled out in section 235 (c) and section 242 (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the latter fully sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Carlos Marcello* v. *John M. Bonds* (350 U. S. 856 (1955)). The bill is drawn along the lines of the act of June 11, 1946, generally known as the Administrative Procedure Act and it is designed to fit into the structure of that law.

In full compliance with the due process clause of the Constitution and within a framework constructed by the Administrative Procedure Act, every citizen of the United States would have, under my proposal, his day in court. At the same time, however, the Nation's important secrets will not be divulged to the Communist conspiracy, certain recent court decisions notwithstanding.

While we are on the subject of those court decisions, I might add that I have read some of them with dismay. One cannot help but get the impression that some of our judges dwell in ivory towers with windows shut tight and shutters drawn, unable to see the mortal danger facing our freedom—the freedom which the law is designed to protect and not help to destroy.

Acting in perfect timing with external Soviet attack, the Communist conspiracy is out to destroy the internal security system of our country as well as that of every country still remaining on our side. In that endeavor, the Communist conspiracy is particularly anxious to establish the identity of those courageous undercover agents of our investigative organizations who have infiltrated the conspiracy, thus providing our security agencies with identities of at least some of the conspirators. More and more Communists and people under Communist discipline apply for passports knowing full well that the Secretary of State has the right—the duty, rather—to deny their applications. After denial, they take their cases to courts in order to break the doors to the secret files. There they want to find names of those who keep an eye on their activities. The success of this Communist plan has been greatly enhanced by some of the court decisions, holding that when the Secretary of State refuses to issue a passport to a Communist, he must disclose to the applicant the source of information which caused the refusal.

To abide by those court decisions would mean a fast and complete destruction of our entire security organization. The Congress should not permit that to happen. The very existence of the Nation is at stake.

A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act and the Communist Control Act of 1954 so as to provide for a passport review procedure and to prohibit the issuance of passports to persons under Communist discipline

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237; 5 U. S. C. 1001) is hereby amended by adding a new section entitled "Passport review procedure," to read as follows:

"PASSPORT REVIEW PROCEDURE

"SEC. 13. (a) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'applicant' means a citizen or national of the United States who has made application for a passport in accordance with section 1 of title IX of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 227; 22 U. S. C. 213).

"(2) the term 'special review officer' means any officer of the Department of State whom the Secretary of State deems specifically qualified to conduct proceedings, prescribed by this section and who is selected and designated by the Secretary of State, individually or by regulation, to conduct such proceedings. Such special review officer shall be subject to such supervision and shall perform such duties, not inconsistent with this section, as the Secretary of State shall prescribe.

"(b) Any applicant to whom the Secretary of State has refused to issue a passport, or to renew or extend a passport, may submit to the Secretary of State a timely motion in writing for a review before a special review officer, and any such applicant shall be advised of his right to make such motion.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of State to refer any motion for a review made under subsection (b) of this section to a special review officer. In any case in which the Secretary of State believes that such procedure would be of aid in making a determination, he may direct specifically or by regulation that an additional officer of the Department of State shall be assigned to present the evidence on behalf of the Government and in such case such additional officer shall have authority to present evidence, and to interrogate, examine, and cross-examine the applicant or the witnesses. Nothing in the preceding sentence shall be construed to diminish the authority conferred upon the special review officer conducting proceedings under this section.

"(d) A special review officer shall conduct proceedings under this section for the purpose of submitting to the Secretary of State a recommendation to issue, or to renew or extend a passport to the applicant, or a recommendation that such passport not be issued, or renewed or extended. In proceedings conducted under this section the special review officer may administer oaths, present and receive evidence, interrogate, examine, and cross-examine the applicant or witness. The special review officer shall communicate his recommendation to the Secretary of State with the least possible delay and the decision of the Secretary of State shall be final. Such decision shall be notified to the applicant by the Secretary of State in writing.

"(e) No special review officer shall conduct a proceeding in any case under this section in which he shall have participated in investigative functions or in which he shall have participated in the original refusal of the application for the issuance, or the renewal or extension of a passport.

"(f) Proceedings before a special review officer acting under the provisions of this section shall be in accordance with such regulations, not inconsistent with this section, as the Secretary of State shall prescribe, which regulations shall include requirements that—

"(1) the applicant shall be given notice, reasonable under all the circumstances, of the nature of the charges against him and of the time and place at which the proceedings will be held;

"(2) the applicant shall have the privilege of being advised, assisted or represented (at no expense to the Government) by counsel, authorized to practice in such proceedings;

"(3) the applicant shall have a reasonable opportunity to present all information relevant and material to the formulation of the special review officer's recommendation in his case. The applicant may address a request in writing to the special review officer for such additional information or explanation as may be necessary for the preparation of the hearing before the special review officer. The special review officer shall pass promptly and finally upon such request and advise the applicant of his decision;

"(4) the applicant may testify in his own behalf, present witnesses and offer other evidence. If any witness whom the applicant wishes to call is unable to appear personally, the special review officer may, in his discretion, accept an affidavit by him or order that his testimony be taken by deposition. Such deposition may be taken by any person designated by the special review officer and such designee shall be authorized to administer oaths for the purpose of the depositions;

"(5) a complete verbatim stenographic transcript shall be made of proceedings conducted under this section by qualified reporters, and such transcript shall constitute a permanent part of the record. Upon request the applicant or his counsel shall have the right to inspect the transcript, and each witness shall have the right to inspect the transcript of his own testimony; and

"(6) attendance at hearings under this section shall be restricted to such officers of the Department of State as may be concerned with the case under consideration, the applicant, his counsel, the witnesses, and the official stenographers. Witnesses shall be present at the hearing only while actually giving testimony.

"(g) Proceedings under this section shall be conducted in such manner as to protect from disclosure all information affecting the national security, safety, and public interest or the disclosure of investigative sources or investigative methods.

"(h) The files maintained by the Passport Office of the Department of State and any other pertinent Government files submitted to the special review officer shall be considered as part of the evidence in each case without testimony or a ruling as to admissibility. Such files may not be examined by the applicant.

"(i) It shall be the duty of the special review officer to insure the applicant of complete and fair consideration of his case. In determining whether there is a preponderance of evidence supporting the denial of a passport, or the denial to renew or extend a passport, the special review officer shall consider the entire record, including the transcript of the proceedings and such confidential information as he may have received. The special review officer shall take into consideration the inability of the applicant to challenge information of which he

has not been advised in full or in detail, or to attack the credibility of information which has not been disclosed to him. Formal rules of evidence shall not apply in proceedings under this section except that reasonable restrictions shall be imposed by the special review officer as to the relevancy, competency, and materiality of evidence introduced in the proceedings."

SEC. 2. The Communist Control Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 775; 50 U. S. C. 782) is hereby amended by adding the following:

"ISSUANCE OF PASSPORTS TO PERSONS UNDER COMMUNIST DISCIPLINE

"SEC. 13. It shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States to issue or to direct the issue of a passport to, or to renew or extend or to direct the renewal or extension of the passport of any person, if such officer or employee knows or has reason to believe such person to be under Communist discipline, or to be a substantial supporter of the Communist movement, or to be proposing to travel abroad for the purpose of engaging in activities which will contribute to strengthening the Communist movement.

"SEC. 14. For the purposes of section 13 of this act, any person shall be considered to be under Communist discipline or to be a substantial supporter of the Communist movement if such person—

"(a) is a member of the Communist Party or has terminated such membership under such circumstances as to warrant the conclusion, not ortherwise rebutted by evidence, that he continues to act in furtherance of the interests of the Communist Party; or

"(b) regardless of the formal state of his affiliation with the Communist Party, has engaged or engages in activities which support the Communist movement under such circumstances as to warrant the conclusion, not otherwise rebutted by evidence, that he has engaged or engages in activities as a result of direction, domination, or control exercised over him by the Communist movement; or

"(c) regardless of the formal state of his affiliation with the Communist Party, on the balance of available unrebutted evidence, is proceeding abroad to engage in activities which will advance the cause of the Communist movement; or

"(d) has, on the balance of available unrebutted evidence, consistently over an extensive period of time indicated through his actions that he adhered or adheres to the Communist doctrine as such doctrine is expressed in the Communist movement's actions and writings on a variety of issues, including shifts and changes in the Communist movement's doctrinal line.

"SEC. 15. Any person who is convicted of a violation of section 13 of this act shall be punished for each such violation by imprisonment for not more than 2 years or fined not more than $5,000, or by both such imprisonment and fine."

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MARCH 19

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma what the program will be for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, I am pleased to advise the House that the Consent Calendar will be called on Monday and also the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for 1957.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called. Likewise on Tuesday the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1956, and H. R. 9770, District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1956, will be taken up.

For the balance of the week, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday we have programed the bills S. 1271, appointment of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard; and S. 1272, appointment of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge; and S. 1188, dealing with the examination of national banks; S. 1736 regarding the qualifications of national bank directors; and H. R. 9285 to extend authority—direct purchases bill.

There are, of course, the customary reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman advise what the program will be for today?

Mr. ALBERT. The program for today includes House Resolution 376, Investigations, Committee on Veterans Affairs, and H. R. 7744, a bill to amend the act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to classified substitute personnel in the field service of the Post Office Department.

At 3 o'clock the Prime Minister of Ireland will be the guest of the House. I will advise also that it is the purpose of the leadership to ask to adjourn over from today till Monday next.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House vacate the proceedings by which the resolution, House Resolution 420, was passed, and that this resolution be laid upon the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THURSDAY, APRIL 12 DESIGNATED AS "PAN-AMERICAN DAY"

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 433).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby designates Thursday, April 12, 1956, for the celebration of Pan-American Day, on which day remarks appropriate to such occasion may occur.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate in sessions of the House all next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to make an observation. As the Members know, we will have as our guest this afternoon a very distinguished visitor to our country, the Prime Minister of Ireland. The Chair hopes that the legislative business will be disposed of before the time of his arrival and the ordinary recess taken, and trusts that all Members will make it their business to be on the floor when our distinguished guest arrives.

DR. WOLFGANG A. O. POHLE'S VISIT TO WASHINGTON

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the other day it was my privilege to be a guest at a luncheon given in the Speaker's private dining room in honor of Dr. Wolfgang A. O. Pohle, one of Germany's most distinguished statesmen, a businessman, and lawyer. He has played a most important role in helping rebuild Western Germany, in addition to being an important leader of Chancellor Adenauer's Christian Democratic Party.

Dr. Pohle is a member of the Montan Parliament, which is the Joint European Committee for Coal and Steel. He is also a member of the Foreign Relations Judiciary and Economic Committee of the German Parliament, and is on the Board of Management of the famous Mannesmann Werke—one of Germany's and the world's greatest seamless pipe plants with many branches throughout the world. Incidentally, the Mannesmann Co., of which Dr. Pohle is a member, acted as host to Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks last year in Germany.

It is typical of the new Germany that such a distinguished businessman and lawyer should also devote his time to the Government of his country. Dr. Pohle has been touring the United States for the last month as a guest of the State Department.

I know my colleagues will be interested to hear what Dr. Pohle said at the luncheon including his replies to our questions which he answered with so much frankness. The group of guests included the following Members of Congress: Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee; Representatives

BROOKS HAYS and OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas; Representative MARGUERITE CHURCH; Representative JAMES MURRAY, Representative SIDNEY YATES, and Representative TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, of Illinois; Representative JAMES J. DELANEY, of New York; Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; Representative PAUL F. SCHENCK, of Ohio; Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts; and Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, of New Jersey.

In addition to these distinguished guests, some members of the German Embassy were present and two well-known citizen soldiers, Maj. Gens. Julius Klein and Kenneth Buchanan. The guest list also included Dr. Horst Pelckmann, counselor of the German Embassy; David Ginsburg, attorney; and Dr. Helmuth Wohlthat, of Germany.

Dr. Pohle noted with pleasure the fact that the napkins used at the luncheon in his honor were labeled "Made in Western Germany." This made him feel "very much at home," he said.

He then said:

I have just completed, as a guest of your State Department, a tour of the United States. I have been impressed with my trip here and I cannot overemphasize the importance of personal visits like this between our two countries. In my capacity as member of the Economic Policy Committee of the German Parliament, I hope to reciprocate for the fine hospitality of your great country whenever American officials visit Germany.

I have been away from my country for many weeks, and therefore am not up to date on recent activities within its borders. However, I can say this: The Eisenhower-Adenauer philosophy of the united front against Communist aggression will continue. Germany will not turn her back on NATO commitments. The coalition of the Adenauer government is sufficient to withstand the recent defection. Germany will continue as a prime member of the family of free nations under the leadership of the chancellor.

We are much encouraged and grateful to see that the United States Congress is now considering legislation which would restore seized private German property. Private property should always be sacred. The importance of the sanctity of private property was exemplified on February 20, in the Senate by Senator KNOWLAND who chided Argentina for freezing the assets of American and other foreign companies which carried on operations in Argentina under the former government.

Germany is watching with great interest the final solution of the unfortunate matter which has resulted in the freezing of nearly half a billion dollars worth of German property. When this problem is finally settled, it will do more than anything else to solidify, not only economic and security ties between our two nations, but establish and solidify good will between them. Protection of private property and investment across the seas can stem once and for all the totalitarian philosophy of government where private property and personal liberty means nothing.

Finally, I would like to say a word of endorsement of the proposed world Magna Carta to preserve sanctity of private property which was discussed at the International Investment Law Conference held here in Washington, February 25. This Magna Carta was originally proposed by my fellow countryman, Hermann Abs, member of the board of managers of Germany's largest commercial bank, the Sueddeutsche Bank A. G. Such a document subscribed to by the free nations of the world would go a long way toward securing the objectives of friendly international relations.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] inquired whether Germany is doing anything about using more anthracite coal in the manufacture of steel. Dr. Pohle replied they had plenty of coke in the steel mills of Germany and hard coal was not too much of a problem there.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] inquired whether Dr. Pohle favored legislation that would limit the return of German property to $10,000. Pohle replied, "Yes, but that was not the final solution." The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] said he was concerned about speculators that might be intending to cash in on its recovery and subsequent increased valuation. Dr. Pohle mentioned the moral aspect of the case and emphasized that neither he nor those he represents had any personal interest at stake in the return question.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] asked whether the Saar plebiscite would cause trouble with France. Dr. Pohle replied, "I don't think so. I don't know the new developments in the last 6 weeks. I think we will come to an agreement that provides regular transition in political points between the two countries and in economics. There are some difficult questions, but I think we will overcome them."

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] asked how many claims were still outstanding on the German property situation and Mr. Wohlthat replied that the Office of Alien Property lists the number at about 30,000. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] remarked that "we tried our best to find how many valid claims there would be and we received all kinds of varied information and it is difficult for us to find how many valid claims there might be." The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] said he would like to get the exact number of claims and the amount of money involved.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] voiced concern about what might happen in the event Chancellor Adenauer would not, for any reason, be able to continue to serve the German people and asked Dr. Pohle if his party was prepared for that.

Dr. Pohle replied that his party had several good men and they could settle on a very able man who could succeed Mr. Adenauer, but he declined to name him. He said, "I think there is a team. That team is able and strong enough to continue this policy and secure a majority. We have a sure majority in the parliament of about 50 votes now." Dr. Pohle added that the Chancellor was wise to appoint in the last year a Foreign Minister who had been a leader of the party for 6 years. "It is good," he said, "that the Chancellor appointed Von Brentano to be Minister of Foreign Relations. There is no danger of a breakdown and I think our coalition will stay together. I should like to think there will come good elements from the free democrats from the split of our party."

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed and saddened by the southern declaration on school desegregation presented to the House last Monday.

I arise today because I am one of the few Members of this body who has spoken out plainly on the floor of the House for a reasonable, moderate approach in working out solutions to this grave problem. Yet I would remind my colleagues who signed this declaration that moderation is a two-way street, and a temperate course assumes acceptance of change—and adjustments which will permit headway to be made now toward our ultimate goal.

In all fairness, this statement cannot be classified as a moderate one. It makes no mention of change, or of a transition period. In essence, it is a call to resistance which can only harm the cause of moderation and lend new and powerful support to the diehard's and bitter-ender's who oppose any changes, gradual or otherwise. It was discouraging to see Members of Congress throw their enormous prestige behind the immoderates who resist any forward movement.

What really disturbs me is that I find no element of gradualism in the proclamation. This surprises me, for already school districts in many States represented by signers of this statement are either planning or carrying out integration programs.

I am a moderate because the Supreme Court itself has adopted principles of moderation. I am a gradualist because I believe we have learned that in any democracy social changes can only be brought about by progressive steps which fully take into account the hard facts involved in altering fixed habits and mores.

Unless we adopt the argument that the Supreme Court is really not supreme under the Constitution, there is one honorable and patriotic course open to those who are aggrieved by a decision of our highest tribunal. Under our constitutional system the only ultimate appeal from the Supreme Court is by resort to the procedures provided to amend the Constitution. Certainly, our colleagues should have their day in court if they wish to present forthwith to the Congress and the country a constitutional amendment designed to accomplish the purpose set forth in their declaration.

I am firmly convinced that the moderate cause will fail unless there are signs of statesmanship on the part of southern leadership in the Congress. I urge our friends to reconsider and restate their position in terms which will give new hope for an orderly, democratic solution of this great problem.

THE ROLE OF THE TOWNSEND PLAN

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, man's hostility to the teachings of history alone, in my judgment, stands in the path to a proper understanding in high places of the great role the Townsend plan can serve in the improvement of the economic status of the United States and the world. Today there is no longer any doubt about the validity of the philosophy of the Townsend plan. Opposition to it is predicated on detail, on execution, and on its scope and sweep. The Townsend plan merely recommends on the basis of provable economic arithmetic that Americans achieve financial sufficiency and independence as the final economic result of life.

The acceptance of this abstract idea in the life of our own country has already provided us with a system we call social security or old-age and survivors insurance. I would no more attack this system as such than I would decline a slice of bread to the needy because the more desirable whole loaf had been denied them. It may very well be that social security is good as far as it goes. But it would be idle to insist that social security is anything more than token old-age insurance. It would be idle to argue that social security—in its present status—does not serve for many as an obstruction to the bolder and more dynamic attack on the economic limitations of our society envisioned by the Townsend plan.

For what it all adds up to is that the Townsend plan proposes to do whole hog what the social security we now have does only piecemeal. The principle is identical. The only progress we can be said to have made is to win approval for the idea that poverty under our capitalist scheme of economics need not be mandatory. It took thousands of years of human degradation before man shook off the ugly superstition that hunger, beggary, humiliation, and the defeat of human dignity are indispensable to organized society.

Well, now we have shaken it off like the untidy sackcloth that it is.

But man is still hostile to the teachings of history. While he concedes that something can be done about it—and in fact he has to a pitiful degree done it—he still hesitates to bring the job up to perfection, to fulfillment, to completeness.

And that is why in principle I speak for the Townsend plan. I am not sure of all its implications. I do not pretend to be able to speak like an actuarial expert. I cannot inject myself into the mathematics of this Nation's economic status in relation to the elderly segment of the population. That, I understand, is a study in itself. But when you speak, as President Eisenhower does, of a nation with a $400-billion economy, I insist that this Nation cannot afford to ignore the great principles tha' underlie the Townsend plan.

We know that the population aged 65 and over increased 17 percent from 1947 through 1952. But, by contrast, their share of total personal income increased from 7 percent in 1947 to only 8 percent in 1952. That kind of disparity, it is patent, does not square with what we must consider as economic justice. Nor should it be said that the Townsend plan is merely a device for setting apart a portion of the Nation's population and pampering it. On the contrary, the Townsend plan is determined to employ this group of our society for the betterment of all groups economically, using this group only because in the light of logic and the facts of life it lends itself best to the idea of our social betterment under this scheme. The sponsors of the Townsend plan believe it will solve the problem of surpluses and that it will amplify buying power and enable our economy prosperously to keep abreast of our ever-expanding power to produce.

It seems to me the time has come to reappraise the basic ideas behind the Townsend plan and give them the hearing—and the action—justified by their soundness and the Nation's need.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which provides for an amendment to the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended. The amendment is intended to provide a method of eliminating certain difficulties which have arisen in the administration of Public Law 626, 83d Congress, 2d session—subsection (h) of section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended—and to carry out the purposes of Public Law 626. Representative WOLVERTON of New Jersey, has introduced an identical bill, and has authorized me to state that he joins in these remarks.

The Office of Alien Property has vested large amounts of heirless property. These properties or assets belonged originally to persons who were nominally enemy nationals; that is, who were born or resident in countries like Germany or Japan, but who were in fact persecuted on grounds of race, religion or political belief. Such persons, had they been alive, would have been eligible, under an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act adopted by the Congress in 1946, to obtain return of their property from the Custodian. In a great many cases, however, because of the Nazi extermination program, neither the individual owner of the property in the United States nor any of his heirs survived.

Public Law 626 was addressed to this situation. It established a procedure under which the President of the United States could designate a successor organization which could succeed to the title claims of this category of persecutee, could process them, obtain return of the property or its proceeds, and use the property, under stringent safeguards set by the Congress, for the relief and rehabilitation of needy persecutees now resident in the United States. It establishes the policy that the proceeds of heirless assets, in an amount not to exceed $3 million, should be used for this humanitarian purpose.

In both the House and the Senate, Public Law 626 had strong bipartisan support. It was passed by the 83d Congress, and signed by the President. In January 1955, the President designated a successor organization under the law.

The designated organization—the Jewish Restitution Successor Organization—has undertaken the enormous task of filing and evaluating these claims. In this task it has had the assistance of the appropriate Government agency. Several facts have appeared in the process of carrying out this task.

The first is that there are a vast number of claims. In fact, even after stringent reduction of the number of claims, there still are on file with the Office of Alien Property some 7,400 such claims.

Secondly, it appears that very substantial amounts of money are involved. Althought Public Law 626 imposed a ceiling of $3 million on the amount which could be returned to the successor organization, the preliminary surveys indicate a total, in the claims which have been filed, and as to which there are no adverse title or debt claims, of upward of $10 million.

Thirdly, it is clear that not all of the $10 million is heirless property. Claims necessarily had to be filed on the basis of information and belief and of such legal records as were available. A substantial number of these claims, perhaps in the neighborhood of 50 percent, would ultimately have to be withdrawn if each claim were to be individually processed. But, it is clear that producing proofs on each and every one of these thousands of claims is an almost impossible task. Records, particularly records pertaining to persecutees, have been almost totally destroyed in Germany during the course of the war. Particularly is this the case with respect to records pertaining to properties held abroad, since to have such properties abroad was illegal under the Nazi laws. Again, the penalties for having such properties were especially severe where persecutees were concerned. Thus, the physical task of documenting each of these thousands of claims is of insuperable size. It would require tremendous expenditures of administrative funds by the successor organization—which, under Public Law 626, is prohibited from using any of the proceeds which it derives under that law for administrative costs. It would also require tremendous expenditure of time and services on the part of the staff of the Office of Alien Property, which would result in

heavy costs to the United States Government.

Nothing would be gained by going through this laborious process in this special situation. Even apart from the difficulty of finding proofs and the cost of administration, the end result of proceeding case by case would be intolerable delay. Years and years would be required before the program is finished—in the meanwhile needy persecutees would remain without the benefit of those funds which the Congress has declared should be used for their benefit.

Representative WOLVERTON and I are therefore introducing identical bills in the House. These bills are brief and to the point. They authorize and direct the making of a bulk settlement of these heirless property claims. Such a settlement is supported by ample precedent, as, for example, in connection with similar heirless property claims in the American zone of Germany and in Berlin. The bills preserve the $3 million ceiling which was established under Public Law 626 and also establishes a $2 million minimum. They require that determination of the exact amount between these two figures shall be made not more than 6 months after this bill shall become law, and they provide for payment of this amount out of funds now in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian, which are more than ample at present to meet even the maximum which would thus be authorized.

These bills, in our opinion, are in the interest of the surviving persecutees who are now resident in the United States and who are in need, and in the interest of the United States itself.

It is understood that the Office of Alien Property has recently undertaken a survey of the claims filed relating to heirless property. The result of this preliminary survey, which, as I understand it, has thus far covered only a certain number of the accounts, would seem to be materially to reduce the number and the amount of claims which can properly be classified as heirless property claims. It may well, therefore, be necessary to look into this matter at such time as further material is available and, in the course of such hearings as may be held on the bills now being introduced, to look into the statistical picture as it then exists. Since it is my understanding that the compilation so far done by the Office of Alien Property is at best incomplete, and since the results of the work done by that Office will need careful examination, the bills which Representative WOLVERTON and I are now introducing should receive prompt attention even though they may require some modification at a later date. Even with substantially reduced numbers of claims, the amount outstanding will be sufficient so that a settlement of these claims in bulk is essential. Moreover, delays in actual implementation of the purposes of Public Law 626—in getting relief funds actually to work for the intended beneficiaries—have been so substantial that no further delay should be tolerated.

ABUSES IN AUTOMOBILE MARKETING

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I presented a statement to the committee of Congress investigating the abuses in automobile marketing—the Monroney committee. This is one of the most serious problems in our economy today and I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives. Last year the independent automobile retailers broke all existing records in the number of automobiles sold to the American public. Yet, in spite of the tremendous number of autos sold the dealer barely made enough profit on his sales to cover his expenses. I am informed that a mere 1.7 percent of the dealers total new car sales was left over as personal income to the man who has invested his money in this vital distribution business. The independent auto dealer is caught in a price squeeze which equals anything the farmers in this country have ever known.

The basic cause of this price squeeze is the simple fact that the big automobile manufacturers have been insistently producing more cars than the public can buy at a fair price to the retailer. The big automotive corporations have forced their excess stock on the dealer and he has had to suffer the losses. The contractual relationship between the small-business man and the giant automotive corporations is little more than one of indentured servant and master. The dealer has had to take cars he could not sell by ethical merchandising. This means that the public suffers because of the resultant "bootlegging," false advertising and inadequate servicing.

Individually the automobile dealers are helpless in this production and pricing tug of war. They have been forced to combine in the NADA to resist the unfair pressure of the fat cat producers who think only of their own immediate profit. Still, if basic reforms and protection for the dealer and public are to result they will need the help of Congress.

We do not want to add another industry to the long list of the regulated. We will not add another industry to that growing list because I firmly believe the auto industry can regulate itself. It will, however, need the assistance of Congress in laying down certain ground rules to equalize the relations between producers and distributors, prohibit phony freight charges to the public, prohibit the insidious bootlegging of excess stock, and clarify the service obligations of certain dealers.

Most of these provisions are currently before Congress in the form of bills. I am for these bills and will do everything in my power to see that these hard working small-business men get the necessary protection which will permit them to keep their heads above water. They deserve our wholehearted support in their struggle to maintain the free competitive economy which has made this country the greatest on earth.

POST OFFICES

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, each day I receive complaints from my district about the closing of our little post offices. I always tell our people that is the responsibility of the Republican administration. Now, I read some weeks ago that the Post Office Department had closed 3,000 of these little post offices at a saving of $4 million. I submit such a small saving in the light of the annual deficit of half a billion dollars the Post Office Department have, is not conclusive proof to me that our little post offices should continue to be closed. And, I make this plea to my colleagues on the Republican side: If you have any allotments for little post offices, please save some for the Congressman from the Eighth Congressional District of Florida. I do not want any of my little post offices closed. I see no rhyme or reason in this continued effort to take a service away from thousands of our people who get nothing else from the Federal Government except their mail through our little post offices or rural routes. So, please, if you have an allotment, give me a post office or two.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am sorry that my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Florida, was not on the floor of the House to hear the testimony of Democratic Members of the House in favor of these actions by the Post Office Department of the United States. They involve better service at a lesser cost.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to say that the gentleman from Florida never approved it then, and he still does not.

NECESSITIES INSTEAD OF MONEY FOR LEGATEES IN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the Communists are using every weapon, including money, to confuse, divide, weaken, and defeat the United States.

Unwittingly, as we follow old precedents that were valid before the Communist conspiracy found ways to turn our own habits against us, we sometimes assist in our own undoing.

Ever since the first emigrant came to this country, we have sent money and of our earnings to help less fortunate relatives or friends abroad. This thoughtfulness was both humanitarian and constructive, and helped to promote international good will.

That is, until the Communists, who specialize in betrayal and subversion, took over a number of countries.

In many cases, we have failed to take counteraction against this dangerous reality.

Take the matter of legacies.

Well-meaning people in this country often leave shares of their estates to relatives or friends abroad, not realizing that Communist Governments will intercept most of the money intended for the beneficiaries, and employ it as part of the Communist campaign of world conquest.

By a typical Communist twist, double harm is done. The legatee is robbed of his inheritance, and the loot is used in economic warfare against the country where the benefaction originated.

I believe that we should amend the laws governing payment of legacies to people in Communist countries, in order to prevent those unfriendly governments from seizing money sent from the United States, and thereby using it against us.

At the same time, we must do everything possible under the circumstances, to abide by the will of the legator, and, insofar as we are able to insure justice in such cases, make every effort to see that the legatee receives what is his due.

This can be done by legally requiring that money bequeathed in the legacy, be converted into necessities of life, of corresponding value, if the court so orders.

With the added precaution, that any recognized public or private agency—United States Consular Service, Red Cross, or various religious organizations, and so forth—so authorized, shall supervise shipment and distribution of such necessities to make certain that they reach the hands of those designated as beneficiaries who happen to reside in unfriendly Communist countries.

Our purpose is to protect the rights of the individuals concerned, without abetting, even indirectly, the Communist conspiracy.

Much as they might protest, or attempt to distort our motives through propaganda, I believe that the Communists would prefer to have food and clothing and necessities of life coming into their countries in the form of bequests, rather than have us cut off such bequests completely.

There are so many people in Poland, and Lithuania, and Czechoslovakia, and other Communist-controlled countries who look to their kinfolk in the United States for help.

The best we can do for them through bequests is to provide them with the necessities of life, actually delivered to them.

The legislation, I recommend, would carry out the will of the legators, while eliminating the diversion of such legacies by Communist Governments for the purpose of weakening the national security of the United States.

THE SEGREGATION ISSUE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there have been two critical periods in our history. The first was graphically described by the great historian, John Fisk. The period referred to was those years between 1783 and 1789.

The Treaty of Peace in the American Revolution was signed in 1783, and from there on to the inauguration of George Washington as President there was no central government, except the Continental Congress, holding the Colonies together more by sentiment than by law.

During this period John Hanson of Maryland was President of the Congress and signed executive papers, such as they were. John Hanson is referred to as the first President of the United States, and in the limited way, he was.

It was soon discovered that we should have a stronger national government, with powers to tax and raise an army, which the old government did not have. When the Constitutional Convention met at Philadelphia in 1787 there was, at first, no intention of doing anything except to amend the Articles of Confederation. The debates developed the proposition that it was easier to build a new Constitution than to amend the old one. At the conclusion of the proceedings this present Government was born.

The first Congress met in New York in 1789. George Washington was inaugurated as President and the ship of state started on its course, but this period from 1783 to 1789 could well be called the crucial period.

The second critical period covered the period from 1789 to 1865, in which the War between the States was fought. The question of State rights was the issue on which the people were fast separating into two classes, namely, those who favored a strong central government and those who maintained that those rights of States which had not been directly surrendered to the Federal Government were reserved to the States, or to the people. Slavery was a subject that brought out these two views.

During the period from 1845 to 1861 attempts were made on both sides to come to some understanding about this clash between States rights and Federal rights, but as this debate proceeded, the question became more acute and less possible of amicable settlement. Hot tempers exploded in the Congress on both sides, and an amiable understanding became impossible.

To add fuel to the flames of this contest, the Dred Scott decision was handed down from the Supreme Court, headed by Chief Justice Taney of Maryland, which upheld State rights in the matter of slaves.

Another faggot was added to the fire by the publication of the book entitled Uncle Tom's Cabin, written by Harriet Beecher Stowe, sister of Henry Ward Beecher, the great antislavery advocate of the North. At this juncture there was no possibility of a peaceful settlement of the controversy, and the War Between the States engulfed the North and the South. Here we presented to the world a demonstration of how our heralded democracy was in the process of destroying itself. This clash ended when Lee surrendered.

This was indeed a critical period in our history. The unfortunate result of this contest was that while slavery was abolished, the question of what are State rights and what are Federal rights was not settled.

We are now living in a period just a century later, and following the course of history, this era now has all the earmarks of that period preceding the War Between the States. Can it be that we are to have another critical period in this history of the United States?

Since the end of the second critical period many acts of Congress and many decisions of the Supreme Court have gradually but surely granted powers to the Federal Government, and therefore ignored in proportion, the sovereign rights of States.

Our many wars have been strongly in contravention of State rights. When in actual war the Federal Government, which is empowered by the Constitution to defend this country, ignores practically all of the Bill of Rights. Property can be taken without due process of law; free speech can be denied; a free press can be muzzled; State militias can be drafted into the service, and every citizen, no matter where he is, can be drafted for foreign service without a declaration of war by the Congress. The President, with the consent of the Senate, can enter into treaties that the people know nothing about and have not approved. Relief granted in times of distress always has a string attached to it in provisions that such relief shall be handled by Federal officers within the States. Federal support to education has a Federal string attached to it. The Federal courts take jurisdiction of crimes such as are committed by Indians on Indian Reservations, the crime of transporting stolen goods from one State to another; the transportation of women from one State to another for immoral purposes; crimes committed on Government property within a State; the uncontrolled condemnation of land for military purposes and for the erection of dams; the investigation of election frauds committed wholly within State lines; the passage of mental and public health laws. All these have gradually built up a stronger Federal authority,

and submerged State laws to the extent that it can well be said that the tendency is to more and more ignore the States in the interest of the Federal Government.

At this period right now, the Supreme Court has handed down an opinion that segregation laws of the States shall surrender to the will of the Federal Government. Without discussing the merits and demerits of this decision, it certainly is true that this decision has engendered the same feeling in the South that the Dred Scott decision did in the North. I think it just to say that the Negro race has made great advancement since its liberation, and in the Deep South the Negro is making strides that a few short years ago was thought impossible.

The common practice of lynching in the South has greatly lessened in the last 10 years, and this has been brought about by force of public opinion. This public opinion has not all come from the North. If we do not move too fast, and proceed without hysteria, the segregation question can be ironed out without frenzied opposition to the Supreme Court opinion. In the opinion itself, the time element is outlined, indicating that the Supreme Court itself did not contemplate that segregation should be accomplished overnight.

The segregation question might well be the cause of starting another contest between the North and South and, with our history before us, and knowing that hotheads, both North and South, contributed to that disastrous conflict in 1861, we should avoid that course now.

This is the most critical period of all that have preceded it. Here we are, still fighting a cold war, where this Nation should not be divided, and we should bend every effort to remain united. The Communists will take advanage of this troublesome question that has arisen, and will pour oil on the flames of dissension. This situation requires restraint in every direction. The Negroes themselves should exercise restraint and when they know and can see the rapid advance of their race they will not wish to be a party to stirring up a contest between the North and the South. In time, there will be no question about their receiving all the rights and privileges that any other class of citizens enjoys under our Constitution. Much of the trouble about segregation will be ironed out by the South itself, but doing a thing voluntarily and being forced to do it by the power of government are two entirely different things. Speedy action does not conform to the opinion of the Supreme Court, nor is it a wise policy.

POSTAGE STAMP IN HONOR OF THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to authorize the Postmaster General to issue a postage stamp in honor of the American farmer.

Our Nation has frequently used its postage stamps to honor and pay tribute to a multitude of events and persons. Meanwhile, the American farmer has continued in his steady fashion to plant, cultivate, harvest, and market the food America's millions require.

Mr. Speaker, I have known many farmers and have lived and worked with them. With hardiness and rugged determination, generations of farmers cleared the wilderness of this continent and prepared new fields to provide food for their families and their neighbors. From this humble beginning, the importance of the farmer's role has increased steadily throughout our history as he produced in ever-greater abundance the food and fiber necessary to support our expanding industries and the vast numbers of our growing population concentrated in our urban areas.

Busy as our early farmers were in building their homes on the frontier and establishing the fertility of our fields and, badly as they needed the assistance of each member of their families, they insisted that their children receive an education in schools which they provided through their own labor. From these rude classrooms, the statesmen of our new Nation came. Busy as they were, they set aside 1 day of rest to worship in one of the country churches which symbolized their religious faiths. This deep spiritual conviction has guided our Nation through its darkest days of crisis and peril.

It was the farmer's faith and his belief in freedom which stiffened his determination to assist his neighbors in their stand at Lexington. It was his clear and reflective mind that helped formulate the bold new concepts of our infant Nation which produced our Constitution—that document which made a reality of man's struggle for individual dignity and freedom.

The American farmer has remembered the meaning of that document and earnestly believes in the rights and privileges which it guarantees. In no segment of our population does the fire of freedom burn more fiercely nor are the aspirations of liberty more appreciated than by our farmers. This pioneer, this rail-splitter, this homespun, religious, hardworking man, whose children have gone forth to serve on the battlefields, in the laboratory, and the factory, ever keeping our Nation strong, should receive the recognition which other groups of our population have been accorded through the issuance of a special stamp.

LACK OF RAILWAY FREIGHT CARS

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members of the House do not realize the real and present danger to the economy of our country because of the lack of an adequate number of railway freight cars necessary to move the products of our farms, factories, forests, and mines on the railroads of the United States.

We do know that last year during the summer and fall months a nationwide car shortage was experienced which did severe damage. Since a crisis of that kind had not been experienced for several years, I think it may have been generally assumed that 1955 was an exceptional year and that, all in all, things were not so bad and that it might not happen again.

Mr. Speaker, what happened last year was just a preview of what inevitably must occur again this year and in future years until the present adverse car situation is corrected.

Let me present a few figures: In 1935, the number of freight cars on the class A railroads was 2,000,000. By 1954 that number dropped to 1,735,900. At the first of this year the total number of cars on the lines is 1,694,000. Meanwhile, our annual gross-product figure has touched the $4 billion mark, and 8 percent more cars are being loaded now than at this same period last year.

In 1955, 37,509 new and rebuilt cars were installed on the railroads. In that same year 73,491 cars were junked. In other words, the number of available freight cars is being sharply reduced at the same time the need for more cars is sharply increasing.

The car shortage for this year, 1956, has already begun. The net shortage reported by the Car Service Section of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the week of February 25 of this year was 2,174 cars.

Obviously, the solution of this problem lies with the railroads themselves. But as of this moment the railroads have not met and are not meeting their responsibility. The result of their failure can be disastrous. Their policy is tragically one of too little and too late.

Last year the railroads did order 147,320 freight cars and now they are anxiously awaiting delivery of those cars. If the entire 147,320 cars could be delivered within the next 6 months, the situation would be relieved. The fact is, however, that delivery of new cars is averaging only 4,000 a month, while at the same time 8,000 cars per month are being junked.

The picture becomes even blacker when it is realized that the all-time record of car production which occurred during World War II was only a little more than 10,000 cars a month.

There seems to be only one possibility of relieving the situation for this year, at least to some extent, and that is to obtain maximum efficiency from the present inadequate supply of cars. The railroads themselves have made marvelous strides toward greater efficiency in freight handling, but there are still many abuses. As I see it, the appropriate action for Congress to take toward relieving this situation and toward meeting what is inevitably bound to be an emergency is to pass legislation which can direct the Interstate Commerce

Commission, at least partially, to eliminate the abuses.

I have introduced a bill for the consideration of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which at least suggests several steps the ICC can take to speed up the movement of freight cars.

The bill I have introduced provides the Commission with authority, under emergency conditions: First, to levy a penalty against a railroad for failing to supply a shipper with a car within a reasonable time; second, my bill gives the Commission the authority to levy a penalty against any shipper, including the Government of the United States, who holds and uses a freight car for storage purposes; third, my bill gives the Commission the authority to prescribe the routing of traffic in such manner as to insure the minimum per diem use of a car from the shipper to its destination; and fourth, the bill gives the Commission the authority to levy a penalty per diem against any railroad which is unreasonably holding on its lines cars owned by another railroad.

Admittedly, these provisions place drastic power in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission, but a crisis such as we inevitably face would seem to require the application of drastic remedies.

I hope the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will give early attention to this bill and the problem it seeks to solve. That great committee with its professional staff may have better ideas to incorporate into law. My only hope is that something be done and be done soon. It is already much later than you think.

SCHOOL-MILK PROGRAM

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the debate that took place a few minutes ago regarding H. R. 8320. There is a great deal of misunderstanding about what this bill actually does. The Senate has added an amendment to this bill which provides for a 2-year extension for the school-milk program, which is serving 16 million American schoolchildren. Also included was an amendment which provides for the continuation of the brucellosis program for the next 2 fiscal years.

It is important that this bill with these extensions become law as soon as possible in order for each of the 48 States to make its school-milk plans for the new school year and for each State department of agriculture to proceed with plans for their brucellosis program for the next fiscal year. It is most important that the House recede from its position and accept the Senate amendments. If the conference which takes place at 3 o'clock this afternoon does not result in the House's receding from its position, I intend to oppose the conference report and support the motion of my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] that the conference report be rejected and that the House recede from its position and accept the Senate amendments. It is important that this legislation with the Senate amendments be sent to the White House immediately. This procedure is the only one available to positively insure that the school-milk and brucellosis programs are extended for the next 2 years.

EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, in view of the delay in appointing House conferees on the bill to extend the Sugar Act, H. R. 7030, I hope the conferees will act with dispatch.

In my opinion, there were certain deficiences in H. R. 7030 as it passed the House to which I called attention at the time. The bill, as amended by the Senate, corrects some of these deficiencies. I think we should agree to the Senate amendments.

We hear many statements on doing something about our agricultural situation. Here is an opportunity to do something. The farmers of 50 percent of our States are directly and vitally affected by this sugar legislation. Many other crops, States, and farmers are indirectly affected.

Another planting season is upon us. The expiration date of the Sugar Act is rapidly approaching. This important segment of our farm economy is entitled to have the uncertainty removed. I hope the conferees will report and the legislation be enacted without delay to accomplish these purposes.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, March 17 is a bright day for all men of good will, whether they claim direct connection with Ireland or not. For on that day, all of us can wear a bit of green as a token of our esteem and love for Ireland and for St. Patrick, who laid the foundations of that land's greatness.

What an altered world it would be without the Irish. It would lack a great deal of its wit and learning, its gaiety and glory, its tears and laughter.

We in this country are especially indebted to the sons and daughters of the Emerald Isle. They have brought to our shores a certain native quality that takes the form of dashing and selfless courage. It is the kind of courage which makes the Irishman lend his heart and soul to any cause he espouses.

All through our history the names of Irish descendants stand out as shining lights. They have toiled, fought, suffered, and sacrificed in the building of our great Nation. They have carved their names deeply on the scrolls of our history and in the deepest recesses of our hearts.

To all Irishmen and to all men everywhere, St. Patrick stands as the symbol of this Irish valor and love of liberty. He is one of the great leaders of all time in the fight for freedom for all mankind and to men of religious conviction particularly his example will be an eternal stimulus. Especially today, with so much of the earth's population trapped behind the Iron Curtain and elsewhere under the heel of godless rulers, we can learn from his life that suffering should lead to even more deeply religious convictions. It is a thought well worth pondering and remembering.

I ask that all men of good faith pause with me today to think upon the life, deeds, and glorious memory of this great, good, and holy man.

It is my earnest hope that America will always pay tribute throughout the land to Ireland, that living symbol of the love of freedom, and to the great St. Patrick, whose life symbolizes devotion to God.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Hal O'Boyle, the noted columnist, writes that on the 17th of March there are two kinds of people—those who are Irish and those who wish they were Irish. Speaking last night in our Nation's Capital, the very distinguished, the very able, and the very witty Prime Minister of the Republic of Ireland, Mr. Costello, said:

> I feel very sorry for those few Americans who do not have some Irish connections.

Well, I feel likewise, and I think those Americans are very few indeed. Speaking for myself, I am very proud of those connections, both by blood and friendship. This afternoon, I know the House is going to give a very friendly and a very warm reception to our distinguished visitor from the Republic of Ireland, bearing in mind the timeliness of his visit on the eve of St. Patrick's Day, and having in mind also hs own eminence in Ireland, and remembering too the affection between our two peoples and all that the Irish have done to build our United States of America.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I am delighted to yield to my friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the gentleman's statement about feeling sorry for Americans who do not have Irish blood in them, I might say as an Irish American that the

fundamental spiritual thing in all Irishmen is love of individual freedom under God, and in that respect every American has Irish blood in him.

Mr. CANFIELD. With that I most certainly agree.

ANNUAL REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 253)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the annual report of the United States Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 15, 1956.*

INVESTIGATION OF CHARITY APPEALS IN THE NAME OF THE AMERICAN VETERAN

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 376) to authorize the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to investigate and study appeals for charitable contributions made in the name of the American veteran, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the American people annually contribute millions of dollars to assist veterans and their dependents and survivors;

Whereas the size of such contributions testifies to the deep sense of indebtedness felt by the American people toward the veteran;

Whereas this sense of indebtedness makes a fertile field for solicitors of charitable contributions who are unwise or unscrupulous to obtain contributions for uses not contemplated by the donor;

Whereas the Congress has a responsibility to the veterans to prevent abuses which would discourage the making of charitable contributions on their behalf: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study to determine—

(1) the extent to which appeals for charitable contributions are made to the American people, or segments thereof, in the name of American veterans by appealing to the desire of the American people to assist such veterans and their survivors or dependents;

(2) whether an undue proportion of such charitable contribution is used to meet the expenses of conducting such appeals and for other administrative expenses rather than for providing services for or benefits to veterans;

(3) whether any of such appeals are fraudulent in nature;

(4) whether additional supervision of the fund-raising activities conducted by organizations chartered by act of Congress in the name of veterans are necessary or desirable; and

(5) the existence of any other abuses connected with charitable appeals made in the name of veterans.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such records, documents, and papers, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has reported House Resolution 376, authorizing the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to investigate and study appeals for charitable contributions made in the name of the American veteran.

Millions of dollars are contributed annually for veterans, widows, and orphans. Several incidents have occurred in recent years which prompted the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to introduce the resolution to authorize such an investigation. A case in point is the organization which raised approximately $1,900,000, but only $300,000 was spent for the purpose for which the funds were solicited.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs proposes to make a study to determine the extent of such appeals made in the name of the American veteran, their survivors or dependents; whether an undue proportion of such contributions is used to meet the expenses of conducting the appeals; whether the appeals are fraudulent in nature, and whether additional supervision of the fund-raising activities conducted by organizations chartered by act of Congress is necessary.

The committee will report the results of the investigation to the House during the present Congress, or to the Clerk of the House, if the House is not in session. The committee is authorized to meet at such places in the United States and its Territories as it deems necessary, to require the attendance of witnesses, production of records, documents and papers, and subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member of the committee designated by the chairman.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of this resolution have been explained by the gentleman from Texas in an able manner. I see no need for an extended discussion on the rule, and if there are no requests for time on this side, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 376 directs the Committee on Veterans' Affairs or a subcommittee thereof to conduct a complete investigation and study to determine—

First, the extent to which appeals for charitable contributions are made to the American people for the benefit of American veterans, their survivors, or dependents.

Second, whether a proper proportion of such contributions are used for providing services or benefits for veterans, their survivors, or dependents.

Third, whether any such appeals are fraudulent in nature.

Fourth, whether additional supervision of fund raising activities of veterans' organizations chartered by Congress is necessary or desirable.

Fifth, the existence of any other abuses connected with charitable appeals made in the name of veterans.

The resolution authorizes the committee or a subcommittee to sit and act during the present Congress, within the United States, its Territories and possessions, whether or not the House is in session; to hold hearings and to require the attendance of witnesses and the production of such records as it deems necessary.

Veterans served the Nation as a whole in time of war. Congress has properly recognized that the obligation arising to those veterans for their wartime service is a national obligation and has established a broad program of benefits to those who are disabled, their survivors, and dependents. In fiscal 1956, the Congress appropriated more than $4½ billion for this broad program of veterans' benefits, and in fiscal 1957 the budget request for such purposes is nearly $4¾ million. Congress has firmly established the policy that the care of veterans is a national obligation, the cost of which is apportioned among the taxpayers on an equitable basis through the tax structure which finances all obligations of the Federal Government. It, therefore, seems that Congress also has an obligation to the general public to protect it from charitable appeals on behalf of the veteran class, if they are fraudulent in nature, or are motivated primarily by greedy self-seeking individuals who falsely profess concern for the welfare of veterans.

Appeals by unscrupulous or dishonest persons made in an improper manner bring discredit upon the veteran class for whose benefit they are ostensibly made. If we are to properly discharge our duties to the veterans of this country, we must protect them from the activities of such predatory groups. Otherwise the public concept of disabled veterans, their widows, orphans, and dependent parents, as self-sacrificing citizens entitled to the sympathy and assistance of the Nation will be perverted and destroyed.

The Congress has enacted laws creating several high-principled veterans' organizations which conduct extensive nationwide programs for the relief and assistance of veterans, their survivors and dependents. These organizations employ several hundred service officers who are furnished office space in the various offices and facilities of the Veterans' Administration. These service officers work and cooperate with various agencies of

the Veterans' Administration and perform an invaluable service to all those for whose benefit veterans' laws have been enacted, without any charge to or obligation on the part of those they serve. These unselfish services for the most part are financed by dues of the members who belong to these organizations, with very little appeal to the general public for funds. Since the Congress has created them, it is the obligation of the Congress to see that they remain faithful to their trust. If any such organization engages in fund-raising appeals to the public, which are improper in nature or which entail excessively high costs, then such activities are a proper concern of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Congress of the United States. If these organizations do not engage in improper fund-raising activities, they are entitled to the protection which will necessarily result from a public realization that their activities have been scrutinized and approved by the Congress which created them.

There are instances in which organizations incorporated under the laws of the several States have engaged in extensive fund-raising appeals to the general public in the name of veterans. While the activities of such organizations are a proper concern of the State which authorized their existence and of the States in which they conduct their fund-raising campaigns, we must not overlook the fact that their activities affect the veteran class and to that extent are a proper concern of the Congress. To our knowledge, there are such organizations that have solicited and obtained millions of dollars by false representations and promises. It is not enough to say that the State or some other agency of the Government should prevent such acts. It is also the responsibility of Congress, and I believe the approval of this resolution will itself constitute a deterrent to those who may contemplate such action in the future.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on his willingness to develop, for the information of the House, matters relating to the solicitation of funds by some very large veterans groups.

The veterans organizations generally have done an outstanding job in their efforts to assist veterans. I feel sure that the investigation will point up many things that will be helpful, not only to the public, but to these organizations in taking a rather careful and searching look in what has become a tremendous business.

I know that most of the veterans organizations are concerned about a lot of adverse publicity that is developing as a result of schemes by individuals to use specially organized veterans organizations or new or little known veterans groups as a front to sell their merchandise or to provide them with large promotional profits.

I am chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service that is looking into the problem of the sending of unordered merchandise through the mail, using the mail to defraud and sending obscene matter and many other practices which are objectionable and which cause concern to right-thinking people.

Having in mind the resolution which my colleague from Texas has introduced and his interest in this specific field, we have not developed to any great extent material which would be considered by this particular resolution.

I would like to assure the House that while we are looking into some related matters, that there is no reason why there should be a duplication of effort.

I should like to suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that I know that my committee will be glad to cooperate in any way in following through on the results of his studies where it is shown that changes in the postal laws are desirable.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES IN POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 432.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3744) to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to classified substitute clerks in the field service of the Post Office Department. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM].

Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up the resolution to make in order consideration of the bill (H. R. 3744) to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence, with pay, to substitute employees in the postal field service.

The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate on the bill.

Under present law officers and employees of the United States, or the District of Columbia, who are members of Reserve components of the armed forces are entitled to leave of absence with pay from their positions for a period not to exceed 15 days when they are ordered to active duty for training. This Reserve training is manditory under the Reserves Forces Act of 1955.

Employees of the postal field service are not covered by the act of July 1, 1947, and H. R. 3744 extends coverage to these employees. A formula for computing leave credit earned by substitute employees is set up in the measure and places a limitation on the entitlement of military leave of absence. Such a provision was believed necessary by the Armed Services Committee because substitute employees of the postal field service work irregular hours.

The cost of the bill, if enacted, is estimated to be $2,800,000 per year.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule and I hope the resolution will be adopted so the House may proceed to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, this is obviously a very meritorious bill. It removes inequities in the existing law. We are for it on this side.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3744) to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to classified substitute clerks in the field service of the Post Office Department.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3744, with Mr. BOLAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was introduced in the interest of the National Defense in order to encourage young men to engage in reserve activities. On page 3 of the report there is the following statement by the Secretary of the Army:

> The Department of Defense has urged private employers to grant military leave with pay to their employees. As it will apparently be necessary to continue such position in view of anticipated increased Reserve training, the Federal Government should take the lead in providing military leave with pay for all Federal employees.

The statutes of our country already provide for military leave with pay to most Federal employees. In fact, it is pretty apparent from the wording of the statute that it was the intention of the Congress to include all Federal employees; but, accidentally, certain Federal employees were omitted.

It is the purpose of this legislation to take care of this omission. As pointed out in the quotation which I have read from the Department of the Army report, the Government has a program to encourage private industry to grant military leave with pay. The purpose of this legislation is to strengthen the defense structure of our country and to eliminate the inequities which are in existing law that arose by the accidental exclusion of classified substitute employees. The bill would correct this inequity or discrimination against these employees by including them under a formula set out in the bill.

Secondly, it would put the Government in the consistent position of providing this measure in the interest of national defense which it also asks private employers to do in the interest of national defense.

The two major reasons for the passage of this legislation are (1) to eliminate an accidental inequity against substitute classified employees because they are the only ones left out of the Federal employees in this military leave with pay legislation previously existing, and (2) to put the Federal Government in the consistent position of doing for Federal employees what it asks private employers to do for its employees in the interest of national defense.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, in supporting this bill may I say that I concur in every word that has been said by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] who had much to do with the hearings on the bill before the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]. There is nothing more to add to what he has said. The gentleman has completely covered the subject. This bill simply remedies a present inequity affecting postal employees in the field service as well as postal clerks. This inequity, as he stated, exists because of an inadvertence in former legislation, leaving out a word or two that should have been there dealing with substitute postal employees and postal clerks, as well as others. Therefore, in my opinion, the bill should be passed unanimously without question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does this bill compare favorably with leave time for classified employees?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman will find an explanation of that on page 5 of the report.

Mr. GROSS. It does compare favorably with leave time for classified employees?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It does.

Mr. GROSS. It affects some 6,000 employees at a cost of how much?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It affects 16,000 at a cost of approximately $2½ million. The original bill without the amendment would be about 10,000 or 9,400 clerks. The amendment will add sufficiently to make it about 16,000 postal clerks.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I heartily endorse this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is with very great pleasure and sincerity for me to join with my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] in making this tribute to the Prime Minister of Ireland, His Excellency, Mr. Costello. On other occasions, I have enjoyed the delightful experience of hearing Prime Minister Costello speak and of having the pleasure of meeting and conversing with him personally. He is a charming and extremely able gentleman. He is eloquent and persuasive. He is extremely well informed on many subjects dealing with life and living and government, and has the extraordinary ability to present his ideas in public address in an interesting and penetrating manner.

The distinguished membership of this House is extremely fortunate to have as the guest of the Congress today the eminent Prime Minister of Ireland. No time could be better employed by any Member of the Congress than to be here this afternoon to listen to the timely message the Prime Minister will give. He has very graciously accepted the invitation of the Congress to speak this afternoon and his thoughts and ideas will not only be important to us, the Members of this House and of the Congress, but I am sure they will be of interest to people everywhere in the world.

The Irish people represent in mind and thought and ability one of the powerful nations on the earth. The influence of the Irish people and the force and drive and loyalty of their spirit have crossed the wide oceans and continents to new lands, new countries, and new areas in all parts of the world. Here in America, in our own wonderful country, and in my wonderful Commonwealth of Massachusetts, we have many, many, wonderful American citizens of Irish descent. Either they themselves have come directly from the Land of the Green, or they are descendants of their forefathers who came over many years ago.

As I have said, the Irish influence is worldwide. In fact, like my distinguished friend from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], it is a well accepted fact that almost all of us possess in varying amounts and degrees some Irish blood and Irish ancestry in our backgrounds. There are many of us here in the Congress who are of Irish descent and there are a lot more who have a little bit of Irish in us. It might be a very good thing for us if we had more.

For many years, our present majority leader and sometimes minority leader, and now acting Speaker of this House, my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts,, and eminent American, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, our respected friend and gentleman, is of Irish descent. His background, his loyalty to man and country, his faith in God and people, his principles of life and living have not only endeared him to every Member of this House on both sides of the aisle for his fairness, honesty, and impartiality in the activities and operation of the Congress, but have also engraved for him a place among the very great and distinguished Members of this House of Representatives in the molding and forming of our Nation's destiny from day to day and through these years of difficulty and crisis.

In my Commonwealth of Massachusetts, there are many Americans of Irish descent. Among them is one of the great spiritual leaders of our Nation, his distinguished Excellency, the archbishop of Massachusetts, his Grace, the Very Reverend Richard J. Cushing. As a great spiritual leader, as a human being, as a man of purpose and objective, I have never known anyone anywhere to work more diligently, more efficiently, more untiringly, or more constantly than does Archbishop Cushing to bring inspiration to people of all faiths, to help lift the burdens from their shoulders, to constantly elevate the ideals and principles of living, to bring peace and happiness to everyone and to bring everyone closer to our God and the Christian way of life. He is a dedicated man, dedicated to both God and man. Respected everywhere, he is a distinguished credit to his church, to his country, to Ireland, the ancient and modern land of his ancestors and background.

In my district, where the shot was fired that was heard around the world to make mankind free, I have many friends of Irish descent. They are wonderful people, always ready to help in time of sorrow, always ready to extend the hand of friendship and kindliness, always ready with a good word and always ready with the spark of good humor. These Americans of Irish descent have unselfishly given of themselves to help mold America into the great land of freedom that it is. I value their friendship and their loyalty tremendously. Among these friends is the wonderful mother of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

America is proud of its many citizens of Irish descent. Not only have they joined completely and determinedly in the struggle against communism, they represent today a great bulwark in the cause of the destiny of freedom everywhere.

To the Prime Minister of Ireland, Mr. Costello, I join with other Members in extending the hand of welcome, and my best wishes for a very pleasant and happy visit here in the United States of America. I look forward with interest and pleasure to his address this afternoon.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to take a moment to endorse this legislation. It is certainly needed, and it is an encouragement, certainly, to our reserve forces in which we are all very much interested.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services and the full committee as well for reporting this bill. I also want to compliment the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], for not only introducing the bill but for his tireless work in prosecuting its consideration. I appeared before the subcommittee in favor of this bill. I have received letters from the national presidents of both the National Association of Letter Carriers and the National Association of Post Office Clerks. They are very much interested in this bill, as are other postal organizations.

Mr. Chairman, this bill corrects an unintentional injustice, and that is what commended it to me. While none of us are perfect, none of us can do all the things we would like to do, the one thing that attracts my attention is when something is either called to my attention or comes across my desk that convinces me or satisfies me that an injustice exists, whether intentional or unintentional, and in this case it was purely unintentional. But, I was attracted because I considered it to be an injustice, and when I find that situation to exist, I like to have it corrected as quickly as possible. The passage of this bill will correct that injustice and bring justice to a number of employees of the Post Office Department who have shown their loyalty to our country by being members of the reserves of the different branches of our Government.

Again I congratulate the subcommittee and its members as well as the full committee, and in particular the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], who introduced the bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, of course I support this bill. The reason I have requested this time is to ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], author of the bill, if he will tell us just a little more clearly why this bill is necessary. I understand it is because of certain interpretation of the original act by the General Accounting Office. The law being amended came from the Armed Services Committee of the House.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. There was a ruling by the Comptroller General on the language of the bill passed in 1947 that these people were not included. I do not have a copy of his ruling with me, but I know that is the predicate upon which the necessity for this bill was founded. I do not think Congress ever intended to exclude these people, as I said in my remarks previously. I do not believe that it was the intent of Congress to exclude them. But the Comptroller General found that the language was not sufficiently broad in the previous legislation to include them. Not being mentioned, he felt that they were excluded and as a matter of fact they have been excluded. Possibly the statute should have been differently interpreted. This bill will eliminate all difficulty in the future.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is it not a fact that there was some confusion concerning the use of the terms temporary and indefinite employees and substitute employees? Was there not some question in respect to the terms that were used?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If the gentleman will yield to me, I believe I can help on that. I think the trouble was not because of confusion so much. The gentleman knows a great deal with reference to the point that I am about to make. Was not the position of classified substitute built up perhaps after the legislation originally passed the Congress and for that reason it was held that he did not come within the term permanent or temporary employee?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I wanted to clarify the situation for the record, to indicate exactly what the difficulty was and how it was cured in this proposed legislation.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I recall that when we enacted the bill it was our purpose to cover all Federal employees.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We did not cover the classified substitute. Since then I think the gentleman's committee has made the position of classified substitute a real position in the postal service.

Mr. REES of Kansas. For some time I have been concerned about the discrimination against regular substitutes in the postal service when it comes to giving them the 2 weeks' military leave which is given to all other regular Federal employees under the terms of legislation applying to our Reserve forces. This discrimination results from the fact that a decision was made some time ago that although they are regular employees, they were not included under the terms of "Federal Employees in the Reserve Act." This bill was, of course, handled by a committee other than the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on which I serve. It is quite proper that the corrective action with respect to the misunderstanding of this language be taken by the committee which had originally drafted the language in question. This very situation was directed to my attention some time ago. Because of the fact that an all-inclusive definition had not been used and came from another committee, our committee did not take action. I am happy to see that we are finally now taking corrective action.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the chairman of our subcommittee, Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] may speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the majority leader for his kind words about the committee and about my colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], who introduced this measure and who has been very zealous in the pushing of the measure. I think it is a most meritorious measure.

The majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK] has always been interested in national defense. I want to say that in my 20 years of service on the Military Affairs and Armed Services Committees, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has always responded when we needed his assistance on defense measures. I pay him a special tribute for his interest in this bill and generally in national defense over a period of years.

I rise today, Mr. Chairman, to say something about a trip which some of the members of the Committee on Armed Services made yesterday to Fort Jackson in South Carolina. The purpose of the trip was to inspect Reservists who have been in training at Fort Jackson and throughout the United States. This week over 1,500 of these Reservists under the 6-months programs will graduate. They will graduate in the next few days. The committee to which I have referred was a subcommittee from the Committee on Armed Services. We wanted to see personally what the morale was of these men; what the problems of training were that were encountered at Fort Jackson and throughout the country; and wanted to have an opportunity to see those men march, see how they handled themselves, how they performed; and an opportunity to talk to them, all to see what were the results of their training for the first 6 months under the new Reserve Act of 1955. We were pleased with everything we saw down there at Fort Jackson. These men were about evenly divided between National Guardsmen and Reserves for the Army. They paraded for the congressional group. Then we had an opportunity after the dress parade to go down to the mess hall and eat with them at their own mess. I ate with a boy from Louisiana. Some of the other members ate with young men from their own States. We had a chance to talk to them while we were eating.

I want to tell you this: The morale of those men is excellent. They are in fine physical condition. Those young men in the 6 months' training have gained in weight an average of 11 pounds per man. The young man I sat next to from my own State of Louisiana had gained 26 pounds in weight in a little less than the 6 months period. He comes from the National Guard. He told me he had the intention of remaining in the Regular service if they would accept his enlistment when his 6 months time expired and he was formally graduated, which would be in the next few days.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Were they serving a lot of Louisiana surplus rice down there that fattened them up?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I regret to inform the gentleman there was no rice there. I would have liked to have seen some rice, but they did serve mashed potatoes with brown gravy, which was very good.

Mr. GROSS. Of course I was being facetious in asking that question. I rose to ask the gentleman this question: Are these trainees the young men 18 years old who have gone in under the law providing for 6 months' training and 7½ years in the Reserve?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes; they are the ones from 17 to 18½ that go in for 6 months' active training and then into the Reserves. However, as I say, a good many of those men want to remain in the service and enter the Regular Establishment. They are not being pushed to remain; but some of them think they like the life. It has been a healthy one, they have gained weight under the diet they have, and they are very happy with it.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman found them to be well trained?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I am not a military man. I was in the Artillery during World War I. But I inquired of the officers as to whether or not a 6 months' trainee coming out of active training would be of real service to the Nation in time of emergency. The commanding officer there told me that he thought in time of a great emergency those men coming out of that 6 months' training could be sandwiched into a Regular outfit and be very fine troops for the Nation's defense.

Mr. GROSS. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that. It long has been my contention that we ought to cut very materially the draft period that we are now using, to spread the good things of life to more of the boys in this country who can serve under the draft. I am delighted to hear the gentleman say they can now produce well-trained troops with 6 months of training at that age.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman must not misunderstand me. The gentleman is always understanding in his attitude, but what we were told was when placed with Regular troops they would be of great service. For instance, in World War I, I went in the Regular Establishment and was sandwiched in with Regulars. With a small amount of training a man can go in and be a serviceable soldier to his Nation if he serves with trained troops. They would not say that in 6 months they could set up separate units or separate divisions that would be thoroughly trained. As a part of a seasoned unit, those men would be valuable to the defense of the Nation.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman expects that we will have a standing army with us for a long time; does he not? That is a Regular Establishment. Therefore, the draft period might well be cut to 12 months.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman certainly has made an observation there.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Of course, I must yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. If the distinguished chairman will allow me, I would like to make an observation that I believe is somewhat worthwhile. Of course, the reason we are having to draft men to go into the service now is to meet the needs of the services as they exist today. The other day I had the benefit of an observation by the Secretary of the Army who said that within a very short time they expect that 70 percent of their enlisted personnel would be professionals, and by professionals is meant men who are not just in the first period of enlistment, but in the second enlistment. I think that is extremely encouraging.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few more words in regard to this experience that we had yesterday. Another thing which I think is very important, and which our committee is now considering, is the matter of amendments to the Uniform Code of Military Justice. I asked about the morale of those men. I was told the morale was excellent. You could talk to the men and see that their morale was fine. I asked about the number of cases they had had of a punishable nature and when we consider 1,500 men throughout the Nation under the 6-month program—we were told there had been 15 AWOL cases since the beginning of this program for the reserves, and that all but 6 of those 15 had returned voluntarily. Furthermore, it was hardly a case of going AWOL in most instances, but it was a matter of the men overstaying their leave. I was told there was not a single delinquency there, and that is a marvelous record when we consider the testimony that we get from some of the services with reference to their problems.

There is another thing which I believe you will be interested in and that is the cost of the program. We were shown charts and a breakdown of the figures covering different phases of the program. The total overall cost for training a 6-month trainee is $2,080. That training includes dental care which averaged about $10.82 per individual, as I remember it, medical care, clothes, food and the ammunition they consume in the course of that 6-month training period. So I say all in all the program is excellent. It is going forward. The men who are doing the training are satisfied with the job that they are doing. They want to continue training those men. The men are happy and their morale is high and the program is moving forward.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to amend existing laws relating to military leave of certain employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia so as to equalize rights to leave of absence and reemployment for such employees who are members of the Enlisted or Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard or the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1947 (Public Law 153, 80th Cong.; 61 Stat. 239; 10 U. S. C., sec. 371a; 32 U. S. C., sec. 76), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The words 'officers and employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia,' as used in such provisions of law, as now or hereafter amended, also shall be construed to mean classified substitute clerks in the field service of the Post Office Department; such classified substitute clerks shall be entitled to military leave of absence on the basis of 1 hour of such leave for each period of 17 hours of work, such leave not to exceed 120 hours (15 days) a year."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 5, strike the word "classified" and strike all of lines 6 through 11, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "substitute employees in the postal field service; such substitute employees shall be entitled to military leave of absence on the basis of 1 hour of such leave for each period or periods aggregating 26 hours of work performed in the calendar year immediately preceding the year in which they are ordered to duty by proper authority: *Provided*, That the number of hours worked during the preceding calendar year shall not be less than 1,040 hours before such substitute employee shall be entitled to military leave of absence, pay for such leave not to exceed 80 hours in each calendar year."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3744) to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to classified substitute clerks in the field service of the Post Office Department, pursuant to House Resolution 432, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to substitute employees in the postal field service."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFICE OF THE DOORKEEPER

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offered a privileged resolution (H. Res. 424) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective March 1, 1956, until otherwise provided by law there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House compensation at the basic rate of $1,650 each per annum for the employment of four additional laborers, office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRICE SUPPORT POLICY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill already introduced by Senators WATKINS and BENNETT, of Utah. The pertinent portions of this bill provide that price support shall not be made available during any calendar year, beginning with 1956, with respect to the products of any one farm of a total value, determined on the basis of support prices, in excess of $50,000. Following are some of the probable effects of passage of this legislation on large, intermediate, and small farmers:

THE LARGE FARM

It would appear that direct effects would fall primarily on a relatively few large operators. There is not presently available in recent hearings of the Agricultural committees or other relevant compilations any very exact information on how many farms or farmers would be directly affected by the proposed $50,000 limitation.

The 1950 census of agriculture does indicate that 103,231 farmers, or about 1 out of each 50 engaged in farming sold produce valued at $25,000 or more. Some of these are corporate units, but many are nothing more than very substantial family farms.

A special study of the United States Department of Agriculture of the size of the major 1953 crop-grain loans indicates the following—summary of sample survey of size of major 1953 crop-grain loans, Agricultural Marketing Service and Commodity Stabilization Service, United States Department of Agriculture, January 1956, processed:

Crop	Total number of loans (1953)	Number of loans over $25,000	Average value of loans over $25,000
Wheat	591,206	1,468	$43,214
Corn	295,508	104	34,379
Oats	43,322	10	27,198
Barley	33,952	66	96,424
Sorghum	32,822	25	40,115
Soybeans	60,524	5	37,996
Flaxseed	57,543	18	28,909
Total	1,116,105	1,696	

It should be noted that only for barley is the average size of these larger loans above $50,000. It would be reasonable to suppose that more than half, perhaps many more than half, are for amounts smaller than the average—mean. That is to say, a few very large loans are known to be included ranging upward to several hundreds of thousands of dollars and these have resulted in what the statistician calls a skewed distribution.

These data rather strongly suggest that at most only a few hundred very large or very productive farms would be affected by the $50,000 cutoff. Of course, some farms may appear in more than one of the grain-crop categories or may have taken out other, smaller loans on grains or cotton. Also, inasmuch as loans would be available under S. 3126 for up to $50,000 of products per farm, the cutoff would be only on amounts above that limit.

The statistics at hand do not clear up the question of the extent to which the grain and cotton on which these large loans are made is eventually delivered to the Government to satisfy the loan, or redeemed by the borrowing farmer prior to loan maturity and sold on the market rather than falling into the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Though detailed quantitative information is not available, discussion seems to bring out the general information that many of these loans are taken mostly because they provide a low interest credit source for the very large short-term capital requirements of these large farms. Particularly in the drier parts of the Great Plains where most of the large loans are made on wheat, the product is generally a high quality, high protein wheat, which in most years can be and is sold on the market at premium price levels above the loan rate. Thus there would appear to be considerable support for the claim that many, though not all, of the large loans have been redeemed. Their function then has been largely one of credit which has enabled the large farmer to hold his production off the market at harvest time, awaiting a more opportune marketing time and a higher price later in the year. By marketing the product at some more favorable price period during the post-harvest year, there may well be significant contribution to market stability which benefits other producers as well as the large operator.

The further question arises of whether, if the Government loan were not available beyond $50,000, capital from other sources would nevertheless be available and would be used to perform the same function. We can only guess that capital would be available, but not so abundantly, nor on quite so favorable terms. Hence the withholding function would in some degree be handicapped or partially abandoned.

Whether the unavailability of Government loans in excess of $50,000 per farm per year would lead to a reduction or restriction in scale of operations is also speculative. In some instances the limit, if considered very important, might lead to splitting up the operations within the family so each of two or more independent operators could stay below the limit. Whether it would result in acreage reduction of crops in surplus is doubtful. Likewise it could not be expected to have much significant effect on further accumulation of additional land by energetic and successful operators.

THE INTERMEDIATE AND SMALLER FARMS

These much more numerous groups, accounting for a very large fraction of the 1,116,105 loans made on the 7 grain and oil seed crops of 1953, presumably would not feel any direct effects from the loan cutoff at $50,000 per farm. There might be in practice some significant indirect effects of which the following may serve as hypothetical illustrations.

In 1953 the 1,696 loans for more than $25,000 amounted to a total of $75,361,539. If as much as one-third of that amount might be considered as representing crops which would not be eligible for Government loan under the proposed $50,000 per farm cutoff, those products might have to move, or at least might be moved, to market at harvesttime. If so, the harvesttime market price presumably would be depressed more severely than has recently been the case. The smaller and intermediate size farm operator, eligible for a loan on his full crop, would then have more reason to seek shelter under the Government support than would otherwise be the case. Of course, he might not be able to avail himself of the Government price support unless storage facilities were to be provided in areas where they are not now adequately available. That might lead to further expansion in Government storage facilities or further efforts to get others to provide such space. There is some doubt whether these smaller loans, once made, would be quite so likely to be redeemed. That is, the Government might end up owning more wheat from numerous smaller loans than would have been the case with fewer, larger loans. Administrative problems too might be more complex, partly because of the larger number of farmers involved but also because of greater diversity in type of product.

However, there does seem to be at least one way in which the small and intermediate farmer might benefit. The support program has arrived at a position in the public estimation which might be designated as critical. The publicity and criticism which has in the past few years accompanied the large loans has done much to undermine public confidence in the equity of the whole program. If such a loan ceiling of $50,000 on the products of one farm in 1 year, though touching only a few farmers directly, should take some of that burden off the back of the program and permit it to function in a more favorable public relations environment, that in itself might be considered to be a major value of the proposed limit.

OTC WILL USURP THE POWERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, OTC is a subtle maneuver that would lead us into a form of world government without our knowledge or consent.

It is a form of brainwashing whereby the Congress would be deceived into signing its own death warrant.

Behind this conspiracy is the State Department of our own Government.

An agency that is sworn to protect the interests of the United States in its relationship with other nations. An agency whose career personnel are familiar with conditions in every other nation except the United States. An agency that, in promoting cooperation, or in making concessions to win the alleged good will of other nations, is not remotely concerned with the havoc inflicted upon certain American industries and American workers by such policies.

The State Department acts alone, preferring to ignore public opinion as expressed through the duly elected representatives of the American people who constitute the Congress of the United States.

The ill-concealed arrogance of the planners in the State Department is exposed by their own hand in asking us to vote for H. R. 5550.

For behind this initial step is the transfer of the Constitution powers and responsibilities of the Congress to the State Department, to be followed inevitably by our participation in a 35-member rulemaking body in which we would have but 1 voice against 34. An international legislature that would acquire the hidden power to liquidate some American industries and the livelihood of many American workers.

They tried it before under GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Congress has never ratified participation by the United States in GATT. Yet representatives from the executive department attend these meetings, and are drawing up various reciprocal trade arrangements. OTC is a side-door attempt, not only to ratify GATT, but to extend its authority, and dangerously so.

OTC is the big fist in silk gloves that would put us at the mercy of have-not nations, and require the United States to make every sacrifice.

Communist Czechoslovakia and neutralist India are members of GATT.

Red Russia could join, if it so wishes. With that would come the opportunity to sabotage our domestic economy, and our strength as the leader of the free world.

Repeatedly, some Members of Congress have asked for Federal help to assist distressed industries and labor-surplus areas in the United States, but our proposals have been brushed aside in favor of giveaway programs to help other nations.

In view of this contradiction, it appears that the welfare of other nations is receiving more consideration within the secret councils of the executive department, than the welfare of Americans.

Secr.

So are many of the decisions made by GATT. Some of its reports are classified so that the American people will not learn, in time, how some of their industries and many of their jobs are being traded away.

As recently as August 25, 1955, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association adopted a resolution disapproving H. R. 5550. Its reasoning was unassailable when it stated that, and I quote:

> Neither the President, nor Congress has the legal authority under the Constitution, to delegate the regulation of our commerce with foreign nations to a foreign-controlled group.

No man can question the vast amount of help given in the postwar years to help other nations build their economies. This was done voluntarily. It has been largely successful. We have already made great reductions in our tariffs. Why then, the drive to place international controls over our domestic economy?

To open up an export market for a few American industries, at the expense of the majority of American producers whose market is in the United States, and who would be destroyed by an influx of foreign goods produced by low-wage countries?

Or does it mask some other purpose?

Such as involving us in the regimentation of the one-worlders, who are so fascinated by the idea of global law and order that they would buy it at the expense of our own hard-won freedoms?

I suggest to the State Department that the Constitution cannot be amended by the indirect and illegal method that is implicit in H. R. 5550.

We will not be a party to such deception, or to the abdication of those powers vested in the Congress by the Constitution.

The bill to subordinate us to OTC must be defeated, if Americans are to retain control over their own industries and their own jobs.

THE SEGREGATION ISSUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, recently we heard a lengthy debate here about the Supreme Court decision in the case of Brown against Board of Education, the so-called school segregation opinion.

On Monday, 96 Members of Congress issued a declaration of constitutional principles, in which they attacked the decision in the school-segregation cases. In this manifesto they called the action of the Court an "unwarranted decision" and a "clear abuse of judicial power," which substituted "naked power for established law."

I am fortunate to represent communities where the segregation concept is simply unknown. Most of those who live in my part of the country find it hard to understand the intense feelings that have been expressed here by spokesmen for communities which are directly affected by the Court's holding. But I am not going to speak as a New Yorker this afternoon, nor as a northerner. Nor do I rise to criticize any of my colleagues, who have made such eloquent and stirring presentations of their problem and their points of view.

On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that all of us who have the honor of serving in this House should welcome the complete freedom and genuine tolerance with which conflicting viewpoints are received and considered here. It is a very good thing to air the problems and strongly held feelings of the people in any community of this Nation.

I am taking part in this discussion primarily as a lawyer, Mr. Speaker. Most of the gentlemen who addressed themselves to the segregation opinion last week identified themselves, in the course of their remarks, as members of our profession, and there was a statement at one point to the effect that no reputable lawyer will rise to defend the legality of what the Court undertook to do in these decisions. I feel that the record should not be left standing open on this point. My conscience compels me to speak.

I happen to agree with the decision. Furthermore, I have an abiding respect for the institution known as the Supreme Court. I have great admiration for Chief Justice Warren, identified in each of the opinions as the man who actually chose the words in which they are cast, and who is generally accorded credit for the manifest statesmanship that produced unanimity at every stage of the proceedings. But my main purpose today is to explain and describe what the Court seems actually to have done in deciding Brown against Board of Education and its companion cases.

Before turning to the decisions themselves, let me touch briefly on one other collateral issue about which the record has been left in some confusion, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman who spoke recently quoted rather extensively from the great and wise man who gave us the description of our glorious Nation: "conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Particular stress was laid on Mr. Lincoln's arguments in the course of the Douglas debates, aimed at the errors which he felt were present in the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. Lincoln was an eloquent and sometimes impassioned debater, and the language from his lips which found its way recently into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was indeed forceful. But it speaks very well of the integrity of purpose and thoroughness of preparation which characterized the principal speech by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER], in which Mr. Lincoln was extensively quoted, that he included a quotation which puts everything else in proper context. Let me repeat that quotation here. Mr. Lincoln said, in the June 26 debate—1857:

> We think the Dred Scott decision is erroneous. We know the Court that made it has often overruled its own decisions, and we shall do what we can to have it to overrule this.

I reiterate that language, because it negates some of the implications sought to be drawn from other quotations of the period. Mr. Lincoln thought it might be possible to prevail upon the Court to amend or reverse the stand it

had taken. He did not approve, and he did not at any point propose, the policy of defying or resisting the authority of the Justices, or the terms of their decision. That is where I feel the line must still be drawn. The very oaths of office we took on entering service in this House would prohibit advocacy of defiance amounting to a conflict with the Federal Constitution.

The decisions about which all this interest centers are actually one important order of the Court, and three separate opinions. But they are surprising, by contrast with the verbosity of many less important findings, in that all of them together fill only about 20 pages of the official United States Reports. They are also surprising, and in my view, very gratifying, in that every one of them is written by the Chief Justice for a unanimous Court. Whatever questions or difficulties might have troubled the nine Justices who comprise the Court were resolved before the opinion was prepared. The result is that the Court throws all its weight and prestige, with undivided force, behind this determination of what the Federal Constitution means, as applied to the rights of an important segment of our American community.

While I am characterizing the opinions in general, I would add one more comment: As a lawyer, with a draftsman's respect for the written word, I appraise these opinions as singularly fine specimens of clear legal writing. They are terse, lucid, and to the point in a style which recalls the Olympian simplicity of Oliver Wendell Holmes.

The facts in all the cases which were joined together for consideration are substantially the same: Negro children of elementary and high-school age applied to various courts, in jurisdictions where the school systems were segregated, urging that the laws which denied them free access to segregated white schools deprived them of rights which the Federal Constitution protects. In all but one of the cases, the lower courts denied relief, citing the so-called separate-but-equal doctrine expounded by the Supreme Court in the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U. S. 537 (decided in 1896)). All the cases which arose in State jurisdictions depended on the application of the 14th amendment of the Constitution. The one which arose in the District of Columbia, Bolling, et al. against Sharpe, et al., depended on the 5th amendment, since the District of Columbia is a Federal jurisdiction, and the 14th amendment would consequently have no application.

The first two cases reached the Supreme Court in 1952, and were set for argument in the October term of that year. The Court officially noted that the other two cases, including the Bolling case from the District of Columbia, were pending and would likely be appealed, and it therefore deferred the arguments so that all could be consolidated. By an order which appears at page 14 of volume 344, United States Reports, the Court requested the State of Kansas and the Topeka Board of Education, defendants in the Brown case, to appear and present arguments. On November 10, 1952, certiorari was granted in the Bolling case (344 U. S. 837); and the consolidated cases were set for hearing by the Court on December 9, 1952.

These were preliminary orders, merely bringing the cases together and arranging the mechanics of consolidated hearings, though it is noteworthy that the only dissent in the entire proceedings arose in this phase, over the question of deferring the initial argument in the first two cases which came up to the Court—Three Hundred and Forty-fourth United States Reports, page 1.

After the first hearing and holding the cases under advisement for several months, the Court issued an order, on June 8, 1953, setting all of them for reargument, and requesting counsel to develop arguments on the legislative history of the 14th amendment and whether that amendment was intended to reach public education, the existence and extent of the power of the Court to deal with the segregation issue in public schools, and, if the power were adequate, the best and most practical way to accomplish a gradual readjustment in accord with whatever the Court might rule. This order—Three Hundred and Forty-fifth United States Reports, page 972—also included an invitation to the Attorney General of the United States to appear and participate in the argument if he wished to do so. The second argument, pursuant to this order, followed on December 8, 1953.

Five months later, on May 17, 1954, the Court handed down its principal, unanimous decisions in the cases which had arisen from State jurisdictions—*Brown* v. *Board of Education, etc.* (347 U. S. 483), and in the Bolling case, from the District of Columbia—Three Hundred and Forty-seventh United States Reports, page 497.

It is perhaps presumptuous for me to try to explain what the Court said in these opinions with any idea of making it clearer than the language of the opinions themselves. Under leave already granted, I attach the text as an appendix, since I feel that it will be very useful to the Members to have the decisions themselves gathered here at one point in the RECORD. But, in summary, the Brown opinion concludes that there is nothing definitive in the legislative history of the 14th amendment, and that the drafters could not have held any opinion about public education since public school systems had not yet been developed on any significant scale. Negro education at that time was nonexistent, the Court notes, and it was actually a violation of local laws to offer any kind of education to Negroes in some jurisdictions.

The earliest judicial interpretations of the 14th amendment held unequivocally that any discrimination based on race differences was unconstitutional. Then, in 1896, a divided Court wrote, Plessy against Ferguson, enunciating the separate-but-equal doctrine. Chief Justice Warren's opinion notes that the Plessy case dealt with transportation facilities, holding that laws which required separate railroad facilities were not violative of the 14th amendment, so long as the facilities provided were equal in quality and comfort. Subsequently, the same doctrine was applied in the field of education, but the cases which the Court collects all turned on a finding of the fact that the educational facilities involved were not, in fact, equal, so that the separation was stricken on this basis. It should be noted, however, that these cases, cited in the opinion, constitute in fact judicial holdings that segregation in certain limited educational fields has been unconstitutional for some time past.

Then Chief Justice Warren passes to the simple heart of the current cases. In each of them the lower courts had found as a fact that the accommodations tendered white and colored children were equal, so that for the first time the Court was obliged to determine whether the fact that they were separate, standing alone, constituted a deprivation of equal protection or due process. This was and is a pure question of fact, of course, and it appears from the opinion that three of the lower courts had made findings precisely to this effect, that is, that even though the facilities provided both groups of children were equal, the mere fact of separation or segregation alone deprived the Negroes of equally good educations.

This explains why the Court acknowledges, in one of its footnotes, a number of eminent authorities in the fields of psychology and education. It turned to the experts, to ascertain what the effects of separation, or implied ostracism, might be on the school-age child and his learning processes. The experts seemingly buttressed the findings of the lower courts, that such effects were adverse.

No one can disagree with the Court's observation that—

> We must consider public education in the light of its full development and its present place in American life throughout the Nation.

And in this light, there is certainly an eminently reasonable foundation for the opinion that segregation per se has deleterious effects. The conclusion from which everything follows, by the automatic application of constitutional principles, is as follows:

> We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.

In the companion case of *Bolling et al.* v. *Sharpe et al.* (347 U. S. 497), decided at the same time, the Court applies the same reasoning to the District of Columbia, invoking the due process clause of the fifth amendment, as a limitation upon the Government of the United States, acting through the government of the District of Columbia, on the reasoning that segregation is a violation of personal rights which amounts also to a deprivation of liberty without due process. The Court is also candid about a practical consideration underlying this reasoning: It would be unthinkable that the Constitution could impose less of a burden in this respect upon the Federal Government than it imposes upon the several States.

It is surprising that the device, adopted by the Court, which is most clearly and obviously a judicial effort to temper the impact of this decision is the device which has evoked most bitter and enduring criticism. Instead of reversing the cases and closing the matter, with the new principle unequivocally established as controlling precedent for all school systems from that date forward, the Court set yet another hearing, for the following term, and invited interested parties to brief the questions of implementation, how the new principle might be most fairly applied, with a minimum of hardship and disruption. These final arguments were heard on April 11, 1955, and the final, consolidated opinion, covering all the cases, was handed down on May 31, 1955, 349 United States, page 294.

This opinion, also written by the Chief Justice for a unanimous Court, consists of four pages and cites no authorities, as it is more in the nature of an order of the Court than a supplementary opinion. Referring to the principle established previously, that segregation in public-school systems, is per se, a violation of civil rights, the Court notes that this will make all provisions of Federal, State, and local law to the contrary unconstitutional. The precise words are that such laws "must yield to this principle."

I should like to dwell on those words for a moment, because I suspect that they are what critics of the opinion mean to attack as judicial legislation, usurpation, political, or policymaking, and so forth. It is true that the Court is seemingly challenging a considerable body of State and local law. It is true that the opinion must necessarily conflict with that body of law. But look again at the words, "must yield to this principle."

The Court is not saying that the laws must fall by its authority or by its order. The Court only observes, quite properly, that such a result will follow. And as for the absence of citation of authorities, I am sure there is not a Member present in this Chamber who could not quickly supply the absolute authority which the Court had in mind. I shall read it:

> Article VI, clause 2: This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Court concludes that the best and most orderly way in which to implement its decision is to refer the matter back, in each case, to the local courts for application of their plenary equity powers. This it does, with the warning, "but it should go without saying that the vitality of these constitutional principles cannot be allowed to yield simply because of disagreement with them." The parties defendant are required to make a prompt and reasonable start in the matter of desegregation, and thereafter they are to be liberally accorded such time as they may need to make a smooth transition to nonsegregated educational systems. The opinion observes:

> To that end, the courts may consider problems related to administration, arising from the physical condition of the school plant, the school transportation system, personnel, revision of school districts and attendant areas into compact units to achieve a system determining admission to the public schools on a nonracial basis, and the revision of local laws and regulations which may be necessary in solving the foregoing problems.

The foregoing is the sum and substance of the decisions of the Court. I submit that, taken together, they are an exemplary demonstration of moderation in approaching what is patently a painful and difficult problem.

In conclusion, I should like to say a few words more about the matter of precedents for these opinions. Several of the gentlemen who spoke the other day implied there were none, as if the Court had taken off upon some new and uncharted path. Precisely the opposite is true. The sharpest break with tradition in applying the 14th amendment, from the date of its adoption to the present, came with the Plessy case, decided in 1896, and which I have already cited. The dissent of Mr. Justice Harlan, ancestor and namesake of the present Justice, collects numerous authorities which support this recent action of the Court. And let me read you a few lines of Justice Harlan's language, written for that occasion 60 years ago:

> The white race deems itself to be the dominant race in this country. And so it is, in prestige, in achievements, in education, in wealth, and in power. So I doubt not that it will continue to be for all time, if it remains true to its great heritage and holds fast to the principles of constitutional liberty. But in view of the Constitution, in the eye of the law, there is in this country no superior, dominant, ruling class of citizens. There is no caste here. Our Constitution is colorblind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens. In respect of civil rights, all citizens are equal before the law. The humblest is the peer of the most powerful. The law regards man as man, and takes no account of his surroundings or of his color when his civil rights as guaranteed by the supreme law of the land are involved.

To this I would add one more brief quote, from an act done in the First Congress, from which we who are assembled here today trace our origin, in a document signed 180 years ago:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

I hope we shall be able to keep this great heritage in focus. I agree with my esteemed friends from Southern States that we are facing challenges akin to those which plagued our Nation in the sad days of reconstruction. But I am sure that, on reflection, none of us will wish to carry his partisanship on this matter beyond the limits of judicial reconsideration, or legislative or constitutional revision. And I hope that the wisdom and restraint of the Court's own language in these decisions will prove helpful to all of us.

Under leave already granted, I attach pertinent texts from the Supreme Court:

APPENDIX

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—DECISIONS PER CURIAM AND ORDERS—FROM MAY 18 THROUGH JUNE 15, 1953

(345 U. S. 972)

JUNE 8, 1953

Miscellaneous orders

No. 8. *Brown et al.* v. *Board of Education of Topeka et al.*;

No. 101. *Briggs et al.* v. *Elliott et al., Members of Board of Trustees of School District No. 22, et al.*;

No. 191. *Davis et al.* v. *County School Board of Prince Edward County et al.*;

No. 413. *Bolling et al.* v. *Sharpe et al.*; and

No. 448. *Gebhart et al.* v. *Belton et al.*

Each of these cases is ordered restored to the docket and is assigned for reargument on Monday, October 12, next. In their briefs and on oral argument counsel are requested to discuss particularly the following questions insofar as they are relevant to the respective cases:

1. What evidence is there that the Congress which submitted and the State legislatures and conventions which ratified the 14th amendment contemplated or did not contemplate, understood or did not understand, that it would abolish segregation in public schools?

2. If neither the Congress in submitting nor the States in ratifying the 14th amendment understood that compliance with it would require the immediate abolition of segregation in public schools, was it nevertheless the understanding of the framers of the amendment (a) that future Congresses might, in the exercise of their power under section 5 of the amendment, abolish such segregation, or (b) that it would be within the judicial power, in light of future conditions, to construe the amendment as abolishing such segregation of its own force?

3. On the assumption that the answers to questions 2 (a) and (b) do not dispose of the issue, is it within the judicial power, in construing the amendment, to abolish segregation in public schools?

4. Assuming it is decided that segregation in public schools violates the 14th amendment (a) would a decree necessarily follow providing that, within the limits set by normal geographic school districting, Negro children should forthwith be admitted to schools of their choice; or (b) may this Court, in the exercise of its equity powers, permit an effective gradual adjustment to be brought about from existing segregated systems to a system not based on color distinctions?

5. On the assumption on which questions 4 (a) and (b) are based, and assuming further that this Court will exercise its equity powers to the end described in question 4 (b), (a) should this Court formulate detailed decrees in these cases; (b) if so, what specific issues should the decrees reach; (c) should this Court appoint a special master to hear evidence with a view to recommending specific terms for such decrees; (d) should this Court remand to the courts of first instance with directions to frame decrees in these cases, and if so what general directions should the decrees of this Court include and what procedures should the courts of first instance follow in arriving at the specific terms of more detailed decrees?

The Attorney General of the United States is invited to take part in the oral argument and to file an additional brief if he so desires.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—NOS. 1, 2, 4, AND 10—OCTOBER TERM 1953

(347 U. S. 483)

1. *Oliver Brown et al., Appellants,* v. *Board of Education of Topeka, Shawnee County, Kansas, et al.:* On appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Kansas.

2. *Harry Briggs, Jr., et al., Appellants,* v. *R. W. Elliott et al.:* On appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina.

4. *Dorothy E. Davis et al., Appellants,* v. *County School Board of Prince Edward County, Virginia, et al.:* On appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

10. *Francis B. Gebhart et al., Petitioners,* v. *Ethel Louise Belton et al.:* On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Delaware.

MAY 17, 1954

Mr. Chief Justice Warren delivered the opinion of the Court.

These cases come to us from the States of Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware. They are premised on different facts and different local conditions, but a common legal question justifies their consideration together in this consolidated opinion.[1]

[1] In the Kansas case, *Brown* v. *Board of Education,* the plaintiffs are Negro children of elementary school age residing in Topeka. They brought this action in the United States District Court for the District of Kansas to enjoin enforcement of a Kansas statute which permits, but does not require, cities of more than 15,000 population to maintain separate school facilities for Negro and white students. Kan. Gen. Stat. § 72–1724 (1949). Pursuant to that authority, the Topeka Board of Education elected to establish segregated elementary schools. Other public schools in the community, however, are operated on a nonsegregated basis. The three-judge district court, convened under 28 U. S. C. §§ 2281 and 2284, found that segregation in public education has a detrimental effect upon Negro children, but denied relief on the ground that the Negro and white schools were substantially equal with respect to buildings, transportation, curricula, and educational qualifications of teachers. 98 F. Supp. 797. The case is here on direct appeal under 28 U. S. C. § 1253.

In the South Carolina case, *Briggs* v. *Elliott,* the plaintiffs are Negro children of both elementary and high school age residing in Clarendon County. They brought this action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to enjoin enforcement of provisions in the State constitution and statutory code which require the segregation of Negroes and whites in public schools. (S. C. Const., Art. XI, § 7; S. C. Code § 5377 (1942).) The three-judge district court, convened under 28 U. S. C. §§ 2281 and 2284, denied the requested relief. The court found that the Negro schools were inferior to the white schools and ordered the defendants to begin immediately to equalize the facilities. But the court sustained the validity of the contested provisions and denied the plaintiffs admission to the white schools during the equalization program. (98 F. Supp. 529.) This Court vacated the district court's judgment and remanded the case for the purpose of obtaining the court's views on a report filed by the defendants concerning the progress made in the equalization program. (342 U. S. 350.) On remand, the district court found that substantial equality had been achieved except for buildings and that the defendants were proceeding to rectify this inequality as well. (103 F. Supp. 920.) The case is again here on direct appeal under 28 U. S. C. § 1253.

In each of the cases, minors of the Negro race, through their legal representatives, seek the aid of the courts in obtaining admission to the public schools of their community on a nonsegregated basis. In each instance, they had been denied admission to schools attended by white children under laws requiring or permitting segregation according to race. This segregation was alleged to deprive the plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws under the 14th amendment. In each of the cases other than the Delaware case, a three-judge federal district court denied relief to the plaintiffs on the so-called separate but equal doctrine announced by this Court in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson,* (163 U. S. 537). Under that doctrine, equality of treatment is accorded when the races are provided substantially equal facilities, even though these facilities be separate. In the Delaware case, the supreme court of Delaware adhered to that doctrine, but ordered that the plaintiffs be admitted to the white schools because of their superiority to the Negro schools.

The plaintiffs contend that segregated public schools are not "equal" and cannot be made "equal," and that hence they are deprived of the equal protection of the laws. Because of the obvious importance of the question presented, the Court took jurisdiction.[2] Argument was heard in the 1952 Term, and reargument was heard this Term on certain questions propounded by the Court.[3]

Reargument was largely devoted to the circumstances surrounding the adoption of the 14th amendment in 1868. It covered exhaustively consideration of the amendment in Congress, ratification by the States, then existing practices in racial segregation, and the views of proponents and opponents of the amendment. This discussion and our own investigation convince us that, although these sources cast some light, it is not enough to resolve the problem with which we are faced. At best, they are inconclusive. The most avid proponents of the postwar amendments undoubtedly intended them to remove all legal distinctions among "all persons born or naturalized in the United States." Their opponents, just as certainly, were antagonistic to both the letter and the spirit of the amendments and wished them to have the most limited effect. What others in Congress and the State legislatures had in mind cannot be determined with any degree of certainty.

An additional reason for the inconclusive nature of the amendment's history, with respect to segregated schools, is the status of public education at that time.[4] In the South, the movement toward free common schools, supported by general taxation, had not yet taken hold. Education of white children was largely in the hands of private groups. Education of Negroes was almost nonexistent, and practically all of the race were illiterate. In fact, any education of Negroes was forbidden by law in some States. Today, in contrast, many Negroes have achieved outstanding success in the arts and sciences as well as in the business and professional world. It is true that public education had already advanced further in

In the Virginia case, *Davis* v. *County School Board,* the plaintiffs are Negro children of high school age residing in Prince Edward County. They brought this action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to enjoin enforcement of provisions in the State constitution and statutory code which require the segregation of Negroes and whites in public schools. Va. Const., § 140; Va. Code § 22–221 (1950). The three-judge district court, convened under 28 U. S. C. §§ 2281 and 2284, denied the requested relief. The court found the Negro school inferior in physical plant, curricula, and transportation, and ordered the defendants forthwith to provide substantially equal curricula and transportation and to "proceed with all reasonable diligence and dispatch to remove" the inequality in physical plant. But, as in the South Carolina case, the court sustained the validity of the contested provisions and denied the plaintiffs admission to the white schools during the equalization program. 103 F. Supp. 337. The case is here on direct appeal under 28 U. S. C. § 1253.

In the Delaware case, *Gebhart* v. *Belton,* the plaintiffs are Negro children of both elementary and high school age residing in New Castle County. They brought this action in the Delaware Court of Chancery to enjoin enforcement of provisions in the State constitution and statutory code which require the segregation of Negroes and whites in public schools. (Del. Const., art. X, § 2; Del. Rev. Code § 2631 (1935).) The chancellor gave judgment for the plaintiffs and ordered their immediate admission to schools previously attended only by white children, on the ground that the Negro schools were inferior with respect to teacher training, pupil-teacher ratio, extra-curricular activities, physical plant, and time and distance involved in travel. (87 A. 2d 862.) The chancellor also found that segregation itself results in an inferior education for Negro children (see note 10, infra), but did not rest his decision on that ground. (Id., at 865.) The chancellor's decree was affirmed by the supreme court of Delaware, which intimated, however, that the defendants might be able to obtain a modification of the decree after equalization of the Negro and white schools had been accomplished. (91 A. 2d 137, 152.) The defendants, contending only that the Delaware courts had erred in ordering the immediate admission of the Negro plaintiffs to the white schools, applied to this Court for certiorari. The writ was granted (344 U. S. 891). The plaintiffs, who were successful below, did not submit to a cross petition.

[2] 344 U. S. 1, 141, 891.

[3] 345 U. S. 972. The Attorney General of the United States participated both Terms as amicus curiae.

[4] For a general study of the development of public education prior to the amendment, see Butts and Cremin, A History of Education in American Culture (1953), pts. I, II; Cubberley, Public Education in the United States (1934 ed.), cc. II–XII. School practices current at the time of the adoption of the 14th amendment are described in Butts and Crimen, supra, at 269–275; Cubberley, supra, at 288–339, 408–431; Knight, Public Education in the South (1922), cc. VIII, IX. See also H. Ex. Doc. No. 315, 41st Cong., 2d sess. (1871). Although the demand for free public schools followed substantially the same pattern in both the North and the South, the development in the South did not begin to gain momentum until about 1850, some 20 years after that in the North. The reasons for the somewhat slower development in the South (e. g., the rural character of the South and the different regional attitudes toward State assistance) are well explained in Cubberley, supra, at 408–423. In the country as a whole, but particularly in the South, the war virtually stopped all progress in public education. Id., at 427–428. The low status of Negro education in all sections of the country, both before and immediately after the war, is described in Beale, A History of Freedom of Teaching in American Schools (1941), 112–132, 175–195. Compulsory school attendance laws were not generally adopted until after the ratification of the 14th amendment, and it was not until 1918 that such laws were in force in all the States. Cubberley, supra, at 563–565.

the North, but the effect of the amendment on Northern States was generally ignored in the congressional debates. Even in the North, the conditions of public education did not approximate those existing today. The curriculum was usually rudimentary; ungraded schools were common in rural areas; the school term was but 3 months a year in many States; and compulsory school attendance was virtually unknown. As a consequence, it is not surprising that there should be so little in the history of the 14th amendment relating to its intended effect on public education.

In the first cases in this Court construing the 14th amendment, decided shortly after its adoption, the Court interpreted it as proscribing all State-imposed discriminations against the Negro race. [5] The doctrine of "separate but equal" did not make its appearance in this Court until 1896 in the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson, supra,* involving not education but transportation.[6] American courts have since labored with the doctrine for over half a century. In this Court, there have been six cases involving the "separate but equal" doctrine in the field of public education.[7] In *Cumming* v. *County Board of Education,* (175 U. S. 528), and *Gong Lum* v. *Rice* (275 U. S. 78), the validity of the doctrine itself was not challenged.[8] In more recent cases, all on the graduate school level, inequality was found in that specific benefits enjoyed by white students were denied to Negro students of the same educational qualifications. (*Missouri ex rel. Gaines* v. *Canada* (305 U. S. 337); *Sipuel* v. *Oklahoma* (332 U. S. 631); *Sweatt* v. *Painter* (330 U. S. 629); *McLaurin* v. *Oklahoma State Regents* (693 U. S. 637).) In none of these cases was it necessary to reexamine the doctrine to grant relief to the Negro plaintiff. And in *Sweatt* v. *Painter, supra,* the Court expressly reserved decision on the question whether *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* should be held inapplicable to public education.

In the instant cases, that question is directly presented. Here, unlike *Sweatt* v. *Painter,* there are findings below that the Negro and white schools involved have been equalized, or are being equalized, with respect to buildings, curricula, qualifications, and salaries of teachers, and other "tangible" factors.[9] Our decision, therefore, cannot turn on merely a comparison of these tangible factors in the Negro and white schools involved in each of the cases. We must look instead to the effect of segregation itself on public education.

In approaching this problem, we cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the amendment was adopted, or even to 1896 when *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was written. We must consider public education in the light of its full development and its present place in American life throughout the Nation. Only in this way can it be determined if segregation in public schools deprives these plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws.

Today, education is perhaps the most important function of State and local governments. Compulsory school attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities, even service in the Armed Forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. Today it is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the State has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.

We come then to the question presented: Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other "tangible" factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does.

In *Sweatt* v. *Painter,* supra, in finding that a segregated law school for Negroes could not provide them equal educational opportunities, this Court relied in large part on "those qualities which are incapable of objective measurement but which make for greatness in a law school." In *McLaurin* v. *Oklahoma State Regents,* supra, the Court, in requiring that a Negro admitted to a white graduate school be treated like all other students, again resorted to intangible considerations: "* * * his ability to study, to engage in discussions and exchange views with other students, and, in general, to learn his profession." Such considerations apply with added force to children in grade and high schools. To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. The effect of this separation on their educational opportunities was well stated by a finding in the Kansas case by a court which nevertheless felt compelled to rule against the Negro plaintiffs:

"Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law; for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the Negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to retard the educational and mental development of Negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racially integrated school system." [10]

Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson,* this finding is amply supported by modern authority.[11] Any language in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* contrary to this finding is rejected.

We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment. This disposition makes unnecessary any discussion whether such segregation also violates the Due Process Clause of the 14th amendment.[12]

Because these are class actions, because of the wide applicability of this decision, and because of the great variety of local conditions, the formulation of decrees in these cases presents problems of considerable complexity. On reargument, the consideration of appropriate relief was necessarily subordinated to the primary question—the constitutionality of segregation in public education. We have now announced that such segregation is a denial of the equal protection of the laws. In order that we may have the full assistance of the parties in formulating decrees, the cases will be re-

---

[5] *Slaughter-House Cases* (16 Wall. 36, 67–72 (1873)); *Strauder* v. *West Virginia* (100 U. S. 303, 307–308 (1879)):

"It ordains that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, or deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. What is this but declaring that the law in the States shall be the same for the black as for the white; that all persons, whether colored or white, shall stand equal before the laws of the States, and, in regard to the colored race, for whose protection the amendment was primarily designed, that no discrimination shall be made against them by law because of their color? The words of the amendment, it is true, are prohibitory, but they contain a necessary implication of a positive immunity, or right, most valuable to the colored race—the right to exemption from unfriendly legislation against them distinctively as colored—exemption from legal discriminations, implying inferiority in civil society, lessening the security of their enjoyment of the rights which others enjoy, and discriminations which are steps towards reducing them to the condition of a subject race." See also *Virginia* v. *Rives* (100 U. S. 313, 318 (1879)); *Ex parte Virginia* (100 U. S. 339, 344–345 (1879)).

[6] The doctrine apparently originated in *Roberts* v. *City of Boston,* 59 Mass. 198, 206 (1849), upholding school segregation against attack as being violative of a State constitutional guarantee of equality. Segregation in Boston public schools was eliminated in 1855. Mass. Acts 1855, c. 256. But elsewhere in the North segregation in public education has persisted until recent years. It is apparent that such segregation has long been a nationwide problem, not merely one of sectional concern.

[7] See also *Berea College* v. *Kentucky* (211 U. S. 45 (1908)).

[8] In the *Cumming* case, Negro taxpayers sought an injunction requiring the defendant school board to discontinue the operation of a high school for white children until the board resumed operation of a high school for Negro children. Similarly, in the *Gong Lum* case, the plaintiff, a child of Chinese descent, contended only that State authorities had misapplied the doctrine by classifying him with Negro children and requiring him to attend a Negro school.

[9] In the Kansas case, the court below found substantial equality as to all such factors (98 F. Supp. 797, 798). In the South Carolina case, the court below found that the defendants were proceeding "promptly and in good faith to comply with the court's decree" (103 F. Supp. 920, 921). In the Virginia case, the court below noted that the equalization program was already "afoot and progressing" (103 F. Supp. 337, 341); since then, we have been advised, in the Virginia attorney general's brief on reargument, that the program has now been completed. In the Delaware case, the court below similarly noted that the State's equalization program was well under way (91 A. 2d 137, 149).

[10] A similar finding was made in the Delaware case: "I conclude from the testimony that in our Delaware society, State-imposed segregation in education itself results in the Negro children, as a class, receiving educational opportunities which are substantially inferior to those available to white children otherwise similarly situated." (87 A. 2d 862, 865.)

[11] K. B. Clark, Effect of Prejudice and Discrimination on Personality Development (Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, 1950); Witmer and Kotinsky, Personality in the Making (1952), c. VI; Deutscher and Chein, The Psychological Effects of Enforced Segregation: A Survey of Social Science Opinion, 26 J. Psychol. 259 (1948); Chein, What are the Psychological Effects of Segregation Under Conditions of Equal Facilities?, 3 Int. J. Opinion and Attitude Res. 229 (1949); Brameld, Educational Costs, in Discrimination and National Welfare (MacIver, ed., 1949), 44–48; Frazier, The Negro in the United States (1949), 674–681. And see generally Myrdal, An American Dilemma (1944).

[12] See *Bolling* v. *Sharpe, infra,* concerning the due process clause of the fifth amendment.

stored to the docket, and the parties are requested to present further argument on questions 4 and 5 previously propounded by the Court for the reargument this Term.[13] The Attorney General of the United States is again invited to participate. The attorneys general of the States requiring or permitting segregation in public education will also be permitted to appear as amici curiae upon request to do so by September 15, 1954, and submission of briefs by October 1, 1954.[14]

It is so ordered.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—No. 8. OCTOBER TERM, 1953

Spottswood Thomas Bolling et al., Petitioner, v. *C. Melvin Sharpe et al.:* On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

MAY 17, 1954

(347 U. S. 497)

Mr. Chief Justice Warren delivered the opinion of the Court.

This case challenges the validity of segregation in the public schools of the District of Columbia. The petitioners, minors of the Negro race, allege that such segregation deprives them of due process of law under the fifth amendment. They were refused admission to a public school attended by white children solely because of their race. They sought the aid of the District Court for the District of Columbia in obtaining admission. That court dismissed their complaint. We granted a writ of certiorari before judgment in the court of appeals because of the importance of the constitutional question presented (344 U. S. 873).

We have this day held that the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment prohibits the States from maintaining racially segregated public schools.[1] The legal problem in the District of Columbia is somewhat different, however. The fifth amendment, which is applicable in the District of Columbia, does not contain an equal protection clause as does the 14th amendment which applies only to the States. But the concepts of equal protection and due process, both stemming from our American ideal of fairness, are not mutually exclusive. The "equal protection of the laws" is a more explicit safeguard of prohibited unfairness than "due process of law," and, therefore, we do not imply that the two are always interchangeable phrases. But, as this Court has recognized, discrimination may be so unjustifiable as to be violative of due process.[2]

Classifications based solely upon race must be scrutinized with particular care, since they are contrary to our traditions and hence constitutionally suspect.[3] As long ago as 1896, this Court declared the principle "that the Constitution of the United States, in its present form, forbids, so far as civil and political rights are concerned, discrimination by the General Government, or by the States, against any citizen because of his race."[4] And in *Buchanan* v. *Warley* (245 U. S. 60), the Court held that a statute which limited the right of a property owner to convey his property to a person of another race was, as an unreasonable discrimination, a denial of due process of law.

Although the Court has not assumed to define "liberty" with any great precision, that term is not confined to mere freedom from bodily restraint. Liberty under law extends to the full range of conduct which the individual is free to pursue, and it cannot be restricted except for a proper governmental objective. Segregation in public education is not reasonably related to any proper governmental objective, and thus it imposes on Negro children of the District of Columbia a burden that constitutes an arbitrary deprivation of their liberty in violation of the due process clause.

In view of our decision that the Constitution prohibits the States from maintaining racially segregated public schools, it would be unthinkable that the same Constitution would impose a lesser duty on the Federal Government.[5] We hold that racial segregation in the public schools of the District of Columbia is a denial of the due process of law guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution.

For the reasons set out in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, this case will be restored to the docket for reargument on questions 4 and 5 previously propounded by the Court (345 U. S. 972).

It is so ordered.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—NOS. 1, 2, 3, 4, AND 5—OCTOBER TERM, 1954

(349 U. S. 294)

1. *Oliver Brown, et al., Appellants,* v. *Board of Education of Topeka, Shawnee County, Kansas, et al.:* On appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Kansas.

2. *Harry Briggs, Jr., et al., Appellants,* v. *R. W. Elliott, et al.:* On appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina.

3. *Dorothy E. Davis, et al., Appellants,* v. *County School Board of Prince Edward County, Virginia, et al.:* On appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

4. *Spottswood Thomas Bolling, et al., Petitioners,* v. *C. Melvin Sharpe, et al.:* On writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

5. *Francis B. Gebhart, et al., Petitioners,* v. *Ethel Louise Belton, et al.:* On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Delaware.

MAY 31, 1955

Mr. Chief Justice Warren delivered the opinion of the Court.

These cases were decided on May 17, 1954. The opinions of that date,[1] declaring the fundamental principle that racial discrimination in public education is unconstitutional, are incorporated herein by reference. All provisions of Federal, State, or local law requiring or permitting such discrimination must yield to this principle. There remains for consideration the manner in which relief is to be accorded.

Because these cases arose under different local conditions and their disposition will involve a variety of local problems, we requested further argument on the question of relief.[2] In view of the nationwide importance of the decision, we invited the Attorney General of the United States and the attorneys general of all States requiring or permitting racial discrimination in public education to present their views on that question. The parties, the United States, and the States of Florida, North Carolina, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Maryland, and Texas filed briefs and participated in the oral argument.

These presentations were informative and helpful to the Court in its consideration of the complexities arising from the transition to a system of public education freed of racial discrimination. The presentations also demonstrated that substantial steps to eliminate racial discrimination in public schools have already been taken, not only in some of the communities in which these cases arose, but in some of the States appearing as amici curiae, and in other States as well. Substantial progress has been made in the District of Columbia and in the communities in Kansas and Delaware involved in this litigation. The defendants in the cases coming to us from South Carolina and Virginia are awaiting the decision of this Court concerning relief.

Full implementation of these constitutional principles may require solution of varied local school problems. School authorities have the primary responsibility for elucidating, assessing, and solving these problems; courts will have to consider

---

[13] "4. Assuming it is decided that segregation in public schools violates the 14th amendment—

"(a) would a decree necessarily follow providing that, within the limits set by normal geographic school districting, Negro children should forthwith be admitted to schools of their choice, or

"(b) may this Court, in the exercise of its equity powers, permit an effective gradual adjustment to be brought about from existing segregated systems to a system not based on color distinctions?

"5. On the assumption on which questions 4 (a) and (b) are based, and assuming further that this Court will exercise its equity powers to the end described in question 4 (b),

"(a) should this Court formulate detailed decrees in these cases;

"(b) if so, what specific issues should the decrees reach;

"(c) should this Court appoint a special master to hear evidence with a view to recommending specific terms for such decrees;

"(d) should this Court remand to the courts of first instance with directions to frame decrees in these cases, and if so, what general directions should the decrees of this Court include and what procedures should the courts of first instance follow in arriving at the specific terms of more detailed decrees?"

[14] See Rule 42, Revised Rules of this Court (effective July 1, 1954).

[1] *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, ——U. S.

[2] *Detroit Bank* v. *United States* (317 U. S. 329); *Currin* v. *Wallace*, (306 U. S. 1, 13–14); *Steward Machine Co.* v. *Davis*, (301 U. S. 548, 585).

[3] *Korematsu* v. *United States* (323 U. S. 214, 216); *Hirabayashi* v. *United States* (320 U. S. 81, 100).

[4] *Gibson* v. *Mississippi* (162 U. S. 565, 591). Cf. *Steele* v. *Louisville & Nashville R. Co.*, (323 U. S. 192, 198–199).

[5] Cf. *Hurd* v. *Hodge* (334 U. S. 24).

[1] 347 U. S. 483; 347 U. S. 497.

[2] Further argument was requested on the following questions, 347 U. S. 483, 495–496, n. 13, previously propounded by the Court:

"4. Assuming it is decided that segregation in public schools violates the 14th amendment—

"(a) would a decree necessarily follow providing that, within the limits set by normal geographic school districting, Negro children should forthwith be admitted to schools of their choice, or

"(b) may this Court, in the exercise of its equity powers, permit an effective gradual adjustment to be brought about from existing segregated systems to a system not based on color distinctions?

"5. On the assumption on which questions 4 (a) and (b) are based, and assuming further that this Court will exercise its equity powers to the end described in question 4 (b),

"(a) should this Court formulate detailed decrees in these cases;

"(b) if so, what specific issues should the decrees reach;

"(c) should this Court appoint a special master to hear evidence with a view to recommending specific terms for such decrees;

"(d) should this Court remand to the courts of first instance with directions to frame decrees in these cases, and if so, what general directions should the decrees of this Court include and what procedures should the courts of first instance follow in arriving at the specific terms of more detailed decrees?"

whether the action of school authorities constitutes good faith implementation of the governing constitutional principles. Because of their proximity to local conditions and the possible need for further hearings, the courts which originally heard these cases can best perform this judicial appraisal. Accordingly, we believe it appropriate to remand the cases to those courts.[3]

In fashioning and effectuating the decrees, the courts will be guided by equitable principles. Traditionally, equity has been characterized by a practical flexibility in shaping its remedies [4] and by a facility for adjusting and reconciling public and private needs.[5] These cases call for the exercise of these traditional attributes of equity power. At stake is the personal interest of the plaintiffs in admission to public schools as soon as practicable on a nondiscriminatory basis. To effectuate this interest may call for elimination of a variety of obstacles in making the transition to school systems operated in accordance with the constitutional principles set forth in our May 17, 1954, decision. Courts of equity may properly take into account the public interest in the elimination of such obstacles in a systematic and effective manner. But it should go without saying that the vitality of these constitutional principles cannot be allowed to yield simply because of disagreement with them.

While giving weight to these public and private considerations, the courts will require that the defendants make a prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance with our May 17, 1954, ruling. Once such a start has been made, the courts may find that additional time is necessary to carry out the ruling in an effective manner. The burden rests upon the defendants to establish that such time is necessary in the public interest and is consistent with good faith compliance at the earliest practicable date. To that end, the courts may consider problems related to administration, arising from the physical condition of the school plant, the school transportation system, personnel, revision of school districts and attendance areas into compact units to achieve a system of determining admission to the public schools on a nonracial basis, and revision of local laws and regulations which may be necessary in solving the foregoing problems. They will also consider the adequacy of any plans the defendants may propose to meet these problems and to effectuate a transition to a racially nondiscriminatory school system. During this period of transition, the courts will retain jurisdiction of these cases.

The judgments below, except that in the Delaware case, are accordingly reversed and remanded to the district courts to take such proceedings and enter such orders and decrees consistent with this opinion as are necessary and proper to admit to public schools on a racially nondiscriminatory basis with all deliberate speed the parties to these cases. The judgment in the Delaware case—ordering the immediate admission of the plaintiffs to schools previously attended only by white children—is affirmed on the basis of the principles stated in our May 17, 1954, opinion, but the case is remanded to the supreme court of Delaware for such further proceedings as that court may deem necessary in light of this opinion.

It is so ordered.

---

[3] The cases coming to us from Kansas, South Carolina, and Virginia were originally heard by three-judge District Courts convened under 28 U. S. C. §§ 2281 and 2284. These cases will accordingly be remanded to those three-judge courts. See *Briggs* v. *Elliott* (342 U. S. 350).

[4] See *Alexander* v. *Hillman* (296 U. S. 222, 239).

[5] See *Hecht Co.* v. *Bowles* (321 U. S. 321, 329–330).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I congratulate and commend the gentleman for a scholarly, temperate, and excellent delineation of the law and of a viewpoint which, I think, is and should be the viewpoint of those of us who are honored to represent constituencies in one branch of the Government. I think the gentleman has stated my position as I would want to state it. He has gone further, and I think the gentleman will agree with me that it is very good and positive and it is a beneficient sign to see the manner in which the courts, even in the Southern States, are citing the Supreme Court decision and following its mandate. I only hope there were an opportunity for others in the branches of Government to do the same. I commend the gentleman again for what he has stated today.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman. Of course, I agree with his comments about the splendid way the Federal courts have handled this problem.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I would also like to commend the gentleman from New York who is one of the leaders of the bar in his own State and who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and whose achievements in the field of law are shortly to be recognized in his own home city by the bar association of his city in a forthcoming banquet. The gentleman has made a judicial and a judicious survey of the most troublesome problem confronting all of our citizens today. I think it is of extreme importance that all of us should remember the necessity for temperate conduct and temperate words although we may sometimes regret that the press reports as intemperate those remarks which we have sought diligently to make temperate and levelheaded. I think it is the responsibility of the Congress and of the press and of the people of the North and the South to do their level best to work this problem out as the Supreme Court has said, with all possible speed or some such phraseology.

In any event, the intent of the Court, as the gentleman has said, is to give the people of this country in those parts of the country affected time to work out the problem. At the same time appeals to violence in one section of the country or the other are neither within the purport of the decision of the Supreme Court and certainly would be no part of the will of the Congress or of its Members. I do think it is most important that on civil-rights legislation we here, too, should move with all reasonable speed. I would like to ask the gentleman a question regarding the President's own statements as to the necessity in his opinion of the creation of a bipartisan commission to investigate the racial tensions. Does the gentleman have any suggestions as to how we may be able to get action in the House of Representatives on the President's recommendations?

Mr. KEATING. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I hope the President's specific recommendations, which I understand will be here shortly on this subject, will be of such a character that they will commend themselves to the majority of the Members on both sides. I believe they will. I know of the President's keen interest in meeting this problem, and I feel sure that however much we may differ on various phases of the questions involved, we all recognize his desire to do something constructive in this field.

I believe that the legislation which will be sent to us will have an early hearing in the committee of which I am a member and of which the gentleman himself is a member, and I would hope for favorable action.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman. I am, as he is, hopeful that we may hear from the Department of Justice in the immediate future as to what recommendations they have for affirmative implementation of legislation on this subject.

Mr. KEATING. I hope so, too.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is a very distinguished Member of this House and I think that the statement he has made, exactly what I would have expected from him, was considerate, thoughtful, restrained, and many of us who are newer in this House have hopes that we can in due course resolve this problem, but we must look to men like the gentleman and to the great committee of which he is a distinguished member to bring out some legislation which will at least in part and in due course entirely solve the problem.

I wonder if the gentleman can tell us if he has any hopes that in this particular 84th Congress we may expect some legislation like that to come from his great committee.

Mr. KEATING. I have hopes. I would not want to mislead the gentleman by stating it stronger than that. I am sure a good many of us on the committee are anxious to see legislation in this Congress.

Mr. PELLY. I particularly have felt, after listening to the gentleman, the need for restraint. I do not believe there is a Member on either side of the aisle or from any section of the country who could take in any way exception to any of the thoughtful statements that have been made by the gentleman. I want to say that I appreciate that very much.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to join in commending the gentleman for taking the floor to discuss this very important matter. With his background from the Judiciary Committee and his great knowledge of the law I think it is very fitting that a position should be expressed so that those of us who believe as he does that the Supreme Court decision was well considered and certainly within the traditions of our Constitution and our form of government

could have an opportunity of expressing ourselves.

Being a lawyer and having a regard for my professional integrity, I welcome the opportunity of joining the gentleman in expressing the belief that the Supreme Court decision was a proper one and well considered.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish may extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with appreciation to the scholarly remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

I am glad to find that he fully sustains a statement of mine which has been quoted in newspapers published in the district which I represent, as follows:

> There can be no doubt that the doctrine of interposition has no constitutional justification. Under the Constitution the Supreme Court is the final authority in interpreting the Constitution. When the Court has spoken, that ends it, unless the Constitution is amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on the excellent speech made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] concerning the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Brown against the Board of Education. He made a scholarly and objective argument sustaining the viewpoint of the Court. Also he made it very clear that he respected the viewpoint of the group that seek to have the decision of the Supreme Court neutralized and pointed out that this group, despite their deep feelings about this case, stated that they would use all lawful means to bring about its reversal.

I was particularly pleased with the argument wherein it referred to Chief Justice Warren and the able and skillful manner in which he prepared the opinion that was concurred in by every member of the Court.

I think I may properly state that I am extremely proud of what the Chief Justice did in this case. But it was no surprise to me. Earl Warren and I were fellow students at Boalt Hall of Law of the University of California. In 1938 a group of us, some of whom are now in Congress, helped elect him as the attorney general of California. Here he did a magnificent job. His argument in the tidelands cases were mainly responsible for the decision by the Supreme Court that gave California and other coastal States the title to offshore lands under tidewater. Later, in 1942, he was a candidate for Governor; and some of the same group mentioned above were the ones that got him to seek the office. He was elected in 1942 at the same election which sent me to the House of Representatives. In that office he displayed remarkable capacity for getting the State government working smoothly and efficiently.

Also as Governor he displayed his ability to get people of differing viewpoints to reconcile their differences and get along together. He had that remarkable characteristic that we call commonsense.

Perhaps some may decide that the matters which I have discussed are irrelevant. My feeling is that I would like those who are challenging the judgment of the Chief Justice and also the Court should know something of the man who wrote the decision for the whole Court.

In California we have no segregation problem. Since 1908 when President Theodore Roosevelt informed the city of San Francisco tersely and positively that they could not bar Japanese children from their schools we have not had the problem. In these schools of Stockton, where I live, we have pupils of practically every racial strain. They get along well both in the classroom and on the athletic field and in school social life.

I cannot forget a statement that one of our closest friends in Congress made when the segregation agitation began to flare up at frequent intervals. This person, who is a southerner said that if people will simply look back 25 years and see the steady progress that had been made to give Negroes more rights they will realize that if we in the South are left alone the problem will solve itself. Looking back over the various legal steps that have been taken such as the cases that decided that segregation could not be practiced in State universities; also the case that decided that covenants restricting the use of property to only white persons were void; and other steps such as integration decreed for the Armed Forces by President Eisenhower; the banning of segregation in the National Theater, and so forth.

I am willing to accept without reservation the Court's decision which interprets the 14th amendment as was done in the case under consideration.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York may be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds the gentleman that there are other special orders pending.

AMERICAN AVIATION POLICY IN THE PACIFIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, recently the White House asked the Civil Aeronautics Board to reexamine Pan American Airways' application for authority to fly the north Pacific route from our west coast to Tokyo, in competition with Northwest Airlines' existing service on the Great Circle route. This action has increased the uncertainty and confusion which already existed regarding this case. Because it involves our national defense requirements and our interests in the Far East as well as the sound aviation policy we have heretofore maintained in the Pacific, I feel duty-bound to bring it to the attention of the Congress in order to clarify the issues.

The Civil Aeronautics Board in 1946, after long and exhaustive study, concluded that two separate and competing United States-flag routes across the Pacific should be established and maintained, not only to promote and protect our interests in the Orient, but because the national defense of our Nation required such a policy. This policy was reiterated by President Eisenhower last year in a letter to the CAB in which he stated:

> The continuation of two United States-flag carriers across the Pacific at this time is required by considerations of national defense and foreign policy.

At the time the policy was established in 1946, the only commercial air tie between the United States and the Orient linked California to Manila and certain points in China and areas south, on routes operated by Pan American World Airways.

Because of the need for a stronger network of air routes in the Pacific, the Board recommended establishment of a route to the Orient across the north Pacific and an extension of Pan American's California-Hawaii route to Tokyo, thereby creating two separate and competing United States-flag routes to the Far East as the best answer to the Nation's problem.

Although the bulk of all Orient traffic passed through the California gateway via Hawaii, the Board then reasoned that the shorter route over the north Pacific would eventually become self-sufficient and eliminate the need for subsidized operations. The Board's reasoning proved to be sound because the airline which was given authority to conduct operations on the Great Circle route has not received any Government subsidy since the beginning of 1955.

That airline, certificated by the Board in 1946 for 7 years over the North Pacific route, was Northwest Airlines. Northwest has been a Minnesota organization since the early days when it began flying between Chicago and Minneapolis. Naturally all Minnesotans have taken pride in its growth and development. But my present concern is on a far more important basis than the well-being of a Minnesota company. This case involves our whole long-established international aviation policy and our national security in the Pacific.

Let me outline the picture: The Civil Aeronautics Board selected Northwest in 1946 to fly the North Pacific route because that air carrier had had a vast experience during the war in conducting flights in extremely cold temperatures, having conducted extensive operations between the United States and Alaska and the Aleutian Islands. Northwest operated planes under military contract between Seattle and Anchorage, between the Twin Cities and Fairbanks, and from Anchorage to Attu in the Aleutian chain. It had flown more than 17 million miles in areas north of the United States, with more than 2 million miles over North Pacific waters.

In connection with this Army flying, Northwest engineers, pilots and mechanics did a great deal of research work in

regard to cold weather operational problems. This was in addition to its accomplishments at the bomber modification center in the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, and its many other wartime activities.

The original granting of a certificate to Northwest on the north Pacific route was opposed by Pan American, which had applied for authority to operate to the Orient over both the central and north Pacific routes, arguing that it should be the sole United States carrier across the Pacific.

The Board denied Pan American's bid for the northern route, but granted Pan American authority to extend its California-Hawaii routes on to Tokyo for a period of 7 years to maintain the competitive balance.

Hawaii, with its unsurpassed attractiveness and vacation possibilities, has given Pan American's exclusive central Pacific route a decided pull on the traveling public. The record shows that there has also been a significant volume of traffic originating in Hawaii to points in Japan and China, which further increases the value of the central Pacific route to Pan American.

Operating results of both airlines for the last 7 years have proven the Board's original recommendations sound in every respect. Seventy-five percent of the United States-Orient traffic has moved over the central Pacific. Northwest Airlines, despite the fact its smaller market generated far less traffic, was able last year to file a document with the Government waiving further claim to subsidy.

Because of the progress that had been made, the Board in 1954, after hearing proceedings to renew the original certificates, recommended to the White House that Northwest be granted a permanent certificate over the northern route to the Orient and that Pan American's authority to fly the central route be continued. The Board recommended denial of Pan American's application to duplicate Northwest's service on the northern route and thereby upset the balanced competitive pattern by gaining access to all Pacific traffic.

Here is what the Civil Aeronautics Board had to say in December 1954 in sending its recommendations to the White House:

> In 1946 in its decision in the Pacific case, the Board concluded that there should be two separate and competing United States-flag routes across the Pacific. * * * We find nothing in this case that would call for a change in that policy. * * * On the contrary, we are convinced that the need and justification for the separate and competitive routings across the Pacific area are, if anything, even stronger and more compelling today than they were at the time of the original awards. * * *
>
> * * * Conditions have served to increase the importance of the Pacific area to the United States until today there is perhaps no region in the entire world more vital to its overall interests. * * * The protection and promotion of those interests call for a strong network of United States commercial air routes across the Pacific; an objective that we believe can only be fully guaranteed by the maintenance of strong and effective competitive carriers over the two trans-Pacific routings. In our judgment, it would be shortsighted and not in furtherance of the mandates of the act to withdraw from the country the benefits of the existing competitive services by two United States carriers and to entrust those important routes to a single carrier, no matter who that carrier might be. * * *
>
> * * * It is only the retention of these different flight courses that makes it possible under existing conditions to maintain the balanced competitive routes we have found to be required by the public convenience and necessity. It is inevitable that the granting of the relief Pan American seeks would divert such a substantial volume of traffic from Northwest as to destroy its ability to render the effective competition that is required all over the Pacific. In addition, such action with its resulting diversion from Northwest would undoubtedly require substantial additional Government subsidy.

In January 1955 the President wrote a letter to CAB, disapproving a permanent certificate for Northwest on the ground that it was still receiving subsidy payments, and ordered a 7-year temporary certificate instead. [Actually Northwest's operations had become self-sufficient at the end of 1954, and it therefore went off subsidy at that time; but that fact was not yet known at the time of the President's decision. Northwest has just resubmitted its application for a permanent certificate over the great circle route; and since the previous application was denied only because of subsidy payments which no longer exist, there is every reason to believe that both the Board and the President will promptly approve this application.]

Also in his January 1955 letter, the President instructed CAB to hold in abeyance Pan American's application to cut in on Northwest's traffic from Seattle and Portland over the Great Circle route "pending further study and later report on the economic and technical feasibility and the military and foreign policy implications of nonstop service between the west coast and the Orient."

From the time the White House announced that decision, the real issues have been confused and beclouded by all sorts of claims and rumors.

For example, Pan American claims its restriction to traffic through the central Pacific wastes taxpayer's money, delays the mail and forces passengers to fly miles out of their way in order to get to the Orient. But the mail and passengers do not have to go via Pan American; they can go via Northwest. Does Pan American have to have all the advantages—the much larger traffic via Hawaii and the shorter, faster northern route too? If so, why?

Pan American and its supporters also make such claims as:

> Unless Pan American is enabled to compete for through Orient traffic on fair terms. * * * Northwest will emerge with a monopoly.

This was contained in a written statement by Pan American in April 1955. But does not Pan American already have a monopoly on the central Pacific route? If Pan American is to compete with Northwest over the northern route, must not Northwest be allowed to compete with Pan American over the central route? Would Pan American consent to that?

Perhaps it was because of such contentions by Pan American that the White House was prompted to return its application to fly the Great Circle Route to the Civil Aeronautics Board on January 26 this year for further consideration, "in the light of any new and relevant circumstances or developments that it finds to exist."

The Board took action and, following a prehearing conference February 6, expanded the scope of the case to include Northwest's applications, first, to amend its certificate and include San Francisco and Los Angeles as coterminals with Seattle and Portland on the Great Circle route; and, second, for a permanent certificate on the Great Circle route. If Pan American were to be allowed to share Seattle and Portland traffic to the Orient, why should not Northwest be allowed to share San Francisco and Los Angeles traffic to the Orient?

But the White House letter dated March 3 asked the Board to reconsider its February 6 decision to expand the scope of the case and instead, confine the issue to Pan American's application to use the northern route and limit consideration to circumstances and developments relevant to that issue.

On March 7, the Board issued an order vacating its previous order, and limiting the reopened case to the one issue—Pan American's application to fly the northern route, competing with Northwest for Seattle and Portland traffic to and from the Orient. The Board is now to consider a proposed change in the Government's established Pacific air policy without the opportunity to weigh fully, or compensate for, the impact Pan American's duplication of service would have on all concerned.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, in such a situation, there is only one possible decision that would not violate all reason and fairness, namely a decision to deny Pan American's application. For if the long standing and sound policy of competition by two American Flag carriers over separate routes across the Pacific were to be changed to allow competition by both of the carriers for the smaller traffic over one of the routes, then obviously the policy would also have to be changed to allow competition by both of the carriers for the much larger traffic over the other route.

To demonstrate further that Pan American already has by far the more lucrative route, Pan American's own reports filed with the CAB covering its Pacific Ocean operations show that in 1955 it carried nearly 100 million revenue ton-miles of traffic for which it received almost $60 million in revenue. This does not include its traffic between the United States and Alaska. Northwest's reports, including Alaska traffic, show only 38 million revenue ton-miles carried in the Pacific for which it received only $21 million in revenue. The above comparison makes clear the dominance Pan American already has in the

So in reality, the only question the Civil Aeronautics Board now has before it is whether or not to allow the clearly dominant carrier, showing substantial earnings from its lush route across the central Pacific, access also to the lean route and smaller market served by its much smaller competitor. If Pan Amer-

ican is granted access to the northern route and permitted to increase its earnings by diverting traffic from Northwest, then the Government will be forced to underwrite the contribution to Pan American by placing Northwest back on subsidy to make up for the losses it certainly will incur.

Mr. Speaker, under all the circumstances, surely the only sensible and fair decision for the Board to make is to retain the present balanced competitive pattern, at no expense to the taxpayer, by again denying Pan American's application, as the Board did previously for the same sound reasons.

And, under all the circumstances, it is impossible for me to see how the President can fail to approve such a decision.

THE SHAMROCK AND THE STAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we have now entered the month of March whose 17th day has become a symbol for Irishmen the world over. On St. Patrick's day the sons of Eire will march with heads high in Dublin and in New York City. They will honor their ancestors' persistent resistance to invasion and oppression. And well they deserve to be proud that 700 years of foreign domination could not drown their Gaelic characteristics or quench the flame of the Irish spirit. Most of all on St. Patrick's Day, Irishmen will rejoice in that tiny Emerald Isle that has stood free and independent for 34 years as a monument to Irish valor.

As we approach St. Patrick's Day this year, I am struck by the similarities between the glorious Irish struggle for their birthright and Israel's present-day plight. Like the Irish, the Jewish people are devoutly religious and like the Irish they have been victims of terrible religious persecutions. We know that three centuries have not erased Hibernian memories of Cromwell's cruel anti-Catholic outrages; Jewish memories of European pogroms and Hitler's barbaric concentration camps and gas chambers will be equally hard to dismiss. When one thinks of the hundreds of years which both the Irish and the Jewish people waited before achieving their own independent states it reminds me of the patience which Paddy McGinty showed once after a trial. Pat and an Englishman and a Scotchman were all found guilty of murder and sentenced to death, in a manner which they were allowed to choose for themselves. The Scotchman promptly chose to be hanged on an ash tree, and the Englishman on an oak; but Pat said: "If you plaze, your honor, I'd rather be hung on a gooseberry bush."

"That's not big enough," said the judge.

"Begorra thin," said Pat, brightening up, "Oi'll wait till it grows."

But centuries of oppression have not been able to extinguish the genius of either group. Irish contributions have enriched the world's culture. The great satirists, Jonathan Swift, Oscar Wilde, and George Bernard Shaw, are Irish. The lovely poetry of Yeats and Russell, steeped in Gaelic spirit, is Irish. So are the hard-hitting novels of F. Scott Fitzgerald, Edwin O'Connor, and James T. Farrell, and the lilting music of Victor Herbert. I would be greatly remiss not to mention those lovely colleens who have brightened the American horizon—Maureen O'Hara, Margaret Sullavan, and Greer Garson. The Jewish people, too, in spite of bitter suffering, have managed to supply an imposing list of contributors to civilization. Einstein needs no introduction. Hum the melody of Oklahoma or Summertime or White Christmas and you are drawing on some of the fantastically rich contributions made to United States music by the brilliant Jewish trio, Oscar Hammerstein, George Gershwin, and Irving Berlin. The Jews have also produced some of the greatest musical soloists of our epoch, Zimbalist, Horowitz, Menuhin, and Fritz Kreisler, to mention a few. Then there is the great Hebrew poet known as David. It is not my purpose to list here all the personages of both groups who have contributed to American and Western culture; I could practically conduct a filibuster by attempting it. I merely wish to point out that both groups, in spite of centuries of oppression, have made significant contributions to our way of life.

In 1922 the Irish were at last able to break the chains with which England bound them. Mighty England, with its military tradition and powerful Navy, could not hold the fighting Irish. In similar manner the Jews after World War II defied the British edict to restrict immigration into Palestine. Then the world was treated to the spectacle of a handful of Jews, who numbered not 1 million, standing up to an invasion by Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Iraq, whose combined populations numbered 30 to 40 times that of the Jews. I can only say that the daring and bravery of the feat was worthy of the Irish.

The emergence of the new State of Israel was greeted by men of good heart everywhere, as had been the reception of the Irish Free State into the world family in 1922. But the first 8 years of Israel's existence have been perilous ones. Pilgrims to the holy places in Jerusalem and surrounding villages have been saddened by the tension which they have found in Israel. The Arab countries have obstinately refused to negotiate final peace terms with Israel. They have erected economic barriers around the little nation in the hope that it would collapse internally. But the illegal blockade of ships bound for Israel via the Suez Canal and of the Gulf of Aqaba, and Arab refusal to buy Israel's products or sell to it such vital supplies as oil have only served to energize Israeli determination to make their country a going concern. Even more trying than boycott and blockade has been the steady barrage of nuisance attacks by the Arabs across Israel's borders. The Israeli has had to keep one hand on the plow and one on his rifle.

There is no question that the State of Israel needs peace to insure its full flowering as a modern state which could contribute to the general progress and stability of the Middle East. It reminds me a little of the frustration of the Irishman who was wearing himself out trying to pull on a new pair of boots. He expressed his exasperation by saying, "I'll never get these boots on at all until I wear them a day or two."

Nevertheless, an unsteady peace of sorts was maintained in the Middle East, principally by the 1950 agreement between Britain, France, and the United States to guarantee Israel's borders against violent changes and not to permit an arms race in the area. But since then, the British evacuation of one Middle East stronghold after another—the latest blow occurring just last week in Jordan—has reduced Britain's effectiveness as a party to the guaranty, while the violent Arab uprisings in North Africa against France have as good as nullified France as a pillar of the tripartite agreement. Meanwhile, the Soviet bloc sale of arms to Egypt has completely upset the arms balance in the Middle East. Tensions have reached such a fever pitch that the region, to borrow a phrase, hovers "on the brink of war."

The perils of the present situation on the frontiers of Israel cannot be minimized. The Israeli soldiers may find themselves on the firing line at any moment. They need not dramatize their peril to their friends—like the somewhat overexuberant Irish soldier who once boasted to a gaping crowd of colleens, "See there," he exclaimed, pointing with pride to a bullet hole in his hat, "look at that hole, will you? Ye see, if it had been a low-crowned hat, I should have been killed outright." Soldiers on the frontier of Israel have been killed outright; our country is committed to preventing them from being killed wholesale as well.

It is somewhat encouraging that our Government has dispatched a battalion of marines to the western Mediterranean during the past week. This action should serve notice on the Arab leaders that the United States intends to stand by her promise of 1950 to guarantee Israel's borders against violent change; and it should also make the American people more aware of the perils which confront us in this area. A second Arab-Israeli war would surely not remain a neighborhood affair. The outbreak of war in the Middle East might directly affect all Americans, whatever their religious or political persuasion. For this reason it is imperative that our foreign policymakers assess the military capabilities of the Israeli forces with the utmost care and monitor the plans and estimates of the Arab forces with similar accuracy. We should make absolutely certain that the defensive capabilities of Israel are not permitted to dip below the capabilities of the armies which threaten her, unless it is made crystal clear to any possible aggressors that American, British, and possibly French forces are immediately prepared to add themselves to the defense of Israel. Up to the present time we have been given no categorical assurance that such a military estimate of the situation has been made, or that the denial of arms sales to Israel will be

compensated for by a guaranty of immediate assistance if the Arabs should attack. Nor do we know what we can hope for in the way of American diplomatic persuasion in the Arab capitals. The American people, and our friends in Israel have every right to demand forthright assurances on these questions.

What has the administration done to avert the impending holocaust? Each day, as Western prestige declines, the Arab nations become more bellicose. Israel, in view of the disappearance of the former deterrents to violence in the region, has appealed to the United States for permission to purchase $50 million worth of arms to defend itself. The administration has refused. I am astounded by the Secretary of State's reasoning in this matter. Mr. Dulles states that Israel, due to its small size and population, could not win an arms race against Arabs having access to Soviet bloc weapons. Does Mr. Dulles then suggest that we likewise abandon the small nations in Asia to their defenseless fates because they could not possibly compete with the more than 600 million Red Chinese that threaten them?

In the same statement, Mr. Dulles declares that it is United States policy to be neutral in the Arab-Israel dispute. Yet what kind of neutrality is it that stands by when one side receives modern jet airplanes and tells the other side to look to the United Nations for its salvation? The Israelis, I am sure, wish they could depend on the U. N. There is, however, every indication that the Soviet Union might veto U. N. action or delay it. Moreover, the slow-cranking diplomatic procedures might leave little of Haifa and Tel Aviv to save.

I say it is urgent that the President and the Department of State reconsider the dangerous course of action they are pursuing in the Middle East. Last week's newspapers carried reports of new requests from Saudi Arabia for arms, and we do not yet have any assurance that such requests will not be fulfilled like the previous ones because of our oil interests and military bases in that country. In their eagerness to win friends among the Arabs, the administration has taken the anomalous position of endangering the very existence of the free world's only democratic outpost in the area. Placating the Arabs at every turn is not going to bring peace to the troubled Middle East. On the contrary, it may very well be the signal for Arab hotheads to act. If they think they can attack Israel with impunity, what is going to stand in their way? Israel is pleading for the means to defend itself. Israel's pleas continue to get no response at the State Department, and we might well consider what drastic steps remain to her Government. They will not emulate the Irish well digger, we can hope, who was being hauled up from the bottom of a well by his frisky friends. They decided to let him dangle for a while midway between the top and the bottom. The poor fellow entreated and begged, stormed, and raved, but all to no avail. Finally he sung out, "Haul me out, ye ———, or by the piper that played before Moses, I'll be afther cuttin' the rope."

Probably Israel feels such frustration at this moment, after receiving support from us halfway through its perilous times, and if there is an analogy to the behavior of the Irish well digger it is that she might figuratively have to cut the rope by submitting to threats of her neighbors.

Free Ireland, since its creation 34 years ago, has not been troubled by hostile external forces seeking its destruction. But the seven centuries of struggling for the right to call a tiny island their own has made the Irish particularly sympathetic to the Israeli cause. On this St. Patrick's Day after giving heartfelt thanks for their own freedom, many sons and daughters of Erie will offer a prayer for the early settlement of Israel's problems.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I want to associate myself with the remarks the gentleman is making about the closeness between the Irish people and the Jewish people. The gentleman's story reminds me of a story at the time an Irish candidate and a Jewish candidate were running for office. There were 97 members who were Irish and 3 who were Jewish. When the votes were tabulated at the end of the election it was found that the Irish candidate had 97 votes and the Jewish candidate had 3. The Jewish candidate went to the Irish candidate and congratulated him on his election. The Irishman said: "Thank you, but why are you Jews so clannish?"

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. We are both clannish, maybe.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. It has been my happy privilege to have been on the floor on many St. Patrick's days. I will bore the House by repeating what I have often said on each of those occasions, and that is that this is just 1 more day on which the sons of Erin join with the sons of Aaron as brothers.

This year, in view of the comment of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, I want to take just a moment to pay a compliment to him for his fine discourse on this important and timely subject. When we talk of Ireland we have an "I." When we talk of the Israelis we have an "I." And I can look around and be reminded that we also ought to think of the third "I," Italy, and the Italians, all of whom have rendered such fine, patriotic service to our country over the years, all of whom have suffered persecutions through the years. May I, too, express the hope that maybe we can add a fourth "I" and probably bring peace to the world and relieve some of the tension now in the Middle East. Let us ask that these 3 I's, Israel, Ireland and Italy, be joined by Islam in true brotherhood and maybe the 4 I's can march forward together arm-in-arm toward true peace.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from New York, and I hope that that is possible. In speaking of the three I's, since the gentleman mentioned our friends, the Italians, I might remind the House that there were two St. Patricks, the first of whom was, in fact, an Italian, so that they have quite a legitimate claim on our day. And, we always welcome them to bend an elbow with us and join with us in our tributes on this day.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RODINO. I was very happy to hear the gentleman from New Jersey mention the third I, the Italian I. Of course, I was going to make that claim if the gentleman did not admit it, that the first St. Patrick actually originated in Italy. Therefore, we join with you, along with the other I's, in the celebration of this St. Patrick's Day, feeling that we have not only a common interest in St. Patrick but the fact that we can claim also that he comes from that sunny land of Italy.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Well, it is a great pleasure to note this, and with all due respect to the first St. Patrick who was born in Italy, we are very proud of the Irish St. Patrick. I know you realize that.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I should like to ask if the gentleman will yield about 10 minutes of his time to me, before he concludes?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. With pleasure.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I should like first to comment on the statement the gentleman from New Jersey made at the beginning of his address concerning a parade on St. Patrick's Day in New York and Boston. I should like to advise the gentleman that in Chicago we have 2 parades, 1 on St. Patrick's Day and 1 on the day following St. Patrick's Day.

Actually, some Biblical scholars have stated that the Irish are descendants of 1 of the 12 sons of Joseph mentioned in the Old Testament. I do not know whether that suggestion is correct, but I do recall a song my grandfather used to sing which would indicate that the Irish made the Passover from Egypt to Israel with Moses. It goes like this: "It must have been the Irish that swam the River Nile because only an Irishman would fight a crocodile."

In the serious vein, I do think there is a parallel between the Irish and the Jewish people. I think there is a remarkable parallel in their love and struggle for their homelands. It is of extreme importance not only to Irish-Americans but to all Americans that this little state, which represents the greatest foothold democracy has in the Middle East, survive.

I commend the gentleman on his fine statement.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. As a Representative from Boston I am glad to join in this tribute to Americans of Irish extraction. People of Irish extraction have made tremendous contributions to our Commonwealth of Massachusetts and to its capital city of Boston.

Today they occupy the highest positions in our community: United States Senator, recent governors, leaders of the church, leaders in the military, leaders of industry, lawyers, and doctors; in fact, leaders of all that is best in our community.

They are not only able and successful, but are people of faith and vision, and people who have proved their remarkable capacity for friendship. What more can one say? You cannot have a finer friend than a citizen of Irish extraction.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I remind the House again that we have in the Congress a very distinguished and very able and very true gentleman of Irish descent in the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Democratic majority leader and Acting Speaker and that our splendid Republican minority leader and former Speaker of the House owes much of his great career to his Irish strain as he is half of Irish descent—and I remind the House that they are both great Americans.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the United Nations is either undependable, incapable, or impotent to handle the situation?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman certainly does not understand me to say that. What you do understand me to say is that the United Nations Security Council would be hampered by a prospective Russian veto.

Mr. GROSS. Then it would fall in one category or the other; would it not? Does that not mean that the United Nations is impotent to handle any situation of that kind?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It does not.

Mr. GROSS. It would appear to me that the United Nations is impotent to handle a situation of that kind, if the Russians can veto any action.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am talking about the urgency of the matter. I am not suggesting in the slightest that the United Nations would be either impotent or incapable.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman is suggesting that if he says the Russians can exercise a veto that can prevent effective United Nations action. In that case, the organization is rendered impotent.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I think not—indeed, not. I am questioning the time element.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New Jersey for pointing up at this time the perilous situation which exists in the Middle East. I know that my fine constituents, not only those of Irish ancestry and Israeli ancestry, but all the people of my district, are attuned to this immense problem that is challenging the imagination of all the people in the world. The problem is calling for help, calling for assistance, and calling for need. It cannot be solved of itself, and I would like to direct my one small voice to the State Department to ask them to work with dispatch to alleviate the perilous situation which exists in the Middle East and threatens another war.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. I, too, want to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey for his foresight and for his statesmanship in making the utterances we have just heard with a great deal of interest. There is a great nexus between the little State of Israel and the State of Ireland. I remember an old story—it comes out of Greek mythology, about Sisyphus. Sisyphus was condemned to Hades and his punishment was to push a heavy stone up a steep hill, but every time he got the stone up to the top it fell down upon him. It would seem that the terrible ordeals of the Israelis and the Irish are very much like that, possibly: pushing a heavy stone up to the top of a steep hill only to have it roll down upon them.

But I am sure that the statesmanlike Costello who heads the Irish Republic, and David Ben-Gurion who heads the Israeli Republic, will be able to keep that stone on top of the hill and that there may be a surcease from the persecution and the travails of all.

I read in the Irish Review published in Dublin some years ago, the following:

> Everything the Jewish people have suffered, the Irish people have suffered themselves from invasion and religious persecution to dispersion, everything except Hitler's gas chambers.

Indeed, when we review the history of the peoples of Israel or the history of the Jews and the people of Ireland, we find that they both have an abiding faith in their respective countries. They are both fiercely patriotic. They have displayed unflinching courage, and they are indeed willing to make sacrifices for their country and their dear ones; and you find in both places a wondrous family tradition—they do all and sundry for their families.

At this time I should like to place in the RECORD something of the history of the Jews in Ireland, from 1170 on. I shall not take the time to read it now but I shall place it at this point in the RECORD.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

From the year 1170 on Ireand was merely a British dependency. The Jews who came to Great Britain on the heels of William the Conqueror swarmed over the whole of the territory. In the 16th century they were to be found in London as well as in Glasgow and Dublin. In order to consolidate the reconquest of Ireland by Cromwell—ignominious as it was to the Irish—Anglicans and Jews were invited to Ireland. In 1660 the first synagogue was opened in Dublin by Portuguese Marranos. For a long time the Jewish community in Ireland was composed only of these noble aristocrats, the Pereiras, the Faros, etc., not as numerous as they were at Amsterdam, but just as haughty. In the 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries a slow invasion of Ashkenazim modified the face of the community whose institutions and way of life approximated more and more closely those of the respectable communities of England and Scotland.

The Irish Republic contains scarcely more than 5,000 Jews, 3,000 of whom live in Dublin and the remainder distributed in the few important towns of the country, Cork, Galway and Limerick. The Irish Jews are free citizens, have the vote and can also stand as candidates. The parliament—Dail—contains a Jewish representative, Robert Briscoe, one of the leaders of the Fianna Fail, De Valera's party. It is interesting to note that Mr. Briscoe, who was one of the leaders of the Sinn Fein and played a glorious part in the Irish nationalist revolution, was an active supporter of the Irgun in Palestine at the time of the risings there. The political evolution of Irgun-Heruth bears a strong resemblance to that of the Sinn Fein in Ireland, now the Praetorian Guard of the Capital.

The prosperity of the Jews in Eire is eloquently testified to by the fact that the sum of 50,000 pounds was donated to the United Appeal during the last 2 years. Both Orthodox and Zionist, the 3,000 Jews of Dublin maintain 7 synagogues, 1 of which is Liberal, a Jewish school, the Zion School—a huge building of red bricks where some 200 Jewish children learn the raucous Gaelic language in neo-Greek letters together with the language of the prophets—as well as innumerable philanthropic and cultural institutions. The whole gamut of organizations belonging to Jewish life in the British Isles: the Daughters of Zion, the Board of Guardians, as well as the K. K. L. and the Zionist parties—is to be found in Dublin. The somewhat conservative character of Irish Jewry may easily be explained by reference to the moral climate of Ireland—a profoundly Catholic country where the clergy exerts an influence stronger than anywhere else in Europe, except, perhaps, at the Vatican.

Patriarchal in quality and somewhat authoritarian, Jewish life in Dublin is nonetheless extraordinarily intense and active for so small a community. Doubtless the presence of the young and very learned Chief Rabbi of Eire, Dr. Jakubovicz, has not a little to do with this. Advice and directives of all sorts make their way from his calm and spacious apartment in Bloomfield Avenue. The Chief Rabbi dispenses them with intense earnestness and—with humor. And it is no slight honor to occupy the position of the Chief Rabbi Herzog, now the spiritual leader in Israel.

The relations between Israel and Eire are quite cordial. There was, it is true, some disagreement with the Catholic hierarchy concerning the Holy Places, but the resistance of the Jews in Palestine awakened

genuine sympathy, England having remained the national enemy here. The recent visit of Mr. de Valera and of Robert Briscoe to Israel provided an occasion for the Dublin press to devote several enthusiastic articles to the young Jewish state.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to know that the Irish people in Ireland, and Irish immigrants here, have manifested a keen interest in the welfare of Israel, and deeply sympathize with the aspirations of the Israeli people. Witness the many Irish Americans in this House who signed the petition for arms for Israel and who have manifested on many occasions their genuine regard for the welfare of Israel. In that connection, I might say that I am very much concerned with the policy that has been expressed by our State Department and our President vis-a-vis Israel. I would call that policy a policy of delay, indecision, and inaction. Something must be done. Some definite action must be taken by the administration, headed by President Eisenhower. Of course, it is hard to expect anything from Secretary of State Dulles, since he does not remain here long enough to know what the score is. He is constantly on the go peregrinating the world over. Let him come back and find out and read the reports from his agents in the Middle East, and he will then know how dangerous, how explosive is the situation in the Middle East.

It is in our self-interest to send arms to Israel so that Israel can fight her own battles. She is able to do so. She, almost with her bare knuckles, warded off seven hostile, well-armed nations in 1948 who converged on her from all directions, bent upon plunging her into the sea. She took care of herself. Israel can take care of herself now if she is given the implements to do so. She needs these arms.

I read in dispatches yesterday that several countries are sending—think of it—$250 million of heavy arms to Egypt, including heavy artillery, tanks, and jets. Israel has asked for $50 million worth of defense weapons, not arms for aggression, but arms for defense. When she defends herself she defends the Western democracies. Israel is the only nation in that part of the world who is oriented westward.

Nasser has said that despite our aid the United States is hostile to Egypt. Pick up your shortwave sets and listen to the horrendous Cairo radio voice. What do you hear? Nothing but condemnation of the United States. And yet we have offered her millions of dollars.

Our State Department is myopic in its view in regard to the question of arms to Israel. Think of this, Mr. Speaker, the Soviets through Czechoslovakia are sending six submarines to Egypt.

The President has said that we should have another commission to look into the matter. But we have had commission upon commission. A commission is not going to serve any good purpose whatsoever. There is only one thing that will preserve peace in the Middle East, and that is to give arms to Israel to defend herself, because then the Egyptians will know that they dare not attempt to invade the sovereignty of Israel's borders.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York.

I would like to reiterate the great and crying need for an adjustment, an evaluation of the whole situation by the State Department if and when the Secretary of State decides to return to the United States. And, I would like to say, too, to the Israeli nation, that those of us who will celebrate St. Patrick's Day on Saturday will take a moment or two out of our own joy and thoughtfulness and think about them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment my able colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, for his timely, able, and statesmanlike presentation of a problem which affects the whole United States and the friendly peoples of the world.

Despite the Nazi and Fascist fury that had descended upon the Jewish population of Italy, the Jews of Italy played an active part in the final liberation of their land. They were members of the partisan movement and numbers of them were killed in the fighting. Eugenio Colorni edited a secret newspaper and was killed as a consequence. Enzo Sereni came back from Palestine to fight for the liberation of his native land. Hero to the people of Israel, he became a hero to the people of Italy. He parachuted behind the enemy lines on a special mission, was captured and died in a German concentration camp.

The Jews in Italy were a small minority, but as a minority and as individuals, they fought for their land, loving above all else the flag of Italy. Out of some 42,000 native Jews who had lived in Italy in 1938, some 15,000 were removed from Italy either by death or through deportation.

The history of the Jews in Italy reaches back into antiquity. It is the one land, except the area of Israel, where there are unbroken Jewish connections from ancient days to the present. As Cecil Roth, author of "The History of the Jews of Italy" states:

> A quaint, but in its way profound, Talmudic fable tells how, when King Solomon sinned, an angel planted a reed in the Great Sea; the mud that gathered round it became in due course dry land, and thereon in fullness of time was built the great city of Rome. The intention of the parable is plain. The lots of Jerusalem and of Rome, of Israel and of Italy, are inextricably interwoven. The one exists in history, the rabbis thought, as corrective to the other.

The Jews of Italy identified themselves with all of the free struggles for civil and social freedom, the cause of Italian independence and unification. They were in the ranks of the Carboneria and in Mazzini's Young Italy movement. They fought under Garibaldi and among them will be found such Italian heroes as Ina Ottolenghi, Ciro Finzi, Tullo Massarani and Giuseppe Revere.

The Jews of Italy were fashioned in the fires of liberty, because Italy itself bequeaths that heritage to its people. The Jews of Italian descent now in Israel exhibited that fierce pride of free men. It is little wonder then that between the 2 countries there exists such cordial relations. The Italian Embassy in Israel and the Israelian Embassy in Italy reflect the friendliness of the two countries, and pay homage to the spirit of liberty. Italy's struggle for independence and freedom is an historical fact. Israel itself has made and is making history in freedom's fight. They understand each other, these two, for both have suffered much, yet both are strong in the resolution that "freedom shall not perish from this earth."

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the House is about to have the honor and pleasure of greeting a great statesman from the Irish Republic. We all join in welcoming him at this particularly appropriate time as St. Patrick's Day approaches.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] for obtaining this time which permits us to address our remarks on the land of my forefathers—Ireland. In February a number of Members of Congress had the pleasure of a luncheon meeting with the Deputy Prime Minister of Eire, the Honorable William Norton. My colleague from New York, Hon. JOHN ROONEY, organized the affair on very short notice. I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate him for a job well done. All of us who attended regret the fact that the rare treat of this impromptu meeting was not enjoyed by all the Members of Congress. It is for this reason that I take time now to address the House and attempt to relay Mr. Norton's message to us.

A strong appeal was made for more trade between the United States and Eire. The Deputy Prime Minister asked, not for money, but that the hand of fellowship be extended to Eire in business or trade. There is at present a gap of nearly $30 million: Last year Eire imported $36 million worth of American goods while the United States imported only $6 million worth of goods from Eire. Our attention was called to the store of goods for which Ireland is famous—its linen, its exquisite china, its tweeds, and its renowned Irish whisky.

Mr. Norton congratulated us on the grandeur of our country and on the understandable pride of Americans in its material and spiritual bounty. In continuing his felicitations to those of us who have Irish antecedents, he reminded us that we are Americans, first, last, and always. This is our own, our native land. Our loyalty to it has never been questioned. The Nation and the world know where we stand—and we stand there immovable.

However, on St. Patrick's Day, Irish people all over the world dwell upon the country of their ancestors and its glorious history—the Kings of Tara's Hill,

Brian Boru, and the Battle of Clontarf. They dwell upon the sweetness of the land of Ireland, the brilliance of her emerald cloak, the stark beauty of the isles, the sad splendor of the gloaming upon her evening hills, the lilt of her gay little rivers, the peaceful stillness of her lakes, the rugged coasts, and the ever sounding seas about her.

They remember with pride that the treasury of Ireland has been indeed heavily drawn upon for the endowment of Western civilization. It will never be forgotten that when darkness engulfed the minds and hearts of men, and the lamps of learning were blown out by the fierce winds of barbarian invasion and shattered by ignorance, the only light, besides the Beacon of the Holy Faith, that the eyes of man could see and finally take bearings by was the single, strong flame which was nourished and kept alive on the little green isle. So powerful was this flame, and zealous its monastic guardians, that no assault could cause it to flicker or sink, and it burns today in every achievement of the Western World that is good, true, and beautiful. And it will burn forever, because it was fed with the oil of truth and kindled with the breath of belief in God, His justice, His wisdom, His mercy, and His love.

Americans of Irish heritage recall the priceless substantial contributions of the Irish to our beloved America and the part they have played in every field of endeavor. Irish names come to mind from every decade of our history and from every quarter of the land—and from every bit of hallowed ground, far-flung throughout the world, wherein rest the bodies of our heroic American dead. In a final charming appeal to Americans, Mr. Norton asked us this year to celebrate the day of the Irish, March 17th, by purchasing a "bit" of Irish goods—linen, china and crystal for our tables; tweeds for our backs; and for our toasts a sip of Irish whisky.

And now, my honored colleagues, may I extend to you an old Gaelic blessing:

May the roads rise with you,
And the wind be always at your back;
And may the Lord hold you in the hollow of His hand.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on this subject may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HARLEY MARTIN KILGORE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to read a communication from the gracious and benevolent wife of the late Senator Harley Martin Kilgore to the House of Representatives of the United States:

To the House of Representatives of the United States:

The family of Harley Martin Kilgore will forever remember your great kindness to us in our dark hour. In pardonable pride I can say—your dark hour, too, for there never lived a greater patriot than Harley Kilgore.

LOIS LILLY KILGORE.

MARCH 15, 1956.

COMMITTEE OF ESCORT

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of a committee to escort the Prime Minister of Ireland into the Chamber the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN; the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. RICHARDS; and the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. VORYS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

VISIT OF HIS EXCELLENCY JOHN A. COSTELLO, PRIME MINISTER OF IRELAND

During the recess the following occurred:

The Doorkeeper (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) announced His Excellency, John A. Costello, the Prime Minister of Ireland.

The Prime Minister of Ireland escorted by the committee of Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members of the House of Representatives, I have the great pleasure, personal pleasure as well, the high privilege, and the distinguished honor of presenting to you His Excellency John A. Costello, Prime Minister of Ireland. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives: I am deeply honored by the invitation to address your assembly. I am sensible that you are honoring not me but the Irish Government and the whole Irish people, whose spokesman I am today.

I bring you a message of good will from a young republic, which is an old nation, to your young nation, the oldest republic on earth.

At the outset of my remarks, and before I address you on the topics I wish to cover in my address today, I seek your permission to present to the Library of Congress five unpublished letters which Richard Fitzpatrick wrote to his brother, the Second Earl of Upper Ossory during your War of Independence. These letters were purchased by the trustees of our National Library of Ireland and were lodged in the National Library. The originals of these letters go back to 1777. Richard Fitzpatrick, who wrote those letters, the originals of which are in this small case, was an Irishman fighting with the British Army against the army of the forthcoming United States of America. He did not like this task, but as a soldier he felt bound to obey the orders to fight in a cause of which he did not approve. During the course of his campaigning against the soldiers of the American Republic, he wrote some letters to his brother in which he expressed the opinion that the British people were fighting a battle in which they should not be engaged. He also indicated what his view would be of the outcome of the struggle.

I ask you to permit me to present the originals of these letters to the Library of Congress. They are remarkable for the fact they are so old, still more remarkable for the fact they are the candid and self-critical expressions of a soldier who was fighting against an army who were themselves struggling for independence, but they are really remarkable, outstandingly remarkable, for one particular passage which I ask your permission to read to you and which in itself furnishes me with an excuse, if an excuse were needed, and certainly with a justification, for asking that your Library shall have custody of these historic documents rather than our National Library of Ireland.

In one of his letters, giving expression to his views after Congress had struck a medal in commemoration of the Convention of Saratoga he said:

There is a greatness and a dignity in all the proceedings of this people that makes us contemptible indeed. I am well convinced they will be the first and greatest people there ever was an example of in the history of mankind.

I am presenting you with this small gift as the representative of a small nation to this Nation which has fulfilled the prophecy Fitzpatrick made 180 years ago. [Applause.]

I take leave to express the conviction that your actions will always be worthy of the responsibility which has been thrust upon you and that there will always be in the proceedings of this great Nation a greatness and dignity in your proceedings that will continue to keep you the first and greatest people there ever was an example of in the history of mankind. [Applause.]

Your countrymen are well aware that they occupy a very special place in the hearts of all Irishmen, a position due as much to Irish admiration of the achievements and attainments of the United States as to the many associations our two countries have in common.

You have been the world's exemplar of liberty and the course you have so brilliantly traveled, many in the rest of the world have been content but to follow. Your magnificent political institutions, the creation of your youthful genius, have been the model not less for us in Dublin than for the other centers of the civilized world. Yours has been the idea of a fundamental document protecting, with a carefully balanced arrangement of political power, the fundamental human rights. What a noble conception of man has inspired your Constitution, yet how well founded it is on

the earth. The idealism has not vanished like a dream but has remained the angelic part of a truly human institution.

For your Founding Fathers, to whose broodings political philosophers of every age return for inspiration, were not merely thinkers but men of action, too: If theoretical, practical also. They knew the nature of man, so wittily disclosed by G. K. Chesterton who said:

> There is one little defect about man, the image of God, the wonder of the world and the paragon of animals, he is not to be trusted.

This fine distrust, a lawyer's shrewdness, is writ large over your Constitution. The men who made it built well on sound foundations: and what they built has endured.

It has been said that growth is the only evidence of life. What amazing, unexampled growth has not your history shown. What abounding life does not your country display. May your future repeat the miracles of your past and well will humanity be served. Your present hospitality is but another happy instance of those many friendly gestures toward Ireland which the United States has made in the past. It is not very many years ago since it was my pleasant duty to express our thanks for the generous help which we received under Marshall aid. But the help which America gave Ireland did not start with Marshall aid. Long before Marshall aid was thought of, American support sustained the Irish people.

Ages ago, long before America was discovered by Europe, it was imagined by Europe, it was imagined by Irish seers as I-Breasail—The Island of Great Desire, a fertile land of alluring loveliness; in the terrible centuries of Ireland's misfortune when "Hope had grown gray hairs, Hope had mourning on," this memory remained. Then out into the miraculous sunsets of the west coast of Ireland went many an Irish family to reach this Island of Great Desire, and truly were they not mistaken in their journeys, because abounding hospitality and consolation in plenty awaited them and a fine future of noble living. And it is our boast that our emigrants have contributed not insignificantly to the building up of America. We allow ourselves, therefore, to feel that we, too, may to an extent share your greatness.

All small nations owe a special debt of gratitude to the United States for its strong and unceasing efforts for world peace. Through your efforts we have been spared the unlimited horrors of modern war and have thereby been able to maintain unscathed our Christian, democratic, and free way of life.

It has been your honor to have exercised the greatest power on earth in accordance with the high principles of justice. It has, indeed, been well said that you are apt for power. If you do but maintain your power as the servant of your rectitude, the world's future will be in good hands. I pray that it may be so. You will not need encouragement from me to ignore the misunderstandings and misrepresentations with which your foreign policy has been met in certain lands, for ingratitude is the first of the sins of man. But I can assure you that the free critical intelligence of my countrymen has not faulted your intention.

History has inextricably intertwined the fortunes of our two countries, and it is an easy task to come on such a mission as mine. I have the sense of having traveled far only to find myself at home. It was the Irish statesman, Henry Grattan, who said that the ocean unites, and in the west of my country we say that the next parish is America. [Applause.]

Time has not fulfilled nor realized the optimist's dream. Its passage has not exclusively brought improvement to the human situation. Indeed, some of the developments we have witnessed have confronted mankind with the ultimate decisions about life. Nevertheless, it was your great American judge, Oliver Wendell Holmes, who said:

> I think it not improbable that man, like the grub that prepares a chamber for the winged thing it never has seen but is to be—that man may have cosmic destinies that he does not understand.

This has been the heart of the Christian message, imparted to all of us, that man has such cosmic destinies; and it is good that the people of America and of Ireland can share together the Christian hope. [Applause, the Members rising.]

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS DURING RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE PRIME MINISTER OF IRELAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in a hearty and warm welcome to His Excellency, John A. Costello, the Prime Minister of Ireland. Mr. Costello's moving and inspiring address today to the Congress was a masterpiece of simplicity, encouragement, and good will. His well-chosen words have bound more tightly the ties between his little Republic of the Emerald Isle and this great Nation of ours. His magnificent phrases and his warm personality depict the great friendship that exists between these countries. That friendship is cemented by the role the Irish have played in the building and development of the United States. It has been made strong by the immigrants that left the shores of Eire many years ago seeking a new life and a new hope. It continues to grow with the more recent arrivals who seek new opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, it was a high honor for me to spend a few precious moments with our distinguished visitor and listen to him as he spoke of Ireland's opportunities and the manner in which his Government is trying to meet the great task that lies ahead. Under the leadership of this great jurist and statesman, one gets the feeling that better days lie ahead for his beloved country.

I include with my remarks an editorial and article from today's issue of the Washington Evening Star:

A TIMELY VISIT

There is a seasonable timeliness to the visit here of Ireland's Prime Minister John A. Costello in the week of St. Patrick's Day. And even if this element of timing were absent, the First Minister of the Irish Republican Government would be welcome in our Capital. One of his country's great jurists, Mr. Costello likewise has become one of its outstanding political figures. As chief of the Fine Gael (United Ireland) Party, he was elected to his present post in 1954 as the candidate of a coalition group that ousted the Fianna Fail of former Premier Eamon de Valera. Mr. Costello had served once before as Prime Minister, from 1948 to 1951. A major plank in his political platform called for the improvement and modernization of Irish agriculture, his contention being that the country's 12 million acres of arable land is its greatest natural asset. In the 2 years since, the Costello government has recorded progress in this direction as well as in certain industrialization. The Prime Minister has a full schedule here, including addresses today at the National Press Club and before both branches of Congress. We hope he enjoys the Washington hospitality.

COSTELLO SAYS IRISH GOAL IS PEACE, END TO PARTITION

(By Mary McGrory)

The Prime Minister of Ireland, John A. Costello, told a National Press Club luncheon meeting today that Ireland's foreign policy is directed generally toward using its influence for world peace and specifically toward the ending of partition.

The achievement of Irish independence in 1921 did not mean "a retreat toward isolation," Mr. Costello told the newspapermen at a luncheon given in his honor.

Partition, however, had created "circumstances which do not permit any Irish government to enter into military alliances such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization."

UNACCEPTABLE TO PEOPLE

"Any such alliance or commitment," Mr. Costello said, "whatever might otherwise commend it, would be unacceptable to the Irish people, whose sympathies and emotional energies are needlessly distracted by partition."

With a solution of this paramount problem, Mr. Costello said, would come "a fresh and enthusiastic flow of Irish energy in aid of Western institutions."

Mr. Costello, who arrived in the rain yesterday, began the second day of his 3-day state visit with a drive to Arlington Cemetery and Mount Vernon.

Following an afternoon reception at the American Newspaperwoman's Club, the Prime Minister will act as host to Acting Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., at dinner.

LUNCH AT WHITE HOUSE

The Prime Minister, accompanied by the United States Ambassador to Ireland, William Howard Taft III, and other members of his party, went to lunch at the White House with President Eisenhower immediately after his arrival yesterday.

The lunch went on for an hour and a half. Mr. Costello told reporters later, "We had a pleasant chat. The President was extremely complimentary about Ireland, and he looked extremely well."

Tomorrow the Prime Minister will visit the National Archives, the Library of Congress, and the Supreme Court. He will be entertained at lunch by Vice President NIXON at the Capitol and in the afternoon receive an honorary degree from Catholic University.

He will speak at 9 p. m. at Georgetown University. A program of Irish music at 8:15 p. m. will precede Mr. Costello's talk, which will be in Gaston Hall. The Very Reverend Edward B. Bunn, university president, will give the Prime Minister a special citation, and there will be a reception later in the Healy Building for university officials and guests.

ADDRESS OF PRIME MINISTER OF IRELAND TO NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of the Republic of Ireland, the Honorable John A. Costello, today addressed the National Press Club here in Washington, D. C. I was deeply impressed by the Prime Minister's remarks and urge all my colleagues who were unable to attend the Press Club affair to read them at their earliest convenience. In these troubled times, it was refreshing to hear this great statesman call for an approach to world peace through moral principles. I know that all of us will accept his suggestion that we celebrate St. Patrick's Day by praying that the Dove of Peace will soon hover over the world with "warm breast and bright wings." And more particularly that Mother Ireland will soon be able to walk through all four of her beautiful green fields and that she will walk there with "the walk of a queen." Mr. Speaker, I include this outstanding address by Prime Minister Costello in the RECORD:

I have some hesitation in selecting the theme of Ireland's foreign policy in addressing an audience such as this. I am conscious that I speak in the capital of a country the burdens of whose enormous power include daily preoccupation with the most vexed and varied problems of foreign policy.

Relative to these major problems of war and peace which are primarily your problems and the problems of those others to whom God has committed great power, good sense proclaims that Ireland should not attach disproportionate importance to her own anxieties. I hope and believe she does not do so.

Though her own special anxieties are real, Ireland cannot be unconcerned at the fate of the rest of the world. This is so, if for no other reason than that Ireland, and here I speak for the 32 counties of Ireland, is almost exclusively Christian, and what Christian can isolate himself from the pains and sufferings of the rest of the human race in which he is mystically involved and is responsible and from which he even more mystically benefits? We are all children of Adam before even we are Irishmen. The words of John Donne if much quoted are yet apt:

"No man is an Iland, intire of it selfe; every man is a peece of the Continent, a part of the maine; if a Clod bee washed away by the Sea, Europe is the lesse, as well as if a Promontorie were, as well as if a Mannor of thy friends or of thine owne were; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in Mankinde; And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; It tolls for thee."

Or as your own great Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes has magnificently put it, we must share the passion and action of our time "at the period of being judged not to have lived."

I need not remind you too that Ireland is a mother country whose children have been scattered by destiny all over the world and all their concerns must also be hers. Our great national movement of Sinn Fein by whose energy self-government was achieved in 1921 should not mistakenly be understood as a retreat toward isolation. The great object of independence was to secure the right for Irish energy and Irish intelligence to play their proper part freely in the active life of the world.

It has been said that it would be good for Ireland to forget its history and for certain of our neighbors to remember it. We in Ireland will not have it so. We must remember, but we will forgive. We must remember for the pride of the memory and as a reminder of our common fate.

Our roots in Europe have so deeply grown in history that we would perish, were we to tear them up. From Europe came to us the great gift of religion and much else besides. In the fifth century, the century of St. Augustine and St. Jerome when they bemoaned the fall of Rome and of civilization itself, the great missioner St. Patrick set forth with unshakeable faith to bring Christianity to Ireland. In the succeeding centuries of the Dark Ages the Holy Scholars of Ireland carried light and learning to Europe. May I establish this by citing the description by an English historian of our Irish philosopher John Scotus Eriugena as having achieved an intellectual peak in the ninth century which was not excelled until the Renaissance in the 15th?

When Irish Society was finally disrupted in the 17th century its leaders were then given an honorable reception by many of the courts of Europe, including those of Spain, France, Austria and Russia, and many of them acquitted themselves well in the service of these foreign powers.

To America, in the 18th century, came our admirable compatriots, the Protestant Ulstermen, as well as many Catholics. Later there came the full tide of our exiled Catholics, in the 19th century. To all alike have you given refuge and opportunity, and how much have you not returned to us in political support and economic aid. This support came to us in times past like some special prophetic anticipation of your later famous Marshall aid. Surely must we remember our history, for it is very relevant to the problems and decisions of today. If we are to be right, we must be guided by our traditions. We must respect the past.

In selecting, therefore, the theme of Ireland's foreign policy, I am desirous, first, of emphasizing how conscious we are of a common concern with you in the great issues that confront humanity in our time.

You must not expect me to offer you any readymade solutions. You and I know there are none such; the real and permanent solutions could come only through a moral resolution that would inspire in the hearts and minds of men a universal will to peace.

The object of Irish foreign policy is to use such influence as we possess to promote the spirit of justice, Christian charity, and goodwill on which the hope of peace must ultimately depend. Within the broad scope of that purpose, we seek, in common with other small nations, our own survival, the welfare of our people and the preservation of peace and of the rule of law in international relations. We have our own special object of policy, in full harmony with our general purpose of promoting justice in international affairs, namely, the restoration of the territorial unity of Ireland.

The object of survival involves a recognition, which we grant, that world peace is for Ireland a paramount national interest, greater than any other, greater even than the remedying of deeply felt national wrongs, however grievous they may be. Ireland can never pursue adventurous policies at the risk of war and hazard thereby the Nation's survival.

As a small country, Ireland can perhaps, in common with other small countries similarly situated, seek by attentive study to find a creative way out of the world's impasse. In the past, the role for international peace of the small country has been to serve as a bridge between opposing points of view, to be some means of communication when others have gone. In the major issues that divide the world today, we see little opportunity of our playing such a role. Communism, in our view, is a creed which confronts the established order of society with the most uncompromising challenge in history, a creed to which we are implacably opposed. Lenin has dismissed liberty as a bourgeois prejudice. That prejudice is deeply ingrained in Ireland—a country in which there are proportionately fewer Communists than anywhere else in the world. We see no point in survival if we cannot preserve the essential liberties without which the human spirit droops to slavery. While we preserve these liberties, we may yet work quietly on free minds and even eventually affect the course of human affairs at the mundane level. We can expect much from the gradual establishment of stable conditions and the healing effect of time.

In seeking to promote the welfare, spiritual and material, of our own people, we require a wide diplomatic representation, and there are a multiplicity of ways in which friendly foreign associations can further Irish interests. The obvious cases are trade arrangements and cultural and educational exchanges. A nation which saw value in the idea behind Marshall aid and which still maintains an extensive system of foreign help will readily recognize the paradoxical corollary of that idea. The paradox is that a nation's domestic policy can sometimes be seen as an extension of its foreign policy—it is at least the other side of the coin. By a wise domestic policy, with the three features of prudent finance, productive development, and social amelioration, Ireland hopes in its way to contribute toward the defense of civilization. Civilization should, after all, steal its enemies' best weapons.

I have said that one of the objects of our policy is to contribute, so far as we can, toward the preservation of the rule of law in international affairs. Recently, we have been admitted to membership of the United Nations Organization. This we welcome. UNO is an excellent means of fabricating a tradition of common action, and we are glad to be able to play our part in that work. The function of law is undoubtedly to protect the weak against the strong, and the vested interest of small countries in a rule of international order is very great. Our own constitution affirms our adherence to the principle of pacific settlement of international disputes by international arbitration or judicial determination and recognizes our acceptance of the principles of international law in our relations with other states. The language of the Charter of the United Nations corresponds with the language of our own constitution when it reaffirms faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small. Neither document creates the values there enshrined; those values, which are part of the common Christian inheritance of the West, are there rather reflected and protected.

Our own special object of foreign policy is the abolition of partition and the establishment of full national unity in the whole of our island territory. We believe that partition contradicts the facts of history and geography and spuriously denies the democratic principle. Its maintenance impairs the good relations which, with its

ending, could exist in full measure. Its solution should commend itself to just-minded people as a genuine contribution to international peace and the defense of the West. Partition has created circumstances which do not permit any Irish government to enter into military alliances such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Any such alliance or commitment, whatever might otherwise commend it, would be unacceptable to the Irish people, whose sympathies and emotional energies are needlessly distracted by partition, and I do not need to remind the citizens of this great democracy that the basis of democratic government is the consent of the citizens. It remains, this aim of our foreign policy, the main political objective of the great majority of Irishmen—a majority which is certainly not less than 80 percent. It is a problem whose existence in some degree lessens the strength of Western defenses. Ireland needs a long period of domestic peace in which to complete a major task of cultural and material reconstruction. It needs opportunity to discharge what Mazzini called that high special function in the interests of humanity which alone justifies a nation's independence. When the problem is solved—and the good will of our friends everywhere can help its solution—I confidently believe there will be liberated in aid of Western institutions a fresh and enthusiastic flow of Irish energy.

I thank you for the opportunity you have given me of speaking to you on these matters. Shortly, we will celebrate St. Patrick's Day. On that day, Irishmen will pray that soon "the dove of peace will hover over the world with warm breast and bright wings"; and they will pray that soon, too, our Mother Ireland will be able to walk through all four of her beautiful green fields and that she will walk there with "the walk of a queen."

ATTEMPT OF RUMANIAN LEGATION TO INTERFERE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure most of the Members of the House saw in today's edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald, a report that the Communist officials in the Rumanian Legation have made a protest to the president of the National Broadcasting Co. against one of its scheduled programs titled "The Five Who Shook the Mighty." In my judgment, this is a most serious matter because it involves a bold and brazen effort on the part of the Communists to interfere with the internal affairs of the American people.

I have today sent a letter to the president of the National Broadcasting Co. on this subject which I should like to read:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1956.

Mr. ROBERT W. SARNOFF,
President, National Broadcasting Co.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: It was brought to my attention several days ago that the National Broadcasting Co. would, on March 20 at 9:30 p. m. telecast a human interest program under the title "The Five Who Shook the Mighty." I became especially interested in this when I learned that this program would tell the story about those five young Rumanian patriots who, in seeking to bring about the release from Communist prisons in Rumania of their compatriots, took over the legation in Bern, Switzerland, then occupied by the Russian regime which now controls the affairs of the Rumanian people.

While I have not seen this proposed telecast, I felt certain an objective job would be done in depicting the motives which compelled these young patriots to take the action they did.

I was therefore shocked to read in the Washington morning newspaper that the Rumanian Government had lodged a protest with you in an effort to bring about the cancellation of this television program. In my judgment this is not only an unprecedented action, but one which violates the fundamental principles of free speech and free enterprise, which are among the bulwarks of Amercan democracy. I believe this action on the part of the Communist officials in the Rumanian Legation is direct interference in the internal affairs of the Amercan people.

I sincerely hope that the National Broadcasting Co. will in no way yield its rights to the shocking efforts of the Communist officials in the Rumanian Legation to intimidate and regulate one of our basic free enterprise activities. I am confident that the American people are the best judge on such matters and that they will look forward to seeing your program on next Tuesday at 9:30 p. m., over channel 4. I shall look forward to seeing your program, The Five Who Shook the Mighty, on next Tuesday evening.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN.

PROPOSAL TO MOVE COMMERCIAL AIR ACTIVITIES FROM WILLOW RUN AIRPORT TO DETROIT-WAYNE MAJOR AIRPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, after the statements made last Tuesday, I gathered various figures and facts and reports together in the controversy regarding the Willow Run–Detroit-Wayne Major Airport matter.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to give further testimony which will clarify the misleading information that has been circulated and to point out the arrogant attitude of the commercial airlines regarding the recommendations to move commercial air activities from Willow Run to Detroit-Wayne Major Airport and to concentrate military air activities at the Willow Run Airport.

First of all I should like to clarify certain facts.

In June of 1955 the President's Airport Use Panel, composed of experts in the field of engineering and airport use, military and civilian, and functioning under President Eisenhower's Executive Order 10655, conducted an investigation in Detroit, Mich., to resolve certain problems regarding airport facilities in the Detroit area. This panel of experts made studies of the conditions at the several airports in the Detroit area. Detroit, as you know, is a highly industrialized and heavily populated area, ranking fifth in total population in the United States and having a metropolitan area with 4 million people. With air travel continuing to grow by leaps and bounds, it is very important that full consideration be given to the most efficient and economical means of serving the traveling public in the area, as well as keeping aware of the needs of our national defense.

At the time of the hearings, I presented a statement to the Airport Use Panel, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. JOHN LESINSKI, UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE 16TH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, BEFORE THE AIRPORT USE PANEL OF THE PRESIDENT'S AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE, DETROIT, MICH., JUNE 22, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the panel, I want to state at the outset that it was with extremely good foresight and in the interest of the public that the Wayne County Board of Supervisors acted in recommending almost unanimously that the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport be used exclusively for commercial air activities and that the Willow Run Airport be developed for military purposes. I would like to express my support of that position.

Having traveled between Washington and Detroit by air on occasion, I have many times heard complaints from other passengers about the distance they had to travel in order to get into Detroit from the airport. The transfer of commercial air activities to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport would be a great convenience and a saver of time for those who use air travel for the particular purpose of saving time.

However, I do not believe that any person should approve of a move strictly with one objective in mind. Other related problems have to be considered.

I would like to mention the difficulties the Navy Department is having in trying to obtain facilities for its Reserve activities, which include flying jet aircraft. At the present time there is a naval air station located at Grosse Ile, Mich., but the runways are inadequate for jet planes and cannot be extended because of prohibitive costs. Some months ago I had correspondence with the Navy Department regarding the use of the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport for such Reserve activities. In response, the Navy Department, although mentioning possible use of the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, said they would explore the feasibility of relocating at another site not more than 25 miles from Detroit. The Willow Run Airport falls within this range. At the present time, the Department has made no progress in its plans to relocate the Reserve air activities, and one of the reasons for their difficulty seems to be that they are under the impression that there is little prospect of the airlines leaving Willow Run. I hope that this situation will be changed and the move of commercial airlines to the Detroit-Wayne Airport made without undue delay, thereby giving the Navy Department the opportunity to complete its plans to relocate the Reserve activities.

Furthermore, the headquarters of the 30th Air Division is presently at the Willow Run Air Force Station. This installation is in command of the defense of the area. It certainly seems to be practical to incorporate other military units with this installation. Such a move would be economical, would allow for better coordination, and would locate the military air activities at a place that has greater expandability if additional facilities are needed. Let us not lose sight of the fact that the Willow Run Airport was built by the Federal Government for the purpose of building and flying the B–24's during World War II. The present facilities could be readily modified for present day needs of military aircraft.

For these reasons, I strongly recommend that the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport be set aside exclusively for commercial air purposes and that the necessary military air activities of the area be centered at Willow Run.

Taking into account all aspects of national defense and civilian air activities, the Airport Use Panel, composed of civilian and military representatives, unanimously agreed upon the recommendation that the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport be developed for the major civil air activities in the Detroit area and that the military air units in the area be centered at Willow Run. I should like to emphasize the unanimous agreement of these experts as to the solution of the problems in the area. Reports of this nature require unanimous approval; the vote of one member of the Airport Use Panel can veto the votes of all other members on reports such as the one submitted in this case.

Further, the report was prepared after consultation with the Airport Use Panel advisory committee, which is composed of 13 trade organizations, such as the United States Conference of Mayors, Flight Safety Association, Airport Owners Association, National Association of State Aviation Officials, to name several. This committee had the one responsibility of acting in a purely advisory capacity to the Airport Use Panel and has no responsibility for approving or disapproving any report of the panel.

In the transmittal letter of the report, a statement is made to the effect that nothing in the report should be construed to mean that any airspace problems have been resolved. I should like to point out that airspace problems are not within the province of the Airport Use Panel. An airspace panel has been set up for the purpose of handling these specific problems, and the airspace problems are to be taken up at the time the military units are relocated at Willow Run. Also, prior to submitting its report, the Airport Use Panel consulted with both the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the airspace panel regarding the problem.

There are a number of other points which I should like to emphasize in which I believe the Members will be interested.

As has been pointed out, Willow Run Airport was built during World War II for the primary purpose of assembling B–24's. The facilities there are not in keeping with modern airport needs, and, therefore, in a relatively short time would have to be rebuilt for commercial air activities. On the other hand, the buildings which had housed the factory, even though in their present state not sufficient for military purposes, could easily be converted for military use.

From the standpoint of defense, I believe Willow Run is much more suitably located for military air activities. An important item to consider in the defense of an area is the distance of a military air base from a community as vital as Detroit. As we all know, a hydrogen bomb has an approximate destructive force of about 15 miles in radius. The total area of possible destruction, of course, would depend upon the pinpointing of the bomb and its size. Detroit-Wayne Major Airport is 17 air miles from the center of Detroit. Willow Run is approximately 25 air miles from Detroit. So it is obvious that if a bomb were dropped in the center of Detroit with any accuracy, Willow Run would be less apt to be neutralized, and retaliation could be initiated. Therefore, I believe that this point is a very important one to consider.

Additionally, in spite of modern technical developments in the use of telephones for transmitting messages, there is always a possibility of failure of communication because of sabotage. At a prearranged signal telephone wires could be cut or doctored so that orders from the headquarters of the 30th Air Division could be affected. In such a case air defense could easily be rendered useless. Willow Run, being adjacent to the headquarters of the 30th Air Division, in case of any interference would be in direct communication rather than having to depend on telephones for contacting the air units. This, I believe, is a most important point to emphasize, for I have always found that anything mechanical can very readily be altered to fit the occasion.

I would also like to emphasize to the Members that we are trying to develop reservists. The reservists, such as the Navy which is presently located at Grosse Ile and whose problem I discussed in my statement before the Airport Use Panel, are anxiously looking forward to the resolution of this problem so that they can start on the relocation of their facilities.

There is a certain amount of anxiety on the part of certain groups of people in the area that are opposed to military aircraft because of noise. This, I believe, should have no bearing for, as we all know, the majority of aircrafts in the future will be jet propelled. The matter of sound will be nullified in a relatively short time.

Furthermore, I have found from past experience that business people in a community favor military establishments adjacent to or in close proximity to their places of business. The reason is natural. The military personnel off duty spend their money invariably in the closest community to them. For that reason I think the people at Ypsilanti should welcome the establishment of a strictly military base at Willow Run.

The majority of the commercial airlines have flagrantly disregarded the recommendations of the President's Airport Use Panel, in spite of the national-defense aspects of the problem.

However, one airline, American Airlines, has taken a most progressive and forthright stand in this matter and has announced its intention to move operations from Willow Run to Detroit Wayne Major with October 1, 1957, as its target date. The company said that such a move would mean improved service at an airport more convenient to the Detroit air-traveling public. Detroit Wayne Major Airport is some 12 ground miles closer to downtown Detroit than Willow Run is. The greater convenience will mean improved passenger service. In making the announcement, the district sales manager for American Airlines said:

We believe our Detroit passengers can be better served out of Wayne Major Airport. We feel that this is a new concrete way in which American can express its faith in the continuing growth of Detroit and its desire to provide this dynamic air-travel market with the best possible service.

American Airlines is interested in giving improved passenger service to the Detroit area. Apparently the other airlines are not, although they have been beneficiaries of money from our Government. Capital Airlines, for example, received subsidies until October 1, 1951.

Some statistics might be of interest. According to the airport manager at San Francisco, the estimated gross revenues for the airport for 1956 are $3,100,000; the operating costs, $2,100,000. That airport has high operating costs because it has its own police force and fire department. The enplaning passengers for 1955 were 1,003,000 and deplaning passengers amounted to 1,002,000.

Figures for Willow Run are not available since they will not open their books. However, in his testimony before the Airport Use Panel, Mr. Wilson of Capital Airlines said the annual cost of operation is $907,000. Compare that figure with the $2,100,000 for the San Francisco Airport. Yet both airports serve approximately the same number of passengers. Willow Run in 1955 served 1,001,000 enplaning passengers and 1,001,000 deplaning passengers. San Francisco served only 2,000 more enplaning passengers and only 1,000 deplaning passengers.

There is another benefit the commercial airlines at Willow Run receive. In the State of Michigan a 3-cent-a-gallon aeronautical tax has been levied; however, commercial airlines are reimbursed 1½ cents per gallon quarterly. Altogether, according to available figures, the airlines at Willow Run are saving about a million dollars, plus what they are reimbursed on this gasoline tax.

Under the Federal Airport Act of 1946, the Civil Aeronautics Administration is authorized to expend funds for the development of civil aviation. Detroit-Wayne Major Airport has been designated as the civil airport for the Detroit area and as such qualifies for Federal aid. Willow Run has been designated as a military airport and consequently has not been included in the CAA airport aid program for fiscal year 1956.

Total expenditures for capital improvement of the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport since the war amounted to $11,027,000; of which $3,009,000 was Federal funds; $1,108,000 was State funds; and $5,009,000 was Wayne County funds. The completion program will cost approximately $12,000,000.

Under the present program the total investment at Detroit-Wayne Major Airport will be approximately $23 million, of which $7,250,000 will be Wayne County tax money. New hangar facilities that the airlines might need will be built by themselves or built by the county in which case the airlines will be given 25 years to amortize the cost. Any additional moneys expended in excess of the

$23 million on the airport for airline occupancy will be without additional cost to the taxpayers. All funds expended by Wayne County will be repaid by the airlines through use of the airport and all net revenue derived after expenses will be set aside for development of a new airport.

If the commercial airlines were to remain at Willow Run, within a few years additional sums would have to be poured into the field to modernize and equip it. And it would still be inadequate and look like what it is, a converted factory.

Detroit needs service from a convenient modern airport. Detroit-Wayne Major Airport is such a place.

Paramount in considering this entire matter, however, is our national defense. Coordination of air defense activities in a central location such as Willow Run is, I believe, very important. It is true that we are not presently being attacked. However, proper precautions are vitally important. The leopard may change its tactics but never its spots. We must be ever alert.

Mr. Speaker I should like at this point to insert in the RECORD the report of the Airport Use Panel to which I referred, Airport Use Panel Memorandum No. 8–55, dated November 4, 1955, on the problem of "the most feasible civil/military utilization of airports, existing and proposed, in the Detroit, Mich., area." I should also like to insert an editorial from the Detroit News of Thursday, January 19, 1956, entitled: "Time for a Stand—Wayne or Willow Run?":

TIME FOR A STAND—WAYNE OR WILLOW RUN?

We find nothing in the explanations offered here by the spokesmen of the seven holdout airlines to justify their refusal to join American Airlines in moving to the county airport.

The time has come, we think, for Detroit and Wayne County to be just as stubborn as the airlines. Their refusal to cooperate will add greatly to the financial difficulty of providing Detroit with better aviation facilities than those of distant Willow Run. It may render still more remote the date when we shall be able to afford both a west side and a needed east side airport. Nevertheless, the time is here to make a stand.

It is apparent now, if it was not before, that the scorn expressed for the comparative advantages of Wayne County Major Airport is synthetic. The decision of American Airlines to make the move leaves that quite clear. Clear, too, is the hollowness of the claim that the refusal to move is inspired by a hope, eventually, of helping Detroit to get a better airport.

The holdouts prefer to stay at Willow Run for only one substantial reason, which is financial. The University of Michigan, having exactly $1 invested in this former Government property, makes an incomparably easy landlord. The airlines pay only a nominal rent—which they are accustomed to cite when they bargain with airports elsewhere in the country. It is for this supreme advantage that they would condemn Detroit to indefinite reliance on an air terminal so far on the way to Chicago as to make it a standing joke.

Almost from the beginning of air travel, Detroit has been afflicted by indecision over acquisition of a suitable airport. Mere mention of the word has set up a confusion of counsels like that which halted work on the Tower of Babel. A year ago Mayor Cobo sought to end this by making the report by the Federal Panel on Airport Use the basis for a decision. The panel recommended adoption of Wayne Major as Detroit's chief air terminal. Mayor Cobo threw Detroit's support behind the recommendation.

It is time to rally behind that decision, which as its first fruit now can be said to have encouraged American Airlines to make its move. American does 30 percent of the passenger business at Willow Run. If we stand firm, the others may well find that their best advantage lies with following American to Wayne Major.

AIRPORT USE PANEL MEMORANDUM NO. 8–55

AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE,
AIRPORT USE PANEL,
Washington, D. C., November 4, 1955.

Subject: Airport Use Panel Report concerning public hearing to "determine, in the best interests of the public, the most feasible civil-military utilization of the airports, existing and proposed, in the Detroit, Mich., area."

Attached is a copy of the subject report unanimously approved by the Airport Use Panel November 4, 1955.

The contents of this report are self-explanatory. The official transcripts of the meetings conducted by the panel in its consideration of this matter, together with copies of the exhibits and other supporting information upon which the recommendations of the panel are based, are available for appropriate review in the office of the Airport Use Panel, Room 7832, Department of Commerce Building, Washington, D. C.

Nothing in this report should be construed to mean that any airspace problems involved in this matter have necessarily been resolved or that the recommendations contained herein have been endorsed by the members of the Airport Use Panel Advisory Committee.

JOSEPH W. JOHNSON,
Secretary, Airport Use Panel.

Problem: Determine, in the best interests of the public, the most feasible civil-military utilization of the airports, existing and proposed, in the Detroit, Mich., area.

DISCUSSION

On March 29, 1955, the Honorable Albert E. Cobo, mayor of the city of Detroit, together with Mr. Ed. Connor, chairman, Board of Wayne County Supervisors, and Mr. Michael J. O'Brien, chairman, Board of Wayne County Road Commissioners, addressed a letter to the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense, requesting his assistance in resolving certain problems relative to the use of the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport.

In their letter to the Secretary of Defense, the mayor and Wayne County officials advised that in the initial planning and development of the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport all officials concerned, including the Metropolitan Airport Authority, the Michigan Department of Aeronautics, and the Civil Aeronautics Administration (CAA), had agreed this airport should be expanded and improved as a major commercial airport. In explaining the current plans to develop additional facilities at the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, the city and county officials also advised that, because of the need for this airport as a civil facility, it had been necessary to deny recent requests from the Navy Department to use the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport for Naval Air Reserve training purposes. These officials further advised that the expansion of the Air Force had also brought requests from the Department for the use of civil airport facilities in the Detroit area.

In brief, the mayor and Wayne County officials expressed the opinion that the Willow Run Airport, conveyed as surplus airport property to the regents of the University of Michigan following World War II, should be used to serve the military requirements of the Detroit area, and the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport should be used primarily as the major civil airport for that area.

On April 14, 1955, the Department of Defense member of the Airport Use Panel, because of the multiplicity of civil aviation interests involved, referred the Detroit and Wayne County officials' letter to the panel, and requested that the problems presented therein be coordinated with the interested Federal agencies with a view toward satisfying the immediate airport requirements of the Air Force Reserve in establishing a jet fighter squadron of the Air Force, together with the needs of the Navy which proposed to relocate the Naval and Marine Air Reserve units now stationed at Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile.

In consideration of the request from its defense member, it was the consensus of the panel that, because of the complexity of the problems involved compounded by the divergent views of local officials, together with the urgent need to establish the Air Force and Naval Air Reserve training activities noted above, a public hearing should be conducted at the local level as soon as possible in order that all concerned with this problem might have an opportunity to state their views.

WILLOW RUN AIRPORT

The Willow Run Airport, acquired in fee simple title and developed by the Federal Government during World War II, was used until the end of the war exclusively by the Army. Its principal use, during that time, was in conjunction with the manufacture and testing of bomber-type aircraft. The Willow Run Airport was designed and planned to satisfy an immediate wartime need and similar to many other projects of this nature, there is little indication that this facility was contemplated for any other purpose at that time.

Following World War II, the Willow Run Airport, including the improvements, buildings, utilities, considerable personal property and approximately 3,143 acres of land was declared surplus to the needs of the War Department and placed in the custody of the War Assets Administration (WAA) for disposal. In an effort to salvage as much of this project as could be utilized at that time for civil aviation, the Willow Run Airport, pursuant to the regulations governing the disposal of airport property, was offered without charge to those public agencies in the Detroit area which might wish to acquire, maintain, and operate this facility as a civil airport. In this connection, the officials of Wayne County declined the offer of the Willow Run Airport, and proceeded with the development of the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, with the full endorsement and financial aid of the CAA, as the primary commercial civil airport to serve the Detroit area.

Testimony from the officials of the University of Michigan indicates that in 1946, at the time the Willow Run Airport was available as surplus property, the university was urgently in need of immediate space for a research program being conducted for the military. Concurrently, the commercial airlines serving Detroit and southeastern Michigan were also in need of adequate airport facilities which, at that time, were unavailable elsewhere. An arrangement was worked out under which the entire airport was conveyed to the regents of the University of Michigan providing the university with space for its research program, but with the condition that the airport was to be maintained as a public airport and preserved in standby condition for use by the Government in the event of a national emergency. Officials of the University of Michigan further advised the panel that to fulfill its obligation to the Federal Government, the university entered into an agreement with the Airlines National Terminal Service Co., Inc. (ANTSCO), organ-

ized by seven of the scheduled air carriers serving Detroit, under which this company is obligated to operate and maintain the airport at no cost to the university.

In transferring the Willow Run Airport to the regents of the University of Michigan, the following statement was included in and made a part of the deed of conveyance:

"That during any national emergency declared by the President of the United States of America or the Congress thereof, the Government shall have the right to make exclusive or nonexclusive use and have exclusive or nonexclusive control and possession, without charge, of the airport at which any of the property transferred by this instrument is located or used, or of such portion thereof as it may desire, provided, however, that the Government shall be responsible for the entire cost of maintaining such part of the airport as it may use exclusively, or over which it may have exclusive possession, or control, during the period of such use, possession, or control and shall be obligated to contribute a reasonable share, commensurate with the use made by it, of the cost of maintenance of such property as it may use nonexclusively or over which it may have nonexclusive control and possession; *Provided, further,* That the Government shall pay a fair rental for its use, control, or possession, exclusively or nonexclusively of any improvements to the airport made without United States aid."

Pursuant to Presidential Proclamation 2914, dated December 16, 1950, such a national emergency exists at the present time.

During times other than a national emergency, the following provisions extracted from various agreements in effect between the Government and the University of Michigan outline the rights of the Government to use the Willow Run Airport:

Quitclaim deed, dated January 15, 1947:

"B. (1) That the United States of America (hereinafter sometimes referred to as the 'Government') shall at all times have the right to use the landing area of the airport in common with others: *Provided, however,* That such use may be limited as may be determined at any time by the Civil Aeronautics Administration or the successor Government agency to be necessary to prevent interference with use by other authorized aircraft, so long as such limitation does not restrict Government use to less than twenty-five (25) percent of capacity of the airport. Government use of the airport to this extent shall be without charge of any nature other than payment for damage caused by Government aircraft."

Quitclaim deed, dated April 8, 1949:

"(2) That the United States of America, through any of its employees or agents shall at all times have the right to make nonexclusive use of the landing area of the airport at which any of the property transferred by this instrument is located or used, without charge: *Provided, however,* That such use may be limited as may be determined at any time by the Civil Aeronautics Administrator or his successor to be necessary to prevent undue interference with use by other authorized aircraft: *Provided, further,* That the Government shall be obligated to pay for damage caused by such use, or if its use of the landing area is substantial, to contribute a reasonable share of the cost of maintaining and operating the landing area, commensurate with the use made by it."

Grant agreement, Federal-aid airport program:

"8. All facilities of the airport developed with Federal aid, and all those usable for the landing and taking-off of aircraft, will be available to the United States at all times, without charge, for use by military and naval aircraft in common with other aircraft, except that if the use by military and naval aircraft is substantial, a reasonable share, proportional to such use, of the cost of operating and maintaining facilities so used, may be charged. The amount of use to be considered 'substantial,' and the charges to be made therefor, shall be determined by the Sponsor and the using agency."

Exclusive of the lands transferred to the university, the Government retained fee simple title to 23.57 acres on the east side of the Willow Run Airport on which is located a hangar and other facilities currently needed for Air Force Reserve activities. One of the most usable buildings located in this area is the so-called Packard Building A. F. Plant No. 31 which, the Panel was advised by officials of the university, is presently desired in the university's research program being conducted for the military. The Department of Defense, however, has advised the Panel that it is of the opinion that use of this facility for the current air defense mission takes precedence over its diversion to the research program.

The Willow Run Airport consists of the following runway system: North-south, 160 feet by 6,777 feet; east-west, 160 feet by 7,283 feet; east-west, 160 feet by 6,502 feet; northeast-southwest, 160 feet by 6,741 feet; northeast-southwest, 160 feet by 7,335 feet; northwest-southeast, 160 feet by 6,602 feet.

It is served by the following scheduled air carriers: American Airlines, Eastern Airlines, Northwest Airlines, Delta-Chicago and Southern Airlines, United Airlines, Capital Airlines, North Central Airlines, Trans World Airlines.

For the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, the following operations (landing or takeoff) were conducted at the Willow Run Airport (excerpted from Federal Airways Traffic Activity):

	1954	1955
Air carrier	105,380	109,961
Itinerant	21,302	20,605
Local	1,918	1,942
Total	128,600	132,508

The itinerant traffic consisted of the following:

	1954	1955
Air Force–Army	5,218	4,358
Navy	303	282
Civil	15,781	15,965
Total	21,302	20,605

The local traffic consisted of the following:

	1954	1955
Air Force–Army	908	840
Navy	22	14
Civil	988	1,083
Total	1,918	1,942

The segment of aviation making the greatest use of the Willow Run Airport is obviously that comprising the scheduled air carriers.

The Willow Run Airport is 33.8 miles from the city hall, downtown Detroit.

In addition to the substantial initial cost of constructing the Willow Run Airport and the facilities located thereon, the Government has expended, under the Federal-aid airport program, $70,031 for major improvements. It is understood that ANTSCO has expended some $1,250,000 on improvements to the terminal facilities at the Willow Run Airport.

DETROIT-WAYNE MAJOR AIRPORT

The Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, owned by Wayne County, Mich., and operated by the board of county road commissioners, was originally established in September 1928. This airport was also leased and operated by the War Department during World War II as the Romulus Army Airbase. In addition to the approximately 540 acres leased from Wayne County, the War Department acquired approximately 30 acres of land in fee-simple title. Under a surplus airport disposal instrument, dated May 5, 1948, the Government's interest in this airport was released and improvements made by the War Department during its occupancy were conveyed to Wayne County as surplus airport property.

In certain respects, however, the aforementioned surplus property instrument of disposal differs from the usual WAA surplus-property instrument; paragraph 4 (e) reads as follows:

"4. (e) Itinerant aircraft owned or used by the United States shall have at all times the right to use not more than 15 percent of the capacity of the landing area of the airport, without charge of any nature, other than payment for any damage which might be caused by such itinerant aircraft, and payment for any special service rendered to such itinerant aircraft."

Paragraph 7 thereof reads as follows:

"7. The restrictions and conditions enumerated above and particularly those set forth in paragraph 4 of this instrument as it affects buildings and improvements shall apply only to those buildings and/or improvements transferred hereunder located on that part of section 14, township 3 south and range 9 east, Romulus Township lying south of the right-of-way of the Wabash Railroad, leased by the United States from the county of Wayne by lease No. W–2288–eng–28 dated February 28, 1942, and the property described in lease No. W–2288–eng–763 dated November 30, 1942, but such restrictions and conditions shall not apply in any manner to additions to Wayne County Airport or to any other land or improvements whatsoever."

Subsequent to the date of this agreement, Detroit-Wayne Major Airport has been substantially improved under the Federal-aid airport program, Federal funds having been expended in the amount of approximately $4 million. At the present time, the airport encompasses an area of approximately 4 square miles as contrasted to its original 1 square mile and is subject to use by the Government as provided in the Grant Agreement (same as Willow Run—p.4). The Government owns no land at this airport.

Since the end of World War II, officials of Wayne County have vigorously proceeded with the development and modernization of the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. At present, the terminal area of this airport contains the first increment of an administration building; a control tower; a modern cargo building with cold storage and bonded freight facilities. The airport is a port of entry with customs and immigration facilities services used by Pan American World Airways, the only scheduled passenger-air carrier presently utilizing this airport. Runway approaches have been completely cleared of all obstructions and are protected from future encroachment by the provisions of the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport zoning ordinances. There are 10 hangar buildings for civil use located on the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport containing a total of 217,300 square feet. Air freight carriers presently operating from this airport include Flying Tiger Line, Slick Airways, Zantop Flying Service, and Meteor Air Transport.

Wayne County, to date, has spent approximately $13 million of its own funds in the development of the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport and has under active consideration an extensive program for additional improvements involving approximately $10 million of local funds. Upon completion of the facilities now contemplated, for which funds are available, the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport will be comparable in all respects to other major airports serving large cities of similar airline traffic potential.

The Detroit-Wayne Major Airport is 21.5 miles from the city hall, downtown Detroit.

Of particular importance is the fact that the same expressway that provides access to the Willow Run Airport passes the entrance to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport which is 12.3 miles closer to downtown Detroit.

At present, the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport consists of the following runway system: Northeast/southwest, 200 feet by 7,030 feet; northeast/southwest, 200 feet by 7,902 feet; east/west, 200 feet by 7,580 feet; northwest/southeast, 200 feet by 5,815 feet; northeast/southwest (presently closed), 200 feet by 5,893 feet; northwest/southeast (presently closed), 200 feet by 4,447 feet.

For the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, the following operations (landing or takeoff) were conducted at the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport (excerpted from Federal Airways Air Traffic Activity):

	1954	1955
Air carrier	14,030	16,153
Itinerant	55,090	62,197
Local	52,694	56,979
Total	121,814	135,329

The itinerant traffic consisted of the following:

	1954	1955
Air Force-Army	12,218	13,787
Navy	1,017	1,220
Civil	41,855	47,190
Total	55,090	62,197

The local traffic consisted of the following:

	1954	1955
Air Force-Army	6,704	5,717
Navy	660	784
Civil	45,330	50,478
Total	52,694	56,979

A review of the historical background leading up to the development of the Detroit-Wayne major airport leaves no doubt that this airport, with the full knowledge and endorsement of those Government officials, local, State, and Federal, responsible for the development of civil airports, was planned, designed, and intended to be used as the primary commercial airport to serve the Detroit area. Its accessibility and other conveniences to the traveling public, when completed, cannot be duplicated by any other facility now serving this area.

DETROIT CITY AIRPORT

The Detroit City Airport, located 6 miles northeast of downtown Detroit, is owned and operated by the city. Its runway system consists of the following: East northeast-west southwest, 100 feet by 4,042 feet; north northeast-south southwest, 100 feet by 2,748 feet; northwest-southeast, 100 feet by 4,585 feet; northwest-southeast, 100 feet by 1,141 feet.

It is interesting to note that despite the fact that this airport is so badly obstructed and is subject to such poor visibility that the city proposes eventually to dispose of it for other than airport purposes, it, nevertheless, accommodates more traffic in terms of aircraft operations than any other airport in the Detroit area. During fiscal year 1954, there was a total of 150,295 operations at this airport, the greater portion of which consisted of itinerant civil craft, or general aviation. During fiscal year 1955, the operations at this airport increased to a total of 155,844. One of the most desirable features of this airport is its proximity to downtown Detroit, and it is reasonable to assume that its customer-convenience accounts, in large measure, for its extensive use.

Obviously, however, the Detroit City Airport cannot be considered adaptable to military or expanded civil use, and consequently will not, in that regard, receive extensive treatment in this report.

NAVAL AIR STATION GROSSE ILE

Naval Air Station Grosse Ile is located 17 miles southwest of downtown Detroit, is owned by the Federal Government and operated by the Navy; it consists of the following runways: east-west, 150 by 3,920 feet; northeast-southwest, 150 by 4,743 feet; northwest-southeast, 150 feet by 4,580 feet.

The Navy has determined from engineering estimates that it would cost a minimum of $4½ million to develop one runway at Naval Air Station Grosse Ile capable of accommodating modern military jet aircraft. Because of its location, adjacent to the St. Lawrence Waterway, the development of an intersecting runway would be physically impractical. This airport, therefore, is neither suitable nor economically adaptable for military jet aircraft and for all practical purposes has lost its value as a naval air installation. Accordingly, the Naval and Marine Air Reserve units now stationed at this location, in order to become jet-equipped, must be relocated at another site in the Detroit area.

SELFRIDGE AIR FORCE BASE

Selfridge Air Force Base is located approximately 25 miles northeast of downtown Detroit, is owned by the Federal Government and operated by the Air Force. It consists of two runways, east/west and north/south, 150 feet by 6,000 feet and 150 feet by 8,200 feet respectively. The Air Force has advised that it is presently utilized in excess of its designed operational capacity by Regular and Reserve Air Force units. Additional runway and air defense facilities are planned by the Air Defense Command, but the size and operating characteristics of the type of aircraft programed, plus a necessity for immediate runway availability for interceptor missions, require a reduction in the number of aircraft operating from this base.

NORTHEAST SITE

During the course of the subject hearing, the mayor of Detroit and other officials indicated that they are actively planning the development of the so-called "northeast site" as another major civil airport to serve the northern portion of Detroit and its environs, and are engaged in acquiring real estate for this purpose. The suggestion was made that an airport located on or near this site would offer the possibility of split airline operations for metropolitan Detroit.

Conversely, public officials and a large number of citizens from Warren Township, in which the "northeast site" is located, are historically opposed to the development of a major airport at this location. While the panel recognizes that this controversy may ultimately be resolved, it foresees no possibility that an airport will be developed at this location sufficiently soon to alleviate either the military or civil requirements presently under consideration.

CURRENT MILITARY REQUIREMENTS IN THE DETROIT AREA

Air Force

The Air Force has an immediate requirement to detach two Reserve fighter squadrons from the jet units now located at Selfridge Air Force Base. Air Force officials desire to locate one jet squadron on the Willow Run Airport on a permanent basis in order to make facilities available for Reserve personnel in the south and west areas of metropolitan Detroit. In addition to the fact that the Willow Run Airport is well located, strategically, and meets the physical requirements of the Air Force, one of the more important reasons influencing the selection of the Willow Run Airport for this purpose is the fact that the Government, as noted above, has the right to use this facility, exclusively or nonexclusively, during a national emergency. No such rights exist on any other civil airport in the Detroit area. Further, the Government owns 23.57 acres of land, together with the following facilities, on the east side of the Willow Run Airport: Apron, 20,000 square yards; hangar, 25,280 square feet; administrative space, 23,000 square feet; storage space, 3,200 square feet; aviation-gas storage, 28,000 gallons; other fuel storage, 15,000 gallons.

Facilities of this nature do not exist elsewhere to accommodate this squadron and construction of new facilities to this extent at another location would delay relocation of this unit an estimated 2 years and increase Government construction costs an estimated $2 million.

Navy

The Navy has a requirement to equip with modern jet aircraft the Naval and Marine Air Reserve units now established at Naval Air Station Grosse Ile. It is not economically feasible to expand Naval Air Station Grosse Ile to the extent required to accommodate jet aircraft.

In its consideration of another site to accommodate its current and continuing mission, the Navy has investigated the possibilities of joint use of the Selfridge Air Force Base, the Willow Run Airport, and the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. The Air Force has advised the Navy that Selfridge Air Force Base is already congested and even with two fighter squadrons relocated, its proposed utilization precludes such joint use. The Board of Wayne County Road Commisisoners, having jurisdiction over the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, has stated that it cannot agree to the Naval and Marine Air Reserve using that airport as its operating base. While the Navy has stated a preference for utilizing the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, inasmuch as it is nearer downtown Detroit than the Willow Run Airport and has newer runways and other facilities in excellent condition, no Government rights exist to do so without the consent of the Wayne County road commissioners.

Air National Guard

The Air National Guard is located on the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport and has been there for 25 years. It expects to reach a complement of 60 jet aircraft, or 2 squadrons, by the end of this calendar year.

During the period that the Air National Guard has been located on the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport approximately $2 million of Federal funds have been or are being spent in the construction of buildings and other parmanent improvements to serve its needs. Title to certain of these facilities is vested in the State of Michigan and these are situated on land leased by the State. The more recently constructed facilities, including the shop-hangar now under construction at an estimated cost of $670,000, are owned by the Federal Government and are situated on land leased by the Federal Government.

Officials of the guard advised that they were satisfied with their present arranagement at Detroit-Wayne Major Airport and were most desirous of remaining there. Officials of Wayne County, however, while not emphatic on the subject, felt that the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport might be better utilized exclusively for civil purposes and suggested the possibility of reimbursing the guard for any of its facilities adaptable to civil use in the event the Guard moved its operations elsewhere.

SCHEDULED AIR CARRIER ACTIVITIES IN THE DETROIT AREA

Based upon extensive research, the CAA has determined that a community's population size and economic character fix its air traffic potential. It has also been determined that enplaned airplane passengers and air carrier departures are indexes of primary importance in air transportation.

Among the 22 "Large Hubs," which have been designated on the basis of enplaned airline passengers during 1954, Detroit rated sixth in continental United States. Of the total enplaned passengers in the entire United States, during 1954, Detroit produced 2.82 percent.

From the Willow Run, Detroit-Wayne Major and Detroit City Airports, during fiscal years 1954 and 1955, there were a total of:

	1954	1955
Scheduled aircraft departures	52,238	55,596
Passengers enplaned	854,739	957,251

The CAA forecast for the Detroit area is as follows:

	1960	1965
Scheduled aircraft departures	70,500	80,000
Passengers enplaned	1,550,000	1,975,000

GENERAL AVIATION ACTIVITIES IN THE DETROIT AREA

According to the 1950 census, the population of the city of Detroit proper was 1,849,568; the population of Wayne County, which also includes the population of Detroit, was 2,435,235. As of June 30, 1955, there was a total of 1,025 registered (non-air-carrier) aircraft in Wayne County.

During the period from June 1, 1954, to May 31, 1955, there was an average of 248 aircraft based at the Detroit City Airport, of which there were 147 business aircraft owned and operated by private companies. While there are substantial general aviation operations at other airports, traffic counts indicate that the majority of general aviation aircraft in the Detroit area utilize the Detroit City Airport. Available forecasts indicate an increase of 40 percent in general aviation operations during the next 5 years. The Detroit City Airport, meanwhile, has already reached the near-saturation point; hangar space is unavailable and the lack of ground space precludes the construction of new hangar facilities, as well as the expansion of the airport.

A cursory study of general aviation in this densely populated and highly industrial area indicates an acute shortage of airports to serve the future needs of this segment of aviation.

AIR TRAFFIC PROBLEMS IN THE DETROIT AREA

In order to be sure that the airport use panel's recommendations with regard to the airports in question would not result in unnecessary or unworkable traffic conflicts, appropriate personnel of the CAA were requested to study the following combinations of joint civil military use:

"1. What would be the effect under instrument flight rules and visual flight rules conditions, taking into consideration the existing and foreseeable civil air traffic in the Detroit area if 2 squadrons of Navy Reserve are added to the 2 squadrons of the Air National Guard now operating from the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport; the scheduled air carriers, with 1 squadron Air Force Reserve operating from Willow Run Airport?

"2. What would be the effect under instrument flight rules and visual flight rules conditions, taking into consideration existing and foreseeable civil aircraft in the Detroit area, if 2 squadrons of Navy Reserve, 1 squadron of Air Force Reserve and 2 squadrons of Air National Guard would operate from the Willow Run Airport and the scheduled air carriers would operate from Detroit-Wayne Major Airport?

"3. What would be the effect under instrument flight rules and visual flight rules conditions, taking into consideration the existing and foreseeable air traffic in the Detroit area if the 2 squadrons of Air National Guard were to remain at the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport and the scheduled air carriers were to be relocated from Willow Run to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, with 2 squadrons of Navy Reserve and 1 squadron of Air Force Reserve operating from the Willow Run Airport?

"4. What would be the effect under instrument flight rules and visual flight rules conditions if the air carriers were to remain at Willow Run and add thereto 1 squadron of Air Force Reserve and 2 squadrons of Navy Reserve with Air National Guard remaining at Detroit-Wayne Major Airport along with present civil operations?"

This study indicates that the traffic handling capabilities of air-traffic control would be enhanced if the scheduled air carriers were to be located at the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport and the military units in question stationed at the Willow Run Airport.

PROPOSED HOUSING DEVELOPMENT NEAR WILLOW RUN AIRPORT

During the course of the hearing, the panel was advised that the city of Ypsilanti, on October 29, 1954, acquired a former defense housing facility known as Willow Village, and presently has under consideration an extensive program to replace these temporary structures with permanent housing. Under the laws of the State of Michigan, the township of Ypsilanti will be required to remove all temporary units by June 30, 1958. Many of the loans required for the development of new homes in this area must necessarily be approved and insured by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA).

Officials of Ypsilanti advised the panel that "when an application was made for a final commitment from the FHA, all concerned were disturbed to be informed by Mr. George Strye, head of the valuation section of the FHA (Detroit) that all FHA commitments, not only in the Willow Village area but in all areas adjacent to the airport, were being withheld until definite information could be obtained as to whether or not jet military planes were to be located at the Willow Run Airport."

While the matter of a housing project might, at first, appear secondary to the strictly aeronautical elements of this problem, it nevertheless raises certain very important issues of direct concern to the panel and introduces one of the most puzzling features of the hearing.

Specifically, considerable testimony was presented during the hearing, some by officials of ANTSCO, urging that the Willow Run Airport not be used by military jet aircraft because of the noise and other objectionable features affecting the proposed housing development. Conversely, there was little indication that any attempt had been made by the officials responsible for the management and operation of the Willow Run Airport to zone or otherwise control the erection of these houses, some of which would lie directly under certain of the approaches to the airport.

During the past few years aircraft noise has become a matter of great concern among aviation officials over the entire Nation. Inestimable sums of money have been spent in clearing airport approach zones, removing aerial obstructions, and otherwise making the airport as desirable and safe a neighbor as possible. In fact, aircraft noise abatement and hazards to aerial navigation have become of such national importance as to attract the attention of various committees of the Congress. It is a strange paradox, therefore, to find the officials responsible for the management of the Willow Run Airport, in effect, advocating a housing project which, at best, could only compound their future administrative problems and create serious public relations difficulties.

With regard to the possibility of military jet aircraft using the Willow Run Airport, FHA officials in Washington have advised the panel, as follows: "The FHA has no policy differentiating between military or commercial airports or the types of aircraft used at either. While it is recognized that jet aircraft might create more noise and other nuisances, basic policies would be the same as for commercial aircraft. * * *" In view of the fact that civil jet aircraft are presently being developed and are expected to be in commercial use by 1959, it is evident that the Willow Run Airport will ultimately be used by jet aircraft in any event. It would appear, then, that the officials of the Willow Village Housing Development and the Willow Run Airport should be guided accordingly, and while the opportunity is still available, plan the construction of this housing development in a manner best suited to the unrestricted future utilization of the airport, as well as the homes in question.

MANAGEMENT AND OPERATION OF THE WILLOW RUN AIRPORT

Because of the unique arrangement between the University of Michigan and ANTSCO providing for the maintenance and operation of the Willow Run Airport, and because of the fact that an equitable solution of the problem under consideration depends, to such a great extent, upon the future disposition of the scheduled air carriers comprising ANTSCO, the panel is of the opinion that this arrangement should be clearly understood.

As noted above, the Willow Run Airport was transferred to the regents of the University of Michigan by the Federal Government without cost to the university. In consideration of this transfer, the university agreed, among other things, that the land, buildings, structures, improvements, and equipment so transferred shall be "used for public airport purposes for the use and benefit of the public, on reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination and without grant or exercise of any exclusive right for use of the airport."

Following the transfer of the airport to the university, ANTSCO entered into a lease with the University of Michigan and, for all practical purposes, assumed all of the responsibilities of the university to maintain and operate the Willow Run Airport as a public airport.

The original lease, dated February 7, 1947, for the Willow Run Airport was between the university and Pennsylvania-Central Airlines Corp. (now Capital Airlines) and expired September 30, 1949. Upon establishment of ANTSCO, Pennsylvania-Central Airlines furnished a guaranty to provide for the faithful discharge of duties by the service company.

Pursuant to the agreement between ANTSCO and the University of Michigan, the service company (ANTSCO) is responsible to the university for:

"1. The service company shall pay all maintenance, repair, and operating costs (including, but not limited to, water, electricity, heat, sewage disposal and other utilities, plant protection, fire protection, snow removal, taxes, insurance, first aid, etc.) of the entire airport property, and of all landing aids used in the operation of the airport, or required by Civil Aeronautics Authority.

"2. All work required to be performed by the service company pursuant hereto shall be of such standard that the airport property, including buildings and equipment, will be operated and maintained in a proper and efficient condition.

"3. The service company shall carry and maintain all such fire insurance (including supplemental coverages as may customarily be carried in connection with the ownership or operation of airport property) on the airport property, and on the maintenance and operating equipment furnished to it pursuant to paragraph 16 hereof, in responsible companies, in such amounts, and in such form, as the university may require.

"4. The service company shall also procure and maintain public liability insurance.

"The service company shall pay the cost of all improvements to the property deemed necessary or desirable by it.

"5. Subject to any required approval of Civil Aeronautics Authority, the service company shall have control of and the right to operate the airport and all concessions on the

airport property (except concessions on the reserved property) and to collect all revenue realized from such operations of the service company.

"6. The service company may, subject to the approval of Civil Aeronautics Authority, make reasonable rules and regulations necessary to the safe operation of the landing area.

"7. The service company shall use its best efforts to develop and promte the use of the airport as a public airport.

"8. The parties recognize that it would be desirable to obtain certain easements for aviation purposes in respect to the approaches to the airport and it is understood that the costs in connection therewith shall be paid by the service company."

Supplement No. 1 executed August 1, 1947, provides for the exchange of certain space in hangars, theater, offices, etc., between the parties.

Renewal of airport lease dated October 17, 1951, effective October 1, 1952, follows substantially previous provisions except rental is specified as $15,000 per annum and 10 percent of gross nonairline revenue in excess of $250,000. This lease remains in effect until September 30, 1962, and may be terminated as of September 30, 1955, or any September 30 thereafter.

In simple terms, the university received from the Federal Government, without charge, a ready-made, multi-million-dollar airport with all necessary facilities. The airport was then leased to ANTSCO which collects all revenues from the airport and its concessions and, in turn, pays the cost of its maintenance and operation. Inasmuch as the airport was originally received without cost, however, there is no initial capital investment to be amortized. The scheduled air carriers are charged landing fees by ANTSCO, but since ANTSCO is comprised of the same air carriers, they, in effect, pay these fees to themselves. When the landing charges are balanced against the revenues received from concessions and other sources, it appears entirely possible for the carriers to use the Willow Run Airport free; in fact, if the revenues are sufficiently great, the carriers stand to make a profit by doing so. Regardless of its redeeming features as a successful business enterprise, the panel has been unable to ascertain that any substantial benefit has accrued to the public as a result of this arrangement.

Officials of ANTSCO have advised the panel that they do not welcome the additional burden and probable delay and inconvenience to the scheduled airlines through the addition of Reserve Air Force pilots in weekend training in jet planes from the Willow Run Airport. They have likewise advised that the airlines have no intention, interest, or plans to move from the Willow Run Airport. ANTSCO's position in this connection is supported by the university. Testimony presented during the hearing, however, indicated that the scheduled carriers now using the Willow Run Airport would consider a reasonable proposition from appropriate officials of Wayne County to transfer their operations to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport.

SUMMARY OF PERTINENT FACTS

In determining the advantages and disadvantages of the possible combinations of civil and/or military use of the Willow Run and Detroit-Wayne Major Airports, there are certain factors which must be considered:

1. The need to relocate the Air Force Reserve training and the Naval and Marine Air Reserve units in the Detroit area is immediate—this cannot be delayed unnecessarily.

2. These military units, once relocated, must be able to function effectively with the least possible interference to civil aviation activities, and vice versa, in the Detroit area.

3. The future capabilities of aviation, both military and civil, to develop in a manner best suited to the needs of the public in the Detroit complex, hinges, in very large measure, upon the selection of the right airport for the right purpose—now.

Mindful of these factors, the first question which arises is:

"A. Is it in the best interest of the public for the scheduled air carriers to remain on the Willow Run Airport and continue operations from that location on a permanent basis?"

In support of the carriers remaining on the Willow Run Airport is the fact that they are already there, have been for a number of years, and have meanwhile invested sizable sums of money in facilities and other improvements on the airport. The airport, at the present time, is operating on a profitable basis. While the panel questions the 20 to 30 million-dollar figure suggested during the hearing as the estimated cost of transferring the carriers to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, it knows, of course, that such a move might very well be costly. In arriving at the exact cost of transferring the carriers to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, however, the possibility that certain profits may have been realized by ANTSCO in its operations at the Willow Run Airport should not be overlooked.

While it is granted that the Willow Run Airport may, at the present time, be economically attractive to the carriers, the panel doubts that, as a permanent base of operations, it can be profitably supported by the carriers alone. If, for example, the carriers were required to finance future major runway and building improvements, inevitable at any airport, including Willow Run, without the benefit of Federal aid, the possibility of operating at a profit on a long-term basis would then appear to be a very dubious proposition.

Viewing this matter from the standpoint of public interest, the panel is unable to find any compelling reason for the air carriers remaining at the Willow Run Airport. Available studies, based upon personal interviews with airline passengers on a nationwide basis, indicate that the majority of the flying public either originate or terminate their trip in or near the business areas of the cities served by the respective airports. This conclusion is supported by the fact that public ground transportation, highways and thoroughfares are normally designed to serve airports in that manner. The Detroit-Wayne Major Airport is 12.3 miles closer to downtown Detroit than the Willow Run Airport. Within equal radii, it would serve a considerably larger population area than the Willow Run Airport. There is no reasonable justification, therefore, to impose upon the majority of the public the burden of traveling some 24 extra ground miles, in a roundtrip to the Willow Run Airport when, in doing so, the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport is passed en route.

In addition to the fact that the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport is more accessible to the majority of the traveling public than the Willow Run Airport, its runways are wider, longer, newer, and of a heavier design; the approaches to the airport are clear of obstructions and fully protected from future encroachment; the terminal building, when completed, will be capable of serving the needs of the carriers and the public in an entirely functional and timesaving manner as contrasted to the inefficient converted hangar presently being used at the Willow Run Airport.

Further, the panel carefully considered the many facets associated with the control of air traffic with respect to this problem, and is of the opinion that the optimum efficiency of IFR operations in the Detroit area can be obtained by using the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport as the principal scheduled air carrier terminal in the Detroit area.

The principal disadvantages involved in transferring scheduled operations to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport would be the resultant cost to the carriers in physically relocating from one airport to another. It is the opinion of the panel, however, that public convenience takes precedence over other considerations in this matter, and while it is recognized that the Willow Run Airport has, to date, served a very useful purpose, its continued use in the future as the major terminal for scheduled airline service in the Detroit area, cannot be justified in the best interest of the public.

The next question which arises is:

"B. Under what combination of civil/military use of the Willow Run and Detroit-Wayne Major Airports can the interests of the Federal Government best be served?"

As previously noted, the Government has certain vested rights to use the Willow Run Airport during a national emergency; no such rights exist to use any other civil airport in the Detroit area. Hence, the matter immediately reduces itself to one of practical and economic considerations.

Located on the 23.57 acres owned in fee by the Government on the east side of the Willow Run Airport are facilities the use of which would save the Government an estimated $2 million. These facilities would satisfy the initial requirements of the Air Force Reserve squadron and could be made available without delay.

The hangar and other building requirements of the Naval Air Reserve unit could be easily met, with substantial savings to the Government, by utilizing facilities now being occupied by the air carriers on the west side of the airport. These facilities are already in existence and are adaptable to military use without extensive modification or expense to the Government. Conversely, to duplicate these facilities at another airport would necessitate the Government acquiring some 50 acres of land, together with the construction of new facilities, involving a minimum of $3 million.

The third question which arises is:

"C. Assuming the scheduled carriers transfer operations to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport and the Air Force and Naval Air Reserve units establish their activities on the Willow Run Airport, what is in the best interest of the Air National Guard now located on the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport?"

While it is recognized that the Air National Guard has traditionally been a tenant on the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, having successfully operated there for many years, the panel is of the opinion that the transfer of the scheduled air carriers to that location would reduce the efficiency of the guard's activities, in very large measure. In that connection, the additional air traffic created by the scheduled carriers alone would impose a substantial workload on the tower and other traffic handling facilities of the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport. The ground space required on the airport proper for hangars and other operational facilities needed by the carriers and general aviation would progressively increase. If the Air Force and naval jet units occupy the Willow Run Airport, it is the opinion of the panel that the interests of all concerned could best be served by placing all of the military units on the Willow Run Airport where the flying characteristics of the aircraft would be relatively the same, meanwhile affording scheduled and other civil craft the unrestricted use of the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, both on the ground and in the air. In this manner, the master planning of both airports could be integrated in strict adherence to the needs of the units located thereon much to the financial advantage of the local, State, and Federal agencies concerned.

Corollary to the proposed utilization of the Willow Run and Detroit-Wayne Major Airports, the panel believes it advisable to take into account the future airport needs of the

Detroit area in addition to those now available for civil aviation. In this connection, it would appear that the Grosse Ile Airport could be readily converted to civil use following the transfer of the naval activities to another location. While this facility is adaptable only to smaller type aircraft, the need for an additional airport of this nature to serve general civil aviation in the Detroit area is most apparent.

Another factor bearing upon this matter is the statement made during the hearing that the University of Michigan could not afford to maintain and operate the Willow Run Airport without the support of the scheduled air carriers. In this event, the panel wishes to emphasize that the Willow Run Airport should remain in civil ownership and that the military units located thereon use this airport as tenants in common with civil aviation; also, that the university be afforded the continued use of such nonairport facilities as may be required in the conduct of its research activities.

The panel is of the further opinion that notwithstanding the advantages which will accrue to civil aviation as a result of the most effective use possible of existing airports, additional civil airports will be necessary to serve the Detroit area.

In view of the forecasted growth of civil aviation and, because of the numerous political subdivisions having an interest in the Detroit airport complex, the panel also believes that the establishment of a single airport authority, which can be responsible for the planning, coordination, and administration of all civil airports in the Detroit metropolitan area, would best serve the interests of aviation and the public.

RECOMMENDATIONS

After consideration of all factors involved and in consonance with applicable Federal policies, the Airport Use Panel recommends:

1. That the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport be developed and utilized as the major civil air terminal serving the Detroit area.

2. That the scheduled air carriers now using the Willow Run Airport transfer their operatings to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport as soon as adequate facilities can be made available to serve their needs.

3. That the Willow Run Airport continue to be operated under civil ownership as a joint civil/military airport.

4. That one Air Force Reserve fighter squadron be immediately relocated from Selfridge Air Force Base and established on the Willow Run Airport, utilizing present Government-owned facilities and pursuant to existing rights of the Government to use the airport.

5. That the naval air station be relocated from Grosse Ile and established on the Willow Run Airport.

6. That the Air National Guard squadrons now stationed at the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport be transferred to the Willow Run Airport as soon as agreement can be reached between the State of Michigan and the officials of Wayne County for the replacement of Air National Guard facilities now existing or under construction at the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport with equally adequate facilities at the Willow Run Airport.

7. That the proper authorities proceed with plans to develop additional public airports adequate to serve present and future civil-aviation requirements in the Detroit area.

8. That, in the event Naval Air Station Grosse Ile is declared surplus to the needs of the military, consideration be given to civil use of this airport for general aviation.

9. That the appropriate local, State, and Federal officials develop, coordinate, and integrate the master plans of all airports in the Detroit metropolitan area to the extent necessary that each airport may be utilized effectively and fully consistent with the recommendations contained herein.

10. That consideration be given to the establishment of a single metropolitan airport authority to administer the civil airports in the Detroit area.

The following members of the respective Federal agencies constituting the Airport Use Panel unanimously approved the foregoing report on November 4, 1955: Department of Commerce, Fred B. Lee (chairman), Administrator of Civil Aeronautics; Department of Defense, Roger W. Fulling, Director of Construction (P. & I.), Office of the Secretary; Department of the Air Force, Maj. Gen. Kenneth P. Bergquist, Director of Operations; Department of the Army, Maj. Gen. Hamilton H. Howze, Chief, Army Aviation Division; Department of the Navy, Rear Adm. W. L. Rees, Assistant Chief of Naval Operations (Air); Civil Aeronautics Board, Joseph P. Adams, Vice Chairman.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Detroit News and a report from the Air Coordinating Committee, Airport Use Panel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SUSQUEHANNA WATERSHED COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to lay before the Congress a bill for the creation of a Susquehanna Watershed Commission whose assignment it will be to prepare plans for the development of the resources of the Susquehanna Watershed Area for purposes of flood control, economic development, navigation, soil conservation, economic and physical solutions to surface subsidence and mine drainage conditions, recreation and other purposes.

This program of legislation I have initiated is composed of measures directed both toward immediate, short-range action, and toward long-range development.

I do not need to recite the facts concerning the acute and persistent economic distress of the anthracite area. They are well known. They stem from the decline in demand for anthracite which began over 2 decades ago and which has dropped further and further, year after year.

Mr. Speaker, the northern and middle anthracite areas of Pennsylvania lie within the watershed of the Susquehanna River. That watershed includes a vast area of eastern Pennsylvania and smaller areas of the States of New York and Maryland.

The resources of the Susquehanna Valley constitute a rich endownment of nature. Today they are only partially developed. Their full conservation and development can mean new wealth, new income, and new employment opportunities both for the distressed anthracite area and for the other areas of Pennsylvania, New York and Maryland.

The Susquehanna Watershed comprises some 27,000 square miles and is the largest undeveloped river on the eastern seaboard. It contains large industrial centers, the anthracite coal fields, numerous farms, and woodlands as well as a network of railroads and highways.

Somewhat more than half of its acreage is in farms and some of the farmlands are among the finest in the Nation. At the other extreme, some of the lands are definitely submarginal. The rest of the acreage in the watershed is in forest and game lands, with large areas of second-growth timber. Recreation facilities need to be further developed and there are fine opportunities for them.

The most urgent problem of the area over the years has been the need for flood control. For example, it was estimated that the floods of 1935 and 1936 caused property damage just short of $100 million. At today's costs, that loss would be even more staggering, yet it fails to reflect the far greater loss in human lives.

Over the years there has been progress with respect to flood control. Through a large program of levels and protection walls along the main river, and by building dams, improving channels, and constructing floodwalls along the tributaries, the United States Army Corps of Engineers has given the people of the Susquehanna Watershed a large measure of flood protection. However, there is still a lot of work to be done in this field.

Agricultural agencies of the State and Federal Governments have supplemented this flood-control program through forestry and soil conservation activities. The State of Pennsylvania has made great strides in pollution abatement in the basin.

In its lower reaches, the Susquehanna provides a channel for river transportation, with access to the sea. In my judgment, there may be opportunities for its further use as an artery of commerce beyond what has as yet been envisioned.

It is perhaps natural that this Nation should proceed first with the multiple-purpose development of our larger river basins—such as the Columbia, Missouri, and Tennessee basins—for they represent, of course, our larger opportunities. However, that work is well along in our larger basins.

If this Nation is to achieve real economic security and realize the expansion roles which a growing population and labor force require, we must now turn to planning for the multiple purpose development of our smaller watersheds, such as the Susquehanna Watershed.

While we have abandoned or are on the road to abandoning a piecemeal approach to resources development in our larger basins, we are still using that approach in the Susquehanna and other small watersheds.

While there were certain efforts at Federal-State cooperation in multiple-purpose development of smaller watersheds during the 1930's, I have been informed that the bill which I am proposing will mark the first instance in which the approach will proceed under statutory auspices.

I believe that what I am suggesting may be equally applicable to other small watersheds in the Nation, and that for

this reason the bill to create a Susquehanna Watershed Commission merits the interest of many of my colleagues from other States.

Mr. Speaker, what I am suggesting is the creation of a Susquehanna Watershed Commission to consist of 9 full-time members, 6 of whom shall be appointed by the Secretaries of the Army, Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, Health-Education-Welfare, and 1 by the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The remaining 3 members shall be appointed from private life, 1 each by the Governors of Pennsylvania, New York and Maryland. I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that each member of the Commission shall devote his full-time to the work of the Commission.

Using the staff facilities of Federal and State agencies conducting water resource development programs, it shall be the duty of this Commission, after reviewing pertinent existing surveys, plans, projects, and activities introduced and considered by the individual localities and regions, to prepare such multiple-purpose and unified plans and programs for the conservation and development of natural resources and expansion of industry and business as may be useful to the President and the Congress in guiding and controlling the nature, extent, and sequence of Federal programs, projects, and activities in the area.

With respect to all of its work, the Commission will be directed to seek the advice, assistance, and participation of the people of the watershed and their State and local governments.

In turn, the Commission will report its recommendations with reference to plans and programs to the President for transmission with his recommendations to Congress 1 year after the effective date of the act.

The Commission's recommendations shall include proposals with respect to ways and means of carrying out and giving force and effect to the recommended plans and programs, including legislation, organization, administration, budget requirements and relationships with local and State governments.

Having delivered its programs, plans and recommendations, the Commission will go out of existence. The work of the Commission shall last 2 years.

After studying its recommendations with respect to implementing the program, I shall sponsor appropriate legislation for an operating organization.

Mr. Speaker, I have given considerable study to the activities of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, Federal Power Commission, and the Corps of Engineers in the Columbia and Missouri Basins and elsewhere, and I have noted with particular interest their cooperation and collaboration with similar agencies in State governments.

What these efforts really involve is the marshalling of the programs of all of these agencies into unified plans which will achieve full development of our natural resources and the latent economic opportunities they hold in store.

My observations leave me with the conviction that the collaborative planning work of those various agencies can be expedited and improved qualitatively if it can be done under the aegis of a central body vested by the Congress with real power of decision with reference to the detailed nature of the plans.

It is for that reason that I have suggested the vesting of that kind of power in a Commission of nine men, none of whom represents or is responsible for any going program of Federal or State governments.

Whatever operating agency or agencies complete the development of resources in the Susquehanna Watershed, this initial period of planning will be required. No time will have been lost, and, in my judgment, much time will have been gained through this procedure.

I am, therefore, extremely anxious that a Susquehanna Watershed Commission be created at an early date so that it may make direct and practical use of these materials in which I firmly believe can be a landmark in our approach to the development of resources in our smaller watersheds and with particular advantage at once to the distressed economic areas of northeastern Pennsylvania, which is the largest single area lying in the Susquehanna Watershed region.

For generations, this kind of planning for this area has been discussed, but no one has ever done anything about it. I feel, therefore, this legislation is the answer to its numerous vital economic and conservation problems.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

FOOD CANNERS AND PROCESSORS ASK FOR STRONG EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a petition on the Clerk's desk to discharge the bill H. R. 11.

The reason for this discharge petition is that it is vital to small business that we pass this bill and pass it promptly.

On Thursday, March 8, I explained precisely what H. R. 11 does, and how the need for this legislation arose. My statement appears at page 4346 of the RECORD of that date. Then Tuesday, March 13, I gave a more exhaustive statement, reviewing the history of the legislation and the key court decisions dealing with this matter. This appears at page 4634 of the RECORD.

H. R. 11 will amend and strengthen our antitrust laws. Specifically, it will strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act so as to repair the damages done to this law by an error in interpretation which the Supreme Court made in its majority opinion in the Standard Oil of Indiana case.

LETTERS FROM FOOD CANNERS AND PROCESSORS

Today I would like to call the Members' attention to excerpts from a number of letters which I received during December of last year, and January of this year from food canners and food processors located in all parts of the United States.

The main topic for comment in these letters is not directly related to H. R. 11. These letters comment mainly on subsection 2 (c) of the Robinson-Patman Act, which is the so-called brokerage section. H. R. 11 would in no way affect subsection 2 (c), or the so-called brokerage section. H. R. 11 will amend subsection 2 (b) of the act. Nonetheless, many of these letters from food processors and the food canners comment on, and express attitudes about, the Robinson-Patman Act as a whole. Consequently, I believe that these letters will be of interest and assistance to the Members in considering H. R. 11. The general attitude expressed in these letters is that the Robinson-Patman Act should be maintained and strengthened, and that it should be more fully enforced.

LOBBYIST'S ATTACK ON SMALL BUSINESS

Now how did these letters come to be?

Late last fall we had, among other witnesses before the House Small Business Committee, one notorious lawyer-lobbyist who has for several years specialized in propagandizing against the Robinson-Patman Act. His particular specialty has been to think up gimmicks which would weaken or destroy this act, and then start campaigns to get these gimmicks enacted into law. At different times this gentleman has concentrated his fire on different sections of the act, and at different times has built up a steamroller of slogans directed exclusively against first one feature of the act, then another. When he appeared before the Small Business Committee his particular target at that time was section 2 (c), or the so-called brokerage section of the act, as he had then only recently become associated with a fund raising campaign among trade groups whom he evidently thought would be attracted by the prospect of getting this particular section of the law repealed. More than that, the report of the Attorney General's Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws had proposed legislation to weaken the brokerage provision in subsection 2 (c) of the act. When this very active gentleman appeared before our committee, he handed out press releases charging that the Robinson-Patman Act causes increased spreads between farm and consumer prices, and called for legislation to weaken subsection 2 (c) of the act. These releases were widely quoted in the press over the United States.

LETTERS FAVOR EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY 15 TO 1

As a consequence, I sent a form letter to the food canners and food processors inviting them to comment and to tell me frankly what they think of the Robinson-Patman Act. The replies were overwhelmingly favorable to the Robinson-Patman Act, by a margin of better than 15 to 1, and most of the letters characterized the charge that the act contributes to the price spread as the sheer nonsense which it patently is. My letter to the food processors and canners made no mention of the question of whether the Robinson-Patman Act should be

strengthened; nor did it mention H. R. 11 or any other bill for this purpose. Nevertheless, many of the food processors and canners stated that the law should be strengthened, and there is a clear inference to this effect in many of the other letters where the matter is not explicitly mentioned.

Since I did not warn the canners or processors that I might want to make their letters public—because this possibility had not occurred to me at that time—I will not identify the writers of these letters, except to indicate their general size and line of business. The excerpts are as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS

One large food processor stated its views in this matter as follows:

I am writing to state this company's strong opposition to the position of the Attorney General's Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws regarding the brokerage section of the Robinson-Patman Act.

As the law now stands, section 2 (c) of the Robinson-Patman Act forbids payment of brokerage to any person who is acting for or is under the control of a buyer. This provision was aimed at an abuse widely practiced before adoption of the act—the maintenance of so-called brokerage departments by large buyers. Such buyers were in the practice of demanding brokerage for these departments in amounts completely unrelated to the value of any services received by the seller. The brokerage was, of course, nothing but a price concession given color of validity by the brokerage department device.

A majority of the Attorney General's Committee proposes to amend section 2 (c) of the act so as to permit payment of brokerage to buyers to the extent of services rendered the seller by the buyer. In our opinion this seemingly innocent exception would make the section entirely unenforcible. It would make every complaint under the section depend on difficult questions of cost accounting. In practical effect, the section would be a dead letter.

The consequences would be extremely serious, both to sellers and all but the largest buyers. It is only relatively large buyers that are in a position to establish brokerage departments and take advantage of the loophole proposed by the Attorney General's Committee. In our judgment the Committee's proposal is inconsistent with the basic purpose of the act, to preserve equality of economic opportunity.

The payment of brokerage to a buyer is a merchandising absurdity. A bona fide broker is the seller's sales representative; his function is to give sales service. In the nature of things a broker employed by a buyer cannot and will not do this job. A more honest and descriptive name for a broker acting for a buyer is purchasing agent. His interests are essentially adverse to those of the seller, and no seller would ever voluntarily agree to pay him. This practical inability of such a broker to give any service of value to a seller justifies the present outright prohibition of brokerage in such a case. Any payment to such a broker is in practical effect a payment to a buyer's purchasing department and results in unfair discrimination as between competing buyers.

Please forgive the length of this letter. This company well remembers the brokerage practices that existed before the adoption of section 2 (c) of the Robinson-Patman Act. They were costly and unfair, and should never be permitted again.

A large vegetable canner stated:

We have vigorously defended the Robin-Patman Act from its original enactment in 1936 for the reason that prior to that date we experienced some of the worst conditions from price cutting and freezing out of small manufacturers from several different angles, viz., secret rebates, ficitious retailers and numerous other ways in which big distributors named the price of the processor regardless as to whether they were able to deliver merchandise at the price. We, therefore, think that instead of the Robinson-Patman Act being weakened that it should be strengthened as big business certainly is trying to get around and have been getting around the Robinson-Patman Act now for the past 2 years due to negligence on the part of Federal Trade Commission that had a chairman who was in sympathy with big business.

An organization in the food distribution industry stated:

We consider that the Robinson-Patman Act was one of the best pieces of legislation that ever happened in this country in the last 100 years. Without it the small buyer would be absolutely defenseless. If the larger buyer was permitted to obtain brokerage and other concessions from canners, not only would the small buyer who could not demand such terms be forced out of business, but canners themselves would eventually be put into bankruptcy by the avariciousness and vicious methods of these larger buyers.

It may be Congressman PATMAN that some canners in this country are intimidated and afraid that anything they say might be held against them by large buyers, but if the truth was known the canning industry is 100 percent for the Robinson-Patman bill. Without it I honestly believe the economy of the whole country would be undermined. You have always had my keen admiration.

Another canner replied:

We sincerely hope that the act will be strengthened rather than weakened by any changes.

A large fruit canner wrote:

We think by all means the Robinson-Patman act should be strengthened and a stop put to trying to wreck it. We feel sure it has in the past done worlds of good and held most concerns in the right direction while some have slipped by and done acts that it does not allow.

The small operator is gradually being squeezed out by the big fellow and that very fast as his capital is limited and not in a position when he needs money to offer a batch of stock to get more ready capital and etc. Then they are in position where they demand lower prices from their suppliers who can always find a slick way to dodge the law.

Another packer stated:

So far as our company is concerned, we certainly are in favor of retaining the present legislation and, as a matter of fact, strengthening this legislation, if such might be possible. We are of the opinion that the small canners today are actually fighting for their lives against the larger operators and, very frankly, the past several years have been having a very difficult time in keeping their heads above water. Certainly all of these smaller canners should be in favor of reasonable legislation that at least gives them a fighting chance to compete with the several large processors and so-called National advertisers.

And another processor stated:

This law has proven the greatest value to small business firms, due to the fact that they cannot be placed in a position of jeopardy when attempting to obtain business from large organizations. Extra discounts, special deals, preferred arrangements, are successfully eliminated through recourse to this bill. We are completely and heartily in favor of it.

We would be most interested in seeing this law strengthened many fold, rather than weakened as big business is apparently trying to do.

One food processor stated:

First, let me say that I subscribe firmly to the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act and believe strongly that it has been responsible for the elimination of many evil practices in the food business. However, many problems which relate to pricing still exist and require correction, possibly through legislation.

One canning company stated:

We are certain that the majority of the membership of the National Canners Association is definitely opposed to the weakening.

The writer and his company will be glad to go on record at any time in saying that we favor strengthening of the act rather than any weakening.

Another processor wrote:

As a small-business man, I would like to see the Robinson-Patman Act strengthened wherever necessary, especially the clause which entitles a manufacturer to meet competitive prices. Over the years we have found this competitive clause used as an excuse to lower the price in restricted areas regardless of the quality of the products involved. While we recognize the necessity of meeting competition we feel that the products involved should be equal in quality, so that the buyer is unable to use the Robinson-Patman law as a lever in forcing a quality manufacturer to meet a price on an inferior competitive product.

A large packer of an important food product wrote:

We are unalterably opposed to any weakening of the Robinson-Patman Act and particularly section 2 (c) of the law.

Recently I took the opportunity of writing all the members of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee studying the problem, expressing our opposition to weakening section 2 (c) and the entire Robinson-Patman Act. On other occasions I have expressed similar views to Senators PRICE DANIEL and LYNDON JOHNSON and Congressman JOE KILGORE.

I am sure that you will find that most grocery manufacturers have the same sentiment. Certainly we are not disposed to return to the chaotic conditions that existed in food manufacturing and distribution in the 1930's.

The charge that is being made by some groups that the Robinson-Patman law is responsible in whole or in part for the high spread between the price farmers receive and the price consumers pay is absolutely ridiculous, and I know that you are well aware of this fact. May I take this opportunity of thanking you for your continued interest in warding off the attacks that are being made to weaken the Robinson-Patman Act and assure you that it is sincerely appreciated.

And a large fruit canning company stated:

The principal concern and worry confronting most farmers, growers, and processors is the definite trend in the past 2 years to supercolossal food retail groups which is resulting in an increasing proportion of the retail food business in the hands of a few. There seems to be a race amongst the large retail groups to get up into the yearly multibillion dollar sales category. It isn't necessary to go into detail relative to the potential situations which this type of a retail food setup will develop.

One small canner wrote:

No small canner can afford a large sales staff. We must rely on our brokers as our most economical means for disposing of our products. And I would dread to see the day come when the large chains could again pressure us for brokerage. They can force enough concessions from us now without being given the added weapon of a brokerage allowance.

Clearly it is any canned-food buyer's privilege to purchase as cheaply as he can. It is his job to probe the market to be sure that he is getting prices that are as favorable as those obtained by his competitors. But why must a blackjack be put in his hands in the form of brokerage allowances to bludgeon we small canners into oblivion?

Another canner replied:

At the present time we are engaged in a $250,000 expansion program. This program is being financed on borrowed money. If I had any idea that they would change section 2 C to allow buyers to collect brokerage, instead of an expansion program, we would be in one of liquidation. The mortality rate of smaller distributors has been very high and the mortality rate of the smaller canners has been high. I am sure that if section 2 C is changed, we would have only a few of the large national advertisers in the canning business and only a few of the large national chains in the distributing business.

Another processor stated:

The only change we would like to see in the Robinson-Patman Act is to strengthen it, not in any way to weaken or abandon it. We believe that it has done a great deal of good toward the orderly marketing of food products in this country, and have supported it from its inception.

The charge of high spread between the producers and consumers of food products is not due to this or any other law, except the law of supply and demand. The most of the increased cost is due to the high cost of labor for handling the food, the packaging, and all the various expenses that arise between the producer and the consumer. In fact, we believe that the handlers of food between the producer and the consumer are in many cases, the poorest paid of any similar industry. We ourselves are well known as working on a very small margin, which very seldom enables us to pay dividends to our stockholders.

* * * * *

We hope that every effort of your committee will be toward strengthening this very beneficial act and certainly not countenance any efforts by interested parties to weaken the act.

One of the largest packers of an important food product stated:

We are in very hearty agreement as to the necessity of retaining the Robinson-Patman Act for the benefit of all concerned.

We believe that if this act is properly enforced, and all covered by same cooperate fully, that it will work to the mutual benefit of the entire country.

A canner of vegetable products wrote:

We are against any brokerage allowances to buyers contained in section 2 (C) of the Robinson-Patman Act and under no circumstances would we care to see any weakening of that act.

Undoubtedly there have been many violations of the Robinson-Patman law but we believe that is up to our Judiciary Department to see that these violations are dealt with strongly.

Another vegetable canning company stated:

As you probably realize, there has been a revolution in distribution of foods. Many of the smaller operators would not have been able to continue or to grow to their present size had it not been for your act.

I was in Washington a year ago at which time your act was discussed with the "top brass" of the National Canners Association and there wasn't a single voice raised against the law. Even the big canners are in favor of it.

And another canner wrote:

We are sympathetic with your views regarding the whole Robinson-Patman Act issue. Certainly we as a small canner do not wish to see it weakened.

One processor wrote:

I believe I can say with complete sincerity that as far as this company is concerned, we have had no reason to believe that the Robinson-Patman Act has been anything other than helpful over the period of years in which it has been in operation. There is no major area of activity covered by the act which has restricted our operations or, to my knowledge, placed us in an unfavorable competitive position.

It is also my own personal opinion that section 2 (c) of the act is serving the purpose for which it was intended, and I can see no reason why modifications are necessary or desirable. It is also very difficult for me to understand how the Robinson-Patman law could contribute to a spread between farm prices and those being paid by the consumer, as it would seem that the effect would be just the reverse in that there is no possibility for hidden brokerage and discounts which must ultimately be absorbed by the consuming public.

Another processor replied:

We are certainly in favor of the Robinson-Patman law, as in our opinion it works to the best interest of our economy.

Any weakening of the provisions of this law would open up the door for the abuses prevalent in the trade prior to its enactment. With the trend toward bigger chains and greater concentrations of buying power a strong law is the only means to protect the small manufacturer and our business economy.

One processor replied:

It is truly a pleasure to answer your letter of December 14, and I would like to begin by saying that it is certainly a shame that valuable time and money has to be spent defending this rather ridiculous attack on the Robinson-Patman Act.

A large food processor wrote:

Our company has always favored the objectives of the Robinson-Patman law and we have not been following the developments with regard to this National Committee and the contents of its report.

A canner of fruit products wrote:

You must remember that we have several very large retail distributors who, if allowed, could just about write their own ticket through their buying power and we feel that this would have a tendency to hurt farm prices rather than to help them, as the market prices that we receive are automatically passed back to the farmer in our industry.

* * * * *

In any event, we are very much against the weakening of this Robinson-Patman Act and we believe a closer analysis would be in order to determine just what is causing this so-called spread.

Another fruit and vegetable canner stated:

Legitimate brokers is the only thing which is permitting small canners to stay in.

The elimination of secret rebates and dummy brokerage has been a large item in letting small business survive for the past 20 years.

One of the largest canners of food products stated:

It has always been our feeling that the Robinson-Patman law was a step in the right direction, and it helped to clarify an intolerable position in which the canners were placed during the thirties. We would hate to see the effectiveness of this law reduced in any way, and if it could be strengthened we are most heartily in favor of it.

We regret the fact there is not sufficient enforcement of this law because with a constant threat over the heads of many of the suppliers, as well as distributors, we feel that most of these discriminations could be eliminated.

A large association of canners replied:

We are unalterably opposed to any weakening of the Robinson-Patman Act. We disagree most strenuously with the lawyers' statement "that consumers are paying many millions of dollars because of unnecessary brokerage payments," for at least two reasons. In the first place, brokers in our opinion are a necessary part of the successful operations of many manufacturers, and render a service for them at an unusually low cost. In the second place, we are not in sympathy with a two-price system.

One processor wrote:

It is our opinion that the act has not caused a widening of the spread between prices paid by this company for raw agricultural products and the price paid by consumers for these products after processing and manufacturing by us.

Another canner stated:

We are very much opposed to any change in the act which would weaken the act with respect to discriminatory prices, secret rebates or payment of brokerage to buyers. We believe the canned foods market to be very competitive at the present time and we also believe that special prices to large distributors would have the eventual effect of destroying the competition of the smaller distributors.

And another canner cooperative replied:

Being a farmer's cooperative and handling a crop from the farmer to the retailer we can demonstrate very clearly that the Robinson-Patman Act helps the farmer financially. It stops some of the secret rebates, discriminatory prices, dummy brokerage payments made by some of our competitors and permits us to obtain fair prices for our products. This in turn, permits us to pay our members more money for their crops. However, we would like to see more enforcement of the act.

* * * *

Again we would like to report that we think the Robinson-Patman law is a boon to the farmers and canners alike and is working for the best interest of the entire economy of the United States.

At this time we wish to thank you for sponsoring this bill and for your great efforts in defending it. May the Robinson-Patman law be more strictly enforced and not weakened.

A processor of fruit products replied:

We are manufacturers of jellies and preserves, as well as fruit juices made from the fruits grown in this area. All of our sales of the jellies and preserves are made through food brokers, most of whom are members of the National Food Brokers Association. Frankly, I do not know what we would do without them. If we were to put our own representatives in the various areas, the

cost would be prohibitive and therefore the housewife would find a much greater cost of the finished product than exists today.

On the other hand, if it were not for the Robinson-Patman Act our competitors would be selling the very large accounts on a brokerage rebate basis and this, of course, would create unfair competition between the large groups and the small groups. That, too, would make a condition that would force many of the smaller retailers out of business.

A small canner wrote:

We believe very strongly that this law should continue in force and we will be glad to cooperate in any reasonable way in the support of that opinion. We have not seen any evidence of this act contributing to the spread between prices paid by the consumer and received by the farmer.

A small food processors' cooperative wrote:

Acting by authority of our board of directors who, incidentally, are all farmers, we are writing this letter to defend the brokerage method of food distribution as being vital to our operation as small food processors.

A small canner stated:

We are canners of fruits and vegetables operating two small factories * * * and would be classified as operators of a small business. The food industry is very highly competitive, and because of this, it takes a lot of selling to move our production. Our production is sold mostly in the large cities in the northeastern section of the United States. Because of our size, it would be impossible for us to maintain our own salesmen in the numerous cities in which we distribute our products. Therefore, our only remaining outlet for servicing our customers is through established food brokers in the various cities.

Another canner wrote:

First of all, we are strongly in favor of the Robinson-Patman law, and definitely would not be in favor of any suggestions for weakening it. We think that the Robinson-Patman law has been very effective in straightening out most of the malpractice that existed in our particular industry, and the law has done a world of good.

A processor stated:

The writer was quite active in business when the Robinson-Patman Act was enacted and was a strong advocate of it at that time and has been ever since. It is tough enough for us small packers to exist these days, and make a reasonable profit—and if the Robinson-Patman Act were nullified and we had to go back to the old deal of giving so-called brokerage to buyers as a rebate—we might as well quit. We were getting pretty close to that in 1935, when the Robinson-Patman law was enacted.

I appreciate the fact that you are still on the job defending that law and we also appreciate your other activities on behalf of small business.

And another processor wrote:

We believe that even with the Robinson-Patman Act the chain buyer is being bribed by gifts, vacations, and entertainment and that without enforcement of this act the tendency of the food business to monopolize will be greatly accelerated.

A canner stated:

We believe that any change which would weaken this law would be contrary to the best interests of the majority of the people both manufacturers and consumers.

Another canning company wrote:

It is the belief, well-founded, of many canners, that the weakening of the Robinson-Patman Act will mean the end of and the elimination of the food brokers and brokerage concerns; then, if the small or medium-sized canner is to stay in business, he will have to set up, either alone or in connection with others, sales organizations or hire traveling sales representatives, to sell their products to the wholesalers or chain stores. This is an expensive method of distribution, much more expensive than the present method of selling through food brokers. The ultimate end result would be that the large nationally advertised products (with not infrequently inferior products to those of many of the nonadvertisers) would gradually eliminate from food production the small- and medium-sized canner, freezer and processor.

Another fruit and vegetable canner stated:

As far as the Robinson-Patman Act, it is our feeling that it has been a good thing for the small independent packers and I do not believe that the National Canners Association, of which we are a member, are adverse to this act.

Another packer wrote:

We wish to go on record as being strongly in favor of the Robinson-Patman bill remaining intact, and rather than being weakened, have it strengthened.

* * * * *

Any attack to weaken the Robinson-Patman Act should be resisted to the utmost. We have gone on record with letters to our Congressmen as being against any legislation which would weaken the Robinson-Patman Act.

* * * * *

Our thinking has not changed since the 1935–36 period. We are still against discriminatory prices, secret rebates, and dummy brokerage payments which were rife at that time, and which would be prevalent again were the Robinson-Patman bill to be weakened in any respect.

A canner replied:

We believe this law to be the salvation of the small business concerns throughout the United States of America. It is our belief that this law has kept small businesses in competition with the concerns that could monopolize the industry.

Another packer wrote:

The Robinson-Patman law in principle and practice creates and maintains trade and industry relationship based on truth, fairness, and justice to all segments. In our opinion it is the greatest and most needed piece of legislation ever enacted in its field, and we speak from experience both before and after its enactment. Trade done within the meaningful purpose of this law cannot help but work to the best interest of the entire economy. We endorse the Robinson-Patman law fully.

Another large packer wrote:

Thank you again for this opportunity of expressing our viewpoint and it is our hope that you will strongly oppose any move to weaken any section of the Robinson-Patman law.

Another processor stated:

The Robinson-Patman Act brought order out of chaos to the grocery trade. It forced manufacturers to treat like buyers alike in a marketing area, not only as to price but also regarding discounts, special deals, cooperative advertising, etc. * * * If the Congress is sincere in its desire to protect small business, it could not render a greater disservice than to weaken the legislation which has been its (small business') greatest protection.

Another food-canning company stated:

Our company, which is in its 53d year of business with dealing direct with the farmers, and operating under the regulation of the Robinson-Patman Act since it became a law, and feel that its basic principle is sound and has been a real protection to all fair-minded operators and, in the whole, a real benefit to private enterprise, the producer, processor, and consumer.

* * * * *

May I close my position in stating (in part repetition) that the Robinson-Patman Act has been, and is, a sound piece of legislation, should not be weakened, and if clarification is required, that in so doing, strength should be basic, that position reflects a preponderant segment of National Canners Association membership.

Another canner replied:

We acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 10 and wish to state that if the Robinson-Patman bill was carried out as to its meaning it would be a wonderful asset to business.

A large processor stated:

Evidently the contention has been made that unnecessary brokerage payments contribute to the widening of the price spread between producer, manufacturer, and consumer. This, in our opinion, is entirely incorrect and in fact it is our opinion that when a group of food brokers comprises the sales organization of a manufacturer—the really opposite could easily ocur—the price spread referred to above could be reduced because in most cases selling through brokers achieves a lower selling expense for the manufacturer.

* * * * *

From a personal experience as a board member of a moderately sized food company which had its own selling organization when I came on the board—and which shortly thereafter shifted to food brokers in all the markets where it had been operating—I can recall that the selling expense was cut in half. The company averages approximately 3 percent against its sales as payments to food-brokerage organizations throughout the country for handling its business. Previously, the company was actually operating in the red for some considerable time.

The small manufacturer or moderately sized manufacturer or processor in the food field cannot afford the expense of his own selling organization and must depend upon food brokers throughout America to sell his pack and obviously the general welfare of food brokers is very important to him. In fact, several of the larger food manufacturers have in the past several years turned their field-sales activities over to food brokers—as is generally known and has been publicized.

A canner of meat products stated:

There can be no possible question in our minds or in the minds of any individuals concerned with the welfare of the food industry, the farmer, and the consuming American public, that the Robinson-Patman Act continues to be of vital importance to our Nation and to all of us engaged in the food industry.

Our particular business is cataloged as small and in the category of a small-business operator, we definitely recognize that the Robinson-Patman Act permits us to reasonably compete with big business in our field on a reasonable sales-cost basis, and, in reverse, any inclination by our big-business competitors to overprice foods to Mrs. Housewife is in some degree controlled by our competitive sales pattern.

Consequently, it is felt that Mrs. Consumer saves a considerable amount of money on food during the course of the year by reason

of the fact that we do not have to incorporate in our closely controlled cost structure an excessive figure for sales cost. Further, as a small-business operator, we are not big enough to maintain a costly nationwide sales staff on an inflexible salary basis, in order to effectively service the trade in all major marketing areas. It is only by means of brokerage arrangements with the food brokers of the Nation that we are able to have proper representation in each market and by such arrangement we do avoid those permanent inflexible salesmen's salaries, with the net result that we are able to compete with big business and make available our complete selection of foods to Mrs. Consumer on a nationwide basis at a competitive figure.

Quite frankly, if it were not for the economies of sales costs effected through brokerage arrangements, we would be forced out of most of the markets in which we now transact business. Were that to occur, our big-business competitors with their huge sales organizations, staffed by hundreds of salesmen, would be more or less in control of every market and, not being confronted with a competitive situation, would be able to establish selling prices of their own choosing, which would definitely not be to the best interest of Mrs. Consumer.

Another canner stated:

We have always been in favor of it and still feel the same way.

A large food processor stated:

Our company is strangly opposed to any move which would weaken or destroy the effectiveness of the Robinson-Patman Act.

A producer of one of America's well-known products stated:

It is our belief that the Robinson-Patman Act has not contributed to the spread between the prices consumers pay and farmers receive.

* * * * *

It is our impression that the question of revising the Robinson-Patman Act as it concerns the payment of brokerage has been reviewed from time to time, and I believe it is correct to say that the attitude of the grocery manufacturers is practically unanimous that the provisions which control brokerage in the present act should be retained.

A food canner stated:

We thoroughly believe in the soundness of the Robinson-Patman law and I would suggest that it could have more meaning and greater respect if it were better enforced.

Another large processor stated:

There are probably a few large food distributors who would like to have the act repealed . . . but we believe the rank and file of the grocery distributors are in favor of the protection afforded them by the Robinson-Patman Act and most definitely would not want it repealed or weakened.

A medium-size packer stated:

We are thankful for the protection afforded us by the Robinson-Patman Act.

We do not feel that this act is responsible for any abnormal, if any, spread in price between what the farmer receives from us for our raw material and what the ultimate consumer pays for our finished product.

Another canner of food products wrote:

I never could understand why the attempt was made to weaken the present Robinson-Patman Act, because we have always been benefited since its inception. I am, therefore, presuming that there is more on the part of the objectors than meets the eye. By that I mean, there must be certain interests behind this movement, with only one thought in their minds, and that is to feather their own nests.

Another canner wrote:

We favor strengthening, rather than weakening, the act, to avoid what might otherwise develop into practices even more discriminatory than existed prior to the act, through undercover and unpunished violations favoring the violators at the expense of the ethical operator observing the spirit and letter of the act, yet subjected to the contagion of violation in self-protection.

Another large processor wrote:

We feel that section 2 (c) is fair and just, and no attempt should be made to weaken or destroy the effectiveness of that provision.

We are also of the opinion that any weakening of this provision would not result in lower prices or a decreased "spread" between the prices farmers receive and the prices consumers are paying.

Another vegetable canner stated:

We are very favorable and think the Robinson-Patman Act was a good law, and helped the whole industry. As to the unnecessary brokerage payment which we have not come in contact with, our brokers are very fair, and are necessary for the business. We have no secret rebates, and every one large and small is treated the same.

A medium size packer stated:

In my opinion the Robinson-Patman Act is a splendid piece of legislation, protecting not only manufacturers and processors but also those at the wholesale and retail levels as well.

I certainly do not believe that the act has contributed to the "spread" in food prices.

A large organization of processors wrote:

The average brokerage payment paid by manufacturers, and ourselves, is 2½ percent and it would be impossible for us to operate as effectively or as economically by any other sales method. We also realize that a broker, and you may call him by any other appellation you see fit, such as sales representative, attorney, or agent, in order to survive is obliged to participate in all of the sales his principal consummates; otherwise the great bulk of the business would be handled by the manufacturer on a direct basis and all the broker would be able to participate in would be a multitude of small sales which would seriously hinder the effectiveness of his organization.

What we are fighting for in the food industry today is parallel to what was accomplished through the enactment of the Interstate Commerce Act which eliminated all rebates, special privileges, etc., that had favored certain shippers.

A small canner stated:

We as a small canner are very definitely opposed to any changes in the present law to weaken or destroy its purpose.

Another processor wrote:

Having been on both sides of the fence in the food business, once as a retail grocery operator, prior to the Robinson-Patman Act, and now as a manufacturer of * * * sold at retail grocery outlets under provisions of the act, I feel I am qualified to comment on the effect of the Robinson-Patman Act.

With my family, I was associated with the retail grocery business on quite a large scale from 1924 to 1934. In the last several years of that period there was urgent need for the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act. Absence of the provisions was harmful to the natural progress of the retail grocery business.

Since 1949 we have manufactured * * * and distributed them nationally under the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act. Very evident is the daily need for the act today and greater the substantiation for the need during our retail grocery operation prior to 1934.

The need for the Robinson-Patman Act today is urgent.

Another vegetable canner stated:

As to the representation of certain attorneys on the Attorney General's National Committee To Study Anti-Trust Laws, all we can say is that the attorney for the National Canners' Association, certainly did not represent us, did not express our views, and we don't believe he expressed the views of a majority of the smaller canners of this area. We would suggest your committee hear a representative of the American Institute of Food Distribution, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York. Frankly, it is this writer's opinion that lawyers attacking the present law, see some juicy fees in prospect if they can secure an amendment eliminating the act, or force its outright repeal.

A small processor stated:

As you can guess from our letterhead, we are very small business—and before the Robinson-Patman law were definitely having the big buyers swinging the big stick over our heads either as to price or as to brokerage.

That law has made it possible for us to play fair with all distributors and, I am glad to say, to be able to get some sound sleep at nights for all the years the law has been on the books.

Don't let anyone weaken it, please.

A small food packer wrote:

It is a well-known fact that the Robinson-Patman Act has saved thousands of small food packers from their destruction.

Another processor replied:

We wish to advise that we are strongly opposed to any move that would in any way, weaken or destroy the effectiveness of the Robinson-Patman law.

One canner stated:

At a meeting of the officers of our company recently held, we discussed the matter brought out in your letter of December 12 regarding the Robinson-Patman Act.

We do not feel that the act has been responsible for the high spread between prices the farmers receive and what the consumer pays and think that anything done to take the act off the books or curb its power in any way would be very undesirable.

And another canner stated:

We take the position that control over these practices be exercised for the very existence of the small independent canner and we will go on record as favoring such procedure.

Another processor wrote:

It is my personal opinion that the Robinson-Patman law has been the biggest boon and protective force for the smaller or independent food manufacturer and just as much for the smaller or independent wholesale and chainstore operations.

It is the one basic force that creates a fair deal all around. Without this law, I don't think that our own business could have existed through this dog-eat-dog competition in the food industry.

A small canner wrote:

Just a short note to let you know how one little canner feels about any attempts to weaken any of the sections of the Robinson-Patman Act.

It has been the lifesaver of the small canner. I sold canned food prior to the act and I am still selling canned foods; and marketing under the act is much more orderly and businesslike than it ever was before. It has made competition cleaner and fairer and gives a measure of protection to the little fellow, not only from his big and powerful competitor, but also protects him from the big and unscrupulous corporate buyer.

One packer stated:

Just how anyone could determine that the Robinson-Patman law resulted in unnecessary brokerage payments, we fail to see. On the other hand, if brokerage payments were permitted to voluntary and other groups or the chains, that would naturally add to the manufacturer's cost which would be reflected in their selling price and, ultimately higher prices to the consumer.

In our opinion, serious damage would result to the economy if section 2 C of the Robinson-Patman law and other administrative interpretations were in any way weakened and that chaos in the grocery business with eventual higher prices to the consumer and a harmful monopolistic condition would result.

A canner replied:

Of first importance is to report that, though we were one of the oldest continuous members of the National Canners Association in good standing (over 40 years), we a year ago withdrew our membership solely in protest to the position taken by its counsel, Mr. Austern, on the Robinson-Patman Act. We believe if it had been put to a vote an overwhelming majority of members would have differed with Mr. Austern's position.

When a farmer sells fresh produce in the New York City market we believe he pays a 12-percent commission. When he sells to a canner he pays no commission. Did any member of the Attorney General's Committee suggest this high fresh-market commission be discontinued and that each farmer put his salesmen on the road as a substitute? The question answers itself—there are thousands of farmers selling into New York City, each farmer having no more than 3 or 4 items, and it would be the peak of folly to duplicate services now rendered by the resident commission houses. The cost, rather than being 12 percent, might well climb to 50 percent.

Like the farmer, the average canner handles only a few items, all of a seasonal nature. To be severed from brokers and to put his own salesmen on the road would in like manner duplicate services and run selling cost upward many-fold. Only a Mad Hatter's tea party could conceive of such a bedlam in commerce.

Another canning company stated:

I can only say, speaking for our company, that I am strongly opposed to any weakening of the Robinson-Patman Act which would in any way allow discriminatory prices or dummy brokerage payments to buyers or buying groups.

* * * * *

It is my firm belief that you have the overwhelming majority of the canning industry with you in your efforts to eliminate discriminatory practices.

A small processor wrote:

We, as manufacturers, are wholeheartedly behind the Robinson-Patman Act and oppose any changes in the act which would weaken it in any way whatsoever.

Another canning company replied:

With reference to the Robinson-Patman law, I believe if this law had not been in force the past 20 years, the small- and medium-sized-food processor would have ceased to exist. I entered the canning business in the production end back in 1935, and however well do I remember stories about deals where one small canner was played against another small canner by the large buying organizations. At that time not only were many small canners forced out of business, but independent retailers by the score were falling by the wayside. After the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a matter of history that the independent retailer and the canning industry has made great strides in development.

A food processor stated:

Our firm strongly believes in the Robinson-Patman law, being a small manufacturer. We feel this law not only protects our customers but it protects us. If there were no laws governing business transactions, our larger competitors could come to our customers and offer them special discriminative prices which we could not meet; but they, because of their large size, could absorb in certain markets. However, under the Robinson-Patman law, everyone is treated equally and a manufacturer cannot give special deals to one account that he does not give to the others.

One processor of fruit products replied:

As food manufacturers we are trying to get distribution of our products all over the United States. In order to do this it is necessary for us to contact all types of trade, a good deal of it in areas where no great yearly sales volume is possible. I am sure I don't have to point out to you how costly it would be if we had to maintain our own sales organizations in all of these areas. In short, we need brokers and we are happy to pay brokerage fees.

I can only repeat what I have said above. We are opposed to any legislation which would tend to weaken the effectiveness of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Another food packer stated:

It is our general belief that the Robinson-Patman law to the extent that it has prevented discriminatory pricing and dummy brokerage payments, has been a good thing for the grocery industry and for the country in general.

A food canner replied:

My personal opinion is that the regulations of the Robinson-Patman bills are the best in legislation that have ever been passed for the protection of the food canning industry and small business. Without its protection and its regulations many more individual canners would have passed out of existence. Surely, you must continue to make every effort to prevent its weakening.

A canning company wrote:

We assure you we are entirely against any legislation that would weaken the Robinson-Patman law.

A small packer wrote:

Any attempt to weaken the Robinson-Patman laws would be the death knell to small business, for it is the last area in the business world where we are on a free and equal basis with our large competitors.

* * * * *

It is beyond belief that anyone can even suggest that the Robinson-Patman Act is even partially responsible for the spread between prices farmers receive and prices the consumer pays. On the contrary, your law is a nondiscriminatory monopoly preventive; and fair competition as you know is the best way to produce more to sell for less.

Another packer stated:

We feel very strongly that the Robinson-Patman Act should be maintained and not weakened. It has been very helpful to us as a small * * * manufacturer.

A small canner wrote:

I, personally, feel and I am sure all small canners do, that the broker is an absolute necessity, unless the canning business is to develop into a situation such as the auto industry has. It is not possible for a small or medium-sized canner to have his own sales organization and he must depend on his broker, who not only sells the products he manufactures, but many many others. If we do away with this system, which I feel the Robinson-Patman Act protects to a certain extent, we would then have a situation whereby the canning business would be in the hands of a few and these few would be financially able to quote a price which would eventually cost the consumer more money, as the margin of profit now in the canning business of both small and large is relatively small as compared with other industries.

One processor stated:

We are not members of the Associated Grocery Manufacturers of America because we are opposed to organized groups, but we are quite certain that the great majority of the members of that association are very much opposed to any weakening of the Robinson-Patman law.

Another packer responded:

Replying to your letter of the 14th, insofar as we are concerned, do not see how the Robinson-Patman Act can do anything except lower the price of food.

Another organization in the food-distribution industry stated:

If it were not for the Robinson-Patman Act, these large buyers would be in a position where they could demand discounts or hidden rebates, thus depressing returns to growers, without any corresponding reduction in the prices they obtain from consumers.

A large canner wrote:

When the Robinson-Patman Act was passed we, like most food canners, welcomed it wholeheartedly because it cured, or at least provided the legal machinery to cure, many of the ills that had been plaguing the food industry. We are of the opinion that the act is good.

We do feel that experience under the provisions of the act, particularly in recent years, shows that it has been extremely difficult to enforce the act properly. It has always been our intent to operate our own business upon a philosophy founded upon fair play and honest dealings. We intend to support any legislation based upon these same principles which would limit or eliminate unfair trade practices such as discriminatory prices and secret rebates.

And a processor wrote:

We, like so many others, at first felt that the act would work to our disadvantage, but since living with it find that we have benefited.

If the act is weakened, as suggested by the opponents, it is conceivable that many of the smaller packers, like ourselves, could easily be squeezed out of business.

You have our support and best wishes for your success in staving off the attack.

A vegetable cannery wrote:

We trust you will do everything in your power to keep the Robinson-Patman Act in force.

A fruit and vegetable canner responded:

Our company favors retaining the Robinson-Patman law and does not desire it to be weakened by amendments, for we feel

that marketing chaos would develop and practices of secret rebates, dummy brokerage payments, etc., would again become common.

We do not agree with the lawyer who charged that "Consumers are paying many millions of dollars because of unnecessary brokerage payments, which contribute to the spread between the farmer's returns and the consumer's price." The small canner must depend upon the broker to represent him as his sales agent because the cost would be prohibitive for the small canner to maintain his own sales organization in the principal markets. We favor the prohibition against any brokerage allowanace to buyers contained in section 2 (c) of the Robinson-Patman Act.

And a packer wrote:

We believe wholeheartedly in the Robinson-Patman law. In our opinion there is absolutely no truth in any suggestion that the Robinson-Patman Act is contributing to the spread between prices farmers receive and prices consumers are paying.

The largest organization of food processors in the United States sent a circular letter to all of its members on December 21, 1955, in which it stated:

I do not believe that the Robinson-Patman Act has in any way contributed to the "spread" between prices farmers receive and prices consumers pay. You are familiar with the "spread" studies we have been making with the National Grange over the past 8 years. We are making these studies in order to find out what the facts are, and we have widely disseminated this information. We are continuing these studies with the Grange.

A manufacturer-processor stated:

We manufacture nonfood items which are distributed through the food trade as well as through other channels. We use the services of food brokers, and other type manufacturers' representatives because statistics will show that on an average, the cost of selling through brokers is less than one-third of the sales cost of selling through salaried salesmen.

We are very much opposed to any weakening of the Robinson-Patman law that would permit the return of the discriminatory prices, secret rebates, and dummy brokerage payments which were prevalent prior to the enactment of the Robinson-Patman law.

Another processor wrote:

It is our sincere hope that you will be successful in retaining the original purpose of the Robinson-Patman Act.

One processor of food products responded:

About 50 percent of our sales are with the larger chains, with whom before the Robinson-Patman Act we had agreements, which called for extra discounts perhaps not any two alike, and sometimes the chains did not give the advertisements that they agreed.

All this was overcome when the Robinson-Patman Act became effective and conditions have been very satisfactory since then. We do not approve any weakening of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Another large processor stated:

I could write many pages containing the reasons why I heartily support the measure but I know that would only be echoing your own thoughts. Therefore, if there is any way in which we cannot only support the Robinson-Patman law but aid in strengthening it, I want you to know that you can count on us completely.

One large processor wrote:

In regard to the Robinson-Patman Act, I would like to make two observations. In the first place, it has been our experience that since this statute was placed on the books it has produced greater efficiency in operations on the part of the large distributors. This, of course, has redounded to the benefit of the public. In the second place, it has unquestionably been a big help to the smaller businessman. Under this statute he has been able to do things legally in the way of pricing that the bigger company cannot as a practical matter do.

Another canner wrote:

When I was a young salesman starting out, I well remember the disheartening effect of realizing that the only way to sell certain large organizations was to buy, with various percentages, the head group, the district group, and the branch group. It was common knowledge that prior to the passage of the Robinson-Patman law payoffs were necessary all up and down the line, to get a product, especially a new one, even considered.

A fruit and vegetable canning company stated:

Our company has been packing and processing fruits and vegetables for 50 years. Although we are comparatively a small cog in the wheel, we certainly have a picture from the processor's viewpoint. Our company is represented throughout the United States by bonafide brokers on a commission basis whose problems are our problems and as far as the Robinson-Patman Act is concerned, I feel very keenly in favor of it. Without it, I am sure there would certainly be difficulties such as you are already uncovering. Without proper controls, it is my belief that Mr. Farmer and Mr. Consumer would certainly have more to worry about.

One processor wrote:

One only needs to wander through a grocery store and take note of the many items and the number of competing brands of each that are in that category, most all of which could not be found in food stores 20 years ago.

* * * * *

It is therefore completely inconceivable that our Congress, whether it be Democratic or Republican controlled, should wish to bring back the era of secret rebates, discriminatory prices, dummy brokerage payments and all the various and sundry abuses and bankruptcies such conditions breed, and you have my permission to use this letter if it will help in protecting the order out of chaos brought about by the Robinson-Patman Act.

Another processor stated:

The Robinson-Patman Act tends to assure equal treatment to the ultimate consumer through equality to distributors. It is not a price umbrella, and we would oppose any change tending to weaken it. The alertness of yourself and your committee in this connection is deeply appreciated.

Another processor stated:

All of us in our organization are absolutely against it and will do anything that we can to assist you and your good committees' efforts to retain or strengthen the Robinson-Patman Law as it now stands.

Another canner replied:

Our operation dates from 1932. Therefore we have had experience prior to the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act and experience under the act. Our products are priced at levels to meet competition and at levels that are sufficiently low to each year move our products into consumption. Prices move up or down with demand and supply. The Robinson-Patman Act holds no umbrella over us but it does provide a climate that allows us to know that we do not need to make a special deal every time we make a sale.

And another canner of food products replied:

I am heartily in favor of the Robinson-Patman law and I should be extremely sorry to see it weakened in any respect. The small canner and the small distributor are having a hard time anyway, and had it not been for this law it is my opinion they would have been decidedly worse off. I believe my opinion is shared by many other canners, though I cannot, of course, speak for them.

One large processor food products stated:

My personal belief is that the brokerage payment provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act, section 2 (c), should not be eliminated. It is my firm conviction that this provision has had no effect on increasing the spread between prices the farmers receive and prices consumers are paying.

One canning company responded:

We are also of the opinion that the spread in food prices between farmer and consumer has no relationship with the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act.

One organization in the food distribution industry wrote:

The campaign for repeal or amendment of the Robinson-Patman Act has been backed by a minority whose single purpose has been to serve their own selfish interests. Without exception, it is my opinion they are not sincere when they try to show that the provisions of the measure add to the cost of living.

* * * * * * *

To those who are honest in their consideration of the situation, the provisions of the Robinson-Patman measure protect all and discriminate against none. As I put it in a short talk before a group of lawmakers in Washington, D. C., some 2 years ago, the application of the Robinson-Patman Act is as simple as the application of the Golden Rule.

Another packer responded:

We believe your efforts to prevent discrimination is now more necessary than ever. The trend today of mergers and consolidation makes it increasingly difficult for small manufacturers to market their merchandise freely.

Any work which you may do to prevent special concessions will help keep these smaller companies in a healthier condition.

A food canner stated:

I am in favor of strengthening the Robinson-Patman law if possible, so as to control and retard the growing tendency toward discrimination and rebates and other practices which we have learned through experience to have been damaging and detrimental.

A large processor replied:

Being very familiar with the Robinson-Patman Act, we can in no way conceive of any of the restrictions of this act contributing to the current spread between prices farmers receive and prices consumers pay. In our experience all grocery products are highly competitive at all levels, i. e., manufacturer, jobber, and retailer. If the spread is higher today than in the past, it is due to higher costs of doing business at each of these levels. Certainly the "build-in maid services" now being put into food products contributes largely to the spread.

Our company pays no brokerage fees except when this type of selling results in a

lower cost than the use of our own sales force. It should result in no difference in consumer cost. It is our belief that the consumer pays the same price in either instance.

Another small food processor wrote:

I was a small food processor from 1946 when I founded the business until August 1955 when it was sold. All during that period I was 100 percent behind the Robinson-Patman Act and believe that to large measure our ability to survive was attributable to the Robinson-Patman Act, which in essence guarantees fair play that we Americans so strongly profess to have anyway. Although I was not around in business before 1936, I know that the practices then prevalent worked against everyone's interest, including the farmer and the consumer. Whenever the giants of any industry are permitted to crush smaller enterprises by discriminatory practices, then very definitely the interests of the country are in jeopardy. Even with the Robinson-Patman Act, there is a strong tendency in the food industry toward discriminatory practices because of the dog-eat-dog competition that exists.

I do not see how any intelligent person could oppose the fair play principles in the Robinson-Patman Act, which in no sense lessens competition but really makes it possible for more people to get into the act and honestly compete, and all such competition inevitably works toward the interest of the farmer and consumer.

One canning company responded:

It is ridiculous to attempt to blame this spread on the Robinson-Patman law. This law has been most effective in preventing large distributors of food from wringing further discounts from manufacturers and canners in the guise of brokerage. Canners' prices are always realistic. The canning industry is, as you point out, one of the most fiercly competitive of all industries. The distribution of food has had the highest of any mortality rate in the past decade. Jobbers must have streamlined their operations, organized a group of member stores, gone cost plus, or sold shares and became a cooperative to have survived.

* * * * *

The Robinson-Patman law has in no way made food products more expensive to the consumer.

A small processor replied:

We, ourselves, even before the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act, did not discriminate between customers and we feel that the Robinson-Patman Act has had a salutary effect on the food business, and, rather than increasing the cost of doing business has, in the long run, effected a better, a more efficient, and a lower cost distribution system. * * * the United States food industry is operating with the most efficient and cheapest distribution system, not only in this country but in the entire world. In speaking to friends in other types of business they are always amazed at the low profits on which food distributors operate.

We therefore want to wish you the best of success in your fight for good business practice in defending the Robinson-Patman Act and the food brokers against these unjustified and selfish attacks.

A food canner replied:

I do not believe that it would be possible for any canner to exist without the services of the food broker, which is particularly true of the smaller operator, who could not possibly maintain an adequate sales staff.

Another vegetable canner stated:

In regards to your letter of December 10, 1955, pertaining to the price spread between the prices farmers receive and the prices the consumers are paying, I think the attack on the Robinson-Patman Act, which was launched by the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws, was all wrong. I and all the canners I have talked to like the Robinson-Patman Act, and think it has been a great help in establishing fair prices and practices.

A canning company responded:

We wish to advise that we are definitely in favor of the Robinson-Patman Act.

A food cooperative stated:

I sincerely hope that you will continue the fight to strengthen the enforcement of the Robinson-Patman law as it is the only protection we have against the continued demands of the buyers for special discounts, promotional allowances, free goods, rebates, etc.

A processor of food products wrote:

It is our opinion that the Robinson-Patman Act in no way, shape, manner, or form contributes to the "spread" between prices farmers receive and prices consumers are paying, especially so in view of the fact that this act prohibits the paying of unearned brokerage.

* * * * *

There are many points that enter into the picture between the time the farmer furnishes raw material, to the end price at the retail level, such as factory expenses, selling expenses, promotion, freight, and last but not least, Federal income tax. If any manufacturer is fortunate enough to end up after paying all of the above with a gross profit, he faces the 52-percent income tax, which of course makes his net profit very reasonable indeed.

Another processor stated:

We are glad to know that someone is working for the best interest of the small-business man. It is my opinion that you are doing the proper thing for the good of the overall economy. One of the worst things that could happen would be the weakening of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Another canner stated:

As a canner, we employ the services of a brokerage firm to assist us in obtaining markets for our canned * * *. The brokers perform a specialized service that the canners themselves are, as a rule, unable to offer and for which service we are certainly willing to pay a brokerage fee which has, in our opinion, been a reasonable rate for a function performed and has not been at the material expense of the consuming public. I frankly believe that if the canners in general were to take over the responsibility of contacting the distributors and large chain operators, the cost which consumers would assuredly undoubtedly bear would be higher than using the currently available brokerage channels.

Another food canner replied:

I wish to state that the Robinson-Patman Act in my opinion has contributed to the reduction to the consumer. I know it put a lot of food brokers out of business who were acting as brokers and dealers. In other words these brokers bought for their own account when it was to their advantage, and resold later at a higher price. It is my opinion that the food brokers earn their 3 or 5 percent brokerage, which is the usual price paid. If we had to employ salesmen it would cost us much more than this.

One processor stated:

Concerning the Robinson-Patman Act, it is the general opinion that it has not in any way contributed to the spread between prices farmers received and prices consumers pay. The Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., have made spread studies and are continuing to do so. I personally do not feel that further studies will reveal any other opinion than that just expressed.

THE GOLDEN YEARS CAN BE GLORIOUS YEARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker—

Cherish and love old age—

Said Seneca long ago—

for it is full of pleasure if one knows how to use it. The best morsel of food is reserved for the last.

It might appear that Seneca was forecasting our modern society which offers more years of life to most of us along with shorter hours of work and greater freedom to enjoy our rising standard of living.

Yet, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that for a rapidly increasing number of older people in our country these appear to be hollow achievements.

Many have inadequate financial resources for maintaining themselves as independent, self-respecting members of their communities. Many are poorly clothed, badly housed, and underfed. Hundreds of thousands are suffering needlessly from physical and mental sickness and deterioration and are being driven by frustration and despair into overcrowded mental hospitals, nursing homes, and general hospitals for the acutely ill. Thousands in your State and in mine are living an isolated, useless, and lonely existence.

Why, Mr. Speaker, is this so?

Look back over the past 50 years, and we see that the question answers itself.

In 1900, life expectancy was but 47 or 48 years. We had but 3 million older people in a total population of 75 million—or roughly about 1 in 25. And the majority of these older people lived in small towns or rural communities where they could find some type of employment even in their declining years. And most of them were able to live with their families in housing adequate for their needs.

But the picture today is a vastly different one. Average life expectancy has increased to almost 70 years. The number of older people, increasing now at the rate of almost 400,000 a year, has reached 14.5 million or about 1 in 11 of our total population. Moreover, in another 20 years the number of older people will exceed 20 million and will constitute one-tenth of our population.

This remarkable extension of life, coupled as it is with improved health and a phenomenal rise in our standard of living, represent solid victories over the forces of nature. Clearly they mark the development of a new era in which we can see greater progress almost day by day.

But what, Mr. Speaker, has it meant to our older people? The record is not a good one. Work opportunities have been denied so that today only 40 percent of our older men and 9 percent of older women are able to find paid jobs.

Family structure has been altered with the result that millions of older people are trying to live in housing grossly inadequate to their needs. Literally millions live in mortal fear of long-term illness for which they cannot afford the treatment and the rehabilitative services that would restore them to health and self-sufficiency. And perhaps the greatest tragedy of all is that hundreds of thousands or more have been made to feel so unwanted and outcast that they are asking plaintively why their lives have been spared?

The impact on our communities has been equally great. Old-age assistance is now a major part of the expenditures of all of our States. Mental hospitals and facilities for the care of the chronically ill are taxed far beyond capacity. Through short-sighted employment and retirement policies, we are denying ourselves the services of thousands of experienced workers when there are critical shortages in scores of technical occupations. The old-age and survivors insurance program still falls far short of providing incomes adequate for a minimum standard of living. Current efforts to provide income and personnel to meet rising medical needs in the later years can be labeled as little more than a gesture.

I am sure you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that we are grossly short-changing our revered senior citizens who contributed so greatly to the standard of living the rest of us now enjoy. We have prolonged their lives but we have failed almost completely to make the adaptations—to create the conditions, that will give health, comfort, usefulness, and meaning to these added years.

The question I ask is: Must the next 50 years remain as intolerable? Or can we create for our senior citizens a climate within which old age can be both cherished and enjoyed as it so often was by our forefathers?

For me the choice is perfectly clear. Older people have the right to lead proud, productive, independent lives. They will if given the opportunity; of that I am sure. But to do so, they need our help, and we must give it.

But how?

How can we enhance the paltry and tattered life now faced by millions of our fellow human beings?

There is, Mr. Speaker, no one answer; instead, there are many answers. More income, suitable housing, better health, greater opportunity for employment, for education and creative activity, for useful community service, for counseling, for social contacts, and for recreation. These—all of these, are needed.

All can come to pass in proper measure, however, only if we buttress existing services with a fresh approach. Income is basic, but income alone is not enough. Housing is essential, but by itself, it affords little protection against the ravages of social isolation and despair.

We need, Mr. Speaker, a new, broad program of action by all levels of Government and private groups alike, which will treat an older person as a whole personality with total and related needs.

Such a proposal is contained in a bill I introduced on January 26, H. R. 8863, which provides for the establishment of a Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; grants-in-aid to States to assist in plans and projects related to the needs of older persons; and grants-in-aid to selected institutions and organizations for research, demonstration, and training which "hold promise of making a substantial contribution to projects for older persons in all or several States."

H. R. 8863, which if passed, would become the "Services to Older Persons Act", seeks to serve the broader needs of our older citizens. I shall insert a copy of the bill in the record following my remarks.

I propose now, Mr. Speaker, to examine the needs of older persons in connection with each of the objectives of the bill as well as the ways in which they could be more adequately met by the bill and related programs. Following such a discussion, I shall attempt to suggest why I consider prompt and favorable consideration of H. R. 8863 so highly important.

II. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TO WORK

The first policy objective of H. R. 8863, Mr. Speaker, is equal opportunity to work.

Age by itself does not preclude good job performance or even outstanding achievement.

To the contrary, as Henry Ford once said:

> If you take all the experience and judgment of men over 50 out of the world, there wouldn't be enough left to run it.

Who can forget such men of science and of letters as Benjamin Franklin, who at the age of 78 invented bifocal glasses; Cervantes, whose Don Quixote, the second part of which was completed when he was 68, was published in 728 editions within 2½ centuries; William Cullen, whose textbooks on medicine, several of which were finished at ages 67 and 79, were classics of his day; Galileo, whose discoveries continued through age 74; Goethe, who, after he passed his 70th birthday, was such a brilliant critic he was known as "the literary dictator of Europe"; Thomas Hardy, Victor Hugo, T. P. Lamarck, Pierre LaPlace, Samuel Johnson, Herbert Spencer, Alfred Tennyson, Giuseppe Verdi, Robert Frost, Albert Sweitzer, Toscanini, and a host of others.

In Congress itself, 17 Members of the Senate, including the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Finance Committee, and 55 Members of this House, are 65 and over. Just recently our beloved Speaker celebrated his 74th birthday, while our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Minority Leader MARTIN, is 71. During the first 40 years of this century, the median age of Speakers of the House was 67.

In the executive branch, President Truman was 68 at the time he left office. President Eisenhower, Secretary Humphrey, and Secretary Wilson are 65. John Foster Dulles is 67. In the Supreme Court, Justices Black, Reed, Frankfurter, Burton, and Minton are over 65, while Chief Justice Warren is 64.

But despite impressive evidence, Mr. Speaker, that age and achievement are not mutually exclusive conditions, equal opportunity to work without discrimination based on age alone is far from a reality at the present time.

Although one recent study showed that, just prior to turning 65, 77 percent of the men in a median industrial group said that "if it were up to them alone, they would continue working for their present employer," employment beyond age 65, has become increasingly difficult. In 1890, 68 percent of men over 65 were employed. Today, only 40 percent are employed. By 1975, there may be only 30 percent.

Half of all employees now participating in company pension plans—which embrace one-third of the labor force—are compelled to retire at a fixed age, usually 65.

Older workers who become unemployed are still worse off. A survey conducted jointly by the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce in 1950, as reported in the New Twentieth Century Fund report, indicated that of the 279 firms studied, 79, or 26 percent, did not hire workers over 45. Eleven companies said their work prevented the hiring of older workers, and 19 companies stated that they hired older workers only when they could not promote from within.

In another survey, more than 50 percent of the job orders received in 1950 in public employment offices in 5 widely scattered cities specified workers within certain age limits. By far the greatest number called for persons under 45, while many specified under 35, and even under 25.

To my amazement, I discovered in 1952 that the Federal Government was also discriminating against older workers by placing arbitrary hiring age limits on most jobs. To correct this inequity, I sponsored, and the Congress accepted, a provision which stated:

> The Civil Service Commission shall not impose a requirement or a limitation on maximum age with respect to the appointment of persons to positions in the competitive service, except such positions as the Civil Service Commission may publish from time to time in such form and manner as it may determine: *Provided*, That no person who has reached his 70th birthday shall be appointed in the competitive civil service on other than a temporary basis.

This provision, I believe, would end Federal discrimination against older workers. Last spring, however, I was shocked to discover that the Civil Service Commission was not abiding by my 1952 amendment. Through a 36-year-old applicant who had been refused, I obtained a copy of a Civil Service announcement on openings for Internal Revenue collectors for which there was a maximum age limit of 35. Exceptions for a few jobs I could understand, but an exception for tax collectors which permitted applications only from persons under 35 I found almost unbelievable.

So I renewed my objection, and proposed an additional amendment, reading as follows:

> No part of any appropriation contained in this title (the Independent Offices appro-

priation bill) shall be used to pay the compensation of any officers and employees who allocate positions in the classified civil service with a requirement of maximum age for such positions: *Provided*, That (1) ability, and (2) qualifications for employment to such positions shall be the governing considerations.

This, I am happy to report, also was accepted by Congress, and is now law. Under its terms, the Civil Service Commission has eliminated age as a factor in employment, not only for the agencies in the Independent Offices appropriation bill, but in the entire Government.

But for equal opportunity to work to become a reality in all segments of our private and public life, leaders in industry, as well as in Government, must exert strong leadership. Recently I received a letter from a good friend of mine, the president of a sizable Chicago manufacturing firm, which is encouraging in this respect. His company, he reported, had added age to its regular rule against discrimination on account of race, color, creed, "or other artificial barriers." This is commendable, and I hope it will find favor in more industrial quarters.

I also hope the United States Department of Labor will continue to encourage and promote nondiscrimination in private employment of workers over 45, including, of course, those over 65. In the recent session of Congress additional funds, for which I voted, were provided for its intensification and improvement, and there are now underway studies in the following fields:

First. Productivity and performance of the older worker: His work qualities, including absenteeism, accident record, dependability, attitudes and faithfulness.

Second. Another study is being made of collective bargaining agreements for older worker provisions, to ascertain how age is treated in contracts between management and unions.

A third study will treat the impact of private pension costs on hiring policies. Companies with private pension plans often refuse to hire older workers on the ground that the cost for pension coverage would be excessive.

A fourth study deals with employment patterns, policies, and practices and should result not only in the compilation of useful information, but also, it is hoped, in the publication of a casebook of good hiring and utilization practices.

A fifth study will analyze the characteristics and work potentials of the older unemployed.

A sixth project consists of demonstrations on methods, time, and cost in counseling and placement of older workers, conducted in cooperation with community groups.

A seventh project consists of demonstrations on recruitment and training of older men and women for fields of employment having manpower shortages, particularly teaching, nursing, and secretarial work.

H. R. 8863, Mr. Speaker, could contribute toward equal opportunity to work in a variety of ways. The Bureau of Older Persons would cooperate with the Department of Labor in studies and projects for the promotion of nondiscriminatory practices. States would study the employment and unemployment of older workers from the standpoint of prevailing legislation and industrial practices; could provide counselors for older workers in State employment agencies; and overhaul State employment and retirement programs to bring them into line with forward-looking practices.

States and communities, under H. R. 8863, could seek to interest management, labor, and the general public in the employment of older workers. Communities could also survey job opportunities in the area for persons 65 and over, and stimulate the creation of small firms managed and staffed entirely by retired people who are not interested in regular, full-time employment but who seek a profitable use of their time.

III. ADEQUATE MINIMUM INCOME

The second policy objective of H. R. 8863, Mr. Speaker, is adequate minimum income.

Considerations of income, as we all are aware, are basic to any attempt to improve life over 65. In a survey in my own city of Chicago, for example, income appeared first in a list of aging problems followed by health, housing, family relationships and personal adjustments, supplementary services and personal care, recreation and companionship, and employment.

According to the latest report from the Bureau of the Census, the median income of families in which the family head was 65 or more years old was $2,294 in 1954, less than half of the family income at the peak earning period, 45 to 54. The median income of single and widowed older men and women living apart from relatives was $796 for the same year.

The incomes of older people have been rising during recent years largely because the social-security system has come of age and because private pensions are being extended to retirees. The higher incomes, however, accounting for the majority of those above the $2,294 median, are enjoyed by those who are fortunate enough to hold onto their jobs.

The great majority of those who are trying to live on social-security benefits, with or without the added advantage of private pensions, are having a rough time trying to make things go.

There are few who would argue that an income of $2,294 a year is adequate for an older man and his wife. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we have no comprehensive studies of what it costs older people to live if they are to maintain adequate diets and health, live and dress decently, and participate in community life instead of wasting away in a corner rocking chair.

But there have been some careful estimates. One study several years ago in Detroit, reported by a member of the Kestnbaum Commission, calculated that a moderate budget for an elderly couple living alone would come to $200 a month.

More recently the University of California concluded from a nationwide sample that upward of one-half of our older couples and about three-fifths of older individuals do not have enough income to maintain a standard of decent living.

Income is basic, Mr. Speaker. Our national income has been rising steadily over the past 2 decades. Last year, 1955, it increased by more than 8 percent. Surely, in view of this trend, we can afford to do better by our older people. I am, therefore, making a number of proposals.

Consistent with the recommendation of the recent Twentieth Century Fund report, I am in favor of extending Old-Age and Survivor's Insurance to certain self-employed professional groups—including lawyers, dentists, and osteopaths. A bill for this purpose is now pending in the Senate. When it passed the House last July by 372–31, I voted yes.

I also am in favor of reducing to 62 the age at which women are eligible for OASI benefits. For widows, I would prefer reduction of age of eligibility to 55, and last spring I introduced such a bill. That measure is still awaiting action. It is interesting, incidentally, to note that the authors of the Twentieth Century Fund study also suggest "55 or 60" as a more reasonable eligibility age for widows.

Another provision of the Social Security bill now being considered in the Senate lowers to age 50 the eligibility age for persons with total and extended disability. In voting for this proposal I was fully aware of the objections it has evoked. Certain additional costs will have to be borne by the Social Security Fund, and there is a chance—a slim chance in my judgment—that the measure might promote malingering and collusion. But its merits far outweigh its limitations, for as the Committee of the Twentieth Century Fund which supervised the recent study asserts, "loss of income due to permanent and total disability is a major threat by some provision of income to totally and permanently disabled persons." In all fairness to that committee, however, I must add that its members were divided on the best way of accomplishing this goal. I must also add that, for me, the phrase "economic security" applies with equal force to the disabled person himself and our economy as a whole.

"Adequate minimum income" can also be more nearly attained, in my opinion, through a liberalized retirement test. You will recall that prior to the Social Security amendments of 1954, any OASI beneficiary earning over $75 a month lost his social security payments for that month. Rather than encouraging self-help in increasing income, this onerous provision often penalized those persons who sought to raise their living standards. In 1954 Congress recognized that fact and provided that a beneficiary can make up to $1,200 a year—or for a tax year of less than 12 months, $100 a month without losing any OASI payments. This helped, but believe the limit should be raised to $2,000 a year. Accordingly, I have introduced a bill providing for a retirement test of $2,000 for a tax year of less than 12 months.

Under H. R. 8863, Mr. Speaker, we could make still more progress on this matter of income. The Bureau of Older Persons, with the help of the Social

Security Administration and other agencies, could develop much needed studies of the actual income needs of older persons living under different circumstances. It could explore and stimulate the States to explore ways in which income could be supplemented.

IV. HOME LIVING AND HOMELIKE INSTITUTIONAL CARE

The third objective of H. R. 8863, Mr. Speaker, is home living and homelike institutional care. Data from the 1950 census, as substantiated by the Twentieth Century Fund report and the Council of State Governments' report, show that although older persons—in the main—are less crowded, more of their homes are dilapidated, and more—36 percent more—lack either a private flush toilet, a bath, or running water. Although in 1950 about 68 percent of people over 65 owned their own single-family dwellings, as compared with about 53 percent for the entire population, the value of these homes averaged only $6,000, as compared with $7,400 for the entire population. Homes owned by persons over 65 also—on the whole—depreciate more rapidly than homes owned by people under 65. For the 32 percent of the population over 65 which rents housing, rates are generally lower than for the rest of the population, but consume a high percentage of income. In a recent study in New York State, for example, the median percentage of rent to income for persons over 65 was found to be 27.8 as compared with 18.4 for the entire population. Whereas only 20.1 percent of total households in the State pay 30 percent or more of their income for rent—an alarmingly high figure, I should add—45.5 percent of households headed by a person over 65 pay 30 percent or more. Contrast these figures with differences in income, and the situation appears even more acute.

Home living and homelike institutional care mean to me that older people should have safe and enjoyable housing facilities, either in their own home, in rented quarters at reasonable rates, in satisfactory foster homes, or in homes for the aged.

Some progress is being made. Four or five States provide public housing for older people, or facilitate their private housing needs. One of these—New York—adopted several years ago, a provision that 5 percent of all apartments in state-aided public housing be designed and reserved for older people.

Another New York experiment was described by an article in the New York Times for December 14, 1955:

A $1 million home, modeled after a motel to give easy access to recreation rooms and open courtyards will be built by New York State next year for 200 senile aged persons.

State Senator Thomas C. Desmond, Republican of Newburgh, who is chairman of the joint legislative committee on problems of the aging, said yesterday that it would be built on the grounds of the Middletown State Hospital.

He described the project as a collection of one-story, glass-enclosed buildings to give the occupants a sense of freedom.

"Numerous radio and TV outlets will be provided, along with day rooms and recreation rooms," the Senator declared. "An elaborate courtyard, with fountains, pools, and extensive plantings, is planned."

He said that the experimental motel-type project might provide clues to show old age homes and communities how to improve their own handling of the problem. Senator Desmond said that construction of the project would start next spring.

In Massachusetts, under the direction of a State Housing Board, $15 million in public funds are being used for long-term public housing in 23 communities. Designed particularly for the safety and comfort of their inhabitants, these apartments will rent for approximately the same amount which the State allows for rent for recipients of old-age assistance—a maximum of $40 per month including some utilities.

Similar projects have been launched by several cities. The Housing Authority of Providence, R. I., has earmarked for persons over 65, an entire building of 3-room apartments in a public housing project.

The Housing Authority of the city and county of San Francisco is planning an older-persons' apartment home, including 200 apartments and 40 units for social activities and craft work.

In my own city, the Chicago Housing Authority is cooperating with the committee on the aged of the welfare council of Metropolitan Chicago in providing 36 1-bedroom apartments for couples 60 years or over at the Prairie Avenue Courts housing project. Twelve other apartments in the 7-story elevator building are occupied by families with children, and the remainder of the project houses families in normally mixed aged groups. Responsibility for the organization and direction of services for the older residents—including casework, homemaking and housekeeping, medical and group programs—is vested in the Ada S. McKinley Community Home. Research on the project is under the auspices of the University of Chicago family fund center.

Notable work also has been performed by private groups and organizations. For over 25 years the Community Service Society of New York has successfully operated the Tompkins Square Apartment House for older persons with small incomes.

In Santa Barbara, Calif. the American Women's Voluntary Services has constructed 26 ground-floor apartments for older couples. As of 1954, rent was $30.00 a month, including utilities.

In the southwestern part of the State of Washington a former logging camp is now a thriving community of retired workers. Owned by a commercial corporation, this town consists of individually owned homes, selling from $2,500 to $3,500, with low downpayments. Shops in the town are operated by residents. There is a community building with a theater. Craft shops, gardening, fishing, square dancing, community singing and games are available to all residents.

In my own city of Chicago again, Drexel Home, a private home for aged Jews which has been in existence for 65 years, is considered by specialists in aging one of the outstanding institutions of its kind in the country. At Drexel Home, homelike institutional care is a watchword. Its inhabitants are provided the most modern activity programs, therapy, and creative community life.

All of these, you will agree, are heartening contributions toward improving the critical housing situations which confronts many of our senior citizens.

Some of us had high hopes last year that Congress, in passing the housing amendment of 1955, would also contribute toward improved housing for older people under FHA and the Public Housing Administration. As passed by the Senate, and as reported from committee to the House, the bill provided for 10,000 public housing units annually for persons over 65. It also provided a redefinition of the term "elderly families" to permit single persons over 65 to occupy public housing units. It gave persons over 65 first preference in other low-rent public housing units up to 10 percent of the estimated admission in any given year. Finally, it authorized the Public Housing Administration to permit local public housing agencies to reconstruct or remodel any low-rent housing for use by persons over 65.

In conference—much to my regret—all of these provisions for assisting older people to acquire better housing were eliminated.

This winter three bills to promote housing for older people have been introduced in the Senate, one of them an administration bill. While this bill does seek to encourage private builders to give more attention to the needs of older people, I think I should have to characterize it as a reluctant step forward. Certainly, it represents a far cry from the needs as outlined in the report on Housing for the Aged recently completed by the Senate's Subcommittee on Housing.

I also wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether it would be feasible to invest a small portion of the Old Age and Survivors' Insurance Trust Fund in housing for those OASI recipients who are in need of low-cost living facilities. This idea, which in no way envisions either an intervention in business management or an unsafe investment of public money, was, I assumed, original. Just the other day, however, I discovered a similar thought developed in some detail in the January 1952 issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

In an effort to secure the views of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on this intriguing possibility, I recently wrote to Mr. Charles Schottland, Social Security Administrator.

In reply Mr. Schottland stated as follows:

If the Federal Government should issue its own obligations, or if it should guarantee obligations issued by other agencies specifically to finance housing for the aged, the managing trustee of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund could under present statutory authorization purchase such obligations. These purchases could be financed with current receipts of the fund, by the sale of marketable obligations held by the fund, or by redemption of nonmarketable special certificates previously issued to the fund. Under present law, the Secretary of the Treasury as managing trustee

would have full discretion as to whether, and in what amounts, Government securities issued specifically to finance housing for the aged should be purchased by the trust fund.

You will, of course, understand that whether they were purchased by use of current receipts or by use of existing assets of the trust fund, the obligations issued or guaranteed by the United States Government to finance housing for the aged would form part of the Federal debt. The receipts and assets of the trust fund could not be used to provide assistance to housing for the aged unless the money was obtained from the fund as a loan acknowledged by debt obligations of the United States or guaranteed by the United States, since the Social Security Act specifically requires that all amounts credited to the trust fund shall be available for the payment of the cash benefits and administrative expenditures required under title II of the Act. We believe that this requirement is essential to the sound financing of the old-age and survivors insurance program and that it would endanger this program if the receipts or assets of the fund were diverted to any other purpose.

As I interpret these opinions, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Shottland is suggesting that although under the law the trust fund must remain intact for payment of OASI benefits, if obligations for housing for older persons should either be issued by the Federal Government or issued by other agencies and guaranteed by the Federal Government funds from the trust fund could be used for purchase of such obligations. This would seem to merit our consideration.

H. R. 8863, Mr. Speaker, would permit the Bureau of Older Persons to cooperate with the Federal Housing Administration in studying the adequacy of housing for older persons, as well as ways through which necessary aid could be rendered. States also could survey their housing needs, and consider the possibility of constructing State-supported low-cost housing for older persons. States could survey the conditions of public and private homes for the aged, and seek, if necessary, to bring such institutions under a more adequate system of inspection for the maintenance of high standards of safety and health.

States and communities could seek to encourage private builders to construct housing for older persons especially designed for their needs. Communities could survey their own housing facilities for older persons and seek through local, State and Federal assistance to improve existing conditions. Communities could seek to convert county homes for the aged into county nursing homes related to local hospitals, or into modern homes for older people, as we have begun to do in Illinois. Communities could also launch training projects for matrons of homes for older people, as well as projects for placing older persons in boarding homes.

V. PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH AND REHABILITATION

The fourth and fifth policy criteria of H. R. 8863, Mr. Speaker, relate to physical and mental health and rehabilitation.

The need of our older people for health services—prevention, treatment, rehabilitation, and long-term care, together with the money to pay for them—far outstrips the facilities and resources available.

Despite the phenomenal improvements in health over the past 50 years, there is still a vast amount of illness. The reasons are easy to see. Better nutrition, public-health services, and medical care do indeed spare us from many of the diseases of childhood and of the early adult years. Yet this very fact enables more of us to live into the older years in which the long, devastating chronic diseases take their greatest toll. Presumably, we shall learn to control these—cancer, diabetes, heart and circulatory disorders, arthritis and rheumatism, and mental conditions—but we are only now beginning to do it.

There is, I regret to say, another major factor in the rising rate of sickness among older people. That is that we are not making sufficiently available the knowledge we already have. Preventive services and health education that might ward off much chronic disease reach all too few of our people.

There is a widely held belief among geriatricians and psychiatrists that much physical and mental deterioration stems directly from our failure to provide work opportunities and other meaningful activities for our older people. The physical organism and mental capacities deteriorate rapidly when they are not used. People often become sick when they have nothing else to do.

And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest punishments we are inflicting on our older people is to permit those who do develop chronic health conditions to languish in their growing misery when they could be restored to usefulness.

The incidence of chronic illness begins to rise after age 45. Among those 65 years old and over, more than three-fifths are suffering from 1 or more long-term, handicapping conditions. The numbers of these will increase, because as I have shown, the number of older people is increasing at the rate of about 400,000 a year.

The strain on our health facilities and on our health personnel is enormous. The strain on the victims of chronic disease who are not receiving proper care—our older citizens, by and large, is still greater. These include many older people in my own district who are surrounded by some of the Nation's best medical facilities but who, all too often, are unable to afford their services.

The situation today is that many of the expensive beds in general hospitals are occupied by older people whose needs are great but not for care in a general hospital which is designed primarily for acute illnesses.

At the same time, we have, according to recent estimates of the Public Health Service, only one-eighth of the less expensive facilities needed for the care of the chronically ill.

Mental hospitals, as we all know, are bursting their walls, trying to accommodate the overflow in crowded wards and in hallways.

Many older people who should be cared for in up-to-date institutions or in the security of their own homes have been stowed away in antiquated public infirmaries or in substandard nursing and convalescent homes for lack of better facilities.

Many of our nursing homes are offering the highest quality of care available but there are still far too many in which this is not the case. The Twentieth Century Fund has this to say on the subject:

A visit to a typical nursing home—

Says the report—

is a sobering experience. A considerable proportion of the "guests" are elderly people waiting to die. There are frequent instances of neglect, even among persons able to pay their way. Many homes provide no regular medical supervision of patients; a doctor is summoned only at the discretion of the proprietor. Some nusring homes seem to keep patients in bed as much as possible to minimize supervision by attendants. Rehabilitation is seldom attempted, though research suggests that 75 percent of chronic diseases are partially or completely controllable.

We are, Mr. Speaker, trying to remedy this appalling situation. Through the Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act we have begun—barely so, but begun, nevertheless—to provide hospitals for the chronically ill, nonprofit nursing homes, geriatric clinics, and rehabilitation services. Between the bill's enactment in 1946 and September of 1955, there have been provided under Hill-Burton 7,300 chronic hospital beds.

I have been pleased to support this program, Mr. Speaker, but I should like to see it move faster. During each of the fiscal years 1955 and 1956, the Congress appropriated $21 million for these special facilities for older people. To my great amazement, I learned from the recent budget hearings, that in these 2 years only $3 million of the $42 million had been used. It is mandatory, it seems to me, that this program must move faster if we are to begin to meet the needs of our older people.

Part of this shortage of facilities can be alleviated through provision of health and related services to older people in their own homes. The Public Health Service has just published a report of 11 successful home-care programs—successful because they are meeting the medical needs of hundreds of older people without the expense of institutional care and without the disruption of home living. Services provided under these plans range from a minimum of nursing care and social work to visits by physicians, physical and occupational therapists, housekeeping help, attendance at night, and regular friendly visiting.

Home care of this nature offers great promise and should be developed to the fullest possible extent. And, along with it, we should explore much more intensively than we have done the use of boarding homes for those who are socially isolated and enfeebled, perhaps, but not in need of intensive medical treatment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct your attention briefly to the matter of rehabilitation for our older people. In the recent past and far too commonly today, there has been the inhuman practice of writing off older people with

chronic disease—of regarding long, disabling sickness as an inevitable consequence of old age.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that what we need more than facilities alone, is a new approach to this whole problem of medical care in the older years. I have seen enough to know for certain that great numbers of our older people who have been consigned to helpless uselessness could be up and around, caring for themselves, and often giving important services to their families and communities.

The report of the Council of State Governments says that "older people who are chronically ill, physically disabled, mentally disturbed, or unemployable for other reasons have a right, to the fullest extent possible, to be restored to independent, useful lives."

There are today, literally thousands of older people in general hospitals, in mental institutions, in nursing homes, or confined to their own homes or those of their grown children who could be active members of their communities.

A few places, notably in Connecticut, New York, California, Illinois, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania are pioneering in the rehabilitation of older patients. One county institution in Pennsylvania undertook an experiment of providing complete rehabilitation services to a group of 400 chronic invalids, many of them bedridden. To the amazement of even those in charge of the experiment, three-quarters of the group were restored to the point they could provide their own personal care, one-half were able to leave the institution, and one-fourth—think of it—were able to return to work.

With reference to mental hospitals alone, the Council of State Governments states "enough experience has been accumulated to indicate that imaginative programs of rehabilitation often can accomplish wonders—among older persons—who previously were counted as hopeless. Increasing numbers are being returned to their communities as active, productive members."

Programs such as these have been strongly endorsed by the National Commission on Chronic Illness, by the Hoover Commission, and, in fact, by every investigative body we have had during the past decade or more. Their extension would make a significant dent in current overcrowding of institutions and in the shortage of beds.

Some relief is now being provided, much of it through the amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act that I was only too glad to support. Besides increasing the authorization and the goals for the total rehabilitation program, this legislation authorized grants for research, demonstration, personnel training, and projects. This program appears to be going forward at a fairly rapid pace, and I shall certainly continue to support it.

Yet, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is more to rehabilitation than the retrieving of people for employment. It is just as important that rehabilitation have as its goal the restoration of a person to his family or to normal living. Less than 5 percent of all persons capable of becoming vocationally rehabilitated are over age 65. Yet, as I have shown, there are many thousands in the older age groups who can and should be and have the right to be restored to independence, usefulness, and pride in daily living. Surely, we can no longer deny them.

Great as is the need for more medical facilities and for improved rehabilitation programs, even greater, I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, is the need for adequate financial resources of older persons to pay for the preventive and treatment services they so badly need.

There is ample evidence from many studies that the majority of older persons are just plainly unable to pay the costs of medical care and that they either neglect their ailments, resort to quack remedies and nostrums, or seek assistance, often in the form of reduced fees.

According to one comprehensive report, only three-fifths of old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries were able to meet their yearly medical expenses in whole or in part. And we can certainly assume that few of these poor people were able to purchase the periodic medical examinations and preventive services that we so glibly urge upon all people after middle age.

It is perfectly true that some relief is being provided through voluntary hospital and surgical insurance. Yet, helpful as such protection may be to people in the younger ages it is of very restricted value to our older people.

The recent study of the Commission on Financing Hospital Care in the United States reports that these voluntary prepayment plans reach only 36 percent of the people 65–69 years of age, 25 percent of those 70–74, and but 15 percent of those 75 years and above among whom the need is, by all odds, the greatest.

One reason for these abysmally low ratios is that many workers are forced to drop out of such plans when they retire from work. In many cases, the protection is not available to retired workers. In others the premiums are too high to be met out of the reduced retirement income. Moreover, in the majority of instances where continued coverage is to be had the benefits become more restricted.

The picture, Mr. Speaker, is a sorry one indeed. We can only conclude that it is just at the period of life when the likelihood of sickness is the greatest that the individual is least able to find the protection he needs. And the fear of long, suffering illness without money to pay for care is one of the most pervasive and heart-rending fears of our older people today.

To meet this situation, the administration has come up with a "bold" reinsurance plan—a plan to use Federal funds to underwrite the risks of insurance who have or might be expected to extend their insurance to older people.

Although this plan has not been accepted by the medical societies or by the Blue Cross Associations, or by other insurance companies, it might be a useful way to assist companies while they are getting their initial experience with coverage of older people. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the proposal fails completely to attack the truly basic difficulty; namely, the low income of the retired person or the still lower income of his widow and their consequent inability to pay the premiums.

It is patently obvious that a sine qua non of a reinsurance program, is the possession of insurance in the first place. The evidence proves beyond question that a reinsurance program would do little to alleviate the medical problem of our older people today.

Deserving consideration a proposal which is currently commanding the attention of at least one State medical society, and that is the possibility of linking a health insurance program for older persons to old-age and survivors insurance. Such a step has been advanced by the Commission on Geriatrics of the Medical Society of Pennsylvania. Several days ago, I discussed the matter with a member of that commission and was informed that the commission's entire membership of eight physicians is in agreement and plans to present the proposal to the State society for approval. All are members of the American Medical Association.

Let me give you the words of the commission itself, as they appeared in the Pennsylvania Medical Journal for January 1955:

It would seem valid—

The report declares—

to explore a practical approach to the problems of financing medical care for the older individual who is on old-age and survivors insurance, who has had an average of over 40 years of work behind him, who has never been able to amass more than a modest amount of capital assets, whose medical needs rise with his years as his income falls, who desires to be as independent as possible through his life span and yet who must meet the reality of his personal and family health situations without destroying his economic structure. An alert expanding national economy must be able to find some independent way to meet these needs without resorting to a welfare state's methods.

The essence of the plan is that all employees choosing to do so would authorize an additional social-security deduction during their working years. These deductions, or premiums, would be used to build up a reserve out of which costs of preventive and treatment services would be paid after the worker (and his wife or widow) had reached age 65.

While the program, as proposed by the commission of 8 doctors, would be administered by the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, the payments would be made through Blue Cross, Blue Shield, or other accredited nonprofit health plans.

There would remain, notes the commission, the problem of meeting the medical payments of those who are already retired or who are so near retirement that they do not have the time to make the necessary contributions. This problem, says the commission, would be met by direct appropriations to the program until the reserve fund has had time to mature.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission on Geriatrics of the Medical Society of Pennsylvania is attempting to find an answer to this most difficult question. I hope that other medical groups will see

fit to launch similar studies, and that together we may seek ways of helping older persons receive the medical care they so sorely need and richly deserve.

Under my own proposal, H. R. 8863, the Bureau of Older Persons could contribute toward the advancement of physical and mental health and rehabilitation by cooperating with the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the Public Health Service, and other appropriate public and private agencies in studying ways of improving medical and rehabilitation care for older persons. States could conduct similar studies, particularly in conjunction with State public health authorities. States could also consider ways of broadening prevention and rehabilitation programs, particularly in terms of preventing physical and mental breakdowns, of restoring to health as quickly as possible all who can be restored, and of relocating chronic and nonpsychotic senile patients in nursing or boarding homes, or providing services to them in their own homes. States and municipalities could be encouraged through educational campaigns to take full advantage of Federal assistance to older persons through the expanded Hill-Burton program, the expanded vocational rehabilitation program, and the national mental health program. Communities could conduct educational programs on the possibilities and value inherent in prevention, in better nutrition, and in general rehabilitation, health departments, educational agencies, and organized groups of older people as the means of communication. Communities could also sponsor training programs for professional workers of all sorts, including the personnel of old-age and nursing homes with the possibility of eventually requiring—locally, or through the States—minimum standards of training as a basis for all health and rehabilitation work with older people.

VI. PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

The sixth point of H. R. 8863, Mr. Speaker, would greatly facilitate participation by older persons in social groups, educational and creative activities, citizenship and voluntary community service, religious and cultural programs. Such active participation in a whole round of pleasurable and useful activities is essential for older people who are no longer able to work in full-time employment or who have made their contribution through 40 to 50 years of paid employment.

Yet for perhaps the great majority such opportunities are denied. Far too many have insufficient income to take part in any activity. Others lack energy because of infirmity or malnutrition. And still others are homebound by reason of unnecessary disability from chronic illness.

One of the tragic outcomes of enforced withdrawal from participation in community activities is premature physical and mental deterioration. Unquestionably, Mr. Speaker, much of the bitterness, much of the dependency, and much of the pressure on our institutional facilities today arises from the absence of opportunity for our older people to continue as active participants in the normal life of the community. By denying these opportunities we are creating still greater problems of dependency and early deterioration.

We can now point to concrete evidence of a positive correlation between continued activity and good health and happiness among older people.

One study of old-age assistance recipients in my own city showed that good personal adjustment was dependent, among other things, upon having more than 25 friends, more than 10 intimate friends, 6 or more activities, hobbies.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, noted rehabilitation expert, has found in his work in New York City's Hodson Community Center a marked reduction in the number of visits to the doctor and a 10-year average extension of the life of older persons participating in its program. The noted psychiatrist, Dr. William C. Menninger, has said that "recreation is an extremely important aid to growing old gracefully. People who stay young despite their years do so because of an active interest that provides satisfaction through participation."

An active interest that provides satisfaction through participation—this is the key phrase. Older persons must have an interest in something outside themselves and their daily routine. It must be an active interest, which, if possible, calls them forth from their lonely rooms into contact with other human beings, particularly those of a contemporaneous age.

Nevertheless, and despite the demonstrated value of meaningful activity, communities in general, in the words of the Council of State Government's report—

are not now organized adequately to meet the leisure time needs of their older residents.

Save in a very few instances, our communities simply have not provided new and lifegiving activities for their older people whose work days are past. And this is appallingly true in homes for the aged, nursing and convalescent homes, and hospitals, which by contenting themselves with providing custodial care are thereby almost forcing passivity and hastening further deterioration.

The picture, Mr. Speaker, is a sorry one, indeed. Yet, I can report a glimmer of hope. Today, there does exist some awareness of the importance to older persons of stronger community participation.

In Chicago, we have a fine training center in which older people are learning skills in the arts and crafts so that they in turn, can go to the homebound and teach them activities that provide some degree of interest in their otherwise barren lives.

Throughout California, public schools are providing scores of courses in which literally thousands of older persons enroll each year.

Philadelphia has more than 100 recreation groups for senior citizens. Cleveland features a camping program along with its Golden Age clubs.

In Milwaukee, North Carolina, and Los Angeles, the departments of recreation sponsor dozens of clubs and recreation programs with full-time directors.

New York City has 27 community centers for older persons with up to 70 different activities provided. Members of one of these—the Sirovich Center, produce a play on Broadway each winter. But let Dr. Harry A. Levine, the director of special services for the aged in New York City's Department of Welfare, describe the setup and activities of such a project:

Facilities in the centers—

He states—

include lounges for talk and reading, large rooms for mass activities, playrooms, or play areas for cards, checkers and chess, workshops, meeting rooms, classrooms, and libraries. A number have darkrooms for photography; one has a poolroom. Some have yards for outdoor games. A kitchen is part of every center, for lunch and refreshments and to make parties possible.

The members of the centers sing, dance, and play cards and games. They make friends. They visit each other. Some even find romance; there have been 11 marriages in one center to date. They visit musuems and places of interest regularly. They celebrate each other's birthdays once a month. They plan boat rides and picnics, and celebrate holidays. They have motion pictures, bazaars, and exhibitions of their work. They paint, write, and participate in editing magazines. They write their own plays and act in them. They make clothes, hats, jewelry, and costumes for plays. They have classes in woodwork, copper, leather, ceramics, English, sculpture, poetry, music and music appreciation, elocution, and acting. They maintain old skills or develop new skills and interests. They have discussion groups and regular information programs on health and geriatrics. The center becomes a major source of information. They have orchestras and choral groups. They do all the arts and crafts. The retired or unemployed older person may well bring a renaissance of folk art and craft to America.

There seems to be no limit to the interest and activity that may be developed. Interest can be aroused that will hold groups of different cultural levels. There are unlimited areas for activity, both intellectual and physical, for continued personal development.

Staff members include caseworkers, group workers, registered occupational therapists, and specialists in activities such as music, dramatics, carpentry, and arts and crafts. Counseling and casework are important areas of activity for the staff. A housing registry is maintained in some centers. Every center has developed a visiting committee of members who not only visit their own sick members but are extending this service to agencies in the community to visit shut-in older people.

In the Day Center—

Dr. Levine writes in another connection—

the older person moves slowly but surely toward active participation and social activity, first with one another and then in small groups, moving toward groups involving more members and finally with the center as a whole involving all of the members. Efforts are made to expand their interest and to increase their ability to carry some responsibility for developing their own program. The older persons are involved in helping one another, but, most important, a climate is created affecting the group so that it has warmth and is conducive to growth and expansion of the personality.

Participation in the program as a whole or in some particular part of the program serves to displace preoccupation with fantasy, feelings of inadequacy, fancied grievances, feeling of displacement by family and children, and it serves as a constructive reality

experience for distorted hostile experiences. Participating actively in some part of the program helps in the integration of the personality through clarifying some of the inconsistencies and misplaced hostility.

Even more hopeful, Mr. Speaker, is the evidence of the eagerness of older people to take initiative in developing activities for themselves and in discovering new ways to serve their communities.

In one New York community, a group of older people have adopted a ward in a mental hospital and are providing gifts and entertainment for the patients. More recently, the group extended its services to the residents of a home for the blind.

And now in several places—in Wilmington, Del., St. Louis, Hempstead, Long Island, and Cleveland retired workers have organized as senior consultants to provide advisory services to young and struggling business people and to serve their communities in a variety of voluntary capacities.

In Greenwich, Conn., the members of the Retirement Men's Club are studying their local government, discovering for the first time in detail what its functions are and how it operates.

All of these projects, Mr. Speaker, are commendable examples of the diverse ways in which older people can be active, happy, and useful citizens. They are splendid, but they are reaching perhaps 1 or 2 percent of the older people who need and want them. We are woefully behind.

One purpose of H. R. 8863 is to speed up the development of such programs and extend them to every community in the land. I am convinced that a Bureau of Older Persons with grant-in-aid funds could be a tremendous stimulus.

The States, under the encouragement of the Council of State Governments, could promote survey of needs, resources, and opportunities within their communities. They could employ trained leaders to help the communities. They could develop requirements for social and recreational programs in boarding, nursing and old-age homes and in hospitals as recommended by the report of the Council of State Governments. Conferences and training programs could be held to encourage and train skilled leaders—another recommendation of the council's report.

Community—nonprofit community groups—under my bill could construct activity centers, organize older persons' clubs, conduct or stimulate adult education courses, craft shops and fairs, camping, picnics, community choral and orchestral projects, volunteer professional service organizations, Gray Ladies and Red Cross activities. Communities—the older people themselves, could compile a city directory of recreational and cultural opportunities and facilities for older people. And, I venture to suggest, that if they were given the assignment, older people could make a great contribution toward community understanding and control of such problems as juvenile delinquency, improvement of nursing home standards, and automobile accidents.

Almost every primitive society undertakes to make use of all of its older people. We have hardly begun to recognize the resource that lies within our older citizens.

VII. SOCIAL SERVICE

Of great importance, also, Mr. Speaker, is the range of social services suggested under the seventh policy section of H. R. 8863.

More people are living beyond age 65, an average of 13 additional years. But even more striking are the rates of increase of those living into the late seventies, eighties, and even nineties. For these social casework becomes imperative—in its broadest sense, including information and counseling, assistance in finding housing and medical care, homemaking and housekeeping service, systematic visiting of shut-ins, attendance at night or while family members are away.

Here and there such services have begun to appear. They are of inestimable value in enabling truly aged people to remain comfortably in their own homes and, hence, in avoiding the personal and community costs of institutional care.

Boston and New York are providing large scale counseling and information services to older people. Los Angeles has just opened a similar service with 17 full-time staff members.

A demonstration project in my own city of Chicago offers a combination of casework, housekeeping help, health care, and regular visiting to the older residents of a public housing project, Prairie Courts. In Cook County, in which Chicago lies, and in Peoria County, the Illinois public aid commission is establishing a diagnostic and rehabilitation demonstration project, in which social services will play a key role. Social workers will talk with patients and their families before admission, will assist in implementing the recommendations of the physician, and will help to arrange placement of the patient once treatment has concluded.

In Summit County, N. J., a group of volunteers are providing housekeeping assistance to older persons who, without it, would have to crowd in with their children and grandchildren or seek the shelter of an institution.

One of the most unique experiments is a meals-on-wheels project operated by a Philadelphia settlement house. Volunteers cook, pack, and deliver a hot and cold meal to homebound older people each day, providing at the same time a brief social visit. Rates vary from 40 cents to 80 cents for two people. Think of the potentialities, Mr. Speaker, of a meals-on-wheels program based on the use of the surplus foods already stored up out of our agricultural abundance. As in other situations, a little thoughtful planning, such as we might expect from a Bureau of Older Persons, would enable us to achieve two results with but a single effort.

All of the projects I have mentioned have been tried out somewhere. What is needed, Mr. Speaker, is the impetus that would be provided by H. R. 8863 to extend them to older people throughout the land.

VIII. RESEARCH AND TRAINING

Mr. Speaker, the eighth and final item in the policy statement of my bill, H. R. 8863, is aimed at stepping up badly needed research in the field of aging and at alleviating the very critical shortage of personnel trained to work with older people. It is obvious that we cannot expect to accomplish very much without knowing a great deal about the problem with which we are dealing and without technically trained people for work in the field.

It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that the net effect of our achievement in extending the years of life has been to prolong the period of dying. I, sir, do not believe this statement but we shall all have to admit that it contains a sizable element of truth. Many older people today are suffering, as I have shown earlier, from long-term, chronic illnesses that make a mockery of longer life. And many are so infirm as to render futile any attempt at normal living.

It is perfectly clear to me that we must step up our efforts toward understanding the nature of the aging process itself.

And, at the same time, we must do all we can to encourage research in other fields that are equally important. One of the most frequently cited objections to a policy of flexible retirement is that we are not able to decide which workers should be retained and which retired. We must push forward with all possible speed research that will enable us to set up objective criteria for both the hiring and the retirement of older workers. We need very much to know why men and women in their fifties and, yes, even in their forties find it difficult to obtain employment.

We need research—we need it badly, to discover how older women who have completed their family responsibilities and how older men and women who have retired can find new activities that will give purpose and satisfaction to their extended lives.

We need to know far more than we do about the housing requirements of older people. Dozens of housing experiments are under way in different parts of the country. Which ones are meeting the needs of older people? Which ones provide little more than shelter from the elements?

It is perfectly true, Mr. Speaker, that considerable progress has been made during recent years. The National Institutes of Health, almost every one of which was set up under a Democratic Congress, are now doing some research in aging. All of them, as we all know, are doing intensive work on the chronic diseases so common among our older people and are making grants to universities and hospitals for similar research.

Yet, the amount of research is pitifully small when contrasted with the magnitude of the problem, with the amount of suffering and premature death, the retirements from work forced by illness or infirmity, and the cost of care and rehabilitation.

With regard to other aspects of the field, we have hardly scratched the surface. There is only one major research project that I have been able to dis-

cover devoted to determination of criteria for continued employment of older workers. This project is being done by the University of Chicago.

There are only two significant studies in process—one in Kansas City and one at Cornell University, on the personal adjustments that people make in their later years. And, I have been unable to discover even one important research on the housing needs of older people.

What I have said, Mr. Speaker, reflects a very shortsighted situation. Research and factfinding must be strengthened and improved unless we are to fall still further behind in getting the information we need for sound policy determination. H. R. 8863 would promote the development of research both inside and outside of the Federal Government.

The facts regarding the training of skilled and professional personnel are even worse than those regarding research. Let me given you an example with reference to courses on problems of the aged. In New York State, a recent survey disclosed that out of eight medical schools, none had a faculty member in charge of teaching geriatric medicine. None had a department or subdepartment of geriatric medicine. Only two found it desirable to include geriatric medicine as a separate teaching unit. Only one had sponsored postgraduate teaching specifically on geriatric studies.

The shortage of trained workers is just as acute in the fields of other health personnel, adult educators, recreation workers, occupational therapists, rehabilitation workers, and social caseworkers.

The number of professionally trained workers must be increased at least as rapidly as the older population is growing. H. R. 8863 makes specific provision for helping States, universities, and other agencies sponsor training programs to overcome present shortages.

One of the obvious needs is for comprehensive research and training programs such as those that have been started at the University of Chicago, the State University of Iowa, the University of Florida, and the University of Michigan. It is my great regret, Mr. Speaker, that the research programs of these and other centers are languishing for lack of personnel and funds. We must offer them every encouragement to go forward.

It is encouraging to see one organization of such groups as the American Society for the Aged, organized last year to serve for older persons in somewhat the same capacity as the American Cancer Society and the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis serve their fields. I welcome the creation of the American Society for the Aged, and wish it success. This new body, which proposes to collect and disseminate information, undertake and finance research, cooperate in studies, and further assist in a wide variety of ways to promote the welfare of our older people, is a heartening sign of growing public recognition of the needs of our senior citizens. If we are to seek to enrich the lives of older people, we must pay more serious attention to improving provisions for these services.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, the golden years can be glorious years if our older people have sufficient income, good housing accommodations, activities to keep them interested and occupied, and the vital feeling that they are wanted, that they belong, that the community has not discarded them. We are still far from that goal, but it is one to which we must strive.

H. R. 8863

A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Services to Older Persons Act."

TITLE I—NEED FOR LEGISLATION; DECLARATION OF POLICY; DEFINITIONS

Need for legislation

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the public interest requires the enactment of legislation to aid in meeting the problems of older persons in our population because—

(1) the tremendous increase in the total population of the United States in the last half century has caused profound changes in the age structure of our population, particularly in the sharply increased life expectancy of the individual; and

(2) it is now quite apparent that the fastest growing segment of our population consists of persons 65 years of age and over, the number of whom totaled approximately 3 million in the year 1900 and whose number increased to 14 million in 1955, a growth which is expected to continue and to reach approximately 21 million in 1975; and

(3) during the last 50 years, our national economy has moved from one based primarily upon agriculture to one of huge industrialization, creating many new and unanticipated social problems, particularly with respect to our older persons; these have been shunted more and more to an insecure, dependent, and much too hopeless and helpless a position in our society, through the deprivation, because of their age, of their opportunity for gainful work and by compelling them to retire prematurely; and

(4) as a result, many of our older people have inadequate financial resources to maintain themselves and their families as independent and self-respecting members of their communities, are unable to find adequate housing for themselves and their families, are confronted with disabling health and medical problems, are driven by frustration and despair to private and public mental institutions and general hospitals, are forced into positions of isolation and lonesomeness, are placed in increasing numbers on old-age assistance rolls; and

(5) it is therefore essential that such trends be checked and that concerted and comprehensive efforts be made to formulate, and put into operation, projects which will permit our older people to continue to lead proud and independent lives which will restore and rehabilitate many of them to useful and dignified positions among their neighbors; which will enhance the vigor and vitality of the communities; and which will prevent further aggravation of their problem with resulting increased social, financial, and medical burdens.

Declaration of policy

SEC. 102. (a) The primary responsibility for caring for and working out the problems for our older persons is that of the States; however, it is the policy of this act to aid the States, so far as practicable, in helping solve the problems of older persons through projects, consistent with subsection (b) of this section, which will help—

(1) to assure to older persons an equal opportunity with others to engage in gainful employment which they are physically and mentally able to perform;

(2) to enable older persons to achieve a retirement income sufficient for health and for participation in community life as self-respecting citizens;

(3) to provide older persons, so far as possible, with the opportunity of living in their own homes or, when this is not feasible, in suitable substitute private homes; and in the case of such persons who need care that cannot be given them in their own or other private homes, to provide them with the opportunity to live in institutions that are as homelike as possible and have high standards of care;

(4) older persons to receive adequate nutrition, preventive medicine, and medical care adapted to the conditions of their years;

(5) to rehabilitate and to restore to independent, useful lives in their homes, to the fullest extent possible, older persons who are chronically ill, physically disabled, mentally disturbed, or incapacitated for other reasons;

(6) to assist older persons to have access to social groups and to participate with those of other ages in recreational, educational, cultural, religious, and civic activities;

(7) to assure that older persons, in planning for retirement and in meeting the crises of their later years, will have the benefits of such services as counseling, information, vocational retraining, and social casework; and

(8) to relieve the problems of older persons through an increase of research on the various aspects of aging and the development of special courses in schools and departments of medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, and social work to train professional workers in the field of aging.

(b) It is further declared to be the policy of this act that in the projects referred to in this section there should be emphasis upon the right and obligation of such older persons to free choice, self-help, and planning their own futures.

Definitions

SEC. 103. For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(2) The term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico; and

(3) The term "older population" means that portion of the population of the age of 65 years and over, determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce;

(4) The term "older persons" means persons of the age of 65 years and over;

(5) The term "nonprofit institution or organization" means an institution or organization which is owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

TITLE II—PLANNING GRANTS

Authorization and use of appropriation

SEC. 201. (a) For the purpose of assisting each State to develop plans for new programs, or for the improvement of existing programs, which will further the policies set forth in section 102 of this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2 million, to remain available until expended.

(b) The sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted and had approved, under this title, applications for funds to be used in developing such plans.

State applications

SEC. 202. The Secretary shall approve any application of a State for funds to be used in developing plans referred to in section 201 if such application—

(1) designates a State officer or agency which shall, either directly or through arrangements with other State or local agencies, have the responsibility of developing such plans;

(2) shows that in the preparation of such application there has been participation on the part of representatives of State agencies concerned with the needs of older persons (including, to the extent feasible, the State welfare, education, recreation, housing, health, and labor agencies, State mental health and vocational rehabilitation authorities, the State employment service, and State agencies responsible for services to such older persons) and provides for the participation of such representatives in the work of developing such plans;

(3) provides for consultation, in connection with the development of such plans, with voluntary organizations providing services to older persons and civic groups concerned with the needs of older persons, as well as organizations of older persons themselves;

(4) provides for a survey of existing facilities and services, as well as an analysis of the needs and potentialities of the older persons of the State and a determination of the most urgent priorities for services on their behalf; and

(5) provides that the designated State officer or agency shall make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time reasonably require, and comply with such provisions as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

Allotments and payments to States

SEC. 203. Each State shall be entitled to an allotment of such proportion of any appropriation made pursuant to section 201 as the older population of such State bears to the older population of all the States, and within such allotment shall be entitled to receive 33⅓ percent of its expenditures in developing plans referred to in section 201: *Provided,* That no such allotment to any State shall be less than $10,000.

TITLE III—PROJECT GRANTS

Authorization and use of appropriations

SEC. 301. (a) For the purpose of assisting States to initiate and operate projects in accordance with plans which they have developed to further the policies set forth in section 102 of this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the sum of $3 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the sum of $4 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and the sum of $5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

(b) The sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available for making grants to States which have submitted and had approved, under this title, State plans developed to further the policies set forth in section 102 of this act.

State plans

SEC. 302. The Secretary shall approve any State plan submitted to him if he finds that such plan—

(1) makes provision for the initiation and operation of projects which will further one or more of the policies set forth in section 102 of this act;

(2) provides for the administration of the plan by a single State officer or agency or the supervision (through arrangements with other State or local agencies, or otherwise) of the administration of the plan by a single State officer or agency;

(3) provides for coordination of State and local programs for services to older persons and for coordinated planning of such programs;

(4) provides for consultation with voluntary organizations providing services for older persons with civic groups concerned with their needs, and with organized groups of older persons;

(5) provides for financial participation by the State in each major category of service contemplated by the plan and sets forth the method of allocating funds among the State or local agencies participating in carrying out the State plan or specified portions of the State plan;

(6) provides such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that (A) the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods and (B) approval of a State plan shall not be withheld by reason of a State law which prevents a State or local agency from providing such methods, if the Secretary finds that such law was enacted prior to the enactment of this act and the plan provides methods assuring that only qualified personnel will be employed) as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan; and

(7) provides that the State officer or agency administering or supervising the administration of the plan shall make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary may from time to time reasonably require, and comply with such provisions as he may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

Allotments and payments to the States

SEC. 303. (a) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 301, the Secretary shall allot to each State the sum of (1) $25,000, and (2) an amount which bears the same ratio to the remainder of the sums so appropriated for such fiscal year as the older population of such State bears to the older population of all the States. So much of the total amount allotted to any State for any fiscal year as remains unpaid to such State at the end of such fiscal year shall be available for payment to such State until the close of the succeeding fiscal year.

(b) (1) From each State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year the Secretary shall pay to such State an amount equal to the Federal share of the cost, during such fiscal year, of initiating and operating projects under and in accordance with its State plan approved under section 302.

(2) For the purposes of this subsection the "Federal share" of the cost involved shall be, in the case of any State, 100 percent less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (A) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66⅔ percent or less than 33⅓ percent, and (B) the Federal share for Hawaii and Alaska shall be 50 percent, and for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 66⅔ percent.

(3) The "Federal shares" of the several States shall be promulgated by the Secretary between July 1 and September 30 of each odd-numbered year, on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation.

TITLE IV—GRANTS TO INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

Authorization and use of appropriation

SEC. 401. (a) For the purpose of assisting public and other nonprofit institutions and organizations in carrying out research, demonstration, training and traineeship, which, in the judgment of the Secretary, hold promise of making a substantial contribution to projects for older persons in all or several States and will further the policies set forth in section 102 of this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $500,000, to remain available until expended.

(b) The sum appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for making payment to public and other nonprofit institutions and organizations under standards which shall be prescribed by the Secretary: *Provided,* That the aggregate of any and all payments to any such institution or organization under this section shall not exceed $30,000.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Administration

SEC. 501. (a) In administering this act, the Secretary shall cooperate with and render technical assistance to States and organizations in matters relating to needs of older persons, provide short-term training and instruction in technical matters relating to services, and otherwise promote the development and improvement of programs for services on their behalf.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to make rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act.

(c) The Secretary shall include in his annual report a full report on the administration of this act.

(d) There is hereby authorized to be included in the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for each fiscal year such sums as are necessary to administer this act.

Advisory committees

SEC. 502. The Secretary is authorized to establish an Advisory Committee on Aging and Geriatrics composed of professional and public members, and, as necessary, to establish technical advisory committees, to advise and assist him in the administration of this act. Appointed members of such committees, while attending conferences or meetings of their committees or otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Payments

SEC. 503. (a) The method of computing payments under title II or III of this act shall be as follows:

(1) The Secretary shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Secretary may find necessary.

(2) The Secretary shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid the State for any prior period under such title was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such prior period under such title.

(b) Payments under title IV shall be made in advance or by way of reimbursement for services performed and purchases made, as may be determined by the Secretary, and shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out the purposes of such title.

(c) Payments of grants made under this act shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, in such installments as the Secretary may determine.

(d) Any funds paid under this act to a State or to a public or other nonprofit institution or organization which are not expended for the purposes for which paid shall be repaid to the Treasury of the United States.

Withholding of payments and judicial review

SEC. 504. (a) Whenever the Secretary—

(1) after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State officer or agency designated in accordance with section 202 (a), finds that the State officer or agency is not complying substantially with a provision required by section 202 to be contained in its application for funds under title II, or

(2) after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State officer or agency administering or supervising the administration of a State plan finds (A) that the State plan or a specified portion of the State plan submitted and approved under section 302 has been so changed that it no longer complies with a provision required by section 302 to be included in the plan, or (B) that in the administration of the plan or a specified portion of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such a provision,

the Secretary shall notify the State officer or agency that no further payments will be made to the State under section 203 or section 303, as the case may be (or in his discretion that further payments will not be made to the State for portions of the State application or State plans affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be such failure. Until he is so satisfied, the Secretary shall make no further payments to such State under section 203 or section 303 (or shall limit payments to portions of the State plan in which there is no such failure).

(b) If any State is dissatisfied with the Secretary's action under subsection (a), such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The findings of fact by the Secretary, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence. The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

National conference on older persons

SEC. 505. The Secretary shall call a national conference on the problems of older persons, to be held not later than the calendar year 1960.

Cumulative report to Congress

SEC. 506. Not later than January 1, 1961, the Secretary shall transmit to the President for transmission to the Congress (1) a report of the experience of Federal, State, and local agencies in the administration of titles II, III, IV, and V of the act, together with such recommendations as he deems advisable, and (2) a report on the national conference on the problems of older persons held pursuant to section 505, together with such recommendations as he deems advisable.

TITLE VI—BUREAU OF OLDER PERSONS

Creation

SEC. 601. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a bureau to be known as the Bureau of Older Persons, referred to in this title as the "Bureau".

(b) The Bureau shall be under the direction of a chief, to be appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate.

Functions

SEC. 602. The Bureau, acting under the general direction of the Secretary—

(1) shall aid the Secretary in the performance of his functions under section 501 (a) of this Act;

(2) shall make studies and investigations for the purpose of developing ways and means by which the policies set forth in section 102 may best be effectuated; and

(3) shall make studies and investigations of, and prepare reports with respect to, such other matters as the Secretary may deem appropriate pertaining to the welfare of the older persons in our population.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ROOSEVELT, for Monday, March 19, on account of official business for the Select Small Business Committee.

SPECIAL ORDERS

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, for 1 hour today.

Mr. LESINSKI, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 30 minutes, on today.

Mr. PATMAN, for 15 minutes, on today and Monday next.

Mr. JUDD, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. YATES, for 30 minutes, on today.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) canceled his special order for today and was granted a special order of 20 minutes on Thursday, March 22.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. WALTER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include a speech by Mr. Paul Butler.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LESINSKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARNAHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DIGGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLTZMAN (at the request of Mr. KLEIN) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. KLEIN) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUDDLESTON (at the request of Mr. BONNER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRIEST.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (at the request of Mr. MORANO).

Mr. WESTLAND.

Mr. AVERY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RADWAN.

Mr. SAYLOR (at the request of Mr. HALLECK).

Mr. DINGELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DIXON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. CANFIELD.

Mr. BENTLEY.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3091. An act to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 1207 at Louisville, Ky.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 19, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1634. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $3 million for the Department of Labor (H. Doc. No. 357); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1635. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration," for the fiscal year 1956, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1636. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force,

transmitting the semi-annual report entitled "Research and Development Procurement Action Report," for the period July 1 to December 31, 1955, pursuant to section IV of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1637. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Drs. Alfred M. Lueck, John A. Pearson, L. M. Baskett, and Thomas Clemons, which, when executed by the Superintendent, Yellowstone National Park, will authorize the concessioners to provide medical, hospital, and dental service for the public and employees in Yellowstone National Park, Wyo., for a 3-year period beginning January 1, 1956, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1638. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the United States assistance program for Iran as administered by the International Cooperation Administration, an agency of the Department of State, and the predecessor agencies, for the 4-year period from 1952 through 1955, pursuant to the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 832); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 582. Joint Resolution making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1956, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1880). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 428. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9770, a bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1881). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 429. Resolution for consideration of S. 1188, an act to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks; without amendment (Rept. No. 1882). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 430. Resolution for consideration of S. 1736, an act to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1883). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 431. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9285, a bill to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, so as to extend for two additional years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury; without amendment (Rept. No. 1884). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 432. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 3744, a bill to amend an act of July 1, 1947, to grant military leave of absence with pay to classified substitute clerks in the field service of the Post Office Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 1885). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 424. Resolution providing for employment of four additional laborers, office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1886). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 7913. A bill authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1888). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9424. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of certain corporate mergers; with amendment (Rept. No. 1889). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9893. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1890). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Tenth intermediate report of Committee on Government Operations pertaining to Navy jet aircraft permanent program (Rept No. 1891). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Eleventh intermediate report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to contracts for rental of automobiles by Bureau of Indian Affairs; (Rept. No. 1892). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 8547. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y."; with amendment (Rept. No. 1893). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 8807. A bill to extend for an additional 3 years the time within which the State of Michigan may commence and complete the construction of certain projects heretofore authorized by the Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1894). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 319. A bill to punish the malicious destruction of aircraft and attempts to destroy aircraft; with amendment (Rept. No. 1895). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RABAUT: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 10003. A bill making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1896). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 10004. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1897). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8087. A bill for the relief of Paul G. Abernathy; with amendment (Rept. No. 1887). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 9949. A bill relating to the distribution of certain assets of the Russo-Asiatic Bank in the possession of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 9950. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 9951. A bill to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington September 10, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 9952. A bill to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 9953. A bill to grant leaves of absence to homestead entrymen and to permit suspension of cultivation and improvement operations on homestead and desert land entries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9954. A bill to exempt certain shipments of farm produce from the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUSH:

H. R. 9955. A bill to provide for the consolidation of the existing Veterans' Administration hospital and regional office at Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 9956. A bill to amend subdivision (e) of section 58, notices of the Bankruptcy Act as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 9957. A bill to authorize the removal and preservation of petroglyphs from the site of the reservoir behind the Dalles Dam on the Columbia River in the States of Oregon and Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 9958. A bill to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington September 10, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 9959. A bill amending the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 9960. A bill to limit the total amount of price support which may be made available with respect to the products of any farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 9961. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army to the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 9962. A bill to amend section 1 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to give to the Interstate Commerce Commission authority for use in alleviating car shortages during periods of emergency or threatened emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 9963. A bill to limit the total amount of price support which may be made available with respect to the products of any farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 9964. A bill to provide for the consolidation of the existing Veterans' Administration hospital and regional office at Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 9965. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, to provide that the level of price supports for certain basic agricultural commodities shall be related to the units of production produced on the farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H. R. 9966. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the American farmer; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 9967. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 9968. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of certain corporate mergers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 9969. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the readjustment of tax in the case of certain amounts received for breach of contract; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 9970. A bill to provide for the disposition of a portion of Sharpe General Depot, Stockton Annex, California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 9971. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 9972. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, so as to allow bulk settlement of certain claims by successor organizations to heirless or unclaimed property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 9973. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, so as to allow bulk settlement of certain claims by successor organizations to heirless or unclaimed property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 9974. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the cutting of timber, the manufacture and sale of lumber, and the preservation of the forests on the Menominee Indian Reservation in the State of Wisconsin," approved March 28, 1908, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9975. A bill to provide that courts administering estates of deceased persons may require that legacies payable to persons in certain Communist countries be paid in the form of necessaries of life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 9976. A bill to provide for registration and reporting of welfare and benefit plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 9977. A bill to authorize operation by the Capital Transit Co. after August 14, 1956, under a revised franchise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 9978. A bill to authorize operation by the Capital Transit Co. after August 14, 1956, under a revised franchise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 9979. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 9980. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide insurance thereunder against the cost of hospitalization for insured aged persons and their dependents and for the survivors of deceased insured persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9981. A bill to reduce retirement age under title II of the Social Security Act from 65 to 60 in the case of men and from 65 to 55 in the case of women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 9982. A bill to establish a plan and appropriate procedures for the promotion of employees of the Government on the basis of merit; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 9983. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act with reference to procedure as to making loans by Federal credit unions and to provide authorization for loan officers of Federal credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 9984. A bill to extend for 1 year the time for filing of claims by former prisoners of war under section 6 (e) of the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 9985. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 9986. A bill to provide pension for widows and children of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict on the same basis as pension is provided for widows and children of veterans of World War I, and to liberalize certain criteria for determining eligibility of widows for benefits; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 9987. A bill to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9988. A bill to make available temporary exhibition space for the National Collection of Fine Arts until such time as the Smithsonian Gallery of Art is finally established, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 9989. A bill for the relief of the city of Clarksville, Ark.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H. R. 9990. A bill to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of cigarettes containing stems of tobacco leaves unless each package of such cigarettes is labeled to indicate such content; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 9991. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act and the Communist Control Act of 1954 so as to provide for a passport review procedure and to prohibit the issuance of passports to persons under Communist discipline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 9992. A bill to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 9993. A bill to transfer certain Government-owned manganese ore facilities to the Secretary of the Interior, to provide for the erection of one or more beneficiation plants to treat manganese ores, to stimulate the production of certain strategic and critical materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9994. A bill to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 9995. A bill to provide in certain additional cases for the granting of the status of regular substitute in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 9996. A bill to require the Bureau of the Census to develop farm income data by economic class of farm; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 9997. A bill to create a Susquehanna Watershed Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 9998. A bill to amend the first section of the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, as amended, so as to provide for 6-year terms of office for members of the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 9999. A bill to transfer certain Government-owned manganese ore facilities to the Secretary of the Interior, to provide for the erection of one or more beneficiation plants to treat manganese ores, to stimulate the production of certain strategic and critical materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 10000. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly families and persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 10001. A bill to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington September 10, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 10002. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 10003. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 10004. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 583. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. J. Res. 584. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. Con. Res. 222. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress on the

policy of the United States in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 434. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the publication entitled, "Interim Report on Corporate and Bank Mergers", 84th Congress, 1st session, for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. Res. 435. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of forest land problems and related subjects; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MURRAY of Illinois:

H. Res. 436. Resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Republic of Ireland embrace all of the territory of Ireland unless a clear majority of all people of Ireland in a free plebiscite determine the contrary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress and the Department of Defense to retain employees of the United States armory in Springfield; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARTIN: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress and the Department of Defense to retain employees of the United States armory in Springfield; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to retain employees of the United States armory in Springfield; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 10005. A bill for the relief of Fernanda de Castro Ramos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 10006. A bill for the relief of Vincent P. Svelnis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 10007. A bill for the relief of Ching-Sheng Shen and Lee-Ming Chow Shen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 10008. A bill for the relief of Maria Leister De Angelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 10009. A bill for the relief of Patricia Ann Dutchess; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 10010. A bill for the relief of Roy Click; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10011. A bill for the relief of Jess Gray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES:

H. R. 10012. A bill for the relief of Alexander Rudhart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10013. A bill for the relief of Sfc. Henry F. Ferry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 10014. A bill for the relief of Filomena and Gabriele Scarsella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 10015. A bill for the relief of Jelena Simicevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 10016. A bill for the relief of Grace Yu Ching Wang Li (nee Wang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 10017. A bill for the relief of Hene (Genia) Wasser and Michael Wasser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 10018. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to cancel certain obligations arising out of a contract relating to the reimbursement to the United States of certain costs incurred by it in the construction of irrigation facilities at Ganado, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. R. 10019. A bill for the relief of Xanthi Grekas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES (by request):

H. R. 10020. A bill for the relief of the Construction Aggregates Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 10021. A bill for the relief of Manuel Sanchez Miranda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10022. A bill for the relief of George Liberatos (Lymperatos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10023. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Kavalieratos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

667. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of the Woman's Club of Hughesville, Lycoming County, Pa., endorsing and urging early enactment of H. R. 8540, relative to humane slaughter methods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

668. By Mr. CRETELLA: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Connecticut, Inc., urging Congress to get alcoholic-beverage advertising off the air and out of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

669. By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition of Kenneth Eby of Elkhart, Ind., and 44 other residents of Elkhart County and St. Joseph County, Ind., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

670. Also, petition of Claude Lacefield of Plymouth, Ind., and 44 other residents of Marshall, St. Joseph, and Elkhart Counties, Ind., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

671. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 45 persons at the United States Veterans' Administration domiciliary, Clinton, Iowa, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

672. Also, petition of 46 residents of Mason City, Iowa, and vicinity urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

673. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

674. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition to the President and Congress of the United States urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans, on an equal basis with the aging veterans of previous wars in line with established American traditions, signed by 45 veterans of Athens County, Ohio; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

675. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of World War I veterans of Chariton, Iowa, urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

676. Also, petition of World War I veterans of Ottumwa, Iowa, urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

677. By Mr. MILLER of New York: Petition of Mrs. Alvin E. Katz, Niagara Falls, N. Y., and 134 other citizens of western New York strongly protesting the stand the State Department has taken in regard to the shipment of arms to the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

678. By Mr. POLK: Petition of Edgar Kochensparger, Ashville, Ohio, in behalf of Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 3331 and 46 members of Eagles Lodge, No. 685, Circleville, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans and stating that aging World War I veterans are deserving of consideration and treatment on an equal basis with the aging veterans of previous wars in our Nation's history, and in line with established American traditions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

679. Also, petition of Edwin Hidy, Washington Court House, Ohio, and 44 other citizens of Fayette County, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans, and stating that aging World War I veterans are deserving of consideration and treatment on an equal basis with the aging veterans of previous wars in our Nation's history, and in line with established American traditions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

680. Also, petition of E. A. Gardner, Portsmouth, Ohio, and 44 other citizens of Scioto County, Ohio, and vicinity, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans, and stating that aging World War I veterans are deserving of consideration and treatment on an equal basis with the aging veterans of previous wars in our Nation's history, and in line with established American traditions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

681. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Benjamin Evans and other citizens of Springfield, Mo., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

682. By Mr. SILER: Petition of Mrs. Mabel Haus and 1,220 other residents of Philadelphia, Stewartstown, Millersburg, Williamsport, Ulysses, Delta, Beaver Falls, and Norristown, Pa., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

683. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the executive secretary, Texas Motor Court Association, San Antonio, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their declaration of ideas on the Federal highway program; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Amending the Trading With the Enemy Act and the War Claims Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the bill just introduced by me in the House of Representatives, H. R. 9864, combines the best features, in my opinion, of H. R. 5840 introduced by me on April 26, 1955, at the 1st session of the 84th Congress, and H. R. 6730, the so-called administration bill, introduced by Congressman PRIEST on June 8, 1955. A companion bill to H. R. 6730, viz. the administration bill, was introduced in the Senate by Senator Kilgore on June 14, 1955.

Both H. R. 6730 and S. 2227—the administration bills—contained a $10,000 ceiling on return of vested property to natural German citizens and also contained a similiar $10,000 ceiling on payment of United States citizens' war damage claims against Germany. I believe that these ceilings are indefensible as they evade the moral principles involved in full return of vested properties to natural German citizens and full payment of war damage claims of United States citizens. Furthermore, the administration bills unfortunately provide that the United States war-damage claimant against Germany must have been a United States citizen at the time of loss as well as of the time of claim. This would bar numerous deserving claimants, many of whom served in the United States Armed Forces in World War II.

I am in accord with the administration bills in making no provision for German vested corporate returns so as to eliminate this somewhat complicated and vexatious problem from current legislation and require that it be dealt with properly by separate legislation.

The outstanding features of H. R. 9864 just introduced by me and which were formerly contained in H. R. 5840, are the following:

First. All claimants whose claims are not processed, adjudicated and paid within 2 years after the claims shall have been filed with the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission or within 2 years after passage of the act may institute a civil action de novo in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia or in the Court of Claims within 1 year after the expiration of said 2 year period to establish the loss or damage sustained by the claimant. Any claimant aggrieved with any decision of either of said courts shall have the right to have full judicial review of the final decision or judgment of either court.

Second. Any claimant who is aggrieved with any final decision, award or order of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission in the adjudication of his claim or in the denial of his claim may appeal from such decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to obtain a complete judicial review of such final decision, award or order as provided by the Administrative Procedure Act.

Third. There is ample provision in section 211 of the bill for financing of the United States citizens' war damage claims primarily out of the $1 billion which is to be covered into a German claims fund representing repayments by Germany for postwar economic assistance, and other sources of funds already realized or appropriated, without imposing any further burden upon the American taxpayer.

My bill provides for the return of property to natural German citizens of West Germany to restore the traditional practice which dominated United States policy prior to the year 1945, viz, the honorable policy of nonconfiscation of private property in war and peace. This is in sound accord with our principles of moral and constitutional law as well as with the basic concepts of international law.

Good Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, management of our timber resources has progressed from an idea to a program of perpetuating yield and protecting stands of timber awaiting harvest.

This week I received the annual report of the United States Forest Service on the Olympic National Forest in my district. This report has several interesting phases which I believe my colleagues will be interested in reading about.

Timber is a crop. During the past year, the Olympic National Forest harvested 342 million board-feet of timber and other forest products. This cut included considerable salvage work on fire-killed timber. During 1951 and 1952 the forest had a fire kill of 560 million board-feet. The 1955 salvage program completed the utilization of this timber.

Since the annual cut for the forest is pegged at about 300 million board-feet, completion of the salvage operation will level off timber harvest for the next few years to the allowable footage.

Of special interest is the fact that the timber cut from the forest last year went mostly to small logging operators. The volume was handled under 255 different sales. Of these sales, 176, or 70 percent, were for stumpage valued at less than $2,000 per sale. I am gratified to see that our national forests are being managed so that small loggers have an opportunity to participate in the harvest of this valuable resource.

The State of Washington got back about 25 percent of the receipts of Olympic National Forest, with Jefferson County getting 45 percent, or $545,000, Clallam County 33 percent, or $402,568 out of the $1,203,922 available for distribution.

In addition to harvest supervision, the Forest Service continued an active insect- and disease-control program, reseeded 4,335 acres, and maintained a phenomenal fire-control program. Total fire loss for the forest was only 2 acres during 1955—both of the two small fires, I regret to say, caused by unwatched campfires.

Recreation facilities were enhanced by rehabilitation of campgrounds and provision for more water developments on existing campgrounds. The city of Port Townsend has applied for additional water from the Little Quilcene River to augment their supply.

Some 58 miles of new road were constructed, bringing the total to 394.

All in all, I believe the report shows that under Mason B. Bruce, supervisor, the Olympic National Forest is undergoing excellent management along the lines of multiple use which will provide the most good for the most people from these forest lands.

A Bill To Require the Bureau of the Census To Develop Farm Income Data by Economic Class of Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, it has become evident to me that one of the first steps in formulating agricultural legislation which can meet the problems of different types of farmers depends upon our obtaining accurate annual farm income data by economic class of farm. Average farm income figures and per capita income figures in agriculture do not provide adequate guides for the formulation of legislation designed to increase the economic well-being of farmers.

For example, the 1954 Agricultural Census reveals that we have 4.7 million farms. Two million of the larger commercial farms, although mostly family-type in nature, produce nearly 85 percent of our annual marketable crop value and their owners receive nearly 80 percent of net farm income. On the other hand, 2.7 million of the smaller family-type commercial farms, residential farms and part-time farms produce only about 15 percent of the annual marketable

crop value and receive about 20 percent of the net farm income.

It is obvious from these data, that average per capita and family incomes derived by dividing 4.7 million farms into the 19.9 billion dollars of agricultural income which farmers receive from all sources distorts completely the economic well-being of various types of farms. Obviously most of the 4.7 million farms that produce 85 percent of our annual crop values and get 87 percent of our net farm income provide their owners with per capita and family incomes much higher than the average. Such averages also add to the fact that the per capita and average incomes of most of these farmers are just as high as the average per capita and family incomes of nonfarm workers, but when the incomes of the owners of 2.7 million smaller farms are combined with the 4.7 million I have just mentioned and the total divided into net farm income, the latter's incomes appear much higher than they really are and the former's incomes are much smaller than they really are.

Now then, with respect to price support policies, it should be obvious that 90 percent price supports will never narrow the gap between average per capita and family farm and nonfarm incomes because over half of our farms produce very little, therefore, can sell very little and because they have little to sell they cannot obtain price supports. For a great number of the owners and operators of the 2.7 million small farms, other types of programs can better serve to increase their economic levels of living than price support programs.

If the Members of the Congress had annual data showing the distribution of income by economic class of farms, they would better be able to legislate policies for different phases of productive farms. For example, the Census Bureau defines a farm as 3 acres or more of land if the annual value of agricultural products produced amounted to $150 or more. Places of less than 3 acres are counted as farms if the annual value of sales of agricultural commodities amounted to $150 or more. With the use of such a definition of a farm being relied upon, it is important that we have annual data giving us the number of farms, for example, which produced products valued at $25,000 or more; the size of the per capita and average family incomes of their owners and operators; and at the other end of the scale, it is important that we have the same data relative to the number of farms which sold products valued at between $250 and $1,200; and the average per capita and family incomes which those farms returned their owners or operators. When such data are available on an annual basis, it will be much easier for not only the Members of Congress, but the general public as well, to better understand the types of programs which can best meet the needs of different types and sizes of farms.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk for introduction, a bill which would require the Bureau of the Census in conducting current population surveys to include and publish annually money and nonmoney income data relating to per capita and family farm income by economic class of farm.

This is introduced as a companion bill to S. 3145 introduced by Senator WATKINS.

Fraudulent Advertising on Television and Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues a timely article which appeared on the front page of the March 14 issue of the New York Times. The article deals with fraudulent and misleading advertising which is being used on television and radio.

District Attorney Edward S. Silver of my home borough of Brooklyn has installed in his office a monitor system, operated by city policemen on a 24-hour basis, to check the various programs on television and radio for false ads. He has discovered many abuses by smooth-talking advertisers and their pitchmen.

The benevolent prosecutor, seeking to protect the public against such abuses, is conducting a relentless campaign and thus far has already obtained six convictions for misleading advertising since January 1 of this year.

District Attorney Silver says, however, that local officials cannot do this job alone. He accuses the Federal Communications Commission for failing to do its job of protecting the public in this matter.

I have addressed a letter to Mr. George C. McConnaughey, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, in which I am inviting his response to the charges made by District Attorney Silver.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting into the RECORD both the New York Times article of March 14, 1956, and the text of my letter to FCC Chairman McConnaughey:

MONITOR SYSTEM CHECKS TV AND RADIO FOR FALSE ADS

Edward S. Silver, Kings County district attorney, accused the Federal Communications Commission yesterday of failing to protect the public against fraudulent and misleading advertising on television and radio. Mr. Silver made his accusation at a demonstration of a new monitoring setup at his racket squad headquarters, 186 Joralemon Street, Brooklyn. Nine television sets and 13 radios have been installed to check on airwave programs. A squad of young city policemen has been assigned on a 24-hour, 7-day-a-week schedule. Six tape recorders are used to pick up the sales talks of programs under suspicion. "During the last few months I have been getting an increasing number of complaints from Brooklyn residents indicating that they have been 'taken in' by certain 'over-the-air' advertisers," Mr. Silver said. "These victims are in the low-income group and can least afford to be taken over.

"I regret to say that the Federal Communications Commission is of little or no help in the matter. The TV and radio stations are licensed by the Government through the agency of the FCC. They have a real responsibility to the people not to permit the air waves to be used to the citizens' detriment. Their machinery is slow and cumbersome. In my opinion, they are not doing their job."

Mr. Silver urged the public to be on guard against "the smooth-talking advertisers and their 'pitch men'." The prosecutor also said that his staff had obtained six convictions for misleading and fraudulent advertising since January 1.

MARCH 15, 1956.

Mr. GEORGE C. MCCONNAUGHEY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, New Post Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: My attention has been called to the fraudulent and misleading advertising which is being used on television and radio.

Several convictions have already been obtained recently in my home borough of Brooklyn.

If you will read the front-page article of the New York Times of March 14 you will note that District Attorney Edward S. Silver, of Brooklyn, whose office has obtained these convictions, says that the bigger responsibility of avoiding and preventing such large-scale fraudulent practices rests in your office.

I am sure that Members of Congress will be very interested to know what steps you have taken or what steps you are contemplating in order to prevent further abuses of this sort.

Thanking you for an early reply, I am

Sincerely,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

Unwarranted Charges of Violation of the Walter-McCarran Immigration Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions during the last month I have received communications concerning the legality of the admission of Leopold D. Silberstein to the United States.

As the result of a careful investigation of the charges, I have reached the conclusion that they have been made for an ulterior purpose—I say this because there is no question about the legality of Mr. Silberstein's admission to the United States, or that he was not qualified in every respect for the United States citizenship he enjoys.

Mr. Silberstein is the president of the Penn-Texas Corp. incorporated under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania in which State the home office of the company is located. Because of wise reorganization procedures, 1,000 Pennsylvanians whose jobs were in jeopardy are now enjoying full employment.

It is indeed unfortunate that the time of busy investigative forces should be consumed in making investigations of unwarranted charges of violations of the Walter-McCarran immigration law.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important and far-reaching issues before us today is the cause of civil rights. There has been much said about it in the press, on the radio and television, in the Congress, and by private organizations and individuals.

However, rather than mouth high-sounding phrases which in themselves accomplish nothing, we must continue to exert every possible effort to ensure that each and every citizen in this country, regardless of race, creed, color or national origin, shall enjoy equal treatment under the law as guaranteed by our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

We have made good progress on the civil-rights front in the last 20 years, but much remains to be done. Many more Americans today are aware of the problems facing us, and have contributed greatly in the past to the victories that we have won against bigotry and intolerance.

Unfortunately, many areas in our country, notably in the South, still enforce discrimination and segregation, mostly as a result of custom and practice, or through ignorance. These are the areas where we must concentrate our efforts so that our Negro or other minority groups will be able to exercise their rights to vote, to attend public affairs, to have access to public facilities, and to attend the public school of their choice.

Many of the southern Members of Congress have recently signed a Declaration of Constitutional Principles, and have pledged themselves to prevent the enforcement of the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court ordering the end of segregation. This manifesto reflects the Southern point of view that the Supreme Court decision is an encroachment on States' rights.

One of our liberal Senators has suggested that a petition in response to the Dixie declaration, circulated among the other Members of Congress, would get many more signatures. It seems much more practical to me at this time, however, to urge further consideration of the civil rights bills which have been pending in Congress for a number of years—the anti-poll-tax bill, the anti-lynch bill, the fair employment practices bill, and so forth.

With racial tensions mounting it is time the Congress took some concrete action on civil rights legislation. To delay further will be dangerous, and will hamper seriously the moral progress of our country.

At the present time the problem of civil rights and the fight against discrimination are continuing ones, which we must face realistically, and which must be solved if we are to be true to our own democratic principles, and if we are to maintain and direct the course of the free world. We are no longer a Nation unto ourselves. We live among other nations who look to us for inspiration and leadership. Freedom is our heritage, and we must protect the rights and privileges granted by law to all our citizens, or we lose face in the eyes of the world.

Since the days of our forefathers we have been steadfast in our professed belief that all men are created equal. We must practice what we preach, lest we lend credence to the Communist accusations of divisions and injustices in our own country.

Economic Security for the Family-Size Farming Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I would like to discuss provisions of H. R. 9861, a bill which I introduced on March 12, 1956, to restore economic security to the family-size farming operation.

This bill would place the price-support program for certain basic agricultural commodities under a graduated scale ranging from 95 to 70 percent of parity with volume of production the determining factor.

There have been many arguments advanced for rigid 90 percent of parity price supports on the basic commodities as well as justification given for the present flexible supports provided in the amendments passed by the 83d Congress to the Agricultural Act of 1949. We all recognize there is some merit in both plans for a parity base. There is agreement also on the fact the agricultural program since its beginning in 1933 has largely worked in favor of the big operator and corporation farm. In adjusting parity to make the program less attractive to the big operator, the income of the smaller farmer has been reduced at a time when it was unusually difficult for him to adjust to a lower income because of increased operating costs.

In theory, at least, it is the income of the small farmer on the family-size unit that we are attempting to stabilize. With these considerations in mind, I have prepared and introduced H. R. 9861, a bill which would fix parity on a graduated basis which is varied according to the units of production for certain basic commodities.

This bill contains a graduated scale for wheat and corn with price support set at 95 percent of parity for the first 1,000 bushels of grain produced on any one farming unit, 85 percent on the next 2,000 bushels, 75 percent on the next 3,000 bushels, and 70 percent on all grain exceeding 6,000 bushels.

Based on national production averages, this scale would result in payment of 95 percent of parity support for wheat grown on 65 acres or less, which constitutes approximately 38 percent of the total wheat raised in this country. Support would be 85 percent of parity for wheat grown on acreage exceeding 65 but less than 200, which is approximately 24 percent of total production. Wheat grown in the 200–400 acre range is approximately 23 percent of total production and would be supported at 75 percent of parity. Production on more than 400 acres, approximately 15 percent of the total wheat raised, would be supported at 70 percent of parity.

In the case of corn, also based on national averages, the scale would result in payment of 95 percent of parity support for production on less than 27 acres, approximately 25 percent of the total corn raised. Support would be 85 percent of parity for corn grown on acreage exceeding 27 but less than 100 acres, which is approximately 49 percent of total production. Corn grown in the 100–200 acre range is approximately 18 percent of total production and would be supported at 75 percent of parity. Production on more than 200 acres, approximately 8 percent of the total corn raised, would be supported at 70 percent of parity.

H. R. 9861 also contains a graduated scale for cotton and peanuts which specifies 95 percent of parity for the first 12 bales of cotton and first 8,000 pounds of peanuts produced on the farm, 85 percent of parity for the next 24 bales of cotton and next 16,000 pounds of peanuts produced on the same unit, 75 percent of parity for the next 36 bales of cotton and next 24,000 pounds of peanuts produced on the same farming unit, and 70 percent of parity for all production exceeding 72 bales of cotton and all production exceeding 48,000 pounds of peanuts on the same farming unit.

The principle of this graduated parity system is obvious. The small farmer, who is not for the most part a commercial producer, would receive a higher parity for his crop than would the big operator and corporation farm. It would definitely be advantageous to the small farmer. Most Members of Congress have expressed interest in the problems of this group and this legislation would work directly to the end of easing the economic situation of the small farmer while also reducing the incentive for further overproduction of commodities now in surplus supply. If the number of cooperating farms under this plan is approximately the same as under the present plan, the cost to the Federal Government would remain the same as it now is.

One of the weaknesses of the present price-support program is that it results in the payment of ridiculously high loans to the big operator or corporation farm, the very producer who does not need financial aid. For example, the largest wheat loan to any producer in 1954 was $430,691 paid on 208,881 bushels grown in Montana. The largest corn loan for the same year was $179,127 paid to an Iowa producer on 115,566 bushels. But the whopper of them all was the loan payment of $1,292,472 for 7,554

bales of cotton grown by a Mississippi producer.

I am certain it is not the intent of Congress to make the corporate producer prosper at the expense of the family-size farming operators. As I pointed out previously, efforts to adjust parity to make the program less attractive to the big operator have resulted in a reduction of income for the smaller farmer at a time when it was unusually difficult for him to adjust to a lower income because of increased operating costs. H. R. 9861 would make the program less attractive to the large operator while also bolstering the economic lot of his smaller neighbor. This is in accordance with the request by President Eisenhower in his farm message to Congress that a dollar limit be placed on the size of price-support loans available to any one individual or farming unit. The President pointed out that price-support loans of tremendous size have occurred, and stated that it is not sound Government policy to underwrite at public expense such formidable competition with family-operated farms.

I concur wholeheartedly with the President's views and submit the following table as evidence of weakness in the present support program:

Large 1954 crop loans

UNITED STATES WHEAT LOANS, 1954 CROP

Producer	State	Bushels	Loan
1. Campbell Farming Corp.	Montana	208,881	$430,691
2. Broughton Land Co.	Washington	136,969	298,308
3. Grote Farms	do	122,281	286,830
4. R. H. Phillips	do	111,969	268,830
5. Waggoner Estate	Texas	107,673	244,783
6. E. C. Hay & Sons	Idaho	116,710	243,642

UNITED STATES CORN LOANS, 1954 CROP

1. Adams Bros. & Co.	Iowa	115,566	$179,127
2. Emil Savich	Indiana	88,505	145,148
3. Richard Gumz	do	79,798	130,868
4. Charles R. Bartels	Illinois	49,896	82,757
5. Walton & Case Farms.	Ohio	46,570	77,771

UNITED STATES RICE LOANS, 1954 CROP

Producer	State	Loan
1. Louisiana Irrigation & Mill Co.	Louisiana	$486,725
2. Craighead Rice Mill Co.	Arkansas	431,853
3. Southern Rice Co.	do	350,824

UNITED STATES COTTON LOANS, 1954 CROP

Producer	State	Bales	Loan
1. Delta & Pine Land Co.	Mississippi	7,554	$1,292,472
2. Chandler Co.	Texas	3,945	814,801
3. J. G. Adams & Son	Arkansas	3,998	624,754
4. Buchanan Farms	Texas	2,298	449,661

I submit that H. R. 9861, coupled with provisions of the proposed soil-bank program, would bring lasting beneficial results not only to the agricultural economy but to the national economy as a whole. Briefly stated, here is what I believe this bill would accomplish:

First. Greater long-range benefits to all farmers through stabilization of the economy and immediate financial relief to small operators through support payments this year.

Second. Impartial treatment for all farmers, regardless of the size of operations.

Third. Wheat produced for domestic consumption, such as food, feed, and seed, will be grown by small and medium farming units who come under the high parity price supports provisions.

Fourth. The excessive production by large farming units will fall under lower parity support provisions and will have to be sold in foreign trade at the going market price. This will return surplus commodities to natural economic conditions and should result in reduced production.

Fifth. Large loan payments, which are undesirable from the viewpoint of the taxpaying public and the family-sized farm operators whose livelihood they jeopardize, would be reduced substantially.

Sixth. Lessening of incentive for overproduction of commodities now in surplus supply would result in a large-scale shift in operations by large farming units back to grasses, legumes, and other land uses which come under provisions of the proposed soil-bank program. Resulting reduction in wheat acreage would enable the useful disposal of the Nation's wheat stockpile over a period of years.

Seventh. Curtailment of production incentive would result in a trend back to the average-sized farm, thereby preserving a valuable segment of traditional American society.

Eighth. A stabilized production basis, with excess production turned to world markets, would result in reduced feedgrain prices. This would directly lessen farm production costs, thereby benefiting the entire agricultural economy.

Recognition of Organization of Postal and Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, all new Members of Congress become quickly aware through correspondence with their constituents in the civil service that there is confusion, failure, and injustice in our Federal grievance procedures. Our civil servants find themselves second-class citizens under the present system where they so often have to fight for the fundamental right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty as guaranteed under our Constitution.

In the belief that full recognition of unions is the first step toward minimizing the confusion and injustices now existing, I am today introducing legislation to give them this deserved recognition. Because of the public-service nature of Federal employment, the union rights of these employees are understandably limited in certain respects. But the fact that it is unlawful to strike against the Government should not reduce employee unions to completely impotent and unrecognized representatives of Government employees. Legislation to give full recognition to employee unions for the purpose of grievances and appeals is a must. Some Government departments claim this is already the case in practice, therefore such legislation is not needed. If this is true, or to the extent that it is true, passage of this measure will do no harm. If it is not the case, as I believe, then the legislation which I have introduced to grant this recognition is vitally needed.

Mr. Speaker, this need was brought out in a report of the House Subcommittee on Civil Service during the 83d Congress, when a very detailed and excellent investigation was made of our grievance procedures. The report pointed out:

> There has been too little consultation by departments, agencies, and the Civil Service Commission with established employee groups. * * * The subcommittee had an opportunity to observe at firsthand the work being done by the larger employee organizations, and found that these organizations are a real force for good in keeping purely vexatious and frivolous appeals and grievances at a minimum.

In addition to full recognition for employee unions, it becomes clear that there is need not only for improved administration of present grievance machinery—its simplification and clarification—but new legislation to provide an equal right of appeal for both preference and nonpreference Federal employees within certain limitations. Moreover, it is vital that supervisors be given special training in how to inform their employees of appeals and grievance rights and how to handle grievances properly.

Now I would like to go from this general summary into some detail on this complex subject. After thorough examination and investigation, relying heavily on the yeoman's job done by the House Subcommittee on Civil Service in the 83d Congress, I have found that the following situation seems to exist.

There are literally as many different appeals and grievance systems as there are departments and agencies. The confusion of thinking represented by these many procedures extends, also, to opinions on what should be done to improve them. There is no better exposition of the disparity in administrative handling of appeals and grievances than a simple comparison of the regulations which provide minimum and maximum rights. Three old-line departments, for instance, have no provision at all for real appeals from removals and suspensions. There is no formal hearing or right to confront and cross-examine an accuser. In these departments the charges and the employee's answer are reviewed at bureau level, in the Office of Personnel, and in the Office of the Secretary before the penalty is finalized. At the opposite extreme we find a large department which some time ago reported an average time for appellate proceedings—complete with hearings, reviews, and rereviews—of about 5 months. While it is understood that this period may have been reduced somewhat in recent months, this Department's program appears rather more extensive and detailed than necessary.

There is singular unanimity of opinion with respect to the undesirability of the existing situation. Almost to a man, top personnel and operating officials have sharply criticized the complexity and prolixity of the present laws, regulations, and procedures.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Civil Service of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the failure of Civil Service Commission leadership in this field became apparent. Weakness and looseness of the Commission's rules and regulations were held responsible for their failure to act under the implied authority of the Lloyd-La Follette Act of 1912 and the Veterans Preference Act of 1944.

But the Civil Service Commission is not wholly to blame for the confusion and lack of leadership. During the hearings concern was expressed at the lack of cooperation on the part of some Government agencies in complying with Civil Service Commission directives.

As a result of its study, the subcommittee had among its findings the following:

First. The primary responsibility for the prompt, economical, and just disposition of appeals and grievances rests with each executive department and agency and is an integral part of overall management responsibility. The importance of this principle has never been fully recognized; nor is it spelled out with sufficient clarity anywhere in the present law or regulations.

Second. The executive branch of the Government is without adequate machinery to guarantee equal and fair treatment to all Federal employees in respect to appeals from adverse personnel actions.

Third. The volume and seriousness of appeals and grievances are directly related to supervisory ability and alertness or the lack of it. It has been conservatively estimated that this one factor is concerned in 90 percent of appeals and grievances. There is urgent need for improvement in supervisory training—especially in the understanding and handling of employees' problems.

Fourth. The departments and agencies are not making effectual use of even such appeals machinery as presently exists. This results from lack of supervisory ability mentioned above.

Fifth. There has been too little consultation by departments and agencies—and by the Civil Service Commission—with established employee groups.

Sixth. The subcommittee had an opportunity to observe at firsthand the work being done by the larger employee organizations, and found that these organizations are a real force for good in keeping purely vexatious and frivolous appeals and grievances at a minimum.

Seventh. The Civil Service Commission appeals procedure is slow, cumbersome, and repetitive, has far too many steps and levels of consideration, and in some respects is practically useless. It does not even purport to protect nonpreference employees. The Commission affords protection in a negative fashion for preference employees to the extent that it evades jurisdiction of substantive matters and restricts itself to review of compliance with procedures.

Eighth. There is no adequate provision of law for recompense in all cases of erroneous or improper dismissal, suspension, or demotion of Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, the facts speak for themselves. Our present grievance and appeals procedures for Federal employees are desperately in need of overhauling. I hope the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will give the House an opportunity to vote on a bill containing the recommendations of its subcommittee. Meanwhile, I urge that the first step be taken for a more fair and workable system by granting full recognition to employee unions, as embodied in the bill I am now introducing.

The Gallant Struggle for Freedom by the People of the Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the gallant struggle which the people of the Ukraine are making against the forces of world communism is a matter of inspiration to us all. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared emphasizing the Ukrainian people's continuing contribution to the cause of the free world be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

Throughout the ages man's character has been measured by his ability to overcome the forces pitted against him in his struggle for a better life. All too often his battle has been fought against certain of his fellow men who, for reasons of personal greed, lust, or power have endeavored to destroy our free institutions, deny the teachings of God, and make slaves of all people. The pages of history recount many such individuals who have sought to impose their will upon freedom-loving people. Though successful for a time, inevitably their stranglehold on freemen has been loosened, in most instances through the courage, fortitude, and will of men to be free. We continue to live in a hostile world, and man must still fight for his freedom and independence if we are to achieve a better world for tomorrow when all people will live in peace and harmony with their neighbors in accordance with God's teachings.

Those of us who now enjoy freedom and independence look with sorrow and anguish upon the plight of our close friends, the people of the Ukraine, whose lives must now be lived in anticipation of liberty rather than the enjoyment of it. The annals of mankind contain no greater display of valor and courage than that of the people of the Ukraine in their struggle for freedom. On occasions they have achieved independence only to lose it through no fault of their own. At the present time the oppressive yoke of the Communist dictators weighs heavily upon their shoulders.

Running roughshod over both remembrances of the heroic past and over hopes for a brighter future is the grim reality of the present—the chains of the Communist conspiracy which grips the Ukraine and seeks relentlessly to suck the lifeblood of liberty and national pride from her veins. Diabolical schemes to destroy this freedom-loving and peaceful nation flow interminably from the warped, depraved minds of foreign tyrants.

With a firm knowledge and understanding of these stark realities, with great respect for their devotion to our common cause, the people of the Ukraine have our admiration and esteem. The struggle against tyranny and oppression shall go forward with vigor and strength sustained by their magnificent example—the Ukrainian people's undying and unconquerable will to be free.

Address by Hon. John J. Sparkman, of Alabama, Concerning Recent Announcement by the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the able address by our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], delivered over the Mutual Broadcasting Co. last week, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The speech is an analysis of the recent announcement of the President of his availability as a candidate for reelection to the Presidency.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN J. SPARKMAN, DEMOCRAT OF ALABAMA, OVER MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 1956

One week ago tonight President Eisenhower was given time on all of the Nation's radio and television systems to announce and discuss his candidacy for a second term on the Republican Presidential ticket.

His decision to make that race confronts the people of this country with challenging questions which are unprecedented—questions which have never before been raised in a Presidential election campaign since we started holding popular elections more than 160 years ago. Some of those questions were discussed by Mr. Eisenhower himself the night of February 29 in his 20-minute explanation of his decision to run again.

It is the duty of the opposition party to discuss, earnestly and honestly, the issues President Eisenhower set forth, and other questions which are properly related to his candidacy. As one who has been chosen as the Democratic Party's spokesman for this occasion tonight, I desire to express to the Mutual Broadcasting System our party's appreciation of Mutual's fair play in granting the Democratic Party equal time to that devoted to Mr. Eisenhower's opening political speech in the 1956 campaign.

PRESIDENT REGARDS HIS HEALTH AS CAMPAIGN FACTOR

To begin, let me say that all Democrats rejoice at the extent of President Eisenhower's recovery from the heart attack

he suffered last September 24. All good Americans—and that of course includes all true Democrats—sincerely wish the fullest possible measure of happy years to Dwight D. Eisenhower. Our political references have never and will never lessen that personal regard.

We respect Mr. Eisenhower for the candor he has shown in his report to the people on his condition. We thank him for his frank explanation of the terms on which his candidacy is based, and for his exposition of the conditions attached to his continued occupancy of the Chief Executive's office.

The American public, we are certain, is gratified at the fact that the President did not accept the view expressed by Republican Chairman Leonard Hall that Mr. Eisenhower's health is not a consideration in this campaign. We are glad that the President does not share Mr. Hall's attitude that it is somehow wrong to discuss Mr. Eisenhower's physical capacity for the presidential office which he now seeks to hold for another 4-year term.

Judging by Mr. Eisenhower's own statements about his condition, I am also confident that he does not feel that the question was settled—and the debate closed—when he announced his candidacy as a second-term candidate.

All the Democrats I have talked to regret that there is a health question which is bound to divert attention from the great policy issues which our party intends to raise during the coming campaign. The issue of Mr. Eisenhower's physical fitness for this race and for another 4-year term was not injected into this campaign by the Democratic Party. It was introduced by Mr. Eisenhower himself.

The President first raised the question of his own health in a telegram to the secretary of state of New Hampshire on January 19, in which he said:

"It would be idle to pretend that my health can be wholly restored to the excellent state in which the doctors believed it to be in mid-September."

And then, more significantly, he added:

"My future life must be carefully regulated to avoid excessive fatigue."

If there was any doubt that the President considered his health a major consideration, he dispelled that doubt in his television broadcast to the Nation on February 29. He devoted nearly all of that broadcast to a discussion of his physical condition, and of the restrictions this would impose upon his future conduct of the highest office in the land.

HIS PHYSICAL CONDITION MUST IMPOSE RESTRICTIONS ON PRESIDENT'S ACTIVITIES

What the President was telling the country in that broadcast was this: For the rest of his time in the White House, he will have to conduct the duties of the Presidency on a sharply curtailed schedule. He is quite frankly and openly saying to the country that he can never be a truly full-time President, unrestricted in his activities.

This should bring no personal criticism upon the President, and I do not mean to imply any personal criticism of him. The curtained schedule he outlined to the people is entirely to be expected of a man of his age who has suffered a heart attack. The question the voters must consider, is, Should any man operating under known restrictions upon his activity be chosen for the toughest and most important job in the country? Should we, the citizens of the United States, deliberately choose a part-time President?

The issue raised by the President, then, is "Shall we or shall we not have a part-time President?"

What does this issue mean to us, as citizens, and to our country?

ONLY THE PRESIDENT MAY MAKE FUNDAMENTAL POLICY DECISIONS

First of all, I think this issue raises basic questions about our form of Government as it was designed by the Founding Fathers and set forth in the Constitution. Under the Constitution, "the Executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America"—who shall be elected by the people. Of course, the President must appoint associates to help him administer the Government, but the Executive power resides in the President, and no one else. It is important to remember that none of the Cabinet officers is elected by or directly answerable to the people; in fact, nowhere in the Constitution is there any mention of a Cabinet. The same applies to members of the President's personal staff.

It would be idle to think that the President can achieve the curtailed schedule demanded by his doctors simply by dropping social and ceremonial functions from his schedule. He himself spoke of handing over to his associates functions which lie at the very core of the Presidency, and which, under the Constitution, cannot be delegated to nonelected subordinates of the President.

For example, the President spoke of having devoted "much time and effort," during his first 2½ years in office, to the task of "clarifying our own thinking with respect to problems of international peace and our Nation's security * * * problems of the Nation's farmers; the need for highways; the building of schools; the extension of social welfare and a myriad of other items of similar importance."

But then the President goes on to say, "In many cases these things can now be done equally well by my close associates."

ANY DELEGATION OF BASIC POLICYMAKING WOULD SHRINK PRESIDENCY

This basic policymaking function, which Mr. Eisenhower proposes to delegate, is the Presidency itself. To delegate any basic part of this policymaking function, to nonelected subordinates actually means a shrinking of the office of the Presidency. Perhaps some fringe and ceremonial activities can and should be dropped from the President's schedule. But Mr. Eisenhower is talking of transferring much more fundamental functions and powers to his subordinates, and I believe we citizens should think very carefully before we allow such powers to be placed in the hands of nonelected officials who are not directly responsible to us. And we should also be wary of allowing such a fundamental change in the office of the Presidency. As the President himself has said, "The problem is what will be the effect on the Presidency, not on me."

The noted columnist Walter Lippmann has commented that President Eisenhower's television speech to the Nation was "the talk of a man who has managed to say, 'Yes,' but is still full of doubts and misgivings." And, Mr. Lippmann added, Mr. Eisenhower's misgivings were unavoidable. That was so, he said, because—and I quote again:

"Given his age and his illness, the one thing the doctors cannot promise him is that he may count on having the extraordinary energies required by the President of the United States. They may tell him, as they have told him, that by following a regime, the risks of death or disability are no greater in his case than for any other man.

"But the real risk is that of a diminishing Chief Executive in what promises to be increasingly difficult and trying days. Five years are a long time at the President's age, and under our system of government there is no way to delegate the critical responsibilities of the office.

"When the President is diminished, there is no one who can anticipate, seize, and master the great issues. Then the basic line of policy is to muddle through somehow.

"Uncertainty about the Presidency has beclouded all our affairs for several months. The uncertainty has not been cleared away. The debate which has been going on inside the White House and in the President's mind is now to become a public debate in an election year. The people are to decide the most unusual question which has ever been put to a democracy. It is a big gamble."

CONTRACTION OF PRESIDENCY WOULD UPSET CONSTITUTIONAL BALANCE OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. Eisenhower's candidacy also poses the question of how much of the President's authority and responsibility will be diminished through disuse. How much will the Presidential office shrink through failure to take decisions which the President alone can take, decisions which cannot be referred to close associates or deputies?

Any such contraction of the Presidency as is contemplated in the Eisenhower proposal cannot but upset the balances set up in our Constitution for the preservation of popular government.

You know that the central pillar of that system is the separation of powers among the three coordinate branches of our Federal Government—the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary. You know too that each branch must fully discharge the responsibilities it bears under our Constitution if our system is to maintain its proper balance and function efficiently.

When one branch is diminished in any way, a dangerous imbalance is created and a hazardous vacuum begins to develop in our Government.

ALREADY THERE IS A LAPSE IN OUR CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM

Unfortunately, there already has been a wide diffusion of the Presidential authority—on a scale unprecedented in our century—under the present administration. President Eisenhower's marked tendency to delegate the Executive leadership to deputies has been increasingly manifest since the beginning of his administration. During the period of hospitalization and recuperation from his heart attack, the diffusion of White House leadership to a sort of regency was necessarily complete. During the period of his resumption of what the White House describes as his normal duties, the absence of a full-time Presidential command has been made apparent. Some of the unhappy consequences of this situation are impressed on the public almost daily in newspaper accounts of incidents reflecting indecision, confusion, and drift, in both our international and domestic affairs.

And now the people are being asked to sanction the indefinite extension of this lapse in our constitutional system, in circumstances which make the hazards larger rather than smaller.

In his television broadcast, Mr. Eisenhower said he thought he could perform as well as ever all the important duties of the Presidency, because "I am actually doing so and have been so for many weeks."

RECENT EVENTS HIGHLIGHT LACK OF LEADERSHIP

Since the President himself has chosen the early weeks of 1956 as the standard by which to judge his performance, let us look closely at the events of those weeks so that each of us can judge whether our country has had the degree of Presidential leadership America will require in the next 5 years.

It was during this period that the United States suffered the embarrassment of reversing itself twice in 2 days on the shipment of tanks to Saudi Arabia. When this incident

first broke into the news, the President was away from the White House, and the Secretary of State was not even reachable by telephone. The burden of this particular crisis fell on the Under Secretary of State and the President's Press Secretary. So shaky was our policy about arms shipment to the Middle East that the tank shipment had to be cancelled in the middle of the night—a decision that was reversed only 40 hours later.

This incident is important because such confusion can only arise when there is no firm direction at the very top. If there were clear Presidential leadership in our Middle East policy, there would be no need for the uncertainty, the hesitation, the hasty orders, and counter-orders.

So far as can be discerned, our Government still has no firm policy in the Middle East. Meanwhile, as America drifts, tensions in the Middle East mount. This is but one of many problems whose solution will not await the convenience of our Government.

Another such problem is the new Soviet economic offensive which poses the most urgent new threat the free world has had to meet in its struggle with the Communists for the uncommitted areas. Here again, the President appears to have no clear policy for meeting this threat, and Secretary Dulles has not added to American stature by his recent claims that the West is making big gains and exerting the initiative in the cold war.

An even clearer example of the vacuum of leadership was Mr. Dulles' "brink of war" misadventure. What caused such consternation throughout the free world was not so much Mr. Dulles' exaggerated claim, but the fact that the policies of the Secretary of State did not seem to square with the stated policies of the President. Then, at a press conference, Mr. Eisenhower was given an opportunity to resolve the matter and reassert his constitutional leadership. But he backed away, because he had not found time to read the Dulles article.

During recent weeks, the President has refused to meet directly the serious charges by General Ridgway that the cuts in our defense forces were dictated by political rather than military consideration.

Meanwhile, the farm crisis has deepened further, but there has been no evidence of Presidential intervention to impart the urgency and imagination needed to meet this emergency.

These are but a few examples of the administration's indecision, and of Mr. Eisenhower's isolation from the stream of events—revealed by the administration's on-again, off-again approach to so many problems. The evidence that Mr. Eisenhower has been a part-time President is confirmed far more by administration indecision and uncertainty than by the fact that the President's workload has been reduced from a 55- to 60-hour week prior to his illness to a 35- to 40-hour week today.

AMERICAN PEOPLE CANNOT SANCTION DEMOTION OF THE PRESIDENCY

The real burden of the Presidency—the policy and command decisions—cannot be reduced. Instead, those burdens are growing constantly, and the evidence of recent weeks tell us that they cannot properly be carried by any President confined to the regime which Mr. Eisenhower must follow.

Mr. Eisenhower's decision to seek another term as President on a limited schedule and under strict medical supervision is, to my mind, contrary to the rule he sets forth in his autobiography, Crusade in Europe.

"The doctors took charge," he writes in an account of a serious illness which struck him while he was our supreme commander in Europe.

"For 4 days they would not let me move," he continues, "and during that time I not only recovered my health, I learned a lesson I did not thereafter violate: A full measure of health is basic to successful command."

I think we can all agree that if a full measure of health is ever needed anywhere, it is needed in the White House. So, in concluding this talk, I do not hesitate to say that the American people cannot and will not sanction the Republican proposal for a part-time President to deal with full-time problems. They will never agree to demotion of the Presidency at a time when the whole free world looks to the American Chief Executive for strength and leadership.

Annual Questionnaire of Hon. Alvin M. Bentley to Constituents in His Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the following result of my annual questionnaire to constituents of my congressional district:

MARCH 14, 1956.

Congressman ALVIN M. BENTLEY, Republican, Michigan, today released the results of his annual questionnaire sent to residents of the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan. Mr. BENTLEY said that he had received about a 15-percent return on the 55,000 questionnaires. Those replying were divided into occupations as follows:

	Percent
Farmers	22
Workers	19
Business	13
Professional	11
Housewife	6
White collar	6
Other	23

The following is the list of questions included in the Congressman's poll and the percentage replying affirmatively to the individual answers (percentages do not usually total 100 because few persons answered all questions):

1. On the question of farm price supports, I am in favor of:

	Percent
(1) Supports at 90 percent of parity	15.4
(2) Flexible supports from 75 to 90 percent of parity	43.9
(3) No supports	30.8

Mr. BENTLEY commented that farmers who replied to this question voted as follows:
(1) 28.2 percent.
(2) 31.1 percent.
(3) 34.6 percent.

2. If there is a surplus in our national budget next year, I favor:

	Percent
(1) Apply the surplus toward retirement of the national debt	64.1
(2) An income tax cut through increasing personal exemptions	27.8
(3) A tax cut through lowering personal tax rates	14.3
(4) Reducing the corporate tax rates	1.9
(5) Cutting excise taxes	6.2

A majority of all groups voted for (1). Several persons voted for more than one answer.

3. In the field of Federal aid to education, I favor:

	Percent
(1) The Federal Government providing school-construction funds to States on a matching basis	33.3
(2) The Federal Government making long-term, low-interest loans to States for school construction	44.5
(3) No Federal aid	20.1

All groups gave a majority to (2).

4. For financing Federal aid to highways, I favor:

	Percent
(1) The issuance of bonds to be retired from future gas and fuel oil taxes	62.2
(2) Tax increases on gasoline, other fuels, trucks, tires, and related products	24.1

All groups gave a majority to (1).

5. Military and economic aid to friendly foreign nations should be:

	Percent
(1) Increased	6.6
(2) Kept at present levels	58.7
(3) Stopped	24.0

All groups gave a majority to (2).

6. New social-security legislation should:

	Percent
(1) Lower the retirement age for women	39.0
(2) Permit increased outside earnings	51.6
(3) Permit disabled workers to get benefits at age 50	52.4
(4) Increase minimum benefits to retired workers	33.8

Farmers and workers gave a majority of their votes to (3); all other groups to (2).

7. If you answer any part of question No. 6, should contributions be raised to keep the system on a pay-as-you-go basis?

	Percent
Yes	68.3
No	16.6

All groups voted in the affirmative.

8. Regarding the McCarran-Walter Act, I favor:

	Percent
(1) Changing its provisions to permit more liberal immigration	11.3
(2) Repealing the act	10.5
(3) Leaving it unchanged	48.3

All groups gave a majority vote to (3). This question was omitted by many.

9. To balance the post-office budget, I favor:

	Percent
(1) Raise first-class rates if necessary	36.3
(2) Raise only second- and third-class rates	50.4
(3) Leave the postal budget in the red but no raises	9.0

All groups voted for (2).

10. The Federal Government should provide low-cost disaster insurance against floods and other catastrophes:

	Percent
Yes	59.0
No	20.7

All groups voted affirmatively.

11. I favor passage of a right-to-work law outlawing the union shop:

	Percent
Yes	64.0
No	20.4

All groups voted in the majority affirmatively. Workers voted 48.3 percent "yes," and 36.0 percent "no."

12. I favor permitting labor unions to use compulsory membership dues for political purposes:

	Percent
Yes	6.4
No	79.2

A majority of all groups voted negatively. Workers voted 9.8 percent "yes" and 79.2 percent "no."

13. Hawaii and Alaska should both be admitted as States:

	Percent
Yes	70.6
No	9.9

All groups voted affirmatively.

14. The Federal Government should control natural gas prices:

	Percent
(1) At the wellhead	26.8
(2) In interstate pipelines	29.0
(3) Not at all	23.8

Farmers and other groups gave a slight majority to (1), all remaining categories an equally slight majority to (2).

15. I think the Federal Government should check the growth in size of:

	Percent
(1) Corporations	49.8
(2) Labor unions	66.6
(3) Government itself	47.7

Mr. BENTLEY commented here: "Many persons voted for 2 and even 3 of these answers. However, all groups gave a majority to (2). The vote among workers was surprising since it was 53.5 percent for (1) and 58.5 percent for (2)."

The Michigan Congressman concluded by saying:

"The results of this poll are very helpful to me and I wish to express my appreciation to all those who replied. I also want to thank those who included their personal comments and opinions. All of those will be personally answered as soon as possible.

"I would say that the most controversial questions appear to be on the farm program, the type of Federal aid to education, the nature of social-security amendments, postal rates, natural gas control, and certainly the final question, No. 15. During the balance of this session and during the next Congress, if I am reelected, I shall do my best to reflect majority opinion within my district, guided by my own judgment and consideration in all these matters."

Anniversary of Hungarian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, more than 100 years ago, in the year 1848, the Hungarian people under the leadership of Louis Kossuth revolted against an authoritarian regime. Unfortunately their independence was short-lived. That day of independence is still celebrated, nevertheless, in thousands of homes both in Europe and the United States. Indeed, there are today many fine men and women living in my own congressional district who have been obliged to flee from Hungary and seek refuge in our own country. They have come here to escape a newer tyranny which tightly grips their native land.

Although the Hungarian people today still suffer from oppression, the celebration of this March 15 anniversary should give them hope and inspiration. A desire for liberty is an invincible force. The cause of freedom, and the will of a people for independence cannot be quenched. We here in the United States can salute their courage and wish them well.

Bill To Amend Credit Union Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a proposed amendment to the Credit Union Act I am introducing today, along with an explanation of the proposal. It is as follows:

Following amendment of the Federal Credit Union Act as proposed, the sections referred to would read, through the amended parts, as follows (portions in brackets being the additions):

"Section 7 (5), Federal Credit Union Act (12 U. S. C., sec. 1757 (5)): To make loans with maturities not exceeding 3 years to its members for provident or productive purposes upon such terms and conditions as this chapter and the bylaws provide and as the credit committee [(except as provided in section 11 (d) of this chapter)] may approve, at rates of interest not exceeding 1 percent per month on unpaid balances (inclusive of all charges incident to making the loan): *Provided,* That no loans to a director, officer, or member of a committee shall exceed the amount of his holdings in the Federal credit union as represented by shares thereof."

"Section 11 (d), Federal Credit Union Act (12 U. S. C., sec. 1761 (d)): The credit committee shall hold such meetings as the business of the Federal credit union may require and not less frequently than once a month (of which meetings due notice shall be given to members of the committee) to consider applications for loans. No loan shall be made unless approved by a majority of the entire committee and by all the members of the committee who are present at the meeting at which the application is considered: [*Provided, however,* (i) the credit committee may delegate to the treasurer or assistant treasurer authority to approve a loan to a member of a Federal credit union which is secured in its entirety by an assignment of shares in such Federal credit union owned by such member which are not impaired by pledge or assignment as security on any other loan to such member or others, and (ii) the credit committee may appoint one or more loan officers, who may be the treasurer or assistant treasurer, and delegate to him (them) power to approve or disapprove loans within limitations authorized by the committee on any such loan officer. The applicant for a loan may appeal from the decision of the loan officer to the credit committee. No loan officer, including the treasurer or assistant treasurer, if appointed as such, shall have authority to disburse funds of the Federal credit union for any loan which has been approved by him except as to loans secured in accordance with subdivision (i) of this subsection. No more than one member of the credit committee may be appointed as a loan officer. A loan officer may be compensated to the extent authorized by the board of directors. All loans approved by treasurer, assistant treasurer, or a loan officer shall be reviewed by the credit committee at its next regular meeting]."

There are two purposes in the proposed legislation. The first is to permit the credit committee of a Federal credit union to delegate to the treasurer or assistant treasurer authority to approve a loan which is fully secured by the member's shares in the credit union, and to disburse funds therefor. In this respect, if the treasurer or assistant treasurer has authority to approve and disburse a loan secured by shares it might prevent the member withdrawing them to meet his needs, particularly if he must have funds immediately. Members usually prefer to borrow than to withdraw savings.

The second purpose is to give the credit committee the right to appoint one or more loan officers and delegate to him (them) power to approve or disapprove loans within limitations determined by the committee, with the applicant having the right to appeal from the decision of the loan officer to the credit committee. No loan officer would have authority to disburse funds for any loan which he has approved as a loan officer, if he is also a disbursing officer of the credit union, except as to loans fully secured by the borrowing member's shares.

The credit committee will have the responsibility of appointing the loan officer, and all loans made in accordance with either of the foregoing provisions must be reviewed by the committee at its next regular meeting.

The enactment of these amendments to the Federal Credit Union Act would enable federally chartered credit unions to render more prompt and efficient service to their borrowing members.

Committee for Montazzolesi Children's Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, all of us in this body were especially conscious of the warm bond of friendship between the people of the United States and the people of the Republic of Italy when President Giovanni Gronchi visited us recently and addressed a joint session of the Congress. Preservation of this close feeling is vital to the welfare of both nations. Our Government has done much to help our Italian friends. Much more remains to be done, and perhaps emphasis should now be on private, rather than public, efforts.

Recently I called the attention of this body to the support given by many Americans to Boys Towns of Italy, a magnificient program designed to give war orphans the opportunity of achieving a meaningful way of life. A new expression of our friendship for Italy was born recently in a community in my district—Scotch Plains, N. J. A group of my constituents have formed the Committee for Montazzolesi Children's Welfare, choosing as their honorary chairmen Don Nicola Masciuli, of Montazzoli, Italy, and Rev. John S. Nelligan, pastor of St. Bartholomew the Apostle Church, Scotch Plains, at whose invitation Don Masciuli had visted the United States last summer.

This organization has dedicated its efforts to raising funds for the establishment of a children's nursery in Montazzoli. The officers are Paul Di Francesco,

president; Warren Sangiuliano, vice president; Felix Novello, secretary; and Arthur Venneri, treasurer. These men—indeed, all the members and contributors to the Committee for Montazzolesi Children's Welfare—are to be commended for their dedicated work on a project which embodies as little else can the friendship we hold for Italy and the determination we feel to help Italian children get a healthy start toward productive and happy lives.

A Bill To Provide Insurance for Motor Vehicle Employees of the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, March 13, I had introduced a bill, H. R. 9911, which would provide for the insuring against accidents of the employees of the Post Office Department who drive vehicles in the carrying out of their duties.

Under present law, there is no protection whatsoever for the individual postal employee who is assigned to the duty of driving a Post Office Department vehicle if he is involved in an accident. True, the Department itself has authority under the Federal Tort Claims Act to make settlements up to a certain amount with any injured party. However, this does not preclude the possibility of the driver of a postal vehicle also being sued and having a judgment rendered against him, irrespective of whether or not the Department has or has not acknowledged liability and made a settlement. There have been a considerable number of instances reported of situations where individual employees find judgments rendered against them for accidents for which the Department accepts no responsibility and makes no payment.

At the present time there is no provision for insurance to cover the possible liability of these drivers for damages or injuries caused by the vehicle they are operating in the performance of official duties. Equity and good conscience certainly dictate that some provision should be made to provide insurance coverage for these drivers who are sometimes called upon to operate trucks or other vehicles that may not be in completely satisfactory operating condition. Additionally, in many cases weather conditions and other traffic hazards increase the possibility of accidents. We all know the motto of the postal employees: "Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night shall stay these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds." These employees are in what might be termed a hazardous situation because of the service they render, their devotion to duty, their customary habit of driving vehicles whenever postal service is needed regardless of prevailing conditions. Because of this, they are placed in extraordinary situations, above and beyond that which most drivers face, in which there is much greater danger of sustaining accidents.

The probable cost of such large-fleet insurance coverage for postal vehicle drivers as recommended in my bill would not be prohibitive and would certainly be a sound investment for the Government when compared with the highly desirable measure of protection and assurance it would provide for these employees and their families.

Bill To Amend Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to the operators of farms which are smaller than those capable of supporting family units.

This bill is intended to supplement the purposes of H. R. 8834 and H. R. 8835, which I earlier in the session introduced to liberalize credit through the Farmers Home Administration, to worthy farmers who cannot obtain credit from private sources, but who can repay such loans is given liberal enough terms. In essence, this bill would:

First. Authorize real estate loans to owner-operators of family-type farms for the refinancing of debts. Insured loans for this purpose may not exceed $45 million per fiscal year. This would authorize refinancing as the sole purpose of the loan where it is now limited to an incidental loan purpose.

Second. Authorize real estate and operating loans under titles I and II of the act on less than adequate farms where satisfactory off-farm income is to be available. This would permit the Department to more adequately serve the credit needs of farmers and ranchers for housing and other farm buildings and assist low-income farmers under the Rural Development Program.

Third. Increase the aggregate amount of insured loans for a fiscal year from $100 million to $125 million.

Fourth. Eliminate the present limitation on insured loans of not exceeding 90 percent of the fair and reasonable value of the farm, thereby placing the insured loans and direct loans under title I on the same basis.

Fifth. Eliminating the requirements that loans may not be made in excess of the average value of efficient family-type farm management units in the county, thereby making it possible to serve any family-type farm operator who is otherwise eligible for credit services under the act.

Sixth. Provide that, not to exceed 10 percent of the annual appropriation for operating loans under title II may be used for loans in excess of $10,000 but in no event in excess of $20,000.

Seventh. Permit in justifiable cases, due to causes beyond the borrower's control, outstanding loans to be renewed or extended for a period not to exceed 11 years and also authorize the agency to make further loans in such cases during the 11-year period. Present limitation is 7 years.

Eighth. Change the name of loans under title II from "Production and Subsistence Loans" to "Operating Loans."

Ninth. Extend and revise the authority under the statute for the compromise, adjustment, and reduction of debts for loans being serviced by the agency. These suggested amendments are based upon operating experience that would improve the loan-servicing aspects of the agency's program.

Tenth. There are several other minor changes of less significance but which would improve the administration of the program.

Public Opinion in the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting a questionnaire submitted to voters of the Seventh District of Virginia, together with the answers thereto.

To each of the 3,668 voters who answered this questionnaire, I am sending a copy of this statement. In addition, I am returning the original questionnaire as filled out by each of them. This is to enable each person to compare his answers with the overall results. It will also assure each person that his answers are confidential.

Many of those answering were kind enough to write some comments. There were four topics which were the subject of more comment than others.

These topics are:

SOCIAL SECURITY

Opinion was sought in the questionnaire on the changes in the social security law in the bill now pending in the Congress. Of the answers received, 2,515 favored the measure and 993 opposed it. Many of those who opposed wrote that they did so because they thought the bill did not go far enough. In addition, over half of those answering the questionnaire wrote in comments advocating various methods of liberalizing the existing law.

It is important that everyone realize that the benefits payable under social security come entirely from the fund paid in by the working people and their employers, and by the self-employed, in the social security tax. In other words, social security is an insurance fund, and if the benefits are larger than the fund will stand, there will be no money to pay them.

For example, in full operation, it would cost nearly $2 billion a year for every year the basic benefit age was lowered from 65. It would be necessary to increase the tax paid by the working people and their employers a total of about 1 percent for each year lowered.

THIRD CLASS MAIL

A total of 3,087 persons favored requiring advertising circulars and letters now sent at reduced bulk rate to pay the full first-class rate. Only 163 were opposed to this.

In January, I introduced a bill to do this. I am regretful that the bill has been opposed by the administration.

RACIAL INTEGRATION OF SCHOOLS

Many answering the questionnaire expressed the hope that Congress would pass a law restricting the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Southern Congressmen and Senators are in agreement that it is impossible to do this. Indeed, there may be danger that the Congress would enact legislation to carry out the Supreme Court decision.

INCREASED PERSONAL EXEMPTION ON INCOME TAX

Many of those answering wrote comments advocating increase in personal exemption. Those answering the questionnaire also voted 2,961 to 583 against any tax reduction until the Federal budget is balanced.

The Federal budget is not yet balanced, and there would be a loss in revenue to the Treasury of $2,400,000,000 for every $100 that personal exemptions are raised.

It is my sincere hope that soon Government expenditures may be reduced to the point that Congress may enact legislation giving tax relief to those in the lower income brackets.

The questionnaire and the results follow:

	Yes	No	No opinion
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS			
1. Do you favor continuing military aid to foreign nations presumed friendly to us?	2,423	907	338
2. Do you favor continuing economic aid to foreign nations presumed friendly to us—			
(a) For 1 year?	2,001	905	
(b) On a long-term basis?	814	1,454	
3. Do you approve shifting unused United States immigration quotas to countries which have used up their quotas?	1,095	2,033	540
4. Do you think our immigration quotas should be changed in favor of the nations of southern Europe?	584	2,245	839
5. Do you think the United States should join the Organization for Trade Cooperation, an international agency to administer reciprocal trade agreements?	2,085	745	838
6. By law, a treaty is the highest obligation of the United States. Do you favor the Bricker amendment to the Constitution which would provide that, "No treaty or other international agreement shall of itself be law within the United States, nor shall it enlarge the power of the Congress to enact law?"	1,475	1,281	912
7. In general, do you believe the Nation as a whole would benefit more from—			
A gradual further decrease in our tariffs?	1,504		1,275
Increased tariffs and/or extension of the import quota idea?	889		
AGRICULTURE			
8. Do you approve of a soil bank plan, which would pay farmers in cash or surplus commodities or both, to take a portion of their producing lands out of field crop production?	1,526	1,754	388
9. Do you think farmers should be permitted to raise outside of quotas as much wheat as they need for feed on the farm?	2,786	679	203
10. Do you approve limiting the amount of price support money available to any one farmer or farm operation?	2,951	397	320
11. Do you favor exempting from the Federal gasoline tax gasoline used by farmers off the highway, such as in farm machinery?	2,611	899	158
12. Do you favor a food-stamp plan, or something similar, to provide for issuance of meat to needy families when meat is in surplus?	2,623	756	289
13. Do you think our farm policy should include price supports on a basis of—			
(a) A return to rigid supports on basic commodities?	641	1,662	1,365
(b) Continuation of the flexible supports on the basic commodities?	2,063	637	968
14. Do you favor extension of the price support system to any agricultural commodities not now covered?	365	2,368	935
State which:			
FEDERAL FINANCES			
15. Do you believe the Federal budget should be balanced before tax reductions of any kind are considered?	2,961	583	124
16. If it becomes clear that the sentiment in Congress is for some tax relief, even though the budget is not balanced, indicate by numbering in the order of your preference these proposals:			
(209) Reduction or elimination of the capital gains tax.			
(123) Reduction in the corporate income tax.			
(284) Reduction or elimination of Federal excise tax.			
(1,497) Increase in the personal exemptions under the income tax.			
(607) A flat, across the board reduction in the individual income tax.			
(880) A graduated reduction in the individual income tax.			
17. If the budget is balanced, do you think tax reduction should be delayed until some reduction is made in the national debt?	2,326	1,119	223
18. The Post Office Department continued to operate at a heavy loss, although 1st-class mail substantially pays its own way. Do you think an increase in postal rates is preferable to making up the postal deficit out of taxes?	2,538	736	394
19. If so, would you favor—			
(a) A 1-cent increase in the 1st-class rate to help make up the deficit on the other types of mail?	700	1,852	1,116
(b) An increase in parcel post rates?	966	1,503	1,199
(c) An increase in the rates on newspapers and magazines?	2,009	708	951
(d) Requiring advertising circulars and letters now sent at the reduced bulk rate to pay the full 1st-class rate?	3,087	163	418
PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS			
20. Do you favor a new Federal highway program with emphasis on improving the major through roads of the Nation?	2,132	1,139	397
21. If so, do you think the Federal Government should have the say as to which roads are to be improved?	1,243	1,662	763
22. Would you prefer a new Federal highway program which merely provided more money on the matching basis with the States as at present?	2,155	914	599
23. If we are to have a new Federal highway construction program, superimposed on the existing plan, do you think it should be financed—			
(a) By an increase in the Federal gasoline tax alone?	963	1,486	1,219
(b) By an increase in the Federal gasoline tax and in Federal excise taxes on motor vehicles and motor vehicle parts, such as tires?	1,461	961	1,246
24. Do you believe that trucks pay their fair share of highway costs?	1,010	2,129	529
25. If not, how would you suggest the highway user tax burden be equalized?			
26. Do you favor direct Federal grants to the States for school construction?	1,553	1,809	306
27. If a Federal regulation, or court order, required that such Federal money could go only to integrated schools, would you favor taking the money anyway?	966	2,310	392
LABOR AND SOCIAL WELFARE			
28. Do you favor requiring Federal registration of union pension funds and public disclosure of their finances?	2,960	354	354
29. Do you favor extending the compulsory $1 minimum wage and 40-hour week, with time-and-half for overtime, to retail stores and service establishments, such as hotels, laundries, dry cleaners, shoe-repair shops, etc.?	1,740	1,689	239
30. Do you favor direct Federal insurance to cover losses by natural disasters such as floods, hurricanes, and earthquakes?	1,577	1,744	347
31. If not, do you favor Federal subsidization of such insurance to permit private insurance companies to sell it at low rates?	1,230	1,352	1,086
32. Do you favor extending social security, or an equivalent plan, to professional groups not now covered?	2,146	1,166	356
33. Do you favor making women eligible for old-age insurance benefits under social security at 62, instead of 65, and disabled persons at 50, with an increase of ½ percent in the social security tax?	2,515	993	160
34. Do you favor the Federal Government's subsidizing volunteer hospitalization and surgical insurance plans to permit private companies to sell them at low rates?	1,360	1,935	373
35. Do you favor continuation of the public housing program of the Federal Government?	1,613	1,564	491
36. Do you favor integration of the races in the public schools?	896	2,512	260
37. Do you favor a compulsory FEPC to require that there be no discrimination on account of race in employment or in union membership?	1,265	2,057	346
38. Do you favor a Federal law to supersede State laws as to voting qualifications in order to eliminate poll taxes?	1,092	2,409	167

Pell City Courthouse Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made by my colleague, Mr. ROBERTS, of Alabama, at the dedication of the magnificent new county courthouse in Pell City, Ala., on March 3:

PELL CITY COURTHOUSE DEDICATION

It is a great honor to be here with all of you today on this occasion of the dedication of the new county courthouse. This magnificent new courthouse can truly be claimed one of the most beautiful in the Nation and it is only fitting that it should grace our lovely St. Clair County.

The history of St. Clair County is fascinating and, indeed, one which is truly American. The county was created by an act of the Alabama Territorial Legislature in November 1818, and was named in honor of the very prominent Revolutionary War soldier, Gen. Arthur St. Clair. As man pushed the frontier southward and westward, St. Clair County played an important role. Here in 1813 Gen. Andrew Jackson erected Fort Strother just above the shallow ford across the Coosa River which in 1540 had been visited by De Soto's expedition. Fort Strother was vital as a base of operations against the Creeks during the Creek Indian War.

The heritage of St. Clair County with its area of 641 square miles, is one in which all of us can take pride. The first county courthouse was begun in Ashville in 1821. The branch courthouse in Pell City was begun in 1903. Now today we witness this magnificent new edifice, a symbol of the faith and the pride which the citizens of this community and the county have in their fine local government.

At this time I should also like to pay my respects to the Honorable Judge Forman, who has been probate judge of St. Clair County since 1935. Judge Forman, in cooperation with the able members of the County Commission has done much to guide the growth and progress of our county.

On this very pleasant occasion I wish to extend my congratulations to this community and the county. I feel that this lovely new building symbolizes the faith, so characteristic of all of you—your faith in the progress in the future.

The building of this courthouse is the beginning of a new era in the history of St. Clair County. With one of the finest road systems in the State, through the efforts of your able probate judge and members of the county commission, the foundation has been well laid for the progress that is to come. Industry will be balanced with agriculture. Recently the Alabama Power Co. announced the building of 5 dams—2 of which will border on St. Clair County. The hydroelectric power developed at these dams will furnish the necessary electricity which industry is seeking.

It is the duty of the Congress, under the Constitution, to develop our great waterway, the Coosa River, which is more than 659 miles long and extends from the city of Rome, Ga., to Mobile, Ala. And, it is going to be developed.

The Bible says, "Where there is no vision, the people perish." Let us have the vision today to realize our responsibilities and to develop our young people who must take over the reins of leadership in a few years. Let us here resolve that as we dedicate this magnificent edifice that we at the same time shall dedicate ourselves to the continuing development of this great county to the end that it may take its place in the forefront of Alabama's 67 counties and with its great natural resources it may make a great contribution to the defense, health and welfare of our State and our Nation. Let us all remember, as said in the 127th Psalm:

"Except the Lord build the House
They labour in vain that build it
Except the Lord keepeth the city
The watchman waketh but in vain."

Elpidio Quirino: Symbol of Democracy in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Elpidio Quirino, to whom I would like to pay tribute today, rose from obscurity to become the second President of the Philippine Republic. On his way to that office, he became an eminent lawyer, a distinguished and shrewd legislator and a keen economist. Like many of our own American leaders, he was a self-made man.

He was born of humble parents on November 16, 1890. His early life was a constant struggle against poverty. Notwithstanding numerous hardships, he was determined to receive an education, and by working his way through college he finally received his law degree.

He was an instrumental force in the struggle for Philippine independence: it was largely as a result of his efforts that our Congress passed the Tydings-McDuffie Act in 1932 setting July 4, 1946, as the date for independence. Quirino was also a drafter of the Philippine Republic's constitution, which was accepted by his people on May 15, 1935.

In addition to being a wise man active in his country's affairs, Quirino was also a brave one. Tangible evidence of his courage was his refusal to compromise with the Japanese invaders. In December of 1941 he rejected a post offered to him by the puppet government. He chose rather to resist the encroacher and became a leader of the underground movement. In an act of heartless cruelty the Japanese retaliated by massacring his wife and three children.

Perhaps Quirino's greatest contribution to the Philippine nation was his prodigious efforts to rehabilitate and reconstruct his country after the war. As first Vice President of the Philippine Republic, he was the man most responsible for negotiating for the American aid that bolstered the Philippines' sagging economy.

He became the leader of his government upon the death of President Manual Roxas on April 15, 1948. Under his administration, with the continued assistance of United States financial and technical aid, the Philippines made rapid economic progress. His knowledge of economics was an aid in stabilizing the currency and in placing the budget in a satisfactory position.

Elpidio Quirino was also a stanch foe of communism. The elimination of the Communist Huk menace on the islands, while he was in office, assisted national as well as free world security by preventing the expansion of communism in Southeast Asia. He was also credited with urging a defense pact similar to the North Atlantic Organization which culminated in the formation of the Southeast Asia Defense Organization.

Quirino always displayed tenacity and perseverance while encountering any adversity. Even his political adversaries were the first to admit that he was a fighter; and that in defeat he was never morose and in victory never arrogant. The fact that the Philippines are today considered "a showplace of democracy in the Far East" is in large measure due to his great statesmanship. The Philippines have lost a great leader, and Americans everywhere have lost a friend.

A Bill To Limit the Total Amount of Price Support Which May Be Made Available With Respect to the Products of Any Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, we have in this country some 4.7 million farms, of which some 480,000 produce about 51 percent of the total value of all farm products sold. As you can see, these are the largest and most efficient farms operated by farmers with the highest income.

Under our price-support program, the largest commodity loans have been made not to family-sized farms, but to corporation farms which are found among this 9 percent or 480,000 farms which produce over half of all our agricultural products. For example, two corporation farms received cotton loans last year in excess of $1 million; 2 received wheat loans in excess of $325,000, and 2 received corn loans in excess of $100,000.

I seriously doubt, Mr. Speaker, that these largest farms require unlimited price-support assistance. Our objective, as President Eisenhower pointed out in his special agricultural message in early January, is to protect the family-sized farm. For this reason, I send to the desk for introduction a bill which provides that price support shall not be made available during any calendar year with respect to the products of any one farm of a total value, determined on the

basis of the support price, in excess of $100,000.

It is the large corporation farm encouraged by a rigid 90 percent price program that has been producing wheat, cotton, and corn for Government storage warehouses, rather than for human consumption. This they have been able to do by applying to their land just the right amounts of labor and equipment which enables them to produce the largest output at the lowest possible cost per unit of output. This, of course, results in the highest gross income which is possible to achieve with their particular size of farm, or, as the economist puts it, "scale of plant."

A measure of their success in filling Government warehouses is provided by the inventory levels of wheat, corn, and cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation as of January 31, 1956, the latest date for which this data is available. At that time the Commodity Credit Corporation held in inventory: 871,691,644 bushels of wheat, 746,698,536 bushels of corn, 6,684,441 bales of cotton.

This limitation of $100,000 is high enough to give full protection to efficiently operated family farms and in this respect follows the recommendation President Eisenhower made in his special agricultural message. It is also high enough to prevent any adverse effect upon the price-support program, and the total amounts of commodities which some producers might put on the market as a result of the limitation will not be so great that they would materially affect the market price.

University of Buffalo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, we in Buffalo can once again take justifiable pride in our splendid university. Freedoms Foundation has honored the University of Buffalo with award of the George Washington honor medal, plus $200, for its conference on American student life and higher education, held last June for 40 foreign Fulbright scholars.

There is cause for additional pride, in the plan for disposition of the cash award. In order to achieve a multiplier effect, it is proposed that for the next 4 years an annual award of $50 in silver will be presented to the resident of, or student in, Erie and Niagara counties who makes the greatest contribution to international understanding, with the nominations being judged by the Student Council of the College of Arts and Sciences. This was announced by Dr. Richard H. Heindel, dean of that college who further stated:

> I believe the plan is appropriate in view of the nature of the conference which won the award and the fact that international understanding is a crucial element in the American way of life. Besides, it enables us to recognize that many persons and organizations from the two counties pitched in to make the conference a success.

Among the local cooperating agencies last June were Canisius College, Niagara University, State Teachers College, and the Albright Art Gallery.

Hungarian Freedom Day, March 15, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, March 15, 1848, was a memorable day in the history of the Hungarian nation. It is still celebrated by the Hungarians as the day of the liberation of Hungary from the tyrannical rule of Austria. It was on that date that the students and people of Budapest, encouraged and inspired by their marvelous leader, Louis Kossuth, started the movement to regain their freedom and equality.

Following the Congress of Vienna, Hungary was put under the control of the Austrian monarch. This Emperor had promised to rule Hungary according to her constitution and laws, but did not keep his word. In succeeding years the constitution of Hungary was suspended and its lawmaking body, the Diet, was not convoked. Instead, a campaign of terror was pursued; right of free speech and freedom of the press was suspended. The supervision of education was transferred to Vienna and a new system of education was devised. Foreign books and newspapers were barred from the country. Wholesale arrests were made. Legislators and others of liberal tendencies were arrested and charged with high treason. The accused were denied the right of defending themselves and were not permitted to face their accusers.

On March 15, 1848, while a deputation of 72 members of the Hungarian Diet, under the leadership of Louis Kossuth, was on the way to Vienna to demand of the Emperor that Hungary's rights be restored, an occasion of great importance took place in Budapest. The young men of the city circulated copies of petition containing 12 demands for the rights and liberties of the Hungarian people, together with copies of Alexander Petofy's stirring nationalistic poem, Rise Magyar. The professors and the students at the university in Budapest caught the spirit of the movement and left their classrooms to assemble on the campus. From there the whole student body marched onto the streets and mingled with the people. The people, caught up in the movement, demanded freedom of the political prisoners which was granted by the representatives of the Emperor in Budapest. Thus, while Kossuth and the deputation were on their way to Vienna, the first step to liberate Hungary from the clutches of the tyranny was taken.

This was the movement that stirred the Hungarians to fight with determination and fortitude and to become in April 1849 free and independent. However, tyranny was still reigning throughout Europe and the overwhelming odds of the powerful troops of the Quadruple Alliance soon cut short the liberty Hungary had gained.

Although the freedom achieved through the student's movement of March 15 was shortlived, the courage displayed by the Hungarian people was an example to be followed by all oppressed peoples. We see the parallel of oppression and tryanny in the captive nations of Europe today; and we have no doubt that the people of Hungary, as well as the other people behind the Iron Curtain, still have and always will have the courage and fortitude of their forefathers and will eventually, when proper opportunity presents itself arise en masse against their oppressors to gain the freedom and liberty, the love of which is inherent in them and which they cherish as they do life itself.

Delay on Sugar Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. COOLEY, to be present this morning in order to explain or defend his position in not bringing up the sugar bill for conference. I understand he will ask for conferees today.

It was nearly 8½ months ago that the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee presented H. R. 7030 to this body and even though the committee had conducted no hearings on the bill, because of its importance, on July 30, 1955, it was passed by the House with an overwhelming majority.

On February 8 of this year, the other body passed this measure with certain amendments which would give all domestic sugar producers a more just and proportionate share of the American sugar market. On that same day the Presiding Officer of the Senate appointed conferees on the part of the Senate to adjust the differences between their bill and the House bill.

For some reason, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee has not seen fit to even appoint conferees to meet with those from the Senate who were appointed on February 8. I know the gentleman from North Carolina who heads the Agriculture Committee is a busy man but I am sure he will not plead that he is too busy to attend to the responsibilities of his office. In his original presentation of this legislation, the chairman of that committee referred to this legislation in these terms, "It is of far-reaching importance because it affects people in far-distant places and it vitally affects every one of your constituents."

In view of the urgent need of this legislation as expressed by the gentleman from North Carolina, would it not be appropriate for him to now appoint conferees and get this bill on the way. I think the Members of the House have a right to know why this important legislation is being delayed. Why did the chairman refuse to name conferees?

The beetgrowers of my district are nearing the beet-planting season. The domestic sugar producers are acutely aware that legislation is needed. It is needed now. Perhaps the gentleman from North Carolina who has not appointed the conferees can explain the delay for their benefit.

Thirty-Eighth Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 38th anniversary of that memorable day when, freed from the oppression of the Bolsheviks, the Byelorussian National Republic was established as a free and independent nation on March 25, 1918.

The new nation quickly established consular and diplomatic relations with her neighbors. Although the period of independence was brief, definite advances were made in the social, economic and cultural fields. The Republic eagerly demonstrated its desire to take its place amongst the free nations of the world. Unfortunately, the infant Republic was not able to resist for long the advance of the new Russian imperialism; and its independence, for which it had struggled so valiantly, was lost.

On January 1, 1919, the Communists established the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. After a period of consolidation, the Communists initiated a policy of persecution and annihilation with the intent of eliminating all vestiges of Byelorussian nationalism. This policy went into full effect in 1928.

The extent of the terror, arrests, mass deportations, carnage, and deliberate genocide was incredible. It has been estimated that over 4½ million Byelorussians have been annihilated since the Soviets occupied the country. Anything having semblance to a Byelorussian national feeling was eradicated; for it was only through the propagation of Soviet communism and the imposition of Soviet culture that Byelorussia could be completely subjugated.

For 38 years the Byelorussian people have suffered under the totalitarian grip of ruthless Kremlin Communists. However, they have never voluntarily accepted communism, and their desire for freedom has not been extinguished. As long as there is the hope of eventual independence, the spirit of liberty lives on.

It is appropriate on the 38th anniversary of Byelorussian independence that the American people bolster this hope by reiterating our concern for the enslaved Byelorussian people and expressing our confidence that tyranny will not permanently prevent this courageous nation from obtaining that freedom for which it has struggled so valiantly.

Opposition to H. R. 5550

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the testimony given on March 8 before the Committee on Ways and Means relative to my opposition to H. R. 5550:

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing before you today in opposition to H. R. 5550. I shall not, in this brief discussion, examine the technical aspects of the proposed membership for the United States in the Organization for Trade Cooperation; that is, I am not going to impose on your time by outlining the objectionable operational features that are latent in such an organization. Other Members of Congress have exposed the dangers, the weaknesses, the insidious potential of the whole organizational and functional structure of the OTC. To avoid repetition, I shall speak as a citizen of the 22d Congressional District of Pennsylvania who is dedicated to the Constitution of the United States, who is dependent upon a healthy economy for his livelihood, and whose very survival may revolve around the decisions of this committee and the Congress in respect to the bill under consideration here today.

I use the word "survival" because in this period of grave world tension, we Americans must rely upon an industrial stockpile and upon industrial manpower as much as upon our military for our security. How foreign commerce affects industrial activity and employment is a determining factor in the effectiveness of our defense structure. This influence must therefore be taken under the most careful scrutiny, along with the other ramifications which I have pointed out, before action is taken on any legislation pertaining to foreign trade.

I oppose H. R. 5550 because it would further remove from Congress powers delegated to it by the Constitution. I say to you that had Congress not permitted its authority in the field of foreign commerce to have been slowly eroded over the past 23 years, then the State Department, which is behind H. R. 5550 and would absorb the powers surrendered by Congress, would never have had the temerity to come before this committee, or any other group on Capitol Hill, to ask for anything that resembles this bill. I do not care what party was in power prior to the time when the encroachment by the State Department on congressional powers got under way; I say that the Congress would have been so resentful of any such proposal as this as to have issued a joint message of condemnation to the responsible parties in the State Department for having dared to have prepared such an arrogant proposal.

With the passing of years, however, the executive branch of the Government has gradually usurped so much of the authority constitutionally resting in Congress that attempts at making further inroads are taken as a matter of course by the executive department. This consideration alone should be sufficient premise for members of this committee to base their decision in rejecting the bill.

It is not enough that H. R. 5550 would deprive Congress of its rightful responsibility; it would place the powers thus taken from this body in the hands of a department which is not yet above suspicion despite the years that have intervened since it was first disclosed that enemies of the American Government not only infested this Department, but also occupy some of the very top policymaking jobs. Presumably, the notoriously perfidious element within the Department has largely been dismissed, yet there remains a hard core of questionable characters whose career was born under the domination of that cell which sought to dispel any thought that the welfare of the United States should serve as the guiding light in carrying out the affairs of our Government. These employees, some of whom have advanced by reason of seniority if not ability, to policymaking positions over the past two decades, are not now capable of revising this philosophy to the extent that American people and American jobs should be given preferential treatment in negotiations with other nations.

On occasion there have been constituents from the 22d Congressional District who have come to Washington and have had cause to visit the State Department. On a number of occasions, these patriotic citizens from western Pennsylvania have expressed wonderment at the caliber of so-called diplomats employed in our State Department. Many the time I have heard it said: "Those people do not talk like Americans." "They act as though we do not belong in there, asking for something that would help someone in this country." "Those fellows talk about a new order for the world, and conditions in this country are evidently of no concern to them."

Mr. Chairman, why permit the powers of this Congress, a legislative body representing all sections of our country and all of our people, to be taken away by a detachment of supercilious egoists who do not know and do not care what is going on back in our hometowns. These fellows are not equipped and not inclined to deal with domestic problems.

I ask that you look at the history of our trade negotiations since the State Department outfit took over. They boast of having lowered our tariffs consistently from year to year. I do not challenge that contention, but I ask that you look into the record of their dealings and try to ascertain what America has received in return for these concessions. I also remind you that you will not find any evidence of where the domestic economy and security have been of any consquence whatsoever when the State Department sat down with their pals from across the seas.

Do not give them this new power, Mr. Chairman. If any Congressman feels that he is not capable of assuming the responsibility in the matters of foreign commerce that were delegated to him by the drafters of the Constitution, then he should acknowledge that he does not have the capacity to fulfill his duties to the Federal Government.

The State Department, as I have said, does not know and does not care what is going on back in our towns. I can tell you what this attitude has done in many communities of my district. Fortunately, the expanding economy has absorbed an increasing number of unemployed in recent months, but these better signs would disappear in a hurry if there is any more manipulating of tariffs without regard to the impact on the domestic economy. As a matter of fact, I believe that we have one of the best examples back at home of the need for sensible restrictions

on imports. Year after year, following the conclusion of World War II, increasing amounts of residual oil were shipped into the eastern industrial markets. Cheap foreign oil would take over one coal market, then another, then another. Much of that coal had been coming from central and western Pennsylvania; as a consequence, many of our mines were closed and an increasing number of our workingmen saw their jobs washed away.

Last year, after persistent attempts to place some sort of barricade against the onrush of oil from foreign refineries, we finally succeeded in incorporating in the bill extending the Foreign Trade Agreements Act, a provision recommended by the Cabinet Committee on Energy Supply and Resources Policy. It was not much, but at least it was a start toward offering some sort of protection from the inequitable competition of foreign shippers. Oil importers were notified that we meant business about holding down this tide which by now had engulfed our seaboard markets. Gradually coal's position became more firm. Public utilities and industrial plants from New England to the Chesapeake, realizing that this cheap foreign fuel was not going to continue to roll in here at ever-increasing rates, began to place their orders for coal. Our mines began to step up their activities. Last year the bituminous coal industry produced about 465 million tons, as compared with 392 million tons in the preceding year. You understand, of course, that not all of this upturn—not even a predominant proportion—was attributable to the holdback in residual oil imports. But that restriction, I assure you, had a very telling effect in the overall story. My hope is that we are going, through a united effort here on Capitol Hill, to close the faucet still more on foreign-oil shipments, so that more and more of our people can get back to work. Until these developments come to pass, thus further reducing the number of our unemployed, the district which I represent will continue to suffer from a unique situation which has come to create social as well as economic problems.

Back in Armstrong, Indiana, and Cambria Counties of Pennsylvania you will find many people enjoying the prosperity that prevails in most other parts of the country. What is disturbing, however, is that next-door neighbors and large segments of many communities are unemployed and must subsist on unemployment compensation, public assistance, and surplus foods. Thus you can see the perplexing problems of morale that develop under these circumstances.

As I have said, we could continue to eliminate the distress if we attack the causative factor in a logical manner, such as by proper regulation of incoming shipments of commodities from abroad.

I have mentioned the threat of improper trade laws to the national security. Here also the coal-mining regions offer supporting evidence of the injurious effect of too much foreign competition on home industry. Excessive shipments of foreign oil closed coal mines and disemployed mine workers. Should a national emergency develop when our mines are down and our miners out elsewhere over the country looking for jobs, a fuel shortage would be inevitable. And it could cost us heavily in our war effort. A year ago, a sudden strike by the Soviet Union would have found our industrial capacity in a far more unhealthy condition than is generally realized. Our mine output was more than 100 million tons below the figure set as necessary to meet mobilization base requirements. Instead of less than 400 million tons of coal, America would suddenly have needed—on an annual basis—650 to 750 million tons. The combined bituminous and anthracite coal industries were not then capable of meeting these demands. Perhaps we are still a little short, but at least we have come a long way since then and—given the opportunity—the coal industry is going to be up to the standard stipulated by our defense authorities. Providing, of course, that we do not permit the free traders in our State Department to get hold of such things as the OTC and other instruments of destruction to the American economy and security.

I have spoken of the coal industry, but I could very easily have substituted the glass industry, pottery, ceramics, machine tools. On record before the House Ways and Means Committee over the past several years, Mr. Chairman, are scores of industries which have been hurt by lowered tariffs and which, like coal, are essential to the national defense.

I know that some of the committee members are thinking about the high industrial activity that is taking place at the present time in most industries which I have mentioned. I ask you, however, that you do not overlook the fact that, given the power asked for in H. R. 5550, the State Department could very quickly sign us into a situation that would disengage thousands upon thousands of workers right in my own district. In the name of those men and their families, I ask you to prevent this from happening. Do not surrender further the powers of Congress. The people back home look to their Representatives and Senators to provide them the protection necessary for maintaining their jobs. Please do not disregard their trust in you.

Production of Poliomyelitis Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, every day more parents come to realize that only small amounts of poliomyelitis vaccine—falling far below present needs—are available in their communities for the vaccination of children under age 20 and expectant mothers, constituting the priority group.

In considering the extension through June 30, 1957, of the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955, Public Law 377, 84th Congress, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce gave careful consideration to the availability of adequate supplies of safe and effective vaccine.

In order to get a first-hand impression and better appreciation of the complexities inherent in the production and testing of the Salk vaccine, the committee visited the plants and laboratories of Eli Lilly & Co., Indianapolis, Ind., which furnished approximately 70 percent of the Nation's total supply of vaccine approved during 1955 and the first 6 weeks of 1956.

In submitting its summary statement on poliomyelitis vaccine production, and the present efforts made by several drug companies to increase their production, the committee takes cognizance of presently existing shortages of available vaccine supplies. The committee desires to emphasize, on the other hand, the magnitude of the achievement resulting from the wholehearted cooperation among scientists in the pharmaceutical industry, private research institutions, and Government agencies, that the American people today have every reasonable assurance that supplies which will become available will be both safe and effective.

Less than a year ago, approval of poliomyelitis vaccine by the Federal Government had to be suspended and public confidence in the safety of the vaccine was placed in serious jeopardy. Today, instead of being ready to criticize Government agencies and the pharmaceutical industry for existing shortages, we should be mindful of the fact that if it were not for the valiant efforts of the present producers, no safe and effective vaccine would be available at all at this time.

The committee's summary statement on poliomyelitis vaccine production follows:

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE STATEMENT ON POLIOMYELITIS VACCINE PRODUCTION

On January 24, 1956, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held hearings on legislation to extend through June 30, 1957, the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955 (Public Law 377, 84th Cong.). This legislation since then has passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, and has been approved by the President (Public Law 411, 84th Cong., 2d sess.). In considering this legislation, the paramount question in the committee's mind was the availability of adequate supplies of safe and effective vaccine.

In the course of the hearings, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, furnished the committee, upon its request, estimates of anticipated production of vaccine during the year 1956. It was estimated that during the calendar year 1956, approximately 166 million net cubic centimeters of vaccine might become available for use. This amount, plus approximately 30 million cubic centimeters released prior to January 1, 1956, would make a total of 196 million cubic centimeters available by December 31, 1956. This quantity would suffice to make 3 injections available for each of the 65 million children under age 20 and expectant mothers, constituting the priority groups.

In furnishing these rough estimates Dr. Scheele cautioned that the figures submitted by him were subject to many contingencies. Dr. Scheele pointed out that the difficulty of making the vaccine was one of the principal factors which make it inadvisable to attempt to make firm projections or to place too much reliance in the accuracy of such estimates.

In order to get a first-hand impression and better appreciation of the complexities inherent in the production and testing of the Salk vaccine, the committee decided to accept an invitation extended to it by Eli Lilly & Co., of Indianapolis, Ind., to visit the company's plants and laboratories. The chairman of the committee, Congressman J. PERCY PRIEST, Democrat, of Tennessee, and 13 members of the committee visited Eli Lilly's facilities on February 24 and 25, 1956. The Lilly Co. was one of two companies whose vaccine was used during the field trials conducted by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis in 1954. During 1955 and the first 6 weeks of 1956, almost 24 million cubic centimeters of Lilly vaccine were approved by the Federal Government. This amount represents approximately 70 percent of the Nation's total supply of vaccine approved during that period.

The visit to Eli Lilly's vaccine manufacturing facilities has provided the committee with a unique opportunity to gain some insight into the reasons why it is not a simple matter to step up production of the Salk vaccine. The biggest problem in expanding

operations is obtaining trained personnel. The principal, and perhaps only, source from which such personnel can be secured on short notice is from other programs of the Lilly Co. The committee is gratified that the Lilly Co. has decided to take this important step.

Since the testing of vaccine fluid has failed to keep pace with production of vaccine fluid, the Lilly Co. has accumulated a considerable backlog awaiting testing. The company expected to complete its tests on this backlog by November 1, 1956. In view of the great need for additional vaccine supplies, the company, by shifting personnel, now expects to complete tests on this backlog by June 30, 1956. It is now the goal of Eli Lilly & Co. to test 60 million doses during the first 6 months of this year. This goal is 20 million doses greater than the amount of vaccine previously scheduled for completion by June 30, 1956.

Eugene N. Beesley, president of Eli Lilly & Co., who gave the committee these estimates, cautioned, however, just as did Dr. Scheele in submitting his estimates, that unforeseen delays may occur in the testing procedure which might cause vaccine actually available for use by June 30, 1956, to fall well below this goal.

Mr. Beesley further stated that virus fluid production would be stepped up from 4,500,000 doses per month to 6,800,000 doses per month. If this rate of fluid production is maintained successfully, and if no unforeseen delays occur in the expanded testing operations, 40 million doses of finished vaccine may be expected from the company during the last 6 months of this year.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Marion B. Folsom, after conferences with each of the five manufacturers of polio vaccine, has reported that several manufacturers were taking steps, involving additional personnel and equipment, in an effort to increase their output. However, he states accurate predictions of future supplies are impossible.

Apart from securing additional trained manpower and equipment, care must, of course, be taken that supplies of raw materials are adequate to stay abreast of the stepped-up production of polio vaccine. There have been some preliminary indications that eventually refinements in the field of tissue culture may obviate the need for monkeys or other animals now used as a source of tissue for virus production. At the present time and for the immediate future, however, monkey kidneys are the indispensable raw material required for vaccine production.

Suitable arrangements are now in existence with the Indian Government to facilitate imports of rhesus monkeys for use in medical research and in the preparation and testing of polio vaccine. As long as this cooperation on the part of the Indian Government continues, there is no reason to believe that a shortage of rhesus monkeys will become a factor limiting the supply of polio vaccine.

While the committee appreciates the desire of the American people to see that ample supplies of vaccine will become available in time to complete present vaccination programs on schedule, the committee is deeply impressed with the complexities of the manufacturing and testing processes involved in the making of the vaccine. If the attitude of Eli Lilly & Co. is representative of the attitude of the other four companies presently engaged in the manufacture of vaccine—and the committee has no reason to doubt that this is the case—then each of the companies will produce the maximum amount of vaccine that can be produced with reasonable assurance of safety.

The committee believes that the American people would rather suffer a slight delay in present vaccination programs than see the programs jeopardized in any way by a recurrence of events which led to the suspension of vaccine approval by the Federal Government in April 1955. At that time, public confidence in the vaccine as a safe and effective weapon in the prevention of poliomyelitis was placed in jeopardy, and only through the heroic and cooperative efforts of scientists in industry, private research institutions, and Government agencies was the program resumed without permanent damage to public confidence.

While it is gratifying that forecasts for vaccine production during 1956 are optimistic, it is perhaps even more gratifying that the American people have every reasonable assurance that supplies which will be available will be both safe and effective.

Employment Problem at New York Naval Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 1956, the New York Herald Tribune published a story under the headline "Democratic Criticism Said To Hurt Yards Here," in which reference was made to protests by Democratic congressmen from New York in connection with the layoff of 600 workers at the New York Naval Shipyard, which is located in my congressional district.

Several days later, on March 1, I wrote a letter to Navy Secretary Charles S. Thomas in which I asked him "to allay my own disturbed feeling and the feelings of the thousands of employees involved." I also urged that the New York Naval Shipyard "be considered fairly on all future contracts."

I am now in receipt of a reply from Navy Secretary Thomas in which he denies that the reduction in personnel at the New York Naval Shipyard was part of a scheme by the administration to turn this work over to private shipyards. In view of the widespread interest in this matter in New York generally, and in my district in particular, I am inserting into the RECORD the text of my letter of March 1 to Mr. Thomas and his reply of March 13:

MARCH 1, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES S. THOMAS,
Secretary of the Navy, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This letter is in reference to the New York Naval Shipyard in Brooklyn, which is in my congressional district.

I was very much disturbed by the New York Herald Tribune article of February 26, 1956, entitled "Democratic Criticism Said to Hurt Yards Here," copy of which is enclosed. I further quote from the article:

"The congressional group headed by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, New York, protested the layoff of 600 workers just before Christmas. Mr. CELLER asserted then that it was 'part and parcel of a scheme by Mr. (Charles E.) Wilson and the Republican administration to turn this work over to private industry.'"

I recall very well the meeting which we had with Under Secretary of the Navy Gates. Representatives of the more than 17,000 workers at the yard were present at this meeting; also Congressman FRANCIS E. DORN, Republican, of New York. I pleaded for bipartisan support to prevent the further layoff of workers. At no time did I complain of overtime work which I know is absolutely essential to meet commitments.

I have kept in constant touch with your office and have never issued any statement to the press. Recently I was satisfied that no immediate layoffs were contemplated and overtime work would continue to meet necessary deadlines. It is my impression that Rear Admiral Roy T. Cowdrey, Commander of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, has been doing a good job to keep the yard busy.

I am compelled to write you this letter because of the acknowledged fair stand which I have always taken in the matter and because so many people at the Brooklyn Navy Yard now seem to be disturbed because of the newspaper article referred to above.

I am certain that all members of our New York delegation, both Democrats and Republicans, want the New York Naval Ship Yard to be considered fairly on all future contracts because it is one of the best yards in the entire United States from the point of view of management and efficiency.

I do not believe that you, Mr. Secretary, had anything at all to do with the article I have referred to, and for that reason I would appreciate receiving a letter from you to allay my own disturbed feeling and the feelings of the thousands of employees involved.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, March 13, 1956.

Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANFUSO: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 1, enclosing an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on February 26, 1956, entitled "Democratic Criticism Said To Hurt Yards Here."

In answer to your question, the Navy had nothing whatsoever to do with the article. As for myself, I had never seen or heard of it.

As a matter of fact, the Navy has made every effort to see that employment at the New York Naval Shipyard has been maintained at the highest possible level consistent with the available workload. I am sure you realize that it is impossible to maintain the personnel of an operation of this size and type at a fixed level. There are bound to be variances in the workload and some resultant fluctuation in personnel.

However, as we have explained to the various representatives and committees who have called upon us, we always try, insofar as possible, to absorb any reductions by attrition, but this cannot always be done.

I would think that the best proof of what we have done for the New York Naval Shipyard is the fact that while the total employment at all the shipyards is 149 percent of the pre-Korean employment, that at the New York Shipyard is 170 percent.

The Navy, at the same time, has a responsibility to maintain the mobilization capacity of the private shipyards. Obviously, all the work cannot be given to the naval shipyards, or otherwise we would have no mobilization skills and reserves in the private yards, and which will also be essential during a period of emergency.

The Navy has, however, tried to use its best judgment in maintaining this balance, but, as you will see from the above figures, the New York Naval Shipyard has done exceptionally well and has been maintained far above the average.

There is no truth whatsoever to the statement quoted in your letter that the reduction in personnel was "part and parcel of a scheme by Mr. Charles E. Wilson and the Republican administration to turn this work over to private industry."

We, of course, in the Navy cannot prevent any criticism of the Navy and the administration of the shipyards which are a part of the Navy. All we can do is cite the record and let that stand for itself. I think, however, the record will show that the Navy has done everything it properly can to maintain employment at the New York Naval Shipyard at a high level. This we will continue to do, regardless of any criticism to the contrary.

Sincerely,

CHARLES S. THOMAS.

Labor Unions and the Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the antitrust laws of the United States prevent big corporations, big trusts, or big combinations of industrial management from restraining or controlling trade in their respective fields. In short, monopolies are against the law so far as big business is concerned. Labor is not a commodity like ships or shoes or sealing wax, and the antitrust laws were never intended to be applicable to organized labor. If the antitrust laws were made applicable to labor unions, they would be destroyed and the American economy would suffer. Unions have brought to the Nation immense benefits in the form of higher wages and increased purchasing power, without which there could not be the huge demand for automobiles, refrigerators, radio and television sets, and the innumerable modern conveniences which have added so much richness to our lives.

The right of men to join together in a union to enable them to bargain collectively for wages and working conditions was finally established despite the bitterness of opposition from those who sought to gain added profits from a constant supply of cheap labor to keep wages depressed, to hire and fire at whim, to eliminate the expense of good working conditions, to extend the working day as served their purpose.

There were those who maintained that the labor union actually was a combination in restraint of trade. With the passage of the historic Sherman antitrust law in 1890 which declared, among other things:

> Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, is hereby declared to be illegal.

The cry arose that this provision applied with equal force to the labor union. A series of cases in the courts disclosed the danger that unless Congress acted specifically, this interpretation would prevail and destroy forever the principle of free collective bargaining.

In 1914 the Congress did act specifically, and in the provisions of the Clayton Act Congress declared:

> The labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce * * * nothing contained in the antitrust laws shall be construed to forbid the existence and operation of labor organizations * * * or to forbid or restrain individual members of such organizations from lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof; nor shall such organizations * * * be held or construed to be illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade, under the antitrust laws.

I direct your attention to the words in the act "the legitimate objects."

When the acts of a labor union in conspiracy with management result in price fixing or when labor unions enter into combines to restrict production, allocate areas or fix prices, then the labor union is no more immune than any other combination acting to restrain competition. If labor unions conspire with employer groups toward monopolistic ends, they are not immune to the antitrust laws.

To bring labor unions within the purview of the antitrust laws as such would be to strike a blow against the collective strength of the workingman. There might appear to be a greater advantage to management in lower wages, fewer holidays, no fringe benefits, and so forth, but in the long run the economy of the country would suffer bitterly, which, in turn, would reflect management's problem.

The high standard of living brought about through the process of collective bargaining has resulted in increased consumer purchase, increased demands for goods, increased production, and in the sum total of economic gain both for management and for labor.

I repeat the language of the act:

> The labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce.

More than that, I say that the human being himself is not a commodity or an article of commerce.

Career Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I read the other day that Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, has urged that the politicians do not make a political football out of career service during the coming campaign, on the ground that this might impair the morale of civil servants.

I seem to recall that Mr. Young gave comfort to the numbers game played by the administration in order to convey the notion that loads of security risks were fired by his department even though he was later obliged to admit that over 90 percent of the firings were routine and totally unrelated to subversion. I seem to recall that under Chairman Young appointments had to be cleared through the Republican National Committee. His newly expressed concern for the morale and prestige of the department leaves me as cold as Mr. Benson's plea to avoid discussion of our farm policy, and Mr. Dulles' exhortation to eliminate debate on our foreign policy from the coming campaign.

Somehow, I feel no pity for those who sold "corruption, communism, and Korea" in 1952.

Address Delivered at State of North Carolina Convention of R. O. S. of A., at Charlotte, N. C., March 13, 1956, by Hon. Francis E. Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

Tonight I shall discuss a serious threat to the security of the United States—a threat which requires action by the Committee on Un-American Activities, together with the full support of the committee in this work, by you and all your fellow Americans. The issuance of American passports to Communists, and how this is inimical to the best interest of the United States, constitutes this threat.

Recently there has been syndicated in leading newspapers a series of articles dealing with the issuance of American passports. One article dealt with an American's pro-Communist conduct in India—conduct which caused India to file a formal protest with the Department of State. As pointed out in this article, the Passport Division of the Department of State had refused to issue a passport, only to have its decision overruled.

What these articles did not point out is that the issuance of passports to members of the Communist Party demonstrates the inability of top advisers in both the Departments of State and Justice to cope with the strategy of the Communist Party. The issuance of this passport, as the result of an administrative ruling, and the issuance of other passports as the result of decisions by our Federal courts, shows how completely successful the Communist Party is in its No. 1 objective. What is this objective? It is the destruction of the discretionary power of the Secretary of State in the matter of the issuance or denial of passports.

Before outlining the use which the international Communist movement has made of American passports over the last quarter of a century, let's examine the strategy behind their current objective. To understand the strategy, we must understand the organization of the Communist Party. Through this understanding, we know that as the tides change, so has the Communist organization. During the late 1920's and early thirties, the Communist Party of the United States merged with the Socialist Party in a united front movement—a movement strikingly similar to the united front program advocated just last month by the Communist Party Congress in Russia. During the united front period of the twenties and the early thirties, many important Communist Party functionaries worked with the party without being members, as membership is defined by Webster. This organizational method permitted important Communist leaders to carry out their Communist work, while at the same time denying membership. Since 1948, as a result of the threat to the security of

the Communist Party, through prosecution of the Communist Party leaders, no individual has carried a Communist Party card; likewise his name is not carried on any roll maintained by the party. This concealment of membership is what makes the Communist strategy such a threat to the security of the United States. Today, when a Communist denies party membership, his word must be accepted, if we are to understand court decisions, or accept administrative rulings in respect to passports or other matters affecting the Communist Party and its advocates.

To be extremely accurate, I should point up the several escape clauses made available to the State Department by the courts, and administrative rulings designed to please the courts. The Government need not accept an applicant's word, providing the Government is willing to destroy, or abolish, its security agencies and their methods of checking on the activities of the Communist Party. To illustrate these points, let's take the case of a Communist applying for a passport. Let's make him an attorney. The Government has in its possession evidence that in 1947 and prior thereto, he held a membership card in the Communist Party. When security measures were instituted by the party this attorney, together with other party members, stopped receiving membership cards. The attorney enters into an understanding that henceforth, he will not attend meetings, and will not be known as a member, to other members of the Communist Party. He continues to meet with party leaders in private, and he continues to legally represent the party. Several years later he applies for a passport. The Passport Office knows that the attorney was a member before he went underground, and from information supplied by investigative agencies, knows of his underground relationship with the party, up until the present time. Knowing him to be an agent of the Communist Party, they refuse him a passport. He sues the Secretary of State, and the courts order the Secretary to either give the attorney a passport or a hearing. Now this hearing is not for the purpose of having the attorney testify as to his relationship with the Communist Party, but under the conditions established by the court, is merely a forum to force the Government to expose its informants and its evidence, without any assurance that the attorney will affirm or deny the testimony or evidence.

This is a double barrel strategy advanced by the Communists. For when the courts intervene, the discretionary power of the Secretary of State is destroyed, the Communist Party receives a complete victory. If a hearing is granted, the Communist Party learns the identity of the FBI agents within its ranks. If the Government refuses a hearing, the Communist Party member, the potential espionage agent, receives his passport.

I am reminded of a story about a Communist Party member who was arrested in Virginia for a traffic violation. During his trial he was asked if he were a member of the Communist Party. Boldly and firmly, he answered "No." After the trial, this Communist advised the district secretary of the Communist Party of his testimony. He received immediate protection, as the district secretary prepared an expulsion notice dated prior to his trial.

The denial of membership in the Communist Party cannot be accepted by the Government unless the applicant for a passport demonstrates by his statements that his break with this conspiracy was final and complete. The security of the United States will not be safeguarded through demands that the burden of proof is upon the Government. During our recent hearings dealing with Communist activities among Government employees, more than one witness admitted perjuring himself when questioned about his membership in the Communist Party, while a Government employee.

Applicants for passports sign an oath of allegiance to the United States. However, this oath cannot be accepted when it is executed by an applicant who is a member, or supporter, of the Communist conspiracy. One such applicant was a delegate to the Peking Peace Conference in 1952. He traveled to Peking on a United States passport, stamped "Not valid for travel in Communist China." In spite of this restriction, he traveled to China, even though in his application he withheld the knowledge that he was a delegate to this Communist-sponsored and controlled conference.

In my opinion, the fraud perpetrated on the United States in obtaining and traveling on this passport, was a crime, but his conduct while at the conference constituted treason. This naturalized American not only blamed the death of American servicemen in the Korean war upon the United States, but over the Communist radio, beamed around the world, he confirmed Communist China's charges that the United States had engaged in biological warfare. He based his findings on evidence presented by a Communist scientific commission and the confessions of those Americans who were Communist prisoners of war. That the commission was a fake, and the confessions forged, made no difference to this traitor.

On January 29 of last year, this man was a witness before the Committee on Un-American Activities. Was he a Communist? Was he a delegate to the Peking Peace Conference? Did he make the radio speech which was monitored in the United States? His responses to all these questions were that he refused to answer, because (1), it is improper under the 9th and 10th amendments for the committee to inquire into the activities of private citizens; (2), because the 4th amendment prevents the searching of his mind; (3), because the 1st amendment guarantees him freedom of speech and association; and (4), the most important to him—the 5th amendment, which protects him in his fear of self-incrimination.

In discussing the Communists' use of American passports, to conduct their international espionage organization, to cause civil unrest, and to flee from their crimes, I wish to point out that North Carolina was one of the first States to be temporarily denied justice because of a fraudulent passport.

I need not recall to many of you the violent Gastonia textile strike of 1929. This was the strike which resulted in the unfortunate death of the chief of police of Gastonia. This was the strike conceived and led by the Communist Party. As you know, those responsible for the violence were convicted for their crime. The convicted Communist leaders fled North Carolina and the United States through fraudulent passports obtained with the assistance of the Communist Party in New York. Fred Beal, the leader, testified before the committee some 10 years later. He related how he was instructed in the identity of an individual whose name he was to assume. How he obtained a birth certificate belonging to his pseudonym, and thereafter obtained a passport, under which he traveled to Russia. As you know, Beal later chose jail in North Carolina to freedom in Russia.

Beal advised the Congress how his passport was taken from him in Russia. A former head of the Communist Party has testified that American and Canadian passports were the most important item necessary to the successful operation of an international espionage organization. He testified that the Communist International—whether known as "Comintern" or "Cominform"—operated an espionage school in Moscow, known as the Lenin Institute. At the Lenin Institute instructions were given in espionage and sabotage, which instructions included a course in passports. Hundreds of American Communists, most of the present leaders of the American Communist Party, learned how to obtain passports through the use of false birth records, false nationalization certificates, counterfeiting, or other fraudulent methods. These leaders learned their lesson well, because many of them have traveled on passports obtained through forged documents. Not only American Communists have traveled on American passports, but also international Communist agents who were not American citizens.

In the early 1920's, there was established in the United States and in England, a corporation known as "Arcos-America." According to its articles of incorporation, this firm dealt solely in trade between the United States and England with the Soviet Union. Soon after its organization, the British Government suspected that the corporation was a cover for military intelligence activities. In 1927, as a result of evidence obtained through raids on the corporation and its personnel, these suspicions were confirmed. The evidence was so shocking to the people of England, that that country severed diplomatic relationship with the Soviet Union. Included in the evidence obtained were documents which clearly established that the American Communist Party was being financed by the Soviet Union through this corporation. The documents established that an attorney for the Communist Party of the United States, was the individual through whom the money was transmitted, proving that membership in the Communist Party is not an important item in determining a Communist. This same attorney, in 1939, testified before the Dies committee. He testified he was not then, nor had he ever been, a member of the Communist Party.

The head of the English branch of Arcos-America, was an international Communist espionage agent, by the name of Kirchenstein. He was not an American, yet it was established that he traveled through Canada in 1922, 1923, and 1925, posing as an American. In 1929, this same Kirchenstein obtained an American passport under the name of Kleges. This was accomplished through orders received by an American Communist from the head of Soviet Military Intelligence. This same Communist traveled to Moscow to obtain these instructions, and thereafter obtained the passport through false naturalization documents, which he obtained through a fellow-Communist, who was an undertaker in Brooklyn, N. Y.

This is not an isolated case. The records relating to the use of fraudulent passports by Communists are voluminous. They include American Communists traveling under false documents into almost every country of Europe, Asia, and South America. All of this activity was carried out through instructions issued by their masters in Russia.

To deceive the American Government, they created travel agencies. The most famous in America was World Tourists. This agency was headed by Golos, the man identified by Elizabeth Bentley as one of the heads of Soviet espionage activities in America. World Tourists, which also handled the travel business of non-Communists, maintained four separate accounts, used solely to cover travel of the Communist Party and its front organizations.

Whittaker Chambers testified at length about the use made of American and Canadian passports by Communist espionage agents. He described how the Communists used members of the Young Communist League to search metropolitan newspapers to learn the identity of people who had died, but who possessed the approximate birthdate and national origin characteristics of an agent whom the Communists desired to

use in their espionage apparatus. After obtaining suitable statistics, the Communist Party would then apply for a copy of a birth certificate covering the birth of an individual they found to be deceased. Under the name of a dead man, the espionage agents, armed with an American passport, would then travel the world.

Chambers identified the notorious J. Peters, the author of the Communist manual on organization, as the person in charge of this vital espionage operation.

Many Americans who fought for international communism in Spain during the Spanish civil war, have testified as to how their passports were taken from them when they arrived in Spain. They told of how they were instructed to supply false information to the State Department, in order to cover their intended destination. Others have testified that these passports were used during their validity by Communist espionage agents who were issued these same passports by the Communist headquarters in Russia.

Gerhart Eisler, a leader of the German Communist Party, illegally entered the United States in the early 1930's. After his arrival, he became a leader of the American Communist Party. In 1934, Eisler was called to Russia. Because of his illegal status, he could not apply for or receive an exit or reentry permit. Therefore, his only recourse was through a fraudulent passport. Utilizing the espionage resources of American Communist agents, he obtained a United States passport, using the naturalization certificate of a member of the Communist Party. Not until after World War II, through the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities, was Eisler exposed, tried, and convicted for a portion of his treachery against America. While on $25,000 bail, pending appeal from his conviction, he jumped bail, fled to Poland, and again assumed his position of Communist leadership.

Since World War II, the Communists have continued to use American passports to the detriment of the United States and in support of international communism. American delegates to Communist youth festivals have condemned America to the world. The worldwide peace offensive staged by the Communist conspiracy was under the leadership of American Communists. At Communist peace conferences, American Communists proclaimed to the world that America was a warmongering Nation, while Russia was the bulwark for peace. Labor delegations from America have condemned the United States as a slave labor country, while praising the Soviet Union as the workers' paradise.

These Communist delegates obtained American passports by withholding from the Government the fact that they were both delegates to these Communist conferences, and also the fact that they even intended traveling in the countries where the conferences were held. Many of these conferences, such as the Peking Conference, which I have discussed, were in countries where travel was restricted by the Department of State.

These disclosures which I have called to your attention, brings us to the current struggle faced by the Secretary of State in an attempt to protect the security of the United States in the cases of applications for passports by Communists. It is a battle which I have indicated we are losing, if, in fact, we have not already lost.

In 1950, together with John S. Wood, of Georgia, and the late Senator McCarran of Nevada, I authored a provision to the Internal Security Act which was intended to deny passports to members of the Communist Party. Knowing the organizations of the Communist Party, I provided that passports should be denied to all persons regardless of their formal affiliation with the Communist Party, if there was in the possession of the Government, reasonable evidence that their travel would advance the cause of the Communist movement.

This is not the time for America to be weak. We need the courage of Andrew Jackson, who told Chief Justice Marshall "Now that you have issued your order, let's see you enforce it."

Brotherhood or Stepbrotherhood?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "Brotherhood or Step-Brotherhood?" delivered by me on Sunday, March 11, 1956, before the Mattapan-Dorchester-Roxbury District Council of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States at their annual encampment at the Hotel Vendome, Boston, Mass.

The address follows:

BROTHERHOOD OR STEPBROTHERHOOD?

I consider it a distinguished honor to address the annual encampment of the Mattapan, Dorchester, and Roxbury district councils of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

My presence here today, among other things, symbolizes the intertwining of interests which has historically characterized the association of Jews and Negroes. Many of the most prosperous Jews in America can trace their successes in business and professional fields to the substantial support of the so-called Negro market. As a matter of fact Jews have long recognized and respected the still growing $16 billion yearly purchasing power of Negroes, equal to all of Canada, which their gentile counterparts have finally become aware of in the last few years. In turn, many Negroes have been the grateful recipients of employment opportunities and philanthropy from those of the Jewish faith. The affinity of the two groups has not been confined just to economic reciprocity. In political affairs for instance, Senator Lehman, of New York; Governor Ribicoff, of Connecticut; Attorney General Javits, of New York; and your speaker, in addition to others too numerous to mention, owe their present positions to the significant measure of confidence in their ability manifested by the Jewish and Negro voters. And I must certainly say in passing that in the process of the restoration of Israel, a prominent part was played by an American of Negro descent, Dr. Ralph Bunche. For it was Dr. Bunche who effectuated the recognition of Israel by the Arab adversaries who were attempting to annihilate the tiny republic so recently established as a national home for the Jews. How is it that American Negroes should have played a role so closely intertwined with the historic destinies of the Jewish people?

The Negro, too, has had his history of adversity and abnegation. He was brought to America, the land of the free, as a slave. He came not of his own free will, like other peoples, but in captivity and friendless. He was a hewer of wood and a drawer of water in a new continent where others were staking out the land and making their fortunes.

But the Lord relented and a new breath of freedom blew over the land, with the Emancipation Proclamation. Men, who all their lives had been considered only chattel property, were made conscious of their human dignity for the first time, and they were free at last to go and come as they pleased and live as other men lived, following their best lights.

The great cities of the North—New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Cleveland—offered the newly emancipated Negro opportunities hitherto undreamed of. There he came into contact with other peoples who had undergone rejection like himself, particularly the Jews. Founded on a common experience of social adversity, a new and firm friendship grew up between the Jew and the Negro.

Students of race and human genetics furnished an abundance of evidence that the Negro and the Jew had in their inheritance many valuable treasures which would contribute to human progress. In fact, it was brought out that the social order among the so-called primitive peoples was often far more complex and intricate in nature than that of the civilized folk. It was made abundantly evident, also, that no one race had a monopoly on brains or on virtue which would justify discriminatory practices in regard to the other groups.

Hence a deep sympathy and common bond of experience linked the Negro and Jewish interests, both having suffered adversities in their social recognition. They learned to cooperate in overcoming the adversities. Thus the value of the intertwining of interests was made manifest.

In this age of great upheaval and turmoil when the hydrogen bomb looms menacingly in the future as a threat to the entire human race, we must recognize our larger obligations, our larger citizenship in the interest of humanity itself. Not only is there an intertwining of interests between Jew and Negro but there is and should be an intertwining of interests between Jew and gentile generally, and between all races who are mutually concerned in the fulfillment of the purposes of God.

It is 60 years since soldiers of the Jewish faith formed an organization and, while vast changes have been wrought in the life of our Nation during the intervening years, the spirit which animated the founders has never changed—the spirit of Americanism and brotherhood.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States were cradled in the American way of life. When they came to maturity they grew in stature and influence because they were rooted in genuine American ideals. They are part and parcel of a system of society that has made this Nation great and glorious and that will never be changed by those who would try to tear down this system.

The boys of Jewish blood who stood beside their Christian comrades in the foxholes of our wars never asked those with whom they fought to what religion they belonged. They, in turn, were never questioned about their faith. The men in the foxholes had a common denominator—democracy. Each worshipped God in his own way.

The Jewish war veterans who have emerged from the slime and dirt and heartbreak of the battlefields have taken their place in the forums of peace. It is worth mentioning and repeating from time to time that these men who fought so valiantly so that democracy might survive are now engaged in another monumental struggle—the fight to create a peace that will banish the fear of the atom bomb and make the hearts of men and women glad that there is no longer any prospect of needless slaughter.

I would like to say a word about your organization which has become a permanent part of the general pattern of American Democracy.

In Europe, for centuries Jews were not permitted to volunteer to fight for their country. And in this country Asser Levy, the Dutch Jew, was denied permission by Governor Peter Stuyvesant to participate in

the defense of the colony of New Amsterdam.

Peter Stuyvesant was only reflecting the prejudice that clouded the minds of European sovereignty. Levy had to plead with Stuyvesant to be allowed to risk his life in the common defense of the colony before he was accepted for service.

All this changed when America was born. It was one of the few countries that permitted Jews to wear the uniform of their country as honorable volunteers. More than 10,000 Jews fought in the contending armies of the Civil War. Seven of these men were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

I could go on and on giving the record and it is a story abundant with deeds of heroism and sacrifice. The figures I might give are astounding—but they need no praise from me. But I would like to point out that some 250,000 Jews saw service in World War I and more than 550,000—over half a million—served in World War II.

Among them were those who had recently become citizens. Many were the descendants of those who were forced to wear the Yellow Star of David under German and Russian tyrants and who emerged from the war wearing the Purple Heart for wounds received in the service of democracy.

During World War II, the Jewish representation in the armed services was far above its pro rata allotment. A large concentration of Jewish people live in metropolitan centers. Agricultural, mining, and metal industries, and so forth, which were favored by draft exemptions did not apply to metropolitan centers, such as this Boston area. Besides the relatively large proportion of Jewish boys taken in the draft, there were approximately 35,000 Jewish volunteers. Statistics show that honors conferred on Jewish soldiers for valor in action included no less than 1,100 citations. These included the Congressional Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, Croix de Guerre, and other decorations. The records also reveal that more than 10,000 Jewish commissioned officers were in several branches of the service. The total of Jewish casualties was from 13,000 to 14,000, including 2,800 who made the supreme sacrifice.

These figures tell of a sacrificial devotion and patriotism to your country which is in line with your age-long battle for freedom.

The patriotism and the loyalty of the Jews has been tested in wartime and in peacetime. It reveals a brilliant and patriotic service to your country. The Jewish people of the United States have given far more than their share of lives and money to help in all times of crisis.

You are now sacrificing millions of dollars to help Israel survive in order to preserve your homeland and also to fight the Communist aggressor.

The preamble to the original constitution of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States—dating back to the year 1896—declared your objectives as follows:

"To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America; to foster and perpetuate true Americanism; to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions; to uphold the fair name of the Jew, and fight his battles whenever unjustly assailed; to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men; to combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating, and whatever their target; to preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families; to instill love of country and flag, and to promote sound minds and bodies in our members and our youth; to preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men of our faith; to honor their memory, and shield from neglect the graves of our heroic dead."

With these noble aims, the Jewish War Veterans were prepared to face three wars: The Spanish-American, and World Wars I and II.

Then in 1936 in the city of Philadelphia, the cradle of American liberty—20 years ago in May to be exact—your convention thoroughly revised the organization's constitution. It is my understanding the workings of your group were provided for in great detail; the duties and obligations of the national executive council, the national executive committee, and those of the several departments, district councils, ladies auxiliary, and Sons of the Jewish War Veterans defined. The duties of the various officers were prescribed, uniforms and insignia described, and a seal adopted.

It is apparent that article II of the revised constitution embodied the spirit and general purpose of the preamble to the original instrument. I will not enumerate the objects of your organization as set forth in the 1936 revision of your constitution. I do note, however, that your second objective reads "To combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target."

This can be summed up in one word—"brotherhood." Not stepbrotherhood.

It is an inspiring experience for me to be a part of this gathering; to speak to you concerning brotherhood, which symbolizes the fundamental moral principle on which our Nation was founded—a principle which all of us, in our churches, in our synagogues, in our organizations hold in common. This principle was stated in our Declaration of Independence in words which changed the course of human history for all time—"All men are created equal."

I call your attention to one word in that famous sentence, the word "created." The self-evident truth which our American forefathers proclaimed was not simply that all men are equal—but that they are created equal. They are equal because they are equally creatures of one Creator—God—a just and loving God who commands that we be just and loving to one another.

Human brotherhood is more than mere human equality. Without a moral basis, the idea of equality is bound to be empty and vain and frightfully destructive.

Communism perfectly illustrates this fact. The equality it preaches leads to strife and hatred, envy and malice. It denounces justice, mercy and love as fatal weaknesses. It ignores the priceless value of the individual soul and looks upon man as a mere instrument of the state. It denies brotherhood and all the noble motives of the mind, and, in the end, it brings on the very antithesis of brotherhood—the ruthless domination of man by man.

It is not enough for us to condemn this evil force of communism. Our condemnations do not change the fact that it is on the march in the world today. I believe it is our duty to assume our share of responsibility for that terrible fact. If we can understand why we of the Western World share the responsibility for this tragic state of affairs, then we may gain some insight into the question of how to stop it.

Should we not concede that every success made by communism represents the shortcomings of the free, democratic world? Has the United States failed to apply the concept of human equality and brotherhood so that its example may be reflected all over the world? I fear we have tolerated injustice in various ways, and, as a result, we have seen the growth of extreme and ruthless movements under the banners of communism. In the colonial areas of the world, the principles of brotherhood which have been professed at home have often been totally ignored.

Today the greatest danger in the struggle with communism is in Asia. That should not surprise us too much—for it is in Asia that the Western nations for centuries past have failed most tragically to carry out their own principles of human brotherhood. This has been the great area of supposed supremacy of the white man, the great area of colonial subjection, and the great area of economic exploitation. The United States is challenged today to show the Asian people that it represents not racialism, colonialism, and exploitation, but their very opposites: Individual human dignity, national independence, and free economic development for the benefit of the people.

No nation is likely to welcome an American policy if they think that policy is a mere defensive move designed to strengthen America against communism. No nation will be happy over the idea of being used as an American shield. Therefore, we must show that we seek the development and freedom and prosperity of these nations for their own sakes.

We must keep our actions in line with the ideals which must guide us abroad. America cannot afford to be indifferent to the cry of freedom anywhere in the world. Our inventive genius has so expanded our communication that isolation is a thing of the past. Now a billion eyes watch to see if there is a lag between our physical knowledge and our skill and fairness in human relations. A billion eyes watch to see whether or not we in the United States are ready to practice in our own homeland the ideal of brotherhood which we seek to promote in the world—or stepbrotherhood. I can see only one basic solution to this question, and that is the solution based on our common belief that we are all equally the creatures of God.

In Asia and Africa—where the peoples of vast former colonial areas have known the humiliation of being treated as inferior races—the way in which the United States acts to implement the rights of its own Negro citizens among other minority groups is of the highest significance. I know of no other field in which the quality of our own actions at home so directly affects our moral power in the world.

Enlightened men may differ in detail as to the best way for us to proceed. This is a question on which there should be no conflict between our political parties. Naturally, I am most anxious to see that my own party maintains an advanced position on this question.

Statesmanlike leadership is demanded to rechart the course of interracial tolerance and understanding before we find ourselves inextricably cast upon the reef. There is no room for the kind of leadership which expelled Miss Lucy but retained the identifiable white student insurrectionists at the University of Alabama without penalty of any kind. There is no room for the kind of leadership which compels the orderly protesters against the humiliating bus situation in Montgomery to face the prospect of jail or a fine, or both. There is no room for the kind of leadership which attacks the established integrity of the United States Supreme Court by the passage of interposition and even nullification resolutions. There is no room for the kind of leadership which attempts to stifle the voices of freedom, including many of your own from being heard in a Government-owned auditorium or educational institution. There is no room for the kind of leadership which endeavors to brand the NAACP as subversive, contrary to the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States, the House Un-American Activities Committee, or any other official Federal body. There is no room for the kind of leadership which denies voting privileges to Negroes through intimidation, interference, and illegal schemes. There is no room for the kind of leadership which permits the allocation of Federal funds, gathered through

a process of taxing everyone, to those States who dare resist legislative and judicial commands regarding racial discrimination. There is no room for the kind of leadership which allows the most distinguished white supremist in America to become head of the very committee through which minority groups seek relief from their inequities. There is no room for the kind of leadership which pleads for moderation and gradualism in the wake of the inflexible resistance of the proponents of segregation. There is no room for the kind of leadership which seeks election support of those affected and concerned with civil rights based alone upon past performance and the slippery decrees of a party platform. There is no room for the kind of leadership which speaks one way in Washington or some northern city and another way in the South.

Even in a society as advanced in culture as the United States, we hear a lot about prejudice—associated mainly with the problem of American minorities. Not many people nowadays would be caught admitting they are prejudiced about anything. There are a few exceptions, of course; one only has to read the newspapers. Prejudice, localized in our own lives, harms few people, if any. But small feelings of prejudice that have no sensible basis can spread into race attitudes and can ultimately defeat the moral obligations of a democracy.

It was Goebbels, during the dark days of fascism in Germany, who said: "Nothing will be easier than to produce a bloody revolution in America. No other country has so many racial and social tensions. We shall be able to play on many strings there."

Any American who "plays on these strings" by spreading prejudices against minorities—Catholics, Jews, Negroes, foreign-born and others—is, whether he knows it or not, weakening our Nation.

History has taught us that when we discriminate against one segment of the people, we set a pattern that may be used against other groups. Hitler's persecution of the Jews, trade unionists, Communists, and Socialists was later directed against Catholics, Protestants, liberals and eventually the people of the world.

In 1855 Agraham Lincoln understood this when he said: "As a Nation we began by declaring all men are created equal. We now read it 'All men are created equal except Negroes.' When the Know Nothings get control it will read 'All men are created equal except Negroes, and foreigners, and Catholics' ".

Consideration for the Negro, the Jew, the Catholic, the foreign-born or for any other minority group rests not merely on the grounds of humanity and justice; it rests on the solid base of self-interest.

Prejudice makes all of us poorer. We cannot have an enlightened democracy with minority groups living in ignorance. We cannot have a prosperous democracy with minority groups so poor that they cannot afford to buy the goods America produces.

As Eric A. Johnston, ex-president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, declared, "Whenever we erect barriers on the grounds of race or religion, or of occupational or professional status, we hamper the fullest expansion of our economic security. Prejudice doesn't pay. Discrimination is destructive."

Prejudice—or lack of brotherhood—makes impossible any real solution of economic, social, or personal difficulties. When we blame war or social and economic troubles on some innocent minority group, we are diverting our attention from the real cause. Social ills can be remedied only through acceptance of responsibility and cooperation through democratic means to solve common problems.

How we apply brotherhood is more than a matter of mere domestic concern. Almost 13 million people in the United States were born in Europe. The mistreatment of some Mexicans in the United States echoes throughout North and South America; a race riot provokes discussions and resentments in Africa, the Philippines, and among the 800 million nonwhite people in China and India.

Throughout the world there are millions of people who believe that World War II—to which your group contributed so much—was a total war against fascism and Fascist ideas. Their concept of peace includes the hope—even the determination—that there will be no such thing as superior and inferior peoples anywhere in the world.

The story of America should prove that there are no superior or inferior people. Our country has been made great by people who came from every land under the sun—people with names like Carnegie, Sikorsky, Toscanini, Einstein, Osler, Carver, and thousands more. But it isn't only the big names—the Hall of Fame names—that have made America, any more than it is only the big names that won the war. We know that the war was fought and won by the little names—by millions who never made the headlines.

The men who built and are building America—who clear her forests, span her rivers, dig her coal, plow her fields, work her machines—the men who made America strong and free are men of every race, color, religion, and nationality. Listen to the names at rollcall, or read these names from a casualty list in the New York Times of March 29, 1945: Agostinello, Cohen, Curran, Grunwald, Hrubec, Ivanoski, Kuzian, Marshall, Thomas, Warblanski. Were any of these inferior in the eyes of true brotherhood?

All of America should be proud of these names. For what they did is more than a tribute to their individual faiths—be they Jewish, Catholic, or Protestant. Their sacrifices are a reflection of the splendid faith which we of all races and creeds have in the strength and nobility of American democracy. It is democracy, as we practice it in this country, that has been a springboard for the vast strides we have made in so short a time. It will continue to remain the motivating factor of our daily lives.

What you, the Jewish veterans, have done in the past is now part of the history of this country. But what about the present? I could quote amazing figures and statistics. But I think the citizens of this Nation should be fully aware of your program in the field of human relations. In the present state of the world, human relationships have become a very vital part in the planning for a permanent peace.

Your organization is engaged in fighting every form of tyranny, bigotry, and intolerance. The Jewish War Veterans of the United States were among the first to speak out boldly against Hungary's persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty and the oppression visited on the Protestant clergies in Central Europe. In the past you have been assailed by the Communists as a tool of big business interests on the one hand and by Gerald L. K. Smith's anti-Semitic cross and flag on the other hand.

What has been your answer to these attacks? A program of action in the field of human relations—in the field of brotherhood. You have worked with the American Legion, the Catholic War Veterans, and other major veterans' organizations. You have reminded America that racial and religious disunity can be just as harmful and menacing to the country's welfare in peace as it would have been in war.

It is my understanding that the Jewish War Veterans' service program, staffed by hundreds of professional and voluntary counselors, serves more than 110,000 veterans and veterans' dependents of all faiths. More than 30 percent of those you have aided have been non-Jewish.

There you have American democracy in action—action that is unfettered by any consideration of race or creed. That is something worth fighting for and keeping, so that we and our children and our children's children may enjoy the blessings of our glorious way of life.

I think that members of the Jewish faith may well be proud of the fact that the principle of brotherhood was proclaimed centuries ago by your teachers, rabbis, and national leaders. We read in Leviticus the command "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Believing in the spiritual interpretation of the universe, in peacetime the Jewish War Veterans are assisting to promote justice, amity, understanding, and cooperation among Protestants, Jews, and Catholics.

Whether we like it or not, America has been vested with the leadership of the free world and the task of defending Western civilization. The success of that defense will determine the survival of our way of life and the maintenance of the dignity of man.

Until and unless bigotry, prejudice, and intolerance among intercreedal and interracial groups have disappeared from the American scene, the success of that leadership and of that defense will be in jeopardy.

Until we have achieved a practical day-to-day implementation of the principles of brotherhood, we cannot be sure that our American democracy is secure. But once we have attained throughout this fair land a unity which comes from an understanding, group by group; an appreciation of culture, group by group; and respect of racial, religious differences, group by group, American democracy will have a much firmer foundation.

America stands at the crossroads—one way points to brotherhood—the other points to intolerance and prejudice. I do not wish to minimize the seriousness of the situation—but America has survived a great many crises in the last 180 years. I think we will survive this one.

In words of the poet, Stephen Vincent Benet:

"We have made this thing, this dream.
This land unsatisfied by little ways,
Open to every man who brought good will,
This peaceless vision, groping for the stars,
Not as a huge devouring machine
Rolling and clanking with remorseless force
Over submitted bodies and the dead,
But as live earth where anything could grow
We made it and it's ours.
We shall maintain it. It shall be sustained."

May God give us the grace and the strength to maintain this land of ours in the name of brotherhood.

Outstanding Bowling Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the members of the Wyoming Valley Bowling Association, which includes a large portion of my constituency of Luzerne County, Pa., for the outstanding record which they have achieved in recent nationwide bowling competition.

One team, comprised of George Billick, George Tomek, Michael Cuce and Frank Clause, rolled the Nation's highest 3-game total for a 4-man team—a com-

posite score of 2,673, in a nationwide match held last January.

Two other constituents of mine—Harry Zoeller and George Pacropis—in competition held at Fort Wayne, Ind., rolled the 8th highest doubles total in the history of the American Bowling Congress. Their total for 3 games was 1,365.

I am very proud of the national records which these gentlemen have established, and anyone who is conversant and experienced in the sport of bowling will agree with me that these men have done an outstanding job in representing their respective teams as well as the Wyoming Valley Bowling Association.

I wish them all even greater success in future nationwide competition.

Black Market for Nickel Gets Blacker Despite Rising Output

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Wall Street Journal of March 13, 1956, entitled "Black Market for Nickel Gets Blacker Despite Rising Output." I also include a letter I wrote to Dr. Flemming, Director of ODM, on January 11, 1956, asking a number of questions about the nickel situation. To date the questions which I asked Dr. Flemming have not been answered although he acknowledged receipt of my letter on January 18, 1956, and promised a reply by January 24, 1956.

As the nickel situation worsens as stated in the Wall Street Journal, it is acknowledged by the Commerce Department that certain companies are obtaining nickel for defense purposes and illegally selling some of it through the back door for what is well known to be enormous profits. It is also found that we are exporting nickel alloys and nickel-containing scrap.

I am also advised that the stockpile requirements may need revision and that the basis for allocation of nickel for civilian purposes was established on pre-Korean usage and that the allocation program is administered not by the Government but by the producers, principally International Nickel, though BDSA is supposed to audit the producers' books to insure that equitable distribution is made. I also find that the small users of nickel, particularly the plating industry are complaining that they must buy nickel in the black market at exorbitant prices as indicated by the Wall Street Journal article or close shop.

It seems to me that the Director of ODM who sets the stockpile goals and enforces the National Production Act and the Secretary of Commerce must bear the responsibility for the current situation and for its equitable solution.

The above-mentioned follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of March 13, 1956]

BLACK MARKET FOR NICKEL GETS BLACKER DESPITE RISING OUTPUT

The official price has held at 64½ cents a pound since late 1954. But buyers who need extra nickel now pay about $3 a pound in the black market, up from between $1 and $1.50 a year ago. Stainless steel scrap, containing 8 percent nickel, brings a steep $400 a ton, double a year earlier. The auto industry alone spent over $10 million in 1955 on nickel premiums, one parts-making firm says.

Free world production of the silvery metal reached a record 427 million pounds in 1955, up 40 million pounds from the year before, the previous record. Output this year may exceed 440 million. But roughly 84 million went into Uncle Sam's stockpile last year, 4 million more than in 1954. The stockpile and United States defense uses probably now take about 40 percent of free world nickel output. The remaining supply isn't big enough to meet booming demand for peacetime applications.

The quantity of nickel moving in the black market probably is small in proportion to the total—the same tonnage is often offered to a number of users, tending to exaggerate offerings.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C. January 11, 1956.

Hon. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director Office of Defense Mobilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. FLEMMING: I have reviewed your very considerate letter of December 16, 1955 and have discussed the points you have raised with responsible members of industry and wish to avail myself of your kind offer and ask some additional questions which appear germane to me at the present time. I am willing to accept your position that technically the terms "gray and black market" may be misnomers since no law or regulations are being violated. However, there is an implied regulation apparently established and administered by industry and checked for compliance by BDSA as the representative of industry.

Evidently BDSA officials agree that some nickel is being sold at very high prices and that the nickel comes from Japanese, French, and German imports (possibly 4 million pounds per year) plus secondary nickel recovered from scrap and some scattered sales from Canada.

Will you please supply the quantities from each of these sources including the breakdown of the 4 million pounds?

You mention that "probably 96 percent of the nickel consumed in 1955 came from market price sources." It has been suggested that there may be an arrangement between some scrap dealers whereby they supply the mills certain materials and receive nickel in return. In such a case, the nickel would technically be "market price source" but not in accord with the spirit of the allocation system. Has this come to your attention? If true, can either the supplier or the BDSA cope with this situation? Or O. D. M.?

I am advised that 75 percent of released stockpile nickel goes to defense purposes, mostly Air Force, and not to commercial fields as your letter seems to imply. Will you please verify this? If my statement is approximately correct, would it not be equitable to earmark all stockpile diversions for commercial users in order to break the high-price market?

Will you also advise me as to the following:

1. How have the stockpile objectives been set? By whom? When last reviewed? And what consideration was given to the fact that the source being principally from Canada is virtually domestic and free from being cut off?

2. Information I have received does not confirm your statement as to the date of the establishment of the allocation base. Will you please verify and advise if you think it should be brought up to date in view of industry changes, new businesses, etc.

3. Please furnish the historical figures showing the allocations between defense and nondefense purposes since 1949.

4. Does authority exist in ODM, BDSA or any other agency to take such action as may be needed to insure fair and equitable distribution of nickel to commercial (nondefense) users?

5. What is the legal relationship between ODM and BDSA so far as the allocation of nickel to commercial users is concerned?

6. How are the stockpile releases geared into INCO's allocations to insure fair and equitable distribution? Also other producers, Falconbridge, Sherritt-Gordon, Nicaro, Hanna, etc.?

7. How frequently does BDSA audit the producer's books? When was the last audit? What recommendations were made? Were they accepted or rejected?

8. Is ODM satisfied with the system of audits? And does it consider that there is fair and equitable allocation to the nondefense users?

9. At what price is stockpile nickel from the various sources furnished to industry?

10. What right of appeal is afforded businessmen who feel that the present allocation system is not fair and equitable?

11. I am very pleased to learn that you have taken steps to have a survey made of the nickel situation and shall look forward to the receipt of a copy of the survey report. When will the survey be concluded and the report made? And will the nondefense aspects be covered which I have referred to above?

Very sincerely yours,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Speech by Hon. Chester E. Merrow, of New Hampshire, Before the Conference of National Organizations, Washington, D. C., February 28, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is a pleasure to include herewith an address by my esteemed colleague the gentleman from New Hampshire, Congressman CHESTER E. MERROW.

From his experience as a member of the United States Delegation to the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations held in New York last fall, Mr. MERROW gives an excellent summation of his work as a United States delegate to the U. N. General Asembly:

THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM: COST AND EVALUATION

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and members of the Conference of National Organizations, it is a pleasure to be here with you this afternoon, and I hope you will not consider it a poor return for your excellent hospitality if I employ this opportunity you

have so generously afforded me to address my remarks primarily to the subject of how much money the United Nations and the agencies associated with it costs and what is accomplished by the expenditure of such funds.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 10TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

A large part of what I wish to say this afternoon grows out of my experience as a member on the United States delegation to the 10th General Assembly held in New York from September 20 to December 20, 1955. I should like to take a moment at the very beginning to comment briefly on the significance of the 10th session which marked the beginning of the second decade of the United Nations.

Two major forces seemed to pervade and shape the discussions; the worldwide struggle between freedom and communism, and the resurgence of nationalism among the peoples of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. Once again the United Nations proved itself to be a forum where we can meet the Soviet threat to the free world and expose that threat for what it is even when its drive to dominate the world is set forth in economic rather than in purely political terms.

On specific issues, the highlights of the accomplishments can be said to include the admission of 12 free nations, the overwhelming endorsement of President Eisenhower's "open sky" plan for inspection from the air and the exchange of military blueprints, the approval of further steps to develop the peaceful uses of atomic energy by providing a method for the establishment of an International Atomic Energy Agency, and the formation of a committee to fix the time, place, and procedures of a conference on charter review, such committee to report to the 12th General Assembly in 1957.

On the so-called colonial issues, the action that eventuated was, on the whole moderate, but owing to the passions aroused during discussions, the course at times came dangerously close to imposing on the Assembly a role which would prolong and further embitter the issues, rather than contribute to their solution.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY COMMITTEE

My primary responsibility on the delegation was to serve as the United States spokesman on the Administrative and Budgetary Committee. Since I am a native of that part of the country noted for its thrift and practicality, you will readily understand that I embarked upon this assignment with interest and with an eye to seeing whether the taxpayer's money is being well spent in our contribution to the United Nations.

I came away from this experience greatly reassured. Because we constantly hear so much criticism of "cost" of the United Nations activities without very much being done to develop an appreciation or understanding of what we really do get for our money, I thought it might be worth while for me to discuss with you some of the conclusions I have reached in reference to our participation in the U. N. system.

UNITED NATIONS IN NO RESPECT A WORLD GOVERNMENT

To put the budget process in perspective, let me reassure anyone who may entertain any qualms about the United Nations invading our national sovereignty. The United Nations is not a world government. It cannot enact legislation, levy taxes, raise armies, or enforce laws. We certainly do not want it to have these powers. Its powers are strictly advisory depending on the voluntary cooperation of sovereign states. The General Assembly does, of course, make decisions about the structure and work of the Secretariat and it can assess member states for annual dues. On the other hand, any member government that has really serious objections to the majority decision on such issues can always, as a last resort, withdraw.

BUDGET REVIEW AND CONTROL

I should now like to proceed to the question of the system for keeping United Nations expenditures under review and control. The regular annual budget of the organization is drawn up by the Secretary General. Given the financial background of the present Secretary General (you recall that he was one time Under Secretary of the Finance Ministry of Sweden) and the well-established internal administrative controls at his disposal, the estimates presented to the General Assembly have, on the whole I believe, been conservative. Of course, one can disagree with the need for certain activities or programs, and we do and did, but by and large, these are the outgrowth of decisions by the Assembly or other governmental organs, decisions which the Secretary General has no alternative but to carry out.

The estimates submitted by the Secretary General are carefully reviewed in detail by a small advisory committee of nine experts appointed by the General Assembly for this purpose. The United States has a member on this committee. Like an Appropriations Committee of the Congress, its report usually indicates where economies can be made and efficiency improved. As a consequence, its recommendations are usually adopted when the budget estimates of the Secretary General and report of this expert committee are considered by the General Assembly in its committee of the whole, known as the Administrative and Budgetary Committee, or the Fifth Committee.

I can assure you that the Fifth Committee reviews with thoroughness the estimates and the other details connected with the financial administration of the United Nations. A remarkable sense of responsibility and concern for efficiency and economy are shown by the majority of participating governments. It may be of interest to know that this is one area in which the U. S. S. R. and the United States, as the two largest contributors, vote together more often than not.

The United States, though it has but one vote, exercises nevertheless a significant role in the work of the Fifth Committee. It is worthy of note that the United States has generally been represented on this committee by a Member of Congress. Since the beginning of the organization, there have been only two exceptions to this practice. It is the kind of committee where there is genuine give and take and where reason usually prevails. This, together with the obvious financial stake of the United States in the United Nations, means that the voice of the United States is both sought after and respected. Although this does not mean that everyone always agrees with us—it would be unhealthy if they did—it does usually lead to reasonable accommodations of differences. This is true not only on strictly budgetary matters but it extends also to the broader administrative problems considered by this committee.

ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

I wish to mention that the efforts of the United States over a period of years to bring the judgments of the independent United States Administrative Tribunal under review were finally successful in the tenth session. The procedure evolved was a compromise embodying varying points of view, but the important objective from the United States standpoint was achieved, in that such judgments are no longer final but can be taken to a higher judicial body—the International Court of Justice. This provides a mean for member states to be heard when their interests are involved and should prevent the recurrence of the controversy which arose over some awards made by the Administrative Tribunal in 1953.

In speaking on the Administrative Tribunal before a plenary session of the General Assembly I said:

"The primary objective of the procedure adopted has been to provide a way in which the possible concern of member states with respect to future administrative tribunal judgments could be dealt with by judicial process. * * *

"In the opinion of my Government the resolution adopted * * * presents us with a method of solving a vexing problem by a procedure which recognizes the basic principles of judicial review, which protects the interests of the staff and of the Secretary General, and which provides a method for meeting any concern of member states which may arise in the future as the result of administrative tribunal judgments."

UNITED NATIONS COSTS

Let us now turn our attention to the amount and the purpose of the United Nations expenditures over the years. In 1946, the regular expenditures of the United Nations amounted to approximately $19 million. The budget authorized for 1956 is $48,566,350, more than 2½ times as much. What does the difference represent? The expenditures for 1946 were largely devoted to organizing the United Nations and servicing meetings of the primary governmental organs—the Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council.

In 1956, one can note that the budget of $48.5 million not only covers servicing of regular meetings, it also provides for expenses connected with the vastly successful scientific conference on peaceful uses of atomic energy at Geneva in 1955 and for a wide range of activities that are contributing to the maintenance of peace and security, to economic development and improvement of living standards, to the protection of refugees, and to the orderly development of territories toward self-government. A few specific examples of this type of activity include: the operations of an observer mission in India and Pakistan and the conciliation and truce missions in Palestine; the administration of a plebiscite in British Togoland; the collection on a worldwide basis and publication of needed economic data and analyses; and assistance to numerous governments in improving social welfare services. I could easily spend the rest of my time enumerating all the activities which the United Nations undertakes in any one year.

Instead of doing this, I refer you to the most recent annual report of the Secretary General, because I should like to turn to some comparisons that will make it easier for us in the United States to understand what we are getting for our money. This $48.5 million budget will result, when other income is taken into account, in an assessment upon the United States of approximately $16 million.

On the basis of relative capacity to pay, modified by the United Nations recognition that it is not healthy for any one country to contribute more than one-third, the United States share of the budget is presently calculated at 33⅓ percent. Given what I have indicated as the scope of United Nations activities which presently cost the United States $16 million, it is interesting to note what this compares to in terms of national programs. It about equals the amount the United States Forest Service spends currently in constructing roads and trails in national forests.

I discussed at some length on December 16 the United Nations budget before the General Assembly's plenary session. In my re-

marks, I said: "* * * the United States will support the appropriation recommended * * * for 1956. We do so in recognition of two facts: (1) that the Secretary General and the General Assembly have, over the past 2 years, made a real effort and considerable progress in reducing the regular budget; and (2) that a sizable amount of the increased assessments being voted for 1956 is of a nonrecurring character."

I further stated that "these increases fall largely into four categories of expenditures; activities related to peaceful uses of atomic energy, technical assistance in the social welfare and human rights field, operation of field offices and special missions, and salary adjustments. * * *"

I concluded by stating: "* * * my delegation firmly believes that, by continued pursuance of sound financial principles, the United Nations, during its second decade, will increase in influence and effectiveness as the greatest force for helping man to realize his hopes for bringing about a peaceful world."

COSTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM OVER 10 YEARS

While we are relating costs and value received in respect to international programs to costs of national programs, let me broaden the perspective by giving you some interesting figures extending beyond just the annual regular budget of the United Nations. During my service on the United States delegation I had the opportunity of also looking into the regular expenditures of the United Nations specialized agencies and the amounts which have been voluntarily contributed by both member governments of the United Nations and nonmember governments for special large scale assistance programs operated under United Nations aegis. I might say here that both the small expert advisory committee and the fifth committee on which I served are giving increasing attention to better coordination of the administrative and budgetary practices of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

For the 10-year period from 1946 to 1955 inclusive, the total funds devoted by the international community to the work of the United Nations agencies with the exception of the International Bank and Monetary Fund have amounted to $1,751,063,198. Of this total, $686,344,569 represents the amount spent through the regular assessed budgets of the United Nations and the currently existing specialized agencies—Food and Agriculture Organization, International Labor Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Universal Postal Union, World Health Organization, World Meteorological Organization, and the International Telecommunications Union. Six hundred and fifty-two million twenty-six thousand seven hundred and fourteen dollars has been spent on the current voluntarily financed operational programs of the United Nations: The International Children's Fund to promote maternal and child welfare; the Techanical Assistance Program for Economic Development; the Palestine Relief and Works Agency to provide food, shelter, and gainful employment for nearly 900,000 refugees; the Korean Reconstruction Agency, to relieve the suffering and repair the devastation caused by aggression; the Refugee Fund to find permanent solutions for limited groups of refugees; and the joint support program of ICAO to finance certain services essential to the safety of international air navigation. The final portion of this $1,751,063,198 is accounted for by the $412,691,915 spent by the International Refugee Organization during its short existence from 1947–1950.

The United States contribution to this 10-year total amounts to $893,425,948; $219,331,126 on an assessed basis, to present agencies; $436,978,466 on a voluntary basis; and $237,116,356 to the one-time IRO. In other words, it costs the United States an average of 54 cents per person per year for the 10-year period.

Another way of putting it is that the total amount contributed by the United States to the whole complex of United Nations activities over 10 years as a leading partner in an enterprise engaged in promoting peace, raising standards of living, feeding the hungry, caring for the displaced and homeless, and fighting disease and ignorance—I repeat, this 10-year total—is small compared to United States annual expenditures for defense.

The President's 1957 budget calls for $42.4 billion for protection. This covers the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, expenditures for atomic energy, foreign aid, defense production expansion and related programs. I am in favor of these appropriations. I would not cut our defense a single cent. The comparison I am making is useful in the development of adequate perspectives.

To achieve a peaceful world, we must have programs in addition to military defense. Another interesting comparison is the fact that the sum total of the cost of the United Nations agencies to the United States over 10 years is less than what United States citizens voluntarily spent in 1 month in 1954 on recreation alone. One can well ask whether this is too much to pay for one of our insurance policies against the outbreak of another world war.

EVALUATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

Why is it, then, that we continue to hear so much criticism of the cost of the United Nations? In one sense I suppose it can be said to be human nature. What man or woman here present isn't aware of a husband's continual complaint about all the money being spent on the food budget even though we men expect ample meals and relish good cooking. But in a deeper sense, the criticism must be regarded as the surface manifestation of the misconceptions, doubts, and antagonisms surrounding the fact of United States participation in international organizations. It also reflects honest and somewhat misguided disagreement with the programs and policies of these organizations. All of this is to be expected in a free and democratic society.

It does, however, place an enormous responsibility on the people who are in such a position to become well acquainted with the workings of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. We must be sure that there are adequate safeguards of United States interests, particularly in matters of expenditures. It is especially incumbent on us to explain why and how these particular mechanisms are important instrumentalities by which governments can contribute to the building of a peaceful world. We need to tell the story of what these agencies are actively doing to combat disease, poverty, hunger, and illiteracy.

In emphasizing our special responsibility for interpretation, I do not suggest blind advocacy. On the contrary, I would say that the exercise of this responsibility carries with it an obligation to appreciate the limitations as well as the possibilities of these particular instrumentalities, to acknowledge and help correct the mistakes as well as to applaud the successes. For this reason I believe the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, of which I am a member, will be rendering a valuable service to the cause of the United Nations Specialized Agencies and United States participation therein when it completes its present hearings and study, started on February 20 and designed to provide an evaluation of the importance of the work of these agencies to the United States.

UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP IN UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

Returning now to my stated purpose at the outset of this speech, I believe you will agree that it can be fairly concluded that the United Nations and its specialized agencies are well worth their present cost and more, if it becomes necessary. They afford a quicker and less expensive way of handling complex matters which arise in diplomatic relations today. They provide an avenue through which the rising expectations and demands of rapidly developing peoples can be channeled and met in a peaceful, evolutionary, and cooperative manner. They help governments to develop the methods and habit of cooperation and of working toward economic goals by democratic methods.

All of the above would be compelling reasons for United States participation even if there were no aggressive challenge from the Soviet Union. With this challenge, the United Nations and specialized agencies take on added significance for the United States. They provide a forum of open and observable competition which all the world can and does watch closely. This affords us a unique opportunity to disclose the diabolical nature of international communism. The record shows that, to date, we have nothing to fear and have made the most of the opportunity.

The free world countries by overwhelming majorities have outvoted the Soviet bloc on all important matters which have been at issue between us. As the result of the Soviet Union's recent dramatic shift in tactics, however, we face a new challenge. In the words of warning issues by the United States delegation of which I was a member, "The present period in history may one day be recognized as a major turning point in the struggle between communism and freedom. It appears to be clearly a shift in the cold war, in which economic and social problems have moved to the forefront."

The maintenance of United States leadership in the United Nations and the specialized agencies becomes more important now than ever before. The United Nations system provides for effective machinery to meet the task which is ahead and which has been characterized by the President, in his recent state of the Union message, as the necessity of waging the peace with all the tools and ideas and means at hand. The President in his message stated, "In the pursuit of our national purposes, we have been steadfast in our support of the United Nations, now entering its second decade with a wider membership and ever increasing influence and usefulness."

The United States of America finds itself in the high position of world leadership. We are leading the free world in one of the greatest struggles to make certain the continuation of freedom that has ever engaged the attention of mankind. We must exercise this leadership in various fields: in the economic field, as was emphasized by the United States delegation to the 10th General Assembly; in the military, as is so eloquently portrayed by the suggested appropriations for defense in the President's budget for the next fiscal year; in the field of international organizations, which I have been discussing today; and in the spiritual field, since at the heart of our free system and our free civilization are the noblest and highest ideals to which the human spirit is capable of aspiring.

What a tremendous opportunity stretches before us. An opportunity to combat hunger, disease, illiteracy and poverty through the big four of the specialized agencies of the United Nations as well as through United Nations technical assistance and our own bilateral programs. We have an opportunity to continue to exercise ever greater

political leadership in the general assembly and the various organs of the United Nations. By fully grasping this opportunity, the Republic of the United States will be able to make an imperishable contribution in this worldwide struggle to ensure the continuation of free civilization. Never has a nation had a greater opportunity to make its influence and power felt for the well being and happiness of all mankind. Destiny has designated this Republic as the leader of the free world in this global encounter. Inspired and impelled by the noble ideals that has made us what we are today, we cannot and we will not fail.

Statement of Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the case for new and realistic postal rates enabling the Post Office Department to operate without a deficit has been made by Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield and I agree with our colleague and distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, Chairman MURRAY, of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, when he says:

This statement of the Postmaster General is the clearest, most convincing, and most persuasive statement I have ever heard.

I am sure that the House will recall when we had before us the Treasury Department-Post Office Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1957, I described the ever-recurring problem of the deficit and outlined briefly the Department's program to combat it. It is my firm belief, the American people preponderantly want the Post Office Department operated on a business basis as is done in practically all of the major countries of the world. Argentina, I believe, is the only country of any size wherein there is a perennial deficit like our own. It is almost unbelievable that the American taxpayers have had to pay in taxes approximately 5 billion dollars for losses sustained by the Post Office Department in the decade since World War II.

The Postmaster General's statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF POSTMASTER GENERAL ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 9228, A BILL TO ADJUST POSTAL RATES, ESTABLISH A COMMISSION ON POSTAL RATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, PRESENTED BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 13, 1956

Mr. Chairman and members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee:

I. INTRODUCTION

Your postal management has done its best during the past 3 years to improve mail service and lower costs. Our efforts have been helped immeasurably by the valued guidance of the Congress and the splendid cooperation of our half million postal workers. Our programs are well under way and are showing gratifying results.

One major task remains. If we are to continue to assure this expanding Nation the better and enlarged postal services it needs, the serious problem of the huge postal deficit must now be solved.

I want to express my appreciation to this committee for its willingness to again give consideration to the financial plight of the Post Office Department. This is a difficult problem for this committee as well as the Department.

I am most hopeful that together we may reach a solution.

The bill before you represents the judgment of the administration and the Department as to how the Congress can establish a sound fiscal policy for the Department which will strengthen the fiscal integrity of the Government and remove a tax burden from our citizens.

We believe the American people want their Post Office Department to operate on a self-sustaining basis. We are asking the Congress to take a hard look at the present level of postal rates.

In making this presentation to you I realize full well that certain facts are already well known to many members of this committee.

However, to present the complete story, which undoubtedly some new members of this committee have not heard before, I shall attempt to give you in summary the important facts so that they may be evaluated in proper perspective.

For your ready reference and possible future study we have reproduced the large charts I shall refer to in my comments this morning in booklet form. You may find it convenient to refer to them, by number, as I proceed with my remarks.

As shown on chart 1 the record high postal deficit of 1952 has been reduced. But increases in costs of about $200 million a year, resulting largely from wage increases and fringe benefits recently enacted by the Congress, have reversed the downward deficit trend. As this chart clearly indicates, in the next fiscal year the deficit will once again approach the half-billion-dollar level. Without rate increases now, the financial gains we have made will be offset and the postal deficit will once again move upward.

The losses sustained in the decade since World War II total $4.6 billion. These losses, which are five times as great as the deficit accumulated during the decade prior to the war, have become part of the national debt.

Four and six-tenths billion dollars is a staggering sum for the American people to owe for postal services they have received over the last 10 years. It means that each family in the United States owes more than $100 for mail long since read and disposed of. Deferred payment for homes, cars, and refrigerators has a proper place in our economy, but we should not mortgage the future of the American citizen for the price of postage.

Rate increases alone will not provide a complete or lasting solution for today's deficit problem. What is needed is a fiscal program, including rate increases, which will lead to financial stability in the Post Office Department. The President, in a special message to the Congress on January 1, 1955, advanced such a program. The bill now before this committee embodies the major proposals enumerated in his message. If enacted, the bill will do the following:

1. Provide interim rate increases as a step toward balancing the postal budget.

2. Establish a permanent ratemaking commission which will prescribe rates of postage under policy guidance of the Congress.

3. Express the determination of the Congress that the post office shall be operated on a sound financial basis.

II. HUGE ANNUAL DEFICITS—A POSTWAR

Before examining the general proposals contained in H. R. 9228, I should like to further emphasize the enormous scope of the postwar postal deficit.

There is widespread misunderstanding concerning the causes, the dimensions, and the historical facts concerning the postal deficit. Many people mistakenly believe that the Post Office has always operated at a heavy loss. The fact is that oppressive postal deficits are an unfortunate phenomenon of the postwar years alone.

Chart 2 reveals in simple graphic form the overwhelming disparity between the average prewar and the average postwar deficits. As you can see, from 1900 to 1940 the average annual deficit was about $33 million. During the decade following World War II, the average annual deficit increased to about $460 million—almost 14 times as great as the prewar average.

In recent years, heavy expenditures by Government for national defense and other essential purposes have tended to make us indifferent to figures running into billions of dollars. Perhaps the real cost of the postwar postal deficit is more apparent in terms of what that money might have bought for the American people. This appears on Chart 3.

The aggregate postwar deficit of $4.6 billion could have made a very substantial contribution to national defense. It might have added 150 destroyers to the fleet or provided funds for 20 new bomber wings with a total of a thousand planes. Or it might have equipped 23 infantry divisions with modern arms and equipment.

In terms of our badly needed road program, the postwar postal deficit might have built 46,000 miles of new roads exclusive of right-of-way.

Many opponents of rate increases seek to justify large postal losses as a contribution to the educational and cultural advancement of the American people. I certainly favor better public education, but I seriously question that subsidized postal rates are the best means to this end. Let me show you—on chart 4—what a direct expenditure of this sum for educational purposes might have meant for the American people.

Four billion six hundred million dollars might have built 6,000 high schools or 13,000 badly needed elementary schools. It could have provided 4-year scholarships in science and the arts to a million deserving young Americans otherwise not financially able to receive the benefits of higher education. In terms of the dissemination of printed matter, this sum could have built 13,800 public libraries for the use of all Americans, young and old alike, or more than 7,000 libraries on the campuses of small colleges and universities whose facilities have been long outgrown.

If doubt still exists concerning the need for rate adjustments, I am certain that it will be quickly dispelled by chart 5 which is now before you. This chart tells a story which every American should know. The annual postal deficit in this Nation is three and one-half times as great as the combined postal deficits of the world's free nations. And, ladies and gentlemen, the people of this great Nation have the right to ask—"Why?"

It may appear to members of this committee that I am belaboring the magnitude of the postwar postal deficit but I am convinced that its true dimensions are not known and understood by the public. I hope that the Congress, in behalf of the

American public, will take immediate and positive action to reduce it to manageable proportions.

III. CAUSES OF THE POSTWAR DEFICIT

I should like now to deviate a moment in anticipation of a question which surely has occurred to each of you: "What has caused the postal deficit to increase so alarmingly in the postwar period?"

The Post Office Department operates in the same economic climate as other Government agencies, private businesses and the households of America. Costs increased sharply for business, Government and households alike in the postwar years and the Post Office was affected in the same measure as indicated on chart 6.

Since 1945, annual postal costs have increased by $1.6 billion. The largest part by far of this increase was due to labor costs.

The increases in wages and employee benefits enacted by the Congress since 1945 are listed on the next chart (7). The Congress has granted postal workers six increases in wages since the end of World War II which, together with fringe benefits, have added more than a billion and a quarters dollars to our annual operating costs.

These increases were just and necessary to keep postal wages on a par with wages paid for similar skills by industry.

However, while postal wages were increasing as indicated, the Congress raised postal rates to provide only $286 million in additional revenues.

Simply stated, the deficits of recent years are the direct result of the disparity between increases in costs and increases in rates of postage. For all practical purposes, our rate level today is little changed from the level of 1932.

This is illustrated on chart 8.

Since 1932, the level of postal costs has increased 107 percent but postal rates have lagged far behind. Despite sharp increases in cost, letter rates are the same today as they were in 1932.

Third-class mail, consisting largely of advertising matter, has increased only 38 percent.

Second-class rates were increased by 30 percent in 1951, but it should be noted that this increase merely offset rate decreases granted in previous years. As a result, publishers' second-class rates today are only 3 percent above the level of 1932. As a matter of further interest, I might point out that the rates in 1932 were the same as the final level of rates effected by the act of October 3, 1917, when zone rates on advertising were initiated.

The failure to adjust rates of postage to offset unavoidable changes in cost is the main reason for the record total deficit of $4.6 billion in the last 10 years.

IV. COMMONSENSE PRICING

The need for additional revenues is obvious. However, differences exist as to how these increases shall be apportioned among the various classes of mail.

The Congress, recognizing the need for a more systematic approach to rate making, authorized the Department to establish a divison of postal rates. This was accomplished in May 1953.

We employed a small staff of rate experts to develop a system of pricing which would provide proper and adequate revenues for each class of mail.

These experts reported that such a pricing system already exists and is widely used by the courts, regulatory agencies and such business-type branches of the Federal Government as the Alaska Railroad, the Panama Canal Company, and others.

They refer to this system as differential pricing but I prefer to think of it as "common sense" pricing.

Differential pricing is a process of establishing charges based on differences in the various services. These differences relate to very realistic elements of cost which are not subject to cost accounting procedures. They relate, also, to market characteristics of each such service which bear no relations to cost.

Rate proposals submitted to the Congress in the past have been challenged repeatedly due to the overemphasis of costs in the pricing of postal services. Cost alone is not an acceptable basis for rate making. Cost ascertainment is a tool of management which should not be confused with rate ascertainment.

The complex subject of cost ascertainment and its application to rate-making procedures will be discussed in considerable detail by the Deputy Postmaster General, Mr. Maurice H. Stans, whose testimony will follow mine.

The proposals under consideration conform to sound principles of differential pricing. While a detailed statement in support of each of the specific rate provisions contained in H. R. 9228 will be presented by Mr. Albert J. Robertson, Assistant Postmaster General and Controller, I should now like to discuss briefly its principal provisions.

V. THE FIRST STEP—RATE ADJUSTMENTS

The bill consists of two titles. Title I provides for general rate adjustments. Title II establishes a permanent rate-making Commission and prescribes in detail the framework of policy within which the Commission shall function.

First-class mail

One of our proposals calls for an increase in first-class letter rates. There is a good reason for this proposal.

First-class mail is a prime postal service, receiving preferential treatment every step of the way. The security, privacy, and priority of service received by first-class mail are premium-service factors. Premium service is a more valuable service and we believe that those who receive the greater benefits of letter mail should pay a larger share of postal costs.

Even at the new rate we are recommending for letter mail I believe the public in general—the first-class postal patron—also the voter—will agree that it would be the biggest bargain in America to purchase a 4-cent stamp and to know that a 1-ounce letter can be handed to your carrier at your door—or dropped in any collection box any place in the United States—and be delivered safely and expeditiously either across town or across the United States.

In fact, the thoughtful citizen must wonder why letter rates have not been raised in almost a quarter of a century. He knows that the nickel telephone call, the 10-cent loaf of bread, and 50-cent haircut are prices of a past era—and yet, letter stamps are still 3 cents.

The ability of the postal patron to absorb a 1-cent increase in letter mail is manifest, as shown on chart 9. Since 1932, per capita disposable income has increased more than 300 percent.

The prices of telephone and telegraph messages have also increased. Prices are up all along the line but letter rates are the same as they were in 1932.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Post Office is not an institutional relic. It is a dynamic business-type organization serving a progressive American economy. The letter rate should not be based on the historical environment of the early 1930's.

The Post Office operates a vast communications system for the exchange of information and ideas among our people. But the telegraph and telephone industries also provide networks of communications. Is it reasonable and consistent to subsidize the mails as a contribution to "public welfare" while taxing those who use the others?

The responsibilities we share for the sound fiscal management of the Post Office compel us to exact revenues from each class of mail equal to the value of the services performed for that class. One might think from adverse comment against a letter-rate increase that these proposals reflect a reversal of congressional policy. The facts show otherwise.

The Congress itself has established the policy that first-class mail, which receives preferential treatment, should make a revenue contribution above cost. In 1932, the Congress reiterated its faith in this historic doctrine by increasing the revenue contribution of first-class mail from 12 to 46 percent above cost and maintaining it at approximately this level until World War II. We wholeheartedly endorse this policy. It is the foundation of "common sense" pricing and is equitable in terms of value received. The present proposals will merely continue this policy.

Every citizen is aware that if postal expenses are not recovered from those who use the mails, they must then be paid by the taxpayer. Let's take a closer look at this proposition on chart 10.

If letter rates are advanced 75 percent of the additional revenues will be derived from business users of the mails and 25 percent from individuals for their personal mail.

Now, what would be the situation if postal rates are permitted to remain at their present inadequate levels? The postal deficit will then be borne, for the most part, by those who pay Federal income taxes. Over 60 percent of total Federal income taxes are paid by individuals, while the portion paid by corporations is only 40 percent.

In brief, ladies and gentleman, low letter rates maintained by taxes work to the disadvantage of the individual. The large users of the mails benefit.

In view of all these facts, the proposal to increase the letter rate by 1 cent per ounce appears to be moderate, fair and reasonable.

Second-class mail

We come next to second-class mail, a classification which has always been carried at a substantial loss.

I should like to comment first on the increase in second-class rates enacted by the Congress in 1951. As shown on chart 11 this adjustment has produced additional annual revenues of about $12.8 million. However, while second-class mail was producing $12.8 million in additional revenues, the cost of providing this service increased by $56.4 million a year—or better than a 4 to 1 ratio. On this basis alone, a rate increase is overdue in second-class mail.

But there is another and even more urgent consideration portrayed on chart 12. The proposed rates will increase revenues from second-class mail by about $17 million. This is actually less than the increased costs of postal pay and fringe benefit legislation recently enacted by the Congress. These additional costs amount to about $21 million a year for second-class mail only.

The service which is extended to newspaper and magazine publishers is made up of several operations, each of which costs money. Labor and transportation alone add up to 93 percent of total expenditures.

Now, let me show you a familiar sight—the mailman starting on his rounds. (This is 12-A in your booklet.)

We selected one at random here in the city of Washington and analyzed the mail he was going to deliver that day. Here is what we found:

Seventeen percent of the weight consisted of letter mail.

Fourteen percent of small parcels.

Eleven percent of advertising matter moving at third-class rates.

The balance of 58 percent consisted of magazines and newspapers.

That these figures are fairly typical is indicated by the fact that in fiscal 1955 the weight of second-class mail was 59.1 percent of the total weight of all mail other than parcel post.

From a standpoint of manpower it is obvious that carrying magazines around a mailman's route presents more of a problem than handling first-class mail.

Here is a copy of one of the magazines in his pack. This one tips the scales at about a pound. The mail circulation of this magazine is currently somewhat over 4½ million per week, which means that the post office must handle and transport, in the course of a year, somewhat more than 117,000 tons of this magazine to all parts of the United States.

In fiscal 1955 it cost the Post Office Department—which at the present time means the American taxpayer—$235 million more to deliver second-class publications than was received from them in payment of postal rates.

The question we must face is this: With due regard for public welfare, how much of this cost should the taxpayer absorb—and how much can fairly be charged to the publications?

Here is a 1932 issue of one of these publications. I direct your attention to the price printed on the cover: 5 cents. Here is a current issue of the same publication. The price printed on the cover of this one is 15 cents. Apparently, public welfare suffered no setback from this price increase, since the circulation today is more than 4½ million compared with a circulation of about 2¾ million in 1932.

As a matter of further interest, the advertising revenue for this publication in 1932 was about $22 million—while the advertising revenue in 1955 is reported to be about $83 million.

Now, I have no criticism of these figures. But it is difficult to understand why a publication which has tripled its newsstand price, and has had almost a fourfold increase in advertising revenue, should continue to receive postal service at 1932 rates.

May I hasten to add that the situation of this magazine is not unique but was selected as being fairly typical.

Almost all publications have shared in the growing volume of magazine advertising which reached an all-time high in 1955. It is also true that virtually all major publications have increased their newsstand prices since the 1930's.

There is still another point involved. In spite of magazine price increases, total circulation of all magazines has soared—reaching a record high in 1955. No one can seriously contend that increases in the selling prices of publications—ranging as high as 300 percent—have been a deterrent to total magazine circulation. The continuing increase in circulation—despite higher prices—proves beyond all doubt that the people are willing to pay a price sufficient to cover all costs—including fair postal rates.

I strongly believe in the American pricing system. This pricing system has resulted in the highest per capita output that the world has ever known. The pricing policies adopted by newspapers and magazines in their general business dealings conform to that system. I do not believe—and never will—that a profit-motivated publisher who is turning out a good product cannot pay a fair price for the postal services he receives—and, ladies and gentlemen, the rates we are recommending for second-class matter are extremely moderate.

There is one final point I should like to raise regarding the rates on periodical mail.

You are all aware that some people contend that the Post Office Department was established to carry letter mail and therefore all other classes of mail should pay only the additional operating costs incurred in their handling. We do not subscribe to this theory but let us examine it as it applies to second-class rates of postage.

In its report of March 24, 1954, the Senate Advisory Council estimated the additional operating costs incurred in providing second-class service to be $107 million. At the present time we estimate that these incremental costs applicable to second-class mail are about $150 million a year. Nevertheless, using the Council's estimate as a base, second-class mail revenues in 1955 were at least $50 million below these incremental costs and more than $221 million below fully allocated costs.

The proposals relating to second-class rate adjustments will not even recover this understated out-of-pocket loss of $50 million. This is important, for past discussions have been confused by contentions that Congress has adopted the policy that publications should be subsidized in the public interest.

Whether or not that is the case, even after these rate proposals become effective, second-class mail will still be carried far below cost. The only question is—how much below cost is fair and equitable to all concerned?

Third-class mail

Certain rate adjustments are also being recommended for third-class mail which consists largely of advertising matter.

It was never the sense of the Congress, as far as we can ascertain, that commercial advertising matter should be carried in the mails at the expense of the general taxpayer. In 1926, when the annual cost ascertainment program was inaugurated, third-class mail was paying 98 percent of its fully allocated cost.

Despite this excellent beginning—and here I should like to direct your attention to chart 13—successive pay and other cost increase have caused an excess of expenditures over revenues in third-class mail of $1.3 billion in the postwar years.

The effect of the twin evils of rising costs and lagging rates was to reduce expense coverage in this class of mail to 61 percent in the last fiscal year and to 57 percent in this fiscal year. The proposals under consideration will increase the expense coverage to 73 percent.

This class of mail does not receive the privileges and preferment of service which letter mail receives. These are pertinent differentials which are reflected in our rate recommendations.

In proposing third-class rate adjustments we have been mindful of the importance of advertising in the American economy. We recognize that advertising plays a key role in the distribution of goods and services which are produced in our factories and mills. But this should not preclude a fair and reasonable rate for the services extended by the Post Office Department in delivering the advertisements.

Since 1946 national expenditures for advertising have more than doubled, reaching an alltime high in 1955. Direct mail advertising shared in these phenomenal gains, increasing by almost 250 percent during this period.

This increase in direct mail advertising is reflected in the volume of third-class mail. In 1946 we handled about 6 billion pieces. In the present fiscal year volume is expected to be about 15 billion pieces.

There is no valid reason why the taxpayer should continue to subsidize the distribution of advertisements.

VI. THE SECOND STEP: A COMMISSION ON POSTAL RATES

I should like to read a brief passage from the President's special message on the Post Office dated January 11, 1955:

"If the Post Office is to successfully meet the challenge of the future its prices must be sufficiently flexible to reflect changes in costs and the developing needs of a dynamic economy. It is my belief that an independent commission entrusted with the authority to establish and maintain fair and equitable postal rates can best provide this needed flexibility."

Consideration of the rate problems which have beset this committee in the past shows the tremendous magnitude and detail of the task encompassed in adjustment of postal rates. The vigorous American economy is a breeding place of change. That there will be a need for rate adjustments in the future is a certainty.

The rate structure has grown complex and cumbersome. The complexity of ratemaking is due, in large measure, to the fact that the consumer of goods and services does not pay for cost but for value received. Only through appraisal of ability to pay, value of service, the cost and nature of alternative services available, and a host of other tangible and intangible factors can a fair and equitable rate pattern be established. The experience of all regulatory agencies indicates that such an appraisal can best be made by highly skilled specialists who, through constant application, develop a reservoir of experience in establishing specific rates.

Another and equally important consideration is the urgent need for rate-making procedures which will allow greater flexibility in adjusting rates to meet changing conditions as they occur. Ratemaking by legislation has resulted in a tendency for rate adjustments to lag far behind the need for revenues. Moreover it has damaging effects on the financial condition of the postal service and—in terms of deficit financing—operates to the detriment of the taxpayer.

These facts lead to the unavoidable conclusion that a permanent commission, empowered to develop and maintain equitable and reasonable postal rates under policy guidance of the Congress is the only practical solution.

The proposals under consideration would place the pricing of postal services on a sound economic basis and relieve the Congress of the burdensome, time-consuming, and technical task of ratemaking.

The establishment of a ratemaking commission does not mean that the Congress will relinquish control over the postal rate structure. The Congress will continue to dictate the policy framework within which the Commission shall operate. The Congress will also prescribe, and amend—when necessary, the rules of ratemaking which the Commission must follow. It will also remain the prerogative of the Congress to prescribe special low rates of postage for certain postal services to give expression to public welfare factors.

In short, it is intended that the Congress maintain control over postal rates through policy guidance while the Commission gives specific expression to such policies.

VII. A SELF-SUSTAINING POST OFFICE

The phenomenal economic growth of the Nation since the turn of the century has been reflected in an even greater growth in the volume of mail. While our population has doubled and our gross national product—measured in terms of constant dollars—has more than trebled, the volume of mail matter increased almost seven and one-half times.

In its report of October 27, 1954, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report predicted that by 1965 population would reach 190 million and total national output would increase to $535 billion. On the basis of these estimates, it is predicted that mail volume will climb to 74 billion in the next 10 years.

Ladies and gentlemen, if we do not put our financial house in order now, how shall we fare in 1965? If we assume that costs and revenues in the decade ahead continue in the same relationship as the last 10 years, the postal deficit in 1965 may be more than a billion dollars. Continued delay will not solve our fiscal problems but will further complicate and intensify them.

Opponents of our views will base their opposition, in part, on the contention that the post office is a public service institution. They will say: Why should Congress be concerned about the postal deficit? Why not support the post office with tax funds as is done with other Federal agencies?

The allegation that the Post Office Department is attempting to operate under a different set of fiscal rules than those guiding other departments of the Federal Government is not true.

All Federal agencies are encouraged by law to establish fees and charges for measurable services when performed for identifiable individuals or organizations. Public Law 137 (5 U. S. C. 140) of the 82nd Congress established the policy that such services be "self-sustaining to the full extent possible."

The fact that other agencies do not attempt to break even overall does not indicate that they or the Post Office are in conflict with expressed congressional intent. Generally speaking, only a relatively small portion of the functions of other Federal agencies are of measurable value as they apply to identifiable individuals or businesses. When other departments do perform such services they charge accordingly. The Post Office is unique only in that practically all of its services are of measurable value and are performed for identifiable patrons.

There are other forceful arguments in support of a break-even policy for the Post Office.

There is the American tradition of fair play. In the interest of common justice those individuals and organizations that receive the benefits of postal services should support those services.

The Post Office is dedicated to service in the public interest, but this is not a valid reason for operating the Post Office at a loss which must be made up by the taxpayer.

Privately and publicly owned gas, light, transportation, and water companies all provide essential public services. They are required by law to operate in the public interest. But these utilities, whether privately or publicly owned, charge a fair price for the services they perform. When then should the Post Office Department continue to operate at a deficit?

The Department recognizes that a small number of its services are performed for the benefit of the people at large. One such example is free mail for the blind. The cost of these welfare services is relatively low and should not hinder us in placing the Post Office on a self-supporting basis. All that is necessary is that public welfare services be identified and provision made by the Congress to reimburse the Department for their costs.

I think what we are trying to accomplish is clearly defined on chart 14.

We are asking that postal patrons pay only for the services they receive. In this category falls the four classes of mail and the special services, both domestic and international. On the other side of the fence are the services performed either for government agencies or in the interest of the public at large.

As you can see, the Congress has already taken action to remove from the postal deficit two major items of cost not related to patron services. The Department is now reimbursed for penalty and franked mail and the airline subsidy has been transferred from the Post Office to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Two bills, which we support, have already been introduced in the Congress. If enacted, these bills will provide reimbursement of about $30 million to postal accounts for services performed by the Department either for Government agencies or in the interest of the general public.

The importance of identifying and providing reimbursement for so-called "public-welfare" services is further emphasized by the misapplication of this term by opponents of rate increases. In seeking to adapt the "public-welfare" concept to their own ends, they allege that no private business could operate so many units and offer such broad services as does the Post Office and still break even. They reason from this that smaller post offices and rural routes are operated in the public welfare and that the costs should be paid by the taxpayer. This is specious reasoning.

The Department dispenses a national communication service in which rural routes and smaller post offices peform a necessary function. Many of these do not take in sufficient revenues to cover costs. But how much revenue would be lost at the larger post offices if these smaller units and rural routes were not available to distribute the mails? The small post offices and rural routes were not established primarily to originate revenue, but are an integral part of our national distribution network. More than 10 million families are served by rural routes and small post offices.

Post office terminals, also an integral part of our distribution system, do not produce any revenues. Shall we ask the taxpayers to underwrite the cost of our terminals, too?

The rate proposals under discussion are fair and reasonable. Only by means of rate increases can we place the Post Office on a sound financial basis. However, as stated earlier, these proposals will not immediately make the Post Office a breakeven operation.

The deficit in the next fiscal year is estimated at $470 million. The bill before us will produce about $407 million in additional revenues, leaving a deficit of $63 million.

Most of the member nations of the Universal Postal Union operate close to a breakeven basis. Many actually make a profit from their postal operations. I do not endorse this idea. But I do maintain that the Post Office of this Nation should be operated on a self-sustaining basis.

VIII. THE NEED FOR MODERNIZATION

There is another problem of the Post Office which should be considered when talking about our financial situation. I am referring to the need of a modernization program.

Over the past 20 years, the Post Office has experienced an increase of almost 250 percent in mail volume while its Government-owned buildings have remained virtually unchanged. As a result, its physical plant has grown obsolescent and inadequate. Our expenditures on our postal buildings are not keeping up with their deterioration and our need for expansion.

In many cities we have completely outgrown these buildings. In some localities we are handling mail on the sidewalks regardless of weather conditions. In hundreds of post offices, postal workers are hampered by poor lighting, antiquated equipment, and insufficient space. Under such handicaps, morale and efficiency suffer, and only through exceptional efforts is the American public afforded adequate mail service.

A few post offices have already been renovated with the limited funds at our disposal. The resulting experience proves beyond doubt that an investment in modernizing postal facilities brings an immediate return in better mail service.

A comprehensive survey has now been completed of the Department's building and modernization needs. This is explained on chart 15. A 5-year program has been developed but not yet activated. The annual cost to accomplish this program would average about $133 million, but, for the first year, cost would be somewhat less than that.

In my report to the President dated January 30, 1956, I informed him that the rate proposals now under consideration would provide $56½ million above the estimates included in the 1957 budget. The enactment of these proposals would provide funds to begin the modernization program during the next fiscal year.

This program should pay dividends in improved operating efficiency and employee morale. By increasing postal rates, adopting sound fiscal policies and ratemaking procedures, and by modernizing postal facilities, the Congress will have insured the American people that heavy postal deficits are a matter of history.

IX. CONFUSION

I have appeared before you today because the task which we have undertaken cannot be completed without your help. The issues at stake involve more than fiscal responsibility. There is a moral issue as well. We cannot, in good conscience, continue to burden the taxpayer for services rendered to others. We should not—as responsible members of the Government—allow the problem to fester in the hope that it will be cured by future administration. We should, in my judgment, put an end to the practice of saddling generations yet unborn with the cost of today's postal services.

For our part, we intend to continue our efforts to increase our efficiency and to further reduce our costs. But a half billion-dollar deficit is not a problem which can be met in this way.

This has been recognized by the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate. House Committee Report No. 1743, dated February 3, 1956, in referring to the cost of handling the mails, stated "it is obvious that the presently established rates are woefully inadequate to compensate for such necessary expenditures."

I should also like to quote a brief passage from Report No. 1624 of the Senate Committee on Appropriations dated March 6, 1956:

"Regardless of any additional economies which might be effected in the operation of the Department, there will still be a need for additional revenues and this committee urges the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the Members of the Senate to give diligent attention to the problem of increasing postal revenues if the Department is to be placed on a sound fiscal basis while carrying out its service responsibilities to the people."

The proposals before us are neither political nor partisan in nature. Sound financial management is the common responsibility of all who hold public office regardless of political affiliation. I might add that every postal rate adjustment enacted in previous years has received support from both sides of the aisle.

I might add, too, that the rates which we have adjusted under our own authority have been well accepted by the public.

I am deeply appreciative of the courtesies which the members of this committee have extended to me today. I wish to thank each of you individually for this opportunity to appear before you.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 16, 1956

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 13, 1956)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Daniel W. Justice, D. D., minister, St. Luke's Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father of all mankind, teach us always that Thou art our refuge and our redemption.

Give to us the power to perform our personal and national tasks in the quietness and confidence of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, who shared Thy life so beautifully and helpfully with all mankind.

Teach us how to take the gift of a new day and make of it one that is free in conscience, joyous in relationship to our fellow men, radiant in faith, and rich in consecrated service.

Bless the President of this great country, bless the assembled Congress of the United States in all its responsibilities, and grant that the beauty of Thy spirit may be upon its members and strengthen them in every undertaking.

These blessings we ask in the name of our dear Redeemer, Christ. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. EARLE C. CLEMENTS, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CLEMENTS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Thursday, March 15, 1956, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 16, 1956, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2884) to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Barkley	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Clements	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Magnuson	Stennis
Hill	Murray	Young
Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger	
Kerr	Payne	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GORE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. WILLIAMS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). A quorum is present.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we have the usual morning hour, with the remarks of Senators limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. Doc. No. 105)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the Department of the Interior, in the amount of $764,000, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ALTERNATE DRAFTS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting alternate drafts of proposed legislation to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SECOND LT. ROBERT J. MARSHALL

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of 2d Lt. Robert J. Marshall (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter, in the nature of a memorial, from the Northeast Businessmen's Association, Washington, D. C., signed by August R. Terneak, secretary, remonstrating against public ownership of the transit system in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A resolution adopted by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, at Chicago, Ill., favoring enactment of the bill (S. 748) to prohibit the United States from acquiring mineral interests in lands acquired by it except when necessary to serve the purpose for which such lands are acquired; ordered to lie on the table.

FEDERAL AID TO SMALL IRRIGATION PROJECTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the establishment of small irrigation projects in cooperation with the States.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the establishment of small irrigation projects in North Dakota, and in other States, periodically afflicted by drought on account of variation of rainfall, is needed to stabilize the production of crops, particularly feed crops, and thereby stabilize the

agricultural economy and promote the welfare of the people therein; and

Whereas it has been conservatively estimated, and in fact demonstrated, that because of the routine of specialized detailed investigation, cross checking of design and division of staff into many categories, required by Federal regulations, the cost of small irrigation projects, planned, designed and constructed by the Federal Government is approximately 30 percent larger than the cost of similar projects, planned, designed and constructed by a State or local governmental unit thereof; and

Whereas some western and midwestern States, including North Dakota, maintain engineering staffs, which, although not specialized, have professional competence in the field of engineering to adequately investigate, plan, design and construct small multiple-purpose projects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission in meeting assembled this 9th day of March 1956, That the commission does hereby recommend and request that Congress enact a bill providing for the establishment of small irrigation projects in cooperation with the States.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. 3116. A bill to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals; with amendments (Rept. No. 1664).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3461. A bill for the relief of Margaret C. Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. POTTER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. THYE, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. DWORSHAK):

S. 3462. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE (for himself, Mr. WILEY and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 3463. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to extend the provisions of section 201 (c) and the provisions of section 202 (a) and (b), relating to the disposition of surplus dairy products, and the provisions of section 204 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1954 relating to the program for eradication of brucellosis; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 3464. A bil for the relief of Edward W. Mundie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3465. A bill relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 3466. A bill to exempt certain shipments of farm produce from the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 3467. A bill to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 3468. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend certain contracts providing for the furnishing of water to the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., for municipal purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITION TO NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleagues, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senato from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. [MCCARTHY], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the national system of interstate highways.

The interstate highway that my colleagues and I are interested in having designated as a national highway is Highway No. 2, approximately 2,300 miles in length, beginning at some point on the existing interstate highway system in the eastern portion of the northern peninsula of Michigan and extending across that peninsula running in a generally westerly direction through Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana and Idaho, and ending in Everett, Wash.

U. S. Highway No. 2 is the shortest through arterial connecting highway link between Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and Seattle, Wash. This is the only United States highway which runs parallel with the northern border of the United States. U. S. No. 2 intercepts all north and south highway communications between Canada and this country west of the Great Lakes.

In recent years there has been a tremendous growth of industries—lumbering, minerals, oil, and nuclear in the States along this route. In addition there is great industrial potential in the area because of the power projects completed, under construction, and those planned in the Northwest. There has been a comparable growth in the ad-Columbia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan, joining Canadian Provinces of British making the necessity of a national highway in the area all the more important. The increased interest in the defense of our northern frontier has resulted in a more important part to play for this interstate highway.

The expansion and development of this area is typified by the Glasgow and Great Falls Airbases, the Anaconda Aluminum Co. of Columbia Falls, Mont., and Hungry Horse Dam. These are illustrations in my State alone. There are comparable developments in all the States served by Highway No. 2. This highway connects with the Alcan Highway. It is a means of contact between our air defense bases along the entire northern boundary.

If a mutual agreement can be made with Canada, Highway No. 2 can be linked from the east coast to the west coast through New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine.

In 1955 both houses of the Montana State Legislature passed memorials urging that United States Highway No. 2 be placed on the national highway system. It is my understanding that four of the State legislatures concerned have passed memorials recommending this action—Montana, Washington, Idaho, and North Dakota.

Congressman LEE METCALF, of Montana's First Congressional District, has joined with Congressman VICTOR KNOX, of Michigan, in introducing similar bills in the House of Representatives.

On behalf of myself and my colleagues, cosponsors of this bill, I urge that this proposal be given early consideration and approval so that United States Highway No. 2 can be added to the strategic highway system in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3462) to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the national system of interstate highways, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In addition to the routes designated under the preceding provisions of this section there shall be designated as a part of such system a highway approximately 2,300 miles in length, beginning at some point on the existing interstate highway system in the eastern portion of the northern peninsula of Michigan and extending across that peninsula running in a generally westerly direction through Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, and Idaho, and ending in Everett, Wash."

EFFECTIVE DATES OF INCREASES IN COMPENSATION GRANTED TO WAGE BOARD EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to fix a more realistic effective date for wage adjustments for Federal civil service per diem and hourly paid employees whose wages are determined by departmental wage boards and other administrative wage-fixing authorities.

This bill would expedite wage adjustments to these Federal employees, consistent with the intent of statutory provisions, which require that such wage rates of Federal per diem and hourly paid employees be consistent with rates paid to private-industry employees who are performing comparable work within recruiting and commuting distances of each of the federally owned and operated facilities of the various agencies of the Government.

Administrative policy does not authorize a local area private industry wage survey to determine the local wage rate, unless there is evidence to indicate that adjustments in hourly rates are necessary because of changing private industry wage patterns in each area. Therefore, this fact alone should justify the necessity of requiring that such wage adjustments be made effective at the beginning of the first pay period following the ordering of such local wage surveys.

This bill provides safeguards against the retroactive payment of wage adjustments to employees who voluntarily quit or who are discharged for cause. It likewise contains a safeguard against the possibility of the estate of a deceased employee, claiming increased life-insurance benefits under the Federal Employee Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, because of a demise of the employee between the effective date of wage adjustments and the date that retroactive payment is actually made. The bill does authorize the retroactive payment of wage adjustments to employees who die or who retire under applicable provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act, between the effective date of wage adjustments and the date that such employees' retirement becomes effective.

Mr. President, a recent survey supplied to my office reveals that in one Government agency the lag of time between the starting of a local wage survey, and the effective date of payment of wage adjustments amounts to an average of 109 working days, excluding Saturdays and Sundays. Inasmuch as the various agencies coordinate the effective dates of such wage adjustments in each local area we can conclude that the lag in wage adjustments is generally comparable throughout the entire Federal service.

This loss of wages, properly due the affected employees, has caused a serious loss of purchasing power, and is of grave concern to the local businesses in each of the affected areas.

Mr. President, I am convinced that this bill, when enacted into law, will correct a serious inequity to Federal per diem and hourly rate employees under administrative wage-fixing authorities. I am also convinced that it will boost morale and confidence in the Federal civilian service by establishing a wage-adjustment policy which is universally accepted in private industry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3465) relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage-board employees, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENT

Mr. HOLLAND submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. SCOTT) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

GREAT LAKES FISHERY ACT OF 1956—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 14, 1956, the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3447) to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington, September 10, 1954, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THYE (for himself and other Senators) on March 14, 1956.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HRUSKA:

Statement prepared by him with reference to Archbishop Josef Beran, archbishop of Prague.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Press release issued by him on March 15, 1956, on the repayment by the Henry J. Kaiser companies of their Government loans.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE SENATE FOR 10 MINUTES DURING THE MORNING HOUR

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that before the morning hour has been concluded I be permitted to address the Senate for about 10 minutes on a very important subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope the Senator will permit other Senators who desire to make insertions under the 2-minute rule to do so, if it is agreeable to him, before he makes his address to the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, Mr. President; that is why I requested permission to make my remarks before the conclusion of the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AN EQUITABLE ALLOCATION OF THE ELECTORAL VOTES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, soon there will be before the Senate the proposed constitutional amendment to reform the inequitable system of allocating electoral votes by which the President and Vice President are chosen. I have been interested in this reform for some years, and was one of the sponsors, with former Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, in introducing the so-called Lodge-Gossett joint resolution a couple of years ago.

Now, through the efforts of those sponsoring different approaches to this question, we have a measure that should make it possible for the States to participate in the proposed reform in an effective way. In the New York Times of today, Friday, March 16, Mr. Arthur Krock, in his column under the title of "An Equitable Division of the Electoral Vote," makes a very clear statement of what the proposed amendment will do. This column of Mr. Krock's is enlightening to all of us, and in view of the probably early consideration of this matter, I ask unanimous consent that the column be published in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EQUITABLE DIVISION OF THE ELECTORAL VOTE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 15.—Congress, in a bill to be taken up by the Senate next Monday, now has the best opportunity in many years to reform the inequitable system of allocating the electoral votes by which Presidents and Vice Presidents are chosen. The movement has at last taken on legislative momentum that could result in the submission to the States at this session of a constitutional amendment by two-thirds of the Senate and the House.

If the draft, or its substance, endorsed today by 51 Senate sponsors, is approved by Congress, and three-fourths of the States follow suit, the text will become part of the Constitution. Thereafter:

No roving pressure or special-interest bloc of voters in a State where citizens are nar-

rowly divided in support of the two major parties can, by concentrating on one national ticket, deliver all the State's electors to that ticket.

No longer, whether because of this pressure bloc concentration or because of a naturally close division of the party vote, can all a State's electoral votes be won by the candidate with a majority or plurality, as the present system provides, even if that majority or plurality is represented by a single popular vote.

In States which choose the first of two alternatives in the draft agreed on today, their electoral votes will be apportioned among the three national tickets that lead in the popular poll, no matter how many tickets are in the field, in the same ratio that the popular vote received by each ticket bears to the total cast.

CHOICE FOR THE STATES

In States whose legislatures choose the second alternative, two electors, representing the two Senators to which each State is entitled, will be credited to the ticket receiving the statewide popular majority or plurality; and the one elector to which each Congressional district in a State is entitled will be credited to the ticket receiving the popular majoriy or plurality in that district. (This method, by which Senators and Representatives are now chosen, was embodied in the earliest reform of the electoral system after the adoption of the Constitution.)

The first alternative is the substance of the plan proposed to this Congress by Senator DANIEL, of Texas. The second embodies the device advocated by Senator MUNDT, of South Dakota; Senator THURMOND, of South Carolina; and Representative COUDERT, of New York.

The agreement today culminates a long and hitherto unproductive era of pioneering in electoral reform during which the pioneers, in addition to Coudert, were former Senator Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts; former Representative Gossett, of Texas; former Representative Lea, of California; and Senator Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee. Others, such as Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, have proposed the elimination of the electoral college, with its State blocs, and the direct choice of the President and Vice President by a nationwide popular majority or plurality. This was not included in the Daniel-Mundt-Thurmond bill, nor was the plan of Dr. Ralph M. Goldman of the Brookings Institution. He would give the two statewide electors to the ticket receiving a majority or plurality, and divide the remaining 435 (of the national total of 531) electors in ratio to the popular vote cast for each of 3 sets of candidates that led in the national poll.

OTHER NEW FEATURES

There are provisions in the draft for replacing winning candidates who die between election day and inauguration; also:

In apportioning a State's electors any fraction to which a ticket was entitled would be disregarded if less than one-thousandth of the statewide vote.

The States which choose the first alternative (above) shall send two lists to the United States Government within 45 days after the Presidential election. These lists will certify the number of popular votes cast for each Presidential and Vice Presidential candidate, with the number of electoral votes to which he is entitled.

If a national candidate has failed to acquire an electoral majority, Congress as a whole will make that choice by majority vote. In such circumstances now the House elects the President, the Senate, the Vice President, each State delegation having one vote for that purpose.

In States which prefer the second alternative, electors will be chosen at the polls, as at present, and the certificates sent to Washington will allocate the electors chosen according to the method fixed in the second alternative. In those States, also, a successful candidate for elector who has pledged his vote to specific candidates must cast his vote for them.

TRIBUTE TO MR. MAURICE PATE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to pay a personal tribute to a personal friend of mine for many years, Mr. Maurice Pate, who has been the U. N. representative in carrying on the work of UNICEF, which, as we all know, is the U. N. organization for the welfare of the children of the world. UNICEF has recently given Mr. Pate an award under the salutation of "friend of the world's children."

I have known Mr. Pate for many years, and value him highly not only as a friend, but because against many obstacles and difficulties, he has constantly continued to emphasize to the peoples of the world the importance of the International Children's Fund, the full name of which is the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, which was set up shortly after the close of World War II.

Mr. President, in the New York Times of March 16, there appeared an editorial entitled "Well-Deserved Award," which pays a tribute to Mr. Pate, and outlines briefly the vitally important work in which he has been engaged for so many years.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELL-DESERVED REWARD

One of the quiet men of the United Nations, Maurice Pate, has received a salute for his efforts with an award as Friend of the World's Children from the United States Committee for UNICEF. His devotion to the cause has assisted millions of children in 107 countries and territories. It comes at a time when Mr. Pate has just mildly informed his executive board that to live up to its obligations the member nations of UNICEF must set their sights higher for the future. The control of the world's killers and maimers—malaria, tuberculosis, yaws—has fired the minds of people in many countries, has demonstrated not only the humanity of these campaigns but the economic benefits that derive from having healthy, working populations. But studies estimate that nearly one-eighth of the world's people still have clinical attacks of malaria every year, and that in spite of dramatic advances malaria and yaws remain killers of children.

For the immediate future UNICEF expects voluntary contributions of $19 million, a slight increase over 1955, which may meet requirements for this year. But an eventual budget of $30 million must be sought to help countries build health solidly for their children. This is small change, indeed, for the more fortunate nations to provide. Mr. Pate has shown the way—and we expect that he will have his way.

REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES P. NELSON, OF MAINE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the announcement yesterday of Representative CHARLES P. NELSON, of the Second Maine Congressional District, that he will not seek reelection because of poor health was a surprise and shock to his many friends in Maine and throughout the Nation. The retirement because of poor health of an able colleague at the prime of life is, indeed, a sad occasion.

For many years CHARLIE NELSON and I have been closely associated in various public activities. Throughout the entire period I served as mayor of Augusta, 1935–41, he served as city solicitor. We both entered the Army Air Force at approximately the same time in World War II. After the war he served as mayor of Augusta. In 1948 he was elected to his first term in Congress at the same time I was elected Governor of Maine. Then in 1953, when I was elected to the Senate, I resumed my associations with CHARLIE NELSON in the Maine congressional delegation here in Washington.

CHARLIE NELSON, who was educated at Colby College and Harvard Law School, has distinguished himself as a hardworking and conscientious public servant. He is the able son of an able and distinguished father, the late John E. Nelson, who, himself, represented the Second Maine Congressional District in Congress from 1922 to 1933.

In the Congress, Charlie has worked diligently on matters relating to the economy and well-being of his district. He has served as an outstanding member of the House Armed Services Committee, where his own military experiences gave him an insight into the many problems of national defense.

The people of the Second Maine Congressional District, including myself, are losing the services of an able Representative. It is my hope that CHARLIE NELSON will be able to return to active political life after he has regained his health. I wish him a full and speedy recovery.

HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared apropos of Hungarian Independence Day, March 15.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

The 15th day of March is of special significance to all Americans of Hungarian descent. It is a day to be noted by every freedom-loving person for it marks the liberation of the Hungarian people from Hapsburg despotism.

The great leader in the battle for Hungarian independence in 1848 was the renowned Louis Kossuth. The memory of this champion of freedom is held dearly by all Hungarians. It has given to the brave people of Hungary the will to resist all oppressors and will continue to sustain them until their ultimate liberation is secured from the Russian invaders.

I join with all Americans in the fervent hope that this independence day brings the gallant people of Hungary closer to their liberation from the Soviet tyranny.

SUGGESTION THAT CLEARWATER NATIONAL FOREST OF IDAHO BE NAMED IN TRIBUTE TO BERNARD DE VOTO

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have just received a letter from the Honorable Christian A. Herter, Governor of

Massachusetts, supporting my proposal that the Clearwater National Forest of Idaho be named in tribute to the late great conservationist and author, Bernard De Voto.

Governor Herter's letter, which was unsolicited by me, is a fitting rebuke to those politicians who would make a partisan and provincial issue of my suggestion that Mr. De Voto be thus honored. Certain persons have claimed that Oregon Senators have no business proposing that a national forest in Idaho be renamed.

Let me say that, in 1949, the Columbia National Forest of the State of Washington was renamed in tribute to the late Gifford Pinchot, the illustrious conservationist who founded the United States Forest Service. People in Washington State welcomed this action. They felt it was a distinction for one of their scenic realms to be so honored. Washington then had a Democratic Senator, WARREN MAGNUSON, who still graces our Chamber today, and a Republican Senator, Harry Cain, since defeated for reelection. Both these men accepted the honor done their State without protest or public complaint. Indeed, I even have justifiable reason to believe that they heralded the move.

I believe, Mr. President, that the fine letter from Governor Herter, who is a national figure in the Republican Party, should silence effectively those persons who have tried to make a partisan local issue out of S. 3210, a bill introduced by my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] and myself to rename the Clearwater National Forest in tribute to Bernard De Voto, who wrote so vividly about the trail of Lewis and Clark through that mountain area of outdoor grandeur and majesty, and which this summer will become Mr. De Voto's last resting place.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Governor Herter's letter of March 12, 1956, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
State House, Boston, March 12, 1956.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing notes to both you and Senator MORSE as I have just learned from an editorial in the Boston Globe that you have jointly proposed a national forest to commemorate the name of Bernard De Voto.

As one of Bernard De Voto's friends, I would like very much to go on record in favor of honoring him. As I told Senator MORSE I hope the details can be worked out to the mutual satisfaction of all concerned.

With warmest regards.

Most sincerely yours,

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER.

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on several occasions during the present debate on the farm bill, severe criticism has been leveled at the National Farmers Union because of its advocacy of high-parity price supports. An effort has been on foot to create the impression that the Farmers Union is following the Communist or Socialist line in advocating this program of parity-price supports.

Coming from a State where I have had an opportunity to have close contact with the Farmers Union and its officers, I should like to make a few remarks to refute the charge that the members of the Farmers Union are inclined toward Communist or Socialist doctrines.

Mr. President I deeply regret the intimation that there is some sort of parallel between the doctrines of the Communist Party and the program of high price supports advocated by the Farmers Union.

I have waited several days for an opportunity to address the Senate, without unduly delaying the farm bill, in regard to the National Farmers Union. There has been no such opportunity, so I shall take only a moment at this time, and ask permission to have more extended remarks printed in the RECORD.

When the Farmers Union program and the Communist Party program were again compared recently on the Senate floor, I had a little research made on the inception of the full parity goal for agriculture, and on the results of other efforts to parallel Farmers Union objectives with socialism or communism.

I find that the National Farmers Union needs no defense. I know Jim Patton and other officers of the National Farmers Union, the Montana Farmers Union, and other State groups. They and the Farmers Union members are fine, loyal citizens, as more than a score of Senators on both sides of the aisle have already stated on the floor. I am glad these testimonials have been given, and am delighted to join in them. But the Farmers Union's ability to take care of itself even without our comments is evidenced by its growing membership, by numerous apologies and retractions that have been made by misguided individuals and groups who have attacked it, and by a $25,000 Federal court libel verdict it won in 1951, against the Utah Farm Bureau.

The only thing with which the Farmers Union can be charged is aggressively and tenaciously fighting for the parity goal for farmers, which Ed O'Neal of the Farm Bureau and other farm leaders launched in the thirties, but some have abandoned.

I ask unanimous consent that my prepared remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

Near the conclusion of the session of the Senate which adjourned at 11 p. m., Wednesday evening, March 7, the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] delivered an address in which he discussed at some length the farm programs advocated by the National Farmers Union and the Communist Party.

Near the conclusion of his remarks, the distinguished Senator made the statement that "he had not the faintest idea that either the officers or the members of the National Farmers Union are Communists, or communistic or that they have the slightest idea that their program is as close to the program announced by the American Communist Party as it is."

A little later he stated:

"I think there are tens of thousands of good farmers throughout the country who are supporting the leadership of the National Farmers Union and the program announced by that organization who have not the faintest idea that they are treading as closely as they are to the Communist line."

The Senator from Florida was very careful, as he always is, to be clear and exact in his statements, and to be completely fair in making the frank statement that he "had not the faintest idea if the officers or the members of the National Farmers Union" have "the slightest idea that their program is as close to the program announced by the American Communist Party as it is."

I am certain that, in his great fairness, the distinguished Senator will reassert and emphasize that portion of his statement which I have quoted, to any who might misunderstand his remarks. I know that he would be the last person who would want his remarks to be misinterpreted and improperly used.

Therefore, I am sure that he will welcome my making some remarks for the RECORD in regard to the inception of the parity goal, the Farmers Union and its record, and Communist objectives, which are intended to emphasize the true facts.

First and foremost, I should like to say that I know most of the leaders of the National Farmers Union. I know that they are not Communists or Communist sympathizers. They are all loyal, intelligent, and patriotic American citizens who know full well that other segments of the American economy have received Government protection—tariffs, subsidies, accelerated amortization, and similar programs of assistance—and realize that farmers are entitled to equal treatment from the Government unless they are to remain perpetually in economic trouble.

Second, I want to point out that the demand for parity for farmers did not start with the appearance of Farmers Union witnesses before the Senate Agriculture Committee, which the Senator from Florida described, nor with last year's Communist Party platform.

The demand for full parity for farmers started away back in the thirties, and it was the American Farm Bureau Federation and its leaders who were then demanding it, in the form of parity payments in addition to the 85 percent commodity loans then provided by the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

In 1938, President Edward A. O'Neal wrote a letter to the late Senator Alva Adams which appears at page 2074 of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 19, 1938, saying:

"Failure of Congress to provide parity payments to cooperating farmers as contemplated under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 will be a tragic mistake and will precipitate a serious situation of national proportions next fall and winter unless the situation is remedied. * * * There can be no remedy for business depression and unemployment in the cities until farm prices and farm income are restored to parity level with industry and labor."

There were repeated appeals for parity payments to bridge the final gap to full parity for farmers from men like Mr. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation; Mr. Earl Smith, vice president of the American Farm Bureau, and the organization's legislative representative here. As quotations I shall cite will reveal, they wanted full parity on all farm products.

Vice President Earl Smith, of the Farm Bureau, appeared and presented the Farm Bureau's demands to the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee on March 2, 1940.

At pages 520 and 521 of those hearings, we find this testimony by Mr. Smith:

"We affirm our uncompromising support of the broad principles set forth in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which in our opinion is the most comprehensive and effective law ever enacted for farmers by the Congress. We believe that the methods employed in this legislation are sound in principle, and that if sufficient Federal funds are appropriated to make it fully effective, the objective of this legislation, which is the attainment of parity prices and parity income for American farmers, can be achieved. Experience has proved that, to the extent appropriations for carrying out this act have been made available, the program under it has been effective. We further believe that national ecoonmic welfare is dependent on restoring agriculture to parity position.

"We are now insisting that appropriations sufficient to make the law fully effective be made by this Congress for the fiscal year 1941. Careful study indicates that the sum of $607 million will be required for this purpose.

"The parity goal for agriculture was established by Congress in the original Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, also in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936, and again the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. In addition to the national program for agriculture, as outlined in these several basic acts, section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 provided the means to bridge the final gap, as, if, and when appropriations by Congress might be made available for this purpose. Section 303, authorizing parity payments, recognizes no limitation short of parity. It appears at this time that a substantial parity payment appropriation by Congress is fully justified."

President Edward A. O'Neal, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, appearing before the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee that same year, 1940, testified at pages 1449–1450 of those hearings, as follows:

"We are asking the Committee on Appropriations and Congress to appropriate the sum of $607 million for parity payments to producers of basic commodities in order to make fully effective the pledge of Congress of parity to farmers producing these commodities."

The following year, in 1941, the Farm Bureau got Congressman CLARENCE CANNON of our State to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by its president, Ed O'Neal, which appeared in the Nation's Agriculture (see Appendix to CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 87, part 11, page A1875) in which he said:

"Bills to give the farmer parity are awaiting action by House and Senate. It is now or never for the farmer. I pledge you here and now that the American Farm Bureau Federation will demand of the President and Congress, of Republicans and Democrats, a definite legislative action to give the American farmer full parity at this session of Congress."

Later that year, the Farm Bureau convention adopted a resolution (No. 3) which was later submitted to Congress by Mr. O'Neal, which declared:

"We renew the federation's support of the continuance of 85 percent of parity loans on basic soil crops and of such appropriations as are necessary to bridge the gap between loan levels and price levels of basic farm commodities, whichever are higher, and parity prices."

In hearings on the extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, held before the Banking and Currency Committee on May 30, 1941 (see p. 140), President O'Neal, of Farm Bureau, again called for full parity when he testified:

"The issue raised by the Gore amendment is very clear. That issue is whether the parity objective is to be a reality for American farmers or whether it is to be merely an illusive mirage dangled before the eyes of farmers but which they are never permitted to attain.

"The Congress of the United States has again and again declared its policy that the prices and income of farmers should be restored and maintained on a basis of parity with industrial wages and prices. * * *

"The action taken on the 85 percent parity loan bill takes care of the five basic commodities only. The American Farm Bureau Federation takes the position that we must have a program which will assure full parity not only to the five basic crops but to all American agriculture. Many people do not realize that the AAA of 1933 established a parity-price goal for all agricultural commodities, and that this portion of the act has not been invalidated by the Supreme Court."

I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Florida did not realize, when he made his address, that the inception of the demand for full parity—and for full parity for all agricultural commodities—came years ago, and that its outstanding proponents in those early days were the leaders of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

I am certain that, in his great fairness, realizing that the demand for full parity on all commodities started back in the thirties, with all the farm organizations supporting it (and possibly the Communist Party, too), he will want the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to reflect the full facts. He will not, I know, want the impression to remain that 100 percent of parity for all farm commodities is of recent origin with its support confined to the National Farmers Union and the American Communist Party.

That impression would be inaccurate, for there was no more vigorous proponents of full parity for all farm commodities in the days when that goal was first advocated than the Farm Bureau Federation and its officers, headed by Edward A. O'Neal.

Ed O'Neal was not being either socialistic or communistic. The Farmers Union should not be smeared by innuendos because the American Communist Party has demanded that the so-called parity objective should be made a reality for farmers. But if comparing programs with what the Communists advocate is carried to the ultimate conclusion, Ed O'Neal's advocacy of parity for farmers back in the thirties and early forties would make him out a founder of such a movement.

Of course that is ridiculous. It is also ridiculous for anyone to imply that any officials or members of the National Farmers Union are socialistic or communistic because they happen to advocate today the parity objective which Ed O'Neal advocated 2 decades ago.

As the able and distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] pointed out, Communists have aped 90 percent of the democratic programs of the last 20 years, just as the Republican leadership is adopting many of the programs of the Democratic Party today.

Neither Democrats nor Republicans have become Communists merely because they have finally seen the light and now support social security, unemployment compensation, minimum wage, full employment, home loan programs, bank deposit insurance, and similar Democratic doctrines.

The consequences of comparison of programs with the Communist Party line can be very serious if misunderstood. A somewhat similar talk about the Farmers Union position was made on the floor of the Senate in 1948—two elections ago—and it was followed by very serious consequences for the Farm Bureau Federation—not the Farmers Union, but the Farm Bureau.

At that time, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] delivered a speech on the floor of the Senate, discussing the activities of Communists in the field of agriculture and expressing a concern over the direction which the National Farmers Union was taking.

Like the distinguished Senator from Florida, he made no direct charges against the officers of the National Farmers Union.

Sometime later the Farm Bureau Federation in the State of Utah got out a political circular in which they referred to the Farmers Union as "Communist dominated." The Farmers Union sued and got a Federal district court jury verdict awarding them $25,000 damages. The jury found the charge false.

The case was appealed, and the verdict was sustained in the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals.

During the course of the trial, the Farm Bureau Federation proposed to put before the jury, in mitigation of damages, a copy of Senator BRIDGES' speech on the Senate floor.

The Farmers Union's attorneys objected to the inclusion of the speech in the RECORD, charging that a member of the Farm Bureau's trial staff, sitting at counsel table throughout the trial of the case, had prepared the Senator's address. Subsequently, Mr. Robert Cruise McManus offered to testify as to the background of the speech and was put on the stand.

I attach hereto an account from the May 1951 issue of the National Union Farmer on Mr. McManus' appearance as a witness.

McManus testified that he had outlined the address, documented it, and then—and I quote directly—he said: "I—I mean we—wrote the final draft."

In his testimony he told the court frankly that politics was involved.

I also call attention to the account of the trial which appeared in the May 1951 issue of the National Union Farmer, attached hereto.

I also direct attention to an account from the June 1952 issue of the National Union Farmer, attached hereto, reporting the decision of the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals which sustained the Farmers Union's judgment against the Farm Bureau which specifically commented on the exclusion of the Senate address. The cricuit judges said:

"It (the district court) excluded the BRIDGES' speech because it would be unfair to allow the appellants to avail themselves of a publication which their agent had prepared and submitted for delivery on the Senate floor.

"The ruling of the court finds support in the weight of authority and exclusion of the third-party documents was not error."

Two years ago when the farm bill was before the United States Senate, a Glen Martz issued a newspaper column, put into the RECORD by Senator YOUNG, of North Dakota, which claimed the Communists were supporting 90 percent of parity. The columnist then asked the question, directing it by name to a number of our Midwest Republican Senators and 1 or 2 southern Democrats, as to how it felt to be following the Communist Party line.

Senator YOUNG explained that Martz had been an editor of Farm Bureau Federation publications, who then was working with a Farm Bureau official. The Senator denounced the low level of the Martz attack.

This is a deplorable thing to do, whether the names of Senators, private individuals, or private organiations are used, because of the danger that the precise nature of the statement will not be understood.

I am aware, and I want the RECORD to be completely clear, that the distinguished Senator from Florida made no charge of

improper affiliations against the National Farmers Union or its officers.

On the affirmative side I would like to say that James G. Patton, Glenn J. Talbott, and other Farmers Union leaders I know are distinguished Americans who have rendered distinguished service not only to American farmers but to this Nation.

President James G. Patton of the Farmers Union has been appointed to many national posts, and international advisory positions, requiring clearance for security and handling security information, by Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower.

Glenn J. Talbott of the North Dakota Farmers Union, chairman of the board of the National Farmers Union, has held many similar positions requiring the same sort of clearance.

I attach hereto a list of a dozen of the positions which Mr. Patton has held.

National positions to which Mr. James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, has been appointed and on which he served:

National Advisory Board, National Youth Administration. President Roosevelt appointed.

Economic Stabilization Board. Appointed by President Roosevelt.

Adviser, United States delegation, Second Inter-American Conference on Agriculture, Mexico City 1942. Appointed by President Roosevelt and Secretary of State.

Public Advisory Board, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. Appointed by President Roosevelt, confirmed by Senate.

Adviser to United States delegation, Inter-American Conference on War and Peace, Chapultepec Conference, Mexico City, March 1945. Appointed by President Roosevelt and Secretary of State.

Consultant United States delegation, United Nations Conference on International Organization, founding meeting of United Nations, San Francisco, 1945. Appointed by President Roosevelt and Secretary of State.

Adviser, United States delegation, founding meeting Food and Agriculture Organization, Quebec, Canada, October 1945. Appointed by President Truman and Secretary of State.

Adviser United States delegation, FAO, Copenhagen, Denmark, 1946; Geneva Switzerland, 1947; 1948, 1949, 1950, Washington, D. C.; 1951, Rome, Italy.

1948: Public Advisory Board, Economic Cooperation Administration and later Mutual Security Administration. Appointed by President Truman, confirmed by Senate.

Member, National Security Resources Board. Appointed by President Truman.

Member, Mobilization Policy Board. Charles E. Wilson, Chairman. Appointed by President Truman.

Public Advisory Board, Foreign Operations Administration. Appointed by President Eisenhower, 1953. Still serving.

All of these positions were cleared for handling security information.

The National Farmers Union is entitled to the thanks of the Nation for the services it has rendered to food production programs in wartime, and the services which its officials have rendered the Nation in defense agencies, and international efforts to build the basis for lasting peace.

Finally, I want to say just a word for the farmers who have asked their Government for price support. The distinguished Senator from Florida was alarmed at the attitude of farmers who feel that the Government should assure them a fair price.

The petitions of farmers for Government assistance are in a large measure the result of special favors previously granted industry, transportation, and other segments of our economy by the Government. The great business interests in this Nation got their subsidies, and they keep adding to them regularly, long before farmers had their first farm program.

If we would tear down all our foreign trade and tariff barriers, farm equipment prices would tumble, petroleum prices would tumble, automobile prices would tumble, the cost of living and the cost of farming would drop enough to give substantial relief to farmers as industries were favored to meet foreign price competition.

If we would give farmers depletion allowances, accelerated amortization, special low transportation rates and subsidies paralleling those given petroleum, power companies and newspapers and magazines, it would provide substantial relief to the farmers.

Farmers have not lost their moral fiber because they want equal treatment with the big industries of this Nation.

They have just gotten smart.

Henry Cantwell Wallace, after serving as Secretary of Agriculture under President Warren G. Harding, wrote a book in which he concluded that the Nation must do one of two things: give farmers supports equal to subsidies to other sections of the economy; or repeal the tariff, repeal all subsidies and all protections to other segments, putting them on an unaided, purely competitive basis.

If asking Government for farm price supports is communistic or socialistic, then asking for these other Government aids is equally so.

The farmers of America know enough about the realities of life that they are not going to be frightened by cries of socialism or communism.

They deserve equal treatment with other segments of the economy. In reality, 100 percent of parity is less than equal treatment.

General Motors Corp. and other corporations with profits running several times 6 percent and even several times 10 percent after taxes based on net worth, are making from 200 percent to 1,000 percent of parity, thanks to tariff protection, negotiated contracts, reduced taxes, and other Federal concessions to them.

[From the National Union Farmer for May 1951]

WRITER ADMITS HE ASSEMBLED BRIDGES' SMEAR SPEECH AND THAT "POLITICS WAS INVOLVED"

The real author of Senator STYLES BRIDGES' smear attack on Farmers Union tried to prove his charges in a court of justice in the Utah libel suit and failed utterly.

Robert Cruise McManus, the writer who has repeatedly attempted to smear the Farmers Union during election campaigns since 1948, admitted under oath during the Utah libel suit trial that he assembled Senator STYLES BRIDGES' smear of Farmers Union and that politics was involved.

Senator BRIDGES delivered a long tirade against Farmers Union, charging Communist influence last September 7 on the floor of the Senate, where he was immune from libel charges.

The Farmers Union then charged that McManus had prepared the speech and that it was pure politics.

Called to the witness stand during the Utah libel suit trial in the jury's absence, McManus testified under oath that he had outlined the speech, documented it, and that then "I—I mean we—wrote the final draft."

BOASTS OF SMEARS

The witness was almost boastful about his part in efforts to smear the Farmers Union. He told of writing an article, "Communist Beachhead in Agriculture," for the Farm Journal, published by Joe Pew, of Sun Oil and shipbuilding wealth, and another for Alfred Kohlberg's Freeman magazine. He showed some resentment because Louis Bromfield had not given him credit for facts in another Freeman article.

McManus said he was writing a book on Communist infiltration in agriculture when an unnamed friend at his home in Hopewell, N. J., suggested that he write a speech for a United States Senator to deliver against Farmers Union. It was at this point that McManus told the court that frankly politics was involved in the matter.

McManus and the unnamed friend went to Washington, D. C., and sold their idea to Senator BRIDGES, who just happens to have been a former county agent, former secretary of the New Hampshire Farm Bureau, and currently is listed as a director of a New Hampshire Farm Bureau mutual insurance company.

McManus denied that he had worked for the American Farm Bureau Federation until his employment in February to prepare for the trial of the Utah libel suit.

BIG FIGURE AT TRIAL

The writer was a major figure in the trial.

Under the rules of courts, witnesses may be excluded from the courtroom during the trial of a case. When the Farmers Union called for application of the rule, the Farm Bureau's lawyers asked that McManus be made an exception. They explained that he had charge of files of their materials and was needed by counsel to aid them.

Federal Judge Willis Ritter ruled, however, that McManus must either leave the room or he could not be used as a witness. He left the room.

A little later, however, the Farm Bureau attorneys again requested that McManus be permitted to come to the counsel table beside them. This time, it was stipulated that McManus might stay in the courtroom and be used as a witness for the identification of documents only.

From that point on, the writer sat with the Farm Bureau's counsel and was repeatedly consulted by the lawyers.

McManus went to the witness stand during a debate over the admissibility of the Bridges speech into evidence to mitigate damages, but not to prove the truth. Farmers Union had objected to the admission of the Bridges speech because it was hearsay, there was no opportunity to cross-examine the Senator, most of his alleged charges, even if true, would be immaterial, and for many other reasons. The Farm Bureau contended that it had a right to show that it had made its charges against the Farmers Union as a result of the Bridges speech—and that this fact would mitigate damages.

TELLS ABOUT HIMSELF

Quentin Burdick, representing Farmers Union, protested that McManus had written the Bridges speech; that he had attempted to prove the truth of the Bridges charges during the trial which was in progress and failed, and that he had no right to put his charges before the jury in the form of the Bridges speech, a third party document.

Judge Ritter announced that he wanted to know who wrote BRIDGES' speech before he ruled and McManus was put on the witness stand.

The writer made a lengthy explanation of his career, and how he happened to take up his anti-Farmers Union profession. Then he told of doing the Bridges operation, admitting that "politics was involved."

During his testimony it also came out that he had been brought into the suit by the chief counsel for the American Farm Bureau Federation. Although the American Farm Bureau's participation in the suit in the background has been apparent, it was not of record until McManus testified. The AFBF did not send their attorney to help with the trial, apparently attempting to avoid revelation of its support of the smear tactic.

FARM BUREAU SMEAR FALSE; JURY AWARDS FARMERS UNION $25,000 DAMAGES

A Utah Federal court jury has awarded Farmers Union $25,000 damages against Utah Farm Bureau for calling the Farmers Union

"Communist dominated" during the last election campaign in that State.

After a week-long trial, in which Federal Judge Willis Ritter called some of the Farm Bureau's evidence "ridiculous" and admonished their attorneys repeatedly to produce some facts, the jury voted that the Farm Bureau charges were untrue. The jury considered the case approximately 4 hours. Apparently most of the time was taken agreeing on the amount.

Although the defendants in the case were the Utah Farm Bureau, its executive secretary and its vice president, Frank Shelley and A. V. Smoot, it developed during the trial that the American Farm Bureau Federation was participating in the background and had supplied Robert Cruise McManus, a violently anti-Farmers Union writer, to prove the charge. (The Utah Farm Bureau had at one time agreed to apologize and settle, but it is now clear that it canceled that arrangement because of American Farm Bureau action.)

Advised of the jury's verdict, President James G. Patton of National Farmers Union, said:

"We are, of course, gratified with the outcome of our libel suit against the Farm Bureau Federation in Utah.

"We hope that the Farmers Union shall now be permitted to devote its full energies to organizing and representing the interests of family farmers."

The trial started May 14 and ended May 21.

President Patton, C. E. Huff, Secretary-Treasurer Tony T. Dechant and Ben Stong of Farmers Union Washington office went to Salt Lake City. President Patton then flew to Washington, D. C., for Tuesday's meeting of the President's Defense Mobilization Advisory Board and it was not found necessary for him to return to Salt Lake City.

The Farmers Union called one of the defendants, Executive Secretary Frank Shelley, of Utah Farm Bureau, to prove that the libel was published and circulated. C. E. Huff, general manager of businesses for NFU, and Paul V. Kelly, Utah manager for Farmers Union, testified as to Farmers Union, its membership and cooperative business activities subject to damage. Two rural paper publishers testified they received and printed the Farm Bureau's libelous statement. Publication in at least two other papers was shown in the record.

The Farmers Union then rested and it became the Farm Bureau's duty to prove the truth of its statement or take the consequences at the hands of the jury.

FARM BUREAU WITNESSES, EX-COMMIES, CHANGE THEIR STORIES ON STAND

The Farm Bureau Federation used 4 ex-Communists—3 of them imported from New York City and 1 from Miami, Fla.—in their effort to make their smear of Farmers Union stick.

One of their stars was Paul Crouch, a Miami, Fla., newspaperman, who testified that a former regional representative of Farmers Union in Tennessee had been a secret Communist in the thirties who did not pay dues or let his name go on any lists in order to protect himself. On cross-examination, Crouch admitted that he had previously testified, under oath before the House Un-American Activities Committee, that this person was not a Communist Party member.

The jury got another peek at the credibility of the Farm Bureau witnesses during the cross-examination of Manning Johnson, who was a Communist in the thirties and became a member of the Communist Party Central Committee.

Johnson testified that a former Farmers Union division president had been known to him as a Communist in 1935-36 and that the Communists helped get farmers into Farmers Unions in New York. He testified that the Communists managed to get "fractions" or "cells" into several Farmers Union locals and one Grange local.

Confronted on cross-examination with the fact that there was no Farmers Union in New York State in the thirties, Johnson said he had made a mistake. He meant another organization. He did not know anything about Farmers Union. Judge Ritter then ordered all his testimony concerning Farmers Union stricken from the record and disregarded by the jury. The fact is there was no FU in New York until 1944, long after the period to which Johnson testified.

Howard Rushmore, a Hearst newspaper reporter in New York City, and Maurice Malkin, of New York, both testified about the National Youth Congress, which they claimed they helped to organize as members of the Communist Party.

Malkin told the jury that preachers and teachers were easy marks for the Communists. A little later he said that Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt "fell for anything." At this point, Judge Ritter called him to order, saying that he had gratuitously insulted people not involved in the trial, without cause, and that the court was prepared to take appropriate action if it happened again. Malkin became more subdued.

Rushmore identified a former South Dakota Farmers Union member and a former Eastern Farmers Union officer as Communists in the thirties, working in youth movements. Neither are members of FU today. He told of talking with a national FU official about the National Youth Congress. He was not certain that the FU official knew he was a Communist, but said the official was cooperative in National Youth Congress work, which was sponsored by outstanding citizens like Mrs. Roosevelt and Harold Ickes. However, he was unable to say what resulted from this contact, if anything, and he readily testified that the Communist strategy was to conceal their affiliations and use every sort of subterfuge to draw non-Communist citizens into their activities.

OTHER WITNESSES FAIL TO DEVELOP PROOF OF DOMINATION CHARGE

Another witness was James Elmore, former editor of the National Union Farmer for 5 months, who testified that he had been "mildly rebuked" by NFU President Patton for printing a cartoon critical of Russia in 1946 and for using labels like communism, fascism and Americanism instead of speaking functionally. Elmore testified that Patton felt it poor policy to criticize a fellow-member of the United Nations. President Patton also urged discussion of issues, on their merits, rather than labelling them as one ism or another.

John C. Dustin, an insurance actuary for a farm bureau insurance company in North Dakota, took the witness stand to testify that he had been in the Farmers Union lunchroom in Denver in 1946—a room about 10 feet by 20 feet—and that there were pictures of President Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman and Joseph Stalin on the wall.

General Manager C. E. Huff took the witness stand in rebuttal to testify that the room was actually 20 by 40 feet and that there never had been either a Truman picture or a Stalin picture on the wall. There was, he testified, a picture of Roosevelt.

Two witnesses were brought from New Jersey to identify names on the nominating papers of a Communist candidate as some of the same names as appear in the editorial masthead of the Eastern Union Farmer. But they were unable to establish the authenticity of their documents, identify signatures or prove their allegations.

FARMERS UNION SUPPORT OF CO-OPS STRESSED TO PROVE SMEAR CHARGE

The principal proof which the Farm Bureau had to support its charges was that the Farmers Union advocates cooperatives.

Manning Johnson, the former member of the Communist Central Committee testified that his committee at one time decided to push cooperatives and infiltrer them as a means of attaining Communist objectives.

The Farm Bureau also offered exhibits which showed that the Farmers Union promotes cooperatives. One was a study book by Stanley Vogt, "The Last Frontier." The other was an address which President James G. Patton made when still president of the Colorado Farmers Union (at least 12 years ago) on the "Future of the Farmers Union."

In both documents, the authors were critical of the profit system and urged real action to build cooperatives and the cooperative movement.

Farmers Union counsel maintained that this line of "parallelism" used by Farm Bureau was not proof of the charge of Communist domination.

"Communists wear pants and Americans wear pants," Farmers Union counsel Quentin Burdick told the court. "But not all Americans are therefore Communists."

In arguing the case to the jury, both Burdick and Warwick Lameroux, attorneys for Farmers Union, pointed out to the jury that the Utah Farm Bureau itself claims to have associated with it nine different cooperative associations in marketing and supply fields and was hardly in a position to argue that sponsoring co-ops is communistic.

A. H. Nebeker, one of the Farm Bureau lawyers, at one point expressed great amazement to the court that a farm organization should take any position on foreign affairs. He pointed out that the Farmers Union does pass resolutions on foreign affairs and raised a big question of why. He did not mention that both the Farm Bureau and Grange have foreign affairs sections in their programs—nor that the Nation's four major farm groups participate in the International Council of Agricultural Producers. The Farm Bureau has at least one full-time man on international affairs.

After the evidence was completed, Judge Willis Ritter once indicated from the bench that he did not feel that the Farm Bureau had submitted any evidence in support of its libel which even warranted submitting the question of truth of the charges to the jury.

He was then considering a motion by Farmers Union lawyers for a directed verdict, because Farm Bureau had failed to produce even a shred of evidence in support of its defamatory statement.

Judge Ritter finally reserved his ruling on this motion for a directed verdict, as permitted under Federal court rules.

In his instructions to the jury, Judge Ritter quoted from a recent Supreme Court decision concerning the seriousness of the Communist charge. He cautioned the jury to consider the case without prejudice, and told them they might take into consideration the hysteria of the times. The judge also cautioned the jury to allow only such damages as were done directly by the libel in question.

The Farm Bureau made many exceptions to court rulings as the basis for appeal to the United States circuit court. Bureau attorneys told reporters that they would appeal.

Representing Farmers Union in the trial were Quentin Burdick, attorney for Farmers Union at Fargo, N. Dak., and Warwick Lameroux, of Salt Lake City.

The complainants in the suit were National Farmers Union, National Farmers Union Service Corp., and National Farmers Union Life Insurance Co.

[From the National Union Farmer for June 1952]

CIRCUIT COURT AFFIRMS FARMERS UNION LIBEL VERDICT AGAINST FARM BUREAU—OWN SPEECH, USED IN SENATE, NO ALIBI

The 10th circuit court of appeals has unanimously sustained the Farmers Union's $25,000 judgment against the Farm Bureau

in Utah for a libel published in 1950, Circuit Judges Bratton, Huxman, and Murrah handed down their decision in Denver on June 11.

In a most significant passage in its written 3,000-word decision, the high court held that the weight of authority supported the district court ruling when it excluded the United States Senator STYLES) BRIDGES speech (from the trial record as evidence) because it would be unfair to allow the appellants (Farm Bureau) to avail themselves of a publication which their agent had prepared and submitted for delivery on the Senate floor.

The circuit court decision thus again helped clarify the source of the Communist-dominated smear of the Farmers Union which the former New Hampshire Farm Bureau secretary, now Republican floor leader in the Senate, delivered on the Senate floor 2 years ago. During the trial, Robert Cruise McManus, an eastern writer for Joe Pew's Farm Journal and Alfred Kohlberg's Freeman magazine, who was in the employ of the Farm Bureau, admitted under oath that he had gone to Washington at the suggestion of an unnamed New Jersey friend and written the Bridges speech for delivery on the libel-proof Senate floor. He added: "I want to be frank, politics was involved."

The United States circuit court judges said:

"It (the district court) excluded the Bridges speech because it would be unfair to allow the appellants to avail themselves of a publication which their agent had prepared and submitted for delivery on the Senate floor.

"The ruling of the court finds support in the weight of authority and exclusion of the third party documents was not error."

JURY FOUND CHARGE FALSE

The Farmers Union libel suit against the Farm Bureau in Utah was brought late in 1950 and tried before Federal Judge Willis Ritter of Salt Lake City in May 1951. The trial took a full week, although it took the jury only 4 hours to decide that the Utah Farm Bureau had falsely stated in a circular that the Farmers Union was Communist dominated, and to fix the amount of damages at $25,000.

Throughout the trial, Robert Cruise McManus, the writer, sat with Farm Bureau counsel consulting with them and handling documents for them. Finally, in the absence of the jury, he was put on the stand and admitted his authorship of the Bridges speech, which the Farm Bureau wanted to get in the record in mitigation of damages.

After their loss in district court, the Farm Bureau appealed to the circuit court of appeals and that has now resulted in another flat defeat.

The Farm Bureau now has 90 days to apply to the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari. If the court should grant it, then they would be allowed to appeal. There is no indication, as this issue of NUFarmer goes to press, whether or not the Farm Bureau will make this last effort to escape the consequences of its smear plan, or it will now give up court proceedings.

The circuit court of appeals decision runs approximately 3,000 words and deals with several claims by the Farm Bureau that District Judge Ritter erred in the conduct of the trial below.

The appeals court decision points out several times that the authorities sustain the circuit judge's rulings.

"The law draws a clear distinction between criticism or comment, which may or may not be privileged, depending on the circumstances under which it was uttered, and publication of an unequivocal and unambiguous fact, the legal import of which is a question of law for the courts to decide, leaving only its truth or falsity for the determination of the jury," the circuit court opinion said. "If the published statement is libelous as a matter of law, it is no defense that it was repeated from another source. * * * It follows that the appellants (Farm Bureau) can claim no conditional privilege from a reference to the Bridges speech if the statement is libelous per se.

"Adopting the dictionary definition of 'dominated,' the trial court instructed the jury that 'the label of Communist today, in these things in which we live, in the minds of average and respectable persons, places the plaintiffs beyond the pale of respectability and makes them a symbol of public hatred, ridicule or contempt. * * * And * * * to designate plaintiffs herein as 'Communist dominated' is to cripple the functioning and damage the reputation of those organizations (Farmers Union, Farmers Union Service Corp., and FU Life Insurance Co.) in the communities in which they do business * * *."

"While the Utah courts have not had occasion to construe the words 'Communist dominated' under the legislative definition of libel, it is now the generally accepted view that to speak or write of a person or an organization as being 'Communist' or a 'Communist sympathizer' is to subject such person or organization to public hatred, odium, and contempt, to his immediate harm, and is therefore libelous per se." (Here the court quotes several decisions to that effect.)

The circuit court of appeals then added its own view of the character of the Farm Bureau libel of Farmers Union, when it said:

"Construing Utah law, we have held that to speak of one as a pro-Nazi or a pro-Fascist is libelous per se and not within the rule of conditional privilege. In the temper of the times, the Communist label is even more odious and defamatory than the pro-Nazi and pro-Fascist label of another day. Furthermore, to call someone or refer to him as 'Communist dominated' is a statement of a bald and unambiguous fact. It is not a criticism or comment on an acknowledged or accepted fact. We think the trial court correctly stated applicable law under the facts.

"* * * The trial court held as a matter of law that the words 'Communist dominated' were libelous per se, leaving to the jury the clear-cut issues whether the libelous statement was true or false and, if false, whether its publication resulted in damages to the plaintiff (Farmers Union). The jury resolved the issues in favor of the plaintiff (Farmers Union), awarded damages in the sum of $25,000. * * *"

The circuit court's opinion dealt with numerous other claims of error by the Farm Bureau, disposing of them one by one, and finally on the whole record, affirming the decision of the lower court.

FU PROGRESSING IN UTAH

Farmers Union started organization work in Utah in 1948, and has made excellent progress despite a temporary slowdown caused by the Farm Bureau smear.

The FU purchased Kelly-Western Seed & Fertilizer Co. at Salt Lake City, licensed life, automobile, and property insurance companies in the State, and was doing well when the Bureau's libelous attack occurred. The FB itself had never been able to acquire a large membership in the State.

One of the first counties in the State in which organization work was done was Emery County, in the southeastern area—an area in the picturesque Castle Valley which had been bypassed by others apparently because it was an area of smaller farmers. Today, the Castle Valley farmers have their own Farmers Union Cooperative Association. They received the first rural telephone loan ever made to a cooperative under the Federal rural telephone program. (They recently got a second loan to extend their rural telephone system.)

Farmers Union is also now a strong and familiar institution in the Uintah Basin, in northeastern Utah, where there are several Farmers Union cooperatives and splendid membership.

The Farm Bureau effort to smear Farmers Union, however, had much wider than Utah significance. It was launched by Senator BRIDGES with the Senate floor speech written for him by McManus. Senator BRIDGES' biography in the Congressional Directory shows that he is a former county agent, former secretary of the New Hampshire Farm Bureau and still a director of the Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Company in his State.

MCMANUS WORKED FOR PEW

McManus, author of the speech, was for a time on the editorial staff of the Farm Journal owned by J. N. Pew of the Sun Oil Co. and Sun Shipbuilding interests, widely identified as a leading ultraconservative. Pew is currently chairman of a finance committee for the new National Council of Churches which liberal churchmen charge is a Big Business effort to move in on all Protestant churches, end all social action programs like that of the Federal Council of Churches, and make the churches at least not "objectionable" to big business interests. (The Farm Journal dropped McManus because his interests were too limited, they said.) McManus was also author of articles in the Freeman magazine, owned and published by Alfred Kohlberg, controversial China lobby figure.

McManus described as one of his friends in New Jersey the president of the New Jersey Farm Bureau, Herb Voorhies. However, McManus did not name, when he testified in Utah, the person in New Jersey who enlisted him to write the BRIDGES attack on the Farmers Union.

McManus stated at the trial that he was writing a book on Communist efforts to infiltrate agriculture in the United States. It has not yet been printed but, of course, might appear this election year.

McManus was described during the trial as the central figure in the Farm Bureau defense. When excluded from the courtroom because he was to testify as a witness, the Farm Bureau's attorneys told the courtroom to handle their materials. He was permitted to sit with Farm Bureau attorneys throughout the trial.

Attorneys for the Farm Bureau in the suit were A. H. Nebeker and C. N. Otteson of Salt Lake City.

The Farmers Union's attorneys were Warwick Lamoreaux of Salt Lake City and Quentin Burdick of Fargo, N. Dak. Mr Burdick is a son of Congressman USHER BURDICK and attorney for the North Dakota Farmers Union. Mr. Lamoreaux is attorney for several Utah cooperative groups as well as Farmers Union in that State.

Since trial of the libel suit, and the jury's decision that the Farm Bureau libel was false, Farmers Union activity has again moved forward and major, favorable developments appear to be impending in the State to further expand the Utah Farmers Union strength and prestige.

The Farmers Union judgment is against the Utah State Farm Bureau Federation, Frank G. Shelley its executive secretary, and A. V. Smoot, one of the directors. Mr. Shelley, acting for the Farm Bureau, circulated the original libel. Mr. Smoot caused the publication of Mr. Shelley's writing in a newspaper. There was no evidence during the trial that other directors, as individuals, caused publication of the libel.

SUGGESTED WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON RACE RELATIONS AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on March 12 and again on March 14 I called upon President Eisenhower to convene a White House conference on the imme-

diate crisis in race relations and civil rights which is developing in the wake of the school-integration rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States. I also suggested that he appoint at once a Presidential commission to make a longer-range study of ways to ease the inevitable adjustment to the end of race segregation in our country.

By a coincidence, on the same day that I made this suggestion in the Senate President Eisenhower stated at his press conference that he thought a presidential commission would not be a good instrument for this task. This is how the transcript of his press conference is reported in the New York Times of Thursday, March 15:

> If you will look at my state of the Union message, I pled for a joint commission authorized by Congress, and the reason I want it authorized by Congress is a simple one—because then they can subpena witnesses and bring people in and compel them to testify.
>
> Now, if I merely appoint, call in a party, and let everybody air their views, that would be one thing to do. But it is not the thing I want done.

Mr. President, I must most respectfully differ with the hesitancy expressed by President Eisenhower about the value of a presidential commission and other White House action in the present emergency. President Eisenhower gave the reason that only a commission created by Congress would have subpena powers to compel testimony, delivery of records, and so on, in studying the situation in the affected States.

I do not see that this is an adequate ground for the President's inaction and for his refusal to use his unquestioned authority to create a Presidential commission. It is an inadequate ground for these reasons:

First, the situation calls for action as soon as possible. It is incumbent on the President, whose office represents the acme of national leadership, to exercise that leadership in a national crisis as grave and far reaching as this one. The sooner the President does so, the better are the chances to head off further deterioration in the sitation, to the untold damage of our country's strength at home and abroad.

Second, the press conference statement clearly implies that the President considers subpena powers essential to the work of a commission on the segregation issue. Now, I do not know what kind of a commission President Eisenhower has in mind, and how he expects it to operate, but I believe that a commission in this highly charged area will be successful to the extent that it can command confidence and cooperation without the use of compulsion. That is the kind of presidential commission I am calling for. President Eisenhower's emphasis on compulsion as being essential to a commission seems quite inconsistent with the emphasis on moderation and cooperation in the rest of his statement.

The President told the assembled correspondents that "we must be patient without being complacent," and "we must be understanding of other people's deep emotions;" that "we are not talking here about coercing," and that "the American people, faced with a great problem like this, will approach it intelligently and with patience and with understanding." Mr. President, this intelligent and patient approach of which Mr. Eisenhower spoke can be greatly facilitated and speeded up by the prompt creation of a presidential commission. In the light of his general remarks, I do not see why President Eisenhower spurns such a step, which is clearly within his immediate authority, because of insistence on powers of compulsion. I renew my suggestion that the President use his authority and call a White House conference on race relations and individual rights, that he appoint a presidential commission on the subject, and preferably both.

OPPOSITION TO CERTAIN DECISIONS OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I address myself to the challenge which has been and is being offered to our constitutional processes, to law and order, and beyond even that, to the basic propositions of democracy in our country. This is how I see it, Mr. President. This is how I react, as an individual American citizen, and as a Senator of the United States from New York, to the overt defiance which has been and is being publicly offered to the decisions and decrees of the Supreme Court of the United States in regard to segregation in the public schools.

I speak without rancor or bitterness of any kind, Mr. President. I speak without any personal animosity whatsoever toward those in this Chamber, and in Congress, who either urge or defend the tragic course of defiance which has been charted. I speak in what I hope is understanding of their attitude, and of their problem. But let me emphasize here, that it is not their problem alone, Mr. President. It is our problem. It is America's problem. For its solution all America carries a heavy burden of responsibility.

No, Mr. President, I address myself to my friends from the South out of a deep regard, with understanding, and with, I assure them, forbearance.

Mr. President, none of us is without an underlying sense of guilt in the present situation. Each of us, both in the North and in the South, bears in his secret heart a sense of responsibility for the fact that there has been denied and there continues to be denied to a major share of the population, the basic human rights we pretend, in our Constitution, to assure to all, without distinction on the basis of race, creed, color, or previous condition of servitude.

And so today, we have a crisis, a crisis which some have suddenly recognized, although this crisis has been brewing for a long, long time.

We bring to this crisis various degrees of passion. This is inevitable. It cannot now be avoided. It is all the more important, then, to speak in words of reason, even while we are stirred, some of us, by feelings of passion.

I will not deny the fact, Mr. President, that I feel passionately. I feel this issue more keenly than any other issue, because, in my judgment, the massive injustice of discrimination and repression against these of our fellow Americans, who happen to have a skin color of a different shade, is not only absolutely unjustifiable, in any sense, but, to me, absolutely intolerable.

Only yesterday President Eisenhower spoke of moderation in this matter of civil rights. He warned against what he called extremists.

Oh, Mr President, I am for moderation. We are all for moderation. But what does moderation, in this instance, mean? And whom does he identify as the extremists?

Does he picture himself as a mediator between two contending factions, the rights and merits of whose respective positions he is unable to assess? In this situation, is he a neutralist?

Mr. President, I am frankly not a neutralist here. I am a partisan, a participating partisan. I identify myself with anybody and everybody who is suffering from discrimination. While they are suffering and are being denied their basic rights, I am not without pain, and I do not feel my rights to be secure.

The extremists, in my judgment, are those who deny the rule of law and who defy the sanctity of law.

I ask only that the law be enforced in a lawful manner, and in such a graduated fashion as the courts themselves shall find feasible and practical.

I cannot stand above the battle, like President Eisenhower, and say with fine impartiality that both sides must show restraint.

Those who go about obeying the law, in an orderly and practical manner, are the moderates. Those who defy and resist the law are law violators, and are not to be judged in the same scale with those who suffer from the indignities of the violators of the law.

I do not want violence. No serious person advocates violence. It must be avoided But the law must be enforced. And I call upon the President of the United States, and the executive branch of the Government, to assume the responsibility to see that the laws are faithfully executed. Is that not part of the oath that President Eisenhower took when he became President, to execute faithfully the office of President, and defend the Constitution? I ask him only to fulfill the obligations of his oath of office.

So much for him.

What are the facts? The fact is that 2 years ago, short of 2 months, the Supreme Court, by unanimous vote, decided that segregation in the public schools was unconstitutional and specifically repugnant to the 14th amendment.

The Supreme Court subsequently laid down standards of procedure, in the form of a decree, for the application of its ruling, in specific reference to the monumental task of desegregating the schools in those parts of the country where segregation was being practiced.

But now there develops a concerted move to defy those decisions and decrees of the Supreme Court, and to persist in acts which the Court says are repugnant to the Constitution. Under these circumstances, I say, Mr. President, that

the very bedrock of our Nation, and of our particular form of government, is being attacked. Shall each individual in our Nation have the right to say that he disagrees with the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution and, therefore, will not abide by the supreme law of the land, as laid down by the Supreme Court? Obviously, that would be anarchy, and our Nation would collapse in chaos and disorder.

Well, then, shall a particular State government, through its legislature, or its Governor, or a particular schoolboard in a particular locality, have that right?

My colleagues, that is nothing less or nothing different than the advocacy of nullification, and all of us know it for what it is, by whatever name it is called, in whatever dress of polite words it is paraded.

To deny and defy the interpretation of the Constitution by the Supreme Court is to deny and defy the Federal Government. The Supreme Court is, as every schoolboy knows, the keystone of the arch of the judiciary, which is one of the three arches which make up the Federal Government. The Supreme Court is coequal with the Congress and the Executive. In its sphere, it is supreme.

By the very terms of the Constitution, the Supreme Court is supreme over the States in matters of legal interpretation, and has on numerous occasions declared provisions of State constitutions to be null and void because of conflict with the Federal Constitution. There can be no supportable challenge to the supremacy or competency of the Supreme Court in deciding what is and what is not constitutional, as strongly as some might disagree with the High Court's findings. It would be absurd, if it were not so deadly serious and so highly dangerous, to hold otherwise.

This week there was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, both in this body and in the House, a manifesto signed by 19 Members of the Senate and 77 Members of the House of Representatives, on this subject. That manifesto pledged its signatories to undertake to overturn the Supreme Court decision in the school-segregation cases. That manifesto was certainly not inflammatory in tone, but its effect was surely to support the doctrine of nullification which has been enunciated, in one form or another, by the Legislatures of the States of Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia.

That manifesto, that action by these of our colleagues, cannot go unchallenged. It cannot go unanswered in full measure. And it will not be permitted to.

Everybody says this is a grave matter, and it is. Who made it grave? Was it the Supreme Court, by finally rendering a finding of constitutional law which, in my judgment, was long overdue, or was it those who now urge and advocate defiance of the Constitution of the United States?

Oh, I know, Mr. President, that the manifesto calls for the use of all lawful means to overturn the decision of the Supreme Court. But these words are in support of action in some States to defy the law and to prevent its enforcement. That is not lawful action.

Now, let us get away from legalisms and from words which obscure substance. What is the substance of the situation?

The substance is that a vast number of people in the Southern States were and are being denied the equal protection of the laws, and were being set apart, and treated as pariahs in our society in access to public facilities supported by general tax revenues. Who can possibly justify the continuation, for one needless moment, of this intolerable discrimination, of this oppression?

Do I hear it said, as it has been said, that this is not discrimination nor oppression? Who says that? It is not the Negro who says that. It is those who practice the discrimination and the oppression who deny its nature. I scarcely think that they are competent witnesses.

What do our fellow Americans of darker skin say? Today they are crying out, from one end of the Nation to the other, including those in the South, that it is discrimination, and it is oppression, and they can bear it no longer. They are the ones who feel harrow of pain and indignity as it passes over them, and they are the ones to say what it feels like, and what its nature is.

And their cry for equal justice, and no more than that—for the enforcement of the law, and no more than that—is echoed throughout the land, by white and black, by the heart and conscience of America, which knows no distinctions of race, creed, or color.

Yes, my colleagues, it is easy for some of you, and for other public figures, to speak of gradualism. But let you be the one who feels the keen cutting edge of discrimination, let you be the one who has suffered through as many years as you can remember the indignity of being considered of an inferior breed, on the basis of the color of your skin, and you will understand the meaning of the word "gradualism."

You, some of my greatly respected colleagues from the South, have lost, I fear, effective communication and contact with your fellow-citizens of darker skin if you imagine for a moment that they do not desire, as fiercely as their hearts are capable, the removal of the bar sinister of official segregation.

Some of them may be reconciled to discrimination and inferior status. None is content with it. And increasing numbers demand, in louder and louder tones, an end to it. Now that the Supreme Court has spoken, they will not be denied.

I am convinced, deeply convinced, that we can avoid the worst potentialities of the present crisis.

I am convinced, deeply convinced, that the deep devotion of all our people, including those in the South, to the ways of democracy will prevail in the end, and the dark dangers that we all fear and hesitate even to discuss will be averted.

It should be encouraging to all of us—it is to me—how much compliance there has already been with the Supreme Court decision.

Of the 17 States and the District of Columbia in which segregation was practiced in the public schools on the date of the Supreme Court decision in May, 1954, 5 States and the District of Columbia are already well along in the integration process. That is more than one-fourth of all those States.

Seven States are either divided internally as to what to do, or just engaged in watchful waiting, permitting, in some cases, some few school districts to go ahead and integrate.

Five States—only five—are at this time actively resisting the Supreme Court decision—less than a fourth of the original total number.

So, in a sense, we can see how the battle is going. It is only a small minority of the States which seek actively to defy the Constitution. And of the population of the entire United States, it is a tiny minority, indeed, which would approve of the course of action now being followed by these five States.

I challenge them to submit their doctrine—this so-called doctrine of interposition—to the judgment of the American people as a whole, and see how far they get.

But Mr. President, this is not a matter for challenges or plebiscites. This is a matter of right and justice and law. I want to reason with my colleagues and to take counsel with them. I want to work with them in a resolution of practical problems and difficulties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is 2 minutes sufficient?

Mr. LEHMAN. It will not take more than 15 seconds.

But if there is a challenge to the Constitution, if there is a challenge to the concept of equal justice and equal rights under law to all Americans, I cannot do other than accept the challenge and take my place in the ranks of those who today are demanding the regular order of law and justice for all our citizens in all parts of our country.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The Senator has made an eloquent and a deeply moving and sincere statement. I do want to make this point, however, to him and to the Members of this body. Any suggestion that the President is a neutralist or is standing aloof from this problem is unwarranted and unfounded. I hope that there will be, from no side, even an implicit injection of this question into politics. Such an inference, I regret to say, could be drawn from the remarks of my colleague from New York.

The President's position is clear. As we all do, he agrees that the decision of the Supreme Court is based upon right and conscience. There is no question as to that. The only question is as

to the speed with which it may be put into effect, and here again the President's position that the Supreme Court's decision and its implementation orders must be obeyed is clear also.

I beg my colleagues here, and all people who are interested in this question, that we have no more of suggestions of politics in this matter, which will require the utmost restraint and consecration on the part of people of good will in this country and in this body in which we have the honor to sit.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I say to the Senator from New Jersey that of course the future is going to test the attitude of the President, but I want to emphasize, as I did in my remarks, we are not asking for anything out of the ordinary. We are not asking for new legislation. We are not asking for a new judicial interpretation. All we are asking for is the acceptance of and adherence to the supreme law of the land, the Constitution, and as I said in my remarks, I call upon the President to assume the responsibility to see that the laws are faithfully executed. That is the duty of the Executive. I ask him only to execute the obligations of his office and to defend the Constitution, as interpreted by the Supreme Court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? May we have another minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I am sure the Senator will concede to me an equal devotion to this principle.

Mr. LEHMAN. I not only concede that, but I was very much interested in the very fine remarks made yesterday on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I am sorry. I did not mean to ask for a compliment, but I appreciate what the Senator has said. I wanted it to be very clear that we are on common ground as to basic issues and basic objectives.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to commend the Senator from New York for his courage in defense of elemental human rights, which is characteristic of him. I should like to say, if I may, to the very able and eloquent Senator from New Jersey, that, in my opinion, the man who put this matter into politics is the Vice President of the United States, who referred to the Chief Justice of the United States, who wrote the very outstanding and humanitarian opinion in this historic case, as a Republican Chief Justice. The Vice President is the man who put politics into this vital issue, from which politics should be eliminated. It was not the distinguished Senator from New York, who has fought all of his life for equal rights for all people, regardless of race, creed, or color. Politics was introduced into this issue when the Chief Justice of the United States, who should be above politics, and who himself is above politics, was referred to in a speech as a Republican Chief Justice.

I am sure the Senator from New Jersey joins me in deploring that reference.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I was not present when the statement referred to was made by the Vice President. I regard it as unfortunate. I think he feels the same way about it—it was not a calculated statement. Regardless of that and, for the purpose of this discussion, conceding the unfortunateness of the statement, it is no justification to carry this matter any further into politics. My remarks have been made not in a spirit of partisanship, but as a word of caution. Whenever partisanship enters into this discussion, all of us ought to be careful to draw back, because partisanship can only inflame a situation already difficult.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I say to the Senator from New Jersey that this is no new field in which I am working.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I recognize that. I understand that the whole life of the Senator has been dedicated to this cause.

Mr. LEHMAN. For the 10 years I was governor of my State I fought against discrimination. I was able to bring about a tearing down of some of the barriers. I have fought against discrimination since I came to the Senate. There is no politics in this matter. I have no idea where A, B, C, D, or X, or Y may stand politically. What I am trying to emphasize is that all people should fully understand that there is only one question involved: Are we going to accept and respect and adhere to the Constitution of the United States, or are we going to defy it and advocate nullification? That is the fundamental issue. There is no other major question involved in this matter, except, of course, the moving question of dealing with all our people equally and in accordance with law without reference to race, creed, or color, and I am sure the Senator from New Jersey and I stand equally.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I am so glad we have had this discussion and this colloquy. We agree deeply on the question of the rightness of the Supreme Court's decision, as well as the fact that it is now the law of the land. My only reason for asking that the Senator from New York yield to me was to caution against any temptation any of us may have at any time to suggest that politics may be involved in this matter; and, in regard to the Senator's reference to President Eisenhower, to reject any suggestion that the President feels that he stands above this problem or that he is mediating between those who support and those who oppose the decision. His whole career negates that suggestion.

TRIBUTE TO THE GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, during the week of March 11 through the 17th, the Girl Scouts of America are celebrating their 44th anniversary. Thursday of Girl Scout Week is traditionally observed as International Friendship Day, and I feel that it is appropriate for the Senate to pay tribute to this great organization.

Mr. President, I have a special interest in the Girl Scouts, in the first place because two of my daughters were members of the organization, and benefited very much from that experience; and, in the second place, because the national executive director of the Girl Scouts, Miss Dorothy C. Stratton, is a cousin of mine. Miss Stratton is an outstanding woman with a fine record of public service. She has contributed very much to the success of the Girl Scout organization.

During these 44 years, this organization has grown to a membership of more than 2 million girls of whom more than 1 million are Brownie Scouts.

Not only are these activities prevalent in America, but they are found throughout the world. During the past 10 years, the Troops of Foreign Soils have increased from 10 troops with 121 girls to almost 1,000 troops with membership of more than 15,000 girls and 5,000 adults. Reports from all over the world indicate that our Girl Scouts, carrying on the same activities as their sisters at home, are proving the finest ambassadors of good will in Ireland, Egypt, Venezuela, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, the Philippines, and 30 other countries.

It is, of course, particularly gratifying to me to know that the Girl Scouts of America continue to carry on a worldwide exchange-of-persons program which involves nearly 200 girls and adults every year. Through this program, both adults and girls from many of the 34 organizations in the world association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts are brought to the United States to live and work with our own Scout organizations, and representatives from the United States visit many other lands to assist with the development of Scouting for Girls. These Scouts of all ages, from 7-year-old Brownies to lifelong volunteer workers, have a chance to further this program of friendship between the nations of the world.

Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to pay my respects to this great organization as its members observe International Friendship Day during their 44th birthday week. Not only have they made a great contribution to America, but they are contributing to the economic, spiritual, and cultural welfare of the entire free world.

EXPANDED HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have before me a letter from the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce, under date of March 2, 1956, in which is expressed the interest of that organization in highway legislation, particularly in securing an expanded highway program. I

ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Topeka, Kans., March 2, 1956.

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: The Kansas State Chamber of Commerce believes that one of the major problems we face today is that of providing a highway system adequate for both today's and tomorrow's needs. Our policy with regard to this important subject is as follows:

1. Adequate highways are essential to the Nation's welfare. Every effort should be made to create a highway system commensurate with the needs of a growing and dynamic economy, as well as national defense.

An expanded construction program is necessary to remedy present deficiencies and improve the Nation's highways.

2. Because of the national importance of the interstate highway system, the Federal Government should assume primary responsibility for financing modernization of this system.

The State chamber favors (1) the Federal Government increasing its total expenditures for improvements in the interstate highway system, and (2) increasing the Federal Government's share of aid to the interstate system beyond the present 60 percent (thus reducing the State's proportionate share).

3. Additional funds needed to finance the Federal Government's augmented share of the costs of the interstate highway system should be obtained to the maximum extent feasible from current revenues.

If such revenues are insufficient for these needs, additional funds should be obtained from one or both of the following: (a) reasonable and equitable increases in excise and motor fuel taxes upon highway users, and (b) bonds issued within the statutory Federal debt limit, the interest and principal on such bonds to be obtained from the suggested additional taxes on users.

In line with this policy, we respectfully urge you to support and vote for an expanded Federal highway construction program at this session of Congress.

In considering such a program, we would call your attention to our position with regard to extension of the Davis-Bacon Act to highway construction projects: The State chamber opposes application of the Davis-Bacon Prevailing Wage Act to Federal highway construction.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT A. FINNEY, *President.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ANDERSON obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is desired to have the Executive Calendar called at this time, and then to have the Senate take up calendar No. 1648, Senate Joint Resolution 135, which has been cleared. However, before that, I should like to have all Senators on notice; and, therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of John E. Harrison to be postmaster at Eastsound, Wash., which nominating messages were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. BENNETT, from the Committee on Finance:

Edgar Bernard Brossard, of Utah, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the executive calendar.

GOVERNOR OF THE CANAL ZONE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. William E. Potter, Corps of Engineers, for appointment as Governor of the Canal Zone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Army nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

THE AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Air Force be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Air Force will be considered en bloc.

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc.

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Gerald C. Thomas, United States Marine Corps, to have the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list of the Marine Corps effective from the date of his retirement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS REPORTED FAVORABLY AND PLACED ON THE VICE PRESIDENT'S DESK, WITHOUT PRINTING

The legislative clerk proceeded to read a total of 1,166 routine nominations in the grades from lieutenant to lieutenant colonel in the Army and the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, these nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be notified forwith of all these confirmations of nominations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ANNOUNCEMENT WITH RESPECT TO QUORUM CALLS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement.

The custom has grown up in the Senate whereby, when the absence of a quorum is suggested, and before the first call is completed, the order for the quorum call is rescinded.

Often when the order for the quorum call is not rescinded, and a quorum of 49, 50, or 51 is obtained, the clerks have been adding to the list the names of Senators who may be in committees or elsewhere in the Capitol, or engaged in other official business. They either make a brief appearance and answer to their names, or call over the telephone. As a result, it has been very difficult to maintain an attendance in the Chamber by a substantial number of Senators during

the consideration of some of the most important business of the Senate.

I should like to inform the Senate—and I so direct the clerks—that when the absence of a quorum is suggested, when the quorum is obtained, the only names listed on that quorum call shall be the names of Senators who were actually present and answered the quorum call. I hope that will be custom from now on. I hope Senators may be on notice.

Often there is a quorum call requiring 30 or 40 minutes, with the result that at the conclusion of the quorum call fewer Senators are present in the Chamber than were present at the beginning. I do not think that is conducive to the efficient transaction of the public business.

PAYMENT TO CROW INDIAN TRIBE FOR CONSENT OF TRANSFER OF RIGHT OF WAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 135, calendar No. 1648.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the resolution clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter referred to as the "Secretary") be authorized and directed to accept the offer of the Crow Tribal Council, acting on behalf of the Crow Indian Tribe, in its Resolution No. 63 of January 11, 1956, as clarified with respect to recreational and related purposes by its Resolution No. 70 of February 18, 1956, for the payment of $5 million for consent to and the transfer of right-of-way required for the construction and operation of Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, out of funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and allocated to the Missouri River Basin project: *Provided*, That the right of entry to the Yellowtail Dam site to permit the said Secretary, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to initiate and carry on construction, and operation and maintenance of the dam shall not be conditioned on the consummation of the transfer of the interest herein referred to in this joint resolution.

SEC. 2. The Crow Tribal Council, or the qualified individual members of the Crow Tribe, as the Secretary may determine is required, shall consent to the conveyance to the United States of all rights (except mineral, including oil and gas), title and interest in said lands required for the Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir right-of-way described in said tribal Resolution No. 63: *Provided*, That in the exercise of such mineral rights and of the recreational and related purposes referred to in section 1 of this resolution there shall be no interference with the construction or operation of the dam and reservoir.

SEC. 3. There shall be transferred in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Crow Tribe of Indians, the sum of $5 million set forth in section 1 of this resolution as just compensation for the transfer to the United States as herein provided of the right, title, and interest of the Crow Tribe in and to the certain tribal lands required for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Yellowtail unit, Missouri River Basin project. The Secretary, with the cooperation of the Crow Tribe of Indians, shall proceed with all dispatch possible to carry out the provisions of this resolution to the end that construction of Yellowtail Dam shall be initiated promptly: *Provided*, That for the protection of the Crow Indians, fees and expenses of counsel for the Crow Indian Tribe in connection with the settlement of claims related to Yellowtail Dam right-of-way shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior and in no event shall exceed 1 percent of the net amount paid under authority of this resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to say for the information of the Senate that the majority leader asked for consideration of this joint resolution several days ago. At that time the minority leader wished to check with certain minority Members. I am informed that he has completed his check, and that there is no objection to following the procedure which is suggested by the joint resolution.

The senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is prepared to make an explanation, as is the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I understand that certain minority Members may wish to make suggestions. Therefore I yield the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 135, as amended, was ordered reported without a dissenting vote by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs after thorough consideration of the several vital features of the measure.

The committee's report No. 1626 has been printed. It sets forth the text of the resolution and the amendment in the nature of a substitute under the resolving clause.

Briefly, the purpose of the resolution is to end a long standing controversy between the Crow Indian Tribe in Montana and the Department of the Interior over compensation to the Crow Indians for consenting to the transfer of title to land required for the site of Yellowtail Dam and powerplant and the reservoir. This development program was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944. More than $2½ million has been spent for investigation and preliminary plans.

The resolution authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to accept the offer of the Crow Tribe for $5 million compensation for its consent to the transfer to the United States of the right-of-way required. In return, it is the intent of the resolution that all rights, title, and interest of the Crow Indians in the right-of-way land shall be transferred to the United States by the appropriate processes which carry approval of the Congress. Certain reservations are provided for mineral rights and recreational purposes to be retained by the Crow Indians.

Funds are available, out of appropriations to the Missouri River Basin project and no additional appropriation is requested. The Secretary of the Treasury is directed to transfer the $5 million from funds previously appropriated to the Missouri River Basin project. There is ample precedent for authorizing this payment on the part of both the Government and private power companies for power site values on Indian land, as set forth in the report.

Cooperation on the part of the Crow Indians and the Secretary of the Interior is urged to effect promptly the transfer of title to the United States when the funds in the Treasury are placed to the credit of the Crow Tribal Council. In the meantime, the Crow Tribal Council is also urged to provide immediate right of entry so that preliminary work on the dam can be started promptly.

The Senate, of course, is aware that the Congress last year appropriated $4 million specifically to start Yellowtail Dam construction. The President has recommended $10,850,000 in the 1957 budget to continue construction. Therefore, the Crow Indian Tribal Council, the President, and the Congress are united in favor of building the dam.

The terms of the resolution are simple and direct and it is expected that the executive departments will carry out the provisions with the cooperation of the Crow Tribal Council.

The report sets forth the fact that the Kerr Dam, which was built in Montana some years ago, was on Indian land. At that time the Indians were paid something like $7 million for the land. It was not as much land as we are receiving from the Crow Indian Tribe in this instance. As I say, there was no objection to the approval of the joint resolution in the committee. It was approved by a unanimous vote of the committee, and I think it should be passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to compliment my distinguished colleague for stating the facts as succinctly and clearly as he has stated them. I also wish to compliment him for the fine continuous work which he has done in behalf of this project, which, as he has pointed out, was first authorized in 1944. It is of exceedingly great interest to the States of Montana and Wyoming. It required 10 years to get the first appropriation. What we are doing now is in accord with the wishes of the Crow Tribal Council in the Crow Indian Tribe.

I hope the joint resolution will be passed, so that we can complete this leg of the journey toward completion of the Yellowtail project, which will mean so much to the people of southeastern Montana, the Crow Indian Tribe, and the people of northern Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which is a complete substitute for the original text of the joint resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution for payment to Crow

Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming."

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which Senate Joint Resolution 135 was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "3-15-56-E."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 31, beginning at line 11, it is proposed to strike out that line and the rest of the page, and to strike out all of pages 32 and 33. On page 34, it is proposed to strike out lines 1 through 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 30 minutes, or so much thereof as he may choose to use.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

This is an old story, in which certain Senators ought to be interested. This is a subject which we discussed on the floor of the Senate for hours only a couple of years ago.

Because of the working of the minimum-acreage laws, this provision in the bill transfers certain acreage from certain States and gives it to certain other States. It develops that States like California, Arizona, Texas, New Mexico, Arkansas, and Missouri would lose substantial acreage under this provision, and that acreage would be gained by the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North and South Carolina, and Tennessee.

My only point has been that we have been pretty generous on the question of cotton acreage during this discussion. The able junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] presented an amendment to leave cotton acreage where it was for 1957 and 1958. The allocation has already been made for this year. If we were to proceed to do that, we would avoid getting into squabbles and storms.

I think it is a mistake to introduce a 1 percent national reserve, and try to reallocate on the basis of small farms. I realize that there are more small farms in what might be called the Deep South than there are in areas such as the Delta of the Mississippi, west Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, Oklahoma, and even the State of Nevada. The State of Nevada has only a few hundred acres of cotton; yet this provision would take 23 acres away from it, and push it further into a difficult position. I have twice advocated that in reallocating cotton acreage we should give the State of Nevada an annual minimum sufficient to permit it to have a cotton-gin mill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, so long as the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has mentioned my State of Nevada, let me say that we are very much interested in obtaining enough acreage to permit us to have a cotton-gin mill. At the present time, we have approximately 2,400 acres in cultivation. We are asking for an additional 1,500 or 1,600 acres, so that we shall not be compelled to transport the cotton some 200 miles, at great expense, into the State of California.

It was frozen by the Agricultural Act a number of years ago, and I am somewhat disturbed to find that for the first time, we are losing acres; and although the amount involved is small—we are losing 23 acres—it is just cause for concern.

Mr. ANDERSON. When the Cotton Allotment Act of 1949 was introduced, I was the sponsor of it. At that time we tried to put enough cotton into Nevada so that it could have its own cotton gin. We put a minimum figure in there for that particular allotment, but subsequently when the cotton acreage was shrunk, it put them in bad shape. I refer now to the State of Texas. It has the largest cotton acreage of any State in the Union. The amendment would take 74,109 acres from Texas as its contribution to the national reserve, and return to Texas 20,400 acres, a net loss of 55,000 acres.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator mentioned figures with reference to Texas. Is it not also correct to say that under the natural migration of these acres from the East to the West, under the operation of the present law, which we will not change, Texas will gain acreage every year?

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to read figures which show that Texas would gain next year 139,000 acres under that provision, and that would be a natural gain under the historic change.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sorry to say that I do not know where those figures come from. I do not know how the figures are arrived at. However, I say that whatever Texas gains on that basis she gains lawfully and legally and in a perfectly proper fashion. I do not believe that we should offer an amendment at this time which would take one acre away from Texas. What she gets she gets in observance of the present law.

By the same token, the State of California, which is also expanding its cotton acreage, under this legislation would be asked to give up 7,824 acres, and would get back perhaps a thousand acres under the new division.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall not ask the Senator to yield again, but I have some figures showing what California would gain under the present law.

Mr. ANDERSON. I point out that whatever California gains under the present law she gains by virtue of the fact that when we applied acreage limitations California had a large acreage devoted to cotton. We had to put special gadgets in the 1949 law to soften the blow. California had more than a million acres in cotton. She was cut down by approximately 600,000 acres. She gave up that amount of acreage, recognizing the fact that there would be an accretion to her as we developed the cotton history and as she had a chance to regain some of the acreage.

I point out that to come here now with an attempt to prevent California from benefiting under these developments would be a rather peculiar circumstance. California gave up more acreage, perhaps, than any other State.

Arizona followed the same course. We had to recognize that fact when the Control Act of 1949 was enacted. I should like to say that that act was not put on the statute books quickly or hastily. We held long, long meetings all through the Cotton Belt. The first meeting was held, I believe, in Bakersfield, Calif. Another meeting was held at Fort Worth, Tex. Still another meeting was held in the Deep South area. All the farmers, after long work, were brought together into an understanding that they would shrink the acreage of certain States and expand it in other States, and in that way make it possible for us to enact a cotton bill. It took an almost endless amount of work to bring that about. I say very frankly to the Senate that I have spent many hours on it.

We had thought that it would be impossible ever to bring cotton acreage under control. We had an old law under which it was not possible to shrink the cotton acreage below 27 million acres. Today we have surpluses of cotton with 17 million acres. We can readily see what the effect on the cotton economy and on the economy generally would have been if we had stayed with that provision.

We put into the law a provision which permits a State, if it desires to do so, to reserve a portion of its acreage and devote it to small farmers. The State of Arkansas, which would be punished, has done so. I cannot imagine any sound reason why Arkansas should be punished because its triple A has done what the law says should be done.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. There are several States which could not set aside enough reserve to take care of the small farmer.

Mr. ANDERSON. That I readily concede.

Mr. EASTLAND. Those States would be Florida, North Carolina, and Tennessee, I believe.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. I agree with the Senator that it is not posbile for every State to work out its cotton problem exactly. I only point out that this is no time to come into the Senate to try to switch acres around to suit peculiar circumstances. The cotton people are, or should be very happy that they have been allowed to have cotton acreage frozen for 2 years at a figure which will produce approximately 3 million bales of cotton more than the Secretary of Agriculture would ask them to grow if this provision had not been adopted. We will export every one of these bales of cotton at a loss of per-

haps $40 a bale. A loss of $120 million under this plan is sufficient. We ought to stop right there. It is dangerous in the extreme to open this question, because is may prove highly explosive.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield very briefly?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I am sure the Senator understands, in referring to a refiguring of acreage allotments that this provision which the committee has put into the bill would not change the acreage allotments during the year 1956, and there would be no refiguring for that purpose.

Mr. ANDERSON. Exactly; I would agree to that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would the Senator from New Mexico explain to me what effect the bill as now written would have on Texas and how his amendment would change it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to do so because the distinguished majority leader has asked me, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry from my part of the country, to try to watch the situation in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. It would take 74,109 acres from Texas and return to Texas 20,000 acres.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Where would the other 50,000 acres go?

Mr. ANDERSON. To the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On what theory would that be done?

Mr. ANDERSON. On the theory that Texas has 7 million acres, and that taking 50,000 acres away would not hurt. After 5 years it would amount to a half million acreage shrinkage in the State of Texas. All I am trying to say to the distinguished majority leader and other Senators is that this is a very poor time to start trying to redivide the cotton acreage of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. I hope he will not use all his time.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will not use all my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I make that suggestion so that the full membership of the Senate may be heard before we vote on the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. As the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has said, this matter has been under discussion from time to time during the past 4 or 5 years. It will be recalled that when the original Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed, in 1938, there was a minimum acreage allotment of the smaller of 5 acres the highest acreage planted in any of the preceding 3 years provided for cotton farmers. As time went on much of that acreage was not planted. In 1949 we applied the historic basis to the acreage allotment program on a discretionary basis, and many small farmers—the ones who had very small acreage—lost the little they had when that alternative was followed.

There is without question a problem in a number of the Southern States where the acreage of many farmers has been reduced to a point where it is uneconomical for them to continue to produce cotton.

Mr. President, the provision of the bill which this amendment would strike is in the nature of an equitable approach to the solution of a problem which is destroying the small farmers and tenant farmers of the cotton-growing South. The Deep South has been the traditional cotton-producing area of our Nation. The States which would benefit most from the committee provision are those States which have the highest proportion of small cotton farms, and which, incidentally, are the States that have been producing cotton since the early days of our Nation.

As the Senate knows, the present acreage allotment program is working a severe hardship upon small cotton farmers. Their land upon which they are allowed to produce cotton has, in many cases, been cut to almost the vanishing point. As a result, we are facing a severe social problem, as well as a most serious economic problem, in the historic Cotton Belt. These small cotton farmers are, to be blunt, being allotted off their land, and into semistarvation. Many of them are going to lose their lands, unless we give them some relief.

This provision of the committee bill, the provision which the Senator from New Mexico would strike, was placed in the omnibus farm bill purely and simply as a means of doing equity to these small farmers. They are in a critical position, through no fault of their own. Their acreages are constantly being reduced—first and foremost because the large, new cotton States—and Arkansas and Texas are two of them—are moving into really big cotton production. Thus, the national allotment has to be spread thinner and thinner in the historic cotton States.

This provision would do no violence to anyone; it would, however, bring at least a semblance of relief to our hard-pressed small farmers. It, in effect, says to the large and new cotton States that in order to prevent hardship in the historic cotton-producing areas, in order to make a start toward giving each farmer a minimum of 4 acres—and 4 acres is not much, Mr. President—they would be required to give up to a national reserve a total of 1 percent of their total State acreage allotment. All cotton States would do so; some, those in need of help, would be allocated back more than they placed in the national reserve in order to relieve hardships. The other States would wind up with a net loss—but the net losses involved are small, when compared with their contribution toward the relief of the small farmer.

The committee gave careful study to this provision, Mr. President. It was discussed often and at length. We voted to place it in the bill, not as a penalty imposed upon the newer cotton States, but in the nature of a reasonable means by which those who have received so much in recent years would come to the assistance of those who now find themselves with so little. The contributions of States to this national reserve would be upon the same basis—each would contribute 1 percent of its total allotted cotton acreage. From this "fund," from this national reserve, it would be possible for us to give some relief to the really small farmers—to the tenant farmers—to the really "little men" who are being starved out of existence simply because their historic plantings are not enough to bring them the minimum acreage from which to earn even a subsistence living.

I urge the Senate to defeat the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico. Goodness knows, the small farmer has little enough in this bill. Let us not strike out this provision, too, which simply attempts to make it possible for a small cotton farmer in a historic cotton State to grow enough cotton to buy his bread for his family.

If this entire farm bill has a heart, Mr. President, it is encased in this small farm section. This is the place in the bill that we find equity in its most concentrated and pure form; this is the place in the bill from which the small farmer, the really small farmer, would receive help. It must not be defeated, Mr. President. If it is, the Senate has served notice that it is willing to throw the most helpless segment of our already-burdened farm population to the economic wolves.

In order to demonstrate net losses and gains that will result to cotton States from the small farm section, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing estimated 1957 State allocations of national 1 percent reserve for minimum farm allotments.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated 1957 State allocations of national 1 percent reserve for additional acreage for minimum farm allotments pursuant to S. 3183

State	State allocationfrom national reserve [1]	State contribution to national reserve [2]
Alabama	27,900	10,252
Arizona	200	3,436
Arkansas	9,900	14,245
California	1,000	7,824
Florida	3,400	370
Georgia	18,100	9,032
Illinois	100	31
Kansas	0	0
Kentucky	300	78
Louisiana	8,500	6,109
Mississippi	21,400	16,460
Missouri	2,300	3,781
Nevada	0	23
New Mexico	500	1,794
North Carolina	20,400	4,839
Oklahoma	6,600	8,456
South Carolina	13,900	7,262
Tennessee	17,200	5,635
Texas	20,400	74,109
Virginia	1,900	171
United States	174,000	173,913

[1] Estimates based on additional acreage needs developed for similar purposes in connection with 1956 acreage allotments on the assumption of (1) apportioning 100 percent of county allotments to farms and increasing farm allotments to the larger of 4 acres or 80 percent of the highest planted acreage for the 3 years 1953, 1954, and 1955, and (2) a 1957 national acreage allotment of 17.4 million acres, or the same as the 1956 national acreage allotment.

[2] 1 percent of the 1956 State acreage allotment. The 1956 allotments used here for purposes of comparison, since 1957 State allotments have not been determined.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the table shows, with reference to the State of Arkansas, that Arkansas would receive 9,900 acres under the 1-percent allotment, and would lose 14,240 acres in the distribution. There is a net loss involved of almost 5,000 acres for the State of Arkansas.

With respect to the State of Texas, as has been brought out by my good friend, the majority leader, under the proposal to allocate 1 percent of a State's acreage to the national reserve, Texas would receive 20,400 acres and lose 74,109 acres, a net loss of 53,709 acres.

As has been stated by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, in the past 4 or 5 years the trend has been that the States of Texas and Arkansas and many of the States of the Far West have gained considerably in acreage. In the Southern States farmers have been growing cotton from almost time immemorial. They have planted to almost their capacity, and in that way they have lost much of their acreage.

Mr. President, I now yield 10 minutes to my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask especially for the attention of the Senators present, because even though the acreage involved is very small, this provision which has been included by the committee will affect more than 2 million persons. It involves only 150,000 acres of cotton lands in the allotment, but it will directly affect in its application more than 2 million persons.

Let me say in the beginning, Mr. President, that this is not a contest between States. If it were, the amendment never would have been presented to the committee, and I am sure the committee would not have voted for its inclusion in the bill. It is a committee amendment, and it comes before the Senate with the recommendation of a majority of the members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who know the problem backward and forward.

It is merely provided that there shall be a 1-percent national reserve of cotton acreage held out before it is distributed to the States, and then that 1 percent shall be used where needed, regardless of State lines, for the benefit of the very, very small independent farmer in bringing his acreage up to a minimum of 4 acres, or the highest acreage he might have planted for one of the last 3 years. That may have been only 2 acres. In that case, he will receive only 2 acres.

Mr. President, until 3 years ago there was a provision in the law which applied to the very, very small farmer, and which kept him from having his acreage reduced below 5 acres. The law was changed in a conference report which was never debated on the floor of the Senate, and the effect of it was literally to reduce the living standard of the very small farmer, running him off his own land. Those people are not migrants or indifferent tenants; they are homesteaders. In many instances their ancestors lived on the farms more than 150 years.

The provision which the committee placed in the bill is based solely on the social problem involved and on the humanitarian principles which apply. Senators from the great wheat area have a provision which keeps the small wheat farmer from being submerged, and there is a corn provision which protects the corn farmer. The same is true as to peanuts. This involves a humanitarian principle, Mr. President. There are 407,000 farms affected. Figuring 5 persons to a farm, there are over 2 million persons involved, and they are scattered throughout the entire cotton area.

Their fate hangs upon the vote on this amendment. Within a few weeks we shall hear powerful pleas in this Chamber for the little people of the Middle East, for the little people in Europe, for the little people all over the world.

But the little people of America—white and black—are represented here on the floor of the Senate today, asking Senators not to chase them off their own land. That is exactly what the application of the present cotton law is doing to the little people in these great areas. Their plea is not opposed by the Department of Agriculture; it is not opposed by the committee. When they came before the committee, to get the ear of the committee, so as to have this humanitarian principle voted upon in the Senate, their request is challenged on the floor of the Senate. The claim is made that acres are being taken away from one State and are being given to another. My point is that the acres do not belong to any State. They belong, first, to the people—the people who lease the land and live on it; who cultivate it and rear children on it. Their's are the kind of homes from which come the boys who are chosen by the Selective Service. Their's are the homes who supply the privates first class, the corporals, and the sergeants. Those people are being driven off the land. I know that of my own personal knowledge.

Mississippi will gain very few acres under this provision in the bill. Mississippi will gain only between 5,000 and 6,000 acres. But those acres will be located where they mean the most. Even if a person gets his acreage built up to four acres of that type of land, under the proposal in the bill, he will do exceedingly well to make three bales of cotton. He will do exceedingly well to make a net profit of $50 a year on those bales. That will be the profit for the year on that little farmland, after it has been built up to four acres; and it will not be built up that far with only $150 as the income for a year.

Mr. President, compare those earnings with the earnings of a man working in an industrial plant at $1 an hour, the lowest scale of wages, and working only 4 weeks a year. Such a person would make $160.

Suppose the Senate was considering a bill which provided that the factory workers in Detroit—the little factory workers in Detroit—shall not be allowed to work more than 4 weeks a year. Do Senators think that such a bill would pass? The provision in the bill as approved by the committee merely makes certain that the little people will not be smothered. It allows them to work on their own plan at a bare minimum—not up to 4 acres a year, no; simply up to the largest planted acreage in 1 of the last 3 years.

If Senators will pardon me for a personal illustration, during the depression I represented a rather large estate that had mortgages and deeds of trust on many, many pieces of land. One of those who owed money to the estate was a Negro woman who had a little farm of about 30 acres. When cotton was selling for 4.8 cents a pound, she nevertheless managed to pay her taxes on the land, and every year she would make some kind of cash payment on the interest or principal. Sometimes the payment was as little as $10 a year. But she hung onto that land, she and her children, and finally paid out the mortgage.

I stopped at her farm not many months ago. To my amazement, I found that under the operation of the law, that poor woman had had her entire homestead reduced to about 2.8 acres. The little patch of land which is left will not make 2.8 bales of cotton.

The operation of the law in its present state actually is designed to drive persons such as that woman away from their land. It is now proposed to say that this shall be a State proposition, and to take acreage from one State and give it to another.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. The provision in the bill will prevent acres from being taken away from areas where they should remain. I do not see how Senators can stand here and cut the foundation from under that vast group of small farmers, and then talk about displaced persons in foreign countries, foreign aid, and a host of other humanitarian projects, about which we hold ourselves up to the world as being so generous.

Our own displaced persons are, in effect, coming upon the floor of the Senate today, not asking for favors, not asking for generosity, but asking for some kind of minor, minimum protection whereby they can continue to live and to continue to cultivate the land they own and the land they love.

I appeal to every Member of the Senate to consider the merits of this matter, and to vote to keep in the bill this great humanitarian, social principle.

I shall make one more point. The operation of the provisions in the bill would tend to affect the historical basis for the allotments for future years in each State. I have an amendment already prepared, which I intended to offer had not this question come up— and I shall offer it anyway at the proper time—providing that the historical basis for each State's allotment in the years hereafter will not be affected. Under the present law there is a general migration, so to speak, of acres from the East to the West. I shall propose an amend-

ment to the committee bill which will preserve the status quo of the Western States in whatever situation or advantage they may now have in the operation of the present law.

The amendment which is under consideration does not add a single acre to the national cotton acreage; it merely eliminates the mere pittance which the small cotton farmers now have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the amendment would take away a few square feet of the surface of the Lord's earth and would give it to the most helpless of God's children. The amendment would affect the lives of approximately 2 million persons, who are the most helpless of God's children. The only thing they would get would be the right to plant cotton on the amount of acreage they had for the past 3 years; and in no event could they get more than a maximum of 4 acres.

These people have no way in which to get any money for medicine or for food, or with which to pay their taxes, or for any other purpose, except from their little patches of cotton.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the provision shall stay in the bill, what State will be hurt?

Mr. ERVIN. No State will be hurt; but about 2 million of the most helpless of God's children will be helped.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true. But if no State will be hurt, and no quota will be hurt, why not leave the provision in the bill?

Mr. ERVIN. That is what I urge. The matter was considered at length in the committee, and the committee reported the bill containing this provision.

In my State, there are about 48,000 cotton growers who have less than 4 acres each. Their families, including their wives and children, number in the neighborhood of 250,000. They have no other way in which to get money except by planting cotton. They do not know anything else to do.

We hear much talk about the little man. If the United States Senate wants to help the little farmers, if he wants to help people who cannot help themselves, then it will have to stand by the committee and let a few square feet of the surface of God's earth be given to aid the most helpless of God's children.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did the Senator say that no State would be hurt by this provision? I do not think he should make such a statement on the floor of the Senate. Will not 50,000 acres be lost in Texas?

Mr. ERVIN. The planters of Texas will not be hurt to the extent that many of the helpless people in my State will be hurt. Most of the people in my State who operate the cotton farms are colored people. This provision is one way in which to help them. If we shall change the law so that it will no longer be economical to operate little farms, those people will be left without an avocation in life.

If anybody is going to be hurt, let somebody other than these little people get hurt. Let the big men give up something.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes, so that I may comment on the Senator's last statement. The law of this country allows any State committee, which so desires, to set up a reserve, up to 10 percent, to take care of the small farmers. If people's hearts are bleeding so for the small farmers, why not let them bleed a little bit before the State committees, which have refused, in many instances, to make allotments to small farmers? I think it is pretty bad when it is said that this is a proposal to give a few acres to a few poor people, when all one has to do is look at the law and see that the State committees can set aside those acres, if they feel so sorry for the individual farmers.

This is nothing else but an attempt to move acreage by a minimum acreage device.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, if the provision remains in the bill, no State will lose enough acreage to injure the cotton economy of that State. It is true that the State of Texas would lose 53,000 acres under the provision which the committee placed in the bill, but it is also true that, if I remember the figures correctly, Texas would get about 40 percent of the national cotton allotment; in other words, 40 percent of 17 million-odd-thousand acres. Fifty-three thousand acres would not mean anything.

The statement was made by my good friend, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, that the matter should be taken up with the State committees. The fact is that some States, like Florida, North Carolina, and Tennessee, cannot withhold enough acres.

As far as the State of Mississippi is concerned, I do not think the provision would be of material benefit, because we would gain just 4,900 acres in the State of Mississippi. But a social question is involved. We have hundreds of thousands of people, at the bottom of the economic ladder, who cannot get enough acreage to enable them to buy bread and who cannot get the necessities of life. The provision would enable them to stay on the land and earn their bread in an honorable manner.

I repeat, the committee put the provision in the bill. If the provision remains in the bill, no State will be appreciably hurt. No single farmer will be injured, in my candid judgment. But there are hundreds of thousands of little people, at the bottom of the economic ladder, to whom the provision will mean the difference between bankruptcy and a living.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has spoken of the loss which Texas would sustain. Texas has approximately 40 percent of the entire national allotment. If the language as written in the bill, and as considered by the committee, and as put into the bill by the committee, remains in the bill, Texas will lose only seven-tenths of 1 percent of its allotment.

As the Senator from Mississippi has so well said, there are a number of counties and there are a number of States that simply do not have the allotment to meet the situation with its compelling needs. So the committee, after weighing the matter, recognized the fact that if the provision were not put in the bill, there would be displaced 2 million farm people, and over 400,000 farms would be wiped out. As Senators have stated in this debate, they are little people. All they have is a small pittance of acreage, which we are today trying to hold for them.

Do not forget, Senators, if you wipe out these farm families, it also means the destruction of community churches, community schools, and small community stores. Not only would the amendment wipe out farm families, but it would wipe out splendid, God-fearing rural communities in many States. Let us not forget that these rural communities, through the decades, have been the wellsprings that have provided the intellectual, the moral, and the spiritual strength that has contributed so much to the building of the greatness of our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the amendment would strike from the committee bill a provision which would care for small cotton farmers having 4 acres and less, in this manner: It provides that 1 percent of the national cotton allotment throughout the United States would be used for small farms having 4 acres and less of cotton acreage. When I say "less," I point out that many of the farms have less than 4 acres. A great many of them have 2 acres, 2½ acres, 3 acres, and 3½ acres. The provision would care for the small farmers of this Nation.

In these days and times, we hear a great deal of talk about our desire to help the little farmers. If anyone wants to help the little farmer, he has the opportunity now to do so by voting against the amendment to the committee provision. The committee made an extensive and profound study of this matter, and came to the conclusion that the best way to work out the problem was to have this provision in the bill. At one time the committee had before it a proposed amendment to add 2 percent, but some of the committee did not wish to add too much acreage to the United States allotment and thus build up our surpluses.

The provision under discussion would not build up the surpluses. In my opinion, it would cut down the surpluses. The reason I say that is that it will be found that in this very last year, throughout the United States, the big farmers made a greater average amount an acre than did the small farmer. So, in a way, the provision would cut down the amount of cotton which would be produced, and at the same time would help the little farmers who need help. Goodness knows, they not only need the help, but they need to be encouraged to stay on the farm.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So I urge Senators to vote against the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Georgia the remaining time on the amendment, which is 1 minute, and I also yield him 4 minutes on the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think I am aware of the forces that are in control of the Senate at the presesnt time so far as the proposed legislation is concerned. I have been associated with those who have been defeated on a number of propositions. With that I have no complaint, but I am heartsick at the prospect that the provision now in question will be stricken from the bill.

We have heard within the past several weeks statements and figures of the hundreds of thousands of people—yea, millions—in this country whose cash income is less than $1,000 a year, in the midst of the greatest abundance that any people under the canopy of heaven have ever enjoyed.

Every person affected by this amendment is in that group whose cash income is less than $1,000 a year. In this case we are dealing, Mr. President, with persons whose cash dollar income is around $300 to $500 a year. We are dealing with little people, people who have 10, 12, 15, 18, or 20 acres of land, who raise several hogs, have a garden spot, have a few hens and a cow, and look to the pittance they obtain from their cotton to enable them to clothe themselves and to see to it that their children can hide their nakedness and go to school.

Mr. President, if the purpose of the bill is, throughout, to complete the liquidation of the family-size-farm operations, this amendment gives Senators a chance to strike the strongest blow in that direction. But I am one of those who think that the family-size farmer is one of the most valuable assets of America. I think the family-size farmers give our Nation a spiritual value which cannot be found in the teeming cities. There is something to the man who communes with God and with nature's God on the farm, that brings him a little closer to God. Some may call the section in which those farmers live the "Bible belt," if they wish. These farmers are not ashamed of that designation.

But, Mr. President, this amendment will speed the time when there will be no family-size farms, but only "farm factories" controlled by the very rich farmers or by the corporate farming interests.

Mr. President, we hear a great deal here about doing something for the Negro people. I wish to say that, insofar as my State is concerned, more than half of those who will be affected by this amendment are Negroes. The National Colored People's Association is not raising its voice against this amendment because it has little interest in that type of Negro. But this amendment will bring those Negro people to an economic problem that will be insoluble—if they only have an acreage allotment of 1 acre or 1½ acres of land. They cannot possibly exist with so small an amount of land, and they cannot find the means with which to clothe themselves. As a result, they are leaving the farms. Today they are leaving by the thousands for the towns and cities and other sections of the Nation because of the fact that the pressure on their acreage allotments is driving them from the little farms they have sacrificed so much to be able to own and that afford them their homes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 more minute on the bill to the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 1 minute on the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this amendment will force many more of those little people—by the tens of thousands—to leave their small farms where they have developed their homes. Eventually those people will be driven onto the welfare rolls, and thus they will cost the several States and the Nation tens of millions of dollars. Today, these little people have only enough to eke out a pitiable existence with a couple of hogs, a cow, and a garden spot from which they obtain much of the food they eat, and also the means of feeding their hogs; and this provision will allow them a pitifully small patch of cotton from which they can obtain a cash return of $200 or $300—sufficient to enable them to purchase clothing for themselves and to have enough means to prevent their children from being naked.

Mr. President, this is as important, a humanitarian question as has ever confronted the Senate. I appeal to the Senate to preserve the homes and livelihood of these little farmers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico. I shall do it in great part because, as has been previously stated, the law today on the statute books gives to any State which wishes to take into consideration the plight of the poor who happen to be farmers, complete opportunity to right the wrongs which may exist under the acreage allotments.

In that connection, I wish to read a portion of the present law, namely, subsection (e) of section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act:

> The State acreage allotment for cotton shall be apportioned to counties on the same basis as to years and conditions as is applicable to the State under subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section—

Then, Mr President, listen to this:

> *Provided*, That the State committee may reserve not to exceed 10 percent of its State acreage allotment (15 percent if the State's 1948 planted acreage was in excess of 1 million acres and less than half its 1943 allotment) which shall be used to make adjustments in county allotments for trends in acreage, for counties adversely affected by abnormal conditions affecting plantings, or for small or new farms, or to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship.

Mr. President, if there has been any hardship, if inequities have occurred under the national acreage allotments, I respectfully suggest that the Congress of the United States in its wisdom has given authority to correct those injustices and those hardships; and the authority is vested in the State committee in every State. There is where the responsibility rests. That is where it ought to rest.

Mr. President, it is wrong now to ask the Congress to adopt the language presently in the bill; and it seems to me that the Senator from New Mexico has suggested the sound basis upon which to proceed—namely, to continue placing the responsibility to correct inequities where it is now, and to indicate to the States involved that they have a power, apparently an unused power, which they ought to exercise.

Mr. President, I hope my brethren will support the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico wish to yield any time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time there may be a quorum call, without charging to either side the time required therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chavez	Green
Allott	Clements	Hayden
Anderson	Cotton	Hennings
Barkley	Curtis	Hickenlooper
Barrett	Dirksen	Hill
Beall	Douglas	Holland
Bennett	Duff	Hruska
Bible	Dworshak	Humphrey
Bricker	Eastland	Ives
Bridges	Ellender	Jackson
Bush	Ervin	Jenner
Butler	Flanders	Johnson, Tex.
Byrd	Fulbright	Johnston, S. C.
Capehart	George	Kennedy
Case, N. J.	Goldwater	Kerr
Case, S. Dak.	Gore	Knowland

Kuchel	Morse	Scott
Laird	Mundt	Smathers
Langer	Murray	Smith, Maine
Lehman	Neely	Smith, N. J.
Magnuson	Neuberger	Sparkman
Malone	O'Mahoney	Stennis
Mansfield	Pastore	Symington
Martin, Iowa	Payne	Thurmond
Martin, Pa.	Potter	Thye
McCarthy	Purtell	Watkins
McClellan	Robertson	Welker
McNamara	Russell	Wiley
Millikin	Saltonstall	Williams
Monroney	Schoeppel	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] 1 minute on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a few moments ago I referred to the fact that there was another clarifying amendment to the bill which would insure that each State would preserve, under the present law, its historical basis for acreage allotment each year. Under the present law, there is a natural migration of acres from East to West. It is not the purpose of those interested in the committee provision to change that in the slightest. So if this provision remains in the bill, I shall immediately offer an amendment which I am sure will not be contested, and which will preserve the status of every State, so that it will not lose, from the standpoint of what we call the historical basis upon which acreage allotments are to be figured each year hereafter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to speak in favor of the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not believe that the rules of the game under which cotton acreage is divided among the cotton-producing States should be changed except in a cotton acreage bill. We have before us a farm bill.

I can understand the deep concern of my friends over helping the little farmer. I would be more impressed with their argument if they helped the little farmer out of the allotments they get for their States, instead of being willing to help the little farmers of their States out of an allotment taken away from my State.

As I understand the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the desire to help the little farmer results in taking 74,000 acres away from Texas, and giving back 20,000. So there is a net change of more than 50,000 acres to help the little farmer. In a 10-year period that would amount to more than half a million acres. If that is to be done, it ought to be done in an acreage allotment bill.

The same thing applies to California. The same thing applies to many other States. I hope the Anderson amendment will be adopted.

Our State is one of the largest cotton-producing States. We have tried to take reasonably good care of our small farmers in our State allotment. We do not think we should be penalized because some other State refuses to take care of its small farmers and comes here at the last minute saying, "Let us reach over into our neighbor's backyard and take away some of his allotment, to take care of our small farmers."

Half a dozen or more States would benefit by the provision in the bill. I think it is unsound. I think it is unfair. I hope the Anderson amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time in favor of the amendment is controlled by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask that someone yield me 2 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not believe any Senator will charge the Senator from Florida with having been unkind to the great States of California and Texas, because he stood on this floor for a great many days in the fight on behalf of the so-called Tidelands bill, which has poured hundreds of millions of dollars into the treasuries of those States. It did not pour such money into the treasury of Florida, because there are no known oil or gas reserves in my State.

Furthermore, I wish to make it clear that so far as my State is concerned a provision such as is now contained in the bill is necessary for the welfare of the small cottongrowers. Those are the only kind of cottongrowers we have in Florida. We do not have any big cottongrowers in our State. We have only 37,000 acres in our allotment, and by dividing that among our seven-thousand-odd cotton farmers it would mean an average allotment of about 5 acres per farmer.

We have used our 10-percent State reserve in the way prescribed in an effort to take care of distress cases and small farms but the available acreage was wholly inadequate. We come here pleading for what we are entitled to have. We believe that the problem should be looked at as a national problem, because if our small cotton growers should go on relief the burden will fall partly on the whole country. We do not come as mendicants, because we pay much more than our per capita share in Federal taxes. We suggest that this is a national problem, and it is our hope that the committee's action will be sustained and that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico will not be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. I believe there exists a problem in the several States which have been mentioned by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] with regard to small farmers, but, as has been pointed out by my colleague, the way to meet the problem of the small farmer is by the allotment committees in the several States.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly on that point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. We should not make a substantial change in the general acreage allotments relative to cotton as it affects the entire country.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator yield briefly on that point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator spoke about the States taking care of the small farmers. Does he not know that in more than one county in my State, as in many other States, there are not enough acres under the present allotment law to give every farmer in that county the minimum that we are talking about, because there just are not enough acres, and there are so many small farmers? The acreage has been reduced so low that there are not enough acres available.

Mr. ANDERSON. That problem should be solved where the majority leader and minority leader have suggested that it should be solved; namely, in the States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico if he could tell me how we could divide the acreage in North Carolina and cure the situation.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have already said that the North Carolina situation is bad, but that is not the only bad situation.

Mr. ERVIN. I do not see how we could cure the situation at the local level.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. It is impossible to hear what Senators say.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has all time been used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only remaining time is controlled by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have yielded back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the question now on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Is it correct to say that the vote now comes directly on the Anderson amendment, which would strike out the provision in the bill inserted by the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The

question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent because of illness in his family.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay" and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is necessarily absent and on this vote he is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is detained on official business, and if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays, 43, as follows:

YEAS—46

Aiken	Curtis	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Dirksen	McCarthy
Anderson	Duff	Millikin
Barkley	Dworshak	Monroney
Beall	Goldwater	Payne
Bennett	Hennings	Potter
Bible	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Bricker	Hruska	Saltonstall
Bridges	Humphrey	Smith, Maine
Bush	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Butler	Kerr	Symington
Capehart	Knowland	Watkins
Case, N. J.	Kuchel	Welker
Chavez	Lehman	Wiley
Clements	Malone	
Cotton	Martin, Iowa	

NAYS—43

Barrett	Ives	Neuberger
Byrd	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Case, S. Dak.	Jenner	Pastore
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Eastland	Kennedy	Russell
Ellender	Laird	Schoeppel
Ervin	Langer	Scott
Flanders	Magnuson	Smathers
Fulbright	Mansfield	Stennis
George	McClellan	Thurmond
Gore	McNamara	Thye
Green	Morse	Williams
Hayden	Mundt	Young
Hill	Murray	
Holland	Neely	

NOT VOTING—7

Bender	Frear	Sparkman
Carlson	Kefauver	
Daniel	Long	

So Mr. ANDERSON'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "3-6-56-D," and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 30, between lines 17 and 18, it is proposed to insert the following:

LIMITATION ON IMPORTS OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

SEC. 310. If at the beginning of any calendar year the Secretary of Agriculture determines that there is a surplus of any agriculture commodity in the United States, no such commodity, including products composed wholly or in chief value of any such commodity, shall be permitted to be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, during any such calendar year which would cause the total quantity of such commodity entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, during any such calendar year, to exceed the annual average for imports of such commodity entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, during the 3 years immediately preceding such calendar year.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to curtail imports of agricultural commodities to the level of the previous 3-year average, for commodities which are in surplus. We have greatly increased some of our imports in recent years. Imports of pork products have increased in the past 2 years. Over the years we have imported a great deal of grain. During the past 5-year period we have imported half a billion bushels of feed grains.

The half billion bushels of feed grain which were imported were not needed. We already had all we needed. The imports greatly contributed to our surpluses of grains, and lowered the price of feed grains. Lower feed grain prices in turn are largely responsible for present meat surpluses.

For the fiscal year 1954-55, 1,497,000,000 bushels of oats were produced, but only about 300 million bushels of this oats reached the terminal markets. Our imports for that year were 20 million bushels. Thus, 7 percent of all the oats reaching the terminal markets were of foreign origin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a table relating to the total production and the imports of oats and barley printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fiscal year 1954-55

Oats:	*Bushels*
Total production	1,497,000,000
Left the farm to commercial channels	300,000,000
Imports	20,000,000

About 7 percent of the oats on the United States market were of foreign origin.

Barley:	*Bushels*
Total production	371,000,000
Left the farm to commercial channels	125,000,000
Imports	24,000,000

About 20 percent of the barley on the United States market was of foreign origin.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota give the figures on rye?

Mr. YOUNG. I regret that I do not have the figures on rye.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My informatiton is that the United States production of rye in the fiscal year 1954-55 was 21,861,000 bushels. The importations were 3,448,000. Even as against the total amount, that is better than 15 percent; it is almost 16 percent of the rye imports. But if we eliminate from the amount which goes to market that which is fed, the percentage of rye imported would be tremendously high.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I think later figures are available than those given by the Senator from South Dakota. Last year we raised about 23 million bushels of rye, and imported 12 million bushels.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Last year?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. I obtained those figures from the Secretary of Agriculture at a hearing before the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to have that information, because it points up the real problem to which the amendment is directed.

Mr. YOUNG. I think barley is in an even worse situation. During the last fiscal year, 371 million bushels of barley were produced in the United States. Of that amount, 125 million bushels reached the terminal markets. Imports of barley into the United States were 24 million bushels, or 20 percent of all the barley reaching the terminal markets was of foreign origin. Whenever 20 percent of any commodity reaching the terminal markets is of foreign origin, it is bound to have a serious and adverse effect on the cash price of that commodity.

The main purpose of introducing the amendment is that if the soil bank works, as it is thought it will, and if it increases the price of agricultural commodities, there will be more trouble with imports in the future than there is now.

What the amendment does is to limit the imports of any commodity which is in surplus to the average amount of the importations of the previous 3 years. I think most Senators are familiar with the situation.

I may say, however, that the House may object to an amendment which has to do with imports. I have consulted with our legislative counsel, and they have prepared a memorandum for me. They believe the amendment is germane.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum prepared by the legislative counsel may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR YOUNG

This memorandum is in response to your inquiry as to whether an amendment drafted in this office for you to S. 3183, now pending before the Senate, is objectionable on the grounds that it is a bill for raising revenue within the meaning of the constitutional provision that "all bills for raising revenue

shall originate in the House of Representatives" (art. I, sec. 7, clause 1).

The time element involved prohibits a thorough examination of the question, and therefore, any conclusion reached in this memorandum must necessarily rest upon cursory research.

In order to determine whether the amendment in question is a revenue measure which may not originate in the Senate, it is necessary not only to determine what the purpose of the amendment is, but also how the amendment proposes to accomplish that purpose. The amendment reads as follows:

"SEC. 310. If at the beginning of any calendar year the Secretary of Agriculture determines that there is a surplus of any agriculture commodity in the United States, no such commodity, including products composed wholly or in chief value of any such commodity, shall be permitted to be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, during any such calendar year which would cause the total quantity of such commodity entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, during any such calendar year, to exceed the annual average for imports of such commodity entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, during the 3 years immediately preceding such calendar year."

The apparent purpose of the amendment is to limit, by a specified formula, the quantitative imports of certain agricultural commodities. This action would be accomplished by the imposition of an embargo on such commodities when the imports of such commodities reach a certain predetermined limit.

Bills which impose taxes upon the people, directly or indirectly, or which lay duties or excises, are clearly revenue bills. However, bills for other purposes, which only incidentally create revenue, are not always held to be revenue bills within the meaning of the Constitution.

Assuming, as would appear to be obvious, that no argument can be made that the amendment in question has a primary purpose "raising revenue," the remaining possible contention is that by imposing a limitation upon the imports of agricultural commodities, customs and duties from the imports of such commodities will be reduced, thereby making the amendment a provision relating to revenue within the purview of the above cited constitutional provision.

No authority directly on the point has been found. However, Story says in discussing the revenue clause of the Constitution: "* * * the history of the origin of the power already suggested abundantly proves that it has been confined to bills to levy taxes in the strict sense of the words, and has not been understood to extend to bills for other purposes, which may incidentally create revenue." (I Story on the Constitution (fifth edition) sec. 880.)

There have been at least two Supreme Court cases sustaining measures originating in the Senate under the so-called doctrine of "incidental purpose." In *Twin City Bank* v. *Nebeker* (1897) (167 U. S. 196), it was held that the imposition of a tax upon the circulation of notes of national banks, upon their deposits, and upon their capital stock, by an act the primary purpose of which was to provide a national currency, did not make the act a revenue law. The Court, therefore, held that the act was not open to objection because it had originated in the Senate as the imposition of the tax was merely incidental to the main purpose of the act. Another case illustrating the same point is *Millard* v. *Roberts* (1906) (202 U. S. 429). In this case the statute authorized payments to certain railroads in the District of Columbia for elevating tracks, the construction of a station, and other improvements, the cost to be levied and assessed upon the taxable property in the District of Columbia. The Court dismissed the argument that the act was unconstitutional as having originated in the Senate by briefly citing the Twin City Bank case and adding that "Whatever taxes are imposed are but means for the purposes provided by the act." Here again the provision for the tax was merely an incidental provision.

However, it should be noted that such opinions have not been looked upon with favor in at least one instance. Commenting on one of these cases, *Twin City Bank* v. *Nebeker*, Judge Hough in his opinion in *Hubbard* v. *Lowe* (1915) (226 Fed. 135), holding unconstitutional the first Cotton Futures Act because it was a tax measure and had originated in the Senate, observed: "It has sometimes required a good deal of mental strain to demonstrate that some piece of legislation originating in the Senate was not 'a bill for raising revenue'."

A circuit court of appeals case, *Bertelsen* v. *White* (1933) (65 F. (2d) 719), contains language which indicates that the court finds significant the fact that the section there in question, section 23 of the Merchant Marine Act of June 5, 1920, which altered the method of ascertaining the net income subject to the war-profits and excess-profits taxes imposed by title III of the Revenue Act of 1918, had the effect of diminishing revenue rather than raising it. The court held that although section 23 amended title III, section 301 (b), of the Internal Revenue Act of 1918, it did not thereby become a revenue measure since the amendment was only incidental to the primary purpose which was to establish an American merchant marine.

It is believed that even though the amendment in question might have an effect upon customs and duties and might have the effect of imposing an embargo, such effects are so remote and incidental to the purpose of the amendment that they cannot logically be said to have the result of making the amendment a revenue measure within the meaning of the constitutional provision requiring such measures to originate in the House of Representatives.

Regardless of opinion and precedent the House might object to the amendment if adopted by the Senate. It may be safely said without citing authority that the House jealously guards its prerogative as to revenue legislation, and if it is of the opinion that the amendment in question is a revenue measure within the meaning of the Constitution it would no doubt insist that no such measure might originate in the Senate. It would only be speculation on our part to say what the position of the House would be in this case; however, it is felt that the amendment here under consideration is not a bill for raising revenue within the meaning of the constitutional provisions and may, therefore, properly originate in the Senate.

Respectfully,

HUGH C. EVANS,
Assistant Counsel.

MARCH 6, 1956.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, despite the fact that the legislative counsel of the Senate believes the amendment is germane, I want the Senate to know there is a possibility the House might return the bill if the amendment were included by the Senate and were retained by the House conferees. However, I believe no harm would be done by approving the amendment. It would go a long way toward curbing the unnecessary importation of agricultural commodities which are already in surplus.

If the soil bank works, as it is believed it will work, and if it raises the prices of commodities to 90 percent or 100 percent of parity, we shall have more trouble with imports than we have had before. Unfortunately, in the last 5 years or more, the importation of agricultural commodities into the United States has been on the increase. Exports have decreased from what they were 5 years ago.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator, of course, is aware of the fact, is he not, that we were getting $1.80 for rye until 12 million bushels of rye came into the United States from Canada. The price of rye then went down to about 70 cents a bushel.

Mr. YOUNG. My distinguished colleague is absolutely correct. The cash price of rye at present is below the support levels. It would not at all be necessary for the cash price of rye to be below the support levels if we had only sense enough to curtail our imports.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD tables relating to imports of feed grains and also the imports of pork and pork products and beef and veal and their products.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Grain imports in millions

[Fiscal or marketing years]

	1952–53	1953–54	1954–55	1955–56 (estimate)
Oats	68.6	79.7	20.0	20.0
Barley	24.9	38.3	24.1	25.0
Rye	5.6	13.4	3.4	3.0
Feed wheat	20.4	4.3	2.9	3.0
All wheat	21.6	5.5	4.4	4.0

(Information obtained from Schaefner—USDA.)

Pork and pork product imports (except lard)

[Calendar years]

	Pounds
1953	146,026,000
1954	170,327,000
1955: January-November	150,456,000

Beef and veal imports (including beef-veal products)

[Calendar years]

	Pounds
1953	160,099,000
1954	125,692,000
1955: January-November	111,601,000

Source: Jaffe Livestock and Meat Products Division, Foreign Agriculture Service, USDA.

TRIP LEASING LEGISLATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there will shortly come up on the Senate floor, following completion of action on the farm parity bill, an important piece of legislation, S. 898—commonly referred to as the trip leasing bill.

I bring up this matter now, while the farm bill is under debate, because it is really a part and parcel of the program for the protection of the farmers of the Nation.

It is designed to preserve, by statute, the right of farmers, cooperative associations, private carriers, and other agri-

cultural haulers, to lease their trucks to authorized motor carriers, for back hauls, and for other short periods of time, rather than having to return empty in the direction of the areas where their trucks are usually based.

A bill of this nature has been necessitated by the proposed imposing on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission of a 30-day minimum limitation on the length of time for which a truck might be leased. And, so, there is a continuing threat that unless a clear policy is established by statute, the ICC might, at will, reinstate such an arbitrary limitation, or even a more stringent one, as applied to trucks hauling agricultural commodities.

Now, Mr. President, I raise this issue, while the present farm parity bill is under debate, because it is part and parcel of assuring a fair break for the farmer. Trip leasing, such as is supported by S. 898, not only promotes economy in transportation charges for the movement of farm goods from farm to consumer, but it also results in efficient and full utilization of equipment, and in balanced operations for both the lessor and lessee motor carriers.

The bill would not effect any changes in present trip leasing practices. It would, however, wisely make certain by law that in the future the ICC does not put into effect any harmful regulation such as it has attempted in the past.

I point out that favoring this legislation are such splendid groups as the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, and the National Milk Producers Federation, together with the Dairy Industry Committee. The Departments of Agriculture and Interior favor it; the National Potato Council favors it; the National Livestock Producers Association, the National Farmers Union, the American Association of Nurserymen—and many others.

I point out further that if we are to be consistent in passing the present farm parity bill, we can hardly fail to pass a bill which will also help the farmer and the farm co-op.

My State of Wisconsin is one of the great cooperative States of the Union, and I have been pleased to hear from Mr. Homer L. Brinkley, executive vice president of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, vigorously endorsing this measure and analyzing it most carefully and objectively.

I have in my hand, too, a great many representative messages from my State. For example, there is a message from one of our most prominent businessmen, active in civic affairs and in constructive political work. He points out that "trucks hauling products from Wisconsin, such as milk, cheese, butter, and so forth, to the East, pick up under lease arrangement seafood and other products from the East to haul back to Wisconsin. This gives them a payload in both directions, and makes it cheaper for the shippers."

He goes on to point out:

If this bill is not passed, the ICC will prevent the farm people and their carriers from returning to Wisconsin with a payload.

And he concludes:

I believe it is in the best interests of Wisconsin to have this bill passed, and urge you to vote for it.

I have in my hand the text of a wire from the Antigo, Wisconsin Truckers Association, urging strong support of the bill.

Mr. Charles Cruezinger, president of the Wisconsin Potato Association, has telegraphed me similarly.

As a sample of other businessmen supporting it, Mr. Roy J. Denson, of the Perfect Seal Manufacturing Co., has wired:

Small business firms, such as ours along with all the agricultural groups such as farmers, fishermen, fuel and food processors, will be greatly aided in their fight for survival by the passage of the trip lease bill, S. 898. I sincerely hope you can throw your great prestige into the fight for the passage of this bill and thus against the railroad and giant trucking concerns who are fighting so hard against this bill.

Under these circumstances, I believe that the judgment of the Senate Commerce Committee in favorably reporting the bill out should be followed.

The House of Representatives, on June 24, 1953, overwhelmingly passed a bill of this nature. But, unfortunately, the Senate did not take final action at that time. Now the House is awaiting our Senate decision, and I am hoping that the Senate will soon act accordingly.

I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished minority leader yield time to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota is exactly the way in which to handle this situation. Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 provides authority for limiting the importation of price-supported crops, when such imports would impair the support program.

The amendment goes beyond price-supported commodities and provides a completely rigid formula for import restrictions.

A few years ago there was trouble about imports. They were not closely controlled. In 2 years, or so, there were 66 million bushels of wheat imported, which ought not to have been imported. The importation was really in violation of the law. Large quantities of other grains were imported. However, that condition has been tightened in the last 2 years. So far as I know, no edible wheat is being imported into the United States above the 800,000 bushel importation limitation. The importation of oats has been pretty well stopped. I know the people in the northeastern part of the United States used to go to Canada to get oats; now they get oats from Ohio and other States of the Middle West.

I do not know about rye. I do not suppose we produce all the rye we need, anyway.

It seems to me that what is sought to be accomplished by the amendment could best be handled through the provisions of section 22, which are workable if used. The fact that they were not enforced a few years ago should not react against the law itself. I think section 22 is now being invoked. I do not see any need to include the amendment in the bill. I appreciate the purpose and the intent of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In connection with the matter of rye, we had a hearing before the committee. We tried to have section 22 invoked. We waited 7 months before the Tariff Commission would act, even though we had the Department of Agriculture for us.

Mr. AIKEN. Was rye selling at below the support level?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. In other words, the cash price was 70 cents, as was stated by my colleague. Twelve million bushels of rye came into this country before the President stopped it. Of course, the Commodity Credit Corporation simply bought that rye, at a loss to it.

Mr. AIKEN. There is so little rye in any form consumed in Vermont that I do not know about that. I do know about the importation of oats and feed wheat. They were brought very much under control. Now we are using domestic, rather than Canadian crops for feed, as we used to.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. Then I shall yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. President, it is true that the imports of oats during the last 2 or 3 years have greatly decreased. That has happened for two reasons. One reason is that our domestic price is cheaper. A second reason is that the Canadian oat crop was much smaller. Barley imports are on the increase, and 20 percent of the barley which reaches the terminal markets is of foreign origin.

Mr. AIKEN. I might say to the Senator from North Dakota we are now getting our oats in the United States, not only because the price in the United States is better, but because the quality of the oats produced in the United States has been improving in the last 3 or 4 years. One reason why Canadian oats were bought in past years was that the heavy, crinkly oats could be bought at a better price. That situation seems to have been straightened out. We in the northeast part of the country are using high-quality domestic oats.

Mr. YOUNG. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from North Dakota, who is one of the most consistent and constructive battlers on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for the cause of agriculture in the Midwest and throughout America. I wish to say

I am mighty happy to be associated with the Senator from North Dakota, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], in the preparation and the introduction of the amendment, because it seems to me that it strikes at the heart of one of the reasons why we have been concerned with this agricultural bill for these many long weeks and months.

The amendment is something that strikes at the problem of surpluses, and strikes, in a sensible and logical manner, at the heart of the problem. It simply says, "Surely, the surpluses of America's agricultural products are big enough now without having to import trouble and import surpluses and products which, in short order, will magnify our problem."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. As a matter of fact, the proposal treats the importer more generously than it does our own farmers. The importers are not frozen at the average level of the last 3 years, are they?

Mr. MUNDT. Not only that, but we treat the importer much more generously than we treat the American farmer, because the foreign exporter does not have to pay any tax to provide the price support which he needs; but the American farmer, just like every other American citizen, is subject to taxes. What we are trying to do by the amendment is make this the agricultural bill of 1956 for the American farmer, instead of the agricultural bill of 1956 for farmers and exporters all over the world. It is as simple as that.

There just is not any way that we are going to find dollars enough, or a way in which we can mint or mine money enough for the United States to provide price floors for all the farm products of the world. Until we stop trying to do that, until we recognize the utter futility of asking people all over our country to pay taxes for a price support program for the Canadian grain farmer, for the Danish producer of butter and hams, for the Argentine farmer, for farmers and exporters from every area, we are never going to solve the problem of American surpluses. We may as well spend our time spitting in the sea; we do not have enough money to support farm prices around the world.

We are pretty rich and we have pretty good tax collectors. They collect a lot of money. But they will not be able to collect it as fast as we shall spend it if we are going to continue to try to have a price support program for everything farmers can produce in any country anywhere.

The soil bank program is designed to increase farm prices. We hope it will. We believe it will. To the degree that the program works, it is going to increase the prices of farm products. To the degree that it increases the prices of farm products and works, it is going to attract additional imports from abroad. And to the degree it does that, we intensify the silly process, in which we have been engaged for well over 10 years, of trying to run a price support program for the American farmers and an import market for world products at the same time.

This is about our only chance to put economic sanity in the struggle against the problem of surpluses, and to do something sensible from the standpoint of the American taxpayer. Not much has been said about him. We have been talking about the American farmer. Yet we are going to have to rely on the largesse of the American taxpayer to foot the bill, which is going to be sizable. That is proper since this is a national problem, but we should not waste our money. But, as we begin, we should at least write rules of the game that will work, and not rules of the game which have built into them a braking mechanism, because imports will have a tendency to force prices down and to put immediate and effective brakes on any upward trends.

If there ever has been an amendment offered, during the debate on the agricultural bill, which should be agreed to overwhelmingly, it is this one. I recommend the adoption of the amendment by an overwhelming vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 26 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, first I should like to say I think the Senator from South Dakota is seeing things when he says he is worried about the imports of Danish butter. We do not import into this country any Danish butter.

If imports to be made in the future are restricted to the average annual imports during the last 3 years, the great agricultural States east of Ohio are not going to be able to import any oats at all, no matter how much they may need them, so long as there is an available supply in this country, and no matter at what price the oats are held. The amendment would have a very bad effect.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should first like to make a parliamentary inquiry and ask if the amendment is germane, as it deals with imports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the precedents of this body and the precedents of the other body, the matter would be referred to the membership for a decision. If the Senator makes a point of order, under the precedents it will be referred to the membership of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment would affect revenue, and therefore is not germane to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the point of order is made, it will have to be decided by reference to the membership of the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. In such case, will the same rule not apply here as applies in the House of Representatives, namely, that if a point of order is to be raised against an amendment, it cannot be raised until the time available on the amendment has been fully used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the point of order will not be in order until all time available on the amendment has either been used or yielded back.

Mr. MUNDT. So I understand that the point of order is not now in order; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; the point of order is not now in order.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, Mr. President, I say that the amendment would seriously restrict imports in the future, and the time might come when we would very badly need those imports, even though there might be an adequate supply in the United States, for the price could be held so high as to be prohibitive.

So, Mr. President, I am interested in what the Senator says about our holding umbrellas over other countries. We have done that, we have held a 90-percent umbrella over them until we have lost our business to those countries. One reason why I have not supported high supports more than I have is that I felt that they encouraged greatly increased production and imports from other countries.

But I think that in the event of possible contingencies this amendment would practically work hardships upon the dairymen in the Northeast and those in the Southeast part of the United States, as well as California and possibly other feed-consuming States of the West.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to my senior colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LANGER. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, I simply wish to point out the difference between the way Canada takes care of her farmers and the way the United States takes care of the farmers of our country. A year ago I got in touch with the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Morse; and it was entirely agreed that we would get 200,000 bushels of Selkirk wheat, which was so badly needed in North Dakota for seed. Agreement had been reached with Ottawa to import the wheat. Then, overnight, an embargo was declared by Canada on Selkirk wheat. Nevertheless, there was some Selkirk wheat in this country; but the effect of that development was to raise the price to 7, 8, or 9 dollars a bushel. In various parts of North Dakota the farmers paid 7, 8, or 9

dollars a bushel, and in some cases $10 a bushel, for Selkirk wheat.

We had a magnificent crop. The seed was certified; and the farmers proceeded to raise the wheat from the seed last spring.

But now we suddenly find Canada exporting to the United States 680,000 bushels, and selling it at between $2.35 and $2.50 a bushel.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Our average importation of oats for the last 3 years has been 39 million bushels. The estimated importation for this fiscal year is 20 million bushels. So the people of the United States could import more next year than they are importing this year. The amendment affects only commodities which are in surplus supply, and limits imports to the average of the previous 3 years.

Mr. LANGER. I may say, in connection with rye, that we raised 23 million bushels, and imported 12 million bushels. When the price goes from $1.80 to 70 cents, and the Commodity Credit Corporation buys the rye and stores it and pays storage on it, certainly something should be done to stop the importation of rye. We called on the Tariff Commission, and submitted the matter to the Department of Agriculture. It took 7 months before we got a directive from the President of the United States to stop the importation of rye.

I think that what my colleague has said in regard to oats is equally true of any other agricultural commodity which is imported into the United States. In one day 250,000 bushels of rye were imported. My colleague is familiar with what happened in connection with oats, in the case of the Cargill suit.

The distinguished Senator from Vermont has said that some wheat shipped into the United States was unfit for human consumption; and on that basis the importation of such wheat was stopped by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this is a very far-reaching amendment, and it has not received study by the committee.

The amendment would prohibit the importation in any year of surplus agricultural commodities and their products in amounts in excess of the average of imports for those commodities for the preceding 3 years. The amendment would be applicable to each and every agricultural commodity, or products of them, determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply, and would cut across the many trade agreements we now have. It strikes me that before an amendment of this character is adopted, it should receive the full study of the committees which would have an interest in not only the substantive legislation, but its effects, as well.

Mr. President, this matter has been discussed many times on the floor of the Senate in connection with our various Agricultural Adjustment Acts, beginning with the act of 1933, and as subsequently amended.

Personally, I am in sympathy with the amendment. Yet, it would, as I have stated, cut across many of the trade agreements we now have with various countries of the world, and this factor alone is sufficient evidence for me to believe that it would be unwise to adopt this amendment at this time, without more study.

It will be recalled that section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, provides a way by which the importation of products in surplus supply can be treated so as to make it almost impossible for them to be imported into the United States in quantities which would adversely affect our farm program.

I refer specifically to subsection (a) of section 22, which sets out the manner and method by which the Secretary of Agriculture shall proceed whenever in his opinion there is in the United States a surplus of any commodity which is eligible for price support. He can bring the situation to the attention of the President; and if the President agrees with the Secretary of Agriculture that further importation of such commodity would do violence to any of our farm price programs, the President then has the right to call upon the Tariff Commission to examine the matter. If the report by the Tariff Commission is favorable—in other words, if the facts found by the Tariff Commission are in accord with the view expressed by the Secretary of Agriculture—then the President, on the basis of such investigations, may proceed as follows:

> If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts—

That is to say, that the commodity is in surplus supply, and that the importation of the commodity does violence to our farm program—

> he shall by proclamation impose such fees not in excess of 50 percent ad valorem, or such quantitative limitations on any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation referred to in subsection (a) of this section—

It strikes me that if the President were to exercise the authority now granted to him under section 22, he could easily meet the situation to which the distinguished Senator from North Dakota and other Senators are referring.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. It is assumed that the amendment applies only to grains. That is what we have been talking about. If the Senator will read the amendment carefully, he will find that it applies to anything manufactured from agricultural products. If this amendment were approved, it would automatically result in an immediate cutback in textiles imported into this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 more minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. I am very much in favor of protecting our textile industry, and I know that efforts are being made to devise some protection for it. But if we go back 3 years, when there was very little being imported into this country, we shall have to slash the importation of all kinds of textiles into this country immediately upon the enactment of this provision. It seems to me it is going a bit too far when we do something affecting every single person in the United States, with a snap amendment such as this.

I shall ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is really objectionable about the amendment, in my judgment, in that it would cut across the many trade agreements we now have. As the distinguished Senator from Vermont has just indicated, this provision would operate automatically if imports were in excess of the average amount imported during the past 3 years. There is no question that the amendment might be of advantage to many segments of our farm economy, but in the long run we might lose more than we would gain.

Let me say to my good friend from North Dakota that we now have before us, as he knows, several bills on the subject of import quotas. I think two of them were introduced by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. I told him, as well as my good friend from South Carolina, who is very much interested in obtaining enactment of legislation to curtail the importation of cotton goods from Japan and other countries, that if we ascertain that our committee has jurisdiction over the problem I shall gladly recommend to the committee that we look into it and endeavor to report out legislation looking toward alleviating the situation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I am curious to know what the Senator from Louisiana would suggest as another means of curtailing imports of commodities already in surplus. We have had section 22. That seemed ineffective. We had quotas on imports of oats and barley. They have been abandoned. There is little now to stop imports pouring in, at a time when we already have surpluses. I think the present law might be effective if it were properly administered.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is aware of the fact that I am in complete sympathy with what he is trying to accomplish.

Mr. YOUNG. I know that.

Mr. ELLENDER. If we could limit the provision to some of the commodities which the Senator mentions, there

might not be too much objection to it. However, the amendment covers every surplus commodity, and whatever is produced from such commodities. It is so broad that there is no question that it would do violence to our trade agreements and cause more trouble than we are looking for.

As I have just indicated, under section 22, if the Secretary of Agriculture chose to perform his duty and the President were to follow the suggestion made by the Secretary of Agriculture, this situation could be remedied without additional legislation. I believe the problem can be solved more easily and expeditiously by the Republican Members of Congress urging the Secretary of Agriculture, as well as the President, to use the machinery which Congress has already provided in order to accomplish the purpose the Senator seeks to accomplish.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from North Dakota realizes that it is not a perfect amendment. I did the best I could to correct a bad situation. In the past 5 years we have increased our imports of agricultural commodities at a time when we have decreased our exports. The movement is running in the wrong direction. If the soil-bank program works, as we hope it will, raising prices of agricultural commodities will cause more and more trouble with imports. It will nullify all the effects of the soil bank, on which we expect to spend $1⅓ billion a year.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am certain my good friend from North Dakota will agree that if the soil bank operates as we hope it will, a good many of the surpluses will be eliminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 more minute.

Mr. President, it is entirely possible that if the soil bank works well, the distressing situation with which we are now confronted with respect to wheat, cotton, and other commodities will be dissipated.

I repeat that I am in thorough sympathy with what the Senator from North Dakota is trying to accomplish. I think it is immoral for us to dip down into the Treasury to support farm prices, and, on the other hand, permit other countries to add to our own surpluses by shipping more of the same products to the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to inquire, first, of my distinguished colleague, if he would be willing to modify his amendment so as to cover only wheat, oats, and barley, and rye. Also I wish to ask the Senator from Louisiana if such a modified amendment would be satisfactory?

Mr. ELLENDER. So far as I am concerned, it would assist producers of those crops, but cotton producers would want a similar provision in their favor.

Mr. LANGER. Cotton could be included.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have said, no matter what language is used, the import quotas would operate automatically. There is no discretion. If the amount proposed to be imported is in excess of the 3-year average, it is prohibited from coming in, without any further administrative action.

Mr. LANGER. Going back to section 22, the Senator knows that we had a reduction in wheat acreage. The result was that the farmers wanted to seed rye or barley instead of wheat. At a hearing before the Antimonopoly Committee in Chicago, dealing with that situation, we heard Mr. Morse and other members of the Department of Agriculture. It required 7 months to get an order from the President to bar imports from Canada. So, of course, the time went by to seed barley or rye.

Knowing how sympathetic the Senator from Louisiana is toward agriculture, if my colleague from North Dakota were to modify his amendment as indicated, I ask the Senator from Louisiana whether it would be acceptable.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. A good Republican, and my friend from North Dakota is a good Republican, ought to be able to get the President to act very quickly.

Mr. LANGER. My experience has been that many more Democrats have influence at the White House than do Republicans.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to say to my colleague that I would not wish to amend my amendment to include only grains, because during this year pork has been in very serious trouble.

I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. He has done a great service in calling attention to a very difficult matter, which I believe needs study and consideration. While the statute provides that action can be taken in case of surpluses, what we must do today is study both ends of the problem. Let us take, for example, cheese. The Government has approximately 300 million pounds of cheese in storage, which it has acquired. From looking at the table of exports and imports however, I find that in the years 1954 and 1955, we have imported into this country 50 million pounds of all kinds of cheese, every type of which, practically, we manufacture in Wisconsin. I cannot think of myself as being only a Senator from Wisconsin. I am a Senator who represents the entire United States. The United States is buying cheese, and all the people are paying for it.

There is another question involved here. Probably it has been stressed by other Senators. However, we know that the minimum price fixes the general price. Therefore it is all important to farmers that they get a reasonable return on their investment, whether they produce milk or other products., and that they get what might be called the cost of production plus a reasonable return.

If imported cheese is sold to the consumer for less than Wisconsin cheese is sold, the cheesemaker of Wisconsin will not be able to sell his cheese. The result is that Uncle Sam buys it, under the present law.

Therefore there are three parties to be considered. There is the producer of the milk. the producer of the cheese, and Uncle Sam, to say nothing of the consumer. Therefore, I say that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has brought up an important subject.

I heard the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont that we did not import any butter. Of course the record shows that we do import butter. In 1954 and 1955 we imported butter from Canada, the Argentine, Denmark, New Zealand, and other countries. We imported 720,000 pounds. That is not very much. However, we must compete with that butter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. We must compete also with the product called oleo. That product has taken over a large percent of the spread market of this country. Butter used to represent about 70 percent of the spread market. Now that oleo has come into the market, it has taken over about 60 percent of the spread market. Then, on top of it all, butter is imported. What do the exporters get for their butter, and how does that price fix the price? The effect is not very much. However, I would say that 50 million pounds of cheese of different kinds that are being imported have an immediate impact upon what is produced in the United States, and has the additional effect of more or less fixing the price.

Under the laws that exist today, as quoted by the distinguished chairman of the committee, authority already exists for the Government to protect its interests.

I realize also that foreign policy and foreign relations are involved. However, the first law of human nature is self-preservation. The Good Book itself says that one should not neglect his own. It is therefore a matter of great importance for the appropriate branches of government to reach a conclusion that will protect our own people. Therefore, I compliment the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for bringing up this matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD at this point a part of table 2, entitled "Imports for Consumption" published in Foreign Agricultural Trade of February 1956. I ask only that the portion of the table relating to cheese be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2.—*Imports (for consumption): Principal agricultural products, by countries of origin 1953–54 and 1954–55*

Commodity imported and country of origin	Year beginning July 1	
	1953–54	1954–55
CHEESE		
Swiss, Emmentaler, with eye formation:	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*
Denmark	251	253
West Germany	153	36
Austria	35	178
Switzerland	7,275	7,350
Finland	484	760
Other countries	14	85
Total	8,212	8,662
Swiss, Gruyere, process cheese:		
Denmark	106	34
Netherlands	16	30
Austria	48	80
Finland	4	8
Switzerland	2,541	3,067
Other countries	10	20
Total	2,725	3,239
Blue mold:		
Europe:		
Denmark	3,327	3,222
Italy	110	110
Other Europe	98	61
Total Europe	3,535	3,393
Other countries	0	0
Total	3,535	3,393
Bryndza	0	9
Cheddar:		
Canada (including Newfoundland and Labrador)	490	518
New Zealand	2,179	2,163
Other countries	15	5
Total	2,684	2,686
Edam and Goude:		
Argentina	165	92
Europe:		
Norway	217	169
Denmark	200	313
Netherlands	4,196	4,289
Other Europe	19	19
Total Europe	4,632	4,790
Other countries	0	0
Total	4,797	4,882
Goya	0	3
Provoloni:		
Argentina	10	0
Italy	3,603	1,829
Other countries	0	0
Total	3,613	1,829
Provolette	32	15
Provoloni and Provolette	----------	1,890
Reggiano:		
Brazil	15	18
Argentina	1,605	1,018
Italy	274	648
Other countries	0	0
Total	1,894	1,684
Parmesano	283	478
Romano:		
Argentina	2,349	1,035
Other countries	0	8
Total	2,340	1,043
Pecorino:		
Argentina	124	209
Italy	12,652	13,507
Yugoslavia	1	57
Other countries	71	46
Total	12,848	13,819

TABLE 2.—*Imports (for consumption): Principal agricultural products, by countries of origin 1953–54 and 1954–55*—Continued

Commodity imported and country of origin	Year beginning July 1	
	1953–54	1954–55
CHEESE—continued		
Roquefort:	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*
France	1,861	1,914
Other countries	0	4
Total	1,861	1,918
Sbrinz	172	24
Other cheese:		
Canada (including Newfoundland and Labrador)	34	5
Latin American Republics:		
Mexico	7	0
Argentina	35	2
Other Latin American Republics	3	0
Total Latin American Republics	45	2
Europe:		
Norway	482	541
Denmark	813	924
Netherlands	142	129
France	41	56
West Germany	88	204
Switzerland	222	114
Italy	2,025	3,171
Yugoslavia	187	181
Greece	101	208
Bulgaria	56	14
Other Europe	152	147
Total, Europe	5,209	5,689
Other countries	0	9
Total	5,288	5,705

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I yield a half minute to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for the time being?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont withhold that suggestion?

Mr. AIKEN. I withhold it.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; there was not a sufficient second.

Mr. MUNDT. May we have the assurance of the chairman of the committee that we will have a quorum call before a vote is taken, so that we may make another request for the yeas and nays?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The suggestion of the absence of a quorum has been temporarily withheld. It will be renewed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall not take the full 4 minutes. I should like to say that I appreciate the very constructive speech made by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, and I am happy that he corrected the misapprehension of the ranking minority member of the committee, who did not realize that we were importing butter into the United States. Arithmetic and statistics are against him. The figures show that we are very definitely importing butter as well as cheese.

I point out further that there is something, however, the Senator from Vermont said with which I do agree. He said the amendment would affect every person in the United States. I concur in that statement.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. I concur in the statement of the Senator from Vermont, because every citizen of the United States is a taxpayer, directly or indirectly. So indeed our amendment does affect every American.

The amendment will make it unnecessary in the future to tax American citizens to provide price supports for foreign farmers. It does not cut back our imports. It takes the average of the past 3 years, which is pretty bad vis-a-vis the American taxpayer, and as it relates itself to the American producer. However, bad as it has been, large as are these imports, the provision would not come into effect except when and as imports expand beyond the 3-year averages. However, if we expand imports and if we try to put price floors under everything and everyone, at long last we will break the American taxpayer, and for that disaster no one will be taxed; to cure that there will be no price supports.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a half minute to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to make——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Have my 4 minutes expired already?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Then I shall suggest the absence of a quorum, because we are having some difficulty in getting a yea and nay vote.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, out of whose time is that to come, unless all time has been yielded back?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield a minute of my time for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, my understanding of the parliamentary situation is that until all time has expired and the Senate is prepared to vote, a quorum call is not in order unless it comes out of someone's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If Senators on both sides of the question are prepared to yield back their time so that Senators can vote, we can have a quorum call without its coming out of someone's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, that being the strange and unique rule, I wonder if I may be permitted to have a minute's worth of time to have a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional minute of the Senator from South Dakota has expired. [Laughter.]

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has 4 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I yield 3½ minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, what I have to say I think will prove to be germane to this discussion, but I wish to start on another note. I should not like to see the debate close without at least recording my feeling and what I regard as the position of the Department of Agriculture with reference to title IV. I did propose an amendment early in the discussion to strike that title. I shall not press the amendment, but I still believe that a record should be made and that I utter my own opposition, because I think the title is bad, although, if I had my choice as between the grain which covers a good section of the country and the grain which involves only four States, I think I would choose the latter.

Mr. President, there is a rice provision in the bill. Cuba is part of the primary market for rice, and that would account for nearly 25 percent of the rice which is consumed at home, in industry, and for food purposes. I can envision that some other country might pick an independent republic and say, "That is our primary market," and in a little while we would inherit some difficulties, particularly administrative difficulties. I can readily understand a rice exporter exporting rice to the Bahamas, to the Dominican Republic, or to Haiti, and going to the Commodity Credit Corporation and getting $1.90 a bag, which is the certificate value, not letting the rice remain in the Bahamas, but sending it on to Cuba. There are a great many difficulties involved. In addition to that, I fancy we would invite retaliation. If we have 25 million bags of rice left over, what happens to it? It could go into industry for the manufacture of beer. It can be exported for table purposes. But, of course, we have got to get rid of 25 million or 30 million bags of rice.

This Nation is negotiating with Indochina, with the Malayan States, with the Asiatic countries where rice is a staple commodity. We can do that so long as we can take counterpart funds. But that is something which a private exporter cannot do. What happens if we pull out the government? We will have a situation which might be disastrous to the rice industry itself.

Another thing which could happen—and it is germane to this discussion—is that we can invite retaliation by dumping in other countries where, of course, they do not want their own markets broken.

I remember what was said to me in Rangoon, Burma, in June of last year. One of the Cabinet members said to me, "We do not like what you are doing."

I said, "What are we doing?"

He said, "You are negotiating to send 250,000 tons of rice to the Japanese market. That is our market."

The following day I was taken on a trip, and we went up and down the Irrawaddy River and saw warehouse after warehouse filled with surplus rice, with the market going down.

If we trim some of their market they will get righteously indignant about it, and then what happens? The spirit of retaliation develops.

Mr. President, whether we admit it or not, we are evidencing that spirit here on the floor of the Senate of the United States this very afternoon, because we have before us an amendment offered in the utmost of good faith. I sympathize entirely with the objective which our distinguished friend from North Dakota has in mind, but it is a retaliation against the importation of goods from the outside when we have a surplus here. My distinguished friend, for whom I have an affection which is as deep as the seas and as high as the stars, mentioned a moment ago that a few years back we tried to get 200,000 bushels of a certain type of wheat for seed. We endeavored to get it from Canada, but Canada takes care of her own and would not permit its export. That was an embargo put on her own exporters, not on ours. But the situation is later reversed. We are evidencing in the Senate this afternoon what can happen in a parliamentary body in Formosa, in Cambodia, in Vietnam, in China, in Korea, in any one of the great rice-consuming areas of the world.

So, Mr. President, if we have a surplus of 25 million or 30 million bags of rice, under the two-price system, with the incentive pressures which are present, what will be the retaliation? It will not be strange; it will not be abnormal or extraordinary that they would rise in their places where they deliberate on the statutes of their country and give expression to the very identical sentiments being uttered on the floor of the United States Senate this afternoon.

I wish I could embrace the amendment which my friend has offered, but I am afraid I cannot.

I went through the cheese battle. Where is my friend from Wisconsin who was speaking about cheese a moment ago? We were belabored in the Banking and Currency Committee when we wrote a provision with reference to section 2 of the old Agricultural Act under which the Secretary shut off the importation of cheese. Who came to see us? Nearly every cheese importer in New York, Philadelphia, and elsewhere. They protested that there were several kinds of cheese which had an appeal to a certain taste bud or to a person's personal preference for the succulency of one type of cheese over another, and very soon we were in cheese up to our ears. But we wrote the provision into the bill.

I go back to rice, Mr. President. I sincerely hope that the General Agreement on Trade and Tariff is not being transgressed as a result of our arrangement with Cuba under the most-favored-nations clause. But those are the complications, Mr. President. I shall not urge that the amendment be rejected. I wish only to record my views and to say that they are in accord with those of the Secretary of Agriculture in regard to 2 prices on rice and 2 prices on wheat, as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to embrace the amendment, but I am afraid that under the circumstances I cannot do so.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota has one-half minute remaining.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I modify my amendment as follows:

On page 1, lines 1 and 2, strike out "Limitation on Imports of Surplus Agricultural Commodities"; and in line 3, strike out "SEC. 310." and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by adding a new paragraph (g), to read as follows.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, as modified.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, does any time on the amendment remain?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No time remains.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, is my amendment acceptable, as modified?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, as modified.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much time remains on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 1 minute.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back the remainder of my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum while I ask the minority leader if he will yield me 30 seconds out of the time on the bill so that I may make an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I withhold my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from New York.

(At this point Mr. IVES asked unanimous consent for the insertion in the RECORD of a statement by him apropos Hungarian Independence Day. The statement appears elsewhere in the RECORD.)

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana had suggested the absence of a quorum. The request for a quorum call was withheld pending a unanimous-consent request by the Senator from New York.

For what purpose does the Senator from Idaho rise?

Mr. WELKER. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That this paragraph shall not be effective with respect to any commodity or product concerning which the President has imposed appropriate import limitations under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment as amended.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. As I understand, the Senator from Idaho is asking for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, as modified by the amendment of the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment which the Senator from Idaho has proposed to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota. The amendment of the Senator from North Dakota has not yet been modified by the amendment of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I should like to direct a question to the junior Senator from North Dakota. Will the Senator from North Dakota accept the modification by the junior Senator from Idaho of the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. YOUNG. I am very happy to accept the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment, as modified.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Idaho that since his modification of the amendment has been accepted by the Senator from North Dakota, the Senator from Idaho does not now have time in which to discuss his amendment.

Mr. WELKER. I am mindful of that. I now offer an amendment to the amendment. I propose, on page 1, line 3, to strike out the following:

If at the begininng of any calendar year the Secretary of Agriculture determines that there is a surplus of any agricultural commodity in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 3, it is proposed to strike out:

If at the beginning of any calendar year the Secretary of Agriculture determines that there is a surplus of any agriculture commodity in the United States.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time for the quorum call to be taken out of my time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Millikin
Allott	Goldwater	Monroney
Anderson	Gore	Morse
Barkley	Green	Mundt
Barrett	Hayden	Murray
Beall	Hennings	Neely
Bender	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bennett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bible	Holland	Pastore
Bricker	Hruska	Payne
Bridges	Humphrey	Potter
Bush	Ives	Purtell
Butler	Jackson	Robertson
Byrd	Jenner	Russell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Schoppel
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Smathers
Chavez	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Laird	Stennis
Curtis	Langer	Symington
Dirksen	Lehman	Thurmond
Douglas	Magnuson	Thye
Duff	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	Mansfield	Welker
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Ervin	McCarthy	Young
Flanders	McClellan	
Fulbright	McNamara	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I desire to withdraw my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, which I heretofore presented, and I ask for the yeas and nays on the Young amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill itself to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment for several different reasons. One is that it could be very harmful to every State in the Union that purchases mixed feeds or any dairy feed. I am also opposed to it because the amendment, besides restricting the importation of oats and barley from Canada at a time when we might desperately need them—we do not need them now, but we might at some time in the future—would also mean the restriction of imports of other products into the United States.

The purpose of the amendment is to preclude entry into the United States, in amounts greater than the annual average for the last 3 years, of any commodities processed from agricultural commodities which are in surplus.

If the amendment should become law, the effect of it would be immediately to cut back severely the importations of all cotton textile goods brought into the United States. It would also keep out of the United States various types of tobacco which our manufacturers require for blending purposes. The result would be to violate agreements we have with almost every country in the world; all our trade agreements would be violated. The amendment would soon restrict our exports.

Mr. President, although my time is limited, I wish to call attention to what the exports of agricultural commodities mean to the United States:

For the first 7 months of this fiscal year, we exported $1,945 million worth of agricultural commodities, or 5 percent above our exports for the corresponding period a year ago; and that was despite the fact that our cotton exports fell off disastrously. During the 7 months from July through January, we exported only 950,000 bales of cotton, compared with 2,277,000 bales in the same period last year—or a 60 percent drop.

But let us see what we have done in the way of exporting other agricultural commodities, Mr. President: From July through January, tobacco exports were valued at $280 million, or 25 percent above the exports of the preceding year.

We exported in that 7 months' period, $620 million worth of grain and feeds, or 30 percent above the amount we exported in 1954.

We exported vegetable oil and oil seeds worth $233 million in that period—or a gain of 13 percent over the previous year. Think what that means to our cottonseed and our soybean producers.

We exported $170 million worth of fruits and vegetables, or 10 percent over the exports last year.

We exported $310 million worth of livestock products—or a gain of 17 percent over the exports in the same period the previous year.

Mr. President, let us think twice before we take any step which will harm our trade relations with other countries, because our exports of agricultural commodities, even including grains and feed, far, far exceed the total of our imports.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, as is so often the case, I shall have to disagree with my friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. He says this amendment will hurt the feed dealers. However, we have a great surplus of feed grains in the United States. If the feed dealers do not wish to use United States-produced grains, they do not have to.

Last year and the year before we imported 20 million bushels of oats; but the year before that we imported 78 million bushels of oats. So, although we imported only 20 million bushels of oats last year, the average for the previous 3 years is 39 million bushels. Therefore, under the provisions of the amendment, next year we could almost double our imports of oats from Canada; and that would not be affected by the amendment. Certainly such a limitation would not hurt New England feed users.

Mr. President, our overall agricultural imports exceed our exports. If we read the record carefully, we will find that during the last 5 years we have increased our imports and have decreased our exports of agricultural commodities. That is a very bad situation. These large imports are in a large measure responsible for our surpluses and depressed farm prices.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from California very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I simply wish to reiterate, now that there is a reasonably good attendance of Senators in the Chamber, that this amendment is very much more important than might appear on its surface, because it enables us to do something with our American taxpayers' money for the American farmers. The amendment will not shut off any of the imports now coming into the United States. Under the amendment, the imports of the past 3 years will be used as an average; and the amendment provides that that average cannot be exceeded.

The point in regard to the soil bank is to increase prices above the average for the last few years. In other words, we are trying to make the American farmer more prosperous. But if, whenever the price of his products rises, we are to be deluged with a wave of new, cheap imports from abroad, we shall not help the prices of American agricultural commodities. Instead, the American taxpayer will be spending his dollars all over the world, to help stabilize the prices of the agricultural products of foreign countries.

Mr. President, we cannot move in two directions at the same time; we cannot push up prices while, at the same time, we are increasing imports, and thus pulling down the prices. In such a situation, we are getting Uncle Sam into the position of Lord Nosh, who, every morning, got up and jumped on his pony and rode off rapidly in all directions. He never went anyplace or got anywhere.

Mr. President, we had better give at least some consideration to the economics of the situation and the law of supply and demand; and we had better give some consideration to the American taxpayer, who should not be asked forever to maintain a price-support program for all the other countries of the Western Hemisphere and all the countries of Europe and the countries of all other parts of the world.

I think the amendment is a very salutary one and is in the interest of both the farmer and the agricultural economy. So, Mr. President, I call for adoption of the amendment. I hope it will be approved.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota is incorrect when he says this amendment would not cut back any imports. Under the amendment, the average of the last 3 years would be used. Mr. President, 3 years ago we were not importing as much textiles as we are now. We should protect our textile manufacturers. But it is not correct to say that this amendment would not cut back imports, because when we take the average of those 3 years, we find that figure is well below the amount of the imports this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, submitted by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], on behalf of himself and other Senators.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I have a live pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent because of illness in his family.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—43

Barrett	Humphrey	Neuberger
Bible	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Jenner	Potter
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Carlson	Laird	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Langer	Scott
Chavez	Magnuson	Stennis
Cotton	Malone	Thurmond
Curtis	Mansfield	Thye
Dworshak	McCarthy	Watkins
Eastland	McClellan	Welker
Ervin	Morse	Wiley
George	Mundt	Young
Hill	Murray	
Hruska	Neely	

NAYS—47

Aiken	Flanders	Martin, Iowa
Allott	Fulbright	Martin, Pa.
Anderson	Goldwater	McNamara
Barkley	Gore	Millikin
Beall	Green	Monroney
Bennett	Hayden	Pastore
Bricker	Hennings	Payne
Bush	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Butler	Holland	Robertson
Byrd	Ives	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Clements	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Knowland	Symington
Duff	Kuchel	Williams
Ellender	Lehman	

NOT VOTING—6

Bender	Frear	Long
Daniel	Kefauver	Sparkman

So Mr. YOUNG's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "3–15–56–D."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 30, after line 17, it is proposed to insert the following:

FEDERAL IRRIGATION, DRAINAGE, AND FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

SEC. 310. (a) For a period of 3 years from the date of enactment of this act, no agricultural commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with subsection (c) to be in surplus supply shall receive any crop loans or Federal farm payments or benefits on any newly irrigated or drained lands within any Federal irrigation or drainage project hereafter authorized unless such lands were used for the production of such commodity prior to the construction of such project.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause to be included, in all irrigation, drainage, or flood-control contracts entered into with respect to Federal irrigation, drainage, or flood-control projects hereafter authorized, such provisions as they may deem necessary to provide for the enforcement of the provisions of this section. Surplus crops grown on lands reclaimed by flood-control projects shall be ineligible for any benefits under the soil-bank provisions of this act and under price-support legislation.

(c) On or before October 1 of each year, the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine and proclaim the agricultural commodities the supplies of which are in excess of estimated requirements for domestic consumption and export plus adequate reserves for emergencies. The commodities so proclaimed shall be considered to be in surplus supply for the purposes of subsection (a) during the succeeding crop year.

(d) For the purposes of this section the term "Federal irrigation or drainage project" means any irrigation or drainage project subject to the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) in effect at the date of the adoption of this amendment and any irrigation or drainage project subject to the laws relating to irrigation and drainage administered by the Department of Agriculture or the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, yesterday for the better part of the afternoon we debated a similar amendment, which had been offered by me, and during the ensuing hours last evening I contacted at least 90 percent of the Senators who had objected to my amendment yesterday. I tried to rewrite it so that it would be satisfactory to each of them

and to our country as a whole. I have changed the period from 5 years to 3 years, and I have brought in Federal irrigation drainage and flood-control projects, which caused a great deal of concern to Senators yesterday.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I do not desire to argue the matter at great length, because all of us are familiar with the subject, particularly from the debate of yesterday.

As I said yesterday, this seems to me to be a common, ordinary, horsesense amendment. While the American taxpayers are paying out millions of dollars through one agency for the so-called soil bank, I am asking that the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior shall not bring in new lands for a period of 3 years and in that way make the taxpayers pay millions and—yes, perhaps even billions—while we still have surpluses on hand.

The administration is to be left at the discretion of the Secretary, and I hope and pray that the amendment will not be in effect for more than a year, as the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont said yesterday. The amendment is intended to meet a temporary situation. However, if we are to make sense with the soil-bank proposal, certainly the American taxpayer has a right to know why we should be paying out money to take some land out of production and at the same time spend money to put land into production.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I understand the Senator's amendment, with whose purpose I am wholly in accord, it is limited to projects of irrigation or drainage hereafter to be authorized. Is that correct?

Mr. WELKER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It does not affect those already in existence?

Mr. WELKER. It does not affect those already in existence.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Or those which may, perhaps, be 75 percent completed.

Mr. WELKER. That is correct. It does not affect those projects.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Idaho in support of the amendment, because I agree with him fully that it does not make sense for the Government to spend money through one department in developing new lands and bringing them into production, and thereby create new surpluses, while at the same time we are setting up a soil bank for the purpose of taking out of production presently cultivated land. The amendment of the Senator from Idaho makes a good deal of sense to me.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Although I agreed with the Senator's amendment of yesterday, I believe his revision of it today makes it a much better amendment, and I believe also it precludes the possibility of doing harm to any individuals who might be concerned with it. To me it looks like a good amendment.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator. I hope other Senators have heard what the distinguished Senator from Vermont has said, that, although he agreed with the amendment I offered yesterday, he believes my amendment today is an even better one, and that no one can be injured by it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. WELKER. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was against this amendment yesterday, and even though the version today is a good deal more palatable to me, I am afraid I shall still have to vote against it. What I am afraid of, and I think I echo the sentiments of Senators from reclamation States, is that this will not be a temporary measure. As I stated yesterday on the floor of the Senate, we are not noted in this body for enacting temporary legislation. The halls are filled with books containing legislation designed to be temporary, but it has become permanent.

I have a fear, and I think I share that fear with Senators from most of the 17 reclamation States, that this provision could be used by foes of reclamation. I know the Senator from Idaho is not a foe of reclamation. He is one of its stanchest backers.

There are those who argue that there should be no reclamation in the United States. They feel that the naturally watered areas of their own States should be developed rather than the lands in the arid West.

I sound this warning, that in the future the same approach may be used to stop any reclamation development in the West. As I have told the Senator from Idaho in private conversation, I think there is wisdom in his idea. I think he has a common, horsesense approach to it, as the Senator has in his approach to all legislation, but as a Senator who has to depend on reclamation in his State for the people's livelihood, I think I should be doing my conscience an injustice, and, certainly, my constituents, if I failed to voice my fears about this amendment and if I failed to register my vote against it.

Mr. WELKER. I am sorry that the Senator from Arizona became alarmed in walking past the graveyard. I will say to the Senator from Arizona that my State blossomed by virtue of the gratuities of this legislative body long before Arizona ever thought of becoming a State—22 years before. Our deserts started blossoming. Why? Because Congress wanted to see our lands grow and prosper. I have confidence in every Senator on this floor. Of course, there are differences of opinion, but I can go to my friends of the South and to my friends of the Midwest, and I can build a better case for reclamation in the West by virtue of the fact that we at least are trying to be fair and honest in the matter. We are trying to save the taxpayers' money. Had I thought for one moment that the amendment would result in the loss of any project in Idaho, it would not have been offered.

Let me say to my friend from Arizona, a great, dedicated Arizona man whom I admire not only as a great Senator, but personally, that there is nothing in my amendment which would foreclose the building of projects when water means the development of our country, when more persons will come to the West, as they should be coming and soon will be coming. There is nothing in the bill to preclude a reclamation plant being ready to turn on the water after the emergency is over.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield further?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I echo the feelings of the Senator from Idaho with reference to this august body and to the men who comprise it, but we have a habit of holding elections in this country, and there may be some changes in this body as the years go by. I do not think the junior Senator from Idaho can pledge a future Senate to the support of reclamation in the West. I wish he could, but we have found in this body a not-too-sympathetic ear on the part of all Senators toward reclamation.

The Senator made a remark with reference to Idaho having blossomed 22 years before Arizona became a State. I imagine the land of Idaho has always blossomed. It is a beautiful State. I have fished its streams, climbed its mountains, and skied on its ski slopes. I do not think its becoming a State had anything to do with those natural beauties.

Our deserts in Arizona were flourishing 3,000 years ago. We are the sixth civilization to live on the land, and we do not want to see our civilization become just another number. We do not want to become what the Indians call "Ho-ho-kam"—those who have gone.

Mr. WELKER. I remember when the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] was one of the 12 or 15 Senators on this side of the aisle. The opposite political party was in control, and we received no abuse from them.

Had it not been for water on the great Arizona desert a gila monster would starve to death, as the Senator well knows.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me say to the Senator that I have a frog which is 13 years, and he cannot swim. [Laughter.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In order that there may be no misunderstanding or misinterpretation, I should like to read one sentence which appears on page 2 of the Senator's amendment.

I think the Senator from Idaho should explain it. Possibly it should be modified or removed from the bill. I read from page 2, beginning at line 7:

Surplus crops grown on lands reclaimed by flood control projects shall be ineligible for any benefits under the soil bank provisions of this act and under price support legislation.

What concerns me, Mr. President, is the possibility that that language could be interpreted as forbidding benefits for crops which might be grown on some normal farmland which has a flood-control project under way and where the completion of the flood control project might permit corn to be grown every year instead of once in 2 or 3 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. With reference to the sentence just read by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, I wish to ask the Senator whether the language refers only to projects that would be authorized hereafter?

Mr. WELKER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. It might be well to modify it so that there will be no doubt about it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. There are certain categories of projects which have been authorized subject to a finding of feasibility by the Congress. Is it the intent of the distinguished Senator from Idaho to place them in a class of projects which have not been authorized?

Mr. WELKER. Not in the least. The matter was brought to my attention yesterday by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] and we came to a happy conclusion on the matter. If the lands are developed, awaiting the time when the water authorization and money from the Federal Government can be obtained——

Mr. CURTIS. I am afraid the Senator did not understand my question. Congress has passed an act authorizing a project, but it is authorized subject to a feasibility report approved by Congress, and Congress has not approved the feasibility.

Mr. WELKER. Such projects will be protected. There is no intention of writing them off.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to inquire about another category of projects. I have in mind 2 projects in the Missouri River Basin, 1 of which has been authorized by the Army engineers and the other one by the Bureau of Reclamation. For reasons which I shall not take time to explain now, we are seeking to get those projects interchanged, to get the Army project authorized by the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bureau of Reclamation project authorized by the Army. Is it the Senator's intention to include such a situation as that?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the distinguished Senator has modified his amendment as I have suggested, on page 2, line 8, after the word "projects," by inserting "hereafter authorized."

Mr. CURTIS. May I ask the Senator from Idaho what his answer is to my question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did the Chair and the clerks understand the request of the Senator from Idaho to modify his amendment, on page 2, line 8, after the word "projects," by inserting the words "hereafter authorized"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair could not hear the Senator from Idaho. The Senate will be in order, please.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I understood the Senator from Idaho to say, in response to the query of the Senator from Louisiana, that he was agreeable to modifying his amendment on page 2, line 8, after the word "projects," by inserting "hereafter authorized," but I had not heard that that request was recognized by the Chair and the amendment so modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Idaho has so modified his amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator from Idaho have an answer to my question?

Mr. WELKER. No, they could not be authorized to go ahead and receive the benefits of farm surplus. But please do not have any fear. A rider has been attached to the upper Colorado Basin bill to the extent that farmers in that area cannot produce any crops for a period of 10 years. I believe almost anyone who is familiar with irrigable lands knows that it will take 10 years before crops can be planted. But in a spirit of compromise yesterday I reduced the time to 5 years; and, further, to protect the Senator in the situation with which he is concerned I reduced the time to 3 years. The Senator well knows that canals and other installations cannot be built in that time.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose a project has been authorized for years, but it becomes necessary to reauthorize it. What would be the status of such a project under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. WELKER. I do not fully understand the Senator. Why would it be necessary to reauthorize a project?

Mr. CURTIS. Perhaps the cost estimates have changed, or perhaps engineers have injected new features into the project, and the Bureau of the Budget has said the project cannot be built without a new authorization, even though the project has been authorized for years.

Mr. WELKER. In a direct and positive answer to my colleague, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] let me say it is my intention to exclude only those projects which have not been authorized at all.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose the reauthorization were enacted by Congress to meet any objection. I believe that 1 of 2 things will happen. If the amendment shall be agreed to now, and the time never extended, it will not make any difference, because a project cannot be authorized and water put on the land in 3 years. But if the amendment shall be agreed to, and it sets the date as 25 years, that may make a difference.

Mr. WELKER. I might answer the Senator from Nebraska as I answered the Senator from Arizona. I think we are assuming a great deal. I do not believe anyone who understands the intent and purpose of the amendment will assume that we shall be liquidating ourselves in the reclamation field by the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will again refer to the sentence beginning on page 2, beginning on line 7, which he modified a moment ago, he will note that the sentence reads:

Surplus crops grown on lands reclaimed by flood-control projects—

And then come the words of the Senator's modification——

Mr. WELKER. "Hereafter authorized."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I continue—

hereafter authorized shall be eligible for any benefits under the soil-bank provisions of this act and under price-support legislation.

It seems to me that as the language stands, the crops themselves would not be available for any benefits, but the land itself would not be prohibited from coming within the soil bank, because the first words are "surplus crops." The sentence does not say that the land which is brought in could be retired in the soil bank.

I am merely raising the question because it seems to me the land itself which is brought in under projects hereafter authorized could be brought in and then immediately put into the soil bank.

Mr. WELKER. I think the Senator has raised a nice point.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wished to call it to the Senator's attention. I am not unfriendly to his amendment.

Mr. WELKER. If the Senator from Iowa will suggest appropriate wording, I shall accept it. I think that from a legal standpoint the Senator is absolutely correct; there is a slight confusion.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have written my suggestion hurriedly; it may not be proper. But, as a suggestion, I propose that the sentence read as follows:

Surplus crops grown on lands reclaimed by flood-control projects hereafter authorized and the lands so reclaimed shall be ineligible for any benefits under the soil-bank provisions of this act and under price-support legislation.

Mr. WELKER. I think that is a good suggestion.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I also suggest that the Senator from Idaho give consideration to whether the 3-year limitation applies to that sentence, because it

is a sentence which stands alone and could very easily, at least upon superficial reading, be interpreted as a permanent denial to the crops and to the lands themselves at any time to come into the soil bank, unless otherwise adequately explained.

Mr. WELKER. I think the language is very clear. If the Senator wishes me to include the 3-year limitation, I shall do so. I was wondering if the words "surplus crops and land grown"——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Land is not grown on land.

Mr. WELKER. The Senator is correct. Will he state the language again, please?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The language I have suggested is as follows:

Surplus crops grown on lands reclaimed by flood-control projects hereafter authorized and the lands so reclaimed shall be ineligible for any benefits under the soil-bank provisions of this act and under price-support legislation.

Mr. WELKER. I accept the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator from Idaho modifying his amendment as stated by the Senator from Iowa? Hearing no objection, the amendment is so modified.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WELKER. I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. MALONE. And also, if the Senator's time will permit, a short statement?

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator from Nevada favor or oppose my amendment? I shall not yield to him in my time.

Mr. MALONE. Then I shall ask a question.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is under the control of the minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, how much time remains on each side?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has 22 minutes remaining; the majority leader has 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. WELKER. I have already yielded to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair inquire how much time the Senator from Idaho has yielded to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. WELKER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I think I had better ask for time from the other side, because I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Idaho a question.

Mr. WELKER. Very well; the Senator can go ahead and play with the other side.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, there are——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, what did the Senator say?

Mr. WELKER. I refused to yield.

ESTABLISHED CONGRESSIONAL POLICIES

Mr. MALONE. I did intend to ask the distinguished Senator from Idaho a question, but I will make a statement on my own time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. MALONE. About 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield him 10 minutes, and if the Senator then desires additional time, I shall yield additional time to him.

Mr. MALONE. I want to say at the outset I have the highest regard for the distinguished Senator from Idaho. The points I am about to make are, in the opinion of the senior Senator from Nevada, important to the future development of this Nation. I served for 4 years on the Senate Public Works Committee which had to do with flood-control and Rivers and Harbors projects.

There have been hundreds of flood-control projects authorized by Congress over the past years that will never be constructed for a variety of reasons. The language contained in the amendment excepts such projects unless and until they must be reconsidered.

The development program in the public land States has been under way since 1902, when the distinguished Senator from Nevada, the late Mr. Newlands, introduced a bill that resulted in the establishment of what is now known as the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Bureau was established for the purpose of developing the public desert lands and including the taxable property of this Nation.

It is unfair for the RECORD to show that the people settling these lands were the recipients of charity by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me, so that I may propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without the time being charged to either side, the Senator from Nevada may yield to me for the purpose of my moving to reconsider the vote by which the Anderson amendment was adopted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Anderson amendment was adopted.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to considering the motion to lay the motion to reconsider on the table? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, for more than half a century, the policy has been laid down by the Congress of the United States, in the interest of the Nation that the development of the public lands of the United States was a public benefit, and that the money so appropriated by Congress and devoted to the development of these desert lands should be repaid without interest over a reasonable period of years. The policy established by Congress on flood control construction projects for 75 years has been that whenever the Army engineers report showed benefits beyond the cost of construction then such projects were submitted to Congress, and if Congress approved the report the funds were appropriated and the projects constructed, with the cost written off to the benefit of the whole country.

In the West we store water for irrigation, and furnish flood control—paying the money to the United States Treasury without interest.

The record will show that it has been the established policy of Congress to develop the public lands in conjunction with the homesteaders as an incentive for the people to live on such land—the policy benefits the United States as a whole in the same manner that the cost of flood control and rivers and harbors was written off as a benefit to the United States as a whole.

In the construction of Hoover Dam on the Colorado River through the passage of the Boulder Dam Project Act of 1928, which was completed in 1935, another precedent was set.

It is that when there is a commercial project involving the sale of a product or a commodity, interest must be paid.

For many years we paid 4 percent interest on the total cost of the project. It has now been reduced to 3 percent, which is still more than the cost to the Government.

I point out that the policies I have outlined were laid down by the Congress of the United States and were intended in no wise to favor any particular people in any particular area, but for the development of the Nations taxable property.

I want to point out that on the homesteads of the West, the filing on public land, it generally requires as many as three attempts before a homesteader sticks to the land.

The first homesteader usually clears part of the land. The next one may build a few fences and perhaps a house, before he goes broke. The third homesteader sticks to the land until he can get water to irrigate it, and then he obtains a patent. That is how the West was developed.

It can be seen that the policy of repaying the money to the United States Treasury without interest was a partnership affair.

It has paid off in income to the United States Treasury in income taxes and in transportation development and in the development of the whole country for all of the people.

I wish to pinpoint one more situation. Yesterday, during the debate, I made the point that there is no connection between a surplus crop grown west of the Rockies, and one grown east of the Mississippi River.

I voted last year, the year before, and I am voting this year, to help the area east of the Mississippi with respect to the problem caused by surplus crops.

It will not help my State of Nevada, because we do not have a surplus, but I shall vote that way because it was found after World War II that the farmers were in a jackpot not altogether of their own making.

We are trying to help them get down off of the ladder built up during two wars.

However, if the precedent to be set is one in which we in the West must depend for our feed on buying it from areas east of the Mississippi and shipping the feed west to feed our cattle and hogs, we will not be able to survive.

We, west of the Rockies cannot pay the support price for the feed in the Corn Belt, ship it west of the Rockies, feed it to the livestock and break even.

I regret having to make these points again, but I say that if it comes to pass that any of these projects should need a loan—and it is the law of the land that they cannot get a loan until there is no surplus east of the Mississippi—we may wait a very long time. I must vote against the proposal because, in my opinion, once the precedent is set it will be continued just as the free-trade precedent—the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—passed as an emergency and continued for 25 years—and still in effect .

There always seems to be some compelling reason to extend a law, once passed, whether it is free trade, $5 billion for foreign aid, or raising the debt limit in peacetimes. Once a law is passed by Congress especially if it costs the taxpayers money, some excuse is found to continue it, and it becomes a permanent fixture on the statute books.

The proposed legislation establishes a bad precedent and I shall vote against it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I do not know from whom I should get time to speak, unless it be from the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I have only 7 minutes left.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall not take 7 minutes. I merely desired to ask a question.

Mr. WELKER. Very well. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I read the first paragraph of the amendment of the Senator:

> SEC. 310. (a) For a period of 3 years from the date of enactment of this act, no agricultural commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with subsection (c) to be in surplus supply shall receive any crop loans or Federal farm payments or benefits on any newly irrigated or drained lands within any Federal irrigation or drainage project hereafter authorized unless such lands were used for the production of such commodity prior to the construction of such project.

That would seem to cover every possible irrigation project on lands that were withdrawn for irrigation since 1902, when the Reclamation Act was first adopted.

In the Western States, before these reclamation projects were established, the lands were desert lands, and did not grow any crops at all. Does the Senator desire to go back as far as that? We began authorizing projects a long time ago.

Would the Senator accept an amendment to his proposal in line 11, page 1, so that instead of the amendment reading "prior to the construction of such project," the language would read, "prior to the enactment of this act," would it not?

Mr. WELKER. I shall be very happy to accept the modification to my amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I offer that amendment, if the Senator will accept it.

Mr. WELKER. I shall be very happy to make the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection to further modification of his amendment by the Senator from Idaho? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, in conclusion I merely wish to say again that I am thrilled and honored to have the backing of the two great leaders of our Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am certain that my amendment will not interfere with the future development of the West. Of course, all of us who know the West and love it, know that many more people will be going there, and that the development of new projects will be needed. I am sure that all Members of the Senate are in favor of that, and will never let us down.

I listened with great interest to the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. Rarely, if ever, do we disagree, because he is fundamentally correct in 99⅔ of his observations. However, I must disagree with him in this case, because I believe the amendment to be sound, and I believe that it will enhance the value of the bill. After all, all of us want to help the taxpayers and the farmers. We do not want to hurt either group.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me on the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may now suggest the absence of a quorum, and that the time required for the call of the roll shall not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas withdraw his request for the call of the roll, for just 1 minute, until I can further modify my amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may further modify my amendment, on page 2, in line 7, before the beginning of the sentence which commences with the words "Surplus crops," by inserting:

> For a period of 3 years from the date of the enactment of this act.

That modification will cure the objection which has been made by the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa—an objection which I believe to be well taken.

I appreciate the courtesy of the majority leader in this connection, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the further modification of the amendment of the Senator from Idaho? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I repeat my request that at this time there may be a quorum call, and that the time required therefor shall not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 O'CLOCK MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I respectfully ask the attention of the distinguished minority leader, the chairman of the committee [Mr. ELLENDER], and the ranking Republican member of the committee [Mr. AIKEN].

How many amendments to the pending bill are still upon the table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 62 amendments still lying on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that perhaps half of those are duplications.

Mr. President, the Senate has been in session approximately 41 hours this week. We are very desirous of disposing of the bill. I do not wish to be caught without a quorum late this evening. If it is possible to dispose of the bill, I am willing that the Senate should remain in session until late in the evening.

I now request that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until Monday next at 11 o'clock a. m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The original unanimous-consent agreement provided an hour on each side on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to

lay on the table. When the majority leader returned from Texas and the Senate did not seem to be making much progress, when amendments were gaining on us each day, I asked unanimous consent to modify that agreement so as to reduce the time from 1 hour on each side to 30 minutes on each side. At that time there were 74 amendments lying on the table.

We have made some progress. We have reduced the number to 62. I believe that if we had the same good fortune with the next unanimous-consent request we could finally vote on the bill. I hope we can vote on it this evening.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to modify the present unanimous-consent agreement, which calls for 30 minutes on each side on each amendment, so as to reduce the time to 15 minutes on each side on each amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I certainly would not wish to object to the request of the majority leader. However, I do not believe that in 15 minutes full justice could be done to the amendment which I know will be offered by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to strike section 307 from the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator suggest how much time he would like on that amendment? We can make a special exception of it.

Mr. BUTLER. I should say a minimum of 30 minutes on a side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I modify my request so as to provide 15 minutes on each side on each amendment, with the exception of the amendment referred to by the Senator from Maryland, to strike section 307 from the bill, and, with respect to that particular amendment, to allow 30 minutes on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Reserving the right to object—and I shall object—this is one of the most important bills to come before the Congress this session. It involves farmers all over the country. I certainly want to have at least the time agreed upon originally.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from North Dakota object?

Mr. LANGER. I object.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the unanimous consent agreement that, at the conclusion of its business today, the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a. m., on Monday, mean that there will be votes continuously during the day and night?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to confer with the distinguished minority leader. He and I are very desirous, if possible, to conclude action upon the bill today. However, we are realistic. We know the difficulties involved. If, by chance, we are fortunate enough to confine all the discussion to the amendments, and if a number of amendments are not called up, it may be that we can conclude consideration of the bill today. I do not wish to make a prediction at this time. I should like to defer answering the Senator's question until after I have had an opportunity to confer with the distinguished minority leader. I can give a better answer around 5 o'clock.

If the Senate can complete consideration and action upon the bill today, I am willing to remain here until midnight, 1 o'clock, 2 o'clock, or whatever hour suits the pleasure of the Senate. I am the servant of the Senate. We wish to conclude action on the bill today if possible.

However, if 55 or 60 amendments remain to be acted upon, I do not wish to ask 25 or 30 Senators to cancel speaking engagements for tomorrow if it is to become necessary to continue work on the bill on Monday.

So I express the hope, first, that the Senate can compete action on the bill today. As to the prospects in that respect, we shall be able to judge better at 5 o'clock than at 3:25. If it does not appear likely that we can complete action of the bill tonight, I shall be able to inform the Senate at 5 o'clock as to what our hours will be for the evening, and there will be no session on Saturday.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. While we have been talking here, the Commodity Credit Corporation has sold approximately three-quarters of its total supply of rice on hand, and only this morning it concluded arrangements for disposing of the last pound of butter. Perhaps the longer we postpone legislation, the better off the farmers of the country will be. If we can leave them alone long enough, they will regain prosperity under their own steam.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. My friend from Vermont knows the position of the majority leader. The majority leader has many problems on this side of the aisle—49 of them, in fact. I think, in all fairness, that the Senator from Vermont will do his usually good job of persuading his colleagues not to talk. Perhaps I can be successful in some degree on this side of the aisle, and perhaps we can complete action on the bill today. After all, the objection came from the other side of the aisle. I am doing everything I can to expedite the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. AIKEN. I assure the majority leader that I shall try to set a good example. It may be difficult, but I shall try.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall make an announcement to the Senate after conferring with the minority leader around 5 o'clock, as to how long we shall ask the Senate to remain in session this evening. I hope Senators will do all they can to expedite action on the amendments which still lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], as modified.

Does the Senator from Idaho yield back the remaining time on the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. My friend from Idaho has 7 minutes.

Mr. WELKER. I shall be glad to yield back my remaining time, if the Senator from Texas will yield back his remaining time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am delighted to yield back the remaining time.

Mr. WELKER. I yield back all my remaining time.

I understand the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], as modified. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 30, after line 17, it is proposed to insert:

FEDERAL IRRIGATION, DRAINAGE, AND FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

SEC. 310. (a) For a period of 3 years from the date of enactment of this act, no agricultural commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with subsection (c) to be in surplus supply shall receive any crop loans or Federal farm payments or benefits on any newly irrigated or drained lands within any Federal irrigation or drainage project hereafter authorized unless such lands were used for the production of such commodity prior to the enactment of this act.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause to be included, in all irrigation, drainage, or flood-control contracts entered into with respect to Federal irrigation, drainage, or flood-control projects hereafter authorized, such provisions as they may deem necessary to provide for the enforcement of the provisions of this section. For a period of 3 years from the date of enactment of this act surplus crops grown on lands reclaimed by flood-control projects hereafter authorized and the lands so reclaimed shall be ineligible for any benefits under the soil-bank provisions of this act and under price-support legislation.

(c) On or before October 1 of each year, the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine and proclaim the agricultural commodities the supplies of which are in excess of estimated requirements for domestic consumption and export plus adequate reserves for emergencies. The commodities so proclaimed shall be considered to be in surplus supply for the purposes of subsection (a) during the succeeeding crop year.

(d) For the purposes of this section the term "Federal irrigation of drainage project" means any irrigation or drainage project subject to the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) in effect at the date of the adoption of this amendment and any irrigation or drainage project subject to the laws relating to irrigation and drainage administered by the Department of Agriculture or the Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent because of illness in his family.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If

present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

If present and voting the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea."

I further announce, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—63

Aiken	Flanders	Mundt
Allott	Frear	Neely
Beall	Fulbright	Pastore
Bender	George	Payne
Bennett	Green	Potter
Bricker	Hennings	Purtell
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bush	Hill	Russell
Butler	Holland	Saltonstall
Byrd	Hruska	Schoeppel
Capehart	Ives	Scott
Carlson	Jenner	Smathers
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Knowland	Symington
Curtis	Kuchel	Thurmond
Dirksen	Laird	Thye
Douglas	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Duff	Martin, Pa.	Welker
Dworshak	McCarthy	Wiley
Ervin	McClellan	Williams

NAYS—28

Anderson	Hayden	Millikin
Barkley	Humphrey	Monroney
Barrett	Jackson	Morse
Bible	Kerr	Murray
Chavez	Langer	Neuberger
Clements	Lehman	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Magnuson	Stennis
Ellender	Malone	Young
Goldwater	Mansfield	
Gore	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—5

Daniel	Kennedy	Sparkman
Kefauver	Long	

So Mr. WELKER'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that that motion be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Idaho.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS Mr. President, I call up my amendment "3–13–56–E" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 30, line 18, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 310. Section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 as amended, is amended by inserting before the last sentence thereof a new sentence as follows: "In addition, in the case of food commodities disposed of under this section, the Commodity Credit Corporation may pay the cost of processing such commodities into a form suitable for home or institutional use, such processing to be accomplished through private trade facilities to the greatest extent possible."

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, this amendment would grant authority to the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay the cost of processing grain which is in surplus supply, for institutional use and use by the needy. It would include the school-lunch program and other domestic programs of that kind. Actually, it is a companion to the amendment passed on Wednesday of this week dealing with overseas shipments to CARE and church activities. The amendment is one, I think, which will be concurred in not only by all members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but every Member of the Senate. It speaks for itself. It provides authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay the costs of processing these surplus supplies.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, we had this subject matter before our committee last year, and after thorough consideration we reported out a bill which was considered and passed by the Senate, and, following conference with the House, became law. That law was restricted to the use of section 32 funds for the distribution of wheat flour and cornmeal.

When we first embarked upon this program to make Government-owned surplus foods available to institutions and to the needy, we felt that we were performing a good deed, and I was glad to join others of my colleagues in support of the proposal. We thought that church organizations, CARE, and other agencies would be able to dispose of substantial quantities of foods to the needy. The next thing that happened, however, was a request to furnish the money to pay the freight to ship them overseas. We provided that, through the foreign relief program.

Just this week we were asked to provide authorization to the CCC to pay freight charges, and also to provide more money to increase the size and scope of the disposal program to the needy. We approved that request.

Now, Mr. President, we are being asked to provide the money to process all of the surplus food commodities given away under section 416 of the 1949 act. We not only must give the commodities free of cost, and ship them to destination, but we are told that we must process them also. I ask, Mr. President, where are we going to draw the line? Will the next step be to cook them, and, after that, to serve them at the table? The Senate must decide now just how far we are going to carry this program of making surplus foods available to the needy. I hope the Senate will bear in mind that adoption of the pending amendment means additional expenses to the CCC in disposing of our surpluses. The committee, as I recall, took no action on a similar proposal that was before it; the proposition is still pending before the committee.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it not a fact that the Department, in handling the processing of grain being paid for out of section 32 funds, has found that the by-products have taken care of the cost of the processing?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not been informed to that effect.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is my information from the Department.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment which the Senator seeks to have adopted is much broader than the proposal we had before the committee.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It involves the same principle.

Mr. ELLENDER. If Senators want the CCC to undertake the new expense involved under the Senator's amendment and spend more money to process wheat and other products in order to get rid of our agricultural surpluses——

Mr. CLEMENTS. Certainly, Mr. President, no Member of this body has been more active and interested in the disposal of surpluses than has the Senator from Louisiana. This is just another way in which a very sizable portion of the surplus can be disposed of.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree that it will result in getting rid of more surplus commodities, but what I am complaining about is the additional cost involved. It strikes me that those to whom we give these foods ought to absorb the cost involved in putting the products into such shape that they can be utilized.

Mr. CLEMENTS. We have from the Department assurance that the byproducts are very important in taking care of the cost.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky, yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I yield a minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I strongly support the amendment. I think it will very greatly increase the possibilities of distributing surplus foods abroad to relief and charitable organizations for feeding people in countries where our help is so greatly needed. I think this is one of the great weapons which we have, one which I think we have only partially used. I think our opportunities have been neglected. I think the Soviets are more and more coming to the conclusion and the conviction that since they cannot hope to win by force of arms, they hope to win by force of gaining the good will, the respect, and the cooperation of other nations which are now neutral. Those nations contain approximately a third of the people of the globe. So, Mr. President, I very strongly endorse and support this amendment of which I am a cosponsor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Kentucky has been vigorously and enthusiastically endorsed and supported by many religious organizations in this country and great voluntary charitable agencies which are doing overseas relief work, as well as domestic relief activities.

The President and the Secretary of Agriculture not long ago released a certain amount of surplus commodities to

those respective religious and voluntary agencies. Those commodities were sometimes in an unusable form.

If the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky is adopted, such commodities, processed for human consumption, will be usable commodities. They will do what we want them to do, rather than to be shipped in bulk and found not to be adequately processed and cared for.

As the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, the byproducts will take care of the costs of processing. Insofar as the cost of commodities is concerned, it has already been authorized and directed by the President. What we are doing here is going an extra step to make these commodities usable for human consumption. It seems to me that the amendment is not only a desirable one, but is a logical step to do what we said we were going to do, namely, to provide assistance out of the abundance of our surpluses and available supplies.

I am happy to be associated with the Senator from Kentucky in this amendment. It will represent a great deal of humanitarian good to people at home and abroad. Surely the Government should be authorized to do what the amendment provides, in light of the waste that is involved in connection with these surplus commodities.

Much of the trouble we have had about these commodities is that they have been unprocessed and have been in such large packages that they could not be used. The storage costs on these commodities many times is greater than the processing costs.

When we get into it, as I pointed out in my discussion about 2 or 3 days ago on the subject of ocean freight, actually the amount of money provided for freight to dispose of the products has been less than the cost of the storage of products.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it not true that the surpluses in the form of wheat and corn, if they are processed in this country, will provide employment for labor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course they will.

Mr. CLEMENTS. In addition to that, the byproducts of these surplus commodities will practically pay for the cost of the milk.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the statement which was brought to my attention by the agencies and organizations which were keenly interested in this particular amendment.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Unless the commodities are processed before they are sent to many of the States, is it not a fact that there are not enough milling facilities in those particular States to handle the commodities?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true in many of the areas.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have the privilege of addressing some questions to the Senator from Kentucky, if he is agreeable to that.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am glad to answer the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. A year ago the Senator from Kentucky was the principal sponsor, as I recall, of a measure approved by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and later last year approved by Congress, under which wheat and corn were processed into usable food and made available free in areas where great unemployment existed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct. As I recall, it was Public Law 311.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought that was a fine service which was rendered by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, and I certainly was happy to support him in that service.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator's words are kind words, but much of his own language is in that measure.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

On the pending proposal, I find myself a little more reluctant to support the Senator from Kentucky, because it seems to me the amendment is too far-reaching. I have before me section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, which, as I understand, is the section which the Senator from Kentucky proposes to amend by his pending amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I notice that section 416 covers all commodities acquired through price-support operations by the Commodity Credit Corporation; and it covers not only the disposal in domestic channels, but also the making of such commodities available to any Federal agency for use in making payment for commodities not produced in the United States.

Section 416 also covers the barter or exchange of such commodities for strategic or other materials as authorized by law. It covers in the case of food commodities, the donation of such commodities to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and to such State, Federal, or private agency or agencies as may be designated by the proper State or Federal authority for use in the school-lunch programs, in the assistance of needy persons, and in charitable institutions, including hospitals, to the extent that needy persons are served in those hospitals, and to donate any such food commodities in excess of anticipated disposition under the three programs I have just covered in my enumeration.

Section 416 also covers the furnishing of such commodities to nonprofit voluntary agencies registered with the Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the Foreign Operations Administration or other appropriate department or agency of the Federal Government and intergovernmental organizations for use in the assistance of needy persons outside the United States.

The section also contains the condition that the Secretary shall obtain such assurance as he deems necessary that the recipients thereof will not diminish their normal expenditures for food by reason of such donation.

That section seems to cover, in short, everything the Commodity Credit Corporation has and everything it can do with what it has as to normal trading.

The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky seems to cover all that great amount of stores, both present and future, which can be apprehended under the term "food commodities," and covers the use of those food commodities in all the various fields I have just recited. Is that correct?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Where they are in surplus. There are only two items, as my distinguished friend knows, that would be items which would be processed—wheat and corn.

Mr. HOLLAND. What about peanuts?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Certainly this country had a shortage of peanuts last year. There was a considerable quantity of peanuts shipped into the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. What about the small grains? This section covers, in short, everything that can be used for food; does it not?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I should say that was correct. It would cover the two principal items which are actually involved, or items for which provision was made a year ago, to be processed for the needy and for distressed areas of the country. The amendment would provide CARE and the private charity organizations with a processed product which was in surplus in this country, to be sent overseas, where now they could send a given amount of wheat or a given amount of corn if it was provided to them.

The amendment also would permit the processed items to go into institutional work, including school-lunch programs in this country, whereby those schools themselves would not be in a position to process the food.

Many States do not have mills in which to process wheat. Certainly wheat can be processed much cheaper when a large quantity is processed than it could be if only a smaller amount were distributed to the many schools of this country.

Mr. HOLLAND. I notice the amendment seems to provide that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall pay the cost of the processing, which would mean that all this vast additional investment would be charged to the agricultural price-support program. Is that correct?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Much as I regret it, and as strongly as I supported the distinguished Senator in his more limited program last year, it seems to me that for Congress to launch into such a program as is contemplated, without any idea of the cost, but with full knowledge of the tremendous coverage of the proposed amendment, would be unwise.

Before any such measure as is here proposed should be considered, it should certainly have the benefit of hearings by a committee, and we should also know how much was being added out of the cost of the price-support program, not out of the general fund, to the cost of the agricultural program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understand the present language or the present ruling, voluntary agencies are permitted to get supplies under the language that they can be reprocessed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What we have run into are some legal technicalities. We have apparently run into legal counsel who interpret the reprocessing provision in a very strict manner.

The purpose of the amendment is to include processing as well as reprocessing, is it not?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Also, it is not mandatory; it merely says "may."

I think we ought to take into consideration that where we are paying storage costs upon storable commodities at no small sum, by giving authority to the Department of Agriculture on a discretionary basis with the word "may," we shall be facilitating the use of commodities where those commodities are needed.

For all practical purposes, the present law states what the amendment provides, except that someone has gone in with a fine-point pencil and a sharp legal mind and has started to split legal hairs, saying that reprocessing does not mean processing. Thus we get into a big argument about the interpretation of the law, when the people are led to believe the voluntary agencies are entitled under the law and under the order of the Secretary and the President to utilize these commodities for welfare purposes.

ORDER FOR CALL OF CALENDAR ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning business on Monday next there be a call of the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection, from the beginning of the calendar, and that, notwithstanding the fact that the morning hour may be passed, there be an order that the call of the calendar be completed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator a question. In the unhappy event that we have not completed action on the farm bill by next Monday, how much time does the majority leader feel will be stolen away from the discussion of the farm bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would think very little. The calendar will be taken up during the morning hour. I would not want to see the end of the morning hour arrive and cut off a discussion of a bill in which the Senator from South Dakota might be interested. I may say I have cleared the request with the minority leader.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from South Dakota is propounding the question with an easy conscience, because he has no bills on the calendar, but I wanted to be sure we did not get into something that might delay consideration of the farm bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Only 5 minutes is allowed for discussion of each bill, and that much time is rarely used.

Mr. President, I renew my request that on Monday next there be a call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, from the beginning, and that we complete the call of the calendar notwithstanding the fact that we may pass the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have all Senators put on notice that there will be a call of the calendar. I hope the calendar committees on both the majority and the minority sides will be ready.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I again bring to the attention of the Senator from Kentucky the language in section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to which his amendment directly refers. I read from section 416 the following language:

> The Commodity Credit Corporation may pay, with respect to commodities disposed of under this section, reprocessing, packaging, transporting, handling, and other charges accruing up to the time of their delivery to a Federal agency or to the designated State or private agency, in the case of commodities made available for use within the United States, or their delivery free alongside ship or free on board export carrier at point of export, in the case of commodities made available for use outside the United States.

We could actually have had the amendment state "add processing."

The real problem, as the Senator from Kentucky knows—both he and I have visited and talked about this—is that although the agencies which do the work are the finest agencies in the land, they say, when they get to the point of a legal definition of "reprocessing," they run into trouble on the word "reprocessing." There is a doubt as to whether it includes processing. It seems to me it is more expensive to reprocess than to process.

I say, most respectfully, we have already charged all this up to the Commodity Credit Corporation in section 416. It has been adopted unanimously by the Congress.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Let me say to my good friend from Minnesota that actually what the amendment would permit which is not permitted now is the processing of corn and wheat into flour and meal, which would then be in a form that could be used by people both out of this country and in this country who are authorized to receive it under section 416.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. One of the troubles we run into in normal trade channels is that when large quantities of corn and wheat are sent to other countries in bulk, then our own millers and our own business people say, "Look, we have the finest milling facilities. We have trained millers. We have people who can do the job. Why is it the United States pays the freight, ships it overseas, sends it to another country 6,000 miles away, and then pays that country to process it?"—which we have done. We would like to have written into the law a provision that such products can be processed in the United States of America, if it is so desired.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Would not the Senator agree that one of the really important things is that when CARE or church groups to whom surplus commodities are furnished sends them outside, they must be in processed form if 100 percent use of the items is to be obtained?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's explanation is directly to the point. As he recalls, when we put the language in the act about packaging and handling, we did it so that butter and fruits and vegetables we may have had could be used. I can recall days not long ago when one had to get some of those commodities in 100-pound bulk packages and in huge casks. Schools were served with butter in 25, 50, or 100-pound packages, but it was wasted, because butter spoils. We were told that if the butter could be packaged in 5-pound or 10-pound packages, it could be used, and there would be no waste, and good could be had out of it. The amendment relates not only to humanitarian purposes, but forms a sensible way of handling our abundance.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I can speak with some degree of experience with regard to the indescribably beneficial effects that come to this country by our following a course of helping to feed persons abroad who need our assistance. During the years immediately following the Second World War, and during the last year and a half of the war, I had a part in helping to feed many hundreds of millions of people all over the world. I do not think this country has ever made an investment that paid better dividends than the money which we made available for that purpose. Even today we have, in my opinion, millions of friends, silent though they may be for the time being, behind the Iron Curtain in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Rumania, in Hungary, and in the other countries, who are helped through the beneficence of this and other countries. The United States, of course, got the major part of the credit. So every ton of food we send abroad now, through the good offices of our fine relief organizations, properly supervised, will mean a tremendously important return to this country in the goodwill which many develop as a result.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I appreciate the fine comment of the Senator from New York. I see the Senator from Vermont is present. I am certainly in no position to state the position of the Department on the amendment, but it has been my understanding that there was no objection in the Department to the adoption of the amendment now under consideration. If there is any objection on the part of the Department, I am sure the Senator from Vermont is in a position to express its opposition.

Mr. AIKEN. I have a statement from the Department, and I am looking for it. It is my impression that the

Department has no objection to the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator from Kentucky indicate what, in his judgment, would be the dollar amount involved in the processing?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am not in a position to state to the Senator from California what the dollar cost would be. The information I have has come from those in the Department, namely, that as a result of the milling of byproducts, when the cost of storage is eliminated, only a very, very negligible cost accrues to the Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with surplus agricultural commodities processed in this country.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator from Kentucky have any estimate of that cost?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I do not. It all depends on how much is used. Certainly the cost has been very negligible under Public Law 311, which was passed last year, to give assistance to the needy and to distress areas in the United States. The milling byproducts have practically paid for the cost of the processing.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Some figure—even though perhaps a little larger than the amount actually necessary—would at least provide some kind of dollar limitation. I wondered whether the Senator from Kentucky had considered that point, so there would not be unlimited authority.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Let me say to my friend, the Senator from California, that the Secretary is not compelled to do what is provided for. He may do it; authority is granted to him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is purely optional, and not mandatory, is it?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes; it is purely optional on the part of the Secretary. He can dispose of it in bulk, or this amendment would give him authority to dispose of it in processed form if, in his best judgment, it is best to use it in processed form, rather than to transfer it in bulk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield back the remainder of the time available to him on the amendment?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am delighted to yield back the remainder of the time available to this side, if those in control of the time on the other side will do likewise.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], on behalf of himself and other Senators. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was agreed to, as follows:

On page 30, line 18, insert the following:

"SEC. 310. Section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 as amended, is amended by inserting before the last sentence thereof a new sentence as follows: 'In addition, in the case of food commodities disposed of under this section, the Commodity Credit Corporation may pay the cost of processing such commodities into a form suitable for home or institutional use, such processing to be accomplished through private trade facilities to the greatest extent possible.'"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "2–27–56–K." I offer the amendment on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

AUTHORITY FOR PAYMENTS

SEC. 107. (a) Section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after "rice," the following: "hogs, cattle, manufacturing milk."

(b) Such section is further amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) The Secretary is authorized, at any time, to make payments for the purposes of subsection (a), with respect to any of the commodities specified therein, and to use for such purposes the funds appropriated by or for the purposes of section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612c)."

On page 4, line 24, strike out "107" and insert "108."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this amendment will amend section 303. At the present time section 303 reads in part as follows:

If and when appropriations are made therefor, the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to producers of corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco on the normal production of such commodities in amounts which, together with the proceeds thereof, will provide a return to such producers which is as nearly equal to the parity price as the funds so made available will permit.

Mr. President, I have just read a section of our basic agricultural law which is called the parity-payment section. I believe that section was placed in the law in 1938. Senators will note that it relates to the producers of corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco. However, it does not relate to any of the perishable commodities. I should like it to be noted that under this section, to which my amendment would be added, the language is permissive, insofar as the Secretary is concerned.

In the amendment relating to hogs, cattle, and manufacturing milk, I ask that the authority be only discretionary, not mandatory. I believe that the Secretary ought to have another means of supporting or assisting the perishable commodities, when and if needed.

Again and again we have tried to include in the bill a provision relating to some of the most important of all our agricultural production, namely, hogs and cattle. In this instance I add manufacturing milk because during the war years we had experience with production payments on that commodity. I think that experience was rather creditable, insofar as the consumers were concerned, as well as insofar as the producers were concerned.

I do not think this amendment needs a great deal of further explanation, if it is understood that the amendment is permissive, not mandatory, and provides discretionary authority to the Secretary, and will give him—in addition to his power to purchase the milk, as he is now doing in the case of pork products, and as he did a year or two ago in the case of beef products—the means, if he so desires, of using the payments as another effective tool to provide better income for our agricultural-commodity producers.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. What is the present authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with reference to other commodities on a similar basis; and what are the commodities?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The authority is that, if and when appropriations are made for such payments, the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments to the producers of corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco. It is all conditioned on the question of whether appropriations for such payments are made. At the present time there are no appropriations for making such payments.

But the particular commodities stated in my amendment are excluded under section 303 of the basic agricultural law. Instead, I want them to be included. I think it should be crystal clear that this would not be an automatic arrangement. First of all, the commodities would have to be included; in the second place, the appropriations would have to be made.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is there in the bill an authorization for an additional $250 million to be available to the Secretary, to be used in the support of any agricultural commodity which he can now support with section 32 funds?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator's amendment—which he has offered for himself and other Senators, including the Senator from Oklahoma—is adopted, will it mean that authority is thereby granted for the Secretary of Agriculture to use for that purpose the $250 million authorized in the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If he found it desirable to do so.

Mr. KERR. It would not be a mandate, but permissive authority.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. The amendment cosponsored by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and myself does not direct the Secretary. The authority is here for the Secretary

to utilize premium payments, or production payments, if need be—whatever may be the payment method desirable, the authority is there, to be used if the Secretary deems it in the public interest.

Mr. KERR. As I understand what the Senator has said—and it accords with my own understanding of the amendment—it would give the Secretary authority, with reference to the producers of hogs, cattle, and manufacturing milk, to do what he now has the discretionary authority to do with respect to other agricultural commodities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has analyzed it perfectly. This amendment adds a new section, specifically providing that section 32 funds may be used for this purpose. It would amend section 303 so as to include the commodities of cattle, hogs, and manufacturing milk. It seems to me to be a logical extension of the agricultural program.

I think I heard the Senator from Oklahome say yesterday that around 60 percent—or is it 80 percent——

Mr. KERR. Eighty percent of what the soil produces in agricultural products is compensated for to the producer by the sale of livestock or products of livestock.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I point out most respectfully that with the exception of milk products, no other perishable commodity is really covered in the legislation.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that, as of this hour, hogs and cattle are selling at a lower percentage of parity than any other agricultural commodities?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct. So far as I know, the record shows that cattle prices are the lowest of the major agricultural commodity prices.

Mr. KERR. Paritywise, hogs are even lower than cattle.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. This amendment would merely authorize the Secretary to have the same authority with reference to the producers of hogs, cattle, and manufacturing milk as he now has with reference to other agricultural commodities, which, in reality, are selling at higher prices, paritywise, than either cattle or hogs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

I should like to quote from section 32 of Public Law 320, which provides for the use of receipts and customs duties to aid agriculture. It outlines three uses to which the Secretary may put these funds.

The first is to encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities, providing for payments of any losses sustained on such exports. That is the source of the authority to subsidize exports, such as wheat.

The second use outlined is to encourage diversion of agricultural products from normal channels of trade into byproducts.

As to the third use, the present law reads:

> Reestablish farmers' purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity for domestic consumption.

That means that the basic Agricultural Act encompasses the use of a method of payments to sustain farmers' prices and farmers' purchasing power. As has been said on this floor repeatedly during this debate, with respect to cattle, hogs, and perishable commodities—in this instance I limit it to hogs, cattle and manufactured milk, although I could emphasize the first two, hogs and cattle—there is nothing in the present law which provides any benefit to producers of such commodities except with respect to purchases. In connection with purchases most of the economic good goes to the processor, rather than the producer. That is an indisputable fact which has been documented.

It seems to me that if we can authorize the use of substantial sums of money, running into millions of dollars, for the benefit of the processor, we ought not to hesitate to include in the law a discretionary use of authority for payments to producers. It is not mandatory. I am becoming tired of hearing those in responsible positions say, "We would like to do this, but we do not have the authority." Repeatedly when a proposal is made in a difficult situation, we hear it said, "We would like to do it, but we do not have the authority."

Some time ago I brought into the debate an exchange of correspondence between a member of the Iowa congressional delegation and the counselor of the Department of Agriculture. It was inferred, in that exchange of correspondence, that possibly the language of section 303 and section 32 might include payments. I wish to see that it is clearly outlined in detail.

I point out further that the farm people in the Midwest, where producers, and hog producers are in the largest numbers, are solidly behind this proposal. Every poll that has been taken in the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa is overwhelmingly for the inclusion of such language in the bill.

Mr. KERR. Also Oklahoma.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The same is true of Oklahoma.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes to ask some questions of my good friend from Minnesota.

Under section 303 of the act it is stated that the Secretary is authorized and directed to make payments, if money is provided, to producers of corn, wheat, rice, or tobacco, on the normal production of such commodities. Will the Senator tell us what the Secretary would have to do to determine the normal production of cattle, hogs, and manufacturing milk? How would he go about doing that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suppose normal production is what a producer is accustomed to producing.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know. As the Senator knows, under the law with respect to the basic crops, there is a formula for determining normal production, whether or not price supports shall be available for any of the basic crops. I should like to have the Senator from Minnesota tell me how the Secretary would go about calculating the normal production with respect to cattle? Would it be determined on the basis of the number of cattle sufficient to feed the population, a certain number of pounds of meat per week, or would it be the number of cattle slaughtered last year, or some other formula?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad the Senator brings up that question. My understanding is that these payments would be used for the normal producers, and the normal production of cattle and hogs. We are not out to stimulate the program, but to assist in the established areas of production.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, the production of cattle, as well as the production of hogs, has been abnormally high—far above our average consumption requirements.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say with equal candor that the production of cotton, wheat, corn, and practically everything else that is produced, has been above normal.

Mr. ELLENDER. We have in the law a formula for arriving at the national acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and price-support levels for the basics. We provide price support for the basics through CCC loans and purchase agreements. The Senator's amendment provides that if and when money is appropriated, the producers of cattle, hogs, and manufacturing milk are to receive direct payments from the Government to bring their income up to parity, or as near parity as possible, dependent upon the amount of funds available.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The amendment would merely authorize the use of these particular funds for payment purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Senator speaks of "these funds," to what funds does he refer?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If funds are appropriated.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows that under the law as it now stands there is available approximately $440 million out of section 32 funds, for the purpose of making payments to the hog growers and the cattle growers and producers of other perishable commodities in order to assist them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; that is where the Senator from Minnesota must differ with the chairman of the committee.

The present section 32 limitations or authorizations provide for purchases. The section does not provide funds for payments. Purchases, as the Department of Agriculture has interpreted that term, are purchases from processors. I am not complaining about that. There is no other place where purchases of beef or pork products can be made. I am not advocating that the Government go into the processing business. The amendment provides that if the Secretary should find that purchases do not work, or if he finds that other means he wishes to use do not work, he shall have the payment authority.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. At the present time surplus products, whether they be beef or pork, are bought and used in the school lunch program. If the amendment is adopted, the producer could receive, for

instance, a dollar a head as a subsidy on the live hog.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. I am using pork as an example. The producer would be paid a dollar a hundredweight. On the other hand, if he desired it, he could be paid a dollar a head. That would be a subsidy paid on weight or on the hog. Then what method would be used to dispose of the products once the pork got into the channels of trade? Would it go at whatever levels the overburdening on the market would force the seller of the product to demand? I am sincere in my inquiries.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know the Senator is.

Mr. THYE. I know that the producer does not get the full benefit of the amount of money that is spent by the Department of Agriculture in the purchase of surplus pork or surplus beef, or whatever the product is. It would have to be put through the school-lunch program or into international channels, or fed back into military needs.

Therefore, I do not believe that anyone would particularly object if he knew that the method now proposed would broaden the opportunity of the Secretary of Agriculture to pursue new courses of action. One course might be for him to pay a subsidy to the producer of the live animal, and then use a portion of the funds to pick up the overburdening of the surplus, for whatever the need in the school-lunch program would be.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my intention.

Mr. THYE. We cannot make it mandatory in any sense on the Secretary, because the feed supply must be the factor to govern the overall production of livestock or poultry or milk. That is why I have differed with those who do not believe in the soil bank or in the retirement of acres. I do believe it is feasible, because it is the supply of feed that will bring on a supply of pork or milk or livestock.

We know that the method of buying surplus pork or surplus beef did not give a return to the producer of the benefits the Treasury actually made available through moneys used in the purchase of surpluses. We know that it did not materially reduce the surpluses on the market. It stiffened the market to the consumer, because it took the end product out of the warehouse and took the overburden in the warehouse and put it into the school-lunch program. What we did was to firm up the market to the retailer and to the consumer at the time those purchases were made. Therefore the program was not as effective as it should have been.

If we can do what the Senator proposes without in some way involving ourselves in underwriting surpluses of livestock, and thereby firm up the market on surpluses and overproduction in the next year and a half, until we get a feed balance, we will take a step in the right direction.

That is the only concern I have. I know that the buying of beef and pork was not effective last year, and is not effective now. It has the tendency of stiffening the market so far as the retailer is concerned and to firm up the market so far as the housewife is concerned. If we could find language which will not tie the hands of the Secretary and encourage production of pork and beef, we would be taking a step in the right direction.

The question is involved. After a year and a half we might decide that we had made a mistake. That is the danger I see in this venture, and that is why I am speaking as frankly as I am on the question. We did not do the right thing for the producer by the manner in which we bought pork last year, because we firmed up the market for the housewife, and we softened the market for the wholesaler. We did not materially channel that buying back into the pocketbooks of the men who had fed the hogs.

If anyone can tell me how we can do that without tying the Secretary's hands so firmly that he cannot untie them, that is what I should like to hear.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, that is what also concerns me, and that is why I am asking these questions of my friend, the junior Senator from Minnesota. I should like to know how the Secretary of Agriculture will determine the normal production of the commodities the Senator mentions.

As I said a short time ago, section 32 funds have been available for quite a number of years to assist in supporting prices for the commodities covered by the Senator's amendment. Funds are now available. Up to about 90 days ago $444 million of section 32 funds were available for the purchase of commodities in surplus.

The Senator knows that under section 32, not more than 25 percent of the funds, or $111 million may be used for any one commodity. In the case of hogs, the Secretary has utilized or set aside $80 million of the $111 million he could have used.

I wish to direct the Senator's attention to a provision in section 32. I believe the Senator proposes by his amendment to reestablish the farmer's purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of agricultural commodities for normal domestic consumption. That is the purpose of the amendment, is it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to know who would be entitled to payments among the Nation's hog growers and among the Nation's cattle growers, if normal production was exceeded. Again I ask: What is normal production? Is it a quantity sufficient to feed the population of the United States? What would be a producers' normal production? How would it be determined?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator that we have a pretty good understanding of what normal production is. We take an average period of time as it relates to an equitable price in the market place. For example, with respect to hogs, I have some statistics which show that we could eliminate about 800 million pounds of pork and in that way bring pork products back into what is a relatively normal span of pork products that will give a fairly reasonable price in the market place.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I say to my good friend that that is the reason why we in the committee placed a provision in the bill authorizing a quarter of a billion dollars to supplement the present section 32 funds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is for purchases.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that; but the object is to reestablish the farmers' purchasing power by removing surplus agricultural products from the market. In that manner we hope to achieve a return to normalcy and enable the producers of perishable commodities to get the parity to which the Senator refers in his amendment.

It strikes me that the additional $250 million of section 32 funds we already have provided for perishable commodities, which would include hogs and cattle, offer the best approach toward solving this problem. I may state that there is a possibility of raising the authorization.

I understand that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] has offered an amendment to increase this authorization to half a billion dollars. As chairman of the committee, I originally offered an amendment in committee to increase the funds by half a billion dollars. Personally, I would not raise any objection to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma. The purpose which the Senator has in mind is to take off the market a certain amount of perishable products which are in excess of requirements.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to see it done by premium payments on lightweights.

Mr. ELLENDER. Congress has not provided funds to make parity payments under section 303 which the Senator seeks to amend. His amendment may be just an idle gesture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; it is not. I have in my hand a photostatic copy of a letter addressed to Representative CHARLES B. HOEVEN, of Iowa, dated January 23, 1956, and I also have a copy of the second page of a personally penned note signed by Representative JENSEN, of Iowa.

It is an exhibit which I shall be glad to present to the chairman of the committee.

They were in discussion with the office of the general counsel of the Department of Agriculture, and that office pointed out:

> It is doubtful if authority exists to make a "bonus" payment on a particular variety of any designated commodity, unless such a payment would come within the authorization contained in section 403 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

Then the section is set out. I read further:

> Under the authority for purchase operations, the Commodity Credit Corporation could, among other things, buy live animals and enter into contracts with slaughterers and packers for processing the animals into storable products. Such products would be available for sale by the Corporation into domestic and export markets, including sales pursuant to Public Law 480 * * * as amended, and for donation pursuant to section

416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

The legislative history makes it clear that it does not include payments to producers, since such payments do not have the effect of supporting prices of livestock in the market.

It is because of this kind of letter and exchange of correspondence that the language as now written in sections 303 and 32 has become meaningless to the Department.

To make a long story short, the Secretary of Agriculture has available right now, in round figures, $800 million which he has full authority to spend to support hogs, and so forth. I think a payment is a much more sensible means. That is my personal opinion. I do not say that the Secretary needs to follow that plan. But he ought to make payments, rather than spend money just on purchases.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I believe we should be very careful as to whether we involve the Department of Agriculture in anything that is mandatory, whereby the Secretary would have to support livestock at any specific figure of parity, so long as we have the present terrifically high supply of feed. We could within the next 9 months effect such a production that neither the Treasury nor commonsense could support it. It requires only about 9 months, from the time a litter of pigs is farrowed, until that offspring can bring forth another litter of pigs. Therefore, if we write anything that makes it mandatory on the Secretary to support live hogs at any figure, hogs will be in such abundance within the next 18 months that we will not know what to do with them.

I am in sympathy with the general idea that the Secretary should have the right to pay a certain fixed sum on a lightweight hog in order to bring the producer out of an emergency because of such low prices as we have witnessed within the past 6 months. I would be very fearful of merely granting authority.

Mr. President, why do we not take this amendment into conference on the bill, instruct the staff of the committee to work with the solicitors of the Department of Agriculture, and see if we can draft some kind of language which would be acceptable to the conferees and that will permit the Secretary to bring dollars to the live hog producer, rather than to buy, as an end product, from a wholesale house? When the product is bought from the wholesaler it only firms up the market to the housewife by taking the surplus out of the hands of the wholesaler and putting it into international channels of relief or into the school lunch program. But the producer will only in a remote manner realize any benefit; and insofar as the housewife is concerned, she will have the Treasury bidding against her.

I should like to see the matter put into the hands of the solicitors of the Department of Agriculture and into the hands of the committee staff. We could have a vote here, but we would not resolve the doubt as to whether the producer would receive any benefit.

That is the whole question, as I see it. There are many amendments pending that can take hours and hours of time, and we have debated the question until it is becoming so that no more good can be amended into the bill. I think that from here on it will look like an extra pair of shafts on a cart if we continue to attach amendments to the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the Senator is suggesting that we accept the pending amendment.

Mr. THYE. I think we should get it into the hands of the solicitors of the committee and of the Department and see if we can draft a paragraph which can be adopted in conference and that will let the Secretary do what he has said he has not the authority to do, namely, somehow compensate a producer who got caught in the squeeze.

The Senator from Louisiana and I, if I may trespass on the Senator's time to say this, were as instrumental in being responsible for the big pork production last year as anyone else in the United States.

When we asked the Northwest wheatgrower in Oregon and Washington to divert their wheat, they already were in a summer-fallow operation. They already had their farm unit laying black throughout the year. They pay taxes on their black land for a year. They plow and harrow the land in order to keep the weeds out, and so as to keep the moisture in the land. They have overhead which they cannot escape.

When the wheat farmer is asked to cut down on his wheat acreage, oftentimes another 20 or 30 percent of his farm unit is forced into idleness. He is not able to bear such a burden. So he sows barley. When he sows barley what is he going to do? If he is a good, thrifty, hard-working operator, he looks around and asks himself, "How can I feed it rather than to channel it into cash sales?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the senior Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the Senator from Minnesota that in our recent hearings we came across many farmers in the Northwest who planted a large amount of barley on their diverted acres. Instead of feeding it, as the Senator suggests, they sold it to Uncle Sam.

Mr. THYE. But the Senator and I can find evidence in the hearing testimony that a Washington farmer diverted his acres from wheat and planted them in barley. Then he bought some brood sows, fed the pigs the barley, and overproduced on pork. That helped to glut the markets of our Nation.

Mr. ELLENDER. What they did was to borrow from Uncle Sam, and they never expected to redeem their loans.

Mr. THYE. That is what I meant when I said that the Senator from Louisiana and I were responsible for the production of the surplus of pork.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator should place the blame on this type of farmer, and not on the Congress.

Mr. THYE. If there had been a soil bank 2 years ago, there would have been a place to put the diverted acres, and there would not be the surplus food there is today. But we have a problem to solve, and we will not be able to resolve it until we get our feed supply down and are able to determine how we can channel the money of the Treasury to the producers rather than to the processors and the warehouses which are full of processed meats. If we resolved that question, we would depart from the philosophy which has existed in the free-enterprise system over the years. We cannot resolve it in the amendment. I think we might run into the danger of putting some mandatory provisions upon the Secretary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understand, one of the main objections of the Senator from Louisiana, besides some minor objections, is that the Senator feels that by adding this language to section 303, matters would be complicated. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. In regard to the determination of what constitutes normal production.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understand, the Senator would like to have payments made out of section 32 funds and under the terms of section 32 language, rather than section 303, which talks about normal production and requires the Secretary to set up standards of what we call normal production.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; and, as I understand, under the present law it can be done. If the Secretary is not exercising the rights he has under that law, and the Senator is desirous of changing the law so as to force the Secretary to carry out the law as Congress intends, I personally would not have any objection to that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my desire. One way in which that can be accomplished is to have specific language, and I call the attention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to this language:

> In order to encourage the marketing of cattle and hogs at lighter than normal weight, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make payments to producers to market cattle and hogs at lighter than normal weights. Such payments shall be made from funds appropriated by section 32 of Public Law 320, whichever may be cheaper, in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purpose of this section.

That ties the provision directly to section 32 funds. It does not complicate the situation at all in terms of section 303.

I think my senior colleague has put his finger on the point which needs to be emphasized. We need to get into the bill some reference to the whole concept of payments. I prefer to call them premium payments, so that weight, not products, will be marketed. It is necessary to reduce the poundage. The poundage is what causes surpluses—not the census, but the poundage.

Once this was written into the law, the Solicitor, together with the Secretary, could make whatever regulations

were necessary to put the plan on a feasible, workable basis.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. As one of the cosponsors of the amendment, I think the suggested change is acceptable.

I may say to the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] that I find myself in agreement with practically everything he has said. He has put his finger on our problem. Our problem is to get the amendment into conference.

I say very candidly to him that I think we ought to have had a soil bank 2 years ago. Some of us advocated a soil bank then, but Benson kept sending to Congress adverse reports on the soil bank. He has changed his opinion since then, but I think he is 2 years late with relation to hogs.

Now, I should like to ask the junior Senator from Minnesota if he thinks the amendment would be at all workable if poultry were included.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, but I should prefer, if the Senator does not mind, in the light of the fact that the major problem is in the cattle and hog area, to limit the amendment to cattle and hogs.

Mr. MORSE. I am perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There are funds under section 32 for poultry, which is much more adaptable for purchase, because the processing of poultry is not nearly the same as it is for cattle and hogs. So I should like to limit the amendment to cattle and hogs, in order to get something into the proposed law which relates directly to them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it the intention of the Senator from Minnesota, by the insertion of the new words in section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to make available the production payment procedure up to full parity?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; that is not the intention. I may say that the proposal is strictly permissive, not mandatory. I have suggested a modification so as not to limit it to section 303, but also to include section 32, so there can be no doubt about production payments up to full parity. I am not even talking about full parity.

I am talking about having the Secretary of Agriculture, if there is at his disposal and at his command authority, use premium payments to provide a more expeditious marketing of the commodities, such as cattle and hogs, thereby relieving the market of the excess poundage which has driven market prices down. That is precisely what we are advocating.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is not clear to me what the Senator from Minnesota proposes to do under his amendment. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Louisiana, if I may.

I am not certain what the most recent suggestion of my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, may embody; but I think I know that what he originally proposed would result in the opening of a veritable Pandora's box.

Section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 related to a law which at the time referred only to products which were later called the basic products. That section related to parity payments, and would have allowed the Secretary to make, out of any appropriations available for that purpose, payments to producers of corn, wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco—and later the law was amended to include peanuts—which, together with the proceeds received by the producers, would provide a return to such producers which is as nearly equal to parity prices as the funds so made available will permit.

In other words, it aimed toward full parity. It aimed toward parity payments. It aimed toward sale in the market place of the six products related, and payment of sufficient supplemental funds above the sales price to realize the parity price.

Following that time, of course, specific acts were provided for price supports, and they wholly abandoned the principle of payment by direct payment of production funds to bring the producer up to full parity. To put under that particular section the commodities which the distinguished Senator proposes to include would bring utter confusion.

I call to the Senator's attention that there are several pages of definitions that precede section 303, which relate to such words as "normal production," "normal supply," "normal supply of tobacco," "normal supply of cotton," "normal domestic consumption," and so forth, making a total of, I think, 4 pages of definitions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. To include in this provision the other commodities, without any definition or without any showing of what constitutes normal production, without any showing of how the Secretary should proceed, and without any specific detailed law set up such as we have under price-support legislation for these other commodities, would be to create confusion of the worst kind, and to leave anybody who felt so inclined free to blame the secretary for not applying any funds provided, such as section 32 funds or the additional $52 million proposed to be authorized under the bill, as production payments to producers of cattle and hogs. I am not willing to leave it in that position.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it would be difficult to arrive at what normal production is. Would it be the 60 pound per capita pork production of last year, or the 80 pound per capita production of this year?

Mr. HOLLAND. That question of normal production is such a difficult one that it is defined in the act in various ways, none of them applicable to cattle and hogs, because this is the general definition:

"Normal production" as applied to any number of acres of corn, cotton, rice, or wheat means the normal yield for the farm times such number of acres.

The problem was such a complicated one that the drafters of the original legislation were required to put in the definitions. To adopt this provision without any definition would leave the picture so confused that it would be impossible of interpretation or application. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield such time to the Senator from Illinois as he may require to make an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, made a statement yesterday setting forth the result of the two-price wheat plan on agriculture generally and on the Midwest in particular. I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, MARCH 15.—President Charles B. Shuman, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, said today that the "domestic dumping plan for wheat voted by the Senate this week would have disastrous effects on the prices and incomes of most farmers."

"This plan has been presented as a two-price plan designed to meet competition in the foreign market, while at the same time supporting prices in the domestic food market," Shuman pointed out.

"Actually, the Senate plan is a 'three-price plan'. It provides one price for wheat consumed as food in the United States, a second price for foreign sales, and a third price—potentially the most significant price to United States farmers—for wheat consumed as livestock feed in this country.

"The real objective of the certificate plan is to dump the wheat surplus into the domestic feed market," he said.

The Federation president pointed out that "the fact is that we already have a two-price plan as far as the international market is concerned. We have been meeting foreign competition by subsidizing wheat exports and selling surplus wheat for foreign currencies."

"The Senate action constitutes a grave threat to the income of all farmers who depend on feed grain and livestock for their livelihood.

"This includes the producers of wheat, corn, oats, barley, beef cattle, hogs, poultry, and dairy products. As of July 1, 1956, we will have a carry-over of more than 1 billion bushels of old crop wheat mostly in the Commodity Credit Corporation's hands.

"As adopted by the Senate this week, the certificate plan would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to unload the CCC's entire wheat surplus on the domestic feed market. This would have disastrous effects on the prices and incomes of all producers of feed grains, livestock, poultry, and dairy products.

"In view of the present record supplies of feed grain and the present low level of hog and cattle prices, the Senate's action in opening the floodgates on the wheat surplus shows a callous disregard for the welfare of the feed grain and livestock sectors of our economy.

"As far as feed grain and livestock producers are concerned, this action—if allowed to stand—will more than cancel any good effects that are to be expected from the soil bank plan.

"The certificate plan also discriminates against the wheat producers who have been producing the types and qualities of wheat that the domestic food market demands.

"It treats all wheat producers alike regardless of whether they have been producing low quality feed wheat or high-grade milling wheat.

"In effect it would put a tax on wheat producers who have been supplying the domestic food market for the benefit of those who have been producing wheat that is not wanted by the domestic food market."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to modify my amendment in accordance with the language I read a few moments ago. I send the amendment to the desk. I am going to speak about 2 minutes on the amendment, and then I shall ask for a vote, because there is no need for any further discussion on it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator desire to modify or substitute?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I mean to substitute. I offer the amendments as a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed as an amendment on page 4, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

LIGHTWEIGHT CATTLE AND HOGS

SEC. 106. (a) In order to encourage the marketing of cattle and hogs at lighter than normal weights, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make incentive payments to producers who market cattle and hogs at lighter than normal weights.

(b) Such payments shall be made from funds appropriated by section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress (49 Stat. 774; 7 U. S. C. 612c), as amended, and shall be in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purpose of this section.

On page 4, line 24, strike out "107" and insert "108."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my only purpose in offering the amendment is to get included in the bill some reference to cattle and hogs and the payment system. I recognize the validity of the argument that we should not have payments to encourage production. I think we should have premium payments to discourage weighted production. The problem is one of poundage. The figures which I presented for the RECORD will bear out the point that it is more economical to the Government to make premium payments.

Concerning the question of maintaining payments, there is considerable sentiment for so-called production payments. I know of few, if any, great agricultural economists who are not for production payments. I do not recall any who do not recognize the safety and the desirability of production payments, particularly on perishable commodities. The question has always been, How do we control production? The pending amendment is one which is designed to have lighter weight animals marketed. It can go to conference, if my colleagues will agree to the amendment. If any refining should be needed, staff personnel would be able to do it. The amendment does not spell how the provision would be carried out, primarily because I think the regulations should be drawn up by the Secretary and the technicians in the Department.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

We had occasion to pass upon this very amendment a couple of days ago, when it was attached to an amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. The amendment which is now under consideration would permit the Secretary to make incentive payments to producers who market lightweight cattle and hogs. Payments would be made from section 32 funds, as has been stated by the author of the amendment. The purpose of the amendment is to reduce surplus production of beef and pork products.

I wish to say this amendment was considered by the committee, but was rejected on the ground that an incentive payment program, with all the implications involved, should not be enacted without full hearings. The committee also thought it would result in an increase in the total production of beef and pork.

One of the questions that bothered the committee very much was in respect to making a determination as to the marketing of cattle and hogs at lighter than normal weights. The amendment proposes that payments be made to farmers who sell their cattle and hogs at lighter than normal weights.

But, Mr. President, what are lighter than normal weights? If the normal weight for hogs is fixed at, let us say, 190 pounds, how much less would the hogs have to be in weight, so that the farmer could receive the payments? As I recall from the discussion we have had, it probably would be necessary for each sow, each calf, and each hog to be weighed separately. The administrative difficulties involved would be so great that the program would be unworkable.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The point is that under the amendment the Secretary will provide the rules and regulations. The Senator from Louisiana will remember that the amendment I offered in the committee provided a detailed plan.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I recall, the vote in the committee was 9 to 6 or 9 to 7 against the amendment.

But this amendment is permissive, and permits the Secretary to do as he sees fit.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am willing to raise the authorization for additional section 32 funds to $500 million or more, instead of the $250 million as is now provided in the bill. By using these funds to purchase surplus perishable products we can help stabilize the market and get it back to normal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 more minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me read the amendment:

In order to encourage the marketing of cattle and hogs at lighter than normal weights—

So it would be necessary for the Secretary to make that determination.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. What would it be?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Department must have a fairly good idea.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose we estimate that the normal weight of a hog is 190 pounds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The normal weight of a hog would be approximately 225 pounds, more or less.

Mr. ELLENDER. How about determining the minimum weight?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It depends upon how many pounds they wish to remove from the market supply.

Mr. ELLENDER. What would that be?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If it is desired to bring the price of hogs up to 80 percent or 90 percent of parity, it would be necessary to remove approximately 800 million pounds of hogs from the market. That would be done by marketing hogs at 200 pounds or less, rather than at the present average of 225 or 240 pounds.

Mr. ELLENDER. What about the minimum weight?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Secretary would have to determine that.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is where the trouble would begin. If payments depended upon the minimum weight and the maximum weight, then each hog and each cow sold would have to be weighed separately.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They are already fairly well tabulated that way on the bill of sale, when they come into the yards. We went over this point fairly well in the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was because of this administrative difficulty that the committee rejected the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; the committee rejected it because under the detailed plan which I then included in the amendment, there was no provision to prevent the inclusion of some old sow or old hog that might be practically on its last legs and would be unable to come up to the standards required for a good animal.

But I do not think there is any need to debate the amendment further, Mr. President.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with my distinguished colleague. Let us vote on the amendment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. If authority is provided for the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe, according to rules and regulations which he may develop, that would be a better arrangement than to have the Congress make provision for the regulations, and include the regulations in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but I do not see how the Secretary could fix the regulations and still eliminate the necessity of determining the weight of each

animal. Suppose the Secretary determined that in order for the farmer to receive these incentive payments, the hog could not weigh more than 190 pounds or less than 160 pounds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Secretary would not fix the minimum; he would fix only the maximum.

Mr. ELLENDER. Even so, every hog would have to be weighed, and so would all the cattle.

Mr. KERR. At the present time is it not necessary to weigh all the hogs that are purchased?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not individually.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There are weighers who can determine the weight of the hogs just by spotting them or looking at them as they pass through.

Mr. KERR. Yes; within 2 pounds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. At any rate, a number of additional persons would have to be employed to make and record that determination.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; that is done by the buyer; and if payments are made, he has to certify the weights to the county committee.

Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from Louisiana has done heroic work on the bill, and he is a good fighter. But we have only to examine the soil-bank provision of the bill to see that the Secretary will do everything in that connection. Not only will he prescribe and describe, but he will also ascribe. Under the soil-bank provisions we provide that the Secretary shall prescribe the acreage for the entire country. As a result, he would virtually have to measure every allotted acre in the country. So I think the Secretary will be able to do the things required by this amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not suppose we shall get anywhere by arguing the matter further. I repeat, the administration of such an amendment will be so complicated that it will require employment of a large number of additional personnel. There would have to be people at the packing sheds to weigh each hog and determine what the incentive payment should be as to each hog.

Mr. President, I believe the Senate should reject the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand, neither the authors of the amendment nor the chairman of the committee desire the yeas and nays on this amendment. So if all time is exhausted, a vote can now be had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for himself and other Senators.

The amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I call up the amendment offered on behalf of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and myself. It is designated "2–17–56–G."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 27, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "$250,000,000" and insert "$500,000,000."

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to arm the Secretary of Agriculture with a more effective weapon to carry out whatever provisions may ultimately be in this bill in connection with programs of support by the Secretary of Agriculture for agricultural products.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the committee I had offered a proposal authorizing the $500 million additional of section 32 funds, as suggested by the Senator in his amendment. I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield back his time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back all the time I have.

Mr. KERR. I yield back all my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All unused time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] for himself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not offering an amendment. I am asking unanimous consent to suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to either side, until a certain Senator who has an amendment to offer may have an opportunity to reach the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to strike out section 307 of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is quite simple. In the bill there is contained a provision at page 29 headed "Cargo Preference on Sales for Foreign Currency." It is section 307 of the bill. That provision repeals the so-called 50–50 cargo preference law with respect to certain commodities, including some under the agricultural act. Some people in the Department, and others, as well, feel that this provision might be a deterrent to a freer movement under the surplus-sales program.

This question has been discussed at length, and many of us feel very strongly about it. The sole purpose of the 50–50 cargo preference law, which had been added to many foreign aid programs, and was finally made a permanent part of the law by an almost unanimous vote of the Senate, on not 1 but perhaps 8 or 10 occasions, has been a very vital factor in the development of our American merchant marine.

I need not repeat what I have said in the past. Senators have heard me discuss this question before. It is difficult enough to keep our merchant marine alive, without too many unnecessary and high subsidies, even with the 50–50 provision. I believe I could convince the Senate, if I had the time, or if we held hearings, that the repeal of the provision would have very little effect on the broad agricultural program of surplus disposals.

Even if it were true that the provision did have some bearing on the agricultural program, that bearing would be so minute, compared with the almost ruinous situation that would occur in the American merchant marine, that, in weighing the two factors in the balance, I am sure I could convince any Senator—realizing that we have both agricultural problems and merchant marine problems in a troubled world—that we should not retain the repeal provision in the bill before the Senate.

Frankly, I do not believe that, technically, it belongs in the measure. A bill dealing with this subject was introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. Oddly enough, that bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. No hearings have been held on the bill. I believe that logically it should have been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, where merchant marine matters are considered.

I see on the floor the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], who is the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Both of us can assure the Senate that we will very promptly hold hearings on that bill, or on the whole subject.

As strong a supporter of the merchant marine as I am, I feel that there should be some modification made in the law, because of the situation in Florida, in California, and in other parts of the country. Certainly it was never intended that perishables should be included in the law. The law should be amended with respect to perishables.

The amount involved is minute so far as tonnage is concerned. In addition, there are very few reefers that fly the American flag. As a matter of fact, the Senator from California and I know that no reefers flying the American flag come to the west coast.

The law affects the shipment of citrus fruits from Florida. We will hold hearings on the whole subject, and we will discuss it with everyone who is interested, including those interested in agriculture and those interested in the merchant marine.

I do feel that the Senate should not include this provision in a broad agricultural bill. It is a separate matter, and it is of vital concern to the merchant marine. We believe that no Senator would want to go along with such a provision if he knew all the facts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thoroughly agree with what the Senator has said. I should like to ask him two questions. First, is it not true that 78 percent of exports are shipped in foreign bottoms, even though we have the 50–50 law on the books, because of the fact that American ships are not available at the ports where they are required?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; our merchant marine is in that condition. The foreign maritime countries haul between 77 and 80 percent of our outbound cargoes. Therefore, we are dealing with only 20 percent of the cargoes, and only a small portion of that includes Government-financed programs.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The argument is made that the amendment of the Senator, with which I am in hearty accord, would slow up the disposal of surplus agricultural products. Is it not true that the Secretary of Agriculture issued a release this afternoon in which he said that he is pleased to be able to report that as of today not only have actual agreements been made totaling $1,200,000,000, but that negotiations are also under way that should lead to the disposal of the remainder of the $1,500,000,000 program in the very near future? Therefore we are ahead on that program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct. I have received those figures too. The surplus program had a contingent terminal date of June 30, 1957.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. A 3-year period.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Three years; that is correct. The total is $1,500,000,000. As of yesterday the Government had reached an agreement with Chile, South Korea, and Turkey, involving a total of $82 million. The Government has now reached agreements in the amount stated by the Senator, $1,200,000,000. Furthermore, the Department of Agriculture stated today that they should have a completion of the entire $1,500,000,000 program in the very near future, and prior to the termination date.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Therefore the 50–50 provision has not been slowing up the sale of the surplus commodities. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; I do not believe it has. I think it is of little importance to the program. However, any weighing in the balance of the disastrous effects it would have on the merchant marine must convince Senators that the provision should be repealed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope the Senator's amendment will prevail.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator. I do not wish to burden the Senate further. I have an array of figures before me. They prove that the 50–50 provision has not had the effect on the surplus disposal program some thought it would have. Without doubt I could convince any Senator that it does have a real effect on our merchant marine, which we are trying to keep alive and adequate. It is a merchant marine that we need.

I assure the Senate, as I have assured the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in which I am sure the Senator from Maryland will join me, that we will proceed with the matter efficiently and promptly, and make some modifications if we find that such modifications can be made.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to hear the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce assure the Senate that hearings will be held on the measure to amend or change greatly the definition of the 50–50 provision, which in the case of my State has been very, very hurtful in a dollars-and-cents-way.

Mr. President, I should like first to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter under date of July 12, 1955 addressed to me by Mr. M. E. Hearn, Florida Citrus Mutual export coordinator. I have already shown the letter to the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and I have discussed the letter with the people concerned in Florida.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLORIDA CITRUS MUTUAL,
Lakeland, Fla., July 12, 1955.

S. 2253.
Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: We understand there is a strong possibility of opposition developing on the floor of the Senate over the 50–50 proviso elimination in this bill, recently approved by the Agriculture Committee.

Insofar as fruits are concerned, we questioned the wisdom of this measure which stipulated that half the cargoes moved by American-flag vessels where Mutual Security Act funds were involved, as far back as February 25, 1954, with the Foreign Operations Administration charged with handling this program. At that time, we pointed out to Mr. Arthur G. Syran, Director of the Office of Transportation in FOA what difficulties were involved in adhering to this condition.

From the practical standpoint of the fruit exporter whose merchandise must move in refrigerated space to assure sound outturns at destination, it has been found that no American shipping concern was interested in diverting scheduled vessels to Florida ports for the European run. When the Spanish citrus freeze hit in early February 1954, we contacted every American shipbroker to find suitable space for the anticipated heavy orange movement out of Jacksonville or Fort Pierce to Rotterdam; the only replies received were from agents of Scandinavian and British shipping concerns. The same thing occurred in the fall of 1954. And, with the exception of an infinitesimal volume going through New York Harbor on regular scheduled European Continent runs by American vessels, every single box of the total volume of 1,500,000 boxes of oranges and grapefruit exported by this State to Europe went by Norwegian, Danish, Swedish, or British boats during the 1954–55 season. There simply are no unscheduled refrigerated boats of United States registry to be found.

The second question raised with the FOA was the matter of freight terms and conditions of payment. In 1954 we were approached by representatives of United States merchant shipping lines operating out of Florida, with the request that we use our influence to get processors to move their canned citrus by American ships. However, United States shipping lines were not prepared either to accept "freight payable at destination by consignee" or "freight payable in currency of country of destination" terms offered by competing foreign lines. To countries overseas, anxious to harbor their dollar reserves, paying for the freight in advance in United States currency was totally unacceptable if that was the requirement of American shipping lines, consequently the overwhelming proportion of the canned citrus exported went on foreign-flag boats. Whether the strict requirements of dollar payment in advance for freight are still in force on United States shipping, we do not know, but the fact still remains that a potentially large volume of business was lost to foreign fleets in past years. And, by giving consistently satisfactory delivery, many European shipping lines are now enjoying steady repeat business from Florida processors exporting to Holland, Germany, Belgium, and other areas.

The third point we raised, and have repeatedly brought up in talks with other fruit trade organizations was that this 50–50 is without question highly discriminatory. As you know, the fruit industry of this country has opposed discrimination in every way, shape, size, and form, not only because we are one of the major victims but also because it hampers the normal flow of international trade and the natural interplay of open competition. We were particularly fearful of the reactions of foreign countries, particularly those maritime nations, traditionally good customers for American fruit, whose international trading deficits are recouped by invisible exports such as shipping and freight receipts. Last December, Mr. J. Henry Burke warned Florida Citrus Mutual's export committee that unless this 50–50 proviso were eliminated from Public Law 480, we could not expect any business in fruits from countries like Denmark and Norway; how accurate his prediction was is shown by the fact that these two markets are closed to us except on highly involved and complicated barter deals.

This 50–50 proviso was the major stumbling block that marred the United Kingdom-United States apple deal in October

1954, and we feel sure Truman Nold will be glad to furnish you with full details on the disastrous results of this delay in the negotiations.

The main point in Public Law 480 is that it is a trading bill, not a relief or gift scheme such as section 402 of Public Law 665. In other words, this country is trying to sell some of its agricultural commodities, not give them away. And, as seller, the United States must follow the wishes of its potential customers as to the means of transportation to be used. If it refuses, then there will be no sale in a number of instances.

Assuming freight rates on different methods of transportation to be equal, we believe a buyer has the option of selecting how his purchase will move from a plant to his warehouse. Atlantic Ocean steamship rates are, we believe, the same whether it be American, British, Dutch, or any other line, as these are determined by steamship conference agreements. So, logically, the foreign buyer should be able to choose what line his purchases under Public Law 480 should travel.

One way to settle any possible controversy over the 50–50 elimination would be to make the sales of eligible agricultural commodities on an f. o. b. United States port basis (and the buyer to select his transportation as he wishes), but to stipulate that any strategic materials acquired with the counterpart funds be moved in United States-flag ships. We suggest this as a compromise in the event of a deadlock during the debate of S. 2253 on the floor of the Senate.

At all events, we should like you to know that we warmly support your position on this piece of legislation, and trust that its passage will result in an increased movement of all agricultural commodities to overseas countries.

Most sincerely yours,

M. E. HEARN,
Export Coordinator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to point out also that the 50–50 provision is not mandatory, as some people claim it is. It is flexible. It is not mandatory ship by ship. I must say also that some countries have used it as a lever. We had some trouble with one sale to Denmark, in which this matter was brought up. I ran this incident down very carefully, and there was only one sale.

In view of the progress of the general program, and in view of what repeal of the law would do to the American merchant marine, I do not understand what benefits would flow from such a repeal. It is a flexible law. Over the years we have tried to strike a balance and an average.

I remember when I first introduced the 50–50 provision in the first foreign-aid bill some Senator said, "Why 50–50? Why not 100 percent in American bottoms"?

It simply does not work that way, Mr. President. It has not been a hardship on other countries. They haul almost 80 percent of our outbound cargoes, and I think that is more than the lion's share.

We are having a most difficult time keeping our merchant marine alive. We appropriate billions of dollars for the defense of our country, and rightly so. I serve on the Appropriations Committee, and I have voted for those funds. They are appropriated on the premise that if trouble comes it will be away from our shores. When we go away from our shores, Mr. President, that means that water is involved. Our merchant marine in World War I hauled over 90 percent of the cargoes going to our troops abroad.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield, although I have promised time to the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]——

Mr. HOLLAND. This is a very vital matter to our people, and I would not be satisfied by a token recognition and the privilege of asking a question or two, and unless we can show our case in the RECORD——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, from the letter which I have just placed in the RECORD I should like to read two quotations, because they show clearly the practical workings in connection with the shipment of fresh and perishable commodities from my State, and, I believe, with reference to the Senator's State, for it applies in even greater measure to Pacific coast shipments.

I quote this paragraph:

From the practical standpoint of the fruit exporter, whose merchandise must move in refrigerated space to assure sound outturns at destination, it had been found that no American shipping concern was interested in diverting scheduled vessels to Florida ports for the European run.

When the Spanish citrus freeze hit in early February 1954, we contacted every American shipbroker to find suitable space for the anticipated heavy orange movement out of Jacksonville or Fort Pierce to Rotterdam; the only replies received were from agents of Scandinavian and British shipping concerns. The same thing occurred in the fall of 1954. And, with the exception of an infinitesimal volume going through New York Harbor on regular scheduled European Continent runs by American vessels, every single box of the total volume of 1,150,000 boxes of oranges and grapefruit exported by this State to Europe went by Norwegian, Danish, Swedish, or British boats during the 1954–55 season. There simply are no unscheduled refrigerated boats of United States registry to be found.

There is more of the same, Mr. President. I take it that the distinguished Senator from Washington likewise knows that so far as refrigerated space is concerned, we simply do not have it in our American merchant marine.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It affects the State of Washington vitally, because there are practically no shipments on the Pacific coast under the American flag.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall not undertake to read further from this letter, but there is more to the same effect. The Department of Agriculture has said that until the measure to which reference has been made is repealed, we cannot get any citrus business under Public Law 480 from the United Kingdom and from other maritime European countries.

That warning has been justified, because we have not had a single shipment of citrus under P. L. 480, and since 1953 have been allowed to send to the United Kingdom, under MSA, only $500,000 worth of canned grapefruit sections, which formerly constituted our largest citrus business with that country, reaching as much as 1¾ million cases a year. This sale was finally worked out as a concession made to us by the United Kingdom, which has received great sums of money from us but will not deal with us.

Does the Senator from Washington have any objection to placing in the RECORD a copy of a recent letter addressed to him from M. E. Hearn, Export Coordinator?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from M. E. Hearn, Florida Citrus Mutual Export Coordinator, to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITRUS FLORIDA MUTUAL,
Lakeland, Fla., February 25, 1956.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: We deeply appreciate your courtesy and kindness in receiving Mr. Ernest Falk and myself last Wednesday, February 22, when we explained to you the crippling handicaps that face United States agriculture in selling its products to maritime nations under title I of Public Law 480 as long as the 50–50 cargo preference stipulation applies to this legislation.

This conviction was deepened during a recent visit by a 10-man delegation of the Florida citrus industry to Europe investigating export opportunities for our products.

At a luncheon given by the United States agricultural attaché in the Columbia Club, London, on January 17, 1956, to which the Florida delegation and top-ranking members of the British Ministeries of Agriculture, Board of Trade and Treasury were invited, Mr. R. E. Stedman, Under Secretary for the Ministry of Agriculture openly told the group that until such time as the 50–50 preference clause was stricken from title I of the Agricultural Trade Development Act of 1954 (i. e., P. L. 480), his country would not even discuss purchasing an ounce of United States fruits under the act.

Identical statements were made to that portion of the Florida delegation visiting Norway and Denmark during the trip. The United States Agricultural and Commercial Attachés to Great Britain and Scandinavia likewise confirmed it. Even the many people in the fruit import trades of these countries, who for years have been desperately anxious to resume normal purchases of United States fruit and fruit products frankly admitted that unless this proviso was repealed, the chances of our securing anything but occasional token shipments through section 402 of the Mutual Security Act looked hopeless.

Proof of the position taken by these maritime countries is shown in the official summaries of sales made under title I of Public Law 480 as of October 14, 1955. With one solitary exception—a sale of $15,200,000—worth of tobacco to England who automatically was raising additional revenue by the excise taxes levied on British tobacco concerns—not one agricultural commodity has been sold to the United Kingdom, Denmark or Norway under this law. Any unbiased parties are emphatic this will continue to be so until the repeal of the 50–50 preference clause.

In a lengthy talk with Mr. R. E. Stedman on February 2, 1956, at the British Ministry of Agriculture, the undersigned was informed that Her Majesty's Government did not dispute the justice and validity of the 50–50 clause under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, Public Law 665, section 402, and title II of Public Law 480 where a definite element of aid was involved. Under title I of Public

Law 480, however, the British Government maintains it was Congress' specific intent to place United States agricultural products, currencywise, on an equally competitive basis as those of competing soft-currency countries, and, as such, it can only be regarded as a trade-facilitating measure. Disposal of the counterpart funds are a purely secondary consideration to the sale itself.

(It might be relevant to note in the sale of $15.2 million worth of tobacco to the United Kingdom, that the British conceded to waive the 50–50 proviso because the counterpart sterling were diverted to mutually beneficial military projects in the form of housing construction for United States Air Force personnel based in England, and this was considered as an aid project.)

Of considerable significance, too, is these maritime nations point out, without fear of contradiction, that even with the currency convertibility problem resolved for United States agricultural commodities, there are many other countries capable of furnishing these products and are highly competitive both qualitywise and pricewise but who do not demand that 50 percent of the tonnage move in their own bottoms. Boiled down to plain cold facts, United States agriculture, to sell, must be in a position to offer identical terms, right across the board, that its competitors are offering.

Faced with this position, it becomes clear that if we ever hope to sell any substantial amounts of American agricultural products to England, Denmark, and Norway—and it must be remembered they provided an enormous outlet for a wide range of such items prewar—then the 50–50 proviso must be removed from title I of Public Law 480.

Notwithstanding this, we strongly concur with you that our own maritime interests, for national defense purposes, should not be endangered. And it is our belief that if a compromise, mutually acceptable to both agriculture and shipping can be reached, where each group helped in a constructive manner to resolve the other party's problem, such a plan would be infinitely preferable to lengthy hearings and debates in the Senate that might only result in bitterness and resentment.

It was with this in view that we suggested to you last Wednesday, the following solution:

In exchange for eliminating the 50–50 Cargo Preference Act from title I of Public Law 480, add such a stipulation to sections 104 (b) and 104 (d) of that law and, likewise, extend this proviso to cover United States purchases of strategic materials under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as well as any aid or offshore procurement programs undertaken by the United States Government.

At present all strategic materials acquired under either Public Law 480 or Public Law 665 are not required to move 50 percent in American-flag ships. Yet those purchases are definitely United States-financed commodities. For goods purchased abroad for relief purposes to a third country, these are without question aid programs paid for by this country and the United States merchant marine is entitled to move 50 percent of them in their vessels. Likewise, offshore purchases of materials for airbases overseas (e. g., German cement and steel for United States Air Force bases in Spain) should, by rights move 50 percent in American ships.

Such a plan would not only give the United States merchant marine a fair share in homebound cargoes by carrying these strategic materials (a type of cargo which you believed highly desirable as many American vessels are presently returning home in ballast which hikes their overall operating costs and outbound freight charges), but it would also give it far greater worldwide operating flexibility, as well as being of general overall assistance in maintaining volume revenue.

We are convinced the additional freight business arising from such a plan would offset many times any possible loss that may be incurred by eliminating the 50–50 proviso from title I on outbound shipments.

In our conversation, you indicated that such a plan might prove workable. For our part, we feel confident that a concession such as is requested by agriculture from the merchant marine would be reciprocated by agriculture supporting the merchant marine's request to extend the 50–50 proviso to cover inbound strategic material cargoes, aid programs, and other United States Government-financed projects covered by Public Law 665 and Public Law 480 described above.

As we informed you, we are positive that a partial compromise on title I, such as elimination of specific geographical areas (i. e., England, Denmark, and Norway) from the proviso, or eliminating perishable commodities like fruits, or striking it out from private-stock sales, would be totally unacceptable to these aggrieved maritime nations. Their feeling is that a fundamental basic principle is involved, so that a half-hearted gesture would be worse than none at all.

We sincerely hope that you and Senator HOLLAND can get together on this knotty problem and resolve it to everybody's satisfaction.

Very truly yours,

M. E. HEARN,
Export Coordinator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to read from that letter, because it shows again the difficult situation we have met:

At a luncheon given by the United States agricultural attaché in the Columbia Club, London, on January 17, 1956, to which the Florida delegation and top-ranking members of the British Ministries of Agriculture, Board of Trade, and Treasury were invited, Mr. R. E. Stedman, Under Secretary for the Ministry of Agriculture, openly told the group that until such time as the 50–50 preference clause was stricken from title I of the Agricultural Trade Development Act of 1954 his country would not even discuss purchasing an ounce of United States fruits under the act.

Identical statements were made to that portion of the Florida delegation visiting Norway and Denmark during the trip.

Mr. President, there are other words of caution in this letter, which would indicate that greater refrigerated space will not help the situation. It is a serious problem with an industry which does not ask for price supports and has prided itself on building up a very heavy export business. We do not want to be penalized by a provision in our law which was well intentioned, but which has brought distress to our people.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I share the Senator's problem. I have the same one in my State. I can assure the Senator that we shall get at it promptly and try to work it out to the satisfaction of everyone.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and I have joined in a bill which would bring about the result desired. It has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It has been suggested that it should be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Department of Agriculture has reported on it favorably. The State Department has reported on it favorably, and the Department of Commerce has reported adversely. If the Senator from Washington will say to us that it is not going to be put off and is not going to be stymied, and that there will be an opportunity for farm organizations to be heard, we shall be perfectly happy to have the bill go to his committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I assure the Senator that prompt hearings will be had.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the Members of the Senate ought to know that the bill was introduced on the 20th of July 1955. It is Senate bill 2584. Under date of October 28, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was supplied with a favorable report from the Department of State, and on the 2d of November 1955, it was supplied with a favorable report from the Department of Agriculture, but not until March 5 of this year did a report come from the Department of Commerce, and it was adverse. If anyone can read anything from that, it would be that the Department of Agriculture was for it and replied promptly, the State Department was for it and replied promptly, but the Department of Commerce dragged its feet.

The assurance of a prompt hearing is given by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but the bill is before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, depending upon what the action of the Senate is on this amendment, it is my intention to request that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that it be referred instead to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This action on my part, I may state, is predicated on the assurance of the senior Senator from Washington that prompt hearings will be held on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to say to the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that I have checked again this afternoon the schedule of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I hope to set the hearings, or I will promise that they will be set, for the week after the Easter recess.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I may say, then, as the Senator who introduced the bill—and it was done as the result of a debate and colloquy which the Senator from New Mexico had last year—that with the assurance of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, if the bill shall be transferred to his committee, I would not resist the proposal to have the provision removed from the farm bill, because I am perfectly agreeable to having adequate hearings held before the Senator's committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would object to taking the provision out of the farm bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is under the control of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think I have said as much as I want to say. I wish to yield to the Senator from Maryland, who has been active in this matter and knows about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator state how much time he yields to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. MAGNUSON. How much time have I remaining?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator from Washington yield to me, so that I may make a brief announcement?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have talked with many Senators on both sides of the aisle. At present some 60 amendments have not been disposed of. I am certain that about half of them are duplications, and that the Senate probably will not have to act on more than 20 or 30 amendments.

It does not appear that it would be possible to conclude action on the bill tonight, even by remaining in session to a late hour. I have talked with the distinguished minority leader about the situation. We are both very anxious to have action on the bill completed on Monday, if that is possible. We, of course, must be guided by the will of the Senate.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] if either of them desires to have the yeas and nays ordered on the amendment. If so, the yeas and nays ought to be ordered, so that Senators may know there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment. Following the action on this amendment, it is the intention of the leadership to move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock on Monday morning.

I think every Senator should be on notice, wherever he may be tonight and tomorrow, that on Monday the Senate will try to finish action on the bill. There will be several yea-and-nay votes, and I hope a yea-and-nay vote on final passage.

I hope the staff members will take proper notice of this announcement, and will notify every Senator who is not in the city that his presence is requested in the Senate on Monday next.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, can the Senator from Texas give assurance that the Senate will remain in session on Monday until the bill has been passed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; the Senator from Texas could never give that assurance.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry followed this procedure when the bill was about to be reported. If the chairman had not prevailed upon the committee to stay in session until the bill was finally ordered reported, the committee might have kept the bill under consideration for 2 or 3 weeks longer.

Why do we not agree tonight—right now—that when we convene at 11 o'clock on Monday morning, we will stay with the bill until it has been passed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Because the Senator from Texas does not want to take the responsibility of asking the Senate to stay in session every night for 2 or 3 weeks.

Mr. ELLENDER. We did that in the committee; and all the members of the committee are in good health.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Texas attempted to do that, I think some Senators might be equally arbitrary, and the first thing I knew the Senate would likely be voting on each of the 60 amendments. The Senate has spent 44 hours this week in actual sessions on the bill. I think that is a good, average workweek.

I do not want to impose my will on any Senator; but I believe the decision which the leadership has reached represents the decision of the majority of the Members of the Senate.

I tried today to get a unanimous-consent agreement to limit the time for debate on each amendment to 15 minutes for each side. Some Senators would not agree to that proposal. The request may be renewed on Monday, if it is thought possible to obtain such consent.

In any event, we will try to finish action on the bill on Monday, if that be at all possible. But I shall not ask Senators to stay in session until midnight or 1 o'clock in the morning when there is no hope of finishing action on the bill. I do not believe there is a single Senator who thinks it is possible for the Senate to act on 60 amendments between now and 12 o'clock tonight.

If the Senator from Washington, or any other Senator, wishes to ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment, he may ask for them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think we need the yeas and nays. I think all Senators understand the importance of the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me? I will yield myself a half a minute on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know what the judgment of the Senate will be on the question of asking for the yeas and nays. Whichever way the vote on the amendment is handled will be satisfactory, so far as I am concerned. But until that issue has been determined—and no Senator will know the answer until a request has been made and the question determined—all Senators should assume that there will be a yea-and-nay vote, and should make themselves available when the time for the vote comes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wanted to speak briefly, before a request was made for the yeas and nays, because what I shall say may impress some Senators with the importance of having a yea-and-nay vote. However, if the Senate is willing to agree to a yea-and-nay vote now, I shall have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest that the Senator from Vermont make his request now, and renew it later, if necessary.

Mr. AIKEN. I will make the request now. If I do not succeed now, I shall renew my request later.

Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the past 5 minutes of debate not be taken out of my time, because it was used for a discussion of Senate business, and not for a discussion of my amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will yield from the time on the bill whatever additional time the Senator from Washington may require.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have heretofore spoken on the amendment to some extent. I think the colloquy on the floor shows the necessity, and I may say the absolute necessity, of having the bill which is now before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—the Case bill—referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for a study of the problem involved. It is indeed a very complex problem.

Hasty or improper action, in my opinion, if section 307 shall not be removed, may in one fell swoop destroy the American merchant marine. I point out to Senators that 80 percent of the cargoes of our tramp ships, or our entire American tramp fleet, is the type of cargo covered by section 307. So it can be seen what hasty action would do. It would compel the tying up of our tramp fleet or the transfer of those vessels to foreign flags, which would cost some 3,000 jobs at sea and innumerable jobs on shore.

I think the only proper action for the Senate to take in a case of this kind, where such a weighty issue is involved, is to allow the matter to be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, where it belongs, in order that full hearings may be held, and then to have the matter come to the floor, where it can be debated as a single issue. We were perfectly willing to follow that course last year. In the committee we asked that that be done. A bill was introduced by the Senator from North Dakota. Instead of the bill going to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce wanted to hold hearings on the proposal. We are convinced that if full hearings are held on the matter, we will demonstrate the correctness of our position.

We know that no Member of the Senate would do anything which would hurt the American merchant marine. We want to air the whole subject.

I plead with the Senate, when the yea-and-nay vote is taken, to vote section 307 out of the bill. Do not take the chance of destroying the American merchant marine. First, it is necessary to know all the facts. I say that all the facts cannot be known from the short debate we have had on the proposal.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. PAYNE. I am wholly in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I have prepared in support of the amendment, together with the text of the conclusions and recommendations of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in House Report No. 1818, 84th Congress. The record then will be rather full and complete, because the hearings which were held by the House committee ran to 599 pages, and the committee report itself contains about 30 pages; it is very comprehensive.

In the 83d Congress I had the privilege of being a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which drafted the Cargo Preference Act. I know what it means to the merchant marine of this country to make certain that it has certain rights and privileges.

There being no objection, the statement and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

Section 307 of the pending bill would exclude transactions under the Agricultural Trade and Assistance Act of 1954 from the provisions of the Cargo Preference Act. I should like to speak briefly in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to delete that section from the pending bill.

During the 83d Congress, it was my privilege to serve as a member of the Water Transportation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce when the Cargo Preference Act was drafted. The importance of the American merchant marine to our Nation's defense and commerce is so obvious that elaboration is not necessary during this debate on the farm bill. Nor is this an appropriate time to discuss the problems facing the American merchant marine and the American shipbuilding industry.

The provisions of the Cargo Preference Act (Public Law 664, 83d Cong.) apply only to shipments in which the Federal Government has a financial interest such as foreign aid or surplus farm commodities from CCC bins. It does not apply to ordinary commercial shipments in which the Federal Government has no financial interest. Furthermore, the act does not apply if United States-flag bottoms are not available and it does not apply if they are not available at fair and reasonble rates.

Recently the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who is one of the best versed men on farm matters not only in the Senate but in the entire United States, discussed with me complaints he had received from apple growers in his State indicating they were unable to obtain cargo space for apple shipments overseas. These growers blamed the Cargo Preference Act for their inability to obtain cargo space. Since their shipments would be ordinary commercial shipments, the Cargo Preference Act was not applicable to their case. This illustrates some of the confusion in people's minds over the scope and purpose of this law.

Recently the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries held 10 days of hearings and issued a report on the operation and administration of the Cargo Preference Act with particular reference to its relation to the farm surplus disposal program. The printed hearings run to 599 pages and the committee report to 30 pages; this is a comprehensive and thorough review of this whole question. In its report the House committee propounded eight questions on the relationship of the Cargo Preference Act to the farm surplus disposal program. In abbreviated form those questions and answers are as follows:

Question 1. Has the cargo-preference law impaired the success of the farm products disposal program under title I, Public Law 480?

Answer. It definitely has not.

Question 2. Has the cargo-preference law been detrimental to the title I, Public Law 480, program?

Answer. The evidence shows that only one country, Denmark, has definitely rejected an offer and that amounting to $7.7 million or about 1½ percent of the total export value of commodities scheduled for disposal.

Question 3. Has the cargo-preference law imposed an excessive financial burden upon the appropriations made available for carrying out title I, Public Law 480?

Answer. Definitely not.

Question 4. Does compliance with the cargo-preference law impose an unwarranted administrative burden upon the Government agencies responsible for its operation?

Answer. Definitely not.

Question 5. Has the cargo-preference law established an undesirable precedent in world trade?

Answer. Definitely not.

Question 6. Has the cargo-preference law hindered the efforts of the State Department and other agencies to obtain liberalization by foreign nations of trade restrictions and quotas?

Answer. Nebulous but doubtful.

Question 7. Is the cargo-preference law essential to the American merchant marine?

Answer. Definitely; yes.

Question 8. If the cargo-preference law were made inapplicable to shipments under title I, Public Law 480, could the assistance afforded by its provisions to the American merchant marine be replaced with direct subsidy?

Answer. Definitely not.

The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries made the following recommendation at the conclusion of its report:

"The committee recommends to the House that it vigorously opposes all efforts to change or modify the Cargo Preference Act as presently applied to Government-sponsored cargoes. The record of the hearings contains overwhelming evidence of the vital relationship between the 50–50 law and the American merchant marine. Any weakening of this law would have tragic consequences."

The information contained in the recent House committee report on this subject indicates that the provisions of the Cargo Preference Act are not an impediment to transactions under the Agricultural Trade and Assistance Act. The report further indicates that the removal of shipments of surplus farm commodities from the cargo-preference program would have serious adverse effects on the American merchant marine. I shall, therefore, support the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) to strike section 307 from the pending bill.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, HOUSE REPORT 1818, 84TH CONGRESS

CONCLUSIONS

It became apparent as the hearings progressed that the opponents of the 50–50 Cargo Preference Act were united as to the grounds for objection. The Department of Agriculture listed three separate disadvantages of cargo preference: (a) loss of opportunities to move commodities abroad; (b) added cost to the farm program; and (c) hampering efforts to obtain trade liberalization on agricultural commodities. Basically, the views of all other adverse witnesses fell into one of these three categories. It can be said, too, that by far the most important factor is the position taken by the maritime nations of Western Europe. Perhaps the best way to analyze the merits of all the objections which have been raised to the 50–50 principle, whether major or minor, is to consider the following crucial questions:

1. Has the cargo-preference law impaired the success of the farm products disposal program under title I of Public Law 480?

It definitely has not. This is not a conclusion based upon the fact that during the first 18 months of the program—one-half the 3-year period set in the act—there has been committed for disposal $769 million worth of farm products, or one-half the $1.5 billion authorized in the act. Rather, it is the appraisal given by the Government officials of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of State, and the International Cooperation Administration, the very people who oppose the 50–50 law. The Deputy Under Secretary of State went so far as to say that the program was more successful than was originally anticipated. The most that any of these witnesses could say against the law was that it increased the difficulties of negotiation in the case of a few countries.

2. Has the cargo-preference law been detrimental to the title I, Public Law 480, program?

The evidence shows that only one country, Denmark, has definitely rejected an offer and that amounting to $7.7 million or about 1½ percent of the total export value of commodities scheduled for disposal. Whether Denmark, an historically maritime nation, used the 50–50 clause as an excuse to refuse a deal it did not like for other reasons is not known and cannot be ascertained. There is also evidence that three other maritime nations of Western Europe have delayed negotiations in connection with $40 million worth of goods, with cargo preference as the apparent cause. Here again, even assuming the transactions are never consummated, although at present negotiations have not broken off completely—quite possibly, a significant fact—it is most speculative to attribute the failure solely to the existence of the cargo-preference law. There are many other factors, not the least important of which is price, which may be much greater contributing factors to the failure of these transactions than the mere manner of shipments.

So, in one sense and looking at the program strictly from the standpoint of disposal agreement failures, it could be said that the 50–50 principle has had some detrimental effect, albeit slight, upon the title I, Public Law 480, operation. However, the only fair approach to this question is to consider also the possible offsetting benefits to the program derived from the cargo-preference law. For example, the shipping expert from the Department of Agriculture readily agreed that without the American tramp fleet—whose continued existence has been made possible by 50–50—and without the ceiling on freight rates imposed by Public Law 664, the cost of ocean freight under the Public Law 480 program undeniably would have been much greater. How much greater, no one obviously can say. But, if 70 American-flag vessels are driven from the high seas and a completely unregulated freight market is left to foreign owners, it might not take long for agriculture to appreciate the true value of the 50–50 law and the American merchant marine.

3. Has the cargo preference law imposed an excessive financial burden upon the appropriations made available for carrying out title I of Public Law 480?

Definitely not. This objection clearly will not stand the test of factual analysis. Here again, the committee refers for evidence not to data supplied by the maritime industry or even by the Department of Commerce, but to testimony from the opponents of the 50–50 law.

As a matter of fact, the committee found that the American merchant marine, through use of reserve fleet vessels for grain storage purposes, is lightening the financial burden upon agriculture appropriations. As a rough calculation, it was estimated that storage charges amounting to almost $22 million annually are saved through the use of merchant vessels in the several reserve fleets. This is, in effect, an indirect subsidy afforded to agriculture by the American merchant marine.

To date, the ocean freight costs chargeable to the Commodity Credit Corporation have amounted to $53 million. Of this amount $27 million was paid in connection with the transportation of goods to five countries, Korea, Thailand, Turkey, Yugoslavia, and Pakistan. These countries have no merchant marines to speak of, and their currencies would not have been acceptable by any maritime nation for the freight charges. Therefore, it was incumbent upon the United States, if the deal was to be made at all, to supply the dollars to cover shipping costs. And this would have been true with or without 50–50.

Of the remaining $25 million, approximately $22 million was paid for transporting goods to countries which either have merchant marines or whose currency would be acceptable to foreign maritime nations. The balance of $3 million represents the differential between foreign- and American-tramp rates which under the law is absorbed by the United States. It is this $25 million to which reference has been made as constituting an undue and unwarranted burden upon appropriations made available for agriculture. Let us examine the figure more closely in the light of statements from opponents of 50–50.

First, it must be borne in mind that the $22 million is matched in full by the foreign purchasing country with the currency of that country. True, those funds are available only for use in that country and for certain specified purposes. If, however, some other agency of the United States Government elects to use a portion of the funds, CCC is reimbursed therefore in dollars. Also, at least some of the funds are expended for purposes which can reasonably be expected to result in a direct benefit to American agriculture. (See, for example, market development, sec. 104–a.)

It is important to remember, too, that the amounts paid to United States vessels for freight charges are no higher in the great majority of instances than would be paid to foreign lines. Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, an operating subsidy is paid to the liner companies, the effect of which is to equalize their operating expenses with that of their competitors. As a consequence, American liner companies are able to participate with foreign lines in conference agreements fixing uniform freight rates. In other words, this part of the freight costs is no more a burden to CCC than the cost of storing, rail charges, stevedoring, etc.

"But," it has been argued, "if we didn't have to use United States-flag vessels, we could let the foreign maritime nations carry all this cargo and thus save our farm dollars for more disposals." Let us see what the officials of Agriculture and ICA have to say on that score.

Mr. Garnett says, in effect: "Do away with the 50–50 law to appease the foreign maritime nations who object to it on principle only, but substitute for it a provision offering to pay 50 percent of all freight charges with American dollars. If you do this, the American merchant marine won't suffer at all because many nations will be eager to have the United States pay the freight. This includes even the maritime nations of Western Europe who oppose the principle of 50–50.

Obviously, Mr. Garnett's suggested substitute would involve the continued use of CCC dollars for freight. He does not contend otherwise. In fact, he said during the hearings that Agriculture has made no effort to conserve dollars in connection with freight charges. The use of dollars for freight has unquestionably facilitated the consummation of transactions with certain countries. In some cases, no deal could have been made otherwise.

But what does Agriculture get for the differential paid to United States tramps? The $3 million paid in this connection represents less than one-half of 1 percent of total program costs to date. This $3 million has kept 70 American-flag tramp vessels in operation and available for title I, Public Law 480, cargoes. It stands to reason that the existence of 70 vessels must have had a significant effect on any freight rates which are fixed by the law of supply and demand, as tramp rates are. If any estimate could be made, this factor alone has probably accounted for the entire $3 million.

In fact, the testimony from all witnesses as to the state of the present market, in which foreign-flag tramp rates have approached and in some cases even exceeded American-flag tramp rates, was to the effect that the control feature of Public Law 664 has acted as "an umbrella" over freight rates and kept them within reasonable limits.

It was inferred during the hearings that the administrative agencies do not ask of Congress any additional funds to cover this differential and, therefore, they feel it is a dissipation of funds appropriated for other purposes. This is entirely erroneous. The Congress appropriates funds to CCC for this freight differential just as definitely as if it were spelled out in terms. With the enactment of Public Law 664, containing specific authorization for cognizant agencies to absorb such an expense, each appropriation thereafter must be regarded legally as made available for such a purpose. The mere fact that the differential is not included in the budget request is immaterial.

Under those circumstances, can it logically be contended that the Cargo Preference Act imposes an "excessive" burden upon CCC appropriations? There may be some cost involved to be sure, but no objective analysis could fail to result in a finding that on the whole the money is well spent. It is to be hoped that the American taxpayer gets as much value out of the remaining $744 million as he does out of the $25 million in question.

4. Does compliance with the Cargo Preference Act impose an unwarranted administrative burden upon the Government agencies responsible for its operation?

Definitely not. As with all laws imposing restrictions or limitations upon the operations of the executive branch, some detail is necessarily involved in adhering to the provisions of Public Law 664. The advertising-for-bids laws, the fair labor standards laws, the printing and binding laws, the Buy American Act, and a myriad of others, involve some expense in the course of administration. And those employed in the various executive departments have from time to time expressed desires to be free of such controls. But in the last analysis, the Congress must be governed not by what any one individual or group of individuals may desire but by what is finally determined to be in the best interests of the entire country. In the case of the 50–50 law, even those charged with its administration said it was not unduly burdensome to carry out.

5. Has the cargo-preference law established an undesirable precedent in world trade?

Definitely not. The simple answer to this question is that any country which gives of its wealth to others or which sells its goods to others and then furnishes the money for the sale should have the right to carry one-half the goods. Of course, it is a known fact that the United States is the only Nation on earth in this category. But should Canada or any other nation with a surplus on hand decide to follow the precedent set by the application of 50–50 to title I of Public Law 480, the action would be not only understandable, but consistent with plain commonsense and in accord with every principle of equity and fair play.

6. Has the cargo-preference law hindered the efforts of the State Department and other agencies to obtain liberalization by foreign nations of trade restrictions and quotas?

This is another of those nebulous areas where no concrete answer is possible. We do know that many of the restrictions and limitations antedate the 50–50 principle in our law. We also know that cargo preference is only one of a great number of tariffs, quotas, restrictions, and contracts applicable to our foreign trade. Who is to say that the removal of one would have any appreciable influence in negotiations with foreign countries? None of the witnesses who cited this as an obstacle could say with certainty—or even with uncertainty, for that matter—that repeal of the cargo-preference law would guarantee removal of even one foreign restriction. Candidly, it is the view of the committee that this is one of those reasons that opponents of the 50–50 principle find it convenient to "toss in the pot" without fear of being clearly contradicted.

7. Is the cargo-preference law essential to the American merchant marine?

Definitely yes. The fact is that no member of the committee, informed as they are with respect to maritime matters, realized prior to the hearings just concluded how vitally necessary the Cargo Preference Act is to the American merchant marine. The more serious problem presented by the evidence now of record before the committee concerns the fate of our merchant fleet when the aid programs of the Government terminate. But first let us analyze the existing situation with the aid of uncontested statistics.

There are today a little over 1,000 ships in the active operating American merchant marine. Even the most conservative estimates from defense experts place this figure as representing a deficiency of several hundred vessels from what would be needed immediately upon the outbreak of a new war. Moreover, today the American merchant marine is carrying about 23 percent of the export-import commerce of the United States. In exports alone, where the aid cargoes are assured to United States-flag ships by force of the 50–50 law, some statistics showed we are carrying only 16 percent overall and the foreigners, the remaining 84 percent.

It has been suggested, however, that the American-flag liner fleet should compete on equal basis for all cargo, both commercial and Government-sponsored, and that the direct subsidy received by that segment should make such competition possible. The committee inquired into that phase of the problem specifically. It requested testimony from traffic men doing business on all three coasts of the United States and the direct question was put to them: Why can't you compete on equal basis with the foreign liners without the aid of 50–50?

The answer lies in a combination of factors each detrimental to American-flag shipping. One reason is that the nationals of other countries prefer to ship under their own flag and take steps to see that this is done. Shippers in this country do not have the same preference or at least do not have the bargaining power necessary to accomplish

the result. There is, of course, the dollar exchange problem which provides added impulse to the foreign exporter or importer. He is in a position where he must conserve dollars.

Another cause is traceable direct to the foreign governments themselves. And here we find the same countries who object to the protection afforded the American merchant marine under the 50–50 principle. Whenever the opportunity presents itself, these governments direct or instruct that the cargo be shipped in vessels of its own flag. Unfortunately, those in charge of directing shipping for United States Government cargoes are not governed by the same policy. If they were, specific legislation to effect cargo preference for Government-sponsored cargoes might not be necessary.

In July 1954, there were some 130 vessels in the American tramp fleet. Many were laid up for lack of cargoes and the remainder were barely able to make ends meet. The Maritime Administrator permitted almost half of these to transfer to foreign registry hoping that there would be enough United States Government-sponsored cargo to keep the remaining 70 vessels operating. These vessels are today in active operation. However, every competent maritime authority has stated that repeal of the cargo-preference law would result in the immediate demise of the entire American tramp fleet. The facts support this inasmuch as 78.5 percent of the business of American tramps during 1955 involved aid cargo. It is somewhat unusual that they were able to secure the remaining 21.5 percent on a purely commercial basis. The only explanation is that they happened to have vessels in the right places at the right times.

Aid cargoes accounted for 19.4 percent of American-flag liner carryings. If the 50–50 law were repealed, there is no reason to expect that the liners would be able to obtain any greater percentage of Government-sponsored cargo than in the case of their existing carryings of commercial cargo. The impact upon their financial condition which the loss of this business would entail could well mean the demise also of some of the marginal companies in the industry. It would also reduce the profit of even the most successful companies so seriously as to jeopardize the rebuilding program now just getting under way. Indeed, some companies might be so discouraged with the future prospects of the industry as voluntarily to abandon plans to replace their existing fleets.

So, the committee has concluded not only that the cargo-preference law is vital to the American merchant marine but that the national defenses of the United States would be needlessly jeopardized by any weakening changes in the provisions of Public Law 664. The tragedy of the situation is the lack of knowledge and understanding of the problem by those who publicly favor some amendment of the law. Those who testified along that line professed to having no facts on the effect such action would have on the merchant marine. They had chosen to study the matter of cargo-preference only from the standpoint of its impact upon American agriculture and international relations. The result was that the case they attempted to make out for changing the 50–50 law fell apart almost at the outset. The weakness of the opponents' case will be surprising to all who read the record.

8. If the Cargo Preference Act were made inapplicable to shipments under title I of Public Law 480, could the assistance afforded by its provisions to the American merchant marine be replaced with direct subsidy?

Definitely not. The Cargo Preference Act is designed to assure 50 percent of all United States Government sponsored cargoes to United States-flag ships. The operating expenses of United States-flag liner services are already on a parity with those of foreign competitors by reason of the subsidy granted them under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. However, this subsidy is paid only on the basis of expenses actually incurred on voyages made and invoices submitted to the Maritime Administration. So, under the 1936 act, the proposition is simple: No cargo—no voyages; and no voyages—no subsidy; which sooner or later, means no American merchant marine.

Also, under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 the Government is in partnership with the subsidized lines. Through the Federal Maritime Board and Administration the Government has a direct hand in the management of each company. This can, and often does, involve matters such as dividend policy, buying procedures, accounting controls, overhead expense, number of vessel sailings, and other operating details. Then each year the Government shares in the profits of the subsidized companies to the extent of one-half of all profits in excess of 10 percent of the capital. Is it so strange that this same Government should take steps to assure its merchant fleet of 50 percent of all cargoes sponsored by the Government?

To substitute direct subsidy for cargo preference would be wholly unfeasible and unjustified. In the first place, it would represent a complete departure from the parity principle of the 1936 act. It would involve an outright grant of money to the lines measured by their loss of business to foreign lines upon the repeal of the 50–50 law. During 1953 and 1954 American-flag ships carried 5,200,000 tons of aid cargo out of a total of 9,500,000 tons—or about 54 percent. At the present time, American-flag ships are carrying less than 20 percent of our exports including aid cargo. So, we could expect repeal of cargo preference to cause a loss of more than four-fifths of United States vessel carryings of aid cargo. For 1953 and 1954 this would have meant the loss of 4 million tons. During the hearings, the Maritime Administration used an average freight rate of $15 a ton which would have meant an outright payment of $60 million to United States companies to cover their losses without 50–50.

The amount of this payment is not nearly as shocking as the realization that we would be getting nothing for it. It would be the most inexcusable economic waste of public funds ever committed by the United States Government. We would be, in effect, paying twice for the same service, once to the foreign lines for carrying the freight and once to the American lines for not carrying it. Could there be anything more ridiculous than that?

The problem of whether a direct subsidy should be made available to United States-flag tramp vessels involves entirely different factors. Such a subsidy would unquestionably render unnecessary the present freight rate differential paid to American tramp vessels and which is chargeable to CCC funds so far as concerns shipments under title I of Public Law 480. It was stated during the hearings that this has amounted to about $3 million. Since, however, the differential is clearly delineated, so to that extent is not hidden or disguised, and since the amount involved is so small in comparison to the overall program as not to impede its success in any way, the question of whether the financial assistance necessary to keep the United States tramp fleet in active operation is charged to one appropriation or another does not impress the committee as being of crucial importance. The vital problem is retaining for all segments of the American merchant marine, including tramps, the cargo carryings made possible only by force of the Cargo Preference Act.

Recommendations

1. The committee recommends to the House that it vigorously oppose all efforts to change or modify the Cargo Preference Act as presently applied to Government-sponsored cargoes. The record of the hearings contains overwhelming evidence of the vital relationship betweeen the 50–50 law and the American merchant marine. Any weakening of this law would have tragic consequences.

2. The only other recommendation the committee has to make is addressed to the Federal Maritime Administration. The hearings just concluded disclosed an inherent weakness in the American merchant marine. The statistics on the percentage of participation by United States-flag vessels in the export-import commerce of this country show that our ships are carrying less than one-fourth of our foreign commerce and that no improvement is in sight. In fact, United States carryings are on the decline.

The Cargo Preference Act applies only to aid cargoes, including the disposal of farm surplus under title I of Public Law 480. If United States-flag vessels are carrying less than 20 percent of our exports even with the assistance of the 50–50 law, what will happen when the aid programs of the Government cease?

The shipping companies attribute this deficiency in the main to exchange controls and the strong nationalistic feeling which foreign shippers and buyers have for their own flag vessels. If that is so, what are we in this country to do to protect our merchant fleet?

The other question that naturally arises involves the efficiency of our American-flag companies in the field of cargo solicitation. Is every possible effort being made by these companies to obtain business? What are the circumstances preventing them from securing more cargo, and are these circumstances actually beyond their control?

The committee requests that a study be made of these matters and that a full report of the findings be furnished to it as soon as possible.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The bill which was introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], S. 2584, has been before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for quite some time. Many representatives of the shipping industry had requested that the committee hold hearings before taking action on the measure. As long ago as last summer I had indicated to them that hearings would be held and that those opposing the bill would be given an opportunity to testify.

When the proposal was made to insert section 307 in the pending measure, I made it known to members of the committee, as the committee's minutes show, that we had not held hearings on this issue. Notwithstanding that fact, the committee voted to put the section in the bill. The language was inserted based chiefly on a report which the committee had received from the Department of Agriculture. I wish to read from a summary of that report, which appears at the bottom of page 26 of the committee report on the pending measure. It reads as follows:

The Department reported favorably on S. 2584, a bill to exempt the title I program from cargo preference, for the following reasons:

First, we have lost opportunities to move commodities to a number of countries. Only one country, Denmark, has definitely rejected the possibility of negotiating a title

I program because of cargo preference. Difficulties in securing acceptance of cargo preference by three other maritime nations have delayed negotiations for extended periods. These negotiations have not been terminated, however, and efforts are being continued to overcome this resistance. It is impossible to estimate with any degree of accuracy the value of commodity movement lost because of this problem.

Second, the cargo-preference requirement has resulted in added cost to the farm program. It is necessary to provide dollar financing of ocean freight charges on United States-flag vessels required to be used. Total freight approved for financing during 1955 was about $31 million. About $12 million of this was on United States vessels required to be used in programs with maritime nations which carried all or substantially all of the non-United States-flag tonnage in their own vessels. In the absence of the United States-flag requirement these countries could be expected to participate in the program without any financing of ocean freight by the United States.

In addition to financing the freight charges on United States-flag vessels required to be used, it is necessary for the United States to absorb the differential resulting from use of such vessels where shipment would be cheaper on foreign-flag vessels. On vessels approved during 1955, differentials amounting to about $3 million will have been paid by CCC. This amount will not be covered by foreign-currency payments of the importing countries.

Third, the cargo-preference requirement is hampering efforts to obtain trade liberalization on agricultural commodities. Many importing countries discriminate against imports of United States commodities through quotas, exchange controls, and other restrictions. The Department of Agriculture is making a determined effort to obtain liberalization of such restrictions as part of its overall program to expand exports of United States farm commodities. Obviously, it is difficult for the United States to argue for the lifting of restrictions while imposing restrictions of its own. Maritime nations argue that the freedom of their merchant fleets to compete in the world market is as important to them as the freedom of our farmers to compete in the world market is to us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 5 minutes more.

Mr. President, it is neither my desire nor my intention to do anything that will bring harm to our merchant marine. I think we ought to protect it to the extent of our ability. We are now paying quite a large amount in subsidies to the merchant marine.

We have the assurance of the distinguished Senator from Washington that S. 2584, which is now before our committee, will receive hearings following the Easter holidays.

As I stated a moment ago, it will be my purpose, if the Senate agrees, to have the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry discharged from further consideration of that bill, and permit the bill to go to the committee where it probably should have gone in the beginning. I am sure if it is referred to that committee, and based upon the assurance received from the Senator from Washington, we can depend upon hearings being held soon.

It is my concern and my hope that if and when hearings are held, the committee will go thoroughly into the matter. Many of us have suggested that our surplus supplies be sold to foreign countries and that we accept their currencies.

It strikes me that where such sales can be effectuated, and the local-country currencies are used by us in order to purchase goods from them, this constitutes a bona fide sale and should not be subject to the 50–50 shipping clause. But in cases where we accept the currencies of the foreign countries, and in turn lend the proceeds to them, in return for small interest payments, under such conditions that we may never receive payment of the principal, I believe we can rightly place such sales in the category of gifts and donations.

So I am going to ask my good friend from Washington to try to devise some ways and means whereby, if it is at all possible, in the case of bona fide sales where we are permitted to use the moneys received from the foreign countries with which to buy things we need, we can exempt such sales from the provisions of the Cargo Preference Act.

I am in thorough agreement with argument advanced by the proponent of the proposal, that where we accept foreign currencies, and then give them away as donations and loans, which will never be repaid, those transactions should not be exempt from cargo preference. If language could be worked out whereby the purpose I have expressed could be accomplished, I think it would satisfy most of the Senators who favor amending the Cargo Preference Act.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I should very much like to see some such arrangement worked out. The testimony by the representatives of the Department of Agriculture before the House committee was that in all cases none of the money could be spent by us except after collaboration with the other parties and under their terms.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 2 more minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. It seems to me that is a field we can well look into. It points up the necessity of looking into the refinements of this very complicated matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not believe there will be any quarrel over the matter if some language can be worked out whereby we can protect bona fide sales as distinguished from gifts, donations, and loans. That is what we argued against in the committee for quite some time.

Mr. BUTLER. May I suggest that the act itself now says it shall not apply to commercial sales. Perhaps the language should be clarified. We do not intend to have it apply to ordinary commercial sales.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 2 more minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I assure Senators what has just been referred to is one of the complicated evils of the matter. Secondly, it also points up the necessity of going into the subject. The Senator and I are members of the Committee on Appropriations. He knows we are now appropriating a great deal of money to buy strategic materials in other countries. We have never had provisions affecting incoming cargoes. It might be well, when we look into the whole program, to see if we can find a way of making up a great deal of the tonnage by having some sort of arrangement whereby we would pay our cash to a country for strategic materials, and have them brought in as incoming cargo. The arguments all point up the necessity of doing what I suggested to the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I regret that this section was put in the bill without hearings. As has been demonstrated this afternoon and part of the evening, the questions involved are very complicated.

I repeat, it is my hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will look into the matter immediately, and will report a bill which we may be able to act upon at this session. Let us not delay this matter until next year. Instead, let us try to pass clarifying legislation before Congress adjourns.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the language appearing at the bottom of page 25 of the report, beginning with the heading for section 307, the section referring to the report explaining the position taken by the committee, and continuing to the point where I began to read from the report, be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1484) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION 307. SALES FOR FOREIGN CURRENCY EXEMPTED FROM CARGO PREFERENCE

Section 307 removes sales for foreign currency under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 from the requirement of the cargo preference statute, Public Law 664, 83d Congress, that at least 50 percent of commodities transported on ocean vessels under certain foreign aid programs and other Government programs shall be transported on privately owned United States-flag vessels.

From the inception of the title I program under Public Law 480 through January 31, 1956, agreements have been entered into with 22 countries providing for the sale of approximately $517 million worth of commodities at export market value. The cost to the Commodity Credit Corporation of financing these sales will be about $769 million. Ocean freight costs involved in moving these commodities and financed by the United States will amount to about $53 million. The export market value of the commodities plus the amount of ocean freight financed, except for differentials absorbed by the United States, is paid by the importing countries in their own currencies.

In applying the cargo preference law to the program, at least 50 percent of each commodity to each country is required to be moved on United States flag vessels, if available. Also, at least 50 percent of shipments in each of the categories, liner, tramp, and tanker are required to move on United States flag vessels, if available. Compliance with these requirements is assured through prior approval by the Department of all vessel charters and liner bookings.

The Commodity Credit Corporation finances ocean transportation costs on United States vessels when such vessels are required to be used in order to assure compliance with the provisions of the Cargo Preference Act. The amount by which freight costs on such vessels exceed the prevailing rate on foreign flag vessels is absorbed by the United States. Ocean transportation costs on United States vessels over and above that necessary to comply with the provisions of the Cargo Preference Act and on third country vessels is financed only to the extent that the importing country is unable to pay such costs. Transportation costs on vessels of the importing country are not financed under the program.

Approximately 53 percent of the total tonnage was approved for shipment on United States-flag vessels. Tramp tonnage was about 81 percent of the total, liner tonnage about 18 percent, and tanker tonnage about 1 percent. The 18 percent liner tonnage breaks down, 13 percent United States flag and 5 percent foreign flag. Tramp tonnage divided about 40 percent United States and 41 percent foreign, the 1 percent in favor of foreign tramps being the result of the shortage of United States-flag tramps to carry wheat to Yugoslavia during February of 1955. Since that time no appreciable difficulty has been experienced in the chartering of sufficient United States-flag vessels.

Your committee is firmly convinced that the maintenance of our merchant marine fleet is essential to national welfare and security. However, such governmental support as is necessary for maintenance should be directly provided and should not be at the expense of the farm program. The word "expense" is used in this connection to connote not so much monetary expense as the expense of curtailed dispositions of surpluses under the program and hampered efforts to obtain the liberalization of restrictions against the commercial importation of United States agricultural products into maritime nations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I cannot be too much disturbed because the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] thinks this matter should be recommitted and that extensive hearings should be held on it, because the 50–50 cargo preference provision got into the law, if I correctly recall, as a rider, with no hearings held, and no notice given that it would be voted on, and no quorum call at the time when it was voted on. The result was that very few Senators were on the floor at the time; in fact, I, myself, was not present when that action was taken. So why should there suddenly be so much excitement about having extended hearings on the matter now?

It is my opinion that if hearings were held on it, this year, an election year, when the attention of Members is necessarily given to so many different matters, to recommit the provision to the committee would mean that the provision would be killed.

Of course, we do want to have a strong merchant marine; and, Mr. President, our country has been more than generous to its merchant marine. We have given our merchant marine literally billions of dollars.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. No; Mr. President, I cannot yield, because I want to present my side of the case for the record; and I cannot yield time to the opposition.

Mr. President, we have literally put billions of dollars into our merchant marine, and we are continuing to be very generous to our merchant marine during peacetime.

I understand that this fiscal year we are appropriating $80 million to help our merchant marine meet the competition with which it is faced. I understand that the President has requested more than $164 million for the merchant marine for the coming fiscal year. I also understand that during the current fiscal year, $110 million is available to pay the merchant marine operating subsidy, and that proposals to increase that amount to $124 million for the next fiscal year are being made. Approximately $5 million is requested for research and development and an additional $2,800,000 is requested to help train merchant marine officers.

So we have been very generous—generous in the extreme—to our merchant marine. It is perfectly right that we should have a strong merchant marine, but we should not let our merchant marine reduce the income of farmers.

I understand that the merchant marine has just had its best year in peacetime history. However, our farmers are caught in a price-cost squeeze. How are we trying to help them? Our export markets are extremely essential if we are to find a solution to the problems caused by the surpluses of agricultural commodities. We have to export 4 out of every 10 bales of cotton we produce, or at least we should. We have to export 3 out of every 10 bushels of wheat. We have to export 4 out of every 10 bags of rice. We have to export 25 percent of our tobacco and soybeans.

Public Law 480—the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, which was passed in 1954—is an important tool in this struggle. Title I of that act is not merely a surplus-disposal program. It is a means by which we can convert a portion of our huge surplus into working capital and use that capital to help create and expand permanent markets for farm products.

Mr. President, this program has been successful. This week we have learned that surplus United States agricultural commodities worth $1,218,000,000 have already been disposed of abroad. There is a chance to widen this market even more than that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the United States Department of Agriculture, dated March 14, printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE I, PUBLIC LAW 480, COMMITMENTS PASS BILLION-DOLLAR MARK

WASHINGTON, March 14, 1956.—Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today announced that agreements totaling $1.2 billion have been signed for export sale of surplus United States agricultural commodities, under title I of Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

This law provides for sale of commodities to friendly foreign countries for their currencies, thereby helping meet convertibility and dollar-shortage problems and facilitate export of farm surpluses.

"This represents excellent progress," Secretary Benson said. "The program was set up by the Congress for 3 years, ending June 30, 1957. The goal of $1.5 billion in export commitments was to be reached as rapidly as possible. We are pleased to be able to report that as of today, not only are actual agreements signed that total $1.2 billion, but also negotiations are under way that should lead to commitments for the remainder of the allotted $1.5 billion in the near future.

"The program is having timely and helpful effect. It has given strength to our foreign and domestic markets at a time when such strength has been needed.

"Thanks in big part to the program, our agricultural exports have been able not only to hold their own in the face of increased world competition but, on a volume basis, have increased 16 percent during the past 2 years. And these gains appear to be continuing."

The $1.2 billion of title I commitments since the fall of 1954 is based on Commodity Credit Corporation value of commodities. It represents well over $900 million export value of commodities. The mark was attained this week with the signing of agreements with Chile, Korea, and Turkey.

A total of 50 agreements have been made with the following 25 countries:

Latin America (6): Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru.

Western Europe (10): Austria, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, Yugoslavia.

Far East (7): Burma, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Korea, Pakistan, Thailand.

Middle East (2): Egypt, Israel.

It is estimated that title I agricultural exports during the current fiscal year will total from $500 million to $550 million. This would represent about one-sixth of expected total farm exports.

During the 6 months, July through December 1955, title I exports totaled about $217 million. Commitments made prior to that time have largely been carried out, except for cotton, and here it is expected that the recently announced export sales program for all upland cotton should substantially increase exports after August 1.

Commodity highlights:

Rice: Export commitments recently made or in process will virtually wipe out Government holdings of surplus milled rice resulting from 1953 and 1954 crops. Programs announced a few days ago will result in the movement of almost as much rice as the total United States rice exports in fiscal year 1955. These programs include 7,800,000 bags of rice for Indonesia and Pakistan under title I, as well as an additional 1,320,000 bags programed for Pakistan under title II of Public Law 480, administered by the International Cooperation Administration.

Wheat: The program has helped maintain United States wheat exports, despite increased foreign competition. An estimated 40 percent of all United States wheat exports are now moving as a result of title I arrangements. To date, more than 120 million bushels of wheat have been programed. Through January, 64 million bushels had been exported.

Livestock products: Yugoslavia has purchased nearly 88 million pounds of lard under the program, which has helped bolster the domestic lard market. Israel is beginning procurement of 40 million pounds of beef, recently arranged for. Programs recently signed with Spain and Korea include

28 million pounds of pork products. An agreement has been made with West Germany that includes 3 million pounds of poultry.

Vegetable oils: Since July 1955, title I agreements have included about 700 million pounds of vegetable oils. This programing has been a major factor in strengthening markets for soybeans and cottonseed.

Tobacco: Largely due to title I sales, exports of United States tobacco in 1955 exceeded the previous year by about 15 percent. Agreements with Korea and Burma represent the opening of new markets for United States tobacco. Under an arrangement with the United Kingdom, it is making an equivalent value of housing available to the United States Air Force in return for $15 million of United States tobacco.

Cotton: From July through December 1955, title I exports of 307,000 bales accounted for 40 percent of total United States cotton exports. A total of 1⅓ million bales has been programed under title I, with nearly half of this due to agreements signed during the past 6 weeks.

Fruits and vegetables: Within the last few weeks 2 program agreements have been signed providing for the sale of fruit and 1 for the sale of potatoes.

Approximate quantities of commodities included in title I, Public Law 480 agreements

Commodity	Quantity		Market value	CCC cost
	Unit	Amount		
		Thousands	*Millions of dollars*	*Millions of dollars*
Wheat	Bushel	120,908	208.0	406.8
Feed grains	do	45,418	55.4	86.9
Rice	Hundredweight	9,926	65.2	119.1
Cotton	Bale	1,302.3	238.9	238.9
Cotton linters	do	16.7	.3	.3
Tobacco	Pound	96,753	62.6	62.6
Dairy products	do	89,366	19.4	33.2
Fats and oils	do	1,022,326	153.4	161.9
Poultry	do	3,000	1.2	1.2
Dry edible beans	Hundredwieght	37	.3	.3
Fruits	Pound	4,630	.5	.5
Potatoes	Hundredweight	667	1.4	1.4
Hay and pasture seed	do	55	2.5	4.0
Meat	Pound	81,284	25.1	25.1
Total commodities			834.2	1,142.2
Ocean transportation			75.8	75.8
Total agreements			910.0	1,218.0

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this program has been successful. As I have said, we have sold over $1 billion worth of commodities—almost one and one-fourth billion dollars worth. However, we have not been able to utilize this law to the maximum.

The United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark purchased $694,500,000 worth of farm products from the United States in 1954. That represented over 23 percent of all our agricultural commodity exports. Then we applied this cargo preference for our shipping interests to the law. When we tried to deal with those countries under title I of Public Law 480, we found that we cannot do business with them in that way, and we have not yet been able to develop any markets in those countries for our agricultural commodities through sales of present surpluses for their currencies. Indeed, in all of these countries, put together, we have had only one sale—of $15 million—since Public Law 480 went into effect. That sale was in the United Kingdom, and it was made possible only by agreeing to restrict the use of the foreign currency to the construction of military housing.

Most of these countries are maritime nations; and they have told us that they will not buy our products if we try to dictate to them how the commodities are to be shipped, when they are buying the products and are paying for them in their own money.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to read an excerpt from a letter from Mr. John Chandler, executive vice president of the New England & New York Apple Institute. He writes as follows:

British markets have always been our best foreign outlets. We have been making progress in regaining these markets under licensed quota in private transactions between growers and shippers here and importers in England. The British currency has been handled by the Mutual Security Act, section 402, which we understand expires shortly and will be superseded by Public Law 480.

So we are vitally interested in Public Law 480, but we are advised by the import buyers in Britain that their government will not permit them to buy apples under Public Law 480 unless the 50–50 shipping requirements are removed. The United States Department of Agriculture confirms that this is a serious issue.

Mr. President, this is a serious issue for our fruit growers in New England, New York, Virginia, Washington, and Oregon. The best export market in the world is simply gone; and those countries will not buy our apples, so long as we require that they move half of them in our ships, and let their own ships go somewhere else.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have only 10 minutes; and I have some other things to say.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But I am sure the Senator from Vermont would not want the record to be incorrect.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator ask the question he has in mind in his own time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is not true that because of the 50–50 provision we cannot move perishables. This situation applies to the overall tonnage. It does not apply ship by ship.

Mr. AIKEN. It is true that after the war England did not buy our apples. She started to buy them again, and when we applied the 50–50 cargo preference, we knocked the market for New York, Virginia, New England, Oregon, and Washington apples into a cocked hat.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The problem of refrigerators in the United States fleet is such that I think the committee will be unanimous in taking care of the situation in relation to perishables.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not impressed by the answer some give, that those countries are only bluffing, and that they will eventually have to buy from us. The fact is that if this is a bluff, it has already lasted a year and a half, and shows no evidence of abatement. In the meantime, our fruit growers and producers of other commodities are losing sales overseas. In those countries in 1954 we did almost $700 million worth of business in agricultural commodities.

Let me give 2 or 3 concrete examples, if I have time.

In March 1955, after 6 months of negotiations, the United Kingdom completely rejected a $45 million sale because of cargo preference.

On April 4, 1955, Denmark officially rejected a $7,700,000 sale because of the cargo preference.

Norway has continued to refuse an $11 million sale which we had arranged with her.

Sweden also refuses to buy. This is plenty of proof. I do not know how many other cases there are. These four were handed to me. They are graphic proof that cargo preference has severely handicapped operations under Public Law 480 in some of our best potential markets.

Most of our purchasers would have been able to buy and pay for this transportation themselves. Oftentimes, indeed, they would have hired American ships under normal competitive conditions, and paid for them out of their own dollar exchange.

The latest information I have, containing figures for grain, indicates that there is a difference of $3.50 between American and foreign tramp vessels. That is 10 or 12 cents a bushel.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know whether I have any time left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 30 seconds left.

Mr. AIKEN. The latest figure is $3.50.

Mr. BUTLER. $3.50 for what?

Mr. AIKEN. $3.50 a ton.

Mr. BUTLER. Is that the differential between the American rate and the foreign rate?

Mr. AIKEN. Those are the figures which have been supplied to me.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator has some bad figures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield 10 seconds to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to my friend from Wisconsin 10 of my 30 seconds.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall not have time to make the statement which I had planned to make. I support the amendment of the Senator from Washington. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I had planned to make.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARTHY

I shall vote for the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Washington, which would delete section 307 from the farm bill. I agree with the Senator that since this section relates primarily to maritime matters, it should not be made a part of the farm bill, and I think the Senator is right in recommending that this proposed revision of the Cargo Preference Act be referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Also, I am impressed by the fact that no hearings have been held on this section, which is a further reason for not acting on so important a matter at this time.

There are, however, some further remarks I should like to make on this subject. I am informed that Congress is being asked to enact section 307 because certain foreign nations have protested against American ships having the right to carry 50 percent of our agricultural surpluses. I am further informed that the nations making these protests are the very nations which, with one hand, accept financial aid from the United States, and with the other engage in maritime trade with the Communist bloc.

On the first point, let me cite testimony heard before the Merchant Marine Committee of the House last month. The witness was Mr. Gwynn Garnett, Director of the Foreign Agricultural Service.

"Congressman TUMULTY. Is it not a fact that the only reason you are here is because of their opposition? [Meaning the opposition of foreign maritime nations.]

"Mr. GARNETT. That is right.

"Congressman TUMULTY. If they had not taken this attitude [of protesting the 50–50 Cargo Preference Act provision] you would not be here?

"Mr. GARNETT. Correct."

The report filed by the Merchant Marine Committee concludes from this testimony: "Thus, the real basis for objection lies in the attitude of certain foreign maritime nations. These objections lie more to the principle of the cargo preference law than to any damaging effect it presently has upon the foreign maritime nations themselves."

Now it strikes me as a little strange that our maritime policy should be dictated by the nations that are principally responsible for free world trade with Communist China and other countries in the Communist bloc. The Senate Subcommittee on Investigations, in 1953, learned that during the calendar year of 1952 some 193 calls were made in Red Chinese ports by vessels registered under the flags of nations supposedly friendly to us. A large majority of these vessels flew the flags of Great Britain and several other nations that are currently protesting against our maritime policy. The most recent statistics on this subject show that during a 7-month period in 1955, 477 vessel calls were made at Red Chinese ports and again these vessels were primarily those flying the flags of the nations that are protesting against the 50–50 provision. It is beyond my comprehension why we should permit nations conducting this nefarious and immoral trade, to tell the Congress that it must take steps to scuttle the American merchant marine.

As the Senators know, a hair-raising tale concerning East-West trade is now being unfolded before the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations. I shall make some extended remarks on this subject in the very near future. I want to say, now, however, that the committee has learned that, in addition to its trade with Red China, Great Britain has been carrying on voluminous trade with the Soviet Union in highly strategic materials. Thus, by way of repaying us for American aid, Great Britain is helping to build the Communist war machine.

Let me now put the whole picture in proper perspective: The United States gives billions of dollars each year to Great Britain in the form of foreign aid. Great Britain, in turn, sells millions of dollars worth of strategic goods to the Communist bloc that will help build a war machine that is designed to destroy the United States. Then, to top it off, Great Britain, and the other nations in a similar situation, have the effrontery to demand that the United States take measures that will result in great injury to the American merchant marine.

I think it is high time, Mr. President, that the United States cease bowing to the dictates of foreign nations, and start looking after its own interests.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes—and not more than 5 minutes—to my good friend from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think we can close this discussion. I promised the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that he could have a couple of minutes. I also promised time to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. Much of my time was taken up by the majority leader and other Senators.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, is this coming out of my time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not being taken out of the Senator's time. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes, under the time available to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who at this point has 6 minutes left.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have been waiting until this late hour in the agricultural debate for the happy time to arrive when I could find myself in complete agreement with the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That time has now arrived. I agree with everything the distinguished Senator from Vermont has said about the importance of this amendment. I join him emphatically in his opposition to the Magnuson amendment.

I wish that Members of the Senate from the Farm Belt would give their attention long enough to get some of the facts clearly in mind. I am not one of those who believe in retreating from a fight before the first shot is fired. I am a little disturbed. I find a couple of my friends on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who voted for the amendment now willing to retreat, to the point where they want not only to return the subject to committee, but to take it away from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and give it to a committee friendly to the merchant marine.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator decline to yield?

Mr. MUNDT. If I have the time later I will yield, but not now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota declines to yield at this point.

Mr. MUNDT. Something has been said about this provision going into the bill without a hearing.

Mr. BUTLER. We were refused a hearing.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to point out that this so-called 50–50 provision was put into the bill, as the Senator from Vermont points out, without any hearings, late in a session, without a rollcall. If it is logical to have hearings on the legislation, the logical thing to do is to take it out now, let the committee hold hearings, and, if a case can be built up for the legislation, place it back in a new bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Not at the moment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wished to give the Senator——

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The second thing I should like to point out is this: Why in the world should the farmers of the United States be charged for a ship subsidy? This comes out of the pockets of farmers, out of the money intended for farm assistance and price supports, out of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations I, too, have frequently voted for subsidies for the merchant marine; but such subsidies should be in the open, and not masquerading in the overalls and the work clothes of farm aid and farm relief. That is where they are now. It is no more logical to charge to the farm program a part of the subsidy to the merchant marine than it would be to charge to the farm program part of the subsidy to the Post Office because the Postal Department loses money in the mailing of periodicals to farm families. Subsidies should not be disguised and their costs should not be shifted in this manner.

It has been proved over and over again that this is the feature which retards the surplus-disposal program. Are we serious about disposing of our farm surpluses, or are we not? Do we want to get rid of those products or not?

I believe that the farmers of the United States are suffering from the old legendary curse of Sisyphus in this regard. In connection with every farm bill we have, they march up the hill, and then slide down again. This time they are not only sliding down, but they are going all the way to the bottom, by reason of the fact that the subject is being taken away from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and turned over to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I predict that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will not bring in anything effective from the standpoint of helping the farmer. Our job on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is to stay with this problem and to try to have appropriate legislation enacted. If, after hearings, a good case can be made, let us go forward with a subsidy, to be charged to the merchant marine, and not to the farmers. Let us make this a bill to support farmers and farm prices, and not the merchant marine and shiploads of sailors.

Mr. President, I oppose the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 1 minute remaining; the Senator from Washington has 20 seconds remaining.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the amendment and 1 minute on the bill to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is a major issue in my State, as between the shipping interests and the farm interests. The farm interests are opposed to the 50–50 cargo preference proposal, and the shipping interests are, of course, for it.

There is much to be said from the point of view of the farm organization that unless an agricultural bill does something to increase farm prices and the purchasing power of the farmers, this amendment should not be adopted.

I think there is no doubt about the fact that any legislation we enact should at least eliminate all perishables, I shall vote for the amendment because of the promise that the entire issue will go to hearing before the Interstate Commerce Committee immediately after the Easter recess and the processing products of all perishables. Further it is my understanding that not only perishables and processed products of perishables will be exempted but that the fruit industry generally will be protected.

There seems to be a dispute as to whether any hearings were held on this question in 1954. I hold in my hand the printed hearings of May 5, 13, 17, and 24, 1954, with reference to this subject. Within the report, there is a letter from the United States Department of Agriculture setting forth the point of view that the Department of Agriculture officials did not think their attendance at the hearing was necessary. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE,
TRANSPORTATION AND
WAREHOUSING DIVISION,
Washington, D. C., May 6, 1954.

Mr. DONALD D. WEBSTER,
Special Counsel, Subcommittee on Water Transportation, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WEBSTER: This is in reply to your letter dated April 30, 1954, in which you invited our participation in an open hearing on S. 3233 (cargo preference bill) before your subcommittee.

In arranging ocean transportation on agricultural commodities from United States and foreign ports to various overseas destinations under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, as amended, this Department acts in the capacity of an agent for the Foreign Operations Administration. We, therefore, feel that our attendance at this hearing would be unnecessary. I am pleased, however, to furnish the following information which was requested in the last two paragraphs of your letter.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 provides that at least 50 percent of the tonnage shipped overseas from United States ports or United States possessions be transported in United States-flag vessels. In the administration of this provision, the Foreign Operations Administration divides ocean carriers into 3 categories, namely, charter, berth, and tanker so that in effect the 50 percent provision applies to each of these categories.

In addition, these 3 categories are maintained within specific geographical areas. For example, shipments to Greece are included in the Mediterranean sector which also embraces other Mediterranean countries. Such charters are coordinated with FOA in order that the 50 percent provision be maintained in balance for the entire geographical area.

The attached tables indicate shipments actually handled by this Department from July 1, 1953, through April 1954, and show that 68 percent of our chartered tonnage and 94 percent of our berth tonnage were transported on United States-flag vessels.

You will note that table I attached hereto indicates 11 vessels were chartered to transport offshore sugar to Iran. These were the only shipments arranged by this Department on shipments from foreign ports of origin to another foreign country. Our records indicate the following with respect to these shipments:

On October 9, 1953, 2 foreign-flag vessels were chartered out of Antwerp, Belgium, to Iran at rates of $8.25 and $8.50 per long ton. We received a bid from a United States-flag vessel at the rate of $16 per long ton.

On November 30, 1953, two foreign-flag vessels were chartered to transport sugar from Formosa to Iran at the rate of $6.70 per long ton for each vessel. One United States-flag vessel bid $12.45 and another $14.95 per long ton.

On December 31, 1953, we chartered a foreign-flag vessel for a movement from Formosa to Iran at the rate of $7 per long ton. One United States-flag vessel bid $13.38 per long ton.

This Department obtained prior clearance from FOA before awarding the above-cited charters to the foreign-flag vessels notwithstanding the great differential in rates quoted.

We trust that the above information will be helpful in your subcommittee considerations.

Very truly yours,

M. J. HUDTLOFF,
Director.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point certain communications I have received on both sides of the issue.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACIFIC AMERICAN
STEAMSHIP ASSOCIATION,
San Francisco, Calif., February 14, 1956.

To the Members of the United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: In 1947 Congress, in the first United States foreign aid program, established a partnership composed of the American taxpayer, the American farmer and the American merchant marine to carry out world rehabilitation.

To implement this three-way partnership, Congress decreed that 50 percent of noncommercial cargoes moving under this program go in American vessels. By enacting the 50–50 law, Congress endorsed the fundamental rule that foreign trade is a two-way street, in that it equitably divided these cargoes among American and foreign lines. It thus created a balance in one commodity—shipping space—as related to these cargoes.

Today, foreign interests are distributing propaganda, falsely labeling the 50–50 law as discriminatory, when, by its very title and operation, it is a protection against discrimination. These foreign interests are doing their best to bring about a cleavage in the three-way partnership mentioned above by falsely claiming that the surplus disposal program is impeded by the 50–50 principle and are urging certain organizations in the United States to pressure Congress to repeal the 50–50 law.

For this reason, we have taken the liberty of enclosing with this letter a brochure and copies of several resolutions from leading farm, veteran and labor organizations which indicate that many leading organizations have taken affirmative action to make certain that no one in the United States is duped by this foreign propaganda.

As you well know, the American merchant marine serves our economy during peacetime by providing access to the markets of the world for our agricultural and manufactured products. This same merchant marine acts as a naval auxiliary during wartime, and Congress has repeatedly reaffirmed the 50–50 principle in order to make certain that this merchant fleet shall be strong enough to perform these dual roles and assist in carrying out our foreign policy.

In view of the importance to the citizens of this Nation of retaining the 50–50 principle, it will be greatly appreciated if you will give your consideration to this letter and the enclosures, if and when this matter comes up for action before the Congress.

Any comments you have concerning this subject will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

R. E. MAYER,
President.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *February 23, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Understand S. 3183, farm omnibus bill, now on Senate floor, containing section 307, repealing 50–50 law on farm surplus shipments although no committee hearings have been held or scheduled this session at which shipping industry could be heard despite promise made by Agricultural Committee Chairman ELLENDER last July in his speech on the floor relating to farm bill. Consider inclusion of section 307 most unfair, particularly without hearings. Furthermore, repealing 50–50 provisions of Public Law 480 can only increase costs of those cargoes, because foreign tramp-shipping

rates are same as American tramp rates. Therefore urge you work for elimination section 307 from S. 3183 or any similar legislation before Senate. Will appreciate reply.

T. E. CUFFE,
President, Pacific Far East Line, Inc.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *February 23, 1956.*
Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Shipping was promised full hearings on the 50–50 law as it relates to the farm bill in a speech on the Senate floor July 20, 1955, by Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Agricultural Committee.

S. 3183 is now on the Senate floor. Section 307 repeals the 50–50 law on farm-surplus shipments. No hearings have been held or scheduled this session. Repealing the 50–50 provisions of Public Law 480 will increase shipping costs on Public Law 480 cargoes, because foreign tramp-shipping rates are the same as United States tramp rates. United States tramp rates act as deterrent to increased rates.

We urgently request you demand the elimination of section 307 of S. 3183 or any other bill in which this provision comes before the Senate.

Would appreciate your replying.

RANDOLPH SEVIER,
President, Matson Navigation Co.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *February 21, 1956.*
Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully call your attention to S. 3183, farm omnibus bill, now on Senate floor. Maritime industry had been promised full hearings on 50–50 law as it relates to farm bill in speech on Senate floor last July 20, by Senator ELLENDER, chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 9, p. 11025). Section 307 of farm bill now on Senate floor repeals 50–50 law on farm surplus shipments, and no hearings have been held or scheduled this session. Foreign tramp shipping rates are same as United States tramp rates, repeal of 50–50 provisions in Public Law 480 would eliminate American-flag ships and result in loss of competitive rate controls. Respectfully and urgently request your efforts to eliminate section 307 of S. 3183, or any other bill in which this provision comes before Senate.

GEORGE KILLION,
President, American President Lines.

SEATTLE, WASH.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I earnestly seek your support in keeping the 50–50 provision as it is now in effect in regard to the carrying of agricultural commodities. It is my understanding that the Agriculture Committee is urging that the 50–50 be dropped. I know you realize that this would result in serious cutbacks in the American merchant marine and in addition to putting thousands of men, maritime workers, out of work, it would also weaken this country's defense, since it is an established fact that a strong merchant fleet is one of the four arms of defense.

Although public hearings were promised on this 50–50 provision, none were held and the committee simply attached to their agricultural bill their recommendation that the 50–50 provision or proposition on agricultural commodities be stricken from the law.

Please give this your most serious and utmost regard.

Most respectfully yours,

JAMES ALLEN MCGEE.

AMERICAN MERCHANT
MARINE INSTITUTE, INC.,
New York, February 28, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the American-flag steamship lines represented by our institute, I wish to express to you their collective appreciation for clarifying for the Senate an important point in the 50–50 issue during debate on the Senate floor yesterday.

That point, important to the orchardists in your home State of Oregon, and other Pacific Northwest regions, was that 50–50 does not apply when American-flag ships are not available for the transport of taxpayer-financed American products overseas. In every such case, we have firmly supported your position that foreign-flag ships can, and should be utilized at once.

It was fortuitous and most helpful that you should interject in the floor debate to clarify this point so strikingly. Our American-flag lines believe that the 50–50 philosophy is fair and honest, and that its application works to the advantage of American agriculture, even in such rare examples as you cited yesterday.

With appreciation.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS T. GREENE,
President.

OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE,
Pendleton, Oreg., January 18, 1956.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: During the last annual meeting, the Oregon Wheat Growers League reaffirmed its opposition to having the Butler amendment apply to Public Law 480 sales.

We are not opposed to the Government subsidizing the American shipping interests but the costs of such a program should be charged to them and not to agriculture.

Requiring 50 percent of sales under Public Law 480 to be handled by American bottoms is losing the United States business. Public Law 480 is a sales program and not a giveaway. For that reason, foreign countries object to paying for United States goods with local currency and then being told that half of the purchases must be carried in American ships while their ships sit idle.

The costs are higher for shipping goods in American bottoms. These additional charges come from the overall appropriation of 480 funds which were set aside for purchase of United States goods and which are charged to agriculture. It is estimated that 20 percent of all 480 funds could be used up in paying higher freight charges to United States companies.

In other words, $300 million of funds intended for purchasing United States agriculture commodities would be used as a subsidy for United States shipping lines. This much money could be used to move over 100 million bushels of wheat, which is about the surplus we have on hand now in the Pacific Northwest.

The Oregon League and Commission have spent over $47,000 of wheat growers' money during the past few years working to expand Asiatic markets for our wheat. This is a self-help program which promises to obtain results.

We would appreciate your consideration of the league action on this matter.

Very truly yours,

Dick Baum
RICHARD K. BAUM,
Executive Secretary.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., *February 21, 1956.*
Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Section 307 of S. 3193 now on Senate floor repeals the 50–50 law on farm surplus shipments. Urgently request you demand the elimination of section 307 of S. 3183 or any other bill in which this provision comes before the Senate. Would appreciate reply.

V. P. MCMURDO.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 15, 1956.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Will appreciate your opposition to amendment to S. 3183 which would tend to exempt agricultural products to provision of 50–50 shipping bill; too many American marine workers are currently unemployed already and addition of such amendment would add to their ranks.

Regards,

BILL WAY,
President, Central Labor Council.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 15, 1956.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am in receipt of a wire from our secretary treasurer John M. Bishop, International Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots, Washington, D. C., that an amendment to Senate bill 3183 has been reported out of committee to Senate for vote which states to exempt agricultural products from the 50–50 shipping provision. We as members of the International Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots, West Coast Local No. 90, respectfully request nonsupport of this amendment as it is a very vital issue to our tramp vessels of the merchant marine fleet.

Capt. M. D. MACRAY,
Portland Representative, International Organization, West Coast Local No. 90.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 15, 1956.*
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We are in receipt of information from Captain Bishop of International Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots that Senate bill 3183 has been reported out with an amendment exempting agricultural products from the 50–50 shipping provision. It is our opinion that the American merchant marine should be protected by the terms of the 50–50 provision and this amendment is not in the public interest. We respectfully ask that you do not support this amendment.

Capt. RALPH F. CAPLES,
President, Columbia River Pilots.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 14, 1956.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I earnestly seek your support in keeping the 50–50 provision as it is now in effect, in regard to the carrying of agricultural commodities. It is my understanding the agricultural committee is urging that the 50–50 provision be dropped.

I know you realize this would result in serious cutbacks in the American Merchant Marine and in addition to putting thousands of maritime workers out of work, it would also weaken this country's defenses, since it is an established fact that a strong merchant fleet is one of the four arms of defense.

Although public hearings were promised on this 50–50 provision, none were held, and the committee just attached to their agricultural bill their recommendation that

the 50–50 proposition on agricultural commodities be stricken from the law.

Please give this your serious consideration.

Respectfully yours,

CLYDE JONES.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 16, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Next Monday, February 20, 1956, there is a bill S. 3183, omnibus farm bill out by Senate Agricultural and Forestry Committee exempts agricultural products from 50–50 shipping provision. Will you please vote against it.

It will abolish our tramp fleet of ships and cause more unemployment in our merchant marine.

Sincerely,

EUGENE H. FRANKLIN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 16, 1956.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As one whose husband is in the merchant marine on which our livelihood depends, I request that you vote against the amendment to S. 3183 omnibus farm bill which would eliminate the 50–50 agreement for shipping foreign aid (not commercial) cargoes on American ships.

Repeal of the 50–50 provision would eliminate at once practically all cargoes now shipped in American bottoms and would in no way aid the farm situation, which it is misguidedly said to do. It seems to me that enough of our ships are now laid up without adding to the number and to the number of unemployed persons.

Last May, I believe, Representative JOHN F. SHELLEY of California spoke on the subject before the American University Transportation Institute in Washington, D. C., pointing out the very grave danger to this country of losing any more of our ships through the shortsighted policy of eliminating the 50–50 provision. Since I no longer have a copy of the speech to send you, perhaps you could get one from Mr. SHELLEY if you would be interested.

And again, I urgently request that you give this matter your immediate attention.

Respectfully,

ELMA L. REVELL.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 16, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WAYNE: Capt. Ralph F. Caples, president of Columbia River Pilots, has wired you, urging you to oppose this bill which has a rider which would eliminate the 50–50 provision regarding the export of Government financial agricultural products in vessels of United States registry.

While I was at Maritime we always supported United States-flag vessel participation.

The pilots' interest is easily understood; i. e., they are for a prosperous American merchant marine.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH K. CARSON, JR.

MARINE COOKS AND STEWARDS, AFL,
Seattle, Wash., February 16, 1956.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MORSE: In support of your untiring efforts to sustain the American merchant marine we have this date sent to President Eisenhower the following letter of protest to a rider attached to the Senate bill S. 3183:

"The membership of the Marine Cooks and Stewards, A. F. of L., Seattle Branch, Pacific District, unanimously adopted a resolution vigorously protesting the arbitrary action of the Senate Committee on Agriculture in attaching, as a rider to Senate bill S. 3183, a provision which would exempt the requirement that American ships carry 50 percent of the agricultural surplus commodities which are financed by foreign currencies, guaranteed for convertibility by United States dollar.

"The members of the Marine Cooks and Stewards, A. F. of L., Seattle Branch, Pacific District, are incensed over this un-American and undemocratic action of not permitting those interested parties the opportunity to be heard. It is further the opinion of the Marine Cooks and Stewards, A. F. of L., that you should stop the dictatorial procedure and we urge that you support our action.

"This late move of the Senate Committee on Agriculture in attaching such rider to Senate bill S. 3183 would dismantle, mothball, and keep the American flag off the oceans.

"We are very much in need of our fourth line of defense, the United States merchant marine, and the American flag must be flown on all the seas of the world."

Hoping this will assist you in the forthcoming issue on the Senate floor.

Very truly yours,

MARINE COOKS AND STEWARDS, AFL,
SEATTLE BRANCH, PACIFIC DISTRICT,
JAMES O. WILLOUGHBY, *Port Agent.*

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 16, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: As one of your constituents I am writing you in regards the 50–50 Cargo Preference Act, in which there is a move by certain interests to amend this act so as to exempt $1.5 billions of agricultural surpluses from its provisions.

I believe that if this act is amended in this manner that it would prove detrimental to the United States merchant marine and also undermine the security and defense of our Nation because untold quantities of cargo would be lost to foreign ship operators causing American bottoms to be tied up with hundreds of jobs lost by American seamen.

I feel that both the domestic and foreign agricultural interests in conjunction with foreign shipping interests are pressing for this amendment for strictly selfish reasons, and with total disregard for America's interest, therefore I urge you to vote against exempting or repealing any part of the 50–50 act.

In ending this note I would like to state that I personally believe that 100 percent of all surplus cargoes should be carried in American bottoms, thus strengthening our American merchant marine instead of weakening it.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM M. CALDWELL.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 22, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In a speech on the Senate floor July 20, 1955, Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Agricultural Committee, promised the shipping industry a full hearing on the 50–50 law as it relates to the farm bill. Section 307 of S. 3183, which we understand is now on the Senate floor, repeals the 50–50 law on farm-surplus shipments. To our knowledge, no hearings have been held or scheduled.

Foreign tramp-shipping rates are the same as United States tramp rates, and repeal of the 50–50 provision of Public Law 480 will increase shipping costs on those cargoes.

We would appreciate your requesting the elimination of section 307 of S. 3183, or any similar bill in which a provision of this kind comes before the Senate.

Please advise.

HILLMAN LUEDDEMANN,
Vice President; Northwest Manager, Pope & Talbot Lines.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 23, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Shipping was promised full hearings on the 50–50 law as it relates to the farm bill in a speech on the Senate floor last July 20, 1955. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 9, page 11025, by Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Agricultural Committee, S. 3183, the farm omnibus bill, is now on the Senate floor. Section 307 repeals the 50–50 law on farm surplus shipments. No hearings have been held or scheduled this session. Repealing the 50–50 provisions of Public Law 480 will increase shipping costs on Public Law 480 cargoes, because foreign tramp-shipping rates are the same as United Senate floor. Section 307 repeals the 50–50 you demand the elimination of section 307 of S. 3183, or any other bill in which this provision comes before the Senate.

Appreciate reply.

AMERICAN MAIL LINE,
W. L. WILLIAMS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 23, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Shipping was promised full hearings on the 50–50 law as it relates to the farm bill in a speech on the Senate floor last July 20, 1955, CONGESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 9, page 11025, by Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. S. 3183, the farm omnibus bill, is now on the Senate floor. Section 307 repeals the 50–50 law on farm surplus shipments. No hearings have been held or scheduled this session. Repealing the 50–50 provisions of Public Law 480 will increase shipping costs on Public Law 480 cargoes because foreign tramp shipping rates are the same as United States tramp rates. Most urgently request you demand the elimination of section 307 of S. 3183 or any other bill in which this provision comes before the Senate. Appreciate reply.

MOORE-MCCORMACK LINES,
P. J. KLEIN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 24, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Our records indicate that shipping was promised full hearings on the 50–50 law as it relates to the farm bill in a speech on the Senate floor last July 20, 1955, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 9, page 11025, by Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. We understand S. 3183, the farm omnibus bill, is now on the Senate floor. Section 307 repeals the 50–50 law on farm surplus shipments. To our best knowledge no hearings have been held or scheduled for this session. Repealing the 50–50 provisions of Public Law 480 will increase shipping costs on Public Law 480 cargoes because foreign tramp shipping rates are the same as United States tramp rates. We most urgently request you demand the elimination of section 307 of S. 3183 or any other bill in which this provision comes before the Senate. Would appreciate your reply.

STATES STEAMSHIP CO.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 24, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Reference S. 3183, farm omnibus bill, now on Senate floor, section 307 repeals the 50–50 law on surplus farm shipments. Appreciate your working for hearings on behalf American shipping and urgently request work toward elimination section 307 or any other bill containing similar provisions which comes before Senate. Appreciate reply.

HOLLIS FARWELL,
Agent for Matson Lines.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 27, 1956.*

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our company vitally affected by S. 3187, the farm omnibus bill, now before Senate.

Section 307 of the bill repeals 50–50 law on farm-surplus shipments and we urgently request your support in eliminating section 307 of this bill, which would deal a stunning blow to our company and to American merchant marine.

West Coast Steamship Co. is an Oregon corporation largely owned by Oregonians and the only oceangoing fleet with Portland its home port. We own five Liberty vessels, all operated under American-flag registry. Our vessels are largely employed in offshore bulk-carrying trade principally transpacific, and the only tramp fleet owned by a Pacific coast shipping concern.

During 1955 68 percent of the offshore cargoes handled by our fleet consisting largely of grains, coal, and fertilizer, were secured as a direct result of application of 50–50 provision of the Cargo Preference Act.

The annual dollar contribution which our company made to the general business economy of Oregon is deserving of consideration because of its substantial nature. During 1955 West Coast Steamship Co. paid:

Wages to vessel crews, $1,265,990.35.

Vessel stores, supplies, and equipment, $180,011.40.

Foodstuffs, including agricultural products, meats, and poultry, $193,948.35.

Maintenance and repair to Oregon and Washington shipyards, $226,744.57.

Stevedore wages and other cargo expense, $753,224.06.

Fuel-oil purchases, $501,927.37.

Marine insurance, $213,964.37.

Preservation of 50–50 provision is vital to our continued operation under the American flag. It is economically impossible for an American-flag tramp operator to compete on an equal basis with foreign-flag tramps. If 50–50 provision is nullified we would be compelled to seek protection of foreign-flag registry for our vessels with its low standard of operating cost if we desire to survive. This action will be forced upon us if 50–50 provision is repealed.

We urgently request your efforts to preserve 50–50 legislation, repeal of which would sound the death knell to American tramp shipping, seriously damage the American merchant marine, and cause widespread unemployment to American maritime labor. Please keep me advised of developments this bill.

K. C. CONYERS,
Executive Vice President, West Coast Steamship Co.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 29, 1956.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand S. 3183, farm omnibus bill, with section 307 exempting agricultural shipments from 50–50 law voted out of Senate Agricultural Committee without hearings as promised in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 9, page 11025, Senator ELLENDER'S speech July 20, 1955. Section 307 repeals 50–50 provisions in Public Law 480. Most urgently request you demand elimination of section 307 of S. 3183 or any other Senate bill with these provisions before bill comes before Senate. Appreciate reply.

COASTWISE LINE,
H. H. WRIGHTSON.

THE PORT OF PORTLAND,
Portland, Oreg., March 7, 1956.
Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I believe that S. 3183, the farm omnibus bill, includes a section repealing the 50–50 law on farm-surplus shipments. From all that I can gather, this would be extremely detrimental to all shipping interests since it would, in effect, repeal the 50–50 provisions of Public Law 480 and the views that I have heard would indicate that it would not greatly help the farm program but might increase the cost of cargoes because foreign tramp rates are the same as American tramp rates and the elimination of the 50–50 protection could only mean the reduction of American-flag shipping with possible detriment to the whole economy. I refer, of course, to section 307 of S. 3183. I would greatly appreciate it if you would let me have your views on this matter.

Very truly yours,

JOHN J. WINN, Jr.
General Manager.

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S AND WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION, LOCAL NO. 12,
North Bend, Oreg., March 1, 1956.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable WAYNE MORSE: Our Washington representative, Jeff Kibre, advises our membership that an amendment to the farm bill now being debated in the Senate is aimed at scuttling the 50–50 law, which provides that not less than one-half of Government-financed cargoes must be shipped in United States bottoms. If this amendment is voted up it will eliminate a great deal of the United States merchant fleet and add to the present unemployment situation which is plaguing our country.

As this is a bread-and-butter issue for us, we strongly urge that you do all in your power to see that this amendment is defeated.

Another legislative issue that concerns us is liberalization of social security—especially the lowering of the age limits to 60 years instead of the present 65. Mr. Kibre observes that the leadership of the Senate Finance Committee is out to stop any such liberalization.

We ask that you also use your influence in this matter, which is of vital concern to us.

Respectfully yours,

GORDON RASMUSSEN,
Secretary.

THE SEAFARERS INTERNATIONAL UNION,
ATLANTIC AND GULF DISTRICT, CIO,
Brooklyn, N. Y., February 29, 1956.
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For the past 8 years, the Congress has repeatedly and clearly indicated its intent that 50 percent of all Government-financed cargoes be carried in United States-flag ships. The 50–50 law has been of inestimable value in keeping the United States merchant fleet alive at extremely small cost. This keeping of United States ships in business has time and again prevented runaway freight charges by foreign shipping groups in times of shipping crisis.

Now the life of the United States merchant marine is threatened anew by a provision (section 307) of the proposed farm bill, S. 3183, which would specifically exempt the shipments of surplus farm cargoes from the Cargo Preference Act, otherwise known as the 50–50 law. Thus, the Senate Agricultural Committee's vote to drop 50–50 from the surplus farm disposal program is a clear contradiction of the Congress' traditional and oft-stated intent. It is imperative that the 50–50 provision be made applicable to that part of the farm bill which provides for the disposal of farm surplus under the United States Government aid program.

The committee's action ostensibly to aid disposal of farm surplus will actually benefit no one but the foreign ship operators in general and particularly the runaway flag operators of the nonlegitimate maritime nations, which offer escape from the Government taxes, decent wages, and safety conditions imposed by the United States and other legitimate maritime nations. The scuttling of 50–50 will sap whatever strength remains in the already badly-battered United States merchant marine, and at a critical point in international relations when we should be building our merchant marine.

All evidence points to the fact that repeal of 50–50 will not move one additional pound of United States surplus. The world agricultural situation is such that farm surpluses are plaguing many nations.

It is especially interesting to note that the nations protesting the 50–50 account for only about 5 percent of the farm surplus involved. The nations taking the major share of the farm surplus under the United States aid program have little or no merchant marine of their own. Consequently, the cargo-carrying that would be lost to the American fleet without the 50–50 proviso would undoubtedly be picked up by the Panamanian, Honduran, Liberian and other low-cost, tax-loophole runaway registries.

The importance of 50–50 to the very life of the United States merchant marine is emphasized by the fact that American-flag ships carry only 21 percent of our Nation's own commerce.

Failure to include the traditional 50–50 provision in the proposed agricultural act, known as S. 3183 will, therefore, blast away a substantial section of our already inadequate United States-flag fleet.

We respectfully ask your consideration of these facts and urge your support in the fight to keep the United States flag flying on the high seas by insisting upon the restoration of the 50–50 provision to the farm bill, S. 3183.

The membership and the organization will deeply appreciate your efforts in this direction.

Respectfully yours,

PAUL HALL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 27, 1956.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am enclosing a complete copy of the policy statements adopted by the delegate body of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives at their annual meeting in Los Angeles last week.

I have checked on pages 1, 4, 6, and 7 the resolutions pertaining to matters I discussed with you yesterday. The fact that these have been adopted as representative of the views of the members of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives indicates the widespread interest of farmer cooperatives along these important lines. I hope you will have time to read all of these resolutions—certainly the ones I have checked.

Thanking you for your kindness during my visit, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. E. KLAHRE,
Manager, Apple Growers Association, Hood River, Oreg.

NOTE.—50–50 cargo preference clause: The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives favors legislation which would bring about such modifications or adjustments of the so-called 50-50 cargo perference clause as not to impede exports of United States agricultural products.

Mr. MORSE. I believe we should be very careful, as we work out this program in the hearings which the Senator from Washington has said will be held by the Interstate Commerce Committee of which he is chairman, that it will not be possible to say with propriety, as the Senator from South Dakota has suggested, that the effect of the operation of the 50–50 formula would be to ask the

farmers to subsidize the merchant marine.

I believe we must subsidize the merchant marine from the standpoint of our national security. However, as I said earlier, some language must be worked out so that our shipping interests will be guaranteed some of the cargo of surplus Commodity Credit food shipped abroad, but the farmers will not have to pay through the nose by way of a ship subsidy deducted from the price that they are paid for agricultural products. Further, I think we must insist that all farm perishables and products processed therefrom are exempted from the 50–50 formula. It needs to be emphasized that the foreign governments who are buying the surplus food involved in this issue are obtaining it either at very low prices or for practically nothing. It certainly is not unreasonable to ask that they pay for the shipping of a portion of it in American bottoms. Therefore, because I think this matter can be worked out fairly in respect to the best interests of both the farmers and the shipping industry in the hearings which have been promised by the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, if the question is to come to a vote, we ought to know what we are voting on. The Department of State, under date of October 26, 1955, stated:

> The application of cargo preference legislation to the sale of surplus United States agricultural commodities for foreign currencies under title I of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, has increased the difficulties attending the satisfactory negotiation of title I agreements. The Department of State therefore supports the enactment of S. 2584.

That is the provision in the pending bill.

The Department of Agriculture, under date of October 31, 1955, stated:

> The Department favors enactment of the bill for the following reasons:
>
> 1. In the case of maritime nations, cargo preference makes title I programing impossible in some instances and in other instances results in less desirable programs than could otherwise be developed.
>
> 2. The application of cargo preference to title I shipments, which constitute trade rather than aid, makes it more difficult to obtain liberalization of restrictions against the importation of United States agricultural products into maritime nations.

Senators who wish to support agriculture should vote "no" on the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is under the control of the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington advises me that I was in error in saying that no hearings were held on this provision in 1954. He has handed me a copy of the hearings. Hearings were held on May 5, 13, 17, and 24, 1954. Therefore, I wish to make that correction of the RECORD. I made the statement that no hearings were held on the cargo preference bill. I still do not recall any action on the floor, on that bill, and I believe I am right. I believe we eventually did add it as an amendment on another bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont said that last year was the best year for the American merchant marine. So far as shipbuilding was concerned, it was the worst year. I visited the Fall River yards, and I saw only three ships on the ways. The reason is that it is cheaper to operate foreign ships, and it is cheaper to build foreign ships in foreign yards.

One of the basic ways of helping the merchant marine, which is to the interest of all of us, is through the program now proposed. In a program which provides such great subsidies to farmers, and gives such vast support to them, it does not seem to make any sense to knock out this basic benefit, on which the American merchant marine depends, of shipping half of the surpluses in our own bottoms.

If we cannot agree on that point, then no subsidy makes any sense. I hope Senators will remember that this is vital to our security.

Mr. AIKEN. I was referring to the earnings of the shipping lines, not to the cost of building the ships.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute on the bill to the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a question has been raised with regard to the significance of section 213 of the bill, which provides protection for tenants and sharecroppers. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee to give us his interpretation of that section, because I believe it is necessary to have a clear legislative history made on that point. Suppose that a tenant is on a year-to-year basis with no written lease. Would this provision give him any protection at the end of the year when his term expired?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly what the provision is designed to do. The term "tenant," as used in the bill, refers to anyone in a tenant relationship whether under a written or a verbal contract, or any other arrangement that may be customary in the locality where the question arises. And the provision is designed to apply to the case where the lease or other arrangement is expiring. Up until that time the landlord would have no legal right to displace the tenant. This provision is designed to require the conservation reserve program to be so administered as to protect the rights of tenants and discourage landlords from displacing them when their terms expire, so as to reap greater benefits under the program for themselves. Of course the landlords' rights must be observed, too, but the program should not make it more profitable for them to displace their tenants. Other provisions for the protection of tenants appear on pages 8 and 24 of the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is the interpretation of the chairman of the committee that it is not necessary that there be a written lease in order to protect the rights of tenants, as described in the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If it is a verbal agreement, they would still be protected?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to myself on the bill.

I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I believe that the procedure suggested by the chairman of the committee who is handling the bill is eminently sound and equitable. As I understand, both the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have indicated they will promptly hold hearings.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has stated to the Senate that immediately following the Easter recess, both the agricultural groups who have a vital interest in the matter and the merchant marine groups will have an opportunity to come before the committee and give their testimony, and that, also, certain facets of the legislation, such as that dealing with reefers, will be considered.

I have been a little surprised by some statements made that apparently a foreign government had indicated that unless the Congress of the United States passed legislation which met that country's specifications, it would not deal with our Government. I do not want the Congress of the United States to be asked to legislate with a gun at its head. The American people have been very generous in the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield myself an additional minute. The American people have been very generous, to the extent of $35 billion, in helping to rehabilitate the industries of Europe and of Asia, and have been endeavoring to build up the economies of those foreign countries.

I believe it comes with ill grace indeed to have it suggested to Congress, a coordinate branch of government under the Constitution, that unless we legislate on a definition of what foreign countries believe should be included in legislation, they will not deal with this country. I think as a matter of self respect Congress should strike the provision from the bill, and then through normal legislative processes hold hearings to make certain that equity is done to the American farmer and to the American merchant marine.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 5 minutes to answer some of the statements that have been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

SEVERAL SENATORS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. I shall try to complete my statement in 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, if the Senate now fails to strike section 307 from the bill, it will indeed have done a great injury to the American merchant marine. The same provision was included in the farm bill last year. We went to the then chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and asked him to remove that provision from the bill, so that we could hold hearings on it. I believe he agreed to do it at that time, and a bill was introduced almost immediately, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a correction. I was not chairman of the committee at the time.

Mr. BUTLER. I am sorry. It was the Senator from Louisiana. I should like the RECORD to show it was the Senator from Louisiana. The bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator from Louisiana promised the labor organizations, the A. F. of L., the CIO, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and many other organizations and individuals that a prompt hearing would be held. No hearing has ever been held, although we have asked for one time and time again. Now the Senate, under a limitation of time, says we cannot have time to be heard on the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Maryland has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, these transactions are not really commercial transactions. If Senators will look at page 57 of the report, they will see that in many instances the currencies received are being given to foreign countries for economic development, and if Senators will look at the House hearings they will find in volume 1 of the transcript, page 22, a statement of the Department of Agriculture——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Maryland has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, this is very important legislation, and if we are to be cut off——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as I was about to say, on page 22 of volume 1 of the House hearings, the following appears:

> I believe that many countries would object to the United States coming in and, without consultation, spending these funds in a foreign country.

Does that sound like these sales are an ordinary commercial transaction? They are nothing but a part of the "giveaway."

The 50–50 principle has not slowed up the agricultural program.

Mr. President, under the program, $1,500,000,000 worth of agricultural products were to have been disposed of in three years. In a little more than two years, we have disposed of $1,200,000,000 worth. So Senators can see that the program has not been slowed up on account of the 50–50 principle. In addition, when we consider that approximately 80 percent of all the cargoes of our tramp fleet are 50–50 cargoes, it is clear that unless section 307 is deleted, the 50–50 provision will be substantially impaired, if not repealed. If that is the case, it is not difficult to grasp the significance of the Maritime Administrator's statement that in such case our tramp fleet would have to be tied up or sold foreign.

Mr. President, if the foreign nations referred to in the letter to which our distinguished minority leader has made reference are able to dictate to us the terms on which we are to run our merchant marine, then I say to the farmers, "If you lay up your merchant marine you will pay such a heavy tariff for freight that you will not be able to carry away your agricultural products."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, do not forget that in the Second World War ocean rates went up 2,000 percent because we did not have American bottoms. We cannot destroy our merchant marine and develop our farm community at the same time, or farmers will pay through the nose for every ton that is shipped abroad. We are now carrying only about 22 percent of our export and import commerce in American-flag vessels.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Maryland has again expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield half a minute to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I also wish to point out that up to date we have carried $769,000,000 worth of surplus agricultural products, which, under the 50–50 principle, have cost us but $3 million, or less than one-half of one percent of the total dollar value of the agricultural products carried.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I further announce, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—57

Barkley	Hennings	Millikin
Beall	Hill	Monroney
Bender	Hruska	Morse
Bible	Humphrey	Murray
Bridges	Ives	Neely
Bush	Jackson	Neuberger
Butler	Jenner	Pastore
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Payne
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Potter
Cotton	Kennedy	Purtell
Curtis	Kerr	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Knowland	Scott
Duff	Kuchel	Smathers
Ellender	Laird	Smith, Maine
Ervin	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Magnuson	Sparkman
Goldwater	Malone	Stennis
Green	Martin, Pa.	Thurmond
Hyden	McCarthy	Williams

NAYS—23

Aiken	Flanders	Mundt
Anderson	Fullbright	Schoeppel
Barrett	Gore	Thye
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Watkins
Case, S. Dak.	Holland	Welker
Douglas	Langer	Wiley
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Young
Eastland	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—16

Allott	Daniel	O'Mahoney
Bricker	George	Robertson
Byrd	Kefauver	Russell
Capehart	Long	Symington
Carlson	Mansfield	
Chavez	McNamara	

So Mr. MAGNUSON'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Washington to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not have the floor. The Senator can have the floor in his own right.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, during the debate on the agricultural bill, it has been constantly asserted that the reasons for flexible parity supports in the Benson farm program have been threefold: First, to reduce the cost of the operation of the farm program; second, to reduce production of surplus agricultural commodities; and, third, to reduce the amounts of such commodities that are going into storage under the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a series of tables. The figures show the cost of the rigid price-support program as compared with the cost under the Benson program. The figures show clearly that the total cost of maintaining price supports for all commodities from the years 1933 to 1955 was $2,720,800,000, while the cost for the basics was only $489,600,000.

Only about 39 percent of the total cost of the program was incurred between 1933 and the end of fiscal 1952. All the rest of the cost of the program occurred under Mr. Benson. He has neither reduced the cost of the program, nor reduced the production of surplus commodities, nor reduced the amount that has gone into storage.

The tables clearly show that, based on experience of the cost of the programs, Mr. Benson truly deserves the title of "Mr. Wrongway Benson," because that is exactly the direction which his program has taken. The tables, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, will support my contention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Costs of maintaining price supports on agricultural commodities

[In millions of dollars]

	Basics	Designated nonbasics	Other nonbasics	All commodities
1933-52	+25.1	−702.5	−371.6	−1,048.9
1953	−45.8	−5.3	−10.0	−61.1
1954	−177.4	−131.2	−110.9	−419.5
1955	−194.5	−441.6	−162.9	−799.1
July–December 1955	−97.0	−185.6	−109.5	−392.1
Total, 1953–55	−514.7	−763.7	−393.3	−1,671.8
Total, 1933–55	−489.6	−1,466	−764.9	−2,720.8
Percent of total cost	18	54	28	

NOTE.—Only about 39 percent of the total cost of the program was incurred between 1933 and the end of fiscal 1952, less than 41 percent by the end of fiscal 1953, and the remaining 59 percent since then.

Effect of lower support levels on amounts going into storage, and production resulting from changes in acreage, 1954 and 1955

	Change in support level	Acreage	Production	Change in quantities in support program		Change in support level	Acreage	Production	Change in quantities in support program
Corn	−2.5	+6	+5.8	+365	Barley	−18	+9	+5.4	−22
Cotton, upland	+3	−15	+7.4	+206	Flaxseed	−7.3	−11.5	−.5	+19
Peanuts			+57	+2,192	Grain sorghum	−21.5	+19	+7.4	+2.4
Rice	−5.3	−29	−17.4	−19	Oats	−15	+1	+5.3	−13
Tobacco		−9	+.5	+38	Rye	−17.5	+24	+21	+82
Wheat	−8	−11	−4.7	−36	Soybeans	−8	+5	+8.5	−2.6

Percentage changes in parity, support levels, production, and price supports extended, 1954 and 1955

	Unit of quantity	Percent of parity		Percent change in support level, 1954–55	Percent change in production, 1954–55	Percent change in quantities in support program, 1954–55		Unit of quantity	Percent of parity		Percent change in support level, 1954–55	Percent change in production, 1954–55	Percent change in quantities in support program, 1954–55
		1954	1955						1954	1955			
Corn	Bushel	90	87	−2.5	+5.8	+365	Barley	do	85	70	−18	+5.4	−22
Cotton, upland	Bale	90	90	+3	+7.4	+206	Flaxseed	do	70	65	−7.3	−.5	+19
Peanuts	Pound	90	90		+57	+2,192	Grain sorghum	do	85	70	−21.5	+7.4	+2.4
Rice	Hundredweight	91	86	−5.3	−17.4	−19	Oats	do	85	70	−15	+5.3	−13
Tobacco	Pound	90	90		+.5	+38	Rye	do	85	70	−17.5	+21	+82
Wheat	Bushel	90	82½	−8	−4.7	−36	Soybeans	do	80	70	−8	+8.5	−2.6

In this 2-year period, changes in the support level were more frequently than not accompanied by increases in production.

The only substantial reductions in production were on rice and wheat, which also had the largest reductions in harvested acreage, 28 and 13 percent, respectively.

At the same time the proportion of total production going into the loan program for these 2 commodities was actually reduced.

Parity and support levels

	1952		1953		1954		1955			1952		1953		1954		1955	
	Actual level	Percent of parity	Actual level	Percent of parity	Actual level	Percent of parity	Actual level	Percent of parity		Actual level	Percent of parity	Actual level	Percent of parity	Actual level	Percent of parity	Actual level	Percent of parity
Corn	$1.60	90	$1.60	90	$1.62	90	$1.58	87	Barley	$1.22	80	$1.24	85	$1.15	85	$0.94	70
Cotton	.30	90	.30	90	.31	90	.32	90	Flaxseed	3.77	80	3.79	80	3.14	70	2.91	65
Peanuts	.12	90	.119	90	.12	90	.12	90	Grain sorghum	2.38	80	2.43	85	2.28	85	1.78	70
Rice	5.04	90	4.84	91	4.92	91	4.66	86	Oats	.78	80	.80	85	.75	85	.61	70
Tobacco		90		90		90		90	Rye	1.42	80	1.43	85	1.43	85	1.18	70
Wheat	2.20	90	2.21	91	2.24	90	2.06	82.5	Soybeans	2.56	90	2.56	90	2.22	80	2.04	70

Acreage

	1954	1955	Percent change		1954	1955	Percent change
Corn	46,996	49,843	+6	Barley	14,759	16,102	+9
Cotton, upland	21,379	18,113	−15	Flaxseed	5,869	5,192	−11.5
Peanuts	1,610	1,610		Grain sorghum	20,233	24,113	+19
Rice	2,600	1,842	−29	Oats	47,542	48,021	+1
Tobacco (harvested)	1,668	1,510	−9	Rye	4,045	5,033	+24
Wheat	62,000	55,000	−11	Soybeans	19,115	20,132	+5

Crop production

[In millions of units]

	1952	1953	1954	1955	Percent change, 1952-55	Percent change, 1954-55		1952	1953	1954	1955	Percent change, 1952-55	Percent change, 1954-55
Corn	2,977	2,869.6	3,010	3,185	+7	+5.8	Barley	226	241	371	391	+73	+5.4
Cotton	15	16	13.6	14.6	−2.7	+7.4	Flaxseed	30	36.8	40.8	40.6	+37	−.5
Peanuts	1,371	1,574	1,025	1,610	+16.7	+57	Grain sorghum	83	102	216	232	+180	+7.4
Rice	48	52.5	64.2	53	+9.4	−17.4	Oats	1,260	1,216	1,497	1,576	+25	+5.3
Tobacco	2,274	2,076	2,245	2,256	−.8	+.5	Rye	16	17.9	24	29	+81	+21
Wheat	1,299	1,168.5	984	938	−28	−4.7	Soybeans	298	262	342	371	+30	+8.5

Proportion of total production on which price supports were extended, 1954 and 1955

	1954		1955			1954		1955	
	Amount supported (million) units)	Percent of total production	Amount supported (million units)	Percent of total production		Amount supported (million units)	Percent of total production	Amount supported (million units)	Percent of total production
Corn	19.1	0.6	88.8	2.8	Barley	85	23	66.7	17
Cotton	1.8	13	5.5	37.7	Flaxseed	5.7	14	6.8	14.3
Peanuts	13.2	1.3	298.6	18.5	Grain sorghum	42.5		43.5	
Rice	15.4	24	12.5	23.6	Oats	60.2	4	51.9	3
Tobacco	233.7	10.4	323.4	14.3	Rye	5.0	20.8	9.1	31
Wheat	349.4	35.5	222.9	24	Soybeans	23.4	6.8	22.8	6.1

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF S. 2584

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, pursuant to a suggestion I made a while ago, I now move that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from further consideration of S. 2584, to exempt sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies from certain statutes relating to shipping, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

DECISION OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR McKAY TO RUN FOR REPUBLICAN NOMINATION FOR ELECTION TO UNITED STATES SENATE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Coos Bay Times of March 10, 1956, entitled "McKay's Was Good Move."

The editorial comments on the presence in the Oregon senatorial race of Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay. The facts brought out in the editorial make evident the fact—and I believe it to be a fact—that Mr. McKay will be defeated overwhelmingly in November 1956, by the present senior Senator from the State of Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McKAY'S WAS GOOD MOVE

The decision of Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay to run for the Republican nomination for United States Senator is good. It is good for the politics of this State, it is good for the country, and in the long run it should prove good for Senator WAYNE MORSE.

It is good for the people of Oregon because it will provide them with a clearcut choice next November between the forces of the public weal and the forces of the public be damned. This is, of course, assuming that McKay wins the Republican nomination, and that's almost a foregone conclusion.

The decision is good for the country because it will get "Generous Doug" McKay out of his important Cabinet post, where he has done more to damage the economic advancement and good name of this region than any other Secretary of Interior within memory. His replacement may not be much better; it can't be worse.

And the decision is good for Senator MORSE because it will remove any necessity of shadow boxing come November against the outpouring of millions of dollars from all over the country that will be sent into Oregon against him. He will be running against a known quantity in McKay and can draw the issues cleanly. McKay has a record, and that record is easy to criticize. For the most part, the other Republicans who sought the post after the death of Governor Paul Patterson were nonentities, politically speaking.

Let there be no misunderstanding about it. WAYNE MORSE is in the fight of his life this fall. This battle-scarred veteran of principled politics is the No. 1 target of every Republican leader in the United States.

Oregon can look forward to a dirty, expensive campaign. It will parallel the 1954 senatorial races throughout the West when Republican candidates were backed by a conservatively estimated $10 million in partially successful efforts to defeat liberal Democrats, primarily in Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado.

The smears and stench of that campaign, led onward by Vice President RICHARD NIXON, were just short of bad enough to demand investigation.

It should be even worse in Oregon. WAYNE MORSE is the pet hate of every conservative Republican in the Nation. Not only is he an ex-Republican, but he has had the colossal gall to stand up and blow the whistle on giveaways and corruption and—worse of all—to doubt the sainthood of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

But we think that Senator MORSE, cast in the image of George Norris and other great independents of the past, will win. This much is certain, Oregon and the entire Nation cannot afford to have him lose.

For McKay, the decision to run was almost a necessity. With the death of Governor Patterson, Oregon Republicans were left without a "name" candidate to oppose the best known political figure in the State. McKay, as ex-governor and Secretary of the Interior, was the only logical Republican to make the race. Indications are he would rather have stayed out of elective politics, but that when he was asked to run by General Eisenhower, he could not refuse.

One can imagine his reluctance. He is at an age when retirement entices most men after a long and prominent career. In addition, he has been one of the chief targets in the Eisenhower administration for blows from the opposition.

Most of these blows, from our point of view, were justifiable. Examples were the giveaway of the Hells Canyon damsite to Idaho Power Co. for erection of a two-bit generating plant, the strange, strange Al Sarena case where some of the best timber along the Rogue River was given away for the price of a gold mine claim, and the systematic rape of the country's wildlife refuges for the benefit of a small group of oilmen. McKay was up to his hips in each of these cases.

All this will be brought out strongly in the coming campaign, and this newspaper hopes to have a part in bringing them out.

It is a good thing that McKay has decided to run. It is good for all of us.

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the National Gallery of Art will mark the 15th anniversary of the opening of its doors tomorrow, March 17. The occasion will be observed by the showing of collections of the Samuel H. Kress Foundation of paintings, ranging from the 13th to the 19th centuries. The gala anniversary will also be featured by exhibits of other works of art collected over the years by the late Andrew W. Mellon, by Chester Dale, Lessing Rosenwald, the Widener Foundation, and other individuals and organizations whose generosity to the American people have, indeed, made this National Capital preeminent as a world cultural center.

It is a source of great satisfaction and pride to me and other South Carolinians, Mr. President, to know that our State will be well represented on this occasion because of the works of two leading citizens. The late Claude W. Kress, who

died in 1940, was second only to his brother, the late Samuel H. Kress, in contributing generously to the foundation bearing their family name. Mr. Claude Kress was also a benefactor of Clemson Agricultural College, in South Carolina, the Log Foundation of North Carolina, and the Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration. Mr. Kress resided at Buckfield Plantation, Yemasee, S. C. He had been president for 12 years of S. H. Kress & Co., a leading American enterprise.

Claude Kress is remembered with appreciation and gratitude by the State of South Carolina for the foundation's gifts to the Columbia Museum of Art. Two years ago at this time, at ceremonies dedicating a wing of the museum and the display of a large art collection given by the Kress family, Governor James F. Byrnes paid homage to the memory of Claude W. Kress and his eleemosynary works.

On that occasion, as on tomorrow, Mr. Kress' daughters are attending ceremonies marking the unveiling of the latest acquisitions of the Kress Foundation—paintings and sculptures which ultimately will become the property of the American people. Mrs. C. Wesley Frame, the former Rosalind Kress of Yemassee, S. C., and Mrs. Raymond Jack, who also has a home in Yemassee, are in Washington today for the National Gallery's anniversary.

I should also like to cite another distinguished citizen of South Carolina whom we all have known over the years as the director of the National Gallery of Art, Mr. David Finley. Mr. Finley's father was for many years a Member of the House of Representatives from the Charleston district. David Finley will retire in June from the responsibilities which he has discharged with great distinction since that day in March 1941, when Andrew Mellon's bequest to the American people materialized with the opening of the magnificent structure on the Mall, within view of the Capitol.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A. M. ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m., Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, March 19, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 16 (legislative day of March 13), 1956:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Charles E. Whittaker, of Missouri, to be United States circuit judge, eighth circuit, vice John Caskie Collet, deceased.

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Harry R. Hewitt, of Hawaii, to be associate justice of the supreme court, Territory of Hawaii, for a term of 4 years, vice Ingram M. Stainback whose term has expired.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be judge of the second circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice William B. Brown, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 16 (legislative day of March 13), 1956:

GOVERNOR OF THE CANAL ZONE

Brig. Gen. William E. Potter, Corps of Engineers, O17098, to be Governor of the Canal Zone, under the provisions of section 6, chapter 1, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Edward Thomas Williams, O12818.
Maj. Gen. William Stevens Lawton, O14924.
Maj. Gen. Arthur Gilbert Trudeau, O15513.
Maj. Gen. Charles Lanier Dasher, Jr., O15634.
Maj. Gen. Gaydon Lemaire Boatner, O15641.
Maj. Gen. James Edward Moore, O15650.
Maj. Gen. Armistead Davis Mead, O15767.
Lt. Gen. Clyde Davis Eddleman, O15842.
Lt. Gen. George Henry Decker, O15950.
Lt. Gen. James Maurice Gavin, O17676.
Maj. Gen. Gordon Byrom Rogers, O15620.
Maj. Gen. George Bateman Peploe, O16246.
Maj. Gen. Hobart Hewett, O12328.
Maj. Gen. Bernard Linn Robinson, O12652.

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. Aubrey Strode Newman, O16099.
Brig. Gen. John Franklin Bird, O16179.

To be major generals, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Alvin Levi Gorby, O16546.
Maj. Gen. James Patrick Cooney, O17338.

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Stuart Gross Smith, O16369.
Brig. Gen. Elbert DeCoursey, O17813.

To be brigadier general, Dental Corps

Brig. Gen. Arthur Letcher Irons, O16526.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. David Henry Tulley, O16075.
Brig. Gen. Lewis Sherrill Griffing, O16413.
Brig. Gen. Edward Harold McDaniel, O16497.
Brig. Gen. Alfred Benjamin Denniston, O17315.
Brig. Gen. William Lewis Bell, Jr., O17549.
Brig. Gen. George Elial Bush, O17634.
Brig. Gen. Nelson Marquis Lynde, Jr., O17730.
Brig. Gen. John Francis Regis Seitz, O17734.
Brig. Gen. Robert Jefferson Wood, O18064.

To be brigadier generals

Col. George Robinson Mather, O18696.
Col. William Jonas Ely, O18974.
Col. Frederick William Gibb, O19222.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The nominations of Frederick R. Abrams and 281 other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 16, 1956, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Frederick R. Abrams, which is shown on page 2675, and ending with the name of Charles E. Word, which appears on page 2676.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Earl Walter Barnes, 67A, Regular Air Force, in the rank of lieutenant general, United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Frederic Harrison Smith, Jr., 461A, Regular Air Force, in the rank of lieutenant general, United States Air Force.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force for service as members of the Air National Guard of the United States under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 and the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954:

To be major general

Col. Francis William Billado, AO311562, Vermont Air National Guard.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Lawrence Haas Bell, Jr., AO423819, Arizona Air National Guard.
Col. Edsel Olin Clark, AO1699452, Ohio Air National Guard.
Col. Homer Reid Flynn, AO1797983, Georgia Air National Guard.
Lt. Col. Jack LaGrange, Jr., AO1551661, Nevada Air National Guard.
Col. John Patrick McFarland, AO256643, New Mexico Air National Guard.
Col. John Lawrence Strauss, AO326325, Missouri Air National Guard.

The nominations of William G. Miller and 21 other persons for appointment or reappointment in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 27, 1956, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of William G. Miller, which is shown on page 3398, and ending with the name of Juanita Howle, on the same page.

The nominations of Samuel W. Askinas and 861 other officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, which were received by the Senate on February 10, 1956, were confirmed today, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Samuel W. Askinas, which appears on page 2508, and ending with the name of Dorotha N. Wunderlich, which appears on page 2512.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Walter F. Boone, United States Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Robert L. Dennison, United States Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of vice admiral while so serving.

Adm. John H. Cassady, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of admiral.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. Gerald C. Thomas, United States Marine Corps, to have the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list in the Marine Corps effective from the date of his retirement.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 16 (legislative day of March 13), 1956:

POSTMASTER

John E. Harrison to be postmaster at Eastsound in the State of Washington.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Repayment by the Henry J. Kaiser Companies of Their Government Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 16, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a press release I made on yesterday.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR J. W. FULBRIGHT ON THE REPAYMENT BY THE HENRY J. KAISER COMPANIES OF THEIR GOVERNMENT LOANS

I want to commend the Henry J. Kaiser companies for paying off all their debts to the Federal Government several years before their due date.

When I was chairman of a Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee which reviewed the activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, we made a study of the loans to the Kaiser-Fraser Corp. Although the subcommittee in its report stated that it believed that the RFC should not have made the original loan, it also stated that it did not question the Kaiser-Fraser loans from the standpoint of their repayment, though repayment might ultimately be made from proceeds of operations not contemplated by either the borrower or the RFC when the first loan was made. The subcommittee also pointed out that it was impressive that the other RFC loans to Kaiser managed companies had been repaid and that these enterprises had refinanced themselves by obtaining capital from private sources.

As I understand the situation, the judgment of the subcommittee in this respect has been vindicated and the Kaiser organization is to be congratulated and commended, particularly as other companies equally or perhaps better able to repay their obligations to the Federal Government have not chosen to do so.

Archbishop Josef Beran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 16, 1956

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared with reference to Archbishop Josef Beran, archbishop of Prague, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARCHBISHOP JOSEF BERAN

(Statement by Senator HRUSKA)

Five years ago, on March 10, 1951, the Communist radio of Prague, Czechoslovakia, trumpeted victory after a 2-year battle to crush 1 valiant churchman. The broadcast said Dr. Josef Beran, archbishop of Prague, has been fined and banished from the city. There were no further details on the whereabouts of the archbishop, nor have there been any since then.

Archbishop Beran was not hailed before a people's court, tried on trumped-up treason charges, and then imprisoned as was Cardinal Mindszenty. Instead, Communist police used brute force and terrorism to break up his opposition to the new rule, imprisoned him in his residence for 18 months, and then spirited him away to an undisclosed prison.

The Communists resorted to ill-disguised violence to crush the archbishop because they knew well the valiant spirit this distinguished churchman had displayed in the face of attacks on his church and his God.

In 1942, the archbishop, then Monsignor Beran, was arrested by the Nazi gestapo. He spent the next 3 years in Nazi prisons, most of that time in the infamous concentration camp at Dachau.

The case of Archbishop Josef Beran stands as an undeniable character witness for the Communist rulers of Czechoslovakia. It leaves no doubt in the mind of any reasonable man that communism absolutely denies the foundation stones of any free people the freedoms of speech, press, and religious expression.

Communist tyranny knows it cannot coexist with a free Christian religion.

When, by infiltration and treason, Communists extended their iron rule over Czechoslovakia, the archbishop was a pillar of strength to his people. For him, there was no compromise with the godless dictates of the invaders.

When Communist agents arrived at the archbishop's residence in late 1949 to order him to end resistance to the new regime, he went to a closet, took out a bundle of rags, and said, "Here is my uniform from Dachau. Let's go." Archbishop Beran was confined to his residence until 1951 when he was banished from Prague.

Earlier, he had warned his people, "Perhaps very soon you will hear all sorts of things about me from the radio. You may hear that I have made a confession or other things. But no matter how often you hear these things I hope you believe in me."

Freedom-loving peoples everywhere believe in Archbishop Beran. Stripped of the formal symbols of church leadership, the archbishop is an eternal symbol of the power of a simple, uncompromising resistance to tyranny. The stories of the archbishop, of the hundreds of other clergymen imprisoned and killed in Czechoslovakia, and of Cardinal Mindszenty, Archbishop Joszef Groesz, and other Christian victims of this new infidel, will live forever as black testaments to the terrorist doctrine of communism.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 19, 1956

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who revealest Thyself in the true, the honest, the pure, and the lovely, make even our wayward minds Thy audience chamber and our fickle hearts Thy dwelling place. In this quiet moment of prayer, which stands as a hallowed altar in the midst of a demanding day, we pause to ask Thy guidance as we tread unknown and tangled ways. We seek that sense of the invisible and the eternal that alone can bring peace and restoration to jaded bodies and to spirits with spent strength.

In this great day of human destiny, grant us such a vision of our needy world, with all its yawning divisions and its poisoning suspicions, and yet with its dawning sense of human brotherhood, that the decisions that are here made may never have to be reversed by those who come after us. So at the last may we be counted, by grateful generations who shall inherit a kindlier earth, among the architects of the final parliament of peace and plenty, in which every kindred and tongue under all skies shall find their rightful place. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 16, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 358)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to the mutual security program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's message be referred to the appropriate committee, in view of the fact that it has been read in the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take up the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. WELKER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Stanley N. Barnes, of California, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, vice William E. Orr, retired.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edgar Bernard Brossard, of Utah, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the nomination today confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, investigating distribution of water rights, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a 2-minute limitation on statements during the regular morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Are we in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; morning business is in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF FEDERAL FACILITIES CORPORATION ON TIN OPERATIONS

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Facilities Corporation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation on its tin operations, dated December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Nevada State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Fallon, Nev., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the citizens traffic and transportation committee for the extended Los Angeles area, California, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide additional funds for the construction of a national system of interstate and defense highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the national executive committee, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., Washington, D. C., expressing its sorrow over the death of the late Senator Kilgore, of West Virginia; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition signed by sundry citizens of the State of Montana, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 923) to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the State under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages.

At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the audio and visual suggestion of radio and television.

(Signed by H. W. Eklund and 30 other citizens of the State of Montana.)

GRANDFATHER'S AND GRANDMOTHER'S DAY—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by Emmons County Farm Bureau, Linton, N. Dak., favoring the designation of a Grandfather's and Grandmother's Day in the month of July.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE EMMONS COUNTY FARM BUREAU, LINTON, N. DAK., REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROCLAIM A GRANDFATHER'S AND GRANDMOTHER'S DAY

Whereas we now have a designated day, week, or month for almost every event or occasion of any significance in the United States; and

Whereas the family and family life is the basic foundation of any civilization, and that we in the United States have especially been concerned about preserving the family and family life; and

Whereas we now have a Father's Day and Mother's Day to honor and respect our parents, it would be appropriate and desirable to extend this most laudable recognition of the family further to give due and proper recognition and respect to the many grandfathers and grandmothers in our great Nation; and

Whereas the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, has always shown great concern for the American family, and he and Mrs. Eisenhower being model grandparents themselves: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of the Emmons County Farm Bureau, That the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, be requested to proclaim a day during the month of July as Grandfather's and Grandmother's Day to honor the many grandparents in our Nation; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Emmons County Farm Bureau forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the North Dakota congressional delegation and to the Honorable Norman Brunsdale, the Governor of the State of North Dakota.

LAWRENCE NAADEN,
President.

Attest:

HOWARD F. BIER,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 2909. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe seals for bureaus and officers of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1665);

S. 3269. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation (Rept. No. 1666); and

H. R. 5889. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the town of Savannah Beach, Tybee Island, Ga. (Rept. No. 1667).

By Mr. SMATHERS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 1777. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to authorize common carriers by railroad to carry a disabled individual requiring an attendant and such attendant at the usual fare charged for one person; with amendments (Rept. No. 1694).

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H. R. 6574. A bill to amend section 2 of title IV of the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 680), as amended (Rept. No. 1668).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 648. A bill for the relief of John Soudas (Rept. No. 1670);

S. 2152. A bill for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer (Rept. No. 1671);

S. 2291. A bill for the relief of Albino Brailuca (Rept. No. 1672);

S. 2422. A bill for the relief of Manuel Vilar Soler (Rept. No. 1673);

S. 2423. A bill for the relief of Lin Tsai (Rept. No. 1674);

S. 2594. A bill for the relief of Wan Ngo Lim (Rept. No. 1675);

S. 2596. A bill for the relief of Renza Marsale Bartlett (Rept. No. 1676);

S. 2665. A bill for the relief of Joyce Soonhwe Kim (Rept. No. 1677);

S. 2701. A bill for the relief of Hisakazu Hozaki (Rept. No. 1678);

S. 2721. A bill for the relief of Ursula Jadwiga Milarski Goodman (Rept. No. 1679);

S. 2724. A bill for the relief of Georgina Feher (Rept. No. 1680);

H. R. 1892. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lu Ho Tung and his wife, Ching-hsi (nee Tsao) Tung (Rept. No. 1681);

H. R. 3233. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to make it a criminal offense to move or travel in interstate commerce with intent to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for arson (Rept. No. 1682); and

H. R. 6421. A bill for the relief of Roy Cowan and others (Rept. No. 1683).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 2355. A bill for the relief of Katina R. Landrum (Rept. No. 1684); and

S. 2595. A bill for the relief of George Henry MacDonald (formerly Frederick William Arthur) (Rept. No. 1685).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 220. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims arising as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande (Rept. No. 1686);

S. 2650. A bill for the relief of Antonio Rubi Mendiola (Rept. No. 1687);

S. 2652. A bill for the relief of Robert Geoffrey Hunt (Rept. No. 1688);

S. 2674. A bill for the relief of Shakeeb Bakour (Rept. No. 1689);

S. 2698. A bill for the relief of Leopold Riedl and his wife, Bozena Riedl, and their daughter, Rostislava Bericochea (nee Reidl) (Rept. No. 1690); and

S. 2887. A bill to further protect and assure the privacy of grand or petit juries in the courts of the United States while such juries are deliberating or voting (Rept. No. 1691).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 6904. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument; without amendment (Rept. No. 1692).

MARION G. DENTON—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1669)

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 233), which was placed on the calendar as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 98) entitled "A bill for the relief of Marion G. Denton," now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same, in accordance with the provisions of said sections, and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS ENTITLED "COMPETITION, REGULATION, AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST IN THE MOTOR-CARRIER INDUSTRY" (S. REPT NO. 1693)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, from the Select Committee on Small Business, I submit a report entitled "Competition, Regulation, and the Public Interest in the Motor Carrier Industry," which deals with the administration of the Motor Carrier Act by the Interstate Commerce Commission, together with the minority views of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], which I ask to have printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 3469. A bill to increase and revise the authorization for small flood-control projects in section 205 of the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, as amended by section 212 of the Flood Control Act of May 17, 1950; and to extend such authorization to bank protection projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 3470. A bill to provide for examination, licensing, registration, and regulation of professional and practical nurses, and for nursing education in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 3471. A bill to amend the joint resolution of May 17, 1938, to provide for the construction and maintenance of a National Collection of Fine Arts Museum on the site set aside for an art gallery thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 3472. A bill for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 3473. A bill for the relief of Kurt Johan Paro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3474. A bill to exempt from tax admissions to certain cultural and trade centers; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3475. A bill for the relief of Esther Guagliardo; and

S. 3476. A bill for the relief of Ljerka Zagar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3477. A bill to provide for the procurement by the Government of insurance against risk to civilian personnel of liability for personal injury or death, or for property damage, arising from the operation of motor vehicles in the performance of official Government duties, and for other purposes; and

S. 3478. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance payable to rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3479. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Vamardelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLANDERS (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 3480. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine any claims of the heirs of the late Irvin Scranton Ross under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 3481. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 3482. A bill to provide for transfer of title to certain lands to the Carlsbad Irrigation District, New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was reported, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. Res. 233. Resolution for the relief of Marion G. Denton; reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, and placed on the calendar.

(See resolution printed in full when referred to under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INCREASED AUTHORIZATION FOR SMALL FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase and revise the authorization for small flood-control projects in section 205 of the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, as amended, by section 212 of the Flood Control Act of May 17, 1950; and to extend such authorization to bank protection projects.

This bill is designed to provide the means for attacking a most pressing problem. This problem is the need for

flood protection on smaller river valleys and in isolated locations on major rivers. The very minimum of protection is not available in many of these areas and is urgently needed.

The Chief of Engineers has estimated that flood-control projects now in operation prevent over $490 million in damages each year. When authorized projects now under construction or not yet started are complete, it is expected that annual flood losses will be reduced to $200 million annually.

However, these figures apply only to the main river and major tributary valleys of the country. The Department of Agriculture has estimated that floods on smaller river valleys cause additional losses of $300 million annually.

In meeting the needs of flood protection we must give attention to reducing the losses from damage in these areas. The procedure of authorization and appropriation by the Congress for flood-control projects, now required by law, is a necessary requirement in the case of large projects involving considerable expenditures. This procedure protects the taxpayers' interests. Surveys and hearings are required; the process usually requires a number of years to complete.

In the case of small projects, the delay in time may make earlier surveys and hearings out of date and repetition of the process may be required. Requests for authorizations and appropriations for small projects may be deferred during consideration of larger, more impressive requests. The final expense in time and money for this complicated procedure, when compared with the cost of small projects under $500,000, is not justified.

The Congress has recognized the need for a better procedure to handle small projects. Existing law permits the construction of projects costing less than $150,000 without action by this laborious process. A limit of $3 million is now placed on the amount which can be expended in 1 fiscal year.

Although these provisions have brought about needed work in many areas, the limitations must be liberalized if the required job is to be done. The bill I am introducing would raise the maximum amount which can be spent on a single project to $500,000 and would allow the total expenditure of $15 million in a single fiscal year.

A most significant addition in the bill is the provision for bank-protection projects. In many areas bank protection is the most feasible and effective means for solving a flood problem. Adoption of this additional authorization would, therefore, significantly increase our ability to meet flood-control needs.

In my own State of Washington, it is expected that such works could be effectively used to relieve flooding problems on the Skagit, Nooksack, Snohomish, and Cedar Rivers. Bank-protection works could also provide relief on the Yakima River near Ellensburg, the Columbia River near Brewster, and on the Touchet River at Dayton and Waitsburg. In the neighboring State of Oregon such works could help on the Willamette, Umpqua, and Rogue Rivers. In Idaho, bank-protection projects are expected to be effective in the Boise, Weiser, and Payette Valleys and along the Blackfoot River.

The need for such work, however, is nationwide and the proposed legislation would provide the means for additional flood protection in many States.

Mr. President, the extensive damage caused by disastrous floods in New England has dramatized to the Nation the need for additional investment in flood control. Additional extensive damage has already occurred in the Northwest this year and the spring runoff is expected to create dangerous conditions. Work on small projects which can be undertaken under the provisions of this bill will help to avoid this damage in future years.

The success of past efforts to control flooding have shown that we can substantially reduce the $500 million average annual loss from floods if we make the required investment. This investment is small in comparison to the savings which will result.

The bill I am introducing would provide the most effective means for moving immediately to eliminate a significant part of losses from flood damage. The small projects for which it provides are those which might otherwise be lost in the shuffle of gaining congressional authorization for larger works in major river valleys.

I am hopeful that the Congress will take early action to provide this protection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3469) to increase and revise the authorization for small flood-control projects in section 205 of the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, as amended by section 212 of the Flood Control Act of May 17, 1950; and to extend such authorization to bank protection projects, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

NATIONAL COLLECTION OF FINE ARTS MUSEUM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the construction of a Museum for the National Collection of Fine Arts in Washington, D. C.

My bill is a companion bill to H. R. 7974, introduced in the other House by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey. Representative THOMPSON has taken the lead in bringing to the attention of the Congress an area of our national life which, in the day-to-day pressures of urgent economic and international issues, we are sometimes in danger of forgetting—the area of the fine arts. He deserves a great deal of credit for his initiative in promoting congressional attention to a number of programs of cultural activity, and I am pleased to take this opportunity to cooperate with him in one of these programs.

The present bill would authorize the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in collaboration with an advisory board of qualified private persons and with other existing commissions in this field, to arrange for the construction of a National Collection of Fine Arts Museum. This is not a new or radical idea, Mr. President. Indeed, Congress chartered a private institution known as the National Institute which began to collect works of art in the year 1840, 116 years ago. In 1846 the Smithsonian Institution was formed to collect paintings and sculpture, and the two organizations were combined in 1862. In 1920 Congress took a long step further and provided the Smithsonian Institution with a director and a staff. In 1937 the Nation received the gift of the magnificent Mellon collection and a building to house this collection. But today, Mr. President, with $10 million worth of art held by the Smithsonian Institution looking desperately for a decent home, we have yet to provide a fitting location. In 1938 such a building was authorized. The 75th Congress authorized in its Senate Joint Resolution 599, an appropriation of $40,000 to be combined with donations from private sources to build a suitable museum. This authorization has been allowed to become a dead letter since that time.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that we may now revive interest in and action toward carrying out the plan for a museum, as well as for a number of other cultural activities. Our country, which leads the world in so many fields of human endeavor, unfortunately has a reputation abroad for callous neglect of cultural values. While it is no doubt true that we have not gone so far as many other nations in giving public support to the arts, we know this charge to be false. But, undeserved as it may be, this reputation has done us much damage.

Washington, the National Capital, is a good and a proper site for our Nation to display some of its outstanding cultural resources. Ten thousand travelers, from every part of our country and from abroad, visit this city daily. In the past decade, 18½ million visitors have seen the art treasures of the National Gallery, which represent the finest in the European tradition upon which our own art has grown. The National Capital needs its counterpart in a home for the treasures in American art held by the Smithsonian Institution, which are now practically inaccessible to public view.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3471) to amend the joint resolution of May 17, 1938, to provide for the construction and maintenance of a National Collection of Fine Arts Museum on the site set aside for an art gallery thereunder, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENT

Mr. STENNIS (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. GORE, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. HILL, and Mr. SPARKMAN) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S.

3183) to provide an improved farm program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

FEDERAL-STATES LAND STUDY COMMISSION—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations, to which was referred the bill (S. 3444) to provide for the establishment of Federal-State Land Study Commissions in the several States, introduced by me on March 13, 1956, be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I might add that I have discussed the matter with the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations and with the Parliamentarian, and they both agree that the bill should be more appropriately referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, has the Senator from Louisiana discussed the matter with the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]?

Mr. LONG. Yes, I have.

Mr. McCARTHY. And does the chairman of the committee agree with the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LONG. Yes, he does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be referred as requested by the Senator from Louisiana.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him to the Young Democratic Club, Inc., in New York City, on February 24, 1956.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Address by Representative BOLLING, of Missouri, before Washington Statistical Society, at Washington, D. C., January 23, 1956.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID E. FINLEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, during the past weekend, our city of Washington has been very much inspired by the dinners and meetings in connection with the exhibition, in our National Gallery of Art, of the special display of the wonderful Kress collection of art treasures.

As we all know, it has been due to the energy, vision, and imagination of Dr. David Finley, the Director, that we have in the United States one of the most important art museums of the world, which houses many of our great art treasures. It is a great regret to the people of the Nation, and especially those of us who live in Washington, that David Finley is now retiring from the directorship of the National Gallery.

I feel that it is appropriate that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carry a tribute to this great citizen who has unselfishly given of himself in the performance of a superb assignment. From the time when Mr. Mellon first conceived the gallery, David Finley has been his close adviser; and besides the permanent art treasures which the museum owns, he has brought to this country wonderful temporary exhibits of world masterpieces of art. I need only cite the German loan and the Japanese loan to illustrate the kind of art treasures we have been able to enjoy.

In the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, March 18, the Alsop brothers paid a well-deserved tribute to Dr. Finley. In their column entitled, "Kindness of David Edward Finley," they present a magnificent outline of his contribution to the appreciation and happiness of literally thousands of people who have enjoyed this great gallery of ours. In their article they sum up in one paragraph what Dr. Finley's achievement was:

> Mellon it was who first conceived the notion of giving an art gallery to the Nation. But it was Finley, very certainly, who decided that the gallery must be fit to stand comparison with the Louvre and the Prado, the National Gallery of London, the Hermitage in Moscow, and Pitti in Florence. And it was Finley who made the great scheme for a national treasure house into the dominating interest of Mellon's later years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by the Alsop brothers, to which I have referred, be inserted in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KINDNESS OF DAVID EDWARD FINLEY

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

The National Gallery of Art is only incidentally located on Constitution Avenue; it is not local but national, as its name implies. The true address of this vast pink marble treasure house is really not Washington, D. C., but simply the United States of America.

These fairly obvious facts are worth pointing out at the moment because David Edward Finley is now retiring from the National Gallery directorship. The Almighty made the Yellowstone and the Grand Canyon. The Capitol, the White House, and our other manmade landscape features are owed to scores of hands and minds. But David Finley, the real creator of the National Gallery, has added a new and major feature to the American landscape almost singlehanded.

There is a good deal of confusion on this point, no doubt. The National Gallery is often called the Mellon Gallery; and it is certainly true that Andrew W. Mellon generously spent something like $50 million buying pictures for and endowing and building the great gallery. But where Mellon gave money, Finley gave himself, which was rather more important in the long run.

On first acquaintance, to be sure, you would not suppose that David Finley is the sort of man who could matter quite a lot more, all by himself, than $50 million. He is a short, slender fellow of decidedly avian appearance, with the almost exhaustingly good manners af an old-fashioned South Carolinian. He never speaks an unkind word or does an unkind thing. He is an enthusiastic gardener, but you feel he is even polite to the weeds as he uproots them. He goes to church, sits on the vestry, and is loyal to old friends.

But David Finley's beautiful manners and mild appearance mask a steely determination and a happy ruthlessness that would not be entirely out of place in the Kremlin. He has never wanted much, rather luckily, for himself. But when Finley wants something for the National Gallery, iron men are twisted into knots; strong men blanch and stand aside; and obstinate men do not know what has hit them.

There was the occasion, for example, when the Pennsylvanians were being small-minded about keeping Joseph A. Widener's incomparable pictures at home in Philadelphia. The Pennsylvania Legislature passed a special estate-tax bill designed to prevent Widener from giving his pictures to Finley. Finley got President Roosevelt to ask Congress for another special bill to allow the United States Treasury to pay the tax. The entire Pennsylvania congressional delegation was alerted to defeat this bill of Finley's. There were 30 of them. There was only one Finley.

But Finley managed to whisk through his bill by unanimous consent when all 30 Pennsylvanians were absent mindedly looking the other way.

But while the Finley drama has had its iron scenes, the sympathetic scenes have been far more common. Finley has an unusual gift of sympathy (except for anyone who wants something the National Gallery ought to have); and it was this special gift of his, one suspects, that made Andrew Mellon, aging, a little chilly and isolated by his fantastic wealth, choose out David Finley for his man Friday among all the young officials of the Treasury who might have filled the post.

Mellon it was who first conceived the notion of giving an art gallery to the Nation. But it was Finley, very certainly, who decided that the gallery must be fit to stand comparison with the Louvre and the Prado, the National Gallery of London, the Hermitage in Moscow, and Pitti in Florence. And it was Finley who made the great scheme for a national treasure house into the dominating interest of Mellon's later years.

How the Soviets sold the gallery the masterpieces of art they inherited from Catherine the Great; how the magnificent Kress collection, the splendid pictures of Chester Dale, and many more came to the gallery; all this should, of course, be told.

But the truth is that except for J. P. Morgan's lovely Ghirlandaio portrait that went to Switzerland, almost nothing that the gallery should have had and could have had has failed to find its way there somehow.

"Mr. Morgan," says Finley, still visibly distressed after 20 years, "was in much too much of a hurry to sell to Baron Thyssen." But this one defeat can surely be forgiven in David Finley's long record of splendid triumph on our behalf.

PROPOSED REVISION OF THE McCARRAN-WALTER ACT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the New York Herald Tribune recently

printed a letter dealing with the McCarran-Walter Act, from the Honorable Phelps Phelps, former American official and diplomat.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Phelps, which appeared in the letter-to-the-editor column of the New York Herald Tribune, be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMMIGRATION REVISION

To the New York Herald Tribune:

IMMIGRATION REVISION

It is disturbing to note the tendency to view the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act as a purely regional or local issue involving people of Italian or Greek ancestry. In view of the international situation today, it should be obvious that correct revision of this act is everyone's concern.

Millions of people throughout the world still look hopefully to us for the type of leadership that will help them to obtain their objectives of self-government, human dignity and equality, rapid economic development and lasting peace. But they will look elsewhere for this leadership if our leaders fail to help us remove existing discriminations.

As former Ambassador Chester Bowles expresses it, the world expects from us the spirit of Lincoln. One excellent way to demonstrate this spirit is to remove the national origins quota system and other discriminatory provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act. One excellent way to obtain this removal is for every one interested in justice to demand it.

PHELPS PHELPS.

NEWARK, N. J., *March 1, 1956.*

TRIBUTE TO AMERICANS OF JAPANESE EXTRACTION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, several weeks ago I had occasion to comment on a sneering, slurring, slanderous letter purportedly written by a man paradoxically named Lincoln Yamamoto, addressed to Newsweek magazine. I do not know whether there is such a person. In any event, whoever wrote the letter contemptuously asserted that American citizens of Japanese extraction owe their first allegiance to Japan. That statement, Mr. President, defiled a host of nisei who died in World War II to preserve the people and the Government of the United States. The letter gratuitously wronged all those good Americans of Japanese extraction. The statement was a willful untruth.

In a subsequent issue of Newsweek—that for March 5—some of our fellow citizens who are nisei spoke up righteously, through letters of their own, and denounced the alleged Yamamoto canard for what it is: a base lie.

Mr. President, I should like to read several of those letters:

During the Second World War, more than 600 nisei soldiers died wearing the United States Army uniform, and many of them died in the Pacific Theater of Operations, fighting the enemies from Japan. That * * * ought to throw the lie in "Lincoln Yamamoto's" teeth. * * *

Instead of giving Iva D'Aquino a heroine's welcome, it is our conviction that men like Hiroshi Miyamura, of Gallup, N. Mex., and Sadao Mumemori, of California, both winners of the Congressional Medal of Honor, are the heroes of the Japanese Americans in the United States.

MINORU YASUI.

DENVER, COLO.

I read from another one:

All of us are proud of our fathers and mothers (who) have renounced any allegiance to Japan to become naturalized American citizens indicating that they, like immigrants from so many other countries, believed that their adopted land is the best in the world.

LESTER J. HOSHIDA,
President, Japanese American Citizens League, Livingston-Merced Chapter, Merced, Calif.

Mr. President, I am particularly glad to call to the attention of the Senate the comments which Newsweek magazine made at the conclusion of the whole series of letters to the editor in the March 5 issue:

Newsweek agrees heartily with the sentiments expressed above and deeply regrets any suggestion to the contrary. Americans of Japanese descent have proved themselves, both at home and on the battlefield, as citizens who yield to no one in their loyalty to the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a group of letters to the editor of Newsweek printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Regarding letter by Lincoln Yamamoto that there was a miscarriage of justice for Tokyo Rose to be convicted of treason and that United States citizens of Japanese ancestry declare their first allegiance to be to the country of Japan, I personally categorically deny that our allegiance is to any country but to the United States. We niseis, Americans of Japanese ancestry, have proven our loyalty in the Second World War by service to our country throughout the world. The Japanese American Citizens League, the only representative national organization of Americans of Japanese ancestry, have expressed in words and manifested by action for more than 25 years that we are Americans and that our first and only loyalty is to the United States of America. * * * Every member of our organization protests the publication of this letter.

FRANK F. CHUMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The deeds and not the words stand unretractable. The combat record of the nisei GI's in the Second World War and Korea, and the civic participation of the overwhelming majority of Americans with Japanese faces, speak for themselves.

GEORGE M. SAKAI.

REDONDO BEACH, CALIF.

We niseis are proud that we are Americans for we feel that we have justly earned the right to be called Americans. * * * The 442d Regimental Combat Team * * * fought with valor and distinction in Europe, earning more decorations than any other American unit. Their casualty rate of 308 percent speaks more profoundly than the irresponsible and stupid outbursts in the Yamamoto letter. Furthermore, several thousand niseis served in military intelligence in the war against Japan, and fought with distinction.

PETER M. NAKAHARA.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.

Letter by Lincoln Yamamoto is blot on the name of the nisei Japanese-American. We nisei who are born and raised in this country are first and always true to the United States of America.

CINCINNATI CHAPTER, JAPANESE-AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE.

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Three hundred members of the Berkeley Japanese-American Citizens League disclaim the allegations of one Lincoln Yamamoto. * * * "Bouquets from one Yamamoto to another."

PAUL H. YAMAMOTO.

OAKLAND, CALIF.

Lincoln Yamamoto is not a nisei. He can't be because he does not share the Americanism and loyalty of the nisei.

TATS KUSHIDA.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Opinions * * * by Lincoln Yamamoto certainly do not reflect those of Americans of Japanese ancestry of this community, nor, I am certain, do they represent those of anyone other than Lincoln Yamamoto.

DEAN ITANO,
President, Sacramento Chapter, Japanese-American Citizens League.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

Lincoln Yamamoto, if there be such a person, speaks only for himself in his irresponsible, fanatical outburst * * * for more than a quarter of a century our national organization of the Japanese-American Citizens League, with its motto "for better Americans in a greater America," has operated upon the principle that we are Americans and that our first and only loyalty is to the United States of America. Not a single one of our members believes as does Yamamoto that it is our custom to consider ourselves citizens of Japan.

MASAO W. SATOW,
National Director, Japanese-American Citizens League.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

During the Second World War, more than 600 nisei soldiers died wearing the United States Army uniform, and many of them died in the Pacific Theater of Operations, fighting the enemies from Japan. That * * * ought to throw the lie in Lincoln Yamamoto's teeth * * *

Instead of giving Iva D'Aquino a heroine's welcome it is our conviction that men like Hiroshi Miyamura of Gallup, N. Mex., and Sadao Mumemori of California, both winners of the Congressional Medal of Honor, are the heroes of the Japanese Americans in the United States.

MINORU YASUI.

DENVER, COLO.

All of us are proud of our fathers and mothers [who] have renounced any allegiance to Japan to become naturalized American citizens indicating that they, like immigrants from so many other countries, believed that their adopted land is the best in the world. * * *

LESTER J. HOSHIDA,
President, Japanese-American Citizens League, Livingston-Merced Chapter, Merced, Calif.

On behalf of the Pasadena Japanese Community Center, we wish to refuse the letter written by Lincoln Yamamoto. He does not represent the nisei of Pasadena.

JIRO OISHI.

PASADENA, CALIF.

Mr. KUCHEL. I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from Mr. Dwight W. Norris, for the editors of Newsweek, be printed in the REC-

ORD at this point as a part of my remarks. The letter repeats the deep regret which Newsweek shares with us in the statements made by Yamamoto.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSWEEK,
New York, March 16, 1956.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are in receipt of a letter from the commander of the Townsend Harris Post No. 438 of the American Legion, San Francisco, Calif., dated March 3, 1956, in reference to a letter to the editor by Lincoln Yamamoto which was published in the letters column of the February 20 issue of Newsweek. It appears that a copy of the commander's letter was sent to you.

We are enclosing for your information a copy of our reply to the commander. Also enclosed is a copy of our March 5 issue, in which we published letters and telegrams, or excerpts, and our sincere expression of regrets, as referred to in our letter to the legion commander.

Inasmuch as your speech, to which the legion commander refers, was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 20, 1956, we would be grateful to you if you would insert a brief note in the RECORD referring to our letters column and expression of regrets in our March 5 issue of the magazine.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT W. NORRIS
(For the Editors).

Mr. KUCHEL. I ask also unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of a letter which Mr. Norris wrote to Mr. George K. Kayano, commander of the Townsend Harris Post, No. 438, of the American Legion, San Francisco, Calif.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 16, 1956.

Mr. GEORGE K. KAYANO,
Commander, Townsend Harris Post,
No. 438, the American Legion,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MR. KAYANO: This is in reply to your letter of March 3, 1956, in reference to the Lincoln Yamamoto letter which was published in the Letters column of the February 20th issue of Newsweek.

At the time of our March 5 issue we did not have before us a copy of Senator KUCHEL's speech, to which you refer. We have since received a complete copy and are in full accord with the sentiments which he expressed.

We are sorry that you do not consider the Letters column in our March 5 issue satisfactory. The column, extending over nearly 3 pages, reproduced letters and telegrams from readers, or excerpts therefrom, condemning Mr. Yamamoto's position and ended with an expression of deep regrets on our part. We have received expressions of appreciation for the March 5 column from others who had communicated with us about the matter.

We wish to assure you that our expression of regrets was sincere and intended to be full and complete. We hope that on further consideration you will agree with us.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT W. NORRIS
(For the Editors).

THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have received from the Governor of California, Hon. Goodwin J. Knight, a telegram in which he outlines, on behalf of the government of my native State, his views on the basic principles which should guide Congress in fashioning proper legislation to cope with the problem of providing modern interstate highways in America. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *March 16, 1956*

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

California has a vital economic interest in the Federal highway program now before the Congress. California is particularly interested in the following features of the program: first, that adequate highway legislation be enacted which will provide for the completion of the national system of interstate highways, not only in California but throughout the entire Nation, without interference with the orderly allocation of Federal funds to the other systems of Federal-aid highways; second, that the formula for the allocation of funds among the several States for the improvement of the national system of interstate highways be based upon the cost of completing that system in each State, as related to the cost of completing the entire national system; third, that repayment provisions with regard to roads already constructed, either toll roads or freeways that are a part of the national interstate system, be subordinated to the completion of the entire system. With regard to other features of the legislation, we suggest that the Congress give consideration to the demonstrated ability of the State Highway Departments to accomplish satisfactorily highway work under existing Federal and State laws.

Cordially,

GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
Governor.

HARDSHIPS INVOLVED IN REDUCTION OF COTTON ACREAGE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, last Friday, by the close vote of 46 to 43, the Senate rejected a committee-approved amendment setting up a small cotton acreage reserve to be used in bringing each cotton farm up to 4 acres, or the highest planted acreage under 4 acres of any one of the last 3 proceeding years.

I feel sure the Senate did not intend to reject the plea of the 407,000 very small independent landowners in this class, and their families, representing a total of over 2 million people.

Former acreage reductions on this group are unbearable and are driving this group from their own land. President Eisenhower and virtually every Member of the Senate have spoken of a program designed to help the family-size farmer, and these 407,000 families are outstanding examples of this group.

Small families who plant wheat, peanuts, corn, and rice have some kind of provision which serves as a floor for their acreage. Only the cotton farmer is without this statutory protection. During the Senate debate, no Senator denied the urgent need of relief in this matter. Opposition was based upon the fact that under the amendment, certain States would lose acreage.

I shall propose another amendment which will afford some relief to meet this dire need, but which will take no acreage from any State. I ask the earnest consideration of each Senator of the new amendment, and all possible aid in its passage.

THE PROBLEM OF SUICIDES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the disturbing elements in our society is the number of people who annually take their own lives. The factors of maladjustment, depression, and unhappiness which cause this tragedy are a detriment and handicap to our Nation. Mental illness, of course, is at the root of most suicides.

A most thoughtful article on this subject appeared in the Sunday Oregonian, Northwest magazine section, of Portland, Oreg., for March 18, 1956. The author of the article is Mr. Fred M. White, assistant city editor of the Oregonian, who has been a leader in efforts in my State to cope successfully with the grim problem of mental illness. Mr. White has tried to probe the reasons for suicide nationally, and also to localize why there has been a disproportionate number of suicides along the Pacific coast. For example, suicide, according to Mr. White, is not among the 10 top causes of death in our Nation as a whole, but is the eighth leading cause in the State of Oregon.

Because Mr. White's article may indicate some of the reasons for suicide taking place in one area of our country rather than in another area, I believe it should be called to the attention of the Senate. All too often when we are preoccupied with such cruel physical illnesses as cancer, tuberculosis, and heart disease, we forget that mental afflictions frequently incapacitate almost as many people. I believe that both the article by Mr. White and a most complete and informative letter which I have received from Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States, are of importance to this vital topic. In my opinion, some national committee, either created by the Congress or formed within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, should make an exhaustive study of the causes of suicide and how these causes may be eradicated or diminished.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there appear in the body of the RECORD the article by Mr. Fred M. White, published in the Portland Oregonian of March 18, 1956, and a letter which I have received from Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian of March 18, 1956]

OREGON HAS TOO MANY

(By Fred M. White)

Oregon's suicide rate is much too high—15.8 deaths for each 100,000 of population

against a national average of 10.1 per 100,000. Suicide is not in the top 10 causes of death in the United States, but is eighth leading cause in Oregon.

Why?

Don't say it's the gloomy weather, because sunny California is right behind us with a suicide rate of 15.5 per 100,000. Washington State is just ahead of us with 16.5. Nevada tops the whole country with a rate of 22.3, but Nevada's population is so small that a few deaths can make a big impression on a percentage figure.

Among those who are puzzled and concerned about Oregon's high suicide rate is Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER. Being an inveterate factfinder, he asked the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, if there was any tenable explanation of the high rate of self-destruction in the comparatively pleasant Pacific coast region, and whether a comprehensive study of the problem was not in order.

Senator NEUBERGER has made available to the Oregonian a thoughtful and informative letter he received in reply from Dr. Leonard Scheele, United States Surgeon General, of which the substance is:

1. The national suicide rate appears to fluctuate markedly over a long period, but does not show a tendency to rise or fall in any consistent manner.

2. The Pacific Coast States tend to run relatively high while the East, South, Central, Southwest, and South Central States have low rates.

3. Available data are not age-adjusted. Suicide is more likely at some periods of life than at others.

4. One hypothesis suggests that rapidly developing regions attract persons who are seeking illusory objectives and are doomed to disappointment wherever they reside.

5. Suicide reflects the subjective status of the individual rather than real, objective conditions. Many persons who do not commit suicide have more provocation than those who do.

6. One does not have to assume that anyone who commits suicide is mentally ill, but one does have to agree that there is a difference in the personality of those who choose suicide to those who adopt a more realistic attitude of coping with their problems on a survival basis.

Dr. Scheele also informed NEUBERGER that the national advisory mental health council has approved funds for a research grant to study the psychology of suicides, with Prof. Edwin S. Schneidman, University of Southern California, and Norman L. Farberow as the principal investigators. This project is in progress and will be completed this year.

In the United States in 1953, the latest year for which complete figures are available, 15,947 persons killed themselves, and uncounted thousands made unsuccessful attempts. In Oregon in 1954, 254 persons died by suicide.

Oregon suicides by counties are about proportional to population, with no apparent significance in the distribution. Clatsop County formerly had a high rate, but not in recent years.

The coroner's office logged 94 suicides in Multnomah County in 1954 and the same number in the first 11 months of 1955, so the year's total will show an increase when the December figures are added in.

State totals for 1955, now being compiled in the offices of the State board of health, are running about the same as for 1954.

The tragedy of some 16,000 suicidal deaths in the United States and 250 in Oregon annually, year after year, is heightened by the knowledge that many of them could be prevented.

A few suicides are committed calmly and deliberately to end unbearable pain and escape the slow ravages of an incurable disease. The great majority of persons who kill themselves do so in a mentally and emotionally disturbed state of which the outward symptoms are recognizable.

Dr. William C. Menninger, nationally noted neuropsychiatrist and general secretary of the Menninger Foundation at Topeka, Kans., where many psychiatrists are trained, was a Portland visitor recently, and in an interview agreed with the premise that many suicides are preventable.

"Any seriously depressed person is a potential suicide," he said. "But suppose a wife realizes that her husband is dangerously depressed, what can she do? Say he's a workingman making $5,000 a year or less, where can she go for help?

"People may tell her: 'Your husband should see a psychiatrist.' Of course, he should. If they can raise the money, he probably can get an appointment to see a psychiatrist month after next. That's very likely to be too late.

"In every city the size of Portland there should be a public mental-health clinic to which any disturbed person can go for competent advice. We have child-guidance clinics, but we need adult-guidance clinics, too."

Dr. Harold M. Erickson, State health officer, has given much study to the problem of Oregon's suicide rate.

"You can't tell who is going to kill himself," he told the Oregonian. "But we know that anyone showing a sudden change in behavior is a suicide risk and should have close observation and the best consultation he can get.

"Anyone threatening suicide should be confined immediately and should have psychiatric care. Just how all this is to be accomplished I don't know, but we are working toward it.

"The best anyone with a case of mental disturbance or depression in his family can do now is to consult his family physician. One of the aims and accomplishments of modern medical teaching is to give some knowledge of psychiatric procedure to all doctors, rather than to give all such knowledge to a few specialists."

Among behavior traits Dr. Erickson mentioned as indicating a disturbed emotional state are unusual silence and moodiness, unusual talkativeness and sustained excitement, an unusual tendency to laugh or weep easily, or a tendency to be easily upset.

Rev. Ludovic J. Derouin, in his 15 years as chaplain of Providence hospital, Portland, has given spiritual counsel to scores of persons who made serious attempts or, as he says, "gestures" at suicide. Earlier, his experience included service as chaplain at Oregon State institutions, particularly the penitentiary and the State hospital, where he ministered to thousands of disturbed or maladjusted persons.

"Religion is the best answer," he told the Oregonian. "Most persons who attempt suicide have put God out of their lives. When they get into trouble, what have they got? Natural laws? Natural laws won't help you.

"Persons with a firm belief in any substantial faith—Catholic, Protestant or Jewish—rarely attempt suicide. Their faith gives them the fortitude to bear their share of suffering. Through religion they have a source of help in solving their problems."

Father Derouin is glad that many of his suicide-attempt patients are living useful lives without recurrence of gestures at self-destruction. "I know I helped some of them," he said. "They have told me so."

One more quote from Dr. Menninger:

"You are talking about suicide as if it were an independent entity. It isn't. It is only one symptom of maladjustment. It goes right along with other symptoms such as alcoholism, wife-beating, accident proneness, absenteeism, drug addiction, and reckless driving.

"You can't eliminate one symptom without attacking the whole problem of mental health. Trying to solve the suicide problem alone is like trying to cure the patient's fever while overlooking his pneumonia."

Attacking the mental health problem as a whole are many agencies, including the Mental Health Association of Oregon, and the National Mental Health Association of which it is a part. Serious studies also are being made under Federal Government auspices at the National Mental Health Institute of the Public Health Service at Bethesda, Md.

One opinion in which leading students of the problem appear to agree is that, nationally and locally, many lives are being wasted that could be saved, and that increasing and improving facilities for psychiatric counseling would pay big dividends.

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1956.

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: In accordance with the promise contained in my letter of January 12, in response to your letter of January 11, concerning suicide rates in the Pacific Coast States, I am writing at this time to give you some additional information which I have been able to secure from sources within the Public Health Service.

The problem of suicide is indeed an important one, and has become increasingly recognized by public-health people during the last decade or so. The rate of suicide per 100,000 has shown considerable fluctuation during the period of 1900 to 1950, which represents a convenient 50-year span for purposes of reference, but have not in the long run shown any definite trend or consistent pattern of change during that period. The rate per 100,000 for the entire country in 1900 was 10.2; in 1950, the corresponding figure was 11.4. During that time the high rates were as follows: 1915, 16.2; 1932, 17.4; 1940, 14.4. You will recognize immediately that these years with high rates were times of unusual stress and difficulty in the country. It would be impossible to assert, however, that these suicide rates can be casually related to the imminence of war or to economic stress, but it is true that the high suicide rates do coincide with such periods. In summary, then, the suicide rate is one which appears to fluctuate in a fairly marked manner over the period of time, but does not show a tendency to rise or fall in any consistent manner over a long period of time.

Its importance as a cause of death has increased in terms of rank order during this 50-year span primarily because some of the other causes of death have decreased markedly while suicide has remained relatively stable except for periodic variations. It should also be pointed out that there are some consistent regional differences throughout the country during the same span of years. The Pacific Coast States tend to run relatively high while the East, South, Central, Southwest, and South Central States have low rates. Other regions have intermediate values which are around the national average or slightly above or below this figure.

In view of the fact that there are rather marked regional differences, one must assume that there are very complex factors at work determining suicide rates. First, the data which are available are not age adjusted, and it is quite conceivable that part of the differences may be related to this factor, since suicide is known to be more likely at some periods of life than at others. Second, there may be highly complex factors which determine migration of individuals, causing those with high suicide tendencies to populate some parts of the country in preference to others. One hypothesis would suggest that

people who go to the regions which are rapidly developing and which have not established all of the rigidities of our established social milieu in the older parts of the country, may be those who are seeking illusory objectives which are doomed to disappointment regardless of the actual locale in which they reside. I would stress again that this is a hypothesis, but it does somewhat square with the relative rates in various parts of the country. It should be stressed, too, that suicide is in fact a reflection of the status of the individual rather than a mirror of objective, real conditions. It is perfectly obvious that many people who do not commit suicide face extreme disappointment, deprivation, and reverses. On the other hand, those who do commit the act frequently have provocation which is minor in comparison with that of other people who eschew the solution. It is a personal environmental relationship that is involved, and sudden changes for better or worse may cause a change in rate. Therefore, one does not have to assume that anyone who commits suicide is mentally ill, but one does have to agree that there is a definite difference in the personality structure of those who choose this mode of adaptation to those who adopt a more realistic attitude of coping with their problems on a survival basis.

Specifically, it has been suggested that suicide is likely to be the highest among those who have relatively little indentification with the established social order as evidenced by the many indications of group membership and community involvement. Single people show a higher rate than do married persons, as do those living in disorganized social milieus. Insofar as the Pacific Coast States have any prevailing conditions of an economic or industrial nature that tend to cast large numbers of people into the role of the segregated and not established individuals, one would expect the rate to be correspondingly high.

The National Advisory Mental Health Council has approved funds for a research grant to study the psychology of suicides with Prof. Edwin S. Shneidman, University of Southern California, and Norman L. Farberow as the principal investigators. This project which will be completed in 1956, is now in progress.

Perhaps what has been said represents enough in the way of speculation. It should be clear that suicide represents a special problem in terms of the ability of people to meet their difficulties. It is rather doubtful whether it would be desirable at this time to initiate special studies vis-a-vis the problem of suicide, since probably the basic and clinical research being conducted at the National Institute of Mental Health and many of the studies supported through the grant program will contribute to an understanding of the dynamics of the suicide mechanism. It would seem that an epidemiological approach might well await further clarification of some of the problems of personality structure and that the field studies you suggest could be fruitfully considered in a future, although not distant, context.

Because of your interest in the problem, I believe you will find the three articles listed provocative and enlightening:

An Epidemiologic Analysis of Suicide, by John E. Gordon, M. D., Erich Lindemann, M. D., Johannes Ipsen, M. D., and Warren T. Vaughan, Jr., M. D.; pages 136–175. The article appears in Epidemiology of Mental Disorder. Papers presented at a round table at the 1949 annual conference of the Milbank Memorial Fund, November 16–17, 1949.

Suicide Prevention as a Public Health Problem, by Dr. John F. Oliver, appearing in American Journal of Public Health, the American Public Health Association, November 1954, volume 44, No. 11.

Suicide—An Epidemiologic Analysis, by James Weiss, M. D., appearing in Psychiatric Quarterly, April 1954.

The last article includes a good bibliography, in case you wish to explore the subject further.

It is gratifying to know of your interest in a problem which is of real concern to those of us in the public health field. If there is anything further I can do to be of assistance, please call on me.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD A. SCHEELE,
Surgeon General.

"THE MONTANA CONTINGENT" OF THE NAVAL AIR RESERVE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak for 2 extra minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Congress and the Department of Defense have been disturbed in recent months over the effectiveness and progress of our military Reserve programs. The Reserve programs are being continually reorganized and subject to revision. However, in reading the March 12 issue of the Great Falls Tribune, Great Falls, Mont., I found some encouragement insofar as it concerns the Naval Air Reserve.

The Tribune carries an article about a group of 13 Montana naval officers and pilots, sometimes referred to as the "Montana contingent" of VF–901 Naval Air Reserve Fighter Squadron. These men travel an unbelievable amount of road miles each month in order to attend weekend drill periods with the Naval Air Station at Spokane, Wash.

This group constitutes only 60 percent of the pilot strength of Fighter Squadron VF–901 but each lives in Montana and each travels the distance involved at his own expense and on his own time. This is an example of the enthusiasm we need in our Reserve programs throughout the Nation.

During bad weather, it takes some members of the "Montana contingent" at least 36 hours over slick mountain roads to make the round trip by automobile. On occasion these roads are impassable and the pilots travel by commercial or private aircraft.

Because no airlift is provided by the Naval Air Station, the group of men has traveled over 11,174 total miles a month for the last 3 years. The total time spent on the road amounts to an incredible 347 hours a month, according to the Tribune article.

This does not include the annual 2-week training cruises each pilot must attend nor the special cruises which are sometimes necessary for efficient flying practices.

This same group recently completed a transitional training period in the changeover from propeller-driven aircraft to jet aircraft. Now each pilot has been "checked out" and has flown over 50 hours in the F9F–6 Cougar near-sonic Navy jet.

Mr. President, I ask that the names of the Naval Air Reserve officers in the "Montana contingent" be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Lt. N. E. Lieberg, Helena; Lt. N. Sevalstad, Jr., Wise River; Lt. R. A. Taylor, Chinook; Lt. A. N. Hellsmark, Livingston; Lt. W. H. Green, Havre, and Lt. S. E. Stanley, Great Falls; Comdr. R. J. Anderson, Havre; Lt. F. D. Mahrt, Great Falls; Lt. C. E. McPherson, Helena; Lt. M. P. Volkman, Great Falls; Lt. A. G. Christensen, Kalispell; Lt. Comdr. Daly, Missoula, and Lt. C. W. Timmerman, Boulder.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The enthusiasm and active interest in the Naval Reserve shown by the 13 pilots is not limited to these men, as there are many more Naval reservists in Washington, Idaho, and Montana who are active in the weekend training program at the Spokane Naval Air Station.

The disheartening thing about all of this is that the Secretary of the Navy has issued an order closing the Spokane Naval Air Station at Geiger Field as of June 30, 1956. This unit has been recognized as one of the finest in the entire Naval Air Reserve, but it is being closed. This is the only Naval Reserve station offering jet training located in the area west of Minneapolis, northwest of Denver, and north of Oakland. The closing of this station will leave the entire Northwest without a single Naval Reserve jet-training facility.

The order to close this station was brought to the attention of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] early this month, whereupon they called a meeting with naval officials, attempting to arrive at an understanding of the situation. The net result of the meeting was a joint letter of protest sent to the Secretary of the Navy, signed by the Senators and several Representatives from the States of Washington, Idaho, and Montana. I ask unanimous consent that this letter, dated March 7, 1956, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
March 7, 1956.

HON. CHARLES S. THOMAS,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington 25, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Yesterday, at our request, Rear Adm. W. L. Rees, Assistant Chief of Naval Operations (Air) met with us, or our representatives, to discuss the announced closing of the Naval Air Station, Spokane, by June 30, 1956.

At this meeting the following facts were developed:

The Spokane Naval Air Station is the only Naval Reserve Station offering jet training located in the area west of Minneapolis, northwest of Denver, and north of Oakland. Closing of the Spokane station will, therefore, leave one-quarter of the Nation without a single Naval Reserve jet training facility.

We have been provided with conflicting figures on the number of Reserve personnel affiliated with the Spokane Naval Air Station. Information received from Spokane indicates 112 jet pilots are affiliated. An informal Navy report by telephone on March 5 quoted a lower figure. Yesterday, Admiral Rees presented figures which differed from

both accounts. Despite these conflicts, it is evident that a large number of trained jet aviators will be lost if the Spokane activity is closed—at a time when the Soviets outnumber us 2 to 1 in jet flyers.

On a money basis alone, as you know, it costs about $100,000 to train a jet pilot. If only 50 trained men were lost because of the Spokane closing it would mean a $5 million waste. But this tells only a small part of the story. When pilots are needed, they will be needed immediately, and no amount of money will give us a single additional trained man soon enough.

At the meeting yesterday, Admiral Rees indicated Spokane will be closed with the expectation that losses in Reserve personnel in that area will be made up when a new facility is constructed near Portland. As you know, a new base at Portland will not be available for at least 3 years. Therefore, even if the proposition were accepted, we cannot see the justification for cutting off perhaps 100 trained men at Spokane immediately with the expectation of making up the loss in a few years. We do not believe we should relinquish our "birds in hand" in the hope of eventually getting more "birds in the bush."

Furthermore, we cannot accept the proposition that the Spokane facility should be replaced by the new one proposed at Portland. The investments made at Spokane are just beginning to bear fruit because of the recent enrollment of returning fleet naval aviators. The number of reservists at Spokane is increasing; and these men come from eastern Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and from points in Washington, as far away as Seattle.

The Navy has done an admirable job in its Air Reserve program. When the Korean conflict broke out, Navy and Marine Corps pilots were recalled to active duty and went into action immediately. The contribution of these men who went from civilian life directly to war, is one of the most inspiring examples of patriotic sacrifice in our history. The men now training at Spokane include many of those who made this contribution, as well as others of the same quality and courage who are prepared to make a similar sacrifice. It is inconceivable to us that the Navy will now abandon men who have devoted so much of their time, at personal risk and inconvenience, to the Nation's defense.

If it is money that is lacking, we are more than willing to support appropriations for the small additional expenditure which will enable us to retain the irreplaceable know-how of these trained men.

We urge you to reconsider this decision and retain the Spokane Naval Air Station; we respectfully request that the closure order be rescinded, at least until such time as you provide us with proof that our Reserve capability will not be dissipated.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES MURRAY, United States Senator; MIKE MANSFIELD, United States Senator; WARREN G. MAGNUSON, United States Senator; HENRY M. JACKSON, United States Senator; WALT HORAN, Member of Congress; LEE METCALF, Member of Congress; DON MAGNUSON, Member of Congress; HENRY C. DWORSHAK, United States Senator; HERMAN WELKER, United States Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In conclusion, I wish to say that there is no doubt in my mind that the curtailment of such an active unit will severely hamper the capabilities of our Naval Reserve.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I commend the distinguished junior Senator from Montana for a very fine statement in connection with the announced closing of the large Naval Reserve training center at Spokane. With all the talk which has been going on about building up our reserves, it seems almost incredible that at this stage the Navy should announce the closing of the only jet air training center west of the Mississippi and north of California.

If we are to encourage an interest in our Reserve program and to build it up, certainly there is a very positive need for the continuation of the installation at Spokane, which has the enthusiastic support of the naval airmen from Idaho, Montana, and Washington.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to take this occasion publicly to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and his colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], for the leading part they have taken in trying to keep alive the naval air station at Spokane, Wash., and to bring about a rescinding of the order issued by the Secretary of the Navy closing the station as of June 30, 1956. I assure the Senators from Washington that the Senators from Idaho and Montana will be very happy indeed to be of all possible assistance to them in their endeavor to prevent the closing of the station.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS TO INFLUENCE VOTES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OR DECISIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senate has authorized a special committee, the purpose of which is to check lobbying activities with particular emphasis upon the possibility that campaign contribution might have been made for the intended purpose of either influencing votes by the Members of Congress or influencing decisions by officials in the executive departments.

In this connection, last week, on March 12, 13, 14, and 15, there appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch a series of articles giving a detailed account of how a Joseph Mitchell, owner of the Jefferson Loan Co. and various other enterprises, with offices in St. Louis, Mo., had in 1948 made an offer to contribute $70,000 to the Democratic National Committee at a time when he was asking the finance director of that committee to intercede with both the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department to stop prosecution on his pending $1 million tax case.

According to these articles it is alleged that the finance director of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. S. Acey Carraway, to whom the offer was made, did intercede with the Department of Justice in an attempt to stop prosecution.

These articles also contain allegations that a $5,000 gift under the guise of a loan was made to this same official of the Democratic National Committee along with a gift of $2,500 fur coat to the wife of a prominent political figure, who likewise was intervening in this case.

It should be pointed out that in these same articles there is a denial by Mr. Mitchell that he gave the committee any money.

Mr. S. Acey Carraway, then the finance director of the Democratic National Committee to whom the alleged offer was made, does not deny the offers having been made, but he does say that he refused to accept the donation after being informed by former Assistant Attorney General T. Lamar Caudle that Mr. Mitchell was having income-tax trouble.

The Congressman referred to likewise denies that he accepted this $70,000 contribution after he found that Mr. Carraway was afraid to touch it.

But Mr. Vernon F. Neubauer, then the president of the Jefferson Loan Co.—owned by Mr. Mitchell—says he heard Mr. Mitchell offer the $70,000 and that later Mr. Mitchell told him that he had paid the money.

There seems to be no denial, however, that this $70,000 offer of a campaign contribution to the Democratic National Committee was made by a man at a time when he was being charged with a large tax deficiency and that it was made through an official of the Democratic National Committee or a Member of Congress, both of whom were being asked to intervene, and who did intervene, in his case.

Unquestionably, this raises serious questions of propriety, and I join the St. Louis Post-Dispatch when in their editorial of March 14, they state:

> Here, in broad outline, is a story which certainly demands full investigation by the Department of Justice and by the proper congressional committee. More than that, it is a mandate for the adoption of legislation which would make such situations less probable.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 13, 1956, followed by the other articles appearing under dates of March 12, 14, and 15 and the editorial of March 14, 1956, all be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 13, 1956]

GIFT TO TRUMAN CAMPAIGN FUND OFFERED IN 1948 BY TAX EVADER—JOSEPH MITCHELL SAID TO HAVE APPEARED AT DEMOCRATIC HEADQUARTERS WITH MONEY IN PAPER BAG

(By James A. Kearns, Jr.)

Joseph Mitchell, owner of Jefferson Loan Co., which had offices in St. Louis, offered to contribute a large sum of money to the Democratic National Committee near the close of the 1948 presidential campaign when Mitchell was making strenuous efforts to avoid prosecution for income-tax evasion, the Post-Dispatch learned today.

S. Acey Carraway, who was then finance director for the financially hard-pressed Democratic National Committee, told how Mitchell appeared at the committee's office in Washington with a brown paper sack containing cash.

"He said he wanted to contribute a large amount," Carraway, who now lives in Alexandria, Va., said, "I don't recall how much it was, but it was substantial."

Vernon F. Neubauer, then president of Jefferson Loan and now under a 2-year prison sentence for using the mails to defraud, told the Post-Dispatch he heard Mitchell agree to provide $70,000 to pay for

nationwide broadcasts of two of President Truman's closing talks in the campaign.

REJECTED BY CARRAWAY

Carraway said he rejected Mitchell's offer on the advice of T. Lamar Caudle, then head of the Justice Department's Tax Division, although he heard later the donation had been made. Neubauer said Mitchell told him he had paid the money.

Caudle was quoted by a subordinate at a congressional hearing as having said that Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN (Democrat, of Alabama) "went ahead and took the money" despite Caudle's advice. BOYKIN and Caudle were accused by the witness of having intervened to discourage prosecution of Mitchell.

Mitchell emphatically denied to the Post-Dispatch that he gave any money to the Democratic National Committee. BOYKIN declared he had no knowledge of the reported contribution and did not handle any of the money. Caudle has denied making the statement about BOYKIN attributed to him.

Carraway confirmed that Neubauer was present when Mitchell appeared at the Democratic committee's headquarters in the Ring Building in 1948 with his bag of cash and offered a large contribution.

CARRAWAY'S STORY

Explaining his part in the meeting, Carraway said:

"I knew Joe Mitchell was in tax trouble and I called Lamar Caudle, who advised me not to take any money from him.

"I heard later that the money had been donated and, on one occasion, I asked Joseph L. Blythe, then Democratic National Committee treasurer, about it and he denied the money had been contributed.

"On this occasion, I warned him about Mitchell being in tax trouble and told him what Caudle told me—not to take the money."

Carraway added: "If the $70,000 went into the committee, it didn't go in through me."

Blythe is now dead.

As disclosed yesterday by the Post-Dispatch, Carraway interceded with Government officials in Mitchell's behalf after receiving $5,000 from Jefferson Loan Co. in early 1949. Only $100 of the $5,000, carried as a loan on books of Mitchell's firm, has been repaid.

NEUBAUER'S ACCOUNT

Neubauer, in his account of circumstances relating to Mitchell's offer to the Democratic National Committee, told the Post-Dispatch:

"I went to New York City to attend a convention of the National Council of Commercial Receivable Companies and, upon my arrival, I received a telephone call from Mobile, Ala., from Mrs. Joe Mitchell with the request that I contact her husband, who was stopping at the Hotel Washington in Washington, D. C.

"I then placed a call to Mr. Mitchell at the Hotel Washington and he requested that I come to Washington and I did. If my memory serves me correctly, it was the following day.

"In Washington, Mr. Mitchell introduced me to Mr. Acey Carraway in the Ring Building, where the national headquarters of the National Democratic Committee was maintained, and discussion followed regarding making a contribution to the National Democratic Committee.

"Mr. Joe Mitchell and his brother-in-law, Sam Ripps, were being investigated by the Internal Revenue Department.

TREASURY ABOUT EMPTY

"It was indicated at the time that the national treasury of the committee was just about empty and contributions were coming in the amount of $5 and $10 denominations, and it was necessary to raise $70,000 in order to pay for 2 national broadcasts by President Truman—1 from Boston, Mass., and the other from Madison Square Garden in New York, which were scheduled to come up very shortly.

"In fact, the statement was made that the broadcasting company had told them that the money for each broadcast, which was $35,000, would have to be deposited in a New York bank 24 hours before the scheduled time in order to continue to hold that time open.

"Mr. Mitchell had brought a certain amount of cash money with him, apparently intending to pay for just one of the broadcasts, but finally made the statement that he would pay for both of them if they couldn't get the money anywhere else.

"Part of the money that was brought to Washington by Mr. Mitchell, I was told, was put up by his brother-in-law, Mr. Sam Ripps, who was in tax trouble with him."

MONEY IN PAPER BAG

Mitchell often carried as much as $50,000 to $60,000 in cash in an ordinary paper bag in his transactions, believing that thieves would not suspect he was carrying large sums in that manner, Neubauer explained.

He said that Mitchell, needing more money to complete arrangements for paying for the broadcasts, instructed Neubauer to call the Jefferson Loan Co.'s office in St. Louis and have several checks forwarded to New York.

"Mr. Mitchell told me at that time he would need the money for only a very short time and would return it to the Jefferson Loan Co. within 30 days." Neubauer related, adding that the loan was repaid later.

"I returned to New York City the next day and Mr. Mitchell followed me in a day or two. Checks which I received from the St. Louis office of the Jefferson Loan Co. were turned over to Mr. Mitchell and he told me he had an appointment with Blythe, who had an office in New York, to make the final payment for the broadcast, which was to originate at Madison Square Garden in New York City.

"I was further informed that part of this money also for this broadcast was to be put up by Mr. Sam Ripps."

COMMITTEE HARD PRESSED

Neubauer fixed the date of the Washington meeting as the latter part of October 1948. At the time, the Democratic National Committee was hard pressed for funds, since Truman was conceded little chance to defeat the Republican candidate, Thomas E. Dewey.

The Truman campaign talks for which Mitchell offered to foot the bill were ones given in Boston and in Madison Square Garden in New York, Neubauer said, adding that they were the second and third to last speeches by the Democratic candidate before the election.

Neubauer said Mitchell, who went to prison in 1950 on a 3-year sentence after his determined effort to avoid prosecution failed, requested him to attempt to recover the $70,000 alleged provided for the two broadcasts.

Neubauer stated he went to Washington, saw Carraway and informed him of his mission. He said he knows of no further development in the matter. Carraway denied Neubauer ever came to him in that connection.

Mitchell, whose home is in Mobile, Ala., also denied asking Carraway to seek return of any money.

"I have never contributed a dime to the Democratic Party nationally," Mitchell said, although he acknowledged he made donations to local compaigns.

One of the officials whom Carraway said he called in regard to Mitchell's tax troubles was Caudle, who was subsequently fired at President Truman's personal direction and now faces trial here on an indictment charging him with conspiracy to defraud the Government in another tax case.

Caudle was the central figure in a searching inquiry by a House subcommittee in 1951 and 1952 into circumstances surrounding the long delay in prosecuting Mitchell and Ripps on the tax evasion charges. The committee showed considerable interest in reports the two men had made big contributions to the National Democratic Committee.

AID TOLD CAUDLE OF RUMORS

An Assistant Attorney General, John H. Mitchell (not related to Joseph Mitchell) testified he told Caudle, his superior in the Tax Division, of rumors current in Alabama that Caudle and Representative BOYKIN had "fixed" the Mitchell-Ripps tax case.

"Mr. Caudle's name and Mr. BOYKIN's name had both been bandied around as having fixed the case," John Mitchell testified. "There was also the statement that these men (Joseph Mitchell and Ripps) had made a substantial contribution to the national committee and some promise by Mr. BOYKIN that the tax case would not be prosecuted."

The Government official, describing a discussion he had with BOYKIN on the pending Mitchell-Ripps income tax case, said:

"He, in one of his conversations, had told me what fine people these were, and what good friends they were of his, and what good friends they had been to the party and that, in effect, they were the victims of spleen and malice and racial prejudice, and it would be a grave miscarriage of justice if they would be prosecuted."

CAUDLE TELLS OF WARNING

Caudle, questioned sharply by committee members as to how he handled the tax case, said at one point:

"I remember sometime in 1948 when I got rumors that these men might try to make some contribution to the Democratic Committee. Mr. Joe Blythe was treasurer then and I knew that the Democratic Committee was hard up and did not have anything, you will remember.

"And I called up Mr. Blythe and told him under no circumstances to accept a contribution from these taxpayers, because of the rumors I had heard about the case—under no circumstance. Mr. Joe Blythe is dead now, and he is not here to confirm those things."

Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin, a committee member, asked Caudle how he happened to call Blythe.

Caudle replied that he had heard "rumors and gossip" to the effect Mitchell and Ripps might make a substantial contribution to the Democratic Committee and he wanted to avoid any embarrassment for the committee.

REPORTS OF PROMISED FREEDOM

BYRNES then inquired if John Mitchell had not told Caudle of reports that the tax case defendants were promised freedom from prosecution if they gave $50,000 to $75,000 to the Democratic National Committee.

Caudle said he recalled hearing the two men had made a substantial contribution but he denied knowing any details.

The former head of the Tax Division said he never made an investigation to determine if reports of the contributions were true.

Carraway, who was on the payroll of the Democratic National Committee from December 31, 1945, to February 3, 1951, told the Post-Dispatch that he, Caudle, Boykin, and Joseph Mitchell had been fishing and hunting companions.

He contended there was no connection between the $5,000 he received from Mitchell's Jefferson Loan Co., and calls he made to Government officials in behalf of the tax evader, both while Mitchell was trying to escape prosecution and, later, to obtain a parole from prison.

Carraway said the $5,000 was "simply a loan—nothing more." Neubauer delivered the check to him at Hotel Jefferson in St. Louis. Principal and interest now total more than $6,000.

Carraway now lives in Alexandria, Va., and has been associated since leaving the Democratic Committee with a firm formed to obtain defense-contract work. He is in Tallahassee, Fla., in connection with a $39 million suit filed against Bethlehem Steel Corp. in a contract dispute.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 12, 1956]

PARTY OFFICIAL WHO INTERCEDED FOR TAX EVADER GOT $5,000 LOAN—MONEY LENT BY JOSEPH MITCHELL'S FIRM TO S. ACEY CARRAWAY, FORMER DEMOCRATIC FINANCE CHIEF

(By Theodore C. Link)

TALLAHASSEE, FLA., March 12.—S. Acey Carraway interceded with Government officials in behalf of income-tax evader Joseph Mitchell after receiving $5,000 from Mitchell's loan firm in St. Louis when Carraway was finance director for the Democratic National Committee, the Post-Dispatch was told today.

The $5,000, given to Carraway in early 1949 and carried on the company's books as a loan represented by his unsecured note, has not been repaid. In the last 7 years Carraway has made only a $100 payment. Principal and interest now total more than $6,000.

Carraway acknowledged to the Post-Dispatch that he made calls to Government officials on Mitchell's behalf after getting the money, although he denied there was any connection. These calls were made during Mitchell's determined attempt to escape prosecution and, later, to get out of prison on parole. He did not succeed.

Thereon Lamar Caudle, then head of the Justice Department's Tax Division, was contacted frequently in the Mitchell matter, Carraway said. The Democratic Committee official contended that he was only making routine checks to determine the status of the case.

CAUDLE INTERVENED

Testimony before a congressional committee in 1951 disclosed that Caudle had intervened to discourage prosecution of Mitchell and Mitchell's brother-in-law, Sam Ripps, for income-tax evasion. When one of Caudle's subordinates insisted on going ahead and finally obtained convictions, Caudle ordered that no more tax cases be assigned to him.

Later fired at the personal order of President Harry S. Truman, Caudle is 1 of 3 men under indictment in St. Louis as a result of an investigation into tax scandals in the Truman administration.

Carraway, who left the Democratic National Committee in 1951 and now lives in Alexandria, Va., near Washington, said he saw nothing wrong in receiving $5,000 from Mitchell's Jefferson Loan Co. in 1949.

"It was just a loan—a purely personal matter," he told the Post-Dispatch. "It had nothing to do with Mitchell's tax troubles.

"I knew Mitchell was in the lending business and I needed money to help finance the purchase of two pieces of farm property. They were large, run-down places at Manassas, Va.

"I went to Mitchell and he said he would take care of me. I offered to give him a second or third mortgage as security, but he wouldn't listen to me."

His acquaintance with Mitchell was through Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN, Democrat, Alabama, who is still in Congress, Carraway said. He came to know Caudle through the same source, he added.

CUT REDTAPE

Carraway insisted to the Post-Dispatch he did nothing more for Joseph Mitchell while working for the Democratic National Committee than he would for anyone.

"I did what all the others do on the national committees—Democratic and Republican. I called people in Government, made appointments and cut redtape as much as I could. It was just routine."

Details of how the $5,000 loan was arranged were described by Vernon F. Neubauer, then president of the Mitchell-controlled Jefferson Loan Co., with offices at 818 Olive Street, St. Louis. Neubauer was sentenced last Friday to serve 2 years in a penitentiary for using the mails to defraud by sending out false audits of the loan firm to obtain bank loans.

"Carraway came to St. Louis, stopping at the Hotel Jefferson," Neubauer related. "Mr. Mitchell, whose home is in Mobile, Ala., also was in St. Louis at this time.

"I don't know if they came to St. Louis by prearrangement or not, but Mr. Mitchell requested that I make Mr. Carraway a $5,000 loan without any credit information whatsoever, secured only by a note signed by Carraway.

"I personally delivered a check for $5,000 to Acey Carraway the same day. He was in his room at the Jefferson Hotel."

COMPANY IN RECEIVERSHIP

Neubauer said no repayment on the $5,000 was made until after the company went into receivership in 1952.

"When I pressed for payment, Carraway made a trip to Mobile to see Mitchell, who then had all the company records sent there and it was taken out of my hands," he said.

"That was between May 23 and October 1, 1953. I took no part in the discussion regarding sending the records to Mobile."

Carraway recalled going to Mobile to see Mitchell when he was called upon to make a payment.

"I talked to Mitchell and offered to sell the remaining part of my farm, but he told me not to go that far, although some payment should be made on the loan," Carraway related. He then told of paying $100.

When asked why he had been so delinquent, Carraway said:

"From the time I got the $5,000, all the business ventures I went into did not succeed. I sold some of the Manassas property and made a little profit on it, but that was merely 'eating money' and I couldn't pay off anything on the loan."

The Manassas farms acquired by Carraway with help of the $5,000 arranged through his friend, Mitchell, include a 221-acre tract and house bought for $21,000 and a 208-acre tract and house, for which he paid $15,500.

He said he later sold the smaller farm for $50,000 after "making improvements." A tenant occupies the remaining farm.

Carraway, a celery farmer at Sanford, Fla., joined the Democratic National Committee in Washington in 1945 at $6,000 a year. His salary was raised to $10,000 in 1947 and he was making that amount when he left early in 1951. He was the committee's finance director in 1947, 1948, and 1949, he said.

"We were fishing and hunting companions—BOYKIN, Caudle, Joe, and myself," he stated. "We went to BOYKIN's place in Mobile on a number of occasions."

At a hearing in 1951 before a House committee investigating tax law enforcement, John H. Mitchell, then an Assistant Attorney General, testified that BOYKIN, as well as Caudle, intervened to discourage prosecution of Joseph Mitchell for income tax evasion.

BASIS OF TAX CHARGES

The tax evasion charges against Mitchell and Ripps grew out of their operation of Gulf Coast Tobacco Co., which sold millions of dollars' worth of jewelry to Army post exchanges and Navy ships' service stores during World War II.

Internal revenue agents, who found the company kept two sets of books, figured the income taxes paid the Government were $700,000 to $1,300,000 less than they should have been, because of understatement of income.

Use was made of the Jefferson Loan Co. in St. Louis in the involved scheme to cover up transaction of the Gulf Coast Tobacco Co., investigators discovered. Joseph Mitchell, himself a former internal revenue agent, later settled his $400,000 tax debt by paying about $60,000, or 15 cents on the $1.

John Mitchell, who is not related to Joseph Mitchell, said BOYKIN telephoned in connection with the tax case, asserted he knew exactly what course the Government planned to follow in the grand jury investigation and declared that Mitchell and Ripps could explain all these matters.

INVITATION TURNED DOWN

On another occasion, John Mitchell turned down an invitation for him and his wife to be guests at BOYKIN's place on Mobile Bay. The Assistant Attorney General thought it would be highly improper to accept, because of BOYKIN's interest in the pending income tax case.

He said Caudle took an entirely opposite view. Testifying on this point, John Mitchell said: "He told me he thought I would have a good time down there and he would like me to talk to BOYKIN about the case."

John Mitchell informed Caudle of rumors current in Alabama that Caudle and BOYKIN had fixed the Joseph Mitchell-Sam Ripps tax case.

The Assistant Attorney General, who had been working on the case since 1947, persisted despite all effort of intervention and succeeded in obtaining indictments in early 1950. Joseph Mitchell and Ripps then pleaded guilty.

While Mitchell was in the Federal prison at Tallahassee under a 3-year sentence, Carraway made calls to Government officials in connection with the prisoner's attempt to get a parole.

"All I did was to call the parties who could act in the matter if they chose to," said Carraway, who was still on the Democratic National Committee payroll. "I considered this entirely proper. I used no influence."

TALKED WITH BOYKIN

One of the persons with whom Carraway discussed Mitchell's parole application was Congressman BOYKIN, he recalled. Mitchell did not succeed in getting a parole and was eventually released from prison in 1952, with time off for good behavior.

Caudle, in his testimony before the congressional committee inquiring into tax matters, recalled receiving a call from Carraway when Caudle was head of the Tax Division.

A committee member asked what the conversation with Carraway was about.

Caudle replied: "If I remember it was about the Ripps-Mitchell case, and I think it was about when the indictment had been returned or when I sent the case out. I can't remember what he told me about it."

Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin, inquired: "Your memory is that he contacted you after you referred the case out to the United States Attorney?"

Caudle said: "I am sure it was, my best recollection is, after I sent the case out to the United States attorney, yes, sir."

DETERMINED TO PROSECUTE

BYRNES: "You do not recall whether he wanted anything more than facts about the case?"

Caudle: "No, sir. I think he wanted to know what I was going to do, and I told him I was determined to prosecute the people, and that is my best recollection."

BYRNES asked if Carraway requested Caudle "to go easy with them, or anything like that." Caudle said "No."

"Did Mr. Carraway call you more than once?" BYRNES asked.

"He may have," Caudle conceded.

Joseph Mitchell, who now heads a number of real estate and loan firms in Mobile, told the Post-Dispatch that Carraway is an old friend.

He acknowledged that he vouched for Carraway and instructed Neubauer to give him a $5,000 loan on his signature.

Carraway told the Post-Dispatch he left the Democratic National Committee in 1950 on a friendly basis. He and several associates then joined to seek defense contracts, he said.

FORMED CORPORATION

The group put up $1 million and formed Seaboard Maritime Corp., with offices in Washington and Florida, Carraway related. He became president and a director of the firm.

At the outset, Seaboard got contracts for providing five shipsets of hatches, Carraway stated. He explained that a shipset consists of 23 hatch covers—the largest of which weighs 23 tons.

Seaboard's biggest customer was Bethlehem Steel Corp., which later canceled its contract, Carraway asserted. As a result, Seaboard is suing Bethlehem for $39,101,322 in Federal court here. In terms of money sought, it is the largest suit ever filed in Florida.

Former Gov. Millard Caldwell is representing Seaboard at the trial. Bethlehem's chief counsel is former United States Senator Claude Pepper.

Carraway, 48 years old, is here in connection with the trial. He said he has drawn no salary from Seaboard since cancellation of the Bethlehem contracts.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 14, 1956]

FUR COAT GIFT BY TAX EVADER TO POLITICIAN'S WIFE REPORTED—JOSEPH MITCHELL SAID TO HAVE DONATED $2,500 GARMENT TO DEMOCRAT—INQUIRY BY UNITED STATES AGENTS

Reports that income-tax evader Joseph Mitchell, owner of Jefferson Loan Co. here, gave a $2,500 fur coat to the wife of a Democratic politician and provided the politician with free office space will be investigated by Federal authorities, it was learned today.

The Post-Dispatch has reported that Mitchell, a former St. Louisan, offered a large contribution to the Democratic National Committee and arranged for his loan firm to give $5,000 to the committee's finance director, at a time when Mitchell was seeking to avoid prosecution for income-tax evasion.

Vernon F. Neubauer, former president of Jefferson Loan and now under 2-year sentence for using the mails to defraud, told the Post-Dispatch he bought the fur coat from a St. Louis firm at Mitchell's direction in the winter of 1948 or 1949. The $2,500 was the wholesale price for the ranch mink garment, he added.

Neubauer said he later saw the politician's wife wearing the coat in Washington and Mitchell who was with him, asked: "Do you recognize that fur coat?"

MITCHELL DENIES GIFT

Mitchell denied to a Post-Dispatch reporter he gave the coat to the woman, although he acknowledged he had Neubauer pick up 2 ranch mink coats for him at the St. Louis firm. One was for his wife and the other for a woman not related to the politician, he said.

The free-rent office given to the politician is in a building partly owned by Mitchell, but the politician's quarters are provided by a firm that leases the building, Mitchell stated. He said the politician had done the firm a favor.

All aspects of the income-tax case involving Mitchell and his brother-in-law, Sam Ripps, will be investigated in connection with the extensive inquiry being conducted into tax scandals in the Truman administration, the Post-Dispatch was told.

A congressional hearing disclosed that the case was first referred to the Justice Department's Tax Division in 1947, but little effort was made toward prosecution until early 1950, when Mitchell and Ripps pleaded guilty and were sentenced to prison.

INTERVIEWED BY GOLDSCHEIN

Neubauer, who is to start his mail-fraud sentence March 23 unless he appeals, was interviewed at length yesterday by Max H. Goldschein, an Assistant Attorney General who has been assigned to the Federal grand jury's tax investigation here.

Goldschein would not comment on the interview, but Neubauer said that, as a result of the conference, he expected to be called before a grand jury.

John H. Mitchell (not related to Joseph Mitchell), an Assistant Attorney General, testified at a congressional hearing in 1951 that T. Lamar Caudle, then head of the Justice Department's Tax Division, and Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN, Democrat, of Alabama, intervened to discourage prosecution of the two tax evaders.

Through efforts of John Mitchell and Deputy Attorney General Peyton Ford, the case was finally taken before the grand jury in Mobile, Ala., and indictments were returned.

Neubauer has told of being present at the Democratic National Committee office in 1948 when Joseph Mitchell agreed that he and Ripps would put up $70,000 to pay for two nationwide broadcasts by President Truman at the close of the presidential campaign.

S. Acey Carraway, of Alexandria, Va., also has said that Mitchell offered a substantial amount of money to the committee, bringing a brown paper bag stuffed with cash along with him.

Several months later Mitchell arranged for Jefferson Loan Co., which then had offices at 818 Olive Street, to give $5,000 to Carraway—a loan on which only $100 has been repaid although principal and interest now total more than $6,000.

Mitchell is a brother of Louis (Champ) Mitchell, St. Louis credit-clothing merchant.

The Government placed a big claim for unpaid income taxes against Champ Mitchell after the Post-Dispatch disclosed he had won more than $300,000 in the floating "town game"—a large-scale dice game that flourished here in 1945 and 1946.

Champ Mitchell later agreed to pay $524,251, representing the full amount of claimed unpaid taxes for 1942 through 1946, plus penalties and interest.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 15, 1956]

BOYKIN HELPED MITCHELL GET UNITED STATES PROSECUTION OF NEUBAUER—HOUSE MEMBER SAYS HE CALLED ON UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, JUSTICE DEPARTMENT—CASE PRESSED ON WASHINGTON ORDERS

(By Theodore C. Link)

WASHINGTON, March 15.—Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN, Democrat, of Alabama, told the Post-Dispatch today he played an active role in obtaining prosecution of Vernon F. Neubauer, former president of Jefferson Loan Co., of St. Louis.

BOYKIN said he made calls at the request of income-tax evader Joseph Mitchell, owner of the loan firm, for whom the Congressman interceded with Government officials when Mitchell was trying to avoid prosecution several years ago.

Neubauer was convicted March 2 in United States District Court in St. Louis of using the mails to defraud by sending out false audits of Jefferson Loan Co. to two banks. Unless an appeal is taken, he is to report to the United States marshal March 23 to begin a 2-year prison term.

CALL FROM MITCHELL

BOYKIN, telling of his efforts to get Neubauer prosecuted, said: "I received a telephone call last spring from Joe Mitchell from his home in Mobile, Ala. He was protesting that he could not get a proper audience with the United States attorney in St. Louis in securing an investigation and prosecution of Neubauer.

"Mitchell claimed that he lost $1 million because of Neubauer's handling of affairs of the loan company.

"I then called Harry Richards, the United States attorney in St. Louis, and told him the circumstances."

BOYKIN at first denied that he had also gone to the Department of Justice here with a complaint against Neubauer, but changed his statement when his executive secretary, Alphonse Lucas, said: "You're wrong about that, Congressman. Don't you remember Mitchell sent a lot of material to us, and we forwarded it to the Attorney General?"

APPEALED TO BOYKIN

At Mobile, Mitchell told a Post-Dispatch reporter he appealed to BOYKIN when he was unsuccessful in persuading Richards and one of his assistants to prosecute Neubauer.

BOYKIN went to the Justice Department and obtained a promise from Attorney General Herbert Brownell that the Justice Department would look into the case, Mitchell said.

Richards, at first reluctant to press charges against Neubauer, was subsequently instructed by the Justice Department to do so.

Describing the handling of the case by the United States attorney's office in St. Louis, Richards said:

"We had declined to act, but the Criminal Division of the Justice Department instructed us to go ahead anyway. They insisted on it saying the case was an important one."

About 1 month previously, BOYKIN had called requesting that prosecution be started against Neubauer, Richards stated.

"I told him we were investigating the case," the United States attorney said.

INSISTENCE BY ACCOUNTANTS

He explained that the investigation had been reopened at the insistence of an accounts' organization in St. Louis. Marion F. Langenberg, who had been accountant for Jefferson Loan Co., was involved in the inquiry and was subsequently convicted with Neubauer. He has not been sentenced yet.

Richards said that, prior to BOYKIN'S call, Mitchell had appeared at his office several times, accompanied by an attorney, to ask that Neubauer be prosecuted.

"At the time we had only a mail fraud case, and only a weak one at that," Richards declared. "We couldn't charge Neubauer and Langenberg with taking any of the firm's money.

"There were a number of charges pending against the two men in the circuit court, and we believed the State had the strongest case. That seemed to be the place to prosecute them, but the circuit attorney's office hadn't done anything about it."

FURTHER EVIDENCE FOUND

Richards said that, originally, his office had proof of only one false audit of Jefferson Loan Co. being mailed by Neubauer and Langenberg. Later, when the case was being prepared for prosecution, the mailing of another false audit was discovered, he explained.

Herbert H. Freer, an assistant United States attorney in St. Louis, told the Post-Dispatch he originally had rejected Mitchell's request for prosecution because evidence at the time was insufficient. Freer wrote to Mitchell's attorney in St. Louis, saying: "We have concluded against undertaking prosecution in this case and the file has been closed."

Shortly after Attorney General Brownell's department ordered prosecution, the case was presented to the Federal grand jury in St. Louis, which returned indictments last June 28.

EARLIER ASSISTANCE

When Mitchell and his brother-in-law, Sam Ripps, found themselves deep in income-tax trouble with the Government, BOYKIN

tried to discourage prosecution, a congressional committee was told.

An assistant attorney general testified before the committee in 1951 that BOYKIN had intervened on behalf of the two Alabama tax evaders.

BOYKIN acknowledged to the Post-Dispatch that he made frequent calls to T. Lamar Caudle, then head of the Justice Department's tax division, regarding the Mitchell-Ripps tax case.

John H. Mitchell (not related to Joseph Mitchell), told the congressional committee, that when he was handling the tax case, as an assistant attorney general, he heard rumors in Alabama that BOYKIN and Caudle had fixed the tax case.

The witness also said that he suspected there had been a leak to BOYKIN of what the Government planned to take in the case.

DEMOCRATIC GIFT OFFER

The Post-Dispatch has reported that Joseph Mitchell, a former St. Louisan, offered a large contribution to the Democratic National Committee and arranged for his loan firm to give $5,000 to the committee's finance director at a time when Mitchell was in tax trouble.

All aspects of the Mitchell-Ripps tax case, including a report that Mitchell gave a $2,500 fur coat to the wife of a Democratic politician, will be investigated by Federal authorities, it was learned. Neubauer was interviewed Tuesday on his knowledge of Mitchell's activities in attempts to avoid prosecution.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 14, 1956]

A CAMPAIGN CASE HISTORY

The pressures to which campaign managers are subjected by the high cost of running for public office are only too well illustrated by the story of how Joseph Mitchell, who controlled Jefferson Loan Co., with offices in St. Louis, sought to give the Democratic National Committee enough money to pay for 2 of the last 3 broadcasts made by Harry S. Truman in the 1948 Presidential campaign.

Mitchell denies that he gave the committee any money. S. Acey Carraway, then its financial director, says he refused to accept a donation when informed by former Assistant Attorney General T. Lamar Caudle that Mitchell was having income tax trouble. A similar denial has been made by Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama, that he accepted the money when Carraway would not touch it. But Vernon F. Neubauer, then president of Jefferson Loan, and now under sentence for using the mails to defraud, says he heard Mitchell offer $70,000 and that Mitchell later told him that he had paid the money.

Here, in broad outline, is a story which certainly demands full investigation by the Department of Justice and by the proper congressional committees. More than that, it is a mandate for the adoption of legislation which would make such situations less probable.

This does not mean that the politician who becomes involved is necessarily dishonest. But it does mean that he is put under unusual pressures. Is this Nation wise in exposing to such pressures those who would be its servants? There is no excuse for the politician who succumbs to temptation, but there also is a heavy responsibility on a nation which exposes him to it.

As for the Mitchell case itself, it is further clouded by a $5,000 loan from the Jefferson Loan Co., of which only $100 has been repaid. After the negotiation of this loan, Carraway is said to have interceded with Government on Mitchell's behalf. The whole story should be disclosed in full and under oath. If illegalities are exposed, they should be punished. But the election laws also should be revised so that questionable contributions can appeal only to men of corrupt nature, men who have no place in public office.

RECEPTION OF DR. WOLFGANG POHLE, MEMBER OF WEST GERMAN PARLIAMENT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, recently Dr. Wolfgang Pohle, member of the West German Parliament, was in Washington, and on January 26 he visited the Senate and was introduced on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], also added their greetings to Dr. Pohle on that occasion.

On February 28, Dr. Pohle was in Washington again and I held a small reception for him, attended by various Members of Congress and other Federal officials. I think it is well to establish the best possible relations with men of his type who will play an important part in the new German Republic.

KHRUSHCHEV REMARKS REGARDING STALIN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, press accounts over the weekend describing Khrushchev's attack on Stalin have up to this time attracted little official or semiofficial comment in Washington. Perhaps this is because the President has been out of town over the weekend, and Mr. Dulles is out of the country.

In view of the fact that these stories tend to "humanize" Khrushchev, there is some danger that they will have a strong impact in neutral countries.

Khrushchev has finally admitted publicly what the United States has been saying since the war, namely, that the Soviet dictatorship is unscrupulous, and that the power of a dictatorship corrupts.

Why has it taken 2½ years, since the death of Stalin, for this information to become public? Does this mean that Khrushchev now feels his control is assured?

If the announcement of Khrushchev is in fact an indication that the time of purges and terror in Russia is over, and that more attention is to be paid to the feelings of the people of Russia, this is a welcome change.

One cannot help but be suspicious of the motives of the Khrushchev statement. If it was made for domestic reasons, it might indicate increased tensions in the Soviet Union. If the statement was made for foreign-policy reasons, its impact on the neutral countries may be very great.

I hope our United States Information Agency is spreading all the facts it has, and that it is beaming the story of Soviet dissension to the captive countries, so that they may become aware of the Soviet discontent which is evidently going on at the present time.

I thank the Senator from Illinois.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1585) to provide for the return to the town of Hartford, Vt., of certain land which was donated by such town to the United States as a site for a veterans hospital and which is no longer needed for such purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8780) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes; asked for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLS, Mr. GREGORY, Mr. REED, and Mr. JENKINS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1529. An act to revise the boundaries of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 582. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1956, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 19, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1529) to revise the boundaries of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

In accordance with the order entered on Friday, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with the first measure on the calendar.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate will proceed to the consideration of the calendar, under the agreement which was reached last Friday, and the clerk will state the first order of business.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE—BILLS, ETC., PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 17) to amend rule XXV of the standing rules of the Senate was announced as first in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 300) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask that Senate bill 300 be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 63) to provide for the appointment of the heads of regional and district offices of the Post Office Department by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate was announced as next in order.

Mr. CURTIS. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 636) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 131) relating to the refusal of Harvey M. Matusow to answer questions before a Senate committee was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2577) to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask that that bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization and authorizing appropriations therefor was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask that Calendar No. 1193, Senate Concurrent Resolution 36, requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House; Calendar No. 1285, S. 2523, to amend section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; Calendar No. 1287, Senate bill 898, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers—under leases, contracts, or other arrangements—of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property; and Calendar No. 1347, H. R. 1667, for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution and bills will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1244) for the relief of Eva Gershbein Rubinstein was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 173) to conduct a study of juvenile delinquency in the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1823) to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) relating to the compensation of the Executive Director of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 514) relating to the compensation of the Executive Director of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill just called is the unfinished business, and will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill just called is practically the same as the unfinished business, and will be passed over.

EXTENSION OF GREETINGS TO THE SUDAN

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) to extend greetings to the Sudan was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States extend its most cordial greetings to the Parliament of the Sudan on the occasion of Sudanese independence, express the earnest hope that the Parliament and the people of the Sudan will enjoy continuing success in the devolpment of a sovereign democratic republic and reaffirm the friendship of the United States for the people of the Sudan.

EXEMPTION FROM DUTY THE IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN HAND-WOVEN FABRICS

The bill (H. R. 4376) to exempt from duty the importation of certain handwoven fabrics when used in the making of religious vestments was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3653) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of amorphous graphite was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ALICE ELIZABETH MARJORIBANKS

The bill (S. 885) for the relief of Alice Elizabeth Marjoribanks was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Alice Elizabeth Marjoribanks, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 349 (a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, may be naturalized by taking prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Alice Elizabeth Marjoribanks shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

ERIC A. CUMMINGS

The bill (S. 1111) for the relief of Eric A. Cummings was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (19) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eric A. Cummings may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

JOSE ARRIAGA-MARIN

The bill (S. 1347) for the relief of Jose Arriaga-Marin was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose Arriaga-Marin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

BILL INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

The bill (S. 1525) for the relief of Serojini Dongre Harris was announced as next in order.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask that Senate bill 1525 be indefinitely postponed, inasmuch as the beneficiary has been granted an administrative remedy, and the bill is no longer necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1525 is indefinitely postponed.

MIKIE WOODARD

The bill (S. 1552) for the relief of Mikie Woodard was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mikie Woodard shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DR. JOHN JOON SIK CHUNG

The bill (S. 1560) for the relief of Dr. John Joon Sik Chung was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. John Joon Sik Chung may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

GIUSEPPE VENTURA

The bill (S. 1619) for the relief of Giuseppe Ventura was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppe Ventura shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

TERESA LUCIA CILLI AND GUISEPPE CORRADO CILLI

The bill (S. 1814) for the relief of Teresa Lucia Cilli and Guiseppe Corrado Cilli was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Teresa Lucia Cilli and Guiseppe Corrado Cilli, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Sfc. Joseph C. Smith, a citizen of the United States.

PANTELES KERKOS

The bill (S. 1831) for the relief of Panteles Kerkos was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Panteles Kerkos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

PIETRO RODOLFO WALTER STULIN

The bill (S. 1883) for the relief of Pietro Rodolfo Walter Stulin was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Pietro Rodolfo Walter Stulin, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sfc. Abraham N. Alvarez, a citizen of the United States.

DR. FU-CHUAN CHAO AND HIS WIFE CHUI LAI YUK

The bill (S. 1950) for the relief of Dr. Fu-Chuan Chao (also known as Fuk Kun Chiu) and his wife, Chui Lai Yuk (also known as Lai Yuk Chao) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Fu-Chuan Chao (also known as Fuk Kun Chiu) and his wife, Chui Lai Yuk (also known as Lai Yuk Chao), shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

YVONNE MARY FLORESCU (SISTER JOHN BAPTIST)

The bill (S. 1953) for the relief of Yvonne Mary Florescu (Sister John Baptist) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc. That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Yvonne Mary Florescu (Sister John Baptist) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

KIM BOKSOON

The bill (S. 1970) for the relief of Kim Boksoon was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kim Boksoon, the fiancee of Alexander Adams, Jr., a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months, if the administrative authorities find (1) that the said Kim Boksoon is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Alexander Adams, Jr., and (2) that she is otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not accur within 3 months after the entry of the said Kim Boksoon, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported accordance with the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Kim Boksoon, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Kim Boksoon as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

NICOLAS HERNANDEZ-VALENCIA

The bill (S. 2035) for the relief of Nicolas Hernandez-Valencia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nicolas Hernandez-Valencia shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

ADELE KNOFF AND HER MINOR CHILD, HANS KNOFF

The bill (S. 2037) for the relief of Adele Knoff and her minor child, Hans Knoff, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Adele Knoff, and her minor child, Hans Knoff, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

DEMETRIOS K. GEORGARAS

The bill (S. 2052) for the relief of Demetrios K. Georgaras was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Demetrios K. Georgaras shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act,

upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ABDULLAH IBRAHIM HAKIM

The bill (S. 2077) for the relief of Abdullah Ibrahim Hakim was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Abdullah Ibrahim Hakim shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CHARLOTTE MUHLEFELDT

The bill (S. 2104) for the relief of Charlotte Muhlefeldt was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Charlotte Muhlefeldt may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

DOROTHY MAY AKERMANN

The bill (S. 2138) for the relief of Dorothy May Akermann was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dorothy May Akermann shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JOSE TORRES

The bill (S. 2155) for the relief of Jose Torres was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose Torres shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

THOMAS H. ROS

The bill (S. 2156) for the relief of Thomas H. Ros was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Thomas H. Ros shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DR. WEI-CHI LIU

The bill (S. 2201) for the relief of Dr. Wei-Chi Liu was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Wei-Chi Liu shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

PIL NYI KWAK

The bill (S. 2249) for the relief of Pil Nyi Kwak was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pil Nyi Kwak shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

YU HENG GEE

The bill (S. 2264) for the relief of Yu Heng Gee was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yu Heng Gee shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DOMINGO LIM

The bill (S. 2284) for the relief of Domingo Lim (also known as Lim Eng Kok and Domingo Lim Chay Seng) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Domingo Lim (also known as Lim Eng Kok and Domingo Lim Chay Seng) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MISS PILAR A. GARCIA

The bill (S. 2349) for the relief of Miss Pilar A. Garcia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miss Pilar A. Garcia shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

RENATE KAROLINA HORKY

The bill (S. 2358) for the relief of Renate Karolina Horky was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Renate Karolina Horky, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sfc. Chester M. Zentner, a citizen of the United States.

KNAR CARMEN IVES

The bill (S. 2445) for the relief of Knar Carmen Ives was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Knar Carmen Ives shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

PAULA EDITH REYNOLDS

The bill (S. 2590) for the relief of Paula Edith Reynolds was considered,

ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Paula Edith Reynolds may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

ALICE DUCKETT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1005) for the relief of Alice Duckett, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in line 6, after the word "Act", to strike out "upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JOHN DANIEL POPA

The bill (H. R. 930) for the relief of John Daniel Popa was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHUNG FOOK YEE CHUNG

The bill (H. R. 1014) for the relief of Chung Fook Yee Chung was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ESTHER CHAN LEE (ETA LEE)

The bill (H. R. 1074) for the relief of Mrs. Esther Chan Lee (Eta Lee) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN MEREDITH McFARLANE

The bill (H. R. 1097) for the relief of John Meredith McFarlane was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUENTHER KASCHNER

The bill (H. R. 1104) for the relief of Guenther Kaschner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRY JOHN WILSON

The bill (H. R. 1137) for the relief of Harry John Wilson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NUMERIANO LAGMAY

The bill (H. R. 1209) for the relief of Numeriano Lagmay was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SISTER RAMONA MARIA (RAMONA E. TOMBO)

The bill (H. R. 1323) for the relief of Sister Ramona Maria (Ramona E. Tombo) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MOLI (MALI) SOBEL

The bill (H. R. 1544) for the relief of Mrs. Moli (Mali) Sobel was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSE CANENCIA-CASTANEDO

The bill (H. R. 1666) for the relief of Jose Canencia-Castanedo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANE KARLIC VLASICH

The bill (H. R. 1920) for the relief of Ane Karlic Vlasich was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KEVIN MURPHY

The bill (H. R. 1923) for the relief of Kevin Murphy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INDUK PAHK

The bill (H. R. 2054) for the relief of Induk Pahk was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JULIAN NOWAKOWSKI OR WILLIAM NOWAK (NOVAK)

The bill (H. R. 2072) for the relief of Julian Nowakowski or William Nowak (Novak) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILHELMUS MARIUS VAN DER VEUR

The bill (H. R. 2283) for the relief of Wilhelmus Marius Van der Veur was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIE LIM TSIEN

The bill (H. R. 2285) for the relief of Marie Lim Tsien was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JEAN HENRI BUCHET

The bill (H. R. 2345) for the relief of Jean Henri Buchet was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HEINRICH WOLFGANG

The bill (H. R. 2347) for the relief of Heinrich Wolfgang was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. BIENVENIDO L. BALINGIT

The bill (H. R. 3057) for the relief of Dr. Bienvenido L. Balingit was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE MIKROULIS AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 3201) for the relief of George Mikroulis, his wife, Dora Mikroulis, and his daughter, Madonna G. Mikroulis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALKISTA SFOUNIS

The bill (H. R. 3265) for the relief of Alkista Sfounis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. JAMES C. S. LEE AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 3375) for the relief of Dr. James C. S. Lee, his wife, Dora Ting Wei, and their daughter, Vivian Lee was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NISAN SARKIS GIRITLIYAN AND VIRGIN GIRITLIYAN

The bill (H. R. 3501) for the relief of Nisan Sarkis Giritliyan and Virgin Giritliyan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FREDA H. SULLIVAN

The bill (H. R. 3723) for the relief of Freda H. Sullivan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUILLERMO PEDRAZA

The bill (H. R. 3845) for the relief of Guillermo Pedraza was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTANTIN DAVID AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 3857) for the relief of Constantin David, Paula Marie David, Claire Edmonde David, and Ariane Constance David was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTHER LEDEA ESCOBEDO

The bill (H. R. 3869) for the relief of Esther Ledea Escobedo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ASHOT MNATZAKANIAN AND OPHELIA MNATZAKONIAN

The bill (H. R. 3963) for the relief of Ashot Mnatzakanian and Ophelia Mnat-

zakanian was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAX MOSKOWITZ

The bill (H. R. 3965) for the relief of Max Moskowitz was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ZABEL VARTANIAN

The bill (H. R. 4185) for the relief of Zabel Vartanian was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GIOVANNI LAZARICH

The bill (H. R. 5866) for the relief of Giovanni Lazarich was considered, ordered, to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDWARD BARNETT

The bill (H. R. 6363) for the relief of Edward Barnett was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KONSTANTINOS ZAFERATOS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 850) for the relief of Konstantinos Zaferatos, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct an appropriate number from the first available appropriate quota", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Konstantinos Zaferatos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUDREY JEAN YOUNKERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1465) for the relief of Audrey Jean Younkers which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "act", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Audrey Jean Younkers may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MANDA PAULINE PETRICEVIC

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2143) for the relief of Manda Pauline Petricevic which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 5, after the word "and", to strike out "considered to be the natural-born child of Paul Schuldt, a citizen of the United States, and his spouse, Katherine Schuldt" and insert "considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Paul G. Schuldt, citizens of the United States," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Manda Pauline Petricevic, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Paul G. Schuldt, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BALBINA BORENSTEIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1664) for the relief of Balbina Borenstein, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Balbina Borenstein shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAVID HAYES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2289) for the relief of David Hayes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "this", to strike out "Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriated quota for the first year that such quota is available" and insert "act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, David Hayes, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NENITA SANTOS AND ELIZABETH SANTOS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2357) for the relief of Nenita Santos and Elizabeth Santos, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nenita Santos and Elizabeth Santos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAXIMILIEN BEAUVOIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2570) for the relief of Maximilien Beauvois, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment; on page 1, line 8, after the word "that", to strike out "Act:" and insert "Act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose:", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, not withstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maximilien Beauvois, the father of Mrs. Roger L. Dock, a citizen of the United States, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HAROLD MANLY STEWART

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2744) for the relief of Harold Manly Stewart, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment; in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the

first year that such quota is available", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Harold Manly Stewart shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SZLOMA KLEIDERMACHER AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1122) for the relief of Szloma Kleidermacher and his wife Sarah Kleidermacher and their childred Ruchla, Abram, and Toba Kleidermacher, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sarah Kleidermacher may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Sarah Kleidermacher."

DR. HOWARD SEEMING LIANG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1846) for the relief of Dr. Howard Seeming Liang, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the name "Liang", to insert "Lai Yen Mark Liang, and Howard Seeming Liang, Junior"; in line 8, after the word "visa", to strike out "fee" and insert "fees"; at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "alien" and insert "aliens"; on page 2, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "one number" and insert "the required numbers"; and, in the same line, after the word "from", to strike out "the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available" and insert "the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Howard Seeming Liang, Lai Yen Mark Liang, and Howard Seeming Liang, Jr., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Dr. Howard Seeming Liang, Lai Yen Mark Liang, and Howard Seeming Liang, Jr."

MARIA GUADALUPE SHOCKLEY AND HER MINOR DAUGHTER, EVANGELINE VEGA SHOCKLEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1889) for the relief of Maria Guadalupe Shockley and her minor daughter, Evangeline Vega Shockley, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "Evangeline" and insert "Evangelina," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Guadalupe Shockley and her minor daughter, Evangelina Vega Shockley, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Maria Guadalupe Shockley and her minor daughter, Evangelina Vega Shockley."

VICTORINE (VICKY) SHALAM AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consided the bill (S. 1939) for the relief of Victorine (Vicky) Shalam, John Shalam, and Claude Shalem, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "act", to strike out "Victorine (Vicky) Shalam", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Shalam and Claude Shalam shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of John Shalam and Claude Shalam."

DR. AND MRS. PETER CHOU YUEN TCHEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1987) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Peter Chou Yuen Tchen which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Peter Chou-Yuen Tchen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Dr. Peter Chou-Yuen Tchen."

MARY TARLICH GOLDSTEIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2304) for the relief of Mary Tarlich Goldstein, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments in line 4, after the name "Mary", to strike out "Tarlich" and insert "Parlich", and in line 7, after the word "fee", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mary Parlich Goldstein shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mary Parlich Goldstein."

ANNA ABBENE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2495) for the relief of Anna Abbene, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, in line 4, after the numeral "(7)", to insert "and (25)", and in line 7, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and *"Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act: *And provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (7) and (25) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Abbene may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is

found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act: *And provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JULIAN LIZARDO AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4039) for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Jaime, Dennis, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act Jaime and Dennis Lizardo, shall be classifiable as nonquota immigrants under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo."

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO MARY ROYALL BROWN

The resolution (S. Res. 220) to pay a gratuity to Mary Royall Brown was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary Royall Brown, widow of Jonathan H. Brown, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

FILLING OF VACANCY IN THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, be filled by the appointment of Everette Lee DeGolyer, a citizen of Texas, for the statutory term of 6 years, to succeed Harvey N. Davis, deceased.

FILLING OF VACANCY IN THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, be filled by the appointment of Crawford Hallock Greenewalt, a citizen of Delaware, for the statutory term of 6 years, to succeed Vannevar Bush, resigned.

FILLING OF VACANCY IN THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonion Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, be filled by the appointment of Caryl Parker Haskins, resident in the city of Washington, for the statutory term of 6 years, to succeed Owen Josephus Roberts, deceased.

CHANGE OF DATE FOR THE COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES IN 1957

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 517) changing the date for the counting of the electoral votes in 1957 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Whereas January 6, 1957, is a Sunday; and

Whereas Public Law 771, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 672, 675), provides that "Congress shall be in session on the 6th day of January succeeding every meeting of the (Presidential) electors" for the purpose of counting the electoral votes: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, the 7th day of January 1957, at 1 o'clock post meridian, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed by the President of the Senate on the part of the Senate and two by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President of the Senate, all the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A; and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE — CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask that the concurrent resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be passed over.

ANDREW ROSNER

The bill (S. 767) for the relief of Andrew Rosner was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Andrew Rosner shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

VITTORIO VENTIMIGLIA

The bill (S. 1881) for the relief of Vittorio Ventimiglia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vittorio Ventimiglia shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JENNY ANTOINETTE V. INGRUM

The bill (S. 1975) for the relief of Jenny Antoinette V. Ingrum was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jenny Antoinette V. Ingrum may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

CHONG YOU HOW AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 2012) for the relief of Chong You How (also known as Edward Charles Yee), his wife, Eng Lai Fong, and his child, Chong Yim Keung was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chong You How (also known as Edward Charles Yee), his wife, Eng Lai Fong, and his child, Chong Yim Keung, shall be held

and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

JURISDICTION OF DISTRICT COURTS IN CERTAIN CIVIL ACTIONS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2042) to restore the jurisdiction of the district courts in certain civil actions brought against the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

LILU YUEN CHUANG

The bill (S. 2345) for the relief of Lilu Yuen Chuang was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lilu Yuen Chuang shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CATHERINE TOEWS

The bill (S. 2666) for the relief of Catherine Toews was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Catherine Toews shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

GIUSEPPA BONI

The bill (S. 2686) for the relief of Giuseppa Boni was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppa Boni may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to a ground for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

NICOLA TEODOSIA

The bill (H. R. 944) for the relief of Nicola Teodosia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KRSEVAN SPANJOL

The bill (H. R. 1492) for the relief of Krsevan Spanjol was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOWARD RIECK

The bill (H. R. 1912) for the relief of Howard Rieck was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. CHIU-AN WANG

The bill (H. R. 1973) for the relief of Mrs. Chiu-An Wang (nee Alice Chiacheng Sze) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY MILITARY PERSONNEL OR CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 3557) to further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this proposed legislation was submitted to the Congress by the Department of the Air Force, as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955, with the recommendation that it be enacted.

Section 1 of the act of July 3, 1943, authorizes the settlement of claims based on loss of or damage to property or personal injury or death resulting from noncombat activities of the Armed Forces. Ordinarily, there is a 1-year statute of limitations on these claims. However, if the accident or incident on which the claim is based occurs during or within 1 year before a war, the claim may, for good cause shown, be presented within 1 year after peace is established.

This bill would amend the basic law to provide a 2-year statute of limitations for filing claims thereunder instead of the 1 year now provided. This change would be consistent with a similar change made in the military personnel claims act by Public Law 439, 82d Congress, and is considered advisable in the interest of creating uniformity with respect to the statute of limitations in these claims laws.

The basic law allows an extension of the statute of limitations only if there is a war. The conflict in Korea did not constitute a war within the technical sense used in the statute. This proposed legislation would also eliminate this inequity by extending the statute of limitations upon the occurrence of an armed conflict.

Another inequity under existing law arises because, in the case of personal injury or death, the amount is limited to reasonable medical, hospital, and burial expenses actually incurred. No recovery is permitted for the loss of earnings, diminished earning capacity, permanent injury, pain and suffering, and death benefits. This proposal would allow settlement under the act of claims based on these reasons, retaining, however, the amount of payment limitation to $1,000. The amendment would apply to claims accruing after the date of its enactment, and the proposed amendment would eliminate many costly lawsuits, reduce the number of private relief bills, and expedite the settlement of claims.

The committee, after considering this matter, has reached the conclusion that the bill is meritorious and, therefore, recommends it to the favorable consideration of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

P. F. CLAVEAU

The bill (H. R. 4181) for the relief of P. F. Claveau, as successor to the firm of Rodger G. Ritchie Painting & Decorating Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN WILLIAM SCHOLTES

The bill (H. R. 6532) for the relief of John William Scholtes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BORIS KOWERDA

The bill (H. R. 6617) for the relief of Boris Kowerda was announced as next in order.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this bill waives the excluding provisions of existing law relating to one who has been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, in behalf of the husband of a lawfully resident alien. The record discloses that on June 7, 1927, the beneficiary, then 19 years of age, fired 6 fatal shots at the Soviet diplomatic representative in Poland, and was subsequently convicted of premeditated manslaughter. He was sentenced to life imprisonment, which was later commuted to 10 years hard labor. The beneficiary admitted that he took the life of the Soviet Ambassador, acting as a Russian refugee who wanted to punish the official representative of the Soviet Government "for the infamous acts of persecution against the Russian people." He stated he also wanted to kill the Ambassador "as a direct participant in the execution of the czar and his family and as a member of the Comintern." The beneficiary was sent to Germany as a slave laborer in 1944, with his wife and infant daughter. In 1945 they were classified as displaced persons, and in 1949 were issued quota visas under the Displaced Persons Act.

However, prior to embarkation, the beneficiary was found inadmissible to the United States as one who had been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude. The beneficiariary's wife, daughter, and aged mother-in-law have been admitted to the United States for permanent residence. Without the waiver provided for in the bill, the beneficiary will be unable to join his family in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6617) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1411) for the relief of Marion Drucker was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The bill will be passed over.

JOHN NICHOLAS CHRISTODOULIAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1533) for the relief of John Nicholas Christodoulias, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Nicholas Christodoulias shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1687) for the relief of Lydia G. Dickerson was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

JOHANN ANTONIUS TUDHOPE AND WALDA FEDOR TUDHOPE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1734) for the relief of Johann Antonius Tudhope and Walda Fedor Tudhope, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "fees", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Johann Antonius Tudhope and Walda Fedor Tudhope shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2016) for the relief of Lawrence F. Kramer was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

KIMIKO YAMADA CLARK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2697) for the relief of Kimiko Yamada Clark, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "act", to strike out the comma and "upon payment of the required visa fee", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kimiko Yamada Clark shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GOLDA I. STEGNER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1082) for the relief of Golda I. Stegner, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 5, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JOSEPH J. PORTER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1495) for the relief of Joseph J. Porter, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EUGENE DUS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2946) for the relief of Eugene Dus, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT OF 1945

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3996) to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out "That section 1 (a) of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 225), as amended, is further amended by deleting the words "not in excess of $2,500", and insert "That section 1 (a) of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 225), as amended, is further amended by striking out '$2,500' and inserting in lieu thereof $4,000'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

REGINA M. KNIGHT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1929) for the relief of Regina M. Knight, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "paragraphs" and insert "paragraph"; in line 4, after the numeral "(9)", to strike out "and (10)"; and in line 9, after the word "such", to strike out "paragraphs" and insert "paragraph", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted., etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Regina M. Knight may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISABELLE S. GORRELL AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1008) for the relief of Isabelle S. Gorrell, Donald E. Gorrell, Mary Owen Gorrell, and Kathryn G. Wright, was announced as next in order.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, there is now pending in the Committee on the

Judiciary a bill, H. R. 2522, in the same text as the bill just reached on the calendar. In order that the approval of this claim may be expedited, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H. R. 2522 and that the Senate then proceed to the consideration of H. R. 2522, in lieu of the consideration of S. 1008, the bill just called.

If the bill H. R. 2522 shall be approved by the Senate, I shall ask that S. 1008 be postponed indefinitely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary is discharged from further consideration of House bill 2522.

Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 2522?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2522) for the relief of Isabelle S. Gorrell, Donald E. Gorrell, Mary Owen Gorrell, and Kathryn G. Wright, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill S. 1008 is indefinitely postponed.

CONSOLIDATION OF ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION WITH WOMEN'S THEODORE ROOSEVELT ASSOCIATION, INC.

The bill (H. R. 1806) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, as heretofore amended, so as to permit such corporation to consolidate with Women's Theodore Roosevelt Association, Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEPOSIT OF PHOTOGRAPHS IN COPYRIGHT OFFICE IN LIEU OF CERTAIN PUBLISHED WORKS

The bill (H. R. 5876) to amend the copyright law to permit in certain classes of works, the deposit of photographs or other identifying reproductions in lieu of copies of published works was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT RELATING TO FEES OF AGENTS, ATTORNEYS, AND REPRESENTATIVES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1146) to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives, was announced as next in order

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of S. 1146?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation of S. 1146 is requested.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, under the existing law, the fees of the Alien Property Custodian, in the event an attorney's fee is up to 10 percent of the amount involved, has to make a finding as to the reasonableness of the attorney's fee. The bill takes that power away from the office of the Alien Property Cutsodian and puts it in the court. A fee can be as much as 10 percent of the amount involved, but cannot exceed 10 percent unless the court makes a specific finding and authorizes the fee as reasonable. That is the object of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1146) which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 8, after the word "any", to strike out "propery" and insert "property", and on page 2, line 15, after the word "such", to strike out "petition" and insert "petition,", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (60 Stat. 54; 50 U. S. C. App. 20), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 20. No property or interest or proceeds shall be returned under this act, nor shall any payment be made or judgment awarded in respect of any property or interest vested in or transferred to any officer or agency of the United States under this act unless satisfactory evidence is furnished to the President or such officer or agency as he may designate, or the court, as the case may be, that the aggregate of the fees to be paid to all agents, attorneys at law or in fact, or representatives, for services rendered in connection with such return or payment or judgment does not exceed 10 percent of the value of such property or interest or proceeds or of such payment. Any agent, attorney at law or in fact, or representative, believing that the aggregate of the fees should be in excess of such 10 percent may, in the case of any return of, or the making of any payment in respect of, such property or interest or proceeds by the President or such officer or agency as he may designate, petition the district court of the United States for the district in which he resides for an order authorizing fees in excess of 10 percent and shall name such officer or agency as respondent. The court hearing such petition, or a court awarding any judgment in respect of any such property or interest or proceeds, as the case may be, shall approve an aggregate of fees in excess of 10 percent of the value of such property or interest or proceeds only upon a finding that there exist special circumstances of unusual hardship which require the payment of such excess. Any person accepting any fee in excess of an amount approved hereunder, or retaining for more than 30 days any portion of a fee, accepted prior to approval hereunder, in excess of the fee as approved, shall be guilty of a violation of this act."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3340) to transfer the functions of the Passport Office to a new agency of the Department of State, to be known as the "United States Passport Service," to establish a Passport Service Fund to finance the operations of the United States Passport Service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5265) to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2562) to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments, on page 1, line 9, after the word "by", to insert "inserting '(a)' after the section number and by"; on page 2, line 7, after the word "been", to strike out "continuously"; and in line 15, after the word "interest", to insert a colon and "*And provided further*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall apply only to those persons acquiring exchange visitor status subsequent to the date of the enactment hereof.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 201 of the act of January 27, 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong., 62 Stat. 6, as amended by sec. 402 (f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 66 Stat. 163) entitled "An act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations" is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and by adding a new paragraph reading as follows:

"(b) No person admitted as an exchange visitor under this section or acquiring exchange visitor status after admission shall be eligible to apply for an immigrant visa, or for a nonimmigrant visa under section 101 (a) (15) (H) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, until it is established that such person has resided and been physically present in a cooperating country or countries for an aggregate of at least 2 years following departure from the United States: *Provided*, That upon request of an interested Government agency and the recommendation of the Secretary of State, the Attorney General may waive such 2-year period of residence abroad in the case of any alien whose admission to the United States is found by the Attorney General to be in the public interest: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall apply only to those persons acquiring exchange visitor status subsequent to the date of the enactment hereof."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD, following the passage of the bill, a statement by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in support of S. 2562, a bill amending the United States Information and Exchange Act of 1948.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT IN SUPPORT OF S. 2562, A BILL AMENDING THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AND EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948

Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate, S. 2562, is designed to correct a condition which has existed since this country became engaged in educational exchange programs. Under those programs, thousands of students, trainees, teachers, and leaders in specialized knowledge and skills have come from abroad to this country in a reciprocal interchange of scholars and professional talent.

When this program was adopted, it was, of course, expected that these individuals who came here on a nonimmigrant basis would return to their own or to another country cooperating in the exchange program. They were expected to impart to their associates and the community in which they live impressions of the United States and its culture. Thereby, through such interchanges, an effective method would be developed of increasing mutual understanding between the people of the United States and of other countries.

Every exchange visitor visa issued to a foreign national is accompanied by the condition that at the expiration of the time for which he is admitted he will depart from the United States. This is equally true whether the exchange visitor is sponsored by the Government or by a private agency, and, under the law which has been in force since 1948, the failure of such a visitor to comply with that condition constitutes ground for deportation.

Yet almost from the very beginning of the program, Mr. President, increasing numbers of exchange visitors have sought to remain here at the expiration of their authorized stay, by obtaining immigrant status through one device or another. Numerous private bills have been introduced to achieve this result, many of which have been passed by Congress. On so large a scale has this occurred that the administration concluded some time ago that remedial action must be taken. For, the objective of the program is nullified each time the exchange visitor, instead of returning to his own or to a cooperating country, remains in the United States or else departs only for a brief interval to return as an immigrant.

The purpose of S. 2562, which was introduced at the specific recommendation of the President, is, therefore, to prevent circumvention of the immigration laws by exchange visitors who have been admitted to the United States as nonimmigrants, for the specific purpose of the educational exchange program. Under that program, many foreign medical students, for example, serving internship in the United States have benefited by a relaxation of the conditions of admission and stay under our immigration laws which normally apply to nonimmigrants.

It should be pointed out, Mr. President, that the provisions of law requiring the return of these exchange visitors apply equally to all individuals who come here under the program, whether with private or Government sponsorship. The Government has the same obligation to see to it that they return to their own countries, there to use the skill and knowledge they have acquired. Unless this obligation is discharged, the expenditure that has been incurred and the special dispensations accorded from our immigration requirements, will have been fruitless.

It is true that existing law prevents an exchange visitor from changing his status to that of a lawfully entered immigrant, or from applying for a suspension of deportations orders against him. Unfortunately, however, there is noting to preclude him from qualifying for an immigration visa after departing from the United States temporarily, and from returning as an immigrant from a neighboring country such as Canada or Mexico. This temporary departure satisfies the letter of the statute while defeating its purpose; for there is no provision of law which clearly defines the obligation of an exchange visitor to return home and remain there for any substantial period of time. As a consequence, the basic objectives of the program are defeated.

In short, Mr. President, the proposed amendment to Public Law 402 imposes no really new restriction on exchange visitors. Certainly it was believed at the time that law was enacted that section 201 contained sufficient restrictions to prevent exchange program participants from using the program as an avenue to immigration. When it became evident that exchange visitors in considerable numbers were departing from the United States only long enough to obtain immigrant visas, I requested the Department of State to ascertain whether appropriate administrative and regulatory measures had been taken to stop the practice. Although everything legally possible had been done, the loophole in existing legislation limited effective action.

These are the reasons, Mr. President, why the Committee on Foreign Relations, concurring in the recommendations of the administration, voted to report the bill favorably, after adopting certain amendments which were deemed necessary.

I should like now to summarize what the bill accomplishes, and the effect of the committee amendments.

S. 2562 would require an exchange visitor not only to leave the United States at the expiration of his stay, but to remain physically in his own or in another cooperating country, for a total of 2 years before becoming eligible for permanent residence here as an immigrant. Until he had done so, he would be barred recourse to those procedures under our immigration laws which provide for lawful entry, including that of adjustment of status. The bar would operate whether he entered the United States as an exchange visitor, or whether he acquired exchange-visitor status after being admitted. A 2-year absence period was regarded as reasonable for the basic objectives of the exchange program.

On the other hand, as is pointed out in the committee report, it would be unfair to apply such a condition—that of 2 years ineligibility for permanent entry—to those individuals who were already in the United States as exchange visitors at the time this measure is enacted. To do so would be to attach a retroactive condition to their presence here which did not apply at the time they undertook to depart from the United States. It was to eliminate any uncertainty on that score that the committee amended the bill by adopting a specific provision to the effect that only those individuals who acquired exchange-visitor status subsequent to the date of its enactment, would be subject to the 2-year provision.

Now, it frequently happens that individuals who come over here on exchange visitor visas, apply for an extension of their stay in order to complete projects on which they are engaged or to broaden their studies in a particular field. Should they apply for such an extension after the present bill is enacted, it would apply to them exactly as it would if they were applying for exchange-visitor status in the first instance. They may, of course, if they choose, depart without jeopardizing their right to apply for admission immediately; but if they want to extend their stay, they can only do so by subjecting themselves to the 2-year absence provision.

On the other hand, Mr. President, there may be individual cases in which the exceptional talents of the exchange visitor are so greatly needed by our Government as to warrant treatment other than that indicated in ordinary cases. For this reason a proviso in the bill authorizes the Attorney General, upon the request of an interested Government agency and the recommendation of the Secretary of State, to waive the 2 year period of foreign residence for any alien whose admission to the United States is found by the Attorney General to be in the public interest. And, by "public interest" is meant such public interest as relates to the defense and security of the United States. In passing, it is hardly necessary to observe that there is nothing in the bill which prevents—or could prevent—the introduction of a private bill to relieve particular individuals in cases of extraordinary hardship.

These, Mr. President, are the essential features of S. 2562.

I should like to emphasize that there is nothing punitive about the proposed change in legislation. It is not a method of making foreign nationals "pay for" their participation by being "exiled" from the United States for 2 years. Unless or until an exchange visitor decides to immigrate, he will be unaffected by the 2-year waiting period. He may return to this country as often as he and his exchange sponsors may wish as an exchange visitor. He may enter at any time for business, pleasure, or study. I have already referred to the amendment adopted by the committee, under which foreign nationals currently on exchange visitor status would be exempted from the pending measure. What the bill seeks to insure is that foreign nationals who desire extensions of stay as exchange visitors, or who are hereafter selected to participate in the exchange programs, are bona fide exchange visitors—people who know precisely what their obligations are when they accept exchange status, and who have definite plans to return to their homeland and resume their professional lives there.

The legislation embodied in S. 2562 is long overdue. It affords a justified means of insuring that the objectives of the program which Congress approved will be met, and I therefore commend it to the Senate.

MR. AND MRS. DELIO A. LOO MURGAS

The bill (S. 572) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Delio A. Loo Murgas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mr. and Mrs. Delio A. Loo Murgas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

IMRE DE CHOLNOKY

The bill (S. 1240) for the relief of Imre de Cholnoky was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act,

Imre de Cholnoky shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

HILDEGARD SILVONEN

The bill (S. 1701) for the relief of Hildegard Silvonen was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hildegard Silvonen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

STANISLAW ARGASINSKI

The bill (S. 1733) for the relief of Stanislaw Argasinski was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stanislaw Argasinski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available: *Provided*, That the past membership of Stanislaw Argasinski in the classes defined in section 212 (a) (28) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall not hereafter be a cause for his exclusion from the United States.

RUDOLF FRITZ LIERMANN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1762) for the relief of Rudolf Fritz Liermann, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rudolf Fritz Liermann shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACOB HASS, ROZA HASS, AND MALA HASS

The bill (H. R. 3037) for the relief of Jacob Hass, Roza Hass, and Mala Hass was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HELEN AGNES BLIAS (JUNKO FURAKAWA)

The bill (S. 1900) for the relief of Helen Agnes Blais (Junko Furakawa) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Helen Agnes Blais (Junko Furakawa), alien adopted daughter of Sgt. La Vern Blais, United States Army, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

ANKE NABER

The bill (S. 2103) for the relief of Anke Naber was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anke Naber, the fiance of 1st Lt. Jack B. Stewart, United States Air Force, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Anke Naber is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Jack B. Stewart and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Anke Naber, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of section 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Anke Naber, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Anke Naber as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

MARY BOONE LACSON

The bill (S. 2243) for the relief of Mary Boone Lacson was considered, ordered to be engrosed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mary Boone Lacson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

TAKAKO IBA

The bill (S. 2327) for the relief of Takako Iba was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Imigration and Nationality Act, Takako Iba, the fiancée of Goddard Friel, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Takako Iba is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Goddard Friel and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Takako Iba, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Takoko Iba, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Takako Iba as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

CHARLES BLACK, ALSO KNOWN AS JOSEPH CLARK

The bill (S. 2371) for the relief of Charles Black also known as Joseph Clark was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (19) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Charles Black, also known as Joseph Clark, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

DR. MAHMOOD SAJJADI

The bill (S. 2381) for the relief of Dr. Mahmood Sajjadi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Mahmood Sajjadi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

HUA-TUNG LEE (GORDON LEE) AND HIS WIFE, CHI-WAN MOW LEE (JANE LEE)

The bill (S. 2399) for the relief of Hua-Tung Lee (Gordon Lee) and his wife, Chi-Wan Mow Lee (Jane Lee) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hua-Tung Lee (Gordon Lee) and his wife, Chi-

Wan Mow Lee (Jane Lee), shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

LINA DIAZ

The bill (S. 2414) for the relief of Lina Diaz was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lina Diaz (formerly Lena Reeg) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR INITIAL PAYMENT BY THE STATE OF LOUISIANA FOR PURCHASE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 7927) to extend the time within which the State of Louisiana may make initial payment on the purchase of certain property from the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Obviously, Mr. President, this measure is not calendar business. I ask that the joint resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO EILEF RUE IN CASSIA COUNTY, IDAHO

The bill (H. R. 3650) to provide for the conveyance to Eilef Rue of certain real property situated in Cassia County, Idaho, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which House bill 3650 was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, be reconsidered; I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, in response to the request of the Senator from Oregon, let me say the bill would make an exchange of land to Mr. Rue. The land in question is located in Cassia County, Idaho. Originally, 160 acres stood in Mr. Rue's name. An offer of some $25 was made for the purchase of the land. The appraised value of the land was considerably higher; if my memory serves me correctly, it was in the neighborhood of $640.

The departmental position was that in place of paying for the land by means of condemnation, a fair method of treating Mr. Rue would be to exchange the land, as set forth in the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in understanding that the committee decided that passage of the bill is justified, in order to do equity to Mr. Rue?

Mr. BIBLE. That is exactly correct. The proffer of $25 was completely inadequate, in terms of the true value of the land, title to which was vested in Mr. Rue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 3650) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELOCATION OF TRENTON MASSACRE CANYON MONUMENT NEAR TRENTON, NEBR.

The bill (H. R. 6022) to provide for the relocation of the Trenton Massacre Canyon Monument, presently located near Trenton, Nebr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION OF SEWAGE-DISPOSAL SYSTEM TO SERVE YORKTOWN AREA OF THE COLONIAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, VA.

The bill (H. R. 6112) to authorize the construction of a sewage-disposal system to serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ETHA DORA JOHNSON

The bill (H. R. 6618) for the relief of Etha Dora Johnson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DESIGNATION OF GENERAL GRANT TREE IN KING'S CANYON NATIONAL PARK, CALIF., AS NATIONAL SHRINE

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 194) to designate the General Grant tree (known as the Nation's Christmas Tree) in King's Canyon National Park, Calif., as a national shrine was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

MODIFYING THE PROJECT FOR ST. MARYS RIVER, MICH.

The bill (S. 2210) to modify the project for the St. Marys River, Mich., South Canal, to repeal the authorization for the alteration of the International Bridge as a part of such project was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the project for the St. Marys River, Mich., South Canal, as approved by the act of March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 10), is modified by repealing the authorization for the alteration as part of such project of the International Bridge owned by the Sault St. Marie Bridge Co.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to accomplish the alteration of the bridge referred to in the first section of this act under such an agreement as he may arrive at with the owners of such bridge. The costs of any such alteration shall be approtioned between the United States and such bridge owners in accordance with section 6 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters of the United States, for the apportionment of the cost of such alternations between the United States and the owners of such bridges, and for other purposes," approved June 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 497).

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

DESIGNATION OF RESERVOIR ABOVE MONTICELLO DAM IN CALIFORNIA AS LAKE BERRYESSA

The bill (S. 2755) to designate the reservoir above the Monticello Dam in California as Lake Berryessa was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the reservoir located above the Monticello Dam in Napa County, Calif., shall hereafter be known as Lake Berryessa, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such reservoir is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such reservoir under and by the name of Lake Berryessa.

INCREASE OF EMERGENCY RELIEF HIGHWAY FUNDS

The bill (S. 2861) to authorize an increase of emergency relief highway funds from $10 million to $30 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the amount of $10 million authorized as an emergency relief fund by section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 for the repair and reconstruction of highways and bridges on the Federal-aid highway systems which have suffered serious damage as a result of disaster over a wide area is hereby increased to the amount of $30 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. Such amount shall be available to pay the Federal share of the cost of emergency relief projects programed for construction at any time during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION AND SURVEY OF McGIRTS CREEK, FLA., FOR FLOOD CONTROL

The bill (H. R. 5556) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of

McGirts Creek, Fla., for flood control was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION OF MISSISSIPPI-GULF OUTLET BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6309) to authorize construction of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the bill has to do with an authorization of approximately $88 million. In view of that fact, it is suggested that the bill should not properly be passed during the call of the Consent Calendar.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, there is no objection to the bill.

Mr. HRUSKA. No, there is no objection. I have canvassed the Members in regard to the bill; and the bill has great merit. I have no objection to having the bill taken up at the conclusion of the call of the calendar. In the meantime, Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

DESIGNATION OF LAKE CREATED BY BUFORD DAM, GEORGIA, AS "LAKE SIDNEY LANIER"

The bill (H. R. 6961) to designate the lake created by Buford Dam in the State of Georgia as "Lake Sidney Lanier," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 6268) to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that Calendar No. 1662, House bill 6268, go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

RESTORATION OF TRIBAL OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN LANDS UPON CROW INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

The bill (S. 1555) authorizing the restoration in tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the undisposed of lots in the Pryor townsite and the Crow Agency townsite and the undisposed of lands on the ceded portion of the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., heretofore opened to entry or other form of disposal under the public-land laws are hereby restored to tribal ownership: *Provided*, That restoration shall be subject to any existing valid rights: *Provided further*, That restoration shall not apply to lands within any reclamation project heretofore authorized on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.

SEC. 2. The lands restored to the Crow Tribe under section 1 may be sold and the proceeds thereof may be used for such purposes as may be requested by the tribal governing authorities and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. Title to lands or any interest therein acquired pursuant to this act shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Crow Tribe.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO DAVID PETERS

The bill (H. R. 8607) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to David Peters, or to his heirs or assigns, title to land held by the United States in trust for him was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6625) to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo of Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CONTINUANCE OF LIFE INSURANCE OF DISABLED EMPLOYEES

The bill (S. 3237) to provide for continuance of life insurance coverage under the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, in the case of employees receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Each policy purchased under this act shall contain a provision, in terms approved by the Commission, to the effect that any insurance thereunder or any employee shall cease upon his separation from the service or 12 months after discontinuance of his salary payments, whichever first occurs, subject to a provision which shall be contained in the policy for temporary extension of coverage and for conversion to an individual policy of life insurance under conditions approved by the Commission.

"(b) If upon such date as the insurance would otherwise cease the employee retires on an immediate annuity and (1) his retirement is for disability or (2) he has completed 15 years of creditable service, as determined by the Commission, his life insurance only may, under conditions determined by the Commission, be continued without cost to him in the amounts for which he would have been insured from time to time had his salary payments continued at the same rate as on the date of cessation. Periods of honorable active service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States shall be credited toward the required 15 years provided the employee has completed at least 5 years of civilian service.

"(c) If upon such date as the insurance would otherwise cease the employee is receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act because of disease or injury to himself, his life insurance may, as provided in subsection (b), be continued during the period he is in receipt of such benefits and held by the United States Department of Labor to be unable to return to duty."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall become effective as of August 29, 1954.

WAIVER OF REEMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENT IN CASES OF DEATH

The bill (S. 3315) to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1939, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, Senate bill 3315 amends the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to waive certain provisions in the case of employees separated from the service by reason of death.

The provision being amended provides that title to benefits from the civil-service retirement and disability fund shall not arise from any separation unless the employee has, within the 2-year period immediately preceding the separation, completed at least 1 year of creditable service.

Under other provisions of present law, an employee obtains entitlement to survivorship rights after 5 years of creditable service. Thus, if an employee with more than 5 years of service dies, his surviving widow and children are entitled to survivorship benefits. If, however, the same employee is out of the Federal service for a period of 1 year or over, and then returns, he would have to be reemployed long enough to have 1 year of service during the 2-year period preceding any given date, before regaining his survivorship rights. In the event of his death during his period of reemployment, before meeting this requirement, his surviving widow and children would not receive survivorship benefits.

Since enactment of the provision in question, there has been at least one instance where operation of the provision has worked an injustice on the surviving family of a long-time Federal employee. This bill would correct the injustice by waiving the 1-year reemployment requirement in cases where employees are separated by reason of death.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3315) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the next to the last paragraph in section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after the word "separated" the following: "has been separated by death or."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect as of August 31, 1954, but no annuity shall be paid by reason of such amendment (a) for any period prior to the date of enactment of this act, or (b) unless the amount of any lump sum death benefit heretofore paid under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is redeposited in the civil service retirement and disability fund.

Mr. MAGNUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in connection with Calendar No.

1667, Senate bill 3315, to have printed in the RECORD a few remarks pertaining to the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I, too, urge the enactment of S. 3315 because it would be an injustice to the family of a faithful employee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am chairman, if it were not approved by the Senate.

The present Civil Service and Retirement Act provides that when a Federal employee leaves the service of the Government and returns to the service he must serve 1 full year before he is eligible for benefits of the retirement act and his family is eligible to a pension toward which he has worked.

Frank Pellegrini, chief counsel for our committee, died on January 14, just 11 months and 6 days after he reentered the Government service after having worked elsewhere for a time. He lacked only 24 days of having worked a full year after his return to Government service.

This brief amendment will enable his family to receive the pension to which they would be entitled for his 16 years and 7 months in the Government service.

Mr. Pellegrini served the Senate faithfully, and enjoyed the esteem and respect of every member of our committee, everyone of whom he served with equal faithfulness. We miss him in our work, and unless the amendment is enacted, his widow and twin sons will not receive the pension to which they are justly entitled as a result of his long employment by the Government.

Mr. Pellegrini gave to our committee loyal, efficient and energetic service. He came to us first as counsel for our subcommittee on merchant marine and fisheries, and was promoted to general counsel on February 9, 1955. In approving this amendment I feel that we are only discharging a debt we owe to the the memory of a faithful, long time friend.

SEGREGATION OF CERTAIN FUNDS OF THE FORT BERTHOLD INDIANS

The bill (S. 2151) to provide for the segregation of certain funds of the Fort Berthold Indians on the basis of a membership roll prepared for such purpose was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to segregate the fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States titled "the Three Affiliated Tribes of Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak." on the basis of a membership roll prepared for that purpose and approved by the Secretary. The segregated shares of adults, including interest accruals thereon, shall be subject to expenditure in accordance with plans prepared and submitted by such adults and approved by the Secretary. The segregated shares, including interest accruals thereon, of persons who are minors or non compos mentis shall be subject to expenditure in accordance with procedures approved by the Secretary. The Secretary may require any segregated share of a member to be used to pay a debt that is owed by such person to the Tribes or to the United States and that is due and payable.

CONVEYANCE TO LAKE COUNTY, CALIF., OF LOWER LAKE RANCHERIA

The bill (H. R. 585) to authorize the conveyance to Lake County, Calif., of the Lower Lake Rancheria, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the bill provides for the conveyance to Lake County, Calif., of a part of the Lower Lake Rancheria. The purpose is the establishment of an airport. However, title to 41 acres of the approximately 140 acres is to be vested in Mr. Harry Johnson, the present occupant of the 41-acre tract; and the land is to be sold for its fair market value.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 585) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELEASE BY THE UNITED STATES OF RIGHT AND INTEREST IN CERTAIN LAND IN SAGINAW COUNTY, MICH.

The bill (H. R. 622) to provide for the release by the United States of its right and interest in certain land located in Saginaw County, Mich., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I do not have objection, but I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this bill releases any right that the United States may retain in 640 acres in Saginaw County, Mich., which rights inure to Saginaw County, stemming from some Indian treaties. The reason for the release is to remove any possible cloud on title which results from the discrepancy between the old deeds and the Indian treaties. There was no objection by the Department of the Interior. As a matter of fact, the Department recommends that the bill be passed, in order to remove possible clouds on title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNAMARA. I have no objection, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 622) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTION OF MORTGAGES AND DEEDS OF TRUST ON INDIAN TRUST OR RESTRICTED LAND

The bill (H. R. 4802) to authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACQUIREMENT OF TRUST INTERESTS IN TRIBAL LANDS OF THE FORT BERTHOLD RESERVATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1528) to authorize enrolled members of the three affiliated tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., to acquire trust interest in the tribal lands of the reservation, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out "That the Secretary of the Interior, with the consent of the Fort Berthold Tribal Business Council of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., is" and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of the constitution and charter of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., the Secretary of the Interior, with the consent of the governing body of the tribes, is", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the constitution and charter of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., the Secretary of the Interior, with the consent of the governing body of the tribes, is hereby authorized to dispose of tribal lands within the boundaries of such reservation to any enrolled member of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe. Title to any land conveyed under this act shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the individual Indian owner.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASED APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION FOR THE WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 443) to increase the appropriation authorization for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR TRANSMISSION OF OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT MAIL MATTER

The bill (S. 1871) to amend the act entitled "An act to reimburse the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government mail matter," approved August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 614), and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to reimburse the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government-mail matter," approved August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 614), is amended by the addition of sections 3 and 4 to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. There shall be paid to the Post Office Department, as postal revenue, out of the respective appropriations or funds available to the departments, agencies, establishments, Government corporations, and all other organizations and persons concerned, the equivalent amount of postage or registry fees, as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General for matter sent in the mails without prepayment of postage, or without prepayment of registry fees, by the department, agency, establishment, Government corporation, organization, or person concerned, for which the Post Office Department otherwise does

not receive compensation, under authority of the following laws:

"(1) Section 3932 of the Revised Statutes (39 U. S. C. 385);

"(2) That part of section 3 of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1885, and for other purposes,' approved July 5, 1884 (23 Stat. 158), as amended by section 2 of the act entitled 'An act authorizing the Postmaster General to establish a uniform system of registration of mail matter, and for other purposes,' approved May 1, 1928 (45 Stat. 469), and codified in section 321a of title 39, United States Code;

"(3) Section 10 of title 13, United States Code (sec. 1, ch. 1158, 68 Stat. 1012, 1014);

"(4) The first and second provisos of section 306 of title III of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes,' approved June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1049; 39 U. S. C. 321n); and

"(5) Section 345 of the act entitled 'An act to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes,' approved June 27, 1952 (66 Stat. 266; 8 U. S. C. 1456).

"Such payments shall be regarded as a necessary expense of the respective appropriations and activities.

"SEC. 4. There shall be paid to the Post Office Department, as postal revenue, out of appropriations made therefor, to the Department of Agriculture, the equivalent amount of postage, as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General for matter sent in the mails without prepayment of postage pursuant to the following laws:

"(1) Section 4 of the act entitled 'An act to establish agricultural experiment stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplementary thereto,' approved March 2, 1887 (24 Stat. 441; 7 U. S. C. 365);

"(2) Section 3 of the act entitled 'An act to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862,' approved August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 418; 7 U. S. C. 325); and

"(3) The proviso in the third paragraph under 'General expenses, offices of experiment stations' in the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915,' approved June 30, 1914 (38 Stat. 438; 39 U. S. C. 330)."

SEC. 2. Section 15 of title 17, United States Code (sec. 1, ch. 391, 61 Stat. 652), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 306 of title III of the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1049; 39 U. S. C. 321n), is hereby amended by (A) striking out the words "free of postage" wherever they appear therein, and by inserting in lieu thereof "as penalty mail"; and (B) by striking out all of the second sentence down to and including the words *"Provided,* That," in the first proviso.

SEC. 4. This act shall be effective July 1, 1955.

ALLOWANCE FOR NOTARIES PUBLIC

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1542) to authorize an allowance for civilian officers and employees of the Government who are notaries public, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments on page 1, line 4, after the word "the", to strike out "Government" and insert "Federal Government and the municipal government of the District of Columbia," and on page 2, line 2, after the word "the", to strike out "Government" and insert "Federal Government and the municipal government of the District of Columbia", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That civilian officers and employees of the departments and establishments of the Federal Government and the municipal government of the District of Columbia who are required to serve as notaries public in connection with the performance of official business shall be paid an allowance to be established by the department or establishment concerned not to exceed the expense required to be incurred by them in order to obtain their commission from and after January 1, 1955.

SEC. 2. Funds available to the departments and establishments of the Federal Government and the municipal government of the District of Columbia for personal services or general administrative expenses shall be available to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. This act may be cited as the "Notaries Public Expense Act of 1955."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1161) to abolish the Fossil Cycad National Monument, South Dakota, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HRUSKA. Over.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, some question has arise with regard to certain features of this bill, and I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AFFIRMATION OF TITLE TO CERTAIN LAND IN CALIFORNIA

The bill (H. R. 4680) affirming that title to a certain tract of land in California vested in the State of California on January 21, 1897 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND TO SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 24, LAKE COUNTY, OREG.

The bill (H. R. 6772) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain federally owned land under his jurisdiction to the school district No. 24 of Lake County, Oreg., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask the author of the bill if it contains a provision for compensation. As the Senate knows, I have insisted since 1946 that Federal property belonging to all of the taxpayers of the Nation should not be given away. As a result of my persistence in this matter the Senate has come to apply, with only rare exceptions, the so-called Morse formula recommended by the old Naval Affairs Committee in 1946. Under this formula when Federal property is to be transferred to a State government, or a county or municipal governmental body or a school district or any other local governmental unit the Federal Government must receive payment of at least 50 percent of the appraised fair market value for the property if it is to be used for a local public use. Of course, it would not be fair of me to insist that the formula not be applied in my own State and, therefore, I have been as insistent that it be applied to Oregon as to every other State. The Morse formula has saved the taxpayers of the United States about $500 million since 1946.

I certainly want school district No. 24 in Lake County, Oreg., to obtain the property involved in this bill and I am sure that the school district would want to comply with the Morse formula.

Mr. ERVIN. The bill provides that conveyance shall be made upon payment of the fair market value of the land, as determined by the Secretary.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection. However, let me say for the record that, inasmuch as this is a bill involving my own State, I would object if it did not provide for compensation at a figure equal to at least half of the appraised fair market value of the property. Under the Morse formula, the Secretary could fix the price at half of the fair market value, but apparently in this case the committee believes that a fair market value would be just and reasonable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

ABOLISHMENT OF CASTLE PINCKNEY NATIONAL MONUMENT, S. C.

The bill (H. R. 4391) to abolish the Castle Pinckney National Monument in the State of South Carolina, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCHANGE AND TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

The bill (H. R. 5280) to authorize land exchanges for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park in the State of Virginia; to authorize the transfer of certain lands of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia, to the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? I am satisfied that it meets the compensation requirement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am interested in the bill, because the national park is in Virginia. The Government owns more than 9,000 acres. Within that boundary are about 90 acres of privately owned land which the Government very much needs. There is more than 100 acres on the perimeter which the Government does not need. The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate land transfers. There is to be an appraisal of

value, and if there is any difference in value, the difference will have to be paid in cash. It is all on a strictly cash basis, and very much to the interest of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECONVEYANCE OF OIL AND GAS AND MINERAL INTERESTS IN CERTAIN LANDS TO FORMER OWNERS

The bill (H. R. 7097) to provide for the reconveyance of oil and gas and mineral interests in a portion of the lands acquired for the Demopolis Lock and Dam project, to the former owners thereof, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR REPORTING PENALTY ENVELOPES AND WRAPPERS ON HAND TO THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

The bill (H. R. 5856) to repeal the requirement for the heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO GEORGE JOSEPH VAUGHAN AND OTHERS

The resolution (S. Res. 231) to pay a gratuity to George Joseph Vaughan and others was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to George Joseph Vaughan, brother of James Frederick Vaughan, an employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol at the time of his death, a sum equal to one-half of 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, and to Dudley J. Vaughan, Jr., Donald Vaughan, and George Vaughan, nephews of said James Frederick Vaughan, sums each equal to one-sixth of 6 months' compensation at the rate James Frederick Vaughan was receiving by law at the time of his death, all sums to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRINTING OF CHAPLAIN'S PRAYERS

The resolution (S. Res. 226) to print copies of the prayers by the Senate Chaplain was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That 3,000 copies of the prayers offered by the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, Doctor of Divinity, Chaplain of the Senate, at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate during the 84th Congress be printed and bound for the use of the Senate.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 232) to extend the time of Senate Resolution 200, agreed to February 8, 1956, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BUSH. Let the resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

SALE OR PLEDGE OF POSTAGE STAMPS

The bill (S. 1702) to amend section 1721, title 28, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1721, title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"§ 1721. Sale or pledge of stamps

"Whoever, being a postmaster or postal service employee knowingly and willingly: uses or disposes of postage stamps, stamped envelopes, or postal cards entrusted to his care or custody in the payment of debts, or in the purchase of merchandise or other salable articles, or pledges or hypothecates the same or sells or disposes of them except for cash; or sells or disposes of postage stamps or postal cards for any larger or less sum than the values indicated on their faces; or sells or disposes of stamped envelopes for a larger or less sum than is charged therefor by the Post Office Department for like quantities; or sells or disposes of postage stamps, stamped envelopes, or postal cards at any point or place outside of the delivery of the office where such postmaster or other person is employed; or for the purpose of increasing the emoluments, or compensation of the postmaster or any employee of a post office or station or branch thereof, inflates or induces the inflation of the receipts of any post office or any station or branch thereof; or sells or disposes of postage stamps, stamped envelopes, or postal cards, otherwise than as provided by law or the regulations of the Post Office Department; shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS TO THE CITY OF HENDERSON, NEV.

The bill (S. 2267) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the city of Henderson, Nev., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the bill provides, as set out on page 3:

That the Secretary of the Interior shall issue to the city of Henderson, Nev., upon the payment by the city into the Treasury of the United States, not more than 5 years after the Secretary has notified the city of the purchase price, of an amount equal to the fair market value of the lands to be conveyed, as determined by the Secretary—

And so forth. I wish to commend the authors of the bill for the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior shall issue to the city of Henderson, Nev., upon the payment by the city into the Treasury of the United States, not more than five years after the Secretary has notified the city of the purchase price, of an amount equal to the fair market value of the lands to be conveyed as determined by the Secretary upon the appraisal of those lands, a patent for the following-described lands, situated in the State of Nevada and comprising approximately six thousand eight hundred and fifty-nine acres (all range references are to the Mount Diablo base and meridian):

(1) All of sections 2, 3, 4, and 24, township 22 south, range 62 east.

(2) All of section 33, township 21 south, range 63 east.

(3) The east half of section 8; the east half of section 17; east half of section 20; west half of section 21; the east half and the northwest quarter of section 28; all of sections 30, 31, and 32; all in township 22 south, range 63 east.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall be made subject to any existing valid claims against the lands described in the first section of this Act, and to any reservations necessary to protect continuing uses of those lands by the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3116) to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals was announced as next in order.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, for further study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF MEASURES PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR AND PASSED OVER

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to a consideration of Calendar No. 1411.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator that the first bill placed at the foot of the calendar, to be called up at this time, is Calendar No. 1662, H. R. 6268.

Mr. ERVIN. For the information of the members of the calendar committee, I should like to say that after Calendar No. 1662, H. R. 6268, shall be disposed of, I shall ask unanimous consent that the bill in which the Senator from Tennessee is interested be considered by the Senate. Then I shall ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1687, Senate Resolution 232.

CONSTRUCTION OF DRAINAGE WORKS ON FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the first bill placed at

the foot of the calendar, Calendar No. 1662, H. R. 6268, which the clerk will state by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6268) to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 5, after the word "work", it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the amount of contracts or force-account work herein authorized shall not exceed $200,000 on any one project, division, or a unit of a project, and then only after funds have been appropriated by the Congress for that purpose."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

STUDY OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES—SENATE RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1411, Senate Resolution 173.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before that resolution is considered, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum. I have no objection to its being taken up, but I shall first suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ERVIN. Does the Senator from California make the same statement with respect to Calendar No. 1687, Senate Resolution 232?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no objection to that resolution being considered at this time, although there will be a little discussion of it.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR INVESTIGATION OF WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1687, Senate Resolution 232.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 232) to extend the time of Senate Resolution 200, agreed to on February 8, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate Resolution 232?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no objection to its present consideration, but I do wish to have some discussion of it.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I should like to make an explanation of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I wish to make the explanation that was asked for as to Senate Resolution 232.

The only effect of the resolution would be to extend for 1 month, from March 15 to April 15, 1956, the life of the subcommittee making an investigation of welfare and pension plans. It also provides $10,000 to cover the expenses of the subcommittee during its 1-month existence. I submitted the resolution at the request of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The subcommittee in question, the Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds, is a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The chairman of the subcommittee to which I have referred has entered the Chamber, and I shall ask him to add a word.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the life of the subcommittee has already been extended by a month and a half, from the first of February to the middle of March. We had hoped and expected that we would be able to finish our report by March 15. However, we found that the report was much longer and much more complicated than we at first had believed. Because of lack of time we have been unable to reach agreement on the text of the report.

Therefore the members of the subcommittee, of both parties, felt that we should ask, reluctantly, for an extension of another month. We met this morning to hammer out the report. We are confident that this will be the last extension that we shall ask. We feel that on so important a subject we should submit a very carefully considered and weighed report. Therefore it is the recommendation of the subcommittee, both the majority and minority members, that this extension of time be granted. We have been trying to work harmoniously on this subject without regard to party. The subcommittee is unanimous in its request.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is this the same resolution which the Senator from Illinois discussed with me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I spoke to the Senator from Louisiana about this matter last week; yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall not object to the extension requested by the Senator from Illinois, because I understand that both the majority and minority members of the subcommittee have asked for the extension.

However, I do wish to call the attention of the Senate to the colloquy which took place on February 8 when this matter was considered by the Senate with relation to granting funds to the committee. The colloquy appears at pages 2358 and 2359 of the RECORD of February 8, and reads as follows:

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am not going to object to taking the resolution up, but I should like to have an understanding with the majority leader. I understand there remains in the funds available to the committee the sum of $20,500. What the resolution seeks to do is make that amount available until March 15. The committee normally would have finished its work and reported by January 31.

This resolution extends the period to March 15. But I should like to have assurances that this will complete the job, and that the committee will not return, seeking an extension of time or additional funds with which to finish its work.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, my distinguished friend, the Senator from California, is correct, insofar as I am informed. Sufficient money remains with the committee for the completion of its work. It does need the time from now to the 15th of March to complete its report and submit its report to the Senate.

I was informed today, by letter from the committee chairman, that the March 15 date would give him ample time, and that the money which remains unexpended is ample to take care of the committee's needs.

Mr. KNOWLAND. With that understanding, I am prepared to join the Senator from Kentucky in the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 200) was agreed to, as follows:

"Resolved, That section 1 of Senate Resolution 40, 84th Congress, 1st session, agreed to February 21, 1955 (authorizing an investigation of welfare and pension plans by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare) is amended by striking out 'January 31, 1956', and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 15, 1956'."

I shall not object, in view of the explanation that has been made, but I do urge both the majority and minority members of the subcommittee to finish work on this matter within 30 days, and make a report to the Senate on it within that time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words on the subject. I appreciate the position of the minority leader, and under ordinary circumstances I would concur in his remarks. The members of the subcommittee—and I am sure I speak for the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] also—feel that this is a matter of very great importance. The subcommittee has approached it with a very objective point of view. We have found that it is impossible to complete the work within the time we had originally scheduled for it, and that an additional 30 days are necessary for the completion of the investigation. Therefore, we have joined the Senator from Illinois in his request that the time be extended. We do so because we feel the investigation should be made, and done thoroughly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That section 1 of Senate Resolution 200, 84th Congress, 2d session, agreed to February 8, 1956 (authorizing an extention of time for investigation of welfare and pension plans by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare), is amended by striking

out the date "March 15, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "April 15, 1956".

SEC. 2. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

CONSTRUCTION OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER-GULF OUTLET

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1660, H. R. 6309.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6309) to authorize construction of the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, order No. 1660, H. R. 6309, which was reported March 7 from the Senate Committee on Public Works, authorizes the construction of the so-called Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet, a 70-mile tidewater channel which would provide the port of New Orleans with an alternate route to the Gulf of Mexico.

This project is of vital necessity to the city of New Orleans, the State of Louisiana, and the entire Mississippi Valley. It has the support of 11 governors of States embraced within the primary trade area of the Mississippi Valley. These States are Louisiana, Nebraska, Tennessee, Arkansas, Alabama, Oklahoma, Iowa, Ohio, Texas, South Dakota, and Mississippi. The project has been heartily endorsed by shipping interests, commercial interests, business, professional and agricultural leaders, as well as the entire Louisiana congressional delegation.

This project would do three things:

First, it would reduce the distance from the city of New Orleans to the Gulf of Mexico by some 50 miles.

By so doing, that is, by slashing from 120 to 70 miles the distance seagoing vessels must travel from the gulf to the port of New Orleans, this project would bring about reduced shipping costs equivalent to about 40 percent more than the annual maintenance cost of the channel.

Second, the project would eliminate the dual navigation hazards of fog and shifting sandbars which presently plague Mississippi River shipping. The Mississippi is a treacherous river; its channel shifts from day to day—sometimes from hour to hour. As a result, vessels must take pilots aboard before making the journey from the mouth of the river to New Orleans. The new channel would be free of these shifting sandbars; it would eliminate the necessity for ships having to wait—frequently for long periods of time—to take aboard a pilot or for fogs to lift.

To me, one of the most remarkable things about this new channel is that the Corps of Engineers believes it will be fog-free most of the time—even when the Mississippi River itself is fogbound. Thus, a second navigational hazard will be virtually eliminated.

Mr. President, the dense banks of fog which frequently blanket the Mississippi River and the passes at its mouth cost shipping interests millions of dollars in lost time each year. This monetary saving, plus the vastly increased factors of safety and ease of navigation, would, alone, be sufficient to justify the construction of this much-needed project. It would also eliminate the varying water levels in the present harbor caused by floods on the Mississippi River.

The Federal cost of this project has been estimated at $88 million—that is the authorized amount—with annual charges estimated at $4,258,000. Of this amount, $1 million would be for maintenance. The estimated non-Federal cost is $2,300,000 with annual charges of $125,000. As Maj. Gen. John R. Hardin, president of the Mississippi River Commission, pointed out before the Public Works Committee, the non-Federal cost is exclusive of the extensive development which will be necessary to provide terminals to make the channel and the turning basin usable, which are estimated to cost $65 million.

The truth of the matter is, Mr. President, that not only New Orleans but the entire Mississippi Valley wants and needs this project. If the valley is to continue its phenomenal growth, this alternative route to the gulf must be authorized and quickly completed. The present harbor is congested and additional room for expansion is needed.

The port of New Orleans is a two-way funnel, channeling products from the United States into export markets, and serving as a great gateway through which the world trades with the Mississippi Valley. For example, Mr. President, the Department of Commerce figures show that in 1954—the latest figures I have available—New Orleans ranked first for the export of wheat, flour, agricultural machinery, soybeans, and cotton; it also ranked first in imports of sugar, burlap, sisal, molasses, and bananas.

Mr. President, New Orleans is the natural outlet, the natural gateway, for goods flowing from and into the 24 States of the Mississippi Valley. Linked to the other States of our Nation by a network of highways and railroads, the Mississippi River is the great artery through which the blood of commerce is pumped into the heartland of America.

The great bulk of the inland empire, which embraces the Mississippi Valley, has New Orleans as its import and export outlet. The great and growing cities which border on the river—Memphis, St. Louis, Baton Rouge, and others—as well as the inland centers which are linked to the river by rail and road, have a vital stake in this important project.

Unless it is authorized as quickly as possible, unless we begin work on it just as soon as we can, the development of the fastest growing area of our Nation will stagnate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the authorization of a tidewater canal to connect the port of New Orleans with the rest of the world is, in my opinion, a matter of great importance to the United States at this particular time.

This project is important from a national standpoint because the city of New Orleans is without a doubt the best guarded port in North America and the gateway that it offers to Latin America is a vital element in our overall setup for national defense.

The Mississippi River has stood New Orleans and the lower Mississippi Valley in good stead for a long time. Tremendous developments in recent years, however, indicate that the river passes are no longer adequate. The commerce passing through the port of New Orleans in both directions needs a shorter, less hazardous, and more spacious channel. A tidewater canal from New Orleans to the Gulf of Mexico will fulfill these three requisites: A channel that is some 45 miles shorter; a channel that is reasonably fog-free; and a channel that offers many needed facilities to serve as an adjunct to a growing world port.

The port of New Orleans is essentially a river port with wharves, transit sheds, railroads, and streets, built on or in close proximity to the levees which provide the flood protection to the city of New Orleans. Wharves and terminals extending for a distance of approximately 10 miles terminate in a harbor area where there is a lock capable of handling ships of deep-sea draft. This lock was built by an agency of the State of Louisiana and is capable of handling seagoing traffic as well as the traffic to or from the intracoastal waterway which extends from Texas through Louisiana to the State of Florida.

The port of New Orleans has increased its tonnage on the average of better than a million tons a year since 1938. This commerce is continuing to grow as the importance of America's overseas shipments continues. Experts who have checked this trend state that there is no reason to believe that the demand for movements to the port of New Orleans is in any sense near a flattening-out point on this upward curve of development.

The proposed tidewater canal will permit the building of modern facilities on a tidewater basis rather than continuing with the present 20-foot variation that exists in connection with facilities built on the Mississippi River itself. This is in keeping with practices that have been adopted at most modern ports and, in this case, it will mean a saving of more than 18 feet in variation of water level.

Continued growth of the commerce using the port of New Orleans and the pressing needs of planning further port expansion makes it highly appropriate that action be taken to authorize this project. The natural resources being opened up in the entire Gulf region are causing new industries to seek sites in and near New Orleans. The main reason why these industries are moving into the lower Mississippi Valley is because that valley, as a result of the projects authorized by the Congress of the United States in the past 30 years, has been made practically flood-free.

As a means of carrying this work forward and to permit our country to realize the fullest development of these improvements that have already been made, I urge the authorization of this project. It will bring America even closer to its world markets. It will offer America a needed additional avenue of defense should we ever be faced with another world conflict.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR TODAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senate. I am informed that it has completed action on 162 bills, and the morning hour is not yet concluded. I wish I were able to say that we had concluded action on 163 bills, including the farm bill.

Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is the plan of the leadership to run until at least 10 o'clock tonight, unless the farm bill should be passed before that hour.

I had hoped that it might be possible to modify the existing unanimous-consent agreement, which provides for an hour's debate on any motion, amendment, or appeal, by providing for 40 minutes debate on any motion, amendment, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table. I talked with the distinguished minority leader about it. There are still a number of amendments pending at the desk. I believe the Senate will remember that we modified the agreement from 2 hours of debate to 1 hour on each amendment, and so forth, and if we can modify it so that there will be 40 minutes debate on any motion, amendment, or appeal, I think we can progress more rapidly.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the present unanimous-consent agreement be further modified so that there may be 40 minutes debate on amendments, motions, and appeals, instead of 1 hour, as now provided in the agreement.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the House passed the farm bill on May 16. We had the rest of May, June, July, and part of August to take up the farm bill, and it has only recently been called up. We had raised our own salaries to $22,500 when we went home in August. I consider this bill the most important bill that will come up during the entire session this year. The unanimous-consent agreement has been modified once, and I object to any further modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

COMMENDATION OF CALENDAR COMMITTEES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas made a brief reference to the Senate having disposed of 162 bills today. I think the longest session we have had in disposing of the calendar was a few years ago, when between shortly after noon and 7 o'clock at night we passed some 700 bills.

The calendar committees are deserving of the highest commendation of the Senate for the preparation of the work on the calendar. Today we have passed a great many bills in the space of 2 hours. That could not have been done if we did not have calendar committees in which we have complete confidence, the members of which are always prepared to point out the facts concerning a bill if we have any doubts about it. Too frequently in the Senate we fail to express our appreciation of exceptionally good work. I am sure I speak for every Member of the Senate not on the calendar committees when I say that each one of us is deeply indebted to the committees for the great efficiency which they have demonstrated this morning. I am very thankful to them because they make my work much easier as I sit here and try to act as watchdog on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I completely and wholeheartedly agree with everything the Senator from Oregon has said about the calendar committees, which applies on both sides of the aisle. The able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and the able members of the calendar committee on the opposite side of the aisle have a very unpleasant task.

They work long and late in an attempt to prepare the bills for consideration by the Senate. I am glad the senior Senator from Oregon, in his usually generous spirit, has called their fine work to the attention of the Senate. I appreciate it. I know also that the distinguished minority leader appreciates the work which the Senators and the staff on his side of the aisle have done. It is noteworthy that there is excellent coordination and cooperation between the Senators and staffs on both sides of the aisle. I am proud of them.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I know that the other members of the calendar committees, on both sides of the aisle, are deeply grateful for the very generous remarks made by the senior Senator from Oregon, the majority leader, and the minority leader. The work has been a pleasure, not only because of the excellent cooperation among Senators on this side of the aisle, but also because of the way in which the members of the calendar committee on the other side of the aisle have assisted us in our work.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I simply wish to corroborate the statement of my distinguished associate on the calendar committee by saying "Amen."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am certain the majority leader and also the minority leader express not only their own views and appreciation in regard to the work of the calendar committees on both sides of the aisle, but also reflect the judgment of all 96 Members of the Senate. All of us have served in the Senate at periods of time in the past when this particular type of operations was not in effect. I think every one of us recognizes that there has been a great and constructive improvement in the procedures of the Senate, and the work of both calendar committees has been helpful to all Senators in the conducting of legislative business.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senate last week spent approximately 45 hours in discussing the farm bill, and I am informed that up until now the Senate has spent 132 hours and 41 minutes in discussing that bill.

I dislike to have the Senate remain in session late in the evening; but I think we shall have to come early and stay late until action has been concluded upon the bill. I appeal to each Senator for cooperation, and I hope and believe we can have it.

STUDY OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1411, Senate Resolution 173, relating to the so-called Kefauver Special Committee for the Study of Juvenile Delinquency in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 173) to conduct a study of juvenile delinquency in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 173) to conduct a study of juvenile delinquency in the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 2, line 11, after the word "the", where it apears the first time, to insert "prior", and in line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$110,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts, and (d) the extent to which

juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1957.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $110,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment was, on page 2, line 11, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to insert "prior".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$110,000".

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand an additional amendment is to be offered at this point.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in a discussion with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], I have been informed that the amendments I am about to offer are acceptable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection, first, to the committee amendment just stated?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wanted to make certain, from a parliamentary standpoint, that there would be no problem involved in treating the committee amendment as though it were an original part of the bill, so that the amendment to be proposed by the Senator from Tennessee will be entirely in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee may proceed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. On page 2, line 7, its is proposed to strike out "February" and insert in lieu thereof "March."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. On page 2, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "$110,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$55,000."

The $55,000 will be in addition to the amount which was spent by the committee, under the resolution, for the month of February, $5,000 having been expended at that time. So the total amount the committee will have had under the amendment will be $50,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment as amended is agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, my understanding is that in line with the other amendment which has been offered, or which is to be offered, the work of the committee will be concluded with this amount. Is that the understanding?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have written to the senior Senator from Louisiana a letter which sets forth my position. The letter states that, so far as I am concerned, the work of the committee will be continued by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary with its regular staff. I personally do not expect or intend to ask for special appropriations next year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understood the Senator in his conversation with me, the amount which is now proposed would complete the study. Is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. There are on the agenda further investigations and additional reports which will be filed and which it is expected will be completed this year.

But I wish to make it clear that of course I cannot speak for any other Member of the Senate or the Committee on the Judiciary. The field of juvenile delinquency is an important one, and other matters might arise. But the agenda we now have, the investigations which are scheduled, and the reports to be filed, are expected to be completed this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter dated March 15, 1956, addressed to me by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have the letter read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The letter will be read by the clerk for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

MARCH 15, 1956.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This will confirm our telephone conversation of Saturday morning concerning Senate Resolution 173 to extend the work of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency.

I have talked with the other members of the subcommittee, Senator HENNINGS, Senator DANIEL, Senator LANGER, and Senator WILEY, and they have agreed to go along with the request for $60,000, less one-twelfth for the money expended in February, making a total of $55,000, effective March 1, 1956.

As I told you, as chairman, I will not seek an extension of time nor appropriation for this subcommittee next year, but will advise the Judiciary Committee that the delinquency matters should be handled with the regular staff after we have finished the necessary hearings, reports, and legislation that are before the subcommittee this year, and submit our final report and recommendations.

With kindest regards, I am
Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER,
Chairman.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to the Senator from Tennessee for just a moment about the problem, because I think we are all looking forward to the report of his Committee on Juvenile Delinquency.

In my opinion we expect much of the committee, and we have a right to expect much of it. I am certain that our expectations will not be found wanting. In fact, I commend the Senator from Tennessee for the tenacity he has demonstrated in pursuing this very important study.

It has been my observation, however, that too frequently after a special committee has done a great piece of work and reported to the Senate, there is a tendency for the report of such a committee to be placed on file and to gather dust. Then in a few years the problem to which the committee directed its attention remains unsolved, and the investigation procedure must be started all over again.

So I should like to have from the Senator from Tennessee his answer to this question: Am I correct in my understanding that although his subcommittee is supposed to go out of existence, so far as the conducting of a special study on juvenile delinquency is concerned, it is not contemplated by the Committee on the Judiciary that its standing subcommittee, which would have jurisdiction over the subject matter of juvenile delinquency, will cease its interest in pursuing the leads which the Senator's special committee report will give to the Committee on the Judiciary and to the Senate?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is entirely correct.

AGRIGULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the clerk will lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

STUDY OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that we may proceed with the juvenile delinquency matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 173) to conduct a study of juvenile delinquency in the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may have an additional 5 minutes, in order to dispose of this matter. I was not aware that we were so close to the deadline. By my questioning, I did not mean to prevent a disposal of this particular matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request that the Senator may proceed for 5 additional minutes? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon amend his request by asking for 10 minutes?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the minority leader if he has any objection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no objection to 10 additional minutes being granted, but I hope we can get back promptly to the consideration of the agricultural bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. We can get back to it promptly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no objection to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the observations of my distinguished colleague from Oregon. His idea about how the committee expects to handle problems of juvenile delinquency within the jurisdiction of the Congress in the future is correct. That is, the work will be continued by the Committee on the Judiciary through its regular subcommittees and by the permanent staff of the Judiciary Committee.

There are many matters that the committee will consider further, there may be further investigations to be made, but it is my judgment that the future ones can be made by the regular staff of the Judiciary Committee.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senator that during this year we have already filed five very important reports.

The committee filed report No. 61, a general report on the problem of juvenile delinquency in the United States.

Report No. 62 had to do with comic books and juvenile delinquency. Let me say that this work, which had to do with comic books involving crime, horror, and disrespect for law enforcement, has brought the distribution of such comic books to an end. The industry has appointed a czar to go over the matters. Voluntary compliance has been brought about, and the comic book situation has been brought under control.

The subcommittee has filed report No. 1463, having to do with problems of youth employment, which has received much attention all over the United States.

Report No. 1466 has to do with television and juvenile delinquency. As a result of our hearings and reports, we have noted a better effort on the part of the television industry to take out of television so many programs having to do with crime and violence, and substituting constructive programs.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], on behalf of the subcommittee, has filed a very excellent report on juvenile problems among Indian children. As a result of the investigations of the subcommittee for which the Senator from North Dakota acted as chairman, a great deal has been done for the Indians, particularly Indian children. The result of the matters which he and I brought before the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is one of the notable achievements of the subcommittee.

The subcommittee has prepared and ready for submission an interim report on motion pictures and juvenile delinquency.

The subcommittee has made an investigation of pornography and the sale of pornographic literature to juvenile delinquents. The subcommittee has learned of indecent and illicit literature getting into the hands of the children of our country, and the business had grown to be a $500 million a year business. The subcommittee, along with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], proposed legislation to bar the shipment of indecent literature in interstate commerce, and that law has been enacted. That report will be submitted very soon.

The subcommittee has a report prepared on church and religion and juvenile delinquency.

The subcommittee has a report in the process of being prepared on education and schools and juvenile delinquency. Another report in the process of being prepared is one on interstate adoptions and the blackmarket baby traffic.

The subcommittee has had some 25 separate hearings in different States. It has had before it about 600 witnesses on various problems of juvenile delinquency.

There are 20 bills now pending, some of which are in different stages before various committees, all of which we think will be helpful.

The work of the subcommittee has been nonpartisan in its nature. We have had wonderful cooperation everywhere we have gone. I am happy to report that as a result of great public interest, many things have been done at the Federal, State, and local level, and for the first time the substantial rise in juvenile delinquency in the United States has leveled off. I think much more consideration is being given to opportunities for children to keep them interested. There is better law enforcement. I like to think that within a reasonable period the amount of juvenile delinquency in the country is going to be on the downgrade. I am very proud of the work the subcommittee has done and what little it has contributed.

I wish to point out also that the subcommittee has been operated on a purely nonpartisan basis. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] held some of the hearings. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] held some. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] held some. The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] has participated.

The committee will complete the hearings it has scheduled and filed reports, and the other matters will be handled by the regular staff of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I cannot let this opportunity go by without bringing to the attention of the Senate the excellent job which has been done by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. His work has been outstanding, and the entire Nation owes him a debt of gratitude. I want to serve notice now that I know of no understanding by anyone that we will not ask for a continuation of the committee. I was not consulted about the matter. I intend to ask next year that the committee be continued. This committee has done a remarkable job.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that 20,000 babies have been sold each year in the black market. Right now there are quite a few lawyers in court who have been dealing in babies, for which they have bargained with poor, innocent girls who have been unfortunate. The lawyers charge all the way from $2,500 to $5,000 for each baby, Mr. President. That is done in spite of the fact there are relief agencies in practically every State of the Union.

The publication and distribution of pornographic literature is a multimillion dollar a year business. There are arrests pending in the Federal courts. We have already put in the penitentiary men who deal in such literature.

We have also before us the problem of polygamy, which I investigated as head of the minority of the committee. That situation is unspeakably disgraceful. States cannot cope with the problem. Two years ago the Governor of Arizona needed witnesses who were across State lines. The power of subpena must be available to those coping with the problem. At a future date, I intend to give a detailed report as to what the committee has accomplished. I am proud of this committee's work.

I am proud of the subcommittee's work. The subcommittee was established while I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. President, and I intend to make clear to the people of the United States how badly the subcommittee is needed.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to repeat that I commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for doing such outstanding work.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a digest of the work of the subcommittee, showing the investigations and hearings which have been conducted, the questionnaires which have been sent out, the reports which have been submitted, and the proposed legislation, now pending, that has come from the subcommittee; and, following that, a summary of the general activities of the subcommittee, giving in more detail the work done by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], and myself.

There being no objection, the digest and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIGEST OF WORK OF SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY DURING 1ST SESSION OF 84TH CONGRESS

(Subcommittee composed of Senators KEFAUVER, HENNINGS, DANIEL, LANGER, and WILEY)

INVESTIGATIONS AND HEARINGS

Television.
Youth employment.
Comic books.
Motion pictures.

Pornography.
Education.
Church and religion.
Black-market baby and adoptions.
Indians.
Pittsburgh community.
Los Angeles community.
Chicago community.
Providence community.
Miami and Florida community.
Nashville community.

QUESTIONNAIRES

Veneral disease among juveniles.
Narcotics.
Care and treatment in institutions.
Armed Forces induction policies.
Handling of delinquents (courts).
Education.
Religion.
Pornography.

ORGANIZATIONS INAUGURATED NATIONALLY

Conference of Civic, Fraternal and Veterans Organizations.

Conference on Youth Serving Organizations.

REPORTS PREPARED

Interim Report No. 61: Juvenile Delinquency in the United States.

Interim Report No. 62: Comic Books and Juvenile Delinquency.

Interim Report No. 1463: Youth Employment.

Interim Report No. 1466: Television and Juvenile Delinquency.

Interim Report No. 1483: Indians.

Interim report: Motion Pictures and Juvenile Delinquency.

Interim report: Pornography Traffic Among Juveniles.

Interim report: Church and Religion and Juvenile Delinquency.

REPORTS IN PREPARATION

Interim report: Education and Schools and Juvenile Delinquency.

Interim report: Interstate Adoptions and Black Market Baby Traffic.

LEGISLATIVE HEARINGS

S. 959: Exit permit for juveniles going to Mexico.

S. 599: Interstate pornography (enacted into law).

S. 600: Interstate pornography (enacted into law).

S. 1087: Aftercare payments for Youth Division of United States Parole Board.

S. 1955: Support orders for deserting fathers.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE, 84TH CONGRESS

S. 728: To provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the control of juvenile delinquency. Referred to Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 957: To permit any taxpayer who provides a home for any foster child placed in his home by a licensed agency to treat such child as a dependent for Federal income tax purposes. Referred to Committee on Finance.

S. 958: Relating to the handling of juvenile delinquents. Referred to Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency.

S. 959: To prohibit juveniles, unaccompanied by a parent or guardian, from going outside of the United States without a permit issued by the Attorney General for such purposes. Referred to Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency.

S. 1087: To authorize aftercare payments by the Youth Division of the United States Board of Parole. Referred to Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency.

S. 1088. To assist the States to return runaway children to their own communities in another State. Referred to Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1955: To provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders. Referred to Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency.

S. 2190: To amend the act entitled "An act to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia," so as to provide for the appointment of a referee. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2191. To amend section 7 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2192. To amend section 13 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2193: To amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia. Referred to Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2194: to amend certain provisions of the laws relating to the functioning of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia so as to permit the waiver of the jurisdiction of the court in certain additional cases. Referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2195: to make uniform the law of reciprocal enforcement of support in the District of Columbia. Referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2213: to require that any publication transported in interstate commerce shall contain the name and address of the publisher of such publication. Referred to the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

S. 2281: to make unlawful certain commercial dealings in minor children. Referred to the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

S. 2433: to provide for the establishment within the national parks of the United States of a series of Federal forestry camps for the training, education, rehabilitation, security and correction of male juvenile delinquents. Referred to Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2515: to provide more stringent penalties for violaions of laws concerning pornography and related matters. Referred to Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

S. 2516: to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases. Referred to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3021: to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption. Referred to Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

Senate Joint Resolution 44: to give the consent of the Congress to interstate compacts or agreements dealing with the cooperative supervision of juvenile probationers and parolees, the return of runaway children, the return of juvenile delinquent escapees, and for other purposes. Referred to Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency.

FUTURE HEARINGS

Narcotic addiction among minors.
Institutions and treatment.
Federal forestry camps.
Federal probation system.
Youth correction act.
Mental health facilities for youth.
Youthful offenders 18 to 21.
Armed Forces induction policy.
Runaway children.
Juvenile court system.
Delinquency in rural areas.
Preventive programs.
Slum areas and housing.
Mass media (continuation).
Legislative hearings.
Problems of Indian children (continuation).

SUMMARY OF GENERAL ACTIVITIES OF SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

During the past 11 months the subcommittee composed of Senators HENNINGS, DANIEL, LONG, WILEY, and myself has concentrated on certain environmental situations felt to have a direct connection with the steadily increasing incidence of juvenile delinquency during the last half decade. The investigations have been directed toward those problems which were found to be subject to Federal controls and for which the Congress of the United States could provide remedies and solutions through legislation. In addition to this function of the subcommittee, it has also focused nationwide attention on many problems of juvenile delinquency and has had a far-reaching impact in stimulating and strengthening many remedial efforts throughout the Nation.

In every city where hearings of this subcommittee have been held, local officials have been given the opportunity to testify as to their particular problems and their outstanding preventive programs. The effect of this type of testimony has been to provide a wide exchange of information between many cities and States, resulting in the greatest possible dissemination of constructive information on combating delinquency among our youth.

The subcommittee has been conducted on a completely bipartisan basis with the Members from both sides of the aisle serving at times as chairman of the hearings that we have held. In every instance where hearings have been held the Members of the Congress in both Houses have been invited to sit with the subcommittee and take part in the hearing.

This year the subcommittee has conducted investigations and staff studies into the effect of television on juvenile delinquency, youth employment, traffic in pornographic literature, education and schools, religion's effort to prevent delinquency, the black-market baby traffic and interstate adoption practices, delinquency among the Indians, motion pictures, and comic books. Hearings on these subjects were held in Washington, D. C.; New York, N. Y.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Chicago, Ill.; Providence, R. I.; Miami, Fla.; Nashville, Tenn.; Phoenix, Ariz., and Pittsburgh, Pa. The subcommittee heard testimoney from 335 witnesses during the past 11 months.

In addition to these investigations and staff studies, the subcommittee has also gathered information through questionnaires on such subjects as venereal disease among juveniles, narcotics and their uses by youth, care and treatment of delinquents in institutions, Armed Forces induction policies, juvenile courts and their handling of delinquents, and education.

In answer to requests for publications of the subcommittee it has sent out approximately 100,000 reports and transcripts of hearings to interest individuals and agencies in addition to answering approximately 25,000 individual letters on the problem.

To indicate the size of the problem with which the subcommittee has been dealing, it was found that more than 475,000 boys and girls were brought to the attention of the juvenile courts in 1954 because of delinquent behavior. This was an increase of 40,000 over the previous year.

More than 1,333,000 juveniles were dealt with by the police in the same year, which was an increase of 100,000 over the previous year.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation estimates the current annual cost of crime in America to be $20 billion. The tremendous cost to the Nation of juvenile delinquency in dollars can be seen from the following statistics: Young people under 18 years of age committed 58 percent of the auto thefts, 49 percent of burglaries, 15 percent of rapes, 5 percent of homicide cases,

6 percent of assault cases, and those under 21 years of age accounted for 51 percent of all persons arrested for crimes against property.

The first investigation of the subcommittee this year was into the relationship between youth employment and juvenile delinquency. We wanted to learn how much connection there was betwen the inability of some teenagers to find suitable employment and the growth of juvenile delinquency.

In our report on youth employment, we made several recommendations which we feel will go a long way toward solving the problem. These recommendations have been and are being incorporated into legislation for the Congress.

Another phase of our work concerns the impact of the mass media on youth. The first topic within this area to receive consideration was the crime and horror comic book. As a result of the subcommittee's studies, the industry appointed its own code administrator and began serious efforts to clean out the books adjudged to have a bad influence on young people. The subcommittee is continuing to study this effort on behalf of the comic book industry and the effectiveness of the code. Production of crime and horror comics has been practically eliminated during the first year of code operation, but whether this will be a continuing operation can only be determined through test of time. The subcommittee has filled thousands of requests for information on the comic book investigation and has furnished successful citizen participation programs to many communities which have asked for guidance in meeting the problem on a local level.

Television was the second topic for consideration in our mass media study. At our hearings, we heard from leaders in the television industry, their critics, and those who have conducted scholarly surveys of the mass media.

The industry, brought face to face with the problem of its influence on juvenile conduct, is already making efforts to improve its programs so that a more beneficial diet will be presented to the child turning to television for entertainment.

We asked the television broadcasters to adhere more closely to their own code. We pointed out to them that many violations of their own code are occurring which could have detrimental effects on children. We then asked those not belonging to the Radio and Television Code to join, so that a united front could be presented for better programing. We were also especially interested in having those produce films for television come under some sort of industry regulation. After the release of our television report we were informed by the National Association of Television Producers that their group had met and was formulating an industry code of regulation for the production of motion pictures for television.

In Los Angeles, we heard from those engaged in motion-picture production. This study was an extention of our television study for the basic principles applying to television also apply to motion pictures.

We also wanted to take a closer look at the Hollywood advertising code, which seemed to have been administered far too laxly in the last few years. The predominance of crime, horror and violence, and sex portrayed in film advertisements not only transgresses upon good taste, but also constitutes a genuinely harmful influence on young people.

Both the motion-picture producers and the advertisers have finely worded codes, but too often these codes are violated. When they are violated, so are the minds and sensibilities of our children.

With the cooperation of the motion-picture industry, the subcommittee believes that many of the detrimental aspects of these pictures and their advertising have been eliminated. The subcommittee furnished much information and many exhibits to the motion-picture advertising code administrators which he used in conveying to the individual advertisers the objectionable features of motion-picture advertising. The report of this subcommittee sets forth certain recommendations that will materially improve motion pictures and provide leadership in furnishing good entertainment that does not have the harmful effect of leading children into crime.

One of the most shocking of our investigations revealed the extent to which pornography was reaching even our very young children, and the terrible influence and filth was having on their conduct.

The subcommittee uncovered during its investigations and hearings on legislation indications that this traffic in pornography was in excess of $500 million annually.

From testimony received we know that this pornography is reaching the hands of children. These thoroughly nasty materials portray the abnormal as normal. They are sold to children by adults. Psychiatrists told us that much of the pornography was deliberately geared to the young and sexually inquisitive mind.

The perversion of the individuals who produce this material was brought home to us with startling emphasis when we learned that they no longer rely solely upon adults to participate in the scenes involving sex which they record on motion-picture film and still photographs. College girls, teenagers, and in 1 extreme case, a child of 4, are being enticed into participating in abnormal sex by unscrupulous adults who traffic in this filth.

We have compiled lists of pornographers, whose names have come into our possession through investigations and hearings, and have sent them to police chiefs over the country. For example in Houston, Tex., Minneapolis, Minn., Pittsburgh, Pa., Bismarck, N. Dak., and other cities large quantities of pornography have been seized as a result of these lists being in the hands of local police departments.

The subcommittee held hearings on S. 599 and S. 600 during the past year. These bills were reported by the subcommittee and passed by the Congress to become law and close one of the largest loopholes in transporting pornography in interstate commerce. This is legislation that might have been unduly delayed but for the prompt consideration of it by this subcommittee.

In the report of this subcommittee on pornography other recommendations for legislation are being made, and legislation is being prepared to further stem the flow of this material. Our staff is working closely with the Post Office Department on this legislation to assure that the mails will not be used to distribute pornography, and in this endeavor we have the active support of the American Bar Association.

In the field of education it was the opinion of this subcommittee that the first line of defense against delinquency was the school. Almost every authority agreed that the school can and must play a major role in its prevention.

The hearings on this subject explored what extent overcrowded and undermanned schools were actually a contributing cause of juvenile delinquency and what programs could be effectively utilized in the schools to meet the growing problems of youth.

Our report on education and the schools presents many outstanding programs and definite recommendations for both legislative and executive action to alleviate many of the existing conditions in our Nation's school systems.

In conjunction with the hearings on education, a hearing was also held which stressed the role of the church in combating delinquency. These hearings were so designed that each major denomination in the Nation could present its program for study by other denominations and also gain from the testimony of all others. Many sound and constructive programs of enlisting youth in religious activities as a method of combating delinquency have been included in the subcommittee's report on religion.

No legislation will result from this hearing, but the subcommittee provided through the hearing a wide dissemination of information that has proved of great value to the religious leaders of the Nation.

Hearings were held in Chicago, Ill., and Miami, Fla., exploring the nationwide traffic in selling babies for profit across State lines. These hearings were held in connection with legislation introduced by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], S. 1123. The subcommittee found that approximately 25,000 babies are placed each year outside of legitimate adoption placement agencies. Thousands of these children are sold by doctors, lawyers, midwives, and other individuals to couples desiring children, without any investigation as to the suitability of parents or child. This traffic is largely interstate to escape the restrictions of State laws dealing with intrastate adoptions.

As a result of these hearings a subcommittee bill S. 3021 has been introduced to correct many of abuses arising from this traffic.

One of the most important measures to come from the subcommittee is S. 728, which has been referred to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and it is believed it will be reported favorably during this session of Congress.

This bill will provide the States with funds to initiate new programs for delinquency control and also provide money for training essential personnel skilled in the handling of children's problems.

This bill meets the request in the President's budget message when he stated: "Another growing social problem of concern to the entire Nation is juvenile delinquency. During the last 8 years there has been a 60 percent increase in the number of children appearing before our courts. The States and communities need technical assistance and financial aid to help them halt this trend. I therefore renew my request that Congress enact legislation promptly to authorize Federal aid to the States for strengthening their services for prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency."

Much important work remains to be done. In at least 12 major areas we must conduct further investigations and this is a minimum figure.

The budget request for the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee for the year 1956 is $110,000. This is $65,000 less than requested in 1954 and $44,000 less than requested in 1955. Yet the work we plan to do is no less important.

There are 23 million children in the Nation of juvenile court age. One-seventh of the population. Yet from a budget of $65 million to operate the legislative branch of the Government we are requesting only $110,000, or two one-thousandths of the total budget to study ways and means whereby our greatest asset can be given an opportunity to grow to be useful American citizens.

There is much that has been done and much that can be done by the Federal Government in meeting the problems of juvenile delinquency as evidenced by the legislation introduced by this subcommittee. The Congress must meet these problems today or face greater problems in the future.

Our Government today is spending billions of dollars. We spend $7½ billion for Agriculture; $1 billion for Commerce; $2 billion for Health, Education, and Welfare; $3 billion for the Post Office; $7½ billion for the Treasury; one-half billion dollars for Labor; and $182 million for the Justice Department.

For meeting what is becoming the No. 1 social problem we are spending only $200,000 for a small section within the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Division of Juvenile Delinquency Service, in addition to the work of this subcommittee.

In the next 11 months we plan to study the following problems. It is a large task and will require diligent work, but we believe it can be accomplished, and if accomplished it will mean much to the youth of America.

1. A study of the causes for narcotic addiction among minors, the source of supply, and the extent of use by them is already underway by the subcommittee. This study will in no way overlap the work done by the Daniel subcommittee during the past year but will be directed wholly toward the juvenile aspect of this problem where addiction begins.

The most disheartening discovery of our prehearing study is that many youngsters take to narcotics just for the thrill. Once addicted the road back is long and the cure uncertain. For instance, only two cities in the United States have follow-up centers for the care of cured-narcotic addicts, yet some estimates of recurrence run as high as 99 percent.

This investigation will also include the tremendously increasing use of the barbiturates and amphetamines by youth for thrill. These drugs are easily procurable and are manufactured by the millions of pounds each year in this country.

2. Also underway at the present time is a subcommittee investigation of treatment services and facilities, including detention homes, training schools and after-care services. Many persons think placing a child behind four walls for a length of time is a cure for delinquency. This is just not so. Too often exactly the opposite happens—the child becomes a hardened criminal.

Every year over 100,000 children are confined in common jails. They are thrown in with hardened criminals and come under their influence for varying periods of time. Other youngsters are confined in institutions wholely inadequate for rehabilitation. These institutions geared to meet this problem are sorely overtaxed.

To complicate this already complex problem, there is a severe lack of trained personnel to care for the youngsters.

The lack of uniformity of professional conviction among groups that contribute to the thinking in this field leads to indecision and lack of support on the part of the public and its legislators. This slows down progress in meeting the problem. Federal investigation and assistance is needed to clear away differences and to suggest adequate means of meeting this problem with all available resources.

Specifically the subcommittee plans to:

Study the Federal probation system and Federal youth correction institutions with an eye toward having the Federal Government provide the example of State institutions.

Study institutional handling of minors and detention facilities used for them.

Explore the possibility of establishing within the national forests forestry camps on a cooperative basis with the States for the rehabilitation of youth that can benefit from such a program. The subcommittee has already introduced legislation S. 2433 to originate this program.

Investigate the entire unexplored area of treatment and responsibility for seriously emotionally and mentally disturbed children.

Another problem needing immediate attention is that of mental health. The emotionally disturbed child whose problems are noted early enough can often be saved from a later life of crime and delinquency if treatment is promptly available. All too often, even where there are sufficient mental health facilities, treatment is often available only after months and months of waiting.

Our hearings may result in legislation that will enable two or more States to share the responsibility and the cost of a joint facility for handling these cases. The initial cost of such an institution often prohibits one State from going it alone.

An increasing number of serious crimes are being committed by the youthful offender—the youngster over the age of jurisdiction by the juvenile court, but still under 21.

The subcommittee hopes to conduct hearings on the extent of involvement in crime of youths between 18 and 21 years of age, and to investigate the detention facilities used on both the State and Federal level for these minors. The entire situation of the youthful offender must come under serious study if we are to reduce crime in this country and prepare all our youth for good citizenship. This would also include a study of the Youth Corrections Act to determine its effectiveness and the extent of its application in Federal jurisdictions.

The recruitment of those youths who have been juvenile delinquents for the armed services presents a series of problems based upon, (1) the increasingly trying demands presented by the volume of juvenile delinquents available for military service, (2) the negative impact that they are believed to have upon military efficiency and discipline, and (3) the expense and confusion attendant to their enlistment and subsequent discharge under the existing conflicts of applicable laws.

This does not mean that the majority of juvenile delinquents may not make good soldiers, sailors, or airmen. It does mean that we have not yet learned how to predict their success or failure in service, and our nation may be losing for active military service many thousands of these youths.

The subcommittee would like to explore what the Department of Defense is doing to develop screening techniques and rehabilitative processes that will be equitable and effective.

Each year 200,000 children run away from home. Many end up in jail or are sentenced to institutions on charges of vagrancy. This is one of the Nation's most serious problems and needs immediate Federal attention and study. The subcommittee has introduced two measures S. 1088. To assist the States to return runaway children to their own communities in another State, and Senate Joint Resolution 44, to give the consent of the Congress for interstate compacts for the return of runaway children.

Hearings must be held on these measures so that action may be taken immediately to assist in handling this problem.

A study of what constitutes the most effective court system for the handling of juvenile offenders is most important. The subcommittee feels that the Federal Government should take leadership in establishing a proper court system. The Federal court system for handling juveniles should adopt procedures that can serve as an example for the rest of the Nation. Today the Federal system lags far behind many communities.

Out of these hearings will come some idea of how a juvenile court can be effectively run, the size of staff relative to the cases handled, how much time the court should spend in social study of the youthful offender before the trial, the adequacy of probation supervision, the availability of clinical service and the extent to which they are used, and the professional qualifications needed by judge and staff.

Many times children are deprived of their constitutional rights through the arbitrary proceedings of some of our courts and oftentimes are subject to "star chamber" proceedings that leave them with a lasting disrespect for law and justice.

Delinquency is a problem with which many people, groups, and agencies are concerned. During the hearings, it has been forcefully brought home time and time again that there is all too often a decided lack of coordination and cooperation among the agencies trying to do the job. This is true both nationally and in local communities. Unless all efforts are brought into focus, there is bound to be duplication of effort. Worse yet, unless all of these good people and organizations work together, certain aspects of the problem are bound to be neglected or overlooked.

The subcommittee has already helped to establish two nationwide groups to deal with the problems of juvenile delinquency on a local level. One of these groups brought together the civic, fraternal, and veterans' organizations, representing a total membership of approximately 8 million persons. Where these organizations had many overlapping plans and programs to assist youth, they now have a national clearinghouse of information and are doing effective work in preventing delinquency.

The second group was composed of the 18 leading national public and private organizations which are active in formulating standards for local agencies handling delinquent children. This group was brought together so that the several organizations might join for sharing of information and joint planning on a continuing basis.

Delinquency in rural areas has grown almost twice as quickly as the delinquency in urban areas. Juvenile gangs, once thought of as merely a big-city problem, have now become a rural problem too. It is essential that the subcommittee devote time to a study of delinquency problems in rural areas as these communities have neither the funds nor the personnel to adequately determine the causes nor the preventive measures needed to alleviate the growing incidence of juvenile delinquency.

During the life of this subcommittee, much information has been collected on outstanding preventive programs, work of organizations, State and community plans. As an adjunct to investigations and hearings, this material should be researched and reported to the Senate and made available to the public. It comprises the most complete file on juvenile delinquency ever collected and only because of the necessity to devote most of the efforts of this subcommittee to the most pressing problems during its existence it has not been adequately studied.

Preliminary reports list that in slum areas as many as 20 percent of the juvenile population gets into trouble with the police.

The subcommittee would like to investigate the adequacy of the Federal housing program in slum areas and the effect of slum areas and conditions of poverty have on juvenile delinquency in such cities as Chicago, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and New York.

Of great concern to the subcommittee is the tremendous gap between the number of dollars needed and the number of dollars allotted to family-welfare work, education, psychiatric treatment and research, police court and probation work.

The subcommittee proposes an over-all evaluation of Federal programs in the fields of social service, employment, law enforcement, courts, detention, and recreation. Coordination is needed so that the small amount of money devoted to this work is effectively used.

In addition to these studies and investigations the subcommittee has the continuing task of holding hearings on legislation now before it. Hearings and reports must be prepared on the following Senate bills:

S. 958: Relating to the handling of juvenile delinquents.

S. 959: To prohibit juveniles, unaccompanied, from going outside the United States without a permit issued by the Attorney General.

S. 1087: To authorize aftercare payments by the Youth Division of the United States Board of Parole.

S. 1955: To provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts.

S. 2213: Relating to pornographic literature publication.

S. 2281: To make unlawful certain commercial dealing in minor children.

S. 2515: Relating to penalties for violations of laws concerning pornography and related matters.

S. J. Res. 44: Interstate compacts for return of runaway children.

S. 3021: Relating to interstate adoption traffic.

It is vitally important that the subcommittee complete its hearings on these bills and strengthen the program of the Federal Government in meeting these problems.

The complex problem of juvenile crime in this country is not the subject for quick, piecemeal examination. Our findings are being added to the literature available on the problem and a growing number of students of juvenile delinquency are turning to the reports of the subcommittee as the only centralized source of information on the problem.

We would not do justice either to our assignment or to the Congress unless our studies were conducted in a sound, scholarly fashion. The subcommittee's approach to its work justifies our findings taking their rightful place beside the other important literature in a field of deep concern to all Americans.

The fight against juvenile delinquency is vital in safeguarding our Nation's greatest resource—the young people who will take over its responsibilities and determine its future. Once we know the causes of juvenile delinquency, we can prescribe some of the remedies, as we have already suggested Federal remedies to alleviate some of the more outward symptoms of this national disease.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to add my word to the effect that the investigation of juvenile delinquency touches one of the most serious social problems existing today in the United States. In my opinion, this resolution should be adopted. I am heartily in favor of its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 173) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary, to conduct a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal Courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1957.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $55,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McClellan
Allott	George	McNamara
Anderson	Goldwater	Millikin
Barkley	Gore	Monroney
Barrett	Green	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bender	Hennings	Murray
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bible	Hill	Neuberger
Bricker	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hruska	Pastore
Bush	Humphrey	Payne
Butler	Ives	Potter
Byrd	Jackson	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Scott
Chavez	Kennedy	Smathers
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Kuchel	Sparkman
Daniel	Laird	Stennis
Dirksen	Langer	Symington
Douglas	Lehman	Thurmond
Duff	Long	Thye
Dworshak	Magnuson	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Young
Frear	McCarthy	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). A quorum is present.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARTHY. In view of the fact that no business has been conducted since the last quorum call, is not this quorum call out of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is out of order to raise any point of order.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that if no business has been conducted between quorum calls, the additional quorum call would not be in order and that an objection should be made to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's point should have been made before the second quorum call was started.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Do I correctly understand that the point could have been made before the quorum call was commenced, but that it is not proper to make it at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The quorum call was resumed and concluded, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McClellan
Allott	George	McNamara
Anderson	Goldwater	Millikin
Barkley	Gore	Monroney
Barrett	Green	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bender	Hennings	Murray
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bible	Hill	Neuberger
Bricker	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hruska	Pastore
Bush	Humphrey	Payne
Butler	Ives	Potter
Byrd	Jackson	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Scott
Chavez	Kennedy	Smathers
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Kuchel	Sparkman
Daniel	Laird	Stennis
Dirksen	Langer	Symington
Douglas	Lehman	Thurmond
Duff	Long	Thye
Dworshak	Magnuson	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Young
Frear	McCarthy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "3-7-56-M" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 11, after "hereof", it is proposed to insert "under which the tenants or sharecroppers share in that part of such certificate which represents acreage previously used or cultivated by the tenant or sharecropper shall not be less than his share of the crop or produce under his agreement with the owner."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may be willing to accept my amendment. What it seeks to do is to make explicit the method of protecting tenants in payments which are made for acreage put under the acreage reserve program.

The provision in the bill as it is at present drawn is as follows:

The Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including provision for sharing, on a fair and equitable basis, in the certificates issued pursuant to section 205 hereof.

That is a worthy statement of purpose, but it does not provide a specific method of protection. In view of the testimony which has been given concern-

ing the operation of allotments in certain States, it would seem that more definite provision is needed to protect tenant farmers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may state to the distinguished Senator that I do not have any objection to the amendment at all. I think it is a good amendment. The only thing that I desire to be certain of is that it will not provide a vested right in the landlord's certificates to tenants who may have left the farm 6 months ago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; it is applicable only in case the tenant completes his crop.

Mr. ELLENDER. He must be on the farm working his crop before he becomes entitled to share the certificate with the landlord?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. With that understanding, Mr. President, I accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to reiterate a point which I made the other night in a colloquy with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as to the nature of the relationship of landlord and tenant. In many places, these agreements are not actually written, formal leases such as we find in connection with city property.

I wanted to make it clear that the chairman agreed with me that the agreements may be informal in nature. What we have in mind is protecting the agreements in whatever way they have been recognized in a community. Very frequently they are verbal agreements, which may continue year after year. As I understand, if that has been the case in the past, it will still be recognized by the Secretary and by the proposed law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. The amendment provides that the division of farms for acreage for the acreage reserve program shall be approximately according to the share of the crop as divided between the landlord and tenant; or, at least, that the tenant's share shall not be less than the share of the crop which he receives.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is understood we are not talking of the formal, legal, written tenancy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. A verbal agreement would be covered as well as a written agreement.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I was wondering if the Senator's amendment touched a problem that occurs to me. It may very well be that a landlord farmer may have certain acreage which is planted and worked by a tenant. Suppose the farmer had 1,000 acres. He may have 500 acres customarily worked by tenants. The other 500 acres he may customarily work with outside labor.

That farmer may make a decision to put into the soil bank the 500 acres worked by the outside labor, and thereby take unto himself the entire payment for the soil bank program insofar as his farm is concerned. While he would be benefited, he would theoretically displace the outside hired labor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And then the tenant's share of the 500 acres, which would continue to be farmed, would be decreased.

Mr. LONG. Not theoretically. But the tenant who farmed the other 500 acres would be excluded from any benefit from the soil bank, just as the outside labor could be excluded. At least, it would appear that way to me.

Frankly, I have raised the problem because it was suggested to me by at least one large farmer, that what a large farmer would prefer to do would be to put into the soil bank that part of the acreage which he customarily farmed and worked with hired labor, labor which did not live on the farm.

I do not believe the Senator's amendment would reach that problem, unless it has some interpretation other than that which I have given to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am afraid the junior Senator from Louisiana is correct.

I yield to the senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. The 500 acres mentioned by my distinguished colleague would not be subject to any tenant-landlord relationship. The landlord could do whatever he pleased with it.

The amendment of the Senator from Illinois merely affects actual contracts, whether in writing or verbal A writing or other formality would not be required so long as the contracts involved are performed as is the custom in the community involved, with the parties, and so on. The amendment should not go beyond that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not see how, legally, it could go beyond that; but I think the junior Senator from Louisiana has pointed out a weakness with the amendment as drafted.

Mr. ELLENDER. It might be a flaw, but my good friend is correct when he states that his amendment goes as far as the law will permit it. I do not see how we could legally touch the situation given as an example by my colleague.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have offered the amendment in order to make certain that the tenant will receive compensation for the acreage which he formerly cultivated and on which he produced, but which is not now cultivated.

In the illustration given by the junior Senator from Louisiana, in which 500 acres is cultivated by a tenant, and 500 acres is cultivated by the landlord himself, with hired labor, the 500 acres cultivated by the landlord with the hired labor, he could then reduce the acreage he rents not only to the tenant, say to 250 acres, and the tenant would suffer from a reduction in acreage without compensation payment for the acres withdrawn.

I do not quite see how that can be met in any amendment. I do not want to admit too much, but I think the junior Senator from Louisiana has put his finger on a weak spot.

Mr. ELLENDER. I read:

On page 8, line 11 of the bill, after the comma; "on a fair and equitable basis, in the certificates issued pursuant to section 205 hereof, and including such provision as may be necessary to prevent them from being forced off the farm."

That further provision is contained in the bill so as to assist tenants. As I said, if a landlord happens to have a farm part of which he rents and part of which he works himself, the two parts are to be considered, so far as the soil bank bid is concerned, as entirely separate units.

Mr. LONG. The only point I had in mind was could be illustrated in this fashion if a person had very good cotton land, in some cases, the payment might be as high as $60 an acre. A farmer with 1,000 acres of cotton might have had half his acreage worked by hired laborers, who did not live on the farm. It would be a good business decision, although it might not be necessarily in the interest of the sharecropper, for the farmer to take out of cultivation 500 acres which had been worked by the farm-hired labor. The hired laborers would not share in soil-bank payments. Inasmuch as there would be no particular person to whom the farmer would hire from year to year, the day laborer would not share in the profits of the soil bank. The 500 acres could bring to the farmer, at $60 an acre, $30,000.

Based upon the information I have received from one farmer, there would be no requirement that he share any of that revenue with the persons who had previously worked for him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is no protection for the day worker.

But if the tenant continued to farm the other 500 acres, as he did before, then he would not be injured by the withdrawal of the other 500 acres. But if his acreage were reduced from 500 to 250, while still not forced off the farm, he still would be compelled to make a living on a smaller number of acres, and would be in trouble. Of course, we are dealing with large units.

Mr. LONG. One thing which occurred to me about the soil-bank proposal is that I should like to see it benefit the small person and do justice to him in the same way as it would benefit and do justice to the large farmer. The small farmer, with only a few acres, would hardly find it to his advantage to put those acres into a soil bank, because that person has to sell his labor in order to make sufficient income to stay on his farm.

If labor accounts for half the expense, he needs to do that work and make that 50 percent himself. He has labor for sale, just as he would hope to sell the use of the land, the various other expenses which go into producing the crop.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I certainly do not pretend that the amendment plugs or meets all the possible difficulties, but I think it would help to protect the tenant from any unfair attempts by the landlord to take an unfair share of the land for the soil bank, land which otherwise would be covered by either a written or

a verbal agreement on that portion of the soil which would furnish the tenant protection.

Mr. LONG. So far as I can determine, there is no provision in the amendment, and, so far as I know, there is no provision in the bill, which would prevent the owner of the land from making the decision himself, which would have the effect of exacting from the sharecropper land which would go into the soil-bank program. That decision would remain with the farmer.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I point out to both the Senator from Illinois and my colleague from Louisiana the following language in the bill at the bottom of page 24:

SEC. 223. In any case in which the Secretary determines (1) that a producer has displaced any tenant or sharecropper, or reduced the acreage of any commodity farmed by any tenant or sharecropper, on any farm owned or controlled by such producer, (2) that such displacement or reduction was made in contemplation of, or on account of, participation by such producer in either the acreage-reserve program or the conservation reserve progam, and (3) that such displacement or reduction was without the consent of the tenant or sharecropper, the Secretary is authorized to deny such producer all or any part of the benefits provided under this act.

I believe that covers the problem, at least as far as it is within the power of Congress to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the senior Senator from Louisiana. That would seem to be the difficulty raised by the junior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. The question raised by my colleague is one of the weaknesses, if we may call it so, of the soil bank. It may be that, in fact, we did hear from many parts of the country some criticism about land remaining idle and that hired labor may suffer. But that is something we cannot expect to help. I believe that if the bill as a whole is read, and if the language shall be added as the Senator from Illinois has just proposed, the tenant will be protected.

I thank the Senator from Illinois. I wish to say I shall be glad to yield him more time if he finds he needs any.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana for not only the courteous but the friendly manner in which he has received the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in addition section 223, to which reference has been made, I point out that section 213, on page 20 of the bill, further alludes to the question of giving the Secretary power to provide for adequate safeguards. That, together with the other section mentioned, is about all we can do to protect the interests of the sharecroppers.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, while I would support the Senator's amendment, and while I think it is an improvement in the bill, the thought occurs to me that, under the soil-bank proposal as it is drafted, there will be a great amount of displacement of hired labor. I do not see how that conclusion can be escaped. Unless employment is available elsewhere for such persons, I think we can anticipate that there will be further hardship in rural areas where persons who do not live on the farm are accustomed to being hired from day to day as agricultural workers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If 25 million acres are to be withdrawn from cultivation, it naturally follows that fewer people will be needed to cultivate that land. I think that is true. That is one of the troubles with all these acreage-reduction programs.

Mr. LONG. The point I wish to make is that in withdrawing that acreage, very liberal payments will be made to the farmers who own the land, but there is no provision to look after the day laborers who would ordinarily work on those acres.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the point which the Senator from Louisiana has made will lead him to support a bill which I am sponsoring for governmental aid in areas where there has been a considerable amount of unemployment for a considerable period of time. I think we do owe an obligation to the people forced off the soil who may find it difficult to get jobs in towns.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for accepting the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield back such time as he has remaining?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield back such time as remains to me.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator has stated that trees can be grown in 15 years. Let me state that it will take longer than that for a tree to mature. Does not the Senator think 15 years is too short a time?

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee studied that question very carefully. At first a maximum limitation of 10 years was suggested, but because in some areas as much as 15 years are required to produce a mature tree, the committee provided an additional 5 years, when trees are to be planted on cultivated lands. From the testimony we received, it was felt that 15 years would be ample time.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator tell us what kind of trees can be grown in 15 years?

Mr. ELLENDER. For example, pine trees. They grow in 7 or 8 years in the south; trees of that age can be used for cordwood and pulpwood. The testimony was that in the Northeast it would require as long as 15 years for a tree in that area to reach its useful size. I believe the provision for 15 years represents a happy and workable limitation.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I call up the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and myself, identified as "2-17-56-C."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 107. Section 401 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In the case of any such operation which is carried out through purchases, regardless of the source of the funds used for such purpose, the Secretary shall obtain from the processor a certification that the price received by the producer for the agricultural commodity involved was not less than the support price therefor or, in the absence of a support price, a fair price as determined by the Secretary."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The sole purpose of this amendment is to insure that when the Secretary of Agriculture engages in a so-called support program for the benefit of an agricultural commodity, the producer of that commodity shall receive some of the benefit from the money spent. I have in my hand the report of the United States Department of Agriculture for March 15, 1956. I read from it, as follows:

USDA buys 11.2 million pounds of pork; total now 177 million pounds. Pork purchases of 11,220,600 pounds this week under the continuing program to assist hog producers brought overall purchases of pork and lard to 176,921,350 pounds since November, when the special USDA program got under way to help expand the consumption of pork products. Beginning March 19, USDA is discontinuing purchase of canned pork luncheon meat packed in 12-ounce tins. USDA will continue to accept offers for other canned products and has also requested offers to sell USDA 15 million pounds of lard; offers due not later than 2 p. m., eastern standard time, March 19. This week's purchases include 9,048,000 pounds of pork and gravy at from 66.48 to 67.97 cents a pound; 612,000 pounds of pork luncheon meat in 12-ounce tins at 47.17 to 47.18 cents, and 1,128,600 pounds in 6-pound tins at 44.69 to 44.73 cents; 432 pounds of canned ham at 64.97 to 65.39 cents.

Under the language of the report of the Department of Agriculture it says: "the continuing program to assist hog producers." Yet the fact is, and the record shows, that the hog producer is not getting the benefit of this program. The Secretary does not ask the packer what he paid the producer of the hog for the live animal. The Secretary does not even urge the packer to pay a reasonable price for the live animal on the hoof.

The hogs, Mr. President, are bringing less than 12 cents a pound; and, think of it, pork and gravy in the can is bringing 66½ to 68 cents a pound.

That is quite reminiscent of the program of some 2½ years ago, when the Secretary was buying beef products purportedly to support the price of beef. Yet, Mr. President, the fact is that the packers profited greatly, and the producers profited little, if anything, by reason of that program. Yet in the beef-buying program the Secretary bought considerably in excess of $100 million worth of products. In this program the Secretary has already bought far in excess of $100 million worth of products; and last week he spent between $4 million and $7 mil-

lion, purportedly, according to his own statement, under the continuing program to assist hog producers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, if we are going either to authorize or to permit the continuing expenditure of public funds to support the price of agricultural products, we should do all within our power to insure that the producers of those products are the beneficiaries of our legislation.

Mr. President, this amendment would not require the Secretary to support the price of beef or cattle. I feel that that should be provided for in the law; but efforts to bring that about have failed.

This amendment would, however, require the Secretary to obtain from the packer either a certificate that he had paid the producer the parity percentage required by law, if any, or, in the absence of such a requirement, a certificate that the producer had received a fair price for the product, as determined by the Secretary.

We know the Secretary has available to him so-called section 32 money. As I understand, there is some $400 million in that fund now. It is a continuingly replenishable revolving fund, being replenished from certain sources of revenue. So far as I know, for the past several years that fund has been in the neighborhood of $400 million or more. The bill now carries an authorization for an additional $500 million, as supplemental funds available to the Secretary to support the price of any agricultural product he deems should be so supported. The purpose of this amendment is to see to it that, when he does, he obtains from the processor a certificate that the producer received the benefit of the expenditure. Mr. President, I submit that in equity, justice, and fair play we can do no less than adopt the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield briefly to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield to my friend, the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, that a short time ago I was talking to a packer, and he said, "I never made more money than I did during the drought in the twenties and thirties"; and he mentioned the very price support the Senator from Oklahoma has just mentioned. He said the farmers and hog producers made nothing, but the packers made the money.

So, Mr. President, I support the amendment; and I think it one of the best that has been offered. I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will request the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, this amendment makes our support program one for the producers, instead of one for the packers.

Mr. LANGER. At the present time the program is just a joke, so far as the producers are concerned.

Mr. KERR. Absolutely.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I applaud the amendment the Senator has offered. However, I note that it places in the Secretary the authority to determine what the fair price for the producer is. Has the Senator from Oklahoma attempted to define "fair price", or to state what the fair price should be?

Mr. KERR. I say to my good friend, the Senator from Wyoming, that I have attempted to do so in every way that I know how to approach it. I offered an amendment that it be fixed at 90 percent of parity, but that amendment was defeated. I offered an amendment that it be fixed either at 75 percent of parity or at the same percentage of parity for livestock as was currently in effect for corn. But that amendment was defeated. In other words, every effort of the Senator from Oklahoma and other Senators to write into the bill the specifications of what a fair price would be, has failed. Our efforts failed under the attack of Senators who said that mandatory price supports at rigid levels could not be enforced or effectuated with reference to livestock.

Only as a last resort have I approached it from the standpoint which in a measure would give the Secretary discretion in that regard. The requirement of this amendment would be that the certificate show that the producer had either received the parity formula fixed by law or, in the absence of any, had received a fair price for his product, as fixed by the Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is there any possibility of defining the considerations which the Secretary should take into account in determining the fair price, so as to make certain that the price of cattle—if it should continue to fall as it has been falling in recent months and in recent years—would be a fair price which would not be below the price which was less than fair at the beginning of this year? It is highly important to make it clear, either by legislative discussion or by amendment to the amendment, that the intention of the author of the amendment and the intention of the Senate is not merely to provide protection for the profits of the packer, without consideration of the price which the producer ought to be able to receive.

Mr. KERR. I say to the Senator from Wyoming that I am wholeheartedly in favor of such a provision. But in view of the fact that every previous effort in that direction had failed, it was the opinion of the Senator from Georgia and myself, in pressing for the adoption of this amendment, that this amendment would be the most we could hope to secure from a Senate which had so decidedly rejected every effort that carried in it the specifications as suggested by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In this country we have a situation, insofar as livestock is concerned, in which the livestock population, particularly the population of cattle, is at the greatest peak in history. There are more cattle in the country than would be necessary to furnish 1½ animals for every individual in the population.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Therefore, the cattleman cannot accept the soil-bank withdrawal of part of his acreage, because then he will have no place to send his cattle, and he will be able to do nothing except sell them at a loss. So the purpose should be made clear—and this is all I hope to do at the moment—namely, that in this amendment the intention of the Senator from Oklahoma and the other Senators who are voting with him is to make certain that the Secretary of Agriculture, in administering this program of purchasing beef, shall give first consideration to the dropping prices of cattle under the present agricultural administration.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator, and I say to him that what he has stated is definitely the purpose of the amendment. Its purpose is definitely to direct the Secretary not only to determine what the fair price would be, but to make it public. I feel that thereby the Congress would have at least that check on the Secretary, and that the public would have at least on the actions of the Secretary, with knowledge on his part that the price would have to be one which he had determined to be a fair price.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] be shown as a cosponsor of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was reading the amendment 2 or 3 days ago, and noticed the provision that if any such operation is to be carried out, the Secretary shall obtain a certificate from the processor. We had a long argument in connection with the dairy price-support program, to the effect that the processor had given the producers a price which reflected what the processor was to get from the Treasury when the particular

quantity of butter, cheese, or other commodity was placed in storage. Do I correctly understand that this amendment is intended to make sure that if the support level is established, the processor must recognize that fact in the payment he makes to the producer?

Mr. KERR. And he must so certify. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. And if there is no support price, the Secretary of Agriculture has the right to determine a fair price.

Mr. KERR. The right and the responsibility.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does anyone feel that the Secretary should not determine a fair price, as a part of his real responsibility when he becomes Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. KERR. I certainly agree with the Senator. I wonder if he does not agree with me that that would be especially true when we are arming the Secretary with nearly $1 billion to carry out a program to support the prices of agricultural products, and when he does it through buying the products of the processor rather than the products of the producer.

Mr. ANDERSON. I notice that a very substantial additional amount is made available to the Secretary. I think it would be too bad if that money were not used to try to obtain fair prices for the producers of agricultural commodities. I think it is a very difficult thing to obtain an absolute guaranty at a certain level. As the Senator knows, I have occasionally voted against amendments which he has offered with reference to livestock, because such amendments sought to establish a firm level. But a fair price is quite a different thing, and I believe such a provision could be justified. I intend to vote for the Senator's amendment.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator. I recall an incident when the Senator from New Mexico was Secretary of Agriculture. The producers of alfalfa seed in Oklahoma, along with those in adjacent areas, were in the midst of a very adverse market. Petitions were sent to Congress, but nothing was done. A group came to see me. I called the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture and told him their dilemma. The producers were receiving less than 15 cents a pound, and the processors were selling it in the open market for more than 30 cents a pound. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the then Secretary of Agriculture, said he thought he could do something effective, and at least he would try. He arbitrarily fixed what he considered would be a fair price, and offered to buy alfalfa seed at that figure. As I recall, he did not succeed in buying a single pound.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have forgotten the exact details of the incident, although I remember the incident in general. A price level was established which was substantially above what the processors were paying. As I remember, I did not buy a single pound of alfalfa seed. As soon as that level was fixed, it fixed the other level.

Mr. KERR. And the processors paid it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I think the Secretary of Agriculture can do that sort of thing, and ought to do that sort of thing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to address a question both to the Senator from Oklahoma and the distinguished former Secretary of Agriculture, now the very able Senator from New Mexico.

Would it be practicable, from the point of view of accomplishing the purpose the Senator has in mind, if an amendment were offered to this amendment, adding a sentence somewhat like the following, after the word "Secretary" and before the end of the quotation:

Before completing any of such purchases, the Secretary shall make public announcement of the sale price so determined by him.

Mr. KERR. In answer to the question, I should like to have the Senator from New Mexico advise with me. If it were not plain that that was the intent of the amendment, would it not be clearly established if the word "publicly" were inserted in line 9, between the word "as" and the word "determined"?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; it would.

Mr. KERR. So as to read "a fair price as publicly determined by the Secretary."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The important thing is to have such determination made before the completion of the sale.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma that if the Senator says "publicly determined," that means that the Secretary must publicly display the processes of determination. If the amendment were to read "as determined and publicly announced," there would be a determination, followed by a public announcement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not essential to do that prior to the completion of the purchases?

Mr. KERR. These purchases extend over a period of weeks, and I am sure that if this provision were in the bill, it would be clear that that was the purpose of the language.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the modification suggested by the Senator from New Mexico would attain the objective which the Senator from Oklahoma has in mind.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Some time ago, when we were in the midst of the dairy program, there was a story to the effect that the dairy farmer was getting only 70 percent, even though the support level was 90 percent. In the milk sheds where there was a firm agreement, he was probably getting the full 90 percent. Out in the areas where there was not complete protection, he was getting substantially less than 90 percent. At that time the Senator from Vermont and the junior Senator from New Mexico joined in a bill which would require the processor to pay to the producer what the processor was going to establish as his price. It is out of that experience that I believe the Senator from Oklahoma has gained an important point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is clear that the legislative intent is now so plain that no one in the Department can fail to know what we intend to have done.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional minute, in order to thank the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from New Mexico for this assistance, and to announce that my amendment has been modified by inserting, in line 9, after the word "determined", the words "and publicly announced", so as to read:

SEC. 107. Section 401 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In the case of any such operation which is carried out through purchases, regardless of the source of the funds used for such purpose, the Secretary shall obtain from the processor a certification that the price received by the producer for the agricultural commodity involved was not less than the support price therefor or, in the absence of a support price, a fair price as determined and publicly announced by the Secretary."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I regret to again have to oppose an amendment offered by my good friend from Oklahoma.

As he stated, the amendment would require certification by a processor that the producer who sold him live animals or unprocessed commodities was paid not less than the support price, or a fair price as determined by the Secretary.

The amendment has a good purpose, and that is to assure producers that they will receive the benefit of surplus removal or price support programs carried out through purchases from processors.

This subject was thoroughly discussed when we considered the Agricultural Act of 1954, when section 401 (e) was before the Senate.

This question was again considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this year when we had the pending bill under study. It was our conclusion that the amendment would not achieve the desired purpose, and would hamper the operation of the program. It was our view that certification such as that required by the amendment could probably not be made by processors, for many reasons.

I should like to cite only a few of these reasons. First, the processors who do not purchase directly from producers all of the commodities they process cannot certify as to the price paid the producers. All of us know that a great many cattle are purchased on the hoof by truckmen. Many slaughterers purchase cattle, and thereafter sell them to processors.

Another reason is that processors who purchase directly from producers cannot identify a particular producer with the particular lots of processed commodities sold to the Government. That is especially true when the surplus removal program involves only a limited portion of the total production.

All of us know that many of the surpluses come about after an increase in

the production of a commodity. This amendment does not take into consideration any amount of a purchased or supported product that may have been already processed before the purchase or support program began. For example, with respect to cattle, it is possible that at the time a purchase program is begun, a packer may have on hand a great deal of meat that has been canned and placed in cold storage, and the purchase of which could well bolster prices. With respect to that particular meat it would be very difficult to identify all the cattle from which it was processed.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall yield in a few minutes. It would be impossible to ascertain who the producer of that particular quantity of processed meat might be. It would be impossible for a packer to certify that a fair price as set by the Secretary and thereafter publicly announced by him, was paid as to that quantity of the processed commodity.

I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. As I understood the Senator, he referred to a situation wherein a surplus had accumulated, with the evidence of its presence in the form of a great supply of products. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. That is one of the objections I am advancing. The Senator knows that some of the processors hold on hand as much as a 6 months' supply of a commodity; and some of them hold an even larger supply on hand. When it is determined that there is a surplus of a commodity on hand, it would be very difficult for the processor to determine whether he was paid a fair price under the bill, as determined by the Secretary, or the support price with respect to commodities on hand and already processed.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The situation the Senator has described undoubtedly has in part existed not only with reference to products when they were being purchased, but with reference to products being produced and when the practice is being operated solely for the purpose of relieving the packers of stocks on hand. It then becomes a bill primarily for the benefit of packers. It is to avoid and to make certain that the bill may accomplish the purpose that I know the great Senator from Louisiana himself has in mind, that is, to help the producers, that we ask the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I realize that, I am sure, as well as my good friend from Oklahoma does. I made the suggestion in debate last week that the Secretary of Agriculture make contracts with cooperatives that process meats or even with packers that process meats, and to let the quantity so contracted for be distributed to the school-lunch program, on condition that those packers with whom the Secretary of Agriculture makes such a contract pay producers either the support price or a fair price, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, as the Senator well knows, the purpose of purchase programs is to take from the market that amount of the commodity involved which will result in higher prices—in other words, to remove the glut which may be depressing the price. Frequently commodities dangle over the market and thereby depress prices.

Now, when the supply of such a commodity is reduced, it makes no difference whether they are newly processed stocks. that are 4 months or 5 months old or whether they are newly processed stocks. The fact that they are removed from the market tends to create a shortage which makes producers' prices rise.

No one in the Senate would better prefer to see something done about assuring producers a more direct participation in these programs than the Senator from Louisiana. The great difficulty with the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma is that the program it envisions would be very difficult if not impossible to administer.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. For the packer to have to keep records as to the farm price paid for every head of cattle or each hog that he processes, would offer insurmountable administrative difficulties. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. The Senator remembers that the Department of Agriculture supported the price of pecans.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the men who were in the process of accumulating a supply in carload lots for delivery to the Government were required to get a receipt from the individual producers, either directly or through those who had dealt directly with the producer, certifying that a certain minimum price had been paid to the producer, before a carload of pecans was eligible to be sold to the Commodity Credit Corporation at the agreed price?

Mr. ELLENDER. That may be true. I frankly do not recall the details of that particular program.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator believe it would be any more difficult to trace down the individual animal than it was to try to trace down the individual pecan?

Mr. ELLENDER. To begin with, it was not necessary to trace down the individual pecan. The Senator in his question said the pecans were dealt with in carload lots. The particular lot could easily be identified. However, a hog or an animal cannot be processed overnight. Usually the animals are brought to the processor either directly or after purchase by people who work for themselves, and in many cases a great many of those hogs and cattle are bought slaughtered and then sold to processors by middlemen. The packing business is vastly different from the pecan incident the Senator has referred to. For example, the processing of cattle and hogs is a much larger scale operation than that of pecans; it is nationwide. The Senator knows, I am sure, that there is really no comparison between the two situations. There are a great many meat-processing plants in every State of the Union. In Iowa there is a processing plant in practically every city, or perhaps within every 10 square miles. Let me say to the Senator that I personally am in sympathy with his proposal, but the committee gave considerable thought to the matter and decided in 1954 not to incorporate such a provision in the bill. We again this year gave the matter a great deal of study. It is not that the amendment does not have a good purpose, but the difficulties connected with its administration would be insurmountable. I fear the Senator's proposal would not work, and that it might actually hamper the whole purchase and support programs.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, If I thought the amendment would achieve the purpose for which it is obviously intended, I would be in favor of it. But work has been done on this problem for many years and we have not yet found a solution. For instance, meat products are processed from cattle fattened on an Iowa farm; but could it be determined that the original producer of the livestock on the Wyoming range received a fair price for his product? I do not know. No one has been able to figure that out.

Another problem connected with administering the amendment would be in connection with the purchase of dairy products. Take, for instance, a large cooperative in Minnesota, such as the Land O' Lakes, which sells for perhaps 200 small cooperatives scattered around the country. I do not know how they could certify that the original producers have received the full support price or a fair price as determined and published by the Secretary.

The support price for manufactured milk is $3.14 or $3.15 a hundred pounds, yet the average price paid in the State of Wisconsin is $3 a hundred pounds. Most of the creameries and cheese plants are cooperatives. At the end of the season they might make additional payments, but no one knows what those payments may be. No one knows whether they will come up to the full support price. It looks to me that this amendment, if adopted, would make it very difficult for the Government legally to do business with the dairy cooperatives of the great north central dairying section.

One of the weaknesses of our farm program is that we have not yet found any way to translate the full support price guaranteed by the Government to the farmers. I do not know how we can do that without nationalizing the industry. I do not know that we could do it even then. I wish we could find a way to guarantee full support prices to farmers, but I am told that it is a fact that many of the small cooperative processing plants in Wisconsin and Minnesota could not continue in business if they had to return the full amount to

the producer. They are small plants located conveniently to the community. The community might have to go a long distance to market, or have no market at all if it were not for these cooperatives.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that Secretary Benson is a very, very smart man, and could figure out the problem with the staff he has?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think his predecessor was able to figure it out. I am no judge of human intelligence. The more I see of it, the less I consider myself to be a judge.

Mr. LANGER. Has it not been stated that Mr. Benson is almost a superman?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think he is a superman in any respect. I think if we could strengthen our cooperatives and could get good cooperative managements who in every instance were able to carry on their work, we could do quite a great deal to improve farm income. I doubt that any Secretary of Agriculture could comply with this amendment and certain other parts of the law at the same time. I wish it were possible, but I do not know how it can be done.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, this amendment is just another amendment which in some ways might seem on its face to be a good amendment, but it would be, in the end, completely fatal to the livestock industry of the United States. It proposes, in effect, to put a very attractive support price on livestock in the market place, without any control whatsoever, and without any reasonable approach to the question of surpluses at the bottom. If it is adopted we shall have livestock in such numbers that the storage space could not take care of them, nor could the public purse support them. It is not only a dangerous amendment, but it would be doing the greatest disservice to the livestock economy in agriculture that one could imagine. We are all hoping that agriculture can get on a sound and prosperous basis, but such amendments as this one, Mr. President, will wreck it rather than help it. If the amendment is adopted we shall be doing something to the agricultural industry rather than something for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I was impressed by the statement by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, and I knew he meant what he said when he told us he favored the objective of this amendment. He not only helped to put a provision into the bill to make $250 million available to the Secretary, but accepted the suggestion of the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Georgia to add to that amount. Under this amendment the Secretary would have more than $500 million available to him to use. I know the Senator means what he says when he says he is in favor of the objective.

The Senator from Vermont said that if he thought the amendment would achieve its purpose, he would be for it.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana who is chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Vermont who is former chairman of the committee, and all the members of the committee have worked toward the objective sought by this amendment, but the fact remains that the objective has not been achieved. I have pressed other amendments which I thought would achieve the objective sought, but they have been rejected. I submit that the cattle producers and hog producers in this country are entitled to more than the good wishes of Senators in this matter.

They are entitled to positive action; and if we refuse to tell the Secretary of Agriculture that he shall support, and at a definite price, and how it shall be done; if we still favor the objective of getting it done; how can we refuse a directive to the Secretary to get it done on the basis that he himself will develop and plan it?

I submit that in justice the amendment should be agreed to.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. KERR. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time allotted to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As many as favor the amendment will please stand.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dworshak	Knowland
Allott	Eastland	Kuchel
Anderson	Ellender	Laird
Barkley	Ervin	Langer
Barrett	Flanders	Lehman
Beall	Frear	Long
Bender	Fulbright	Magnuson
Bennett	George	Malone
Bible	Goldwater	Mansfield
Bricker	Gore	Martin, Iowa
Bridges	Green	Martin, Pa.
Bush	Hayden	McCarthy
Butler	Hennings	McClellan
Byrd	Hickenlooper	McNamara
Capehart	Hill	Millikin
Carlson	Holland	Monroney
Case, N. J.	Hruska	Morse
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Mundt
Chavez	Ives	Murray
Clements	Jackson	Neely
Cotton	Jenner	Neuberger
Curtis	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Dirksen	Kefauver	Payne
Douglas	Kennedy	Potter
Duff	Kerr	Robertson
Russell	Smith, N. J.	Watkins
Saltonstall	Sparkman	Welker
Schoeppel	Stennis	Wiley
Scott	Symington	Williams
Smathers	Thurmond	Young
Smith, Maine	Thye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The vote was recapitulated.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. McNAMARA. I vote "yea."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, am I recorded on this vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I understood the Chair to state that I am recorded as voting in the affirmative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. AIKEN. In the negative?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I understood the Chair to state that I was recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I vote "yea."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. ERVIN. I vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina votes "yea"?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes, "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have the regular order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is called for.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent. His pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] has been announced previously.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is detained on official business. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—49

Anderson	Jackson	Mundt
Barkley	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Bible	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Byrd	Kefauver	Neuberger
Chavez	Kennedy	O'Mahoney
Clements	Kerr	Russell
Daniel	Kuchel	Scott
Douglas	Laird	Sparkman
Ervin	Langer	Symington
Frear	Lehman	Thurmond
Fulbright	Long	Thye
George	Magnuson	Watkins
Gore	Mansfield	Wiley
Hayden	McClellan	Williams
Hennings	McNamara	Young
Hill	Monroney	
Humphrey	Morse	

NAYS—44

Aiken	Dirksen	Martin, Iowa
Allott	Duff	Martin, Pa.
Barrett	Dworshak	Millikin
Beall	Eastland	Pastore
Bender	Ellender	Payne
Bennett	Flanders	Potter
Bricker	Goldwater	Robertson
Bridges	Green	Saltonstall
Butler	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Capehart	Holland	Smathers
Carlson	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Case, N. J.	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.	Jenner	Stennis
Cotton	Knowland	Welker
Curtis	Malone	

NOT VOTING—3

Bush	McCarthy	Purtell

So the amendment offered by Mr. KERR on behalf of himself and other Senators was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—52

Anderson	Humphrey	Murray
Barkley	Jackson	Neely
Bible	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kefauver	Pastore
Clements	Kennedy	Russell
Daniel	Kerr	Scott
Douglas	Kuchel	Smathers
Eastland	Laird	Sparkman
Ervin	Langer	Stennis
Frear	Lehman	Symington
Fulbright	Long	Thurmond
George	Magnuson	Thye
Gore	Mansfield	Watkins
Green	McClellan	Williams
Hayden	McNamara	Young
Hennings	Monroney	
Hill	Morse	

NAYS—42

Aiken	Cotton	Malone
Allott	Curtis	Martin, Iowa
Barrett	Dirksen	Martin, Pa.
Beall	Duff	McCarthy
Bender	Dworshak	Millikin
Bennett	Ellender	Mundt
Bricker	Flanders	Payne
Bridges	Goldwater	Potter
Bush	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Butler	Holland	Saltonstall
Capehart	Hruska	Schoeppel
Carlson	Ives	Smith, Maine
Case, N. J.	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Welker

NOT VOTING—2

Purtell	Wiley

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WATKINS subsequently said: Mr. President, I voted for the amendment which was voted upon a few minutes ago. I had prepared an amendment covering the same general substance, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote an amendment which I intended to offer which would cover the same general purpose, together with my statement with reference to the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement and amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. WATKINS to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, viz., on page 4, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

"CERTIFICATION OF RECEIPT OF SUPPORT PRICES BY PRODUCERS

"SEC. 107. Section 401 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(e) (1) Whenever any price support or surplus removal operation for any agricultural commodity is carried out through purchases from or loans or payments to processors, the Secretary shall obtain certifications from such processors that the producers of the agricultural commodities involved have received not less than the support price therefor or, in the case of commodities for which no support price has been established, such price, not less than 75 percent of the parity price, as may be determined by the Secretary to be necessary to provide a reasonable return to such producers.

"'(2) In any case in which any such purchase is made from a processor, or a processor receives any such loan or payment, and such processor (1) fails to make the certification required by this subsection either prior to such purchase, loan, or payment or within a reasonable time thereafter, or (2) knowingly makes a false certification under this subsection, such processor shall refund to the Secretary the proceeds of the purchase, loan, or payment and shall forfeit to the United States any commodities delivered to the Secretary pursuant to such purchase, loan, or payment, and shall be ineligible to participate in such price support or surplus removal program for such period as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Upon failure of the processor to make any refund required by this subsection, the Secretary shall maintain a civil suit in the name of the United States for the recovery of the amount thereof. The penalties provided by this paragraph shall be in addition to the penalties provided by any other applicable provisions of law.'"

On page 4, line 24, strike out "107" and insert "108."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

Mr. President, last Friday, March 16, the Senate adopted an amendment which would increase the authorization for appropriations to further carry out the purpose for which Section 32 funds can be used, from $250 million to $500 million.

The principal method of removing surpluses by expenditure of section 32 funds is the direct purchase program. These purchases generally are made from processors rather than directly from the farmers. However, the law does not require processors to pay farmers a price which reflects a stipulated percentage of partiy.

The Congress has no way of ascertaining, therefore, whether the surplus removal programs actually benefit farmers.

Section 401 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 merely provides that:

"Whenever any price support or surplus removal operation for any agricultural commodity is carried out through purchases from or loans or payments to processors, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, obtain from the processors such assurances as he deems adequate that the producers of the agricultural commodity involved have received or will receive maximum benefits from the price support or surplus removal operation. (U. S. C. 1421 (e)))."

It appears to me that if the Congress is going to appropriate such vast amounts of money for surplus-removal programs, then it ought to have assurance that farmers, not processors, are going to benefit.

For example, as of March 8, some 165,700,750 pounds of pork and lard have been purchased with section 32 funds at a cost of $83.4 million, yet the parity price of hogs as of March 15, 1956 stood at only 57 percent of parity. This is a rise of 5 percent of parity since January 15, but probably most of this increase in parity price is due to the marketing of fewer hogs and not necessarily this support program.

Until the Senate adopted this amendment to increase the authorized appropriation to carry out the purpose of Section 32 funds to $500 million, I had some doubt of offering my amendment which would require the Secretary of Agriculture to obtain certifications from processors that the producers of agricultural commodities, for which any price support or surplus removal operation is carried out through purchases from, or loans or payments to processors, have been paid for their product:

1. Not less than the support price therefor; or

2. In the case of commodities for which no support price has been established, such price, but not less than 75 per centum of the parity price, as the Secretary finds necessary to provide a reasonable return to such producers.

By way of explanation, let me point out that the amendment would require 75 percent of the parity price to be paid producers in the case of commodities for which no support price has been established, because Title III of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended provides that for commodities other than the basics (wheat, cotton, corn, rice, peanuts and tobacco) and the designated nonbasics (wool, including mohair; tung

nuts; honey, milk, butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat) that the level of support, depending upon supply conditions, for commodities for which a control program is in effect shall be not less than 75 percent of parity.

Mr. President, it does a farmer very little good to have the Department of Agriculture through expenditure of Commodity Credit Corporation funds, or section 32 funds purchase commodities through surplus removal operations unless

1. A support level as a percentage of the parity price of the commodity is set by the Secretary of Agriculture.

2. And processors are required to certify that producers have been paid that price. It would seem much wiser not to institute such purchase programs unless it is evident that producers, for whose benefit the program is initiated in the first place, will actually benefit price-wise. To spend millions of dollars in surplus removal operations without a support level being announced and which does not result in the improvement of market prices can only lead to bitterness of feelings on the part of producers toward both the processors and their government.

For example, as I have noted under the pork purchase program as of March 8 some 165,700,750 pounds of pork and lard have been purchased at a cost of $83.4 million, yet the parity price of hogs as of February 15, 1956, stood at only 57 percent of parity.

It seems unfair to accuse processors of not paying producers a fair price and of charging the Government progressively more for the commodity in question, as has been the case with the beef cattle and pork purchase programs, when the Government has failed at the outset to say what price is a "fair price." Perhaps some meat packers have taken unfair advantage of both beef cattle and hog producers and the Government as well, but until Congress requires that the prices paid producers reflect a stipulated support level such practices cannot be halted.

Mr. President, the amendment also provides sanction for failure on the part of processors to provide such certifications.

In any case in which any such purchase is made from a processor, etc., and such processor fails to make the certification required by this amendment either prior to such purchase, loan or payment, and such processor (1) fails to make the certification required by this subsection either prior to such purchase, loan or payment or within a reasonable time thereafter, or (2) who knowingly makes a false certification under this amendment, such processor (1) shall refund to the Secretary the proceeds of the purchase, loan or payment, (2) shall forfeit to the United States any commodities to be delivered to the Secretary pursuant to such purchase, loan or payment, (3) shall be ineligible to participate in such price support or surplus removal program for such a period as the Secretary may prescribe.

Should the processor fail to make any refund required by this amendment, the Secretary would be required to institute a suit in the name of the United States for the recovery of the amount paid.

In addition to these sanctions contained in the amendment, title 18, United States Code, provides an additional sanction for filing with the Government instrumentality a false certification. Section 1001 of this title provides for a maximum fine of $10,000 and imprisonment not to exceed more than 5 years or both.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "3-16-56-B." I send it to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 25, between lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 225. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning with the 1957 crops, the Secretary shall require as a condition of eligibility for price support on any agricultural crop, except tung nuts, that the producer agree, if otherwise eligible, to devote an acreage of cropland (tillable in regular rotation) to either the acreage reserve program or the conservation reserve program, or both: *Provided*, That this requirement shall not be applied to any crop as a condition of eligibility for price support in any year in which marketing quotas are in effect on such crop as a result of a referendum conducted prior to the enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That this requirement shall not be applicable to any farm with 15 acres or less devoted to price-supported crops during any one marketing year: *Provided further*, That the amount of such acreage of cropland shall be determined by applying a percentage factor to the total acreage of cropland being planted to price-supported crops for harvest during the marketing years for which eligibility for price support is being determined. The percentage factor shall be that determined by the Secretary, and in no event in excess of 15 percent of the acreage of cropland being devoted to price-supported crops. The Secretary is authorized to make agricultural conservation payments for approved conservation practices performed on land removed from production for market under this section.

(b) Except as the Secretary may otherwise provide by regulation, no producer shall be eligible for any payment under this act if the acreage of cropland devoted to price-supported crops, other than tung nuts, on any farm controlled by such producer is increased to an acreage greater than the average devoted to such crops in the immediately preceding 5 years (considering normal rotation practices).

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the amendment I have just called up for consideration is a simple one, but I regard it as basic if we are to make any real inroads on our surpluses by making effective use of the soil bank.

Briefly, the amendment would require those who receive the benefit of price supports to help balance supply with demand by contributing to the soil bank. In other words, those who are the heaviest beneficiaries of the farm program would be required to accept some of the responsibility for its overall success.

First, beginning with 1957 crops, the amendment requires, as a condition of eligibility for price support on any agricultural crop, except tung nuts, that producers must make a contribution to the soil bank—either the acreage reserve or conservation reserve—the percentage factor to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, but in no event to be in excess of 15 percent of the acreage of cropland being devoted to price-supported crops. Tung nuts are excepted because many growers of that commodity have no land other than that upon which tung trees are planted, and we could not expect them to destroy a part of their orchard.

I should like to call attention, at this time, to the fact that since we began the debate on the pending bill, the complete necessity of adopting an amendment of this kind has become evident by reason of the fact that amendments which have been adopted as applicable to corn and applicable to the four small grain crops provide in substance that 15 percent of each of those crops must be diverted into either the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve as a condition for price support. In other words, a principle has been followed by the Senate in the adoption of amendments with reference to corn and with reference to the four small grain crops; and it is rather clear that to have any degree of justice between the various commodities and the producers who produce the various commodities which are under price support, that that principle requires consideration and, I believe, extension to the other crops.

Second. The amendment is not applicable to farms that have 15 acres or less devoted to price-supported crops. This takes care of the question of minimum acreage allotments for wheat, cotton, burley tobacco, and small farms in general.

Third. It does not apply to crops in 1957 for which producers have already voted in marketing quotas prior to enactment of this act. It would apply in 1957 to most quota crops, but some types of tobacco have voted quotas for more than 1 year and it would not be applicable to those crops.

Fourth. In order to eliminate the possibility of producers plowing up a lot of land currently being devoted to soil conservation crops, and not replacing such soil conserving crops with other acreage, it requires that no farm shall have a greater acreage of cropland devoted to price-supported crops than normally was planted to price-supported crops during the last 5 years. Of course an allowance is made for normal rotation practices.

Mr. President, the proposed amendment is the essence of assurance that acreage which is diverted shall not simply be placed into crops which although not basic crops, are nevertheless important crops, and thus aggravate the problems of other producers. Furthermore, the amendment is the logical accompaniment to amendments which have already been adopted by the Senate with relation to corn and small grains.

Mr. President, I should like to quote for the RECORD the applicable portions of the amendments which we have already adopted with relation to corn and small grains. The applicable portion of the amendment adopted with reference to corn reads as follows:

> The Secretary shall require, as a condition of eligibility for price support on corn, that the producer agree to devote an acreage of cropland (tilled in normal rotation), at the option of the producer, to either the acreage reserve program or the conservation reserve program, equal to 15 percent of such producer's farm base acreage for corn.

Likewise, it is stated as an absolute prerequisite, in the case of a corn grower, in order to come into the program, that such grower is required to underplant his farm base acreage for corn.

In the case of the other four grain crops, I should like to quote the relevant portion of the amendment which

has been adopted with reference to those crops:

The producers of such commodities—

And the commodities are grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye—

to be eligible for price support, shall have (a) entered into contracts with the Secretary to place into the acreage reserve or conservation reserve a portion of the tillable acres of grain sorghums, rye, oats, and barley equivalent to 15 percent of the average number of acres devoted to production of such commodities, during the preceding 3 years.

In closing my presentation, let me say that it seems to me that, first, an amendment of the kind I have offered is required if we are serious about getting farmers to comply and to make a contribution to the soil bank and in that way build up soil fertility, which is the only justification for the huge amounts that we are to spend on the soil bank.

Second, Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that except for the adoption of such an amendment, we would have a one-sided program because of the amendments which have been adopted by the Senate, in that corn and small grains have to make a contribution by placing either in the conservation reserve or acreage reserve, of 15 percent of their acreage heretofore planted, as a condition to their participation in price supports.

Is it fair, is it reasonable, to require that kind of participation by the producers of corn and the four small grains and have no such requirement for those who produce soybeans, or for those who produce flaxseed, or for those who produce the basic crops?

It seems to me that it is elemental justice to have a provision similar to that we have already adopted with reference to corn and the small grains applicable all the way through. Otherwise we will find many people not complying and not putting land into the soil bank and not building up the reserve fertility for the Nation, which justifies the soil bank, and not playing fair with the producers who produce corn and small grains.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida if his amendment would establish what has been called a cross compliance.

Mr. HOLLAND. It would establish a measure of cross compliance, and it would establish assurance that no farmer could simply take out a part of his basic crop—as, for example, cotton or wheat—and get paid at the high rates that he would get under the acreage-reserve program, and at the same time plant other land, not of the kind that he has in the acreage reserve, but other land, and in such a way make more complex the problems of the producers of those other crops.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe it is equitable that when a farmer applies for price support on a particular crop, that he should comply with the requirement in the main program, and that he should put something into the soil bank with reference to that particular crop. However, it seems to me that the same difficulty will arise, if we are to establish cross compliance, that the Secretary found last year, when cross compliance was first proposed and we found it necessary to abandon so-called cross compliance. It might well be that a corn farmer would find that he should put some land into the corn soil bank, so to speak, but, because of his operations, might feel that he should not go into the soil bank on every one of his crops.

Mr. HOLLAND. Either I have misunderstood the Senator's earlier question, or the Senator has misunderstood my answer. If the Senator will read subsection (b) of my proposed amendment, he will find that the lands a producer may divert are not specific acres. The condition imposed is that his total acreage on all price supported crops may not exceed that which was planted in the immediate 5 preceding years. That means he must devote some of his land to soil conserving crops, and he must also not exceed the total acreage for all price supported crops that he has had heretofore.

I may say, Mr. President, that it is very similar to the provision which has been written into the corn amendment and into the amendment relating to grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye.

Mr CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, this illustrates the complexities which exist in dealing with agriculture when problems of this sort become involved in the operation of any program. I do not object to the requirement as to a particular crop, nor as to the total, but it seems to me that there might be a problem of crop compliance. Last year there was a great deal of practical difficulty.

Mr. HOLLAND. To amplify my former answer, while a certain measure of compliance is required, it is not required of any grower that he shall plant a smaller acreage of the total crops he produces under price supports than that which he has produced heretofore, but neither is he permitted to add to his total acreage for all those price-supported crops, as has frequently been done in the past, thus introducing other problems concerning other commodities than those receiving direct benefits from price supports.

Mr. President, I yield so much time as he may require to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to say, first, that I do not think there is any Member of the Senate who is more in favor of helping the farmer than is the distinguished Senator from Florida. He has kept away from political implications. He has but one thing in mind in connection with this measure, and that is to restore a higher level of prosperity to the American farmer.

The farm bill is getting into such shape, particularly in connection with the last amendment, which I think will preclude the Government from purchasing butter and cheese in Minnesota and Wisconsin, or canned meats in Montana, Idaho, or Colorado, that it seems just too much to expect that it can be successfully administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I think we should treat seriously the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida. Very obviously, when we fixed high support prices, we did so for the purpose of bringing higher income to the farmer. When surpluses accumulated, acreage had to be cut. It is not right, Mr. President, for those who are the beneficiaries of high support prices to take the acreage which they are required to reduce from their original planting, and plant another commodity which breaks the price and backs of other producers who have not been benefiting from any support price at all, in many cases. There is a strong element of justice in the proposal of the Senator from Florida, just as he has the maximum element of justice in his own character.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I have only a few minutes. I have about concluded what I had to say. Let us cast a vote for the amendment on its merits. Let us forget whether it will or will not embarrass the Secretary or the President. Let us cast a vote on the basis of whether it is going to help American agriculture.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Why was not that provision written into the bill by the committee?

Mr. AIKEN. What provision?

Mr. PASTORE. The amendment which is being sponsored by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. AIKEN. Because the Senator from Florida and I were in the minority when some other provisions were written into the bill, and we reserved the right to present our own position through amendments on the floor. The majority of the committee did not see fit to write this particular provision into the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. The argument which is being made by the Senator from Vermont seems to reflect a great deal of reasonableness and justice.

Mr. AIKEN. I regret the majority of the committee did not agree.

Mr. PASTORE. Do farmers have the right to plant something which might undermine other farmers?

Mr. AIKEN. That is what has been happening. That is one particular reason why we are in difficulty at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield so that I may answer the Senator from Rhode Island further? I will extend the Senator's time 1 minute.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Not only is it true, as stated by the Senator from Vermont, that the committee was divided in its position on a similar amendment to this one, which covered all crops, but it was divided, as I recall, about the same way it was divided as to other controversial matters. But since the committee acted on this question, I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island to the fact that the Senate has itself written a provision into the bill requiring the application of this principle to the producers of corn and the small grain crops.

Mr. PASTORE. As a matter of fact, does it not amount to a second bite of the cherry?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not know that I understand the Senator. I suppose cherries are raised in Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. We do not raise cherries, but we know a little bit about a second bite of a cherry.

We are saying that unless the amendment is passed, insofar as certain commodities are concerned, some farmers can undermine other farmers.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, twice before we have sought to place a provision of this nature into a bill which would protect the producer of unsupported crops from being hurt by the policy of those who had high-support prices. We have heard that the Secretary did not enforce compliance last year. Why? Because Congress, the Senate particularly, expressed itself as being opposed to compulsory compliance with all acreage allotments in order to receive price support. If we had insisted on compulsory compliance last year we would be far better off today than we are at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] such time as he may require.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if we had a soil bank program, providing that the producer could retire acreage and be compensated for such acreage retired, the producer would have an income from the program which would enable him to pay some of his more or less fixed expenses including his taxes. Cross compliance without a soil bank program as is envisioned in the pending legislation would be impossible of achievement. We cannot expect a man to lay idle some of his acres without a return. If we were farmers in the semiarid areas, where it is customary to lay idle half of the unit for summer fallowing, and then be compelled to set aside 30 or 40 percent of the other tillable acres without compensation, the best of us would be ruined.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I should be delighted, if the Senator from Florida will let me have sufficient time to yield.

Mr. YOUNG. With respect to the wheat farmer, he has already cut his acreage at least one-third, and, in many areas, more than that. If he could not plant anything on those diverted acres, it would be an impossible situation.

Mr. THYE. That is what I was trying to say to my colleagues.

What is being proposed is a concerted effort to get a reduction in the number of acres tilled, thereby reducing the surpluses ruining the farmers' markets today. That is the only commonsense approach to the question. Full parity in the market place cannot be obtained so long as these surpluses exist to destroy the markets. The amendment proposing that it be mandatory to comply and to lay idle diverted acres—the acres diverted from cotton, wheat, corn, or any of the basics—is a perfectly sound and logical approach, in my opinion, to the question. That is why I shall support the amendment.

Mr. President, I want to emphasize that this is the first time there has been an intelligent approach to the question of surpluses, and it is the first time a legislative enactment has been proposed which makes commonsense from the standpoint of reducing the farm plant.

Now let us try to visualize, Mr. President, what it would be like if you were a cash renter of a 200-acre farm and were paying $12 or $15 an acre rent. Do you think for 1 moment that it would be financially possible to retire 50 percent wheat acreage, 20 percent of your corn acreage, or a like percentage of your cotton acreage, and then not be able to obtain any compensation whatever for doing so?

Do you think, Mr. President, that the farm operator could pay $15 an acre cash rent, retire some of the rented acreage, and still remain solvent? Of course not. Some of us endeavored 2 years ago to provide for the retirement of tillable acres through some sort of compensating retirement program. We were unsuccessful. Now we are proceeding toward such a course of action. It is a first common-sense approach to the problem, as I have already said. Give us a year and a half, and I would be willing to wager—and I am not a wagering man—that there will be notable progress in the retirement of tillable acres; and once this has been achieved, we shall be well on the way to bringing surpluses within manageable proportions and to establishing conditions in the market place reflecting 100 percent of parity. This will be possible because of the high level of our Nation's economy.

Times are not like they were in the depression years of the early 1930's, when there were millions of unemployed persons, and our national economy was depressed. That is not the case today. This country is experiencing record employment with high wages for the worker. Resale and wholesale price levels are such that our economy should reflect full parity for the farmer. What has kept the farmer, however, from receiving 100 percent of parity is the burden of surpluses.

It will be well into 1957 before the soil bank program will prove its effectiveness in reducing materially the surpluses. That is why the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has proposed the amendment which would make it mandatory to retire acres. The acres must lie idle. If the program is to operate effectively, acres must not be used for production of other crops.

Had such a program become effective 2 years ago, the farmer would be pretty well out of the woods and into the daylight and the farm economy would not continue to be threatened by these surpluses of agricultural commodities. Therefore, for the reasons I have stated, I support the amendment of the Senator from Florida. I want to reiterate, Mr. President, that we cannot hope to achieve this year substantial results from the soil bank program, specifically so far as the surpluses are concerned. Winter wheat was planted last fall in Oregon, Washington, Colorado, Oklahoma, Kansas, and in the Panhandle area of Texas. In Minnesota, winter wheat was planted last September. Therefore, it will be possible to obtain only a very limited reduction of tillable winter wheat acres in 1956 through the operations of the soil bank program. Because of this situation, I proposed a 1-year restoration of 90 percent price supports in committee so as to stabilize the whole farm economy until such time as the soil bank achieves the objectives sought by it. The proposal, however, was rejected.

Then we subsequently voted a 2 years' restoration of 90 percent supports, because it was believed that a time well beyond this year must pass before there would be any material results achieved from the soil bank program. In the meantime, we were convinced of the necessity of maintaining higher supports so as to prevent the farm economy from going farther down hill.

But so far as the pending question is concerned, I am convinced there must be mandatory provision governing the diverted acres if there is to be a positive reduction in acreage. In the past, through corn acreage allotments, acreage allotments on wheat, cotton, and the other basics, we have merely changed the production of an acre of wheat, or one of the other basics, to production on that acre of another crop, such as oats, barley, or sorghum grains. We have never effected a complete reduction in the overall farm plant, but merely permitted acreage to be diverted from one basic crop to another or to a feed crop.

I regret exceedingly that so many criticisms have been made with respect to the sincere efforts being put forth to write a sound, constructive farm bill. I think time will prove the merit of amendments which have been offered up to the present time.

However, some have weakened the supports materially on commodities such as corn, wheat, and cotton.

The question of wheat supports will face an uncertain future in conference because of the two-price system and the objection by the administration to the two-price system.

But in the main we have legislated constructively. If we could have retained the committee's restoration of 90 percent price supports on the basics for at least this year, we would then have guaranteed that the price would not drop further in this calendar year. Then with the complete introduction of the soil bank program, and an effective administration of it, I believe we would be so well along with controlling surpluses that the price support factor would be unimportant.

But in the main—and I say this without even a quiver in my voice—I believe that in this bill we have done a better job for the farmer than has ever been done before, because we are proposing positive action, through the soil bank features, to manage surpluses, and we are also supplementing section 32 funds in order to dispose of and handle perishables. In all, we have done a pretty good job with the bill. I feel confident that time will prove the accuracy of that statement. My major concern has been that if the farmers go into the fall of 1956 with a 27 cents a bushel price drop

on wheat and an 18 cents per bushel price drop on corn as announced by the Secretary of Agriculture under flexible price supports, those price reductions would be reflected in the prices of feed grains. Cheaper feed grains will mean probable increased livestock production, and we shall again be on the merry-go-round of reduced farm prices and further declining income for the farmer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from Florida for granting me time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator from Florida on the amendment has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask the chairman of the committee if he will yield me 1 minute. I understand the distinguished senior Senator from Utah wishes to propound a question, and I should like to have the privilege of answering it. I do not know what his question will be.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. May I ask the Senator from Florida if the amendment he has offered is substantially the same amendment which was offered last year during one of the discussions on the farm program?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is in the field of cross-compliance and assurance that diverted acres will not be used to ruin someone else. My amendment is not so far-reaching as the one which was considered before.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I had intended to offer an amendment, but the amendment of the Senator from Florida is in the same field in which I had prepared to offer my amendment. I think his amendment will take care of the situation.

However, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I have prepared in support of this general proposition, and of the amendment I had intended to offer, but shall not now offer, because I believe the amendment of the Senator from Florida will take care of the general situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

ELIGIBILITY FOR PRICE SUPPORT AND ACP PAYMENT AMENDMENT

(Statement by Senator WATKINS)

I had had some reservations about introducing my amendment labeled as 2-22-56-F until last week when the Senate attached several amendments which increase Government transfer payments to farmers by at least one-half billion dollars over that amount originally provided for in S. 3183 as reported from committee. Because of this, I now call for consideration of this amendment which, if adopted, would:

1. Permit the Secretary of Agriculture to require, as a condition of eligibility for price support under the Agricultural Act of 1949, that farmers participate in the acreage-reserve program provided for in sections 203 through 206, inclusive, of this bill—S. 3183.

2. Require farmers to participate in the acreage-reserve program provided for in sections 203 through 206, inclusive, of S. 3183 in order to be eligible for payments under the agricultural-conservation program authorized by the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936, if they produce wheat, cotton, corn, rice, flue-cured tobacco, burley tobacco, and cigar binder tobacco types 51, 52, 54, and 55.

3. Render any farmer who knowingly harvested any acreage of a basic commodity in excess of the farm acreage allotment for that farm ineligible for payments under the agricultural conservation program authorized by the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936.

No person, however, is deemed to have harvested any basic commodity acreage in excess of his acreage allotment by reason of harvesting:

1. Corn for ensilage;

2. Wheat in an amount not in excess of 15 acres;

3. A commodity or crop with respect to which producers have rejected marketing quotas in a marketing quota referendum; or

4. Peanuts for seed to be used for the raising of peanuts to be hogged off.

Mr. President, it appears to me essential that the Secretary of Agriculture be given permissive authority to require that farmers participate in the acreage-reserve program in order to be eligible for price support. The acreage-reserve program certainly will fail to produce the desired results unless farmer participation in the cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco producing areas is very substantial. At a time when we have almost unprecedented Commodity Credit Corporation inventories of these commodities, it appears essential that the Secretary should have a sanction at hand to induce substantial participation in the event the rates of payment are not high enough to accomplish this basic objective. Unless farmers participate, the program will fail to materially reduce surpluses—the objective of the acreage-reserve program.

In this respect, I should like to point out that as of December 31, 1955 the Commodity Credit Corporation had in inventory: (1) 888,542,189 bushels of wheat valued at $2,399,042,201; (2) 7,920,833 bales of upland cotton valued at $1,437,071,012; (3) 757,612,049 bushels of corn valued at $1,300,322,952; (4) 15,387,444 hundredweight of rice, rough and milled, valued at $175,902,152.

These you will note are the commodities eligible for the acreage reserve program.

Likewise, Mr. President, if farmers are going to continue to get payments for carrying out conservation practices under the agricultural conservation program, which will result in increased yields and total output of cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco, they ought to be required to participate in the acreage reserve program.

It is sheer nonsense and a waste of public funds on the one hand to pay out money to increase production and then not to require participation in an acreage reserve program which has, as its objective, the reduction of cotton, corn, wheat, rice and tobacco production.

For the same reason, any farmer who knowingly harvests any acreage of a basic commodity—wheat, cotton, corn, rice, tobacco and peanuts—all of which except peanuts are eligible for the acreage reserve program, in excess of his acreage allotment should not be eligible to receive payments under the agricultural conservation program. The only exceptions to such a provision should be in those cases in which—

1. A farmer has an acreage allotment of less than 15 acres, since under the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended, a farmer with a wheat acreage allotment of less than 15 acres can grow and harvest 15 acres of wheat without penalty.

2. A farmer grows corn for ensilage, since it is consumed on the farm.

3. A farmer grows peanuts for seed to be planted to peanuts to be grazed by hogs on the farm.

4. Farmers have rejected marketing quotas in a referendum, since adequate penalty in the loss of maximum price support assistance is provided in the law.

The basic reason for requiring that farmers must comply with acreage allotments in order to receive assistance under the agricultural conservation program is to provide an added sanction to induce compliance with production controls so that production can more nearly be brought into line with demand. Although production controls at best are not too effective in bringing and keeping supply in line with demand, it is important, in light of the big surpluses on hand of basic commodities, that they be reinforced by such a sanction as this amendment provides. This is especially true with respect to the farms owned by one-third of our farmers who produce 80 percent of our marketable crop value and who receive 85 percent of our net farm income.

However, I do agree that such a sanction should not apply to our small farms, especially those having wheat and corn acreage allotments of less than 15 acres. But I cannot agree that it should not be made applicable to the large commercial farms, though fewer in number, but which produce the bulk of our food and forage crops. Specifically, my reasons for this are:

1. If public funds are to be used to increase the capacity of these commercial farms, as is the case with respect to the agricultural conservation program, while, at the same time, the Government is obliged to support the prices of the crops in question, then the public interest certainly requires that sanctions be imposed which will work toward the goal of keeping supply in line with demand.

That the bulk of payments now made under the agricultural conservation program are for practices which primarily increase output rather than build the soil, as do more permanent-type practices, is revealed by table 5 of the Summary of the Agricultural Conservation Program for 1953, published by the United States Department of Agriculture. In 1953, 42 percent of the $185 million farmers received was spent for fertilizer and inorganic materials—limestone, phosphate, and potash. Another 14 percent was used for protective manure crops.

2. If we want to really advance soil conservation on lands devoted to the growing of soil-depleting crops, then farmers, if they are to be eligible for such financial assistance on such crops—and they are the crops in question here—should be required to observe acreage allotments. In this respect, I should like to call your attention, Mr. President, that from 1936 to 1944 the USDA paid farmers $1,666,300,000 under the agricultural conservation program to withdraw soil-depleting crops, including those here in question, from production. Farmers were given an acreage allotment, and if they kept within that allotment, they received an agricultural conservation program payment.

That such a practice was more of a permanent soil-conserving nature than most of those for which farmers are compensated today under the agricultural conservation program cannot be disputed. As Rainer Schickele, chairman of the agricultural economics department of North Dakota Agricultural College, has so ably stated in his recent book Agricultural Policy: "* * * the public interest is concerned primarily with erosion control, with keeping the topsoil in place, because it constitutes the nonrenewable fund resource of the soil. Fertility maintenance, better farm use of water, and maintaining forages are essential only insofar as they

are needed to control erosion. The ACP objective fails to make this important distinction. Consequently, a certain proportion of the available funds is used to pay for practices on land which would not have been permanently damaged if these practices had not been performed. * * *

"There can be no question that a considerable part of the ACP payments are being made for practices on land where those practices are not necessary for the public interest in soil conservation. * * *

"If the funds now disbursed on lands not subject to erosion could be shifted over to unprotected erosible lands, the effectiveness of the program could be substantially increased. We, as a nation, would get more real soil conservation per tax dollars spent than we are getting now" (p. 104).

Contrary to the opinion of some people with respect to this matter, it is evident that not to require compliance with acreage allotments on soil-depleting crops as a condition for receiving ACP payments on farms having an allotment of over 15 acres would result in less conservation worthy of the name, than would otherwise be the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry passed upon this proposal during the deliberations of the committee. It is what might be called the third prong of the soil bank proposal as submitted by the American Farm Bureau Federation. The Farm Bureau presented us with a proposal calling for first, a voluntary retirement of allotted acres, with the farmers being paid mostly in kind—that is in CCC agricultural surplus stocks—for diverting their allotted acres.

The second prong of the Farm Bureau proposal was similar to the conservation reserve section which is in our own bill, under which the farmers would be paid a certain amount to reduce production by diverting a portion of their cultivated acres to conservation purposes, for a period of not less than 3 years.

The third prong of the Farm Bureau's proposal is embodied in what the Senate is now considering, in a greatly modified form. Originally the Farm Bureau recommended the setting aside of a portion of a farmer's cropland acreage without payment and with denial of price supports as the penalty for the farmer's failure to comply. The amendment which the Senate is now considering carries out this proposal by the Farm Bureau, but with this exception, that for diverting acreage to the soil bank up to an amount equal to 15 percent of a farmer's acreage devoted to price-supported crops, the farmer would be paid under either the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve program.

Mr. President, the committee after mature deliberation decided to make the soil bank a voluntary program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall yield in a moment.

The committee decided to make it purely voluntary, but we now have presented to us an amendment that would force farmers either to set aside and divert to the soil bank up to 15 percent of their croplands, or be penalized by being denied price supports.

Mr. President, I would not have any difficulty in accepting the amendment of my good friend from Florida if it simply treated price-supported crops other than the basics in the same manner that we have treated barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. It would be all right to do that, so far as I can see. But the Senator's amendment goes further. He tells the farmers that in order to be eligible to receive price supports, they must divert cropland to the soil bank up to an amount equal to 15 percent of their acreage devoted to price-supported crops.

Mr. President, in my judgment, this is an effort to convert the soil-bank program, which the administration wants to be a voluntary program, and which I believe the vast majority of our farmers want to be a voluntary program, into a more or less compulsory program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that with reference to corn and the four small grain crops the Senate has already adopted a provision requiring, as a condition of eligibility for price support, that the producer must divert, either to the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve program, an acreage equal to 15 percent of the producer's farm base acreage for corn, and somewhat similar language for the four small grain crops?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct, but the difference between the crops he has mentioned and the crops of cotton or wheat or other basics is that in the latter cases we have in recent years forced farmers to reduce their acreages devoted to these basic crops—that is, their allotted acres, until it hurts. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the wheat farmer's acreage allotment has already been reduced from 78 million acres to a minimum of 55 million acres. The cotton farmer's allotment has already been reduced from twenty-eight or twenty-nine million acres to seventeen - million - three - hundred - thousand-odd acres.

I say to put a further condition on the eligibility of those farmers to receive price supports is unfair and inequitable.

As I said before the Senate started voting on the bill, the first question the committee decided was whether or not we should make the soil-bank program compulsory or put it on a voluntary basis, and the committee went on record as desiring to make it voluntary. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico offered, as a substitute to the soil-bank provision that is now in the bill, the original proposal of the farm bureau, and one of the objectionable features in the proposal, from the standpoint of a majority of the committee, was the third prong of it which the Senator from Florida, as I understand, is now trying to incorporate in the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that one very great difference between corn and the four small grain crops, as embodied in the amendment which the Senate has already adopted, and the other crops is that mandatory price supports are required in the amendment for corn and the four small grain crops, whereas there is no such provision with reference to all the others; and is that not a very great difference to the advantage of producers of corn and the four small grain crops?

Mr. ELLENDER. I would have no objection to the amendment of the Senator from Florida if he struck the basics from it. I discussed that with him, as I am sure he remembers. If the amendment is adopted without exempting the basics, and the producers of the basic crops were forced to put up to 15 percent of their cropland into the soil bank——

Mr. HOLLAND. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator's amendment would take the soil bank out of the category of being a voluntary program. In other words, unless cultivated acreage equivalent to up to 15 percent of a farmer's land devoted to price-supported crops placed either in the conservation reserve or the acreage reserve, the producer of the basics is denied price supports. It is that compulsory feature as applied to producers of basic crops that I do not like in the Senator's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, I respect the expression of the distinguished chairman of the committee; but I think perhaps he has overlooked certain wording of the amendment. I call his attention to lines 10, 11, and 12, on page 2, from which I think it is quite clear that the 15 percent, which is the maximum which can be kept out of production, is of the acreage of cropland, and not necessarily of the acreage of a particular basic crop. Instead, it is of all of the cropland.

Mr. ELLENDER. If I said otherwise, I was in error. Of course I meant any cropland tilled regularly.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, the amendment does not force any reduction at all in the acreage of any basic crop.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; but it treats the producers of basics in the same manner as we treated the producers of grain sorghum, barley, oats, and rye, with respect to which there have been no acreage allotments, and where the farmers have enjoyed unrestricted planting privileges. The Senator from Florida well knows that in the case of the corngrowers, compliance with acreage allotments is on a purely voluntary basis, and no

penalties are attached. If the corn farmer fails to comply with his acreage allotment, the only thing he loses is the privilege of placing his crop under price-support loan. In the case of the other basics, he would also have to pay marketing penalties.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The purpose of the Senator from Florida is to make it very clear that the producers of supported crops which do not have acreage allotments and are not subject to mandatory price support are not going to be subjected to having their acreage menaced by the competition of acres that are diverted from the production of basic crops. It seems to me that purpose has already been carried out in its application to corn and to the four small-grain crops; and in order to enable the doing of justice in conference, this amendment should by all means be accepted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I return to the proposition that it is our desire, as I understand it, to make this program a purely voluntary one; and it is far removed from the cross-compliance that my good friend, the Senator from South Dakota, had in mind when he asked his question of the Senator from Florida. It has no connection with it.

Let me point out that what the acreage reserve phase of the soil-bank plan seeks to do is to take out of cultivation from 12 million to 15 million acres of wheatland—that is, allotted acres—so as to relieve and not further aggravate our surplus in wheat. It seeks to take out of production 3 million acres of cotton-land, so as to reduce the surplus of cotton. Let me make it plain that on these diverted acres a farmer is prohibited from growing any kind of crop from which he can obtain a dime's worth of revenue. He cannot graze cattle on those acres; he cannot harvest hay off those acres. They must remain out of circulation, so to speak, insofar as any kind of agricultural production is concerned.

When we come to the conservation reserve program in that operation, cultivated acres are also set aside, and the farmer is entitled to payments on those acres. The payments would be far less than he would receive under the acreage reserve program. He cannot pasture that land either, except under certain disaster conditions prescribed in the bill.

But this amendment would say to a farmer who plants cotton or wheat or peanuts or any of the other basics, "You must devote cultivated acreage equivalent to up to 15 percent of your cropland devoted to price-supported crops, to either the acreage reserve or conservation reserve program, and, unless you do that, you are not eligible for price supports."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not true that the amendment affecting oats, barley, rye, and sorghum, providing support prices for them of 95 percent of the corn price-support level, is not to be effective until next year?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my recollection.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not also true that, as the bill is now written, dairy commodities get 80 percent supports, and will have no controls whatever?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG. But now it is proposed to impose still further upon the wheat farmer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. Now it is proposed that still further restrictions be imposed upon the wheat farmer, and that he must reduce or cut his acreage one-third. In addition, his price was cut nearly one-third; and he cannot plant anything on those acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

To make himself eligible for price supports, he would have to participate in either the acreage reserve or conservation reserve programs.

This amendment will also prohibit any soil bank payment if the acreage devoted to price-support crops, other than tung nuts, on any farm controlled by the producer exceeds the average acreage devoted to such crops in the immediately preceding 5 years; the amendment provides, however, that the Secretary can by regulation modify or make exceptions to this rule.

Mr. President, I should like to call attention also to the fact that the pending amendment will be particularly difficult to administer, since the Department of Agriculture does not have adequate data on the acreage devoted to price-supported nonbasic crops during the past 5 years. That is one of the major difficulties that would develop if the amendment were to be adopted.

As I suggested to the Senator from Florida, as chairman of the committee, I would be willing to accept and to take to conference, a modification of the amendment requiring, in the case of all crops, that they be on the same basis as barley, rye, oats, and grain sorghum, provided we exempt producers of the basic crops, since they already have been cut to the bone.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Florida refers to the fact that corn does have this mandatory 15 percent cutback provision, which I wish were not in the bill, and which I voted for with great reluctance; but the reason why it is in the bill is that the bill increases the acreage of corn, rather than reduces it as in the case of wheat.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from South Dakota means from the allotted acreage, does he not?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. I wish to say that the committee threshed this out, and seriously considered whether it should be a voluntary provision, from the very beginning, when the bill first came up. It was overwhelmingly—I shall not say unanimously—the consensus of opinion in the committee that we should institute this new program on a voluntary basis.

There were two good reasons for that, in addition to what the chairman of the committee has said. One of those reasons was that this is a new program which, whenever it is imposed, will be imposed in the middle of someone's crop year; and it is a good idea, when we begin with a new program, to let those who wish to cooperate on a voluntary basis do so, and to build up some experience with the program before we try to coerce people on a mandatory basis.

The second reason is in my opinion even more important. We felt, and I still feel, and I believe the chairman does, that on a strictly voluntary basis there will be a greater inducement for the Department of Agriculture to make the program increasingly attractive to the farmers, by giving them a little better rental for their acres than would be necessary or probable or certainly realistically true if there were a compulsory program.

So it seems to me that there are two very attractive reasons for trying the program for several years on a voluntary basis. Then, if problems grow out of that type of operation as the Senator from Florida anticipates may be the case, there would be time to tighten it up and put in some coercive or compulsory features, if necessary. Personally, I do not think they will ever be necessary.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from South Dakota will recall that I sought in committee to make the acreage reserve program compulsory and mandatory after 1956.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. But after talking to the Secretary of Agriculture and to his Assistant Secretary and others in the Department, I changed my mind about it.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee decided that it would be impractical to force participation in either phase of the soil bank program. As the Senator from South Dakota has just stated, we said, "Let us try it a while" on a purely voluntary basis.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the end, I voted to make it strictly voluntary.

Mr. MUNDT. I may say that I think all members of the committee changed their minds several times on a great many issues, during the course of the very complicated hearings and in our efforts to develop a workable bill which the majority of the committee would approve.

Mr. ELLENDER. We had decided, if the Senator will recall——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much more time have I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 10 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 3 more minutes.

When we heard testimony from the Secretary and his assistants to the effect that they could get more acres in the program by making it voluntary, all of us changed our minds.

Mr. MUNDT. Exactly.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] proposed the farm bureau amendment, which sought to put into the bill the very proposal which the Senator from Florida is seeking to put into it, in a modified form, I do not believe there were more than 1 or 2 Senators—perhaps 3—who voted to accept the farm bureau proposal.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not think there were more than three.

Mr. ELLENDER. We again stated emphatically that we were going to make the soil-bank program voluntary for the first year.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I understand the distinction which the chairman has made with respect to cross-compliance, because I think that referred to payments for soil-conservation practices, as well as for limitation of acres. Would I interpret the amendment correctly if I suggested that it would make mandatory a multiple-compliance?

Mr. ELLENDER. For price supports.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. For price supports.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. As I told the Senator from Florida, we have no objection to placing other price-supported crops in the same category as we have placed barley, oats, rye, and sorghum. However, as I indicated a while ago, the Department of Agriculture does not have adequate acreage data with respect to these other price-supported crops, such as soybeans.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If I correctly understand, the amendment would compel anyone who wanted to have price supports come into the program on every crop.

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly. He would have to put in the program the equivalent of at least 15 percent of his acreage devoted to price supported crops. Otherwise he would lose his eligibility for price supports.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I realize that the Senator does not wish to have an incorrect impression left in the RECORD.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly not.

Mr. HOLLAND. This amendment does not require a mandatory reduction. It simply requires, as a condition, that the total acreage planted to price-supported crops may not exceed the average which has been planted for the past 5 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I noted the statement made by one of the other Senators in the colloquy, to the effect that the corn and small grain crop program was to begin in 1957. It begins in 1956.

Mr. ELLENDER. With respect to corn, it is mandatory in 1956.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that with reference to corn and all the small grain crops, mandatory price support is applied?

Mr. ELLENDER. When they are hitched to the price of corn.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida was not willling to create more mandatory price-supported crops.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 7 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 2 more minutes.

I wish to make it plain again to the Senate that if this amendment is adopted it will force producers of the basic crops to put the equivalent of at least 15 percent of their price-supported cropland into the soil bank; and unless they do so, they will be denied support payments.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to reiterate also that the soil program as now written, requires that all the acres that will be used in the conservation reserve, as well as in the acreage reserve program, must be taken out of production. They cannot be used in order to grow any crops in competition with other crops. Those acres must stand by themselves, and the owner of the land cannot receive payment on them unless he complies with the regulations established by the Secretary of Agriculture. So what the program really means is that we shall have in the program probably 15 million acres, or perhaps more than that, if the corn producers come in with 3 or 4 million acres. We can expect to have at least 18 million allotted acres taken out of cultivation; and on those acres nothing can be grown that will come in competition with any other crop. As to the conservation reserve acres, which may amount to 25 million or 30 million acres, on those acres no crops can be grown to compete with other crops. They cannot be pastured, except under certain conditions written into the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 5 more minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of Members of the Senate who are present, and of administrative assistants who are present, who will talk with Members when they come to the Chamber, as well as of anyone else who may receive this information directly or indirectly. Since we have only a few Senators on the floor to hear this debate, that if we adopt the Holland amendment, we shall be changing the entire basic philosophy of the bill from one of voluntary cooperation to some kind of coercion or compulsion.

To me it is always difficult to associate the good American concept with that kind of approach; but knowing the sponsor of the amendment as I do, I know that I cannot say that there is anything wrong with it, except that I do not like the kind of Americanism which requires a man to do something against his will, especially if he is a farmer desiring to operate his farm in accordance with his own judgment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask the Senator if he did not strongly support the amendment for corn for the lesser grains, which does for those grains——

Mr. MUNDT. I answered that question 10 minutes before the Senator asked it. I said that I reluctantly supported the amendment with respect to corn because compulsion for the corn farmer was in the amendment. In order to get anything at all done for corn at that stage, the 90 percent price supports having been defeated, I voted for the amendment.

The bill we now have before us follows the approach of placing a carrot in front of a horse's nose to induce him to move forward. The Holland amendment uses the approach of digging the spurs into the flanks of the horse to make him do something he may not wish to do.

I think we are on sound ground when we adopt a program on a voluntary basis, and require the administration and the Department of Agriculture to make the program so attractive that farmers will desire to cooperate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

The Senator from Louisiana has 3 minutes remaining. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much time is left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has no time. The Senator from Louisiana has 3 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back my 3 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to strike out lines 17 through 23, on page 2 of the Holland amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2 of the Holland amendment, it is proposed to strike out lines 17 through 23, inclusive.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Frankly, Mr. President, I intend to withdraw my amendment in a few moments. However, I found that I was caught with no time on the side of the proponents of the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

I do not mean to foreclose any Senator from asking questions. I think the amendment of the Senator from Florida is utterly sound.

There is no question in my mind at all but that the evils from which we have been suffering have been caused by the fact that we have not had mandatory cross compliance in the past. We have required under the quota systems or

otherwise the taking of certain crop land out of production, and we have permitted lands that have been taken out of production to produce crops in direct competition with the crops that have been reduced.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. For example, we have taken corn land out of production and put it into the production of soybeans or perhaps sorghums.

I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator heard me say a short time ago that the soil bank as we now have it constituted will prevent such practices, and that all allotted acres that are set aside cannot be utilized to put any crops in competition, and that applies also to conservation reserve acres. If we have 45 million acres in the soil bank that will be quite a few acres. The reduction should bring about a substantial decrease in production. I have not been able to find anything in the amendment which has anything at all to do with cross-compliance that the Senator from Iowa is talking about.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It has this to do with the theory of cross compliance, that it puts in the requirement that a person who becomes eligible for price support must stay within the base, and then he must put the equivalent of 15 percent of those price-supported acres into the soil bank in one way or another. That theory is in the amendment which deals with corn, which we adopted a week or so ago.

Personally, I think it is a fair amendment. In order to make available to the farmer price supports, I see nothing wrong with saying to him, "You must contribute something to the soil bank."

The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida recognizes the fact that marketing quotas have been voted on such crops as cotton and wheat, and the farmers are not required under that provision to come into the soil bank this year while the marketing quotas are in effect, but does after this year's crop; and as a condition for them to enjoy price supports, they ought to be required or they would be required to put something into the soil bank, according to the factor that is set out in the Senator's amendment. I think it is only fair.

Certainly the voluntary theory and the requirement theory were argued in committee. We discussed it at some length. One of the reasons that the theory of the bill as it came out of committee was left voluntary was that with respect to at least some of the crops quotas had been voted, and the terms under which those quotas had been voted did not include a requirement that a certain percentage of land be put into the soil bank.

The committee thought that it should not change the rules of the game while the runner was between second and third base. Therefore, the committee felt that there should not be mandatory requirements for crops which are now under quotas that have been voted this year. However, thereafter, the theory was put into the corn amendment, and such a requirement was put into the corn amendment. It was perfectly sound procedure to do so.

The fact is that the small-grain amendment, which was attached to the corn amendment, goes even further, and it provides that with respect to such grains as grain sorghums and barley and so on, farmers must put in 15 percent of the acres heretofore devoted to these particular crops.

The Senator's amendment does not say that, as I understand the amendment. It says that a percentage of the tillable acres must be put in. It does not require that a percentage of the crops under price support be put in, but the tillable acres. Perhaps under a voluntary basis the Secretary will have to raise the price so high it might even be out of reason. On a requirement basis the Secretary under the formulas which have been discussed and which would be in effect, would establish a fair and adequate and satisfactory price for the acres put into the soil bank.

I believe the Senator's amendment is a sound amendment, and I shall support it. It does not affect cotton. It does not affect the quota for this year. Farmers can come in or stay out if they want to, but it will hereafter affect those crops that enjoy price supports, by requiring that farmers contribute, for a reasonable compensation requirement, at least a fixed percentage of their tillable acres into the soil bank program.

Mr. President, we must attack the problem, not by treating symptoms, as so many of the amendments do that have been proposed, and some of which unfortunately have been adopted, but on the basis of treating the disease itself, and on the basis of getting to the heart of the problem, which is surpluses. We can take various commodities and say any one of them would not be in surplus. However, the entire agricultural production is in surplus, and we must therefore attack the problem in such a way that we will be treating the disease, instead of symptoms.

I congratulate the Senator from Florida for the amendment. He knows that in the past I have agreed with the theory. I hope his amendment will be adopted. It is a sound approach to curing the disease in agriculture from which we are suffering, and it is not a superficial treatment of the symptoms. I hope his amendment will be adopted.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I hope he will yield me 3 minutes before he concludes his remarks.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield the Senator 3 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to one fundamental fallacy in the approach to this subject by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. Of course he is correct in his oft-repeated statement that the acreage which comes into the acreage reserve or conservation reserve cannot be diverted. The place wherein he fails to put anything of substance into his bill is in his failure to give any assurance that there will be any large participation in the acreage reserve or in the conservation reserve program. The purpose of the pending amendment is to insure that on an equitable basis, as between the producers and the commodities, there will be a substantial participation in both soil bank activities.

Without some such approach, the Senator from Florida fears we will find that the soil bank will be a weak approach to the problem. If we are sincere in our desire to clear up the surpluses, the Senate ought to adopt a program which will assure enough acreage coming into the soil bank program on a sufficient and equitable basis, to make some headway toward cutting down production and relieving us from the overhanging menace of these constant surpluses.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield me 1 minute to reply to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not correct to say that when Under Secretary Morse and Secretary Benson appeared before our committee they were desirous of having the soil-bank program placed on a purely voluntary basis?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is completely correct. However, I wish to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the Senate has departed from that approach by voting into the bill amendments affecting corn and the four small grains which do have a compulsory effect in those 5 fields.

It seems to the Senator from Florida that unless similar action is taken at this time the conferees will sit down with hands tied and will not possibly be able to do justice among all the facets of the far-spreading American agriculture.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week the Senator from Iowa and I were confronted with a problem in the Middle West which seems to have a good deal of substance. I think the matter is resolved, but it ties in very directly with the discussion today, because the problem has reference to an adjustment of acres downward so that the pressure can be lessened. Of course, Mr. President, it becomes a question of incentive. How are we to get farmers to reduce their acreage? Do we compel them, or do we lure them? That is a peculiar problem in connection with high-priced land in Iowa, Illinois, and elsewhere, where there is land worth $500 or $600 an acre. We have to figure the investment cost. We figure all that goes into it, as well as very high taxes. It is obvious that unless the farmer goes into the acreage reserve he could scarcely hope to surrender his acres to the conservation reserve where the return would not exceed $15 an acre.

So I wish to make this statement for the RECORD, that in determining the payments for the conservation reserve, which, of course, will be infinitely smaller than those in the acreage reserve, the Secretary should keep in mind the value of the land. There is quite a difference between putting up an acre worth $600 and an acre worth $100, when we think of taxation. The value should be kept in mind. He should also keep in mind the cash rentals which obtain

in certain areas of the country. For instance, the rental of an acre may be $15 in one place and $5 in another place. That is something which the Secretary must keep in mind when he establishes the level of payment in connection with the conservation reserve. There are also other factors. In so doing, it will be possible for a farmer on high-priced land not only to surrender some of the acres heretofore devoted to basic crops, but also acres on which he has sown barley, oats, soybeans, and other crops which are quite common to the Corn Belt.

The only purpose in taking this time, Mr. President, is to make sure that it is noted in the RECORD so that the Secretary of Agriculture can at least give attention to it and take cognizance of it, because I believe it is a problem with which we in the Middle Western area must live.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am prepared to withdraw my amendment. I do not wish to pull the rug out from under anyone, but I am prepared to withdraw it, unless some Senator has questions he would care to ask or unless the Senator from Louisiana cares to use any time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have said all that I desired to say. If someone else desires to be heard, I am willing to yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McNamara
Allott	George	Millikin
Anderson	Goldwater	Monroney
Barkley	Gore	Morse
Barrett	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Murray
Bender	Hennings	Neely
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Butler	Jackson	Robertson
Byrd	Jenner	Russell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Clements	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparkman
Curtis	Laird	Stennis
Daniel	Langer	Symington
Dirksen	Lehman	Thurmond
Douglas	Long	Thye
Duff	Magnuson	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Welker
Eastland	Mansfield	Wiley
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Young
Flanders	McCarthy	
Frear	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent and, if present and voting, he would vote "yea." The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness, and if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—48

Aiken	Douglas	McCarthy
Allott	Duff	Millikin
Anderson	Dworshak	Morse
Barrett	Flanders	Pastore
Beall	Frear	Payne
Bender	Goldwater	Potter
Bennett	Gore	Robertson
Bricker	Green	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smathers
Bush	Holland	Smith, Maine
Butler	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Kennedy	Thye
Case, N. J.	Kuchel	Watkins
Cotton	Malone	Welker
Curtis	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Dirksen	Martin, Pa.	Williams

NAYS—46

Barkley	Humphrey	Monroney
Bible	Jackson	Mundt
Capehart	Jenner	Murray
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Neuberger
Chavez	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Clements	Kerr	Russell
Daniel	Knowland	Schoeppel
Eastland	Laird	Scott
Ellender	Langer	Sparkman
Ervin	Lehman	Stennis
Fulbright	Long	Symington
George	Magnuson	Thurmond
Hayden	Mansfield	Young
Hennings	McClellan	
Hill	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—2

Ives Purtell

So Mr. HOLLAND's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "3–6–56–F."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, between lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

VIRGINIA AND VALENCIA TYPE PEANUTS

SEC. 406. Section 358 (c) (2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after the second sentence therof a new sentence as follows: "In any State in which the acreage devoted to the production of Virginia or Valencia type peanuts for 1956 or any subsequent year is less than ten thousand acres, the Secretary shall increase the acreage allotment of such State for such year by 50 percent, if there is filed with the Secretary by processors within such State a written statement of their intention to purchase the peanuts produced on such additional acreage at not less than the parity price thereof, such statements for years subsequent to 1956 to be filed prior to the announcement by the Secretary of the national marketing quotas for such years."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 30 minutes, or so much thereof as he may desire to use.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield 10 seconds to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield, provided I do not thereby lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico can yield for a question without losing the floor.

Mr. FLANDERS. I wish to suggest that whenever the clerk reads an amendment, he first state in a clear voice the date and the letter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not a bad suggestion. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, of course I wish to address myself to the Senate as a whole; but I am particularly glad that my good friend, the Senator from Georgia, and my good friend, the Senator from Virginia, are now in the Chamber, because I am going to discuss peanuts.

Mr. President, it is somewhat ironic that in the midst of a debate about agricultural surpluses and what to do with them, I should be offering an amendment to break the Secretary of Agriculture's barrier in the farm field and try to meet a real demand.

We have heard a great deal about surplus foodstuffs, and we are badgered with questions about what to do with them. The Secretary wants not only lowered supports, but also reduced acreage. This amendment, Mr. President, would demand that the Secretary release his administrative stranglehold and allow an increase where there is a ready market for peanuts of the Valencia type.

The Secretary granted a 14.5 percent peanut acreage increase this year, and treated everyone just alike, percentagewise. But we want to meet the local market, and to guarantee it. At one time we had 12,000 acres of these peanuts in New Mexico. Today, with the increase announced February 21, we have 5,338 acres. We got 482 acres, when the State was demanding 2,500 acres.

The amendment would affect—and I call this matter particularly to the attention of the Senators from the States I shall now name—only the States of Arizona, Arkansas, California, Lousiana, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, and Tennessee. It might not affect all of these; but at least these represent the possibilities, since each of these States has less than the 10,000-acre provisional figure contained in the amendment.

The amendment is quite simple. It recognizes the fact that users of the Virginia and Valencia type peanuts are unable to supply the market within the United States, and the fact that the processors notified the Department of Agriculture that unless additional acreage was to be had, importations would be necessary. Unless the amendment is adopted, it will be necessary to import edible peanuts.

We in New Mexico want another 2,500 acres of Valencia type peanuts. The New Mexico Valencia peanuts have never cost the Government one red cent, and they will not now. The amend-

ment directs the Secretary to increase the State quota by 50 percent where a State has less than 10,000 acres, and provides for the sale without Government aid. It provides that to get this 50 percent increase the processors within that particular State must file with the Secretary, before any such increase is approved, a written declaration to buy the production from the added acreage at not less than parity. Such a procedure would be required each and every year thereafter, in order to maintain the acreage. In other words, the processors will either guarantee to buy the peanuts, or there will not be any peanuts planted on the added acreage.

We have 3 peanut processing plants in New Mexico, and 90 percent of the production is bought by these 3 plants. Usually the peanut supply in New Mexico is exhausted by December of each year, which means that peanuts of the Valencia type have been available only 2 to 2½ months out of the year.

I realize that what I propose is out of the ordinary. Secretary Benson is asking for reduced acreage on crops because the farmers, the Secretary, and the markets cannot buy all the crops now being produced. I am asking for more acreage because we can sell more of these peanuts. If we cannot sell them, we do not get the increased acreage. I think that is fair and just.

Mr. President, I am willing to let the Senate decide for itself on this amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a few questions?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the amendment, it would require an increase of as much as 50 percent in peanut acreage allotments to any State in which the acreage devoted to Virginia- or Valencia-type peanuts is less than 10,000 acres.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from New Mexico has mentioned the States to which the amendment would apply. Does he interpret his amendment as meaning that as to the 50-percent increase in acreage allotments the farmers in those States would be bound to plant Virginia- or Valencia-type peanuts or could they plant any type of peanut they might desire?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; the amendment relates only to Virginia- or Valencia-type peanuts.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator's amendment is not very clear on that point, as I understand it. But that is the Senator's intention; is it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only is it the intention, but such peanuts are the only ones grown in New Mexico.

Mr. ELLENDER. I so understand. But perhaps in some of the States the Senator from New Mexico has mentioned, peanuts other than Virginia- or Valencia-type peanuts are grown.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. As I understand, if States which have less than 10,000 acres could grow any other kind of peanuts they would not have less than 10,000 acres. They would have more.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to make certain that the amendment would do what the Senator proposes; that is, in all States where the acreage is less than 10,000 acres, they will be able to obtain a 50-percent increase in acreage of Valencia- or Virginia-type peanuts?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. That is my intention.

Mr. ELLENDER. And no other type or types of peanuts could be planted on that increased acreage?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that the intention of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this amendment provides a special dispensation for a State which has less than 10,000 acres of Virginia- or Valencia-type peanuts. It requires that the acreage allotment be increased by 50 percent. There has been a good market for this type of peanuts. It has been necessary to increase the acreage for 1956. Substantial increases have been given to the States producing this type of peanuts, which at the present time is selling for about $50 a ton over the support price.

However, the increase has been given according to the acreage commonly produced in the State. Virginia has had a 15 percent increase. North Carolina has had an increase. Texas has had an increase. I presume other States have had increases. The State of New Mexico has also had an increase.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I merely wish to point out that if this amendment is adopted and an increase of 3 or 4 thousand acres were given to one State which had less than 10,000 acres, that increased acreage would have to come from the other States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My State asked for an increase of 2,500 acres this year. We got an increase of about 460 acres, not 2,500. What I had in mind by this amendment was to cure that inequality.

Mr. AIKEN. I realize that. I think, however, the State of New Mexico got a percentage increase comparable with that given to Virginia, Texas, Louisiana, and other States which grow this type of peanuts.

I can understand that a State wants to produce more of a crop which pays well, as the Virginia- or Valencia-type of peanuts has been doing during the past 2 years, and presumably will do for some time in the future.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say to my good friend from Vermont that unless we can sell the peanuts we will not get the additional acreage. Unless we prove to the Secretary of Agriculture that we can sell them, we will not get additional acreage; and it would not cost the Government one cent to carry out the program. All we want is a little increase in acreage.

Mr. AIKEN. I presume price supports on Virginia or Valencia-type peanuts have the effect of holding the price down, rather than holding it up. If the States of North Carolina and Virginia have no objection to reducing their acreage in order to help other States which have less than 10,000 acres, it certainly should not make any difference to me. I have raised very few peanuts in my life. All I could ever grow was shells.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the committee did not have an opportunity to examine this amendment very closely, but the intention of the Senator from New Mexico is to confine the planting of this additional acreage to Virginia- or Valencia-type peanuts. That being true, I am willing to take the amendment to conference and see what can be done with it.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

LIGHTWEIGHT CATTLE AND HOGS

SEC. 106. (a) In order to encourage the marketing of hogs at lighter than normal weights, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make incentive payments to producers who market cattle and hogs at lighter than normal weights.

(b) Such payments shall be made from funds appropriated by section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress (49 Stat. 774; 7 U. S. C. 612c), as amended, and shall be in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purpose of this section.

On page 4, line 24, strike out "107" and insert "108."

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, within recent years, Congress has had before it legislation of worldwide importance.

Our decisions have literally affected the fate of the world.

I believe that the farm bill before us today falls within that category. It becomes a question of world importance because it affects the very survival of our economic and political system.

Freedom, Mr. President, in any nation depends upon the equality of opportunity which is available to all citizens, whether they toil in teeming cities or on our fertile farms. Without such equality, the nation will perish and, with it, the last bulwark of freedom in the world.

We have devoted much attention to bolstering economies all over the world; it is now high time we gave at least equal

attention to laying a firm foundation for the agricultural economy in our country.

No one can longer maintain the fiction that the farmers of American are well-off today. No one can logically argue that there is equality of economic opportunity on the farm and in industry. There has been a nearly disastrous drop in the income of American farmers.

Since 1951, $5 billion has been cut from the net income of farmers, and the drop is still continuing today.

To put it another way, today the farmer receives only 38 cents of the consumers' dollar, whereas his share 10 years ago was 52 cents. There has been no comparable reduction in the farmer's workload or his production.

The nine point 4-percent decrease in gross farm income from 1947 to 1955, for example, was accompanied by an increase of 12 percent in production.

To make this burden on the farmer unbearable, the remainder of the economy has been blooming and his fellow citizens in other walks of life have seen their living standards increase and their incomes grow apace with the growing industrial strength of the Nation.

In the past 10 years—while the farm share of the consumer dollar was dropping more than 23 percent, the national income from nonagricultural production went up 68 percent.

All these figures come into sharp focus when we see what has happened to the so-called parity ratio, that is to say, the ratio of the cost of things the farmer buys compared to the things he sells.

In October 1946, the parity ratio stood at 123, but in January of this year, it had avalanched to only 80. All this happened, Mr. President, in a period of unparalleled industrial prosperity and undreamed of national income.

The parallel to the trend of farm prices in those prosperous days before the 1929 depression is too glaring to need explaining.

It is imperative that we now take action which will reverse the fall in farm prices and restore farm purchasing power to a level comparatively equal with that of industrial wage earners.

It is argued that the major share of the price drop has come under the previous administration and its farm program.

That is, of course, true, but the drop has continued at an excessive rate since 1953.

As the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] pointed out, the drop since 1953 has amounted to more than $3 billion, or a fourth of the total national farm income.

Aside from the chronologic occurrence of the farm price drop, we have a present responsibility to do something about it.

Perhaps my colleagues on this side of the aisle will recall the solemn promise that we made in the election campaign of 1952, to do something affirmative to raise farm prices.

It was our Republican platform of 1952 that proclaimed:

> The good earth is the food storehouse for future generations.
>
> The tending of the soil is a sacred responsibility.
>
> Any program that will benefit the farmers must serve the national welfare. * * *
>
> We favor a farm program aimed at full parity prices for all farm products in the market place. * * *
>
> The Republican Party will create conditions providing for farm prosperity and stability.

Far from enjoying that promised prosperity, the farmers of America are suffering a serious economic depression.

I believe that we must do everything possible to fulfill that promise of 4 years ago to restore farm prosperity.

The farm bill before us has undergone many modifications.

Some of the changes will undoubtedly help us to solve the overall farm situation.

We are uncertain about the effect of some others.

It is important, however, that we come quickly to the end of our work so that steps can be taken to solve the emergency situation.

It is the emergency situation that we are trying to solve.

I am grateful that the Senate saw fit to adopt three amendments which I submitted or cosponsored.

These will, I believe, help us realize the intent of the farm bill to help preserve family-type farms.

We cannot overemphasize the importance of family farms.

The very strength of our Nation rests on a sound agriculture and an agricultural population that has a chance to earn a decent American living standard.

Let me say, at this time, however, that there are serious long-range implications to both the farm situation and the farm legislation, which the Congress has not considered fully in the present discussion.

It is my intention to speak further on that subject in the very near future, because I believe that only by a complete reorientation of our farm program philosophy are we going to solve a farm situation that has been with us in every peacetime year for a quarter of a century.

At that time I intend to propose some broad considerations to the Senate which will give us the opportunity to make a legislative inquiry and legislative decisions geared to the long pull.

Only by such long-range consideration can we, I believe, solve the long-term needs of American agriculture.

While we think of long-range problems, we might well devote some thought, at this time, to the question of the existing surpluses.

Is it all bad?

The answer is "No."

In some basic commodities, such as corn, the actual surplus is very small, perhaps as little as a 90-day supply.

In others, such as wheat, it is comparatively large.

But we must look toward the future.

One year of bad weather in the areas growing such commodities will not only wipe out the surpluses, but make us glad that we had them in the first place.

It is well for us to remember the Biblical prophecy of the 7 lean years and the 7 fat years.

Furthermore, we are constantly told that the United States is faced with the possibility of all-out war at the whim of the Kremlin.

Suppose such a war does come.

These abhorred surpluses of today will feed our Nation and possibly make the difference between death or survival.

A judicious program of surplus retention for the future, together with a more active marketing program, will go far to solve the current production situation.

I sometimes wonder, Mr. President, why there is so much panic about the farm surpluses.

After all, we have surpluses in many other fields and we hardly hear anything about it.

The surpluses in military equipment alone amounts to many hundreds of millions of dollars.

In my own State of Indiana, we recently found nearly $1 million worth of surplus saddles, troughs and harnesses for horse-drawn vehicles stored since the Spanish-American War.

Then how about the surplus 80-mile pipeline built by the United States in North Africa.

It is surplus because it leads nowhere, it just lies there.

The Army alone, we are told, has stored up goods of various kinds, amounting to $30 billion, much of which, according to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army, is "pretty useless."

If we can afford this wasteful expenditure of tax money to accumulate "pretty useless" surpluses, we can certainly take a less frightened view of surplus food stocks which may well save our Nation in the future.

Mr. President, the detailed facts on the farm situation—the rows of figures, the legal analyses, and the numerous examples—have been presented to the Senate by others.

I do not wish to repeat the truths that they have already spoken.

It is only necessary to remember that what they have told us speaks eloquently of the plight of the American farmer, of the potential disaster for the Nation that lies in an inadequate solution of the farm price problem.

As I have said, I intend to take up the subject at greater length in the near future.

I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator withdraws his amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which amendment designated "2-29-56-A" offered by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], was rejected on last Thursday in my absence.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, is this with reference to the so-called Morse amendment?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to preserve the parliamentary situation. At a later point I may wish to move to lay the motion on the table. However, I do not wish to foreclose the Senator from making his statement.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, last Thursday night after 10 o'clock, during my absence from the floor of the Senate,

the Senate took under consideration the amendment to the farm bill, designated as "2-29-56-A." I was one of the cosponsors of the amendment. I was necessarily absent at the time this amendment was taken up. I left the floor of the Senate shortly after 9:30 Thursday evening to attend to some personal matters.

At that time, I was under the impression that no yea-and-nay votes were to be taken that late at night. I was deeply concerned when I learned that the amendment had been rejected by a margin of one vote at that late hour.

Mr. President, I am satisfied that the amendment I have just mentioned, which would strike out section 309 of the pending farm bill, represents a fair and humanitarian proposal in the best sense of the term. Section 309 of the bill would require States in which disasters have struck to contribute 15 percent toward the cost of disaster feed and seed supplied by the Government to farmers who have suffered in such disasters. Section 309 would become effective in March 1957, but regardless of its effective date, it is the type of provision which we should not have on our statute books.

I cannot imagine a more burdensome requirement in the aftermath of disaster emergencies, such as the great floods recently experienced in New England and on the Pacific coast, than the requirement that the afflicted States should pay 15 percent of the costs of disaster feed for surviving livestock, and seed for flood-washed fields.

The anomaly of section 309 becomes apparent when we stop to recall that the United States is always in the forefront in supplying disaster relief in foreign countries. To me, it appears unthinkable that we should insist that our States pay Uncle Sam a portion of the cost for the same type of service that is supplied to stricken foreign nations gratuitously.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, since this involves an amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon the other night, which was defeated after considerable discussion and a rollcall vote, I wonder if it would be agreeable that we have a quorum call without the time being taken out of either side. I think all Members of the Senate should be advised.

Mr. MORSE. I was just about to make the same suggestion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may have a quorum call without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Carlson	Flanders
Allott	Case, N. J.	Frear
Anderson	Case, S. Dak.	Fulbright
Barkley	Chavez	George
Barrett	Clements	Goldwater
Beall	Cotton	Gore
Bender	Curtis	Green
Bennett	Daniel	Hayden
Bible	Dirksen	Hennings
Bricker	Douglas	Hickenlooper
Bridges	Duff	Hill
Bush	Dworshak	Holland
Butler	Eastland	Hruska
Byrd	Ellender	Humphrey
Capehart	Ervin	Jackson
Jenner	Martin, Pa.	Saltonstall
Johnson, Tex.	McCarthy	Schoeppel
Johnston, S. C.	McClellan	Scott
Kefauver	McNamara	Smathers
Kennedy	Millikin	Smith, Maine
Kerr	Monroney	Smith, N. J.
Knowland	Morse	Sparkman
Kuchel	Mundt	Stennis
Laird	Murray	Symington
Langer	Neely	Thurmond
Lehman	Neuberger	Thye
Long	O'Mahoney	Watkins
Magnuson	Pastore	Welker
Malone	Payne	Wiley
Mansfield	Potter	Williams
Martin, Iowa	Robertson	Young

CII——318

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to reconsider the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon was rejected a few days ago.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to reconsider.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield, I may say that because I do not want to foreclose a discussion of the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected, I do not at present intend to offer a motion to lay on the table, but the vote will come on the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 30 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the minority leader that I shall be very brief in my remarks. I hope we can yield back most of our time. However, I want an opportunity to speak a very few minutes so that I can give a summary of my position.

I shall recapitulate very briefly the argument I made the other night.

First, when a State has been struck with a flood, hurricane, drought, or other disaster, time is of the essence. I think it is very unfair for Congress to take the position that when we have bins bulging with surplus food, and a disaster has hit a segment of our population, the farmers who have been flooded out, hit by a hurricane, or have suffered from other acts of God, which have done disastrous damage to them, should have to wait for all the redtape, delay, and procedural, time-consuming work which would be necessary to get the States to put up 15 percent of the cost of the seed and feed which would come from the surplus-food bins.

If a situation exised in which a State would have to call a special session of the legislature because a disaster struck when the legislature was not in session, the expense of covening the legislature would be greater than the cost of the food. Yet the farmers would be subjected to that time lost.

I do not think I speak simply as an idealist or as a sentimental humanitarian. I cannot escape what I think is a moral principle which is involved in the matter. For the life of me, I cannot square with the teaching "we are our brother's keeper" with the requirement of the bill that disaster-stricken farmers cannot obtain seed and feed unless their States put up 15 percent of the cost. It is not very charitable or moral to say to the farmer of the Nation, "We are going to hold the seed and feed back from you unless and until your State puts up 15 percent of its cost." Let us not forget that we ship overseas—and we should—great quantities of surplus food for relief and disaster purposes. I hope my country never fails to come to the rescue of distressed human beings when a great disaster hits India, Europe, or any other part of the globe, and the victims need food and seed. What do we do in those cases of disaster in foreign countries? We empty out our hearts to fellow human beings abroad, as we should. We do not ask that they put up 15 percent or a major percentage of the cost of the food and seed before we put our Christian principles to practice. I repeat what I said the other night. My amendment is applied Christianity.

Furthermore, as my third argument, when a State is struck by a disaster, it spends great sums of money, such as my own State spent in the last great flood disaster that struck Oregon in recent months, as it struck also California and certain other parts of the West. This is not a case of expenditure by the Federal Government with no expenditure by a disaster-stricken State. When a State has been hit by a disaster we should not add to its cost a 15-percent assessment for the cost of surplus grain needed for food for livestock and seed for planting.

I have a letter sent to my junior colleague by Mrs. Jean M. Wicks, who, together with her husband, operates a small 6-acre ranch, as we call them in Oregon. This appears to be primarily a little chicken ranch, a small farm of 6 acres. She tells in a heart-rending letter what the flood disaster meant to that family. They were washed out of their worldly possessions.

She lists the following:

Gone—$2,500, shop on foundation (full of power and hand tools, building supplies, doors, windows, hardboard, etc.); $1,500 barn on foundation, also feed, $200; $250, chicken house with 30 hens; $150, small buildings—brooders, smokehouse, etc.; $150, 15 cords of firewood (last week flood took out 5 more cords); $35 trailer; $12, garden hose and tools; $80, ornaments, jewelry, small furniture; $210, davenport and chair set; $200, antique chest full of linen.

Mrs. Wicks continues by listing all their worldly possessions which went down the Rogue River in a disastrous flood.

Are we going to take the position, with that kind of situation multiplied many times—are we going to say to the farmers—"We are not going to make available to you the feed you need for your cattle and poultry and the rest of your livestock, unless and until the State puts up 15 percent of the cost of that feed"?

I cannot reconcile that with my heart strings. I cannot reconcile it with what my sense of justice and fair play tells me is just and right.

I think if we look upon the proposition from the standpoint of what I believe is our humanitarian duty, we cannot justify such a 15 percent assessment upon the States before they can get surplus feed and seed to relieve disaster stricken farmers.

I now wish to answer the last argument which was made the other night, an argument which reflects upon the States, to the effect that the States will ask for more feed and seed than they are entitled to. What happens in the disaster areas? The administration of relief is put on a State basis. The Army engineers, for example, go into the area, make their survey of flood damage, and then report to the Governor of the State the condition which they find in any part of the State. The Governor then declares the area a disaster area if the facts warrant it. On the basis of the Governor's proclamation, the Federal Government cooperates in the administration of relief in that area.

Do we mean to say that we are not going to trust our States, that we are unwilling to trust our Governors? Are we going to take the position that in an hour of very great disaster the States would chisel on the Federal Government? I do not believe it. I do not believe we should proceed on that assumption.

I close by stating what I think is the unanswerable argument in support of my amendment. Our Government under the general welfare clause of the Constitution has a moral obligation to come to the assistance of farmers whose farms have been washed out by floods, or who have suffered disastrous losses by hurricanes, or drought, and who need feed and seed to tide them over. Uncle Sam should be a Dutch uncle in some disastrous situations. Is he going to be a true Dutch uncle by seeing to it that the surplus feed and seed go into the States, without Uncle Sam taking the position that the States have to pay him at least 15 percent of the value of the grain before he will proceed to help the farm victims of floods, hurricanes, droughts and other disasters?

I rest my case in support of my amendment at the door of the conscience of each Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I expressed my views on the soundness of the amendment at the time I presented the motion for reconsideration. I thoroughly agree with everything that has been said by the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Montana yield himself?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield myself 3 minutes.

I think it is very unjust to try to compel the people of my State of Montana or any State to pay 15 percent of the cost of the feed and seed which is supplied in the time of disaster, such as has been described by the senior Senator from Oregon.

In cases of disaster, the United States does not hesitate to give stricken countries every assistance they need at such a time. It seems to me that we should be just as fair and reasonable to unfortunate people in our own country who have suffered from disasters as we are in cases of disaster abroad.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to associate myself with the position taken by the distinguished Senators from Oregon and Montana. I think I am safe in saying that, in all probability I know as much about the effects of floods and other disasters upon the economy of the various States as does any other Member of the Senate. I was acting chairman of a committee which held 13 hearings on the subject. I have seen the tremendous losses which were suffered and the extreme hardships which were endured by the farmers of all the States that were affected.

It seems to me that the least the Federal Government can do is to render every possible assistance to those persons who have suffered so much. Although bills have been introduced on this subject, considerable difficulty is being experienced in preparing a practicable bill, but I believe it can be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. In the meantime, there are great difficulties in solving the problem. Here is a situation that is simple, and contains no complexities. The question is simply whether the Federal Government wants to assist the disaster-stricken people to rehabilitate themselves as the producers, by undertaking to give them the assistance which is so necessary.

I am very glad indeed to associate myself with my colleagues in this matter.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am delighted to associate myself with the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Oregon, and the Senator from New York in this matter. I call attention to the San Francisco earthquake, when the Federal Government poured large sums of money into California almost overnight.

The distinguished Senators have mentioned our aid to foreign countries. They are familiar with the earthquake in Japan only a few years ago. In other words, if the motion to reconsider does not prevail, we are going to send millions of dollars to foreign countries, where they do not put up 15 percent; whereas, if we have a desire to help our own people, the States must put up 15 percent. I am amazed that anybody could take that position, in view of the fact that we have helped State after State, as in the case of the State of California.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Oregon. Being one of the co-sponsors of the amendment, I naturally should like to see the vote reconsidered; but there is also a practical matter involved. Last year in my part of the country there was an unexpected freeze, which caused huge damage, and farmers could not move their cattle. A year ago there was a drought and a freeze in the Midwest.

If the States are to be required to contribute 15 percent of the cost of such relief, even though sometimes the States may wish to do so, they will not, on many occasions, have the machinery to put the relief program into action. The legislatures in many States meet only once, every other year. The governors of many States do not have a fund with which to meet emergencies, as the President of the United States has. As a practical matter, by the time the States could go through the procedure of guaranteeing the 15 percent, the harm would have been done, and the relief would not be available at the time it was sorely needed.

So I think it is only fair and humanitarian that we do away with the 15-percent provision and the complicated procedures that would often stall the program, so that by the time the Federal Government decided to do something, the time of emergency would have passed.

It seems to me that with all we are doing in cases such as this, we can well take care of the matter of the 15 percent, in a humanitarian way, as we have done in many instances, not only for other countries, but for disaster areas throughout the United States.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, originally I voted along with the Senator from Delaware in the belief that a restriction on the quantity of goods would probably be a good restriction. I have not changed my belief that the Senator from Delaware is trying to make such programs more effective and better for this country, but I have heard steadily of the requirements and the needs for these commodities, and I have seen very little go into the bill that I think would reduce surpluses. I think the greatest problem still is a reduction of these enormous quantities of goods we have on hand. Therefore, even though I originally supported the Senator from Delaware, I voted the other night with the Senator from Oregon to strike that provision from the bill. I think we have made several changes that are going to make the problem of disposition of agricultural products more difficult than they have been. I think our world problem with regard to the disposition of our agricultural commodities is not easing at all. Therefore, I shall vote in favor of the motion to reconsider.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am wondering how the provision would operate. Suppose a very serious situation existed in State X, and the State called for a half million bushels of seed. Would the State itself make the application for the relief? How would the need for the half million

bushels of seed be arrived at? Would any accounting be required in any way, would there be a blanket application, or how would it work?

Mr. ANDERSON. My understanding is, and I hope it is correct, that the governor of a State would make the application. The State itself would have to make the distribution. The State itself would make its accounting to the Department of Agriculture in Washington. I do not say that procedure is bulletproof, but it is probably more satisfactory than some of the distributions we have made in countries other than the United States.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has pointed out that he considered a moral principle to be involved. I do not know how he arrives at that conclusion, because all of this will be paid for by the American taxpayer, regardless of whether it is paid for at the national or the State level. Certainly, I have confidence that the people of the State of Montana or Washington would not refuse to put up 15 percent of the cost when Uncle Sam stated that he will bear 85 percent of the cost of relieving disasters.

As for the argument which has been made that there would be too much redtape to cut before a program could be started, I point out that the provision in the bill would not go into effect until March 1, 1957. Between now and then the legislatures of all the 48 States will hold sessions. They are scheduled to go into session after the next election or in January, 1957, and they will have been in session 60 days. So any State which refused to enact the necessary enabling legislation would do so simply because it was not interested in participating in the program.

The President of the United States in his message to the Congress in 1955, asked for such a provision. I point out again that this is not a flood control or an earthquake provision. This is a drought-relief program or an emergency-feeding program. I quote the President of the United States when he was addressing the joint session of Congress on this subject on January 6, 1955:

> Because drought always remains a serious agricultural program, I shall recommend legislation to strengthen Federal disaster assistance programs. This legislation will seek an improved appraisal of need, better adjustment of the various programs to local conditions, and a more equitable sharing of costs between the States and the Federal Government.

The President of the United States has recognized that there is some need of State participation, in order that a greater degree of State responsibility might be secured.

Last Friday, when discussing this same question, a Senator said on the floor of the Senate that he would like to have one example pointed out where the program had not been administered properly. I shall accommodate him and point out one example wherein the administration of the program was not administered properly; furthermore, this example would not have taken place had there been participation of cost at the local level. The people of the State would not have permitted it had it been their own money. In 1954 we distributed, under this program, all of which was paid for by the United States Government, a total of $61,181,906.37. In the State of Texas, a drought existed in one area of the State, an emergency had been declared by the Governor, and the State was participating, with 100 percent of the cost being paid for by the Federal Government. Much to the surprise of all of us, we found that the famous King's ranch, owned by Mr. Kleberg, went on the relief rolls and drew a total of $32,585 to help underwrite the cost of feeding his livestock. Just a week before Mr. Kleberg received that relief from the United States Government, he had a horse that won the Belmont Sweepstakes, for which he received $25,000. What the people at the racetrack and the American taxpayers did not know at the time was that the horse was on relief at the time he won the Belmont Sweepstakes.

Does that example answer the question. Do you not agree with me that if some form of State participation had been in effect, the people of the State of Texas or any other State would not have stood for this millionaire participating in this relief program?

Do not forget that in addition to owning several of the Nation's best racehorses, Mr. Kleberg owns the King Ranch which embraces 1,250,000 acres or an area larger than the State of Delaware.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the motion to reconsider. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon a few evenings ago strikes out that section of the bill which deals with this subject matter, and which was brought to the Senate by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senate has been considering the bill for a considerable period of time. I know the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is hopeful that the Senate will complete action on the bill today, and certainly no later than tomorrow. The same hope has been expressed by the distinguished majority leader, and it certainly has been expressed by the minority leader and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. If the Senate starts going back to reconsider every amendment that has been defeated or adopted, the process will never end.

In addition, I think the distinguished Senator from Delaware has pointed out some of the reasons which led him and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to propose the safeguards contained in the bill.

We hear on the other side of the aisle and on this side a great many Members talk about States rights. I think it is also very important that we consider States responsibilities. When the Federal Government is making a substantial contribution—and, I think, a proper one—in regard to drought conditions, to provide feed, it seems to me the States should be able and willing to take a monetary interest in the matter, primarily because it will be more or less of a signal for them to take a keener interest in the applications that are made and in how the funds are expended.

For that reason, I hope the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to have the Senate reconsider the vote by which the Morse amendment was rejected, will not be agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield 2 or 3 minutes to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I may say that I have been deeply disturbed by what appears to be a deliberate filibuster against any effective farm legislation. I have a great deal of respect for many of my friends on the other side of the aisle, but I think they are doing a great disservice to the farmer by trying to make it impossible to have the Congress pass a farm bill which the President can sign. I think there is a deliberate attempt on the part of some of our good friends to mess up the farm bill to such an extent that no farm bill will be passed and enacted during this session.

Although it may be a cause of censure for me to say so, let me say that my Democratic friends are making it impossible to have farm legislation enacted at this session.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield 3 minutes to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say to my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, that it is well for all of us to remember the saying, "Judge not, that ye be not judged." I think it is very dangerous for one to begin judging the motives of others as the Senator from Wisconsin has just done.

I assure the Senator from Wisconsin that I am not participating in a filibuster. I think I made it very clear the other evening that I would look for a reconsideration of this matter. The parliamentary procedure was available to the Senate if it wished to lay on the table at that time a motion to reconsider the vote on the amendment. But the majority did not follow that course of action. It kept open the right of the Senate to reconsider the matter today.

I am supporting the motion to reconsider because I think it is only the just, fair, and equitable thing to do for the farmers in the disaster areas. That is my only motivation, I say to the Senator from Wisconsin. My one objective is to be fair to the farmers who are involved in disaster situations.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does not the Senator from Oregon agree with me that the net result of what is happening on the other side of the aisle will be that we shall have no farm bill at this session; that nothing will be done to help the

farmer because of what is being done on the other side of the aisle?

Mr. MORSE. I completely disagree with the Senator from Wisconsin. I think that when the bill goes to conference, there will come from the conference a bill beneficial to the farmer, and a bill the President of the United States will be able to sign.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield briefly to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the Senator recognize that I have at the desk an amendment which will take the clerk a long time to read, which is in favor of the soil bank, advocated by the Farm Bureau; and that with the adoption of the Holland amendment a moment ago, I have no intention of offering the amendment?

I also have a dairy products amendment—and this will cause deep concern to the Senator from Wisconsin—which would strike the dairy section from the bill; and at this time I do not plan to offer that amendment. I hope many Senators will withhold their amendments, so that we may bring the bill to a prompt vote. I hope it will be brought to a vote tonight.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield 10 seconds to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to say that I think the Senator from New Mexico has done a very, very good job, insofar as the farmer is concerned; and my remarks were not directed toward him.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. MURRAY. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for an additional minute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to reply very briefly to the remarks of my good friend, the Senator fom Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who, I think, gave us a very good example of a chain of false reasoning. First, the amendment applies to flooded areas and to hurricane areas and to drought areas and is not as limited as the Senator from Delaware stated.

Then let us take his nonsequitur argument in regard to the King Ranch. Let us remember that the Governor of Texas had to declare the area a disaster area. Does the Senator from Delaware think the Governor of Texas would be less inclined to declare an area a disaster area if the State were providing 15 percent of the cost of the feed and the seed? Of course he would not be. The governors will continue to declare such areas disaster areas if a given disaster, be it flood, drought, or hurricane, does in fact create a disaster. Does the Senator from Delaware wish to argue that the Texas drought did not strike that portion of the King Ranch holdings covered by the proclamation of the governor of Texas? If we are to bring relief to drought stricken areas we have to apply the relief to the entire area involved. The fact that some farmers in the area may be better able to suffer the loss than some others does not justify our rejecting a relief program to the area.

How do these programs work out in practice? I know something about them, because in connection with the Oregon flood disaster I spent many hours in recent weeks in working with the officials of my State and with the officials of the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I request the Senator from Montana to yield 2 more minutes to me.

Mr. MURRAY. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I was saying, in connection with this matter I spent many hours working with the officials of my State as segment after segment of the State was declared a disaster area as a result of our recent terrible floods. The governors do not serve as dictators. They do not exercise arbitrary, capricious power. The Army engineers go in, and the Red Cross goes in, and the Department of Agriculture officials go in, and quickly gather the facts about the extent of disaster damage. All of them look over the situation, and report to the governor what they find, in cooperation with State officials. When they report to the governor that in their opinion an appeal should be made for help from the Federal Government on the basis of the existence of disaster, then the governor declares the existence of a disaster area. Such a proclamation applies to the rich and the poor alike in that disaster area.

Mr. President, I hope we have not reached a point where we are going to draw distinctions between rich farmers and poor farmers when a terrible disaster has struck a farming community. Disaster draws no distinction among its victims' based upon economic station.

Our purpose at such a time should be to use our surplus feed and seed to try to make whole again, as nearly as we can, the area as it existed prior to the disaster. I assume that is what happened in Texas. I know it is what happened in my State.

So we get right back to the major consideration before us, which is, Is my amendment right? Is it just? Is it fair and moral?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded the Senator from Oregon has again expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will my friend, the Senator from Montana, yield 2 more minutes to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, does my amendment put moral principles of charity into practice when we say that Uncle Sam should step in and should cooperate with the State officials by providing free seed and grain to disaster areas? Let us remember that the State officials together with the Federal Government are spending huge sums of money in connection with every disaster.

For instance, consider the situation in Massachusetts, in Connecticut, North Carolina, California, and Oregon during recent disasters. Those States did not come out of such a trial without the expenditure of great sums of State money. As the Senator from New Mexico said, we are pleading that Uncle Sam be authorized to use some of our surplus seed and feed, in order to perform a humanitarian service for fellow American farmers who suffer disaster losses from flood, hurricanes, droughts or other terrible calamities that bring their farms under the terms of a governor's disaster area proclamation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Oregon is defending the right of King's Ranch to go on the relief rolls at the expense of the taxpayers, when that ranch owns more than 1¼ million acres of the richest land in the United States?

Mr. MORSE. I am defending the right of the Governor of Texas to declare an area a disaster area and to ask to have a uniform application of disaster relief made to the land, under the amendment, regardless of who owns the land.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Adoption or rejection of the amendment would in no way affect the right of the governor of a State to declare his State or any part of his State to be a disaster area. All that I am asking is that in asking for Federal relief the State indicate a willingness to underwrite at least 15 percent of the cost.

Mr. MORSE. That is my answer to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I venture to say that the King's Ranch would never have been on the relief rolls if the State of Texas had had to pay a portion of the cost. We hear a lot about State rights but far too many people forget that with State rights go States responsibilities. The advocates of State rights far too often sell their freedom for more and more Federal aid.

Mr. MORSE. Now a further word about the King Ranch argument of the Senator from Delaware. Let me say to the Senator that he is caught in the vicious circle of his own fallacious argument. The Government would still have power without my amendment to declare a disaster area. Requiring Texas to pay 15 percent of the cost of the grain would not take the King Ranch out of the disaster area. The Governor and State officials would still administer the relief program and report to the Federal Government. The Governor of Texas would continue to include the entire area affected within the disaster proclamation. The Federal and State officials cooperating with him would not have any justification in all farmers to deny disaster relief to farmers who they thought might have sufficient wealth from other sources even including race horses to pay for disaster relief. Such is not the policy of helping disaster areas and

should not be. Class conscious considerations have no place in assisting flooded out farmers or farmers who have suffered great losses from other types of disaster. The argument of the Senator from Delaware overlooks the social justice of disaster relief.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if there are no further requests for time, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All unused time has been yielded back.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	McCarthy
Allott	Fulbright	McClellan
Anderson	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Monroney
Beall	Green	Morse
Bender	Hayden	Mundt
Bennett	Hennings	Murray
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bricker	Hill	Neuberger
Bridges	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bush	Hruska	Pastore
Butler	Humphrey	Payne
Byrd	Jackson	Potter
Capehart	Jenner	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Scott
Chavez	Kennedy	Smathers
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Kuchel	Sparkman
Daniel	Laird	Stennis
Dirksen	Langer	Symington
Douglas	Lehman	Thurmond
Duff	Long	Thye
Dworshak	Magnuson	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to reconsider the vote by which the Morse amendment was defeated on last Thursday. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent on official business. I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent, and, if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness, and his pair with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has been announced previously.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—47

Anderson	Holland	Monroney
Barkley	Humphrey	Morse
Bible	Jackson	Murray
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Neuberger
Daniel	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kennedy	Pastore
Eastland	Kerr	Robertson
Ervin	Laird	Scott
Fulbright	Langer	Smathers
George	Lehman	Sparkman
Gore	Long	Stennis
Green	Magnuson	Symington
Hayden	Mansfield	Thurmond
Hennings	McClellan	Young
Hill	McNamara	

NAYS—45

Aiken	Cotton	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Curtis	McCarthy
Barrett	Dirksen	Millikin
Beall	Duff	Mundt
Bender	Dworshak	Payne
Bennett	Ellender	Potter
Bricker	Flanders	Saltonstall
Bridges	Frear	Schoeppel
Bush	Goldwater	Smith, Maine
Butler	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Hruska	Thye
Capehart	Jenner	Watkins
Carlson	Knowland	Welker
Case, N. J.	Malone	Wiley
Case, S. Dak.	Martin, Iowa	Williams

NOT VOTING—4

Ives	Purtell	Russell
Kuchel		

So Mr. MURRAY's motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Automatically the situation reverts to the point where the Morse amendment was voted upon. All time was exhausted or yielded back on the amendment, and the yeas and nays were ordered. The question now comes on the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have already been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, may we have the amendment read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, beginning with line 17, it is proposed to strike out through line 17 on page 30, as follows:

STATE CONTRIBUTION TO COST OF COMMODITIES FURNISHED TO DISASTER AREAS

SEC. 309. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no feed for livestock or seed for planting shall be furnished, after March 1, 1957, to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen pursuant to the act entitled "An act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes," approved September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1109; 42 U. S. C. 1855 and the following); section 2 of the act entitled "An act to abolish the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., and transfer its functions to the Secretary of Agriculture, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make disaster loans, and for other purposes," approved April 6, 1949, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148); the provision under the heading "Disaster Loan Revolving Fund," Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954 (68 Stat. 88); the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454; 7 U. S. C. 1691 and the following), or pursuant to any other law as a disaster relief measure, unless, in addition to such administrative costs as may be assumed by the State, the State in which such feed or seed is furnished agrees to contribute an amount not less than 15 percent of the cost, including transportation, of such feed or seed which is not paid for by the recipients thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for himself and other Senators. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL (when his name was called). Mr. President, I have a pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent on official business. I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent and, if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness, and his pair with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has been announced previously.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—47

Anderson	Holland	Monroney
Barkley	Humphrey	Morse
Bible	Jackson	Murray
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Neuberger
Daniel	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kennedy	Pastore
Eastland	Kerr	Robertson
Ervin	Laird	Scott
Fulbright	Langer	Smathers
George	Lehman	Sparkman
Gore	Long	Stennis
Green	Magnuson	Symington
Hayden	Mansfield	Thurmond
Hennings	McClellan	Young
Hill	McNamara	

NAYS—45

Aiken	Cotton	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Curtis	McCarthy
Barrett	Dirksen	Millikin
Beall	Duff	Mundt
Bender	Dworshak	Payne
Bennett	Ellender	Potter
Bricker	Flanders	Saltonstall
Bridges	Frear	Schoeppel
Bush	Goldwater	Smith, Maine
Butler	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Hruska	Thye
Capehart	Jenner	Watkins
Carlson	Knowland	Welker
Case, N. J.	Malone	Wiley
Case, S. Dak.	Martin, Iowa	Williams

NOT VOTING—4

Ives	Purtell	Russell
Kuchel		

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on

the table the motion of the Senator from Oregon to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment for myself and on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota for himself and on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 25, line 19, it is proposed to strike out "may" and insert in lieu thereof "shall."

On line 20, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert in lieu thereof a comma, and to add "and the maximum and minimum quantities of upland cotton shall be raised to 10 million and 9 million bales, and the maximum and minimum quantities of wheat shall be raised to 800 million and 750 million bushels, respectively."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minesota is recognized for 30 minutes, or so much of that time as he wishes to use.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I recognize that the amendment was not previously submitted for printing. Therefore, I know all my colleagues will wish to know in specific terms what it provides. I think its language is very simple and to the point.

First, so far as the corn set-aside in the bill is concerned, it removes the word "may," which would have provided discretionary authority to the Secretary, and substitutes the word "shall," which means that the set-aside will be mandatory.

Second, the amendment increases the set-asides for upland cotton and also for wheat.

The amendment is designed to take into consideration the very practical realities of the current supply situation, and is also designed to make the flexible price support program work.

Mr. President, the administration has insisted upon changing from price supports at a fixed level which the farmer could depend upon to a sliding scale of lower supports. It is perfectly obvious that this attitude and opinion have prevailed. In other words, we have had votes in the Senate which have made it crystal clear that the majority of the body is for a flexible price support program.

Regardless of what system we use, we want a program that truly works for agriculture and produces results in terms of higher income—not 10 years from now, but now—this year.

The administration has blamed surpluses for the inability of its flexible support program to effectively halt declining farm prices.

Excessive stocks can be removed from commercial channels for constructive purposes that will benefit the people of the United States and our friends abroad.

Removal of the threat of huge surpluses of farm commodities from current markets is an essential part of the program the administration has presented.

Destruction of surplus commodities cannot be countenanced under any circumstances. They can be insulated from the commercial markets and used in constructive ways. Such uses will include school-lunch programs, disaster relief, aid to the people of other countries, and stockpiled reserves at home and abroad.

In other words, the uses to which I refer are those that are provided in accordance with the provisions of section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1954, Public Law 480, 83d Congress; section 490 of the Mutual Security Act, 83d Congress, and other appropriate legislation.

Authority to insulate or set aside such frozen reserves should be coupled with legislative safeguards to prevent the return of these stocks to domestic or foreign markets so as to cause disturbance in normal trade. Perishable stocks should, of course, be rotated. Stocks of wheat, cotton, vegetable oils, and possibly some dairy products should be set aside after this program takes effect.

The insulation of our excess reserves of food and fiber is an essential first step in making the administration's flexible support program work. I regret that my colleagues have not paid close attention to those words, because they have a very familiar sound.

Mr. President, those words should sound familiar. They are primarily the words of the President of the United States, from his message to the Congress on January 11, 1954, transmitting recommendations affecting the Nation's agriculture.

A few days earlier, on January 7, in his state of the Union message, when the President first announced his plan of sending a new farm program to the Congress, he also commented:

> To make it effective, surpluses existing when the new program begins must be insulated from the normal channels of trade for special uses. These uses would include school-lunch programs, disaster relief, emergency assistance to foreign friends, and of particular importance the stockpiling of reserves for a national emergency.

Mr. President, if the administration's lower support program has not worked satisfactorily perhaps it is because, as the President said, "to make it effective, surpluses existing must be insulated from the normal channels of trade for special uses."

Secretary Benson apparently agrees with the President and me on the particular subject. As recently as March 5, in speaking before the National Farm and Ranch Congress in Denver, Colo., Mr. Benson said:

> A year and a half ago, the Congress passed the Agricultural Act of 1954. That act had substantial bipartisan support. It moved toward a more realistic use of the essential tool of price supports.
>
> But the Agricultural Act of 1954 is smothered beneath the surpluses accumulated under past 90 percent support programs. We come back again to one inescapable fact: The surpluses must be reduced before any sound farm program can work successfully.

Mr. Benson had the word "must" underlined in his text.

In a talk before the National American Wholesale Grocers' Association, in Chicago, on the next day, March 6, Secretary Benson quoted Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, former Secretary of Agriculture, as saying, in part:

> If we are to be fair, we should give flexible supports a chance to work in a market not glutted with surplus crops.

Secretary Benson added that the Senator from New Mexico was right about this.

Mr. President, we want to be fair. We want to provide that chance.

That is the purpose of the amendment now before us.

If the President was right in saying the first step in making flexible supports work was insulating surpluses from the market, if Secretary Benson is now right in saying just a week ago that the surpluses must be reduced before any sound farm program can work successfully, this amendment proposes to carry out just what the President and Secretary Benson have said was necessary.

If the flexible program has not worked, perhaps it is because the last Republican Congress and Secretary Benson have not properly carried out the full spirit of the President's message in 1954.

Surpluses have not been effectively isolated from the market.

The President suggested, in 1954, a way to set aside the surpluses that were then concerning him, the surpluses he and Secretary Benson say they inherited from the Democrats.

I am not going to argue that point any longer. I do not propose to argue who was right or wrong—Mr. Brannan or Mr. Benson. I have gone over this argument repeatedly. I think the time is at hand to make up our minds as to whether we want a farm bill which will do something for the farmers rather than a bill simply to win a political argument.

Neither the President nor the Secretary seems to have been willing to suggest, however, that they apply the very same principle to the surpluses the country has inherited under the Republicans.

Mr. President, I think that we have to be equally fair and candid in the present situation.

The set-aside provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1954 authorized putting 3 million bales of cotton and 500 million bushels of wheat in a set-aside, not to be counted for purposes of computing price supports, and to be disposed of in ways not interfering with normal channels of trade. They said they believed this would permit the flexible-support program to work properly.

I have outlined those points by referring to other acts enacted by Congress, including section 101 of the act of 1954, Public Law 480, 83d Congress, and section 490 of the Mutual Security Act of the 83d Congress.

All we are asking in this amendment is to not penalize farmers for the additional surpluses created under either the past or present administrations, so that farmers may not be penalized by any mismanagement that has contributed to increasing rather than decreasing surpluses.

The President's state of the Union message outlining the set-aside idea to isolate and insulate surpluses was sent to the Congress on January 7, 1954.

Stocks of commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation which have been accumulated since December 31, 1953—the final year-end report before the President's message of 1954—amount to 7.46 million bales of cotton, 385 million bushels of corn, and 124 million bushels of wheat.

That is the difference between the stocks owned by the CCC December 31, 1953, and the stocks owned by the CCC January 31, 1956, the last published report of CCC holdings.

We just ask that such excess supplies be disposed of without penalizing farmers.

Essentially, we are just earmarking the surplus into a disposal pool and saying to Secretary Benson: "This is your surplus—this is what you must dispose of."

All we ask is that American farmers not be penalized with lower prices and lower incomes while Secretary Benson is disposing of it.

That is what the President said was fair to do in 1954. That is what we say is equally fair to do today.

If, as Secretary Benson says, it was wrong to have farmers' prices suffer because of surpluses accumulated by Democratic administrations, it is just as wrong to have them suffer from lower prices because of the Benson surplus accumulated under his own management, after his administration had already had a full year in office to develop a workable farm program.

Because the administration has added a new proposal this year to reduce future production below annual needs under the acreage-reserve portion of the Soil Bank Act, we make provision for meeting the Nation's full needs in the disposal methods authorized for the set-aside, to offset any such reduction achieved under the soil bank.

Secretary Benson says his soil bank aim is to use the surplus to get rid of the surplus. The Republican advertising supporting the soil bank says reductions achieved under the soil bank will enable them to reduce the surplus by an equivalent amount.

If what they contend is true, Mr. President, there need be no hesitancy about temporarily setting this surplus aside until it is used up to make up for lower production as a result of the soil bank.

All my amendment does is to protect farmers from suffering lower prices while that surplus is being worked off. If what the administration promises is true, the soil bank should produce enough results to take care of the situation.

We just want to give them that fair chance, without penalizing farmers meanwhile.

The committee bill before us already requires the Secretary of Agriculture to submit a detailed surplus disposal plan in 60 days.

We have had a vigorous debate on this farm bill as a result of deeply held convictions that often are in conflict.

This amendment is offered in the spirit of achieving some sound improvements in the light of floor developments.

Everyone's purpose should be protecting our agricultural economy. We fully recognize the acute surplus problem. But in curing one problem, we cannot neglect another. The purpose of this amendment is to protect the income of our farmers while the administration has a chance to prove its claim that its soil bank, increased export proposals, and other programs can effectively dispose of our surplus. We invite bipartisan support as a constructive way of meeting the urgent needs of American agriculture.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will the Senator tell us what his amendment does?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. The amendment raises the set-asides. Very frankly, the effect of it would be to provide, for example, in the instance of wheat, that the effective price support this year could be about 84 percent as compared with 76 percent. It could be that. The Secretary could still lower it, under the flexible-support provision, but he would have to give sound reasons for doing so, under the pending amendment.

For corn the effective price support could be 87 percent, and it could be 90 percent for cotton. It does not bring all commodities up to 90 percent. It preserves the flexible-support structure, but it says that these surpluses shall be used under the terms of the soil-bank acreage reserve provision or Public Law 480, or section 101 of the act of 1954, or section 490 of the Mutual Security Act of the 83d Congress.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did the Senator say this would change the corn-support level in any way? As I understand the amendment which was put in the bill, it was for 250 million bushels of corn in the reserve.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is right.

Mr. ANDERSON. So the corn price would not be changed in the slightest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the word "may" were changed to "shall," it would not change it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Changing the word from "may" to "shall" would not make any difference, because the Secretary of Agriculture is privileged to ignore the whole recommendation, if he wishes to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. The prices of grain sorghums, oats, barley, and rye would be the same, regardless of what happens on the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. On the question of wheat, it raises the set-aside to how much?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It raises the set-aside from 750 million to 800 million.

Mr. ANDERSON. How does that compare with the amount of wheat there was at the time the set-aside was made originally, and a set-aside of 400 million or 500 million bushels was made?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is about the same amount in total quantity.

Mr. ANDERSON. The only difference might be as to cotton, which is 9 million and 10 million.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is right; 9 million and 10 million.

Mr. ANDERSON. At the time the set-aside was established, it was established at from three to four million bales, and there was a supply of 9 million bales on hand. Now the supply is about 15 million. So the figures are somewhat relative.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is right.

As the Senator knows so well, as the President said in 1954, if the program is going to work, we should not be burdened down with surpluses which had been accumulated up to that time.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator can make the disposition of surpluses work, he would have struck the biggest blow at what is wrong with the agricultural picture. Every comment I have seen is that flexible price supports will not work and 90-percent supports will not work with burdensome surpluses on hand. I made that point in a speech I delivered to the Texas Farm Bureau. If I am not mistaken, the Secretary of Agriculture picked that up and repeated it in his speech in Chicago this past month, and said that I was right. If we are to have a program that will work, the surpluses must be moved. If the moving of them involves a little burden on the part of the Secretary, that is not too bad.

Is it not a fact that the Secretary has succeeded in gettting rid of a great deal of dairy surpluses in the last few years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Has not that been of benefit to every farmer in the country?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It has been.

Mr. ANDERSON. Should we not try to follow that practice on every one of our surplus commodities?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was one of the purposes of setting up the set-aside, in line with the language in the bill on line 15, page 25—a surplus disposal program of orderly liquidation. The bill provides that the Secretary come back in 60 days with a program for orderly dispostion of these surplus commodities.

Instead of calling this a commodity set-aside, I think it ought to be called something like the Senator suggested in one of his long discussions, a commodity disposal inventory, placing the emphasis on disposal.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is exactly what I wish it could have been called. I was one of the few Senators who voted—as I think the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] did—against the set-aside provisions of the bill in 1954, inside the committee. I said it was merely sweeping dirt under the rug, and that we ought to say this was a commodity disposal program. We called it a commodity set-aside. The result of it has been that in the case of some commodities we have not used up the set-aside at all; but in the case of the dairy commodities, they have been used up—and I think in a good cause.

I do not care if we make the Secretary give them away; I think the farmers

will pay enough income taxes to make up for that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and also that will eliminate some of the storage costs.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think we should try to say that we will not tolerate a continuation of the surplus situation. I do not blame the Secretary of Agriculture entirely for it. I think he has bumped up against rather rough opposition in the State Department. But I think now the State Department has said he can go ahead with a program of 5 million bales of cotton in the next year. If he does, this program will become all right again.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. And if he does not, he should be punished.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from New Mexico has put his finger on the core of the argument; namely, that the surpluses should be disposed of; and, as a result of the long Senate debate during all these weeks, there should be a clear understanding of the overwhelming desire of the Congress to have affirmative action taken—as the Senator from New Mexico did when he was Secretary of Agriculture. He has not asked me to praise him, but the record under his administration is second to none.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am not asking for praise.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But I think that is true.

Mr. ANDERSON. But the Senate would not be debating this matter into the fourth week if it were not for the existence of the surpluses, because if the Secretary of Agriculture had only about 4 million or 5 million bales of cotton on hand today, the support price would be 90 percent; and if he had only 300 million or 400 million bushels of wheat on hand today, the support price would be 90 percent; and there would not be any fight between the 90 percenters and the flexible price support advocates.

I hate to see fights on this floor between those who are just as devoted to agriculture as I am and those who take the opposite view.

What we need to do is put an end to our surplus, and bring our expanding agricultural plant under control.

I am sorry that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is not now on the floor, because one of the good things which has been accomplished during this debate has been the adoption of the Holland amendment which, coupled with the soil bank advocated by the Secretary of Agricultural and the President, will help bring our expanding agriculture under control. Those are things we must do. If we can transfer a little of the set-aside, we ought to do it; but that will not repeal flexible price supports, will it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, it will not.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course, if we wish to begin to argue again against flexible price supports, the argument would last all night, no doubt, if not longer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, and I judge that argument is scarcely worth bringing up again. If it were brought up, I gather that it could be carried on for months.

My firm belief is, first, that we should implement, insofar as we practically can, at least for this year, some of the surpluses which continue to burden the market; and, second, we should dispose of them. In fact, probably I should state those two points in the reverse order, so as to put the emphasis upon disposal of the surpluses. I think it has been demonstrated that just as a result of the discussion of these matters here in the Senate, the Secretary of Agriculture recently announced that approximately 900 thousand tons, or some substantial amount, of the rice surplus would be exported—he announced a considerable increase in the exports of rice—simply because Senators have been somewhat concerned about that subject.

I do not wish to refer personally to the Senator from New Mexico again; but I can recall that recently he was on the Columbia Broadcasting System television program, and at that time he produced a chart in regard to the accumulation of rice. When it became known what the figures on the chart were, I gather that the Department of Agriculture said, in effect, "We had better do something about this"; and, as a result, action has occurred.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, the chart showed that the level of accumulation of rice had previously never been more than about one and one-half million bags. As a matter of fact, in the entire 20 years of Democratic administration—and it was easy to do; I am not trying to praise the Democrats for it—the total during those 20 years did not amount to 20 million hundredweight. Yet in 1 year we accumulated some 29 million hundredweight.

I tried to show that when the Secretary of Agriculture came into office, there was only 1,515,000 hundredweight of rice on hand, and the amount increased to 29 million hundredweight. That was not the fault of the farmer. The testimony by representatives of the Department of Agriculture, delivered in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, was that the Department of Agriculture should have imposed controls on rice in 1954. I admit that sometimes that is hard to do. The Secretary did not believe the market for it would collapse; he thought that much rice would be useful in worldwide trade.

But the point is that it was not the farmers' fault. The Secretary was doing what he thought was best. But it was not the farmers' fault, and the farmers should not be blamed for it.

The last report—as of March 14—says that export commitments made or in process will virtually wipe out the Government's surplus holdings of rice resulting from the 1953 and 1954 crops. That is what should happen to all our commodities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator from New Mexico will agree that it has been announced that in midsummer there will be a substantial export program on cotton. But what we need is to start moving these surpluses into world trade, because unless we do, one of two things will result: either the Government will have increased surpluses, with the resultant increased storage charges; or there will be depressed prices.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I see the able senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] in the Chamber. It is my personal knowledge that the able senior Senator from Mississippi has been battling for 3 solid years for a cotton export program. A short time ago the Cotton Subcommittee made a report to the effect that there should be an export program on cotton. I believe the Senator from Mississippi was chairman of that subcommittee; at least, he was a member of it.

We have been trying to get an export program on cotton. The announcement was that the export program will begin August 1, and will move 5 million bales of cotton. I say that program should have begun last year, and that movement of 5 million bales should have begun last year. If that had been done, we would now be in a very good situation—exactly the situation that, according to the Senator's amendment, we should now be in.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me say that I have followed the very able leadership of my friend, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. Certainly I agree with him that there should have been an export program for cotton beginning in August a year ago.

Let me ask a question: What is the set-aside provision of this amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would raise it to a minimum of 9 million or a maximum of 10 million bales of cotton.

Mr. ANDERSON. It was 3 million to 4 million bales; and this amendment would increase that to from 9 million to 10 million bales—just the difference for the export program.

Mr. EASTLAND. In other words, between 9 million and 10 million bales of cotton would be placed in a set-aside; is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, for the purpose of excluding it from the price-support calculations under the formulas in the acts of 1938, 1949, and 1954.

Mr. EASTLAND. What will happen to that cotton?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is to be sold. It is not to be a set-aside, as such. As I said to the Senator from New Mexico, I think the set-aside should be called a commodity disposal inventory. The words "set-aside" are unfortunate. Actually, it is the amount which it is indicated will be left, under the 1954 act.

Mr. EASTLAND. Then it is not a set-aside?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. It is to insulate it from the market.

Mr. EASTLAND. What is it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is a pool of the products that are to be utilized through foreign consumption, under the author-

ity of section 101 of Public Law 480 and section 490 of the Mutual Security Act, and in other ways that the President may deem feasible.

Mr. EASTLAND. What is to be disposed of? Three million bales of cotton have been placed in the set-aside.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. The set-aside provision, so described in the amendment, is how many bales?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Nine to ten million bales.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it 9 million or 10 million?

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the act of 1954 the minimums are 3 and the maximums are 4. In this case the minimums are 9 and the maximums are 10. We have maximum and minimums under the current law.

Mr. EASTLAND. That means we would dispose of 6 or 7 million bales.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is our hope.

Mr. EASTLAND. In what length of time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No particular length of time is stated. This is an amendment to the present act, the act of 1954. Under the surplus disposal features of Senate bill 3183, we find the following:

> The Secretary shall submit a detailed program for the disposition of surplus commodities as required by subsection (a) to Congress within 60 days after the enactment of this act, and shall report annually thereafter on his operations under subsection (a).

Mr. EASTLAND. But the distinguished Senator mentions 6 or 7 million bales of cotton.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Over what length of time is that to be disposed of? I understand this is a surplus disposal program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would hope it would be disposed of as rapidly as possible—whenever we could find the market.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Secretary of Agriculture has announced his intention to dispose of 5 million bales.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. In the year beginning August 1. What is the commitment here to dispose of the 6 or 7 million bales?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no particular commitment made at all by anyone to dispose of it, except that we are asking the Secretary to do it as rapidly as possible.

Mr. EASTLAND. Then it is meaningless.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at all.

Mr. EASTLAND. There is no commitment to dispose of it in any length of time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no valid commitment on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of 5 or 6 million bales. He says, "If the weather is good, if the sun shines, if other conditions are favorable, and nothing untoward happens, come next August I hope to announce an export program." There is not a line in writing. This provision merely points out that there is a provision in the bill which says that a Surplus Commodity Administrator must be appointed. That is in the bill now, in section 308. There is also a provision in the bill that the Secretary shall report as to how he disposes of these surpluses.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is a good provision.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to hear the Senator say so.

Mr. EASTLAND. What is the commitment to dispose of the 6 or 7 million bales, and over what length of time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no particular commitment. The commitment the Senator will have to get from the Secretary.

Mr. EASTLAND. We can make a commitment in a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall have to yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana care to yield further time to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there are two sides to this question.

I was somewhat amazed at the Senator from Minnesota bringing in a "quickie" amendment like this. No one could see it. It has not been printed. If it had been a good amendment, he certainly would have had no objection to the public knowing what was going on. It is one of those "quickie" affairs which we should not accept. Even though it may be pretty good, we should not accept it at this time.

I believe the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota is found in the platform of the Farmer's Union. It provides for an enormous Government reserve, as it is called. They ask for a year's supply of everything, to be held under Federal control, a supply so large that it would accomplish the purpose of those who believe that the farmers of the United States should be absolutely under the control and domination of the executive branch of Government. We cannot get away from that. There is no surer way to accomplish that purpose than to have constantly hanging over their heads 10 million bales of cotton, 1 billion bushels of wheat, and great surpluses of other commodities.

If we want the farmers to have any freedom at all, we will put these surplus commodities on the open market and sell them. I agree that we should have a selling program. We have a selling program. While we have been taking time talking here, the Commodity Credit Corporation has sold more than $250 million worth of our surpluses to other countries. That has been accomplished since consideration of this bill began.

I am informed that there has been a great deal of conferring today by those who thought they were going to put the President in a hole. They are the ones who seem to be getting into difficulties. They are resorting to all sorts of measures. I do not believe this proposal would ever have been submitted if they knew what it really means.

We know that there are those in this country who do not want the farmers of this country to have their own choice of operations. One way to bring about that is to pile up enormous surpluses, lock them up, and call them "reserves."

One reason for calling them "reserves" is that it sounds better when the taxpayer gets the bill for storage. The supporters of this proposal do not like to say that we are spending $1 million a day for storing surpluses. When they say we are spending $2 million a day for storing a "national reserve," that sounds a great deal better.

Some of the very people who are doing everything they can, day and night, to propagandize the country in a way it has never been propagandized before, are cleaning up on the storage of these same so-called national reserves.

Let us not fool ourselves as to what is meant. If this amendment is being offered in an effort to force the President to veto the bill, I do not think it is necessary to bother with any more amendments. Already enough amendments have been added to the bill to warrant several vetoes.

It is time for the farmers of the country to wake up, when a campaign such as the one now in progress is being waged. If reports which I receive from various parts of the country are correct, many people have been called and told to work on their Senators to get this amendment through.

I think we should wake up. If we want our farmers to remain free, we will see to it that they do not have unmanageable surpluses hanging over their heads. If we put aside 10 million bales of cotton, it will nullify everything that is planned to improve the cotton market. The cotton market is going to improve. If we set aside or put in the "national reserve" 800 or 900 million bushels of wheat, we nullify the efforts to move our wheat out, so that the time may come when our wheat producers may again plant a decent crop and make a living from it.

Mr. President, this is a bad amendment. It is bad in more ways than one. It is bad for our economy. It is bad for our farmers socially. It is bad for the Nation politically—and I am not speaking of partisan politics, either. If we wish to place our farmers in such a situation that they can never have freedom of choice again, let us go ahead and enact a sufficient amount of this type of legislation, and we can accomplish that purpose.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Probably I exhibit my ignorance, but changing the word "may" to "shall" would make it mandatory, as I understand this amendment, that there be set aside—frozen, as it were—approximately 10 million bales of cotton, and 800 million bushels of wheat.

There is nothing in it that provides for disposal. It says it shall be set aside pursuant to section 101 of the act.

Mr. AIKEN. The people who are promoting enormous price depressing surpluses are not particularly interested in disposals. The thing they are interested in is to accumulate such crushing surpluses that the farmer will always be

controlled and directed by the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. WILEY. I wonder whether I could ask a question of the Senator from Minnesota. Why is the word "may" changed to "shall," if it is not for the purpose of creating a frozen condition?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may answer the Senator's question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield 1 minute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I point out that it is in compliance with section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954. It would bring in corn; that is all. The set aside is for the purpose of the calculation of the price support level upon corn. It does not freeze it at all. In section 103 of the act of 1954, there is contained a request to the Department of Agriculture to dispose of these items, not to freeze them.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me read the plank of the Farmers Union platform which the amendment intends to carry out. It is plank No. 11, Evernormal Storehouse:

> We advocate the building and maintenance of safety reserves, equal to at least 1 full year's domestic and export needs of farm commodities and their products and an adequate dispersed storage reserve of fertilizer, insecticides, machinery and other supplies needed by family farms. This safety reserve of food and fiber should be handled in such a way as not to have a price-depressing effect upon the market. CCC should be fully reimbursed for stocks transferred to the safety reserve. The national safety reserve should be established under the Stockpiling Act separate from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

With respect to cotton, it calls for 9 million bales of cotton to be perpetually in that reserve.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. It calls for several hundred million bushels of wheat to be kept perpetually in that reserve.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to discuss this matter in a spirit of fair play and on the basis of the facts. If the Senator from Vermont will refer to the act of 1954, under the set aside provisions, he will find that we are not talking about a security reserve. We are merely amending the act of 1954. That is the act which the President himself sent to Congress, and is in his own language.

Mr. AIKEN. The proposal of the Farmers Union and the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota make no mention of disposing of the 10 million bales of cotton.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It amends the act of 1954. If the Senator will read sections 101, 103, and 105, he will find the terms of the disposal. I say in a most friendly manner that this does not concern a national safety reserve. I had such an amendment, but it has not been offered. Many Senators who have worked on the amendment believe in flexible price supports.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the difference between the Farmers' Union program and what the Senator has offered? He hands in an amendment on one sheet of paper, and the other 95 Senators have not seen that sheet of paper. How are we to know what the heading is, whether it says national reserve or agricultural abundance, or whatever it may be?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I asked the clerk to read it. I went over it 2 or 3 times. I asked for the attention of my colleagues. I tried to explain exactly what it would do. I say most kindly to the Senator that all it does is to amend the act of 1954. There is not even a tinkling of the Farmers' Union to it. I believe the Senator from Vermont introduced the set-aside provision in connection with the act of 1954.

Mr. AIKEN. This is what is called one of those little "clarifying amendments", which could tie up the American farmer for years to come. I have given my opinion on the amendment. I do not know that there is anything to be gained by talking and taking any more time on it.

If one of the purposes of offering the amendment, if it is adopted, is to invite a veto, such action is superfluous. I have not talked with the President as to what he would do in connection with the bill. I do know that there are provisions in the bill already as it stands now to warrant 2 or 3 vetoes, and possibly 3 or 4 vetoes. That would be up to the President. I say the proposed accumulation of the stocks, whether they are under lock or key or wherever they are, is bound to have a deterrent effect on farm prices in this country, and it will seriously affect the right of the American farmer to make his own choice as to what type of farming he is going to do and how he will do it.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief announcement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. AIKEN. To which side will the time be charged, and for how long does the Senator from West Virginia intend to speak?

Mr. NEELY. For not more than 2 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield two minutes on the bill to the Senator from West Virginia. We are operating under a unanimous-consent agreement, and I will yield 2 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia on the bill.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I give notice that it is my purpose to break my prolonged and profound silence tomorrow by addressing the Senate Deo volente for not more than 20 minutes. My text will be from the Sermon on the Mount, as follows:

> Use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking.
>
> Let your communication be, yea, yea; nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.

The texts will be followed by an exposition of the cost to the farmers, of senatorial blah, blah, blah for the past 27 days, when we should have been "yeaing" and "naying" and working for farmer relief.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 10 seconds?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to say that the Senator from West Virginia has certainly made an excellent point.

Mr. AIKEN. I would have yielded the time to the Senator from West Virginia if I had known what he would speak about, or if I had known he would say what he did say. What he said just now is what I said at least 2 weeks ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I did not know what the Senator from West Virginia was going to say, but I trusted him, and I am sure I have profited from my yielding him 2 minutes, as we always do when we yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

I now yield 5 minutes on the bill to the former Secretary of Agriculture, the junior Senator from New Mexico. I hope we may have order in the Senate, and I hope the Senator from Vermont will follow very closely what the Senator from New Mexico has to say, because I believe he will explain the amendment in terms that even the Senator from Vermont will understand.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota if he really feels that he must put the cotton quantity up to 10 million bales. I personally would like to vote for something that could go to conference in connection with the surplus problem. If he reduced the cotton provision from the maximum of 10 to a maximum of 8, and the minimum from 9 to 7½, I believe it would be a better amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator restate his request?

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder whether the Senator from Minnesota would reduce his maximum from 10 to 8, and his minimum from 9 to 7½ million bales.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I so modify my amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator will modify his amendment in that way, I believe I can explain why I would be interested in the amendment, and not too unwilling to vote for it. I do not believe the amendment has any connection with the program of the Farmers Union. It comes directly from the Agricultural Act of 1954. I say again that I was one of very few Senators—I believe the Senator from North Dakota and I—who voted against the set-aside in committee. I voted against it on the theory that to adopt such a provision would merely sweep the problem under the rug and not dispose of it.

The Secretary of Agriculture has launched a program of trying to dispose of surplus cotton, wheat, and other commodities. I should like to have Congress say to him, "We want them moved within a specific time." I tried to present in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a recommendation that we require the Secretary to dispose of the surpluses within 4 years or 5 years. We did not do it, and we added to the set-aside. There are provisions in section 103 that make sense to me. They provide that the Secretary may reduce the set-aside in accordance with the directions of the President.

Everything that was done in connection with the disposal was at the direction of the President. The farm bill that became Public Law 480 was sponsored in a Republican Congress. It was a very good bill, and it has disposed of a great many commodities.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I should apologize for my ignorance. The cotton is on hand. What is the real advantage of using the phrase "setting it aside"? Is it to be placed in a corner somewhere so that there can be more adequate disposition of it? What is the purpose? How much does it cost to set aside 10 million bales of cotton?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Secretary now has 14 million bales of surplus, and a visible supply of more than 25 million bales of cotton. A situation has grown up which needs correction. This is not a political situation at all.

Mr. WILEY. I did not say it was.

Mr. ANDERSON. Secretary Benson, when he became Secretary of Agriculture, inherited at the end of the crop year 3,600,000 bales of cotton. The next growing season he picked up about 6 million bales. That probably was not his fault. I should say it surely was not his fault. Quotas should have been put on the year before. He ended with 9 million bales of cotton. That is even more than the figure which the Senator from Minnesota is now willing to accept. But since Mr. Benson has been Secretary of Agriculture the quantity has grown from 9 million bales to 14 million bales. We cannot look at it forever and say is is going on forever. We have written into the bill a provision that cotton acreage is to be frozen for the next 2 years. The Secretary of Agriculture ought to know that 9 million bales should be disposed of under the very fine language of the Agricultural Act of 1954 which was requested by the Secretary and glowingly approved by the President of the United States.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator does not mean disposal, does he?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do mean disposal.

In the previous bill there was no legislative history to indicate that we expected the Secretary to get rid of these surpluses.

I think Congress, in view of what has been said by the author of this amendment, well knows that we should get rid of the surplus now. I have not criticized the efforts of this administration; I have supported them steadfastly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I must admit that neither flexible supports nor rigid supports will work when we have on hand these enormous quantities of goods. I want to wipe the slate clean and start over again.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator believe that one could support this amendment and still be true to the theory of flexible supports?

Mr. ANDERSON. If I did not think so, I would not support it. If I have not battled for flexible supports in season and out of season, I do not know who has. I made such a recommendation in 1947. In 1948 I renewed it and it was incorporated in the Agricultural Act of 1948. In 1949 I battled for it on the floor, and it was incorporated in the Agricultural Act of 1949, and I still believe in it.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it the Senator's understanding that if the surpluses are disposed of, the theory of flexible supports will work even better?

Mr. ANDERSON. They will have a chance to work. I believe they will work. I believe it strongly, but I cannot find out, because there are quantities of products on hand that will not let them work. We have such an enormous surplus of wheat on hand that there is no chance for flexible supports to work in that situation.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator, who has consistently voted for a flexible price-support program, can now support this particular amendment and do so consistently?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think so. It is like a great many amendments I have seen accepted on the floor. They go to conference. In the conference we may find they are not the last word in human wisdom, and the conferees may recommend a different disposition of the surpluses.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Would it have the effect of raising price supports?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it would, but not in the case of corn. The corn amendment, which was accepted without a mumur, automatically worked to raise the price of corn.

Mr. THYE. It would, therefore, effect the raising of price supports. Why did the Senator from New Mexico vote for lower price supports?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is a very simple question. If this raises the price support on cotton from 87 percent, and the Secretary has announced that he will leave it there next year, to about 89 percent how does that upset the situation? Of course, we realize that there are difficulties to these problems. I voted against a two-price plan on wheat. I voted against the amendment concerning milling quality wheat. I started out to support the amendment of the junior Senator from North Dakota. But I am saying that I am not going to vote for the amendment on the ground that it will raise prices. I shall vote for it in the hope that the conference will deal with the surplus question in unmistakable language. If it does not, the Secretary will have to support prices at a higher level, or refuse to do so. He has full authority to ignore the whole sliding scale, if he wishes to do so.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will some Senator yield me another couple of minutes? I asked for the time, but the Senator from New Mexico used it up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has the Senator from Vermont any time that is unused?

Mr. AIKEN. I promised 10 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if I cannot have a couple of minutes I can offer an amendment that will give me all the time I desire.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, my time has expired. I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I thank the majority leader.

I have great admiration and respect for the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, and I do not wish to be out of step with him. I was out of step with him when we voted on the question of 90-percent supports. I was taken to task because I had not seen fit to follow the distinguished Senator from New Mexico who knew all there was to know about the Department of Agriculture, because he had been Secretary of Agriculture. But I said I could not support the Senator because he wanted to go down with the farmers' prices and I wanted to go up with them. Therefore, we differed.

The Senator now proposes to go in the back door and start up the back stairs and go up 2 or 3 percentage points on cotton and corn. That is what I tried to do by going through the front door. I should like to go through the front door instead of through the back door, but I will stand with the Senator after we get up to the next landing. I shall vote for it even though it does come through the back door.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute to say that I have apparently located the real source of this amendment.

I said it was in the Farmers Union platform. It is. Apparently it originated in a report made to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on April 14, 1952, a report written by the then Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan.

Mr. Brannan now being the counsel for the Farmers Union, it is only natural that they like Mr. Brannan very much and get along with him very well, and tried to help him do the best he could with what he had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield me 1 minute on the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota on the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Some Senators have been trying to ascertain where the amendment came from. I was its sponsor, together with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. So that my colleagues may understand, we

really did not have an opportunity to consult with the legislative reference service, as the Senator from Vermont has proposed.

I hope I am not divulging any secrets when I say that a number of Senators have been discussing this proposal for several days.

My good friend, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], indicated that he was not in support of it, but he said, "Senator, if you are looking for a means to try to make the flexible price-support program a little more meaningful, why do you not think in terms of amending the set-aside section?"

I got some good advice from the Senator from Virginia. He did not agree with the purpose I had in mind, but I thank him here, on the floor of the Senate, for the fine advice he presented to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have been laboring under the impression that we were all trying to bring out a bill which would effectively deal with the present critical farm situation and yet be of such a nature that the President could sign it. I have been hoping, during the more than a year we have been working on the matter, that we were all working toward substantially the same end. I have come, in the last few minutes, to question whether we are all working toward that end, because it seems to me that the adoption of the pending amendment would so clearly place responsibility on those who urge it and those who vote for it for a veto of the bill, and would place upon them the responsibility of accepting the failure of this long-extended effort. In effect it would be a statement to the public in general, and the farmers in particular, that although we have planned many good things in the bill for them, such as the soil bank, such as the extension of $500 million more to purchase surpluses, and various other provisions, that we are going to throw them all overboard by trying to play the old shell game again with our farmers and those who handle their products.

The farmers are not that unintelligent, and the public is not that unintelligent. The farmers and the public both are going to understand perfectly well that when we set up the set-aside, which was created for a definite purpose in 1954, through the extravagant figures stated in the amendment, we will be in effect saying that by wishing out of existence, by playing the old shell game and imagining out of existence the immense quantities of surpluses, we will be creating a different situation under which a self-respecting Department of Agriculture could say the surplus is so reduced that they will put in force much higher price supports than could possibly be the case if we looked realistically at the present situation.

While I do not claim to have the great knowledge of this subject that some of my friends have, I think I know something about the psychology of farm people. I was raised among them and have been a part of them. I happen to live in one of the biggest farming counties of one of the best agricultural States of its size in the Nation. I represented that farm county in the State legislature for 8 years, then served as Governor of the State, and have since represented my State in the Senate of the United States for 10 years.

I maintain that Congress will be held up to absolute ridicule if it seeks to apply this kind of remedy at a time of grave trouble and disaster, and seeks, instead of trying to provide helpful legislation, to say that by a device, by mere shenanigans, by mere wishful thinking, we can ignore the huge quantities of cotton, wheat, and corn, such as are mentioned in this particular amendment.

I have before me the figures of the amounts of corn and wheat on hand. It simply seems to me that to say that by our wishful thinking we can wish them out of existence, particularly in the case of corn since we will probably have about 1 billion bushels carryover on hand, we shall in effect, hold ourselves up as having trifled with public opinion all this time and as having not seriously addressed ourselves to the consideration and passage of a bill which effectively, in many particulars at least, dealt with the difficult situations of many of our farmers. I do not believe we can get by with this kind of action.

So far as I am concerned, I would not want to put myself in a position of inviting a veto, inviting failure, inviting disaster, and inviting the disappointment of the good people of this country, who are looking to Congress to bring something useful and workable out of a long discussion and consideration of this bill. I feel I would be doing just that if I voted for the amendment. Therefore, I certainly cannot even think of voting for an amendment which does little credit to the intelligence of the farmers of the country and the intelligence of the general public. They will see it for exactly what it is—a device which seeks to wink at the fact that we have heavy surpluses on hand, and which would raise the price supports to figures substantially as they would exist if we had no surpluses at all.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator says "a device which seeks to wink." Was the Agricultural Act of 1954 a device that sought to wink?

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico, of course, seemed to think so, because he opposed set-asides. I did not, because I thought there was some basis for set-asides at that time. We were embarking upon a very serious and large program, and there were surpluses on hand which had been created during the Korean war, as a result of very strong appeals from the Government. We tried to set them aside.

But now the set-aside has proved very clearly that it is not useful and is not giving us better prices at all. It has not done us any good in that regard.

I heard the distinguished Senator say only the other day on the floor—and I hope I do not misquote him—that the very existence of the surpluses, whether they were called set-asides or not, was what was causing the debacle in farm prices and the great difficulties for our farmers.

I simply think we are kidding ourselves, and nobody else, for by this device we greatly increase the set-asides on not nearly so good a basis as existed when they were established in 1954, and invite upon ourselves the wrath of the people, who would say, with some justice, in my opinion, that by taking this step we had deliberately crucified a bill which still had many elements of strength in it.

Mr. ANDERSON. The situation in cotton was that we had 9 million bales and set aside 4 million. At present, we have 14 million bales and propose to set aside 8 million. Why is that any shenanigan?

Mr. HOLLAND. The first was an effort to cope realistically with a condition that had been promoted by a definite effort of the Government to invite and insist upon greater crops to deal with the Korean situation. No such situation as that faces us now.

In addition to the fact that my distinguished friend thought poorly of the program at that time and opposed it, I call his attention to the fact that it has been clearly proved by the history we have had under it up to this time, that it does not justify greater supports. To the contrary, it has launched us upon a program of even more calamitous prices for farmers. It has brought disaster to them. This would be just an effort to again try to fool people who have been fooled once, and who I do not think will be fooled again.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only seek to try to get a way whereby the surpluses can be disposed of. The Senator from Florida knows very well that I have been urging the passage of a bill which would require the disposition of the surpluses in 4 or 5 years. I introduced on the first day of the session a bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to come under the surplus disposal program.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have commended my friend on that stand and would be ready to support him in it now.

But I call the Senator's attention to this fact: By putting all these bales of cotton and all these bushels of wheat into a set-aside, we are not making these commodities more available for sale, and are not by any means dealing realistically with a program to require their sale. The distinguished Senator has, in effect, said that, as I understood him a little while ago. He said he was not thinking of supporting the amendment because he thought it in itself would be good, but because he thought that in conference, with that language in the bill, the conferees would bring out a more mandatory program for surplus disposal. I tried to quote the Senator correctly, and if that is not correct I yield to him for a correction of my statement.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is nearly correct. I said if this does not seem to accomplish it, then in conference, perhaps it could be accomplished, but if all effort fails, it will at least point up the situation and show we have accumulated five million

bales of cotton after the peak supposedly was reached after the Korean war. We have not exported the cotton. There apparently is no intent to export it until after Congress adjourned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may I have 2 more minutes?

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator will yield first, I wish to point out how ridiculous the proposals are in requiring the Secretary to set aside 9 or 10 million bales of cotton, when all the cotton owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation is 6,798,000 bales. In other words, he is directed to go out and buy cotton to set aside. He is directed to set aside 800 million bushels of wheat. He could do that, because the Commodity Credit Corporation owns 806 million bushels.

This is ridiculous. I think it is worthy of a stronger word than that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not think the Senator from New Mexico needs anyone to defend him, but first I wish to call attention to the fact that the figures have been reduced. Secondly, I point out that the Senator from New Mexico, in mentioning the large figures mentioned, in addition to the stocks already held, stocks on which loans have been made. That is perfectly compatible with figures which have been used on the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. If anyone did not have interest enough to find out how much the Commodity Credit Corporation owned before putting the figures in the original amendment, I would say the amendment was not exactly an amendment to improve the farm economic situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not care to make charges. We are all trying to make constructive suggestions. I know we are all tired. Some of us—and I may be one—are not thinking too clearly. From where I sit it looks as though this is an invitation to those who are invited to support the measure to accept responsibility for killing the pending measure, upon which we have spent thousands of man-hours, in the most serious effort made on any one bill since I have been a Member of the Senate.

I would not feel that I had done my duty to my colleagues, or to my constituents, or to the public if I did not say that, in my opinion, this proposal does not have behind it the soundness of judgment which justifies our support of it. To the contrary, we are being invited to take a position which says we do not want any bill, because I feel that it is not a bill which will receive the approval of the President.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not think any Member of this body would question the motives of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I certainly do not.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not, nor do I question the motives of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. EASTLAND. They are very conscientious, and have contributed greatly to agriculture. At the end of this cotton year, there will be about 11 million bales.

Mr. ANDERSON. Exactly.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have yielded to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am not in favor of the amendment of my friend from Minnesota, but I think both Senators are very conscientious, and both of them have rendered a real service to agriculture.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is no question about that.

In the closing hours of the debate, which has exhausted all of us—and probably the public is more exhausted than we are by our gyrations on the floor of the Senate—we are being asked to approve a provision which is poison to the bill, and which will not, after we get home and have a chance to survey what we have done, be the subject of pleasure or create any feeling of credit to those who support it. If I did not feel that way completely, I would not make this statement on the floor.

I hope the amendment will not prevail, but will be voted down.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was wondering if the Senator speaks from authentic information when he says this is poison and the end of the bill. I thought the principle of set-aside was established by the President's recommendation a year or so ago, which resulted in the Agricultural Act of 1954.

Mr. HOLLAND. It was; and for the purpose which I just stated, which was an allowance to the farmers for having in good faith brought about surpluses, which they did under urging from the Government to produce crops to meet the needs of the Korean period. That situation does not exist now, and for us to simply stand or sit here and try to wish out of existence enough bales of cotton to fill all the warehouses in the country will be to bring about a situation in which the whole public will question the sincerity of those of us who worked so hard to bring out legislation. I could not retain my own self-respect without rising to say that I could not support the amendment, and I think it would be the height of unwisdom to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has all the time been used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that immediately thereafter the Senate may proceed to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection to the quorum call, but I think it may be advisable, in view of the fact that some Senators are absent, that we have a minute or two on each side to make a statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I modify my request so that 3 minutes may be allowed on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McNamara
Allott	George	Millikin
Anderson	Goldwater	Monroney
Barkley	Gore	Morse
Barrett	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Murray
Bender	Hennings	Neely
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Butler	Jackson	Robertson
Byrd	Jenner	Russell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Clements	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparkman
Curtis	Laird	Stennis
Daniel	Langer	Symington
Dirksen	Lehman	Thurmond
Douglas	Long	Thye
Duff	Magnuson	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Welker
Eastland	Mansfield	Wiley
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Young
Flanders	McCarthy	
Frear	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). A quorum is present.

The Chair understands that 3 minutes have been allotted to each side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the Senator from Vermont desire that I yield time first?

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, we have already had no less than 16 imaginary vetoes of the bill by the President of the United States. I do not think the President will split hairs, as has been suggested here today; I think he will be fair. Secretary Benson has already promised the cotton farmers 86 or 87 percent of parity. I have no objection to that; and I admire the Senators from the cotton States because they will stand up here and help the wheat farmers get fair treatment. Besides, the Senators who represent the wheat farmers are mostly Republicans [laughter], and about the only way we can get help for the wheat farmers is through legislation of this kind.

Mr. President, last year in the committee I voted against the set-asides, and this year I voted against them. I objected to their being used as a device to rig price supports. But that apparently is the sole purpose for which

the Secretary used them in the last 2 years. I learned a lesson from Secretary Benson. If the only way we can get a halfway decent price support for the wheat farmers is through rigging the set-asides, as the Secretary has been doing, then I think we are completely justified in doing so.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have heard the comments relating to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of Agriculture which have been spoken on this floor tonight. I wish to say that the Secretary has carried out the letter of the law. The President in 1954 had the good sense not to ask that the entire stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation be set aside. He asked to have from 400 million to 500 million bushels of wheat set aside, and from 3 million to 4 million bales of cotton set aside.

Mr. President, 3 million bales of cotton were set aside. Five hundred million bushels of wheat—the maximum amount—were set aside. The Secretary was authorized to deduct from those set-asides only the amounts needed for certain purposes: donations, sales, or other disposition for disaster or other relief purposes outside the United States, pursuant to and subject to the limitations of title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; sale or barter, including barter for strategic materials, to develop new or expanded markets for American agricultural commodities; donation to school-lunch programs; transfer to the national stockpile; donation, sale, or other disposition for research, experimental, or educational purposes; and donation, sale, or other disposition for disaster relief purposes. That is what has brought about the reduction in the set-asides.

We now have 2,605,645 bales left, of the original 3 million bales of cotton set aside. The other bales have been used for barter or for relief. We have, out of the 500 million bushels of wheat originally set aside, 411,107,605 bushels left. The rest has been used for relief purposes and for assistance in foreign countries, as was required by law. The President never requested anything as ridiculous as this amendment. The Secretary has complied absolutely with the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have concluded my remarks. If the Senator from California wishes to yield back the time, that will be satisfactory to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, how have we gotten into our present position? In January 1954, the President of the United States sent to the Congress a message in which he said that, in order to make the program effective, the surpluses existing when the new program went into operation must be insulated from the normal channels of trade, and must be devoted to special uses. I could cite the rest of it; but he was telling us that these surpluses should be put aside.

Secretary Benson said, in a speech on March 5 of this year:

> A year and a half ago Congress passed the Agricultural Act of 1954, which moved toward a more realistic use of the essential tools of price support. But the Agricultural Act of 1954 is smothered beneath the surpluses accumulated under past 90 percent price support programs.

We are here today, realizing that that smothering still exists. When this act came before the Congress in 1954 we had a surplus of 9 million bales of cotton. Today we have a surplus of 14 million bales. This amendment proposes to raise the set-aside by 4 million bales, instead of 5 million bales.

When Congress previously dealt with the question of wheat, we had a surplus of 500 million bushels. Today we have a surplus of 1 billion bushels.

Have not the facts changed? If we follow the recommendations made, what is wrong with such action?

I have tried constantly to support the agricultural policy which the President has announced; but the one thing that condemns both the 75–90 percent supports and the flat, rigid 90 percent price supports is the fact that, as the Secretary of Agriculture has said, they are smothered under the pile of surpluses.

We may be uncertain about other things, but we know that if we want to strike one blow for the farmer we should start to move the surpluses. That would help him. If the surpluses are set aside so that we cannot avoid them we shall know where they are and we shall deal with them. Once before we swept them under the rug. There was no debate to prove that the surpluses had to be disposed of. This time we are insisting that there be disposition of the surpluses; and I think there should be. In my opinion this amendment would help toward disposition of the surpluses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and ask for a negative vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent and, if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness, and if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—Yeas 50, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—50

Anderson	Hill	Monroney
Barkley	Humphrey	Morse
Bible	Jackson	Mundt
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Clements	Kefauver	Neuberger
Daniel	Kennedy	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kerr	Pastore
Ellender	Laird	Russell
Ervin	Langer	Scott
Frear	Lehman	Smathers
Fulbright	Long	Sparkman
George	Magnuson	Symington
Gore	Mansfield	Thurmond
Green	McCarthy	Thye
Hayden	McClellan	Young
Hennings	McNamara	

NAYS—44

Aiken	Curtis	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Dirksen	Millikin
Barrett	Duff	Payne
Beall	Dworshak	Potter
Bender	Eastland	Robertson
Bennett	Flanders	Saltonstall
Bricker	Goldwater	Schoeppel
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Bush	Holland	Smith, N. J.
Butler	Hruska	Stennis
Byrd	Jenner	Watkins
Capehart	Knowland	Welker
Carlson	Kuchel	Wiley
Case, N. J.	Malone	Williams
Cotton	Martin, Iowa	

NOT VOTING—2

Ives Purtell

So Mr. HUMPHREY's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the Humphrey amendment was as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there is no further amendment to be offered——

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. The junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], for himself and the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], offer an amendment, to insert at the proper place in the bill the following:

COTTON—SMALL FARM ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 403. (a) Section 344 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That there is hereby established a national acreage reserve consisting of 100,000 acres which shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment; and such reserve shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of their needs for additional acreage for establishing minimum farm allot-

ments under subsection (f) (1), as determined by the Secretary without regard to State and county acreage reserves (except that the amount apportioned to Nevada shall be 1,000 acres), and the additional acreage so apportioned to the State shall be apportioned to the counties on the same basis and added to the county acreage allotment for apportionment to farms pursuant to subsection (f) of this section (except that no part of such additional acreage shall be used to increase the county reserve above 15 percent of the county allotment determined without regard to such additional acreage). Additional acreage apportioned to a State for any year under the foregoing proviso shall not be taken into account in establishing future State acreage allotments. Needs for additional acreage under the foregoing proviso and under the last proviso in subsection (e) shall be determined as though allotments were first computed without regard to subsection (f) (1)."

(b) Section 344 (e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That if the additional acreage allocated to a State under the proviso in subsection (b) is less than the requirements as determined by the Secretary for establishing minimum farm allotments for the State under subsection (f) (1), the acreage reserved by the State committee under this subsection shall be not less than the smaller of (1) the remaining acreage so determined to be required for establishing minimum farm allotments or (2) 3 percent of the State acreage allotment; and the acreage which the State committee is required to reserve under this proviso shall be allocated to counties on the basis of their needs for additional acreage for establishing minimum farm allotments under subsection (f) (1), and added to the county acreage allotment for apportionment to farms pursuant to subsection (f) of this section (except that no part of such additional acreage shall be used to increase the county reserve above 15 percent of the county allotment determined without regard to such additional acreages)."

(c) Section 344 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by changing paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1) Insofar as such acreage is available, there shall be allotted the smaller of the following: (A) 4 acres; or (b) the highest number of acres planted to cotton in any year of such 3-year period."

(d) The first sentence of section 344 (f) (6) of such act is amended to read as follows: "Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection, if the county committee recommends such action and the Secretary determined that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the county allotment among farms in the county, the remainder of the county acreage allotment (after making allotments as provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection) shall be allotted to farms other than farms to which an allotment has been made under paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection so that the allotment to each farm under this paragraph together with the amount of the allotment of such farm under paragraph (1) (A) of this subsection shall be a prescribed percentage (which percentage shall be the same for all such farms in the county) of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm during the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined, adjusted as may be necessary for abnormal conditions affecting plantings during such 3-year period: *Provided*, That the county committee may in its discretion limit any farm acreage allotment established under the provisions of this paragraph for any year to an acreage not in excess of 50 percent of the cropland on the farm, as determined pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection: *Provided further*, That any part of the county acreage allotment not apportioned under this paragraph by reason of the initial application of such 50 percent limitation shall be added to the county acreage reserve under paragraph (3) of this subsection and shall be available for the purposes specified therein."

(e) The amendments made by this section shall be effective only with respect to 1957 and 1958 crops.

Mr. STENNIS. I modify the amendment on line 4, by striking out the words "an amount" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "100,000 acres."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may modify his amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. And additionally, on lines 5 and 6, by striking out the words "equal to one per centum of such national acreage allotment."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield myself 15 minutes. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the amendment take one acre away from the States that we discussed the other day?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from New Mexico asks whether it takes any acreage from the States that are involved in the so-called small farms provision. The answer is it does not take away one acre from any State.

Mr. ANDERSON. So in effect it is an increase of 100,000 acres in the total national allotment, and charges nothing against the States of Arizona, Texas, or California?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. It takes away no acreage from any State. It merely adds the round number of 100,000 acres to the present national allotment. It does not disturb the history of the acreage allotments or the history for future years.

Mr. ANDERSON. How has the Senator from Mississippi protected the historical situation so that the 100,000 acres will in no way affect the history? Is there specific language in the amendment to that effect?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; there is specific language in the amendment. That point is expressly covered. It is the same language contained in the present law. It is language which is well understood. The sole purpose of this acreage is to bring the very small farmer up to the smaller of 4 acres, or the largest acreage planted to cotton in the last 3 preceding years. It is a very small farm amendment, and can be used only for that purpose.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did the Senator in any way take care of the situation in the State of Nevada, to which reference was made the other day? Nevada needs a cotton gin. Farmers in Nevada are hauling cotton all the way to Arden, Calif. That is an imposition on those farmers. I see on the floor both Senators from Nevada.

Mr. STENNIS. As the amendment is written, that provision was not included in the amendment, but the Senator from Mississippi is entirely willing to include such an amendment. I think it has merit. I did not have an opportunity to confer with the Senator from New Mexico, although we had conferred on it previously. I have the necessary language before me, and I shall be very glad to offer it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to say to the senior Senator from Nevada that for years I have sought to make the cotton operation in the State of Nevada a self-sufficient one, so that Nevada can maintain one cotton gin. Five hundred acres would just about make the difference between having it and not having it.

Mr. STENNIS. That point has been debated on the floor. I modify the amendment further by adding the words "except that the amount apportioned to Nevada shall be 500 acres."

ADDITIONAL ACREAGE—ECONOMIC UNIT FOR NEVADA COTTON GIN

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say that we now have about 2,500 acres. I am advised that to have an economic cotton operation would require about 4,000 acres. Therefore, I should like to offer a further amendment to increase the allotment from 500 acres to 1,500 acres.

After consultation, I offer an amendment to change the 500-acre figure suggested by the Senator from Mississippi to 1,000 acres. That would give us 3,500 acres, which I am informed will be sufficient for an economic cotton gin operation.

Mr. STENNIS. This is on a temporary basis, and applies only for the years 1957 and 1958. I call that fact to the attention of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator from Mississippi will further yield. The time can be extended in 1957 or 1958.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute in order to ask a question of the Senator from Mississippi. I am somewhat confused, Mr. President. The language which the distinguished Senator seeks to amend has been stricken from the bill. It is no longer in the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. I had understood that an amendment could be prepared to be inserted at the proper place and offered in lieu of the language already stricken from the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment which was read from the desk provided that after the quotation mark at the end of line 8 certain language would be inserted; and the language which the Senator seeks to amend has been stricken.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be inserted at the proper place in the bill and that the language be that of the amendment as submitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me out of my own time?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the amendment provides an additional 100,000 acres over and above the national acreage allotment for cotton.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct; the allotment of 1957 and 1958.

Mr. ELLENDER. And that 100,000 acres will be allocated to small farmers?

Mr. STENNIS. Exclusively.

Mr. ELLENDER. On the basis of need?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. It will be used exclusively for those described small farmers, and in the States based on need.

Mr. ELLENDER. And this will be in addition to what the States themselves will provide for small farmers out of the State reserves; is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. This special provision will be used exclusively for that purpose, to take care of the small farmers. An estimate has been made as to how much will go to each State, but it is all based on the percentage of need in relation to the entire picture.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am familiar with the revised amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi, and I, for one, have no objection whatever to the language being added to the bill.

Furthermore, I wish to take this opportunity to say that regardless of what happens to the measure before us—and the outlook is not too promising at this time, as we all must recognize—I think there will be a good cotton program this year and that we will recover some of our lost world markets for cotton. If that is accomplished, the cotton growers of the South will be indebted to the Senator from Mississippi and his senior colleague for their steadfast work in behalf of the cotton farmers of this country.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This amendment would not take acreage away from any other State. It is simply an addition for the benefit of small farmers?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I say, further, that the Senator has steadfastly urged this kind of legislation, as I recall, in the committee, and I should like to commend him. I think he is again performing a great service for his people and for the small farmers of the Nation.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator has time and again used the phrase "small farmers." Does that refer to those who have 4 acres or less?

Mr. STENNIS. It applies exclusively to that group.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I voted in favor of the amendment the other day under more or less of a misapprehension. I did not realize that in voting for the amendment I was helping to penalize the small farmer, the man who, I think, above all, should be protected and encouraged. I am very glad indeed to have the opportunity, at least to an extent, of rectifying the effect of my vote, and I wish to thank the Senator from Mississippi for offering his amendment. I think he has rendered a fine service.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much, and I appreciate his fine sentiments of support.

Mr. President, in line 10, I modify the language by changing the number of 500 acres to 1,000 acres, to take care of a special situation.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish especially to thank the Senator from Mississippi for that modification.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I, too, wish to add my word of thanks and appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi for his action in this very fine cause and for his recognition of the needs of Nevada. I echo the sentiments of my colleague.

Mr. STENNIS. I hope it will meet the situation.

Mr. President, I do not care to use any more time unless some Senator has a question to ask me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, under the unanimous-consent agreement, a motion is now in order to proceed to the consideration of the House bill; is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 12.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 12. Thirty minutes will be allowed on a side in connection with the motion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection to taking up the House bill, striking out all after the enacting clause, and substituting the text of the Senate bill, as amended; but I wish to preserve the parliamentary situation, so that before final passage, we may have a division of time for such remarks as Senators may care to make on the bill itself.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, that is provided for under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the House bill; and, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the bill will be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the text of the Senate bill, as amended.

The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, we are now considering the House bill with the Senate amendment inserted as a substitute for the text of the House bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the amendment is deemed to be engrossed, and the House bill, as amended, read the third time.

The question is on the passage of the House bill, as amended. The proponents of the bill have 39 minutes remaining, and those who oppose the bill have 76 minutes remaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as this bill now stands, it would demoralize our farm economy.

I make this statement with a keen feeling of disappointment. Many farmers have been caught in a cost-price squeeze.

They have looked to this body for constructive action.

The Senate has been debating this measure for almost a month.

Before that, the Senate Committee on Agriculture spent many months in deliberation, and traveled many thousand miles.

The executive branch has developed a constructive program.

This program should be written into law at the earliest possible moment, so that we need not spend another year under the shadow of a $9 billion accumulation of farm products.

It would be better to continue under the present law than to adopt the tortured and battered bill which is now before us.

The bill has been warped and emasculated beyond any visible resemblance to the program recommended by the President.

It scarcely resembles the bill reported by the committee 5 weeks ago.

More than 100 amendments have been offered, of which about half have been approved.

No farm legislation within my memory has had so much outward appeal and so many inward conflicts.

We claim to be reluctant to surrender authority.

Nevertheless, the bill delegates virtually all our authority regarding the wheat program to the big wheat farmers and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The bill contains a formula which raises the level of price support for grain sorghum by 30 percent in some counties, and lowers it in others.

It would completely distort the normal geographical pattern of prices.

The bill abandons parity as a principle. Parity becomes a statistical stairway to the promised land. The bill turns dairy farmers back to the dark days of 1953 and early 1954, when butter pushed the Russians off the front page of American newspapers.

It would impede our progress in recapturing traditional markets for milk products.

This bill recognizes the popularity of the soil bank, but to the coattails of the soil bank are attached a number of unwise proposals, heretofore rejected.

There were at least five major provisions in the bill which would have made it contrary to the best interests of farmers prior to today's action.

If these were deleted, the bill could well fulfill the hopes our farmers have for it.

DOMESTIC PARITY PLAN FOR WHEAT

The bill contains an amendment which would hurt the small wheat farmers.

The small operators, about half the total number, presently can grow up to 15 acres of wheat without penalty.

As it now stands, the bill would saddle these small farmers with redtape, reduce their incomes, and deny them any voice in the program.

What redress would they have?

They cannot vote in the referendum.

They could write to their Senators, whose response would be that the matter had been turned over to the big wheat farmers and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

They could write to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Secretary's response would be that he was instructed by Congress to give heed to the big operators, not the small ones.

The bill provides that the big wheat farmers can vote themselves a price which is about twice the level at which free wheat is moving in world trade.

Corn farmers will protest the excessive amounts of feed wheat dumped on them by this program.

Consumers would protest at the increased price for breadstuffs.

Friendly foreign nations would object to the disruption of their own economy.

But all these things need not alarm the Senate, because we have designated the Secretary of Agriculture to referee the conflict between the corngrower and the wheatgrower, and we would have abdicated our responsibility for prices at home or in foreign trade.

If this provision shall become law, it will be a long step toward fragmentation of the national interest.

Let us be honest about the domestic parity plan for wheat.

It will mortally hurt the small wheatgrower.

It will break the prices for feed grain.

Exports will not increase appreciably.

We are already exporting nearly to the maximum.

Government controls will increase rather than diminish.

There will still be support prices, acreage allotments, Government storage, and export subsidies.

Besides, there will be wheat certificates, domestic food allotments, and a host of regulatory devices.

The burden would fall most heavily on low-income families and small farmers.

The provision introduces a unique—and dangerous—concept of government. The proposal would divide wheat farmers and corn farmers into warring camps.

The corngrower will not willingly permit his economy to be harmed for the benefit of the big wheatgrowers.

We cannot solve problems simply by shifting them from one group to another.

TWO-PRICE PLAN FOR RICE

In the bill is another feature which has survived almost a month of debate, namely, the two-price plan for rice.

Mr. President, there are less than 30,000 rice farmers in the United States. About one-half of 1 percent of our farmers produce rice. This basic commodity brings in about eight-tenths of 1 percent of our farm income. Yet rice takes up 20 percent of the space in S. 3183.

For every producer of rice there are more than 5,000 rice consumers in this country.

Biggest rice consumers are the people with low incomes and large families.

The bill would provide the machinery to transfer nickels and dimes from the many to the few.

This program would mean more controls, rather than fewer. Enforcement problems would be complex.

We would risk our friendly relationships with Burma and Thailand, relationships which are vitally important and are already strained.

The rice proposal risks what is vital in order to win that which is fleeting. It pits the special interest against the national interest. Its advocates are concentrated and its opposition is diffused.

The proposal is immature, and its passage would be untimely.

DUAL PARITY

Parity is figured by the Department of Agriculture for about 160 commodities.

The bill before us specifies that for just 4 of them—peanuts, wheat, corn, and cotton—parity must be figured 2 ways, and that the higher of the 2 methods must prevail.

If modernized parity is right for rice, tobacco, soybeans, hogs, lemons, cucumbers, pine gum, pomegranates, and 150 other commodities, why is it not right for wheat?

If old parity is right for peanuts, wheat, corn, and cotton, why is it not right for pine gum and peppermint oil?

The shift proposed in the law would boost parity prices of the four commodities by the following amounts:

	Percent
Peanuts	19
Wheat	15
Corn	11
Cotton	1

These commodities are now all in heavy supply, except edible peanuts.

To the extent that we artificially raise prices we will stimulate production, reduce consumption, increase stocks, lower free market prices, and reduce the amount that farmers can produce.

The intent of the provision seems to be, frankly, to raise support prices. For this the parity concept is violated. Indeed, this dual approach destroys the very usefulness of the parity concept itself.

High quality peanuts of the Virginia type are selling for $50 per ton over the support level.

Let dual parity be written into the law and the price of peanuts will soon drop to the support level.

There are more direct and more honest ways to raise support prices.

Why not a formula which ties the price of peanuts to the batting average of Washington Nationals or the New York Yankees, whichever is higher? And we all know which will be higher. This could be rationalized, since peanuts are consumed in all ball parks.

Why not a formula which makes the price of cotton inversely proportional to the mule population?

This should insure a steady rise for cotton.

The possibilities in this field are infinite.

I come now to the subject of mandatory supports for feed grains. I hope Senators from the sorghum-growing areas will listen to what I have to say on this subject.

Early in the voting, the Senate adopted an amendment which made price supports mandatory for feed grains at a level related to corn. The full significance of this amendment is not yet evident. But the specialists in the Department of Agriculture have examined it, and have some interesting results to report.

In New Mexico, the support level for the 1956 crop of grain sorghum, as presently announced, would be $1.67 per hundred pounds. The amendment would raise it to $1.97, an increase of 18 percent.

In El Paso County, Tex., the already announced level of price support is $1.51.

The amendment would raise it to $1.92, an increase of 27 percent.

In San Mateo County, Calif., the already announced level of price support is $2.44.

The amendment would lower it to $2.12.

But, of course, the already announced rate, being higher, is the one which would apply for 1956.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I may say also for the benefit of my friend, the Senator from Texas, that his sorghum amendment will lower the price supports for sorghum along the Galveston coast.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I have only a limited amount of time.

Mr. DANIEL. Would not the Senator yield simply for the purpose of acknowledging that the amendment provides that in no way shall the support price be lower than the price at which it has already been fixed?

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, yes. The already announced price is the one which would apply for 1956.

The amendment would result in support levels on adjourning farms in adjoining counties which differed 25 percent from one another.

This would be true in spite of the fact that the conditions of eligibility for price support would be identical, that no differences in the support level had previously existed, and that market prices were the same in the two counties.

For 1957, supports would be conditioned on what happened to the corn program. The corn farmers would vote on this, but the producers of other feed grains could not vote. And those feedgrain producers in States adversely affected by the new formula would have no previously announced support level to protect them, as they do in 1956.

There is a normal geographic pattern for corn prices, with prices lowest in the surplus area. There are geographic price patterns for the other feed grains, and the surplus areas differ as to location. To require uniform price support levels among these various feed grains will have disastrous effects.

Grain sorghums will pile up in the Southwest, oats will clog the elevators in Minnesota, and more corn bins will dot the Iowa landscape. Feed grain will not flow among different geographic regions as it should.

Furthermore, the amendment requires detailed crop history on many farms on which we now have no data—farms on which 1956 crops are already being planted.

This provision as it now stands cannot be made operative in 1956, and if it were it would work havoc with the feed grain—livestock economy. It is a hastily contrived piece of legislation. To send the bill to conference with this provision in it reflects no credit to this body.

BOOST IN DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS

One of the brighter spots in American agriculture is the dairy business. Not everything is as we would like it, true enough, but things are improving. Production and consumption are coming into better balance.

During the past year, numbers of milk cows decreased 1 percent, consumption of milk increased 5 percent, per capita consumption of butter increased 2 percent, milk prices increased 1 percent, feed prices declined 7 percent, farm income from the sale of milk increased 2 percent.

Stocks of CCC-owned butter, which stood at 466 million pounds in 1954, and 250 million pounds a year ago, are down to almost nothing now. Government purchases have dropped.

In the marketing year 1953–54, the equivalent of 11 billion pounds of milk was acquired. In 1954–55 the figure was 5.7 billion pounds, and in 1955–56, purchases will be about 5 billion pounds. The American Dairy Association has increased its expenditures for milk promotion from $2 million to $6½ million. These efforts are paying off.

Now comes S. 3183 with a provision that turns us back toward the depressing days of 1953 and 1954. The bill as it stands requires an increase of 10 cents per hundred pounds in the present level of price support for manufactured milk, from $3.15 to $3.25 a hundred pounds. It will boost the minimum level of price support for manufactured milk from $2.88 to $3.25.

In other words, the supports would be boosted above present levels, and there would be no opportunity to lower them, even though supply might increase or demand might diminish. It will freeze a parity relationship which is already badly out of date, and will become more so. It will discourage the dairy industry from its valiant and successful efforts to promote consumption of dairy products. Why try to sell milk in the commercial market when Uncle Sam stands ready to pay more than the trade will pay?

In House Document No. 57, 84th Congress, we have a technical study of the probable effect of changes now embodied in S. 3183. According to this House document, there would be a further increase in milk production of about 600 million pounds a year.

Milk consumption would fall about a billion pounds below what it would otherwise be.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 10 additional minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr President, Government costs for the dairy program, which during the last year of record totaled $440 million, would rise by approximately $75 million.

These are figures from House Document No. 57.

The results of enacting this provision might seem advantageous to those dairymen who are shortsighted. But those who are farsighted or have normal vision will recognize the same old siren song that let their ship onto the rocks before.

Mr. President, we have an agricultural law on the books which is fundamentally sound. It is presently smothered with the mistakes of the past. The soil bank is intended to clear away the debris, so that this sound law can operate. The soil bank, as now embodied in Senate bill 3183, has become encumbered with unwise provisions which defeat its very purpose.

If Senate bill 3183 becomes law we shall be spending a billion dollars to decrease our surplus and another billion to pile it higher. What we would do with our right hand we would undo with our left. We have been using temporary palliatives to rescue agriculture for a considerable number of years. And during this time the patient's health has steadily grown worse.

If the unwise provisions of Senate bill 3183 had been left out of the bill we could have in operation in 1956 a program that would take farmers out from under the crushing surplus burden and greatly increase their income. In fact, it is conceivable that American farmers could have the best year in our agricultural history.

Now we have to rely upon the conference committees to undo the ill-advised action of the Senate. Whatever is done, however, should be done quickly. We have already delayed too long.

Presumably, House and Senate conferees will consider this bill. It is my earnest hope that the results of their considerations will be such that a sound and acceptable bill, minus the objectionable features to which I have referred, will quickly be sent to the President's desk for his approval.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the agriculture bill, which the Senate is about to consider in its final form, I think is a pretty good bill. It is not all that farmers need, but it is a step forward. There is no 90-percent support provision in it, and I think 90-percent supports are completely justified. It will provide a little increase in price supports of from 5 to 10 percent. To that extent it will give farmers some relief. The big wheat farmers of the Nation will, of course, be disappointed that they now have a $100,000 limitation on the amounts of price supports they can receive. They will be disappointed, too, because they liked a bill such as the Aiken Act of 1948.

The soil-bank provision as proposed by the President is now in the bill. The Senate gave him all he asked for, and I think more, too. It certainly is as liberal as it possibly can be in all respects.

Senators are laughing. I do not think it is a laughing matter, Mr. President, because everything the President asked for is in the bill, plus an authorization to go further.

One disappointment, so far as the administration is concerned, is the mandatory provision of the soil bank. The administration wanted it completely voluntary. The adoption of the Holland amendment makes it mandatory now, at least in part of its application. I think that is a disappointment to the administration. Certainly, Secretary Benson did everything he possibly could do to oppose any mandatory provision.

There will be a little relief for the dairy farmer. Price supports will be raised 5 percent. That will particularly help the dairy farmers in the Midwest. Certainly 5 percent is not going to wreck the dairy price-support program, particularly when the top price support will be only 80 percent of parity.

Next year feed grains will get about a 5 percent increase in supports. That will be considerably below what supports for

feed grains were 2 or 3 years ago. They will, however, still have to be at a level 5 percent below that established for corn. Certainly there is nothing unreasonable about this small increase in feed-grain supports.

The two-price system on the domestic parity plan for wheat is now in the bill substantially as proposed by the National Grange, the second largest farm organization, and the National Wheat Growers Association. Two-thirds of the wheat farmers will have to approve the plan before it can go into effect. It also will have to have the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. So all of the derogatory statements about the domestic parity plan certainly are not true. Two-thirds of the wheat farmers will not approve an unreasonable price-support program. Even after two-thirds of the wheat farmers approve, the Secretary does not have to accept it unless he wants to.

I hope the conferees will make some improvements in the bill. Not too much is needed. For the time being, at least, we have rid ourselves of one of the most unreasonable parity formulas which has ever been written into a farm bill. It uses as its major provision in determining parity the average price be received over the previous 10-year period. If there had been a depression for 10 years, the average price of that period would become the fair price for the next 10 years. Is there anything reasonable about a provision like that?

That is the reason why dairy farmers all over the Nation, when we held hearings last fall, disapproved of it. The wheat farmers disapproved of it. The cotton farmers disapproved of it. I shall vote for the passage of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as minority floor leader, I intend to vote to send the bill to conference.

I believe the bill has been encumbered with a great many unwise provisions. I am very hopeful that the conference committee will be able to make improvements in the bill. I certainly hope so.

The parliamentary situation is just this: The House of Representatives has passed one version of the bill; the Senate has passed another version. We have substituted the text of the Senate bill for the text of the House bill, after the enacting clause of the House bill. Under the parliamentary situation, the bill now goes to conference. I think we may have a reasonable hope that—inasmuch as the conferees will be interested in the problems of the American farmer—the conferees will try to work out a satisfactory measure, one which ultimately can become the law, after being approved by the President of the United States. I sincerely hope the conferees will act in that way. In any event, from the parliamentary point of view, after the conferees meet, the conference report will be sent to the House and to the Senate. At that time, we shall know whether the conferees have accomplished that objective, which all of us desire. If they have not, the House and Senate will have an opportunity to pass upon the conference report on that basis. At that time, according to the judgment of Congress, we can determine whether, in our judgment, the bill is in satisfactory form to be sent to the President of the United States, for him to exercise his constitutional responsibility.

I assume that the President's decision will rest primarily upon what will be the final form of the bill. For that reason, I shall vote to send the bill to conference, where I hope and expect it will go.

The House of Representatives will make its own determination. It may or it may not, according to its judgment, instruct its conferees.

In any event, I express the hope that in the days immediately ahead we shall have the cooperation of both of the great parties in the Senate and in the House of Representatives and their conferees, in having early meetings of the conference committee. I hope the conferees will report to their respective bodies before the Easter recess. I can think of nothing that would be more damaging to the American farmer than for us to permit this measure to be delayed until after the Easter recess and until it could no longer be of benefit to the American farmer.

So, speaking from this side of the aisle, I express the hope and I am sure I also express the hope of many Senators on the other side of the aisle, who have labored so diligently on the bill—that the conferees will meet promptly, and will make their decision, and will report to the two Houses of the Congress before the Easter recess; and that then, without any prolonged delay, that the two Houses will express their judgment on the conference report, and that the measure then will be sent to the President of the United States, for his action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I conclude by saying that I certainly hope that when the conference report comes back to us, it will be one which we, in good conscience, can support; and I doubly hope that it will be one which the President of the United States in good conscience, in carrying out his constitutional responsibility, will feel justified in approving.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at this time I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of final passage.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to have a little time in which to discuss the bill, before the final vote is taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Certainly. How much time does the Senator from South Dakota wish me to yield to him?

Mr. MUNDT. Approximately 3 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I would not want this measure to go to a yea-and-nay vote with the words of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] still ringing in our ears, so as to lead Members who perhaps are not on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and perhaps have not followed the bill through its various stages during the long and tumultuous debate we have had, to believe that the bill is anywhere near the undesirable piece of proposed legislation that the Senator from Vermont in his pessimistic view of it has described it as being.

Personally, I do not think it is as good a bill as it was when it was brought to the floor of the Senate from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. As the bill was reported by the committee, it contained provision for a twofold program of conserving acres and reducing acres while at the same time providing price supports, which would have worked fairly well in the next 2 years.

But in the early stages of consideration of the bill on the floor of the Senate, the support program we in the committee had provided in the first two sections of the bill was annihilated and removed from the bill. Subsequently, some patches were put on, which moved back in the direction of better price supports. Some conceptions were included to move in that direction, although I do not believe they are going to be as effective as the 90 percent provisions would have been if we had kept them in the bill. Some of the same Members who voted against maintaining price supports by the two sections we in the committee wrote into the bill, voted to put them back in my some awkward mechanisms which I predict, will not serve the farmer or the country as well as the price supports we incorporated in this bill in our committee. But, Mr. President, that is the way the democratic process works. In this legislative business, no one gets everything he wants. Frequently—indeed usually—we reach our decisions through such compromises. Certainly we have a clear demonstration of that in this measure.

In the United States there are three major general farm organizations of longstanding records of public service over the span of many years. Any one of those three organizations now can go to its constituent members and can say to them with pride, "Look at what we succeeded in having put into the Agricultural Act of 1956"; and the presidents of the two rival organizations can say, "Yes, that is true; but look at the battles you lost"—because certainly a bill of this

sort is not the creation or the brainchild or the product of any particular organization, nor need it become the anathema of any organization. Each organization contributed to its final forum; each, likewise, opposed certain provisions it now contains.

For example, Mr. President, consider the oldest of the farm organizations, the National Grange. It finally found itself at a point where it could applaud the incorporation in the bill of the 2-price system which it has advocated for many, many years; and we voted to provide for that system in the bill, in the case of rice and in the case of wheat. Certainly that should be a cause of gratification for the Grangers of America, who for so long have advocated this approach so persistently.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I suppose however the grangers look askance at the dual parity formula for which we have provided in the bill, and also at some of the price-support mechanisms. But they have been put into the bill. The members of the grange will find in the bill some things they like and some things they do not like, just as the Department of Agriculture will find and just as the President will find, and just as Senators already have found, in connection with our action in bringing the bill up to the point of passage that it has features which most of us both approve and disapprove. That is also true from the standpoint of both the Republican and the Democrat Parties.

Consider the American Farm Bureau. I believe it claims to be the largest of the farm organizations. It is not the largest in the particular area of the country from which I come, but certainly it is a great and distinguished fam organization. At its national conventions, its officials and other members can certainly give speeches which will ring the rafters with paeans of praise over the fact that it succeeded in having a compulsory soil bank provision put into the bill, because in an amendment adopted today we made soil-bank participation compulsory. In the main, the American Farm Bureau can also take great pride in the corn program, because many farm bureau officials felt that this particular approach to the corn program and the corn problem was better than a provision for 90 percent. But on the other hand, some officials of the American Farm Bureau will point to the bill and will say, "What a calamity. Look at the dairy provision"—which the committee wrote into the bill, and which I am happy to say has remained in the bill. The members of the farm bureau also will say, no doubt, "What a calamity that the bill contains the price-support mechanisms"—written in by the Humphrey amendment, near the concluding stages of our action on the bill. And no doubt they will say, "What a calamity that the provision for dual parity is in the bill." But, Mr. President, like the grangers, they will find that they won some battles and lost others. That is America; that happens to us all.

And then there is the Farmers Union. During several days of the debate, there was considerable discussion and colloquy regarding the Farmers Union, touched off by a speech by the senior Senator from Florida. It is a large and representative and responsible farm organization; and in certain areas of the country, primarily in those which raise wheat, and perhaps in those which raise corn and livestock, the Farmers Union is a very strong and active organization. It can look with real pride to the fact that provision for dual parity has been retained in the bill as it was written in committee. Dual parity is something the Farmers Union members believe in. Just as there are other special ideas that other farm organizations have, the Farmers Union has felt that dual parity is essential and necessary. Its members will be happy and will smile a bit about the upward trend of price supports, even though at their conventions they will bemoan the fact that 90 percent price supports on the basic commodities have been eliminated from the bill. So, like the Grange and the Farm Bureau, the members of the Farmers Union have won some battles and have lost some others. This bill as we now have it before us, Mr. President, wears no man's collar and is the product of many minds. It incorporates constructive proposals from every farm organization.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will support this measure overwhelmingly, and will send it to conference. I join the distinguished minority leader in the hope that in the conference, the conferees will act in such a way as to turn the frowns of some of the farm organizations into smiles, and will tone down some features a little, so there will be a composure and a concern which will enable the conferees to return to us a conference report for which all of us can vote, and which will work in the direction of increasing farm income in 1956 and in the succeeding years, and will be a measure which the President will sign. The conferees have the raw material with which to work. In the proper spirit of give and take, they can improve this bill tremendously. They can eliminate certain weaknesses, they can refine hasty language, they can reconcile differences, and they can avail themselves of expert counsel on any features which raise serious doubts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that I hope all this is done before the Easter recess is taken. I think Congress needs an Easter recess; but I think America needs a farm bill worse than Congress needs a recess. If there is any tendency in the other body to drag heels or to delay action in conference, I suggest that we abandon the Easter recess, rather than abandon the idea of having a new farm bill for the farmers to use in the crop year 1956. Time is running short but there is still time to complete this task by Easter—and we should resolve to stay here in session until conference approval is completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if agreeable to the Senator from Texas, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in my comments on the bill, I neglected to say that we should not assume that the bill cannot be cleaned up in conference and made a decent bill to be sent to the President. It is my hope that it can. For that reason, I shall vote to send the bill to conference.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall vote for the bill reluctantly and with considerable, shall I say, trepidation, or something of that sort. I have seen more inconsistency on the floor of the Senate in connection with the bill so far as basic principles are concerned than I have seen in a great many years. I have been disappointed in the fundamental attitudes of a great many people. The bill is a hodgepodge of political manipulation and political distortion.

It is unfortunate that we must approach a fundamental economic problem such as the farm problem with the political twists which have been put on the bill. I only hope that in some way in conference we shall be able to arrive at a sound and equitable bill. I say I hope so. I am not so sanguine as to express the idea tonight that we shall.

Fundamentally, Mr. President, agriculture is utterly basic to the prosperity of this country. For many years I have decried the fact that the problems of agriculture have been approached on the basis of treating symptoms instead of the disease itself. We had an opportunity in the pending bill when we started its consideration to treat the fundamentals, not the symptoms.

Unfortunately, as the bill now stands, we have treated the symptoms, not the fundamental causes of the disease. Perhaps it is politically expedient to do that. I do not know. To me it is offensive.

I can only hope that in the minds of men of good will and sincerity we may find an area of compromise and settlement which will give us an acceptable bill.

For that reason I shall vote for the bill tonight. I shall not vote for it because it is a good bill. I think that

fundamentally it is probably the worst agricultural bill that has been passed by the Senate. It has been influenced by political manipulations which are almost beyond belief, if we consider the fact that we should act from the standpoint of the best interests of agriculture.

Be that as it may, we have now reached the point of voting on the bill. While there are provisions in it that will be of some assistance to my section of the country, there are also provisions in the bill which will be of disservice to the very sections represented by Senators who voted for them. When they analyze those sections, they will find that they voted a disservice to their sections.

I do not wish to do a disservice to any section of agriculture in this country. I have voted for some provisions from the standpoint of the welfare of my area for which, perhaps, I could be criticized. Nevertheless, I believe that the fundamental philosophy of agriculture should be the guiding motive, not what political advantage will accrue to those who have emotionally evangelized their people as to what they have done for agriculture.

Mr. President, I believe we are making a mistake, not in voting for the bill, because that is all over the dam, but in letting ourselves to be led as a body into particular political areas where we believe we can get a little advantage locally, but by which we do things to agriculture instead of things for agriculture. That is what we have done in the bill. I believe we have so classified and characterized the bill that no one can now look on it with a feeling of pride.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I venture to say that there is not a Member of the Senate—perhaps I am wrong—who can look at the result of his vote tonight with the feeling of personal satisfaction and personal pride that he has voted for or supported a bill which in the long run will be good for agriculture.

We may take some comfort in saying, "I got this little piece out of it." However, in getting a particular little piece, I believe most of us are bound to admit that we have sacrificed the general welfare of agriculture to the sectional selfishness of a little bit of local advantage in some particular. If anyone can get any comfort out of that, bless him in his comfort. If anyone can get any benefit out of the fact that he feels he can go to his own constituency and say, "Look what I did for you in this little part of the bill," let him get comfort out of it. I derive no comfort from the fact that I may have obtained a little advantage for a particular locality, to the detriment of the whole economic structure of agriculture. We might as well face it.

I shall vote for the bill tonight, not because it is a good bill—it is a bad bill for agriculture in the main—but in the hope that in conference there will be a sufficient amount of unselfishness to bring out a good bill. I hope the conference committee does not go to Europe for 2 or 3 weeks to avoid action on the bill in conference. I hope there is enough responsibility in the conference committee to avoid that kind of situation, and that the conference will meet immediately. I shall vote for the bill in the hope that out of conference will come a bill that will do something for agriculture instead of something to agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, of course, I am disappointed that the Senate did not enact the bill as reported by the committee. However, I am not really surprised at either the number or outcome of votes that have been taken. It is now my hope that the bill can be sent to conference, and that the conferees will sit down together and, with this bill as a foundation, agree upon a measure that will be acceptable to both Houses of Congress and to the President.

Mr. President, I am not as much of a pessimist as my good friend from Vermont seems to be. He has complained about a number of provisions in the bill. Of course, he has had every opportunity to move to strike out the sections of which he now complains. For example, he tonight has referred to the milk section and has indicated that portion of the bill is terrible. He paid his respects, too, Mr. President, to the two-price plan for rice and has complained about the space it occupies in the bill. However, Mr. President, he did not attempt to strike either of those sections from the bill. In these two provisions of which he complains, his opposition was not translated into motions to strike the offending provisions from this legislation.

As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and as chairman of the Senate conference committee, I shall do all I can to see that a workable and effective conference report is sent to both Houses, I will do my best to see that both the House and the Senate have an opportunity to vote on a conference report before Congress takes an Easter recess. I have already taken up this matter with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House [Mr. COOLEY] and he indicated to me some time ago that he would do his utmost to have the committee on conference meet at an early date, to the end that we can have a farm bill enacted as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, as soon as this bill is passed by the Senate, I hope to ask for a conference with the House, that we insist on the Senate amendments, and that conferees be appointed. According to the views expressed by my good friend the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], it will be almost impossible for us in good faith to insist on all our amendments—at least, he has declared that many of them are bad. However, again I am an optimist. I do not share my friend's dark views. I think this is a good beginning, and I believe the conference report will please the majority of Senators. Of course, I do not think we can please everybody. When we held hearings in the fall we could not get unanimity of action or thought as to this bill from the organizations or from the farmers, and we had, as all Senators know, much difficulty in getting unanimity on enough of the provisions of the bill before the committee to have it brought before the Senate. Therefore, it would be foolish to expect the committee on conference to agree upon a report that would please everyone.

Let us hope that with the bill we shall pass as a starting point, although some of my good friends on the other side of the aisle have spent considerable time lambasting some of its provisions, we shall be able to reach agreement with the House conferees within the next 2 weeks on a conference report, one the Senate shall be able to complete action upon before the Easter recess.

I have done nothing since last November but work on the farm bill, and I am not one who gives up. I believe we have material on hand which we can get to work on in conference. I reemphasize that I shall make every effort to start this week with a conference on the bill. I believe that if the conferees will get together and make up their minds that they want a report, we can have a conference report ready for action by both Houses before the Easter recess. It will take much work and long hours, but it can be done. We have come too far since the fall to permit ourselves the luxury of foot-dragging at this point.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senate from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall vote for the bill. I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but I am a farmer. I know what the problems of the farmer are. I believe I know the cure for the problems. I am conscious of the fact that it is no easy matter to effect a cure. The immediate problem, of course, is to get rid of the existing surpluses. The next problem is to make certain that we do not accumulate in the immediate future other surpluses, because of our ability to produce agricultural products. The reason we have low farm prices is that we have a great capacity to produce agricultural commodities to an almost unlimited extent. Our capacity to produce is due to our having tractors and fertilizer and all kinds of new seeds. All that hangs as a threat over the price structure of America.

Therefore, we have two immediate problems. One is the surplus problem, and the other is the problem of keeping down the surpluses, so that prices in the open market may rise to where they belong.

I am not wise enough to know whether we have done that in the bill we are about to pass, because I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. However I do wish to say that in my opinion we have done in the pending bill as good as job as we could have done—or perhaps should not have done—depending on the viewpoint of Senators. However, we have not as yet touched the fundamental cause or a fundamental cure. There is only one cure for the farm problem, and that is increased production and increased consumption. We cannot cure the farm

problem by cutting the farmer's production.

If the best we can offer to the American farmer is a reduction in his production and perhaps a slight increase in his prices by taxing the American people and by paying subsidies, then we are not living up to our responsibilities. I do hope that we may have adopted rules and regulations or passed a law which will get rid of existing surpluses. I hope so.

We may likewise, through the soil bank and other amendments, temporarily cut back production, which likewise will raise prices. But, Mr. President, if that is all we have to offer the American farmer, if that is all we have to offer the American people—reduce production and reduce markets, while other segments of our industry are increasing—we had better beware, because we have not solved the problem.

Mr. President, I shall introduce tomorrow, or at least before this week ends, a bill which I hope every Senator will join with me in passing. The reason why I have not introduced it is because I did not want it to be an amendment to the present bill. The bill which I shall introduce will increase the uses for farm products, will increase consumption of farm products, and will increase the income of the American farmer by giving him more, not less. I hope that when I introduce it, it will not be considered as political. I shall invite every Senator on both sides of the aisle to join with me on this bill. It will increase the uses of farm products, thereby making the farmer more prosperous by virtue of more consumption instead of less consumption.

I am aware of the fact, of course, that Senators on both sides of the aisle take credit for the soil bank. That, of course, is nothing more nor less than reducing the production of the American farmer. I am in favor of the soil bank, because we must reduce the surpluses, or we shall not increase farm prices.

I hope the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will hold hearings on my bill and that the Senate will pass it in order that we may do something constructive for American agriculture by increasing production because of new uses for farm products.

Senators will be amazed by what the Department has in its laboratory and what private industry is at the moment in position to do and what it will do if it is given an opportunity to do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I suggest that we pass the farm bill tonight and send it to the House, that the conferees get together on the best features of the bill, and particularly get together on those things which will reduce surpluses and those things which will hold down production temporarily, and then, that the Congress, without any thought of politics whatsoever, will do what is necessary to find new uses for farm products in industry. Thereby we shall be serving the American farmer and the American people. I am confident of that.

Mr. President, when I introduce my bill tomorrow I hope every Senator on both sides of the aisle will join with me and that hearings will be held on the bill in order to make certain it contains the proper language and will do what we believe it will do, namely, increase the income of farmers and increase their production, rather than to depress farm prices.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I do not assume for a moment that this bill will not come out of conference a good bill. I have faith in my friends in the House and in my colleagues in the Senate, and that hope and faith will be abiding until I find that I am wrong. I shall always be grateful to this body of Senators who gave me a vote on my amendment. I know the people of Idaho will want to know whether we have done a good job for those who have an oversupply of dried beans, fruits and vegetables, onions and potatoes, row crops, and dairy products.

I hope we shall remember the words used by the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] the other day when he stated that the farmers are likely to take a new look at the so-called basic commodities that seem to control the farm economy of this Nation. After all, our Nation was built on the small-family farm. I wonder if we have done our duty here. I hope and pray that we have, but, somehow, I feel that we have not.

Mr. President, as a first-term Senator in this august body, permit me, as a farmer, to give the Senate this word, if I may. I think it is time that people who are not farmers keep their noses out of the farmers' business. I mean by that, the middlemen, the makers of increases in freight rates, and the tremendous number of things which have brought about the dilemma of the American farmer, whether he be big or small.

Mr. President, I shall vote for this bill. It is not what I wanted, but I do not think 10 percent of the Senators on the floor understand the bill and the great number of amendments which are attached to it. But I have faith and confidence in my colleagues, and I know they will do what they think is best for their States and for their Nation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, when this bill was reported to the Senate and the first amendment was passed by a vote of 54 to 41, I fully intended to vote for the bill with that amendment. After these days of discussion we have just heard the report of the Senator from Vermont as to what he thinks of the bill in its present form. He has labored over it, as have other members of the committee, conscientiously and faithfully.

But the result of the labors of the Senate is a bill so full of amendments as to make it really and completely unacceptable to him. I believe his views reflect the views of the Department of Agriculture, and they would agree with the fine statement made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on the floor a few minutes ago.

We are asked, in view of that statement and other statements about the imperfections of the bill, to put our faith in the House of Representatives, and to hope that the conferees will produce a conference report which will be acceptable to us, although this bill is not. Certainly I can see little reason to place one's faith in the other body on this issue, when they have sent to the Senate a bill which is even less acceptable than is the bill in its present form.

I simply say that I cannot reconcile the thought that we must place what many Senators feel to be our failure in the hands of the other body or to join with them in trying to make something good out of two bad bills.

So very reluctantly I shall vote against the bill in its present form, hoping that a miracle may happen, and that the conference report may be adopted in such a form as may be acceptable to us, as was the bill itself after the first amendment had been adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the bill as it was reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was undoubtedly a great improvement over the present farm bill. I regret exceedingly the fact that the 90 percent of party provisions were generally stricken from the bill as it came from the committee. I had hoped the bill would be improved instead of weakened.

It was very encouraging to hear the statement of the distinguished chairman of the committee that he intends to fight for some of the provisions which were eliminated, and to press for a strengthening of the bill in the committee of conference.

I hope the conferees will consider that what we are witnessing today is almost the same as that which happened in 1929.

Then, as now, stock market prices were soaring. Dividends were soaring. But there was a soft spot, and that soft spot was in the farm economy. The recession that began on the farm spread to the towns and cities, and we went through the terrible crash which all of us hope will never occur again.

I have been in the farm areas, and I know what I am talking about. The farmers are really hurting. Millions of small farmers are being squeezed out of production. Those not so small are barely hanging on as they see their reserves of money diminish in ever-decreasing income.

Already the second phase of this recession is noticeable. It has spread to the small towns and villages of the Nation, ordinarily the most stable point of our economy. There has been a reduction in revenue for those industries serving the farmers. Unless we put a halt to the trend, there will be additional suffering, and the cycle will have really started swinging—a cycle which we know from experience is exceedingly hard to stop.

Senators know what I have tried to do about the farm bill. Along with others of our colleagues, I worked for establishing a support program based upon a graduated income plan, with 100 percent supports up to $7,000 of gross income; 90 percent up to $20,000; and 75 percent up to $50,000.

Some persons think a high support program is only an interim step-by-step measure. I feel, however, that we should have a permanent Government policy and program which will try to keep farm income on a full parity with other segments of the econmy. Let me make this clear: I think our laws and their administration should be aimed at the objective of keeping the farmers on a full parity basis. The farmers are entitled to the stability which would come from a long range program of this kind.

The amendment giving special relief to the small farmer is at least a start toward this objective.

Such support for the small farmer is gaining strength all the time. While it may not be adopted at this session, I know it has merit and eventually will be adopted.

I urged the adoption of an incentive payment plan for hogs and livestock to encourage marketing at lower weights. I urged the food stamp plan for distribution of the surplus, and a strategic reserve plan for removing some of the stocks from the surplus where they tend to reduce the market.

I believe that this, along with other features of the present farm bill, would have been a good program. The Senate, however, did not adopt these proposals and other proposals which I supported along with many other Senators.

I now make a final plea. We have not taken the steps which many of us thought would improve and stabilize the farm economy.

At least, I hope the conference committee will take the step of continuing 90-percent supports for a limited period, while we have time to stop and take stock.

At least, let us try to stop the downward spiral now and pull the farmer through this year's crops.

Ever since Secretary Benson took office he has been telling us that finally prices have stabilized and the farm prices are substantially solid. But ever since he has had free sway with his program of reduced supports, the fact is that farm prices have been falling. Every time he has said the market was stabilized, parity has dropped a little more.

Unless we stop the drop now, with a high support for a limited period, at least, we shall live to regret it.

I shall vote for the bill, even though I think it most inadequate. However, there are some worthwhile features of the bill, and there is the hope that the conference committee will bring out a measure that will give more substantial relief to the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think I am by nature an optimist. Being such, I shall certainly draw as fully as I may upon my optimism to vote for this measure, about which I have very grave doubts, and many of whose provisions I think are exceedingly unwise, in the hope that the bill may be returned from conference in better condition.

Certainly I have no feeling at all of infallibility, and I do not believe any other Member of the Senate has. I cannot refrain, however, from expressing the hope that a much sounder bill will be returned from conference than we now have before us.

Generally when I vote for a measure on final passage, it is because I have the conviction that it is sound and should prevail. I regret to say that I do not have that conviction with reference to this bill. I shall vote for it only in order that it may go to conference, and with the expressed hope that it may come back to us in much better shape than it is in now. I have added this statement tonight because when I vote for a bill on final passage, I generally like to feel so sure of the rightness of my position that I expect to see it through, even to the extent of voting to disapprove a veto by the President, if that should ensue. I think my voting record in the Senate will so indicate.

In the present instance, I wish to leave the record perfectly clear on this point. If some of the errors, which I think to be very grave expressions of poor judgment, and conclusions that not only will not bring solutions to hard-pressed agriculture, but instead will worsen their situation, shall remain in the bill, I reserve the right not only to vote against the report which will come back from conference, but if what remains in conference report may be adopted and relied upon as ground for disapproval of the bill by the Executive, I reserve the right to vote to sustain such disapproval, because I think that unless several very bad features are eliminated from the bill, instead of having brought relief, help, and succor to agriculture, we will instead actually have worsened their situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, this nation is enjoying the highest national income in its history. There are more people employed at higher wages than has ever before been experienced in this land.

Unfortunately, agriculture does not share that kind of income. That is the one reason why I have endeavored, in my efforts, to raise the supports in the basic commodities. I know that the high support prices on the basics will have a reflection into the nonbasics.

Mr. President, we need to examine some of the national facts in order to understand and appreciate what we are endeavoring to do in enacting farm legislation. In 1947, the national income for agriculture was $17,200,000,000. Today, in 1956, it stands at $10,200,0000,000.

If we further examine the records, we will find that in 1947 the farmer enjoyed 54 cents of the market-basket dollar. Today the farmer receives out of the dollar spent for the food basket only 39 cents. What has happened to the farmer's income?

Mr. President, the farmer today is mechanized. His every turn is dependent upon industrial output, whether it be for tractors, fuel, or any other operating supplies. If he is competing in the inflationary market for all the things he must have with which to operate, and if he is then receiving extremely low income, for how long will the farmer be able to remain solvent? If the farmer does not remain solvent, how long will it be before the local merchant on Main Street will meet with a dropoff in his business? Could it not endanger the entire economy in the future?

These are the facts which motivated me to vote for the 90-percent supports on the basic commodities. These are the facts which motivated me to vote for an 11 cents per hundredweight increase in the dairy price supports.

Let us examine the record again, Mr. President. In 1954 the Secretary of Agriculture dropped the supports on dairy products from 90 percent to 75 percent. What effect did that have on the producer of milk which is used in the manufacture of butter, powdered milk, cheese, or casein, which are sold on the national market? It dropped his price 59 cents a hundredweight. Has his previous higher price returned? It has not. At present—in 1956—the farmer's price for fluid milk used in the manufacture of butter, cheese, and powdered milk is lower than it was in the spring of 1954, when the price dropped from 90 percent to 75 percent.

Mr. President, these are the facts which motivated me to vote contrary to the wishes of my administration and contrary to the majority of my Republican colleagues.

I come from a highly surplus-producing agricultural area. The people of that area are not protected by the Federal milk-marketing orders, as is true in the East, where it is advantageous to have cheap feed because there is a market for his dairy products. Here the markets are controlled, and competition does not disturb the producers to any extent. But in my area the producers are dependent upon the sales of the manufactured dairy products, such as butter, cheese and powdered milk in the national markets.

Mr. President, this is not as bad a bill as has been reported by the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Bear that in mind, and do not be too badly misled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, no one can quarrel with the statistics given by the able Senator from Minnesota, but he gives us what the problem is and does not give us the cure. The only cure offered is that the Government, through support prices, buy the products from the farmers. If that is all that we as Representatives and Senators can offer the American farmer, God help us. I am a farmer, and I would want to get out

of farming if I had to have the Government guarantee my sales.

The second thing I wish to say is that we have had 90 percent support prices on commodities except dairy products. On the basics, except for the crop-year of last year, there were support prices of, I think, 82 percent on wheat and 87 percent on corn. Do not let anybody fool us that 90 percent support prices had anything to do with this matter one way or the other, because they had not had anything to do with it one way or the other. If all we have to offer the American farmer, that great individualist, who is a private enterpriser, who owns his own farm, is guaranteed prices to be paid by the American taxpayer, then we had better quit, because the farmer does not want it or like it. What the American farmer wants is 100 percent in the market place, without any subsidies or controls by the Government. Do not let anyone fool us about that, and we are not fooling the American farmer. We may fool him temporarily, but we would be fooling him only temporarily. I hope tomorrow we can get down to the business of doing something for the American farmer that will result in more consumption, more markets, and more production, instead of less, and instead of guaranteed markets, subsidies, and prices.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Minnesota, but I hope he and his colleague will come to some agreement and let us vote on the bill. I yield the Senator from Minnesota 2 minutes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the only reason I asked to be recognized is that I could answer my distinguished and good friend from Indiana. This bill contains the first realistic approach to getting rid of our surpluses which have been accumulated over the years. Until such time as that is done, the markets will never be anything but weak. The soil bank is the first realistic approach to the problem of surpluses. Had it been put into effect 2 years ago, we would not today be confronted with the huge surpluses which we have in this country. However, there is no promise in the soil bank that any relief will be given the farmer in 1956. It was for that reason that I voted for the 90 percent supports for 2 years, notwithstanding that the soil bank will eventually affect the surpluses.

We have voted for the most realistic and sound agricultural bill which has ever been drafted to deal with the Nation's farm surpluses, because of the inclusion of the soil bank provision. Ninety percent supports were proposed to assure the farmer that there will be some semblance of balance between his income and that of the rest of the Nation until the soil bank can effect a reduction in the surpluses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall not yield any more time for debate of Senators with each other. I am a great believer in the 133d Psalm, "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity," and I hope the rest of the debate will be on the unity theme.

Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to point out the effective workings of democracy. I told the majority leader I did not desire that he yield me any time, but he has the right to yield me 3 minutes, and I am going to take them, because I was interested in what the senior Senator from Minnesota said a minute ago.

There are two things we must do. First, we must dispose of our surpluses, and second, we must bring our expanding agricultural production under control.

The Senator from Minnesota was entirely right when he said this is the first approach toward the control of surpluses. I am not saying everything we have proposed is perfect, but we must move in the direction of controlling our surpluses.

As to the control of our expanding agricultural production, the soil-bank provision as it came out of committee did not suit me, and I offered on the floor of the Senate a substitute soil-bank proposal of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which provided for a mandatory soil bank. But the amendment proposed by the able senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] improved the soil-bank provision immensely, and I think the soil-bank provision, as it is now carried in the bill, thanks to the amendment of the Senator from Florida, is an effective way of bringing our expanding agricultural plant under control, without taking money away from the farmer.

Some time ago there was a big irrigation meeting held in the Southwest which dealt with Indian lands as well as those of white men. In the course of the discussion of the problem an Indian finally got up and said, "My creed is simple: drain the land but not the Indians." My creed is simple: "Bring the expanding agricultural plant under control, but do not try to break every farmer while you are doing it."

I think the soil bank will work well. I think the control of surpluses will work well. I did not vote for the two-price system offered in the amendment of the Senator from Kansas. I am not hostile to the fact that it is in the bill. Let the farmers choose whether they want it. The able Senator from Louisiana asked for a two-price system on rice. I held hearings on that particular subject. I did not think it was perfect, but it is in the bill, and I am glad it is in the bill. We shall have fine conferees on the bill. Those conferees will largely be against some of the things I have stood for. Nevertheless, I have faith that a pretty good law will emerge.

I should say that if we have done anything at all about making a move toward control of our surpluses by the soil bank, as it is now amended, and by trying to bring our expanding agricultural plant under control, it is a good thing.

We now move to a conference with the House. I have great faith that what will come out of conference will be something worthwhile for the farmers of America.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, to whom we are all grateful for the fine work he has done on the bill and the amendment he offered, along with our colleague from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to speak in the spirit which has been so well set and established by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and the distinguished majority leader.

The bill has provisions in it as to which men of different persuasions can disagree. I very much would like to have had rigid 90 percent support scheduled. We fought for such a proposal, but the decision of the majority has been clearly registered.

In the bill there are many important features that represent progress in agricultural legislation. The features of the soil bank should not be underestimated, particularly the feature known as the conservation reserve. It contains one of the great conservation features for reforestation and for tending to the land, the great heritage of the American people.

The acreage-reserve section can help in the utilization of our surpluses.

Furthermore, we have done something for a segment of American agricultural economy that has been greatly pressed, the dairy producers of this land. The dairy producers include some of the finest citizens in America. They have made great investments; they are intelligent farmers; they are skilled craftsmen, so to speak, in their line of work.

There are also amendments in the bill relating to feed grains which are vital to every segment of American agriculture. That language may very well require clarification and some pinpointing in conference. The conference committee has jurisdiction over the bill, and that conference will include men of different points of view, men who are seasoned in the work of the Congress of the United States, men who have respect for and work with farm bills year in and year out. I am of the opinion they will do a good job.

I emphasize the forestry provisions in the bill. It will benefit America in years to come. Our forests are one of our great natural resources. We have had something built up which is of monumental importance.

I agree with the Senator from New Mexico about the two-price system. I did not support it in committee. However, I thought it was worthy of trial. We now have two commodities, rice and wheat, as to which we can try the two-price structure, if the farmers so will it by their vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota 3 more minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Permit me to say in conclusion, Mr. President, I am very grateful to the leadership for the direction and the hard work which the majority leader has put into this bill. I know of the work he has been going through. I heard this morning on television that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] had gone back to

Minnesota this weekend so he could campaign. I want the RECORD to be perfectly clear that I was working with the Senator from New Mexico, that I was working with the Senator from Texas, the majority leader, that I was working with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], that I was working with other Senators, in an effort to do what? In an effort to improve the bill. We have dedicated hours and hours of our time and energy to it, and I am delighted that we have made the progress we have.

That is not to say that the bill is perfect, Mr. President. Man's work is never perfect, and never will be. But at least the bill represents intelligent, consistent, persevering efforts for progress in the field of agricultural legislation.

I am particularly grateful to my friend on the other side of the aisle, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], for his work and his courage; and I am also grateful to the Senators on that side of the aisle who have stood with him; and that includes all Senators who have stood with him and who have put the cause of the welfare of agriculture above party considerations.

Let me say that I am deeply grateful to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. On several provisions of the bill, we disagreed. But I wish the RECORD made clear: The Senator from New Mexico has held his position consistently, and has fought for it; and many times he has fought for it to victory. Certainly he has given us great help and guidance. I particularly thank him for the help given us in connection with the amendment adopted at the conclusion of our action on amendments to the bill.

Finally, Mr. President, let me say that no Member deserves more credit than does the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I want my colleagues to look at this man, who has given hundreds of hours of ceaseless energy, time, and dedication in trying, first, to bring from the committee a good agricultural bill, and who has managed the bill while it has been on the floor of the Senate. Every Senator, regardless of his opinion, owes the Senator from Louisiana a debt of gratitude for his outstanding leadership, his perseverance, and his understanding.

Mr. President, let me also thank Senators who come from the great, urban States for their understanding of the farm problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I realize that in the main it has not been easy for Senators who come from the great urban States in which the metropolitan centers are located to go along with others of us in connection with the various provisions of the bill; but they have understood the interdependence of our economy. They have understood the relationship existing between farm worker and industrial worker, between farm and city, among all the people of the Nation.

Mr. President, it is for these reasons that I shall vote for the bill—not that it is a bill which I personally would have written, or a bill about which I can agree in every detail; but it is a bill which has been measurably improved; and let me say that in regard to the perishable commodities and in regard to the storable commodities. And I say that due to the efforts of the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Georgia, there have been written into the bill amendments which will mean improvement for our farmers and improvement for agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 30 seconds to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I think we should also thank the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who, although he may not have agreed with the Senator from Minnesota and other Senators, certainly worked very hard on the bill. I, for one, appreciate very much his arduous, sincere, and highly intelligent efforts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, after all these long, weary days, we are finally approaching the final vote on the farm bill.

It has been a hard and difficult process. It has been a debate marked by shifts and changes that have been difficult to follow. All of us, I think, will admit the measure is finally a product of the collective judgment of the entire Senate.

There is little point in recounting the steps we have taken. I doubt whether any of us are completely satisfied with the measure. But we now have to make the decision of whether to vote for—or against—the measure the Senate has produced.

I want to make my own position perfectly clear.

There was a period when I seriously considered casting my final vote against this measure.

It does not contain the clear, consistent 90 percent philosophy in a form which I believe holds forth the best solution to our farm problems.

It is a peculiar mixture of the Agriculture Department's philosophy that the solution to the farm problem is lower farm income and the philosophy that the solution is a stable farm income.

The soil-bank concept is sound as long-range philosophy.

I have decided that the bill has been improved to a point where I can vote for it. It will not solve—or even partially solve—the problems before us. But it will make a bad situation less bad.

It will be of some help to our farmers; and some help is better than no help at all. Furthermore, I am hopeful that the measure can be improved even further in conference.

If constructive alternatives were available to me, I would vote to take those alternatives. But it seems to me that it is obvious that they are not there.

It is also obvious that they will not be there until there is a drastic shift in the composition of the Agriculture Department. This debate has accomplished one thing that cannot be disputed: It is in the opinion of the senior Senator from Texas, that the Agriculture Department holds enormous powers in terms of the future of America's farmers. With those powers goes an unusual degree of ability to influence legislation.

Practically every victory that has been won for the farmer in this bill has been equally a victory against the Agriculture Department, a victory which the Department opposed. Every instance in which the Agriculture Department has yielded has been a case history of grudging reluctance to face up to farmers' problems.

I believe the Agriculture Department is sincere in its theory that farm problems can be solved by lowering farm income and permitting marginal farmers to be driven off the land. But sincerity on the part of the executioner is cold comfort for the victim.

Mr. President, the time must come when the farmers of the country have an Agriculture Department that is sympathetic to their problems.

This is not the end of the trail for legislation to meet the problems of the farmers. But the real solution will be found in changing the Agriculture Department more than in changing the legislation.

In a very real sense, the people of America themselves must take this matter into their own hands; and I am confident they will know how to do it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join in paying tribute to the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who, along with his colleagues, worked long hours and very diligently in order to produce satisfactory legislation on this subject.

I also wish to pay tribute to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson. In the field of public policy, honorable men may differ as to what is best for the country and what is best for a segment of the Nation. But it has been my privilege to come to know Ezra Benson. He is a man of high courage. He is a man of great ability. He is a man of sincere devotion to the cause of agriculture. I have a deep conviction that there is no man in this country who wants to help the American farmer and the American economy more than does the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Benson. In this I believe he has had the support of his Chief, President Eisenhower. I believe there is no man in the country

who is more anxious than he to work out the problems of American agriculture, because he recognizes that when there are conditions which may be adverse to one segment of the economy, in time, they are bound to affect all segments of the American economy. I do not believe there is any American who believes that knowingly or willfully either President Eisenhower or Secretary Benson would do anything which would be detrimental to American agriculture.

We have had a great debate. It has extended over a period of many weeks. Honest men have come to different conclusions, perhaps based on the same set of facts. That is our representative, constitutional process at work.

I am still hopeful that from the conference we may obtain a better bill. I think no man needs question the motives of those on the other side, either in the executive branch or in the legislative branch of the Government.

We have completed our work. Now we are ready to vote.

For the reasons I indicated earlier, I intend to support the bill, in the hope that the conference committee will work out some of the problems which I believe all of us recognize need to be worked out in this measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness, and, if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—93

Aiken	George	McNamara
Allott	Goldwater	Millikin
Anderson	Gore	Monroney
Barkley	Green	Morse
Barrett	Hayden	Mundt
Beall	Hennings	Murray
Bender	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bennett	Hill	Neuberger
Bible	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hruska	Pastore
Bridges	Humphrey	Payne
Butler	Jackson	Potter
Byrd	Jenner	Purtell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kerr	Scott
Clements	Knowland	Smathers
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Laird	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Langer	Sparkman
Dirksen	Lehman	Stennis
Douglas	Long	Symington
Duff	Magnuson	Thurmond
Dworshak	Malone	Thye
Eastland	Mansfield	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Frear	McCarthy	Williams
Fulbright	McClellan	Young

NAYS—2

Bush Flanders

NOT VOTING—1

Ives

So the bill (H. R. 12) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide an improved farm program."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, the Senate bill (S. 3183) will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill as passed be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOVIET EDUCATION—SPEECH DELIVERED BY FORMER SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a former colleague of ours, Hon. William Benton, recently spent some time in Russia studying the educational system of the Soviets. Bill Benton is an observant and intelligent man. His observations about the Russian system furnish us with material worthy of our best thought, if we are seriously concerned with the survival of our free democratic society.

I urge my colleagues to read the speech carefully, and I hope they will then be able to bury their differences and join forces to bring about some improvement in our educational system.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech by Mr. Benton be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET EDUCATION: NEW CHALLENGE TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Address by Hon. William Benton, publisher, Encyclopedia Britannica, before the Association for Higher Education, Chicago, Ill., March 6, 1956)

My friends and fellow politicians, when, as the war ended, Secretary Byrnes asked me to be Assistant Secretary of State, he told me that he thought my early years in advertising should prove good training for politics. I assured him that my 8 years as a part-time university vice president were far more valuable to him—and to me. I told him I already had won my political Ph. D. in campus politics.

I shall talk to you tonight about a critical political problem affecting education and a critical educational problem affecting politics. Indeed, this problem gravely affects the survival of our country and our civilization, and it can only be met by a merger of politicians and educators.

We are met here at a moment when whole galaxies of educational neglect are in head-on collision. The facts and figures have been in the newspapers—and on the front pages. They have been featured in the magazines. They have even been discussed on the air. Some of you may have heard that conferences in Washington have been devoted to them. But they have not broken through the crust of public consciousness.

Where is the present prospect of national action adequate to match the crisis? I fear I cannot even assure you that a Democratic victory next November would secure the action so urgently needed. My fears and forebodings caused me to accept this invitation when it was tendered to me, so that I might share them with you. If I am to be a Cassandra, at least I want companions from among you.

You here tonight must accept partial responsibility for the country's unhappy predicament. Education is the field which you have homesteaded as your very own. The solutions you have proposed have not been drastic enough, bold enough, imaginative enough. You have been too deeply mired in your own folklore. All too often your proposals have been geared to somebody's guess as to what the Congress, or the State legislature, or the latest commission or committee, or your own board of trustees, would stand for.

I commend to you the example of Commissioner Murray, of the Atomic Energy Commission. At a congressional hearing a week or so ago, he was asking for a mere additional $5 billion. Congressman COLE remarked, "I doubt that the taxpayers are ready to gamble such large stakes." Mr. Murray replied, "If they knew the whole story, the would." The task of you educators is dramatically to expound the whole story.

More important than any failure of leadership on your part is that all America now appears to be sleepwalking on the brink, if you will excuse the plagiarism. The American people do not as yet identify the growing educational crisis with their national security.

You have invited me to report on what I learned about education in the Soviet Union, and to suggest what this may mean for America and the free world. Leon Bloy, the French philosopher, once referred to what he called "the good news of damnation." His theory was that none of us might behave as Christians if we were not afraid of perpetual hell-fire. When I finish tonight, I hope you will ask yourselves whether it might not be that the Soviet educational system can prove to be the good news of damnation for American education—the spur which may rouse us and propel us toward salvation.

I shall begin my report by summarizing it in a sentence. I have returned convinced that education has become a main theater of the cold war; Russia's classrooms and libraries, her laboratories and teaching methods may threaten us more than her hydrogen bombs or her guided missiles to deliver them.

For decades, the Soviet Union has had a long-range plan for ideological and economic world conquest—a plan so potent as to make her current military and political maneuvering seem by comparison tactical and even diversionary. At the heart of this project is the schooling for export of scores of thousands of indoctrinated and capable engineers, scientists, schoolmasters, and technicians of all kinds. These are being trained to help develop the resources of countries outside the present Soviet orbit, and to help convert the world to communism. And please do not doubt the high quality of their training. Only last week came a story from Moscow which amused me, a kind of man-bites-dog story. A Texas corporation, no less, was granted the right to manufacture a turbodrill, no less. This drill was developed by the Soviet petroleum industry for digging wells through hard rock. The New York Times said it was "10 times as fast as our conventional rotary drill." Detroit engineers report automation matching our best. Each day and week there is a new story of Soviet technological advances. But, after all, a nation that can produce the hydrogen bomb and airplanes said to match or outdo our own, must have mastered the intricacies of modern science and its application.

These forthcoming battalions of Soviet experts and technicians, ready and eager for export, are now assembling in the staging phase of the offensive. They are a symptom of what is developing in the new world of competitive coexistence. Khrushchev and Bulganin converted them into a symbol of the future when, on leaving Burma, they gave to the Burmese people as a gift from the Russian people a technological institute to be built in Rangoon and staffed by Soviet experts.

Even more formidable is the spectacular example of mass-training for the Soviet Union's own domestic industrial needs. Without the present outpouring of trained experts within the U. S. S. R. the sixth 5-year plan, only recently announced, could not promise by 1960 a 60-percent increase in the national product of the U. S. S. R. and a 70-percent stepup in heavy industry. Bulganin at the recent party congress announced that the production of trained specialists and experts in the current 5-year plan would be 4 million—equal to the last two 5-year plans put together.

What is it that most impresses a foreign observer about the Soviet school system? In less than 40 years, starting with a population at least 50 percent illiterate, the Soviets have built a 7-year primary school system rivaling our own in universality, with nearly 100-percent enrollment. Further, since World War II the Soviet secondary-school system has mushroomed amazingly. By 1960 the basic 10-year school is to be compulsory everywhere. In spite of acute labor shortages, all children are to be kept in school from 7 to 17. Every Russian youngster is to be given an education, a Communist education, of course, comparable to high standards of study and learning in an English public school or a French lycee but without the same emphasis on the humanities. I shall return to this in a moment. The Soviet standard is far higher than that of even the best American high school. It is perhaps comparable to a couple of years at a top college.

Further, the U. S. S. R. has already surpassed us both in the number and percentage of students enrolled in institutions above the secondary level—with 4,300,000 in 1955. This is a 70-percent bulge over our 2,700,000.

The Communists from the earliest days gave up butter for guns; but they gave up meat for education.

The figures I am quoting were given me by top Soviet school officials. They may exaggerate. But perhaps they do not. I suggest we would be wise to accept the figures literally. Americans have for years scoffed at Soviet claims—only to find that they have out-stripped all nations but ourselves in industrial production. We are learning only now that they have the steel and the fuel and the electric energy which they told us they were going to have by this target date. We scoffed for years, only to discover that Lenin's and Stalin's "visions" have become today's industrial realities, with the achievement often surpassing the seemingly fantastic predictions.

Education is one area where we in America most surely have nothing to lose if we accept Russian claims. Intercontinental competition in education need be no challenge to an arms race or a war. If the Russians goad us to do a better educational job ourselves, then we shall only do what our own best tradition calls for—what we should be doing even if the Soviet Union were to sink suddenly into the sea. But if we are complacent about our educational efforts and system, if we allow ourselves to fall behind the Russians, we may find ourselves outwitted, outmaneuvered, outthought, and outbuilt throughout the world.

Russian youngsters go to school 6 days a week, 10 months a year. Discipline is strict, study hours are long, and the curriculum is demanding. At all levels, the Soviet students like European students in general work much harder than do our American youngsters.

Wearing their military-looking uniforms, Soviet children for the first 4 years concentrate on reading, writing, arithmetic, and Russian. In the last 6 years, more than 40 percent of their time goes to science and mathematics. During these years, they must take algebra, geometry, and trigonometry. Also compulsory are 4 or 5 years of physics, 4 years of chemistry, 2 years of biology, a year of astronomy, and a year of psychology. Finally, each student takes 6 years of a foreign language, and English, the new language of science, is the favorite.

My understanding is that there are no electives. Indeed, I was told that the first time the student has any choice of subjects, once he has chosen his field after the 10-year school, is as a graduate student at a university.

The contrast with our secondary-school curriculum is startling. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, recently told the Thomas Alva Edison Foundation: "I can learn of no public high school in our country where a student obtains so thorough a preparation in science and mathematics, even if he seeks it—even if he should be a potential Einstein, Edison, Fermi, or Bell." Indeed, last year for all the high schools of the United States, we produced only 125 new teachers of physics. Think of it. Only 125 for 28,000 high schools.

The U. S. S. R. in the last quarter century has applied the educational goals of the old elite—the high standards of the Czarist system—to the new masses. In this mass application, the Soviets are challenging us with their version of the American dream. They offer high-grade training to every boy and girl, and as much as his talents and abilities will absorb. They are seeking to steal the American dream and in broad daylight.

Pro-Rector Vovchenko of the University of Moscow told me that, above the 10-year schools, there are now more than 2,000 "tekhnikums." These have an enrollment of 2½ million students. We in the United States have no parallel for them. They are a kind of vocational college. They give 2½- and 4-year courses to 2.5 million students. They produce "middle grade" specialists in scores of fields. There are even tekhnikums in such areas as music, art, medicine and education. However, the great concentration is in the field of industry.

The industrial tekhnikums are operated by such ministries as electricity, railroads, communications and agriculture. The Ministry of Higher Education, however, helps maintain academic standards. From their tekhnikums, the various ministries draw their nonprofessional technicians who move ahead into key supervisory and operating jobs in industry.

Then there are the 800 institutions of higher Soviet education. Thirty-three of these are universities. The balance are the specialized institutes for doctors, engineers, lawyers, dentists, aeronautical experts, electrical specialists, agricultural experts, etc., etc.—all the specialized skills in such demand throughout the world. The universities do not have authority over such vocational colleges, but concentrate largely on the training of teachers for above the fourth-year level, and of scientists and scholars. All universities and higher institutes provide 5-year programs, except the teacher-training institutes, which are 4 years. (The U. S. S. R. seems to think that after 4 or 5 years of physics in a 10-year school, another 4 years of physics in a pedagogical institute is enough to train a physics teacher for a high school.) The universities and higher institutes have an estimated enrollment of 1,825,000 students.

The University of Moscow, dominating the city with its gleaming new 33-story central tower dedicated to the sciences, enrolls 23,000 students. The recent investment of 3 billion rubles for this new building, completed in 1953, is astonishing by our standards. It is equivalent to at least $150 million, figuring the ruble at 5 cents, the lowest estimate of its value given anywhere. Thus this building costs more than has been spent for the completed physical plant of all but a very few American universities. It contains 1,900 laboratory rooms. It symbolizes to all Russia what lies ahead in the fulfillment of Soviet ambitions for youth. Here work most of the 2,000 professors of the University of Moscow who teach students. Here, too, are the 500 scholars dedicated to research from whom no teaching is expected. All 2,500 must seek to make their own individual scientific contributions in the laboratories. Those who succeed receive the highly prized doctorate, a top or super degree for which we have no equivalent. It is even claimed that this Soviet degree makes most of our doctors of philosophy appear like diplomas from junior colleges.

As to teaching in the Soviet Union, the U. S. S. R. has many advantages. I realize that the very idea that the U. S. S. R. can have an educational advantage over us is one which many of us emotionally resist. But many among you have found that on some questions it is advantageous to an administrator to enjoy centralized control. We don't like such a pushbutton system in education and we don't want it. But it can have advantages. For example, the 10-year schools don't have to compete with General Electric for physics teachers; the state trains the teachers and funnels them to the schools.

The advantage of such central control which most interested me, because I am chairman of Encyclopaedia Britannica Films, was the extraordinary progress of the Russians in the use of classroom and educational motion pictures. Ralph Tyler, known to many of you as a man who doesn't exaggerate, once remarked that it takes half a century for half of our educators to adopt a good new idea. To any good new idea, our teachers, administrators, and school board members across the entire United States of America must be won over almost one at a time. Thus after 26 years of pioneering effort, the classroom film producers in the United States haven't yet put a projector into more than 1 out of 50 classrooms. This great instrument can even improve the technique for teaching children how to read, the task which George Stoddard estimates costs about half of the Nation's annual budget for public education. Yet in the United States this new weapon has gone largely unnoticed by school boards and educators.

By contrast, the U. S. S. R., once it began to use classroom films, has made rapid progress. The Russian films are like our "documentaries." They are not yet planned and produced for close integration with the curriculum. However, the Russians have pressed their pushbutton and they are now forging ahead of us rapidly in the use of film in the classrooms, and in the production of such films in quantity. The Soviet 1954 catalog of films for educational purposes, brought out by the Ministry of Culture in Moscow, runs 206 pages and lists 937 titles. The Soviet educators will soon learn, in my judgment, to produce the high quality of teaching film which is tied to the curriculum. This is the type we produce here but cannot distribute in any quantity.

The goal of a projector in every classroom has not yet been achieved in the U. S. S. R. But at present rates of progress the Soviets will achieve this a decade before the United States gets a projector into every school building.

The Soviet educational system has, of course, grave and indeed tragic weaknesses by our standards and goals. There is no academic freedom or tenure for teachers or professors. No criticism of the regime, or of official dogma, is permitted. Classroom discussion is not encouraged. Heavy emphasis is given to rote memorization of texts. Every advanced student must devote his full time to his specialty except for 10 percent to the study of dialectical materialism and Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism. The student can't change his mind about his profession in midstream; he can't shift. Every graduate of a tekhnikum, institute, or university must work for 3 years on any assigned job in his specialty, under penalty of prosecution.

To us this seems a system of training, rather than education—training for the service for the state and not for the happiness or fulfillment of the individual. But we must recognize that this is a doctrine which sharpens the tools for the new 5-year plan and for the New Look of the new Soviet competition throughout the wrold.

I fear the Communists may have found a formula for combining, on the one hand, high quality in scientific and technological training and research, including production of original and creative work in the natural sciences, and, on the other hand, an acceptance and obedience in political, economic, philosophical, and moral matters. Whether this formula will hold up over the decades may turn out to be the crucial question of our historical epoch. Allen Dulles expresses "cautious hope" that it won't.

This, then, is the spectacle of the growth of Soviet education. This is the story of its explosively expanding output.

By contrast, we in the United States have been talking about our own impending school crisis for years, but doing little about it, as your previous speakers have pointed out. What was predicted by President Truman's Commission on Higher Education has come to pass. Yet Secretary Folsom tells me President Eisenhower is about to appoint still another committee. Must it not again conclude that we dare not procrastinate and postpone any longer?

New school buildings—the main object of current educational legislation in Washington—are imperative. But in my view, they hold a third priority. I see two requirements even more urgent and a fourth that is equally so. In the balance of my talk tonight, I shall examine these four major requirements of our educational system.

1. Our first priority is scholarships and fellowships, awarded on a competitive basis. You have heard many times that our industries and our defense establishments require at least 45 to 50 thousand new engineers a year, and that Russia produced 53,000 engineering graduates last year in contrast to our 23,000.

The frantic competition for engineers now going on in the United States has been reported on the front pages of the New York Times. There is also a scramble for physicists, chemists, and mathematicians. These shortages have obscured the swelling demand for professional and technical experts in many other fields. At the rate we are growing, we can expect shortages of at least 22,000 physicians and 100,000 nurses by 1960. The need for dentists, architects, and psychologists has jumped, too, and we must not forget the liberal arts. The shortage of teachers may be the most acute of all.

Eighty to ninety percent of all students at the Soviet higher institutions have been on state scholarships. Three weeks ago we learned from the party congress that beginning this autumn all education is to be free. Every Soviet student can now keep going upward in the Communist world at the state's expense so long as he can make the grades. Indeed, he is pushed, prodded, pressured, and enticed to reach the limit of his capacity for training.

Weighed against our practices, these policies give the Kremlin obvious advantages for developing and exploiting its manpower potential. While the Russians try to harness 100 percent of theirs, we waste much of ours, and most flagrantly.

In the light of today's emergency, we must develop the imagination and courage to embark upon an adequate Federal scholarship program.

The Federal Government should undertake immediately a national scholarship program beginning with as many as 20,000 scholarships a year, each covering 4 years of college. Further, this should be increased as rapidly as the administration of the program, and the absorption capacity of the colleges and universities permit to a level of 100,000 scholarships a year. To these should be added 20,000 or more graduate scholarships. Trained manpower is money in the bank. It is our most important national resource. It is what Bulganin called Russia's gold reserve.

Our high schools abound with talent worthy of such scholarships. Secretary Folsom 2 weeks ago cited an estimate that "each year about 60,000 students of high ability drop out of high school before graduation * * * and half of the students in the upper one-fourth of their high school classes do not go on to college." Dael Wolfle tells us that 150,000 pupils from each age and class who could enter the important specialties fail to go to college.

The Soviets have made the life of science and research, of engineering and of scholarship, among the best rewarded in the entire Union, in terms of salaries and prestige and of freedom from the harsher realties of life under the hammer and sickle. The epithet "egg head" would seem to be a compliment in the U. S. S. R. When a Soviet student is accepted for graduate work, his future is virtually assured. About 5 to 10 percent of those who complete the regular university and institute programs are accepted. More than 90 percent of those accepted roll on through the next 3 years and secure the advanced degree which leads to a life of scholarship, research and teaching. The average professor in the U. S. S. R. earns perhaps 10 times what an ordinary Russian worker gets. Outstanding professors earn the equivalent of the annual salary of an American industrial corporation president.

For most of the U. S. S. R.'s 60 million students enrolled in courses of study or educational institutions, graduation from a 10-year school or tekhnikum marks the end of formal education. But many students continue to struggle and strive for another chance and still another. This is why one sees the teenagers in bookstores buying books on nuclear physics. This is why in the Leningrad library I found every desk occupied in the great science reading room. The silence was absolute; the concentrated zeal of the students was breathtaking. I asked my librarian guide, "Are these university students?" He replied, "Oh, no, the university has its own library; these are workers from the night shifts of the factories; we keep the library open at night for the day-shift workers." Those who successfully pursue their studies can continue ever upward and onward in the academic and scientific hierarchy.

2. And this brings me to my second priority. Without delay, and on a bold scale, we must develop new incentives for teachers. Although the objective should be universal, my discussion tonight will deal largely with the problem in our public schools. However, we do not give to our professors and scholars the prestige and prequisites they enjoy in western Europe; we would do well to emulate the Russians in the financial opportunities offered.

Beardsley Ruml has shown how teachers' real earnings have gone steadily downward since the early days of this century.

What puzzles me about the proposals for a blanket percentage increase in all teachers' salaries—in the public schools—the idea that every teacher's salary should go up 50 percent, let us say—is a theory of my mother's. She was a knowledgeable teacher and administrator. At 13, she was a teacher in a country school in Iowa and among her pupils were farm boys of 16 who attended school for 3 months a year, in the winter. At 25 she was the first woman county superintendent of school in the history of Minnesota. After my father died, she served for a while on the staff of teachers college and later became one of the highest paid women in American education. Her theory was that many, if not most, teachers were overpaid. Many, she contended, were mediocre and couldn't earn as much doing anything else.

Perhaps the key question is in two parts: First, how can we offer greater incentives to the talented public school teacher, and to every teacher who successfully seeks self-improvement; and, second, what system of incentive will tempt and hold young prospective teachers of talent? I do not see why the taxpayers should succumb to bureaucracy, and now greatly step up the salaries of hundreds of thousands of teachers who are inferior. Indeed, one of our national tragedies is that our teachers colleges do not attract a better caliber of students. Are we not indeed using them as a refuge for the bottom one-fourth of the academic spectrum?

In the development of new and far bigger incentives for talented teachers, I fear we must again turn to the Federal Government for leadership. Some 5 or 10 years hence, several billion dollars annually will have to be found to add to teachers' salaries. This program, to stimulate our present teachers and to attract new ones, should be launched at once and on a scale into the hundreds of millions, allocated through State departments of education to communities which undertake to attract and keep uncommonly promising teachers. The Federal Government must help establish a pattern of standards. This will cause a hue and cry about Federal control. We must face up to it.

This was John D. Rockefeller's idea back in 1891 and we have forgotten it. He sent Dr. William Rainey Harper, from Yale, to found his new University of Chicago. Dr. Harper reported back to him, "Mr. Rockefeller, I cannot persuade the top scholars of the East and of Europe to move to Chicago." Mr. Rockefeller asked, "What is the top salary in the world paid to a university professor?" The answer: "$3,500." Mr. Rockefeller issued the order that in a decade developed one of the greatest universities of the world, "Pay your top men $7,000." This was the salary in 1891 of the president of the First National Bank of Chicago. Perhaps this order explains why, as Arthur Page once said to me, the University of Chicago advanced the cultural development of the West by a full generation.

Now if you think I am exaggerating money as an incentive, I can only reply that this is because of the environment which surrounds our schools and educational institutions. It's due to the American climate in which they live. This of course is a subject for quite another speech.

3. And this brings me to the third requirement, the dilemma of the physical plant. Here again, I refer principally to the public schools.

Delegates to the White House Conference on Education went on record by more than 2 to 1 approving Federal money for schoolbuilding construction. In late January this year Dr. Gallup found that 67 percent of all adults were in favor, with only 24 percent opposed. And this is said to represent a major breakthrough on the whole principle of Federal aid to schools.

I've wondered what the White House conferees who opposed Federal aid may have been thinking of. Perhaps one clue is that the delegates from Texas were almost unanimously opposed. But if they had understood that the issue of national survival is literally tied up to an adequate educational plant, the vote should have been 99 to 1. The important question isn't who were the two-thirds, but how could there have been a one-third minority? The idea of Federal aid to education is neither new nor revolutionary. Even Senator Taft was for it.

As soon as this year's legislation is passed and passed it must be, we must face up to the need for a new act designed to stimulate school building up to a rate of $3.8 billion a year. This is the goal if we are to secure the 950,000 classrooms we must build in the next 10 years. Further, as Benjamin Fine reported on Monday in the New York Times, from your conference here in Chicago, college enrollment will double by 1970 and only 6 States have taken any steps to handle this impending wave of students.

Because State and local community outlays for school construction are now at a $2-billion level, leaving a gap of $1.8 billion, the $250 million offered by the present administration or even the $400 million visualized in the Kelley bill are far too little. I don't like to keep stepping up the urgent need for massive Federal funds, but there is no help for it. As Mr. Murray told Congressman COLE, if the public knew the facts, it would put up the money.

When Mr. Khrushchev looks across the Atlantic at us what he sees in education is 48 Balkanized units, each in turn Balkanized into scores of hundreds of local districts, with school boards worrying about their mill rates while Mr. Khrushchev tools up for political conquest. A fortnight ago Marion Folsom said, "Education is basic * * * to our collective strength in the cause of world peace." Is not this an issue on which the United States must unite? If I sound alarmist it is only because I am trying to do so.

George Stoddard wrote me last week that the only answer to the Soviet educational advance is "to push to the limit our own democratic ideal of developing the total resources of every person." This is in the spirit of Thomas Jefferson, who believed that democracy would succeed if education were placed within the reach of as many of our people as possible. We can't begin, in today's world, to live up to this great goal without teachers—and classrooms—and scholarships.

4. Finally and fourthly, let us reexamine our teaching methods and our institutional setup.

Our goal of secondary school pupil-teacher ratio has been 25 to 1; in the university it has been 12 or 13 to 1. These goals now seem to be about to vanish. Soon we shall receive the tide of 42 million school children.

Some of our associates still cherish the dream of Mark Hopkins sitting on one end of the log teaching a single boy on the other. This dream breeds the ideal of the tiny class in which every student more than 1 is 1 too many.

We should no longer indulge ourselves in cultural lag. We must learn to close Ralph Tyler's 50-year gap. We must bring technology to the schools. For example, all plans for new buildings should make it easy for children in Maine and Kansas to learn history and science and arithmetic from the Californian or the Britisher who understands them best and can explain them best through films and educational television.

One good teacher, with a couple of aides, can learn how to take care of 200 or 300 pupils, and improve the instruction. This makes it profitable as well as easy greatly to raise salaries in order to attract and hold good teachers.

This raises the question of how can we now begin to cut down in many areas the enormous waste in our system and thus, as best we can, hold down its mounting cost? The American public school pattern is still based on the 8-4-4 plan. At least 2 years of the first 12 are clearly wasted. We should expect more of the teachers as we pay them better, so they won't have the time or the need to sell books in the summertime. Further, let's get rid of some of the many phony certification procedures. These often require inferior courses at second rate colleges. They keep graduates from Yale or Princeton who are physics majors from teaching. As the superintendent of schools of Hartford said this week, such conditions for teaching positions are excluding capable teachers because "they don't meet the book even though they are doing a fine job." He added, "Perhaps it's time we reoriented our thinking on what makes a good teacher.

"While we raise teachers' salaries, can we not lengthen the school day, and the school week, and the school year? As the father of 4, I attest to the fact that my children would profit from school 6 days a week, and longer school days, and 10 months a year. This would not only compress the first 12 years to 10, but should give them something like 14 years of schooling in 10, by present standards. Such a change would immediately reduce our present need for precollege teachers by at least one-sixth. And salaries for the competent could be sharply raised even on present budgets."

And can we not learn how to compress some of the years en route to the doctoral degree, by cutting down wasted time, so that a self-supporting physician or scholar need not be nudging middle age before he can afford to get married?

Further, can't we agree with former President Conant of Harvard that we must have more and better junior colleges? In many ways, they offer our best hope for free mass public education beyond high school. Fifty percent of America's present junior colleges are in California. Now I ask this audience: from the standpoint of the interest of the people of the United States, what kind of situation is this?

Let us also study the creation of new kinds of institutions as they may be needed. A few weeks ago I suggested that our Government create technical assistance academies, equal in status to the United States Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies—to educate picked young men and women for service overseas as technical specialists. Someone called my suggested academies "West Points of point 4." I emphasized that such academies—and I apply this to all technical or scientific education in our country—should have a curriculum with a strong infusion of the liberal arts, so that our young engineers and scientists can better serve their country overseas. Today how can we expect to persuade the young engineer to serve overseas? If he is well advised he'll go to Topeka or Fargo instead of to Rangoon.

One vast reservoir of talent consists of our entire present labor force, those whose education stopped when they left school. Can we not launch a national revival for citizen participation in education at all ages? I think we can, and this is a great challenge to our universities, much as they may resist it.

I cite the foregoing merely as samples of ways in which we can seek to improve the structure of our educational system and of the institutions within it. Many of you here are better qualified than I to explore these problems and opportunities.

As I conclude in hope that I shall not be misunderstood tonight, may I stress that our best over-all opportunity for doing a better educational job than the U. S. S. R. continues to lie in educating whole men. This must and will remain our goal rather than the Soviet prototype of the specialist, technician or functionary. Yes, we must make a far larger investment for training in science. But we must also recognize that for us the sharp distinctions between the sciences and the humanities are obsolete. Most United States engineering schools today at least pay lipservice to the idea that specialists must also be broadly educated men and women.

When a friend of mine who is on your program of speakers learned that the theme of my remarks was to be Soviet education and what we might learn from it, he said my theme boils down to a single lesson. "We must abandon pragmatic-instrumentalism," he said, and "return to a deep faith in man, as the son of God, and in the values which accrue to that status."

A deep faith in man is the total opposite to the Soviet system which offers a vast technocratic new Sparta. By our standards, their system is more like animal training than the education of human beings. It is without human spirit or soul. It is the state-take-all and let the individual take the hindmost. It is the gospel according to Pavlov.

The peoples of the world are now entering an era when energy comes from rocks and sunlight; when materials for shelter and clothing derive from air, water, and chemicals. Barring war, the aspirations of underdeveloped peoples will soon force industrial and educational development into every cranny of human society. If we of the United States are to meet the new challenge of the worldwide revolt against hunger and disease and ignorance—you who are our leaders in the field of education must march forward in the front ranks. Believe me, however, I do appreciate my difficulty tonight. It is not easy to exhort the professional exhorters.

But before I close, I must get back for a moment to money. Money is a refrain which runs through part of this paper. Many of you, I know, may question whether the United States can afford the costly program I have advocated. Indeed, the cost is an even bigger hurdle than the haggard spectre of Federal control.

Educators have almost always had to beg for money. Back in 1426, the fathers of Oxford approached the Duke of Gloucester for help, and put their case this way:

"What aim can be more noble than the advancement of learning, which raises man above the beasts and lifts him towards a higher life? It was a divine inspiration that suggested a foundation of lectures, and we hope the intention will be fully carried out. Let not poverty, that cursed stepmother of learning, disappoint us of our hopes."

I say today, in this boom year of which some are boasting, let not the plea of poverty, a still more despicable stepmother of learning, deprive our children of their future development in freedom, and our Nation of its destiny.

Soviet Russia may be the first country to develop free and unlimited schooling for all with the talent who are willing to work hard. But we in the United States have tended a brighter fire during the last 180 years. This should be far more appealing to all mankind if we now begin to do a better job of living up to it. This is our dedication to the advancement and perfection of the individual. Here in this city, the University of Chicago is drawing upon our past heritage as it builds toward the future. The university trustees say in their recent brochure: "Education would make children better than their fathers, and that was part of the strange American idea of how things ought to be." The brochure continues, "Education was what it was virtuous to spend money on. Education was the banner of equality. Education would make democracy work. The educated man as we understood him is the best weapon we have."

You leaders in the field of education have the knowledge and the insight and I trust that such great meetings as this today in Chicago will help you to cultivate the wisdom and the courage. If you will, you can persuade us. Tell all America that we ignore at our peril any mute unkempt Einstein, be he listless and unmotivated in a Chicago suburb or cut off from opportunity in a Mississippi shack. Tell us the truth, I say, and see to it that your words become epidemic. If we, your alumni and constituents and taxpayers, are given courage and vision by you, you will find us ready to respond—to respond with generosity, with devotion, and enthusiasm—and with renewed dedication to the fulfillment of the American dream of which you are the leading inheritors and the spokesmen. The parents and the youth of our great free country are waiting for you and your words—today—this very night.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 364, Senate Joint Resolution 31.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the joint resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution.

LOUIS BROMFIELD

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, the death of Louis Bromfield is a tragic loss not only to the world of literature, but also to the cause of human freedom. Ever since his return from Europe, Louis Bromfield had dedicated himself to the battle for political understanding.

His analysis of the major issues of our times and the trends he had witnessed overseas led him inevitably into the ranks of the Republican Party. He found himself in close sympathy with the work of the late Robert A. Taft. "Liberty under law" became Mr. Bromfield's slogan as it had been that of Bob Taft.

In his work on the soil, seeking to develop ways of rehabilitating barren lands, Louis Bromfield expressed an inner drive for the improvement of all mankind.

In my campaign for the Senate in 1954, Louis Bromfield gave generously of his time, his thought, and his interest. I am shocked by his premature passing from the American scene. We have lost a man of profound insight into both the world of ideas and of positive action.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR), by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 3483) to modify the authorized project for construction of the Millwood Reservoir on the Little River in Arkansas, to include the construction of the Pine Creek, Lukfata, Sherwood (Narrows), and Broken Bow Reservoirs, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, March 26, 1956, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Paul C. Weick, of Ohio, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio, vice Emerich B. Freed, deceased;

Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be chief justice of the supreme court, Territory of Hawaii, for a term of 4 years, vice Edward A. Towse, whose term has expired; and

Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be judge of the second circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice William B. Brown, resigned.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and myself, chairman.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 20, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 19, 1956:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Edgar Bernard Brossard, of Utah, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1962.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 19, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Sterling Lorenz Price, minister, the University Baptist Church, Abilene, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we are grateful today for Thy tender mercies and Thy loving kindness. We do not stand before Thee as preachers and lawmakers—rather do we stand as needy mortals pleading for that peace that passes all understanding.

Teach us to know that there can be no peace without until we have Thy peace within and that we cannot solve problems until we cease to be problems.

Forgive us our sins. We say we know Thee and then act as if we had never heard of Thee; we say Thy way is best and then walk in strange ways; we quote Thy word and do not live by Thy word.

In these days of stress give us strength to stand for something lest we fall for anything. Give us wisdom to distinguish between the true patriot who keeps our beloved country strong and the charlatan who would sell out to the highest bidder both his soul and his country for a mess of pottage.

And we pray it through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 15, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On March 16, 1956:

H. R. 7588. An act granting the benefits of section 301 (a) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to certain children of United States citizens.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 582. Joint resolution making additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1956, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3452. An act to amend the act of July 15, 1955, Public Law 161, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 324), by increasing the appropriation authorization for the aircraft control and warning system.

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1529. An act to revise the boundaries of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8320) entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school milk program and the brucellosis eradication program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956."

EXCISE TAXES ON GASOLINE AND SPECIAL FUELS USED ON THE FARM FOR FARMING PURPOSES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8780) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOPER, MILLS, GREGORY, REED, and JENKINS.

HIGHWAY REVENUE ACT OF 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report, including any supplemental views, on the bill H. R. 9075, the Highway Revenue Act of 1956.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 358)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

For almost a decade the United States has moved, year by year, with growing success, to help fortify the economies and military strength of nations of the free world. Over the years this effort has changed in size and character in keeping with changing world affairs. Today it remains as indispensable to the security of every American citizen and to the building of an enduring peace as on the day it began 9 years ago.

Today this great Nation, at the peak of its peacetime military and economic strength, must not hesitate or retreat in this vital undertaking. Nor can we subordinate this program to local concerns or collateral issues, on the unsound premise that steady progress through this program for 9 years makes it no longer necessary.

We cannot now falter in our quest for peace.

The need for a mutual security program is urgent because there are still nations that are eager to strive with us for peace and freedom but, without our help, lack the means of doing so.

The need is urgent because there are still forces hostile to freedom that compel the free world to maintain adequate and coordinated military power to deter aggression.

The need is urgent because there are still peoples who aspire to sustain their freedom but confront economic obstacles that are beyond their capabilities of surmounting alone.

These facts are as fundamental to our own security and well-being as the maintenance of our own Armed Forces.

Our goal is clear—an enduring peace with justice. To achieve it will continue to require effort, skill, patience, and sacrifice. Toward it we must and will strive constantly by every means available to us.

We must continue to work with other countries to insure that each free nation remains free, secure from external aggression and subversion, and able to develop a society marked by human welfare, individual liberty, and a rising standard of living. We must continue to maintain our economic and military strength at home. We must continue to stimulate expansion of trade and investment in the free world. We must continue helping to build the productive capacities of free nations through public loans and guaranties of private investment. We must continue to provide technical knowledge and essential materials to speed the advance of other nations in peaceful uses of the atom. We must continue our cultural and educational exchanges to expand mutual knowledge and understanding. We must continue and intensify our information programs so that the peoples of the world may know our peaceful purposes and our love of human liberty. And through our mutual security programs we must continue helping to create in the free world conditions in which freedom can survive and develop, and free nations can maintain the defensive strength necessary to deter aggression.

Peace with justice remains the sole objective of our mutual security programs. We have no other interest to advance. We have no desire or intent to subjugate or subvert other peoples—no purpose to change their chosen political, economic, or cultural patterns—no wish to make any of them our satellites. We seek only to further the cause of freedom and independence and to develop the military strength necessary to protect and defend it, in the interest of peace.

To help a free country to maintain forces necessary for the protection of its freedom and independence but beyond those which it can alone support may mean foregoing some domestic expenditure. To help a less developed nation in its initial steps toward an economy that can sustain freedom and independence and provide opportunity for higher living standards may mean postponement of desirable projects here in this country. We must continue willing to make these sacrifices, for the benefits we gain in the interests of peace are well worth the price. The mutual security program is a demand of the highest priority upon our resources.

Because our people and the peoples of other nations in the free world have been willing to make the necessary sacrifices, the past mutual-security programs have achieved a real measure of success. By combined effort the free world has advanced toward stability and toward economic strength. It has achieved the power and the will to resist aggression. Collective security arrangements have brought into existence free world defense forces and facilities far greater than those which we, by our unaided efforts, could have raised and maintained from our own resources without a crushing burden of taxation on our people. In their economic aspects, our programs have made significant advances toward the solution of many problems of the free world. Without this assistance many other nations, beyond doubt, if existing at all, would exist today only in the grip of chaos. Moreover, we ourselves are more secure, more prosperous, better fitted to go forward in the common enterprise of freedom than ever before.

Significant testimony to the success of our mutual security programs appears in the new turns and developments of Soviet policy. Aggression through force appears to have been put aside, at least temporarily, and the Communists are now making trade approaches to many nations of the free world.

The Soviet maneuver, which is still developing, includes offers of bilateral trade arrangements which may involve provision of arms and capital goods as well as technical assistance. Had we any reason to believe that the Soviet leaders had abandoned their sinister objectives, and now shared our own high purpose of helping other nations to develop freedom and independence, we would welcome the new Soviet program, for it appears to have aspects of normal trade expansion and business competition. Its danger for us and for other free nations, however, lies in the additional Soviet objectives and in the entanglements to which acceptance of their offers may lead.

Even while we welcome respite from the Soviet policy of threat and violence, we must take careful stock of what still remains of it. The vast Soviet military establishment has not been scrapped. On the contrary, the Soviets and their Communist allies are increasing the strength and effectiveness of their armed forces and are providing them with with equipment of the most modern design. The threat implicit in this huge aggregation of military power still casts an ominous shadow over the world. There is nothing here to warrant a slackening of our efforts to strengthen the common defense of the free world.

In its new departments in foreign policy, we see that the Soviet Union continues in its familiar pattern of ceaseless probing for opportunities to exploit political and economic weaknesses. We cannot view otherwise the arms traffic in areas where tensions are high and the peace is in danger. We cannot view otherwise the extension of credits hand in hand with exploitation of ancient animosities and new hatreds in a world already overburdened with them.

We must therefore assume that Soviet expansionism has merely taken on a somewhat different guise and that its fundamental objective is still to disrupt

and in the end to dominate the free nations. With Soviet leaders openly proclaiming their world aim, it would be folly for us and our friends to relax our collective efforts toward stability and security.

Needless to say, we do not intend to permit specific Soviet moves to control our activities. Our mutual-security program, conceived in the common interests of the free nations, must go ahead affirmatively along tested lines to meet the common need. Where changes now give promise of making the program more responsive to the need and more effective, I am recommending changes.

The authorizations and appropriations I am recommending for fiscal year 1957 are designed to carry forward the program toward the goal we seek.

I recommend that the Congress authorize appropriations of $4,672,475,000 in accordance with the schedule attached. In a separate letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, I am requesting the appropriation of $4,859,975,000 for the same fiscal year to cover these recommended authorizations together with authorizations granted but not fully used in prior years. Certain aspects of this program require special attention.

CONTINUITY AND FLEXIBILITY

We should be able to assure the nations of the free world that we will continue to participate in particular nonmilitary projects and enterprises which will take a number of years to complete. Such assurance from us will help these nations to mobilize their own funds for projects which will contribute to an important degree to their economic strength, to enlist public and private loans and investment, and to plan ahead intelligently. It will be difficult for these nations to organize such projects unless mutual security program support can be relied on for more than a single year.

I request authority of the Congress to make commitments up to 10 years in length to assist less developed countries in long-term projects important to their development. Funds to fulfill such commitments would come from appropriations for nonmilitary mutual security, and would not exceed an aggregate of $100 million in any year.

The mutual security program, in a world in which events move with great rapidity, requires that flexible authority exist for the use of funds made available by the Congress. Section 401 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, provides such flexibility with respect to the funds appropriated, or transferred, for use pursuant to that section. It provides a valuable means of meeting numerous unforeseeable requirements for assistance without the necessity for postponing or reducing other urgently needed programs.

A year ago the Congress appropriated a special Presidential fund of $100 million to be used under section 401. For fiscal year 1957, I request the authorization of an appropriation of a further $100 million for this special fund. I also ask that the authority of the President to transfer other mutual security funds for use under the provisions of section 401 be increased. With respect to at least $100 million in this special fund, I urge that the maximum degree of flexibility be authorized for its expenditure whenever the President determines that the use of sums in this manner is important to the security of the United States.

The Middle East and Africa are areas in which it is especially important to build new strength friendly to us. There is need for an adequate fund which can be used to assist in meeting special economic problems that may arise in those regions. The United States must be in a position to act promptly to help the governments in this area in their efforts to find solutions for economic and social problems. I therefore recommend creation of a special fund of $100 million to be available for use in any part of the Middle East or Africa for nonmilitary mutual security programs which will advance the cause of free world security and economic strength.

In 1955, the President's fund for Asian economic development was established. The sum of $100 million was then appropriated for it and authorization was given for the appropriation of a further $100 million. It is now desirable that the whole of the funds authorized be made available, and I shall request the appropriation of the remaining $100 million.

ADVANCED WEAPONS SYSTEMS

I recommend that about $530 million be made available to enable the Department of Defense to begin a program of aiding our allies in developing an even more effective defense based on an improved and better coordinated early warning and communications system and utilizing advanced weapons systems, including missiles, now being procured for our troops.

These advanced weapons, which are purely defensive in character, pose no threat to any nation which does not initiate aggression. They are designed to give warning of, and repel, such aggression—and by their potential effectiveness to deter it.

The sum of $195 million has been included initially for NATO countries in the fiscal year 1957 program. The eventual distribution of the balance of the advanced weapons included in the 1957 program will be made on the basis of later judgment as to their most effective employment worldwide.

Our defense methods cannot be static in view of the constant growth of the military potential of the Communists. We and our allies must keep our defenses adequate to meet new methods of attack. Because of the rapidity of scientific advances, it is likely that the content of this advanced weapons program will be modified from time to time.

EUROPE

The program for the NATO countries of Europe, excluding Greece and Turkey, is primarily one of military assistance. This includes the advanced weapons I have mentioned. Although our allies have made great progress in building up their defense forces, military grant assistance is still necessary in most countries to assist them in maintaining equipment and replacing material lost by attrition. No economic assistance is proposed for any European country in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. A small amount of technical exchange assistance is proposed.

Continued economic support is required for Berlin, and military and economic support for Spain and Yugoslavia.

MIDDLE EAST, AFRICA, AND ASIA

In Asia and the Middle East, serious risk of aggression still exists. The program recommends aggregate military assistance of approximately $1,640 million for countries in these regions which must maintain substantial forces in the field to resist possible attacks. The military assistance which we propose will support the objectives of various mutual defense pacts, including SEATO, to which the United States is a party.

In these areas, the problems of building security are economic as well as military. Many of the nations in the area do not now have the resources required for a minimum rate of economic growth. They are striving to create the standards of living under which their economies can develop. This is a long-term process, in which their own efforts will play the major part, but in which our help can be crucial.

The program, accordingly, proposes economic help to those of our allies whose own resources cannot support their essential defense effort. This help is designed, as in former years, in part to assist projects of a nonmilitary character which further defense activities, in part to help build internal resources and economic stability, and in part to contribute to the recipient's programs of economic development.

Provision is also made for economic assistance to nations in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia which receive no military assistance, where such economic assistance will contribute to their economic strength and thus to their ability to retain their independence. This program is of the utmost importance to the security of the free world.

The program for fiscal year 1957 also provides for continuing our technical cooperation and assistance in less-developed countries.

LATIN AMERICA

We propose to strengthen further the friendly relationships which exist with our sister republics to the south. I recommend that we continue to encourage by technical assistance the programs initiated by Latin American nations to make better use of their own resources. We should also continue our participation in the technical-assistance activities of the Organization of American States.

In special circumstances, when loans from the Export-Import Bank and the World Bank are not available to countries facing critical situations, the mutual-security program has assisted in meeting temporary economic problems, as in the case of two countries where it is proposed that such assistance be continued in the next fiscal year.

Military assistance in Latin America should be continued where needed in order to provide standardized equipment, maintenance of equipment already furnished, and training in the use of such equipment.

UNITED NATIONS AND OTHER SPECIAL PROGRAMS

The United States should continue its support of the United Nations expanded technical assistance program, the United Nations Children's Fund, and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency which provides relief and rehabilitation of the Arab refugees from Palestine.

Provision is also made for continuing our support of the program of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the work of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. Authoritizations for continuing our own Government's program for care and resettlement of escapees from communism, and our program of paying the ocean freight costs of shipment both of relief supplies donated to our voluntary relief agencies and of surplus agricultural commodities, are also recommended.

SIZE OF THE PROGRAM

The request for military assistance authorization in fiscal year 1957 is substantially larger than the requests and appropriations for this purpose for the past 2 years. The lower level of appropriations for fiscal years 1955 and 1956 will, by the end of the current fiscal year, have brought about reduction in unexpended balances over the 2-year period by approximately $2½ to $3 billion. Now, however, in order to maintain the flow of military assistance in 1958 and 1959 an increase in the appropriation for fiscal year 1957 is required.

A substantial period of lead time is required to translate appropriated funds into actual payment for, and deliveries of, nearly all items of military equipment. This year, for the first time, more than $500 million are included in the military-assistance program for advanced weapons. These weapons, because of their complexity, have even longer lead times.

On the economic side of the program, appropriations for the last 2 years have been approximately at the same rate as expenditures. The amounts requested this year for economic assistance are larger principally because of the new fund proposed for the Middle East and Africa and because of heavier emphasis on programs in Asia.

OTHER ASPECTS OF THE PROGRAM

The mutual security program for fiscal year 1957 proposes continued procurement within the United States of surplus agricultural commodities for use abroad. In addition, large amounts of such commodities are moving abroad under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act for the mutual benefit of this and other countries. This latter effort has been considered in the development of the 1957 mutual security program requirements, and every effort is being made to coordinate the two programs.

In the request for appropriations to carry out the fiscal year 1957 program, I am urging that Congress permit greater flexibility in the obligation of appropriations, in order that there may be more thorough planning of expenditures and more time allowed for necessary negotiation of contracts with suppliers and of arrangements with other nations.

CONCLUSION

The mutual security program is vitally important to our people. Its cost is not disproportionate to our Nation's resources and to our national income. That cost is a low price to pay for the security and vastly greater chances for world peace which the program provides.

The mutual security program is an indispensable part of our national effort to meet affirmatively the challenge of all the forces which threaten the independence of the free world and to overcome the conditions which make peace insecure and progress difficult.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 19, 1956.*

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the special order which I have for today to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE LATE LOUIS BROMFIELD

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret to inform the House of the passing of one of my notable constituents. In the passing of Louis Bromfield, known to all of us as Louie, our country has lost a great American, the three daughters have lost a worthy father and I have lost a true and loyal friend.

Louis Bromfield passed away yesterday in a Columbus, Ohio, hospital shortly after a report had been given that his "condition was satisfactory." That report, I am sure, is the way Louie would want it. To him his condition was always satisfactory but he was constantly working for the improvement and benefit of those he loved and his country was certainly included in that group.

Louis Bromfield was author, farmer and Pulitzer Prize winner. He was a novelist, newspaper columnist, historian and was the owner and operator of the famous "Malabar Farm," which is known to his many admirers throughout the world. He was one of the foremost advocators of soil conservation in the United States. He won the Pulitzer Prize in 1926 for his novel Early Autumn. Many of the more than two score novels he wrote became movies. He served in World War I with the American Ambulance Corps attached to the French Army and won the Croix de Guerre and the Legion of Honor. His wife, the former Mary Appleton Wood, preceded him in death in 1952.

I join with his thousands of friends in extending sympathy to his daughters.

RETIREMENT OF CHARLES P. NELSON

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Maine delegation have been saddened to learn of the decision made by their colleague CHARLES P. NELSON, representing the Second District, not to seek reelection to this body. Mr. NELSON'S decision comes as a complete and unhappy surprise. It is predicated on grounds of health which, of course, we cannot challenge.

Mr. NELSON came to this body in January 1949, and he is now in the closing session of his fourth term here. He is the son of a most respected and able Member of this body, the late John E. Nelson, and we rejoiced to see a son walking in the footsteps of an illustrious father.

CHARLES NELSON is an able lawyer. He had an outstanding record in the Air Force in World War II when he rose to the rank of lieutenant colonel. The combination of a fine legal mind with military experience and high military responsibility made Mr. NELSON an obvious choice for the Committee on Armed Services, on which he has served with distinction to himself and with great value to the armed services and to the Congress.

Mr. NELSON'S retirement is a blow to our State. On the more personal side, it deprives us of the counsel and companionship of one on whom we had come to rely for wise and penetrating judgment. I express the hope that in some happier day Mr. NELSON will return to the public service for which he is so well endowed and trained.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman from Maine in expressing keen regret at the retirement of Mr. NELSON. He is an outstanding legislator and a man of great promise. The Congress has lost a valued legislator in his determination to retire because of ill health. All of us regret his decision and hope for him an early restoration to health.

Mr. HALE. I feel sure that I have the sympathy of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, and I feel confident that the Maine delegation has the sympathy of the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to express my deep regret that the gentleman from Maine, my colleague in the Congress, Mr. NELSON, is not seeking further service in this body. He is an extremely able legislator and brilliant lawyer, and, as we know, secured results for his State and country. I served with his father. The

gentleman from Maine is a very worthy son and successor of a remarkably fine, able father, a former Member of this House. We cannot afford to lose men of their character.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the statements of the gentleman and the other Members who have spoken with respect to the retirement of Mr. NELSON, the gentleman from Maine. I have always considered Mr. NELSON a very close friend. In his retirement we are losing a very able public servant. I shall personally miss his counsel.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I, too, would like to join in the many fine things that have been said about CHARLIE NELSON. I have had the privilege of serving with him all during the time he has been a Member of the House. One thing particularly I have known about CHARLIE NELSON is his fine work on the Committee on Armed Services of which I, too, happen to be a member. It was there we recognized his ability, his keen mind and the intelligence he portrayed in his approach to very complex problems before our committee. We are certainly going to miss him on the committee at this particular time.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Maine, CHARLES NELSON, came to the Congress at the same time I did in the 81st Congress. I have known him personally very well during the past 7½ years. He will be greatly missed for he has been an outstanding Member with an enviable record in all respects. We certainly hope that his future life will be enjoyable and fruitful. He and his family will always be most welcome in the Congress or elsewhere.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my compliments to those that have been paid our colleague CHARLES P. NELSON. I, too, have been a member of the Committee on Armed Services during the time that the gentleman from Maine served on that committee. He has been a very fine person to work with, an able and intelligent member, who has contributed much to the record which the Armed Services Committee has made.

I wish for him many years of happiness in his home life and also in the practice of law which I understand he will take up again when he returns to Maine.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] and the other Members who have spoken, to pay tribute to CHARLIE NELSON. It has been my rare privilege to sit beside him as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. I have had the opportunity to observe the way his mind works; his devotion to duty; his patriotism. Everything that has been said about him by the gentleman who has the floor is correct. I regret that he is going to leave the House.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his contribution.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman from Maine and others who have spoken in expressing regret that our colleague, CHARLIE NELSON, is not going to be a candidate for reelection to this House. I have served with CHARLIE NELSON for the past 8 years. In my opinion he is one of our most highly respected Members and his absence will be keenly felt by all of us. Maine is losing an outstanding Congressman and I sincerely hope that in the not too distant future we will have the benefit of his many talents and pleasing personality once again.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague from Maine [Mr. HALE] in expressing deep regret that the Maine House delegation and the House of Representatives is to lose from its membership the Honorable CHARLES P. NELSON, Representative of the Second Congressional District of Maine.

When I came into the Congress to fill the vacancy created by the death of the beloved Frank Fellows, I knew CHARLIE NELSON but slightly. The times I have gone to him in the intervening period for advice and counsel are innumerable. I found him ever willing to help, sound in his advice, and sympathetic in his counsel. He has been a true friend, indeed.

CHARLES NELSON has rendered distinguished service. He is a member of the Maine bar, served his home city as its mayor, marked up an outstanding military record in World War II, served an apprenticeship—we might say—on Capitol Hill as Secretary to one of Maine's brilliant statesmen in Congress, the Honorable John Nelson, his father, and contributed much to the Republican Party in Maine, particularly with regard to the organization of the Young Republicans in our State. He has had 4 terms in Congress—8 years of distinguished service to his constituents, his State, and his Nation.

Since World War II, Maine has found itself on the main line, so to speak, in the development of defense for our country. As a member of the Armed Services Committee of the House, Charlie's counsel has helped immeasurably in the many complex problems associated with military expansion.

His full knowledge of the textile industry, the economy of coastal industries—shipping, shipbuilding, and fishing—military and veterans' affairs has made his service here invaluable to his State and his colleagues in Congress.

His decision to retire from Congress is predicated on the advice of his doctors.

I wish for him full recovery of his health, and for him and his family a full measure of success and happiness in the future. I want to express to him my deepest appreciation for his many kindnesses and his generous display of warm friendship.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member of the House may have leave to extend his remarks regarding the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON] at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

LEADERSHIP: MORE THAN A MATTER OF PHYSIQUE

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of President Eisenhower's unprecedented radio-TV statement to the American people as to his health and his decision to run again, I hesitate to add even a word to the all too many that have been said and written upon a subject which has been for so many weeks in the minds and hearts of our people. But it was a refreshing note to read an editorial which appears in the April issue of the Journal of Lifetime Living. It reminds us what history has taught that "leadership is more than a matter of physique and that great men often confute their diagnoses."

Surely we are agreed, Mr. Speaker, that we must all rely upon the best medical advices available to us. This the President is doing. Yet in the best interest of the Presidency, the Nation, and the literally millions of people who have long since learned that mere diagnosis and prognosis of the physical body is not the whole story, can we not stop talking about it? For it is the certainty within the very being of the individual that life is always creative and recreative, which brings about the miracle of renewal and gives the individual the courage, the faith, and the will to live in order to serve.

Let us be ever grateful that these things are so.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the article above-mentioned.

[From the Journal of Lifetime Living of April 1956]

HOW HEALTHY MUST PRESIDENTS BE?

(By Leonard M. Leonard, editor)

Should physicians pass upon the fitness of candidates for the Presidency?

With medical opinion in the foreground of election talk this year, it is natural to raise the question, and the idea will appeal to many as a form of protection for both the Nation and its leaders.

But whether this authority rests with a candidate's own doctors or with a more official board of medical examiners, we can't help wondering what effects it would have—and how a similar practice might have changed the course of our history.

Would doctors have O. K.'d George Washington for the Presidency? It seems unlikely, for our first President was anything but a healthy one. He suffered at various times from smallpox, malaria, pleurisy (possibly tuberculosis), and frequent bouts with infections. Doctors all but gave up hope for him twice, and with a weak longevity record on his father's side to begin with Washington himself long expected an untimely end. But after surviving the trials of the Revolution, he proceeded to serve two vital terms as President.

Andrew Jackson would certainly have flunked almost any physical test. He had a bullet in his arm and another in his chest, plus a history of smallpox, dysentery, malaria, swollen legs, and lung hemorrhages. None of this, however, prevented him from completing two terms in the Presidency.

Grover Cleveland underwent a secret operation for cancer shortly after becoming President for the second time. Yet he not only completed his term, but remained active for many years afterward, finally succumbing to an entirely different ailment.

The ponderous William Howard Taft was so grossly overweight that modern doctors would have labeled him a poor risk.

History seems to have given us the lesson that leadership is more than a matter of physique, and that great men often confute their diagnoses. Just like ordinary people, they are, of course, subject to accidents, coronary and otherwise. But a passing grade in any medical examination is no guaranty against these occurrences.

It is not clear precisely how much we would gain by a system of "medical elections," so to speak, if ever we came to adopt it. But if overconcern about health would tend to bar older men from office and deprive us of their experience, it would certainly seem questionable.

When we are otherwise ready to trust a candidate in high office, it might be simpler if we also trusted him to evaluate his own physical fitness, with such expert advice as he would naturally be inclined to seek. Then, to protect the Nation from misjudgments and accidents, let us make sure that we have the right man to succeed him.

HON. WILLIAM J. OBERDORFFER

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimouse consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, March 18, the oldest living former member of the Michigan Legislature, the Honorable William J. Oberdorffer, celebrated his 101st birthday in the village of Stephenson, Mich.

Mr. Oberdorffer emigrated to the United States from Germany at the age of 19, and has distinguished himself in the State of Michigan in public service and as a servant to his fellow man.

He was first elected a member of the house of representatives from Menominee County in 1896, and served two terms. In 1906 Gov. Fred Warner appointed him as a member of the State board of agriculture, on which he served with distinction. In 1907 he was elected from the Upper Peninsula of Michigan as a delegate to the constitutional convention, where his many contributions to sound and representative government won him great acclaim. He authored a bill creating the experiment station at Chatham, Mich., an institution that has grown and continues to perform a valuable agricultural service.

Mr. Oberdorffer returned to the Michigan State Legislature in 1925, and during that period and subsequent to it he served on the board of education, the village council, and as justice of the peace.

At the age of 101 he still finds the time, interest, and energy to be cognizant of local, State, National, and world affairs. To this pioneer of the great north country, who still commands a deep respect of his friends and neighbors, I extend sincere and hearty congratulations.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I was out in the worst storm I have ever known in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Thirty-one persons lost their lives. Many acts of kindness and heroism took place.

I should like to speak of what the Veterans' Administration did. The veterans' hospital at the Jamaica Plain Parkway took in and housed and insofar as possible gave beds to 1,800 persons, a very remarkable act of kindness and humanity. We thank the Veterans' Administration.

The following article describes the situation faced by this hospital:

VA HOSPITAL SHELTERS 1,800 BLIZZARD REFUGEES

The Veterans' Administration Hospital on South Huntington Avenue, Jamaica Plain, resembled a wartime evacuation center yesterday.

More than 1,800 refugee motorists—men, women, and children—were housed overnight at the sprawling institution when their cars stalled or bogged down on nearby highways.

The refugees, some from as far away as Martha's Vineyard, were rounded up at the height of the storm by volunteer workers who trudged from car to car through heavy drifts to invite the stranded travelers in for the night.

Many of the motorists, whose cars were trapped on surrounding highways, had settled down with motors running and heaters turned on. They were prepared to spend the night in their snow-bound vehicles.

Authorities at the hospital, however, were fearful that some of the motorists might be overcome by carbon monoxide fumes from the running motors.

John Gallagher, assistant hospital manager, opened the doors to all refugees.

Volunteer crews, most of them hospital staff workers, began a systematic search of all bogged down cars on Jamaicaway, South Huntington Avenue, and other nearby highways.

More than 20 travelers—all women or children—were removed from cars and carried on litters into the hospital.

Most were victims of overexertion or overtiredness. Some had suffered temporary blindness from the snow and were given emergency treatment by staff doctors.

Women and children were given first option on the vacant hospital beds.

The men slept on cots in the corridors or curled up on the lobby chairs. Coffee and food were available for all.

Stranded travelers flooded the institution's switchboard with telephone calls—all attempting to inform anxious relatives at home that they had found a safe shelter for the night.

FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to farmers and consumers, it is time that we speak out and let them know what certain members of the Democrat Party are doing to their farm legislation.

President Eisenhower gave his 9-point program to the Congress and it was receiving highest acclaim and support from the honest-to-goodness farmers and from businessmen associated with or interested in agriculture.

The Senate started out to enact these proposals into legislation and then something happened. The opposition realized that deserving benefits very quickly would come to the farmers. It was then that the prophets of gloom and doom started their delaying action. These men who are more interested in the possible gathering of votes than in the general welfare used delaying tactics.

These same men had been sowing seeds of discontent in the hope of garnering a harvest of votes in the next election. It is only a brief span of time to recall how former Secretary of Agriculture Brannan proposed to socialize agriculture—how he forsook the policy of his predecessors to make 2 blades of grass grow where only 1 grew before, and, instead, attempt to garner 2 votes where only 1 previously existed.

As a farmer, I know that the farmers will not permit themselves to be betrayed for 30 pieces of silver. They have a birthright and a proud heritage. They are entitled to the same farm bill that the President presented to the Congress.

If the farmers do not get it, they can blame only those Democrats who are stalling and delaying. The Senate and House records are clear as to the real friends of the farmers and their friends are not the men who continue to delay this worthy legislation.

It should reach the conference committee and be acted upon by the House this week. Any further delay is reprehensible.

CONGRESSIONAL FRANKING PRIVILEGES

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which, if adopted, would save at least several hundred thousand dollars. I think the bill would serve to restore some of the original intent of the Congress when the franking privilege was granted. This bill would, in effect, limit the use of the frank for the sending of reprints of speeches and other material from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to addresses within the States, Territories, or Commonwealths served by the Member using the frank or by the Delegate or Resident Commissioner.

SCHOOL-MILK AND BRUCELLOSIS-ERADICATION PROGRAMS

Mr. COOLEY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8320) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school-milk program and the brucellosis-eradication program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

SCHOOL-MILK AND BRUCELLOSIS-ERADICATION PROGRAMS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentlemen from North Carolina when he expects to call up the conference report?

Mr. COOLEY. As early tomorrow as possible.

Mr. MARTIN. That is tomorrow?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

TITLE III OF THE BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6815) to provide for the orderly disposition of property acquired under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATING NATIONAL FARM-CITY WEEK

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 317) designating the last week in October of each year as National Farm-City Week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I call to the attention of my colleague that this resolution, as he will recall, was before us in the last session. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the ranking Republican on our committee, introduced an identical resolution. It was thoroughly considered by our committee, and I recall when it was called up at that time there was one objection. May I point out to my colleague what this resolution does. May I also say to the gentleman I had intended to offer an amendment changing the date that was fixed in the original resolution so as to make it applicable during the current year only. Last year, although we failed to pass the resolution, the President did what the resolution indicates would be appropriate for him to do and that is to designate National Farm-City Week.

Mr. Speaker, it is especially desirable at this time that we open a broad opportunity for understanding and friendship between the people who produce our food and fiber and those who consume it.

Agriculture's position in the whole economy is the most pressing domestic problem confronting our country, and the least understood.

It is essential that city people understand agriculture. It is to their own self-interest that agriculture be prosperous and not become a depressing drag upon the whole economy. Our great strength as a Nation has its roots in the soil and a large dependence upon the people who till the soil. Farmers want to join city people, and we want them to join us, in establishing and assuring a condition of permanent prosperity in this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, thousands and thousands of words critical of American farmers have been beamed to city dwellers in recent months, by news releases, radio, and television, in speeches and in magazines. A rather successful attempt has been made to prejudice city people against farmers. This has been a destructive and regrettable part of the controversy over the farm program.

The time now has come when those of us who are interested in the welfare of farmers—and, indeed, in the welfare of our country—must, and I say must, find a way to present the truth about agriculture to the people—especially to the great urban populations of the Nation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge upon the House its unanimous approval of House Joint Resolution 317, which I have introduced. This and an identical resolution by Mr. HOPE, of Kansas—House Joint Resolution 318—would designate, as amended, the week of November 16–22, 1956, as National Farm-City Week, to honor America's farm families and to promote understanding between farm and city people.

For many years individuals and organizations interested in the welfare of American agriculture realized the need to bring about a greater mutual understanding between our urban population and the Nation's farmers. Although it was recognized that the program of improving relations should be carried on continuously, a group which was formed last year felt it desirable to set aside 1 week each year during which special emphasis would be applied to the problem and strong efforts would be made to develop solutions.

A national steering committee for Farm-City Week was set up in March of 1955. The dates, October 23 to 29, 1955, were selected as the week for Farm-City Week observance and plans were formulated up until that time for the most successful possible participation of as many organizations as possible. Kiwanis International was named as the coordinating agency for the project and the program was designed and promoted to produce an impact in every American home.

Farm-City Week made its presence felt in all parts of the United States. It received the official blessing of President Eisenhower when he issued a proclamation on October 17.

Needless to say, the greatest amount of attention was given to the development of local community programs. In this effort, countless organizations took part, Kiwanis and other service-club groups, agricultural agencies, youth groups, State and local farm bureaus, local and Pomona granges, chambers of commerce, individual businesses, colleges and universities, churches, schools, railroads, and labor groups. From reports received, more than a quarter million people became involved in the program.

Most significant is the fact that continuing projects were indicated and there is great hope that last year's programs will be revitalized, expanded, and intensified to insure further impact during this year.

It should be emphasized that never during 1955 was Farm-City Week used for selfish purposes. Its fundamental philosophy of demonstrating the interdependence of all segments of our society permeated all projects. The week contributed its share to the real meaning of the American way of life.

One of the factors most responsible for the success of this initial Farm-City Week effort was the tremendous contribution made by various media of communication, including local and national newspapers, farm press and special press, and local, regional and national radio and television. The press associations were especially helpful in promoting the project on a national scale.

Those who fostered the first annual observance of Farm-City Week are gratified at the results. For an initial effort they believe it was highly successful. They are convinced that with each succeeding year the program will see wider participation, more intensive national and local efforts, and a consequent growth of understanding.

Only last month the 1955 observance of Farm-City Week was recognized by Freedom Foundation. It was the recipient of a distinguished service award in the foundation's Americanism contest. Presentation of the award was made to Merle H. Tucker, general chairman of the National Farm-City Week Committee in ceremonies on Washington's birthday, at Valley Forge.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that the Congress lend encouragement to this undertaking in understanding between our rural and city people.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say to my friend that I am not opposed to the bill, but the way the bill reads now it is not appropriate and it is not in order, and no one has advised the members of the objectors committee that they were willing to put the resolution in order.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that situation, of course, but if the gentleman would withdraw his request, I would like to offer two amendments which would correct the dates. With the gentleman's permission, may we proceed to the consideration of the resolution and I will ask that these amendments be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire whether any of the Republican members of the Committee on Agriculture are aware of the nature of the amendments the gentleman from North Carolina is going to offer.

Mr. COOLEY. I am sure that my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is aware of them. But, I am not sure that all of the Members have been advised. The only thing that it is proposed to do by these amendments is to change the date which originally provided that National Farm-City Week be designated in each year or as of October 1955, to the week of November 16, 1956. We did that to carry it clear beyond the election. I believe, perhaps, that the objection was interposed previously because of the fact that Farm-City Week as proposed in the original bill was fixed to come before the election.

Mr. MARTIN. Then the legislation would have no effect until next November?

Mr. COOLEY. It would come into effect on November 16, 1956.

Mr. MARTIN. Then, why not let the bill go over for 2 weeks so that opportunity may be had to consult about the proposal.

Mr. COOLEY. May I say that I have been just advised by one of my colleagues on the committee that these amendments were considered in the committee and were approved in the committee. The resolution, of course, will have to pass the other body.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], one of the senior members of the committee, is present.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman from Minnesota assures me that the amendments are satisfactory and therefore I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the last week in October of each year is to be designated as National Farm-City Week, in recognition of the contribution American farm families have made to our civilization and in order to promote better public understanding of the needs, problems, and opportunities of our country's agriculture and farm people, and to honor men and women who have contributed to agricultural achievements and progress.

To this end the President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling upon the Department of Agriculture, the land-grant colleges, the Agricultural Extension Service and all other appropriate agencies and officials of the Government, to cooperate with National, State, and local farm organizations and other groups in the several States and counties in preparing and carrying out programs for the appropriate observation of National Farm-City Week, including plans for public meetings, discussions, exhibits, pageants, and press, radio, and television features, with a special emphasis on notable achievements by rural groups and individuals, local, State, and National, and on the all-around enrichment of American country living through adequate cultural, spiritual, educational, recreational, and health facilities for both rural youth and rural adults.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "last", insert the word "full."

Page 1, line 3, after the word "October", strike out "of each year is to" and insert "1955."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "issue", strike out the word "annually."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY to the committee amendment: Page 1, line 3, strike out all of line 3 after the word "last" and insert in place thereof the following: "that the week of November 16–22, 1956."

The amendment to the commmittee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution designating the week of November 16–22, 1956, as National Farm-City Week."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AINSWORTH UNIT OF MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9132) to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TO REIMBURSE OWNERS OF LANDS ACQUIRED UNDER FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5975) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners of lands acquired under the Federal reclamation laws for their moving expenses, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I am taking advantage of this opportunity to direct attention to H. R. 9351, a bill that I have introduced to cover the need for relief in a situation similar in character to that covered in the pending bill.

The bill now before the House, and which I anticipate will be passed by consent and without objection, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners and tenants of lands acquired under the Federal reclamation laws for their moving expenses. This I think is a good bill with a just and meritorious purpose.

We are told by the committee that existing law relating to the acquisition of lands for projects and works constructed by the Secretary of the Interior provides only for the purchase of lands and property at their fair market value. There is no provision to reimburse owners and tenants dispossessed for their moving expenses. H. R. 5975 is intended to make possible this reimbursement for moving expenses in such situations.

It follows the pattern set in the act of July 14, 1952 whereby the military departments were given authority to reimburse landowners and tenants for moving expenses when acquiring lands for their public-works projects.

In the city of Chicago, as in New York and other large cities, vast redevelopment projects are in progress. These have been made necessary by the advent of the automobile, the requirement of superhighways and wider streets and of parking spaces, and also by the necessity of removing the blight of slums. Under the power granted it by State law, and to advance the purposes of the rehabilitation program, the Chicago Land Clearance Commission has condemned

and taken over large areas. In some of these areas are business properties, tenanted by merchants and others who have been long-established, and who must now seek new locations.

Under the law the owners of these properties are being reimbursed on the basis of fair market value. But there is no provision in existing law to recompense the displaced small business tenants for their necessary moving expenses to new localities. Everyone is agreed that these business tenants are entitled to such reimbursement just as everyone in the Congress when the act of July 14, 1952 was passed was agreed that owners and tenants forced from lands acquired for the benefit of the public were entitled to reimbursement for their moving expenses. And so today in passing by consent the pending legislation we extend the principle in the case of projects in the Department of the Interior.

But there is still no provision for the relief in the case of business tenants who are being displaced in the rebuilding of our big cities. H. R. 9351 I have introduced to extend this relief. It amends the Small Business Act of 1953 to assist small businesses which are displaced by urban renewal projects by providing reimbursement for necessary moving expenses and loans to cover certain costs incurred in the relocation of such businesses.

Some of my colleagues may ask why the amendment is to the Small Business Act and not to the Housing Act. The reason is this: In Chicago and elsewhere many business tenants are on the eve of being dispossessed. The need for relief is immediate. It will not wait until the convening of the State legislatures in January of 1957 and the amendments that are required to State laws governing the contribution of State and local funds to projects in which the Federal Government participates.

I anticipate that later when the Banking and Currency Committee undertakes the task of writing the Housing Act of 1956 proper consideration will be given to the subject. But that will be too late to give the relief now needed to these business tenants on the very eve of being dispossessed. The prompt enactment of H. R. 9351 will give that relief. Its passage is demanded by every concept of justice and every rule of equity. I know of no better time to bring this to the attention of the House than this occasion when we are by unanimous consent passing a bill for the relief of dispossessed owners and tenants in areas of reclamation. What is good for our citizens in areas under the Federal reclamation laws is good for our people who live in the cities. What is just and right in one part of our country is just and right in other parts of our country.

I am supporting H. R. 5975 because I think it is right in principle just as the act of July 14, 1952, was right in principle. I trust that my colleagues from the wide open spaces will join with us from the metropolitan centers in making applicable to a very acute urban problem the same principle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to the extent administratively determined by him to be fair and reasonable to reimburse the owners and tenants of lands acquired for the construction, operation or maintenance of a project under the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388 and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) for expenses and other losses and damages incurred by them in the process and as a direct result of such moving of themselves, their families, and their possessions from said lands as is occasioned by said acquisition, which reimbursement shall be in addition to, but not in duplication of, any payments that may otherwise be authorized by law: *Provided*, That the total of such reimbursement to the owners and tenants of any parcel of land shall in no event exceed 25 percent of its fair value, as determined by the Secretary. No payment under this act shall be made unless application therefor, supported by an itemized statement of the expenses, losses, and damages incurred, is submitted to the Secretary within 1 year from the date upon which the premises involved are vacated or, in the case of lands acquired and vacated prior to the date of this act but after July 14, 1952, within 1 year from the date of this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary may perform any and all acts and make such rules and regulations as he finds necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act. All functions performed under this act shall be exempt from the operation of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 237), as amended (5 U. S. C., secs. 1001–1011), except as to the requirements of section 3 of said act.

SEC. 3. As used in this act, the term "lands" shall include interests in land; the term "acquisition" and its cognates shall include the exercise of a right-of-way upon lands subject thereto under the act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 371, 391, 43 U. S. C., sec. 945); and the term "fair value" shall, in the case of interests in land and of rights-of-way under the act of August 30, 1890, mean a fair value of the interest acquired or of the right-of-way occupied.

SEC. 4. Funds appropriated for the construction, operation, or maintenance of Federal reclamation projects shall also be available for carrying out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 7, 8, and 9, strike the words "a project under the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto)," and insert the words "water and power developments under his jurisdiction."

Page 2, line 2, strike the words "from said lands."

Page 2, strike lines 13, 14, and 15, and insert the following: "vacated: *Provided further*, That in the case of lands acquired and vacated prior to the date of this act but after July 14, 1952, such payments may be made upon application therefor within 1 year from the date of this act."

Page 3, line 8, strike the words "Federal reclamation projects" and insert the words "water and power developments under the jurisdiction of the Secretary."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners of lands acquired for water and power developments for their moving expenses, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF IRRIGATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8535) to amend the act of July 4, 1955, relating to the construction of irrigation distribution systems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act of July 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 245) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary shall require, as conditions to any such loan, that the borrower contribute in money or materials, labor, lands, or interests in land, computed at their reasonable value, a portion, not in excess of 10 percent of the construction cost of the distribution system (including all costs of acquiring lands and interests in land), that the plans for the system be in accord with sound engineering practices and be such as will achieve the purposes for which the system was authorized, and that the borrower agree to account in full in regard to all disbursements of borrowed funds and to return at once for application toward amortization of the loan all funds which are not expended in the construction of the distribution system. Prior to the consummation of any loan under this act, the borrower shall also be required to transfer to the United States any lands or interests in land which it then holds and which the Secretary finds are required for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the distribution system and to agree to transfer to the United States any lands or interests in land which it may thereafter acquire and which the Secretary may find are required for this purpose. Title to all such lands and interests in land and to distribution works constructed, in whole or in part, with moneys lent under this act shall remain in the United States until the loan is repaid. Every organization contracting for repayment of a loan under this act shall operate and maintain its distribution works in conformity with reasonable contractual requirements determined to be appropriate for the protection of the United States. When full repayment has been made to the United States, the Secretary shall relinquish all claims under said contracts and shall retransfer to the borrowed title to the works and all lands and interests in land which were transferred by it to the United States. The head of any department or agency of the Government within whose administrative jurisdiction are lands owned by the United States the use of which is reasonably necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of distribution works under this act may grant to a borrower or prospective borrower under this act revocable permission for the use thereof in like manner as under the Acts of March 3, 1891,, secs. 18–21, 26 Stat. 1101, as amended (43 U. S. C., secs. 946–949), January 21, 1895, 28 Stat. 635, as amended (43 U. S. C., sec. 956), February 15, 1901, 31 Stat. 790, as amended (16 U. S. C., secs. 79, 522, 43 U. S. C., sec. 959), February 1, 1905, 33 Stat. 628 (16 U. S. C., sec. 524), March 1, 1921, 41 Stat. 1194 (43 U. S. C., sec. 950), May 9, 1941, 55 Stat. 183 (43 U. S. C., sec. 931a), July 24, 1946, sec. 7, 60 Stat. 643, as amended (43 U. S. C., sec. 931b), May 31, 1947, 61 Stat. 124 (38 U. S. C., sec. 111), Februrary 5, 1948, 62 Stat. 17 (25 U. S. C., secs. 323–328), or September 3, 1954, 68 Stat. 1146 (43 U. S. C., secs. 931c–931d), or any other

similar act which is applicable to the lands involved: *Provided*, That no such permission shall be granted in the case of lands being administered for national park, national monument, or wildlife purposes. No benefits or privileges under the Federal reclamation laws, including repayment provisions, shall be denied an irrigation distribution system because such system has been constructed pursuant to this act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to irrigation purposes, including incidental domestic and stock water, and loans hereunder shall be interest free. Nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal or limit the procedural and substantive requirements of section 8 of the act of June 17, 1902."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 15, after the word "purpose", insert "and distribution works constructed, in whole or in part, with moneys lent under this act for the construction thereof."

Page 2, line 17, strike out the balance of line 17, all of lines 18, 19, and 20, down to and including the word "repaid." and insert "Title to all such lands, interests in land, and distribution works shall remain in the United States until the loan is repaid."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RED WILLOW DAM AND RESERVOIR, NEBRASKA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1194) to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebraska, and construction by the Secretary of the Army of the Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kansas, as units of the Missouri River Basin project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., a unit of the Missouri River Basin project (act of December 22, 1944, 58 Stat. 887, 891) shall be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary of the Interior for the principal purposes of making available a regulated supply of water for irrigation and of assisting the control of floods.

SEC. 2. The Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., also a unit of the Missouri River Basin project (act of December 22, 1944, aforesaid) shall be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary of the Army for the principal purposes of flood control and assisting in making available a regulated supply of water for irrigation and low flow regulation.

SEC. 3. Both the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army shall cause these units of the Missouri River Basin project to be coordinated and integrated physically and financially, with the other Federal works constructed or authorized to be constructed under the comprehensive plans approved by section 9 of the act of December 22, 1944, aforesaid, as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the Secretary of the Army shall, in the case of the Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, be responsible for flood-control regulation as provided in section 7 of the act of December 22, 1944, and the Secretary of the Interior shall, in the case of Wilson Dam and Reservoir, be responsible for the disposal of water for irrigation or space reserved for this purpose in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause down to and including line 23 on page 2, and include: "That administrative jurisrdiction over the construction, operation, and maintenance of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Neb., an authorized unit of the Missouri River Basin project (act of December 22, 1944, sec. 9, 58 Stat. 887, as amended and supplemented), is hereby transferred from the Secretary of the Army to the Secretary of the Interior and jurisdiction over the construction, operation, and maintenance of Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., another authorized unit of the same project, is hereby transferred from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of the Army. The principal purposes of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir shall be those of making available a regulated supply of water for irrigation and of assisting in the control of floods, and the principal purposes of Wilson Dam and Reservoir those of flood control and of assisting in making available a regulated supply of water for irrigation and low-flow regulation: *Provided*, That no expenditure of funds shall be made for construction of such projects until the Secretary of the Interior, in the case of the Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., and the Secretary of the Army, in the case of the Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., with the approval of the President, have submitted to the Congress completed reports demonstrating such projects to be economically justified, and the Congress has approved such reports.

"SEC. 2. Both the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army shall cause these units of the Missouri River Basin project to be coordinated and integrated physically and financially with the other Federal works constructed or authorized to be constructed under the comprehensive plans approved by section 9 of the act of December 22, 1944, aforesaid, as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the Secretary of the Army shall, in the case of the Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, be responsible for flood-control regulation as provided in section 7 of the act of December 22, 1944, and the Secretary of the Interior shall, in the case of Wilson Dam and Reservoir, be responsible for the disposal of water for irrigation or space reserved for this purpose in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for transfer of administrative jurisdiction over Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebraska, to the Secretary of the Interior and over Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kansas, to the Secretary of the Army."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO RETURN TO HARTFORD, VT., CERTAIN LAND

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1585) to provide for the return to the town of Hartford, Vt., of certain land, which was donated by such town to the United States as a site for a veterans hospital and which is no longer needed for such purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the town of Hartford, Vt., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion, consisting of approximately 53$^{9}/_{10}$ acres, of the tract of land theretofore donated by such town to the United States for the purpose of providing a site for a veterans hospital, which has been determined to be in excess of the amount needed for the purposes of such hospital and transferred to the General Services Administration for disposition as surplus property.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WITHHOLDING FOR STATE RETIREMENT PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4437) relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That where—

(1) the law of any State or Territory provides for the payment of employee contributions to State or Territorial employee retirement systems by withholding sums from the compensation of State or Territorial employees and making returns of such sums to the authorities of such State or Territory; and

(2) civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard other that those employed by the National Guard Bureau are eligible for membership in a State or Territorial employee retirement system, then the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to such regulation as may be promulgated by the President, is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with such State or Territory within 120 days of the request for agreement from the proper official of such State or Territory. Such agreement shall provide that the Department of Defense shall comply with the requirements of such law in the case of employees subject to this act who are eligble for membership in a retirement system for State or Territorial employees, and the disbursing officers paying such employees shall withhold and pay over to such retirement system the employee contributions for such employees.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES BEFORE FOREIGN JUDICIAL TRIBUNALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7646) to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, to incur expenses incident to the representation of their personnel before judicial tribunals and administrative agencies of any foreign nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have not had an opportunity to study this legislation thoroughly, but it appears to me it provides for the implementation of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say to the gentleman from Iowa that I understand his views on this Status of Forces Agreement. My views are not far different from his in that respect; but this bill alleviates the situation somewhat. Knowing his views in reference to the Status of Forces Agreement as I do, I may say that this bill will help our people and not affect that situation one bit. It will mean that a soldier or his dependents, or an employee of the Government overseas will have an opportunity to get counsel and get expenses of a trial over there paid and have help in making bail, which he might not have the ability to do under the present situation if the bill is not passed. It really is the kind of consideration we ought to give our Armed Forces and their dependents overseas.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman feels as I do about the NATO Status of Forces Treaty and secret treaties and agreements in countries other than NATO countries, then why does this language appear in this report:

> This bill is the means of supplementing the substantial list of protections already secured by the NATO Status of Forces Agreement and related agreements.

How can the gentleman subscribe to that kind of language in a report on a bill which is brought to the floor of the House?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I will answer the gentleman. I do not subscribe to that language. I think that was an unfortunate phraseology, and I am trying to correct the impression that the statement leaves.

If we do not pass this bill then those people over there in uniform and the dependents of those people, and those employees we send over there, are not provided the assistance that a grateful Government ought to give them when they are overseas.

We are powerless to revoke the treaty which establishes the Status of Forces Agreement. The authority in this bill is to give these men counsel and pay for the counsel and see that they and their families get the best protection possible; and we do not have the authority today to give these men the opportunity to make bail—in fact, to let the Government arrange bail for them—so that they will not be compelled to stay in prison pending trial. They will have an opportunity to be on bail until the time comes for their trial and they are either acquitted or convicted.

Mr. GROSS. May I say to the gentleman from Louisiana with all due respect to him and to the Committee on Armed Services that no matter how much money we may spend in an effort to see that a man has a fair trial, there is no way in the world under proceedings in certain foreign courts whereby you can get him that fair trial by American standards, and the gentleman well knows it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I answer by saying that that may be entirely true, but we ought not to send our people overseas and then after this Status of Forces Treaty has been ratified and we in the House are powerless to take action to rescind it, we ought not to fail to provide counsel for these men, their families, and dependents in foreign courts, and we ought not to object to protecting them or providing them with bail rather than for them to have to stay in prison because they cannot make bail in a foreign land. This bill provides that those expenses may be borne by the United States Government, and thus we alleviate to some extent the inconvenience those people might otherwise feel.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that it is already provided that we have observers in these courts?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes; however an observer can do nothing but report.

Mr. GROSS. And that is about all we can do for them, is it not?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No; under this bill we go further than that. We still have the observer to watch to see if there is any travesty on justice, and in this bill we also provide the money by which competent counsel can be obtained for these people—and that is at Government expense—and we also under this bill provide that the Government shall make bail for them where bail is proper to be made. The other expenses, for instance the trial expenses that come up, likewise are provided for in this bill. Without this bill those people may not have the ability to obtain counsel overseas. We have observers, yes, but no counsel.

Mr. GROSS. Is there anything in any NATO Status of Forces Treaty or in any of these secret agreements that the gentleman knows anything about which says that foreign civil courts and judges must recognize American lawyers or foreign lawyers who might be hired under the terms of this bill?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I am not fully conversant with that.

Mr. GROSS. The provisions of this bill, if enacted, would not supersede a treaty?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No, it does not.

Mr. GROSS. All right.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. But this does not violate the terms of any treaty.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa that at the time this was being considered by the Committee on Armed Services I had the same apprehension about it that the gentleman from Iowa voices. I was worried about whether it changed the Status of Forces Agreement. The gentleman fears that this will get the camel's nose under the tent. But after going over the bill and understanding its purposes I came to the conclusion that it would have no such effect, it would not put the camel's nose under the tent but instead would render a great service to our American soldiers serving abroad who are being denied that service at the present time.

I would like to add at this point that a few years ago an American boy from Iowa in lighting a fire in a barracks over in Turkey caused the barracks to be burned down. He was completely absolved by a military court. However, the building belonged to the Turkish Government. The boy was arrested and we had a terrible time getting him out.

This particular bill simply does this: At the present time the Defense Department has no power to employ Turkish counsel, French counsel, or the counsel or lawyer of any country where a boy may be to aid American counsel, American officers who are attorneys in the Judge Advocate General's Department sitting in court, to see that the boy gets the best possible defense he can be given under the circumstances. To fail to pass this bill might injure one or more American boys. If one boy alone were protected it would justify the passage of this bill. I trust the gentleman from Iowa will not object to its passage or ask that it be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I say, that there was some doubt in our minds, for instance, as to the possibility that the Government, having spent money in working up the defense of a case, at a later date to go to the defendant and collect the money that was put up for his trial. This bill will prevent that from occurring. The normal expenses of trial overseas of this sort will be the responsibility of the Government and at no future date will the Government bill the defendant for the expenses incurred under those circumstances. An enlisted man over there may not have proper counsel unless we supplement this situation with the bill that is before us today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear the fine arguments made by the gentlemen who represent the Committee on the Armed Services of the House against the NATO Status of Forces Treaty. I only wish that some of these House Armed Services Committee members could have appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House when some of us did last year in opposition to the NATO Status of Forces Treaty and other secret agreements trying to get them thrown out; trying to get the President of the United States to take action to nullify these treaties. The point is that we should not be sending any servicemen overseas to be tried in foreign courts. Now you are asking American taxpayers to provide money to defend American servicemen who are tried in foreign courts when these servicemen and their dependents should never be subject to trial in foreign civil courts.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think a short delay will hurt this bill at all and I therefore renew my request that the bill be passed over without prejudice until I have had an opportunity to study it thoroughly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10003) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be confined to the bill and be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 10003, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill appropriates $179,797,800 for the operation of the District government. This amount includes $33,562,500 for capital outlay. The amount recommended by the committee is an increase of $10,316,313 above the 1956 appropriations. However, $8,330,610 of the increase is due to increased pay costs, so the net increase other than pay costs is $1,986,303, which is for mandatory expenses—such as retirement costs—staffing of new buildings, and increases for increased population or workload.

As you know, there is a District revenue bill pending before the House. Upon passage of that bill, the District of Columbia government expects to submit a supplemental estimate for $13,215,000 for further capital outlay projects.

The reduction in this bill of $3,101,700 is the lowest reduction made in a District bill since 1952.

The bill includes the full Federal payment of $20 million to the general fund and the budget estimates for payments to the water fund and the sanitary sewage works fund.

There are three items for which the committee has gone over the budget estimate. The first one is a $100,000 increase for the Metropolitan Police Department. This increase will help them fill a little over one-half the presently existing 37 vacancies and should result in more and better enforcement of the laws. The second increase is $32,800 for the public schools. The need for 180 elementary-school teachers was the subject of statements of approximately 40 of the 75 or 80 outside witnesses that the committee heard in two evening sessions. Briefly, the committee allowed the 40 additional teachers in the budget, directed the transfer of the salaries of 50 teaching positions from the secondary schools to the elementary schools, and allocated $157,500 of the total budget for the hiring of at least 35 more, depending on their starting salary. To offset this action, the committee applied its reduction of $124,700 in the requested budget increases against the allocation for additional teachers. The effect of the committee's action is a net increase in the budget of $32,800. The third item of increase is for the District of Columbia General Hospital. The committee was shocked at the various shortages, such as not enough money for drugs and supplies, a lack of nurses—197 when, by national standards, they should have 533—and so forth. The committee approved an increase in the estimate for the hospital of $431,000. However, in an effort to keep within shooting distance of the budget, the committee made other reductions, based on overestimated patient load, and so forth, and applied that reduction against the recommended increase. Again, the net effect of the action was an increase of $100,000.

As to major decreases, there are several. One is a decrease of $103,000 in the Department of General Administration. I don't believe this reduction is too heavy as they were requesting funds for 631 man-years of employment. As of February 13, they only had 601 employees on the rolls so the committee took a little bite out of their estimate. Another large reduction is in the Office of Civil Defense, where we cut $97,000. However, the committee is not impressed with what they are doing and if we gave them the full amount requested, we doubt if they could use it intelligently. The Department of Highways was cut $102,000. The request for new equipment at a cost of $58,000 was denied and most of the other reductions were requests for new positions.

The biggest reduction made by the committee in the capital outlay program was $1,021,700 for a new health school. The committee is favorably inclined toward building the new school on or near the site of the present school. There is considerable disagreement as to the proposed site even within the school system and we have knocked out the funds in an effort to force a decision as to where the school is to be located. This action should force a decision and the committee will agree to whatever decision is reached.

We have made reductions in the capital outlay programs of the other departments, but, in each instance, the appropriation is at least $400,000 above last year's appropriation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Those of us who do not have the opportunity and upon whom does not fall the obligation devolving upon the gentleman and his committee appreciate greatly the work which has been done by the subcommittee. If the gentleman is worried or inclined to be worried about what the local press says about his committee, he might just as well forget it because if the Washington Post and Times Herald wrote the bill itself, in a week they would be back criticizing it. All they want to do is to run the Government. If they do not like Washington, why do they not move out?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that his colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, does not bruise easily. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, first, I want to pay my respects to our distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and to the other members of the committee for the interest they have taken in behalf of the problems of the District of Columbia, their Nation's Capital, and the work they did in bringing about this bill.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] was very interested in the views of everyone. He was extremely courteous to all who cared to testify, listened to them carefully, and I know was benefited by some of the expert testimony given by the general public. Other members of the committee were very regular in attendance at committee meetings and did a mighty good job of interrogating the witnesses, which brought about the bill we have before us today.

It is not the most pleasant task to serve on the District Committee. When you get members there who really take it upon themselves to assume the responsibility commensurate with the authority vested in them to run the District, I think due credit and due praise should be given them.

The gentleman from Michigan covered the bill very well. The bill was voted out of the subcommittee unanimously, and also out of the full Appropriations Committee. I know of no objection to the bill or anything that is in it. It may not be perfect, it may not meet to perfection the ideas of every Member of the Congress, but I think it is a splendid bill in most every respect. I agreed to support it as it is and I am glad to do so.

The biggest problem and the only problem I am going to discuss, and that very briefly, is the problem of the schools, which has been brought about by integrating of division 1 and division 2. The integration problem seriously increased our teacher problem, in addition to the increase due to increased enrollment.

It is easier to teach pupils in the same class and do a good job, and I say this as a former school administrator, who vary widely in ability than it is students who vary widely in age. This integration problem has forced a burden on the teachers of having pupils in the same class of varying ability by 2, 3, or 4 grades and who also vary in age by 3 or 4 years. Whenever you throw pupils together of different ages and different stages of development during the preadolescent and the adolescent period, you are inviting

social problems. It is the teacher's job, of course, to make a better citizen out of the child. The subject matter is merely a means to an end and not the end itself. So the committee saw fit to go beyond the recommendation of the Commissioners and give some additional teachers, realizing that the teacher load was tremendously increased and the problem tremendously aggravated by the integration of the schools. There are some other things I would like to talk about, but I do not believe I will take the time. I do hope that, if I am returned to serve in the 85th Congress, I will be able to find the time to make a little closer personal survey and observation of the problems of the District, and especially the problems of the schools and the libraries. I know the gentleman from Michigan, our chairman [Mr. RABAUT], has given a great deal of time to it, and it is unfortunate that we do not have the time we would like to have to personally familiarize ourselves with those problems.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] 10 minutes.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the Appropriations Committee once again brings to the floor of the House for your approval the annual District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1957.

It has been a pleasure working with our subcommittee chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], and the other members of this committee.

We recommend appropriations totaling $179,797,800 for the operation of the government of the District of Columbia, with $33,562,500 of this amount being for capital outlay. This is an increase of $10,316,313 in the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1956, and a reduction of $3,101,700 in the budget estimates.

The District of Columbia is financed out of five separate funds—a general fund, a highway fund, a water fund, a motor-vehicle-parking fund, and a sanitary sewage fund.

The District of Columbia appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1957 contains a Federal contribution of $20 million for the general fund, $1,613,950 for the water fund, and $744,700 for the sanitary sewage works fund, making a total Federal payment of $22,358,650. This is an increase of $2,465,950 over the fiscal year of 1956.

This appropriations bill for 1957 provides for operating expenses in the sum of $146,235,300. The budget estimates for 1957 call for the sum of $146,719,399, and the District of Columbia Appropriations Act of 1956 provided for a total operating expense appropriation of $134,035,987. The bill before us today calls for an increase in the appropriations for operating expenses in the sum of $12,199,313 over the 1956 appropriations, and $484,000 less than the 1957 estimates. This total of $146,235,300 is composed of the following items: Executive Office, $323,000; Department of General Administration, $3,425,000; Office of Corporation Counsel, $480,000; compensation and retirement fund expenses, $11,100,000; regulatory agencies, $1,053,000; Department of Occupations and Professions, $262,000; public schools, $32,130,800; Public Library, $1,783,000; Recreation Department, $1,892,000; Metropolitan Police, $13,773,000; additional municipal services, inaugural ceremonies, $155,000; Fire Department, $6,755,000; Veterans Service Center, $98,500; Office of Civil Defense; $78,000; Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, $147,000; courts, $3,972,000; Department of Public Health, $25,434,000; Department of Corrections, $4,710,000; Department of Public Welfare $10,642,500; Department of Buildings and Grounds, $1,780,000; Office of Surveyor, $164,000; Department of Licenses and Inspections, $1,640,000; Department of Highways, $6,485,000; Department of Vehicles and Traffic, $1,291,000; Motor Vehicle Parking Agency, $295,000; Department of Sanitary Engineering, $10,846,000; Washington Aqueduct, $2,137,000; National Guard, $128,500; National Capital Parks, $2,535,000; National Zoological Park, $720,000.

For capital outlay this bill contains the sum of $33,562,500. This amount, plus the total for operating expenses of $146,235,300, makes the amount recommended in this bill total $179,797,800.

This program will be financed by the Federal contribution and payments to the water and sanitary sewage works funds; Federal loan authorizations; District of Columbia revenue by 1957, together with surplus on hand as of June 30, 1956.

As pointed out heretofore, the total appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1957 amounts to $179,797,800, and the Federal contribution to the general fund amounts to $20 million. You will be interested to know that in the year 1922 the total appropriations for the District of Columbia amounted to $22,977,411.07. The share of the Federal Government at that time amounted to $9,192,763.37. From 1922 to 1956 the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia has ranged from $4,539,295 to the maximum authorized under the present law of $20 million. The members of this committee are of the opinion that the $20-million Federal contribution requested has been justified. This differs somewhat from the fiscal year 1956, wherein this committee failed to see sufficient justification for the total request of $20 million, and at that time recommended only $16 million. In conference this amount was increased to $18 million, which was finally approved by the Congress.

It is a recognized fact that our Capital City is one of the great cities in the world and I believe that every Member of Congress takes pride in the advancement and accomplishments of Washington. Here we have the ninth largest city in the United States—population estimated today at 854,000—a city with many problems. Realizing the seriousness of these problems, every effort was made to carefully analyze each and every budget request presented.

One hundred and seventy witnesses appeared and our attention was called time after time to the need for additional funds for additional crime-prevention personnel and facilities, additional elementary teachers in the public-school system, and urgent need for funds to provide additional staffing and for medical and hospital supplies for District of Columbia General Hospital.

The total enrollment of the District schools on February 2, 1956, was 105,482, and February 3, 1955, the enrollment was 103,496. Recent surveys show that large numbers of children in the public schools of the District of Columbia are retarded in academic subjects and that there are hundreds of overcrowded classrooms. Deficiencies brought to light by the national achievement tests emphasize the results of oversized classes, insufficient classrooms, limited personnel and supplies. To meet this need we recommended $32,130,800 for the operation of the public-school system in the District. This is an increase of $4,800,000 over the 1956 appropriation and $32,800 over the 1957 estimate. This additional amount will provide, among other things, 125 new elementary teachers.

To take care of additional staffing, medical, and hospital supplies for the District of Columbia General Hospital we recommend $100,000 more than the budget request. For the Department of Public Health we recommend $25,434,000, which is $1,842,000 more than the 1956 appropriation.

After careful study we recommend $13,773,000 for the Police Department. This is an increase of $956,00 over the 1956 appropriation and $100,000 over the 1957 estimate. This $100,000 is to be used to fill as many vacancies in the uniformed force as possible.

As pointed out by the chief of police, Maj. Robert V. Murray, the very best deterrent for crime is the presence of a uniformed man on the street. Authorized strength under present law is 2,278 men. Forty to fifty vacancies must be maintained at all times in order to meet terminal-leave pay, step increases, and Government insurance. At the present time there are 2,241 men employed by the District Police Department. Three hundred and forty-five are assigned to administrative, supervisory, and clerical positions; 974 are assigned to prevention and detection of crime; 77 are assigned to details, courts, and hearings; absentees represent the total of 845, and all of these figures give us present employment figure of 2,241. Counting the 37 vacancies, we have the authorized strength of 2,278.

In 1955 the Police Department had available for prevention and detection of crime 932 men. These men were divided into 3 tours of duty, and there were only 311 men on at any 1 time. One hundred of this number were assigned to foot patrol. In other words, during the hours when more crime is committed, 6 p. m. to 2 a. m., the police force here in the District is at its lowest ebb in police personnel on duty. The 100 footmen must cover 60 square miles. One footman for each 8,540 residents and 1 footman for every 189 offenses. The District is at present experiencing its lowest crime rate since inauguration of the present reporting system in 1949. We still had 18,910 serious offenses committed here

during the fiscal year 1955. This is a decrease of 5.6 percent under the preceding fiscal year and a decrease of 23.1 percent under the peak of offenses reached in January of 1953. In spite of the record in crime prevention in 1955, the District should not feel that its police force is adequately manned. During this all-time low there was a criminal homicide for every 13,000 persons in the city, a rape for every 4,000, a robbery for every 762 persons, an aggravated assault for every 188, a housebreaking for every 240, a larceny for every 108, and an auto theft for every 585 persons. These figures represent a serious offense for every 45 persons living in the District. Of the 13 cities in the United States with populations of 500,000 to 1 million, Washington ranked fourth from the top in number of major offenses committed from January to June 1955. Here in Washington we had 9,163; for Baltimore, 11,244; for San Francisco, 11,600; for Houston, 8,249; and for St. Louis, 14,878.

A great many of the crimes committed in the District could have been prevented if we had an adequate police force. We must endeavor to eliminate crime in the District and not just reduce the number of crimes.

I have had some experience as far as law enforcement is concerned and I say to you advisedly that the Metropolitan Police Force here in the District is one of the finest police departments in the United States. We believe that Chief Murray and his department are to be commended, and with more men in uniform crime conditions will improve in the District. Good schools, hospitals, streets and many other governmental functions are necessary in the District, and at the same time it is just as important to see that we have adquate police protection for the people who live here and for those who visit the Capital City of the United States.

Recruitment of personnel is no longer a problem in the District, and the increase of $965,000 over the 1956 appropriation and the $100,000 over the 1957 estimate should go a long way in relieving a critical situation which is important to every one within the sound of my voice.

Notwithstanding the fact that the problems confronting our Capital City are many and in some instances serious we will see them successfully solved because we will have the complete cooperation of the citizens of the District, the District officials, and the Congress of the United States.

In closing I desire to pay my respects to Samuel Spencer, the President of the Board of Commissioners who leaves office in April of this year. He was not an applicant for reappointment. He has been an able, conscientious public servant and he will be missed by every member of this committee.

Mr. Chairman, our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 1003, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, 1957, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill designed to secure for all American citizens the civil rights that they are guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States and under the laws of our Nation. It is an unhappy fact that for some of our people many of these rights exist on paper only. There is, unfortunately, a gap between what is assured to them by the Constitution and by Federal law and what they actually enjoy.

I believe that the enactment of my bill would help to close this gap. I believe it would be a step toward making the promise of American life a reality for all Americans.

As Americans we now enjoy a measure of civil rights unsurpassed by any other people. These rights are the bedrock of our freedom. They are, perhaps, the most characteristic feature of all that our country stands for. They are the fundamental expression of our own values, and they are the standard by which the world judges us. We are determined to nurture and cherish them in the future as we have in the past.

But, despite all our freedom and our rights, we dare not permit ourselves to become blinded to certain shortcomings in our society. It is a fact that some Americans are being deprived of the full exercise of their rights. This is morally and legally wrong. We cannot expect a perfect society, but our national conscience cannot rest easy if we do not make a sincere and continuing effort to expand the rights of all citizens.

My bill provides for the establishment within the Department of Justice of a Civil Rights Division. Another Assistant Attorney General is added to the Department of Justice to exercise direct supervision and control over the Civil Rights Division. This bill calls for the delegation by the Attorney General to the Civil Rights Division of all of his functions relating to the enforcement of Federal laws concerned with the protection of civil rights, except those functions he may wish to retain and exercise himself or to delegate to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

In addition to the enforcement of Federal civil-rights laws, the Civil Rights Division, under this measure, has the responsibility for conducting a continuous survey of the status of our civil rights, the best means of securing these rights to the people, and the most effective methods by which they might be improved. Adequate provisions are made for the staffing and training of agents employed by the Civil Rights Division.

When compared to much of the proposed legislation that Congress regularly considers, this bill is not a complicated one. But I do feel strongly that it is an important measure and that it deserves the earnest consideration of this body.

Congress is constantly talking about the importance of our civil rights. This is the way it should be because nothing is more vital to our country. But we have done very little to correct the abuses, imperfections, and inadequacies which we all know to exist and which we all deplore.

Talk without action is useless. It makes a mockery of American traditions and ideals. It does nothing to correct inequities or to bring these American ideals to complete fulfillment.

I am fully aware that the bill that I am introducing is no cure-all for the weaknesses in our civil-rights program. I do, however, feel that it is needed. I do feel that it is a step in the right direction. I urgently request the Congress to give this bill its thoughtful consideration.

THE LIFE OF INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE BAKERS DEPENDS UPON IMMEDIATE PASSAGE OF H. R. 11

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many Members know that the small wholesale bakers in their districts are being destroyed as a result of a loophole in the antitrust laws?

The fact is that today a few giant corporations which distribute bakery products on a nationwide basis are invading many of the Members' districts and destroying the local bakers. The method of this destruction is as old as monopoly itself. The big corporations simply cut prices in one area at a time. The local competitor takes a beating on all of his sales, while the profits of the chain baker are sustained by high-priced sales in other areas. The results are inevitable: The smaller baker is squeezed out.

This has nothing to do with the question of who bakes the better product—who bakes the most tasty and nutritious loaf of bread, and delivers it freshest to the retailers' shelves. It has

nothing to do with the question of who can bake a given loaf of bread and deliver it at the lowest unit cost. Price discrimination makes the competitive contest purely and simply a question of which competitor is the biggest.

Several weeks ago your Small Business Committee heard sworn testimony from a number of independent wholesale bakers doing business in various parts of the Middle West. They all described a desperate situation in their areas, resulting from the discriminatory tactics of a few nationwide corporations. Likewise, we received in January a petition signed by 48 wholesale bakers in Pennsylvania—praying for relief from the same kind of discriminatory practices in their area. I should like to demonstrate just what these price discriminations mean to smaller baking companies.

First, however, let me remind the Members that on March 8, and again on Tuesday, March 13, I explained how the loophole which permits these tactics came to be placed in our antitrust laws, and how this loophole would be plugged by H. R. 11. These statements appear at pages 4345 and 4634 of the RECORD, respectively.

The continued existence of small firms in all kinds of business depends upon prompt passage of H. R. 11. Small business failures keep increasing, week after week. The Dun & Bradstreet reports show that these failures are occurring in all branches of business, and your Small Business Committee is receiving urgent pleas from small firms in all lines of business. All small business wants from this Congress is a fair chance and fair consideration. The Supreme Court has knocked a hole in the antitrust law which is supposed to curb discriminatory pricing practices. As a result small business is now without adequate protection against these deadly practices. Every small business in the United States has become a sitting duck, completely exposed to destruction by the sheer weight and size of a bigger competitor. There is no line of business in which small firms are immune to destruction from a big competitor's abuse of power. We should pass H. R. 11 to restore the protection of the antitrust laws, and thus make competition in the free enterprise system a competition of merit and efficiency, not just a contest in which the bigger firms will always win out over the smaller firms.

As a practical illustration of the way in which the loophole in the antidiscrimination law works to the detriment of small business, I described on Tuesday the conditions which prevailed several years ago in the whole baking industry. I now call attention to those conditions as they exist today.

During November, last year, seven witnesses from the wholesale baking industry testified before the House Small Business Committee on these conditions. The descriptions given by these witnesses were all the same. The testimony of Mr. Victor Wendelin, a wholesale baker in Lincoln, Nebr., covers the point.

By way of introduction to Mr. Wendelin's testimony, allow me to add a description of two large baking companies which figure in Mr. Wendelin's testimony. These are the Colonial Bakery, a division of Campbell-Taggart Associated Bakeries, Inc., and the Continental Baking Co. Mr. Wendelin testified that last summer Colonial and Continental reduced their prices on their pound loaves of bread in a marketing area covering a 90-mile radius around Des Moines, Iowa, to meet the prices of local bakers in that area, and that these two companies were selling bread in this area at 12 cents while at the same time they were selling the same bread in other areas at 16 cents, which is 33 percent more than their Des Moines price.

Moody's Industrials for 1955 reports that Campbell-Taggart markets bakery products in 57 cities in 20 States. In 1954 this company's total assets were reported as $46 million, and its sales volume in that year was $134 million.

Moody's likewise reports that the Continental Baking Co. operates 80 baking plants, in 64 cities and 29 States, and some 143 distribution agencies or depots. Its assets in 1955 were reported as $49 million and its sales in that year were $141 million.

The transcript covering Mr. Wendelin's testimony is quoted in part, as follows:

Mr. WENDELIN. I am Victor Wendelin, of Lincoln, Nebr. I am a partner with my brother and my father. We have an independent bakery there, doing over a million dollars worth of business a year, and we have filed no complaint with the Federal Trade Commission.

I am primarily here to substantiate the statement of these other bakers, and also as an independent baker, I am kind of looking to the future as to what is going to happen to us, so I have some remarks to make here.

On July 15–16, 1955, Colonial Bakery, which is a division of the Campbell-Taggart, announced to their trade that the following Monday the price of bread would be reduced one and a half cents. They were selling a 20-ounce loaf of bread wholesale for 18½ cents, and they reduced it to 17 cents. This reduction was in an area of Des Moines, Iowa, a radius of 90 miles.

The Continental Baking Co. on July 18, that Monday, started with a price on their bread of 18½ cents. Their bread was selling at 18½ cents. When they discovered that Colonial reduced their price to 17 cents, they met the lower price. The other wholesale bakers in the Des Moines area, including Ungels, Interstate, Peter Pan, and Metz followed.

Further, while the price reduction was initiated by Colonial, and covered only the area of Des Moines and all territory within 90 miles radius, because of the extent of their operations, Peter Pan Bakery on the same date, July 18, reduced their price to 17 cents in Omaha and Lincoln, Nebr., areas, as well as throughout the remainder of the State of Iowa.

All the other wholesalers in Omaha and Lincoln, the remainder of the State of Iowa, within a radius of 90 miles, met the reduction to 17 cents instituted by Peter Pan.

On August 3, 1955, the Colonial Bakery Co., a division of Campbell-Taggart, introduced a new pound loaf of bread at 13½ cents. This loaf was inadequate for a profit to the grocer, so Colonial later reduced the price to 12 cents.

Campbell-Taggart bought a bakery in Grand Island, Nebr., and they are now getting very ambitious and energetic, and they have gone into some of the territory we operate in, and in the early part of October a grocery store in Sutton, Nebr., was offered $50 worth of free bread if he would eliminate some other baker's products.

Well, from the groceryman's standpoint, we being the third selling bread in his grocerystore, we were eliminated.

They also went to Exeter, which is 30 miles from Sutton, and offered a groceryman by the name of Schafer free bread, all he could sell, for 1 week. This groceryman refused to let them put the bread in.

I have here the cost of bread per 100 pounds, made by Hal Lymes, who is an accountant for 12 to 15 bakers in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Nebraska, that do over a million dollars worth of business in a 4-week period, and he has these costs broken down.

Flour costs, on a hundred pounds of bread, $3.67. Other ingredients, $1.63. Wrappers, $1.05. Total cost for 100 pounds of bread is $6.35. Shop labor is $1.87. Shop expense is 70 cents. Administrative expense is 82 cents. Total plant cost, $9.74. Sales promotion expense, 70 cents. Distribution expense, $2.38. Returns minus the recovery, which all the bakers have to pick up, and I might mention here it is a pretty vicious thing when the chain operators come in, because their thought is to get as much space on their bread racks as they can, and they put in probably 4 or 5 times the amount of bread that a groceryman can sell, just to get the display and crowd the smaller baker out, where a smaller independent cannot bake that much bread to make a display. Total plant and selling cost, $13.50.

I think I forgot to mention the cost of the returns, minus recovery, and that was 68 cents.

So the cost for a hundred pounds of baked bread is $13.50, which means 13½ cents per pound loaf.

Some of these bakers I speak of, like Campbell-Taggart and Continental, they operate in other areas, and for the same loaf of bread they get 16 cents. The price of bread in Lincoln now is 14.8 cents.

The CHAIRMAN. Fourteen and eight-tenths?

Mr. WENDELIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They are selling it now at 12 cents?

Mr. WENDELIN. They are selling it for 12 cents in Des Moines, 16 cents in Salt Lake City.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very kindly, sir.

Mr. WENDELIN. Thank you.

Despite the increased sales volume which has taken place in the last 10 years, and the increased number of mouths to be fed, the increased population and the expanded opportunity for independent business which should have taken place, the number of independent wholesale bakers in the United States has shrunk by about 50 percent. At this rate we can expect that in another 10 years there will be no independent wholesale bakers left. I invite the Members' attention to an excerpt from the testimony of Mr. Marion McClelland, of Mount Vernon, Ill., who is secretary of the independent bakers of the State of Illinois:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McClelland, you are secretary of the independent bakers of the State of Illinois?

Mr. MCCLELLAND. Illinois Bakers Association.

The CHAIRMAN. How many independent bakeries do we have in the country now, if you know, compared to say 10 years ago?

Mr. MCCLELLAND. I am sorry I can't answer that question, Mr. PATMAN.

The CHAIRMAN. What about your own State?

Mr. MCCLELLAND. You are trying to determine the mortality of the independent baker.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAND. Could I read you a partial list? I asked a baker recently to submit to me the list of names of bakeries and towns they were located in that formerly were in business that are not now in business.

Without reading these particular names I might read the town names so that you will have an idea of some of the mortality.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAND. Some are retail bakers, some wholesale bakers, but they are all independent bakers. In West Frankfort, Ill., there were 3 formerly in business that are not now in business; Eldorado, Ill., 1; Harrisburg, 1; Metropolis, 2; Christopher, 1; Sesser, 1; Salem, Ill., 1; Dowel, 1; Murphysboro, 1; Herrin, 1; Carterville, 1; Zeigler, 1; Valier, 1; Cairo, 4; Anna, 1; Tamms, 1; Mounds, 1; Carbondale, 1; Murphysboro, 2; Johnston City, 1; Mount Vernon, 1; Pinckneyville, 1; Carterville, 1; Royalton, 1; Mount Vernon, 1.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. These are the mortalities?

Mr. McCLELLAND. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. These are the ones that went out of business?

Mr. McCLELLAND. This goes back a period of 10 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McCulloch just suggested to me probably you could tell us the number of members you have now compared to the number of members you had 5 years ago.

Mr. McCLELLAND. About 5 years ago there were 75 independent wholesale bakers; as members today there are approximately 45. Some of those members have gone out of business through sale to other bakery operators.

The CHAIRMAN. How many were there 10 years ago?

Mr. McCLELLAND. About 50 percent as many as 10 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Fifty percent as many?

Mr. McCLELLAND. Yes, sir.

I come now to the situation in Pennsylvania. On January 4 our committee received a letter from the president of one of the small wholesale baking companies in that State attaching a petition signed by 48 other wholesale bakers in that State. This petition asserts that discriminatory pricing practices are prevalent in the wholesale marketing of bread in that State and describes discriminatory tactics like those already described for the Middle West. Moreover, some of the national corporations alleged to be engaging in these practices in Pennsylvania are the very corporations that are alleged to be engaged in these practices in the Middle West. I should like to call the Members' attention to excerpts from the letter transmitting this petition, as follows:

For years the independent baking companies have had to meet the competition of the baking companies operating nationally such as Continental, American, Campbell-Taggart, Ward, General, National, and other interstate baking companies, which at times and here and there and more or less have indulged in unfair trade competition. Some of their practices are in violation of the Clayton and Robinson-Patman Acts and have been so adjudicated.

In the course of years quite a number of independent baking companies have fallen by the wayside because of inability to meet competition of that kind.

I and officers of other independent baking companies think it necessary to have further Federal legislation against unfair trade competition by the so-called national baking companies, and we would like to tell you what and why.

* * * * *

If the independent baking companies and the independent grocers are to survive, it is essential that there be Federal legislation prohibiting or regulating the practices of the chainstores in merchandising bakery products; otherwise the mortality of independent bakeries will become very great indeed.

It is my understanding that your committees are interested in protecting independent operations relatively small. Therefore you should be interested in the plight of the independent baking companies.

The destruction of small and efficient businesses through discriminatory pricing practices is no academic question suitable for debate at some time in the distant future. The destruction is taking place now. I know that all of the Members are concerned about this matter. I hope that those who want to plug the loophole in our antitrust laws, so as to give small business some equality of opportunity, will sign the petition to discharge H. R. 11 and then vote to pass H. R. 11.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, for March 20, on account of death in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, for 1 hour, on April 17.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 30 minutes, on March 21.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include a speech by Hon. ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama, made at the American Bar Association Convention in New York City on March 7.

Mr. RABAUT the remarks he will make on the District of Columbia appropriation bill today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. RABAUT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AVERY in two instances.

Mr. FEIGHAN in two instances.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio and to include an address by Hon. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, of Michigan.

Mr. YOUNGER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIS (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Texas).

Mr. FLOOD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIKES.

Mr. MULTER.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. J. Res. 582. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1956, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1529. An act to revise the boundaries of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3452. An act to amend the act of July 15, 1955, Public Law 161, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 324), by increasing the appropriation authorization for the aircraft control and warning system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 20, 1956, at 12 o'clock, noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1639. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Facilities Corporation, transmitting the report of Federal Facilities Corporation on tin operations for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 125, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1640. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide recognition for meritorious service by members of the Police and Fire Departments of the District of Columbia', approved March 4, 1929"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1641. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of 2d Lt. Robert J. Marshall"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1642. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to

merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1643. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee of Conference. H. R. 8320. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school-milk program and the brucellosis-eradication program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956 (Rept. No. 1898). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 9075. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; with amendment (Rept. No. 1899). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 10024. A bill to permit the Secretary of the Interior to waive certain requirements of law with respect to joint liability under contracts entered into pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10025. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend certain contracts providing for the furnishing of water to the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., for municipal purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 10026. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of Federal funds payable thereunder to States which have approved plans for old-age assistance and which maintain their expenditures for such assistance at or above the 1955 level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 10027. A bill to establish and prescribe the duties of a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 10028. A bill to provide for annual sessions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, to provide for compensation for the members of such legislature, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 10029. A bill to amend section 317 (a) of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10030. A bill to provide for transfer of title of certain lands to the Carlsbad Irrigation District, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H. R. 10031. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1875, as amended, relating to the franking of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and parts thereof; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 10032. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the drilling of the first oil well at Titusville, Pa., in 1859; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 10033. A bill to provide for the disposal of federally owned property of the upper Fox River, Wis., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 10034. A bill to provide for the disposal of federally owned property of the upper Fox River, Wis., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 10035. A bill to provide for the disposal of federally owned property of the upper Fox Rixer, Wis., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 10036. A bill to amend sections 1861 and 1863 of title 28 of the United States Code to change the qualifications and requirements for exemption from service on a Federal jury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 10037. A bill to provide for the construction of buildings for post-office purposes and for the replacement of inadequate postal buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 10038. A bill to establish a conclusive presumption of service connection in the case of the death of any veteran of World War I who was rated as totally disabled from service-connected causes for 10 or more consecutive years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 10039. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that clergymen who are naturalized citizens shall not lose their nationality by residence abroad, even though they are not representatives of American organizations, if they devote full time to their clerical duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 10040. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 10041. A bill to amend the first section of the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, as amended, so as to provide for 6-year terms of office for members of the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 10042. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the cutting of timber, the manufacture and sale of lumber, and the preservation of the forests on the Menominee Indian Reservation in the State of Wisconsin," approved March 28, 1908, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10043. A bill to amend the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 10044. A bill to reduce the percentage depletion for natural resources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10045. A bill to permit deductions for Federal income-tax purposes of certain political contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 10046. A bill to simplify and make more nearly uniform the laws governing the payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HESS:

H. J. Res. 585. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning October 21, 1956, as Cleaner Air Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. J. Res. 586. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. J. Res. 587. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to establish and construct certain facilities at San Diego, County, Calif., for the purpose of conducting research in methods of converting saline water to potable water; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. Con. Res. 223. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings to Pakistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. Res. 437. Resolution requesting a review of reports on the Wabash River, Ind., and Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 10047. A bill for the relief of Ercilia Feijoo Seijo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (by request):

H. R. 10048. A bill for the relief of Marika E. Demos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10049. A bill for the relief of Albert Steven Watson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 10050. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Mets; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 10051. A bill for the relief of Tiit Lehtmets; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 10052. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lonna Louise Koch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 10053. A bill for the relief of Jane Froman and Gypsy Markoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 10054. A bill for the relief of Rose Goldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

684. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Robert M. Dincher and other veterans of Williamsport, Lycoming County, Pa. urging the immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

685. Also, petition of Cataldo Poritto and other veterans of Williamsport, Pa., urging the immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

686. Also, petition of foremen and supervisory staff of Bloomsburg Mills, Inc., Blooms-

burg, Pa. urging the defeat of H. R. 5550 dealing with the entrance of the United States into the Organization for Trade Cooperation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

687. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

688. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of VFW Post of Ottumwa, Iowa, urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

689. Also, petition of veterans of Newton and Albia, Iowa, urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

690. By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of Covenant Woman's Auxiliary, North Easton, Mass., re Siler bill, H. R. 4627, and Langer bill, S. 923; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

691. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Veterans of World War I, U. S. A., Barracks 487, Springfield, Mo., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

692. Also, petition of Mrs. E. E. Snell and other citizens of Ozark, Mo., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

693. Also, petition of E. R. Jones and other citizens of Lawrence County, Mo., and surrounding towns, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

694. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by the Farm Truckers' Association of Wisconsin requesting the National Congress to enact a greatly expanded Federal-State highway program in 1956 to alleviate the present highway emergency, the legislation to contain certain provisions; to the Committee on Public Works.

695. By the SPEAKER: Petition of M. J. Maloney, Spokane, Wash., with reference to the money being spent by our Government on foreign aid, and how it affects the United States, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

696. Also, petition of the secretary-manager, Los Angeles Metropolitan Traffic Association, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging support of H. R. 8836, to provide for the construction, reconstruction and improvement of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

697. Also, petition of the chairman, Citizens Traffic and Transportation Committee, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging favorable consideration of H. R. 8836 or other similar legislation to provide additional funds for completing construction of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways within a reasonable period of time; to the Committee on Public Works.

698. Also, petition of Jack N. Anderson, Commander Mabank Memorial Post, No. 8780, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Mabank, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

699. Also, petition of W. R. Skipworth and others, Sherman, Tex., with reference to urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

700. Also, petition of Virgil G. Cajulis, M. D., APO 239, San Francisco, Calif., with reference to obtaining a commission as a regular medical officer in either the Reserve or the Regular component of the Air Force, etc.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

701. Also, petition of Rotary Club de Guantanamo, Guantanamo, Cuba, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to housing conditions in Guantanamo, Cuba, and requesting that a special committee visit Guantanamo, for the purpose of becoming correctly informed of the true conditions existing there; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tax Relief for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a statement which I have prepared in conjunction with my introduction of a bill to amend the corporation income tax rate to provide needed tax relief for small businesses. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE M. RHODES, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 14TH DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA, ON THE NEED FOR TAX RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESS

I have today introduced a bill to amend the corporation income tax rate to provide needed tax relief for small businesses.

It is manifestly clear that a strong and healthy economy requires the continued prosperity and growth of our small-business establishments. Recent trends in our economy have raised certain danger signals concerning the ability of small business to grow and prosper in proportion to the rest of our economy.

Recent reports of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, as well as the House and Senate Small Business Committees have documented the serious problems facing small businesses. There is every indication that this problem is growing ever more serious. Many of these danger signals have been pointed out in previous discussions of this subject. They are important and bear repeating.

The rate of failures among small businesses has risen to an alarming degree over what it was 10 years ago. In 1945 there were only 809 business failures. This figure had risen to 11,086 in 1954, and statistics for the 1955 boom year reveal an almost equal number of failures. Individual retail establishments across the country have been especially hard hit.

The sharply increasing number of corporate mergers is another alarming development. In 1952 corporations with more than $100 million in assets had 52 percent of the total assets held by manufacturing corporations in the United States. After 3 years of Republican rule, these giant corporations now have 57 percent of all such assets. In its report on Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth and Stability in January of this year, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report stated:

"The importance of small and new business in preserving and strengthening a competitive market economy has long been recognized. A large number of small business units is required to insure that control over the use of resources and therefore over output and prices is widely diffused. A high entrance rate of new businesses is required to insure the continuing challenge of established firms so essential to the development of new products and more economical production processes and methods.

"In recent months, increasing attention has been focused on the rise in mergers and consolidations of corporate enterprise. While this development does not uniquely involve small businesses, their position is weakened by any tendency toward concentration of enterprise in fewer and fewer hands."

It seems obvious that if big business continues to gobble up small businesses at the present rate, the hand of monopoly will be fastened securely around the throat of every community in our Nation.

The plight of many small businesses has been closely related to the policies of the administration in the awarding of defense contracts. Small business has been denied hundreds of thousands of defense contracts amounting to millions of dollars because of certain bidding procedures and the unwarranted and excessive use of negotiated contracts which favor giant business. Small business has not received a fair share of our billions of dollars of defense contracts; instead it has been offered the leftover crumbs.

Recent estimates made by the Small Business Administration show that 6 percent of our largest corporations produce 70 percent of all manufactured goods in this country. The other 94 percent of the corporations produce only 30 percent.

Profits of corporations with assets of over $100 million amounted to 13.7 percent of stockholders' equity in 1954, while the smallest manufacturing corporations went into the red by 3.5 percent upon their equity, after paying taxes.

Latest available figures for the second quarter of 1955 show that large corporations earned 7.4 cents for each dollar of sales, on the average, while small corporations averaged only 1.1 cents per each dollar of sales.

Under present conditions, many small businesses have found it difficult if not impossible to expand their productive facilities or extend their markets because capital needed for expansion must come largely from retained corporate earnings after taxes. While many big businesses receive tax amortization writeoffs in the form of subsidies from the Government, small businesses have been strangled by inequitable tax rates. A sudden business recession such as the one experienced in 1954 may drive thousands of marginal small businesses into bankruptcy.

The bill which I have introduced would provide for a tax of 22 percent on a corporation's net earnings, plus a 33-percent surtax on earnings over $25,000 a year. The present law, of course, levies a tax of 30 percent on net earnings, plus a 22-percent surtax on earnings over $25,000.

Table I, prepared by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, shows the comparison of tax liabiltiy under my proposal with the tax liability under the present law for selected levels of corporation incomes:

TABLE I. *Comparison of tax liability under proposal with tax liability under present law on selected incomes*

Proposal: Corporation rates—22 percent normal, 33 percent surtax, $25,000 surtax exemption

Income subject to both normal and surtax	Tax under proposal	Tax under present law	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	
			Amount	Percent
$5,000	$1,100	$1,500	−$400	−26.7
$10,000	2,200	3,000	−800	−26.7
$25,000	5,500	7,500	−2,000	−26.7
$50,000	19,250	20,500	−1,250	−6.1
$91,666.67	42,166.67	42,166.67		
$100,000	46,750	46,500	+250	+.5
$225,000	115,500	111,500	+4,000	+3.6
$500,000	266,750	254,500	+12,250	+4.8
$1,000,000	541,750	514,500	+27,250	+5.3
$10,000,000	5,491,750	5,194,500	+297,250	+5.7
$100,000,000	54,991,750	51,994,500	+2,997,250	+5.8

The joint committee estimates an increase in corporation income tax liability under my proposal of about $725 million annually, based on the level of corporate profits for the first half of 1955. The bulk of the tax relief would be provided where it is most needed—among corporations having net earnings of less than $91,000 a year. Most of the increased corporate income tax revenue would come from the giant corporations who already have a stranglehold on our national economy.

I am convinced that some action must be taken to encourage the growth of small business and to offset the recent alarming trend toward monopolization of business in this country. I feel that this small-business tax-relief measure which I have introduced is a positive and necessary approach to meet this problem.

Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from my very good and personal friend, Mr. J. Dewey Singleton, of Arnaudville, La., where I was born and reared. Mr. Singleton is not only an outstanding farmer and businessman but possesses old time qualities of deep rooted honesty and Christian goodness. Although he is a man of substance, he is very thrifty, and quite conservative in his views. I know Mr. Singleton to be a Democrat; I know also that he admires the President of the United States, but I frankly do not know how he voted in 1952; so politics has nothing to do with the expression of his sincere convictions.

Dewey invites me to pass his letter on to Mr. Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture. Now, I know that Mr. Benson is a busy man and a letter of this kind might escape his personal attention. I understand, however, that Mr. Benson is an avid reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so I have concluded to use the letter where it might do the most good.

During last summer, I had to make a speech in Breaux Bridge, La., a town near Arnaudville, La., on the occasion of the Young Men's Business Club Farmers' night where each member had one or more farmers as guests. I called on Mr. Singleton to get figures from him on the price of farm commodities produced right in his and my backyard because I happen to own a farm next to that of the Singleton's. The figures I quote below were in large measure those supplied to me by Mr. Singleton, but I had quite a talk with him about the problems of our farmers. In our discussion we bounced around the thought that the farmers throughout the Nation, and particularly those in my area, were caught in a three-way squeeze.

First. Since 1952, the last year of the Democratic administration, the price of things the farmers have to buy has gone up. The cost of tractors, tires, tools, materials, fertilizers, labor, and everything else on the farm has increased since 1952, along with the price of groceries, food, and clothing.

Second. On the other hand, since 1952, when Mr. Benson took over as Secretary of Agriculture, the price of the things the farmers sell has gone down something like 25 percent across the board and throughout the Nation. Exactly what does that mean to Mr. Singleton, to me as a farmer, and to all the farmers in the parish—county—of St. Martin? Well here are the figures I obtained from Mr. Singleton and other reliable sources:

	1952	1955
Cotton, per pound	$0.40	$0.31
Short grain green rice, per barrel of 162 pounds	7.90	5.50
Sweetpotatoes, per crate on season's average for Nos. 1 and 2	2.45	1.25
Sugarcane, per ton with benefit payments	7.90	7.40
Corn, per barrel	2.75	1.50

Third. And to add insult to injury, under the Republican regime, since 1952, the farmers throughout the Nation, and particularly those in my congressional district, sustained severe and unbearable acreage reductions. The cotton farmers sustained an acreage cut of 35 percent. The rice farmers suffered a reduction of 37.7 percent. The acreage of the sugarcane farmers was reduced by 30 percent. And still Mr. Benson preaches that he is opposed to regimentation.

And what solution do they propose? Among other ineffective measures, they talk a great deal about a soil-bank and acreage-reserve program. Exactly how much will the farmers receive for each acre of land in the soil-bank or in the acreage-reserve pool? Will the farmers derive a profit from such land by acreage? If there is a profit, will it be calculated according to good accounting methods, or will they fix it so that the supposed profit will turn out to a break-even point? And what about the sharecropper? Suppose the landlord places in the soil-bank and acreage-reserve program a part of the land the sharecropper used to cultivate: will the sharecropper get a part of the money? I have not seen specific illustrative figures put out by the Department of Agriculture that would provide accurate answers to these questions.

But let me come back to Mr. Singleton's letter. We produce a great deal of cabbage in Mr. Singleton's neighborhood. In fact, I grow cabbage also. The farmers are starting to market the current crop. On the date of Mr. Singleton's letter, March 10, 1956, the price to the farmer was $10 per ton. Right in the country town of Arnaudville, surrounded by cabbage farmers, the housewife on that date was paying 8 cents per pound, or $160 per ton. Quite a spread, is it not?

Then Mr. Singleton bought a shirt in Arnaudville for $4.03, and he figures that there was only 11 cents worth of cotton in it.

What is farm income? In my book it is production or volume, multiplied by price, less cost. Now if you reduce acreage and thus reduce the volume and then lower the price and at the same time increase the cost, I think even Mr. Benson can figure that the farm income is bound to drop to depression level. The only provision in the farm bill, which was debated for so long on the Senate side, that would provide an effective and immediate improvement to farm income or a price increase was the 90 percent of parity provision and that was the one provision that Mr. Benson is bent on throwing out the window.

At this point I should like to insert Mr. Singleton's letter in full, together with my reply thereto:

ARNAUDVILLE, LA., *March 10, 1956.*

Congressman EDWIN E. WILLIS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED: I do not want to burden you too much with the farmer's problems but since writing you about sweetpotatoes something else has come up.

About 2 weeks back Mrs. Singleton bought a cabbage in one of the retail stores in Arnaudville. Being interested in cabbage and prospects of what we might get for them I asked her what it cost and she said 8 cents per pound. This sounded like it might be high so I asked another store what they were selling for and they told me the same price. Now the farmers have just started to ship from the Breaux Bridge and Cecilia sections and yesterday morning we called one of the buyers and asked what the farmers were getting and we were told $10 per ton. From $160 to $10 is quite a spread.

I am the owner of a light cotton shirt and recently I weighed it, with the buttons, and

the weight is 5½ ounces. Our cotton averaged about 32 cents per pound last year or 2 cents per ounce. You will note the cotton cost 11 cents for this shirt. It was priced to me at $3.95 plus 8 cents State sales tax or a total of $4.03.

When this has served its purpose if you like you might send it to Mr. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, and ask him what he thinks about it.

Regards and best wishes.

J. D. SINGLETON.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1956.

Mr. J. D. SINGLETON,
Arnaudville, La.

DEAR DEWEY: My reply to your letter will be found in Monday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If Mr. Benson gets mad, don't blame me.

Very sincerely,

EDWIN E. WILLIS,
Member of Congress.

Railroad Retirement Annuities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I want to call attention of the Congress to correspondence I have received on the subject of proposed increases in railroad retirement annuities.

Last week I received letters from two gentlemen who live at Topeka in my home district of Kansas. They are Mr. R. H. Weeks and Mr. Kenneth Clark, president and secretary, respectively, of the Topeka Santa Fe Retired Employees Club.

I have formally referred the contents of their letters to my colleague, Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and to the Honorable LISTER HILL, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I have no doubt that members of the aforementioned committees will give their considered attention to these letters, which read as follows:

DEAR SIR: The members of the Topeka Santa Fe Retired Employees Club, representing approximately 500 retired employees, residing in Topeka, Kans., at our last meeting instructed we write you requesting your support of pending bills seeking increases in railroad retirement annuities.

Our retired employees are finding it increasingly difficulty to meet living expenses on a pegged income because of almost daily increases in cost of living. The annuity income has not been increased since 1951.

Each member of our club will sincerely appreciate and thank you for the earnest support of your committee in working for the passage in Congress of bills H. R. 757, H. R. 3087, and H. R. 5702.

Yours truly,

R. H. WEEKS,
President.
KENNETH CLARK,
Secretary.

As I stated previously, I have no doubt that the respective committees will give their considered attention to the contents of these letters. However, I felt this matter is of such general importance to the Nation that I wanted to take this means of calling the attention of all Members of Congress to it.

It is my sincere belief that legislation must keep abreast of the times, whether it be for vital defense appropriations or for sorely needed annuity increases. We must view such measures from a realistic standpoint.

Irish Partition: The Bitter Fruit of Expediency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address I delivered at the 89th annual St. Patrick's Day banquet of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and Ladies Auxiliary of Cuyahoga County, held in Cleveland, Saturday, March 17, titled "Irish Partition: The Bitter Fruit of Expediency":

On this happy feast of our patron St. Patrick our thoughts necessarily turn to those great ideals and spiritual values which he gave to all humanity.

All of us surely realize the importance of those ideals and spiritual values in these troubled days when all the world seems so upset and civilization is almost on the brink of allowing itself to be destroyed.

As we reflect upon these wonderful gifts of St. Patrick, we cannot turn our eyes away from those many injustices and inequities which beset other nations of the world.

Among those great injustices is the false partition of Ireland. This state of inequity has unfortunately existed since the days when the Irish patriots won freedom and independence for a large part of the emerald isle.

In recent years we have witnessed the cruel division of nations by the Russian Communists. I speak especially about the Communist partition of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam.

The leading statesmen of the West do not hesitate to state that the continued false partition of these three nations constitutes a threat to the survival of our entire civilization.

But it is sad to note that these same statesmen, who are charged with charting the course to victory for all free men, are blind to the false partition of Ireland.

It seems to me there has grown up in the world of our times an acceptance of the dangerous notions that a little bit of tyranny is all right, that a little bit of imperialism will do no great harm, and that so long as human injustices do not threaten to cause an outbreak of general war it can be tolerated.

It is in this confused state of affairs that the cause of an united Ireland must seek to win the final victory envisioned by every Irish patriot from the beginning of time.

In my considered judgment the greatest barrier to winning a free and united Ireland is the philosophy of expediency which has spread almost like wildfire throughout our civilization during the last thirty-five-odd years. If we look about us it is easy to see the terrible penalties we are now paying for following a course of expediency in the conduct of our international affairs.

Expediency allowed Russian communism to get a foothold on the ruins of the Russian czarist empire;

Expediency prevented the western powers following World War I from establishing a just social order among nations which could have forbidden World War II;

Expediency led us to enter into diplomatic and trade relations with Communist Russia just as expediency led us into fighting side by side with the pagan philosophy of communism in what the common people were led to believe was a war to restore the basic freedoms to all nations and all men.

That same expediency has led us into our present precarious position wherein we seem to know not our allies and where there is an ever-present inclination to sacrifice someone else's territory and other people's future to the insatiable appetite of the Russian Communist aggressors.

The danger exists that unless we immediately and completely reject expediency as a consideration in the conduct of our affairs with other nations and in meeting the present Christian crisis we will soon find that our own Nation has fallen upon the pagan altar of expediency from which escape is impossible and through which civilization as we know it may be blotted from the memory of mankind forever.

I therefore commend to your consideration the need for each and every one of us to fight against the trend of expediency in our national and international affairs as a practical way of striking a telling blow for the cause of a free and united Ireland.

Unfair Practices of Automobile Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1956, I testified before the Subcommittee on Automobile Marketing Practices of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I addressed myself to the unfair practices of automobile manufacturers, among other things. My testimony appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13, 1956, at page 4677, and those that follow. As a result thereof, I have been receiving considerable mail, all of it substaining the facts as stated by me. My attention has just been directed to a large advertisement, almost half a page, which appeared in the New York Daily Mirror of March 9, 1956, which reads as follows:

No cash down! Up to 36 months to pay when you trade during Chrysler Manhattan's sensational sale of 1956 Chryslers and Plymouths.

One thousand dollars, sometimes more, in over-allowances if you trade now!

You can deal and buy with confidence from Chrysler Manhattan Co., a direct factory retail branch.

Three hundred and fifty cars, all body types, all colors, to chose from. Largest, most complete inventory, warehoused indoors in greater New York.

Terrific deals also available if you have no car to trade!

Factory guarantee and service.

Lowest down payments. Lowest monthly payments.

CHRYSLER MANHATTAN CO., INC.,
1757 Broadway (between 56th and 57th)
CI 6-4362.

As indicated by the ad, this is not a franchised dealer but is a factory retail outlet of the automobile manufacturer. This is a sample of what we can expect from the automobile manufacturers if we follow their suggestion of letting them correct the practices so bitterly complained about by dealers and consumers. On the one hand, they tell us that they do not countenance improper advertising by their dealers, and on the other hand, we find them engaging in the very activities they pretend to condemn.

Some Southerners Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous material, I submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following comments by Senator Willis Robertson, of Virginia; Congressman Brooks Hays, of Arkansas; Hon. Colgate W. Darden, Jr., president of the University of Virginia; Hon. Boyd Campbell, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and board chairman of the Mississippi School Supply Co.; and Mr. C. A. McKnight, editor of the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, N. C., on their region's state of mind and any specific American attitudes they feel are necessary in order to avoid violence and bring healing in a deteriorating situation following the Supreme Court desegregation order, which appeared in the Saturday, March 10, 1956, edition of the Christian Science Monitor:

SOME SOUTHERNERS SPEAK

To clarify national thinking this newspaper asked some southern leaders to comment on their region's state of mind and any specific American attitudes they feel are necessary in order to avoid violence and bring healing in a deteriorating situation following the Supreme Court desegregation order. Replies appear below:

From WILLIS ROBERTSON, United States Senator from Virginia:

"Virginia recognizes the correctness of the 1850 decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Court and in the 155 subsequent decisions of State and Federal courts holding that the equal rights provision of a constitution could properly be satisfied by public schools for the white and colored races which are separate but equal.

"During the last 10 years notable progress has been made in the Southern States is meeting that equality requirement. But that progress will be nullified by a program of rapid, enforced desegregation. In fact, public education for both races in some Southern States would be destroyed.

"The worst feature of the current desegregation effort, however, is the resulting bitterness and racial animosities in areas where harmony heretofore prevailed. Southerners believe that the cherished constitutional right of every citizen to select his personal associates is being violated.

"The South is grateful for the leadership through the years of the Christian Science Monitor in urging that racial problems be approached from the standpoint of voluntary cooperation rather than mandatory laws.

"This was particularly illustrated by your editorial of January 26, 1950, which stated that the FEPC [Fair Employment Practices Commission] bill, then under discussion, would infringe the right of employers and union members to choose their associates and added:

" 'It may be argued that they should be willing to choose their associates without regard to race or religion. But there is a vital difference between should and must. When the State tells the individual how he must choose his associates, it is interfering with a peculiarly intimate freedom. To correct one injustice, it is committing another.'

"What is most needed to avoid violence and heal the situation today in the South is national recognition of the soundness of the viewpoint presented in that editorial."

From BROOKS HAYS, Member of Congress, Arkansas:

"The situation in parts of the South is extremely serious, but strains on interracial harmony can be relieved by exertions of both races. I commend you for your previous efforts to interpret southern viewpoints to the Nation, and for your current effort to prevent further deterioration.

"Most of the aims of the minority group were being steadily realized prior to the Supreme Court decisions. Good faith and efforts to live by a rule-of-law tradition have been interrupted by extremists on both sides. The South properly resents every form of threat to enforce immediate and complete integration by Federal power, and the difficulties are compounded by such threats.

"Protests and reasonable criticism must not be construed as defiance and nullification.

"We need an intelligent and understanding attitude by those outside the South who are concerned with our problem. More depends, however, on work at the local level. Participation by outsiders at the present moment, even by those from adjoining counties, is causing some trouble.

"Appointment of official State and local committees, which include both races, would be a great help.

"The problem is not too great for a solution if consultation is encouraged, and strengthened faith in the South's intellectual and moral resources is displayed at this crucial stage.

"The Supreme Court decisions should be studied widely, and clarifying interpretations should be sought by responsible officials. Above all, common sense should prevail. And in my judgment any effort to fan the fires of hatred will be sharply rebuked.

"We have enough trouble in the world already. Church leaders of both races are in an admirable position to use their influence for minimum demands of justice while stressing the necessity for preserving a bridge of understanding between the groups."

From Colgate W. Darden, Jr., president, University of Virginia:

"It appears to me that much of the difficulty which confronts us arises out of the failure to comprehend the revolutionary nature of the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court and its far-reaching effect. It reverses the whole pattern of life in those States maintaining separate schools. It touches the intimate family life of some 40 million people.

"To assume, as is being assumed in some quarters, that it is possible to change overnight, or for that matter within a few years, the habits, the customs, and prejudices, either good or bad, of generations is to fall victim to wishful thinking.

"And to substitute emotions for reason—such an assumption fails utterly to take into account the magnitude and the delicate nature of the problem.

"The situation, so far as I am able to judge it, has grown worse in recent months. I think the reason for this lies in what appears to be a demand that integration of the schools be carried out forthwith. This step the southern people are unwilling to take and insistence on it will bring, in my opinion, violence—and in the end disestablishment of the public-school system in many areas.

"Time and great patience are going to be required to work out a plan which the leaders of both races in the locality concerned consider both equitable and workable. It can be done, but not as we are presently moving."

From Boyd Campbell, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; board chairman, Mississippi School Supply Co.:

"The vast improvement in race relationship and the progress of southern Negroes in education, health, and economic opportunity were brought about by the enlightened leadership of men of good will in both races. This progress came to a jarring halt when the NAACP usurped local Negro leadership and by aggressive and intolerable methods undertook to speedily compel a condition that is contrary to the Anglo-Saxon tradition.

"The problem is one that will not be solved by name calling and weight throwing. The deteriorating relationship between the races in the South will continue as long as outside groups attempt to force integration upon us. History does not record a single instance of compulsory integration. It will not do so in this instance.

"Meantime, there are heartaches aplenty on both sides, as we witness the result of years of patient effort being swept away ruthlessly by methods that engender hatred rather than good will. We can only hope that those who would condemn us would first try to understand us and to understand the vastly complex problem which is ours and which lends itself to no superimposed solution. If and when methods of pressure and compulsion are abandoned, the voices of the moderates of both races will be heard and heeded."

From C. A. McKnight, editor, the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, N. C.:

"I would be less than candid if I did not say I am gravely apprehensive over the state of affairs in the South today.

"Resistance to the Supreme Court school ruling in parts of the region is firm, determined and, in most cases, sincere. Relations between the races have deteriorated seriously. The situation has all the ingredients to produce violence and mass disobedience of court orders.

"What is desperately needed is a breathing spell during which some of the issues, now so confused, can be clarified. I see only two ways to gain such a respite:

"1. The NAACP, having established a significant legal principle, could well afford now to delay further test cases in highly sensitive areas and turn its talents to the broader field of human relations in areas where transition is feasible.

"2. In lieu of that, Federal district judges may be forced to adopt a less literal interpretation of the Supreme Court ruling and withhold desegregation orders where they patently cannot be enforced without en-

dangering public order, or public education, or both.

"In the final analysis, compulsion, legal or otherwise, will never be the answer. A better understanding of that fact outside the South would be helpful."

The Independence Day of Byelorussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on the occasion of the 38th anniversary of the Byelorussian National Republic.

Mr. Speaker, the month of March is a memorable month for many peoples in Central Europe, who today are enslaved by international communism.

March 14, for example, is the day when the Slovak people commemorate, with piety, the foundation of their Republic in 1939, for which even today the underground of Slovakia fights.

Also in March, the Hungarian patriots celebrate the heroism of their valiant generals and leaders who laid down their lives for freedom in 1849 in their fight against Austria's supremacy.

And on March 25, our friends from Byelorussia celebrate their 38th anniversary of independence and the establishment of their National Republic.

Byelorussia is situated in Eastern Europe, bordering Russia in the north and east, Ukraine in the south, Poland in the west, and Baltic States in the northwest. It is about the size of California—some 150,000 square miles, with about 18 million people. Both figures are taken with reference to the ethnic boundaries. The officially existing so-called Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, with the Moscow-stamped puppet government, is much smaller in both respects. The Republic is a charter member of the United Nations.

In its historic past the nation was a dominant factor in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which in the 15th century established a union—later transformed into the commonwealth—with the Polish Crown in order to strengthen her defenses against Russian pressure. About 1795 both nations lost their independence on account of their imperialist neighbors. Lithuania—the name later was changed to Byelorussia—became a part of the Czarist Empire; Poland was divided between Prussia and Austria.

There were continuous efforts on the part of Byelorussians to regain freedom. In 1812, with the help of Napoleon; in 1863 by armed uprising, but no decisive success could be claimed until the October revolution in Russia offered another opportunity to shake off the chains of slavery. This time by the means of democratic self-determination, by the way, just before the famous principle was announced by President Woodrow Wilson at the Versailles Peace Conference. Through the coordinated effort of all Byelorussian organizations a national representation, consisting of 1,872 delegates from all corners of the country, convened in Minsk on December 18, 1917. That First All-Byelorussian Congress became in fact the constituent assembly of Byelorussia.

Though dispersed later by the armed Bolshevik intervention, nevertheless it adopted, just in time, a resolution calling for the creation of a free and independent Byelorussian State, and elected an executive body—Byelorussian National Rada Council—and its presidium to lead the nation to that great goal. In the execution of that resolution, Rada solemnly proclaimed the independent Byelorussian National Republic by the Third Constituent Act of March 25, 1918. The new republic was quickly recognized "de jure" by all her neighbors, except Russia, also by Austria, Czechoslovakia, Georgia, Turkey and "de facto" by many other countries.

In fact, the general situation of the country was a desperate one at that time. The war raged at its worst, foreign troops crossed the country back and forth, one occupation succeeded the other. Under such conditions the organization of administration and of the defense of the new state was rendered extremely difficult to the government; no wonder, then, that, after a short period of desperate armed resistance, deprived of any assistance or even understanding on the part of the western powers—the young republic fell the victim of the newly organized Red Army and by the treaty of Riga her territory was divided between Russia and Poland in 1921.

To counteract the claims of the democratic Government of Byelorussian Nation Republic which migrated abroad, Russian Communists sponsored the creation of the already mentioned B. S. S. R. in Smolensk on January 1, 1919.

That union republic is still in existence, but never did the people of Byelorussia accept the government forced upon them. They resisted it in any possible way; they knew that Byelorussian National Rada—Council—and Government in exile are continuing the struggle against the Communist aggression for final liberation and restoration of the Byelorussian democratic and independent statehood. Also they hope that their perennial craving for freedom and justice will eventually awake more understanding and sympathy in the free West.

The Nixon Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently Congressman EARL WILSON, of Indiana, sent to his constituents a letter on Vice President NIXON which I think is both accurate and logical, and I am sure will be of interest to those who use the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for research or for current congressional action:

THE NIXON QUESTION

While Congress has been driving away at important business such as farm legislation, still the big news and topic of most conversation the past week has been about Vice President NIXON. Is he suitable and acceptable to the people as Mr. Eisenhower's running mate again in 1956?

As a Congressman representing for 16 years one of the most wholesome and down-to-earth districts in the country, I have some definite ideas about NIXON—ideas I am sure represent the convictions of most of the people who have kept me in this job.

I've known DICK NIXON a long time, in and out of Congress. A young war veteran from California, he was elected to the House, then the Senate, then to the Vice Presidency. He has performed most credibly all along the line.

NIXON won the confidence and admiration of millions when he unmasked Alger Hiss. He made America aware of the diabolical intent and ruthless methods of the Kremlin, and of the extent to which communism had bored into vital circles of our Government.

In doing this, he made powerful enemies who singled him out as the major target of a vicious smear campaign. This has gone on for 3 years and it has been so successful as to aline some otherwise well-meaning columnists, editors, and commentators against NIXON. They tried to make him a "whipping boy." This smear campaign recently reached its climax with the "dump NIXON" drive intended to split Republican ranks and bring about defeat of the 1956 Eisenhower ticket. Masterminds of this ambitious effort have outsmarted themselves, however. They've gone too far.

Today, people are asking themselves: "Is there really anything wrong with NIXON? If so, what is it? What has he done, or what has he failed to do which means so much to the well-being and security of America?"

They have found the truth, which simply is this:

NIXON has been a conscientious, hard-working Vice President, affable, helpful, and sympathetic to all who have contacted him. He has never shirked a job. His background is good, his record in war, in Congress and in the Vice Presidency is above reproach. He is of solid American Quaker stock, his mother a native of Jennings County, Ind. He likes his work, his boss, and his people.

Next November the Eisenhower-Nixon ticket will win by a landslide greater than in 1952.

When We See We Will Believe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I read in the papers over the weekend that Nikita S. Khrushchev, Secretary General of the Communist Party, has been announcing to the world the thousands of massacres, tortures, and murders which the dictator Stalin perpetrated not only on Russian citizens, but upon citizens of other countries. Mr. Khrushchev makes these speeches in tones which would indicate that he is horrified at the ferocious, repressive measures

which the late, unlamented Stalin perpetrated upon millions of helpless citizenry.

I feel that these pious pronouncements come a little late to benefit the thousands of dead who are now beyond the reach of this Communist horror.

I say that this is more propaganda, merely aimed at deceiving and trapping the unwary. I view this with the same suspicion that I would view crocodile tears. Over 30 years history of oppression and terror cannot be upset by one speech expressing sorrow.

There are grounds available to the present masters of the Kremlin by which they may show the world that their latest pronouncements are not just cant and hypocrisy. I say let them prove it by concrete action on which we may place some reliance.

It is well known that the Soviets have vast slave-labor camps scattered across the face of the U. S. S. R. Thousands are kept in these places of horror and repression, citizens of Russia and citizens of other countries. Let the masters of this communistic dictatorship show their disapproval of the methods of their late master by freeing these victims of theirs, and indemnifying them as best they may for the privation and suffering which they have so wrongfully suffered.

Let them prove their good intentions by recognizing the rights of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and the other once free sovereign nations now held behind a Curtain of Iron, to free and unfettered self-determination. Let them call for free elections supervised by the United Nations as provided for by the Yalta Agreement in all the countries behind the Iron Curtain. Better yet, let them have free unfettered elections within the borders of Russia herself.

I say that if these protestations are genuine they must include behind their oral pronouncements some desire to amend the untold evil done by the monster Stalin.

I call upon them to cease furnishing arms to Egypt and to stop attempting to start in the Middle East a war which may be world war III.

Unless and until they show that these statements are more than propaganda, we will not believe them; we dare not believe them. Men in the Kremlin who take from the hand of a dying dictator a scepter of power, stained by the blood of millions find their own hands fouled with the same gore. They receive the guilt with the power; they must prove their innocence by something more than words.

I heartily endorse the views of Mr. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland, in his telegram to Mr. Nikita Khrushchev, which I insert here:

In the last few days the Western press reported shocking facts—generally known before but now acknowledged by you at the secret session of the last Congress of the Communist Party in Moscow—how Stalin had humiliated, terrorized and liquidated his opponents. The same methods of terror and liquidation—only on a much larger scale were and are used in Poland and in other countries behind the Iron Curtain. Moreover, these countries have been deprived by the Soviet Union of their independence and no mercy is shown for entire nations and their non-Communist leaders who are being humiliated, deported, terrorized, imprisoned and murdered.

When you condemn the wrongdoing to the Communist Party in the U. S. S. R. by Stalin I ask you if you are ready to condemn also the wrongdoing by communism to Poland and other nations behind the Iron Curtain and to agree to the demands made by President Eisenhower and supported by the British and French Governments at the first Geneva Conference for the liberation of the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain.

In particular, I ask you to release all the people of these nations deported and imprisoned in the U. S. S. R., to order the withdrawal of the Red army and other Soviet functionaries from these countries, and not to oppose the right of these nations to hold free and truly democratic elections under the United Nations supervision.

I urge that our President seize upon this to demand positive proofs of good intentions I suggested from the present leadership in the Kremlin. I urge that he adopt and use as a tool of working diplomacy the program of Mr. Mikolajczyk.

I urge him to tell the Russians that when we see we will believe.

St. Patrick and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over station WMEX, Boston, on Saturday, March 17, 1956:

It may seem a bit late as the hours go to remind you good people that this is St. Patrick's Day.

The signs are all about us, for this is the proud day for "the wearing of the green" by 20 million of Irish descent, as well as by their friends, the Joneses, the Carusos, the Goldbergs, the Ouellettes, the Witkowskis.

For this is a happy day, and everyone wants to be a part of it.

At first thought, there might seem to be little connection between the belived patron saint of Ireland and the United States.

It was far back in A. D. 432 that St. Patrick brought Christianity to the Emerald Isle. That was more than a thousand years before the discovery of America.

Ah, but 'tis the spirit that counts, and not the far-away dates of history, or the spaces in between them.

The Irish, with their fierce love of independence, and trapped by the twin miseries of famine and the hard hand of persecuting tyrants, were among the first to settle in our free land.

By working with a will, and by putting a few dollars aside, they were able to pay the way for relatives and friends who crowded the holds of small ships—generation after generation—on the one-way trip to the paradise of America.

The rich and colorful oratory that fills the air with its own music on this St. Patrick's Day, pays tribute to their faith and their courage.

From the Revolution on through every emergency in which the United States called upon the best in its manhood and its womanhood, to fight and die if need be, the Irish were always up front, and in numbers greater than they were called upon to give in service to their adopted country.

Adopted, did I say?

'Twas a slip of the tongue.

No people have every embraced this land with greater warmth or devotion, making it their own, in company with other immigrants of good will, and giving richly to the family life and the neighborliness that make the United States a home for humanity.

Like other races, we have had a few among us with thin hearts.

The criminals, known or unknown, the draft-dodgers, the grafters, and the slippery ones who have stained their rich heritage—may God forgive them.

But not many of them, I can assure you, as the record proves.

These few shadows are almost invisible in the sunlight of Irish cheerfulness, and good character, and loyalty to God and country.

The lovely green, which forever recalls the scenery of their native land, is symbolic of the vitality and creative powers of the Irish. Of the hopefulness, and the joy of spring, that make the Irish eternally young. As immortal as their faith, which wins the respect and admiration of their fellowmen.

Remember the Boston policeman, who was recently singled out for honor by a nationwide television program? Quietly, and through the years, his kindness and his help had encouraged a young girl not of his own family, to overcome her disfigurement and her despair. And then—soon after—his own wife died after a long illness during which he had attended to her needs with a loving gentleness that inspired her to ask, almost with her last breath, whether she had married a man or a saint. His humble goodness, in helping others as well as his own, won the heart of the Nation.

He did not seek this tribute. Far from it. Others arranged it without his knowledge, for they believed that his pure and unselfish love for others should be recognized for its true worth. Above and beyond the evil that makes up so much of the news.

The Boston police officer whose great heart was revealed to us in spite of his wish to remain unknown bears a proud Irish name.

It is this abundant human quality of his race that we honor on St. Patrick's Day.

The unsung glory of those with Irish blood in their veins; industrious, reverent, but with the saving grace of humor that brightens the way, no matter how difficult it may be.

Saints and poets, athletes and labor leaders, scientists and statesmen, it is easy enough to mention the famous ones who are known to all. But where would they be without the pious example of their mothers or the strength for truth and honesty that they admired in their fathers.

The world of today places great store in the cleverness of a man, and of the skill he acquires through education and experience, but how often have we been disappointed to find that those we once looked up to, are lacking in character when put to the test.

That is why, on this St. Patrick's Day we should think first of the average American of Irish descent, and of the virtues of his race that make him a good man, a good worker, and a good citizen.

That he is courageous, no one dares deny.

His love for independence is so strong that he willingly gives himself to help other nations win their freedom.

There is no doubt that his faith in God, and in the life of the spirit that is eternal, inspires in him a longing for justice tempered with charity.

Thanks to the supreme teachings that St. Patrick brought to Ireland over 1,500

years ago; that have been handed on from parents to children through the generations; so that every true Irishman tries to live his life in honor of his Divine Creator.

Perhaps no other people have dedicated themselves to the sacred vocation of religion, in such numbers and with such devotion, as the Irish.

Church and home are their altars.

The fellowship of men of good will is their faith.

This then is the foundation from which their sons and daughters rise to eminence in our national life.

There were joyous parades in New York and other large cities today, but did you know that as far back as 1737, there were that many Irish in Boston that they were able to have a St. Patrick's Day celebration, to the delight of the early colonists?

Or that they were a potent force in the revolutionary army that won independence for us? George Washington's forces never had more than 25,000 men under arms at their peak, but of these, more than 4,000 had names that were as Irish as Sullivan or O'Brien?

More than 170,000 served in the Union armies during the Civil War. Under their own green battle flags, the Irish Zouaves, the Emmett Guards, the St. Patrick's Brigade, and other noted regiments, wrote brilliant chapters of heroism into American history.

During World War I there was hardly a unit in the United States Army and Navy that did not have Irish names to add luster to its morale and its valor. Three hundred and seventy-nine were awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for exceptional courage under fire.

When World War II threatened our survival as a nation they volunteered for national service by the hundreds of thousands. Whoever can forget Capt. Colin Kelly, one of the first heroes, or Audie Murphy who won more decorations than any other American fighting man, or the last full measure of devotion given by the Sullivan family, whose five sons died to keep us free?

As long as men shall live they will remember the time when General McAuliffe and his troops were surrounded by superior forces at Bastogne. His position seemed hopeless, and the enemy called upon him to surrender. To their demand, General McAuliffe replied, "Nuts." It took some time for the enemy to understand the positive meaning of this American slang, but as the Americans fought on against great odds until a relief column broke through, the enemy learned that the word surrender was never part of the Irish vocabulary.

Since World War II, they have risen to top posts of command in the Army and Navy in the persons of General Collins, and Admirals Carney and Burke.

One of our greatest sculptors was Augustus Saint-Gaudens. One of the most popular composers was Victor Herbert. You are right. Both were born in Ireland.

There are many who do not bear Irish names but who have Irish in them, nonetheless, including Presidents of the United States. It would take years to trace the whole story, and give full credit to all we owe to the charm, the stout hearts, and the integrity of the Irish.

So we must cull the few—the unmistakable ones.

Among our oustanding writers we mention the names of Kathleen Norris, F. Scott Fitzgerald, and Margaret Culkin Banning. And the most famous of all dramatists, Eugene O'Neill.

John L. Sullivan, Jim Corbett, Jim Jeffries, Jack Dempsey, Gene Tunney * * * who has not thrilled to their courage and their sportsmanship?

In political life, the Irish have found a fertile field for their talents. As governors, mayors, Senators, Ambassadors they have contributed so much that one wonders if American Government could function without them.

In the wonderful world of entertainment, they have captivated us with song and story. Whose heart has not been warmed this day upon hearing Kathleen Mavourneen, The Rose of Tralee, and When Irish Eyes Are Smiling? Ah, but that last one is indeed a beautiful sight to see.

From the Barrymores to Helen Hayes, Bing Crosby, Spencer Tracy, Pat O'Brien, Margaret Sullavan, and the Kelly girl who lives up to the name of Grace—what sweet and wholesome pleasure they have given us. Not to mention the bright youngsters coming along in their friendly way, through radio and TV, to gladden us in our homes.

If all the world were Irish, there would never be such a devil of a thing as communism. Of that you can be sure, for the God-fearing Irish will have no part of anything that would degrade the soul of man and turn him into an animal. Lucky it is that we have holy men like Bishop Sheen to show the Communists up for the scoundrels that they are.

Look about you to all the churches and colleges, and hospitals, and orphanages, and homes for the aged, that the Irish are building, not only for themselves, but for the benefit of their fellow Americans who seek inspiration, education, or sanctuary.

If more of this kind spirit could enter and humanize our business, and industry, and science, the United States would have nothing to fear, for all the world would be heartened by our example.

'Tis a proud day for the Irish, and a generous one.

Our happiness is complete as Yankees and southerners, Hebrews, French, Italians, and Polish people, in fact, all our brothers and sisters in this blessed land smile with us.

A toast to St. Patrick and the United States.

To a glorious past, and to the miracle of the future when all men will share in a better life.

Believing in God and in freedom.

Conference Report on H. R. 8320

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following statement:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 8320

The issue involved in the conference report on H. R. 8320 is simple. The question is should the following programs be extended:

1. School milk program (expires June 30, 1956).
2. Brucellosis eradiction program (expires June 30, 1956).
3. Veterans' hospitals and Armed Forces milk program (expires December 31, 1956).

SUMMARY OF PROBLEM

House passed H. R. 8320 unanimously February 1, 1956. The bill provided for additional funds to carry school milk and brucellosis programs to this June 30.

The Senate passed H. R. 8320 unanimously on February 8, 1956. As passed by Senate, the bill included the additional funds plus Senate amendment to extend the school milk and brucellosis eradication program and also the veterans' hospital and Armed Forces milk programs for 2 more years to 1958.

The conference committee at the insistence of the Democrat House managers has reported the bill back to the House with the Senate amendment stricken from the bill.

This course was insisted upon by Democrat House members of the conference committee in spite of the fact that the House last year in H. R. 12 (the general farm bill that is still pending in Senate) approved a 1-year extension of the school milk program and a 2-year extension of the brucellosis eradication program.

There can be but one reason for the position taken by the Democrat managers of the House, a desire to keep these programs in suspense as part of the general farm bill for bargaining purposes. It will thus remain as a club over the heads of those who believe in the desirability of these programs but who may oppose other provisions of the general farm bill.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SITUATION

Adoption of the conference report by the House will send the bill (H. R. 8320) to the President without the extensions.

Rejection of the conference report by the House will pave the way for a motion in the House to concur in the Senate amendments and thus send the bill to the President with the extensions.

Neither rejection nor adoption of conference report will affect the emergency funds needed by the school milk or brucellosis programs to carry them through the remainder of the fiscal year.

A vote for the adoption of the conference report will be a vote against the extension of the school milk, the veterans' hospital and Armed Forces milk programs, and the brucellosis eradication program.

A vote against the adoption of the conference report will be a vote for the extension of the school milk, the veterans' hospital, and Armed Forces milk programs, and the brucellosis eradication program.

The Role of Government in Housing and Real Estate Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by Hon. ALBERT RAINS before the American Bankers Association at their annual convention in New York on March 7. I am sure the Members will be interested in this splendid discussion of the Government's role in housing. Congressman RAINS is a recognized authority on this subject and I am very pleased to bring it to the attention of the House.

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN HOUSING AND REAL ESTATE FINANCING

Mr. Chairman, the banking system plays a vital, indeed an indispensable, role in our private-enterprise economy. Through your institutions flows the stream of commercial, industrial, and agricultural credit which is the lifeblood and invigorating force of our economy. The layman like myself often finds the banking process somewhat mysterious in its complicated and technical workings, but he is nonetheless aware that our economy would die without the flow of credit necessary to sustain it.

While the extension of commercial, industrial, and agricultural credit is widely recognized as the prime function of commercial bankers, we must not overlook the tremendous contribution made by commercial banks in the field of housing construction and home-mortgage financing.

Available statistics bear eloquent testimony on this point. According to the latest Federal Reserve Board statistics commercial banks hold nearly $16 billion in residential mortgage loans. Although some of this total includes loans on apartment structures—the $16 billion total looms large against the approximately $88 billions national total of mortgage debt estimated to be outstanding on 1- to 4-family homes.

Looking at the Government-aided sector of mortgage finance, I find that commercial banks hold nearly $4.6 billion in FHA-insured loans and about $3.7 billion in GI loans. This represents nearly one-third of the national total of FHA loans outstanding, and about 15 percent of the GI loan total.

In terms of more recent activity commercial banks account for about 15 percent of GI loans. Most recent FHA figures show that commercial banks made about 1 FHA loan in 3. In the case of project mortgages—e. g., 213 cooperative loans and section 207 apartment loans—the share of commercial banks is even greater. In 1954, commercial banks accounted for about 57 percent of total FHA project mortgages.

I would like also to compliment the mutual-savings banks for their great contribution in the housing finance field. Funds from these institutions give a strong underpinning to home construction and home finance in many areas of the country.

Mutual-savings banks hold over $15 billions in residential mortgages, very close to the portfolio total of commercial banks. Their holdings of FHA and GI loans are even larger, totaling nearly $10 billion or approximately one-fourth of the national total of Government-supported housing loans.

These statistics do not tell the whole story by any means, of course. They do not give proper weight to the prominent, possibly the dominant, role played by bankers in supplying the construction financing which builders must have to proceed. Nor do they give weight to the mortgage warehousing activities of commercial banks which are so beneficial in smoothing out the flow of credit in the home-financing process.

And now I would like to turn to the Washington scene and discuss some of the things which our subcommittee on housing has been doing, and also to give you some of my views on the general subject of the proper role of Government in the housing and real-estate finance field.

Recognizing that the housing industry is a kingpin in our economy and that the Government conducts a variety of programs in the housing field, the House of Representatives last June passed a resolution authorizing the Banking and Currency Committee to study and investigate virtually all phases of the Government-assisted housing programs. Acting under this resolution the Banking and Currency Committee set up a Subcommittee on Housing. I was greatly honored to be named chairman of the subcommittee.

Gentlemen, I want to say that our subcommittee has really been at work. Over the past few months, we have held five field hearings in New York, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Cleveland. In most cases, the hearings extended for several days and we heard expert testimony of every shade and variety of opinion from Government officials and industry representatives with a first-hand knowledge of local problems.

We carefully selected subject areas in which real problems were apparent—areas in which we hoped that the subcommittee's labors would produce tangible results. The subjects initially selected for study included the slum clearance and urban renewal programs, the multi-family housing programs under FHA, and the problems of mortgage credit.

I think that our efforts in these hearings have borne fruit. After careful study of all the testimony presented, we have issued reports on these subjects which recommend legislative changes and also contain suggestions for changes in administrative policy on the part of the executive agencies concerned.

We have attempted to be objective and fair in our reports but at the same time have pulled no punches. For example, we were greatly distressed to find that the slum clearance and urban renewal programs were bogged down in a morass of administrative red tape. We found a timid and negative attitude on the part of many Government officials—and a lack of drive and the bold imagination which must be present if the grave problems of slum elimination and prevention are ever to be solved. Our criticisms on these matters were expressed in strong language.

We have tried, however, to make our criticism constructive. If you will examine our report on slum clearance and urban renewal, you will find that we made a long series of recommendations on things which can and should be done to make the slum clearance and urban renewal program more workable and effective.

I by no means wish to imply any lack of interest on your part in the challenge of slum clearance and prevention, but as bankers you will probably be more interested in the subcommittee's report on mortgage credit. Our mortgage credit report discusses the question of discounts, of credit controls, of mortgage warehousing—all timely subjects, indeed.

In this field too we had concrete recommendations to make, both of a legislative and an administrative policy nature. You may not agree with some of the views we champion, but I think you will agree we went into the subject deeply and conscientiously.

I hope you will read our reports and I can assure you we will be glad to have the benefit of your comments. Our subcommittee will undoubtedly play a role in the evolution of the general housing bill, which will emerge before the gavel sounds a close to the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

Last month in Washington we held a hearing on the general subject of the operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association. Because of the excessive discounts on GI and FHA loans which the subcommittee learned about in some areas, and because FNMA has a support role for such mortgages, we thought it would be timely to restudy FNMA's organization and operation to see what changes, if any, should be made to make it a more effective support.

We heard views which varied considerably. On the one hand, the home builders proposed some rather sweeping changes which would greatly liberalize FNMA's secondary market operation. In addition to the present mortgage purchase authority, the home builders proposed that FNMA be authorized to rediscount GI and FHA mortgages and also to issue standby commitments with certain limitations.

At the other end of the spectrum, we heard considerable testimony against any further liberalization in FNMA's program. Generally, all of the institutional lender groups—including the spokesmen for the American Bankers Association and the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks—took this view.

Frankly, I do not know yet what our subcommittee will recommend in the way of FNMA legislation. Our report should be out before long and you may be sure we will have recommendations, but at the moment, we are still studying various alternatives.

The subject of FNMA presents a convenient point of departure from which to launch into a more general discussion of the nature of our problems in the housing field and more specifically, what the role of the Federal Government should be in relation to these problems.

Now certainly no thinking person believes in Government for Government's sake. Only the anarchist on the other hand believes that a country can exist without some governmental powers and control. The real issues is the degree to which the Government should intervene.

Whether we like it or not, the Government is deeply involved in the housing field. With the onset of the great depression, the Government was forced to intervene in the housing economy, for example, to rescue homeowners from foreclosure with loans from the Home Owners Loan Corporation and to stabilize the mortgage market; stimulate home construction through the establishment of the FHA insurance program. Creation of the home-loan bank system was necessary to provide a credit backstop to our Nation's savings and loan associations. Construction of low rent subsidized public housing units was undertaken with a twofold purpose—(1) to provide decent housing for the low-income families which could not afford private housing; and (2) to help clear our Nation's slums.

Again, whether we like it or not, there has been since World War II a continuing expansion of government activities in the housing field. As major examples, we have seen a tremendous increase of the GI home loan program for veterans. We have seen enacted a large scale program for loans and grants for slum clearance and urban renewal.

Now all of these programs are not just devices of the devil fashioned by some evil planner who are interested in expanding government power with no valid purpose in mind. All of these programs were conceived and put into operation by the American people through their representatives because they were necessary to meet a real and valid national need.

And most significantly, none of these programs has really been competitive with private enterprise. These programs have either furnished supplemental assistance so that private capital and private enterprise could do a more effective job or as in the case of the low rent housing program, they have met a pressing social need which just could not be achieved without direct public subsidy.

I am convinced that these governmental housing programs have greatly assisted our economy and the national welfare, and they have done so with a minimum of Government interference with private enterprise, and I believe that many enlightened businessmen share my view.

Now let me make it clear that I am an advocate of the middle ground. I think that each proposal must be carefully considered on its merits. And the adoption of any new Government program should be done only when it is clearly in the public interest and because it is necessary to meet an unfilled need.

But by the same token, I cannot go along with those who blindly oppose any change in the status quo. We must face the fact that in this great growing economy of ours, some degree of balanced change in our policies and programs is inevitable.

I would like if I may to discuss several specific examples in an attempt to make my position clear:

Take public housing, which is a scare word in many quarters. I frankly cannot understand how enlightened men with a comprehension of our social and economic problems can oppose a reasonable public housing program.

Our home building industry has done a monumental job in providing excellent housing at a moderate price for a large majority of our families. Likewise, for many other middle- and lower middle-income families decent accommodations are available at a reasonable price or rent from our huge stock of existing housing.

But the blunt fact remains that private industry cannot supply adequate and decent housing for many of our low income families. Many of these families are forced to pay disproportionately high rents for the privilege of living in slums. I for one cannot be complacent as long as this social and economic fact exists. In the words of a great and eloquent American, "Are we really prosperous when our national income is going up but our schools are becoming more crowded, our slums more contagious. Sure, the figures on the paycheck are important, but is a family really prosperous if it lives in an urban jungle where juvenile delinquency takes growing children for its prey?

"We are for a country where no man's home is blighted by smoke, dirt, and noise and cut off from sunlight, trees, and air."

Until I can see some workable alternative proposed—and I have yet to see one that makes real sense—I am going to continue to fight strongly for a low rent public housing and for an effective slum clearance and urban renewal program. Admittedly these programs involve Government intervention and they involve Government subsidy. But likewise the FHA and GI programs involve Government intervention and Government subsidy. I am for all of these programs—because they meet desirable social needs, keep competition with private enterprise to a minimum, and help us to maintain a prosperous and expanding economy.

I think we can take the Federal National Mortgage Association as another example.

The main thesis developed by representatives of banking groups at our recent FNMA hearing seemed to be that the private mortgage market is capable of meeting all legitimate mortgage needs.

Now that may be true in some parts of the country. But, gentlemen, I can tell you that it is not true in the South and West, including my own home State of Alabama. In many parts of the country it is extremely difficult to obtain FHA and GI financing except at a prohibitive cost. Many of us in Congress are deeply concerned about the high and unreasonable discounts on Government-assisted mortgage loans which prevail in many areas. The unsatisfied mortgage financing needs of minority groups is another example of a deficiency in our existing financing machinery.

So I cannot in good conscience take the negative stand that all is well in the mortgage world. I am certain we will recommend some amendments to improve FNMA so it can do a better job in supporting the private market, in remote and high-discount areas.

There is another area of need—which is not now being met—I refer to the problem of decent housing at a reasonable cost for our elderly citizens.

A ground swell of sentiment seems to be growing in Congress in response to this unmet need. Many bills to provide housing aid for the elderly have been introduced. I shall shortly introduce a bill which would provide low-cost, long-term financing for nonprofit corporations such as charitable groups to build low-cost housing for older people. It is my hope that the bill will receive favorable action in this session.

As a matter of fact, I hope there will be action taken in all of these sectors in the 1956 Housing Act; a provision for a sizable number of low-rent public-housing units, some amendments to make FNMA a more effective support facility, and a program for housing for the elderly.

The 1956 act will undoubtedly contain other provisions. It will provide for the necessary extensions of the various FHA programs. It will probably extend and liberalize the title VIII military-housing program. It will probably contain some liberalizing features in the FHA title I home-improvement loan program. I hope also it will contain liberalizing amendments to make the FHA section 207 rental-housing program more effective, and also changes to liberalize the section 221 program designed to supply housing for persons displaced by urban-renewal operations.

Whether it will contain anything relating to the GI loan program I cannot say. The present law expires in July 1957. While veterans' housing legislation falls under the jurisdiction of the Committee for Veterans' Affairs, I would like to emphasize my personal support of the GI loan program and state my hope and belief that provision will be made for some form of reasonable extension of this act.

Of course, any prediction as to what will finally emerge in the way of housing legislation is hazardous. The great democratic process of lawmaking in our country is a complicated one and no one can ever be certain about the final outcome. But we can be sure that all sides will have their innings in shaping the end result. And I am also confident that the end product will provide housing legislation to help build a stronger and sounder housing economy and in so doing to promote the national welfare.

Address of Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, to the New York Young Democratic Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on February 24, I spoke to a very fine organization of eager-minded young men and women of New York City, called the New York Young Democratic Club, Inc. It was a speech in which I expressed myself on some of the thorny issues with which we are confronted today. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Democrats, I am a little late in arriving here—just about a year late. It is almost exactly a year and a month since I was scheduled to address this organization. Indeed, I prepared some remarks for that occasion and those remarks were delivered to you, but it was not I who delivered them. It was my administrative assistant, Julius Edelstein.

I was kept in Washington that day and night—it was January 28, 1955—voting on, or rather against, the President's proposal for a congressional resolution giving the President authority to defend, with American arms, not only Formosa, but the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. Those were new names in the news at that time, but they are quite familiar to us now.

Yes, that was 13 months ago. It seems much more. It seems almost like an age. So much has happened since then. It was, in fact, just before the time of the last brink, according to the chronology of John Foster Dulles.

Had my view, and that of Senator WAYNE MORSE prevailed at the time, Secretary Dulles would have been able to report only 2 brinks instead of 3 to those impartial biographers, the editors of Life magazine.

But it is really no laughing matter. That was a deadly serious time. The debate that kept me from coming here on January 28, 1955 was a deadly serious vote, and I am well satisfied with the way I voted on that occasion.

We were dealing with your lives, the lives of all the young men and women of America. We were dealing with the world's peace. We were dealing with the life of civilization as we know it.

Had not the new masters of the Kremlin, seeking perhaps a breathing space within which to consolidate their own power and for other devious purposes still unknown to us, decided at that time to launch a great new peace offensive, some of us might not be here tonight. That peace offensive culminated in the summit conference at Geneva last summer.

Since then, there have been several anticlimaxes and there has been a general disillusionment, but the world atmosphere is still, thank God, free of the deadly effects of hydrogen bombs.

I'm not quite sure whom we need to thank for this, but I am sure that it isn't Secretary Dulles, and it wasn't the Formosa Resolution.

Yes, it is a year and a month later, and I am pleased as can be that I am able, at long last, to make a personal appearance before the Young Democrats. I don't know why, but I always feel particularly comfortable when I am talking to or visiting with young Democrats. I know I am somewhat past the age of eligibility for active membership, but still I feel at home here.

I think it is probably because I have always felt—and have acted on that feeling—that the Democratic Party is peculiarly the party of youth, young in spirit and ideology, and determined to grapple with the problems of the future as well as to meet the pressing needs of the moment.

And therein lies one of the critical differences between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party.

It is really no accident that the overwhelming majority of the young men and women in our country—the overwhelming majority of first voters—join the Democratic Party. Our party has had this attraction since the time of Al Smith. And woe betide us if it ever stops having that attraction.

Indeed I am more than a little worried at reports I hear that some of the enthusiasm for the Democratic Party among the youth of our land has become somewhat dampened in recent months. I hope these reports are not true. I hope and believe that our party is going to light the usual fires among the youth of the land, both by reason of its policies and its candidates, in the months immediately ahead.

I want to tell you, and to recall for the sake of the older Young Democrats among us, that we have had an attraction for youth not by accident, nor by mere reputation. It has been because the Democratic Party has reflected in its programs and principles the spirit of boldness and imagination which is so appealing to youth.

The Democratic Party has consistently reflected that spirit of liberalism which is a particular attribute of youth as contrasted with that crochety and fearsome conservatism which is supposed to be a particular attribute of old age.

The Democratic Party has been willing to confront and attack problems, however great, with solutions, however novel. In the past, we have not tried to solve problems by ignoring their existence. We have not tried to gloss over our difficulties by pretending that they do not exist. Indeed our tradition is one of exposing problems—those of the

future as well as the present—by looking ahead to see problems, and by looking under the surface to find them.

Moreover our tradition has been to sponsor programs to meet the special needs of youth in training, education, and rehabilitation.

I would not expect many of you here tonight to remember by personal experience, but I recall how the early years of the New Deal were highlighted by the special youth programs—the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration, and the writers' and artists' project of the WPA.

It was an exciting time. The country throbbed. Youth groups went in and out of the White House, conferring with the President and with Mrs. Roosevelt—making headlines and news.

It was a young man's Government, and there was a premium on youth. The ideas that were generated at that time weren't all sound, and there were some that were tried and failed rather dismally.

But they were ideas for action—and the sum total of the action was recovery from depression and the restoration of a dynamic momentum to both the economic and political life of the United States. And in the long run, the mistakes didn't matter too much.

And even after that phase, when we had to turn to the youth of the land to build an Army and a Navy and an Air Force to fight a war—two wars, in fact—youth was not forgotten in our social welfare measures.

There was the GI bill of rights. Millions of young men and women got high-school and college educations and training in specialized vocations.

There was also the scholarship program of the National Science Foundation, and the grants-in-aid to hundreds of universities amounting to millions of dollars for scientific research and training.

And, finally, there were and still are: The vocational rehabilitation program, to restore thousands of physically handicapped young men and women to active and useful life; and the program of Federal aid to dependent children to keep families together which might otherwise be broken up.

All these programs, when they were first proposed, were bitterly opposed by the reactionary forces in Congress and elsewhere. We had to fight every foot of the way to get them approved. They weren't called creeping socialism. They were called out-and-out socialism. The "creeping" has crept in in recent years. But now all these programs, those that are still in operation, are considered sound and respectable, and some of them are even being claimed as the accomplishments of the Republican Party and the Eisenhower administration.

Now let's think for just a moment, what new programs have been launched since the Republicans have been in power, not only for youth, but for any sector of the population.

What new ideas have been brought forth?

There is, of course, the go-to-the-brink concept of foreign policy, but most of its sponsors have been inclined to disown even that.

There is the what-is-good-for-General Motors concept—also known as the trickle-down theory—and the partnership plan for public power—also known as the giveaway—and some others of the same sort and variety.

But I don't remember anything positive or constructive or dynamic which has been proposed or urged by this administration in its 3 years in office.

Faced with the critical distress of the Nation's farmers, the administration has come up with a soil-bank plan, submitted and recommended with all the noise and flashbulbs of a Hollywood premiere. That plan has its merits.

It turns out, however, that the plan isn't new. It was originally proposed, it seems, quite a few years ago, by a Democratic Secretary of Agriculture by the name of Henry A. Wallace, who has since gone through some rather startling political transitions, ending up most recently as an avowed supporter of President Eisenhower.

But if I were to name the most characteristic policy of this administration, it would be the giveaway, and its most characteristic act, the Dixon-Yates contract.

Yet, let's face it, the political picture has been considerably confused in recent days by the vote on the veto of the natural gas bill. I don't know how much political credit we can gather out of that most unfortunate legislative struggle.

It ended all right because President Eisenhower vetoed the bill—and I was one of the first to praise him for doing so. The consumers have been temporarily saved. But we cannot deny that Democrats led the fight for this legislation, just as Democrats led the fight against it. There were Republicans, too, on both sides of this issue. The big oil and gas interests—the producers—had their friends in both parties. And the consumers had their friends in both parties. But unhappily the consumers didn't have as many friends as the producers.

But when the tablecloth was lifted by Senator CASE of South Dakota, and the public got a glimpse of what seemed to have been going on under the table, the President vetoed the bill.

Now we are going to have an investigation of what may have been going on under the table. I hope that investigation is going to be thorough, with no holds barred.

But I am not happy over all the intensive maneuvers which resulted in the decision to appoint a special committee, in place of the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee, to conduct this investigation.

This decision has been thoroughly rationalized. It is hard to rebut the rationalizations. But I have a feeling of disquiet. Why was it necessary to take this investigation away from the standing committees which had jurisdiction? I hope with all my heart that my suspicions will be allayed by events.

Now I have been studying the field of insurance lately in connection with the flood insurance legislation I have been working on. And I have come across the technical insurance term called "spreading the risk." By including as many risks as possible in one insurance policy, and by spreading these policies over as vast a geographic area as possible, the insurance companies avoid the danger of excess loss as a result of any disaster in any particular area.

I am afraid that there will be a strong pressure, in this special committee, to spread the risk as widely as possible, and by accepting the obligation to investigate everything, they will end up by investigating nothing very thoroughly. I hope this will not be so.

One final thought. I can scarcely make a speech these days without referring to the subject of civil rights. It is a subject very close to my heart.

We have been hearing a great deal about the civil rights issue in recent weeks. Well, I have been speaking about it for many months. I made a speech here in New York City on November 11 last year and predicted that the civil rights issue was going to be a live one in 1956. I said that party principle could not be and must not be, sacrificed to party unity.

I made a similar speech on December 15 here in this city. I used the same theme—I devoted my whole speech to it—in a speech at the State Democratic dinner on February 2.

I understand that because of the noise in the hall, not very many people heard me. And the newspapers paid only scant attention.

But it wasn't long before that issue made news. And it is going to continue to make news.

It isn't an easy issue, believe me. It isn't a simple problem, and I say this as one of those who has been in the forefront of this fight for many years. There are some phases of the problem on which honest men may honestly differ.

But as far as I am concerned, this issue is going to be pressed. I want to see the Constitution of the United States enforced * * * and I mean all the provisions of the Constitution which deal with civil rights * * * and all the laws of the United States which deal with civil rights.

And they must be enforced in a way designed to secure their maximum effectiveness in the minimum amount of time. The action I seek is action now—a prompt and reasonable start with what the Supreme Court called "deliberate speed."

I shall press on all the fronts on which I operate, in the Senate of the United States. I join in urging and advocating that the executive branch discharge its full responsibility, and that the courts continue to discharge their full responsibility. But Congress must also accept its responsibility.

And the Democratic Party must accept its responsibility.

I do not have a crystal ball in which to see the outcome of our efforts, either on this front or on any other.

Never has the crystal ball of even the immediate future been more clouded.

But I appeal to you, not just as young Democrats, but as young Americans, to accept the responsibilities of these tense and difficult hours, and to brace yourselves to them. We need all the best thought, all the best will, all the courage, and dedication which can be mustered in this entire country of ours, to meet the problems which confront us all.

Of course, I hope with all my heart that the Democrats win the coming election, but I hope even more deeply and more fervently that America will win the next election. I hope that however that election comes out, the cause of freedom, justice, peace and security for all Americans and for all mankind will be advanced, under God.

St. Patrick and the Christian Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously obtained, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered on March 17, over radio stations WJW and WERE, and television station WXEL, Cleveland, on St. Patrick and the Christian Crisis:

On this St. Patrick's day I vividly recall the exquisite charm of the Emerald Isle—a garden of green midst seas, lakes, rivers, and valleys. Its beauty is indelibly impressed in my mind and memory—the natural beauty of God's creation.

One's fascination for its beautiful countryside is excelled only by the warmth and friendliness of its people. My subject truly befits the life and times of St. Patrick, which has to do with the world in which we live, and what the future may hold for all of us.

Fifteen hundred years ago the great empire of Rome stood as a symbol of power and might. That was the external appearance of the Roman empire, but its heart was gone and a civilization that had spread over most of the world was dying.

From all sides, the barbarian tribes from the east and the north were storming the ramparts of the Roman empire, and those ramparts were decayed at their foundations.

At the same time, a young slave escaped from Ireland to France. That young slave became known to the world at St. Patrick.

After completing his studies in France, he returned to pagan Ireland and made it Christian.

He made Ireland the isle of saints and scholars. When the Roman empire collapsed and all of Europe became engulfed in spiritual darkness, it was from Ireland that the light of knowledge came to illumine it again.

Today the civilization of which we are a part is being threatened by a new and even crueler barbarianism which springs from militant materialism.

All of us seeking the way to preserve our civilization dread the darkness which shall surely come should the forces of materialism capture the world.

I believe the answer to our problem is, in very large measure, found in the life and teachings of St. Patrick and through a better understanding of the great spiritual treasure he bequeathed to all mankind.

Before the coming of St. Patrick, the clan wars of Ireland were a tradition that stirred the hearts and the muscles of every Gaelic son. There were constant and bitter wars between the clans.

Each of the clans engaged in the evil practice of slavery, since it was their custom to take from a defeated enemy as many of the able-bodied men as they decided necessary to do the menial tasks of the victorious clan.

The family as the basic unit of society, was in a most precarious condition because the clan wars could easily disrupt it through the death of the father or by his being carried away in slavery by the victorious clan.

Physical might was the dominating element in all life in and among the Gaelic clans.

As you know, the Irish before the coming of St. Patrick, were pagans and sun worshipers. But these pagan Gaels had great courage, were avid adventurers, and were possessed of a confidence that made would-be foreign invaders hesitate to touch their boats upon the shores of Ireland.

But with the coming of St. Patrick and his winning of the Irish, an almost complete change took place in the basic character of the people.

St. Patrick taught the Irish the true dignity of man. He traveled the highways and byways of Ireland teaching everyone who would listen to his voice that all men were creatures of God, and as such, possessed an individual value which must be respected by all his fellowmen. The old clan wars which made life cheap indeed soon disappeared because they ran counter to the basic teachings of St. Patrick.

Through St. Patrick the Irish learned about the sanctity of the family and the integrity of the home.

The family became the primary unit of a new Irish civilization and the hearth of each home took on a blessedness which forbade the invasion of any but friends.

The Irish learned the lessons of charity, tolerance and brotherhood from the good St. Patrick. They learned that it is Christian to overlook the shortcomings of our neighbors and to forgive those trespasses which in the past had been an occasion for strife and warfare.

The true lessons of brotherhood became an indelible character of the Irish because St. Patrick insisted that his followers should never forget the essential dignity possessed by each and every human being.

St. Patrick brought to the Irish people a spirit of charity which he intended should dominate their characters for all time. This was a charity not only extended to those in need of material assistance or a friendly hand, but also a charity of thought toward our fellowman.

It goes without saying that slavery as a once accepted practice of the Gaelic clans passed into limbo with the advent of St. Patrick. It will be recalled that St. Patrick himself was a slave who had been captured by a warring Gaelic tribe and therefore knew from his own sad experience the cruel indignities that grow out of a society which permits any of its members to be regarded as less worthy than other members of that society.

The Irish always possessed courage, but St. Patrick gave to the Irish a new type of courage which goes well beyond the usual physical courage. That is the moral courage to stand up for what is right, even though the temporary cost for doing what is right may be very heavy.

The courage that springs from high principle and a desire to preserve an unquestioned integrity is the special gift of courage from St. Patrick.

The faith of the Irish which is legendary throughout the length and breadth of the world also came from the teachings of good St. Patrick. He taught the Irish to have faith in themselves, faith in the righteous cause, faith in our nation and faith in the ultimate triumph of goodness over evil in a world in which the devil's helpers are never quiet. This noble faith, of course, has its source in faith in God.

It has often been said that hope springs eternal in the hearts of the Irish, and that is true, because St. Patrick planted the seed so deep that all the Irish have learned the lesson of rejecting despair as the desperate lot of those who know not God.

The inspired hopes of the Irish have been the beacon hopes of the world because the Irish people have wished nothing but the best for all the people of the world.

And so all these attributes are the result of the works of St. Patrick and his blessings upon the Irish people.

I cannot help but wonder what St. Patrick would do if he were among us today, being confronted, as we are, with an all-out attack against the very pillars of the civilization he did so much to nurture and expand.

I speak of the ruthless onslaught against all the people of the world being made by the pagan Communists, as they seek to turn back the pages of history and to restore the barbaric rule of the pre-Christian era.

Everywhere the great moral and human values taught by good St. Patrick are being challenged, desecrated, and ridiculed by those who have been foolishly led to believe that man is nothing but an animal, and the only things of value in this world are those which can be measured according to some material worth.

The brotherhood of man, long cherished by all loyal sons of St. Patrick, is torn asunder by the cruelties and inhumanities of Iron Curtains, bigotry, intolerance, and, indeed, hatred.

Communism would bring to mankind a human slavery far worse than that experienced by St. Patrick in his boyhood, just as it has established a super-race which grants itself the privilege to exploit all other men and to hold blithely in their hands even the question of life or death over their enslaved fellow man.

The virtues of faith, hope, and charity are degraded as the earmarks of a decaying society by those who would replace these great qualities with the rule of the jungle.

The sanctity of the family and the home is under attack by the new order which claims that the state is all-knowing and therefore has the right to invasion of the home, the right to force separation of husband from wife, and children from parents, and even the right to cruel deportation of people to barren and lifeless parts of the Russian empire.

The new order being advanced by the Russian Communists seeks to destroy all hope in mankind, to create a general attitude of despair, and to so weaken the will of civilized mankind as to make easy the way of world conquest which is, of course, the goal of the Comunist tyrants.

To be sure, St. Patrick would recognize that all civilization is being put to an acid test, the outcome of which may very well determine the destiny of all mankind for a thousand years.

One can only speculate as to what St. Patrick would do under these circumstances if he were here with us today, but I am certain, if I understand the many gifts of St. Patrick to all the human race, that he would make a great effort to restore the integrity of nations as well as individuals.

He surely would point out to us that integrity of both nation and individual is soon lost if any nation or individual fails to stand up for what is right, to stand by their friends in time of need, to have no fear of the enemy, to be courageous in the face of overwhelming odds, and above all, to unde stand that there is a state of life far worse than the cruelties of war.

St. Patrick, were he among us today, would, I believe, insist that our national integrity be removed from the altar of expediency.

He would, no doubt, point out that we are running short of allies to be sacrificed on that pagan altar of expediency, and that unless we amend our ways, we, as a nation, will soon find ourselves on the sacrificial altar of militant materialism.

He would insist that the tortured cries for help which come forth from the many nations enslaved by the ruthless Russian Communists, be answered in a true and unyielding Christian spirit.

Above all, he would urge that we restore the hopes of the enslaved people for early liberation from their martyrdom, those hopes which have been so shattered and worn by continued adherence to the amoral policy of containment.

I have no doubt he would reprimand those in public life who advocate a do nothing policy by holding that the evils of our day must be overcome by evolution rather than by righteous action.

It also seems certain to me that St. Patrick would take steps to restore that great virtue of faith without which no civilization, or nation, or individual can long endure. He would stir up in all civilized mankind such faith in the future as to make the threats of war and reprisal by the Communists sound like empty echoes from the dampness of the grave.

Through this great faith, false fears would disappear and true values would predominate every choice we must necessarily make if we are to preserve the civilization of which we are a part.

I am, above all else, certain that St. Patrick would admonish each and every one of us to do good works, for, by our good works, we shall be known as the true sons of St. Patrick.

It will do us little good on this glorious feast day of St. Patrick to sit idly by awaiting the return of St. Patrick to save us from the forces of evil which seek to destroy our civilization.

So sit idly by when there is so much to be done, is to invite the very disaster which all thinking men now seek desperately to avoid.

The barbarians of our day, who lead the cause of militant materialism, can be turned back to the primitive jungle from whence they have come. All mankind can be returned to a sanity, a peace of heart and mind that the great teachings of St. Patrick intended to be the birthright of every man.

We can accomplish all of this if each and every one of us, in the exercise of our daily lives, apply the wonderful teachings of St. Patrick.

This, then, is my plea to you today—let us each and every one pledge ourselves to a renewal of our great faith in the teachings of our patron saint—Patrick.

The Role of Statistics in Shaping Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "The Role of Statistics in Shaping Economic Policy," delivered by Representative RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri, chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, before the annual dinner meeting of the Washington Statistical Society, in Washington, D. C., on January 23, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF STATICS IN SHAPING ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. Chairman, President Parmalee, members of the Washington Statistical Society, and guests, I am most grateful for this invitation to bring to you my views on a subject which some of my colleagues in the Congress may think is fast becoming an obsession with me—the importance of the role of statistics in shaping economic policy. And I am grateful, too, for the opportunity to express once again my thanks to the many members of your craft who have so often taken time from busy lives to come before the Joint Economic Committee or one of its subcommittees.

Basically the role of statistics in shaping economic policy can be little different than the role of statistics in any other kind of decision making. We are dealing essentially with a branch of scientific method. This particular branch is concerned with problems capable of being answered to some degree by numerical information—that is, information obtained by counting or measuring. It makes little difference whether we are making fish counts for a biological study or surveying hours of work in an industrial plant. The role of statistics and statisticians, it seems to me, is to first select the kind of information which will be needed for policymaking, then to direct the proper and efficient collection and processing of that information and, finally, to interpret the results. In interpreting these results, especially where they are based on partial data, the statistician is expected to apply principles and techniques which let the layman use the findings with comforting assurance, and perhaps even abandon. This process is described sometimes as providing a method for making wise decisions in the face of uncertainty.

I doubt if, barring declarations of war, there is any place where a method for making wise decisions in the face of uncertainty is needed more than in economic policymaking. Especially is this true of Government economic policymaking, which is probably the first area where statistics were used as a tool or guide. That the word "statistics" is related to the word "state" is, as all of you know, not a coincidence. Our earliest statistics were collected for the one purpose of providing legislators and Government administrators with data for managing the affairs of the state. These were series dealing with such subjects as population, taxes, taxable property, and foreign trade.

In this connection I like to recall the delight with which Senator O'MAHONEY used to point out to his colleagues that the interest of national governments in adequate programs of social and economic statistics was not as new as it might seem. On Washington's Birthday the Senator would quote from a wonderful letter from our first President to Sir John Sinclair commending him for the statistical studies he had under way in Scotland. John Sinclair, as you will recall, was the man who in 1791 set up a very comprehensive system of statistical accounts in that country, statistics which were based on a 200-question schedule sent to each of the nation's 850 parish ministers. In a letter dated March 15, 1793, George Washington wrote:

"I cannot but express myself highly pleased with the undertaking in which you are engaged, and give my best wishes for its success. I am full persuaded that when enlightened men will take the trouble to examine so minutely into the state of society, as your inquiries seem to go, it must result in greatly ameliorating the condition of the people, promoting the interests of civil society, and the happiness of mankind at large. These are objects truly worthy the attention of a great mind and every friend to the human race, must readily lend his aid toward their accomplishment."

By the 20th century persons concerned with making public and private policy in economics had available scattered continuous series which generally were used to provide a basis for each person's or industry's own kind of business barometer. But it always comes as somewhat of a surprise to me to realize that out of the statistical series which are used so widely today—and we publish over a hundred in our monthly Economic Indicators—most of them were not collected at all only two decades ago and those that were available were collected at wide intervals. Before 1929, for example, neither the Federal Government nor businessmen had anything like our present series on national income, gross national product, and their components. Even the consumers price index, upon which we rely for much of our understanding of what is going on in the economy, was, in 1929, computed just twice a year and then with a very substantial lag between the collections and the publication of the data. Such basic statistics as the total money supply, for which we now have preliminary data weekly and substantially complete data within the month, were not available until after a 3 months' lag. The statistics on consumer credit were not established until 1942. Reports on developments in the labor force, employment and unemployment statistics, which we all watch closely today and which subcommittees of the Joint Economic Committee have been making strenuous efforts to improve, were, for all practical purposes, not available before the great depression.

The improvements in statistics for economic policy in the last 20 years have done much to make realistic the national goals of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power which are set in the Employment Act of 1946. The Joint Economic Committee which was one of the two major new agencies established by the act, recognized almost as soon as it was established that it could not make the economic decisions it would need to under the act without having increasingly adequate economic information. The committee was quick to recognize also that the responsibility for decision making in a sound free-enterprise economy is broadly based on and more often rests with the individual consumer, businessman, labor leader, or farmer than with government. Decision making in the area of economic policy in peacetime is, and should be, largely decentralized in an economy such as ours.

It is this very decentralization which placed on government an obligation for insuring that the statistics it collects are not only accurate and properly presented but are of the widest usefulness. As the distinguished head of your national organization emphasized in his presidential address, much of our success in handling the two recessions since the end of World War II could not have been achieved without good statistical records and good analysis.

An interesting contrast is the experience of the British Government which was reported to me when I was in England last fall. I talked with a man who was concerned, long before the Government indicated an awareness of it, that they were going to have the inflation which they have been experiencing in the last months. He felt very strongly that if they had had a reasonably good series on business investment, they could have caught the trend at a time which would have been both objectively and politically more convenient for the Government to take action. And I understand that the Government in the United Kingdom has now undertaken to fill that gap with a series on business investment.

This reminds me to make the point that when we are talking about statistics which help shape economic policy in this country, we are talking not only about our own series but must include the statistics of other countries as well. Many of our judgments as to the success or failure of our programs in the cold war have to be based on our analysis of statistics collected and processed in other countries. The Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy devoted an entire hearing to this subject, including our own foreign trade figures. Our feeling about the significance of statistics in this area is expressed in our first finding which reads:

"Adequate statistics for international comparisons and intergovernment use are the key to scientific appraisal of needs for business and government decision making."

I think this may be the place to point out, too, that there is an obligation not only on government but also on private groups and individuals to improve the basis for their decisionmaking. Members of the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics were particularly impressed with this point during the recent hearings on the Federal Reserve Board Consultant Committee on Statistics of General Business Expectations. One of the recommendations of the consultant committee called for the immediate organization of a continuing private group interested in all branches of expectational economics. The subcommittee endorsed this thought in its own recommendations in a report which was later approved by the full committee for transmission to the Congress.

It may be of interest to know that work has already started on such a project. George Stigler, chairman of the Universities-National Committee for Economic Research, reported to the subcommittee on January 3 that their 30 operating universities were sponsoring a conference to examine the quality of the data on anticipations of businessmen and consumers.

The Subcommittee on Economic Statistics also recommended that "during 1956 a survey be made by the subcommittee of procedures and methods used by Government agencies in projecting Government revenues by the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget, in preparing and disseminating outlook materials by the Department of Agriculture, in estimating the following year's construction activity by the Departments of Commerce and Labor, and in coordinating such work by the Council of Economic Advisers."

It is in this whole area of the preparation of quantitative economic projections that the role of economic statistics has one of the greatest contributions to make to policy-making. The development and use of tools which will enable us to qualify our assumptions in regard to the economic outlook in some rational way seems to me essential to any scientific policy review.

Having said this, however, I must recognize immediately as a legislator that there will be times when decisions affecting economic policy will be made on entirely different grounds—political, social, diplomatic. Nor can we be sure that the assumptions we have made are all valid. The most complete and consistent statistical complex can never relieve us of thinking.

Regardless of these difficulties, if Government and the private economy is to take seriously the objectives of the Employment Act, we are going to have to have reliable and prompt economic statistics, capable of the widest use and with the greatest possibilities for integration into a comprehensive system.

So far I have attempted to make clear that the role of statistics in shaping economic policy is no different than the role of statistics in shaping any other policy, that this role is historic and basic, that it is equally important in public and private economic policymaking, that it includes international as well as national considerations, and that it is essential in carrying out any program aimed at the continued stability and growth of the Nation's economy.

We might look now at the significance attached to the role of economic statistics in shaping economic policy, as measured by current Federal appropriations and next year's budget. If a little smugness is permissible, I might say it is easier to take such a look at the status of appropriations for economic statistics since the inclusion of special analysis I in the budget document. This is an innovation recommended by the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics in 1954 during Congressman TALLE's chairmanship, and we were all gratified at its ready acceptance. It shows in a separate compilation the appropriations for major economic statistical programs, by broad subject areas and by agency.

According to analysis I, final appropriations for fiscal year 1956 allowed increases totaling $2,616,000 for current economic statistical programs, as compared with requested increases totaling $4,722,000. Areas in which improvements are being made this year as a result of the increases allowed are statistics on employment and unemployment, agricultural marketing research, estimates of farmers' expenditures, crop and livestock estimates, and the economics of farm production. Funds were added by the Congress for additional work in agricultural economics and statistics for projects which had not been included in the budget request—a study of acreage diversion, a study of the price spread between the farmer and the consumer, and establishment of a crop-reporting program in Hawaii.

The subcommittee found it most unfortunate that no funds were provided for better construction statistics but we were gratified by the extent of the Congress interest in the many programs where improvements were allowed. We are looking forward, both as a committee and as individual Members of Congress, to supporting the improvements for fiscal 1957 which have just been proposed in the President's budget, and are set forth in the budget document this year in special analysis J. According to that analysis, direct obligations for current statistical programs totaled $27.8 million in the fiscal year 1955. The estimate of expenditures for fiscal 1956 is $31.9 million and $35.1 million has been requested for fiscal 1957. Again, for a bit of pointing with pride, many of the improvements requested for 1957 have come from recommendations made in the testimony of governmental, business, and labor economists and analysts before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and in reports made by the joint committee. They include also specific suggestions made in the reports of the five committees of expert consultants established by the Federal Reserve Board, at the request of the Joint Economic Committee, to appraise certain statistical fields. We have asked the Bureau of the Budget to report particularly as to the progress of the actions taken during the year on the recommendations of these committees.

We shall do our best also to see that the Members of Congress understand the need for these statistics but many of our colleagues will be looking to other sources for additional advice on these programs. I hope those of you who are from outside the Government will feel an equal obligation to see that your managements are aware of the necessity for making clear to members of the appropriations committees concerned the use of and need for economic statistics—and I am sure you will.

As individual statisticians it will be up to many of you to see that the increasingly important role of economic statistics in shaping economic policy is justified. It will be up to you to come up with answers to the technical problems such as how we can be sure in our concept of the labor force that we are adequately taking account of shifts in the patterns of employment—a question, incidentally, which we raised in the subcommittee report. Upon you rests an obligation to see that the maximum efficient use is made of funds expended for statistical resources; that collection methods are sound and limits properly assessed and stated; that analysis is adequate and warning raised where warning is needed; and that the spirit which seeks and accepts new methods and improvement to existing methods is kept ever alive.

Conservation: A Program of Merit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I would like to pay tribute to the memory of the late Col. Henry J. Weltmer, of Hiawatha, in my home district of Kansas and to the outstanding program of soil conservation which he helped foster in my home State and the Nation.

Agricultural interests throughout the country lost a stanch and leading advocate of conservation with the death of Colonel Weltmer last January 14 at the age of 68. His final day of work before he was fatally stricken by a heart attack was spent in editing material for the Disseminator, a semiofficial quarterly publication which he originated to disseminate information about the various activities of government and semi-government business and activities in Brown County, Kans. It is fitting that his final activity was in the field he loved so much.

Despite his strong home ties, however, Colonel Weltmer's activities were not confined to Kansas. His energy and talents always were directed toward the national level as he strived constantly to promote defense and agricultural measures which would make his fellow Americans more secure and self-sufficient. He was an Army veteran of the Mexican Border and World Wars I and II, and served actively in the military reserve program prior to his retirement under the Reserve Officers Retirement Act. He was a former newspaperman, insurance agent, and postmaster at Hiawatha, where he was always active in civic affairs.

Greatly interested in soil conservation practices, Colonel Weltmer had been active in recent years in organizing subwatershed districts and promoting conservation farming everywhere he went. I state without reservation that the late Henry Weltmer contributed more toward the progress of conservation in Northeast Kansas than has any other individual. The success of his efforts and those of his associates is clearly evident in the 1955 reports of progress made by the various soil and water conservation offices in my home district.

Statistical information is usually uninteresting but it does give some indication of progress made and work yet to be done, so I will cite those official figures which have been transmitted to me from conservation offices in my district.

In Brown County during the past year there were 117 new conservation district cooperators. There remain only 306 of the possible 1,829 basic conservation plans in the county for which application has not been made. It would appear, therefore, there is in the county a great interest in soil conservation. The eventual goal is best summarized in the most recent issue of Colonel Weltmer's publication, the Disseminator:

> There remains so much to be done that we cannot think of lessening our efforts toward soil and water conservation. We should increase our activities in order that sometime in the foreseeable future every farmer in Brown County will be able to stand on his land and say, "I have done all that can be done to keep this soil here for myself and my family and the generations that are to come."
>
> Before all of the farmers in the county can do this, we must have every farm in the county with a basic plan. We will have 242,214 acres of rotated crops; we will have 11,457 acres in waterways; we will have 46,636 acres of brush under control; we will have added 54,415 acres of cropland to our pastureland; we will have developed 1,722 acres in wildlife area, drained 6,627 acres, and built more than 144 flood retarding structures. * * * Consider the innumerable * * * ponds which are needed for conservation of water and the 12,896 miles of terraces which will slowly drain the water into the waterways and ponds. All of this would indicate the years ahead will be busy ones and that our technicians are going to be much behind with their work, especially when you consider that they will probably have at least three organized watersheds in the county by the end of 1956.

The 1955 annual report of the Jefferson County Soil Conservation District in the State of Kansas also lists major accomplishments. The district has received 879 applications in the 8-year period it has operated. These applications represent 166,672 acres. Basic conservation plans have been developed for 633 of these applications and the remaining applications are in initial or

advanced stages of conservation planning.

Accomplishments during the past year are indicative of the current upward trend toward applying soil conservation practices in Jefferson County. During 1955, the first major irrigation project to occur within the district was started. Increased interest among bottomland farmers concerning irrigation indicates this practice will now become widespread and rather rapidly applied.

Within the past year the district also extended help to two groups organizing watersheds under the Hope-Aiken Act. This is typical of the cooperation found in my home district.

The annual report of the supervisors of the Nemaha County (Kans.) Soil Conservation District for 1955 shows similar progress has been made in that area. Community watershed activity has increased in the county, with eight additional watersheds being formed during the past year. Work is progressing satisfactorily on projects already in operation.

Nemaha County now has 25,382 acres in conservation crop rotation, 33,312 acres in contour farming, 62,202 acres in stubble mulching, 3,088 acres in waterway development, 13,728 acres in brush control, 6,990 acres in pasture planting, 27,446 acres in proper use practices, 568 rods in fence-row improvement, 85 miles in diversion construction, 1,436 acres in drainage, 229 ponds in construction stages, 4 drop spillways, 85 drop inlets, 303 gully-control dams with vegetated spillways, 1,575 miles of terracing, and 260 acres of water spreading. Although this is a fine record of accomplishment, much work remains to be done in each phase of conservation practice.

Soil-conservation practices, which are the backbone of any watershed-development program, have shown a remarkable upswing in Leavenworth County, Kans., since the first of this year due in large part to the activities of the people pushing for the creation of Big Stranger watershed district. The Leavenworth conservation office reports that applications have been received for 170 erosion-control dams, which are structures built in ditches and gulleys to stop further erosion. These structures also give the farmer a permanent body of water for livestock purposes. Applications have been received for 41 stockwater pond dams, 73 grass waterways, and 29 terracing projects. These applications were received during the first 2 months of the year. In addition, there were many other applications for other practices under the agricultural stabilization committee program, such as the initial establishment of permanent cover, seeding legumes, applying agricultural limestone, seeding pastures, spring development, seeding against erosion, diversion terracing, drainage ditches, clearing brush and trees from pastures, and leveling land for irrigation.

The applications filed the first 2 months of 1956 in Leavenworth County represent more soil-conservation practices than were carried out in the county during the whole of 1955 and many times the amount done in any year prior to 1955. This response of cooperators to the program is very heartening to the people who are backing the watershed district movement, since it indicates very clearly that the people want the project to be carried out. The success of the program is very largely due to the work of the subdistrict committees working in cooperation. The men of these committees have been giving much of their time and effort, holding meetings and making calls from farm to farm in an attempt to line up every farm in the watershed of Big Stranger Creek for the program.

The tricounty—Atchison-Jefferson-Leavenworth—steering committee for the watershed association, in a meeting March 8 at Leavenworth, started proceedings toward the filing of a petition with the Governor's water resources board for a charter for the watershed association. The group is also taking steps for filing an application with the United States Department of Agriculture for Federal assistance under the Hope-Aiken Act, Public Law 566.

Doniphan County, also in my home district, ranks second in its area for soil-conservation work accomplished. The annual report of the board of supervisors for 1955 shows there were 43 new cooperators who signed up with the district and there were 28 basic farm plans completed. Soil surveys were made on 6,450 acres. Among cooperators there were 3,002 acres in conservation crop rotation, 2,945 acres of contour farming, 97 acres of stubble mulching, and 140 acres of waterways developed. There were brush control programs on 162 acres, deferred grazing on 5,100 acres, pasture planting on 1,122 acres, and tree planting for windbreaks on 1 acre. Members of the district constructed 2.7 miles of diversions, provided drainage on 876 acres, constructed 1 pond, built 29 drop inlet dams, erected 8 drop spillway dams, and completed 116.4 miles of terraces. In part, the report reads as follows:

> Last year was dry and at the same time some flash floods occurred. In both cases the work of the Soil Conesrvation Service proved its value. No longer do we feel we cannot afford it, but rather that we cannot afford to be without it.
>
> Farm prices slowed down our work in some cases, but our personnel has been very busy. In fact, we could well find use for another man.

As you can readily see, my interest in conservation farming practices is more than perfunctory. In fact, I built the first detention dam in Kansas under the Agricultural Stabilization Committee program on my farm in Clay County. The evidence of progress I have cited above is repeated in each of the 13 soil conservation districts in my congressional district. Each district has the legal responsibility for developing a districtwide soil and water conservation program aimed at solving local soil and water problems. Each district is responsible for carrying forward that program by helping farmers, upon request, to plan, apply, and maintain soil and water conservation measures which are sound technically and economically.

I would like to point out that perhaps the greatest limiting factor in the rate of applying conservation practices of any nature is the shortage of personnel required to plan, lay out, and certify the proper application of any particular practice. It was for this reason that I appeared before the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations of the House Committee on Appropriations on February 27, 1956, to request an additional $10 million increase in funds be appropriated for conservation service use. This would increase the allowance for each of the Nation's 2,700 soil conservation districts by $3,700, thereby enabling the addition of soil and water conservation technicians to presently undermanned staffs.

Another means of stimulating water conservation practices would be a revision of directives which have been given by the Department of Agriculture with reference to the Hope-Aiken Act. Money spent for conservation work done prior to enactment of this legislation is not reimbursable under present Department of Agriculture policy. Any program which does not take into consideration land treatment already done and to be done will certainly retard watershed development. When participating farmers are assured of reasonable cost sharing in the projects, there will be great progress in all watersheds of my home district. H. R. 8750, reported favorably by the Conservation and Credit Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, contains measures to correct this problem, and I am hopeful of favorable and early action on this bill.

Records in the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture show there has been more interest and performance in water- and soil-conservation development in my home district than in any similar area in the United States. Further, 3 of the 6 pilot projects authorized in Kansas by the 83d Congress are in my home district. Despite the present unfavorable economic position of the farmers in my district, their determination to proceed with conservation projects has not diminished. We are proud of this unselfish attitude shared by our farmers.

During the past few months, I have visited with the governing bodies of these soil-conservation districts. They are comprised of public-spirited men who serve without pay and at a personal sacrifice to advance soil and conservation work. They told me about the work cooperating farmers are doing and showed me the results of this work in the field. They also showed me the many soil- and water-conservation problems that urgently need attention. They said this work is being retarded by a lack of conservation service technicians to direct the projects.

I recognize fully that many of the 2,700 soil-conservation districts throughout the Nation are in the same situation. I suggest to the Members of Congress that serious consideration be given to legislation which would further this valuable program. It seems to me that the Government spends no money more wisely than the small amount it appropriates for the soil-conservation activity. I believe it has accomplished more lasting good at less expense to the Federal Government than has almost any other

Federal undertaking. I know this is true in my section of Kansas.

In closing, I want to state that this program is a relatively new approach to the vast problem of conserving our natural resources. It is a long-range program and at this time we cannot determine how long it will take to complete this highly important initial phase of work. Any delay resulting from lack of legislative support will further deplete a natural resource that cannot be recovered.

It is my belief that the speed with which conservation farming practices are adopted and the degree to which they are maintained play a key role in determining the future economic stability of this Nation. If a good job conservation on the land is done quickly, we can all eat better. If a poor job is done, we may not eat as well as we now do. I stand solidly behind a Federal program which would speed soil- and water-conservation work in Kansas and the other States of our great country.

Hoover Commission Recommendations Are Not Gathering Dust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 19, 1956

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday evening my colleague from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] delivered an address at a public meeting in Kalamazoo, Mich., in his district, sponsored by the Kalamazoo Junior Chamber of Commerce as a part of its month-long campaign to recruit public and congressional support for the recommendations of the Second Hoover Commission.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the address by Mr. JOHANSEN and extend my compliments to the Kalamazoo Jaycees on their activity in behalf of the Commission's work:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, AT MEETING OF THE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, KALAMAZOO, MICH., MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1956

Mr. Chairman, officers and members of the Kalamazoo Junior Chamber of Commerce, and my fellow citizens, I am greatly honored to be invited to participate in this evening's program. This public meeting is a part of a 30-day community campaign sponsored by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Kalamazoo.

The twofold purpose of this campaign is to generate greater public knowledge of, interest in, and support for the findings and recommendations of the Second Hoover Commission, and to convey the fact of that public interest and support to your elected Representatives in Congress.

I commend the Kalamazoo Jaycees on this major public service. I commend also those of you here tonight who are not members of the junior chamber of commerce. Your presence testifies to your belief that the business of the Federal Government is also very much your own business. I hope that sound American conviction will continue and grow.

Before I go any further, I want to read a telegram which I received before leaving Washington:

"I would be glad indeed if you would convey my greetings to the Kalamazoo Junior Chamber of Commerce. The Jaycees all over the country have given more study and greater support to the Commission's work than any other organization. I deeply appreciate the support you yourself have given to our recommendations and in my belief that is a great national service. I am indebted to the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Kalamazoo."

This telegram is signed: "Herbert Hoover."

And, having quoted that distinguished former President of the United States, I want to quote one more statement. It was made in a public address last October by another able American who served on both Hoover Commissions. Commenting on the fact that nearly 75 percent of the recommendations of the first Hoover Commission have been accepted, with savings totaling nearly $7 billion, this gentleman said:

"This was a phenomenal record of achievement, against great odds, and I for one attribute it primarily to the stature, the statesmanship, and the tireless and unselfish labors of the Commission's Chairman, the Honorable Herbert Hoover. No one else could have done what he did."

That tribute to Mr. Hoover was paid by the Honorable James A. Farley.

I begin my discussion with a question:

Have the people of the United States, and those who represent them in Congress, completely lost the traditional American concern, distrust, and fear with respect to increasingly larger, more costly, more complex, and more powerful centralized Federal Government?

I did not originally write that question for use in this particular speech. It was written to express my very grave concern over a specific legislative proposal still pending before Congress—a proposal which involves more taxes, more Federal spending in the guise of so-called Federal aid, larger bureaucracy in Washington, a new and major centralization in Federal Government of a function and responsibility historically retained by State and local governmental units, and new potentialities of Federal power and of political pressure activities on a national scale.

Although I first wrote that question in connection with the issue of Federal assistance to the States for school construction, it is entirely appropriate to the subject before us tonight. It is a question which haunts many of us in Congress with respect to numerous legislative proposals and procedures. It recurs many times in the course of a single session of Congress. Sometimes we ask ourselves this question in deep discouragement, bordering on despair.

Tonight I do not raise this question in the spirit of discouragement. On the contrary, I believe the work of the second Hoover Commission on the national level, and this Jaycee-sponsored campaign of public education and citizen recruitment at the community level, provide the most reassuring and hopeful answer that could be given to this question.

The creation and the labors of the two Hoover Commissions are the clearest evidence possible that both the Congress and the American people are acutely aware of the fact and threat of too big, too complex, too costly, and too powerful Federal Government.

As a Member of Congress I am jealous of its good standing in the eyes of the American people. Therefore I want to emphasize the fact that the second Hoover Commission was created in 1953 by unanimous vote—let me repeat that, by unanimous vote—of the Congress. Moreover the mandate which the Congress unanimously gave to the second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government went far beyond the scope of tht assignment given to the first Hoover Commission.

This mandate called upon the Commission to study and recommend possible elimination of wasteful expenditures, inefficiency, faulty organization, duplication and overlapping, all similar to the assignment given the first Hoover Commission. But it also directed attention of the Commission to the problem and possibilities of "abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of Government;" and "eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise."

The difference between the mandates given the first and second Hoover Commissions by the Congress is the difference between a license to perform a minor operation and a license to engage in major surgery.

Certainly that is a resounding answer to the question of whether your Representatives in Congress have completely lost the traditional American concern, distrust, and fear of increasingly larger, more costly, more complex, and more powerful centralized Federal Government.

At the same time, optimism ought to be restrained by a realistic awareness that the very scope of the authority given the second Hoover Commission, the extent to which the Commission executed its mandate in the 314 recommendations it submitted, and the unavoidable controversial character of many of these recommendations, make the followup task far more complicated, difficult, and arduous than was the case with the first Hoover Commission report.

It will be a far more complicated, difficult, and arduous task for Congress, for the executive department, and for the people themselves to accomplish the beneficial results of the present Commission reports.

I want to warn you, with all possible frankness, that the outcome, in terms of specific accomplishments, will in this instance be far more uncertain and precarious.

For this reason, I counsel both patience and understanding on your part, and at the same time I urge persistence of interest, and tenaciousness and firmness of purpose.

Particularly I hope you will give close attention to specific legislative proposals for implementing the Commission's recommendations, as these specific proposals are considered in Congress, that you will carefully weigh the pros and cons of these specific proposals, and that you will give your Representatives in Congress the benefit of your judgment and of your support, as individuals and as an organization.

This is no quick or easy task, and it will be a source of great assistance and encouragement to us to have evidence of this continued and active interest and support. This job of combating big government down in Congress can sometimes be a somewhat lonely business.

In that connection, I hope you will not regard it as improper for me, as your representative, to invite your attention to some of the instances in the last and present sessions of the 84th Congress in which I have voted for measures designed to implement specific recommendations of the Hoover Commission or to further the objectives defined by the Commission.

I believe you are entitled to this information, and that I am entitled to offer this evidence of my own good-faith performance on this score:

1. I voted—both in the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and on the floor of the House—for pay increases for heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies, recommended by the Hoover Commission to aid in securing and holding competent public officials. This bill passed the House last year but awaits Senate action.

2. Similarly, both in committee and in the House, I voted for a genuine classification of all postal employees—a measure enacted into law last session.

3. I voted, both last session and this, for the program of disposal to private enterprise, under adequate safeguards of the national security and of the competitive system, of the synthetic-rubber plants, in line with Hoover Commission recommendations to eliminate unnecessary and undesirable Government competition with private enterprise.

4. I voted against the foreign-aid authorization and appropriation bills for the very reasons which prompted both the second Hoover Commission task force, and the Commission itself, to sharply question and criticize the philosophy and operation of this program and the lax methods by which billions of tax dollars are being appropriated and spent. I may add, I was in the minority on this one.

5. I voted for the Phillips amendment to the 1956 Public Works appropriation bill, deleting a $6½ million item for a steam powerplant at TVA—in line with the subsequent Hoover Commission recommendation: "That the Government or its agencies cease building steam plants." I was on the winning side on this one.

6. I voted for the Vinson amendment to the defense appropriation bill designed to delete section 639 which bars the disposal of work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Defense Department to private enterprise unless that action has been justified by the appropriate committee of Congress. This amendment was defeated and section 639 was retained in the bill, and you will recall that President Eisenhower severely criticized this provision—which threatens to hamstring the Hoover Commission recommendations on this matter.

7. As a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization, I am working to secure further reductions in the 2,300,000 civilian payroll of the Federal Government. One legislative proposal of this subcommittee is a requirement that every appropriation request from the executive branch be accompanied by a detailed estimate of the effect of such proposed appropriation in terms of additional personnel.

8. Finally, I am flying back to Washington after midnight tonight to attend tomorrow forenoon the first public hearings by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on proposed postal rate increases designed to reduce the unconscionable half-billion-dollar-a-year Post Office Department deficit.

So much for this personal allusion, which I hope you will accept in the spirit in which it is made. I hope it will establish in your mind my devotion to the spirit and goals of the Hoover Commission recommendations.

Now let us turn to this broad subject.

May I say that I can think of only one other assignment which might be as impossible as the one I have tonight. That would be to try to give you, in 30 minutes, a comprehensive outline and analysis of the contents of Webster's Unabridged Dictionary. The Hoover Commission reports cover 19 areas of governmental operation. The reports cover 1,632 pages, plus many million additional words contained in the task force reports. As I have said, the reports include 314 specific recommendations. As the man remarked who was reading the dictionary through, cover to cover, "It's interesting reading all right, but the book sure does change the subject frequently."

With such a vast and varied subject matter, the best that I can do is call attention to a few main categories or types of findings and recommendations. These illustrations, I hope, will serve to emphasize the potential value of the Commission's work and recommendations—value not alone in terms of potential savings estimated conservatively at $5 billion a year, but in terms of increased efficiency of Government and, most important of all, in terms of restraining and reversing the trend toward too big, too costly, too complex, and too powerful centralized Federal Government.

Before I go further, let me be a little more specific about this mushrooming of Federal Government. I know that any reference to things-as-they-were prior to—say 1933, invites the devastating crack about "wanting to turn the clock back." Well, let me say, simply, in answer to that supposedly unanswerable argument, that I'm not interested in turning the clock back—I merely want to keep the clock of human progress (and that means progress in freedom from the bondage of too big Government), I merely want to keep the clock running.

In 1910 the annual budget was $694 million. Today it is $62 billion. In 1910 Federal costs were about $38 per average American family. Today they are 42 times as much, or $1,600 per family. As Jim Farley pointed out in the same speech I quoted earlier, when he became Postmaster General in 1933 the executive branch had 572,000 employees, with some 450 different departments and agencies, and a $4 billion budget. Today there are 2,300,000 civilian employees plus nearly 3 million more in uniform; more than 2,100 departments and agencies in the Federal Government, and—again—a $62 billion budget. Twenty-five years ago the Federal budget called for taxes of $113 per family, as against $1,600 per family today, and the national debt amounted to $1,076 per family as against $7,000 per family now. And that, of course, is only a statistical appraisal of the mushrooming of big government. An appraisal in terms of abdicated or usurped initiative, responsibility, and power of the citizen, of nongovernmental agencies, and of local and State units of government is even more appalling. An appraisal in terms of the dangerous concentrations of power and capacity for interference and dictation within the Federal Government is still worse. That's what I am talking about, and what the Hoover Commission is talking about, in referring to too big government.

Now as to some of the broad categories of Hoover Commission findings and recommendations:

1. Let me refer, first, to what for want of a better designation I shall describe as the headlinemaking, just-how-silly-can-we-get type of disclosure, and the recommendations offered for correcting that kind of a situation.

No doubt your own Jaycee publicity has exploited this kind of thing—

The Army shipping 807,000 pounds of canned tomatoes from California and the Navy simultaneously shipping 775,000 pounds of tomatoes from the East to California;

The Army Signal Corps authorizing an 8½-year supply of the relatively short lived small dry-cell flashlight batteries;

The Government borrowing money at 3 percent and then loaning it through such agencies as the Rural Electrification Administration at 2 percent;

The 25 billion pieces of paper created and handled annually in Government operations—forms, letters, and other papers which laid end to end would stretch from the earth to the moon 13 times.

And so, on and on.

No one, I am sure, opposes, or wants to get caught opposing the correction of these kinds of abuses. That fact, I suspect, explains the statement by my able and distinguished friend, Mr. Clarence Francis, national chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, that "there is very general support for, and no known opposition to, 194.5 of the 314 Hoover Commission recommendations [and] general support for, and mild opposition to, another 71.5" with the remaining 48 recommendations drawing both strong opposition from some quarters and warm support from others.

It is impossible to detail the various recommendations offered by the Hoover Commission to correct such abuses. Very many of them doubtless are among the 145 administrative recommendations of the Hoover Commission which are within the authority of the various departments and agencies to adopt. The Government Operations Committees of the House and Senate, as well as other key investigating committees and subcommittees of both Houses, are, I know, riding herd on such abuses and their administrative correction, as well as considering and acting on recommendations of the commission requiring legislative action.

Let me add, by way of further progress report, that the final report to Congress of the Hoover Commission, issued in June 1955, completing its 2-year life and activity, states that even at that early date "a total of 50 identifiable actions have been taken by various agencies," by way of implementing administrative recommendations.

Furthermore, a report made at my request by Harold W. Metz, director of research for the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report and former research director for the Hoover Commission, in a letter dated February 29, states:

"In the first session of the 84th Congress, legislation was enacted to implement in whole or in part 14 recommendations of the Commission."

Let me inject that this was even prior to the completion of the Commission's work. Mr. Metz continues:

"About 142 of the 314 recommendations of the Commission require legislation. Bills have been introduced in either or both Houses to carry out most of these recommendations that require it."

Referring to the administrative recommendations, Mr. Metz further writes:

"As for the executive branch, defense has done much to implement the reports of the Commission on research and development, depot utilization, food and clothing, and surplus property. Additional action by this most important Department probably will be forthcoming shortly. The General Services Administration is taking steps to carry out significant portions of the reports on transportation, surplus property, food and clothing, depot utilization, and paperwork management, part 1. On January 26, 1956, the President directed the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to give careful study to implementing the Commission's proposals of personnel and civil service. Also in January, the President appointed a special commission to watch and report on intelligence activities of the Government pursuant to a Commission recommendation."

I think this is evidence, from a most trustworthy source, that the Hoover Commission reports and recommendations are not being permitted merely to gather dust in either bureaucratic or congressional pigeonholes.

2. Let me cite a second major category of Hoover Commission recommendations—those which involve either broad or specific governmental policy. I offer three examples of such recommendations, and I should like to point out that these types of recommendations are the direct result of the much broader mandate given the second Hoover Commission by Congress, to which I referred earlier in this talk. I should also like to point out, most emphatically, that implementing this type of recommendation is quite a different undertaking than merely trying to eliminate some of the simpler brands of governmental foolishness.

Example 1: The curtailment or elimination of governmental competition with private enterprise. You will notice that the

Commission itself rejected its own task force's recommendation that Federal power projects, such as TVA, be sold to private industry. There is an area here for honest differences of judgment and opinion, for opposing views as to how far or how fast we should go in disposing of Government business activities—particularly where national security is genuinely involved. Certainly here is an area which will require careful congressional scrutiny and considered judgment. This does not argue that nothing should be done or that a hard and fast position can be taken. It does argue that you, as well as we in Congress, will want to weigh the matters as carefully and wisely as we can.

Example 2: The Hoover Commission recommendations with reference to Federal medical services, particularly as they relate to the care of veterans. Here is an instance in which emotionalized reaction and pressure group activity could make a shambles of sound economy measures, particularly since these health services now involve some 30 million Americans; here, also, is a field in which cold statistics alone cannot provide the only criterion for wise judgment and, let me add, I do not believe for one moment that the Hoover Commission placed the dollar mark above humanitarian considerations in this area. Certainly this is an aspect of the Commission recommendations which calls for united support of all recommendations on which there is agreement, and full, frank, face-to-face study and debate of those recommendations which will inevitably be in controversy.

Example 3: The broad and highly controversial field of foreign aid involves the dual problem of administrative reforms, recommended by the Hoover Commission, and the question of the wisdom of all or parts of this program. Obviously this is an area in which Executive recommendations and congressional decisions will necessarily be the determining factor. I believe the many searching questions raised in the Hoover Commission and its task force reports are of tremendous value in helping the Nation, the Congress, and the Executive grapple with this problem. My votes in the past indicate my own thinking to date on the subject. This is neither the time nor place for a full-dress discussion of this crucial issue. I will only make this observation that the recommendation of congressional approval for a 10-year program of foreign aid is not—I repeat, not—consonant, in my judgment, with either the spirit of the specific recommendations of the Hoover Commission. I shall oppose it.

3. A final area of Hoover Commission recommendations has to do, actually, with basic legislative procedure, as it relates to appropriations and to the recovery by the Congress of its seriously weakened control of the pursestrings. Stated briefly, and in simplest terms, it would require, as the Hoover Commission recommends, "that the executive budget and congressional appropriations be made on an annual accrued basis," even while authorization of a long-term project would still be possible by a single congressional action. This would reduce, if not eliminate, vast carryovers of unexpended funds; it would permit annual review of progress, of costs, and of Executive performance, and would obviate the grave situation reported by the Budget Director in October 1953, that as of July 1 of that year "$81 billion of unfinanced appropriations existed as a claim against current and future income or borrowing."

This subject is too vast for detailed discussion here—but I believe it is a key to very substantial economies, to the effective congressional control of spending required by the Constitution, and to sound fiscal policy which, in importance, overshadows many of the more dramatic and spectacular findings and recommendations of the Hoover Commission. It is one more assurance that even in big government, government as the agent of the people and of the national welfare, will have a fighting chance to govern justly, wisely, and well.

I know of no more appropriate words with which to close these already too-lengthy remarks than this concluding statement of the Hoover Commission's final report:

"The problems before the Commission have by no means been purely financial. In our recommendations we have sought six objectives:

"First. To preserve the full security of the Nation in a disturbed world.

"Second. To maintain the functioning of all necessary agencies which make for the common welfare.

"Third. To stimulate the fundamental research upon which national security and progress are based.

"Fourth. To improve the efficiency and eliminate waste in the executive agencies.

"Fifth. To eliminate or reduce Government competition with private enterprise.

"Sixth, and perhaps the most important of all. To strengthen the economic, social, and governmental structure which has brought us, now for 166 years, constant blessings and progress."

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, March 19, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as noontide marks the fast hurrying day, and the voices of this Chamber are hushed to silence, we would steady our hearts and minds in the glorious thought that amidst all life's fleeting scenes we are with Thee, who changeth not.

We come in the heat and burden of another day, grateful for the love that our indifference cannot discourage and for the patience that our folly cannot exhaust. Come to us, we pray Thee, as refining fire, to purge our inner lives from hatred and envy, from prejudice and malice. Suffer us not to let the sun go down on our wrath. In a mad and violent day may we walk and work in the peace that the world cannot give, in the charity that thinketh no evil, in the good will that bridges all chasms. And when the sunset comes, may we face its summons with an approving conscience void of offense toward Thee and our fellow men. We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 20, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARKLEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 19, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 19, 1956, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1483) for the relief of Irfan Kawar.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate on official business of the Senate in connection with the Committee on Armed Services, beginning tomorrow, and until Saturday of this week.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate, for the purpose of considering a Presidential nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, with a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CERTAIN MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Supply, and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms for work in the United States for the period July 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION TO FACILITATE THE IMPORTATION OF COMMERCIAL SAMPLES AND ADVERTISING MATTER

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to carry out the International Convention To Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Matter (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN POSITIONS IN DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the establishment of eight positions for specially qualified scientific and professional personnel in the Department of Commerce with rates of compensation at rates not to exceed the maximum rate payable under Public Law 313, 80th Congress, as amended and supplemented (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution 16

"Resolution urging Federal action to support the civil-rights decision of the Supreme Court of the United States

"Whereas our great American democracy was founded upon the basic concepts of equality and liberty for all, which principles are embodied in our Constitution and cherished as the supreme law of our land; and

"Whereas these doctrines of equality and freedom have been fountainheads of strength to our Nation which have borne us through our times of trial, nurtured us as a free people who have matured a mighty and thriving civilization, and brought us to an ascendency among the nations of the earth; and

"Whereas there have been reliable reports of serious violations of these American democratic principles in certain of our sister States of the South which threaten the national security, the orderly processes of commerce among the several States, and the welfare of the Nation; and

"Whereas, according to these reports of this critical situation, the constitutional rights of citizens to vote and engage in the pursuit of happiness, to travel, work, and attend school are violated frequently and often with means of physical violence and terror; and

"Whereas these attacks, based soely upon bigotry and race prejudice, have in some Southern States achieved the sanction of State governments in the form of nefarious attempts to defy the Supreme Court of the United States and to threaten nullification of the Constitution; and

"Whereas such unlawful acts and overt defiance of the Constitution and the power of the United States Supreme Court are of national concern, regardless of the States in which they occur, and demand the cognizance of all States, as well as the active attention of the Federal Government, because they are repugnant to every moral, religious, and political principle of our great American democracy and seriously weaken the United States in the international conflict between democracy and totalitarianism: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That it memorializes the executive branch and Congress of the United States to take the necessary action to support the recent decisions of the Supreme Court on civil rights by the utilization of available agencies and facilities to maintain peace and order, protect the rights of citizens, and enforce the laws of our land; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives, United States Department of Justice, and to each Senator and Representative of the State of California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the Woodville, Calif., Chamber of Commerce, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for the construction of Success Dam, on the Tule River, California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Harbor Commission, San Diego, Calif., approving the need for a national policy to stimulate the domestic fishing industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Terminus Dam Project Committee, Tulare, Calif., favoring the early construction of the Terminus Dam in California; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by Saint Martin's Council 2489, Knights of Columbus, Amityville, Long Island, N. Y., favoring enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; ordered to lie on the table.

RETENTION OF EMPLOYEES AT UNITED STATES ARMORY IN SPRINGFIELD, MASS.—RESOLUTIONS OF MASSACHUSETTS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on March 5, 1956.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the resolutions will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing Congress and the Department of Defense to retain employees of the United States Armory in Springfield

Whereas the United States Department of Defense has announced that 799 employees of the United States Armory at Springfield will be dismissed from employment on or before June 30, 1956; and

Whereas these employees have devoted many years of faithful service to the production of material essential to the national defense; and

Whereas the skill of said employees in turning out implements of war cannot be duplicated elsewhere in any part of this Nation; and

Whereas said skill is of great importance in this critical period, and should not be permitted to be lost by the Department of Defense; and

Whereas the record of the Springfield Armory and its service to the country since its establishment as the first United States arsenal has not been equaled by any other military equipment installation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United State Department of Defense is hereby urged by the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts to conduct a survey of the needs of all military units, present and future, for the purpose of making every possible effort to retain all of the employees affected by this contemplated layoff, to the end that the defense of our country shall not be jeopardized by the loss of their important skills; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to each Member of the United States Senate and United States House of Representatives from Massachusetts, and to the Secretary of Defense.

COOPERATIVE TAX POLICY—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution on co-op tax policy adopted by the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives at Los Angeles, Calif.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATIVE TAX POLICY RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATONAL COUNCIL OF FARMERS COOPERATVES, JANUARY 16–19, 1956

The clear intention of the Congress in 1951 in the changes made in the tax treatment of farmer cooperatives was that the savings resulting from the operation of such organizations should be subject to a single tax. A number of Court decisions since 1951 tend to prevent the carrying out of the above intent.

Therefore, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives states its support of the following policies and principles:

1. Farmer cooperatives are owned and controlled by farmers and operate on a cost of doing business basis for the primary purpose of providing essential services and increasing the income of their farmer members and patrons. Under such operations and purposes, the savings resulting therefrom which the cooperative distributes to the patrons under an obligation and agreement to do so represents income to the patron. Such amounts are, and should be

excludible or deductible by the cooperative, and the right of members and patrons to receive such refunds as income, whether in cash or non-cash form, and to invest such amounts in their cooperatives either directly or by setoff, should be recognized.

The council supports the tax status of farmer cooperatives under existing law and shall seek clarification of the 1951 act as to the taxable status of patrons with regard to distributions made to them by their cooperatives, in line with the intent of Congress in the passage of that act.

2. The council is opposed to the application of a withholding tax to patronage refunds and reaffirms the principles of its resolution adopted at the 1951 annual meeting to the effect that—

A withholding tax on patronage refunds is unnecessary and unsound. It would unduly burden cooperatives in both cost and manpower in deducting, recording, reporting, and remitting such taxes without materially increasing net revenue collections. Because the tax withheld has no relation to the rate of taxes owed by the recipient, many recipients would be entitled to tax refunds, and the cost in money and manpower of internal revenue administration would be unnecessarily and substantially increased. Furthermore, a withholding tax would confuse, rather than clarify, the taxable status of such refunds.

3. The council seeks legislation which would eliminate the double taxation to patrons and members which occurs when the Treasury seeks to impose in the same year a tax both on cash payments in redemption of prior issues of non-cash patronage distributions, and also on current distributions in non-cash form.

4. The executive committee is given the authority to implement the above policies during the coming year in a manner deemed best designed to accomplish these expressed objectives.

INTERSTATE FEDERAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution passed by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., urging that Congress pass legislation for an interstate Federal highway system.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ENDORSING ACTION BY THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES AT THIS SESSION IN THE ESTABLISHMENT AND FINANCING OF A FEDERAL INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Whereas the city of Minneapolis is vitally concerned in the determination of a location and design of major highways, Federal, State, and local, in the city of Minneapolis; and

Whereas such determination has a significant bearing upon the development of a long range capital improvement program of the city; and

Whereas the specific location of major highways in the city is a necessary prerequisite to decisions by business and industry on location of plants, facilities and services in the city: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That we endorse and urge action by the Congress of the United States at this session to adopt a highway and finance program on the interstate Federal system.

Further, that the city clerk be directed to transmit, forthwith, a copy of this resolution to each Member of the House and Senate from the State of Minnesota.

Passed March 9, 1956.

EUGENE E. STOKOWSKI,
President of the Council.

Approved March 12, 1956.

ERIC G. HOYER, *Mayor.*

Attest:

LEONARD A. JOHNSON,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION, INC.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, two resolutions adopted by the Minnesota Telephone Association, Inc., at their 47th annual convention held in St. Paul, Minn.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolutions will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions, presented by Mr. HUMPHREY, were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

To the Committee on Public Works:

"Whereas occupancy of highway rights-of-way by utilities benefits the public as utilities have been permitted and encouraged by legislative enactments and municipal ordinances over the years to make use of public highways for the location of their plant and facilities in order to stimulate development of utility services and to make these services available to the greatest number of people at the lowest possible cost. It has long been recognized by the courts that utilities do not occupy public rights-of-way by sufferance, but, on the contrary, when they construct facilities in public rights-of-way under legislative sanction their right to continue to use the public highway becomes a fixed and vested property right (e. g. *Russell* v. *Sebastian* (233 U. S. 195)); and

"Whereas the burden of relocation costs falls on the subscriber as the cost of providing utility services can be met only through rates collected from the customer; and

"Whereas relocation costs should be charged to the highway project as the cost of relocating utility plant and facilities required by highway improvement projects must, of course, be met from some source, and, in the final analysis, the primary question for determination is where the responsibility for this cost equitably rests; and

"Whereas relocation problem cannot be settled on State level as the expenditure of Federal funds for construction of Federal-aid highways stems from the interest of the Federal Government in promoting interstate commerce and the national defense; and

"Whereas relocation costs of railroads are paid from Federal funds as reimbursement of railroads for relocation costs incurred in connection with Federal-aid projects is justifiable. However, there is no sound basis for relieving one utility, the railroad, of a burden which is left to be borne by the users of other utility services. The unfairness of this is even more apparent in light of the fact that railroad facilities create a hazard to the traveling public, but the facilities of other utilities do not present a hazard. The argument is advanced that railroads are reimbursed from Federal funds because their facilities are situated within private rights-of-way. Special provision for relief in the Federal-aid Highway Act would not be required if the railroad problem only involved the fact that their facilities are located on private rights-of-way. All private property owners are entitled to compensation under general condemnation laws. The special provision is needed to relieve the railroads of the above-mentioned varying State obligations to contribute to the cost of eliminating the hazards of railway grade crossings which are imposed on them regardless of whether their facilities are on private or public rights-of-way. Certainly, the other utilities are entitled to equal treatment with respect to the State laws imposing varying obligations on them; and

"Whereas use of highways as access for maintenance of facilities is no justification for refusal to reimburse utilities, as it has been stated that the utilities receive some advantage because of the convenience of the highways as a means of access for maintaining and servicing their facilities. This is undisputed but this argument ignores the obvious fact that without access through use of the highways to their facilities, the utilities would be wholly unable to furnish service to the public. Here again the use of highways by the utilities in this respect promotes the public interest; and

"Whereas impact of modern highways is particularly burdensome on smaller utilities as the impact on the utilities of the changing character of modern highways has become increasingly serious in recent years. The primary and interstate highways involving the construction of multiple lanes, clover leaves, and other features have necessitated costly utility relocations—moves for the third and fourth time are not uncommon. These costly relocations result in great hardships particularly on the smaller utilities, both publicly and privately owned with limited resources; and

"Whereas a number of States have recognized the principle of reimbursement in the case of toll roads, as the impact of the changing character of modern highways on utility companies is receiving recognition by the States on roads which are not constructed out of funds appropriated for Federal-aid highways or funds expended under the jurisdiction of the State Highway Commission. A number of States in recent years have passed statutes providing for the construction of turnpikes or toll roads. In size and character of construction they are similar to Federal-aid highways. Seventeen State legislatures, largely in the last 2 years, have recognized that public utilities should be fully reimbursed for relocation costs incident to the construction of these toll roads. The following States have so provided: Florida, 1953; Georgia, 1952; Illinois, 1953; Kansas, 1953; Kentucky, 1950; Louisiana, 1952; Michigan, 1953; Nebraska, 1953; New Jersey, 1948; New York, 1946; North Carolina, 1951; Ohio, 1949; Oklahoma, 1953; Rhode Island, 1954; Texas, 1953, Virginia, 1952; Wisconsin, 1953; and

"Whereas, relocation costs while serious to utilities would not burden the Federal-aid highway program, as testimony presented to the Public Works Committee of Congress shows that costs experienced by utilities are of serious concern to the individual utilities but are a small part of the total cost of constructing Federal-aid highways; and

"Whereas a study was made under the direction of Congress to determine the amount of the cost being imposed on utilities as the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 (Public Law 350) directed the Secretary of Commerce to make a study 'which shall include a review and financial analysis of existing relationship between the State highway departments and affected utilities of all kinds.' The Secretary of Commerce designated the Bureau of Public Roads to make the study. The Bureau called on the various utilities for assistance in obtaining the extent of the cost imposed on the utilities by the relocation of utility facilities in order to accommodate Federal-aid highway projects. The results of this study were reported to Congress in February 1955: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Minnesota Telephone Association, Inc., in convention assembled, this 15th day of February 1956, That this document be served on each member of the Minnesota Congressional delegation and that they and the whole Congress be urged and requested to include utility highway relocation costs in total, in any legislation so as to provide reimbursements to utilities affected under the vast Federal-aid highway program.

"Resolution adopted unanimously February 15, 1956, by the 47th annual convention, Minnesota Telephone Association, Inc., held at the St. Paul Hotel, St. Paul, Minn., February 13, 14, and 15, 1956.

"Attest:

"KEITH W. VOGT,
"Secretary-Treasurer."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Whereas over 5,000 independent telephone companies provide service in 11,000 cities and towns. Most of the exchanges are very small, many having less than 100 telephones. Many switchboards are taken care of by housewives in their homes. Eighty percent of independent telephones are in residences, many of them farm homes; and

"Whereas living costs are much lower in small towns. In a small community a 5-room house may rent for $30 or $35 compared with $60 or $100 in large towns. In small towns many people have vegetable gardens with chickens, and a cow in the barn; and

"Whereas independent telephone company revenues disable them from paying wage rates considered reasonable in large towns. Average annual earnings per telephone for independent companies range generally from $30 to $45, many a great deal less; and

"Whereas a telephone exchange must provide 24-hour service, a wage increase hits it three times a day. There are three 8-hour shifts; and

"Whereas present law exempts 'any switchboard operator employed in a public telephone exchange which has less than 750 stations.' When an exemption of 500 stations was provided by Congress in 1939, it was given because 'small telephone companies * * * are financially unable to comply with the wage provisions of the act' (House committee Rept. 1448, 76th Cong., 1st sess., accompanying exemption bill, August 3, 1939). When in 1949 Congress increased the exemption of 750 stations Senator BUTLER of Nebraska who introduced an amendment in the Senate, said: 'I believe that my amendment really comes close to carrying out the original intent by exempting most of the smaller independent companies which serve small towns or rural sections.' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 9, p. 12489); and

"Whereas Wage and Hour Division of Department of Labor in 1939 sent telegrams to State public utility commissions asking if any exemption should be provided and how. Twenty-two commissions recommended 1,000 telephones, 1 recommended 750, 6 recommended 500, and 1 recommended 250; and

"Whereas if exemption is repealed it will cripple many small exchanges. They would be compelled to increase rates so high that farmers and small income people in rural areas would take out their telephones. Service would be seriously curtailed. This essential branch of American small business would be on the way out. Senator BUTLER said in 1949 when his amendment was being considered:

" 'In practically every State, telephone rates are regulated by the State commission and, of course, we all know that those rates are based primarily on costs of operation. It is obvious that if their costs go up it will be necessary to raise rates to subscribers. In many farming regions the subscribers simply will not stand for an increase in rates, and it will simply mean that many subscribers will discontinue their phone service. I do not believe we want to bring about that result, Mr. President. We should be aiming at methods to expand telephone service in rural regions instead of passing regulations that will have the effect of cutting down the availability of such service. * * * In case of sickness or some other emergency, a telephone frequently makes the difference between life and death. I do not believe the Congress should take any action that will place the telephone service in these sections beyond the reach of the average farm family. We do not have enough telephones on the farm today, Mr. President. I certainly don't believe the Congress should take any action to make it still more difficult for the farmer to acquire such service.

" 'It is important to realize that if, as expected, the application of the 75-cent minimum forces a sharp increase in rates and results in many subscribers dropping their telephones, it will mean unemployment among the very group that this bill is designed to benefit—that is, the telephone operators themselves. If several hundred present subscribers discount their service at each of the exchanges affected, it will mean that 1 or 2 or 3 of these operators will be laid off at these exchanges' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 9, p. 12489); and

"Whereas Congress has now again raised the minimum hourly wage to $1 per hour effective March 1, 1956 further aggravating the situation and causing the impact to be even greater should the 750-station operator exemption be repealed; and

"Whereas in many towns a telephone exchange is the only business subject to the Wage-Hour Act because it is the only one doing interstate business. If the exchange loses its exemption and is compelled to pay a higher wage than the prevailing wage there will be a widespread dissatisfaction from subscribers, other employers, regulatory commissions, etc. As public utilities, rates of telephone companies are under strict public regulation; and

"Whereas there is no surer way of putting small business out of business than by subjecting small business in every instance to legislative standards considered reasonable in large metropolitan areas: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Minnesota Telephone Association, Inc., in convention assembled this 15th day of February 1956, That this document be served on each member of the Minnesota congressional delegation and that they and the whole Congress be urged and requested to preserve the 750-station operator exemption in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

"Resolution adopted unanimously February 15, 1956, by the 47th annual convention, Minnesota Telephone Association, Inc., held at the St. Paul Hotel, St. Paul, Minn., February 13, 14, and 15, 1956.

"Attest:

"KEITH W. VOGT,
"Secretary-Treasurer."

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; without amendment:

H. R. 6461. A bill to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act (Rept. No. 1695);

H. R. 6463. A bill to ratify and confirm section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, section 1 (b), act 12, session laws of Hawaii 1951, and the sales of public lands consummated pursuant to the terms of said statutes (Rept. No. 1696);

H. R. 6807. A bill to authorize the amendment of certain patents of Government lands containing restrictions as to use of such lands in the Territory of Hawaii (Rept. No. 1697);

H. R. 6808. A bill to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act (Rept. No. 1698); and

H. R. 6824. A bill to authorize the amendment of the restrictive covenant on land patent numbered 10,410, issued to Keoshi Matsunaga, his heirs or assigns, on July 20, 1936, and covering lot 48 of Ponahawai house lots, situated in the county of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii (Rept. No. 1699).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 3484. A bill to provide for the location of mining claims by geological, geochemical, and geophysical prospecting methods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. MALONE):

S. 3485. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of columbium-tantalum bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. MALONE):

S. 3486. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of beryl in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3487. A bill for the relief of Lucy Lin and her minor child, Peter Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 3488. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide recognition for meritorious service by members of the police and fire departments of the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1929; and

S. 3489. A bill to amend the acts known as the Life Insurance Act, approved June 19, 1934, and the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 3490. A bill to provide for transfer of title of certain lands to the Carlsbad Irrigation District, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 3491. A bill to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 3492. A bill for the relief of Ching-Sheng Shen and Lee-Ming Chow Shen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 3493. A bill for the relief of Lydia Anne Foote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3494. A bill to prohibit certain unfair practices with respect to the cancellation of franchises held by automobile dealers and by radio and television broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 3495. A bill to amend section 753 of title 28 of the United States Code to prescribe more fully the duties and obligations of official reporters appointed by district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to make an

investigation and study of the production, transportation, distribution, and sale of refined petroleum products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

INVESTIGATION OF PRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, DISTRIBUTION, AND SALE OF REFINED PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation and study of the production, transportation, distribution and sale of refined petroleum products. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation and study of the production, transportation, distribution, and sale of refined petroleum products, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Federal Trade Commission is hereby authorized and directed to make a thorough investigation and study of the structure of the industry and of the corporate and commercial relationships and practices which affect the supply, production, transportation, distribution and sale of refined petroleum products including particularly, gasoline, fuel oils and lubricating oils and report the facts, with any recommendations deemed appropriate, to the Congress of the United States; and

That the investigation directed include ascertainment of the facts necessary to determine if there exist in the refined petroleum products industry, practices and policies which may violate any of the laws of the United States and whether practices and policies employed in the industry in the United States may have a tendency to restrain competition or to create a monopoly at any industry level in any section of the country; and

That the Federal Trade Commission shall specifically report as to any practices current in the industry which may adversely affect the public and small and independent refiners and marketers of refined petroleum products; and

That in order to avoid any unnecessary duplication of work already done by other agencies of the Government the Federal Trade Commission, for the purposes of this resolution is authorized to request any pertinent information in the possession of, or loan of specially qualified personnel of, any other agency of the United States Government; and

That the Federal Trade Commission shall from time to time and at intervals of not more than 6 months report to the Congress of the United States upon the progress of the investigation and study herein directed and shall within 18 months after the effective date of this resolution and the availability of appropriations, make a final report, with its recommendations, to the Congress of the United States; and

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Trade Commission for carrying out the purposes of this resolution the sum of $600,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The purpose of this joint resolution is to empower the Federal Trade Commission to investigate competitive conditions existing in the oil industry. In more formal language, the joint resolution may be said to authorize and direct the Commission to make an investigation and study of the existing structure of the oil industry and of the corporate and commercial relationships which affect the supply, production, transportation, distribution, and sale of refined petroleum products including particularly gasoline, fuel oils, and lubricating oils.

By design, the scope of the investigation to be authorized is quite broad. To insure the success of the undertaking the Commission must be enabled to freely examine every relevant activity of the industry. Accordingly, the Commission is expected to explore thoroughly those industry marketing practices having anticompetitive effects or which would otherwise violate Federal antitrust law. In addition, it anticipated that the Commission in the course of its investigation will bring into proper focus any industry practices adversely affecting the interest of the public and the small and independent refiners and marketers of petroleum products.

Recognition of the pressing need for an investigation of the oil industry is not, of course, being made now for the first time. On previous occasions, other Members of Congress have called for such an inquiry, the most recent being recommended in 1950 by Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri. The Federal Trade Commission has also been aware of the necessity for an investigation of the oil industry, at least since 1939. In that year, the Commission submitted to the celebrated Temporary National Economic Committee a formal report entitled "A survey of Controversial Marketing Practices in the Petroleum Products Retail Industry as Presented to the Temporary National Economic Committee." The favorable attitude of the Commission toward investigating the oil industry was expressed in that report in these words:

The data presented herewith constitute a survey of the character of questionable and perhaps illegal marketing practices, which allegedly permeate the entire retail marketing structure of the petroleum industry. It is quite apparent that a proper solution of the various problems presented herewith cannot be made until a thorough and complete investigation has been made of the marketing practices in this industry, with particular relation to the marketing practices of the major oil companies. The report itself is illustrative of the fact that complaints have been lodged against every large marketer, group of marketers, and some retail associations. Some of these matters (those which seem most serious or oppressive) have been investigated by the Commission and corrective action taken in a number of instances. Other complaints have been referred to the Department of Justice. The Commission has been unable to undertake a general investigation of the various practices for the reason that it has not had an appropriation sufficient to enable it to conduct such a comprehensive investigation and at the same time carry on the duties imposed upon it by law.

Unfortunately for the small-business segment of the oil industry, the investigation so firmly urged by the Commission in its report to the TNEC was never undertaken.

Less than a month ago, during the final public testimony received by my Small Business Subcommittee on the New Jersey gasoline price war, John W. Gwynne, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, was asked whether competitive conditions in the oil industry today are as serious as in 1939 when the Commission made its report to the TNEC. The considered reply of the Chairman and his staff associates was that the industry's competitive situation had not been improved appreciably over the past 17 years. Most importantly, the Commission representatives declared their willingness to launch as soon as possible an investigation such as that outlined by their agency back in 1939. Thus, it is now incumbent upon Congress to proceed expeditiously in providing the Commission with the appropriate authority and funds to be required for the investigation.

Mr. President, this joint resolution is presented as a result of hearings which were held in the so-called gasoline price war problem, which related specifically to New Jersey, but also is to be found in other parts of the United States.

I sincerely believe this investigation will be productive of good results. The hearings themselves were beneficial. In fact, many points of law were clarified in the hearings, as were rules of the Federal Trade Commission.

I hope Congress will see fit to act promptly upon the joint resolution, and provide the necessary funds required for this inquiry.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have a statement which was prepared by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, supporting this resolution, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

I am happy to join my distinguished colleague, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, in sponsorship of his resolution authorizing the FTC to investigate competition conditions in the oil industry. While serving as chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, I have become aware of many facts indicating that the Nation's gasoline retailers do not possess the true independence to which they are entitled as small-business men.

When the Congress adopts this resolution, it will have taken an important step toward eliminating from the oil industry those practices which prevent service-station dealers from achieving their rightful competitive position in the national economy. The hope that the proposed Commission investigation will raise 250,000 service-station operators to the rank of truly independent small-business men is more than sufficient justification for favoring the undertaking.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment proposed by Mr. DANIEL (for himself and other Senators), to Senate Joint Resolution 31, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate Joint Resolution 31, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. NEUBERGER) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate Joint Resolution 31, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

RELIEF OF FARMERS FROM EXCISE TAX ON CERTAIN FUELS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8780) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BYRD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CARLSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2286) to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to provide for the utilization of privately owned shipping services in connection with the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of certain personnel of the Department of Defense, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 901 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(c) That notwithstanding any other provision of law, privately owned American shipping services may be utilized for the transportation of motor vehicles owned by Government personnel whenever transportation of such vehicles at Government expense is otherwise authorized by law."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to provide for the utilization of privately owned shipping services in connection with the transportation of privately owned vehicles."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. DUFF conferees on the part of the Senate.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF SHELDON T. MILLS, OF OREGON, TO BE AMBASSADOR TO AFGHANISTAN

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today the nomination of Sheldon T. Mills, of Oregon, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador of the United States to Afghanistan, vice Angus Ward, resigned. This nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

THE PRESIDENT'S MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the New York Times of this morning, Tuesday, March 20, there is an important editorial entitled "The President's Message," which comments on President Eisenhower's mutual security program presented in his message of yesterday.

One of the issues raised by the President's message is the question of increased flexibility and continuity. The editorial comments on this point as follows:

There is also opposition both to the increased flexibility and to the requested continuity. But as the President points out, flexibility is needed to meet unexpected shifts in a rapidly changing world, continuity is essential to permit long-term planning for economic developments for which both local and world public and private capital must be mobilized.

In connection with the mutual security program, which will soon be before the Senate, I feel that this editorial comment is important, and I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Undeceived by the new Kremlin strategy, which repudiates Stalin in order to pursue Stalin's policy of Communist expansion the more effectively, President Eisenhower sent a message to Congress yesterday proposing a mutual security program designed to meet the new challenge. This program calls for an appropriation of $4,859,975,000 for military and economic assistance to free nations during the next fiscal year. There is a new emphasis both on flexibility and on continuity, to provide assurance that both we and the recipients will achieve the most for the money spent.

Our mutual security program has helped to save most of the free world, to the great benefit of our own peace and security, not to mention our prosperity, and as the President says, we must not falter now. On the contrary, we must expand our aid and above all improve our methods, to meet the more subtle and therefore more dangerous Kremlin policy.

Despite this obvious fact, the new program seems to be running into considerable congressional opposition. There is opposition to the total amount, which, discounting previously authorized but unspent sums, is about $2 billion above the appropriations for the current fiscal year. But, as the President explains, most of this additional money is needed to fill the pipelines now running empty, and the actual increase in expenditures will be less than $500 million. There is also opposition both to the increased flexibility and to the requested continuity. But as the President points out, flexibility is needed to meet unexpected shifts in a rapidly changing world, continuity is essential to permit long-term planning for economic developments for which both local and world public and private capital must be mobilized.

The congressional opponents of this program seem to believe that the Soviet threat is abating, and that therefore the time has come to cut down on what is miscalled "foreign aid." Any such thesis, however, is vigorously rejected by the President. On the contrary, he warns that Soviet military might continues to cast an ominous shadow and that even if the Soviets have put aside for the moment aggression by force, they continue to pursue their fundamental objective, which is to disrupt and in the end to dominate the free nations. It would therefore be folly to relax. For that reason he still allocates the larger part of the total asked, or $3 billion, for military assistance to deter aggression, with more than half going to the Middle East and Asia, where the threat of aggression is most acute. The rest of the requested appropriation is assigned to economic assistance, to meet the danger of Soviet economic penetration.

Only a small part of the total here would go to Europe, which, except for Greece and Turkey, is enjoying unprecedented prosperity. Most of it would go to Asia, the Middle East, and Africa, now being bombarded by the Soviets with deceptive trade offers that can lead only to suicidal entanglements for the nations permitting themselves to be trapped.

As Secretary Dulles has told the Asian nations on his present tour, our aid is not for our own aggrandizement and is not tied to military commitments, as the Soviets contend. It has only one purpose, defined again by the President. That purpose is to achieve an enduring peace with justice and freedom. The investment of only a little more than 1 percent of our national product in the pursuit of this goal is an investment in our own security.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take up the nomination on the executive calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the executive calendar.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Stanley N. Barnes, of California, to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the nomination today confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement to make. Last evening, by unanimous consent, the Senate made Senate Joint Resolution 31, Calendar No. 364, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, the unfinished business. It may be, if that measure involves lengthy discussion, consent of the Senate may be requested to set it aside, so that the Senate may consider other bills, particularly Order No. 1107, Senate bill 2577, a bill to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests, as well as Order No. 629, Senate bill 636, a bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, and certain amendments and substitutes which may be offered to it.

I do not state that the unfinished business will be set aside, but I should like all Senators to be on notice that there is a possibility the two measures I have mentioned will be considered either immediately following the disposition of the unfinished business or at some time when the unfinished business is before the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Beall	Bridges
Allott	Bender	Bush
Anderson	Bennett	Byrd
Barkley	Bible	Capehart
Barrett	Bricker	Carlson
Case, N. J.	Humphrey	Neuberger
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Jenner	Pastore
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Payne
Cotton	Johnston, S. C.	Potter
Daniel	Kefauver	Purtell
Dirksen	Kennedy	Robertson
Douglas	Kerr	Russell
Duff	Knowland	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Eastland	Laird	Scott
Ellender	Langer	Smathers
Ervin	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Flanders	Long	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Magnuson	Sparkman
Fulbright	Mansfield	Stennis
George	Martin, Iowa	Symington
Goldwater	Martin, Pa.	Thurmond
Gore	McCarthy	Thye
Green	McClellan	Watkins
Hayden	McNamara	Welker
Hennings	Millikin	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Morse	Williams
Hill	Mundt	Young
Holland	Murray	
Hruska	Neely	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

SENATOR LANGER'S ALLEGED PREJUDICE AGAINST THE SOUTH

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a very interesting editorial published in a recent issue of a Mobile, Ala., newspaper. I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read it. The reading will require about 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk may read.

The legislative clerk read the editorial, as follows:

NOT QUALIFIED TO HOLD PREJUDICE AGAINST SOUTH

United States Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, claims the distinction of being the only person ever arrested in an English-speaking country for "filing an affidavit of prejudice against a judge."

History is repeating itself, with variations, in the case of Senator LANGER and his prejudice.

He exploded his prejudice against the South on the Senate floor one day this week. Said he:

"On behalf of the Abraham Lincoln-Theodore Roosevelt-Robert La Follette, Sr.-George Norris faction of the Republican Party, I am authorized to say that we accept the challenge issued * * * by 19 Senators and 77 Members of the House who issued a manifesto on the subject of the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the segregation-in-public-education cases."

We are not concerned with whether Senator LANGER was qualified to hold prejudice against a judge, but we submit that he lacks qualifications to hold prejudice against the South.

As proof, we offer this excerpt from the Encyclopedia Britannica:

"The white population of North Dakota formed 98.5 percent of the total in 1940, as compared with 98.7 percent in 1930, practically all the nonwhite population being Indians."

This, of course, is a sharp contrast to the population structure in the South.

As one example of this contrast, we offer this excerpt from the Encyclopedia Britannica:

"The white population of Alabama formed 65.2 percent of the total in 1940, as compared with 64.3 percent in 1930, practically all the nonwhite population being Negro."

Another example of the contrast appears in this observation by the Britannica:

"The white population of Mississippi formed 50.5 percent of the total in 1940, as compared with 49.7 percent in 1930, practically all the nonwhite population being Negro."

If Senator LANGER will abandon the prejudice he is not qualified to hold against the South and set himself up as an Indian expert, we shall be glad to second the motion, inasmuch as he was adopted by Sioux Indian tribes almost a quarter of a century ago and assigned the name of White Bear.

Senator LANGER is a classic case in point of outsiders attempting to meddle in the South's racial relations when they are no more qualified than a lost ball in a haystack to butt in and tell the white and Negro people of this region how to run their affairs.

If the buttinskies had shown the good judgment to keep their troublemaking noses out of the South's business from the start, the white and Negro people in Alabama and other Southern States would not be harassed as they are today.

Briefly stated, the racial problem in the South is the handiwork of intermeddlers.

Representative ARMISTEAD L. SELDEN, JR., of the Sixth Alabama Congressional District, called attention over the TV from Washington the other day to the harmonious racial situation that had grown up in the South before the integration agitators got busy.

"In my State of Alabama, as in other sections of the South," Congressman SELDEN pointed out, "we have always operated under a segregated system. The Negro race, under that system, has made great progress—perhaps greater progress than any race anywhere at any time in history.

"This progress had been made with the help of the southern white people, and I am happy to say that at the same time racial strife and hatred had been reduced to a minimum."

An honest history will be compelled to record as a great American tragedy the fact that the buttinskies poked their meddling noses into the South's racial affairs.

Happily for both races, and to the everlasting credit of their good sense, the vast mass of the Negro people of the South and the vast mass of the white people of the South still choose the segregation which the intermeddlers would destroy.

SECRETARY McKAY AND CONSERVATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on March 10 a statement by Secretary of the Interior McKay on natural resources, published in the Washington Post and Times Herald, was included in the RECORD. I desire today to include in the RECORD the reply to that statement which I have sent to the Washington Post and Times Herald.

Reference has been made to Douglas McKay's future ambitions. Mr. McKay may some day be a Member of this body, but I believe he will have to come here from some State other than Oregon. The people of Oregon believe in public power; Douglas McKay is one of the country's leading foes of public power. The people of Oregon believe in conservation; Douglas McKay has done his

best to wreck conservation in this country.

Oregon's ideal of a Republican Senator was the late Charles L. McNary. Senator McNary fought for public-power projects in the Columbia Basin like Bonneville and Grand Coulee; Secretary McKay has used his high office to thwart public-power projects like Hells Canyon and John Day. Charles L. McNary and Douglas McKay were so far apart on conservation—considering McKay's record as Secretary of the Interior—that they could not communicate by telegraph. McNary sponsored the Clarke-McNary Act and other forestry conservation measures; McKay has promoted the Al Sarena timber giveaway, the oil-leasing on wildlife refuges, the attempt to invade our national park system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 20, 1956, in answer to that of Mr. McKay, may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY MCKAY AND CONSERVATION

Interior Secretary McKay's lengthy defense in your March 10 issue of his 3-year role as chief liquidator of the Nation's natural resources contains many distortions of history that should not go unchallenged.

Mr. McKay said that "when I became Secretary I quickly concluded that protection of the parks was only part of the action that was necessary." Apparently he thought park protection was only a very minor part because his appointment as Secretary was followed by a 3-year battle by conservationists to prevent construction of the McKay-sponsored Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument. If this move, endorsed by McKay's department, had been successful it would have been the open sesame for commercial invasion of the entire national parks system.

Only after 3 years of tooth-and-fang fighting were such organizations as the National Parks Association, the Wilderness Society, Wildlife Management Institute, National Audubon Society, General Federation of Women's Clubs, American Nature Association, the Council of Conservationists, the Garden Club of America, and many others, able to knock out Echo Park Dam from the upper Colorado project which McKay's Department sought to build.

Mr. McKay implied that the larger staff and more adequate financing of the national park service program is one of the rewards of his administration. He failed to mention that the Park Service budget for the current fiscal year, authorized by the Democratic 84th Congress, represents an increase of over 40 percent above the funds authorized for such work by the Republican 83d Congress. Also, he did not mention that the authorization is an increase over the recommendations in the administration budget. Why does McKay take credit for congressional action?

In attempting to justify its Al Sarena decision, the Interior Department always returns to the sole defense that its action did not violate any law. Many of this administration's giveaways have been accomplished by steps short of illegality. However, that is a curious defense for a decision, in the exercise of administrative discretion, which—

1. Allowed a private assay 3,000 miles away from Oregon to set aside assays conducted in the West by the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.

2. Established a procedure that Dr. Richard E. McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service, testified he had never encountered in 32 years of Government service.

3. Gave Al Sarena patents ostensibly to operate a mine, although in 2 years not a cupful of ore has been mined while the company has logged more than 2 million board-feet of valuable fir and pine timber.

Mr. McKay defends the administration's power partnership program with the statement that "the development of the power resources of the Snake River in the Hells Canyon reach is going forward under private auspices." But what of the 400,000 potential kilowatts and the 3 million acre-feet of flood-control storage lost at Hells Canyon by Secretary McKay's abject surrender of the Hells Canyon damsite to partial development by the Idaho Power Co? If McKay's policies had existed in the 1920's, when Washington Water Power Co., sought to build the little Kettle Falls plant in what was to be the Grand Coulee Reservoir pool, the largest power producer on earth would never have become a reality.

Leading American conservationists have recognized the far-reaching effects of the give-away of the high damsite at Hells Canyon. Loss of storage for power and flood control at Hells Canyon has built up pressure to blockade the scenic Clearwater and Salmon Rivers in an effort to secure alternative reservoir space. No fisheries, wildlife, or recreational values were at stake at Hells Canyon, but now the administration has asked for construction of dams in some of America's finest scenic splendor and a major spawning area for migratory fish.

I would like to cite a paragraph from the statement issued by the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources last month when it called for a reappraisal of McKay's action on Hells Canyon. Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, distinguished biologist and chairman of the committee, said:

"We are not concerned with the battle between public versus private power interests. But it is apparent that reduction in reservoir capacity at the Hells Canyon site is forcing power and water interests to advocate high dams on the Clearwater River, where a disastrous effect on fish and wildlife resources of national importance will needlessly result."

Here we see the real meaning of the "give-away." When less than the full potential is realized from a natural resource, a chain reaction is created which subtracts from the value of related resources. For that reason, it may be many years before the cumulative deficits from Mr. McKay's backward policies can be fully tabulated.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator from Oregon.
WASHINGTON.

KHRUSHCHEV-MALENKOV REPUDIATION OF STALIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared concerning the Khrushchev-Malenkov repudiation of Stalin.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. President, throughout the world there is speculation as to the real meaning behind the dramatic blasting of the Stalin myth—the Stalin legend—by Khrushchev, and to a lesser extent by Malenkov, by Soviet satellite bosses and others.

I do not profess to be sure of knowing the genuine answer. But I do feel that these facts are relatively sure:

(a) Khrushchev will no doubt try to use the new pattern of so-called collective leadership as a further sales argument to the neutralist world and to other non-Communist areas. He will try to portray Red Russia's present regime as more reasonable, more attractive, more wholesome, more worthy of widespread support in the so-called zone of peace.

As such, the latest Red propaganda tactics can prove exceedingly dangerous and beguiling to parts of the free world.

(b) The description of Stalin as the mass murderer that he was confirms that every totalitarian regime is really built on clay which can crumble, except for the temporary "mortar and cement" of terror.

The latest developments show the abiding weaknesses inside Red Russia—the tensions (which I had personally previously pointed up in original and revised editions of Senate documents on Tension Inside the Soviet Union).

SOME HOPE FOR GOOD OUT OF PRESENT DEVELOPMENTS

Of course, if the denunciation of the arch-assassin Stalin serves ultimately to encourage the prospect of peace in the world, we shall rejoice.

If it helps in some way genuinely to lessen the tensions between Communist countries and the free world, this in itself will be a boon for humanity.

The world would be delighted too if it augured some brighter tomorrow for the long-suffering Russian people themselves.

"The old order changeth, giving way to the new."

REDS STILL BENT ON WORLD DOMINATION

But let us not be hasty or premature or overoptimistic. "One swallow does not make a summer." And one series of relatively frank speeches does not alter a fundamental dictatorship.

The Russian bear has not suddenly become domesticated. Let us remember that his teeth are as sharp as ever, his claws as dangerous, and his strength no less because he seems to amble amiably along the forest path to whatever goal he has in mind.

If Russian history means anything (and it has been fairly consistent in its expansionist emphasis since the time of Peter the Great) we dare not assume that Khrushchev and company have suddenly lost their taste for power. They have not abandoned Russia's historic drive for warm-water ports, for a stranglehold on Poland, for dominance in the Balkans, for a greater hand in the exploitation of territories of other countries bordering Russia, nor have they lost their capacity to scheme and connive and conspire and plunge other peoples into wars, or to injure or demoralize others to serve their own expansionist aims.

Nor, Mr. President, have they given the slightest indication that they are abandoning international communism and international espionage as weapons of penetration useful in the furtherance of Russia's imperialistic ambitions.

Their leaders openly admit that they are still wedded to Marxist communism. They say they have no intention of dropping it as the basis of their social system nor as a means to their end of world domination.

KEEP FREE WORLD STRONG BY MUTUAL SECURITY

Only the future can disclose the extent to which they will be forced as time goes on, further to modify this system or perhaps someday to give up this goal. It is a goal which we can be sure they will never reach, so long as we remain strong and maintain our friendships overseas, as we shall.

To maintain such free world strength will require sympathetic consideration of the President's mutual security proposals of yesterday, although certainly many controversial points therein will have to be resolved.

Russia today is changing. It is on the brink indeed of vastly accelerated changes.

The old Bolsheviks are dying off. Stalin slaughtered many of them. The attrition of time will take care of the others. A new generation is rising. From it will come the leaders of tomorrow, leaders in whom a strong seed of doubt has now been planted against the infallibility of Soviet leadership.

It may be that competition with the free world will further force modifications yet to be expected. Certainly we have every evidence, thus far, that our own system of free enterprise is infinitely superior in every way to the system of forced labor and planned economy to which the U. S. S. R. is still unfortunately committed.

SUPERIORITY OF FREE WORLD

Here in the free world, as men work at the things they like most to do, and which bring them more of the rewards they seek in life than any other system thus far devised by man, our people enjoy more of liberty, more of happiness, more of the spiritual things of life, more of opportunity for advancement, and greater economic advantages than the Russian people can ever possibly realize under communism—collective leadership or not.

We know that no man or group of men can ever be wise enough, Mr. President, to plan every detail of the lives of the 200 million peoples of diverse origins and languages and habits that make up the U. S. S. R.

Nor, as these millions become educated and are permitted to learn more of the world in which they live, will they be long content to remain subject to the whims and ambitions and terroristic tactics of the dictators at the top, whether called Stalin or Khrushchev or by some other name.

So though we must be vigilantly on guard, we can hope that the changes we are witnessing in Russia today may somehow be the beginning of better things; of more reasonable action—not just on the surface, but genuinely—perhaps the beginnings of sounder judgments by the leaders in the Kremlin, and of increased intercommunication with the rest of the world.

Perhaps the Iron Curtain, as we have known it, has outlived its usefulness in concealing Russia's weaknesses and preparation for war.

The Soviet leaders know that we know what these sources of weakness are. So, too, we know the sources of Mother Russia's strength—the strength of a great and virile and hard-working people who—like men and women everywhere—want all they can get of the better things of life. Being realists, they know, too, that war in the jet-atomic age cannot possibly pay off. And so we may hope that there will be no war, particularly no war of major magnitude in the foreseeable future.

WISDOM OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND SECRETARY DULLES

Meanwhile, whatever the future may hold, we have peace today.

We have peace, thanks to the great and wise leadership of Dwight D. Eisenhower and the able implementation by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. Incidentally, we see anew the wisdom of Secretary Dulles in perceiving the impact on Red Russia of American diplomatic successes and the impact of our spiritual strength brought to bear against her.

MEN OF GOOD WILL CAN RESOLVE CONFLICTS

Meanwhile, too, we are, of course, living in a new revolutionary age. The whole world is changing. Colonialism is forced to give way to nationalism, because it failed to give colonial peoples what they wanted and what they think they can get through their own efforts and under their own systems of self-rule.

New forces are arising. Ancient civilizations are reaching for a renaissance under the impact of rapid communication and the availability of modern tools and methods with which to build for the future.

There are obviously conflicts in many areas of the world. There are problems everywhere—even in our own country.

But there are definitely no conflicts and no problems, Mr. President, that cannot be resolved by men of good will.

Let us pray that they will be resolved—in Russia, in the Middle East, in Africa, in Asia—in such an atmosphere. They cannot be solved by war. They can be and must be worked out in peace—not the phony peace of a Soviet graveyard zone, but the living peace of free men.

This is the great lesson we all have to learn today. And this must be our message to the world.

This is the essence of our partnership with the free peoples of the world. Humanity, helpfulness, regard for the rights of others, and the sharing of ideas as well as of our great abundance: These are the roads to peace. And peace, in turn, points the way to happiness and the security that all men seek.

RED BEASTS STILL ON PROWL

The death of the Stalin myth may contribute to this goal. But the Communist leopard has not changed its spots. And in the jungle of world communism, the hungry Soviet bear is still on the prowl for the weak and the unwary.

BOOKER T. WASHINGTON NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the present consideration of Calendar No. 1718, H. R 6904, to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument. The bill has been cleared on both sides of the aisle. The dedication ceremony has been set for early in April, and we would like to get action on it promptly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6904) to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of H. R. 6904 is to establish the Booker T. Washington National Monument. This monument would be a public national memorial for Booker T. Washington, often referred to as the Moses of his race, and the only American who has ever made the long journey from a slave cabin to the Hall of Fame. It would serve not only as a recognition of his great contributions to America, but also as an inspiration to present and future generations of Americans.

I ask unanimous consent to have the committee report accompanying H. R. 6904 printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1692) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6904) to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The committee concurs in the excellent report submitted in connection with this bill by the committee of the House of Representatives the pertinent portions of which are set forth below.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H. R. 6904 is to establish the Booker T. Washington National Monument. This monument would be a public national memorial to Booker Taliaferro Washington (1856–1915), often referred to as the Moses of his race and the only American who has ever made the long journey from a slave cabin to the Hall of Fame. It would serve not only in recognition of his great contributions to America but also as an inspiration to present and future generations of Americans.

The site of the proposed national monument would be the old plantation in Franklin County, Va., where Booker T. Washington was born a slave and where he spent his early boyhood days until freed from slavery by the Emancipation Proclamation.

The measure, if enacted, would require the Secretary of the Interior to maintain and preserve the monument in a "* * * suitable and enduring manner which, in his judgment, will provide for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States." The Secretary would be authorized to establish on the monument grounds a museum of relics and records of Booker T. Washington and for other articles of national and patriotic interest; to provide for public parks and recreational areas, construct roads, and mark with monuments, tablets, or otherwise, points of interest within the boundaries of the monument.

The bill would authorize an appropriation of $200,000 for such purpose.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument at his birthplace in Franklin County, Va., would be of great national significance to millions of Americans. The committee notes that a few years ago a national monument was created at the birthplace of George Washington Carver, who served under Booker T. Washington at Tuskegee Institute and who also won the acclaim of the American people for the great contributions he made to his country.

The integrity of the site of the birthplace and early boyhood of Booker T. Washington is beyond question; the site is available; it is easily accessible to many millions of Americans; and it is readily adaptable to the development of a living monument which would inspire those who would walk within its boundaries.

National significance

Booker T. Washington dedicated his life to teaching millions of people the glory and dignity of work well done; to creating and sponsoring programs for the progress of his people; and to furthering national movements for public health, social welfare, and interracial and intersectional harmony. It is said of him that "He lifted the veil of ignorance from his people and pointed the way to progress through education and industry." Dr. Charles Eliot, president of Harvard University, summed up the character of Booker T. Washington in these words: "Teacher, wise helper of his race, a good servant of God and his country."

Booker T. Washington's life and work was monumental. He left a deep imprint on life in America and his influence will be felt far into posterity. A national monument to Booker T. Washington at his birthplace in Virginia would be a deserved and fitting tribute to his accomplishments and his teachings.

Integrity of the site

Booker T. Washington was born in a slave cabin April 5, 1856, on the plantation of James S. Burroughs, his owner prior to emancipation. He lived on this plantation until he was emancipated in April 1865.

A few years ago a log cabin, reconstructed in accordance with plans prepared by the Virginia Fine Arts Commission, was placed on the foundations of the cabin in which Booker T. Washington lived. It is said that other slave quarters can be located by the foundations of the cabins. A description of this cabin and life on the plantation is given by Booker T. Washington in his autobiography, Up From Slavery.

The Burroughs family house was destroyed by fire in 1951. The foundations remain.

An old cemetery of the Burroughs family is on the site. It is said to contain the grave of "Marse Billy," one of Booker T. Washington's young masters who was killed in the Civil War and whom he mentions in his book, Up From Slavery.

Also on the plantation site is the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Post Office, established in 1948.

Availability of the site

The central portion of the plantation tract, on which are located the reconstructed birthplace cabin, foundations of other slave quarters, and the Burroughs house, and the cemetery, contains 165 acres. A modern, 2-story brick building, said to have cost in the neighborhood of $40,000, a 2-story frame dwelling, and a converted old barn (Tuck Industrial Hall) are on this plantation tract. A two-lane driveway, constructed with funds appropriated by the State of Virginia, provides access to the site.

The plantation tract described above is owned by the Booker T. Washington National Monument Foundation, a nonprofit corporation chartered and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia. This foundation, in furtherance of its aims to obtain a national monument to Booker T. Washington at his birthplace in Virginia, has indicated its complete willingness to convey all its title and interest in the plantation tract and buildings and improvements thereon as described above on payment of the outstanding indebtedness against the property, which amounts to approximately $17,000.

It is reported that the Commonwealth of Virginia, as an indication of its pride in the accomplishments of Booker T. Washington, has included the sum of $17,000 in its budget for 1956 for the purpose of purchasing the plantation tract described above with the intent of presenting the birthplace site to the United States Government for the establishment of a Booker T. Washington National Monument to serve as a symbol of the opportunities which America offers to all its people. The committee commends the Commonwealth of Virginia for this splendid gesture.

Accessibility of the site

The birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va., is near the center of one of the most populous sections of the country. It is estimated that more than 100 million people in 23 States live within 750 miles of his birthplace and that more than 87 million live within a 500-mile radius. It is estimated that approximately 32 million tourists visit the many points of interest in Virginia annually.

Booker T. Washington's birthplace is 225 miles from Washington, D. C., 165 miles from Richmond, 53 miles from Lynchburg, and 16 miles from Rocky Mount, Va. It is a short distance from the Shenandoah Valley and only 43 miles from the Skyline Drive of the Blue Ridge Parkway by way of the Booker T. Washington Memorial Highway which passes by his birthplace.

The committee feels that placing the Booker T. Washington National Monument at his birthplace in Franklin County, Va., would make it accessible to the largest possible number of our own citizens and visitors from foreign lands.

Adaptability of the site to development

The plantation on which Booker T. Washington was born and spent the first 9 years of his life is in an agrcultural area in the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia. The whole area is said to be practically in the same condition as it was when Booker T. Washington left it and went to Malden, W. Va.

"A most fitting monument to Booker T. Washington—one that would be highly adaptable to the site of his birth and early boyhood days, as well as one which would provide the greatest human interest and inspirational values—would be one which would include a restoration of the original plantation setting to depict his humble beginnings, together with a museum that would record the progress of the Negro in America from the time of his coming to these shores as a slave, with exhibits of the achievements of the race in industry, commerce, education, the arts, sciences, and literature, and in other fields of endeavor, thus preserving for posterity the evidence of the contributions of his race to the history and development of our country. The committee notes that this type of monument to Booker T. Washington, located at his birthplace, probably would come closer than anything else to filling a real need long felt in the hearts of millions of Americans and so eloquently expressed by Booker T. Washington in 1899 when he wrote in his book, The Future of the American Negro:

"I wish to say that it [my race] may have reasonable pride in all that is honorable to its history * * *. We have reached a period when educated Negroes should give more attention to the history of their race, and in collecting in some museum the relics that mark its progress. It is true of all races of culture and refinement and civilization that they have gathered in some place, the relics which mark the progress of their civilization, which show how they have lived from period to period. We should have so much pride that we would spend more time in looking into the history of the race * * * in perpetuating in some durable form its achievements, so that from year to year, instead of looking back with regret, we can point to our children the rough path through which we grew strong and great."

The committee concludes that no site other than his birthplace in the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia would be as adaptable to an appropriate national monument to Booker T. Washington.

SUPPORT FOR H. R. 6904

The committee calls attention to various groups and individuals supporting this legislation as follows:

The American Teachers Association, with its 20,000 members who are representative of the 75,000 teachers who instruct and administer the affairs in all Negro schools throughout the country.

The National Baptist Convention of America with more than 2 million members.

The National Baptist Convention, U. S. A., Inc., with more than 4,500,000 members.

The Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of the Elks of the World, with more than 500,000 members.

Booker T. Washington National Monument Foundation, Sidney J. Phillips, president; George S. Schuyler, editor, Pittsburgh Courier; G. Lake Ines, retired secretary, Tuskegee Institute (45 years of his life identified with Booker T. Washington and Tuskegee Institute).

In addition to the above, letters received by the Booker T. Washington National Monument Foundation from about three-fourths of the Members of Congress indicate that the majority are in favor of this legislation, while others were noncommittal at the time of writing.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORT

The Department of the Interior has submitted an adverse report on the bill. In this instanee, the Department has chosen to follow the recommendation of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments.

The Advisory Board feels that "while Booker T. Washington, the man, is an impressive national figure, the birth site is not equally impressive." The Department reports that the Board feels "* * * that the achievements of Booker T. Washintgon are worthy of national recognition and should be appropriately memorialized." In its view, "the place of such memorialization is at Tuskegee Institute, Alabama."

The committee feels that the National Park Service has shown little interest in establishing a national monument to Booker T. Washington, whether at his birthplace, at Tuskegee Institute, or elsewhere. The only witness sent by the Park Service to testify at the hearings affirmed that the Service had made no plans for the establishment of a national monument to Booker T. Washington.

The committee also feels that the Advisory Board lost sight of fundamental human values in arriving at its conclusions. Beyond this, the Board's reluctance to consider birthplace sites because "* * * today more and more persons are born in hospitals, they are not born in homes," as reported by the historian for the National Park Service, is less than persuasive, if germane.

During the hearings on the bill, it was pointed out by Dr. G. Lake Ines, who spent 45 years at Tuskegee Institute, that "As a memorial, Tuskegee Institute is complete in itseM. No single monument or building on that campus could add anything to the glory of that achievement. Rather, it would be dwarfed by the magnitude of his own creation."

It is pointed out that the work and influence of Booker T. Washington was not confined to the school which he established in Alabama. He traveled extensively in all parts of the country in his endeavors and served his country at large.

Attention also is called to the fact that Tuskegee Institute is a private institution directly serving the educational needs of a few. Whether or not millions of Americans lacking the advantages of an adequate education would be reluctant to journey to the campus of an educational institution of higher learning where they might feel out of place, is a further consideration.

In view of the above, the committee is compelled to disagree with the conclusions of the Department of the Interior and the Advisory Board.

The recommendations of Booker T. Washington, as quoted in the foregoing under the heading "Adaptability of the site to development," brings to mind the phrase that a man's achievements are to be measured not so much by the heights to which he has attained, as by the depths from which he came. The committee feels that no other place in America could so well provide the base for that measurement in the case of Booker T. Washington than the place where he was born and lived in the days of his early childhood.

The committee urges the enactment of H. R. 6904. It is hoped that this legislation establishing the Booker T. Washington National Monument at his birthplace in Franklin County, Va., will be enacted in time for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Booker T. Washington.

The Department's report is set forth following:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C. February 2, 1956.

Hon. CLAIR ENGLE,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ENGLE: Your committee has requested a report on H. R. 6904, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument. This proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the property located at Booker Washington Birthplace, Virginia, as a public national memorial to Booker T. Washington, noted Negro educator and apostle of good will. The proposed area would constitute the Booker T. Washington National Monument. The bill would authorize the appropriation of not to exceed $200,000 for purposes thereof.

We recommend that H. R. 6904 be not enacted.

The Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial is located in Franklin County, Va., 16 miles northeast of Rocky Mount. The 537.2-acre tract constituting the memorial consists of the plantation of Booker's owner prior to emancipation, James S. Burroughs (a central 207-acre tract, the eastern boundary of which cannot today be determined with exactitude), and land adjoining north and south of State Highway 122. On the plantation tract, there are, principally, a reconstructed birthplace cabin, 1 modern brick 2-story building serving as post office and administration center, the foundation of another building, a converted old barn (Tuck Industrial Hall), and a 2-story frame dwelling used as a residence for the president of the memorial.

There can be very little doubt that the central part of the birthplace memorial property is the birth site and early childhood home of Booker T. Washington, American educator and Negro leader. According to the Burroughs family Bible, Booker T. Washington was born (presumably on the plantation) April 5, 1856. On this site in Franklin County, Booker lived with his mother until emancipated in April 1865. He did not return until 1908, when, sentimentally, he sought out his birthplace.

As is well known, Booker T. Washington was the founder of the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute and achieved international fame as a Negro leader, educator, speaker, and writer. At the time of his death in 1915, he was one of the best known Negro leaders in America.

This proposed legislation has been considered by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, which Board was established by the Congress to render advice in matters of this kind. The Advisory Board has considered this matter on two separate occasions. Following its first meeting on the subject, which was held on March 22, 1954, the Board approved the following resolution:

"The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments having considered the proposal that the Booker T. Washington birthplace be included in the national park system, resolves that while Booker T. Washington, the man, is an impressive national figure, the birth site is not equally impressive, since it is largely devoid of original structures or object remains associated with him. It is also lacking in outstanding potentialities for recreational development were the area to be included in the national park system on recreational grounds. The Board greatly appreciates the value of the work that the Booker T. Washington Memorial is doing and commends it for preserving a spot which was dear to Booker T. Washington."

At a subsequent meeting, held on September 7–9, 1955, the Board reaffirmed its earlier view that the achievements of Booker T. Washington are worthy of national recognition and should be appropriately memorialized. The Board stated, however, its view that the place for such memorialization is at Tuskegee Institute, Ala., where he made his greatest contributions to American life. The Board concluded that, since none of the original buildings remained at the birthplace, no expenditure of Federal funds was justified at that site.

In the circumstances, we conclude that, based upon the several recommendations of the Board and other information of record, the Booker T. Washington birthplace site does not measure up to the criteria or standards that have been adopted for the purpose of determining whether historic landmarks, structures, or other objects of historic or scientific interest warrant recognition as national monuments. It is felt also that the area lacks the scenic and topographic appeal of a recreational park. Because of its remoteness from urban areas, its potentiality as a day-use recreational area is limited. It follows that this site does not qualify for admission to the national park system.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS IN THE LIFE OF BOOKER T. WASHINGTON

A condensed record of certain important events and accomplishments in the life of Booker T. Washington is set forth below. The significance of many of these far-reaching events and accomplishments are not conveyed by their titles.

Condensed record of some events and accomplishments in the life of Booker T. Washington, from a chronoloy filed with the committee

Born a slave on the James Burroughs plantation, April 5, 1856, in Franklin County, Va.

Moved with mother Jane Ferguson, brother John, and sister Amanda to new home in Malden, W. Va., in 1865, after being freed from slavery.

Worked as houseboy in the family of Mrs. Viola Ruffner, wife of Gen. Lewis Ruffner, at $6 per month.

Gained entrance to Hampton Institute in 1872 by cleaning a room which he swept and dusted three times as his examination. Miss Mackie, the lady principal, inspected his work with a white handkerchief to reveal any dust or dirt. Graduated from Hampton Institute in 1875.

Accepted invitation to principalship of a proposed training school for Negro teachers at Tuskegee, June 15, 1881, authorized by State Legislature of Alabama with appropriation of $2,000 for salaries. Opened Tuskegee Normal School July 4 with 30 students in Butler's Chapel, A. M. E. Z. Church, which has since grown to become the most famous school for Negroes in the world.

In 1890, organized Annual Farmers' Conference which helps to raise the standards of rural life in the South.

Pleaded with a congressional committee for a large Federal grant-in-aid in support of the Atlantic Cotton States Exposition held in 1895.

Delivered famous Atlanta Exposition Address, 1895, which was the first of many notable speeches such as: Peace Jubilee in Chicago; Jamestown Exposition in 1907; Fourth American Peace Congress, 1913; National Educational Association, and many others.

He was the recipient of many honorary degrees from such outstanding institutions as Harvard University, Dartmouth College, Wilberforce and Howard University.

Invited Dr. George Washington Carver to join agricultural staff at Tuskegee in 1896.

Wrote over 40 books, among them Up From Slavery, an autobiography, in 1900, which has become world famous. His other works dealt with the school and his activities in behalf of people.

Organized the Anna T. Jeanes Foundation in 1907 in cooperation with Dr. H. O. Frissell of Hampton Institute.

Interested the United States Government in Liberia and was appointed to United States commission by President Theodore Roosevelt.

Cooperated with Mr. John D. Rockefeller in the establishment of the General Education Board in 1910.

Cooperated in the establishment of the Phelps-Stokes Fund and Carnegie Foundation in 1911.

Influenced the establishment of first Rosenwald School built at Notasulga, Ala., which finally grew to 5,000 schools in 1,000 counties in the South at a cost of $21 million, employing 1,500 teachers, with student bodies of 750,000 annually.

In 1900 founded National Negro Business League.

Founded National Negro Health Week in 1914.

Established Baldwin Farms colony in Macon County, Ala., in 1914.

Last public address was before the American Missionary Association and National Council on Congregational Churches in New Haven, Conn., in 1915.

Gave last Sunday evening talk to teachers and students in the institute chapel October 17, 1915, his subject, Team Work. He died November 14, 1915, at Tuskegee Institute and is buried on the campus.

CONCLUSION

Past Congresses or past Executive orders have brought into being more than 180 units of the National Park Service.

The coming into being of national park, national monument, national historic sites, and related Park Service units assumes existence of what might be called a "yardstick of eligibility" of the physical area thus set aside.

Similarly, the committee believes that the individuals or groups of individuals commemorated through bringing into being numerous national park units for that purpose assumes application of a "yardstick of greatness."

Having in mind these two assumptions, and notwithstanding the position of the National Park Service and its Advisory Board, the committee has concluded that Booker T. Washington, the man, measures up fully to any yardstick of greatness which might be applied. The Booker T. Washington birthplace, as a physical area so intimately associated with the man, qualifies when measured by our historic yardstick of eligibility.

While this committee concurs in the conclusions reached by the House committee, we wish here to set forth a special conclusion. It is the unanimous feeling of the committee that every effort should be made by the National Park Service to develop newly created monuments and memorials in a manner that will entail no excessive annual maintenance costs. The committee suggests, therefore, that in developing the Booker T. Washington National Monument, the National Park Service attempt to concentrate its efforts in this particular area to a fitting treatment of the central features of the tract to be donated by the State of Virginia, rather than attempt to reconstruct the original plantation theme by fully developing the entire tract. The willingness of the National Park Service to follow this suggestion of

the committee's is expressed in the communication set forth below:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1956.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Director Wirth has asked me to reply to your letter of March 14, concerning H. R. 6904, to establish the Booker T. Washington National Monument. It is our understanding that statements were made during hearings on the bill that the central portion of the lands, amounting to about 165 acres, would be donated to the Government by the State of Virginia, and your letter confirms this. We are of the opinion that this acreage, and perhaps even less, would be adequate for a proper development. We believe that this area can be appropriately treated to commemorate the achievements of Booker T. Washington without reconstructing the plantation setting with all of its buildings, fields, and appurtenances, and the expensive maintenance that such construction and program would entail.

If the essential lands are to be donated, as you state, the $200,000 authorized by the bill would appear to be adequate to provide a fitting memorial treatment in the central portion and, at the same time, provide the basic facilities needed by visitors to the memorial area.

Sincerely yours,
E. T. SCOYEN, *Acting Director.*

The committee also considered a companion measure, S. 2553, which was introduced by Senator THYE. Reports received on that bill from the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget are set forth below and made a part of this report:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1956.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Your committee has requested a report on S. 2553, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument. This proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the property located at Booker Washington Birthplace, Virginia, as a public national memorial to Booker T. Washington, noted Negro educator and apostle of good will. The proposed area would constitute the Booker T. Washington National Monument. The bill would authorize the appropriation of not to exceed $200,000 for purposes thereof.

We recommend that S. 2553 be not enacted.

The Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial is located in Franklin County, Va., 16 miles northeast of Rocky Mount. The 537.2-acre tract constituting the memorial consists of the plantation of Booker's owner prior to emancipation, James S. Burroughs (a central 207-acre tract, the eastern boundary of which cannot today be determined with exactitude), and land adjoining north and south of State Highway 122. On the plantation tract there are principally a reconstructed birthplace cabin, 1 modern brick 2-story building serving as post office and administration center, the foundation of another building, a converted old barn (Tuck Industrial Hall), and a 2-story frame dwelling used as a residence for the president of the memorial.

There can be very little doubt that the central part of the birthplace memorial property is the birth site and early childhood home of Booker T. Washington, American educator and Negro leader. According to the Burroughs family Bible, Booker T. Washington was born (presumably on the plantation), April 5, 1856. On this site in Franklin County, Booker lived with his mother until emancipated in April 1865. He did not return until 1908, when, sentimentally, he sought out his birthplace.

As is well known, Booker T. Washington was the founder of the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, and achieved international fame as a Negro leader, educator, speaker, and writer. At the time of his death in 1915, he was one of the best known Negro leaders in America.

This proposed legislation has been considered by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, which Board was established by the Congress to render advice in matters of this kind. The Advisory Board has considered this matter on two separate occasions. Following its first meeting on the subject, which was held on March 22, 1954, the Board approved the following resolution:

"The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, having considered the proposal that the Booker T. Washington birthplace be included in the national park system, resolves that while Booker T. Washington, the man, is an impressive national figure, the birth site is not equally impressive, since it is largely devoid of original structures or object remains associated with him. It is also lacking in outstanding potentialities for recreational development were the area to be included in the national park system on recreational grounds. The Board greatly appreciates the value of the work that the Booker T. Washington Memorial is doing and commends it for preserving a spot which was dear to Booker T. Washington."

At a subsequent meeting, held on September 7–9, 1955, the Board reaffirmed its earlier view that the achievements of Booker T. Washington are worthy of national recognition and should be appropriately memorialized. The Board stated, however, its view that "the place for such memorialization is at Tuskegee Institute, Ala., where he made his greatest contributions to American life." The Board concluded that, since none of the original buildings remained at the birthplace, no expenditure of Federal funds was justified at that site.

In the circumstances, we conclude that, based upon the several recommendations of the Board and other information of record, the Booker T. Washington birthplace site does not measure up to the criteria or standards that have been adopted for the purpose of determining whether historic landmarks, structures, or other objects of historic or scientific interest warrant recognition as national monuments. It is felt also that the area lacks the scenic and topographic appeal of a recreational park. Because of its remoteness from urban areas, its potentiality as a day-use recreational area is limited. It follows that this site does not qualify for admission to the national park system.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C. February 1, 1956.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States, Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 2553, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument.

The Department of the Interior informs us that the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments has considered this matter on two separate occasions and advised against designating the site as a national monument. While recognizing Booker T. Washington as an impressive national figure, the Board noted that the site of his birth is largely devoid of structures or objects associated with him. It also noted that the site is lacking in outstanding recreational values that might justify its inclusion in the national park system on recreational grounds.

This Bureau agrees with the findings of the Board that expenditure of Federal funds is not justified at this site and accordingly recommends against enactment of S. 2553.

Sincerely yours,
PERCY RAPPAPORT,
Assistant Director.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OIL LEASES ON WILDLIFE REFUGES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Representative HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Saturday, March 17, 1956, on the subject of the oil leases which have been granted on wildlife refuges under this administration.

Mr. REUSS wrote in answer to a long letter to the Post from Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, which sought to defend his Department's sorry record on conservation and natural resources under the Eisenhower administration. A major portion of that defense was devoted to the question of oil drilling on areas of federally owned lands which have been set aside for wildlife refuges. The Department has pointed with pride to a so-called "stop order" which it put into effect while drafting new regulations governing such oil drilling.

But Representative REUSS' letter points out that "in the 28 months between August 23, 1953, and December 1955, while the stop order remained in effect, Mr. McKay's Department proceeded to grant 566 oil leases in the wildlife refuges" and game management areas, while only a total of 11 oil leases had been granted in wildlife refuges in the preceding 33 years.

In other words, Mr. President, preceding Secretaries of the Interior, Republicans and Democrats, had granted 1 oil lease on a wildlife refuge in every 3 years—but Secretary McKay granted them on the average of 1 in every working day.

Mr. President, just the other day we had the news that one of the dwindling band of the last surviving whooping cranes has died, and that only 13 couples of these birds now remain.

I also ask unanimous consent to include at the end of my remarks an editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 17, 1956, on this event, which so dramatizes the significance of our efforts to preserve wildlife and fowl in our country; and I am sure that everyone concerned about these efforts will read with interest Congressman REUSS' discussion of the policies of the Eisen-

hower administration, under Secretary McKay, toward oil and wildlife.

Without objection, the letter to the editor and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAIDING THE WILDLIFE REFUGES

In his letter to you of March 10, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay complains that he is falsely accused of giveaways by Prof. Seymour E. Harris of Harvard. Secretary McKay charges that "Dr. Harris fails to cite a single policy or action by the Eisenhower administration to support his allegation that the Republicans are not preserving natural resources for all the people."

The only reason we have any waterfowl left is because the Department of the Interior over the years has been willing to outlaw the market hunters, the duck baiters, and the other predatory groups which have been intent on making ducks and geese go the way of passenger pigeon. Prior to Mr. McKay's administration, the department had always rigorously enforced the ban on shooting migratory waterfowl that have been lured into gun range by corn, wheat, or other bait.

During the administration of Fish and Wildlife Director Albert Day, from 1946 to 1952, anyone found feeding or baiting ducks as close as 200 yards to the guns was promptly arrested and prosecuted. One of Mr. McKay's first actions after he came to power in 1953 was to remove the office of Fish and Wildlife Service Director from the protection of civil service, then to remove Mr. Day, and instead appoint the present Fish and Wildlife Director, Mr. John L. Farley.

Former Under Secretary of the Interior Ralph A. Tudor tells the story of the replacement of Mr. Day by Mr. Farley in an article in the Saturday Evening Post for November 27, 1954:

"Even before I left for the Capital to take on the new job, my friends in the banking business were telling me that I must 'do something about the Fish and Wildlife Service.' Complaints about Fish and Wildlife continued to reach me at my desk in Washington, and 90 percent of them were from bankers. This puzzled me at first, for it would seem more logical for unhappy bankers to be writing the Secretary of the Treasury. It turned out, however, that apparently every banker on the west coast is a duck hunter. Fish and Wildlife has a rough job, for among its many duties it must tell people when and how long they can hunt and how many ducks they can take—and evidently it is impossible to satisfy a duck hunter.

"I turned the tables on the complainants in this instance by making them talent scouts. My reply to them was that the best way to start improving the Fish and Wildlife Service was to get the man available to head it—and had they any suggestions? The upshot was that they had, and that is how John L. Farley, ardent fisherman, former schoolteacher, businessman, and one-time executive officer of the California Fish and Game Department, came to head the Fish and Wildlife Service."

Under Mr. McKay's administration, violations of the Federal antibaiting regulations have been winked at on a wholesale basis. For the past 3 seasons hunting clubs in California have been allowed to feed and bait ducks as close as 200 yards to the blinds with impunity. In the 1954 season, for example, there was not a single prosecution in the length and breadth of California for violation of the Federal antibaiting regulation.

The public outcry against Mr. McKay's giveaway of our waterfowl resources to the California financial interests may shortly be producing results. According to a report in the Milwaukee Journal for March 5, 1956, of the National Wildlife Federation Conference:

"The nationwide furor among duck hunters over the feeding of ducks during the hunting season on California's licensed shooting preserves may end the practice, Harley Knox, president of the California Fish and Game Commission told the National Waterfowl Flyway Council here Sunday.

"Knox said that he thought the feeding allowed in his State was, in fact, baiting ducks to guns, contrary to Federal regulations.

"'I'm afraid I'm in the minority on the commission,' he added, 'but I do feel that we may abandon the practice so as to be of no further embarrassment to Mr. Farley's office.'"

Having turned migratory waterfowl over to the game-hog pressure groups, there was left to Mr. McKay the problem of the wildlife refuges themselves. Since 1920, the oil companies have been interested in exploiting the Nation's 264 wildlife refuges. Under the administration of courageous Secretaries of Interior like Republican Ray Lyman Wilber and Democrat Harold L. Ickes, the oil companies, with their derricks, their pollution, and their commotion, have been effectively kept out of the wildlife refuges. From 1920 to 1953, only 11 oil leases were granted—1 lease every 3 years.

Then came Mr. McKay. The Department of the Interior, proclaiming that it wanted to "tighten up" the policy on granting oil leases, issued a stop order on August 31, 1953, announcing that it intended to "suspend action on all pending oil and gas lease offers and applications." Then, in the 28 months between August 1953, and December 1955, while the stop order remained in effect, Mr. McKay's Department proceeded to grant 566 oil leases in the wildlife refuges.

Mr. McKay in his letter to you claims that the new regulations, adopted by the Department in December 1955, adequately protect the wildlife refuges against exploitation by the oil companies. I wouldn't know. What is clear, however, is that issuing of the regulations in December 1955, is like locking the stable after the horse has been stolen. Whereas, prior to Mr. McKay, one oil lease was issued on the average every 3 years, under Mr. McKay one oil lease has been issued on the average every working day.

If letting the California financial interests bait migratory waterfowl, in square violation of the antibaiting regulation, and letting the oil companies get 566 oil leases in the wildlife refuges, in square violation of the "no leasing" stop order, aren't giveaways, I wish Mr. McKay would tell us what is.

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress from Wisconsin.
WASHINGTON.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 17, 1956]

DARWINIAN DIRGE

Well, it looks as though National Wildlife Week got off to a rather unfortunate start. Down at Austwell, Tex., one of the last surviving whooping cranes has been reported AWOL since January, and is now presumed dead. That presumption, if verified, would leave only 27 whooping cranes left in all this wide, wide world, or for reproductive purposes—which is really what matters—only 13 pairs.

The whooping crane is strictly a piscivorous and herbivorous creature, and in all its biological history has probably never done harm to any human being, although human beings seem to have done a good deal to it, especially by destroying, in their obsession with progress, most of its feeding and breeding places. One trouble, apparently, is that the whooping crane cannot adapt its way of life, as some other species, including our own, have been able to do, to suit altered conditions. Thus it has been gradually falling behind in the grim evolutionary race for survival, in which, it would appear that cockroaches and some other equally unpleasant fauna are the now odds-on favorites. Or, to paraphrase Mr. Leo Durocher, nice things finish soonest.

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Portland (Maine) Evening Express of March 15, 1956, discussing electoral college reform which is the subject of Senate Joint Resolution 31, the unfinished business of the Senate, may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO BURY THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

The presidential election system suffers from a dangerously inflamed appendix. It is known as the electoral college and the sooner it is cut out the healthier will be the body politic.

The trouble with the electoral college system is that it prevents millions of people from having a say in the selection of Presidents and Vice Presidents. New York State, for instance, has 45 electoral votes, but the candidate who carries New York by, say, 55 percent of the popular vote, receives all of the 45 electoral votes under the present system. So 45 percent of the State's voters are effectively disfranchised. Obviously this isn't fair.

Congress has talked for years about submitting this useless vestige of yesterday to surgery but not until this year has there been much real hope for action. This year a number of plans for reform have been discussed in Washington and if the various factions who agree in principle that it is time to bury the electoral college can also agree on details we may get some action.

Democratic Senators DANIEL, of Texas, and KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, have cleared for debate a proposed constitutional amendment which would split the electoral vote of each State in exact mathematical relationship to the popular vote, including decimals. The Daniel-Kefauver plan was favorably reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee in May of last year but got nowhere after that.

The other proposal which has attracted wide support is that of 2 Republicans, Senator MUNDT and Representative FREDERIC COUDERT, JR., of New York. This would retain the electoral college, entitling each State to a number of electors equal to its delegation in Congress. The electors of a State would be chosen, however, "in the same manner in which its Senators and Representatives are nominated and elected."

In other words, the candidates for President and Vice President who won statewide pluralities would get as many electors as the State had Senators and Representatives at Large. After that the national candidates with a plurality in each congressional district would get the elector from that district.

Senator MUNDT is agreeable to stipulating that the Daniel-Kefauver plan would not go into effect unless a State specifically chose the Mundt-Coudert plan. Such a compromise would appear to favor the first plan, but MUNDT is so sure of the superiority of his plan that he feels most or all States would choose it.

Still other plans have been suggested, some more complicated than these two, some less. Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, put forward at the 1955 session a constitutional amendment for direct election of the President and Vice President by popular vote. HUMPHREY also cosponsored the Daniel-Kefauver plan and at this session produced still another which would split 435 electoral votes according to the popular vote on a nationwide basis with 96 electoral votes—2 per State—to be determined by the vote within the State.

Chief trouble with the Mundt-Coudert plan is that it is unnecessarily complicated, would be unnecessarily expensive, and would not require full participation by all States. The Daniel-Kefauver approach is best because it is simple and, by splitting the elec-

toral vote in exact mathematical relationship to the popular vote, would accomplish the desired end of giving every voter a voice.

Now that most top political leaders agree that the electoral college is outmoded there is greater hope than ever that it can be given a swift and decent burial. Any amendment passed by the Senate and House would still have to be ratified by the legislatures of 36 States to become effective but if the Congress will show some intelligent and persuasive leadership we think the States would be convinced of a need for a change.

THE MUTUAL AID PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a statement I issued yesterday relative to foreign aid legislation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KNOWLAND

Congress will adequately support the continuation of the mutual aid program to those nations doing their utmost to help themselves.

Except as to specific public works projects that may be presented to and approved by Congress, I do not look with favor upon commitments for 10 years or other long-term periods for foreign economic aid.

Our budget is not yet balanced. Our national debt is over $280 billion. Our individual citizens and our free-enterprise system are carrying heavy tax burdens.

For the economic development of countries in need of capital funds for new or enlarged industrial plants they should look primarily to private investment rather than government-to-government grants and loans.

These countries should create an economic climate that would attract rather than repel such investment.

This will not be accomplished if their tax laws, government-owned competition, or threat of confiscation of private property without just compensation discourages such private investment.

As part of its responsibility as a coordinate branch of the Government, Congress has the duty to carefully consider the proposals of the President and to fully inquire into the programs already under way and those now in contemplation.

HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that March 15 was the anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution of 1848.

On that day in 1848, the youth of Hungary revolted in Budapest to enforce their demands for representative government and the elimination of authoritarian abuses, including the imposition of censorship. On the same day, Alexander Petofi, leader of the Hungarian youth movement and a well-known poet, circulated a stirring revolutionary poem destined to become the Marseillaise of Hungarian liberty. Initially the revolution was bloodless, as the Emperor accepted the demands of the people of Hungary and appointed the first Cabinet responsible to the National Legislature. However, the Austrian armies invaded Hungary in the fall of 1848, where they were repulsed by Hungarian forces. In the summer of the next year, the Russian Czar ordered his armies to invade Hungary, at the request of Austria. In the ensuing struggle, Alexander Petofi was killed, at the age of 26, and Louis Kossuth, the Regent, was required to flee the country. Incidentally, Mr. President, during his exile, he spent 9 months in the United States, where he was most hospitably received.

This anniversary reminds every Hungarian of the rich, liberal, democratic traditions of Hungarian history, and of that nation's continuing struggle for independence and freedom. Although today finds Hungary under the yoke of a more thorough and vicious tyranny than in 1848, March 15 provides the hope that Hungary will once again be free. Surely that nation's desire for freedom and the right of self-determination persists under the domination of the Communists, as evidenced by the recent shining examples of resistance to oppression of Cardinal Mindszenty, Bishop William Apor, and the Hungarians arrested at Pocspetri when they forcibly resisted the nationalization of their schools.

Americans of Hungarian descent are to be congratulated on this independence day, and I know that we join with them in their hope that the bright sun of freedom again shines on Hungary before the next Hungarian Independence Day.

CORPORATION AND EXCISE TAXES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Congress is in the process of enacting a tax bill extending peacetime corporation and excise taxes at highest wartime rates which reflect directly in the high cost of living.

In effect, Federal excise taxes are simply Federal sales taxes on things we buy. Corporation taxes are largely passed on to consumers of corporate production and services.

Taxes to be collected by the Federal Government under the pending tax bill are estimated at $3.2 billion a year.

Until Congress and the administration reduce expenditures by this amount and more, continuation of high taxes is an inescapable necessity. And unless Congress reduces appropriations requested in the budget for uncontrolled expenditure by Federal agencies in future years, sound responsible tax reduction in the foreseeable future is unlikely.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD some observations which I have made on the basis of a thorough analysis of nearly 1,000 appropriation account items in the Budget Document for fiscal year 1957, which begins on July 1.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

BUDGET: CURRENT YEAR, ENDING JUNE 30

The Federal budget will be in delicate temporary balance when fiscal year 1956 ends June 30. This fourth balance in 26 years since 1931, as on each occasion in the past, will be by inadvertance. The spenders underestimated receipts.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET: COMING YEAR, BEGINNING ON JULY 1

As for the President's estimate that the budget will be in balance next fiscal year, beginning July 1, for which we are now enacting appropriation and tax bills, the prediction hangs almost entirely on the proposal to raise postal rates.

Under these circumstances, renewal of deficit spending is probable unless both appropriations and expenditures are substantially reduced. The President's budget calls for increases in both.

As submitted to Congress for enactment, the budget for fiscal year 1957, beginning July 1, along with budget figures for previous years of the present administration for comparison purposes, is summarized as follows:

Administration budgets

[In billions]

	Receipts	Expenditures	Deficits	Appropriations
1954	$64.7	$67.8	$3.1	$62.8
1955	60.4	64.6	4.2	57.1
1956 (estimated)	64.5	64.3	+.2	62.0
1957 (proposed)	66.3	65.9	+.4	66.3

BYRD BUDGET

I suggest revisions in the President's budget for fiscal year 1957, beginning July 1, to reduce expenditures by at least $3.2 billion, increase the surplus by at least $3.2 billion and to reduce appropriations by at least $7.8 billion. These revisions are summarized as follows:

[In billions]

	Receipts		Expenditures		Surplus		Appropriations	
	Amount	Change	Amount (not more than)	Change (at least)	Amount (minimum)	Change (at least)	Amount (not more than)	Change (at least)
Fiscal year 1957 (beginning July 1)	$66.3	--------	$62.7	−$3.2	+$3.6	+$3.2	$58.5	−$7.8

These reductions in expenditures and appropriations are based on careful scrutiny of nearly 1,000 appropriation accounts, expenditure estimates, and unexpended balance projections in the President's budget document. The detail is available in worksheet form, but its volume, of course, precludes presentation in this statement.

In brief:

The expenditure reductions generally involve nonessential expansion in domestic-civilian programs, new nonessential employment, waste and extravagance in the military agencies, and expenditures for foreign economic assistance except under firm obligations already made under prior appropriations.

The appropriation reductions generally involve elimination of those for new nonessential domestic-civilian programs, new nonessential employment, new foreign economic assistance, and for nonessential buildup in unexpected balances.

EXPENDITURES: APPROPRIATIONS

In order to act effectively on budget reductions it is necessary to realize there is a vast difference between annual expenditures and appropriations enacted in the year. It is expenditures, not appropriations, measured by revenue which results in deficit or surplus.

An appropriation simply authorizes a Federal agency to spend money out of the Treasury. In too many instances appropriations enacted in one year may not be finally spent for years to come. Appropriations enacted in a year when revenue is high may not actually be spent until some year when rev-

enue is low. Meanwhile unexpended balances in old appropriations are carried over from year to year and added to new appropriations enacted for the same program.

Once Congress enacts the appropriation, it virtually loses control over its annual rate of expenditure in subsequent years. Exclusive of all new appropriations to be enacted in the current session of Congress, Federal agencies will enter the new fiscal year July 1 with unexpended balances in old appropriations and other expenditure authorizations totaling nearly $75 billion. If the President's request for new appropriations totaling $66.3 billion is fully enacted, funds available to Federal agencies for expenditure on July 1 will total $141 billion.

Of the $66.3 billion in new authorizations requested, $42.7 billion is for expenditure in the coming year and $23.6 billion is for expenditure in future years.

Of the $65.9 billion which the President estimates Federal agencies will spend in the coming year $42.7 billion would be spent from new appropriations on which Congress will act this year, and $23.2 billion will be spent out of balances in old authorizations which are not ordinarily before Congress for action in terms of coming year expenditures.

Under such a procedure effective expenditure control in the coming year requires a combination of tight constructive administrative control in the executive branch of the Government along with cooperative congressional action on that part of new appropriations which are to be spent in the coming year.

To assure expenditure reduction in the future, it will be necessary for Congress to reduce appropriations in a manner to eliminate that part which will be carried over to build up unnecessary balances for expenditure in subsequent years.

In the interest of American taxpayers both expenditures and appropriations can and should be cut substantially, without impairing any essential function of Government.

EXPENDITURE REDUCTION

On the basis of analysis of every one of the nearly 1,000 appropriation account items in the budget, it is feasible to cut expenditures in the coming fiscal year, beginning July 1, as follows:

	Billion
1. By elimination of new domestic-civilian programs, etc. (Limited largely to programs previously unauthorized.)	$1.0
2. In miscellaneous domestic-civilian reductions, more than	.4
3. By reduction in foreign economic aid. (Expenditures from firmly obligated balances in prior year appropriations would be allowed for foreign economic assistance. No expenditures would be allowed from new appropriations or unobligated balances. Expenditures for military assistance and direct forces support would not be reduced.)	.9
4. By reduction in nonessential military expenditures. (These reductions would not apply to any major procurement—aircraft, ship, missile, etc.—or to any research and development item. They would not impair any essential element of combat strength or preparedness. They would apply to nonessential new programs, construction, additional civilian employment, etc. They contemplate efficiency and elimination of waste.)	.9
Total	3.2

APPROPRIATION REDUCTION

One of the most inexcusable features in the President's budget is a $9.2 billion increase in appropriations, as compared with those enacted for fiscal year 1955, which ended last June 30; and a great part of this increase in appropriations will be used to increase expenditures for domestic-civilian programs, and add to unexpended balances in all categories to be carried over into fiscal year 1958.

In view of the fact that only $42.7 billion of the $66.3 billion in requested appropriations is for expenditure in the coming year, analysis of appropriation accounts clearly indicates that it is feasible to cut requested new appropriations as follows:

	Billion
1. By elimination of all new domestic-civilian programs, etc. (Limited largely to programs previously unauthorized.)	$1.7
2. In miscellaneous domestic-civilian reductions. (Based largely on reductions to fiscal year 1956 level, elimination of unnecessary buildup in unexpended balances, and elimination of additional new personnel.)	1.3
3. By reduction in foreign aid. (Limited largely to elimination of all new appropriations for so-called economic assistance but including small reductions in appropriations for direct forces support and military assistance which would be used to add to unnecessary balances.)	2.5
4. By reduction in nonessential military appropriations. (These reductions would not apply to any major procurement—aircraft, ship, missile, etc.—or to any research and development item. They would not impair any essential element of combat strength or preparedness. They would apply to nonessential new programs, construction, additional civilian employment, etc. They contemplate efficiency and elimination of waste. They would reduce unnecessary balances.)	$2.3
Total	7.8

With the kind of administration and legislative action to which American taxpayers are entitled, such expenditure and appropriation reductions would not curtail any essential functions of the Federal Government. They would curtail initiation of new so-called foreign economic assistance projects, and eliminate new nonessential domestic-civilian programs. They would reduce unexpended balances at the end of fiscal year 1957 by $4.4 billion. They would preclude employment of 46,000 new additional civilian employees on Federal payrolls.

These reductions in expenditures and appropriations are summarized in the following table:

Suggested reductions in appropriations and expenditures

[In millions]

	1956 actual		1957 requested		1957 Byrd budget			
					Reduction		Suggested	
	Appropriations	Expenditures	Appropriations	Expenditures	Appropriations	Expenditures	Appropriations	Expenditures
Foreign aid:								
New legislation			$4,860	$990	$2,460	$540	$2,400	$450
Old appropriations	$2,703	$4,190		3,300		360		2,940
Total	2,703	4,190	4,860	4,290	2,460	900	2,400	3,390
Military:								
Existing legislation	33,147	34,575	33,790	35,347	1,161	681	32,629	34,666
New legislation			1,117	200	1,117	200		
Total	33,147	34,575	34,907	35,547	2,278	881	32,629	34,666
Domestic-civilian:								
Existing legislation	26,134	25,505	23,989	25,212	1,308	419	22,681	24,793
New legislation			2,885	1,166	1,745	1,026	1,140	140
Postal rate increase			−350	−350			−350	−350
Total	26,134	25,505	26,524	26,028	3,053	1,445	23,471	24,583
Grand total	61,984	64,270	66,291	65,865	7,791	3,226	58,500	62,639

The effect of these suggested reductions on unexpended balances is summarized by categories as follows:

Unexpended balances (start of the year)

[In millions]

	1957, estimated (July 1, 1956)	1958, requested (July 1, 1957)	Cut suggested	Under Byrd budget (at start of fiscal year 1958)
Foreign	$6,592	$7,157	$1,605	$5,553
Military [1]	39,061	38,100	1,417	36,683
Domestic-civilian	28,920	28,448	1,411	27,037
Total	74,574	73,705	4,433	69,272

[1] Exclusive of balances in transfers from foreign military assistance funds.

MILITARY FUNDS

It is noted with emphasis that these reductions in expenditures and appropriations are not applied to major procurement of aircraft, ships, ordnance, missiles, or to military research and development items.

Neither is there reduction in expenditures for military assistance.

Budget figures show military agencies at the beginning of the new fiscal year on July 1, exclusive of new appropriations, will have unexpended balances totaling $39.1 billion. These balances are in direct appropriations to the military agencies. They do not include $3.1 billion additional available to them in transfers from old foreign-military assistance appropriations. When old military-assistance funds are added, military balances total $42.2 billion. If requested new military appropriations are fully enacted the total expenditure availability for military agencies would be more than $77.1 billion. And to this would be added any additional transfers from new military assistance appropriations yet to be enacted.

The military-fiscal situation may be summarized as follows:

1. Military agencies will start fiscal year 1957 on July 1, with unexpended balances in old direct appropriations and other expenditure authorizations totaling $39.1 billion.

2. Military agencies will have additional balances available to them in transfers from old foreign-military assistance funds of $3.1 billion.

3. Exclusive of new money to be appropriated in this session of Congress, military agencies will start the fiscal year with spending authority totaling $42.2 billion.

4. New appropriations requested for military agencies total $34.9 billion.

5. Assuming full appropriation of the request, military agencies will start fiscal year 1957 on July 1 with direct and indirect spending authority totaling $77.1 billion.

6. This total does not include additional funds to be transferred to military agencies during the coming year from new foreign-military assistance appropriations.

7. Of the $77.1 plus billion available to military agencies, it is estimated that they will spend $36.7 billion, leaving an unexpended balance at the end of the year of more than $40 billion.

As for the Air Force, it will start the fiscal year with unexpended balances, including those available to it from foreign-aid money, totaling $20.1 billion. The proposed $15.4 billion in new appropriations for the Air Force would bring its total spending authority to $35.5 billion. Of this total it is estimated Air Force will spend less than $17.3 billion and end the year with a balance of $18.3 billion plus transfers during the year from new foreign military assistance funds.

To show the effect of building up such balances as those which exist in the Military Establishment, it may be interesting to note that there is not a dollar of appropriation in the new budget for such an important item as Army procurement and production. There hasn't been an appropriation to this item since the Korean war.

All expenditures for Army procurement and production since the Korean war have been out of balances in old appropriations. This will be continued in the coming year with expenditures estimated at $1.6 billion. At the end of next year these old balances in the Army production and procurement account will still total $4 billion.

This is to say for years a military agency has been spending more than a billion dollars a year for procurement and production without ordinary appropriation control.

The time has come for a complete and thorough examination of fiscal practices which have grown up in all the military agencies. This would not necessarily involve programs.

There is evidence of abuse of privileges which have been made available in the name of preparedness, including exploitation of balances, use of military assistance funds, use of foreign currencies, use of revolving funds, use of Federal housing insurance, use of civilian manpower, etc.

The reductions in military budgets which I am suggesting are based on more efficient use of facilities, funds, and civilian employment. That is not too much to ask of agencies with more than $75 billions of taxpayers' money at their disposal.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT

Of the 48,000 new civilian employees requested in the President's budget, 22,556 are requested through military appropriation accounts. Of this total 20,858 are requested in the Air Force which is increasing civilian employment more than 28,000 in the current year—a total of 49,000 civilian employees in 2 years.

The remaining 25,000 new civilian employees are requested for the coming year through domestic-civilian and foreign aid appropriation accounts. It is difficult, if not impossible, to determine precisely the increase in foreign aid employment because budget detail for foreign assistance has not been submitted.

The 48,000 civilian employment increase figure is not a net figure. The net increase in the President's budget is 9,000. In activities where decreases or present levels have been recommended, my suggestions would not disturb the requests for personal service.

The President's budget requests employment of 48,000 new people. My suggestions would allow 2,000 new employees for military research and development work and eliminate the remaining 46,000 at a saving of $274 million. This would eliminate requests for increases in all items where the figures are up, except those involving increases for military research and development .

EXPENDITURE CONTROL

The reductions I have suggested could be accomplished in the coming fiscal year 1957, beginning July 1, and in future years, without damage to any essential function of Government. It is disappointing that the administration, which made a good start in reducing appropriations, expenditures, and unexpended balances, now proposes increases.

Unfortunately, some of the more nonessential programs cannot be reached by the orthodox process of reducing appropriations. There are more than 100 program accounts outside appropriation control.

This type of Federal commitment is growing. It involves Federal guaranties, insurance, statutory authority to spend from the public debt, use of foreign currencies, use of the corporate device, permanent appropriations; and now there is a trend toward trust funds, which should be watched.

The reputation of the Federal Government as guardian of trust funds is already questionable. If trust funds are to become a means of evading Federal control of Federal programs at all points except the bureaucrats who promote them, we may as well expect continuing pressure to set up every Federal program as a trust fund.

Sound tax reduction depends upon expenditure control. Expenditure control requires vigilant administration in the executive branch over appropriations already enacted and careful consideration by Congress of appropriations when they are authorized and requested.

Meanwhile, the Federal debt, by the latest Treasury report, stands at nearly $280 billion—nearly $5 billion over the permanent statutory limit.

In 26 years, since we started the deficit-financing spree, interest on the steadily growing debt has cost taxpaying Americans $82 billion. Interest in the coming year will bring the cost of this debt to nearly $90 billion.

Until control over expenditures is regained and applied effectively for sufficient expenditure and debt reduction, taxes cannot be reduced if the Government is to remain sound.

TRIBUTE TO MILWAUKEE SENTINEL SPORTS AND VACATION SHOW

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there is going on right now in the Milwaukee Arena Auditorium one of the great shows of the Midwest and the Nation—the Milwaukee Sentinel Sports and Vacation Show.

This is the 16th year of this entertaining show which attracts a tremendous attendance—over 150,000 a year.

I wish to convey my warmest greetings to all the folks who have contributed to and are participating in the show, and to state that it is a splendid symbol of America's vacationland, wonderful Wisconsin.

I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on this subject, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELCOME TO WONDERFUL WISCONSIN

(Statement by Senator WILEY)

The call of the outdoors can be heard throughout America.

It is a call to enjoy the best possible way the miracle of leisure time in our country—more leisure than any other people has known in history.

THE LURE OF BADGER FISHING, HUNTING

It is a call, in particular, to the 8,676 lakes of Wisconsin, and especially to the 1,412 trout streams, totaling 8,349 miles.

This summer well over a million anglers will try their excellent luck in Wisconsin waters.

Around three-quarters of a million of that number will be residents. But Wisconsin also leads the Nation in the number of nonresident fishermen. Last year's total reached more than 326,000.

At hunting time, some 450,000 big- and small-game hunters will take to the State's woods and marshlands.

It is only natural, therefore, that in Wisconsin's greatest city—Milwaukee—there should be conducted one of the greatest, if not the greatest, sports shows of the Nation.

DIVERSE SENTINEL PROMOTIONS

It has been staged every year since 1940, with the exception of 1943, when it was suspended because of the war. It is the only sports show owned and operated by a newspaper—the Hearst newspapers' Milwaukee Sentinel.

It is a part of a diversified Sentinel promotion program, which includes such well-attended attractions as the Winnebago Outboard Marathon (cosponsored by the Wisconsin Stock Utility Outboard Racing Association and the Fond du Lac Association of Commerce), the Sentinel-Chevrolet Soap-Box Derby, as well as golf, bowling, and baseball events, pointing dog trials, junior rifle championships, and archery competition. These events, with vast drawing power in sports-minded Wisconsin, are all crowd-pleasers and certainly in the wholesome public interest.

The outdoor show itself attracts multitudes not only from all over my own State but from northern Illinois, Michigan, eastern Iowa, and Minnesota.

As the attractive souvenir edition of last Sunday's Milwaukee Sentinel demonstrated, the show is also the occasion for the display of the greatest sports and vacation equipment of the Nation. That means the finest outboard motors (products of Wisconsin craftsmanship). It means every conceivable type of fishing lure and other items for our Izaac Waltons; it means hunting and camping equipment, golf clubs, canoes, aluminum boats, and a vast variety of other material, including modern station wagons and trailers.

WISCONSIN OUTBOARD MOTORS

Wisconsin is particularly proud of its outboard motors—which I have been pleased previously to commend in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Midwest is, of course, the boating capital of the Nation. This is only natural because fishermen purchase 66 percent of the Nation's motors, and the Midwest yields to no area in its enjoyment of fishing. (As regards the remainder of outboard sales, incidentally, 19 percent are bought for cruising, 8 percent for hunting, and 7 percent for water skiing.)

DIVERSE EVENTS AT SHOW

The overall show itself will be the scene of the ninth annual Wisconsin indoor archery championship, cosponsored by the

Sentinel and the Wisconsin Field Archers Association. Archery has, in recent years, gained ever wider public acceptance, and is a rapidly growing segment of Wisconsin's inviting recreational picture.

There will also be spin casting tests, the second annual junior rifle championship contest, a competition in the Milwaukee Council Industrial Recreation Bait Casting League, a camera contest and numerous other events.

All of these attractions will naturally increase the outdoor man's appetite and his wife's; so they will naturally enjoy the best eating thereafter in Milwaukee's great restaurant establishments.

WISCONSIN'S OUTSTANDING RESORTS

And their thoughts will turn to the approaching period of their complete vacation—not just for a weekend but for several weeks—perhaps in the north woods or elsewhere in the Badger State. A variety of resort association booths and exhibits, and abundant literature from the Wisconsin Conservation Department give the vacationer helpful facts and suggestions. Wisconsin's resorts are of course famed throughout the Nation for their hospitality, attractiveness, and pride in service.

CONSTRUCTIVE USE OF LEISURE

And so, the show plays a vital role in Wisconsin's economy, because naturally it helps assure tremendously increased tourist revenue to America's vacationland.

It symbolizes, however, the American way of life. It represents wholesome enjoyment of leisure time in the great outdoors, in God's country, where the air is fresh in a man's lungs and on his face, where he can really relax, away from life's tensions, where he can teach his youngster in the values of nature, of camping, of self-reliance, of strengthening one's body and one's mind.

Thus, although there are but a few days remaining, I want to issue my warmest invitation to folks in the midwestern area to take in the sports show and best of all take in wonderful Wisconsin.

WHAT AVIATION EDUCATION MEANS TO ME—ADDRESS BY ARTHUR GODFREY

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, Arthur Godfrey is known in every home in this country as a great figure in the entertainment field. It is not so widely known that Mr. Arthur Godfrey is a great expert in the field of aviation. He has not only flown practically every type of plane that has been in the air for the last 20 years, but he has made a study of aviation as related to the defense of the United States.

On March 16, 1956, Mr. Godfrey made a speech before the sixth annual conference of the National Aviation Education Council in New York, which I think would be interesting to those who are concerned about the national defense and are interested in aviation education. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I should like to associate myself with everything the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has said about Arthur Godfrey. I spent 2 delightful days with him this past fall in Texas, at which time, at his own expense and in his own time, he came to discuss the air power situation in the United States and in the world. I think he is very well informed, is a lovable gentleman, and is extremely patriotic. I received a copy of the address which the Senator from Georgia has asked to have printed in the RECORD. I hope every Member of the Senate will have an opportunity to read it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the statement made by the distinguished majority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT AVIATION EDUCATION MEANS TO ME

(By Arthur Godfrey)

It is a distinct and very great privilege to be permitted to speak to this audience tonight. As a matter of fact, it is a real treat for me. Rarely, indeed, do I have the opportunity to appear publicly without my ukulele or my jokebook. American radio and television audiences (God bless them), unfortunately are not noted for swarming to their sets these days to listen to a man with a message; especially, curiously enough, if that message is for "their own good." And, more especially, if the man, burning with this message, happens to be a popular entertainer. 'Tis a most discouraging paradox: if a man be a recognized authority on a subject such as ours tonight, few save those who already understand him, will bother to tune in his broadcast. If, on the other hand, he happens to be a so-called big name in the entertainment world, he has to use extreme care about the manner in which he tries to get his message across, no matter how well informed he may be, no matter how dedicated, no matter how bursting with the desire to share his information with his countrymen.

When people picture you a whimsical clown, they tune you in to be entertained—not scolded. It's extremely difficult ever to get them to take you seriously. For the past quarter century, therefore, I have been forced to restrict most of my "lectures" on airpower to a word here and a sentence there sandwiched in between poor jokes and commercial plugs for my good sponsors.

Having said that, let me add quickly that I've got a fair amount of uneasiness about addressing a group of professional educators on any aspect of how to do better the job of aviation education. In my business—which has its complicated, technical aspects, too—we're always leery about the well-meaning gent who wants to blind us with the brilliance of his ignorance. Sit easy, I'm not about to lecture you on how to run your business.

Instead, and begging your indulgence in advance, I'm going to think out loud a little—about what has happened, what is happening today and, maybe, even take a look-see ahead with you at what lies beyond the horizon.

Now this may come as a surprise to some of you but flying has been a consuming interest of mine ever since that first ride I got in a Navy flying boat at Norfolk, Va., in the late summer of 1920.

I suppose the big attraction then was the thrill, the glamor of it all.

Like a million other American kids—I was fascinated by the accounts of the dogfights of the First World War, led by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker.

But, over and beyond the appeal of what others had done in the air, was the quite indescribable feel of wind in my face as I sat in an open cockpit—as near to being completely out of this world as is ever given to earth-bound man. Aviation was something far removed from education in the formal sense, and few dreamed of aviation ever having any commercial usefulness.

We learned about flying because we wanted to. If anybody had said what we were doing was educational, we'd have dropped it like a hot potato.

In those golden days, everyone who flew was a hero. The men who flew the mail were heroes. Short-lived ones; each year 1 out of every 4 was killed. The Army pilots and the Navy pilots were heroes, too, but now they were peacetime heroes. There was no grim specter of impending war, we thought.

Ten years later, Lindbergh and a host of other trans-Atlantic fliers had fired the imagination of the whole world. Commercial aviation was struggling to get off the ground, and Mrs. Godfrey's boy Arthur was just barely becoming solvent to the point where he could begin the business of self-education in aviation with real live airplanes. By about 1929 or 1930, I had become acquainted with the special joys of gliding, quiet as a wheeling hawk across the sky. I had many different instructors. Few of them remained in one place very long in those days. We flew in many types of airplanes.

Outstanding among those who gave me my early training in the fundamentals of flying, was Bob Ashburn, of Alexandria, Va.—still one of the greatest in the business. The planes we used were Aeroncas and Taylor Cubs—little 40-horsepower jobs on wheels or floats. Bob had an OX–5 Travelair and a J–6–7 Challenger. George Brinkerhoff, who still runs the oldest airport in America, College Park, Md., gave me instruction in the old fleet trainers. We had a wonderful time, in the true sense of the word, during those happy, carefree days and we logged hundreds of flying hours.

Most important, I soaked up every particle of information I could get my hands on about flying, about planes and their engines, about the men who flew for a living, about meteorology, and about navigation. I devoured every piece of literature on the subject I could find and on bad days I sat for hours absorbed in "hangar flying" swapping lies with other pilots. My aviation education was progressing.

Simultaneously, I began to talk about flying on the radio, and I've been talking about aviation ever since. Once in Washington, about 1934, I said something over the air, about why didn't my listeners—the ones who wanted to—come out to the little airport—Beacon Field—just south of Alexandria, Va., and let me give 'em a ride. I expected 3 or 4, maybe even a dozen, would take me up on the offer. Well sir, before we got through making good on that one, there were hundreds. We had to call into service every light plane available in the Washington area, and I darned near went broke.

I've never been sorry I did that. Even today—every now and then—somebody comes up to me and says: "You know, you gave me my first ride in an airplane." At least one of them is a senior captain on American Airlines today.

For the past 5 years, I've been privileged to give a leg up to a bunch of transportation students at American University in Washington. They get the chance to learn to fly—and from my standpoint, what's best of all, their instructor is the same Bob Ashburn who was one of mine nearly a quarter of a century ago.

In the early days, then, I talked only about the joys of aviation—the astringent cleanliness that pervades your mind and body when you get into the air. But, in

addition to flying those little planes myself, I had become practically a commuter between Washington and New York, flying in the early tri-motored Stinsons, Curtis Condors, and the first Douglas DC–2's and DC–3's. I began to learn about commercial aviation—including the fact that even with DC–3's, the airlines made very little money in those days. Eastern Airlines was the first to operate in the black without subsidy, years before any other.

Too many of the airline flights carried but a single passenger, me. I got thus to know a good many of the pilots personally—great guys, all of them. And, one way or another, I gathered many priceless pilot-hours in twin-engined equipment and, after the war, four-engined transports. Little by little, I got an insight into the tremendous ground organization that is required to keep those planes in the air. More and more I realized how necessary to the welfare of our Nation is a healthy, growing air transport network.

That realization, you might say, was the equivalent of a passing mark for me, in another grade in the school of aviation education.

When the clouds that foretold the beginning of World War II began to darken, military aviation in this country had fallen behind in many respects. Our long-range bombers—the B–17 and the B–24—were the best in the world, but we had precious few of them. Our fighters—the ones we had on Pearl Harbor day—consisted of too few of any kind. The ones that were really good were hardly beyond the prototype stage.

Looking back, we can thank God for two things upon which I'm afraid we can no longer depend—our brave allies who fought on in the face of overwhelming odds to give us time to build the planes to punch back—and for the broad Atlantic and Pacific which protected our shores.

Late in 1944, I flew in a B–24 to Saipan, getting there on the eve of the first B–29 raid on Tokyo. I thrilled to see the fleets of those great superforts take to the air. While there, I learned a grim lesson—one all of us should keep uppermost in our minds: Those B–29's flew to Tokyo and back in the face of some of the most savage defense the Japs could mount. We lost a lot of them and a lot of good men—but no mission was ever turned back by enemy action short of its target.

After the war, and the end of gasoline rationing, I went back to light planes again. I fooled around with a Luscombe and the grand little Taylorcraft and the Piper Cub—graduating to the SeaBee; to the Navion (of which I have owned three successive models); to a Twin-Beech. In 1950, when Eastern Airlines began to retire their DC–3's, my good and dear old friend—one of my boyhood idols—one of the truly big men of aviation—Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, sold me one at book value.

I had it completely rebuilt better than new; and, equipped with DC–4 engines and the latest available electronic equipment, it serves me as a fast, dependable, comfortable transport for my troupe and other business associates. Last fall, I traded in my last Navion for a new Beechcraft Bonanza, the sweetest little four-place, single-engine airplane I have ever flown. In it, I commute back and forth between New York and my home in Virginia each week.

You may be interested in knowing that I have just ordered a brand-new helicopter from Larry Bell to be delivered within the next month or two. I borrowed one from him last November and demonstrated it on my television programs from Florida and learned, interestingly enough, that since I can fly and maneuver it within the range of a television camera, it seems to arouse more interest in aviation generally than a fixed-wing airplane.

In 1950, however, my aviation education took on a new phase. Come Armed Forces Day that year (I believe it was the first such) I was invited by the Air Force, even though at that time I was a Naval Reserve officer, to fly an Air Force jet—a little T–33 trainer. Up until that time, despite thousands of hours of experience in flying my own and other commercial and executive airplanes, I had been denied the privilege of learning to fly naval aircraft on grounds of physical disability.

After having demonstrated rather quickly to my Air Force hosts my ability to fly that jet, they half jokingly, half seriously invited me to resign my Navy commission and join up with them—saying they would be delighted to have me learn to fly everything they had. I began to "ride" my Navy friends a little bit about that and it wasn't very long before (more to shut me up than anything else, I think) they permitted me to take a course of instruction at the Naval Air Training Command in Pensacola.

I never worked harder in my life and, noting my enthusiasm and earnestness, my instructors, bless their hearts, went to work with a will with me and after several short tours of duty, by 1953, I had qualified as a carrier pilot, had checked out in jets, became a qualified instrument pilot and learned to fly helicopters. I even took a short whack at blimps at Lakehurst. I had won the coveted Navy wings.

None of this was easy; all of it was wonderful, even though it did take a lot of time away from my professional commitments. What I've been telling you is not to prove what a smart guy I am, but so you'll understand that for me it hasn't been enough to learn about aviation in books—I had to get in all over.

Sometimes I wish I could have confined my love for and knowledge of aviation to the sheer happiness of flying; to the weekly joy of heading back to Leesburg to my beloved wife and children; to an occasional romp through an old-fashioned loop or a chandelle or an Immelmann.

But, as time when on, it became increasingly evident that V–E day and V–J day were just the end of fighting Germany and Japan.

We had another enemy—whom we might easily have put down—at the time. Never, in the history of the world, it seems to me, has a situation been handled quite so badly. As late as 1952 or even 1953 this Russian threat to our way of life might have been removed—without firing a shot—without dropping a bomb—yes, without risking a single life. And there were those in high places who sought to do it that way—but you know how this lovable, ponderous, slow-witted democracy of ours works. It doesn't take much to get us going—just a bomb or two dropped on us. The only trouble is—nowadays it only takes one bomb—in one plane—per city.

Can you guess what one high Government official told me 3 years ago, when I asked him to give me his objections to the proposal to go over and stick a gun in Stalin's ribs and make him pull that Iron Curtain down? He said: "Arthur, we couldn't do that: it would frighten our Allies, and, besides, if we defeat Russia, we'll have to feed all those people and it would break us."

That kindly old gentleman is still very active in our Government in Washington today.

Let's face it, we're engaged in a bitter technological race with Russia. The stakes, on our side of the table, are not only survival of our way of life but of our very own lives.

The weapons which comprise modern air power have become enormously complicated. Even compared to the airplanes of World War II, today's supersonic fighters and near-supersonic, long-range bombers are as different as is today's television set from the crystal receivers and earphones of yesterday's radio.

They cannot be flown by "weekend warriors" or part-time reservists of any nature, no matter how dedicated they may be. If we are to maintain the deterrant air superiority so vital to our survival, we must induce the cream of America's youth to become professional airmen.

Military aviation must be made an attractive career. How do this? The same way we could make teaching a more attractive profession—pay decent salaries.

The record of the strategic bomber in World War II is there for all to see. No American bombing mission was ever stopped by enemy action short of its target. It is only reasonable to assume, therefore, that any first-class bombing force can do the same—whether the bomber crews speak Russian or English. We lost only 5 percent of our bombers to enemy action in World War II—4 percent to fighters and 1 percent to ack-ack. The men who fly our bombers today, many of them veterans of scores of missions, doubt seriously if those figures would be changed much in a modern air battle. But, without going into great detail, let's say that our defenses are five times better than the Nazis and the Japs had. Let's say they're 10 times better—or 15 times better. That would mean we could keep 75 percent of an enemy bombing mission from reaching the target. Only 25 percent would get through. But, you see, nowadays it takes only one bomb—in one plane—per city. Each bomb more powerful than all the bombs dropped in World War II. Just let me ask you to stop here a minute and picture if you can what would happen if only six Russian bombers got through our defenses some night—each one carrying an H-bomb. New York, Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Washington, and Seattle. One bomb per city. Oh, they don't get away with it. Somebody shoots 'em down all right eventually—but the bombs are away. Those six cities are gone. Three or four or five million people are dead. We've got no Government seat (and probably no Government)—no power to produce—the great American know-how is all shot. Ah, but we've still got a few guided missiles.

The Navy's out there somewhere steaming along at 31 knots—and the Army's shooting off those atomic cannons at somebody, someplace. It was back in 1951 when I first became really aware of this mess. I got a big shock listening to a high ranking Naval officer make a speech one night. He said General Curt LeMay was a madman and called the B–36 bomber the most horrible waste of time and money and manpower in the history of our country. I decided to find out for myself—because if that were true, then we were begging for trouble.

Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, who shortened his life by sticking to the job of Air Force Chief of Staff long after he had become deathly ill, made it possible for me to get the facts. I met General LeMay and I have since made a comprehensive study of his command. That man is so dedicated, so competent, so inspiring. To know him is to admire him—to know him well is to believe and to have confidence that he and his command are doing the very best job that can be done with what they have. Their tools must be better and in greater numbers. His equipment has been B–36's and B–47's—which I have flown. They now have the B–52, but in small quantities. Without more and soon, the grim threat increases in an inexorable geometric ratio, a factor I'll have more to say about later.

Last fall, I wrote about this experience in the Saturday Evening Post. They titled it "This Is My Story." In the section about flying in the B–47, the printers goofed and it came out I had been flying at Mach 9 instead of 9 tenths. Maybe I haven't been kidded about flying at more than 5,000 miles per hour.

What I have discovered in this latest course of my aviation education is that instead of the unification of the armed services we're supposed to have—we have triplification—with each service competing bitterly against the others to obtain a bigger share of the Defense Department dollar. The technological revolution has obsoleted most of the weapons used effectively as recently as the Korean war. But, you'd never believe it—to hear some of the arguments.

In order not to embarrass my friends, in order to be free to say what I had found to be true—after long and very serious consideration—I took a step last spring that was a tough one: I resigned my proud commission in the Naval Reserve. I think we are in grave danger, and believe me this is one time I'd love to be proven wrong.

Listen to me another few minutes.

You and I know that air power includes the sum total of a nation's aeronautical development, inclusive of its public opinion, as Gill Robb Wilson said not long ago, "What military aviation is to the business of security, civil aviation is to the security of business; for defense there are no geographic perimeters but only those which define the aeronautical stature of a nation. These studied conclusions all seem very clear to us.

"But we must remember that the American lay public has had no background from which to reach this understanding. Our public education is only scantily geared to produce airwise youth."

Our adult population is even more ignorant of the most elementary principles of aeronautics. During the past 4 or 5 years, we have managed to convince millions of people of the comparative safety of airline travel—but that's all they know about it—and apparently that's all they care. In true, typically American fashion, even those who use the airlines in their travels, spend a lot of time and energy cussing the inconveniences. Airport development has been a bone of contention in most every city. I've seen airports built far out on the outskirts of a town where there were none but scattered farmhouses. Within a few years, thriving communities have been built around these airports. And from whom come the complaints about noise and low-flying aircraft? The people who built their homes alongside the runways.

If somebody wants to build a new radio or television tower, where do they locate it? Right off the end of the runway that's in use most of the time. These new communities must have schools for their children. Where do they build them? Close by the airport where the noises will cause the most interference with classroom work. And even those with sufficient vision to plan and build an airport, where do they put it? On the leeward side of the city so that planes taking off on the runway planned for the prevailing winds will have to climb out over the city, thus disturbing everybody's sleep.

Airline passengers, actually, pay even less attention today to the captain and copilot up in the cockpit than they give to the engineer and fireman in the locomotive of a pullman train. All they want to know is how much does a ticket cost, why don't you serve a cocktail with the luncheon and why is the pilot bouncing the plane like that? They even hope the plane hits an air pocket or two so that they can brag about it to their friends when they get back on the ground and describe how rough the flight was because they had a tail-wind. They could actually feel it kicking the tail around and the pilot was exhausted.

It is nothing short of amazing to me that aviation—even military aviation—has advanced so far along as it has in this country. You'd be astounded if you knew how little some of the men in the highest places in Washington know about aviation.

In 53 short years, the science of aeronautics has progressed at an appalling rate. This, despite public apathy, despite a sometimes indifferent Government attitude, and despite often paralyzing opposition even to this day. And further, despite the unheeded fact that aviation has led the great technological march of the past half century, if we were to plot a curve showing development of the speed of aircraft over the past 50 years, we would find that it has just about doubled itself every 10 years.

By 1910 we had reached 100 miles per hour; 1920, 220 miles per hour; 1930, 300 miles per hour; 1940, 600 miles per hour; 1950, 1,200 miles per hour; and you know where we're headed for now. If you plot the gross national product over the same period of time, you find the curve almost coincides. The same goes for the use of electrical energy measures in trillions of kilowatt-hours. The same goes for the national wealth, for construction costs, for patents, for population, for mental patients, for discovery of the elements.

In other words, if you combine all these curves, you come up with one which I think we can logically label our national-growth curve. Call it coincidence, if you will, but that national-growth curve follows almost exactly our airspeed curve, proving, it seems to me, that even those who have never seen an airplane, let alone ride in one, owe every last bit of the high standards of living in America today to the growth of aviation.

Furthermore, a study of this curve will show that normal technical and associated progress is a geometric progression and that progress occurs at any given time at a rate substantially proportional to the total progress made up to that time.

And yet, if you plot the actual support given to Air Force research and development from 1930 up to the present time, you will find that this country really believes in research and development and is willing to support it only when danger threatens.

The current research and development effort in the Air Force is about one one-thousandth part of the gross national product, having leveled off since Korea at about this rate. Therein lies the key to the desperate situation in which we find ourselves today insofar as our airpower is concerned. We blow hot and we blow cold. Our national policy does not recognize the natural rate of technical progress—does not recognize the natural increase in support we have to build into a research and development program if we are going to progress at a normal rate.

That's the reason we find ourselves in America today losing progressively faster the power to deter a long-range Soviet bombing attack. Therefore, unless we make some changes in the right direction pretty quick, some time next year, or by 1958 at the latest, our deterrent curve will be crossed by the Russian deterrent curve. What happens after that, only providence knows.

Our deterrent power for the past 5 years has been, and is today, a fleet of B–36 intercontinental bombers. For those same 5 years, the B–36 has been obsolescent and is today obsolete. It must be replaced by a much faster, better airplane—the B–52.

Five years ago, I started telling this story, not only to the listeners to my programs but to select audiences such as this. But these things sink in slowly, and the path of those of us who are seriously concerned has been a rocky one. To date, we haven't even got one wing of B–52's in combat readiness. We are building them at the ridiculous rate of four per month. Plans have been instituted to raise that production to 16 or 17 a month, I have read. By what date, I don't know.

Meanwhile, all I know is that last May, almost 1 year ago, the Russians allowed us to see in flight more comparable airplanes than have been delivered to our Strategic Air Command to this day. From the articles I have read in public print, authored by people supposed to know, I gather that the Russians are building their version of the B–52 at the rate of at least 35 a month and have been doing so for at least a year. We've been concerned with more bang for a buck and haven't stopped to realize that in a critical time like this you can't get a bang out of a buck.

We don't know—those of us who have been fighting this fight—how much good we have done or how much progress we have made in awakening the American people to the threat that lies only hours away across the North Pole. But there has been a stirring of activity in Washington and in remote places like Ramey Air Force Base in Puerto Rico, where the Joint Chiefs of Staff just met to review the situation. A select Senate committee has been appointed to investigate the facts. Lots of people are beginning to take a good hard look at things. There are many reasons for it as there naturally would be in our system of government with its checks and balances and in our military picture with its own checks and balances. But regardless of the reasons, I am very much heartened by the fact that we are looking at it and that this will give the American people a few cold turkey facts. I am confident that given the facts to which they are entitled—American will come up with the right answers. I know, too, that our way of life depends on those decisions being made now.

Phew—I sure got serious, but that's the way I feel, and that's what aviation education means to me.

Let me close with this one thought—be proud, ladies and gentlemen, in the vital work you are doing. Be strong in the knowledge that upon the success of your work depends the freedom we hold so dear.

Thank you, and God bless you.

THE PELTON DAM, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent statement that was made by my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], this morning before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the Pelton Dam issue in my State; also a statement which was made by Mr. Roland Bowles, of the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League, on the same issue, one of the clearest, most concise, and, I believe, most clarifying statements on the subject I have ever heard; and also the text of my statement before the committee.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time which the committee is giving today to hearing opening testimony on the bill introduced by Senator MORSE and myself, S. 3250, to deal with the immediate problem of water law raised by the Pelton Dam decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. I realize that your committee has a particularly heavy schedule this week and in the weeks immediately ahead, and that you have interrupted consideration of other measures before you for the sake of these hearings today. Consequently, Mr. Chairman, I shall keep my own remarks brief.

I asked the committee whether it might not be possible to have these first hearings on S. 3250 today because hearings are also being held this week by other committees on related legislation. As one example, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is now holding hearings on S. 863 introduced

by Senator BARRETT which would have a major impact on the relationship between the Federal Government and the States as to the use and control of water on federally owned lands within the different States. This bill, and others like it, which have been introduced in the House of Representatives, have received much of their present impetus from the Supreme Court's opinion in the case of the Federal Power Commission against Oregon—the decision which we refer to as the "Pelton Dam case" for short.

Mr. Chairman, at the conclusion of my remarks, I am going to ask to have made a part of the record of these hearings the Supreme Court's opinion, from 349 U. S. 435, as well as my statement in the Senate in introducing S. 3250. At this time, however, I should only like to review briefly the background of the Pelton Dam case which led up to the Supreme Court's decision of last summer.

The controversy arose 7 years ago from an application by a predecessor of the Portland General Electric Co. to construct a hydroelectric project on the Deschutes River. The Deschutes is a tributary of the Columbia River which is located entirely within the borders of the State of Oregon and which is one of the famous fishing streams of the Pacific Northwest and, indeed, of the Nation. Agencies of the State of Oregon—the State Game Commission and the State Fish Commission—as well as the Oregon Division of the Izaak Walton League intervened before the Federal Power Commission in opposition to the application for a license to construct the Pelton project on the Deschutes.

In 1953 the power company unsuccessfully sought to have State opposition to its project eliminated by means of special State legislation.

The Federal Power Commission granted a license to the Portland General Electric Co., overriding the objections of the intervening agencies of the Oregon State Government. It is important to note that the FPC did this without any finding concerning navigability of the Deschutes; it based its authority for the license on the fact that the project is to be built on lands belonging to the United States.

The State took an appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. That court set aside the Commission's order on the ground that Federal public lands laws had long ago made the use of nonnavigable waters on Federal lands subject to State control, and that licensees would have to comply with State water law.

Upon the petition of the FPC, the Supreme Court took up the case for review and reversed the decision of the Court of Appeals. The significance of the issue presented by the case and in S. 3250 is shown not only by the fact that the Supreme Court granted certiorari, but also by the fact that several other Western States in which, as in Oregon, the Federal Government owns a large proportion of the land, joined Oregon in the litigation as amici curiae.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a lawyer, and I shall not try to develop in detail the full legal implications of the Supreme Court's decision that the United States may, by a simple administrative order, "reserve" for itself or its licensees the water flowing through all Federal public lands without regard to the procedures of State legislation designed to carry out State policies for the best use of this precious resource. I do want to point out, however, that S. 3250 does not seek to go nearly so far as other pending bills to establish a universal supremacy of State law over Federal needs in this field. I believe that some of the other proposals I have seen go too far, and that as a result of seeking a complete and far-reaching solution, no legislation at all may be enacted in this highly controversial field. Therefore, my bill, S. 3250, proposes only to reverse the narrow basis for the specific holding in the Pelton Dam case—i. e., that, whatever might otherwise be the law on the Federal public lands, the creation of a reservation permits the FPC to disregard State water law in licensing a project even on a wholly intrastate nonnavigable stream.

Section 2 of my bill would revoke the license granted for the Pelton Dam project pending any future procedures in accordance with law as amended by my proposed amendment to the Federal Power Act.

That amendment, to summarize it once more, would only apply to the question of FPC licenses—not to Federal projects—and to only licenses for projects which come under FPC jurisdiction because they are to be built on lands of the United States. As to such projects, of which the Pelton Dam happens to be the example which raised the issue of State water law all the way to the Supreme Court, S. 3250 proposes only to overcome the effect of a Federal "reservation" on the applicability or nonapplicability of State law—in other words, to return the law to the position in which it was before the Supreme Court's decision. Because this aim is much more modest than that of the other proposals made in the wake of the Pelton Dam decision, I believe it can and should be enacted at this session of Congress.

STATEMENT BY ROLAND BOWLES, PRESIDENT, OREGON DIVISION, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE ON PELTON DAM BILL, S. 235, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Gentlemen, the Deschutes River from its source to its confluence with the Columbia River lies entirely within the State of Oregon, the source being in the easterly slope of the Cascade Mountains; and it empties into the Columbia some few miles above The Dalles, on the south side of the great river. The principal tributary of the Deschutes in the area with which we are concerned is the Metolius River, a stream that is world renowned in a world of rivers, by reason of the constancy of its flow and the relatively slight fluctuation in temperature from the coldest day in winter to the hottest day in summer. The Metolius arises from the porous lava of the eastern slope of the Cascade Mountains, which acts as an absorbent for the rainfall and snow, thus accounting for both the constancy of flow and the remarkably small fluctuation in temperature.

In 1909 the State of Oregon enacted its basic water law, wherein it laid claim to all waters within the State of Oregon from all sources of supply, pursuant to the Desert Land Acts of 1866, 1870, and 1877, which by that time had been tested numerous times in the courts and tested in numerous cases by the Supreme Court of the United States, always to the end that the intention of Congress in those acts had been to give to the States the right of control over water on all Federal lands. This law became effective in July, 1909, and on December 31, 1909, the Secretary of the Interior withdrew some of the public domain on the east bank of the Deschutes River, in the area concerned in the Pelton project, from entry and reserved it for power purposes. Other lands along the east bank in the project area were withdrawn, until the withdrawals were completed in about 1920. The west bank of the river in the area is in Indian Reservation, which was established by treaty in 1855. Numerous other power withdrawals were made along the banks of the Deschutes River between 1910 and 1920, all the way to its mouth.

No attempt was made by any company to exploit the power resources of the Deschutes River until about 1922 when substantial surveys were run, and no development of any kind was undertaken until in 1949 Portland General Electric Co. made application to the Hydroelectric Commission of Oregon for a permit to construct a dam at the Pelton site. The hearing was held by the Hydroelectric Commission of Oregon, in which all of the interested fisheries agencies objected to any development in this stretch of the river. The objection by the fisheries agencies was on several grounds. The first was that any project of the height contemplated would inevitably destroy the anadramous fishes of the salmonoid type using the river above the point of the proposed construction; and that the State of Oregon through its Fish Commission had established a salmon hatchery at the headwaters of the Metolius River, which is the principal spawning stream for the spring Chinook salmon using the Deschutes River system, and that this hatchery would be made utterly useless as the result of the proposal by Portland General Electric Co.; and also the Oregon State Game Commission had established a hatchery in the Metolius System for taking the spawn from the summer run of steelhead that likewise used that stretch of the Metolius River, this fish providing a great deal of the recreational fishery for which the Deschutes River System is world famous.

Attempts were being made at that time to establish a run of sockeye, or blueback, as they are locally known, in Blue and Suttle Lakes, which are part of the Metolius System. The Metolius River System, which has throughout the year an almost contant temperature of relatively cool water, is ideal for the hatching and rearing of the types of salmonoid fishes peculiar to this river system, in that the spring run of Chinook come into the river in June, July, and August and do not spawn until the latter part of September and into October, spending several months prior to spawning in the cool waters. The summer run of steelhead come in in July, August, and September and do not spawn until the following January through April.

The Portland General Electric Co. had proposed a holding pond system at the point of construction, holding these fish in artificial ponds until they were ready to spawn, removing the eggs, placing them in a hatchery till the eggs were "eyed out," and then transporting the eggs to the hatcheries in the Metolius area, holding the small fish in holding ponds at the large hatcheries until they were ready for their downstream migration, then transporting them again in tank trucks below the dam and releasing them downstream of the dam.

In contrast to the cool waters of the Metolius, temperatures in the Deschutes at the pont of construction of the Pelton Dam have been known to reach 68° during the time the fish would be held. That alone is enough to indicate that the salmonoid fishes could not withstand the long interval of time in captivity prior to spawning, as the temperature increase would cause the fish to become diseased and die before the spawning operation could take place.

This proposal for fish handling has been tried at other similar structures in the Northwest, with known results, namely, an almost complete elimination of the salmonoid fish of the types encountered here.

At the time of the original proposal to the Hydroelectric Commission of Oregon no reregulating dam was contemplated by the applicant. As a result of the strenuous objections on the part of the fisheries agencies, permits were denied by the State agencies to Portland General Electric Co. An application in the interim was made to the Federal Power Commission, and a hearing on that application was held in Portland, Oreg., beginning June 8, 1951. At that time a reregulating dam was proposed some 2½ miles below the main structure, to impound the waters that would be released from the generators, twice each day, over a period of approximately 3 hours.

The operation contemplated by the Portland General Electric Co. being a peaking operation, this type of operation, unregulated, would of course cause very serious fluctuation in the stream below the dam, and inevitably would result in serious erosive effects on the bed and banks of the stream itself, as well as possibly death to people using the river for recreational purposes, or for any purpose.

The reregulating dam will be so operated as to maintain the flow of the Deschutes River in a constant state, in other words, the same amount of water will be released from the reregulating dam as would normally flow in the channel were no structures placed across the river.

At the Federal Power Commission hearing the same general principle of fisheries handling was suggested by the applicant, and an offer was made by the applicant to provide the State fisheries agencies the sum of $100,000 annually for increased costs made necessary as the result. This was objected to on the grounds as was the situation before the Hydroelectric Commission of Oregon, that it would be destructive of the fisheries resource, and no known method of handling the anadromous fish involved could replace the natural spawning and rearing areas, and that the salmonoids would eventually be eliminated from the river system above the point of construction at least.

The State of Oregon likewise objected on the ground that the Federal Power Commission had no jurisdiction to grant a license under the Federal Power Act until all State laws had been complied with with respect to the utilization of water resource. Nonetheless, a license was granted by the Federal Power Commission, in spite of the failure of the applicant, that it had complied with State laws. This license was challenged in the Circuit Court of Appeals of the United States, Ninth Circuit, San Francisco, which in an opinion of February 18, 1954, ruled that the Federal Power Commission had no authority to issue such a license. The case was then appealed to the United States Supreme Court, which, on June 6, 1955, ruled that the Circuit Court of Appeals was in error, in that Pelton Dam would be constructed on "reserved lands" of the United States, and the Desert Land Acts specifically exempted reserved lands from their application.

However, the Federal Power Commission's general counsel, Mr. Gatchell, has publicly stated that the Supreme Court decision has not nor did the Federal Power Commission in its findings and order, grant to the applicant any right to the use of the water, only a right to construct a dam. This decision then, of course, leaves the situation exceedingly clouded in that respect, and in the respect that the reregulating dam will not be constructed on "reserved lands."

The lands involved at the reregulating dam site are private lands, on both banks. Those on the east bank had been a part of the public domain and taken up for homestead long ago, as were those on the west bank of the river at that point. And it is at that point that the migratory fishes will be blocked from the use of their normal path to their historic spawning grounds and whatever fishery facilities are finally decided upon are installed.

The fisheries resources agencies also objected to this license on the further ground that the 1948 report of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, known as the 308 Report, recommended that all construction of dams on streams entering the Columbia River west of McNary dam, of which the Deschutes is one (other than the Willamette) should be withheld for a period of years, and that these streams should be used and built up so far as possible as salmon-spawning streams, to offset the losses that were effected because of huge upstream projects such as Grand Coulee Dam. All interested agencies, including the Federal Power Commission, had taken part in the discussion and formulation of the policies as shown in the 308 Report, even though they had not been a formal party to it. As the result of the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers, the Congress of the United States set about implementing the program with respect to salmon fisheries, which is known as the lower Columbia River program, by appropriating money for the establishment of hatcheries, putting in fishways past both natural and manmade obstructions, and stream clearance and related facilities, to the end that these streams could be fully utilized to their greatest extent, to rehabilitate the salmon runs for which the Columbia River system had long been famous. Up to the present time, the Congress of the United States has appropriated in excess of $12 million in the furtherance of this program.

In excess of $200,000 had been allocated by the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, for expansion of the salmon hatchery on the Metolius River at the time the application was made by Portland General Electric Co. for this construction. As the result of the application work was suspended, no funds have been released, and that expansion is at a total standstill at this time; indicating that the Fish and Wildlife Service feel definitely and positively that any construction at the Pelton site would result in a wasteful expenditure of funds for a hatchery upstream.

In 1953 the legislature of the State of Oregon had an opportunity to pass upon this project in its session, when a bill sponsored by the Portland General Electric Co., which would in effect have given them a permit for this construction, was denied in the lower house of that legislature.

In recent weeks petitions have been circulated throughout the State, a sample of which is being left with this committee, and in excess of 15,000 names were secured within a matter of days upon these petitions. All circulation was on a purely voluntary basis. No funds were expended to secure names or signers. People from every walk of life and of every political complexion have expressed violent opposition.

The Save-the-Deschutes Committee, which was formed primarily for the purpose of protecting this river from encroachment of high hydroelectric construction such as is contemplated here, is composed of representatives of many sportsman's groups, including but not limited to the Izaak Walton League of America, the Oregon Wildlife Federation, and others, many independent individuals who neither fish nor hunt, the Oregon State Grange, the International Woodworkers A. F. of L., the Oregon State Industrial Union Council, CIO., and others, who are opposing this project, irrespective of whatever agency, either public or private, were proposing its construction.

The Deschutes River, as this committee may well know, has long been famous over much of the world, for its magnificent rainbow trout and the wonderful fishing and recreational opportunities that it affords. This construction will inevitably do much to destroy that recreational resource. More important, however, though we are not minimizing the value of the fishing and the recreational resource, is that matter of water.

The Deschutes River is in a comparatively dry area where irrigation is necessary to the production of crops. It is true that present irrigation water is protected under the terms of the license granted by the Federal Power Commission, but unfortunately the Federal Power Commission failed to take into consideration two very important and fundamental points, the first of which is that our population in this area is growing at a rate substantially faster than that of the rest of the Nation, that that population has now more time to spend in recreational pursuits and more opportunity to pursue outdoor recreation than ever in our history by reason of good roads, good automobiles and generally more money to spend.

Recreation is the third largest industry in the State of Oregon, exceeded only by lumbering and agriculture. Tourists from outside the State, in the year 1955, spent in excess of $120 million in Oregon. It is the considered opinion of competent persons in the field that if the resident tourist dollar were added to this, it is very likely that the total would exceed even agriculture. In 1955 there were 322,529 persons licensed to angle in the State of Oregon. Experience of the past has indicated that this number will increase with each succeeding year, so long as there is reasonable opportunity to enjoy this type of recreation. Certainly it is not too much to ask that at least some few streams, of major importance, in the State of Oregon be dedicated to this task.

The other aspect of this Deschutes River that was totally overlooked by the Federal Power Commission is that while electrical energy can be generated in many fashions, from oil, natural gas, even wind, though that would not be recommended in this area, we will only have the amount of water that God has given us. If the waters of the Deschutes system are dedicated to the production of electrical energy, in defiance to the expressed public policy of the State, then this water will be forever denied other uses. While we realize that the water will not be consumed in the process, still it must be delivered to the turbines and cannot be taken out in the event that our expanding population some day might demand that this water be devoted to irrigation or domestic consumption. With the tremendous potential that is now on the immediate horizon, to be derived from the application of atomic sources to power production, it would be the greatest folly to tie up a river as important for other benefits, in a single purpose project, which will have a rated capacity of 120,000 kilowatts, but by the figures of the Federal Power Commission itself will only be able to produce on a constant basis not over 40 percent of that rated capacity. Contrary to the claims of the applicant in the hearing in 1951, who stated that we would have a power shortage in the Northwest by 1955, we have ample power; and all people connected with the industry who are of fair mind, state that with the construction on the large streams now contemplated or in progress, we face no power shortage prior to 1964 or 1965, and by that time atomic energy is likely to be a major factor in the electrical picture of the entire Nation.

This construction is not needed, particularly at this time. The recreational aspects of the stream are certainly needed at this time, and will be more greatly needed as our population expands.

Fisheries resources are especially needed. They cannot ever be replaced, once they are lost. Every square yard of spawning and rearing area must be maintained in order to preserve what little is remaining of the resource that meant so much to the economy of the region in years gone by. The salmon fishing industry has made its sacrifice in this program, along with the many others, in that it has been severely curtailed in its operations and fishing time. Certainly another sacrifice in the form of eliminating spawning and rearing grounds, such as will result from this construction, is neither wise nor advisable, particularly when no power shortage exists.

In addition, the economic factors of this construction must also be considered. In the hearing before the Federal Power Commission, the applicant stated that it had made application to the Office of Defense Mobilization for a certificate of necessity, giving it a rapid writeoff against the income taxes on this project, that if the applicant received the requested writeoff of 80 percent over a 60-month period that it could produce power

at $22.60 per kilowatt-year; that if it received no writeoff and the normal amortization would apply, power would cost $26.20 per kilowatt-year. They were given a certificate to the extent of 65 percent in 60 months, which means that the power produced at this plant will cost approximately $24 per kilowatt-year, in contrast to power that is sold by the Bonneville Power Administration of $17.50 per kilowatt-year.

We are interested in the entire body of this legislation, S. 3250, first, that the license granted by the Federal Power Commission to the Portland General Electric Co. to construct what is known as the Pelton project, F. P. C. No. 2030, be revoked; and secondly, that the position of the State with respect to their right to control the waters of their internal nonnavigable streams, such as the Deschutes, be restored to them; for water is the lifeblood of the West, and the people closest to those resources are most generally in a much better position to determine their use, than a board or commission sitting some 3,000 miles away, for the plans and aspirations of the people who have grown up close to those resources are more likely to result in a wiser use for the greatest number over the greatest length of time.

THE PROBLEMS POSED BY THE PELTON DAM PROJECT AND DECISION

(Statement by Senator WAYNE MORSE on S. 3250 before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Tuesday, March 21, 1956)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committe, your action in scheduling hearings on S. 3250 is appreciated. As you know, I am a sponsor of the bill and, of course, advocate favorable action. In fairness to the many groups in central Oregon and to the committee, I must state for the record that this is a controversial project. Therefore, I request that the opportunity be afforded advocates of the Pelton Dam project to present their views to the committee.

At this time I do not wish to make an extended statement because there are witnesses from Oregon whose time in Washington is very limited.

TWO BASIC PROBLEMS PRESENTED

A. State authority over intrastate, nonnavigable streams

The Pelton Dam, for which the Federal Power Commission has issued a license over the protest of Oregon agencies, would be located on the Deshcutes River, a wholly intrastate stream. In the case before the Commission and the courts, no party contested its classification as a nonnavigable waterway. Federal jurisdiction was based upon the fact that the dam would be built on Federal land, which had been reserved by administrative action for future power development.

The Supreme Court's decision upholding the Federal Power Commission license was based in major part upon a technical difference between "public lands of the United States" and "reserved" lands. There was no doubt that as to "public lands" the Desert Lands Act applied, thereby insuring the State control over water rights. The Court held, however, that reserved lands, though formerly public lands, were not covered by the Desert Land Act and hence the State did not have the authority to withhold approval of a dam and the use of the water proposed.

It is quite clear that this is a technical kind of distinction which has no support in policy considerations. I do not criticize the Court. It interpreted the law as it found it, and that was in a somewhat confused condition.

The bill which Senator NEUBERGER and I propose would do no more than remove the distinction without a difference from the Federal Power Act. We share the concern of many Westerners over the implications of the *Federal Power Commission* v. *Oregon* decision. It does endanger State authority in private license proceedings for projects on wholly intrastate, nonnavigable streams.

Some have advocated a drastic and radical revision of the Federal Power Act as a result of what has become known as the *Pelton* case. This is a dangerous and shotgun approach to what is a narrow problem so far as the text of the law is concerned.

We urge returning the law to the condition it was in before the *Federal Power Commission* v. *Oregon* decision without major and dangerous surgery.

B. Power versus conservation

As every member of this committee knows, I am an advocate of hydroelectric power development. None knows this better than the chairman, the senior Senator from Washington, Mr. MAGNUSON.

However, in approaching problems of resource development in the river rich Pacific Northwest and elsewhere, a proper balance must be maintained between power production and other very valuable resources. Wherever possible, the use of a stream for power and other conservation uses should be harmonized so as to promote the greatest good for the people of the area. At certain sites the economic production of power should take precedence over competing potential uses. At others, the preservation of invaluable fish runs or other wildlife resources have a higher social value.

The Deschutes is famous for its commercial and sports fish runs. The power potential of the Pelton site is relatively small; it is a total installed capacity of 108,000 kilowatts. I am not completely convinced that the fish and power uses are finally irreconcilable, although the procedure in this case has led to a winner-take-all result to date. Some, who believe that the power use is more important than fish resources in the Deschutes and the Metolius which joins it above the Pelton site, do not fully appreciate that the power that would be generated would not be used in central Oregon, but would go into the Portland General Electric service area in western Oregon. Yet many who support the project argue that the power produced at Pelton would provide central Oregon with badly needed power.

I believe that a cancellation of the Pelton license and the revision of the law proposed would make possible a fresh start on attempts to harmonize use of the site for power and preservation of fish runs. However, if a final choice must be made between relatively small power production and the irreplaceable commercial and sport fish runs, the latter have higher social utility in this area. Commercial fishing in the Columbia Basin has been declining. Sport fish resources are shrinking in Oregon and elsewhere in the Nation. Once lost they are difficult, and probably impossible to replace.

Outdoor recreation is of ever-increasing importance to our people. Our growing population, increasing leisure, and the pressures of city life make outdoor recreational opportunities ever more important. We cannot afford to shrink those opportunities.

The bill Senator NEUBERGER and I have introduced is designed to prevent shortsighted use of a site and the frustration of State authority by a technical, and probably unintended, distinction in the Federal law.

We, therefore, urge that this reasonable and moderate proposal be enacted into law, lest accumulated dissatisfaction result in more far-reaching and less desirable revision of the Federal Power Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, Senate Joint Resolution 31.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. WELKER obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I request that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] be permitted to yield to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] for not exceeding 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, previously, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I reported Senate Joint Resolution 31. It proposed the submission of a constitutional amendment providing for the election of a President and Vice President. I wish to take this opportunity to make a general statement in connection with it.

The modernization of the Constitution with reference to the election of a President and Vice President has been the subject of discussion for many, many years. Undoubtedly, the concept of an elector has changed since the time of the adoption of the Constitution. At that time it was contemplated that electors would be men of superior intelligence who themselves would exercise their judgment in the selection of candidates for the two highest positions in the United States, but as political parties have formed and as time has gone on, such electors are supposed to carry out the will of the political party which elects them, although there is still no provision requiring them to do so.

As late as 1948, one elector, who was elected in the State of Tennessee on the Democratic slate for Mr. Truman and Mr. BARKLEY, voted instead for the candidates of the States Rights Party. This was not material in that particular case, but if the will of a majority of the people should be overthrown by some group of electors casting their votes in a manner different from that which was expected of them, it could bring about a very distressing and confusing situation in the United States which might lead to disaster.

Furthermore, Mr. President, there has never been any uniformity in the methods pursued by the various States as to their rights in connection with the election of a President.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. GORE. Before the Senator leaves the question of the latitude of electors, I should like to inquire of him if it is not a fact that although electors under the present system may, as the able Senator has pointed out, be elected and

commissioned from their respective States as the result of the efforts of organized political parties, nevertheless, there is no legal compulsion on the electors to obey the will of the mandate. There is a moral obligation, as I interpret it, but, as the Senator has pointed out, one elector from the State which he and I have the privilege and honor to represent did, indeed, cast his ballot for a candidate whose electors had not carried the State of Tennessee. Does not the Senator think that some remedy for such a situation is required?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I fully agree with my distinguished colleague that while there is a custom and a moral obligation on an elector to vote for the Presidential candidate who receives the greatest number of votes, there is no legal compulsion that he do so. As late as 1948, one elector voted for the candidate who received, I believe, the third largest number of votes in his State. It was a very much smaller number of votes than were cast for President Truman and Vice President BARKLEY.

Mr. GORE. Would it not have been legally possible for all the electors from the State of Tennessee to have cast their votes as did that one elector?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It would have been legally possible.

Mr. GORE. Would not such a practice lead to an incorrect reflection of the franchises of the people of the whole State?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Such a practice could completely reverse the intention of the people of a State, and if it changed the eventual result, it might not only lead to a great deal of confusion, but might actually lead to a rebellion, or a very hectic time.

It might lead to the election of a person for whom the people had not voted.

This is a problem that is fraught with many dangers. We have realized for a long time that the electoral college system was completely outmoded; that the system might lead to a miscarriage of the intention of the people. I think the condition should be remedied.

Mr. GORE. I congratulate my able colleague upon the leadership he has provided in this field, and for the proposal he has made to remedy a basically undemocratic and, as the Senator has so ably pointed out, dangerous situation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Tennessee may be permitted to have 2 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I had intended to make a general statement about the status of the matter, and its details could be more fully explained by some of my colleagues.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know the senior Senator from Tennessee is a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 31. I was wondering whether or not the Senator supports the proposed substitute, which is, I believe, the Daniel-Mundt——

Mr. DANIEL. The Daniel-Kefauver-Mundt resolution. My question has been answered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I strongly favor the proposal which was originally labeled as the Lodge-Gossett proposal, whereby the Federal vote of a State would be divided in proportion to the popular vote. That has many advantages which I shall point out.

However, as my colleagues know, that proposal passed the Senate in the 81st Congress and went to the House of Representatives. There the Mundt-Coudert plan was offered, but resulted in nothing being done. At this session of Congress there has been much interest as indicated by the number of Senators who have joined in sponsorship of one or another of the plans. I filed one resolution, providing for the Lodge-Gossett plan in which nine Senators joined, including Senators HUMPHREY, COTTON, SPARKMAN, MANSFIELD, DIRKSEN, ERVIN, DANIEL, NEUBERGER, and HILL. The distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], who has done such fine work in trying to bring forth a bill on which action can be taken, sponsored a similar resolution on which 19 Senators joined. Meanwhile the Mundt-Coudert plan was again offered. The provisions of the Mundt-Coudert measure can be followed at present under the Constitution. As a matter of fact, a large number of States have elected electors on the district basis.

The Mundt-Coudert proposal contains some improvements over the Constitution at present. My feeling was that the matter should be brought up for discussion, so that it might receive the attention of the Senate and the House of Representatives, thus enabling the two Houses to compose their differences and to work out a plan which would remedy the defect in the present system, and thus bring about as popular a vote as can be had. It was my view that by combining the two measures there would be a better chance of having full consideration of them throughout the debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Idaho may yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Mundt-Coudert plan were offered as a plan in itself, separate from the others, I should be very reluctant to support it. But in order to have the matter considered, with a likelihood of some kind of constitutional amendment being submitted to the people, I have favored considering the Lodge-Gossett plan and the Mundt-Coudert plan along with the Senate proposals. What the two Houses of Congress may eventually work out, I, of course, do not know, but the two plans have been joined for the purpose of discussion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Has the Senator from Tennessee read and studied Senate Joint Resolution 152, which is another proposal that has been advanced, and which I was privileged to sponsor? It was developed by a research staff of the Brookings Institution. It has received considerable support from persons in the field of constitutional law and those who have studied the operations of the electoral college.

I have asked my question because I am concerned that by the substitute proposal which the Senator from Tennessee has said he would like to have considered, the Senate might very well enact a measure which would not work to the advantage of a better electoral college system, but might actually work to the disadvantage of majority rule.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Idaho may yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is the proposal referred to by the Senator from Minnesota a popular-vote proposal?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; it is not. It is a proposal which provides that the votes cast for Senator in each State shall go to the party getting the majority of the votes, the remainder of the votes to be divided according to the votes of the candidates of the respective political parties.

Mr. KEFAUVER. This is my attitude about the entire matter. I think it is quite apparent, in the first place, that there needs to be some modernization of the method of electing the President and Vice President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. A moment ago the Senator from Tennessee said that his amendment would come as close to the popular vote proposal as possible.

Why hold back from the popular vote method? Why not let the people vote directly for President and Vice President, instead of going through the electoral college, which is an outmoded, antiquated piece of machinery, adopted 175 years ago, because those who adopted the Constitution were not quite sure whether the people were capable of governing themselves?

I have favored the popular voting system for President and Vice President for 40 years. One of the first measures I introduced in Congress in 1913, was a resolution to adopt a constitutional amendment which would have allowed the people to vote directly for President and Vice President. That is what I favor now. I do not see why we should hesitate about adopting it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the observation of my distinguished colleague. I, too, would be very happy if the President and Vice President could be elected by popular vote. I think that if in the beginning the Constitution had been written so that the people of the States could have voted for President and Vice President by popular vote, and if there could have been some uniform requirements or qualifications for the voters, that would have been a good thing.

Even now I would support the idea of the proposal submitted by my distinguished colleague from Kentucky for a popular vote if it were possible to have the Constitution so amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Idaho may yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The reason I do not support the popular vote proposal today, is that the political facts of life make it impossible to secure the approval of such an amendment by three-fourths of the States. About two-thirds of the States secure some benefit because the number of electors is based upon the number of Senators and Representatives, which gives to the small States a little advantage.

Surveys have shown that a popular-vote amendment would have absolutely no chance of being approved by three-fourths of the States.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that. Still, that offers to me a good reason to believe in or advocate the popular election of President and Vice President. It took a long time before the Constitution was amended to provide for the popular voting for United States Senators.

The electoral college was really intended to function under the Constitution, and it did function, because it provided that the candidate receiving the highest vote for President should be President, and the candidate receiving the next highest vote should be Vice President. But later, when the party system was adopted, it developed that that procedure was impractical.

It took a long time to secure a constitutional amendment to provide for the election of Senators by the direct vote of the people.

Notwithstanding the difficulties which I realize the Senator has mentioned, they do not in any way dampen my belief or my feeling that some of these days we shall have to give the American people the right to vote directly for President and Vice President. I favor that now, notwithstanding the difficulties involved in the procedure.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think there is no disagreement between the position taken by the Senator from Kentucky and myself. I wish it were possible to give the people the right to vote by popular vote for President and Vice President. But the electoral college system having been established in the beginning, and certain benefits accruing to the smaller States by virtue of the system—the survey, I believe, shows that some 30 or 31 States would actually lose some of their status in the election of President and Vice President if the present system were abandoned and the popular vote plan were adopted—a political impossibility presents itself so far as the securing of a popular vote resolution is concerned.

Since that is the situation, I have advocated getting as close as possible to the popular-vote system, while at the same time getting away from the obsolete, antiquated electoral college, which might cause much distress in the Nation one of these days.

Mr. BARKLEY. While the popular election of President and Vice President might affect the political strength of some States, it would give the people of this country more strength; it would not take away from their strength. It has happened in 2 or 3 instances that the man who received the largest number of votes from the people did not get the presidential office, because of the shifting of the electoral votes. Under the electoral college system, the man who received a minority of the votes received the majority in the electoral college and became President.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. My recollection is that three times in our history the candidate who received the majority of the votes was not elected. That is unfortunate. I wish we had started out on a popular vote basis. Of course, that would require uniformity of qualifications for voters throughout the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true, but I am not arguing that point at this time.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a second?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am at the mercy of my friend from Idaho. Will the Senator yield me more time?

Mr. WELKER. How much times does the Senator wish?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Idaho may yield the Senator from Tennessee not to exceed 5 minutes, and I ask the indulgence of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I am happy to indulge the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Tennessee is yielded 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not true that since there are different voting age requirements in some of the States—for instance, Georgia allows those who are 18 and over to vote; other States require that a person be 21 to vote—that would be one factor that would prohibit us from having a popular vote and being fair to all the States?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. I wish there was a popular vote basis, and that we had started out on that basis, but I think if we had such a basis we would have to have uniform qualifications for the voters. Otherwise one State might endeavor to secure an advantage by having different qualifications from those which existed in other States. For my part, I wish all the States had an 18-year-old provision, as does the State of Georgia; but that is a separate and a different matter. I do believe the so-called Lodge-Gossett plan is the nearest we can get to a popular vote plan, and at the same time have some chance of getting it approved by the various States. It also would get rid of the antiquated electoral college system.

Generally, the advantages of that plan are, first, that it would avoid the dangerous situation which would result from electors voting for a candidate who was other than the choice of the people in a particular State.

The second advantage is that it would mean a real two-party system in the United States, because a vote in any State would mean just as much as a vote in one of the so-called pivotal States. Both parties would fight just as hard for votes in other States as they now fight for the votes in the present pivotal States. We know that, as matters are now, in each political party the strategists decide that the campaign is to be waged in key States. Although they did in 1952. Ordinarily the Republican candidates do not go into the Southern States. Ordinarily the Democratic candidates do not feel it is worth their time to go to New England, for instance. If the proposed plan were adopted, the voters of every State would have the educational advantage which would accrue to them from an active participation in a national election. It would certainly cause more citizens to exercise their right to vote. There would be more interest. They would vote and participate more in the elections, and that certainly would be in the public interest.

Furthermore, if a voter in one State had as much influence as the voter in another State, the emoluments coming from the Federal Government would be more equitably distributed among States in all sections of the United States. The same applies to the appointment of officers in the excutive departments, Cabinet members, and their administrators.

I believe the general welfare, through the participation of more people in elections, would be furthered by the adoption of the plan. I know it has been argued that this amendment might take away the influence of certain minority groups in some of the States of the Union, but I submit it would be an incentive for a much larger participation by minority groups all over the United States. I am certain that more of our Negro citizens would have an incentive to participate, and that many barriers to their participation would be more readily removed in some of the Southern States, if this plan were put into operation. The same is true as to other groups in other parts of the country.

The Mundt-Coudert system can be used by the States now. It has been joined in the proposal for the purpose of getting a full discussion of the entire matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I hope this discussion will end in the passage of a good resolution, which the House of Representatives and the Senate will submit to the people.

ATOMIC PROGRESS AND REACTOR HAZARDS

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss an extremely important subject—one which affects all the people of the United States, and one in which, to a particular degree, the people of my State of Idaho are interested. The Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have been notified of my intention to speak today. It is my hope that they are present. However, in order to maintain continuity and to prevent digressions, it will be necessary for me to refuse to yield for questions until my statement is completed.

For many years now the atom has been a sacred subject in the Halls of Congress, a subject of which only the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy were presumed to have knowledge. There are some of us who have not been members of this very powerful and influential committee. Yet the activities of the atomic-energy program vitally affect the lives of the citizens of all our States.

In the year 1949 the Atomic Energy Commission established the national reactor test site in Idaho.

According to the semiannual report of the Atomic Energy Commission, dated July 1949—

> To assure proper experimental testing and operation of new reactors without hazard to any large nearby community, the Commission is establishing a reactor testing station at a remote location. The location that has been selected as best for this testing station is an area in southern Idaho, including grounds now occupied by a naval ordnance station.

In the next semiannual report of the same Commission, it was stated:

> In the interest of public safety, operational economy, and security, the Commission in the fall of 1948 determined to establish in a remote location a reactor testing station capable of accommodating a number of the newest and most powerful reactors then under design. Accordingly, with the cooperation of the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the United States Geological Survey, more than 70 possible locations in various parts of the country were surveyed on the basis of such factors as isolation, accessibility, availability of water supply, and favorable meteorological conditions.
>
> As a result of the surveys, the Commission last March announced that it had selected a 400,000-acre site in the Snake River plains of southern Idaho—including 173,000 acres of naval proving ground property near the town of Arco—as the best location for the new station.

My friends and neighbors from the adjoining great Western States of Montana and Wyoming were not particularly pleased with the location of this facility in Idaho. In April and May of 1949, they requested permission to appear, and did appear, before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to put forward the reasons why this reactor test area should be located within their States. I refer those who are interested to the hearings held before the Joint Commission on Atomic Energy, 81st Congress, 1st session, entitled, "Selection of Site for Reactor Test Station." These hearings, which encompass 165 pages, set forth the reasons why the Atomic Enery Commission felt that such a site was essential, and established the justification for the location of this site in my home State of Idaho.

A letter written on April 12, 1949, by David E. Lilienthal, then Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, to Representative MIKE MANSFIELD, now a United States Senator from the State of Montana, said in part:

> The requirements for such a station demanded an isolated area of at least 400,000 acres to minimize potential hazards.

The same letter discussed at some length the question of the disposal of radioactive wastes.

Mr. Roger S. Warner, Jr., Director of Engineering of the Atomic Energy Commission, quoted Mr. Lilienthal as stating:

> This is the site we want, and we will go up to the President, if it is necessary, to get it.

Mr. Carleton Shugg, then the General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, stated in these hearings the basic need for a test site and the criteria used in selecting the area. He said—page 84:

> The Atomic Energy Commission has concluded that in order to press forward with the development of new reactors in a manner compatible with public safety and welfare, acquisition, and development of a new remote testing site is necessary.
>
> The test station will be essentially a field facility for testing and proving for the entire national reactor-development program, while research and development activities continue at existing installations. Participating in this project will be Commission research units working on reactors, Armed Forces agencies concerned with military utilization of reactors, and industrial groups working on problems for the Commission in this field.
>
> During the first half of 1948, the importance of the development of a separate reactor-testing station became increasingly apparent to representatives of the Commission, advisory groups, and others engaged in the reactor-development program. All known factors related to the subject were considered by staff members in the light of the objectives of such a program, and a general statement of criteria for the site of such a station were developed. These criteria, which were later refined and developed in the course of further study, provided in general that the site for a reactor-testing station should:
>
> 1. Be removed from heavily populated and industrialized areas.
> 2. Be near enough to existing communities so that construction and operating personnel can be accommodated.
> 3. Contain at least 400,000 acres of land, preferably of submarginal value for farming and ranching and not suitable for future agricultural, mining, or other development.
> 4. Be near a readily accessible reliable water source that would supply continuously a minimum of 50 cubic feet per second.
> 5. Have geological, hydrological, and meteorological conditions facilitating the handling of radioactive wastes under normal and emergency operations.
> 6. Be near an electric power source that will be capable of supplying a minimum of 70,000 kilowatts at a reasonable cost.
> 7. Be amenable to acquisition and development with utmost economy.

To some degree Mr. Shugg was repeating the information previously released by the Atomic Energy Commission on March 22, 1949, in a press release announcing the selection of the Idaho site for the reactor test station.

Mr. President, my point in reviving this bit of important history is to set the stage for some questions which I intend to ask, and to which I hope to obtain straightforward, clearcut answers.

There can be no doubt that it was the intent of the Atomic Energy Commission, with the support of the Congress of the United States, to establish in a remote and isolated area a proving ground for the development of atomic reactors. What was the first criterion in the selection of a site? I quote from Mr. Shugg, who, I again remind Senators, was then General Manager of the Commission, that the site "be removed from heavily populated and industrialized areas." No voice was ever raised by any person at any time against the advisability of locating these potentially hazardous machines in isolated areas. My State was proud to participate in the program. Four hundred thousand acres, a territory almost half the size of the State of Rhode Island, are encompassed in this one facility. If need be, an area twice that size is available. I am certain that other States in the West will be glad to furnish additional land if needed.

In March 1954 Dr. H. D. Smyth, then a Commissioner of Atomic Energy, when discussing an experiment in Idaho with a boiling water reactor, stated:

> This particular experiment illustrates very well the reasons for choosing an isolated area as a site for experimental reactors. It was not only that some of the reactors might be inherently dangerous, but it was felt that an experimental reactor, one built primarily for the purpose of obtaining information, should be operated to extremes, and that it was desirable to have them in an isolated location for that reason. In other words, if you want to get as much information as you can out of a reactor, you need to push it to the point where it might conceivably run into trouble.

Let us get one thing straight before we go any further. Today we are not talking about small research facilities, as was Dr. Smyth. We are not talking about low-powered, portable, package reactors. We are addressing our remarks today to the location of those reactors which will contain within their cores fissionable material and fission products with a radiation equivalent exceeding that of all the radium in the world. I became increasingly restless as each day brought more news that it was the intention of this group or that group or the other group to build an atomic power reactor at or near large city industrial regions. I am in favor of the most vigorous program for the development of atomic power that can be achieved in the United States; but I want the program to be carried out with a little bit of commonsense.

Why did the Congress of the United States consent to the establishment of a national reactor test site in Idaho if we are now to allow a pressurized water reactor, containing over 100

pounds of enriched uranium to be located within 20 miles of Pittsburgh, Pa.? I recently read testimony given before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy by one atomic energy Commissioner that for the first year of operation this reactor would lose more money in operating costs than its entire replacement value.

Furthermore, I have been told by individuals upon whose scientific competence I rely, that the impact of atomic power on the economy of the United States would be slight, if at all, in the foreseeable future because of the abundance of fossil fuels which God has so graciously bestowed on our Nation.

Just for the sake of the record, may I quote from the McKinney Panel Report issued in February 1956 by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—page 49:

We recommend:

1. That the Congress, the American people, and the people of the world recognize that large sums of money and years of effort must be spent to bring atomic power to a point where it can be used effectively and widely on a competitive basis; unless and until research and development demonstrate that atomic power can be economically feasible, there can be no substantial impact.

This, in essence, is but a repetition of remarks made some years ago by Dr. Lawrence Hafstad, at that time Director of the Reactor Division of the Atomic Energy Commission. In 1949 Dr. Hafstad said—page 119:

The large electric-power plants supplying our cities and atomic-power reactors would seem to be of more nearly comparable size. However, this does not mean that cheap electric power from atomic sources is assured. The money the consumer pays for electricity goes largely to cover costs of distribution. Relatively, the cost of the coal or other fuel is small. Therefore, since atomic energy promises further reduction in fuel costs only, it is clear that even successful power-producing reactors could bring little, if any, immediate reduction in the cost of electric power to the consumer.

In 1950 he said—page 126:

First to assist in cutting through the underbrush, let us assume that the cost of uranium fuel is zero, that peace unexpectedly breaks out and that fissionable material is available as war surplus. Then reminding you again that all we produce in a reactor is heat, you will note that all we can replace with nuclear energy components in the conventional steam powerplant is the firebox and boiler. All the heat transfer apparatus, the turbines, the generators, and the distribution system remain the same. In this regard, a rough figure to carry in mind is that even if power could be put on the bus bars at the central station at zero cost, the costs of distribution are such that the cost to the consumer would be reduced only by 25 to 35 percent. The fondest hopes for civilian atomic energy must therefore be expected to produce savings somewhat less than this and can hardly be expected to be really revolutionary.

His successors in office have never basically disagreed with him in his conclusions.

It is clear that the problem with which we are dealing is the design and development of a reactor which will be safe, and which eventually will be competitive with conventional fuels in the high-power cost areas.

Let me point out that our present reactor designs are merely a substitute form of heat, and that the remainder of the generating and transmission system is unchanged. We are merely trying to replace the boiler and the fuel with an atomic reactor.

There has been much discussion about the necessity for the development of atomic power as an instrument of foreign policy. It has been said that if we do not build reactors in foreign countries that can produce power, the Soviets will most certainly step in and perform this service. In the magazine U. S. News & World Report, March 16, 1956, there is an article which sets forth plan A, sponsored by Commissioner Thomas Murray, of the Atomic Energy Commission, and plan B, sponsored by Chairman Lewis L. Strauss, of the Atomic Energy Commission, for putting the peacetime atom to work. Mr. Murray wants the Government to put up $1 billion; Mr. Strauss wants industry to do the financing. Both want the reactors built near cities.

Today I want to talk about plan C, which we will call the "Commonsense plan." I submit that we should build every conceivable type of reactor, regardless of cost, which our scientists feel offers prospect of ultimate success.

Mr. President, I have stood on the floor of the Senate and watched billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money be scooped out in our Santa Claus foreign-aid programs over my objections. I am not going to argue about the cost of developing atomic power. I am not going to sit here and watch the bureaucrats go to the Waldorf for dinner and then protest against leaving a tip to the waiter. Far from it. As long as we are dissipating our national assets in precarious overseas adventures, I am perfectly willing to endorse either Mr. Murray's $1 billion plan or anybody else's $2 billion program for the development of atomic energy. Plan C, however, differs from plan A of Mr. Murray's and plan B of Mr. Strauss in that it reverts to the original stated intent of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Congress to build these experimental power reactors in isolated sites purchased specifically for that purpose.

Why does the Senator from Idaho make such a fuss about this subject? Is it because he is jealous that the people of Pennsylvania are going to have a reactor 20 miles from the great industrial metropolis of Pittsburgh? Is the Senator from Idaho again complaining because his State and the other western States seem to be always left out when Federal money is being expended? Oh, no, Mr. President. I am sure the Senators from North Dakota and the Senators from Wyoming, Montana, Nevada, Utah, and Colorado could make quite a case if we were to place our objections to this reactor program on the basis of the expenditure of Federal funds in certain selected States.

I am no babe in the woods, Mr. President. It has not escaped my notice that every time one of these tremendous installations was built it just happened to end up in Tennessee or South Carolina or New Mexico or Washington or certain other favored areas.

Of course we in Idaho welcome any program which will give increased employment and increased earning to our people. But that is not why I rise on the floor of the Senate today. Anyone but a congenital idiot knows that if atomic power is ever to be in the competitive field, the last place in the world to build a reactor would be at Shippingport, Pa., sitting on top of a coalfield in a region that has more coal, oil, and natural gas per capita than almost any area in the United States, or, for that matter, in the world. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] appeared before the joint committee some time ago. He tried to tell them that if it is desired to locate an atomic reactor where power costs were high it should be built in New England. His logic is unassailable, but, in my opinion, his conclusions are wrong.

Mr. President, I shall tell my colleagues why I rise to protest the spreading of these atomic reactors near large civic centers of the United States. I shall quote the experts of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, this McKinney panel, and I invite every Member of the Senate to rise, when I finish, and accept the responsibility for the location of these nuclear devices in or near populated areas.

First one. I quote from page 124 of the Report of the Panel on the Impact of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, January 1956:

A nuclear reactor's getting out of control may, under special conditions, cause widespread injury to people and loss of use of property because of radioactive contamination. These events should not occur if design and operating standards are properly established and effectively enforced. Yet, men make mistakes and accidents happen.

Then I wish to read pages 126, 127, and 128. I wish to read carefully so that at no time can any person say that the Senator from Idaho failed to bring this information to the attention of this Congress and, insofar as possible, to the people of the United States.

14.4. INSURANCE AGAINST DAMAGER RESULTING FROM PEACEFUL USES

The 1954 act requires all licensees of the Commission to hold the Government free from any liability arising from damage to persons or property as a result of any licensed peaceful uses of atomic energy. This means that the licensees must pay for all damages, even though the special nuclear materials which they may be using under license belong to the Federal Government and even though all Commission and local regulations are fully obeyed. The risks incurred run from minor health hazards risked by direct employees to the extremes of potential damage resulting from runaway atomic powerplants. These upper damage limits could theoretically include the severe radioactive contamination of expensive urban and industrial areas and radiation injury to millions of persons—injury which might not be able to be evaluated completely for decades or even generations. This is the most extreme view and is the one which is commonly used to prove that the risks are too great for private enterprise to assume. It is in the light of these risks that the respective obligations of private enterprise and Government must be balanced.

Sufficient experience in the atomic-energy program to date has permitted private insurance companies to provide coverage of the risks to employees within a reasonable rate structure. This accomplishment is in

contrast with the practice that prevailed during World War II when personnel engaged in atomic energy work were injured against job-incurred injuries by complete Government assumption of the insurance risk.

Many States have already modified their workmen's compensation laws and regulations to permit coverage for radiation injuries. Care must be exercised by all those connected with these programs to make sure that all real injuries are properly covered, but that at the same time imagined or tenuously related injuries continue to be dealt with in reasonable balance.

There is real urgency in getting more and better knowledge about the effects of radiation and continuously reviewing standards in the light of the best knowledge available. The Commission has a heavy obligation to sponsor such research in every possible way. Yet, at the same time, the public must be given better understanding of the fact that development of scientifically complete knowledge in these areas is a never-ending task and that a great deal of such research requires a stepwise process which dollars alone cannot speed.

The more widely discussed insurance problem, however, is that relating to the liability of licensees operating atomic powerplants which might theoretically go out of control and shower nearby cities or the countryside with radioactive materials.

No 100-percent safe power reactor has as yet been conceived; 99.99-percent safe may not be enough. While every precaution has been taken in reactor and component designs to assure safety, manmade devices and controls are involved. Unforeseen malfunctions may occur, leading to reactor or plant destruction. Just as perverse ingenuity of punch-press operators has on occasion counteracted safety devices designed for their own protection, reactor safety and control equipment and procedures may be circumvented. Consequences may be serious.

Experience on reactor accidents is meager. Research on this problem is barely started. Important background data has been obtained as a result of an accident involving a research reactor in Canada, and from a deliberate "runaway" reactor experiment conducted by the Commission. From this limited base, it has been concluded that damage may range from local contamination of the reactor structure to contamination of an area of several square miles or more if weather conditions contribute to dispersal and fallout of radioactive particles. The results seem to range from the rough equivalent of partial or complete destruction of a plant by fire to events on the scale of the Texas City disaster. The maximum effects on high industrial or population concentration may be far-reaching in terms of radioactive contamination and radiation exposure. Destructive shock waves of overpressures, however, are unlikely to accompany a "runaway" reactor and nothing like the effects of atomic bombs seems likely or even possible.

If, in spite of all the safety precautions taken, injuries or property damage should still take place, what can be done to insure against ruinous financial loss?

The number of claims for injury or damage resulting from an accident may reach extremely large proportions. Those involved from the liability standpoint include not only the designers and fabricators of equipment, but the operators, corporate licensees, and all of the businesses servicing licensees. The assets of many companies might thus be available to cover such liabilities. Yet no company seems likely to be able to assume liabilities so great as to threaten its solvency.

The insurance industry can cover the atomic powerplant risks involved to the same extent that it normally does in hazardous industries. Several competent studies are in progress, and these should be permitted to determine whether current efforts to form special funds to cover atomic-energy risks will be successful. The obstacle of insurance seems quite likely to be overcome for at least the present development phases of the atomic-power industry.

Those proposing to build and operate atomic facilities and the insurance industry are naturally trying to minimize the possibility of extreme financial losses to their organizations by seeking to have the Government reconsider its position and underwrite losses which are purported to be beyond the capacity of industry.

It is still difficult to judge how necessary it may be to encouragement of development of peaceful uses of atomic energy for the Government to go into the atomic catastrophe insurance business.

Several things must be considered:

Assumption of insurance risks by Government will not now speed demonstration of economic feasibility appreciably. Research and development in reactor technology are going forward in Commission laboratories. Construction of the Commission's first large-scale demonstration plan is under way. As we have said, several additional demonstration plants privately sponsored are now to operate in 1958 or 1959. Should private sponsors withdraw from these projects, we believe that the Commission should proceed with the construction of one demonstration plant of each promising major type.

There is, accordingly, no sound basis for attempting to devise now on a crash basis a Government insurance program.

We recognize that the present power reactor demonstration program is directed at proving part of the Nation's energy reserves for the future. Risks in this stage of the development tend to be high. It seems to us, however, to be much too early for private enterprise to concede defeat on the insurance problem. To do so is to prejudge the research efforts still under way and to jeopardize unnecessarily the national attempt to carry atomic power forward to widespread application by private enterprise.

14.5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The possible hazards from peaceful uses of atomic energy range from minor to catastrophic. Hundreds of applications in the fields of medicine, agriculture, and industry can apparently go forward under present regulations and standards with no serious risks.

There is urgent need for better data, however, and every effort to expedite its development should be made by the Commission and all other responsible public and private groups involved in development of peaceful uses. Every argument for changes in standards should be explored fully in competent forums to insure that no lead is left unexplored and that real doubts are resolved for maximum public safety.

Federal, State, and local authorities must continue to cooperate closely in the establishment and enforcement of the best uniform radiation health standards which can be developed. There must be balance between the conceivable and the actual hazards, however, and for some years to come the Federal Government will certainly have the responsibility of establishing this balance. This is not the sole responsibility of the Commission, but a joint responsibility of all Federal agencies involved or affected.

We are not satisfied that the time has yet arrived to reconsider the need for a Federal atomic insurance program covering peaceful uses. We have noted with interest recent plans of private insurance companies to deal with these problems. Such efforts should be encouraged. At least 2 and possibly 3 years remain in which to conduct research and accumulate knowledge and experience before any substantial private activity can be delayed or stopped because of inability to obtain adequate insurance. In fact, implications that the Government is prepared now to take on the insurance burden might stifle vigorous private efforts to meet the problem. We look on a Federal atomic insurance program as a threat to private atomic enterprise, not a benefit. It is a last resort not yet called for and one which may not be needed.

Therefore, we recommend—

1. That the Commission be encouraged to step up its program of research into the causes, effects, and control of atomic hazards; the 2 or 3 years remaining before any full-scale "demonstration" atomic powerplant comes into operation must be used to obtain the maximum amount of information in order that both those concerned with protection against harmful levels of radiation and those concerned with providing insurance to cover such damage as may occur can have the most advanced knowledge possible at the earliest time; and

2. That the joint committee and the Commission continue to encourage the insurance industry to develop ways of meeting atomic insurance problems entirely within the concepts of private enterprise.

Now let us check a few things which were said there. The panel says:

1. The risks incurred run from minor health hazards risked by direct employees to the extremes of potential damage resulting from runaway atomic powerplants. These upper damage limits could theoretically include the severe radioactive contamination of expensive urban and industrial areas and radiation injury to millions of persons—injury which might not be able to be evaluated completely for decades or even generations.

2. No 100-percent safe power reactor has as yet been conceived; 99.99 percent safe may not be enough. While every precaution has been taken in reactor and component designs to assure safety, manmade devices and controls are involved. Unforeseen malfunctions may occur, leading to reactor or plant destruction.

3. Experience on reactor accidents is meager. Research on this problem is barely started.

4. The possible hazards range from minor to catastrophic.

Mr. President, either this panel was composed of uninformed and unintelligent individuals, or we had better heed their solemn warnings. I happen to know that they are neither uninformed or unintelligent, and I would like the record to show that before arriving at their conclusions they collected 749 pages of testimony and affidavits.

I should like the record to show that the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission on November 9, 1955, just 4 months ago, when talking of reactor technology, said "the state of the art is still primitive."

Further evidence of the potential hazards involved is shown by the difficulty of obtaining adequate insurance.

As late as March 15, 1956, only last week, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy conducted a seminar with the representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission and with atomic manufacturing, operating, and insurance interests to exchange views "on the problems of providing adequate indemnification for reactor owners and manufacturers." The Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy said:

It was necessary that this seminar be conducted in executive session to insure the greatest possible freedom of expression for various participants.

Since no classified information was involved, it is difficult to understand this atomic curtain. The fact is, that some

industrial representatives at this seminar stated that at the present time they would not place the fissionable material in the reactors under construction because of the danger of a catastrophe.

Instead of worrying about "providing adequate indemnification for reactor owners and manufacturers," it is about time that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy began to worry about the safety of the people living in these areas. One wonders what will happen if some intelligent citizen at Shippingport, Pa., seeks a court injunction to prevent the construction of what might be a public hazard. I believe he would get the court injunction.

As further evidence to show that I am not an alarmist, may I quote a report prepared by the Division of Biology and Medicine of the Atomic Energy Commission and submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on October 10, 1955. This report states, at page 590:

Until more quantitative estimates of the probabilities of accidents of various degrees of severity can be made, it will be generally impossible to determine whether the precautions taken in the construction of a particular reactor are inadequate or unduly expensive. In view of the general perversity of nature, it is not inconceivable that we may experience a series of catastrophic accidents after a longer period of favorable experience in the construction and operation of nuclear reactors. Similar considerations apply to an even greater degree to the extension of nuclear power to the propulsion of planes, trains, ships, and so forth.

Let me also quote from a staff study of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy dated November 28, 1955, which says:

There seems to be an appalling lack of scientific analysis of the scope of the damage which might be caused by a runaway reactor. One license application before the Commission—that of the Commonwealth Edison Company of Chicago—has the start of a good study of the problem. The environmental report for the site selected for this reactor shows the geographical and meteorological data for the site. These include studies of flooding the site, prevailing wind direction, and amounts of rainfall. The studies appear to be very complete in the areas they cover. However, I find a noticeable lack of other information:

(a) Nowhere in the materials is there any probable fallout pattern. The Atomic Energy Commission was able to put together such a pattern for the benefit of the public press in connection with the possible detonation of a hydrogen bomb over the city of Washington. It would seem to me to be entirely feasible to obtain a similar pattern—especially if the results of the borax experiment, and of some of the Las Vegas tests and of its monitoring of its own reactors are circulated.

(b) There is no indication of the radioisotopes which are likely to be unleashed into the atmosphere in the event of a possible malfunctioning.

(c) There is no study of the population whom the fallout from such a reactor would affect. It is relatively easy to obtain this population study. Radio stations make this study for their coverage all the time and use this information in filing with the Federal Communications Commission and in selling station time.

(d) There is no study of the watersheds lying under the probable fallout patterns—although this would be important only if there are long-lived radioisotopes in the debris such as radiostrontium.

(e) There is no study of the probable injuries which would be incurred by the population under the fallout pattern—either to persons or to property.

(f) There is no study of the sums which would be required to pay for most of those injuries to persons or to property. The insurance companies have this information at their fingertips.

(g) There is no study of the frequency of the possibility of malfunctioning of reactors. One of the most important factors for the amount of damage which could be done is the presence of a containing vessel. If there is a containing vessel (and not a pressure vessel which is part of the structure of the reactor itself) there can be minor incidents which occur in the operation of the reactor which will not materially affect parties outside of the container. This could have a material effect on the possibility of damage outside, since the container could hold the small incidences while giving way only for major catastrophes. The point at which it would give way would depend on such items as the structural strength of the container, the strength of connecting pipes and openings, and the requirements for escape hatches for employees who might be caught within the container.

Without any scientific information before me it would be my first uneducated guess that the funds put up by the insurance companies would probably be able to take care of the malfunctioning of the reactor which did not rupture the containing vessel. If the containing vessel should be ruptured, then the insurance funds may well be completely inadequate to take care of the catastrophe.

The Commission so far apparently has failed to require any of this kind of information in its license applications which could afford a basis for thinking about the possibility involved in the safety of a reactor.

May I emphasize that the material which I have quoted on the possibility of a reactor catastrophe does not represent the relatively uninformed view of the Senator from Idaho. These are the words of the experts, and we in the Senate had better listen.

What has happened to the theory of orderly progress in science? We do not even know today which type of reactor holds the most promise for the ultimate development of power. As a matter of fact, according to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Shippingport type is the most uneconomic of them all. In my opinion, we shall never know until we build them. They will never be built until the Government builds them in the isolated sites already in existence or others purchased, if need be, for that specific purpose.

The atom is a marvelous thing, but it has not changed the law of economics. How can any utility company legally invest the funds of its stockholders in a $30 million venture to produce electric power which at the present time will cost 52 mills as against the 5 mills from a conventional plant?

We know how to build steam turbines and transmission lines. What we have to learn how to build is a reactor with a fuel cycle economical enough to generate heat which can be transferred to those turbines and which will operate in a completely safe fashion.

Who is going to accept the responsibility if any large-scale reactor accident occurs, with the resulting loss of life and radioactive contamination of land surface and subsurface waters?

How can the Congress of the United States sit idly by and let this program get so far out of hand as to constitute a menace to large segments of our population?

What legitimate opposition can the Atomic Energy Commission, any member of the Joint Committee, or any other Member of this Senate raise against a vigorous reactor-development program located in isolated areas?

I have no objection to the spending of $30 million on the Shippingport reactor, but can anyone tell me why it should not have been built at the national reactor test site? Why should it not be operated only so long as it contributes to the technology which we seek to advance and then either abandoned or used as a training vehicle?

Mr. President, I have attempted to follow this situation as it has developed, and the only stated opposition to the principle which I propose is one to which I cannot give credence. I have been told that out scientists will not work in areas that are not adjacent to their normal environs. Perhaps someone can explain to me how they managed to keep them up on top of a 7,500-foot mesa at Los Alamos, N. Mex. I have only the greatest admiration for our men of science. Hundreds of them are now at work in Idaho on just the very job which I am discussing today. Their contributions have been magnificent. American scientists will go where their duty calls them, just as many an American boy in recent years went to the far-flung corners of the earth, some never to return, because of their responsibilities to our society. Mr. President, I would not want my previous remarks to be interpreted by uninformed easterners to be detrimental to the wide open spaces of my beloved Idaho. For those to whom hunting, fishing, skiing, and the glories of nature have any allure, Idaho beckons. Do not tell me our great scientists would not love to live in our beautiful and fine cities of Blackfoot, Pocatello, Shelley, and Idaho Falls.

But this is a serious subject, Mr. President, and one which deserves immediate serious attention. I serve notice that, insofar as I am capable, I intend to resist in every orderly fashion any attempt to locate any power-producing reactor near any populated area at the present stage of the art.

I have been one who believes that the United States tells too much while the Soviets tell nothing. I know I am a voice crying in the wilderness as I sit on the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and listen to the story of Soviet intrigue and espionage. On this subject of atomic power, however, Mr. President, I am going to become a "giant liberal." I am going to demand that, in addition to declassifying all of the information on building reactors, which is so fashionable, we also declassify all information on reactor hazards.

If there are not any reactor hazards, I am going to ask why the Atomic Energy Commission has a committee on reactor safeguards, which advises it "with regard to the hazards associated with the operation of reactor facilities."

I am going to get somebody on the line before we have a catastrophe, and I pray we never will have such a catastrophe.

I am going to find out who is legally responsible for the damages incurred if we do have a catastrophe. At every opportunity I am going to try to make sure that "fools don't rush in where angels fear to tread."

Now, Mr. President, I have had my say. I want to summarize my views so that the record will be clear:

First. I am in favor of a vigorous reactor development program.

Second. I am in favor of the construction of all of the various types of reactors which, in the opinion of the Atomic Energy Commission, should be constructed.

Third. I have taken cognizance of the expressed warnings of competent people that at the present time the hazards of reactor operation are practically unknown, and that they might be catastrophic.

Fourth. I believe that any large scale reactor accident either here or abroad will be a serious setback to the atomic-power program.

Fifth. I believe that the building of potentially hazardous, large-scale, uneconomic power reactors—complete with turbogenerating systems—is not conducive to progress.

Sixth. I know of no urgent or compelling reason why, in the face of these warnings, these reactors should be built near giant centers of population.

Seventh. I, therefore, sincerely urge that until such time as we have thoroughly explored the hazards involved that these nuclear machines be built and operated in remote and isolated regions specifically purchased by the Government for that purpose.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 760. An act for the relief of Pietro Meduri;

S. 1992. An act to provide for the conveyance of a certain tract of land in Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association;

S. 3452. An act to amend the act of July 15, 1955, Public Law 161, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 324), by increasing the appropriation authorization for the Aircraft Control and Warning System; and

S. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1194) to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., and construction by the Secretary of the Army of the Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., as units of the Missouri River Basin project, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4437. An act relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard;

H. R. 5975. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners of lands acquired for water and power developments for their moving expenses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8535. An act to amend the act of July 4, 1955, relating to the construction of irrigation distribution systems;

H. R. 10003. An act making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 317. Joint resolution designating the week of November 16 to 22, 1956, as National Farm-City Week.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 4437. An act relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5975. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners of lands acquired for water and power developments for their moving expenses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8535. An act to amend the act of July 4, 1955, relating to the construction of irrigation-distribution systems; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10003. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 317. Joint resolution designating the week of November 16 to 22, 1956, as National Farm-City Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REVIEW OF FOREIGN POLICY—III—THE NORTH AFRICAN CRISIS

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me, to permit me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, provided I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, under such unanimous consent, let me say that I understand the distinguished Senator from Montana is about to deliver a very, very important address. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on several occasions in recent weeks I have addressed the Senate on foreign policy. On January 20, I dealt with the need for a general review of foreign policy, as have other Members of the Senate. My thought, as I expressed it at the time, was that out of the review "there could come new ideas to fill the vacuum, to stop the dangerous drift which has settled over our foreign policy."

A month later, on February 16, I discussed the region of southeast Asia as it relates to American foreign policy. An examination of the situation in that region led me to the following conclusions:

1. The United States should make clear that it stands solidly behind our present obligations under the Southeast Asia Defense Treaty. At the same time, however, we should also make clear that we are always prepared to consider a reduction in our role in the defense of that area under certain conditions. The conditions are either a recession in the totalitarian threat to southeast Asia or the strengthening of its defenses by the accession of nations more directly concerned to the treaty or by other defensive arrangements.

2. The executive branch should make a careful reexamination of the premises under which it dispenses military aid. It must bring into its calculations more emphatically than it has in the past such factors as genuine need and capacity of recipient governments in terms of their defense and the degree of responsibility which they show to their own peoples.

Further, the executive branch should report as fully as possible to the American people on the extent to which American equipment has fallen into the hands of the Communists in Asia. If it fails to do so in the near future, then the appropriate committees of Congress might well consider a complete investigation of this matter.

3. Nonmilitary grant aid as a permanent element of American foreign policy should be limited, as was intended by Congress, to the technical assistance or the point 4 program. If the executive branch presents a prospectus for a useful and effective expansion of this program—and I am not at all sure that this is possible—then I believe Congress should give it sympathetic consideration.

Large-scale grants of economic aid to any country, when necessitated by unusual circumstances, however, should be considered individually on their own merits by the Congress.

If the southeast Asian and other underdeveloped countries seek long-range aid for economic development unavailable through existing sources, such aid should be considered as far as possible for whole regions and on the basis of repayable credits of the most generous terms. The executive branch should present specific proposals in this connection and not seek a permanent blank check which reveals little of the extent to which this country might be committed without the clear understanding of the American people and the consent of the Senate and Congress as a whole.

Mr President, I also pointed out the vital significance of the Bandung Conference—a conference whose importance has been sadly underestimated—the attitude of the overseas Chinese, especially in Singapore, Djakarta, and elsewhere; and, Mr. President, let me say that the

trend on the part of the overseas Chinese, especially in Singapore, is toward Mao Tse-tung and Communist China, and away from Chiang Kai-shek and Formosa, and the attitude of certain southeast Asian states toward the Geneva Conference between the United States and Communist China, a conference now in its seventh month.

Mr. President, my intention, as I have already indicated, is from time to time to review developments in various critical regions of the world—North Africa, Western Europe, the Far East, the Middle East. It is possible to pinpoint half a dozen situations where American policies can profit from examination by the Senate. In some of these situations, as in Korea, our concern is readily apparent. In others, this country appears to be only remotely involved, or not involved at all.

Appearances, however, can be deceptive, Mr. President. What seems remote today can become immediate tomorrow. I need hardly remind the Senate that not so long ago Formosa and Korea were scarcely more than geographic place names. And who among us had ever heard of the so-called offshore islands of China until we were impelled by them toward war?

The examples could be multiplied, but the Senate will understand the point I am trying to make. Every major situation of international tension—however remote, however indirect our present concern may be—every situation of that kind, carries a potential impact for the safety and welfare of this country. Our foreign policy must take these situations fully into consideration, and the Senate cannot afford to lose sight of them. We cannot afford to do so, if we are to fulfill effectively our constitutional function of advice and consent in foreign relations.

It is for this reason, Mr. President, that today I wish to discuss the North African crisis. The difficulties in North Africa have been among the more obscure in their implications for American foreign policy. On the surface they have appeared to have little direct relationship to the interests of this country.

North Africa can be regarded, it has been regarded, as an area which involves only France, Spain, the French, Moslems, and other peoples who inhabit Tunisia, Morocco, and Algeria. This is one way of looking at the North African situation. If we are not involved, if it is solely a matter affecting others, then we have no responsibilities and presumably nothing to worry about.

That is an easy way, Mr. President. But it is an easy way only for the moment. It puts off until tomorrow what blurs the seemingly pleasant portrait of a world of peace and prosperity today.

The trouble with that approach, Mr. President, is that it ignores the repercussions of the crisis in North Africa which do affect us directly. It ignores the likelihood that an intensification of the crisis in that area will draw us deeper and deeper into the situation. That process has already begun. The recent mob violence against the American consular post in Tunis, the anti-American demonstrations, are the first danger signals; and we will ignore them at our own peril.

The easy way, then, Mr. President, is perhaps not as easy as it appears to be at first glance. Perhaps it may be better not to assume that what happens in North Africa is of little significance to the United States. It may be preferable for the Senate, for the American people, to begin now to grapple with the facts in North Africa.

If we do so we may obtain a more accurate understanding of how the totality of our interests is related to these facts and how those interests may best be served. We may see that while the north African crisis does indeed involve in the first instance the relationship of the French and north African Moslems, it also spreads its impact far beyond this core. It involves the future of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European union. It colors the attitudes of the Moslem nations and of colonial peoples toward all western nations, including the United States. It affects the historical friendship between France and the United States, which has its roots in the American Revolution. It can facilitate the penetration of the African continent by the Soviet Union. It embraces, in the last analysis, the future of France as one of the great wellsprings of western civilization and freedom.

Are these matters in which the United States has only a passing interest? Are they matters which can be sloughed off as of only casual concern to this country? Some may so regard them. I cannot share that view; and I doubt that many Americans, if apprised of the facts, will share it.

Can NATO disintegrate; can the animosity of the Afro-Asian world be turned against the West; can Communist totalitarianism penetrate Africa; can the democracy of France be reduced to impotency in the face totalitarian pressures from left and right—can all these developments take place without the most serious implications for this country? Despite the blissful unawareness of some, these developments do threaten to issue from the north African crisis. The seeds of all of them are already germinating in its heat.

Those who talk of success in foreign policy may be able to exorcise this crisis with a smug platitude or a smile of fatuous optimism. The smile must indeed be broad, however, if it is to be stretched to cover the situation in north Africa.

Mr. President, I am no enemy of the smile. When it is evoked by what is pleasant or humorous, it helps to lighten the burden of the day. It may even have a place in the sober business of conducting this Nation's foreign relations, just as it has in the conduct of the Nation's political campaigns. What it is not, however, what the smile can never be, is a substitute for sound foreign policies based on a perceptive understanding of the problems which confront us. Nor is it a substitute for careful thought as to how the interests of the United States may best be safeguarded in dealing with these problems. That is true in the north African crisis no less than in others.

We cannot smile away this situation and its implications for us. We can only face it and seek to delineate an intelligent course for this Nation to pursue with respect to it. That is why I raise the question of north Africa and ask the Senate to take the time to consider it here today.

I have sought, as I am sure other Senators have, to follow as closely as possible the rapid flow of developments in that region as they are reported in the press. Several months ago, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I also found occasion to observe the situation firsthand in Morocco. I regret that I was unable to proceed at that time beyond Morocco to Algeria and Tunisia, as I desired to do.

Limited as this background is, it is sufficient to convince me that the pressures are growing for a more direct involvement of the United States in the north African crisis. It is sufficient to convince me that our policies have drifted dangerously there, as they have elsewhere. It is sufficient to convince me that the time is already late for the Senate to focus attention on north Africa. If the available facts are inadequate for a complete understanding of the situation—and, in my opinion they are inadequate—I trust the executive branch will take the trouble to supplement them. I hope that Members of this body will see fit to acquaint themselves more fully with them by direct observation. In a letter to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, dated October 17, 1955, in which I transmitted a report on Europe after the Geneva Conference, I suggested that—

> In view of the possible repercussions on our policies respecting Europe and the Middle East, it might be desirable for the committee to have some members familiarize themselves at firsthand with the North African situation.

I reiterate that suggestion today.

In the meantime we can begin to examine the situation on the basis of the limited information that is already available. Let me, at the outset, point out that it is inexact to regard all of North Africa as a single crisis except in the broadest sense. The situations in Tunisia, Morocco, and Algeria have many characteristics in common, and present many similar problems. There are, however, also important differences. If our policies respecting North Africa are to be effective, these differences must be given full consideration.

In the discussion today I should like to turn first to the similarities of the situation in all three regions of North Africa. Taken together, Tunisia, Morocco, and Algeria constitute a great crossroads, five times the size of metropolitan France, lying between the heart of the African Continent, the Middle East, and Europe. Over these crossroads, conquerors have moved in one direction or another since time immemorial. The great religious movements have passed through them. North Africa can be, as it has been, a bridge to link three continents in peace, cooperation, and progress. It can also be, as it has been, an avenue of conquest which, if history is any indicator, leads only to the ruin of both conqueror and conquered.

In recent times, Europeans, and particularly the French, have gone to North Africa in great numbers. They brought many of the benefits of material progress as well as political stability to the area and they took much from it. The colons, as those who are settled in the region are called, have a great stake in all three regions, especially in Algeria, where they number a million. Their stake, however, is in many ways a privileged one, supported by the power and sacrifices of metropolitan France. The colons seek to maintain that stake. Many are determined to maintain it by any means, including the terrorization of the Moslem populations, and even the intimidation of the French Government itself.

The great preponderance of the inhabitants of North Africa, however, are not French or European. They are mostly Moroccan, Algerian, and Tunisian Moslems. And the Moslems of North Africa—to identify the people of the three areas—have been caught up in the same wave of militant nationalism and pan-Islamism which has swept through most of the countries of the Middle East in the decade since World War II. These movements among the Moslems of North Africa are, I believe, for the most part authentic expressions of a widespread popular discontent with a status of political inequality and social and economic misery. They contain their share of extremists who, like their counterparts among the colons, are prepared to resort to the terrorizing of peaceful Europeans and even other Moslems in their determination to achieve immediate political domination in the North African regions.

Until recently, the situation in North Africa has been relatively free of Communist influence. That does not mean that it will long remain so. On the contrary, it is clear in Communist broadcasts from Europe, from the activities of agents in North Africa, in the nearby Arab States, and from the diplomacy of the Soviet Union in the Middle East—it is clear that the Communists are seeking by any means to make inroads into the Moslem nationalist movements.

I believe we may expect them to make those inroads unless the causes of North African discontent are alleviated in time, unless progress is made in restoring a political stability to that area which is acceptable to the great majority of the native peoples.

If Communist influence grows, where will the responsibility lie? With the North Africans, who are seeking redress of legitimate political and economic grievances? We can hardly blame a drowning man for grasping at the tail of a shark if, in his agony, he mistakes it for a log. Can we place the responsibility on the diabolic genius of the Communists? They will be only too glad to take it, and they will offer North Africa as one more evidence of the invincible march of communism toward world domination.

If communism takes root in North Africa, I think the responsibility will not be attributable to the invincibility of that ideology or any exceptional ability on the part of its adherents. Nor will it be attributable to the native people, who seek to rectify long-festering wrongs. It will lie, instead, with those who pretend to exercise political responsibility in North Africa—be they French, Spanish, or Moslem—but who fail to exercise it with understanding, with compassion, and with courage. It will lie with those European fanatics in North Africa, France, and elsewhere whose only answer to the restlessness of a whole people is a sterile and, in the long run, futile repression. It will lie with those religious and political extremists in the Moslem camps of North Africa and nearby countries whose personal will to power is so overwhelming that in the name of freedom they adopt irreconcilable positions which can destroy the meaning of freedom for their own people and undermine it elsewhere in the Mediterranean regions.

Mr. President, I do not underestimate the difficulties of reconciliation in North Africa. The bitternesses are intense. The dilemmas are many. The stakes in terms of power for a few are so high that they are blind to all considerations other than what appears to be their immediate self-interest.

Before the chance to obtain a just and reasonable settlement is lost, however, I hope that those who gibe at the idea will consider the consequences which will flow from the failure to achieve one.

Some of these consequences are already apparent. They can be seen in the ugly face of racial and religious terrorism. That face has shown itself in many parts of North Africa during the past few years—in the massacre of the innocent—native and French alike—in the swift and deadly sweep of the knife of the political assassin, in the sabotage of properties representing decades of patient creative labor by both Europeans and Moslems.

Much innocent blood on both sides has already been shed in North Africa. Much wanton destruction has already been done. But more blood will flow and more damage will be done unless a settlement is achieved. What spoils will remain to the side which may emerge victorious if the conflict continues? They will inherit an accumulation of ruins. They will gain a heritage of smoldering hatred and fear, a sullen acquiescence on the part of the defeated.

And if that is the inexorable consequence of an "all or nothing" attitude in North Africa, what of its impact on France?

France is already bleeding itself white to maintain a force of over 300,000 men in North Africa. What have these sacrifices produced other than the scorn and derision of those who, forgetting the real greatness of France in Europe, still dream Louis Napoleon's 19th century dream of grand empire in the deserts and swamps of the tropics? What have these sacrifices produced but the dismay of the decent people of France and the virtual immobilization of their government? Now it has even come to mobs and riots in the streets of Paris. What will follow? The barricades and then, after, the iron fist of tyranny? How much longer will the free institutions of France withstand these pressures? How much longer before Western European cohesion—deprived of the essential cement of French inspiration—how much longer before it begins to crumble?

And what of the Moslem people in North Africa? Will they gain from the agonies of France? Have they forgotten the achievements of French culture and civilization? Have they forgotten, in truth, that the very demands for freedom and equality which they now echo throughout the land are themselves derived from the traditions of liberty which flow from France?

These are some of the questions which I hope those who call for "all or nothing" in North Africa—European and Moslem alike—will consider carefully before it is too late.

There can be a peaceful solution to this crisis. But there can be a solution, in my opinion, only if the realities of the situation are fully and frankly recognized. There can be a solution only if the responsible political leaders—French, Spanish, and Moslem—have the courage and determination to act firmly on these realities, and if they have the sympathetic support of other nations whose fundamental self-interest lies in the preservation of peace in North Africa and the Mediterranean region. I mean this country, as well as the Western European nations and the nearby Arab States. If there is more stirring of the troubled waters, if there is a stubborn resistance to necessary change and if there is malicious fishing for advantage by outsiders, there shall be no solution in North Africa, and all will stand to lose in the long run regardless of any momentary profit that may be gained.

If there is to be a stable and meaningful peace in North Africa, I believe these principles must govern it:

First. The legitimate grievances of the Moslem people must be corrected; the economic, political, and social inequities must be ended as rapidly as possible.

Second. The rights of the European settlers to a place in the future of North Africa must be protected.

Third. Responsible officials in North Africa must be prepared to deal swiftly and impartially with the terrorism of the mob and the assassin, be they European or Moslem.

I realize, Mr. President, that it is easy to state principles involving other peoples several thousand miles away. I realize, too, that if the crisis is met successfully in North Africa, it will be met primarily as a result of the efforts of the French and the Moslems. My purpose in stating these principles is not to presume to guide them. The responsible leaders on both sides have long since recognized them. My purpose in emphasizing these principles is to make clear what I believe to be the only valid framework in which American foreign policy can exercise a constructive influence toward peace in North Africa.

Our direct interests in North Africa are relatively limited and there is little desire or likelihood of any increase in the near future. Few Americans reside in the area. Our commercial interests are small. We have rights in Tangier and extraterritorial privileges in Morocco which we are in the process of surrendering. We have airbases in

Morocco, built at great cost, not for us alone, but as part of the defense structure of the North Atlantic community and the Mediterranean area.

If our direct interests are limited, however, our indirect interests—as I have already tried to point out—are immense. They add up to the urgent necessity of finding a peaceful solution of the North African crisis at one end of the Mediterranean. Our interests will be served by a foreign policy which contributes to that end, to the development of an accommodation that is acceptable to the vast majority of Moslems in North Africa and to France. We cannot be a party to any plan to repress the legitimate aspirations of the Moslem peoples in North Africa but at the same time we cannot abandon a free France in its hour of great need. These are not, necessarily, mutually exclusive objectives. They need not immobilize our foreign policy in that region.

The way for us, then, is clear. If France and the North Africans move toward a reconciliation of their interests—if the concept of "independence with interdependence" takes root—there may be a constructive role which, together with other free nations, we can play; but only in those circumstances.

In some respects, there is hope for a settlement along those lines. In Tunisia important political agreements have already been achieved. Something similar is taking place with respect to Morocco, despite the reticence of Spain which controls a substantial part of the sultanate. In both these regions, I believe a sound basis for further progress has been laid.

Algeria, however, which is of the greatest importance to France, presents far more difficult and complex problems. Algeria has long been treated as an integral part of metropolitan France, as "France south of the Mediterranean." France seeks a solution respecting Algeria in the alleviation of the political inequities and the crushing burden of poverty under which most Algerians live, but without changing the present integration of Algeria and France. No one can say with any certainty whether this approach will be effective. While it is being attempted, moreover, there is little that this country or any other country can do without complicating the difficulty.

Mr. President, we have had expressions of despair in this country over the North African crisis interspersed with the smiling assurances that conditions were improving in the world. What we have not had is a facing up of the significance of this situation to us. What we have not had is the kind of intelligent initiative in our policies which might contribute to a peaceful solution in North Africa.

At the outset I made clear to the Senate my personal limitations in reviewing this situation. As I pointed out, we may not have all the facts. But on the basis of what we do know, on the basis of the facts which I have attempted to summarize here today, I am not satisfied that we have done what might be done to increase the prospects for peace in North Africa. It seems to me that the logic of these facts opens up avenues of exploration in foreign policy which the executive branch might well pursue and yet has not pursued, at least to the knowledge of the Senate.

As I noted, Tunisia and Morocco are both moving toward freedom with interdependence on the basis of agreements acceptable to responsible French and North African nationalist leaders. The time may be fast approaching when consideration should be given to inviting both Tunisia and Morocco—and Spain—to associate with NATO. They are essential components in the maintenance of peace in the Mediterranean, and I believe that NATO has much to offer for their security.

It seems to me, too, that NATO, or perhaps the Western European Union, could play a significant role in easing the economic stresses that the present transition in North Africa places on both European and Moslem. Is it too much to anticipate that a joint economic effort by the NATO countries could contribute immeasurably to the common progress of both? Is it too much to anticipate that such an effort might do much to alleviate the economic causes of discontent and fear in North Africa, that it might help to develop a mutuality of interest which could translate the concept of independence with interdependence into a reality? Is it too much to expect the executive branch to exercise some initiative in this direction?

Mr. President, I do not know whether these thoughts may have application. I do know, however, that a critical situation exists in North Africa which contains dangerous implications for the United States. It seems to me that in such circumstances there is a responsibility to do more than alternately exude confidence or despair. There is a responsibility on us to raise the issues that are involved and to consider possible ways in which they may be resolved. That is all, Mr. President, that I have been trying to do today.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As in the case of previous reviews of foreign policy, I thoroughly appreciate the fine contribution of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I appreciate especially his analysis of the North African crisis. I am not quite clear, however, as to the estimation at which the Senator is endeavoring to arrive. Is it his opinion that the President should take steps with NATO, with the possible approach of NATO becoming concerned in the African question, and trying to work out some solution of the problem?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. The Senator from New Jersey, whom I value highly as a friend and whom I respect as a keen student of foreign affairs, must have misunderstood me. What I tried to suggest was that once Tunisia and Morocco achieve their independence it might be worthwhile that we consider the possibility of their becoming associated with NATO, and I have reiterated and oft expressed desire that Spain might also be associated with NATO because she is interested in the particular part of the Mediterranean nearest her shores.

I have advanced a further possibility, that the NATO nations, or perhaps a Western European Union group, might consider the possibility of collectively advancing economic aid to the regions bordering the Mediterranean, so that some of the inequalities brought about by poverty and poor housing might be alleviated to some extent. I look upon that as a joint effort in which we might participate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator. I should like to ask him one more question, namely, whether his approach to and study of the matter is leading toward an urging of more and more integration of the European area into what we have called in a broad way the United States of Europe, in order to solve their internal problems among themselves.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct. I have felt for many years, as I know the Senator from New Jersey has felt, that one of the keys to the future of Western Europe is the establishment of a United States of Europe, which would do away with customs walls and other difficulties, and would guarantee a sort of homogeneity which would be of tremendous value to the countries united collectively, but the advantage of which they do not derive so long as they act individually.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I share the view of the Senator from Montana on that subject. I assume from his talk that problems such as the North African one might eventually be considered in relation to the integration of European states, if that could be done in a tactful way.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I had not thought of it in that way, I must admit, because I was looking at the situation from a purely strategic and economic point of view. But with the world becoming smaller, as it is getting smaller every day, we are, of course, neighbors with one another. North Africa is not too far away from Europe any more, geographically, so we must consider the importance of a country like Morocco, which is both a Mediterranean and an Atlantic nation, and the part it would play in the future defense of what we call western civilization. It is very important that those areas should not veer toward the east or the north—I mean toward the Soviet Union, in the latter sense—but should be kept, if possible, within the western orbit.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Montana very much for his observations. Again, I commend him for his fine contribution.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the subject of electoral college reform.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THURMOND

I shall not dwell at any length on the technical aspects of the substitute being proposed here today in lieu of the original version of Senate Joint Resolution 31. However, I do want to make a few comments on the proposal as a whole and state my strong support of this resolution, on which the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and I were able to reach a compromise agreement.

I would like to commend the Senator from Texas and the Senator from South Dakota for the fine work they have done on this substitute amendment. They have made a great contribution to the American system of Government in agreeing on this substitute proposal which combines salient points of our separate plans. I have been happy to have worked with them on this plan for the past several months, through a number of conferences and redrafting of combination plans.

Most important in this plan is the fact that its adoption would result in more exactly translating the will of the people into electoral votes. The proposed amendment would provide a much more exact register of their will than the present winner-take-all system of allocating the electoral votes of the States.

I believe that many citizens who now take little interest in an election of President would be given an incentive to vote under the compromise amendment being considered. In many States where one political party or the other has a vast majority, the individual voter who belongs to the minority party has no incentive to vote because he knows his ballot will in no way affect the outcome of the election.

Under the proposed plan, the individual voter could vote with the knowledge that his effort would carry equal weight to the extent his vote compared with the total votes cast in his State.

From the standpoint of a State, the will of people will be more exactly registered in the division of electoral votes. From the standpoint of the Nation, Presidents elected after adoption of this amendment will be more nearly the candidate who has won the greatest popular vote.

There is another important feature of this plan, Mr. President, which I believe to be highly desirable in maintaining a strong and stable government. The plan limits the electoral votes of any State to the top three candidates, thus discouraging the creation of numerous splinter parties which have caused weak and unstable governments in some foreign countries.

An additional safeguard to the will of the voters is contained in this plan in that candidates for elector, in States where the district system is adopted, would be bound legally to support the presidential candidate to whom they were pledged.

I believe the optional system of choosing electors, as provided in this plan, makes it acceptable in every State. Some States prefer the preservation of the electors, as such. Others want to discard the electors because they believe they have long since stopped serving any good purpose.

Whether a State wants to maintain the buffer of electors, who are State officers, between the State and Federal Government, or whether another State wants to translate the popular vote into electoral votes directly, cannot cause reasonable argument over this plan because it permits the States, individually, to adopt either course for the choosing of electors.

I hope that every Member of this Senate who wants our system of election for the President and Vice President improved will join in supporting the substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 31. While many of us disagree politically, I am convinced that the result of passing this resolution would be consistent with the wishes of a majority of the members of both major political parties because it would give each of the Members a greater voice in his Government.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has reported to the Senate from the Committee on the Judiciary Senate Joint Resolution 31, which would modernize and change the methods of electing the President and Vice President of the United States.

Without a doubt, the electoral college method of electing the President is the most archaic and undemocratic feature of the United States Constitution. It was one of the few mistakes made by the Founding Fathers—a mistake they made because they thought the people could not be trusted to select the President and Vice President.

As originally intended, the States were to select well informed public men as electors, and they were to meet and select a President and Vice President, without reference to popular vote or any other method of expression from the people. The original form has been retained in the solemn words of the Constitution, although for more than a century it has had no practical use. In fact, the electoral college system has never functioned as contemplated by the framers of the Constitution. The form should be removed from our Constitution before it rises to haunt us by flouting the will of the people in selecting a President. So long as the form remains in the Constitution, it is possible for electors to cast their independent votes contrary to the expressed will of their constituents, and this, in fact, has been done in more than one instance.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or would he prefer to yield later?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is my understanding that since 1820, out of 12,000 electors, only in 5 cases have they voted against their instructions—once in 1820; 3 times in 1824, when 3 Clay electors left him; and once in 1948; and in 1948 the elector indicated in advance that he would support Governor Thurmond. So the actions of 5 electors out of 12,000 does not seem to me to represent a major evil.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his contribution. He simply illustrates my point. If it was possible for five electors in our history to act contrary to the vote of the people, and to cast their votes contrary to the will of the people who cast their votes for electors for President and Vice President, it means that we have a system under which similar action could be taken by more electors in the future; and we ought to end any chance of such a practice in the future.

Mr. KENNEDY. That was merely once in a hundred and thirty years, because four of those instances occurred in 1820 and 1824. So the danger does not seem to me to be very substantial, bearing these statistics in mind.

Mr. DANIEL. In the Hayes election, if only one elector had changed his vote, there would have been a different President of the United States. The evil of the matter is to have a constitutional provision which leaves the choice of the President and Vice President to electors named in the States, without having the electors bound to follow the will of the people.

The practice which has been substituted for the constitutional form is just as evil and undemocratic. I refer to the custom which is generally understood and followed—that all electoral votes of each State will be cast for the candidate who receives a plurality of the popular vote within that State. That is the custom to which the Senator from Massachusetts has referred, namely, of actually following, in most cases, the vote which is cast by the people.

In effect, this disfranchises millions of American voters. In effect, we find that the dummy electors merely vote as the people want them to vote. That is the practice which has generally been followed. But we find in our present system that the practice which has been followed by most of the States is that the winner in a State, even if he be the winner by only one vote, takes all the electoral votes of the State. This disfranchises many voters in all our States in every Presidential election year. Their votes for a candidate for President are not counted in the electoral vote, unless their candidate receives a majority of the popular vote in their State.

For instance, if a candidate receives a one-vote plurality in the State of New York, he now receives 100 percent of the electoral votes of New York, and the candidate receiving only one less vote at the polls receives none of the New York electoral vote.

The legislative proposal now before the Senate is not new to those Members of this body who were also Members of the 81st Congress. The measure which became known as the Lodge-Gossett amendment in the 81st Congress was, as reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, in exactly the same text as the resolution approved by the Senate on February 1, 1950. This amendment was the subject of hearings by the Standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary on March 16, 18, 25, April 1 and 6, 1955. Copies of these hearings should be on the desk of each Senator. The amendment was reported to the full Committee on the Judiciary by a vote of 3 to 2 in April 19, 1955. It was considered by the full Judiciary Committee at its meeting of May 16, 1955, and reported to the Senate by a vote of 10 yeas, 3 nays, with 2 members not voting. A cursory examination of the hearings will show that they dealt with proposals other than the amendment now under consideration.

It is no secret, Mr. President, that though there is considerable sentiment for amending the Constitution to eliminate many aspects of an archaic system, not all the proponents of the amendment

are in agreement as to the form which such remedial legislation should take. The Senate in 1950 overwhelmingly supported the Lodge-Gossett amendment which the committee had reported. The vote at that time was 64 yeas, 27 nays.

However, since that time considerable sentiment has developed in favor of a plan which has properly become known as the Mundt-Coudert plan. After the committee had reported the resolution but before it became the unfinished business of the Senate, it was ascertained that remedial reform of any nature would probably be impossible unless some agreement were reached among the proponents of reform on an amendment on which all, or almost all, could agree.

A similar idea must have formed in the mind of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and we discussed with him the possibility of compromising our viewpoints with respect to the form which the amendment should take. It was found that the Senator from South Dakota had the same basic belief which was held by those of us who authored the Gossett-Lodge amendment last year that electoral reform could not be accomplished unless our differences were composed. Later the distinguihed Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] introduced a third proposal embodying some of the features of each of the two proposals then under consideration, plus some new ideas of his own. The three, together with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who acted as chairman of the constitutional amendment subcommittee in hearing these proposals, united in a substitute, which has been introduced on behalf of 53 Members of the Senate.

This substitute, as I stated a few days ago when it was introduced, embodies the original proposal approved by the Senate in 1950, approved by our Committee on the Judiciary, and known as the Lodge-Gossett proposal, by which the States would have their same electoral votes, but the electoral votes would be divided in proportion to the popular vote in each State.

The only provision we have added is that any State which desired to do so, as indicated by action of its legislature, might choose electors on a congressional district basis. States would have 2 electors for their 2 Senators, and would have as many electors from congressional districts as they had congressional districts.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] made the statement earlier that States could now elect to follow the procedure in the Mundt-Coudert proposal. Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct. In other words, all the Senator from South Dakota asked of those of us on the Judiciary Committee who represented the Lodge-Gossett proposal—the proportional division amendment—was to leave that feature as it is today, whereby those States which desire to do so may elect their electors on a congressional-district basis.

It seemed that was a perfectly fair request. The Senator from South Dakota and Representative COUDERT have done a great deal of work on that proposal. If we adopted that proposal alone, it would be much better than the system we have today, and would be more representative of the vote of the people; but all they ask is the alternative by which any State which desires to do so may exercise the right it has today to name its electors, two at large and the rest by congressional districts.

There was one further agreement made before we accepted as an alternative a provision which is not in the Constitution today. That was the provision, which is now in our proposed substitute, that the electors must vote as they are pledged to vote. The elector pledged to vote for a certain presidential or vice presidential candidate would have to cast his vote for such candidate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I have yielded to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has covered the additional question which I had intended to submit. In addition to preserving the latitude now available to the States to select their electors on the basis of action by congressional districts, the Senator's proposal, or the proposal which he and 52 other Senators advocate, and which I support, and intend to support, would impose upon those electors, however they might be elected, whether by the State at large or by congressional district, the obligation of reflecting in the electoral college the mandate of the people.

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct. In other words, the present system of free and independent electors would be abolished, and the vote of the people would determine, and each State's electoral vote would be counted. Under either of the alternative methods provided in the substitute, correct credit would be given to individual voters in selecting the President of the United States.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wonder if the Senator from Texas would be willing to yield the floor temporarily to the able Senator from Massachusetts, so that the Senator from Texas might start a meeting which had been set for 3 o'clock, with the understanding that when the Senator from Texas returned the Senator from Massachusetts would yield the floor back to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without losing the floor, I may yield to the Senator from Massachusetts with the understanding that his remarks will come at the conclusion of my remarks, and that I can interrupt him when I return to the floor and resume my remarks.

Mr. KENNEDY. I accept the floor with that understanding, because, since my remarks will be contradictory to those of the Senator from Texas, I would not want them to appear in the middle of the statement of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. SMATHERS. That will not happen under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. DANIEL. That sentiment is mutual.

Mr. President, has the unanimous-consent request been granted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(At this point Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Senate on the resolution. His address appears at the conclusion of Mr. DANIEL'S remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I deserve no credit whatever for having proposed the amendment to the Constitution. The proposal was contained in similar proposed amendments to the Constitution to improve our electoral system and get rid of the archaic system which we now have, which have been offered in nearly every Congress during the last century.

A strong effort was made for improvement in 1950. At that time the Senate by a two-thirds vote adopted what was known as the Lodge-Gossett amendment. It merely provided that the electoral vote of each State should remain as it is now, namely, 1 vote for each Member in Congress, but that that vote should be divided in proportion to the popular vote in each State. In that way voters themselves would have a more direct say as to who should be the President of the United States.

I was attracted to the amendment then when the Senate was considering it, and when the distinguished Representative from the State of Texas, Ed Gossett, cosponsored the amendment in the House.

When I came to the Senate I introduced the same amendment which the Senate had approved by a two-thirds vote. That is the amendment which was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

I am surprised to hear any Senator defend the present system and say that he does not want the present system changed. It would seem to me that most of the Senators would wish to give the people themselves a more direct say as to who should be President and Vice President.

I have heard discussion on the floor today by several Members of the Senate to the effect that they would like to change the system so as to provide a direct vote of the people for President and Vice President. As has been explained by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], that would be almost impossible to accomplish, because about 31 States would lose some of their representation in the electoral vote—and that is particularly true of the smaller States—because at the present time, instead of the vote being based simply on population or on qualified voters, the States are entitled to 2 votes for their Senators and 1 vote for each Representative in the total electoral vote.

For that reason, and for other reasons, such as differences in voting qualifications in the various States, it would be impossible for us to have a direct vote for President and Vice President. It

would be impossible because too many Members of Congress wish to preserve our State units and the present electoral votes by States when it comes to the election of a President.

Therefore, it seems to me—and this is in accordance with the testimony given at our hearings that were held on this subject—that the closest we can get to the people themselves having a direct vote for President and Vice President is to divide the electoral vote within each State in accordance with the popular vote. That is the amendment I have sponsored. As I say, I have simply sponsored it in the same words in which the Senate adopted it by a more than two-thirds vote in 1950.

It became obvious, after we reported the amendment to the floor, that there were not two-thirds of the Members of the Senate who would support the amendment in that form, because many Members of the Senate—and, I might say, a majority of those who appeared before our committee—testified that they felt the better system for electoral reform would be to let each State keep its present electoral votes but elect named electors in the same manner that named Senators and Representatives are elected.

Therefore, they testified in favor of that plan which we now know as the Mundt-Coudert plan. I personally felt that it was not as desirable as the so-called Lodge-Gossett plan, and I said so in committee. However, on finding such a large number of the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives favoring the proposal of electing their electors on the basis of Congressional districts, with two electors at large, it became evident that if we were ever to get any electoral reform, we would have to compose our differences.

It seems to me that those who adhere to that plan and think it is the best plan by which the people can express themselves on the election of President and Vice President were very fair in agreeing that all they wanted was the alternative of following their program if their State legislature so desired. In other words, the substitute which I shall call up in a moment would put into effect the so-called Lodge-Gossett proposal, with only this change:

We would provide that instead of requiring 40 percent of the vote for election, as it was provided in the original amendment, the electoral vote will be distributed among the highest 3 candidates for President and Vice President. This is to get rid of the argument of splinter parties, to try to get rid of any possibility that dividing the vote in that way would increase splinter parties.

That change has been made in the original resolution as reported from the Judiciary Committee on the Lodge-Gossett amendment. Under this proposed substitute, we would follow the Constitution of the United States on this subject in that any State which may so desire may provide for the election of its electors in the same manner in which it elects its Senators and Representatives.

When that proposal was brought before the subcommittee, it was felt that if the proponents of the Mundt-Coudert alternative would provide further that their electors should be bound to vote for the candidate to whom they are pledged, it would be acceptable as the only means of getting something through the Senate with a two-thirds vote for electoral reform. Frankly, I feel that if the Mundt-Coudert amendment is the one to get through, it would be better than the present system, because the people would have a more direct say in the election of the President and Vice President than they now have.

This is what led the Senator from Texas to try to compose these differences and to support the substitute, namely, that the Mundt-Coudert proposal of the election of electors by congressional districts would be followed under the present amendment. We have had no uniformity in the election of electors for President and Vice President. Even now some of the States have the short ballot where only the names of the President and Vice President go on the ballot.

Other States have the names of all the electors on the ballot. In some States electors have been chosen by the legislature. In some States they have been chosen by direct popular vote. In 11 States we have had the election of the electors under the Mundt-Coudert plan, by congressional districts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When was the Mundt-Coudert plan abandoned? It does not now prevail in any of the States. Was it not abandoned about 1860?

Mr. DANIEL. I think Michigan was the last State to use the plan, in 1892.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Even in 1892 Michigan was an isolated State, so far as this method was concerned, was it not?

Mr. DANIEL. I think that is true; but in the very beginning of the history of our country there were 11 States, including the Senator's State of Illinois, which followed the congressional district system.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that this method was proposed by Alexander Hamilton for the election of 1800, in a letter to John Jay, then governor, because he thought it would be a way in which the Jeffersonian vote in New York could be decreased, but Jay refused to put it into effect? It is true that later the Jeffersonians thought it would be to their advantage to use it upon occasion; but was not the district system abandoned because it was realized that the districts were unequal in size and that such a method would offer an opportunity for the decision of the electoral college to be at great variance with the decision of the voters in an important State or in the Nation?

Mr. DANIEL. I am not sure as to the Senator's reference to our early statesmen. The only quotation I have in mind is one from Madison, in which he said, in effect, that this system of election, the district system, was the plan which the framers of the Constitution had in mind, and it was used in several of the original States.

It was used in a total of 11 States—12, including Michigan.

The point of what I am trying to say is that under our Constitution we can use this system, and it is not a great concession to the supporters of the Mundt-Coudert plan to allow the electors to continue to have their right, if the legislature consents, to use it, because, after all, it is a more direct expression of the people, in my opinion, than is the present method of "winner take all."

I cannot understand how anyone can defend the present system of "winner take all" of a State's votes.

One of my objections to the Mundt-Coudert plan is that by congressional districts we have a smaller unit in which the winner takes all. But it is much better, it seems to me, to have an elector elected just as a Representative is elected by congressional districts, than it is for the total vote of an entire State to go to whoever receives a plurality. The Senator from Illinois knows the result of that. It has caused several of the pivotal States in our country to unduly influence the affairs of our political parties, and to have an undue weight in the election of a President and Vice President.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Texas to be implying that the big States control the policies of either the Democratic or Republican Party?

Mr. DANIEL. The pivotal States, I said.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are the big States, are they not? What are the specific States which the Senator says control the politics of the parties?

Mr. DANIEL. I did not say they control the politics.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought the Senator said that. What are these big States?

Mr. DANIEL. They have undue weight and influence. The large pivotal States which I have in mind are New York, for instance, Ohio, and the Senator's State of Illinois. They have undue weight, it seems to me, under our present system.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What about the State of Texas?

Mr. DANIEL. Texas certainly does not have any undue weight under our present system. Only in exceptional cases do we ever find a vote so close in Texas that there is any contest within the State. In the Senator's State there is a great contest. It is a pivotal State. In New York there is a great contest, because whoever can get one more vote than the other candidate is going to receive the entire electoral vote of that State. Delegates go to the convention and say, "We must have a candidate from New York," or from Illinois, or from one of the pivotal States, because, by having a candidate from one of those States, it can receive the necessary plurality to get all the State's electoral votes. In presidential elections we find most of the campaigning in those pivotal States.

I think it would be more democratic if the appeal were made to a majority of the people of the whole country, and not to just the people concentrated in about eight pivotal States in which a few votes

makes so much difference in the total electoral vote.

If we had, for instance, either of these proposals in effect, I believe we would see campaigning throughout the entire country, and the vote of a citizen in Tennessee would amount to as much as would a vote of a citizen of New York.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the Senator's statement about presidential candidates and vice presidential candidates coming from pivotal States is not really borne out by the facts. Presidents and Vice Presidents have come from such States as Missouri, Utah, Iowa, Kansas. A few have come from States which the Senator refers to as pivotal. About 50 percent of the American people live in the 9 most populous States. Each of these States has only two Senators. Therefore, less than half of the people control 78 of the 96 Senators.

I think when we consider the balance of power in relationship to the Presidency, Nevada, by virtue of the two Senators to which it is entitled—even though Nevada has a much smaller population than has New York—has more than equal representation as compared with the State of New York. Even though Nevada might have a population ratio of 1 to 124 with New York, the electoral vote ratio, as I understand it, gives Nevada a relationship to the State of New York of about 1 to 16 or 17.

So the point I make is that when all these factors are considered, it is not only the unit vote for the Presidency we are talking about, but a whole solar system of governmental power. If it is proposed to change the balance of power of one of the elements of the solar system, it is necessary to consider all the others.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from Massachusetts object to the direct election of the President and Vice President?

Mr. KENNEDY. I do.

Mr. DANIEL. In other words, the Senator from Massachusetts would be opposed to an amendment which provided that the people themselves shall have the right to vote directly on who shall be their President and Vice President?

Mr. KENNEDY. I would object to it, and I would do so on the practical ground that once again the smaller States, having very small populations, would have a disproportionate power in the counting process. The distribution of the population of the country is such that a relatively small percentage of the country could either defeat or ratify a constitutional amendment. Thus, while some States might be shortchanged in some regards in the matter of governmental power, they would receive their just deserts in other regards.

But in answer to the Senator's question, I maintain that on practical grounds the people in the smaller States, would be deprived of their electoral vote on the basis put by the Senator, that is, if they were included in the direct vote, as proposed by Senator LANGER, a proposal which would never be adopted. On theoretical grounds, it seems to me it would be a breach of the agreement made with the States when they came into the Union. At that time it was understood that they would have the same number of electoral votes as they had Senators and Representatives.

Mr. DANIEL. For those two reasons, I agree with the Senator that we should not have the direct vote for President and Vice President; but we should get as close to it as we possibly can.

Does the Senator from Massachusetts have any other objection to the direct election of the Presidfent and Vice President?

Mr. KENNEDY. No; I think the reasons I have given are sufficient. The reason why the Senator may also be against direct elections is that it would place tremendous influence, a disproportionate influence, in the major, pivotal States. So the Senator wants to go just far enough to deprive the States of their rightful influence, but not to go so far in the other direction as to give them what they really deserve.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Texas has already stated that he wants to see the electoral vote remain exactly as it is by States, but within those States the Senator from Texas feels that the direct vote of the people should be reflected as nearly as possible in the electoral vote in each year that the country elects a President and Vice President.

Referring to what I said a moment ago about the pivotal States having many of the candidates for President and Vice President, let me read from page 11 of the committee report on that subject. The Committee on the Judiciary, after going into the matter quite thoroughly, came to this conclusion:

First, it means that presidential candidates from these States—

That is, the doubtful States, under the present system—

It means that presidential candidates from these States have a marked advantage over rivals from other States in the nomination struggle. Sixteen major party candidates since 1900 (17, if Theodore Roosevelt is considered a major party candidate in 1912) have come from New York or Ohio.

Sixteen of the twenty-six major party candidates for President since 1900 have come from New York or Ohio.

I have no desire to do any injustice to those States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is not proposing, is he, that the people from New York, Ohio, or Illinois be disfranchised? Is he not, in fact, proposing that the something less than one-half of the people who under the present system have no voice in the electoral college be, in fact, enfranchised to exercise their proportionate influence in the electoral college.

Mr. DANIEL. That is exactly correct. Today close to one-half of all the voters in the doubtful States are disfranchised. Their votes are not counted in the electoral college, because they do not vote for the candidate getting the plurality in that State. Not only are their votes not counted as they cast them, but they are counted opposite from the way they are cast, because they happen to be in the minority. Their votes are counted as if they had cast them for the presidential candidate receiving the plurality within the State.

The junior Senator from Tennessee is exactly correct. We are not trying to disfranchise anyone; we are simply trying to make an improvement in the electoral system, under which each individual voter will have a chance to have his vote reflected in the total vote in the electoral college.

Mr. GORE. Is not the Senator from Texas also proposing to enfranchise, so to speak—that is, to give some voice in the electoral college—to the seemingly permanent minorities in certain States, such as Mississippi, on the one hand, and Maine, on the other?

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator will examine the records of the past several elections, he will find that there has been a very strong minority vote in Maine, but that in no instance has that minority vote had one iota of influence upon the electoral college.

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct; and there is no incentive among those who might belong to the minority party in either Maine or Mississippi to go to the polls in greater numbers or to do anything about the election, because they feel that their votes will not be counted, or at least will not be counted as they cast them.

Mr. GORE. I happen to believe that in the southern part of our Nation, through the practical workings of politics, a really vigorous two-party system might serve better the public interest. Does not the Senator from Texas think that in both Mississippi and in Maine a real, working, two-party system would be encouraged by the adoption of his proposed amendment?

Mr. DANIEL. There is no doubt about it. The Committee on the Judiciary made the finding that a two-party system would be encouraged in the States which do not now have it. More people would be encouraged to go to the polls in a general election. Let me read something on that point from page 12 of the committee report:

It should be observed that when statisticians compute how much weight is to be given to an electoral vote, they always use the general election figures. These figures are usually very markedly smaller than the primary election figures in one-party States. In 1946 in South Carolina, for example, 13 percent of the population voted in the primaries, while only about 1½ percent voted in the November elections.

Think of that; 1½ percent of the voters in South Carolina voted in the November 1946 elections.

In Georgia, the relationship was 15 percent (primaries) and 4½ percent (general elections). In Mississippi, it was 6 percent (primaries) and 0.2 percent (general elections). In Texas, 28 percent of the population voted in the primaries; only 5 percent turned out for the general elections.

In presidential years, a little larger vote is turned out in the November elections. The last presidential election year, 1952, was an exception. But an examination of the election returns

through a period of years will disclose that in the Southern States both Democrats and Republicans stay away from the polls in November because they think that those States are going to vote for the Democratic Party.

The Democrats reason that there is no use in going to the polls; the election will go in our favor anyway.

The Republicans take no interest, because they figure that their vote will not be reflected in the total electoral votes from that State, under the present system.

The same situation, only in reverse, exists in Maine, as the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, and in some of the other States where the Republican Party is predominant.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator believes, does he not, that every good citizen ought to vote?

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Is not one of the reasons why citizens do not vote the fact that the names of the candidates for President and Vice President do not appear on the ballot?

Mr. DANIEL. In some States that is true.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator believe that the best way to make votes of the minority count is to have a direct popular vote by the people?

Mr. DANIEL. I say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that, as I just said, I think the nearest we can get to a direct popular vote would be the most democratic way of electing our Presidents and Vice Presidents. But there are two reasons agreed upon between the Senator from Massachusetts and myself why we do not believe that will be done. However, the Senator from North Dakota, who was the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and sat through the discussion in the committee, knows that the Senator from Texas would like to get a system which would give the people the best chance to express themselves. I feel the proposal before us is the nearest we can get to a direct election.

Mr. LANGER. Why cannot a President be elected in the same way a United States Senator or a governor, or a Representative is elected? There simply would be primary elections held in June, and the people would elect whatever Republican candidate and Democratic candidate they wanted to run for President and Vice President. The top men would be placed on the Democratic ticket and the Republican ticket, and the people would vote directly for the man they wanted. What is the objection to that?

Mr. DANIEL. I imagine one of the objections would come from the Senator's own State legislature. I think the Senator would find that his own legislature would hesitate or refuse to approve such a proposal. How many Representatives from North Dakota are there?

Mr. LANGER. There are 2 Representatives and 2 Senators.

Mr. DANIEL. There are now 4 electoral votes in North Dakota. The State of North Dakota gets an additional weight in the electoral college, because, as a separate State, it receives 2 votes for the 2 Senators and 2 votes for the 2 representatives. If there were a direct election, the people of North Dakota would not have as much of a say in the election as they do under our present electoral vote division by States. There are 30 or 31 States which would lose some of their total weight in the election of a President if the present division of the electoral vote were abandoned. That is one reason why I stated I do not believe we could go that far.

Mr. LANGER. I am sure the Senator will remember the year when I proposed my constitutional amendment. It was voted down in the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Before I did that I polled the people of North Dakota. By a vote of 8 to 1 the people of North Dakota voted in favor of direct elections for President and Vice President. In election after election only about half the people of the United States vote. As the Senator from Texas said a few moments ago, they are not interested. In the Senator's State, and in some of the other States in that part of the country, they assume that whoever receives the Democratic nomination for governor will be elected.

Mr. DANIEL. That is true.

Mr. LANGER. As the Senator suggested, in Maine, the people probably assume that the Republican nominee will win.

I am not familiar with all of the little towns in the State of Texas, but I venture the guess that if the Senator would go back over the history of Texas he would find again and again and again that a candidate who came from a small town was elected as governor of Texas. That is true in North Dakota. We have small towns with small populations. It is surprising, when one reads the records of our elections, how time and time again the candidates who were elected governors did not come from Fargo or Grand Forks or some of the large towns, but came from small towns. Someone who had been elected to the State Legislature became popular because he advocated things the people liked.

For the life of me, I cannot see why in the United States of America the people should not be allowed to vote for the man they want as President of the United States, why the people should not elect their candidates on the Republican and the Democratic tickets, why a number of fellows in a smoke-filled room should hand-pick candidates for President on both the Democratic and the Republican tickets and say to the people, "Here are the two sons of guns. We are going into the cocktail lounge. You go out and fight over whether you want Mr. A or Mr. B for President." It seems to me if we are truly going to let the people be represented, the way to do it is to let a voter go in a booth, where he or she may be alone with his or her God, and there determine whether he or she will vote for Mr. Dewey or Mr. Dulles or Mr. Eisenhower, and Democrats can decide whether they want Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Daniel, or someone else for President. Does not the Senator believe that is the proper way to do it?

Mr. DANIEL. No, Senator. I am trying to get as close to that as would ever be possible under tthe present Constitution and the present division of the electoral vote in our country. I think the Senator will agree with me that the proposal I am making would get a lot nearer to a direct election by the people than exists now.

Mr. LANGER. I would not approve of it, because I am in favor of abolishing the electoral college. We do not need one if the people vote directly for President and Vice President.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator understand that the proposal now before the Senate would provide that the people would vote directly for President and Vice President in every State except where a State, by its legislature, would decide to have the vote by congressional district?

Mr. LANGER. As I stated in the Judiciary Committee, I totally disagree.

Mr. DANIEL. Under the proposal, the votes, although by States, would be directly for President or Vice President. That would be better than what we have now.

Mr. LANGER. Yes, but why not have a direct election? Eventually; why not now?

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator has an amendment. I am sure he will offer it.

Mr. LANGER. I intend to offer it as a substitute a little later. I received 33 votes in favor of it last year.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from North Dakota and I are much nearer to agreeing in principle than are some who oppose the proposed amendment, because some who oppose the amendment seem to oppose it for a different reason than on the ground of opposition to direct elections of President and Vice President.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask one further question, although I do not want to impose on the Senator's time. In Texas, I take it—not considering the last election—thousands of Republicans do not vote in the general elections.

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct, and thousands of Democrats do not vote.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator believe that if Republicans knew that the vote was going to be counted in the sum total, thousands, and perhaps hundreds of thousands, more would vote?

Mr. DANIEL. There is no doubt about that. That is one of the reasons why the subcommittee, and a majority of the full committee, voted for the resolution and reported it to the Senate. We felt thousands more of the citizens of our Nation, both Democratic and Republican, would come to the polls and vote.

Mr. LANGER. In the event that the measure now before the Senate should be defeated, would the Senator be willing to vote in favor of direct elections?

Mr. DANIEL. No, I would not do so, because of the inequity which would be created as between the States. It would disturb the entire electoral vote which various States now have. The States

have been allowed to have the same number of electoral votes as there are Senators and Representatives in those States, and, as the Senator from Massachusetts said a moment ago, I think it would be unfair to change that.

Mr. LANGER. But in the State of Texas a small county might object to the present arrangement which exists in Texas, might it not?

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator mean in the election of a governor?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. No. The people get to vote in Texas.

Mr. LANGER. Why would not the same arrangement be satisfactory on a national scale?

Mr. DANIEL. The 30 or 31 States which have electoral votes in the same number as there are Senators and Representatives are not going to give up the additional power which they have. In my opinion, that certainly would be the situation.

Mr. LANGER. What power do the smaller States have in that matter?

Mr. DANIEL. Furthermore, let me say to the Senator from North Dakota that according to the evidence before our committee, it would violate the agreement under which the original States entered the Union, if we were to change their proportionate voting power for President of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. It would not change anything at all. They voted to enter the Union, and that was all there was to it—the same as a county does when it becomes part of a State.

At the present time, New York runs the show, although once in a while Chicago comes into the picture. But one presidential candidate after another has come from the State of New York.

Mr. DANIEL. Sixteen of the 26 candidates since 1900, according to our report, came from New York and Ohio.

Mr. LANGER. Yes. I am in favor of having Texas and North Dakota represented in that group.

Mr. DANIEL. I am, too; and that is one of the purposes of this amendment, namely, so that the smaller States will have better representation through individual citizens.

Our amendment goes a great deal nearer to what the Senator from North Dakota wants to have accomplished than does the present system. Our amendment would constitute some improvement.

I hope that if the Senator's amendment for direct elections is defeated, he will at least vote for our amendment, as some improvement.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from North Dakota is very unpredictable; he might do that. [Laughter.]

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. In regard to the point raised by the Senator from North Dakota, I wish to take exception to the suggestion—although I know it was meant very honestly by the Senator from Texas—that the proposed amendment probably would come closer to reflecting the popular vote than does the present system.

As the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, there were 2 instances—or probably there was only 1, if we grant that the Tilden-Hayes contest undoubtedly was affected by fraud—in which, under our present system, the person receiving the largest number of popular votes did not also receive the largest number of electoral votes.

I have had the Library of Congress staff make a study of the presidential elections in the United States going back to 1860. It seems to me that to go back farther than that would serve no useful purpose, because so many social changes, voting changes, and other changes have occurred since that time. I have determined that there are two cases in which, if the Lodge-Gossett proposal or, as it is now known, the proposal of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] had been in effect, the candidates who actually received the larger number of popular votes, and who did also receive the larger number of electoral votes—to wit, McKinley and Garfield—would not have received the larger number of electoral votes, and would not have been elected President.

Mr. DANIEL. Our committee, after weeks of studying this matter, reached the conclusion that it was simply impossible to relate the proposed amendment to previous elections and arrive at any proof of what would have happened back then if this amendment had been in effect, because if there is anything that is certain, it is that under a change in our electoral system, there will be a larger amount of voting on both sides; and that in those cases, the number of votes cast was undoubtedly smaller than the number of votes which would have been cast if another system had been in effect.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I recognize the force of that argument. However, I think it is very limited in its application. But it shows that this entire matter is extremely speculative, insofar as the effect of the proposed constitutional amendment is concerned. However, when one argues that the past would not be repeated, it seems to me that the Senator who uses that argument is basing his case on very dangerous ground; and I take that view in this instance also, if that is the ground upon which the Senator from Texas proposes the amendment. Other than by judging from the experience in the past, we scarcely can test this proposal.

I shall be glad to point out the effect on our two-party system, and as regards the way—perhaps illogical—by which we arrive at the will of the people. I am frank to say that I do not think a popular vote would be as good as the present system, for this purpose. Therefore, I do not regard the fact that a candidate does not receive the largest number of votes on a single day as being the test as to the best way to elect the President of the United States.

In the United States we have accomplished this consensus, not only in the case of the election of candidates, but in the case of the solution of great problems, by a system which is very difficult to explain logically, but which I think is understood by those who have to operate under it. I think the existence of a few difficulties and a few logical inconsistencies, if you will, in a system which in practice has worked so well, does not constitute sufficient ground for changing that system lightly. It seems to me that to change the system under those circumstances would be the height of folly.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from New Jersey believe that the present system has worked well, when we have so small a percentage of the voters of the Nation coming to the polls and expressing their views by means of their votes?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I am very glad to answer that question. There are in the United States certain areas where there should be a much greater vote; and there are also certain areas where that situation exists because the people are prevented from voting by law or by pressure. I do not wish to get unduly partisan or to excite, by referring to irrelevancies, those who participate in the discussion of this issue; but this is not an irrelevancy: I am convinced that if the amendment went into effect, the restrictions by which many persons are not allowed—either by law or by pressure—to vote, would increase, and in that event the participation would be correspondingly smaller. That is one of the reasons why I am opposed to this amendment.

As to the general question of whether it is desirable for us to aim at having 100-percent participation in voting in elections, let me say I think that question is largely irrelevant to our present consideration, if I may say so. Today there is 100-percent participation in voting in Russia, and also in other countries where there are dictatorships.

It seems to me we have accomplished so much by means of the present system, that I hesitate to favor the making of a change. So I believe it does not matter too much to the vital interests of any person which side wins an election. By that, I do not mean to say that I am not strongly partisan in respect to favoring my party at any particular time and wanting to make it as good as I can. But if we had deep divisions among our people, there would be ample participation in the elections. However, such a situation does not now exist. That is one of the very good reasons why we do not have 100-percent participation in elections, although there is 100-percent participation in elections in some countries in Europe and elsewhere.

Mr. DANIEL. Of course, I am not advocating 100-percent participation in elections.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I understand.

Mr. DANIEL. And I would not want to have develop in our country the conditions which have brought that about in other countries. But I think it is a shame for nearly half of the citizens of the State of New Jersey, for instance, to be casting their votes for candidates for President and Vice President, and never have their votes counted—in fact, not only never have their votes counted for

the candidates for whom they cast their votes, but actually have their votes lumped in and counted in favor of the candidates against whom they voted.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Really, Mr. President, this argument amounts to no more than saying that because a choice has to be made between two candidates, when the candidate who received one more than half of the votes is declared elected, those who voted for the losing candidate are disenfranchised. Such an argument does not make sense.

My people in New Jersey gave me a majority of only approximately 3,500. In other words, almost a majority of the voters in New Jersey did not vote for me. Yet I do not regard them as disenfranchised, and I do not think they regard themselves as disenfranchised. The same is true in this case.

Mr. DANIEL. That is a different matter. We elect our Senators and our State officers by majority vote within the State. But when we come to elect the President of the United States, it seems to me that the vote of all the people should have some bearing and should count more in the case of the total.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield briefly to me?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I think of a famous national convention held only a short time ago. The Democrats had in the basement of the convention hall, in Chicago, a man who kept yelling into a microphone, "We want Roosevelt! We want Roosevelt!"

And over in Philadelphia, Wendell Willkie had a lot of forged admission cards for the galleries; and the persons who used those forged admission cards entered the galleries and yelled again and again, "We want Willkie!"

What voice did the people have in the selection of the candidates at the convention? It is nonsense to say that the people selected either one of them. When the nominations were made, the people had a choice between the two.

A little while ago, in a convention a lawyer for J. P. Morgan & Co. was finally nominated. How many people in the United States would have selected that gentleman? The people have no voice in the nomination of such candidates. The distinguished Senator knows it. That is not the way business is done. If the Senator does not believe it, let him go back to the convention in Chicago when Lowden and Wood were opposing candidates. Great sums were spent in behalf of the two candidates.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Who was the man finally selected? It was neither one. It was a man who probably could not have obtained the support of 2 percent of the voters had his name been submitted to a popular vote.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I conclude my presentation by saying that under our amendment, which has been presented in the form of a substitute, we would certainly do away with the independent electors we now have in this country, who are not bound by law to follow the will of the people who vote for them. Even though their names appear under the names of certain candidates for President and Vice President, the electors are not legally bound to cast their votes in the way the people tell them to do.

It is true, as the Senator from Massachusetts has said, that there have been only five occasions, as I recall, in which an elector cast his vote differently from the way the people voted. But had that happened in the case of the Tilden-Hayes contest in 1876, it would have changed the entire election for President of the United States.

It seems to me that this antiquated electoral college system is something we should get rid of. Why should we have a provision in our Constitution which we are sworn to uphold and obey, when none of us is doing so? Today our Constitution provides that the States shall choose their electors, and the electors shall choose a President. That is the form of the Constitution today. The form is not being carried out. Although electors are nominally independent, and have the right to vote any way they wish, in most cases they are simply casting their votes the way the plurality goes in their particular States.

Under the proposed amendment, the independence of those electors would be taken away, and they would be obliged to cast their votes for the candidates to whom they were pledged, under the alternative proposed for any State which wishes to follow the Mundt-Coudert plan.

In the part of our amendment which would apply in States which do not adopt the Mundt-Coudert plan, the vote would be divided, in each State, in proportion to the way it is cast for each candidate. In my opinion, that is the nearest we can ever come in this country to a direct election of President and Vice President. As a practical matter, it is the nearest we can come to having the people of the Nation express themselves as to whom they want for President and Vice President, and find that expression counted in Washington in the electoral vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator from Texas yet proposed his substitute for the original Senate Joint Resolution 31?

Mr. DANIEL. I intend to do so before yielding the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May the Senator from Illinois ask the Senator from Texas questions on the new amendment after he has offered it?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. President, on behalf of 53 other Members of the Senate and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. It is designated "3-15-56-A." It is an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to have the amendment read, or merely printed in the RECORD at this point?

Mr. DANIEL. I ask that the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point, without reading.

There being no objection, the amendmen in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. DANIEL (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILEY, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. JENNER, Mr. IVES, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. HILL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. WELKER, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. KERR, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. THYE, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. FREAR, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. BEALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. WATKINS), which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert certain language, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during a term of 4 years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution. No person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"The Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of the President is to begin. Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress. The electoral votes cast by each State may be cast in the manner provided by section 2 or, if the legislature of such State so provides, in the manner provided by section 3 of this article.

"The voters in each State in any such election shall have the qualifications requisite for persons voting for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

"SEC. 2. Except in any State in which electors are chosen under the provisions of section 3, votes for President and Vice President shall be cast by the people of each State, and the electoral vote to which such State is entitled shall be apportioned among the 3 persons receiving the greatest number of votes of the voters of such State for each office in the same ratio as the number of votes received by each such person bears to the total number of votes received by such 3 persons. In making the apportionment, any fractional portion of an electoral vote to which a person is entitled shall be disregarded if it is less than one one-thousandth.

"Within 45 days after the election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, the official custodian of the election returns of such State shall prepare, sign, certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate, a list of all persons for whom votes were cast for President and a separate list of all persons for whom votes were cast for Vice President. Upon each

such list there shall be entered the number of votes cast for each person whose name appears thereon, the total number of votes cast for all such persons, and the number of electoral votes of such State to which each such person is entitled.

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of this article, the legislature of any State may provide for the election of a number of electors equal to the number of electoral votes to which the State may be entitled in the same manner in which its Senators and Representatives are chosen. Any candidate for elector who before the election has pledged his vote for President or Vice President to a specific person shall, if elected, cast his vote for such person. No Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be chosen elector.

"Within 45 days after the election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, the electors so chosen shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot as pledged for President and Vice President, at least one of whom shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves. They shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice President; and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President and of all persons voted for as Vice President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate.

"SEC. 4. On the 6th day of January following the election, unless the Congress by law appoints a different day not earlier than the 4th day of January and not later than the 10th day of January, the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the vote shall then be counted. The person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be the President, and the person having the greatest number of votes for Vice President shall be the Vice President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electoral votes. If no person has a majority of the whole number of electoral votes for President or Vice President, then from the persons having the three highest numbers of electoral votes for such office the Senate and the House of Representatives sitting in joint session shall choose such officer immediately, by ballot. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of three-fourths of the whole number of the Senators and Representatives, and the person receiving the greatest number of votes shall be chosen.

"SEC. 5. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a President or a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any person who, except for his death, would have been entitled to receive a majority of the electoral votes for President or for Vice President.

"SEC. 6. The 1st, 2d, and 3d paragraphs of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, the 12th article of amendment to the Constitution, and section 4 of the 20th article of amendment to the Constitution are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 7. This article shall take effect on the 10th day of February following its ratification, but shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for some questions upon the substitute which is now the pending question?

Mr. DANIEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that the amendment with which the Senator from Texas and 53 other Senators are now proposing to supersede the original Senate Joint Resolution 31 would give State legislatures the choice as to whether they would use, first, the proportional State method which was originally embodied in the Lodge-Gossett proposal, and then later by the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], or second, the district unit method, under which each congressional district would vote as a unit for 1 elector and with 2 votes for the State as a whole?

Mr. DANIEL. In effect, that statement is correct. Actually the amendment, as drawn, would provide that the so-called Lodge-Gossett proposal for division of the vote in proportion to the popular vote shall be in effect in every State, except where a State legislature exercised its right to choose the alternative proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and Representative COUDERT.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Texas aware of the fact that in the State legislatures of the country, almost without exception the large cities are grossly underrepresented?

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Texas does not know whether or not that is true all over the country, but he does know that it is true in certain sections of the country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois will place in the RECORD at a later time evidence showing the degree to which, in State after State in this Union, large cities are grossly underrepresented in the State legislatures, which will make the choice as to whether or not they will operate under the Lodge-Gossett or the Mundt-Coudert method.

This is true in Rhode Island and Connecticut. It is true in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Delaware. It is true in Georgia and Florida. It is true, in one house, in my own State of Illinois. It is true in Texas. It is true in Minnesota. It is true in Tennessee. It is true in Arizona. It is true in Nevada. It is true in Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, South Carolina, and Idaho. It is true to some degree in North Dakota. It is true in North Carolina and in Mississippi.

It is true in most States of the Union. What will happen will be that the Senator from Texas and his conferees would turn over to grossly unrepresentative State legislatures the choice of a proportional State system or a district unit system. But they would not be allowed to retain the present State unit system which they have all advocated.

Mr. DANIEL. I would say to the Senator from Illinois that I doubt his prediction is correct. I believe that most of the States would follow the proportional system, because that is the preferred plan under the proposed amendment, and affirmative action of a State legislature would be necessary to adopt the district system. The fact that most of the States which have tried the district system have abandoned it, would lead me to believe that the majority of the States would not follow the alternative set up by the Mundt-Coudert plan. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] may disagree with me, but the Senator from Texas is giving his opinion. He does not believe that a majority of the States would follow that system.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask a further question of the Senator?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not correct to say that States could shift back and forth, in one election using the proportional State system, and in the next election using the unit-district system?

Mr. DANIEL. They could.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would there not be a temptation to adopt that system or combination of systems which would be most advantageous to the political parties dominant in various State legislatures, and in that way provide a shifting basis of representation?

Mr. DANIEL. I have never held the suspicion or had the worry of anyone doing anything with the amendment for partisan political purposes which the Senator from Illinois has in mind. I hope the Senator from Illinois knows that in offering the amendment the Senator from Texas sincerely would like to see the people themselves have a more direct voice in deciding who should be elected President.

As the Senator knows, the amendment which I introduced at the beginning would have provided merely for the proportional system, which I believe the Senator from Illinois voted for in 1950.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I voted for it in 1950, when I was a new Member of the Senate and somewhat unwary, and when I believed that if the big States made sacrifices it might induce some reciprocal yielding on the part of other States. Since then the Senator from Illinois has become wiser and more acquainted with the realities. He now understands that there are certain sections of the country which will yield nothing, and which are seeking constantly to diminish the power of the large States and of the large cities and to hold them in bondage. The Senator from Illinois is a wiser man now than he was in 1950. His hair is whiter, but his wisdom is greater.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from Illinois feel that his large State and his large city have some advantage which he wishes to preserve under our present system?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois feels that the big cities of the country are largely in political chains and, as he will develop later, he feels that they are grossly underrepresented in the Senate and are grossly underrepresented in the House and are grossly underrepresented in the various State legislatures of the country.

If we take the entire system of government in the United States, as the Senator from Massachusetts has suggested, the big cities are the most oppressed and the least represented. The

objection of the Senator from Illinois to the amendment which is now being offered is that it would take from the cities the one point of vantage they have and from the big States the one point of vantage they now have.

If the Senator from Texas has a great zeal for reform, why does he not seek to provide universal suffrage in the great State of Texas, or seek to abolish the poll tax, or seek to remove the physical liabilities which are imposed upon a large section of the people there and throughout the South—namely the colored race.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. DANIEL. I yielded to the Senator for questions, not for a speech. I even tried to interrupt him in order that things would not get too far. I do not mind yielding for questions, but I do not yield to him for the purpose of berating the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not berating the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. And I do not yield to the Senator from Illinois to intimate that the Senator from Texas may not have tried to do what he could with respect to the poll tax. I supported a constitutional amendment in my State to get rid of the poll tax. There are several things the Senator from Illinois has mentioned which the Senator from Texas might agree with him on.

However, we now have before us a constitutional amendment. I should like to yield to the Senator from Illinois for questions that he may ask concerning the constitutional amendment, or with respect to the remarks I have made.

I know that the Senator from Illinois feels that Chicago has a great advantage under our present electoral system and that perhaps the State of Illinois has a great advantage under the present electoral system under which all the votes cast go whichever way the plurality goes and under which system all the votes go one way if only a few more votes are cast on one side than on the other. In that way a candidate gets all the electoral votes of a State, even though only a few more votes may have been cast for him than for his opponent.

The fact gives the big cities and the State of Illinois an advantage which the Senator from Illinois would like to retain.

I do not blame the Senator for trying to hold on to the advantage which Illinois and Chicago now have as against the rest of the country. However, I am surprised that he should take that attitude in view of the fact that he voted for a similar amendment in 1950. Does the Senator from Illinois wish me to yield to him for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not mean to break in on the Senator. I feel very deeply on this subject. I thought the Senator was taking an inconsistent view. What I did is what I and other Senators do on occasion, namely, make a statement as well as ask a question. If I violated the rule, I am sorry.

I should like to ask the Senator this question, however. Does he not realize that the alternative method he proposes, namely, the district unit system, will disenfranchise a large number of people in congressional districts? I say that because congressional districts are not of equal size, nor do all voters have an equal vote. What he is proposing is in the nature of the Georgia county system blown up into a national system. Is that not correct?

Mr. DANIEL. No; the Senator from Texas is not proposing that at all. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Texas proposes exactly what the Senator from Illinois voted for in 1950. I am proposing a compromise which would compose the differences which exist among those who want electoral reforms and who believe the present system is unfair.

In order to do that, we felt it was fair to allow under the new amendment what can be done under the present Constitution, namely, the selection of electors on the basis of two for the Senators, two at large, and the remainder by congressional districts.

Does the Senator realize that the objections being raised by him now to the part of the amendment that we have added as an alternative go to the present Constitution as well? Does the Senator realize that 11 States, including his own State, used the Mundt-Coudert system of electing electors at one time or another in their history?

Mr. DOUGLAS. They used it, but they abandoned that system in favor of the State unit system.

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct. Under the present Constitution, however, any State that wishes to do so may return to the Mundt-Coudert system, under the Constitution. Therefore, I do not think it is any great concession to say that under our present amendment we leave the State with that right.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I point out for the RECORD at this time—and I am sure the Senator from Illinois will agree with this observation, because he has read a great deal of American history—that the reason the State of Illinois and other States left the district system and adopted the unit block system was that as soon as some of the larger States had gone in the direction of the unit block system it made them so disproportionately strong in the electoral college that it virtually forced the other States to abandon the district system.

Mr. DANIEL. I return to the quotation I referred to a moment ago. In a letter of August 23, 1823, Mr. Madison wrote:

> The district mode was mostly, if not exclusively, in view when the Constitution was framed and adopted, and was exchanged for the general ticket and the legislative election as the only expedient for baffling the policy of the particular States which had set the example.

That quotation from Madison bears out what the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has stated.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall make my remarks at a later time. I hope the Senator from Texas will pardon me if I say that I think this amendment is extremely unfortunate in that it would tend to weaken the liberal elements in both the Republican and Democratic Parties. I hope to develop that point later. At the moment, I have no further questions.

Mr. DANIEL. Let me say to the Senator that I am surprised at this statement that any constitutional amendment which would bring about more votes in our general elections could in any way weaken the liberal element in either party. It would seem to me that the liberal elements in both parties would want to see more of the people express themselves at the polls. That has been my attitude all the way through. The Senator from Illinois will not find anything in my record in my State or in this body which would prevent the people of my State from having a right to express themselves in elections, especially in elections for President of the United States.

I understand the Senator from Illinois is worried about some States which might gerrymander their districts and may not set up their congressional districts as they should. In some States which adopt as an alternative the Mundt-Coudert plan it might give the Senator some concern.

But section 4 of article I of the Constitution provides as follows:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

So, it would seem to me that if any of the States misuse this power in electing electors by congressional districts, that is, by gerrymandering their congressional districts, Congress would have the right to do something about it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that this right could only be exercised by Congress in which the big States and the big cities which are themselves underrepresented and gerrymandered? In other words Congress is unlikely to reform itself on this point.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not know. I am unable to give the Senator an answer to that question, because I have never heard the argument made that the big States and big cities are not properly represented in the Congress. I have been a Member of the Senate only a short time, but this is the first time I have heard it argued that the big States and the big cities are not properly represented in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The big States are underrepresented in the Senate and the big cities are underrepresented in the House.

Mr. DANIEL. I have always observed that there are many Representatives from the big cities in the House, and the question of whether the big States are underrepresented in the Senate was settled long ago in the constitutional convention. It was one of the most troublesome questions, and it was settled

by providing that each State shall have two Senators. We have had that system so long that there is nothing we can do about it today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to enter into a long colloquy with the Senator, but this part of no underrepresentation of the big States is the one provision in the Constitution which cannot be amended. What I am protesting against is adding still another disability to the big States and big cities. I hope to develop the fact that we are underrepresented in the House of Representatives and in the State legislatures and are frequently denied even the elementary right to govern our own affairs by home rule so far as cities are concerned. The only way we have is some part in the election of a President. If this is taken away it will operate in a much greater degree and the net result will be as additional underrepresentation of the big States and cities.

Mr. DANIEL. In comment on the Senator's statement, it seems to me that instead of taking away any advantage that a State or a city might have, we are simply equalizing the matter and giving the people of the entire Nation, whether they live in small or in large States, an equal amount of say as individuals in the election of a President and Vice President through the system we have advocated in this substitute amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

During the delivery of Mr. DANIEL'S remarks,

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield, with the understanding I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. GORE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTRODUCTION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 31, concerning which there has been little, if any, public interest or knowledge, constitutes one of the most far-reaching—and I believe mistaken—schemes ever proposed to alter the American constitutional system. No one knows with any certainty what will happen if our electoral system is totally revamped as proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 31 and the various amendments which will be offered to it. Today, we have a clearly Federal system of electing our President, under which the States act as units. Today, we have the two-party system, under which third parties and splinter parties are effectively discouraged from playing more than a negligible role. Today, we have a system which—in all but one instance throughout our history—has given us Presidents elected by a plurality of the popular vote. I refer to one instance, because the frequently mentioned situation in 1824, involving Andrew Jackson and John Quincy Adams, in which six States did not have popular votes, can be ignored; and the other frequently mentioned case, that of the Hayes-Tilden contest, involved outright corruption, and the decision of the electoral commission was responsible for the election of Hayes; so in the 175 years of our constitutional system, there is really only one valid example in which the present system produced the election of a candidate who did not receive the largest number of votes. And today we have an electoral vote system which gives both large States and small States certain advantages and disadvantages that offset each other.

Now it is proposed that we change all this. What the effects of these various changes will be on the Federal system, the two-party system, the popular plurality system, and the large-State-small-State checks and balances system, no one knows. Nevertheless, it is proposed to exchange this system—under which we have, on the whole, obtained able Presidents capable of meeting the increased demands upon our Executive—for an unknown, untried, but obviously precarious system which was abandoned in this country long ago, which previous Congresses have rejected, and which has been thoroughly discredited in Europe. No State legislature, political party, or major group of citizens has requested this change. Any State legislature which felt such a change to be more democratic or more logical has been free to adopt it for the past century. No statute or constitutional provision prevented the States from doing so. But, with the single exception of Michigan, which quickly abandoned the system proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 31 after a single trial more than half a century ago, not a single State has done so.

Why should we in Congress be in such a hurry to adopt a drastic constitutional amendment which most of the voters do not know we are considering, and which they certainly have not demanded? These are crucial times—and whatever defects may be claimed in the present federalist two-party system, we at least have knowledge of and experience with its operation. We have no knowledge as to whether these proposed revisions would provide adequate machinery to serve a country in the midst of recurring foreign policy crises—or whether they would lead to a breakdown in this machinery, such as those we have witnessed in France and elsewhere, paralyzing the country before it could return to the old system. The world situation does not permit us to take the risk of experimenting with the constitutional system that is fundamental to our strength and leadership, particularly without full knowledge of the effects of such changes.

No urgent necessity for immediate change has been proven. No minority Presidents have been elected in the 20th century; no elections have been thrown into the House of Representatives; no breakdown in the electoral system, or even widespread lack of confidence in it, can be shown. The evils of the present system alleged by the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 31 are decisive; the benefits they claim for the future are at best speculative, and at worst statements exactly contrary to the results more likely to take place. There is obviously little to gain—but much to lose, by tampering with the Constitution at this time.

It seems to me that Falkland's definition of conservatism is quite appropriate—"When it is not necesary to change, it is necessary not to change."

The substantive arguments advanced by the proponents will be discussed subsequently—but it is revealing to note the political appeal made to various groups. Northern Democrats have been told that the Daniel amendment will assure their party of permanent control of the White House. Southern Democrats were told that the amendment would give them overwhelming control of their party. Liberals were told that the amendment would give them recognition by treating third-party movements more equitably. Conservatives were told that the influence of minority pressure groups in the Northern cities would be eliminated. And Republicans have been told that from the votes that will somehow appear in the South, under the Daniel amendment, or from gerrymandering of electoral districts by Republican-dominated State legislatures, under the Mundt amendment, their party will permanently possess the White House. It is difficult to believe that two-thirds of the Members of the Senate will accept such contradictory predictions.

Mr. President, under the previous agreement I shall yield the floor at this time to the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], who is the sponsor of the proposed amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for comment on his remarks?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. With the understanding that when the Senator has concluded it will be possible for me to regain the floor, I yield for a question.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to make it clear that the Senator from Texas has not made all the representations of which the Senator from Massachusetts has spoken, concerning the effect of the proposed amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. I have read the hearings very carefully. One of the real reasons why I regret that I cannot support the proposed amendment is the fact that the distinguished Senator from Texas has given so much of his time and conscientious effort in behalf of his amendment. It seems to me that his amendment, as he introduced it, and as it was reported to the Senate, was infinitely preferable to the amendments to his amendment, which I believe he was obliged to accept somewhat reluctantly. Therefore I am completely sincere when I say that I appreciate the conscientious work the Senator has done. As he has just said, my discussion of the various arguments with respect to the different sections does not apply to him.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I concur in the observation which the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts has just made. Before going further, I wish to say that I have listened attentively to the very able and challenging remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Like him, I believe that the amendment recommended by the junior Senator from Texas is preferable to the proposed amendment before the Senate, which combines the recommendation of the junior Senator from Texas and the recommendation of the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. However, I ask the Senator this question: If he had to choose between continuation of the present system, which I regard as undemocratic and filled with potential danger of the usurpation of the will of the people, and accepting the proposed change, which would he prefer? Or does the Senator think we must choose between those alternatives?

Mr. KENNEDY. I will say to the Senator that I am opposed to the Daniel amendment, the Mundt amendment, and the combined Daniel-Mundt amendment. I am opposed to the Humphrey amendment, which provides for direct election. In this case, I am opposed to change. Therefore, though I believe the Daniel amendment to be preferable to the Mundt amendment, I should be compelled to vote against it, even if it were offered separately. However, in the combined form, the evils are compounded, in my opinion; and I believe that the benefits which each might have are completely submerged in this strange union.

Mr. GORE. The Senator certainly has great ability to clarify his position. He has made it explicit. Does not the Senator recognize the apprehensions of a Senator who comes from a State which, as recently as 1948, was partially disfranchised through the action of an elector selected and placed on the ballot by the Democratic Party, but who finally, as a member of the electoral college, cast his ballot, not for the candidate whose electors had carried the State, not for the candidate whose electors had been second in the State, but rather for the candidate whose electors had been third in the State?

Mr. KENNEDY. Of course, the Senator has every right to be especially interested in that situation. Nevertheless, the fact is that of the 12,463 votes cast in the electoral college since 1820, only 5 have been cast contrary to instructions. In 1820 one New Hampshire delegate voted for Adams instead of Monroe. In 1824 three New York delegates voted for Henry Clay's opponent, though they were pledged to him.

Then, in spite of the great provocation existing in the Hayes-Tilden contest, which, as the Senator knows, was decided by one vote, I believe one of the electors from Massachusetts uttered a more or less classic phrase when he said he was chosen by the people not because they had confidence in his judgment, but because they knew what his judgment would be. I believe that in every case since 1824, with the exception of the case which the Senator has described in Tennessee in 1948, every elector has obeyed the instructions of his people.

Abuses are always possible. However, I believe that under our present system we have made quite a good record in a democratic society. Nevertheless, I would support that portion of the amendment of the Senator from Texas which would prevent any repetition of the incident to which there has been reference here today. I believe that portion of the Senator's amendment is most important. If the remaining portion of the Senator's amendment is defeated, I hope that this particular section will be pressed, in order to avoid throwing an election into the House of Representatives, which almost occurred in 1948. There it should be decided upon the basis of Members voting as individuals, and not as State delegations, which might result in the election of a so-called minority President.

Regardless of what happens to the remainder of the Senator's amendment, I hope the Senator will press for action on this particular section.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator upon the further exposition of his views. In the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee the Senator from Massachusetts has just acknowledged that the present constitutional provision is not satisfactory. I join him heartily in expressing that view.

I am not entirely satisfed with the proposed amendment now before the Senate. I believe the Senate will have an opportunity to work its will. The able and distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, for whom I have the greatest affection and the highest of esteem, and with whom I enjoy a warm personal friendship, is making a valuable contribution. However, I implore the Senator not to take an adamant position against any change, and not to remain satisfied with the present situation when he has now acknowledged that it is far from satisfactory.

Mr. KENNEDY. I agree; but the Senator should realize that what I am talking about is the method of selecting a President by the House of Representatives. That is a provision in the Constitution which the large States accepted in the Constitutional Convention, for the same reason that they accepted the provision for two Senators from each State—to get the Constitution adopted. However, that is a far cry from the plan proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], which would divide the electoral vote of each State proportionately. That is an entirely different subject, on which I must reluctantly disagree with the Senator from Texas, in spite of the very important work he has done on this subject.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. First, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Massachusetts for his very fine statement and analysis of the pending joint resolution. I wish to emphasize the fact that the Senator from Tennessee has made it possible for us to point out that it is not necessary to accept the provision in the joint resolution with regard to counting the electoral vote or even the provision with respect to casting it, in order to eliminate the defect which, I agree with both Senators, ought to be eliminated, namely, the existence of the electoral college and chance that a member of the electoral college may go haywire.

That provision, as well as the provision for counting the votes, in the event that the election should be thrown into the House of Representatives, can be corrected without in any way involving us in the dangers and difficulties and unknowns which the provisions to which I object would lead us.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is absolutely correct. I believe that half of the States have already removed the danger of electoral college delegates not reflecting the views of the States. States can take care of that situation themselves.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In reply to the junior Senator from New Jersey, I should like to say that it is not a question of an elector going haywire, as he said, under the present system, because under the present system it is an elector's constitutional right to cast a ballot as he pleases. Legally he has the opportunity to do so. There is apparent the possibility that the electoral votes of an entire State could be cast contrary to the wishes of the people, contrary to the first choice, to the second choice, and even to the third choice of the people of that State.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I must disagree with the statement that an elector, even though there may be no law in his State requiring him to do so, is free to cast his vote as he wishes. He is not free, under our system. He is under the greatest obligation to conform with the——

Mr. GORE. Which is a moral obligation.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Yes; a moral obligation, which is the greatest of all. Fortunately, it is not necessary to accept the provisions of the amendment which I regard to be dangerous in the extreme in order to accept other provisions.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am glad that we have been able to isolate that issue, and that people will not feel that they must support the entire amendment on the ground that their only choice is between that and nothing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Massachusetts say that the Senator from Tennessee at the moment seems to be straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel? I hope during the course of the debate the proportions of the gnat which he rejects and the proportions of the camel which he accepts may become manifest and bring the Senator from

Tennessee back to his usual clear perception of the issues.

Mr. GORE. I should like to observe that the Senator from Illinois resembles neither. [Laughter.]

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] stated that the district plan is the plan advocated by the Founding Fathers. They did it at a time when they conceived the electoral college to be completely removed from the people and when they had no conception of the rise of large political parties. So the development of the Nation has been different from the way in which they conceived it.

The Senator from Texas stated that certain States had an undue influence in the election of a President. I would say to the Senator that the solid South has 127 electoral votes, based on an average of 5 million popular votes, which is a very strong position in connection with representing nearly 45 million people. Having a vote of one-eighth of the country at large and a fourth of the electoral votes, it would indicate that those States have a disproportionate influence.

In May of last year, Senate Joint Resolution 31 was reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee. This amendment, known as the Daniel-Kefauver—formerly Lodge-Gossett—amendment, provides for a system of proportional voting, whereby the electoral vote for each State is divided among the various candidates in the same proportion as the popular vote cast within that State. Recognizing that the present requirement of an electoral vote majority would be more difficult to achieve, inasmuch as splinter parties would also be receiving electoral votes, Senate Joint Resolution 31 lowered this requirement to 40 percent.

The committee rejected Senate Joint Resolution 3, the so-called Mundt-Coudert proposal, or district system, whereby the electoral vote for each State would be divided in the same manner as that State's Senators and and Representatives were elected, namely, two electoral votes representing the State's two Senate seats being awarded to the candidate who carried the entire State, and the electoral vote representing each congressional district being awarded to the candidate who carried that district.

In March of this year the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] proposed still another substitute amendment for Senate Joint Resolution 31, under which each State would retain two electoral votes, to be awarded to the candidate carrying that State, but dividing the remainder of the 531 electoral votes cast for them without regard to State lines. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and other Senators also introduced an amendment to provide for election of the President by direct popular vote, without regard to State lines.

On March 15, or less than 1 week ago, the sponsors of both Senate Joint Resolution 31 and Senate Joint Resolution 3 joined in offering a new compromise proposal as a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 31.

This compromise amendment submits both plans to the States for ratification, and permits each State to take its choice. The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] announced to the press that neither plan would have passed the Senate, inasmuch as the proponents of each opposed the other; so the sponsors combined both plans in an effort to satisfy everyone.

In short, the Congress of the United States is to say to the States, "We cannot agree on any single system for electoral reform, and in fact we do not approve of either one of them; therefore, we are giving you your choice."

There is a constitutional obligation to consider which proposal is best on its merits, and affirmatively to approve or disapprove of each for referral to the several States.

That, in my opinion, is a circumvention of the constitutional amendment procedure as proposed by the founding fathers.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Will not the Senator agree that today the States have the choice of any method of naming their electors which they might desire to use?

Mr. KENNEDY. After reading the hearings, after listening to the Senators discuss the deficiencies of the Mundt-Coudert plan, and after hearing the Senator from South Dakota discuss the deficiencies of the Daniel-Kefauver plan, suddenly to find them linked together seems to be a strange combination, arrived at only in order to get two-thirds of the vote.

Mr. DANIEL. No. What I asked the Senator was if it was not true that today the States have a choice of any plan they might desire to use in order to name electors.

Mr. KENNEDY. And they have made that choice. Would the Senator from Texas object to this? Would he object to the present plan's being included among the choices to be given to the States?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes, I would. I feel the present plan is outmoded, works many handicaps, and should be abolished.

Mr. KENNEDY. Would the Senator from Texas deny to the States the opportunity, which they are using, to follow the present plan, and to force them to choose between two other plans, both of which could have been put into effect, if it had been desired to do so, but as to which, of course, there was no desire to do so?

Mr. DANIEL. One of them could not have been put into effect in Texas. The Lodge-Gossett plan could not have been put into effect in the present situation.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is true.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one observation concerning his remarks as to the differences between the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Texas?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. True, each of us argued that his own plan would be better; on the other hand, I think it will be found that each of us acknowledged that the plan of either would be better than the method which is in existence today.

Mr. KENNEDY. I remember the Senator discussed Harris County, Texas, which, as I remember, has one-sixth of the population of Texas, even though there are 22 Representatives from Texas. The Senator suggested that the Mundt-Coudert plan would be an invitation to that sort of procedure all over the country.

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct. That is one argument which I made against the Mundt-Coudert plan. Even though that be true, I feel it is a better system than is in existence today.

I have no idea that the State of Texas would ever adopt the alternative offered by the substitute amendment for the Mundt-Coudert plan, because our State has been very much in favor of the Gossett-Lodge plan of the substitute amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. If I were from Texas, I would be in favor of it, as Representative Gossett was. The Senator has given us the 1948 figures. Under the Senator's proposal, there would have been 15.0 electoral votes for Truman, and 5.6 for Dewey. In other words, there would have been a margin of 9.4.

For the State of Illinois, which the Senator suggested had a disproportionate influence, there would have been 14.0 for Truman and 13.8 for Dewey, making a margin of .2 in the electoral vote balance, while for the State of Texas the margin would have been 9.4.

So it seems to me that there would be taken away all the influence Illinois would have with its population of 8 million or 9 million, while the slightly smaller population of Texas would have had a margin of 9.4 balancing the electoral scales. I think that would have been unfortunate for Illinois. It would have been repeated in New York.

New York is the largest State in the Union. It has only 2 Senators, but it has 43 Representatives. One of New York's great hopes of recapturing its relative loss of influence in the legislative branch is to have an effective influence on the presidency.

In 1948, 28.2 percent of the electoral votes were for Truman, and 21.6 percent were for Dewey, a difference of 6.6, compared with Texas' margin of 9.4 electoral votes.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Massachusetts is using percentages.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am using the distribution of the electoral vote.

Mr. DANIEL. On a percentage basis.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. If the Senator will read the distribution of electoral votes, he will see that New York has an electoral vote in proportion to its population. The Senator is reading figures pertaining to an election in which the Lodge-Gossett plan was not in effect. If the Lodge-Gossett plan had been in effect, I imagine the figures would have been quite different. More people would have gone out to vote on both sides.

Mr. KENNEDY. I agree with the statement which the Senator made about the Lodge-Gossett plan. I agree that a prediction cannot be made for the future on the basis of what has happened in the past—at least, with certainty. But an indication is given. We know from what has happened in the past that what I have read would have happened. I also know from reading the RECORD that on

at least three occasions under the Lodge-Gossett plan there would have been a President who was a minority candidate in the election. I think on three occasions there would have been a President elected by one party, while the opposite party would have been in control of Congress.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from Massachusetts realize that under the present system there have been three Presidents elected who received less than a majority of the popular vote?

Mr. KENNEDY. There has been only one occasion, because the Tilden-Hayes election was fraught with corruption. It was won as a result of an electoral commission making a decision that caused Hayes to win the election.

In the 1824 case of Adams, Jackson, and Crawford, there is no indication that the votes that went for Crawford, Adams, and Clay would have gone for Jackson. Jackson was a minority candidate, in any case. So that is not a good example.

Mr. DANIEL. In the record of the hearings, at page 331, there is a listing prepared, I believe, by the Library of Congress of Presidents who received less than a majority of the popular vote.

In 1824, John Q. Adams; in 1876, Rutherford B. Hayes; in 1888, Benjamin Harrison were the Presidents who received less than a plurality of the popular vote from 1824 to 1952.

The fraud which is continually referred to in the Hayes-Tilden case was a fraud that grew up under the present electoral system which is being followed today.

Mr. KENNEDY. Oh, no, the fraud was discovered as a result of the New York Times' refusal to accept the election of Tilden. On the night of the election, the Times sent telegrams to the various States to make certain that they held the line for Hayes; thus it was as the result of Senator Lamar and other influential members of the electoral commission making a deal that Hayes would withdraw Federal troops from the South that they agreed to accept the election of Hayes.

That was the reason for the result; it was not because of an unsatisfactory electoral voting system.

Mr. DANIEL. But the situation arose under the electoral system which is in operation today.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct; but it had nothing to do with it. There was no connection between the two. It occurred, of course; but it was not directly connected with it. There was no cause and effect relationship.

Mr. DANIEL. But there would not have been any electoral commission intervening in the matter if the votes had been counted either by congressional districts or in proportion to the popular vote and certified to the President of the Senate as provided in the proposed amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. I shall quote briefly from a book on the Presidency:

> Had it not been for four journalists, sitting up that night in the New York Times office, that would have been the official result. But these four men changed the course of history. As they watched the returns in the early morning hours, a dispatch came in from Democratic State Chairman Magone: "Please give your estimate of electoral votes secured for Tilden. Answer at once." The four Republican editors guessed that the Democrats were uncertain of the electoral result in the South.
>
> One of the four—John C. Reid, the managing editor of the Times—rushed to the Fifth Avenue hotel where Zachariah Chandler, chairman of the Republican congressional committee, was sleeping in sweet exhaustion, partly as a result of the election, partly from the drinks he had consumed during the night. The two men, one dead sober and the other in not quite the same condition, evolved a plan. Telegrams were sent out to the Republican Party heads in Louisiana, South Carolina, and Florida: "Hayes is elected if we have carried South Carolina, Florida and Louisiana. Can you hold your State? Answer at once."
>
> The second edition of the Times—at 6:30—gave Tilden 184 and Hayes 181 votes (assuming Louisiana and South Carolina for Hayes). Tilden needed 1 more vote for his election, as 185 constituted the majority. But the newspapers stated that Florida with its four votes was doubtful. Therefore, "if the Republicans have carried that State, as they claim, they will have 185 votes—a majority of 1." Thus, the struggle to secure the 1-vote majority began, keeping the country in a state of wild excitement for weeks to come.
>
> The next day the now-sober Chandler announced: "Hayes has 185 electoral votes and is elected." But Hayes was not so confident. He said in an interview in Cincinnati: "I think we are defeated in spite of recent good news. I am of the opinion that the Democrats have carried the country and elected Tilden."

In the 1824 case, the vote was not counted in six States.

Since the Senator from Texas stated there were three cases, I believe we should get this correct. There is no sense in dismissing the past, because the past is a pretty good indication for the future. As I have indicated, there is really only one case in the past in which a minority President was elected.

Offsetting this 1 case are 3 elections in which Senate Joint Resolution 31 would have elected 3 minority Presidents. The proposal before us would have given the country 3 minority Presidents instead of the 3 majority Presidents who took office.

In 1880, under Senate Joint Resolution 31, Hancock would have defeated Garfield in the electoral vote, while losing the popular vote.

In both 1896 and 1900, Bryan would have become President by virtue of the electoral vote under Senate Joint Resolution 31, instead of McKinley, who won the popular vote.

When we talk about what the past has shown, it is easy to ascertain what the results were under the existing procedure. Under this proposal, there would have been 3 cases which would have given a bad result. There would have been 3 cases in which there would have been a President of 1 party at the beginning of his term and a Congress controlled by the other party. I do not think that has happened in any other case in our history.

The two schemes joined together by this shotgun wedding, moreover, are wholly incompatible, the sponsors of each having thoroughly and accurately assailed the merits of the other over the years. The Mundt proposal multiplies the general ticket system; the Daniel proposal abolishes it. The Mundt proposal continues the importance of States as units for electoral purposes; the Daniel proposal reduced it. The Mundt plan keeps the electoral college; the Daniel plan abolishes it. And yet it is now proposed that the Senate, being unable to give its approval to either system, should lump them together and give each State its choice. No surer method of introducing confusion and loss of public confidence in our electoral system could be devised.

It should also be pointed out that two minor but worthwhile changes are included in these amendments: One, the office of presidential elector is either abolished or made specifically nondiscretionary, which would make impossible the never-realized fear of electors defeating the popular will by casting their vote for the losing candidate; and, two, when a presidential election is thrown into the Congress, it would be decided by a majority vote of the Members of the House and Senate in joint meeting, a more democratic method than the present procedure whereby the Members of the House, voting as State units, decide the presidential election.

If the amendment were confined to these two changes, which correct minor but obvious defects, the proposal would not be objectionable; but it should not be necessary to reconstitute our entire electoral system to accomplish these minor changes.

I am very strongly opposed to any change in the Constitution at this time. The present system has served us well. Its advantages are well known. But the consequences of the proposed amendment, however desirable they may appear to be, cannot be foretold.

The Senator from Texas has said there is no use going back over the past figures. They show that in only one case the present system has not provided for the election of the candidate voted for by the majority. But to go back over past history and predict what would have happened if the proposal had been in effect, it is said, does not give a fair picture. The facts indicate it would have a most unfortunate effect.

I am sure the Langer amendment, while purporting to be more democratic, would increase the power of and encourage splinter parties, and I believe it would break down the Federal system under which most States entered the Union, which provides a system of checks and balances to insure that no area or group shall obtain too much power.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota would have the very beneficial effect of expanding the electorate and of encouraging people to vote in areas where they do not now vote. That would be a good thing, but I am afraid we would not get two-thirds of the necessary votes to approve such an amendment. In addition, the claim would be made that the States came into the Union with the understanding that electoral votes would be assigned to the States on the basis of their population, and not on the basis of the number of

people voting. Therefore, I would say it would be better to keep the present system, even though there are many advantages to the system proposed by the Senator.

Under the proportional voting system, the likelihood of a President who had a lesser number of popular votes being elected would be greatly decreased.

The Senator from Texas has now returned to the floor. I wanted to point out that under his proposal there would have been three Presidents elected who were minority candidates from the viewpoint of popularity: Bryan twice and Hancock once, as opposed to the one case involving Harrison.

Mr. DANIEL. Of course, the committee seems to feel that there are three cases in which Presidents were elected with less than a plurality of the votes. As to both of those examples, I will say that if there had been in effect a constitutional amendment which would let the voice of the people be heard in the electoral votes when they are counted here in Washington, we might have had a different result.

In my opinion, and in the opinion of the committee, also, it is impossible to try to relate the presently proposed system back to an election 20 or 30 or 50 years ago, and say the same thing would have happened had we had this system. I am convinced we would have had a different vote. We would have had so many more voters participating, if there had been either of the proposed systems in effect, that I just doubt that the comparisons as to what would have happened in the past under the proposed system are valid.

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not think there is any doubt that probably a greater number of people would have voted, but there is no indication that the proportion would have been any different. There is no indication that there is a great reservoir of Republicans in the Southern States, as the Senator has suggested. By examining the primary figures and the presidential figures, and by examining the registration figures, I do not think there is a great reservoir of Republican votes, and that people would come out and vote when they knew their votes were to be counted.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I associate myself with what the Senator from Texas has said, when he points out that by changing the rules of the game after the game has been completed, there is no way in the world to tell how the game would have been played under different rules, except by replaying the game. I do not think comparisons of figures under the proposed program and applying them to elections which took place 10, 20, or 50 years ago, have any significance whatsoever.

As to registration figures, I have talked with hundreds of northern Republicans who have moved into Dixie and who have told me—and I know they have told me correctly—that when they get down into the South they register as Democrats; but when there is an opportunity, as there was in the 1952 election, and the possibility of sweeping a 1-party State to a 2-party State in the general elections, they vote Republican. But, because of the 1-party system, Republicans in Texas and in South Carolina may register as Democrats. When they move to South Dakota, Democrats register as Republicans to vote in the Republican primaries, but in the elections many of those Democrats vote for the candidates of their choice. So I do not think that comparing primary statistics is very effective.

Mr. KENNEDY. The breakdown for the registration figures for Louisiana are: Republicans, 2,221; Democrats, 999,370. I think Florida and Texas have the best hope for the Republicans of any Southern States. In the general election, there were in Florida, 136,376 Republicans and 1,215,775 Democrats. In the primary elections there were 131,264 Republicans versus 1,197,437 Democrats.

To be honest with the Senator, these amendments would insure that the Republican Party would be a permanent minority party in that section of the country. I do not think there is a larger potential Republican vote there, nor do I think there is a potential Democratic vote in Vermont. In the case of a major overturn, as happened in Maine, they do have an opportunity. But they have never done it over a period of 30 or 40 years.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts agree with me that it is no more significant or meaningful to argue that there is no hope of building a Republican Party in Florida, for example, because the registration there is so overwhelmingly Democratic, than to say that in 1952 a great many more persons in Florida voted Republican than voted Democratic, and therefore Florida must be a Republican State?

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator repeat his question, please?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. In 1952 a great many more persons in Florida voted Republican than voted Democratic. Therefore, would the Senator from Massachusetts conclude that Florida is a Republican State?

Mr. KENNEDY. No.

Mr. MUNDT. Neither would I.

So my point is that primary elections statistics mean little or nothing in the case of a one-party State. I myself live in what is a one-party State, although perhaps not as much so as in the case of the Southern States. But over a quarter of a century, my State has been largely a one-party State. In many of the counties, a Democratic official has not been elected in a quarter of a century. In many, many cases the voters say, when they reach the polls, "I guess I will vote Republican."

I repeat that the statistics on primary elections mean very little, if anything, in connection with this matter.

Mr. KENNEDY. I may point out that in the State of Maine, when the people were stirred up over the local situation, they elected a Democratic governor in 1954.

Mr. MUNDT. That proves my point.

Mr. KENNEDY. But when we examine the figures for the last 40 or 50 years, in the case of the Southern States, we do not find that there has been a strong reservoir of Republican support there. If that were so, there would have been an increasing Republican vote.

The point is that if this amendment were to go into effect, and if the electoral votes were to be divided proportionately, there would be an increase in both the primary and the general vote, but the proportion would remain the same. That is my honest opinion.

Mr. MUNDT. Why does the Senator from Massachusetts believe there is so small a vote in the average fall election in the Southern States—for instance, in the State of Georgia?

Mr. KENNEDY. Because most of the people there are Democrats, and they know that the State will go Democratic.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely. So if a two-party system were encouraged, there would be greater participation in the voting.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes; but in my opinion the relationship between the two figures would not thus be changed. I know the Senator from South Dakota feels that there would be a change, because he favors the amendment. But in my opinion, after examining the figures for the primaries and after examining the figures for the registrations, the Republican Party will not gain enough in the South, in proportion to what it will lose in the pivotal States. I do not think the Republican Party can win without carrying those States, because it suffers such a disadvantage in the Southern States. So if the amendment were adopted, the effect would be to neutralize the vote in the pivotal States. Unless there were a great Republican tide in the Southern States, as the Senator from South Dakota anticipates would be the case—although he does not have any statistical evidence to support his view—in my opinion if the amendment went into effect, the Republican Party would be permanently a minority party.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me point out that, as in the case of the Mundt-Coudert alternative, in a one-party State it does not matter what the system is; in a really one-party State, that party gets 100 percent of the votes for the governor, for instance.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that it makes a great deal of difference in the States which from time to time swing from one side to the other; it diminishes very much the importance of the votes in those States.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator has stated that even in closely contested elections, there is a much smaller vote in the South than there is in the North. In my opinion that is because of the habits and situations in particular areas.

The Senator from New Jersey has given a great deal of consideration to this matter. I think he will agree that there will not be such a tide of Republican votes in the Southern States. The point is that if the Republican Party is to elect a President, it must carry the pivotal States. The proposed change would weaken its position in the pivotal

States, and would not increase in proportion its position in the Southern States—certainly not enough to make up for the loss it would incur in the pivotal States. In my opinion, Mr. President, if the amendment were to go into effect, the Republican Party would never win a presidential election.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Let me say that I think the Senator from Massachusetts is quite correct. I think it was most impressive—although in a rather depressing way—to hear the statistics the Senator from Texas read a few minutes ago. It is quite true that the figures show a larger primary vote than a general election vote. But the primary vote of 15 or 20 percent, in the case of some of the Southern States, was amazingly lower than in the case of my State and, I think, in the case of other Northern States generally.

I think the Senator from Massachusetts is utterly correct when he says it would take a very long time, indeed, if we can anticipate that it would ever happen at any time in the future, before voting habits and restrictions on voting and repressive measures—in the South, particularly—would change; and that long before that could happen, the Republican Party's permanent minority status would have been irrevocably established.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. Is it not true that, under the proposed amendment, during a presidential election there would be a tendency or an incentive for the presidential candidates to concentrate on the States where the votes are one-sided—either the Southern States or the New Hampshires and the Vermonts; in other words, on the Republican voters in the New Hampshires and the Vermonts, or on the Democratic voters in the Southern States—and to completely ignore States such as New York and Ohio?

Mr. KENNEDY. Let me say that in the 1952 election, under the proportionate plan the situation would have been just as I have indicated, namely, that the theoretical advantage to be gained by the Republicans in the Southern States would have become a disadvantage in the case of the larger States. In other words, in that case the influence of the larger States would have been minor as compared with the influence of the Southern States; and of course that situation would not have been based on their relative populations.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield further to me?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I was very much struck by the remark of the Senator from Michigan, because it was almost a paraphrase of a statement made a few years ago by Carl Becker, an eminent historian of this country; I believe he is a teacher of history at Cornell University. He pointed out that one of the least understood, but actually one of the greatest, benefits of our Constitution is that it requires both major parties not to concentrate upon an area where they can get more than 51 percent of the votes. Instead, they are forced to appeal to the country as a whole, and not only to attempt to sell their merits, but also to meet the needs of the people throughout the country as a whole, thus keeping both parties national, as opposed to sectional.

Mr. KENNEDY. In regard to the prospects of Republican success, let me say that Dr. Ruth C. Silva, who I believe knows as much about this matter as does anyone, has made a study of the matter, based on a proportionate division of the votes; and she points out, in effect, that such a change would make the election closer in the years when the Republicans lost the Presidency, but it also would endanger the chances of Republican victory in the years when the Republicans won.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to read into the RECORD what the committee had to say, after much study, about trying to relate the new proposed system back to elections held in the past. I read from page 23 of the committee report:

> It cannot be too strongly emphasized that while it is, of course, easy to apply the amendment retroactively—by adjusting the new rules to the old figures—it is useful to do so only as a means of illustrating how it would have operated mechanically. One cannot assume—as some have, erroneously—that citizens would have voted identically or in the same volume under this new system as they actually did vote under the existing procedure.

The point which the authors of the proposed amendment make, is that if we had an amendment under which the individual voters could have their votes actually show up in the total electoral count, they would come out in greater numbers. We would have a different voting population, and perhaps a different result in some sections, than would be the case as a result of applying the new proposal retroactively to the old case.

Mr. KENNEDY. There might be a different result in the pivotal States, in which there is a big turnout. We know what happened in those States in 1948. Although their voting habits probably would not change, there could conceivably be a more nearly even margin in some of the one-party States. However, we know enough not to risk a very sound system. I can understand why the Senator is reluctant to go back into history. The Senator's system would have resulted in the election of McKinley over Bryan by one-tenth of an electoral vote.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the country would be a great deal better off if the Democrats were to choose their own candidate at a primary? Suppose the Democrats could have held a primary in June, and could have decided as between the senior Senator from Tennessee Mr. [KEFAUVER], Mr. Stevenson, and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who at that time was a candidate; and suppose the Republicans had been able to hold a primary to decide as between Taft and Eisenhower in the last election.

Does not the fallacy of the entire argument of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] lie in the fact that the people do not select the candidates? They are selected by a group of politicians, instead of by the people. Why should there not have been a primary? Why should not Mr. Taft and Mr. Eisenhower have submitted their candidacies by petition, just as is done in the case of a candidate for governor or Senator?

Why should not the people have the opportunity to decide as between Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Barkley, and Mr. Kefauver?

Mr. KENNEDY. I will say to the Senator that in theory his suggestion is good, but I think as a practical matter, it would be a mistake, because I do not think we could ask all the candidates to carry on campaigns over the entire country, in all 48 States, considering all the time and effort which would be required.

In any event, the winner would probably be a minority candidate. There would be 7, 8, or 9 candidates. There would not be a majority candidate. In my opinion the present system, which has produced many great Presidents, is preferable. So I cannot agree with the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the same argument was made against George Norris when he advocated the direct election of Senators? It was argued that there would be a great many candidates, and a great deal of expense. No one compels a man to run for President. But if he can get a petition signed by 1 percent of the voters, why should he not have the privilege of having his name on the ballot?

Mr. KENNEDY. He can in a great many States; but even in those States where there is a campaign, there is still a very small turnout. The people are not as interested as they should be.

The point is that I do not agree with the Senator that we would get better candidates.

Mr. LANGER. They might not be better candidates, but the people would select them.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think we would do well not to abandon the present system. There is an old saying to the effect that one should not take down a fence until he knows why it was put up. In my case, I would be reluctant to take down a fence which has served us pretty well in the past.

Mr. LANGER. In Illinois, Massachusetts, and Ohio there is no provision for a third candidate. There might be a large group of people who wanted to run a man on a third ticket. They could not do so. They are specially prohibited from doing so.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the Senator is mistaken. There have been prohibition candidates and Socialist candidates.

Mr. LANGER. They lose their rights in the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. They had such rights in 1952.

Mr. LANGER. They did not get any votes. They lost their rights in Ohio and Illinois.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is a democratic decision.

Mr. LANGER. I agree with the Senator, provided the people select the candidates, instead of their being selected by politicians meeting in smoke-filled rooms.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I am not too sure that I am convinced that the pending measure would be an improvement over our present system. I am not wholly satisfied that our present system is the proper one; but if we believe that this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and that the President of the United States is President, not of the States, but of the people of the United States, why should we not adopt the principle that the President of the United States ought to be the popular selection of the people, and that the popular vote of the country should count? Why should not that be the system to adopt, rather than the other system? While it may be argued that such a system would be an improvement over the present system, I doubt very much that it would be. I still think there is a "gimmick" in it. The States could adopt one system or the other, as best suited their case. But why should one State be a pivotal State? Why should a group of States be pivotal States?

Mr. KENNEDY. Under the Senator's plan the pivotal States would be infinitely more important than they are today. Except in the Senate, Rhode Island would cease to be of any real importance.

Mr. PASTORE. What does the Senator mean by "any real importance"? Why should one citizen in Rhode Island resent the fact that a man who is elected President receives 51 percent of the entire vote of the country? Why is it of any importance to Rhode Island, if the man who is elected President is the selection of the majority of the people?

Mr. KENNEDY. Rhode Island is overrepresented in the electoral college today, based upon its population.

Mr. PASTORE. I am not going into that question at all. I want to do away with the electoral college. I want to elect my President on election day. I say that when the people go to the polls the man who receives the greatest number of votes should be elected the President of the people. He is the President of the people of the United States, and not the President of the States. It makes no difference to me how many electoral votes the people of Rhode Island have. What difference does it make? Why do we seem to talk so much about the power of a State? There is reason for the States having equal representation in the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY. When those States came into the Union, Madison, who, after all, was the guiding force of the Convention, informed the Virginia Convention:

> This Government is not completely consolidated, nor is it entirely Federal. Who are the parties to it? The people—not the people as composing one great body, but the people as composing 13 sovereignties.

That is the conception of the rights of States. The States have certain rights. Therefore I support that system. I must say that I disagree with the proposal of the Senator. In fact, it would not have a chance to get by. It would require a two-thirds vote, and the smaller States would not accept it.

Mr. PASTORE. I have never worried about what gets by and what does not get by. I am concerned with the principle involved.

One Senator made the statement today that the reason why we have our electoral college is that the framers of the plan had the idea that the people of the United States did not have the intelligence to rule. I understand that it was that attitude which gave birth to this idea. I want to do away with the idea, because I think the American people have an abundance of intelligence. They have the right of franchise, and they want to select their President and Vice President. Most of the people in my State, when they go to the polls on election day, think they are voting for President and Vice President. They do not vote for President if they must elect electors or delegates who meet later in the governor's office and have a luncheon at 12 o'clock noon and then cast their ballot for President.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, is the Senator asking a question?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; I should like to ask a question, and the question is this. If we believe in the principle and in the concept that this is a government of the people, for the people, and by the people, why do we not elect our President by popular vote?

Mr. KENNEDY. I should like to have the Senator——

Mr. PASTORE. That is my question. That is the question I should like to ask.

Mr. KENNEDY. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that he talked about the concept of the electoral college, which was developed in the American Constitution. That has been done away with in practically all cases, with the exception of one case, during the last 120 years. What he fears has happened in only one case. Does the Senator understand what I have in mind?

Mr. PASTORE. I understand.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the point is how to distribute the vote for each State so far as the people's rights are concerned, I will say that the people now have the right of electing their President.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator mean to tell me that under our present system of counting the votes it is not possible to have the situation in which the candidate who has received the largest number of votes will not be elected President?

Mr. KENNEDY. That has happened in one case only.

Mr. PASTORE. But it can happen. That is not the popular way of electing a President. Does the Senator from Massachusetts believe that that system carries out the concept of government of the people, for the people, and by the people, when the candidate who gets the largest number of votes loses the election? That is not my idea of a popular vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. Would the Senator do away with the 2 electors which his State has by virtue of the fact that it has 2 Senators in the Senate of the United States?

Mr. PASTORE. I would do away with the whole electoral college. I would do away with it completely. I would have the people elect the President of the United States on election day. I would not care where the candidates came from, whether they came from the North, the South, the West, or the East. They are all Americans. We are all one country. I say let us vote for the best man. Let the man that gets the most votes be our President. It is as simple as that. That is my idea of representative government. Everything else beyond that is a gimmick.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let me ask the Senator why he believes it to be fair for Rhode Island to have two Senators and for New York State, which is a much larger State, to have only two Senators?

Mr. PASTORE. That is an entirely different matter. We have the concept of the legislative branch of the Government, founded on the principle that every State shall have equal representation in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President——

Mr. PASTORE. In the State of Rhode Island, in the State senate, we have a representative from every city and town. The two systems should not be confused.

Mr. KENNEDY. At the time that Rhode Island came into the Union it came into the Union with the understanding that it would have an electoral vote for each of its Senators. That is why I am against the plan proposed by the Senator. The State represented by the Senator from Rhode Island—which, by the way, I believe was the 13th State to ratify the Constitution—came into the Union with the understanding that it would have two electoral votes. However, that is not what we are talking about.

Mr. PASTORE. I merely wanted to ask a question of the Senator, and I was hopeful that the Senator would answer it. However, I am still as much in the dark as I was before.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS I hope the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, who was governor of his State, does not intend to defend the system in his State senate under which there is an approximate equality of representation among the communities of the State. I can remember when there were 39 Senators in the State of Rhode Island, and the city of Providence, with half the population of

the State, had one of those 39 seats, and the other communities of the State had the 38 seats, with the result that Providence, Pawtucket, and Woonsocket were grossly underrepresented. If I remember the political history of Rhode Island correctly, the present junior Senator from Rhode Island made quite a campaign against that provision. This is why I do not think the legislators can be depended upon to give justice to the crisis.

Mr. PASTORE. I am afraid that the Senator from Rhode Island is being grossly misunderstood. I do not have to defend anything in order to prove something else. I do not have to defend the system in Rhode Island so far as the composition of the Senate of Rhode Island is concerned. All I am saying is that many people have the belief that when they go to the polls on election day and cast their vote, they are voting for the President and Vice President. Unfortunately, that is not the case. We would do ourselves justice if, instead of voting on the bill that is now pending, we would do something about providing for the popular election of the President and Vice President. Certainly I will have to be convinced about any of the provisions of the pending bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am not trying to convince the Senator to accept the present bill, but to vote against it.

Mr. PASTORE. I might do that.

Mr. KENNEDY. The proposal which the Senator is in favor of is not before the Senate. Therefore, it would have to be offered in the form of an amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to submit an amendment now in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield for that purpose, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator. With that understanding Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute. It provides for the direct election of President and Vice President by popular vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. May I ask the Senator from North Dakota what his amendment would do with respect to the two electors, one for each Senator, from North Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not hear what he said.

Mr. KENNEDY. The electoral college is composed of one elector for each Member of Congress. What does the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota do with respect to that provision in the Constitution?

Mr. LANGER. It would wipe out the electoral college entirely. It would wipe out conventions and the electoral college. It would let people select their candidates in the June primaries. The people would select their Republican and Democratic candidates in the primaries, and then they would elect the President and Vice President in November by popular vote.

Mr. PASTORE. I am the one who gave the Senator from North Dakota the inspiration to submit his amendment. I wonder whether he will thank me for making a speech for him.

Mr. LANGER. When the time comes for me to speak on the amendment, I shall be glad to have the Senator from Rhode Island speak for it also.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The amendment of the Senator from North Dakota is one in which I also believe, although I am not certain that this is the time to discuss it. I should like to point out, however, that representatives from two relatively small States, North Dakota and Rhode Island, are proposing an amendment which would decrease the power of their respective States under the present system.

Mr. KENNEDY. By 50 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is somewhat remarkable and to my mind praiseworthy.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is admirable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is an indication that in the small States, as well as in the large States, people who are like these two Senators put the interests of the Nation first. I believe the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from North Dakota ought to be commended for the position they have taken.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not admit that I am making any sacrifice. I believe that the power of a Rhode Islander lies in the fact that he has the right of franchise to vote for the President of the United States. If more Rhode Islanders want a Republican to be President than a Democrat, and more people in the country agree with him than agree with other people who favor a different candidate, then the more popular candidate should be elected President. I do not believe we are making any sacrifice in that regard. We are not talking about power. When we talk about the right to elect a President, we are talking about carrying out the popular will of the people, and to elect a man who gets the greater number of the votes of the people. At least, we would be able to say that the man who has received the most votes is the man who ought to be the President, whether he is from the South or the North or the East or the West. We are all Americans. We are all one Nation. Our President ought to be chosen by popular votes in an election by all the people.

Mr. KENNEDY. The facts of the matter are that the system of proportional voting will greatly increase the likelihood of a minority President. Inasmuch as electoral votes will still be based upon congressional representation rather than voter turnout, thus increasing disproportionately the weight of small and one-party States, a candidate could win, for example, 21 out of 40 million votes cast in the large States, but that 2 million vote lead would not net him as many electoral votes as his opponent would receive for sweeping the small, one-party States with a lead of considerably less than 2 million popular votes. The simplest example is the hypothetical case of 2 States, each having 24 electoral votes. In State A, 4 million popular votes are cast, with the Republican candidate obtaining three-fourths of the vote. In State B, 2.4 million votes are cast, and the Republican candidate receives one-eighth of the vote. In the 2 States combined, the Republican candidate has a popular vote majority of 3.3 million to 3.1 million to the Democratic candidate. Under the present system, each candidate would get 24 electoral votes, but under the proportional voting system of Senate Joint Resolution 31, the Democratic minority candidate would receive 27 electoral votes, with 21 for the Republican, who had won a popular majority.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if the Senator from Massachusetts does not complete his statement this evening, he may have the floor immediately after the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are prepared to stay as long as the Senator from Massachusetts cares to address the Senate, but if he cares to stop at about 6 o'clock, a motion to recess will then be made.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to follow the suggestion of the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator for his usual courtesy.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Before we get too far away from the place in the RECORD where the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] quoted from Professor Becker, I should like to point out that I agree completely with Dr. Becker's hypothesis that we do not now have optimum conditions in conducting an election. If he were among us he would not have us believe that in the last campaign the Republican and Democratic candidates tried to spread out their campaigns equally across the country. We did not see the candidates speaking in Painted Post, N. Y., or in Texas Flats, Wyo.

Mr. KENNEDY. I will say to the Senator that one-half of the population lives in eight of our States——

Mr. MUNDT. But people will be people wherever they live, and voters will be voters. The fact that they can cast unit votes, whereby they register in one bundle not only the electoral votes of all the people but also the popular votes, represents the three bars in the slot machine

which come up when one hits the jackpot.

Mr. KENNEDY. The State of New York has 45 electoral votes and has many millions of people. What the Senator is proposing is to divide those electoral votes on the basis of the proportion of popular votes secured by the candidates. In the pivotal States we have a 4 percent difference betwen the two parties which would neutralize 12 million people politically.

The State from which the Senator comes is over-represented in the electoral college.

Mr. MUNDT. As we are in the Senate. The Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from North Dakota have a practical problem in connection with the adoption of a constitutional amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. I must say that if I were writing the Constitution today without the experience we have had, I think I would probably adopt the system advocated by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. MUNDT. Does the Senator mean that he is moving in our direction?

Mr. KENNEDY. Oh, no. But we have the experience of the past. We see a limited number of persons voting in some of the States. We see how small States are benefited by having the same powers as have large States. We have the benefit of a majority in the House and Senate because Members are elected again and again. So, where we may lose in one way, we gain in another way.

Mr. MUNDT. How does it happen that the State of New York has 45 electoral votes? I think the Senator would agree with me that it is not the fact of the population being so large that would would account for the fact that the winner may receive 26 or 27 electoral votes. The reason why it has 45 electoral votes is because of the electoral college provisions. They count not only the votes that win but the votes of the people who lost, making up the 45 electoral votes.

Mr. KENNEDY. We consider a State a sovereign unit, and therefore we decide the issue in each State.

Mr. MUNDT. It would register the same influence according to population, but it loses the advantage it gets because of the theory which Madison expounded. We have a situation in our democracy where we go to the polling places and count the votes not only of those who voted for the candidate but also those who voted against him.

Mr. KENNEDY. California had 11.9 for Truman and 11.8 for Dewey, counting some 9 million people in 1948. That would give California on balance 0.1 percent.

Mr. MUNDT. It takes something away from the people, but the people of California have the votes counted in the same proportion as they were cast.

Mr. KENNEDY. If we change the balance in one area the whole system is disarranged.

Mr. MUNDT. If we want to elect our Presidents by States, the present system is as effective as any that could be devised. If we believe in electing Presidents by the votes of the people, we come up with the fact that the suggestion the Senator from North Dakota has made would result in election directly by the people. Because of the reasons which have been pointed out, the people would not adopt that system.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from South Dakota has expressed himself as being interested in the people of the pivotal States and is anxious that they should be represented. But, is it not true that in connection with unit representation by districts which he advocates the minority in each of the separate districts would be underrepresented? South Dakota has 2 congressional districts which are grossly unequal in size, and it has 2 Senators. It is undoubtedly true that the minority party would cast over a quarter of the votes. Furthermore, the Second District of South Dakota has, I think, a population of approximately 260,000 or less.

Mr. MUNDT. Approximately.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The first district of South Dakota has a population almost double that number.

Mr. MUNDT. Not quite; approximately.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So there is no equality within South Dakota. Furthermore, the minority will be cooped up in each congressional district, and this will be true throughout the one-party States. I should say that, on the whole, Nebraska is a one-party State. The Democratic minorities in each of the congressional districts would be unrepresented, and the Democratic minority in the State as a whole would be unrepresented.

On the other hand, in the South, the Republican minority in each of the districts would be unrepresented, and also the minority in the State as a whole.

What the Senator from South Dakota is proposing is retaining district gerrymandering for the country as a whole for the election of a President. I am afraid that the State legislatures, being rural dominated, will adopt the Mundt-Coudert method in a very large proportion of the cases, with a net disfranchisement and lack of representation of the cities.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, that I may ask a question of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Does not the Senator from Illinois realize that that could be done under the present Constitution; that it was followed by 11 States; and that what we have today, and what we are trying to change today, would permit that very thing to be done?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The point is that the States have abandoned that method. No State that I know of intends to return to it. But the Senator from Texas and the Senator from South Dakota are now proposing that the States must choose between the district system and a State proportional system.

I think an improper set of ideas will be put in the heads of the legislators, since this amendment would come to them with the prestige of having been approved by Congress.

Mr. KENNEDY. In Massachusetts, in 1932, 1936, 1940, 1944, and 1948, years in which the Democrats won the presidential elections by reasonably large margins, more Republican Representatives were elected than were Democratic Representatives. I do not think there was that much crossing of lines. What it means is, of course, that the boundaries of the districts are badly drawn.

We have the classic example about which the Senator from Texas speaks—Harris County, Tex. In my opinion, it would require action by the State to correct such a condition, because, after all, we believe the State can, more or less, do what it wishes, if it decides to do so. But then it would be difficult to draw a district line in order to give balance to a State. I suppose that is what would have to be done in order to permit the Mundt-Coudert plan to reflect the people's desires.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator be interested in some comparative figures from the Houston area? The Houston area, which is the Eighth Congressional District, had a population in 1950 of 806,701.

In the 17th District on the other hand, the population in 1950 was approximately 226,000.

So within the State of Texas itself, 1 vote in the 17th District today equals approximately 4 votes in the Houston area.

The Dallas district had a population in 1950 of 615,000; the San Antonio district, 500,000.

We find such gross inequalities within all the States.

Mr. KENNEDY. After all, gerrymandering started in Massachusetts, and is named after one of our great Revolutionary figures.

In Georgia, the Fifth Congressional District, which is the Atlanta area, has a population of 618,00, which is larger than the total population of the Eighth and Ninth Districts.

In committee, the Senator from Texas pointed to the possibility of gerrymandering. I do not see how the States could get around the problem of unequal distribution of population.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Texas does not believe that many States will adopt the Mundt-Coudert plan. I dislike to say that in the presence of the Senator from South Dakota, who believes very much in his own plan. But I do not believe many of the States will adopt it. They have a right to do so now, but they are not using that plan.

Mr. KENNEDY. I should like to reply to the Senator on one point. If the State legislatures can arrange the districts—and good draftsmen can arrange them very satisfactorily—every State will adopt the plan, because it will be possible, with the rural populations, to control the State legislatures. Most of them are Republican, and it will be possible, in my opinion, for the Republicans to do much better at the polls than they are doing today. It will be possible to do that in every State of the country.

I mention this to the Senator from Texas, because I know he is not anxious to have that happen.

Mr. DANIEL. Not at all. As the Senator from Massachusetts knows, if that should happen, it would be accusing someone of doing something——

Mr. KENNEDY. Which they are doing now.

Mr. DANIEL. To gain advantage. If they are doing it now, Congress has the right to correct it under section 4, article I, of the Constitution. The Senator realizes, does he not, that Congress has the power to do that, and that Congress has, in some instances, exercised that power?

Mr. KENNEDY. It is true that in 1872, 1901, and 1911 Congressional Reapportionment Acts attempted to prevent gerrymanders, but to no avail; and in the Reapportionment Act of 1929 all such provisions were dropped. Thus 183 congressional seats today represent districts either under- or over-populated, and a Republican assemblyman was able to boast that a blatant gerrymander that gave five seats for the Republicans in 1952 was responsible for Republican control of the House in the 83d Congress. Many States, satisfied with the effects of ancient gerrymanders, do not even bother to reapportion on the basis of up-to-date census figures.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator admits, does he not, that Congress could do something about the situation?

Mr. KENNEDY. It would be extremely difficult.

Mr. DANIEL. But Congress has the power; has it not?

Mr. KENNEDY. Consider the city of Boston. How could the question be decided, unless everyone, more or less, was run out? The lines could be drawn geographically, but how would it be decided where the Democrats and the Republicans should be put? There are 4 districts in Boston, 2 Republican and 2 Democratic. The two Democratic districts are 10-to-1 Democratic. The Republican districts are extremely close. I do not see how that situation could be prevented from Washington.

Mr. DANIEL. All I was pointing out was that Congress has the power to prevent it.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think Congress would have difficulty in enforcing it.

Mr. DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am not certain that I would like to have Congress drawing the lines. If the Republicans were in control, they could probably realine the congressional districts so as to change the whole makeup of Congress, as well as affect the Presidency.

I think that would be opening up a potentially dangerous situation, and that is why I prefer the plan of the Senator from Texas to the plan of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. DANIEL. We are in agreement on that. The only thing I must say in defense of the alternative plan which is in the substitute, and which could be followed today if any of the States wanted to adopt it, is that under section 4, article I, of the Constitution, it is left to the State legislatures to determine the places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives.

Section 4 goes on to say:

But the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

So the power is there. If someone or some State misuses its power under the amendment, under the alternative in the Mundt-Coudert plan, there is a remedy for it.

Mr. KENNEDY. I should say that the remedy would be by a Congress which benefited from it.

I notice that the Senator from New Jersey is in the Chamber. In New Jersey 8 urban counties, with four-fifths of the population, have 8 State senators, while 13 rural counties, with one-fifth of the population, have 13 senators. That illustrates the problem of getting State legislatures to draw lines fairly.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. It is quite true that the State legislatures "overweight the acres," as we say in New Jersey, as against the populous centers.

I know the Senator from Massachusetts does not suggest that there will be a yielding to these temptations, but rather his point is that we already have unbalanced districts, and grossly unbalanced districts, which have proved historical reasons for their existence. These ought not to be made the basic areas for the choosing of electors for President.

Also I wish to make one additional point with regard to the suggestion that Congress may have the constitutional power to correct anything of this sort. To say it has that power is quite naive, when we recognize that Congress has for a long time had the power to reduce the representation in Congress of States where there are restrictions upon the vote, and has never yet felt it was in a position to take action along that line.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am in complete agreement with what the Senator has said. To give another example, let us take the nearby city of Baltimore. Baltimore, with 47 percent of the population of the State, gets 29 percent of the representation. In Connecticut, Hartford, with a population of 126,000, has 2 Representatives. Colebrook, with a population of 527, also has 2 Representatives.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out, and the Senator from New Jersey has reinforced the point, that there is already a great temptation for State legislatures, rural-dominated as they are, to lay down congressional district lines which discriminate against the cities and discriminate against that political party which is strongest in the city but weak in the countryside. Would not this temptation be increased if the congressional districts became the units from which the President was elected?

Mr. KENNEDY. Of course, there would be that much more at stake and the temptation would be that much greater.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So if they succumb to temptation now, the temptation would be intensified and they would succumb still more if the Mundt-Coudert amendment were adopted. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. The figures which have been given are true of every State of the Union.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. So far as New York is concerned, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas and his associates would work a very serious and unfair advantage. The situation in New York is so arranged politically, and, as a matter of fact, constitutionally, that the great centers are at a tremendous disadvantage as compared to the rural centers, the great centers being Democratic, the rural areas being Republican, with the result that, so far as the legislature is concerned, every county of the State must have at least one representative in the assembly, regardless of size. The result is that a county like Putnam, with a population of only 20,000, has an assemblyman, whereas an assemblyman from New York City represents somewhere between three and four hundred thousand.

Furthermore, the congressional districts are very unequal in size. The upstate congressional districts are, generally speaking, very much smaller in population than are the congressional districts in New York City.

Furthermore, we have gone through a period of gerrymandering, which has placed a great handicap on the city districts, which are Democratic.

In spite of the fact that New York State has elected more Democratic governors and more Democratic Senators than Republicans over the past 25 or 30 years, the New York State Legislature has, in only 1 year in the past 21, been Democratic. That was in 1935, when I was governor. I did not permit gerrymandering. I sometimes regretted it a little bit, because of the fact that the Republicans did not repay me in kind. Since then there has been very, very serious gerrymandering, with the result that, through reapportionment, which requires a vote in the assembly of the legislature, and also requires a vote in the congressional district, the gerrymandering has placed the urban centers of New York State at a very great disadvantage.

I have mentioned the situation only as it affects New York State. I think the same arguments could be advanced with regard to many other States of the Union. I shall not go into that tonight, because I know the hour is late. I hope to have an opportunity to speak on the subject again tomorrow, but, as far as New York State is concerned—and I believe I can speak with some authority about New York State—the situation would be extremely unfair and dangerous to the interests of the people of New York State.

I again wish to emphasize that, in spite of the gerrymandering, in spite of the overwhelming control of the legislature by the Republicans, the people of New York State as a whole have elected far more Democratic governors and Senators in the last 25 or 30 years than Republicans.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in conclusion, I would say to the Senator from Texas my feeling would be that the one-party States would use the Mundt-Coudert system particularly to submerge

those aspiring Republican groups which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is hopeful will arise in certain States, and the Democratic groups which other Senators are hopeful will arise in Republican States. It would not take much modification to draw the lines to bring that about. The people in the minority parties would continue to be unrepresented. So I think the things which are hoped for will not come about. I thank the Senator from New York for his statement.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1585. An act to provide for the return to the town of Hartford, Vt., of certain land which was donated by such town to the United States as a site for a veterans' hospital and which is no longer needed for such purposes;

H. R. 585. An act to authorize the conveyance to Lake County, Calif., of the lower Lake Rancheria, and for other purposes;

H. R. 622. An act to provide for the release by the United States of its rights and interests in certain land located in Saginaw County, Mich.;

H. R. 930. An act for the relief of John Daniel Pope;

H. R. 944. An act for the relief of Nicola Teodosio;

H. R. 1014. An act for the relief of Chung Fook Yee Chung;

H. R. 1074. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Chan Lee (Eta Lee);

H. R. 1097. An act for the relief of John Meredith McFarlane;

H. R. 1104. An act for the relief of Guenther Kaschner;

H. R. 1137. An act for the relief of Harry John Wilson;

H. R. 1209. An act for the relief of Numeriano Lagmay;

H. R. 1323. An act for the relief of Sister Ramona Maria (Ramona E. Tombo);

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of Krsevan Spanjol;

H. R. 1544. An act for the relief of Mrs. Moli (Mali) Sobel;

H. R. 1666. An act for the relief of Jose Canencia-Castanedo;

H. R. 1806. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association", approved May 31, 1920, as heretofore amended, so as to permit such corporation to consolidate with Women's Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, Inc.;

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of Howard Rieck;

H. R. 1920. An act for the relief of Ane Karlic Vlasich;

H. R. 1923. An act for the relief of Kevin Murphy;

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chin-An Wang (nee Alice Chiacheng Sze);

H. R. 2054. An act for the relief of Induk Pahk;

H. R. 2072. An act for the relief of Julian Nowakowski, or William Nowak (Novak);

H. R. 2283. An act for the relief of Wilhelmus Marius Van der Veur;

H. R. 2285. An act for the relief of Marie Lim Tsien;

H. R. 2345. An act for the relief of Jean Henri Buchet;

H. R. 2522. An act for the relief of Isabelle S. Gorrell, Donald E. Gorrell, Mary Owen Gorrell, and Kathryn G. Wright;

H. R. 3037. An act for the relief of Jakob Hass, Rosa Hass, and Mala Hass;

H. R. 3057. An act for the relief of Doctor Bienvenido L. Balingit;

H. R. 3201. An act for the relief of George Mikroulis, his wife, Dora Mikroulis, and his daughter Madonna G. Mikroulis;

H. R. 3265. An act for the relief of Alkista Sfounis;

H. R. 3375. An act for the relief of Dr. James C. S. Lee, his wife, Dora Ting Wei, and their daughter, Vivian Lee;

H. R. 3501. An act for the relief of Nisan Sarkis Giritliyan and Virgin Giritliyan;

H. R. 3557. An act to further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed;

H. R. 3650. An act to provide for the conveyance to Elief Rue of certain real property situated in Cassia County, Idaho;

H. R. 3723. An act for the relief of Freda H. Sullivan;

H. R. 3845. An act for the relief of Guillermo Padraza;

H. R. 3857. An act for the relief of Constantin David, Paula Marie David, Claire Edmond David, and Arlane Constance David;

H. R. 3869. An act for the relief of Esther Ledea Escobedo;

H. R. 3965. An act for the relief of Max Moskowitz;

H. R. 4181. An act for the relief of P. F. Claveau, as successor to the firm of Rodger G. Ritchie Painting & Decorating Co.;

H. R. 4185. An act for the relief of Zabel Vartanian;

H. R. 4376. An act to exempt from duty the importation of certain handwoven fabrics when used in the making of religious vestments;

H. R. 4391. An act to abolish the Castle Pinckney National Monument, in the State of South Carolina, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4680. An act affirming that title to a certain tract of land in California vested in the State of California on January 21, 1897;

H. R. 4802. An act to authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land;

H. R. 5280. An act to authorize land exchanges for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia; to authorize the transfer of certain lands of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia, to the Commonwealth of Virginia; and for other purposes;

H. R. 5556. An act authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of McGirts Creek, Florida, for flood control;

H. R. 5856. An act to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year;

H. R. 5866. An act for the relief of Giovanni Lazarich;

H. R. 6112. An act to authorize the constuction of a sewage-disposal system to serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 6309. An act to authorize construction of the Mississippi River-gulf outlet;

H. R. 6363. An act for the relief of Edward Barnett;

H. R. 6532. An act for the relief of John William Scholtes;

H. R. 6617. An act for the relief of Boris Kowerda;

H. R. 6618. An act for the relief of Etha Dora Johnson;

H. R. 6772. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain federally owned land under his jurisdiction to the school district No. 24 of Lake County, Oreg.;

H. R. 6961. An act to designate the lake created by Buford Dam in the State of Georgia as Lake Sidney Lanier;

H. R. 7097. An act to provide for the reconveyance of oil and gas and mineral interests in a portion of the lands acquired for the Demopolis lock and dam project, to the former owners thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7927. An act to extend the time within which the State of Louisiana may make initial payment on the purchase of certain property from the United States;

H. R. 8607. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to David Peters, or to his heirs or assigns, title to land held by the United States in trust for him;

H. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution to designate the General Grant tree (known as the Nation's Christmas tree) in Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., as a national shrine.

H. J. Res. 443. Joint resolution to increase the appropriation authorization for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission; and

H. J. Res. 517. Joint resolution changing the date for the counting of the electoral votes in 1957.

RECESS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in line with my agreement with the majority leader, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. I believe the majority leader stated it would be possible for the Senator from Massachusetts to have the floor again after the morning business.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 21, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 20 (legislative day of March 19), 1956:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Sheldon T. Mills, of Oregon, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan, vice Angus Ward, resigned.

CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

Lewis E. Berry, Jr., of Michigan, to be Deputy Federal Civil Defense Administrator, vice Mrs. Katherine C. Howard, resigned.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

FOR APPOINTMENT, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS

To be senior assistant surgeons

John K. Irion	Lesther Winkler
Harold P. Schedl	Samuel G. Southwick
Allen C. Pirkle	Robert H. Parrott
James L. German	Edward F. Wenzleff
Patrick J. Hennelly, Jr.	

To be assistant surgeons

Duane L. Hanson	Munsey S. Wheby
W. King Engel	James C. Wooton
Theodore A. Labow	Alvin Singer

Lowell H. Hansen	Alex Rosen
Donald A. Neher	Herman L. Smith
Leon N. Branton	Hugh S. Pershing

To be assistant dental surgeon

Dale E. Smith

To be nurse officer

Mildred Struve

To be senior assistant nurse officer

Jean C. Casey

To be senior assistant therapists

Josef Hoog	JaNeva I. Porter
Howard A. Haak	John R. De Simio
John F. Burke	Nellie L. Evans

To be assistant therapists

Royce P. Noland	Dean P. Currier
Michael J. Oliva	Lennes A. Talbot, Jr.

To be junior assistant therapists

Arthur J. Nelson, Jr.	John L. Echternach
Dell C. Nelms	James W. Barbero

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 20 (legislative day of March 19), 1956:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Stanley N. Barnes, of California, to be United States circuit judge for the ninth circuit.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Garis T. Long, Grace Baptist Church, Richmond, Va., offered the following prayer:

Oh Thou Eternal God, our Father, the God and Father of our Lord, Jesus Christ, our Saviour, we turn our hearts to Thee in thanksgiving and praise for all of the riches of Thy grace and for Thy many blessings and favors. We thank Thee for this land in which we live, for the rich endowments that Thou hast given unto us, for the ideals of democracy, and for the privilege of freedom that we enjoy as individuals and for all of the opportunities which are ours. We pray Thy rich blessings to abide upon this great land and upon all the nations of the earth.

Grant Thy favors upon the President of the United States, upon those who are associated with him in positions of responsibility, and grant, our Father, Thy special blessing upon this assembly. We thank Thee for these men and women who represent us. Wilt Thou richly endow them with divine wisdom that they may seek to do Thy will. Give unto them discerning minds and understanding hearts. May they know the right, and grant, our Father, that they may have courage to act upon the truth as they know it.

Our Father, we realize that we are mortal men. We are dependent creatures. Thine are the true resources of light. Thine are the material bounties. Thine are the spiritual values. Supply us, we pray, with those things which are needful in our choices and decisions. May we ever be mindful of the fact that righteousness exalteth a nation but sin is a reproach to a people. May we know that Thou dost require of us to do justly, love mercy, and to walk humbly before Thee as our God.

Let Thy blessings be upon the people who are represented by these men and women. Wilt Thou give unto them a tolerant spirit and understanding minds and hearts, and may they always give encouragement to the ones whom they have chosen for positions of responsibility. May the people who are represented here today manifest a spirit of appreciation that we as a nation may be undergirded with strength, with courage, and with a desire to do Thy holy will. Let Thy blessings be upon all of the deliberations here in this Congress and grant, our Father, that we may seek Thy kingdom and may Thy will be done in us, through us, and by us. In Jesus' name and for His sake, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 585. An act to authorize the conveyance to Lake County, Calif., of the Lower Lake Rancheria, and for other purposes;

H. R. 622. An act to provide for the release by the United States of its rights and interests in certain land located in Saginaw County, Mich.;

H. R. 930. An act for the relief of John Daniel Popa;

H. R. 944. An act for the relief of Nicola Teodosio;

H. R. 1014. An act for the relief of Chung Fook Yee Chung;

H. R. 1074. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Chan Lee (Eta Lee);

H. R. 1097. An act for the relief of John Meredith McFarlane;

H. R. 1104. An act for the relief of Guenther Kaschner;

H. R. 1137. An act for the relief of Harry John Wilson;

H. R. 1209. An act for the relief of Numeriano Lagmay;

H. R. 1323. An act for the relief of Sister Ramona Maria (Ramona E. Tombo);

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of Krsevan Spanjol;

H. R. 1544. An act for the relief of Mrs. Moli (Mali) Sobel;

H. R. 1666. An act for the relief of Jose Canencia-Castanedo;

H. R. 1806. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, as heretofore amended, so as to permit such corporation to consolidate with Women's Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, Inc.;

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of Howard Rieck;

H. R. 1920. An act for the relief of Ane Karlic Vlasich;

H. R. 1923. An act for the relief of Kevin Murphy;

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chiu-An Wang (nee Alice Chiacheng Sze);

H. R. 2054. An act for the relief of Induk Pahk;

H. R. 2072. An act for the relief of Julian Nowakowski, or William Nowak (Novak);

H. R. 2283. An act for the relief of Wilhelmus Marius Van der Veur;

H. R. 2285. An act for the relief of Marie Lim Tsien;

H. R. 2345. An act for the relief of Jean Henri Buchet;

H. R. 2347. An act for the relief of Heinrich Wolfgang;

H. R. 2522. An act for the relief of Isabelle S. Gorrell, Donald E. Gorrell, Mary Owen Gorrell, and Kathryn G. Wright;

H. R. 3037. An act for the relief of Jakob Hass, Roza Hass, and Mala Hass;

H. R. 3057. An act for the relief of Dr. Bienvenido L. Balingit;

H. R. 3201. An act for the relief of George Mikroulis, his wife, Dora Mikroulis, and his daughter, Madonna G. Mikroulis;

H. R. 3265. An act for the relief of Airista Sfounis;

H. R. 3375. An act for the relief of Dr. James C. S. Lee, his wife Dora Ting Wei, and their daughter, Vivian Lee;

H. R. 3501. An act for the relief of Nisan Sarkis Giritliyan and Virgin Giritliyan;

H. R. 3557. An act to further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed;

H. R. 3650. An act to provide for the conveyance to Eilef Rue of certain real property situated in Cassia County, Idaho;

H. R. 3723. An act for the relief of Freda H. Sullivan;

H. R. 3845. An act for the relief of Guillermo Pedraza;

H. R. 3857. An act for the relief of Constantin David, Paula Marie David, Claire Edmonde David, and Ariane Constance David;

H. R. 3869. An act for the relief of Esther Ledea Escobedo;

H. R. 3963. An act for the relief of Ashot Mnatzakanian and Ophelia Mnatzakanian;

H. R. 3965. An act for the relief of Max Moskowitz;

H. R. 4181. An act for the relief of P. F. Claveau, as successor to the firm of Rodger G. Ritchie Painting & Decorating Co.;

H. R. 4185. An act for the relief of Zabel Vartanian;

H. R. 4376. An act to exempt from duty the importation of certain handwoven fabrics when used in the making of religious vestments;

H. R. 4391. An act to abolish the Castle Pinckney National Monument, in the State of South Carolina, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4680. An act affirming that title to a certain tract of land in California vested in the State of California on January 21, 1897;

H. R. 4802. An act to authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land;

H. R. 5280. An act to authorize land exchanges for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia; to authorize the transfer of certain lands of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia, to the Commonwealth of Virginia; and for other purposes;

H. R. 5556. An act authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of McGirts Creek, Fla., for flood control;

H. R. 5856. An act to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year;

H. R. 5866. An act for the relief of Giovanni Lazarich;

H. R. 5876. An act to amend the copyright law to permit, in certain classes of works, the deposit of photographs or other identifying reproductions in lieu of copies of published works;

H. R. 6022. An act to provide for the relocation of the Trenton Massacre Canyon Monument presently located near Trenton, Nebr.;

H. R. 6112. An act to authorize the construction of a sewage-disposal system to

serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 6309. An act to authorize construction of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet;

H. R. 6363. An act for the relief of Edward Barnett;

H. R. 6532. An act for the relief of John William Scholtes;

H. R. 6617. An act for the relief of Boris Kowerda;

H. R. 6618. An act for the relief of Etha Dora Johnson;

H. R. 6772. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain federally owned land under his jurisdiction to the school district No. 24 of Lake County, Oreg.

H. R. 6904. An act to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument;

H. R. 6961. An act to designate the lake created by Buford Dam in the State of Georgia as "Lake Sidney Lanier";

H. R. 7097. An act to provide for the reconveyance of oil and gas and mineral interests in a portion of the lands acquired for the Demopolis lock and dam project, to the former owners thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7927. An act to extend the time within which the State of Louisiana may make the initial payment on the purchase of certain property from the United States;

H. R. 8607. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to David Peters, or to his heirs or assigns, title to land held by the United States in trust for him;

H. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution to designate the General Grant tree (known as the Nation's Christmas Tree) in Kings Canyon National Park, California, as a national shrine;

H. J. Res. 443. Joint resolution to increase the appropriation authorization for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission; and

H. J. Res. 517. Joint resolution changing the date for the counting of the electoral votes in 1957.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1005. An act for the relief of Alice Duckett;

H. R. 1082. An act for the relief of Golda I. Stegner;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Porter;

H. R. 2946. An act for the relief of Eugene Dus;

H. R. 3996. An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 4039. An act for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Jaime, Dennis, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo; and

H. R. 6268. An act to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 12. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, joint resolutions, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 572. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Delio A. Loo Murgas;

S. 767. An act for the relief of Andrew Rosner;

S. 850. An act for the relief of Konstantinos Zaferatos;

S. 885. An act for the relief of Alice Elizabeth Marjoribanks;

S. 1111. An act for the relief of Eric A. Cummings;

S. 1122. An act for the relief of Sarah Kleidermacher;

S. 1146. An act to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives;

S. 1240. An act for the relief of Imre de Cholnoky;

S. 1347. An act for the relief of Jose Arriaga-Marin;

S. 1465. An act for the relief of Audrey Jean Younkers;

S. 1528. An act to authorize enrolled members of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., to acquire trust interests in tribal lands of the reservation, and for other purposes;

S. 1533. An act for the relief of John Nicholas Christodoulias;

S. 1542. An act to authorize an allowance for civilian officers and employees of the Government who are notaries public;

S. 1552. An act for the relief of Mikie Woodard;

S. 1555. An act authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes;

S. 1560. An act for the relief of Dr. John Joon Sik Chung;

S. 1619. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Ventura;

S. 1664. An act for the relief of Balbina Borenstein;

S. 1701. An act for the relief of Hildegard Silvonen;

S. 1702. An act to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps;

S. 1733. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Argasinski;

S. 1734. An act for the relief of Johann Antonius Tudhope and Walda Fedor Tudhope;

S. 1762. An act for the relief of Rudolf Fritz Liermann;

S. 1814. An act for the relief of Teresa Lucia Cilli and Guiseppe Corrado Cilli;

S. 1831. An act for the relief of Panteles Kerkos;

S. 1846. An act for the relief of Dr. Howard Seeming Liang; Lai Yen Mark Liang, and Howard Seeming Liang, Jr.;

S. 1871. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to reimburse the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government-mail matter," approved August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 614), and for other purposes;

S. 1881. An act for the relief of Vittorio Ventimiglia;

S. 1883. An act for the relief of Pietro Rodolfo Walter Stulin;

S. 1889. An act for the relief of Maria Guadalupe Shockley and her minor daughter, Evangelina Vega Shockley;

S. 1900. An act for the relief of Helen Agnes Blais (Junko Furakawa);

S. 1929. An act for the relief of Regina M. Knight;

S. 1939. An act for the relief of John Shalam and Claude Shalam;

S. 1950. An act for the relief of Dr. Fu-Chuan Chao (also known as Fuk Kun Chiu) and his wife, Chiu Lai Yuk (also known as Lai Yuk Chao);

S. 1953. An act for the relief of Yvonne Mary Florescu (Sister John Baptist);

S. 1970. An act for the relief of Kim Boksoon;

S. 1975. An act for the relief of Jenny Antoinette V. Ingrum;

S. 1987. An act for the relief of Dr. Peter Chou-Yuen Tchen;

S. 2012. An act for the relief of Chong You How (also known as Edward Charles Yee), his wife, Eng Lai Fong, and his child, Chong Yim Keung;

S. 2035. An act for the relief of Nicholas Hernandez-Valencia;

S. 2037. An act for the relief of Adele Knoff and her minor child, Hans Knoff;

S. 2052. An act for the relief of Demetrios K. Georgaras;

S. 2077. An act for the relief of Abdullah Ibrahim Hakim;

S. 2103. An act for the relief of Anke Naber;

S. 2104. An act for the relief of Charlotte Muhlefeldt;

S. 2138. An act for the relief of Dorothy May Ackermann;

S. 2143. An act for the relief of Manda Pauline Petricevic;

S. 2151. An act to provide for the segregation of certain funds of the Fort Berthold Indians on the basis of a membership roll prepared for such purpose;

S. 2155. An act for the relief of Jose Torres;

S. 2156. An act for the relief of Thomas H. Ros;

S. 2201. An act for the relief of Dr. Wei-Chi Liu;

S. 2243. An act for the relief of Mary Boone Lacson;

S. 2249. An act for the relief of Pil Nyi Kwak;

S. 2264. An act for the relief of Yu Heng Gee;

S. 2267. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the city of Henderson, Nev.;

S. 2284. An act for the relief of Domingo Lim (also known as Lim Eng Kok and Domingo Lim Chay Seng);

S. 2289. An act for the relief of David Hayes;

S. 2304. An act for the relief of Mary Parlich Goldstein;

S. 2327. An act for the relief of Takako Iba;

S. 2345. An act for the relief of Liiu Yuen Chuang;

S. 2349. An act for the relief of Miss Pilar A. Garcia;

S. 2357. An act for the relief of Nenita Santos and Elizabeth Santos;

S. 2358. An act for the relief of Renate Karolina Horky;

S. 2371. An act for the relief of Charles Black, also known as Joseph Clark;

S. 2381. An act for the relief of Dr. Mahmood Sajjadi;

S. 2399. An act for the relief of Hua-Tung Lee (Gordon Lee) and his wife, Chi-Wan Mow Lee (Jane Lee);

S. 2414. An act for the relief of Lina Diaz;

S. 2445. An act for the relief of Knar Carmen Ives;

S. 2495. An act for the relief of Anna Abbene;

S. 2570. An act for the relief of Maximilien Beauvois;

S. 2590. An act for the relief of Paula Edith Reynolds;

S. 2666. An act for the relief of Catherine Towes;

S. 2686. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Boni;

S. 2697. An act for the relief of Kimiko Yamada Clark;

S. 2744. An act for the relief of Harold Manly Stewart;

S. 2755. An act to designate the reservoir above the Monticello Dam in California as Lake Berryessa;

S. 2861. An act to authorize an increase of emergency relief highway funds from $10 million to $30 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956;

S. 3237. An act to provide for continuance of live insurance coverage under the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, in the case of employees receiving benefits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act;

S. 3315. An act to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Member of Congress;

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Member of Congress;

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution providing for the filing of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Member of Congress; and

S. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings to the Sudan.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3452) to amend the act of July 15, 1955, Public Law 161, 84th Congress—Sixty-ninth United States Statutes at Large, page 324—by increasing the appropriation authorization for the Aircraft Control and Warning System.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 15, 1955, Public Law 161, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 324), is hereby amended as follows:

(1) With respect to various locations under the heading "Outside Continental United States" and subheading "Aircraft Control and Warning System" in section 301 strike out "$98,552,000" and insert in place thereof "$170,552,000."

(2) In clause (3) of section 502 thereof strike out the amounts "$458,563,000" and "$1,207,902,000" and insert in place thereof "$530,563,000" and "$1,279,902,000" respectively.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNWARRANTED CHARGE OF ATTEMPTING TO INFLUENCE JUDICIAL DECISION

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions recently there has appeared in the public press an attack on me because of alleged bullying of a judge. It is unfortunate, indeed, that the Committee on Appropriations released testimony adduced before that committee in connection with an appropriation request, before the circuit court handed down a decision in a case now before it for reconsideration. I assure you that in answering the question propounded by the distinguished chairman of that subcommittee I had no intention of attempting to influence the judgment of the court, and I am sure that everybody who knows me knows that I have never attempted either directly or indirectly to influence a decision of any court made against me.

I think it is important in considering the accusation to call your attention to the fact that the man who made this unfounded charge, one of the directors of the ADA, one Edward D. Hollander, was a member of the Washington Book Shop, an organization cited by Attorneys General Francis Biddle and Tom Clark as being a subversive and Communist-front organization and redesignated by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 10450 in 1953 as a subversive and Communist organization. I am very proud of the fact that the attacks made upon me because of criticism leveled against a judge for a decision which was strained, to say the least, come from that source. Attacks of this sort are not leveled against me as an individual but as the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Recently I learned that a newspaperman was assigned to the task of trying to "get me." Several months ago a female newspaperwriter threatened that "wait until we get through with you." All of this furnishes abundant proof of the wisdom of Congress in appropriating funds with which activities of subversives and their stooges can be watched.

REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, advised us on March 1, 1956, that an appraisal of the program of operations under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, indicates that about 50,000 visas of the 209,000 nonquota visas allocated under that act would remain unused at the termination date of the program which is December 31, 1956.

I see no reason why the visas allocated by the Congress should remain unused, but, at the same time I do not see why we should extend the lifetime of a very expensive administration which is in charge of that program.

I have today introduced a bill which would terminate that expensive operation on the date fixed by the Congress but would permit the use of the entire allocation of visas to those people for whom the Congress intended to provide resettlement opportunities in the United States.

The ethnic groups affected would be the Greeks, natives of the Netherlands, Italians, German expellees and anti-Communist Chinese, as well as war orphans of all nationalities.

The Immigration and Nationality Act, often referred to as the Walter-McCarran Act, would be fully applicable.

The escapees from Communist oppression would benefit under one of the sections of my bill which would restore the full use of annual quotas to natives of countries taken over by Soviet Russia, namely, the Baltic countries, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and so forth, as well as to Greeks who have an extremely small immigration quota for their use—a quota amounting to only 308 annually.

There is one more feature of my bill which I believe will meet with the approval of the Congress. In view of the progress made by medical science, we can now afford, without injuring our citizens, to admit in the name of enlightened humanitarianism a relatively small number of people afflicted with tuberculosis and to place them in institutions prepared to take care of them. Smaller countries like Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, and the Federal Republic of Germany have similarly contributed to helping the sick and homeless. I believe the United States will do well to join in that humanitarian endeavor, under proper safeguards and controls which are provided for in my proposal. I have been reliably informed that charitable groups have guaranteed to do all of the financing necessary in order to maintain these people until such time as a cure has been effected.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to press vigorously for the enactment of this bill before the end of this session of Congress.

POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, complaints from postal workers relative to working conditions and from people in my district relative to postal service have been more numerous in recent months than any time during my term of office.

Recently I have received a number of complaints from postal workers about the difficulty in securing their annual leave. On checking into the matter, I find that the Post Office Department is attempting to operate without adequate funds. In testifying before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the post-office appropriation, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield testified that they would have to come in and request a deficiency appropriation of $20 million to operate for the balance of the fiscal year. I have been informed that up to the present time they have not made such a request, but apparently are doing everything possible to save this amount by restricting the rights and privileges of employees, and by denying service to the public.

I am anxious to see the budget balanced, not for political reasons, but for the welfare of the American taxpayer, but I do not believe the postal employees should be imposed upon by being expected to handle a staggering amount of work without proper assistance, nor do I believe that the American people should be denied their traditionally good postal service.

The population in this country is growing at a tremendous rate. On February 1 the Census Bureau estimated the population at 166.9 million. Since February 1, according to a rough estimate kept by the Census Bureau, the population has increased beyond the 167 million mark.

The Post Office Department has not had sufficient employees to keep pace with the growing volume of mail and with the rapidly expanding population. The decision as to whether or not a deficiency appropriation will be requested is being discussed at a budget level. Rightfully this problem is of such grave import that it should be taken up with the elected representatives of the people and I believe that the Postmaster General is not living up to his proper responsibility in failing to do so.

I want to refer to the remarks made by my able colleague from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] on March 15 when he rose on the floor of the House of Representatives and reported that he was receiving daily complaints about the closing of many small post offices. We are experiencing the same difficulty in my district. The Post Office Department has boasted that they have closed 3,000 of these little post offices at a saving of $4 million. This amount is infinitesimal. The fourth-class post office serves as more than a distributor of mail. It has a definite social significance to rural America. It represents the local pride of the rural community in which it is situated, and I do hope that we can do something to stop this mad attempt to eliminate the fourth-class post offices from the American scene.

BILL DIGEST

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time to direct the attention of the membership to the improvement by the Legislative Reference Service in producing and publishing the important Digest of Public General Bills. In May of 1955, my colleague from the great State of Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] informed the House that the Bill Digest had lost its effectiveness as a legislative information publication, because it ran from 30 to 60 days behind current dates. He pointed out that its importance was being completely lost because requests for explanation of legislative proposals were generally in connection with newly introduced bills. It, hence, served no useful purpose for analysis and breakdown of the measures in question.

I am pleased to report that action taken this year by the House Subcommittee on Printing, of which I am chairman, has brought about a noticeable speed-up of operation. Following conversations between members of the subcommittee staff and the director and other officials of the Legislative Reference Service, it was decided that a revised schedule of cumulative issues in February, April, June, and the final copy would also be supplemented by bi-weekly issues.

Although the new schedule is a big improvement over the publishing schedule of the last session, I wish to add that members of the Printing Subcommittee staff are working with Library of Congress officials to further shorten the publishing schedule of the Bill Digest. Meetings have been held with these officials and steps are being taken to acquire a suitable camera, utilizing roll film, for installation in the Library of Congress. This camera could then be advantageously used, not only to make the offset negatives which are required for the printing of the Bill Digest, but would also be used to make negatives of numerous other publications which are issued by the Library of Congress.

If this proposal is put into effect, as I hope it will be, it is my understanding that we can expect a more timely schedule for the issuance of the Bill Digest which has been lacking for a long time.

JANE FROMAN AND GYPSY MARKOFF

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill (H. R. 10053) to authorize payments to Jane Froman and to Gypsy Markoff, for partial compensation on account of personal injuries they suffered during World War II, as the result of the crash of a seaplane in which they were passengers under Government orders, the destination of which was a military secret and unknown to them, as well as were all the details of their transportation, departure, and so forth.

Jane Froman at the time of the accident was a performer of international prominence. Gypsy Markoff was likewise a recognized entertainer, her profession being that of accordion player. Both were performers of outstanding reputation who volunteered their services, and at the time of the crash they were on their way to entertain our Armed Forces in the European theater of war. The War Department made all transportation arrangements for these performers, and the usual insurance coverage obtainable by passengers in normal air transportation was not available to them because of the military secrecy surrounding the flight.

The entire country has sympathized with Jane Froman in her severe and painful bodily injuries. In the 10 years following the accident Miss Froman has undergone some 30 operations. She has been in and out of hospitals since the accident. Miss Markoff suffered extreme injuries to her right shoulder and left hand, resulting in deformities of the hand with permanent limitation of motion, and a number of other painful injuries.

Miss Froman and Miss Markoff were precluded from obtaining proper relief by reason of the terms of the outmoded Warsaw Convention of 1929, an international treaty that regulates and limits the liability of air carriers engaged in international transportation. Moreover, these claimants had no choice in the matter; they were engaged in a voluntary, patriotic task, the arrangements of which, including transportation, were unknown to them and were beyond their control.

In view of these circumstances, it is the duty of the Congress to take proper action to express to these individuals the gratitude that is in the hearts of our men and women. The amounts claimed represent only their out-of-pocket expenses for hospitalization and medical expenses and their actual loss of earnings. No part of the sums claimed is compensation for their pain and suffering.

I urge early passage of this bill.

AMENDMENT TO THE IMMIGRATION ACT OF IMPORTANCE TO CLERGYMEN

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, until about 20 years ago we found that many clergymen and members of religious orders were coming to the United States to help meet the religious needs of our communities. Since World War II this situation has reversed itself, and now the entire world is drawing on our theological schools for its graduates. These men and women are being called upon to serve abroad, and some of them, while otherwise willing to do so, refuse for the reason that they are naturalized citizens and would lose their citizenship by accepting such employment abroad.

In order to eliminate this hardship, yesterday I introduced a bill (H. R. 10039) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit clergymen, members of religious orders, and representatives of bona fide religious organizations to perform their religious duties abroad, provided that such persons register each year at the appropriate Foreign Service office.

The second part of my bill would restore citizenship status to those persons fulfilling religious assigments abroad at the time of the enactment of the Immigration Act in 1952, who lost their citizenship right for that reason. Such persons would be restored to citizenship by taking the required oaths referred to in section 310 (a) of the Immigration Act.

I hope we can have early hearings on this bill and bring about its early enactment.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this is a time of trouble, a time of abundant talk on the subject of civil rights, with some of it violent, all of it earnest. The debate goes on between the men who would guarantee to all Americans the liberties that are theirs by right and the men who would not. There is also strife between those of us who want to secure these rights now and those who counsel prudence and caution, advising us to slow down and hold back in our efforts. The result is confusion and bitterness, and men who should be working shoulder to shoulder for the attainment of full civil rights for all Americans are divided over the means and the time. This is a tragic fact.

These individuals who would have us move slowly and cautiously tell us that having taken one large step down the difficult path we are treading we should now stop and rest a bit. The Supreme Court decision, they say, stands as a declaration to the world and to our citizens of America's basic faith in human equality and of her determination to achieve it for all her citizens. Now, these men of prudence say, give history a chance to work her ways. She and time will bring to flowering the seed planted by the Court, just as nature watches over the growth of the unborn child and brings it forth when it is ready for birth. But, we say, the Emancipation Proclamation is already a century old; the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights almost twice that. And, the babe is still unborn. No, we have suffered the pains of labor too long and too vainly to put our trust solely in the ministrations of history. We have learned that she is almost always neutral in the conflicts of men and, unlike Mother Nature, does not preside over the evolution and growth of the life which flows beneath her gaze. Greater freedom and equality will not automatically be ours tomorrow simply because it is tomorrow and not today. If we are to have the goal we seek we must work for it; fight for it. And we must do it now.

Because I am so fully convinced that this is so, I introduced into the House in January of 1955 H. R. 702, a bill "to protect the right of individuals to be free from discrimination or segregation by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin." It is an omnibus bill, the provisions of which are designed to obtain now, immediately, all civil rights for all persons, and to guarantee to every lawful minority freedom from all forms of discrimination and segregation. As an omnibus bill, it proposes not only to remedy the evil of segregated education, so prominent in the public mind just now, but also those evils which permit lynch mobs to seize the law into their own hands and allow lawless-enforcement officials to close their eyes. The bill contains measures to outlaw lynching, poll taxes; segregation in housing, education, and interstate transportation; and discrimination in employment. It also guarantees to all men the right to a fair trial, to the exercise of the ballot, and to religious toleration.

Furthermore the bill does not single out one section of the country for remedial action to the exclusion of others. The South has its segregated schools, and the North its segregated housing. Nor is only one race or one religion the beneficiary of its provisions. All regions, all peoples, all rights are covered by the actions it proposes. It is an omnibus bill, a bill for all.

Freedom cannot be fragmentized.[1]

The many aspects of civil rights are interrelated, and all are interwoven in the fabric of our American democracy. Integration in the schools is in part dependent upon integration in housing. Democracy is dependent upon both. Full protection from lynching is dependent upon police officers who impartially uphold the observance of the law, and where both are not present there is no liberty. My bill recognizes these facts and recognizes that where men are half-free freedom does not exist. When some of its citizens are exposed to some discriminatory practices, a nation is not free. This is a bill to give us total freedom.

To achieve this total freedom I have further provided for simultaneous action on all fronts of governmental authority; State and Federal, legislative and executive. The judiciary has already discharged its function by rendering clear and indisputable the requirements of the Constitution with regard to civil rights. It will continue to play its role by applying the law to specific cases as they are brought before it for review. Now machinery must be set up in the legislative and executive branches to insure a program that will attack the problem in all its many and varied aspects.

To assist the Congress in its deliberations I have called for the creation of a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, which will conduct a continuous survey of the situation to discover and define the areas of trouble and to recommend legislation to meet the difficulties. The Congress has desperate need of such a committee, now more than ever before. It will provide a center for the action of all who work toward the achievement of equality for all men, and it will help put an end to the dissipation of our energies which springs from a lack of coordination and which so often results in ineffective action. Such a committee will also be a place where those who favor these measures and those who oppose them can discuss and thrash out their differences. While there is, these days, it seems to me, too much talk and far too little action, we must be careful not to totally disparage the value of talk. We will all be happier if ultimately men of goodwill can arrive at understanding.

To insure the swift and complete enforcement of the legislative measures, I have in H. R. 702 proposed the establishment of the post of Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights in the Department of Justice. This post will elevate civil rights to the place of importance they should hold in the pattern of our law-enforcement policies. I have also proposed the creation of two Commissions. The first of these, a Commission on Fair Employment, is for the purpose of seeing that policies of nondiscrimination are adhered to by all employers and labor organizations. This Commission is to be given full investigatory powers, and a refusal to acknowledge its authority shall be punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both. The second such body is to be a Commission on Civil Rights, composed of five Presidential appointees, who are to make a continuing study of all State and Federal civil-rights policies. The Commission's job will be to expose unlawful and discriminatory actions and to recommend corrective measures. There is today in Western Europe a human rights commission with the power to compel observance of basic civil liberties in six European countries. While I do not propose to give the Commission any sweeping police powers. I do think that the creation of an independent organ, designed to hear complaints of infraction, is needed to insure the effectiveness of all actions taken to eradicate this sore on the national body.

There is not a moment to be lost. In 1947 the President's Committee on Civil Rights gave in its report three reasons why urgent action was necessary. They were moral, economic, and international and were as follows:

1. The United States can no longer countenance these burdens on its conscience, these inroads on its moral fiber.

2. The United States can no longer afford this heavy drain upon its human wealth, its national competence.

3. The United States is not so strong, the triumph of the democratic ideal is not so inevitable, that we can ignore what the world thinks of us and of our record.

Nine years have passed, 9 years that have seen little or no action in the area of civil rights. If the reasons made action imperative then, what must be the situation now? The need for action is more compelling than ever. It is no longer only a moral obligation to give all our citizens full civil rights, but a political necessity if we are to survive in a hostile world. We must prove our worth to other nations; even more important, we must consolidate our internal life to make sure we are strong enough to stand firm in the face of the external threat. This strength is one that can come only from moral fitness, and from a unity of soul and purpose that will be ours only with the full participation of all our citizens in all aspects of our national life. If we are to preserve our heritage we must keep faith with it.

Now, while so many people are concerned with civil rights, is the moment to move ahead, to awaken and reawaken in every American heart the meaning and implication of the democratic ideal.

[1] Philip Graham, publisher of the Washington Post and Times Herald, in an address before the National Civil Liberties Clearing House, Report of the Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Congress, p. 6.

For so long as any individual is deprived of his freedom to vote, his protection under the law, his dignity as a human being, so long as any or all of these things occur, all of us suffer.

Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto Me.

On the hearth of civil rights is forged the chain that unites and makes us strong. Let us not be misled or sidetracked, dismayed, or discouraged, or divided in our drive to attain the long-overdue fulfillment of the American dream. If this is a time of trouble, it is also a time of awareness, and because it is a time of awareness it is a time of unparalleled opportunity. The challenge is before us; let us rise and meet it.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may sit during general debate tomorrow afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SCHOOL-MILK PROGRAM, BRUCELLOSIS ERADICATION, AND VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the conference report on the bill H. R. 8320, which will be coming before the House, I wish to state that the issue in that matter is very simple. The question is whether the House is going to take action to extend at this time the school-milk program which expires on June 30, the brucellosis eradication program which expires on June 30, and whether we are going to act to extend the veterans' hospitals and Armed Forces milk program. If we vote down the conference report, it will mean we do intend to extend those programs. If we adopt the conference report, it means those programs are not extended and we will, therefore, be voting against their extension. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's RECORD at page 5105 I inserted a brief history and discussion of the problem involved in the matter of this conference report. I would call your attention particularly to the parliamentary situation.

The bill in its present form contains Senate amendments extending the various programs referred to. The conference report eliminates the extensions.

If we reject the conference report we will then be in the same situation we were in when the bill was returned to us from the Senate with the amendments and before the bill was sent to conference. A motion will then be in order, and such a motion will be made, to recede and concur in the Senate amendments. In this way we will provide the additional funds needed for the school milk and brucellosis programs for this fiscal year and also provide for a 2-year extension of these programs.

SCHOOL-MILK PROGRAM

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, with all deference to the gentleman who has just spoken, he did not accurately state the issue. What he has said might be the political issue, but it is not the real issue. A great deal of politics has been inserted in this measure by the gentleman and others, which I think is very unfortunate.

The only issue is whether or not the House will carry through on the objective submitted to us in January, that is—are we going to extend through the remainder of this year the school-milk program? That is the issue. That is all there is to it. There is an amount of $10 million involved. The House has already authorized it. The only question is whether or not we are going to carry through on it. If the gentleman from Wisconsin does not want to do that, all he has to do tomorrow is to vote against the conference report and his vote will then be recorded as evidence of his unwillingness to extend the school-milk program through this fiscal year.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state in answer to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] that that is not the issue as far as the conference report is concerned. Neither the rejection nor adoption of the conference report tomorrow will have any effect upon the continuation of the school-milk program for the remaining portion of fiscal 1956. The question that is proposed to us in the conference report is purely a question of whether we adopt the Senate amendments or reject the Senate amendments. The conference report recommends rejection of the Senate amendments, which provide for a 2-year extension. There is no controversy over the issue of whether the program will be extended for the present fiscal year, whether the conference report is adopted or rejected. The question before us tomorrow is whether we will vote to extend this important program for the school children of America, 16 million of them, and whether we will go forward with the brucellosis program for an additional 2 years.

I hope the conference report will be rejected and that the House will accept the Senate amendments and go forward with this important, worthwhile school-milk program, and also in the important brucellosis program which is being carried on in each of our States. In this way not only will the emergency funds be provided, but final action will be taken to assure continuation of these programs for the next 2 years.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the matter that will be presented to the House by this conference report on H. R. 8320 is simply this: Will you adopt the report and pass the bill as the House passed it, or will you now adopt amendments added to the bill in the other body, and which that body has now rejected. After this bill went to the other body, it added some amendments to the bill. Then the bill went to conference, and in conference the Senate conferees receded and the conference report without those amendments went back to the other body which has already rejected its own amendments by adopting the conference report. Now the report come to us. You have a choice, when this comes before you, to pass the bill precisely as you passed it originally, and precisely in the form in which the other body now agrees to it or you can try to enact into law what that body has rejected.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, I yield, if I have time.

Mr. LAIRD. I think the position is not correctly stated by the gentleman from New York. H. R. 8320 is before the House with the Senate amendments attached. If the House rejects the conference report and accepts the Senate amendments, the bill (H. R. 8320) will go immediately to the White House and can be signed into law, and the 2-year extension will be reality.

Mr. MULTER. That is not the parliamentary situation as I understand it.

Mr. LAIRD. I understand the parliamentary situation is exactly as stated by me.

Mr. MULTER. The other body has adopted the conference report and it now comes to us. We now can send the bill to the White House, precisely as it was when it passed the House originally. All you were asked to do originally was to give this authority for emergency use of $10 million for the school milk program, so it can go on for the balance of this fiscal year. All the other things you now seek to inject into this bill are extraneous to it. They belong in the agricultural bill and should be handled there and not here on this conference report.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is the day for the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Calendar.

EDWARD F. O'HARE

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 380) for the relief of Edward F. O'Hare.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 8572) entitled "A bill for the relief of Edward F. O'Hare," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHAIM GRADE AND INNA HEKKER GRADE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6955) for the relief of Chaim Grade and Inna Hekker Grade.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chaim Grade and Inna Hekker Grade shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on September 14, 1948, upon payment of the required visa fees.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "act", strike out Chaim Grade and."

On page 1, line 6, after the figure "1948", strike out "upon payment of the required visa fees."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Inna Hekker Grade."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACILITATING ADMISSION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 555) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tokiyo Nakajima, the fiance of Richard L. Brinkley, a citizen of the United States, and her child, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Tokiyo Nakajima is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Richard L. Brinkley and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Tokiyo Nakajima and her child, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Tokiyo Nakajima and her child, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Tokiyo Nakajima and her child as the date of the payment by them of the required visa fee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Marko Radic and Irene Radic, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Marko A. Radic, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of section 101 (a) (27) (B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stephen Moe Jung shall be held and considered to be a returning resident alien.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the joint resolution, add two new sections, as follows:

"SEC. 4. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Kate Fiorovic and Pave Fiorovic, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mrs. Helen Kovacevich, a citizen of the United States.

"SEC. 5. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Toyoji (Suzuki) Whipple, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. Jack Whipple, a citizen of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 963) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Andrej (Avram) Gottlieb.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mr. and Mrs. Andrej (Avram) Gottlieb, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Andrej (Avram) Gottlieb, Jenny Gottleib (nee Binder), Toy Lin Chen, Nouritza Terzian, Maria Ioannou Karvelis, Martha Karvelis, Boeleta Karvelis, and Euterpi Karvelis, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of certain aliens."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PIETRO MEDURI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 760) for the relief of Pietro Meduri.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pietro Meduri shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND IN MADISON COUNTY, KY., TO PIONEER NATIONAL MONUMENT ASSOCIATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1992) to provide for the conveyance of a certain tract of land in Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey, without consideration, to the Pioneer National Monument Association, for designation and use, including disposition to a public agency if deemed appropriate, as a part of an historic site or monument, all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this act, in and to the following described tract of land consisting of 7⁹⁄₁₀ acres, more or less, situated in Madison County, Ky., on the left bank of the Kentucky River and being a part of United States Lock and Dam No. 10 Reservation:

Beginning at the end of a stone wall, said end of stone wall being south 20 degrees 19 minutes east 360 feet from the most westerly corner of Lock and Dam No. 10 Reservation and east of the Old County Road; thence severing said reservation and parallel to the north boundary north 85 degrees 00 minutes east 800 feet, more or less, to a point, said point being on the west boundary line of a 10.53 acre tract formerly owned by Thomas H. Stevens; thence with the old boundary line south 14 degrees 25 minutes east 562 feet, more or less, to a stone; thence south 82 degrees 09 minutes west 144 feet to a point; thence north 78 degrees 57 minutes west 104.42 feet to a point; thence with an old stone wall north 69 degrees 45 minutes west 610 feet, more or less, to an

angle in the stone wall; thence along said stone wall northwesterly 300 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning.

SEC. 2. The deed effecting the conveyance authorized by the first section of this act shall—

(a) reserve to the United States rights of ingress and egress over the road presently existing on the southern boundary of the above described tract of land;

(b) reserve to the United States a perpetual easement for maintenance of a water pipeline on such tract of land;

(c) provide that such tract of land shall be reserved or used for the purpose for which it is conveyed for a period of not less than 25 years, and that in the event said property ceases to remain available or be utilized for such purposes during such period, as may be determined by the Secretary of the Interior, all or any portion thereof, in its then existing condition, shall revert to the United States; and

(d) provide that during any state of war or national emergency and for 6 months thereafter, if the Secretary of Defense determines that such tract of land is useful or necessary for national defense purposes, the United States may, without payment therefor, reenter such tract of land and use all or part of it (including improvements thereon), but upon the termination of such use such tract of land shall revert to the Pioneer National Monument Association or its successor in title, as the case may be.

SEC. 3. In addition to the exceptions, conditions, and reservations provided for in section 2 of this act, the Administrator of General Services shall impose such other exemptions, conditions, and reservations as he determines to be necessary or desirable to safeguard the interests of the United States and to insure that such tract of land will be used for the purpose for which it is conveyed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVERS FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 553) waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alexander A. Nifiodoff may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kieran Patrick Kenny may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Emma Green may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9), (12), and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Enriqueta Velarde de Boyce may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Elizabeth G. B. Hohn may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Gertrud Auguste French may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds of exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 565) for the relief of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Maria Luisa Gallegos, Aavo Lohuaru, Peter Berth, Ming Yu Chen, Michele Constantino Pastore, Oswald E. Kohlruss, Antonie Kohlruss, Evelyn Hedy Kohlruss, and Paul Max Julius Schweitzer, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ulf Krabbe shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "Michele", strike out "Constantino" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Costantino."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL HOWARD AND GENERAL PARTRIDGE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1271, Private Calendar No. 890) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes, and the bill (S. 1272, Private Calendar No. 891) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes, may be passed over without prejudice, due to the fact that rules have been granted on these bills and will be called up tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in addition to presenting Mr. MOLLOHAN'S views today, I wish to record my opposition to the appointments of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge and Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard to civilian positions in the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

I believe the Immigration and Naturalization Service is essentially a civilian function, one calling for humane administration by persons trained in the particular service or in similar civilian positions. I believe it should remain a civilian function, administered by civilians.

Already we have a general in the first echelon of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Already we have a general in the second echelon. Now it is proposed that we put two generals in the third echelon. It seems to me that civilians should show up in here somewhere.

May I make it clear that I am not objecting to these men on a personal basis. I simply believe that this instance is one in which the wisdom of an earlier Congress is demonstrated. I speak of the Congress which enacted the law barring retired officers, except those with combat-connected disability, from Federal civilian employment paying $2,500 or more per year.

Despite this, we have many generals and admirals in civilian government positions right now. I question whether many more are needed at this time. A list I have today shows 38 generals and admirals now in the Federal Government. The list was compiled from departmental listings in the Congressional Directory for 1955. It does not include generals holding positions in the selective service, and the Departments of the

Army, Navy, and Air Force below the Secretary, Under Secretary, or Assistant Secretary level. Other source material includes Who's Who in America, a December 3, 1955, report of the Library of Congress, newspaper articles, and Naval and Military Academy registers.

This is the list:

Eisenhower, Dwight D.: General of the Army (U. S. Army, retired), President of the United States.

Vogel, Herbert D.: Brigadier general (U. S. Army, retired), Chairman, Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority.

Smith, Walter Bedell: General (U. S. Army, retired), Commissioner, National Security Training Commission, formerly Under Secretary of State.

Kinkaid, Thomas C.: Admiral (U. S. Navy, retired), Commissioner, National Security Training Commission; Commissioner, American Battle Monuments Commission.

Adler, Julius Ochs: Major general (U. S. Army Reserve, retired), Chairman, National Security Training Commission.

Delany, Walter S.; Admiral (U. S. Navy, retired), Deputy Director for the Mutual Defense Assistance Control, FOA.

Riley, William E.: Lieutenant general (U. S. Marine Corps, retired), Deputy Director for Management, FOA.

Edgerton, Glen E.: Major general (U. S. Army, retired), President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, now retiring.

Seybold, John States: Brigadier general (U. S. Army, retired), appointed Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, 1952.

Nichols, Kenneth D.: Major general (U. S. Army, retired), General Manager of Atomic Energy Commission.

Milton, Hugh M., II: Brigadier general (U. S. Army, retired), Assistant Secretary to the Army (Manpower and Reserve Forces). He has been in the Department of the Army since 1951.

Loper, Herbert B.: Brigadier General (U. S. Army, retired), Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Atomic Energy).

Berry, Frank B.: Brigadier general (U. S. Army, retired, medical career), Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health and Medical).

McNeil, W. J.: Rear admiral (U. S. Navy, retired), Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) in the Department of Defense since 1947.

Erskine, G. B.: General (U. S. Marine Corps, retired), Director of Special Operations, Department of Defense.

Babcock, C. Stanton: Brigadier general (U. S. Army, retired), counselor to United States Mission to the United Nations.

Craig, Howard A.: Lieutenant general (U. S. Air Force, retired), Chairman, Inter-American Defense Board.

Willard S. Paul: Lieutenant general (U. S. Army, retired), Assistant to the Director of Defense Mobilization for Plans and Readiness.

Cabell, C. P.: Lieutenant general (U. S. Air Force, retired), Deputy Director of CIA.

Persons, Wilton B.: Major general (U. S. Army, retired), Deputy Assistant to the President.

Strauss, Lewis L.: Rear admiral (U. S. Navy, retired), Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.

Cutler, Robert: Brigadier general (U. S. Army, retired), Special Assistant to the President for Security Affairs.

Swing, Joseph M.: Lieutenant general (U. S. Army, retired), Chairman, United States Commission of Immigration and Naturalization.

Ageton, A.: Rear admiral (U. S. Navy, retired), Ambassador to Paraguay.

Byroade, Henry A.: Brigadier general (U. S. Army, retired), Ambassador to Egypt.

Clark, Mark: General (U. S. Army, retired), headed Hoover Commission Study of Intelligence Agencies.

Spruance, Raymond A.: Admiral (U. S. Navy, retired), Ambassador to the Philippines.

Boone, Joel T.: Vice admiral (U. S. Navy, retired) (Marine Corps), Chief, Medical Director, Veterans' Administration.

Cook, Everett R.: Brigadier general (U. S. Air Force Reserve, retired), member, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission.

Davis, Benjamin O.: Brigadier general (U. S. Army, retired), Commissioner, American Battle Monuments Commission.

Doolittle, James H.: Lieutenant general (U. S. Air Force Reserve, retired), member, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Marshall, George C.: General of the Army (U. S. Army, retired), Chairman, American Battle Monuments Commission.

McNeil, E. C.: Brigadier general (U. S. Army, retired), Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Forces).

Mudge, Verne D.: Major general (U. S. Army, retired), professional staff, Senate Committee on Armed Services.

North, Thomas: Brigadier general (U. S. Army, retired), Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commisison.

Paul, W. S.: Lieutenant general (U. S. Army, retired), Assistant to the Director for Non-Military Defense, Office of Defense Mobilization.

Spaatz, Carl: General (U. S. Air Force, retired), Commissioner, American Battle Monuments Commission.

Vandegrift, Alexander A.: General (U. S. Marine Corps, retired), Commissioner, American Battle Monuments Commission.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, my many colleagues who are members of the legal profession will appreciate that one who seeks equitable relief must do so with clean hands.

In a very real sense, these bills to exempt two retired generals from the statutory dual position prohibition, are for equitable relief. If the basic legal proposition which I have cited has any validity, it should be invoked to bar passage of this legislation.

One of these bills—for General Partridge—was originally introduced in the 83d Congress. During the 84th Congress, and the two bills now under consideration, were introduced, and in June, 1955, appeared on the consent calendar, at which time they were objected to. On August 1, these bills again appeared on the consent calendar and were, at that time, recommitted. The bills were again reported from the Armed Services Committee on February 8, but on February 29—only 3 weeks ago—the Rules Committee refused a rule on the bills. On March 9, according to an Associated Press wire report, the President personally intervened and requested the minority leader to influence action on the bills. Thereupon, on March 8, a hastily convened Rules Committee overruled its action of February 29, resulting in our consideration of this legislation at this moment.

In view of repeated congressional rejection of this legislation, the question naturally suggests itself: What is the compelling reason for the persistence of the administration, first through the Attorney General, then by the Commissioner of Immigration, and now by the President himself, to secure their passage? I am sure that history will offer few precedents of personal intervention by the Chief Executive to press for the appointment of secondary officials in a Government agency. What is so unique about the qualifications of these two generals that makes their appointment as Assistant Commissioners of Immigration and Naturalization so vital? What is the reason that the executive branch is lavishing all of its attention on two obscure retired generals, who, by no stretch of the imagination, are in such dire economic straits as to be in urgent need of employment?

I have received no answers to any of these questions. If the Chief Executive had centered as much attention on the problems of surplus-labor areas or falling farm prices, or to our lagging guided missile program, I am sure that it would have far more effectively promoted the general welfare and our national defense.

In my capacity as chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, I have had more than just casual familiarity with the situation involving these two retired generals.

As I indicated previously, the bills would exempt them from the prohibition against holding two Government positions. The first evasion of this statutory prohibition came in 1954 when they were hired by the Immigration Service as consultants. I use the term "evasion," for, although consultants are prohibited from acting in anything but an advisory capacity, under General Swing, these two generals served in regular executive capacities. This was established by an audit of their duties performed, at my request, by the Civil Service Commission. Chairman Young advised me that these generals were, in fact, acting beyond their advisory capacity and that:

> It is clearly evident that operating responsibilities, normally assigned to regular executive positions within the organization, constituted a significant portion of the total responsibilities assigned in each case.

In addition, the Comptroller General found that as so-called consultants, these generals were being paid at a rate in excess of that permitted by law—Public Law 600, title 5, United States Code, chapter 55a.

Let me point out that the two positions which these generals would occupy have now been vacant for almost a year and a half. During about half that time, while Federal laws were being flouted, as I have indicated, Generals Partridge and Howard were presumably performing the duties of these positions, although nominally consultants.

If these bills are passed, the Immigration Service will become a home for retired generals who will then occupy 3 of the top 5 positions of the Service.

General Swing, the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, has stated that he is unable to find any replacements capable of filling these positions. Think of it—a civilian agency of

long standing, charged with execution of our immigration laws, and General Swing cannot find any qualified civilians within or outside of Government to assist in the administration of his agency. This is sheer nonsense.

However, it does shed light on how the present Commissioner thinks and operates. We are not discussing an infantry division. We are talking about the Immigration and Naturalization Service, long established and traditionally civilian. But General Swing apparently has some perverse notions concerning the mission of his agency.

In hearings before my subcommittee, although admitting that immigration during wartime would be nil, General Swing stated that "the land borders of this country are my responsibility" and particularly so in time of war. I have not been advised that the Immigration and Naturalization Service has been made an adjunct of the Armed Forces—or for that matter, that the friendly nations of our borders, Canada and Mexico, are ever likely to plan an attack.

Another curious military development in the service is plan A signed by General Partridge as Special Assistant to the Commissioner, a title customarily reserved for operating and not advisory personnel. Plan A, I am told, calls for the recruitment of some 8,000 volunteer patrol inspectors, the purchase of jeeps, airplanes, trucks, arms, setting up of demolition squads to blow up bridges and roads leading into the country from Canada, and contemplates persuasion to participate in the plan of the State highway patrols and National Guard. How many armies are we supporting? It never has been the function of the Immigration Service to act as an auxiliary of our Armed Forces.

My attempts to obtain more information about plan A have met with the customary rebuff—by the convenient iron curtain which the present administration has lowered between Congress and the executive branch of the Government—that this is classified information.

The militarizing of the Immigration Service suggests a most fundamental problem. It may be an indication that by administrative fiat, and without congressional authority, the functions of the Immigration Service are being diverted from the purposes intended and specified by Congress. If such is the case, Congress is entitled to know about it, and, to date, General Swing has refused to so inform the members of my subcommittee. If it is not the case, then the military talents of two retired generals are of no special value to the Immigration Service.

While responsibility for the execution of the immigration and naturalization laws may entail some tasks which resemble police duties, by no stretch of the imagination do they encompass military duties. And while I do not for one moment wish to deprecate men who have dedicated their lives to the military service, I say to my colleagues that the last place in the world for retired military officers is the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

On four different occasions the House has rejected this legislation. To enact these bills would condone the evasion and flouting of Federal laws by the Service.

I think we should remind the President that in this democracy, although retired generals may be of real value to companies engaged in Government procurement, they have no place in the Immigration Service.

I ask your support in my opposition to these bills.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 554) for the relief of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marie Jeanne Lapierre O'Donnell and Maisie K. Bartholomew (nee Fisher) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fees, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That suitable and proper bonds or undertakings, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Constancio Loyola Abracia shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of that act. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Federico Cano-Valera, Angela De Silva De Valera, Jose Federico Valera, Ricardo Valera, Bernardo Regino, Imre de Cholnoky, Abdul Haleem, Magdalena F. Bristol, Sister Jules M. Bernadette, Kan-Nien Chen, Lihwa Y. Chen, and Nancy Chen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maurice Ghnassia, Hilda Anna Stegedirk, and Roswitha Hewerer, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 9, after the words "visa fee," strike out the colon and insert the following: ", under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose.

On page 2, line 21, after the title "Sister", strike out "Jules M." and substitute in lieu thereof the name "Jewel."

On page 2, line 21, after the name "Kan-Nien Chen,", strike out "Lihwa" and substitute in lieu thereof the name "Li-Hwa."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Page 2, line 24, strike out the name "Imre de Cholnoky."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING PROVISIONS IN BEHALF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res.566) to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Emmy Rothe Hirsch and Mrs. Betty W. Webster may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Armando Alfaro-Arciniega may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elvira Villasenor Din may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (28) (C) (iv) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gertrud Koch may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9), (17), and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Juan Nestor Vinbela-Medina may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 6. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 8, strike out the word "provision" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "provisions."

On page 1, line 9, after "(a)", insert "(17) and."

On page 2, beginning on line 8, after "SEC. 4.", strike out the remainder of line 8, and all of lines 9, 10, 11, and 12, and insert

in lieu thereof the following: "In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gertrud Koch, the fiance of Frank J. Kleczewski, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Gertrud Koch is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Frank J. Kleczewski and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws other than the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (28) (C) (iv) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the abovenamed persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Gertrud Koch, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the abovenamed persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Gertrud Koch, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Gertrud Koch as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL G. ABERNETHY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8087) for the relief of Paul G. Abernathy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Commissioned Warrant Officer Paul G. Abernathy (O12440), United States Marine Corps, the sum of $413.39. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Paul G. Abernathy against the United States for refund of expenses incurred in shipping his household effects and transporting his family from Oceanside, Calif., to Culpeper, Va., following his transfer (pursuant to orders dated January 6, 1951) from Camp Pendleton, Calif., to overseas duty. Payment of such expenses (as expenses incident to a transfer from a permanent station) was originally allowed, but the amount thereof was subsequently deducted from his pay on the ground that his earlier transfer from Camp Lejeune, N. C., to Camp Pendleton had been only a temporary change of station and that therefore the payment of such expenses upon his transfer from Camp Pendleton to overseas duty was not authorized: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percentum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, page 1, strike out "Abernathy" an insert "Abernethy."

Line 8, page 1, strike out "Abernathy" and insert "Abernethy."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Paul G. Abernethy."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ACCEPTANCE OF GIFT FROM ERICSSON MEMORIAL COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 93, authorizing the acceptance of a gift from the Ericsson Memorial Committee of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what this resolution is?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is a joint resolution that was approved unanimously by the Committee on House Administration. There is a bronze statue of Leif Ericsson in this country. At this time we are authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the offer of this statue.

There is a committee amendment which eliminates any cost which had been included in the Senate bill. This resolution authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to accept any gift or donation that might carry out the provisions of the authority. There is no money involved.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It is without expense to the taxpayers?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Without any expense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, on behalf of the United States, is hereby authorized to accept the offer of the Ericsson Memorial Committee of the United States of a replica of the heroic bronze statue of Leif Ericsson, the original of said replica having been presented to the people of Iceland by the United States Government as a gesture of good will and friendly relations on the 1,000th anniversary of Althing, the Icelandic parliament.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is further authorized and directed to choose upon the recommendation of the National Commission of Fine Arts, and concurred in by the National Park Service, a site on the public grounds of the United States in the District of Columbia; and is further authorized and directed to design and erect an appropriate pedestal upon which to place said statue.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is further authorized to accept from any source, public or private, donations of funds to reimburse the United States for amounts expended under the provisions of section 2 of this joint resolution. Any such funds shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $65,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution including the transportation and erection of the statute at the place selected.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, after the word "source", strike out the balance of the bill and insert "donations of funds to carry out the provisions of section 2 of this joint resolution."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION TO PREPARE PLANS AND ESTIMATES FOR ERECTION OF MEMORIAL TO GEN. JOHN J. PERSHING

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 95 to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES]?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Missouri explain this resolution briefly?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution, also unanimously adopted by the Committee on House Administration, authorizing the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing. It does not specify any site or design. All of that will be left to the Commission to report back to the Congress before any action is taken in connection with the establishment of such a memorial. This only authorizes a study by the American Battle Monuments Commission.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It does not involve the expenditure of any money until they report?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The only authorization would be that the American Battle Monuments Commission already has authority to expend money under the limitation of any appropriation that might be made to them.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only to ask the gentleman if this would not establish a new precedent? I am not saying it is right or wrong. The American Battle Monuments Commission has jurisdiction over monuments, cemeteries, and memorials outside the borders of the United States. I suppose by specific authorization, it could be extended to cover this matter, and I assume that is the intent of the resolution?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think it would. However, I do not think there is any intention to set up this memorial outside of the United States. There are several bills which have been introduced——

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman did not understand. The authority presently in the Commission covers monuments outside the United States. This resolution would instruct them to erect a monument inside the United States which, I suggest, is new in the procedure of the Battle Monuments Commission. I presume the intent of the resolution is to give them an authority which is beyond their present authority.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Frankly, I will have to admit I am not acquainted with that feature. It was not brought up in the discussion. I call the attention of the gentleman from California to the fact that those plans, prior to submission to the Congress, must be submitted to the National Commission of Fine Arts with respect to design and so forth.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Apparently the resolution is asking only or instructing the Battle Monuments Commission to do what it can and to submit recommendations to the Congress for approval. I foresee no particular problem.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think that is provided in the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the American Battle Monuments Commission, whose former chairman was the late John J. Pershing, General of the Armies of the United States, is authorized and directed to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing, together with recommendations with respect to site, design, and materials, for submission to the Congress at as early a date as practicable. Such plans shall, prior to submission to the Congress, be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts with respect to the design and materials to be used.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of asking the minority whip if he can tell us about the change in program for today and the reason we have delayed the consideration of the conference report from the Committee on Agriculture. Can the gentleman tell us what we might expect?

Mr. ALBERT. As the gentleman knows, we had announced yesterday that the conference report on H. R. 8320 would be called up today. However, we have put that over because of the Minnesota primary, and it is our plan to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow and to take up the conference report on H. R. 8320 at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. May I further ask the gentleman if by coming in early we can get rid of the conference report and any other business that may come up in order to accommodate the departure for the many Members who are leaving on this trip?

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman has stated the situation correctly.

PROCEDURE ON PRIMARY DAY

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, can the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma tell us whether or not we can take as a guide for our future activity the fact that on primary days there will be no rollcalls?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state to the gentleman from New York that that is a matter of consultation between the leadership. There are some cases when Members are going to be here, but whenever any are away, the leadership on both sides have always been consulted, and have as complete regard for the interests and the problems of the Members as is humanly possible. I think that expression constitutes the sentiment on both sides, regardless of party.

Mr. MULTER. The entire body is appreciative of that statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I think the gentleman from New York can have confidence in the leadership.

Mr. MULTER. He does have such complete confidence.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 17]

Barrett	Harrison, Nebr.	Rains
Baumhart	Hillings	Riehlman
Bolling	Holifield	Rivers
Canfield	Holt	Shelley
Cannon	Jensen	Sheppard
Chase	Knutson	Spence
Diggs	Lankford	Taylor
Donovan	Miller, Calif.	Thompson, N. J.
Eberharter	Miller, Nebr.	Tollefson
Engle	Mollohan	Tuck
Fino	Osmers	Weaver
Gamble	Powell	
Grant	Prouty	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and eighty-four Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10004) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1½ hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10004, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 45 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will be recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 11 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is the second supplemental appropriation bill for the current fiscal year. The total budget requests of the Congress in connection with this measure were $835 million. The Committee on Appropriations rejected budget requests in the sum of $40 million and brings the bill before the House today with an appropriation of $795 million. Most of the items in this measure are wholly noncontroversial, most of them are here because they are required expenditures of the Government by reason of prior enactments of the Congress.

For instance, there is the item of $103 million to liquidate contract authority previously granted for the Federal-aid highway program. There is $195 million in the bill for veterans' compensation and readjustment benefits, all of which, of

course, are fixed by law. There is also in the bill $266 million for Federal employees by reason of the pay-raise legislation enacted last year, so nothing can be done about that. There is $47 million for public-assistance grants fixed by law, $34 million for prescribed school assistance in areas where Federal activities have imposed unusual burdens on the local school system and then there is $27 million in the bill for the program of aiding in polio vaccinations.

Mr. Chairman, the able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is not able to be present this afternoon so I am acting in his stead in presenting this bill to the House. Actually hearings were held by the various subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations and various markups were made by the subcommittees. Last Thursday the 50-man Appropriations Committee met and approved the bill before us, H. R. 10004, in its present form. The people who know most about various chapters are those who served on the various panels.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I note in the bill as reported in the Department of Defense military functions section there is no provision for additional funds for the Air Force. I am told that this is the first year in a number of years that there has not been a supplemental appropriation bill for the Air Force. Would the gentleman comment on why there is no supplemental appropriation coming up this year for Air Force needs when we are getting a good deal of evidence to the effect there is a serious lag in some particulars in the Air Force program?

Mr. MAHON. The effect of a lag in the Air Force program would mean that funds would not be spent quite as rapidly and would mean there would be less necessity for a supplemental appropriation. I might say that there are some deficiencies in our defense program, but there was no necessity under the circumstances for a special supplemental appropriation for the Air Force in this bill, in my judgment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not in his knowledge there will be a supplemental appropriation for the Air Force in this fiscal year?

Mr. MAHON. I have no information that there will be one. In my opinion, there will not be one, yet there is considerable controversy in regard to the 1957 Air Force and military program generally. But I think that controversy will be resolved in the annual supply bill, the $35 billion defense appropriation bill, that will probably be considered by the House in late April or May. Also, I must point out that there will be an additional bill before us for Air Force public works.

Mr. EDMONDSON. There is one further question in regard to the Air Force, and I will close with thanks to the gentleman for his kindness. For some time there has been pending in the Department of Defense a very strong recommendation that a program known as the air technicians plan be placed in operation in the Air Reserve squadrons and wings of this country. This program has been placed in successful operation in the Air National Guard. It has proved to save money and to save personnel and to greatly increase the efficiency of the squadrons and wings where it is in operation. I wonder if the gentleman can shed any light upon the fact that the Department of Defense has not seen fit to implement this program with funds necessary to place it in operation at the outset.

Mr. MAHON. I would say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that in my judgment there is great merit in the suggestion which the gentleman makes. Hearings are now in progress before the Committee on Appropriations, at which time that matter will be thoroughly explored, and I hope some way may be found to bring about the condition which the gentleman from Oklahoma advocates. His suggestions are timely and most helpful.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does this bill provide, may I ask the gentleman, for any supergrade employees?

Mr. MAHON. I believe not. I know of none, and as the debate progresses I will make further investigation. But I know of none.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Does the bill provide for increased employment in the Federal Government?

Mr. MAHON. The bill provides for approximately 900 additional civilian employees in the Government, some of whom are temporary employees.

Mr. GROSS. Nine hundred additional employees?

Mr. MAHON. They are broken down in various categories. For example, in the chapter on the Department of Agriculture there is a request for 350 additional employees. That is the Commodity Credit Corporation, which could be better explained by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], later in the debate. In the Commerce Department, 10; general Government matters, 169; Labor Department, none; Public Works, none; Justice Department, 149. The list is here, and I will make it available to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that these new positions are completely justified on the basis of hearings held by the committee?

Mr. MAHON. Well, hearings have been held and the results of those hearings are printed and available to the House. I personally cannot vouch for the validity of each and every increase in personnel, but the Committee on Appropriations through its action has considered these employees necessary and have approved specifically all those included.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that this poses a difficult problem for the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. We are trying to reduce Federal employment, the number of people on the Federal payroll. So that when we run into this kind of a situation, it makes it extremely difficult to accomplish anything.

Mr. MAHON. I will say to the gentleman that I think we all join in the effort to reduce the number of employees of the Federal Government. Last year the Committee on Appropriations made certain reductions that brought about a reduction in personnel. The President, through his Bureau of the Budget, has said that certain additional employees are necessary and after screening those requests there were approved the 900-odd which are proposed here. Not all the employees requested were approved.

Mr. GROSS. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that employment in the Federal Government is now going back up again. I regret to hear that some 900 new employees are provided under this bill.

Mr. MAHON. I think we all regret that fact. I think the gentleman has posed a very important and disturbing question and I shall gladly continue to work with him and others in an effort to get more economy and efficiency in the Government.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it not a fact that each chapter of this bill has been very carefully considered by the subcommittee that handles the regular appropriation for the specific department and agencies in each chapter?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the subcommittee handling appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] that I thoroughly agree with his concern over increasing governmental employment. However, insofar as the chapter on Agriculture is concerned, the substantial increase in number of employees is based on this situation.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has asked for an increase in its administrative fund. For years we have been trying to get them to offer commodities for sale in world channels, and finally we have got them moving to a considerable degree. Unfortunately, as you begin to move commodities out it requires more handling, more paperwork, and more employees.

In addition to that, in recent years, due to other conditions, the volume of business of the Corporation has required more manpower. We cannot meet the

problem without people to do the work under present conditions. The other increases, which are minor in character, have to do with a program for the remainder of this year for the Farmers' Home Administration, with regard to certain people who cannot qualify under either of the other housing programs. This is loan money.

In addition to that money that was made available last year to meet the drought disaster in some of the Western States, the time for the use of those funds on emergency basis expired the 1st of January. We have renewed the availability of those funds under the regular programs of the Department.

We certainly have not tried to add any permanent employees to the Department, but only to meet these new workloads, which in themselves, I think, are very sound, and for that we did have to have people to do the work.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOWDY. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has been getting a good many complaints from postal employees in regard to a suggestion, perhaps from the Department, that they defer taking their annual leave until after the 1st of July. I understand that there is an appropriation in this bill for the Post Office Department. Is it of sufficient amount to relieve that situation? In other words, it seems to me that as long as annual leave is due them, it could be paid for in this fiscal year as well as in the next fiscal year. It would not cost any more. I wonder if that is taken care of in the bill.

Mr. MAHON. To answer the question, I should like to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee for the Post Office Department, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. The only item in this bill for the Post Office Department is an appropriation to cover the pay increases which the Congress authorized last year. It is my understanding that the Post Office Department has presented a further request to the Bureau of the Budget for additional funds for the operation of the Department for the current fiscal year, but that request has not yet reached the Congress.

Mr. DOWDY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill calls for a total of $795 million. The big items involved are the Veterans' Administration, old-age pension, the vaccine for polio, and the increased-pay items.

The other items are all in themselves small with the exception of the Commerce Department, where we have a large item for ship subsidy and another quite substantial item involving about $100 million for Federal aid to highways.

As to the items that are included in the bill, I do not care to address myself to them at this time. The only thing I care to say at this time is that there is included in the bill nothing whatever with reference to the Tennessee Valley Authority. There was a budget estimate for it, which I should oppose if it were in the bill, for the starting of a steam plant at John Sevier, involving $3,500,000.

The majority report tells the Tennessee Valley Authority to use the money received out of their operating revenues for the construction of this steam plant at John Sevier, which will cost in the neighborhood of $28 million. That steam plant is being talked about because of a deal that was made to supply the Reynolds Metals Corporation with 235,000 kilowatts of power, and which drew the Reynolds Metals Corporation away from a coal mine that they are supposed to own, and right beside which they intended to build an aluminum plant costing in the neighborhood of 300 million on the basis of their statement.

This particular plant at John Sevier would produce, according to what they told us, 180,000 kilowatts. All last summer they were cutting down on the users of power for aluminum because they did not have enough, yet they have reached out to take in more.

As everybody knows who has studied the question, the Tennessee Valley Authority is being operated on a basis that does not produce revenue enough to pay the operating expenses, property depreciation, or interest upon the money invested, plus the allotment for taxes of a proper amount. When the whole situation was explored in 1948, there was this provision placed in the appropriation bill which was passed by the House and agreed to by the other body:

> None of the power revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for the construction of new power-producing projects except for replacement purposes unless and until approved by act of Congress.

Later on, on July 14, 1954, one of the leading advocates of the TVA and Member of the other body made this statement:

> The TVA cannot start one single new power facility; it cannot put one dollar of its income or any other funds into any new power facility except by and with the advice and direction of Congress.

This particular authorization or direction to the TVA, which is in the majority report, to use its revenues to build this additional power unit in the John Sevier setup is not in an act of Congress. In my opinion, and I think in the opinion of any good lawyer, the direction is an absolute nullity. It gives us no opportunity to raise the question here on the floor and simply is an attempt to bypass the Congress and its control over the operations of the Government and the spending of the people's money. Frankly, I do not approve of that. But the situation is this. The only thing there is is in the majority report signed by the majority of the committee, and it is impossible under the rules of the House to amend a committee report on the floor of this body. Nor is it possible to provide any legislative amendment to an appropriation bill which would be of any value here.

Mr. Chairman, with that statement I feel I should yield the floor.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I call the gentleman's attention to an appropriation provision on page 16 of the bill—for an additional amount for construction of $3 million to remain available until expended. As I understand it, this is for a Jefferson Memorial in St. Louis; is that correct?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Does not this authorization fly in the face of Public Law 361, approved May 17, 1954, which provides that no authorization is to be made until the receipts of the Government for the preceding fiscal year have exceeded the expenditures of the Government for such year, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, or the budget submitted to the Congress by the President under the Budget Accounting Act of 1921 reveals that "the estimated receipts of the Government for the fiscal year, for which such budget is submitted, are in excess of the estimated expenditures of the Government for such fiscal year"?

Mr. TABER. The proper procedure on that would be when that point is reached to make a point of order, and it would be up to those who feel that it is properly in the bill to justify their position. The burden would be on them to justify their position.

Mr. GROSS. But there is some question in the gentleman's mind as to the validity of this authorization.

Mr. TABER. I do not think the validity would be established until after the budget had been balanced.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield myself 2 additional minutes, and I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. I thank the gentleman.

Now, talking about the Reynolds plant, I refer to page 669 of the hearings. The interrogator is none other than the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. He says:

> Well, now, what you are really asking for in this particular plant is to put it on—is to put yourself in a position where you can take care of this Reynolds metal outfit; is that not it? That is really what you are asking for, is it not?

That is what Mr. TABER said.

Mr. Wessenauer making reply said:

> No, sir. The request was made before the Reynolds load came in and has to do with all the various load developments which will take place in the next 2 years.

That was the answer.

Mr. TABER. But it came right along at that time, and right after it.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, the question of further expansion of the New Deal's pet socialistic experiment is again before the Congress. Norman Thomas,

the Socialist presidential candidate, aptly described it in these words:

The TVA is the only genuinely socialistic act (in the New Deal)—a flower in the midst of weeds.

Let us take a look at the record and see how this socialistic flower has grown in the twenty-odd years since it was brought forth as H. R. 5081:

A bill to provide for the common defense; to aid interstate commerce for navigation; to provide flood control; to promote the general welfare by creating the Tennessee Valley Authority; to operate the Muscle Shoals properities; and to encourage agricultural, industrial, and economic development; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Perhaps it would be better to characterize it as a growth from little acorn to giant oak at the taxpayers' expense.

The bill (H. R. 5081) was introduced in the House on April 20, 1933, by Mr. HILL, of Alabama, and even though no direct mention was made of power in the stated purpose of the act there could have been little question in anyone's mind but that it was primarily a power bill being enacted by a subservient rubberstamp Congress with the thought that it would be the forerunner of other valley authorities throughout the Nation.

In the debate on the bill—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2178, 73d Congress, 1st session—Mr. Byrns had this to say:

Our great leader in the White House has had the vision to see what it will mean to the great section of my own State in the development of the great Tennessee River Valley Basin and he has stated that in his opinion, it is simply the forerunner of similar developments which will take place throughout the country. * * * It means also, that if the investment is to be operated by the Government, it will present a yardstick by which the utility commissions of this country will know, in exact figures, just what it costs to produce power and thereby fix the rate to the great consuming public accordingly.

As to its purpose and cost, Mr. HILL, the author of the bill had this to say—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 2186–2188, 73d Congress, 1st session:

The Authority is given the power to build dams on the Tennessee River, and the act expressly lays down the policy that the Authority, in the construction of the dams, shall build joint power and navigation dams so that the power may in large measure take care of the cost of navigation.

The dream is that the operations of this bill will not only bring industrial development through cheap power but that, first and foremost, it will carry cheap power to the domestic consumer and more particularly to the farmer out on his farm, and provisions to insure that are in the bill.

If every dam that can be built on the river should be built, the estimate of the engineers made back in 1928 would give you a total cost of only $209 million. It was thought at that time, even though we were then in the midst of a boom, that $209 million was an excessive estimate. * * * Therefore the Authority today could build every dam for less than $15 million.

Now there we have the little acorn, ostensibly a national defense, navigation and flood-control project which would have incidental or surplus power to sell. At least that was their main contention at that time. Of course, many of those who voted for it could not have realized how big this little acorn was to grow; watered by the never-ending request for more and more of the taxpayers' dollars.

Illustrative of how the bill was pushed through the subservient House, just 11 days after its introduction and after brief hearings, the bill was being debated on the floor of the House. It was brought out under a special rule providing for only 6 hours of general debate with the further proviso that "only amendments can be offered by authority of the committee having charge of the measure, and for that restriction we have no apologies to make. It is the purpose of the Committee on Rules, as far as we can, to provide restrictions whereby members of this Committee on Military Affairs, working in harmony with the administration, shall keep absolute control of this measure on the floor of the House."

In connection with the contention by Mr. Mapes that the TVA project would ultimately cost over $1 billion, I repeat what Mr. HILL, the author of the bill in the House, had to say:

If every dam that can be built on the river should be built, the estimate of the engineers made back in 1928 would give you a total cost of only $209 million. It was thought at that time, even though we were then in the midst of a boom, that $209 million was an excessive estimate. * * * Therefore the Authority today could build every dam for less than $150 million.

So we see the original TVA "acorn" was a program for the development of the Tennessee Valley that was claimed to be primarily for navigation and flood control with incidental power development and an assurance by the author of the bill that all the dams that can be built on the river could be built for less than $150 million.

THE GROWTH OF THE GIANT OAK AT TAXPAYERS' EXPENSE

The great delusion was not long in coming. At the 1934 hearings of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Additional Appropriations for Emergency Purposes, prolonged attempts were made to elicit a definite answer as to what the total TVA project was going to cost. Dr. A. E. Morgan, the TVA Chairman, after much questioning, finally indicated that the project would cost about $310 million with $200 million for the dams and powerplants, $100 million for purchase or construction of transmission lines, and $10 million for fertilizer works. The little acorn was beginning to send out roots to tap the taxpayers; not for $150 million as Mr. HILL, the author, contended, but more than double that amount.

Two years later Dr. A. E. Morgan in testifying at the House hearings on the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1936—page 134—said the total cost of the TVA program would be $438 million. In 3 years the little acorn had swelled nearly 3 times the original size proclaimed by the author, Mr. HILL, to the House in pressing for the passage of the TVA act.

In these same 1936 deficiency bill hearings, Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Lilienthal—page 280:

Mr. TAYLOR. Do you have any limitation on the time when you will stop this dam-construction business? * * * You have some termination in sight, have you not, or you really anticipate stopping somewhere?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. The testimony of the chairman the other day, and the report which will be filed on a unified development in a few days, gives the plan for the recommended development. Under that plan the last dam recommended will be completed in the fiscal year of 1943.

Mr. TAYLOR. We would like to be able to tell the House that there will be a stop somewhere.

But there was no stopping the growth of this socialistic acorn planted among the New Deal weeds. It was beginning to sprout now and send out roots for more and more of the taxpayers' dollars to sustain its continuing expansion.

This pattern of growth continued, nurtured by the sunshine of the golden dollars and watered by the sweat of the taxpayers of the Nation. This little acorn has become an ever-spreading oak with an expected cost of projects now completed or under construction of over $2 billion.

So today we find a TVA that has cost more than 13 times the amount its author told the House the TVA projects would cost.

We also find that through the years the original fable of incidental or surplus electric power production and sale has given way so that today the primary objective of a Federal power empire contemplated by its original sponsors stands out clear. I refer in part to the League for Industrial Democracy and the Public Ownership League who over the years worked with and through Senators Norris, Dill, and other public-power advocates with the objective of a national superpower system for the entire country.

When the TVA acorn was first planted and during the early years when it needed watering by the sweat from the taxpayers' brow, TVA was hailed far and wide as an honest and fair yardstick for the measurement of electric rates throughout the country. Its spokesmen also claimed that these TVA yardstick rates were going to provide for all operating expenses, taxes on power investment equivalent to local, State, and National taxes paid by private utilities, interest on the power investment at 3½ percent, depreciation at 3 percent of the power investment, and in addition would provide a net revenue for amortization of the entire TVA project cost over a 50-year period after the development of a market for the power. I refer you to pages 1947 and 1948 of the hearings on public utility holding companies before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 74th Congress, 1st session; and pages 277–283 of House Appropriation Committee hearings on the first deficiency bill for 1936.

A look at the record shows how miserably TVA has failed to come up to the fair and honest yardstick criteria it had set and how it has failed by tremendous sums of providing sufficient revenue to cover the items its spokesmen claimed would be provided for.

TVA testified to the House Appropriations Committee in 1934 that given a 5-year development period, TVA then could amortize the project cost in 25

years. Eliminating the first 5 years we find that the 1939–54 total power revenue is reported by TVA to be $821,900,000. The reported operating expenses, exclusive of depreciation and in-lieu-of-tax payments, totals $375,700,000. Three and one-half percent interest on the average power investment each year amounts to $250 million, depreciation at 3 percent equals $214 million, and tax equivalent to average rate paid on plant investment by private utilities contiguous to the TVA area would take $373 million, and amortization on a sinking fund basis would add $93 million; or a total revenue requirement of $1,305,700,000. This is a shortage of $484,800,000 in revenue needed to meet the TVA yardstick criteria. This contrasts to a TVA reported net income of $253,914,000; a total difference of $738,714,000.

Other costs that the taxpayers of the Nation have to provide for are interest on TVA construction work in progress—$55 million—and interest on the costs allocated to other than power—$138 million. Also, due to the fact that TVA has not been providing for interest and other items currently, a compound interest cost of $80 million is encountered. These three items total an additional $273 million.

The above analysis has been predicated on the premise that TVA cost allocations to power are reasonable and proper; however there appears to be considerable evidence that these allocations should be revised upward.

Crocodile tears are being shed by TVA proponents about not letting TVA use its own money to expand its steam plants so that it can continue to draw industry into the area on the basis of low subsidized electric rates.

The fact that the Congress has been bamboozled into not insisting that TVA meet its own rate criteria testified to before committees of Congress and has not required TVA to return to the Federal Treasury the interest costs to the Nation's taxpayers and a national tax equivalent based on the average percent of Federal tax paid by private utilities on their electric plant, is no reason for letting TVA try to fool the Congress and the public into thinking TVA has been a paying proposition.

Is there any reason under the sun why the TVA region should not pay through their rates their fair share of taxes for operating the Federal Government, why they should not pay interest on the funds that were provided by the Nation's taxpayers who have to pay such costs, and why they should not make the repayment of the cost of the projects as TVA said it would do?

With respect to the provision for taking care of future growth of electric power requirements in the TVA region, one of the first things should be a renunciation by TVA of the captive clause put in all contracts so that any and all customers, if they so desire, might be able to construct or otherwise provide for all or part of their future requirements. Also that the dictation of TVA as to what the retail rates shall be and how each municipality or cooperative shall run its own affairs should be eliminated.

Perhaps a majority of the people of the TVA region, if they were made aware of how miserable TVA has failed to meet the yardstick criteria TVA itself set up, and how they have not progressed at the rate the TVA ballyhoo has led them to believe, might want to take over and do for themselves in the American way.

As the editorial of the Tupelo (Miss.) Journal said on July 12, 1953:

> The time has come for TVA to back up and admit that the fastest growth in the South actually has taken place outside the TVA area and we who live within its borders are still as a whole about the poorest people in America.

If the people in the TVA region could be made to realize how much better many other sections of the country have fared without the paternalistic care of the TVA octopus, perhaps they then would like to trade TVA off for a chance to be on their own. Maybe the subsidized low electric rates have come pretty high in other costs. Perhaps more than 1 farmer in 4 could have running water if they had not been under the social planning of the "Great White Father" for lo these twenty-odd years. Perhaps the shade from this giant oak has retarded as much as it has helped the growth on the land under its spreading branches. Perhaps its roots have sapped the will and initiative of its people to do for themselves. Anyway, TVA is a far cry from the tiny acorn it grew from twenty-odd years ago.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. I noticed a press account some 10 days ago to the effect that this same aluminum company, to which the gentleman has referred, had entered into a contract with a private utility in the Ohio Valley, to purchase power from that private utility at 4 mills. Can the TVA compete with that price?

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I am not competent to answer that. I would doubt very much if they could, if they charged the costs that should go into the project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I regret the partisan tone of the majority report. This is a bad precedent to set for the committee, which normally proceeds with remarkable harmony despite its differences.

The subcommittee report as written contains a number of misstatements of facts and erroneously indicates or infers that the minority members hold certain views with respect to the TVA and its operations.

The report states that the minority opposes the TVA using its own money to meet its power needs. The minority does oppose the use of TVA power revenues for the expansion of TVA power producing facilities without specific legislative authorization of the Congress. We also take exception to the implication that the TVA power revenues belong to TVA. Under the TVA Act, as amended, and the Government Corporation Act and limitations relating to TVA, the power revenues in excess of the amount needed for operating expense are to be returned to the Treasury or used for capital additions only upon specific authorization of the Congress. In other words these net revenues belong to all the people and their use should be controlled by the Congress and not by a majority of a board of three men.

The report goes on to say the only conclusion to be reached is that the minority is simply opposed to the people of the TVA region having power to meet increasing needs. This is specious reasoning as the minority report is crystal clear that we are not opposed to the TVA region having all the power they want and need, but we think the time long past for the region to provide for its own needs without being subsidized by the taxpayers of the Nation. We believe that other sections of the country are tired of providing subsidized power for TVA to use to draw industry from elsewhere into the area. The Reynolds Metals action in contracting for more TVA power after having publicly announced plans to construct its own steam powerplant to furnish electric power for a new aluminum plant in the Ohio River Valley in northwestern Kentucky is TVA's latest activity along this line.

The report states that extraneous matters were raised during the hearings that were not pertinent to the problems of the committee. It is apparent that reference is made to the effort to place on the record the repeated failures of TVA to live up to the statements it made to the Congress and to the world since its inception, and to its failure to live up to statements it made to the United States Court of Appeals in trying to justify a constitutional right to go into the power business, and to the failure to set rates that would provide for all operating expenses, depreciation, interest at 3½ percent, local, State and Federal taxes equivalent to the rate paid by private utilities and to provide for amortization of the entire TVA investment as its directors testified it would do. We hold to this truth, that all these matters are not extraneous but are of utmost concern when TVA and its proponents come to the Congress for taxpayers' funds for the continued expansion of a $2 billion development that its original sponsor in the House said would not cost more than $150 million.

We are told that the authorization by Congress for TVA to buy out certain private utilities in 1940, made TVA the sole source of power supply for the area it serves. It is inconceivable that any rational person could read such an intent into the law. The report appears to imply that TVA has not expanded the area it serves since 1940. Actually TVA reports show that the TVA service was expanded in 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, 1947, 1948, 1949, and in 1952.

The report says that there are only two methods of financing available to TVA at the present time. It does not point out however that there are several ways for the TVA area to provide for its own future growth in electric power requirements. Large industrial concerns such as Reynolds, Alcoa and others can construct their own powerplants as many of them have done in the past in

other areas of the Nation. The major distributors are of a size to justify construction of their own powerplants as Memphis is doing. Also TVA could release all the distributors from bondage and permit them to purchase power from adjacent utilities or to construct their own powerplants if they so desired.

A justified change in distributors electric rates to discourage future growth in house heating load now approaching 1 million kilowatts—or more than five times the power TVA furnished AEC for the production of materials for the first atomic bomb—is another method of relieving the demand for more TVA power. TVA revenue for this house heating power is considerably less than cost and justifies such a rate change.

The committee report implies that a lower court action on a case and Congressional approval of funds for steam plant construction by TVA settles the question as to the constitutionality of the construction of steam plants by the Federal Government. I am sure the lawyers on the committee know full well that until the matter is ruled upon on its merits by the Supreme Court of the land, the question of constitutionality has not been settled.

The committee report talks about TVA's statutory authority to use power proceeds for the construction of new power generating units. We have not questioned the use of such funds for new generating units but rather the authority to use such funds for that purpose without specific approval by the Congress. We disagree with the inference that Congress has not questioned the right of TVA to use such funds for constructing new generating units without specific congressional approval. Even some of TVA's own proponents in the other body have specifically stated as recently as 1954 that TVA cannot spend $1 of such power revenues for such purpose without congressional approval.

The funds specifically authorized by Congress for TVA steam-plant construction in the past more than provides for all vital defense installations in the TVA area. To suggest that the denial of funds to construct additional units to provide for future growth in TVA area loads such as house heating, new loads enticed from other areas, et cetera, will result in denial of power to defense installations is without foundation. Of greater moment and concern to national defense is the hydrostorage operation and coal reserve policy of TVA that left 3 million kilowatts of steam-plant capacity with only 12 to 16 days' supply of coal on hand when the normal industry reserve runs from 90 to 120 days supply. This negligence warrants careful investigation.

The report also speaks of the administration making interest-free loans to private utilities—in the form of tax amortization—totaling over $2 billion. There has been so much misrepresentation on this score that I think it time to "look at the record."

The latest record shows that a total of only $1,333,000,000 of tax-amortization certificates were issued by this administration under the law passed by a Democratic-controlled administration and Congress in 1950; whereas $1,566,000,000 of these tax-amortization certificates were actually issued by the previous administration.

Public power advocates attempt to compare these tax-amortization certificates to the taxpayer's funds furnished to the TVA. This is specious reasoning. The ultimate gain to the utility is practically nil. In fact in relation to a normal construction program it is considerably more costly. These rapid tax-amortization certificates provide for a small reduction in Federal taxes for each of 5 years and an increase in such taxes for the following 15 years. Contrasted to this, TVA and other public power systems pay no Federal tax.

There is not a Member who signed the minority report who wants to destroy the existing TVA system. Neither do we want to subsidize them with Federal funds, and tax-free operations, enabling them to continue competition for industries from the very areas which pay those subsidies.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, of course, I differ entirely with my friend from New York [Mr. TABER] in what the facts are in this case. The record shows that the Reynolds plant, to which he refers, is an expansion of operations which they have had since 1940 in Alabama. It further shows the rate charged the Reynolds Metals Co. is one-fourth of 1 mill per kilowatt-hour higher than other companies are paying for current from a private utility.

I would like to show the facts with regard to aluminum production in the TVA area.

The Tennessee Valley's aluminum production—including Reynolds' recently announced expansion, to which the minority statement refers—is a gradually diminishing share of the national total.

Before TVA was created the largest aluminum plant in the country was in the Tennessee Valley. The Aluminum Company of America built it there a generation ago to use the waterpower it was developing on the Little Tennessee River.

In 1939, before Alcoa's first competitor built its first aluminum plant, 42 percent of United States aluminum capacity was in the Tennessee Valley. Last year the figure was 28 percent. After the aluminum plants now under construction and recently announced, including Reynolds, are built, about 25 percent of United States aluminum capacity will be in the TVA area.

NEW PRODUCTION (THROUGH 1957) AS REPORTED IN THE PRESS

Oregon: 54,000 tons, Harvey Aluminum Co.

Montana: 60,000 tons, Anaconda Aluminum Co.

Texas: 75,000 tons, Alcoa.

Ohio Valley: 60,000 tons, Olin Mathieson Chemical Co.; 220,000 tons, Kaiser Aluminum Co.; 120,000 tons, Alcoa (per Wall Street Journal, March 15, 1956).

Tennessee Valley: 120,000 tons, Reynolds.

The Tennessee Valley's share of added capacity is about 17 percent. The other new production listed above are plants at new locations, whereas Reynolds is an expansion of an existing plant. The Reynolds plant has been located in Alabama since 1940.

The power rate was not the principal concern in Reynolds' consideration. The company informed TVA that comparable rates could be had elsewhere and that they could achieve lower costs if they constructed their own powerplant. Reynolds chose not to construct their own plant largely because of time schedules. Presumably they have plans for later development of their properties near the Ohio River. There are, of course, important advantages in expanding at an existing location.

In connection with power rates, it should be noted regarding the location of Kaiser Aluminum Co. in the Ohio Valley that—as published in the Electrical World of December 12, 1955, page 88—an A. G. & E. spokesman said the final cost of power to Kaiser would be about 4 mills per kilowatt-hour. TVA's rate to Reynolds will be about 4¼ mills per kilowatt-hour, according to testimony in the hearings before the committee.

Olin Mathieson Chemical Co. in entering the aluminum industry was aware of possible locations in the TVA area. They chose to locate in the Ohio Valley, presumably at a comparable or lower power cost.

The power costs for Reynolds' plant in Arkansas and for Alcoa's plant in Texas have both been reported to compare favorably with rates that the TVA area offers. It is abundantly clear that other areas now can and do offer power to large power-consuming industries at costs which are about the same as TVA rates.

The chief consideration is not power rates, but availability of a power supply. If any region is to continue to advance, electric power must be available to meet new needs.

But, my prime purpose is to point out to the Congress the language which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] would indicate prohibited what is sought here. In the first place, what the TVA has announced to the Congress that it plans to do under the law is to put new units in existing projects to meet constantly growing needs in the area that they have heretofore served and where they are the only source of supply to which people can look.

As presented to the committee, three steam units at existing projects were in the program submitted by the President, with initial appropriation recommended for one. Two other units at existing projects were recommended by TVA. All would use coal.

It so happens that I was on the committee when the language quoted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was written and I wrote the final draft of the language as it appears in the act. I would like to read it to you:

None of the power revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for the construction of new power producing projects (except for replacement purposes) unless and until approved by act of the Congress.

At that time nobody said they wanted to stop the TVA from building additional units to existing projects to meet the load in an area where the TVA was

the only utility; no one on either side ever contended that they wanted to do that. We carefully wrote language saying that TVA could not enter upon the construction of a new big dam without coming to Congress for authority to build it; but we very carefully provided language which in effect said that even though they could not use their own funds to do that, yet if some disastrous flood should wash out one of these big installations, or an atomic bomb or something else of that nature, TVA could use its own money even to replace such a major project; but in the absence of something like that we said that where new projects were concerned the TVA would have to come to Congress for approval. Insofar as TVA's adding units to existing plants and all the other things that are essential to it, they were not prohibited and you will find no word by anyone even hinting that such member wanted to prevent new units at existing projects. All questions were directed toward making sure that such additional units at existing projects were not prohibited by the language quoted. All members joined in satisfying those who raised such questions that such was not the intent.

I would like to present in detail the other side of what the minority sets out in its report.

The minority argues that the word "projects" as used in the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, extends not only to new plants, but also to new units at existing plants, despite the agreement to the contrary expressed during the debate on this section of the bill by Representative Ploeser, who was in charge of the debate on behalf of the subcommittee which wrote it. In seeking to explain away Representative Ploeser's statement at the time, the minority now attempts to find in his words a meaning which is not there.

The legislative situation at the time Mr. Ploeser made his remarks did not leave any question as to what those remarks meant. The House Committee on Appropriations had reported out the Government corporations appropriation bill, with the following language, which was included without change in the bill as passed:

> None of the power revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for the construction of new power producing projects (except for replacement purposes) unless and until approved by act of Congress.

The pertinent portion of the debate on this provision appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 5, pages 6827–6828.

During the debate, Mr. KEFAUVER suggested that an amendment might be desirable to make entirely clear that this language, while requiring that TVA obtain congressional approval only "before beginning any new dam or constructing any new steam plant," would not require such approval as a condition for, in Mr. KEFAUVER's words, TVA's "buying a generator, which would be a new generator, and placing it in some of the stalls they already have where they can use additional generators." Mr. GORE, a minority member of the subcommittee which wrote the language, assured Mr. KEFAUVER that no amendment was necessary because the language as drafted by the subcommittee was intended to extend, and would extend, only to new plants and not to generators at existing plants. Congressman GORE stated in this connection:

> As the bill was first drafted, the word "project" was "facility." I persuaded the subcommittee to change the word "facility" to "project" for the specific reason that a facility might be interpreted to be a much smaller installation, not only a generator but a small part of a generator. By the word "project," I think it is clear that the committee intends, and I believe it to be legislative intent that it applies only to new multipurpose dams, or a hydroelectric dam or a major steam plant. It is not the intent, as I understand the committee, nor is it the intent of the language nor the portent of that language, that it would be restrictive of the smaller items such as generators, substations, transmission facilities, and other such operative facilities.

Mr. Ploeser then joined Mr. GORE in assuring Mr. KEFAUVER that no amendment was necessary to accomplish what he had in mind, and expressed complete agreement with what Mr. GORE had said. Mr. Ploeser's statement was as follows:

> Mr. PLOESER. I see no reason for any such amendment. I think the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has expressed the committee's intent. The language is rather explicit, "Except for replacement purposes" means maintenance or replacement of facilities that are necessary, or the replacement of machinery which has already been arranged for, not projects. I see no need for the amendment.

That everyone at the time recognized Mr. Ploeser's statement as one of agreement with the position taken by Mr. GORE is clearly demonstrated by the fact that on the strength of his statement Mr. KEFAUVER dropped the question of an amendment.

The minority now says, in effect, that the third sentence in Mr. Ploeser's statement is unclear and is consistent with the position for which they now contend. This sentence is unclear. But the sentence immediately preceding—"I think the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has expressed the committee's intent"—is perfectly clear, and the last sentence, assuring Mr. KEFAUVER that his amendment was not needed, is equally so. Mr. Ploeser cannot have intended clearly to state one thing at the beginning and again at the end of his brief statement and something different in a sentence sandwiched in between.

Further, during the subcommittee hearings on the Government Corporations Appropriation Act for 1949, Congresseman Ploeser himself confirmed what he had said a year before. In the course of these hearings, he expressly agreed with my statement on the meaning of the word "project" while at the same time raising a question as to the meaning of other language in the 1948 act relating to amortization payments. The colloquy was as follows:

> Mr. WHITTEN. Well, I mean this committee wrote the language, this committee had clearly in mind, according to my own recollection what they intended.
>
> A project meant a new dam, a steam plant, or a new operation, and they did not have in mind a facility, as we then understood it. That is, the placing of a turbine or a generator, or the replacement of one in a going dam, or going power-producing projects or units.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Mr. PLOESER. I think I can agree with what Mr. WHITTEN has said as to the intent of the committee on the term "project," in last year's appropriation bill, but we find that intents are not always understood alike [with reference to the requirements of the 1948 act concerning amortization payments]. (Hearings before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, 80th Cong., 2d sess. (1948), p. 596.)

The President has agreed that there is a power shortage in that area; the Bureau of the Budget has agreed there is a power shortage in that area. Mr. Vogel, the President's appointee, says that you need an increase in power production in that area and all three have agreed that TVA must take action toward meeting the need.

Again I say, all that is involved today is the adding of units to existing projects. I respectfully submit that the language which was quoted, which I have read, was written with that intent, and if you read it you can clearly see that that is what it does say. You should not consider extraneous statements or take portions out of context, as various Members have done, but if you will read the whole statement and the whole discussion you will find that nobody even contended that they could not use their revenues to meet this need.

I would like to say further that I most respectfully differ with my colleague the gentleman from New York in the matter of returns from TVA. They return 4 percent of the total invested. They return the full amount of money invested in power projects to the Government. Over the 40-year period the money paid out in dividends and paid into the Government will amount to the entire cost of these projects and they will still belong to the Government.

I respectfully submit that the greatest increase in aluminum production in this country has been outside of the TVA area. As I have pointed out the amount of aluminum produced in the TVA area has gone down from 42 percent of the national total to about 25 percent during the period he talks about.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not true that the statements contained in the committee report reflect the exact truth and the true facts?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is; and I would say also that it is the opinion of the committee and it is my opinion that the right has always existed, and I may say, has been used. The committee explained that it was not making the appropriation recommended by the President because TVA's revenue funds could be used for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, so much misleading information has been given about industrial growth in the TVA region that I feel compelled to present the facts of the case in detail. First, the industrial growth of the TVA area has not been.

and is not being, achieved at the expense of other regions of the United States. Established industries are not migrating to the TVA power service area from other parts of the country enticed by low power rates. Such charges are made repeatedly in an effort to arouse hostility to TVA in those areas where industrial growth has been of long duration, but which are now affected by competition with other regions of the United States. No evidence has ever been cited to prove the claim that industries are moving to the TVA power service area. The only responsible data are contributed by TVA itself. In 1953 TVA surveyed its area and discovered that in the preceding 12 years only a dozen small enterprises, employing in all less than 700 persons, had moved to the TVA area from other locations. None was a large power user, and none had moved from New England, the area most frequently suggested as the loser to the TVA area. At the same time and as part of the same picture of normal industrial mobility certain industries were found to have moved away from the Tennessee Valley to establish their operations in other regions. Last year another check was made and out of 244 new industries in the Tennessee Valley, only one was found to represent a relocation. This plant makes bicycles, and the cost of power is a minor concern to its management. The industrial growth of the TVA area consists of new industries, additions to our national productive capacity.

Second. Actually there would be no reason to expect large-scale movement of industry to any area just because savings in power costs might be achieved, for, while the availability of power is essential to all industries, the cost of power is an important factor to only a few in considering plant locations. One of these is aluminum. Power costs are important to that industry, and in 1939, 42 percent of the aluminum capacity of the United States was located in the Tennessee Valley. It was located there prior to TVA, and hydro sites had been developed by Alcoa to power its operations. By last year with the expansion of aluminum production the proportion had been reduced. Only 28 percent of the total national capacity for aluminum was located in the TVA area. When announced aluminum production plans are completed, about 25 percent of the United States aluminum capacity will be located in this area, surely not a disproportionate share, and no evidence of an enticement policy by TVA.

What has happened is that, as expanded production has required the aluminum industry to move to the use of steam power, other progressive power systems have learned from TVA's example and have found ways, including use of tax amortization certificates, to make power available at lowered cost. In Texas, in West Virginia, up and down the Ohio Valley, aluminum plants are springing up based on a reported 4-mill power rate from privately owned plants.

Third. The TVA power policies have not harmed—in fact they have directly benefited—the industries of other areas and the people who depend on those industries for their livelihood. TVA's power rates to the homes and farms of the area have stimulated a rise in electricity use of the average domestic consumer from 600 kilowatt-hours in 1933 to 5,240 kilowatt-hours in 1955. That increase, together with the use of electricity by the industries located in the valley, has required the addition of generating capacity at a faster rate than most power systems have considered necessary. This has helped rather than harmed industrial growth of other areas, for the purchase by TVA and its distributors of electrical equipment, and the purchase of electrical appliances by TVA power consumers, has meant employment, wages paid and profit earned, in other sections of the country.

In the decade since World War II it is estimated that TVA's power distributors and the consumers they serve have spent about $2.5 billion for equipment and appliances, most of it outside the region. Such expenditures will continue. The Electrical World of December 26, 1955 (p. 57), for example, published an REA estimate of farm purchases of electrical equipment. It indicates that between 1956 and 1960 such purchases in the State of Tennessee are expected to exceed those for every State in the Union except California.

The purchases of TVA itself, as distinguished from its distributors and consumers, outside the Tennessee Valley total almost a billion dollars for the years 1934–55. The investment made by TVA is located in the region it serves, of course, and power consumers of the area will pay back the Government's power investment, but the money spent by this Government agency is not all spent inside the region. Many of its orders for steel, for generators and turbines, for complicated equipment, are filled outside the region.

Fourth. In addition to the considerations mentioned above, clearly industrial growth in the TVA area contributes to national prosperity and strength. Industrial growth means jobs in the TVA area. It means a rising standard of living, and therefore jobs in other regions as better markets for all types of production develop. This interrelation of regional prosperity is not confined to the conspicuous example of appliance use cited above. It includes grain, and oil, and automobiles. Industrial growth has not only increased commerce between regions, it has enabled the people living in the area to bear a larger share of the support of the whole Federal establishment. In 1934, the 7 States which lie in part in the Tennessee Valley provided only 3.4 percent of the total individual income tax collections; in 1954 the proportion was more than 6 percent. Over the years 1933–54, the seven Tennessee Valley States have contributed $7.5 billion more in individual income taxes than they would have contributed if the proportion had remained at the 3.4 percent level of 1933.

This interrelation of regional welfare has been recognized by responsible spokesmen of the more highly industrialized States. For example statements made by official of two Eastern States at the National Forum on Planning and Development Problems and Techniques, held in Denver, Colo., June 7–10, 1955, can be cited. Mr. Edward T. Dickinson, formerly a research assistant to the chairman of the board of United States Steel and now of the New York State Department of Commerce, said this:

> We would like to consider New York State a seedbed for industry and when an industry grows, say in New York City, and has not the space, we think it is a good thing that they move out to areas where they have plant space in which to work. We would hope that a good many would move upstate into our own territory or they'd move to Staten Island, which is going to be opening up and will be a vast new industrial community for smaller plants, but if they move to a new vicinity or community of the South, we think it is a good and healthy thing because whatever growth we have in the United States cannot help but improve the economy of New York because we have centered there so many companies that do supply industrial materials and services—and services I cannot emphasize too much—to the total economy of this country. So we are anxious to help all the States grow industrially; it is to our own self-interest. (Proceedings 10th Annual Convention Association of State Planning and Development Agencies, Washington, D. C., p. 41.)

Mr. Joseph E. McLean, commissioner of conservation and economic development, New Jersey, said:

> Yet who can seriously doubt the rewards of TVA have spread far beyond the communities of the Tennessee Valley? The higher income of the people of the Tennessee Valley has created a vast new market for the industries of the other regions.
>
> The last point is especially important to us in the East. Our industry is highly specialized. Our workers have been trained to produce a long line of complex goods, such as chemicals, air-conditioning units, machine tools, airplane engines, etc. Any development in other regions that raises income levels and expands the market for these products inevitably benefits us and benefits us directly.
>
> All of this leads me to suggest that we must place increasing emphasis on the national interest and seek to minimize interregional and interstate rivalries in considering proposals for the development of natural resources in the United States. (Ibid., pp. 45–46.)

Fifth. Industrial growth is being experienced in all sections of the country (the percentage of growth will of course be higher in areas where industrial development was delayed for many years). The May 1955 "Monthly Review" of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston reported:

> Manufacturers plan to spend $200 million for new plant and equipment in Massachusetts in 1955. This is 20 percent more than they spent last year. Capital expenditures in the hardgoods industries are expected to rise almost three times as much as in the nondurable-goods industries.

CONCLUSION

The case is clear, and the statement of the minority commenting on the proposed supplemental appropriation to add to TVA's generating capacity is not based on an examination of the facts of record. The statement contends that low industrial power rates are enticing industries to locate in the Tennessee Valley. They imply that this is unfair,

that citizens in areas thus disadvantaged are required to furnish the capital needed for TVA expansion. They claim that TVA power operations are subsidized, and imply that Congress never intended TVA to furnish power for industries. Every assumption and statement is incorrect, and in fact none of them is relevant to the problem under discussion.

It is true that the President recommended an appropriation of $3,500,000 to commence construction of an additional unit at the existing John Sevier steam plant. The committee as well as the minority disapproved the item, but for different reasons. The committee points out that no appropriation is required, that TVA can proceed to finance this and other units out of its earnings. Under this plan TVA will enhance the value of the Government's investment, increase its earnings, without the appropriation of additional funds to be provided by the taxpayer.

With respect to the other points the truth is that while power rates in the TVA area are generally at a lower level than the level of rates charged by private companies, the sharp difference lies in the rates charged by TVA's distributors for electricity service to the homes and farms of the Tennessee Valley. This has made the TVA power service area the best market in the country for the sale of electric appliances, manufactured almost entirely outside the region. It has been a boon to other areas. With respect to the importance of power rates as a factor in plant location, the fact is that power costs are decisive in plant location for only a few industries, and the record shows that in the case of the particular industry—aluminum—selected for comment in the minority statement, the enticement of low rates has not been offered by TVA, but by private power companies over the past 15 years. Power costs were not the controlling factor in the announced expansion plans of the Reynolds Metals Co. which began its aluminum production in the Tennessee Valley in 1940.

The TVA power system is not subsidized. Its earnings cover all costs of operation, including depreciation, and provide in addition a return on the Government's investment which has averaged 4 percent over the years. During the same period the cost of money to the Government has averaged about 2 percent.

The TVA Act clearly contemplated the industrial development of the area, a development basic to its economic growth, and from the beginning there has been steam generating capacity on the TVA system. With the approval of the Congress TVA has purchased and has constructed steam plants, and that power has been available from the beginning to use in the development of the economy of the area for the benefit of the people and the nation. The minority statement is incorrect.

Those who would discourage industrial growth in the TVA area similar to what is going on elsewhere forget that the privately owned plants which are large power users are vital to national defense. Any action to prevent expansion of the production of the chemical and metallurgical industries located in the Tennessee Valley would put a ceiling on our national resources for defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] for yielding me this time.

I certainly am in agreement with the statement which he has made, and I most respectfully disagree with the statement of my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] who preceded the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The major consideration—and I do not think it is controverted by the minority—is that there is no dispute about the need for additional capacity to meet the power requirements of the area; there is no dispute in this matter about the need for additional power as indicated by Chairman Vogel, of the TVA Board, who was appointed by the President. Following General Vogel's confirmation, he took a new survey and a new look at TVA's power needs. It was determined that some six new starts would possibly be required.

The full Board unanimously recommended to the Bureau of the Budget four new starts be authorized. This was a unanimous action. Following this report to the Bureau of the Budget, we know that the Bureau did not recommend any new starts last year, but did recommend the Dixon-Yates plan substitute power for TVA area and defense needs. This scheme was fought out and defeated. The President withdrew or canceled the contract. Thus, no new starts were authorized and no additional power supplied the area. There can be no dispute or controversy that additional power is needed and will increasingly be required in the area. The President himself has recognized this fact by recommending a supplemental item for beginning construction of the Sevier plant.

Since the committee has disallowed this $3½ million, the majority in its wisdom has properly stated in the report that the TVA can use some of its corporate funds to begin construction of this new project that is needed by TVA, needed by the people, and needed for national defense. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has endeavored to say that TVA does not have such authority. It has been historic in the operation of TVA that the Board can use its corporate funds for certain facilities, for additional units at existing plants where they are required. To build a new system—a new start—they would have to get congressional approval. Like in the case of the proposed Fulton plant last year. Congressional approval has not been required for adding units or facilities at existing plants. The law gives them that authority.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] quoted from the Government Corporations Act. I should like to quote from the TVA Act, which says, in effect, that commencing on July 1, 1936, the TVA power proceeds shall be turned into the Federal Treasury, save and except such part of such proceeds as in the opinion of the Board shall be necessary for the construction of and in the conducting of its business of generating, transmitting, and distributing public energy. In other words, the act itself empowers the authority, gives the right, to use certain of its corporate funds. Here is the language of the act itself:

> Commencing July 1, 1936, the proceeds for each fiscal year derived by the Board from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the Corporation, and from any other activities of the Corporation, including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year, save and except such part of such proceeds as in the opinion of the Board shall be necessary for the Corporation in conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy (16 U. S. C. 831y).

In addition to the act giving authority to do that, there have been several instances in which this specific authority has been used for completing units—for instance, Kentucky unit No. 5 and certain of the Douglas Dam units and other facilities.

I should like to point out that in addition to this authority, custom and usage has established TVA's practice in this field. Also, the congressional intent has been spelled out on this floor more than once. The history of the debates will show the congressional intent was that they were so empowered. In addition, I might point out that the Federal Power Commission uses the word "projects" in a broad sense. There have been many interpretations of the use of the term "projects" by the Federal Power Commission and in other Federal legislation such as the Bonneville Act, the Reclamation Bureau and others in which there are very similar usage of the term implied here.

So I think there is no doubt but that the position taken by the gentleman from New York is in error and that TVA does have power to use its corporate funds for existing facilities. I certainly think the record should be made clear on that point.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. All I would like to comment on is with reference to the legislative situation as it is. With the language in the report and no amendment to be offered, does not the gentleman feel we from the TVA region should be satisfied at least for the moment?

Mr. EVINS. I must agree with the gentleman that any crippling amendment should not be offered; if offered, it should be rejected.

Considering all the realities of the situation, the Appropriations Committee disallowed the $3,500,000 for John Sevier steam plant and recommended that the TVA follow its normal business procedure and use its accumulated corporate funds, as it has in the past, to finance the beginning of this unit.

In its report, the committee agreed that no new arguments or novel considerations have been raised in connection with this proposal and it reaffirmed the belief that TVA should use its revenues to the extent that they are available in order to meet the power requirements of the service area.

This agency now has corporate funds in excess of $58 million. Certainly a portion of these funds should be used for the beginning of this project without further delay. The power revenues of the TVA should not be drained off and this great agency weakened by those who would deny it any means of support.

TVA is now repaying into the Treasury the total cost of the investment in its power system. Over a 40-year period, the agency will repay $348 million. For the coming fiscal year the TVA Board of Directors proposed repaying $35 million toward the debt. This payment would have been in line with the requirements of Congress as set out in 1948. However, TVA recently was confronted with the unprecedented demand that it repay $75 million into the Treasury during 1957. This payment would put TVA 21 years ahead of the legal requirement, or, in other words, bring its total repayment schedule up to the amount that Congress required TVA to have repaid by 1978.

Now there is no other explanation or excuse for this unprecedented demand on TVA's funds than to conclude that the present administration, for reasons not announced, is attempting to weaken TVA—tearing from this agency the corporate funds which are necessary for sound operation.

Some have termed the demand a milking action. Perhaps it is. But regardless of what we call it, the effort is designed to weaken and eventually destroy TVA. This most certainly is not a part of the continued expansion and maximum efficiency operation that administration leaders promised before the 1952 elections.

In this new and latest attempt to destroy TVA, the administration has at least brought one fact to light. That is that even with the arbitrary demand for the $75 million repayment, it is a striking tribute to the financial success of this agency and proof that TVA can pay its own way.

By June 30, TVA will have repaid $186,500,000 back into the Treasury, and the additional demand repayment by the administration of $75 million would bring the total paid to $261,500,000 on this investment.

Now the question of TVA's statutory authority to use power proceeds for the construction of new generating units was raised by certain members of the committee—traditional foes of TVA. This question, I should add, is not new and has been understood and approved by Congress for many years and in many instances.

There is absolutely no question of congressional intent or the legality of this method of financing additions to existing TVA facilities. This was brought out fully in a recent opinion prepared by Joseph C. Swidler, chief counsel for TVA, which, in brief, concluded that the legislative history of the act, the congressional intent, court decisions and the statutes entitle TVA to expend its corporate funds for individual generating units at existing projects and facilities.

The TVA Act, approved in 1933, stated that the agency should pay into the Treasury each year money derived from the sale of power or other products, except, and I quote, "such proceeds as in the opinion of the Board of Directors shall be necessary for the corporation, in conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy."

While TVA has always come to Congress with requests for funds to begin construction of new projects, such as dams and steam plants, it has often used its own corporate funds to complete construction of units already started.

Such a practice was followed in completion of the Watts Bar steam plant, the Apalachia, and Ocoee No. 3. In the same manner TVA has used its power revenue to begin installation of new generating units at existing projects, exactly like the recommendation now before the Congress for the John Sevier plant. Corporate funds were used to begin construction of Kentucky unit No. 5, Fort Loudoun units 3 and 4, Wheeler units 5 and 6, Douglas unit No. 3, and certain units at Wilson Dam.

It is argued that the Government Corporations Act of 1948 curtailed or limited TVA's authority to use its corporate funds in the manner employed in the past. This argument apparently hinges on the wording of the 1948 act which says, and I quote:

> None of the power revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for the construction of new power-producing projects except for replacement purposes, unless and until approved by Congress.

But, in close examination of the hearings on this reuse-of-funds proposal, as well as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during debate, it was clearly brought out and understood by members of the committee that the language used in the 1948 act was not intended to alter the use of TVA's revenue in this connection. It was clearly demonstrated during 1948 and again in debate during 1949 that the term "project" was specifically stated to mean complete dams or steam plants, and not individual generating units. The Federal Power Act likewise uses the term "project" in a broad sense and it is defined there to mean complete units and this definition has been upheld by the Courts.

Mr. Swindler states in his opinion, which upholds the right of TVA to use its corporate funds for this purpose, that, and again I quote:

> If Congress, in the Government Corporations Appropriation Act of 1948, had wished to prohibit use of TVA's revenues for construction of individual generating units, as distinguished from new dams and steam plants, the term "new power-producing projects" would have represented a singularly inappropriate description of the prohibition. There is nothing in the legislative history to indicate that the term was used in other than its normal sense; on the contrary, the legislative history shows explicitly that it was used in this sense.

We have had a span of many years' use when the Congress realized and understood what the term "project" meant and Congress was also well aware, and approved, of how TVA was using its corporate funds. It is only in the last few years that the enemies of TVA, notwithstanding their outward apparent show of friendship for TVA, have tried to cripple and thwart TVA at every turn, by throwing the weight of every imaginable road block in the path of TVA's progress. These include the denial of needed appropriations for TVA, the cutting drastically of its budgets, proposing restrictive and limiting self-financing proposals, Dixon-Yates, and all the rest, and now the denial of use of TVA's power revenues for facilities essential to monitor its operations.

This latest proposal is contrary both to law, congressional intent, court interpretation as well as usage, practice, and custom. This latest crippling effort should be resoundly defeated.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I address myself to chapter 8, which is the chapter presently under general discussion. I presume the Members of the House, Mr. Chairman, have read the majority report which appears on page 32 of the report accompanying this bill, and I ask them also to read carefully the minority report which begins on page 50 of the same report, which is House Report No. 1897.

Mr. Chairman, when this bill was under consideration, the committee denied the TVA request for $3,500,000 to provide for a start on construction of the fourth electric generating unit at the John Sevier steam plant. The committee report states at one point that the committee believes TVA should use its revenues, to the extent they are available, to add units at existing plants. At another point, the committee recommends that TVA use power revenues to construct new generating units. The committee, however, did not give a specific direction to TVA to use its power revenues to construct new generating units. Had the committee given such a specific direction, it would undoubtedly have been declared null and void as contrary to the legislative restriction on such use without specific legislative approval by the Congress.

The committee report would seem to imply that Congress has accepted the interpretation, handed down September 10, 1955, by TVA's own attorney, that TVA has statutory authority to use power proceeds for the construction of new generating units without further legislative approval. Opinions expressed in previous Congresses, by TVA proponents among others, do not support such a contention, as the following examples show:

> All the net earnings, all the proceeds, all the properties are subject to the disposition of the United States Congress. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 8, p. 10490.)
>
> The Congress upon each occasion, in its appropriation bills, has had the disposal of the net earnings. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 8, p. 10490.)
>
> All the earnings of TVA are within the disposition of the Congress each year. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 8, p. 10490.)

The TVA cannot start one single new power facility, it cannot put $1 of its income or any other funds into any new power facility, except by and with the advice and direction of Congress. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 8, p. 10490.)

Congress has control of every dollar which comes into the TVA, and Congress can decide how much shall be used for plant improvement, and what amount shall go into the Treasury. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 8, p. 10494.)

The legislative history of the amendment to section 26 of the TVA Act leaves no doubt that Congress intended that TVA should have no authority to use power revenues for constructing new generating units without the specific approval of the Congress.

Section 26 of the original TVA Act reads as follows:

SEC. 26. The net proceeds derived by the Board from the sale of power and any of the products manufactured by the corporation, after deducting the cost of operation, maintenance, depreciation, amortization, and an amount deemed by the Board as necessary to withhold as operating capital, or devoted by the Board to new construction, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year. (TVA Act of 1933.)

The section, in this original form, did give the TVA Board the authority to use net revenues for new construction. This section was amended in 1935.

In 1935, after extended hearings before the Military Affairs Committee, H. R. 8623 was passed by the House and among other things, amended section 26 of the TVA Act as follows:

SEC. 26. Commencing July 1, 1936, the proceeds for each fiscal year derived by the Board from the sale of power and of the products manufactured by the corporation, and from any other activities of the corporation, including disposition of any real or personal property, shall not be expended by the Board except in consequence of annual appropriation thereof by the Congress, and the appropriation of such proceeds is authorized to meet the cost of operation, maintenance, depreciation, amortization, interest on bonds, and operating capital or for improvements, betterments, or the acquisition of facilities necessary to carry out the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the use by the Board, after June 30, 1936, of proceeds accruing prior to July 1, 1936, for payment of obligations lawfully incurred prior to such latter date.

This amendment, while it authorized TVA to use its revenues for the construction of new facilities and other purposes, at the same time required annual approval of such use by the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress.

The Senate in 1935 proposed to amend section 26 of the TVA Act to read as follows:

SEC. 26. The net proceeds for each fiscal year derived by the Board from the sale of power and any of the products manufactured by the corporation, and from any other activities of the corporation, including disposition of real or personal property, after deducting the cost of operation, maintenance, depreciation, amortization, interest on bonds, and an amount derived by the Board as necessary to withhold as operating capital or to be devoted by the Board to new construction, improvements, betterments, or the acquisition of facilities to carry out the purposes of this act, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year.

This proposal, like section 26 of the original act, would have permitted TVA to use its revenues to construct new generating facilities or other capital additions without any further approval of the Congress.

However, when the committee on Conference submitted a conference report, that report contained the following wording for the proposed amendment of section 26:

SEC. 26. Commencing July 1, 1936, the proceeds for each fiscal year derived by the Board from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the Corporation, and from any other activities of the Corporation including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year, save and except such part of such proceeds as in the opinion of the Board shall be necessary for the Corporation in the operation of dams and reservoirs, in conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy and in manufacturing, selling, and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients. A continuing fund of $1 million is also expected from the requirements of this section and may be withheld by the Board to defray emergency expenses and to insure continuous operation: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the use by the Board, after June 30, 1936, of proceeds accruing prior to July 1, 1936, for the payment of obligations lawfully incurred prior to such latter date.

This amendment was approved by both Houses and is the present section 26 of the TVA act as amended. It confirms the feeling that Congress did not intend TVA to spend its money for capital improvements without specific legislative approval.

The Statement of the Managers on the part of the House had this to say about section 10 of the conference action which amended section 26 of the original act:

Section 10 is modified by preserving the principle of congressional control through appropriations over the activities of the Board. But an exception was made as to funds necessary to carry on the business of generating and distributing electricity and of manufacturing and selling fertilizers. It is manifest that long-term contracts could not be made if the power of the Tennessee Valley Authority to carry out those contracts is dependent upon appropriations by Congress. Furthermore, we have provided that a fund of $1 million may be constantly kept on hand by the Corporation to meet emergencies, such as breaks or threatened breaks in dams or destruction of any of the property by the forces of nature, so that said $1 million may be constantly available to make repairs, or to prevent damage, and thus to insure continuance of operations in the manufacture and distribution of electric energy and fertilizers.

It is increasingly evident that the House desired to have Congress assume complete control of TVA's activity through the annual appropriation process, but agreed to liberalize the amended act to the extent of letting TVA use its revenues for the normal business of operating its existing power and fertilizer facilities. There is nothing in the language, nor in the debate, to indicate that Congress thought it was approving the use of TVA revenues for the construction of new generating units, or plants, nor of new fertilizer plants, without specific approval of the Congress. It is difficult to see how anyone can read into the language "in conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy and in manufacturing, selling and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients" any intent to cover TVA's business of "constructing new hydroelectric or new steam-electric generating plants or units."

Reading section 26 of the TVA Act, as amended, together with the 1948 congressional limitation on the use of TVA revenues, which says:

None of the power revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for the construction of new power producing projects (except for replacement purposes) unless and until approved by act of Congress. (Government Corporations Act, 1948.)

Clearly shows that Congress was only giving authority to use power revenues for replacement purposes, and was reiterating that TVA must obtain specific legislative authority from the Congress for the construction of new generating units.

I think the intent of Congress is often expressed not only by what a Member says, but by the previous actions and opinions of that Member. In August 1935, when this question was up on the floor, the Member from New Jersey, Mr. McLean, had something to say which I shall quote in a moment.

In view of the statement on the floor of the House by Mr. McLean in August 1935, it is inconceivable that section 26 of the TVA Act, as amended, can be interpreted to confer on TVA the authority to construct additional generating capacity at will without the specific authority of the Congress. Mr. McLean had this to say—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1935, at page 13998:

Mr. Speaker, I signed this conference report and I advise its adoption. * * *

Let it not be understood that, in taking this position I do, I have not in any way changed my attitude towards the philosophy of the Tennessee Valley project. I still believe it is fraught with danger and to a very considerable extent is an unfair burden upon taxpayers in districts not affected by the expenditures being made, and that entirely too much money is being spent in the Tennessee Valley without regard to the constantly increasing national debt and its ultimate payment by generations yet unborn. As a member of the committee of conference it was my duty to endeavor to reconcile the differences in proposed legislation between the Senate and the House of Representatives, and I believe that out of the controversy surrounding proposed legislation effecting the Tennessee Valley Authority there is now before the House a piece of legislation which will meet many of the criticisms, restrain many of the unwise activities, and clarify many misunderstandings. What is of greater importance than anything else is the fact that the direc-

tors brought upon themselves much of the criticism that has been advanced against them, should have a better understanding of their obligations to the Government of the United States and to the Congress; and I believe that in the future we shall see more orderly procedure so far as that agency is concerned.

One of my principal complaints in this controversy was the fact that the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority had entirely disregarded the Congress. There were indications that they held it in contempt. They made no report as to their plans, purposes or ultimate objectives as they were required to do by the act in order that Congress might guide and control the nature, sequence, and extent of the development. There now can be no doubt in this regard, for we have specifically provided in the pending bill that on or before the 1st of April of next year there shall be such a report by this governmental agency to the Congress which created it and whose agent it is.

* * * * *

Mr. Speaker, I feel, in spite of the turmoil, the vexations, and the criminations and recriminations that have gone on while this bill was pending, that we now have a better understanding between the Congress and its creature, the Tennessee Valley Authority. The directors of the Authority should have a better understanding of the obligations which they owe to the Government and Congress in the discharge of their duties, and although, as I have said, I cannot bring myself to favor the objectives intended to be brought about by the Tennessee Valley Authority, I feel that if we must have a new law, we have written a much better piece of legislation than was first proposed by the Authority itself, and much good should come as a result of the adoption of this report.

Here was a man opposed to the TVA concept. Can anyone contend that he would have made the above statements had he believed TVA was being given almost unlimited authority to expand its generating facilities without further review by, and approval of the Congress? I think not.

According to the TVA method of accounting, which leaves out any payment to the Treasury for the interest cost to the taxpayers, or for Federal tax equivalent, which TVA officials claimed TVA rates provided for; the net annual power revenue now approaches $60 million. To permit a board of three men to use such an amount each year to expand socialized power facilities at will is unthinkable, particularly when TVA is using this subsidized electric power to draw industry from other sections of the country by their low power rates.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

USE OF TVA SUBSIDIZED POWER TO ENTICE INDUSTRY INTO THE TENNESSEE VALLEY

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, we have heard arguments pro and con, on whether TVA entices industry to the TVA area through its subsidized low electric rates. There can be no doubt, however, about the effort of the TVA distributors and the Tennessee Industrial and Agricultural Development Commission to lure industry from other sections of the country.

The Tennessee Valley Yearbook, 1955, a colorful brochure printed in Chattanooga, Tenn., carries a number of advertisements extolling cheap power as an incentive for industry to locate in the Tennessee Valley. At the same time the Yearbook—page 37—says the valley should quit luring industry from the outside in these words:

We must organize new industries—quit luring them from outside—such gain is permanent—other communities need all they can keep. Let's be just. New plant-branches O. K.

The Nashville Electric Power Board advertisement on page 62 says:

Life in Nashville is higher and brighter because of cheap, convenient electric power.

We earnestly advise any industry considering the establishment of a new southern factory branch, plant, or distribution warehouse to come to Nashville where you will receive the "finest electric service in the entire Nation."

In Nashville we say "Electricity—biggest bargain in your budget."

Chattanooga, on page 8 of the Yearbook, says:

Power, low-cost power, and plenty of it. * * *

* * * The widespread use of this low-cost TVA electricity makes the Board the largest single distributor of power produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Then goes on to say:

TVA is a sound national investment. Not only does it prevent millions of dollars in flood damages annually but all appropriations for electric power development are repaid to the National Government with a 6-percent interest payment.

This advertisement demonstrates the attempt to sell the Tennessee Valley from a low-cost power standpoint while it at the same time is trying to make the Nation believe TVA is repaying the Government investment in the power development with interest at 6 percent. The record shows, of course, that this is not true. TVA has paid a small amount of interest at low rates on an early bond issue which represents less than 4 percent of the present total TVA project cost. TVA revenue has not been sufficient to pay operating expenses, pay interest cost on power investment, and make repayment of the investment. Nor have they paid or provided for taxes equivalent to the local, State, and Federal tax rates paid by private utilities.

The Tennessee Industrial and Agricultural Development Commission uses the following bait as one of its reasons why northern or other manufacturers should move to the TVA area:

ABUNDANT LOW-COST POWER

Low-cost electric power is sold at standard rates throughout the State. Most of Tennessee is supplied with electricity from the vast TVA system of dams and steam plants, the largest integrated power system in the United States. Over the next 2 years, some 2½ billion kilowatts will be available in the TVA region for industrial development. Generally, TVA power rates are 30 percent to 45 percent below the national average. For example, certain industrial consumers in Tennessee pay only 6.03 mills per kilowatt-hour on a monthly consumption of 400,000 kilowatt-hours—1,000 kilowatt demand. A recent study for a small northern manufacturer revealed that his annual power bill of $16,128 could be reduced to approximately $8,000 in Tennessee.

I wonder how much longer the long-suffering taxpayers in Ohio and other sections of the country are going to put up with the increasing demands for more funds to expand this socialistic power empire? I am sure my people think the time has come for the TVA area to stand on its own feet and pay its proper share of Federal taxes and interest costs.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of brevity I shall not take the time to read the two statements I hold in my hand but shall insert them at this point. They are as follows:

USE OF REVENUES FOR GENERATING UNITS AT EXISTING PROJECTS

The minority report seeks to cast doubt on an opinion written by TVA's General Counsel, Mr. Joseph C. Swidler, concluding that TVA has statutory authority to expend power proceeds for new generating units at existing plants. The section of the minority report dealing with this point begins by quoting out of context a statement in Mr. Swidler's opinion that section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act "standing alone, is broad enough to authorize use of proceeds for construction of any type of power installations, including steam plants and single-purpose power dams as well as individual generating units and transmission facilities." The minority report implies that the words "standing alone" deprive the statement of meaning because other subsequent legislation, specifically the Government Corporation Control Act and the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, have changed the situation. In fact, the words "standing alone" appear on page 1 of the opinion, and the remaining 8 pages are devoted to showing that no subsequent legislation has changed the situation.

So far as the Government Corporation Control Act is concerned, section 104 of that statute, which governs congressional action on agency budget programs, includes an express provision that such section "shall not be construed as affecting the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended."

With respect to the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, the pertinent statutory limitation is that TVA power revenues shall not be used for construction of new power producing projects unless first approved by Congress. When the bill was debated on the floor of the House during the 80th Congress, the meaning of this language was agreed upon by spokesmen for the majority and minority members of the House Appropriations Subcommittee which drafted it. Representative Ploeser, chairman of the subcommittee, expressly concurred in the interpretation of the then Representative GORE, as follows:

"By the word 'project,' I think it is clear that the committee intends, and I believe it to be the legislative intent that it applies only to new multi-purpose dams, or a hydro-electric dam or a major steam plant. It is not the intent, as I understand the committee, nor is it the intent of the language nor the portent of that language, that it would

be restrictive of the smaller items such as generators, substations, transmission facilities, and other such operative facilities." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 5, p. 6828.

The minority report also states that doubts concerning TVA's statutory authority to expend revenue were expressed by Senators friendly to TVA during a 1955 appropriations debate. Examination of the debate shows that there was considerable discussion whether TVA should use revenue to construct additional units, but no direct challenge to the statement of Senator HILL, one of the authors of the original TVA Act, that—

"The Tennessee Valley Authority has 1 of 2 ways in which it can install units. One is by coming to Congress and getting an appropriation, which means getting funds out of the Treasury of the United States. The other way is by husbanding and wisely using its revenues from sale of power, its proceeds, so as to enhance the Government's property by installing additional units." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 8, p. 10401.)

Senator HILL's statement accords completely with the interpretation agreed upon by Mr. Ploeser and Mr. GORE at the time the Government corporations appropriation bill for 1948 was debated in the House.

The minority report also states that TVA has not begun any new units out of revenues without prior congressional approval since the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, was enacted. If this were true, it would have no bearing on whether TVA has statutory authority to follow this course. But it is not true. The fact is that TVA financed construction of Wheeler Dam units 7 and 8 out of revenues and without prior congressional approval within a period of months after the bill was enacted; that it revealed this fact during the hearings on the Government corporations appropriation bill for 1949; and that majority and minority members discussed the matter during the 1949 hearings and again agreed that the limitation adopted the prior year applied only to new plants and not to units—hearings before the Subcommittee on Government Corporations of the House Committee on Appropriations, 80th Congress, 2d session, 1948, page 596.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF TVA STEAM PLANTS

When the TVA Act was passed in 1933, it included a provision—section 7 (a)—which transferred to TVA 2 steam plants previously constructed by the Corps of Engineers at Sheffield and Muscle Shoals, Ala. Section 15, which was also included in the original act, expressly authorized TVA to issue $50 million of bonds to finance, among other things, construction of steam plants. In 1939, Congress amended the act by adopting section 15c, which authorized TVA to purchase generating and transmission properties from private utility companies in its area. The hearings on this legislation made clear that these properties included several steam generating plants. Further, TVA's manager of power testified expressly that TVA intended to operate these plants, and that, since acquisition of the private utility properties would make TVA the sole supplier in the area, TVA would be required in the future to build new steam plants—hearings before subcommittee of House Committee on Military Affairs on S. 1796, 76th Congress, 1st session, pages 19–21, 111–112. In 1940, Congress appropriated funds for construction of a steam plant by TVA at Watts Bar.

No serious question was raised in Congress as to the constitutionality of any of these legislative actions. The constitutional issue was first raised in 1948 and 1949 by opponents of an appropriation requested by TVA for the Johnsonville steam plant. Early in 1949 Congress approved an appropriation for this plant. Since then Congress has appropriated funds for six other TVA steam plants at Colbert, Gallatin, John Sevier, Kingston, Shawnee and Widows Creek. The steam generating unit now challenged is to be installed at one of these plants, John Sevier, which has already been specifically approved by Congress.

The matter has already been judicially tested and sustained by a three-judge Federal court in *Rainbow Realty Co.* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (124 F. Supp. 436 (M. D. Tenn. 1954)). In that case, the respondent challenged TVA's authority to condemn a right-of-way for a transmission line near Nashville, Tenn., on the ground that the line would be used to transmit power generated predominantly at TVA steam plants, which it claimed TVA lacked constitutional authority to construct or operate. In the course of its opinion rejecting respondent's contention, the court stated that—

"The extent to which electric power from steam plants commingled with power from hydroelectric plants may be supplied by TVA is a question for legislative determination and not for determination by the courts" (p. 441).

Further, may I mention that the majority report in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority is not found only on page 32, it is on pages 32, 33, and 34.

As to the directive which the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] said was missing, I quote the following language from the majority report:

The committee * * * believes that the Agency should follow normal business procedure, using its revenues to the extent necessary. The requested $3,500,000 has therefore been disallowed.

Again:

The committee shares the desire of the administration to reduce appropriations wherever possible and therefore recommends use of its power revenues so as not to require new appropriations.

Finally, at the bottom of page 34 appears this language:

The committee reaffirms its judgment, and believes that TVA should use its revenues to the extent they are available to add units at existing plants to meet the power requirements of its service area.

Not projects, units; "units at existing plants."

If a man builds a home and says, "I am not going to plaster the upstairs part of this house," and finds afterward that his family has come along and he needs the additional rooms and plasters those rooms, that is exactly what they are doing here at this John Sevier plant. They are using a place that has been prepared and are setting in the generator. That is all there is to it. That is the answer to these questions.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Does not the gentleman from Michigan feel certain that the very clear and convincing statement made by the gentleman from Mississippi, who is a member of the committee, and wrote the language to which reference has here been made, as well as the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] and others of the majority speaking, and the majority report here, clearly show the intent of the Congress to be just as stated in the majority report?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. Chairman, I am including at this point the entire majority report in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The supplemental estimate considered by the Committee was for $3,500,000 to finance construction work during the current fiscal year on a needed generating unit at the John Sevier steam plant. The budget recommendations for this supplemental estimate and for the fiscal year 1957 contemplate that completion of the unit at the John Sevier Plant and construction of additional units at the Johnsonville steam plant will be financed with revenue bonds under legislation which is now pending in committee in the two Houses. The committee finds that the Tennessee Valley Authority's power revenues have provided it with sufficient funds for the construction of such additional units as TVA now requires, and believes that the Agency should follow normal business procedure, using its revenues to the extent necessary. The requested $3,500,000 has therefore been disallowed.

A minority of the committee opposes the TVA using its own money to meet its power needs and in addition voted against the President's recommendation to appropriate money for this purpose. The only conclusion to be reached is that the minority is simply opposed to the people of the TVA region having power to meet increasing needs.

Extraneous matters were raised during consideration of this estimate which, while not pertinent to the problem before our committee, do require some comment to keep the record straight.

Briefly, the President of the United States, in his annual budget message to the Congress, expressed his approval of the commencement of construction of certain generating units to be added to existing plants on the TVA system. He recommended that $3,500,000 be appropriated to begin construction immediately of a unit at the John Sevier plant in Eastern Tennessee and proposed that the balance of the costs of this unit, and all the costs of the additional units be met by proceeds from the sale of revenue bonds. Much of the space and a good deal of the heat in the hearings appears to be directed at the President's suggestion that TVA finance additions to its power system by the issuance of revenue bonds. This is a controversy between certain minority members of the committee and the President of the United States. No position is taken on the merits of revenue bond legislation since that is a matter for the appropriate legislative committees of the Congress.

The realities of the situation are clear. In 1940, following authorization by the Congress of the purchase of the properties of certain private power companies TVA became the sole source of power supply for its service area. Now, over 1,300,000 customers buy their electricity from the 150 distributors which purchase power at wholesale from TVA. The farms, the homes, and industries of this great area rely on TVA to meet their increasing needs for energy. Great installations for our national defense are located in the region. There is no dispute about the need for additional capacity to meet their

power requirements. The question is how new capacity shall be financed. At the time the President made his recommendation it might have been reasonable to anticipate early action on the so-called bond amendments to the TVA Act, and therefore to expect bond proceeds to be available to meet the costs of generating units in the next fiscal year. At the present time, however, it is obvious that even if passage of the legislation were accomplished with a celerity unprecedented in congressional history, the long and complicated process of bond issuance could not be expected to provide funds in time to meet the need.

The committee considered this situation, and recognizing that only two methods of financing are available to TVA at the present time—the appropriation of funds by Congress, or the use by TVA of its revenues for the purposes authorized by law, the latter method is recommended. The committee shares the desire of the administration to reduce appropriations wherever possible and therefore recommends use of its power revenues so as not to require new appropriations.

A minority of the committee, on the other hand, gives no consideration to this answer. Instead, it resorts to familiar attacks on TVA, and in effect proposes to break up and destroy this great power system, repealing the TVA Act by indirection, and as a consequence leaving the people of this one area without power required to maintain its standard of living or provide for the economic growth of the present geographic area served by TVA. In the opinion of the committee it is unthinkable that the Congress would deliberately schedule a power shortage in 1957 and 1958 in any area of the Nation, and when we consider that more than half of TVA's power output in now being used by AEC, the Air Force wind tunnel center at Tullahoma, Tenn., the guided missile project at Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, and other vital defense installations, we realize that a breakdown of TVA power supply would be a national disaster.

The question of the constitutionality of the TVA steam plants has been raised repeatedly in debate on TVA appropriations over the past 10 years, and Congress, overruling such contention, has approved 8 large steam plants. The question has come before the courts in one case, and in that case a 3-judge Federal court sustained the constitutionality of the TVA steam plants. (*See Rainbow Realty Company* v. *TVA* (F. Supp. 436 (1954)).) Likewise the question of TVA's statutory authority to use power proceeds for the construction of new power generating units is not novel. The TVA Act has been so interpreted from the beginning, and Congress has known and accepted this interpretation, and has indeed welcomed the reduction in the amount of appropriation which would otherwise have been requested. Over the years 10 generating units in existing projects have been begun with earnings from the power system and all but 2 have been completed out of earnings. Two of these units at Wheeler Dam were begun after the addition of the language in the 1948 Appropriation Act so frequently referred to. A reading of the full congressional debate at the time this provision was enacted, quoted in the opinion of TVA's general counsel in the hearings can leave no doubt that Congress did not intend to restrict the use of revenues for new units at existing projects, such as are involved here, but only to limit the commencement of construction of new projects out of earnings.

The committee would point out that the Administration has recognized the national importance of adequate generating capacity on privately owned power systems to the extent of providing (through the tax amortization device) over two billion dollars of interest-free loans to the private utilities for the construction of new capacity. Certainly the need for power in this area, where the percentage of national defense loads is higher than in any other area of the country, is just as urgent and the responsibility of the government is greater.

Common business sense supports the committee's recommendation. We believe it is more sound to use money at hand rather than make new appropriations. The power units which are involved are all in existing plants, and much of the investment in general facilities required for their operation, such as rail connections, coalyards, and coal handling equipment, and smokestacks, has already been made in connection with the installation of earlier units. The new generating capacity can therefore be installed at low unit cost. It constitutes economical additions to the TVA system which is owned by the United States to provide power urgently needed. It will preserve and enhance the investment which the Federal Government has already made.

No new arguments or novel considerations have been raised in consideration of the estimate before the committee. The committee reaffirms its judgment, and believes that TVA should use its revenues to the extent they are available to add units at existing plants to meet the power requirements of its service area.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Members, I am including at this point the minority views on the Tennessee Valley Authority matter:

MINORITY VIEWS

The members of the Subcommittee on Public Works who sign this minority report disagree with the action and vote of the majority on the request of the Tennessee Valley Authority for funds with which to build an additional generating unit at the John Sevier plant.

There were four possible answers to that request:

(1) To agree and to appropriate $3,500,000 in new money to start construction on this unit. It must be understood this was only the request of the moment. The total needed is $28 million.

The idea of voting new money to TVA was refused by the subcommittee. The Congress in the past few years has refused more than once to appropriate new money for steamplants or additional units to existing steamplants.

It should be noted that there is still grave doubt in the minds of able lawyers and of Members of the Congress whether there was actually any constitutional authority for the TVA to build steamplants at any time. Since this is a technical legal question, not to be discussed in this minority report, it should definitely be considered by the Congress with the thought of giving authority to take the question to the Supreme Court of the United States. Certainly no more money should be voted to the TVA to build steamplants or additional units until the question is resolved.

(2) To take the money from its own funds without further approval by the Congress and build the additional unit, or any other structures in the future. This was the recommendation of the subcommittee's majority. We disagree. It is the line of reasoning expressed in the opinion rendered to the TVA Directors on September 10, 1955, by the TVA Counsel, Joseph C. Swidler, which, in our opinion, controverts itself. Counsel says, for example:

"This language [meaning section 26 of the TVA Act of 1933, as amended], standing alone, is broad enough to authorize use of proceeds for construction of any type of power installations, including steamplants and single-purpose power dams, as well as individual generating units and transmission facilities."

The catch words are, of course, "standing alone." The point is that section 26 of the TVA Act does not "stand alone." It must be read not only with the remainder of the act, but also with all other congressional actions (particularly those subsequent to its passage) or limitations thereto.

The citations given by Mr. Swidler, to support his opinion, refer, without exception, to the use of power proceeds by TVA prior to the passage of limitations on such use. We refer particularly to section 104 of the Government Corporations Control Act, which was passed in 1945 and to which a limitation was added in 1948, reading as follows:

"None of the power revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for the construction of new power-producing projects (except for replacement purposes) unless and until approved by act of Congress."

Nothing could be clearer, to us, as to the intent of the Congress. However, counsel for TVA offers this interesting interpretation (says Mr. Swidler):

"In thus prohibiting the use of revenues for construction of 'new power-producing projects' without prior Congressional approval, Congress clearly intended that the prohibition should apply only to new steam plants and single-purpose power dams, and not to generating units in existing plants or to transmission facilities."

We challenge the use of the word "clearly." To us, the language is a definite prohibition, and if it is to be reinterpreted for the benefit of the TVA, this should not be by TVA's own counsel alone, but either by the Congress or the courts, or perhaps by both, as we have indicated above.

This opinion and interpretation have already been challenged in the Congress, in part by Members sympathetic to the Tennessee Valley Authority. We suggest the reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 8, pages 10400 and 10402; also of the RECORD, volume 100, part 8, pages 10490 and 10494; and of the RECORD, volume 101, part 10, page 12889.

It would be well, in view of the present request for new money, and the ensuing discussion, for all Members of Congress to reread the testimony of the then TVA Directors in 1935, in which the witnesses testified to the intent of TVA policy and their own opinions as to TVA's obligations. For example, Mr. David Lilienthal testified, regarding the way TVA would set the power rates:

"These rates are based on certain principles, and the first principle is that the consumers of electricity must pay all the operating cost of furnishing that electricity, without any contribution whatever from taxpayers.

"Second, that consumers of electricity, the people who pay the rates, shall pay taxes, through the rates, which, of course, is the way all utility operations pay taxes equivalent to the national average of taxes, local, State, and Federal, paid by private-owned utilities. Municipalities which purchase power from the Tennessee Valley Authority plant at the Wilson Dam and resell it in turn, at retail to their citizens also pay taxes, as required by their contract with the Authority, and those taxes are also equivalent to the

amount a private utility would pay, a private utility in that community.

"Third, depreciation and amortization are provided for, both by TVA and by the municipalities. As to TVA, the rates charged include a margin to offset depreciation from year to year, so that in the course of years there is a reserve adequate to rebuild the plant as a new plant; and there is also a surplus which, if Congress so desires, can be used to pay back into the Treasury not only the present value of this depreciated wartime property, but also every penny of the original investment put into the property in order to defend this country against its enemies.

"Fourth: Interest is charged."

Dr. A. E. Morgan, the first TVA chairman, expressed his opinion of TVA power operations and rates in these words:

"They must be fair, with no special arbitrary advantage; they must pay taxes, just as private utility companies must do, and every other reasonable charge if they are to provide us with a fair comparison."

He refers of course to the "yardstick" theory, so often advanced by TVA and its supporters. We hardly need add that any resemblance of present TVA policies, including the current request for an appropriation to build the John Sevier unit, to the original testimonies on the basis of which the TVA Act was passed, is entirely coincidental.

(3) To permit the TVA to issue its own revenue bonds, to cover the $28 million it estimates it needs for this unit. Whatever icing may be spread over this proposal, it means essentially that these bonds, directly or indirectly, now or in the future, will be obligations of the United States Government, just as surely as if we had approved the original request for new money and then gone out and secured that money by borrowing it (with interest) or by taxing the people of the 48 States for it. This has been so often refused in recent years by the Congress that to propose it now, somewhat disguised, seems to us to be completely out of order.

Whether or not the TVA shall be permitted to set itself up as an independent agency, or utility, furnishing power in a designated area, paying local, State, and equivalent Federal taxes and interest, underwriting its operations from its own income, adjusting its rates to meet its needs under such incorporation, borrowing money to expand or place its facilities, is a matter now before the proper legislative committees in this Congress. Certainly, if the TVA is to be given the right to its independence and to operate as any power utility operates, then it might properly have the authority to issue bonds. In that case, however, they would not be bonds of the United States, adding to our already topheavy national debt; they would be bonds of a utility corporation, not of the autocratic power empire envisioned in the opinion of the TVA counsel and other TVA proponents. Such bonds would be sold to the public as the bonds of any power utility are marketed. This is a reasonable suggestion; any idea that we should permit the TVA, an agency of our United States Government, to issue revenue bonds which would become contingent obligations of the United States, is unthinkable.

If the TVA desires independence, let it separate its power functions from its other functions, if necessary, and then issue bonds for its entire power construction debt in the past. It would, by such a bond issue, with repayments determined, and on which it would pay interest, assume the financial responsibility for all money already advanced by the Treasury (or in other words by the taxpayers, the great majority of whom in no way benefit from this expenditure); pay normal interest thereon, and secure complete independence, with the pride and integrity which accompanies independence.

The responsibility to recommend that such authority be given the TVA lies with a legislative committee, not with the Committee on Appropriations.

(4) The proper choice, in our opinion, is to follow the course already adopted by Memphis, the first of the captive municipalities to take itself out from under TVA bondage. This statement is made advisedly; under TVA contracts, no other power may be bought in its area, nor can a distributor provide power from its own or any other source, without TVA permission. Even the rates charged its customers, by the distributors of TVA power, may be set only with the approval of the TVA. Memphis has proved that this choice is feasible; it should be followed by other distributors in the TVA area.

The request of the TVA, for money to build an additional unit at the John Sevier plant, should simply be denied.

It must be understood that this in no way denies TVA any power for legitimate uses. The United States has first call on its power for its needs. TVA can, in case of emergency, secure power from the surrounding utilities, all of which are now tied in with the TVA grid. The TVA has bought such power in the past.

Actually, the immediate request is for a unit which would produce approximately 180,000 kilowatts of power. One private industry in Tennessee alone is currently asking for 235,000 kilowatts, for expansion, yet this industry, by name, announced through the press 3 months ago, that it intended and was fully prepared to build a plant for itself to supply the needed power. It was "enticed" (to quote the newspaper reports) to change its plans and expand in the TVA area, with the Federal Government expected to pay for the plant for added power.

Certainly, whatever else may be argued about the intent of Congress in 1933, there must be unanimous agreement that Congress never contemplated an authorization to entice industries into the TVA area, by offering power, sold at subsidized rates, and produced in steam plants. TVA itself, in the answer filed in the 18 company suit, January 8, 1937, implied it had no such authority and denied any such intent.

None of the requested additional power, therefore is to be used for national defense, nor for the needs of the Federal Government; this is an effort to draw industries into the TVA area, at the expense of the taxpayers of the other States where local, State, and Federal taxes are paid on power revenues.

We believe the request should be denied by the Congress.

GLENN R. DAVIS.
BEN F. JENSEN.
JOHN PHILLIPS.
T. MILLET HAND.
JOHN TABER.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, those of us who take exception to the use of $3½ million of TVA revenues to initiate construction of a new steam-generating plant are placed in a most frustrating position. There is no language in the bill which we can seek to delete, or to which we can seek to add a limitation. The use of the $3½ million is authorized by the language of the majority committee report, which is not subject to amendment, under the rules of the House, on the floor.

We believe that TVA, as a creature of Congress, should be limited to the use of authority specifically granted by Congress.

This Government venture is simply not carrying its fair financial load, with the result that power users in other parts of the country are being unfairly discriminated against, and the public generally is carrying and extra tax burden.

Even now, the TVA area is greatly expanding its powerloads by the enticement of industry through promises of cheap power.

One wonders how long the people in other areas of the country are going to allow TVA to entice industry to the valley through subsidized low electric rates all the while TVA officials deny luring industry into the area, the Reynolds case being the latest of the series.

Representative WOLVERTON—page 818 of the joint committee investigation of TVA in 1938—asked Mr. Lilienthal:

As a matter of fact, do you seek to promote business for TVA by bringing other industries to the valley?

To which Mr. Lilienthal replied:

No; we do not.

Later at the same hearing—page 1163—Mr. Blandford said:

But the answer is positively "No," that the Authority does not engage in solicitation of industries from other parts of the country.

How Mr. Lilienthal and Mr. Blandford justified such statements is difficult to understand when Mr. Lilienthal 4 years earlier had this to say at Chattanooga on April 21, 1934:

I am very definitely of the opinion that it is the Authority's duty to encourage and stimulate the growth of large-scale industry in the Tennessee Valley area. We are making provision for one of the largest hydroelectric developments in the world, with a potential of 3 million horsepower available. We are expending, and expect to expend, millions upon millions of dollars in construction activities, all looking toward the development of more and more power. Although we are bending every effort to greatly increase the use of electricity in the home and on the farm, it is obvious that only a large-scale industrial expansion will absorb the great pool of power which is thus being created. As we lay our plans for developing this cheap power in great quantities, it seems to me to be mandatory that we also lay plans for utilizing it in an industrial expansion program.

And at Birmingham, Ala., on October 31, 1934, he said:

But industries don't set themselves up in a region automatically. There must be some organizing force, with technical and research facilities. We believe it is appropriate that some of this technical and research work should be undertaken by the Tennessee Valley Authority as an agency of all the people. (From p. 419, House Military Affairs Committee hearings on TVA, 1935.)

Perhaps TVA itself is not directly engaged in open and aboveboard publicity and advertising for new industrial expansion in the Tennessee Valley area. But just where does enticing begin? If TVA because of its subsidized Federal tax and interest-free power can and does offer rates lower than an investor-owned utility can meet—who has to provide for interest and Federal taxes—what is that but an enticement?

Again, are not the captive TVA distributors of TVA power in effect agents of TVA and therefore a responsibility of TVA? These distributors actively advertise and promote industrial expan-

sion in the areas they serve with low-cost power as one of their main attractions. The Tennessee Industrial and Agricultural Development Commission located in Nashville, Tenn., has currently under way an advertising campaign to entice manufacturers to move to Tennessee. The following item is one of the reasons set forth in their brochure on the subject:

ABUNDANT LOW-COST POWER

Low-cost electric power is sold at standard rates throughout the State. Most of Tennessee is supplied with electricity from the vast TVA system of dams and steam plants, the largest integrated power system in the United States. Over the next 2 years, some 2½ billion kilowatts will be available in the TVA region for industrial development. Generally, TVA power rates are 30 to 45 percent below the national average. For example, certain industrial consumers in Tennessee pay only 6.03 mills per kilowatt-hour on a monthly consumption of 400,000 kilowatt-hours—1,000-kilowatt demand. A recent study for a small northern manufacturer revealed that his annual power bill of $16,128 could be reduced to approximately $8,000 in Tennessee.

Of course the copywriter was a little optimistic in thinking the rest of the country is going to provide 2½ billion kilowatts of power for industrial expansion in the TVA area in the next 2 years. Nevertheless the general idea is there that the TVA source of power is unlimited and northern manufacturers are invited to move to the TVA area.

Now comes the Reynolds Metals Co.'s recent announcement that the TVA has contracted to supply up to 225,000 kilowatts for a new aluminum plant at Listerhill, Ala., adjacent to which the Ford Co. will build a foundry. This at a time when TVA was curtailing power to existing aluminum electrochemical plants.

Yet on August 3, 1955, the press reported that Reynolds had announced the planned expansion would be made in northwestern Kentucky and that the company would construct its own 300,000-kilowatt steam plant near company-owned coal deposits to provide the needed power.

According to reliable reports Reynolds also was considering locating the new aluminum plant in northeastern Ohio or western West Virginia. Information obtained from the investor-owned utility serving the West Virginia site discloses that that company had proposed furnishing the Reynolds power requirements at a rate under 4½ mills per kilowatt-hour. Adding a Federal tax—equivalent to the rate paid by private utilities—to the TVA rate to Reynolds would result in the TVA rate being nearly 10 percent above the rate offered by the investor-owned utility. The tax subsidy amounts to about $1 billion annually.

One wonders what will be the reaction of the businessmen, labor, and the Members of Congress from the districts that Reynolds was considering as potential locations before TVA made its low subsidized rate proposal, a proposal made with the knowledge that TVA could not serve the load from existing plants.

I do not see how any Member of Congress, regardless of the section of the country he represents, or regardless of party, can condone the evasion of the law by TVA. In commiting funds for an additional steam generating unit at the John Sevier plant after the Senate refused to approve the use of power revenues for the purpose, TVA has figuratively thumbed its nose at Congress. This deliberate affront to Congress cannot be tolerated.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] such time as he may require.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the issue we face today is one of congressional responsibility toward an agency of Congress' own creation, the Tennessee Valley Authority.

It seems to me that the Committee on Appropriations has provided opportunity for particularly painless exercise of that responsibility. We are confronted with no question of appropriations for TVA, no question of a new dam or steam plant, no question of geographical expansion. It is simply a matter of providing for the necessary new generating capacity for TVA, and doing so without appropriating a nickel from the Federal Treasury.

If I correctly remember the debates on TVA that I have taken part in during my 10 years in this House, the loudest complaints always have come over the matter of appropriating funds for the TVA power system. If those who have consistently opposed TVA appropriations as a burden on the American taxpayer are now proposing to shut off this alternative source of funds—a source of funds used in all normal business procedure and not affecting the level of Federal expenditures, except to reduce that level—then we must ask if they actually wish to have the congressional responsibility carried out or are merely looking for another way to destroy TVA.

This bill carries no money for TVA. In fact, it eliminates the $3.5 million requested for TVA in the budget estimate.

The committee report affirms TVA's right and authority to use its own power revenues, to the extent available, to add power-generating units at existing plants in order to meet the power requirements of its service area.

In this respect the Committee on Appropriations is simply permitting TVA the same growth that every other utility system in the country in enjoying. It recognizes that industrial development and economic growth in the Tennessee Valley should not be treated any differently than industrial development and economic growth in the other regions of the United States. The committee recognizes that TVA, as a publicly owned development, is a sound national investment, and that this investment will be preserved and enhanced with additional capacity available to provide urgently needed power.

Use of TVA power revenues to begin construction of this additional generating capacity will not impair the pay-back of appropriated funds as required of TVA under the Government Corporations Appropriation Act of 1948. TVA is 46 percent ahead of the repayment schedule established in that act. The subcommittee hearings brought out the fact that through June 30, 1955, TVA had made payments totaling $127.5 million. Equal annual payments through the same period would have required only $87.6 million. The minimum repayment schedule would have required a repayment of only $28 million by that time.

By the end of the current fiscal year TVA will have repaid $186.5 million, which is $155 million more than is required and over $70 million more than might normally be expected. By the end of this fiscal year—in about 3 months from now—TVA will have paid back more money than the average schedule requires through 1958.

The $3.5 million requested for TVA, which was eliminated by the Committee on Appropriations, would have been used to start construction of an additional unit at an already existing plant. The committee simply concluded that TVA has sufficient funds out of its power revenues to do such work, and reaffirmed TVA's authority to do so.

I suggest that my colleagues not be confused by efforts to raise questions about the legality or constitutionality of TVA steam plants. There have been vague suggestions that we ought to have a court test of the constitutionality of TVA steam plants. The fact is that the court test has already been had; a three-judge Federal court in the Rainbow Realty case sustained the constitutionality of TVA steam plants 2 years ago. I might say that in that respect the court agrees with the Congress, which over the years has approved eight large steam plants.

Nor should any of us be confused by the questioning of TVA's right to use power revenues for this purpose. As the committee report states:

The question of TVA's statutory authority to use power proceeds for the construction of new power generating units is not novel. The TVA Act has been so interpreted from the beginning, and Congress has known and accepted this interpretation, and has indeed welcomed the reduction in the amount of appropriation which would otherwise have been requested. Over the years 10 generating units in existing projects have been begun with earnings from the power system and all but 2 have been completed out of earnings. Two of these units at Wheeler Dam were begun after the addition of the language in the 1948 Appropriation Act so frequently referred to. A reading of the full congressional debate at the time this provision was enacted, quoted in the opinion of TVA's General Counsel in the hearings, can leave no doubt that Congress did not intend to restrict the use of revenues for new units at existing projects, such as are involved here, but only to limit the commencement of construction of new projects out of earnings.

The minority views printed in the committee report contain an allegation to which I address myself at this point. The minority claims that this new generating capacity would not be needed if TVA had not enticed a private industry in Tennessee to expand its aluminum producing facilities in the TVA area. I assume the minority is referring to the Reynolds Metals Co.—which, incidentally, is in Alabama, not Tennessee—since Reynolds was the subject of discussion in the subcommittee hearings as revealed in the printed record.

The facts in the Reynolds matter are these: Reynolds Metals Co. has been producing aluminum in the Tennessee Valley since 1941. It has contributed much to the strength of our national defense and to the economic progress of the Tennessee Valley, and it in turn has prospered. Last year Reynolds announced a proposed expansion of its aluminum production program. In connection with this, TVA was approached by Reynolds in November of 1955. Reynolds tentatively planned to locate a new aluminum plant near Henderson, Ky., which is situated on the Ohio River, and to build its own powerplant. Its discussion with TVA at that time was on the question whether the proposed Reynolds powerplant could be interconnected with the TVA system.

Soon after this initial discussion, Reynolds informed TVA that it had changed its plans, that it had decided to purchase its electricity instead of construct its own powerplant. Among proposed sites Reynolds discussed were 3 in Kentucky—2 within the TVA power service area and 1 at Henderson, outside the TVA power service area. TVA could not, of course, make a proposal for supplying power to the Henderson site since it is outside TVA's service area. With respect to the other 2, TVA informed Reynolds it would make a proposal once Reynolds decided which of the sites it favored.

That was the situation when, in January of this year, Reynolds came back to TVA and notified the Authority that it had again changed its plans. Because of the sizable economies involved, it had decided to expand its 15-year-old facilities in Colbert County, Alabama, rather than locate a new plant elsewhere.

Reynolds' requirements at its new plant are 235,000 kilowatts, which TVA proposes to furnish at approximately 4.25 mills per kilowatt-hour.

These facts disprove the claim that TVA enticed the new Reynolds plant into the TVA area and away from the Ohio Valley.

The Ohio Valley is doing remarkably well industrially, and particularly well in the matter of new aluminum production. Of course, those of us who believe in progress for all in an expanding national economy are happy to hear of this.

Last December the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., announced plans to build a $120 million aluminum reduction plant at Ravenswood, W. Va., on the Ohio River. Within the following month the Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. announced plans to build an aluminum plant on the Ohio near Clarington, Ohio, also at a cost of $120 million. So here is $240 million worth of aluminum production facilities going into the great Ohio Valley.

These two companies, according to the New York Times of February 26, 1956, have contracted for power supply with the Ohio Power Co., a subsidiary of American Gas & Electric, of which Mr. Philip Sporn is president. According to the Times this power will be made available "at about 4 mills a kilowatt-hour."

It is extremely interesting to note that just since last November Ohio Power Co. has received $56.8 million worth of accelerated tax amortization certificates for new power-generating capacity at two locations only a few miles from the sites of the new aluminum plants. According to the Federal Power Commission these tax amortizations are equivalent to interest-free loans, which in this particular case total $25 million. The total benefit to the Ohio Power Co. over a 33⅓-year period amounts to $85 million.

It could be said, therefore, that expansion of the aluminum industry in the Ohio Valley is being accomplished by means of an $85 million subsidy from the American taxpayer to the Ohio Power Co.

TVA, of course, cannot participate in this subsidy program of the Office of Defense Mobilization. It cannot avoid meeting its financial obligations to the Treasury, nor does it care to. On the contrary, it is meeting its obligations 46 percent ahead of schedule, as I have shown. Moreover, when capacity expansion is handled through use of power revenues, there is a double benefit: First, the investment is enhanced; and, second, additional investor funds are unnecessary.

The new Reynolds load is representative of the increasing power demand in the Tennessee Valley occasioned by industrial development and economic growth. TVA must take account of this increasing demand in planning its future. It must have the power on the line when it is needed. Whether the increased demand comes in one 235,000-kilowatt chunk such as the Reynolds load, or in chunks of 10, 15, or 20 smaller loads, the demand is there and TVA must meet it.

Surely the Congress is not going to put a ceiling on economic growth in the Tennessee Valley any more than it would put a ceiling on any other region of the country.

Surely the Congress is not going to tell American industry it cannot locate in the Tennessee Valley.

Surely the Congress will act responsibly, and accept this opportunity to support an agency of its own creation and without a cent of appropriation being necessary.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to point out to the committee how to balance the budget. Last year, this House and this Congress refused the request of the President and of the Department of Defense to cut the United States Marine Corps 15,000 men. At that time the Secretary of Defense withdrew a battalion of Marines from the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean to save dollars and in the name of economy. Today that battalion went back on transports to join the Sixth Fleet. Now, the Congress of the United States rejected the demand that the Marine Corps be cut. The Secretary of Defense, however, 10 minutes after the Congress adjourned sine die issued a statement that regardless of what the Congress said he was going to cut the Marine Corps 15,000 men—and, Mr. Chairman, he cut it—15,000 men; period. This year, when he appeared before the appropriation defense subcommittee, I brought up this problem. I asked him: "Did you consult the President about this?" He said, "No." I asked him: "Did you inquire of the Attorney General as to your constitutional rights under the circumstances?" He said, "No."

I asked him, "Did you bother to consult the General Counsel for the Department of Defense?" He said, "No."

I asked him, "Did you find it worthwhile or did you think you had occasion to consult anybody before you vetoed an act of Congress?" He said to me that he did not think it was necessary.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Office of Secretary of Defense is a Frankenstein created by the Congress, and that is just retribution for our conduct.

Now let me tell you what happened. Here is the way the budget was out of balance by over $10 million the day it was announced as balanced, because now, Mr. Chairman, let me read to you the request in this supplemental bill:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY FUNCTIONS

Office of the Secretary of Defense: "Salaries and expenses," $769,000.

Where is he going to get it? A budget request? Oh, no.

To be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, United States Marine Corps."

That is the way to balance the budget. What further?

"Office of Public Affairs," Department of Defense, $27,500.

A request for a budget grant? Oh, no.

To be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps."

What else?

Interservice activities: "Court of Military Appeals," $41,400."

A budget request for money? Oh, no.

To be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps."

What else?

Department of the Navy: "Servicewide supply and finance," $7,400,000.

A request for money? Oh, no.

To be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps."

"Servicewide operations," $2,180,000.

A request for money? Oh, no. Here is the way to balance the budget:

To be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps."

Now, Mr. Chairman, if and when the situation arises that you reach that high estate of Secretary of Defense and it is incumbent upon you, for whatever reasons you have in mind, to balance the budget and to take advantage of whatever way you see wise in that great achievement, may I suggest you follow the established practice of the Department of Defense. Do not ask for money; transfer appropriations given by Congress to the United States Marine Corps.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I welcome the gentleman to the ranks of those who have been concerned and who have shown by our actions our desire to balance the budget, but the only thing lacking in his remarks is the fact that there is not one grain of sincerity in it.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not understand what the gentleman has in mind, because he has never established to me that he has practiced that standard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice objection to the committee report telling the TVA that it believes TVA should use its power revenues to the extent necessary for the construction of new generating units and recommending that TVA so use its revenues.

TVA does not have the legal authority to use its power revenues for constructing new generating units without coming to Congress for specific legislative approval. The Appropriation Committee therefore does not have the authority to tell TVA to use its power revenues for such purposes, hence, in effect, the committee action is null and void because a law cannot be amended by just saying so in a committee report.

Under section 26 of the original TVA Act, TVA did have the authority to use its power revenues to construct new generating units without coming to Congress for specific approval for such use. However there appears to have been some feeling in Congress in 1935 that the authority given to TVA was being misused. In 1935 after extended hearings the House passed H. R. 8623, a bill to amend the TVA Act.

Section 26 of this House bill would have required annual appropriation by the Congress of any TVA power revenues to be used by TVA for operation or for construction of power facilities.

The Senate version of amendments for the TVA Act left section 26 in substantially the original form in that it permitted use of TVA power revenues for new construction without specific approval of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I was chairman of the Government Corporations Subcommittee of Appropriations in 1947 when that committee wrote into the appropriation bill certain limitations on TVA and how and where it could spend its revenues. I am sure that every Member of this Congress recognizes and feels his responsibility to the highest degree, but on occasion in the desire to have one's way too often some things are forgotten that should be remembered. So I wish at this time to read an amendment to the basic TVA Act which was made law in 1947 and is still the law of the land. Here is the language. It is very simple and understandable, and regardless of what anyone says, nothing can be read into this language except exactly what it says and exactly what it means. It reads as follows:

None of the power revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for the construction of new power-producing projects (except for replacement purposes) unless and until approved by act of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, anyone can understand that language, and I do not care how they want to twist it around to fit their own wishes, that language speaks for itself.

I remember well when that language was written into the bill, the committee decided the thing to do was to see to it that the TVA came to the Congress of the United States whenever they wanted authority to spend any revenues unless for replacements, and the language says that and nothing but that. Now certainly a complete new power unit is not replacement for anything, by any stretch of the imagination.

We are the lawmakers of the United States of America. If we, the lawmakers, refuse to stand up and defend and uphold the laws that we ourselves make, then America will soon be in a terrible bad fix.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Did the gentleman ever hear before of a committee report being an act of Congress?

Mr. JENSEN. I certainly never have, and I sincerely hope this attempt to do so will be the last of that kind of business.

The legislative history of the present section 26 of the TVA act as amended and of the 1948 limitation on the expenditure of TVA power revenues makes it clear that TVA has the authority to use its power revenues for the construction of replacement power facilities but does not have the authority to use power revenues for the construction of new power producing facilities without the specific legislative approval of the Congress. One of TVA's own proponents in Congress expressed this interpretation in these words:

The TVA cannot start one single new power facility; it cannot put $1 of its income or any other funds into any new power facilty, except by and with the advice and direction of Congress. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 8, p. 10490.)

We often hear TVA and its proponents state or infer that if it had not been for TVA the atom bomb might not have been developed or the aluminum for the plane that dropped the first bomb might not have been produced. Actually, the Oak Ridge plant of AEC could have been placed at many locations in the country where power was available. Also AEC constructed their own steam plant of 260,000-kilowatt capacity. TVA furnished a peak supply to AEC of 98,200 kilowatts in fiscal year 1944 and 273,800 kilowatts in 1945. The maximum was less than one-half of 1 percent of the total generating capacity of the utility industry, and just a little over one-fourth of the TVA capacity now being used for house heating in the TVA area. With regard to aluminum production, in 1939 the TVA area had 50 percent of the Nation's aluminum productive capacity, served in major part by the aluminum company's own powerplants. By 1943 the TVA area was down to 19 percent of the Nation's productive capacity for aluminum. With TVA power supplying only part of 19 percent of aluminum capacity one wonders how TVA can claim preeminence in aluminum production.

Last year we heard testimony about what a wonderful record TVA had with its steam plants. It seems strange that the Federal Power Commission records would not list any TVA steam electric generating plant among the first 18 most efficient steam electric plants in the country. Of course, this is in keeping with the usual TVA propaganda.

At the hearing on the TVA request for $3,500,000 to start construction of a new unit at the John Sevier steam plant I disclosed that TVA back in 1937 was trying to persuade the United States circuit court of appeals that it had a constitutional right to go into the power business by contending that such power operations only were incidental to navigation and flood control. The TVA statement to the court said that "The defendant Tennessee Valley Authority has disposed of and will dispose of only such electric energy as is generated from waterpower inevitably created by the operation of the said dams for navigation and flood control, and which is not needed for governmental purposes and which would otherwise be wasted"; and made other statements as to TVA authority and intent.

Of course we all know that TVA has not honored all their solemn statements made to the high United States court. The record since then leaves little alternative than to believe there was a deliberate attempt to deceive the court as to TVA's intentions. The record shows that 2 years earlier the TVA legal staff in preparing for the lawsuits then besetting TVA had a conference with the engineers on the question of what should and should not be said in engineering reports with reference to the power situation and the economic aspects of any water-control program which the Tennessee Valley Authority develops.

TVA officials had gone over a copy of the preliminary report on the proposed development of the Hiwassee River, indicating in pencil numerous deletions, changes, and qualifications which should be made in this report to avoid any implications of questionable or unconstitutional activities, with the thought in mind that a copy of one of these reports might be subpenaed, or by other means get into the hands of the opponents of the Tennessee Valley Authority; and that this report, even as written, with considerable care to avoid such questions, raises many doubts as to the planning of our approach in the whole matter of planning.

Among the suggestions reported to have been made by the TVA Legal Division were the following:

Tone down system power studies and avoid intimating that Tennessee Valley Authority has any power program * * *.

Put all recommendations on a hypothetical basis and draw no conclusion as to whether they should be developed by the Tennessee Valley Authority or by other agencies. Make no specific recommendation for the development of a stream or a project, but rather

carry the idea all the way through the report that it is just a possible scheme, without recommendation that it is the one to be considered.

Avoid any allocation of costs specifically to navigation, flood control, and power. No attempt should be made to allocate these costs in order to calculate the cost of generating power, but in event something must be said on this subject, to make the assumption that the dams, locks, reservoirs, and all appurtenances should arbitrarily be charged against navigation and flood control, and only the cost of power structures and generating equipment should be charged against power.

You may ask what this has to do with the present question on the TVA request for funds to continue the expansion of its power empire. It is to give Congress and the people just a small part of the long record of misrepresentation and subterfuge on the part of TVA in its expansion from the small navigation and flood-control development with incidental power that Congress was told would not cost more than $150 million, into the present $2 billion electric power empire.

Are we to set idly by while members of the same TVA legal staff, who told the TVA engineers not to admit that TVA had a power program, advise the TVA directors to figuratively thumb their noses at the Congress by spending the power revenues to construct new generating units without the approval of Congress, after Congress had specifically refused to approve such use.

It is too bad that Congress and the people of the Nation cannot have the whole record of TVA from its inception to the present. Reading the TVA annual reports and the almost limitless TVA publicity releases one would think TVA a haven of virtue and accomplishment. However the record gives quite a different story:

Flood control by permanently flooding out hundreds of thousands of acres of the most production lands of the Tennessee River Valley.

Pioneering of rural electrification by lagging behind the national average for more than 16 years, 3 out of 4 farms without running water, and farm use of electric energy below the national average even with the subsidized low power rate.

Distributors of TVA power operating in the red and with per customer average power use below the national average even under the subsidized low power rates.

Economic development that has not kept pace with economic and industrial development of other section of the South.

Unparalleled unified operation of a whole river basin which left several TVA reservoirs almost dry and which could not have happened under proper operation for navigation and flood control. The press has carried numerous stories and pictures of dry lakes.

A coal purchase policy that resulted in coal reserves for over 3 million kilowatts of TVA steam generating plant capacity being down to 12 to 16 days' supply. This has been characterized as criminal negligence. Normal utility practice is to carry 90 to 120 days' supply of coal on hand.

These and other records of TVA operations and results do not justify nor substantiate the many TVA claims of accomplishment.

It seems that the time long has passed to require the TVA to meet some of the many claims it has made in the past. TVA said its power rates were to be a yardstick, and would provide for interest at 3½ percent on the power investment, local, State, and Federal taxes equivalent to the rate paid by taxpaying utilities, depreciation, all operating expenses, and would amortize all the TVA investment.

Is there any valid reason why the TVA area should not pay their fair share of Federal taxes; why they should not pay the interest cost to the taxpayers on the funds advanced to TVA; why they should not provide for all, not just a part of the legitimate costs of doing business just like other utilities? Is there any valid reason why the area in which this Federal electric power empire can operate should not be prescribed? I think not and I am sure a majority of our people also think not.

TVA has relegated Congress to a back seat when it comes to control over the spending of taxpayers' money for power expansion.

On July 1, 1955, the Senate Appropriations Committee, by a decisive vote of 13 to 10, told TVA that it could not use its power proceeds for expansion purposes without congressional approval before the fact.

In spite of this clear directive, TVA has gone ahead and obligated Federal funds by issuing letters of intent covering the acquisition of major equipment for a fourth generating unit at its John Sevier plant. In clear defiance of Congress, it has stated openly that it believes it has the authority to expend its power revenues for this purpose without prior approval by Congress.

The history of the John Sevier steam plant is a case in point. On September 13, 1955, without coming to Congress for approval, TVA issued letters of intent covering the acquisition of major equipment for this plant. Some 5 months later, on February 8, 1956, Congress was notified of TVA's independent action when the Budget Bureau submitted its request for supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1956. Included among these requests was one from TVA for an initial appropriation of $3.5 million to start construction work on a $28 million addition to the John Sevier plant.

TVA has thus put Congress in a box. If Congress now denies TVA's request, the Government, under the letters of intent TVA has issued, is liable for a major share of whatever costs have accrued in the 6-month period since these letters were issued. On the other hand, if Congress goes along with TVA's use of power revenues in this instance, it gives its tacit approval to the "act-first-get-permission-later" theory under which TVA has operated. In short, TVA has already made up Congress' mind that money shall be spent at John Sevier.

This current action by TVA reveals a shocking disregard for congressional authority. It indicates that Congress must tighten its control over TVA.

Clearly, the time has come to make certain that TVA's future actions are dependent upon the will of the Congress, rather than making congressional action dependent upon a condition of TVA liking and then submit it to the Congress, requesting the Congress to approve questionable actions on the part of the TVA.

HOW TO SELL SOMETHING YOU HAVEN'T GOT

Without question, the TVA area needs more power. Like every other section of the country, power demands in the area served by the Tennessee Valley Authority have grown by leaps and bounds in the past decade.

But, unlike other areas, Tennessee is compounding its power-shortage problems by stressing the ready availability of cheap electricity in its current, aggressive promotion campaign designed to attract new industry to the State.

For example, the New York Times for January 22, 1956, carried an advertisement of the Tennessee Industrial and Agricultural Commission with the bold type headline "Industrial Power as Low as 6.03 Mills Per Kilowatt-Hour." And a booklet put out by the Commission boasts:

Over the next 2 years some 2½ billion kilowatts will be available in the TVA region for industrial development. Generally, TVA power rates are 30 percent to 45 percent below the national average. * * * A recent study for a small northern manufacturer revealed that his annual power bill of $16,128 could be reduced to approximately $8,000 in Tennessee.

Thus we have the curious picture of an area, already caught in the pinch of a power shortage, yet actively engaged in luring still more large-scale users of power to the area. In effect, Tennessee is selling something it has not got—worse, is getting away with it.

The point is, of course, that if industry reacts favorably and locates in Tennessee, the resultant greatly aggravated power shortage can then be used as justification for increased Federal expenditures for the construction of additional powerplants. When these are built, the power they produce can be used as the basis for luring still more industry. This, in turn, will create new shortages which will be used as the excuse for building more generating plants. Once set in motion, this cycle can be repeated over and over again from now on at your expense Mr. Taxpayer.

These tactics might be condoned—and even admired as an excellent example of "gamesmanship"—were it not for one vital fact. And that fact is that TVA has no responsibility under law for serving industrial customers. Its only function, under the authority granted it by Congress, is to make its surplus power available to its preferred customers—the municipalities, REA cooperative and federal agencies in the TVA area. Industrial firms are not "preference customers"—in spite of the fact that they buy their power from TVA at a rate 20 percent less than that paid by the preference customers who are supposed to have first claim to TVA power.

Last year, for example—according to TVA's annual report for fiscal 1955—slightly more than 6 billion kilowatt-hours of TVA electricity was sold to these private industrial firms. This amounts to 14 percent of TVA's total power production for the period. In view of the admitted power shortage in the area, it seems fair to wonder why TVA has not taken the obvious step of canceling its contracts with these nonpreference customers and letting them supply their own power needs either by purchase from companies outside the TVA area or by construction of their own powerplants. This simple—and justifiable—step would amount to increasing TVA's present power capacity by 14 percent without expending another cent of taxpayers' money for a new plant or an additional generator.

In short, in this instance, TVA might well heed the word of the late Senator George W. Norris—the father of TVA—who once said:

> My own idea would be (that) before we would permit electricity to be used by Mr. Ford to make automobiles, it ought to be given to the people to light their homes, to cook their meals, to run their washing machines, at the lowest possible price. That comes nearer to giving it to everybody, because if you give it to one man to manufacture with, and he is in competition with a man who does not have that power, all he does is to just cut under the other fellow enough to sell his product, and he makes a big profit himself.[1]

If TVA could only bring itself to follow this advice—if it could only bear the thought of limiting its responsibilities to those outlined in existing legislation—it could do much to solve its own problems. For, as we have seen, the power shortage of the TVA area is largely self imposed: first, by the insistence of TVA on discharging a utility responsibility to nonpreference industrial firms; second, by the activity of Tennessee in using the lure of cheap power to draw even more nonpreference, large-scale users into the area from other sections of the country.

Instead of taking the obvious and logical steps, TVA has stubbornly refused to consider any other solution to the area's power shortage problem except that of continued expansion at the continued expense of the United States taxpayer.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my thanks to the gentlemen on the majority and minority sides for their liberal offer of time. I can assure you I will not consume the full 7 minutes which have been allotted me.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to alert my colleagues in the House to a situation that is unusual indeed in this legislation. I refer to the item there where you are proposing to appropriate $3½ million to the Atomic Energy Commission and then by provision in your committee report attempt to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to use its surplus earnings in the construction of added facilities to produce power in the Tennessee Valley. Let me say that this is a dangerous procedure; it is a very, very grave departure from the ordinary legislative procedures to attempt to do that and not put it definitely into legislation of some kind or to increase that item in the appropriation bill to the amount necessary to build this steam plant that the Tennessee Valley Authority is asking the privilege to build.

Let us see what is back of all of this. West Virginia, as you will recall, is the largest bituminous coal-producing State in the Union. We are vitally interested. We are interested, of course, in the construction of a steam plant, but let me say to you that this authority as I read it in the report does not confine itself to the construction of steam-plant facilities, it is not confined to this one project. It is giving authority to the Tennessee Valley Authority to build any type of structure it wants to build. It could even tap the Big Inch pipeline which runs from Texas to the East, pipe gas over there and produce electricity with this cheap gas from Texas. They could build additional hydroelectric plants out of their earnings.

As I remember it, they turned back last year unused about $72 million of their earnings into the Treasury of the United States. If you are going to give them authority, let us confine it to this one particular project and not give them blanket authority to proceed to build any type of structure they want to build with no limit on time in which they might do this. They might continue for years. Unless the Congress took direct action they might continue for years to use every cent of that $70 million a year earnings for plant expansion. It ought to be confined to the one particular plant in question that is involved in the appropriation of $3½ million which everybody knows will not be sufficient to build this facility.

West Virginia, as I said before, is interested, its coal operators are interested, the coal miners of West Virginia are interested. Let me tell you just what is going on. The State of West Virginia lost a tremendously big plant of the Reynolds Metals Co. within the past 10 days or 2 weeks. Why? That plant is going to Alabama. The argument was that they could get electric power from the Tennessee Valley Authority cheaper than they could get it in West Virginia. Papers were all drawn up to locate that plant in West Virginia, but all of a sudden, by reason of a lower bid for power from the Tennessee Valley Authority, West Virginia lost this tremendous plant which would have consumed 2 million tons of coal annually.

We are, therefore, vitally interested. We want to build some steam plants because it furnishes a market for coal, but we do not want to give blanket authority to build any other type.

I am speaking for the 30 or 31 congressional districts that have a tremendous amount of coal production and are vitally interested in this legislation. We want no part of it. We will either vote to recommit your bill or vote against it on final passage unless that point in the committee report can be clarified, confirming it to this one particular project.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Does the gentleman know that the Kaiser Aluminum Co. is going to build a plant at Ravenswood, W. Va.?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly I know it, a $200 million or $216 million plant. One is practically completed, and they are building an additional one. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman from West Virginia stated, as I understood him to say, that the reason Reynolds gave for going to Muscle Shoals was the differential in power rates.

Mr. BAILEY. That is exactly right.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. On what authority does the gentleman tell the Committee that that was the deciding factor?

Mr. BAILEY. On the authority of the Appalachian Power Co., of West Virginia, who had the contract ready for the signature of the Reynolds Co., and they backed down at the last minute and said they were going to Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman means the same company that obtained a tax amortization for $36.6 million to construct its plant and given an interest-free loan in the amount of $16 million to build the plant?

Mr. BAILEY. I do not know the details. I assume the gentleman is talking about the Appalachian Power Co.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. That may be true. I am not discussing that angle of it at all.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. There is nothing involved here except the fourth unit at the John Sevier plant. The gentleman wanted to know if it was confined to this one thing. Yes, the budget estimate is confined to the one unit. There are three units in there, and this is the fourth unit at this plant.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the wording of the committee report tie it down to that? That is the point I am raising, exactly. It does not.

Mr. RABAUT. That is all that is in the estimate; just dealing with this one subject.

Mr. BAILEY. Then, the gentleman is telling me that you are not giving blanket authority to the TVA to use those funds in the future for other expansions? I would like to have that question answered.

Mr. RABAUT. The TVA is not to do what the gentleman is talking about. The President endorsed three new units to existing projects and recommended appropriations to initiate one unit immediately. The committee believes that if funds are available for units at existing projects, such funds should be used instead of Congress making appropriations. I might say that all units will use coal.

[1] Muscle Shoals, hearings before Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, 67th Congress, 2d sess., on S. 3420, p. 525.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct the attention of the committee to the section of the bill having to do with the Bureau of Land Management and especially to the section of the report on page 22. I believe that the committee inadvertently struck some funds out of the budget request which should be included in this bill. I am going to submit some facts to the committee with the thought in mind that if the chairman of the subcommittee and the members can agree with me, perhaps an amendment might be accepted or offered by the committee on the floor.

The paragraph in the report under the heading "Bureau of Land Management" states, under the subheading "Construction," that:

> The budget estimate of $2 million for accelerating the access road program in the Oregon and California land grant area has been disallowed.

Now, let me explain to the committee that in the States of Oregon and Washington is produced more than half of all of the lumber and wood products used in the United States. About half of it comes from the State of Oregon.

Again, about half of that comes from the O. and C. area which is owned by the United States Government. About 70 percent of all the raw material for the production of these products comes from land owned by the Federal Government so that any money appropriated here for the Bureau of Land Management or for the Forest Service, tending to accelerate, to manage properly and efficiently this land of the United States which produces revenue in the form of money from the sale of timber—any appropriation made for that purpose is not an expenditure; it is merely an amount of money used in management. In other words, the money is returned 10 for 1.

With reference to the $2 million for access roads, a rather unusual situation exists; and I believe the subcommittee may have overlooked it. That is, the $2 million which the budget requested to be appropriated is actually money which belongs to the counties in the O. and C. land-grant area. The counties in the State of Oregon in which this access road program is located, in which the O. and C. lands are located, are willing to have the Government's property increased in value by the creation of access roads through the use of $2 million which otherwise would be paid to the counties. The Congress in this case would be merely taking $2 million of county revenue and turning it over to the Bureau of Public Roads for the construction of access roads, $2 million which otherwise would go to the counties.

When the regular appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1957 was before the committee, the committee very wisely agreed to increase the appropriation for the acceleration of timber sales in the area. The bill as passed by the House included money for access roads, $4 million of the kind that I have just mentioned; money that belonged to the counties actually, but was put in the bill for the purpose of building access roads that I have mentioned.

Mr. Chairman, we are short of timber in this area which furnishes half of the lumber and other wood products of the United States. Most of the timber cut comes from Government land. If we continue to be short of timber, you know what will happen under the law of supply and demand. The price of lumber and other wood products inevitably must go up. There is being created in this instance a condition of scarcity by failing to provide money necessary to properly manage the lands which furnish the raw materials for the wood products, thereby cutting down the supply of those products and increasing the price to the consumer all over the United States.

When the committee accelerated the program for the fiscal year 1957, that was a very good move, very sound. But the fiscal year 1957 begins July 1, 1956. The lumber and logging business is a seasonal business. The months of May and June are exceedingly important in the harvesting of the forest crop owned by the United States. So the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Interior very reasonably came to the committee and said, "Let us step the program up according to the season. Let us have some money in a supplemental bill to get this entire program going and not only for all of fiscal 1957 but beginning in May of 1956."

So I am appealing to the Committee to understand these facts, and to do precisely in a supplemental bill what was done, what was approved by the House in the regular bill, and move the entire acceleration of the timber harvest, on the O. and C. lands in particular, up for the 2 months of May and June.

What I have said also applies to the item for the Forest Service wherein $200,000 was cut.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, when the committee came in with the regular bill it said that the bill provided more money than at any time in the history of this Nation for timber and for every other purpose in the bill. The sustained yield is 780 million feet, and the gentleman wants to put the cut up above that. Sooner or later, that is going to come back down and will be disastrous to the industry.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. It should be understood that the amount we harvest in the national forests and on the O. and C. land is definitely limited by what we call the allowable cut. What the Department of the Interior seeks to do, and the Forest Service, is to harvest from those lands up to the allowable cut. If we do less than that, then the timber less than the allowable cut is wasted.

Mr. KIRWAN. I think the allowable cut is 780 million feet, and is being overrun while getting out damaged timber. You want to put it up higher.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. We want to put it up to the point which will be permitted on the basis of a proper inventory.

Mr. KIRWAN. It is probably beyond that now because of salvage.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I do not have that figure. Does the gentleman refer to fiscal 1957, or the present date?

Mr. KIRWAN. At the present date and up to fiscal 1957, you want to put it up to 840 million board-feet. You will be coming in here in another year hollering, "Just look what we did."

Mr. ELLSWORTH. If the 840 is allowed on the basis of an up-to-date inventory that is the proper figure.

Mr. KIRWAN. Seven hundred and eighty is the sustained yield. If you go up to the other one you are going out of bounds. Then you are going to come back here in a couple of years and say we made a mistake. More money was given in the Interior Department bill for 1957 than at any other time. Had we given them $50 million they would be in for a supplement and put 394 men to work and get a running start on next year. If the committee was with them and gave them $50 million, they would say, "All right, come on with more money."

Mr. ELLSWORTH. After all, that is a perfectly logical and reasonable situation in the States of Oregon and Washington for the reason, that until quite recently the wood products industries were harvesting from lands owned by themselves under private ownership. That timber is virtually gone. Now the industry depends about 70 percent upon harvesting the crop of the national forests and O. and C. and the cut of Federal timber is increasing.

Mr. KIRWAN. That is what I said. When we doubled it for this next year we raised it $2,400,000 for access roads in there. We went out of bounds in giving you the money. Now you want to come along and get a running start at it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Natuarally we want to accelerate the operation to the sustained yield capacity of the land.

Mr. KIRWAN. You are up to that operation now. You want to go up beyond that.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. May I direct the gentleman's attention particularly to the $2-million item, which I am sure he understands is money that actually belongs to the counties.

Mr. KIRWAN. I understand that. It will go back to the counties.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes. They are very close to the situation. They understand exactly, much better than we do, what the situation is. They have said to the Department, to the Bureau of the Budget, and I guess to the committee, "We want you to take this money which is ours and which will go into our treasuries, and we would like to have you spend it on these roads because we need the employment, we need to keep the industry going." That is all we have asked.

Mr. KIRWAN. The appropriation for 1957 has been acted upon by the House. The net effect of allowing the supplemental funds would be to create a balance in the amounts provided for 1957 which would remain unobligated at the end of that fiscal year or be applied to construction program items of lower priority. Neither is considered necessary at this time.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I disagree with the statement in the report. When the gentleman refers to roads of less priority, I think that is reaching out for a phrase because these roads are planned and they are all on approximately the same priority.

I do urge that you give this matter some further consideration and agree to put in the $2 million.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. TABER. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service

Salaries and Expenses

For additional amounts for "Salaries and expenses," as follows:

"Research," $1,217,530;

"Plant and animal disease and pest control," $1,527,780, of which $500,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for the control of outbreaks of insects and plant diseases under the joint resolution approved May 9, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 148–148e), and the Act of August 13, 1954, (7 U. S. C. 148), to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions; and

"Meat inspection," $1,048,690.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to concur in the statements just made by my friend and colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

The Forest Service asked the committee for an additional $500,000 to process the sale of additional federally owned timber. The Budget Bureau approved this request. The Eisenhower administration wants Congress to approve this $500,000 for additional Forest Service timber sale processing.

Despite this the committee in this bill has cut the $500,000 amount requested to increase timber sales to $200,000. This reduction of $300,000 in the amount of money available to process more Federal forest timber for sale, in my opinion, was unwise and not good business.

When a piece of Federal timber is to be sold, an up-to-date cruise of the timber to be sold must be made. Then, the timber must be advertised for sale. After that, when the timber is cut by the successful bidder, Forest Service log scalers must scale the logs to make sure the Government receives from the logger all the money to which the Government is entitled. The doing of these things is called the processing. The cost of this processing timber for sale, experience reveals, averages $1 a thousand board feet.

The Government, however, receives an average of $13 a thousand board feet for the timber it sells. That is what the Government averaged, last year, on the sale of about 6½ billion feet of its Forest Service timber.

On the basis of these figures, whenever the Forest Service spends $1 to process a thousand board feet of timber for sale the Federal Government obtains $13 from the buyer for that thousand board feet of timber. Thus, on the $1 invested in processing timber for sale the Federal Government makes a gross profit of $12.

The Federal Government gives 25 percent or $3 of that $12 to the county government in the county where the timber was cut and the remaining $9 goes into the Federal Treasury. Thus, the Federal Government when it spends $1 to process the sale of 1,000 feet of timber makes a net profit of $9. When one can make a profit of $9 on each dollar spent, then spending is a good investment and not spending $1 to make $9 is folly.

If the committee had granted in this bill the full $500,000 of additional timber processing funds requested by the Eisenhower administration, the Forest Service could sell an additional 500 million feet of timber. The Government would receive, at $13 a thousand board feet, $6,500,000 for that additional timber of which about $1,500,000 would go to the counties and almost $5 million into the Federal Treasury.

The committee by cutting this appropriation to $200,000 prevents the sale of an additional 300 million feet of timber that can and should be sold. The committee saves $300,000 but loses the additional $3,900,000 that this additional timber would bring were it sold.

This is a case where the Federal Government should spend money to make money. To pinch dollars and hold back the sale of timber that ought to be sold is unbusinesslike and a folly.

The Forest Service officials in testimony before your committee on this bill stressed that the Federal Government has much burned and blowdown timber in its forest reserves and that most of this additional $500,000, if granted, would be employed to salvage blowdown and burned timber. Blowdown and fire-damaged timber deteriorates rapidly. The longer the Government delays in getting such timber out of the woods the greater the deterioration and the larger the Federal loss in potential revenues.

The Federal Government, today, owns and has under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service more than 400 million acres of commercial timberland. This commercial timberland if in one block would be 50 percent larger than the combined area of all 6 New England States. On these acres of Forest Service commercial timberland are growing 700 billion feet of timber. This timber, at $13 a thousand board-feet, which was last year's average price, has a present value of $9 billion.

Under the laws that govern the United States Forest Service operations, all this timber must be logged on a sustained-yield basis. By sustained yield we mean that whenever or wherever a tree is cut on Federal forest land a young tree must be planted to take its place.

The Forest Service can, its experts estimate, cut 9½ billion feet of timber each year from Federal forest commercial timberlands and by planting new trees to replace the old can have a perpetual Federal forest of 700 or more billion feet where 9½ billion feet always can be harvested annually.

Last year instead of cutting 9½ billion feet the Forest Service allowed the harvesting of about 6 billion feet and received $71 million for that timber. This fiscal year, which ends July 1, the Forest Service estimates the cut will be about 7¼ billion feet and return an estimated $101 million to the Federal Treasury. The additional cutting provides the Federal Government about $30 million in additional revenue.

The more timber the Forest Service sells the more money the Forest Service must spend to process timber sales. Keep in mind, however, that for each $1 spent for processing timber sales $13 in timber revenues are obtained.

The timber of which I have been speaking is all in the Federal forests and none of it in national parks. The timber in national parks under the law cannot be sold or cut.

The United States Forest Service is the only agency of the Government which shows a profit. The post office and all other Federal agencies always lose money. The Forest Service, alone, operates with a profit. This profit helps decrease the amount of money that must be raised by taxes.

The Forest Service should, as rapidly as feasible, expand timber cutting up to the allowable annual sustained yield of our commercial forest lands which is estimated now at 9½ billion feet. This is almost 3 billion feet a year more than now is being cut. When the cut from national forests is increased to this 9½ billion feet a year as it someday should and will be, Federal timber revenues will be increased by $50 million a year for every year thereafter. In 20 years this will mean increased revenues from timber of a billion dollars.

There are great stands of Federal timber which are overripe and deteriorating. Unless harvested in time, the old trees die and decay. If sold before decay sets in the Government obtains better prices for its trees and at the same time profits by planting young growing trees to replace old ones that no longer are growing.

The $9 billion commercial forest our Government now owns if efficiently managed can provide the Nation with a perpetual crop of wood and in doing so can be a constant year-after-year source of increased employment for workers and of larger revenue to the Federal Treasury.

In forest management we must spend money to make money.

We earnestly trust that before this appropriation bill reaches final passage that the committee will reconsider its position on the $500,000 requested by the Eisenhower administration for additional sale timber processing funds and provide the full $500,000 amount requested instead of reducing this figure to $200,000 as has been done in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

National Park Service

Construction

For an additional amount for "Construction," $3 million, to remain available until expended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on lines 9, 10, 11, and 12, page 16, that it constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill; further, that it does not comply with Public Law 361, 83d Congress, approved May 17, 1954. In those respects the money to be appropriated here is subject to certain restrictions under the law.

I read subsection (b):

The authorization for the appropriation contained in subsection (a) shall not be effective until such time as, (1) the receipts of the Government for the preceding fiscal year have exceeded the expenditures of the Government for such year, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; or, (2) the Budget submitted to the Congress by the President under the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 reveals that the estimated receipts of the Government for the fiscal year for which such budget is submitted are in excess of the estimated expenditures of the Government for such fiscal year.

I maintain that the appropriation herein set forth does not comply with this act.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is not well taken, because the provision is authorized by law. Public Law 361, approved May 17, 1954, provides that when a balanced budget is submitted, then this project will be in order. The President has submitted a balanced budget, estimating that the 1956 budget will be balanced plus $200 million, and the 1957 budget will be balanced plus $400 million.

I agree this is a very unusual provision, but it does seem that the language complained of is not subject to a point of order for the reasons pointed out.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Texas point out to the Chair where in Public Law 361 there is authorization for the language at the end of the paragraph: "To remain available until expended"?

What authority is there in the act for that language?

Mr. MAHON. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, there is no authority in the act for those words.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman supply to the Chair what the Chair sought from the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. KARSTEN. The Chair seeks to establish the basis for including the words "to remain available until expended." That is common for all appropriations, I should think.

The CHAIRMAN. I am afraid I shall have to disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. KARSTEN. May I be heard further on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the Chair will hear the gentleman briefly. That information would certainly enable the Chair to reach a decision.

Mr. KARSTEN. The point of order, as I understand, is made that the budgetary requirements have not been met. Is that the basis of the point of order?

Mr. GROSS. And also——

The CHAIRMAN. Let us get the record straight. The complaint was that the language "to remain available until expended" was subject to a point of order. That was the objection, among other things, raised by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. KARSTEN. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the language of authorization is broad enough to include those words; and I would like to address myself to the major point raised by the gentleman from Iowa, if the Chair will indulge me for just a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair looked very carefully for this language and the Chair repeats what he said before, that he does not agree with the gentleman. The Chair does not find anything in (b) of section 4 of Public Law 361 that would lead anybody to that conclusion.

Mr. KARSTEN. Will the Chair hear me further on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; briefly.

Mr. KARSTEN. Anticipating that this question would be raised, on January 31 I contacted the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and talked with him. I cited the two appropriations that were contained in this act. He was familiar with this law. He told me that in his opinion the second condition had been met and that no legal prohibition existed for the appropriation of these funds.

I have here in my hand a letter from the Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget which I will be glad to read if the Chair wishes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not care to hear it, because we have not reached the time when we accept a letter from some bureaucrat as to what the law is.

When it is explained as it is to me, the Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that the language contained on page 16 which reads: "For an additional amount for construction, $3 million, to remain available until expended," is subject to a point of order because there is no authorization which justifies the committee placing that language in the bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 16, line 9, insert the following:

"National Park Service: Construction: For an additional amount for construction $3 million."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state the point of order?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the wording of the amendment does not comply with Public Law 361 of the 83d Congress, 2d session, chapter 204, approved May 17, 1954.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

It is a matter of public knowledge that the budget submitted by the President is a balanced budget; therefore, the Chair feels that subsection 2 (b) of section 4, Public Law 361, has been complied with.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this portion of the bill has been studied carefully and approved by the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations has also approved this item. I have no desire to further argue the point.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that anyone in this House today can tell before the end of this session whether we will or will not have a balanced budget. It seems to me, if my memory serves me correctly, that the balanced budget which we have heard about as coming from the White House is contingent upon whether, among other things but chiefly upon whether, this Congress passes a postal rate increase bill to increase postal rates.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I think it is clearly possible that we will not have a balanced budget, but that is not the yardstick which is being used. The President submitted in his budget document to the Congress a balanced budget. The provision of the law is that "if the budget submitted to the Congress by the President under the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 reveals that the estimated receipts of the Government for the fiscal year for which such budget is submitted is in excess of the estimated expenditures of the Government for such fiscal year," therefore it is not a question of whether or not the budget will ultimately be balanced but whether or not the President submits a balanced budget. The President did, as is public knowledge, submit a balanced budget.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I took this up with the Budget Bureau and they quoted some figures which I shall state to the gentleman from Iowa:

"Answering your specific question, the budget for the fiscal year 1957 shows estimated budget receipts of $66.3 billion and estimated expenditures of $65.9 billion," which would indicate that provision of the law has been met.

Mr. GROSS. I take it from the arguments on the part of both gentlemen that this law could well be set aside, as apparently it will be in this case, simply by someone—the President of the United States—estimating that we are going to have a balanced budget, not whether in truth and in fact we will have a balanced budget. We might just as well never enact this kind of legislation if it has no

more meaning than what the gentlemen have stated.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure that the gentleman understands this request for $3 million was made by President Eisenhower, who as President of the United States is certifying that there will be a balanced budget.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that I am not concerned with who made the request for the $3 million.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It seems to me that the ruling of the Chair is eminently correct. Any budget submitted by the President must be based on the estimated income and outgo. If that were not true, and if that could not be the ruling of the Chair based on those estimates, then any time the Chair ruled on the application of this law he would do so in peril because it may turn out at the end of the fiscal year that we had a balanced budget.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman that I do not question the ruling of the Chair. I do say that clearly it was the intent of the Congress that this money not be appropriated unless the budget was assuredly in balance. Does the gentleman not agree with me on that point?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would not agree with the gentleman. As a matter of fact, I ask the Members of this House how many times has some group come in and submitted themselves to such a limitation? The spirit is complied with. We did not want to come in until it looked like the budget was going to be balanced. The budget is proposed to be balanced, and now we have come in and the administration has agreed and the committee has agreed that this is a worthy request.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Does the gentleman not feel that no President, particularly the present President, would submit to the Congress a balanced budget other than in good faith? I think if we do not accept good faith, if we cannot accept sincerity and honesty in fiscal matters from the Chief Executive, whoever he may be, the gentleman's point is well taken. But, as long as the budget is submitted in good faith, there should be little room for serious abuses.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman say, as he stands here today, that this House is going to pass a postal rate increase bill that will balance the budget? Is he standing here today saying that?

Mr. MAHON. I very much fear that the budget will not be balanced, but I do believe that the President submitted in good faith a balanced budget. Of course, there were several contingencies such as passing certain tax legislation, rates, et cetera.

Mr. GROSS. I am opposed to this expenditure for the purposes stated in Public Law 361. Here is what the taxpayers of the country will contribute to this project in St. Louis: $1,875,000 for the relocation of railroad tracks and other railroad facilities; $1,125,000 for grading and filling along the Mississippi River waterfront; $500,000 for landscaping; $900,000 for paving, utilities, and so forth, and $600,000 for restoration of what is known as Old Courthouse. That is a total of $5 million so we can look forward to further heavy expenditures of taxpayer money in behalf of the civic improvement of St. Louis.

Members of the House may well ask themselves how many millions of dollars the Federal Government is spending toward the relocation of railroad tracks and otherwise financing civic improvements in the cities and towns of their districts.

This bill also contains funds for the start of construction of a new State Department building in Washington to cost many millions of dollars. Yet with all this projected spending, including a big increase in the foreign handout program, there is talk here today of a balanced budget. Let us not deceive ourselves—either Congress must call a halt to some of this spending or write off completely any thought of balanced budgets in the future.

I am opposed to this bill and will so vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 59, noes 26.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Department of the Army—Civil Functions

Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control

Operation and maintenance, general

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, general," to remain available until expended, $15,350,000, of which $15,000,000 shall be available for carrying out the provisions of the act of June 28, 1955 (Public Law 99).

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

On page 19, line 20, strike out "$15,350,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$15,375,000."

And on line 22, before the period, insert the following: ", and of which not more than $25,000 shall be available for the dredging of the Kalamazoo River where it flows into Lake Michigan."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Is that $25,000?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is all it is.

Mr. RABAUT. I have no objection to it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10004) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings on the pending bill (H. R. 10004) be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

speaking on the bill H. R. 10004 be permitted to revise and extend their remarks and to include brief excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1956

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 428 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of the revenue bill for the District of Columbia. It is a tax bill. The rule that is here offered to the House is the usual rule on tax bills. It is a closed rule, and provides for 2 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia has stated the purpose of this resolution, which would make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 9770, with 2 hours of general debate, under a so-called closed rule, which is usually granted for the consideration of tax bills.

I have no requests for time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 223) to extend greetings to Pakistan.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas it is the policy of the Government of the United States to encourage the orderly development of free, democratic institutions among our friends and allies, and

Whereas the people of the United States and the people of Pakistan have established friendly ties; and

Whereas the Government of the United States and the Government of Pakistan have jointly collaborated in collective defense efforts to preserve the peace; and

Whereas the Pakistan Constituent Assembly has recently approved a constitution establishing Pakistan as a Republic on March 23, 1956: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring) That the Congress of the United States extend its most cordial greetings and warmest congratulations to the new Pakistan National Assembly and to the people of Pakistan on the occasion of Pakistan's establishment as a Republic, and reaffirm the friendship of the United States for the people of Pakistan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to know something about this resolution.

Mr. RICHARDS. This is a simple resolution congratulating and felicitating the people of Pakistan upon the establishment of the Republic by the Constituent Assembly and the ratification of the adoption of the constitution of Pakistan which will take place on March 23 next.

This is the kind of resolution that I believe the Congress and the American people would like. When in the course of human events around this earth a people have established their independence and declared themselves a democracy as a self-governing country, it has always been the custom of the United States to felicitate and congratulate the new nation when it comes into being. That is all the resolution does.

Pakistan became a sovereign nation when the British withdrew from India in 1947. Until the adoption of a constitution in February of this year, Pakistan has been governed under a provisional constitution based upon the British-promulgated Government of India Act of 1935. The democratic processes followed under the provisional constitution have been enlarged and incorporated in the new constitution. Provision is made for a unicameral legislature, elected by popular vote. Individual liberty, equality before the law, and freedom of worship are guaranteed. Fundamental rights are enforced by an independent judiciary.

The people of the United States and the people of Pakistan have established friendly ties and their Government has joined with us in collective efforts to preserve the peace.

It is indeed fitting that when the Republic of Pakistan is formally established under its constitution on March 23 that we extend the congratulations and greetings of the United States Congress, on behalf of the American people, to the new Pakistan National Assembly, to President Iskander Mirza and to the valiant and courageous people of that great country. With this thought and purpose in mind, the Committee on Foreign Affairs this morning unanimously voted to report House Concurrent Resolution 223, to extend greetings to Pakistan. I urge its immediate adoption by the House.

Mr. GROSS. This does not provide for the United States buying some more rice, of which we have a tremendous surplus in this country, from Burma to give to Pakistan?

Mr. RICHARDS. It does not provide for buying or selling anything or giving anything away.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad there is one bill from the Committee on Foreign Affairs that does not provide for giving something away. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. VORYS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina on bringing to the floor this concurrent resolution, which our administration is eager to have passed promptly, because the new Republic is to go into effect, as I understand, on Friday, March 23. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with our chairman [Mr. RICHARDS] in urging unanimous approval of this resolution congratulating the people of Pakistan upon their becoming a Republic next Friday, March 23. This resolution was recommended by the administration and was unanimously approved by our committee.

I doubt if all of us realize the tremendous task in political science that faced the leaders of Pakistan in creating a representative government for a country separated physically into two divisions a thousand miles apart. I believe these statesmen built wisely and well, from the information I have obtained. They have built strength into their institutions and have guaranteed freedom not only for their Republic but for its individual citizens.

I remember vividly our meeting with General Mirza, who is the first President of Pakistan, when Mr. RICHARDS and I were in Karachi over a year ago. I was impressed then with his strong, magnetic personality, his broad vision, his practical commonsense, his devotion to the cause of the free world. He is a stouthearted leader of a stouthearted people. This new Republic stands guard in a strategic place on the frontiers of the free world. We can rejoice in her new-found freedom, confident that in safeguarding her own liberty she will be helping to protect ours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to repeal section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley law. That is the provision which permits States to enact the so-called right-to-work laws.

That provision has been called immoral by labor leaders, by churchmen, and by other citizens, who think deeper than the mere title of the laws passed by the States under the authority given in that section.

As said by Rabbi Israel Goldstein, president of the American Jewish Congress:

> The term "right to work" in these statutes is a fraud and a misnomer to conceal their true purpose; * * * these statutes do not guarantee anyone the right to work but represent merely an attempt to capitalize on the hopes raised by a guaranteed right to work in order to restrict or outlaw completely all forms of union security arrangements worked out in collective bargaining by labor and management.

I wholeheartedly agree with Rabbi Goldstein's very carefully expressed thought. It is my feeling that the right to work embodied by such a law is only the right to work at the complete mercy of employers free from the protection which the unions offer.

Despite high-sounding phrases to the contrary, the real purpose of that section of the law is to hamper and cripple the unions in their dealings with the employees. The right to work laws aim at the return to the days when workers used to seek employment on the employers' terms; where the worker never had the right to raise any question as to wages, or conditions of employment. These so-called right to work laws recognize that the "right of the worker to bargain in majestic and poverty-stricken aloofness for the wages of his service is a right of which he cannot be deprived," as was said in a famous early opinion in our Supreme Court.

The proponents of the Taft-Hartley law overlooked the fact that not only does a union have the duty to represent employees who are members but who are nonunionized, as well as it represents its own members, but that it does do so. They also overlooked, in their shortsightedness, the fact that the great prosperity which we in America now enjoy has existed only since the workingman achieved a position of relative economic well being. They also lose sight of the direct and overwhelming causal effect which the unions by their activity on his behalf have had on giving to the worker and the little man this high standard of living.

In the language of a distinguished member of the Catholic clergy, Father William J. Kelley, O. M. I., L. L. D., who for more than 10 years chairman of the New York State Labor Relations Board, and is now assigned to teaching at the Oblate Scholasticate at Catholic University, in Washington, D. C.:

> Similarly, I am in company with such scholars as Rev. William J. Smith, S. J., Rev. Benjamin Masse, S. J., and Rev. Louis Twomey, S. J. Also, Rev. Dr. John Cronin and Msgr. George Higgins. I am also in the company of the editors of the St. Louis Register, official organ of the Archdiocese of St. Louis, whose language is:
>
> "The avowed purpose of the right-to-work bill in Missouri is to protect the worker from paying dues against his will as a condition of employment.
>
> "The actual purpose is to hamstring unions.
>
> "The real aim of this campaign, although it pretends to be interested in protecting the individual worker, is to destroy unions by making them ineffective."
>
> Based on this analysis of the law and principal arguments of the proponents, I hold that these right-to-work laws take away from man a necessary means to achieve and protect his God-given right of association.
>
> 1. Right-to-work laws are immoral according to Catholic social teaching.
>
> 2. No man or woman of good will should contribute money to proponents of this legislation to defray "the educational campaign expenses." To contribute financial aid would be morally wrong.
>
> 3. All good men and women, Protestants, Jews, and Catholics, should seek by every just means to get such right-to-work laws repealed and should oppose them whenever they are proposed.
>
> 4. Men of good will should not be a party to or cooperate with the proponents of right-to-work laws.
>
> 5. The right-to-work bills don't guarantee the individual any right at all. They provide him with an opportunity to work alone, to work at less than union wages.
>
> 6. The right-to-work laws recall the American plan or open-shop plan of 1920–24, which led to low wages, strikes, industrial unrest.
>
> 7. The right-to-work laws may well be an invitation to disaster of the general welfare.
>
> Leo XIII points out the preeminent position of legislators:
>
> "Some there must be who dedicate themselves to the work of the commonwealth, who make the laws, who administer justice, whose advice and authority govern the Nation in time of peace and defend it in war. Such men clearly occupy the foremost place in the State and should be held in the foremost estimation, for their work touches most nearly and effectively the general interest of the community."
>
> I appeal to the legislators of the 17 States to repeal the right-to-work bills now in existence.
>
> I can find no more powerful way to conclude these conclusions than by the following quotation of Pope Pius XII:
>
> "Neither collective bargaining nor arbitration, nor all the directives of the most progressive legislation will be able to provide a lasting labor peace unless there is also a constant effort to infuse the principles of spiritual and moral life into the framework of industrial relations."

Further there is no statistical proof that these laws have benefited employers, raised income, or increased job opportunity. Quite the contrary, statistics show that areas, like my own State of Michigan, where we have no such law, enjoy such great opportunity for employment and high wages that there is a constant flow of migrants to those areas from most of the States which have right-to-work laws. Despite this our Michigan corporations are enjoying record earnings and profits.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that both the union shop and the closed shop are perfectly legitimate forms of organized labor. As so aptly stated by the executive committee of the Federated Churches of Christ in America, in the statement The Church Looks at Industrial Relations, 1949:

> Where either the closed or the union shop emerges with proper safeguards as the result of collective bargaining, we believe the agreement arrived at on this point should be approved and supported by church people.

It is clear that laws which strike at this perfectly proper result of collective bargaining are aimed at only one thing, the destruction of the unions and the return of America to the poverty and privation enjoyed by our working classes before workers banded together in unions to better the conditions of their employment.

For this reason I urge early and favorable consideration of my bill.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1956

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9770, with Mr. CHATHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill, such time as he may care to use.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is a revenue bill, a tax bill for the District of Columbia. Certain things happened last year which threw the budget of the District of Columbia out of balance to the extent of some $10 million. After the budget had been arranged last year, the Congress made certain obligations on the District of Columbia that threw it out of balance to the extent of $10 million. There was a salary raise all the way around for civil-service employees. That was followed by action of Congress in voting an increase for all employees of the District of Columbia, which came to about $10 million. The District of Columbia Committee then had to find the revenue to meet the action of Congress. We considered this bill in a joint subcommittee of the Senate and House, and the bill which you have before you now is the unanimous conclusion and has the unanimous support of both the House and Senate subcommittees, and is reported unanimously by the District of Columbia Committee.

There was some objection in the committee to this item or that item, but

when it came to a vote it was voted out of committee unanimously.

I would like to say that the joint subcommittee has been working on this bill since the first part of the session in January. We held extended hearings on the proposals that were submitted to us by the District Commissioners, and we advertised public hearings, and we heard everybody who had anything to say about the bill—citizens and officials of the District of Columbia—at great length. There were many suggestions as to how this $10 million could be raised. Some were adopted and some were rejected. By and large, what we did about this deficit that was created by the increase in salaries voted by the Congress, we put in the bill an authorization for $2 million additional by the Federal Government, which is 20 percent of it, and the remaining 80 percent, or $8 million, was imposed on the taxpayers of the District of Columbia.

Briefly this is what the bill provides: Under existing law the income tax for the District of Columbia carries an exemption of $4,000 a year. We reduced that exemption to $2,000 a year, which is more in conformity with similar income tax laws in the various States of the Union. That is calculated to raise $3,400,000.

Then there was an item here that has been escaping taxation, which is called "rental of personal property," which is expected to yield $150,000 a year. It is an item that has escaped taxation heretofore. That is, where a person makes a business of renting personal property—machinery, and articles of various and sundry kinds. That is made subject to the District sales tax.

Then the exemption on meals was reduced from 50 cents to 14 cents, under the sales tax law. A tax of 15 cents a gallon was imposed upon what is called "table wine." I understand they are light, nonintoxicating wines.

We imposed a tax of $25 per annum on professional personnel. That is, lawyers, doctors, and so forth. We find that that was a practice prevalent throughout the States—a license tax for the practice of a profession. It is small, but it yields a considerable amount of money. The tax imposed under this bill is $25 a year, and yields $175,000.

Then we increased the tax on liquors from $1 to $1.25 per gallon, an increase of $980,000 per annum.

We increased the tax on beer from $1.25 to $1.50 per barrel, which will raise $132,000.

The District of Columbia Commissioners will raise the real estate tax as they are directed to do under the law by 10 cents per hundred, and that will raise $1,800,000.

The total of these increases brings us approximately the amount the budget is in default, that is, $9,812,000. We think some of these items have been perhaps underestimated, but $9,812,000 was coming pretty close to the $10 million desired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Calling the gentleman's attention to the increased tax on liquor and the sale of liquor in the District of Columbia, did the committee give serious consideration to providing for monopoly sale of liquor in the District, that is, to establish District stores for the sale of package liquor?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; the committee set aside a specific time to hear the proposal which was submitted by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Frankly, I have always favored that method myself. In this instance the general opinion—and I could not find too much fault with it—was that to make the change now after we have gotten into it would cause such disruption here that it probably would not be a desirable thing to do. As a matter of fact, when this present law was passed I offered a substitute for it to set up State liquor stores. I was defeated. There was very little sentiment for the change anyway.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back such time as I may not have consumed.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Virginia has stated to the committee, this measure comes before you with the unanimous report from the Joint Fiscal Affairs Committee of the Senate and House and also was reported without objection from the District Committee.

In the first place I would like to compliment my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia, as chairman of the Joint Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the House and Senate for the very patient, careful, and long consideration which was given to the problem of raising approximately $10 million needed to take up the deficit in the financing of the District of Columbia. We had long hearings and we had more lengthy executive consideration by the subcommittee acting on the proposal.

It was not a pleasant duty to add to the taxes of the residents of the District of Columbia, as we were forced to do. I think the committee has done as good a job as it was humanly possible to do under the circumstances in spreading this taxation as equitably as could be—not pleasantly at all because it is no pleasure for Members of Congress to have to increase taxes, nor is it pleasant to try to figure out where it may be raised with the least difficulty—but I do say that the committee worked earnestly, worked hard in trying to raise the necessary funds to meet this problem. As one individual who has served for some time on the District of Columbia Committee I hope that it will not be necessary for some years to come that we will be asked to raise additional funds. The bill as written and as submitted to the committee today is as fairly considered, as equitably and as justly spread over the tax-raising possibilities that are left in the District as it could be.

I sincerely hope it may be passed with the least possible argument over this, that, or the other provision. It is almost impossible to say that any member of the subcommittee was completely pleased with every item in the bill. As I say, it was a matter of give and take and working out the best possible legislation that could be worked out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time, first, to compliment with great sincerity the leadership of this subcommittee of which I am a member. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] was untiring in his efforts and was most courteous in every way. We had long hearings on this matter and went into every detail.

To increase taxes is not a pleasant job, but this unpleasant job was done thoroughly and with every consideration under the leadership of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

I may say that I raised a question about a bond issue for the District of Columbia to meet some of the capital expenditures which are included in this measure. Studies are still being made of such a proposal and I hope that perhaps a little later the committee may have an opportunity to consider suggestions covering such a bond issue which I hope may bring some relief to the taxpayers.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I can hardly sit here and let this bill go by without some comment on what I think are unfair and apparent weaknesses, not particularly in the bill but on the whole question of arriving at fair and equitable taxes for all of the citizens of the District of Columbia. I have no desire to be critical of the committee or of any member of the committee. I recently became a member of this committee and I have much to learn, but in my 8 years as a Member of this House I have observed and I have heard many of the problems that have come up in connection with District rules and regulations, and tax legislation.

This bill was worked out, as has been previously stated, by a subcommittee of the House and a subcommittee of the Senate. My understanding is that they spent many hours trying to arrive at an equitable bill. To most of us on the committee I think we had about an hour a few days ago to hear the report of the subcommittee of the House on what their findings were with the Senate committee, and that report became this bill.

Now, it is true that I, along with others, raised some question about this bill. We raised some question about the procedure, about where the tax increases fell, and in behalf of the thousands and thousands of Government employees here and particularly those in the low-income brackets, below the 5th and 6th grades of civil service, I felt that their problems ought to be given some recognition in the light of what this bill does.

Washington, unfortunately, has no industry to tax. My city has large and substantial industry and payroll. The District of Columbia tax revenue is made up in the main for tax purposes of wages and real property. Washington is a city

of nearly a million people. It is a wide and expansive community, and I am sure that with all of the services that members of the District Committee have on other important committees, the time is not available for the job necessary on the District Committee of doing that which probably would bring about a better form of government here. The real estate and the commercial interests in this community have the board of trade who speak and represent the views of those people very well, but there is a great mass of wage earners and Government employees that have no one to speak for them. They do not even have an organization to make known their problems.

Now, this is what I find as a matter of importance to me, at least, and I am sure to those millions of low-paid, low-income group workers. I point my finger particularly at the lack of keeping up the real and true valuation of private and commercial property in the District, and, of course, I look at what real and commercial property is doing in bringing up this tax bill to the amount necessary or somewhere near the amount necessary. So, I look around to see what has been done in making possible an equitable part of the tax increase on the commercial and real property of this community, and I find that the real estate assessment on real estate and commercial property from 1934 to 1937 was $1.50 per $100; from 1938 to 1947 the tax rate was $1.75 per $100; and from 1948 to 1949, it was $2 per $100. Then from 1950 to 1954 it was $2.15 per 100, and from 1955 to the present time, 1956, it is $2.20. Now, the committee recommends in this bill, on the basis of a promise from the Commissioners, an increase from $2.20 to $2.30 per $100. Now, that is a very reasonable rate of taxation or assessment on valuation as compared to the city that I come from on a $10,000 home that I figured out. We pay considerably more than that on a $10,000 home in the city of Minneapolis. For 1957 the Commissioners have announced their intention to increase this rate to $2.30. But, how are they going to increase it? That brings up the question of the present real and true values of all residential and commercial property in the District as compared to the many other communities of this Nation who have cited the tax figures of their communities on a $10,000 home. Of course, everyone knows that in the main there has been a continuing increase in the value of all real property in the District, and I do not think that can be disputed, beginning with about 1945 or 1946. But, when we check this item of revaluation of District property, we find that there has not been a complete or a broad reassessment of real property under a single program, but there has been some reassessment of areas only as personnel and time permitted the Assessor in the past 10 years.

In 1951 the District assessor had only 5 assistant assessors, in this large community, with its broad and expansive area, to carry out his work. During 1954, 1955, and 1956 some additional personnel were permitted the assessor to begin a complete reassessment of all residential and commercial real property. This survey is now scheduled to be completed in time for the new assessment to become effective by July 1, 1959. That is a long time from now, so far as the government and other workers of this community are concerned who will have to wait for an equitable adjustment of taxes.

In the meantime, the burden of taxes for the operation of the District government has been from year to year since 1950 slowly but surely shifted from those best able to pay to those less able to pay, beginning with the sales tax in 1952; and in the bill before us today we have a most unfair and unjustified share of the tax burden placed on the salaried employees and wage earners of the District. Look at the increase in the sales tax imposed on the poor, hungry individual who may want to buy a cup of coffee or a hamburger, for 15 cents. That individual now has imposed on him a sales tax of 1 cent on, say, a 15-cent purchase of a cup of coffee and a doughnut.

But here is what aroused my interest most. That was the cut of the exemption on the personal income tax from $4,000 for the single individual to $1,000, or $2,000 for the married couple. That is the figure as I read the bill as it pertains to the personal income tax. Certainly that is a blow to the thousands of low-income Government employees and other wage earners in the District.

Let us take a look at the part that the Federal Government plays in the affairs of the District, so far as the maintenance of the District government is concerned. The Federal Government has had no policy on a fair and equitable payment on the property that it represents in the District, nor has it had any understanding with the District as to what that share should be each year for the maintenance of the functions of the District government. I have been here when the Congress was economy-minded and I have seen the amount of money allowed the District by the Federal Government for its needs cut to $15 million, $16 million, or $17 million, here in the House. In the Senate I have seen that raised, for instance, a couple of years ago, to $18 million. So that even with the Congress, there is no determination of what we ought to pay for the maintenance and operation of this government in lieu of taxes, each year. It ought to be a given amount, and on the basis of what Federal property represents as against private property.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain that you and every Member of the House fully realize that this is a very unpleasant duty placed upon the members of the House District Committee. We members of this committee dislike as much as anyone else increasing the taxes on people who reside here in Washington. However, since Congress has increased the salaries of the 18,000 employees here in the District of Columbia, it is absolutely necessary that we secure additional funds from some source to take care of these salary increases. I believe the subcommittee that held hearings for 2 months on H. R. 9770 now under consideration came very near complying with the requests made by the District Commissioners.

I personally am opposed to this type of taxation at the present time. I felt at the time the Commissioners requested additional funds, that we should levy an additional penny to the present 2-cent sales tax which would have raised sufficient funds to take care of all the salary increases in the District of Columbia without any of the taxes mentioned in H. R. 9770. I favored adding 1 penny to the present sales tax as several thousands of the people who move to the District of Columbia and are filling up our schools with their children do not pay any taxes other than a sales tax. I am certain the people who utilize our schools and are protected by police and firemen in the District of Columbia are perfectly willing to pay a 3-cent sales tax so that they would know they are doing something to pay for the services they are receiving from the District government.

However, the Commissioners opposed this type of legislation and thought that the people who are already burdened with taxes should have additional taxes imposed upon them. We have now taxed liquor to the extent that we are encouraging the bootlegger to import unstamped whisky into the District. We all know that one of the main reasons the District of Columbia has collected so many millions in revenue from the liquor and beer source of taxes is the fact that it was sold cheaper in the District of Columbia than in almost any State in the United States. I am of the opinion that the District of Columbia will not collect anywhere near the amount from this source after the additional tax is placed on liquor and beer.

I desperately fought the additional tax that was placed on cigarettes during the past few years which has proven without a doubt the District is receiving much less revenue from the sale of cigarettes than they were before the additional tax was levied here in the District of Columbia. At the present time a carton of regular cigarettes with taxes cost approximately $2.15 per carton in the District of Columbia, and just across the river in Virginia you can buy the same carton of cigarettes for $1.75. The same comparison can be given the sale of gasoline, as the District officials insisted on placing an additional tax of a penny per gallon on gasoline last year, and now have approximately the same tax that they have in Virginia and Maryland, which gives the average motorist in Virginia and Maryland, who is employed in Washington, no incentive to purchase his gasoline in the District.

I have called these facts to the attention of the District Commissioners on several occasions; however, as usual, my recommendations fell on deaf ears; for instance, I strenuously objected last year to the Commissioners and the Public Utility Commission's insistence and recommendation to cancel the Capital Transit Co.'s franchise here in the District of Columbia without having a definite purchaser to take over the mass transportation here in the District.

I certainly do not agree with the majority of the tax recommendations in H. R. 9770; however, in my opinion, it is the best the subcommittee on fiscal affairs of my committee could recommend using the District Commissioners' recommendations as a yardstick. I, of course, have learned during the 18 years I have been a member of the House District Committee, that the Congress of the United States is blamed and criticized for everything that happens in the District of Columbia when we have no jurisdiction whatsoever in administering any of the affairs.

We are now strenuously criticized if we do not abide by the recommendations of the District Commissioners, who are the President's appointees, on every piece of legislation that comes before the District committee for consideration. I certainly feel that it is useless for the Members of Congress to spend their time attending District committee meetings if they are compelled to enact only legislation recommended by the District Commissioners. Mr. Chairman, since the Congress is partially responsible for the deficiency in funds to take care of salary increases in the District of Columbia, I hope that this bill passes without delay.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has implied that no one has thanked the committee for what they have done. I for one would be very glad to thank the committee for its hard work. I know it is a thankless job. I doubt that it helps the Members at home.

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not know of anyone who could possibly get any help at home politically on any work he did in connection with the District of Columbia, except that I think the people are proud of their Capital, and appreciate the work of their Representatives in keeping the Capital a decent place in which to live.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know they are. They want to have their Capital the best in the world. There is a group in the gallery called the Golden Age group from my own city of Lowell, Mass., and I presume they are interested in the city of Washington and their Government.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk now report the committee amendments as contained in the bill. There are seven of them. Amendments 1 to 6 and No. 9 are technical amendments correcting or changing certain minor details. Then there is one substantive item on page 34, line 7, which exempts registered nurses or practical nurses from having to obtain what is known as the annual revenue license to which I referred earlier in my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments are in order to the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "1956." " and insert in lieu thereof "1956"."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "(c)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 1, insert a comma after "1954."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 8, insert a comma after "1954."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 10, strike out "by" and insert in lieu thereof "between."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 18, strike out "XII" and insert in lieu thereof "XIII."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, line 7, insert after "profession" a comma and the following: "other than that of registered nurse or practical nurse."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, line 19, insert after "profession" a comma and the following: "other than that of registered nurse or practical nurse."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 37, line 8, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further committee amendments?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, there are no further amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. CHATHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 428, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 29, 1956, the junior Senator from Arizona inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 3541 a purported analysis of giveaway charges made against the administration. The Public Works and Resources Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations has held hearings on the Al Sarena timber mining matter, and on various irregularities arising in connection with federally generated power and with powerlines. I will not say more about these at the present time other than they will be considered thoroughly in committee reports which should be forthcoming very soon. A review of the records will, I am sure, completely refute the Senator's attempt to gloss over or defend the Interior Department officials' actions on these matters.

Today I wish merely to discuss two items which reveal the inaccurate nature of the defense which someone evidently prevailed upon the Senator to put in the RECORD.

The Senator's analysis includes the following:

Charge: The Bureau of Indian Affairs showed impropriety in awarding a food contract to an unpaid Bureau consultant.

Among the so-called facts to refute the charge, the analysis states:

The short-term contract, which was limited to less than 1 percent of the Bureau's feeding operations, was awarded not to an "unpaid consultant" but to an experienced food service organization which had an excellent reputation for satisfactory performance on contracts for this general type.

Now it just so happens that on May 4, 1955, I asked the Comptroller General to look into this matter. Here is what the Comptroller General, in a letter of May 17, 1955, reported to me:

The Bureau contacted Colonel Cleaves, an expert in the food servicing business who had made a survey of the situation at the Cherokee Indian Reservation without compensation. Upon completion of the survey, he advised the Bureau that a private firm under contract could do the feeding more efficiently and economically than the Bureau. At the request of the Bureau, Colonel Cleaves agreed to accept a contract for feeding the children. * * * The contract was entered into by negotiation on December 20, 1954, and provided for the furnishing of the meals during the period from January 17 to June 30, 1955.

The Comptroller General was disturbed by this arrangement, but he decided that it did not furnish him with legal grounds for invalidating the contract. He said:

Ordinarily, of course, it would not appear to be in the interest of the Government to negotiate a contract with an individual in a case where the decision of the Government to enter into the contract is based on a gratuitous survey made by that individual. In the absence of evidence of bad faith, however, we do not believe that the contract may be considered legally objectionable solely for this reason.

It should be noted that holding the contract was not "legally objectionable," is a far cry, under these circumstances, from clearing it of charges of impropriety. I shall insert the complete letter at the close of this statement.

The Senator's analysis contains the following charge:

Charge: The Bureau of Indian Affairs negotiated a "rigged" contract to rent automobiles instead of buying them and then abandoned the plan because of a threatened congressional investigation.

The so-called facts, supplied by the Senator's analysis include the following:

Facts: The Bureau did rent 39 automobiles from a rental firm, after careful investigation of the company's rental plan and the plans of other national rental agencies. * * * The charge that the contract was "rigged" is entirely without foundation. * * * The contract was not abandoned because of a threatened investigation, but was cancelled by action of the Comptroller General of the United States on the ground that it was entered into without competitive bidding.

These so-called facts do not disclose what actually occurred. This whole matter is considered in a committee report. Briefly, however, this is what happened.

On March 30, 1955, at my request, the staff director of the subcommittee asked the Comptroller General to review the Bureau's automobile rental contract. It appeared that the alleged careful investigation of the plans of other national agencies had consisted of telephoning the Washington, D. C., rental offices of the concerns and ascertaining their standard charges. The inadequacy of this telephonic check, as a substitute for competitive bidding, is so obvious as not to require comment. Consequently the Comptroller General, on April 27, 1955, declared the contract void.

Subsequently, on June 2, 1955, the Indian Bureau issued invitations to bid on automobile leases. The automobiles described in the invitations coincided exactly with the descriptions in the purchase orders issued for automobiles delivered and used under the voided contract even including special equipment. The invitation, however, provided that the automobiles could have 15,000 miles use on them. Bids were to be opened on June 17, 1955, and the cars all had to be delivered by July 1, 1955, 5 to Cherokee, N. C., and 34 to Albuquesque, N. Mex. Five of the automobiles delivered under the voided contract were actually at Cherokee and 34 were at Albuquerque.

This time a potential bidder protested the invitation and brought it to the subcommittee's attention. As a result, the subcommittee scheduled hearings and the Interior Department was compelled to ask the Comptroller General to review the situation.

On June 24, 1955, the Comptroller General ruled as follows:

It is recognized that it is the duty and responsibility of the administrative offices to draw specifications which will meet their requirements and that if an emergency exists, purchases may even be made without advertising. However, it has been consistently held that specifications should be so drawn as to allow all interested bidders an opportunity to meet the actual needs of the Government. In the instant case, a maximum of 14 days was allowed for the delivery of the vehicles with the required accessories, even if award were made on the day of the opening.

Although due to the invalidation of the prior lease agreement, vehicles are being obtained on a temporary basis pending the execution of a valid lease, it is our opinion that such fact did not warrant such stringent limitation of the time allowed prospective bidders to make delivery. That the limitation imposed was too unrealistic to meet the requirements of open competition is substantiated by the fact that the abstract of bids received in response to the invitations shows that 4 of the 5 firms who submitted bids were unable to meet the delivery requirement. The 1 firm which offered to meet the delivery requirement offered to make delivery within 9 days at Albuquerque, N. Mex., and within 5 days at Cherokee, N. C., after receipt of formal purchase order. Thus, with respect to Albuquerque, even that bid could not now be accepted so as to require the bidder to deliver by July 1, 1955.

Under the circumstances, we conclude that the time limitation provided in the invitations for delivery was insufficient to allow the free and open competition required by section 3709, Revised Statutes, and that, therefore, no award should be made under either invitation.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. WEITZEL,
Assistant Comptroller General of the United States.

I might add that the subcommittee learned that the delivered price of the cars under the leasing arrangement would average about $400 per car more than the price for which the Government could purchase the cars delivered. Furthermore, under the rental agreements, the Government paid 4½ percent interest on the unamortized balance, while the Government can borrow money for similar periods at only 2 percent.

Following the hearings and the second ruling of the Comptroller General, the Bureau abandoned its efforts to rent automobiles.

These are the facts in the two matters. I merely ask that they be compared with the purported analysis appearing on page 3544 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 29, 1955.

The letter from the Comptroller General on the Cleaves food contract follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 17, 1955.

Hon. EARL CHUDOFF,
Chairman, Public Works and Resources Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of May 4, 1955, transmitted a copy of a contract entered into between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Cleaves Food Service Corp., Maryland. You request our views as to whether there is any legal objection to the contract or to the manner in which it was entered into.

Before commenting on the contract, we should like to discuss briefly the background of the contract. It appears that the Bureau of Indian Affairs believed that its methods of serving lunches to the schoolchildren on Indian reservations were uneconomical and that information on how to correct the situation could be obtained from a private firm on the food-services line. The Bureau contacted Colonel Cleaves, an expert in the food-servicing business, who made a survey of the situation at the Cherokee Indian Reservation without compensation. Upon completion of the survey, he advised the Bureau that a private firm under contract could do the feeding job more efficiently and economically than the Bureau. At the request of the Bureau, Colonel Cleaves agreed to accept a contract for feeding the children. The Bureau then asked for and received the necessary clearance from the Administrator of General Services to negotiate the contract for such services without competitive bidding. The contract was negotiated as a "pilot" contract to furnish the Bureau the data needed to determine whether it would be advisable to contract for food service and to furnish necessary data for securing competitive bids for future contracts. The contract was entered into by negotiation on December 20, 1954, and provided for the furnishing of the meals during the period from January 17 to June 30, 1955. It has been informally ascertained from the Bureau's property and supply officer that the contract will be terminated June 30, 1955, and that competitive bids will be invited thereafter for furnishing the services.

Regarding the propriety of the manner in which the contract was entered into, it may be stated that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has no general authority to negotiate contracts without competitive bidding. The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, however, empowers the Administrator of General Services to delegate to the head of an agency authority to make contracts for supplies or services pursuant to the provisions of that act whenever the Administrator determines such delegation is advantageous to the Government in terms of economy, efficiency, or national security. In a letter dated December 1, 1954, the Administrator of General Services delegated to the Secretary of the Interior the authority to negotiate, without advertising, under section 302 (c) (9) of that act, contracts for feeding services required to carry out Indian education program responsibilities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The contract was negotiated under such delegated authority and, in our opinion, there is no legal objection to the manner in which this particular contract was entered into. Ordinarily, of course, it would not appear to be in the interest of the Government to negotiate a contract with an individual in a case where the decision of the Government to enter into the contract is based on a gratuitous survey made by that individual. In the absence of evidence of bad faith, however, we do not believe that the contract may be considered legally objectionable solely for this reason. It is also our opinion that there is no legal objection to the terms of the contract.

Commenting generally, we note that paragraphs (b) (2) and (4) of section 3 of the contract require that the food shall be served in adequate quantities to meet the needs of growing children and that copies of a monthly menu shall be submitted by the operator to the Bureau for approval a week in advance of serving. Although it is recognized that menus and portion sizes are details of food service management it is believed that the

contract could have been stated more specifically in that regard by providing some general criteria as to what the lunch must consist of and the size of the portions required to be furnished. Without any criteria in those respects there is a possibility of disagreement between the parties as to just what must be furnished to comply with the terms of the contract.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

H. R. 2569, A BILL TO RAISE INCOME TAX EXEMPTIONS

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1955, I introduced H. R. 2569 which seeks to raise the yearly income tax exemption of a dependent from $600 to $1,000 and, in the case where dependent children are in a bona fide business school, college or a university, up to $1,800. It is when a child is in school or college that dad has to really sweat it out in order to make ends meet.

This bill was introduced by me because I sincerely believe that it will give much needed relief to our farmers, veterans, small-business men, white collar employees and the laboring men and women of the country. In other words, it will definitely raise the income of the little fellow in that he will have more Saturday night rattling change after present high cost living expenses and taxes have been met.

It may be argued by those who see fit to oppose my bill that it might cost the Treasury, in the loss of income taxes, nearly $1 billion per year, and that such would keep the budget in the red. However, I contend that, although the Government might possibly lose this sum of money in the form of income taxes from our little fellow; nevertheless, the Treasury will receive a similar amount or even a larger amount of money through the medium of excise taxes and other tax sources. In other words, my plan would only shift the burden of taxation from income tax to the excise tax, insofar as the small wage earner is concerned.

The individual who now earns less than $4,500 per year must, through necessity, spend the bulk of it just in order to exist or live. By allowing him this income tax exemption under H. R. 2569 we would leave him more defrosted cash on payday, hence, more money to spend. As a result, he would drive his automobile more frequently, buy more gasoline, oil, tires, and tubes. Each time he would make a purchase of any of these items, he would pay a Federal excise tax. Likewise, he would be in a position to buy more tobacco, furs, and jewelry. He would buy more food and clothes which would help tremendously to reduce our surplus stocks of food, fiber, and other commodities now stored in surplus supply and which depress our present farm prices. Mr. John Q. would make more long distance calls, send more telegrams, go to more movies, see more ball games and actually be in a position to take little Mrs. John Q. out to dinner or to a reasonably priced dance now and then. All of this would swell the excise taxes to such an extent that nothing actually would be lost through the medium of the raise in the income tax exemption. Fact is, I honestly believe that the Treasury would collect more taxes by the enactment of my bill.

It is my belief that by giving this proposed income-tax relief to Mr. and Mrs. John Q.—the forgotten public—our entire economic structure will be strengthened because it will enable the little fellow to pay his debts and to be able to spend more—all of which will put more money in circulation, create more buying power, and, in the final analysis, return more Federal revenue into the Treasury through excise taxes in lieu of income taxes. As I have said, it also will help to reduce our vast stocks of surplus food and other commodities.

Under the old tax code—prior to January 1, 1954—a conscientious, energetic, industrious boy or girl who actually wanted to help Dad with his financial responsibilities by seeking a job during the summer months, unfortunately, could not do so because the father was required to impress upon the child not to earn wages in excess of $600 a year. If this was done Dad lost his $600 exemption. By the old tax regulation we denied a fine young boy or girl the opportunity to help to make his own way. At the same time we were denying that boy or girl an opportunity to develop a sense of balance and responsibility. This helped to create in the mind of the teen-ager a disrespect for our tax laws. What is worse, if possible, the old tax code helped to retard and even to destroy the development of character and individual initiative and ambition in our young men and women of America. I am, therefore, delighted that a youngster—at least under 19 years of age—can now help his dad without the father losing that particular $600 dependent's exemption. This improvement came about less than 3 weeks before the original introduction of my bill on January 18, 1954—then numbered H. R. 7283. This change was definitely a progressive step. My legislation would be also.

Since enactment of Federal aid to education has been stymied due to its highly controversial amendments in some form or another, I would suggest that we enact H. R. 2569. My thinking may be a bit old-fashioned, but I believe with all my heart that a partial solution to our national education problem could be brought about by simply allowing—by sufficient tax exemptions—the individual family to educate their own children. Let me get the record straight, I have always been and am now for a fair and reasonable Federal aid to education bill. However, since it does not seem possible, at this time at least, to enact such legislation, I sincerely feel that the enactment of H. R. 2569 would help materially to relieve to a great extent the present financial burden that exists with respect to education. Although I favor some equitable form of Federal aid to education; nevertheless, I believe that it would be democracy at its finest for the people's Government to give back to the people, to the individual family unit—if you please—a tax cut so that the breadwinner of the household might educate his own child in his own way and in his own time. If this were done it would help education while the Congress endeavored to work out a fair and a complete program of Federal aid.

I sincerely trust that the great Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives will make a study of this problem with the hope that some immediate form of tax relief will be given to our small farmers, veterans, little-business men, white collar employees, and all of our laboring men and women.

If we would only try to help balance the budget of John Q. Public—he would balance our Federal budget with the result that our Armed Forces would not suffer and, therefore, our very freedom would not be endangered by the advance of communism throughout the world.

The fair thing to do as I see it—is to give my bill, H. R. 2569, a chance. If it is good it ought to be retained as law. If it fails—it ought to be repealed. There is much to be gained—nothing to be lost, and all of the time we will at least be trying to help our little people in our democracy. As long as we do that—we shall never have to really fear communism gaining any ground in America.

THE LATEST KREMLIN TACTIC IN THE COLD WAR

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, we have read in the press a great deal during the past few days about the latest Kremlin tactic in the cold war which calls for blaming Stalin for all the failures of communism as a system. Khrushchev and Bulganin cannot disassociate themselves from the cruelties of Stalin. We made a mistake by meeting with the Russians as equals at Geneva and thereby giving the appearance of humanizing them. The only difference between Stalin and Khrushchev is that Khrushchev has been trained to smile. Let us have a look at the record of this man, Khrushchev, who now calls his former boss, Stalin, the great murderer.

While everyone who knows anything at all about the history of communism understands that Stalin was the biggest murderer in all history, the important thing for us to remember is that those who today are running the Communist terror machine, cannot disassociate themselves from the brutal reign of Stalin. They are part of the most cruel tyranny in the history of all mankind.

It is a fact of history that the present rulers of the Kremlin were in fact, the hatchet men of Stalin. The unclean hands of every one of them drip with the

blood of martyrs who died because of the historical tyranny of the Russians and in the cause of their own individual liberty and freedom. It will be recalled that at the Nurnberg trials, the Russians insisted that the Nazi officials, military and civilian, who carried out the orders of Hitler, were equally guilty and should be punished accordingly. The Russians held that the Nazis were voluntary and willing hatchet men for Hitler.

The men who now rule the Kremlin as members of the Communist Party have been in the past, not only willing and devoted servants of Stalin, but indeed they have carried out his orders with the gusto of gleeful vengeance.

Time does not permit me to enumerate all the sordid facts concerning the crimes of Khrushchev himself, whose evil works earned for him the iniquitous title of "Hangman of the Ukraine." The same applies in equal or lesser degree to the black and diabolical record of every member of the Communist Party central committee, because, like any criminal conspiracy, they earn their way to recognition by demonstrating a ruthless, unswerving, and heartless devotion to the leader of the mob.

It would be both unwarranted and foolhardy for us to believe that Khrushchev's blaming Stalin for all the shortcomings and evils of communism is a sign that the criminal regime is prepared to alter its nafarious ways. If we were to make such a blunder, we would be doing exactly what the tactical plan of the Communist peaceful coexistence campaign calls for. We would be the helpless victims of a gigantic international con game. We would, in fact, be the simple minded victims of the biggest shell game in all of history.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that before the con men in the Kremlin get through with their latest act, we are certain to see a considerable number of staged performances like that reportedly taking place in the enslaved Georgian nation today. Here we see the Russian propaganda machine attempting to convince the people of the world that the Georgian people had a respect and a regard for the tyrant Stalin. Anyone who has the slightest understanding of the historical struggles of the Georgian nation against the Russians, will immediately smell an oversmoked Russian salmon.

It will be recalled that the Russian Communists, in accordance with the long established Russian precedent, have set up large colonies of Russians in all of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union, including the Georgian nation. The Georgians have long been beset and exploited by the large Russian colony which has been built up in Tiflis, the capital city of the Georgian nation. Accordingly, if, as reported, there have been riots in Georgia protesting the exposure of the true character of Stalin, we can be reasonably certain that such protests and demonstrations have been carried out by the Russian exploiters who were sent to Georgia to colonize, terrorize, and control that enslaved nation. And since the news reports of this morning indicate similar disturbances in Armenia, and Azerbaijan, this same set of facts I have cited here, beyond any doubt, apply equally to them.

In any case, I believe it is important for us to keep our sense of values straight as we analyze the torturous twists and turns in the Communist campaign of peaceful coexistence. Until the Russian Communists have demonstrated a capacity to act like human beings, our own enlightened self interest demands that we appraise them on the basis of the record. That record should leave no doubt in the mind of anyone who will take the time to read it that you can no more change the character of a Russian commissar than you can change the spots on a leopard.

There appeared in the press a dispatch from London highly pertinent to the remarks I have just made. Eddy Gilmore, a reporter of the Associated Press points up that it is impossible to regard the Georgians as admirers of the despot Stalin, and that we had best remember that the fiery spirit for national independence of the Georgians has not been conquered by the Russians.

By unanimous consent, I include the article to which I have reference:

GEORGIANS ARE REPORTED WIDELY DETESTING STALIN

(By Eddy Gilmore)

(Eddy Gilmore, while Associated Press bureau chief in Moscow, spent several weeks in the Soviet Republic of Georgia in 1953.)

LONDON, March 18.—"A photograph of Stalin's birthplace?" asked a surprised storekeeper in Gori, the late dictator's Georgian hometown. "Now who would want that?"

Inside the Stalin shrine (erected by him) in Gori is a showcase holding what is supposed to be Stalin's school report cards. They depict him as perfect in every subject.

"Perfect?" scoffed a Georgian under his breath. "Why one of my grandfathers was his teacher. It took Stalin 6 years to get through 4 grades and he never could learn arithmetic."

Halfway up Mount David, where Stalin's mother Catherine, is buried, a grounds keeper pointed to her grave and sighed.

"Look at it," he said, "It's falling to pieces. He never visited it. He never cared. God of mine, what a man to have for a son."

He crossed himself.

The Georgian people may riot against communism, Russian domination or their hard way of life, but hardly over the shattered myth of their late oppressor.

The 4 million inhabitants of the Soviet Republic passionately love their mountain homeland, resent Russians, and generally detested Stalin.

It is easy to believe that Georgians may have used Nikita Khrushchev's reported attack as an excuse to rebel, but to anyone who has spent time in Georgia, widespread national love for Stalin just doesn't seem logical.

STOCK PRICES AND BUSINESS FAILURES AT POSTWAR HIGH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the morning papers carry some wonderful news. They report that the stock market rode up to a new historic peak last week. Every day now we receive news stories announcing that one great corporation after another has set a new high in its profits. This is truly a golden age for the giant corporations.

Some of the newspapers have noted that this wonderful news about new highs in stock prices and new highs in corporate profits is not altogether cheering and reassuring to the farmers. I think I would be correct in reporting that this wondrous news is not altogether cheering and reassuring to small business. Unless there is something peculiar about the small-business people who are writing to me, and writing to your Small Business Committee, the typical attitude of the small-business man, I might say, is that the front-page prosperity about which he is reading leaves something to be desired. To put the matter bluntly, I think we could say that small-business people are downright unappreciative of the new records being set in stock prices and big-business profits.

One of the troublesome aspects of the current business prosperity is that while last week witnessed an all-time high in stock prices, the week also witnessed a postwar high in business failures. Dun & Bradstreet reports that there were 300 business failures last week. For all practical purposes we can say that all of these 300 failures were small-business failures. These 300 business failures last week compare to 226 business failures in the corresponding week of 1955, a period when business had not yet recovered. Moreover, these 300 failures which took place last week compare with 243 failures which occurred in the corresponding week of 1954, when there was a business recession. In other words, over the last 2 years we have had a very peculiar kind of business prosperity: the greater the number of business failures, the greater big-business profits and the higher rose stock prices.

This is an interesting and highly unusual phenomena. But, as I say, it has a certain beauty which small business people cannot altogether appreciate.

Business failures this year, up through last week, numbered 2,848. Total business failures in the corresponding period of last year numbered 2,508. And business failures through the first 2½ months of 1954 numbered 2,472.

And despite all the efforts at educating the small-business people to the value of this kind of prosperity, I find that these small-business people are a little backward in absorbing this kind of education.

A DIPOMATIC OFFENSIVE

I believe that in view of the peculiar circumstances of the time, it might be well for the House to start a diplomatic offensive toward small business. My proposal is that the two major parties undertake such an offensive, and that we make a bipartisan effort aimed at saving some of the small business firms. For this purpose moreover, it is my proposal that we give small business what it wants most of all.

Small business wants more than anything else antitrust laws which are at least reasonable and moderate in protecting small business against destruction by sheer abuse of big business power. First and foremost, small-business people want a restoration of the antitrust law which protected them from destruction

through price discrimination. Price discrimination is the most widespread, the most deadly, and the most unfair monopolistic practice with which small business has to cope.

A successful diplomatic offensive toward small business will have to contain more than mere speeches. It will have to contain more than waving the flag or waving the high-sounding phrases of the Sherman Act. Small-business people have grown weary of flag waving, and they have grown skeptical of the efficacy of waving the Sherman Act. In other words, if our diplomatic offensive is successful it will have to contain something specific and definite to cope with the abuse of power by which small business is being destroyed.

H. R. 11 WOULD STOP MANY SMALL BUSINESS FAILURES

For the purposes of this diplomatic offensive I propose that we bring up H. R. 11 and pass it. H. R. 11 was introduced on the first day of the last session of this Congress, and it was introduced with approximately 50 cosponsors. This bill would close the loophole which the Supreme Court knocked into the Robinson-Patman Act in an opinion misinterpreting that act in the Standard Oil of Indiana case. The bill would simply restore to small business the protection against price discrimination which Congress sought to give small business in 1936. Practically all small-business firms in the United States are aware of this loophole, they are suffering and going out of business as a result of this loophole, and they are aware that Congress now holds the future of small business in the palm of its hand. In short, small-business firms all over the United States are waiting and watching to see whether there are as many as 218 Members of the House who will sign the discharge petition to bring up and consider the bill which small business wants passed.

I am sure that at least 218 Members of the House would like to consider H. R. 11, hear it debated, and then vote on it. I am sure that there are at least 218 Members of the House who feel that we are not so busy at this period but what we could afford 2 hours for debating a bill which is vital to the continued existence of small business. The petition to bring up H. R. 11 is petition No. 3 on the Clerk's desk.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to Mr. PATMAN, for 15 minutes, on today and tomorrow; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. CHUDOFF, following the legislative business of the day, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILLIPS to revise and extend his remarks on the supplemental appropriation bill and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TABER (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS) to revise and extend his remarks on the supplemental appropriation bill and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include an article entitled "The Majority Leader of the House of Representatives," notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $374.

Mr. THOMAS.

Mr. HINSHAW.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS.

Mr. BUDGE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DIGGS (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. WOLVERTON), for March 21 and 22, on account of official business.

Mr. KRUEGER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for Wednesday and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. DOYLE, for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 585. An act to authorize the conveyance to Lake County, Calif., of the Lower Lake Rancheria, and for other purposes;

H. R. 622. An act to provide for the release by the United States of its rights and interests in certain land located in Saginaw County, Mich.;

H. R. 930. An act for the relief of John Daniel Pope;

H. R. 944. An act for the relief of Nicola Teodosio;

H. R. 1014. An act for the relief of Chung Fook Yee Chung;

H. R. 1074. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Chan Lee (Eta Lee).

H. R. 1097. An act for the relief of John Meredith McFarlane;

H. R. 1104. An act for the relief of Guenther Kaschner;

H. R. 1137. An act for the relief of Harry John Wilson;

H. R. 1209. An act for the relief of Numeriano Lagmay;

H. R. 1323. An act for the relief of Sister Ramona Maria (Ramona E. Tombo);

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of Krsevan Spanjol;

H. R. 1544. An act for the relief of Mrs. Moli (Mali) Sobel;

H. R. 1666. An act for the relief of Jose Canencia-Castanedo;

H. R. 1806. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, as heretofore amended, so as to permit such corporation to consolidate with Women's Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, Inc.;

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of Howard Rieck;

H. R. 1920. An act for the relief of Ane Karlic Vlasich;

H. R. 1923. An act for the relief of Kevin Murphy;

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chin-An Wang (nee Alice Chiacheng Sze);

H. R. 2054. An act for the relief of Induk Pahk;

H. R. 2072. An act for the relief of Julian Nowakowski, or William Nowak (Novak);

H. R. 2283. An act for the relief of Wilhelmus Marius Van der Veur;

H. R. 2285. An act for the relief of Marie Lim Tsien;

H. R. 2345. An act for the relief of Jean Henri Buchet;

H. R. 2522. An act for the relief of Isabelle S. Gorrell, Donald E. Gorrell, Mary Owen Gorrell, and Kathryn G. Wright;

H. R. 3037. An act for the relief of Jakob Hass, Rosa Hass, and Mala Hass;

H. R. 3057. An act for the relief of Doctor Beinvenido L. Balingit;

H. R. 3201. An act for the relief of George Mikroulis, his wife, Dora Mikroulis, and his daughter, Madonna G. Mikroulis;

H. R. 3265. An act for the relief of Alkista Sfounis;

H. R. 3375. An act for the relief of Dr. James C. S. Lee, his wife, Dora Ting Wei, and their daughter, Vivian Lee;

H. R. 3501. An act for the relief of Nisan Sarkis Giritliyan and Virgin Giritliyan;

H. R. 3557. An act to further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed;

H. R. 3650. An act to provide for the conveyance to Elief Rue of certain real property situated in Cassia County, Idaho;

H. R. 3723. An act for the relief of Freda H. Sullivan;

H. R. 3845. An act for the relief of Guillermo Pedraza;

H. R. 3857. An act for the relief of Constantin David, Paula Marie David, Claire Edmonde David, and Arlane Constance David;

H. R. 3869. An act for the relief of Esther Ledea Escobedo;

H. R. 3965. An act for the relief of Max Moskowitz;

H. R. 4181. An act for the relief of P. F. Claveau, as successor to the firm of Rodger G. Ritchie Painting & Decorating Co.

H. R. 4185. An act for the relief of Zabel Vartanian;

H. R. 4376. An act to exempt from duty the importation of certain handwoven fabrics when used in the making of religious vestments;

H. R. 4391. An act to abolish the Castle Pinckney National Monument, in the State of South Carolina, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4680. An act affirming that title to a certain tract of land in California vested in the State of California on January 21, 1897.

H. R. 4802. An act to authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land;

H. R. 5280. An act to authorize land exchanges for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia; to authorize the transfer of certain lands of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia, to the Commonwealth of Virginia; and for other purposes;

H. R. 5556. An act authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of McGirts Creek, Fla., for flood control;

H. R. 5856. An act to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year;

H. R. 5866. An act for the relief of Giovanni Lazarich;

H. R. 6112. An act to authorize the construction of a sewage-disposal system to serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 6309. An act to authorize construction of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet;

H. R. 6363. An act for the relief of Edward Barnett;

H. R. 6532. An act for the relief of John William Scholtes;

H. R. 6617. An act for the relief of Boris Kowerda;

H. R. 6618. An act for the relief of Etha Dora Johnson;

H.R. 6772. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain federally owned land under his jurisdiction to the school district No. 24 of Lake County, Oreg.;

H. R. 6961. An act to designate the lake created by Buford Dam in the State of Georgia as "Lake Sidney Lanier";

H. R. 7097. An act to provide for the reconveyance of oil and gas and mineral interests in a portion of the lands acquired for the Demopolis lock and dam project, to the former owners thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7927. An act to extend the time within which the State of Louisiana may make initial payment on the purchase of certain property from the United States;

H. R. 8607. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to David Peters, or to his heirs or assigns, title to land held by the United States in trust for him;

H. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution to designate the General Grant tree (known as the Nation's Christmas tree) in Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., as a national shrine;

H. J. Res. 443. Joint resolution to increase the appropriation authorization for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission; and

H. J. Res. 517. Joint resolution changing the date for the counting of the electoral votes in 1957.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1585. An act to provide for the return to the town of Hartford, Vt., of certain land which was donated by such town to the United States as a site for a veterans hospital and which is no longer needed for such purposes.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTIONS, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills, joint resolutions, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 572. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Delio A. Loo Murgas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 767. An act for the relief of Andrew Rosner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 850. An act for the relief of Konstantinos Zaferatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 885. An act for the relief of Alice Elizabeth Marjoribanks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1111. An act for the relief of Eric A. Cummings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1122. An act for the relief of Sarah Kleidermacher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1146. An act to further amend section 20 of the Trading with the Enemy Act, relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1240. An act for the relief of Imre de Cholnoky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1347. An act for the relief of Jose Arriaga-Marin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1465. An act for the relief of Audrey Jean Younkers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1528. An act to authorize enrolled members of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, North Dakota, to acquire trust interests in tribal lands of the reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1533. An act for the relief of John Nicholas Christodoulias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1542. An act to authorize an allowance for civilian officers and employees of the Government who are notaries public, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1552. An act for the relief of Mikie Woodard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1555. An act authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Crow Indian Reservation, Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1560. An act for the relief of Dr. John Joon Sik Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1619. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Ventura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1664. An act for the relief of Balbina Borenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1701. An act for the relief of Hildegard Silvonen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1733. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Argasinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1734. An act for the relief of Johann Antonius Tudhope and Walda Fedor Tudhope; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1762. An act for the relief of Rudolf Fritz Liermann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1814. An act for the relief of Teresa Lucia Cilli and Guiseppe Corrado Cilli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1831. An act for the relief of Panteles Kerkos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1846. An act for the relief of Dr. Howard Seeming Liang; Lai Yen Mark Liang, and Howard Seeming Liang, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1871. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to reimburse the Post Office Department for transmission of official Government-mail matter," approved August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 614), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1881. An act for the relief of Vittorio Ventimiglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1883. An act for the relief of Pietro Rodolfo Walter Stulin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1889. An act for the relief of Maria Guadalupe Shockley and her minor daughter, Evangelina Vega Shockley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1900. An act for the relief of Helen Agnes Blais (Junko Furakawa); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1929. An act for the relief of Regina M. Knight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1939. An act for the relief of John Shalam and Claude Shalam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1950. An act for the relief of Dr. Fu-Chuan Chao (also known as Fuk Kun Chiu) and his wife, Chiu Lai Yuk (also known as Lai Yuk Chao); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1953. An act for the relief of Yvonne Mary Florescu (Sister John Baptist); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1970. An act for the relief of Kim Boksoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1975. An act for the relief of Jenny Antoinette V. Ingrum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1987. An act for the relief of Dr. Peter Chou-Yuen Tchen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2012. An act for the relief of Chong You How (also known as Edward Charles Yee), his wife, Eng Lai Fong, and his child, Chong Yim Keung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2035. An act for the relief of Nicholas Hernandez-Valencia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2037. An act for the relief of Adele Knoff and her minor child, Hans Knoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2052. An act for the relief of Demetrios K. Georgaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2077. An act for the relief of Abdullah Ibrahim Hakim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2103. An act for the relief of Anke Naber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2104. An act for the relief of Charlotte Muhlefeldt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2138. An act for the relief of Dorothy May Ackermann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2143. An act for the relief of Manda Pauline Petricevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2151. An act to provide for the segregation of certain funds of the Fort Berthold Indians on the basis of a membership roll prepared for such purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2155. An act for the relief of Jose Torres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2156. An act for the relief of Thomas H. Ros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2201. An act for the relief of Dr. Wei-Chi Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2243. An act for the relief of Mary Boone Lacson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2249. An act for the relief of Pil Nyi Kwak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2264. An act for the relief of Yu Heng Gee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2267. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the city of Henderson, Nev.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2284. An act for the relief of Domingo Lim (also known as Lim Eng Kok and Domingo Lim Chay Seng); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2289. An act for the relief of David Hayes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2304. An act for the relief of Mary Parlich Goldstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2327. An act for the relief of Takako Iba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2345. An act for the relief of Lilu Yuen Chuang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2349. An act for the relief of Miss Pilar A. Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2357. An act for the relief of Nenita Santos and Elizabeth Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2358. An act for the relief of Renate Karolina Horky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2371. An act for the relief of Charles Black, also known as Joseph Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2381. An act for the relief of Dr. Mahmood Sajjadi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2399. An act for the relief of Hua-Tung Lee (Gordon Lee) and his wife, Chi-Wan Mow Lee (Jane Lee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2414. An act for the relief of Lina Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2445. An act for the relief of Knar Carmen Ives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2495. An act for the relief of Anna Abbene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2570. An act for the relief of Maximilien Beauvois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2590. An act for the relief of Paula Edith Reynolds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2666. An act for the relief of Catherine Toews; Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2686. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Boni; Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2697. An act for the relief of Kimileo Yamada Clark; Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2744. An act for the relief of Harold Manly Stewart; Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2755. An act to designate the reservoir above the Monticello Dam in California as Lake Berryessa; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2861. An act to authorize an increase of emergency relief highway funds from $10 million to $30 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956; Committee on Public Works.

S. 3237. An act to provide for continuance of live insurance coverage under the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, in the case of employees receiving benefits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act; Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3315. An act to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents in the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Member of Congress; Committee on House Administration.

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Member of Congress; Committee on House Administration.

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Member of Congress; Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings to the Sudan; Committee on Foreign Affairs.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 19, 1956, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 582. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1956, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 21, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1644. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed appropriations for the fiscal year 1957 in the amount of $4,859,975,000 for mutual security (H. Doc. No. 360); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1645. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, relative to local phone charges to Congressmen, and suggesting that the language of appropriations in the legislative appropriation bill for 1957 be changed so as to authorize payment for these services by the respective disbursing officers, as is the case with long-distance charges, pursuant to section 210 (f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1646. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting a report on military prime contracts with business firms for work in the United States for the period from July 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 268, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1647. A letter from the executive secretary, American Chemical Society, transmitting the annual report of the American Chemical Society for the calendar year 1955, pursuant to Public Law 358, 75th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1648. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the establishment of 8 positions for specially qualified scientific and professional personnel in the Department of Commerce with rates of compensation at rates not to exceed the maximum rate payable, pursuant to Public Law 313, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1649. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to carry out the International Convention To Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Matter"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 93. Joint resolution authorizing the acceptance of a gift from the Ericsson Memorial Committee of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1900). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 95. Joint resolution to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing; without amendment (Rept. No. 1901). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7611. A bill to establish a date of rank for pay purposes for certain Naval Reserve officers promoted to the grades of lieutenant and lieutenant commander; without amendment (Rept. No. 1902). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 8390. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1903). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 8477. A bill to amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1904). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 8904. A bill to amend certain laws relating to the grade of certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps upon retirement; without amendment (Rept. No. 1905). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2005. A bill to further amend the provisions of the acts authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of persons in the Armed Forces; with amendment (Rept. No. 1906). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1834. An act to authorize certain retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to use the commissioned grade authorized them by the law under which they retired, in the computation of their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1907). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 464. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fifth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1922). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8334. A bill to permit the importation free of duty of racing shells to be used in connection with preparations for the 1956 Olympic games; without amendment (Rept. No. 1923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8942. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Theatre Equipment Trade Show, New York, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1924). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8959. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Photographic Exposition, to be held at Washington, D. C., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1925). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EBERHARTER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 7678. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the 11th Annual Instrument-Automation (International) Conference and Exhibit, New York, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 223. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings to Pakistan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1927). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 909. A bill for the relief of Charles O. Ferry and other employees of the Alaska Road Commission; with amendment (Rept. No. 1908). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1096. A bill for the relief of Nathan Phillips; without amendment (Rept. No. 1909). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1476. A bill for the relief of the Spicer Ice & Coal Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1910). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2524. A bill for the relief of Oather S. Hall; without amendment (Rept. No. 1911). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4851. A bill for the relief of the Kelmoor Fox and Fur Farm; with amendment (Rept. No. 1912). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5382. A bill for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Company of Louisiana, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1913). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5453. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert Bradford Bickerstaff; without amendment (Rept. No. 1914). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5813. A bill for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Company of Louisiana, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1915). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6313. A bill for the relief of Vincent N. Caldes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1916). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 221. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1917). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 31. An act for the relief of Shih Ming Wang; with amendment (Rept. No. 1918). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 47. Concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation of Benito Quintana Sears; without amendment (Rept. No. 1919). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 83. An act for the relief of Ottile Hitzlberger Lachelt; with amendment (Rept. No. 1920). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1255. An act for the relief of Brigitta Poberetski; with amendment (Rept. No. 1921). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 10055. A bill to modify the authorized project for construction of the Millwood Reservoir on the Little River in Arkansas to include the construction of the Pine Creek, Lukfata, Sherwood (Narrows) and Broken Bow Reservoirs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 10056. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 10057. A bill designating September 13 in each year as Barry Day, and declaring such day to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 10058. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 10059. A bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 10060. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 10061. A bill to provide for transfer of title of certain lands to the Carlsbad Irrigation District, New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 10062. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 10063. A bill to exempt from tax admissions to certain cultural and trade centers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 10064. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce retirement age 65 to 60 in the case of men and from 65 to 55 in the case of women, and to provide that any fully insured individual who becomes permanently and totally disabled shall be deemed to have reached retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 10065. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an import tax on natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 10066. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain timber access roads, to permit maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 10067. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 10068. A bill relating to the quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 10069. A bill to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 10070. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in operation of industries affecting commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 10071. A bill to promote the self-sufficiency of the local service air carriers and to contribute to the national defense by providing for Federal participation in the design, development, testing, tooling, and construction costs of prototype transport aircraft suitable to the needs of local service airlines, and adaptable to auxiliary military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 10072. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 10073. A bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 10074. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 10075. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the town of Bald Knob, Ark.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 10076. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of Federal funds payable thereunder to States which have approved plans for old-age assistance and which maintain their expenditures for such assistance at or above the 1955 level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10077. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10078. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 10079. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide that foremen shall in certain cases be considered as employees for purposes of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 10080. A bill to provide for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury of the unpaid balance due on defaulted joint stock land bank bonds under the supervision and direction of the Farm Credit Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10081. A bill to establish corporate income-tax rates of 22 percent normal tax and 33 percent surtax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDS (by request):

H. R. 10082. A bill to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 10083. A bill to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 10084. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic interstate forest-fire protection compact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10085. A bill to remove inequities in the allowances for interest on overpayments attributable to final determinations on applications for relief under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 10086. A bill to provide vocational training for adult Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 10087. A bill to terminate operations under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended; and to provide relief to certain orphans and immigrants qualifying under the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 588. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the power of the States to conserve and regulate the exploration, production, and distribution of their petroleum products, water, sulfur and all other minerals and natural resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. J. Res. 589. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Con. Res. 224. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that ways and means be explored and found to insure applicability of principle of self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the consideration of House Resolution No. 16, a resolution urging Federal action to support the civil rights decision of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 10088. A bill for the relief of Rupert Waltl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 10089. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. David Tsun-Ngang Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 10090. A bill for the relief of Antonino Giordano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 10091. A bill for the relief of Ying Lun Ma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10092. A bill for the relief of the former shareholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 10093. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Gordon C. Brown, Sr. (in behalf of the minor child, Robert Gordon Brown); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 10094. A bill for the relief of King-Kay Kwong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 10095. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cora V. March; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 10096. A bill for the relief of Constantinos F. Agoris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 10097. A bill for the relief of Wing Lok So; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 10098. A bill for the relief of Hur Mei Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 591. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 592. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. Res. 438. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 6893, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

702. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of J. G. Winters and other veterans of Lycoming County, Pa., urging the immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

703. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 18 members of the American Legion Auxiliary at Hampton, Iowa, urging that favorable consideration be given H. R. 7886, to liberalize veterans' pensions for non-service-connected permanent and total disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

704. Also, petition of 45 residents of Marshalltown, Iowa, and vicinity urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

705. Also, petition of 45 residents of Waterloo, Iowa, and vicinity urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

706. By Mrs. KEE: Petition of W. C. Williams of Hinton, W. Va., and 46 other residents of Summers County, W. Va., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

707. Also, petition of Lawrence Boyd, of Alderson, W. Va., and 45 other residents of Monroe County, W. Va., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

708. Also, petition of Tom Bailey, of Iaeger, W. Va., and 44 other residents of McDowell County, W. Va., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

709. Also, petition of Tony Crane, of Renick, W. Va., and 43 other residents of Greenbrier County, W. Va., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

710. Also, petition of Elmer Morrison, of Renick, W. Va., and 45 other residents of Greenbrier County, W. Va., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

711. Also, petition of Walter Hambrick, of Renick, W. Va., and 45 other residents of Greenbrier County, W. Va., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

712. Also, petition of George E. Wilson, Jr., of Peterstown, W. Va., and 78 other residents of Monroe County, W. Va., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

713. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of VFW post of Decatur, Iowa, urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

714. Also, petition of veterans of Hedrick, Iowa, urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

715. By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of Mrs. Lillian Henderson, Charleroi, Pa., and members of Charleroi Council No. 162 Daughters of America, in support of the McCarran-Walter Act in its present form; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

716. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of E. J. Dietz and 53 other citizens of the State of Oregon urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

717. Also, petition of Willard M. Montgomery and 45 other citizens of the State of Oregon urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

718. Also, petition of Mr. Edward L. Smoke and 21 other citizens of the State of Oregon urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

719. Also, petition of Melton F. Smith and 44 other citizens of the State of Oregon urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

720. Also, petition of George H. Price and 44 other citizens of the State of Oregon urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

721. Also, petition of R. J. Baldwin and 295 other citizens of the State of Oregon urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

722. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Mrs. Rena Hobson, president, VFW Ladies Auxiliary 3130, Center Line, Mich. and 40 veteran employees of the Rockwell Steel and Axel plant, Detroit, Mich. for separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

723. Also, petition of Guy Stocks, Brown City, Mich., and 60 friends and neighbors of Brown City, Mich., regarding a pension for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

724. By Mr. VORYS: Petition of 45 residents of Columbus, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

725. Also, petition of 44 residents of Ohio and West Virginia, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

726. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the grand knight, St. Martin's Council, No. 2489, Knights of Columbus, Amityville, Long Island, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing their support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

727. Also, petition of Richard N. Gonzalez, Folsom State Prison, Represa, Calif., relative to the case of Richard N. Gonzalez, Crime No. 132107, *The People of the State of California, plaintiff,* v. *Richard N. Gonzalez, defendant, Folsom State Prison, Represa, Calif.*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

728. Also, petition of the president, Woodville Chamber of Commerce, Woodville, Calif., urging the immediate appropriation of the initial funds necessary for the commencement of construction of Success Dam, etc.; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Surplus of Farm Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, 1956, Gov. Orville Freeman, of Minnesota, stated on a national television program that there was "no farm surplus whatever" up to the time the Eisenhower administration went into office—that there was in fact a shortage of farm goods.

The following information was today furnished me by the Department of Agriculture:

In January of 1953, when this administration took over, the Commodity Credit Corporation had investments in price-supported commodities totaling $2,905,000,000. This included 469 million bushels of corn and 499 million bushels of wheat.

In addition, former Secretary Brannan had announced the elimination of production controls for the 1953 crop. Thus it was impossible for this administration to bring production under control until the end of the 1953 marketing year. By that time, the Commodity Credit Corporation investment had reached $6,005,000,000.

Further, there was a law on the books which made necessary the continuation of price supports at an incentive level for the 1954 crops, further adding to our surplus.

To summarize, this administration inherited a $3 billion surplus.

In addition, we inherited administrative actions of the previous Secretary which boosted the surplus to $6 billion.

Beyond that, we inherited a law under which the surplus reached $7 billion.

Latest available figures show a Commodity Credit Corporation investment of $8,690,000,000.

The present administration has faithfully invoked acreage controls and marketing quotas in an effort to bring production into line.

By the end of this fiscal year, this administration will have disposed of surplus stocks with a total value of approximately $6,500,000,000.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 38th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Byelorussia, sometimes known also as White Ruthenia. This is another one of the captive nations swallowed up by Communist Russia in 1921. Like the others of Eastern Europe, the people of this nation and their kin now living in this country and elsewhere are observing this anniversary with a feeling of sadness.

Nevertheless, it is good to observe such occasions because they serve as a moral encouragement to the people of Byelorussia and their kinsmen to continue their struggle for national independence, for justice and democracy. The people of Byelorussia cannot celebrate this anniversary. They are behind the Iron Curtain where freedom is not tolerated and democracy has been perverted in its meaning and purpose. They can only hope for a better day in the future, free from the yoke of Communist oppression.

On this eventful anniversary, I am happy to join with all freedom-loving people in commemorating this day and in sending our greetings and our prayers for the liberation of the White Ruthenian nation. We join in the fervent wish that delivery of the White Ruthenian nation from her oppressors will not be long delayed.

TVA Repayments Into the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the TVA is required by law to pay back into the Federal Treasury the entire Federal investment in its power operations. TVA is far in advance of its scheduled annual repayments into the Treasury. Through 1955 a total of $127,500,000 has been repaid by TVA into the Federal Treasury. This year, through 1956, a total of $186,500,000 will have been repaid into the Federal Treasury. The following table of repayments show accurately the annual revenues paid by TVA into the Federal Treasury:

Payments made by TVA into the U. S. Treasury as repayment of investment in its power program

Fiscal year	Payment	Total payment
1948	$10,500,000	$10,500,000
1949	5,500,000	16,000,000
1950	5,500,000	21,500,000
1951	9,000,000	30,500,000
1952	12,000,000	42,500,000
1953	15,000,000	57,500,000
1954	20,000,000	77,500,000
1955	50,000,000	127,500,000
1956 (estimated)	59,000,000	186,500,000

Results of Poll on National Issues in the 39th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, during the month of February, I conducted a poll among the voters of the 39th Congressional District of New York on several of the major issues now before our country. The poll covered every third voter in the district who registered in the 1954 elections, regardless of party affiliation. Some 41,000 ballots were delivered to residents of the district, and of that total 5,569 were marked and returned, or approximately 13 percent.

The questions, 20 in number, covered major domestic and international issues before the country today, and included 2 of major interest to the voters in this Presidential election year: Who is your first choice for President? and who is your next choice?

On the first question, a resounding 87 percent of those who signified a choice designated President Eisenhower. On the second question, more than 36 percent of those who voted designated Vice President Nixon. Both men far outran their nearest rivals. The runner-up to President Eisenhower was Gov. Adlai Stevenson, and the runner-up to Vice President Nixon was Chief Justice Warren.

Since not everyone voted on every issue, 2 sets of percentage calculations were made on the returns: 1 based on the total number of votes cast and 1 based on the total vote on each individual question. The following tabulation is based on the latter set of calculations:

	Percentages	
	Yes	No
1. Do you favor the President's soil-bank proposals, to improve our farm economy?	77.43	22.57
2. If there is a revenue surplus this year, should it be used (1) to reduce the national debt (70.74); or (2) to further reduce taxes? (29.26).		
3. Should the Taft-Hartley Act be (1) revised (36.94); (2) repealed (7.96); (3) let alone? (55.10).		
4. Should our immigration laws be further relaxed?	22.37	77.63
5. Do you favor Federal aid for school construction?	64.58	35.42
If so, should it be available to all school districts (26.16); or only to those where there is proven financial need? (73.84).		
Should it be made available to school systems maintaining segregated schools?	32.0	68.0
6. Should hydroelectric power at Niagara be developed by (1) the Federal Government (12.28); (2) the New York State government (11.92); (3) private enterprise? (75.80).		
7. Do you favor further development of power by Government agencies, where private enterprise is prepared to do the job?	16.74	83.26
8. Should the postal service be self-supporting?	82.29	17.71
9. On the premise that further substantial expansion of social security will involve increases in social-security taxes, over and above those already scheduled, do you favor:		
Elimination of the earnings ceiling, now set at $1,200 annually?	64.57	35.43
Lowering the age of eligibility from 65 to 62?	68.26	31.74
Extension of benefits to the disabled at age 50?	84.64	15.36
10. Should the Attorney General have power, on court order, to tap wires in suspected kidnaping and national security cases?	85.91	14.09
11. Should the Constitution be amended to provide that treaties and executive agreements which abridge or nullify constitutional rights are of no force and effect?	72.56	27.44
12. Do you favor the revision of the electoral college to make the electoral vote more nearly reflect the popular vote?	89.33	10.67
13. Should foreign aid be continued?	61.54	38.46
14. If so, should it be stabilized on a long-range basis?	50.35	49.65
15. Should the United States extend recognition to Red China?	12.15	87.85
16. If Red China is admitted to the United Nations, should the United States withdraw?	23.03	76.97
17. Do you favor more cultural and commercial ties with Russia?	38.1	61.9
18. Do you favor the establishment in our National Government of a Department of Peace?	55.71	44.29
19. Who is your first choice for President in 1956? Eisenhower (87.49).		
20. Who is your next choice? Nixon (36.07).		

On question 19, Who is your first choice for President?, a total of 4,668 voted, and 4,084 designated Eisenhower. The runnerup was Adlai Stevenson, with 197 votes, and 36 others were also-rans. On the question of next choice, only 3,532 voted, and 1,274 designated Nixon, with Chief Justice Warren next in line with 811 votes. Altogether there were 65 individuals named for second choice.

Cancer Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the disease that is the Nation's second largest killer is cancer. It causes 1 out of every 7 deaths of this country. It will strike 2 out of 3 families. If present death rates continue 24 million Americans now living will die of this dread disease. These are hard facts and cruel facts, I know, but they are facts that will come true unless we continue and make ever stronger our fight against this vicious killer.

The organization that is leading the fight against this killer is the American Cancer Society. Made up of units like our own Essex County chapter, the American Cancer Society is the only voluntary national health agency engaged in a program of cancer education, research, and service. The society, then, presents a three-pronged attack against cancer.

The first line of attack in this campaign against cancer is by education. Through films, speakers, exhibits, panel discussions, mobile education units, forums and literature our local Essex County chapter is carrying out a year-round program to give us as much information as possible regarding the nature and prevention of cancer. The seven danger signs must become known and watched for by everyone. The importance of immediate and prompt treatment at the first sign or suspicion of cancer must be stressed. Oftentimes cancer, in its earliest stages, cannot be detected by the average person, yet can be diagnosed by a physician. Therefore, the society emphasizes the importance of a yearly physical examination.

But education is not confined to laymen alone. Members of the medical profession also benefit from our contributions. Technical publications and a film library are made available to them by our local chapter. In addition, the national organization provides many more technical aids. For instance, doctors may attend clinics where they are informed of the latest developments in cancer detection, surgery, and X-ray and radium treatment.

The second line of attack is through research. Perhaps your dollars for the 1956 campaign will finance the research project that will unlock the key to the ultimate control of cancer. The fight for the discovery of the causes of cancer and a practical cure to this killer must continue. Our contributions will help 1,000 scientists and 3,000 laboratory technicians and assistants in this fight for the control of cancer. Today the only approved means of curing cancer are X-ray, radium, and surgery. This is not enough. There are still types of cancer for which almost nothing can be done. These scientists and technicians, supported by our dollars, must continue to do their utmost to find the answers to the cure of this dread disease.

The third line of attack is by service to those already suffering from cancer. Dressings and medication are made available through our local chapter. Articles contributing to the comfort of the patient can also be borrowed. Transportation is provided to and from clinics and even nursing care, including treatment and administration of drugs are provided.

The American Cancer Crusade is a voluntary organization. It can succeed only if we support this campaign with the same generousness, the same unselfishness, that the American people always support a worthwhile cause. This is the American way—the democratic way. I am sure that all of us will open our hearts and give generously. The quota for the Essex County Chapter of the American Cancer Society is $199,200. This must be reached for the unit to continue its activities.

Let us each resolve to keep the red sword, the symbol of the American Cancer Society, ever raised—ever ready to strike back at one of our worst enemies. We must succeed in this campaign in order to give hope to those already afflicted and to those who will become afflicted. Remember that now 1 out of 3 of these cases of cancer can be cured if treated promptly. Let us give our dollars to the cancer crusade with the hope that during the coming year an even

greater number will be cured—that during the following years cancer will be eliminated completely. Let us make this crusade a success.

The American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my remarks under the heading "The American Bar Association Fails the American People." On March 17, I received a letter from one of the vice chairmen of the membership campaign committee of the American Bar Association which in all fairness to the association should be added to the RECORD since the letter does say, in so many words, that Negroes are now admitted to membership in the American Bar Association. The letter of March 15 reads as follows:

MY DEAR MR. MULTER: There has been forwarded to me for reply your letter of February 28 to Mr. Travers E. Devlin, of Caverly, Dimond, Dwyer & Lawler.

The question on the application form to which you refer no longer has any bearing on the eligibility of any individual for membership in the American Bar Association. Prior to undertaking this campaign, the New York City committee asked for and received a firm assurance from the association that no individual would be barred from membership on the basis of race. Fulfillment of this assurance is attested to by the participation of several Negroes in the current campaign and the enlistment of many more to membership during the last few weeks.

You may be assured that Mr. Seymour and I, and as far as I know, all of the members of the New York committee, agree with you that the race question should be removed from the association's application and have been actively endeavoring to have it removed. We agree with you in principle—we have only differed in our belief that we stood a better chance of effecting its removal as members than as outsiders. I personally believe that the association has a fine record of accomplishment even though I have disagreed with it on particular questions, including this one.

I do wish you would reconsider and rejoin the association.

Sincerely yours,
LYMAN M. TONDEL, JR.

I answered Mr. Tondel on March 19 as follows:

DEAR MR. TONDEL: Receipt is acknowledged with thanks of yours of March 15 in answer to mine of February 28 addressed to Mr. Travers E. Devlin.

I am pleased to have your assurances that Negroes are now being admitted to membership and are being allowed to participate fully in the activities of the American Bar Association. Until the reference to race is removed from the association's application form, however, I will continue to believe that those in control of the association are opposed to the principle upon which you and I agree.

Can you tell me how many Negro lawyers have been admitted to the American Bar Association within the last year, who reside and practice in any State south of the Mason-Dixon line? Also, has a single Negro been admitted to membership who resides or practices in the District of Columbia?

Sincerely yours,
ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

When that letter is answered, the reply also will be placed in the RECORD.

Blast at Blasting Radio-TV Commercials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 5 I complained to the Federal Communications Commission that radio and TV broadcasters are imposing extra volume on listeners during commercials as follows:

CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It occurs to me that there is an area in which your organization might perform a service to the American people either by tightening up its regulations or enforcing those now on the books. This concerns the irritating and obnoxious practice of radio and television stations, both local and network, permitting the sound volume to increase during the presentation of commercials.

Everyone has experienced many times the adjustment of his set to an agreeable sound level during the entertainment portion of a program only to be blasted unmercifully by the noise of the commercial.

It is understood that present regulations maintained by you require stations to maintain as high a volume output without distortion as possible at all times. Possibly stations are deliberately preparing their commercials in such a manner as to be particularly distortion-free and thus permit the increase of modulation in a feigned compliance with the Commission's regulations.

At any rate, I believe that you will agree that whatever needs to be done, should be done to protect the American people from the imposition upon them of these excessively loud commercials.

I would appreciate your advising me in connection with the above and as to any steps which you may take to remedy the situation.

Thank you for your courtesy.

Very truly yours,
CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress,
18th District, California.

Mr. Speaker, I have waited 2 weeks for a reply or an acknowledgement from the FCC, but as yet none has come. Approximately March 15 a number of newspapers printed a very short item regarding my complaint. There was an immediate and decisive public response. The following are extracts from typical letters I have already received from all over the country:

We are behind you 100 percent on your stand concerning the irritating and obnoxious practice of turning up volume during commercials on TV. (Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Wallace, Wichita, Kans.)

We thank you again and again and hope you can get results for us. (Mrs. Evelyn Binns, Hollywood, Calif.)

Thank you for your protest against the noisy TV spielers. (Miss Nellie C. Sprague, Los Angeles, Calif.)

Congratulations! Keep up the good work. Try to correct a very annoying practice. (Mr. Joseph Kane, El Cajon, Calif.)

Bully for you—keep at 'em. One of my pet peeves. (Mr. Walt Haring, Rocky River, Ohio.)

When I read your article in my home paper urging the Federal Communications Commission to stop radio and TV stations from turning up the sound volume during the commercials, I said, "Amen to that." Maybe if you would call for write-ins, we would get results. (Mrs. H. J. Baber, Waxahachu, Tex.)

I certainly want to thank you. My interpretation of the real meaning of your effort is to stop that unmerciful blasting noise of the commercial advertisers. I pray that you may be able to help the listeners of the radio and television audience. (Mr. Clinton W. Fancher, Hamburg, N. J.)

If it will be of any information and benefit to you, permit me to say that I canvassed the office yesterday and I find that each and every one that I talked to have also shared my view as well as yours, and they are very anxious that something be done to remedy this very irritating situation. (Mr. W. F. Durbin, New Albany, Ind.)

I am delighted to see that someone is interested in stopping a practice which has annoyed me and interfered with my pleasure from radio programs for a long time. (Dr. Charles L. Clay, M. D., Auburndale, Mass.)

You are so right and more power to you. It is high time that someone took the bull by the horns, my hat is off to you. (Mr. Edward Sander, Sr., St. Louis, Mo.)

Hurrah for your stand! (Mrs. E. W. Loenig, Lincoln, Nebr.)

Your action toward noisy commercials is well taken. There is no reason why the listening public should be blasted out of the house when the commercials come on and the volume is doubled. (Mr. R. R. Goodson, Malibu, Calif.)

It's about time something was done about it. Nothing is more annoying than to have the set properly tuned for enjoyable listening and viewing, and then have the quiet of the living room shattered by some loud, noisy, and uninteresting commercial. As far as I'm concerned more sales are lost on my family due to this bad practice than any other reason I can think of. Certainly hope you are successful in your complaint to the Commission. (Mr. Elmer E. Donald, St. Louis, Mo.)

We are truly grateful to you for advancing a protest against noisy television commercials. We have written to every known authority, but have had no result. (Mrs. Elinor Oliver, Beverly Hills, Calif.)

Thank the Lord someone has seen fit to take up the cudgel against the loud, blaring, blatant commercials forced on television viewers. Your efforts are certainly appreciated by this writer, and I certainly hope you will be able to force some action to be taken in this respect. (Mr. Franz A. Hirt, Atlanta, Ga.)

Millions of Americans hope that your recent letter to the Federal Communications Commission will bring the long-sought relief from extra loud radio and television commercials. The unnecessary and obnoxious increase in modulation or power which accompanies most commercials is a violation of good taste and no doubt makes the advertised products less attractive to the consumers. (Mr. R. A. Mattmueller, Arlington, Va.)

It has been a situation that I have criticized many times and not knowing just who

to refer the matter to have failed to do so myself or I would have with plenty of weighty emphasis. (Mr. Frank A. Winslow, Long Beach, Calif.)

It is not often that one in office can comprehend a nuisance and a cure for same, that will serve so many. (Mr. Chris Pritchard, San Leandro, Calif.)

Many millions may not write you, but I'm sure they're with you. I've heard many say, "I'll never buy a product they shout at me." (Mrs. Jessie G. Norton, Bronxville, N. Y.)

Pleased to have someone in a high office express my feelings exactly. (Mrs. Claud Nixon, Lynwood, Calif.)

More power to you in combating the nuisance of loud TV and radio commercials. (Mr. Jack Gibson, Long Beach, Calif.)

All hail to you in your fight on noisy commercials on TV. (Col. R. McKerchar, Los Angeles, Calif.)

You took the words out of my mouth, in your outcry against loud commercials. (Mr. William Austin Moore, Long Beach, Calif.)

Mr. Speaker, this means is taken to discuss public reaction to my complaint to illustrate that it is not an isolated one. I hope it may serve either to get action from the FCC, or to spur broadcasters themselves to adopt self-disciplinary measures against "riding the gain," the trade's expression for blasting out commercials at a greater volume than the entertainment portion of a program. The mildest thing that can be said of the practice is that it is unsportsmanlike, the worst that can be said of it is unprintable.

These remarks will be sent directly to the major radio and TV networks with a request they take action to clean up their own houses. If so, perhaps their example will be followed by nonnetwork stations which I do not have the means of contacting.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, every nation in the world has figures of note who have left an impact on world history or whose advanced social and political concepts have gone into the stream of thinking over the centuries, inspiring countless other peoples to strive toward the fulfillment of high national goals. But there is perhaps no single country that has bequeathed to future generations as significant a list of such legacies as Greece. It is with extreme pride, therefore, that we congratulate the peoples of Greece and Greek decendants everywhere on the commemoration of Greek Independence Day. Since the idea of independence originated long ago with the ancestors of present-day Greeks, the day the Greeks themselves celebrate assumes a particular significance for the supporters of liberty and independence throughout the world.

Some 500 years before the birth of Christ the city of Athens was experimenting with a type of democratic government premised on ideas and aims which would benefit the individual above all else. The results of those early experiments were passed on to other peoples and countries, and, although the concepts were reinterpreted and elaborated upon in order to fit each changing scene, the basic beliefs in liberty, freedom, and individual dignity remained a central core of democratic philosophy. Greece, as the cradle of democracy, is the fountainhead of our own liberties and ideals, and the centuries have only served to mellow and refurbish the intrinsic qualities of the Greeks themselves, who remain stanch lovers of personal freedom and of human dignity.

As a gateway between Asia and Europe, Greece has suffered the incursions of foreign powers, events so unfortunately familiar to all areas lying in the path of states struggling for international aggrandizement and a strategic foothold. In the middle of the 15th century Turkish bands overran Greece, and the Greeks were under the invaders' domination for 4 centuries. Even though 1821 signaled the end of that phase of foreign rule, the Greeks were to feel again the tyrant's tread during the Second World War and in the years following its end. Nazism and communism were to test the fortitude and heroism of the Greeks, and they were to prove themselves equal to the task. At this very moment, however, the Communists within Greece are again persisting in seeking a predominant place within the Greek political structure, with the recent February elections showing that the Greeks still have a struggle ahead of them to counter this latest Communist ambition for power.

The future is bright, however, because the Greeks are united with us and with the adherents of the democratic way of life everywhere in the common moral battle to preserve democracy and personal integrity. Since President Truman in 1947 moved to help preserve the independence of Greece against the Communist onrush by extending military and economic aid to that country, the Greeks have continued to be a bulwark of strength within the Atlantic-Mediterranean community. We still remain at the side of Greece in her support of the cause of freedom on next Sunday, March 25, the independence day of the nation of Greece.

Manifesto on Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to say that I am in sympathy with the general intent of the manifesto because I do not believe in integration, nor have I in the past. However, I have not signed it because I fear it will do more harm than good. The Supreme Court surely did some legislating that the Congress has refused to do.

Religion as a Weapon Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, one of the strongest weapons we have in the struggle against communism is the belief in God. Unfortunately, we are not using this weapon sufficiently and the people of the free world somehow fail to realize the significance of religion in this struggle. It regards communism as a political conspiracy, but fails to realize that it is also an anti-religious conspiracy. I believe we should give religion a greater role in this struggle for freedom.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to insert the text of an address on the above subject which I delivered on Sunday, March 18, 1956, at a communion breakfast of the Lexington Council of Knights of Columbus in Brooklyn:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO, CATHOLIC COMMUNION BREAKFAST, SUNDAY, MARCH 18, 1956

My dear friends and fellow Americans, I am delighted to be here this morning and to have the opportunity to address your communion breakfast. I appreciate the invitation to meet with you and to express some thoughts which I should like to share with you.

But first let me tell you a little story which I recently heard and which is quite appropriate to what I am going to discuss with you. According to this story, a highly significant trade conference was held recently in Moscow among the nations in the Soviet orbit. The chairman—a Russian, naturally—reported as follows:

"As you know, Bulgaria produces bricks. These bricks will from now on be sent to Poland, which will give Bulgaria clothing in exchange."

All the Bulgarians applauded vigorously. The chairman then continued:

"Then Bulgaria will export this clothing to Czechosolvakia in exchange for Czech machinery."

Again the Bulgarians applauded, but not so vigorously. The chairman went on:

"However, this Czech machinery is needed more in Hungary, so it will be shipped there, and the Hungarians will send in exchange their excellent salamis."

This time the Bulgarians applauded very loudly. Then the chairman said:

"Finally, the salamis will be exported to the Soviet Union, which in exchange will send Bulgaria an excellent quality of clay for brick-making."

All the Bulgarians collapsed.

My friends, this story may perhaps be a bit exaggerated, but it gives us a clear picture of the people and the governments behind the Iron Curtain, the life they live, the problems they face, their struggle for existence as human beings, their struggle to worship God. It is impossible for me—as a Member of Congress and a loyal American—to face this devoutly religious audience in this safe and free environment of ours, and to close my mind to the outrages that are being perpetrated, even as I speak to you, against the religious spirit of man wherever communism holds sway.

I shall not distress you with the anti-religious tortures and the massacres and the

purges, the confiscation of church property, and the misuse of the church as an instrument of the Communist state. You know that story very well. I merely wish to point out that communism is not only a political conspiracy whose primary aim is to dominate the entire world, but it is also an anti-religious conspiracy whose aim is to wipe out all religious thinking and beliefs and to destroy everything that is spiritual. The Communist state has no room for God. It cannot share its authority with any other institution, spiritual, or temporal. Its basic credo forbids it to accept the supremacy of the people in government or the principle of obedience to God.

Communism, therefore, constitutes a threat to our civilization and our way of life in many ways. It is a threat to democratic government. It is a threat to the national independence of whole peoples. It is a threat to human rights and human dignity. And it is a threat to our right of worshipping God in freedom. With diabolical cunning, communism seeks to subvert religion and God to a position of subordination to the state.

This is one of the most wicked elements of all in the fraud being perpetuated against people everywhere by communism. It calls for a struggle against this most devastating enemy, a spiritual war in which none of us can afford to rest. I believe it will shape up as a monumental and historic world struggle, for it is clear to all of us that in the field of religion co-existence is impossible because of the godless philosophy of communism.

The point that I wish to impress upon you as strongly as I can is this: We can lose that struggle against communism without a shooting war. In fact, we are very much in danger of losing that struggle without a blow. We are on the defensive everywhere today, spiritually as well as politically. Communism coils its poisonous tentacles from its center in the Kremlin beyond the Iron Curtain into every part of the world. It represents a clear and definite danger to free civilization and goes to the very roots of life in all its aspects, political, economic, social, religious and even personal.

It uses subversion and chicanery, defection and brutal tyranny. Soviet Russia continues to chip away at the free world, knocking off a piece here and a corner there, gradually encircling pivotal nations and eventually crushing them. All this she does not by war or violence or revolutionary means, but by exploiting democratic methods and weaknesses which serve her purpose best. Right now the Communists are concentrating on the 800 million people in Asia, whom they are constantly inciting by pointing a finger of guilt at us, by seeking to convince them that we, the nations of the free world, stand in the way of human progress. If they succeed in winning them over through these tactics, you can readily see what a blow this would constitute to the whole free world and how much it would weaken us.

So, let us not minimize the danger of losing this struggle without a shot being fired. It is a very real danger, indeed. And the danger is even greater when we realize that these are not the only tactics employed by the Communists. One of the methods they use, for example, is the spread and encouragement of narcotic addiction, particularly among our youth in the armed forces, in the schools, in places where our youth congregate. This is done with but one purpose in mind: to weaken and corrupt American youth, to make criminals out of them, to bring them to a state of desperation where they will be completely dominated, to show to the world that our youth is weak and sick and unable to present any resistance. That is why, some months ago I proposed that not only should we establish a very strict control at our borders, docks, and airports to stop the traffic in narcotics from abroad, but that the death penalty be meted out to all dope peddlers and traffickers in narcotics who, to my way of thinking, are committing murder and national treason.

Another reason why we are losing the struggle against communism is that for some unexplained reasons the West has always been on the defensive, and has never displayed enough initiative in cementing greater unity of the free world. I cannot believe that the peoples of Asia, in their desire to maintain their freedom and independence, will voluntarily suppress this desire and allow themselves to be swallowed up within the Communist empire. It is incumbent upon us, the people of America, to bring to the people of Asia a clear conception of the advantages and disadvantages of a free and democratic society such as ours based on the belief in God, as against the ruthless and despotic society of the Communist world which is based on immorality and godlessness. There is no doubt in my mind as to their choice, if given the true facts and the opportunity to pursue their choice. Unfortunately, we are not doing enough, we are always on the defensive, so that our motives are sometimes misconstrued by the peoples of Asia who suspect us of endeavoring to impose our domination over them. Nothing is further from the truth, but the Communists are exploiting this suspicion in order to divide the free nations and to entrap in their clutches the weak and the naive.

And let me mention another very significant factor why we are losing the struggle. I refer to the role of religion in this vast struggle. Unfortunately, it is not playing the leading role that it should. Somehow we fail to realize that the strongest weapon which the democracies have is not the atomic bomb, nor the hydrogen bomb, nor any other weapon of huge destructive force. Our strongest weapon is and always will be the belief in God. To a tortured mankind which is hungry for genuine peace this means justice, morality, dignity, freedom and the good life. Unfortunately, we have failed to make this sufficiently clear to the suffering millions all over the world. Unfortunately, we have also failed to raise our voice loudly in behalf of freedom of worship everywhere and religious toleration. My friends, I shudder to think what this world would be like, and what it would come to, without religion. This is a thought worthy of deep concentration as we plan our struggle against this godless evil in the days and months ahead.

Now, the question I wish to raise is how we can win the struggle against communism. First and foremost, of course, is for us to reverse the policies which we are pursuing and which I indicated above. Let us expose the tactics used by the Communists against the free nations. Let us put a stop to the deadly traffic in narcotics. Let us stop being on the defensive and undertake effective means of bringing the true facts to peoples everywhere. And above all let us give religion its rightful place in this universal struggle. It may prove to be the decisive weapon to win the hearts and minds of men.

In addition, there are many more things we can do. Allow me to enumerate just a few such steps and to discuss them briefly.

First, the eradication of famine in the world. It is contrary to all reason—I would go a step further and say it is well-nigh criminal—that in a world of abundance of food and great scientific progress in producing more food, people should starve. There is no need for anyone to go hungry, anywhere. Mankind has the means and the wherewithal to produce all it needs. Much can be done in this respect. In my own way, as one Member of Congress, I instigated some action. Let me tell you about it.

As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I am well aware of the problems of our farmers, particularly the disposal of food surpluses. During the past year I have been continually advocating the distribution of some of these surpluses to institutions for the poor in this country, to private relief organizations and religious agencies operating here and abroad (such as the National Catholic Welfare Agency), and even distribution of food on a direct people-to-people basis overseas. In November 1955 I was a member of the United States delegation to the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) conference in Rome. During the conference, I discussed with Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz, who headed our delegation, the question of distributing food to religious and private welfare agencies. He promised me to look into the matter upon his return to Washington. Upon our return, I again conferred with Mr. Butz and others in Washington about releasing more of our food surpluses to these welfare agencies. As a result of these discussions you will recall that shortly before Christmas our Government announced it is making available considerable quantities of wheat, corn and other products to welfare organizations for distribution to needy persons abroad. I am convinced that this aid will prove most helpful in countries like Italy, France, Greece, Turkey and other parts of the world, in combating communism and strengthening the forces of freedom.

Second, stockpiling of food surpluses for emergencies. In July of 1955 I was a member of the United States congressional delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Conference in Paris, which discussed problems dealing with the security of the North Atlantic nations. There I advocated a plan to stockpile food surpluses for future emergencies, primarily intended for use during war, but also for use in fighting famine, floods, etc. These stockpiles of food are to be kept in strategic areas throughout the world, in Europe, Asia, Africa, the Far East, and in this capacity it would serve as a lifeline extending over the world for use of the free nations or those associated with us in the struggle aaginst communism.

Specifically, I suggested that we establish a quasi-Government agency which is to be entrusted with the task of stockpiling and distributing our food surpluses abroad, but that it is to be done in a manner intended to aid the nations and forces which are fighting communism. Those using our stockpiles or accepting our gifts of food must know that this aid comes from the people of the United States.

Third, extension of our school-aid program. My proposal is that this be done not only domestically, but also in foreign countries. You can well understand what it would mean to the prestige of the United States if we could bring some of our food and milk into the schools of friendly nations and the people would see how their children are directly benefited. Furthermore, I am strongly in favor of extending this program to public and parochial schools so that all children could benefit. I recently advocated both to the House Appropriations Committee and the House Agriculture Committee that this program be extended and that the required sums be allotted for this purpose.

Fourth, send surplus food to the starving people behind the Iron Curtain. During the past year I have been advocating the idea of sending some of our surplus wheat to feed starving people behind the Iron Curtain, not only as a humanitarian act, but also for its propaganda value in winning over those people to our cause. Only very recently, in January of this year, Secretary of Agriculture Benson came out in favor of the idea, but nothing has been done to date.

In order to win the cold war and to avert a world catastrophe, we must reach the people flanked against us and those undecided with actions of love, charity, and understanding; not with acts of hatred which will further inflame them to support their leaders against us. I believe that had we done this, we might have prevented the shipment of Czech arms to Egypt. Czechoslovakia needed cotton, while Egypt wanted arms. Had we suplied some of our surplus cotton to Czechoslovakia, we could have attached a condition not to export arms, and perhaps prevented the present situation in the Middle East.

And finally, United States representation at the Vatican. I have been urging this ever since I came to Congress. I am sure there is no need for me to go into an extensive explanation to this audience why it is urgent that the United States have a diplomatic representative at the Vatican. It is well known that the Vatican maintains diplomatic relations with some 50 countries, but among the major countries which have thus far not established such relations are Communist Russia, Red China, and, I regret to include in this group, our own United States. The Catholic Church is today a major force, spiritually and morally, in the struggle against the evil forces of communism. The Vatican is an important source of information and intelligence concerning the countries and peoples behind the Iron Curtain. This information would unquestionably be available to us, if we had a diplomatic representative there.

These, then, are a few of the things I should like to see done in pushing this struggle to a final victory. The free world is anxiously waiting and watching our actions. As the moral leader of the free nations it is up to us to show the way. We who have faith know that, regardless of its temporary gains, communism will be eventually defeated and destroyed because of its godless philosophy and its persecution of everything that is sacred to mankind. Faith, my friends, can be a tremendous driving force in our daily life. For Christ has taught us:

"If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth." (Mark 9: 23.)

Moderation Is Needed in Extension of Territorial Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a matter of importance is being discussed at the meeting of the Inter-American Specialized Conference on the Conservation of the Resources of the Continental Shelf and Marine Waters, at Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic. This is the proposal by some of the member states to extend territorial waters to a distance of 200 miles.

There has been much friction between the United States and Latin American nations over the extent of sovereignty over coastal waters, and there is great need for a just and equitable solution to this problem.

However, the proposal for 200-mile sovereignty seems to me not only to fly in the face of tradition and accepted international law, but also to fail to be in accord with realities. It is my understanding that sovereignty over coastal waters has traditionally been determined by practical considerations of the area over which the nation can effectively exercise control. It has been said that the 3-mile rule originated at a time when the range of coastal guns was approximately that distance. While it is true that technological advances may have rendered that limit obsolete, 200 miles offshore is still far more than nations can effectively control. Imposition of the 200-mile rule can only intensify friction between our American Nations and damage the cause of peace.

The matter is no academic one, for American fishermen have habitually fished in waters which would be prohibited to them by this new ruling and their industry could be very detrimentally affected by its imposition.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our representatives to this conference deserve our thanks for their steadfast opposition to the inauguration of this new proposal. I want them to know that the people of the second district of Florida appreciate their efforts to work out a more realistic solution to the offshore sovereignty problem.

Exchange Club of Glendale Memorial Citizenship Award Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we give national recognition to the Glendale, Calif., Exchange Club for its praiseworthy efforts to promote better citizenship and a better understanding of our Government and American institutions.

The Glendale Exchange Club has undertaken for the last 8 years to send the two outstanding high-school boys from Glendale to the Nation's Capital as a part of its Memorial Citizenship Award program.

This activity has been an outstanding success. At the end of World War II, the Exchange Club decided to establish a memorial to the sons of Glendale who gave their lives for their country.

Instead of erecting a monument, the club created a living memorial—that of sending the two outstanding senior boys from Glendale and Hoover high schools in Glendale for a week's visit in Washington, D. C.

This year, the eighth annual Memorial Citizenship Award winners—Gordon C. Gunn, of Glendale High School and Richard E. Foushee, of Hoover High School—will be with us. They arrive Tuesday, March 27.

Preceding them were Charles Waite and Wayne Anderson in 1955, Richard K. Harmon and Edward Coates in 1954, Jack Springer and David Anderson in 1953, Larry Hicks and Dudley Kebow in 1952, John Breckenridge and John Madden in 1951, Sumner Hopkins and Wayne Clemens in 1950, and Jack Hill and Charles Newman in 1949.

I might say that all these award winners have gone on to establish wonderful records in college and in their chosen fields of endeavor, reflecting the high caliber of these youthful ambassadors to the Nation's Capital from Glendale.

It is fitting and timely to announce that this year's winners will be guests of honor of the Washington Exchange Club on March 27, on which day the National Exchange Club will observe the 45th anniversary of its founding. Present with the two Glendale high-school seniors will be Harold Mott, of Washington, D. C., president of the National Exchange Club this year.

The Majority Leader of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of inquiries concerning the position of majority leader of the United States House of Representatives and the duties and responsibilities of the majority leader thereof. I assume that from time to time other Members of the House have also received similar inquiries.

As a result, I requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare a history for me on the subject of the majority leader of the United States House of Representatives. Dr. George B. Galloway, acting on my request, has done considerable research on this subject and has prepared an excellent article on the office of the majority leader and in it there is described the duties and responsibilities of the incumbent of this office.

It is a pleasure for me to give full credit to Dr. Galloway for the fine work that he did in preparing this article. I am pleased to insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Members of the House and for other persons who may have occasion to refer to this subject now or in the future:

THE MAJORITY LEADER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Political leadership is a fascinating subject for study, and nowhere more so than in nations with democratic forms of government. Such countries are governed in large part by their national legislatures the role of whose leaders excites perennial interest. Writing in 1885 Woodrow Wilson remarked that "in a country which governs itself by means of a public meeting, a congress or a parliament, a country whose political life is representative, the only real leadership in governmental affairs must be legislative leadership—ascendancy in the public meeting which decides everything. The leaders, if there be any, must be those who suggest the opinions and rule the actions of the representative body."

The position of Congress in the American system of government may not be so supreme today as it was when Wilson wrote his little classic on congressional government. But the leadership of Congress continues to intrigue the interest of scholars and laymen alike. Especially is this true in the House of Representatives where the character and conditions of leadership have had a most interesting history.

In any numerous body leaders must arise or be chosen to manage its business and the American House of Representatives has long had its posts of leadership. Outstanding among them have been the Speaker, the floor leader, and the chairman of the Committee on Rules. The chairmen of Ways and Means and of Appropriations have also long been top leadership positions in the hierarchy of the House, followed by the chairmen of the other great standing committees of that body. This article will be limited to the office of the majority leader of the House: its history, role, and relationships.

HISTORY OF THE OFFICE

In the history of the evolution of the office of majority leader the year 1910 marks a major dividing point. For the reform of the House rules adopted in that year brought about a redistribution of the powers of the Speakership and a significant change in the position of the floor leader.

During the 19th century the floor leader was customarily selected by the Speaker who often designated either his leading opponent within the party or the chairman of Ways and Means or of the Appropriations Committee or one of his faithful lieutenants. Thus Winthrop appointed his opponent Samuel F. Vinton in 1847; Banks designated Lewis D. Campbell in 1856; Pennington named John Sherman in 1859, and Reed selected McKinley in 1889. Ranking membership of Ways and Means accounted for Clay's appointment of Ezekiel Bacon in 1811; Stevenson's choice of Gulian C. Verplanck in 1822; Polk's selection of Churchill C. Cambreleng in 1835; Orr's promotion of James S. Phelps in 1858; Randall's advancement of Fernando Wood in 1879; Keifer's appointment of William D. Kelley in 1881; Carlisle's designation of Roger Q. Mills in 1887; and Henderson's selection of Sereno E. Payne in 1899. Faithful lieutenants were rewarded by the appointment of James J. McKay by Jones in 1843; Thomas S. Bayly by Cobb in 1849; George S. Houston by Boyd in 1851; William H. Morrison by Kerr and Carlisle in 1875 and 1883; and William M. Springer by Crisp in 1891.[1]

According to Riddick, "in the House, the early titular floor leaders were at the same time the chairmen of the Ways and Means Committee. Before the division of the work of that committee, the duties of its chairmen were so numerous that they automatically became the actual leaders, since as chairmen of that committee they had to direct the consideration of most of the legislation presented to the House. (Ways and Means handled both the revenue and the appropriations bills down to 1865.) From 1865 until 1896 the burden of handling most of the legislation was shifted to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who then was designated most frequently as the leader. From 1896 until 1910 once again the chairmen of the Ways and Means Committee were usually sought as the floor leaders."[2]

Since 1910 the floor leader has been elected by secret ballot of the party caucus. During the Wilson administrations the Democrats resumed their former practice of naming the chairman of Ways and Means as floor leader, but since the 72d Congress (1931–33), when the Democrats recovered control of the House, their floor leaders have not retained their former committee assignments. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, who was elected Democratic floor leader on September 16, 1940, and who has held that office longer than any predecessor, resigned his seat on Ways and Means when he became majority leader. In 1919, when the Republicans captured control of the House, they elected as their floor leader the former chairman of Ways and Means and made him ex-officio chairman of their committee on committees and of their steering committee. He gave up his former legislative committee assignments in order to devote himself, with the Speaker, to the management of the business of the House.

CHANGES AFTER 1910

As a result of the so-called revolution of 1910, notable changes were made in the power structure of the House. Under "Uncle Joe" Cannon who had been Speaker since 1903, the Speaker was supreme and all-powerful. He dominated the Rules Committee which made the rules and was a law unto itself. The majority party caucus was seldom needed or used. The Speaker appointed the standing committees which were entirely free from control by a majority of the House, while the floor leader was a figurehead.

After the congressional elections of November, 1910, in which the Democrats won full control of the House, they held a party caucus on January 19, 1911, and chose Champ Clark as Speaker and Oscar Underwood as their floor leader and as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Under the new system that became effective in the 1911–12 session of the 62d Congress, the Speaker was largely shorn of power and the majority party caucus became the dominant factor. The Rules Committee was controlled by the floor leader and the caucus; it made the rules and retained all its former powers. The Democratic members of Ways and Means organized the House by naming its standing committees.

Under Underwood the floor leader was supreme, the Speaker a figurehead. The main cogs in the machine were the caucus, the floor leadership, the Rules Committee, the standing committees, and special rules. Oscar Underwood became the real leader of the House. He dominated the party caucus, influenced the rules, and as chairman of Ways and Means chose the committees. Champ Clark was given the shadow, Underwood the substance of power. As floor leader, he could ask and obtain recognition at any time to make motions to restrict debate or preclude amendments or both. "Clothed with this perpetual privilege of recognition, and backed by his caucus," remarked a contemporary observer, "the floor leader had it in his power to make a Punch and Judy show of the House at any time."[3]

After the First World War the party caucus gradually fell into disuse, the floor leader ceased to be chairman of Ways and Means, the standing committees continued to function as autonomous bodies, and the Rules Committee became a more influential factor in the power structure of the House. After 1937 this powerful committee ceased to function as an agent of the majority leadership and came under the control of a bipartisan coalition which was often able to exercise an effective veto power over measures favored by the majority party and its leadership.

The net effect of the various changes of the last 35 years in the power structure of the House of Representatives has been to diffuse the leadership, and to disperse its risks, among a numerous body of leaders. The superstructure which has come to control "overhead" strategy now includes the Speaker, the floor leader, the chairman of rules, and the party whip. At a somewhat lower echelon behind this inner "board of strategy" are the chairman and the secretary of the party caucus or conference, the majority members of rules who have grown from 3 to 8, and the members of the steering (Democratic) and policy (Republican) committees and of the 2 committees on committees. Thus the top leaders of the House are no longer "the chairmen of the principal standing committees," as Woodrow Wilson described them in 1885, although the chairmen still have large powers over bills within their jurisdiction.

So far as the position of floor leader is concerned, he no longer occupies the post of supremacy that Oscar Underwood held. There is no provision for his office in the standing rules of the House. Nevertheless, he stands today in a place of great influence and prestige, the acknowledged leader of the majority party in the Chamber, its field general on the floor, No. 2 man in the party hierarchy, and heir apparent to the Speaker himself. All the Speakers of the past quarter century have been advanced to the Speakership from the floor leadership position.

QUALIFICATIONS AND PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE

After retiring from the House of Representatives where he represented Buffalo from 1897 to 1911, DeAlva Alexander wrote an informative history of that body which contains a series of character sketches of the floor leaders of the House from Griswold in 1800 to Underwood in 1911. Most of these mighty men of old are now forgotten, but to their contemporaries they were men of exceptional capacity. "In interesting personality and real ability the floor leader is not infrequently the strongest and at the time the best-known man in the House."

Alexander went on to give his own evaluation of the characteristics of a good leader as follows:[4]

"It certainly does not follow that a floor leader is the most effective debater, or the profoundest thinker, or the accepted leader of his party, although he may be and sometimes is all of these. It should imply, however, that in the art of clear, forceful statement, of readily spotting weak points in an opponent's argument, and in dominating power to safeguard the interests of the party temporarily responsible for the legislative record of the House, he is the best equipped for his trade. It is neither necessary nor advisable for him to lead or even to take part in every debate. The wisdom of silence is a great asset. Besides, chairmen and members of other committees are usually quite capable and sufficiently enthusiastic to protect their own measures. But the floor leader must aid the Speaker in straightening out parliamentary tangles, in progressing business, and in exhibiting an irresistible desire to club any captious interference with the plans and purposes of the majority."

Thirteen men have held the office of floor leader of the House of Representatives since 1919. Six of them were Republicans: Mondell, Longworth, Tilson, Snell, Martin, and Halleck. Seven were Democrats: Garrett, Garner, Rainey, Byrns, Bankhead, Rayburn, and McCormack. Elevation to the floor leadership comes only after long service in the House. The Republican floor leaders had served, on the average, 16 years in the Chamber; the Democrats 21 years before their election. The combined average for the whole group was 19 years previous service in the House. The long-run trend in point of previous House experience is downward, both McCormack and Halleck having been elected floor leader after serving only 6 terms in the House.

All the floor leaders since the First World War have also enjoyed long service on some

---

[1] DeAlva S. Alexander, History and Procedure of the House of Representatives (1916), ch. VII, Floor Leaders, pp. 110–111.

[2] Floyd M. Riddick, The United States Congress: Organization and Procedure (1949), ch. V, The Floor Leaders and Whips, p. 86n.

[3] Lynn Haines, Law Making in America (1912), pp. 15–16.

[4] Alexander, op. cit., p. 109.

of the most eminent committees of the House. Of the six Republicans, three had served on the Rules Committee, two ranked high on Ways and Means, and one on the Appropriations Committee. Of the seven Democrats, three were high ranking on Ways and Means, two on Rules, one on Appropriations, and one (RAYBURN) had been chairman of Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF FLOOR LEADER

The standing rules of the House are silent on the duties of the floor leaders who, as we have seen, are selected by the caucus or conference of their respective parties. As his title indicates, the principal function of the majority leader is that of field marshal on the floor of the House. He is responsible for guiding the legislative program of the majority party through the House. In cooperation with the Speaker, he formulates and announces the legislative program, keeps in touch with the activities of the legislative committees through their chairmen, and stimulates the reporting of bills deemed important to the Nation and the party. After conferring with the Speaker and majority leader, the majority whip customarily sends out a "whip notice" on Fridays to the party Members in the House, indicating the order of business on the floor for the following week, and the majority leader makes an announcement to the same effect on the floor in response to an inquiry from the minority leader. The legislative program is planned ahead on a weekly basis according to the readiness of committees to report, the condition of the calendars, the exigencies of the season, and the judgment of the party leaders. Advance announcement of the weekly program protects the membership against surprise action.

The role of the majority leader was lucidly summarized in a statement inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 11, 1928, when the Republicans were in power, by Representative Hardy, of Colorado: [5]

"The floor leader, especially the leader of the majority side, has much to do with the legislative program. The majority leader, of course, represents the majority on the floor. Motions he makes are usually passed. He endeavors to represent the majority view and the majority follow his leadership. He leads in debate on administration matters and gives the House and the country the viewpoint of his party on the legislative program.

"The leader keeps in touch with proposed legislation, the status of bills of importance, with the steering committee of which he is chairman, and with the attitude of the Rules Committee. He confers with committee chairmen and Members in general. The majority leader often confers with the President and advises with him regarding administrative measures. He takes to the President the sentiment of the party in the House and he brings to the party in the House the sentiment of the President. The majority leader acts also as chairman of the committee on committees and of the steering committee."

The Democratic Party in the House set up its own steering committee in 1933, composed of the Speaker, floor leader, chairman of the party caucus, party whip, the chairmen of Ways and Means, Appropriations, and Rules, and one Representative from each of the 15 zones into which the country is divided for party purposes, each such Representative being elected by the Democratic delegation in the House from the zone. The steering committee elects its own chairman, vice chairman, and secretary and cooperates with the leadership in the planning and execution of party policy. In actual practice, nowadays, however, "the Democratic steering committee seldom meets and never steers," according to James F. Byrnes.

Various parliamentary procedures are employed by the floor leader in directing and expediting the legislative program. Much noncontroversial business on the Unanimous Consent Calendar is disposed of without debate and without objection. The work of the House is sometimes described as "lawmaking by unanimous consent" because the floor leader uses this device to fix the program of business. Members know that it would be futile to object to his unanimous consent requests to consider legislation because the same end could be achieved via a special rule from the Committee on Rules. Similarly, if a Member sought to bring up a matter out of its turn without prior agreement with the leadership, the floor leader could defeat him by objecting.

The floor leader can also limit debate on a bill, if it tends to get out of control, by making the point of order that debate is not germane to the pending subject or by moving that all debate on the pending bill and all amendments thereto close in a certain time. By his temper and spirit he can also influence the tone of debate.

As the end of a session approaches, with many measures pressing for passage, the Speaker and the floor leader cooperate closely to avoid a last-minute jam. The procedural devices employed at this time are largely unanimous consent, special orders, and motions to suspend the rules which are in order on the last 6 days of a session and require a two-thirds vote. "There is a usual speeding up of the program during the last days. But there is also a tightening of control. In strong contrast to the Senate, the House remains a poised, businesslike body as it approaches adjournment. The men in the cab hold the legislative train steady to the very end of its run." [6] At the end of each session the floor leader customarily extends his remarks by inserting a record of its accomplishments, showing the major legislative actions taken and the number of public and private laws enacted, viewing with pride the role of the majority party in the legislative process.

In 1909 the House adopted a rule whereby Wednesdays were set apart for the consideration of unprivileged bills on the House and Union Calendars. Under this Calendar Wednesday rule, when invoked, the clerk calls the roll of the committees in turn and authorized members call up bills that their committees have reported. At the time of its adoption this rule was regarded as perhaps the most vital of the reforms that the progressives won under Cannonism. For it reserved Wednesday as the one day of each week which had to be given to the consideration of bills upon the House Calendar. Before its adoption, the call of committees was rarely reached as the result of the accidental or intentional manipulation of privileged matters. To remedy that condition the new rule provided that on one day each week no business, regardless of its privileged character, should be allowed to interfere with the regular routine. In obtaining its adoption the progressives demanded, and thought that they had secured, 1 day so guarded that nothing could interfere with the consideration and final passage of general legislation.

For many years, however, the Calendar Wednesday rule has been more honored in the breach than in the observance. Session after session passed without a call of the committees. In practice, Calendar Wednesday is usually dispensed with by unanimous consent at the request of the majority leader. If there is objection, it requires a two-thirds vote to dispense with it, but no one ever objects. The leadership has evidently felt that there is little, if any, need for Calendar Wednesday because of the alternative methods by which bills can be brought up and over which they have more control. In the modern practice there are five routes by which bills and resolutions reach the floor of the House: (1) By the leave of certain committees to report at any time; (2) under unanimous consent, on call of the Unanimous-Consent Calendar or the Private Calendar; (3) on special days, as on District Day, when particular types of business are privileged; (4) under suspension of the rules on the first and third Mondays and the last 6 days of the session; and (5) under special orders reported by the Committee on Rules.

Since the floor leader is responsible for the orderly conduct of the business of legislation on the floor, it is necessary for him to keep in close touch with the sentiment of the House and with the chairmen of committees that have under consideration bills of interest to the House, the country, and the party. To this end he holds frequent conferences with those concerned with prospective measures in order to compose any differences that may arise, as well as to plan the strategy and tactics of his campaign. Information as to party sentiment on a particular bill is also obtained, with the aid of the party whips, by polls of the State delegations.

On the Democratic side the whip organization in the House consists of a chief whip who is appointed by the majority leader in consultation with the Speaker, and 15 assistant whips who are selected by the Democratic Representatives from as many zones into which the country is divided for party purposes. Representative CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, is Democratic whip at the present time. It is the whip's job to be present on the House floor most of the time the House is in session. He helps the majority leader keep tab on legislation, and he keeps the Members advised of the legislative schedule. He attempts to make sure the Members of his party are on the floor when a significant vote is imminent. On occasion the whip joins the Speaker and the majority leader in seeking to round up votes on an important issue.

On the Republican side the whip organization includes the chief whip who is elected by the committee on committees, 3 regional whips selected from 3 regions by the Republican whip, and 10 assistant whips who are also appointed by the chief whip. Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois, is presently the Republican whip.

Under the old system the congressional parties held frequent caucuses at which party policies were vigorously discussed and differences settled. Every major measure of a session was considered in party caucus and Members were bound to abide by its decisions. The leadership then knew exactly where it stood, whether bills could be passed on the floor without amendment or whether compromises would have to be made. After Champ Clark became floor leader in 1909 the House Democrats held many binding caucuses and much of the success of the legislative program of the Wilson administration was attributed to the effective use of the caucus by the Democratic Party in both Houses of Congress. For many decades House Republicans also held frequent party conferences which, although they were not binding, made for a consensus among the party membership and helped a succession of strong GOP Speakers and floor leaders to hold the party reins tightly.

Under the new system, however, party causes are seldom held except at the opening of a new Congress to nominate House officers and approve recommendations of the leadership for committee appointments. Perhaps party leaders nowadays consider these meetings too hazardous. The leadership cannot compel Members to vote against their will or conscience nor can it discipline

[5] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 70th Cong., 1st sess., p. 8439.

[6] Paul D. Hasbrouck, Party Government in the House of Representatives (1927), p. 117.

them by removal or demotion from committees. In latter years the floor leader has relied for the cooperation of his followers not upon the compulsion of party rules but upon his own powers of logic and persuasion and considerations of party welfare. "Under the new system the floor leader is dependent not upon his power under the rules, but upon his own personality and character, upon the esteem in which he is held in the House for his political sagacity and his wisdom as a statesman, and upon the natural instincts which prompt men belonging to a party, and held together by natural selfish instincts for mutual protection, for his success in harmonizing differences and thus being able to go into the House with a measure assured of sufficient support to secure its enactment * * * the floor leader has become the general manager of his party in the House, the counselor of his colleagues, the harmonizer of their conflicting opinions, their servant, but not their master." [7]

Summarizing, the function of a leader is to lead. In the case of a majority leader of a legislative assembly, leadership involves planning the legislative program, scheduling the order of business on the floor, supporting legislation calculated to implement the party's platform, pledges, coordinating committee action to this end, and using his individual influence to keep the members of the party in the House in line with party policies. The majority leader's task is to steer his party in the House toward the formulation and adoption of policies and strategy designed to carry out the administration's legislative program, where the House and the Presidency are controlled by the same political party. As floor leader his function is to employ all the arts of parliamentary procedure to expedite the enactment of that program.

Under existing conditions in the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives, this is a large order. For the party is deeply divided along sectional lines. It has both conservative and liberal Members who wear the same party emblem, but lack a common political philosophy. Loyalty to local and sectional interests sometimes transcends a sense of responsibility to the national political party. Under these circumstances, the task of the party leader is difficult to accomplish. Who can lead where others will not follow? Who can discipline recalcitrant party members for failing to cooperate when effective sanctions are lacking? To be sure, rule 2 of the House Democratic caucus rules provides that "any member of the Democratic caucus of the House of Representatives failing to abide by the rules governing the same shall thereby automatically cease to be a member of the caucus." And rule 7 provides that "in deciding upon action in the House involving party policy or principle, a two-thirds vote of those present and voting at a caucus meeting shall bind all members of the causes: Provided, The said two-thirds votes is a majority of the full Democratic membership of the House." But for all practical purposes these rules are moribund.

RELATIONS WITH COMMITTEES

During the 19th century, as already noted, the actual floor leader was often the chairman of Ways and Means prior to 1865 when this committee handled both the revenue and appropriation bills. In that year the supply bills were given to the Committee on Appropriations and thereafter the floor leader was often the chairman of Appropriations. When the 62d Congress (1911–13) transferred the power to appoint committees from the Speaker to the Democratic members of Ways and Means, its chairman (Underwood) who was also floor leader thus acquired an indirect influence over legislation not enjoyed by his predecessors. Today Democratic vacancies on Ways and Means are filled by election by the party caucus which ratifies the choice of the party leadership which is thus able to exercise influence over tax and other legislation reported by that committee. Representative MACHROWICZ was elected to fill a vacancy on Ways and Means in this manner early in 1956.

As already noted, the Republican floor leader serves as chairman of the Republican Committee on Committees of the House which has the task of filling its party vacancies on the legislative committees. This involves hearing the claims of interested candidates and deciding who should be chosen.

The floor leader on both sides of the House aisle is also a member of his party's steering or policy committee. The Republican floor leader has been ex officio chairman of his steering committee. An interesting account of the role of the Republican steering committee several years ago was given by Representative HARDY of Colorado, as follows: [8]

"An influential factor in Government is the steering committee. It exerts a powerful influence but makes no effort to exhibit power. It works along diplomatic lines to feel out and consolidate sentiment for administration measures and procedure. It meets at the call of the chairman, and considers the welfare of the Government from the party point of view. It advises with the White House, the chairmen of important committees, the party leaders, and the Rules Committee. It helps to iron out differences, and to formulate the majority program in the House. The chairman of the steering committee is the floor leader. When the committee meets the Speaker sometimes and the chairman of the Rules Committee usually are invited in for consultation."

Relations between the leadership of the House and the Rules Committee have varied over the years. From 1890 to 1910 they were merged, for Rules was then a triumvirate composed of the Speaker and his two chief lieutenants, often the chairmen of Ways and Means and of Appropriations. After 1910 the speakership was "syndicated" and the leadership was separated from the members of the Committee on Rules who ceased to be the dominant figures in the House, although their chairman continued to be an important personality because of his position.[9] Writing in 1927 Hasbrouck said of the Rules Committee: [10]

"It is the trump card of the floor leader, but he himself is not officially identified with it. True, he must appeal to the reason of 12 men, and win a majority of them to the support of his proposals. But the mainspring of action is not in the Rules Committee. The impulse comes from the floor leader after consultation with his board of strategy or, for purposes of more formal and routine action, with the Steering Committee."

In 1937 the leadership lost control of the House Rules Committee, thanks to the seniority custom, when three of its Democratic members joined with the four Republican members to block floor consideration of controversial administration bills. The coalition succeeded in preventing many New Deal-Fair Deal measures from reaching the House floor except by the laborious discharge route. After World War II a rising demand developed for reform of the Rules Committee whose powers were temporarily curbed during the 81st Congress (1949–50) by adoption of the so-called "21-day rule." This rule strengthened the position of the chairman of the legislative committees of the House vis-a-vis both the Rules Committee and the leadership. While it was in effect, the 21-day rule brought the antipoll-tax bill to the House floor for a successful vote and forced action on the housing and minimum wage bills. It also enabled the House to vote for the National Science Foundation, Alaska and Hawaii statehood legislation, and other important measures. Altogether, during the 81st Congress 8 measures were brought to the House floor and passed by resort to the 21-day rule, while its existence caused the Rules Committee to act in other cases. Repeal of this rule in January, 1951, restored the checkrein power of the Rules Committee which it has since exercised on various occasions. "Until the 21-day rule is restored," remarked Representative HOLIFIELD, "we can expect further situations in which a few men, strategically situated in the Rules Committee, can impose their will on the Congress and prevent the enactment of legislation deemed by the House majority to be essential to the security and welfare of this Nation." [11]

Today the Rules Committee is regarded as an important arm of the House leadership whose wishes it is expected to respect. Presumably it does so on most occasions. But "traditions of seniority and tenure have at times made certain of the majority members of the Rules Committee of the House somewhat out of tune with the larger portion of their party colleagues, with the result that there has been something of a cleavage between the actions of the committee and the wishes of the core leadership of the party." [12]

The influence of the party leadership on the legislative committees of the House is suggestive, not coercive, informal, not official, tactful, not dictatorial. The floor leader seldom appears in person before a committee, but he maintains close and friendly relations with their chairmen on matters of party policy, seeking to mediate between the wishes of the administration and those of the committeemen. Prior to 1947, before the committee structure had been streamlined and jurisdictions clarified, leadership could influence the fate of a bill by referring it to a favorable or unfavorable committee; but freedom of choice in bill referrals was reduced by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The practice of flood leaders regarding their own committee assignments has varied in recent times. Representative MCCORMACK, now the majority leader, voluntarily resigned from Ways and Means in 1940 when he was elected floor leader on account of the strenuous duties of that office. But when the Republicans captured control of the House in the 80th Congress and Mr. MCCORMACK became minority whip, he accepted membership on the Committee on Government Operations and has since continued to serve on that committee. On the other hand, Mr. MARTIN, now minority floor leader and former Speaker, has had no committee assignments, while Mr. HALLECK, who was majority leader in the 80th and 83d Congresses, has served on the Rules and House Administration Committees.

RELATIONS WITH THE PRESIDENT

For more than 15 years now regular conferences have been held at the White House between the President and his party leaders in Congress—the so-called Big Four: The Speaker and majority leader of the House and the Vice President and majority leader of the Senate, when they belong to the President's party. When, as at present, opposing political parties control Congress and the Presidency, the minority leaders attend

[7] George R. Brown, The Leadership of Congress (1922), pp. 221–222, 224.

[8] Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. 8, sec. 3626.

[9] Atkinson and Beard, The Syndication of the Speakership, Political Science Quarterly, September 1911, p. 414.

[10] Hashbrouck, op. cit., pp. 95–96.

[11] Hearings before the Senate Committee on Government Operations, on the Organization and Operation of Congress, June 1951, p. 52.

[12] Ernest S. Griffith, Congress: Its Contemporary Role (1956), p. 165.

these meetings at the White House which are usually weekly while Congress is in session, if the President is in town. These Big Four meetings have helped to bridge the gap between the legislative and executive branches of the National Government created by our inherited system of separated powers.

Mutatis mutandis, they are the American counterpart of what Bagehot, referring to the British Cabinet, described as "the hyphen that joins, the buckle that fastens, the executive to the legislature." They are advantageous to both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue because they give congressional leaders an insight into the President's plans, while affording the President valuable counsel and guidance on the prospects of his legislative program. When of the same political party, the floor leaders are expected to serve as spokesmen for the administration, although there have been a few noteworthy departures from this practice. On the House side, however, during the 83d Congress, Majority Leader HALLECK successfully made the transition from opposition to administration leader and became the most effective champion in Congress of Eisenhower's program. In the White House those days CHARLIE HALLECK was the best liked man on Capitol Hill.

When President Roosevelt took office in 1933, he launched such a varied legislative program that it was necessary for him to keep in close touch with Congress through the leaders of both Houses. He consulted with his party leaders and committee chairmen with respect to the New Deal measures before they were introduced as administration bills, usually by the majority leaders. Sometimes he called the majority leader of the House or Senate individually to the White House to confer about some problem peculiar to one Chamber or the other. After his return from trips abroad he sometimes asked the floor leaders of each house to brief him on legislative developments during his absence.

When opposing parties control the two branches, the President is more likely to discuss domestic legislative matters with the congressional leaders of his own party, although in the early days of the 80th Congress President Truman occasionally conferred with Messrs. Vandenberg, White, Martin, and Halleck, especially on legislation of a nonpartisan nature. In view of the vital role of Congress in the field of foreign relations, the President must sometimes take the leaders of both political parties in both Houses into his confidence. In the days before the Second World War, when President Roosevelt was seeking to strengthen our defenses, he frequently confered with both Democratic and Republican leaders in both Houses of Congress. Such a conference was the famous night meeting at the White House late in July 1939, when the President and Secretary of State Cordell Hull urged that Congress repeal the Embargo Act. Among those in attendance were the chairmen of the Foreign and Military Affairs Committees, members of the Cabinet, and the majority and minority leaders of the House and Senate.

JOHN M'CORMACK'S SERVICE AS MAJORITY LEADER

JOHN W. MCCORMACK has represented the 12th Massachusetts District in the House of Representatives since November 6, 1928. Twelve years later he was first elected majority leader of the House on September 16, 1940: an office which he has held ever since except during the Republican 80th and 83d Congresses when he served as minority whip. Thus, he is serving his 28th year in the House and his 12th year as majority leader, longer than any predecessor in this post. For many years he was the faithful lieutenant of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, and was responsible for steering through the House the vital legislation of the 1940's.

MCCORMACK'S incumbency of the floor leadership coincided with the Second World War and the postwar years. During the fateful forties Congress made many vital legislative decisions in important fields of public policy. The problem areas that called for legislative action included conversion and control over manpower, money, and supplies; labor policy, price control, monetary policy, military policy and the conduct of the war, foreign policy and postwar commitments, and reconversion to peace. Among the typical issues of congressional politics during this eventful decade were the efforts to achieve "equality of sacrifice," to "take the profits out of war," and to "freeze economic relationships," as well as wartime elections, the New Deal, and bureaucracy. Far from becoming an anachronism or merely a rubber stamp in providing funds and delegating powers to the President, the role of Congress in wartime increased rather than diminished. The National Legislature considered simultaneously many facets of the war and postwar economy of the Nation.

During the Second World War, Congress performed three major functions: It made both broad and specific grants of power to the President; it adjusted conflicts of interest among various groups in American society; and it supervised the execution of policy. Many difficult decisions were made by the Congress on organizing the resources of the Nation and allocating men, money, and materials among competing claimants. Alternative choices and different standards of judgment gave rise to political competition both within Congress and between Congress and the President. Partisanship continued throughout the war with recurring elections and debates over such controversial issues as price control, consumer subsidies, war taxes, and reconversion.

After the war, Congress repealed the emergency grants of power, abolished the war agencies and administrative courts, disassembled the great military machine, and reestablished a free economy. It regained the great powers it had delegated to the President during the war and reestablished the constitutional position it enjoyed before the war.

Representative MCCORMACK was in the forefront of all these momentous wartime and postwar activities on Capitol Hill. Although deeply devoted to his political party, he has always put national above party and personal interest. He believes that above all sections is the Nation, and above all nations is humanity. He is very close, officially and personally, to Speaker SAM RAYBURN for whom he feels deep respect and friendship. They assumed their respective offices on the same day back in 1940 and they have functioned as a team ever since. Mr. MCCORMACK has frequently been elected as Acting Speaker pro tempore and has presided over the House in Mr. RAYBURN'S absence.

The subject index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD affords one measure of Mr. MCCORMACK'S amazing versatility. It shows that during the 2d session of the 83d Congress, for example, he made speeches on the House floor and took part in the debate of 200 subjects. These included discussions of our two-party system of government, the campaign promises and responsibilities of the majority party, the career jobs of politicians, the responsibility of Congress to the Nation, the conditions of leadership, and the accomplishments of the session.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK has received many deserved tributes down through the years. One of the most informative of these tributes, as regards the nature of his services as majority leader, appeared in the Lynn (Mass.) Telegram-News on April 17, 1949. It reads in part as follows:

"The press of the Nation has again acclaimed the leadership of Massachusetts' outstanding citizen for his effective masterminding of America's most important legislative position.

"Momentous moments arrive, and critical crises come, but Leader MCCORMACK meets them head on. Through his legislative magic, what at one time appear to be insoluble problems, finally go through the legislative channels smoothly and quietly and become a part of the warp and woof of our governmental processes.

"Down through the years, House Leader MCCORMACK has demonstrated this extraordinary ability to mold public opinion and to produce legislation which meets almost unanimous approval of Congress.

"During the hectic years of the depression, Congressman MCCORMACK was always in the vanguard of our progressive governmental forces that were seeking remedial legislation to cure the ills which produced such distress, discouragement, and near disaster.

"When World War II, with its turmoil, trouble and turbulence, broke upon a disheartened world, again the magic of MCCORMACK came into being, and again huge appropriations for armament and defense became law under his guidance. All the necessary legislation to take care of business, rationing, shortages, and a million other dislocations in our national economy, received the magic touch of MCCORMACK in the Legislative Halls at our National Capital.

"With the the end of World War II, House Leader MCCORMACK was again confronted with innumerable requests for his services in straightening out our postwar economy. In addition to our own domestic problems, rent control, housing, veterans' care, taxation, and so forth, there came a crushing burden of legislation whose objective was to crush communism and to further the American way of life.

"Thus as time goes on, President Harry S Truman finds modest Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, as his best bet when it comes to getting things done. Under MCCORMACK'S direction, the aid to Greece and Turkey bill, the Marshall plan for European relief, the Economic Cooperation Administration with Paul Hoffman as Director, the Treaty of Rio with its necessary appropriations, as an aid to hemispheric solidarity and defense of North and South America, and now the epoch-making North Atlantic Pact with its huge billion-dollar program for rearmament of Europe in order to prevent the spread of Marxian communism and to contain Soviet Russia within its own territorial domain, have all become part and parcel of the legislative burden that our own JOHN W. MCCORMACK has had to shoulder.

"But Congressman MCCORMACK has broad legislative shoulders that have been broadened by 20 years of intelligent, intense leadership. His habit of industry and his intense devotion to his country, to his President, to his church, and to his dutiful wife have made JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, one of America's great leaders and a great Christian gentleman."

A TYPICAL DAY

A few years ago a Washington reporter devoted a day of his life to trailing the majority leader of the House and setting down his activities. He concluded that his duties were comparable to those of the entire personnel of a traveling baseball club. "He is at once the manager directing general team activity; the field captain keeping tab on individual players; the pinch-hitter preparing to step in and deliver a blow at a crucial moment; the mascot trying to produce a barrel of luck; the first-base coach encouraging his own men or harassing the enemy; and the clubhouse man seeing that

all the paraphernalia are ready before the game starts."[13]

Here were the high points in a typical day of CHARLES A. HALLECK, then the majority leader:[14]

8 a. m.: While breakfasting at home, read the House proceedings of the previous day from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, delivered on his doorstep shortly before daylight.

9 a. m.: Arrived at office in Capitol and began to scan important mail. Talked with early visitors and newspapermen. Answered 15 telephone calls. Dictated several emergency telegrams and started answering mail.

10 a. m.: Resumed dictating letters, interrupted repeatedly by telephone calls from Speaker and special pleaders regarding the current and future floor program.

11:45 a. m.: Went to floor to meet committee chairman in charge of bill about to go under consideration, arranging such details as time for speakers, etc.

12 noon: Took over post at majority table and, with Speaker and Parliamentarian cooperating, made the various motions which are necessary to getting House work under way.

12:30 p. m.: Decks cleared of routine, turned control over to chairman of committee which brought in current bill and sat by in role of referee to smooth majority inter-party situations, direct attack on opposition, or speak in an emergency. (Time out for a sandwich; there is no luncheon recess.)

1:30 p. m.: Returned to office to preside as chairman over committee on committees, which makes committee assignments for majority. Talked before meeting with various applicants for committee appointments or transfers.

2 p. m.: Got committee under way and found there were a dozen applicants for two vacancies. Urged sponsors to explain in open meeting reasons why candidates should have job and thus started field day of talk.

2:15 p. m.: Called to floor to straighten out a parliamentary situation which threatened to get out of hand. Mixed good humoredly with minority leadership and made impromptu 5-minute speech.

2:30 p. m.: Resumed chair at committee session. Settled major appointment by inducing all members to compromise.

3 p. m.: Conferred on anti-inflation legislation with Senator Taft and Chairman Wolcott of House Banking and Currency Committee. Answered 10 more phone calls. Dictated letters.

3:30 p. m.: Attended majority steering committee meeting to decide on anti-inflation program.

4 p. m.: Met newspapermen to discuss the legislative program. Resumed dictating. Interrupted by long distance call of 10 minutes from a Pacific Coast Republican State leader who felt that a certain bill, if passed, would lose State for GOP next fall. Calmed caller's fears.

4:30 p. m.: Resumed dictating but soon was stopped by hurry-up call from floor for him to have whip round up majority membership for important vote. Returned to floor and conferred with Members about party matters.

4:45 p. m.: Made closing 10-minute speech on current bill appealing for favorable vote by both Republicans and Democrats.

5:45 p. m.: Made necessary motions for filing committee reports, etc., and House adjournment.

5:50 p. m.: Met with veterans' delegation concerning pending bill.

6 p. m.: Took series of telephone calls, dictated more letters and telegrams, conferred with research staff on material to be used in an address in Chicago.

6:45 p. m.: Left for home to dress for three evening engagements. Read in car summaries of stack of bills.

7:30 p. m.: Dropped in at State association party in downtown hotel, remained a few minutes, called briefly at second meeting of another group in same hotel, and took a taxi to a second hotel.

8 p. m.: Attended dinner meeting of business group.

10 p. m.: Addressed meeting on national problems, including taxes and reduction of Government costs.

11:15 p. m.: Arrived home to find several long-distance calls and telegrams requiring attention.

12 p. m.: To bed and, except for a few calls from morning newspapermen, nothing to do until tomorrow.

[13] Labert St. Clair, Foreman in the Legislative Mill, Nation's Business, May 1948, p. 45.
[14] Ibid., pp. 45–46.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, March 19, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. Sterling L. Price, minister, University Baptist Church, Abilene, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, in the midst of pomp and circumstance we would fain pause a moment to speak to Thee in the sweet grace of prayer. In our preoccupation we may have forgotten that man proposes but only God disposes.

Teacher of men, teach us afresh before it is too late that "righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." Once we roared like lions for liberty; now we bleat like sheep for security.

We know what we are living on but we sometimes do not know what we are living for. We have spent much time trying to add years to our lives but little time in adding life to our years. We show our genius in flying through the air as birds and swimming through the sea as fish, but have not learned to walk on the earth like men.

Forgive us if in our zeal we are more interested in doing something than we are in being something; more interested in making a living than we are in making a life; more interested in what we are than what we could be by Thy help.

Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet, lest we forget, lest we forget. And we pray it through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 20, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 963. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Andrej (Avram) Gottlieb; and

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution authorizing the acceptance of a gift from the Ericsson Memorial Committee of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6955. An act for the relief of Inna Hekker Grade;

H. R. 8087. An act for the relief of Paul G. Abernethy;

H. R. 9770. An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 553. Joint resolution waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 554. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 555. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 566. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 223) to extend greetings to Pakistan, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 760. An act for the relief of Pietro Meduri;

S. 1992. An act to provide for the conveyance of a certain tract of land in Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association;

S. 3452. An act to amend the act of July 15, 1955, Public Law 161, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 324), by increasing the appropriation authorization for the aircraft control and warning system; and

S. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 6955. An act for the relief of Inna Hekker Grade;

H. R. 8087. An act for the relief of Paul G. Abernethy;

H. J. Res. 553. Joint resolution waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 554. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 555. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 566. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9770. An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KENNEDY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. KENNEDY, and by unanimous consent, the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE (S. Doc. No. 106)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the amount of $330,000, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED CHANGE OF LANGUAGE IN LEGISLATIVE APPROPTIATION BILL FOR 1957, RELATING TO CERTAIN TELEPHONE CHARGES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., suggesting that language of appropriations in the legislative appropriation bill for 1957 be changed so as to authorize payment for local phone charges to Senators by the Senate Disbursing Officer; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the quarter ended December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commisioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF ASSOCIATION OF WESTERN STATE ENGINEERS, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Association of Western State Engineers, at their recent meeting in Denver, Colo., favoring the enactment of legislation to the effect that within the States lying west of the 98th meridian, and subject to existing rights under State laws, all navigable and nonnavigable waters together with underground water be reserved for appropriation and use by the public, pursuant to State law.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF ASSOCIATION OF WESTERN STATE ENGINEERS, 28TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, DENVER, COLO., SEPTEMBER 26–28, 1955

RESOLUTION NO. 1

Whereas the authority to regulate and control the appropriation, distribution and use of all of the waters of States lying wholly or partially west of the 98th meridian is properly the exclusive sovereign function of the States; and

Whereas existing laws have not resulted in clear and uniform practice in accordance with said principle by all Federal agencies and officers having to do with the use or development of water resources; and

Whereas the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Pelton Dam case (*Federal Power Commission* v. *State of Oregon*, 349 U. S. 435) points to the urgent need for the Congress to legislate to the end that all Federal agencies comply with State law to safeguard the rights of the States to control and regulate the beneficial use of water within their borders; and

Whereas the Pelton Dam case establishes a dangerous precedent because it has already been used by one agency of the Federal Government as a basis for its refusal to complete existing permits to appropriate ground water under the laws of Nevada on the grounds that the wells are on reserved lands of the Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Association of Western State Engineers, That the Congress be urged to pass legislation to the effect that within the States lying west of the 98th meridian, and subject to existing rights under State laws, all navigable and nonnavigable waters together with underground water be reserved for appropriation and use by the public pursuant to State law; and be it further

Resolved, That the Federal agencies and committees, licensees, and employees of the Federal Government, in the use of water for any purpose in connection with Federal programs, projects, activities, licenses, or permits, shall, as a condition precedent to the use of any such waters, acquire rights to the use thereof in conformity with State laws and procedures relating to the control, appropriation, use or distribution of such water; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to all Members of Congress and the heads of appropriate Federal agencies.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. MALONE):

S. 3496. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of antimony in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 3497. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of mercury in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 3498. A bill to extend the authority of the American Battle Monuments Commission to all areas in which the Armed Forces of the United States have conducted operations since April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. MALONE):

S. 3499. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of nonferrous chrysotile asbestos in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. GOLDWATER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3500. A bill to reduce postage rates on parcels containing only food, clothing, medicines, or drugs sent abroad by mail for relief purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 3501. A bill for the relief of Alas Ellis Auger and Violet Webster Auger; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3502. A bill for the relief of Emma Dube O'Mara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WELKER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. BUSH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. THYE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. COTTON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 3503. A bill to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. MALONE):

S. 3504. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of chromite in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF INDEX TO REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 234), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the Index to the Reports of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations including the Commission's Report and Various Committee Reports and Supporting Documents, and that 3,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations.

PRODUCTION OF NONFERROUS CHRYSOTILE ASBESTOS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in the high mountains of the central part of Arizona are to be found some of the richest and most abundant deposits of asbestos in the world. At the present time there are 8 substantial producers of this mineral in my State, and there are 7 mills handling this ore. The people who are engaged in this work have been doing a patriotic duty of making available for the stockpile this valued and scarce mineral. They have not only aided the defense efforts of this country, but they have at the same time provided employment for a number of our oldest citizens—the Apache Indians. The asbestos industry employs 125 of these people, who, in turn, provide a living for their families, which would total some 1,000 Apaches. The rentals paid to the tribal council provide that tribe with 25 percent of their income.

Mr. President, the discontinuance of the asbestos program would be disastrous to these people, and would, at the same time, work a distinct hardship on the stockpile program of this country.

For this reason, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of nonferrous chrysotile asbestos in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3499) to encourage the discovery, development, and production of nonferrous chrysotile asbestos in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. MALONE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Domestic Nonferrous Chrysotile Asbestos Program Extension Act of 1956."

SEC. 2. It is hereby recognized that the continued dependence on overseas sources of supply for nonferrous chrysotile asbestos during periods of threatening world conflict or of political instability within those nations controlling the sources of supply of such material gravely endangers the present and future economy and security of the United States. It is therefore declared to be the policy of the Congress that each department and agency of the Federal Government charged with responsibilities concerning the discovery, development, production, and acquisition of nonferrous chysotile asbestos shall undertake to decrease further and to eliminate where possible the dependency of the United States on overseas sources of supply of such material.

SEC. 3. (a) In carrying out the declaration of policy set forth in section 2 of this act—

(1) the termination date of all purchase programs designed to stimulate the domestic production of nonferrous chrysotile asbestos and established by regulations issued pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and/or the Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of 1946, and amendments thereto (hereinafter in this section referred to as "purchase programs"), shall be extended to the close of June 30, 1961, or when deliveries under this program total in the aggregate 5,000 short tons of Crude No. 1 and/or Crude No. 2, whichever event first occurs: *And provided further*, That

(2) Crude No. 3 nonferrous chrysotile asbestos, as defined under existing General Services Administration regulations and specifications, shall be purchased only when offered with Crude No. 1 or Crude No. 2, or both, at a ratio of not in excess of 1 to 1; and

(3) nothing contained in paragraphs (1) and (2) above shall be construed to limit or restrict the officer or agency of the United States administering the nonferrous chrysotile asbestos purchase program from extending the termination dates provided for by paragraph (1) of subsection (a) or from changing specifications or price schedules now existing and/or amended by paragraph (2) of subsection (a) above except no such change shall be on terms less favorable to the producer than those specifications and price schedules which were in effect on January 1, 1956.

SEC. 4. In order that those persons who produce or plan to produce under purchase programs established pursuant to this act may be in position to plan their investment and production with due regard to requirements, the officer or agency of the United States administering the purchase programs for domestic nonferrous chrysotile asbestos shall publish at the end of each calendar quarter the amount of nonferrous chrysotile asbestos purchased during that quarter and the cumulative total amount of such purchases.

DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, AND PRODUCTION OF CHROMITE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would extend from the 30th of June, 1957, to the 30th of June, 1961, the existing program for stockpiling chromite.

I wish to call attention to the fact that chromite, an absolute necessity as a steel hardener in time of war, is among the most critical of all minerals, as 95 percent of all chromite used in the United States must be imported. Our principal sources of supply are the Union of South Africa, Turkey, and Rhodesia, and these areas stretch many miles across the sealanes from our shores.

The record shows that during World War II the loss of ships carrying chromite ran as high as 85 percent during some months. No calculation is available, and probably one has never been made, of the final cost per ton of chromite ore actually delivered to our ports during those hazardous days.

I submit, Mr. President, that every effort should be made to stockpile as large quantities of chromite as is consonant with good business practice, and this bill I am introducing, if enacted into law will serve as a base for planned production of additional domestic chrome ore.

Current domestic production of chrome is found in Montana, northern California, Washington and the State of Oregon. The Grants Pass, Oreg., purchase depot for chromite constitutes an important link in our national defense chain. None of our domestic chromite mines are large, but several of them, particularly those in my State, have great potentials, if the operators are given an opportunity to make their plans for the future with a knowledge that their product will enjoy a stable price.

The needs of the national economy and the needs of national defense are two compelling reasons why this measure, dealing with increased domestic production of chromite, should be enacted into law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3504) to encourage the discovery, development, and production

of chromite in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. MALONE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. BEALL submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LEHMAN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] (for himself and other Senators), to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on yesterday I submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the pending joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment. Let me state that I shall be glad to have other Senators join in sponsoring the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address entitled "A Housing Program for Today and Tomorrow," delivered by him at the Legislative Conference of Building and Construction Trade Unions (AFL–CIO) at Washington, D. C., on March 5, 1956.

By Mr. BENDER:

Address entitled "A Nation of 'Haves'," delivered by Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey at San Francisco, Calif.

AMERICAN PROSPERITY POISED FOR NEW JUMP FORWARD

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, American prosperity, now at all-time high levels, will move forward in the next decade to still greater achievements for the Nation's workers, business and professional people, with a corresponding boost for our farming population.

Today we are standing on the threshold of a new economic era. There have been many times in history when a gigantic change in the whole structure of human society took place. This will be one of these dramatic times. Just as the industrial revolution ushered in the age of machinery, just as the development of iron and steel brought a still more drastic change, so, too, the launching of the atomic age will alter our present living standards.

This change will be all the more remarkable in America because it follows so rapidly upon the heels of a defeatist outlook engendered and encouraged by those who ran our country only 20 years ago. They told us that America was built up, that our entire industrial plant was completed, that we had no new frontiers to explore, that there were no new horizons to reach.

Today, we know how wrong these prophets of stagnation were. We have emerged from the despair, the confusion, and the days of little faith, to establish new milestones in the American story. Our record is not one of gain for the few at the expense of the many. It is a record of widespread prosperity.

In the 3 years since President Eisenhower came into office, we have made incredible strides forward.

The American worker is better off in every way today than at any other time in history. His wages are at record levels; his purchasing power is at an all-time high; the income-insurance measures that guard him against deprivation caused by illness, accident and involuntary unemployment are stronger than ever. This administration is vitally interested in promoting the welfare of all workers, whether they are organized or unorganized, whether they work on the farm or in the factory, whether they live in the country or the city. In 1955, under President Eisenhower, civilian jobs topped by nearly 4 million the greatest number of jobs ever reached in any peacetime Democratic administration year, and by nearly 2 million the highest employment ever provided in any wartime Democratic administration year.

The 1955 Republican peacetime average of 63.2 million is 3.8 million above the highest Democratic peacetime high of 59.4 million, in 1948; and 1.9 million more than the highest Democratic wartime high of 61.3 million in 1952.

The all-time monthly record of 65.5 million civilians employed in August 1955, surpassed by 3.9 million jobs the highest Democratic peacetime monthly record of 61.6 million in July 1948. After that month, employment slumped consistently until the Korean war pushed it up again in 1950. But even the Democrats' peak wartime month of 62.6 million in August 1951, came 2.9 million jobs below the Republican peacetime record of 65.5 million in August 1955. Nineteen fifty-five employment records were achieved, moreover, without padding the Government payrolls. Instead, by 1955, civilian Federal jobs had been reduced an average of 225,000 from 1952.

In addition, the military services were reduced by over half a million—546,000. The net result was not only a savings of billions of dollars for the taxpayers, but less disruption to the lives of hundreds of thousands of young Americans who otherwise would have been called into uniform.

Strike losses, in man-days-idle, were down 54 percent in 1955, as compared with 1952. Thus, the innocent victims of labor-strife workers, their families, and consumers, as well, were saved untold billions of dollars in wages and consumer goods last year. Both hourly and weekly earnings of the average worker in peacetime 1955 were more than 12½ percent higher than in the best Democratic wartime year of 1952. More important, his average weekly take-home pay after taxes and social security was up from 11 to 13½ percent, depending on the size of his family, for the identical number of average hours worked each week—40.7.

By conquering the inflation which year after year had robbed workers of any real pay gains under the Democrats, the Republicans have given record purchasing power to every American worker. Compared to a 12-percent loss in purchasing power during the last 3 years of Democratic policies, Republican leadership in 3 years has held the value of the dollar to within 1 percent of its 1952 purchasing power.

Unemployment in Republican peacetime 1955 was substantially lower than in the last peacetime year under the Democrats—2.7 million in 1955, compared to 3.4 million in 1949. And never in any individual month in the 3 Republican years since January 1953, when the transition to peace was being achieved, did unemployment rise to anywhere near the 4.7 million it reached in February 1950, just before the Korean war solved the unemployment problem for the Truman administration.

In relative terms, Republican peacetime unemployment in 1955 averaged 4 percent of the total civilian labor force. This compared with 5½ percent in the last full peacetime Democratic year of 1949, and with over 7½ percent in the Democratic month of February, 1950, immediately prior to the Korean war.

In addition, due mainly to administration urging of State action in the past 2 years, average weekly unemployment benefit checks are now the largest in history, and also the longest in duration. In 1955 they averaged about $2.30 a week higher than in 1952, for payments which averaged 1 week longer. Coverage also now includes Federal em-

ployees, as of 1955; and small business firms employing 4 to 8 workers, as of 1956.

Here is the legislative record:

Social security has been extended to 10 million additional workers, and the benefits have been liberalized.

Unemployment insurance has been extended by Federal law to 4 million additional workers, bringing the total covered to 41 million. Following urging by President Eisenhower and Labor Secretary Mitchell, maximum weekly benefits have been increased in 32 States. Seventy percent of all covered workers now live in States that have a maximum of $30 or more.

Workmen's compensation laws were improved in 42 States and 3 Territories. Six States raised their maximum weekly benefit to $40 or more, bringing the total of States and Territories with such a maximum to 18. The Labor Department backed this legislative action, and has prepared a model law, now in the hands of over 2,000 interested parties, in an attempt to improve further this vital legislative area.

The minimum wage was raised to $1, directly affecting the pay envelopes of over 2 million workers, and indirectly affecting millions more by raising the general wage level.

The vocational-rehabilitation program has been liberalized and expanded to benefit additional hundreds of thousands of handicapped workers.

The military and Federal civilan workers received pay raises.

Railroad retirement benefits were increased, and tax provisions were changed to aid retired people.

Additional programs to aid workers are under consideration. In the case of our older worker, in view of the fact that longevity is extending rapidly, that new industries are coming into being under the impulse of increasing technology, and that some workers who have spent many years in an occupation are faced with readjustment and relocation, the Department of Labor has requested and received from Congress an appropriation to develop a program for the older worker. The objective of the program is to find means of breaking down the prejudicial age barriers that exist in some industries, and to restore justified confidence in men of experience and skill. One of the vital programs undertaken by the Department of Labor is that of increasing and maintaining the skills of the work force.

Advances such as the elimination of discrimination and segregation in executive branch operations and in the Armed Forces have taken place, along with parallel progress in the elimination of discrimination in employment and advancement and in the extension of equal job opportunity as a policy in American business. For the first time, Government contracts contain a standard nondiscrimination clause, with adequate machinery and trained personnel to enforce it.

Under the direction of President Eisenhower's Committee on Government Contracts, an organized program to meet the discrimination problem has been developed, resulting in improved conditions for minority groups' workers in such industries as oil, aircraft, atomic energy, and meat packing.

In the first 11 months of 1955, the latest months for which figures are available, an estimated 243,750 handicapped workers were placed in employment in the United States by the United States Employment Service and cooperating State public employment offices. Of this figure, 108,993 were veterans. Forty-eight Governors' Committees and more than 700 community committees cooperated with President Eisenhower's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped in encouraging employers to provide job opportunity for the physically impaired. Seven regional meetings of the President's Committee were also held during the year, to expedite the hire-the-handicapped program.

Labor standards laws have been more vigorously enforced by this administration than ever before. In the area of wage standards on Government construction work in the 3-year period from 1950 through 1952, the Department of Labor undertook 476 enforcement actions. Year by year since this administration took office there has been a progressively accelerated enforcement program. Starting in 1953, there were 250 cases; in 1954, 346 cases; and by 1955, 547 cases. The total number of contractors made ineligible to receive Government contracts for violation of labor standards laws in previous administrations since 1935 was 4; in this administration, 40.

During the period from 1953 to 1955, the Department of Labor instituted 278 cases for the benefit of workingmen under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as compared with 148 cases during the period from 1950–52. As a result of Department of Labor investigations during the fiscal year 1955, more than $6,165,000 in back wages owed under the Fair Labor Standards Act was paid to 81,330 employees by 15,310 firms.

Mr. President, the working men and women were never better off. I believe they are going to keep on being better off by voting Republican. The professional and business people are going to join them. Our farming communities, in the light of our rapidly increasing population, will share in this overall prosperity.

Mr. President, this is a great day. An even greater day is coming—and it is coming soon.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COMMISSIONERS OF CUMBERLAND, MD.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, it is my pleasure today to have in the Senate gallery the mayor and the city commissioners of my home community of Cumberland, Md. The party consists of R. W. Eves, mayor; William Keegan, police commissioner; William Buckholtz, street commissioner; William Edwards, water commissioner; Thomas B. Finnen, city attorney; William Gibson, city auditor; C. R. Nuzum, city engineer. These gentlemen are escorted by my aide, "Sparky" Jenkins. I will ask the members of the party to rise, so they may be greeted by the Members of the Senate. [Applause.]

THE VOTERS' APPROVAL OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, the Minnesota vote shows what it cost Governor Stevenson to associate himself with Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and Gov. Orville Freeman. Stevenson changed his farm position to comply with Senator HUMPHREY on the promise of support in Minnesota. The voters repudiated the Humphrey-Freeman leadership, and Governor Stevenson has suffered a disastrous blow.

Stevenson tried to alibi his defeat in New Hampshire last week, just as he is trying to alibi his defeat in Minnesota. If he keeps this up, we are going to call him "Alibi Adlai."

The fact is that the voters have just grown tired of Mr. Stevenson's smart aleck approach to national and international issues.

It was very gratifying to see the substantial vote for President Eisenhower in Minnesota yesterday. In the primary in 1952, he received 108,692 write-in votes; and President Eisenhower's huge vote yesterday, even though there was no contest on the Republican side, indicates the voters' approval of the President's administration.

REASON FOR SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN-AID REQUEST

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, there already appears to be considerable discussion over certain aspects of the President's recent foreign-aid request.

Many persons have sincerely opposed these requests in the past.

Others have supported the President in this security program, but are concerned especially over the relatively new request for authority to make certain commitments of a longer-term nature in assisting other nations to develop several important projects.

The question is raised, "Why should we give the President this new authority?"

Yesterday, while testifying before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Acting Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., gave this answer:

> It is contemplated that this kind of assistance will be furnished in special cases where the recipient country cannot carry out a major project with its own resources. I have in mind such projects as river development, improvement of ports, highways, railroads, or other means of communication and important large industrial projects. Works of this kind generally require a number of years for completion. Where we provide aid for these purposes it is essential that the recipient country be given reasonable assurance that our aid may be continued for the period of time necessary for completion of the projects and so long as the purposes of the free world are served thereby. Only with assurances of this type of support will these countries be able to

develop additional financing from other sources.

Mr. President, the statement I have read explains briefly but clearly why this request for additional authority has been made. I am confident that as the committees of Congress take up the mutual-security program, more detailed answers to this important question will be given.

I am most hopeful that those who have doubts will be given satisfactory explanations, and will be able to join in supporting this new and vitally necessary segment of our mutual-security program.

As Mr. Hoover said yesterday:

We do need to make our own program * * * as effective an instrument for aiding the cause of independence and freedom as is possible.

RUSSIA'S GREAT STRIDES IN SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, evidence and indication of Soviet Russia's great strides in scientific development continue. This is particularly true as regards the field of military strength.

It was significant to note that, in Mr. Khrushchev's speech before the 20th Congress of the Communist Party on February 15, he quoted figures showing an amazing increase in their production of watch movements.

According to an article from the February 29 issue of the Elgin (Ill.) Daily Courier-News, only a small percentage of the 19.7 million watch movements produced by the Soviets in 1955 went to the consumer's market. It is a reasonable conclusion that the vast majority of these precision goods were funneled into their military machine.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA PUSHES ITS PRECISION INDUSTRIES

(By Frank Kuest)

WASHINGTON.—Communist boss Nikita Khrushchev has jolted United States defense planners with what no doubt to them is a horrible horologic nightmare—Russia is losing no time in developing her precision watch industry.

Analysis of Khrushchev's stemwinding, 7-hour speech given before the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, February 15 in Moscow, turned up interesting, if not alarming, evidence that Russia is pursuing precision industries to the hilt.

Commerce Department experts, after a thorough sentence-by-sentence examination of the speech are convinced Khrushchev was not engaging in an oratorical endurance contest, nor was he charmed by the sound of his own voice, especially as regards the Russian horologic industry.

UNITS OF PRODUCTION

The American experts were particularly struck by Khrushchev's reference to units of production rather than the usual percentage gains in output.

Time was when the Russians, in dealing with production statistics, would give mere percentage gains, never providing unit figures.

For example, if Russia produced 1 watch in 1950 and 2 in 1955, the Kremlin bureaucrats would boast of a 100 percent gain in the production of timepieces.

But Khrushchev dealt in unit figures in his speech, noting that Russian production of watch movements and clocks jumped from 7.6 million units in 1950 to 19.7 million in 1955.

He said the target for 1960 is 33.6 million units.

UNITED STATES EXPERTS IMPRESSED

These figures impressed the American experts that Khrushchev might have known what he was talking about and are bound to shock those planners who want to deemphasize the domestic watch industry in favor of Swiss imports.

There was no way of distinguishing between watch movements and clocks in the Khrushchev statement, but, nevertheless, the inclusion of precision movements must be considered extremely significant, especially when the Russian production claims are contrasted with the production figures of the four remaining watch manufacturers in the United States.

In 1947, according to the Census Bureau, the 4 United States companies—Elgin, Hamilton, Bulova, and Waltham—produced a total of 2.3 million jeweled-watch movements, 5 million such movements were imported from Switzerland.

In 1954, these four companies turned out 1,716,000 jeweled movements, while imports that year skyrocketed to 7,390,000.

WHAT ABOUT RUSSIA?

What happened in Russia in 1954 with respect to watches? Khrushchev claimed that the Soviet horologic industry turned out 16.8 million timepieces, of which 5.6 million were made available to the consuming public.

What happened to the balance? The best guess that the experts can come up with, and it seems to be a good one, is that the remainder was in the form of intricate timing devices for military weapons.

There is little doubt, according to American experts, that Russia's rapid advance in developing precision watch skills is dictated by the needs of intricate, complicated mechanisms required for setting off the diabolical devices that go with modern war.

One American expert predicted that if Russia achieves a production of 33.6 million precision movements by 1960, a very small percentage of that output will find its way into consumer channels in the Soviet Union.

IMPORTANT, IF TRUE

And it was only 2 years ago that watch importers and some officials in the Defense Department and several Members of Congress were arguing that the domestic precision-watch industry was not vital to the national defense.

If there is an element of truth in Khrushchev's figures, Russia has achieved a remarkable precision industry in a relatively short time, because it can be recalled that when the joint occupation of Berlin began after Germany surrendered, Red soldiers were trampling each other in their rush to buy wrist watches from American GI's.

Watches were not available to the Russian soldiers and with worthless—to them—Allied military marks printed on United States plates they would offer a GI as much as $1,500 for a cheap wrist watch. The GI, of course, could convert the marks into postal money orders.

And now Russia is time conscious, according to Khrushchev.

GREETINGS TO PAKISTAN NATIONAL ASSEMBLY AND PEOPLE OF PAKISTAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Concurrent resolution coming from the House to Pakistan. I have discussed this subject with the distinguished minority leader and with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The concurrent resolution has already passed the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 223) to extend greetings to Pakistan, was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States extend its most cordial greetings and warmest congratulations to the new Pakistan National Assembly and to the people of Pakistan on the occasion of Pakistan's establishment as a Republic, and reaffirm the friendship of the United States for the people of Pakistan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join my good friend, the distinguished majority leader, in urging the passage of this concurrent resolution.

The people of the United States and the people of Pakistan have established friendly ties, and they have jointly collaborated in collective defense efforts to preserve the peace in southeast Asia and in the Middle East.

It is well to note that Pakistan became a sovereign nation when the British withdrew from India in 1947, but it was not until February of this year that Pakistan adopted its constitution. This constitution goes into effect next Friday. It is indeed fittting that on this occasion the United States Congress should extend best wishes and felicitations to this new republic, and, through it, to its unicameral legislative body and its people.

It is a pleasure to be a participant upon an occasion of this sort.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am happy to join the majority leader and the Senator from Montana in supporting the concurrent resolution which comes from the House of Representatives, and which provides "that the Congress of the United States extend its most cordial greetings and warmest congratulations to the new Pakistan National Assembly and to the people of Pakistan on the occasion of Pakistan's establishment as a republic, and reaffirm the friendship of the United States for the people of Pakistan."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 223) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

REPUDIATION OF STALIN BY SURVIVING COMMUNIST HIERARCHY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the recent repudiation of Stalin by the present surviving Communist hierarchy is interesting.

These men were the partners in crime of Stalin in the mass murders, slave labor camps, and destruction of sovereign nations. They were accomplices in the crimes. They shared the loot.

Now they want to cast off the evil acts, but not the benefits derived. They want to get a cloak of respectability before going to London and calling on the Queen.

I would be more impressed if the Kremlin would free the millions in the slave labor camps of Siberia; if they would agree to restore independence to Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia; if they would agree to free elections in Eastern Germany and would free their hold on Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania.

It is my belief that the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and other agencies should challenge the Kremlin's rulers to perform deeds repudiating acts of Stalin, rather than use mere words of repudiation. The dead cannot be brought back to life, but the enslaved can be freed. The sovereignties of captive nations can be restored. This would be the acid test as to whether there has been a basic change in Soviet policy.

MILWAUKEE ATTACK AGAINST PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to read in the Friday, March 16, Milwaukee newspapers that the Metropolitan Commission on Crime Prevention had begun a much needed community drive against the distribution of lewd, lascivious, and filthy books, cartoons, and magazines.

The commission instructed its secretary, Charles Komass, to write to more than 100 organizations in the Milwaukee area urging the formation of committees to attack the problem. These committees, the commission said, should carry out educational programs to arouse parental action to combat this ever increasing blight on the youth of our community.

As a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, I personally have been deeply interested in continuing to do everything I can against the pornographic menace to the morals of the Nation's youngsters.

At hearings in New York, our subcommittee turned the spotlight on pornography in that area. We demonstrated that, as it spreads its greedy tentacles across the Nation, pornography is a vicious third of a billion dollar industry.

Nothing short of intense local community action can suffice to meet this problem head-on.

The Federal Government can, of course, continue to do its part to spotlight the danger. The post office can take legal action wherever appropriate, and the United States attorneys' offices can vigorously and expeditiously prosecute cases. But there is no substitute for effective local enforcement and effective local parent-teacher church voluntary action.

That is why I have been in contact with both religious and lay leaders in my State and elsewhere. Fortunately, Wisconsin has only a relatively mild problem as compared with other States, but a number of diocesan groups, for example, have brought to my attention some extremely disturbing instances which they encountered.

A great many communities in Wisconsin have now begun organized action to cleanse the newsstands and other points of distribution of this magazine and other filth.

It is always the follow-through on such efforts which counts, not merely an announcement of a new campaign to crack down on the filth peddlers.

Thus, a New York World-Telegram reporter found that, although 100 filthy-book peddlers have been arrested since 1953—as but one part of the filth racket—only 2 of the 100 have actually been convicted in court.

Every sort of delaying tactic and legal loophole is used to prevent effective punishment within Federal, State, and local courts. Of course, due process must and will be observed, but I am cosponsor of legislation to help make sure that the law shall be a help, not an unnecessary hindrance to prosecution.

I trust, therefore, that our juvenile delinquency subcommittee will be supported in its further efforts to carry on this fight as well as its other endeavors to protect the Nation's millions of youngsters.

The granting of extension funds on Monday to our subcommittee was a welcome bit of news to all those interested in our country's children.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1271. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; and

S. 1272. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House did not agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8320) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school milk program and the brucellosis eradication program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to said bill, and concurred therein.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10004) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 2347. An act for the relief of Heinrich Wolfgang;

H. R. 3963. An act for the relief of Ashot Mnatzakanian and Ophelia Mnatzakanian;

H. R. 5876. An act to amend the copyright law to permit, in certain classes of works, the deposit of photographs or other identifying reproductions in lieu of copies of published works;

H. R. 6022. An act to provide for the relocation of the Trenton Massacre Canyon Monument presently located near Trenton, Nebr.; and

H. R. 6904. An act to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 10004) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

SCHOOL MILK AND BRUCELLOSIS PROGRAMS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 215 to 195, has rejected the conference report on the school milk and brucellosis bill, and has agreed to accept the 2-year extension of both those programs. I am sure Senators will be very much gratified at the action of the House.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 31.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as I told the Senate yesterday, Senate Joint Resolution 31 and the various substitute

amendments proposed thereto constitute some of the most far-reaching but little known potential dangers to our constitutional system.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate my colleague's yielding to me, because I have a committee meeting this afternoon which I must attend. I know the Senator has made a very complete study of the problem covered by the resolution, judging from the remarks he made yesterday, and I should like to ask him three questions.

Mr. KENNEDY. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My first question is this. This resolution is in alternative form. Is it not the Senator's opinion that whichever party may be in power in a State like Massachusetts will adopt the method most advantageous to the party?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is natural; yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that in our State of Massachusetts the State congressional districts can be very properly and easily changed in various ways which would mean quite a different result?

Mr. KENNEDY. I think that the Senator is aware of the situation in Massachusetts because of the way the congressional districts there have been gerrymandered. In 1932, 1936, 1944, and 1948 the Republicans carried the State by a reasonably large majority. In those years there were fewer Democrats than Republicans. The districts are gerrymandered in favor of the rural areas as against the urban areas.

My opinion is that most State legislatures would adopt the Mundt-Coudert system for reorganizing the congressional districts, and it would be possible to affect vitally the result of a presidential election. In the one-party States in the South the districts would be drawn so that we would still have the result we are now getting.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My third question is this: If the other alternative should be adopted on a statewide basis, how would it affect the electoral vote in Massachusetts? I may say, parenthetically, that I voted for the other alternative 6 years ago, but I feel that I would not want to vote for it this year.

Mr. KENNEDY. In the 1948 election Massachusetts went 8.8 for Truman and 6.9 for Dewey, making a differential of 1.9.

In the case of New York there were 21.2 electoral votes for Truman and 21.6 for Dewey, making a differential of 0.4, while in the case of Texas there were 15 electoral votes for Truman and 5.6 for Dewey, making a differential of 9.4, as opposed to New York, which was almost even, and to Massachusetts which was almost even.

It would have little effect in the State of Texas. It would be infinitely more important to Massachusetts or New York or any of the pivotal States where the results are very close. If we take the 6 or 7 most important States, the electoral difference, adding them all together, is only about 1.2 electoral votes. The one-party States would be affected more greatly. It would place the balance of power in the hands of the one-party States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The practical result of our methods of electing officials in the United States is to have a majority determine the result of an election, no matter how small the majority may be.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. After all, the States came into the Union as units. Electoral votes are given not on the basis of the voting numbers, but on the basis of population. The electoral votes belong to each State. The way the system works now is that we carry on a campaign in 48 States, and the electoral votes of that State belong to that party which party carries each State. If we are going to change that system, it seems to me it would strike a blow at States rights in major proportions. It would probably end States rights and make this country one great unit. Under the proposal advocated by the very able Senator from South Dakota, if it is finally adopted in most of the States, in my opinion, the Daniel-Kefauver proposal would not be used, but the proposal recommended by the Senator from South Dakota would be used, and it would encourage gerrymandering on an infinitely larger scale than it is indulged in today. That is why I object to that proposal, even though I agree with some features of it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the Senator's belief that the subject should be given further study?

Mr. KENNEDY. It has been given study and, in my opinion, the proposal should be rejected.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is also my own feeling.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of this colloquy an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning, entitled "Electoral Reform in Reverse."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A recent compromise puts a very different face on the Daniel-Kefauver resolution which the Senate began to debate yesterday. The original purpose of this proposed amendment to the Constitution was simply to divide the electoral votes of the States in the same proportion that the popular vote may be divided in future presidential elections, 1956 excepted, of course. In other words, it was a duplication of the Lodge-Gossett resolution which the Senate adopted by a two-thirds vote in 1950. Various competing amendments were being pushed, however, and Senators KEFAUVER and DANIEL allowed themselves to be maneuvered into a compromise of a very dubious character.

As it now stands, the proposed amendment would not accomplish the purpose of its original sponsors. To be sure, it would permit the States to divide their electoral votes among the three leading presidential candidates in accord with their share of the popular vote, instead of allowing the winning candidate to sweep all the electoral votes of the State into his column. But the States would not be bound to accept this reform. If a legislature should so choose, it could give one electoral vote to the leading candidate in each congressional district, with the remainder of its electoral votes going to the candidate winning in the State as a whole. The effect would undoubtedly be to enhance the political strength of the rural areas because of the gerrymandering of legislative and congressional districts and the underrepresentation of the cities in most of the country's legislative halls. A further complication lies in the proviso that all presidential contests in which the leading candidate did not receive 50 percent of the votes would be referred to the House and Senate, sitting jointly, for decision.

This compromise turns a sensible and needed reform into a mishmash. The country would have no uniform way of counting electoral votes. States in which urban population predominates would probably divide their votes on a percentage basis, and rural States would doubtless parcel out electoral votes to congressional districts. Legislatures could be expected to switch from one method to the other from time to time as political exigencies might dictate. The result would be not to correct present weaknesses in the outmoded electoral system but to foul it up.

The Senate should waste little time on this crude patchwork. The movement to make votes for presidential candidates count throughout the Nation has degenerated into a scheme to give more weight in such contests to groups that already have more than their fair share. In these circumstances the best course for the Senate would be to send the resolution back to the Judiciary Committee with instructions to report out a resolution that would correct the defects in the present electoral system instead of multiplying them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In 1940 I was elected Governor of Massachusetts after a recount which resulted in my having a little under one-fourth of 1 percent majority. Once it was determined, there was no question of the fact that I was elected, and I was sworn in as Governor. That was a very small majority, but under our system in the United States it was accepted. If the Daniel-Kefauver resolution is adopted it would practically nullify the results in a State that is so close, would it not?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Daniel-Kefauver resolution would carry the losing votes in a State like Massachusetts, and put them into the national result, but, sooner or later, losing votes are lost in this country, unless we have a plural executive, as Benjamin Franklin suggested. My own feeling is that it would affect the even balance in pivotal States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would nullify it, and it is quite contrary to the majority prevailing, no matter how small that majority may be.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. There are other advantages which one-party States have, as compared with States which do not have the population which pivotal States have. The objection is made that they have greater influence in the House and Senate because they keep sending back the same representatives year after year.

The third advantage is in the counting process.

The fourth advantage is in connection with the election being thrown into the House of Representatives under the present system.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I was interested in the Senator's observation that he felt that if the compromise amendment were

adopted a lesser number of the States would go to the district system. I agree entirely with that suggestion. I think the district system has certain very definite advantages from the standpoint of giving the individual citizen the right to have his impact felt in a national election. I feel that the Senator's main objection to the district system feature of the amendment is the fear of gerrymandering taking place, is it not?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is aware, I am sure, that the Congress of the United States now has and would still retain control over that type of situation.

Mr. KENNEDY. As the Senator knows, Congress has on several occasions passed statutes which called for the setting up of congressional districts on the basis of the population being contiguous, and geographical areas being contiguous.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Nothing was ever done to implement those statutes. I do not think the Senator from South Dakota would disagree with the statement that the rural element of a community has disproportionate influence in the election of Representatives with respect to their numbers. Would not the Senator agree to that?

Mr. MUNDT. I have not sufficiently studied the congressional districts of the country to know whether that is or is not a fact; but I think it is a fact that that situation would be intensified if the Senator's assumption is correct that the congressional districts as they tend to exist from year to year create a sort of built-in defensive mechanism, whereby certain districts will represent cities, and certain districts will represent rural areas. They may represent the dairy industry, the mining industry, or the coastal region of a State. Those are built-in defenses against promiscuous gerrymandering, because the people of each district have reasons why they want to have Representatives of their own selection. Is not that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. May I ask the Senator a question? After all, the Senator is advocating a system under which the congressional districts would become tremendously important. Does he believe today that the districts are overweighted in favor of the rural population?

Mr. MUNDT. That is not my opinion; that is the opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts. I am not prepared to challenge the statistics as to how that is done, except to express the conviction that each State, for reasons best known to itself, must establish the election districts which it considers satisfactory, so far as United States Representatives are concerned.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from South Dakota has stated exactly why I am opposed to his amendment. There is no doubt in my mind that the present situation does not result in Congress being truly representative, because some of the districts are overweighted, and some groups are overweighted in their representation in Congress based upon the population. With that point of view, the Senator from South Dakota does not agree.

My point is that if he does not agree with the present system, I am not sure that he would be able to make certain that Congress should move in this situation in the future, particularly as I think his party would be benefited to some degree.

Mr. MUNDT. There are no glaring examples of gerrymandering which have been brought to my attention in any of the States of the Union. In my area of the country, there is no quarrel with the existing congressional districts. They represent all types of regions in the State. They represent all kinds of industrial, occupational, and vocational pursuits, and there is no quarrel with them from the standpoint of there being too large a representation in the cities or in the rural area, so far as the congressional districts are concerned.

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not know about the situation in South Dakota, but the Senator from South Dakota was present in the committee when a discussion took place about Harris County, Tex. That congressional district contains one-sixth of the population of Texas, and has one Representative in Congress. Yet there are a total of 22 Representatives from Texas. This indicates very substantial gerrymandering in the State of Texas. That situation is duplicated in almost every other States. For example, in the 11th Congressional District of Indiana, which contains the city of Indianapolis, the population is as large as that of the 6th and 9th Districts.

The 16th Congressional District of Michigan has a population of 525,000, which is 120,000 more than the total population of the 11th and 12th Districts, the 11th District being located in the upper peninsula.

Those examples could be multiplied indefinitely in all the States, including Massachusetts.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator from Massachusetts is trying to point out that there is no complaint on the part of the people about the division of a congressional district, that is true. The arrangements he has mentioned have been made, and they appear to be satisfactory to the people within the States. If the people were dissatisfied with what happened in Harris County, Tex., they could correct the condition through the legislature, if they wanted to do so.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator knows that the lines for congressional districts are set by the State legislatures; and once again, gerrymandering in State legislatures is infinitely worse than it is in Congress. So how can it be hoped to get any relief from the State legislatures, which themselves are the victims or the sponsors of substantial abuses in this field?

Mr. MUNDT. I thought the Senator was saying he was afraid of new abuses. If abuses were to grow out of the proposal because of a desire to influence a presidential election, Congress could at any time exercise its residual power under the Constitution to make regulations concerning congressional districts. It has done so in the past, and it could do so again.

Mr. KENNEDY. The party in control of the State legislature would reorganize the congressional districts within the State so that not only would their party be successful in a congressional election, but their action would also affect the presidency. Once they got a majority, it seems to me it would be extremely difficult for congress to realine those districts.

For instance, Wayne County, Mich., which contains the city of Detroit, and contains 40 percent of the population of the State, has 27 percent of the representation in the lower house.

In Rhode Island, Providence, with 36 percent of the population, has 25 percent of the representation in the lower house.

In Wisconsin, each assembly district represents an urban population of 67,447, and a rural population of 15,827.

The point is that similar conditions exist all over the country. I gave an example in the case of New Jersey. Eight urban counties, with four-fifths of the population of the State, have 8 State senators, while 13 rural counties, with one-fifth of the population, have 13 senators.

That is true also in Massachusetts. The Massachusetts House of Representatives—the general court—has gone Democratic only three times in its history, in spite of the Democratic landslides that have happened, both nationally and in Massachusetts, particularly in this century. In spite of the Democratic landslides of 1932, 1936, 1940, 1944, and 1948, the general court went Democratic in only 1 of those years—1948.

The point I make is that State legislatures are weighted in favor of one group.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator will concede, will he not, that should a State or a party within a State attempt to change the Presidential election result by means of gerrymandering, Congress has the authority, the power, and the right, to correct the situation?

Mr. KENNEDY. The great difficulty is that, as a practical matter, the party which had been successful might not be inclined to do that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true, in reviewing the point made by the Senator from South Dakota, that even if Congress were to attempt to cure gerrymandering, and were again to lay down the principle which it once adopted, that is to require congressional districts to be approximately equal in size, compact, and contiguous to each other, nevertheless it would be virtually impossible to enforce such a practice because there was such a provision on the statute books earlier, and the States disregarded it?

In Illinois the State legislature gerrymandered the districts, and the districts were of grossly unequal size. One district had a population of approximately a million; another district had a population of little more than 200,000. Some of us subscribed money and hired a very good lawyer to take the case through the courts, to see if Congress would not take

jurisdiction and require the State legislature to redistrict. The case went to the Supreme Court. It was known as Colegrove against Green. The Supreme Court, by a decision of 4 to 3, refused to take jurisdiction, saying that there was no legal remedy or constitutional remedy for the failure of a State legislature properly to redistrict. The case of Colegrove against Green is still controlling.

The decision was so close that it made the Illinois Legislature a little afraid, and it did redistrict in practice, and the present districts are better than the old ones, although not perfect.

Therefore, the remedy which the Senator from South Dakota suggests would never, I think, be put into effect, because it would be asking the State legislatures to reform themselves; it would be asking the party in Congress which would benefit from the gerrymandering to reform itself. Even if all those requirements were to be met, the States could go blithely on their way and disregard the constitutional provisions; and so far as the decisions of the Supreme Court are concerned, if the Court held to its past decisions, there would be no remedy. The Colegrove against Green case, in which the Supreme Court refused certiorari, is extremely important in this connection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Even if there are districts of similar population, which we have in 4 of the districts in Massachusetts, where there is a very compact geographical area, the record shows that in 2 of the districts the Democrats outnumber the Republicans 10 to 1, and in the other 2 districts the Republicans have a rather narrow margin. In spite of the fact that the Democrats outnumber the Republicans overwhelmingly, the result is there is a 2-to-2 distribution. I am not sure it would be possible for Congress to go in and redraw those lines to the satisfaction of the people of Massachusetts, without taking away from one group or the other, even though a standard were established that every congressional district must have the same population and must be compact geographically.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that the historic tendency of the country's population has been to shift from the farms to the cities, and that has resulted in every State legislature having a disproportionately heavy representation from the rural areas? In other words, in many instances people have moved away from rural areas, yet, because the State legislatures were set up many years ago, when there was a larger proportion of the people living in those rural areas, the representatives from those sections have continued to retain their proportion in the State legislatures. Because of the fact that the representation has not been changed, the result is that the rural vote is much more significant than the population would indicate it to be.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is true in many districts.

Mr. LONG. So the farm-to-city movement of the population has resulted in an indirect gerrymandering of the State legislatures. The State legislatures have a disproportionately heavy representation from the rural areas. Naturally, members of the legislatures try to do all they can for the areas they represent, including the setting up of the congressional districts. Once again, because the rural vote is disproportionately strong in the State legislature, the same tendency shows itself in the setting up of the congressional districts so as to place as much emphasis as possible on the rural areas in giving them an opportunity to be represented in Congress.

Mr. KENNEDY. In North Carolina, the 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th Districts are narrow and run from the hill country to the seaboard. The result is that Republican strength is concentrated in the 10th District. With 68 percent of the votes in the State, the Democrats control 90 percent of the seats, whereas in neighboring Tennessee, where no such gerrymander is practiced, Democrats, with 70 percent of the vote, carry only 77 percent of the seats.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator is to be commended for pointing out that we Democrats have sinned in a number of States. To North Carolina I would add Oklahoma, as well as Missouri. I think it is quite possible that we sinned in Kentucky. I would say that morally there is no difference between the actions of Democratic legislatures and Republican legislatures, but that quantitatively there is a great deal of difference, because the Republicans have done it more often than we have. So that while we have no superior virtue, nevertheless, we have suffered more at the hands of the Republicans than they have suffered at our hands.

It is true that when Governor LEHMAN had the support of the New York State Legislature he did not correct the gerrymandering which was then in effect. He did not wipe out the inequalities which had been operating in favor of the Republicans. That is a case where he leaned over backwards. There may also have been cases where Republicans leaned over backwards. In Wisconsin the Republican State Legislature tried to gerrymander when the Republicans were in power, and the Republican governor vetoed the measure.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I just wished to make a light comment and say both Senators have been fair, but when the Senator from Illinois suggests that we have sinned more quantitatively than have the Democrats, I wish to suggest that I think the stings we have suffered from the fewer misdeeds have been much harder to bear.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is always harder to bear the afflictions which others visit upon one than it is to bear those afflictions which one visits upon others.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it not correct to say that the States even now, if they desire, can cast their votes by congressional districts, under existing law?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. That is a plan that could be followed, but it is not done because it cuts down the power of the States.

Mr. LONG. That is just the point. Whereas every State in the Union has the right to break its electoral vote up and cast its vote so it would go by congressional districts, States do not use that method, because if one of the States uses the winner-take-all approach, other States, in self-defense, have to do the same thing, in order that each State may have the greatest possible impact on the outcome of the election.

If we were to pass the Mundt-Coudert proposal, along with the Lodge-Gossett proposal, obviously if one State, such as South Dakota, proceeded to use the Mundt-Coudert suggestion, that State would cast four electoral votes. In the State of Louisiana, in order to offset that, instead of breaking up the vote so that one candidate would get 52 percent and the other candidate would get 48 percent, it would use the other proposal, so that perhaps Eisenhower would have had 1 electoral vote and Stevenson the other 7. Therefore every State would have to use the arrangement which would have the greatest possible effect on the election. Every State would not have a chance to use the very meritorious proposal which was originally offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and other Senators, under which each State would divide the votes according to the way the people voted.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator has reached the heart of the matter. The Mundt-Coudert plan would be the one which nearly all the States would use. The United States Congress would be up to its neck in trying to set up congressional districts, and would be involved, not only in the election of the President, but of every Member who would come to Congress. So we would be opening up a Pandora's box of heartaches.

Mr. LONG. It appears that the very worthy proposal of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and other Senators was changed in an effort to gain additional support, and was compromised in an effort to win over those who favored the Mundt-Coudert plan. When the Senator from Texas and other Senators thought they were making a compromise, and were making the Mundt-Coudert plan optional to their proposal, which could be followed in other States, they did not make a compromise; they entered into a 100-percent surrender to pick up supporters of the Mundt-Coudert proposal. While I was for the old Lodge-Gossett proposal, or the Daniel proposal as advanced in the committee, personally I could not vote for it once this additional feature was added to it.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the Senator is on sound ground.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator be willing to support the original Daniel proposal as supported by the committee?

Mr. KENNEDY. No. I said yesterday it was preferable, but, in my opinion,

there are major deficiencies in it. In the first place, though the Senator from Texas has maintained that we could not say what would have happened in the past had this plan been in effect, nevertheless, there would have been three times since 1860 when we would have elected a President who had a lesser number of popular votes than the other candidates. In addition, there would have been 3 times when there would have been the election of a President of 1 party and the election of a Congress of another party. Therefore, I think it would be a mistake to adopt the original Daniel proposal.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, would that have happened three times under the Daniel plan?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes; three times under the Daniel plan. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that in 1880, under Senate Joint Resolution 31, Hancock would have defeated Garfield in electoral votes, while losing in the popular vote. In both 1896 and 1900, instead of McKinley, Bryan would have become President by virtue of his electoral vote, if Senate Joint Resolution 31 had been the law. In all three of those cases of a Democratic President, a Republican House of Representatives at the beginning of the same term—which we have never had under the present system—would have been elected. Of course, this woud have presented the President and the Congress with a completely untenable situation, in my opinion.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, does the Senator from Massachusetts have a concrete proposal to make as a reform of the present system?

Mr. KENNEDY. The only proposal I make is this: In 1948 it would have been possible, by a change of some votes, to throw the election into the House of Representatives. The portion of the pending measure which permits the House Members to vote as individuals, instead of by States, therefore, constitutes a most important reform. If the presidential election were ever thrown into the House of Representatives by the building up of an important third party, we would find States with very limited populations able to elect the President; perhaps one-fourth of the population then would be able to elect the President, which would be a disaster. That is the only suggestion I would make.

Mr. LONG. It would seem to me that the best way to have the presidential vote cast would be to get away from the electoral-college distribution, and to let each State vote on the basis of its percentage of the population, and then break down that State vote on a percentage basis, depending on which way the State went. The small States might object to that plan, but it seems to me that is the fairest way.

Mr. KENNEDY. As a practical matter, we would never be able to get Nevada to approve of the plan on that basis. So what the Senator from Louisiana has stated is good in theory, but would be impossible in practice. One of the plans would be to permit them to keep their electoral votes, but to have them awarded, not on the basis of the candidate who carried the State, but on the basis of proportion. In the case of Nevada there would not be any proportion.

Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that in 1948, under the proposal of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the State of Connecticut would have been split 3.9 to 4.0, or with a margin of 0.1 percent of the electoral vote, which in my opinion would make Connecticut of minor importance in the counting of the electoral votes.

I am not sure that the Senator from Connecticut was in the Chamber yesterday when I presented the figures in the case of some of the other States, particularly in the case of Texas, where the margin was 15.0 to 5.6, giving Texas a margin of 9.4.

Mr. BUSH. From what page is the Senator from Massachusetts reading?

Mr. KENNEDY. From page 24 of the report.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, now it is proposed that we change all this. What the effects of such a change would be on the Federal system, on the two-party system, on the popular and plurality systems, and on the large States versus the small States checks-and-balances system, no one really knows.

I. THE PROPORTIONAL VOTING SYSTEM

First. Under the proportional voting system, the likelihood of Presidents being elected with fewer popular votes than their opponents would be greatly increased. Proponents of proportional voting frequently refer to three alleged instances when a President was elected with fewer popular votes than his leading opponent. But the election of John Quincy Adams in 1824 was the result of the elections being thrown into the Congress, which also would have happened under Senate Joint Resolution 31. Moreover, there was no popular vote in 6 States, and no unit electoral vote in 6 others; so this is hardly an example of a minority President's being elected under the present system. Similarly, the election of Hayes in 1876 was the result of a decision along political lines by a special electoral commission established by the Congress. This, too, could have occurred under any of the proposed changes; and one reason for its occurrence was the doubt cast on the popular vote count in several States.

(At this point Mr. KENNEDY yielded to Mr. GOLDWATER for comment on another subject, which appears elsewhere in the RECORD under the appropriate headline.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have been glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. I merely wish to say to him that in the 1948 election, under the proposal of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] the electoral vote for Arizona would have been divided 2.1 to 1.8, giving Arizona a balance, on the electoral college margin, of 0.3 percent, which would mean that Arizona would have had very minor importance.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that no matter how the proposed amendment is written, it will be many years before Arizona will be of extreme importance to the electoral college; and no matter how the amendment is written, I think it will be many years before Arizona consistently goes in favor of the Republicans. If the Senator from Massachusetts can prepare a formula which will aid those of us in Arizona who are Republicans, I shall be most grateful to him.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is almost impossible, however desirable. [Laughter.]

Thus, Mr. President, the election of Harrison in 1888, some 68 years ago, is a true example of a President's being elected under the present system with fewer popular votes than those of his leading opponent. In short, what the committee report calls the "minority President evil" occurs at a rate of once every 175 years—hardly cause for an immediate and drastic change which the proponents admit will not even do away with it.

But the facts of the matter are that the system of proportional voting will greatly increase the likelihood of minority Presidents. Inasmuch as electoral votes will still be based upon congressional representation, rather than on voter turnout, thus increasing disproportionately the weight of small States and one-party States, a candidate could win, for example, 21 out of 40 million votes cast in the large States; but that 2-million-vote lead would not net him as many electoral votes as those his opponents would receive for sweeping the small, one-party States with a lead of considerably less than 2 million popular votes. The simplest example is the hypothetical case of two States, each having 24 electoral votes. In State A, 4 million popular votes are cast, with the Republican candidate obtaining three-fourths of the vote. In State B, 2.4 million votes are cast, and the Republican candidate receives one-eighth of the vote.

In the two States combined, the Republican candidate has a popular vote majority of 3.3 to a vote of 3.1 million for the Democratic candidate. Under the present system each candidate would get 24 electoral votes, but under the proportional voting system, as set out in Senate Joint Resolution 31, the Democratic candidate would receive 27 electoral votes, with 21 for the Republican candidate.

Using the figures on page 24 of the report, suppose, in 1948, the Nation had consisted of 7 States, namely, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Georgia. Mr. Dewey would have won the first 6 named, and Mr. Truman would have won only Georgia.

In the 7 States combined Mr. Dewey had a majority of some 192,000 votes. Under the present system he would have won the election as a "majority" President, with 138 electoral votes compared

with 12 for Mr. Truman. But under Senate Joint Resolution 31 Mr. Truman would have won 6 States in the hypothetical 7-State election as a "minority" President, by getting 71.4 electoral votes to Mr. Dewey's 69.3. Mr. Truman's margin for winning 1 comparatively small one-party State would have been greater than Dewey's entire electoral vote margin for winning, by a much larger popular vote, 6 large but more closely divided States.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. That illustration is a most striking one. However, I point out that that group of States includes only one of the many one-party States. When we multiply that factor by 10 or 11—as there are at least that number among the Southern States—plus some Republican States in the North, to increase the multiplier, we can easily see what the effect is in destroying the expression of the will of the majority of the people of the country.

Mr. KENNEDY. As the Senator knows, because of the small turnout in the one-party States, particularly in the South, a much smaller number of popular votes is required in the South to win an electoral vote than is the case in New Jersey, California, Massachusetts, or Connecticut. So that system gives a tremendous advantage to the one-party States with a low turnout, over the more populous States of the North. Anyone who says that a more accurate result would be obtained under the proposed new system is, in my opinion, mistaken.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Did I correctly understand the distinguished Senator from New Jersey to say that the will of the people was not considered?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I pointed out that this was a very striking example of how the will of the people would be defeated by the proposed amendment.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from North Dakota wishes to say that the will of the people is not expressed. The fallacy of the argument made yesterday by the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Massachusetts was that the people have nothing to say about the candidates. The way the procedure is rigged now, a group of Republicans meet in a smoke-filled room and select some candidate. A group of Democrats meet in a smoke-filled room, and they select a candidate. The people are not consulted, as they would be in a direct primary.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. Just a moment.

The two candidates are chosen, and the people of the United States are told, "Take your pick. One is as bad as the other, but you may vote for either one you choose."

In a primary there is no reason why Mr. Taft, Mr. Dewey, and Mr. Eisenhower could not all have been on the ballot, as well as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], if he wanted to run, or any other Republican Senator or Representative in Congress. The people would have gone to the polls in a primary in June, and the majority of the people would have expressed their will as to whom they wanted on the Republican ticket for President.

On the Democratic side, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and Governor Stevenson would all have been on the ballot. The Democrats of the country could have said, "We want Mr. KENNEDY for President," or "We want Mr. KEFAUVER for President." The will of the people is entirely ignored at the present time.

Mr. WILEY. What happened in Minnesota yesterday?

Mr. LANGER. The politicians met, and they were for Stevenson. The common people met yesterday, and they reversed that decision.

A small group in either a Democratic or a Republican convention, composed of politicians and officeholders—ward heelers, in a great many instances—selects the candidate for President. Under the provisions of my substitute, the Republican people of the country would decide which Republican they wanted on the ticket, and the Democratic people of the country would decide which Democrat they wanted on their ticket. It seems to me that if this is a good way to choose United States Senators, Representatives in Congress, and governors, it is a proper way to elect a President of the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY. What the Senator says is true to some extent. However, the pending measure deals only with general elections, and not with the problem of primary elections, which has been the subject of some other legislative proposals.

Mr. LANGER. What good does it do to deal with a general election after the 2 candidates are nominated in smoke-filled rooms? They are handpicked. I know that a few years ago the Senator from Massachusetts would never have voted for J. P. Morgan's lawyer to be the Democratic candidate for President of the United States. The people of the United States would never have selected him. He was totally unknown. Yet J. P. Morgan's lawyer was selected to be the Democratic candidate for President of the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY. I always thought that Oscar Underwood would have been a better candidate.

Mr. LANGER. I believe that in a primary he would have been the choice.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. This is really a bit off the subject, although it is a matter of great interest, and I know it is considered to be of great importance by the Senator from North Dakota. I really must enter a slight protest against the suggestion that it would be possible to have a system of elections of national officeholders in this country without the interposition of a party system, and without the display of party responsibility in the selection of candidates. There would be absolute chaos if individuals by the dozen or by the hundred were to have their names placed upon a ballot in a primary for either party, without action by that party's official machinery for the purpose of making a wise selection of candidates.

While the system to which the Senator is undoubtedly accustomed, may work well in a State the size of his State, particularly in the case of a man like him, who for a generation or more has been a great public figure, such a system would not work in my State. It certainly would not work in the Nation as a whole.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let me ask the Senator from New Jersey whether or not he was nominated in a primary.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. We have a primary law in New Jersey. It is an open primary. We think very highly of it. In my opinion it is most useful as a safety valve, if there is any question of chicanery or fraud on the part of the party organization. But I know perfectly well that without party leadership in New Jersey, or in any other State, small or large, there would be merely a contest among those who were able to get, from whatever source, the resources necessary to conduct a statewide campaign. Such a system would entirely exclude people of modest means from entering politics on this level, which would certainly be a most undesirable result.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let me make one point as to what the effect of the Daniel proposal would be on the large States. I think the point is made most clear by the 1944 election.

Twelve Southern States, polling a vote of 5,609,000, showed a plurality of 2,263,270 for Roosevelt, which brought him 186 electoral votes, and none for his opponent.

A proportional division would have cut his lead by 65.697 electoral votes, giving him, under the proportional system, 99.576, with 33.879 for Dewey, and 4.445 for minor candidates.

The five States with the largest voting population, all with active party competition, cast a total vote of 20,621,569, returning to Roosevelt a plurality of 1,026,256, which gave him 135 electoral votes, to 25 for Dewey, an advantage of 110. A proportional division would have cut the lead to less than 8. The point is made that that would have given the 5 most populated States a margin of only about 8 electoral votes. The southern margin, with a voting turnout of a quarter of the 5 top States, would be 66.

The point I make is that in the case of the States with the largest population, their influence would be almost nil, and that it would make the influence of the Democratic Party in the South far greater than it is.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Just yesterday the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts gave illustrations of States that had won by a fraction so far as the result in the

States was concerned in a general election.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. What good is it, for example, for a Republican in Mississippi to go to the polls? Of course, a great many people in the United States do not bother to vote at the general election. Take, for example, the people in the gallery today. Not one of them voted for Eisenhower or for Stevenson. Some of them may have thought they had voted for either candidate. As a matter of fact, they voted for electors, who went into a smoke-filled room and selected the man of their choice. The only choice that existed in the illustration of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts was the choice between Dewey and Roosevelt. There may have been hundreds of thousands of people who may have wanted to vote for someone else. Why should not the Republicans have an opportunity in a primary to elect the person the party wants to have run for President?

Mr. KENNEDY. That proposal is worthy of consideration, but it is not before the Senate today.

Mr. LANGER. I am inquiring of the distinguished Senator along that line because there is such a proposal at the desk.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator's proposal is for a general election. It does not provide for a direct primary in every State, as I understand.

Mr. LANGER. Yes; it provides for national primaries.

Mr. KENNEDY. And also for a national election?

Mr. LANGER. It provides for direct primaries in June. The argument made by my friend, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], does not apply to my proposal.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let us assume that there were 8 or 9 candidates in June. How would that represent a better system of selecting a top candidate, who might get only 20 percent of the vote?

Mr. LANGER. Which would the Senator rather have, 8 or 9 men running, as in the case of the primaries for governor and Senator, with the people electing the man they want, or to have some politicians get together and say, "We want John Jones for governor"?

Mr. KENNEDY. With all due respect to the Senator, I do not believe that his proposal for a primary of that kind would produce any better result than we have now. The present system, after all, has produced Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, Charles Evans Hughes, Dwight Eisenhower, Adlai Stevenson, and a great many other men of talent. I do not believe that is the basic problem, however, because what would happen under the Senator's proposal would be that there would be 7 or 8 candidates, and the top man might get only 18 percent of the votes, and the other candidates probably would get 12 or 9 or 8 or 7 percent. Under that system, how would we know who is the real choice?

Mr. LANGER. What the Senator says is the argument that was made when George Norris advocated the direct election of Senators, instead of having them elected by State legislatures. The legislature in my State went into session for 60 days, sometimes, when it had to select a person for the Senate, and the great argument in the legislature then was, "Who should be our Senator?" That was the prevailing issue. The issue always was, "Who would be the United States Senator?" There is nothing wrong with people electing United States Senators now. I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts will agree with me on that point.

Mr. KENNEDY. I agree with the Senator from North Dakota on that.

Mr. LANGER. We are getting just as good Senators as previously.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, we are getting better Senators under the present system of having the people select the man they want to represent them in the United States Senate. We have been getting men like Bob La Follette, George Norris, and Bob Taft.

I believe the American people can be trusted to select the best man, when they get a chance to do it, and when we get rid of the political machines that pick out the man who is susceptible to the whims and wishes of the machines.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Perhaps there is some misunderstanding about the election of delegates. In my own State delegates are selected on the first Tuesday in April. They are delegates for a particular individual, both on the Democratic ticket and on the Republican ticket, who they believe should be named in the conventions. For example, President Eisenhower had to agree to be a candidate before his name could appear on the ballot. In addition to his name, there could be perhaps a dozen other names. Therefore, it seems to me it is a pretty good mechanism. If a person wants to be a candidate for the presidency he must get delegates in the State. In that way the delegates have the direction not only of the people, but of the candidate also. At the present time the candidates are Eisenhower and also 2 or 3 other gentlemen, if I am not mistaken. In other words, it requires the action of the electors plus the action of the one who wants to be the candidate. Therefore, it seems to me that there is a perfect mechanism with which to get an expression of the people before the delegates go to the national conventions. As I understand, most of the States have similar mechanisms in effect. In the conventions the delegates will vote in accordance with the directions given by the electorate of the States and with the consent of the individual who wants to be President.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Has the Senator ever seen a ballot in New York State?

Mr. WILEY. I do not believe I have.

Mr. LANGER. In the last general election in New York State there were 285 delegates on the ballot. I do not know how any person in New York State could find out which delegates were for a particular candidate. The Republican machine and the Democratic machine merely made up little pieces of paper which gave directions to the voters: "Vote for these people."

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not wish to discuss the Senator's plan in detail, because I wish to conclude with this part of my presentation. However, I believe that his plan would result in the development of favorite sons in many States, and bringing forth minority candidates by each party. I am not sure that we would get better candidates.

Naturally we are very anxious to get the support of the Senator from North Dakota in our efforts to oppose the Mundt-Coudert plan or the Daniel-Kefauver plan, which would be a step away from direct elections.

Mr. LANGER. Of course I do not know what I will do, because I am very unpredictable. [Laughter.] I might even come around to supporting the Senator's measure.

Mr. WILEY. That sounds to me like an admission.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I think the remark of the Senator from North Dakota should be stricken. I do not believe anyone should say that about a Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGER. However, I cannot imagine voting for the plan proposed, when I have a chance to vote for the direct election of President and Vice President.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in 1952, if Adlai Stevenson had had 1,150,000 more popular votes in the Solid South, under the proportional system, he would have been elected by a narrow electoral margin, even though Eisenhower still would have had a nationwide popular margin of more than 3 million votes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield further?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Did the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts see over television the convention of the Democratic Party?

Mr. KENNEDY. I was there.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Illinois stood there over an hour before he was accorded the courtesy of being called to the platform.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Illinois is here and may want to comment on that. But I will say that in my opinion the convention in 1952 made the right choice.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, men disagree on that. He was not elected.

Mr. KENNEDY. The reason for my statement a few moments ago was that one electoral vote in Mississippi represented, in 1952, less than 36,000 popular votes, while 1 electoral vote in Illinois represented nearly 166,000 popular votes.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator did not get my point. Who selected the candidate? The point is that candidates are selected by a bunch of politicians in smoke-filled rooms. They are not chosen by the people. When the Senator ran for the United States Senate, he

was chosen in a primary election, was he not?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. He might have had a convention that was rigged against him. I could not be elected dogcatcher if we had a convention.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am not discussing the primary plan; that is not before us now.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is begging the question, because the people have to vote in a general election for the men put up by the two political machines.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Would the Senator from North Dakota add to the two groups he has already mentioned, namely, the Republicans and Democrats, the Farmer-Labor Party, which apparently had a smoke-filled room also?

Mr. LANGER. I put them all together, in any convention. I believe the members of a party ought to select their candidates.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the conclusion that Senate Joint Resolution 31 would give us more, not fewer, minority Presidents need not rest on hypothetical cases. For if Senate Joint Resolution 31 had been in effect throughout our history, it would have elected one majority President—Cleveland instead of Harrison—in 1888, in the only case where the present system resulted in a minority President. But offsetting this one case are three elections in which Senate Joint Resolution 31 would have given us three minority Presidents instead of the three majority Presidents who took office. In 1880, under Senate Joint Resolution 31, Hancock would have defeated Garfield in the electoral vote while losing the popular vote. In both 1896 and 1900 Bryan would have become President by virtue of his electoral votes under Senate Joint Resolution 31, instead of McKinley, who won the popular vote. In all three of these cases, and in the single case where a majority President—Cleveland—would have been elected at the same time as a Republican House of Representatives—a difficulty which has never occurred under the present system. We have had Presidents face Congresses controlled by the opposition in the middle of their terms, but never at the very beginning.

In addition, as the report mentions, a different use of the term "minority President" refers to those who fail to get a majority—greater than 50 percent—of the popular vote although winning by a plurality over their other opponents, a result which is not infrequent when there are more than 2 strong candidates. Although this is not inherently evil, its effects on the prestige of the Presidency and the respect and unity of the Nation are obvious. Senate Joint Resolution 31, by stimulating the multiplication and growth of splinter party movements would almost certainly result in this kind of "minority President" in practically every election.

Finally, the problem of "minority Presidents" should concern not only the popular vote but the electoral vote. And here it is significant to note that the report, which complained on page 10 of one minority—popular vote—President in 75 years, admits on page 21:

> It must be expected that comparatively few candidates (except in true landslides) will receive a clear majority of electoral votes under the proposed system.

This is a serious admission—and it is not made less serious by the companion proposal to throw the election into Congress every time the leading candidate fails to get 40 percent of the electoral vote. In short, a supposed "evil" almost never existent under the present system, a minority President, will ocur time and time again—in terms of both popular and electoral votes—under Senate Joint Resolution 31.

Second. Under the proportional voting system, splinter parties would be greatly encouraged. At present, various minority pressure groups are discouraged from forming their own party by the impossibility of ever winning any electoral votes by carrying a State, and by the futility of obtaining 50 percent of all the electoral votes in order to win. They thus find it necessary to work within the two major parties, moderating their own narrow policies to fit the party structure. Thus the American preference for moderation instead of extremities is continued.

But the proportional voting system would enable any number of parties able to attract a sufficient number of its own adherents within a single State to obtain official electoral vote recognition never before possible; and by awarding them electoral votes it will give to such splinter groups a new power they may use to coerce one of the major parties to accede to their demands. The original Senate Joint Resolution 31 reduced to 40 percent the required proportion of electoral votes a winning candidate must obtain. This change was made in recognition of the increase in electoral votes going to splinter parties under the new system. But, recognizing the dangers in providing for Presidents to be elected with less than a majority of the electoral vote, the proponents reversed themselves in the compromise measure, moved the electoral vote requirement back to a majority—greater than 50 percent—and attempted to meet this problem by specifying that within each State electoral votes would be awarded only to the three top candidates.

This is a subject of tremendous importance. In my opinion, this is a most haphazard way of amending the Constitution, which should be amended only in cases where there is need. To undertake to do it by suggesting amendments on the floor is not a satisfactory way to amend the Constitution.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield further?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Has it not been the practice for a bunch of men in a smoke-filled room to say, "We will name this man to the Supreme Court; we will name this fellow Secretary of Agriculture," and they divide up all the offices they want to fill, without the people being consulted at all?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not that the way Abraham Lincoln was nominated? Did he not promise Pennsylvania that Simon Cameron would be either Secretary of the Treasury or Secretary of War, and did he not promise New Jersey that William L. Daton would have a leading place?

Mr. KENNEDY. Speaking of Simon Cameron, Stanton said, "It is true that Simon Cameron would not take a red hot stove." Lincoln repeated that to Cameron, who objected to the statement. Lincoln later said, "In my opinion, he would." So concessions were made at that time by one of our great Presidents.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield further?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As the distinguished Senator knows, the State of Montana has a small delegation at a national convention. Can the Senator name one man from Montana who has ever been appointed an ambassador or who has ever been a member of the Cabinet or a member of the Supreme Court?

Mr. KENNEDY. I can name the late Senator Thomas Walsh.

Mr. LANGER. He died before he had a chance to be confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think what the Senator from North Dakota has in mind is, in reality, not Montana, but North Dakota, which, under a Democratic administration, got an ambassador, but under a Republican administration it has not.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Montana has a traveling ambassador, and America has never had a better one. I refer to the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. KENNEDY. I agree.

Mr. LANGER. I think all Republicans would unanimously vote for confirming his nomination for such a post. But North Dakota, Montana, Arizona—they have never had any ambassadorships or Cabinet posts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Arizona had an ambassador within 5 years—Lewis Douglas.

Mr. LANGER. Arizona never had a man in the Cabinet. Florida is 109 years old, and had one member of a President's Cabinet. It happened only during the Confederacy, when they got a Secretary of the Navy under Jefferson Davis. Aside from that time, they have not had a member of the Cabinet.

Mr. WILEY. I have listened to the statistics which the Senator from Massachusetts has given, and I wish to ask him a question. Does not the Senator feel that if the proposed amendment were to be adopted and were to become a part of the Constitution, it might have very serious influence in creating 1 dominant party? The country needs 2 parties.

Mr. KENNEDY. My opinion is that it would have that tendency. If the

Daniel-Kefauver plan were put into effect, I believe it would help to make the Republican Party a minority party. If the Mundt-Coudert proposal were put into effect, it might have such an effect on the Democratic Party. So I think the State legislatures will make the choice, depending on which party it will help most, and not reflect the desires of their people.

Mr. WILEY. May I present the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] with a cigar, so that he can join with the others in the smoke-filled room? [Laughter.]

Mr. KENNEDY. I may say to the Senator from Wisconsin that Prof. Robert G. Dixon, who is professor of politics at the University of Maryland, after examining the statistics, stated:

> The proportional plan, by present evidence, carries a threat of injury to the Republican Party.

Professor Silva who made a most detailed study of the election statistics which appears in the American Political Science Review for March 1950, states:

> After examining the statistics from 1880 to 1948, the Lodge-Gossett plan, which was the predecessor of the Lodge-Kefauver plan, would have benefited the Democrats at the expense of the Republicans.

The fact is that it would have helped the Republican vote only in those years in which the Democrats won the election. The electoral vote would have been closer, but it would have made it impossible for them to win in the years in which they won.

Mr. WILEY. I have listened with profit to everything the Senator has said. The strength of America is in having two strong political parties. If anything is to be done to the Constitution which would have a tendency in any way to affect that setup, either by creating splinter parties, or by making one party all-dominant, we would not be doing something for the benefit of the country.

Mr. KENNEDY. I agree with the Senator. The Senator from Wisconsin is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and took a very keen part in the discussion of the matter in the subcommittee.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts just before the recent colloquies underscore a point which I should like to pursue a little further. The Senator pointed out that the proponents of the resolution have raised from 40 percent to 50 percent the vote which would be required for the election of a President in the electoral college, or by electoral votes, in order to avoid the effect of splinter parties.

As the Senator has suggested so well—and I wish to emphasize it again—a result of that kind might very well make it very difficult to get 50 percent, and therefore to make it necessary to do a large amount of trading with splinter groups, thereby giving them weight which they do not now have.

Thus, instead of reducing the effect and power of pressure groups, which the sponsors of the proposed legislation have as their main objective, it might well have the opposite result.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is completely right. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the proportional plan would reduce the possibilities of the Republican Party winning.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I think there is no doubt about that, and I am glad the Senator has reminded me of it.

There has never been a more strongly interested supporter of the Republican Party than the late Senator Taft. His view, expressed to us, was clearly to the effect that the plan would have an adverse effect in the wrong sense; that is to say, he pointed out that the Republicans would probably need about 53 percent of the popular vote in order to elect a President. Neither party should have to get 53 percent of the popular vote in order to elect its candidate.

Mr. KENNEDY. It seems to me the proportional plan would have an adverse effect upon the Republican Party. Because of the weighting of the State legislatures, there is a possibility that the Mundt-Coudert plan could be adverse for the Democratic Party, because it would give disproportionate weight to the State legislatures, which are controlled by rural groups, which have a tendency to be Republican. So there would not be a better reflection of the people's will under either one of those systems.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I agree with the statement that the results would be highly erratic. I am not quite sure that the Senator's comment with regard to a possible advantage to the Republican Party under the Mundt-Coudert plan is correct, although I can admit, at least, that it is theoretically possible. The overweighting of the Southern States would still, I think, be effective under the Mundt-Coudert plan.

So I would rather reserve judgment on whether its effect would be as the Senator says it would be, though I certainly concede it might be. The point is that the result would be unpredictable, and the procedure is not one which should lightly be adopted.

Mr. KENNEDY. Referring to the original amendment, this will not discourage splinter parties, each of which will expect to be at least the third highest vote getter; nor will the third highest party necessarily be the same party in each State. The compromise further complicates this by enabling States to adopt the district system, to be discussed subsequently, whereby any number of splinter parties might obtain one or more electoral votes from individual congressional districts. Thus we could well expect to see a Labor Party emerging in Michigan, a Civil Rights Party emerging in New York, a States Rights Party emerging in South Carolina, and numerous others entering the field. The two major parties would have serious difficulty in obtaining a majority of the electoral vote—and they would be forced to accede to the demands of the splinter groups and see the election thrown into the Congress where the will of the people could be completely thwarted.

Proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 31 do not deny that their amendment would put more splinter parties on the ballot and give many of them electoral votes. Can they deny that this would result in confusion, disunity, a distortion of the democratic process and the two-party system, and an increase in the frequency with which an election must be decided by Congress, with all of the evils that accompany that mode of determination? Particularly during the current generation of recurring crises, we should not try to accommodate our Federal-State separation-of-powers, check-and-balance Constitution to a multiparty system. This country has seen more than 100 splinter parties in its history, with 73 of them electing one or more Members to Congress or nominating a Presidential candidate. The two-party system made necessary by the present method of counting electoral votes has made it impossible for these splinter groups to break down our electoral processes as they have in other countries. But the threats to our political stability under Senate Joint Resolution 31 are unknown today and would be unlimited tomorrow.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. How could it possibly result in splinter parties?

Mr. KENNEDY. Because the electoral vote of each State goes to the party which carries the State. Under the proportional system, the electoral votes would be divided, based upon the proportion of votes each party might get in that State.

Mr. LANGER. Senate Joint Resolution 31 abolishes the electoral college entirely. There would not be an electoral college. The Republicans would be voting for their candidate by a popular vote, and the Democrats would be voting for their candidate by a popular vote. How could that procedure result in splinter parties?

Mr. KENNEDY. There would still be the electoral votes.

Mr. LANGER. But the electoral college would be abolished.

Mr. KENNEDY. The electoral college would be abolished, but there would still be the proportional electoral votes; and the votes would be distributed according to the relation of the votes cast in the State.

Mr. LANGER. Under Senate Joint Resolution 31, after election day in November, all the Republican votes would be totaled, and all the Democratic votes would be totaled, and the one who received the most votes would be elected.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator means under his proposal, does he not?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is not Senate Joint Resolution 31.

Mr. LANGER. Well, whatever the number of it is.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am sorry; I was talking about Senate Joint Resolution 31, which is the unfinished business of the Senate, the joint resolution introduced by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Does not the Senator realize that under the present system there is the incentive for splinter parties, in that if splinter parties can get sufficient votes away from one particular party for that purpose, they would enter the field in order to keep the party which they are opposing from getting the plurality vote?

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not think there is any doubt that under the present system splinter parties have had an influence, and in some cases an influence disproportionate to their numbers. I do not dispute that point.

My only point is that I think it would be possible, under the system which the Senator from Texas advocates, to have disproportionate influence; and, in my opinion, an election could be thrown into the House of Representatives much more frequently than the splinter parties have been able to do it in the past.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from Massachusetts realize that the Committee on the Judiciary tried in every conceivable way it could, in the proposed substitute, to eliminate, as nearly as possible, the splinter parties?

Mr. KENNEDY. I agree with the Senator. I know the Senator has been as much concerned about that phase of the problem as with anything else. I know the statement which he made in committee. My own feeling was that the 40 percent proposal was probably better than the 50 percent proposal and the reference to the 3 top candidates. I understand how the proposition could be argued.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator understands that when the substitute was proposed, in the proportional section of the resolution we provided that only the votes for the highest three candidates would be counted. Does he not?

Mr. KENNEDY. I understand that.

Mr. DANIEL. That was done specifically for the purpose of decreasing the possibility, below the possibility which now exists, of splinter parties control.

Mr. KENNEDY. Suppose there were a Civil Rights Party in New York, which might get a substantial number of votes, and there were a States Rights Party in South Carolina. The third-party vote in each State would be counted, would it not?

Mr. DANIEL. The votes for the top three candidates in each State would be counted.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is why I say, that in my opinion it is possible, by a judicious use of the splinter parties, to throw the election into the House of Representatives and prevent a candidate from getting 50 percent of the votes.

Mr. DANIEL. Would not the Senator agree there is more of a possibility of that happening under our present system than there would be under the proposed resolution or the substitute?

Mr. KENNEDY. No. I am aware that the present system sometimes permit splinter parties to have a disproportionate influence. But, in my opinion, I think the difficulty would be compounded if we were to follow the procedure proposed by the Senator.

Mr. DANIEL. The Judiciary Committee, which studied the problem very closely, came to the conclusion that the amendment would do the very thing the Senator has in mind, namely, discourage splinter parties in this country. I believe the substitute, which has the support of a majority of the committee, would also discourage splinter parties.

Mr. KENNEDY. The proposal would give them an electoral vote, which they do not get today. I know the Senator thinks they affect the electoral vote.

Mr. DANIEL. Certainly I do. Did not a splinter party affect the election in New York in 1948?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes; it did affect the election there in 1948.

Mr. DANIEL. Had it not been for the third party, President Truman would have carried New York.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes; but it would also be possible, under the plan of the Senator from Texas, taking the 1948 experience, with a third party in South Carolina, in New York, and 1 or 2 other States, to throw the election into the House of Representatives, which almost happened in 1948. The fact is that in our whole history we have had an election thrown into the House of Representatives only one time.

I am not saying all right is on my side in this phase of the discussion, but neither do I think that the proposed system is, all in all, as satisfactory as the Senator represents. I am not as strong on this part of the discussion as I am in other phases. If nothing else results but a change in the method of the election of the President, which I hope will be brought about, I think the Senator from Texas will have rendered a great public service, because in 1948 the election could have been thrown to the House of Representatives.

Mr. DANIEL. I am glad the Senator is favoring at least part of the proposed amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am, and if that is accomplished, the Senator will have rendered a real public service.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief announcement, which will take just a moment. It is the plan of the leadership to have a call of the calendar on Monday. I hope the proponents and the opponents of the pending joint resolution will try to make some estimate of the time which will be necessary for a discussion of the measure. It may be possible during this week to get some kind of agreement to vote on a specific day next week.

I am informed that one of our colleagues has a speech on an extraneous matter to make, which will take about 4 or 5 hours to deliver, and he plans to deliver that speech on Friday.

The calendar will be called on Monday. So it appears that there is very little likelihood of getting a vote on the pending measure before at least Tuesday, and it may be even later. If the distinguished Senators from Massachusetts, Illinois, and Texas will give some thought to the matter, it may be that, before the week is over, we can agree on a specific date on which to start voting, so we can accommodate our colleagues who are very anxious to know when a vote might come on the measure.

Mr. KENNEDY. Whatever is convenient is satisfactory to me. I think the Senator from Illinois has a speech to make. The Senator from New Jersey has a speech to deliver. Probably the Senator from North Dakota will desire to discuss his amendment. I think that with those addresses made, the discussion would be pretty well completed. I hope to be through my discussion within the hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Today is Wednesday. We shall have Thursday and Friday to discuss the measure. If we could, we should like to avoid a Saturday session. Then probably an hour will be spent on the call of the calendar Monday, and Senators will have the rest of Monday to discuss the pending measure.

Does the Senator think that perhaps Tuesday or Wednesday would be a suitable day on which to start voting? I should like to consult the leadership on the other side and talk to other Senators, but if the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and the distinguished junior Senator from Texas, who are very interested in the measure, will talk to their colleagues—and I shall confer with the minority leader—it may be that on Thursday we can reach an agreement so we can try to vote on Tuesday or Wednesday, so Senators who want to be out of town over the weekend can leave.

Mr. KENNEDY. That would give us Thursday and Friday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That would give us Thursday and Friday, and, if the Senator desires, Saturday, and most of Monday. The Senate passed 163 bills on the last call of the calendar, and I think 35 more have been placed on it. We should complete action on the call of the calendar in 30 minutes on Monday, so that the Senate would have almost all day Monday to discuss the pending measure. The leadership is willing to run as late as 6 or 7 o'clock in the evening, if either the proponents or opponents desire.

My only reason for interrupting the Senator's very able speech is that many Senators wish to make plans for the weekend and the early part of next week. I am not one of the Senators who needs to make those plans, but if we could all agree we shall begin voting on, say, Tuesday, after the morning hour, and work

out a satisfactory time, say 4 hours on the bill, I think many more Senators would be in attendance, and the effectiveness of the debate on both sides would be increased.

I do not desire to propose the unanimous-consent agreement now, but in order ultimately to get one, we have to start talking about it.

Mr. KENNEDY. It sounds satisfactory to me.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with respect to the splinter party matter and the 50 percent requirement, let us assume there would be a civil rights party in New York which would receive a very substantial vote, a very substantial State rights party vote in South Carolina, Mississippi, and some other States, and a liberal labor party vote in still other States. That would cut down the majority votes of the Republicans and Democrats in each State, and I think it would be very easy to prevent either one from getting 50 percent.

Mr. DANIEL. It may be very easy to prevent any certain one in a State from getting 50 percent or any certain one from getting a plurality. Under the present system, the splinter party can affect the whole vote in the State, but under the system we propose all the splinter party could get would be its portion of the vote under sections 1 or 2, or the congressional district it carried under the Mundt-Coudert plan. In other words, today the splinter party can carry the entire electoral vote of the State or throw it to one candidate or the other, as it did in New York in 1948.

Mr. KENNEDY. It can throw it to either the Democrats or the Republicans, as it did in New York in 1948.

Mr. DANIEL. It could throw the entire electoral vote of the State, and under our proposal, it could throw only its proportional part of the total vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. Of course the splinter party does not throw it, because the total vote is made up of many different elements, of which the splinter party vote is just a fraction. If 500,000 of the voters say they prefer a third candidate, the practical effect is to put the Republicans in.

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. But they are only one of many groups which go to make that decision. Therefore, I do not think it would be fair to say that decided the election, any more than to say any of the other elements making up the total vote decided the election.

Mr. DANIEL. But if there is a civil rights party in New York, and if it results in taking a certain number of votes away from the votes ordinarily cast in New York by the members of the Democratic Party, that would result in having the Republican Party get all of New York's 45 electoral votes, under the present system.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. Under the system the Senator from Texas proposes, all that a splinter party could accomplish—provided it was the third highest in the total—would be to get its small percentage recorded in the electoral college; and that would not throw the total vote of the State for either one candidate or the other.

Mr. KENNEDY. But my point is that the Senator from Texas would encourage third parties in all the important States—which would make it impossible for any party to get 50 percent of the vote, for, after all, the margins are very close, anyway—and the election would constantly be thrown into the House of Representatives—which has happened only once in this country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois, for I believe he wishes to comment on this point.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. Is it not true that under the present system, the influence of a splinter group is indirect, and the influence of a splinter party is negative, namely, that since the splinter party will not get electoral votes, its influence at best is negative; and failing to get electoral votes, the formation of a third party or a splinter party is discouraged, whereas under the proposal of the Senator from Texas, a third party or splinter party would get positive electoral votes, and therefore would receive a nestegg upon which it could build, and thus it would be given encouragement for the future?

But in addition to all that, there is the point the Senator has mentioned, namely, that the splinter party, or a series of them, might get such a proportion of the votes in a series of States that neither one of the other two parties would have a majority, and thus the election would under this substitute amendment be thrown into the Congress for decision.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let us take the case of New York. The voters in New York who voted for the Progressive candidate, Mr. Wallace, in effect removed themselves, for all intents and purposes, from the electorate; they were not counted. So the election was really decided by the Republicans and the Democrats.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is exactly right.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts says they were not counted. Actually, were they not counted, in the case of New York?

Mr. KENNEDY. But not as electoral votes.

Mr. DANIEL. But they were counted in determining that the total electoral vote of the State of New York would go to the person receiving the plurality.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. So the first party—the one whose candidates received the highest votes—was not reflected directly in the electoral count, and neither was the second highest party—the Democratic Party, reflected in it.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. Does not the Senator from Massachusetts think we should have a system which would reflect the votes of the individual voters in each State, and thereby the individual voters of the entire Nation?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Texas and I disagree, because I want to discourage third parties, and therefore I do not want to give them recognition unless their strength is very great. My point is that in 1948, by voting for Mr. Wallace, such voters removed themselves from the contest, which then was decided by the regular Republicans and the regular Democrats. Therefore, the supporters of Mr. Wallace did not have their votes counted as electoral votes, because they are based on population.

Mr. DANIEL. But they determined how the electoral votes of New York went in the electoral college.

Mr. KENNEDY. No, they did not; because those voters took themselves out of the election.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Massachusetts cannot be serious in saying that their votes did not count for anything. The Senator has already conceded the fact that the splinter party's effect in that campaign was to give the entire 45 electoral votes of New York to the Republican candidate.

Mr. KENNEDY. Only on the assumption, which some make, that if those voters had not constituted a third party whose candidate was Mr. Wallace, they might then have voted with the Democrats, rather than with the Republicans.

But my point is that under the present system they took themselves out of the election, insofar as concerns having an effective force in it; and thus the election was decided by the purely Republican voters and the purely Democratic voters.

Mr. DANIEL. It seems to me they put themselves into a very effective position, which can be done under the present constitutional provisions.

I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that we could not be in greater agreement on any point than we are on the point that everything possible should be done to discourage splinter parties.

Mr. KENNEDY. I understand.

Mr. DANIEL. Our purpose is simply not to deny the right to have a third party in this country. But we propose to deny a fourth party or a fifth party the right to have its votes counted within the same State.

Of course, Mr. President, I do not know that we shall ever reach any conclusion by arguing this matter and tossing it back and forth; but I wish the Senator from Massachusetts to know that the Judiciary Committee, as shown in its report, and also as shown by our conclusions following the hearings, felt that under the provisions of the proposal now under consideration we would discourage splinter parties more than they discouraged under the present constitutional provision.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield briefly to me?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was particularly interested in the part of the statement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts in which he said that in the election of 1948, the Progressive Party's voters were counted—and stating that they were counted because they voted for Mr. Wallace and his running mate. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator if it is not actually true that they were not counted and did not have any effect or did not make any showing in the tabulation of the electoral vote, and that by voting for a third party they completely eliminated themselves from any count, except from the satisfaction of going to the ballot boxes and voting for a lost cause.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Florida is entirely correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. So it is a fact that by voting as they did, they are not represented at all in the electoral returns for that year.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. And that is the sort of situation which I understand the Senator from Texas and his colleagues protest against. They think that good American votes, regardless of how they are cast, should have some effect when the electoral returns are tabulated—but not the effect of throwing the entire electoral vote of a great State, such as New York, depending on whether they vote for the splinter party candidate, or whether for the moment they vote with the Democrats, or whether for the moment they go over to the Republican side. That is the sort of result which causes some of us to feel that some electoral reform such as the one suggested in this case should be enacted, because in many States a very small minority has thrown the entire electoral strength of the State to a particular candidate; and what is worse for the country, at least as I see it—is that that has kept in a perpetually uncertain condition, and sometimes a condition of timidity, the Senators from the States where so small a percentage of voters by throwing their votes around promiscuously, have to a certain extent dominated the returns from those States.

Mr. KENNEDY. I disagree substantially with the Senator from Florida. He states that the minority controls the vote. The vote is made up of a number of different groups, and they are the ones who decide where the votes of a State such as New York shall go. The electoral vote of New York is based, not on the number of those who turned out, but approximately on the basis of the population of New York; so the New York voters have 45 electoral votes. In 1948, the third party voters chose to support Mr. Wallace, thus they eliminated themselves from consideration. The decision in that election was made on the basis of the purely Republican voters and the purely Democratic voters; and the Republicans won. Therefore, all the electoral votes of New York went to the ultimate winner. That is the system I support, because I believe it is the one which recognizes the importance of State lines.

The system the Senator from Florida talks about, in my opinion, would be a strong blow against the rights of States in this very vital field. The Senator from Florida speaks of the rights of the citizens of New York, and he proposes the making of an attempt to equalize the situation. In 1948, an electoral vote was achieved in South Carolina by only 17,000 voters, while in California 168,862 voters were required for an electoral vote. That situation would be unchanged, because they would still continue to get electoral votes on the basis of population plus two Senators, and not on the basis of turnout. For that reason I am against the proposed amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator think that those of us who come from States which do not vote heavily in the general election have considerable at stake in pressing this amendment, in the hope that it will bring out a much heavier vote in the general election? We think it would result in much greater participation in the general election than has been the case heretofore, if there were some such amendment—and the one now pending is the only one before us—to preclude the basing of the entire electoral vote of a State upon only a few thousand votes, whether they come from a splinter minority, or whether they come from an actual matching of strength between the two great parties.

Mr. KENNEDY. There is nothing to prevent the voters turning out today. In 1952, Florida supported the Republican candidate for President. It has done so in the past, and it could do so at any time. In my opinion, the present system is not the reason why the Republican Party is not stronger in the South. It is because the people of the South—with the exception of the State of Florida, and possibly the State of Texas—simply are not interested in supporting the Republican Party.

Let me quote from Prof. Ruth C. Silva, writing in the American Political Science Review. She has gone into the subject to a much greater extent than most people have:

> The voting pattern of the South has been remarkably uniform ever since the demise of the reconstruction regimes. Even if one compares the primary vote in the South to the general election vote in the other 37 States, the number of southerners going to the polls is relatively low. As a matter of fact, in the South as a whole, participation in a presidential election is usually greater than participation in the largest primaries. And where will Republican votes come from in the South? To expect such miraculous results from mere electoral reform is attaching too little importance to historical, social, economic, and political factors.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let it be distinctly understood that the Senator from Florida is not pleading in the hope of creating a stronger Republican Party in his State. He is pleading in the hope of creating, not merely for his State—because his State has now become, in many respects, a two-party State—but for the other States which have not assumed that condition, larger participation by their electors in the determination of great national issues.

There is another point of view which the Senator from Florida would like to suggest to the distinguished Senator. It may have been discussed before I entered the Chamber. The Senator from Florida thinks it is unsound to try to eliminate from the electoral college returns—as is true under the present system—those several million voters in a State such as New York, our greatest State in population, who happen to be on the minority side in a presidential election. Does the distinguished Senator feel that it is sound philosophy to eliminate those several million voters who, with convictions, go to the polls and vote, as it happens, on the minority side? Does the Senator believe it is sound philosophy to eliminate them entirely from being counted in the electoral college, simply because they are in the minority, in a State with large population, whereas in other parts of the country the same number of votes may permit the piling up of a tremendously greater electoral vote in totality than the electoral vote in New York? Does the Senator think that is sound practice?

Mr. KENNEDY. As I have previously said, the electoral votes of New York are given largely on the basis of population. An election in the State of New York is decided on the basis of whichever party receives a majority. The State's electoral votes go to that party.

The practical effect of the proposed amendment on the State of New York would be to eliminate New York as an effective influence, even though it has a population of more than 15 million. In 1948, if the Daniel plan had been in effect, the electoral vote of New York would have been divided 21.2 electoral votes to 21.6. In other words, the margin was 0.4. The electoral vote of the smaller State of Texas, on the other hand, would have been divided 15 electoral votes to 5 electoral votes for the Republicans, giving a margin of 10. Under the proposed new system, the State of New York, the most populous State in the country, would be far less important than Arkansas, Alabama, and other States which have been one-party States in the past. I do not think that is fair.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. A moment ago the Senator stated that the electoral vote of the State of New York went to the party which receives the majority. Is it not more accurate to say the party which receives a plurality?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not true that, in the illustration the Senator has been using, the 1948 campaign, the majority of the people of New York voted against the Republican candidate?

Mr. KENNEDY. The majority of the people of New York who voted did not vote for the Republican candidate.

Mr. DANIEL. That is true; yet the Republican candidate ended by getting all 45 of the electoral votes of New York. Does the Senator think that is fair?

Mr. KENNEDY. Does the Senator think it is fair to give all the electoral votes of Georgia to one candidate when only 4½ percent of the total population of Georgia goes to the polls in an election?

Mr. DANIEL. At least those in Georgia who went to the polls had their votes expressed in the electoral vote. In the case of New York, the majority of those who actually went to the polls did not have any portion of the electoral vote assigned to them. The candidate with a minority—although he had a plurality of the vote—got all 45 electoral votes. It does not seem fair to allow the vote of a State like New York with 45 electoral votes, to go to a candidate who does not receive a majority of the votes cast in his State. It seems to me that the fair thing to do would be to divide the electoral votes in proportion to the way the people cast their votes, if we want the people to elect the President of the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY. As I have previously stated, what is at stake is the 45 electoral votes of New York. The people voted in the greatest number for a certain candidate, which in this case was Mr. Dewey. The State of New York had spoken, and the 45 electoral votes went to Dewey.

What the Senator wants to do is to break up the vote of the State of New York, which is almost evenly divided, so that the minority vote would be represented in the electoral vote. The result would be to give a disproportionate and wholly unsound influence to one-party States.

Mr. DANIEL. If New York is divided almost equally between the two political parties, it seems to me that is the way the vote of New York should be expressed in the electoral college We should not have a system under which, through splinter parties, third parties, and other means, a vote is expressed in the electoral college contrary to the way the people voted. In New York, in the example the Senator has been using the vote of the majority of the people of New York was never represented in the electoral college.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator might be correct if we were talking about having a direct election of President, and eliminating the extra vote given to the small States because they have two Senators. If the amendment before the Senate were a proposal to provide for direct election of Presidents, without counting electoral votes based on population, but based upon the number of people who voted, I would agree with the Senator. What the Senator advocates is treating the various States as equal in some respects, but not in others. If the Senator would divide the electoral vote of New York based upon the number of people who voted, and the vote of South Carolina, based not on the population of South Carolina, but on the number voting, I would consider the Senator's argument sound, although for reasons which I gave yesterday, I would not support it.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator would not be for that kind of proposal. The Senator stated yesterday that he believed that the electoral vote to which each State is now entitled should be preserved.

Mr. KENNEDY. The first practical reason which I gave is that, under the amendment procedure, every State has the same vote, regardless of population.

The second point, as a practical matter, is that the States came into the Union with the understanding that each would have two Senators and two automatic electoral votes. Therefore, I think it would be unfair to change the rules of the game at this time. The argument of the Senator from Texas would be valid if the proposal before us were for direct election of the President and Vice President, and not a proposal based upon dividing the electoral vote of a State on the basis of the popular vote of the State. Otherwise, I think the electoral vote should be based on the plurality of votes in the State.

Mr. DANIEL. Along that line, may I just say that the Judiciary Committee felt that the nearest we could get to a direct vote for President and Vice President would be by dividing the votes in proportion to the popular vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. In theory it may seem as though that is the nearest one could get to such a result, but, in practice, the result would be just the opposite. Under a direct election plan, New York State would have the largest influence in relation to the other States of the Union, and I am sure the Senator would not agree to anything like that. Therefore such a suggestion goes in the opposite direction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If it is desired to get a larger proportion of popular voting in the southern States, in which desire the Senator from Illinois joins the Senator from Florida—and certainly that is needed, because in the 1952 election the percentage of the population which voted in the State or Mississippi was approximately 11 percent, and in Texas and Florida it was around 26 percent as compared with an average of over 40 percent for the country as a whole, and an average for my State of Illinois of 51 percent—if as I said, it is the intention to get larger participation at the polls in the South—and I think that is greatly to be desired—is there not a much more direct and more satisfactory way of doing that than by a constitutional amendment?

In other words, would it not be easier to accomplish that if the four southern States which still have poll taxes in effect, were to repeal the poll taxes, and if the extra-legal pressures placed upon the Negro population in the South, which prevents them from voting, were removed?

Mr. KENNEDY. I will say that the election turnout is extremely low in many southern States. The argument made by the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Florida is to the effect, I believe, that that situation may be due to the fact that Republicans in those States do not see any chance of winning, and therefore do not turn out on election day. However, I believe there is more to it than that, because there is also a very small turnout at the primaries, and the voting as a whole is abnormally low.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in the one-party Republican States of the North—and I suppose we could include in that category Vermont, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, and Maine—there is a much larger percentage of the population which votes than in the one-party States of the South? That indicates it is not the "winner take all" system which makes for discouragement to voting in the South, but, rather, the poll taxes and the restrictions placed upon the Negro population in the South.

I know that out of deference to our good Southern friends, we usually skirt around the issue, and do not mention it, and do not bring the skeletons out of the closet. However, we should speak frankly, because this is a very important issue so far as the country is concerned. I believe our good Southern friends should recognize that they should not say that the low participation both in the primary and in the general elections in the South is due to the winner-take-all system or to the unit system, but, rather, should place the responsibility where it largely lies, namely, on the poll tax, plus the nonlegal and, I think in many cases, illegal restrictions placed upon the Negro suffrage.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Like the Senator from Illinois, I, too, do not like to leave any skeletons in the closet with respect to a discussion of the poll tax. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Florida, as a member of the State Senate in Florida, was one of the leaders in removing the poll-tax requirement in his State. It has been eliminated now for more than 20 years in my State, as I recall.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is in effect in four States.

Mr. HOLLAND. In five States. It has been eliminated in Florida. Further, Mr. President, accurate as the Senator from Illinois generally is in his quotation of statistics, he has gone badly wrong on his statistics with respect to the participation of Florida in the last election.

I see that the Senator from Massachusetts has the table before him. Reference to the figures will show that President Eisenhower's majority in the last election in Florida was a vote of 100,000, and that the total vote cast was about 1 million votes. With a population of 2,771,000, Florida had a participation of almost 40 percent. Therefore, although the distinguished Senator is always well-meaning and generally well-informed, he has in these two particulars strayed afield so far as Florida is concerned. The Senator from Florida, furthermore, does not mind discussing the poll tax. Before the Senator from Illinois gets away——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I merely wished to get my sources of information.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida wishes to remind the Senator from Illinois that the Senator from Florida has introduced in the Senate a proposed constitutional amendment which would eliminate the poll tax as a requirement for voting in Federal elections. He has introduced such a proposed amendment in the last four Congresses.

He has been very hopeful during all that period—and during all that period I believe the Senator from Illinois has been a Member of the Senate—that he might have the great assistance of the distinguished Senator from Illinois in sponsoring such an amendment. However, up to this moment he has not had any cooperation in that regard from the Senator from Illinois.

I have endeavored to get such support. I see on the floor my good friend, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who has participated in that effort. We have endeavored to get the support of friendly Senators from other parts of the country, including the support of the Senator from Illinois, in submitting this great question for decision by the country.

In that effort the Senator from Florida has been joined by 12 of his colleagues from other Southern States in their determined effort to try to get that reform accomplished. However, for some reason, which the Senator from Florida has never been able to determine, the Senator from Illinois and other Democratic Senators—and Republican Senators also, I might say—have not been willing to join us in that bona fide effort to bring that question to a head and to get the amendment adopted.

The Senator from Florida has gone further repeatedly on the floor of the Senate, and has stated that he would go before his legislature if such an amendment is submitted to the States for decision, in an effort to lend any help that he might be able to lend in getting quick approval of such an amendment by the Florida State Legislature.

Therefore, Mr. President, we are not unwilling to discuss the issues, and we are not unwilling to deal with great issues. We believe that any plan of electoral-college determination which in effect knocks out of the compilation millions of voters, whether they be from New York or Illinois, should be corrected. New York is our favorite illustration, because it happens to be the State which has the heaviest vote, and there are several million votes in that State which are found on the minority side of every race, and which votes are in effect completely knocked out of consideration in the electoral college.

A similar situation exists in the State which is so very well represented by the Senator from Illinois. Therefore I say that any program which in effect knocks out of consideration the votes of a large number of our citizens should be corrected, or at least should be changed so that the result would be more reflective of the attitude of the people themselves.

Mr. KENNEDY. The State of New York, which is the largest State, with a population of 15 million people, has an electoral vote of 45 at the present time. Under the plan of the Senator from Texas, which would have in 1948 split the vote 21½ to 21½, New York State would be less powerful.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent that I may reply to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would be very glad to have the Senator granted his request.

Mr. KENNEDY. How long does the Senator from Illinois expect to take?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Three or four minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I have no objection, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was not running away when the Senator from Florida referred to my getting away. I was merely trying to get my sources of information. This morning I went over the figures of the percentage of population which voted in the various States in the election of 1952. I shall put the figures into the RECORD at a later date. I was quoting the figures from memory.

I remember that in Mississippi it was around 12 percent. I had thought it was only about 26 percent in Florida. If I am incorrect, I shall correct the RECORD tomorrow morning on this point.

Secondly, may I say—and I speak frankly on this issue, but without animus, and with only feelings of personal friendship for Senators from the southern States—that the practice in the South is more extralegal than illegal, through the poll tax. We are glad that the poll tax is being reduced in the South. I congratulate the Senator from Florida for getting the poll-tax eliminated in his State. I think it was first eliminated in North Carolina. I think those are real steps forward. But, in the main, what happens is that it is not healthy for Negroes to vote in the South, particularly in rural sections. We all know that to be the fact. There is actual or tacit coercion, and that keeps the vote down, and there is no use denying it. We may as well face it.

It is true that Virginia, Texas, Alabama, and, I believe, also, Mississippi and Arkansas—I think there are five States in all—which still have the poll tax. I have favored eliminating the poll tax by legislation, but the Senator from Florida proposes a constitutional amendment. The difficulty with a constitutional amendment is that 13 States refusing to ratify it could tie up the amendment. And there are 13 Southern States, plus 4 border States which have a large degree of fellow feeling for the South.

I have informally said this, and I hope the Senator from Florida will pay attention——

Mr. HOLLAND. I am listening to the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have said that if a large number of southern leaders were to make an agreement that if an amendment were submitted to the legislatures they would work for the ratification of it, it would be a great step forward.

If we could get 101 southern leaders to say that if the amendment were proposed they would go before their legislatures and urge ratification, that would have a tremendous influence upon the thinking of the Senator from Illinois, and, I believe, of a large number of other Senators. But we are afraid, very frankly, of being boobytrapped. We are afraid that if we passed an amendment, it would be sabotaged in the State legislatures. If we can get assurance from the leaders of the South that that would not be the case, that they would actually work for its ratification, we would take a very constructive step which might enable this issue to be resolved.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will yield——

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate both the timeliness and the words themselves in the statement of the Senator from Illinois. I now show him a tabulation of participation by voters in the 1952 election, as contained in the hearings.

Virginia participated 5.69 percent as compared with 35 percent in New Mexico, 37.62 percent in Arizona; in Vermont, on the Republican side, 40.64 percent.

So I think the Senator will agree that there is no real or substantial difference between participation in one-party States, at least in the Southwest, and in the Northeast, as compared with the State of Florida.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Florida, and I am very glad he has corrected the figures, but I should also like to point out the percentage of population participating.

I shall review some of the figures of participation.

In Mississippi, 13.1; Alabama, 13.9; South Carolina, 16.1; Virginia, 18.7; Georgia, 19; Arkansas, 21.2; Louisiana, 24.3; Texas, 26.9; Tennessee, 27.1; North Carolina, 29.8; Illinois, 51.4; Rhode Island, 52.3; Connecticut, 54.6; Delaware, 54.7; New Jersey, 50; Massachusetts, 50.8.

And so forth. So that the degree of participation in the Northern States, I may say, in the big States of the North, is much greater than it is in the South.

I am glad the Senator has corrected the record so far as his own State is concerned. I was quoting from memory, and I was off 9 points.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield further?

Mr. KENNEDY. I should like to end this discussion, but I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Most of the States that made the better percentages are traditionally two-party States. The comparison which the Senator made in his earlier statement, at least, as I understood, was in one-party States. I thought the comparison, as shown by the table, was quite close between the participation in Florida and that in Vermont.

Mr. KENNEDY. Florida is not really a one-party State, even without the magic of President Eisenhower's name. Florida is really today a two-party State.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will permit one more statement, I have no objection at all to the electoral votes

from my State being so divided as to reflect the participation of voters.

Even though the record of my State is a good record at the present time, it was in 1952 a one-party State. That record would be a great deal larger by way of participation if this proposed plan or something like it is adopted. I think it is sounder and more in the interests of the country to get as nearly 100 percent of those who are registered and qualified to vote to participate as may be possible for us to get. The present program certainly is not accomplishing that result.

Mr. KENNEDY. Would it interfere with the direct election of a President so that the——

Mr. HOLLAND. I feel that direct election of the President would reflect many injustices that would keep it from being fair. Our sister State of Georgia shows a much smaller participation in voting than does the State of Florida. They have an 18-year age limitation for voting.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the age limit were set at 21, would the Senator then agree?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would never knowingly support anything that would fix the age limit at 18 years, nor would I ever want to take away from any State the privilege of doing it if they saw fit to do it. I feel that it is almost idle folly to have an age limit of 18 when the same people who would be allowed to vote, between 18 and 21 years of age, in choosing a President would not be allowed to vote, because, presumably, of lack of good judgment, in such matters as the imposing of a bond issue or the fixing of a tax, or anything of that kind. I feel that just as good judgment should be required in the selection of President as in any other performance of the voting duty.

Mr. KENNEDY. In my opinion, the result of the amendment will be to throw predominant influence in the one-party States. Many people are against what would really give to the people the influence they deserve, so I think that what is wanted is a system which will give influence to the one-party States in the name of having results reflect better the voting of the people.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will yield further, I think from the mere recital of the figures as to Florida for 1948, when, I believe the Senator said, 3.6 electoral votes would have gone to the Democrats and 2.9 to the Republicans, there should not be any reason for Democrats to stay home, nor should there be any reason for Republicans to stay home. There should be every encouragement for voters of both parties in our State to get out as big a vote as possible. I think it would greatly augment the participation of voters in our general elections to have such an appealing program for controlling presidential elections.

Mr. KENNEDY. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Florida is interested. I do not think the proposal would help Florida, because Florida is a two-party State.

Mr. HOLLAND. It would not discourage the people of Florida from coming out and voting.

Mr. KENNEDY. I except the Senator from Florida from this charge, but I point out that in 1948 in South Carolina an electoral vote represented only 17,000 people. In California 168,000 represented an electoral vote. This indicates a low turnout in some of the one-party States. If those States remained one-party States, which I think they would in many cases, disproportionate influences—not based upon numbers voting and not based on population—would be given to them. That is what concerns me. If New York, which has a population of 15 million, were even in the electoral balance, Democratic and Republican, and a one-party State had 10 electoral votes for 1 party and 5 for the other, the voice of New York would be pretty small.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate greatly both the kindness of the Senator from Massachusetts and his completely conscientious approach to the program.

From the standpoint of Florida, and from the standpoint of the South generally, excepting only 5 States which now retain the poll tax, it would be most encouraging to us to have an amendment of the kind proposed adopted, because it would bring about greater voter participation; it would cause our people to take a much greater interest in the general elections than they have done in the past or are doing now.

I see my distinguished friends, the senior and junior Senators from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH and Mr. CASE], seated in the Chamber; I do not know what their position is on this subject, but they represent a great State, and I submit that it would be a fine thing for the country to have people, regardless of where they are located, whether they live in New Jersey, or in the great State of Massachusetts, which is so well represented by the distinguished Senator who has been speaking, or whatever State it might be, to try to find a suitable provision which will so appeal to our people to make themselves count in the important matter of selecting a President, that they will turn out and vote as nearly to 100 percent as possible for those who are qualified.

I shall not longer take the time of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I commend him for the study he has made. I know he is seeking the right answer. I regret that I am not able at this time to reach the same conclusion he has reached. I am trying just as hard as he is, I believe, to find the right answer.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. Arthur Krock, who has studied the matter for a long time, said:

> Southern Democrats generally favor the amendment * * * because they think the South would regain its old place in the Democratic Party councils through the obvious fact that henceforth movements like that of the 1948 Dixiecrats would carry a larger defeat potential for the national party ticket.

Florida is a different case, because Florida is a 2-party State, in my opinion. Therefore, I think the Senator's remark is completely disinterested, and would lessen the influence of Florida, rather than increase it. But I could not say that of 1-party States, whether they be Democratic or Republican. The point is that the present system provides for an expression of the preference of the people by Statewide units. This is in accordance with the beliefs of the men who wrote the Constitution.

Mr. HOLLAND. At the time of the drafting of the Constitution, the population of the Nation, as I recall, was slightly over 3 million in the Thirteen Colonies, and the people were scattered up and down the seaboard. That situation was far different from the situation today, when the population is about 170 million in a Nation of 48 States that fill the entire continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

I am not impressed by the argument that what was good in the horseback days is necessarily controlling upon this great Nation now.

Mr. KENNEDY. I have a strong belief that the Federal system is the best system. I should hate to see abolishment of State lines. The Senator from Florida made some powerful speeches on that subject 2 or 3 years ago. Therefore, I think the Federal system should continue to apply in this instance. The presidential election is determined on the basis of 48 separate units. I think the election should be decided in each one of them. The alternative is to abolish State lines and to have direct election of the President.

The Senator from Florida does not favor that; I do not favor it. I think the result of a compromise plan would be disastrous and would lessen the influence of the people in the pivotal States. That, I think, would be a mistake, considering the fact that more than half the population is centered in 8 or 9 large States.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. KENNEDY. Under the system of proportional voting, the overrepresentation in our Government of the small rural areas of the country would be tremendously increased and the effective electoral strength of the larger, more evenly divided States would be inequitably reduced. Under the present system, the smaller and more rural areas of the country are overrepresented in the electoral college, where strength is based not upon voter turnout, or even population, but upon congressional representation, including the two votes in the Senate given to every State, regardless of size. In addition, rurally dominated legislatures have gerrymandered congressional districts so that the same areas are also overrepresented in the House, a point to be discussed in more detail in conjunction with the Mundt amendment. To increase still further this overrepresentation in the electoral college, by discouraging candidates from exerting efforts in each State commensurate with the number of votes in each State, and by giving small one-party States greater influence in the outcome of an election than the large, more evenly divided States, would be grossly unfair, and would upset the present political balance, with unforeseeable consequences. But that is precisely what Senate Joint Resolution 31 accomplishes.

As long as electoral votes are not based upon the number of popular votes cast

in each State, an advantage will be held by the small States, the States with proportionately low turnouts and the one-party States. Proportional voting accentuates the advantages of all three, so that those States which are a combination of all three would have tremendous power. They would provide wide electoral margins, based in part on their two automatic electoral votes and such electoral votes as may be based upon Negroes and others who do not vote. The importance of these low-value electoral votes is built up out of all proportion in the one-party States by enabling them to contribute a greater margin to a candidate's winning total than do the much larger and evenly divided States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand the Senator from Massachusetts to be saying, in effect, that if the States adopt the first alternative of the proportional State method which is in the proposed amendment, inside the Democratic Party the influence of the big States will be diminished and the influence of the one-party Southern States will be greatly increased?

Mr. KENNEDY. That must follow.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And, similarly, inside the Republican Party, that the influence of the big States will be decreased, and the influence of the one-party States in northern New England and beyond the Mississippi will be increased?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct. I wish to say to the Senator, as he knows, of course, that with every State getting two electoral votes for each Senator, those States which have only one Representative are given a greater advantage over the voter in such a State as New York. For example, in my own New England, Vermont, the population of which is extremely small in relation to that of New York, has 3 votes, and New York 45. A popular vote in Vermont is equal to about three votes in New York. This is presently written into the system, and would be greatly accentuated by the proportional system.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know the Senator from Massachusetts takes a very broad view of this matter. Would he be willing to speculate on the consequences of this shift of power inside the parties? Would it not mean, in the case of the Republican Party that, on the whole, the group which heretofore has stood for some degree of international participation, and at least some recognition of the rights of labor, would be decreased in importance, and that other sections of the Republican Party would be increased in importance?

Mr. KENNEDY. We would have to assume that the Republican Party in the South would have to appeal to those who do not now vote. If we assume those who do not vote now are Negroes and white voters who have a low income, there would be a number of reorganizations inside the Democratic Party in the South.

In the first place, the conservative southerners who are now in the Democratic Party might switch over to the Republican Party, thereby making the Democratic Party in the South more of a liberal party. So those who are proposing the amendment should consider that possibility in the election of Senators, for example.

The second possibility would be that the Republican Party, in an attempt to appeal to those who are now disfranchised, would attempt to promote civil rights, which would cost them support in other parts of the country.

I think it is impossible to predict what series of changes the proposal would bring about in both parties and how it would all end up, except I think we can be sure it would increase the influence of the one-party States in both parties. If the influence of the South were increased, and the Democratic Party did not become more progressive, and attempted to speak more than its strength warranted, that would affect the strength of the Democratic Party in the North, so that there might be a change in the party, with the Republican Party becoming more liberal.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the Democratic Party becoming more conservative?

Mr. KENNEDY. There would be a radical change in parties which I, for one, would hate to have at the present time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Republican Party might also become more conservative, with the trans-Mississippi States, excluding California, having a greater influence than the Republican Party in the States from Massachusetts to and including New Jersey would have.

Mr. KENNEDY. It seems to me in that case there would spring up a third party representing the more progressive wing made up of those who are now members of the Democratic Party. Instead of having a moderate system by which everyone's ardor is cooled off, there would be a tendency to form a more radical labor party in the North, if the Democratic Party became stronger in the South and did not become a liberal party. So I think the proposed system could change the whole political habits of the country, with results which are hard to predict now.

In short, if any reform is to be made in the electoral college, it should begin by making more equal the proportionate strength of each State and the numerical weight of every ballot cast. But this so-called reform marches in exactly the opposite direction by grossly distorting the importance of the same States which already have an unequal advantage in the electoral college. And there can be little doubt as to the course of any presidential candidate, when he realizes that he can obtain a larger electoral vote advantage from a single small State, as the result of comparatively little effort, than he can from six larger States, with the expenditure of considerably more effort. There can be little doubt as to the course in party circles—in the determination of the ticket and the platform—of the small one-party State, when it realizes that it has contributed or can contribute several times as many votes to the successful candidate's winning margin as can several large States put together. Both parties would be almost completely dependent upon their one-party States—and that is not healthy.

Because most of the large States are more evenly divided politically, their electoral votes—when allocated proportionately among the various candidates—can at most contribute only a small net margin to the overall margin by which a successful candidate wins. But a small State, less evenly divided and possessing a disproportionately larger ratio of electoral votes to popular votes, can provide a candidate with a much larger margin of votes in return for much less effort. Thus, in the example previously mentioned, some 8 million voters for Dewey in 1948—in New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Michigan, Indiana, and Connecticut—would find that under Senate Joint Resolution 31 one-sixteenth as many votes for Truman in Georgia would be more important—that instead of Dewey's 7-State margin of 192,000 votes being translated into an electoral edge, as at present, it would be converted into an electoral deficit under this new system of distortion. These figures are not my own; they are reprinted on page 24 of the report; and they show that had Senate Joint Resolution 31 been in effect, Dewey would have received a margin of 3 electoral votes for winning New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Michigan, Indiana, and Connecticut; and Truman would have received a margin of 5.1 electoral votes for winning Georgia. Or, to put it another way, Mr. Truman's victory in Georgia, under Senate Joint Resolution 31, would have been worth nearly 5 times as much as his victories in California, Illinois, Ohio, Iowa, and Wisconsin—for the former would have added 5.1 votes to his winning margin, and carrying the latter 5 States would have added only 1.1 electoral votes to that margin.

Under the system of proportional voting, the one-party system in many States would be greatly intensified, with incentive for fraud and additional franchise restrictions in the absence of Federal voting standards. As already mentioned, the effective contributions to a candidate's winning margin will be the greatest in the one-party States, where a large electoral vote advantage can be won with comparatively little effort. The leaders in these States will have greater power in the councils and conventions of their respective parties than ever before—and they will not look benignly upon the development of a second party within the State at the very time when the one-party system has given them their greatest power. On the contrary, they will have a tremendous stake to maintain and increase their power by reducing still further the opposition vote; and the incentive for further restrictions on the franchise, or for fraud and intimidation, would be overwhelming. Under such circumstances, there would be considerable pressure on the Congress to adopt Federal standards for voting in order to prevent abuses.

Many have been lured into support of proportional voting in the hopes of de-

veloping a two-party system in the South. But where are the Republicans going to obtain these votes? Not from the Negroes and those unable to meet the various voting requirements, for the incentive to continue there this disfranchisement will be even greater. Not from those disaffected with Democratic positions on civil rights, for experience has shown, as was shown in 1948, that they do not turn to the Republican Party, but to an independent party of their own. And not from those now registered as Republicans, or voting in primaries, who are supposedly discouraged from voting in general elections—because statistics show that there are simply not enough Republicans in these States. The proponents cannot prove that the reason Alabama is solidly Democratic is because the "winner-take-all" general ticket system makes it difficult for the Republican Party to capture that State's electoral votes. They are not winning any elections on the State or local level either. The same, of course, can be said of Democrats in Vermont. The present electoral vote system did not create the one-party States; and proportional voting, instead of making such States more bipartisan, would intensify one-party control within them.

I hope that Republicans who think that under the proposed electoral reform there would be a tremendous springing up of the Republican Party in the southern States will examine the statistics in the primaries in congressional elections since 1868. If they do, they will be greatly disabused. The reason for that situation is that the southerners want it that way, and because they believe in the Democratic Party, and not in the Republican Party.

The proponents cannot prove that the reason Alabama is solidly Democratic is that the "winner-take-all" general ticket system makes it difficult for the Republican Party to capture that State's electoral votes. The reason Alabama is solidly Democratic is that the people of Alabama believe in the Democratic Party. The distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is now on the floor, and I think he will agree that in his opinion at the present time there is not in Alabama a great, unknown, but potential Republican vote which would come to the surface if the change now proposed were to be made. Let me ask whether that is his opinion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. KENNEDY. I shall yield, although I realize that I should not have asked the Senator from Alabama, because probably he will give me the wrong answer. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have followed as best I could, and with considerable interest, the argument being made by the very able Senator from Massachusetts. It seems to me that perhaps the error of his premise is that he is looking at the situation which now exists. For instance, I do not say that Alabama is solidly Democratic because of the way things stand now—in other words, because of the present method of choosing the electors. But what I think I can contend safely is that in Alabama no effort is being made to build up a Republican Party. I think a similar statement can correctly be made in reference to any one-party State. For instance, no such effort is being made in Vermont or in Maine or in other States which I might mention; no efforts are being made in such States to build up, in connection with the National, Federal Government election, a vigorous opposition party.

After the 1928 election, the Republicans made great boasts about what they were going to do in the South; and after the 1952 election, similar boasts were made by the Republicans. But what has actually been done? Nothing—regardless of what the chairman of the Republican National Committee claims he is going to do in the South in the 1956 election. The Republican Party has not made any effort to build up a real, genuine Republican Party there; and I am sure the corresponding statement can be made of the Democratic Party, insofar as the one-party Republican States are concerned.

I will say that if the minority vote were counted—for instance, in the case of Alabama, the vote that is cast for the Republican ticket—and if the potential Republican voters knew it would be worthwhile for them to cast their votes for the Republican Party, the effect, first of all, would be that more persons would participate in the election; and the second effect would be that there would be a greater incentive for voters who think more nearly along the lines of the Republican doctrine to participate in the vote, and to vote the Republic ticket. I am sure the corresponding statement can be made in regard to any one-sided Republican State, insofar as the potential Democratic votes are concerned.

I can say to the Senator from Massachusetts, that all my life I have observed that the general election in my State slides by almost without notice; people do not pay much attention to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Except in 1952.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In 1952 we had a fair turnout—not a large one, but a fair turnout.

But, generally, the general election is held without receiving very much attention. I do not recall what the total vote in Alabama was in 1952; but my recollection is that the voting strength then was better than our usual voting strength in a general election.

Mr. KENNEDY. The total popular vote in Alabama in 1952 was 426,120.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is better than the usual turnout in Alabama for a general election.

Mr. KENNEDY. But in 1948, when the feeling in Alabama ran as strongly as it has run for some time against the Democratic Party—in fact, I believe that Alabama's delegates walked out of the Democratic convention—the voters did not turn to the Republican Party. Instead, they turned to the Dixiecrat Party.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will yield to me at this point, let me say that he certainly needs to learn something about what happened in that instance. That was a situation in which the committee which was supposed to be the State Democratic committee got control of the election machinery. As a matter of fact, the people who voted in Alabama in 1948 were voting under the Democratic emblem. It so happens that in our State the names of the candidates for President and Vice President do not appear on the ballot; the ballot contains only the names of the candidates to be electors. In 1948 in Alabama there did not appear on the ballot any names of electors who were pledged to vote for the nominees of the Democratic Party. It happened that the electors in Alabama were pledged to vote for the names appearing under the Democratic emblem.

Mr. KENNEDY. But in order for the Republicans to be successful in the southern States, they would have to make a very great appeal to the southern voters who regard the Democratic Party as being too liberal in regard to various matters.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the Senator from Massachusetts is correct. Not only would it be necessary for the Republican Party to appeal to those voters, but I think a great many of them would naturally go over to the Republican side because their beliefs are more in accord with the program and the principles of the Republican Party than with those of the Democratic Party; and I think then they would feel some actual incentive to vote the straight Republican ticket, because they would feel that in that case their votes would have some effect.

Mr. KENNEDY. However, the difficulty with that situation would be that in order for the Republicans to win any considerable number of votes on the part of southern voters who might be disaffected with the Democratic policies and programs, the Republican Party would have to adopt policies which would cost it a great many more votes in the Northern States.

Furthermore, after examining all the statistics in regard to the situation in 1948, Prof. Ruth Silva—who, as I have said, I think is the outstanding authority in this field, together with Professor Wilmerding, of Princeton—makes the point that—

> The voting pattern of the South has been remarkably uniform ever since the demise of the reconstruction regimes. Even if one compares the primary vote in the South to the general election vote in the other 37 States, the number of southerners going to the polls is relatively low. As a matter of fact, in the South as a whole participation in a presidential election is usually greater than participation in the largest primaries. And where will Republican votes come from in the South. To expect such miraculous results from mere electoral reform is attaching too little importance to historical, social, economic, and political factors.

I do not think there is any doubt that there would be some of that; but I think the Republican Party would probably be giving up more than it would be gaining; and I think that was the view of the late Senator Taft. We are not as worried about the Republican Party as they are; but that was the opinion of Senator Taft and also of Speaker MARTIN—and I think the Senator from New Jersey has

expressed it rather eloquently on this floor. My guess is that most of the States, such as Alabama and, in the North, Maine, would adopt the Mundt-Coudert system, and would rearrange their congressional districts, so that what the Senator would like to see happen would not occur.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think that is entirely possible, and I have thought of that as a possibility. As a matter of fact, I think the Senator from Massachusetts knows that I have supported the Daniel-Kefauver plan—the old Lodge-Gossett plan—from the time it was first introduced.

I was in the House of Representatives at the time, and I supported it then. Previously, Representative Lea supported it. When I came to the Senate, I became a cosponsor of the amendment. I much prefer it to the Mundt-Coudert plan.

Mr. KENNEDY. So do I.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that under our Constitution today each State could adopt the Mundt-Coudert plan if it saw fit to do so?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. I would have no objection to giving the States the choice of doing 1 of 3 things—either doing what they are doing today, adopting the Mundt-Coudert plan, or adopting the Daniel amendment. Obviously, no State could afford to adopt the Mundt-Coudert plan while other States were free to do as they chose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the point I wish to make. Even though under the Constitution today each State could adopt the Mundt-Coudert plan if it saw fit to do so, not a single State has adopted it.

Mr. KENNEDY. They will not adopt it, when the choice is between the general-ticket plan and the Mundt-Coudert plan. When the choice is between the proportional-voting plan and the Mundt-Coudert plan, they will.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator may have a point there. There have been times when certain States did adopt what we now call the Mundt-Coudert plan, but they gave it up. A uniform pattern developed. I am wondering if the same thing would not happen again, if there would not be a tendency for the States to follow a uniform pattern. My own hope, of course, would be that that pattern would be the Lodge-Gossett formula.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the Senator is correct in saying that the tendency would be to have a uniform pattern, because the controlling party in the State would want to speak with as strong a voice as possible. For that reason, the district system, which was the system advocated by the constitutional fathers, was finally eliminated, because States using that system in competition with States using the general ticket system were at a disadvantage. If the choice were between the proportional voting system and the Mundt proposal, the reigning party in each State would see that it had a definite advantage in adopting the Mundt-Coudert plan, because it would be possible for them to arrange the congressional districts in such a manner as to enable them to speak with a much stronger voice than their actual numbers, under the proportional system, would permit.

The amendment of the Senator from Texas is the proposal in which most Senators were interested. I am afraid that what has happened is that that amendment was used as the stalking horse to get the Mundt-Coudert proposal by. The result would be most unfortunate, I think, because of the over-representation of rural areas in the State legislatures, which has already affected the composition of the Congress.

Under the system of proportional voting, the chances for victory by the Republican Party, and consequently the strength of the two-party system which is important to all regardless of victory, would be greatly reduced. The few electoral votes the Republican Party might gain under proportional voting in the South—and where these would come from, no one knows—could not compare with the additional electoral votes to be obtained under proportional voting by Democratic nominees in all the Northern States which frequently go Republican by small margins. Application of the proportional voting system to past elections shows a gain for the Democrats in practically every instance, by giving them a greater electoral vote than they would be entitled to by their percentage of the popular vote. Moreover, inasmuch as Democratic strength would be located in the small one-party States where each electoral vote represents fewer popular votes, the system of proportional voting would increase the likelihood of Democratic electoral vote victory in a year of Republican popular vote victory. In fact, as already mentioned, this is exactly what would have happened in three elections in the past had proportional voting been in effect.

The present disparity between the electoral and the popular vote has two major elements: the first, which operates to the advantage of the Republicans in those years in which they are able to win a popular majority in the Northern States, by giving to the winner of each State the entire electoral vote regardless of the popular margin. The second element, which operates almost exclusively to the advantage of the Democrats, gives disproportional electoral power to the small one-party States with stringent franchise requirements. Proportional voting would correct that part of the disparity which aids the Republicans without correcting that part which operates to the advantage of the Democrats. The Democrats would continue to secure large blocks of electoral votes in the South, based upon relatively few popular votes, while the Republicans would have to obtain electoral votes in the North where more popular votes would he required to gain each electoral vote. Thus, as already mentioned, had Stevenson obtained 25 more electoral votes in the South through a shift of 1,555,000 popular votes he would have been elected in 1952 under the proportional voting system even though Eisenhower would still have had a nationwide popular vote margin of more than 3 million.

Perhaps, as a Democrat, I should take pleasure in the adoption of a system which shows evidence of making a Republican presidential victory nearly impossible—but as an American I would prefer to see the two-party system preserved.

As a final blow to the two-party system—in addition to creating splinter parties, increasing the power of one-party States and making nearly impossible a Republican victory—proportional voting under Senate Joint Resolution 31 would make possible the election of a President and Vice President from different parties. This is intentionally impossible today—for far from strengthening two-party rule, it would lead to endless confusion and division. This result is obviously unintentional, but I think the language of the amendment should be corrected.

Benefits claimed for proportional voting: The Senate committee report lists 6 evils to be corrected and 3 additional advantages to be obtained by abolishing the present system of counting electoral votes. Each of these nine points is highly speculative, fallacious, or so unimportant as to be very nearly irrelevant—and in many instances Senate Joint Resolution 31 will have exactly the opposite of the effect intended or predicted, accentuating instead of remedying whatever defects exist in the present system.

A. The disfranchisement of voters evil: The report alleges that millions of voters are disfranchised under the prevailing system of winner take all, inasmuch as all those who cast votes for the presidential nominee losing the State might just as well have stayed home. In a sense, that is true, although it is hardly a deterrent on voters hoping to win the State for their candidate—but it is also true of every election for every office under any system other than the European system of proportional representation. Those who voted for the opponent of any Senator on this floor "might just as well have stayed home," too—for, of course, the winner takes all, and those votes are to no avail. Even under Senate Joint Resolution 31 the winner of the presidential race is going to take all—and all the votes cast for his opponent, in that sense, will have been wasted. Indeed, one of the dangers of Senate Joint Resolution 31 is that it may undermine the winner-take-all idea in other spheres—and we will then have a plural executive and a proportionately represented Congress, in which no one's vote is lost but in which no one has any confidence.

Confronted with the fact that winner take all within each State is the accepted system in practically all American elections, proponents then reply that they mean to abolish State lines for purposes of presidential elections, so that each pocket of minority votes within each State can be counted in electoral votes to be added to those from pockets of votes within other States. This is a revolutionary change in our Federal system, and violates the basic premise that each State acts as a unit in its relations with the Central Government. That is the way the Constitution was ratified; that is the way constitutional amendments are approved—not by pooling the nega-

tive votes cast in the legislatures of each State. That is the way the Senate is constituted—even when the party with the fewer Senators elected received, in all senatorial elections combined, the most votes cast. And that is the way our Presidents have been, and should continue to be, elected.

Nor is the report wholly correct in claiming that the system of unit voting is unheard of in senatorial elections—for it is well established in the senatorial primary elections of Georgia and Maryland. The report also errs seriously in claiming that the losing presidential votes in each State are in effect credited to the winner because he takes all the electoral votes of that State. Surely the authors of the report know that the number of electoral votes possessed by each State is based upon congressional representation, including in part population. It is not based upon voter turnout—and the winner in each State would get the same number of electoral votes regardless of the size of his opponent's vote, and even if the opposition stayed home.

B. The minority President evil: The report complains that it is possible under the present system for a President to be elected with fewer popular votes than his leading opponent. This is true—but, as already demonstrated, the likelihood for minority Presidents is greatly increased under the proportional voting system. I pointed out three examples.

C. The doubtful State evil: The report alleges that the present system overemphasizes the political importance of the large politically doubtful States, with supposedly two effects: Presidential and vice presidential candidates are more likely to be chosen from those States, and the campaign is more likely to center around them. But like so many rules in politics, the rule of selecting candidates from large States has so many exceptions as to be practically meaningless. Eisenhower, of Kansas; Sparkman, of Alabama; Truman, of Missouri; Barkley, of Kentucky; Willkie, of Indiana; McNary, of Oregon; Wallace, of Iowa; Landon, of Kansas; Hoover, of Iowa; and Curtis, of Kansas—to name but a few from the past six elections—were not spokesmen for any of the large States. And, although the chief executives, or even Senators, of New York, Illinois, New Jersey, Ohio, California, Massachusetts, and similar States have frequently—though not invariably—been found on the ticket, this is neither evil nor surprising in view of their advantageous experience in administering or dealing with large, complex, and varied problems of political and economic life which a President also faces.

As I pointed out yesterday, while some of the States might lose under the present system by not having their Senators or chief executives considered as presidential candidates, they gain by reason of the fact that one-half the population of the country has 78 Senators, while the remaining half of the population has only 18 Senators. So there are other compensations to the smaller States in that regard, which should make up for their not being considered in many cases for President—even though I have given so many exceptions that the rule hardly applies.

Whatever our political disagreements may have been with them, the Presidents chosen under the present method since the turn of the century have been, on the whole, men of high caliber, responsive to the wishes of all the people, and capable of exercising great leadership, particularly in time of crisis, and particularly in comparison with other free countries. No proponent of Senate Joint Resolution 31 has suggested what better qualified candidates would have been nominated by either party, had Senate Joint Resolution 31 been in effect—and to claim such an effect for the future is highly speculative, to say the least, and hardly grounds for dangerously tampering with the present system.

Any generalization on the conduct of presidential campaigns is equally dubious. With the development of air travel and national telecasts, and the spread of the two-party system, no State or area can claim that it is or will be completely and permanently ignored. Of course, it is true that more attention is necessarily paid to those areas where more people vote—but that is the kind of democratic response which the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 31 supposedly want when they talk about giving greater effect to popular majorities; and it would certainly be true under any truly democratic system.

Moreover, whatever the merits of the arrangement, it can hardly be denied that the smaller and more rural areas of the country have major advantages today, both in the electoral system and in other areas of government. All the small States have 2 Senators and 2 automatic electoral votes. Thus, in 1952, the 9 most populous States, with approximately 50 percent of the total population, elected only 18 of the 96 Senators and automatic electors. Similarly, rurally dominated State legislatures have nearly unbridled discretion in gerrymandering districts from which Congressmen are elected. Thus it has been estimated that 51 percent of the population in towns and on farms elects 61 percent of the House of Representatives. This disparity will be discussed in greater detail in conjunction with the Mundt amendment. Finally, as already mentioned, strength in the electoral college is not reduced by franchise restrictions and low voter turnouts. Thus, in 1952, 1 electoral vote in Mississippi represented less than 36,000 popular votes, while 1 electoral vote in Illinois stood for nearly 166,000 popular votes.

Thus it is not correct to argue that the large, so-called pivotal States have an undue advantage under the present system.

D. The sure-State evil: The report charges that the existence of one-party States today is the result of the present electoral system. I have already indicated that this allegation cannot be proven—that there are just not many Democrats in Vermont or Republicans in Alabama. This is not the result of the present electoral system. In fact, recent elections have indicated that there can be a two-party system established in any State, from Maine to Texas, wherever the voters themselves want to do so.

The report also charges that voter interest and participation—particularly in the South—is low in such States from lack of incentive; and the higher turnout in contested primaries is cited to this effect. But the turnout in even the most hotly contested Southern primaries is generally far lower than the turnout at election time in the rest of the country. Surely the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 31 cannot believe that the low turnout in Southern States is due to discouraged Republicans staying at home because they cannot win their State's electoral votes. In fact, in the South as a whole, turnout in a presidential election is greater than in State primaries, the report deceptively referring to State elections instead. This low turnout is, on the contrary, largely due to the prevailing financial, educational, and other requirements for voting in such States—which have a larger share of the Nation's impoverished or illiterate adults of voting age—that prevent many from voting.

On the other hand, voter turnout will be discouraged in the northern two-party States, where drives to get out the vote are now most effective. Today such drives may result in large electoral gains for the candidate into whose column a closely divided State is swung. But under proportional voting several thousand votes one way or another in such a State will only affect 1 or at most 2 electoral votes—an incentive, of course, but one that will be increasingly dulled by the greater attention given to a handful of voters in the small, one-party States. Voter interest will decline, not increase.

This will be true whether the equally divided States are large or small. In Nevada, for example, a normal division of the electoral vote would be 1⅜ votes for the Republican candidate and 1⅝ votes for the Democratic candidate, for a Democratic electoral lead of one-quarter vote. In a landslide this might be increased one-half an electoral vote. This is hardly an incentive for an increased turnout.

In short, the sure-State evil cited by the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 31 is once again either nonexistent or in no way due to the present system. On the contrary, as already indicated, the one-party States will have a tremendous stake in reducing still further the opposition vote, and the incentive for further statutory or fraudulent restrictions on the franchise would be overwhelming. And, while turnout in such States would thus be further discouraged, it would also be discouraged in those evenly divided States where it now has a much greater incentive.

E. The pressure-group evil: The report alleges that the present system encourages domination of presidential campaigns by minorities or pressure groups within the large pivotal States. In politics, minority-pressure groups almost always refer to those on the other side of the issue. Some of the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 31 have been frank enough to admit they are talking about Negroes, Jews, Catholics,

and labor unions. Congressman GOSSETT, one of the original proponents of this measure, was convinced it would make unnecessary any political recognition of the Negro, Jewish, and organized labor vote in New York City. But to others, the term "pressure groups" refers to farmers, doctors, veterans, the aged, or someone else. Naturally any presidential campaign in any part of the country is directed, among other things, at these and other groups. Some may be given more attention than others—perhaps because they are more numerous—perhaps because they are more undecided—perhaps for some other reason. But no single group within a State swings that State more than any other group in that State—a candidate's majority is built upon a coalition of all of them—and regardless of what electoral system was in effect, all candidates would continue to appeal to all such groups if they sought to be President of all the people. The fact that each such group is comparatively small in terms of the entire Nation, or that bloc voting by any one group—relatively nonexisting—might be numerically equal to the margin by which a candidate wins that State, hardly constitute an evil of sufficient importance to revamp the Constitution—and those who make the allegation are in reality simply repeating their determination, already discussed, to weaken still further the already disproportionately small electoral strength of the large, politically divided States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Massachusetts has been making some statements which are very profound. As he made them, my mind went back to the essay by James Madison in the Federalist Papers—I believe it is the 14th Federalist Paper—in which Madison argued for a Federal Nation of a number of States, because then there would be so many divergent interests that they would in part cancel each other out and the general interest could be served more effectively.

Mr. KENNEDY. What the Senator says is correct, I believe. If it is true that the Negro voter in the South has less influence than his numbers would warrant, then it is also true that the Negro voter in New York State has greater influence than his numbers would warrant. It is a system of checks and balances that has made the system work. As I said yesterday, if I were writing the Constitution, without our experience over the past years, I would probably favor the Daniel-Kefauver plan.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts is also saying that there is such a diversity of interest in the large States themselves, that no one group is in control. The argument that Madison made for having a number of States join together is also applicable within the larger States themselves.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct. If there are 200,000 people in group X, and the State is carried by a majority of 150,000, the charge is made that group X delivered the State. The fact is that group X joined with other groups, none of which could say that they were the ones who delivered the State.

Several years ago in Fall River, Mass., the mayor was elected by a margin of one vote. That is a very terrible thing to have happen to any politician, because then everyone can say to him, "I elected you." [Laughter.]

In short, no evil has been described here that justifies this amendment—but, on the contrary, as previously mentioned, pressure groups and minorities will rush to form new political parties, where they will receive in actual electoral votes an official recognition never before possible, and where they will hold a balance of power calculated to coerce one of the major parties to accede to their demands.

F. The "landslide psychology" evil: The committee report, while admitting that the present electoral system produces the correct popular winner in all but the rarest of cases, complains that it tends to exaggerate the margin of his victory by giving him a proportion of the electoral vote considerably larger than his share of the popular vote. This is frequently true—but its "evil" effects are difficult to determine. The report is fearful that legislators may be deceived and defeated candidates humiliated—but all of them are capable of reading the popular vote tallies, as well as the electoral results, and all of them are free to interpret them as they wish.

Moreover, inasmuch as the correct winner does result, is it not better in the interests of national unity and necessary Presidential prestige and leadership to provide a larger margin of victory? A decisive margin produces fewer disputes, less incentive for fraud, and less likelihood of throwing the election into Congress. The new amendment would reduce margins in some instances to a fraction of a decimal point—as it would have, if supplied in 1900—where one-tenth of 1 percent would have been the margin—thus increasing bitterness over the ability of a few hundred votes to sway an election and encouraging the kind of political instability that characterizes many close, nondecisive European elections. I know of no deception or other evil of this kind under the present system—but I foresee considerable danger under the proposed.

In addition to correcting these 6 evils, Senate Joint Resolution 31, according to the committee report, offers 3 independently affirmative benefits—all of them previously dealt with.

(a) A compromise with direct popular elections is the description given Senate Joint Resolution 31. This is entirely misleading. It is not a compromise. It is not a step forward, but a step in the opposite direction. Far from being a step toward direct popular elections, this is an undemocratic step away from it, aggravating the existing distortions in the division of the electoral vote, diminishing still further the popular vote strength of the voters residing in the most populous areas of the country, and resulting in Presidents less qualified and less responsive to all the people.

(b) "This new system enhances a State's voice in Presidential politics because of the accurate barometer it furnishes of the popular will in the State," according to the report. This statement is hardly correct when the electoral vote contribution of many large States can be tripled by the margin supplied by a small one-party State. As a Democrat, I may be disappointed under the present system to see a million votes cast for the losing Democratic presidential candidate in my State contributing nothing to his overall electoral vote; but, as a citizen of Massachusetts, I would be far more disturbed to see the relative importance of my State, and its effective contribution to the winner's margin, reduced to a level far below that exercised by the considerably smaller, one-party States.

As a Democrat I might have been sorry to see all of the Massachusetts electoral votes in 1952 go to Mr. Eisenhower. However, I would much rather have seen that happen in 1952, hoping that the Democrats would carry the State in 1956, and that all the electoral votes would go to us in 1956, than to have the vote always broken up into small margins which at no time would give the people of Massachusetts any affirmative power.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Under the alternative that is given in the resolution, with respect to proportional representation, it seems to me encouragement would be given to the creation of additional splinter parties, particularly in the larger States, which have a very great diversity of interest.

Mr. KENNEDY. As I said before, I think it could result in an election being thrown into the House of Representatives much oftener than in the past.

Mr. LEHMAN. There is no doubt about it. We were very much worried about it on several occasions during my lifetime. That was in 1912, and again in 1948, when the American Labor Party gave indications that it might be stronger than it was. Of course, that situation did not materialize.

Mr. KENNEDY. Perhaps the most important part of the joint resolution is the part which would change the procedure with respect to voting in the House of Representatives. That voting would be done on the basis of individuals, instead of on the present basis. Some of the proponents may not accept that compromise, as we would not be willing to accept other parts of it. I hope that issue will be determined on its own merits, because I believe that would prevent the present danger of having an election decided in the House of Representative by the votes of States with very small populations. I hope an election is never again thrown into the House of Representatives.

Mr. LEHMAN. It would be a very unfortunate situation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

(c) "Invigoration of the two-party system is the greatest benefit of Senate Joint Resolution 31," the report concludes. As we have seen, the power of one-party States will be tremendously increased, the determination of their leaders to keep down opposition votes will be redoubled and no likely source of additional opposition votes in such

States is apparent anyway. In the rest of the country, splinter parties will grow, confusing the election and intimidating the major parties. Republican chances for presidential victory would practically disappear, and it would become possible for a President and a Vice President to be elected from different parties. These results will be hardly invigorating to the two-party system.

In summary, it is apparent that not a single 1 of the 9 evils to be eliminated or benefits to be derived, claimed by the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 31, offers reasonable grounds for drastically altering the Constitution. There are no substantial evils to be found today under the headings of "Disfranchised Voters," "Minority Presidents," "Excessively Powerful Pivotal States and Minority Groups," or "Landslide Psychology." The present general ticket system is not responsible for one-party States, voter disinterest, the location of presidential candidates and campaigns, or unjustified interpretations of voter mandates. The faults of the present system—in the proportionate inequality of each State's strength, and in the wide variations of electoral vote strength represented by each vote cast—are aggravated, not solved, by the new proposal. Not a single sound argument has been put forth for adoption of this radical change which is demanded by no State, which has been discredited in the past and which promises only doubt and danger for the future.

On the other hand, this is what proportional voting will do to the American system: The importance of State lines in presidential elections would be severely reduced; the likelihood of Presidents being elected with less popular votes than their opponent would be greatly increased; the prospects for obtaining a President with broad experience in a large State would be reduced; the over representation in the Government of the small rural areas of the country would be tremendously increased; the effective electoral strength of most States would be grossly distorted; voting interest in those States would be sharply reduced; the one-party system in other States would be greatly intensified, with incentive for fraud and additional franchise restrictions; Federal voting standards would be invited; splinter parties would be greatly encouraged; hairbreadth elections, with all of their divisive effects, would be made more frequent; the chances for victory of the Republican Party, and consequently the strength of the two-party system, would be permanently ended; and the election of a President and Vice President from different parties would again be made possible.

I know of no other step which could be taken to disrupt more thoroughly and more dangerously the American constitutional system.

The compromise proposal which the Senate will be asked to accept will give to each State the option of adopting the Mundt-Coudert proposal whereby electors would be chosen on the basis of each congressional district along with two electors at large representing the State's two Senators. There is no committee report on this proposal before the Senate; and there was comparatively little attention paid to it in the hearings. And yet it can be predicted with certainty that the district system will be adopted by practically every State. For the choice as to the adoption of either system is left up to the legislature of each State—and the district system would give to each State legislature unprecedented power in influencing presidential elections.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. There is no doubt at all as to the correctness of the observation of the Senator from Massachusetts in regard to the action of legislatures in gerrymandering some of the districts. As I previously pointed out, the State of New York has had just one Democratic legislature in 21 years. The last time it had a Democratic legislature was in 1935.

Mr. KENNEDY. So, after all these years, in spite of the tremendous plurality by which the Democrats carried New York in presidential elections, the legislatures are usually Republican.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is true. We carried the State for the Presidency, for the governorship, for the senatorship at least three-fourths of the time, and yet the legislature went Republican largely because of the constitutional provision which requires every little town, even though it may have a population of only 15,000 or 20,000, to have one assemblyman. That indicates the power which is given to the Legislature of the State of New York, and I have no doubt it is true of other States. It shows the power the legislature has in gerrymandering all the districts of the State, and I have no doubt that it would be done if this amendment or a similar amendment should be adopted.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt that practically all State legislatures, which are themselves the beneficiaries of gerrymandering in favor of rural areas, will adopt the system which will enable them to continue this imbalance of power on the national level. What is worse, under the compromise proposal, a legislature could move from one system to the other every 4 years depending upon which it was calculated would give the party controlling the legislature the greatest electoral power. Nothing could be more confusing or unfair. However, inasmuch as it is proposed to amend the Constitution on the Senate floor in this ungainly fashion, it would be well to examine the evils of the district system.

The district system would distort the popular will through the gerrymandering of electoral districts. The proof of this assertion lies in the unrepresentative nature of the House of Representatives, due to the gerrymandering of congressional districts; and the unrepresentative nature of the state legislatures which accomplish this gerrymandering, by virtue of the gerrymandering of their own local legislative districts. Some congressional seats represent 3 or 4 times as many votes as other congressional seats in the same State. In the 1954 congressional elections, in the States of New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan, and New Jersey, the Republican candidates received less than 50 percent of the vote but more than 58 percent of the seats. In 12 States with a majority of the electoral vote—New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Texas, Michigan, New Jersey, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Missouri, and Indiana—Republican congressional candidates in 1954 did not receive a majority of the two-party popular vote. Nevertheless they won a clear majority of the congressional seats because of the way districts were gerrymandered. In 31 States outside the South, Republicans received approximately 51 percent of the congressional popular vote in 1954, but won nearly 65 percent of the seats. These same discrepancies under the Mundt district system would be translated into the election of the President. Time after time, a minority of the popular vote would be gerrymandered into providing a majority of the electoral vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The situation would be intensified, because there would be an added premium for gerrymandering, since we would get not only more Members of Congress, but the premium of electing a President——

Mr. KENNEDY. I agree with the Senator from South Dakota that his plan is in accord with the original plan of electors. If we could get around the problem of gerrymandering, which I think is impossible even with congressional intervention, his proposal would be more sound. I know that his amendment represents great effort on his part.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I know the Senator from Massachusetts has given the subject a great deal of study and thought. There is much merit in the district system. We have seen today some of the problems which might arise in connection with gerrymandering, but I would invite the Senator's attention to the fact that we are confronted with 2 or 3 different plans, no one of which is utopian in character.

I think the Senator must concede that our present practice has certain deficiencies, and that we should move in the direction of giving citizens a greater impact in a presidential election, realizing that we are not going to have a perfect system. It seems to me that one of the weaknesses to which the Senator has pointed is less serious than a system which gives so undue an influence to big cities, and which big cities can have under the electoral-college system. I recognize the fact that the Senator comes from a big city, but he represents many smaller cities also.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Legislature of Massachusetts has gone Democratic only three times in its history. I have given an example of the situation, and I think it would be accentuated under the Senator's proposal.

Mr. MUNDT. But a great many more voters would be brought to the polls under the compromise plan. It would

bring about an element of unpredictability in a great many areas, rather than have a foregone conclusion as to how the people will vote.

In South Dakota there are only two congressional districts. The one west of the river is, of course, more overwhelmingly Republican than the one east of the river. It would encourage the people to feel that they have a chance, as members of the minority party, to vote, instead of there being a foregone conclusion as to how the election will come out. Where there is a foregone conclusion, we run into conditions such as prevail in the South. In Mississippi everyone knows in October how the people will vote in November.

Mr. KENNEDY. I discussed that point. In 1948, in California and Ohio, under the Senator's system, the votes would have gone to the Republicans, even though the popular vote was for the Democratic candidate.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator picks out one election. In California and Ohio, that particular election was in conformity with the description given by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. According to the American Political Science Association, and the United States Conference of Mayors of 1949, in the 48 State legislatures, urban areas—city areas—representing about 60 percent of the Nation's population, are allotted 25 percent of the legislative seats. That is why, as the Senator from New York has pointed out, in spite of the fact that New York, again and again, was carried by the Democrats for the President by a big margain, only once in the history of New York did the State legislature of New York go Democratic.

The legislatures, which are unfairly weighted in favor of the rural population—and most of them are Republican legislatures—will be the ones who will draw the lines for the congressional districts, which will affect the vote for President. I am reluctant, based upon the previous experience, to give them that power.

Mr. MUNDT. It is not the Senator's contention, is it, that there is some alleged discrimination against the city people by the country people, as the Senator contends prevails in the legislatures? The Senator is not contending that that situation holds true at present in the congressional districts of the Nation, is he?

Mr. KENNEDY. Oh, yes, I am. I know the Senator is familiar with this, and I do not want to repeat something about which he is very well informed.

I could give the Senator the names of at least 8, 9, or 10 States in which 1 congressional district has a greater population than the 2 adjoining districts combined.

Mr. MUNDT. Has the Senator adjusted his figures to the well-known fact that the majority of the alien population is located in the big cities? The alien population is counted in the enumeration which is made to determine the size of congressional districts to which a State is entitled. Obviously, however, the aliens do not become voters until they have become citizens. Has the Senator adjusted his figures in accordance with that fact?

Mr. KENNEDY. Let me see whether what the Senator has said explains what I am about to say.

In Florida, the Fourth Congressional District, which includes Miami, has a population of 525,000. That is greater than the combined population of the Eighth and Ninth Congressional Districts.

A similar situation exists in Ohio. The Third Congressional District has a population greater than the combined population of the 15th and the 23d Districts.

Mr. MUNDT. What city is located in the Third Congressional District of Ohio?

Mr. KENNEDY. Let us consider Georgia, which does not have a large alien population. The district which includes Atlanta has a population of 618,000, which is larger than the total population of the Eighth District, having 267,000, and the Ninth District, having 240,000.

Mr. MUNDT. I could not quarrel with the Senator's findings on that score.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let us consider Texas. Harris County, which contains one-sixth of the population of Texas, has only 1 of the 22 Representatives from Texas.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator skips around so much geographically that it is difficult for me to keep up with him. The Senator would not deny that what I have said about the alien population is true, would he, save for the city of New York?

Mr. KENNEDY. I think probably there are a number of aliens.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it not true of Boston?

Mr. KENNEDY. No. In Boston, gerrymandering takes the form of four congressional districts in a contigious area. There are two Democratic districts, in which all the Democrats are lumped together. I represented one of them and won by a vote of 5 to 1, because there were so many Democrats. The same is true of the district represented by the majority leader of the House, Mr. MCCORMACK.

The other two districts are Republican districts, carefully drawn so as to permit the Democrats to win only by very close votes.

So it was possible to split even and to have 2 Democratic and 2 Republican districts, even though the popular vote, all told, would have given the Democrats 60 percent and the Republicans 40 percent.

Mr. MUNDT. But in the counting of noses to determine the number of congressional districts to which a State is entitled, the census taker counts every person in the district, regardless of whether he is a voter or a nonvoter. A person who may have come into the country recently as an immigrant would be unable to vote for 4 or 5 years; nevertheless, he would be counted.

I think one reason for the disproportionate results is that the legislatures try to regulate the legislative districts and perhaps the congressional districts, too. But let us stay with the congressional districts. The State legislatures relate the congressional districts to the voting population. The disproportion is the disproportion of voting citizens in the same degree as the disproportion of excess population.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the Senator from South Dakota would not agree with what I consider to be a very well-known fact of political life, if he would argue that there have not been terrible abuses of the power to lay out districts, thus denying the people their proportionate rights, I do not see how he could ask the Senate to support his amendment, which would give great powers to those areas, when he does not think the power is being abused by them today.

If the Senator thinks everything is fine now and that the people in Georgia, Texas, and Massachusetts are not being denied their true rights so far as representation in Congress is concerned, I must say, in all reluctance, that I would not want to put into his hands the determination of the question as to whether the people were being denied by gerrymandering the right to pick their President.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator has not devoted his remarks at all to the particular problem which I described, or to the question which I asked. It seemed to me it was very clear.

Mr. KENNEDY. The alien vote in Massachusetts, about which the Senator from South Dakota is speaking, is fractional. Great waves of immigration, as it came to Boston, began to end about the time of World War I. While there may be a few old persons who still are not citizens, nevertheless, based upon a rather limited number of people now coming into the country every year—150,000 spread throughout the entire country—the number of aliens in proportion to the voting population is fractional.

Mr. MUNDT. Would the Senator contend the alien population is fractional in New York City, where aliens who come to this country first tend to congregate after leaving Ellis Island?

Mr. KENNEDY. The number of aliens in the United States does not represent the cause of the situation about which we are speaking.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not talking about the number of aliens in the United States. I am talking about the problem which the Senator is describing, in which some cities have a larger population than is represented in Congress in Washington on a weighted basis. I asked if one reason for that condition was that the big cities contained disproportionately a number of Americans who were not voters because they were not yet citizens.

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not believe the Senator's argument has sufficient substance to explain the situation confronting us.

Mr. MUNDT. So far as Harris County, Tex., is concerned, I am certain the Senator would not contend that it was the meddling of the Republicans of Texas which created the unusual situation in Harris County, and which has made Texas a one-party State. For reasons best known to the Democrats

of Texas, they seem to be perfectly happy with whatever congressional representation they have there.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am not concerned about how the people of Texas select their Representatives. However, in theory, I should like to see the representation distributed better. But I do care if the people of Texas want to pick a President in that way.

Mr. MUNDT. If Texas is a one-party State, it would not make one iota of difference whether they selected their electors by districts or by any other means. The Lodge-Gossett phase of the proposed amendment, as well as the Daniel-Kefauver-Mundt phase, tends to give the minority party in a one-party State a little better representation. But if a State is strictly a one-party State, certainly it does not make any difference whether the electors are chosen en bloc or by districts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think it might make a difference. After all, the Republican Party in Texas is at least half the size of the Democratic Party; yet there is only 1 Republican Representative out of the State delegation of 22 Representatives. So the way a district is arranged might affect that situation.

The Republican Party has not been the only offender. I gave the example of North Carolina, where there are very few aliens. There the Democrats have arranged the boundaries of the 8th and 11th Districts to make certain that the Republicans in the northwest corner of the State shall have not more than one Representative. Thus the Democrats, having 60 percent of the votes of the State, take 90 percent of the State's seats.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is talking about the State legislature, is he?

Mr. KENNEDY. No; I am speaking about congressional districts.

Mr. MUNDT. We are talking about congressional districts, over which Congress exercises supervisory jurisdiction.

Mr. KENNEDY. I should say it would be almost impossible for Congress to exercise it. In the case of Boston, the districts are contiguous geographically.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not challenging the Senator about any of the situations in Boston; I recognize that he knows more about them than I do. I am merely trying to direct his attention to areas where I feel there is an element of fact. While New York State undoubtedly is entitled to several additional Representatives because it has a vast alien population, it does not necessarily hold that that condition must be recognized in the outlining of a congressional district, which should be outlined in conformity with the voting population, rather than simply by the number of people who live in a particular district.

Mr. KENNEDY. I would say, after examining the figures, that experience shows, although I am not familiar with the New York situation, the number of aliens does not really affect the problem.

Mr. MUNDT. Would it be safe to say the Senator has not adjusted those figures to take that particular fact of life into consideration?

Mr. KENNEDY. I have not adjusted them as to whether the weather is good or bad outside, because it does not have anything to do with the problem.

Mr. MUNDT. Whether the weather is good or bad is one of the reasons why I favor the district system, as I shall elaborate when it comes time to discuss my amendment. I think that is highly important.

Mr. KENNEDY. The discrepancy between electoral vote and popular vote would be far greater under the Mundt plan than it is in today's congressional elections, because the small States would also be given their automatic two electoral votes, thus increasing still further the electoral strength of a handful of voters.

But, as indicated, gerrymandering is not confined to small rural States. In 1954, the popular vote for congressional candidates in the State of New York was practically even. But the Republicans won 60 percent of the seats.

Sponsors of the Mundt system insist that the public conscience will not permit such discrepancies in presidential elections. But the public conscience has permitted it, and in fact has permitted it to grow increasingly worse. And there is no way the public can do anything about it, as long as the State legislatures which will be in charge of gerrymandering districts under the Mundt plan are themselves in power by virtue of gerrymandering at its worst. In the 48 State legislatures, the urban areas representing about 60 percent of the Nation's population are allotted 25 percent of the seats in the popularly constituted houses. The United States Conference of Mayors in 1949, and the American Political Science Association in 1954, both called attention to the shockingly unfair composition of most State legislatures.

A second answer given by proponents of the district system is that Congress can always legislate against gerrymandering if the situation gets out of hand. But the facts of the matter are that the situation has always been out of hand, and Congress has frequently legislated—but to no avail. No strict enforcement of such legislation has ever been proposed or attempted, whatever pious declarations for equality, compactness, and contiguity may have been contained in the various reapportionment acts; and the proponents of the Mundt system do not offer any suggestions as to how they could be enforced. Would they be willing, for example, to provide in their constitutional amendment a requirement that all congressional districts must be reasonably compact and contiguous, with approximately equal population; and provide further that any citizen would have the right to contest in the Federal courts the reasonableness of any districting under this amendment; and to provide still further that all electors shall be chosen at large if the Federal court declares a particular districting plan to be invalid?

It is obvious that, under the district system, gerrymandering would not only continue but be intensified. Just as in the House of Representatives today, some presidential electors would represent over 800,000 votes, some would represent under 200,000 votes. Some would represent districts—like the 3d District of Massachusetts, the 26th District of California, the 23d District of Ohio, and the 12th District of New York—which have been drawn in peculiar shapes which are more appropriate to the Rorshach ink-blot test than they are to a political map.

Thus the primary effect of the Mundt plan would be to thwart the popular will by discriminating against the most populous areas. In 1948, for example, Democratic popular majorities in California and Ohio would have resulted in Republican electoral margins. In 1952, the Republican majority in Tennessee would have resulted, under the Mundt plan, in a Democratic electoral majority.

In 1872, 1901, and 1911, congressional reapportionment acts attempted to prevent gerrymanders, but to no avail; and in the Reapportionment Act of 1929 all such provisions were dropped. Thus 183 congressional seats today represent districts either under- or over-populated; and a Republican assemblyman was able to boast that a blatent gerrymander that gave 5 seats for the Republicans in 1952 was responsible for Republican control of the House in the 83d Congress. Many States, satisfied with the effects of ancient gerrymanders, do not even bother to reapportion on the basis of up-to-date census figures.

Even the Kestnbaum report in 1955 deplored the apportionment of our State legislatures which lies at the root of discriminatory congressional apportionment.

In a majority of States—

Said the Kestnbaum report—

city dwellers outnumber the citizens of rural areas. Yet in most States the rural voters are overwhelmingly in control of one legislative house, and overweigh, if not dominate, the other. As cities have grown more rapidly than rural areas * * * this imbalance has grown more and more discriminatory.

Practically all of the defects of the Daniel system apply with equal weight to the Mundt district system.

The likelihood of Presidents being elected with fewer popular votes than their opponents would be greatly increased. The whole purpose of the gerrymander, which is enthroned by the Mundt system, is to deny to populous areas the voting strength which is rightfully theirs.

Splinter parties would be greatly encouraged. A minority pressure group would not have to capture an entire State to obtain electoral recognition, as at present; it would not have to win a substantial number of votes on a statewide basis, as the Daniel system would require. It would only have to carry a particular district—in some instances a city or a small part of a city. There would be more parties on the ballot, and more parties with electoral strength to use as bargaining power, than we can possibly imagine.

The over-representation in our Government of the small rural areas of the country would be tremendously increased and the effective electoral strength of the larger, more evenly divided States would be inequitably reduced. This is obvious from the effect

of the current gerrymandering of congressional districts. The 16th District of Michigan in Detroit, for example, is larger than the totals of the 11th and 12th districts in the upper peninsular put together. And the Atlanta district in Georgia is greater than the rural eighth and ninth districts of that State. Thus, the small, rural areas of the country would have disproportionate power in the electoral college as well as the House and the Senate.

Practically all of the defects of the Daniel system purportedly corrects are found in the Mundt district system. All the voters for the losing side in each State and district are disfranchised. The election of minority Presidents is made more likely. Campaigns will center around key pivotal States and districts, while others will be sure of control by one party. Instead of the general ticket system being abolished, 531 general ticket systems could be established. Instead of the electoral college being abolished, 48 different electoral colleges could be set up. Instead of the presidential ballot being simplified, the voter will be faced with the names of two presidential electors for his State and a different one for his district.

It is incredible to think that 2 such confusing, contradictory, and dangerous proposals could be passed by the Senate when it would refuse to pass either 1 separately. I earnestly hope that those who eagerly rush to support all proposals for electoral reform will realize that this hybrid monstrosity is reform in the wrong direction.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPORTANCE OF THE GADSDEN PURCHASE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me, to permit me to make a brief statement on another matter?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, from 1821 to 1848, all of what is now the State of Arizona was a part of the Republic of Mexico. In 1848, with the ending of the war with Mexico, the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo ceded to the United States the area north of the Gila River. It became obvious that such a dubious southern boundary as this meandering river would form could only be detrimental to the future of the Southwest; so in the summer of 1853, James Gadsden went to Mexico City, as minister, with instructions to secure a new boundary line. He was successful in these efforts; and on December 30, 1853, agreements moving the line to the south were signed by both countries. This new area embraced nearly 30 million acres, and was purchased for a price of 30 cents an acre. The agreement met with violent opposition in the Congress before its final ratification by treaty on April 25, 1854. Thomas Hart Benton in his most vitriolic manner said of the area "desolate, desert, and God forsaken." Kit Carson said "A wolf could not make a living on it."

Mr. President, appearing in the Arizona Republic of Sunday, last, was an tricle showing in part what that great and timely purchase has meant to the United States. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GADSDEN PURCHASE LAND YIELDS GREAT MINERAL WEALTH TO UNITED STATES

The 103-year-old purchase from Mexico of almost 19 million acres of land for a mere $10 million, primarily to straighten out a previously undetermined boundary between the two republics, is proving itself a national mineral bonanza for the United States.

As of today, the Arizona area of the so-called Gadsden Purchase, comprising all the land south of the Gila River in this State, has produced almost half of the $6 billion in minerals that are known to have been mined in Arizona.

As of today—largely because of 46-cent copper—dozens of old-time mine owners are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars annually in new exploration and development.

But copper isn't the only mineral being sought.

The search also is for molybdenum, zinc, lead, tungsten, uranium, and the "rare earths" of which a dozen are being hunted as minute heat-resistant alloys for man-made satellites, jet engines, and devices for possible interplanetary travel of the future.

The riches of southern Arizona's minerals are fabulous.

Within this State's portion of the Gadsden Purchase are such mines as Phelps Dodge's New Cornelia at Ajo, which in depression days paid its keep in production of gold found in the copper ore; Phelps Dodge operations at Bisbee, Lowell, and Warren, which have led to the new multimillion dollar development of Lavendar Pit; and the newly begun copper-molybdenum operations at San Manuel Copper Co.'s $200 million development near Mammoth.

In the same area which the early Spanish conquistadores explored for gold and silver are such redeveloped mines as the old Silver Bell, owned by American Smelting & Refining Co.; and the completely new development of Pima Mining Co., south of Twin Buttes. Both are in Pima County.

Silver Bell, now an open-pit operation, is developing molybdenum in addition to its copper yield.

More fabulous, however, is the Pima Mine, some 45 miles to the southeast of Silver Bell.

Pima explorations were initiated by United Geophysical Corp., one of the largest of the former international mining organizations, about 6 years ago. Union Oil Co. now is reported to control it.

By using the latest and most modern electronic and other devices, copper ore bodies were located of a richness that may surpass the anticipated yield from the San Manuel area.

Pima's ores are said to contain from about 1 percent, the reported average at San Manuel, to as much as 7 percent. Its total copper yield may exceed any mine's.

And with it, as with San Manuel and with Silver Bell, is found molybdenum in percentages high enough to increase the mine's income.

Then there is the B. S. & K. mine, a zinc-lead property across the hill from Silver Bell, where some zinc ores go up to 35 percent to become among the world's richest. Not far from these is Eagle Picher Co.'s lead-zinc-copper operation. With the exception of Pima and San Manuel, these are all old mines.

But new ones—and exploration of old ones—are constantly adding to the potential mineral output of the State's Gadsden area.

New developments in metallurgy, in the economical separation of the different metals so none will be lost in processing, has contributed to the explorations underway. These, and the fact that Arizona has vast quantities of low grade ores of all kinds, have stirred the new rush to find out and develop what's found.

It's no longer a pack-and-bureau prospecting program.

It's being done with seismographs, with scintillation counters, and with half a score of other devices of the electronics age. These help pinpoint the discovery, while assays and known metallurgy can indicate combined values of the often-complex ores.

The rush is underway, from the Gila River to the Mexico border, and from Ajo eastward to the New Mexico State line.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for his usual courtesy.

INCREASED INDUSTRIAL USES OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am about to propose a far-reaching, permanent solution of the farm problem so vast that its potential is virtually unlimited.

While the economic, industrial, and social implications of this program cannot, with any degree of accuracy, at this moment be estimated, it is clear that this program will tend to solve, if not wholly solve, the farm problem for all time.

After months of painstaking examination of its possibilities, I have reached the altogether justifiable conclusion that this plan would, within a few years, create a demand for farm products in industry at least equal in amount to that now consumed for human consumption in the United States. It would double the farm market.

Essentially, this is a solution of the farm problem based, not on the negative theory of curtailing production, but on the positive approach of creating new markets demanding complete and full utilization of our total agricultural capacity.

We have worked long and hard in the Senate for weeks on a farm bill to meet the contingencies of the moment. Out of all the debate, committee findings, staff studies, and my own personal research, I have reached the conclusion that any farm plan, to solve this problem on a permanent basis, must do three things:

First. It must provide for quick disposition of existing surpluses. Our Government is attacking this problem now with admirable vigor. I would like to see it move faster. But we are making substantial progress.

Second. The plan must provide, at the moment, for curtailed production until such time as we can create new demands to prevent accumulation of fu-

ture surpluses based on normal production. This, too, is a part of the existing plan. This effort will be furthered, somewhat, by provisions of what we have called the soil-bank program.

Third. Most important and almost untouched in relation to its real possibilities, any such plan must include a tremendous research and development program—a program which should be started immediately, and financed by whatever Government funds are necessary—to develop to the utmost the industrial uses we already know about for farm products—and they are considerable—and at the same time find new uses creating a demand for at least double what we have considered the normal farm production of the United States.

It is this third point which I now propose. I know enough about its potentialities to convince me that if we in the Congress will face our responsibility to authorize and order such a program, we shall help to bring about 50 years of the greatest agricultural prosperity in the history of our Nation.

I know enough about it that I have been saying to the farmers of my State of Indiana: Do not sell your farm land. Buy more. The next 50 years on the American farm will see unprecedented prosperity.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. As one of the cosponsors of the bill which is being introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana, I wish to say to him that I commend him very highly for this very wonderful bill, which will solve the agricultural dilemma, and again will make it possible for farmers to live. I can pay to the Senator from Indiana no higher tribute than to say that he has done this job extremely well.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator from Idaho very much for his remarks.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me, or does he prefer first to finish his statement?

Mr. CAPEHART. I prefer first to finish my statement, Mr. President.

Imagine, if you can, what it would mean to this country—to all segments of our society—if we of the 84th Congress should be responsible for creating a farm market at least twice as great as any we ever have known.

It can be done if we will legislate a program to take the blinders off, as it were, of our agricultural research and development program, and throw the full white light of technical research and development, experimentation, test facilities, pilot plants, and unexcelled American know-how into an all-out effort to create new industrial uses for just the everyday products of our land.

First, of course, it would mean to the farmer a new life of productivity. It would provide prosperity for him. It would permit him to follow his natural instinct to get everything he can out of his land.

Second, it would create new jobs. Obviously, the demand for farm labor would increase. But its effect on industrial labor generally would be even more phenomenal. Entire new industries with millions of new jobs would come into being—industries to manufacture new products. The demand for new transportation facilities—automobiles, trucks, buses, railroads, airlines, and so forth—would be tremendous. The demand for new farm machinery alone would provide an industrial and labor stimulus almost beyond our comprehension.

Third, the increase in retail business would mount into the billions of dollars. Farmers, laborers, and, I am convinced, just about every other category of business customer in the United States would have more money to spend for just about everything business has to sell.

Fourth, such a program would, in my opinion, mean the end of a tremendous tax burden now imposed to finance our vast agricultural assistance and storage programs of the moment—a burden which we gladly bear as long as it is necessary, but a burden which all of us will agree would be a welcome deletion from our national budgets. If we can bring this about—and I believe we can—it would enable us to reduce taxes substantially and to make it easier to retire the national debt at a faster pace.

Mr. President, the ramifications of such a plan are staggering. It is brand new. At the outset, it would cost a little money—but, by comparison, only a drop in the bucket. After all, when it begins to cost more to repair your automobile, your tractor, or your furnace than a new one would cost, what do you do? You buy a new one.

I say to you, Mr. President, that it is high time this Congress bought a new approach to the farm problem, in the form of this research and development plan.

It meets the essential test. It is good for the farmer. It shows every promise of proving economically sound. It is, at the same time, good for all of the people.

What would such a plan replace eventually? This year, our agricultural assistance programs will represent a total investment of three billion, four billion, or perhaps five billion dollars. Yet, that assistance program has contributed to the accumulation of some $9 billion in farm surpluses, for which not only has the Government paid with the taxpayers' money, but which is costing in storage charges a million dollars a day—$365 million a year.

By means of this bill we are only asking for $100 million or less than one-third of the cost to store for 1 year the surplus agricultural commodities the Government of the United States now owns.

At this point, I want to take full cognizance of the good work being done toward working out the surplus disposal problem. The Government has sold, or otherwise disposed of, much more of our surpluses than generally is known. I do not want to criticize the good work which has been done, but I am firmly convinced that the program should be expanded and accelerated. Whenever possible, more and more of our surpluses should be made available to the needy at home and elsewhere. I believe that program is being speeded up. It must be.

Meantime, these surpluses hang over farm prices like a sword. They depress farm prices. This means lower farm income. It means less farmer spending for consumer goods. It means less tax revenue for the Government. And it means increased investments in agricultural assistance programs.

The plan I am proposing would reverse that situation. It would insure the American farmer his rightful share of an otherwise bountiful prosperity, by requiring full production in an economy guaranteeing fair prices. It would put an end to the unsound practice of spending billions of dollars to preserve a bad situation, when a great deal less would provide a permanent cure.

No, Mr. President, we cannot solve our farm problem permanently by curtailing production. We must increase consumption; we must find new markets. Since, generally speaking, the vast majority of our people are well-fed, our only alternative is to find new and increased industrial uses for our agricultural products.

There is no question that this can be done.

It is my opinion that the Department of Agriculture and our research and development people know enough now, so that, given a real opportunity to prove it, they can find industrial uses for 5 billion additional bushels of grain, such as corn, wheat, rye, barley, oats, rice, sorghum grains, and potatoes, each year. Let us remember that at present our total production of these grains is only about 6½ billion bushels. This entails a total of 180 million acres of grain cultivation. If another 5 billion bushels are added to that, we can see what that would mean in terms of additional cultivation for the American farmers.

Under capable and efficient management, the great chemical and oil industries of the United States, have found, through research, many new industrial and commercial uses for their products. They now make everything from rubber to clothing materials from chemicals. The plastics industry has had a phenomenal growth through research.

All of this came about in the same degree as these companies invested their profits in research. You will agree that our more successful corporations spend millions of dollars each year seeking new and better products through research.

It is exactly this type of program which must be carried out in discovering new markets for farm products. Yet, no farmer or group of farmers can themselves afford to establish the vast laboratories necessary to carry out that research. It is simply impracticable and impossible for 6 million individual farmers to get together to carry out the kind of research and development program required to keep agriculture abreast of the rest of the economy.

Let me give you one example of a failure to keep pace with an important loss of consumption in farm products. Not so many years ago farm power was provided by horses and mules. This animal

power consumed the production equivalent of some 80 million acres of feed grains. For lack of research, in my opinion, we have failed to produce a new market to take up the slack of that displaced production.

We have fewer tillable acres in production today than we had 50 years ago. I think the tillable acres today are about 350 million. Fifty years ago, when the only power on the farm was horses and mules, the horses and mules consumed the equivalent of 80 million acres of feed grains. Therein lies the difference between our surplus today and full consumption.

Mr. President, I come now to the point of proposing the most important program I ever have sponsored in my almost 12 years in the Senate of the United States.

The United States must undertake—and undertake at once—a $100-million-a-year research and development program to find new and increased industrial uses for agricultural products. I send to the desk, for myself and other Senators, a bill to accomplish that purpose.

On behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to accomplish the purposes I have outlined. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

The bill (S. 3503) to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATIONS AND FINDINGS

SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States hereby makes the following declarations and findings concerning the development of new and additional industrial uses for agricultural products:

(a) Current productivity of farms in the United States is substantially in excess of current markets for their products at price levels which provide fair and substantial income to farmers.

(b) National defense and the security interests of the United States require increasing and expanding agricultural productivity to meet possible emergency needs of the United States and its allies, which productivity cannot be achieved or maintained at depressed farm prices resulting from overproduction or with acreage curtailments to avoid overproduction.

(c) It is in the national interest of the United States to increase the level of farm income in order that farmers may continue to share to a greater degree in the general prosperity of the Nation.

(d) No program has been developed, and none can be foreseen, that can successfully shrink farm production for an extended period of time; but research programs provide known means potentially to increase substantially the industrial uses of agricultural products and thereby to achieve farm prosperity based on full, rather than curtailed, production.

(e) Research facilities, both private and public, including those of land-grant colleges and universities, can and should be utilized for an all-out attack on the development of increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products to enlarge opportunities for increased production by farmers and to reduce Government costs for the acquisition, storage and ultimate disposition of agricultural commodities which are now a substantial financial burden to the Government.

(f) The cost to the United States of such a research program may be expected to be more than offset by increased tax revenues resulting from increased earnings of both farmers and those who sell goods, wares, and merchandise to farmers, as well as by savings to the United States in costs of current agricultural assistance programs.

PURPOSES

SEC. 2. The purposes of this act are to find and develop through research, sponsored and financed by the United States, new industrial uses, and increased use under existing processes, of agricultural products.

ADMINISTRATION CREATED

SEC. 3. There is hereby created in the executive branch of the Government an Industrial Agricultural Products Administration (hereinafter referred to as the Administration), in which is vested the duties, powers and responsibilities hereafter set out in this act. Such powers, duties, and responsibilities of the Administration shall be vested in an Administrator, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall serve during the pleasure of the President. The Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.

DUTIES, POWERS, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 4. The Administration shall conduct research, both scientific and chemical, make field studies, conduct both laboratory and field experiments, test production procedures on a commercial basis, maintain and expand pilot plants whenever necessary, maintain and operate manufacturing facilities where necessary to prove the commercial feasibility of volume production, and otherwise promote the finding, development, and commercial use of new, increased, extended, and perfected processes, techniques, and programs for industrial uses of greater quantities of agricultural products.

POWERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 5. The Administration is authorized to:

(a) Utilize such existing facilities of the United States, and such trained personnel employed by the United States, as the President finds can feasibly be transferred to the Administration for carrying out the purposes of this act. The President is hereby authorized to (1) transfer any such facility, facilities, or personnel to the Administration, or to (2) make any such facility, facilities, or personnel available to the Administration for carrying out the purposes of this act.

(b) Build, purchase, or lease plant facilities, or necessary equipment, suitable for research, pilot plant, manufacturing, or other needs of the Administration in carrying out the purposes of this act.

(c) Employ such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act; and all technical or scientific employees engaged for research by the Administration shall be exempt from the civil-service laws and regulations.

(d) Employ or retain on a contract basis individuals, firms, institutions, and organizations, public and private, including land-grant colleges and universites, to conduct research programs for the Administration pursuant to this act.

SEC. 6. The Administration is authorized to pay incentive awards to private citizens for suitable and acceptable suggestions to implement the program established by this act, such payments to be made in accordance with previously published rules stating the amounts of, criteria for determining, and subjects of, such awards.

SEC. 7. The Administrator is authorized to appoint industry advisory committees and to employ consultants without compensation or at rates of compensation not to exceed $50 per diem.

SEC. 8. The Administration may make grants to accredited schools, colleges, and universities for fellowships and scholarships in research for the purposes of this act.

INDUSTRIAL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AGENCY CREATED

SEC. 9. There is hereby created in the Department of Agriculture an Industrial Agricultural Products Agency (hereinafter referred to as the Agency). The duties, obligations, and responsibilities of the Agency shall be carried out by and under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE AGENCY

SEC. 10. Under the delegations, directives, and policy determinations of the Administrator, the Agency shall carry out all of the duties, obligations, and responsibilities imposed upon the Administration by this act, including the making of research contracts, employment of personnel, contracts for the construction, purchase, lease, or other acquisition of real or personal property, and the maintenance of all records, files, studies, and other data undertaken pursuant to this act. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the Administrator may delegate any power given him hereunder to the Agency, and he may control, supervise, and direct all

Agency action permitted by law under this act.

SEC. 11. The Administrator shall report semiannually to the Congress progress on research programs undertaken pursuant to this act to find and develop new and increased industrial uses for agricultural products.

SEC. 12. The Agency may license, at a fair and reasonable royalty, any person, firm, or corporation to use any process developed by the Agency or to make and sell under any patent, or application for patent of the Agency. Such royalties shall be based upon fair compensation to the Government for its investment and shall be nondiscriminatory. Whenever the Administrator finds it in the public interest to do so, he may grant royalty-free licenses for processes developed under this act, including the right to make and sell under any patent or application for patent of the Agency.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 13. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture, for the Industrial Agricultural Products Agency, the sum of $100 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1956, and the same amount annually thereafter. There shall be paid out of such appropriations the salary of the Administrator as well as all other expenses of his office. The President is authorized to transfer to the Agency $1 million out of unexpended Agricultural Department funds to initiate promptly this program following the enactment of this act for and during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the Senator will take into consideration, in introducing his bill, that in 1946 the Congress of the United States enacted the Agricultural Research and Marketing Act of 1946, and made provision that various sums might be appropriated in succeeding years, increasing the amount year by year. The amount that could be used in 1947 for research and marketing was $9½ million. In 1948 it was $19 million. In 1949 it was $33,500,000. In 1950 it was $48 million. In 1951 it was $61 million. Thereafter the sky was the limit. One hundred million dollars could have been appropriated under the act.

I invite attention to the fact that in 1950, when $48 million could have been appropriated for research in marketing, the Congress appropriated $19 million. I suggest to the Senator that the problem is to get Congress to appropriate the money, or authorize it, to the extent of the figure of $100 million, which the Senator has suggested.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am thinking in terms of $100 million in addition to that which the Congress has already appropriated, or might appropriate.

I am also thinking in terms of establishing an organization which will really function and get the job done. Unfortunately, in the past, while the Department of Agriculture has done a good job in developing many programs, it has not had the capacity really to organize and promote a program of research, including the construction of pilot plants, the making of field tests, and doing the job in the spirit called for by the proposed legislation.

As the Senator will see when he reads the bill——

Mr. ANDERSON. I have read it.

Mr. CAPEHART. As an inherent part of the legislation, we wish to set up an administrator who will have almost the title of czar He will proceed to get the job done, in the same fashion in which the Government developed synthetic rubber during the war. One of the weaknesses of the present plan is that everybody's business is nobody's business.

What we propose is to get the job done immediately. The proposed program might well be called a crash program.

I am mindful of what the able Senator has said. Unfortunately the Congress, both in Democratic and Republican administrations, did not take sufficient cognizance of the existing legislation. In my judgment, the job should have been done by this time. At least, we should be well on the road toward accomplishment of it.

What we are now advocating is that we give this program everything we have, and get the job done. We should spend whatever money is necessary, and take whatever time is necessary.

Let me say to the able Senator from New Mexico—and no one knows it any better than he does—that if and when we solve the farm problem, it will be solved on the basis of more uses for farm products in industry. We shall never solve the farmer's problem by producing for food uses alone. He will have to produce for industrial uses.

The question is, shall we solve the problem over a period of 10, 15, or 25 years? Or shall we solve it as we solved the synthetic rubber problem during the war period, by doing the job immediately? That is the purpose of the proposed legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not opposed to solving the problem.

Mr. CAPEHART. I know the able Senator is not opposed to it.

Mr. ANDERSON. On the contrary, under the terms of the Agricultural Research and Marketing Act of 1946, a special agricultural research administration was established in the Department of Agriculture. Many of us have tried repeatedly since to get sufficient appropriations for that agency.

Mr. CAPEHART. Later in my speech I shall name the laboratories we now have. I shall mention some of the things the Department has been able to accomplish, and I shall cite some of the programs which they are about ready to bring to a successful conclusion. With a mandate from the Congress such as is contemplated in the proposed legislation, I am sure the programs will be accomplished more quickly, and that we shall relieve the farm situation by producing more instead of less. I hope we shall be able to do something really worth while for the country and the people. I know that the able Senator is 100 percent in accord with that aim.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, would the Senator object to my asking unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of his remarks, there be printed a table with reference to the previous legislation, showing that it requires steady, constant pushing by the Congress to get the necessary appropriations by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be delighted to have the table printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the table which the able Senator from New Mexico has in his hand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, speaking for a moment about that $100 million figure, it is less than one-third the amount we now spend merely to store surpluses which, as long as they exist, can have no effect other than to cause low farm prices.

I can think of nothing more economically sound than to buy for $100 million a year a program that would eventually replace an assistance program running into the billions and at the same time eliminate the costly surplus situation which makes such an assistance program necessary.

Some may ask why the Government should finance industrial research for one segment of our economy. There are several reasons.

First. Many years ago we "crossed the bridge" in establishing as public policy that the Government had a responsibility to see to it that farmers shared fairly with all others in the national economy. Our farm assistance program is now public policy. That decision has been made. Our job now is to determine whether we are doing so in the most efficient and economical manner.

Second. We now are spending billions of dollars a year on programs which, on the record, do not face up to our basic farm problems. That is evidenced by the fact that farm productive capacity is far greater than existing markets for farm products.

Third. Industry has proved the value of research in finding new uses and new markets for surplus products. Why, then, should we spend billions of dollars to curtail production and reduce farm income when, as I will show, a few hundred millions of dollars spent on research can be expected to find new markets, sufficient not only to consume our present normal productive capacity but double it?

Fourth. It is just good, sound business for the United States Government and all of its people. The Government now owns $9 billion of farm surpluses. Such a program as the one we propose would enable us to realize at least something on the investment we now have in surpluses. But, much greater than that is the probability that such a program should save billions in support programs, increase farm income, boost tax revenues, stimulate business through increased farm purchasing power, and create millions of new jobs. All of this adds up to greater and greater national prosperity to be shared by every man, woman and child in the United States.

So, I say this is the responsibility of the United States Government, which makes

it the solemn duty of the Congress. This Congress and the executive branch of the Government never have had a greater opportunity to serve the welfare of the farmers and all of the people than by extending overwhelming approval to this bill. As far as the Congress is concerned, we should arrange quick hearings and pass the bill promptly.

There are a good many specific examples of benefits, through research already done, which accrue from such a program as this one. Let me recite a few:

Some years ago, the citrus fruit industry was in bad shape. Then, our Department of Agriculture, through research, aided in the perfection of the quick-frozen food process. I am told that this virtually saved the citrus-fruit industry. Consumption went up, income went up, and a great new phase of this industry resulted—from what?—from research.

The Department of Agriculture is said to be on the verge of perfecting powdered, whole milk. All commercial powdered milk at the moment is skim milk. I believe that perfection of powdered whole milk would go a long way toward doing for the dairy industry what the freezing process did for the citrus industry.

I understand the Department is about ready to perfect the research on powdered, whole milk. If they are, it means that there will be twice as much whole milk sold as now. It will require twice as many cows as now. It will give the dairy industry twice as much business. If and when the Department of Agriculture perfects powdered whole milk, that is what will happen.

Someone may say to me, "You say they have perfected it." Possibly that is true. However, even after it is perfected, under the provisions of the bill, pilot plants will be built, to prove its worth. Field tests will be given, and its worth will be proven. Then private industry will be licensed to proceed with the production of powdered whole milk.

Agriculture is now working on a high-protein food for cattle that would, if perfected, revolutionize animal feeding and consume an additional 150 to 160 millions of bushels of wheat a year, the production equivalent of 7½ million acres. From a 56 pound bushel, we would get 16 to 20 pounds of high protein feed.

Think of that, Mr. President. One hundred and fifty million to 160 million bushels of wheat. That is almost enough wheat to take up the surplus of wheat at the moment. That is only one item.

Work is progressing to develop metallurgical oils from grain.

I am told that the researchers are near perfection of an oil made from grains which can be used in the manufacture of paint.

We know that synthetic rubber can be made from grain. True, the process is more expensive, at the moment, than rubber made from crude oil. Agriculture is working now to bring that cost down. It would take 350 bushels of grain to make 1 ton of rubber. If we used ethyl alcohol from grain to produce all of the 900,000 tons of synthetic rubber a year, it would require the consumption of 315 million bushels of grain, or the production equivalent of about 7 million acres.

That is 315 million bushels of grain. At the present time we produce only about 6½ million bushels each year. That 1 item alone would take 315 million bushels.

One of the great potentials in the field is the production of microba rubber, a natural rubber, from the gluten in grain. There is another great possibility.

All of these, if finally perfected, would require the production equivalent of hundreds of thousands—yes, millions of acres of grain. Who can tell just how many acres?

There is no limit, as the population increases and new uses are found for the products of the farm.

We have known for many years that ethyl alcohol can very successfully be blended with the gasoline used in an automobile. If just 10 percent of the blend was ethyl alcohol made from grain, it would require more than 2 billion bushels of grain a year and there would be no grain surplus. Actually, a blend of 25 percent of such alcohol could be used without major adjustments to the engine.

At the moment it would cost more, but know-how in America always gets the price down, as we well know. If we had a 10 percent blend, it would take more than 2 billion bushels of grain. The total production at the moment is only 6½ billion bushels. That is the entire production in the United States. That is just one item, Mr. President, and it is a matter of bringing the price down.

Now, if such a program should be undertaken, it might reduce temporarily the consumption of crude oil. But my best judgment is that in the long run this reduction would be more than offset by increased consumption in the hundreds of thousands of new tractors, trucks, transport vehicles, automobiles, and other petroleum-burning equipment in use because of this very program.

The petroleum industry might lose 10 percent and retain 90 percent. However, the 90 percent in only a few years time would be so much bigger in volume and so much more important to the industry, that the two are hardly worth comparing. It shows what can be done, if only we in Congress would have the same imagination now, and get that same imagination and push and zip into the Department of Agriculture, to do the job that private industry is doing. We would not have to appropriate money for subsidies for the farmer, and we would not have to worry about the farm bill.

We could put the farmer into a very prosperous position. We are not going to help the farmer very much by reducing his production. We can help him only by increasing his production, and this bill provides for that. The White House is already behind it. It is very enthusiastic about the objectives and purposes of the bill.

As many Senators know, it was an Englishman who first discovered penicillin. But, it was our Department of Agriculture that developed the means for its commercial production. So, Mr. President, what I am here proposing already is going on at a snail's pace, while we spend billions on an agricultural surplus program. This must not be a snail's pace program.

This must be a crash program as an investment in agricultural and even greater national prosperity and economic health.

It is the only way I know to achieve a permanent farm prosperity based on full production rather than costly acreage curtailment.

Such a crash program in research will, of course, require pilot plants, field tests, and commercial plant-testing facilities. This type of operation is not new to the United States Government either.

The Government owns a now idle plant in Omaha, Nebr., for making ethyl alcohol from grain. This should be reactivated immediately.

This and possibly other similar plants should at least make into grain alcohol the surplus grains which are available. Yet the plant at Omaha is standing idle, and it should be reactivated.

Plants are being operated under the system about which the Senator from New Mexico was speaking, but they have not a sufficient appropriation. They do not have one man thinking about the problem day and night. They are dragging. They are not going forward. Partially, of course, it is because Congress has not given them sufficient money, and likewise, partially, because they do not have the imagination in the Department which they should have in order to accomplish this objective. In my opinion, they should have advocated the same thing which some 35 Senators are advocating here today. They know the situation and they know what can be done.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Some 10 or 15 years ago there was a great deal of activity in this field by a private organization supported by industry, and known as the Chemurgic Council. They were on the point of success, when the war came on, and the project was temporarily abandoned because of the war. Does the Senator from Indiana know whether there has been any revived activity?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not.

Mr. BRICKER. I have heard of none.

Mr. CAPEHART. It was financed, I think, by private industry.

Mr. BRICKER. It was. The Ford Motor Co. was interested in it, and there was a great deal of interest in my State. It is centrally located, in Columbus, Ohio. It was operated along the line of developing food and fiber products into commercial uses, not only in the field of gasoline, about which the Senator has been speaking, which is entirely practicable except dollarwise, but in every field of utilization for construction, for the building of automobile bodies, as I remember, and soybean utilization. They were manufacturing cloth out of milk. One man had a hat made out of milk. It seemed to be as good as any other hat. It was made by Stetson, as I remember.

Mr. CAPEHART. We should do what we did during the war with reference to synthetic rubber. Once the Government perfects and approves each of these products, it can then be immediately turned over to private industry for production.

Mr. BRICKER. The synthetic rubber program was really perfected by private industry with Government money.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. Private industry is working on many, many uses for farm products. If we can pass this bill, it will help the farmers. The project could be concentrated under one man in Washington whom I am willing to call a czar, to do whatever is necessary—bumping whatever heads are necessary to be bumped in the Government in order to find new ways to use farm products so that the farmer can increase instead of decrease his production and be on an equal footing, so far as profit is concerned, with industry.

Mr. BRICKER. I am happy to join the Senator in sponsoring the bill. I think it offers great possibilities. In the years ahead, I believe the possibilities will become greater and greater. It is a field in which the Government should interest itself.

Mr. CAPEHART. There are 6 million farmers, and they cannot all get together.

Mr. BRICKER. Industry is not interested at this time, because there is no dollar return.

Mr. CAPEHART. They have about all the business they can handle at this time.

Mr. BRICKER. So long as they have the resources available to them in coal and fuel oils, out of which they can make so many of the products which are now being made synthetically, they will not turn to farm products, because of the dollar cost.

Mr. CAPEHART. They are selling about everything they can make. Only the Government can help the farmers at this time. Only the Government can do what is proposed, and it should do it.

Mr. BRICKER. I think it is comparable to an observation I heard yesterday with respect to the fiber-glass development in this country. It started in one small plant, and fiber glass is now used in 101 different ways. There was an adequate return to justify investing capital in the project. But the Senator feels that cotton fiber and the like can be utilized.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall show that 11 probable uses can be made of agricultural products. The Department estimates that these uses will take nearly 3 billion bushels of grain. I shall name the 11 products in just a moment.

Mr. BRICKER. It becomes more important as the years go by, because our other resources, such as oil, coal, minerals, and so forth, are becoming depleted. We shall ultimately have to have some kind of synthetic substance.

Mr. CAPEHART. It will have to be done some day if we are to solve the farm problem. The question is, Will it be done over a period of 50 years, or are we going to just sit down and think about the money, the time, and the effort required to do the job quickly, instead of spending billions of dollars in subsidies paid to the farmer to keep him from producing something? If we spent a small fraction of the money in helping the farmer to find new uses and new markets for his products, everyone would be better off.

Mr. BRICKER. I think we all agree with the Senator's statement of a moment ago that the farm bill is not satisfactory to anyone. It has been hampered by expediency, and we are not happy about the situation existing in agricultural areas.

There is not only a department of research in the Federal Government, but in practically every State there is an agricultural research station bent upon increasing production. They are developing better crops and new things for the farmer to develop in the conventional agricultural line.

Does the Senator from Indiana know of any research work going on, either federally or at State levels, or in the universities, to transfer to industrial uses some of the food and fiber now used in normal consumption?

Mr. CAPEHART. I think there is considerable work going on, possibly in private enterprise. Our Government Departments are doing some work in universities. The Federal Government has been spending hundreds of millions of dollars, as have the agricultural universities, to help farmers to grow more, but they have completely forgotten about where the market can be found. This bill would provide that the Government shall spend money and time finding a market for that which they have been showing the farmers how to produce.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator anticipates, then, in this program, that emphasis would be laid upon the new utilization of farm products, and he would also encourage a continuation of the research now being done in State institutions.

Mr. CAPEHART. The administrator would encourage private industry, the universities, and the Department of Agriculture all to go forward with more research. Everybody would get to work on the problem in an effort to solve it.

Private agencies have been spending large sums of money on research for many years. Consider Purdue University in my home State of Indiana. Purdue has helped the farmers of Indiana to produce more and more and more; but no one is spending the money or taking the time to find out where the farmer will be able to merchandise or sell his increased production. The proposed legislation would do that.

American farm production has been built to a very high level. There is too much on hand. There is over-production. Vast surpluses exist. Now let us spend the time, money, and effort—and it can be done—to find new uses and new markets for the farm products. When that has been done, the farm problem will have been solved.

Mr. BRICKER. I congratulate the Senator from Indiana upon his leadership in the program, which I think is of great interest to all of us. I am very happy to join with him, and I hope we may successfully start the program.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I had occasion to read the remarks of the Senator from Indiana, which he kindly sent to my office yesterday, and I also have scanned the bill.

I am wondering what is the difference between his proposal and the proposal submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], which is a part of the bill that was passed by the Senate on Monday.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the big difference is that the proposal of the Senator from Nebraska, which was made a part of the farm bill, called for a commission to study the problem and to report to Congress in June 1957.

My bill calls for getting busy now—today—because now is when the farmers need the help. The program ought to be started now. I do not think a study is needed to learn what should be done. I am a farmer; I know what ought to be done. Only one thing needs to be done, and that is to find more markets for that which is grown on the farm.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was why I opposed the Curtis amendment. It sought to make studies which already have been made. The Senator is aware of the fact that about 12 years ago, as a result of studies made, Congress authorized the establishment of 4 huge laboratories, 1 of them in New Orleans.

Mr. CAPEHART. Before the Senator from Louisiana came to the Chamber, I named them. They are located in New Orleans; Peoria, Ill.; Albany, Calif.; and Philadelphia.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. Those four research laboratories ought to be required to make the studies. Why is it necessary to spend more money for further research?

Mr. CAPEHART. The bill goes beyond research. It calls for the building of pilot plants. It calls for additional studies to be made by the State universities.

I am not criticizing what has been done in the past. I know that in 1946 a bill was passed, in which a certain sum was authorized, and the laboratories were set up. The complaint I have is that in 10 years——

Mr. ELLENDER. Nothing has been done.

Mr. CAPEHART. There has not been accomplished what I think should have been accomplished. I think that through the proposed legislation Congress ought to mandate the administration, especially the Department of Agriculture. An administrator, whom I should like to call a czar, should be appointed to get the job done. I want to see one appointed who will start bumping heads together. Let us get the job done. The farmers are in a bad situation.

A real farm problem exists. We worried about it on the floor of the Senate for days and days. It is costing billions of dollars.

There is no one who knows anything about business who does not know that a person's income cannot be increased by cutting back production. It is necessary now to do it temporarily under the farm bill, in order to reduce surpluses,

so that prices can be brought up higher. But that is not the real answer; it is only a temporary answer.

Mr. ELLENDER. I simply wish to remark that research as a rule, is a very slow process. What the Senator from Indiana seeks is a continuation of the utilization of the surpluses on hand, without any method having been found for their use.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not follow the Senator's line of reasoning. I am trying to have Congress and the administration do for agriculture that which was done for the rubber industry during the last World War. During the war and in a hurry, the Government developed a synthetic rubber industry to the point where today more synthetic rubber can be produced in the United States than can be used.

I do not want to delay the expenditure of the money. The program ought to be what might well be termed a crash program, and the administration ought to be mandated to proceed with it. We should insist that the administration move ahead promptly with such a program. It ought to be accomplished twice, three times, or four times as fast as any similar program that has been undertaken.

Mr. ELLENDER. There must be a basis from which to start. It is not possible to say that wheat or that cotton should be used unless a process has already been devised, and that requires research.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course it does; and that research will not be done in 1 month or 1 year. But if a start is not made, the research never will be done.

I am going to discuss some 11 projects on which the Department of Agriculture is working at the moment, and which the Department feels reasonably certain can be accomplished and will use 3 billion bushels of corn a year.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me the difference between the approach which the Senator from Indiana is taking—and I commend him for his constructive thinking, and am happy to be one of the sponsors of the bill—and the approach discussed by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, is simply that we find ourselves today where we were in 1943, 1944, and 1945 in the development of atomic energy and the atomic bomb. A large amount of research was in progress in a great number of laboratories for many years. Dr. Lawrence, of South Dakota, one of our distinguished sons, was engaged upon that project for a great many years. When the war began, it was put on a crash basis.

Under the bill which is now proposed, the research program will be put on a crash basis, and will be given new impetus. Discoveries, which have already been made in the Peoria laboratory, and in other laboratories and institutions, will be developed further in pilot plants, in an effort to give publicity to the new uses which can be made of farm products, and thus to speed up the disposal of farm surpluses.

I am certain that no one expects that a bill which will be passed this year will solve the problem next year; but it will certainly shorten the time which otherwise would be taken if we relied solely upon the normal processes of exploration, investigation, and study in Government laboratories. Am I correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the Senator from South Dakota is 100 percent correct. We are trying to make a start and to arouse enthusiasm on the part of the Department of Agriculture to accomplish this job.

Who would have said 50 years ago that today there would be radio, television, and plastics? Who would have said 75 years ago that there would be automobiles to the extent that they exist today? Who would have said at the beginning of the century that we would have all the new products which we enjoy today?

I think that what we are talking about will eventually be worked out. I think eventually enough uses will be found for farm products. But it will take too long to find them unless the Government becomes interested in the matter, because 6 million farmers cannot do the work by themselves; they have no way of doing it.

Mr. MUNDT. What is sought to be done by the bill is to take the program of farm chemurgy out of low gear and to put it into high gear.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is exactly correct.

Mr. MUNDT. There is a very good historical background for doing this. Senators will recall that in World War I the United States found itself without a dye industry. We were at war with Germany, who had a great deal of experience and know-how in the making of dyes. But by putting the program of dye-making on a crash basis, by stimulating the program for the research and development of raw products in laboratories and chemical factories, and in the clothing industry, before the war was over the United States had acquired a first-class dye industry, in a short space of time. What we did in wartime from the standpoint of dyes we can do in peacetime from the standpoint of farm products. We did that in the matter of synthetic rubber produced from industrial alcohol obtained from corn, molasses, and a great number of other products. We did it from the standpoint of utilization of atomic energy as a weapon of war in the more recent war. America's history is replete with evidence of our capacity to get a job done when we concentrate our money, energy, and know-how on the problem. The only way to get ahead is to make a start.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is not any question that the American researcher and American engineer and the American people and this Congress and the Department of Agriculture and our great universities and our great research laboratories can do the job if somebody—and that somebody has to be the Congress of the United States—mandates them and tells them to do it, and helps them to do it with appropriations and with direction, and with an administrator for the whole program.

Mr. MUNDT. The difficulty has been that we have been nibbling away at the whole problem, when it takes a man-sized bite to get going. The bill would provide enough latitude for the Secretary of Agriculture, or the man he appoints to administer the program, not only to enter into contracts with colleges and universities, not only to stimulate American genius in laboratories at Peoria and elsewhere, but to enter into contracts with our great chemical corporations and great industrial laboratories, whereby their genius would be devoted to this problem. Is that correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. So we would bring into the picture not only our scientific scholars and students in the laboratories at colleges and universities, but some of the most hard-headed businessmen who for years have utilized their production with scientific discoveries in the laboratory, and who could devote their efforts to the problem.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. It seems to me the parallel between atomic energy and the production of synthetic rubber during the war does not wholly follow. We are not faced with a great need for a product; we are faced with the need for a new utilization of the surplus production of the farms of the country. The problem becomes not one of scientific development, because that is generally understood. Formulas have been arrived at and the research has been done, but not to the degree of determining the economy of such a process. One of the problems of our scientific and research organizations is to work out the economic problem, because, in our economy, we have to bring the cost of production down to the point where it can compete with products conventionally used.

Mr. CAPEHART. Which means that we must have pilot plants built and field tests must be conducted in order to prove the products.

Mr. BRICKER. It is an engineering and a production problem rather than a scientific and research problem.

Mr. CAPEHART. Possibly it is more of an engineering and production problem.

Mr. BRICKER. I think that is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. We already know how to proceed. It is a question of ways and means to operate economically.

Mr. BRICKER. Those engaged know how to do many things with the products, but new developments may come.

Mr. CAPEHART. There are more developments we have not heard of than there are that we know of.

The Government owns four going research and development laboratories as follows: First, Southern Utilization Branch, New Orleans, La.; second, Northern Utilization Branch, Peoria, Ill.; third, Western Utilization Branch, Albany, Calif.; and, fourth, Eastern Utilization Branch, Philadelphia, Pa.

We now have an oil-from-shale pilot plant at Rifle, Colo.

We have operated two coal hydrogenation plants from which a great deal has been learned about the economics of making gasoline from coal.

Senators all know, of course, that the Government perfected the process of making synthetic rubber during World War II. Recently, we were able to sell the plants we used in this process at a profit and create a whole new series of income-producing, taxpaying properties.

In this connection, it is my belief that as fast as the Government proves the practicability of each new farm product in industry, the process should then be turned over to private industry for production.

Mr. President, there can be no justification for further delay in starting this program.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. There is one item the Senator may have mentioned before I came to the floor, but I did not hear him touch on it. We have also developed a very successful method of utilizing industrial alcohol as a gasoline blend.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; I mentioned that.

Mr. MUNDT. During the great depression days of the thirties we had, in South Dakota, in Sioux City, Iowa, and in that general area, half a hundred filling stations which were at that time selling an alcohol-blend gasoline, and it worked very satisfactorily in the automobiles of motorists. It was sold, that long ago, at competitive prices.

I have under preparation at this time a bill I intend to introduce in the Senate which would provide some kind of method whereby, from tax or some other concessions, we would make it possible to utilize alcohol from farm products for fuel. We do now have a way to cut into the surpluses.

Mr. CAPEHART. The administrator, under the bill, would be authorized immediately to get busy. The Government now owns an alcohol plant in Omaha. We wish to have that reactivated and have it start making grain alcohol. We wish to have a pilot plant to start blending alcohol and gasoline in order to get the price down and prove its worth. We ought to have all sorts of programs of that kind.

Mr. MUNDT. I presume one of the responsibilities and duties of the new administrator would be to make legislative suggestions to Congress so that Congress could be helpful, perhaps in the way of granting tax concessions for the manufacture of alcohol-gasoline blends for automotive purposes, or perhaps granting tax concessions to factories engaged in the production of industrial goods made from agricultural products. There are many ways in which a man dedicated to this responsibility could function, in addition to handling the contracts and the general scientific and exploratory functions of the office.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is absolutely correct.

When it reaches the point of productivity which I envision for it—the point at which it will obviate the necessity for our present agricultural assistance programs—it will have accomplished the dual purpose of reducing Government expenditures and increasing farm and national prosperity and the social, economic, and industrial welfare of our Nation. As I see it, this thing is nearly all pluses and almost no minuses. I cannot see any minuses in it at all.

What we have been doing up to now is based upon a hope that some day conditions may improve to such a point that we shall have an adequate market for our farm products.

I wish to repeat that thought, and I want the officials of the Department of Agriculture to read it, and I should like to have the Secretary of Agriculture to read it. What we have been doing up to now is based upon a hope that some day conditions may improve to the point at which we shall have an adequate market for our farm products.

What we are proposing is a concrete program to create that kind of a market. Much of this program can and should be carried on in existing public and private laboratories, particularly in our schools and colleges. The Department of Agriculture has been working with many such educational institutions for years. Moreover, the Department now has a limited research staff in its several experimental stations working on these and related projects.

The program we propose should be built on the framework of and within the existing research activities of the Department of Agriculture. It would not be well to disrupt the Department's existing organization or disregard the value of its experience.

The program here suggested must use all of the existing research and experimental facilities of the Government. In the past, it seems to me, one of the weaknesses has been a lack of funds for pilot plants and field tests. These are, of course, necessary to test the commercial feasibility of any new process or product. My proposal would make such funds available.

So we propose to utilize to the fullest every existing Government facility. But the larger and more dynamic program which we contemplate cannot be accomplished on any business-as-usual basis.

For that reason, we propose that this entire research and development program be placed under the direction of a full-time administrator at the White House level.

He must be the most competent man available—a man of great stature, who would have the complete confidence of the President. No other man in the executive branch of the Government would have a more important job to do for his country. We are convinced that this program, under such dynamic leadership, would go a long way toward permanent solution of the farm program.

For want of a better term, we might call this man the "czar" of the Agricultural Industrial Products Development program.

Who knows what miracle products such a program might develop? The possibilities are challenging to the Congress, to the executive department, to our best scientific research brains, to the American people, and, more particularly, to the American farmer.

There are many industrial uses for agricultural products on which some research has already been done. I shall read a list of 11 probable industrial uses for agricultural products, on which the best available estimates indicated a likely annual use of 2½ billion bushels of agricultural products, whereas we now produce only 6½ billion yearly. This list was given to me by the Department of Agriculture:

1. High protein food by fermentation, 150 million bushels a year.
2. Paint from vegetable oil, if 5 to 10 percent of potential market is reached, 15 to 60 million bushels a year.
3. Synthetic rubber, 365 million bushels a year.
4. Microbia rubber, if 10 percent of the potential market is reached, 25 to 30 million bushels a year.
5. Increased use of starch in paper, 40 to 100 million bushels a year.
6. Industrial exploitation of oxystarch, 10 million bushels a year.
7. Raising disease-free poultry for export, 13 million bushels a year.
8. New drug plants, 4½ million bushels a year.
9. Hardboard, boxboard, and building board from wheat, 20 to 40 million bushels a year.
10. Development of high amylose corn, 10 million bushels a year.
11. Blending 10-percent grain alcohol with gasoline, 2 billion bushels a year.

Total, 2.6 to 2.7 billion bushels.

Other possible uses for grain derivatives include smokeless powder, plastics, medicinals, toilet preparations, soaps, cleaners, anesthetics, antifreeze, dyes, varnishes, power, and fuel.

If we keep at this research job, I can foresee in time our using in industry 6 billion bushels or more a year of agricultural commodities.

This program has been under study by a great many persons other than myself. It is the product of a great deal of serious consideration of one of the most serious problems in the United States.

The potentialities are so vast that any attempt to evaluate the benefits to this Nation and its people dollarwise is an almost hopeless task. I have been unable to select any segment of our economy—any group of our people—who would not lead more comfortable lives and enjoy higher standards of living and benefit generally from the fruits of such a program.

It would mean the assurance of a full market for full farm production.

It would end our farm-surplus problem.

It would save the Government money.

It would help to relieve the tax burden and give us a chance to reduce the national debt.

It would create new industries.

It would create new jobs.

It would stimulate retail sales.

It would provide better incomes for our people, including the Nation's 6 million farmers.

It is, in our opinion, in all modesty, the most constructive approach to the farm problem yet devised.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say we have no time to waste. I hope

the bill will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that the committee immediately will hold hearings on the bill, and that representatives of the Department of Agriculture will be prepared to testify in behalf of the bill before the committee. I am certain they will favor it, because, in my opinion, this program, as I said a moment ago, is one which the Department of Agriculture itself should have begun and should have suggested to the Congress 1 or 2 years ago, or perhaps longer ago than that. After all, the solution of this problem is the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture, which does have, as it should, the best interests of the farmers at heart; and the Department of Agriculture should be enthusiastic about any plan which shows any chance whatsoever of helping the American farmers, particularly under existing conditions.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Indiana that I appreciate very much the presentation he has made on this very interesting subject. Some 15 years ago, as the Senator from Ohio has stated recently, there was a chemurgic movement, which I believe was a private activity. The Senator has said he is familiar with it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I was very much interested then, as a layman, in the field of farming. I think there are many more commercial uses of farm products.

I desire to commend the distinguished Senator from Indiana for the very fine presentation he has made; and I wish to say that I can well understand the reason for the great success he has had in the business world, because the zip he has shown in his presentation of this bill demonstrates a positive approach to the problem of finding increased uses for our agricultural products, with the result of greater prosperity for the farmers of the Nation.

I am very happy to be a cosponsor of the bill, along with the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

It is so obvious to me that this plan is the only way to solve the farm problem. That problem will be solved only by finding new uses and new markets for our agricultural products. The problem will not be solved—at least, not in a satisfactory way—by paying subsidies or by reducing production or by anything of the sort.

The problem will be solved only by increasing production—by having the farmers produce more and by having an increased economy, rather than a decreased economy. That simply must be the answer; there cannot be any other.

The only question is whether the Congress and the administration wish to go along as usual in regard to this matter; or whether we really want to do a proper job, and do it quickly.

As the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] stated a moment ago, in 1946 the Congress set up the laboratories. But perhaps both the Democratic administrations and the Republican administration since that time should be blamed, and perhaps the Congress itself should be blamed for not appropriating enough money and not requiring the administration to get this job done.

Today, I plead that we do the job. I plead that all of us get behind this program. Let us give the farmer some hope. Let us say to the American farmer, "We are going to get this job done for you. We are going to create new markets for your products. We are going to make it possible for you to grow more, instead of less."

By doing that, the farmer will be able to buy—and will buy—more farm implements and more of all other kinds of products; and the railroads will carry more grain and other farm products, and so will the trucking lines. The retail stores in the small towns in the farming communities will sell more. Everyone will gain; no one will lose.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Indiana for the excellent presentation he has made.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. President, I cannot conceive that anyone would be against this plan. In fact, I do not know of anyone who is against it. Some persons have said, "At the moment there are not enough engineers or scientists to make it possible for such a program to be carried out." However, Mr. President, in my opinion, those are alibis and excuses; they are not good reasons.

I have always said that when handed a lemon, make lemonade out of it.

In this case the farmers and the country generally are faced with a great problem because of the overproduction of agricultural commodities. We have encouraged the farmers to produce more and more. We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars for our agricultural schools, which have worked diligently to show the farmers how to produce more and more and more. The seeds have been improved. Today there is huge production; but the markets for it are insufficient. Let us be just as enthusiastic in helping the farmers find new markets as we have been in increasing agricultural production. Once we do that, we shall really be doing something for the American farmer, and we shall really solve this problem. Unless that is done, the problem will not be solved, in my opinion.

I do not want anyone to get the impression that I am criticizing the farm bill we passed the other night, or that I am criticizing the Department of Agriculture, the Congress, or any individuals. I am simply trying to point out what is so obvious to me as a businessman and a farmer.

We ought to start on this program tonight. Possibly the Senate should remain in session tonight to pass this bill and set ourselves on the road toward accomplishment of this program.

EXHIBIT 1

U. S. Department of Agriculture—Authorizations and appropriations under Research and Marketing Act of 1946

[In thousands of dollars]

	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956
Sec. 9:										
Authorized	2,500	5,000	10,000	15,000	20,000	[1]				
Appropriated		2,500	3,250	5,000	[2] 5,000	[2] 5,000	[2] 5,000	[2] 6,000	[2] 11,500	[2] 16,800
Sec. 10a:										
Authorized	3,000	6,000	9,000	12,000	15,000	[1]				
Appropriated		3,000	3,900	5,000	[3]					
Sec. 10b:										
Authorized	1,500	3,000	4,500	6,000	[1]					
Appropriated		1,500	1,950	3,000	[3]					
Title II:										
Authorized	2,500	5,000	10,000	15,000	20,000	[1]				
Appropriated		2,000	4,750	6,000	[4] 5,932	[5] 4,962	[6] 5,249	5,500	[3]	
Total:										
Authorized	9,500	19,000	33,500	48,000	[7] 61,000					
Appropriated		9,000	13,850	19,000						

[1] "In addition to the foregoing, such additional funds * * * as the Congress may deem necessary."

[2] Appropriated under "Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska and Puerto Rico" for research of agricultural experiment stations. Public Law 352 (84th Cong., 1st sess.) approved Aug. 11, 1955, provided for the consolidation of the various laws relating to appropriation of Federal funds for the support of research at these stations.

[3] Merged with related appropriations of bureaus and agencies of the Department.

[4] Excludes reduction of $68,000 pursuant to sec. 1214 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951.

[5] Includes $212,000 appropriated for pay act costs in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952.

[6] Excludes reduction of $667 pursuant to sec. 411 of the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1953.

[7] For comparison, total for 1951 includes $6,000,000 for sec. 10b; however, language provides such additional amounts as the Congress may deem necessary.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, what is going on here is an attack against the political influence of the big States in the nomination and election of a President of the United States.

Statements have been made about reducing the influence of so-called minority groups and splinter blocs. What minority groups are thus referred to? Let us speak openly and frankly with each other in debating so critical a proposition as a drastic change in the Constitution of the United States.

Is it organized labor? Farmers? Small-business men? Is it the veterans? Naturalized citizens? Negroes? Catholics? Jews? Masons? Which are these minority groups that we must guard against by constitutional amendment?

What events and which tendencies of the past do we mean to forestall in the future?

What influence have New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and California had which must be neutralized now by this constitutional amendment?

Mr. President, it is my responsibility to my State of New York to defend its influence in national affairs. But first, I want to know, specifically, in what way it is claimed that that influence has been bad and has worked to the disadvantage of the United States and of the cause of democracy?

Let us have the facts on the table, in full view, so that we may know why we are asked to follow the incredible and chaotic formula recommended by the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. President, I am in favor of reforming our present system of electing the President of the United States, but not this way. I am aware of the so-called dangers, which have been pointed out by political scientists, of electing a so-called minority President.

I am aware that the electoral college system was originally designed as a means of selecting, and not of electing, a President.

I am in favor of the direct election of a President of the United States by the people, by the direct vote of the people, just as we elect Senators and Members of the House of Representatives.

If 16 million people in New York State can be trusted to elect a United States Senator by direct vote, 160 million people can be trusted to elect a President of the United States by direct vote.

Radio, television, and the press have made the United States one community with instantaneous and comprehensive communication. The direct election of a President is the only democratic way. We will come to it, in good time, I am sure. Even if a constitutional amendment to this effect is not adopted this year, it will be adopted eventually. It is the only logical way of electing a President.

The present system of electing an electoral college which elects a President is obviously archaic. It should be changed.

But, Mr. President, so wise were the drafters of our Constitution—even beyond their own realization—and so flexible is that system, combined with the political genius of the American people, that out of this archaic system has evolved a more or less democratic manner of electing a President. And the people do, in fact, elect the President. And it is a fact of our history, that with but the rarest exceptions, the President elected in this manner has been the actual choice of the majority of the voters of our country.

Now comes this proposal—this political potpourri, this political hash, if I may characterize it as such—which is seriously advocated as means of electing a President of the United States.

The sponsors of the resolution would have us elect a President in a way which would permit State legislatures to gerrymander an election in a positively nightmarish manner. They would permit 36,000 votes cast in Mississippi to be worth as much as 200,000 votes in New York State.

They would permit low-vote one-party States to have more influence in the election of a President than the huge States where elections are fought out under conditions of the keenest competition, where the candidates must prove themselves or lose.

The President is the only officer in the United States who represents all the people of the country. He should and must be elected in the most democratic manner possible, by the closest approach we can make to pure democracy.

In form, the present electoral college system is not so organized. But in actual operation it does, by some miracle, succeed in reflecting a democratic choice.

I want to eliminate the chance that on some future occasion it may not repeat this miracle. I want to see the President elected by the direct vote of the people. But failing that, I must oppose, with all the strength I have, this dangerous and ill-conceived formulation for the amendment of our Constitution, which would make the election of a President subject to a hundred, a thousand whims, vagaries and unpredictable decisions and actions on the part of State legislatures.

Mr. President, New York State is already far underrepresented in proportion to its population, both in the Senate and in the House. The people who live in the congested cities and counties in New York are far underrepresented in the Congress, just as they are underrepresented in the New York State legislature.

Shall we, then, compound and intensify this situation by reflecting this multiple underrepresentation in the choice of a President? Not only would we intensify the underrepresentation, but we would splinter our influence in the nominating conventions and the electoral college.

The sponsors of this proposal would do New York no favor by giving the party which loses the election a proportional representation in the electoral vote, while at the same time they would make every individual vote in New York count for only a fifth as much as a vote in Mississippi, South Carolina, or Arkansas.

I hope we will not tamper with the Constitution, if this is the way we are to do it.

Let me add one further observation. The pending proposal has received very little attention in the press, or at the hands of commentators or the people themselves. There has been virtually no discussion of the amendment, and no debate until the past few days.

It is true that the original resolution was introduced several months ago. It was not considered or acted upon. However, the amendment which is now offered as a substitute, sponsored by a large number of my colleagues in the Senate, was submitted only 5 days ago, on March 15. It has not received any consideration by the public.

We have been operating for 180 years under the present system. It has not been perfect, by any means. One could make a good argument, on logical grounds, against it. But in the main it has worked well, and in only a few cases was the man who became President of the United States not elected by an actual majority of the people of the country.

I very much desire direct election of the President; but to substitute this amendment for what we have been using for 180 years, with 98 or 99 percent satisfaction, certainly does not make sense to me. I think it would be a great mistake to adopt this amendment. I hope with all my heart that it will not be approved. I shall work with all my strength to cause the defeat of the amendment. I think it would be a serious step backward in the democratic processes of this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to discuss briefly the next to the last amendment that was added to the agricultural bill on Monday evening. It related to set-asides and surpluses. I refer to it only because the Price Division of the Department of Agriculture on March 20 issued a summary sheet showing the estimated maximum support level under S. 3183 for basic crops and dairy products.

I am sure those in the Department of Agriculture who issued the report were trying their best merely to give a correct expression of the effect of the amendment. However, because I think they missed the goal very badly, I desire to discuss it. First, I ask unanimous consent that there may be included in

the RECORD at this point the table prepared by the Department of Agriculture and issued on March 20, 1956.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated minimum support level under S. 3183 for basic crops and dairy products [1]

Commodity	Normal supply	Total supply	Set-aside	Supply for price support	Supply percentage	Minimum support level	Parity price Feb. 15, 1956	Minimum support price
	Million bushels	*Million bushels*	*Million bushels*	*Million bushels*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
Wheat:								
Maximum set-aside	1,122	1,991	800	1,191	106.1	87	2.50	2.18
Minimum set-aside	1,122	1,991	750	1,241	110.6	85	2.50	2.12
	Million bales	*Million bales*	*Million bales*	*Million bales*				
Cotton:								
Maximum set-aside	16.25	24.8	8.0	16.8	103.4	90	.3509	[2] .3158
Minimum set-aside	16.25	24.8	7.5	17.3	106.5	90	.3509	[2] .3158
	Million bushels	*Million bushels*	*Million bushels*	*Million bushels*				
Corn: Minimum set-aside	3,628	[3] 4,336	250	4,086	112.6	84	1.82	1.53
Dairy products:								
Butterfat						80	.717	.574
Manufacturing milk						80	[4] 4.06	3.25

[1] Excludes tobacco and rice which are not affected and peanuts which will be affected by changing the effective parity price from 12.9 cents per pound to 13.6 cents per pound.
[2] Applies to average quality rather than ⅞.
[3] 1956 production estimated at 3,185 million bushels, same as 1955. March crop intention indicates the crop may be about 3 billion bushels. On this basis a minimum set-aside of 250 million bushels would result in a minimum support level of 87 percent of parity or $1.58 per bushel.
[4] 88.5 percent of the parity price of all milk wholesale.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the first commodity the table deals with is wheat. Then it shows cotton, then corn, and then dairy products. I shall deal only with wheat, cotton, and corn.

I believe part of the difficulty arose out of the fact that the Department did not carefully read the language of the Agricultural Act that was amended by the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. The Humphrey amendment amended section 301 of the bill which was before the Senate. On page 25 of the bill, line 19, the word "may" was changed to "shall" as the language relates to 250 million bushels of corn.

Then the amendment added language which provided that there shall be added to the commodity set-aside created pursuant to section 101 of that act, "and the maximum and minimum quantities of upland cotton shall be raised to 10 million and 9 million bales, and the maximum and minimum quantities of wheat shall be raised to 800 million and 750 million bushels, respectively."

Subsequently, the Senator from Minnesota modified his amendment to bring cotton down to a maximum of 8 million bales, and to a minimum of 7½ million bales.

I was not certain what the proper figure would be, but as long as the amendment modified section 101, I knew that 10 million bales would be too much.

Section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 provides:

> The Commodity Credit Corporation shall, as rapidly as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine to be practicable, set aside within its inventories not more than the following maximum quantities, and not less than the following minimum quantities of agricultural commodities, or products thereof heretofore or hereafter acquired by it from 1954 and prior years' crops and production in connection with its price support operations.

That limited the amendment as affecting the quantities of wheat, corn, and cotton, to 1954 and prior crops. A great deal that was said on the floor was said out of ignorance of the fact, I am sure, that that would be the effect of the amendment. None the less, that is the effect the amendment would have, and it was understood by the sponsors of the amendment that would be the effect of it.

What does it do? Well, the table which the Department of Agriculture issued on March 20, 1956, shows that the wheat picture will result in a minimum support level of 87 percent of parity if the maximum set-aside is made, and 85 percent if the minimum set-aside is made.

I desire to introduce into the record my own computation, and will let subsequent determinations indicate which computation is the correct one.

The estimated production of wheat, according to the "Wheat Situation," published by the Department of Agriculture on the 28th day of February, shows that the production is anticipated to be 923 million bushels as against a 1955 wheat crop of 938 million bushels.

On top of that, the Department of Agriculture, on March 16, at 3 p. m., issued its crop-production report. On page 6 of that report is shown the estimate of the wheat production. It shows that a total production of 923 million bushels may be anticipated. If we take the total production of 923 million bushels and add to it the carry over, we have a total figure of 1,188 million bushels. I get that figure by taking the carry-over figure of 1,065,000,000 bushels, which again is carried on page 3 of the "Wheat Situation;" and subtracting from it the maximum amount that the Department of Agriculture has estimated would be used, and which the amendment permitted to be used, I get the figure of 265 million bushels. That 265 million bushels, added to the 923 million bushels, makes approximately 1,188,000,000 bushels.

To calculate the normal supply I again turn to page 3 of the Wheat Situation of February 28, which shows that there should be a domestic disappearance of 625 million bushels, exports of 275 million bushels, and a 20 percent carry-over provided by the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended, and that gives a figure of 1,080,000,000 bushels.

If we add some slight exports to the figure of 1,188,000,000, we get a figure of around 1,210,000,000. Dividing the 1,080,000,000 bushels into that, we get a level of about 112 percent. 112 percent, of course, is a support level of 84 percent. If we use the lowest domestic figure that might come into the calculation, we get a figure of 85 percent; and with the maximum set-aside the support level on wheat would be about 85 percent.

The corn situation is a little different from what was anticipated. We have been leaving the corn sealed, and the farmers have been buying cash corn, because its price has been only about $1.10, as compared with the supported level of $1.40.

Again going to the production report of March 16, on page 5 there appears an estimated 3-billion bushel production of corn. The Department of Agriculture, in calculating the normal supply, used a domestic disappearance figure of around 3 billion bushels.

I took the 1955–1956 estimate of the Department, which is 3 billion bushels, and the 1954–1955 annual figure, which was 2,815,000,000 bushels. The 1953–1954 annual figure was 2,946,000,000 bushels. Therefore, I concluded that the 2,900,000,000 figure is a fair figure for domestic disappearance.

To that I add 100 million bushels for export, and in that way get a total consumption of 3 billion bushels.

To that I add 15 percent for carryover, and get a figure of 3,450,000,000 bushels.

If I take the actual carryover of 1,150,000,000, and from that subtract the 250 million bushels authorized by the Humphrey amendment, I get a figure of 900 million bushels.

If I add that amount to the production, which is estimated in the Department of Agriculture reports at 3 billion bushels, I get the figure of 3,900,000,000 bushels. If 3,450,000,000 bushels is divided into 3,900,000,000, I get 113 percent as the supply percentage, or an actual support level of 84 percent.

I say that, Mr. President, because the Department in its sheet said the corn level would also be 84 percent, but arrived at it by a completely different set of figures. Apparently the Department and we can agree that the level on corn should be 84 percent, but we have a difference on wheat of about 2 percentage points.

During the discussion of the amendment the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] asked me what the effect of this amendment would be on the domestic price of cotton, because he had been asked that question, and was anxious to know the answer. I told him I thought it would be negligible; that the Secretary, I understood, had assured cotton producers that the support level would be 86 or 87 percent—probably 87 percent—and I did not think it would vary very much from that figure. I thought it would be almost exactly that

figure. Therefore, we would have to take the cotton figures, and I came out with quite a little different figure than does the Department of Agriculture.

The Department imagines that the minimum support level will be 90 percent. I introduce these figures only to show that the Department apparently overlooked the fact that the figures are for 1954 and prior months. The Department now estimates that if the 1954 and prior crops are used, its inventories do not exceed 6,800,000 bales. We had that figure before us previously. I talked again with the Department this afternoon, and the Department agrees that that figure should be used as against the estimated carryover that should be calculated after the set-aside would therefore be 7,200,000 bales. If that figure is then added to a production of 10 million bales, which the present law requires him to shoot at, the total supply figure would be 17,200,000 bales.

The normal supply should have a domestic disappearance of about 9 million bales; export, 3½ million bales; making a total of 12½ million bales. That figure is carried again in the report of the Department. To that we add 30 percent for extra carryover of cotton. That is 3,750,000 bales, which gives a figure of 16,250,000 bales. If you figure the supply percentage by dividing the normal supply of 16,250,000 bales into the total supply of 17,200,000 bales, the suggested support level for cotton would be 88 percent. That would produce an 88-percent support level for cotton. I say 88 percent is sufficiently close to 87 percent, so that it is proper to say that there was a very slight change. It would add about one-third of 1 cent to the price of cotton.

In the bill there is a provision which changed the grade and staple of cotton from seven-eighths of an inch to the average, and that dropped the price of cotton over 2 cents. So the total overall effect was a reduction in the price of cotton.

I hope that with this particular amendment the cotton level will move from probably 87 to 88 percent. The Department would probably end up with 84 percent. Wheat may end up at 84, or, at the most, 85 percent.

I think that should be of some interest to individuals who have been saying that the amendment probably wrecked the entire bill.

Mr. President, I express the hope that the conferees will have a profitable session when they come to consider the provisions of the bill. I think it would be too bad if the conference came out with something that is wholly impossible for the farmers of the country. I think there are still many things in the bill which can be made useful and very worthwhile, particularly such provisions as the soil bank, the cotton features to which I have referred, and several other things. It is my hope that we shall have a very good bill.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 21, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 760. An act for the relief of Pietro Meduri;

S. 1585. An act to provide for the return to the town of Hartford, Vt., of certain land which was donated by such town to the United States as a site for a veterans hospital and which is no longer needed for such purposes;

S. 1992. An act to provide for the conveyance of a certain tract of land in Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association;

S. 3452. An act to amend the act of July 15, 1955, Public Law 161, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 324), by increasing the appropriation authorization for the Aircraft Control and Warning System; and

S. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to authorize the American Battle Monument Commission to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, March 22, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1956

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in the morning hour of this new day of opportunity and duty, we would render unto Thee our prayers of praise and thanksgiving and renew our pledges of allegiance and devotion.

Grant that we may always seek to live on the highest and noblest levels, having our minds and hearts sensitive and responsive to the voice of conscience and the leading of Thy holy spirit.

We beseech Thee to raise up for these perilous times men and women who are rigidly honest, unswervingly loyal to principles, and faithfully devoted to their high vocation and appointed tasks.

Inspire us with a triumphant faith as we continue to struggle for the welfare and freedom of all mankind and keep us joyously undisturbed in the midst of life's confusions because of Thy grace and our trust in Thee.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2210. An act to modify the project for the St. Marys River, Mich., South Canal, in order to repeal the authorization for the alteration of the International Bridge as part of such project, and to authorize the Secretary of the Army to accomplish such alteration; and

S. 2562. An act to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 8780) entitled "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2286) entitled "An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to provide for the utilization of privately owned shipping services in connection with the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of certain personnel of the Department of Defense," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. DUFF to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

A NATIONAL FUEL POLICY

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, the Interstate Commerce Commission tacked on an increase of 6 percent for the transportation of coal. To the layman this was a news item. But to those engaged in the production and sale of coal in competition with other fuels, it was discouraging.

Much has been said, in times past, by those unfamiliar with coal production and coal markets, that coal has priced itself out of the market. This is meant, usually, in reference to the encroachment of fuel oil and gas on the coal markets.

There has been no increase of the cost of coal at the mine since 1948. In spite of the fact that wages have been increased since then, the production of coal has not increased in price. However, the price to the consumer has increased considerably due to increased freight rates. Some time ago there was an increase of 15 percent given to the carriers and now, later, this additional 6 percent.

For a long time, Mr. Speaker, we should have had a national fuels policy. This could be brought about by a study and recommendations on how to obtain our objectives.

I was interested recently in House Resolution 400, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], which authorizes the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to conduct a complete study on research and development for the coal industry. This was referred to the House Calendar on March 13. I hope the committee will come up with something substantial that will be of benefit to the coal industry and prevent it from being scuttled further.

The only criticism I have to make is that the study should be broadened to include other fuels. I cannot comprehend how a complete study of coal could accomplish a great deal without bringing in other fuels, especially their economic relationship thereto. Also, the damage being done to the coal industry by the dumping of residual oil from foreign ports should be thoroughly investigated.

It is imperative to have a national fuel policy because oil, gas, and coal are basic fuels. The country has an abundance of natural wealth, but it cannot continue these wasteful methods without someday being called to account. Certainly these high-grade fuels cannot last indefinitely. Some high-grade coal beds have even now been depleted.

I hope that this resolution will lead to some beneficial results to the fuel industry, especially to coal.

FLORIDA'S SHRIMPING INDUSTRY

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, on February 28 my friend and colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] brought to the attention of the House a problem with which the Florida delegation is deeply and sincerely concerned. It affects an industry which is of great importance not only to our State but to other States which enjoy the products of its operations. I am speaking of Florida's shrimping industry, which has been subject to manifold problems in recent years in connection with its operations in the Gulf of Mexico, and which is seriously concerned with the conference of the Organization of American States in the Dominican Republic.

My colleague's outline of the problem was so clear and effective as to require no amplification from me. My desire at this time is to endorse his remarks wholeheartedly, and to express on behalf of a great industry my deep interest in and strong support for the efforts which the United States delegation is making at Ciudad Trujillo to work out an equitable and permanent solution in agreement with our neighbors to the south.

AMENDMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, amendments to the Social Security Act provide that most employees of State and local governments can be brought under Federal old-age and survivors insurance by means of agreements between the States and the Federal Government. For employees not under a State or local government retirement system this protection was made possible by the 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act. For employees covered by a State or local retirement system the protection was made possible by the 1954 amendments to the Social Security Act. Before employees in positions under State or local government retirement systems can be included in a State-Federal agreement, a majority of the eligible employees must vote in favor of having old-age and survivors insurance coverage in a special referendum on the question. The law provides for the entry of State and local employees into the old-age and survivors insurance program not individually but in groups called coverage groups. The State decides which groups will be covered.

When I was in my district recently for a series of roving office hours, I had called to my attention a situation which I had not earlier realized existed in connection with social-security coverage for State and local government employees. Many individuals who are eligible for membership in a State retirement system will never be able to draw retirement benefits because of the fact that the wording of the State statute precludes qualifications for such. Although these individuals will not be able to complete a sufficient number of years of membership in the retirement system prior to mandatory retirement age, they are required to be members of the retirement fund. In other words, certain individuals are required to contribute to a compulsory savings plan.

In order to afford individuals in the above-mentioned category the opportunity to become eligible for Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits at some future date, I have today introduced legislation to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit a State or local government employee who is covered by a retirement system, but who cannot receive the benefits of such system, to elect social-security coverage as a self-employed individual if the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system has not been extended to his services by an agreement under section 218 of that act.

The bill which I have introduced provides that any individual who is an employee of a State or political subdivision thereof may file a certificate certifying that he elects to have the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act extended to such services performed by him. This election may be made only if the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act has not been extended to the services performed by him as such employee under an agreement under section 218 of such act, and the services performed by him as such employee are covered by a retirement system, as defined in section 218 (b) (4) of the Social Security Act, but he can under no circumstances complete the period of service required in order to qualify for the benefits of such retirement system.

The measure also contains provisos setting up a time limit for filing a certificate electing coverage and makes the election irrevocable. It also provides that such certificate shall not be effective on or after the first day of any succeeding taxable year in which the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act is extended to such services by means of an agreement under section 218 of such act, or it becomes possible for such individual, currently or at some future date, to receive benefits under such retirement system.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that our Federal old-age and survivors insurance system should be extended to State or local government employees who through no fault of their own will not be able to qualify for the benefits of a retirement system to which they are compelled to contribute. I do not believe that coverage as a self-employed individual should be denied these individuals simply because a majority of the employees in certain situations would not vote in favor of inclusion in a State-Federal agreement. I hope that the legislation which I have introduced will receive the early and favorable consideration of the Congress.

SYNTHETIC TOBACCO THREATENS FARM ECONOMY

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Ninth Indiana Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent in this Chamber for 16 consecutive years, is largely an agricultural area and much of the economy there is dependent upon farming or related activities.

The soil of southeastern Indiana, wherein my district lies, is particularly good for the cultivation of fine burley tobacco. The 14 counties of that district have 6,707 farmers who raise burley on 5,814.5 acres—averaging less than 1 acre per farmer. Hundreds of these growers have tobacco allotments of less than one-half acre. Actually, there are only 225 in the whole district who have allotments of 2 acres or more and not a single one has an allotment as high as 20 acres.

Burley tobacco, then, is a very important cash crop to these farmers. Without the money derived from sale of their tobacco, many hundreds of them would be in a bad way. They have worked closely with the Agriculture Department's tobacco allocation and support program. Indeed, the tobacco program is perhaps the most successful that the United States Department of Agriculture

now has in effect. The growers are due much credit for this.

Now, almost overnight, these farmers are faced by a situation which can, unless it is corrected, disrupt the tobacco-growing industry and drive many tobacco farmers into bankruptcy or out of business. This same situation also is of grave concern to the tobacco-consuming public, especially cigarette smokers.

I am concerned about the development and introduction of synthetic cigarettes—synthetic to the extent that they are not made of the highest quality tobaccos. Instead, they are made of chemically manufactured sheets of pulverized tobacco and tobacco stems.

Here is how this process works:

A hand of dried or cured tobacco is tossed into this pulverizing process—stem, scraps, and all. After it is ground into a substance which I understand is about the same texture as powdered coffee, the product then is blended with a congealing chemical and put through a special heating process which permits of permanent absorption of considerable quantities of air. Next, this synthetic material emerges from the machine in thin slabs or sheets. The final step is in chopping or cutting these synthetic sheets into tiny shreds which are rolled into cigarettes and passed on to the public as fine tobacco.

The swing to these synthetic tobacco sheets has been unheralded by the cigarette makers who have gone into that field. And right here I would like to point out that not all of them have taken to the new formula. At least one of the larger manufacturers is still buying the highest quality tobaccos and using only that portion of the tobacco leaf which makes for the most wholesome smoke. But it is easy to see that he must eventually adopt the synthetic process if he is to stay in business, for the cigarette business is highly competitive.

Whether this congealing chemical and the overall process is going to be more harmful to the cigarette user is, of course, open to discussion. Certainly the smoker will be getting a product of apparently inferior quality. His cigarette will be made up of ground or pulverized tobacco stems and scraps as well as the leafy or heretofore desirable portion of the tobacco plant. Until this new process came along, cigarette and pipe tobacco manufacturers generally discarded the woody stems of the tobacco leaf.

It can well be seen what this will mean to the tobacco grower. He sells his product by the pound and a considerable portion of that poundage has been in the stems running through each tobacco leaf. Now that these stems are to go into cigarettes, and the synthetic product also is to contain much "sealed in" air which requires lesser quantities of the shredded material from which the cigarette is made, the market for his tobacco will be considerably curtailed.

The turn to these synthetic cigarettes is indicated by statistics I found at the Department of Agriculture a few days ago. Last year, in 1955, the cigarette output in this country was up 3 percent over the output of 1954. Yet the disappearance of cigarette tobacco stocks in the country was about 5 percent less. In other words, in making 3 percent more cigarettes we used 5 percent less tobacco.

Also significant is the fact that the so-called finest qualities of cigarette tobaccos are becoming more and more in surplus while the low grades of relatively lower cost to the cigarette manufacturers are becoming scarce. In past years the lower grades have been sold in export, a market which will not buy our finer and costlier grades. Now that cigarette makers are grabbing off the cheap tobacco, our export program will obviously have to be revised.

I do not like this whole picture, Mr. Speaker—from the standpoint of the tobacco growers, of the millions of people who smoke cigarettes and who are not being informed of this swing to synthetics, and the manner in which the transition is taking place. It seems to me that if the new synthetic leaf is a better product, if it is better for the smoker, more pleasant, more palatable, less harmful—then the cigarette manufacturer would be glad to tell the world about it all. Instead, there appears an air of hush, of mystery about the changeover.

I am going to strive to get this thing investigated. I hope the Food and Drug Administration closely examines these cigarettes to see if they contain harmful ingredients.

Incidentally, I understand the makers of this product are calling it homogenized tobacco. That is not my understanding of the meaning of that word, "homogenized." The dictionary says it means to make more nutritious or palatable a given product, such as milk, without adding any chemicals or foreign substance. Such is not the description of synthetic tobacco.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a companion bill to the one introduced yesterday by the senior Senator from Indiana, Senator CAPEHART. Permit me to emphasize that this legislation is supplemental to, not a substitute for, the pending farm bill soon to go to House-Senate conference. The pending farm bill, H. R. 12, will bring our productive capacity into alinement with a shrinking market. This may be a temporary necessity; farmers, however, have never wanted to prosper on a scarcity program. My bill would establish a new agency called the Industrial Agricultural Products Administration. This agency would have authority to coordinate and implement all the research facilities of the Federal Government and bring every potential of these facilities to bear on the problem of greater industrial utilization of the products of our farms. It is my hope that it will receive speedy and favorable consideration.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on the passage of the bill (H. R. 10004) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROLLCALL

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered. The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 18]

Baumhart	Grant	Powell
Boggs	Gray	Rivers
Bolton, Frances P.	Gwinn	Shelley
Boykin	Harrison, Nebr.	Taylor
Canfield	Hinshaw	Thompson, Mich.
Coudert	Holt	Walter
Diggs	Hope	Willis
Eberharter	Mollohan	
Gamble	Morgan	
	Moulder	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Four hundred and eight Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF HOUSE

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate during sessions of the House this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight tonight to file its report on a recent investigation of gas and oil leases on fish and wildlife preserves.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

TESTIMONIAL DINNER HONORS DAIRY LEADER DANIEL T. CARLSON

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 27, the Willmar Citizens Committee of Willmar, Minn., will honor an outstanding dairy leader, Mr. Daniel T. Carlson, at a testimonial dinner.

One of my very good friends, in inviting me to attend the dinner, describes it as follows:

> This dinner is planned that recognition may be given him for his many activities and contributions over a period of many years, in the line of duty and beyond, both in his home community and elsewhere.

All of agricultural America should join the people of Willmar in this testimonial. This is particularly true of dairy farmers and those in the dairy industry to whom Dan Carlson has rendered such magnificent service through the years.

He was one of the founders and first presidents of the American Dairy Association. Through the years he has helped lead that great dairy organization to its pinnacle of service to the dairy industry today. He has done probably as much as any other man in America to improve the quantity and quality of dairy products and to encourage their consumption by our people. Producers and consumers alike owe him a debt of recognition and gratitude.

He is now and has been for many years secretary of the Northwest Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers. He has contributed immeasurably to the manufacture and sale of this quality dairy product.

The people of Willmar and of Minnesota honor themselves when they give this recognition to the selfless service of Dan Carlson. We are proud to have him in our community. We are proud of all that he has done, and we know that his good work is not finished. We know that all of dairyland joins us in this salute to Daniel T. Carlson, outstanding citizen of Willmar, Minn., and dairy leader of America.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the Chamber on account of illness on February 8, 1956, during rollcall No. 7, on House Resolution 396, to disapprove the proposed sale of the Institute, W. Va., copolymer plant.

Had I been present I would have voted "nay."

Mr. Speaker, I was also absent from the Chamber because of the grounding of my airplane flight from Boston to Washington on Tuesday, March 13, 1956, during rollcall No. 16, regarding suspension of the rules and passage of H. R. 9166, to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate, and certain other rates.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

SCHOOL MILK AND BRUCELLOSIS ERADICATION PROGRAMS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8320) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school milk program and the brucellosis-eradication program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1898)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8320) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school milk program and the brucellosis eradication program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments to the text of the bill and to the title of the bill.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLAN ELLENDER,
OLIN D. JOHSTON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing positions of the two Houses on H. R. 8320, providing additional authority for the special school milk program and the brucellosis eradication program for the current fiscal year, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

As passed by the House the bill provided merely the authorization needed to continue these programs at their present level for the rest of this fiscal year. The authorization for the school milk program was increased from $50 million to $60 million. The authorization for the brucellosis eradication program was increased from $15 million to $17 million. The additional authorizations are required, and speedy action is desirable, because a number of States have virtually exhausted their allotments under existing authorizations.

To this emergency bill, designed only to provide funds for the balance of this fiscal year, the Senate added amendments of a semipermanent nature. The amendments added by the Senate would: (1) Extend the special school milk program through fiscal year 1958 and increase to $75 million the amount of Commodity Credit Corporation funds available after fiscal year 1956; (2) Extend the milk program to child care centers, nursery schools, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions; (3) Extend the brucellosis eradication program through fiscal years 1957 and 1958, and increase to $20 million the amount of CCC funds available therefor; (4) Extend for two additional years (from December 31, 1956) authority for the disposal of surplus dairy products through the Veterans' Administration and the Armed Services.

Some of the provisions of the Senate amendments are included in other legislation now under active consideration by the Congress. Other provisions of the Senate amendments requiring, as they do, a substantial deviation from the present emergency programs, or extending those programs in a semipermanent basis, merit more extensive consideration than they would receive by the Congress as amendments to this emergency legislation.

In view of these considerations, the Senate has receded from its position and the bill as agreed upon and reported by the committee of conference is identical with the bill passed by the House.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
THOMAS G. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House of Representatives.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read also.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to submit a parliamentary inquiry at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if this conference report is voted down, would it then be in order immediately thereafter for any Member to offer a motion that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the conference report is voted down, the Senate amendments would then be before the House for further action, and involved in that action a motion to recede and concur would be one of the parliamentary steps that could be employed.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if that motion should prevail, would it have the effect of sending the bill as amended in the other body to the White House for approval?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Assuming that the House was to take such action—and I am not passing any opinion on it at this time—there would be a definite conclusion of legislative action, and the answer to the gentleman's question would be in the affirmative.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of further parliamentary inquiry, if the conference report is voted up or if it is voted down and such a motion to recede and concur should prevail, action on the legislation would be finally completed today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the conference report is agreed to, action is concluded legislatively. On the other hand, if the conference report is rejected and the necessary motion is made and adopted, why, that would also conclude it. The answer to both of the gentleman's questions is in the affirmative.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, there is 1 hour's time for discussion on the conference report which is under the control of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman

from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. Now, I would like to request of the gentleman that he yield one-half of the time to this side of the aisle.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my friend that I do not know what requests will be made for the use of this time. I hope that we might expedite the vote on this report and not consume the entire full hour. I will say to my friend that I will be just as generous in yielding time to him as I possibly can.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me say to the gentleman that I have several requests here for time, and unless I get the full 30 minutes, it would be difficult to accommodate those who have talked with me about having time to say a few words.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, if the gentleman will permit me to present my statement, which I have not timed—and in the interest of time, I will read it; it is very brief—I can tell then how much time I have remaining for yielding to other Members.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not quite customary here to divide the time between the two sides?

Mr. COOLEY. I am not sure whether it is customary on a conference report or not. I doubt whether it is.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In my brief experience in the House, I have always found that both sides were fair in yielding one-half of the time to the other side.

Mr. COOLEY. I will be just as fair as circumstances will permit, and I am sure the gentleman knows I will.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman then yield me 30 minutes?

Mr. COOLEY. I will certainly say I will yield 15 minutes, and I will increase that if circumstances permit. I do not know of any unusual requests over here.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to have at least 3 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. I am sure that the gentleman from Indiana knows that I will see to it that he gets 3 minutes, even if I have to give him 3 minutes of my own time.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of time, I withdraw my request for the reading of the report, because I think I can cover that fully in my statement.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman now give me a definite time of the 1 hour that has been allotted to him? Will the gentleman give me 30 minutes?

Mr. COOLEY. No. I prefer not to do that until I finish and see what the demands are on both sides.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman give me 25 minutes?

Mr. COOLEY. I will give the gentleman 15 minutes and compromise on that for the time being.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman make it 20 minutes? Will the gentleman yield me 20 minutes?

Mr. COOLEY. Not now. I will have to go on with my statement.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, then, I am certain of 15 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago this month the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture in support of the legislation which became the Agricultural Act of 1954. The bill sent up by the Department contained provisions affecting many commodities. It did not, however, contain any provisions respecting price supports for milk or providing any type of relief for the dairy industry which was just then facing the serious economic shock of having the support level for its products reduced from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity.

Feeling strongly that some steps needed to be taken to relieve the distress of dairy farmers, our committee—the Committee on Agriculture—wrote into the bill before reporting it to the House several provisions which originated in the committee itself designed to improve the situation for the dairy industry.

One of these was authority for an extensive school milk program. On the theory that one of the best possible methods of disposing of dairy surpluses is to make them available in the form of fluid milk to the children of the Nation, the committee authorized the use of up to $50 million annually of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out an expanded school milk program. The program was authorized to run through this fiscal year.

A second program for the relief of dairy farmers originated by the committee and written into that bill was authority for an expanded brucellosis-eradication program. Because this program was designed not only to improve dairy herds but as an additional means of stabilizing milk production, CCC funds were authorized also to be used for this program in the amount of not to exceed $15 million a year. This program, too, was authorized to continue through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

Seldom has the hard-earned wisdom and foresight of the House Committee on Agriculture been more quickly and effectively vindicated than in the case of these two programs. They have met the widest and most enthusiastic acceptance and have, I believe, contributed substantially to the welfare of the dairy industry and the Nation as a whole.

In the price support bill, H. R. 12, which the committee reported and the House passed almost a year ago, these two programs were extended for an additional fiscal year and the amount of CCC funds authorized to be expended annually for the school milk program was increased from $50 million to $75 million.

Last January officials of the Department of Agriculture reported to the committee that both the school milk program and the brucellosis program are proving so popular that a number of States were exceeding their anticipated operations and would exhaust their allotment of funds before the end of the fiscal year. Believing it to be the intent of Congress that all the funds which could be efficiently used for these programs be made available, the committee scheduled hearings and reported the bill, H. R. 8320, making additional funds available for these programs for this fiscal year—$10 million additional for school milk, and $2 million additional for the brucellosis program.

At the time of these hearings the question of providing in this same bill for an extension of these programs beyond the current fiscal year was considered. It was the recommendation of various witnesses and the sense of the subcommittee dealing with the bill that it should be confined to this year and that provisions relating to future years should be dealt with separately as has been done in H. R. 12.

In spite of the earnest feeling of many dairy people and their representatives that H. R. 8320 should be treated as an emergency measure with the single objective of providing adequate funds for these two programs this fiscal year, and not encumbered with anything of an even slightly controversial nature, the bill was substantially amended in the Senate.

The Senate not only took the unnecessary action of adding to H. R. 8320 a 2-year extension of the school milk and brucellosis programs, it also added a 2-year extension of the authority to dispose of surplus dairy products through the Veterans' Administration and the armed services. Besides this, another Senate amendment would change the whole scope and administration of the school milk program by including within that program nonprofit nursery schools, child care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions.

At it own initiative the Department of Agriculture has written to me pointing out the difficulties of administering this summer camp provision and suggesting that it not be included in H. R. 8320. The Department points out that its present school-milk program is administered in the States entirely through State departments of education with a minimum of Federal personnel and Federal supervision at the State and local level. There is no such organization in the States set up to deal with nursery schools and summer camps so that a milk program for such institutions would have to be operated on the basis of direct Federal supervision and control.

It is assumed by some, Mr. Speaker, that there is no matter of controversy whatever involved in a 2-year extension of the school-milk and brucellosis programs. This is not the case. While there is, I believe, unanimous sentiment among House Members that these meritorious programs should be continued, there is a substantial and fundamental difference of opinion as to how the funds are to be provided if these programs are going to be continued year after year on a permanent or semipermanent basis. There are many Members who believe that it is not good legislation to bypass the Committees on Appropriations by authorizing the use year after

year of CCC funds on a continuing program. They believe that if this is to be a permanent or semipermanent program, the Department of Agriculture should appear annually before the Appropriations Committees to justify their use of funds and to receive a regular appropriation for the program, just as is done for the school-lunch program and for many other similar activities.

There are also those who believe—and I am one who joins in this belief—that it is unfair to farmers and to our farm programs to make a practice of dipping into the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation for funds to carry on the programs such as these which are essentially for the welfare of the Nation as a whole. No matter how meritorious such programs may be, it is neither good accounting nor good policy to charge them up to the cost of our farm programs, as will inevitably be done if we continue to take these funds year after year from the assets of the CCC.

For these reasons, if for none other, Mr. Speaker, it seems obvious that the proper course for the House is to accept this conference report, make available at once the money which is needed right now for the school-milk program and the brucellosis campaign and to provide for extension of these worthy programs in other legislation where they can be more thoroughly considered strictly on their own merits.

I want to add just one comment. I do have a long letter from the Department of Agriculture pointing out the difficulties in administering the Senate provisions with reference to these other agencies and activities. To disagree to this conference report and to instruct the conferees to accept the Senate amendments would send to the White House a bill in final form which Mr. Benson and his associates say they cannot possibly administer. All we are suggesting is that you approve this conference report, which has already been approved in the other body. The Senate conferees readily receded from their amendments. We can send this bill to the White House, and the money will be made available today.

Mr. Speaker, the letter from the Department of Agriculture to which I have referred is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1956.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: This is in reference to a provision of H. R. 8320 relating to the special school-milk program.

In addition to authorizing an increase in the use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds for the current fiscal year, the bill passed by the Senate provides for the continuation of the school-milk program through 1958 and for the extension of the program to include child-care centers and other nonprofit institutions devoted to the care of underprivileged children. There are certain considerations with respect to this latter provision which we wish to bring to the attention of your committee and the conferees who may be named on the bill.

There is no doubt that there is room for increases in milk consumption among underprivileged children being served by child-care centers, settlement houses, and other similar nonprofit institutions. To reach these children out of school hours, however, would require a different approach than that now being used under the special school-milk program, and would result in a sizable increase in Federal personnel and Federal administrative expense.

It was possible to put the special school-milk program rapidly into operation because State educational agencies were able and willing to assume very substantial administrative responsibilities for its operation. They accept schools for participation, pay the schools' claims for reimbursement from funds advanced by the Department of Agriculture, and generally supervise the operation of the program in individual schools. These State educational agencies would not have the authority to assume such program responsibilities for public and private child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and other institutions for the care and training of children. Therefore, to develop a program that could be put into operation nationwide within a reasonable time, it would be necessary for the Department to deal directly with all such centers and institutions in the various States.

The school-milk program is still authorized as an additional measure of price support for dairy products. Therefore, we do not feel it would be practical to undertake to develop the Federal administrative organization that would be required to extend the current program to outlets other than elementary and secondary schools. If, at any time in the future, the Congress should consider the merits of authorizing a school-milk program on a permanent basis, we believe it would then be highly desirable to consider extending the program to include child-care centers and other such institutions devoted to the care of underprivileged children.

We are sending this same letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. PETERSON,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman mentioned that we ought to have direct appropriations for the dairy stabilization program. I am wondering if the gentleman would agree to the same theory when it comes to taking care of wheat and cotton and the losses that are had on these other commodities? Does the gentleman just want to single out the dairy stabilization program?

Mr. COOLEY. My friend knows whenever there is a deficit in the Commodity Credit Corporation funds the matter is presented to the appropriate committee, the Appropriations Committee, and they then have to justify every item in their budget request.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. For the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct, but what about the school-milk program?

Mr. COOLEY. The difference is that those commodity programs my friend referred to are specifically and definitely farm programs, but this is in addition, a city program. Every school child in America participates or can participate in this program.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When we give to foreign countries and to the people of foreign countries, then the gentleman would rather do that than to give to American school children?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows that he is making an erroneous statement.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am asking the question.

Mr. COOLEY. No, sir; these commodities are available to the school children of America and the gentleman knows that the idea of the school lunch program originated in our committee room, and the gentleman knows that the school milk program originated in our committee room. I can think of no reason why the gentleman from Minnesota should try to bring the foreign-aid program into this discussion. It is certainly foreign to the matter under consideration. The gentleman also knows that all the members of our committee from areas not primarily engaged in dairying have been among the very best friends these programs have had. I certainly do not believe that the gentleman from Minnesota wants to charge the cost of the school lunch program, including fluid milk, and the cost of agricultural commodities which have gone into our foreign-aid program to the farmers of the country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows also that every man on that committee is intensely interested in this program and in the welfare not only of farmers but of the schoolchildren who benefit by the program.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Why does the gentleman want to single out this?

Mr. COOLEY. My position is thoroughly consistent in this House. I think the farmers of America have had to bear the burden to a large degree of our foreign-aid program, and certainly they ought not to have that burden thrown on the back of the farm program.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the gentleman also about the matter of financing. My understanding is that the House bill, H. R. 12, extended the school-milk program for 1 year and that in the Senate the bill, H. R. 12, was amended and when it was sent back here in conference, it was extended for 2 years. The only item in disagreement in the major bill is the question of whether it will be extended for 1 year or 2 years, and there is no disagreement in the bill today on the matter of financing the school milk program; am I not correct?

Mr. COOLEY. If I may interrupt the gentleman, I will say this for the benefit of the House. Our committee staff is making a complete analysis of the Senate bill. I understand it is a very complex and a very controversial measure. We are going to work on it just as expeditiously as circumstances will permit. With reference to the item that you mentioned, the same objectionable amendment which was put into this bill in the Senate is also in H. R. 12, but I have the hope that we can find some way to make this milk program available to summer camps and other agencies.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think you agree with me on the matter of the financing of the milk program which is the question which the gentleman now raises. It is not an item in controversy because it is not in disagreement between the House bill, H. R. 12, which was passed last year and the Senate amendments which were adopted just the other day. So that has been taken out of the picture. Now I would like to ask the gentleman a further question.

Mr. COOLEY. But let us not leave the matter there. We are providing here for an emergency situation—$10 million for milk and $2 million for the brucellosis program. If we agree to extend it, we should only provide a 1-year extension instead of 2 years, and thereafter require the Department to justify all items before the Appropriations Committee and not permit the use of CCC funds in the manner that such funds are now being used.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is the only disagreement. But, there is no disagreement on the financing.

Mr. COOLEY. It should only be extended for 1 year and let the appropriate committees of the Congress receive and consider the recommendations of the Department and the justification for all items.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. A question, if the gentleman will permit, with regard to this enlargement of the school-milk program to the child-care centers—the gentleman could have satisfied that situation, if he was so determined that that was such an inadvisable action by simply accepting the amendments of the other body with regard to the extension of the school-milk program and the brucellosis program, and leaving the other item out.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Why was that not done by the conferees?

Mr. COOLEY. It was not done for a very obvious reason.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. My understanding is that the motion was presented in the conference to strike out that particular section, and it was not agreed to by the House conferees.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think that motion was made. The other body made the motion to recede from their amendments. This money is needed and needed now. The adoption of the amendments of the other body will involve controversial provisions which have not been deleted. I may say to my friend that even if the motion was made to delete it, it has not been deleted and it cannot be administered. Again, it is embarrassing his own Secretary of Agriculture who in his letter to me said that it cannot be administered.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I know the gentleman is concerned about not embarrassing the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not want to embarrass him unnecessarily.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. But I still raise the question why, if the gentleman thought this was so important, did he not agree in the conference—I would like to have that brought out—and then agree to the other parts that were not agreed to in the conference.

Mr. COOLEY. Frankly, I must say to my friend that, honestly, I do not recall that that motion was made to strike out that one section. But, it might have been.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sure that people will recollect I made a motion in the conference committee to agree to the Senate amendment, but to strike out amendment No. 2 on page 2.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman will agree that the motion did not prevail?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But I made the motion. The motion was not put by the chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. I was not chairman of the conference.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The only motion that was made and put by the chairman—and a motion is not before the committee unless it is put by the chairman—was that the Senate recede. That motion was voted on and was carried in the Senate by both the Senate and House conferees. There was but one motion that was ever submitted and that was a motion to recede from the Senate amendments.

Mr. COOLEY. Recede from all amendments.

Mr. POAGE. All amendments, and that was carried.

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to get the record straight. I made a motion to the House conferees that we agree to the Senate amendments on this bill with one exception, and that motion was not put by the chairman of the House delegation.

Mr. COOLEY. Perhaps the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Is my recollection correct that this measure was originally passed by the House of Representatives by a unanimous vote?

Mr. COOLEY. My recollection is that it was passed by the committee unanimously and passed by the House unanimously.

Mr. HALLECK. And that indicates that everybody is in favor of the school milk program and the brucellosis program.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has made a statement of the kind of program he favored. Has the gentleman and his committee taken any action looking to the enactment of legislation that would provide for an extension that was in the Senate amendment?

Mr. COOLEY. A colleague of mine told me a moment ago that he had introduced a bill to take care of any eventuality which might arise. But there is a possibility that in the big farm bill that can be worked out; a plan can be worked out dealing with these summer camps and these other agencies.

Mr. HALLECK. That is what I was coming to. The provisions of the Senate amendments are contained in the big farm bill that is coming over here for action on this side?

Mr. COOLEY. I understand so.

Mr. HALLECK. Is the gentleman going to proceed with his committee to enact separate legislation to which you have referred in your statement for this continuation, or are you going to undertake to rely upon working it out in connection with the big farm bill? Of course the gentleman has just said that the latter is to be his course.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. I say again, we are going to move just as rapidly as we can in an effort to compose our differences and clear up any complications involved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, this question of continuing a program for 2 years that provides good, healthy milk for the schoolchildren of the United States is one that should not be mixed up in politics. These are American children. We tried, in our committee in 1954, to give Americans the benefits of this surplus milk program.

There are more than 33 million schoolchildren in the United States. About half of them in 62,000 schools are getting this surplus milk which is being paid for in large part by the Federal Government. That program is to be continued for another 2 years if there is any way that we can enact our desire here, and the House has already spoken on this once in 1954 and again last year.

I feel that the move that we take here now to reject the conference report and agree to the Senate amendments is the better course to take rather than to get this question of milk and dairy products mixed up in the general farm bill over which there is to be a long conference. Let us pass this bill now and avoid protracted discussion in connection with this important food product.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield briefly for a question.

Mr. BELCHER. If the big farm bill should be long delayed in the House or if for some reason it should suffer a veto, then there would be no extension of this particular program; therefore the necessity for this bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That program would be out unless we enact it here; and I am not a good enough prophet or crystal gazer to tell you what actually will happen to the big farm bill. We may end up without any.

Mr. BELCHER. At any rate it may be quite a while before we get it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It will undoubtedly be several weeks, because our conference committee has not met and probably will not meet until after

we can analyze the bill in our Committee on Agriculture. I do not know what the outcome will be.

I want to take this bill out of that discussion, because it deals with a very important subject, the stabilization of our great dairy industry.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. What I want to ask the gentleman—and I am not too familiar with this situation—the effect of tying this problem into the general farm bill——

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is what I just said, that it was not desirable to tie it into the general farm bill.

Mr. KEATING. Because that might mean that it would not then be feasible to extend this school-milk program.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has stated it correctly.

There are 19 States in this country which are already short of money to carry on the program up to the 30th of June. Those States, for the benefit of the membership, are: California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin.

That is why this emergency money was provided in H. R. 8320 that we reported and which we passed here on February 1. That was to take care of those particular States which were running short of money and could not carry through until June 30. We allocated $10 million to carry on that program. They may not use it all, but if they do not use it all then it stays in the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. If we follow the course suggested by the committee and compose our differences in conference on the big farm bill and the big farm bill should be vetoed, then we lose the program, do we not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then we lose the program. The gentleman has stated the facts.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. To reemphasize the point made by the gentleman from Connecticut, if this conference report is adopted the school-milk program will be tied in to the controversial agriculture bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DONOVAN. If the President vetoes the controversial agriculture bill it means that the school program will go out too.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct.

Mr. DONOVAN. And would be ended unless we passed another school-milk bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Certainly. And I do not know of anyone in this Chamber or the membership of both Houses who disagrees with the idea that this program of disposing of our surplus milk and dairy products not only to the 33 million boys and girls in our public schools, but also to the men in the Army, in the Navy, and the Marine Corps——

Mr. SHORT. And the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And the Veterans' Administration, to disabled veterans, to people on relief. I might point out that there are 2,700,000 needy people in this country who are unemployed and now receive these surplus dairy products together with other food products.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. May I say that I have been advised there are bills now pending before our committee dealing with these two programs. In the event the programs are in a bill that happens to be vetoed by the President, I can assure the House I will immediately call a meeting of our committee and report one of those bills out. It will not meet with any opposition, I know.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman for that assurance, but I hope we can solve the issue here today so that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will not have to devote his valuable time in our committee to reporting out other legislation when we can clean up the entire matter here today by voting down this conference report and agreeing to the Senate amendments, thereby sending the bill to the White House this afternoon.

Mr. DONOVAN. In other words, the sum and substance of the whole business is we are playing a little cute politics at the expense of the schoolchildren who need milk.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would not go that far because I do not believe any Member of this House, on either side of the aisle, would resort to political manipulation when it comes to dealing with schoolchildren, especially when it comes to the American schoolchildren, or the American boys in our Armed Forces who are scattered all over the world or with reference to people in need in this country. It may be strategy rather than political manipulation.

Mr. DONOVAN. I accept the gentleman's viewpoint in changing the word.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give my colleagues the benefit of any ideas that I may have. Their views are laudable, they want to take care of the American boys and girls in the schools of our own country, I know.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If I understood the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture correctly, he said that if the big farm bill bogs down and the extension for 2 years is not passed in connection with that measure, he would immediately get busy to enact the same legislation in a separate bill. If this extension is good, if the 2-year extension is good, then why not vote it today and have it over with today, then we will know the program is in effect?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman want to concur in what the gentleman from Indiana said?

Mr. COOLEY. No. The gentleman from Indiana is very smart and wise. I do not say that we would enact exactly the same legislation, but we would consider the bills in our committee dealing with these two programs. I feel certain that the brucellosis program and the fluid-milk program will be reported immediately and without opposition.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just as quickly as the wheat bill.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture where he is going to find time to do all this. I had the opportunity of reading the papers recently and I note that the gentleman is on record as to what he is going to do in the matter of a conference on the big bill. If the gentleman is going to be so busy on the big bill, he is not going to have much time to attend to matters like this which can be taken care of very adequately this afternoon. The gentleman has a terrific job ironing out the difficulties in the other bill. As I understand from the report in the press this morning, the gentleman has laid out a plan and I am hopeful that pattern can be followed, beginning tomorrow, so that we may have the big bill back out of conference next week and have something done about it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield me 10 additional minutes?

Mr. COOLEY. Not yet.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then please answer the gentleman in your own time.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Agriculture deemed it advisable to amend H. R. 8320 by including the existing provisions of law dealing with the surplus of milk to the school-lunch program, to the armed services, to the needy people in this country, to veterans' hospitals. They put them in and they did it unanimously in the Senate. They sent the bill over here and then probably on account of what we might call military strategy or some other kind of strategy, the Senate bill was disagreed to. The chairman deemed it advisable to send the bill to conference. I tried to urge on him to agree to the Senate amendments. Well, it was over 20 days ago that the bill came over here. He did not listen to me, and I did not expect him to, because he has his own plan of operation. But, we could have avoided all of this today if we had agreed to the Senate amendments, as I proposed to do, and now we can do the

same thing today by voting down the conference report and take the motion I will make later urging that we agree to the Senate amendments.

The Senate did adopt another amendment which has not received very careful study over here, and that was an amendment providing for the use of fluid milk by children in nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps and similar nonprofit institutions.

The Secretary of Agriculture has stated that it would be difficult to administer the Senate amendment from Washington. In a letter which I will put into the RECORD the Secretary of Agriculture said that if it is administered through the States, it can be made workable. In order to place some legislative intent in the debate that we are conducting here on this particular amendment, it is my purpose to point out that the programs called for in this amendment for child centers and the nonprofit groups listed in amendment No. 2 on page 2 of H. R. 8320 shall be administered through the respective States. The Secretary says in his letter that this can be worked out, and I am sure that there will not be any difficulty over that question.

The following letter from the Secretary of Agriculture dated March 19, 1956 to the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., clearly points out my intent and that of the Department of Agriculture that the Senate amendment above referred to will be administered by State agencies in cooperation with the Federal Government:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C. March 19, 1956.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MARTIN: This is in reference to our letter of February 15, 1956, to the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee concerning provisions of H. R. 8320 relating to the special school-milk program.

We again want to state our full support of legislation to extend the school-milk program through June 30, 1958, with an authorized maximum annual expenditure of $75 million during the fiscal years 1957 and 1958. The purpose of this letter is to further clarify our letter of February 15 concerning the provision in the Senate version of the bill which would extend the program to child care centers, summer camps, and other nonprofit institutions "devoted to the care and training of underprivileged children on a public welfare or charitable basis."

As indicated in our February 15 letter, we recognize that there is room for increased milk consumption among underprivileged children. We feel that State agency participation in a program of this type is important to achieve full effectiveness and to hold down administrative costs. Therefore, if legislation providing for the continuation of the special milk program does include its extension to institutions serving underprivileged children, we sincerely hope that the legislative record will indicate that it is the desire and intention of the Congress that such an extension of the program should, so far as possible, be administered through State agencies similar to the manner in which the school-lunch, surplus food donation and special school-milk programs are most generally handled. However, we wish to emphasize that the extension of this program is of uppermost importance and that the Department will devise means of administering the program as provided in H. R. 8320.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think this is a very important point that the gentleman mentioned, particularly in view of the statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina. Do I understand the gentleman is saying that the Secretary himself has said that he can—although there are some administrative problems in this broadening of the program to these child centers and so forth—live with that problem and that it can be resolved and that he is not posing any objection to the adoption of that proposition at this time?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct, and so stated in his letter which I have included as part of my statement.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Do I understand further that he says it is of more importance also that the matter of these two programs be extended than is the administrative difficulty that might be encountered in this one little aspect?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct.

Let me reiterate or restate what I stated here a few minutes ago. There are more than 2.7 million people, some on relief, some of whom are unemployed at the present time, who are getting the benefit of this food surplus disposal program. The State receiving the most is the State of Pennsylvania, because of the difficulties up there in the coal areas. They are getting the surplus dairy products from the Government through distribution by a State agency just like they have in every other State.

Let me point out further that every State in the Union is under the school-milk surplus disposal program. All of them have the benefit of this program. They are all eligible to receive surplus milk. Last year more than 500 million half pints of milk were distributed to the schoolchildren of this country. It is a good program. It is one that should not be interrupted as long as we have these surplus commodities on our hands in this country.

In conclusion, let me again urge that the conference report be rejected, and then vote favorably for my motion to agree to the Senate amendments to H. R. 8320.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENNETT of Florida). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina yield me 5 additional minutes?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes. I have to yield to other members of the committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I wanted the time so that I may yield some time to another Member.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield to the gentleman for him to yield to somebody else.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman and I reserve the 2 minutes the gentleman has yielded me.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished friend on the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the question which we face today is indeed a very simple one. The question is whether or not the school-milk and brucellosis programs should be extended for an additional 2 years by our action today. A vote this morning for the conference report is a vote not to extend these programs for an additional 2 years. A vote to reject the conference report is a vote to extend the school-milk and brucellosis programs for 2 years. Rejection of the conference report by the House will pave the way for preferential motion immediately following the vote on the conference report to concur in the Senate amendments and thus send H. R. 8320 to the President with the extensions of these two important programs for an additional 2 years.

A vote for the adoption of the conference report by the House will send H. R. 8320 to the President without these two important extensions.

Neither rejection or adoption of the conference report will affect the emergency funds needed by the school-milk and brucellosis programs to carry them through the remainder of this fiscal year.

The parliamentary procedure of rejecting the conference report and accepting the Senate amendments is the only one available to positively insure that the school-milk and brucellosis programs are extended for fiscal years 1957 and 1958. It is important that these extensions become law as soon as possible in order for each of the 48 States to make its school-milk plans for the new school year and for each State department of agriculture to proceed with plans for its brucellosis program for the next fiscal year. I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of the House receding from its position and accepting the Senate amendments.

The House passed H. R. 8320 unanimously February 1, 1956. This bill provided for additional funds to carry school-milk and brucellosis programs to June 30.

The Senate passed H. R. 8320 unanimously on February 8, 1956. As passed by the Senate, the bill included the additional funds plus Senate amendments to extend the school-milk and brucellosis-eradication programs and also the veterans' hospitals and Armed Forces milk programs for 2 more years—to 1958.

The conference committee at the insistence of the Democrat House managers has reported the bill back to the House with the Senate amendments stricken from the bill.

This course was insisted upon by Democrat House Members of the conference committee in spite of the fact that the House last year in H. R. 12—the general

farm bill that is still pending in the Congress—approved a 1-year extension of the school-milk program and a 2-year extension of the brucellosis eradication program.

I introduced legislation early in the 2d session of the 84th Congress providing emergency funds for this fiscal year and introduced legislation early in the 1st session of the 84th Congress providing for the continuation of the school-milk and brucellosis programs for fiscal years 1957 and 1958. This bill with the Senate amendments incorporates the provisions of the legislation as it was originally introduced by me.

The school-milk program was developed by our committee as an additional and beneficial means of providing price supports on dairy products. I felt that no finer use could be made of our abundant milk supply than its increased consumption, as fluid milk, by our schoolchildren. I also felt that rather than depend solely upon the purchase and storage approach, the increased efforts should be made to move more milk directly into consumption.

The actual results under the program are more than living up to our expectations. By mid-December of 1955, more than 62,000 schools throughout the country were in the program. This was more schools than are now in the school-lunch program, which has been operating since 1946. Total fluid milk usage under the program this year is expected to be about 800 million pounds.

The Department of Agriculture has reported that, in a study covering more than 1,400 individual schools in 15 States, sales of milk under the program in October 1955 were 80 percent above sales in October 1953. This increase was over and above any increase in milk sold as a part of a complete lunch in these schools.

I feel certain that every member of the House wants this program to continue its fine contribution—both to the expansion of dairy markets and to the health of our children.

This legislation as it passed the Senate included a provision which was not in the legislation as introduced by me. The Senate has added an amendment to the bill which would extend the program to child-care centers, summer camps, and other nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of underprivileged children on a public welfare or charitable basis. It is my hope that this provision can be administered through State agencies similar to the manner in which the school-lunch and surplus-food donations, and special school-milk programs are currently being handled. Certainly this was the intent of the Senate when the amendment was adopted and would clearly be interpreted as the intent of the House of Representatives should we succeed in concurring in the Senate amendments here today.

It is my hope that a majority of the Members will vote against the conference report and then vote for the motion to concur in the Senate amendments. In this way not only will the emergency funds be provided, but final action will be taken to assure continuation of this program for the next 2 years.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the 2 statements that have just been made, I should like to read 2 or 3 very brief excerpts from the letter from the Department. One is this:

> These State educational agencies would not have the authority to assume such program responsibilities for public and private child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and other institutions for the care and training of children. Therefore, to develop a program that could be put into operation nationwide within a reasonable time, it would be necessary for the Department to deal directly with all such centers and institutions in the various States.
>
> The school-milk program is still authorized as an additional measure of price support for dairy products. Therefore, we do not feel it would be practical to undertake to develop the Federal administrative organization that would be required to extend the current program to outlets other than elementary and secondary schools.

That is the statement from the Department of Agriculture in a letter signed by the Acting Secretary, Mr. E. L. Peterson, dated February 15, 1956.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is dated February 15th?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This letter from the Secretary of Agriculture after Mr. Peterson and others made an investigation states that they can administer it through State agencies and that it will not be difficult to administer the program.

Mr. COOLEY. What is the date of the letter the gentleman has?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. March 19th.

Mr. COOLEY. To whom is it addressed?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is addressed to my very distinguished and able leader, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., who gave it to me.

Mr. COOLEY. But it did not come to the House Committee on Agriculture or to the chairman of that committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry that they did not send the gentleman a copy of it.

Mr. COOLEY. Does he say he can now administer it? He said to me he could not do it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He said "State agencies."

Mr. COOLEY. What State agencies? There are no State agencies; that is what he says here.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He has found that there are State agencies.

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, I see, and he has so advised the minority leader, but he has not advised the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite obvious from the proceedings here that there is probably more back of this than meets the eye. If the chairman of the committee had felt such great concern about those provisions, which he says are of minor consequence and importance in the overall picture, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] pointed out, the House conferees had it well within their power to make whatever adjustment was necessary.

The issue here is simple, and let us understand it. The issue here today is, Are you going to vote to continue these vital programs or are you going to vote against continuing them? You have no assurance and can have no assurance that at some future time you will have an opportunity to vote for the 2-year extension. There is no question in my mind that the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House want to vote for the 2-year extension. Here is your chance to do it. If you believe in these programs, and I say we all believe in them, because this measure passed, I think, under unanimous consent, and went through with an almost unanimous vote in the other body, then why pass up the opportunity to vote for the 2-year extension?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I have only 3 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. I will give the gentleman an extra minute.

The gentleman said that the conferees could have worked this extension out in conference, but I tell my friend that is not entirely accurate because we had no such opportunity. Even if the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] had made the motion, and it was never submitted to the conference, it could not have been considered. The chairman of the committee of conference entertained the motion to recede from the Senate amendments, and there the matter ended, so we had no opportunity.

Mr. HALLECK. I am just a little sorry that the gentleman pressed that point because the great alacrity with which the conferees from the other body defended their position, again, I say, just points to the proposition that there is more here than meets the eye. Of course, if the conferees had gone in there, each charged with supporting the position of his own body, then there certainly would have been ample opportunity for the House conferees to take out these provisions to which they now object but which I say in the light of subsequent evidence and determination are not at all bad in this bill but on the contrary are good.

Let us understand this further thing. The people of this country like these programs. If you vote against them today we are going to do what we can to see that the people who are interested know just what has happened. Everybody considers it is a good program. The chairman considers it is a good program. Then, why fool around with it any longer? Why not vote for it today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman. May I ask the gentleman a question. What is here involved that does not meet the eye?

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman want me to answer that? Let me say just this—that the consideration of the farm bill in the other body started out with

a sound measure and has resulted in the greater hodgepodge of contradictions and unworkable provisions that I have ever seen. The gentleman from North Carolina speaks of the unworkability of certain provisions of the Senate amendments. May I say that they are workable compared to some of the things put in. The chairman of the committee says, "Let us put this off today, and later on if we have to, we will do something about it." May I say advisedly at this point, the gentleman from North Carolina says frankly that he is relying on the provisions in the big bill coming over from the other body to provide for the continuation of these programs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman very much. May I say to the gentleman that he is being generous today as always.

Mr. Speaker, to continue—if you rely on that, that is a long road because unless he and his conferees do a real job cleaning up that measure, as it comes from the other body, I predict it will never become a law. In other words, he promises action at a later time. I have a deep conviction that this great 2d session of the 84th Congress can wind up it work come June 30, that we can adjourn and go home and get ready to go to our conventions. I do not know whom you are going to nominate, but I think we know whom we are going to nominate. Actually, what the chairman is suggesting is to let us put this off until some time in June. If you keep on putting off enough things until late in June, you are either going to let a lot of them fall by the wayside or we will never adjourn by June 30. Why not meet this head on and do what we ought to do? We have never had a chance to vote here for the 2-year extension. Now you do have a chance to vote for the 2-year extension. Let us prove that we are for these programs and vote down this conference report. The gentleman from Minnesota will be recognized to offer a motion to recede and concur to the Senate provisions. Then, the bill will go to the White House and the brucellosis program and the school-milk program will be continued for 2 years as it ought to be continued. In that way, we can then go on with other business that ought to be taken up.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, shortly after Congress reconvened last January the President, in his message on farm legislation, recommended a 2-year extension of the school milk and brucellosis programs and an increase in the dollar authorizations.

Since that time the House has passed H. R. 8320 which increased the authorizations for the programs but only for the current fiscal year and without any provisions for extension beyond June 30.

However, the Senate on 2 recent occasions voted unanimously for a 2-year extension of the programs, together with increased funds. In taking this action the other body demonstrated a sound, forward-looking approach and one which the House might well emulate today.

For unless one believes that both programs should be discontinued at the close of the present fiscal year, and I know of no one who does, how can he logically vote against the motion of Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, the gentleman from Minnesota? How can anyone with a serious concern for the welfare of our dairy farmers and that of American youth generally choose a program of brief duration in preference to one which offers a constructive and long-range approach? How can anyone deny the time-tested validity of the old adage that a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush? How can anyone be certain that a vote against the Andresen motion will not result in a termination of the school-milk and brucellosis-control programs at the end of the current fiscal year?

One thing does seem certain to me, however. If the motion to reject the conference report is lost we shall soon find that the school-milk and brucellosis-eradication programs have become political footballs—to be kicked around at will; that we are playing politics with the physical well-being of millions of American schoolchildren, and may have jeopardized, if not completely wrecked, the efforts of thousands of dairy farmers as well as those of State and Federal agencies in the fight against the scourge of brucellosis.

For if the provisions of H. R. 8320 which, insofar as I know, are acceptable to everyone, are included in the controversial omnibus farm bill, one need not be a prophet to anticipate the great pressures which will be exercised in support of or in opposition to some of the provisions in the farm bill. In order to retain the school-milk program those who represent urban districts may find it necessary to support some features of the general farm bill which are highly objectionable to their constituents and this may be true, to a lesser degree, in the case of those who have important agricultural interests in their States.

If we are going to consider legislative proposals of such vital and far-reaching importance as H. R. 8320 on a strictly political basis, I am sure the American people will have just cause for resentment and will not hesitate to express their feelings in plain and emphatic language.

Most of us have received mail expressing serious concern at the failure of Congress to take steps which would assure a continuation of the school-milk program. We have also heard from those with responsibility for the administration of the brucellosis eradication program, pointing out the urgent need of additional funds if the program is to be continued.

Only this morning I received a telegram from the Vermont State veterinarian informing me that Federal funds for indemnity and veterinary hire will be exhausted by April 1, and that the blood-testing program will be halted notwithstanding the fact that 3,000 positive milk test herds need blood tests.

No one can deny that we are faced with an emergency situation, but it is an emergency which will continue far beyond the close of the present fiscal year. If the motion to reject the conference report and a subsequent one to accede to the Senate recommendation of amendments carry, the bill will go to the White House and become law almost immediately.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that a simple, down-to-earth, straightforward, and openhanded approach to the problems which confront us as a nation is much more desirable and effective than political astuteness and subterfuge, however brilliantly executed.

We now have an opportunity to vote for the school-milk and brucellosis-eradication programs on the basis of proven merit alone. It is my hope that we shall take advantage of this opportunity.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately there are certain things which I think are important to all Members of the House, which for some reason or other we cannot get a very good answer to—and that is why the House conferees, particularly the Democratic House conferees, refused to accept the Senate amendments extending the school milk and the brucellosis program. They tell us the reason they did not was because the Senators came in and made a motion first. If you can conceive of anybody just automatically receding without having a good reason for doing so, there is something wrong someplace. I will tell you why they receded, if there is any question about it. All you have to do is to read the debate in the other body of March 14, when the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the other body addressed that body and said:

> Unless the Senate agrees to let the long-range program (namely the extension) be settled in the future, as a part of the consideration of the general farm bill, we shall not in my humble judgment be able to get the House to provide funds for the remainder of this fiscal year.

In other words, it was clear that there was a club over the heads of somebody some place. They said the only way they would get the emergency funds was by yielding. The Senate itself had, before this conference and by a unanimous vote, voted to exceed these 2 programs for 2 additional years. The other body only accepted the conference report because of the absence of two members who had announced themselves as being opposed to the report. If they had been present and voted the way they advised they would vote, the conference report would have been rejected in the Senate.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman agrees with me that the House conferees, finding themselves in the situation you have just described, had no opportunity to accept the Senate amendments?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I admit no such thing. I am saying the impression was given to the Senators, "Either you make this motion to recede or there will be no funds available for the period from now until June 30." That is the club that was over the heads of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, of course, I was on the conference. Certainly no one went to that conference with a blackjack nor with a horse pistol. We went there to meet our colleagues in the other body in an effort to compose our differences. At that time I had in my possession this letter from the Department of Agriculture saying in effect that at least one of the Senate amendments could not be administered. But, before we even had an opportunity to have one motion come from the House conferees, someone made a motion on the Senate side to recede from all the Senate amendments. That motion was carried and the conference was over and the conference report you have before you was signed and is now presented to you. It has already been adopted in the Senate. The Senate has concluded its labors on this bill. All we need to do is accept this conference report and send it to the White House.

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, when I introduced this bill I never dreamed it would create so much controversy.

Thirteen years ago when I first came to this body I often found myself, much too frequently I must now confess, voting with my friends on the other side of the aisle. I disagreed with quite a bit of the New Deal and some of the political maneuvering used to put it over. Later on, I found that the Republicans themselves were quite adept at playing politics; and further that they were very largely New Dealers, too. Early last year one of my good friends on the Republican side, in a personal conversation, was very critical of a speech I had made the year before. He said it was an intemperate speech. It was, and I sort of apologized for it. It was prompted by the fact that the Republicans had run out on some of their campaign promises to my farmers and on TVA. I also told him that I had made some mistakes in the past in voting with him occasionally and now that I had learned just how much politics they could play, especially by promising one thing and doing another, that he would find me leaning over backward whenever and wherever I could from thenceforth on to vote with my own side of the aisle on each and every issue. I have since pursued that course quite regularly and will continue to do so. Of course, I know there will be some exceptions. And there ought to be unless one is going to be a rubber stamp, which I am not.

I introduced this bill at the request of several midwesterners, including those who are making most of the noise today, the two gentlemen from Wisconsin who just addressed themselves to this bill. They appealed to me that they were in a serious emergency, that funds for the program were running out and that they needed some money quick. They asked me to call the Department of Agriculture about it and I did. The Department said, "It is true. We do have an emergency." An emergency for what? An emergency for 1956, not 1957 and 1958, which they now talk about. "What do we need to solve the emergency?" I asked. The answer was a $10 million deficiency authorization. Was anything said about 1957 and 1958? No, not a word; not a word. The entire appeal was for the remainder of 1956.

The facts are that the politics which we have been charged with is on the other side of the aisle; and the facts are that last year when H. R. 12 was brought to the floor of this House these gentlemen who have made all of this noise found themselves voting against this very program. They are now exerting every effort to get off the hook. We know that and they know it.

When the roll was called on the school-milk program last year they voted "no;" and I challenge them to deny it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Did you vote against it?—I beg the gentleman's pardon. I do not charge the gentleman from Minnesota with voting against H. R. 12; he did vote for it. But his two complaining colleagues from Wisconsin and Mr. HALLECK did not.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman also in fairness agree that there were some other far-sighted men of vision on the other side who voted for it?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I will agree to that. There were some—a few.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No, I do not yield. Did you vote aye or no?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I did not vote against this bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Did you vote "aye" or "no" on the school milk bill last year?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I did not vote against the school-milk program; I voted against H. R. 12.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You voted "no"; against school milk too and you are just trying to get off the hook; you are just trying to get off the hook.

When they brought this legislation to me I tried my best to accommodate them. My State does not get anything out of it, not one dime, for school milk. Our funds are not exhausted for 1956. We do get funds for the brucellosis program; so far as school milk is concerned it does not help me, but I have been trying to help them. Now they are putting their heels on my neck. I have tried to be helpful. Now they charge me and you with trying to ruin our dairy farmers. My goodness, had I known that I was going to get into all this fuss I doubt very seriously if I would have introduced the bill. You know I just do not like to be pushed around when I am trying to help, and especially by people who never cooperate in helping other farmers.

All right; the hearings disclosed also that this was an emergency measure. Then we reported the bill from the subcommittee. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK] made the motion that we report the bill and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] seconded the motion. For what? For a piece of emergency legislation, that was all. He offered no amendment for 1957 and 1958.

The bill went to the full committee and it was moved that we report it. Report what? An emergency piece of legislation, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] seconded my motion to report the bill. Again neither he nor any one else offered an amendment for 1957 and 1958.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Who is the author of this bill?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I authored the bill; and when we were in the committee not a single solitary one of them offered an amendment to add 2 more years to it, not one of them, not one.

The bill was brought to the floor of the House and we considered it by unanimous consent. We rushed consideration and passage. They heaped compliments upon my head for having done so. I have the RECORD right here before me. I felt pretty good about it all. Here is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] complimented me. While I deeply appreciated it, I never dreamed they were going to return here today and take it back; I did not know they were going to take it back.

They then said, "This an emergency," Mr. Speaker. The distinguished acting Speaker also referred to it as an emergency measure and helped them along. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] said—reading from the RECORD of the proceedings:

> This bill is of an emergency nature and should be passed as soon as possible.

Did he offer an amendment? Did he offer an amendment for 1957 and 1958? Oh, no.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No. My time is short. I just read your exact words and I did not read them wrong. Did he offer an amendment? Never.

Did Mr. BYRNES offer an amendment? No.

Did Mr. ANDRESEN? No.

Did Mr. HALLECK? No.

And let me tell you something, when you find the able Mr. HALLECK—and he is an able fellow—when you find him, and the distinguished JOE MARTIN, and equally distinguished LES ARENDS sitting

on the floor together armed with telegrams from the American Farm Bureau Federation, you can just put it down that Republican politics has been at work; you can just put that down. They engineered these Farm Bureau telegrams in evidence around here. One State Farm Bureau president has already admitted he did not know what this was about; said he sent the telegram because he was told to.

On January 12 the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] introduced H. R. 8373, an emergency bill for 1956 only. Did he provide for 2 more years? Oh, no. This was emergency legislation. Then the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]——

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No; I do not yield; I just don't have enough time.

Then the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], a very able Member; I am not criticizing him; he introduced a bill to do just exactly the same thing. Did he ask for 2 more years? Oh, no.

Then my bill was passed and sent over to the Senate with a rush tag attached. The Senate then put in what? The Senate tacked on several amendments, one of which excited the alarming concern of the Department of Agriculture to the extent that they voluntarily sent a letter down to the Committee on Agriculture which in effect said: "Go slow." Nobody asked them for that letter, not a soul asked for it. They voluntarily sent it over the signature of the Honorable E. L. Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. He said: "We do not feel it would be practical to undertake to develop the Federal administrative organization that would be required to extend the current program to outlets other than to elementary and secondary schools." He was speaking of the nursery homes, day care centers, summer camps, and so forth.

Oh, but when they got the politics going around, the Republicans rushed down to the Secretary and said, "We want your help. Will you not please take back what you wrote Mr. COOLEY." He then gave them, not Mr. COOLEY, another letter of a different view but he never had the courage to recall the letter he voluntarily sent to the chairman of this committee. He sent Mr. COOLEY, the Democrat, one kind of letter, a letter branding the summer camp amendment. Then he sent the Republicans another kind without notifying Mr. COOLEY, the Democrat, supporting the amendment. You know, this sort of reminds me of the Republicans' campaign promises made to farmers in 1952. Then they were for 100 percent of parity. Do you remember Ike's speech? Now, after they won the race, they are for flexibles.

But the facts are that Mr. Peterson, in effect, warned us the amendment could not be administered and wanted it out. The way to get it out is vote up the conference report.

The biggest organization among the dairymen in the United States is the National Milk Producers Federation. You have all heard of it. It has more members than any other dairy organization in the United States.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I cannot yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield for a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana is making a point of order which is a preferential matter and does not take the gentleman off the floor. The gentleman would not have to yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I beg the Chair's pardon. I am just a new Member, learning something every day, such as a lesson in the art of politics, so well displayed by my Republican colleagues today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana will state his point of order.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reference has been made to H. R. 12 and to the position of certain Members in respect to that bill. Is that the bill that provided a return to the high rigid support of 90 percent of parity?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not state a point of order. The gentleman from Indiana, the Chair believes, clearly understands that fact. The Chair does not recognize it as a point of order.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Now do you see, Mr. Speaker. Do you not see they are again trying to get off the hook; this time with a phony point of order, just playing politics, that is all.

When we had Mr. Norton, secretary of the largest dairy organization in the United States, before our committee a few weeks ago, this very matter was brought to his attention. I directed Mr. Norton's attention to the fact that the Senate had tacked on amendments, one of which the Secretary of Agriculture said would disturb and upset this program. What did Mr. Norton say?

He said, "I might say, Congressman", speaking to me, "from our own standpoint while we certainly were not successful, we were not in favor of tacking it on"—and I said, "Of course you were not"—continuing he said, "the Senate bill because we realize that it was an emergency measure and we were back of the bill"—Whose bill? My bill.—"100 percent." Not 99 percent, 100 percent. There you have the position of the largest dairy farmer organization in America and their position coincides with mine here today.

Now all of my Republican friends were also back of this bill "as is" but recently they have found a way to get some of them off the hook on which they were left after the vote on H. R. 12. That is right. Yes, little politics has gotten into this thing.

In introducing this bill and pressing for its passage, I was really trying to help some friends. I thought I was helping them. I never dreamed I was doing something that would stir up all of this ruckus and political maneuvering from the other side of the aisle. I will tell you this, I surely am going to look at these things closer next time because I have found that they can very easily be converted into a political mess.

When they voted on this issue over in the Senate it turned into a straight party-line vote, do not forget that, a straight party-line vote, except for one Senator on the Republican side who for very good reasons crossed over and voted with the Democrats.

To listen to my Republican friends you would think that everyone in this House who votes for this conference report is against milk for little children. Well, now, is that not ridiculous? Is it not ridiculous to say that the Members of this House are going to pursue a course that would take milk away from the little children? Is that not ridiculous? It is sort of dumb, in my opinion, to charge that the Members who vote for this conference report are against a very popular program.

When a deficiency appropriation bill is brought to this floor, no one attempts to tack onto it for next year's program or the next or the next. The same situation applies here. Let us do what we ought to do. Let us vote this thing up and stop this argument. Let us send it over to the White House and get this money out to Wisconsin and New York and these other places which need it. They need it now. They are now or soon will be out of money for this fiscal year. That is all there is to this issue, and you can be assured, regardless of what anyone says, that there will be an agricultural bill passed in this House this year, in this Congress this year, and this whole issue will be taken care of in the proper manner and in the proper form.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 195, nays, 215, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—195

Abbitt	Chelf	Frazier
Abernethy	Christopher	Friedel
Addonizio	Chudoff	Garmatz
Albert	Colmer	Gary
Alexander	Cooley	Gathings
Andrews	Davidson	Gentry
Anfuso	Davis, Ga.	Gordon
Ashmore	Dawson, Ill.	Granahan
Aspinall	Deane	Gray
Barden	Delaney	Green, Pa.
Barrett	Dempsey	Gregory
Bass, Tenn.	Dies	Griffiths
Bell	Dingell	Hagen
Bennett, Fla.	Dollinger	Haley
Blatnik	Dorn, S. C.	Hardy
Blitch	Dowdy	Harris
Bolling	Doyle	Harrison, Va.
Bonner	Durham	Hays, Ark.
Bowler	Edmondson	Hays, Ohio
Brooks, La.	Elliott	Hayworth
Brooks, Tex.	Engle	Healey
Brown, Ga.	Evins	Hébert
Buckley	Fallon	Herlong
Burleson	Fascell	Holifield
Burnside	Feighan	Holland
Byrd	Fisher	Holtzman
Byrne, Pa.	Flood	Huddleston
Carlyle	Flynt	Hull
Carnahan	Forand	Ikard
Celler	Forrester	Jarman
Chatham	Fountain	Jennings

Johnson, Wis.	Morrison	Selden
Jones, Ala.	Moss	Sheppard
Jones, Mo.	Moulder	Shuford
Jones, N. C.	Multer	Sieminski
Karsten	Murray, Ill.	Sikes
Kee	Natcher	Sisk
Kelley, Pa.	Norrell	Smith, Miss.
Kelly, N. Y.	O'Brien, Ill.	Smith, Va.
Keogh	O'Neill	Spence
Kilday	Passman	Staggers
Kilgore	Patman	Steed
King, Calif.	Perkins	Sullivan
Kirwan	Pfost	Teague, Tex.
Klein	Pilcher	Thomas
Kluczynski	Poage	Thompson, La.
Knutson	Polk	Thompson, N. J.
Landrum	Powell	Thompson, Tex.
Lanham	Preston	Thornberry
Lankford	Price	Trimble
Lesinski	Priest	Tuck
McCarthy	Quigley	Tumulty
McCormack	Rabaut	Udall
McDowell	Rains	Vanik
McMillan	Richards	Vinson
Macdonald	Riley	Watts
Machrowicz	Roberts	Whitten
Madden	Robeson, Va.	Wickersham
Magnuson	Rodino	Wier
Mahon	Rogers, Colo.	Williams, Miss.
Marshall	Rogers, Fla.	Willis
Matthews	Rogers, Tex.	Winstead
Metcalf	Rooney	Wright
Miller, Calif.	Roosevelt	Zablocki
Mills	Rutherford	Zelenko

NAYS—215

Adair	Donohue	Martin
Alger	Donovan	Mason
Allen, Calif.	Dorn, N. Y.	Meader
Allen, Ill.	Ellsworth	Merrow
Andersen, H. Carl	Fenton	Miller, Md.
	Fernandez	Miller, Nebr.
Andresen, August H.	Fino	Miller, N. Y.
	Fjare	Minshall
Arends	Fogarty	Morano
Ashley	Ford	Mumma
Auchincloss	Frelinghuysen	Murray, Tenn.
Avery	Fulton	Nelson
Ayres	Gavin	Nicholson
Baker	George	Norblad
Baldwin	Green, Oreg.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bass, N. H.	Gross	O'Hara, Ill.
Bates	Gubser	O'Hara, Minn.
Beamer	Hale	O'Konski
Becker	Halleck	Osmers
Belcher	Hand	Ostertag
Bennett, Mich.	Harden	Patterson
Bentley	Harvey	Pelly
Berry	Henderson	Philbin
Betts	Heselton	Phillips
Boland	Hess	Pillion
Bolton, Frances P.	Hiestand	Poff
	Hill	Prouty
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hillings	Radwan
	Hinshaw	Ray
Bosch	Hoeven	Reece, Tenn.
Bow	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed
Boyle	Hoffman, Mich.	Rees, Kans.
Bray	Holmes	Reuss
Brown, Ohio	Hope	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brownson	Horan	Rhodes, Pa.
Broyhill	Hosmer	Riehlman
Budge	Hyde	Robsion, Ky.
Burdick	Jackson	Rogers, Mass.
Bush	James	Sadlak
Byrnes, Wis	Jenkins	St. George
Carrigg	Jensen	Saylor
Cederberg	Johansen	Schenck
Chase	Johnson, Calif.	Scherer
Chenoweth	Jonas	Schwengel
Chiperfield	Judd	Scott
Church	Kean	Scrivner
Clark	Kearney	Scudder
Clevenger	Kearns	Seely-Brown
Cole	Keating	Sheehan
Coon	Kilburn	Short
Cooper	King, Pa.	Siler
Corbett	Knox	Simpson, Ill.
Cramer	Krueger	Simpson, Pa.
Cretella	Laird	Smith, Kans.
Crumpacker	Lane	Smith, Wis.
Cunningham	Latham	Springer
Curtis, Mass.	LeCompte	Taber
Curtis, Mo.	Lipscomb	Talle
Dague	Lovre	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Wis.	McConnell	Thompson, Mich.
Dawson, Utah	McCulloch	
Denton	McDonough	Thomson, Wyo.
Derounian	McGregor	Utt
Devereux	McIntire	Van Pelt
Dixon	McVey	Van Zandt
Dodd	Mack, Ill.	Velde
Dolliver	Mack, Wash.	Vorys
Dondero	Mailliard	Vursell
Wainwright	Williams, N. J.	Wolverton
Weaver	Williams, N. Y.	Yates
Westland	Wilson, Calif.	Young
Wharton	Wilson, Ind.	Younger
Widnall	Withrow	
Wigglesworth	Wolcott	

NOT VOTING—23

Bailey	Diggs	Mollohan
Baumhart	Eberharter	Morgan
Boggs	Gamble	Rivers
Boykin	Grant	Shelley
Canfield	Gwinn	Taylor
Cannon	Harrison, Nebr.	Tollefson
Coudert	Holt	Walter
Davis, Tenn.	Long	

So the conference report was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Canfield against.
Mr. Bailey for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. Mollohan for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Baumhart against.
Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.
Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Gamble against.
Mr. Cannon for, with Mr. Gwinn against.
Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Holt against.
Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Tollefson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Grant with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BOYLE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FINO changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DENTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after "$60,000,000," insert "and for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1958, not to exceed $75,000,000."

Page 2, line 1, after "in" insert "(1)"

Page 2, line 2, after "under" insert "; and (2) such nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions as are devoted to the care and training of underprivileged children on a public welfare or charitable basis."

Page 2, line 8, after "1956," insert "and $20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1957 and 1958."

Page 3, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 3. The first sentence of subsection (a) and the first sentence of subsection (b) of section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, are amended by striking out '1956' and inserting in lieu thereof '1958'."

Amend the title so as to read "An Act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school milk program, the veterans and Armed Forces milk programs, and the brucellosis eradication program."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recede and concur.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendments to H. R. 8320 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time and move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas, 406, nays 0, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—406

Abbitt	Coon	Hayworth
Abernethy	Cooper	Healey
Adair	Corbett	Hébert
Addonizio	Cramer	Henderson
Albert	Cretella	Herlong
Alexander	Crumpacker	Heselton
Alger	Cunningham	Hess
Allen, Calif.	Curtis, Mass.	Hiestand
Allen, Ill.	Curtis, Mo.	Hill
Andersen, H. Carl	Dague	Hillings
	Davidson	Hinshaw
Andresen, August H.	Davis, Ga.	Hoeven
	Davis, Wis.	Hoffman, Ill.
Andrews	Dawson, Ill.	Hoffman, Mich.
Anfuso	Dawson, Utah	Holland
Arends	Deane	Holmes
Ashley	Delaney	Holtzman
Ashmore	Dempsey	Hope
Aspinall	Denton	Horan
Auchincloss	Derounian	Hosmer
Avery	Devereux	Huddleston
Ayres	Dies	Hull
Baker	Dingell	Hyde
Baldwin	Dixon	Ikard
Barden	Dodd	Jackson
Barrett	Dollinger	James
Bass, N. H.	Dolliver	Jarman
Bass, Tenn.	Dondero	Jenkins
Bates	Donohue	Jennings
Beamer	Donovan	Jensen
Becker	Dorn, N. Y.	Johansen
Belcher	Dorn, S. C.	Johnson, Calif.
Bell	Dowdy	Johnson, Wis.
Bennett, Fla.	Doyle	Jonas
Bennett, Mich.	Edmondson	Jones, Ala.
Bentley	Elliott	Jones, Mo.
Berry	Ellsworth	Jones, N. C.
Betts	Engle	Judd
Blatnik	Evins	Karsten
Blitch	Fallon	Kean
Boland	Fascell	Kearney
Bolling	Feighan	Kearns
Bolton, Frances P.	Fenton	Keating
	Fernandez	Kee
Bolton, Oliver P.	Fino	Kelley, Pa.
	Fisher	Kelly, N. Y.
Bonner	Fjare	Keogh
Bosch	Flood	Kilburn
Bow	Flynt	Kilday
Bowler	Fogarty	Kilgore
Boyle	Forand	King, Calif.
Bray	Ford	King, Pa.
Brooks, La.	Forrester	Kirwan
Brooks, Tex.	Fountain	Klein
Brown, Ga.	Frazier	Kluczynski
Brown, Ohio	Frelinghuysen	Knox
Brownson	Friedel	Krueger
Broyhill	Fulton	Laird
Buckley	Garmatz	Landrum
Budge	Gary	Lane
Burdick	Gathings	Lanham
Burleson	Gavin	Lankford
Burnside	Gentry	Latham
Bush	George	LeCompte
Byrd	Gordon	Lesinski
Byrne, Pa.	Granahan	Lipscomb
Byrnes, Wis.	Gray	Long
Carlyle	Green, Oreg.	Lovre
Carnahan	Green, Pa.	McCarthy
Carrigg	Gregory	McConnell
Cederberg	Griffiths	McCormack
Celler	Gross	McCulloch
Chase	Gubser	McDonough
Chatham	Hagen	McDowell
Chelf	Hale	McGregor
Chenoweth	Haley	McIntire
Chiperfield	Halleck	McMillan
Christopher	Hand	McVey
Chudoff	Harden	Macdonald
Church	Hardy	Machrowicz
Clark	Harris	Mack, Ill.
Clevenger	Harrison, Va.	Mack, Wash.
Cole	Harvey	Madden
Colmer	Hays, Ark.	Magnuson
Cooley	Hays, Ohio	Mahon

Mailliard	Quigley	Steed
Marshall	Rabaut	Sullivan
Martin	Radwan	Taber
Mason	Rains	Talle
Matthews	Ray	Teague, Calif.
Meader	Reece, Tenn.	Teague, Tex.
Merrow	Reed, N. Y.	Thomas
Metcalf	Rees, Kans.	Thompson, La.
Miller, Calif.	Reuss	Thompson, Mich.
Miller, Md.	Rhodes, Ariz.	Thompson, N. J.
Miller, Nebr.	Rhodes, Pa.	Thompson, Tex.
Miller, N. Y.	Richards	Thomson, Wyo.
Mills	Riehlman	Thornberry
Minshall	Riley	Trimble
Morano	Roberts	Tuck
Morrison	Robeson, Va.	Tumulty
Moss	Robsion, Ky.	Udall
Moulder	Rodino	Utt
Multer	Rogers, Colo.	Vanik
Mumma	Rogers, Fla.	Van Pelt
Murray, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.	Van Zandt
Murray, Tenn.	Rogers, Tex.	Velde
Natcher	Rooney	Vinson
Nelson	Roosevelt	Vorys
Nicholson	Sadlak	Vursell
Norblad	St. George	Wainwright
O'Brien, Ill.	Saylor	Watts
O'Brien, N. Y.	Schenck	Weaver
O'Hara, Ill.	Scherer	Westland
O'Hara, Minn.	Schwengel	Wharton
O'Konski	Scott	Whitten
O'Neill	Scrivner	Wickersham
Osmers	Scudder	Widnall
Ostertag	Seely-Brown	Wier
Passman	Selden	Wigglesworth
Patman	Sheehan	Williams, Miss.
Patterson	Sheppard	Williams, N. J.
Pelly	Short	Williams, N. Y.
Perkins	Shuford	Willis
Pfost	Sieminski	Wilson, Calif.
Philbin	Sikes	Wilson, Ind.
Phillips	Siler	Winstead
Pilcher	Simpson, Ill.	Withrow
Pillion	Simpson, Pa.	Wolcott
Poage	Sisk	Wolverton
Poff	Smith, Kans.	Wright
Polk	Smith, Miss.	Yates
Powell	Smith, Va.	Young
Preston	Smith, Wis.	Younger
Price	Spence	Zablocki
Priest	Springer	Zelenko
Prouty	Staggers	

NOT VOTING—27

Bailey	Durham	Mollohan
Baumhart	Eberharter	Morgan
Boggs	Gamble	Norrell
Boykin	Grant	Rivers
Canfield	Gwinn	Rutherford
Cannon	Harrison, Nebr.	Shelley
Coudert	Holifield	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Holt	Tollefson
Diggs	Knutson	Walter

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Holt.
Mr. Cannon with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Baumhart.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit during general debate this afternoon while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

BRIG. GEN. EDWIN B. HOWARD

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 422 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1271) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of a bill which authorizes the appointment of a retired brigadier general of the United States Army, Edwin B. Howard, as a civilian employee in the Department of Justice. This is a special action which is necessary in view of the existing law prohibiting the employment of retired Army officers except under certain circumstances. General Howard has been occupying this position on a per diem basis for several months. He has performed a splendid service that has been, of course, in the interest of our country. Mr. Speaker, under the terms of this bill the general could be hired for this specific job in the Immigration Service. He not only has demonstrated his ability to perform this service, but a thing which appeals to some of us is the fact that the Government would be saved a considerable amount of money by utilizing the services of this retired Army officer. In fact, if it were filled by any other person, it would cost some $12,000 to $15,000. In view of the fact that the general draws a retirement pay of some $8,000 plus, the Government would get the services of the general in this particular job for a little better than $2,000 a year. I think the resolution should be agreed to and the bill should be enacted into law.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule on this side and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. GEN. FRANK H. PARTRIDGE, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 423) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1272) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I make the usual allocation of one-half hour to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, the remarks that I made a few moments ago with reference to House Resolution 422 apply to this resolution. It is in the same category except it would authorize the appointment, under similar conditions, of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I reserve my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1271) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1271), with Mr. MACK of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and

the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the appointment of Brig. Gen. E. V. Howard, United States Army, retired, to a civilian position in the Department of Justice. The position is Assistant Commissioner in charge of the field inspections and Security Division of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The provisions of the dual-employment statute of 1894 prevent General Howard from being employed in a civilian capacity by the Federal Government because he is a retired officer. This law forbids any retired officer of the Regular service from being appointed to a Federal position if his retired pay amounts to $2,500 annually.

In 1954 General Howard was hired as a consultant at $50 per day. It was subsequently determined that he should have been paid $45.36 per day and that he had been overpaid in the amount of $483.05. He repaid this amount to the Government. But it should be noted that General Howard was not at fault in this matter. He had nothing to do with determining his rate of pay.

At the time of General Howard's employment the rate of illegal entrants into this country was approximately 3,000 per day. During the period of his service, the daily rate of illegal entrants was reduced from 3,000 per day to 200 per day. Since no legislation had been passed to enable General Howard to accept an appointment to the position, his services as a consultant were terminated after approximately 1 year.

Since that time a career civil-service employee in the Immigration and Naturalization Service has performed these duties. However, this is a schedule C position, and in order for a career civil-service employee to receive the appointment, he would be required to surrender his civil-service status. As a consequence, this career employee, who does not want the appointment, has been occupying the position in an acting capacity but with the lesser salary authorized for his civil-service status.

The Commissioner of Naturalization stated that he could not now find any civil-service employee who is qualified for this position, nor has he received any application, verbally or otherwise, from any present civil-service employee of the Immigration and Naturalization Service who desires to be considered for this appointment.

It is doubtful if any fully qualified civil-service employee in another agency of the Government could be found for this position, and it is fair to assume that if such qualified persons could be found that they would not be willing to surrender their civil-service status in order to be appointed to this schedule C position.

It is expected that in the future there will be career civilians in the Department of Justice who will be qualified for this position, and who would be willing to accept it. But this would occur after such persons have qualified for civil-service retirement and not before.

There is ample precedent for the passage of this bill. It has been done in the case of Gen. George C. Marshall; Lieutenant General Erskine, a Marine Corps general; Col. Leland Hewitt, a retired Army officer, and many others.

It is pertinent to note that legislation of this character is not necessary when the appointee must be confirmed by the Senate, or when the officer in question has been retired for disability as a result of wounds received in combat with an enemy of the United States. This is precisely the situation concerning General Swing, who is the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. His appointment required Senate confirmation, and, in addition, he was retired for disability from combat wounds. But General Howard retired on length of service, rather than on disability, making this legislation necessary.

In order that this question be kept in proper perspective, it should be noted that Congress has previously provided a statutory exemption for retired officers from the dual-employment statute of 1894 for the following:

First. The Director and Deputy Director and other officials of the Bureau of the Budget.

Second. All boards and consultants hired under the Mutual Security Act of 1954.

Third. Fifteen retired officers by the Central Intelligence Agency.

Fourth. Twenty-five retired officers by the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

Fifth. Any number of retired officers by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Sixth. Any number of retired officers by the Chief of Army Engineers where such employees are employed on rivers and harbors improvement.

Seventh. Any number of retired officers by the Selective Service System.

Eighth. Any number of retired officers by the Veterans' Administration.

Finally, it should be noted that if General Howard is permitted to accept this appointment with the Federal Government, he will not be allowed to draw both his retired pay and the pay of the civilian position. His retired pay is $8,705 per year. The salary of the civilian position is $11,610 per year, or $2,905 per year more than his retired pay.

So the net effect of the passage of this bill would be to permit the Government to utilize the services of an able retired officer, on a full-time basis, who has already proved his worth in the position, for a net increase in Federal expenditures of $2,905 per year.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to say to the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee that when I listened to the testimony given to the committee on this matter I was very much impressed with the magnificent work that is being done now in closing up the portals of this country to illegal immigration. We need a man with the ability this general has to fill this job, and he fills it well, so we will stop this illegal immigration that has been flooding this country, particularly from the Southwest.

I certainly hope we will pass this bill and give this man the opportunity to give his talents to the United States Government in this activity.

Mr. VINSON. I thank my colleague.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Does this proposal mean that this general can work only at that specific job, or will he be permitted to be transferred to other agencies?

Mr. VINSON. He will be in the Department of Justice. His position will be Assistant Commissioner in charge of the Field Inspection and Security Division of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; and that is the only position that he will be authorized to hold.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee a question about the employment of these generals. There recently was an article in the newspapers to the effect that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare were going to use these generals as teachers in schools. Would they be in this same category? Or would we have to pass special legislation?

Mr. VINSON. This has no reference to teaching school. We would have to pass special legislation unless 1 of 3 things happened: One, that he had been retired for battle wounds; two, that he had been confirmed by the Senate. In those two instances a retired officer does not fall within the purview of the Dual Employment Act. If he has been retired for battle wounds he can hold a dual job. But if he is retired on account of service or length in grade, his employment has to be authorized by law.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. In the gentleman's statement he points out this employment of the general will not cost the Government any more than $2,900 per year inasmuch as the general will have to give up his pension.

Mr. VINSON. No. Of course, he gives up his retired pay and we have to pay his salary.

Mr. VANIK. My question is this: Are his retirement rights permanently lost when he gives up the pension?

Mr. VINSON. No—just suspended.

Mr. VANIK. Or does it accrue to him?

Mr. VINSON. No. He loses it during the time he is holding this position. If he holds this position for 6 months or 6 years, when the job is over, then his retired pay starts again.

Let me say that we had the Commissioner of Immigration before us and we asked him, "How come you cannot go out and employ civil-service people?" He said, "There are two men in my office

who are qualified to do this work, but these men will not take this position because they will lose their civil-service status." That is the reason we are forced to do this.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can it be possible that we are retiring these generals at too early an age?

Mr. VINSON. Oh, no. They have served the full period of time, whatever it is, to qualify for retirement. They went out after serving 30 years or more.

Mr. GROSS. How old is General Howard?

Mr. VINSON. I would imagine they are a little younger than I am, probably in the neighborhood of 55, judging from the fact he served 30 years or more in the service.

Mr. GROSS. He could not be 75 or 85, could he? The gentleman may revise his remarks, but he has just said General Howard could be 62, 3, 4 or 5 years old.

Mr. VINSON. No.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Has the gentleman ever considered general legislation to permit these retired officers to serve in these capacities?

Mr. VINSON. I think this is probably the sound way to do it. We do not want to lay down a general proposition that retired generals can come in and get these jobs, because we have a civil service law and we want to give civilians the opportunity. It seems better to deal with each case on its merits, like we did with General Marshall, like we dealt with all these others. Lay it before the House, let the House have the facts and if the facts warrant, it should be done. If the facts do not warrant, it should not be done.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. In other words, the gentleman thinks the law is all right except there should be some exceptions made?

Mr. VINSON. I think the law is sound, therefore we do not want any general statute. We want to deal with each case, where the facts and circumstances place you in a position like it did when General Marshall was appointed, like it did when other retired generals were appointed, and like in this case, because each case must be determined by the circumstances surrounding it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Did General Swing have to have special legislation?

Mr. VINSON. No, General Swing did not, because he was confirmed by the Senate and was also retired for battle wounds. If you are confirmed by the Senate, or if you are retired for battle wounds, you will not have to have a bill like this. These generals were retired for length of service in the Army. We get this general's services for only an additional cost of some $3,000. If you turn this bill down, then they will have to try to get somebody and pay him $11,600. The General draws his pay of $8,000 just the same. That is not good business. That is the reason why we have such a great deficit in this country today. We do not attend to this business sometimes like we would attend to our own individual affairs.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I think this is a good bill and shall vote for it. As a member of the subcommittee on appropriations for the Treasury Department which handles narcotics, I had hoped these generals would come up with some information to help stop the flow of narcotics into the country, this in addition to their normal duties, and also as a collateral benefit I trust they will look the border situation over and in the event that some day segments of our civilian population have to be evacuated to Mexico or Canada, should a disaster occur, we will have some military minds setting up roads of egress; this was overlooked on Berlin and Vienna as the airlift proved. Also to block roads of ingress to hostile elements.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I would like to ask the gentleman how long these two positions have been vacant.

Mr. VINSON. About 10 months.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I would like to ask further how many examinations have been held in this field, or is an examination necessary to fill the position.

Mr. VINSON. I do not recall General Swing giving any information along that line.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I do not think examinations are given on schedule C jobs.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. How many have applied or how many other people have sought this position?

Mr. SHORT. None has applied for it. As the chairman has stated, the reason they have not asked for this position is that they are very reluctant and hesitant to yield up their civil service status.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Are there not people in other services interested in this position?

Mr. SHORT. It may be possible, but the Commissioner of Immigration has not found them and no one has applied. But, these two men have demonstrated their outstanding ability by cutting down illegal entrants from 3,000 a day to less than 200.

Mr. VINSON. I want to say this, if there was any civil service employee who was qualified and willing to surrender his security, it would be beneficial to the morale of the civil-service organization to appoint him, but unfortunately there is on one down there who wants this job. He would have to pay the penalty of nonsecurity if he accepted the job, because he would lose his job the next day and he would have no civil-service status.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Under what circumstances would he lose his job?

Mr. VINSON. Any career civil-service employee who takes a schedule C position loses his civil-service status.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Is there a real position open, and is there a real need for it?

Mr. VINSON. Of course there is a need for it. There is a very important need for it. And because knowledge is so important, these men are qualified for this job. With 3,000 coming in, they have cut it down to 200 people a day.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. In the testimony before the committee was there any indication that General Swing endeavored to look up the ability of retired admirals or somebody else in the service?

Mr. VINSON. No. He looked up the men that he knew all about in the career service, and selected these two generals when no career employee would accept the jobs.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Would it be possible now that General Swing has brought in both General Howard and General Partridge as two old Army cronies into this position?

Mr. VINSON. Well, I do not think a man of General Swing's standing would try to fill positions of trust and responsibility by taking care of any particular Army officer, even though you might yourself classify the gentlemen as cronies. I do not think so. I have a higher regard for men who serve their country than to think for one moment that they would try to fill the office with men just because they had an acquaintance with them, to take care of them and disregard everything with reference to their qualifications and the ability that is inherent in them.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, S. 1271 deals with the appointment of Brig. Gen. E. B. Howard, United States Army, retired, to a civilian position in the Department of Justice, as Assistant Commissioner in charge of the Field Inspections and Security Division of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

S. 1272 deals with the appointment of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, to a civilian position in the Department of Justice as Assistant Commissioner of the Border Patrol, Detention, and Deportation Division.

Existing law precludes both from being employed in a civilian capacity with the Federal Government because they are retired officers. The law which precludes

their employment is known as the 1894 dual employment statute. This law forbids any retired officer of the Regular service from being appointed to a Federal position if his retired pay amounts to $2,500 annually. It should not be confused with the Dual Compensation Act of 1932, which is an entirely different law, and limits the amount of pay retired officers may receive.

Both generals were hired as consultants at $50 a day in 1954. At the time they were appointed the rate of illegal entrants into this country was running approximately 3,000 a day. Largely through their efforts and advice, that figure was substantially reduced and is now considered to be less than 200 per day.

Neither of the generals are now employed as consultants, since it was decided that they were not functioning as consultants, but were occupying jobs more in the nature of executive positions.

In addition, it was discovered that both generals had been overpaid. One in the amount of $483.05, Howard, and the other in the amount of $395.34, Partridge. They were paid $50 a day, and under the law they should have been paid $45.36 while employed as consultants. Both have repaid the Government the overpayment. They are entirely blameless, however, for both were employed on the advice of the Department of Justice.

The evidence disclosed that there is no present civilian serving in the Department of Justice who is qualified to take either position to which the two generals would be appointed. The two Acting Commissioners are civilians, but they do not want the appointments because they would have to surrender their civil-service status.

It is quite likely that in the future there will be career civilians in the Department of Justice who will be qualified for these positions and who would be willing to accept the positions because by then they will have earned full retirement and may be willing to accept a schedule C position.

However, the Commissioner of Naturalization stated that he could not now find any civil-service employee who was fully qualified for either position, nor has he received any application, verbally or otherwise, from any present civil-service employee of the Immigration and Naturalization Service who is desirous of being considered for either position.

There is ample precedent for the passage of both bills. It was done in the case of Lieutenant General Erskine, Col. Leland Hewitt, and many others.

Had either general been retired for disability, this legislation would not be necessary because the dual-employment statute does not apply to officers retired for disability.

Likewise, it should be noted that Congress has provided statutory exemption from the dual-employment statute of 1894 for the Director and Deputy Director and other officers of the Bureau of the Budget.

Furthermore, the Congress has provided exemption from the dual employment statute for all boards and consultants appointed under the Mutual Security Act of 1954.

In addition, 15 retired officers may be employed by the Central Intelligence Agency, and 25 retired officers may be employed by the Federal Civil Defense Administration without regard to the dual employment statute. Any number of retired officers may be employed by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics without regard to the dual employment statute. Any number of retired officers may be employed by the Chief of Engineers of the Army where such employees are working on rivers or harbor improvement, without regard to the dual employment statute. Any number of retired officers may be employed by the Selective Service System without regard to the dual employment statute; and finally there is no limitation on the number of retired officers who may be employed by the Veterans' Administration without regard to the dual employment statute.

Finally, it should be noted that these officers when employed by the Federal Government will not be allowed to draw their retired pay and the pay of their Federal position. General Partridge now receives retired pay in the amount of $9,688 a year. The salary of the position to which he will be appointed amounts to $11,610 annually. Thus, for practical purposes, the Government will be obtaining General Partridge's services on a full-time basis for $1,922 per year.

In the case of General Howard, he is now drawing retired pay in the amount of $8,705 and the civilian position to which he would be appointed amounts to $11,610 a year. Since he cannot draw both pays, he will have to give up his retired pay, and in effect, he will be working for the Federal Government for $2,905 per year, on a full-time basis.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Is it not true that since May 1955, and September 1955, these two positions have been held by civilians?

Mr. SHORT. No. The positions as Commissioners have been vacant.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. There has been no one in the positions?

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will yield, there have been employees acting in those positions.

Mr. SHORT. These two generals were employed originally on a per diem basis. It was during the time of their service, however, that we cut down the number of illegal entrants from 3,000 to 200 per day.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. According to my information, when they were originally hired they were hired as consultants.

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Also, it was in violation of Public Law 600 and they had to refund a sizable amount of money because they were overpaid as consultants.

Mr. SHORT. I am glad the lady asked that question.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. VINSON. There were 2 civil-service employees acting in these positions but they would not accept the positions permanently because if they had, they would have lost their civil-service status.

Mr. SHORT. That is true. But in direct answer to the gentlewoman's question, which is a very legitimate one, I should like to say that both generals were hired as consultants at $50 a day in 1954. At the time they were appointed, the rate of illegal entrants into this country was running approximately 3,000 a day. Largely through their efforts and advice that figure was substantially reduced and is now considered to be less than 200 a day. Neither one of the generals is now employed as a consultant since it was decided, I think by the Comptroller General, that they were not functioning as consultants but were occupying jobs more in the nature of executive positions.

In addition, it was discovered that both generals had been overpaid, one in the amount of $483.05, Howard, and the other in the amount of $395.34, Partridge. They were paid $50 a day, and under the law they should have been paid $45.36 while employed as consultants. Both have repaid the Government the overpayment. They are entirely blameless, however, for both were employed on the advice of the Department of Justice.

The evidence disclosed that there is no present civilian serving in the Department of Justice who is qualified to take either position to which the two generals would be appointed.

So if there is any blame it will rest not on the generals but upon the Department of Justice, which made this minor mistake of overpaying them, one general $483 and the other $395; the full amounts of which have been turned back to the Government.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If the gentleman will yield further, the law says that, after being hired as consultants, they shall not be consultants for more than 1 year. Is that right?

Mr. SHORT. I am not sure, but that is my understanding.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Then from May and September of 1955 until the present time who has been filling those posts?

Mr. SHORT. Certain employees. The Commissioner of Immigration has been getting along the best he can, but certainly we have to be alert and on guard as to the entrance of illegal immigrants.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Civilians have been filling the posts as acting commissioners?

Mr. SHORT. Yes, they have. But how well? They are doing the best they can but these two assistants are needed by the commissioner.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. They are career people?

Mr. SHORT. Yes; they are career people, under the civil service.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Is it not true that traditionally the top posts in the Immigration Service are filled by civilians?

Mr. SHORT. Most of the positions in the past have been.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. May I ask the gentleman this: Does he feel that it is in the best interests of the country to have 3 of the top 5 posts filled by the military, which would be true if these two appointments go through?

Mr. SHORT. I think at this particular time and with the threat of psychological penetration and subversive infiltration we certainly should appoint men with long experience and mature judgment and of unquestioned patriotism to serve our Nation in these critical hours and in these perilous times. I would be just as strongly as the gentlewoman against militarizing our whole Government. I do not like to see so many of these retired ex-service people taking big, important, and lucrative positions in industry, but I do not know how you are going to prevent it. Members of Congress when they retire or are defeated can get jobs in industry. But this is in an entirely different category.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Did the committee consider putting these positions under civil service so that the career people would want the jobs?

Mr. SHORT. That would be outside our jurisdiction. That falls under the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Our committee being jealous of its own prerogatives and jurisdiction tries to exercise great care and caution not to step on the toes of any other standing legislative committee of the House, because we would get our ears knocked back.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Reference has been made to the number of illegal entries, that have been cut from 3,000 to 200, and all the credit has been given to these two people.

Mr. SHORT. I would not give them all the credit, no.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Is not the matter of finances and the funds that were available also a very important factor in this matter?

Mr. SHORT. That is very true.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. If we are going to save $1,500—why do we not get a couple of retired colonels and we could get them for nothing?

Mr. SHORT. I am afraid that if we used retired colonels, we would have to pay more money—the difference between the retired colonel's pay and the pay of the office involved and the pay of the retired brigadier general and the salary of the office. I imagine that the Commissioner of Immigration found out that these two generals with whom he has worked and whom he knows, perhaps, can fill the bill better than some younger colonel can.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman knows of the deep affection for our distinguished colleague from Missouri and I have the greatest and highest regard for the accuracy of your figures concerning the 3,000 illegal immigrants now being down to 200. Would the gentleman mind stating who furnished those figures and whose guess it is?

Mr. SHORT. They are figures from the Bureau of Immigration itself. I do not consider them a wild guess but an accurate estimate.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. In other words, they guess that there were 3,000 before and now their guess is that there are 200. They do not take a census of these illegal immigrants when they come in; do they?

Mr. SHORT. I really cannot answer that question, of course.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I am very much concerned about the use of retired Army officers. I do not care who they are. As I say, I am concerned about the employment of retired Army officers in positions which, I think, ought to be filled by career employees in the civil service. Can the gentleman tell me what the average retired age of Army officers has been over the last 2 years? Does he have any idea of the average retirement age?

Mr. SHORT. Yes; the average age as I recall it, is about 55. They are retiring earlier than they used to just as they are electing younger Members to the Congress than they used to.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think they have more usefulness in the military service and that the retirement age ought to be extended a few more years?

Mr. SHORT. No; because it is quite necessary to have a rotation in our armed services so that we can keep a constant stream of young blood and imaginative and vigorous young men coming in. We have to retire these older officers to make places for younger men in the services, otherwise you are going to kill all hope and initiative and morale in anticipation of advancement in the services.

Mr. GROSS. General Howard, who is included in this bill, was 53 years old when he retired; is that not correct? And he is 55 years old today?

Mr. SHORT. I really do not know, but I will take your word for it. And we had some other generals retire at a much earlier age who will receive not $2,000 more than their retirement, but who have gone out into private industry and have made anywhere from $30,000 to $50,000 to $75,000 or $100,000 or $125,000 a year—men like Ben Moreell, Omar Bradley, Douglas MacArthur, Lucius Clay, and many others that I could name—all great and good men.

Mr. GROSS. That is quite true.

Mr. SHORT. I dare say that these two men, Generals Howard and Partridge, if they wanted to seek private employment, could make much more than the difference between their retired pay and what they would get. They have not sought these jobs as we seek ours. The jobs have sought them. And we are lucky if we can get them.

Mr. GROSS. That is the point, if the gentleman will bear with me, that is exactly the point that I am trying to make that these men would be very useful in the military service and that they do have useful years remaining to them in the military service. We cannot control what private industry does in the matter of employing retired service personnel, but certainly we can control what we do here in the Congress when it comes to putting them on the Federal payroll or continuing them in military service.

Mr. SHORT. These men have to reach the retirement age before they are dropped from the rolls, unless they are retired for disability. Do not forget that we have many ex-Members of Congress registered as lobbyists who have taken jobs with large companies.

Mr. GROSS. But we cannot draw retirement pay until we are 65.

Mr. SHORT. We are eligible to draw retirement pay when we reach 62 years of age. We reduced the retirement age to 60 with reduction in retirement pay. I hope that I can stay here 4 more years until I reach the age of 62 and then kiss you goodby. I would like, sir, to remind you that we voted ourselves this increase. It was long overdue. While we are on that subject, I hope the gentleman from Kansas, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and my dear and beloved friend, the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] will bring in a resolution already introduced by the very outstanding and able chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] which will grant retired Members of Congress pay for the highest 5 years of service and give ourselves treatment equal to the treatment afforded our office forces and civil service employees generally. Do it. And do it now. Take care of some of our ablest colleagues who are retiring this year. We are craven cowards if we do not.

Mr. GROSS. I would be sorry to see the gentleman leave Congress by retirement or any other means, but certainly I would be delighted to get a sample of a good Ozark kiss.

Mr. SHORT. Well, we know how it is done down in the Ozarks, I will tell you that. And you will never forget it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I rose for the purpose of questioning the policy that seems to be followed in recent months and years of putting former high-ranking Army officers in civilian positions. Here, today, if this legislation is approved, you will put 3 or 4 top-flight officers in civilian positions in the Immigration Service. It seems to me that more and more we are following the policy of military officers taking over civilian jobs. I am not complaining about their qualifications. I do feel, however, employment in civilian positions ought to be considered by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It is this committee that has jurisdiction of all civilian positions in Government. No explanation has been made as to why the Committee on Armed Forces should take jurisdiction of this matter.

Mr. SHORT. I am surprised that we are fortunate and lucky enough to persuade these men of outstanding, proven ability, to accept the positions for the little pay they get. These positions are

type 3 positions, not necessarily under civil service.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Is it not true that these are type-C positions and it would be possible to place them under civil service and if so the Government could determine to appoint them without losing their status under the Civil Service Commission rules?

Mr. SHORT. I will let the able gentleman from Kansas, an authority on that question, answer the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course the Congress can approve any legislation it chooses on that or any other subject matter. However, it would require congressional action.

This is not done by administrative action. This is the kind of legislation upon which hearings should be held by the committee having jurisdiction of this subject matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. But it could be done by administrative action, could it not? Therefore, there is no need of taking these positions out from under civil service.

Mr. SHORT. I certainly question that, but not being a member of the Committee on Civil Service I am not able to say.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I believe the distinguished minority member has just said that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. No. The Congress can pass legislation to do whatever it wants to. If it wants to pass such legislation, very well.

Mr. SHORT. But any legislation would have to come out of the proper committee.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Does not type C have a status so that they could receive their retired pay as well?

Mr. REES of Kansas. You still have the question of an employee of the Government drawing two Federal salaries.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No; because the people who have been doing this job on a voluntary basis would continue to do it.

Mr. SHORT. And not draw their retirement pay?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No. By administrative action they could get their other compensation.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The testimony was that the two men who are civil-service employees refused to accept permanent employment because they would lose their civil-service status.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. But could it not be done by administrative action?

Mr VINSON. The law says what it is, and it cannot be done by administrative action.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I have heard the President of the United States express his hope many times that this legislation be enacted. His interest in it is such that I am convinced that if by administrative action short of legislative action this end result could have been obtained, it would have been obtained long ago.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. If it is necessary to secure qualified personnel for these positions, and apparently it is going to require an act of Congress to permit the employment of two retired generals, would it not be just as easy to go to the Civil Service Committee and ask that these two positions be placed by law under the classified civil service?

Then would we not be encouraging a true career system in this service rather than picking up an occasional expert to fill top positions?

Mr. SHORT. The chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], answered that question a while ago. It would take some time and general hearings I think before you could report a bill out of committee. We might wait but the immigrants do not wait.

What we want is to take care of the present situation. I think perhaps—since the gentleman has raised the question—it should be given serious consideration by the members of the committee on which he himself serves.

Mr. MOSS. Is it not true that this matter has been kicking around for a year?

Mr. SHORT. The Senate passed these bills last year, yes; and we put them on the Private Calendar. They were objected to. That is the reason we had to report them back and get a rule for their consideration.

I hope the bill will pass. It should pass.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield, though I have taken much more time than I intended or wanted.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does not the gentleman feel that the correct way to handle this would be to let it go through the Civil Service Committee and not cut across as you are doing today?

Mr. SHORT. I do not consider that we are cutting across. We shall not encroach upon your jurisdiction or that of any other committee.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman speaks about an emergency.

Mr. SHORT. It applies to these particular jobs.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is there an emergency attached to this thing that you have to do it? Is that what the gentleman says?

Mr. SHORT. I do not like the word "emergency." We have been riding under it for 25 years now, and all too many crimes have been committed in the name of "emergency"; but I feel this legislation is needed and that we should pass it. Do as you will, I shall still love you.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 23 minutes. The gentleman from Georgia has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my objection to this bill has nothing to do with the qualification or lack of qualification of either of the two generals in question; I am opposed to it first on the principle of filling these jobs with ex-generals; and, second, I am suspicious of the men in question because they were picked by General Swing who is the Commissioner.

I have met a lot of arrogant people in my time, but what I could say about General Swing and the arrogance that he shows in that position would only be limited by what would be printable in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If that is the kind of fellow they want, and his two cronies, to head the Immigration Service, then I feel that I should get up here and object to them.

He made the statement that if he had to be bothered with talking to a bunch of Congressmen he would be damned if he would not resign the job. I told him that he would talk to me even if I had to come down and sit outside his office until I was able to see him. He did.

I do not know whether he would be so vindictive or not, but a friend of mine told me only a day or two ago—he was merely trying to be friendly—that I ought to beware of opposing this man Swing because he would probably make trouble for me. I have a little adopted daughter who is an alien. I do not think he will. I cannot think anybody would be that unprincipled as to try to get even with me through a 2-year-old baby. But I will guarantee that if he did try that when I got him face to face he would not be physically able to hold the job from then on.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the debate has taken the turn it has. I hold no particular brief for General Swing except I do happen to know the great job that he did in the northernmost island of Japan, Hokaido, following the close of World War II.

I went out and spoke at the War College in Leavenworth, Kans., when General Swing was commanding officer there. I have spoken at that college since then when another distinguished general was commandant, as I have on two other occasions at the War College at Carlisle Barracks, Pa.

I do not know what personal experience the Members have had with General Swing. But, certainly, I have never found him to be the type of person that he has been pictured today. I feel constrained because of my associations with him, to speak up. I would be untrue to remain silent. My associations with Joe Swing have not been too close or too intimate, but they have extended over a period of years, since the close of World War II. I have been a guest in his home. I know his family. Having talked with him when he was commandant out at the Presidio when I was one of the delegates to the signing of the

Japanese Peace Treaty and because of conversations and dealings I have had with him since then, I do not think he is quite the bad man that some people are inclined to think. I know he has a very tough job and we have to have someone who is firm in that position. He is a man of immense courage and unquestioned patriotism.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, my remarks are naturally prejudiced, because I served with General Swing at the Presidio a few years ago while I kept up my Reserve commission as major in the Army while a Member of the Congress.

General Swing is a fighting general. There is no creampuff diplomatic approach with him as we understand there was in connection with some of our diplomatic World War II negotiators; that is, they failed to get roads of entry and exit into Berlin and Vienna. I flew with General Swing from the Presidio down into Arizona and I was with him when we were near the Mexican border. That was, I think, about 1952 or 1953, I saw the problems they had. Yes, he is tough. When he is confronted with a tough problem he will fight fire with fire. I dare say if you meet him with a smile he will return one to you. If you meet him with a chip on your shoulder that is something else. After all, his family came to New Jersey in the sixteen hundreds. There are plenty red, white, and blue Americans in the Swing strain. There are 48 stars in the heart of General Swing. He has served his country, as did his family ever since they came to Salem, New Jersey, in the sixteen hundreds.

General Swing is an American. Approach him with a smile and he will give it back. Approach him with a chip on your shoulder and, as any red, white, and blue American will do, he will knock your block off. Swing, I say, is a good man. He faces a tough assignment. We hold back immigration. We were asked to bring 200,000 special refugees in. How many have come in? In the summer of 1954, 64,000 illegal Mexicans returned to Mexico from the West. That is a matter of record.

I come from New Jersey, the third State in the Union. Swing's family came in there long before I did, long before the Union. If Swing acted in any other way than like a tough man when he was given this tough job, I would not have any respect for him nor would the State of New Jersey. Give him courtesy and you get it. I served with him, I flew with him. He will give courtesy back to you. Lift that phone and talk to him as if you were talking to a dope or a man that does not know anything because he happened to be in World War II, and Swing will give it back to you whether you are a Congressman, Senator, or anybody else. He is just that kind of a man. Aren't we all?

Perhaps the case which the gentleman from Ohio refers to ran smoother than it did at the start of the gentleman's contact with General Swing's office, which was sworn to enforce the law, because the foreign person in question was married to an American the day or so before he was, by law, scheduled to be deported to Greece. This changed the complexion of the case and no doubt allowed satisfaction for all concerned to set in.

I am certain that General Swing knows absolutely nothing about the adopted daughter of the gentleman from Ohio. If he did, he would be as kindly toward her as General Swing is to his own daughter, I am certain.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I have only in the past few weeks had my attention called to this matter, but, what I have learned in the past few days and what I have heard today on the floor raises some serious questions in my mind.

I feel very strongly that, while the immediate cases may not be crucial, the issues involved are important. Under the circumstances, it seems to me we might well defer action until the Members of this House have more opportunity to consider these issues. After all, the Immigration Service is, by General Swing's own testimony, still flourishing, even though these two jobs have been hanging fire for almost 2 years and even though they have been without the services of these two generals for the better part of a year. This being so, it does not seem that a little longer wait, while we study the problems raised, would be disastrous.

What are these problems? Well, if I understand correctly, they look like this. Here are two top jobs in the Immigration Service that have been in a state of uncertainty for almost 2 years, jobs that have been traditionally held by experienced career men of the Service. According to General Swing, nobody can fill them except Generals Partridge and Howard. And in order to put them into the jobs, he has held the jobs vacant, he has evaded the spirit and letter of the law governing hiring of consultants, he has repeatedly come back to the Congress and asked us to excuse them from the very clear law, passed by the Congress to prevent just this kind of situation.

General Swing says nobody in the Service can fill these jobs or wants to. Well, I doubt this very much. If he cannot find a career man, why is General Swing determined not to look for an experienced civilian outside the Service? He says he has not even explored the field. After all these years of civilian administration, is it really true that only generals can run the Immigration Service?

There are some big questions here. How long are the Service and its career men to play second fiddle to this amazing effort to find jobs for General Swing's two friends? I am sure the generals are able and fine men. But so are the career officials of the Service.

And when, in this continuing trend, will we stop and give some thought to this invasion of the military into civilian government? I have nothing but respect and admiration for men who have distinguished themselves by lifetime careers in military service. But I am not at all sure that they should come to dominate our civilian agencies or that their background is particularly suitable, for instance, to such a special job as the Immigration Service has.

I am told that a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee is presently studying the workings of the dual compensation statute. It seems to me we should wait and see their conclusions.

There are some serious questions raised here. Until they are thoroughly examined and settled, I think we should recommit these bills.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we are faced here with evidence of a growing tendency to take men in the military career status and giving them jobs not only in industry but in our civilian Government. The Hébert subcommittee of the Defense Committee is even now bringing out the fact that general after general and admiral after admiral are leaving the service in a retired status, drawing $8,000, $9,000, and $10,000 a year pensions, and are going into the employ of the big corporations who have business with the Defense Department. I had occasion before my own subcommittee to observe an admiral who quit the Navy one day and went to work the next day for a big aviation company at a much higher salary. During the 2 years preceding his employment by the private company he had control of contract terminations, which also were matters of consideration by this company that hired him.

Now, I make no charges at this time, but I say that is a tendency to give special consideration to retired generals and admirals. My friend, the gentleman from Missouri, protests his desire not to be friendly with the military and deplores giving them extra privileges, but time after time we see this committee coming on the floor and advocating this type of legislation for people whom they have respect, and for those they have been friendly with. I have nothing to say about these 2 men, but I do know something about the Immigration office itself since General Swing has taken it over, and I know that these 3,000 illegal immigrants were not kept out as the result of these 2 officers, but they were kept out as the result of an additional appropriation for border guards for which we Members from southern California for years have tried to get additional appropriations. They never were able to eject illegal entrants until they got the additional appropriations for border guards. The guards were necessary to keep illegal immigrants from coming into the United States from Mexico. So, let us not take this bill at its face value and say that it is the wonderful work that they have done as a result of these two generals. It is the result of the appropriations which allowed them to employ more border guards. I am against this bill because it is class legislation for two specific generals. It does not relieve thousands of former Federal employees from the

prohibition of general law. I speak of the laws which prohibit those on Federal retirement pensions from accepting Federal employment without forfeiting their pension rights.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much against these two bills. We have one general now in charge of the Immigration Service. General Swing came through my district, which extends about 150 miles along the border and proceded to insult many good, upstanding patriotic American citizens who have been in the immigration service all of their lives. I suppose there are chiselers in every walk of life, but he treated these men who have worked all their lives in the Immigration Service as if they were condemned criminals in the guardhouse instead of dedicated Americans doing a good job. Apparently General Swing thinks he is still in the Army and can treat everyone under him in the overbearing, insolent manner that he treated our northern New York citizens in the Service.

I have known some of these men all of my life. They are just as good patriotic citizens as General Swing or anybody else. They are respected and looked up to in their communities and I do not propose to stand for him coming up there and treating them in the way he did.

I understand from some of my friends in northern Vermont that he did the same thing over there; went out of his way to insult good clean honorable men.

These bills propose to put two more generals in this service. I know nothing about the proposed generals, but I do feel very strongly that we have one general too many now and that is General Swing, so I hope these bills are defeated.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take very long, because my views on this bill are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today. I also inserted the views of my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] on this subject.

I have continuously objected to the consideration of this legislation on the Private Calendar. I am not against generals. I was thrilled the other day when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] mentioned with praise General Hodges, the Commanding General of the First Army. I marched with the First Army, and I am proud of it.

I favored General Marshall when he was made Secretary of State. I favor this kind of legislation when the qualifications of the generals or the overriding public need make it imperative that we select generals for the job.

I am not convinced that these generals are needed in this job. I am not convinced that their qualifications are such that they are superior for the purpose of carrying out the duties of the office, to anyone else in civilian life.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] suggested that President Eisenhower wanted these men. I want to quote President Eisenhower:

> It is my conviction that the necessary and wise subordination of the military to the civil power will be best sustained and our people will have great confidence that it is so sustained when lifelong professional soldiers in the absence of some obvious overriding reasons abstain from high political office.

President Eisenhower also said:

> In the American scene I see no dearth of men fitted by training, talent and integrity, for national leadership.

Mr. Chairman, the way to do this has already been pointed out, for the President or the administration to send down legislation to create civil-service security for people so that career employees may rise to administer these jobs instead of sending legislation down or asking for legislation to give to generals special treatment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER.]

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, my opposition to this legislation including both bills that we have before us today relates to some degree at least my bitter opposition to the UMT bill which, as most Members know, I fought most bitterly on this floor. I think there are limits as to how far we ought to go in permitting admirals or generals to take over civilian positions in the Government. That is of my fears and reluctance when turning civilian authority over to the military. It is for that reason I am opposed to these two bills.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the two bills which are before us to provide for the appointment of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard and Maj. Gen. Frank G. Partridge to the Immigration Service of the United States. It is of course regrettable that the appointment of these two distinguished gentlemen should be made the subject of congressional concern, but there is a very important principle involved since their appointment is in effect an exemption from the established law relating to the appointment of retired military personnel to civil positions.

To legalize the appointment of these two gentlemen is to open the front doors of our civil service and particularly to high office to an administration by a military junta. The concepts of retirement would be completely defeated if retired military officers can continue to spend their retirement days in public service. After all, if they have useful years of service, the military organization itself should have first call on these services rather than the civilian Government.

Furthermore, in the case of the Immigration and Naturalization Service which is already headed by General Swing, the inability of the general to find suitable civilian personnel to fill the high offices of Assistant Commissioners of Immigration appears a little like cronyism at its very worst. It is inconceivable that the qualifications of these distinguished gentlemen are of such unique and extraordinary nature that only they can fill these jobs which have been previously filled by civilians with apparent satisfaction and which have already been vacant for 1½ years without any adverse affect to the service. It is also significant that these vacancies were in fact filled by the same generals in question in blatant violation of the principles of the law while they were retained as consultants in an advisory capacity.

The appointment of retired military officials to high offices in the civilian administration of the Government would have the effect of discouraging qualified civilian officers from remaining with Government service. If these devoted servants of the Government must serve throughout the years only to have the top positions filled by others, the effect on morale in the Civil Service would be depressing. The Immigration Service cannot afford to become a sanctuary for retired generals with special dispensations granted by the authority of Congress. It is the solemn obligation of this Congress through its established committees to further inquire and investigate the obvious futility of General Swing's effort to obtain adequate civilian personnel to fill these important posts. It is indeed strange that a general in charge of a civil function of Government is unable to find anyone else but another general to fill an important office of confidence and trust. If the generals have confidence in only themselves, can we safely repose in them the responsibility of executing broad civilian functions of Government.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the passage of S. 1271 and S. 1272 for one very simple reason: It would result in too much military thinking in the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Passage of this legislation would permit two retired generals to serve as 2 of the 5 Assistant Commissioners of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. The present Commissioner, J. W. Swing, is also a retired general. I do not believe that a civilian branch of the Government should have such a large number of military men in key policymaking positions. The law since 1894 has forbidden retired Army officers from accepting civilian employment with the United States Government. That law is particularly sound in relation to the Immigration Service, which involves the direct relationship of the Federal Government with thousands of human beings.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I ask that the bill be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205), as amended (5 U. S. C. 62), or any other provision of law, Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, may be appointed to and accept and hold a civilian position in the Department of Justice.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAYS of Ohio moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI] was addressing the House a few minutes ago he attributed apparently to me, since he was answering my remarks, some allegations or observations of which I am not guilty. I merely want to make the record plain.

I never called General Swing but on one occasion, and that is the time I was told by one of his aides that he was too busy to talk to Congressmen. I made pretty plain to his assistant what I thought about that, and eventually the general came on the phone. I had no chip on my shoulder. I did not get nasty with him, but I told him of a situation that existed in regard to an alien who had married an American citizen and who was under a deportation order but who wanted to leave of his own volition, who wanted to leave at his own expense and return legally. The Commissioner said that it did not make any difference, that he was going to deport him anyway at Government expense.

After some discussion I persuaded him to allow the man to leave on his own power, at his own expense, which he did. The man went to a British possession and remained there until his papers were in order, and returned legally. The Commissioner's office went so far as to say that the British possession, which in this case was Nassau in the Bahamas, would not admit the alien, but I told him that they had already given him a visa, so that if he would just take care of the immigration on this end the British would perhaps take care of their own.

I never served under General Swing. I do not know anything about his empire building in Japan after World War II, or anything else, but there are plenty of Members on this floor right now who have told me that their experiences with him have been very unhappy and that he has been most arrogant. That is what I base my objections to him on.

So far as the Mexican immigration problem is concerned, the Members of this House know that I have never voted for any wetback bills, and I hope that he can dry up all the illegal Mexican immigrants right down to the last one. If he can do that, I am the kind of person that will be the first one to come down here and say more power to him, he has done a good job. But I do not know anything about what he has done except from statistics they have sent up here saying that these two men have done it. Yet we have testimony here on the floor that they have not even been in office for a number of months. So I do not know who has done it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Did I correctly understand from the gentleman that after his conversation with General Swing the matter in which he was interested, and I appreciate that interest and I think it was proper, was satisfactorily worked out?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The matter was satisfactorily worked out after great insistence on my part and many other telephone calls to many of his subordinates down there.

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad to hear it was worked out. I think many times we in the Congress need to be insistent about things, although sometimes I think possibly some of these affairs we are asked to enter into we might as well leave to the administrative branch.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. In this particular affair I saved the Government the price of this man's fare to Greece.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate that, and commend the gentleman for saying here on the floor that it was satisfactorily worked out.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is one aspect of this discussion today which I do not believe has been covered. We are here contemplating voting on two bills to make special exceptions for two retired officers. As many of us know, we have certain statutes on the books which cover the status of retired officers and their employment by the Government of the United States. There are many retired officers in lesser rank who have been affected by the dual compensation act. In my own experience, I have had called to my attention 2 or 3 cases where men of lesser rank who have been retired from the service who were covered by the dual compensation act which provides that they cannot draw more than $3,000 in combined compensation, and in every instance where they have been employed in the cases to which I refer, it had been found that they had drawn money contrary to these acts and had been called upon to refund it. Here we are saying that in the case of two men—and I want to say that so far as I am concerned—I am sure they are two fine gentlemen—they must be in view of the fact that so much pressure has been brought to bear in trying to pass these bills for them. I am not aiming my remarks at either of these gentlemen or at General Swing, but what I am talking about is the continued practice of the Congress of the United States when we think we are interested in special cases, to pass special legislation. But we are never concerned about the rank and file of people who are adversely affected by the general laws which affect them. What we ought to be doing and what this great Committee on Armed Services ought to have been doing is to go into this question of dual compensation to see how it can affect the men of different ranks instead of just passing these two special bills.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. May I point out to the gentleman from Texas that some weeks ago the subcommittee of which the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is the chairman was instructed to make a complete study of the dual compensation law to see whether or not we in the future will deal with it in a general way or whether we will have to deal with it along the lines of this bill. That whole matter is now being looked into by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for giving me this information. I do not know of any Member of the House for whom I have greater admiration and respect for than my colleague from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]. I have discussed this question with him many times, but the point I am making is that it was raised just a few weeks ago for the first time and only now a study is being made of it. But, last year when this great concern arose over these two Generals who are retired, that is when the matter should have been studied. There are a great many aspects of this bill that have to be looked at.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I think the gentleman is a little bit confused about two different laws—the dual compensation act and the dual employment act.

Mr. THORNBERRY. No, sir.

Mr. SHORT. The Veterans' Administration last year raised the pay from $3,000 to $10,000.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I think that is in the case of people who are disabled in the line of service.

Mr. SHORT. No.

Mr. THORNBERRY. The gentleman says I am confused, but I do not think I am confused. I know the law would apply to these generals. And I think that there is another act which applies to these other retired people—I agree to that. But the trouble is that you do not explain that to the man who writes to me and says that he has been employed by the Government of the United States that has recognized that he has been retired, and after he has been employed, it is found that he is employed contrary to law and he has to lose his job and pay back the money and be forever barred from Government employment. You try to explain that to him, and say, "No, we are not talking about this special act that we passed for these two generals, but we are talking about the law that affects you, and that is a general act." Perhaps, you can make a satisfactory distinction, but I do not choose to do so. What I am saying is that there should be no special laws passed for special cases, and that we should approach these cases with a law which applies generally to all cases, which applies to everybody alike. That is the point I am making.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Since there is a subcommittee studying the dual compensation, and since this has been hanging fire for about 2 years, would not the gentleman feel that this matter concerning Generals Howard and Partridge could wait until we find out the

conclusions of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. THORNBERRY. That would be a way, but I want to make it clear that I am not opposed to the Immigration and Naturalization Service enforcing the law. I live 220 miles from the border. My district is not affected by any enforcement program. I hesitated to speak on this for fear someone might think that I was being influenced by the fact that the immigration laws affect the border of my State, but I believe in the enforcement of the law. I am in favor of its fair enforcement against all violations in favor of a fair application of the law to all people who are affected rather than making special exceptions as these bills seek to accomplish.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I only take the floor because the 2 minutes the gentleman granted me was not long enough for me to get over some of the points that I wanted to get over.

On page 2 of the report I find this:

The testimony also revealed that the present Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization examined the files of the senior civil-service employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in an effort to find a civil-service employee who might be qualified to occupy the position of Assistant Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.

We are asked to believe the Commissioner searched the civil-service files and he could not find any one of the hundreds of people in the Immigration and Naturalization Service, who have served year after year, who was capable of filling the job.

Then he goes on and says:

The Commissioner stated in his testimony that he could not find any civil-service employees who were qualified for the position nor has he received any application, verbally or otherwise, from any present civil-service employee of the Immigration and Naturalization Service who is desirous of being considered for the position.

Of course he has not received any application from them, because if they accept a position in schedule C they lose all their rights of retirement. No civil-service employee is going to take a political position for a few months, or perhaps a year or so, and then lose this job, his tenure, and his rights of retirement. That is true.

Further it says here:

The position to which General Howard would be appointed, upon enactment of the proposed legislation, is a schedule C position and according to the testimony, any civil-service employee who accepts the position of Assistant Commissioner would lose his civil-service status.

Here is some other additional material in the report that deserves consideration:

The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization also testified that there is now an Acting Assistant Commissioner who is a civil-service employee but that he has not requested appointment as Assistant Commissioner.

Of course he would lose his civil-service status.

Then he says further:

Testimony further revealed that this civil-service employee may later be qualified for the position.

I suppose after he is relieved of his duties for a year or so, and General Howard is put into the position, then this career man who has spent 15 or 20 years in the Immigration Service will be qualified to take the job as Assistant Commissioner, and that he will then be appointed on a basis where he will not lose his civil-service retirement compensation rights.

This comes down to the basic problem. Are you going to keep on passing special legislation for these generals and admirals, who retire at $8,000 or $9,000 a year, are you going to pass special legislation for individuals, giving them, after they have served in the service of the United States willingly and have accumulated a retirement privilege which is more than could be acquired by a civil-service status employee—give them some special legislation to put them in a job and let them take a higher salary of $11,610 in place of their retirement rates of $8,705? Then when they have finished that year and a half of work for the Government they can go back and get their retirement without any penalty at all.

In the meantime you are asked to believe that there are no civilians qualified in the Immigration Service to take these positions. I cannot go along with that type of thinking; it is just a little too thick for me.

This looks to me like special class legislation for two friends of General Swing. I have nothing to say about these generals; I do not know them personally, but special class legislation for a couple of generals to hold jobs because General Swing wants them looks like special legislation to me.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. As a point of further information, I am told that back in 1950 and 1951 when they had the money, the border patrol did a very excellent job as far as the wetback situation was concerned and that they deported 30,000 in 30 days; and the present Acting Commissioner took a hand in that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is true. I happen to know that because of the fact the Los Angeles area for a great many years had trouble with these illegal Mexican entrants. My purpose has always been to keep them out. The feeling of the Mexican American citizens in my district is to keep them out, unless they enter legally.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Then I cannot understand the statement that the only two people qualified are these generals.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute that I may yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I take it that no one here would be opposed to this legislation that is proposed because they think the immigration laws are too strictly enforced.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No.

Mr. HALLECK. Because we do want them enforced.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right, and we need good men to enforce them.

Mr. HALLECK. I agree with the gentleman in that, but I say based on past experience that if we grant sufficient appropriations to the Border Patrol they can do the job we expect of them.

The gentleman knows of my friendship for him and my appreciation of him. Actually it seems to me that what the gentleman is contending about is the retirement system, because certainly the gentleman would agree that these people have retired under laws that have been passed by the Congress of the United States. Their services would be valuable in a certain field and they could be brought into the civilian service at slightly less expense than the retirement pay would be. In a way it seems to me it would be foolish to say to them: "We are not going to avail ourselves of your services."

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No. The Congress has passed legislation that prohibits an individual from drawing two pay checks from the Government. Now these gentlemen want to have their retirement rights suspended temporarily so they can accept this employment by the Government and then when it is terminated get their retirement pensions restored.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield for a further observation?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given an additional half minute.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, unless I can have 2 additional minutes in which to reply to the gentleman I would rather not take the half minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the bill and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

(The balance of the bill reads as follows:)

SEC. 2. Brigadier General Howard's appointment to, and acceptance and holding of, a civilian position in the Department of Justice shall in no way affect any status,

office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold as a retired officer in the United States Army, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided, however*, That during his incumbency in a civilian position in the Department of Justice he shall receive the compensation appertaining to such position in lieu of the retired pay to which he is entitled as a retired officer of the Army: *Provided further*, That upon the termination of such civilian employment the payment of his retired pay shall be resumed.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, to fill in: First, as I said, I rose originally to state that I was prejudiced toward General Swing. Perhaps because his wife is the daughter of Gen. Peyton March who was Chief of Staff under General Pershing in World War I. General Swing has inherited, via the March connection, a knowledge from "Black Jack" Pershing about the Mexican border, its ins and outs, and how to track down and stop those who would use the border to live beyond the law.

Point No. 2: Maybe in 5 more years we will have more civilians qualified for such jobs. We appear to face in public affairs what might be called military attitudes. But remember, these top men in the Armed Forces have been subjected in the last 15 years to the most brilliant lecturers of the free world, in and out of the War Colleges here and abroad, and have absorbed by that fact and sopped up more than we, if you please, on the battlelines in World War II were exposed to. We were pick and shovel men, by contrast. We are catching up. We should avail ourselves of their knowledge, experience, and services. Civilian takeover will come, as it should, the longer that peace prevails and war recedes. There is a general in the White House.

Think of the experience of Norway in World War II: What could have been worse for those people than to have that great influx of orphaned German youngsters, reared by kindly Norwegians, turn out to be Hitler's fifth column? What would the people of Norway not have given to have had some alert visionaries who knew what the situation might be and have kept this fifth column neutralized?

Where but across the Mexican border do we find an easier place for mass amounts of subversives to get into this country? We can pretty well control them via air and water, via ships and plane. The Mexican border poses a problem. This bill should put us on the road to its settlement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I think my record with respect to voting on this kind of legislation is clear. I opposed the special legislation that was enacted to permit General Marshall to serve as Secretary of State. I have never regretted that vote.

I have no acquaintance with General Swing or General Howard or General Partridge, therefore I have no personal feeling toward any of these gentlemen. I am opposed to this sort of legislation as a matter of principle and I want the RECORD to so show if there is not a record vote on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I just want to register my objection to the philosophy that was advanced on the floor that you can inherit through your in-laws.

Second, I know so often today we are told that the President wants something or the President does not want something. I might prejudice my own case here since I am against this, but I just got word that the White House has ordered that the planes will not leave for Guantanamo until these two generals are voted on.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK) having assumed the Chair, Mr. MACK of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1271) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 422, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon moves to recommit the bill, S. 1271, to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAYS of Ohio) there were—ayes 31, noes 99.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 80, nays 311, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—80

Addonizio	Hull	Powell
Bell	Ikard	Prouty
Blatnik	Jennings	Quigley
Bolling	Johnson, Wis.	Rees, Kans.
Brooks, Tex.	Kelley, Pa.	Reuss
Burleson	Kelly, N. Y.	Rhodes, Pa.
Celler	Kilburn	Roberts
Chudoff	Kilgore	Rodino
Church	King, Calif.	Rogers, Tex.
Clark	Knutson	Roosevelt
Denton	Lesinski	Rutherford
Dies	McDowell	Sadlak
Dingell	Macdonald	Scrivner
Dollinger	Machrowicz	Sisk
Dowdy	Marshall	Staggers
Engle	Metcalf	Taber
Fascell	Moss	Thompson, N. J.
Flynt	Moulder	Thornberry
Green, Oreg.	Multer	Udall
Griffiths	O'Hara, Minn.	Vanik
Gross	O'Konski	Wier
Hale	Passman	Williams, Miss.
Hays, Ohio	Patman	Williams, N. J.
Hayworth	Pelly	Wright
Heselton	Pfost	Yates
Holifield	Poage	Zablocki
Holtzman	Polk	

NAYS—311

Abbitt	Carnahan	Fulton
Abernethy	Carrigg	Gary
Adair	Chase	Gathings
Albert	Chatham	Gavin
Alexander	Chelf	George
Alger	Chenoweth	Granahan
Allen, Calif.	Chiperfield	Gray
Allen, Ill.	Christopher	Green, Pa.
Andersen, H. Carl	Clevenger	Gregory
	Cole	Gubser
Andresen, August H.	Colmer	Hagen
	Cooley	Haley
Andrews	Coon	Halleck
Anfuso	Cooper	Hand
Arends	Corbett	Harden
Ashley	Cramer	Hardy
Ashmore	Cretella	Harris
Aspinall	Crumpacker	Harrison, Va.
Auchincloss	Cunningham	Harvey
Avery	Curtis, Mass.	Hays, Ark.
Ayres	Curtis, Mo.	Healey
Baker	Dague	Hébert
Baldwin	Davis, Ga.	Henderson
Barden	Davis, Wis.	Herlong
Barrett	Dawson, Ill.	Hess
Bass, N. H.	Dawson, Utah	Hiestand
Bass, Tenn.	Deane	Hill
Bates	Delaney	Hillings
Beamer	Dempsey	Hinshaw
Becker	Derounian	Hoeven
Belcher	Devereux	Hoffman, Mich.
Bennett, Fla.	Dixon	Holland
Bennett, Mich.	Dodd	Holmes
Bentley	Dolliver	Horan
Berry	Dondero	Hosmer
Betts	Donohue	Huddleston
Blitch	Donovan	Hyde
Boland	Dorn, N. Y.	Jackson
Bolton, Frances P.	Dorn, S. C.	James
	Doyle	Jarman
Bolton, Oliver P.	Durham	Jenkins
	Edmondson	Jensen
Bonner	Elliott	Johansen
Bosch	Ellsworth	Johnson, Calif.
Bow	Evins	Jonas
Bowler	Feighan	Jones, Ala.
Boyle	Fenton	Jones, Mo.
Bray	Fernandez	Jones, N. C.
Brooks, La.	Fino	Judd
Brown, Ga.	Fisher	Karsten
Brown, Ohio	Fjare	Kean
Brownson	Flood	Kearney
Broyhill	Fogarty	Kearns
Budge	Forand	Keating
Burnside	Ford	Kee
Bush	Forrester	Keogh
Byrd	Fountain	Kilday
Byrne, Pa.	Frazier	King, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Frelinghuysen	Kirwan
Carlyle	Friedel	Kluczynski

Knox	O'Brien, N. Y.	Smith, Miss.
Krueger	O'Hara, Ill.	Smith, Va.
Laird	O'Neill	Springer
Landrum	Osmers	Steed
Lane	Ostertag	Sullivan
Lanham	Patterson	Talle
Lankford	Perkins	Teague, Calif.
Latham	Philbin	Teague, Tex.
LeCompte	Pillion	Thomas
Lipscomb	Poff	Thompson,
Long	Preston	Mich.
Lovre	Price	Thompson, Tex.
McCarthy	Priest	Thomson, Wyo.
McConnell	Rabaut	Tollefson
McCormack	Radwan	Trimble
McCulloch	Rains	Tuck
McDonough	Ray	Tumulty
McGregor	Reece, Tenn.	Utt
McIntire	Rhodes, Ariz.	Van Pelt
McMillan	Richards	Van Zandt
McVey	Riehlman	Velde
Mack, Ill.	Riley	Vinson
Mack, Wash.	Robeson, Va.	Vorys
Madden	Robsion, Ky.	Vursell
Magnuson	Rogers, Colo.	Wainwright
Mahon	Rogers, Fla.	Watts
Mailliard	Rogers, Mass.	Weaver
Martin	Rooney	Westland
Matthews	St. George	Wharton
Meader	Saylor	Whitten
Merrow	Schenck	Wickersham
Miller, Md.	Scherer	Widnall
Miller, Nebr.	Schwengel	Wigglesworth
Miller, N. Y.	Scott	Williams, N. Y.
Mills	Scudder	Willis
Minshall	Seely-Brown	Wilson, Calif.
Morano	Selden	Wilson, Ind.
Morrison	Sheehan	Winstead
Mumma	Short	Withrow
Murray, Ill.	Shuford	Wolcott
Murray, Tenn.	Sieminski	Wolverton
Natcher	Sikes	Young
Nicholson	Siler	Younger
Norblad	Simpson, Ill.	Zelenko
Norrell	Simpson, Pa.	
O'Brien, Ill.	Smith, Kans.	

NOT VOTING—42

Bailey	Fallon	Mollohan
Baumhart	Gamble	Morgan
Boggs	Garmatz	Nelson
Boykin	Gentry	Phillips
Buckley	Gordon	Pilcher
Burdick	Grant	Reed, N. Y.
Canfield	Gwinn	Rivers
Cannon	Harrison, Nebr.	Shelley
Cederberg	Hoffman, Ill.	Sheppard
Coudert	Holt	Smith, Wis.
Davidson	Hope	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Klein	Taylor
Diggs	Mason	Thompson, La.
Eberharter	Miller, Calif.	Walter

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Baumhart.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Cannon with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.
Mr. Davidson with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Holt.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Reed.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. MADDEN, Mr. LONG, Mr. DAWSON of Utah, and Mr. NORBLAD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) there were—ayes 185, noes 35.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. GEN. FRANK H. PARTRIDGE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1272) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1272, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee understands this is a similar bill to the one we have just passed. There is nothing new set forth in the bill that has not been debated in connection with the previous bill. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS—SECOND-CLASS CITIZENS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, there was recently a meeting in the Nation's Capital of a group of worthy citizens intent on the enactment of legislation which would, they claimed, protect the civil rights of the members of certain groups of citizens. Strange as it may seem, these champions of constitutional rights apparently have forgotten the individual who, regardless of color, race, creed, or state of origin, is denied the right to work for a livelihood unless and until he has complied with the demands of certain labor organizations.

How any citizen or group of citizens can entertain high ideals, be so concerned because, as they at least allege, certain citizens are denied the opportunity to exercise the rights and privileges granted to them under the Constitution and at the same time completely ignore the denial of similar rights to others, it is difficult to comprehend.

Education is desirable and it is easy to understand why the denial of the right to be educated at the University of Alabama has caused violent protest by members of certain organizations.

What is puzzling—at least to the average individual—is why so little is said by these same individuals and these same groups when, regardless of race, color, creed, or state of origin, loyal, patriotic capable citizens are arbitrarily denied the right to work, to earn a livelihood, until they have met the demands — sometimes exorbitant demands—of certain individuals who pose as labor leaders but who are in truth and effect arbitrary dictators who all too often make their will effective through the use of goons bearing deadly weapons—goons who assault defenseless men—yes, women and children—brutally beat those who resist their arbitrary commands.

INSINCERITY—HYPOCRISY?

Are the individuals and the groups which are today holding hearings in the Nation's Capital really concerned about principles, about the civil rights of all citizens, or are they just attempting to stir up class strife, secure some special benefit for themselves or their organization? Their complete silence on the denial to every individual of the right to work leads one to question their sincerity.

ATTEMPT TO MINIMIZE RACKETEERING AND EXTORTION BLOCKED

Several years ago, in fact in March 1947, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which it was my privilege to be chairman, held hearings and, notwithstanding the opposition of the Attorney General of the United States, secured the conviction of certain racketeers who were operating at the Dock Street Market in Philadelphia.

Still later, but prior to June 8, 1953, at my request, while acting as chairman of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which later became known as the Committee on Government Operations, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, of which I was a member, appointed a committee of three, of which I was also a member, to act jointly with a similar committee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to ascertain whether the antiracketeering law, and more particularly, the Hobbs amendment to the law, was being effectively enforced.

The suggestion of a joint committee grew out of the thought that it might be well to avoid any question of a conflict of jurisdiction between the two House committees. By the appointment of the two three-man committees, which acted jointly and of each of which I was a member, jurisdictional issues were avoided.

At my suggestion, the Honorable WINT SMITH was made chairman of the joint committee, he being the ranking member on the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Preliminary investigations were made under the direction of Helen M. Boyer, chief of staff of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. The general counsel of the staff of that subcommittee was William Francis McKenna, an able attorney of unimpeachable integrity. Chief investigator was Lester P. Condon. The staff was ably assisted by Clyde W. Smith, investigations counsel, Murray Jackson, and

Frank V. Battle. Beginning on June 8, 1953, hearings were held in the city of Detroit.

At these hearings sworn testimony disclosed that racketeering and extortion were openly practiced by certain officers and members of the teamsters union. That the teamsters union had permitted the misuse and the embezzlement of welfare funds. That James R. Hoffa, business agent and president of the local 299 of the teamsters union, Detroit, Mich., had, through misuse of his authority and power, obtained control for his wife and the wife of one of his associates of a business enterprise conducted by members of his own union. They profited greatly thereby.

On my first visit to Detroit to open the hearings on the 8th of June, Hoffa appeared and one of the first things of which he advised me was that he was a Republican and had supported State Republican candidates on occasion and that he was then supporting a Republican candidate who was a contestant for Federal office.

Shortly after those hearings, which ended on the 13th day of June, the Committee on Government Operations took away my authority to appoint special committees and to continue the hearings, the purpose of which was to expose racketeering and extortion. Undoubtedly this deprivation of authority was due in part to my own attitude toward other members of the committee. I had taken the position and advocated that, when Congress adjourned, committee investigations and hearings should, in the interest of economy, be somewhat curtailed.

Pressure to limit hearings into racketeering and extortion was also brought by individuals high in the management of the two political parties.

Later hearings in Detroit were continued but finally concluded because of the action of the Committee on Government Operations and the failure of the Committee on Education and Labor to authorize a continuance of those hearings. It was evident from the hearings which had been held that James R. Hoffa and his associates, if not themselves personally actively engaged in racketeering and extortion, were profiting from such activities and that they were permitting the misuse of welfare funds.

More recently, a committee of the other body has continued the investigation into misuse of welfare funds and it is to be hoped that those hearings will continue until there is effective prosecution and additional efficient legislation on the books.

Recently, the House has appropriated millions of dollars to finance the construction of Federal projects. Undoubtedly, other millions will be appropriated to finance the construction of highways. In my humble opinion, the labor racketeers and the extortionists will attach themselves to this type of legislation and, like bloodsuckers, will exact toll from every Federal tax dollar spent.

One of the principal racketeers will be Hoffa, whose activities have twice by Look magazine been exposed, who has at least once been "written up" in Reader's Digest. That at least some individuals are aware of what Hoffa and a few, a very few, but extremely powerful union officials intend to do is evidenced by the March 3, 1956, issue of Human Events. There an article entitled "Highway Robbery—The Teamsters Union: It'll Probably Be Worse," by Russell Turner, once again calls attention to the activities of some of these individuals—individuals who levy a tax upon each and every one of us who purchase a single article of merchandise in the open market. That article reads:

HIGHWAY ROBBERY—THE TEAMSTERS UNION: IT'LL PROBABLY BE WORSE

(By Russell Turner)

Any time something bad is found in the organized labor movement—mismanagement of welfare funds, strong-armed hoodlumism, racketeering in any of its many manifestations—the odds are that some unit of the movement's current Peck's Bad Boy will be among the prize exhibits. And the odds are that the bad boy will grow worse before its behavior improves.

The bad boy of the organized labor movement goes under the mouth-filling cognomen of International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America. It's known as the Teamsters Union. It covers the waterfront, literally as well as figuratively.

With a claimed roll of more than 1,400,000 dues-paying members, making it the Nation's biggest labor union numerically, the Teamsters Union exercises an economic life and death grip on thousands of business establishments and on millions of individuals. It has no hesitancy in exercising this power to better the business of a friend or strangle that of a foe, to improve the lot of an order-taking individual, or to force any outspoken antiunion boss individual out of his chosen profession.

Never known for namby-pambyism, the Teamsters Union has reached its current peak of power in the last 3 years under the presidency of a tough, highly individualistic product of the Pacific Northwest's brawling, blustery street wars, 61-year-old Dave Beck.

But if Dave Beck is tough, as he is, and for many years ran his domain with an iron hand, as he did, he is in the process of being shoved out of the presidency by a squat 42-year-old who is just as tough, just as iron handed, and even more dangerous—more dangerous because he is more ruthless, totally unconcerned about individual rights and devoid of scruples about such things as the niceties of the law.

The giver of the business in this case is James Riddle Hoffa, experienced in the art. He helped elect Beck president of the Brotherhood in 1952, a feat requiring a giving of the business to the late Dan Tobin, then the international president who found himself retired, by other than personal request, to the pension-heavy job of president emeritus. Indications are that Beck will be put out in the same pasture along about mid-1957.

Jimmy Hoffa got off to an early start in the union-racket game. A Detroit bakery platform loader at 17, he persuaded his fellow bakeryites to form a new union which soon won a charter from the then struggling Teamsters Union. At age 19, the fist-swinging youngster pushed his way into the presidency of the Detroit Joint Teamsters Council, embracing the 3 Detroit area locals. The climb continues. Today he is the acknowledged czar of teamsters and related craft throughout the Midwest, is throwing his considerable weight around in the South and the East, and is number two pushing one in the International Brotherhood.

His methods are far from soft. His personal gain, financially and powerwise, is large. Truckowners find themselves picketed by imported goons if they refuse to sign Teamsters contracts, even though their employees may not want to be members; they discover that other truckers will not transship their cargoes because of the controverted "hot cargo" clause. Jukebox operators discover their windows smashed and their establishments bombed if they refuse to pay up to $20 a month per employee for "dues" to one of Hoffa's unions. Welfare fund insurance, with premiums of more than $5 million a year, is placed with a little-known company headed by a long-time friend of Hoffa's, which channels $1 million in 3 years as commissions and fees to a Chicago agency; the agency, set up about the time the policies were placed, is owned and operated by other friends of Hoffa who, by coincidence, are his partners in a girls' camp in Wisconsin and an oil lease brokerage firm in North Dakota.

Using their maiden names, Mrs. Hoffa and the wife of one of his top lieutenants put $4,000 into a truck-rental firm which took over the business of a Teamsters strike-bound firm, and in 4 years took out $65,000 in dividends and still own the company—without, of course, doing any work except to tell a clerk to send the dividend checks. The list of equally dubious activities of Hoffa and company could be continued ad infinitum.

Nice work, if you can get it. Hoffa gets it.

But such tactics are not confined to the 23 Central States comprising Hoffa-land. Find a Teamsters local anywhere, and the odds are that you will find some form of strong-arm racketeering.

Tradition means nothing to the Teamsters, even in the field of organizing nonunion workers and bringing them into the fold. The accepted method of most labor unions is to persuade individual workers that they will be better off economically if they join the union and authorize it to bargain for them.

Not the Teamsters. Their method is to look over the field and choose a victim; then they go to the chosen employer and say, "sign or else." The "or else" runs the gamut of every variety of gangster and economic persuasion yet devised; shootings, bombings, beatings, cutting off of supplies—all may be included.

Usually employers fall into line; occasionally they balk, and on extremely rare occasions they win out against the "or else" gamut.

An obdurate gentleman named Paul Andrews heads the B & S Motor Lines of Nashville, Tenn. In November 1954 he was visited by representatives of Teamsters' Nashville local 327, who told him he must sign a new contract covering his over-the-road drivers, similar to one then being negotiated with other Tennessee truck operators. Andrews demurred; virtually all of his work, he said, was handled with individually owned rigs, most of them belonging to young Korean war veterans who drove their own trucks under contract and had no desire to be represented by the Teamsters or any other union.

On the night of December 9, parties unknown sneaked into B & S terminals at Nashville and Memphis, slashed several tires, put syrup and abrasives into several motors. The estimated damage was $3,500. Just a forewarning.

The trouble really began in May, when a State court antipicketing injunction was modified to permit peaceful picket lines, which promptly were established around each of the three B & S terminals—at Nashville, Memphis, and Charlotte, N. C. Picket cars followed trucks and harassed them on

lonely stretches in many ways. Bullets flew on several occasions.

On June 12, in Sevier County, Tenn., a bullet was fired from a fast-moving car into the windshield of a B & S truck but hit the steering wheel and was deflected to the floor. Forty minutes later and only a few miles away, another bullet punctured a rear tire of another B & S rig.

In July, a shotgun blast shattered the left elbow of driver A. D. McKinney, a 24-year-old Gastonia, N. C. veteran of 26 months in Korea. Shotgun blasts were emptied at the line's Nashville terminal. Several rock-throwing incidents were reported. Altogether, Andrews lists more than 30 serious acts of violence between June and November when the climax occurred.

On the evening of November 21, 36-year-old James T. Bruce, a B & S driver for 2 years, was paying his dinner check to the cashier of a Nashville cafe when an unknown husky sidled up to him. The next thing Bruce knew, he was being worked over thoroughly by brass knuckles sheathed in leather gloves, and wound up in a hospital with severe head lacerations, a broken jaw and bruises covering most of his body.

A Nashville grand jury took a dim view of the incident, returning a presentment which named two Teamsters members and an "unknown white man" as conspiring to murder Bruce. It said the unknown was the slugger, that the two union men—Perry H. Canaday and C. B. Richardson—stood by apparently to guard against interference.

By coincidence, Canaday on November 3 had been sentenced to 6 months in jail (on November 21 he was free on bond pending appeal), along with another Teamsters unioneer, on charges of malicious mischief in connection with the window-smashing of two nonunion Nashville barber shops. Also by coincidence, Nashville police had searched the unlicense-plated car of W. A. Smith, assistant business agent of the teamsters Nashville local. They found a heavy leather glove, as well as dynamite percussion caps, several hundred feet of wire and a dynamite-detonating battery. By further coincidence, Canaday and his colleague in the window-smashing incident had testified that on the night they said they had not broken any windows they were in Smith's car.

Meanwhile, other Tennessee truckers had signed contracts with the Teamsters and on October 21, 1955, the union invoked the hot-cargo clause to compel other lines to refuse to transship cargo to or from B & S. Andrews says this cost his firm about 20 truckloads a week, dropping its gross revenue from about $95,000 a month to about $75,000.

Andrews also says that in May a Teamsters business agent told him, "I am giving you one last chance to sign this contract before we set up the picket line and close you up." He hasn't signed yet; neither has he closed, but it certainly has been made a tough business.

Not many truckers beat a Teamsters rap of that sort. One other who did is Desmond A. Barry, president of the Galveston Truck Lines Corp., of Houston, which freights between Houston, Galveston, and Texas City in Texas, and Oklahoma City, Okla. "Desperate Des," as he came to be known, not only forced the Teamsters to retreat ignominiously, but he has pending in Federal court a $75,000 treble-damage antitrust suit against a group of other trucklines which refused to interchange Galveston freight, on the basis of a hot-cargo clause.

Barry's story, as related in his Federal court complaint, is that on March 7, 1955, the president of Oklahoma City local 886 of the Teamsters, James E. Hamilton, informed him he would sign the southern conference over-the-road contract (Barry's line never had belonged to the conference) or the union would tighten the economic screws. On April 2, he was given a 3-day ultimatum by a representative of Houston Teamsters local 968, who said the signed contract should be on Hamilton's desk by April 5—or else. Barry's answer was that he would not sign unless and until the union was certified by the National Labor Relations Board as bargaining agent for his drivers; he said he had checked the 27 drivers, and found that only three carried Teamsters cards, and none showed any interest in being represented by the Teamsters.

About mid-April, says Barry, some of the lines with which Galveston had interchange agreements began sporadic refusals to accept freight for transshipment to his line, on grounds it was involved in a labor dispute. On April 29, Hamilton placed Galveston on local 886's unfair list and called on all other lines, in compliance with their hot-cargo agreements, not to patronize this firm. On May 3, Oklahoma City dock workers began refusing to handle Galveston cargo.

Barry's response was more than the union had anticipated. First, he won immediate emergency permission from the Interstate Commerce Commission, over the objections of some other truckers, to deliver or pick up cargo anywhere in Oklahoma; previously, Oklahoma City had been the only terminal in that State he was permitted to use. Next, he filed charges against the union with the NLRB, and persuaded the Board to petition a Federal district court for an injunction against the alleged illegal secondary boycott.

The union quickly realized it had a hotter potato on its hands than it had bargained for. On June 1, Hamilton withdrew the unfair designation and rescinded its invocation of the hot-cargo clause. On August 2, local 886 formally accepted an NLRB stipulation in which it promised never to repeat various unlawful practices which it insisted it never had done anyway and which, by then, long since had been stopped.

Meanwhile, Barry had instituted his antitrust action against the other trucklines. Conceivably, that suit could result in judicial outlawing of the hot-cargo clause; barring that, if Barry wins, it certainly could have the effect of making employers chary of signing contracts containing it.

Probably the most widely publicized signing of a Teamsters' contract occurred about a year ago when the Sewell Avery management of Montgomery Ward & Co. cheerfully accepted a Teamsters' contract covering some 14,000 employees. At times, the number of coincidences involving the Teamsters seems amazing. Here, the coincidence was that Jimmy Hoffa at the same time had nudged trustees of welfare funds covering three Teamsters' locals into investing some $2 million in Montgomery Ward stock, and later to vote the stock for the Avery management in its last-ditch proxy battle with Louis Wolfson when the latter unsuccessfully sought to take over control of the company.

Management spokesmen, who were on the inside of the Ward-Teamsters negotiations, insist it was pure coincidence that the contract agreement and the stock purchase occurred at approximately the same time. Perhaps so—skeptics are unconvinced. In any event, Hoffa must be given credit for having chosen the psychological time to call on Ward's for a contract—the time when a strike might well have swung the then-nearing proxy election to the upstart Wolfson. Observers, who recall pictures of a stony-faced Avery being carried from his office by Federal troops during the last war because he refused to have anything to do with striking unioneers, agree it would take some emergency such as the Wolfson battle to make him sign as readily as he did.

With all of its deplorable activities, the Teamsters does about as well for its members as any union, better than many, on the vital score of wages, hours, working conditions, and fringe benefits. For example, a union survey finds the average hourly pay of teamsters members increased by 29.8 cents during the 3 years from December 1, 1952, as against an average hourly increase of 12.8 cents for all manufacturing workers. Welfare fund coverage has been expanded, paid holiday, and vacation times have been increased, and various other fringe benefits have grown.

Confronted with new demands from the Teamsters at contract signing time, employers frequently protest that the terms will put them out of business. Some employers have been so put out of business and a large majority of the employer protests are fully justified. Nevertheless, employers as a class are not entirely lily-white and blameless in their dealings with the teamsters.

More than once, employers—individually or as associations—have been more than happy to sign Teamsters' contracts embodying expensive new terms because the signing has been accompanied by an unwritten, tacit agreement that the union will compel nonsigning, independent competitors to fall into line. On occasion, it is entirely willing to exert its power to dissuade competitors from cutting prices or otherwise upsetting the economic applecart, a form of informal, unofficial policing which would be entirely illegal if ever provable.

Thus the new contract may cost the employer substantially; but if his industry is stabilized, prices can be set high enough to cover the increased costs and the ultimate consumer is left paying the cost. This leaves everybody—worker, union, employer—happy, except the consumer; and, usually, he does not even realize what has happened to his pocketbook.

On the other hand, the hatred, fear, and distrust held by other unions for the Teamsters is large. It abides by no interunion rules; its concept of the area covered by teamsters, chauffeurs, warehousemen, and helpers is vast; it refuses to sign the "no raiding" agreement; it sniffs disdainfully at the newly merged AFL–CIO and makes clear that if anybody tries to cross its path, it will pull out to independent status.

The CIO originated, developed and perfected the use of goon squads and strong-arm methods in organizational operations. But it was just last summer, shortly before the AFL-CIO merger, that the CIO-executive board, acting as the behest of its Brewery Workers Union, adopted a resolution roundly condemning a typical, old-fashioned raid which it said had been conducted by the teamsters on the CIO Brewery Workers' 1,000-member St. Paul local 343. Complaining of the customary one-sided, rabble rousing tactics of the Teamsters, it said a horde of that union's officials descended upon a meeting of the local union. * * * This raid was undeniably ordered from the top level administration of the Teamsters because the Teamsters' representatives were drawn from distant points including St. Louis, Chicago, Wisconsin, California and New York. * * * railroaded a series of actions through the meeting by rising votes, disposing of funds of the local, calling for disaffiliation and for affiliation with the Teamsters and a Teamster charter was promptly presented."

This, from the CIO, prompted some wags to comment that the Teamsters had learned too well from the CIO.

Increasingly over the years, Beck has been trying to dissociate himself from his hurly-burly early days, to gather unto himself—and unto the Teamsters, more recently—an aura of respectability, of gentility. Not even a high-school graduate, one of his proudest moments came many years ago when judicious string-pulling won him the post of president of the board of regents of the University of Washington. Over the years, he probably has addressed more Rotary, Kiwanis and Chamber of Commerce luncheons and held more civic positions in his native Seattle than any other union official. To cap it all, this unorthodox character admits having voted for Dewey in 1948 and Eisenhower in 1952.

Hoffa goes along with Beck's search for respectability—just as long as the chief does not interfere with his own operations. Jimmy, at present, is conducting a determined campaign to bring into the teamsters the gangster-ridden International Longshoremen's Association, expelled by the AFL in 1953 because it was dominated by mobsters who shook down the New York waterfront to the tune of millions of dollars yearly. If he succeeds, New Yorkers agree it will mean that the hoods take over complete control of trucking and allied industries in the world's largest city.

If they do, it would not be the first time it has happened in Hoffa-land. Well-substantiated reports tell of the old Capone mob levying their toll on teamsters' operations in Chicago. Frequently, gangsters, run out of one city, turn up on the payroll of a teamsters' local in another city under Hoffa's jurisdiction. Hoffa's own probation report in 1949 showed 17 arrests, 6 on assault charges of which all but 1 were dismissed. The list included a $1,000 fine on his 1940 nolle contendere plea to an indictment charging him with conspiring with Detroit wastepaper collecting companies to set up a monopoly, in connection with which the home of a wastepaper executive was bombed; also, a $500 fine in 1946 when he pleaded guilty to violating a State labor law in lieu of standing trial on an extortion charge in connection with an abortive effort to organize and regulate small grocery stores in Detroit.

The overall picture presented by the Teamsters Union is not pretty. It was bad under Dan Tobin, it has been no better under Dave Beck; but when and if Jimmy Hoffa takes over, and it looks like he will, the picture will become worse.

Now, what's the remedy?

When conditions become bad enough, the public tends to demand curative action. The dramatic change in public attitude toward the Wagner Act is an excellent example. The act—passed in 1935—was thought to be sacrosanct. Even in 1944, the Republican nominee, Thomas E. Dewey, faithfully promised organized labor that he would, if elected, accept the act in toto. Nevertheless, by 1947, its abuses had so aroused the public that the Wagner Act was amended by the Taft-Hartley law. After President Truman's veto, the Republicans in Congress voted almost unanimously to override the law, and even a majority of the Democrats in Congress voted the same way.

The Taft-Hartley story is encouraging to those who have seen the outrages perpetrated by the Teamsters Union. Let the people know, and they will demand proper action.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, at the conclusion of the legislative day I will be speaking under a special order and the subject of my remarks will be discrimination. All of my life I have sought to make my small and humble contribution to the world in which it is given me to live for a span by speaking out on every occasion offered me against discrimination of any nature. The evil is not so much in who or what is the target of discrimination. It is discrimination itself, the spirit of bias and of prejudice that ultimately destroys the contentment of the individual and the unity of the Nation.

I have listened to the debate on this bill and the one previously passed. Some of the arguments of the opposition seem to hold a certain validity. That is, if such enactments interfered with promotions in the civil service earned by long and faithful service there would be in my mind a valid ground of objection. But more and more the debate centers, not upon this phase, but on the question of the qualifications to fill a public position of an officer of the United States Army after his retirement. This it seemed to me is of the nature of discrimination.

We cannot discriminate among our fellow citizens on the lines of race, religion, or station. That truth I hold to be the very foundation of our Republican Democracy. Once we say that a retired general is in a special class of disqualification, it will not be long before we have set the same bars of distinction against retired educators, retired ministers of the gospel, the retired men and women of any group. It sets the pattern of discrimination. Discrimination is a poison that almost undiscerned at first spreads rapidly and destroys.

At the close of World War II a woman who had served with the Armed Forces, and later in this administration, occupied a high place in the executive department of the Federal Government, was quoted as saying that in the matter of civil employment it could be taken for granted that one who had served as an officer was better qualified to do a good job in civil life than one who had served in the ranks. I do not know whether she made that statement. I do know that it was quoted widely in the newspapers and that there was in the homes in the community where I lived a resentment over this apparent attempt to divide into two classes the returned veterans of our wars, those who had served as officers and a lower class composed of those who had served in the ranks.

I can imagine nothing that would quicker destroy our democracy than this kind of discrimination. Most of us in this body have served in the armed services in time of war. We know that there are many circumstances beyond the control of the individual soldier that determine his military status. Every soldier and sailor serves in the position where he is ordered. He does his duty as it is given him to do. The circumstance whether he is called upon to do that duty with the authority of a commissioned officer, or as one of the enlisted personnel is no measure of his ability or of his character. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, we can have no enduring democracy with discrimination between exservice men and women on the lines of the capacities in which they served when our country was at war and every man and woman in uniform did the job that was given him or her to do.

If this be true, and I think my colleagues will join in admitting its truth, the rule holds also with generals. We cannot discriminate against our fellow-Americans because in time of war they were generals any more than we can discriminate against our fellow-Americans because in time of war they served in the ranks. I would say that here in our America every man stands on his own feet.

Every year we Members in the Congress appoint young men to the service academies. I do not think we would wish to have them discriminated against later in life merely because they had gone to those academies, had been educated at the expense of the Government and then had gone as commissioned officers paying their debt to the Government by years of service in the fields in which they had been educated. In the final analysis we would have been the ones responsible for these young men who might never have reached the academies and gone into the commissioned service except for our appointments.

So, Mr. Chairman, I voted for the bill preceding this and I shall vote for the one we now have under consideration. When I came to this Congress I promised myself that on every occasison where I had the opportunity to vote against discrimination in any form I should cast my vote against discrimination. My voting today is an adherence to that rule that I have always followed and that which shall continue to be my guide until the end. At the same time I do feel very strongly that no encouragement should be given to any trend to place retired military men in civil positions merely because of the circumstance that they are military men. That would be a bad practice. It in itself would be a form of discriminaion. The safe rule for us to follow, the safe rule today as it will be centuries from now, is the rule that every man must stand on his own feet, measured by his own worth and his own character. As long as we adhere to that rule our great country will be able to fulfill her destiny of world responsibility.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, since the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has correctly stated the proposition, we have no further requests for time on this side. This involves a major general instead of a brigadier general.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205), as amended (5 U. S. C. 62), or any other provision of law, Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, may be appointed to and accept and hold a civilian position in the Department of Justice.

SEC. 2. Major General Partridge's appointment to, and acceptance and holding of, a civilian position in the Department of Justice shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold as a retired officer in the United States Army, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided, however*, That during his incumbency in a civilian position in the Department of Justice he shall receive the compensation appertaining to such position in lieu of the retired pay to which he is entitled as a retired officer of the Army: *Provided further*, That upon the termination of such civilian employment the payment of his retired pay shall be resumed.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1272) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 423, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX EXEMPTION FOR NEIGHBORHOOD SWIMMING POOL ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 4243 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by exempting neighborhood swimming pool corporations, organizations, or associations from the 20-percent Federal tax on club dues and initiation fees now applying to social, athletic, or sporting clubs or organizations.

Neighborhood swimming pools are a rather recent innovation and have become increasingly popular in many sections of the country. They are in no way to be confused with community-owned swimming pools, which are built at the expense of local taxpayers and paid for in part by admissions and concessions.

The neighborhood swimming pools referred to in this bill are privately financed by the residents of a particular section of the community, through the collection of a specified amount from each family in the neighborhood desiring to join, figured on a pro rata basis to pay for the cost of acquiring the land and building the pool. The pools are relatively small in size and are usually designed to accommodate from 100 to 500 families who are members of the swimming pool organization. Annual dues are charged to pay for lifeguard protection and maintenance.

The swimming pool members are usually brought together by a citizen's association, or similar group and eventually form a non-profit corporation or association to enter into the necessary contractual relationships with contractors who build the pool. In some cases the actual construction is done by the members themselves, drawing upon the talents of their neighbors. Local zoning and building code requirements are of course necessarily complied with.

These neighborhood swimming pools have become most popular in newly developed suburban areas, where community recreational facilities are totally inadequate.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this bill might be given the short title of "A bill to curb juvenile delinquency, promote healthful recreational facilities, and to strengthen neighborhood solidarity and promote good will." Neighborhood swimming pools do all of these things. We hear much these days about what should be done about the mounting juvenile delinquency problem, young people who roam the streets in gangs, destroying private property, and costing local taxpayers untold millions for added police and fire protection. What better way could there be than to provide recreational facilities in their own neighborhood, which would encourage clean, wholesome, and healthful family-type activities. Their parents would also be benefited by having ready accessible recreational facility to relieve some of the tensions of our modern day living, while also becoming better acquainted with their neighbors through the experience of joint endeavor.

I feel that this type of neighborhood initiative would be beneficial to our communities, States, and our Nation. I feel that it is in the best traditions of free enterprise. Many of our sprawling suburban areas have no tie to the community; people living in isolated subdivisions and huge housing developments often have little in common with their neighbors; often there is no place to discuss community problems or join in social activities. Neighborhood swimming pools are one important way in which the people living in these types of suburban developments can be brought together. I feel that this is a worthwhile objective which should be encouraged.

The purpose of my bill is to provide an incentive for such neighborhood groups in the construction of their own swimming pools. We must remember that this is the only way in which this type of recreational facility may ever be obtainable. Tax levels in many suburban areas are already fantastically high because of the critical need for new school construction to take care of the children suddenly moving into an area where a new housing project has been built. New streets, roads, and sewers must also be provided. Thus, community tax-financed swimming pools very often receive little or no consideration.

I feel that the Internal Revenue Code should make some differentiation between taxing of golf and country clubs, riding clubs, and similar private clubs drawing their membership from widely separated parts of the community and the taxing of this type of neighborhood swimming-pool endeavor now coming into vogue because of a legitimate and demonstrated need for recreational facilities.

Section 4243 of the Internal Revenue Code recognizes that some types of organizations have beneficial influences in the community which warrant their exemption from the 20-percent tax on dues and fees paid to other private clubs. This section already exempts "all amounts paid as dues or fees to a fraternal society, order, or association, operating under the lodge system, or to any local fraternal organization among the students of a college or university."

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the basic principle involved in these types of exemptions is in no way different from the neighborhood organizations which I seek to encourage in this bill.

The loss of revenue would be slight and the many benefits would more than compensate them in tax savings at the local governmental level. People who are willing to invest $100 or $200 in the construction of a swimming pool in their own neighborhood should be granted exemption from the Federal tax just as fraternal organizations are exempted. After all, a neighborhood is but a type of fraternity, where people must learn to live together in a spirit of cooperation and brotherhood.

I sincerely hope that this bill will be given consideration by the Ways and Means Committee. It is not just another special interest type of legislation to gain tax exemption. It is a positive approach which we can take to meet the changes in living habits of our modern society by providing healthy recreational outlets for our children, young people and adult citizens alike.

A MORAL OBLIGATION TO JOINT STOCK LAND BANK BONDHOLDERS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have this week introduced H. R. 10080, a bill to provide for the payment by the Treasury of unpaid principal and interest, up to the date of receivership, of bonds of six joint stock land banks which failed in the 1920's and 1930's. Joint stock land bank bonds were the creature of the Federal Farm Loan Act of July 17, 1916. At that time, American agriculture was threatened by the excessive interest rates charged farmers on their mortgages. The purpose was to sell bonds in the joint stock land banks to the public at a low interest rate, so that the funds thus obtained could in turn be lent to farmers at reasonable interest rates, and thus prevent a farm depression.

The act, and the bonds issued by the joint stock land banks pursuant to the act, led the public to believe the joint stock land bank bonds were Government obligations. The act—title 12, paragraph 931—stated that—

> Farm loan bonds shall be deemed and held to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States.

Joint stock land bank bonds are included within the definition of farm loan bonds—title 12, paragraph 642. The wording on the bonds was prepared by the Federal Farm Loan Board—title 12, paragraph 821—and they were printed

by the Treasury on paper resembling liberty bonds—title 12, paragraph 864. Each bond contained on its face the words "Farm loan bonds shall be deemed and held to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States." The joint stock land bank bonds and the joint stock land banks themselves, were subject to the complete control of an official United States Government agency set up by the act, the Farm Loan Board. When various joint stock land banks defaulted on their interest payments, the Farm Loan Board put the banks into receivership.

BELIEVED TO BE GOVERNMENT OBLIGATIONS

That the joint stock land bank bonds were considered as backed by a governmental instrumentality is indicated by their coupon, at the low rate for the 1920's of 5 percent. Actual yields were in the range of 4 to 5 percent. During this period, liberty bonds yielded 4 to 5 percent; farm mortgages yielded up to 15 percent; and gilt-edged first mortgage bonds yielded 7 percent or better, such as Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. first mortgage, 8.05 percent; American Telephone & Telegraph Co. first mortgage, 7.30 percent; Great Northern Railway Co. first mortgage, 7.40 percent.

Joint stock land bank bonds were widely purchased by investors who sincerely believed them to be obligations of the United States Government. The following statements indicate the reliance of both sophisticated and unsophisticated investors on the good faith of the Government in buying joint stock land bank bonds.

Mrs. Mildred Harmon, Oconto, Wis., a widow who invested insurance moneys resulting from her husband's death in joint stock land bank bonds:

At the time of purchase of such bonds I believed and do now believe that the United States Government is liable for the unpaid portion of these bonds because on the face of each bond there was written a statement to the effect that these bonds were deemed and held to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States.

Mrs. Charles Gumaer, San Diego, Calif. She and her deceased husband bought joint stock land bank bonds:

We most certainly did believe and still do believe that the United States is in some manner liable because the act of Congress declared these bonds to be instrumentalities of the United States and that was the reason for the investment in them.

BACKED BY THE UNITED STATES

L. H. Joanes, Green Bay, Wis.:

Everyone who purchased these bonds was definitely under the impression that they were an obligation of the United States Government.

Park Marshall, Franklin, Tenn.:

The bonds had on the face of it that it was an instrumentality of the United States Government and it was wholly the reason I bought the bonds because I fully believed and relied upon that statement.

L. B. Lindsay, of Lindsay Bros., Minneapolis, Minn.:

It has at all times been my understanding that Congress intended to see that these are paid on account of their being instrumentalities of our Government.

Laura M. Hall, widow of Edwin Hall, Freeport, Ill.:

It was common knowledge among Mr. Hall's intimate friends as well as among members of his immediate family that he believed when he purchased these bonds that the United States Government would pay any default if any should occur.

A. Rosenberg, Milwaukee, Wis.:

I wish to say that I certainly was of the impression that these bonds were backed by the United States Government; otherwise I would not have bought them.

N. C. Cross, executor estate of Dr. S. G. Kennedy, Tulsa, Okla.:

The writer was associated with Dr. Kennedy at the time these bonds were acquired, during his ownership thereof, and through the period being liquidated by the receiver. Such bonds were purchased with the understanding they were instrumentalities of the Federal Government.

Attorney Frank L. Stephan, Twin Falls, Idaho, speaking for the Flier Highway District of Twin Falls, Idaho:

The commissioners of the district at the time the investment was made believed the United States had guaranteed payment of the bonds in question and that even though default might be made—the amount would be paid.

Simon S. Mumma, Dayton, Ohio:

At the time of purchase of these bonds it was my understanding and still is that they were backed by the Federal Government.

William McPherson, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio:

I was given to understand (from the words used) that these bonds had the same standing as bonds issued by the United States Government.

THE SOPHISTICATED INVESTOR

R. P. Boardman, president, Wisconsin National Life Insurance Co., of Oshkosh, Wis., formerly trust officer of the First National Bank in Oshkosh, Wis.:

When the First Trust Co. in Oshkosh, with which I was then connected as an investment officer, purchased a block of approximately $15,000 of these bonds for the investment of funds of trusts limited to securities legal for trusts in the State of Wisconsin, such purchase was made to the best of my knowledge and belief upon the understanding that these bonds, as instrumentalities of the United States Government were supported by the faith and credit of said Government.

A block of $33,000 of these same bonds was purchased by the Wisconsin National Life Insurance Co. under the provisions of the Wisconsin statutes regulating the investment of life insurance companies in this State. I was not an officer of the insurance company at that time but inquiry of the treasurer of the company indicates that the investment committee, in selecting and recommending these bonds as suitable for investment of the company's funds, was influenced by the fact that they were instrumentalities of the United States Government and that the Government could be relied upon accordingly for the ultimate payment of these obligations in the event of any default by the issuing bank. Col. I. H. Weed, chief counsel of the company and, as you know, a prominent local attorney at that time, was a member of the committee and expressed it as his opinion that these bonds were backed by the credit of the United States Government. This opinion generally prevailed among local students of investment matters and members of institutional investment committees. The failure of the Government to take action in the matter as expected by those sections of the public interested in these bonds has been not only a source of mystification, but it has also been a cause of disappointment and of some damage to the reputation of the Treasury Department for full and faithful performance with respect to obligations issued as its instrumentalities.

Charles H. Thornton, a trustee of the W. J. Conan Trust of Duluth, Minn.:

This deponent further states that when the United States denies liability on these bonds which are now in default he believes a fraud will be committed on the public because in his opinion the average investor and banker would believe that when Congress declared these bonds to be instrumentalities of the Government that Congress meant to use the term in the ordinary and generally accepted sense, to wit: that Congress meant these bonds to be contracts or obligations of the Government of the United States.

W. R. Frame, president, the Waukesha National Bank and formerly a director of the Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank of Milwaukee:

I know the matter was discussed in a number of our board meetings—and was talked over by many of our officers, all of whom were under the impression that they were buying bonds under which the United States Government had placed itself as virtually guaranteeing the payment.

Sarah Margaret Sloan, Yakima, Wash.:

Since they were instrumentalities of the United States, it only seems right that the balance due on them should be paid by the Government.

PUBLIC PENSION FUNDS

Judge M. S. Sheridan, county judge, Milwaukee, Wis.:

As secretary and treasurer of the Milwaukee County Orphan's Board, believing the representations made to us that the bonds in question were obligations of the United States we purchased $6,000 par value of the bonds.

I have never been able to understand after the representations apparently made by the Government, that it has refused to take care of the deficiency.

Park board employees benefit fund, Chicago, Ill.:

Each bond issued by these banks bore the following inscription: "Farm loan bonds issued under the provisions of this act shall be deemed and held to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States." The bonds were regarded as Government obligations.

Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, which invested $140,000 in joint stock land bank bonds now in default, in teachers', policemen's, and firemen's pension accounts:

Whereas the Treasury printed the bonds and on the face of each bond were these words, "Farm loan bonds issued under the provisions of this act shall be deemed and held to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States"; and

Whereas the teachers', firemen's and policemen's pension fund boards and trustees of the city of Milwaukee invested funds in the bonds of the Milwaukee Joint Stock Land Bank in the justified and sincere belief that they were Government obligations and eligible for trust fund investments; and

Whereas many thousands of investors in Milwaukee and Wisconsin and other States

bought these joint stock land bank bonds and instrumentalities of our Government; and

Whereas purchasers of joint stock land bank bonds who have an unpaid balance thereon will have reason to lose faith in the integrity of the Government of the United States if said bonds are not paid in full: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That we most strongly urge upon your honorable bodies the propriety and justice of passing a bill as will provide for the reimbursement to all purchasers of joint stock land bank bonds.

Affidavit of Otto Muenter, city treasurer, Fond du Lac, Wis.:

This deponent states that it was his belief and the belief of other members that had control of the investment of the above bonds that joint stock land bank bonds were obligations of the United States because they were instrumentalities of the Government of the United States.

This deponent further states that before investing this money the city attorney approved the investment as obligations of the United States.

John B. Dunbar, Shearson, Hammill & Co., New York, former executive vice president C. F. Childs & Co.:

C. F. Childs & Co. at that time (1924–33) was recognized throughout the world as an outstanding United States Government bond house. We handled millions of dollars of both Federal land and joint stock land bank bonds. I am sure in my own mind that the reason we handled them was that we believed that they were an obligation of our Government.

Subsequently, the Government decided to ignore this obligation.

The Farm Loan Board tried to say they were called instrumentalities of the Government simply for tax purposes. This, obviously, is ridiculous, as tax exemption meant little or nothing in those days.

I assure you that I have nothing to gain personally, but believe that right is right and that it is time that the Government recognized its obligation.

RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

Rev. M. Gilles, speaking for Clerics Regular Servants of the Sick, Milwaukee, Wis.:

As you know these bonds were declared by Congress to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States.

Further, the Government agent (Farm Loan Board) is directly chargeable with the existing default. By act of Congress and in fact the Farm Loan Board approved the bond issue, maturity date and collateral, it controlled the bank, appointed its own receiver and controlled the liquidation. But the Government has refused to pay. * * *

Since our order is a nonprofit charitable institution you will understand how much redeeming these bonds would mean to us.

Rev. David W. Ryan, speaking for the Father Fagan Memorial Fund:

The investment in these bonds on behalf of our approximately 3,000 parishoners was largely influenced due to the fact that they were termed instrumentalities of the Government of the United States and as a result were considered assured of payment without loss.

East Wisconsin Trustee Co., Manitowoc, Wis.:

The East Wisconsin Trustees Co., of Manitowoc, Wis., is particularly interested in the above bill because at the time of the issuance of the bonds of the Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank of Milwaukee the bond department of this company sold a number of these bonds to its customers in this vicinity and also purchased bonds for trust accounts, namely guardianships and testamentary trusts.

It was the impression of those in charge at the time the bonds were issued and of the writer that these bonds were in effect obligations of the United States Government. The dealers in these securities represented them as such and the bonds themselves indicated that they had United States Government backing.

A. T. Brenner, a broker at Fond du Lac, Wis.:

A. T. Brenner being first duly sworn, on oath, says that he was president of the Commercial Co., a corporation that engaged in the sale of bonds and stocks, and that he took an active interest personally in the sale of Milwaukee Joint Stock Land Bank bonds and as a result of his efforts the Commercial Co. either directly or as agent sold large amounts of these bonds.

This deponent further states that the bonds were deemed and held to be instrumentalities of the United States by an act of Congress and also that each bond had this statement on the face thereof. The literature pertaining to these bonds also carried this statement, "These bonds are instrumentalities of the United States."

This deponent further states that he always construed the phrase "instrumentalities of the United States" to mean obligations of the United States.

This deponent further states that he has been engaged in the sale of securities for more than 25 years and that his interpretation of the phrase, "instrumentalities of the United States" is that this phrase meant obligations of the United States.

Eliot Fitch, president, Marine National Exchange Bank of Milwaukee, Wis.:

I agree with you that that statement gave to investors a feeling of security, and it was in the hope that some protection would be afforded them that I purchased bonds of the Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank.

THE MISREPRESENTATION ADMITTED

The Farm Loan Board itself, in a letter dated August 22, 1930, frankly admitted that the public had bought joint stock land bank bonds under the impression that they were Government guaranteed obligations:

We have received numerous letters from purchasers of land bank bonds or their representatives, stating that they were led to believe by the phrase "instrumentalities of the Government," that the bonds are the obligations of the Government, or in some sense guaranteed by it. In view of all of the circumstances, it is the feeling of the Board that the use of this phrase should be avoided in any circulars or other literature regarding the bonds issued by joint stock land banks or Federal land banks, and that the statement to the effect that the bonds are free of taxation would express the full meaning of the phrase as used in the law and would serve every proper purpose."

From 1917 to 1931, some 88 joint stock land banks were chartered under the Federal Farm Loan Act by the Federal Farm Loan Board. All of the joint stock land banks have now been liquidated. In order to permit the orderly liquidation of the joint stock land banks, Congress in 1933 passed the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was authorized to make available $100 million to be loaned to the joint stock land banks, and through this means some 81 of the joint stock land banks were liquidated and paid off their bondholders in full. Of the 7 banks which went into receivership, 6 were never paid off in full. These six were not provided for by the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933 because it was felt that their assets would be sufficient to pay off all bondholders. Unfortunately, this proved not to be the case.

THE AMOUNTS OWING

The six banks, with their dates of receivership and the amounts unpaid—principal plus interest to the date of receivership—are as follows:

Bank	Date of receivership	Amounts unpaid	
		Principal	Interest to date of receivership
Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank of Milwaukee, Wis	July 1, 1927	$7,754,896	$109,895
Burlington Joint Stock Land Bank of Des Moines, Iowa	Dec. 12, 1936	198,218	3,046
Chicago Joint Stock Land Bank of Chicago, Ill	Oct. 1, 1932	7,040,932	145,457
Ohio Joint Stock Land Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio	Sept. 1, 1927	508,558	9,949
St. Louis Joint Stock Land Bank of St. Louis, Mo	June 1, 1932	2,099,876	30,512
Central Joint Stock Land Bank of Greenville, Ill. (merged with St. Louis Bank prior to receivership)		1,047,693	18,450
Southern Minnesota Joint Stock Land Bank of Minneapolis, Minn	May 2, 1932	5,341,726	140,246
Total		23,991,899	457,555

This amount of $24,449,454 represents the total outstanding amount of joint-stock land-bank bonds, including principal and interest to date of receivership. This sum is approximately 50 percent of their face value. In the event of repayment, obviously, it is likely that somewhat less than this will be turned in, since most of these bonds were purchased 30 and more years ago.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Beginning in 1945, a series of bills have been introduced in the Congress to attempt to secure relief for the unpaid holders of defaulted joint stock land bank bonds. On October 22, 1945, H. R. 4465, 79th Congress, was introduced by Representative Frank Keefe, of Wisconsin, to provide for payment by the Treasury to the unpaid bondholders of the Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank of Milwaukee. On February 4, 1946, the Attorney General presented an unfavorable report suggesting that the proper forum for relief was the Court of Claims rather than the Congress. Suit was at that time pending in the Court of Claims for the unpaid amount of these bonds. The petition was ultimately dismissed on the ground that these joint-stock land-bank bonds were not obligations of the United States—Sixty-ninth Federal Supplement, page 197, January 6, 1947; certiorari denied, Three Hundred and Thirty-first

United States Reports, page 831. Subsequent bills—S. 2166, 81st Congress; H. R. 6813, 82d Congress; S. 3307, 83d Congress; H. R. 494 and H. R. 1636, 84th Congress—have all been referred to the appropriate Senate or House Committees on Agriculture because of their provisions that unpaid bondholders of joint-stock land-bank bonds should be compensated by bonds of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. In each case, an unfavorable report has been obtained. The most recent such unfavorable report that of the Farm Credit Administration of February 20, 1956, signed by Gov. R. B. Tootell, in response to H. R. 494 and H. R. 1636, 84th Congress, primarily takes the view that, while it may be proper for the United States Government to pay off the unpaid portion of the joint-stock land-bank bonds, such payment should be by the Treasury rather than by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. Governor Tootell's letter states:

> Whatever might be the view as to the payment by the Government of the amount considered to be unpaid on defaulted joint stock land bank bonds, we wish to urge that the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation should not be made the vehicle for such payment. * * * In the circumstances, it would be our view that any provision for payment by the Government of the balance due on defaulted joint stock land bank bonds should be by a direct appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury for that purpose without the intervention of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

THE TEXAS PRECEDENT

H. R. 10080 is designed to carry out the suggestion of Governor Tootell, that payment of the unpaid balance of joint stock land bank bonds should be a general Treasury obligation. H. R. 10080 follows closely the provisions of Public Law 378, 84th Congress, which became law on August 12, 1955. Public Law 378 provided for the payment of a sum in excess of $200 million to reimburse approximately 500 people who had sustained losses to person or property as a result of the explosion of 2 ships carrying fertilizer in Texas City, Tex., on April 16–17, 1947. As in the joint stock land bank case, a Federal court had rejected a claim by the injured persons that there was any liability on the part of the United States Government. Congress thereupon enacted Public Law 378 in order to satisfy the moral obligation of the United States. The Texas City ships were carrying fertilizer to Europe in discharge of a United States foreign policy program, the Interim Aid Act in which we undertook to repair wartorn Europe.

If the United States Government feels a moral obligation to provide more than $200 million for the approximately 500 people injured in the Texas City explosion, it has at least an equal moral obligation to make whole the 5,000 or more joint stock land bank bondholders to the extent of the $24,449,454 of unpaid principal and interest to the date of receivership. These joint stock land bank bondholders have suffered as a result of a United States governmental program aimed to relieve farm distress during World War I and in the 1920's. Had the Government not induced bondholders to buy joint stock land bank bonds and thus provide the capital with which the joint stock land banks refinanced farm mortgages, a great deal of direct and expensive governmental action would doubtless have been necessary. Joint stock land bank bondholders are, therefore, as much a casualty of our farm policy as were the innocent Texas people casualties of our foreign policy.

It is well settled as a matter of constitutional law that the Federal Government has the power to satisfy a moral as well as a legal obligation—*U. S.* v. *Realty Co.* (163 U. S. 424); *Cincinnati Soap Co.* v. *U. S.* (301 U. S. 308); *Ford & Son* v. *Little Falls Co.* (280 U. S. 369).

H. R. 10080 offers a means of meeting a moral obligation from our Government to its citizens. That moral obligation should be deferred no longer.

MODERATION BUT NOT NULLIFICATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been in the Chamber of this House when expressions have been given of the deep emotions of my colleagues coming from another section of our country than that in which I reside. I have thought on the occasion of these special orders that Members enjoying the unanimous privilege of speaking should have the opportunity of expressing themselves without interruption from their colleagues who might hold different views.

This is a forum in which all Members have the right and the opportunity to speak in advocacy of their own convictions and what they beileve to be the convictions of their constituents.

My regret has been that the country at large, and especially the section from which I come, may have gained a wrong impression from the fact that the speakers against the decision of the Supreme Court in this and the other body all were from the South. The impression given is that the question of segregation is an issue between the North and South and that in the South there is a united line-up against the mandate of the Supreme Court of the United States as regards segregation in the public schools.

In this connection it will be helpful to remember that the antisegregation decision of the Supreme Court was unanimous and of the 9 Justices who participated in the decision 3 were southern born, 1 a native of the Far West, 1 a native of Pennsylvania and 3 of Middle Western States. The ninth Justice was born in Vienna. From this it will be seen that the position of the Court now under condemnation by my southern colleagues resulted from the conclusions and findings of a Court that as regards the geography of birth was one-third southern, one-third middle western, one-ninth far western, one-ninth eastern.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that I might get into the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Christian Century issued today and written by Dr. Harold Fey, a constituent of mine, a great American and the editor of this magazine which is frequently referred to as the most influential Protestant publication in the country. When an editorial appears in the interdenominational Christian Century, it carries weight. It appears in a publication that speaks in a large sense for the great Protestant population of this country.

In this editorial the statement is made that today an effort is being made to drive Protestant ministers out of their pulpits because they do not agree with the viewpoint held by some in the section of the country in which those churches are located. I bring this to your attention. Here are the words of the Christian Century:

> They are out to rule the churches from congregations to State organizations, and openly boast that they have accomplished this aim in some denominations. If there was any doubt about their power, the growing number of ministers of both races who have been compelled to leave their pulpits should be taken into account.
>
> This is totalitarianism. When the whole life of a people is controlled from behind the scenes by a private organization which is not elected by the people and is not responsible to them, you have totalitarianism. It can be Communist or Fascist; it cannot be Democratic. When such total control is exercised to maintain racial segregation and white supremacy, it becomes the kind of evil thing which was still rising in Germany 20 years ago. By its nature this racist dictatorship excludes the possibility of moderation. It may recruit moderate community leaders to serve as fronts, but its policies are radical and increasingly play into the hands of extremists. It has no intention of conforming with the Supreme Court's decision now or later. It is prepared to nullify, defy, and discredit the courts and the law on which American justice is based, and to substitute its own decisions, from which there is no appeal, for them.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are deep emotions on both sides, but in the quiet meditations on the teachings of our respective religious faiths we unfailingly can find the guide to common undertanding. What is the position of the church on this issue? I think you should know what the most influential of Protestic publications is saying in this editorial. If this were a publication issued just by an individual, the editorial perhaps would not be of such tremendous import. But this is regarded as the most influential Protestant publication in the country. It is interdenominational and in a large sense speaks for all the Protestant churches. Let me read a little further:

> The congressional southerners denounce outside meddlers for stirring up racial strife. They are referring to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. But what is the method followed by the NAACP? It takes the complaints of Negro citizens to the courts. It organizes Negroes and whites to petition for redress of grievances, as the Constitution provides. It obeys the laws and seeks to get others to do the same. It has not organized riots, or incited rebellion, or otherwise violated the rights of the people who do not agree with it.
>
> On the other hand, the white citizens' councils have organized to drive moderate elements into silence or out of the South. They prefer to work through economic organizations—banks, stores, machinery companies, plantations, marketing associations—but they do not stop there. They seek to infiltrate and dominate every center of power, small or large. They try to control

the administration of government from justices of the peace to legislators, governors and United States Senators. They manipulate the authorities in education from local to State boards. They are out to rule the churches from congregations to State organizations, and openly boast that they have accomplished this aim in some denominations.

Mr. Speaker, I felt that I should bring this editorial to the attention of the House. It reflects the thinking of a great majority of the people in the section of the country from which I come. Recently my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] made a great contribution to the debate now raging by pointing to the Catholic position in the statement of Archbishop Rummel of New Orleans that segregation is a sin.

In Chicago we are working out, as I think we are in all our northern cities, the framework of a real brotherhood of man. We have left far, far behind the concept that you have to discriminate among people because of religion, because of complexion, because of station. We have come to accept and to practice the faith that the God who created us made all his creatures equal and subject in His eyes to the same measurement of worth and character. It was not intended that the finite should exercise a veto power over the determinations of the infinite.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot have standing in your community a church or a synagogue that strengthens your material life by building up the spiritual within you, and have it count for anything, if you permit the conspirators of bias and prejudice by violence and intimidation to silence the lips of ministers, priests, and rabbis whose mission is the doing of the will of God. You cannot bend in worship in church or synagogue, and then go out saying: "Here is one of God's creatures. God has accepted him. God has created him, but he cannot come to the same school with our children or ride in the same bus, or eat at the same table."

You have to throw away your religion or accept it.

This editorial is speaking for the great majority of Protestants as Archbishop Hummel spoke for the great majority of Catholics and Rabbi Morton Berman and others have spoken for the Jewish people.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I wish I had the ability and the eloquence of the gentleman from Illinois. I know he speaks what is in the hearts and the minds of many of us, not only because of the people in the districts that we represent but because we feel very deeply that the future of our country and the position of free people everywhere depends upon the understanding and the acceptance of the principles which he has so eloquently stated.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members of this House know that it has been the hope during all of this session of many of us that the House will have the opportunity to vote upon a measure which will give to the principles that are enunciated in our Constitution effect and reality.

I see on the floor the very distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] who is the chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary and whose committee, I believe, has reported out to the full committee a bill which would give us that opportunity. I should like to congratulate him and his committee.

I can also say that I am sure we all realize that time is passing in this session. Therefore, in order that there should be no slip-up, and only for that reason, not in any way trying to take away the prerogatives of that great Committee on the Judiciary, but with the knowledge and the tacit consent of its chairman, and to make sure that the machinery of the House has been started which will give the Members of the House the opportunity to vote on such a measure, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON] and I will today introduce a resolution calling upon the Rules Committee to bring this matter forward from the Judiciary Committee. We sincerely trust that it will be acted upon by the Rules Committee, but if it is not, it will, of course, under the proper procedures of the House and after the proper time has elapsed be available for a petition upon which the Members of the House who believe that this is a sufficiently important matter may place their names and their signatures.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that in introducing this I should also very carefully point out that this is done not by us as individuals but as representing a very large group who have met for this purpose and with this intention, and that it is our hope that as we move forward to the completion of this legislation we may act upon it not with any emotion but with the high purposes which, I am sure, each and every one of us, whether we are opposed or in agreement, should at all times be courteous enough to give to each other. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois not only for what he has said, but for the opportunity to give this information to the House at this time.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] for a statement of the work of his subcommittee.

Mr. LANE. I am glad to reply to the gentleman from Illinois that this subcommittee has worked long and hard on this subject matter. The hearings were held as you, perhaps, know last July over a period of a number of days and the committee has met on several occasions since then. It was only this afternoon that we finally finished our work and have reported out two of the civil rights bills to the full Committee on the Judiciary with the hope that they will pass that committee without any delay and that we will have the bills on the floor of the House as soon as possible.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman and wish to commend him for the tremendous job that he has done so well.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BROWNSON. I join in commending the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] on his timely discussion and in congratulating the gentleman from Massachusetts and his subcommittee of the great Committee on the Judiciary for the progress that they have made today in reporting basic civil-rights legislation. In introducing an identical resolution to that discussed by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] which provides for consideration of H. R. 627, I certainly want to make it clear that on my part there is no implied criticism of the subcommittee on the Judiciary or of the full Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Rules, but that rather this is intended as a constructive step in the direction of making sure that the Membership of the House will have a full opportunity to express themselves in connection with this problem of curtailment of civil rights. This is an issue growing more serious by the day and by the hour. Like the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], I have introduced this resolution not as a personal gesture, but in behalf of the Members of the House or both sides of the aisle who have been meeting sincerely and earnestly in an attempt to work out with the Attorney General a thoughtful legislative solution to some of the civil-rights problems which face us, especially the matter of the denial of voting rights to large numbers of our citizens.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. May I commend the distinguished gentleman for the magnificent contribution that he has made in the spirit of all of us working together on a bipartisan plane to attain our objective of strengthening our civil-rights legislation.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished and eloquent gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. I want first to congratulate the gentleman for the remarks that he has made and for the sincere spiritual emphasis that the gentleman places upon this problem. I want to extend my felicitations to our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] for the noble work of his subcommittee on these two bills which are now on their way. The first bill is to guarantee the right to vote in Federal elections, and the second bill reported out by Mr. LANE's subcommittee is the bill to make lynching a crime. Mr. BROWNSON and Mr. ROOSEVELT have by their remarks indicated that this is an issue stripped of partisan politics. We intend from here on in to move with love versus hatred; with legal actions versus violence; with prayer versus bigotry. When the discharge petitions are placed upon the desk, we have about 201 Members of the House, Republican and Democratic alike, who have already committed themselves to the signing of it. We hope to have this petition available as soon as the Easter recess is concluded. Again, I

thank the gentleman for giving me this opportunity to speak.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from New York.

I close, Mr. Speaker, with an expression of the hope and prayer that the problem that confronts our people will be worked out understandingly and without undue harshness in the expression of emotions. A changing world has come. New conditions confront us, not only to make our own democracy a real democracy in which there are no lines of discrimination, but also to hold our place as a Nation responsible for world leadership. We must attain and attain promptly real brotherhood. In that objective I know that the good men and the good women and the good children of the South are just as earnest as are the good men and the good women and the good children of the North. I think we will attain that objective the more promptly as we go to our churches and as at night we kneel on our knees and ask the Divine Creator of us all to guide us into acceptance of all of His characters as indeed our brothers. The chains of slavery long since have gone. The social chains of segregation, more brutal and more cruel, are melting fast in the heat of consciences trying to make peace with God. To the task of hastening by every legal means the glad day when in our great and God-fearing Republic there will be no chains of slavery, either of iron structure or of social fabric, we dedicated ourselves.

The full text of the editorial in the Christian Century of March 21, 1956, follows:

MODERATION BUT NOT NULLIFICATION

The Southern Manifesto signed by 96 Congressmen is an exercise in obstruction. It offers no lawful alternative to compliance with the Constitution as interpreted by the one authority legally authorized to make such an interpretation, yet it encourages noncompliance on the ground that such legal means exist. These legislators give as a reason for deciding against integration in education the 1896 "separate but equal doctrine," dismissing as an exercise of "naked judicial power" the 1954 decision by the Supreme Court that equality and segregation cannot coexist under a Constitution which makes no allowance for second-class citizenship based on color. They have presented the Nation with a futile, confused and disappointing document whose net result will be to encourage nullification and anarchy.

We are all for moderation in the enforcement of the nonsegregation ruling of the Supreme Court, but moderation is not nullification. The Supreme Court laid the ground for moderation in its 1955 ruling on procedure. The rate of progress toward integration was to be determined by circumstances. No deadlines were set. The majority of the 17 States which had segregated schools accepted the Court's action in good faith and started to move in the constitutional path. But the 7 States of the Deep South, whose course alone is praised in the Congressional Manifesto, flatly refuse to accept the Court's lead. They refuse to move in any direction except toward more segregation. They have barred any suggestion of moderation, compromise or progress toward equal justice in education. The manifesto is similarly intransigent.

This is nullification. For the third time in our history, it creates a major constitutional crisis. The 1954 Supreme Court decision held that the principles of the Constitution provide for equality under the law without regard to race. The same law applies equally to all races. Separate but equal facilities in public education violate this principle because separated educational facilities cannot be equal, being separate. Inequality is inherent in the separation, so schools supported by taxes paid by all the people must be open to all the people. That is the law, as unanimously interpreted by a Court consisting of men drawn from every section of the land and from both major parties.

William Faulkner, the distinguished Mississippi novelist who wrote the now famous "Letter to the North"(Life, March 5), complained about the disappearance of moderation. He said he and other moderate southerners are in danger of being trampled as they stand on the shrinking middle ground between the white citizens' councils and the NAACP. The congressional manifesto missed a very great opportunity in that it did not stake out and enlarge this middle ground. If it had admitted, as William Faulkner admits, the simple incontrovertible immorality of discrimination by race, one might see in its statement a glimmer of promise. Instead it illustrated the Faulkner dictum: "The South will go to any length, even that fatal and already doomed one, before it will accept alteration of its racial condition by mere force of law or economic threat."

In our society, the Constitution is not "mere." It is the law and it provides the middle ground for us all. As long ago as 1830 Daniel Webster pointed out, in the nullification argument which was then starting, the two brief provisions of the Constitution which are essential to the continuation of our Republic. They are: "The Constitution and laws of the United States made in pursuance thereof shall be the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary nothwithstanding. * * * The judicial power shall extend to all cases arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States." Webster said: "These two provisions cover the whole ground. * * * With these it is a government; without them it is a confederation. In pursuance of these clear and express provisions, Congress established at its very first session in the judicial act a mode for carrying them into full effect and for bringing all questions of constitutional power to the final decision of the Supreme Court. It then, sir, became a government." Webster declared: "I cannot conceive that there can be a middle course between submission to the laws, when regularly pronounced constitutional, on the one hand, and open resistance, which is revolution or rebellion, on the other."

The congressional southerners denounce outside meddlers for stirring up racial strife. They are referring to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. But what is the method followed by the NAACP? It takes the complaints of Negro citizens to the courts. It organizes Negroes and whites to petition for redress of grievances, as the Constitution provides. It obeys the laws and seeks to get others to do the same. It has not organized riots, or incited rebellion, or otherwise violated the rights of the people who do not agree with it.

On other other hand, the white citizens' councils have organized to drive moderate elements into silence or out of the South. They prefer to work through economic organizations—banks, stores, machinery companies, plantations, marketing associations—but they do not stop there. They seek to infiltrate and dominate every center of power, small or large. They try to control the administration of government from justices of the peace to legislators, governors, and United States Senators. They manipulate the authorities in education from local to State boards. They are out to rule the churches from congregations to State organizations, and openly boast that they have accomplished this aim in some denominations. If there was any doubt about their power, the growing number of ministers of both races who have been compelled to leave their pulpits should be taken into account.

This is totalitarianism. When the whole life of a people is controlled from behind the scenes by a private organization which is not elected by the people and is not responsible to them, you have totalitarianism. It can be Communist or Fascist; it cannot be democratic. When such total control is exercised to maintain racial segregation and white supremacy, it becomes the kind of evil thing which was still rising in Germany 20 years ago. By its nature this racist dictatorship excludes the possibility of moderation. It may recruit moderate community leaders to serve as fronts, but its policies are radical and increasingly play into the hands of extremists. It has no intention of conforming with the Supreme Court's decision now or later. It is prepared to nullify, defy, and discredit the courts and the law on which American justice is based, and to substitute its own decisions, from which there is no appeal, for them.

We agree with Life that the "task is to preserve the atmosphere in which reason, tolerance and compromise can still operate." But compromise which can only be attained by sacrifice of the Constitution and at the expense of the authority of the Supreme Court will prove too costly. We do not agree with William Faulkner's implication that the Negro should do all the sacrificing until the white man calms down and decides he will not grow neurotic after all. It would be equally wrong to accept the implication of the congressional manifesto that the rest of the country should consent to the South's insistence that the Supreme Court should reverse itself in order that the South's conception of State's rights shall become the law of the land. That conception is again moving toward the tragically erroneous challenge to national unity which produced the Confederation of 1783–89 and the Confederacy of 1861–65. It is no service to anybody to permit the idea to grow that a third repetition of this experiment is now going to be adopted as a compromise.

What then shall we do? Is violence again to be our fate? We do not think it is. The Negroes of Montgomery, led by their courageous Christian ministers, are presenting an alternative course. Nonviolent resistance is capable of being used by whites as well as Negroes, by majorities as well as minorities. Let those who believe in freedom and equality be as zealous, as frantically busy, as are the organizers of totalitarian citizens' councils. Outside of Montgomery, almost no voluntary organizations in support of the Supreme Court's decisions have been set up, while more than 40 anticourt organizations, of which the white citizens' councils are one, have been spawned. It is high time the defenders of freedom got busy. "Moderation, not nullification," can be a useful slogan.

CONSUMER COOPERATIVES, ORIGINAL ANTIMONOPOLISTS SUPPORT H. R. 11

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 8 I described a meeting which I attended on February 7, with a large group of organizations that are actively supporting H. R. 11. Representatives of practically all of the genuinely small-business organizations in the United States were at this meeting. In addition, representatives of several of the

greatest farm and labor organizations were there. I gave the list of these organizations, which appears at page 4348 of the RECORD.

By inadvertence, however, I omitted from the list of organizations in attendance the name of the Cooperative League of the United States of America. The members may be sure that omission of the name of the Cooperative League was a clerical error, and not an oversight. This great organization has 13 million members and, as we all know, has for 40 years been the outstanding popular force in this country against monopoly, and actively working to preserve economic freedom in the United States.

The Cooperative League has a direct commercial interest in H. R. 11. The cooperative members of this league engage in purchasing for their consumer members. Naturally, they want a fair break on prices. They have experienced the ravages of unfair price discrimination, and they know what this unwholesome practice leads to. But beyond their direct commercial interest, the Cooperative League is far more interested in seeing small business and the free-enterprise system in this country preserved. The long and clear public record of this organization leaves no doubt on that score.

Indeed the consumer cooperative movement in the United States comes about as a direct reaction to the growth of monopoly. This movement represented from the outset a determined effort on the part of millions of small people to resist gouges and exploitation by the monopoly industries which had such a free rein in the early years of this century.

The members of this organization are keenly aware of the values of economic freedom. And more than most people, they find ways of keeping themselves informed on the failures and successes of the public agencies in dealing with the problem of maintaining economic freedom.

As a result of my omission of the Cooperative League as an active supporter of an important antimonopoly measure, H. R. 11, this fine organization has naturally called the omission to my attention. I have a letter from Mr. Jack Jennings, the assistant director of the Cooperative League, reminding me that this organization sent not one representative, but two representatives to the February 7 meeting to urge passage of H. R. 11. Both the director, Mr. Wallace J. Campbell, and the assistant director, Mr. Jack T. Jennings were present.

Mr. Jennings' letter further reminds me of the public record of the Cooperative League on antimonopoly matters.

I am sure that all of the Members will be interested in Mr. Jennings' letter of March 9, 1956, which reads as follows:

We appreciate very much your consistent efforts to protect small business and cooperatives, and particularly are we interested in the passage of H. R. 11 to tighten the Robinson-Patman Act. The fact that you authored both the act and the amendment testifies to your devoted interest in independent and family businesses.

You made a gallant statement on the floor of the House March 8 to get H. R. 11 on to the floor. On the long list of supports you read should have appeared the Cooperative League of the U. S. A. We stand some 13 million strong in support of the measure, and both Wallace J. Campbell, director of the League's Washington office and I were present at the February 7 meeting to which you referred.

Our record in support of effective antitrust and anti-price-fixing laws covers most of the 40 years since the inception of the Cooperative League. We feel strongly that if the present death rate of small businesses continues, the country will find itself in serious economic trouble. As we pointed out in testimony before the House Judiciary Committee January 16:

"Unfortunately, despite the praise which Government officials have from time to time lavished on the concept of a free, competitive economy and despite the clearly announced policy of Congress, economic freedom is languishing in the United States. It is not dead, but it is dying.

"Primary responsibility for our emaciated competition must rest on powerful leaders of the business community who have sought in every conceivable manner to thwart the clear purposes of Congress and to impose on this Nation an economic oligarchy which is destroying not only economic freedom but political democracy and personal liberty as well.

"Government administrators—some who are timid, some who are not imbued with the philosophy of economic competition, and some who have permitted themselves to be seduced by these economic oligarchs—must also share responsibility for the decline of competition in America."

We went ahead to suggest a number of ways competition's struggle for survival can be advanced: By encouragement of more cooperatives giving people a democratic responsibility in business and financial institutions; by encouraging small business and seeing to it that it survives; by Federal loans to new enterprises in fields tightly controlled by a few; strengthening of laws preventing unfair competition, certain mergers, unfair taxes, and price discrimination.

We hope every Member of this Congress will place his name prominently on the petition to bring H. R. 11 up for a vote.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. UTT (at the requst of Mr. ARENDS), for 1 week, beginning March 26, on account of official business.

Mr. MORGAN (at the request of Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania), on official business.

Mr. WILSON of California (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 1 week, beginning March 26, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to:

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. ZELENKO), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, March 28.

Mr. PATMAN, for 15 minutes, on today and tomorrow, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DODD, for 10 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. BAILEY, for 40 minutes, on Tuesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ZELENKO.

Mr. SIEMINSKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HIESTAND.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon.

Mr. DODD in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHORT and to include certain telegrams on the farm bill.

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include an article.

Mr. FLOOD and include a statement made by him in support of a bill he introduced.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2210. An act to modify the project for the St. Marys River, Mich., South Canal, in order to repeal the authorization for the alteration of the International Bridge as part of such project, and to authorize the Secretary of the Army to accomplish such alteration; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2562. An act to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore.

H. R. 2347. An act for the relief of Heinrich Wolfgang;

H. R. 3963. An act for the relief of Ashot Mnatzakanian and Ophelia Mnatzakanian;

H. R. 5876. An act to amend the copyright law to permit, in certain classes of works, the deposit of photographs or other identifying reproductions in lieu of copies of published works;

H. R. 6022. An act to provide for the relocation of the Trenton Massacre Canyon Monument presently located near Trenton, Nebr.; and

H. R. 6904. An act to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 760. An act for the relief of Pietro Meduri;

S. 1992. An act to provide for the conveyance of a certain tract of land in Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association;

S. 3452. An act to amend the act of July 15, 1955, Public Law 161, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 324), by increasing the appropriation

authorization for the aircraft control and warning system; and

S. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to authorize the American Battle Monument Commission to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 585. An act to authorize the conveyance to Lake County, Calif., of the lower Lake Rancheria, and for other purposes;

H. R. 622. An act to provide for the release by the United States of its rights and interests in certain land located in Saginaw County, Mich.;

H. R. 930. An act for the relief of John Daniel Popa;

H. R. 944. An act for the relief of Nicola Teodosio;

H. R. 1014. An act for the relief of Chung Fook Yee Chung;

H. R. 1074. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Chan Lee (Eta Lee);

H. R. 1097. An act for the relief of John Meredith McFarlane;

H. R. 1104. An act for the relief of Guenther Kaschner;

H. R. 1137. An act for the relief of Harry John Wilson;

H. R. 1209. An act for the relief of Numeriano Lagmay;

H. R. 1323. An act for the relief of Sister Ramona Maria (Ramona E. Tombo);

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of Krsevan Spanjol;

H. R. 1544. An act for the relief of Mrs. Moli (Mali) Sobel;

H. R. 1666. An act for the relief of Jose Canencia-Castenedo;

H. R. 1806. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, as heretofore amended, so as to permit such corporation to consolidate with Women's Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, Inc.;

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of Howard Rieck;

H. R. 1920. An act for the relief of Ane Karlic Vlasich;

H. R. 1923. An act for the relief of Kevin Murphy;

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chiu-An Wang (nee Alice Chiacheng Sze);

H. R. 2054. An act for the relief of Induk Pahk;

H. R. 2072. An act for the relief of Julian Nowakowski, or William Nowak (Novak);

H. R. 2283. An act for the relief of Wilhelmus Marius Van der Veur;

H. R. 2285. An act for the relief of Marie Lim Tsien;

H. R. 2345. An act for the relief of Jean Henri Buchet;

H. R. 2522. An act for the relief of Isabelle S. Gorrell, Donald E. Gorrell, Mary Owen Gorrell, and Kathryn G. Wright;

H. R. 3037. An act for the relief of Jakob Hass, Roza Hass, and Mala Hass;

H. R. 3057. An act for the relief of Dr. Bienvenido L. Balingit;

H. R. 3201. An act for the relief of George Mikroulis, his wife, Dora Mikroulis, and his daughter, Madonna G. Mikroulis;

H. R. 3265. An act for the relief of Alkista Sfounis;

H. R. 3375. An act for the relief of Dr. James C. S. Lee, his wife, Dora Ting Wei, and their daughter, Vivian Lee;

H. R. 3501. An act for the relief of Nisan Sarkia Giritliyan and Virgin Giritliyan;

H. R. 3557. An act to further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed;

H. R. 3650. An act to provide for the conveyance to Eilef Rue of certain real property situated in Cassia County, Idaho;

H. R. 3723. An act for the relief of Freda H. Sullivan;

H. R. 3845. An act for the relief of Guillermo Pedraza;

H. R. 3857. An act for the relief of Constantin David, Paula Marie David, Claire Edmonde David, and Ariane Constance David;

H. R. 3869. An act for the relief of Esther Ledea Escobedo;

H. R. 3965. An act for the relief of Max Moskowitz;

H. R. 4181. An act for the relief of P. F. Claveau, as successor to the firm of Rodger G. Ritchie Painting and Decorating Co.;

H. R. 4185. An act for the relief of Zabel Vartanian;

H. R. 4376. An act to exempt from duty the importation of certain handwoven fabrics when used in the making of religious vestments;

H. R. 4391. An act to abolish the Castle Pinckney National Monument, in the State of South Carolina, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4680. An act affirming that title to a certain tract of land in California vested in the State of California on January 21, 1897;

H. R. 4802. An act to authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land;

H. R. 5280. An act to authorize land exchanges for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia; to authorize the transfer of certain lands of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia, to the Commonwealth of Virginia; and for other purposes;

H. R. 5556. An act authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of McGirts Creek, Fla., for flood control;

H. R. 5856. An act to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year;

H. R. 5866. An act for the relief of Giovanni Iazarich;

H. R. 6112. An act to authorize the construction of a sewage-disposal system to serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 6309. An act to authorize construction of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet.

H. R. 6363. An act for the relief of Edward Barnett;

H. R. 6532. An act for the relief of John William Scholtes;

H. R. 6617. An act for the relief of Boris Kowerda;

H. R. 6618. An act for the relief of Etha Dora Johnson;

H. R. 6772. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain federally owned land under his jurisdiction to the school district numbered 24 of Lake County, Oreg.;

H. R. 6961. An act to designate the lake created by Buford Dam, in the State of Georgia, as "Lake Sidney Lanier";

H. R. 7097. An act to provide for the reconveyance of oil and gas and mineral interests in a portion of the lands acquired for the Demopolis Lock and Dam project, to the former owners thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7927. An act to extend the time within which the State of Louisiana may make initial payment on the purchase of certain property from the United States;

H. R. 8607. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to David Peters, or to his heirs or assigns, title to land held by the United States in trust for him;

H. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution to designate the General Grant tree (known as the Nation's Christmas Tree), in Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., as a national shrine;

H. J. Res. 443. Joint resolution to increase the appropriation authorization for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission; and

H. J. Res. 517. Joint resolution changing the date for the counting of electoral votes in 1957.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 22, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1650. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the 35th Annual Report of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year July 1, 1954, to June 30, 1955; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1651. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1652. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 15, 1955, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the shore of New Jersey from Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 361); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 12 illustrations.

1653. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 12, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on Two Rivers Harbor, Wis., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on August 16, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 362); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1654. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the report on borrowing authority for the fourth quarter ending December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 304b of the Defense Production Act as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1655. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, relative to a public announcement made by the Department of State on January 26, 1956, relating to United States policy on treaty rights in Morocco; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1656. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief

Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1657. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1658. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, approved July 1, 1948, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1659. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7874. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1928). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 842. A bill granting increases in the annuities of certain former civilian officials and employees engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1929). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Twelfth intermediate report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to real and personal property (civilian and military) of the United States Government located in the continental United States in the Territories and overseas as of June 30, 1955; without amendment (Rept. No. 1930). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3693. A bill to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1931). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4922. A bill to prohibit picketing in the immediate vicinity of the White House; without amendment (Rept. No. 1932). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 9312. A bill to provide that members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia may be removed for cause; without amendment (Rept. No. 1933). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BETTS:

H. R. 10099. A bill to provide for the extension of rural-mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 10100. A bill to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to conduct an investigation and survey to determine the number of residences not now receiving direct-to-home mail service and to recommend methods and means of providing such rural-mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 10101. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly families and persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 10102. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 10103. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to the effect of State laws on union-shop agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10104. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to reduce the age at which women become eligible for old-age assistance, to provide that (within specified limits) outside earnings of needy individuals will not render them ineligible for public assistance, and to increase the amount of such assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 10105. A bill to provide for the utilization of the Colorado River development fund in the States of the lower division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10106. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct cloud-seeding experiments in the Colorado River Basin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES:

H. R. 10107. A bill to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 10108. A bill to amend section 314 and section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 10109. A bill to permit temporary free importation of automobiles and parts of automobiles when intended solely for show purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 10110. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 10111. A bill to amend sections 657 and 1006 of title 18 of the United States Code in order to include certain savings and loan associations within its provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 10112. A bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10113. A bill to exempt from the tax on club dues amounts paid with respect to any nonprofit neighborhood swimming pool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10114. A bill to make available temporary exhibition space for the national collection of fine arts until such time as the Smithsonian Gallery of Art is finally established, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 10115. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit a State or local government employee who is covered by a retirement system, but who cannot receive the benefits of such system, to elect social-security coverage as a self-employed individual if the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system has not been extended to his services by an agreement under section 218 of that act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 10116. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 10117. A bill to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 10118. A bill to permit payments under Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, with respect to certain children of members of the Armed Forces stationed overseas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 10119. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to provide that employees may recover damages from third parties despite the acceptance of compensation under this act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10120. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that where a husband and wife are both entitled to benefits thereunder and one of them dies, the benefit of the survivor shall be equal to the total of the combined benefits to which they were entitled while both were living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 10121. A bill to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 10122. A bill to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. HARDEN:

H. R. 10123. A bill to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 10124. A bill to provide for registration and reporting of welfare and benefit plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 10125. A bill to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 10126. A bill to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of

Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 10127. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 10128. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 10129. A bill to provide that in determining income of beneficiaries, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall not include certain amounts which are not considered as income for the purposes of section 1034 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 10130. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10131. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 10132. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 10133. A bill to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 10134. A bill relating to the effective date of section 18 (b) of the Customs Simplification Act of 1953; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 439. Resolution authorizing the printing of the prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, D. D., at the opening of the daily sessions of the House of Representatives during the 83d and 84th Congresses; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Res. 440. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 627, to protect individuals from discrimination and to secure the right to vote to all citizens; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. Res. 441. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 627, to protect individuals from discrimination and to secure the right to vote to all citizens; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10135. A bill for the relief of Richard Wukovits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 10136. A bill for the relief of Oswald N. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 10137. A bill for the relief of Louis Coutoupis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10138. A bill for the relief of 2d Lt. Robert J. Marshall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Illinois:

H. R. 10139. A bill for the relief of Antonio De Risi et al.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 10140. A bill for the relief of Orietta Giardino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 10141. A bill for the relief of Antonia DeMarco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 10142. A bill for the relief of Olga Neu Frimer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 10143. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Impagliazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES (by request):

H. R. 10144. A bill for the relief of Rosario Pecoraro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

729. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Frank Bertron and other veterans of Potter and McKean Counties, Pa., urging the immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

730. By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition of James R. Parthun, of La Porte, Ind., and 44 other residents of La Porte County and St. Joseph County, Ind., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

731. Also, petition of Paul Cohen, of South Bend, Ind., and 44 other residents of St. Joseph and La Porte Counties, Ind., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

732. By Mr. HERLONG: Petition of citizens of Orlando, Fla., and vicinity, in support of H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

733. Also, petition of citizens of Orlando, Fla., and vicinity, in support of H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

734. By Mr. MUMMA: Petition of Mrs. Margaret C. Shatto and 18 other residents of Shermans Dale, Perry County, Pa., urging the enactment of legislation prohibiting the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

735. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of S. E. Phillipakis and 45 other citizens of the State of Oregon urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

736. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of Walter Bizezinski and others, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

737. Also, petition of Louis Kron and others, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

738. By the SPEAKER: Petition of J. L. Fowler and others, McKinney, Tex., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans, etc.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Gold Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Government announcement yesterday that it is going on a free-gold market places the question squarely up to the United States whether it wants to stand on the sidelines alone or whether it wants to follow the free-market lead of the other nations.

Those of us who are interested in domestic mineral production have been pressing for this action for some time. The present price of gold precludes the mining of any low-grade ore, resulting in the wasting of our gold resources.

For the past 20 years the price of gold has been pegged by the Federal Government at $35 an ounce. This means that only the most efficient mines could even remain in operation, to say nothing of making a profit for its stockholders.

The time has come when the United States must immediately reevaluate its policy. It must either increase the pegged price or provide for a free market.

The Facts Versus Governor Freeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Gov. Orville Freeman, of Minnesota, was guilty of the worst sort of demagoguery March 18 when he maintained on a national television show that there was "no (farm)

surplus whatever" up to the time the Eisenhower administration went into office, that there was in fact a shortage of farm goods. He later commented to reporters that what the Republicans called farm surpluses at the end of the Truman administration were strategic reserves.

Governor Freeman, as the head of a great agricultural State should, and in all probability does, know better. He had only to go to the reports of the 1952 Agriculture Department to find the facts.

At the end of the 1952 marketing year the carryover of agricultural surplus goods included wheat, 562 million bushels; cotton, 5.6 million bales; corn, 769 million bushels.

The Truman administration, in spite of this, however, announced that there would be no acreage allotments in effect for 1953. This was an obvious trick to woo votes in the agricultural areas, but it also seriously hurt the farmers by continuing production of surpluses which now cost the Nation $2 billion a year.

This failure to improve controls for 1953 resulted in sharp increases in carryover stocks at the end of the 1953 marketing year which included: wheat, 902 million bushels; cotton, 9.7 million bales; corn, 920 million bushels.

With these facts, it is foolish and dishonest for anyone to say there was no carryover surplus when the Truman administration left office.

Governor Freeman's attempt to call these carryover commodities a strategic reserve is a feeble attempt to explain away the surpluses which have depressed farm prices. Every farmer knows that a 2 years' domestic food requirement of wheat is a surplus not a reserve. We do not, by changing the name of these surplus stocks, which are costing $1 million per day for storage alone, lessen their price impact on the market, or raise the price the farmer gets for his wheat.

It is obvious that Governor Freeman was trying to farm the farmer for political gain, but the farmers will not be fooled.

A Bill To Amend Title II of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that where a husband and wife are both entitled to benefits under the act and one of them dies, the benefit of the survivor shall be equal to the total of the combined benefits to which they were entitled while both were living.

Many of our elderly married citizens who, in the twilight of their lives are subsisting on the bare minimums of social-security benefits, are entitled to this additional protection from an appreciative Government.

The death of a beloved one, after many years of living together, is sufficiently distressing in itself. Removing from the survivor a few dollars which has kept the home together, and leaves the survivor not only with an ache in the heart but with insufficient funds, in most cases, to continue to maintain the modest home is, to say the least, inequitable.

The additional cost to the Government will be negligible compared to the irreparable damage done to these citizens in this situation.

I shall most earnestly press for the early passage of this bill, statistics and actuarial compilations which may show monetary detriment to the Government notwithstanding.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include my statement before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

Mr. Chairman, in the introduction of my bill H. R. 5298 I have been prompted by certain discriminations that have been brought to my attention in benefits that inure to those who have served in the Armed Forces of our Nation.

My bill would extend the veterans' benefits that now exist for the wives and widows of male veterans to those dependent husbands and widowers of female veterans of our wars.

From the best estimates available, there is a present total of some 405,000 women who have served our Nation well. This figure includes 320,000 women who served in World War II; 60,000 who were called to service in the Korean crisis, and presently serving in the service; and some 25,000 women who served in World War I and in the Nursing Corps during the Spanish-American War.

I have said that these inequities that exist have been brought to my attention, and particular cases have arisen in my district that have brought out the importance of such legislation to me. There have been those whose husbands through accident or war incurred injury have been disabled to the point where they have become entirely dependent upon their spouse for support and care. In one instance, such care demanded the untiring and faithful attention of the woman at all times. In another case, a female veteran of the First World War had reached the age where she could no longer find gainful employment through which she had cared for an invalid husband over a period of many years. These are but examples.

In all, I am sure that the number of such cases throughout the Nation is not great. Their lack of great numbers, however, does not lessen our debt of fair and equal treatment to these veterans who often served in positions of responsibility equal to and beyond many male veterans. The humanity of this Nation and the heart of this Congress should not be found wanting when such inequities are found.

The provisions of this bill limit the benefits to those women whose husbands are in such condition, as determined by medical authority, that they may be wholly dependent upon the female veteran, or, if she be deceased, would be dependent upon her for support. The bill discontinues benefits should this widower remarry.

It is my hope that this committee will promptly see the justification that does now exist and by its action move to bring this bill to the floor of the House where final decision may be made to correct this existing inequity.

Small Business: Backbone of Our Country's Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my contention that the small businesses of the United States have consistently formed and should continue to form the backbone of our country's economy.

I feel certain that all Members of the House will agree that in order to maintain our economic well-being, we cannot tolerate conditions which would jeopardize the existence of the independent businessman.

For these reasons, I am pleased to be associated with my distinguished friend and colleague, Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN, in cosponsoring H. R. 11, to amend the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936.

The amendment provided for in H. R. 11 is of great interest to me because I feel it will present a further guarantee that our free competitive system will be protected, by seeing to it that equality of opportunity for all businesses, large and small alike, will not be interfered with.

The Nation is constantly being told that we are in an era of prosperity. However, Dun & Bradstreet reports indicate that if there is such an era, it is one of big business prosperity. On the other hand, it is also an era of declining economic health for small businesses.

Although big business profits and stock market prices are at an all-time peak, we are witnessing the greatest number of small business failures since the pre-World War II depression years.

From the beginning of 1956, through March 22, there have been more than 3,050 small business failures in the United States. In a 1-week period of this month, there were more than 300 failures of small businesses. This number of failures sets a tragic record that has not been matched since early 1939.

This startling number of small-business failures clearly indicates that this vital segment of our economy needs help. The small-business organizations of this country have pointed out one way that Congress can help them, and that is for us to pass H. R. 11. This request is a modest and reasonable one. It does not ask for a Federal subsidy. It does not ask for a giveaway, but rather it is simply asking for antitrust laws which will give the small-business man a reasonably equal competitive opportunity to succeed.

I feel that if the small-business man is given this opportunity to succeed, it will serve not only the interests of small business, but it will serve the interests of all Americans.

In order to understand the importance of H. R. 11, it is necessary to review briefly what was accomplished by the Robinson-Patman Act, the act H. R. 11 is intended to amend. In 1936, the Clayton Antitrust Act was amended and

strengthened by the Robinson-Patman Act for the purpose of giving small business protection from price discrimination. Thus the Robinson-Patman Act corrected a situation in this country which was of extreme detriment to small-business men.

Before the Robinson-Patman Act was passed, a big seller could engage in local price cutting, that is, price discrimination to drive the local competitor out of business. Likewise, a large and powerful buyer was able to obtain price concessions which enabled him to sell goods at prices that small competitors in the field could not possibly meet. This was true regardless of the small-business man's efficiency and good service to the public.

The legislative history of the Robinson-Patman Act seems to make one thing clear above all others, and that is that the act was intended to require the supplier to give fair and equal treatment to his wholesale and retail customers. More precisely the law was intended to require the supplier to charge equal prices to competing customers when there was not a difference in costs for supplying his different customers.

The law was not intended, nor did it give the small merchant any undeserved advantage, nor did it interfere with the efficiency that may be associated with large-scale marketing operations. The law clearly and specifically states that the supplier may charge his customers different prices up to the full extent that the different prices are justified by cost differences.

Thus the law was clearly intended to stop price discriminations where the effect of these discriminations would substantially lessen competition and tend to create a monopoly.

In the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of Standard Oil Co., Indiana, against Federal Trade Commission, the desired effect of the Robinson-Patman Act was greatly decreased. In its decision the Supreme Court held that a charge of unlawful price discrimination could be defended by showing that the discrimination was made in good faith to meet competition. The Court held that this defense was good even though the discrimination resulted in a complete destruction of competition.

I feel the law should be effective against a monopolistic practice, and should prevent the creation of monopoly whether it is created in good faith or bad faith.

In the Standard Oil Co. case the Supreme Court seriously weakens the Robinson-Patman Act. H. R. 11 will correct this weakness and enable the Robinson-Patman Act to continue the usefuless to the Nation's economy that it has abundantly demonstrated over a number of years.

In my estimation H. R. 11 is a very modest and reasonable solution to the problem. It will restore the effectiveness of the Robinson-Patman Act. In effect, H. R. 11 simply says that it is illegal for a supplier to discriminate in his prices where the effect of such discriminations may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

This would not prevent a supplier from discriminating to the full extent justified by costs, nor prevent him from changing his prices when he desired, provided he makes the new prices available to all his customers. There is nothing in H. R. 11 that would prevent a supplier from refusing to sell to customers with whom he did not wish to deal.

H. R. 11 is not an antichain-store bill, nor is it in any sense an antibig-business bill. Rather it applies to all businesses, big and small, by giving to each a fair chance to buy from a supplier on the same terms and conditions under similar and like circumstances.

I have been assured that it has been endorsed by every genuine small business organization in the United States.

I strongly feel that H. R. 11 has great merit, and should be passed with dispatch. For the small-business man there is an urgent need that this bill will supply. It is no consolation to small business people who are going out of business today to know that we will eventually get around to passing this vital legislation.

There is a discharge petition on the Speaker's desk, and I ask my colleagues to sign this petition so that the Members of the House may have a prompt opportunity to pass on this legislation which small-business men need and want.

The need is urgent, and I feel that we should do all that is necessary to promptly enact H. R. 11 into law.

The Mistakes of the Hoover Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following article entitled "The Mistakes of the Hoover Commission" prepared by me and appearing in the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States magazine of March 1956:

THE MISTAKES OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION

(By JOHN W. McCORMACK, majority leader, U. S. House of Representatives)

I am particularly pleased to contribute this article to VFW magazine, doing so at the invitation of Commander in Chief Timothy J. Murphy, who has been a close and valued friend of mine for many years.

Commander in Chief Murphy is not only one of our outstanding citizens, but one of the greatest advocates the veterans have in our country.

Commander in Chief Murphy and I are in complete agreement on a subject that we both consider to be of vital importance to all of the veterans of our country, about 22 million in number. We are both opposed to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission relative to the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical program and the operation of the Veterans' Administration.

In my 28 years in the Congress, it has been my pleasure and privilege to help enact into law the great veterans' benefit program that we have today. This program is a very excellent one, with improvements that must be made from time to time. It is a program which I can assure the readers has only become law after full and deliberate study by the able lawmakers of the past three decades.

During this period, with few exceptions, such as the Economy Act of 1933 which I voted against, the Congress has enacted a generally fair and equitable set of laws for veterans. It is true that there have been some inequities which from time to time have been corrected or taken care of, and there are a few that still should be taken care of; but all in all, we have a good set of veterans' laws.

We suddenly find that a study group—the Hoover Commission, if the majority of the members of the Commission had their way—would write off much of the fine work of many Congresses of the past. We find that this commission, in a handful of ill-considered conclusions, which it incorporates into recommendations, would strike a death blow to the justifiable rights of our veterans.

In passing, and yet important, I might say that many of these recommendations have failed to gain even the support of the agency that would have to administer them—the Veterans' Administration. I think I can confidently predict that the Congress will attach very little importance to the recommendations that have been made by this Commission.

None of us oppose any recommendations or actions, whatever their source, that will provide better services for our veterans; but in connection with any recommendations that will eliminate existing veterans' benefits, I am unalterably opposed to them, and particularly when we consider that under the guise of economy—which should properly be termed false economy—results will flow that would be an injustice to our veterans and their dependents.

I consider it a grave mistake on the part of the Hoover Commission in the making of its recommendations in relation to our veterans. In my opinion, this Commission has played into the hands of those persons who are always trying to stir up public opinion against veterans in an effort to take away from them benefits that a grateful country owes to them. We know that the ultimate goal of the antiveteran forces in the country is the eventual eradication of veterans' benefits from our Federal statutes. I cannot picture Congress being a party to any such action.

The goal of the Hoover Commission is a limited veterans' hospital and medical program for service-connected disabled veterans only, under the supervision of a Federal Advisory Council of Health. There are some who even advocate the more disturbing goal of the transfer of the veterans' hospital and medical program to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; in which case, veterans would lose their identities.

In its report on Federal medical services, the Commission's first recommendation was that the President appoint a Federal Advisory Council of Health. There is considerable doubt in the minds of those who direct the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical program, and certainly in my mind also, as to the degree of authority the Commission intends for a Federal Advisory Council. At no time does the Commission say that the Council would not attempt to supervise the operations of the various agencies, including the Veterans' Administration. As I remember, the Veterans' Administration, in its comment on the proposed Advisory Council, said it should be emphasized that such a Council, if established, should be restricted to advisory functions as distinguished from supervision of agency operations. In my opinion, the best way to stop any confusion at all is to defeat any effort to create an Advisory Council.

To achieve its goal of limited government hospital and medical care for only the service-connected disabled veterans, the Hoover Commission recommended the closing and disposition of all VA hospitals which can no longer be operated "effectively and economically," a withdrawal of authorized construction funds, and a halt in the construction of additional veterans' general hospitals. Inasmuch as veterans with non-service-connected disabilities are treated on a "beds available" basis, fewer hospitals would mean fewer non-service-connected patients. Of course, the Commission overlooks the fact that if this should happen, there would be a tremendous increase in the cost of the hospitalization and treatment of service-connected patients.

As I view it, the Hoover Commission insists upon reading into Federal statutes something that is not there, and which the Congress has consistently refused to include. The Commission recommended that the statement (VA Form 10–P–10, together with its addendum) of a veteran of his inability to pay for hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities should be subject to verification; and that the Veterans' Administration be authorized to collect in case such a statement is not substantiated.

Not content with limiting this recommendation to non-service-connected disabled veterans, the Commission suggested that veterans having service-connected disabilities, but who might need treatment of non-service-connected disabilities, also be required to sign the inability-to-pay statement. The Commission would make no distinction.

To compound its unsound recommendations, the Commission offered the incredible recommendation that the veterans should assume a liability to pay for care of his non-service-connected disability at some reasonable time in the future. There was no clarification of what "some reasonable time in the future" might be.

It was further suggested that outpatient care be furnished indigent veterans with non-service-connected disabilities, but that they too, be required to pay for this care—when able—at some time in the future. All of this, and the foregoing, adds up to recommending that the Veterans' Administration should go into the business of selling hospitalization and medical treatment to veterans.

The Commission would give the unsavory chore of passing the laws providing for the collection of these obligations to the Congress. This is one legislative proposal that I do not believe Congress would touch with the proverbial "10-foot-pole."

I wish to assure Commander in Chief Murphy, and the one and one-quarter million members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, that I, as one member of Congress, and as a veteran, will not be part of parcel to any move to dismember the Veterans' Administration and the veterans benefit program—the recommendations of the Hoover Commission notwithstanding.

Role of the Antarctic, the World's Last Outpost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the Antarctic is not covered by the Monroe Doctrine and that it is wide open for all comers to stake claims on it. Will they?

During World War II, it is said that Hitler's submarines refueled from dumps in the Antarctic.

The question is, in the next foray, Would it avail an unfriendly force to set up missile bases on the Antarctic to knock out any war effectiveness of South America, Africa, and Australia? A power astride the Antarctic would look down the throats of Australia, Africa, and South America. To date, wars have been fought and battlelines moved from east to west and from west to east. Note Islam's sweep from China to France and Hitler's dash from Dakar to the gates of Cairo, not to mention Napoleon's nemesis from Paris to Moscow.

In our time, we moved from Pearl Harbor to Africa, from Dieppe to D-day, thence to Japan. Do the Reds now move, in the way of Islam, from China to Paris via the Mediterranean Basin? And will they move south to Africa via the Middle East, knocking out South America and Australia from the Antarctic as they go?

Had the four horsemen of World War II moved north and south instead of east and west, what would have happened? Had Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, and Tojo, in 1939, moved directly south, would Africa, Australia, and South America have remained so secure for the free world?

Should some future horsemen in their sweep against freedom retrieve the errors of World War II and couple with their drive from China to Paris a knock-out blow from the Antarctic against Australia and South America, as they move south on Africa, from Cairo to Cape, how ready would it be to blunt their thrust?

While scientists make soundings of the universe on the Antarctic in the geophysical year, it is hoped that a few sons of freedom there are, whose soundings on survival include the Antarctic in their appraisals.

One remembers how, in the era of good will, the Allies, flushed with victory over the foe, forgot to provide roads of entry and exit from Berlin and Vienna, so clearly revealed by the Berlin airlift.

I thought the attached clipping, Mr. Speaker, might add a point or two of interest to the topic of Antarctic:

[From the Washington Daily News of March 13, 1956]

BOOK REVEALS ANTARCTIC LANDING BY NEW ENGLANDERS

(By E. A. Kendall)

Newspapers have been carrying items about the latest Antarctic expedition. It is of interest to know, therefore, that publication of a book based on a recent discovery of a sealing vessel's log of the early 1820's reveals that New England seamen made a landing on the Antarctic Continent.

If all documentation holds up, this may prove to be the first landing of human beings upon this vast southern continent. First sighting of the continent proper already has been pretty well established as having been made by an American skipper (although which of the three, Palmer, Burdick, or Davis, is not perhaps too certain).

The prowess of the early Americans undoubtedly will strengthen the basis for United States claims to the Antarctic tracts, if and when we decide making formal claims is sensible.

Participation of our scientists in the International Geophysical Year studies during 1957 to 1958 does not solve territorial claims. Today we have no claims to a single pebble on the rich and potentially very important new continent. Tomororw we may not be able to claim any of it; other countries may have stepped in, while we delayed.

Perhaps our hesitancy may be overcome with these new facts about the first landing, as depicted in Dr. Edouard A. Stackpole's book entitled "The Huron and the Huntress."

Bureau of Older Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced a bill to create a Bureau of Older Persons, H. R. 8941. Today I should like to present as clearly and forcefully as I can the reasons why this is a very important bill and why the problems it deals with must be met, and soon, with vigorous action.

H. R. 8941 proposes the creation of a bureau especially charged with developing a program to meet the pressing problems of our fast-growing number of older persons. It calls for planning and operation, at the State and local level, of specific programs for this purpose. It provides funds, to be matched by the States, to furnish tangible, practical benefits—specifically such things as job placement, more and better homes, more and better medical care for the aged.

The United States will spend, in the coming year, $8 million for the control of disease among farm animals and nearly $8 million more for research on field crops. The first year of this older person's program calls for a budget of only $2 million. I believe that the American people consider the problems of our older citizens more important than cattle and seed corn. It is time we said so.

What we can do now is to make a beginning on this program—a beginning that cannot wait unless we are to delay disastrously the solution to problems that are already upon us with terrible urgency. Let me state what seems to me the facts that demonstrate the urgency of action.

We are living through a quiet revolution—a revolution that is tranforming our society. Its character is simple: We as a Nation are growing older. The number of Americans over 65 has quadrupled in the past 50 years; it will continue to grow at a rapid rate, thanks to the improvements in our standard of living and in our health and medical care. Indeed, the number of people over 65 is increasing twice as fast as the total population. For more and more Americans, more and more of their lives will be lived as older people.

Yet ours is a society which is geared to youth. It is a society which has seen the city replace the countryside as home to most of its citizens, without creating, in the city, replacements for the security,

the status, and the useful life that the rural community provided its older members. It is a society that has delayed too long its recognition and adjustment to the quiet revolution. As a result we, as a community, are not prepared to face the problems created by a longer life expectancy. We are not meeting our responsibility to our older citizens; and each of us, as he gets older, will himself pay the price of this social indifference. The older American today sees his problems neglected in the clamor of other public concerns. Yet there are 14 million of these forgotten men and women today—and by 1975 there will be 21 million over 65. Our obligation to them is not being met.

Far too many of these millions of older Americans are ill-clothed, ill-fed, ill-housed. Their material wants and their spiritual wants are great. Too often they are shunted aside and ignored, exiled from their full place in the life of our communities. Job opportunities for the worker past 40 become fewer and poorer as his years increase. Civic activities fail to utilize fully the talents and experience of the older citizen.

The creation of a Bureau of Older Persons, charged with the responsibility and granted some funds, can begin to meet this challenge. We have bureaus for every purpose in the Government today—even statistics have their special bureaus. It really is deplorable that there is no agency of Government specifically charged with a total concern for the problems of the aged.

Now I am not proposing simply to add more desks, telephones, and offices in Washington. But I am certain of this: Unless we create a specific agency, with the power and the responsibility to get action, we will get nothing done. Somebody has to be in charge, with the full-time job, the professional knowledge and ability and the strong desire to do something and to represent in the work of government a group that now has no representative—our older citizens. That is the job of the Bureau of Older Persons.

Well, just what is the Bureau to do? There is certainly no shortage of acute needs and tough problems. The job is limited only by the present plight of our older citizens—which means it is a vast job.

We can start out, here and now, by writing a bill of rights for our senior citizens, and dedicating ourselves to seeing that those rights are respected. The most fundamental of these, of course, is the right to a decent living. Just in terms of money income, which is only part of the problem, the facts are grim. The income of the average person over 65 is less than half that of his neighbor who is between 45 and 65. Over a fourth of the older men, nearly a half of the older women, are in a really serious economic situation. Their incomes fall below the level the experts call an emergency budget; they are below not merely an adequate, but below a substandard survival income. The appalling fact is that these older people, to whom we owe so much, are in many cases living in want and in the spiritual insecurity that want breeds. This is their reward for a lifetime of useful and honorable work.

It is true, no doubt, that not all who could have done so have shown the foresight to provide for their old age. But it would be shortsighted and uncharitable for us to show indifference to any of our older citizens whether unfortunate or improvident. For all our sakes, we should lend our aid to insure, as far as is reasonably possible, that our older citizens have an income sufficient to allow a life free from want and insecurity. Our public programs, particularly Social Security, must be continually reappraised, their adequacy measured by the real needs and those needs met. Individual savings, the pension plans of private enterprise and of the trade unions, and our public insurance programs are the foundations on which retirement security must be built. The Bureau of Older Persons can perform a constructive service by working to insure that these foundations are well and wisely laid to support the best possible security for our older citizens. Not all of them now have ample food, decent clothing, the comforts or even the necessities of life. It is absolutely the first and most elemental job to raise the incomes of these people to an adequate level.

But we must do more. Real income is not just money income. It is not practical, for example, to expect that all the varying and often crushing burdens of medical care—a cardinal necessity for the older person—can be met out of a limited regular income. Medical care, including the true economy of preventive care; nursing care; the expenses of the hospital or the nursing home—these are costly. While long-term home care often represents an impossible financial burden, the alternative of entering an institution is often a personal tragedy. Voluntary medical plans, today, cover hardly a third of our older citizens. Facilities for their care and medical supervision are clearly inadequate. Two out of every five old people cannot, today, meet their medical bills, even for present inadequate levels of care. This is a grim picture; I think our older citizens have a right to a brighter prospect. The program I propose can help to achieve it.

Vast improvement and some new ideas are needed in housing. Our older neighbor, today, lives in a home that is, on the average, substantially inferior to the homes most of us enjoy. In few cases is his home designed for the comfort and convenience of older people. Some progress is being made in this field. In some States, public low-cost housing specially designed for older people is being built. There is a growing awareness of the special needs of the aged—for one-story housing, near ground level, perhaps with ramps in place of stairs, and with other details that can make so much difference in the comfort and pleasure of older, less-active occupants. Often, well-planned housing can provide facilities for an appropriate and richer social and recreational life for the older community, among neighbors of similar age and interests. Yet we have only begun to attack these problems. There is great need for a systematic and energetic program to improve and develop such housing. It can only be met by encouragement and leadership such as this bill would provide.

One of the most serious and pressing problems we face is widespread discrimination in employment against the older worker. While the number of older people steadily increases, their proportionate share of the labor market is steadily shrinking. Studies indicate that a great many, perhaps as many as half of all companies, set age limits for new employees—no jobs for people over 45, sometimes a bar at 35 or even 25. Compulsory retirement at 65, a sound general rule, has become an inflexible law; in some cases, it is not only wasteful but an unnecessary restriction on people who can be happiest and most useful continuing to work. Education of employers, an intensive campaign of public information to emphasize the value of older workers, increased organizational efforts in job placement—all these are sound, constructive contributions to a solution of this problem. Our efforts in this direction should be greatly increased.

Finally, in this brief survey of a vast problem, I want to mention an often overlooked part of it. Sometimes our communities pay scant attention to the social needs and the civic value of their older members. They have a right to social opportunity—to social and recreational clubs, to a share of the community's recreational facilities. A new pattern of senior social life is developing—in such forms as the successful Golden Age Clubs—and it should have every possible help and encouragement from the community. These are practical, tangible things we can do.

But we can do more. We can make fuller use than we are doing of the skills, the energies, and the experience of our older citizens. In some communities, for example, retired businessmen have organized themselves to provide business help and advice to younger men, giving them the benefit of their own experience with gratifying results. In many cases, we could call on older people more than we do for a part in our many voluntary civic enterprises. In countless ways we can recognize and welcome their contribution, to our mutual benefit. Our older people are assets to the community, and they are people with rights of their own. They deserve a place in the sun instead of a rocking chair in the shadows. We all gain by granting it to them.

All I have said here is based on my firm conviction that today, and even more in the future, the needs and problems of our older citizens represent one of the great challenges of our time. I could, at great length, list the inventory of our failure so far to meet it. Yet what is more important than these facts and figures is the real human predicament that lies behind the figures. These are our people, the fathers and mothers whom, in the biblical commandment, we are enjoined to honor. We have paid them scant honor. I cannot, in words, sufficiently convey my own sense of urgency about the unnecessary suffering—the humiliating want and corrosive insecurity, the demoralizing sense of not

being wanted, of being cast aside and forgotten—that exist far too often now and will continue to exist until we act to eliminate their causes.

I believe that these are, too often, forgotten men and women. I do not believe that in good conscience or in commonsense we can allow this to go on. I do not pretend to know how we are to meet this problem in all the details. None of us knows all the answers in this big and difficult field. We do not know nearly as much as we should.

But I do know this. If we are going to get anything accomplished, if we are going to learn more and act wisely and do the best possible job of what must be done, then we should get started now and get started by putting some people to work on these problems, with some money to do the job. And let us get organized so that all of us—the National Government, the States, and the local communities—are working together with a common purpose and common energies, to write and realize this bill of rights for older people.

The Criminal Record of Gen. Ivan Serov

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the people of the free world were shocked last week to hear that Col. Gen. Ivan Serov, chairman of the Soviet Committee of State Security, had landed at London airport for the purpose of completing arrangements for the springtime visit to England of Communist Party boss Khrushchev.

This shock was well founded because General Serov has one of the blackest records as a Kremlin hatchet man. He has been aptly described as the Himmler of the Russian Communist regime.

This General Serov arrived at London Airport in a new Soviet jet-type passenger plane which immediately attracted widespread public attention and speculation. For a while it appeared as though the jet passenger plane he arrived in would get more public attention than the infamous General Serov himself. This was, in my judgment, precisely what the schemers in the Kremlin expected would happen because it is clear that London is indeed an unusual place for the unveiling of a new Russian jet passenger plane.

The free press of Great Britain and the British people were not taken in by this clever trick and consequently lost no time in objecting to this unwelcome visitor, General Serov, and exposing some of his major crimes against humanity. The British press and people engaged in public renunciation of General Serov, which no doubt played a major part in causing his early return to Moscow yesterday.

It is understood that this same General Serov will return to England with Communist Party Boss Khrushchev and his traveling companion, Bulganin. General Serov is the close friend and long-time associate of the big boss, Khrushchev. The record shows that Serov served under Khrushchev in 1940 when Khrushchev was secretary of the Communist Party in the Ukraine. So well did he serve in the capacity of Commissar of Internal Affairs for Ukraine that Khrushchev had him promoted in February 1941 to First Deputy Commissar of State Security for all of the U. S. S. R. It was from this position that he made his unenviable record of major crimes against humanity.

Since it is likely that we will be hearing more about General Serov in the future, especially in connection with his next visit to England as bodyguard of Communist Party Boss Khrushchev, the American people should be given the highlights of his record.

In all my experiences, both as executive trial counsel at the international Nuremberg war-crimes trials and as a member of the House Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress, I have never seen a record of crimes against humanity more shocking than that established by General Serov. Here are some of his crimes which have brought him to the highest Communist glory.

First. In 1941, as Deputy Commissar of State Security of the U. S. S. R., he signed and issued order No. 001223, setting forth "instructions regarding the manner of conducting the deportation of anti-Soviet elements from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia." This order gives minute instructions on how the secret arrest and deportation of all patriots in the Baltic States were to be carried out. All leadership elements of the population of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were to be rounded up and ruthlessly deported to the huge slave empire of the Soviet Union. It is estimated that up to 70,000 patriots of the Baltic States were rounded up during the nights of June 13–14, 1941, in response to this Serov directive and deported to the slavery of the Soviet Union. This was in addition to another 70,000 freedom-loving Balts who were forcibly deported shortly after the first Russian occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Serov Order No. 001223 includes specific instructions on how husbands and wives are to be separated at the railroad station and shipped to different slave-labor camps. Families were to be split and disseminated in a manner unbefitting the treatment of animals. All this was ordered by General Serov in an effort to break the great spirit of the Baltic people and to reduce them to the status of the faceless masses of the Soviet Union.

The full text of Order No. 001223 may be seen on page 464 of the Third Interim Report of the Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress, second session.

Second. In the period 1943 to 1945 this same General Serov supervised the international crimes of genocide against the following nations: (a) The Crimean Tatars. A nation of 500,000 people were forcibly deported from their native Crimea in the course of 48 hours. The entire population was moved from a subtropical climate to the frigid reaches of the Ural Mountains with no preparation whatever as to clothing or housing or food. Thus vanished from the face of the earth the Crimean-Tatar nation. (b) The Kalmyks. These peaceful descendants of Ghengis Khan were uprooted from their autonomous region and scattered to the four winds—including the tundra regions of Siberia and the slave-labor camps found everywhere in the U. S. S. R. A nation once proud and great was erased in a matter of hours by the process of forced deportation and dissemination. (c) The Chechens and the Ingushi. These two ancient nations were located in North Caucaus. Being primarily herdsmen and agriculturists, they were very peaceful. But they too were destroyed by the process of forced deportation. In the course of 48 hours over 350,000 Chechens and Ingushi were rounded up and carted off to the most barren areas of the U. S. S. R., and their native homelands left lifeless and deserted.

Third. From June 1945 to January 1947 Serov served as Security Chief of East Germany. It will be recalled that during this period widespread kidnaping operations were carried out from East Germany against all types of scientists, engineers, and technicians in West Germany. These scientists and technicians were indentured by the Russian Communists in order to better prepare the U. S. S. R. to carry out its unrelenting policy of warfare against all civilization. General Serov was the mastermind behind these kidnapings.

Fourth. In 1952 Serov was awarded the Order of Lenin for his work on the Volga-Dam Canal project. It will be recalled that this canal was dug by slave laborers from every area of the Communist empire. It will also be recalled that the loss of human life in completing the canal dwarfed the horrible human sacrifices caused by Peter the Terrible in carrying out his building program. Thousands of Poles, Lithuanians, Latvians, Ukrainians, Armenians, Byelorussians, Georgians, Slovaks, and Hungarians were among those who perished on this project. Serov was one of the driving forces behind this project, his deportation schemes from all the enslaved non-Russian nations provided the manpower and human sacrifices demanded by the Kremlin.

All this is but a part of the black record of the man sent from Moscow to London by Communist Party boss Khrushchev to complete arrangements for his visit to England in the near future. Serov is a trusted aid and associate of Khrushchev. Khrushchev must depend upon men with black records like Serov's in order to carry out the Kremlin's never-changing plan for world conquest. That is the true nature of the international Communist conspiracy.

The leaders of the free world would do well to measure the sincerity of the Kremlin claims for peaceful coexistence by the character and record of those who now lead the world Communist movement. It is impossible to separate Khrushchev from Serov or Serov from

the Russian campaign for peaceful coexistence. Now is it possible to separate Stalin, Khrushchev, Serov, or any other Communist leader from the many crimes against humanity committed by the conspiracy of communism. These crimes are recorded on the conscience of all civilization and the guilty parties remain the same, despite the present Kremlin effort to shift all the blame to the late dictator Stalin.

The British press and people are to be congratulated on the public renunciation given to General Serov and the part they played in bringing about his early return to Moscow. It is hoped that the British diplomats and political leaders will in turn respond to the will of the British people and thus cancel out the return to England of General Serov and his companion in crime Nikita Khrushchev.

The Manifesto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the splendid analysis of our distinguished colleague, Congressman O. C. FISHER, of Texas, on the manifesto which was subscribed to by more than 100 Members of both branches of the Congress last week.

Coming as this does from a Member of Congress in whose congressional district the race issue as such is relatively unimportant because of the scarcity of Negroes in that part of the great Commonwealth of Texas I think it can be regarded as purely an objective statement. Mr. FISHER not only subscribed to the document himself, but was a member of the House Strategy Group which was responsible for its circulation among the Members of the House.

While I think that our colleague might have gone further in his analysis by pointing out the potent implications of the instrument, his analysis so far as it goes is a logical and sound analysis.

The statement follows:

Resistance to Federal encroachment upon powers and functions reserved by the States when the Constitution was written, was voiced last week by more than 100 Members of Congress. I joined with a half dozen of my Texas colleagues in this declaration of constitutional principles.

It's not just a matter of being for or against segregation. The issue is much more important and fundamental than that. It strikes at a trend which threatens by judicial fiat to gobble up many of the basic rights and powers clearly retained by the States when the Constitution was drafted in 1787.

The integration decision was made 22 months ago. The big question now is: Where will the Supreme Court strike next?

In scores of decisions covering a 100 years of judicial history the Supreme Court has repeatedly scoffed at the very idea that local school trustees—and individual States—did not have the right to separate students, in equally desirable facilities. That included the discretion to separate boys and girls, Negroes and whites, if local trustees thought best.

But a new Supreme Court comes along and wham!—away go the precedents of a 100 years, and for the first time in American history Uncle Sam rides herd on local school boards.

No, the matter of integration now becomes secondary in importance. The big question is: What does the future hold in store for America and for our Constitution? Where will the Supreme Court strike next?

The simple fact is that the original Constitution does not even mention education. Nor does the 14th amendment. The framers enumerated the powers the Federal Government would be allowed to exercise—spelled them out, 18 of them. Control over education was not one of them. And to clinch the meaning, article 10 of the Bill of Rights came along to provide: "The powers not granted to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States."

How could language be more definite, more positive, more understandable?

But now we find the Supreme Court in a completely new role of legislating; of not only going contrary to the wording of the Constitution but also going contrary to more than 50 prior court decisions.

Clearly, the Court now acts not on the written word or precedent but according to the Court's whims, philosophy or shade of political thinking.

What can we do about it? Well, the least we can do is to assert ourselves and hope that an aroused public opinion will make itself felt in opposing future encroachments. Playing ostrich will not suffice. The great Edmund Burke once said: "For evil to succeed it is only necessary for good men to do nothing."

Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my bill, H. R. 10064, which would lower the qualifying age for social security benefits from age 65 to age 60 for men and age 55 for women, as well as to provide that any fully insured individual who becomes permanently and totally disabled shall be considered to have reached retirement age.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that if there is any group in this great land of ours that deserves special consideration it is the totally and permanently disabled who would otherwise be eligible for benefits under the social security system except for the fact that in many, many cases they have not as yet reached retirement age.

In all justice, I feel that these people should not be further penalized by being required to wait for their rightful benefits until they reach age 65. They need economic assistance right now and, after all, they are not employable, and to force them to wait, perhaps for many years, for their benefits, is working a terrible hardship upon them.

I would like to remind the Congress that we have modernized our social security system in other respects. In the 1950 amendments we substantially increased the coverage of the system and more than doubled the amount of the benefits.

Again in 1952 and in 1954 the benefit structure was brought up to date. Today, 9 out of 10 workers in this country are covered by social security—as compared with only 3 out of 5 in 1949.

But, we have made no change whatever in the qualifying age of 65 which was set 20 years ago in the middle of a depression.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for a change. And permit me to outline very briefly some of the reasons why it is imperative that the 84th Congress act on this matter.

The first and most urgent reason for lowering the age requirement grows out of recognition of the human values involved. No longer will it be necessary to explain to the older men and women who, through forces beyond their control, are unable to find work—or are unable to work—that they will have to wait for a number of years for their retirement benefits. No longer will it be our unhappy duty to explain to the aged widow of a worker who has died that she cannot receive any widow's benefit until she has reached her 65th birthday.

We know, too, how significantly increases in our living costs have threatened the security of many older men and women who are the victims of the kind of involuntary retirement I have just described. It used to be that a family which had managed to save a few thousand dollars to purchase a home could survive many years of retirement without additional income. Fifty years ago a backlog of $5,000 would care for a retired couple for 15 or 20 years. Now, if they manage carefully, they may be able to stretch it to cover 2 or 3 years. This is just one of the economic realities of today which calls for a lowering of the qualifying age in social security.

Let us consider, for a moment, other realities which call for the enactment of this bill. First of all, it provides a logical adjustment to the fact that the length of work life, for most of us, has been substantially shortened. In 1900, 39 percent of all persons aged 45 or over were in the labor force. To day this proportion has dropped to around 27 percent. In the language of the technician, the shift from a rural to a highly industrial economy is reflected in the long-term decline of farm employment and in the expansion of such occupations as semiskilled operatives and clerical and sales workers—occupational fields which have a very low proportion of older workers. Translated, this means that the parent or grandparent who, some years ago, could continue to work around the farmyard or by hiring out to the neighbors, must now try to find a job in a labor market which has relatively few openings for older men and women.

It is true, of course, that the older worker who has remained in the same job for a number of years can continue on with it as long as he is able to work, or as long as the job lasts. But let us not fall into the error of believing that this is the typical experience of older citizens.

As of October 1953 workers above 45 were about 50 percent of all unemployment-benefit claimants. We know that unemployment benefits are paid for only a limited period, depending upon limitations set by the States. In spite of our efforts to retrain and reeducate both workers and employers so that more work opportunities may be made for older people, we know in our hearts that this is a solution which will work only in a relatively small proportion of cases.

We know, too, that the remarkable improvements in factory technology are rapidly changing our methods of mass production so that we are producing more and more goods with less and less hours of work. Recently the Federal Reserve Board reported that American factories produced the same amount of goods in November 1954 as during the same month of 1953. But at the same time, the Bureau of Labor Statistics noted that there were 6 percent fewer production workers employed last November than in the same month a year ago. In other words, output per man-hour of work had risen enough in a single year to permit industry to cut down on the number of its employees by 6 percent without decreasing production at all.

Nor is this a temporary development. The whole trend of our industrial expansion has been in the direction of shortening the number of hours of work required to produce a given product. And now we are hearing new predictions that we are on the verge of even more revolutionary developments in this direction. A new word, "automation," has come into our language as the field of electronics is developing the "mechanical brain" and similar devices. We are not yet quite clear as to just what effect the development of nuclear power for peacetime uses will have on this total picture. But we do know that, whatever happens, we are certainly going to be faced with the familiar problem of how to adjust to the machine's contribution to more leisure time. It is true, of course, that new jobs will be created in the manufacture of the machines and in providing for their maintenance. But the overall problem of adjusting the length of work hours—and the length of work life—to this new industrial revolution remains. One important aspect in these considerations will be a recognition of the fact that job opportunities for younger workers with growing families must be maintained.

But someone will say we cannot afford to lower the retirement age so that our older people will quit work and live off the rest of the country for the remainder of their lives. Now, first of all, let us be clear about the fact that lowering the qualifying age in social security does not amount to enforced retirement at that age. Most of the men and women who are able to work, and who are allowed to continue on their jobs, will do so because retirement means a very greatly reduced income. In effect, therefore, my bill would simply shorten—or eliminate entirely—the tragic waiting period now imposed by the provision that benefits cannot be paid until age 65 has been reached.

Let me say, too, that new developments of the kind I have outlined have always brought out the prophets of gloom, who predict that more leisure time is a serious matter. In the early days of the 18th century they opposed the idea of bringing children out of factories and into schools on the ground that the children would thus be encouraged to develop habits of indolence. When the 8-hour day was first proposed, early in this century, there was widespread protest that people would have too much time to get into mischief. We are, indeed, just beginning to learn that more leisure time for more of our people can enrich our national life and create new opportunities for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This is another reason why I believe that the sooner we adjust to the inevitability of a shorter work life for most of us, the sooner we will understand all the implications of our destiny of abundance.

One further change in our work pattern should be noted, especially as it applies to the appropriate qualifying age for women. The fact that older women often survive their husbands had added to the problems of dependency, particularly as living costs have increased. The widow who has married and raised a family is at a special disadvantage in seeking employment not only because job opportunities for older women are limited but also because of her own lack of experience in a job. Moreover, she has other serious disadvantages. Her opportunity to accumulate retirement benefits is cut down; she lacks seniority protections and is often first to be released when reductions in force are put into effect; she must often accept jobs at low wages or salary levels; and she usually lacks training or recent job experience. Can we, therefore, conscientiously continue to extend the burden for the women of America? I think not, and I trust that this legislation which I have introduced today will relieve the grave economic plight that many thousands of our fine citizens are presently experiencing and most certainly will continue to experience unless direct action is taken by the Congress to alleviate this serious situation.

Visit to the Capitol of Men From District 13, United Steelworkers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, a group of 32 men from district 13, United Steelworkers of America, visited the Capitol in conjunction with their classwork on Federal legislative procedure.

I had the privilege of welcoming them on Monday morning, at which time we discussed the passing of legislation and the many other ramifications involved on how a bill becomes a law. These members then attended a full session of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member, and left for a noon luncheon where we all had the pleasure of hearing a talk by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell. The Secretary remained with us for a question-and-answer period, and I am sure the men enjoyed quizzing him on labor legislation and receiving Mr. Mitchell's frank and interesting replies.

The afternoon session included a tour of the House of Representatives. From there we proceeded to the Senate and met with Senators EDWARD E. MARTIN and JAMES H. DUFF. The legislative group were hosts at a dinner in the evening where brief talks were made by me and my colleagues from the western Pennsylvania districts, Representatives KELLEY and MORGAN.

To me, the steelworkers, railroaders, and others who took part in this study have made a distinct contribution to the principles of our form of government. By familiarizing themselves with legislative procedure, they have become better equipped to adjudge the problems connected with the making of Federal laws. At the same time they have acquired information which can be passed along to the advantage of their families, fellow workmen, friends, and neighbors.

I recommend that this visit be made known wherever possible to various labor, business, civic, and other organizations which may follow the example of this group in finding out just how our Government functions. I am sure we will have a better informed citizenry.

As far as I am able to determine, this is the first time that any group of this type has undertaken such a beneficial project, and to further record this event in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the names of the gentlemen who participated:

FROM CAMBRIA COUNTY, PA.

1. Mr. Kenneth L. Bender, legislative director of district 13, United Steelworkers of America, 403 Wallace Building, Johnstown.
2. Mr. Irvin Bartoletti, 424 East Sample Street, Ebensburg.
3. Nicholas C. Borsuk, 335 Strayer Street, Johnstown.
4. Henry A. Emerick, 730 Pine Street, Johnstown.
5. Charles Fesko, 291 Laurel Avenue, Johnstown.
6. Joseph Galagaza, 236 Main Street, Conemaugh.
7. Louis V. Geist, 224 Main Street, Johnstown.
8. John W. Hagins, 182 Blaine Street, Johnstown.
9. Harry E. Hildebrand, 506 Bernard Street, Johnstown.
10. John E. Howe, rural route 4, box 204, Johnstown.
11. Stanley P. Killian, 52 Hazel Street, Conemaugh.
12. R. J. Maley, 17 Cox Street, Johnstown.
13. Rhody L. McCutcheon, 219 Mifflin Street, Johnstown.
14. Sammy McFormick, 652 Linden Avenue, Johnstown.
15. Bill McKendree, 809½ Central Avenue, Johnstown.
16. Kenneth Poorbaugh, 800 Liberty Avenue, Johnstown.
17. Barry D. Richardson, 621 Wynn Avenue, Johnstown.
18. Michael Rizzo, 1336 Saylor Street, Johnstown.
19. Ross Rively, 135 Joseph Avenue, Johnstown.

20. John A. Sukenik, 89 G Street, Johnstown.
21. Thomas Wensel, Carrolltown.
22. Walter Winkler, 246 Spruce Street, Conemaugh.
23. William R. Young, Jr., 333½ Oak Street, Johnstown.

FROM WESTMORELAND COUNTY, PA.

1. Harry J. Sharp, Seward.
2. Alexander Kachmarik, 625 Rostraver Street, Monessen.

FROM FAYETTE COUNTY, PA.

1. Jack Thot, 1104 Henry Street, Belle Vernon.

FROM WASHINGTON COUNTY, PA.

1. Samuel H. Collis, 122 Wellington Avenue, Washington.
2. Edward J. Dombrowski, 432 Franklin Avenue, Canonsburg.
3. Frank Egizio, rural route 1, Canonsburg.
4. Frank Giosta, 436 Cherry Avenue, Houston.
5. Martin Slavonia, 1213 Lover Crest Avenue, Charleroi.
6. John M. Wright, 1030 Bruce Street, Washington.

Special School Milk and Brucellosis Eradication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the complex and difficult farm problem that confronts our Nation will be solved not by emotional appeals or by hungry politicians eager to get votes by waving a magic wand, but by sticking close to the hard, stubborn facts of life.

All of us know that the value of dairying and dairy products is the biggest branch of agriculture and in fact, the greatest industry in our country. Dairying is bigger than United States Steel or Standard Oil or any other single industry.

We are now called upon to vote as to whether or not we shall extend for 2 years the program relating to the special school milk and brucellosis eradication, and for the use of dairy products—milk, butter, and cheese—in veterans hospitals and by the members of our Armed Forces.

I welcome the opportunity to vote for the 2-year extension of all these programs, not merely because I represent a great dairy district, but I think it is in the interest of all the farmers and citizens of our entire Nation.

While the vote may be close, I am confident that these worthy programs will be continued and with the help of Democrats who place the welfare of country above party, I believe we will win this fight. Under permission granted me, I include an important notice from Hon. LESLIE ARENDS, the Republican whip of the House of Representatives, and various telegrams and letters—only a few of the many that I have received—from my constituents whom I have the honor to represent.

Mr. Speaker, we should, by all means, pass this bill to give 33 million schoolchildren in the United States—in 62,000 schools, the nourishment they need and to eradicate the brucellosis disease, in order to bring production and consumption of dairy products into better balance, and to insure our dairy farmers a fair return for their hard and strenuous labors. It will also take care of the millions of our schoolchildren, veterans in our veterans hospitals, and the men and women serving in all branches of our armed services all over the world.

The material referred to follows:

IMPORTANT NOTICE

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 19, 1956.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: It is planned that the conference report on H. R. 8320, relating to the special school-milk and brucellosis-eradication programs be called up for consideration early in the session on Tuesday, March 20.

The conference report eliminates provisions for the extensions of these programs beyond June 30, 1956, when they will otherwise expire.

If we can defeat the conference report the House will then be in a position to accept the Senate amendments, which provide for a 2-year extension of these programs, and also the veterans' hospital and Armed Forces milk program.

A rollcall will be asked for on the conference report.

It is hoped that every Republican will vote against the conference report and then vote for the motion to concur in the Senate amendment. The bill will then be complete to go to the White House.

Sincerely yours,

LES ARENDS,
Republican Whip.

SPRINGFIELD, MO., *March 17, 1956.*
Congressman DEWEY SHORT,
Care House of Representatives:
Greene County, your largest milk producing county, asks your support of bill H. R. 8320 for the extension of milk for school lunch and brucellosis program for 2 years instead of 90 days.

GREENE COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
C. F. SWAN, *Legislative Chairman.*

OSCEOLA, MO., *March 21, 1956.*
DEWEY SHORT,
Congressman, Seventh District,
Washington, D. C.:
I urge support bill H. R. 8320 Senate version for 2 years in addition to the 90 days.

Mrs. ROBERT C. SMITH,
Legislative chairman, St. Clair County Farm Bureau.

SPRINGFIELD, MO., *March 18, 1956.*
Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:
Request your support of bill H. R. 8320 extension for 2 years instead of 90 days.

Mr. and Mrs. R. J. UNDERWOOD,
Legislative committee, Greene County Farm Bureau.

CARTHAGE, MO., *March 19, 1956.*
Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
Member of Congress,
Seventh Missouri District,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:
Jasper County Farm Bureau urge you support Senate version for 2 years in addition to 90 days on brucellosis and milk for school lunch.

J. L. BENSCHOTER,
National Affairs Chairman,
Jasper County Farm Bureau.

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., *March 16, 1956.*
Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Earnestly urge you give support to Senate version of brucellosis and milk for school lunch program, providing for an extension of 90 days and an additional 2 years of both programs. This is highly important to Missouri farmers.

H. E. SLUSHER,
President, Missouri Farm Bureau Federation.

DADEVILLE, MO., *March 19, 1965.*
The Honorable DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: The Dade County Farm Bureau hopes you will see fit to use your influence in getting the 2-year extension on the school milk program through this session of Congress.

Thank you in advance.

Very truly yours,

E. L. SHORT,
Chairman of Legislative Board,
Dade County Farm Bureau.

Now's the Time To Give Small Business a Break

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving a great many letters from small-business people about H. R. 11. These people are asking that I sign the discharge petition to bring up H. R. 11 and then vote for it. This I will do. But we need help from the Members of this House.

The 83d and 84th Congresses have done a great deal for big business. It occurs to me that we can well afford to do something for small business. This is particularly true when the request which small business is making of us is a quite modest and reasonable request.

In this instance the request that small business is making strikes me as being most modest and reasonable. More than that, it is manifestly a request which serves the interests of consumers, farmers, and, in short, the general public good. All that small business is asking us to do is to provide reasonably effective antitrust laws. Small business is not asking for any subsidy. It is not asking for any giveaway. It is simply asking for antitrust laws which give the small man a reasonably equal competitive opportunity to succeed.

Specifically, the small business people are asking for an antitrust law which will protect them from price discrimination. We all know that price discrimination is a weapon of bigness. The big corporation can destroy its local competition by local price cutting. There is nothing new about this. We all know what it means.

Now we do not object to price cutting when it is done fairly. We object to price discrimination because this is an unfair method of price cutting. The local man inevitably gets squeezed out

and the big man survives and prospers. Survival and success in the competitive process is not a result of efficiency—when the weapon of discrimination is used. Then the corporation that survives and prospers is the biggest corporation.

Now why do we need H. R. 11?

In 1936 the Clayton Antitrust Act was amended and strengthened by the Robinson-Patman Act for the purpose of giving small business protection from price discrimination. There is a tremendous legislative history on that amendment. This history seems to make one thing clear, above all others, which is that it was intended to require the supplier to give fair and equal treatment to his wholesale and retail customers. More precisely, the law was intended to require a supplier to make equal prices to competing customers—insofar as he has no differences in costs for supplying his different customers. The law was not intended to give the small merchant any undeserved advantage, or to interfere with any efficiency that may be associated with large-scale marketing operations. The law clearly and specifically states that the supplier may charge his customers different prices up to the full extent that the different prices are justified by cost differences.

The law clearly was intended to stop price discriminations where the effect of these discriminations would substantially lessen competition and tend to create a monopoly.

The majority opinion of the Supreme Court in the *Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) v. F. T. C.* (340 U. S. 231, 1951) however, construes the Robinson-Patman Act in a way which gives small business little protection. The Supreme Court in that opinion held that the supplier's intention, or good faith, is to be the controlling criterion of the law. More specifically, the Court ruled that a supplier is excused from engaging in a discriminatory pricing practice where the supplier is in good faith; and that in such instances there is no power to stop the discriminatory practice, even though the practice substantially lessens competition and tends to create a monopoly. More than that, the Court's opinion went on to hold that a supplier is justified in discriminating to meet the lawful price of a competitor, irrespective of competitive effects. In short, the nub of this ruling is that a supplier is fully justified in engaging in a generally unlawful practice by reason of the fact that his competitor has refrained from engaging in the unlawful practice. This means, in its simplest form, that the big supplier of a nationally-known product can give a selective advantage to the big buyer who is quoted a low price by some small supplier that has no marketing system of its own and cannot, as a practical matter supply the independent merchant. This operates against small business in two ways: First, it cuts out the small supplier who has insufficient capital to expand his operation on a national scale. Second, it cuts out the independent merchant who obviously cannot overcome his big competitor's buying advantage. The practical result is to isolate and neutralize the competitive forces which both small suppliers and small merchants might supply—for the benefit of consumers. In short, this kind of pricing plays off the disadvantages of small merchants against the disadvantages of small suppliers, and ends up with big suppliers and big chain distributors having all the business.

More realistically, the court's ruling will have to be applied where there are not just two suppliers in the market, but several suppliers. This means therefore, that price quotations offered the chain can gravitate to a low level, while prices offered the independent merchants stay at a high level, and there is no practical way to untangle the sequence of events to determine which supplier, if any, acted in bad faith. This kind of pricing will eliminate small suppliers and small retailers from the competitive system and increase monopoly.

H. R. 11 seems to me a very modest and reasonable solution to this problem. In effect it simply says this: Without regard to any question of good faith or bad faith, it is illegal for the supplier to discriminate in his prices where the effect of such discriminations may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. That is all there is to it. There are no qualifications, except of course there is a qualification that the supplier may discriminate to the full extent justified by costs; and there is a qualification that the supplier may change his prices from time to time as often as he likes, just so long as he makes the new prices available to all his customers; and there is a qualification that the supplier is not required to sell to any customer, but is free to sell or reject customers at his pleasure. These qualifications are already clearly in the statute and would not be changed.

I believe that we ought to pass H. R. 11 and pass it promptly. It is no consolation to the small-business people who are going out of business today, to know that we may consider this bill and pass it next month, or the month after that. Passing the bill next month, or the month after next, will not moreover, repair the damages to the free-enterprise system which are being done today.

There is a discharge petition on the Speaker's desk and I ask my colleagues to sign this petition so that the Members of this House may have a prompt opportunity to pass on this legislation which small-business men need and want.

A Nation of "Haves"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, few men have moved from the field of business and industry into the realm of government with the distinction and skill demonstrated by our Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey.

I am particularly happy to submit, for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Humphrey's address delivered at San Francisco, Calif., because Mr. Humphrey is an honored citizen of the State of Ohio and of the Greater Cleveland community. His talk, entitled "A Nation of 'Haves' ", is one of the most forceful replies to the prophets of gloom and doom ever presented to our people. It should be good reading in every American home.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NATION OF "HAVES"

(Remarks by Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, San Francisco, Calif.)

It is an often-neglected fact that within the last half century this Nation has gone through an economic evolution that makes pale any other in the long history of man's efforts to achieve a better life.

The result is that this Nation is today a Nation made up of small to medium savers and investors. This means that today this is a Nation of "haves" and not a Nation of "have nots." We have been in a tremendous and beneficial evolution, peacefully bettering the lives of most of us.

We in this administration have hitched our wagon to this rising star of a "have" nation to make sure of its continued rise; to keep making "have nots" into "haves." We are admirers of and believers in this uniquely American growth and progress. But on coming into office we found that this great day-to-day American evolution from the bottom up was in danger. In fact, we found that it had not even been properly recognized by economic policymakers of the last two decades. They were too busy fighting the ghosts of a "have not" nation, a nation that had even then already ceased to exist.

As a result, we found the economy blown up with the hot air of inflation to a point where there was real danger that it might burst, letting us all down with a crash that would have maimed us as a nation, and dropped the free world's defenses invitingly low.

We found the economy's growth hampered and hobbled by a tangle of successive layers of regulations, controls, subsidies, and taxes imposed in past emergencies. The economy was being twisted into the shape of things past, when it should have been reaching freely for its rightful future.

In addition, we found defense spending being used partly to buy defense, and partly as a crutch to support an unsound economy, thereby endangering both defense and the economy.

In other words, we found an economy in danger of going stale, out of step with the times and out of step with the Nation it had to serve, an economy fearful of the ghosts of bygone crises, living precariously on the treacherous dodges of inflation, subsidy and excessive crash-and-crisis Government spending.

We have been reshaping this Government's economic policies into the policies required for a strong and forward-looking Nation, its economy firmly footed and self-supporting; an economy that will pump a continuous new flow of nourishment into the day-to-day American evolution of self-betterment; an economy that will constantly generate new and better paying jobs for an ever-growing population. At the same time our economy must provide an ever-higher standard of living, plus the social services the people want and need, as well as the

men and the weapons the Nation must have for its defense.

All hands in our Nation—labor unions and the employer, the rich and the poor, both major parties, the farmer and the city man, the woman at home and the man at his job—all have had a part in making our new productive way of life.

The point now is that the peaceful evolution has resulted in a tremendous upheaval of this Nation's whole economy that really has created a different kind of Nation, a unique Nation of haves that needs an up-to-date way of thinking about itself, and up-to-date policies, in keeping with its strength and growth potential.

Let's look back to the turn of the century and see what has been happening, economically, since then.

Our total national production of goods and services now approaches $400 billion. That is just 20 times as much as our national output in 1900. When you make allowance for price rises since the turn of the century, today's national production is still about 7 times what it was in 1900. Our population has more than doubled since 1900, but our national output per capita—production per man, woman and child in the Nation—is 3 times what it was then.

Our national income is now over $320 billion. After allowance again for price changes, this is 7 times what it was in 1900, and our income per man, woman and child in the whole population is, like production, 3 times as much as in 1900.

Here is the important thing about that income change since 1900. The lower and middle income groups have received the greatest share of our increased income. Early in the century, only 1 out of every 10 American families earned as much as $4,000 a year in terms of today's prices. Now almost half of our families earn more than $4,000 a year. Those with inadequate incomes for a decent living are becoming fewer and fewer, and more and more of them are becoming "haves"—people who have enough money not only to live adequately, but to save besides. That is the basic economic development in this country which we are trying most fervently to keep going, and to continually improve.

Let's see just how widespread and important this flow of purchasing power to the broad base of our economy has been and will continue to be.

One of the most common methods of savings is the purchase of insurance. At the turn of the century, people in this country had taken out 14 million life insurance policies. Today, with the population only slightly more than doubled, and with many people owning several policies, the number of life insurance policies has increased nearly 18 times, to about 250 million.

Ownership of individuals in their life insurance has increased from under $2 billion in 1900 to more than $85 billion.

Small investors' holdings in United States savings bonds, total the huge amount of $50 billion. No such investment existed in 1900.

Let's see some other ways in which the average man on the street in this Nation has been making himself over into an investor—a man with a real financial stake in the future such as no other average citizen anywhere ever had before.

Nearly 10 percent of all American families today own stock in American corporations. At the turn of the century, this was just getting underway.

In 1900, individuals had liquid savings of all types amounting to less than $10 billion. Now such savings of individuals in this country total more than $235 billion.

Last year alone, Americans bought equipment for themselves and their homes of almost $30 billion. This included things unknown to the homeowner of 1900, like 7 million radios, 7 million television sets, nearly 3½ million washing machines, and a million air conditioners. These are mass investments in a better life only a Nation of "haves" could make.

About 25 million families own their own homes today, compared with only 7 million homeowners half a century ago, which population has only a little more than doubled in that time. About 55 percent of our families now live in homes of their own. Nearly all others want to. And ways and means of helping them to do so are of greatest concern in present Government policy.

Labor unions to which many American workmen pay dues, are also investors. Not so many years ago, union treasuries were low. Today many of them bulge with huge sums. They own banks and buildings, bonds and stocks, and investments of many kinds. These are investments belonging to—and benefiting—the men in overalls.

Today more than 15 million Americans have more than $30 billion invested in pension and retirement trust funds. This represents an investment of almost $2,000 per worker. Such retirement plans were practically unknown in 1900.

You can see from these few examples what has been happening to the ordinary individual and the ordinary family in our wonderland economy. We need a completely new set of standards in thinking about ourselves. We are a Nation of "haves," not of "have nots." This Nation's economy has grown right over, and has left behind in the dust, both socialism and communism.

The consequence of this brilliant human achievement in our Nation is that the basic interests of the man in the overalls are today the same as the basic interests of the man in the business suit.

Both men have current earnings and probably savings in one form or another. That means that both are interested in seeing the dollar keep its purchasing power. To the extent that inflation develops, both men are robbed.

If you had $1,000 saved up in 1939, which you did not draw out to use until 1953, you really took a beating. Inflation had sneaked into your savings during those years and made off with $478. How? Because inflationary price rises during that time cut the purchasing value of the dollars you were saving, every minute of every day. When you drew out your $1,000 savings, inflation had stolen away with all but $522 of the purchasing power your dollars had when you put them aside in 1939.

The man in the overalls and the man in the business suit often try, by purchasing insurance, to build up some security to leave to their wives and children in the event of untimely death. It is a terrible thing to have the purchasing power of his insurance—the time that it will pay the rent and set the table or help with the education for those that are left—cut nearly in half in the short period of just 15 years.

It is a heartbreaking thing for a man and woman who put aside savings in a pension or retirement trust fund as they work during their lifetime to find on retirement that inflation has robbed them of nearly half of what they had invested to live on in their declining years.

We in the Eisenhower administration have made the halting of inflation one of the principal goals of our administration. In the last 2¾ years, the value of the dollar has changed only one-half of 1 cent. This means that we have kept inflation's hand out of your savings almost entirely. We want to keep inflation locked out, so that when you save—by putting money in the bank, by buying a savings bond, by buying insurance, by contributing either work or money to a pension fund or fraternal order or in any other way—you will get from your investment the same value that you toil now to put into it.

The man in the overalls and the man in the business suit have at least an equal interest in this fight. But, if there is any difference between them, it is the man in the overalls who most needs protection. He can less afford to lose.

Now, it is growing more and more to be, that it is the vast sum of the many smaller savings of the man in the overalls on which our industrial and commercial system depends for its financing. The sum of all the little savings is funneled mainly into big investments by the savings banks, the building and loan associations, the insurance companies, investment trusts, pension funds, union and fraternal organizations, and others handling the savings of the man in the overalls.

Business in this country is pouring nearly $28 billion of new investment into its plants and equipment this year. That tremendous amount must come from somebody's savings. Without it, the future's new jobs will never be born, nor will we get tomorrow's increase in productivity, as the result of new and better tools of production, bought by new investment.

Saving is important to the Nation and must be encouraged, not discouraged, because it strongly influences the security of the job you have and your hopes for ever-better pay through continued increase in your productivity. Thus you can see how inflation can rob you not only of your personal savings but, in addition, steal away your pay increases and perhaps even your jobs.

We must have policies that put solid ground under our day-to-day evolution of continual betterment from the bottom up. Such policies must aim at everyone, spreading the riches throughout the land. There is only one way to have everyone have more and that is to produce more. The Nation's treasures of goods and services must constantly increase, by continually increasing individual productivity, so that they can be spread ever deeper and broader throughout the whole economy.

Our strong economy must—and can—carry the costs of fully adequate defense, and of indispensable public services, and at the same time continue its healthy growth. But it will only be able to do so if we balance the load correctly so that it can be carried, and carried indefinitely, without a breakdown.

We have devised policies to fit our new situation and we are balancing the load.

We are not the slave of any particular aspect of our flexible policies. We regard inflation as a public enemy of the worst type. But we have not hesitated, either, to ease or restrict the basis of credit when need was indicated. Under the new cooperation that exists in this administration between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve, the full force of monetary policy has been made effective more promptly than ever before in the Nation's history to better respond to natural demands.

We found when we came to office an overblown economy. It was hobbled with all sorts of artificial controls, dangerously dependent upon the uncertainties of defense spending, and inflationary pressures. It was borrowing from tomorrow's production and income at a prodigious rate, with unsound confiscatory taxation that still failed to provide for the profligate spending. This resulted in huge deficits that were passing the heavy burden of our excesses on for our children and grandchildren to bear. And sooner or later it was sure to result in complete downfall.

Under the Eisenhower administration, the whole economy, the livelihood of all the people, has been made more safe. This has been done by the timely use of monetary policy and credit in response to actual demand; by the return to the public of purchasing power through the biggest tax cut

in the history of the Nation, by cutting unjustified government spending; and at the same time by timely encouragement to construction, home building, and needed improvements. By the prompt and vigorous use of all these measures we have made the difficult and delicate change from a dangerously artificial economy to a healthful one, with every effort exerted to the utmost to involve the very minimum of cost in terms of unemployment.

In turning our faces resolutely from inflation, and unrealistic spending, what have we turned toward?

We have turned with full confidence to a people that have demonstrated that you are industrious, saving, inventive, daring, progressive and self-reliant to an unprecedented degree. We believe in your capacity to go on providing yourselves with an ever better life, if we in government support your efforts where the general welfare calls for such support, and do not load you with unnecessary burdens, or take from you by excessive taxation the increase in your income that you might otherwise earn and save, or allow you to be robbed by inflation.

We will be rising on the solid ground of these things:

Savings protected against shrinkage by a stable dollar;

Increased production and increased wages and earnings made possible by the investment of those savings in more, new, and better tools of production;

Wide use, by Americans who are both workers and investors, of these tools of production for the creation of more jobs and new, better, and cheaper goods, with ever-widening distribution among an ever-growing number of consumers as their earning power increases and the cost of the goods decline;

Use of the increased income from this increased production of the things you want, not to pay the bill for unneeded or unwise Government spending, or as tribute to inflation, but for the creation of a better life for all.

The United States is now enjoying plenty, in peace. Americans are breaking all records in the number of people with jobs, the high wages they are receiving, and in the production of goods for people to enjoy. And they are enjoying this high prosperity while successfully resisting pressures toward inflation.

We hope for continued prosperity based, not on war scares or artificial Government stimulants, but on steady spending by consumers, and investment by business. It has a broad and solid base. We have laid to rest the myth that a free-enterprise system can thrive only in war. We have shown that free men in a free world can provide an abundance, can provide plenty in peace, far above the capacity of the government-run economies of the world.

A Housing Program for Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech I had the privilege of delivering before the legislative conference of Building and Construction Trade Unions, AFL–CIO, on March 5, 1956, at the meeting of these great unions in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HOUSING PROGRAM FOR TODAY AND TOMORROW

(Remarks of Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN at legislative conference of Building and Construction Trade Unions, AFL–CIO, March 5, 1956)

When representatives of the building and construction trades assemble to discuss legislation, it seems to me that we who have the responsibility for legislating should pay close attention. Through your role in the construction industry, you account for a substantial portion of our total national product. You are a major part of the labor force and a major factor in the national economy. I am grateful for this opportunity to address you.

One of my main areas of interest in the Senate, just as it was for many years before I came to the Senate, is labor. As a member of the Labor Committee, I have always given, and will continue to give, concentrated attention to the views and problems of labor in this country.

To my mind, the organized labor movement as a whole has shown as much statesmanship as any other group or movement in America. It has shown an enlightened interest in the welfare of all Americans, regardless of whether they are or are not members of labor unions. The labor movement has shown farsighted concern with the cause of civil liberties and civil rights and with our national security and our foreign policy.

Despite what my colleague, Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, says, I think the American labor movement is one of the most constructive forces in America today and one of the greatest supports of our democracy and of what we call our American way of life.

As far as your particular unions are concerned, you, too, have wide-ranging interests covering the complete spectrum of the problems facing our Nation.

Among these problems surely one is the problem of housing. I am gratified to know that you are giving major attention to the question of Federal legislation on the subject of housing.

It is, of course, understandable that you should, because housing accounts for about 40 cents out of each dollar spent for construction in America. Without a dynamic home-building industry, geared to the needs of the American people, our economy must languish and suffer.

Of course, you have a vital stake in an expanding home-construction program. You have a deep interest in the perpetuation of a strong and prosperous construction industry, grounded on a system of free, competitive enterprise and dedicated to the general welfare of our entire population.

In this matter your own organizational interest and the public interest happily coincide.

I am sure that all of us here will agree that our Government has a wide range of basic responsibilities to the people. We believe that the Government is the servant of the people. One of the ways in which Government needs to serve the people is in the field of housing.

I believe, and I think you believe, that every inhabitant of our land should be able to look to Government for help in making whatever arrangements are necessary to stimulate and provide adequate housing. It is an obligation of Government to see that no individual is precluded from an opportunity to obtain decent housing conditions for himself and his family at a price he can afford.

This obligation began to be recognized quite a few years ago when our Government, in the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, began to pass housing legislation. I feel that in recent years we have lost sight of the exact nature of this obligation. Today in the field of housing the Government no longer acknowledges a responsibility to the people, but instead an obligation to the private construction industry.

In very recent days Housing and Home Finance Administrator Albert M. Cole has lashed out against the omnibus housing bill which I and nine of my colleagues joined in introducing recently.

Mr. Cole charged that our bill was an "undisguised anti-private-enterprise bill virtually from start to finish and would not get more homes built."

He charged that our bill would go far toward wrecking the private housing economy on which our housing production depends.

He stated that our bill would commit the Government to the expenditure of "untold billions of dollars for unsound and unproductive purposes."

He said that a provision in our bill for a $2-billion Government-financed middle-income housing program would "invade the mass market of private housing and make a large number of our families dependent solely on the Government for a decent home."

I assume that Mr. Cole speaks for the administration, although he might also be speaking from the background of his own prejudices. Mr. Cole, it must be remembered, was a Congressman from Kansas who was defeated for reelection. His principal distinction as a Member of the House was on account of his vicious attacks against the housing program. He did his best to defeat the Housing Act of 1949, and then, after the present administration came to power, he was designated by President Eisenhower to administer that program. So I am not surprised at Mr. Cole's attitude toward the Lehman housing bill. I am only surprised at his frankness.

Implied in Mr. Cole's criticism of this bill is the present administration's housing philosophy. They conceive, as I said, that their primary obligation is to the private construction industry, rather than to the people who are going to rent or buy the houses.

Millions, yes, billions, of dollars of Government credit has been and is being provided to take the risk out of private housing and to support and subsidize private housing. But any suggestion that the Government help ordinary citizens to acquire the housing they need at prices they can afford, or any suggestion that the housing industry be pushed in the direction of providing housing of a kind that is needed, rather than of the kind that can be most profitably built, is immediately and violently attacked as contrary to the principles of private enterprise.

The administration's housing philosophy is but another version of its general economic philosophy—the philosophy of trickle-down. The administration sees nothing wrong in writing down land values for urban redevelopment and providing almost unlimited credit to banks and lending institutions at almost nominal rates of interest. But when it is proposed to guarantee a minimum rate of interest to individual home builders, or to build a sufficient number of low-rent public-housing units, the administration raises its hands in horror and cries socialism.

The philosophy underlying the administration's housing program can best be compared to a school-building program which would be managed for the primary benefit of the building contractors rather than of the children who will attend the schools.

The idea behind the present program is to have the benefits trickle down from the lending, realty, and construction people to the people who need to build, buy, and occupy the homes.

I yield to no one in my devotion to the private-enterprise system. I am for free private enterprise, but I am also for using the powers of Government to see that private enterprise does the kind of job that needs to

be done and to see that the needs of the people in regard to housing are met.

Practically the entire range of private risk in the housing field has been socialized, but there is no protest against this from the spokesmen of the realty interests or of the big banking interests. Yet they are quick to raise their voices against any proposal for a program to build public housing for families of low income. No, that is immediately labeled as socialism or, in the current idiom, creeping socialism. These spokesmen see socialism creeping everywhere, even in this Republican administration.

Well, I am not concerned over this name calling and this attachment of scare labels. I don't think you are, either. We are going to continue to push for legislation that will give the country a housing program designed to meet the critical need.

I think we need a New Deal in housing. My colleagues and I have proposed such a New Deal, and with all my heart I welcome your support of it and the support of all the other constituent unions of the AFL–CIO.

Actually, it was and is my purpose to be totally nonpolitical in my remarks this afternoon. Be very sure that slums, bad housing, unfit neighborhoods, and all our other housing problems are totally nonpartisan. We do not know half of what we should about our housing problems. We have refused to face the facts. The last clear picture of our national housing situation was drawn in the census of 1950. Since then, no new data has been assembled. Yet we have but to drive through our cities to know that great changes have taken place. We can only assess the problem with the tools that we have at hand.

For several years the AFL–CIO has been urging an overall housing program that would produce a minimum of 2 million new homes a year. Of that amount the AFL–CIO has recommended at least 200,000 new public-housing units a year over a period of years to meet the needs of the lowest income families.

You have further advised us on the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that we should approve a new program to assist families of middle income—those families whose income are too high to be eligible for low rent public housing and below the level for which private enterprise is presently supplying homes in any significant amount.

You have urged better housing in farm areas.

And finally you have given recognition to the growing problem of decent housing for our senior citizens so that the elderly and the aged may have proper surroundings adopted to their special needs, but as part of the community.

Time and again I have been proud of your union representatives as they have come before our committee urging that we face up to the horrible housing conditions surrounding families loosely classified as coming from minority groups. These are families who, under today's conditions in many northern as well as southern communities, are unable even to secure land on which to build segregated communities, not to mention their constitutional right to bid for homes in a free market. Unlike other people, these families suffer regardless of their income levels.

Yes, if there is one public interest group which has shown an awareness of the housing problems, and has been unceasingly active in the search for solutions, it has been the AFL–CIO.

Why do we say that our immediate goal in this country should be the construction of a minimum of 2 million new homes a year, for the next 20 years?

Let's look at the record. According to the 1950 census there were 15 million American homes, urban and farm, that were substandard. If current facts were available the number would be substantially larger today. Ten million of these homes should be replaced, and approximately 5 million need to be rehabilitated. Seven million of the houses that must be replaced are in our urban centers. These are slum houses that I am talking about. These are the areas that by their very nature create health, social and economic problems that defy solution unless we have the courage to attack the problem boldly, and as a whole.

These figures represent only the rotten core of our housing problem.

There are constant, vast, new housing needs that must be recognized. For example, 3 million families migrate from city to city each year. In addition, thousands of homes are destroyed by fire and other disasters. These must be replaced. Other homes in increasing numbers are being torn down each year through urban redevelopment, highway and other construction programs. These must be replaced. Finally, hundreds of thousands of homes annually reach obsolescence and must be replaced or rebuilt.

This problem can never be successfully attacked piecemeal. The Housing Act of 1949 established the national housing policy as that of "A decent home in a proper living environment for every American family." It provided the broad framework of governmental guaranties and assistance essential to achieve that goal. You are all aware of the continuing attacks by special interests that have torn that act to shreds bit by bit.

Low-rent public housing has been reduced to an almost meaningless gesture. Urban redevelopment has moved at a snail's pace, and can never succeed until there is a dynamic program of low-rent public housing to shelter families of low income displaced through slum clearance, as well as a new program to assist displaced families of middle income.

To be sure, there has been a gigantic program of private housing throughout the postwar years, made possible through FHA mortgage guaranties and VA loans. In 1950, 1,400,000 new homes were started. In succeeding years the figure dropped, but spurted ahead in 1955 to 1,335,000 new homes. That great building boom, the most dramatic in our history, was almost totally limited to families of high and upper middle income. It has just about kept pace with normal growth. It did nothing to relieve the backlog of substandard shelter.

What must we do to meet these housing needs that I have described? I only wish that I, working with you and others devoted to the public interest, had a perfect answer.

We have, however, what we believe to be a reasonable answer, a good beginning.

On February 8, I introduced two bills in the Senate of the United States. First of all, there was S. 3158, a substantive housing bill, divided into 8 titles, aimed at making possible the production of at least 2 million new homes a year. Joining me as cosponsors were Senators DOUGLAS, MORSE, HUMPHREY, NEUBERGER, MAGNUSON, MURRAY, HENNINGS, KEFAUVER, and MCNAMARA.

Simultaneously, I introduced, with practically the same list of cosponsors, S. 3159, establishing a new Cabinet-level department to be known as the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. All existing housing agencies would be combined within this executive department.

If we are to achieve our total construction goal we must stimulate the production of at least 1,200,000 new homes for families of upper middle and high income. Then we need to stimulate at least 400,000 new homes for families of middle income for whom practically no assistance exists today. Then we require 200,000 new units of low-rent public housing a year to meet the needs of low-income families.

Finally, about 200,000 farm homes are required each year to replace existing substandard units.

This is my prescription for a housing program to meet our present needs and to anticipate the needs that are crowding in upon us. What is now a great shortage will become, in the months and years ahead, I fear, a crisis. The bill which I, together with my colleagues, have introduced, undertakes a program which, we hope, will result in a program of the magnitude I have just described.

I want to deny here and now—although it should not be necessary to do so—that this program is designed in any way to hamstring, hamper, or interfere with the private construction industry. Rather, it should be a great boon to the private construction industry. I must confess, however, that it is designed primarily to serve the needs of the people rather than of the private housing industry.

The middle-income housing program, for instance, would be conducted entirely through private industry, although an initial program of Government loans would be available.

The housing program I have proposed is by no means a perfect program. It is, in some respects, experimental, and provides, by its own terms, for review. It also provides for an expanded program of research.

It is a program of action. It is a program on a scale comparable to the need.

Certainly the administration's program, recently introduced by Senator CAPEHART, is not such a program. It has some good elements in it. It carries over some good features of the Truman program. But by and large it is a patchwork program. It is primarily, by its own emphasis, a program of repairs. It consists, to a great extent, of slogans, and its chief mechanisms are scarcely disguised subsidies to the lenders, realtors, and promoters. It is not a dynamic program of stimulus and leadership.

My bill would nearly double the annual amount of home construction. It would maintain the construction industry at a higher peak than it has ever known before. It would be a major contribution to full employment in this country.

It will mean jobs, but most of all, it will mean homes. It is not a dream. It is a practical program.

I do not propose to discuss this bill in any further detail today. Each of you can study the detailed analysis of this bill which is, I understand, available to those participating in this conference. Make up your own minds. I hope you will indicate any defects you see in my bill, as well as any defects you see in the administration proposal.

I have no pride of authorship in my bill, although I think it is a fine one. Indeed, I would be less than candid if I did not make it a matter of public record that I borrowed liberally from the ideas which your union has advanced from time to time on this subject.

I am proud that the AFL–CIO executive council has endorsed this bill. I am much more eager for action, however, than I am for endorsement. I regard housing as much more of a need than an issue.

Let us all join in demanding and urging that this Congress, at this session, enact a housing bill that makes sense not only for today but for tomorrow—a housing bill not to catch votes but to house the families of America.

And I urge you, who in fact build the homes that are so desperately needed, to inform yourselves thoroughly on this subject.

Make up your own minds on the facts and carry the truth to your Representatives in Congress and back home to your coworkers and your community leaders. We can win this fight for decent housing. We can destroy the slums. We can rebuild our cities if we employ the mighty forces of informed public opinion, based on the facts as they exist.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, March 19, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Father George P. Gallos, pastor, Greek Orthodox Church of the Annunciation, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Creator, who didst make man the crowning glory of Thy work of creation, and didst grant unto him freedom of will to choose between right and wrong, and didst imbue in him the longing for liberty and the passion for freedom; who, through the Angel Gabriel, didst announce to the Virgin the birth of Thy Son who, through His suffering on the Cross and His glorious conquest of death, would free man from the bondage of sin into which he had fallen; Thou who didst lead the children of Israel to the Promised Land, and who didst guide the fathers of this country in founding this promised land of priceless liberty, to Thee, O Lord, do we pray and give thanks.

Keep us ever mindful of man's struggle for liberty throughout the ages. Keep us mindful especially of the Greek people, who, on the day of the Annunciation 135 years ago, did declare their independence from a bondage that had lasted almost 400 years. Bless the land of Greece, the cradle of democracy, and grant that her people always may be on the side of liberty, justice, and enlightenment.

Grant that we, the citizens of this land, may invest the talent of freedom which Thou hast bestowed upon us by always choosing right over wrong, good over evil, liberty over tyranny, freedom over enslavement, and love over hatred. Be ever present with those entrusted with the governing of this great land. Grant them the wisdom and the insight to preserve our country in freedom, courage to face the forces of tyranny which would deprive us of our heritage, and strength to overpower any foe who would enslave us.

Hear our prayer, O Lord, we beseech Thee, hearken unto us, and have mercy upon us. *Amen.*

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 21, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of James Durfee, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour, subject to the usual 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Finance and assigned to service on the Committee on Appropriations; and

That the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and assigned to service on the Committee on Finance; and

That the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD] be, and he is hereby, assigned to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Administration of Territories, Office of Territories," for the fiscal year 1956 has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation because of an emergency involving the safety of human life (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

RELINQUISHMENT OF CONSULAR JURISDICTION IN MOROCCO

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation approving the relinquishment of the consular jurisdiction of the United States in Morocco (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT, MESA VERDE NATIONAL PARK, COLO.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract in the Mesa Verde National Park, Colo. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, KINGS CANYON NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit in Kings Canyon National Park, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

A letter from the Chief Scout Executive, National Council, Boy Scouts of America, New Brunswick, N. J., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that organization, for the year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

A letter from the National Executive Director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixth annual report of that organization, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1955 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COST ASCERTAINMENT REPORT, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the cost ascertainment report of the Post Office Department, for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Angel Figarella, of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTIONS OF WATER USERS IRRIGATION CONFERENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Water Users Irrigation Conference, at Billings, Mont.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION No. 1

SALE OF STATE LANDS WITHIN IRRIGATION DISTRICTS

Whereas land owned by the State and within the boundaries of irrigation districts is not assessable for O. and M. and repayment of construction costs; and

Whereas such land does have infestations of noxious weeds and drainage problems; and

Whereas such land is not assessable for support of local weed control and drainage districts; and

Whereas such land does have canals, laterals, headgates, and other structures which are part of the project works; and

Whereas such lands do not contribute a proportionate share of the tax moneys to operate and maintain the project works; and

Whereas such lands are a detriment to the management of a project and an unfair financial burden to the owners of other lands on irrigation projects: Be it

Resolved, That the State land boards be requested and urged to offer for sale all such lands.

RESOLUTION No. 2

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR IRRIGATION DISTRICT EMPLOYEES

Whereas the Federal Unemployment Tax Act does not now include unemployment compensation for irrigation districts' employees: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the congressional delegations be requested and urged to seek an amendment of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to include such employees.

RESOLUTION No. 3

MINOR CONSTRUCTION BY IRRIGATION DISTRICTS

Whereas irrigation districts have contracted to repay to the United States funds expended for irrigation and drainage works on projects constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation; and

Whereas appropriations of construction funds for the purpose of drainage and minor completion work on irrigation facilities are now subject to laws and Bureau policies, which do not permit the district concerned to perform such work; and

Whereas the districts own or have ready access to the necessary equipment and have skilled personnel available to perform the contemplated work; and

Whereas the scheduling of the work must fit into the regular O. and M. program in order to prevent disruption of regular project operations; and

Whereas a considerable saving could be made by decreasing overhead which is necessary under Government procedure: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That necessary legislation be provided permitting such drainage and minor completion work to be performed, notwithstanding any other law, and subject only to such reasonable terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior shall make, by contract or equipment rental agreement entered into with the irrigation district concerned, whereby such district may perform such work, such authorization to be similar to the present authorization for the R. and B. program as now provided in Public Law No. 335 (81st Cong. 1st sess.).

RESOLUTION No. 4

AMENDMENT OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Whereas the allotment of sugar beets which has decreased our permitted seedings this year will endanger the family-size farm and is inadequate to support a family under our American standard of living; We are hereby

Resolved, That our quota of sugar for the production of beets in the United States be increased in the same proportion as our population increase—this incerase being very essential to keep our irrigation projects in the United States on a sound basis; be it further

Resolved, That we hereby heartily endorse the general conditions of Resolution No. 30 of the 1955 National Reclamation Association meeting, a copy of which follows:

"RESOLUTION NO. 30

"(National Reclamation Association, 24th annual meeting, Lincoln, Nebr., October 24–26, 1955)

"AMENDMENT OF THE SUGAR ACT OF 1948

"Whereas the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, will expire on December 31, 1956, and consequently its protective provisions will apply only to sugar refined from beets grown in 1955 and sold in 1956; and

"Whereas reenactment of the present law, with retention of protective qouta provisions, as well as provisions designed to bring about a parity price for sugar beets and cane produced in domestic areas, is therefore essential early in the 2d session of the 84th Congress; and

"Whereas under the present act, the sugar beet and cane crop has been subjected to acreage restrictions in 1954 and 1955, amounting to from 12 percent in beet areas to 18 percent in cane areas under previous plantings; and

"Whereas the sugar-beet crop is a major and important crop on western irrigation projects and the need is imperative that full acreage be restored and reasonable future expansion be provided for on newly irrigated areas as well as on established projects; and

Whereas the sugar-beet crop is of increasing importance due to the curtailment of other crops and because they furnish a reliable cash crop badly needed on new irrigation projects to meet high development costs as well as on old projects to carry the mounting expenses of irrigation farming; and

"Whereas both domestic sugar beet and cane growing farmers in equity should have the right, denied to them under present law, to participate in the expanding market for sugar in this country; and

"Whereas there is now pending before Congress, legislation to reenact and amend the expiring act; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Reclamation Association hereby directs its officers to actively support new legislation, which will:

"1. Provide sugar quotas to continental beet areas which will restore opportunity for full production among growers with a historical beet-growing base.

"2. Provide immediate opportunity on both new irrigation projects as well as established projects for farmers, who desire to add the beet-growing enterprise to their farming program to the extent that processing facilities are available.

"3. Provide further that in sugar-quota allocations such division of the steadily increasing American market be made as will create a basis for additional sugar processing facilities in irrigated areas adapted to beets and in which farmers evidence a firm and continuing desire to grow beets.

"4. Provide that deficits occurring in the quantities allotted to continental areas be reallocated to other continental areas; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this association actively support a provision in new legislation limiting the term of the Sugar Act, now under consideration, for a period of 4 years in order that in 1960, Congress may again reappraise the need for quotas in all domestic areas and their ability to consistently supply the amounts prescribed."

RESOLUTION No. 5

LIMITATION ON PRICE SUPPORT PAYMENTS

Whereas the farmlands of our Nation are steadily falling into fewer hands and larger holdings; and

Whereas this condition is detrimental to the welfare of our country as the familiy-sized farm is the backbone of our economy; and

Whereas the allotment of certain crops on small farms is inadequate to support a family under the American standard of living: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in the event of any increase of allotments in the future, the small farmer may be given the first consideration.

We recommend that a limitation be fixed on the amount of major farm crops eligible for support price to persons or corporations.

RESOLUTION No. 6

EXPANDED NOXIOUS WEED PROGRAM

Whereas the noxious-weed problem continues to be one of our greatest hazards on irrigated land; and

Whereas a great many noxious weeds become established, because we do not recognize them when they first appear; and

Whereas we feel it is very important that all landowners and county commissioners become fully acquainted with the worst noxious weeds before they gain a foothold: Therefore be it

Resolved, That all county agents, the Bureau of Reclamation, and representatives of other State and Federal agricultural agencies make every effort to acquaint water users with the perennial noxious weeds by use of exhibits of live potted plants, and to promote preventive measures where these weeds are in a state of introduction into new areas; be it further

Resolved, That the Federal Government inaugurate an expanded program to combat perennial noxious weeds on forests, public lands, irrigated projects, and all watersheds adjacent to irrigation projects and that the ASC place more emphasis on noxious-weed control.

RESOLUTION No. 7

FORWARDING OF RESOLUTIONS

Be it resolved, That the regional director of region 6 is hereby requested to forward copies of the resolutions adopted by this conference to the appropriate Federal or State agency or agencies concerned, including all irrigation districts within region 6, and that members of the resolutions committee be furnished copies for their use in communicating with their respective congressional delegations; be it further

Resolved, That each member of this resolution committee be responsible for further action in carrying out the purpose of these resolutions for their respective districts.

RESOLUTION No. 8

APPRECIATION

We, the members of the eighth annual water users irrigation conference, wish to thank the Billings Chamber of Commerce for their hospitality and use of their facilities for this conference, which has made our stay in Billings very pleasant.

We also wish to thank the Bureau of Reclamation officials for their friendly cooperation in making this eighth annual conference a success.

THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM—RESOLUTIONS FROM MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on January 31, and February 21, 1956, I had printed in the RECORD a list of municipal officials and labor unions in all parts of Minnesota who had sent me resolutions regarding the urgent need for a comprehensive, large-scale and long-term highway program. I wish to add to this list eight additional resolutions I have received endorsing Federal-aid highway legislation during this session of Congress.

Two of these resolutions from the Dakota County Board of Commissioners and the City Council of Moorhead specifically support the Gore bill, S. 1048, and/or the Fallon bill, S. 8836.

The other six resolutions from the Virginia Central Labor Union, Cloquet Central Labor Union, City Council of Eveleth, Ramsey County Board of Commissioners, the Duluth section of the American Society of Civil Engineers, and the St. Paul City Council do not specifically support any bill, but do urge an expanded highway-construction program on national, State, and local levels.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MUNDT, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 1688. A bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Seed Act (Rept. No. 1701); and

S. 2246. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands to the city of Wall, S. Dak. (Rept. No. 1700).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

H. R. 374. A bill to authorize the adjustment and clarification of ownership to certain lands within the Stanislaus National Forest, Tuolumne County, Calif., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1702);

H. R. 1855. A bill to amend the act approved April 24, 1950, entitled "An act to

facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes" (Rept. No. 1703); and

H. R. 7236. A bill to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to water conservation practices (Rept. No. 1704).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to release reversionary right to improvements on a 3-acre tract in Orangeburg County, S. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1707).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 3422. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain amounts from unclaimed payments on United States savings bonds to the fund created for the payment of Government losses in shipment; without amendment (Rept. No. 1706).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 6712. A bill to amend section 1237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; with amendments (Rept. No. 1705).

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 8100. A bill to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of Brazil; without amendment (Rept. No. 1708).

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 8107. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1709).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nomination of Lt. Gen. Henry Irving Hodes, Army of the United States, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank of general. General Hodes will succeed General McAuliff as Commander in Chief of the United States Army in Europe. I ask that this nomination be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. STENNIS. In addition, from the Committee on Armed Services, as in executive session, I report favorably a total of 1,204 routine nominations, consisting of 396 first lieutenants in the Air Force and 806 nominations in the Navy and Marine Corps in grades from chief warrant officer to commander. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Mississippi.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 3505. A bill to authorize the sale of certain vessels to citizens of Mexico; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3506. A bill for the relief of Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 3507. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 3508. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a mining and metallurgical research establishment in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 3509. A bill to attend section 1 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to give to the Interstate Commerce Commission authority for use in alleviating car shortages during periods of emergency or threatened emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES:

S. 3510. A bill providing for the furnishing of certain information by the Bureau of the Census relating to the number of aliens or citizens in any State upon request of such State; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3511. A bill for the relief of Grazialla Valencic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 3512. A bill to permit desert land entries on disconnected tracts of lands which, in the case of any one entryman, form a compact unit and do not exceed in the aggregate 320 acres; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 3513. A bill to facilitate the extension of coverage under title II of the Social Security Act to American employees of foreign subsidiaries of domestic corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 3514. A bill for the relief of Heber Lee Bond; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. SMATHERS submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 73) relative to the fight against mental illness and to observe National Mental Health Week, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. SMATHERS, which appears under a separate heading.)

ESTABLISHMENT OF BUREAU OF MINES LABORATORY IN MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since 1950 the long-range construction program of the Bureau of Mines, approved by the Bureau of the Budget, has contained 10 urgent construction projects. One of these projects has been the construction of a Bureau of Mines mining and metallurgical research establishment in the State of Minnesota.

In fact, the Bureau of Mines presently gives this particular project the top priority among its needed minerals research laboratories. Yet last year, and again this year, the administration has failed to recommend the appropriation of funds necessary to construct this vital facility.

The importance of this particular installation is emphasized by the fact that the present geographic distribution of Government metallurgical and mining research establishments is not adequate for serving the area of major significance for mineral resources in the North Central United States.

In endorsing the report of the Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy, dated November 30, 1954, the President emphasized the importance of the problem of research to improve the domestic mineral position.

The significance of this pressing need for improved facilities for mineral research is reflected in the following facts: Manganese has been and is a major national commodity problem. Every ton of steel made requires about 13 pounds of manganese. Domestic production is only sufficient for 10 percent of our Nation's steel requirements, although an estimated reserve of nearly 500 million tons of low-grade manganese-bearing material occurs on the Cuyuna Range of central Minnesota. The Bureau of Mines undertook a study of this tremendous reserve about 4 years ago and today has a fair idea of the great technological problems involved in its utilization as a source of manganese. A metallurgical process has been discovered by the small staff at the Bureau of Mines station at Minneapolis, but a great deal of research and experimental work is necessary before definite results and conclusions can be reached. The manganese shortage continues to plague United States production despite the fact that it is obviously necessary to release our steel industry from its dependence on foreign sources in a national emergency.

Furthermore, titanium is one of the new and more promising structural metals. It is lightweight, has a high melting point, and is highly corrosion resistant. This metal is vital to the further development of new ship and aircraft design; yet little research has been done on its production since 1948, although large reserves of it do exist in Lake and Cook Counties in Minnesota.

In addition, private industry has devoted much time and money in recent years to the development of magnetic taconite as a substitute for scarce high-grade ores. However, the exploitation of the fine-grained, nonmagnetic taconite has been neglected, little or no experimental work is being done, and no

commercial method of extraction thus far has been developed. The Bureau of Mines initiated a long-term field investigation of these nonmagnetic taconites last year. Limited metallurgical research is just now barely getting under way and should be stepped up as mining activity fieldwork progresses to a point where material can be furnished the metallurgical division.

These items are only a partial list that might be made of the tremendous mineral resources awaiting development in Minnesota and the adjacent States of the North Central United States. The Lake Superior region is the largest iron-ore producing area in the United States and provides over 80 percent of the ore required for domestic production. Although very large tonnages of potentially valuable low-grade iron ores occur throughout the Lake Superior district, little or no research has been done on the beneficiation of these ores.

The industrial and security interests of the Nation as a whole as well as the future welfare of the upper Midwest depend on the proper development of these resources, especially of the lower grade and presently less valuable ores. The Government alone is able to sponsor the research that could prevent unnecessary waste and lead to a greater development of the many ores found in the upper Midwest and particularly in the Cuyuna Range in Minnesota. In future years, much of America's heavy industry will sorely need new sources from which to draw essential raw materials. This region is a veritable treasure chest of mineral resources which we can ill afford not to exploit to the limit.

In summary, Mr. President, let me reemphasize that the Bureau of Mines has repeatedly included this proposed laboratory among its 10 most urgent construction projects. The last Democratic administration included the project in its 1953 budget report. There seems to be no reason, apart from the present administration's refusal to plan adequately for the future, why the Bureau of Mines should not be given the necessary authorization and funds to construct this laboratory.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a mining and metallurgical research establishment in the State of Minnesota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3508) to provide for the establishment and operation of a mining and metallurgical research establishment in the State of Minnesota, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO CAR SHORTAGES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to give to the Interstate Commerce Commission authority for use in alleviating the car shortages during times of emergency or threatened emergency.

The problems of boxcar shortages to move northwestern grain has been a recurrent one over the years. Each season we can expect a steady flow of letters and telegrams requesting assistance to relieve the critical situations existing.

The Northwest is not alone in this problem. Statistics reveal that shortages exist in the central West and Southwest, as well as other sections. The files in my office over the years show many hundreds of communications regarding this problem.

When shortages of available cars occur, grain must be stored on the ground, in the open, in many places until cars become available. This results, in many cases, in considerable losses. Losses are both in spoilage and in contamination. With farm income down, these losses further depress the farmer's income, when he is already caught in the cost-price squeeze. At times, when grain elevators have become filled with grain, not willing to take the risk of dumping on the ground, they decline to buy. This then puts the burden of additional transport upon the farmer and disrupts his schedule of moving his grain. The proposed legislation will help to cure the problem.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3509) to amend section 1 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to give to the Interstate Commerce Commission authority for use in alleviating car shortages during periods of emergency or threatened emergency, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSION OF COVERAGE OF TITLE II OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to facilitate extension of coverage under title II of the Social Security Act to American employees of foreign subsidiaries of domestic corporations.

This bill is designed to eliminate an obstacle which appears to be occurring in the case of some American employees of foreign subsidiary corporations who desire to be covered by old-age and survivors insurance and who otherwise might be covered with a slight change in the law.

Senators will recall that the 1954 legislation affecting social security provided that agreements might be entered into between the Secretary of the Treasury and domestic corporations with foreign subsidiaries whereby American employees of those foreign subsidiaries might be brought under social security under certain conditions. One condition was that "any such agreement must apply to all employees who are citizens of the United States," and a further condition was that the corporation must agree to pay the combined employer-employee tax for all American citizens employed by its subsidiary.

The conditions as thus written into the law have had the effect, in a number of instances, of encouraging the domestic corporation to make such an agreement with the Treasury only upon obtaining unanimous approval of its American employees. Since the law requires the corporation to pay the tax upon all of its American employees, this is not surprising. However, it has the unfortunate effect of allowing one American employee who does not wish to enjoy the benefits of social security to prevent perhaps several hundred other American employees from receiving coverage highly desired by them.

For example, in my State there reside a number of American seamen who work on vessels of foreign registry belonging to subsidiaries of American corporations. These citizens pay Federal income tax for the support of our Government and its programs, yet under the present law are prevented by the unanimity rule from coming under the social-security program.

The bill I am introducing would permit a domestic corporation to enter into an agreement to cover only such of its American employees working for a foreign subsidiary as may be specified by the domestic corporation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3513) to facilitate the extenison of coverage under title II of the Social Security Act to American employees of foreign subsidiaries of domestic corporations, introduced by Mr. LONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability-insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes. These amendments, if adopted, would effect a slight change in that section of the House bill which provides for continued payment of child's benefits under old-age and survivors insurance for children who are disabled before reaching 18.

Mr. President, I was very happy to see that the House of Representatives gave the problem of disabled children some of the attention it so highly deserves by including this section in the bill in the Senate which would provide for the continuation of such benefits in those tragic cases where a child is permanently mentally or physically disabled before reaching age 18.

However, the House bill in its present form places a limitation on the retroactivity of this provision, restricting

benefits to those who attain age 18 after 1953.

After careful consideration of this problem last year in connection with my own bill, S. 1638, I came to the conclusion that such a retroactivity limitation was not warranted. Such a limitation would work a hardship on the individuals who would be excluded, and on the other hand would not effect a very substantial saving since the number involved is comparatively small.

It is estimated that under the present provisions of House bill 7225 eventually 5,000 individuals will be benefited by total payments of $2 to $3 million per year. An estimate accompanying House bill 2205 last year, which was similar to Senate bill 1638, and did not include the 1953 limitation, set a figure of 10,000 potential eligibles. Thus at the most only a few thousand additional persons would be included by dropping the 1953 cutoff. In view of the high ratio of benefit to modest level of cost I urge that the 1953 limitation be dropped.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MORSE:

Statement by Mr. KEFAUVER on the 134th anniversary of Greek independence.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the Reverend George Gallos, of the Greek Orthodox Church of Annunciation, Baltimore, Md., gave the invocation before the Senate today commemorating Greek Independence Day, March 25, 1821, when Greece declared her independence from the Ottoman Empire.

Greece has always fought for liberation through the ages. Just as Greece is the cradle of democracy as we live it today, history reveals that we have also received from Greece the arts, the sciences, and many forms of our culture. I wish to join my colleagues who will extol the virtues of our friendly ally, the people of Greece.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, Sunday, March 25, will be celebrated in Greece and throughout the world as Greek Independence Day, in honor of the 135th anniversary of Greek independence from the Turkish Empire.

The 25th of March 1821 is a day to be remembered by all freedom-loving people. On that day the Greek heritage of liberty took on new meaning as the courageous Greek people threw off the Ottoman bondage which had weighed them down since 1453.

As with other freedom-loving people, the Greeks have had to fight for their freedom. The heroism of Marathon, Thermopylae, and Salamis still excites the world. In more recent times, the Greeks also have proved their devotion and skill in defense of their freedom. Who can forget the courage of the Greek response to Mussolini's ultimatum and the heroism of the battles that followed in 1940 and 1941?

Today, Greece is a valued ally and a trusted member of NATO. Greece preached democracy to the world during the Golden Age of Greece, and the lessons of that time have produced splendid results here in the United States.

My interest in Greece and in Americans of Greek descent has always been particularly keen because of my association with Senator George H. Moses many years ago. Senator Moses, of course, had been minister to Greece before being elected to the United States Senate. He spoke Greek fluently, and was an ardent admirer and stanch supporter of Greek culture and character. My association with him sharpened my awareness and understanding of Greek influence on our civilization and our way of life.

This influence of Greece, ancient and modern, on our civilization and our life, can hardly be overestimated. At the same time, however, we must not overlook the great contribution which our citizens of Greek descent have made here in the United States.

We in New Hampshire are proud of our fellow citizens of Greek ancestry and of their many contributions to our State. But we cannot observe the anniversary of Greek independence without noting that all Greeks are not free and independent, ruled by government of their own choosing. The events of the past weeks in Cyprus only serve to emphasize the love of freedom which seems invariably to be found in the hearts of the Greek people.

I was deeply shocked by the British deportation of Archbishop Makarios, and believe it can only worsen an already bad situation. The solution of the problems of Cyprus, in my opinion, are to be found in applying the principles of self-determination and justice, not through the deportation, without even trial or hearing, of a ranking church dignitary and national leader.

Inevitably, the people of Cyprus will gain the right to choose their own government. I want the people of Cyprus to have that right. Resistance to this course can only increase tensions, lead to further bloodshed, and benefit the Communists in the long run.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have submitted an amendment to the social security bill (H. R. 7225) to increase the annual amounts authorized for each of the three maternal and child welfare services to $25 million each.

There are three types of grants now authorized under the maternal and child welfare provisions, title V, of the Social Security Act. These provisions and the annual amounts now authorized to be appropriated under them are as follows:

Annual appropriation authorized

	Million
1. Maternal and child health	$16.5
2. Crippled children	15.0
3. Child welfare services	10.0
Total	41.5

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I became very much aware of the gross inadequacies in the amounts appropriated for children's services. I was also gratified to learn of the tremendous progress made as a result of the grants under title V of the Social Security Act.

There is, however, not only an inadequacy of funds available, but an imbalance in the amounts authorized to be appropriated for each of the three types of services. My amendment would correct both these defects.

The amendment would make $25 million a year available for each of the three types of grants.

This would result in an increase of $8.5 million a year for maternal and child-health services, $10 million for crippled children's services, and $15 million for child-welfare services. This would mean a total increase of $23.5 million a year for all 3 programs. This increase amounts to less than 50 cents per year for each child in the United States. Certainly this is a very small price to pay for enhancing the health and welfare of our Nation's children.

The number of children has been steadily increasing. Four million children are born each year. Medical costs have increased over 30 percent in the past 6 years. Juvenile delinquency has continued to be a pressing problem. Yet, the amounts authorized under the maternal and child-health provisions of the law have not been increased since 1950.

My amendments would make it possible for these programs to be adapted to the changed circumstances we are faced with today.

NOMINATION OF JAMES R. DURFEE TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was delighted to receive confirmation from the White House of the nomination of one of Wisconsin's finest public officials to the important post of member of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The new designee, the Honorable James R. Durfee, will, I know, fill this post with great honor and credit to his State and Nation. The announcement of the White House's approval of his name comes as a fitting new chapter in a long and distinguished career, which he began as an attorney in Langlade County, in my State.

In 1928–32, Mr. Durfee served two terms as district attorney for Langlade County. He has been active as well in Republican politics since he began the practice of law in Antigo, Wis., back in 1927. In law, he had risen in the ranks of the Wisconsin Bar Association, and

served as a member of the board of governors of the association. After completing his term as district attorney in 1928, he returned to the general practice of law in Antigo.

In 1951, Gov. Walter Kohler summoned him to Madison, and appointed him to the public service commission. In 1953, he was appointed chairman of that commission, as a successor to another distinguished Wisconsinite, who was brought to Washington by the President, the Honorable John Derfer, member of the Federal Communications Commission.

Jim Durfee's long and varied career has included all phases of civic activity. Perhaps most noteworthy is his splendid service to the veterans of Wisconsin. In 1943–44, he served as commander of the Wisconsin Department of the American Legion. For 2 years he served on the national executive committee of the Legion, and for 2 years he served as a member of the national legislative committee. At the present time, he is chairman of the policy committee of the Wisconsin Department of the American Legion.

I may say, incidentally, that another great veterans' leader, Mr. Harvey Higley, of Marinette, in my State, likewise serves with distinction in Washington today as head of the Veterans' Administration.

Wisconsin is indeed proud of these men. It is delighted with the Eisenhower administration's recognition of the caliber of public servants in the Badger State.

Wisconsin is particularly proud of Jim Durfee's services as chairman of the public service commission. The historic origins of this commission's vital work in the Badger State include a wide variety of pioneering efforts in the public service. There are few, if any, textbooks on utility regulation in the United States which do not hail Wisconsin leadership in utility regulation, dating back for more than 8½ decades. Wisconsin was not only one of the first States to protect the public interest by fair-rate regulation, but its regulation has proven to be one of the most effective, painstaking, and skilled, setting an inspiring pace for the rest of the Nation's similar bodies. In his service at Madison, Jim Durfee has proved worthy of that tradition.

I know that the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], with my able colleague from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] as its ranking Republican member, will welcome Commissioner Durfee's nomination. I am sure he will serve with great distinction on the Civil Aeronautics Board.

DISABILITY INSURANCE PROVISIONS OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may be permitted to speak for approximately 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have submitted to the social security bill—H. R. 7225—an amendment to strike out the requirement that a person must be 50 years of age in order to receive insurance benefits when such person is totally disabled for an extended period of time.

I have long been an advocate of an amendment to the social-security program to provide insurance benefits to persons totally disabled for an extended period of time. On several occasions I have submitted amendments to this effect in the Senate. It is gratifying that the House of Representatives has passed by the overwhelming vote of 372 to 31 House bill 7225, which includes provision for the payment of disability insurance benefits as part of our social-security system.

My amendment would liberalize the disability provisions in the bill as passed by the House. The amendment retains all the insured-status provisions and the same definition of disability that are contained in the bill as passed by the House, but strikes out the age 50 requirement as a condition for the receipt of benefits.

Total disability is one of the most devastating disasters which strikes the breadwinner. Not only may it result in a person's complete loss of health and job, but it may force a disabled person to use up all his savings, give up his home, and incur large and burdensome medical bills.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Did the distinguished Senator from New York say the limitation is 50 years or 60 years?

Mr. LEHMAN. Under the bill as passed by the House, it is 50 years; but I propose to wipe out all age limitations whatever, and to make these benefits available to any person, regardless of age, when it is shown that he is suffering from total disability. That is provided for under the amendment I submitted on yesterday.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from New York permit the Senator from North Dakota to join him in cosponsoring the amendment?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad indeed to have the distinguished Senator from North Dakota do so, because I know of his long and vital interest in this important matter.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in response to this pressing humanitarian and social need, many of the representatives of the organized medical and rehabilitation associations are urging that rehabilitation is the complete answer to the financial and health problems faced by thousands of disabled persons. These representatives of the medical and rehabilitation groups are trying to create the impression that rehabilitation is a substitute for the payment of disability benefits. They cite cases in which many disabled persons have been rehabilitated, but they ignore the thousands of persons for whom rehabilitation facilities are not available and the thousands upon thousands of persons who cannot be rehabilitated with the limited knowledge which exists today.

All of us hope and pray that more disabled persons can and will be rehabilitated each year. But it is a coldhearted approach to say that thousands of disabled persons should be forced to go on charity or relief while we wait another 5, 10, or 25 years to develop an adequate rehabilitation program in this country.

As Governor of New York, I had the occasion—and the duty—to become acquainted with the rehabilitation and the disability programs in New York. From this experience I am convinced there is no conflict between these two programs.

As a member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I have been a strong supporter of the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program. I supported the amendments to expand and strengthen the rehabilitation program, and I shall continue to do so. I deeply regret that some of the rehabilitation leaders in this country have tried to join the political crusade against disability insurance benefits by accepting the emotional and unfounded argument that disability benefits may become a threat to rehabilitation.

In my opinion, if the pending bill with the age 50 requirement for disability benefits is retained, only a small proportion of the disabled over age 50 will be rehabilitated. The disabled over age 50 comprise the difficult cases to rehabilitate. Many in the age group 55 to 60 cannot be rehabilitated at the present time. The State vocational rehabilitation agencies now take the easy cases, especially those among the younger disabled persons.

But if my amendment is adopted, the disabled under age 50 will also be eligible for benefits, and a larger proportion of these persons can be rehabilitated. This will give the State rehabilitation agencies access to the disabled persons with whom they should be working at the very earliest moment.

The hearings before the Senate Finance Committee have demonstrated that State and Federal administrators are convinced of the feasibility of administering the disability proposal. Both Arthur J. Altmeyer and John W. Tramburg, former commissioners of social security, have stated they favor disability insurance benefits, and believe they can be effectively and economically administered.

Raymond Houston, the commissioner of social welfare of the State of New York, testified before the Senate Finance Committee in favor of disability insurance. His long and successful administrative experience in New York lends convincing weight to the overwhelming evidence in favor of the proposal on humanitarian, social, and administrative grounds.

Disability insurance is the next step in the march toward improving our social-security program.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may proceed for approximately 6 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have had a chance to examine in some detail the message sent to Congress by the President of the United States, regarding the foreign-aid program for the coming fiscal year and succeeding years.

The foreign-aid proposal which now has been submitted for the consideration of Congress is indicative of the lack of leadership which has been characteristic of the administration's activities in the field of foreign policy for the past 3 years.

There are only two elements of the aid proposal which might remotely be described as new. In fact, however, these new characteristics are not novel and I hope not indicative of the kind of initiative that this Nation must assume in the field of foreign policy.

The request for authority to make "long-term commitments" is allegedly new. As a practical matter, however, in the administration of our foreign-aid programs it has been possible for the Executive to obligate this Government in such a way that it is, in fact, committed over a long period of time. By way of example, I merely cite the recent negotiations for United States assistance in constructing the Aswan Dam in Egypt. Although the United States proposal involves only funds which are already available, it will have the effect of committing the United States, morally at least, to continue to give such assistance as may be necessary to complete the project. Another example was the instance in which Congress authorized over a term of years annual contributions to the infrastructure of NATO.

The aid message asks for more flexibility in the administration of the program. Again, Congress in the past has given the administration great flexibility. Ten percent of the funds authorized for particular kinds of assistance has always been available to the President for transfer to other uses. The administration now has 2 emergency funds totaling $200 million; one is comprised of the special Presidential funds, $50 million of which does not even require an accounting in the usual manner. Furthermore, last year Congress gave the President a special Asian fund in the amount of $100 million. This fund was to be available for 3 years. It is my understanding that very little, if any, of this fund has yet been committed, although in fact tremendous pressure was placed on Congress last year to have these funds appropriated because of the emergency nature of the needs in Asia.

The novel element with respect to special funds this year is that the administration asks for a new fund of $100 million for the Near East and Africa. In short, Mr. President, the administration is asking authority for long-term commitments—which it already has in substantial degree—for more flexibility—which it already has in substantial degree, more special funds—it already has two—and more money.

I see no evidence of any new constructive thinking in the approach of this Nation to the Soviet challenge which daily assumes greater proportions. There is no evidence of any reappraisal, for example, of the ratio between the funds requested for economic assistance and those requested for military assistance. All the administration seeks is more of the same old medicine which may have been adequate for the needs of the past but is not adequate for the demands of the present. I am certain that the request for increased military assistance funds is not going to help us in our relations with south Asia.

It is my belief that the American people are willing to face new challenges in the field of foreign policy. They rose nobly when President Truman asked for assistance for Greece and Turkey. They responded with equal support of the Marshall plan and the point 4 program. I believe they would do it again.

The time has come for the American people to prod this administration to rise to the demands of the hour. I believe that we can devise new and better ways to meet the Soviet threat, especially in Asia. I hope representatives of national organizations and individual Americans will come forward with positive, constructive suggestions, which I feel are sadly lacking in the proposal which we have just received from the White House.

By way of example, it seems to me that this Nation might embark on a substantial program of loans to backward countries as distinguished from gifts. There is no reason why the tremendous backlog of investment capital in this country could not be made available in underdeveloped areas of the world at extremely low rates of interest. It would be cheaper for the taxpayer and healthier for the recipient. This country developed its railroads with the help of loans made to us by the nations of western Europe. Those loans, even with their high rates of interest, did not create dependence. They helped us to maintain our independence. I hope that as a result of our consideration of the President's foreign aid proposal we may inaugurate a program which would make these great sums of investment capital available to nations which need that kind of assistance.

Under our system of government it is normal for initiative in the field of foreign policy to come from the Executive. When all the Executive produces in the way of initiative is demand for authority for long-term commitments, for more flexibility, and for more money for military assistance, it is time for the imaginative people of this Nation—and they are numbered in the millions—to prod the Executive and the Congress into action commensurate with the needs of this Nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement for the information of the Senate, if I may have the attention of the distinguished minority leader.

Yesterday I stated that on Monday next there would be a call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection. I believe the call should begin where the previous call ended, and include, by unanimous consent, such other bills as may have been previously objected to, but which are now cleared for passage.

If that is agreeable to the minority leader and to the Senate, I make that request at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In addition, probably following the completion of action on the unfinished business, the electoral college bill, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the following bills, but not necessarily in the order mentioned:

Calendar No. 1107, Senate bill 2577, a bill to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests.

Calendar No. 1629, House bill 5265, a bill to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons.

Calendar No. 1287, Senate bill 898, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property.

In addition, any other bills which the policy committees of both the majority and minority may clear, and which they feel should be brought up, may be considered. I will say to the minority leader that, of course, I will not move to proceed to consider such bills until he has had an opportunity to clear them on his side of the aisle.

It is impossible at this time to determine what order of consideration of these bills would be best under all the circumstances. However, I desire to have the Senate put on notice that any one of them may be brought up at any time following completion of action upon the unfinished business, or, for that matter, during the time the unfinished business is before the Senate.

It is still planned that the Senate should take a recess over the Easter holidays, commencing at the close of business on Thursday, March 29, perhaps around 5:30 o'clock p. m., and continuing until Monday, April 9. Unless unforeseen circumstances arise, the major-

ity leader is hopeful that this can be done, as previously planned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to inquire of the majority leader what the situation is relative to the bill for the extension of excise taxes, which I understand is before the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance tells me that he hopes to report that bill next week and have it considered by the Senate. If his hopes are fulfilled, when that bill is reported the minority leader will be informed, and we shall try to give it high priority. It involves an expiration date. The minority leader may be assured of my usual cooperation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I mention the subject in order that Senators may be on notice that that bill may be included among the bills to be considered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TWA AND SUBSIDIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the debate on the agricultural bill, on March 13, in speaking on the subject of subsidies, I made the following statement, which is found on page 4557 of the RECORD of that day:

> What about TWA? Name any of them. They are all good airlines. I am for them. I am for a modern, efficient transportation system. However, I think the record ought to be clear that while they do not get the publicity, they get the benefit of price supports. This is one time where they get the game instead of the blame. The farmer gets the blame and not the game.

In that connection, Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. W. T. Huff, of Trans-World Airlines, Inc., dated March 19, 1956. It reads as follows:

> TRANS-WORLD AIRLINES, INC.,
> *Washington, D. C., March 19, 1956.*
>
> The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
> *United States Senate,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR: I just noticed in the March 13 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one of your speeches on the farm bill in which you talked about subsidy, and you mentioned TWA in that connection. TWA does not collect any subsidy. We were the first international carrier to obtain a subsidy-free status and were awarded a citation by the Postmaster General, a copy of which is attached.
>
> I realize that your statement was only an item in a far-reaching speech but wanted you to know for the future that TWA has graduated from the subsidy status.
>
> Thank you for many favors in the past.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> W. T. HUFF.

Attached to the letter is the following citation, to which Mr. Huff refers in his letter:

> A CITATION TO TRANS-WORLD AIRLINES, INC.
>
> Whereas the United States Post Office Department appreciates the services rendered by the United States air-transport industry in delivering the mails; and
>
> Whereas it has long been the goal of the United States scheduled airlines to maintain their service without Federal subsidies, the Post Office Department presents this citation to Trans-World Airlines, Inc., on the happy occasion of its completion of 30 years of service and its attainment of a subsidy-free operation over both its domestic and international systems.
>
> ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
> *Postmaster General.*
>
> JUNE 1, 1955.

Mr. President, I regret that I made a misstatement of fact with reference to Trans-World Airlines. I believe that when a Member of Congress is guilty of such a transgression, he should apologize for it. Furthermore, I believe the record ought to be made very clear in that respect.

It is for that purpose that I have read both the letter and the citation, and that I offer to Trans-World Airlines publicly on the floor of the Senate my regrets for having in any way misstated any fact or made any unfortunate observation regarding that splendid airline. I commend Trans-World Airlines for its outstanding record of performance and service, and on the fact that it is not receiving any Federal subsidy, as the citation indicates.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, one of the principal arguments made for the Daniel-Mundt compromise proposal now before the Senate is that it is a step in the direction of a direct primary and a direct election of candidates for President and Vice President.

To me that is not a persuasive argument. To those who make this argument in seeking support for the Daniel-Mundt proposal, I say that if they are really sincere in this argument then they should support the Langer substitute which proposes a direct primary and a direct election.

Several years ago I had a direct presidential primary and election bill drafted for introduction. However, in comparing my ideas with those of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and after talking with him I decided to join him on his bill and support his bill. He had been pioneering legislatively in this field long before I had.

When the Langer substitute for the proposal presently before the Senate is offered I shall vote for it.

I believe that the real objective of a change in the manner of selecting our Presidents and Vice Presidents should be to place that power directly in the hands of the American people themselves—and to take that power away from the political bosses in the smoke-filled back rooms.

We should get away from the present system, under which a handful of men control the selection of the President and Vice President—the present system, under which the people are not given a free choice for President and Vice President—where the people are limited to voting only between 1 Republican nominee and 1 Democratic nominee who have been selected by a handful of men in each party.

For all other elective offices the trend has properly been away from nomination by convention to nomination by primary—and rightly so, because it has placed the power where it should be, in the people, and taken it away from the party bosses.

I am admittedly prejudiced on this matter, for the simple reason that if election to the United States Senate from the State of Maine had remained under the system of nomination by convention instead of nomination by direct primary I would never have been nominated and elected to the United States Senate.

And I say to the women of America that if they are ever to be freed from second-class status attitude with respect to a woman becoming President or Vice President, the only way that they are going to get that freedom and that equal consideration for these high posts is by the adoption of a direct primary in the nomination of President and Vice President.

There is no use kidding ourselves any further. So long as nominations are made by conventions instead of by primary elections, it will be practically impossible for women to have a chance even to be considered, much less be nominated.

To anyone who would challenge this frank observation, I would call his attention to the political party facts of life in both major parties—to the fact that a woman is never national chairman of either the Republican National Committee or the Democratic National Committee. The highest they ever get is the second-class status spots of vice chairman or assistant to the chairman or an assistant in charge of the women's division.

And how many women have been, or are now, permitted to be State chairman or county chairman or town chairman? Practically none.

In view of this, what chance do women have to be considered for nomination by convention? The answer to this question is obvious.

Yet the majority of voters in our country are women.

There are those who would answer these observations by charging that women do not want a woman President or a woman Vice President. They may be right; but we will never have an opportunity to know as long as the nominations are made by convention instead of direct primary.

No; under the present system of nomination by convention there is no full opportunity for this question to be answered. At best there is only the partial opportunity offered by the presidential preference primaries which some of the States hold.

It might be well to get at least a partial answer by having qualified women become candidates in such preferential primaries—to have Democratic women enter such preferential primaries for the Democratic nominations for President and Vice President—to have Republican women enter such primaries for Vice President.

But that is merely another facet of the issue now before the Senate. More important than who runs, or is allowed to run, for President or Vice President, is the giving of the power of the selection of President and Vice President to the American people themselves by direct primary and by direct election—and discarding the party-boss controlled system of nominations by convention, and the antiquated election system of the electoral college.

Mr. President, at this point of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD nationally syndicated columns I wrote 6 years ago on March 15 and 16, 1950, on the subject which the Senate is now considering.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON AND YOU

(By MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Senator from Maine)

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY—I

WASHINGTON.—It is a strange thing that in our American democracy, where the will of the people is supposed to prevail, our Presidents are chosen by political bosses rather than by the people. Nevertheless, it will always remain that way as long as presidential nominations are made by party convention rather than by a direct primary vote of the people themselves.

There is nothing inherently bad about political bosses, and certainly the existing system has produced more good than bad Presidents. Yet they have not really been the direct choices of the people and Americans, besides don't take to being bossed.

On the State level, the people have done something about this. Deciding that they would determine directly who would be their governors, rather than have to choose between two party nominees named by party conventions controlled by political bosses, the people of most of our States have voted to replace nomination by convention with nomination by direct primary.

They have found the direct primary system much more satisfactory and responsive to the wishes of the people. Ordinarily, under the convention system, no one has a chance to be governor of his or her State unless a handful of political bosses gave the nod. Under the direct primary system, no one is barred from running for the gubernatorial nomination merely because the few controlling politicians of his or her party say "No." One can put the question directly to the people instead of the politicians.

In view of this experience in the States, we can wonder why the Federal Government has not followed suit and replaced the convention system with the direct primary system in the nominations for President and Vice President. As it is now, we have only the choice of 1 of 2 nominees selected by conventions rather than by ourselves—we take either the Democratic or the Republican nominee. We have no direct voice in selecting who shall be the nominee of our own political party.

Attempts thus far to do something about this have been without success. An initial barrier is the probability that such a change would require an amendment to the Constitution. Such an amendment would require a two-thirds majority vote in both House and Senate, followed by ratification by three-fourths of the States. It is true that this barrier has been hurdled 21 times before in our history. Yet, in those instances the proposed constitutional amendments were not up against the strongest of all political opposition—the political parties' own organizations, which would fight giving up their power of convention nomination. The counterobservation to this is that such organized political opposition was overcome in most of the States when these changed their system of nomination.

There are joint resolutions now before Congress proposing such a change, but they are literally pigeonholed in committees. Back in 1911 a bill was introduced which included a provision for direct nomination of the President. There have been several such bills introduced since and the proposed change has been supported by leading Republicans and Democrats alike. President Wilson in 1913 urged Congress to adopt such a change. A leading Republican exponent was the late Senator Hiram Johnson, of California. The Progressive Party, headed by Robert La Follette, incorporated such a proposal in its platforms of 1920 and 1924.

At the same time, of course, there are some valid arguments against the desirability of a presidential direct primary. These arguments, together with the ones for the proposal, I will discuss in my next column.

WASHINGTON AND YOU

(By MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Senator from Maine)

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY—II

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Although the proposal for a nationwide presidential direct primary has been a dead issue since 1924, I am going to do what I can to revive that issue. I feel the people themselves should do the nominating as well as the electing of our Presidents.

There are some strong arguments against a Presidential direct primary. There is some question about the constitutionality of legislation making the change from nomination by convention to nomination by direct primary. It would be expensive and time-consuming for a presidential candidate to carry on a campaign throughout the country.

The mechanics of a presidential direct primary make it a proposal that is easier to suggest than to carry out. It would be difficult, for instance, to record accurately popular preferences among candidates. Certain candidates may withdraw and new candidates may enter. Also, a presidential primary would have to be separated from primaries for State and local offices, which would be expensive and complicated. It would be difficult to decide whether the national primary should be run by State or national officials or both. It would be difficult to define what a party is and to which ones the national primary should apply. The role of political minorities also would be made difficult.

Many people object to the national government taking over a function that has long been handled by party organizations. Only 14 States have the mandatory form of presidential primary, no additional State having adopted this form since 1916, and eight States have dropped it altogether. Thirty-four States choose delegates in State and district conventions or by State central committees. Popularity of the presidential primary has declined since 1916. In fact, the electorate has not participated to any great extent in State presidential primaries. I think, however, this is because they realized that such primaries had no legal effect, being only indicative.

These are the principal arguments advanced against a presidential direct primary. I believe that they can be overcome if there is sufficient will to make the change. I don't believe that they stack up with the favorable arguments.

The caucus and convention system is unsatisfactory because it is not sufficiently representative of the voters and the convention is not a deliberative body. A national primary would bring party organization under popular control. Choice by the voters of nominees for the Presidency insures a greater degree of democracy than is possible when nominating conventions intervene between the voters and the candidates. Campaign expenditures cannot be effectively controlled under the convention system. They can be under the primary system. Strong candidates could run in all States and not omit favorite-son States as at present.

The presidential primary has not had a fair trial in the States because not all States have adopted it and because candidates may ignore primaries. Preferences expressed in primaries, being without legal standing in most instances, have had little effect on State party leaders. They are without teeth; they are like polls.

If you will permit me getting a little political for a moment, I would venture the opinion that the Republican Party could come back from defeat in November 1952 if it would take every step that it could to nominate its candidate for President by direct primary. By doing so it would prove beyond any doubt that it was a party of the people. It would let the people, themselves, instead of the party organization, nominate their candidate for President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald be printed at this point in my remarks. The article is entitled "Electoral Reform in Reverse" and describes how Senators KEFAUVER and DANIEL have allowed themselves to be maneuvered into a compromise of a very dubious character.

The editorial points out that the difference between original version of Senate Joint Resolution 31 and the proposed Kefauver-Daniel-Mundt-Thurmond substitute is the difference between a sensible reform and a mishmash. The editorial concludes that the result of what it calls this crude patchwork would be not to correct present weaknesses in the outmoded electoral system but to foul it up.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTORAL REFORM IN REVERSE

A recent compromise puts a very different face on the Daniel-Kefauver resolution which the Senate began to debate yesterday. The original purpose of this proposed amendment to the Constitution was simply to divide the electoral votes of the States in the same proportion that the popular vote may be divided in future presidential elections—1956 excepted, of course. In other words, it was a duplication of the Lodge-Gossett resolution which the Senate adopted by a two-thirds vote in 1950. Various competing amendments were being pushed, however, and Senators KEFAUVER and DANIEL allowed themselves to be maneuvered into a compromise of a very dubious character.

As it now stands, the proposed amendment would not accomplish the purpose of its original sponsors. To be sure, it would permit the States to divide their electoral votes among the three leading presidential candidates in accord with their share of the popular vote, instead of allowing the winning candidate to sweep all the electoral votes of

the State into his column. But the States would not be bound to accept this reform. If a legislature should so choose, it could give one electoral vote to the leading candidate in each congressional district, with the remainder of its electoral votes going to the candidate winning in the State as a whole. The effect would undoubtedly be to enhance the political strength of the rural areas because of the gerrymandering of legislative and congressional districts and the underrepresentation of the cities in most of the country's legislative halls. A further complication lies in the proviso that all presidential contests in which the leading candidate did not receive 50 percent of the votes would be referred to the House and Senate, sitting jointly, for decision.

This compromise turns a sensible and needed reform into a mishmash. The country would have no uniform way of counting electoral votes. States in which urban population predominates would probably divide their votes on a percentage basis, and rural States would doubtless parcel out electoral votes to congressional districts. Legislatures could be expected to switch from one method to the other from time to time as political exigencies might dictate. The result would be not to correct present weaknesses in the outmoded electoral systems but to foul it up.

The Senate should waste little time on this crude patchwork. The movement to make votes for presidential candidates count throughout the Nation has degenerated into a scheme to give more weight in such contests to groups that already have more than their fair share. In these circumstances the best course for the Senate would be to send the resolution back to the Judiciary Committee with instructions to report out a resolution that would correct the defects in the present electoral system instead of multiplying them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Is there further morning business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business?

THE WELFARE OF OLDER PERSONS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have been increasingly asked questions about jobs for older persons, retirement income, medical expenses resulting from chronic disease, and other problems pertaining to the aged. As the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I addressed a letter to the President, under date of March 12, 1956, asking for his views in this connection.

Under date of March 21, he sent me a letter on this subject, together with a memorandum describing the approach of the Federal Government to this question of our elderly people.

These letters were released to the press yesterday. With the full approval of the White House, I ask unanimous consent that my letter of March 12 to the President, and the President's reply of March 21, with the enclosure, be printed in full in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 12, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As more and more people reach the later years of life, we in the Congress are increasingly asked questions about jobs for older people, retirement income, medical expenses resulting from chronic disease, and other problems. We are, of course, seeking sound answers to these questions, and various measures have already been introduced in the Congress.

You have spoken many times of your concern for the welfare of older persons, and I know that you and your administration have given thought to these problems. I also understand that the executive branch has had an informal coordinating group working in the field of aging in the past year. As the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I believe that the Congress would be greatly aided if you could advise us of the thinking of the executive branch with respect to: (a) the special problems of older persons, (b) the overall approach the Federal Government should take with respect to these problems; and (c) the activities and plans of the executive branch directed toward the improvement of the circumstances of older persons.

I am sure that all Members of Congress would appreciate receiving the benefit of your views on this important question.

Always cordially yours,

———

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 21, 1956.

The Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Your concern about the future for older persons in our society is shared by me and by large numbers of our citizens.

The first half of this century has witnessed phenomenal improvements in the health of our citizens and equally striking increases in our productive capacity and in our standard of living. These are the achievements of a free and prosperous society. They have also profoundly altered many of our ways of life.

One of the most significant changes that has taken place is the marked extension of the years of our life expectancy—it has doubled since our country was founded. Our Nation now must learn to take advantage of the full potential of our older citizens—their skills, their wisdom, and their experience. We need those traits fully as much as we need the energy and boldness of youth.

In considering the changed circumstances presented by the lengthening life span, we must recognize older persons as individuals—not a class—and their wide differences in needs, desires, and capacities. The great majority of older persons are capable of continuing their self-sufficiency and usefulness to the community if given the opportunity. Our task is to help in assuring that these opportunities are provided.

All of our people, I believe, share the same objectives in this regard: (1) to help make it possible for older persons who desire and are able to work to continue their productive lives through suitable, gainful employment; (2) to remove the fear of destitution in the later years; (3) to stimulate the construction of housing and the provision of living arrangements suited to the needs and preferences of older people; (4) to improve health during the later years through research into the aging process and the causes of chronic disease, by making health services more readily available, and by better nutrition; and (5) to help encourage, within our communities, increased opportunities for participation by older persons in civic affairs and voluntary services, and for sharing in the educational, recreational, social, and spiritual life of the community.

Obviously the Federal Government alone cannot and should not undertake to meet all these needs. Where assistance is needed, much of the initiative is rightly being taken by the States and communities, and by families, employers, labor organizations, voluntary groups, and religious bodies throughout the country.

The Federal Government can, however, be a helpful partner in many ways. For example, broadened and increased social-security benefits lessen the fear of destitution on the part of our older citizens. Helping to keep the value of the retirement dollar stable has tremendous significance for them. Increased employment opportunities for older persons, in recognition of their desire and continuing capacity for productive work, add to their security and their sense of worth to society. Improved facilities for the promotion of health and for care and rehabilitation contributes to our older citizens' peace of mind and physical well-being. All of these things have been and are being accomplished by or with the help of the Federal Government. They represent significant steps toward improvement of the circumstances of older persons, and help make it possible for most older persons to meet their needs on their own.

With respect to current planning in the field of aging, the administration is working actively and on a coordinated basis. Our basic approach has been (1) to place maximum emphasis on individual freedom and responsibility, and (2) to seek maximum utilization of existing programs and agencies. The sum total of the budget and legislative proposals for next year permits a comprehensive approach toward meeting the challenge of aging in our population. These plans have been developed by the several departments and agencies which have long had programs benefiting older persons.

In order to insure full coordination of the activities of these departments and agencies, I am establishing shortly a Federal Council on Aging. This Council, comprised of representatives of 12 departments and agencies, will be of great value in achieving a more effective Governmentwide approach to the needs of our older citizens.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in collaboration with other departments and agencies, has prepared, at my request, a memorandum on Federal activities and plans in the field of aging. I am sure you will be interested in this memorandum, and I am enclosing a copy for your information.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

———

RECENT AND PROPOSED ACTIONS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AFFECTING OLDER PERSONS

MARCH 19, 1956.

Progress in the Federal Government is being made within existing governmental agencies in such fields as employment, social security, health and rehabilitation, education, food and drug control, rural life and housing. Our efforts are directed toward giving appropriate emphasis, within existing programs, to the special problems of older persons and to the active coordination of those programs.

RECENT ACTIONS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The 1954 amendments to our old-age and survivors insurance system extended the protection of the system to some 10 million additional workers, including farmers and more farmworkers, increased the payments

for all retired persons; enable retired persons to earn as much as $1,200 a year in part-time or occasional employment without loss of social-security benefits; and added a provision preserving the benefit rights of disabled persons so that their old-age benefits would not be reduced by the reason of the years of inability to work.

Inflation has been checked and stability brought to the retirement income dollar. This has contributed greatly to the welfare of those who rely on pensions, annuities, or investment income for their means of subsistence.

The 1954 revision of the income tax laws eased the tax burdens of older people. A tax credit was given for retirement income from public and private pension plans—such as for retired teachers, other municipal employees, and individuals who have provided for retirement through their own savings—comparable to the tax exemptions already accorded for social-security benefits. Allowable deductions for medical expenses were greatly liberalized, affecting older persons particularly. Taxes on annuities were revised to prevent a sudden tax increase in later years. More favorable provision was made for single persons who supported their parents although not sharing the same household with the taxpayer.

A broad program of research and action toward increasing employment opportunities for older workers has been initiated by the Department of Labor. Projects are already underway which should help to develop more job opportunities for older workers and to demonstrate to employers the best methods of hiring and retaining them on the job. These include projects on the relative performance of older workers in industry, better methods of job counseling and placement of older workers, and community programs to recruit and train older persons to meet shortages in such fields as teaching, office work, and health services.

Both research and services in the field of chronic disease have been greatly intensified. Since 1953 congressional appropriations for medical research, largely consisting of chronic disease research conducted by and through the primary research arm of the Public Health Service, the National Institutes of Health, have increased from $51 million to $93 million a year. Research with respect to the aging process itself is receiving increased attention in the program of the National Institutes of Health. During 1955 the Institutes were supporting or conducting at least 170 research projects focused directly upon or related to aging.

Under the 1954 amendments to our Federal-State hospital construction program, a new emphasis has been given to the construction of chronic disease hospitals and nursing homes, which offer long-term care at a lower cost per patient-day than the general hospital.

The 1954 amendments to the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program initiated a new expansion aimed at more than tripling the number of persons—including many older workers—being rehabilitated annually.

The staff or the Committee on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been working to broaden its information clearinghouse service and has been giving significant help and stimulus to national organizations, States, and local groups concerned with adapting their programs to the needs of the growing number of older people.

PROPOSED ACTIONS

The specific recommendations and proposed actions of the administration are set forth below.

1. Support for development of broader employment opportunities

To help promote employment and training opportunities for older persons, the administration is requesting of Congress:

(a) Increased support of Federal and State activities directed toward more jobs for older persons through the services now underway in the Department of Labor and in affiliated State employment security agencies;

(b) Increased support for research and analysis by the Labor Department of actual experience with respect to continued employment of older workers, as well as the attitudes, policies, and practices of management and labor concerning employability, retraining, and counseling of older workers for continued employment;

(c) Increase in Federal funds of over $4 million for the programs of vocational rehabilitation of older as well as younger workers to carry on their old jobs or to fill new jobs in spite of physical handicaps.

In addition, the Departments of Labor; Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Civil Service Commission will work together: (a) to stimulate the adoption by government, private employers and labor unions of more flexible and selective retirement policies; (b) to encourage employers and community agencies to provide facilities for preretirement counseling; and (c) to encourage programs designed to provide supplementary earning opportunities for retired persons in home businesses, sale of handicraft products, part-time or seasonal work, and sheltered workshops.

2. Strengthening our social security programs

Several measures are proposed to strengthen our social security programs:

(a) The enactment of legislation to extend the coverage of the basic program of old-age and survivors insurance to groups not now covered, including Federal employees and military personnel. (S. 3041; H. R. 9090; H. R. 7089.)

(b) The temporary extension of essentially the present formula for Federal grants-in-aid for old-age assistance in order that payments to aged needy individuals will not be reduced, with the addition of the special program of matching grants for their improved medical and health care. (See 4 (a) below.) (S. 3139; H. R. 9091, 9120.)

(c) Greater emphasis on the prevention of dependency among older persons and others, through grants to States in the authorized amount of $5 million annually for the training of skilled welfare personnel; funds for cooperative research by Government and private institutions into the causes of dependency and how they can be alleviated; and increased emphasis in our assistance programs to help welfare recipients achieve a status of self-support and self-care, with the help of coordinated retraining, rehabilitation, and employment efforts.

(These proposals are embodied in S. 3139; H. R. 9091, 9120.)

3. Intensified research into chronic disease and mental illness

The administration is requesting an increase over the current fiscal year of $27.4 million in appropriations to the national institutes of health for medical research and training and related purposes, with emphasis on the problems of chronic illness frequently associated with the later years of life. For example, increases of $3.1 million for heart research and related activities, $7.3 million for cancer activities, and over $2.4 million in increased funds for arthritis and related diseases are being requested.

As for the special problems of mental illness, the budget submitted to Congress calls for an increase of $3.6 million in research and related activities and, contingent upon the enactment of the recommended legislation, $1.5 million for a program of grants to States for conducting special demonstration projects in the field of care and treatment of mental illness. (This legislation is contained in title VI of S. 886 and H. R. 3458, 3720.) These expenditures will include research and projects of particular value to improving the care of aged patients both in and outside of mental institutions.

4. Health services to the aged

The administration is working along several lines to improve health services to the aged, namely:

(a) Requesting legislation for additional public assistance grants, to be matched by the States, for paying medical care costs of indigent older persons, as recommended last year (S. 3139; H. R. 9091, 9120);

(b) Encouraging continuation of the protection of voluntary health insurance plans for retired employees, through reinsurance and pooling arrangements;

(c) Recommending enactment by Congress of a system of mortgage insurance to encourage the construction of more nursing homes and other health facilities (S. 886; H. R. 3458, 3720, title II);

(d) Strengthening of the Federal-State hospital construction program by a requested increase of $19 million in funds, with increased emphasis on chronic disease hospitals and wings in hospitals, nursing homes, and other facilities for long-term care at a lower per-patient-day cost.

5. Housing

Several steps are being recommended by the administration to help assure adequate housing opportunities for our older persons:

1. The United States Housing Act should be amended to make elderly single persons eligible for public housing units suitable for them and to permit local housing authorities to give preference to older persons and their families in admission to federally assisted public housing projects. States and municipalities should consider adopting a similar policy.

2. The National Housing Act should be amended to authorize insurance under especially favorable mortgage terms for apartment projects built by nonprofit organizations for occupancy by older persons.

3. Favorable mortgage insurance terms should also be accorded other multiunit rental projects designed for at least partial occupancy by the aging.

4. Finally, provision should be made to permit third parties, which could be either organizations or individuals, to provide the downpayment and to guarantee monthly interest and amortization payments in behalf of older persons buying a home under a federally insured mortgage. (These proposals are embodied in S. 3302, H. R. 9537.)

6. Older persons in rural areas

The elderly in rural areas are often remote from transportation and living alone where services such as nursing and medical services are difficult to obtain. The rural development program being undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, other Federal agencies, and State and local communities will include research and program activities to provide better health and medical care in those rural areas where the need of the aging is greatest.

7. Education

As older persons find more time for self-development and self-expression, every encouragement and opportunity must be provided for them. New emphasis to these areas will be given through:

(a) The services of the United States Office of Education, in helping the States, institutions of higher education, and voluntary groups to develop educational services

to retrain adults for work opportunities suited to aging persons, to provide educational opportunities to keep aging citizens competent in contemporary citizen problems, and to encourage use of older persons in appropriate educational services.

(b) Development of preretirement informational or counseling services in Federal Departments, and the sharing of experiences in such programs with other employers, public, and private.

8. Federal Council on Aging

A Federal Council on Aging is being established by the President to assist in coordinating the programs of the various Federal departments and agencies which have a special concern with aging, and to assist those departments in achieving a more effective governmentwide approach to the needs of our older citizens.

9. Cooperation with States

It is imperative that the Federal Government's activities in the field of aging be in support of and complementary to the activities of State, local, and voluntary groups. The States have taken constructive leadership, and many have organized or are organizing State commissions on aging. The recent report of the Council of State Governments is a highly constructive contribution in this field.

The Federal Council on Aging will undertake as an initial project, with the joint sponsorship of the Council of State Governments, the holding of a planning conference of State representatives and key Federal personnel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN SOVIET RUSSIA

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the news from the Soviet Union of Comrade Khrushchev's expcsé of Comrade Stalin has its humorous aspects—"the kettle calling the pot black" sort of thing. But it also has deadly serious implications: the repudiation of Stalin looms as the most effective strategem yet devised for luring uncommitted and wavering peoples into the Communist orbit. I do not belive I am overstating the case in predicting that the new anti-Stalin line will furnish the decisive test of the free world's mettle.

While it is yet too early to forecast the results of this new Communist challenge, we should, nonetheless, try to be very clear about its meaning. I suggest that the attack on Stalin tells us important things about current Soviet strategy and about the strength of the current Communist leadership; and I suggest further that if the free world ignores these things, or fails to understand them, it might as well throw in the towel.

It would be the greatest folly to suppose that the disavowal of Stalin is an indication either (a) the long-term Communist objectives have changed, or (b) that the Soviet regime is beset with serious troubles and weaknesses. Quite the contrary: Comrade Khrushchev's attacks on Stalin make the threat of Communist domination of the world more serious than ever before; and the fact that the present regime can, evidently, get away with desanctifying and desecrating the great Stalin proves—if anything—that Khrushchev and company control the Communist international apparatus and the Soviet government with an even surer and tighter hand than we had supposed.

I assume that no one in this body toys with the idea that the attack on Stalin may indicate a genuine conversion on the part of the Soviet regime—although it remains to be seen whether our allies and the neutralists and the liberal propaganda machine in this country will be equally realistic. Experience and logic absolutely forbid such a conclusion. It is a matter of record that Comrade Khrushchev and his cohorts participated, hand in hand, with Stalin in the enslavement of 800 million people—by means of brute force, terrorism, and murder. They are as deeply committed as Stalin ever was to the Marxist-Leninist theory that Communist ends justify any means. And they have never given us the slightest reason to doubt that Communist ends still include Communist domination of the world. It is inconceivable that the present Communist leaders would have survived to rule Russia today if they were not wholehearted supporters of traditional Communist objectives, and enthusiastic practitioners of the very crimes of which Comrade Khrushchev now finds Comrade Stalin guilty.

All of this, of course, is perfectly obvious. It ought to be equally clear what motivated Comrade Khrushchev and his gang to disown Stalin. The attack on Stalin is the Kremlin's master stroke in its current campaign to put a new and pleasing countenance on the world Communist movement. Its primary objective was to make the Soviet Union attractive to the non-Communist world, and thus to accelerate the trend toward popular-front governments. The real target of Comrade Khrushchev's exposé was not the dead Stalin, but the neutralist nations of Southeast Asia, and our wavering allies of Western Europe.

The Soviet Government knew well enough that the principal obstacle to the successful promotion of Communist ideas is the widespread belief that communism means a ruthless police state. The Soviet regime also knew that, for millions throughout the world, Stalin had symbolized the Communist police state. In many areas of the world, especially among Socialists, Stalinism means bad-type communism. Therefore, as the Soviet leaders saw their problem, the most effective way of erasing the idea that communism means slavery, terror, and murder was to erase Stalin. It was a move of sheer genius by Khrushchev and Co., and one that was totally unexpected in the Western World—since we did not believe that the present Communist leadership was so firmly entrenched as to be able to desecrate the shrine of a party idol.

The way is now clear for the Soviet Government to say to the Nehrus, the U Nus, and the Sokarnos, "Look: everything you have disliked about communism has now been disavowed by us. Our movement was once dominated by a wicked tyrant; but we didn't like him any better than you did, and we are now free from his evil influence. There is thus no reason for us not to work together, henceforth, toward our common objective of world socialism."

Roughly the same approach will be made to the Socialist and other leftwing parties in Western Europe—especially in Germany, France, and Italy. The perils here are surely self-evident. During the past few years, the Soviet Union has promoted the theme of peaceful coexistence; and this campaign has had a remarkable success in Western Europe—even though West Europeans have known that coexistence means living alongside a system they fear and detest. It will be even easier for the Soviet leaders to sell coexistence, and also to promote their pet project of popular-front governments, now that they can claim that communism has been shorn of the very attributes that West Europeans feared and detested.

It is of utmost importance, Mr. President, in this increasingly dangerous situation, that our own Government resist any temptation it might have to claim that "the international situation is getting better" as the result of the disavowal of Stalin. Any such statement by our Government would lend credence to the Communist thesis that Khrushchev has reformed the Soviet regime; and it would thus encourage the neutralist nations and our Western European friends to fall into this new Communist trap.

Mr. President, let me turn, just briefly, to the theory—already being advanced in some quarters—that the attack on Stalin somehow represents an internal Communist weakness.

I think we must dismiss, out of hand, the possibility that the attack on Stalin was designed to appease the Russian people. The Russian people may well hate Stalin and the present government which they know has imitated Stalin; but popular discontent in the modern Communist state cannot create serious troubles for the government, let alone exact concessions from it.

It is being said in some quarters, however, that the attack on Stalin was designed to subdue a dissident, pro-Stalin faction in the Communist international hierarchy and in the Soviet regime itself. But if such a faction existed and posed a serious threat, surely the last thing Khrushchev would do is launch an overt attack on Stalin. The Communist way of handling such situations is to liquidate the opposition. Khrushchev, very clearly, would not try to bring his opponents around by verbal persuasion. The kind of attack that has been launched on Stalin would be undertaken only after the Kremlin had reduced the dissident faction, and had no reason to fear the repercussions of defacing a Communist hero.

The most that can be said of the reported demonstrations in Georgia, Stalin's native province—and my personal guess is that they have been greatly overplayed—is that the Kremlin may have experienced a little rougher sailing with the anti-Stalin line than it

anticipated. It is more realistic, however, to suppose that the Kremlin expected a few protests organized by pro-Stalinists, but went ahead with the attack on Stalin, confident it could easily suppress any resistance. This confidence seems entirely warranted. But, more important, there is not the slightest evidence that the attack on Stalin was motivated, as some persons are asserting, by a sense of insecurity on the part of Khrushchev.

The bold attack on Stalin is sobering evidence of a strong and confident Communist leadership—both in the Soviet Union and in the international Communist movement. Of all of the zigs and zags of the Communist Party line during the past 39 years, the attack on Stalin is surely the most dramatic, and, one would think, the most difficult for loyal Communists to digest and accept. Yet Khrushchev went ahead. The Kremlin leaders realized that the attack on Stalin would create an even greater strain on party loyalty than did the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939. At the time of the pact, it was possible for international party members to accept and explain the switch in the Communist line through various rationalizations—such as the practical need to defend the Soviet fatherland. But no such rationalizations are available to the Communists today. They are receiving straight and simple orders to repudiate everything they have been saying about "the great Stalin" for the past 30 years. The fact that the Kremlin thought it could get away with this momentous switch, and that it is getting away with it, prove, once again, that the men in Moscow rule the world Communist movement with an iron hand. I think it is safe to say that Stalin, even if he had wanted to, would never have felt strong enough to denounce Lenin. But now the Communist leadership is strong enough to denounce a man who enjoyed almost the same prominence in Communist mythology that Lenin did.

Finally, Mr. President, let me offer a word of caution against deluding ourselves with the notion that the new Communist friendship line and the exposé of Stalin can be attributed to the strength of the western world. The old Communist line, devised by Stalin, and associated with Stalin's name, was manifestly successful in its time and place. Stalin's tactics achieved the acquisition of 600 million slaves by the Communist empire. Those Communist gains were hardly evidence of free world strength. Now the Communists have devised what they deem will be an even more successful strategy—a strategy directed at the most obvious weakness of the free world. This weakness is the basic tendency of many westerners, American and European, and of the neutralists, to try to see the best in communism, and to wish away the demonstrable facts of its consummate evil. With his master stroke of denouncing Stalin, Khrushchev has sought to disarm the West—to sweep under the rug the aspects of Communism that are especially repugnant to the West. This is why we are in greater peril today than at any time in our history.

I hope that President Eisenhower or Secretary Dulles will soon issue a forthright and realistic appraisal of the recent developments in the Soviet Union. Only if the American Government provides enlightened and unhesitating leadership, Mr President, will the free world be able to resist these new Communist blandishments.

SECRETARY McKAY'S CAMPAIGN MANAGER

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I believe that a politician elevated by the President of the United States to a position of great public trust probably must have lost all sense of propriety and public ethics when he names as his political campaign manager a man whom that politician has made the beneficiary of $1,000 a month, plus expenses, out of the tribal funds of an Indian nation, many of whose families are in relatively modest or even in straitened circumstances.

That has happened under the great Republican crusade. It involves a Cabinet officer of the United States Government, and it involves a seat in the United States Senate. In my opinion this action demands immediate repudiation by the President of the United States.

Mr. President, Secretary McKay has named as his campaign manager for the Oregon Republican primary election a man who, by appointment of Mr. McKay, is drawing $1,000 a month, plus expenses, out of the tribal funds of the Klamath Indian Tribe, in southeastern Oregon.

The Federal responsibility for the supervision of the affairs of the Klamath Tribe and for its financial interests is, of course, entrusted to the Department of the Interior, which President Eisenhower appointed Secretary McKay to head.

Now Mr. McKay, with the President's blessings, has been sent back to Oregon to seek the Republican nomination for one of Oregon's seats in the United States Senate. And, as one of his first acts as a political candidate, the Secretary of the Interior has named as his campaign manager a man whom he had earlier appointed to a $1,000-a-month-and-expenses position of trust as a management specialist for the affairs of an Indian tribe whose interests rest in the hands of Mr. McKay's Department.

Secretary McKay last year appointed three such $1,000-a-month management specialists from among his business friends in Oregon, Mr. President. One of them is Mr. William L. Phillips, of Salem. Mr. Phillips has been Mr. McKay's campaign manager in past elections in Oregon, before Mr. McKay, as Secretary of the Interior, made him a management specialist for the Klamath Indians, at $1,000 a month and expenses out of tribal funds, a position expected to last for 3 years. On March 13, the Associated Press reported that Secretary McKay, having lately entered the race for the Republican nomination for United States Senator from Oregon, had again placed his political campaign in the hands of Mr. William L. Phillips, of Salem, as his campaign manager.

NEWS DISPATCH REPORTS POLITICAL APPOINTMENT

The Associated Press story was duly reported in the Oregon press. That was over a week ago. Yet we have had no word that Mr. Phillips is resigning the $1,000-a-month plum which he enjoys, courtesy of Secretary McKay, from the funds of the Klamath Indians. The story of the appointment of Mr. Phillips to manage Mr. McKay's campaign was reported on Tuesday, March 13, in the Salem Statesman, published in the State capital of Oregon, which also is the hometown of both Mr. McKay and Mr. Phillips.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Associated Press dispatch printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McKAY NAMES PHILLIPS HEAD OF CAMPAIGN

WASHINGTON.—William L. Phillips, Sr., Salem, will manage Secretary of Interior McKay's campaign for the Republican nomination for the United States Senate, McKay said Monday.

The Secretary said he plans no active campaigning in Oregon until after his resignation from the Cabinet early in May. The primary is May 18. He said he had been invited to debate his likely opponent in the November election, Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat of Oregon, but had declined. He said he did not think he should campaign while remaining a Federal official.

McKay told reporters he is confident of victory in the primary and the general elections. He said he may make a trip to Oregon to get his campaign organization set up, probably before his expected May 1 resignation.

William L. Phillips, Sr., was campaign manager for Douglas McKay's 2 successful campaigns for governor, the first in 1948 and again when McKay was reelected in 1950.

At the time McKay and Phillips were competing automobile dealers, but Phillips virtually deserted his business to devote his time in the interests of McKay. At present, both have retired from the automobile business, McKay having turned over his business to his 2 sons-in-law, Lester Green and Wayne Hadley, while Phillips has retired from active business.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, when I read this story, I could not believe that Secretary McKay really expected his campaign to be managed again by the man whom he had appointed to the $1,000-a-month sinecure. I wondered for just a moment whether possibly there might be more than one William Phillips. However, Mr. President, there is no doubt that he is indeed the same William L. Phillips, Sr. An article by Mr. Wallace Turner, published in the Portland Oregonian of Monday, February 14, 1955, reports the appointment as a "management specialist" for the Klamath Reservation of the Mr. W. L. Phillips who had been Mr. McKay's campaign manager. And the Statesman article, to which I have already referred, explains that it is the same Mr. Phillips who is, now once again, Mr. McKay's campaign manager—while also managing, under another appointment by Secretary McKay, plans for the liquidation of the Klamath Reservation.

Of course, Mr. President, even if Mr. Phillips had resigned, the situation would be indefensible. It would display in the crudest way that, far from seeking the best qualified specialists in the management of Indian properties which $1,000 a month might get, Secretary McKay had put on the payroll at this very large sum, from Indian tribal funds entrusted to his Department, an old political crony and functionary of his, between political campaigns. That would be bad enough, Mr. President, had Mr. Phillips resigned from this well-paid position to which Secretary McKay appointed him, before again leading Mr. McKay's political campaign. But I repeat that we have had no such word. Mr. Phillips does not seem to be on the payroll of the Klamath Indians, at Secretary McKay's appointment, only between Mr. McKay's political compaigns. As of today, it seems that Secretary McKay sees nothing wrong with having Mr. Phillips go right on receiving his $1,000 a month and expenses from the Klamath Indians, under the Department of the Interior, while he manages Candidate McKay's campaign for the Republican nomination for United States Senator.

I digress to say that shortly before coming to the Senate Chamber today, I asked the staff of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to check for me, to determine who were the so-called management specialists for the Klamath Indian Tribe. The staff of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported back to me, after checking with the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior, that Mr. Phillips was still at that time a so-called management specialist for the Klamath Indian Nation.

WHY SHOULD INDIAN FUNDS SUBSIDIZE REPUBLICAN POLITICS?

Mr. President, it is none of my business whom Mr. McKay chooses to manage his campaign against the other Republican candidates for the Senate in Oregon's Republican primary this spring. But, as a Senator from Oregon who represents the Klamath tribes, along with the other men and women of my State, and as a member of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, of the Senate Interior Committee, I am concerned about the flagrant impropriety of the action of the Secretary of the Interior in mixing the funds of the Klamath Indians, entrusted to his Department, with Oregon Republican politics.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Am I not correct in saying that the Tribal Council of the Klamath Indian Tribe selected this man, hired him, and set his salary, rather than that he was appointed by Secretary McKay?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Secretary McKay made these three appointments. The appointees were selected by Secretary McKay.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does not the Tribal Council pass on the appointments and salaries, and decide as to who shall be hired?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The decision is with the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior makes these appointments.

Mr. McCARTHY. I respectfully differ with the able Senator. So far as I know, the Tribal Council decides who shall be hired, and passes upon his salary. Approval by the Secretary of the Interior is merely formal. I assume we cannot decide that question here on the floor of the Senate, but I do respectfully differ with the able Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am quite glad to have the contribution of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin; but I am saying to him, as one of the Senators from Oregon, that the appointments of the so-called management specialists for the Klamath Indian Tribe, at the salary I have heretofore mentioned, are made by the Secretary of the Interior.

I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin regards it as somewhat curious that the Klamath Indians should select, as one of the so-called management specialists, a former campaign manager for the Secretary of the Interior. Would not the Senator regard that as a strange appointment to the office of management specialist for the liquidation of the assets of the Klamath Indian Nation?

Mr. McCARTHY. I merely wish to make the point that the appointment was not initiated by Secretary McKay. It was initiated by the Tribal Council. They had a perfect right to select whomever they wanted; and certainly there is nothing improper or immoral in their selection of a man who is a friend of Secretary McKay.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Again I say that these management specialists are selected by the Department of the Interior and are appointed by the Department of the Interior, of which Mr. McKay is Secretary. On the latter point I am sure we agree. The other point is in dispute between us. I simply say that these management specialists are selected by the Department of the Interior, of which Mr. McKay is Secretary. At a later time, we can easily resolve the difference between us.

Mr. President, this exploitation of the Indian wards of the American Government, for the political purposes of Douglas McKay, is so outrageous that I find it difficult to believe that a man in public life today would so lack a sense of propriety and public ethics as to act in the way the Secretary of the Interior is acting in this instance. It was bad enough when Mr. McKay appointed the manager of his former campaigns for the governorship of Oregon, a man without any experience in the Indian problems concerned, to one of the $1,000-a-month jobs he had created out of the funds of the Klamath Tribe. It is many times worse to find Mr. Phillips once again serving as Candidate McKay's political manager, while still benefiting, through the kindness of Secretary of the Interior McKay, from this largess of Indian tribal funds.

Mr. Phillips' entree into the funds of the Klamath tribe was made possible through Mr. McKay's administration of Public Law 587 of the 83d Congress—backed by the Republican Member of the House of Representatives from this Oregon district—which provides for liquidation of the tribal assets. Under this law, Secretary McKay was authorized to appoint a team of so-called management specialists to supervise the appraisal of tribal property and to formulate a program for distribution of the assets to members of the tribe. Mr. McKay approved the contract by which the three men were to receive $1,000 a month and expenses during the 3 years of liquidation procedure.

The three-man team of specialists appointed by Mr. McKay was composed of his former campaign manager, Mr. Phillips; a treasurer of a Republican county organization; and a real-estate operator. This year, these management specialists will have at their disposal a budget of $123,500, from which they may draw their expenses and salaries without the necessity of accounting to the tribal general council.

To his credit, Mr. President, Mr. Phillips—an automobile dealer for 33 years—did not pretend at the time of his selection as a management specialist that he had any special qualifications for this appointment. He did not lay claim, before the representatives of the Indian tribal council, to any particular experience with Indian property, or with timber management, or with livestock, or with the development and management of other natural resources such as those on the Klamath Reservation. He frankly stated: "I don't qualify as a specialist, but the specialists can be had." That is presumably what the rest of that $123,500 budget is for, after Secretary McKay's nonspecialist specialists have drawn their $1,000 a month and expenses.

But I should have thought, Mr. President, that we were entitled to the simple proprieties of public affairs—that, having made him a $1,000-a-month specialist in the management of Indian resources, Secretary McKay would let Mr. Phillips devote himself to that important task to the best of his ability. Instead, Mr. McKay has called the Klamath Indians' management specialist back into service as the manager of Mr. McKay's political ambitions.

INDIAN TRIBES MERIT REAL SPECIALISTS, NOT POLITICAL SPECIALISTS

This amazing episode apparently means that Mr. Phillips, as Mr. McKay's campaign manager, will be carried on the payroll of the Klamath Indian tribe's funds—entrusted to Secretary of the Interior McKay—at $1,000 a month plus expenses. Evidently the duties of a so-called management specialist are so trivial that they permit management of a Republican senatorial campaign, while of course still being handsomely reimbursed from Indian funds in the custody of the Secretary of the Interior who happens also to be the candidate for the senatorial nomination.

Mr. Phillips was campaign manager for Mr. McKay before Secretary McKay

wished him onto the Klamath Indian tribe. He is campaign manager once again, and he is now a management specialist at the expense of Indian funds. It may be that Mr. Phillips will even be able to perform a little precinct work on the Klamath Reservation—of course, at $1,000 a month and expenses.

But, of course, Mr. President, from Secretary McKay's whole approach to the handling of public assets—whether they be timber, or oil leases on wildlife refuges, or irreplaceable dam sites—we should probably not be too surprised by his attitude toward the management of the assets of the Klamath Indian people. The manner in which this espisode has been handled merely serves to indicate that Secretary McKay has been willing to use a position, ostensibly dedicated to the welfare of Indian people, many of whom live in very modest circumstances, to create a niche for political time-servers who, when the occasion arises, round up votes for McKay, the political candidate.

Mr. President, I think it is fair to ask what President Eisenhower, who injected his Secretary of the Interior as a last-minute entry into the senatorial campaign of the State of Oregon, is going to do about his Secretary's unblushing mixture of politics and Indian trust assets. I do ask today what President Eisenhower is going to do about it. But I also propose that the appropriate body of the Senate do something about it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Just so that the record is clear, I should like to say to the able Senator from Oregon that I think he is making a completely unwarranted attack upon the very able Secretary of the Interior, Mr. McKay. Mr. McKay has rendered outstanding service as Secretary. I am sure there is nothing that can reasonably be criticized about his administration. President Eisenhower's selection of him was one of the best appointments he has made.

I do think the Senator from Oregon is making an unwarranted attack on the Secretary of the Interior; and I think the Senator is mistaken about the facts of the matter, when he says Mr. McKay selected Mr. Phillips. Actually, the Tribal Council selected Mr. Phillips. The council had a perfect right to do it, and the Senator from Oregon cannot blame Secretary McKay for what the Indian Tribal Council did. I am not criticizing the Senator from Oregon, but I do think he is being extremely unfair in his criticism.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the able Senator from Wisconsin regard it as within the bounds of propriety that a man who is drawing $1,000 a month, plus expenses, from Indian tribal funds, which are under the administration of the Department of the Interior, should simultaneously be named manager of a political campaign for public office into which the Secretary of the Interior is entering as a candidate?

Mr. McCARTHY. As long as the Tribal Council selected this man and has set his salary, there is nothing wrong with his working in a campaign. I am sure the able Senator had a campaign manager who was drawing funds from other sources. I am sure that the Senator's campaign manager was not solely on the Senator's payroll. Am I right?

Mr. NEUBERGER. My campaign manager was very poorly paid by me, and it is my impression that he was solely on my payroll. However, I assure the Senator that he was not on the payroll of any tribal council and drawing funds from an Indian tribe.

Mr. McCARTHY. He was on someone else's payroll, though, was he not?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do not know that he was. To my knowledge he was only on our payroll, which was a very modest payroll.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am sure the Senator from Oregon received campaign contributions from a number of sources. In fact, I read in the paper the other day, I believe, that he received a sizable contribution from labor organizations. Therefore the Senator's campaign was not financed solely by himself. It is common practice to have a campaign manager who is drawing funds from private employers, and the mere fact that those employers happen to be a tribal council does not make that fact anything improper. I do think, with all due respect to the Senator, that he is making a completely unfair and unwarranted attack upon the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I appreciate the Senator's great desire to shift the scenery from what Secretary McKay has done to my political campaign. I will say that my campaign for the Senate was far less lavishly financed than was that of my opponent. The Senator, if he wishes to do so, may consult the record of the secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and, so far as I am concerned, also the records of the Secretary of the Senate, and the files of the various newspapers.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not criticizing the Senator for the way he conducted his campaign for the Senate. I know that a campaign can only be conducted with outside help. I was merely pointing out that the Senator's campaign and my campaign and the campaign of every other Senator are run by men who normally have other jobs.

All campaigns are financed with outside funds. I was not criticizing the Senator for receiving funds from the outside. A campaign could not be run without such funds.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I will say to the able Senator from Wisconsin that my campaign was not financed by any Indian tribal funds. I will say that to him categorically. If I were the Secretary of the Interior, it would be far more improper if the campaign were financed with Indian tribal funds. So far as my campaign is concerned, I should be very glad to discuss it now and to bring all the facts out on the floor of the Senate, particularly with respect to the contributions I received, and with respect to the contributions received by my opponent. However, I still do not understand what that has to do with the action of the Secretary of the Interior appointing as his campaign manager a man who is the beneficiary to the extent of $1,000 a month, plus expenses, from the tribal funds of the Klamath Indian Nation in southeastern Oregon.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does the distinguished Senator from Oregon know that Mr. Phillips has resigned that position?

Mr. NEUBERGER. When did he resign?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. He has resigned.

Mr. NEUBERGER. When?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Within the past few days.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The distinguished Senator from Kansas was not on the floor when I said a few moments ago that because I wanted to be as fair as might be possible, I asked the staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to check for me as to who the management specialists of the Klamath Indian Nation were at the moment. The staff checked with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and informed me that Mr. Phillips was still numbered among those specialists.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does the distinguished Senator know that Mr. Phillips communicated with Secretary McKay and that they have not yet definitely and formally established the alleged relationship? Does the distinguished Senator know that Mr. Phillips called upon the Secretary of the Interior and offered to resign, or was resigning? Did the distinguished Senator from Oregon check with the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. McKay, to determine what the true facts were?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let me answer the Senator's questions one at a time.

The distinguished Senator from Kansas asked me if I knew that Mr. Phillips had not definitely entered into the relationship as campaign manager for Mr. McKay. There is an Associated Press dispatch which states that Mr. William H. Phillips will manage Mr. McKay's campaign for the United States Senate. It states that Mr. McKay said that on Monday. That is a story of about 1 week ago. Does the Senator think that that Associated Press story is inaccurate?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. That Associated Press story is absolutely contrary to the actual fact, namely, that no firm relationship as campaign manager has been established to date.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The story appeared in one of the leading newspapers in Oregon, in fact, so far as I know, in all of them, on March 13. If the story was inaccurate, why did not the Secretary correct it?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. It is a perfectly logical assumption that Mr. Phillips will probably be the campaign manager, because he managed the Secretary's campaign when he was running for the governorship; but it was a rather premature assumption that the relationship had been established.

I merely point out that if the Senator had called the Secretary's office he probably would have ascertained that Mr. Phillips had tendered his resignation several days ago.

Mr. NEUBERGER. When I read an Associated Press story from the Washington Bureau of the Associated Press, and it is dated March 13, and appears in leading newspapers in my State and throughout the Nation on March 13, and 8 days later no correction or public change in the story has been made by individuals quoted therein, I assume the story to be correct. If we could not make such an assumption we would indeed be without accurate information.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that had inquiry been made of the Secretary, the Senator from Oregon would have learned what the true facts were.

I do not criticize the distinguished Senator for assuming that a press report is absolutely accurate. It was a perfectly proper surmise on the part of the press, but I do know from the information I have that Mr. Phillips has resigned, and that the Secretary and Mr. Phillips up to this moment, unless it has occurred within several hours, have not reached a definite decision with respect to this matter. I am sure the Senator from Oregon would wish to be absolutely fair. I thought the record should be correct in that regard.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Again I say that the staff of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs checked for me, just before I came to the floor, with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and they were told by one of the high officials at that Bureau that Mr. Phillips is still one of the management specialists. So that if he has indeed resigned, the news evidently has not reached the agency which is in charge of administering the Klamath Indian funds. So it is probably in some echelon which does not reach the administration of the funds. If the statement in the Associated Press story that Mr. Phillips had been appointed to manage Mr. McKay's campaign for the Republican nomination for the Senate was incorrect, it should have been corrected within the 8 days since the statement was published.

The able Senator from Wisconsin challenged my statement that Secretary McKay appointed these management specialists. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. I said I thought the tribal council, in effect, passes on the appointment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I did not have a copy of Public Law 587 when I came to the floor this morning, but I am now informed that Public Law 587, of the 83d Congress, provides that the Secretary is authorized and directed to select, retain, or contract with management specialists.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am as certain about this as I can be, that the Tribal Council initiates the appointments. The Secretary may have the ultimate signing of the papers. But will the Senator agree with me that the Tribal Council did select the man?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I will not agree, because, to begin with, I know that Mr. McKay made these appointments, and Public Law 587 provides that the Secretary is authorized and directed to select, to retain, or to contract with these men.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to sit down with the Senator in the very near future and see if we cannot agree on exactly how these men are selected, and then correct the record in that regard.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I shall be quite happy to correct the record if it needs correcting. If I am wrong, it will be corrected. But, again, I say these appointments are made by the Secretary of the Interior.

I shall continue, if I may, with the remainder of my remarks.

The Klamath Indian Reservation contains one of the finest stands of timber in the West, estimated at $80 million in value. The assets of the Klamath Tribe which are to be liquidated also include fine farmlands and other valuable property. Under present plans, these Indian reservation assets are to be put on the auction block under a program to be developed by Mr. McKay's trio of management specialists. As a member of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, I am going to ask the chairman of that subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], to schedule a committee investigation into the steps which these so-called management specialists have taken toward developing a plan of the greatest benefit to the Indians whose property is at stake. I think the subcommittee should find out just what Mr. McKay's specialists on Oregon GOP politics are doing to earn their $1,000 a month and expenses from the Klamath people, who find their economic fate in the hands of Candidate Douglas McKay.

Mr. President, I should like to repeat a relatively small portion of my earlier remarks for the benefit of the able Senator from Kansas who brought to the floor the information, as he stated, that Mr. Phillips has resigned. In the early part of my remarks I had this to say, and I am going to repeat it:

> Of course, Mr. President, even if Mr. Phillips had resigned, the situation would be indefensible. It would display in the crudest way that, far from seeking the best qualified specialist in the management of Indian properties which $1,000 a month might get, Secretary McKay had put on the payroll at this very large sum, from Indian tribal funds entrusted to his Department, an old political crony and functionary of his, between political campaigns. That would be bad enough, Mr. President, had Mr. Phillips resigned from this well paid position to which Secretary McKay appointed him, before again leading Mr. McKay's political campaign.

I said that earlier, before the able senior Senator from Kansas reached the floor. But I wish to say to the Senator from Kansas that if Mr. Phillips is qualified to help liquidate the assets of the Indian people—and I hope he is qualified, because Mr. McKay selected him for his very lucrative position, and his salary comes out of the tribal funds of the Indians, many of whom are in very modest, straitened circumstances—why is Mr. McKay taking him off the job, as the Senator says he is, to manage Mr. McKay's political campaign? If the Indian problems and resources are important enough, and if Mr. Phillips is sufficiently qualified to manage the Indian resources, why is he not left in that position?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Surely.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Oregon is aware that Mr. Phillips is a very reputable businessman in Salem, Oreg.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Indeed, he is; he is a very reputable man.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does the Senator from Oregon mean that Mr. Phillips is a poor businessman and therefore is incapable of discharging his responsibilities in the capacity in which it was intended he should discharge them?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have never said that. Indeed, if the Senator from Kansas had been here a little earlier, he would have heard me say this:

> To his credit, Mr. President, Mr. Phillips, an automobile dealer for 33 years, did not pretend at the time of his selection as a management specialist that he had any special qualifications for this appointment. He did not lay claim, before the representatives of the Indian tribal council, to any particular experence with Indian property, or with timber management, or with livestock, or with the development and management of other natural resources such as those on the Klamath Reservation. He frankly stated: "I don't qualify as a specialist, but the specialists can be had."

I regard Mr. Phillips as a reputable man; but I believe the Indian tribal assets and the management of the resources of a great Indian tribe should not be mixed with a partisan political campaign. I believe that wholeheartedly. I would say that regardless of whether a Democratic campaign or a Republican campaign was concerned. The Indian affairs should be kept apart from partisan politics of any kind.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator indulge me by further yielding?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Surely.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I offer the suggestion that probably Mr. Phillips, at the time he took the position, did not know that the Secretary of the Interior was thinking about getting into the campaign for the United States Senate. Is it not perfectly logical to assume that good businessmen, who have been friends for years, as these two have been, and since Mr. Phillips managed the campaign of Mr. McKay when he was running for Governor of the great State of Oregon, should have mutual confidence in and respect for each other? Surely the Senator from Oregon does not think that in the short space of a few days something heinous, irregular, or improper has taken place. I am certain the Senator does not consider what has happened in that light. It is perfectly natural, when men enter public life or go into a campaign, that they should seek their friends who can best be of aid and assistance to them; friends in whom they have confidence. I am certain Mr. Phillips occupied that relationship with the former Governor of the Great State of Oregon, who is at present the Secretary of the Interior.

Certainly the Senator does not credit or impute any ulterior motives to Mr. Phillips by reason of the resignation of

Mr. Phillips in order to manage the former governor's campaign for the Senate; does he?

Mr. NEUBERGER. No. I may say to the Senator from Kansas that the whole matter of tribal assets has been mixed with partisan politics. Again, I say that Mr. McKay is still the Secretary of the Interior. He holds one of the most important positions in the President's Cabinet. He is the custodian of the vast natural resources of the United States, and of the welfare of such persons as the Indians, who are wards of the Nation, as the Senator from Kansas knows, because there are some Indian tribes in his great State.

If this individual was so well qualified to be the manager of Indian assets, as evidently his appointment implies, then it should not have been taken so lightly and cavalierly by the Secretary of the Interior. Now that the Secretary of the Interior has again become an active candidate for political office, Mr. Phillips has immediately become his campaign manager.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Since the colloquy relates to the Indians, and since South Dakota has the 3d or 4th largest Indian population in the United States, I would be derelict in my duty if I did not suggest to the Senator from Oregon that from the standpoint of the Sioux Indians of South Dakota, regardless of what has happened elsewhere, Douglas McKay has been the best Secretary of the Interior in the last 50 years from the standpoint of the advancement and welfare of the Indians. I think I can say that without qualification. Judging by what has taken place on the Sioux Reservation in my State, the American Indian has made more headway in the few years while Douglas McKay has been the Secretary of the Interior than he made in the entire preceding 20 or 25 years.

Without getting into the colloquy about Mr. Phillips, I desired to pay this tribute to a man who had accomplished so much for the American Indians, so far as can be judged by what has happened on the Sioux Indian Reservation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to learn that the Senator from South Dakota holds the welfare of the Sioux Nation in such high esteem. I am pleased about that, because I am as much concerned about the Sioux Nation as I am about the Klamath Nation. It may be that the Sioux Nation is doing better than the Klamath Nation, because the Secretary of the Interior is not an active candidate for public office in South Dakota; so in that instance South Dakota can consider itself fortunate, indeed.

But we have a situation in my State, which I am happy does not extend to the great States of South Dakota and Kansas, in which the welfare of the Klamath Tribe and the Klamath Indian Nation has very pointedly been mixed with partisan political considerations. I regret that; and as a Senator from Oregon, I certainly have the duty to represent, as best I can, with my limited ability, the welfare of the Klamath Nation.

As I pointed out, the Kamath Tribe has some of the most valuable assets belonging to any of the Indian tribes. One of the great stands of ponderosa timber in the United States grows on the Klamath Reservation. It is worth at least $80 million, perhaps much more at bid prices. That is an example of what is at stake in the management of the Klamath Reservation. I regret very much that the tribal assets and the management of the Klamath resources have been made the subject of partisan politics by the Secretary of the Interior. I rejoice that his activity has not been extended to either South Dakota or Kansas; and I am extremely pleased to hear the high opinion which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has of the welfare of the great Sioux Nation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the head of the Klamath Reservation is an Indian?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. The superintendent of the Klamath Reservation is a graduate of either Yale or Harvard, is he not?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Oh, yes. I have the highest opinion of the superintendent of the reservation; he is an excellent man. He is an able, outstanding person, and is performing his duties well.

What I am referring to, I may say for the information of the Senator from North Dakota, is not the superintendent of the reservation, who is a man of high caliber and is doing an excellent job, as are the three management specialists; I am referring to the way in which political manipulation has been allowed to dominate the selection of the so-called management specialists, who are quite apart from the superintendent of the reservation.

Mr. LANGER. I happen to know most of the reservation superintendents througout the United States, and I know that the man who is superintendent of the Klamath Reservation is one of the very best in the country.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We are very fortunate to have so outstanding a superintendent as the superintendent of the Klamath Reservation. Far from implying any criticism of him, I am pleased that the Senator from North Dakota has afforded me an opportunity to speak glowingly and in praise of his high ability and sincere interest in the Indian wards of our Nation who live on the Klamath Reservation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1271. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes;

S. 1272. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8320. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school milk program, the veterans and Armed Forces milk program, and the brucellosis eradication program.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 22, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1271. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; and

S. 1272. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], and myself, I propose the following unanimous-consent agreement:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, March 27, 1956, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, debate on any amendment (except as hereinafter specified), motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader—

I call particular attention to this part of the proposed agreement—

Provided, however, That on the pending Daniel substitute or on a substitute intended to be proposed by Mr. LANGER, debate on each thereof shall be limited to 3 hours: *Provided*, That if the majority leader is in favor of any amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Sen-

ator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said joint resolution shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said joint resolution, debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may from the time under their control on the passage of the joint resolution, allot additional time to any Senator or Senators during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask the majority leader a question: Would the proposed agreement preclude the offering of an amendment to the substitute or the offering of another substitute, to be voted upon prior to Tuesday?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No, not under any provision of the proposed agreement. The proposed agreement would not begin to run until Tuesday next. However, if the Senator from Minnesota desires to have a yea-and-nay vote taken on another substitute, the general practice has been—although not because of any unanimous-consent agreement—that once such an agreement is entered into, no yea-and-nay votes are had before the time specified in the agreement begins to run. As a result, Senators are on notice, and in the meantime are able to leave town, if necessary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But a substitute could be offered before the agreement takes effect, could it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes; it could be offered this afternoon, and could be voted upon this afternoon. If the minority leader disagrees, I am sure he will say so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure the majority leader is correct in regard to the procedure, although I may say that the general understanding has been that if there is to be a yea-and-nay vote, the Senate will be given notice thereof.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, let me ask when the proposed agreement will take effect.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On Tuesday. I may state that there will be a session on Friday. So if the proposed agreement is entered, it will be possible for Senators to make their plans for Friday, Saturday, and the coming Monday. On Monday, the Senate will convene as early as Senators may desire, and the session on Monday will continue for as late as Senators may desire, so they will be able to discuss the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the proposed amendment is entered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who is always cooperative, and also to my friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], for permitting the agreement to be entered into.

Now all Senators will be on notice that, insofar as the majority leader is aware, no yea-and-nay votes will be taken on Friday, or on Monday. Of course, I cannot speak for all 96 Senators, but I am sure I express the opinion of the minority leader when I say that we shall do our best to protect Senators in that regard.

But beginning on Tuesday, the unanimous-consent agreement will commence to operate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand that the majority leader has already announced that there will be a session tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes; we plan to have a session tomorrow.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But we do not plan to have yea-and-nay votes taken tomorrow.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the method of electing our Presidents and Vice Presidents has always been a matter of great concern to all of us. I have always believed in the desirability of greater participation by our people in both the nomination and the election of our Presidents and Vice Presidents.

On several occasions in the past I joined with other Senators in proposing legislation to permit the Federal Government to cooperate with the several States desiring to conduct preferential presidential primaries. I have also sponsored a constitutional amendment providing for nationwide nominating presidential primaries to be held simultaneously in the States, and another amendment providing for an election when the President dies, or is unable to serve, and more than 2 years and 90 days of his term remain to be served. All of these are important matters, and deserve the attention of the Congress.

However, today I am glad to have the opportunity of speaking in support of Senate Joint Resolution 31. I have joined with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in support of the amendment offered last Thursday.

Senate Joint Resolution 31, as proposed to be amended, embodies both of the two major principles of reform for election of our President advocated in the last 152 years. In other words, Senate Joint Resolution 31, as amended, will send to the States for their ratification an amendment which, once adopted, will leave to the individual State the choice of selecting for itself either one or the other of two plans for election of the President.

One plan is the Daniel-Kefauver plan, also referred to in recent Congresses as the Lodge-Gossett proposal. This plan provides for the direct election of the President and Vice President by the people, the office of presidential elector being abolished. The electoral vote of each State would be retained, but would be divided among the candidates for President and Vice President in ratio to the total number of votes cast in the State. Thus, a presidential candidate who receives 50 percent of a State's popular vote would be assured of at least half of the State's electoral vote. The total electoral vote of each State would be figured, as at present, on the basis of one vote for each Senator and Representative the State is entitled to in Congress. The candidate receiving the highest aggregate number of electoral votes from all the 48 States would be elected President or Vice President, as the case might be, provided the number of electoral votes of such candidate exceeded 40 percent of the electoral vote under the joint resolution as reported out by the committee and 50 percent of the electoral vote under the proposed amendment to the joint resolution.

Plan No. 2 is generally known as the district system for election of the President. It is probably more widely known today as the Mundt-Coudert plan, since the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and Representative COUDERT, of New York, have jointly sponsored the plan in Congress for a number of years. Basically, I do not favor this plan; and if it were offered individually, I would oppose it. However, if, as I understand, it is not possible to pass the joint resolution without it, then I reluctantly go along in an effort not to impede such progress as may be achieved in our present electoral process.

This plan retains the office of elector, but provides for popular election thereto. That is, each State will be entitled to the same number of presidential electors as at the present time, but such electors will be chosen in the same manner as Senators and Representatives in Congress. This means, as a general rule, that in each State 1 elector will be elected by popular vote from each congressional district and 2 electors will be elected at large. Each elector will have 1 vote for President and 1 vote for Vice President. Under this system, just as under plan No. 1, the electoral vote of a State may be divided.

It is contemplated that the legislature of each State, at the time of ratification of the amendment, will also debate the merits of the respective plans and make some recommendations as to which plan it deems more appropriate in its own jurisdiction. In some States, doubtless, the legislatures will submit to the people for their determination the question of which of the two plans the State should apply. It might also be expected that the States at the time of ratification would make a study of the changes in State law that would be necessary to effectuate the application of the plan chosen.

Since a majority—40—of the State legislatures meet in regular session in 1957, at the latest by the end of 1958, ratification of the amendment could be perfected well in advance of the 1960 presidential election.

Favorable action by the Senate on the proposed amendment is certainly hoped for at this time. A vote against Senate Joint Resolution 31 is nothing less than

a vote to preserve an electoral system that is so archaic that it has become a fiction. I agree with Associate Justice Jackson, who said in the Blair case—*Ray* v. *Blair* (1952, 343 U. S. 214, 233–234—in 1952 that as an institution the electoral college has suffered atrophy almost indistinguishable from rigor mortis. He commented that the demise of the whole electoral system would not impress him as a disaster. Further deploring our existing system of choosing our Presidents, he said:

> At best it is a mystifying and distorting factor in presidental elections which may resolve a popular defeat into an electoral victory. At its worst it is open to local corruption and manipulation, once so flagrant as to threaten the stability of the country.

Nothing seems more democratic than to have the people choose their own President and Vice President. No one can doubt the merits of the reform already achieved through popular election of Senators. In this connection it will be noted that reform in electing Senators was achieved in the same manner proposed here today, through ratification of the 17th amendment by the legislatures in 1913. The very legislatures which possessed the power to elect Senators thus voted in 1913 to yield that power to the people, where it rightfully belonged. The proposal before us today is as near as the Congress can come toward effecting the popular will and still maintain the identity of the States.

Today, in the 20th century, we look upon the election of our President and Vice President as a joint venture of all of the people of all of the States. It is a mutual undertaking by the people to secure the ablest person for each of these two high offices.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Would it be possible, under either of the alternatives to the joint resolution, to have a President from one party and a Vice President from the opposite party?

Mr. SMATHERS. I think it would be possible, but it seems to me to be a remote possibility. I raised the same question with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] the other day, and his answer was that in his opinion it would be possible, but very unlikely.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator think it would be desirable to include in the legislation a safeguard against such a contingency?

Mr. SMATHERS. I presume that the committee which reported Senate Joint Resolution 31 went into that particular point very thoroughly. I do not know whether or not members of the committee believe that such a contingency could be prevented. Obviously they must not so believe, in view of the answer which the junior Senator from Texas gave to me.

Mr. BUTLER. I may have been absent from the meeting of the committee at which that question was discussed. However, I do not think I was. The question had not occurred to me until I heard the statement of the Senator from Florida. It seems to me that such a result would be very undesirable.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey rose.

Mr. SMATHERS. I certainly agree with the Senator from Maryland that it would be undesirable.

It may be that the Senator from New Jersey can give us some enlightenment on that point.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I think it is probable that the committee did not endeavor to meet that point. It becomes particularly important when we come to consider the alternative, which was not in the joint resolution as reported by the committee, but is in the substitute for the committee resolution which it is proposed to offer, if it has not already been offered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is that the so-called Daniel substitute?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I refer to the so-called Daniel substitute, which is a combination of the proportional system and the congressional unit system, and allows State legislatures the option to choose one or the other. While I am sure the Senator would normally be correct in stating that the committee had considered this question, I do not believe that is true with respect to the substitute.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not know, of course, what the Judiciary Committee actually considered. My information came to me only through the junior Senator from Texas. It may be that he was speaking of his substitute.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. As I have said, I believe I attended all the meetings of the full committee when the joint resolution was before it for discussion. I cannot recollect hearing that question raised.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator. I certainly agree with him on the point he has raised. Let us hope that somewhere during the discussion of these reforms, which discussion will probably continue through most of next week, provision may be made which would, so far as possible, prevent the election of a President from one party and a Vice President from another.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Under the Senator's proposal, as I understand, the voters would not vote directly for President. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. The people would vote for electors, and the electoral college and conventions would be retained. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct. The proposal is not what the Senator advocates, a direct popular election of the President of the United States. In that respect the Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Just what is the objection on the part of the distinguished Senator from Florida to having people vote directly for President, in the same manner in which they elect mayors and Senators and governors?

Mr. SMATHERS. One of the very practical reasons is that I do not believe we can ever pass such a proposal since it would destroy the identity of the States. In addition most of the smaller States of the Union very much appreciate a version of the electoral college system, because they believe, and correctly so, that having some version of the electoral college they have greater weight as States with respect to determining the outcome of an election which they would not have under a popular voting procedure.

Mr. LANGER. My State is a very small State. It has a population of about 620,000. Recently we took a poll on the question of popular election of President, and that poll carried 8 to 1. Our State is a very small State.

Mr. SMATHERS. As the Senator knows, there are a great many things that are discussed generally, which people favor to a great extent. For many years I have sponsored a nationwide primary for the nomination of President and Vice President. The Gallup poll shows that the people in the country are in favor of such a proposal by 3 to 1, and as much as 4 to 1, according to the result of the last poll on that question.

Nevertheless, we have had great difficulty in getting any proposal like that out of committee, because apparently some people wish to preserve the control they have over the selection of the man who is to run as the candidate for President on their party's ticket.

Mr. LANGER. I feel that if my proposal were submitted to the people, it would be approved by an overwhelming vote. I do not believe that the smaller States have any objection to a direct vote. The Senate voted on this subject in 1950, and one-third of the Senate voted in favor of a direct popular vote.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would have to agree with the Senator that if we start talking about the purification of democracy—and that means letting the people have the greatest voice possible in the selection of the President—then obviously the particular proposal he advocates fits the description of being undoubtedly the most democratic of all.

However, there are some people of great ability who hold a different opinion. It is because of that that we are moving along the road as best we can. At least the so-called Daniel-Kefauver proposal is a step in the right direction, and will remedy the very bad situation which we have today.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I wish to say that I commend my distinguished colleague on his able presentation of this subject. However, with reference to the colloquy just had with the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota, I should like to ask him if it is not true that any amendment requiring the direct

election of President and Vice President by the qualified electors would of necessity require a complete submergence of State control of the election machinery and procedure in the States.

For example, it would require that the Federal Government would have to step into that field instead of having different age qualifications for voting, as the States now have, with most of them setting the age qualification at 21 years, and one State at 18, and I believe one other State has recently adopted the age qualification of 19 years. There are likewise the requirements which are now so carefully retained in the States, such as the period of residence required in the various States, and the period of residence required in the new county of residence, if there has been a moving from one county to another county in the State.

There is also the question of the details of registration. Likewise, there is the question of the requirements as to educational qualifications, and what those requirements are. Then, too, there is the question of absentee voting.

All those matters are jealously safeguarded and retained in the States at the present time, because situations in the various States differ, and the States have up to now not only preferred but have insisted upon retaining the handling of those important details in their States.

In short, would it not be necessary, if there is to be a general popular election by direct vote of President and Vice President, for the Federal Government to step into one of those dearly reserved and last citadels of power reserved to the States and overwhelm State control of the election machinery and procedure?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may answer the distinguished senior Senator from Florida?

Mr. SMATHERS. First, I should like to make a brief statement.

My senior colleague is eminently correct. He proves the validity of my first answer to the Senator from North Dakota, when I said that there were able Senators who took the position that to have a direct popular election would, as the Senator said, destroy the theory of States rights which some of us feel is a very fine theory and principle.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Apparently neither Senator from Florida has read my substitute. It provides that the people who are qualified to vote for governor in a State—and the State fixes the qualifications—shall have the right to vote for President and Vice President.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am aware of the fact just stated by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. However, it has never seemed to me that it would be at all reasonable or that we could hope to have an amendment submitted in this field which would not equalize the voting power on a population level as, for example, between our own State of Florida and the State right across the St. Marys River, which has a voting age qualification of 18 years, whereas we have a qualification of 21 years.

Further, looking at other requirements, I have noted such great differences between qualifications in the various States that if the Nation should at any time decide to adopt the popular direct election of President and Vice President, it would almost of necessity have to take the much further reaching steps I have described, and which I realize the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has omitted from his proposed amendment.

It has been my feeling, however, that certain States which feel they would be discriminated against from the standpoint of their voting and participation in the election would at the very least, in the event a proposal were to be voted on by the several States, insist that that proposal should embrace what I at least do not want to see embraced, and which apparently the distinguished Senator from North Dakota does not want to see embraced, namely, the setting up of uniform qualifications for electors, uniform qualifications for registration, uniform qualifications for residence in the State and for residence in the separate counties of the States, uniform regulations for absentee voting, and all the other things which have so much to do with the question of convenience in voting and equal opportunity of the electors of the several States to participate equally in a nationwide referendum, such as is proposed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Very frankly, I believe in States rights. I believe it is up to the legislature of each State to decide what the qualifications for electors should be. I do not think we should change that at all. If Georgia wishes to let the people vote at 18 years of age—and I believe Kentucky recently adopted a similar statute, or at least the question was on the ballot—that is a matter for that State to decide, as that quesion should be decided by the legislature of each State. That is a matter of States rights. That is something we should take for granted. We are doing it at the present time when we let people vote for electors.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will yield for one further remark, I have always known that that was the position of the distinguished Senator, and for that I honor him, but I think it is completely unreasonable for any of us to assume that any State which felt itself to be discriminated against would approve such an amendment. I think any coercive method of that sort would result very soon in reducing the electoral requirements and voting procedure to a common denominator.

Mr. President, I am called to a conference, but before I leave I wish to thank the distinguished junior Senator from Florida and the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is the Senator supporting only the Daniel amendment?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am enthusiastic only about the Daniel-Kefauver proposal. I am not enthusiastic about the Mundt-Coudert proposal. I have been told, and I presume it is correct, that at one time or another 11 States in the Union followed the Mundt-Coudert proposal, and it is believed that we could not get three-fourths of the States to ratify the proposal. I do not think it is a particularly good one, and I shall not support it.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am glad to hear the Senator say that, because I think it would not be of benefit to the State of Florida if we had the Mundt-Coudert amendment. In 1948, in the State of Florida, the Republican and Democratic vote was split 3.9 to 2.7, giving a differential of 1.2 in the electoral vote. In spite of that fact, the Republican vote was rather strong in Florida in 1948, and carried Florida in 1952.

Mr. SMATHERS. It was very strong in 1952.

Mr. KENNEDY. How many Democratic Representatives and how many Republican Representatives does Florida have?

Mr. SMATHERS. We have 1 Republican Representative and 7 Democratic Representatives.

Mr. KENNEDY. In spite of the fact that the Republicans were able to carry Florida in 1952, the State has only 1 Republican Representative. So that in any State like Florida where the State legislature is controlled by the Democrats or the Republicans, there would be a denial of the popular will if we adopt the Mundt-Coudert amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator from Massachusetts does not have to argue with me about the Mundt-Coudert proposal. I am not in favor of it. If the Daniel-Kefauver proposal comes first, I propose to vote for it.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Mundt-Coudert proposal will come first as a substitute for the Daniel amendment. I think the Mundt-Coudert proposal would be a mistake for all of us, no matter how we may feel about the Daniel-Kefauver proposal.

The Senator said, I believe, that the Daniel proposal is a step forward toward the principles advanced by the Senator from North Dakota, and it would not destroy the Federal system. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. I feel that the Daniel proposal is an improvement over the system we now have. I agree with the Senator from North Dakota. I do not go all the way with him. I do not know that I personally support his position. I honor him in his position. It has many merits, but I am not one who wants to destroy identity of the States and completely nationalize, so to speak, the operations of the Government.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does the Senator feel that electoral votes should be based on the number of people voting in a State or upon the population of the State?

Mr. SMATHERS. I feel that the distribution of the electoral votes in each State should be based on the number of people voting and the manner in which they cast their votes.

Mr. KENNEDY. On the question of whether we should give electoral votes on the basis of population or turnout of the vote, does the Senator believe, or is the Senator supporting the proposal of the Senator from North Dakota, that under the Daniel amendment electoral votes are given on the basis of a State's population?

Mr. SMATHERS. I believe the original Lodge-Gossett amendment was set up so that the electoral vote be divided on the basis of how the popular vote was divided in the State, not only the total population. I ask the Senator from Maryland if that is not correct?

Mr. BUTLER. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not believe it is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator from Maryland is on the Judiciary Committee, as is the Senator from North Dakota, and they are experts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Under the Daniel proposal, the electoral votes are given based on population, so that if only 3 people vote and there is 1 vote for 1 candidate and 2 votes for the other candidate——

Mr. SMATHERS. But that is a rather tortured method of reasoning, because in every State, so long as we have the electoral system, we will have electoral votes based on the number of Representatives and Senators, but the division of the electoral vote is made on the basis of how the popular vote is cast in the election.

Mr. BUTLER. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. We are concerned with the 48 States as units. The electoral vote is not based on the turnout in a State, but on the basis of the State's population. What we are doing in the Daniel amendment is breaking that down. We are no longer treating each State as a sovereign unit which decides how its votes shall be cast. We are nationalizing the States in one particular, but not going as far as does the Senator from North Dakota in another particular. I regard it as a step backward.

Mr. SMATHERS. I appreciate the Senator's observation. He, of course, can have his own opinion about it, just as can the rest of us, but I am of the opinion that the proposal which has been offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is a step in the right direction, a step toward giving the people a more immediate voice in the election of a President and Vice President. It is a purification of our democratic concept, in my judgment.

Mr. KENNEDY. If we are not going to recognize a State as a sovereign unit, then we should go all the way to where the Senator from North Dakota wants to go. If we are going to adopt any such systems, we should adopt the one which the Senator from North Dakota advocates.

Mr. SMATHERS. Which system does the Senator from Massachusetts support?

Mr. KENNEDY. I support the present system, but if I wanted to change it I would change it in the direction of the Senator from North Dakota. If we are going to make this change at all, we may as well go all the way with the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would the Senator from Massachusetts not agree that if we adopted the Daniel-Kefauver proposal it would actually encourage more people in States like Florida and Georgia, where, heretofore, there has not been much of a Republican Party, to strengthen the two-party system?

Mr. KENNEDY. In the State of Florida, I think the reason for a stronger two-party system——

Mr. SMATHERS. Will the Senator simply answer that question?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am attempting to answer it. I think the reason for strong Republican support in Florida is that more people are going from the North to Florida. After examining the statistics for the last 70 years, almost every authority I have read has decided that in the typical one-party State there will be an increase in the vote, but no change in the percentage of votes as between parties. I do not think there is a great potential Republican vote in either Georgia or Mississippi.

Mr. SMATHERS. No; but today Republicans, in large numbers, do not vote because they are of the opinion that their votes do not count. In most instances, the Republican presidential candidate does not even come into the State, in the belief that the vote is already locked up and tied on the other side. Most of the voters within the Democratic Party believe the Republicans cannot even have a look-in.

But if the procedure were changed, so that the electoral vote could be divided on the basis of the popular vote, then, although, the Republicans might have a small vote, nonetheless, they would be encouraged to go to the polls, because they might pick up 1 electoral vote, which would count in the final tally, and might be the 1 vote which would elect a President.

Mr. KENNEDY. The reason there is not a strong Republican Party in those States is not the electoral arrangement; it is the social, economic, and political structure, which has caused the people of those States to support the Democratic Party. Sometimes, when the people really have wanted to support a Republican candidate, as in 1928 and in 1952, they have, of course, done so. But when they have done so, it was not for electoral reasons; it was for a variety of reasons that they did not want to support the Democratic Party.

Mr. SMATHERS. Again, I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. Though we have a difference of opinion with respect to the resolution before us, he is extremely able in representing the people of his fine State in this body. My opinion is that if the Daniel-Kefauver proposal were adopted, the people who are in the minority, politically speaking, would be encouraged to vote. There is not a large minority vote now in the general election because the voters of the minority do not think it is worthwhile to go out and vote.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. The Lodge-Gossett proposal would make a more equitable distribution of the electoral vote, and would prevent the large urban vote from silencing the rural vote completely. The rural votes do not count where there is a large metropolitan city in a State.

Mr. SMATHERS. I completely agree with the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I might ask a question of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield for that purpose, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, at present both propositions will be submitted to the legislatures of the States. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. If it were desired to be fair, why not submit to the State legislatures, along with the Mundt proposal and the Daniel proposal, the Langer proposal also? The State legislatures then could make their decision from the three proposals. I know the Senator from Massachusetts wishes to be fair.

Mr. KENNEDY. I would agree if the State legislatures were allowed to have a choice among proposals which also included the present arrangement. But I think the State legislatures would say that Congress should make up its mind as to what it thinks the States ought to do before submitting a proposed constitutional amendment to the States in any form.

Mr. LANGER. But if Congress is to submit 2 proposals, why not submit 3?

Mr. SMATHERS. So far as I am concerned, I hope the Mundt-Coudert provision is stricken from the proposal, and that only one proposal will be submitted to the State legislatures. But I should have to agree with the logic of what the Senator from North Dakota has said, that if alternative plans are to be submitted, there might just as well be several of them.

I thank the Senators who have contributed to the discussion. So far as the Senator from Massachusetts is concerned, I appreciate his asking me questions. I know he has made a very thorough study of this particular problem and has a great desire to be of service to the people of Massachusetts. He feels that if the present system of electing the President and Vice President were abolished, and the proposed Daniel amendment were substituted, the people of Massachusetts would thereby somehow have their allowance taken away from them. I admire him for his representation in Congress of the views of the esteemed people of Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator. Such a change would, in my opinion, have the effect which the Senator has stated.

Mr. BUTLER. That could not be on account of the large Boston vote, could it?

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not know what could cause it; but if it is the large Bos-

ton vote, the Senator having received it once, I would expect him to get it again.

Mr. BUTLER. That is the precise point I made earlier. The voice of the rural people is completely drowned out by the large city vote. The rural vote is not counted at all and for that reason many rural voters stay at home.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not want to show any preference toward either the rural or the city vote.

Mr. BUTLER. The votes of the rural population should count for something.

The late President Woodrow Wilson has written on this subject and has suggested that perhaps we should not have such a system as we now have.

Mr. LANGER. I am delighted to hear my friend mention President Wilson. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that President Wilson recommended, time and time, the direct election of the President by the popular vote of the people.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. In substantiation of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, I should like to read a paragraph from page 378 of the record of the hearings on the nomination and election of President and Vice President:

> Thus to use an example which will not offend anyone at the moment, we know that in 1868 Boss Tweed manufactured a Democratic majority for the whole State of New York by fraud in the city of New York. This gave Seymour instead of Grant the 33 electoral votes of New York State. A local fraud determined the position of the whole State. In 1868 this fraud did not decide the choice of the President. In a close election it could have done that.

I think that emphasizes the important point made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for that contribution to the discussion.

No stumbling blocks should be allowed to exist which could thwart the will of the whole people. It is highly improper that the majority in any State should seize the votes of the minority, add them to its own, capture the entire vote of the State, and thus give itself an electoral advantage which it has neither earned nor deserved. This obviously is tantamount to having voters disenfranchised. Either of the plans proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 31 would inhibit such a transgression of the will of so many people forming the minority. The term, minority, is used here in the sense that the Republicans or Democrats may be a minority in one State but be a majority when it comes to electing the President.

Translating the present outmoded and unfair system of counting the vote for President, we see the Republican candidate in 1952 receiving 52 percent of the popular vote in Pennsylvania and thus capturing all of the 32 electoral votes of that State. Thus, 2,146,269 citizens of Pennsylvania went to the trouble of registering and voting all for naught. Without any effective proportional counting of the vote, over 2 million people in a single State were denied a voice in the selection of our President. In New York State, similarly, in 1952, over 2,687,890 Democratic votes were discounted. In the same State in 1948, nearly 3 million votes for Truman were lost to the Republicans. Under Senate Joint Resolution 31 and a proportional method of counting the electoral votes in each State, no such injustice could be had.

It will be noted that under the proposal the Vice President will be elected in the same manner as the President. This should result in a greater interest by the people in selection of our Vice President.

I am for the Daniel-Kefauver plan, otherwise known as the Lodge-Gossett proposal, because:

First. It strengthens democratic processes; it makes the vote of every person count.

Second. In States which are now one-party States, it will encourage two parties.

Third. It helps diminish the power of crucial "bloc votes" in certain States, and raises the vote of each person to the level of every other person's vote.

Our effort here today represents the unfolding of history to meet present-day needs to make our electoral system more democratic. I feel that the streamlining process embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 31 goes a long way toward supplying those needs, and trust that it will be overwhelmingly adopted by the Senate.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE JAPANESE DIET

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have the great honor to present to the Senate of the United States two distinguished members of the Japanese Diet, Mr. Uyehara, formerly Speaker of the Diet, and Mr. Narahashi, who is now a member of the Diet. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The Chair is very happy to welcome the distinguished visitors to the Senate.

COOPERATION IN PREVENTION, TREATMENT, AND CURE OF MENTAL ILLNESS, AND OBSERVANCE OF NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH WEEK

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, today I rise to speak in behalf of a very large group of our citizens whose plight demands the attention and consideration of every single adult American. Specifically, I refer to America's 10 million mentally ill and their tragic plight.

There are presently 750,000 mentally ill in mental institutions throughout the country. Another million or more are badly in need of mental hospital care, but cannot get it because of lack of facilities. In addition there are 8 million of our citizens suffering from mental disorders not serious enough to warrant hospitalization, but severe enough to disrupt their lives by making them ineffective and unproductive, causing them and their families endless heartache and misery.

The plight of the mentally ill is tragic, not because of the suffering they endure, but because they are compelled to endure their suffering needlessly. There is tragedy enough in being metally sick, but the crushing tragedy of these helpless people is that they are being kept mentally sick.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the fact that today there are tens of thousands of men and women, old and young alike—who could be living and enjoying the good life which our thriving and prospering Nation has created—languishing behind the walls of mental institutions, in every State, condemned to years, even lifetimes, of hopeless suffering, because we, their neighbors and their fellow citizens, have not taken it upon ourselves to provide them with the care and the treatment which could liberate them.

The shocking truth is that out of every 10 mental-hospital patients, not more than 2 are receiving any kind of psychiatric treatment that even merits being called that. And of the 20 percent who are receiving psychiatric treatment at all, no more than half are receiving intensive treatment of the kind which could increase immeasurably their chances for recovery. In other words, at least 9 out of every 10 mental patients are not even being given a fighting chance to get better and escape from the endless nightmare in which they live.

Mental illness is no longer the almost hopeless matter it was considered to be 20 or 30 years ago. Today, science has at its command methods of treating mental disorders—methods which can assure improvement and recovery for 70 percent or more of the patients entering mental hospitals each year. But these treatment methods require staffs to administer them. They require equipment and medical supplies. They require healthful and uncrowded quarters. They require considerable personal and individualized attention. Given adequate treatment under these conditions, the great majority of the mentally ill could be helped to recovery, or at least be sufficiently improved to permit their discharge from the hospital. That hundreds of thousands of patients are being denied these essentials which could make them better is the great tragedy of mental illness.

Today, in many mental hospitals throughout the country, there is only 1 doctor for every 600 to 700 patients. Today, in many mental hospitals throughout the country, less than $3 a day per patient is being spent to provide him with food, shelter, clothing, and medical treatment. This $3 a day covers not only supplies, but also the salaries of superintendents, doctors, nurses, social workers, psychologists, and attendants. In many mental hospitals today, the patients are quartered in disease-ridden, condemned firetraps, unfit for human habitation. In most mental hospitals today there is insufferable overcrowding, with beds jammed together in corridors, in storage rooms, basements, and rooms originally intended for recreation

Overcrowding means far more than physical discomfort. It not only reduces the chance for recovery; it aggravates and intensifies the mental and physical sickness of the patient. In many States, the chances that a patient will contract tuberculosis are 25 times greater when he enters a mental hospital. Our mental hospitals have only about 56 percent of the beds needed to give patients good care. Of the existing beds, almost 72,000 of them are medically unacceptable in obsolete and deteriorated buildings. According to Federal standards, there is a need for 352,000 additional beds to relieve overcrowding and to replace medically unacceptable accommodations.

A committee of the American Psychiatric Association, which provides States with inspection service on request, has found that of the 124 mental hospitals which have been inspected, only 8 merited approval, and 31 merited conditional approval. The hospitals which have not been approved have not reached even the minimum standards of medical quality and safety.

Not only are the manpower and facilities inadequate to give mental hospital patients adequate psychiatric treatment; there are today at least 60,000 patients remaining in mental hospitals, even though they are improved or sufficiently recovered to leave. One reason for this is that there is not enough hospital staff to examine them and process them for discharge. Another reason is that families and communities will not accept these patients when they are discharged, and there are no facilities in the community to help them through the rehabilitation. period.

And it is not only in the mental hospitals that the tragedy of mental illness is taking place. In communities everywhere, children are becoming criminals, families are being broken, and millions of lives are being ruined, simply because there is almost no place where people with the lesser mental disorders can go to get help.

Yes, there are psychiatrists who could help these people. But altogether, there are only 9,500 of these specially trained doctors. Over 3,000 of them are concentrated in 2 States with many States having fewer than 25 for the entire State. And even in the States where most of the psychiatrists practice they are unable to keep up with half of the demand which is made on them for their services.

Yes, there are mental health clinics. But clinic treatment is available to only a handful of people in the entire country. Of the 1,200 mental health clinics in existence today, only about half operate full time. The rest operate part time; and "part time" means, in many cases, only 3 or 4 hours a month. Furthermore, of the existing clinics, more than half are located in just a few States. Many States have only between 1 to 10 clinics for the entire population. Wherever these clinics exist—full time or part time—they have long waiting lists; waiting lists of 3 months, 6 months, a year, or even 2 years.

Mental illness is like any other illness. If it is not taken care of quickly, it becomes worse; and, as a result, men, women, and children who might be quickly relieved of their mental trouble by prompt and adequate treatment, are forced to become seriously and chronically ill from mental disorders.

Certainly, not all of the picture is bleak. The past 12 months have seen several heartening developments. For one, the introduction of drug therapy for mental illness has created a new surge of hope. The hospitals have had some wonderful results with these drugs. Thousands of patients treated with these drugs have improved considerably, and many have recovered sufficiently to go home.

Another development of very great moment has been the creation of a National Commission on Mental Illness representing the leading national organizations concerned with mental illness and charged and financed by Congress to undertake a 3-year study of the entire problem.

The past 12 months have also seen progress in many States in the creation of new hospital facilities, additional personnel, increase of the per capita expenditure for care and treatment, and the creation of new clinics and guidance services.

These are significant steps in the right direction, but they represent only a small sortie against the greatest health enemy this Nation has ever faced. If there is to be real progress in the fight against mental illness, tremendously greater resources of manpower and money will have to be thrown into the fight. In order for this to happen, the fight against mental illness must be broadened, and millions of new recruits must be drawn into a citizens army to fight mental illness, as they have been drawn into national crusades to fight polio, cancer, heart disease, and other major illnesses.

To that end, it is most important that the American people be aroused as never before to the threat of mental illness, and encouraged to organize in their communities in citizens mental health associations to combat mental illness in every way possible. In addition, they should be stimulated to contribute financially to the work of the National Association for Mental Health, which, nationally and through its local and State mental health associations, has been leading the fight against mental illness.

To express the sense of Congress concerning this serious problem with which the Nation is confronted, I introduce at this time a concurrent resolution, and request that it be kept at the desk for 5 days, so that other Senators may join in sponsoring it.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 73) submitted by Mr. SMATHERS was received, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], as follows:

Whereas there is presently a great need for nationwide action for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness; and

Whereas the National Association for Mental Health and the State and local mental-health organizations associated therewith are working diligently in the fight against mental illness; and

Whereas the mental-health fund is in dire need of public support in order to improve conditions in mental hospitals, provide more adequate treatment for the mentally and emotionally ill, carry on research in the field of the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness, and promote mental-health education; and

Whereas it is understood that week beginning April 29, 1956, and ending May 5, 1956, will be observed as National Mental Health Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby requests the people of the United States to join and cooperate in the fight for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness and to observe National Mental Health Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SHIPMENT OF CRITICAL MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES TO RUSSIA

Mr. McCLELLAN obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum? The address he is about to make will be of such importance that all Senators should be on notice, so they can be present.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I know that Senators who are not now in the Chamber are busy elsewhere, working; they are not absent because of a lack of interest or inattention to duty. So I dislike to interrupt them in their present work.

Mr. McCARTHY. Nevertheless, I think it might be well to have a quorum call at this time, so that other Senators may return to the Chamber, inasmuch as I know that the address the Senator from Arkansas is about to make will be of very great importance.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me say that I agree completely with what the Senator from Wisconsin has said. I have read the draft of the address of the Senator from Arkansas, and I agree completely with the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Very well, Mr. President; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in a speech on the floor of the Senate on February 23, I reviewed the hearings being conducted by the Senate Investigations Subcommittee on the secret relaxation of controls over strategic materials being sent to the European Soviet bloc. I pointed out at that time that some 200 items were removed or downgraded from the international controls list with the concurrence of the United States, and that there had been decontrol and downgrading in such categories as—

First. Critical metals, including copper and aluminum;

Second. Railroad transportation equipment, including freight cars, oil and tank cars, diesel and steam locomotives; and

Third. Machine tools of the latest type essential for the manufacture of weapons such as aircraft, atomic reactors, heavy artillery, tanks, jet engines, and guided missiles.

These items are now permitted to be sent to the Soviet bloc. Not only do the Communists receive the use of such strategic materials, but, according to experts, by having many of these manufactured commodities, they receive the advantage of years of research, engineering, and testing that have gone into their development and efficient operation.

One machine-tool expert testified before our committee that it would have been better for the United States to have permitted the export of shells and missiles to the Soviet Union since they could be used against us only once, whereas these tools and equipment can produce weapons of war to be used against us many times.

In December 1954, in the Fifth Annual Battle Act Report, Mr. Stassen advised Congress on the results of the revisions of the International and Battle Act Lists. He informed Congress at that time:

> Minerals and metals of basic importance to the Soviet military power, such as aluminum, copper, nickel, molybdenum, cobalt, magnesium, tungsten, and titanium remain on the embargo list.

The facts as developed before our committee prove this statement to be quite inaccurate.

First. Aluminum was removed from the embargo as were a number of aluminum alloys.

Second. Copper as a finished product in the form of highly strategic copper wire was removed from embargo.

Third. Nickel alloys up to 30 percent were removed from the embargo.

Fourth. Molybdenum alloys up to 20 percent were removed from the embargo.

Fifth. Magnesium was removed from the embargo.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Would the Senator agree with me that the Stassen report was false and deceptive?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will be charitable and say that it was very inadequate, and certainly misleading to me as one Member of the Congress.

Since I discussed this subject on February 23, further hearings held by the subcommittee disclosed that additional strategic items have been decontrolled and can now be sent to the Communists.

Mr. Stassen advised Congress in the Fifth Battle Act Report regarding electrical equipment as follows:

> Revised electric power equipment group in the embargo list includes heavy power generating equipment which is significant to the Soviet bloc war potential but excludes such items as outboard motors, condenser tubes and smaller sizes of motors, generators and diesel engines.

Let us contrast this statement with what has been developed in testimony before our committee.

Electric generators up to 60,000 kilowatts and turbines up to 85,000 brake horsepower can now be shipped by our allies to the Soviet bloc. Their principal strategic uses are in the manufacture of fissionable atomic material.

Electric motors up to 12,500 brake horsepower can now be shipped to the Soviet bloc. These motors are among the largest in the world and can serve all military needs. They should not be compared to outboard motors, Mr. President.

Diesel engines up to 1,500 brake horsepower and rotary speeds up to 600 revolutions per minute can now be sent to the Soviet bloc. They are used in generating power for radar equipment and are used in military landing craft.

In view of these disclosures, I think, as I said to the Senator from Wisconsin a moment ago, that I am being at least charitable when I describe Mr. Stassen's report to Congress as misleading.

In addition, it has been developed before our committee, in recent hearings, that electronics equipment and various precision instruments have been removed from the embargo list. Our allies are now permitted to ship items such as—

First. Germanium crystal diodes which have widespread use in military equipment;

Second. Electronic vacuum tubes which are the tubes used in guided missiles and rockets and associated proximity fuses; and

Third. Radio transmitters which can be used not only to jam the Voice of America but also many of our military radio wave bands. In addition, many other types of electronic and precision instruments which are of high strategic importance in research and development are now available to Communists whenever they are willing to buy them.

Mr. President, most of the information which I give to Senators today and that which I gave in my other speech has been obtained from sources outside the United States Government.

I have previously reported to the Senate the policy of the executive branch of the Government and its attitude toward the Congress and the American people with respect to the relaxing of trade controls between the West and the Communist bloc countries. It is a policy of secrecy; a policy of taking important and vital actions and then withholding information about such actions from the Congress and the American people.

The Departments of Commerce, State, and Defense, the International Cooperation Administration, and the Battle Act Administrator have acted in concert to conceal the facts from the Congress, from the press, and from the public.

Repeated attempts have been made by the Senate investigating subcommittee to get from the executive branch documents and factual testimony that would reveal to and inform Congress regarding the true operations of our Government, its actions and those of our allies, with respect to trade controls, or rather lack of controls, on vital and strategic materials and equipment that have been disembargoed or downgraded so as to make them available to the Communist bloc countries. This refusal on the part of the executive branch to give to the subcommittee and to the Congress information desired respecting the list of items disembargoed or downgraded at COCOM, and the extent to which our Government has gone in making secret agreements and concurring in the action of disembargoing and downgrading strategic materials and equipment is based on various pretenses. In my opinion, its pretenses and excuses are not valid, and they do not justify the wall of secrecy interposed by the executive branch between it and the Congress and the American people.

I strongly oppose such secrecy and concealment. If what has been done is right, why deny the facts to the Congress? And if the action which has been taken is wrong, there is an even greater reason, a more compelling reason, why the Congress should know it.

The executive branch refuses to allow the Battle Act list to be made public. Following the COCOM conference, the Battle Act list was amended and modified, obviously at the request of our allies, to substantially conform to the revised international list. It refuses to make this information available to the Congress, notwithstanding the Battle Act is solely an American responsibility and practically the identical list of items it contains is published in Great Britain, and which list can be purchased by the Communists or anyone else for 1 shilling.

As pointed out by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and other members of the subcommittee during the course of subcommittee hearings, the Russians—the Communists—know what they have bought and what they can buy. Why, then, should the executive branch of our Government withhold, or even desire to withhold, that information from the Congress?

The Battle Act, as we all know, was passed by Congress to prevent our allies from sending strategic materials to the Soviet bloc. After the COCOM conference in July 1954, our Battle Act list was changed, amended, and modified so as to delete many of the same strategic materials our Government at COCOM consented that our allies might sell and ship to the Communist countries. This action, in my judgment, perverted the intent of Congress and renders the Battle Act in its present form and its enforcement ineffective and useless. So far as the subcommittee is able to ascertain, not in a single instance have the provisions of the Battle Act been invoked since it was enacted.

This revision of the Battle Act list and the secret agreement at COCOM, which is still desperately guarded by the executive branch of the Government, permit our allies to sell and ship the most strategic materials and equipment, such as copper wire, aluminum, machine tools, electric and electronic equipment to the Communist countries.

The shipment of scrap metal to Japan, which became a great tragedy of the 1930's and 1940's, can well be considered a minor blunder when compared with the assistance and benefit that the Communist bloc countries are deriving from the policy that we and our allies are now

pursuing. In permitting the Soviet countries to receive most important machine tools, electronic devices, and strategic materials, we are definitely building up, accelerating, and strengthening the Communist war effort and potential. That statement cannot in my opinion be refuted or challenged.

I do not believe anyone will attempt to assail it.

Mr. President, I have opposed this form of government by secrecy. I wish to advise the Senate that I shall continue to do all within my power to get this vital information for Congress.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I was extremely critical of the Democrat administration for withholding information from Congress. During the hearings which the very able Senator from Arkansas has been conducting, I was appalled by the even greater secrecy maintained by the executive branch today. As the years go by the Executive is becoming more and more arrogant and highhanded toward legitimate congressional requests for information. I sincerely hope that the Senator from Arkansas, as chairman of the committee, will force a showdown, to determine whether Congress can get information which it must have in order to legislate intelligently. I do not believe we can pass on the $4.8 billion foreign-aid program the President has requested unless the Senator from Arkansas, as chairman of the committee, gets the information which he has been requesting and which has been refused consistently.

I have never seen a more arrogant and evasive witness than Mr. Stassen. I hope the Senator will take some steps to get the information from him and other witnesses.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. I may say that whatever action is taken will be the action of the committee and the action of the United States Senate. The committee is an arm of the Senate, and the majority of the committee, or, at least, the chairman and the Senator from Wisconsin, believe that Congress is entitled to the information and that it is necessary for Congress to have it if it is to meet its responsibilities in the field of legislation and in the field of appropriations. If it is to meet its obligations, it needs that information. I still believe it is needed. Not only do I believe it is needed, but I believe it is imperative that the Congress have this information if we are to legislate and appropriate judiciously and intelligently and in the interest of national security, and particularly so with respect to the program of foreign spending of $4.9 billion, to which the Senator from Wisconsin has referred and which Congress is asked in the President's message of March 19 to consider and approve.

Mr. President, the issue these facts present is a critical one. It is one which Congress should and must resolve. We are being asked and pressured by some of our allies to relax trade controls with Red China so as to conform with the relaxed trade arrangements our allies have made with the Soviet bloc countries. In fact, Prime Minister Eden of Great Britain insists that trade controls with Red China should be relaxed to conform with the Soviet bloc agreement. A few weeks ago, when he visited the President of the United States, that was one of the important items on the agenda for their discussion.

Then further, Mr. President, if it is right for our allies to trade in these strategic materials with our potential enemy, if such trade is in fact, as reported by Mr. Stassen immediately following the COCOM conference, in the best interest of the United States, then why is it not also in the best interest of the United States and a net advantage to the free world, as Mr. Stassen maintains, for United States merchants to likewise trade in these strategic goods with the Soviet bloc and with Red China?

If it is in the interest of the United States to have our allies trade in those goods with the Soviet bloc and with Red China, then it seems to me it is only fair to permit United States merchants to trade also. In that way we could add that much more to the validity and benefit of peaceful world trade, if that were true.

Mr. President, the awkward and untenable position we find our Government in today presents a policy situation that is inconsistent, contradictory and confusing. It is a strange paradox indeed when our allies can and do, with our consent, agreement, and concurrence, ship to the Soviet bloc countries strategic goods, materials, and equipment, because, as Mr. Stassen says, such trade is "a net advantage to the free world of expanded peaceable trade," and "in the best interest of the United States," while at the same time, as has been reported to our subcommittee, the Commerce Department here at home refuses to grant licenses to American merchants to sell these identical goods on the grounds that such trade would be "contrary to the national interest and not consistent with the national security."

Just how inconsistent and ridiculous can a national policy become?

Mr. President, the Senate Investigating Subcommittee is going to make one more serious and determined effort to persuade the State Department, the Defense Department, the Commerce Department, the ICA, and the Battle Act Administrator to give to the Congress the information to which it is entitled. Accordingly, I have scheduled further hearings for next Monday, at which time Under Secretary Hoover of the State Department, Secretary Weeks of Commerce, and Mr. John Hollister, Administrator of ICA and of the Battle Act, will appear and testify.

Therefore, I shall make a further report to the United States Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. Before the Senator yields the floor, may I make one comment?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Wisconsin do so.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator from Arkansas and the staff have performed remarkable service for the country by this investigation. They exposed matters which should have been exposed despite the complete lack of cooperation on the part of the executive branch of the Government. I wish to compliment the Senator from Arkansas, the counsel, Mr. Kennedy, and the staff, for doing the almost impossible job of digging out this information.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. I appreciate his remarks very much, and I can say, Mr. President, that the Senator from Wisconsin has wholeheartedly, enthusiastically, and diligently supported the chairman and the committee in their efforts to get the information we gathered, which I believe should have been voluntarily reported to the Congress from the very beginning. I think we were entitled to know what happened at the time it occurred.

Mr. President, the issue is secrecy. That is the big issue. If action taken is right and good, if it serves the best interests of the United States, why not disclose the information? I do not agree that it serves the best interests of the United States, but if there is honest difference of opinion, why not let us have the information? Certainly we should have as much as the Communists have and are able to get, and we should be able to get it without all the effort which the committee is having to put forth.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I say to the Senator from Arkansas that my staff is now preparing a detailed study of the various Government secret orders back to the time when they investigated the war effort, and we are going to give the Senate a detailed report within the next 4 or 5 weeks on what I call government by secrecy.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate that, and I think it is well that it be done. The time is coming, if it is not already here, when that issue must be resolved between the legislative and executive branches of the Government. I do not agree that everything that is done by the executive branch should be made public and set up in the records and sounded abroad from the housetops, when it might involve something which is actually vital to American security and would give information to a potential enemy which it could use to advantage. No American would want that kind of information made available. But when it gets to the situation which has developed in this matter, where the relations and the policies of our Government and our allies are known to Soviet countries, our potential enemies, again, I say, how ridiculous can the Government's policies become and be?

Mr. President, I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Wisconsin. The chairman of the committee and the committee staff have done a fine job in bringing to the people the facts in this case.

May I read a short piece of testimony before our committee, and then ask a question with reference to it?

When Secretary Weeks was before the committee, I said:

Senator SYMINGTON. Secretary Dulles, before the Disarmament Committee in an open hearing, said that he felt that the Russians today were more anxious for peace than they had been for some time, and for peaceful negotiations. I would like to get the exact statement. It was in his printed statement to the committee. I asked him why he felt that way. He said it was because the standards of living of the Russian people were being held so low in order to build their war machine that he felt that the people were beginning to resist those standards.

Now, my question to you, sir, is: If we supply hundreds of millions of pounds of copper and copper wire and if we supply aluminum in quantity and if we supply machine tools so that you are supplying wealth which recreates wealth, do you not feel that we are removing at least to some extent the hope that was expressed by the Secretary when he felt that one of the reasons they were more anxious for peace was because of the low standard of living that was being forced on them in order to build their war machine?

Secretary WEEKS. Well, Senator, I do not have any definite knowledge in that particular area. I cannot controvert what Secretary Dulles has said or affirm it or deny it. My own personal guess is that the standard of living there is not very high, and I do not believe it is going to get much higher in the near future. That would be my guess. Now, as to whether or not this is helping to build a standard of living, I do not believe it is. I do not believe it is moving that fast.

Senator SYMINGTON. You do not think 125 million pounds of copper in any form is a way to improve the standard of living?

Secretary WEEKS. If it is used to improve the standard of living, and I doubt if it is.

Senator SYMINGTON. Do you think it is used for that or the war machine?

Secretary WEEKS. I do not know, but I guess it is used for the war machine.

Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, does not that mean that the Secretary of Commerce is in complete disagreement with the position taken by the Battle Act Administrator, Governor Stassen?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It certainly indicates that he is not convinced that it would promote peaceful world trade and give us greater control over war potentials. It certainly indicates that he is not convinced that Mr. Stassen's position is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me ask another question. Does the Senator not remember that in 1953 there was a discussion of this matter before our committee; and now that disagreement between the State Department and the Department of Defense has been compounded to where there is disagreement between the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Battle Act Administrator?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the testimony before the committee has clearly indicated that certainly the Defense Department, through the experts, have testified that they protested any recommendation to decontrol such items.

Mr. SYMINGTON. My final question to the distinguished senior Senator, as I understand the Senator, he does not say necessarily what policy is right or wrong, although he has his opinion and I have mine, but what he does say is that it is not good public policy for our Government to refuse to give the truth to the American people.

What he says is that it is not in accordance with our form of government for these policies to be decided arbitrarily, and then for the administration to refuse to give out the facts. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I say very definitely, and without any reservations, that one part of his policy, the part I have emphasized the most, is wrong, namely, the policy of secrecy, as to whether the action taken at COCOM, in modifying the list and decontrolling some items, was right or wrong. Certainly there might be honest differences of opinion. But having done so, if it is in the interest of the United States to do it, and if it promotes peaceful world trade and helps us better to exercise control over war potentials, as reported by Mr. Stassen, then certainly we cannot be consistent and say that to permit American merchants to engage in the same trade would be against national security or inconsistent with national security, and not in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, some 18 or 20 press editorials and magazine articles which I interpret as being strongly in support of the position the committee has taken.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Butte (Mont.) Post of February 8, 1956]

TIGHTEN CURBS ON RED TRADE, SAY UNITED STATES LAWMAKERS

Early reaction to British Prime Minister Eden's suggestion that trade controls with Red China be loosened is a demand for even tighter restrictions.

It was voiced by Senator McCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, who, at the same time, announced hearings into alleged western shipments of strategic materials to the Soviet bloc. McCLELLAN in the past has been sharply critical of this trade with particular reference to Great Britain.

This is not a partisan question. Senate GOP Leader KNOWLAND, Republican, California, said he thought the Senate Foreign Relations Committee ought to seek assurances from Secretary of State Dulles that the United States will oppose any move to ease controls. He said this is particularly true in view of Red Chinese Premier Chou En-lai's repeated threats to use force to liberate Formosa.

Eden's proposal was for a step-by-step arrangement which would bring western shipments to Red China to the same level as to Russia.

Answering this, McCLELLAN said, "I think we would downgrade Russia to the point where we ban the shipment of everything to the Soviets that is supposedly denied to China. And then we should start tightening up on both from that point."

It is difficult to see what would be gained by relaxing restrictions on American shipments to China. Traffic in nonstrategic items would be only slightly less disadvantageous than that in strategic materials, for it would free China's own economy for the production of war goods. The same condition applies no less to Russia, with the further consideration that the Soviet is the main arsenal of military supply for the Peiping regime.

Our allies who favor relaxing the trade controls with the Communists are blinded by the profit consideration to the deeper issues involved.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of February 16, 1956]

GO AFTER 'EM, SENATOR

Yesterday in Washington, Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, began some public hearings which we hope will be productive.

As chairman of a Senate investigations subcommittee, McCLELLAN wants to find out how much trading in strategic items is going on between non-Communist nations and the Red slave empire.

The United States agreed about 2 years ago to a loosening of other countries' restrictions on sales of such goods to Red Russia and Red China. We thought that was a mistake at the time.

Now, Senator McCLELLAN says, the volume of business in things which may be useful some day in killing United States fighting men and civilians has become very disturbing. He mentions such items as heavy metalworking machinery, electric generators, and British wire made from copper mined with United States financial aid.

Up to now, McCLELLAN is getting no help from the State Department in his effort to paint the full picture of these dealings with the enemy, pinpoint blame, and recommend ways to halt them.

State objects to public hearings, on the ground that some of our alleged allies' feelings might be wounded.

We hope McCLELLAN will go ahead at full speed. The object would be, not only to shrink Russia's takings of war gear from the West, but also to head off any deal that may be cooking to shoot some holes in the United States refusal to trade with Red China.

Any statesman who tries, as Senator McCLELLAN is trying, to make war preparation tougher for the Red slave empire, deserves the support of all patriotic Americans.

[From the Deseret News-Telegram, Salt Lake City, Utah, of February 17, 1956]

WHAT ARE THE FACTS ON RED TRADE?

This is an election year in which the opposing party controls the committees investigating various activities of the administration. Such a situation is likely to produce most anything by way of charges and countercharges.

Even so, the investigation that seems to be gathering momentum concerning trade behind the Iron Curtain is one the public will want to watch closely.

It is being said privately that the United States has approved shipment by Britain to Russia of 60,000-kilowatt generators—a size, experts say, useful only for work on fissionable materials, most likely in production of A and H bombs.

It is being said that similar approval has been given for shipment of at least one horizontal boring mill—a "must" for basic drill work on airplanes and tanks.

It is being said that in the past 18 months Britain has sent Russia more than 200 million pounds of copper wire and a great deal of other copper—essential for making shell cases and other instruments of war.

All this may be entirely false. Or the information may be twisted. Or there may be some justification not now known to the public.

But it is also being said, and this openly and officially, that department heads in the

administration are refusing to cooperate in the efforts of the Senate Investigations Subcommittee to find the facts. This charge was made by Senator McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, the committee's chairman, in a statement that also declared:

"We firmly believe that the Members of Congress who have the responsibility of voting appropriations for national defense and for military aid and economic assistance to our allies have the right to be informed * * *."

That position can hardly be argued. For the administration to refuse to make an open explanation of its policies courts real political misery. And it should. No government has the right to make secret and basic decisions in such fateful matters without guidance from the people's Representatives in Congress. It was just such secrecy that caused so much criticism of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations and that is chiefly responsible for pressure for the Bricker amendment to control executive powers of the President.

This matter of trade with the Communist bloc is not a simple problem, of course. It remained after the Eden-Eisenhower talks as one of the few issues on which Britain and the United States do not agree. President Eisenhower's agreement to "review" allied trade embargoes with Communist China only began to bridge the difference.

Britain insists that increased trade can help pull the Red bloc toward the free world's side. Or at least, that greater contact between Red China and the West could weaken the Soviet hold over China. Inasmuch as China can get goods through the U. S. S. R., the British argue, there is no justification for not making available directly to Red China the same export items now in trade between Western Europe and the Soviet Union.

Our experts reply that the great amount of western machinery and technical advice poured into Russia in the 1930's did nothing to pull Russia closer to the West. As long as Communist China continues to supply rebel Communist forces in Indochina, build up Red forces in North Korea, and threaten force against Formosa, this country simply is unwilling to help arm her in any way. As for the argument that the Chinese "get the stuff anyway," official estimates are that it costs Red China $312 million extra a year to get goods through Russia. We have no desire to ease that burden as regards any kind of strategic material.

Our policies on trade both with Russia and Red China have been painstakingly hammered out over a period of years through intense public debate. This is not to say they are infallible, nor that they shouldn't be changed to meet changing conditions. But changes of the magnitude of those reportedly made require public justification.

Allowing due discount for the political motives behind Senator McCLELLAN's current charges, the administration still owes an explanation.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle of February 25, 1956]

STATE DEPARTMENT EXCEEDS POWERS IN THWARTING CONGRESSIONAL PROBE

Congress should hold up action on the administration's foreign aid budget request until it gets full information on allied nations' trade with Russia, as Senator McCLELLAN, Democract, of Arkansas, has asked it to do.

Foreign aid certainly should be reduced below the $4,900,000,000 the President has asked. And none of it should go to any allied power that is building up Russia's war potential through sales of strategic tools and materials.

The administration's denial of information Congress needs regarding such sales by our allies is indefensible.

Article 1, section 8 of our Constitution clearly states: "Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations"; and in section 18 of the same article, is added: "And to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

Implicit in this statement of powers is the right of Congress to conduct hearings to gather information needed for drafting whatsoever laws the Congress shall deem necessary for the security and welfare of the Nation.

Therefore, when the State Department, through the agency of Acting Secretary Herbert Hoover, Jr., or any other personality, goes before the current Senate investigating subcommittee headed by Senator McCLELLAN to deny that body required information on the ground it is highly classified, the State Department is exceeding its authority in defying the subcommittee.

Denial of the information Congress needs is the more flagrant and the more dangerous for the reason that the inquiry being conducted by Senator McCLELLAN'S subcommittee strikes at the heart of our security. It seeks to ferret out details of the cut in restrictions on strategic goods going behind the Iron Curtain.

The cut in restrictions was negotiated at a 15-nation parley in August, 1954, at Paris, where Harold Stassen represented the United States. Full details never were made known here although it has since been learned that nearly 100 items, such as machine tools and copper were included on the decontrol list.

Senator McCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, spotlighted the idiocy of the State Department's arrogance when he pointed out "the Communists know what they are getting. Why can't Congress and the American people have information that is known to the Soviet bloc?" Furthermore, the subcommittee is informed that the British Board of Trade was supplied the information in London.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of March 1, 1956]

NOW WHAT'S THE ALIBI?

A Senate investigations subcommittee has tried—unsuccessfully—for weeks to get the executive branch of the Government to tell in public what items the United States agreed, with its western allies, to take off the embargo list for Iron Curtain countries.

The State Department, the Commerce Department, the Defense Department and the International Cooperation Administration refused—pleading that the lists must remain secret because they were arrived at through international negotiations.

The British Foreign Office now has deprived the executive branch of the last shred of argument against putting the facts on the record. In a statement issued yesterday, the Foreign Office conceded that copper wire and horizontal boring machines were removed from the international embargo in 1954.

British figures show that copper wire exports from Britain to Russia soared from 7,500 tons in 1954 to 33,200 tons in 1955 as a result of this action.

The Senate committee is right in pressing the administration to explain publicly why the United States agreed to remove such strategic items from the embargo list.

The importance of copper wire is underscored in Khrushchev's speech to the 20th Communist Party congress. Among other projects mentioned is the electrification of Soviet railways—25,000 miles in 15 years.

Every ton of copper wire the Reds get from the West adds to the Soviet war potential.

[From the Omaha, (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of February 28, 1956]

TODAY IN NATIONAL AFFAIRS—REDS BUY VITAL UNITED STATES DEFENSE TOOLS THROUGH EXECUTIVE'S SECRET PACTS

(By David Lawrence)

JOHN L. McCLELLAN, chairman, of the Senate Subcommittee on Permanent Investigations, made a sensational speech on the Senate floor last Thursday.

He spoke of "the most astounding secret concessions" made by our Government in a conference with its allies.

He cited instance after instance of strategic materials released which will help the Soviet Union build an armament machine that some day can be used to kill American soldiers and devastate American cities.

Senator RICHARD RUSSELL of Georgia, chairman of the all-important Armed Services Committee, rose to characterize it "a most startling state of affairs."

Three other members of the Armed Services Committee joined to deplore a scandal that shocked them.

It was disclosed that Defense Department experts had protested in vain.

EVERY ONE ELSE KNOWS

Senator McCLELLAN said that in August, 1954, at a secret meeting of the United States and its allies 200 of the 450 items previously under embargo to the Soviet Union were released.

The Soviets know what the items are because they are buying them, but to this day the Executive Branch of the Government here refuses to reveal to Congress what the items are, though they have been published in technical periodicals abroad.

Here are four conspicuous examples of the two hundred articles released to the Russians:

1. Boring mills essential to the manufacture of tanks, artillery, aircraft, and for atomic reactors used in submarines.

2. Vertical boring mills essential to the manufacture of jet engines.

3. Dynamic balance machines used for balancing shafts on engines for jet airplanes and guided missiles.

4. External cylindrical grinding machines which a Defense Department expert testified are essential in making engine parts, guided missiles and radar.

"It was emphatically stated," the Arkansas Senator said in describing the testimony of a Defense Department expert on machine tools, "that it would be better to permit shells, guns or guided missiles to be disembargoed and sent to the Soviet Union, for they could be used against us only once while these machine tools will be used to make armaments of war which could be used against us many times."

UNITED STATES COPPER TO REDS

Mr. McCLELLAN said the testimony showed, moreover, how metals and minerals—which are being stockpiled in the United States because they are essential—are removed from the embargoed list of strategic materials.

While America was forced to divert 143 million pounds of copper from its stockpile to help industry here, our allies have shipped since August, 1954, about 250 million pounds to the Soviet Union.

Mr. McCLELLAN and other Senators served notice that they won't vote for the $4,900,000,000 asked by the administration for aid to our allies unless the whole matter is satisfactorily cleared up.

HOW INCONSISTENT?

Mr. McCLELLAN asked the Senate:

"If we are providing these funds to our allies for the purpose of helping them to develop their military power and strength as a defense against communism, then how

inconsistent is it for the same allies, for the sake of trade and profit, to place in the hands of the Communist bloc the machines, materials and other essentials of the war potential in a war effort?

"Is not the advantage we are trying to gain and for which we are trying to provide being offset by the making of such machines, tools and materials available to a potential enemy?"

Also in the offing is a demand from our allies that the articles now permitted for export to Soviet Russia should be released also to Red China, though there is still a state of war between the United Nations and the Red Chinese Government due to the unfinished business in Korea.

Plainly the administration is in for trouble in the Senate on the whole foreign aid program because of what has been done secretly and injudiciously for more trade with the enemy.

[From the Chicago Tribune of March 1, 1956]

FEEDING THE RED WAR MACHINE

The Democrats are waking up to a fact discovered by Senator MCCARTHY several years ago. That is that a flood of strategic materials and machine tools is reaching Russia from the west to build the Soviet war machine. Within the last few days two Democrats who joined in voting to condemn Senator MCCARTHY's methods have been busy repeating what MCCARTHY said of this trade as long ago as 1953.

Senator MCCLELLAN, Democrat, who succeeded MCCARTHY as chairman of the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, has been complaining about this traffic in contraband, as has Senator SYMINGTON, who has charged the British Ambassador with misrepresenting the facts.

Senator MCCLELLAN demanded that the Government stop funneling aid to America's allies until Congress is provided with a full accounting of their economic assistance to the Soviet military establishment. He said that the Government had made astonishing concessions to allies which sought relaxation of American restrictions on trade in war materials with the Soviet bloc.

The Senator further charged that the Government is entertaining allied proposals to relax the trade embargo against Red China so that allied merchants will be able to ship there with the same ease that they now do to Russia.

When Senator MCCARTHY raised these same points, we heard a great deal about McCarthyism and what an uncouth fellow MCCARTHY was for interfering in matters better left to the State Department. We wonder if we are now going to be told about the horrors of McClellanism and Symingtonism.

We haven't the slightest doubt that MCCARTHY and MCCLELLAN are correct in their appraisal of the situation. The British information services have just released a defensive statement on Britain's trade with the Communist bloc. It admits that in 1954 the British succeeded in negotiating an agreement with the United States "to narrow substantially the area of control" over materials traded to the Communists.

The embargo list was cut from 260 to 170 items, and the quantitative control list from 90 to 20. British trade with Russia has risen in value from 12.3 million pounds in 1953 to 31.9 million pounds in 1955.

Exports of generators and motors increased 8.5 times in the same period, other machinery more than 13 times, and exports of copper wire, negligible in 1953, reached a value of 27.5 million pounds in 1955.

Most of the materials reaching the Soviet bloc, according to the Democratic Senators, are essential to the Red military buildup. Within the last week three marshals of the Red army publicly threatened to rain hydrogen bombs on American cities if we take to looking cross-eyed at the Kremlin. Put these two facts together and decide for yourself whether it makes sense for the United States to permit the recipients of American foreign aid to contribute to Soviet power.

[From Boston Traveler of March 6, 1956]

UNDER THE COUNTER

Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, has asked some questions involving national security that we think should be answered promptly and fully by the administration.

We don't particularly care who speaks up for the administration on this matter, but a good candidate would be Harold Stassen, the President's assistant in charge of promoting peace.

MCCLELLAN, who is chairman of the Senate's Subcommittee on Investigations, wants to know how come we give our allies a lot of money and at the same time permit them to sell strategic materials to our enemies.

A good question. And Stassen should know the answer because he headed the United States delegation which drew up an agreement in 1954 listing just which goods should be traded to Iron Curtain countries and which should not.

At that time, according to MCCLELLAN, 200 articles were taken off the embargo list, leaving a total of 250 items restricted.

The administration for some strange reason has never made the list public. But Senator MCCLELLAN has found out that it is now considered perfectly O. K. for our allies to turn over such items as boring mills (used to manufacture tanks, artillery, aircraft, and other weapons of war), balance machines, and grinding machines.

These certainly appear to be items that would come in mighty handy to any nation plotting our destruction.

Now perhaps we can't exactly tell our allies what they may trade or with whom they may trade. But it does seem that the whole free world has a big stake here.

At the time the 1954 agreement was made, Stassen said it was "in the best interest of the United States."

We think Stassen should explain why the list is secret and how he ever figured out that when our allies sell tools to manufacture weapons of war they are doing something that is in the best interests of the United States.

The Russians know what's on the list because they're buying the stuff. We, and Senator MCCLELLAN, have an equal right to know.

[From the Indianapolis Star of March 9, 1956]

THE RED TRADE CARROT

If Chairman JOHN MCCLELLAN, of the Senate Permanent Investigating Committee, wants to find out why we relaxed East-West trade restrictions on strategic materials during 1954—and whether or not we're going to relax them still further, even with Red China—it appears he will have to ask President Eisenhower himself. Questioning second-string officials on Tuesday, all the Senate group got was a lot of, "Sorry, we've orders not to talk," replies.

But the President, at his Wednesday press conference, made it plain that the policy of trade relaxation stems out of his own thinking. Asked flatly whether he believed that the August 1954, relaxations on trade with the European Soviet bloc were desirable, the President said, "No," he didn't believe it was a mistake. Asked whether he favored similar relaxation of trade with Red China, Mr. Eisenhower did not answer directly, but he did say that this is the kind of matter that has to be studied every day.

On the general subject of Red trade he pointed out that several countries had excess production capacity resulting from the Korean war—and that American surplus capacity was actually making their situation worse. We didn't want, forever, to be carrying them by grants and doles, the President said, so we had to find some amount and type of trade with the Reds that would harm us the least. That was about the gist of it.

Let's face it—this means that our policy on Red trade is based on a type of opportunism rather than on any principle. If the net result of this trade is more beneficial to us than harmful, as judged by our economic strategists, we will engage in it. And we take this to mean trade with Red China as well. Indeed, it seems that the distinction between Red Chinese trade and Red Russian trade is rapidly being obliterated.

This is what happens when you sup with the devil—no spoon is long enough. What follows from our cordial diplomatic relations with communism is a policy of accommodation to it in other respects as well. Eventually, whether we like it or not, these relations with the Kremlin will make communism more respectable in the United States as well, since it will be the philosophy of a regime with which we maintain friendly intercourse. Diplomatic recognition has always implied trade ties, then exchanges of scientific and agricultural delegations, then musicians, next ballet dancers. It's not going to be easy under these circumstances for our people to recognize the Marxist ideological baggage that will accompany all these exchanges, but we will have to if we aim to retain our liberties.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of March 10, 1956]

TIME TO GIVE FACTS

Controversy over East-West trade, and more specifically over the question of whether important amounts of warmaking goods are being shipped from the West to Communist countries, has become intense. It threatens, because of a growing irritation between the legislative and executive branches, to jeopardize administration plans for our foreign economic and military aid programs. But more importantly, if critics of the present East-West trade pattern are correct, there is a genuine threat to peace and national security. Unfortunately, all of the facts involved are not openly on the record.

In August 1954, the United States agreed—under admitted pressure from its West European allies—to a relaxation of trade controls with Communist European countries. The relaxation amounted to a disembargoing or downgrading of controls on approximately 200 of the 450 items previously restricted in East-West trade. The action was defended then by Harold E. Stassen, American representative in the decontrol negotiations, on the grounds it would "result in a net advantage to the free world of expanded peaceful trade and more effective control of the war-potential items."

More recently, the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee has been examining this action and its consequences. On the basis of this inquiry, Chairman MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, has disputed flatly Mr. Stassen's conclusion, has charged that "astounding secret concessions" were made by our Government in the negotiations and has asserted that strategic items of great warmaking value are being sold by our Western allies to the European Communist bloc. He has charged, further, that the executive branch is withholding the true facts from Congress and from the American people. And he has said that he cannot vote for further foreign aid so long as this vital information is suppressed.

Mr. McCLELLAN and those who have expressed agreement with him in the Senate are not blind to certain facts in this situation. One, pointed out by President Eisenhower in his news conference, is that our West European allies are nations that need an export market for their products. We do not provide that market because we are a producing nation also. Furthermore, the historic trade pattern in Europe is that of East-West exchange. The second basic fact, as explained to the committee by Secretary of Commerce Weeks, is that the United States has no power beyond that of persuasion to make multilateral trade controls effective. Our own trade with the Communist bloc is minute, but we cannot order our allies to desist to the same extent.

There remains, however, the question of whether the true and full story is being revealed to the Congress and to the American people. It clearly is not. Mr. Weeks, admitting that he personally would prefer tougher international controls, has declined to give the committee the working papers of an interdepartmental group which recommended the American position. Defense Department experts have told the Senate committee that strategic warmaking tools and metals are now flowing to the Iron Curtain countries. The stakes behind this controversy are vital ones. Explanations of why we agreed to decontrols, half-denials of what has happened since, and classification of information apparently easily available to everybody except the Congress and the American people are not good enough. It is time all the facts were disclosed.

[From the American Metal Market of March 10, 1956]

EAST-WEST TRADE

The controversy over East-West trade was clarified somewhat when the issue was raised at the President's press conference on Wednesday. But it certainly was not settled, and there will be many to demand further and more satisfactory explanations of the so-called Paris agreement of August 1954, which led to the dropping of some 200 items from the list of embargoed strategic materials. These included copper wire, and it has been established that, since the Paris action, large quantities of this valuable material (while copper has been in short supply in the free world) have been moving to the East.

The President insisted that this country had not modified its own control restrictions, but had assented to the demands of our European allies for greater freedom of trade with the Soviet bloc. It has become quite apparent that the United States was pressured into this agreement by our European allies. This demand grew out of the economic recovery of Europe and the simultaneous serverance of heretofore normal trade relations with the East, which had always absorbed a certain amount of surplus European production.

As the President put it, "We had friends in the world we wanted to make a living. We didn't want forever to have to just dole out of our pockets and carry them by means of grants. * * * There had to be some relaxation. The great problem is where does trade give the other fellow no advantage that you don't get?"

This is a very plausible explanation, which will assuredly meet with a favorable response from a good segment of the American people. We definitely want to see our friends make a living. The whole purpose of economic aid to Western Europe, and the purpose behind the administration's current program of economic aid to the backward countries has been to put them on their feet economically, so that they could make a living. Surely we do not wish indefinitely to carry them by the means of grants. But the rub is, as the President indicated, whether or not our side or their side is to profit most by a lowering of the barriers. We think it is assuming a lot that private business, in search of expanding markets, is likely to prove a collective match, from the strategic point of view, for the Soviet trade offices, which monopolize Iron Curtain trade in the interest of the state, as a whole, rather than in the interest of any segment of its society.

In making a living it is in the very nature of things that the more advanced West should supply products which are, at best, in short supply behind the Iron Curtain. Monopolizing all trade, the Soviet is in a position to insist on getting what it needs most (as copper). If providing these materials aids employment and the whole European economy, it can do so only if Europe accepts Iron Curtain production in return. European countries are not in our position, to give goods indefinitely without repayment (they know that is poor business), but if they accept Iron Curtain goods in return (as they must, if they are to make a living) they must inevitably aid employment and the economy in the Iron Curtain areas. So, the relaxed embargo most certainly also enables communism to make a living. We may be sure that a Soviet government trade monopoly will see to it that they profit—and profit well—from the trade which they control. It is, moreover, ironical that an end result of aiding the recovery of friendly nations should be the creation of a need to aid the enemy by sanctioning the sale of strategic materials to them when the economies of our friends have recovered.

Before the Paris agreement it had been made amply clear that in no event would the West attack Russia. Now, apparently, the West's need to make a living is such as to assure the Soviets of strategic materials they need for the improvement of their own war economy and war machines. No wonder they feel free to wage a cold war with impunity, whenever and wherever they choose, virtually immune from any retaliatory action which can hurt them. And what assurances does the West have that by the next turn of the wheel, another and even more aggressive Stalin will not take over at Moscow, with greater economic strength at his disposal than Stalin ever possessed?

An inexplicable feature of this controversy is that the facts of the Paris agreement should be withheld from the American people. The only justification for censorship is to deny valuable information to an adversary. But here, the adversary is fully informed. So, too, are the European producers. Only the American public is in the dark. And it so happens that, on the very day that the explanatory statements related above, were made, the President himself characterized the international situation with the Communists as "very serious, very serious." It will be difficult for many to endorse a policy which allows the Soviet bloc to obtain increasing quantities of strategic materials at a time when the situation which it has created is very serious." There is more to East-West trade than making a living.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle of March 11, 1956]

UNITED STATES SECRECY ON TRADE CURB RELAXATION IS STUPID POLICY

Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks' admission that our agreement to relaxation of East-West trade controls for our allies has permitted the flow of strategic war materials to Communist countries is an indictment of our foreign policy that sets a new high in stupidity.

But Harold E. Stassen's refusal to tell Senate investigators just what strategic goods United States allies are free to sell the Soviet bloc is an insult to the intelligence of Congress and the American people that disqualifies him for even a minor post of governmental authority.

To identify the items, Stassen says, would help the Communists.

It was this same Stassen, the President's special assistant on disarmament, who, fresh from his blundering direction of the Foreign Operations Agency, made the secret concessions permitting machinery and materials for munitions and war materials to be sold to the Reds. That was in a 15-nation agreement in August of 1954.

For 18 months the Reds have known what trade items were involved. For 18 months the British, biggest beneficiaries under the agreement, have known. But the American people, who are footing the biggest bill of all in the fight against communism, have been kept in the dark.

In fact, Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate subcommittee probing the affair, indignantly charges governmental agencies acting in concert have done everything to hinder and hamper the committee's efforts.

Weeks as well as other administration leaders can hardly fail to realize the inconsistency involved. On one hand we prohibit, and rightly so, United States manufacturers from selling strategic goods to Red buyers, and we go all out, with military and foreign economic aid, to combat the Communist threat all over the world. On the other hand, we made secret concessions to our allies which allow them to fatten up the war machine of the enemy.

In defending the administration's role in the matter, Weeks said the United States made the best deal it could in the 1954 agreement.

That is a sad admission. It amounts to an agreement to help the enemy in order to help our allies, whom we already are helping with billions of foreign aid. We can't win with any such policy.

[From the Boston Post of March 12, 1956]

AID AND TRADE

Tied in with the foreign-aid program, which has cost the American people so many billions to support a host of quondam friends and passive enemies that even the most prodigal one-worlder shudders at the bill, is the administration's flat refusal to provide the Congress with a list of embargoed items in East-West trade.

This is not an election year controversy cooked up to bemuse the electorate, but a perilous area in which the Government has been less than candid with the people. There are evidences that the military power of the Soviet Union and its satellites is being aided by shipments of strategic goods from the West, including large shipments from Britain and through European factors, from United States.

The State Department has planned a $5 billion foreign-aid program to submit to the Congress. Harold Stassen, former director of foreign-aid programs, didn't do the State Department program any good when he flatly refused to provide the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee with the needed information on embargoed items.

Secretary Dulles, who learned at the Karachi Conference that the Soviet Union is as hostile as ever, thinks that long-term commitments to foreign aid are essential. Such friends as Egypt, seeking money to build the Aswan High Dam while stalking United States with a knife, are the long-term beneficiaries of this foreign-aid program. And India, assured only yesterday that United States would dump Pakistan over the side if Pakistan took military action to defend its borders against aggression, is another beneficiary.

East-West trade is being used by the Soviet Union to acquire the war industry which the Russians and Red Chinese must have to mount a campaign of aggression against the free world. There are Western nations capable of almost any kind of treachery for a

quick profit. That is the forlorn fact with which United States policy must live.

Trade has become a weapon of enormous significance in the cold war. In fact, the Soviet Union employs trade and aid interchangeably. Aid is tied to trade in all the Soviet deals and the nations of the neutralist bloc love it. A sample in proof is the red carpet treatment Bulganin and Khrushchev got in India for agreeing to swap heavy machinery for Indian products, and the cold shoulder given Dulles, who was offering to support India against Pakistan in any kind of a contest between the two nations on the Indian subcontinent.

Stassen's flat refusal of the information sought by the Senate subcommittee is not an isolated action. The administration has consistently refused, despite many reasonable requests, the list which would disclose what is or is not embargoed.

It is reasonable for the people to want to know to whom and for what purpose they are supplying the sinews of war to nations which have for their central policy the destruction of western capitalism.

[From the Wall Street Journal of March 14, 1956]

QUESTIONS AND NO ANSWERS

Some years back the Congress passed a law which placed an embargo on shipment to Iron Curtain countries of goods which might help their warmaking potential. The law gave the executive department a pretty free hand about adding or removing certain goods from the bans.

Some 2 years ago restrictions on East-West trade were eased by the Government on the ground that Western European countries were hard pressed to find markets for some of their goods.

Now the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations wants to find out whether relaxation of restrictions has permitted allies of the United States to supply the Soviet Union and its satellites with goods that actually do aid the East's war potential.

At the time the law was passed it may have been a wise and necessary safeguard in the view of the Government. And when the embargo was relaxed that may also have been thought a wise and necessary act. The trouble is, nobody but a few people in the executive department know the reasons why some goods that once were considered dangerous to trade to Russia are no longer considered dangerous.

And these few people aren't talking. Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks was asked if he would, please, give the Senators a list of goods released from the bans. He was asked if he would, please, tell what were the recommendations of a Joint Operating Committee—headed by a Commerce Department official—about relaxing trade.

Mr. Weeks refused to say. He took the position that the answers to the questions the Senators asked were classified and privileged. What the executive branch had done was its business and it wasn't any business of the Congress.

Well, we think it is the business of the Congress. Congress passed the law, and Congress has a duty to know how the law is working—whether it is a good law or a bad law, or whether it is a law that is being abused.

And where Congress is denied that knowledge how can Congress possibly legislate responsibility?

[From the Chicago American of March 19, 1956]

AIDING THE ENEMY

Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, has taken an unassailable position on the grave matter of the relaxed trade controls which unquestionably gave the Communists a stronger military position in the world.

He insists the vital interests of the American people are deeply involved in this matter, that full information about it has been withheld from them, and that there has been reckless violation of their rights as citizens and needless impairment of their security.

As chairman of the Senate's Permanent Investigations Subcommittee which has been looking into the matter, Mr. MCCLELLAN has brought out abundant evidence that every increase in economic strength we contribute to the Communists enhances their military power by the same measure.

As the Hearst newspapers so often have said, we might just as well send the Communists weapons and munitions in the first place as to sell them the machine tools with which to make them.

Whatever we sell the Communist nations it releases just that much of their own facilities for the production of war tools. We cannot provide the Communists with shoestrings without relieving them of the necessity of making their own, and thus making it possible for them to put more of their industrial plants into military production.

But not all of our recent trade with the Communists under the relaxed controls has been as innocent as shoestrings.

It must send a chill down the spines of all thoughtful Americans to know that, as Senator MCCLELLAN reports, "there is conclusive, undisputed, and unrefuted proof that liberalization of controls has enabled the Russians to buy strategic war materials."

[From the Iron Age of March 22, 1956]

LET'S NOT KID OURSELVES

There is nothing wrong with President Eisenhower's recent statement that our allies must live tradewise. They must trade outside their borders. If we don't buy from them, someone else must.

Our allies have to remain strong so they will not be a pushover for the Communists. That's what we want. That's the plan we have been supporting—and helping to pay for. But this is unrelated to some of the nonsense being passed out at Washington hearings about strategic material shipped to the Reds.

Some of the explanations about Iron Curtain shipments of copper, machine tools, and other machinery are asinine. Copper is in short supply—in any form—and is a defense item.

The Reds want copper—wire, scrap, or any form—for defense or war purposes. Even if the wire they got from the free world was for peaceful purposes, that would release their own output for war or other aggressive uses. There is no excuse for Russia's big copper windfall.

Machine tools build up heavy industry. The Reds are hellbent for heavy industry gains. If we or our allies unwittingly contribute machine tools to the Reds, we aid, abet, and support their drive to: (a) Build a war machine; (b) release their capacity for more heavy industry use; and (c) allow them the tools to overcome us in an economic war in Asia.

If our top diplomats and officials don't recognize the Red menace in all its forms, how can we expect the man on the street to be aware of the danger to our freedom and future?

Most of the delayed explanation given recently about Red trade is intellectual drivel. It doesn't answer the basic question: Why should the United States countenance or agree to strategic material trade with nations whose avowed purpose is to knock us out eventually by any means possible?

Anyone in his right senses doesn't ward off a mortal blow with right hand and give the other fellow a new sword with his left. Whatever we do in this serious East-West trade situation, let's not kid ourselves.

[From the National Review of March 28, 1956]

THE MCCLELLAN INVESTIGATION

In this issue, Mr. Bozell reports on the ingenious devices uncovered by the Senate investigating committee for getting around the law of the land and permitting our allies to trade, extensively and in material of direct importance to a nation's warmaking potential, with the Soviet Union. The story is sordid in its denuding of the materialistic amorality of our allies, and in its exposure of the willingness of our own Government to cooperate in efforts at pulling the wool over the eyes of Congress and the American people. Finally the story is an arresting demonstration of a bureaucracy in almost complete control, of a massive and arrogant contempt, by the executive, for the legislative. In getting to the root of the matter, Senator MCCLELLAN deserves the gratitude of a Nation concerned to press the fight against communism, and restore the division of power in its own Government.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY—A REPORT ON THE MCCLELLAN INVESTIGATION

(By L. Brent Bozell)

One day early last month, after conferring with Sir Anthony Eden, Mr. Eisenhower announced the United States was ready to study British proposals for revising current restrictions on trade with the minor partner of the Communist entente, Red China.

The same day, by perverse coincidence, the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations (now headed by Senator MCCLELLAN) scheduled open hearings on a related matter, namely: on what happened after the United States sat down with its allies, 2 years ago, to consider revising the trade embargo against the entente's major partner. Despite strenuous administration opposition to a public airing of the matter, the McClellan committee has since listened to a hair-raising tale of current, United States-authorized, strategic trade with the Soviet Union—one that shows that United States-China trade negotiators are haggling over whether it is safe to leave the back door ajar when the front door is standing wide open.

Testimony heard by the committee so far makes several conclusions inescapable:

The United States, in August 1954, by agreeing to delete or downgrade approximately 200 of 450 items from the free world's strategic embargo list, made the most damaging concessions yet (vis-a-vis world communism) to its allies; even taking into account Mr. Truman's agreement to confine the Korean war.

In making the concessions, the administration violated the spirit, if not also the letter, of the Battle Act of 1951 (see below).

In order to conceal the nature and extent of the concessions, administration officials resorted, at the time, to positive falsification.

In order to keep congressional discoveries to a minimum now that the McClellan committee is on the track, the administration is defending a plainly indefensible application of executive secrecy orders. For example, in the name of security, the administration is refusing to divulge the official list of disembargoed items, even though the Soviet Union can find out what is available merely by putting in a purchase order.

Then, there is this major conclusion to be drawn:

American taxpayers are currently subsidizing, in part, the construction of the Soviet war machine (see box at end of article).

That the United States was permitting friendly nations on its payroll to ship to the Soviet Union highly strategic machine tools, metals, electronic and transportation equipment, etc., was known to the committee before it started its hearings. That fact had

been established through months of painstaking research and investigation, begun during Senator McCarthy's tenure, and continued under the direction of McClellan's able and persevering chief counsel, Robert Kennedy. The staff's information had come principally from three sources: ex-administration officials, no longer bound by secrecy orders; incumbent lower echelon officials, who talked relatively freely until they received specific gag orders from heads of departments; and foreign trade journals that had made public, over a year ago, much of the information the administration refused to furnish for security reasons. The questions the committee still wanted answered were: Why had the United States agreed to relax strategic trade controls? And who in the administration had been responsible for the decision?

The concessions had been necessary, administration officials asserted, because our allies had insisted on increased trade with the Soviet bloc as the price of keeping the Western alliance a going concern. On the issue of who had decided (a) that the alliance would be jeopardized if the United States insisted on retaining pre-1954 controls and (b) how high a price the United States was prepared to pay to avoid jeopardizing the alliance, the administration seemed determined to keep the Congress as ignorant as possible.

The committee was forced, in the circumstances, to undertake a tedious expedition into heretofore unexplored reaches of the Federal bureaucracy.

HOW UNITED STATES EMBARGO POLICY IS MADE

The committee learned, to begin with, that United States embargo policy, as it affects United States exporters, and United States embargo policy, as it affects allied exporters, are very different things. Though Congress apparently intended similar policies, and though Executive machinery exists for making them similar, that is not the way they end up; and one of the committee's questions became, why?

Before the Marshall plan gave the United States an effective voice in allied export policy, the United States embargo affected only American exporters, and it was handled by the Department of Commerce. Until 1948 Commerce relied upon an informal committee to decide what could be shipped to the Soviet bloc; the chairman of that committee, interestingly enough, was William Remington, later convicted of perjury for falsely denying membership in the Communist Party.

In 1948 the embargo was formalized by Congress and included both domestic and international controls. The Export Control Act authorized the Secretary of Commerce, with the advice of other executive departments, to refuse export licenses for shipment of strategic goods to the Soviet bloc. The Secretary established the Advisory Committee on Export Policy (ACEP), representing the interested departments, to advise him as to the strategic value of specific items. ACEP was instructed to weigh United States needs for the items, as well as their value to the Soviets. The Secretary thereupon published a list of banned goods, which has come to be known as the United States positive list.

Concurrently, the Economic Cooperation Act authorized the ECA Administrator to seek the cooperation of countries receiving United States aid in enforcing a joint anti-Communist embargo. To coordinate the embargo, the Marshall countries set up the International Organization for Strategic Trade Control, a consultative group that now represents all NATO countries, plus Japan. This organization operates through two committees—the Coordinating Committee (COCOM), which supervises trade with Eastern Europe, and the China Committee (CHINCOM), which deals with China and Korea trade. COCOM and CHINCOM classify items as to whether they are to be (a) embargoed completely, (b) shipped in limited quotas, or (c) put on a watch list to ascertain whether trade is kept within safe limits. The result is the ultrasecret[1] international list.

In the Battle Act of 1951, Congress took steps to tighten United States control over allied export policy. The Battle Act declared it to be "the policy of the United States that no military, economic, or financial assistance shall be supplied to any nation unless it applies an embargo * * * on the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic-energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and the implements of war to any nation [in the Soviet bloc]." Termination of United States aid is mandatory if strategic weapons (as opposed to strategic production materials) are shipped to the Communists. As for production materials, aid may be continued in a case where the President finds unusual circumstances, and determines that cutting off aid would be clearly detrimental to United States security; but even then the President must immediately report the exception to Congress. The prior and therefore critical determination as to what production items are strategic is to be made under the act, by the Battle Act administrator. In 1954, when the United States agreed to relax the embargo, the Battle Act administrator was Harold Stassen.

ADVICE FROM OTHER GROUPS

The Battle Act administrator, in making up the Battle Act list (of proscribed items for export by countries receiving United States aid), is, like the Secretary of Commerce in making up the United States positive list, required to seek the advice of other interested departments. The Economic Defense Advisory Committee (EDAC) was thus established as the Battle Act counterpart to ACEP; and both groups were placed under the National Security Council.

ACEP and EDAC soon realized they had common problems, decided to merge on the operational level. The result was the Joint Operating Committee (JOC), which thereupon bore the responsibility for evaluating United States technical advice on both domestic and international embargo policy; and which, as a result, figured prominently in the McClellan hearings. Although JOC's recommendations, as to whether specific items should be disembargoed, theoretically reflected the combined views of four departments (State, Defense, Commerce, and the Foreign Operations Administration[2]), they were, in the last analysis, the recommendations of its Chairman, Mr. Herbert Blackman, who was empowered, under JOC's rules, to resolve disagreements.

JOC's experts were not, however, given a free rein—once the decision had been made on a higher level to relax the allied embargo. JOC's recommendations as to the strategic value of specific items had to conform to criteria prescribed by EDAC (headed by Mr. Stassen), and passed on by the National Security Council. Moreover, recommendations by JOC were subject to an appeal to EDAC or the Council by the head of any of the represented departments.

In sum, during 1953 and 1954, when Western European countries intensified pressures on the United States to relax the anti-Communist embargo, the preliminary United States decisions, as to what goods were strategic, were made by JOC. Under the law, however, the final determination with regard to exports by nations receiving United States aid had to be made by Mr. Stassen (the Battle Act); and with regard to United States exports, by Secretary Weeks (the Export Control Act). Mr. Stassen was clearly on the hot seat: if the United States could not persuade COCOM nations to hold the line on strategic production materials, Mr. Stassen would have to see to it that the United States changed its views as to what items were strategic. Otherwise, President Eisenhower would be forced either to terminate United States foreign aid or to offer to Congress predictably unpalatable explanations as to why that aid was not terminated.

1954: YEAR OF CONCESSIONS

Late in 1953 the Soviet Government stepped up its campaign on behalf of increased East-West trade. In January 1954 a British trade mission visited Moscow to discuss the sort of business the Communists had in mind. And within a month, on February 25, Prime Minister Churchill told Commons the free world ought to relax its embargo against Eastern Europe. In March, the United States proposed a review of the COCOM international list. Later that month, in London, Mr. Stassen for the United States, Peter Thorneycroft (president of the British Board of Trade) for the United Kingdom, and Maurice Schuman for France, reached an agreement in principle as to the kind of relaxation the United States would permit. This tripartite agreement was turned over for implementation to COCOM.

Meanwhile, JOC was busy, on the technical level, preparing the United States position for the COCOM negotiations. JOC had begun a crash review of items theretofore considered strategic, sometime in January 1954—strongly suggesting the United States had decided to go along with British demands a good while before Mr. Churchill applied public pressure in his Commons speech. Mr. Stassen's EDAC had laid down criteria for decontrols. Within that framework, JOC, convening 3 or 4 times a week from January to June, reevaluated United States views on the strategic value of specific items.

Despite intensive, and often angry, questioning of administration officials by the McClellan committee, most of what went on at those meetings remains a dark secret. These facts, however, have been established:

1. JOC recommended that approximately one-third of the items on the pre-1954 strategic list be disembargoed, including 77 machine tools.

2. The Department of Defense vigorously objected to most of the deletions, possibly to all of them.[3] Defense representatives on JOC pointed out, not only that such tools and materials were immensely valuable in Soviet war production, but that all of the metals and minerals in question were on the United States critical stockpile list. Since many of these were (and are) in short supply in the United States (Defense argued) why not make arrangements for the United States to buy them instead of allowing our allies to sell them to the Communists? In some cases, Defense appealed JOC's decision to the National Security Council—and in at

[1] The administration's refusal to permit publication of the international list is one of the McClellan committee's major frustrations. The British positive list for Eastern Europe presumably corresponds with the COCOM international list (unless the British are violating COCOM agreements), and the British list was published in October 1954.

[2] After July 1, 1955, the International Cooperation Administration.

[3] Certainly to all of those listed at the end of this article. Defense Department witnesses, early in the hearings, testified more or less freely as to what their views had been on decontrolling specific items. However, before they had got through the list, the administration decreed that all Department recommendations were to be treated as privileged and forbade ther disclosure to the commitee.

least one instance, successfully. Petroleum was originally deleted from the embargo by JOC, but restored after a Defense appeal.

3. EDAC's criteria for reevaluating strategic items (at least as they were interpreted by State, Commerce, and FOA) appear to have included this basic instruction: if a given item is useful in peaceful industrial production, as well as in war production, it should not be considered strategic. In other words, since aluminum can be used to produce pots as well as bombers, aluminum could be sent to the Soviet Union.

The McClellan committee got nowhere in trying to find out (a) how JOC had recommended on specific items; (b) whether JOC's list had been altered subsequently at the EDAC level; and (c) how the final United States position had fared at the COCOM negotiations. It learned only that COCOM, during the summer of 1954, had prepared a new international list; that nearly half the items theretofore considered strategic had been dropped from or downgraded on the new list; that the United States Battle Act list had been adjusted accordingly on the authority of Mr. Stassen; and that the United States positive list (of strategic items banned in United States trade with the Soviet bloc) remained unchanged.

This was, however, considerably more than Congress or the public had been told when the deed was done. The first news of the COCOM agreements had come from the Department of Commerce on August 26, 1954: "Recent international agreements," the Department announced, will "provide an opportunity for increased trade in peaceful goods," and will "continue the embargo on those goods which are of importance to the military capacity of the Soviet bloc." Shortly thereafter, Battle Act Administrator Stassen advised:

"I am convinced that this revision which has been made with the concurrence of the Department of State, Treasury, Defense, and Commerce, and approved by the President, will result in a net advantage to the free world of expanded peaceful trade and more effective control of the war potential items."

EVEN MORE MISLEADING

In November 1954, when the time came to give Congress the required annual Battle Act report, Mr. Stassen was more specific and even more misleading. Stassen told Congress that, inter alia, "Minerals and metals of basic importance to the Soviet military power such as aluminum, copper, nickel, molybdenum, cobalt, magnesium, tungsten, and titanium remain on the * * * embargo list." This despite the facts, now established, that—

Pure aluminum was removed from the embargo as were a number of aluminum alloys.

Unprocessed copper remained on the embargo, but the finished product, in the form of highly strategic copper wire,[4] was taken off.

Nickel alloys up to 30 percent were removed from the embargo.

Molybdenum alloys up to 20 percent were removed from the embargo.

Magnesium was removed from the embargo.

Mr. Stassen also reported: "The revised electric power-equipment group in the embargo list includes heavy power-generating equipment which is significant to the Soviet bloc war potential, but excludes such items as outboard motors, condenser tubes and smaller sizes of motors, generators, and diesel engines." The McClellan committee learned, however, that 60,000-kilowatt generators, 85,000-horsepower turbines, and 12,500-brake horsepower electric motors were taken off the list. (Far from being in the outboard motor category, the 12,500-brake horsepower motor is one of the largest made.)

DELIBERATE CIRCUMVENTION

But even more serious, in the committee's eyes, than Mr. Stassen's fibs was Mr. Stassen's and the administration's flagrant disregard for the intent of Congress as declared in the Battle Act. Stassen may have been right in maintaining, as he did when he testified before the McClellan committee, that United States failure to go along with allied demands to ease the embargo might well have shattered the Western alliance; and, consequently, might have resulted in a greater relaxation of Western controls than actually took place. But the momentous test remained that Congress had passed a law which instructed the executive branch what to do in such a predicament. Mr. Stassen had deliberately circumvented the act's instruction to cut off aid to countries that insist on shipping strategic goods to the Soviets (or, in the alternative, to report to Congress the reasons for not doing so)—by the simple stratagem of deciding that items our allies wanted most to sell were, for purposes of allied trade, not strategic.

Perhaps, by this device, the administration complied with the letter of the Battle Act; though, again, perhaps not. One of the questions the McClellan committee will raise in its report is whether the Battle Act was violated by Mr. Stassen's failure to treat the COCOM agreement and the resultant revision of the Battle Act list as the kind of exceptions to congressional policy that must, under the provisions of the act, be reported to Congress.

But little will have been achieved by the McClellan investigation if the Committee, or Congress itself, misses the point about who is calling the turns on free-world strategy. The basic decisions are not being made by Congress, and not even by the executive branch of the American Government; but by nations which, for some purposes, have entered into a de facto alliance with the enemy.

Items that nations receiving United States aid may ship to Soviet bloc	War Production uses
Horizontal boring machines (costs $200,000 to $500,000).	Tanks, artillery, aircraft aircraft carrier catapult parts, atom reactors for *Nautilus* class submarines.
Precision boring mills	Radar control mechanisms, jet engines, guided missile components.
Vertical boring mills	Jet engines, guided missiles turbines, aircraft armament.
Hydraulic and mechanical presses.	Aircraft parts (e. g.,wings), shell casings.
Dynamic balancing machines.	Guided missile engines, gyros, radar control, turbines.
Surface grinding machines.	Jet engines, guided missiles radar, gyros.
Copper wire	Aircraft engines, communications.
Aluminum	Aircraft construction shells.
Magnesium	Aircraft construction transportation vehicles, bomb casings.
Asbestos	Cable insulation, gas mask filters.
Talc	Spacer in electronic tubes.
Corundum	Munitions hardware.
Graphite	Making crucibles for heating metals at high temperatures.
Mica	Spacer in electronic tubes.
Quartz Crystal	Electronics field, in general.
Nickel alloy (30 percent)	Heavy construction parts.
Beryllium alloy (50 percent).	Atomic reactors.
Zirconium alloy (50 percent).	Do.
Molybdenum alloy (20 percent).	Jet aircraft parts.
Power generators up to 60,000 kilowatts. Turbines up to 85,000 horsepower.	Making of fissionable material.
Diesel engines, steam locomotives, flatcars, well cars, other railroad equipment.	
Electronics equipment	
Radio transmitters	

[4] The committee adduced the further facts that since August 1954 over 200 million pounds of copper wire have been shipped by the free world to the Soviet bloc, that Britain is the principal shipper, and that the United States is providing a direct subsidy to British copper mines in Rhodesia. Moreover, copper is on the United States critical stockpile list; during 1954 and 1955 the United States found it necessary to divert 150 million pounds of copper from its stockpile for current industrial use.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, how can one Senator yield the floor to another Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A Senator cannot do that, of course.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I did not attempt to do that. I will stay for a question or two, if any Senator wishes to ask me a question.

Mr. MUNDT. My purpose in raising the question, Mr. President, is that I have had my name at the desk, seeking recognition. I was wondering what kind of preliminary arrangement could be made so that one Senator might yield the floor to another.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I simply yielded the floor. The Senator from Missouri was on his feet, and I suppose he thought he had the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The name of the Senator from South Dakota has been at the desk, and he will be recognized as the next speaker.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield for a question.

Mr. BENDER. I happen to be a minority member of the committee which has had before it the questions discussed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who is the chairman of the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, may I yield the floor to whomever the Chair will recognize? I regret that I must leave the Chamber, but I am late for attendance at a committee meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the senior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I am a minority member of the Committee on Government Operations. As a minority member, I believe I have attended as many of the hearings as has any other member of the committee. We must appreciate the fact that we are dealing with 15 nations on a wholly voluntary basis.

The truth of the matter is that, in fact, and I say this emphatically—our country is not doing business with Soviet Russia or with any of her satellites. We are working with 15 member countries as a voluntary organization. There is no law, rule, or way in which we can compel any of our alleged allies not to deal with

the Soviet Union or its satellites. We have no way of controlling such commerce. But I say emphatically that the United States is not doing any business with Russia. Our policy is not to do business with Russia. The President has been outspoken, as all the members of his official family have been outspoken, in their insistence upon not permitting anyone in private industry or the Government itself to do business with any organizations of the Soviet Union or its satellites.

If any of the 15 nations decontrols any items, the only thing the United States can do is to attempt to persuade them not to do business with the Soviet Union or its satellites. We shall have to use persuasion. The United States has been successful in retaining control of about half the items which were originally controlled in the voluntary organization.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENDER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio does not have the floor.

Mr. BENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield so that I may ask the Senator from Ohio a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Ohio and I sat through the hearings. Would not the Senator from Ohio agree with me that although the President has asked for $4.8 billion for our allies, or our alleged allies, Congress should not give them any money if they intend to continue shipping weapons of war to Soviet Russia?

For example, as the Senator from Ohio knows, we built railroads into the British copper mines in Rhodesia. We built docks as a part of the fight against communism. The mines are producing about 250 million pounds of copper which will be manufactured into wire, which is an extremely important item in the building of jet planes and other parts of the Communist war machine.

Getting back to the question, does not the Senator from Ohio agree with me that the United States cannot, in good faith, appropriate $4.8 billion to allies who are shipping to Soviet Russia and her satellites the machine tools and material which can be used to manufacture weapons of war?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BENDER. Is the United States of America prepared, and is it powerful enough, to fight Soviet Russia and the Communist satellites by itself?

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask the Senator from Ohio, Why in heaven's name do we grant money to allies who are supplying weapons which will strengthen the Communist war economy? Should we not, under the Battle Act, cut off aid to any of the countries which are shipping machine tools, copper wire, aluminum, and all the other items which will go into the Soviet war economy?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from South Dakota permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BENDER. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if it is not a fact that the United States has continually decreased the amount of aid we have given to our allies, and that, in fact, our gifts today to our allies are practically nil compared with what they were 3 or 4 years ago?

Mr. McCARTHY. The administration has asked for $4.8 billion. I read the President's message the other day. He said we should give this amount even if it means the elimination of some of our domestic projects.

I do not wish to take more of the time of the Senator from South Dakota, so I make the final comment that I cannot think of any reason on God's earth why the United States should give $4 billion or $5 billion to allies who are shipping weapons of war to Soviet Russia. By so doing, we are unfortunately building up the Soviet war economy. That will mean that if a war shall come, the young men of America will die in battle because American dollars were given to our alleged allies.

Mr. BENDER. I may say in reply to the Senator from Wisconsin, who is a good friend of mine, and for whom I have great respect, and I say it also to the country, as a responsible Member of the Senate, that no one in the United States will say that either President Eisenhower or his administration is interested in or is in any way endeavoring to build up the enemy on any front.

Under the circumstances, I think it is important that we understand this matter clearly. Our problem is to deal with countries like France, for example. France is our ally, but 35 or 40 percent of the members of France's legislative body belong to the Communist Party. Italy is our ally, as well. Yet the Communists received almost 50 percent of the popular votes. In England, the Communists have much more freewheeling than they have here in the United States.

All of these matters are relative. We have to face realities. We cannot fight communism throughout the world by ourselves. We need friends and we need allies. We deplore the fact that any one of our allies may be doing business with the Soviets. We are doing every conceivable thing we can to keep them from carrying on such trade. However, if we do not have a voluntary organization, all items will be decontrolled. We have kept control on over 200 items that are vital. As a result of the organization, which is wholly voluntary, we have been able to use our influence and power in keeping the Soviets from having all of the advantages that we ourselves and our potential alleged allies have.

I am not defending England, France, Belgium, Italy, or any other country for doing business with the Soviets, but we do not control their governments; we control our own. On the basis of our own control, I say, as strongly as I can, that we can only endeavor to persuade them.

I do not think the American people will believe that President Eisenhower, John Hollister—who has charge of the program, and who was a former law partner of Robert A. Taft—Herbert Hoover, Jr., Sinclair Weeks, and all these other men who are part of the administration, want to do anything to strengthen the Communists or implement them in any way.

I wish also to say it is most unfortunate that the inference has gone forth that, as a result of this organization, the administration is going to do something that is dishonest or contrary to good policy and good ethics.

I want to say also that nothing has been produced by the committee, in its deliberations, to indicate that any of those men are insincere or that they are indifferent to the problem confronting us.

Our principal problem in the world today is the Communist problem, and we did not create it; we inherited it. This administration is doing its best to fight it. We did not create or promote the condition that exists in Poland. Poland, which is a 97-percent Catholic country, is run by the Communists, not by men chosen by the Polish people. But because "deals" were made at Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran, the governments of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, China, and other nations are now under Communist domination.

President Eisenhower did not create that situation, nor did Harold Stassen, nor did John Hollister, nor did Sinclair Weeks. We are being forced to fight it, and we are fighting it with the best possible implements we have. The voluntary organization which was created is doing an excellent job—not as good a job as it would like to do. It is terribly disappointed because some of the countries which are our allies yield to the Soviets and give them vital information; but it is not American money that is being used to assist the Soviets, and it is not American machinery that is being used for that purpose.

I have great respect for the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], who has done so much to make America sensitive and conscious of the Communist threat; but I wish to say to him that we must be careful not to give the impression that we are yielding to the Communists, or that President Eisenhower or any member of his administration is in any way implementing the Communist world because of any volunteer organization of which we are a part, or of an organization with which we meet, or that we endeavor to have comply with rules we ourselves make.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENDER. We cannot make rules for the other countries; we can make rules only for ourselves. Is that not true, I ask the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator yield to me? I do not want to take any more of his time——

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to resume my right to the floor, so I can begin my statement. I shall yield one more time to the Senator from Wisconsin, and then to the Senator from Ohio, and then claim my right to the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. I desire to say to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] that, while I disagree with him wholeheartedly in his attitude during the hearings and on the floor of the Senate today, I still think his record is good enough to lead me to come to Ohio and campaign for him, if he thought it would help.

Mr. BENDER. I appreciate the Senator's kindness. I appreciate his good will, and the Senator knows how I feel about him and about my colleagues in the Senate, not only on our side, but on the other side. I do not question the motives of any Member of this body.

THE CASE FOR SEGREGATION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a very fine article entitled "The Case for Segregation," which appears in the April 3, 1956, issue of Look magazine. It was written by one of the most distinguished Members of this body, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

As a former justice on the North Carolina Supreme Court, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina is a learned student of the law and our Constitution. As a resident of North Carolina for all the years of his life, and a public servant most of that time, he is most familiar with local conditions in the Southland, and is thus in a position to know what is feasible and best for his people economically, socially, and politically.

In writing this fine article, Mr. President, he has done a masterful job in presenting to the readers of Look magazine the case for continued segregation in our public schools. I hope that many others will have a chance to read this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have two other items placed in the body of the RECORD, along with Senator ERVIN'S article. One is a resolution passed on March 21, 1956, by the South Carolina Democratic Convention, in Columbia, S. C. The other is a well-written editorial, from the March 20 issue of the Greenville (S. C.) News, entitled "A Nonsoutherner Who Understands." This editorial concerns Mr. David Lawrence, one of the most able columnists and editors in America.

There being no objection, the article, resolution, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE OF SEGREGATION

(By SAM J. ERVIN, JR., United States Senator from North Carolina)

The issue of racial segregation is surcharged with emotional tensions and mental misunderstandings.

I believe in racial segregation as it exists in the South today.

Southerners of both races practice racial segregation in those areas of life which are essentially social in nature. There is little other racial segregation in the South.

As it exists in the South, racial segregation does not prevent a southerner of either race from forming warm and mutually helpful friendships with members of the other race. Interracial friendships of this character are, in fact, commonplace in the South.

The reasons for my belief in social segregation based on race are simple. They do not rest on any theory of racial superiority or racial inferiority.

Despite the clamor of sincere persons, professional agitators and political opportunists to the contrary, racial segregation is not the offspring of racial bigotry or racial prejudice. It results from the exercise of a fundamental American freedom—the freedom to select one's associates. Whenever Americans are at liberty to choose their own associates, they virtually always select within their own race. It is not strange that this is so.

This freedom is bottomed on a basic law of nature—the law that like seeks like. It is one of the most precious of human rights, because man finds his greatest happiness when he is among people of similar cultural, historical and social background.

A great many people of both the white and Negro races are deeply disturbed by the proposals to abolish racial segregation in those areas of life which are essentially social in nature. They realize that if a valid law requiring desegregation should be adopted, they would no longer have the freedom to select their associates. They would be forced to associate by legal formula rather than by personal preference.

Social segregation based on race is an actual condition and not a mere theory in the South. It is indeed, recognized by the vast majority of southerners, both white and Negro, as an acceptable way of life for both races.

These things being true, no one other than a zealot blinded by fanaticism or an opportunist playing the dangerous game of racial exploitation will say that racial segregation as it exists in the South can be abolished by court decree or legislative fiat in the twinkling of an eye. Racial segregation, meanwhile, has not robbed southern Negroes of major economic opportunities. In many southern cities, they operate banks, insurance companies, public-transportation systems and other substantial business enterprises.

The South as a region has many troublesome problems other than that of race—problems arising out of poverty and its Siamese twins, ill health and ignorance. Sincere southerners, white and Negro, work together to find solutions for these problems. These southerners are often hindered in their efforts by the bungling activities of well-meaning persons residing in distant sections of the country. These persons overlook the problems lying on their own doorsteps in their zeal to reconstruct the South once again.

Josh Billings once said: "It is better to be ignorant than to know what ain't so."

These well-meaning intermeddlers are not ignorant but, unfortunately for the South, they "know what ain't so" as far as southern problems are concerned. They are, I must admit, quite human in their cocksureness concerning racial problems. They are confident that they have all the answers for any racial problem in the South, even though their geographical, residential, financial, and social stations isolate them completely from all personal contact with southern conditions.

These interfering outsiders, who weep because they think the South is cruel to its children when it segregates them on the basis of race in the public schools, simply ignore the hundreds of thousands of Negro children who are actually segregated in schools in northern cities by gerrymandered school districts embracing the ghettos where Negroes live.

They likewise overlook the discrimination practiced against Negroes in the North in respect to employment as teachers in public schools. North Carolina alone, with a Negro population of 1,047,353, employs 8,459 Negro schoolteachers—while in 12 States east of the Mississippi and north of the Mason-Dixon line, there are 3,351,402 Negroes and only 7,712 Negro teachers.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS ARE SOCIAL UNITS

The present attack on racial segregation is spearheaded mainly by three groups: well-meaning outsiders, whose unfamiliarity with the South causes them to "darken counsel by words without knowledge"; political opportunists who hanker after votes; and Negro leaders, who demand that all governmental powers be diverted from their proper functions to force the involuntary mixing of the races.

Southern States insist on segregating their children in their public schools according to race because people in these States realize that public schools are social and educational institutions of a local character.

They know that the social commingling of the races is alien to the way of life of southerners of both races. They are satisfied that the children of both races will make the most satisfactory progress in the relaxed atmosphere of segregated schools.

They are convinced, moreover, that the march of the South toward the good life for all its people will be substantially impeded if its public schools are converted into laboratories for sociological experiments in race relations.

These views merit earnest consideration by other sections of the country. After all, the Southern States know something about their racial problem. They live with it day by day and, notwithstanding their comparative poverty, spend far more money for the education of Negroes than all the other States.

But southerners are told somewhat angrily by meddling outsiders that they are not now even privileged to entertain or express their honest opinions as to the desirability of having their own public schools operated on a segregated basis. The reason given southerners for their loss of the basic American rights of freedom of thought and freedom of speech is this: On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision entitled *"Brown* v. *Board of Education,"* holding that the 14th amendment to the Constitution forbids the States to segregate white and Negro children in their public schools solely on the basis of race.

The 14th amendment became effective July 28, 1868. Until May 17, 1954—a period of 86 years—the executive branches of the Federal and State governments, Congress, State legislatures, and Federal and State courts declared by their words and deeds that under the Constitution of the United States each State reserved the power to control its public schools, that a State could establish and operate separate schools for white and Negro children, and that such action by a State did not conflict in any way with the 14th amendment.

The Supreme Court of the United States itself stamped this interpretation of the Constitution with its express approval in two of its decisions—in 1896 and in 1927.

In their opinion in *Brown* v. *Board of Education,* Chief Justice Warren and his associates repudiated upon the basis of psychology and sociology the interpretation placed upon the Constitution in general and the 14th amendment in particular during those preceding 86 years.

In so doing, they said, "We cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the amendment was adopted, or even to 1896 when *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (in which the Court approved the separate-but-equal doctrine) was written." They clearly implied that their novel decision was based on this astounding constitutional philosophy: The Constitution automatically amends itself from time to time without any change in its wording and without any action by the Congress and the States as required by article V; and the scope and times of the automatic amendments are determinable by the Supreme Court alone.

If this philosophy prevails, the Constitution will be reduced to a worthless scrap of

paper, the American system of government will perish, and the States and their citizens will become helpless subjects of a judicial oligarchy.

The unsoundness of this constitutional philosophy is manifest if recourse is had to the writings of Judge Thomas M. Cooley, of Michigan, one of the greatest authorities of all time on the American Constitution. Judge Cooley held that written constitutions are framed "with a view to putting the fundamentals of government" beyond the control of "the varing moods of public opinion"; that the meaning of a written constitution "is fixed when it is adopted and * * * is not different at any subsequent time when a court has occasion to pass upon it;" that "a court * * * which should allow a change in public sentiment to influence it in giving to a written constitution a construction not warranted by the intention of its founders would be justly chargeable with reckless disregard of official oath and public duty"; and that if such a course should become a precedent, a written constitution "would be of little avail."

The interfering outsiders, the political opportunists and the Negro leaders do not stop with denying to southerners freedom of thought and of speech. They say further that the oaths of southerners to support the Constitution bind them to accept the 1954 decision as sacrosanct; and if southerners question the rightness of that decision, they are offering violence to the Constitution itself.

WHO DOES VIOLENCE TO THE CONSTITUTION?

These assertions leave southern laymen somewhat bewildered. They cannot grasp how it is that their oaths to support the Constitution compel them to accept what Chief Justice Warren and his associates said about the 14th amendment; whereas the oaths of Chief Justice Warren and his associates to support the Constitution permit them to reject what their judicial predecessors said on the same subject.

The charge that one offers violence to the Constitution if he question the correctness of a decision of the Supreme Court is not new. It was made against Abraham Lincoln by Stephen A. Douglas in their debates of 1858.

Lincoln denounced the then Supreme Court of the United States for its decision in the Dred Scott Case—a decision to the effect that the Constitution prohibited the Congress from excluding slavery from new territories. This holding was without warrant under the Constitution and was handed down by judges who undertook to substitute their private notions for the law of the land in obedience to public sentiment. It produced a bloody and fratricidal war and the cruelty of Reconstruction.

Lincoln declared that the Dred Scott decision was "erroneous"; that it was based "in part * * * on assumed historical facts which were not really true"; that "all there * * * was in the way of precedent * * * on the points therein decided had been against that decision"; that he would not "make it a rule of political action for the people and * * * the departments of government"; and that if he "were in Congress, and a vote should come * * * on whether slavery should be prohibited in the new" territories in spite of the Dred Scott decision, he "would vote for it."

Thoughtful southerners deplore the 1954 decision for two reasons. They know that the constitutional structure of our Government is imperiled by the astounding philosophy on which the Court based its ruling. They fear, moreover, that the harmonious race relations now existing in the South may be destroyed by the intemperate demands of those who seek immediate mixing of races in public schools.

These persons declare that the decision requires the Southern States to integrate their public schools racially. They demand that this should be done at once, even at the points of bayonets. Most of them would deny the States which resist their demands all Federal school aid and thus visit the supposed sins of southern fathers upon the heads of southern children.

Fortunately, those making these demands put an erroneous construction on the decision of May 17, 1954. This decision does not require immediate integration of the public schools of the South. It does not even require integration.

These observations find support in the words of Chief Judge John J. Parker of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, one of the ablest and most distinguished jurists of America. In explaining "exactly what the Supreme Court has decided," Judge Parker said: "What it has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a State may not deny to any person on account of race the right to attend any school that it maintains. But if the schools which it maintains are open to children of all races, no violation of the Constitution is involved even though the children of different races voluntarily attend different schools, as they attend different churches. Nothing in the Constitution or in the decision of the Supreme Court takes away from the people freedom to choose the schools they attend. The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination. It does not forbid such segregation as occurs as the result of voluntary action. It merely forbids the use of governmental power to enforce segregation."

Thomas Carlyle said: "Our main business is not to see what lies dimly in the distance, but to do what lies clearly at hand." I believe, as he, that it is best to solve today's problems today and leave tomorrow's problems to tomorrow.

The most crucial problem confronting the South today is this: How can we obtain an opportunity to seek a sound solution for the South's racial problem in an atmosphere free from emotional tensions and mental misunderstandings? As one who loves and understands southerners of both races, I believe that this atmosphere can best be obtained at this hour in a system of voluntary school segregation. Such a system is sanctioned by the decision of May 17, 1954. It would afford moderate southerners of both races an opportunity to solve the South's racial problem in an atmosphere of good will, patience and tolerance. This is the only way in which the problem can be satisfactorily solved.

RESOLUTION OF THE PLATFORM AND RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION, MARCH 21, 1956

Be it resolved by the South Carolina Democratic Convention:

I

That the Democratic Party of South Carolina asserts:

(a) That the 10th amendment to the United States Constitution, reserving unto the States and the people thereof all rights not specifically delegated to the United States, remains a vital and living part of freedom's charter under the American concept of a representative republic with powers limited only to those things specifically granted.

(b) That the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States does not apply to educational matters or schools of any kind, and, further, that the 14th amendment, by its very terms, was not intended to be self-enforcing, but to require action of the Congress, which it has never taken.

(c) That steadily throughout the years, by action of the Federal Government from its executive, legislative, and judicial departments, numerous encroachments upon the rights of the States in various matters have been committed, reaching the climax in the illegal and unconstitutional decision in 1954 of the United States Supreme Court whereby the power of the States to regulate educational matters was usurped without precedent or legal justification and following sociological and psychological works of comparatively unknown authors, some of whom were foreigners.

(d) That the courts shall never be permitted to conduct the schools of the Nation or to lay down standards of attendance or instruction therefor.

(e) That if the courts are permitted to usurp the rights of the States to conduct their schools as the States think best, then all rights reserved to the States under the Constitution of the United States are gravely threatened and the entire concept of the American Government of a union of free States supreme in their respective spheres stands in danger to the extent that free men everywhere in the name of the Constitution of the United States should command reconsideration.

(f) That the National Democratic Party traditionally and historically for many years stood for the rights of the States and the preservation of constitutional government, principles dear to free people, and that the remedies for the ills which beset us arising from usurpations, encroachments, unprecedented actions without legal justification, and unreasonable centralization of Government should be earnestly sought within the framework of the National Democratic Party by States believing in constitutional government standing together for the protection of the Constitution and the rights of the people.

II

That the Democratic Party of South Carolina invites all States interested in constitutional government:

(a) To stand together in support of the Constitution of the United States as drafted by the inspired freemen who formed this great Nation to the end that all encroachments of the Central Government upon the rights of the States may be ended immediately; that the rights already invaded may be fully restored; and that constitutional government shall not be sacrified upon the altar of usurpation, encroachment and unconstitutional invasions of the rights of the sovereign people.

(b) That a steering committee to consist of at least three representatives from each of the Southern States and all other States believing in constitutional government be selected for the purpose of drafting a program of constitutional government to be presented as the position of the South and of other States interested in constitutional government to the National Democratic Convention of 1956.

(c) That the States of the South and all others believing in constitutional government achieve solidarity of purpose, program, and procedure in order that a united front may be presented to combat the evils of usurpation and encroachment.

(d) That the steering committee arrange for a meeting of all delegates of the South and other States interested in constitutional government to precede the holding of the National Democratic Convention by at least 1 day, at which all delegates will be given the program of constitutional democracy upon which all freemen can and must stand.

(e) That all southern State Democratic conventions to be held prior to the national convention do not adjourn at the conclusion of the business usually preceding the holding of national conventions but stand in recess and may meet again at the call of the respective State chairmen after the national convention to consider such further program as may be necessary in maintaining unity and solidarity of purpose, program and procedure as may be suggested by the steering commit-

tee which shall continue to function until the holding of the national elections of 1956 with the object in view of similar action being taken by all cooperating States.

III

That the State Democratic executive committee is hereby authorized and instructed:

(a) To transmit at once copies of this resolution to the Democratic Party organizations in all States of the South and other States known to be interested in constitutional government.

(b) That the State chairman as early as practicable shall arrange to confer with all other chairmen of the Democratic Party in the Southern States and all other States interested in constitutional government to the end that a steering committee work out and present a program to the advance meeting of delegates to the national convention interested in constitutional government; that the State chairman is authorized to name the member or members of the stering committee from South Carolina; and that the traveling expenses of the members of the steering committee and the State chairman hereunder shall be paid from party funds.

(c) That the State Democratic executive committee is authorized and instructed to assume leadership in the name of the people of South Carolina for the purpose of securing united endeavor for constitutional government at the national convention, it being recognized that only through a concert of action by the people of the States that think as we do can the principles of the founders of the Democratic Party be preserved and the rights of the States be made secure under the Constitution.

[From the Greenville News of March 20, 1956]

A NONSOUTHERNER WHO UNDERSTANDS

Despite the frenetic and politically-inspired denunciation of the southern manifesto by Members of Congress of the Lehman-Neuberger stripe, the fundamentals of that statement of principle seem to have gotten across to a few thoughtful persons outside the South.

The general reaction of much if not most of the northern liberal press, such as the Herald-Tribune of New York, was to brush aside the constitutional arguments advanced in the statement, but to sit up and take notice of the fact that southerners mean business and will no have integration forced upon them.

However, David Lawrence, conservative newspaper columnist and editor of U. S. News & World Report, was able to see beyond the race issue, and recognize the basic ideas.

In his column, Mr. Lawrence writes:

"The manifesto by the southern Senators reflects a basic principle that cannot be dismissed as merely sectional prejudice. It is primarily an opposition to the so-called liberalism of today whereby the power of the Federal Government has been enlarged on the theory that anything that benefits the general welfare is constitutional, irrespective of what was decided before as to the rights of the States.

"For apart from the merits of integration or segregation, the fact remains that, if the Supreme Court is going to overturn basic principles long ago decided as within the Constitution, and is to undertake to legislate, as the southerners characterize it, then no decision can be regarded as final. It means that what has been decided is effective only until a new judge or set of judges overturns it.

"This is not a system of law according to a written Constitution but law according to public sentiment as the judges interpret it. Precedents and long-cherished principles of jurisprudence thus can be ignored and politics can rule the day. Minority rights would go by the boards and the country would be at the mercy of intolerant majorities.

"The Supreme Court in 1896 decided the question of segregation on the basis of 'equal but separate' facilities. Education has always been regarded as a State problem, and the Constitution's mandate that citizens be given equal protection of the law has been construed to mean that educational facilities could be separate but must be equal.

"The High Court upheld this view consistently until 1954. Then the Supreme Court broke down the precedents which said education was a State affair and claimed the right to order segregation abolished even though separate schools had previously been held to be equal in quality of education given.

"Now the way is opened to Federal control of parochial and private schools and hence Federal control of all systems of education. This is not what the proponents of integration have advocated, but this may turn out to be one of the results of the Supreme Court action in years to come.

"Most of the leaders in the South say the Constitution itself should be amended if integration is to be made compulsory. Until then, a form of nullification which became nationwide against the 18th amendment—when literally millions of citizens disobeyed the prohibition law—may ultimately force a change in the Court's decision or bring about a tacit ignoring of the law through legal subterfuges passed by the States."

Mr. Lawrence thus discerns what most northerners in the blindness of their own brand of provincialism (which they claim is an exclusive Southern weakness) are unable to see:

1. The Supreme Court took the law into its own hands and amended the Constitution outside of the constitutional procedures. It did so to serve temporary expediences dictated by the political climate and circumstances of the moment.

2. If the same, or future Supreme Courts follow this example of departure from the letter of the law and the established legal precedents, they can do endless damage to the Constitution and the basic liberties of the people.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like now to resume my right to the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield for that purpose, because there were some Senators present who wanted to hear the discussion on the amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Is there objection to the calling of the roll, without jeopardizing the right of the Senator from South Dakota to hold the floor? If there be no objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, once again I should like to direct the attention of the Senate to the business at hand, namely, the question of electoral college reform and, more especially, the so-called compromise substitute amendment on which 54 Members of the Senate have joined as cosponsors, in offering it as a proposal for electoral college reform. I refer to the so-called Daniel-Kefauver-Mundt-Thurmond substitute.

I should like to give a few words of background on this measure, and then discuss some of the virtues and values of this particular approach, as I see them, after which I shall discuss some of the criticisms which have been leveled against the ideas of electoral college reform, as they were enunciated on yesterday and the day before by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. At this time I announce myself to that purpose, so as to give those Senators ample opportunity to be on the floor at the time when I shall discuss the criticisms they made during their addresses on yesterday and the day before.

Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the proposed compromise amendment, I rise in support of the measure because I believe it will bring to the United States a long-overdue reform in the method of electing the President and the Vice President. Long hours of work and study and careful thought have gone into the drafting of this compromise proposal; and I hope the Senate will overwhelmingly approve it, and will send it on its way to the House of Representatives, and thence on its way to the various State legislatures.

When the authors of the United States Constitution met in Philadelphia, in 1787, to establish the framework for a strong, just, and lasting Republic, they recognized the importance of including in their proposed fundamental law a provision for amendment of that law. Although they hoped the Constitution would not be lightly altered—and it has not been—and hoped it would not be made too difficult to change—and it has not been—they also realized that, from time to time, unforeseen developments probably would make revision desirable. Except for citizens who simply are opposed to any change at any time for any reason, the amendment procedures and processes of the Constitution have served our Republic well.

The constitutional forefathers of ours knew there might arise events under which amendment of the Constitution might be essential to the continuing functioning of our political system.

By and large, article II of the Constitution, relating to the method of electing the President and the Vice President, has served our country well for over a century and three-quarters. On 42 separate occasions since 1787 it has provided the Nation with a Chief Executive for another 4-year term. Article II has already been amended once; as early as 1804 the 12th amendment to the Constitution provided that the electoral college should vote separately for President and Vice President, instead of giving the Vice Presidency to the candidate receiving the

second largest number of electoral votes for President.

Hesitant as we should feel, therefore, about suggesting any revision in the body of rules under which the United States has grown and has flourished for so long, I believe that the time has come for another adjustment in the Presidential election procedure. In our political mechanism we have failed to keep pace with the developments in our industrial mechanism and with scientific developments in the United States.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am grateful for the opportunity today to bring before the Senate, in behalf of this proposed amendment to the Constitution, some of the reasons why I believe it will greatly improve the procedure by means of which we elect the President of the United States.

For many, many years, I have been interested in the problem of electoral college reform. At one time the Senate voted on such a proposal, and that proposal was passed by this body. That was in 1950. The yea-and-nay vote on that question appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 1, page 1278, and on the adjacent pages are to be found some of the arguments in relation to that question.

At that time the Senate had before it what was known as the Lodge-Gossett proposal, which I may say I opposed at the time. I opposed it then for a series of reasons, which I shall not go into today, because certain of its supporters, in the persons of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and other Senators who have joined in supporting a new version of it, have reformed it considerably, have refined it, and have made it more workable and less objectionable; and it has become part of the compromise proposal. But I was 1 of 11 Members of the Senate who, on February 1, 1950, voted against the Lodge-Gossett proposal standing alone, which now has been joined in the compromise amendment, thus presenting to the Senate and the country a new approach, a new appraisal, and a new version of the old Lodge-Gossett amendment, which now has been corrected so as to eliminate some of its unsatisfactory elements, and has been combined with the so-called district system of selecting electors, which system, I believe, once the legislatures of the country have the power to do so, they will adopt unanimously because of its values and its virtues.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the yea-and-nay vote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 1, page 1278, showing 64 yeas and 27 nays, by which the Lodge-Gossett amendment was approved at that time by the United States Senate.

There being no objection, the vote was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. Taft and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is absent on public business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 27, as follows:

Yeas, 64: Aiken, Anderson, Benton, Cain, Chapman, Chavez, Connally, Douglas, Downey, Eastland, Ecton, Flanders, Frear, Fulbright, George, Gillette, Graham, Green, Hayden, Hendrickson, Hill, Hoey, Holland, Humphrey, Hunt, Ives, Johnston of South Carolina, Kefauver, Kerr, Kilgore, Knowland, Langer, Leahy, Lehman, Lodge, Lucas, McCarran, McClellan, McFarland, McKeller, McMahon, Magnuson, Maybank, Morse, Myers, Neely, O'Conor, O'Mahoney, Pepper, Russell, Saltonstall, Smith of Maine, Smith of New Jersey, Sparkman, Stennis, Taylor, Thomas of Utah, Thye, Tobey, Tydings, Vandenberg, Wiley, Williams, Withers.

Nays, 27: Brewster, Bricker, Bridges, Butler, Byrd, Capehart, Cordon, Darby, Donnell, Dworshak, Ferguson, Gurney, Jenner, Johnson of Colorado, Kem, McCarthy, Malone, Martin, Millikin, Mundt, Robertson, Schoeppel, Taft, Thomas of Oklahoma, Watkins, Wherry, Young.

Not voting, 5:

Ellender, Hickenlooper, Johnson of Texas, Long, Murray.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum being present, more than two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, Senate Joint Resolution 2 is passed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. LUCAS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What was the year of that vote? The Senator has mentioned the month and the day. Was it not 1950?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. It was 1950. The date was February 1, 1950.

A little later the legislation went to the floor of the House, and over there, on July 17, 1950, it was defeated by a roll-call vote of 134 yeas to 210 nays. I think it would unnecessarily encumber the record to place in the RECORD the names of the Members of the House voting at that time. They are to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 8, page 10428. However, so many House Members have been replaced by others since then that the list is not very significant.

My only reason for placing in the RECORD the Senate vote was to point out that 11 of us who opposed that version of the Lodge-Gossett amendment recognize the improvement made in the new version. We recognize the improvement in the substitute amendment, which provides that the States shall have a choice between that system and the district system. Consequently we have joined in doing our best to bring about this long overdue reform in the procedures by which we elect our President and Vice President.

As I have stated a number of times previously on the floor of the Senate, I have grave doubts regarding the effectiveness and justice of the prevailing system of awarding all of a State's electoral votes to the presidential candidate winning a plurality of the popular vote in that State.

In recent years, the general ticket system of choosing presidential electors, that is, electing them in a bloc on the statewide ticket, has tended to exert influence in both parties to nominate presidential candidates who advocate policies designed to win the votes of vote-conscious ethnic, religious, and economic groups in metropolitan centers, where these minorities hold the balance of power in populous States with large blocs of electoral votes.

Sometimes these minority blocs are ethnic, religious, political, or economic in character, but in the main they inhabit the metropolitan communities, where such blocs can hold the balance of power in the States with large blocks of electoral votes, to the point of determining Presidential decisions for 175 million people in 48 States. Such groups and organizations should have the right to operate politically in our body politic. They have a perfect right to endeavor to sell their wares to the average voter. However, it seems to me that they should be compelled, as presidential candidates should be compelled, to make a nationwide appeal, instead of a localized appeal. They should be compelled to appeal to the people in the various areas and States of the country in order to determine, if they can, the kind of Government under which they would have all of us live throughout the length and breadth of the United States.

This compromise amendment would provide that kind of mechanism. I point out that as a result of the concentration upon selected large blocks of electoral votes located in the larger States which have metropolitan centers, cities with vast populations, the individual voter, by his ballot, has greater power in selecting the President than does the individual voter in such States in a smaller State. That is certainly not in keeping with the American concept that all citizens are created equal.

The provisions of our compromise proposal would restore and preserve the balance of voting power between the rural and urban areas, between great States and small States, which was in-

tended by our constitutional forefathers, and which was pointed up emphatically when they established our bicameral legislative system.

The compromise amendment would also provide an opportunity for qualified citizens of any State to become candidates for President or Vice President, because no longer would both our political parties have to play up to mass populations in large cities, and the pressure groups of large cities, to appeal to the mass vote, with its capacity to swing the electoral pendulum back and forth to control the determinations.

Under this amendment each candidate would have to appeal to all the people in their respective places of residence. He would have to run on national issues of national appeal, not localized issues of sectional appeal. I think that is tremendously important when it comes to electing a President and government for all the people.

The compromise amendment would encourage the development of the two-party system on a nationwide basis. I feel that most of us are convinced that the two-party system is one of the sound rocks upon which our freedoms rest, and from whence our liberties have evolved. Under this amendment every citizen would be able to participate in our political campaigns, and would feel on election day that his or her vote could be made to count. He would not be disenfranchised if he were a member of a minority party in an area which normally goes for a particular candidate of a different party. He would not be disenfranchised if he lived in a rural area of a great State with a metropolitan community of 1 million people, where so frequently what happens in the city inevitably determines what is done with the electoral vote cast by the people in the smaller communities and the rural areas of the State.

This is a true compromise, in the best traditions of our National Government and of the Congress. It represents a meeting of minds after long study and careful consideration. It is the result of a careful weighing of facts, and of concessions by all concerned, in the interest of harmony and constructive action.

Were I to have my way, I would prefer to see the amendment contain the district system only. But were the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] to have his way, he would prefer to have it contain alone the proportional system of electing electors. So we merged our proposals, after a careful analysis of the results, to provide that each State should be empowered to select either of the two systems that it feels may best meet the needs of its people.

It is a compromise which will, I am earnestly hopeful—and believe—enable the people of this Nation to conduct the 1956 presidential election on a basis which, for the first time in a century, would enable the people of all the United States to choose their President and Vice President on an equal basis in each State, within the traditional framework and the electoral system of the Constitution. I think this compromise should pass, and I am hopeful, indeed, that it will.

The eminent American historian, George Bancroft, in his History of the United States—VI, pages 339–340—brilliantly summarizes the work of the Constitutional Convention in regard to the election of the President. These are his words:

> And now the whole line of march to the mode of the election of the President can be surveyed. The Convention at first reluctantly conferred that office on the national legislature; and to prevent the possibility of a failure by a negative of one House or the other, to the legislature voting in joint ballot. Then to escape from the danger of cabal and corruption, it next transferred the full and final power of choice to an electoral college that should be the exact counterpart of the two Houses in the representation of the States as units as well as population of the States, and should meet at the seat of government. Then fearing that so large a number of men would not travel to the seat of government for that single purpose, or might be hindered on the way, they most reluctantly went back to the two Houses in joint convention. At this moment the thought arose that the electors might cast their votes in their own States, and transmit the certificates of their ballots to the seat of government. Accordingly, the work of electing the President was divided: the Convention removed the act of voting from the joint session of the two Houses to electoral colleges in the several States, the act of voting to be followed by the transmission of authenticated certificates of the vote to a branch of the general legislature at the seat of government; and then it restored to the two Houses in the presence of each other the same office of counting the collected certificates which they would have performed had the choice remained with the two Houses of the legislature.

Adoption of the 12th amendment in 1804 eliminated the earlier source of intraparty friction and established a basis for more cohesive tendencies within the parties. Left unchanged by the 12th amendment was the provision that each State should appoint electors "in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct." In George Washington's first election the electors were chosen in a variety of ways: First, by popular vote in districts or statewide on a general ticket; second, by State legislatures; and third, by combinations of the first two methods. Only 10 States appointed electors. New York's Legislature could not agree, and North Carolina and Rhode Island had not ratified the Constitution. This variety in the manner of choosing presidential electors continued through the election of 1800, and beyond.

Under the compelling forces of political necessity, however, and aided by the new provision of the 12th amendment, the movement toward a uniform method of appointing the electors made strong headway.

That movement was accelerated and accentuated by virtue of the fact that some States began to use the unit system or the bloc system or the winner-take-all system, under which the candidate receiving the greatest popular vote within that State would get not only the electoral vote to which that candidate was entitled, but would have added to those votes all the electoral votes to which his opponent might logically be entitled.

That built up such a tremendous impact on the part of the States using the unit system in the electoral college, that reluctantly all the other States, in an effort to secure as much authority as possible in electing the President, were forced by political necessity to move in the direction of the unit system.

Therefore, by the time of the presidential election of 1808, in which the same number of States participated, the votes of only New York, Maryland, and North Carolina were divided.

In 1812, when another State had entered the union, only Maryland's electoral vote was divided, all other States by 1812 having pushed reluctantly—and most of them against their better judgment, but by the strong compulsion of political necessity—in the direction of voting their electoral college en bloc, following the unique and somewhat bizarre system, in a self-governing country, of having the victorious candidate lay claim to all of the electoral votes scored by the defeated candidate, thereby giving him a very strong and compelling power in the electoral college, but thereby also giving him the same claim to the votes of those who voted against him, as, logically, he has to the votes of those who had voted for him.

In the fourth election under the 12th amendment, in 1816, when 19 States took part, each cast a solid block of electoral votes, as in 1952. In the following election, 1820, all States would have cast solid blocks of electoral votes for James Monroe, had not a New Hampshire elector—apparently a rather rugged individual of his day—decided that only George Washington should have the honor of a unanimous election, and therefore cast his vote against Monroe.

Andrew Jackson's candidacy in 1824 caused the electoral vote of 5 of the then 24 States to be divided. Four men received electoral votes for President, but since none had a majority, the election was again thrown into the House of Representatives.

We had a discussion of that election on the floor of the Senate during the current debate, so I shall not dilate upon it any further.

Since the Civil War the State bloc system of choosing electors by popular vote has been in almost universal use. There have been very few exceptions, and none of them has occurred within recent years.

I wish now to proceed to some of the arguments which those of us who sponsor electoral college reform believe are important in bringing about this long overdue reform.

The first is that it would tend to restore the balance between the city and noncity voting areas of the country. It would do that because it would provide for every American-born child in all the States the right to aspire to be President, which has today become almost exclusively the aspiration of American-born citizens who happen to be born and cradled in areas represented by not more than 15 populous States of the Union. Fully 30 States, on the record and on the basis of performance and on the basis of mathematics and on the basis of voting habits, have virtually no more chance of having one of their

native sons who has made that State his regular home, elected President than they would have if the potential candidate had been born in Timbuktu far removed from the United States of America.

In this way there has developed a political pattern under which only those candidates who live in States with gigantic cities of 750,000 population or more are considered eligible as candidates for President, because in these big cities of 750,000 population or more are the big clusters of votes with cohesive powers holding them together, so that they shift with the times and they shift with local issues and they shift sometimes with selfish issues en masse from one political party to the other. As they shift they carry with them the electoral vote of the entire State, and that State, having so many electoral votes—45 or 32 or 28 or 24—turns over to the party which has promised the most to the pressure groups almost certain victory. That, unfortunately, is the manner in which so many of our campaigns and convention contests have been fought.

I should like now to emphasize this first reason that we feel the electoral college is necessary, is equitable, is logical, and is thoroughly American. I pointed out how the pressure groups in big cities, because of the unique system we use in electing the President, have a power and a potency and an importance far beyond their numerical strength, and far beyond which they would ordinarily have under any system of electing a President which treated all States and all areas the same.

Interestingly enough, this is a deficiency which occurs not only as among States—big States against small States—but is a deficiency which in many States of the Union has frequently tended virtually to disenfranchise the people living in the rural areas and the average-sized cities of the same State that is host to the metropolitan community. The vote of the people in the rural areas, the votes in the typically American communities of 500,000 population or less, or 500,000 and just a few odd thousand more, are divided among people with a variety of interests, among them people who are affiliated with 1 of the 2 major parties, or are fiercely intense in their attitude. So, in those areas we do not have the type of voting which occurs among tightly compressed groups within the boundaries of the big cities, and we do not find in these rural areas the tendency to swing great bodies of people to one political party or the other as a consequence of the pressures involved, thereby having that issue, which is important to some but completely unimportant to most, dominate or determine the question of who is to be President of the United States and administer this great Republic with its comprehensive character and its complexity of interests.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I wanted to ask the Senator if it would be his preference that we might discuss this particular point at this time, or whether he would rather finish the development of his argument, because there are certain questions I should like to ask on this general subject.

Mr. MUNDT. I have pretty well developed this one point.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. What I desire to inquire about is a very important point, perhaps the crux of the issue, in that it seems to me that if we take the course which I think would lead us into many uncertainties, the course recommended by the Senator, it could not be for any other reason than the one he urges.

The question as to whether it is in fact true that our present system has led us to become unduly subservient to pressure groups is a most important question. Frankly, I do not believe it has. I do not wish in any way to be a cause of embarrassment to the Senator from South Dakota or to other proponents of the resolution, but every time I hear this argument urged, I like to inquire who are these groups and what decisions have been made erroneously under pressure from these groups. Do they exist, or is it a vague fear which has no substance in fact? So, if the Senator will do so, I wish he would be quite specific, because whether we should take this action or not depends on the strength of the argument he makes on this point and upon the question of whether, in fact, it has a substantial basis.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me say, first of all, that I agree with the Senator from New Jersey in his definition of this first issue as an important one. It is one of the things which I think should induce the country to change. It is not the most important reason, as I see it. The most important one is the third one on my agenda, which I hope to come to during the course of the afternoon. If not, I shall discuss it tomorrow.

The Senator asks whether it actually exists. It very definitely exists; and in order to answer the question in a manner which will not be embarrassing either to the Senator from New Jersey or myself——

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The Senator understands that that is not my intention.

Mr. MUNDT. I undertsand that. The Senator's question is a quite appropriate one.

Here is a pressure group for which no one, probably, will turn up as an advocate or an apologist or as a defender. That is the pressure group which we have had frequently in this country, which is known as the big city boss-run political machine. The Senator has had experience with it in his State of New Jersey. Our history is replete with experience with political machines in New York City. We who are Republicans recall with somewhat shamed faces the fact that our party at one time operated a very potent political machine in the city of Philadelphia, quite a few years ago.

Similarly, in the city of Chicago there was a political machine known as the Nash-Kelly machine, and even the most loyal members of it sought to disavow and disclaim it, once they were elected to political office.

It will be recalled that our colleague who had such great success in the State of Minnesota in this week's primary did much to break up a machine in the State of Tennessee, run by a man by the name of Crump.

We do not have to be reminded of the Pendergast machine in Missouri. There are political machines that come and go. There are some which are motivated by selfish reasons. Not all pressure groups are necessarily bad. Some of them serve their functions. But I shall confine my definition to the pressure group known as the boss-run political machine. This present electoral system of ours puts a premium on the political machine. It gives encouragement to the political machine. It gives power to the political machine. It gives opportunity to the political machine, all of which would be denied it under the adoption of the compromise amendment.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I would suggest that the power of the political machine, or its day of power, has gone. I think this is one of the factors, if the Senator will permit me to make a statement when I should be asking a question. We have so changed our political life in the past couple of decades, through the universal use of the radio and television, that the breakdown of the State political machine, it seems to me, is the most unique phenomenon of modern political life. I know that is true in New Jersey. It used to be that a man like "Boss" Hague could press a button and turn out 100,000 majority in Jersey City. That cannot be done any more; nor do I know of any other place in which that power exists today. So, if that is the undue pressure from which the Senator seeks to protect our political system, I suggest that the need for it has substantially gone.

I have heard other pressure groups mentioned. As the Senator says, no implication of evil is suggested by the use of the term "pressure group." There are many pressure groups. There are religious groups, economic groups, labor groups, and so forth. They have all been included. These are not the kinds of groups I have referred to as pressure groups, against whose undue influence this protection should be raised. I would suggest, on that question, that pressure groups are an essential fact in American life, indeed, I think, of life in any society; that they are not more active in big cities than they are in rural communities, and that no group ought to be ignored insofar as its legitimate interest is concerned; that there is a real protection against yielding unwisely or unduly to groups of any sort. Whether it be a religious group or any other kind of group, no party will be unwise enough or wrong enough to ignore legitimate demands in any place, because a couple of million persons throughout the country could still determine the result of a presidential election. There is no way that we as members of a political system can take away from ourselves the need to hear such groups, to resist them when their demands are unwarranted, or elim-

inate the difficulty of having at least to make the decisions which their importuning requires us to make.

I urge this so strongly because I want to develop to the utmost the Senator's argument in behalf of this point, and to clarify to the utmost the issue which I think has the most appeal, or at least is one of the several issues which have so much appeal, to persons who believe something should be done along the line which the Senator from South Dakota suggests.

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad the Senator did not deny, as I knew he would not deny, and could not deny, that in American history, pressure groups, in the form of large boss-run political machines in the metropolitan cities, have had a strong influence upon American politics. I am glad the Senator did not deny, as I did not think he would deny, that that influence, in the main, has been in the wrong direction.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The Senator now is talking about the political machines.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. So the Senator has recognized my point.

Mr. MUNDT. I am coming to that. The Senator from New Jersey says he thinks we are living in happier days. He is filled with optimism and confidence, and believes the day of the city political machine is over.

Why should it be over? It is not in its heyday because it has recently suffered a big political defeat. City machines thrive on victory but tend to grow weak in periods of defeat.

But I read in the newspapers rumblings of their coming back to life. I read about a man in New York City who is the head of Tammany Hall, and who claims he will throw a lot of votes around, come next convention time.

I read about persons in Chicago who at present are engaged in trying to defeat a Democratic friend of mine, who is a Member of Congress, and to replace him with someone else, primarily because my friend had a falling out with persons connected with the political machine.

I think city political machines are simply sleeping; I do not believe they are dead. In some places they have begun to stir. It is coming near the dawn.

What I am pointing out is that the danger is here, the temptation is here, the opportunity is here, the invitation is here; but by this amendment it will be made possible for the city machines in this country ever again to determine either the nomination of a candidate or the election of a President. They will play a fair part. I do not want to disfranchise a fellow in a city machine. I grant, with the Senator from New Jersey, that, of course, a pressure group is a legitimate part of the American political system. I suppose every family is a pressure group, in a way. I suppose every profession and occupation are pressure groups, in a way.

But I want the pressure groups to exercise their authority and their influence in a national election by a national appeal. I do not want them to be permitted to utilize trick mechanisms, which could do violence to the judgment and the wishes of people all over the country. They have done so in the past—they can and will do it again unless we reform our electoral machinery.

The Senator from New Jersey is correct. This is an important reason for a change. It is not the most important. My third reason, I have said, is the most important, and I am coming to it. I know of no other proposal save our proposed amendment whereby Americans can make certain that the inglorious era of political control by pressure groups known as big-city machines will not be revived again.

Now I turn to the second point, because I am certain I have whetted the appetite of my delightful adversary to the point that he wants to hear soon the third point I shall make.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. It is a pleasure to listen to the senior Senator from South Dakota on any subject, even though he may be entirely wrong.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator. I may be wrong at times, but I do not think I am in the instant argument.

I now come to my second point, the district system, which is incorporated in the compromise proposal, and which I sincerely believe most States and I think all States will adopt. At least, it is there for their consideration. It will become available. The States can change it if they wish to. I think they will.

The district system has one advantage over either the present system or, in my opinion, the proportionate voting system, although the proportionate voting system moves in the direction of eliminating from the political campaigns and political decisions a situation which is pretty serious under the system as it operates today, and which the district system would eliminate entirely.

Under the present system, of winner take all, a handful of voters can turn the tide by being able to throw into the electoral college mechanism 45 compelling votes from the State of New York alone. It is so easy for fraud in a single voting area to contaminate the whole election system. It is so easy for fraud in a single community, whether it be Albany, New York City, or Buffalo—I use those cities in a purely hypothetical sense—it is entirely possible and plausible to assume—and perhaps it is probable, sometimes—that the fraud within a single metropolitan voting area could contaminate, first of all, the determination of the people in that State, and by throwing the 45 electoral votes in the direction of the fraudulent candidate, could determine the results of the country as a whole. That would be stopped under the proposed system.

If cheaters get control of the election machinery, as cheaters have at times controlled it in the past, and as they will try to control it again, and as cheaters have always a temptation to do; if cheaters get control of the electoral machinery under the district system, all they will be able to steal in a district is a single electoral vote, and the proportionate influence they would have on the two other electoral votes representing the candidates for Senate. We will have extended that wonderful, built-in mechanism for political honesty, known as American morality, all over the country. We will have made it impossible for influence which might get out of hand, for one reason or another, in a single local voting district, where cheaters get control, to contaminate the whole election.

But it is not only cheaters with whom we are concerned. There is bad weather which occurs all over America. There have been some elections where whole voting areas have been snowed in on election day, and the voters could not get to the polls. I told the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] yesterday that weather plays its part in politics.

Under the block system, it is made possible for those who live in more favored areas, and having easier access to the polls, not only to win the election, not only to register their electoral votes in the electoral college, but to steal from the fellows who are snowed in at home the votes they would have cast for an opposing candidate.

That situation frequently occurs on election day.

My friend, the Senator from New Jersey, comes from an area where hurricanes have been whiplashing his fair State with undue violence. I do not know whether a hurricane has occurred on election day or not, but I suppose that could happen. There have been areas of the country which have been windswept and storm-lashed on election day. Blizzards have occurred. There have been serious disturbances of nature on election day which have made it almost impossible for the people to go to the polls and vote in great areas of the country.

Under the district system, Republicans and Democrats would be treated alike in such weather-torn areas. But under the present system our elections are sometimes made almost subject to the caprices of nature, whereby if a storm or a blizzard or other type of violence should happen to take place in the city of New York, nature would decide, in that election, that not less than 45 electoral votes would go to the Republican candidate. But if the disturbance of nature happened to occur in upstate New York, in the farming region, causing large numbers of farmers and dwellers in small cities to be snowed in, a disproportionate advantage would be given to the voters in New York City, and nature would thereby decide in that election that the 45 electoral votes of New York would go Democratic.

I do not believe that is a good way to decide elections. I do not think it is desirable to leave that kind of hazard in the Constitution of the United States to determine the elective machinery. Under the district system, if the snow hit New York in any area it would hit Republicans and Democrats alike.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wonder if it would be convenient for the Senator from South Dakota to yield to the Senator from Oregon for 30 minutes, with the understanding that the Senator from South Dakota may have the floor

tomorrow when the Senate resumes its business.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be happy to cooperate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota may yield to the Senator from Oregon for 30 minutes, or for such time as the Senator from Oregon may desire, with the understanding that at the conclusion of business today the Senator from South Dakota will retain the floor, and at the conclusion of the morning business tomorrow the Senator from South Dakota will be recognized.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to agree to do that, but first I should like to take about 5 minutes to conclude the particular point I was developing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to conclude the development of point two before yielding to the Senator from Oregon, and I entered into the unanimous consent to relinquish the floor and resume it tomorrow with some doubt in my own mind about its wisdom, because I hesitated to keep the Senator from New Jersey wondering overnight about what I was going to say regarding my point three.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. If the Senator will yield, I hope I shall not reach the point where, having heard the Senator during an evening, I shall be faced with the prospect of not hearing him the next day.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator. The argument on my second point is that the district system would take out of the election pattern the possibility of a local area, because of a caprice of nature, through violent or impassable weather, determining the decision of the Nation.

There is a third matter which sometimes determines an election, and that is that sometimes there is a local issue of tremendous interest to the people in that local area. Instances can be quoted in American history where people have voted for Republicans or Democrats for President and Vice President primarily on the kind of mayor they had the preceding 12 months. It is important that they get a good mayor. It is important that a bad Republican mayor be replaced by a good Democratic mayor, and that a bad Democratic mayor be replaced by a good Republican mayor. The thing that we should not have happen, however, is to have the people's feelings about their mayor reflect themselves in their choice for President. It happens under the present system. If it happened in a large State, it could determine an election. People study the issues, study the platforms, read the literature, and try to find out what happened. The decision came about because a bad mayor may have been in office in a big city for 12 months. Those local issues are important. The district system would eliminate them entirely, and the proportional system would tend to eliminate them as controlling elements in a Presidential election.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Does the Senator honestly suggest that the selection of a mayor would be more important, be it in a big or a little place, than the election of a President of the United States?

Mr. MUNDT. Oh, no, but if it took place in a big city and the experience of the people was that the Republican mayor was corrupt or dishonest or inefficient, the people might endeavor to show their distaste of the Republican Party at the national level, and vote for a Democrat for President. If they had such an experience with a Democratic mayor, they might say, "We are not going to fool around with this city-hall crowd. We are not going to work with the corrupt Democratic machine. We are going to vote for a Republican for President."

I say we should divorce what happens in a single municipality from the determination of what would happen in a presidential election. I would think my good friend from New Jersey would agree with me on that.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I think we can pretty well trust the people to make the distinction in their own minds and act accordingly in the circumstances. As a matter of fact, quickly running over this question in my mind, it seems to me the State legislatures of the larger States have set the local and State elections so they do not fall in a presidential election year.

Mr. MUNDT. That is exactly the point I make. The people may have the experience of 12 months of a bad municipal administration, and then base the way they will vote in the presidential decision on the record of the party in the city hall for the preceding 12 months.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. That is a consideration which everyone will have to take into account. Frankly, it does not seem to me to be a serious one.

Referring to the point which the Senator made a moment ago, the Senator was suggesting that his amendment will take away the effect on elections of national disasters or freaks of weather. I wish the Senator would develop that point.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be happy to. Let us say the five northern counties in the tier of upstate New York are completely snowed in during an election in New York, so that virtually none but the most hardy can get to the polls. Instead of having the normal vote in that area, which happens to be Republican, recorded in the overall figures, because those people do not get to the polls, a mere handful of a Democratic majority in New York City could win the statewide election in New York which they normally would have lost in good weather. So the 45 votes in the electoral college could determine the national election because it snowed in upstate New York.

Under the district system why would that not happen? Because the snow falls on the just and unjust alike, and it would hit Democrats and Republicans alike in those 5 counties, and they would have the same capacity to get to the polls and to vote for their single elector under the district system in the electoral college. I think the Senator understands that.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I think I understand what the Senator has in mind. Each of us must resolve for himself how important that point is when weighed against the effects of the other changes which are proposed. I would respectfully suggest that this is one of the hypothetical situations so unlikely that we should not disturb an arrangement which had gradually developed over a century and a half, and to which all of us are used, and which has worked extremely well.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to assure the Senator from New Jersey—let me say in conclusion of this colloquy, for it has been agreed that we are now to hear from the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]—that if the Senator from New Jersey will come to South Dakota or North Dakota or Montana or Minnesota or Michigan or even New York State in November of a rather typical winter—let us say 1 out of 3—he will find that a blizzard is nothing hypothetical; that impassable weather is nothing hypothetical; that those things happen time after time on election day and have their impact; and that if we limit the impact to the area in which the disaster occurs, we shall not have prejudiced one party as against the other.

But, Mr. President, our political patterns being what they are—in the North, the cities are primarily Democratic, and the country areas are primarily Republican; in the South, just the opposite occurs—the cities are more Republican than are the rural areas. The cities in the South are not very Republican, I must admit; but they are more Republican than the country areas in the South—we find that when we operate with a system which is subject to the caprices of nature, we are subject to something beyond the control of our political parties.

This proposal would eliminate that. I am sure that if the Senator from New Jersey will look across the Delaware River, to the west of his State—to the city of Philadelphia—he will find that in the last series of presidential elections, one of the things which has determined whether Pennsylvania went Republican or Democratic was, not the presidential candidates, not Pennsylvania's very excellent Senators and Representatives, or even her Governors, but the kind of people in charge of the city hall in Philadelphia and the party in charge there. Apparently, both parties have blundered; because time after time the people of Pennsylvania have thrown out one or another set of "rascals," and have put in new officials; and in the process, in the backwash, America has elected its Presidents in part on the basis of bad city politics in the city hall in Philadelphia which in turn influenced its tremendous block of electoral votes to swing one way or another.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Let the Chair call attention to the fact that, under the

unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Oregon was to be recognized after 5 minutes; and the 5 minutes have now expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, Mr. President; I realize that. If the Senator from New Jersey is willing to defer a further discussion of this matter until tomorrow, I am, of course, willing to have the Senator from Oregon proceed at this time.

FOREST ACCESS ROADS—ONE OF OUR BEST INVESTMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on March 12, I introduced Senate bill 3420, to amend the Federal Highway Act as it relates to our national forests and Indian timberlands. Associated with me as cosponsors on that bill are Senators MAGNUSON, JACKSON, NEUBERGER, MURRAY, SCOTT, LEHMAN, HUMPHREY, MCNAMARA, KEFAUVER, and MANSFIELD.

Today, I wish to discuss the bill, under the subject of Forest Access Roads—One of Our Best Investments.

Due to the very heavy schedule of floor debates on the farm bill, I announced on March 12 that I would not take up the time of the Senate in discussing my timber access road bill when it was introduced, but that at a later date I would explain its provisions. At this time, therefore, I propose to make a few brief comments in explanation of my bill.

In order that the provisions of my bill may be fully understood by all interested parties, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be inserted in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3420) to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain timber access roads, to permit maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes, introduced on March 12, 1956, by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. KEFAUVER), was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for forest development roads and trails, including timber access roads to and on the national forests in locations and according to specifications which will permit maximum economy in harvesting timber from national forest lands tributary to such roads, the following sums: $32 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958; $40 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959; $50 million for each of the subsequent 10 fiscal years; and such sums as may be needed for each fiscal year thereafter: *Provided*, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road an advisory public hearing shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) is authorized to provide for the construction of timber access roads to and on the national forests in locations and according to specifications which will permit maximum economy in harvesting timber from national forest lands tributary to such roads, either (1) directly with appropriated funds, and in such case such roads shall be designed to meet the requirements for development and management of other national forest resources in addition to timber; (2) where desirable, by requirements of purchasers in contracts for the sale of timber from such lands and with reasonable allowance therefor in determining the fair market value of such timber; or (3) where desirable, by cooperation with public or private agencies or persons.

(b) The Secretary is authorized in the construction of timber access roads to cooperate with owners of or persons hauling timber from other lands and if the cooperator contributes an equitable share of the cost of construction and maintenance of such roads, as determined by the Secretary, he may be permitted to haul timber over such roads under conditions the Secretary may prescribe. Any moneys deposited under any such agreement shall be covered into the Treasury and shall constitute a special fund which is hereby made available until expended for the construction and maintenance of such roads: *Provided*, That any portion of such deposits in excess of the amount found due shall be refunded to the depositor.

(c) Except as authorized in section 2 (b), timber cut and removed from nonfederally owned lands may be hauled over timber access roads only if (1) the quantity of forest products hauled is minor and the Secretary has determined that the interests of the United States require no payment or deposit; or (2) the payment is made of an equitable fee to be determined by the Secretary, after consideration of the amount necesary to amortize the portion of construction costs allocable to the non-Federal timber tributary to the particular road, which fee will be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt, and a deposit is made to cover the estimated cost of that part of the maintenance of the road occasioned by such hauling. Such deposits shall be covered into the Treasury and shall constitute a special fund which is hereby made available until expended to cover the cost to the United States of performing the work specified. Any portion of such deposits found to be in excess of the cost of doing the work specified shall, upon determination that it is so in excess, be transferred to miscellaneous receipts.

(d) Deposits received for a number of similar types of work on adjacent or overlapping areas, or on areas which in the aggregate are determined to cover a single work unit, may be expended on such combined areas for the purposes for which deposited and if refunds to depositors of excess deposits are provided for such refunds shall be made on a proportionate basis. Where the only practicable and efficient manner of performing such specified work involves an intermingling of other work making it impracticable to keep separate costs on the work herein described an estimate based on a cost analysis of the particular type of work may be used to determine the cost to the United States of performing such work.

(e) In order to provide access to and across private lands and exchange of hauling rights, the Secretary is authorized to grant easements to, or enter into leases or permit agreements for definite periods of years with, owners of private property in the vicinity of national forests for rights-of-way for roads and bridges across the national forest: *Provided*, That such rights-of-way shall not include any more land than is reasonably necessary for the purpose thereof: *Provided further*, That all or any part of such rights-of-way may be terminated by the Secretary for failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the easement, lease, or permit or for nonuse or abandonment.

(f) No agreement under section 2 (e) in connection with which purchasers of national forest timber will be required to pay to private landowners a fee for the use, or contribute to the maintenance, of the road shall be entered into until an advisory public hearing has been held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of the road, with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the necessity and reasonableness of such fees or contributions.

SEC. 3. Timber access roads are defined for purposes of the preceding sections as roads and bridges primarily for use in utilizing timber from national forests but which may be made available for utilizing other timber or for other purposes.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall be construed as modifying or repealing the right under the Act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 36), of persons owning property within the exterior boundaries of national forests to ingress and egress to and from such property.

SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, sums not in excess of $3 million for the purpose of establishing a revolving fund which may be utilized by the Secretary of the Interior, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, for constructing, improving, and maintaining roads and bridges to provide access to timber situated on Indian reservations; if Government aid for such purposes is not otherwise available under the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented. Such revolving fund shall be reimbursed for amounts expended therefrom for the construction, improvement, or maintenance of any such road or bridge on any Indian reservation from the proceeds from the sale of timber from such reservation, and no moneys shall be expended from such fund for such purposes unless such reimbursement has been consented to by the affected Indian tribes and/or individuals on such terms and over such period of time as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and such tribes or individuals.

(b) A report shall be made annually by the Secretary of the Interior to the Congress setting forth operations under this section and the status of the fund established pursuant thereto.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it has been the practice of Congress to amend the Federal Highway Act biennially, and this is the year when the act would normally be amended. Last year, a highway bill did pass the Senate, but it was a bill designed primarily to take care of our interstate system. As will be recalled, there was considerable discussion concerning the method of financing. Before developing this bill, I checked the record, and found that there had not been a hearing on the forest development roads and trails program by the Senate committee. The Department of Agriculture apparently was not called, nor was it requested to submit a report on the forest development road and trail program. Actually, there was no apparent need, because their authorization was good through 1957; and, as I have just said, this is the year when, under customary practice, we would amend the act.

HOW ACCESS ROADS ARE BUILT

Mr. President, the forest development road and trail section of the Federal

Highway Act differs somewhat from any of the other sections. Roads built into national-forest timber are financed in two major ways. The first method is for the Forest Service to reduce the price it is asking for timber offered for sale, by an amount equivalent to the cost of road construction; and the timber sale purchaser then builds the road. The second method is through the use of appropriated funds. Under the first method, the Forest Service, in effect, appropriates the funds to itself. The bill I have introduced merely proposes to spell out the policy of the Congress regarding the types of roads which will be built into national-forest timber with appropriated funds and the types which can best be constructed by timber-sale purchasers. It provides for graduated increases in the amount of money made available for forest-development roads and trails on our national forests. This money is used primarily for timber-access roads.

THE NATIONAL FOREST CAN SUPPLY MORE TIMBER

Mr. President, in 1952, the Forest Service made a detailed public presentation of its access-roads needs. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a popular version of the Forest Service's presentation, designated as "An Access Road Program for National Forests."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ACCESS ROAD PROGRAM FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

(By Mason B. Bruce, Division of Timber Management, U. S. Forest Service)

The national forests of the United States contain some 73 million acres of commercial forest land or 16 percent of the nationwide total. On the basis of current growing stocks, existing utilization standards and adequacy of markets, the sustained yield capacity of these national forests is estimated to be at least 6.6 billion board feet. This estimated capacity is a tentative one that will increase as the basic contributing factors improve.

In 1942 the national forest timber cut was 2.2 billion board feet with a unit value of $2.78 per 1,000 board-feet and a total value of $6.1 million. By 1947 sales had increased to 3.8 billion board-feet with a unit value of $4.28 with a corresponding total value of $16.4 million. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, volume was 4.4 billion board-feet with a value of $59.3 million at the average rate of $13.43 per 1,000 feet.

A major reason for the inability to harvest the sustained yield capacity of national forests is lack of timber access roads. The national forests of the West contain almost one-third of the total volume of sawtimber remaining in the country. Here lies much of the potential for current national forest production. These western forests were created from public domain. They include the most remote, roughest, and least developed timberlands in the West, the fringes and remnants not taken up by early settlers. Original transportation routes avoided them, and to this day large portions of them are still roadless. This group of national forests accounts for most of the difference between actual cut and capacity.

Using the 1952 average value per 1,000 board-feet cut of $13.43 and assuming that national-forest cutting during that year had been at estimated capacity, $89 million would have been paid into the Treasury, an increase of $30 million over that actually earned. Such added revenue to the Government is obtainable with an adequate timber-access road system. Until such a road system is developed, the added revenue is lost each year, and the timber it represents is lost to blowdown, insects, and decay.

Roads of the national forest transportation system fall into two groups, (1) forest highways and (2) forest development roads. Forest highways are roads of primary importance to States, counties, and communities within or adjoining national forests. They are built under Bureau of Public Roads supervision and maintained by States or counties. Forest development roads are roads of primary importance for protection, administration, and utilization of the forest. Planning, construction, and maintenance of these roads are responsibilities of the Forest Service.

Timber access roads as considered here include roads constructed or reconstructed for the primary purpose of utilizing the timber resources of the lands tributary to them. Although forest highways also are commonly used for timber-hauling purposes and are important in timber-access planning, the data developed here refer to forest-development roads.

In the past, funds for national forest timber access road construction have come from regular Forest Service appropriations augmented to a limited extent by special financing such as Defense Highway Act and National Housing Administration funds. Regardless of the financing method, roads designated as timber-access roads conform to the above use classification.

Since timber production is but one of several national-forest uses, many roads have been and will continue to be constructed to serve a number of uses. These are described as general-purpose roads. Oftentimes a road constructed originally for timber-access purposes develops additional traffic for other uses such as mining, recreation, or grazing and thereby becomes a general-purpose road. When such supplementary use can be foreseen roads of this nature are classed as general purpose.

At present forest-development roads on the national forests comprise some 110,000 miles. Of this total approximately 25 percent are of primary importance for timber hauling and are classed as timber-access roads. About 70 percent of the remainder are of secondary value for timber hauling and are classed as general-purpose roads serving timber.

Not all existing roads on the forest-development system are suitable for log hauling. In the early development of the national forests, improvements were necessarily designed primarily for protection from fire. This demanded quick access for manpower; hence, the cheapest and quickest routes were chosen. Roads were built to pioneer standards so that more of the total area could be covered quickly. Often they were routed over high ground to obtain fire detection and control advantages. It is necessary to reconstruct pioneer protection roads to higher standards before they can serve for economical log hauling.

Several types of access roads are commonly used in timber harvesting operations. They are generally described as (1) mainline roads, those providing primary access to major drainages or large timbered areas; (2) lateral roads, those feeding into the primary system and serving relatively smaller drainages and blocks of timber; and (3) logging spurs, low-standard roads which penetrate to all parts of the logging chances. Mainline roads and almost all laterals are considered permanent roads which will be available for timber hauling for many years to come. From a use viewpoint, mainline roads are those receiving almost continuous use for timber hauling, whereas lateral roads, because they give access to smaller timber volumes, receive only intermittent use. Where the cuts are small, laterals may be constructed to low standards. After the timber is cut these are put in condition for minimum maintenance until the next periodic cut occurs. Logging spurs are usually temporary roads serving small areas. They are constructed by timber purchasers.

Mainline and lateral roads may be constructed by either the Government or, as a timber sale requirement, by the operator. This latter method involves selling timber with the requirement that the necessary road be built by the timber purchaser. Whether the public or a timber purchaser builds the road the cost is borne by the United States. If the purchaser builds it, the anticipated cost must be a deduction from the price he is willing to pay for the timber. If the Government provides the road no such deduction is necessary and a corresponding increase in the price of stumpage can be obtained.

The choice between public and operator construction, when conditions permit such a choice, is an important and sometimes difficult one. The decision must take into account a number of factors including nature and resources of local industry being served, timber volumes to be harvested, estimated unit road costs, management objectives, community stability, availability of public access road funds for such construction, and the like.

Under many circumstances the sale of national forest timber without advance construction of the necessary main haul roads is impractical or inadvisable. Where expensive road construction is involved, many small operators lack the capital or equipment to undertake it. Under such circumstances a large block of timber with cutting rights for many years in the future must be offered for sale. Such long-term commitments have generally proved to be undesirable. If construction is by the purchaser, it is usually impossible to avoid selling the most accessible block of timber first. Frequently the timber most in need of cutting is more remote. Hence a sound, systematic plan of marketing cannot be developed.

PUBLIC ROAD CONSTRUCTION

The advantages of public road construction are :

1. A logical order of cutting can be developed. Rapidly deteriorating timber can be marketed first. Cutting can be distributed to avoid concentrations of slash which create difficult problems of fire protection. Cutting can be located to log high elevation timber during the summer months and low elevation timber during the winter months, thus enabling year-round operations. Salvage cutting of individual trees or stands can be undertaken promptly as necessary.

2. A public transportation system broadens competition in bidding for stumpage. Many operators cannot bid for large sale units with costly road requirements. The best returns to the Treasury have proved to come from relatively short-term sale offerings rather than large long-term sales.

3. The road system can be designed and built to furnish the lowest cost transportation system for all of the national forest timber served by it. In contrast, where purchaser construction of the main roads is practiced, the purchaser of course wants to build the road primarily to serve the individual sale, so that considerable rebuilding and often relocation is required for subsequent sales. A road system designed for lowest average transportation cost for all the timber in a national forest working circle will result in great returns to the Treasury through stumpage receipts.

4. Opportunities to market special products can be developed. Much more revenue can be obtained through the sale of special products, such as poles and piling, separately and in advance of the sale of the main sawlog crop. A good deal of such material is unavoidably wasted or put to uses to which it is not best suited when it must be sold in conjunction with the main sawlog harvesting. A public road system is a key to the conduct of this highly profitable special wood products business.

Some mainline and lateral roads are obtained as the result of State and county construction, particularly in localities where national forest lands are intermingled with privately owned lands and in the vicinity of communities. Often too, advantage is taken, through special arrangements, of roads constructed by private timberland owners for access to their lands adjacent to or within national forests. Cooperative arrangements of this nature are common. However, road construction from these sources is a minor segment of the total.

ACCESS ROAD STUDY

During 1951 a study of national forest timber access road construction was made. Its objective was to determine and schedule, in an orderly manner, the road construction necessary for increasing the rate of cutting on national forest lands to sustained yield capacity within 5 years. Involved were two distinct classes of construction and reconstruction: (1) that necessary to maintain the present rate of cutting and (2) that necessary to increase the rate of cutting from its present level to capacity. The data obtained reflect determinations made on the basis of existing logging practices, construction costs, and markets. All construction requirements were calculated as of June 30, 1952.

In scheduling construction responsibility to individuals and groups, an effort was made to be realistic. All construction having a direct effect upon timber access that should properly be done by public agencies such as States, counties, and towns and by neighboring private interests was so scheduled. Of the remaining construction, that considered necessary for a prudent operator to construct in connection with removal of purchased timber, the costs of which would be included in applicable sale appraisals, was scheduled for forest service operator construction. The rest was earmarked for Government construction. This latter consisted largely of high-cost mainline roads, expensive bottlenecks, roads to salvage areas and key roads necessary for effective management of the resource and for community stability.

HOLD GOVERNMENT WORK DOWN

In short, an attempt was made to keep Government-financed construction to a minimum even though, in some cases, the Government might benefit financially if greater portions of the basic transportation system were constructed with Federal funds.

There had been previous estimates of the amount of timber access road construction necessary to increase the rate of cutting on national forests to capacity. During 1949 such a study was made at the request of the National Security Resources Board. Although overall requirements as then determined were later found to be representative, the data soon lost their value because of lack of effective coordination with field activity and planning.

To overcome this fault the new data were developed on a so-called working circle basis, a working circle being the smallest forest unit from which a sustained yield of forest products is planned. Within the national forests are some 600 working circles with sustained yield capacities of 1 million board-feet or more annually. The timber access road situation on each of these was analyzed in the light of current and capacity production and individual road requirement estimates were made. Data were then summarized by national forests, States, and Forest Service regions. The results are representative and provide a substantial basis for planning.

In measuring timber access road requirements for partially developed working circles it was recognized that not all new construction results in sustained increases in production. Maintaining a continuous high level of production from a managed forest area requires a road system that will permit spreading the cut over the entire area. Hence in many working circles where the access road system is now inadequate yet cutting is at capacity, new roads must be constructed to permit planwise expansion of the cutting area. To neglect such maintenance of the current cut will lower the productive capacity of the working circle. At present very few, if any, national forest working circles are completely accessible for timber harvesting.

Table 1 gives an estimate of the mileage and cost of timber access road construction necessary to maintain the current rate of national forest cutting.

The table shows that over 90 percent of the required construction is planned for Government and timber sale operator construction. Maintenance of the present rate of cutting generally involves construction within working circles where initial access already exists. New construction needed is primarily in the form of lateral roads. Since these lend themselves readily to timber sale operator construction, over 50 percent of the total requirements are so scheduled.

It should be borne in mind that operator construction has somewhat the status of contract construction at Government expense, since the Government in effect pays for the roads through equivalent reduction in stumpage prices. If operator construction is to be utilized to the fullest extent for the current and subsequent cuttings, such roads require location and construction design similar to that provided for contract projects financed from appropriated funds. Furthermore, the importance of a road to other unsold timber within the drainage often is of little concern to the immediate purchaser, making it good business for the Government to provide location and design that will benefit all tributary timber. To meet this situation and obtain roads on desired permanent locations and of the proper standards for future use, Government funds are used to supplement the expenditures which are determined prudent for operators to make and which are allowed for in appraisals.

Table 1 (second item listed) and other cost estimates include the Government expense of such cooperation with timber sale purchasers. This allowance varies among Forest Service regions, amounting to approximately 19 percent of countrywide operator construction costs.

Table 2 shows additional timber access road construction necessary to increase the rate of cutting from current level to sustained yield capacity.

Since increases in sustained yield capacity frequently involve mainline road construction with heavy advance investments, table 2 shows relatively less construction by operators.

In order to meet the objective, namely, to increase the rate of cutting on national forests from its present annual level of 4.4 billion board feet to estimated current capacity of some 6.6 billion board feet, both schedules as outlined in tables 1 and 2 must be carried out. It is not practical to attempt to increase the current rate of cutting without taking substantial measures to maintain the position now held. To do so would result in overcutting of stands now accessible, making growing stocks inadequate and eventually curtailing production.

Table 3 combines the information in tables 1 and 2 to show total construction needed to increase the present rate of cutting national forest timber to sustained yield capacity in a period of 5 years.

Table 4 presents an estimate, in terms of current values, of the annual cost of maintaining production at sustained yield capacity for a period commencing after the proposed development program has been accomplished. Maintenance of cutting at capacity will involve somewhat lower annual costs than are necessary to maintain the cut at present, because the major bottlenecks will have been overcome during the initial 5-year program period.

The estimates are based on the assumption that cutting will continue at a rate of some 6.6 billion board feet annually for an additional 5 years after the original 5-year program period. It is reasonable to expect that within 5 years from present date new markets and utilization requirements and wider acceptance of certain species will result in a substantial increase in sustained yield capacity. However, the estimate serves to round out the timber access problem in terms of current volumes and values and suggests what maintenance costs would be involved after reaching currently foreseeable capacity.

It is desirable to bring out in more detail some of the significant financial aspects of the proposed program.

Table 5 shows, by national forest regions, where the access problem is concentrated, cost to the Government to meet it, and the public benefits that may be expected.

Table 6 gives an analysis of the practicability of the proposed program in terms of permanent road cost per 1,000 board feet of planned cut.

The annual cost in Government funds to step up the level of cutting by 2.2 billion board feet to sustained yield capacity in 5 years is $22,494,000. Assuming that the national forest timber current average stumpage value continues unchanged, the increase in annual revenue to the Government would amount to more than annual cost once production is underway.

SUMMARY

1. The current rate of cutting national forest timber is 4.4 billion board feet.

2. Estimated sustained yield capacity of the national forests with existing growing stocks, markets, and utilization standards is 6.6 billion board feet.

3. Inaccessibility is the primary obstacle to reaching sustained yield capacity.

4. Road construction required to increase the cut to sustained yield capacity within a period of five years amounts to 16,707 miles at a cost of $255,802,000.

5. Of this construction 15,420 miles are timber access roads costing $221,764,000. The remaining 1,287 miles costing $34,038,000 are multiple-purpose roads, timber access being secondary to other uses.

6. It is proposed that construction of the 15,420 miles of timber access road be financed on the basis of $112,472,000 from appropriated funds and $109,292,000 from purchasers of national forest timber, the latter in the form of construction included as a timber purchase requirement.

7. On the basis of a 5-year program period, Government cost would amount to $22,494,000 annually. Timber purchaser cost for the same period would be $21,859,000 annually.

8. At present price levels the increase in revenue would more than equal the total Government expenditure of $112,472,000 within four years after increased production is obtained.

TABLE 1.—*Access road construction required to maintain current rate of national forest cutting, exclusive of Alaska, Puerto Rico*

Agency responsible for construction	Requirements, 5-year period				Agency responsible for construction	Requirements, 5-year period			
	Average annual		Total			Average annual		Total	
	Miles	Cost	Miles	Cost		Miles	Cost	Miles	Cost
Forest Service construction using appropriated funds	446	$6,366,000	2,228	$31,830,000	Towns, counties, and States	51	$1,746,000	257	$8,730,000
Forest Service cooperation in timber sale operator construction	----	2,604,000	----	13,020,000	Forest Service timber sale operator construction	1,317	13,761,000	6,583	68,805,000
Total Forest Service construction	446	8,970,000	2,228	44,850,000	Adjacent timberland owners, mining interests, etc	85	554,000	427	2,770,000
					Total requirements	1,899	25,031,000	9,495	125,155,000

TABLE 2.—*Access road construction required to increase rate of cutting to sustained yield capacity in all national forests exclusive of Alaska and Puerto Rico*

Agency responsible for construction	Requirements, 5-year period				Agency responsible for construction	Requirements, 5-year period			
	Average annual		Total			Average annual		Total	
	Miles	Cost	Miles	Cost		Miles	Cost	Miles	Cost
Forest Service construction using appropriated funds	661	$11,657,000	3,304	$58,285,000	Forest Service timber sale, operator construction	661	$8,098,000	3,305	$40,487,000
Forest Service cooperation in timber sale operator construction	----	1,867,000	----	9,337,000	Adjacent timberland owners, mining interests, etc	43	942,000	216	4,711,000
Total Forest Service construction	661	13,524,000	3,304	67,622,000	Total requirements	1,442	26,129,000	7,212	130,647,000
Towns, counties, and States	77	3,565,000	387	17,827,000					

TABLE 3.—*5-year program of timber access road construction for all national forests, exclusive of Alaska and Puerto Rico*

Agency responsible for construction	Requirements, 5-year period				Agency responsible for construction	Requirements, 5-year period			
	Average annual		Total			Average annual		Total	
	Miles	Cost	Miles	Cost		Miles	Cost	Miles	Cost
Forest Service construction using appropriated funds	1,107	$18,023,000	5,532	$90,115,000	Forest Service timber sale operator construction	1,978	$21,859,000	9,888	$109,292,000
Forest Service cooperation in timber sale operator construction	----	4,471,000	----	22,357,000	Adjacent timberland owners, mining interests, etc	128	1,496,000	643	7,481,000
Total Forest Service construction	1,107	22,494,000	5,532	112,472,000	Total requirements	3,341	51,160,000	16,707	255,802,000
Towns, counties, and States	128	5,311,000	644	26,557,000					

TABLE 4.—*Access road construction required to maintain cutting rate after reaching sustained yield capacity in national forests, exclusive of Alaska and Puerto Rico*

Agency responsible for construction	Average annual requirements (5-year period)		Agency responsible for construction	Average annual requirements (5-year period)	
	Miles	Cost		Miles	Cost
Forest Service construction using appropriated funds	518	$4,800,000	Towns, counties, and States	38	$588,000
Forest Service cooperation in timber sale operator construction	----	2,463,000	Forest Service timber sale operator construction	1,062	11,852,000
Total Forest Service construction	518	7,263,000	Adjacent timberland owners, mining interests, etc	67	400,000
			Total requirements	1,685	20,103,000

TABLE 5.—*Financial aspects of timber access program, by Forest Service regions*

National forests regions	Timber cut during fiscal year 1952	Sustained-yield capacity	Annual cost to Government for needed roads [1]	Gain possible with sustained-yield capacity	Annual value of increased cut available [2]	National forests regions	Timber cut during fiscal year 1952	Sustained-yield capacity	Annual cost to Government for needed roads [1]	Gain possible with sustained-yield capacity	Annual value of increased cut available [2]
	Million board feet	*Million board feet*	*Dollars*	*Million board feet*	*Dollars*		*Million board feet*	*Million board feet*	*Dollars*	*Million board feet*	*Dollars*
1. Northern Rocky Mountain	450	810	4,483,000	360	4,835,000	6. Pacific Northwest	1,793	2,552	6,639,000	759	10,193,000
2. Rocky Mountain	198	460	2,131,000	262	3,519,000	7. Eastern	89	120	621,000	31	416,000
3. Southwestern	244	247	493,000	3	40,000	8. Southern	487	651	773,000	164	2,203,000
4. Intermountain	131	195	1,570,000	64	860,000	9. North central	297	415	1,584,000	118	1,585,000
5. California	666	1,181	4,200,000	515	6,916,000						

[1] Cost of roads needed to cut sustained yield capacity and maintain that level, accomplished over 5-year period.

[2] Based on fiscal year 1952 average stumpage value for national forest timber.

TABLE 6.—*Unit costs for Government and operator construction*

Element of cost	Road cost per thousand board feet		
	Government share	Operator share	Total
1. Annual cost per thousand board feet, 5-year period, for permanent access roads necessary to maintain cutting at its present level of 4.4 billion board feet (see table 1)	$2.04	$3.13	$5.17
2. Cost of permanent access roads per board feet of increased cut over present capacity, assuming roads constructed will contribute to a total cut of 22 billion board feet in 10 years (see table 2)	3.07	1.84	4.91
3. Annual cost per thousand board feet, 6th to 10th year, for permanent access roads, necessary to maintain cutting at sustained yield capacity of 6.6 billion board feet (see table 2)	1.10	1.80	2.90

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the access road needs, as set forth in the presentation, were based upon an allowable cut of 6.9 billion board-feet from our national forests, and were also designed to keep Government-financed construction to a minimum, even though in some cases the Government might benefit financially if greater portions of the basic transportation system were constructed with Federal funds.

The situation has now changed. The Chief of the Forest Service testified before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that instead of an annual sustained yield cut of 6.9 billion feet, the Forest Service could be cutting up to 9.5 billion board-feet by 1960, if additional roads could be programed. In his testimony, the Chief of the Forest Service said that the 1952 analysis did not take into account changing standards of merchantability under which areas which were formerly considered not only inaccessible but unmerchantable, are now in demand. In addition, the 1952 analysis did not take into account the revenue opportunities that accrue by salvaging the recurrent natural mortality which is scattered through timberlands. This unrecovered natural mortality is an important leak that can be plugged by light cutting over of these areas. The Chief of the Forest Service recognized that the economic feasibility of this sort of cutting has developed only recently, and he also stated that additional public-road construction, over and above the public-road system needed for cutting the ordinary sustained yield capacity of each working circle, will be required. Recognition of these needs will result in income much greater than the expenditure required to obtain it. He went on to say that even more important is the opportunity to provide additional raw material for the forest-product industries, which are so vital in the economy of the Pacific Northwest and other forest regions of our country.

THE VALUE OF ACCESS ROADS

In addition to these more recently recognized opportunities, the obvious advantages of the access road program are, first, a logical order of cutting can be developed, and second, a public transportation system broadens competitive bidding for stumpage.

Many operators cannot bid for large sales with costly road requirements. The best returns to the Treasury have proved to come from relatively short-term sale offerings rather than from large long-term sales. I might add here that in 1953 the Comptroller General presented a report to the Congress on the sale of Government-owned timber. He stressed that the Congress should authorize the financing and construction of all main line access roads by the agencies themselves rather than by purchasers through an allowance in timber sale price.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in my remarks, a table furnished me by the chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, entitled "Forest Service Large Sale Record, Pacific Northwest Region."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sale size	Number of sales	Total volume (board feet)	Average road cost per sale	Average size of sale (board feet)	Percent of sales with competition	Average percent of increase over appraised price due to bidding
10,000,000 to 25,000,000 board feet	53	863,000,000	$93,000	16,300,000	73	53
25,000,000 to 50,000,000 board feet	16	554,000,000	178,000	34,600,000	41	39
Over 50,000,000 board feet	3	242,000,000	482,000	81,000,000	0	0

Mr. MORSE. In the sales in the ten to twenty-five million board-feet group the total appraised price was $9,443,364 and the bid price received was $14,421,775. The total Forest Service allowance in timber sales for road costs was $4,914,575.

For the sales in the 25 to 50 million board-feet class, the total appraised value was $5,109,971 and the bid total was $7,102,740. The total Forest Service allowance for roads was $2,858,897. As the above table shows, the average road cost per sale almost doubled. It is $178,000 per sale. Note how the bidding dropped. If the Government had built the mainline roads in these sales as well as in some of the ten to twenty-five million board-feet sales the number of bidders and competition would have been increased.

On the sales over 50 million board feet there was no competition. The total appraised and bid price involved $4,731,398 worth of valuable timber. The road-construction allowance in the appraisal was $1,443,529; and I might point out that one sale accounted for $823,880 of this allowance.

Two of the three sales represent lower than usual road costs for this size of sale. Going back a few years more, I find that on these big sales the average road cost is $533,000 per sale. This is over five times the average cost of roads in the smaller class.

If it is a matter of having the roads built on the most economical basis, the program which I am recommending this afternoon is a sound program.

The point I want to make is that in these 72 sales, $9,217,001 was allowed for road construction of all sorts. A portion was for mainline access roads. $4,208,479 was allowed in sales for which no competitive bidding occurred and again a portion of this was for mainline access roads.

This bill, if enacted, will place the construction of mainline access roads under bidding by qualified roadbuilders and put more timber sales in true competitive bidding status.

To the extent that these allowances covered mainline access roads the price of the Government timber would have been raised. In other words, if $5 million of the total involved mainline construction accomplished under appropriated funds, the price of Forest Service timber would be raised to take into account this expenditure.

The third advantage is that the road system can be designed and built to furnish the lowest cost transportation system for all of the national forest timber served by it. The road system can also be developed to provide for the other users of our national forests, such as recreationists, miners, and grazers.

The fourth advantage is the opportunity to market special products. Thinning sales can be conducted in advance of the sale of the main sawlog harvest.

THE VIEWS OF AFFECTED PEOPLE

In 1952 the National Forest Advisory Council issued a report on access road construction on the national forests. They reported to the Secretary of Agriculture that there were many reasons why the Forest Service should build a large part of these main arterial timber roads. They agreed that the timber-sale purchasers should build the secondary and spur roads, as well as a network of local logging roads. They stressed that while the timber industries may spend the necessary funds for building main access roads, the cost has been deducted from the prices which the Government asked when the timber was offered for sale. In this way, the main access roads are, in reality, financed by the Government no matter who builds them; and, I respectfully point out, at a greater cost than if the Government itself built them. If I say nothing else in this speech, I wish to stress that what we want to do

is to avoid false economy. In the matter of building access roads, if my bill is enacted, it will mean money in the pockets of the taxpayers.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table from pages 15 and 16 of the report showing representative views of timbermen all over the Nation.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LIMITED SAMPLING SURVEY OF COMPANIES IN CONTRACT WITH FOREST SERVICE TIMBER SALES TO DETERMINE ATTITUDE ON ACCESS ROADS

In an effort to understand the attitude of industry, large and small, on the question of access roads on the national forests, the advisory council has contacted a number of individuals and companies who either now are interested in the availability of national-forest timber or will be interested later. This limited survey is summarized in the following statements:

1. Should access roads into the national forests be opened up? (No reference as to who should build the roads.)

Large operators: Yes, 88 percent; no, 12 percent.

Medium-sized operators: Yes, 95 percent; no, 5 percent.

Small-sized operators: Yes, 100 percent; no, none.

2. Should main access roads be built by Government?

Large operators: Yes, 33 percent; no, 67 percent.[1]

Medium-sized operators: Yes, 95 percent; no, 5 percent.

Small-sized operators: Yes, 100 percent; no, none.

3. Would lack of Federal access roads restrict bidding on timber?

Large operators: Yes, none; no, 100 percent.[2]

Medium-sized operators: Yes, 84 percent; [3] no, 16 percent.[3]

Small-sized operators: Yes, 65 percent; no, 35 percent.

Mr. MORSE. Starting on page 83, the report cited comments and opinions from segments of the timber industry on Federal timber access-road program. This 29-page section of the report makes interesting reading—and shows almost unanimous opinion by small and medium and by many large operators in favor of increasing Federal financing of construction for mainline roads. Benefits stressed included the creation of equal opportunity to bid on Federal timber, increased returns to the Government, reduction of overcutting on private timber, stretching dwindling supplies of private timber, greater opportunities for small operators, impetus to the local economy. The report also discussed ways of overcoming the difficulties of smaller companies in financing expensive main-road construction, the good effect on size of sale and the enhancement of stumpage prices.

This fall, hearings on timber-sale policy were held on the west coast and it was my pleasure to make a statement before the committee. In addition, I have had an opportunity to study the record of these hearings and to see what the overall views of the people are. Almost without exception, operators large and small favor increased construction of main-line access roads by the Federal Government.

The distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], who now presides over the Senate, participated in those hearings. He was in my State when the hearings were held there. I want him to know that I appreciate very much the way many contributions which he made to those hearings, not only in connection with the access-roads problem, but in connection with the general forest timber problem. I am sure that I could call him to the witness stand as my witness in support of the observation which I have just made with respect to the almost complete unanimity, or, at least, the fact that an overwhelming majority of the timber operators themselves agreed in those hearings that the Federal Government should finance the greater portion of the main-line access roads. In their testimony at the hearing, they set forth many of the same arguments and conclusions which I am setting forth in this speech.

THE SITUATION IN OREGON

The Oregon national forests have vast stands of timber in need of utilization, development and modern management. One of the basic tools of management is a good road system. Our Oregon national forests are currently depositing net profits of $14.5 million in the Federal Treasury each year. This amount is over and above all of the expenses, direct and indirect, for all of the work which the Forest Service does.

It is interesting to note that there are three other States which enjoy this distinction, namely, Washington, Texas and Arkansas. There are many individual forests which are returning big cash dividends to the Treasury and the evidence is clear that timber access roads are the key to not only profitable but also to sound management of public timber.

There are areas like on the Malheur Forest, where only 32 million board feet were cut last year, but the allowable cut is 67 million board feet.

That is not sound conservation, Mr. President. Sometimes we hear people argue that if we cut more we shall be following an unsound conservation program. That is not a sound argument, because the so-called allowable cut which is computed by our Department of Agriculture, through the Forest Service, and by our Department of the Interior, is based upon the cut which will give us the soundest conservation program in the handling of our forests. There is no sound conservation in letting a large Federal forest become inaccessible, with the result that over-ripeness destroys many of the trees, and disease takes hold of the forest and runs unchecked, destroying many of the trees. The operation of the elements and the weather results in the need for salvage operations in the forest in order to get out the blow-down timber, the dead timber, and the overripe timber. These trees become a great fire hazard.

There is no sound conservation program in a policy which permits a great national forest to remain inaccessible, with the result that the blown timber constitutes such a great fire hazard that one spark may result in the loss of many square miles of precious Federal timber, which means a loss of the timber resources of that area for many decades to come.

It is because of an argument made by one witness in one of our hearings against access roads that I make this argument today. This witness expressed the view that if we did not build access roads it might turn out to be a good thing for future generations from the standpoint of a conservation program. My reply to him is that I think one of the essentials of a sound conservation program is a program of access roads, because with these roads we can protect our forests, we can truly conserve our forests, we can expect a sustained yield cutting program, we can get at forest fires in there, we can get at the diseases of the timber, and we can get at the salvage timber.

Let me make it perfectly clear that no one in my State will fight harder for a sound conservation program than the senior Senator from Oregon. However, I wish to stress the fact that if we are to have a sound conservation program, the forests must be accessible for putting into operation a sound conservation program.

It is not sound conservation merely to let forests go unmanaged. That results in terrific losses.

In the Siskiyou National Forest, the cut last year was 75 million board-feet and the potential is 153 million board-feet. On one working circle on that forest, with only 12 miles of road, only 2½ million feet were cut last year and the quota was 54 million feet.

Two and a half million feet of an allowable 54-million-foot cut. That is not a sound conservation program. A sound cutting practice will get out of that forest overripe timber and timber that needs to be taken out in order to maintain a healthy forest.

Mr. President, on the subject of forest conservation I divert for a moment from the principal topic of my remarks—access roads—to discuss briefly the extremely important subject of timber resource development.

TIMBER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Linked very closely to multiple-use management of our national resources are the resource development program on the national forests, and the State and private forestry-aid programs of the Forest Service. Every acre of public and private land that is not well covered with grass or timber hurts us two ways. It does not produce a crop for the future and adds to our erosion and land-management problems today.

The recent timber resources review indicates the need we have to get not only more timber growing but increase its quality. The Forest Service has 4 million acres of its own that should be planted to trees and at the current rate of expenditures it will take 200 years to do the job. They have over 3 million acres of range that need to be planted to grass and it will take 50 years to do this job at the current rate. This is a capital expenditure item which results

[1] No, or with various restrictions or reservations.

[2] Operators with certain exceptions.

[3] Several with some exceptions.

from the misfortunes of the past. In a way it is a part of our national debt and a part that ought to be reduced. It is an investment that we ought to make in the future.

On this item of resource development I think the Forest Service ought to come in next year with a program geared to solve this problem in the next 20 years instead of 200. I think that the Forest Service should get their nursery program in shape because it takes a couple of years to collect seed and grow trees before you can actually start replanting. Getting timberland back in production is vital to meeting future work needs and getting these national forest lands growing timber is another way of increasing the allowable cut.

There are 60 million acres of private land in need of replanting to trees. Based upon combined Federal and State funds currently being spent, it will take 2,000 years to do this job. Under the State and private forestry programs, the Federal Government is expending as its share only $505,000 for what is known as section 4 of the Clarke-McNary Act.

As I recall, in 1950 the Congress authorized up to $2½ million a year as the Federal contribution to this program. I think that the States had every reason to expect that the Federal Government would do something toward getting that authorization and I believe that the amount of Federal participation in this program should be raised to $750,000 this year. In addition, I would like to recommend that the Forest Service and the Association of State Foresters be requested to get together, make use of the text of the Timber Resources Review, and come in here with a program of State and Federal cooperation that will get the job done in less than 2,000 years. Improved productivity of private land is an area where the Federal Government does have responsibilities, but the greatest bulk of the initiative should come from the State and local governments and from private owners themselves.

ACCESS ROADS PAY FOR THEMSELVES

Observe what happens on a fairly well-developed forest, such as the Willamette National Forest. Last year on that forest alone, the full allowable cut, worth $7 million, was sold. This is almost 20 percent of the total for the Oregon national forests.

An outstanding example is on the Mount Hood National Forest where 1 working circle embraces 410,000 acres in the headwaters of the Clackamas River. There are 9 billion board-feet of timber in this drainage and an allowable cut of 200 million feet annually.

In 1942 a timber-access road was put into this drainage with appropriated funds and since then it has been extended. Six million dollars has been invested in this road to date and the Government has gotten back $9 million in cash from the sale of timber. From now on, this drainage alone will bring over $1 million annually because of its development, and that will continue far, far into the future.

I should like to know where else an expenditure of $6 million of taxpayers' money will reap such a large dividend over the years as is being realized from this 1 access road.

In addition, with the construction of a high-grade road, recreationists' visits have increased from 3,000 per year to 112,000 per year. By actual count on a Labor Day weekend, 6,000 cars used this road. On working days, a loaded logging truck travels over this road every 3 minutes.

I think this is an outstanding example of what these access roads mean.

I cite the foregoing examples to show how important it is that we invest a relatively small amount in our Federal forests so that they may be operated on a businesslike basis—on a basis which will bring heavy dividends to the owners of these forests—the American people.

THE BUSINESS ASPECTS

Mr. President, I was shocked to discover that we are investing, in appropriated funds, only 30 cents per acre, based on the commercial timberland acreage, in the national forest road network. We are currently spending the equivalent of 60 cents an acre on national park road network and it is proposed to raise it to 75 cents per acre. The Forest Service has 45 million visitors a year which is as many as the Park Service has. In addition, the Forest Service is our big Federal timber-selling agency.

Over $1 per acre is being invested in access roads on the O. & C. lands, managed by the BLM, and this will be stepped up to $2.25 per acre this year by the House action on the BLM budget. In connection with this, I want to say that because of the special conditions surrounding the revestment, 18 O. & C. counties of Oregon receive as in-lieu payments 3 times the forest income paid to counties under the Forest Service statute. Thus, it is necessary to work with these counties to provide the money for Federal access roads on these lands. Last summer, they petitioned to have one-third of their share of receipts, or $4.5 million annually, allocated to main-line access roads. This amounts to an investment of $2.25 per acre per year. They consider it a good sound investment which will pay dividends.

Let us take a look at who the proponents are. They are the county judges of my State. We call them county judges. We have a commission form of government in our counties, in that we usually have three county judges who have supervisory authority over the county's interests in natural resources. In Oregon they have supervisory authority over the so-called O. & C. counties. What they are saying to the Federal Government is, "We would like to work out an arrangement with you whereby one-third of the payment that you make to our county in lieu of taxes for Federal land that is represented by the O. & C. land will go into main-line access roads, because we know they are a good investment. Furthermore, we are willing to take one-third of the money that you send into our county in lieu of taxpayments and put it into access roads." Of course, they want the Federal Government to do its share, too. However, that one-third would amount to $.2.25 an acre.

There is quite a difference between that amount of money and 30 cents per acre that we are spending at the present time. These county judges are close to the problem. They know what main-line access roads mean to a sound forest-management system. They know that putting that money into main-line access roads will bring out of the forest many times the investment in the roads; and they know that it is not possible to bring out of the forests a dime's worth of the timber without the access roads. In other words, it is necessary to have the roads in order to reap the harvests from the forests.

This will result in tremendously speeding up the development of these valuable lands.

I think it is shocking that the national forests which are the pride of our country are so underfinanced in this vital management investment. The annual investment contemplated by this bill will be only $1 per thousand board-feet for the commercial timber in our national forests over the life of the program.

Our national forests and the timber on them have a capital value in excess of $8 billion. We can only realize a decent return upon our capital by providing investments of the type that will aid in the sound marketing of the timber. With an adequate system of access roads, I forsee an annual income from the sale of timber in excess of $160 million.

Sound business economics will clearly demonstrate that a program at this level will return the full cost, and a profit besides. S. 3420, if enacted, would insure that the mainlines needed for overall access and development can be pushed in faster and in a better way. I believe in this bill because it is a sound investment; second, because it is good for the business economy for our forest regions; and third, because it will promote multiple-use management and make the forest more available to the lumberman, the recreationist and all the other people who use our forests. The views I express here echo those of lumbermen and recreationists at the hearings in November on Federal timber sale practices in the West. This was one of the few subjects upon which there was such agreement.

THE ACCESS ROAD NEEDS

In its 1952 estimate the Forest Service computed that it would require $25 million annually in order to maintain the current rate of cutting on the national forests and that another $26 million would have to be expended annually in order to increase the rate of cutting up to 6.9 billion feet. This called for a total expenditure of $51 million per year for a 5-year period. Approximately one-half of the expenditure was to be appropriated funds and the other one-half of the roads were to be built by allowances to timber-sale contractors.

What is the present status of our forest access road program? When I appeared before the House Public Works Committee this year I heard Mr. Cliff of the Forest Service state that there are 120,000 miles in the Forest Service road system. This includes all classes of roads. There are timber-access roads, roads for fire protection and roads for

general management purposes. There are also 118,000 miles of trails in our national forests, and these trails are used to link up lookouts and quite a number of them are the trails that are used by hunters and campers. Assistant Chief Cliff told the House Public Works Committee, that current plans for the national forest road system indicate they will ultimately need 161,400 miles of roads and 124,700 miles of trails. That means that the Forest Service estimates that they will have to add 41,400 miles of roads and 5,900 miles of trails to their system.

Now in addition, of this existing system, 51,100 miles of roads and 26,300 miles of trails are inadequate. The cost of correcting deficiencies in the existing inadequate mileage plus the cost of building the additional 41,400 miles of roads and 5,900 miles of trails neded for full development of the national forests is currently estimated at $1.2 billion. The total road job involves 92,500 miles of road and 32,300 miles of trail. The bill we are introducing provides that over a 12-year period $572 million will be provided to rehabilitate and to complete the major part of this system.

THE PRESENT PROGRAM

Currently the Forest Service is expending on its road system $34 million of funds either appropriated by the Congress or made available by the 10-percent fund. This expenditure is broken down as follows: maintenance of roads and trails, $9.3 million; replacement of inadequate bridges $3.2 million; construction of fire and general purpose roads $3½ million; construction of fire and general purpose roads $3½ million; engineering services on timber-access roads constructed by timber purchasers, $2.3 million. I might note here that with the expanding cut on the national forests it can be expected that this will rise somewhat because the Forest Service is under constant pressure from the lumber industry to do a better job of enginering on roads constructed by timber-sale purchasers. Thus the present program leaves only $15.7 million for timber access roads.

WHAT THIS BILL WILL DO

Our bill proposes that in fiscal 1958 the authorization be raised from $24 million to $32 million so that $8 million more will be available, and I would envision that most of this money will be used on timber access roads. The 10-percent fund is probably adequate to take care of the maintenance item as it grows, and certainly the Forest Service must continue its bridge-replacement program, put its fire and general-purpose trails in shape, and contemplate some expansion of engineering services.

The bill will then provide for a second $8 million to $40 million in 1959. This will get the amount of money for access roads up to approximately $30 million annually. This bill then proposes that the amount expended for the succeeding 10 years, depending upon the views of the Appropriation Committee, will be increased by another $10 million annually so that the amount of money available for timber access roads would be in the neighborhood of $40 million annually with the balance being spent on the construction of replacement bridges, the construction of general-purposes roads and trails and engineering services, and the 10-percent fund serving to provide the base for maintenance. The construction of timber sale roads by timber sale purchasers would go forward in this period, and would still represent some 50 percent of the overall road expenditures. These two programs should be sufficient to get our access roads and our total development program in shape by 1969.

In the light of changing conditions and the potential allowable cut now forecast as being 2½ billion feet above the 1952 figure, a new look at the access-road program is needed. The bill we are presenting will provide this new look.

THE BILL WILL SPELL OUT CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

First, it will declare that it is the policy of the Congress to develop fully the access-road system of our national forests so that the allowable cut may be realized as rapidly as is economically feasible. Secondly, it will emphasize that where high-cost main-line roads are needed, these roads will be built by the Federal Government. I might digress here just a moment to say that the money spent is appropriated funds, but the road is built by private contractors—roadbuilding contractors, bidding on the construction job. Thus, instead of burying a $200,000 or $500,000 road job in a large timber sale contract, one so large that there is only one bidder, and under a situation which may not allow the Government to get the advantage of the lowest bid for road construction, this bill will provide that the Government gets more for its money.

Also, Mr. President, contrary to thoughtless criticisms that some people make of this proposal of mine to have the Government build the roads, it would provide a great impetus to private enterprise under the competitive system. I am not proposing any so-called socialistic scheme at all. These roads will be built by private contract and by private contractors operating under the very essence of a free-enterprise system, namely, the system of competitive bidding. The Government will get the most for its money and the contractors will get an even break and an opportunity, at least, for the widest possible distribution of construction jobs.

Third, this bill will also declare that it is the policy of the Congress that the less expensive roads and those roads needed to develop individual timber sales will continue to be built by the timber sale purchaser under allowances in the timber sale contract. The result will be that national forest timber will be made available to all bidders on better terms with reduced risks. When the Government finances construction of a road with appropriated funds the price of the stumpage automatically increases because no road allowance is made in the appraisal. In addition, the Government realizes additional revenues because there is a greater opportunity for competition.

The fourth purpose of this bill will be to spell out a congressional policy regarding the development of road systems in our national forests which tap private as well as public timber. It will provide that the Forest Service can enter into agreements for cooperative construction, for sharing of costs, and for the collection of fees when substantial quantities of private timber come out over a national forest road system. The bill will also provide for the holding of public hearings, not only when roads are built with appropriated funds, but also when certain types of road agreements are entered into by the Forest Service. And the bill will protect the historical rights of ingress and egress to our national forests to the public and to landowners. I would like to say that for several of these sections, we have drawn on H. R. 7118, a bill that CLIFFORD HOPE, the distinguished ranking minority member of the House Agricultural Committee, introduced last year.

ACCESS ROADS FOR INDIAN TIMBER

We have also included a section relating to the Indian forests. This section is designed to provide that funds can be advanced to a tribe so that an access road can be constructed and the tribe will be able to pay the money back out of their receipts from the sale of timber. Indians have been at a disadvantage for many years due to their inability to secure funds for access roads into Indian timber. Thus, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has been forced, in opening up areas, to make large sales in order to finance large mainline construction road costs. This provision recognizes the same principle that applies to our national forests. The timber pays for the road, and the Indian can get a better income if the road is built in advance. We feel that it is important in raising the standard of living of our Indian and equipping him to participate as a full-fledged citizen in our civilization, that we make it possible for him to obtain an adequate income. This bill will also take care of that. I might also say that in connection with this section, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs advises me that the problem of access roads to Indian forests is a serious one, and he is pleased to learn that we have introduced a bill on the subject. Without committing the administration, he does indicate a willingness to present their views to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Congress on this matter.

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that the appropriate Senate committee will give early consideration to my bill and that we shall have an opportunity to vote on it at an early date. It is a bill which will save the taxpayers of this country many millions of dollars. It is a sound timber-conservation bill.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to announce that there will be no Saturday session. When the Senate concludes its business tomorrow, it will adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

Following the morning hour on Monday, there will be a call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection. I think permission has already been granted for the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Following the call of the calendar, the debate on the unfinished business will be resumed.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I recognize the lateness of the hour and have had grave doubts whether I should speak at all this evening. I had hoped it might have been possible tomorrow to address myself to the unfinished business, Senate Joint Resolution 31, and the substitute proposed thereto. But I have been informed that a unanimous-consent agreement has been reached which might very well preclude me from obtaining the floor for a presentation of my argument on the unfinished business.

Furthermore, during a part of next week I shall have to be away from the Senate, and therefore shall not be able to participate in the continuing discussion of this very important constitutional matter. Therefore, I utilize this time at the sufferance of the Senate to indicate my interest in and support of certain proposals which I shall outline in some detail as substitute measures.

I have presented to the Senate an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 31, which would provide for the direct election of the President and Vice President of the United States. I strongly favor this particular proposal. The electoral college as it is presently constituted is outmoded. My amendment would abolish it.

The proposed direct-election amendment, which is now at the desk, is one that I have sponsored for several years. I was highly pleased the other day to hear the former Vice President of the United States, the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], say he had long favored the direct election of the President and Vice President of the United States. It appears to me that that is the most democratic procedure possible. Without the possibility of error; it would express the majority will of the American people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the text of the amendment to which I have referred, namely, the amendment providing for the direct election of the President and Vice President of the United States, which is designated as "3–20–56–B."

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. HUMPHREY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States, as provided in the Constitution:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution.

"'The electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. The President and the Vice President shall be elected by a direct vote of the people of the United States, and the choice of the people of each State for President and Vice President shall be determined at a general election held in such State.

"'The Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States, and unless otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November in the year preceding the expiration of the regular term of the President and the Vice President. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

"'SEC. 2. Within 30 days after such election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, each State shall make distinct lists of all persons receiving votes for President and all persons receiving votes for Vice President, and the number of votes cast in such State for each, which lists shall be signed, certified, and transmitted sealed to the seat of government of the United States directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all certificates and the votes shall then be counted. The person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be President, if such number be at least 40 percent of the whole number of votes cast for President.

"'The person having the greatest number of votes for Vice President shall be Vice President, if such number be at least 40 percent of the whole number of votes cast for Vice President. No person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"'SEC. 3. If it is shown by such certificates that no person has received at least 40 percent of the whole number of votes cast for President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately by ballot the President from the 3 persons having the highest number of such votes. If it is shown by such certificates that 2 persons have each received at least 40 percent of the whole number of votes cast for President, and have also received an equal number of all such votes cast, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately by ballot the President from such 2 persons. In choosing the President pursuant to this section each Member of the House of Representatives shall have one vote. A quorum for the purpose of choosing the President shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Representatives, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. If the House of Representatives shall not choose a President before the 20th day of January next following, whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon that body, the Vice President-elect shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President.

"'SEC. 4. If it is shown by such certificates that no person has received at least 40 percent of the whole number of votes cast for Vice President, the Senate shall choose the Vice President from the 3 persons having the highest number of such votes. If it is shown by such certificates that 2 persons have each received at least 40 percent of the whole number of votes cast for Vice President, and have also received an equal number of all such votes cast, the Senate shall choose the Vice President from such two persons. A quorum for the purpose of choosing the Vice President, as provided in this section, shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice.

"'SEC. 5. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution and the 12th article of amendment to the Constitution, are hereby repealed.

"'SEC. 6. This article shall take effect on the 30th day of January following its ratification.

"'SEC. 7. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.'"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that other Senators will offer direct election amendments as substitutes for the unfinished business. I have reservations about direct presidential primaries, but none about direct presidential elections. If I were here next week, I would, of course, cast my vote for any direct election amendment offered. Since other Senators will propose similar amendments, I shall not press the direct election amendment which I have already had printed, and which is laying on the desk. I hope that the direct election proposal will come before the Senate at a time when I can cast my vote for it.

I have also offered, and had printed, another amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 31 which I should like to discuss now. It is generally referred to, and is printed, as Senate Joint Resolution 152. This particular proposal was introduced by me on March 1, 1956, and is cosponsored by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. This new amendment embodies the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 152.

As many of my colleagues already know, Senate Joint Resolution 152 has been proposed as a serious and deliberate compromise of the various proposals previously made, such as Senate Joint Resolutions 9, 10, 30, 31, and 53, to reform the presidential electoral process.

This new proposal would first, eliminate the electoral college and the presidential electors as such; second, retain the numerical strength of both Houses of Congress, that is, 531, as the numerical basis for determining the election of Presidents; third, assign two electoral votes to the candidate winning the plurality of popular votes in each State, and

fourth, divide the remaining block of 435 votes according to the proportion of popular votes received by each candidate on a nationwide basis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the amendment to which I am now addressing myself, which is designated as "3-20-56—A."

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. HUMPHREY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States, as provided in the Constitution:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution.

" 'SEC. 2. The electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. The President and Vice President shall be elected by the people of the several States. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

" 'There shall be a total number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the several States may be entitled in the Congress. Two such electoral votes shall be credited to each person receiving votes for President or Vice President for each State in which he shall have received a plurality of the total number of votes for President or Vice President, as the case may be. From the remaining number of such electoral votes, each person receiving votes for President or Vice President shall be credited with a number of electoral votes which bears the same ratio to the total number of such remaining electoral votes as the number of votes received by him for President or Vice President bears to the total number of votes cast for President or Vice President, as the case may be. In making the computations fractional numbers less than one one-thousandth shall be disregarded.

" 'Congress shall determine the time for electing the President and Vice President, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of the President is to begin.

" 'Within 30 days after such election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, each State shall make distinct lists of all persons receiving votes for President, and all persons receiving votes for Vice President, and the number of votes cast in such State for each, which lists shall be signed, certified, and transmitted sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and the House of Representatives, open all certificates and the electoral votes shall then be credited to each person for whom votes were cast for President and Vice President in the manner prescribed in this article. The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President and the person having the greatest number of electoral votes for Vice President shall be Vice President. No person constitutionally ineligible to the office of the President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

" 'SEC. 3. In the event that two or more persons shall have an equal and the highest number of electoral votes for President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately by ballot the President from such persons. In choosing the President pursuant to this section each Member of the House of Representatives shall have one vote. A quorum for the purpose of choosing the President, as provided in this section, shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Representatives, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. If the House of Representatives shall not choose a President before the 20th day of January next following, whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, the Vice President-elect shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President.

" 'SEC. 4. In the event that two or more persons shall have an equal and highest number of electoral votes for Vice President, the Senate shall choose immediately the Vice President from such persons. A quorum for the purpose of choosing the Vice President, as provided in this section, shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice.

" 'SEC. 5. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution and the 12th article of amendment to the Constitution are hereby repealed.

" 'SEC. 6. This article shall take effect on the 30th day of January following its ratification.

" 'SEC. 7. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.' "

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the elimination of the electoral college and the Presidential electors is a principle upon which all proposals for change in this field agree. The intent of the Founding Fathers was to have the electoral college meet as a body of senior statesmen to choose an outstanding citizen to be President. By 1800, during the lifetime of the Founding Fathers, that intent became obsolete with the development of the political parties.

Retention of the total strength of Congress as the voting basis for the election of a President preserves a time-tested principle in the apportionment of political power in the United States. The Nation and the political forces that make it up have been accustomed both in the national legislature and in the electoral college to an allocation of power among the States and to the people at large within the limits of the sum of 2 votes per State and 435 votes for representation in the lower house, that is, 531 votes in all. Those proposals—the Mundt-Coudert and the Daniel plans—that have retained this voting base have won much wider acceptance than others, for example, my own direct election proposal, Senate Joint Resolution 53, that ignores it.

The reasons for this acceptance are undoubtedly as follows: First, 96 of the 531 electoral-vote base are recognition by the Mundt-Coudert and the Daniel plans of the Federal character of the Republic. Federalism is preserved by the two-vote representation allowed for each of the 48 States; second, 435 of the 531-vote base include the principle of direct representation of the people, such as we have in 1 of the 2 Houses of Congress; third, finally, the 531-vote base is one to which a great many influential political interests have become adjusted. A radical departure from this base would undoubtedly cause serious disruption in the balance among these interests.

My new proposal retains the 531-electoral-vote base and recognizes the Federal principle by awarding 2 votes to each State. Those 2 votes would go to the candidate of the political party which gains a majority in that particular State.

The proposal, however, takes a different position from the others with respect to the application of the principle of direct representation of the people. Thus Senate Joint Resolution 10, introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and my own Senate Joint Resolution 53 would apply the principle of direct representation to the exclusion of the Federal principle entirely. The Mundt-Coudert plan would channel the influence of the people's vote as it is distributed in the congressional districts, duplicating thereby the effect of that influence as it is already felt in the House of Representatives. The Daniel plan would channel the influence of the popular vote for President through the States as units of representation, giving added weight to the Federal principle. My amendment, on the other hand, assumes that the President's constituency is the people as a whole throughout the Nation and without regard to congressional districts and State boundaries. My amendment accepts the traditional allocation of 435 presidential electoral votes as the weight to be given the principle of direct representation, but it then proceeds to divide those 435 votes among the candidates in terms of the nationwide constituency that is the President's.

The President and Vice President are our only nationally elected officers, and surely any plan relating to their election should be based upon a national constituency. What we have, in substance, in the amendment I now speak to, is, recognition of the Federal principle of the Republic by assigning 2 votes to each State regardless eof population or size. These 2 votes would go to the candidate for President who receives a majority of the votes in each particular State. Two votes for each of the 48 States is an appropriate and proper recognition of the Federal principle. The remainder of the electoral votes, namely 435, similar to the 435 congressional seats in the House of Representatives, would go to the presidential candidates on the basis of their proportion of total national votes in the general election, without regard to State lines.

Thus in this instance, we would take the principle of direct election of a President for the 435-vote factor and blend it in with the Federal principle of equality of the States, with two votes for each State. In so doing, Mr. President, we preserve the great historical base of the presidential election process.

This proposal would not seriously alter the balance between the two major parties in presidential politics. If the presidential election outcomes from 1872 to 1952 are recomputed according to this plan, it appears that the outcome of only one election would have been changed, that between Hayes and Tilden in 1876.

It very well should have been changed, in light of the history surrounding that election.

Instead of losing by 185 to 184 electoral votes, Tilden would have won by 183 to 182 votes, under this plan. My amendment would, however, modify the exaggerated majorities won in the electoral college over this period. It would have reduced the size of the electoral college majorities by 169 votes in 1936, down to no change at all for Wilson in 1916. On the average, between 1872 and 1952, this plan would have cut down electoral college majorities by 76 votes. Conversely, the vote of the principal minority would have been raised by 67 votes, on the average, for this same period, ranging from 11 more votes for Blaine in 1884 to 155 more votes for Landon in 1936.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table I have had prepared, relating to presidential electoral vote outcomes from 1872 to 1952, computed according to the formula that is outlined in my amendment to the pending business, more clearly understood as Senate Joint Resolution 152.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Presidential electoral vote outcomes, 1872–1952, computed according to S. J. Res. 152

[Col. (1)×col. (2)=col. (3)+col. (4)=col. (5)]

Year	Nominee	Party	Lower House votes in electoral college (1)	Percent of total national popular vote received (2)	Popular electoral votes won (3)	Senatorial electoral votes won (States carried multiplied by 2) (4)	Total electoral votes received (S. J. Res. 152 plan) (5)	Actual electoral votes received (present system)
1872	Ulysses S. Grant	Republican	[1] 281	55.6	156	[2] 58	214	286
	Scattered	Democrat		43.8	[3] 123	10	133	63
1876	Rutherford B. Hayes	Republican	293	47.9	140	42	182	185
	Samuel J. Tilden	Democrat		51.0	149	34	[4] 183	184
1880	James A. Garfield	Republican	293	48.3	142	[5] 38	180	214
	Winfield S. Hancock	Democrat		48.2	141	38	179	155
1884	James C. Blaine	Republican	325	48.3	157	36	193	182
	Grover Cleveland	Democrat		48.5	158	40	198	219
1888	Benjamin Harrison	Republican	325	47.8	155	40	195	233
	Grover Cleveland	Democrat		48.7	158	36	194	168
1892	Benjamin Harrison	Republican	356	43.1	153	32	185	145
	Grover Cleveland	Democrat		46.1	164	46	210	277
	James B. Weaver	Populist		8.6	31	10	41	22
1896	William McKinley	Republican	357	51.0	182	[6] 46	228	271
	William J. Bryan	Democrat		46.7	167	44	211	176
1900	William McKinley	Republican	357	51.7	185	56	241	292
	William J. Bryan	Democrat		45.5	163	34	197	155
1904	Theodore Roosevelt	Republican	386	56.4	218	[7] 66	284	336
	Alton B. Parker	Democrat		37.6	145	24	169	140
1908	William Howard Taft	Republican	391	51.6	202	[8] 60	262	321
	William J. Bryan	Democrat		43.1	169	32	201	162
1912	William Howard Taft	Republican	435	23.2	101	4	105	8
	Woodrow Wilson	Democrat		41.8	182	80	262	435
	Theodore Roosevelt	Progressive		27.4	119	[9] 12	131	88
1916	Charles Evans Hughes	Republican	435	46.1	201	36	237	254
	Woodrow Wilson	Democrat		49.3	215	62	277	277
1920	Warren G. Harding	Republican	435	60.5	263	74	337	404
	James M. Cox	Democrat		34.1	148	22	170	127
1924	Calvin Coolidge	Republican	435	54.1	235	70	305	382
	John W. Davis	Democrat		28.8	125	24	149	136
	Robert M. La Follette	Progressive		16.6	72	2	74	13
1928	Herbert Hoover	Republican	435	58.0	252	80	332	444
	Alfred E. Smith	Democrat		40.8	178	16	194	87
1932	Herbert Hoover	Republican	435	39.7	173	12	185	59
	Franklin D. Roosevelt	Democrat		57.4	250	84	334	472
1936	Alfred M. Landon	Republican	435	36.5	159	4	163	8
	Franklin D. Roosevelt	Democrat		60.2	262	92	354	523
1940	Wendell L. Willkie	Republican	435	44.8	195	20	215	82
	Franklin D. Roosevelt	Democrat		53.8	234	76	310	449
1944	Thomas E. Dewey	Republican	435	45.9	200	24	224	99
	Franklin D. Roosevelt	Democrat		51.6	225	72	297	432
1948	Thomas E. Dewey	Republican	435	45.0	196	32	228	189
	Harry S. Truman	Democrat		49.4	215	56	271	303
	Strom Thurmond	States Rights.		2.4	10	8	18	39
1952	Dwight D. Eisenhower	Republican	435	55.0	239	78	317	442
	Adlai Stevenson	Democrat		44.4	193	18	211	89

[1] 11 district electoral votes not counted.
[2] Senatorial electoral votes of 3 States not counted.
[3] This vote would have been scattered among several persons.
[4] Results of election would have been reversed under Senate Joint Resolution 152.
[5] California went Democratic but Republicans won 1 of 6 electoral votes; Michigan went Republican but Democrats won 5 of 14 electoral votes; Ohio went Republican but Democrats won 1 of 23 electoral votes; Oregon went Republican but Populists won 1 of 4 electoral votes. North Dakota went Fusion.
[6] California went Republican but Democrats won 1 of 9 electoral votes; Kentucky went Republican but Democrats won 1 of 13 electoral votes.
[7] Maryland went Republican but Democrats won 7 of 8 electoral votes.
[8] Maryland went Republican but Democrats won 6 of 8 electoral votes.
[9] California went Progressive but Democrats won 2 of 13 electoral votes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this amendment would require no special provisions to discourage the rise of third parties in our two-party system. The winning of the two statewide electoral votes in each State under this system would become an all-or-none contest, serious enough to encourage increased two-party organization within each of the States.

I wish to say at this point that I believe any modification of our electoral system should have, as one of its purposes, the encouragement of more effective two-party organizations. We should encourage participation of the public in the two-party structure.

Under my proposal, third parties would be discouraged simply as a matter of the natural laws of competition. Competition for the greater share of the 435-vote block on the basis of the Nation as a whole as a single-member district should also become vigorous enough to discourage the rise of third parties. In recent elections, where third-party votes were significant, recomputation of third-party votes under this plan would change the electoral votes won as follows: The Populist electoral vote in 1892 would have been raised from 22 to 41; the Roosevelt Progressives of 1912 raised from 88 to 131; the La Follette Progressives of 1924 from 13 to 74; and the States rights candidates of 1948 would have dropped from 39 to about 15 votes.

This proposal would make the two statewide electoral votes a much more significant political prize than under any other system, thereby encouraging the development of the two-party system within each of the States. If this system of electoral counting had been operative in three recent presidential elections—1944, 1948, and 1952—most of the States would have been carried by narrow enough margins by one or the other party to make the two-vote prize important. Specifically, the State-by-State margins of victory would have fallen into the following categories.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the table of the figures to which I referred.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Electoral vote margin	1944	1948	1952
States carried by 2.0 to 2.9	34	33	29
States carried by—			
3.0 to 3.9	10	8	9
4.0 to 4.9	2	2	6
5.0 to 5.9	0	0	2
6.0 to 6.9	1	1	0
7.0 to 7.9	1	0	1
8.0 to 8.9	0	0	1
Total	48	[1] 44	48

[1] 4 States rights cases not included.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Most importantly, this proposal would encourage popular participation in presidential elections, because it would penalize those States with a low turnout and reward those with a high turnout. This advantage would remain with the high participation States only so long as the present wide range of difference in voter participation exists among the States. This aspect of Senate Joint Resolution 152 would probably for the first time give some effect to the intent of section 3 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

More specifically, how much would this proposal alter the presidential electoral strength among the various States, at least until the rate of voter participation equalizes itself through the Nation? If my system had been in effect in 1952, it would have increased the electoral vote strength of California, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin, 22 States in all. In the following 10 States the electoral strength would have remained the same, within two-tenths of a vote: Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming. In 6 States electoral strength would have dropped by 1 vote or less: Florida, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Nevada, and New Mexico. In the following States the 1952 vote loss would have ranged from 2 to 7: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. This loss would, of course, be repaired with the increase in voter participation in these States.

I must digress to point out that in the last election, in the States I referred to, the voter participation was not too great, partly because primary elections remain so basic and fundamental in States where there is a predominance of one particular political party. I want the RECORD clear that I believe a healthy, two-party structure in every State is fundamental to good government.

I do not believe it is good for any political party to be without alert, active, strong opposition. I recognize that in some of the so-called one-party States there are factions within the party which serve as a competitive force. But, again, I believe that in the overall situation, the development of a two-party structure in every State—North or South, East or West—is, in the long run, good for the American people, promotes attention to the governmental processes, and serves the public interest.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table, which I have prepared, entitled "Comparison of State Votes in the Electoral College Under Present System and Under Senate Joint Resolution 152, 1912–52."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of State votes in electoral college under present system and S. J. Res. 152, 1912–52

	1952				1948				1944				1940			
	Present system		Proposed system		Present system		Proposed system		Present system		Proposed system		Present system		Proposed system	
	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican
Alabama	11		3.9	1.1	([1])	([1])		0.4	11		3.8	0.4	11		4.2	0.4
Arizona		4	.8	3.1	4		2.8	.7	4		2.7	.5	3		2.8	.5
Arkansas	8		3.6	1.3	9		3.3	.4	9		3.4	.6	9		3.4	.4
California		32	15.5	22.5	25		19.0	16.9	25		20.0	13.7	22		18.4	11.8
Colorado		6	1.7	4.7	6		4.4	2.1		6	2.1	4.4		6	2.3	4.4
Connecticut		8	3.4	6.3		8	3.8	5.9	8		5.9	3.5	8		5.6	3.2
Delaware		3	.6	2.6		3	.6	2.6	3		2.6	.5	3		2.6	.5
Florida		10	3.1	5.8	8		4.5	1.7	8		5.1	1.2	7		5.1	1.1
Georgia	12		5.2	1.4	12		4.3	.7	12		4.4	.5	12		4.3	.2
Idaho		4	.7	3.3	4		3.0	.9	4		3.0	.9	4		3.1	.9
Illinois		27	14.2	19.4	28		19.8	17.5	28		20.9	17.6	29		20.8	17.9
Indiana		13	5.7	10.0		13	7.2	9.3		13	7.1	9.9		14	7.6	9.8
Iowa		10	3.2	7.7	10		6.6	4.4		10	4.5	7.0		11	5.1	7.5
Kansas		8	1.9	6.4		8	3.4	5.8		8	2.6	6.0		9	3.2	6.3
Kentucky	10		5.5	3.5	11		6.2	3.0	11		6.3	3.6	11		6.9	3.6
Louisiana	10		4.4	2.2	([1])	([1])	1.1	.6	10		4.6	.6	10		4.8	.5
Maine		5	.8	3.6		5	1.0	3.3		5	1.3	3.4		5	1.4	3.4
Maryland		9	2.8	5.5		8	2.6	4.6	8		4.9	2.7	8		5.4	2.4
Massachusetts		16	7.7	11.1	16		12.3	8.1	16		11.4	8.4	17		10.2	9.4
Michigan		20	8.7	13.0		19	8.9	11.3	19		12.0	9.8		19	9.0	11.1
Minnesota		11	4.3	7.4	11		8.2	4.3	11		7.4	4.8	11		7.6	5.2
Mississippi	8		3.2	.8	([1])	([1])	.2	0	9		3.4	.1	9		3.5	.3
Missouri		13	6.6	8.8	15		10.2	5.8	15		9.3	6.9	15		10.4	7.6
Montana		4	.8	3.1	4		3.1	.9	4		3.0	.8	4		3.3	.9
Nebraska		6	1.3	5.0		6	2.0	4.4		6	2.1	5.0		7	2.3	5.1
Nevada		3	.2	2.4	3		2.3	.3	3		2.3	.2	3		2.3	.2
New Hampshire		4	.8	3.2		4	1.0	3.1	4		3.1	1.0	4		3.1	1.0
New Jersey		16	7.2	11.7		16	8.0	10.7	16		11.0	8.7	16		10.9	8.2
New Mexico		4	.8	2.9	4		2.9	.7	4		2.7	.6	3		2.9	.7
New York		45	21.9	29.9		47	24.7	27.3	47		24.5	27.1	47		30.4	26.4
North Carolina	14		6.6	3.9	14		6.1	2.3	14		6.8	2.4	13		7.3	1.9
North Dakota		4	.5	3.4		4	.9	3.0		4	.9	3.1		4	1.1	3.4
Ohio		25	11.3	16.8	25		14.9	12.9		25	14.2	16.3	26		17.1	13.9
Oklahoma		8	3.1	5.7	10		6.0	2.4	10		5.6	2.9	11		6.1	3.0
Oregon		6	1.9	5.0		6	2.2	4.3	6		4.3	2.0	5		4.2	1.9
Pennsylvania		32	15.2	19.1		35	15.6	18.9	35		19.6	16.6	36		21.0	16.5
Rhode Island		4	1.4	3.5	4		3.7	1.2	4		3.6	1.1	4		3.6	1.2
South Carolina	8		3.2	1.2	([1])	([1])	.3	0	8		2.8	.1	8		2.8	0
South Dakota		4	.6	3.4		4	1.0	3.2		4	.9	3.2		4	1.1	3.5
Tennessee		11	3.1	5.2	[1] 11		4.4	1.8	12		4.8	1.8	11		5.1	1.5
Texas		24	6.8	9.8	23		8.7	2.5	23		9.5	1.7	23		9.3	1.7
Utah		4	1.0	3.4	4		3.3	1.1	4		3.4	.9	4		3.3	.8
Vermont		3	.3	2.8		3	.4	2.7		3	.5	2.7		3	.7	2.6
Virginia		12	1.9	4.5	11		3.8	1.5	11		4.2	1.3	11		4.1	1.0
Washington		9	3.5	6.2	8		6.2	3.4	8		6.4	3.3	8		6.0	2.8
West Virginia	8		5.2	3.0	8		5.8	2.8	8		5.6	2.9	8		6.3	3.2
Wisconsin		12	4.4	8.9	12		7.8	5.3		12	5.9	8.1	12		8.2	5.9
Wyoming		3	.3	2.6	3		2.5	.4		3	.5	2.5	3		2.5	.5
Other parties			2.1		[1] 39		{ [2] 14.5 [3] 18.1				10.8				2.1	
Total	89	442	210.8	318.1	303	189	271.0	227.4	432	99	296.9	223.3	449	82	312.7	216.2

[1] Electoral votes cast for States rights Democratic candidates: Alabama, 11; Louisiana, 10; Mississippi, 9; South Carolina, 8; Tennessee, 1.

[2] States rights Democratic Party.

[3] Miscellaneous parties other than States rights Democratic Party.

Comparison of State votes in electoral college under present system and S. J. Res. 152, 1912–52—Continued

	1936				1932				1928				1924			
	Present system		Proposed system		Present system		Proposed system		Present system		Proposed system		Present system		Proposed system	
	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican
Alabama	11		4.3	0.3	11		4.2	0.4	12		3.5	1.4	12		3.7	0.6
Arizona	3		2.8	.3	3		2.9	.4		3	.5	2.6		3	.4	2.5
Arkansas	9		3.4	.3	9		4.1	.3	9		3.4	.9	9		3.3	.6
California	22		18.9	8.0	22		16.5	9.3		13	7.2	15.7		13	1.6	13.1
Colorado	6		4.8	1.7	6		4.8	2.1		6	1.6	5.0		6	1.1	4.9
Connecticut	8		5.7	2.7		8	3.1	5.1		7	3.0	5.5		7	1.6	5.8
Delaware	3		2.7	.5		3	.6	2.6		3	.4	2.8		3	.5	2.8
Florida	7		4.4	.7	7		4.3	.8		6	1.2	3.7	6		2.9	.5
Georgia	12		4.4	.4	12		4.6	.2	14		3.5	.8	14		3.8	.4
Idaho	4		3.2	.6	4		3.2	.8		4	.6	3.2		4	.4	3.0
Illinois	29		24.0	15.1	29		22.6	15.7		29	15.6	23.0		29	8.6	23.8
Indiana	14		11.0	6.6	14		11.4	7.4		15	6.7	12.0		15	7.4	12.5
Iowa	11		8.0	4.7	11		8.6	4.5		13	4.5	9.4		13	2.4	10.0
Kansas	9		6.5	3.8	9		6.6	3.8		10	2.3	8.1		10	2.3	8.1
Kentucky	11		7.2	3.5	11		8.4	4.3		13	4.5	8.6		13	5.6	7.9
Louisiana	10		4.8	.4	10		4.7	.2	10		4.0	.6	10		3.4	.4
Maine		5	1.2	3.6		5	1.4	3.8		6	1.0	4.1		6	.6	4.1
Maryland	8		5.7	2.2	8		5.4	2.0		8	2.6	5.6		8	2.2	4.4
Massachusetts	17		11.0	7.4	17		10.8	8.1	18		11.4	9.2		18	4.2	12.5
Michigan	19		11.8	6.7	19		11.6	8.1		15	4.7	13.4		15	2.3	15.2
Minnesota	11		8.7	3.3	11		8.6	4.0		12	4.7	8.6		12	.8	8.3
Mississippi	9		3.5	0	9		3.5	.5	10		3.5	.3	10		3.5	.1
Missouri	15		12.7	6.7	15		13.2	6.2		18	7.8	11.8		18	8.7	11.7
Montana	4		3.5	.6	4		3.4	.8		4	.9	3.3		4	.5	3.1
Nebraska	7		5.3	2.4	7		5.9	2.2		8	2.3	6.1		8	2.0	5.3
Nevada	3		2.3	0.1	3		2.3	0.1		3	0.2	2.2		3	0.1	2.2
New Hampshire	4		3.0	1.0		4	1.1	3.1		4	1.0	3.4		4	.8	3.5
New Jersey	16		12.4	6.9	16		10.8	8.5		14	7.3	12.9		14	4.4	12.1
New Mexico	3		3.0	.6	3		3.0	.6		3	.6	2.8		3	.7	2.8
New York	47		31.0	21.0	47		29.7	21.2		45	24.8	28.0		45	14.3	29.3
North Carolina	13		7.9	2.1	13		7.4	2.3		12	3.4	6.1	12		6.3	2.8
North Dakota	4		3.6	.7	4		4.0	.8		5	1.3	3.5		5	.2	3.4
Ohio	26		18.8	10.8	26		16.2	13.4		24	10.2	21.3		24	7.1	19.7
Oklahoma	11		6.8	2.3	11		7.6	2.1		10	2.6	6.6	10		5.8	3.4
Oregon	5		4.5	1.2	5		4.3	1.5		5	1.3	4.4		5	1.0	4.1
Pennsylvania	36		24.7	16.3		36	14.2	17.9		38	12.7	26.4		38	6.1	22.7
Rhode Island	4		3.6	1.2	4		3.6	1.3	5		3.4	1.4		5	1.2	3.9
South Carolina	8		3.1	0	8		3.1	0	9		2.7	0	9		2.7	0
South Dakota	4		3.5	1.2	4		4.0	1.1		5	1.2	3.9		5	.4	3.5
Tennessee	11		5.1	1.4	11		4.8	1.4		12	1.8	4.3	12		4.4	2.0
Texas	23		9.0	1.0	23		10.2	1.1		20	4.0	6.3	20		9.2	1.9
Utah	4		3.4	.6	4		3.3	.9		4	1.0	3.1		4	.7	3.2
Vermont		3	.6	2.8		3	.6	2.9		4	.5	3.1		4	.2	3.2
Virginia	11		4.2	.9	11		4.2	1.0		12	1.6	4.0	12		4.1	1.1
Washington	8		6.4	2.0	8		5.9	2.3		7	1.8	6.0		7	.6	5.3
West Virginia	8		6.8	3.1	8		6.4	3.6		8	3.1	6.4		8	3.8	6.3
Wisconsin	12		9.7	3.6	12		9.7	3.8		13	5.3	8.4	(4)	(4)	1.0	4.7
Wyoming	3		2.6	.8	3		2.6	.4		3	.3	2.6		3	.2	2.6
Other parties			11.4				12.7				4.7		[5] 13		[6] 74.3 [5] 2.3	
Total	523	8	355.5	164.1	472	59	333.4	184.9	87	444	193.5	332.8	136	382	149.1	305.3

[4] Wisconsin's 13 electoral votes cast for La Follette-Wheeler.
[5] La Follette-Wheeler.
[6] Miscellaneous parties other than La Follette-Wheeler.

Comparison of State votes in electoral college under present system and S. J. Res. 152, 1912–52—Continued

	1920				1916				1912					
	Present system		Proposed system		Present system		Proposed system		Present system			Proposed system		
	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Progressive	Democratic	Republican	Progressive
Alabama	12		4.5	1.2	12		4.3	0.7	12			4.4	0.3	0.7
Arizona		3	.5	2.6	3		2.8	.5	3			2.3	.9	.2
Arkansas	9		3.7	1.1	9		4.6	1.1	9			4.0	.7	.7
California		13	3.7	12.2	13		12.9	10.9	2		11	.82	.1	10.2
Colorado		6	1.7	4.8	6		6.2	2.4	6			5.3	1.7	2.1
Connecticut		7	2.0	6.5		7	2.3	4.5	7			4.2	2.0	1.0
Delaware		3	.6	2.9		3	.6	2.6	3			.6	.5	.3
Florida	6		3.8	.7	6		3.3	.3	6			3.0	.1	.1
Georgia	14		3.7	.7	14		5.0	.3	14			4.7	.2	.6
Idaho		4	.8	3.4	4		3.6	1.3	4			3.0	1.0	.8
Illinois		29	8.7	25.0		29	22.3	29.1	29			13.7	7.4	11.2
Indiana		15	8.3	13.3		15	7.8	10.0	15			10.2	4.4	4.7
Iowa		13	3.7	12.3		13	5.2	8.6	13			7.4	3.5	4.7
Kansas		10	3.0	8.0	10		9.4	6.5	10			6.2	2.2	0
Kentucky	13		9.4	7.3	13		8.3	5.7	13			8.4	3.4	3.0
Louisiana	10		3.4	.6	10		3.9	.1	10			3.7	.1	.3
Maine		6	1.0	4.2		6	1.5	3.6	6			3.5	.8	1.4
Maryland		8	2.9	5.8	8		5.2	2.7	8			5.3	1.6	1.7
Massachusetts		18	4.5	13.1		18	5.8	8.3	18			7.0	4.5	4.1
Michigan		15	3.8	14.2		15	6.7	9.9			15	4.3	4.4	8.2
Minnesota		12	2.3	10.4		12	4.2	6.2			12	3.1	1.9	5.6
Mississippi	10		3.1	.2	10		3.9	.1	10			3.7	.1	.1
Missouri		18	9.2	13.7	18		11.3	8.7	18			11.6	6.0	3.6
Montana		4	.9	3.8	4		4.4	1.6	4			2.8	.6	.6
Nebraska		8	2.0	6.0	8		5.7	2.8	8			5.2	1.6	2.1
Nevada		3	.2	2.2	3		2.4	.3	3			2.2	.1	.2
New Hampshire		4	1.0	3.5	4		3.0	1.0	4			3.0	1.0	.5
New Jersey		14	4.2	11.9		14	4.9	8.3	14			7.2	2.6	4.2
New Mexico		3	.8	2.9	3		2.8	.7	3			2.6	.5	.2
New York		45	12.6	32.3		45	17.8	23.0	45			21.0	13.2	11.3
North Carolina	12		7.0	3.8	12		5.9	2.8	12			6.2	.8	2.0
North Dakota		5	.6	4.6	5		3.3	1.3	5			2.9	.7	.8

Comparison of State votes in electoral college under present system and S. J. Res. 152, 1912–52—Continued

	1920				1916				1912					
	Present system		Proposed system		Present system		Proposed system		Present system			Proposed system		
	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Progressive	Democratic	Republican	Progressive
Ohio		24	12.6	21.1	24		16.2	12.1	24			14.3	8.0	6.7
Oklahoma		10	3.5	6.0	10		5.5	2.3	10			5.5	2.6	0
Oregon		5	1.3	4.3		5	2.8	5.0	5			3.4	1.0	1.1
Pennsylvania		38	8.2	21.7		38	12.2	18.5			38	11.5	7.9	14.9
Rhode Island		5	.9	3.7		5	.9	3.0	5			2.9	.8	.5
South Carolina	9		3.3	0	9		3.4	.1	9			3.4	0	0
South Dakota		5	.6	3.8		5	1.4	3.5			5	1.4	0	3.7
Tennessee		12	3.4	5.6	12		5.6	2.7	12			5.9	1.8	1.6
Texas	20		6.7	1.9	20		8.7	1.5	20			8.4	.8	.8
Utah		4	.9	3.3	4		4.0	1.3		4		1.1	3.2	.7
Vermont		4	.3	3.1		4	.5	2.9		4		.4	2.7	.6
Virginia	12		4.3	1.4	12		4.4	1.2	12			4.6	.7	.6
Washington		7	1.4	5.6	7		6.3	3.9			7	2.5	2.0	5.3
West Virginia		8	3.6	6.6	1	7	3.3	5.4	8			5.3	1.7	2.3
Wisconsin		13	2.2	10.1		13	4.5	7.2	13			6.8	3.8	1.8
Wyoming		3	.3	2.6	3		2.7	.5	3			2.4	.4	.3
Other parties			23.9				20.3					35.9		
Total	127	404	171.1	336.0	277	254	273.7	237.0	435	8	88	260.7	106.3	128.1

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this proposal would undoubtedly lead to a strengthening of the national organizations of our political parties. Such strengthening would be necessary because a nationally coordinated campaign would be essential if either party were to obtain as large a part of the 435-vote block as possible. Stronger national party organizations would also become more active in strengthening State party organizations in order more effectively to compete in every State for the valuable two-vote prize in each. My amendment therefore would tend to strengthen the two-party system on a national basis, as well as on a State-by-State basis. Conversely, it would tend to penalize the areas that maintain one-party systems.

My proposal would alter, but not worsen, the conditions under which organized interest groups would exert influence in presidential politics. It is the somewhat debatable claim of some minority-group leaders that their access to presidential policymakers is enhanced, under the present electoral college system, by their ability to shift strategically located popular votes from one party to the other in closely fought large States.

It is claimed that certain minority groups—economic groups, cultural groups, political groups—have a strategic influence because by the shift of their members from one party to the other they can throw the whole State's electoral vote into a particular party column and to a particular presidential candidate.

Mr. President, it is my sincere belief that if the present system of electing our President does in fact place a preponderant weight upon certain small groups in any election, that is an argument against the present system. I think the presidential election ought to be decided on the basis of majority will. My amendment points in the direction of direct democracy. To a degree it does recognize the principle of federalism by awarding two votes in each State to the candidate who receives the majority vote in that particular State. But the amendment also recognizes the direct election principle in the case of the remaining 435 votes.

Mr. President, as I have said, there has been considerable emphasis by some on the alleged importance of minority-group influence in presidential elections under the present system. This has in fact been an important operating assumption for minority leaders and presidential advisers alike, but it is an assumption that is nowhere conclusively confirmed by facts. I feel that some persons think the present system is more conducive to influence by small groups than really is the case. Political scientists have demonstrated that the outcomes in presidential elections have hinged in an important sense upon the achievement of party majorities in the major metropolitan communities of the country. Political scientists have not been able to demonstrate to what extent minority groups within these metropolitan communities have been mobile between the parties, that is, to what extent their votes can be "delivered."

Under the system I am proposing, organized interest groups capable of mobilizing voter support would probably have to do so on a nationwide scale, rather than in a few strategic places, since there would be a greater number of closely fought States in which a few strategic votes could be influential in winning the statewide two-vote prize. Furthermore, with a premium on high turnout under the proposed system, organized interest groups would become active promoters of voter participation, particularly in the large, high-turnout States which would receive an initial increase in electoral vote strength over the present system.

All this should make minority-interest representation neither more nor less difficult than it now is in presidential politics. Under most systems, however, by the very pluralistic character of American politics, organized interest groups and minorities would be influential in national affairs through one channel or another. To equate the survival of minority-group influence with the preservation of a questionable strategic advantage under the present electoral college system is to place that influence upon very tenuous grounds indeed.

Moreover, Mr. President, there are many other elections besides the Presidential election. There are State elections and congressional elections for membership in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. The smaller cultural, economic, racial, or political groups may also have their influence in those particular elections. But I cannot help saying again that the influence should be on a person-to-person basis, rather than on a group-to-group basis; elections in the United States should be decided by the individual votes of persons who identify themselves as American citizens. There has been just a little bit too much emphasis, I am convinced, upon groupism. In the American election process, we need to have more emphasis upon individualism.

In general, Mr. President, my proposed amendment to change the Presidential election system would also put that system abreast of the recent trends toward greater national-party organization and improved techniques of nationwide campaigning.

What is more, Mr. President, with television, radio, and press—the present rapid means of communication—Presidential elections are, indeed, national. The President of the United States is everyone's President; he represents the entire Nation. And in the campaign, each Presidential candidate is definitely a national candidate. Therefore, the entire election machinery should be designed to further the realization of having the candidate for President be a national candidate for election as a national officer.

This proposal of mine would respond to two recent trends: (1) toward greater national party organization and (2) toward improved techniques of national campaigning.

The Senate has now been given another historic opportunity to correct the archaic procedure which we have hitherto used in casting and counting ballots for the Nation's highest offices. The compromise amendment which I am proposing today would be a giant step forward toward more direct democracy.

while retaining an appropriate recognition of the Federal character of the American Republic.

Mr. President, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under the unanimous-consent agreements which have already been accepted, relating to tomorrow's procedure in the Senate, would it be possible for the junior Senator from Minnesota to offer his amendment at this time and have it made the pending question for consideration tomorrow, without violating the unanimous consent agreements?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment to the Daniel substitute would be in order at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would it be in order for the Senator from Minnesota to offer his amendment as a substitute for the substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then I offer it as an amendment to the Daniel substitute, within the meaning of that ruling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Which amendment is the Senator offering?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is designated "3–20–56—A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to have the amendment to the amendment read at this time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not necessary to have it read. I shall not call it up for action this evening. I shall leave it as the pending question for tomorrow. I only ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment offered by Mr. HUMPHREY to the Daniel amendment, in the nature of a substitute, is as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause in the Daniel amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States, as provided in the Constitution:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution.

"'SEC. 2. The electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. The President and Vice President shall be elected by the people of the several States. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

"'There shall be a total number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the several States may be entitled in the Congress. Two such electoral votes shall be credited to each person receiving votes for President or Vice President for each State in which he shall have received a plurality of the total number of votes for President or Vice President, as the case may be. From the remaining number of such electoral votes, each person receiving votes for President or Vice President shall be credited with a number of electoral votes which bears the same ratio to the total number of such remaining electoral votes as the number of votes received by him for President or Vice President bears to the total number of votes cast for President or Vice President, as the case may be. In making the computations, fractional numbers less than one one-thousandth shall be disregarded.

"'Congress shall determine the time for electing the President and Vice President, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of the President is to begin.

"'Within 30 days after such election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, each State shall make distinct lists of all persons receiving votes for President and all persons receiving votes for Vice President, and the number of votes cast in such State for each, which lists shall be signed, certified, and transmitted sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and the House of Representatives, open all certificates and the electoral votes shall then be credited to each person for whom votes were cast for President and Vice President in the manner prescribed in this article. The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President and the person having the greatest number of electoral votes for Vice President shall be Vice President. No person constitutionally ineligible to the office of the President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"'SEC. 3. In the event that two or more persons shall have an equal and the highest number of electoral votes for President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately by ballot the President from such persons. In choosing the President pursuant to this section each Member of the House of Representatives shall have one vote. A quorum for the purpose of choosing the President, as provided in this section, shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Representatives, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. If the House of Representatives shall not choose a President before the twentieth day of January next following, whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, the Vice President-elect shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President.

"'SEC. 4. In the event that two or more persons shall have an equal and highest number of electoral votes for Vice President, the Senate shall choose immediately the Vice President from such persons. A quorum for the purpose of choosing the Vice President, as provided in this section, shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice.

"'SEC. 5. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution and the 12th article of amendment to the Constitution are hereby repealed.

"'SEC. 6. This article shall take effect on the 30th day of January following its ratification.

"'SEC. 7. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress'."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I inquire whether my amendment may be called up tomorrow prior to the going into effect of the unanimous-consent agreements which have been arrived at or whether it should be called up following that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Conservation between the leaders indicated that there would be no yea-and-nay votes until Tuesday. There is really nothing in the agreement to prevent such a vote, however.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that. As I understand it, my amendment is now the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to direct my attention for a moment to the proposal which was offered as a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 31, by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] for himself and other Senators. I believe it is known as the Daniel-Kefauver-Mundt-Thurmond proposal. It is identified as "3–15–56–A." It was offered by the junior Senator from Texas for himself, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and other Senators.

This proposal is a hybrid. It joins both the original language of Senate Joint Resolution 31 and the language of the resolution introduced in the Senate by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], as well as the resolution introduced in the House by Representative COUDERT. As I have said, it is a hybrid proposal. I speak most kindly and politely of it, when I say that I am confident that it has been designed primarily to gain votes among Members of the Senate who have different points of view as to how the electoral college process ought to be reformed.

It goes in two directions at once. First, it goes in the direction of Senate Joint Resolution 31, which would divide up the vote in a particular State on the basis of the majority and the minority parties, related to the number of statewide votes those two parties receive. In other words, if the Democratic Presidential candidate should receive 60 percent of the vote, and the Republican Presidential candidate should receive 40 percent of the vote, under the original Daniel proposal the Presidential candidate receiving 60 percent of the popular vote in a State would receive 60 percent of the electoral votes assigned to that State, and the Presidential candidate receiving 40 percent of the popular vote in a State would receive 40 percent of the electoral vote in the State. There are also provisions to prevent the rise of what might be called splinter parties, particularly when such splinter parties do not have a substantial following.

The Mundt-Coudert proposal is separate and distinct from the proposal originally introduced by the junior Senator

from Texas, Senate Joint Resolution 31, which was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

I was privileged to be a cosponsor of the original Senate Joint Resolution 31. I joined as a cosponsor, not because I thought that proposal was perfect, or that it answered all the problems related to our archaic electoral system, but because I though it pointed to an improvement in the situation.

However, the Mundt-Coudert proposal goes back to electing Presidents and Vice Presidents on the basis of congressional districts. So we have taken the principle of the statewide popular vote, as it is reflected in the electoral vote, and crossbred that with a proposal where the electoral vote will be determined in each congressional district on the basis of what happens in each congressional district.

This is an impossible situation. I was asked whether or not I would be willing to join as a cosponsor of the so-called substitute proposal introduced by the junior Senator from Texas for himself and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and other Senators. I said no. I should like to state why I feel that my negative decision was right and proper.

First of all, the Mundt-Coudert plan, which was introduced in the Senate by our colleague the Senator from South Dakota, is a part of the package substitute which I discussed earlier, namely, the hybrid arrangement between Senate Joint Resolution 31 and the Mundt resolution. Insofar as the Mundt portion of it is concerned, it retains the electoral college, but would choose the electors by congressional districts, with two at large from each State.

The pattern would correspond exactly to the distribution of the State's congressional delegation. Congressional districts would become the main geographical unit for presidential vote counting. That is the situation relating to the Mundt portion of the substitute to the original Daniel joint resolution. What is the criticism of this particular proposal?

Well, first, for the key States the so-called Mundt-Coudert proposal would substitute certain key districts. Under present arrangements, the political campaign is concentrated in what we call key strategic States. If a Democrat carries the South and New York and Pennsylvania and Michigan, he is elected. Under the present electoral system, the concentration is made upon key States.

Under the proposal which has been offered in the Senate, and to which I have attached my amendment—namely, the Mundt-Coudert aspects of the Daniel-Mundt-Kefauver-Thurmond proposal—we would shift the emphasis from key States to key congressional districts.

Presidential campaigns would be concentrated in about 100 doubtful congressional districts instead of a dozen or so doubtful States. However, congressional districts, as we know, vary widely in voter representation. They range in population from 100,000 to 900,000. One of the two districts in South Dakota, for instance, has more than three times the population of the other district.

To allow each congressional district 1 electoral vote would surely produce a distorted total.

Mr. President, I recall from my service in local government that one of the big reform movements we undertook was to equalize the wards in the city of Minneapolis. We had a situation in which the 6th ward had about 6,000 voters and the 10th ward about 30,000 voters. Each of them had two aldermen.

The people finally got tired of that situation, and therefore we redistricted the city of Minneapolis to make the wards relatively equal in population.

Under the so-called Daniel-Kefauver-Mundt-Thurmond proposal, we would permit electoral votes to come from congressional districts that had a population one-third or one-fourth of the population of the more populace congressional district. That is rather indefensible.

The President of the United States ought to be elected by direct popular vote. If he is not elected by direct popular vote, the vote relating to his election ought to approximate as much as it possibly can the direct popular vote, and at the same time preserve the Federal principle. Under my amendment we would preserve the Federal principle by allowing two votes in each State to be the prize for the candidate that gets the majority. He takes both votes. Throughout the Nation, under my amendment, the presidential candidates would get the share of the remaining 435 votes which related to their national popular vote.

I wish to reemphasize that under the so-called Mundt-Coudert proposal—and that is the best way to identify it, because that is the way it is known in the press and by the public—the emphasis would be upon congressional districts. All of the abuses of the State legislative practices, especially gerrymandering, would be introduced into presidential politics. The prize of the Presidency is a tempting one for political organizations and powerful forces in this country. We can well imagine what would happen if we adopted a proposal such as the one that has been put forth in the Senate under the name of the Daniel-Kefauver-Mundt-Thurmond proposal. We would have gerrymandering of congressional districts. In fact, the major task of every State legislature for a period of time, after a political party got into power, would be to gerrymander congressional districts in such a way that that political party's presidential candidate could win in the congressional districts in the next election.

I think it would be an intolerable situation. It would make a shambles of the American presidential election process. The result would be to establish the same weighted bias toward rural areas which now exists in the House of Representatives.

I should like to use some examples with which I am familiar. In our State of Minnesota there has been no redistricting in the State legislature since 1912. The population has shifted considerably since that time. Many metropolitan areas are underrepresented. Some rural areas are overrepresented

It is the sort of practice that cannot be condoned at the national level, and should not be condoned at the State level.

The Mundt-Coudert plan is a part of the overall Daniel-Mundt-Thurmond-Kefauver proposal and tends to favor the overrepresented, one-party, rule of districts of the South, which are Democratic, and of the Midwest, which are basically and traditionally Republican.

I wish to make it quite clear that I happen to be one who believes that the legislative and congressional districts should be as equal in population as we can make them. It is a prime responsiblity of State legislatures to provide congressional districts as close to equal population as we can design them by law, to provide a modern, up-to-date legislative redistricting for the State legislature. This can, of course, include some considerations other than population. I happen to believe that a State legislature may properly want to have some weight placed upon the territorial size of a particular district. But the Mundt-Coudert proposal invites undue discrimination.

In addition, it is possible now for States to choose to have the Mundt-Coudert proposal without any constitutional amendment. However, to combine it with the Daniel proposal would give us a nonuniform system of electing the President, such as a continuation of the electoral college under the Mundt-Coudert proposal in some States, while abolishing it under the Daniel provisions in other States.

The past system, bad as it has been in many respects, has at least the saving virtue of uniformity.

Now let me say a word about the original Daniel resolution without the Mundt-Coudert addition.

This would itself have had a tendency to reduce the value of a vote in the more populous two-party States and to strengthen the role of the one-party, low-vote States in national elections.

I recognized that to be the case. Nevertheless, I agreed to cosponsor Senate Joint Resolution 31 in its original form because, in spite of its deficiencies, I thought it was a step in the right direction. However, with the Mundt-Coudert option added, I felt the proposal is a step in the wrong direction, and I vigorously opposed it.

It has now become a cumbersome, unwieldy operation with the very real possibility of adding incentives to State legislatures to restrict and gerrymander the popular vote.

If it cannot be otherwise overcome, I would hope that the Senate would recommit this whole proposal to the Committee on the Judiciary. Very frankly, the proposal which was the pending business until I offered my amendment should be considered most carefully, not only by Members of the Senate, but by competent professional staffs, to discover what its ultimate effect would be upon the election system for the offices of President and Vice President. These are two important offices; they are all-important; they are so important that they should not be tampered with by hit-and-miss compromise proposals which are offered

on the floor of the Senate merely as some way by which we might be able to get something done in the Senate, so that something can be done in the House, so that maybe, somehow, somewhere, we might get something worthwhile. We should not amend the Constitution of the United States so haphazardly.

We have used many times the technique of a special governmental commission. If there is any area where a special governmental commission could perform a service, if it consisted of men trained in the law, who also had an acute awareness of the political realities of the Nation, such a commission would be worthy in this particular area of constitutional amendments directed toward the election of a President and Vice President.

The Mundt-Coudert aspects of the new Daniel-Kefauver-Mundt-Thurmond proposal further undercut the whole notion of a national Presidential constituency.

The theory of separate constituencies for the President and Congress is a valuable theory. It underlies the whole checks-and-balances system which is so instrumental in American Government. If the President and Congress are to have the same essential constituency—and this is the result of the Mundt-Coudert proposal—this valuable relationship between the President and Congress is likely to diminish.

The relationship to which I refer is one which is based in essence upon separate constituencies.

Mr. President, I wish to call an editorial to the attention of my colleagues. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] yesterday inserted into the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 21, entitled "Electoral Reform in Reverse." That editorial very carefully and objectively, and, I think, pointedly, discusses the difference between the original Senate Joint Resolution 31 which is identified here as the Daniel-Kefauver resolution, and the substitute which was offered with many cosponsors and which can be identified as the Daniel-Kefauver-Mundt-Thurmond resolution.

I hope my colleagues will read the editorial. I mention it here as a point of reference. The editorial to which I refer will be found on page 5232 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 21. I shall not ask to have it included again at this point in my remarks, because it is already a matter of public notice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Finally, Mr. President, as a guide to all proposals that are before us, I think we should consider the following factors:

The present system contains 3 different kinds of advantages in it for 3 different kinds of States. These advantages tend to balance one another, producing a high degree of correlation between popular vote and election in the past.

These are the types of advantage:

Under the present system, the big States have their advantage, very well known, namely, that they are important States because of the large number of electoral votes they have for a President.

The small States have their advantage, arising from the fact that every State, no matter how small, gets at least 1 Member of the House and 2 Senators.

A table in the Senate Judiciary Committee hearings shows how one popular vote cast in a smaller State is worth many times more than a popular vote cast in a large State.

The third advantage under the present system is the fact that low-vote States have their own kind of advantage arising from the fact that in a low-vote State the electoral vote is based on population and not on the number of votes cast.

So, Mr. President, it will be seen that under the present system there are some counterbalancing effects. They balance off, as experience has more than adequately shown.

If the present countervailing inequities are to be corrected, then all types of advantage should be wiped out. Straight popular election would wipe out all these advantages, whether of big, small, or low-vote States.

It is argued that State legislatures would not approve such a move as direct election. I ask the question, Why not? The answer is that certain States will lose their advantage. This is an admission that the present system not only does not work to the advantage of the large States, but that there are advantages in the present system for the low-vote and small States.

The various proposals before the Senate tend to correct one injustice without correcting another: this introduces an imbalance; this manufactures a discrimination.

The Mundt-Daniels proposals, whether taken as a compromise or taken separately as the old Mundt-Coudert or the Lodge-Gossett, would destroy the advantage of the large States under the present system and would preserve the advantages of the other States. As a result, a recalculation of past elections shows that under the Lodge-Gossett numerous elections would have produced minority elections and that numerous elections would have been tossed into the House.

If present inequities are to be corrected, let them be corrected across the board. Let us not—where there is a state of peace arising from the fact that three armed camps are each in possession of their separate weapons—think we are creating peace by enforcing a unilateral disarmament.

A straight popular election is the fairest way to chose a President. Next to that and apart from my own new amendment, the present system is far fairer than other proposals that would rob some States of their current advantage while maintaining or even enlarging the advantage of other States.

As to the danger that some States will puff up their vote by reducing voting age, the matter can be handled easily by an empowering clause in a proposed constitutional amendment allowing Congress to set a uniform age for voters in Federal elections.

I believe the age should be 18. I see no reason why a young man or a young woman at the age of 18 should not have some say about a government that asks them to do so much.

America's problem right now is not too much participation in elections, but, Mr. President, far too little.

So I suggest that it would be well, despite the work which has gone into them, to send these many projects right back where they came from—to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary—there to be studied again very carefully, in the light of the compromises which have been offered on the floor of the Senate. The word "compromise" is perhaps in error. These proposals are not essentially compromises; they are blends; they are hybrids. Some efforts have been made to tack onto Senate Joint Resolution 31 another proposal, which is anything but related to it, in an effort to see whether or not something would not pass.

I suggest that in designing constitutional provisions for the election of President and Vice President, Congress should be interested in doing a job which is better than simply getting something passed. Congress ought to know what it is passing, and ought to know what its effect might be, could be, and may be.

I shall strongly resist the proposal which was offered as a substitute, known as the Daniel-Kefauver-Mundt-Thurmond proposal. I sincerely believe that all these proposals should go back to the committee, and I suggest that that be done.

I have offered my own new amendment primarily for the purposes of discussion and education. This amendment has had very careful study by competent political scientists, particularly by Mr. Ralph Goldman, of the Brookings Institution.

It is the result of very serious study by men who have spent years studying the elections of Presidents. I have offered this amendment not so much because I believe it will be adopted, but because I believe the subject needs thoughtful, considerate discussion. I should like to leave it as the pending business in that spirit.

THE PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION IN MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since I have been speaking about elections, I wish to say one word in the light of what I read in the RECORD this morning. I shift to something which is out of the realm of theory into that which was a very real part of the political practices of America on the day of Tuesday, March 20, 1956. I think I am somewhat aware of what happened on that day. It happened in Minnesota.

I noticed as of yesterday that one of our colleagues, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], made a comment or two about the primary election in Minnesota. I, of course, respect his judgment. I read his remarks with considerable interest. I should like, not to reply, because no reply is required, but merely to bring to the attention of my colleagues, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, some of the statistical information which

pertained to the Minnesota presidential primary which was held last Tuesday.

In 1952 the Republican primary vote totaled 291,600, or 70 percent of the total vote.

The Democratic total in the presidential primary in 1952 was 131,603, or 30 percent of the total vote.

The Republicans had a contest between former Governor Stassen, General Eisenhower, Senator Taft, and a distinguished Minnesotan by the name of Mr. Slettedahl.

General Eisenhower really never won the Minnesota presidential primary, as he so indicated at a press conference yesterday.

Former Governor Stassen took 44.3 percent of the GOP vote. General Eisenhowever, as a writein candidate, took 37.3 percent.

Mr. Slettedahl, whose name was on the ballot, took 7.4 percent.

Senator Taft, as a writein candidate, took 8.3 percent.

The Democrats, in 1952, had a contest between Senator KEFAUVER and a favorite-son candidate. It was my privilege to be the favorite-son candidate.

The result was: HUMPHREY, 79.1 percent; KEFAUVER, 15.6 percent, the vote for Senator KEFAUVER having been a writein vote. We had no particular campaign.

Let us consider what has happened since then.

In 1954, in the general primary, the Democrats received 351,899 votes, or 55 percent. The Republicans got 290,617 votes, or 45 percent.

That was the first time in Minnesota's political history—at least, within the last 30 or 40 years—that the Democratic Party in Minnesota, known as the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party, received a majority in a primary, or received more votes than the Republican Party received in the primary. That was in 1954. The Democrats received 351,899 votes, or 55 percent; Republicans received 290,617 votes, or 45 percent.

In 1956, in the presidential primary—and I have the returns from only 3,612 out of 3,865 precincts reporting—the Democratic candidates—there were two of them: Governor Stevenson and Senator KEFAUVER—received a total of 416,861 votes, or 68 percent of the total number of votes cast.

The Republican candidates—and there were two of them—two well-known, distinguished Republicans: President Eisenhower and the minority leader, Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND—received 195,928 votes, or 32 percent of the total votes cast.

The presidential primary total in 1956, thus far, was 612,789 votes. It will go higher, probably close to 650,000 votes.

In the general primary election of 1954, 642,006 votes were cast.

I note that with a lower total vote than in the last primary election, the Democrats in the presidential primary election of March 20, 1956, showed a gain of 64,962 over the last primary election, held in 1954, while the GOP showed a loss of 94,689.

In other words, if President Eisenhower's vote of 108,000 in 1952 is hailed as a Minnesota miracle, I should like my Republican friends to think of this: The GOP lost 95,000 votes since the primary election of 1952, and the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party, or the Democratic Party, has gained 285,000 votes. On the basis of that showing, I issued a statement, following last Tuesday's election, which reads as follows:

I offer my congratulations to Senator KEFAUVER and my sympathy to the Eisenhower Republican administration. Both received a special election surprise in Minnesota. Both earned their rewards.

The significant fact of this election is the tremendous increase in the Democratic vote—an increase that swamped the Eisenhower-Knowland totals.

There were two Democrats on the ticket and two Republicans. The election totals thus far indicate a 2 to 1 majority vote for the Democratic candidates over the President and the Republican minority leader.

This election provided the first opportunity in an agricultural area for a test of the Eisenhower-Benson farm policies. Both Adlai Stevenson and ESTES KEFAUVER strongly endorsed 90 percent of parity price supports and the overall Democratic farm program. The election results from rural precincts show overwhelming support of the Democratic farm program and an equally stunning repudiation of the Eisenhower-Benson farm fiasco.

The Democratic majority came in traditionally Republican areas. In this election all the people of Minnesota had their first opportunity since the Eisenhower announcement as a candidate for reelection, to express their judgment on the policies of the respective political parties and potential candidates. The results speak in clear and unmistakable terms.

The only other explanation of the Minnesota election surprise would be that Republicans moved over into the Minnesota primary in order to embarrass Governor Stevenson—to defeat the candidate they most feared. I understand Minnesota Republican leaders are today denying any such deliberate switchover for ulterior purposes. That leaves only the conclusions that Republicans have flocked to the Democratic banner because they are repudiating their own party.

In Blue Earth County, a traditionally Republican county of Minnesota, a county which has always gone Republican, in the presidential primary election of March 20, 1956, there was a Democratic gain of 300 percent over 1952.

In Rock County, which is in a corner of Minnesota between Iowa and South Dakota, there was a Democratic gain of 297 percent over 1952.

In rural precinct after rural precinct, the votes would go like this: For Stevenson, 35; for Eisenhower, 26; for Kefauver, 85.

It appears that the rural voters were looking for an opportunity to cast their vote for one in whom they had belief and faith, and at the same time to repudiate what they considered to be policies adverse to their interests, namely, the Republican agricultural policy.

I say the greatest single fact on the American political scene today is the rebellion and the revolt, so to speak, in the farm areas of America. When I say rebellion and revolt, I mean political resentment and political disgust with the present administration's farm program.

I have said further that, as for myself, I do not question the motives of our voters. Many people tried to say what happened in Minnesota was a switchover or a crossover of Republicans into the Democratic columns just to get even with the Democratic leaders, or alleged leaders, or to embarrass Mr. Stevenson or the governor, or myself; but, may I say very frankly, I do not put too much credence in that. It may have happened in some of the metropolitan areas or suburbs, but I do not think it happened in the rural areas. I do not think either political party has a good enough organization to pin it down to the rural areas.

I believe that Minnesotans take their politics seriously, and in this election expressed their serious disappointment with Republican policies and the failure of the Republican leadership.

We welcome into our ranks those former Republicans and independents who joined with the Democratic Party in this primary. They supported a good Democrat; make no mistake. We had two good Democrats running in that primary. We look forward to their support in the November general election. We urge all voters to join the rising tide of Democratic strength for a victory in November.

Whoever the Democratic candidate for President may be, we can be assured that he will insist upon a change for the better in American politics. For our foreign policy, he will get a new Secretary of State. For our agricultural policy, he will get a new Secretary of Agriculture. For our economic policies, there will be a decided change for the better.

This was a hard-fought campaign. Both Democratic candidates brought the issues to the people. Both leveled hard and factual attacks on the present Republican administration. Both agreed on the inadequacies of the Eisenhower program. The voters apparently concurred.

I am proud to have supported Governor Stevenson. He is a great citizen and an outstanding American leader. But I want the record to be crystal clear that it is somewhat reassuring to those of us who have been concerned about the farm question to see what is happening today, and to note that in a great agricultural State a political party which in 1952 was able to garner 70 percent of the votes in the presidential primary, was in 1956 able to receive slightly over 30 percent of the votes. I believe that is one of the important political facts of the present period.

RECESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Friday, March 23, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 22 (legislative day, March 19), 1956:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

James Durfee, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1960, vice Ross Rizley, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Jack Holcomb, Atlanta, Ga., offered the following prayer:

Our God and Heavenly Father, we thank Thee today for the many past blessings we as a people and Nation have received at Thy hand. We pause now to pray and humble ourselves and to declare to all men everywhere our faith that, "Except God build a house, they labor in vain that built it."

Bless all men today of our Nation who stand in places of responsibility and authority, with courage, with strength, and with health to fulfill, under God, the tremendous tasks that are ours and theirs. In every decision at hand today, whether of national or international import, give guidance by Thy hand.

We ask these blessings in the name of Him who loved us and gave Himself for us, the one, the only Saviour, Christ Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 223. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings to Pakistan.

IMPORTATION OF ARTICLES FOR INTERNATIONAL PHOTOGRAPHIC EXHIBITION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8959) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Photographic Exposition, to be held at Washington, D. C., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes. This bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any article which is imported from a foreign country for the purpose of exhibition at the International Photographic Exposition (hereinafter in this act referred to as the "exposition"), to be held at Washington, D. C., from March 18 to April 4, 1957, inclusive, by the Master Photo Dealers and Finishers Association, a nonprofit membership corporation (hereinafter in this act referred to as the "association"), or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign exhibits at the exposition, upon which article there is a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff or customs duty or any fees or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

SEC. 2. It shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition to sell within the area of the exposition any articles provided for in this act, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe. All such articles, when withdrawn from consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry under this act for consumption or entry under the general tariff law.

SEC. 3. Imported articles provided for in this act shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States.

SEC. 4. At any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition, any article entered under this act may be abandoned to the United States or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such articles shall be remitted.

SEC. 5. Articles which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at the exposition under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

SEC. 6. The association shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under this act. The actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under this act, shall be reimbursed by the association to the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Receipts from such reimbursement shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C. 1524).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, strike out "from" and insert "for."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 8959 has as its purpose the duty-free entry of articles imported for exhibition at the International Photographic Exposition to be held at Washington, D. C.

This legislation follows the pattern of previous legislation enacted by the Congress in connection with various international exhibitions, expositions, and fairs held in the United States. The language of H. R. 8959 parallels that of Public Law 486, 83d Congress, which provided for the entry, free of duty, of articles for the purpose of exhibition, at the Washington State Fourth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., as well as other public laws relating to international fairs and expositions.

It has long been the policy of Congress to facilitate participation of foreign countries in international expositions held in the United States by permitting articles intended for display at these expositions to be entered free of import duties and charges under safeguarding regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Department of the Treasury has informed the Committee on Ways and Means that it anticipates no unusual administrative difficulties if the bill, H. R. 8959, is enacted.

The International Photographic Exposition is to be held at Washington, D. C., from March 18, 1957, to April 4, 1957, inclusive, by the Master Photo Dealers and Finishers Association, and has received a pledge of support from most of the major American photographic organizations. In addition, several other American organizations related to the field of photography have under consideration the matter of adding their support to this undertaking.

H. R. 8959 provides that the imported articles shall not be subject to marking requirements of the general tariff laws except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States. Articles so admitted may be lawfully sold at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

The Departments of State and Treasury favorably reported on H. R. 8959. The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in urging the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my bill, H. R. 8959, is to permit the entry, free of duty, of articles imported for exhibition at the International Photographic Exposition which is scheduled to be held in the city of Washington, D. C., from March 18, 1957, to April 4, 1957, making this city the scene of the first international photographic exposition or trade fair ever held in the United States. I understand that this is one of the very few really comprehensive international expositions, and by far the largest, ever to be held in Washington.

We are indeed fortunate in having the most outstanding and competent photographic manufacturing industry in the world. This is especially significant when we stop to consider the great contributions of this relatively small industry to our national economy in general and our national defense in particular. Our domestic industry in many of its important product areas faces severe foreign competition. By continued research and development and aggressive salesmanship it has been seeking to

meet this competition both in its home markets and throughout the world. In this connection, international expositions such as this will afford an opportunity to make everyone aware of American photographic products, to create an even greater acceptance for them throughout the world, and to further mutual international respect and confidence.

The Committee on Ways and Means unanimously approved the bill. Favorable reports were received from the State Department and the Treasury Department.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPORTATION OF ARTICLES FOR INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENT AUTOMATION CONFERENCE AND EXHIBIT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7678) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the 11th Annual Instrument-Automation International Conference and Exhibit, New York, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object for a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, is the bill open to amendment?

The SPEAKER. It will be if consent is granted for its consideration.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have a pro forma amendment I want to offer.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, these five bills are known as the "fair" bills to allow the importation of articles for fairs to be held at different places in the United States, similar to many such bills we have passed previously.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have a pro forma amendment I want to offer to one of the bills, I do not care which one it is.

Mr. COOPER. We have five of them. The gentleman will have ample opportunity.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Which one does the gentleman want me to offer the amendment to?

Mr. COOPER. Whatever bill the gentleman wants to offer his amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The last one, I guess, would be better.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any article which is imported from a foreign country for the purpose of exhibition at the 11th Annual Instrument-Automation (International) Conference and Exhibit (hereinafter in this act referred to as "exposition"), to be held at New York, N. Y., from September 17 to September 21, 1956, inclusive, by the Instrument Society of America, a corporation, or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign exhibits at such exposition, upon which there is a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff or customs duty or any fees or charges, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

SEC. 2. It shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of such exposition to sell within the area of the exposition any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe. All such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law.

SEC. 3. Imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States.

SEC. 4. At any time within 3 months after the close of the exposition, any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the United States or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted.

SEC. 5. Articles which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at such exposition, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

SEC. 6. The Instrument Society of America, a corporation, shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act. The actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charge for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by the Instrument Society of America, a corporation, to the United States, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1524).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7678 has as its purpose the duty-free entry of articles imported for exhibition at the 11th Annual Instrument Automation International Conference and Exhibit, to be held at New York, N. Y.

H. R. 7678 follows the pattern of previous legislation enacted by the Congress in connection with various international exhibitions, expositions, and fairs held in the United States. It has long been the policy of the Congress to facilitate the participation of foreign countries in international expositions held in the United States by permitting articles intended for display at these expositions to be entered free of import duties and charges under safeguarding regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The 11th Annual Instrument Automation International Conference and Exhibit is to be held at New York, N. Y., from September 17, 1956, to September 21, 1956, inclusive, under the auspices of the Instrument Society of America. Favorable reports on H. R. 7678 were received from the Departments of State, Treasury, and Commerce.

In supporting the enactment of H. R. 7678, the Secretary of Commerce stated as follows in his report to the committee:

> Because of this Department's interest in developing international trade fairs as marketing instruments in the United States and because of the significance of such events as a means of bringing together technicians, producers, and buyers, we recommend the enactment of H. R. 7678.

The Department of the Treasury has advised the Committee on Ways and Means that it anticipates no unusual administrative difficulties of H. R. 7678 is enacted.

H. R. 7678 provides that the imported articles shall not be subject to marking requirements of the general tariff laws except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States. Articles so admitted may be lawfully sold at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in urging the enactment of H. R. 7678.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7678, introduced by my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. EBERHARTER], would permit the entry free of duty of articles imported for exhibition at the 11th Annual Instrument Automation Conference and Exhibit to be held in New York City this year from September 17 to September 21.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in urging the enactment of H. R. 7678. Recommendations for enactment were received from the Departments of Commerce, State, and Treasury.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WASHINGTON STATE FIFTH INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR, SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the unanimous consent for the immediate

consideration of House Joint Resolution 464 to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fifth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fifth International Trade Fair, to be held at Seattle, Wash., from May 4 to May 13, 1956, inclusive, by the International Trade Fair, Inc., a corporation, or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign exhibits at the said trade fair, upon which articles there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff, customs duty, fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the said trade fair to sell within the area of the trade fair any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution of deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further*, That imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further*, That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the trade fair, any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That articles which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to an entry for exhibition at the said trade fair under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further*, That the International Trade Fair, Inc., a corporation, shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this joint resolution, and that the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under the provisions of this joint resolution, shall be reimbursed by the International Trade Fair, Inc., a corporation, to the Government of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C. 1946 edition, title 19, sec. 1524).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 464 has as its purpose the duty-free entry of articles imported for exhibition at the Washington State Fifth International Trade Fair, to be held at Seattle, Wash., in May 1956.

This joint resolution follows the pattern of previous legislation enacted by the Congress in connection with various international exhibitions, expositions, and fairs held in the United States. The language of this resolution parallels that of Public Law 485, 83d Congress, which provided for the entry, free of duty, of articles for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fourth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., as well as other public laws relating to international fairs and expositions.

It has long been the policy of Congress to facilitate participation of foreign countries in international expositions held in the United States by permitting articles intended for display at these expositions to be entered free of import duties and charges under safeguarding regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Department of the Treasury informed the Committee on Ways and Means that it anticipates no unusual administrative difficulties if this joint resolution is enacted.

The Washington State Fifth International Trade Fair is to be held by the International Trade Fair, Inc. This corporation, in the interest of greater international collaboration in the interchange of newly developed products, will assemble a number of products from the Far East for the purpose of educating the American people concerning these items.

The joint resolution provides that the imported articles shall not be subject to marking requirements of the general tariff laws except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption for use in the United States. Articles so admitted may be lawfully sold at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the trade fair, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

The Departments of State and Treasury favorably reported on House Joint Resolution 464.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 464, introduced by my distinguished colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. PELLY], would permit the entry, free of duty, of articles imported for exhibition at the Washington State Fifth International Trade Fair to be held in the city of Seattle from May 4, 1956, to May 13, 1956, by the International Trade Fair, Inc. This corporation, in the interest of greater international collaboration in the interchange of newly developed products, will assemble a number of products from the Far East for the purpose of educating the American people concerning these items.

The Committee on Ways and means is unanimous in urging the enactment of this legislation. The Departments of State and Treasury favorably reported to the committee on the House joint resolution.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr .Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the time is rapidly approaching when the Fifth Washington State International Trade Fair will be held in Seattle, Wash. It has again been my privilege to introduce legislation to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the trade fair to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; namely, House Joint Resolution 464.

The Washington State International Trade Fair is a nonprofit, civic organization for the promotion of international trade and good will. It was formed in 1951 and is sponsored by the State of Washington. Trustees are drawn from civic, business, labor, and community groups. The representation and interest is statewide. All trustees, officers, and members of the executive board serve without compensation. A tremendous outlay of executive time has been given in order to make the previous fairs successful and I have reason to believe that the trade fair this year will prove even more successful.

The International Trade Fair is becoming a business center—a meeting place where handicraft manufacturers of Pacific rim countries can meet buyers from across North America. The products brought to the trade fair are essentially noncompetitive with American products. They are principally quality handicrafts. The aim of those who foster the trade fair and provide the facilities for this meeting of foreign exhibitors and domestic buyers has been to encourage overseas to bring their better quality handicrafts. This move has been increasingly successful and in my opinion will continue to gather productive results in the future.

One of Seattle's highly regarded and outstanding businessmen, in a speech made preceding the launching of the Fourth International Trade Fair spoke as follows:

Nowhere in the world will you find an international market place just like the one we have developed here. This fair is unique and exists today because it is the outcome of a wonderful idea which must eventually permeate the thinking of freemen everywhere. That idea is that we who make up the free world must come together as equals and as friends willing to help one another solve these difficult economic problems which beset us all. We need the nations of the free world and they need us. * * *

Nowhere before have all the intricate fundamental questions of international trade been faced as squarely and honestly as they are being faced here in Seattle.

Obviously, time is of the essence. Judging from past experience with similar enabling legislation, there is nothing controversial about this resolution. I hope House Joint Resolution 464 will have unanimous approval in both bodies.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL THEATER EQUIPMENT TRADE SHOW, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8942) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Theater Equipment Trade Show, New York, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any article which is imported from a foreign country for the purpose of exhibition at the International Theater Equipment Trade Show (hereinafter in this act referred to as "exposition"), to be held at New York, N. Y., from September 19 to September 25, 1956, inclusive, by the Theater Equipment & Supply Manufacturers Association, Inc., a corporation, or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign exhibits at such exposition, upon which there is a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff or customs duty or any fees or charges, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

SEC. 2. It shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of such exposition to sell within the area of the exposition any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe. All such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law.

SEC. 3. Imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States.

SEC. 4. At any time within 3 months after the close of the exposition, any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the United States or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such articles shall be remitted.

SEC. 5. Articles which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at such exposition, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

SEC. 6. The Theater Equipment & Supply Manufacturers Association, Inc., a corporation, shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act. The actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charge for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of and accounting for, articles imported under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by the Theater Equipment & Supply Manufacturers Association, Inc., a corporation, to the United States, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1524).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 8942 has as its purpose the duty-free entry of articles imported for exhibition at the International Theatre Equipment Trade Show to be held at New York, N. Y., from September 19 to 25, 1956, inclusive.

H. R. 8942 follows the pattern of previous legislation enacted by the Congress in connection with various international exhibitions, expositions, and fairs held in the United States.

It has long been the policy of Congress to facilitate participation of foreign countries in international expositions held in the United States by permitting articles intended for display at these expositions to be entered free of import duties and charges under safeguarding regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Department of the Treasury informed the Committee on Ways and Means that it anticipates no unusual administrative difficulties if this bill is enacted.

The Committee on Ways and Means was informed that this International Theatre Equipment Trade Show is to be held under the auspices of the Theatre Equipment & Supply Manufacturers' Association, Inc.

H. R. 8942 provides that the imported articles shall not be subject to marking requirements of the general tariff laws except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States. Articles so admitted may be lawfully sold at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

The Departments of State and Treasury favorably reported to the Committee on Ways and Means on H. R. 8942.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 8942, introduced by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. GWINN], is to permit the entry, free of duty, of articles imported for exhibition at the international theater equipment trade show to be held in the city of New York from September 19 to 25 of this year under the auspices of the Theater Equipment & Supply Manufacturers Association, Inc.

It has long been the policy of Congress to facilitate participation of foreign countries in international expositions held in the United States by permitting articles intended for display at these expositions to be entered free of import duties and charges under safeguarding regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Committee on Ways and Means unanimously reported the bill. The Department of State and the Department of the Treasury submitted favorable reports to the committee on the bill.

I urge approval of H. R. 8942.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, all five of these bills are exactly alike and are of the same import except they apply to different cities, is that right?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct. They are exposition bills similar to bills we have passed previously.

Mr. JENKINS. None of them affects any tariffs and involve the same proposition, all five of them?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIX OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 8334, to permit the importation, free of duty, of racing shells to be used in connection with preparations for the 1956 Olympic games.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but I do want to be recognized to offer a pro forma amendment to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may do so at any time after the bill is under consideration, but consent must be given first for consideration of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the duty imposed by paragraph 412 of section 1 of the Tariff Act of 1930 shall not apply with respect to any racing shell—

(1) which is entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after December 31, 1955, for the purpose of enabling any athletic team or association in the United States to prepare for competition in the 1956 Olympic games (including any competition to determine representatives of the United States in the 1956 Olympic games); and

(2) with respect to which the person so entering or withdrawing has filed with the collector of customs a statement under oath that such entry or withdrawal was for a purpose set forth in clause (1) of this section.

SEC. 2. In the case of any racing shell entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after December 31, 1955, and before the date of the enactment of this act, the first section of this act shall apply, but only if the statement required by clause (2) of the first section of this act is filed within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act. If the liquidation of the entry or withdrawal has become final under section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930, such entry or withdrawal may be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty may be made.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 8334 has as its purpose the exemption from the duty imposed by paragraph 412 of the Tariff Act of 1930, on racing shells entered or withdrawn from warehouse after December 31, 1955, where such racing shells are to be used in connection with preparation for the 1956 Olympic games. The free-entry privilege would be accorded to any athletic team or association in the United States and would include competitions to determine representatives of the United States in such games.

Various sizes of racing shells are used in the Olympic games. Racing shells are long, narrow, and light in weight and are a well-known distinct type of boat. Shells made of cedar and other woods are dutiable as manufactures of wood, not specially provided for, under paragraph 412 of the Tariff Act of 1930. The rate of duty on these shells under the Tariff Act of 1922 and as originally provided in the Tariff Act of 1930 was 33⅓ percent ad valorem. Pursuant to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the rate was reduced to 25 percent ad valorem effective April 21, 1948, and effective May 30, 1950, to the current rate of 16⅔ percent ad valorem.

In order to facilitate preparation for the 1948 Olympic games, Public Law 540, 80th Congress, provided for the suspension of the duty on racing shells imported from the date of enactment until January 1, 1949. Legislation exempting racing shells for use in connection with preparation for the 1952 Olympic games was enacted in 1952—Public Law 349, 82d Congress. Except for the date, the language of H. R. 8334 is identical with that of Public Law 349.

The duty exemption that would be provided in H. R. 8334 is conditioned upon filing with the customs of a sworn statement that the shells were for the purpose indicated. Racing shells entered after December 31, 1955, and before the date of enactment of the act—for which such sworn statements were, of course, not filed—are to receive duty-free treatment if the statement is filed within 1 year after enactment of the act. Provision for refund of duties already collected is also made.

The Departments of State, Treasury, and Commerce submitted reports to the Committee on Ways and Means favoring the enactment of H. R. 8334. The Department of the Treasury advised the committee that it anticipates no unusual administrative problems in connection with this legislation.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in urging the enactment of H. R. 8334.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 8334, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHUDOFF], would exempt from the duty imposed by paragraph 412 of the Tariff Act of 1930, racing shells entered or withdrawn from warehouse after December 31, 1955, where such racing shells are to be used in connection with preparation for the 1956 Olympic games. The free-entry privilege would be accorded to any athletic team or association in the United States and would include competitions to determine representatives of the United States in such games.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in urging the enactment of this bill. Favorable reports were received from the Departments of State, Treasury, and Commerce.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ANOTHER ATTEMPTED SMEAR

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the morning's Washington Post and Times Herald—a notorious publication printed here in the city, and which, as you may recall, some years ago caused 30 individuals, perhaps a few more than 30, to be indicted on the false charge of being seditious, and who, after 4 years of vicious persecution by the Post, which publicly, editorially, finally apologized for its reprehensible conduct, all—yes, all—were discharged by the court because the Post and its coconspirators were unable to produce any evidence against them—there appears an article under the byline of Warren Unna, one of its staff reporters, from which I quote:

WILDLIFE RULE BY MCKAY HIT

(By Warren Unna)

The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee yesterday unanimously approved a report condemning the Department of the Interior for its handling of wildlife refuges.

The article further states:

Simultaneously, the committee exacted a promise from Interior Secretary Douglas McKay that in the future he would give Congress a 60-day notice before either issuing private oil leases on the refuges or disposing of the properties themselves.

Just what authority the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee or any other congressional committee has to exact a promise from Secretary of the Interior McKay or any other Cabinet officer is a question which it would be very interesting to have the committee or its counsel answer.

Often have Members of the Congress complained because an executive department has presumed to take action which was solely the function of the legislative branch. Here is a committee of the House apparently attempting to take over the functions of a Cabinet officer, that is, assuming, as perhaps I should not, that the reporter is making a factual statement. If the statement is accurate, it might be well for the Congress to inquire as to what authority a congressional committee has to direct the actions of an executive department, short, of course, of writing legislation.

Permit a further reference to the newspaper account. Referring to it I find this:

The committee report pointed out that although only 11 leases to Fish and Wildlife Service-managed lands had been granted to private oil companies from the inception of the Mineral Leasing Act in 1920 to August 1953, some 274 leases had been granted since then. The report noted that all the recent leases had been granted during the so-called stop-order period from August 1953 to December 1955 in which McKay had promised lease granting would be suspended.

Note that the article charges that only 11 leases to Fish and Wildlife Service lands had been granted to private oil companies after the enactment of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 and up to August 1953. The record will show that 317 such leases were granted during that period. Some difference between 11 and 317—just 306 in all. If conservation spokesmen are not more accurate just how far can we the Members of the House who wish to adopt helpful legislation go in relying on their statements?

In August 1953, a so-called stop order was issued which withdrew the authority of the Bureau of Land Management to grant leases pending a revision of the rules and regulations which governed the granting of such leases—regulations which, in the opinion of the policymaking officers of the Department, were not as restrictive as they should be.

Because of a variance in the views of those who controlled the lands, regulations satisfactory to the Department were not agreed upon until September

of 1955. During that period, some 282 leases were granted, as have been charged but the assumption that those leases interfered with the proper management of wildlife refuges is not justified by the facts.

In truth and in fact, the 1947 oil and gas regulations, which were the ones which it was desirable to change, did not apply to the so-called Fort Peck Refuge in northern Montana, on which oil was struck in 1951 and 1952. The 1947 regulations did not carry any restrictions protecting wildlife on the Fort Peck game range. That was a game refuge consisting of some 900,000 acres. On it there were no wildfowl refuges. It was a refuge for grouse and big game, with some additional waterfowl use. It was also subject to grazing regulations. Never, at any time, was it a refuge for the exclusive use of either wildfowl or game.

Of the approximately 282 leases which have been granted since 1953, 193 of that number were on this Fort Peck refuge, where, as stated, oil was discovered in 1951 and 1952. What do the Department's critics want? Bottle up the oil and gas so operators can have a monopoly? Nor should it be forgotten that the granting of these leases in no way interfered with the use of the land for the purposes for which it came under the Government's control.

Moreover, of the leasing because of which we now find the extremists going off on a tangent, 53 of the 282, with the possible exception of a few elsewhere—six, I think—all of the leasing of which complaints had been made were on the Railroad Valley refuge in Nevada. There, again, the purpose for which the refuge was established was not interfered with. Moreover that refuge was turned over to the State of Nevada in 1950 by Secretary Chapman because it was considered of little value for anything except local game. Are the critics after Chapman or just McKay? Or do they not trust the Johnny-on-the-spot Nevada authorities? Or do they just want to make political war medicine by panning the Department?

This article in the morning's propaganda sheet, the Washington Post and Times Herald, sets up a squawk about Maine's Widows Island, which is nothing but a small island, of no value as a game refuge, unless the critics class gulls as game, which was turned over to the General Services Administration for disposal as surplus property.

The chronic complainer, the Washington Post and Times Herald, complaining, states:

> Committee officials also pointed out that despite a promise in June to Committee Chairman HERBERT C. BONNER (Democrat, of North Carolina), that no refuge lands would be transferred without congressional notification, two in fact had been: Lenore Lake to the State of Washington and Maine's Widows Island to the General Services Administration for disposal.

In the first place, unless I am completely mistaken, neither Chairman BONNER, of the committee, nor the committee itself had any authority to exact any promise from the Interior Department that no refuge land would be transferred without congressional notification. Comment has already been made about the island.

In truth and fact, the State of Washington owned all of the land around Lenore Lake except a narrow fringe around the water itself and, because it was a navigable lake, they owned the land under the water in the lake. Who owned the fish I have not yet had time to investigate.

Since the State was the prime operator in this area, it seemed only sensible to save Federal funds and let the State operate and manage the Federal area along with its own area as a wildlife refuge, subject to the supervision of the Department of the Interior. The Federal Government has not lost title to the area.

No oil or gas leases have been granted on Lenore Lake nor on the fringe land formerly owned by the Federal Government. Nor was the lake or the land, owned by the Federal Government, transferred to GSA for disposal, as charged in the paragraph quoted.

Do the Post and critics of the Department want the Federal Government to duplicate the State's efforts through a needless expenditure of Federal funds? Some of them—especially the candidates for office in Washington and Oregon—have been squawking about some imaginary giveaway program and the needless expenditure of public funds.

Now let me ask you this simple question. Does the Washington Post and Times Herald or its staff reporter, or those self-appointed spokesmen for conservation interests, know more about how this refuge should be operated than do the authorities of the State of Washington?

One great difficulty which exists today is that altogether too many people—and they are not confined to bureaucrats in Washington—just in some mysterious way arrive at the conclusion that they know more about somebody else's business than do those who have made a lifetime study of the activity.

If the figures which I have given are challenged, let it be remembered that some were in the first report prepared for the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and that when this morning I called that committee for a copy of that report I was told that it had not been adopted, though I have since been told that a revised version of the first proposed report was adopted yesterday but had not been released to the press.

Perhaps not only Drew Pearson, of the Washington Post, but some other snooper, has access, through the committee's staff, to the committee's files. I have not forgotten that, not so long ago, Mr. Redwine, of a Senate committee staff, falsely, and assisted by the Honorable Drew Pearson, charged and gave currency to the vicious charge that our President had attempted to influence the Department of the Interior in making a decision.

Permit me to repeat, that not one of the leases which have been made has interfered in any way with the use of the land which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior as a wildlife refuge.

The point I am trying to make is that some of these committees and some of the subcommittees come up with an attack on the administration which often is not in accord with the facts. And, I might say that the committee on which I am serving has, or had, on its staff two former members, employees, rather, of the Democratic National Committee. They are switching the employees over from the Democratic National Committee to our committee staff and paying them with Federal funds. Well, you can put out a lot of propaganda pretty cheaply by that procedure.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I want to compliment the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the House. I am a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and I sat through the hearing which yesterday approved the report. The report does not substantiate the story that appears in the press. The report indicates that approximately as many oil leases were entered into prior to this administration taking office.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. More.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I say approximately as were entered into afterward. The man in charge of the game refuges says, and he testified before the committee, that the effect upon the game refuges by the oil leases was nil.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, the point is, Mr. Speaker, that it is not fair for the majority here to use their committee staff, operating with Federal tax dollars, to attack the administration for political purposes. That is the point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on the five bills just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, very often we get wrong impressions from reading newspaper articles. Having been in the newspaper business for a long time I know we are not going to win any fights by calling attention to mistakes that appear in newspapers, but I do feel that there is one article that appeared in several papers last week to which I should direct your attention. This headline reads: "House Demos Devise Farm Bill Delays."

It goes on to say that House Democrats plan to slow down the farm bill.

That statement was made 3 days before the bill was even passed by the Senate. I want to call attention to another inaccuracy in this article, where it states as a fact that the chairman of our House Committee on Agriculture will not be available for these conferences until after the middle of April. That is also an error. Our committee has already had meetings and others are scheduled for next week. We have invited the Secretary of Agriculture to give us some information on the farm bill as passed by the other body. I know that everything that can possibly be done is being done to move this legislation expeditiously.

This newspaper article which was published in the Scripps-Howard papers under the headline "Washington Calling" is entirely in error. I hope that they will take the same space to correct this error that they took publishing the original unjustified attack.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Can the gentleman advise me as to the kind of farm bill that passed the other body?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It took 107 pages for an analysis, so-called, of the bill. On each one of those pages, with the exception of one, there is new matter. How anybody can digest that in a couple of hours or a couple of days or even a couple of weeks I do not know.

Here are the facts about the pending farm legislation:

On May 5, 1955, more than 10 months ago the House passed H. R. 12, restoring the principle of 90 percent parity price supports. During the next 3 months while Congress was still in session, the other body took no action on that bill. Secretary Benson as well as other officials in the Department of Agriculture opposed the passage of H. R. 12.

It is interesting to note, also, that on July 27, 1955, the Department of Agriculture, in a report to the House Committee on Agriculture on H. R. 2420, said that it could not give its approval to setting up a soil bank, because of the excessive cost, which it estimated to be approximately $490 million.

Despite this adverse report of a few months earlier, the Department of Agriculture suggested in the early part of this election year that a soil bank would solve most of the farmers' troubles. Accordingly bills were introduced. Extensive hearings were held in the other body in the early part of January and February. On February 10, 1956, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee in the other body introduced a bill; on February 16, the committee report, together with minority and individual views, was filed. This was a 71-page document explaining the bill.

During general debate in the Senate, which extended from February 22 through March 7, more than 60 amendments were proposed. On March 8, the Senate began voting on these amendments, but it was not until 11 days later, after some night sessions, on March 19, that the Senate completed action on its bill.

The distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, had previously advised members of his committee that as soon as the Senate completed action on its bill, which was finally passed as H. R. 12, that he would call a meeting of his committee to discuss the new legislation which had never been considered by the House, either in committee or on the floor. An invitation was extended to Secretary Benson to furnish the House committee with an analysis and explanation of the bill, and to come in person to give the views of the Department.

Secretary Benson has accepted that invitation, but informed Chairman COOLEY that he could not be available to discuss the new proposals until Tuesday of next week. The House Committee on Agriculture held an executive meeting this morning, when members were furnished with a so-called analysis of the bill. Another executive meeting will be held next Monday, and an open meeting with the Secretary of Agriculture has been called for Tuesday.

Chairman COOLEY has announced that he will forego attendance at a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union Council, of which he is a member, in order to devote his undivided attention to this important legislation during the Easter recess when it is expected the conferees will meet. I think it is most commendable that the House, through its Committee on Agriculture, will be given an opportunity to express its views to these conferees before they go into executive session. For, remember, the House will be given no opportunity to debate this bill, as was done in the other body. There will be no opportunity to offer amendments. Our only vote will be on the conference report.

I, for one, want the conference report to embody the best legislation possible for the farmers of America. While time is of the essence, it is even more important to get fair and equitable legislation that will give some relief to our farmers.

The House has been waiting for more than 10 long months for the return of its original bill, H. R. 12, which was passed last May. Let us be fair with our criticism. If the conferees can reach an agreement by April 16 which will result in a bill which will guarantee adequate supports and fair treatment to our farmers, I will congratulate them on having moved expeditiously on the most important legislation before this Congress.

When we attempt to fix the blame for the delay, let us put it where it belongs, and certainly it cannot be charged to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.

DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago—on April 1, 1954—the dairy farmers of the Nation looked straight down the barrel of a flexible shotgun triggered by Secretary of Agriculture Benson. It was on that date Secretary Benson's administrative order became effective to slash dairy price supports from 90 to 75 percent of parity.

During the month of March 1954—beginning on March 22—I addressed the House on seven different occasions. I expressed my opposition to Benson's sharp cut in dairy price supports, and I also urged Congress to enact stopgap legislation to stay the order. In one of my speeches I point out, among other things, that in the due course of time other agricultural producers would fall under the sights of the administration's flexible program shotgun.

I am not a prophet, but some of my predictions have come true. If one is to judge events by what happened to farm legislation on the Senate side, it appears that the administration's flexible shotgun developed into a battery of machineguns firing flexible bullets at all farm commodities.

On this occasion I believe it is advisable to take stock of the Nation's dairy farmers' position and progress for the last 2 years under Secretary Benson's downward flexing program of dairy price supports. Have dairy farmers prospered under the program? Has their total income increased? Have dairy farmers reduced production of milk? Have they shared in the economic gains enjoyed by nonfarm groups?

First, let us take a look at the national gross-income figures for all dairy farmers. I am forced to cite gross-income figures because I cannot secure net income statistics.

In 1953—when dairy products were still supported at 90 percent of parity—the gross income of dairy farmers was $4,372,000,000. Total national production was 120.2 billion pounds of milk. In 1954—when 90 percent supports were effective for only the first 3 months—gross national dairy income dropped to $4,131,000,000. Total milk production for the year increased to 122.1 billion pounds. The increase in milk production for 1954 amounted to 1.9 billion pounds as compared to the 1953 output.

To be specific, gross income of the Nation's dairy farmers dropped $241 million in 1954 in comparison to 1953. In other words, dairy farmers produced 1.9 billion pounds more milk and received $241 million less income in 1954.

Incidentally, it must be noted that this is the income for all dairy farmers producing milk for both fluid and manufacturing purposes. In many sections of the country dairy farmers residing in areas producing milk under Federal marketing orders were not as hard hit as dairy farmers producing milk for manufacturing butter, cheese, dried milk, and other purposes. Unfortunately, statistics are not available to indicate what happened to the income of farmers producing milk for manufactured dairy products.

The reason for increased milk production is obvious. The costs of dairy farmers' operations—including property taxes, interest rates on indebtedness, and the price of commodities they bought—were not flexed downward. So dairy farmers were forced to produce more milk in the hope of recapturing some of the lost income.

According to latest unofficial estimates, gross income for dairy farmers in 1955 will be $4,161,000,000. This represents an increase in gross income for the Nation's dairy farmers of only $30 million over the previous year. At this point I should like to observe that unofficial statistics show that Wisconsin dairy farmers did not share in this slight increase.

The $30 million increase in gross income for dairy farmers does not tell the full story. The monetary increase does not tell the full story because dairy farmers produced 1.3 billion pounds more milk in 1955 than they did in 1954. In the final analysis, dairy farmers received only $2.30 per hundredweight on the additional production of 1.3 billion pounds. Dairy farmers certainly are not going to get rich or break even at this rate.

Other segments in our economy did much better in 1955 than did farmers. Corporation profits were up 26 percent and corporation stockholders' income increased by 10 percent. The take-home pay of workers increased only 3 percent. Big business failures were 15 percent less. Small business did not do so well. Small business failures were up 21 percent.

THE LATE HONORABLE RAYMOND E. WILLIS, OF INDIANA

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a newspaper story.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to inform this House that a former Member of the other body, former Senator Raymond E. Willis, of Indiana, died last night.

Senator Willis was born August 11, 1875, in Waterloo, Ind., a community just south of his long-time hometown, Angola, Ind., where he died. He attended public schools and, thereafter, was graduated from Wabash College in 1896. Afterward he learned the newspaper and printing business and moved to Angola, where in 1898 he started his long and active career in this field.

From 1910 to 1914 he served as postmaster at Angola. During World War I he was chairman of the Steuben County Council of Defense, and from 1919 to 1921 was a member of the Indiana General Assembly.

Always active in religious and civic affairs, he taught a Sunday school class in the Congregational Church for years. He was also a leader in the Rotary Club and served in various capacities in that organization. At one time he served as president of the Indiana Republican Editorial Association, the oldest active organization of its kind in the country.

An unsuccessful candidate for the United States Senate in 1938, he was elected as a Republican to this high office in 1940 for the term ending January 3, 1947. He was not a candidate for reelection in 1946.

Upon his retirement from the Senate, he returned to his first love—the newspaper business—continuing as one of the editors of the Steuben Republican. He also continued, up to the time of his death, a very active interest in the affairs not only of his local community, but of the State and Nation.

Senator Willis was a gentle, kindly man, yet one who had deep convictions and an abiding sense of the obligations of American citizenship. He served his country with great distinction, and we shall miss him greatly.

His funeral will be at 2 o'clock on Saturday, March 24, in the Congregational Church at Angola. His family and friends have our deepest sympathy. He was a great American.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

EX-SENATOR WILLIS DIES AT 80 OF HEART ATTACK

Former Senator Raymond E. Willis, Republican, of Indiana, died of a heart attack last night at his home in Angola, Ind., where he lived since he retired from the Senate in 1947. He was 80 years old.

The son and grandson of Hoosier country newspaper editors, Mr. Willis was himself the editor of the Steuben County Republican when he was elected in 1940. He returned to the presidency of the Steuben Printing Co., which publishes the Republican and the Angola Herald, a Democratic paper.

Born in Waterloo, 1 of 9 children, the former Senator worked his way through Wabash College, and began working as a printer with the Steuben Republican.

Two years later he bought an interest in the paper, which under his editorship supported prohibition, bucked the New Deal and the Ku Klux Klan when it was riding high in Indiana.

On his return home from Washington, Senator Willis took over trusteeship of Tri-State College at Angola and continued in other civic and fraternal duties. He was an active Rotarian and a 33d degree Mason, and also taught Sunday school.

He is survived by his wife, Mary, who is 76, and 6 brothers and sisters, among them Mrs. James P. Hornaday of 1327 Hemlock Street NW.

Funeral services will be in Angola.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague [Mr. ADAIR] in extending our sympathy to the widow of Senator Willis. It was my great privilege to have enjoyed his friendship. He was a fine, great American, an able legislator, and typified all that is good in our Nation's life.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Indiana in an expression of sympathy to the family and friends of Senator Raymond Willis.

It was my privilege to know the Senator before I became as actively engaged in Indiana politics as has been my privilege during the past several years.

The record established by Senator Willis as a Member of the United States Senate during the term ending January 3, 1947, is one of which every Hoosier is very proud. He was not a candidate for renomination in 1946 and returned to Angola where he resumed the publishing business until his retirement only a few years ago.

Raymond Willis did not retire in the usual sense of the word. He possessed a great zeal for the principles of good government and also gave a willing hand and intelligent help to the councils not only of his party but also of his State and his Nation.

Senator Willis and I share the same alma mater—Wabash College in Crawfordsville, Ind. Senator Willis graduated from Wabash College the same year that I was born and, consequently, I knew him during my college years as one of the alumni of whom we were very proud.

Senator Willis has served well his community, his State, and his Nation. The tributes paid Senator Willis will be a fitting memorial to a sterling character, devoted public servant, and a typical American.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of the Honorable Raymond E. Willis, another stanch American has left the scene, and it was with shock and sorrow that I learned of the death of this good man.

Ray Willis was a distinguished son of Indiana, a newspaperman by profession and a credit to the field of journalism.

Those of us who knew him admired his deep sense of loyalty to his country and to the party under whose emblem he served so well in the Senate of the United States.

It was natural that as the publisher of a newspaper Ray Willis took a lively interest in affairs of government, not only at the national level, but at State and community levels as well.

This interest was reflected in his many activities, undertaken, at all times, in a spirit of helpfulness to his fellow men.

Ray Willis was the type of sturdy, self-reliant, hard-working citizen who has

made America the great Nation it is today.

His fine family should find consolation in the knowledge that his was a full life, attended by distinctions and honors that come only to the deserving.

To his loved ones, particularly to his widow, his sister, and his brother, I offer my deepest sympathy in their loss.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and services of the late Raymond Willis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the death of Senator Raymond E. Willis. Although Senator Willis had retired from the Senate before I was elected to Congress, I was personally acquainted with him for many years and visited with him whenever I was in Washington.

Senator Willis was a kind, friendly, capable and hard-working member of the Senate and was never too busy to listen to the problems of his constituents. He added luster to his State and stature to the Senate.

I can frankly say that in all the years I knew Senator Willis, while strong and vigorous in fighting for those things which he believed to be right, I have never heard him say an unkind word about any person. Senator Willis will be deeply missed.

HONORABLE WILLIAM H. HILL

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, March 23, 1956, is the 80th birthday of Hon. William H. Hill, publisher of the Binghamton Sun at Binghamton, N. Y., former Member of this House of Representatives, and my good friend for many years. To his thousands of friends he is affectionately known as Billy Hill. He has a long and distinguished record of public service, as president of his home village of Johnson City at 21 years of age, as a New York State senator, as a Member of the 66th Congress, and 33 years' service on a New York State Parks Commission. It was Congressman Hill, investigating the race riots in Washington, D. C., back in 1919, who discovered there was no restriction in the Capital on the sale of firearms, and wrote and put through Congress the anti-gun-toting bill. He was an early liberal, in the New York State Senate, pushing through the widow's pension law, and in Congress, working as a member of the Committee on Reform of Civil Service, shaping the first measure enacted in this country wherein the United States recognized the right to, and provided for, the retirement on pension of civilian employees of the Government.

Billy Hill has now become the elder statesman of New York State Republican politics. He is the dean of the New York State Republican Executive Committee, was State campaign manager for Herbert Hoover in 1928, and has been a delegate to Republican National Conventions so many times as to be beyond the memory of ordinary men. In what is known as the southern tier of New York State, Billy Hill has been undisputed leader for nearly half a century. He is about the last survivor of the old-time political bosses—the powerful political giants who ruled like kings. Where changing times, political wars, or other causes, ended the sway of the other big bosses, the stature and influence of Billy Hill was steadily increased. As a leader he wisely learned early always to wear a velvet glove over the iron fist, and to stick to the sound rule that good government for the people is the best politics for the party.

Today at 80 years of age, hale, hearty, and alert—ready to attend the Republican National Convention at San Francisco next August—Billy Hill stands forth as a shining exemplification of the great but modest Americans our country produces. A good man, dedicated to fighting for good things, and a kind and helpful neighbor to all. A useful man to his community, always ready to serve the public welfare. A great political leader, always conscious of the public trust, never touched by scandal or avaricious self-interest. An understanding friend to every man and woman in need or in time of trouble. These are the kind of characteristics every mother and father hope for in their sons; the kind our citizens hope for in all our national leaders—the kind we as a nation must display to the world if American leadership is to endure. Because the only true wealth is the good we do in this world, Billy Hill has become one of our richest men in this kind of wealth. Some men build monuments of marble to themselves—other men, modestly unconscious of so doing, build monuments to themselves in humble service to God, humanity, and country—in daily acts of kindliness, charity, and love of fellow men. In his 80 years of life it is this latter kind of everlasting monument Billy Hill has built for himself—and to my mind that is the greatest accomplishment Providence gives any of us the opportunity to achieve. I publicly congratulate my grand old friend, Billy Hill, not only on his 80 years of life, but also on the splendid and inspiring way he has lived it—and it is my earnest hope that the Good Lord, in his infinite mercy will keep Billy Hill with us many more years in good health, happiness, and continued usefulness to mankind.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

BILLY HILL AT 79

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of personal pleasure that I join the distinguished minority leader in paying tribute to the one and only Billy Hill on the occasion of his 79th birthday.

William H. Hill—as he is formally known—has led a busy, fruitful life.

His contributions to his State, his city, and his party are unequalled. For years he has published the Binghamton Sun, and for over 30 years he served with distinction as a member of the New York State Parks Commission.

Special tribute should be accorded Billy Hill's contributions to the Republican Party. For upward of 60 years his energy and ingenuity have helped to guide the destinies of the party. His claim to the title of grand old man of the Republican Party in New York State is unchallenged.

He has led the Broome County Republican Committee in such a manner as to win unparalleled trust and confidence. Members of both political parties look to him for guidance and advice. He served from March 1919 to March 1921 as a Member of the House of Representatives, and has been a member of the New York State Republican Executive Committee, and a delegate to the Republican National Convention for many years.

Active as his life has been, Billy Hill has never been too busy to fail to win the affection of all who have come in contact with him. His integrity, wisdom, courage, and vigor are legend in New York State. In my mind I always think of him as the "Sage of the Southern Tier."

On this, the occasion of the beginning of Billy Hill's 80th year, I salute him for his varied accomplishments and wish him many more years of activity and good health.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to inquire as to the legislative program of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. At this time I am only able to announce the program for Monday because starting Thursday we take the usual Easter recess which will run until April 9. On Monday, there are 10 District bills which I am informed will be called up. They are as follows:

H. R. 3693, amend Revenue Act of 1937.

H. R. 4922, White House, prohibit picketing.

H. R. 7228, transfer authority from Interior Department to Commerce Department.

H. R. 7380, salaries of policemen and firemen.

H. R. 8130, naming Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge.

H. R. 8493, Federation of Women's Clubs, taxes.

H. R. 8957, civic auditorium.

H. R. 9078, police officers and members, staff 2,500.

H. R. 9312, dismissing Board of Education members.

H. R. 9582, reporting births.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the gentleman know whether there is any great controversy on any of these bills?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sorry but I cannot advise the gentleman as to that. I might say that if there are any rollcalls on Monday, since Monday is the first night of the Passover and, of course, we respect all holy days and holidays of all religions, they will be put over until Tuesday. That is agreeable, I know, to my friend.

Mr. MARTIN. That is quite agreeable.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have just been handed a memorandum to the effect that all these District bills are not controversial. Of course, I do not want to be held to that, I am just stating that that is the information I have received.

Any further program for next week will be announced on Monday. I shall give the Members as much advance notice as I possibly can and, of course, later announcements may be made depending upon what rules might come from the Committee on Rules.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate all of next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY TO MEET CHANGING TIMES

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, only recently the 8-millionth American became entitled to social-security benefits and received his first benefit check. This event bears testimony to the fine progress which has been made under the social-security system in the 20 years in which it has been established in this country. Today, with the important improvements in the coverage of the plan which were achieved in the 1954 amendments, 9 out of 10 working men and women in the United States are working in employment covered by the system. Nearly 4½ million Americans who have reached their 65th birthday are receiving benefit checks as retired workers. Another million persons, including aged wives and dependent husbands, receive checks each month as dependents of insured workers. And nearly 1½ million widowed mothers with children under 18 are receiving monthly allotments because of the untimely death of the family breadwinner.

NEED FOR IMPROVEMENTS

While our social-security system is truly the finest in the world, it still falls far short of meeting our present social and economic needs in realistic fashion. It is discriminatory and unjust to large groups of our citizens. It arbitrarily excludes from coverage many persons without just cause or reason. Pension benefits, particularly in the lower brackets, are unreasonably low and completely inadequate to meet ordinary living expenses.

It is because I am convinced that we must move forward toward making this well-proved system an even better one that I am addressing the House today. For I have long felt that there are certain "blindspots" in the existing program which cause severe hardship in thousands of American families each year because the protection provided by our social-security plan is limited in several important respects. I have introduced bills in the past which would meet these needs as I have seen them. I recently introduced a new bill which adds the kind of protection which will relieve the kind of hardship about which I have been concerned.

Briefly, my bill would:

First. Reduce the eligibility age for retirement benefits—now age 65 for everyone—to age 62 for men and age 60 for women.

Second. Provide that widows who have been entitled to mother's benefits because there were young children in the home when the father died may become eligible for benefits in their own right at age 55, regardless of whether there are still children under 18 in the home. Under existing law the benefits to such a widowed mother cease when the youngest child reaches age 18, and she must wait until she is 65 years of age before she is again entitled to a benefit.

Third. Provide that workers aged 50 and over who are retired prematurely from their jobs by a disability which is so severe that they cannot work at any job shall be entitled to benefits on proof of such disability.

Fourth. Provide substantial increases in benefits ranging from 33⅓ percent in the lower and middle brackets to 10 percent in the highest. There is a great and immediate need for increasing pension rates. It is a deplorable thing in this country of ours for retired people to try to keep body and soul together on thirty-five to forty-five dollars a month. Persons receiving pensions of that kind are not living—they are barely existing. Thus, there is an immediate need to bring pensions in line with present living costs, and that is one of the things my bill seeks to do.

LOWER PENSION AGES

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have engaged in a considerable degree of unreality in holding to the eligibility age of 65 years for retirement benefits throughout the 20 years since 1935 when the social-security system was first established. We know that during these two decades amazing progress has been made in our productive power as a Nation. We know that the machine tools brought out since 1947 are rated 40 percent more productive per machine, on the average, than were prewar models. This simply means that, with the same number of new-model machines a manufacturer can now get 40 percent more production with the same—or a smaller—number of workers.

Within the short space of two decades—the life span of our social-security system—machines have steadily been replacing men. Now we are on the verge of what has been called the second industrial revolution, with the recent developments in "automation." But we have not modernized the social-security system itself. We are still using the retirement age of 65 years set 20 years ago during a depression.

We have so far adjusted our working life to these magnificent developments in our productive capacity by shortening the workday and shortening the workweek. I believe that the time has come when we must also recognize that such developments are inevitably shortening the work life for most of us. By lowering the retirement age for men to age 62 and the retirement age for women to age 60, we will bring our social-security system up to date, and provide protection for millions of American homes.

In so doing we will recognize the special problems which thousands of older men and women are facing today. We know that it is especially difficult for the older woman widowed in her later years to maintain herself. We know that the opportunities for older men and women to find employment—or to remain in employment—are more seriously limited than they were when most Americans lived on farms. Many firms require women to leave their jobs at age 60—thus imposing an arbitrary 5-year waiting period before they are eligible for social security benefits. Women aged 60 or over find it practically impossible to get a job unless they have recently been employed.

Most tragic of all, perhaps, is the fact that thousands of older women have to be told, at a time of bereavement because of the death of their husband, that they must wait until they are 65 years of age before they are entitled to the social security benefits toward which the husband contributed throughout his working life. Many of these women have never worked outside their homes. Recent studies show that the proportion of widowed older people is almost twice as high

among women as men—54 percent as against 22 percent. Also to the point is the fact that more than half of married men who attain age 65 have a wife who has reached age 60. Under my bill, widows would be entitled to benefits immediately if they are 60 years of age or over.

I know that most Members of the House are aware of these particular problems, and I invite their support for my bill. For in lowering the age to 60 for women we will make it possible for many aging widows to remain independent of the welfare rolls following the death of their husbands; we will meet the problems of women accustomed to employment who are forced to leave their jobs at age 60. And, in simultaneously lowering the retirement age for men to age 62 we will make it possible for aged couples to enjoy a greater measure of security for a longer period of time because of an increase in family benefit income.

Because it recognizes also the particular problem which faces mothers widowed while their children are small, my bill makes what I believe to be a simple but very essential improvement in the protection now furnished to survivors of young workers who die.

I have always believed that the provision of present law which pays benefits to young mothers bereaved by the death of the husband and father, and to their young children, is one of the most important segments of our social-security system. Because it is written into the law of our land, the working fathers of this country can know that each contribution to social security is a down-payment on a guaranty that their wives and children will not be left penniless if some unforeseen tragedy should claim their lives. It is a testimonial to our concern that the family be protected against such an exigency, so that the widowed mother can remain in the home with her children while they are growing up.

The importance of this family protection can, perhaps, best be gauged as it can apply to specific family situations in terms of total tax-free income from benefits paid because the income of the family breadwinner has ceased with his death. For example, according to estimates prepared by the J. K. Lasser Tax Institute—using standard life insurance expectancies and an average monthly wage of $350—a total of $57,959 would be received by the family of a man who dies leaving a widow aged 30, and 3 children, aged 1, 3, and 5. Under the same assumptions, if the family consists of a widow, aged 35, and 2 children, aged 3 and 6, a total of $52,713 is paid on the basis of the father's wage record. And this protection may be furnished for as little as $126 in the form of a payroll tax contribution, since the minimum requirement is that the father shall have been working in covered employment for just 6 of the 13 calendar quarters preceding his death.

As I said in the beginning, some 1½ million American mothers and their children are now receiving benefits under this important provision of our social-security system.

But here, again, I believe there is a significant "blindspot" in the kind of security provided for the widowed mother. For when the youngest child in the family reaches age 18, all benefits cease abruptly. During this important period in the middle of her life, the mother who has been entitled to her benefit because she remained at home with her children, is cut off the benefit rolls until she reaches age 65. My bill would make her eligible 10 years earlier—at age 55. In this way the waiting period would be reduced for all mothers and, in some cases, there would be no waiting period at all.

Once again, an example from a given family situation illustrates the effect of the cutoff provision of the present law. Again assuming an average monthly wage for the husband of $350 in covered earnings, the mother and her child receive a total monthly benefit of $162.80 up to the child's 18th birthday. Then both benefits are abruptly terminated.

My bill would make her eligible for her widow's benefit at age 55. In this way the cruel waiting period would be reduced for all mothers, and in some cases there would be no waiting period at all.

DISABILITY BENEFITS

Finally the bill I propose would pay benefits to workers aged 50 or over who are forced to retire from their jobs prematurely because of a crippling disability. In this respect, it corresponds to the bill passed by the House of Representatives in the last session of Congress, which is now under consideration in the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

We know that, on the average day, about 2 million persons are kept from gainful employment by a disability which has lasted 6 months or longer—the specification set by my bill. Since only 1 such disablement in 20 is work connected, the other 19 cannot qualify for the limited protection offered by workmen's compensation.

We know that older workers are especially subject to the risk of losing their job because of such a crippling illness or injury. Among workers aged 55 to 65, where the incidence of such disability is highest, a recent survey by the Bureau of the Census shows that 98 percent were working when they were disabled. My bill would make them eligible for social security benefits because they have been forced, through circumstances beyond their control, to cease working before their 65th birthday.

Disability programs have been used for some years in the railroad retirement system, the civil-service retirement system, in State and local retirement systems, and in programs for veterans. We are making such determinations right now in the social-security system under the "disability freeze provision," although no benefits are paid until age 65 is reached.

Moreover, social insurance has devised its own built-in protections against possible abuse. A 6-month waiting period is set before application for disability benefits can be made. The disability must be medically determinable and one which can be expected to make it impossible for him to work at any job. In addition, the applicant must show that he has been in covered employment for 6 of the 13 and 20 of the 40 quarters preceding disability—and that he is also fully insured. In addition, the resources of State vocational rehabilitation agencies would be used, with the possibility that, through a retraining process, the disabled worker can learn another job and once again become self-sufficient. Thus the rehabilitation process can supplement medical diagnosis in testing whether or not the disability is permanent and total.

In effect, therefore, my proposal would reach down below the arbitrary retirement age of 65 and award benefits to those unfortunate workers who are forced to retire prematurely from the labor force because they are physically unable to work.

But, someone may say, are not such proposals going to encourage people to retire prematurely? Now, there are several answers to that question. One is the fact that the average old-age payment in social security is now just around $60 per month. This amount hardly represents an inducement to retire to a life of ease and comfort.

Secondly, most evidence shows that 9 out of 10 workers retire because they are forced to do so. This is one reason the average retirement age for men under social security is around age 69, and that for women age 68. Here is evidence, to my mind, that people want to continue to work, and will continue to do so regardless of their age—if they can find work.

Finally, as I indicated at the beginning of these remarks, I am convinced that it is time that we face up to the reality that the very genius which has so tremendously expanded our productive power as a nation, and the medical genius which has lengthened our life span, is inevitably shortening the number of years we will be required to work. Nor do I believe that it is necessary or wise to view such developments with alarm, as is sometimes done. Rather, it seems to me to be of the very greatest importance that we recognize these facts of our time, and adjust our thinking and our attitudes accordingly.

I am just as convinced that we must begin to recognize in our social-security system that a new day is dawning. We can certainly anticipate that the trend toward a shorter work life will continue, not only because machines are replacing men, but also in order that younger men with growing families may be assured of a job.

Will we use that new leisure to live more abundantly and to assure a better life for all of us? Will we recognize that we can no longer assume that everyone will have the opportunity to work until they reach the arbitrary age of 65? Will we make it possible for young widowed mothers to remain at home with their children instead of being under the necessity of going to work each day to insure some form of income when their children are grown?

I believe that the bill which I have just outlined faces up to these trends of our time. I believe that it is in line with the

purposes outlined by President Eisenhower on January 14, 1954, when he said:

> The human problems of individual citizens are a proper and important concern of our Government. One such problem that faces every individual is the provision of economic security for his old age and economic security for his family in the event of his death. To help individuals provide for that security, to reduce both the fear and the incidence of destitution to the minimum, to promote the confidence of every individual in the future, these are proper aims of all levels of government, including the Federal Government.
>
> * * * In response to the need for protection arising from the complexities of our modern society, the old-age and survivors insurance system was developed. * * * Despite shortcomings, which can be corrected, this system is basically sound. It should remain, as it has been, the cornerstone of the Government's programs to promote the economic security of the individual.

I sincerely believe that the improvements in social security outlined in my bill meet these requirements, and I urge the support of Members of this Congress in enacting it into law.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, when I came on the floor of the House today I had no intention whatever of referring to the matter I am going to speak about briefly at this time. I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and I am not an expert in the field of agriculture, but at least I read the newspapers and I listen to those I think do know something about the situation as it exists.

I know that it is against the rules of the House to comment specifically on anything that happens in the other body. I am sure we are all aware of the fact that the RECORD is available to us and we can follow what has been happening and know what the situation is. For quick reference may I refer to pages 5061, 5062, 5064, 5069, 5070, 5071, and 5073 of the RECORD of Monday, March 19, 1956?

I was rather disappointed to have it indicated that we would have difficulty in finding out what may confront us in the next weeks or months in terms of adequate farm legislation. I think most of us know exactly what that will be.

I want to quote from a telegram I received a few minutes ago from a resident of Massachusetts, who does know what he is talking about and who is an expert in the field. I read one sentence:

> The Nation would be better off with no farm legislation than the bill as it now stands.

I think we had better heed the words of these people who are sincerely interested in the future of agriculture rather than of those whose primary interest is in the political aspects that may confront us.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Would you like to see us get away from here and Congress adjourn without taking any action on the agricultural bill this session?

Mr. HESELTON. No. I would like to see a proper bill enacted, but I object to the devices that have been resorted to in order to try to explain the situation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] has expired.

FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this country, particularly in the Middle West, are in deep economic trouble. The only immediate relief that appears now will be through the medium of the soil bank and rental programs. That means legislation must be enacted by Congress very quickly, because we are beginning the planting season in Iowa and if the soil-bank program is to be enacted we must know not in a matter of weeks or months, but a matter of days. I suggest that this situation is serious enough that the leadership give earnest consideration to the abandonment of the Easter recess and the dedication of our efforts to the immediate passage of the farm bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does the gentleman know that this farm bill is in such shape that even the officials in the Department of Agriculture have indicated that it will be at least next Tuesday before they can even apprise Congress of what is in the bill on which we are trying to work?

Mr. GROSS. I say to the gentleman that is all the more reason why the Congress should remain in session and pass a bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman, but do you not think it requires some study?

Mr. GROSS. You have already started a study of the bill and I would hope that before the end of next week you would be ready to ask the House for a conference.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The committee met this morning. We are meeting Monday and Tuesday with the Secretary and expect to have some meetings to get the views of members of the Committee on Agriculture before the conferees who will represent the House in the conference.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

GUIDED MISSILES

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have been disturbed by the press stories to the effect that there is confusion as to guided missiles and antiaircraft missiles, as between the Navy missile Talos and the Army missile Nike. I think the great cities and areas concerned with this defense should know that the only guided-missile system which is now operational is the Army system Nike. The Navy Talos missile is at this time only in research and development. It is not operational. It will not be operational for quite some time. The Nike missile is in the field, is in locations, as we know, for the defense of certain areas, and these areas will be increased. It is good. It is effective. It is the best and the only one in the world today that is operational. It will be supplemented by additional Nike-class missiles of the same general type and purpose, but, in the meantime, the people of this country are not to be disturbed or concerned that there is now available another guided antiaircraft missile from the Navy, known as the Talos. That is not true. Antiaircraft operations is the delegated area for the Army, and the Army is meeting that duty with Nike actually in operation and for some time. There can be no so-called duel between Nike and Talos except in experimental areas, since only Nike is operational. Talos will not be operational for some time, and by and at that time the latest Nike will be operational. In the meantime, we have only Nike, the Army weapon.

FORESTRY AS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR BIPARTISAN ACTION

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I urge that action be taken to provide adequate funds for forestry activities in forest research, National Forest Administration, and forest tree planting, forest protection, and technical assistance on privately owned land. Foresters everywhere thank the Congress for the modest increases provided over the recent years for forest research. I am happy to report to you that these investments are beginning to pay important dividends. For example, in the sandhills of northwest Florida when the valuable longleaf pine was cut off 40 or 50 years ago, worthless scrub hardwoods covered much of the land. Sporadic attempts were made to reforest this area but failed and the land continued to be unproductive. In 1952 the Southern Forest Experiment Station established a field research center at Marianna, Fla., and began to study how we could make the sandhills produce valuable timber. Already a small group of foresters at the center have learned how to go about reforesting the sandhills. Their findings in these few short years since 1952 are so convincing that today, traveling

through northwest Florida you will see big machinery—powerful bulldozers, root pullers, root rakes, and disks—eradicating the scrub oak and other undesirable vegetation in preparing the land for the planting of slash pine. I do not want to leave the impression that all of our native hardwoods are worthless. Our research foresters tell us of opportunity on the proper sites, chiefly in the bottomlands, to grow quality hardwoods like cherry-bark oak and red gum. Throughout the Nation, however, on poorer lands, there is an abundance of hardwood timber of types which are now largely unmarketable. Through research in marketing and utilization we hope to find profitable markets for this material.

I can tell you also that our National Forest Administration, like our forest research program, is going forward. Whenever I see the splendid records our national forests are making I notice an increase in the amount of receipts from the sale of national forest timber and the number of people who are using the recreational and other resources. One of the national forests is in my district and the folks are mighty proud of it. It contributes much to the economic life of my district and to the pleasure of living there.

The budget proposed modest increases for forest research and for National Forest Administration so I will say no more about these items. Instead I shall direct my remarks chiefly to the problems and opportunities involved on private forest land. As the recent report on the Nation's timber resources brings out, the great bulk of our woodland is privately owned. Contrary to the popular belief, most of the private woodland is not in large forest holdings of big industries but is in the hands of some 4½ million small woodland owners—3 million farmers and 1½ million small-business men, country bankers, small investors, schoolteachers, and others. I am concerned over the fact that the budget proposed no increases for the items which would help these small woodland owners most. I refer to the cooperative State-Federal programs for tree planting, forest protection, and technical forest management assistance.

Tree planting, forest protection, and technical assistance to private landowners are not new activities. Over 50 years ago there were sporadic attempts to accomplish things in these fields of forestry by the States and private woodland owners. In 1924 when the Clarke-McNary Act was passed, the Federal Government joined in a partnership with the States to provide tree seedlings. The plan was that the Federal Government would provide matching funds up to 50 percent and leadership to insure national programs coordinating the efforts of each State. So successful has been the work under the Clarke-McNary Act that it has served as a pattern for other legislation. When it was broadened in scope and authorization in 1949, a great number of people came here to express their interest. As I recall some 70 or 80 Congressmen appeared before the legislative committee and expressed their approval of the Clarke-McNary Act amendments and its companion bill which became the Cooperative Forest Management Act. Today, I can see many faces of my colleagues who can proudly say that they supported these measures. Therefore, I would like to give you a brief progress report.

For tree planting, we recommended $2,500,000 be appropriated annually. No more than $505,000 has ever been granted for any 1 year and that is the budget's recommendation for this year. The States are spending $1,600,000 and hope to have the Federal Government provide matching funds as a true partner. In addition, private landowners are contributing $2 million each year plus their labor. According to the recent Timber Resource Review, some 50 or 60 million acres of forest land are idle and need planting. In addition, many wind barriers are needed on the farms and ranches of the Western Plains. All efforts combined—Federal, State, and private—are now resulting in the planting of less than 1 million of these acres per year. Gentlemen, I contend that this Nation does not wish to wait—must not wait—2 or 3 generations to do the tree planting job.

In the field of forest fire protection we are making some progress but it is disappointingly slow. When we amended the Clarke-McNary law, we provided an annual authorization of $20 million. The budget this year calls for $10,025,000 although the States are spending $28 million. The States expect us to go forward with them, not to drag our feet financially. I would not be concerned if we were on top of the job but we are far from it. There are still 49 million acres in need of organized fire protection. Also, on many of the areas where we do have protection the fire control organizations are spread so dangerously thin that at times they are not truly effective. Consequently on protected areas alone last year there were 119,000 fires and 2,800,000 acres burned over. On the unprotected areas the loss was 5,800,000 acres. The Nation cannot afford to allow such waste to continue.

In the field of technical forestry assistance under the Cooperative Forest Management Act we authorized $2,500,000 annually. The budget this year plans for only $690,000, although the States are putting up twice as much as this. In this program, except in a few States, we have hardly begun. As I said before, throughout the Nation there are 4½ million small woodland owners. While their individual holdings are small their woodlands combined make up three-fourths of the commercial private forest acreage of the Nation. At least half of these 4½ million small woodland owners need technical forest management assistance. Some 3 million of these owners are farmers. At the present size of the program only 35,000 small woodland owners are receiving the on-the-ground help they need to make their woodlands produce the greatest profit to them and the greatest good for the Nation.

To sum up, gentlemen: Although we have authorized a total of $25 million annually for these 3 cooperative programs, the budget plans call for only $11 million, while the cooperating States are spending over $30 million.

Why has the Federal Government fallen behind in these partnerships. These are all activities of bipartisan interest. I know of no Democrat or Republican Member of Congress who is opposed to adequate financing of the Federal share of tree planting, protection, and technical assistance. Why, then, are these activities passed over each year with so little attention to their real needs?

These partnership programs do not involve great armies of Federal workers. The local people see and work with local foresters whom they know. In the Washington office of the Forest Service there are less than a dozen employees handling these activities. In the regional offices of the Forest Service only a small number are available to assist the States in inspections, training, and technical problems. The States administer the programs and provide the on-the-ground service with State employees. This cooperative forestry work is kept close to the woodland owner in a manner that he can understand and appreciate.

Why is it, then, that each year there appear roadblocks preventing adequate financing of the Federal share of tree planting, forest protection, and technical assistance. The woodlands suffer and the job to do grows bigger. A small but extremely vocal minority keeps our path of action filled with roadblocks.

The first of these roadblocks is procrastination. This is a subtle roadblock. It says, "These forestry activities are fine but let us wait until next year. After all it takes many years to grow a tree, so let us wait until next year." I can imagine the same arguments were used in the capitals of the great nations of the Middle East some 2,000 years ago. Before they knew it these ancient civilizations lost their forests, soil, and water resources. And today among the ruins that once were magnificent temples, goats scamble for thistles. Those people were stopped by the roadblock of procrastination.

Another road block in our path is the let-the-States-do-it pholosophy. This could also be called the let-the-other-fellow-pick-up-the-check philosophy. Not only is this an unfair approach to a national problem it simply does not work in any partnership. In the first place these forestry activities have national scope and value. For example, the landowner needs help in protection. Why? Because he does not set the fires. The general public sets the fire on the land he tries to protect. The loss of his woodland by fire affects the tax base of the community, it might affect through erosion a valuable bottomland corn field of his neighbor, it might affect the flood situation 1,000 miles downstream or the water in a city drinking fountain, or the hunter and tourist, or the consumer of forest products, or the Nation's stockpile of war material. A shortage of newsprint pulp in New England or the Lake States can be felt by newspapers all over the Nation. So you see all of the people are concerned with the protection of each small woodland. Furthermore, a forest fire unless controlled promptly has no respect for individual

property lines, highway or other man-made barriers. In the holocaust of southern Maine in 1947 many houses and even villages were destroyed in the loss of a quarter million acres of forest. Only last year a 200,000-acre fire occurred in North Carolina and was so intense it rolled right over the Coastal Canal. Californians will remember the 75,000-acre fire which threatened the town of Yreka last September. This town of 5,000 people was evacuated and saved only by well organized groups of fire fighters who established a back fire at the edge of the town. Such fires have no respect for even State boundaries. They become national catastrophies. Timber burns and all the other values of the forest decline.

The third roadblock the minority will present is an academic one. It can be called, Let's get the facts. This is a difficult roadblock to eliminate. It is used by many who say they want to help but who advocate caution. It has some merit but it will keep us away from our objective if we permit it to block us. With this philosophy the patriots could have laid aside their muskets in the Revolution and said, "Let's wait until we see what the Constitution will look like before we fight this war. Let's get the facts." Historians tell us that the most popular science of the Dark Ages was astronomy. The reason astronomy was more popular than other studies was that it involved problems that were so far away. A man could lie on his back and gaze into the heavens—so occupied that he forgot the pressing everyday problems he should have come to grips with long ago. Today the minority urge us not to take action but to study the situation as to how much each State actually needs, how much is the total cost, what values are involved, and so forth. Of course, we would like to have all these answers but as we search for them we must also act on the problems so obviously at hand. For instance, our forest problems on the small privately owned woodlands are real ones. Man can never wait until he has all the facts neatly cataloged, studied, and analyzed. He must come to grips with the problems confronting him.

These roadblocks I have described are dangerous. We must break through them. We must not let them stop us or even seriously delay us. Every year that they delay us is a serious loss to our Nation's progress. We must take action. As Democratic and Republican Representatives interested in the welfare of our forest resource, we must take the action the great majority of the people want. The 4½ million small woodland owners and the State foresters are counting upon us to give them leadership. They are looking to us to provide the full share which the Congress anticipated would be needed by the Federal Government to participate in these partnership activities. I believe that we should provide: First, for cooperation in forest tree planting, $2,500,000 annually; second, for cooperation in forest fire control, $20 million annually; third, for cooperating in forest management and processing, $2,500,000 annually.

This would provide the full authorization Congress planned when the acts were passed or amended. These sums will be wise investments because the States and private landowners will add their own moneys and make the total effort several times greater than these sums would buy alone. It will be a wise investment in the prosperity and security of the individuals, the States, and the Nation.

THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS NEEDS ADVICE FROM THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, your Small Business Committee has a very serious problem on which I would like to ask for the advice and guidance of the Members.

The other day the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER] referred to our committee a letter from one of his constituents and asked for information necessary for replying to this letter. It is a very brief letter and it is a homey letter, but it says so much. I would like to read it to the Members. I wish all the Members could see it in the original. It is written in longhand and in pencil. It is from Mr. John Fawks, who operates Fawks' Store, dealing in groceries and general merchandise, at Prairie Hill, Mo. I feel sure that Mr. John Fawks would not mind my reading you his letter. He is obviously a man who will say what he has to say. Besides that he has nothing of commercial importance to lose. You will note that he says in his letter that he is now considering giving up his small business—not by choice but by necessity, and finding work. Mr. Fawks' letter to his Representative is as follows:

FAWKS STORE,
Prairie Hill, Mo., March 9, 1956.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am concerned with how rapidly small stores and small wholesalers are being hit. What few dollars farmers have, the big chains get most of it. I am really finding it hard to even pay operating expenses much less other obligations because of lower volume.

Is there anything that can or will be done for us in rural areas? Knowing our party standing for common people, I know you are fighting for relief, but if anything can be done, do it before it is too late. It is far worse than people are being led to believe. I hope there is a change; if not, too bad for the remains of small farmers and grocerymen. I am actually considering, not by choice, finding work. Would you send bills that are being introduced to assist us?

Your friend,

JOHN W. FAWKS.

Now the problem facing your Small Business Committee is this: What bills shall we tell Mr. Fawks are being introduced to assist small business?

The bill which will assist small business more than any other legislation I know of is H. R. 11. Moreover, this is the bill which small-business people have asked for most of all, and they have been asking for it for a long time. But the problem about H. R. 11 is this: All last year when small-business people wrote in and asked what bills were being introduced to help them we then told them about H. R. 11—if for no other reason than that we knew of no other bill to help small business. H. R. 11 was introduced on the opening day of the last session of Congress; and a quite similar bill rode out the 83d Congress. Consequently, Mr. Fawks was probably told about H. R. 11 last year, or the year before that. And if not Mr. Fawks, then perhaps his neighbors who wrote in and asked what bills had been introduced to help small business.

The question now is this. When the Members ask the Small Business Committee for a reference to the bills being introduced to assist small business shall we suggest that they continue year after year to tell them that H. R. 11 has been introduced? What shall we tell them?

My own feeling is that it would be a good thing to be able to write small-business people and tell them, for a change, that H. R. 11 has been passed. The Members know, of course, that there is a discharge petition on the Clerk's desk to call up H. R. 11. If as many as 218 Members of the House sign the discharge petition, then we can call the bill up, debate it for 2 hours, and then pass it in this Congress. Or alternatively we can wait until the next session of Congress and introduce H. R. 11 under a new number and then write small business about a new bill—that is, those of us whom the voters return to the next Congress can write to small-business people about a new bill.

It may be that there is really no place for small business in the future of our country.

LABOR LEADER SAYS SMALL BUSINESS MUST GO

At least one labor leader has expressed the opinion that small business is doomed and will disappear from the American scene.

These thoughts have been attributed to Mr. James R. Hoffa, an international vice president of the Teamsters' Union. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, March 4, carries a front-page account of an interview with Mr. Hoffa which quotes him as saying:

> The future of labor-management relations is big labor and big business, for there is no room for the small business or the small union. That is unfortunate but true.

It may be that Mr. Hoffa is cynical about the future of small business—I do not know. On the other hand, it may be that he is given to honest expression of opinion; and it may also be that Mr. Hoffa accepts the march of events more realistically than do some of us who still hope that there is a place for small business in the future of our country. Perhaps those of us who still hope and still want to try to save a place for small business are merely dreaming and tilting at windmills.

Certainly the record of action and inaction of Congress during the last several years suggests that we are dreaming. During these years Congress has moved with great promptness and diligence to pass legislation favorable to big business. This legislation has covered the range from big business tax relief to a variety of giveaways, and back again. In the meantime small business has been pleading, not for giveaways, but merely for fair antitrust laws which will protect them

from big businesses' abuse of power. Specifically, small business has been pleading for the passage of H. R. 11. Small business has been pleading for the passage of H. R. 11 for almost a year and a half now, and prior to that small business centered its hopes on the passage of a similar bill in the last Congress.

There are many of us in the House who are still dreaming and hoping that H. R. 11 can be passed. H. R. 11 will not reverse the trend of the times and insure that there will be a continuing place for small business in this country. But it will restore some strength to the antitrust laws and give small business some degree of assurance that it will not be destroyed through discriminations in price. Discrimination in price is one of the most frequently used methods by which big business takes advantage of its superior size to destroy small business. If we can succeed in placing a curb on this kind of abuse of power therefore, we will go a long way toward giving small business an equal opportunity to compete.

Small business itself moreover, is still hopeful. It is desperate, but small-business people still believe that this Congress will pass H. R. 11. They know, of course, that the only likely chance that it can be passed in this Congress rests upon the discharge petition. That is the belief of the retail grocers, for example, and they are pleading that the discharge petition be signed.

RETAIL GROCERS URGE SIGNING PETITION TO DISCHARGE H. R. 11

The New York Journal of Commerce carried a news report this morning, dateline Chicago, which will interest the Members. This report covers the position of the National Association of Retail Grocers of the United States on the question of H. R. 11. This association is strongly urging Members of the House to sign the petition to discharge H. R. 11 and then to vote favorably on H. R. 11.

The retailers are entirely correct in saying that consumers suffer from discriminatory pricing practices and that "the way to encourage competition is to treat all buyers alike so when there is a price reduction by the supplier, one or more of them can reflect this in their prices to consumers." In other words, consumers benefit by maintaining competition in the business system and consumers benefit when there is an adequate law to curb monopolistic powers by which big competitors destroy small competitors. For the coercive power to destroy small competitors is also a power for disciplining small competitors and forcing them to keep their prices high.

The independent retail grocers are also precisely right in summing up the principle of H. R. 11. The principle is "that protecting the competitive economy from substantial injury is independent of, and superior to, the right of any buyer to receive harmful discriminatory preferences."

The news report from the New York Journal of Commerce of March 22 is as follows:

RETAILERS URGE ACTION ON PETITION BY PATMAN

CHICAGO, March 21.—The National Association of Retail Grocers this week demanded action on a petition filed in the House of Representatives by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, to bring H. R. 11, the equality of opportunity bill, up for a vote.

This procedure is necessary, NARGUS said, as the only means which accords a good chance of having the bill acted upon before Congress adjourns this year. Scheduled hearings April 18–20, the retailer group said, will be too late for the bill to be approved by Congress this session.

SEEK TO PLUG LOOPHOLE

In explaining H. R. 11, NARGUS points out that it closes a loophole in the Robinson-Patman Act created in 1951 when the Supreme Court held in the Standard Oil of Indiana case that meeting competition was a complete defense justifying a discrimination in price, service or facilities even though the probable effect of the discrimination in price, service or facilities is to injure competition substantially or to tend to create a monopoly.

"To make matters worse," the association adds, "it has been held that it is not incumbent on one charged with an illegal discrimination to establish the lawfulness of the price which he claimed he was meeting. It is evident, therefore, that an illegal discrimination can be a basis for justifying a number of succeeding harmful discriminations which, under the meeting competition defense, the law cannot prevent. This might easily result in the act being more honored in its breach than in its observance."

SEES INJURIES

Continuing its explanation, NARGUS states: "H. R. 11 proposes to disallow this defense as a legal justification for a discrimination in case where there is substantial evidence that the probable effect of the discrimination is to injure competition substantially or to tend to create a monopoly. The bill proposes to establish the principle that protecting the competitive economy from substantial injury is independent of and superior to the right of any buyer to receive harmful discriminatory preferences."

The retailer group further points out that consumers suffer from harmful discriminations, because the large coercive buyer who receives a preferential price is under less competitive pressure to reduce his resale price to consumers than if the same lower price is given to all his competitors, large and small alike.

EQUAL TREATMENT URGED

"The way to encourage competition is to treat all buyers alike so when there is a price reduction by the supplier, one or more of them can reflect this in their prices to consumers," NARGUS declares.

The interests of farmers also will be benefited by the passage of H. R. 11, NARGUS avers. "Discriminations extracted from suppliers by large coercive buyers force suppliers to seek means for making up what they have lost in the sale of their products," the association says. "One way they have of doing this is to reduce what is paid to farmers for the commodities they purchase. Since farmers are frequently in a disadvantageous economic position, they are made to suffer as a result of harmful discriminations."

A DEMOCRATIC FTC COMMISSIONER FAVORS H. R. 11

When President Eisenhower nominated Mr. William C. Kern to take the place of Commissioner James A. Mead on the Federal Trade Commission, I made some public remarks criticizing Mr. Kern's appointment. I will not repeat those remarks now and thus perpetuate any unkind inferences they may have contained.

Because of this background however, I would like to state for the House that I am highly gratified that Mr. Kern has urged passage of H. R. 11. More than that, I am happy to say that Mr. Kern has made an extremely keen analysis of the present state of the law, and both the practical and broad philosophic reasons why H. R. 11 must be passed. I am happy therefore to call attention to Mr. Kern's analysis, which is set out in his letter of March 21, to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and likewise a speech which he delivered before the briefing conference on trade regulation sponsored by the Federal Bar Association in cooperation with the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., at Chicago on March 1, 1956. These documents are submitted for the RECORD herewith:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, March 1, 1956.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: With reference to the request of the late chairman of your committee, Senator Kilgore, to the Federal Trade Commission for an expression of its views on S. 11, 84th Congress, 1st session, I respectfully tender my individual opinion thereon, which is contrary to the position taken by the majority of the Commission as made known in the Federal Trade Commission Chairman's letter to you.

I believe that enactment of S. 11 or similar legislation is essential to realization of the national antitrust policy and is necessary to the restoration of the original force of section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, which was materially weakened by the Supreme Court's decision in *Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) v. FTC* (340 U. S. 231 (1951)). That holding, which many commentators feel was based on an incorrect analysis of the legislative history of the Robinson-Patman amendment, had the effect of reestablishing an infirmity of the original Clayton Act—the provision that a seller could absolve itself from a charge of price discrimination by showing that its lower price was offered in good faith to meet competition.

Besides "substituting the remedy of retaliation for that of law" (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3113 (1936)), the old Clayton Act had made it possible for a large buyer to dictate a price preference to itself by finding a number of sellers willing to charge a lower price than their competitors. (H. Rept. No. 2951, 74th Cong., 2d sess. (1936), p. 7.) This was an abuse fairly prevalent among chain-store companies, and it was chiefly because of fears expressed on this account in the congressional report on chain-store practices (final report on the chain-store investigation, Senate Doc. No. 4, 74th Cong., 1st sess. (1934)) that the Robinson-Patman amendment was enacted into law.

The original Senate and House versions of that measure did not contain a meeting-competition defense, and though one was eventually inserted it was not included among the substantive justifications set out in subparagraph (a) of the revised section 2 but instead was relegated to a separate subparagraph and couched in language indicating that it was only to constitute a procedural defense to a prima facie case made out by merely proving a difference in prices. The procedural character of the amended meeting-competition defense was unequivocally explained by the chairman of the House conferees in reporting the conference version of the Robinson-Patman bill to the House (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9418 (1936)):

"This does not set up the meeting of competition as an absolute bar to a charge of discrimination under the bill. It merely permits it to be shown in evidence. This provision is entirely procedural. It does not determine substantive rights, liabilities, and

duties. * * * If this proviso were construed to permit the showing of a competing offer as an absolute bar to liability for discrimination, then it would nullify the act entirely at the very inception of its enforcement, for in nearly every case mass buyers receive similar discriminations from competing sellers of the same product. One violation of law cannot be permitted to justify another."

By eliminating (as they thought) the absolute defense of meeting competition, which had plagued efforts to enforce the original section 2 of the Clayton Act, the supporters of the amendment believed that they were depriving the large buyer of the competitive advantages it enjoyed over the small buyer because of ability to buy in large quantities and were providing equality of opportunity to all members of a given industry.

The Standard Oil ruling of the Supreme Court has all but revived the meeting-competition feature of the original Clayton Act, to the serious detriment of that very segment of the business community which the Robinson-Patman amendment was to have benefited. In the present state of the law a supplier is free to discriminate in favor of a customer who has been offered a lower price by a competing supplier, irrespective of the injury that such a discrimination may inflict on his other customers. Furthermore, though the majority opinion in the Standard case indicated that the absolute meeting-competition defense was needed to vindicate the right of a business concern to repel a price raid by a competitor, the defense which Standard desired to offer was along different lines. It has been suggested that Standard actually was countering the competition of off-brand gasolines in the Detroit area by price-favoring the Standard dealers best situated to wage a successful price war against the off brands. If such was the case, Standard was not only using its superior financial staying power to subsidize a less profitable or possibly unprofitable sale of its product for the purpose of eliminating a smaller competitor; it was enabling the dealer through which it waged its price war to divert trade from other Standard dealers not able to lower their price.

There is every reason to suppose that this type of situation is not unusual in the gasoline price wars of today, even though the events behind the Standard Oil case occurred about 15 years ago. Indeed, the need for strong anti-price discrimination laws is stronger in the existing buyer's market, when producers compete sharply and make price concessions to some purchasers but not to all. In industries like the gasoline industry, in which thousands of retailers fail annually, the necessity for effective legislation is especially acute. S. 11 would make it clear that discriminatory pricing by or in favor of large business entities would not be allowed to destroy small, independent concerns, and would make efficiency rather than size the key to competitive viability.

The extent to which the good-faith meeting of a lower price of a competitor shall constitute justification for a price discrimination is so fundamental a question that it ought not to be committed to the relative vagaries of interpretation by an administrative agency wherein the volte-face due to changes in political complexion is not wholly unknown. It seems to me highly desirable that the business world be vouchsafed the certainty and exactitude of a definite statutory guide.

I am aware of the arguments that have been vociferously advanced in support of the absolute defense of meeting competition. It is said that if, to meet a competitor's lower price, a seller must lower its prices to all its customers in the pertinent market, then it may not reduce its prices at all, and the consumer will be deprived of the benefits of competition. This economic straitjacket contention is unsound. It is more reasonable to assume that to resist vigorous price competition the concern will be forced to lower its price to all in the market, a circumstance far more advantageous to the consuming public. The selective form of price competition that the absolute defense of meeting competition encourages is in actuality a negation of true price competition, for there remains a certain incentive to the favored buyer to hold his price to that prevailing in the market and thereby enjoy a wider margin of profit. Consumers are much more likely to be advantaged by lower prices given to all competing buyers than by special treatment accorded a single customer.

Paradoxically, a law requiring nondiscriminatory pricing has a tendency to diminish competition on one level of trading while encouraging it on another. However, when the Robinson-Patman Act was passed, this phenomenon did not prove to be a serious obstacle, Congress apparently thinking that it would be a greater boon to competition generally to foster equality of access to supplies for the businessmen closest to the consuming public in the chain of distribution. Moreover, under the provisions of S. 11 a seller is still free to meet a competitor's price by nondiscriminatory means. Competitive price attacks in any market may be met by a price reduction to all purchasers in the market, provided that no primary-line injury develops. Furthermore, since the standard of injury under the Robinson-Patman Act includes competitive effects which may injure competition "with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefits of such discrimination or with the competitors of either of them," the good-faith defense is still available to sellers as to discriminations having competitive effects of this more limited character but which falls short of a substantial lessening of competition.

It would be folly to permit a zeal for preserving an abstract meeting competition concept to overshadow the main purpose of the Clayton Act, which was to outlaw practices leading to unlawful trade restraints or nurturing monopoly. That legislation of this kind should contain an exemption which, in the name of meeting competition in good faith, actually lessens competition on the small-business level is an inexcusable anomaly calling for the correction offered by S. 11, which would permit the absolute defense except where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce. In my opinion, a complete defense should not be granted to discriminatory practices that will suppress competition or foster monopoly.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM C. KERN,
Commissioner.

REMARKS BY COMMISSIONER WILLIAM C. KERN CONCERNING ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT ENFORCEMENT MADE AT BRIEFING CONFERENCE ON TRADE REGULATION SPONSORED BY THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION IN COOPERATION WITH THE BUREAU OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS, INC., CHICAGO, ILL., MARCH 1, 1956

It was my original purpose as Moderator on this program to pontificate briefly upon the history and background of the Robinson-Patman Act, its purposes and objectives, and its relationship to other regulatory laws.

I proposed to point out the harmful competitive practices uncovered by the Federal Trade Commission chainstore investigation of 1934, including special discounts and allowances made by hundreds of manufacturers and the many special discounts received by the large chains in excess of those granted competitors and even wholesalers—practices, if you please, that the original section 2 of the Clayton Act as judicially interpreted was unable to cope with. For, as you know, section 2 of the Clayton Act then placed no limit on differences allowed on account of the difference in quantity; likewise it was understood to permit all discriminatory price differences made to meet competition.

I further proposed to make passing reference to the legislative history in order to demonstrate that the purpose of the Robinson-Patman Act was to protect the competitive opportunity of small business by prohibiting all price differentials other than those which could be justified by cost savings. I intended to point out the expansion of the original section 2 to prohibit discriminations which may "injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination or with the customers of either of them"; and to emphasize that the purpose of such expansion was to reach discriminatory practices resulting in injury to a single individual as well as to competition generally—a marked departure from previous approaches to the antitrust problem. I likewise considered a discussion of the change whereby the old proviso permitting meeting competition in good faith was eliminated and readopted in a greatly modified form in section 2 (b)—a feature which, as you know, has given rise to the long controversy of whether the defense was procedural or substantive—a controversy partially laid to rest at least by the celebrated Standard Oil of Indiana[1] case. Finally I intended pointing out that the main thrust of the Robinson-Patman Act, unlike section 2 of the original Clayton Act, was to curb the predatory use of monopoly power by chainstores and mass buyers and to preserve the place of small business as well as to protect its competitive position.

However, I was advised by a bright young man, much more versed in the intricacies of the Robinson-Patman Act than I, that this approach was extremely naive and that I must recognize the fact that I would be talking to an extremely sophisticated group, so I will refrain from enlarging upon matters which are hardly novel to you. However, the emphasis of this bright young man upon the fact that this group was a most learned, a most intellectual, and a most sophisticated one gave me the idea to speak to you about your sophisticated approach to the problems involved in the intricacies of this complex statute. It is a matter which has been disturbing me for some time.

There seems to me to be too great a disposition on the part of a considerable segment of the antitrust bar to indulge in over-intellectualization and oversophistication in its approach to the antitrust laws generally including its approach to the Robinson-Patman Act. I have the uncomfortable feeling that far too many antitrust lawyers have forsaken the approach to the law that in the dim, dead past made the bar famous as a bulwark of our freedoms and our interests viewed in the broadest public sense. While I recognize that every lawyer has a duty to his client vigorously to present the facts fully and fairly to the Commission and vigorously to defend his client's position on the basis of such a record, nevertheless such a responsibility does not include the right to obstruct or to delay a proceeding or to confuse the issues.

In my preliminary remarks I touched upon the broad objectives of the Robinson-Patman Act as spelled out by the Congress. How many lawyers can say that they have given full recognition to these purposes and objectives in their analysis of the act, in their advice to clients, and in their representation of litigants through formal proceedings growing out of a violation of the statute?

---

[1] *Standard Oil Co.* v. *FTC* (340 U. S. 231 (1951)).

Instead of such full recognition I fear that too many lawyers have treated a Robinson-Patman case as an intellectual exercise in legal ingenuity. Perhaps as Motions Commissioner I am overly sensitive on the matter of dilatory practices. However, too often have I seen quite adequate complaints challenged, quite reasonable subpenas challenged, and then a welter of interlocutory motions thrown into the pot for good measurse. Rather than concede a violation and settle a case expeditiously in accord with present procedures extended by the Commission as a matter of privilege, at savings to client and to the Government, far too many lawyers seem to derive satisfaction from a protracted rearguard action, even though in the end it leads to a cease-and-desist order.

These lawyers realize, of course, that such an order, because of present inadequacies in the Clayton Act, is not final but requires enforcement in the courts which in turn requires added proof of violation before penalties may be awarded. So the upshot of it is that there exists today a small but growing number of lawyers who indulge in practices which have universally been frowned upon when practiced at lower levels of operation: what has been characterized as sharp practice at lower legal levels is considered at antitrust levels an intellectual and sophisticated approach. Furthermore, I understand that there is considerable opposition within the American Bar Association to our legislative proposal to amend the antitrust laws to give finality to Clayton Act orders. I do not see how such a position can be seriously defended as compatible with the public interest.

I have detected an undue desire on the part of some members of the antitrust bar to avoid the simple approach of applying applicable judicial precedents to a particular practice. These gentlemen would far rather depend upon sophisticated legal monographs and articles which attempt to minimize the clear impact of plain judicial precedents or criticize them as being unworthy to be followed. I confess that I am just a simple country lawyer but I have always preferred relying upon applicable judicial precedents of the highest courts in a resolution of controverted legal issues. Law professors and economic pundits have their place—and a very distinguished place—but it seems to me that their place has been unduly elevated by a certain segment of the antitrust bar.

And so I frankly feel that the antitrust bar should search its conscience with respect to its approach to the fulfillment of its responsibilities in connection with the enforcement of the antitrust laws including the Robinson-Patman Act. I believe that ours is a great profession with a great destiny. I believe that we all have a duty, whether within the Government or out, to aid in the enforcement of the laws laid down by the Congress and especially the antitrust laws which are the last bulwarks against socialism.

May I demonstrate by several examples the overly sophisticated approach I have attempted to describe in general terms. While section 3 of the Clayton Act, which is devoted to tying clauses, exclusive dealing and full requirements contracts, falls outside of the Robinson-Patman Act it is closely related thereto and the reaction of the bar to the case law on the subject is singularly illuminating. When the International Salt decision [2] was handed down involving tying clauses and categorically holding that it was illegal per se to foreclose competitors from any substantial market, just as price fixing is illegal per se, its impact was universally played down and minimized by those legal writers who commented upon it. Almost universally its per se approach was explored and the limitation of its application to tying clauses was universally stressed. And the Standard Stations case,[3] involving full requirements or exclusive dealing contracts, was likewise severely criticized in most quarters. More often than not it was misquoted in briefs and arguments which stressed the language of Mr. Justice Frankfurter distinguishing such contracts from tying contracts but which failed to quote the conclusion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter that the same principle was nevertheless applicable. The fact that the rule of reason was discarded in any consideration of the illegality of the practices was politely ignored.

The Anchor Serum [4] and the Dictograph Products [5] cases therefore came as an apparent surprise to those experts who had indulged in their own peculiar intellectual approach toward earlier decisions. However, a typically sophisticated reaction to these decisions found expression in the following footnote of a somewhat controversial current antitrust study: [6]

"Some dicta in the recent court of appeals opinions affirming the Federal Trade Commission's orders in the Dictograph and Anchor Serum cases are susceptible to a contrary interpretation as reverting to a rigid per se rule. * * * Apart from the merits of these decisions on their particular facts, the committee disapproves any 'quantitative substantiality' implications as offensive to a reasonable construction of the Supreme Court's Standard Stations opinion and rational antitrust policy as well."

A final graphic demonstration of the former naive approach of the Federal Trade Commission to Robinson-Patman enforcement as opposed to the more sophisticated approach of respondents' counsel may be found by examining a group of cosmetics cases. In 1936–37 the Commission issued a number of complaints against cosmetic manufacturers alleging violation of sections 2 (a) and either 2 (d) or 2 (e) of the Robinson-Patman Act. One of these cases, the Elizabeth Arden case, as you know, went to order, was appealed, was affirmed by the circuit court of appeals, and certiorari denied by the Supreme Court.[7] The other cases, after protracted hearings, were concluded in 1942 but instead of there being issuance of orders, they were held up pending protracted trade practice conference proceedings and eventually were dismissed upon the basis of the parties respondent being signatory parties to trade practice rules outlawing the complained-of practices. Respondents, represented as they were by competent counsel, apparently persuaded the Commission that they would abide by the rules and that the public interest did not require pressing the formal proceedings to final conclusion. As a result of a check on compliance with trade practice rules the Commission has been given reason to believe that many of these respondents are in open and flagrant violation of the rules and are continuing the very practices which were the basis of the original complaints. As a result the Commission has recently instituted a group of new proceedings, which are now pending. It is impossible for me to defend the handling of these cases as an example of effective enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act.

In closing may I make it clear that I believe my paramount duty rests in the fair but vigorous enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act in accord with the congressional mandate and applicable judicial interpretations. This I shall endeavor to do with all the vigor at my command. I shall strive to do so with fairness and impartiality. And in my efforts I shall not be disturbed by the fact that some of the case law on the subject seems discordant with legal theory laid down in other cases. Wherever I see probability of substantial injury to competition from the facts in a record, I shall utilize any applicable precedent in order effectively to curb the practice. I shall leave to legal theorists the problem of reconciling the various judicial precedents that have grown up in connection with the administration of the act. These precedents are on the books. They are the law. They are guides to follow. I believe it incumbent upon both the bench and the bar to recognize them as applicable authority.

---

[2] *International Salt Co.* v. *United States* (332 U. S. 392 (1947)).

[3] *Standard Oil Co. of California* v. *United States* (337 U. S. 293 (1949)).

[4] *Anchor Serum Co.* v. *FTC* (217 F. 2d 867 (7th Cir. 1954)).

[5] *Dictograph Products, Inc.* v. *FTC* (217 F. 2d 821 (2d Cir. 1954), certiorari denied, 349 U. S. 940 (1955)), petition for hearing pending.

[6] Report of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws, March 31, 1955, p. 143, n. 58.

[7] *Elizabeth Arden, Inc.* v. *FTC* (156 F. 2d 132 (2d Cir. 1946), certiorari denied, 331 U. S. 806 (1947)).

CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago at the annual banquet of the Veterans of Foreign Wars held in Washington, D. C., Gen. Alfred Gruenther, the leader of our European defense, made the statement that the Communist leaders are now campaigning to win the minds of 1 billion persons living outside the Iron Curtain and particularly in Asia, Africa, and South America. He said that this was part of the strategy in the Kremlin's cold war to infiltrate and aggress in their drive for world domination.

Our own country has spent billions of dollars since World War II to curb the Communist expansion and also to win the minds of these billion people referred to by General Gruenther. The United States as a leader of the free world in recent months nullified the effect of a large percentage of these expended billions by the antiquated shortsided policy of some of our political leaders regarding the rights of a large segment of our population who happen to be of the Negro race.

The decision of over 80 Members of Congress by issuing a manifesto in defiance to the decision of the Supreme Court of our land was unfortunate in not only being an implied threat to our constitutional Government but it has been and will continue to be used by the Communist leaders as propaganda to prejudice the minds of these billions whom the Soviets are trying to capture.

An unfortunate demonstration is now taking place in Birmingham, Ala., wherein 90 citizens, including some clergymen, are on trial for refusing to ride the local buses. It can easily be imagined the value of this medieval type of racial pressure when elaborated on by the Soviets of Asia, Africa, South America, and other so-called neutral countries. We know the Soviets have also capitalized propagandawise on cases like the murder of the Chicago Negro boy, Emmett Till, in Mississippi last year.

Only yesterday, the President sent a message to the Congress asking for more billions to be spent in the coming year

and also requesting a 10-year program of expenditures to aid other countries in their fight against communism.

I firmly believe that the President, through the power of the executive department, should call together the governors of not only the States involved in the denial of constitutional rights to a great segment of its citizens but all our governors in the Nation could arrive at a practical solution to this unnecessary frenzy and racial prejudice developing in our land. In addition to the governors, responsible leaders from both white and Negro communities in States where the racial friction exists could contribute greatly to calm down and curtail racial brutality and intolerance.

There is now a group of Members of Congress from both parties which are making every effort to crystallize some kind of practical action on the part of the Congress and the President to bring about a solution to a racial problem which will eventually damage American unity and has already damaged our Nation's prestige throughout the free world.

Almost 6 weeks ago, the Rules Committee of which I am a member started hearing on legislation for Federal financial aid to help certain local communities construct necessary schools and relieve a great crisis in our educational facilities throughout the country. As a member of the Rules Committee, I made several efforts to terminate these hearings and report the bill with an open rule on the floor of the House for debate and whatever amendments the Congress sees fit to adopt. Hundreds of thousands of children in the country are suffering by reason of this inexcusable delay.

Millions of people in the country who realize the necessity to catch up with school construction in certain areas are demanding action on this legislation. The apparent delay is due to the fact that certain Members of the Congress are in dispute as to funds which will be allotted to States who defy the Supreme Court ruling on segregation. This should be no reason for a delay on this necessary legislation because the Congress should exercise its sworn duty to legislate on all bills in conformity with the laws of the land which includes the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The States which are in the forefront opposing civil-rights legislation and the recent Supreme Court decision should realize that as the years pass the intensity on the part of their citizens for the enforcement of equal rights legislation and court decisions will rapidly increase. Union labor has been the pioneer organization in advocating legislation and educating the people on the absolute necessity of making the Constitution of the United States apply to all races and segments of our economy. The great influx of northern industry into the South has also brought thousands of working people from the North into areas where civil rights and racial equality does not exist.

Southern labor is now demanding equal representation for all people in the factories, churches, schools, and transportation facilities. The time is not far distant when the law of the land on racial equality will be effective in all States.

The Constitution and the laws of the land, through the recent Supreme Court decision, has solved and settled the questions which are bringing about these unnecessary complications in disregard for law and order. I would remind the Members of the Congress, the political leaders of the various States raising these unfortunate racial issues at this time article 4, clause 2, of the United States Constitution which says:

> This Constitution and the laws of the United States * * * shall be the supreme law of the land * * * anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

PURCHASE-RESALE TRANSACTIONS OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations has been engaged during the past 10 months in an investigation and study of purchase-resale transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The investigation disclosed that during March and April of 1954 the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased and simultaneously resold through mere paper transactions, or something similar, millions of pounds of cheese and butter. Although the cheese and butter involved was never moved from the warehouses in which it was stored, remaining always in possession and under control of the owners, the Commodity Credit Corporation paid out nearly $2½ million to cheese and butter distributors and dealers, including such business establishments as restaurants, grocery stores, bakeries, and spaghetti manufacturers. As a result of the subcommittee's hearings thus far, the Comptroller General of the United States 7 months ago, on August 15, 1955, ruled that these payments were "unauthorized and improper." To this day not one cent of this money has been recovered by the responsible executive agencies.

In my opinion, the events which have transpired since the Comptroller General's decision on August 15, 1955, are such as to justify a reasonable observer in concluding that the executive agencies concerned are dragging their feet and unreasonably delaying action to recover $2½ million which rightfully belongs to the taxpayers of the United States. Even though the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee is aware of these events and necessarily has not closed out its hearings and filed a final report, the situation has reached such a point that I believe it should be called to the attention of the entire House of Representatives.

During my remarks I will refer to quite a bit of correspondence. I will insert the full text of each piece of correspondence referred to at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

After several weeks of preliminary investigation, the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee held a public hearing on these purchase-resale transactions on June 1, 1955. The facts developed at that time, together with additional information obtained by the subcommittee, made it apparent that it would be necessary to go further into this matter. On July 13, 1955, a letter was addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture asking the Secretary to make available certain witnesses from the Department of Agriculture. In this letter, I told the Secretary that—

> Because of the nature of this matter, I am also inviting you to be present personally so that you may hear the testimony and have an opportunity to comment upon it. Your presence will also give the subcommittee the benefit of the information and opinion of the person who can speak with final authority for the Department on matters involving the policy of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

JULY 13, 1955.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
United States Department of Agriculture.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations heard witnesses from the Department of Agriculture on June 1 on the subject of cheese transactions entered into by the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to announcement DA–112. The facts brought out at that time, together with additional information obtained by the subcommittee, make it apparent that it will be necessary for the subcommittee to go further into this matter. I have, therefore, called a meeting of the subcommittee at 10 a. m., Monday, July 18, in room 1537, House Office Building, to hear further testimony.

It would be appreciated if you would make available as witnesses at that time Mr. Don S. Anderson, Acting Director, Livestock and Dairy Division, Commodity Stabilization Service; Mr. Edward Shulman, Deputy General Counsel, and Mr. George Cooper, Chief, Commodity Credit Division, Office of the General Counsel.

Because of the nature of this matter, I am also inviting you to be present personally so that you may hear the testimony and have an opportunity to comment upon it. Your presence will also give the subcommittee the benefit of the information and opinion of the person who can speak with final authority for the Department on matters involving the policy of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I want to assure you that your cooperation will be very helpful to the subcommittee.

Sincerely,

L. H. FOUNTAIN,
Chairman, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.

Under date of July 15, 1955, I received a letter from True D. Morse, as Acting Secretary of Agriculture, stating that "Secretary Benson is out of town and will not be able to appear at this hearing."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, July 15, 1955.

Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN,
Chairman, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FOUNTAIN: This is in reply to your request of July 13 that the Department testify on July 18 regarding cheese transactions entered into by the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to DA–112.

Secretary Benson is out of town and will not be able to appear at this hearing. In addition to the witnesses requested in your letter, the following will be present: James A. McConnell, Assistant Secretary; Walter C. Berger, Associate Administrator, Commodity Stabilization Service; True D. Morse, Acting Secretary.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

Public hearings were held by the subcommittee on July 18, 19, 20, and 21. The facts brought out at these hearings raised a serious question as to the legality of these transactions and the payments made as a result thereof. Accordingly, on July 29, 1955, I addressed a letter to Mr. Joseph Campbell, the Comptroller General of the United States, stating that—

After a thorough study of the law and facts involved I have been unable to find any legal authority which, in my opinion, would authorize these transactions and the payments made as a result of them.

The Comptroller General was also asked to advise whether these transactions and the payments made as a result thereof were authorized by the Agricultural Act of 1949 or other applicable legislation.

JULY 29, 1955.

Mr. JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
The Comptroller General of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: The Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations has been investigating purchase-resale transactions entered into by the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to USDA Announcement DA–112. Information obtained by the subcommittee has raised a serious question as to the legality of these transactions and the payment of approximately $2 million as a result thereof.

While I am not in a position to speak for other members of the subcommittee, after a thorough study of the law and facts involved, I have been unable to find any legal authority which, in my opinion, would authorize these transactions and the payments made as a result of them.

I would appreciate it, therefore, if you would advise me whether, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, the transactions entered into by the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to USDA Announcement DA–112 and the payments made as a result thereof are authorized by the Agricultural Act of 1949 or other applicable legislation.

I am making available to you the record of the subcommittee's hearings thus far containing testimony of representatives of the Department of Agriculture regarding the above transactions.

Sincerely,

L. H. FOUNTAIN,
Chairman, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.

On August 15, I received Comptroller General's Opinion B–124910 declaring that these transactions "were not premised upon bona fide purchases within the meaning of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and, consequently, that payments thereunder were unauthorized and improper."

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, August 15, 1955.

Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN,
Chairman, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of July 29, 1955, requests our opinion as to whether the transactions entered into and the payments made by the Commodity Credit Corporation to support the price of dairy products through the purchase and resale thereof pursuant to Announcement DA–112, dated March 9, 1954, were authorized by law.

The facts and circumstances surrounding the DA–112 program as related to cheese have been extensively developed and reported in the hearings before your subcommittee. We also have read a legal brief prepared by counsel for the administrative agencies concerned a copy of which it is understood was furnished to your subcommittee. It appears that dairy products were supported at 90 percent of parity during the marketing year 1953–54. The Commodity Credit Corporation purchased American cheddar cheese which met grade, size, and packaging requirements at 37 cents per pound and sold the same at a price 2 cents higher than the support price, or 39 cents per pound, during this period. In February 1954, the Department of Agriculture announced that with the beginning of the 1954–55 marketing year, on April 1, dairy price supports would be reduced to 75 percent of parity and that thereafter the Corporation would buy cheddar cheese at 32¼ cents per pound and offer it for resale at 34¼ cents per pound.

Announcement DA–112, issued March 9, 1954, offered to purchase cheese during the remainder of March, at the March purchase price of 37 cents per pound, provided the offerers contract simultaneously to repurchase the cheese during April, at the April sales price (34¼ cents per pound). The cheese was to remain in the custody of the seller and delivery and transfer of title was to take place at the time of grading or when the offer was accepted, whichever was later. It was to revert to the seller on April 1, if graded prior to that time, or as soon as it was graded, if the grading took place after April 1. On April 1, or as soon afterward as the cheese had been graded, the seller could submit vouchers or invoices, together with USDA grading and inspection certificates, and receive payment of the net difference between purchase and sale prices. Difference payments exceeding $2 million were made for some 86.6 million pounds of cheese.

Authority for the dairy products support program is contained in the Agricultural Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 1052, 1053, 7 U. S. C. 1446 (c)), section 201 (c) of which provides as follows:

"The price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities, respectively, shall be supported at such level not in excess of 90 per centum nor less than 75 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines necessary in order to assure an adequate supply. Such price support shall be provided through loans on, or purchases of, the products of milk and butterfat."

Previous legislation (section 1 of the Agricultural Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1246)), had permitted price support through "loans, purchases, or other operations." That omission from the 1949 act of authority to engage in "other operations" clearly left only the methods of loans or purchases available seems to be undisputed. See opinion of the Solicitor, Department of Agriculture, No. 5587, dated May 7, 1954; opinion of the Attorney General of the United States dated June 9, 1954, volume 41, No. 28.

While the purchase method of supporting prices for dairy products with which we are concerned involves many complicated considerations, it is clear that purchase means an acquisition, if not of full ownership, of a property interest in the commodity which, at the very least, would permit its complete removal from the market. Also, it is clear that the purchase method is to be distinguished from a direct payment without acquisition of any interest in the commodity—the employment of which method the Department of Agriculture has recognized would require additional legislation. (Study of Alternative Methods for Controlling Farm Milk Production and Supporting Prices to Farmers for Milk and Butterfat, H. Doc. No. 57, 84th Cong., Jan. 5, 1955)).

As stated in the legal brief, "Commodity Credit Corporation intended and believed that it was making a true purchase and a true sale." Apparently, therefore, the purchase function of the DA–112 transactions was to remove the commodity from normal markets and to keep it from reentering them until after April 1. While it is recognized that the price-support program necessarily involved problems of disposal, it thus is pertinent and necessary to consider whether the transactions involved bona fide purchases.

The conditions of DA–112 required the commodity to meet inspection standards (sec. 5) and to be held until April 1 (sec. 9), to be eligible. Section 10 required agreement to repurchase and section 11 provided, in pertinent part, that "delivery of the commodity to CCC * * * shall effect redelivery by CCC to the offerer on April 1 or on the date CCC takes delivery, whichever is later."

These conditions fail to disclose any element of property interest passing to the Government that normally would be indicative of or prerequisite to a bona fide purchase. That the Government not only did not acquire any dominion whatsoever over the cheese purported to be purchased but firmly committed itself to resell to the offerer the identical cheese purchased appears to have been established beyond reasonable question by testimony at the hearings, beginning at page 369. However, in the brief it is contended in part as follows:

"It is submitted that the word 'purchase' does not require that the purchaser acquire full and unfettered title in, dominion over, or right to, the commodity purchased and that nothing in the Agricultural Act of 1949 requires the Secretary of Agriculture to effect any type of purchase or control over a commodity to any extent greater than that which he has determined desirable in order to provide price support."

Also, it is stated that "* * * The Corporation under the contract effected all of the domination over the commodity that it found necessary, to-wit: Each pound of the products [butter as well as cheese was covered by the DA–112 program] so purchased was removed from the normal markets in March and did not reenter the channels of trade and commerce until in April and then at prices above the support level."

While it doubtless was intended that the Government would acquire an interest in the cheese sufficient to constitute compliance with the purchase requirements of section 201 (c), a realistic analysis of the so-called purchase-resale arrangements indicates that the purported "sellers" never parted or obligated themselves to part with their property and that the purported "buyer" never bought or obligated itself to buy such property. Since it was stipulated in section 9 that "failure of the offerer to hold the commodity for CCC until its redelivery to the offerer shall render the contract void," not only was acquisition of a sufficient property

interest to insure withdrawal from the market made impossible but expressly provided against. We are unable to see how, as a practical matter, the arrangement constituted anything more than an offer by the Government, continuing until April 1, which might be accepted only by meeting the condition of having the commodities on hand at that date, and which was so indefinite and vague as to property rights obligated that it did not remove them from the market or constitute an agreement to sell any particular interest in them.

No useful purpose would be served by considering whether any different result would be reached in respect to the legal effect of the arrangements if the Government had reserved a right to retain the cheese offered or to return other than the identical cheese, or if provision had been made for liability in the event it was not held until April 1. But in any event a comparison of such arrangements with those actually employed illustrates the deficiencies of the purported purchase function. It is significant that under the actual transactions specially selected or aged cheese valued at in excess of the Government purchase price could and may have been offered and collected for entirely without risk of loss on the part of its owners.

Even if the purported agreement to purchase if held until April 1 was not simultaneously canceled by the inconsistent agreement to resell at that time, the composite net result obviously was that no actual change in the status of the property occurred, and the purchase and sale elements of the transaction constituted in effect simply an agreement to pay a difference between the March Government purchasing price and the April Government selling price.

There has been noted the provision in section 412 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. S., 1429), that "Determinations made by the Secretary under this act shall be final and conclusive * * *." Clearly, the determinations referred to are those involving exercise of the discretion delegated with respect to matters left to his judgment, such as choice between a loan or purchase method, but certainly not a determination as to whether "purchases" or "other operations" could be employed in disregard of the methods of price support authorized under the language of section 201 (c).

In the circumstances, it is our opinion that the DA–112 transactions were not premised upon bona fide "purchases" within the meaning of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and, consequently, that payments thereunder were unauthorized and improper.

However, we do not in any way question the sincerity of purpose, or infer that there was intentional wrongdoing, on the part of any officer concerned.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

On the same day a letter was addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture forwarding the Comptroller General's opinion and stating that—

In view of the Comptroller General's decision that the payment of approximately $2 million as a result of these transactions was illegal, I would appreciate it if you would advise me as soon as possible what action the Department of Agriculture intends to take in this matter.

AUGUST 15, 1955.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, an investigation by the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of purchase-resale transactions entered into by the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to United States Department of Agriculture announcement DA–112 raised a serious question as to the legality of these transactions and the payment of approximately $2 million as a result thereof.

Because of this question, I transmitted to the Comptroller General the record of the subcommittee's hearings to date and requested that he advise me whether, in the opinion of his office, these transactions and the resulting payments were authorized by the Agricultural Act of 1949 or other applicable legislation. I have just been advised by the Comptroller General, in the enclosed opinion, that these transactions and payments were "unauthorized and improper."

In view of the Comptroller General's decision that the payment of approximately $2 million as a result of these transactions was illegal, I would appreciate it if you would advise me as soon as possible what action the Department of Agriculture intends to take in this matter.

Sincerely,

L. H. FOUNTAIN,
Chairman, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.

Under date of September 2, 1955, in reply to my letter to Secretary Benson, a communication was received from Earl L. Butz, as Acting Secretary of Agriculture, stating that "we do not agree" with the conclusion of the Comptroller General and that—

In view of the difference of opinion which exists, we are referring the entire matter to the Attorney General for study and determination as to what legal action, if any, is warranted in the premises.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, September 2, 1955.

Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN,
Chairman, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FOUNTAIN: This responds to your letter of August 15 to the Secretary of Agriculture enclosing a copy of the Comptroller General's opinion, B–124910, of the same date, in which he concludes that transactions by this Department pursuant to announcement DA–112 did not constitute a purchase within the meaning of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

We are pleased to note that the Comptroller General states that he does not "in any way question the sincerity of purpose, or infer that there was intentional wrongdoing on the part of any officer concerned." On the other hand, we do not agree with this conclusion that the transactions did not constitute valid purchases under that act.

In view of the difference of opinion which exists, we are referring the entire matter to the Attorney General for study and determination as to what legal action, if any, is warranted in the premises.

Sincerely yours,

EARL L. BUTZ,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. Butz's letter of September 2 arrived during my absence from Washington. The letter was read to me by telephone, after which I directed the subcommittee counsel to make inquiry as to whether or not Secretary Benson had personally studied the Comptroller General's opinion and whether the action referred to in the letter of September 2 represented the decision of the Secretary himself. In addition, I directed the subcommittee counsel to request that a copy of the letter or other communication by which the matter was referred to the Attorney General be furnished to the subcommittee.

SEPTEMBER 6, 1955.

Mr. EARL L. BUTZ,
Acting Secretary, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BUTZ: Your letter of September 2 regarding transactions by the Department of Agriculture pursuant to announcement DA–112 has been called to the attention of Chairman FOUNTAIN, who is out of the city at present.

The chairman has asked me to request that you advise him whether Secretary Benson has personally studied the Comptroller General's opinion and whether the action referred to in your letter of September 2 represents the decision of the Secretary himself.

The chairman has also asked me to request that a copy of the letter or other communication by which the matter was referred to the Attorney General be furnished to the subcommittee.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. NAUGHTON,
Counsel, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.

Ten days later, on September 16, having received no answer to the letter of September 6, I again wrote Secretary Benson noting that the Department had stated that it did not agree with the Comptroller General's decision and advising the Secretary that—

I am sure you recognize, of course, that an opinion of the Comptroller General is binding upon the Department of Agriculture whether the Department agrees with it or not. However, if you have not already had an opportunity to study the Comptroller General's opinion and the record of the subcommittee's hearings to date, I hope you will do so. In my opinion, this material shows clearly that the Comptroller General could have reached no other conclusion.

I further suggested that the Secretary offer the firms involved an opportunity to voluntarily refund the improper payments.

SEPTEMBER 16, 1955.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I recently forwarded to you Comptroller General's Opinion B–124910 stating that payments in excess of $2 million made to business firms by the Commodity Credit Corporation under United States Department of Agriculture Announcement 112 were unauthorized and improper. I requested at that time that you advise me what action the Department intends to take in this matter. I have since been informed by your Department that the matter has been referred to the Attorney General.

I note that the Department states that it does not agree with the Comptroller General's decision. I am sure you recognize, of course, that an opinion of the Comptroller General is binding upon the Department of Agriculture whether the Department agrees with it or not. However, if you have not already had an opportunity to study the Comptroller General's opinion and the record of the subcommittee's hearings to date, I hope you will do so. In my opinion, this material shows clearly that the Comptroller General could have reached no other conclusion.

Since the Comptroller General is responsible for determining the legality of govern-

mental expenditures, I assume that this matter has been referred to the Attorney General for the purpose of ascertaining what legal action should be taken to recover the unauthorized payments. Before any legal action is taken, I believe the firms involved should be offered an opportunity to voluntarily refund the improper payments, and I suggest that you offer them this opportunity.

Sincerely,

L. H. FOUNTAIN,
Chairman, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.

Under date of September 23, 1955, I received a rather confusing letter purporting to answer the subcommittee counsel's request of September 6 and my own letter to Secretary Benson of September 16. In response to my request for information as to whether the decision communicated in Mr. Butz's letter of September 2 represented the decision of the Secretary himself, the letter contained this statement: Mr. Butz's letter to you dated September 2, 1955, has my approval.

The letter was signed not by Secretary Benson but by True D. Morse. The subcommittee staff was informed by telephone that the letter apparently had been prepared for the Secretary's signature, but had mistakenly been signed by Mr. Morse.

No answer whatever was made to my inquiry as to whether Secretary Benson had examined the Comptroller General's opinion or to my suggestion that the firms involved be requested to refund the improper payments.

The September 23 letter contained an attached copy of a letter from Mr. Morse to the Attorney General which was also dated September 23. This letter indicated that an unidentified representative of the Office of the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture apparently had orally referred the purchase-resale transactions to an unidentified representative of the Department of Justice, and that no letter of transmittal had been written until after our request for a copy of such letter.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., September 23, 1955.

Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN,
Chairman, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FOUNTAIN: This is in response to Mr. James R. Naughton's letter of September 6, 1955, to Mr. Butz, requesting certain information in your behalf and to your letter to me of September 16, 1955.

Mr. Butz's letter to you dated September 2, 1955, has my approval. We are enclosing, for your information, a copy of our letter to the Department of Justice confirming our prior referral of the matter to the Attorney General.

In view of such referral, this Department will proceed in accordance with the Attorney General's advice.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., September 23, 1955.

The honorable the ATTORNEY GENERAL.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: This will confirm the oral conversation between representatives of the Office of the General Counsel of this Department and of your Department in which attention of your Department was invited to the opinion of the Comptroller General of August 15, 1955, holding that transactions under announcement DA–112 by the Commodity Credit Corporation were unauthorized and in which you were requested to study the entire matter and determine what legal action, if any, is warranted in the premises.

We have previously supplied your Department with copies of the documents listed below. We are, however, enclosing an extra set for your convenience.

1. Letter of August 15, 1955, from Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, to the Secretary of Agriculture;

2. Opinion of the Comptroller General of August 15, 1955 (B–124910);

3. Letter of September 2 from Earl L. Butz, Acting Secretary of Agriculture, to Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations;

4. Announcement DA–99 of April 1, 1953, under which offerings of butter could be made throughout the marketing year April 1, 1953 to March 31, 1954, to Commodity Credit Corporation;

5. Announcement DA–100, dated April 1, 1953, under which offerings of cheddar cheese could be made throughout the marketing year April 1, 1953 to March 31, 1954, to Commodity Credit Corporation;

6. Supplements to announcements DA–99 and DA–100, dated December 16, 1953;

7. Amendments to announcements DA–99 and DA–100, dated March 9, 1954;

8. Announcement DA–107 under which sales of dairy products are regularly made;

9. Announcement DA–112 making provisions for contracts covering both the purchase and sale of butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids and simplifying the procedures which would have prevailed had the purchases and sales been effected under the prior announcements DA–99, DA–100, and DA–107;

10. Press release of a price list, dated February 1, 1954, of commodities available for domestic sale during February (a press announcement similar in form was issued for the month of April 1954 but the supply thereof has been exhausted. These press releases are followed by official publications in the Federal Register. The April price list was so published on April 15, 1954 (19 F. R. 2195));

11. Press release of March 12, 1953, announcing the price-support program for the marketing year April 1, 1953–March 31, 1954;

12. Press release of February 15, 1954, announcing the new level of support for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1954;

13. Press release of February 18, 1954, announcing prices at which commodities may be purchased after April 1, 1954; and

14. List of purchases of butter and cheese under announcement DA–112.

Attached also are the recent communications of September 6 from the counsel for the Intergovernmental Relations Committee, and of September 16 from the chairman of that committee, and our reply thereto.

We will be pleased to forward to you any additional material you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

On October 13, 1955, I addressed another letter to the Secretary of Agriculture stating that—

While Comptroller General's opinion B–124910 does not specifically mention butter, I believe its language covers all payments made under DA–112. If there are any significant facts which differentiate the butter payments from the cheese payments, I would appreciate it if you would call these facts to my attention. If there are none, I am sure you will agree that the butter payments should be treated in the same manner as the cheese payments.

OCTOBER 13, 1955.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee's investigation of the DA–112 program has concentrated its attention to date on payments made by the Commodity Credit Corporation to firms with inventories of cheese. However, in addition to the $2,097,494.24 paid to cheese firms, $279,949.48 was paid to firms dealing in butter.

While Comptroller General's opinion B–124910 does not specifically mention butter, I believe its language covers all payments made under DA–112. If there are any significant facts which differentiate the butter payments from the cheese payments, I would appreciate it if you would call these facts to my attention. If there are none, I am sure you will agree that the butter payments should be treated in the same manner as the cheese payments.

Sincerely,

L. H. FOUNTAIN,
Chairman, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.

In reply to my letter to Secretary Benson, I received, under date of October 26, a letter from True D. Morse stating that—

The minor modifications of the program to support the prices of milk and butterfat sold by farmers made by DA–112 applied to both butter and cheese. Therefore, we are treating transactions with respect to butter and cheese the same.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., October 25, 1955.

Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN,
Chairman, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FOUNTAIN: This replies to your inquiry of October 13, as to whether there are significant facts that differentiate butter from cheese transactions under announcement DA–112.

The minor modifications of the program to support the prices of milk and butterfat sold by farmers made by DA–112 applied to both butter and cheese. Therefore we are treating transactions with respect to butter and cheese the same.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Under Secretary.

At the end of November 1955, 3½ months after the Comptroller General's decision and nearly 3 months after the Department of Agriculture had referred the matter to the Justice Department, no further action had been taken. On November 30, therefore, I addressed another letter to Secretary Benson telling the Secretary that—

As I have previously stated, it is my opinion that prompt remedial action should be taken to recover the money which has been paid out illegally.

I then asked the Secretary to inform me as soon as possible of the present status of the matter and that in the event no decision had yet been made, to advise me of the date when such a decision could be expected.

NOVEMBER 30, 1955.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On August 15 I forwarded to you Comptroller General's opinion B–124910 declaring that payment of more

than $2 million pursuant to announcement DA–112 was unauthorized and improper with a request that you advise me what action the Department of Agriculture would take concerning it. On September 2 I was informed that the Department was referring the matter to the Attorney General. During the 3 months since that time no further report has been received as to what action is planned by the Department.

As I have previously stated, it is my opinion that prompt remedial action should be taken to recover the money which has been paid out illegally.

In order that the information may be available to assist in planning further activities of the subcommittee, I would appreciate it if you will inform me as soon as possible of the present status of this matter. If no decision has yet been made regarding action to recover this money, I would appreciate your advising me of the date when such a decision can be expected.

Sincerely,

L. H. FOUNTAIN,
Chairman, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.

(Copy to Mr. Joseph Campbell, the Comptroller General.)

Under date of December 7, 1955, in reply to my letter to Secretary Benson, I received a letter from True D. Morse stating that—

As we previously informed your committee, this entire matter was referred to the Attorney General for study and determination as to what legal action, if any, is warranted in the premises. We understand that the Department of Justice is giving consideration thereto. We have not, however, been informed by that Department as to the date when its decision can be expected.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., December 7, 1955.

Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN,
Chairman, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FOUNTAIN: This will acknowledge your letter of November 30, 1955, requesting information as to the present status of certain possible claims growing out of the Comptroller General's opinion B–124910 in connection with purchases of dairy products under announcement DA–112.

As we previously informed your committee, this entire matter was referred to the Attorney General for study and determination as to what legal action, if any, is warranted in the premises. We understand that the Department of Justice is giving consideration thereto. We have not, however, been informed by that Department as to the date when its decision can be expected.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Under Secretary.

Further inquiries of the Department of Agriculture by the subcommittee counsel produced no information as to when action would be taken. However, a newspaper article regarding this matter did come to my attention. The article, by Marietta Dake of the North American Newspaper Alliance as it appeared in the Kansas City Times, read in part as follows:

NO CHEESE CASE—JUSTICE DEPARTMENT IS UNABLE TO FIND REASON TO PROSECUTE IN DEAL—GONE OVER BY LAWYERS—AGRICULTURE AND GAO OFFICIALS ARE CALLED A BUNCH OF ACCOUNTANTS—CASE CONCERNS SALE TO UNITED STATES AND BUYING BACK AT LOWER PRICE

(By Marietta Dake)

WASHINGTON, November 28.—Justice Department lawyers say they can find no illegalities in the cheese case that has been referred to them by the Agriculture Department and the General Accounting Office officials who are demanding prosecution of the case are "just a bunch of accountants who know nothing of law."

Top legal officials of the civil suits division (formerly claims division) of the Justice Department have given the file received from Agriculture on the cheese case a cursory examination. On the basis of it, they say that there's not enough evidence for a suit.

On Monday, February 13, 1956, I addressed a letter to Attorney General Brownell calling his attention to this newspaper article and stating that—

I assume you share with me an interest in safeguarding the taxpayers' dollars. I have believed, and now believe, that hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money improperly paid out in the cheese deals would be voluntarily refunded upon a request made under the authority of the United States. In instances where voluntary repayment is not secured I am convinced that prompt and vigorous action should be taken to recover the money which was paid out improperly and without authorization.

I further advised the Attorney General that—

As a Member of the Congress of which the General Accounting Office is an arm and as a Member of the committee to which the General Accounting Office is required by law to make its reports, I feel compelled to ask you whether this newspaper account quoting an official in your Department as saying that the General Accounting Office is "just a bunch of accountants who know nothing of law," is an accurate representation of the official or the approved position of the Department of Justice.

Continuing, I stated:

I believe you will agree that the prolonged delay of the Justice Department in replying to the request of the Department of Agriculture, coupled with the attitude of the Department reported in the press justifies deep concern about this matter. My official connection with the matter, coupled with the statement of the Department of Agriculture that action on their part awaits your reply, further impels me to inquire as to the nature of any proposed reply you intend to make and when you will make it.

The letter was delivered by a member of the subcommittee staff to Attorney General Brownell's office shortly after noon on February 13 with the request that it be given to the Attorney General as soon as possible. In the letter I told the Attorney General that a reply during the week would be appreciated so that the subcommittee might schedule its own further activities concerning these transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Hon. HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
Attorney General, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: On the basis of evidence developed through hearings of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, the Comptroller General, on August 15, 1955, rule that payments amounting to more than $2 million made pursuant to purchase-resale transactions by the Commodity Credit Corporation were unauthorized and improper.

In addition, more than $300,000 was paid out on similar, if not identical, butter transactions and the Department of Agriculture advised the subcommittee in a letter of October 25, 1955, that "we are treating transactions with respect to butter and cheese the same."

On September 2, 1955, the Department of Agriculture advised the subcommittee that the matter of these unauthorized payments was being referred to the Attorney General for "study and determination as to what legal action, if any, is warranted in the premises." Repeated inquiries of the Department of Agriculture, the latest on February 8, elicited the information that no reply has been received by the Department to its request for advice as to what legal action is indicated in respect to these transactions.

I assume you share with me an interest in safeguarding the taxpayers' dollars. I have believed, and now believe, that hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money improperly paid out in the cheese deals would be voluntarily refunded upon a request made under the authority of the United States. In instances where voluntary repayment is not secured I am convinced that prompt and vigorous action should be taken to recover the money which was paid out improperly and without authorization.

In view of the fact that the Justice Department has never made inquiry of the subcommittee regarding this matter, I think it proper and relevant to direct your attention to a newspaper article by Marietta Dake, of the North American Newspaper Alliance, which appeared in the Kansas City Times and perhaps other papers under the dateline Washington, November 28, 1955. This article reads, in part, as follows:

"NO CHEESE CASE—JUSTICE DEPARTMENT IS UNABLE TO FIND REASON TO PROSECUTE IN DEAL—GONE OVER BY LAWYERS—AGRICULTURE AND GAO OFFICIALS ARE CALLED A BUNCH OF ACCOUNTANTS—CASE CONCERNS SALE TO UNITED STATES AND BUYING BACK AT LOWER PRICE

"(By Marietta Dake)

"WASHINGTON, November 28.—Justice Department lawyers say they can find no illegalities in the cheese case that has been referred to them by the Agriculture Department and the General Accounting Office officials who are demanding prosecution of the case are 'just a bunch of accountants who know nothing of law.'

"Top legal officials of the civil suits division (formerly claims division) of the Justice Department have given the file received from Agriculture on the cheese case a cursory examination. On the basis of it, they say that there's not enough evidence for a suit."

As a Member of the Congress of which the General Accounting Office is an arm and as a member of the committee to which the General Accounting Office is required by law to make its reports, I feel compelled to ask you whether this newspaper account quoting an official in your Department as saying that the General Accounting Office is "just a bunch of accountants who know nothing of law" is an accurate representation of the official or the approved position of the Department of Justice.

I believe you will agree that the prolonged delay of the Justice Department in replying to the request of the Department of Agriculture, coupled with the attitude of the Department reported in the press justifies deep concern about this matter. My official connection with the matter, coupled with the statement of the Department of Agriculture that action on their part awaits your reply, further impels me to inquire as to the nature of any proposed reply you intend to make, and when you will make it.

In order that the subcommittee may schedule its own further activities in respect to these transactions of the Com-

modity Credit Corporation, it would be appreciated if I might have a reply sometime this week.

Sincerely,

L. H. FOUNTAIN,
Chairman, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.

Under date of February 15, 1956, 6 months to the day after the Comptroller General's opinion, and 5½ months after the Agriculture Department has requested legal advice, I received a letter from the Attorney General stating that—

Our study is completed, and I am endeavoring to set up a conference with the Secretary of Agriculture this week to fully acquaint him with the results of our study. I am glad to be able to advise you that the newspaper article which appeared in the Kansas City Times and is quoted in your letter of February 13 is completely unauthorized and inaccurate.

The Attorney General further informed me that—

Undoubtedly the Secretary of Agriculture will be in touch with you about this matter in the very near future, and after that time if you desire any further information from the Department of Justice please let me know.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1956.

Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN,
Chairman, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of February 13 regarding the matter referred to the Department of Justice by the Department of Agriculture to study and determine as to what legal action, if any, is warranted in connection with the cheese and butter transactions under purchase-resale agreements by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Our study is completed, and I am endeavoring to set up a conference with the Secretary of Agriculture this week to fully acquaint him with the results of our study. I am glad to be able to advise you that the newspaper article which appeared in the Kansas City Times and is quoted in your letter of February 13 is completely unauthorized and inaccurate.

Undoubtedly the Secretary of Agriculture will be in touch with you about this matter in the very near future, and after that time if you desire any further information from the Department of Justice please let me know.

Sincerely,

HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
Attorney General.

It is now more than 9 months since the subcommittee held its first public hearing on these purchase-resale transactions. It is nearly 7 months since the Comptroller General ruled that these transactions were "unauthorized and improper." It is more than 6 months since the Department of Agriculture asked the Attorney General for legal advice. More than a month has passed since the Attorney General informed me that "our study is completed" and "the Secretary of Agriculture will be in touch with you in the very near future."

To this moment I have received no word from the Department of Agriculture as to any action being taken, nor have I received any further communication from the Attorney General.

Members of the House of Representatives can form their own conclusions as to whether the responsible officials are carrying out their duties in this matter in a manner in which the taxpayers have a right to expect.

In presenting these matters to the House, let me emphasize that I am not presenting a report of the subcommittee, nor am I presuming to speak for other members of the subcommittee. After such further hearings as are necessary, the subcommittee will submit to the Committee on Government Operations a full report. I am simply bringing the House up to date on a matter which I believe is of vital concern to the Congress.

Failure of the Department of Agriculture to even attempt to recover the $2½ million of taxpayers' money held by the Comptroller General to have been improperly paid to large processors, distributors, dealers, and others, including grocery chains, is even more amazing when compared to the prompt and vigorous action that has been taken to prosecute certain small farmers. Suits have been filed against more than 300 farmers whose offense had been to produce more on their own farms than was permitted under the marketing quotas in effect.

Legal action was instituted by Federal attorneys against 281 wheat farmers for violation of marketing-quota regulations during 1954. The Department of Agriculture was unable to inform me immediately as to the average size of the claims filed against the 281 wheat farmers, but they estimated that it probably would not exceed $500. On this basis, the total amount sought from all 281 wheat farmers would be less than $200,000.

Of the $2½ million of improper and unauthorized payments in the cheese and butter transactions two large companies received a total of more than a million dollars during 1954—more than 5 times the amount claimed from all 281 wheat farmers combined as penalties for exceeding their quotas.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson said in a speech in Portland, Oreg., on February 2 that—

The Department of Agriculture has been compelled by law to hail before the courts farmers whose only offense was to raise and feed wheat outside their quotas.

I regret that the Secretary apparently does not feel equally compelled to take action against companies which have received improper and unauthorized payments of the taxpayers' money in purchase-resale transactions.

I am disturbed by another aspect of this situation. As the correspondence I have inserted in the RECORD will show, I have made repeated attempts to call this matter to the personal attention of the Secretary of Agriculture and to ascertain whether the Secretary has studied the Comptroller General's decision. As the correspondence will further show, I have received no answer to these inquiries, and, despite five different letters addressed to the Secretary regarding these transactions, I have not had the courtesy of a single reply with Mr. Benson's name signed to it.

In enacting the Government Corporation Control Act, the Congress stated that it is the "policy of the Congress to bring Government corporations and their transactions and operations under annual scrutiny by Congress and provide current financial control thereof." This act provides that the financial transactions of Government corporations shall be audited by the General Accounting Office. The act also requires the Comptroller General to report specifically to the Congress any expenditure observed in the course of the audit which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General has been made without authority of law.

In addition to the Comptroller General's opinion of August 15, 1955, the unauthorized payments pursuant to purchase-resale transactions were called to the attention of the Congress on the very first page of the Comptroller General's audit report on the Commodity Credit Corporation for the 1954 fiscal year. I think the Congress has a responsibility to see that proper remedial action is taken in this matter. However, regardless of any responsibility of the Congress or of the Comptroller General, it appears to me that the executive departments concerned have thus far failed to carry out their clear and unmistakable duties in this matter.

How often has each of us said or heard it said that "Public office is a public trust." Surely the agencies involved in these transactions are not exempt from that age-old principle. Is it not therefore imperative that the responsible public officials take appropriate action without further delay?

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SADLAK, for 15 minutes, on Wednesday next.

Mr. HARVEY, for 15 minutes, on Tuesday next.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. MADDEN, for 10 minutes, on today.

Mr. METCALF, for 20 minutes, on next Wednesday and Thursday.

Mr. EDMONDSON (at the request of Mr. METCALF), for 20 minutes, on next Wednesday and Thursday.

Mr. UDALL, for 20 minutes, on next Wednesday and Thursday.

Mr. FOUNTAIN, for 30 minutes, on today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. JOHNSON of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HESELTON and include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the

following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 8320. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school milk program, the veterans and Armed Forces milk program, and the brucellosis eradication program.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1271. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; and

S. 1272. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, March 26, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1660. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Administration of Territories, Office of Territories," for the fiscal year 1956, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation because of an emergency involving the safety of human life, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1661. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Paul B. Wedel and Howard L. Smith, doing business as B. and H. Distributors, which, when executed by the superintendent, Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, will authorize them to operate a service station at Big Stump in Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., during a 5-year period beginning January 1, 1956, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1662. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with the Mesa Verde Co., which, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service, will authorize the concessioner to provide accommodations, facilities, and services in Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., for a period of 5 years from November 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1663. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled 'Copyrights' with respect to certain fees"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 8130. A bill to designate the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Jones Point, Va., as the "Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1934). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 444. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 9893. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1935). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7380. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 to correct certain inequities; with amendment (Rept. No. 1936). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 8957. A bill to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia, and to provide that such Commission shall continue in existence until the construction of such auditorium has been completed; with amendment (Rept. No. 1937). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 9078. A bill to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall be not less than 2,500 officers and members; without amendment (Rept. No. 1938). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 9582. A bill to provide for the delayed reporting of births within the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1939). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report pursuant to House Resolution 118, 84th Congress, relating to preservation of national wildlife refuges; without amendment (Rept. No. 1941). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 357. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study the causes of the large increase in traffic accidents in the United States during recent years; with amendment (Rept. No. 1942). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 442. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5299, a bill to authorize the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1943). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 443. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 8750, a bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1944). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 580. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1940). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. R. 10145. A bill to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 10146. A bill to provide that officers and employees of the Federal Government shall be excused from duty for a sufficient period of time to vote in elections; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 10147. A bill to amend Public Law 650, 83d Congress, to provide benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 10148. A bill to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 10149. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 10150. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 to change the position of elevator operator from level 2 to level 3 of the postal field service schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 10151. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place crude bauxite and certain calcined bauxite on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 10152. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 10153. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Evgenia Andrianopoulos and her minor son, Konstantino Andrianopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 10154. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Anne McLean-Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 10155. A bill for the relief of Miss Anna Gentile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 10156. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

739. By Mr. BENTLEY: Petition of all organized groups of Ukrainian women in metropolitan Detroit in cooperation with branches of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of Detroit and the Federation of American Ukrainians of Michigan protesting against torturing of millions of slave laborers in U. S. S. R., particularly against murdering of 500 women in a concentration camp in Karaganda, Kazakhstan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

740. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Doyle H. Brewer and other veterans of Orangeville, Columbia County, Pa., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

741. Also, petition of James Sadler and other veterans of Williamsport and Lycoming County, Pa., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

742. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Howard Cessna Post, No. 136, American Legion, Albia, Iowa, urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

743. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of P. E. Ross and many other citizens of Lawrence and Barry Counties, Mo., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

744. Also, petition of William B. Wilks and other citizens of Jasper County, Mo., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

745. Also, petition of E. R. Jones and other urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

One Hundred and Thirty-fourth Anniversary of Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] on the 134th anniversary of Greek independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER ON THE 134TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

On Sunday, March 25, the 134th anniversary of Greek independence from the Ottoman Empire will be commemorated.

It was back in 1821 when the Greek people, after being dominated for over 400 years by the Ottoman Empire, struck for liberty which was symbolic of that era as in the case of the United States and France.

Historically, the Greek nation has fought for liberty and the principles of democracy. It seems that Greece has always fought for freedom. In ancient times Greece protected the advance culture from ruin by invasions from the east. Again in A. D. 407, Greece came to the aid of the civilized world in withstanding assaults from the north. During World War I and World War II, Greece was again an ally of democracy against the enemy.

How thrilled the world was when Greece resisted fascistic, Nazi, and communistic invasions within a period of 10 years. Again, little Greece stood up to the task, but not without paying a price for her victory both in the men and women who lost their lives and in the severe drain on a treasury already depleted by wars.

While the world commemorates Greek Independence Day, there is a sad note in the fact that three of our friendly allies, Greece, England, and Turkey, are disputing over the issue of self-determination for Cyprus. I know that we in this country hope and pray that a just, honorable, and immediate solution to the Cyprus issue will be effected since it is obviously in the interest of the entire free world as well as in the interest of the peoples most directly concerned.

One development in the Cyprus issue that has brought great reaction is the removal of Archbishop Makarios from Cyprus by the British. I have received many telegrams and letters from church leaders of the Orthodox faith in this country requesting that the United States Senate facilitate the archbishop's return to his people.

Archbishop of Canterbury recently spoke out in favor of the immediate return of Archbishop Makarios. Voices in this country have been raised to the same effect.

The world is looking to England to see what her position will be regarding the immediate return to Cyprus of Archbishop Makarios, the highest church official of the Orthodox faith on the island of Cyprus.

Mr. President, I would like to say a word about the Americans of Greek descent in this country who have become an integral part of our Nation and have done much to continue the American way of life. Within the past century we have seen the Greek people who have migrated to the United States emerge as a group of people who follow the democratic principles as were established by their forebears back in the Golden Ages of Greece. Today some of our most prominent business, professional, and civic leaders in public life come from this group.

The record established by the Americans of Greek descent in this country warrants a change of the discriminating immigration quota fixed at 308 per year, which is one two-hundedth of the quota of several other countries in Europe. Certainly such a discriminating immigration quota is not consistent with the American way of justice and equality to our fellow man. Also, there should be an increase in the number of refugees coming to America from Greece and Italy and the abolishing of mortgaged quotas.

Before closing, Mr. President, I would like to point out one thing further, that through the efforts of the United States Senate in S. 106, introduced by Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, and supported by me on the floor of the Senate, not only the Greek Americans of the orthodox faith but also other groups of the eastern (Greek) orthodox faith have been permitted for the first time to designate their religious preference in the Armed Forces, which is a privilege previously denied members of the Armed Forces of the eastern (Greek) orthodox faith. This is as it should be, for it embodies one of our most sacred constitutional protections, that of freedom of religion in every manner and form.

To the nation of Greece, that has through the centuries given to this world great elements of democracy, art, literature, science, medicine, education, philosophy, religion, and the noble spirit to fight for freedom despite the odds, I say, "All honor to you and your descendants."

The Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which provides that employees of the United States Federal Government be excused from duty, without loss of pay or annual leave, for a period of not less than 2 hours nor more than 8 hours in order to be able to vote in national, State, and local elections, including primary elections.

It is unfortunate that many among us take our rights of citizenship for granted. It is a little disturbing that far too many among us in this great land of ours fail to perform their duty on election day each year and fail to utilize their right to vote as free citizens in a free country. Voting is not only a right but also a privilege which no one should ignore. Past generations of Americans fought for this right, and it is because of their struggles that we can enjoy democracy today, the freedom of expression and the freedom to vote according to our own dictates in the best interests of the American people.

Whereas in many lands today the people are subject to government by bullet, we still enjoy government by ballot and we aim to continue this method through the practice of our right to vote. By maintaining and utilizing our rights of suffrage we help keep this country as a true citadel of democracy. In so doing, we participate in choosing men and women for national, State and city office who are best qualified to do the job, regardless of race, religion, or ancestry.

It is important, however, that the rights of citizenship are scrupulously observed, that every American enjoy equal

access to the polls, and that he utilize his right to cast his ballot. In many States throughout the country the people are given sufficient time off for voting in national or State elections.

My bill seeks to obtain the same or similar period of time off to United States Government employees so that they are enabled to perform one of their sacred duties as United States citizens by voting in all elections, whether of a national or local character, and including also primary elections. It is my opinion that the Federal Government has a moral obligation to lead in this field of encouraging good citizenship. Enabling Government employees to utilize their right to vote, through the adoption of my bill, will be a decisive step in that direction.

Scuttling a Solution of the Farm Problem?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain extraneous matter, I want to summarize as briefly as possible certain information for my own use in replying to inquiries I have received. I hope it may be useful also to those of my colleagues who are receiving similar inquiries. Basically, those inquiries are: What has happened to the President's recommendations for agricultural legislation, what are the reasons for what has happened and what are the prospects?

On May 5, 1955, the House passed H. R. 12 by the close vote on rollcall, 206 to 201. The vote of the New England delegation was 26 against and 1 for passage of the bill. I was paired against the bill.

This bill would provide for the restoration of high, rigid price supports at 90 percent of parity for basic farm commodities.

Since then the matter has been exhaustively analyzed and discussed, has been the subject of numerous articles in periodicals, of nationwide editorial comment, of news comments, forum debates, and special programs on radio and television, and of full treatment here on this floor and through every conceivable medium of public information. Within the last few days, the other body has completed its consideration of the legislation and the next logical step would be a conference.

Obviously, H. R. 12, as it passed the House on May 5, 1955, by a margin of five votes, was in direct opposition to the President's recommendations and contrary to the recommendations of the major, responsible farm organizations. It certainly ignored and violated flagrantly the legitimate interests of the consumers. Since it involved, if it became law, the possibility and even the probability that a large majority of the consumers would demand quite properly a sweeping repeal of much legislation in the field of agriculture, it carried a very real threat to agriculture and I am convinced that the majority of those engaged in agriculture realized that fact.

Because of the rules of the House, I cannot comment here upon what happened in the other body. But I can and do recommend that all those who are interested read the brief statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which are most enlightening. And I can refer specifically to pages 5061, 5062, 5064, 5069, 5070, 5071, and 5073 of the RECORD for March 19, 1956.

I shall also be glad to furnish anyone requesting it a reprint of an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News, March 17, entitled "Demos Plan Slowdown on Farm Bill," which has also been described as an exposure of the Democratic slowdown on the farm bill.

Yesterday President Eisenhower held a press conference. He referred briefly, intelligently, and reasonably to the situation we find confronting us as to the farm problem. His comments should be made available to everyone who is interested, not only because of their complete validity, but particularly in the light of the anguished and silly reactions which have been published since then. They are too partisan, too dull, and too shallow to warrant any quotation or further comment except to point out that they range from defensive and meaningless expressions of a determination to resist the President's recommendations to the bitter end to empty and bombastic statements alleging some kind of threat or intimidation. The President's exact words are the best and most complete answer to that sort of partisan and dull buffoonery. They were as follows:

> Now, with respect to the farm problem, I believe that farmers, as well as others, understand that this administration is working hard to produce a program that gives them 100 percent of parity in the marketplace, and if you try to do that 100-percent parity merely by passing laws to that effect, we are going to pile up trouble that we cannot possibly solve, because it means just piling up of reserves and of surpluses, and the products in which we already are oversupplied.
>
> I believe that the program sent to the Hill on this farm problem is comprehensive, helpful, not only helpful today in helping the farmer with his present problem of giving him some profitable way, some income, out of the business of eliminating acres from production, but in the long term for that man's children and for his children's children, you will have a sound program, and you can't possible have it merely by passing large, rigid price-support laws and say, "We will pay this."
>
> If you would apply this to every product in the country, we would certainly be soon in a very bad hole.
>
> Now, we are, with respect to that bill as it now stands—I don't think it is a good bill. I don't think it is workable. I think it would bury the farmers under surpluses that they couldn't stand, and it would break the prices still further.
>
> But I do point out that there is still a conference to go through, and I think those conferees, looking at this thing sensibly, may write a good bill, and one which can really be helpful to the farmer.

Mr. Speaker, finally, as to the prospects, I am confident that the great majority of the people of this country, including a definite majority of those engaged in agriculture, share the President's hope that the conferees may write a good bill and one which can really be helpful to the farmer. But it is impossible to be certain of that today in view of what has happened and of the mixture of defiance and bravado constantly being trumpeted from certain sources. I realize that it is small consolation to those who are very much concerned as to the prospects that those who play with fire usually burn themselves badly. But I am dead certain that the great majority of farmers are intelligent and that, irrespective of where they may live or what they produce, they will not only resent and repudiate any bold attempts to buy their votes but that they with the overwhelming majority of their fellow citizens, will resent deeply any continuation of virulent and unfounded criticism of the sincerity and integrity of President Eisenhower. And I am confident that they will find quite adequate means of expressing their resentment and indignation as to any further transparent efforts to delay or sidetrack a forthright solution of this vital problem.

Californians Live a Long Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 22, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to refer to several people in my home town of Stockton, Calif.

Jacob H. Miller, 97, and his wife, Mrs. Miller, 95, will soon celebrate their 75th wedding anniversary. They live in a house that is 102 years old, and is one of the relics left standing in Stockton. Mr. Miller was one of the first native-born citizens of Stockton. Their daughter, Lois Miller, lives with her parents in this interesting old house in the city where she was born. They have experienced floods in Stockton many times prior to this past year, and the Millers have seen their house surrounded by water due to the high water in Mormon Channel, which is a continuation of the Calaveras River.

The great flood of all time on the Calaveras River was in 1862. Both Mr. and Mrs. Miller were alive then, and Lincoln was our President.

During this period of time, vast changes have come over the country and also over California. Stockton was founded by Captain Weber, and he built a town similar to Spanish towns he had known in Spain. It was 2 miles square, and contained 4 square miles. On the south, it was known as South Street. On the east, as East Street, and on the west, as West Street, and on the north as North Street. These later were changed to Charter Way, Wilson Way, Harding Way, and Pershing Avenue.

From the beginning, Stockton was a port town and was known as the Slough City, because of the fact that Miner Channel was a slough that branched off from the San Joaquin River. The miners would take their cargoes on boats up to Stockton, and from there they would be taken in wagons, to the Mother Lode country, hauled by horses. The Mother Lode country is where there was considerable gold and many millions of dollars of gold was taken out of the lower Sierras. It must be an interesting thing for the Millers, at their age, and in perfect health, to look back over the many interesting experiences and events during their long residence in Stockton. At one time, Stockton was the second largest city in California. Today it is a city of about 125,000 to 145,000 people.

Also, since 1937 toward the end of that year the migration of California has averaged 1,000 per day, including all Sundays and all holidays. The Millers never anticipated such a migration; in fact, it is the largest voluntary migration that has occurred during the entire history of the world. Stockton has produced many important men, both in political life and in business life.

The Holt Manufacturing Co., which was founded by Benjamin Holt, started as a manufacturing concern of wagons. Near Stockton, is a large area known as the delta, which contains thousands of acres of very fertile land. The land in this area is peat land, namely, it is nonmineral land created by the thousands of years of vegetable decay. Mr. Holt made a wagon that could be utilized in this soft, porous, and fertile soil. He first made some large wheels and put strips across them to develop traction for his wagon, thus preventing it from sinking into this soft soil. Later he developed the manufacture of tractors. He built the first tractor propelled by a motor. He built the first military tank in the world, and sold it to the Russians in 1917. Associated with him was a nephew, known as Pliny Holt, who was an inventive genius, and for many years was an adviser to the United States Army in the development of various types of carriages to carry ammunition for the artillery. Pliny Holt also contributed a very great deal to the city of Stockton at the time when its port was developed in the middle twenties. He was chairman of the first port commission, and through his guidance and good judgment, and the capacity of getting along with his associates, the port developed into a very fine inland port.

Among others who were interested in Stockton, the group that was born in California, organized the Native Sons of the Golden West. These were semifraternal and patriotic societies which did much to develop California and maintain a high type of citizenship for its cities, and the country areas.

California is indeed a peculiar State. From the north came the Russians and went down below Fort Bragg, Calif., and a river in that area is today known as the Russian River. Near the coast is a fort that the Russians built and occupied. Luckily, they did not go down further and remain longer in California, or we might never have been a member of the United States of America. In its public life, California has had many important and influential persons. The discovery of gold by John Sutter was an important event. The curious thing is that the discovery of gold in California was made on the same day in which Karl Marx issued his famous manifesto. Today it is being utilized by the Soviet Union and other Communist groups as the basis for a type of government which they claim will give more freedom and more prosperity than the capitalistic system. How wrong they are has been proven during the past 40 years many times, and right at this moment, they are still promulgating the Karl Marx manifesto as their idea of an ideal society.

Stockton gave California a governor. He was James H. Budd who became governor on January 11, 1895. It was January 2, 1939, before we had another governor who was a Democrat, Culbert L. Olson.

In 1911 Hiram W. Johnson became Governor of California, and later in 1917, became a Member of the United States Senate.

California also has furnished several members of the Supreme Court of the United States. In 1863 Stephen Field was made a Justice of the Supreme Court by President Lincoln. He was the 10th member of that Court and he served as a Justice longer than any other member of that Court.

President McKinley appointed Joseph McKenna as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. Justice McKenna took office on January 26, 1898, and served for 26 years. He retired on January 15, 1925. We again had a Californian appointed to the Supreme Court when President Eisenhower appointed Governor Warren, the Chief Justice of the Court, where he is now doing an outstanding job as everyone who reads the newspapers knows.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 23, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, March 19, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of truth, Father of our spirits, without whom our world drifts into darkness, all save the clouds of sin are Thine. Thy effulgent light cannot be put out by the falsehoods and the evasions of evil. Grant us Thy truth to make us free and kindling hearts that burn for Thee; for Thy love exalts our littleness and Thy gentleness makes us great:

"Before Thy ever-blazing throne,
We ask no luster of our own."

For those who here serve as the representatives of the people who have put their trust in them, we pray for deliverance from the subtle lures of office and from the arrogance which lurks in power. Help us all to know that when we forget Thee whatever we attempt to build or to frame is labor lost, and that only in Thy will is our peace and our victory. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 22, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7678. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the 11th Annual Instrument-Automation (International) Conference and Exhibit, New York, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8334. An act to permit the importation, free of duty, of racing shells to be used in connection with preparations for the 1956 Olympic Games;

H. R. 8942. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Theater Equipment Trade Show, New York, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8959. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Photographic Exposition, to be held at Washington, D. C., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 464. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fifth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 7678. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the 11th Annual Instrument-Automation (International) Conference and Exhibit, New York, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8334. An act to permit the importation, free of duty, of racing shells to be used in connection with preparations for the 1956 Olympic Games;

H. R. 8942. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Theater Equipment Trade Show, New York, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8959. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Photographic Exposition, to be held at Washington, D. C., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 464. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fifth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL BILLS TO BE CONSIDERED ON CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MARCH 26, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1617, S. 2016, a bill for the relief of Lawrence F. Kramer, and Calendar No. 1690, S. 3116, a bill to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals, be included in the call of the calendar ordered for Monday, March 26.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

DOROTHY E. GREEN AND THELMA L. ALLEY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Dorothy E. Green and Thelma L. Alley (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY DISPOSAL

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Supply and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on foreign excess property disposal, dated January 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, KINGS CANYON NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit in Kings Canyon National Park, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Henoch Woloch (Wologh) from a report transmitted to the Senate on August 18, 1955, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Two letters from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of Oil Producers Agency of California, Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against any appropriation to finance the drilling of an oil well on San Nicolas Island by the Navy Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by Aerie 1351, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Porterville, Calif., favoring the immediate construction of Success Dam, east of Porterville, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Santa Clara County, Calif., favoring the extension of the term of the activities of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control for an additional 2-year period; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Los Angeles (Calif.) Metropolitan Traffic Association, favoring the enactment of House bill 8836, relating to a national system of interstate and defense highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF HELLS CANYON DAM—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the members of the Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association at their annual meeting held in Sacred Heart, Minn., endorsing legislation authorizing a Federal high dam at Hells Canyon.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

RENVILLE-SIBLEY COOPERATIVE POWER ASSOCIATION,
Danube, Minn., March 12, 1956.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At the annual meeting of the members of the Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association held at Sacred Heart, Minn., on February 23, 1956, the following resolution was duly adopted:

"Be it resolved, That the Renville-Sibley Cooperative Power Association strongly endorses the bill now in Congress authorizing a Federal high dam at Hells Canyon; and

"Be it further resolved, That the association urges the authorization of Hells Canyon Dam at this session of Congress and the appropriation of adequate funds to get construction under way immediately;

"Be it further resolved, That the association opposes the construction of three small dams as proposed by the private utilities, which would result in the waste of power and increase the cost of power.

"Be it further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators for the State of Minnesota and for Representatives in Congress in this district."

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

LESLIE R. SCHRUPP,
Manager.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H. R. 9166. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates (Rept. No. 1710); and

H. J. Res. 464. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fifth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1711).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:

S. 2438. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever" (Rept. No. 1712).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 9770. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1713).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 3515. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3516. A bill to provide additional penalties for violation of the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 3517. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3518. A bill to provide for an annual report on the administration of certain public lands; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 3519. A bill for the relief of Yumi Mense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 3520. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the national system of interstate

highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3521. A bill for the relief of Athanasios Nicholas Prittes (also known as Thomas Prites or Tom N. Phillips); and

S. 3522. A bill for the relief of Theresia Schneider; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 3523. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request).

S. 3524. A bill to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington September 10, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 3525. A bill to extend for 2 years the program of financial assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities under the provisions of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, and to make certain other changes in such provisions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 3526. A bill to extend for 2 years the program of financial assistance in the construction of school facilities in areas affected by Federal activities under the provisions of Public Law 815, 81st Congress, to make certain other changes in such provisions, and to provide for certain retroactive payments for the same purpose; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 3527. A bill authorizing the State highway commission of the State of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 3528. A bill to provide for judicial review of administrative findings of the Secretary of Labor under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and chapter 23 (Federal Unemployment Tax Act) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KNOWLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND (by request):

S. 3529. A bill to provide for judicial review of the findings of the Secretary of Labor under section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, and sections 3303 and 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KNOWLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, RELATING TO HOUSING FOR CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces. The bill is designed to meet a housing need which appears to have become a deterrent to the intermediate continental ballistic missile program. During the past several months, it has become apparent that this vital program must be expedited if the United States is to maintain a position of leadership in the field.

This matter has been brought to my attention very forcefully for two reasons: First, there is located at Huntsville, Ala., the Redstone Arsenal, which is the research and development center for this program. Second, as chairman of the Housing Subcommittee, I have for some time now been in constant contact with the military and with the FHA and with citizens of Huntsville, Ala., all of whom have brought to my attention the need for additional housing for essential civilian workers at the development center.

While I have mentioned that the problem is particularly pressing in Huntsville, I should also point out that there are other military bases in the United States which are now, or soon will be, affected in exactly the same way, namely that civilian workers recruited for research projects canont find adequate housing. Other bases where the need is apparent are the Naval Ordnance Test Station, at China Lake, Calif., and the Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Fla.

The problem has been substantially that, although there has been a universally recognized need to provide housing for essential civilian workers at these research and development centers, our housing legislation has not provided FHA with a means to issue insurance for mortgages on the number of houses needed. The FHA has taken the position that sufficient mortgages could not be issued in areas adjacent to these military bases without violating the requirement of economic soundness required by title II of the National Housing Act.

Although we have tried for some time to find a way of solving this problem under existing legislation, we have not been successful. I am, therefore, taking this opportunity to introduce a bill which, if enacted, will amend title VIII of the National Housing Act in such a way as to provide this needed housing.

Briefly, this proposed legislation would permit the FHA to insure single-family housing mortgages under title VIII, which, as you know, is the title pertaining to military housing. The terms of these mortgages would be identical with mortgages insured under section 203, FHA's regular sales housing program; that is, the down payment, the amount of the insured mortgage, the maximum maturity, and the interest rate would be the same.

After securing the regular 203 terms for prospective mortgagors, the bill, if enacted, provides, by means of language similar to that contained in title VIII, that the Secretary of Defense shall certify to the FHA Commissioner the number of additional units needed to house essential civilian personnel at a particular military base. It is expected that the determination of need as certified by the Secretary of Defense will be based upon an exhaustive survey of the housing market and the needs of additional civilian workers by the Secretary in consultation with the FHA. If the FHA Commissioner does not concur in the needs as certified by the Secretary of Defense, he may require the Secretary to guarantee the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund from loss with respect to such housing. This is the same procedure which is presently followed under the new title VIII of the National Housing Act, which the administration presently requests be made permanent.

While there is presently available no accurate estimate of how many units may be needed under this program, I think it would be reasonable to estimate that for the coming year a limit of 10,000 units would meet all requirements. In order to maintain some control on this program, the Secretary of Defense is required to issue to the civilian worker a notice of eligibility which will secure for him the right to become a mortgagor under this section. It is expected that the Secretary of Defense will establish appropriate regulations defining essential civilian workers to be aided in this program.

I realize that this bill will probably not meet with 100 percent approval of either the FHA or the Department of Defense, but I feel we have made every possible effort to reconcile the different views of these agencies within the time we have had to work. While this bill does not represent the position taken by either the FHA or the military, it is a compromise between the positions of those two agencies, and in my opinion is the best compromise suggested to date. In my opinion it is imperative that something be done now to introduce into the legislative machinery the necessary ingredients to permit us to produce within a reasonable period a finished product which will permit us to initiate the production of needed housing units.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3515) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADDITIONAL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide certain civil penalties for corporation officials who violate the antitrust laws.

This bill is a result of a study I have had prepared as to the effectiveness of the present penalty provisions contained in the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act and the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act. The findings of this study are most interesting, and they point up very clearly the basic weakness in effective enforcement of these laws which are so vital to the continuation of our free-enterprise system.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that although criminal penalties are provided for in the antitrust laws, corporate officials who willfully violate these laws have little reason to fear any punitive action being taken against them.

A compilation, which I ask be included with my statement, lists all the cases which resulted in convictions of imprisonment from the year 1890 when the Sherman Act was enacted into law, until February 15, 1956. Excluding the early cases involving labor unions and the convictions of business racketeers who resorted to threats of and actual physical violence, this compilation reveals the amazing fact that in only one single case has anyone actually gone to jail for violating the antitrust laws. That case is United States against Las Vegas Merchant Plumbers Association, decided in 1951, in which 3 men were sentenced and served 6 months each for conspiring to fix prices for installation of plumbing equipment.

The monetary penalties contained in the antitrust laws have also proved ineffective. I have here, for inclusion with my remarks, a listing of all the cases covering the period from January 1955 to March 1, 1956, in which fines were imposed upon individuals for criminal violation of the antitrust laws. In that time, 101 persons were fined an amount totaling $130,650, an average of $1,294 per individual. Since the maximum fine was raised last July from $5,000 to $50,000, the average fine leveled against individuals has been $1,866. In only one case, United States against Cigarette Merchandisers Association, Inc., has anyone been fined more than $5,000.

The logical question to be asked is why, if there are criminal penalties contained in the antitrust laws, is the record of fines and imprisonment so barren? The answer lies, I believe, not so much in a reluctance on the part of the Department of Justice to prosecute, but rather in the reluctance of the courts and juries to enforce these penalties. In the minds of a good many people, criminal violation of the antitrust laws is not considered in the same light as outright stealing or similar acts. White collar crime, for some reason, is distinguished from less subtle and less ingenious forms of evil.

I am reminded, in this connection, of a short passage from Gulliver's Travels in which Jonathan Swift relates what the people of Lilliput thought of white-collar crime:

> They look upon fraud as a greater crime than theft, and, therefore, seldom fail to punish it with death; for they allege, that care and vigilance, with a very common understanding, may preserve a man's goods from thieves, but honesty has no fence against superior cunning; and since it is necessary that there should be a perpetual intercourse of buying and selling, and dealing upon credit, where fraud is permitted and connived at, or hath no law to punish it, the honest dealer is always undone, and the knave gets the advantage.

Because of the difficulty in obtaining enforcement of the criminal provisions of the antitrust laws, the bill which I am introducing provides civil penalties which do not brand violators as criminals nor involve the stigma that attends indictment and conviction.

Briefly, Mr. President, this bill provides that officers, directors or agents who have authorized acts which constitute criminal violation of the antitrust laws shall be liable to forfeit to the United States an amount equal to twice their compensation covering the period of time during which such violation occurred. This forfeiture shall be recovered in a civil action by the United States. This bill also provides that such officers, directors or agents may be enjoined, in the court's discretion, from rendering any service to their company or to a competing company, permanently or for a specific period of not less than 90 days, and from receiving any compensation during such period.

It is my opinion that the principle of direct civil liability of responsible corporate officials would do much to make the antitrust laws more effective. It is one thing to impose a fine on a giant corporation for violating these laws. It is quite a different matter when the penalties may be imposed upon an individual who is responsible for his corporation's policies and actions.

The record, as I have shown here, seems quite clear that there is little in the present antitrust laws to really deter those who are responsible for the actions of their companies. This bill, in my opinion, does provide an effective deterrence to those persons who are acting contrary to the welfare of our economic system. It is my fervent hope that this bill will be given careful consideration by the committee to which it is referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the compilations will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3516) to provide additional penalties for violation of the antitrust laws, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The compilations presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follows:

Convictions of imprisonment under Federal antitrust law, July 1890–Feb. 15, 1956

Title	Type of case	Proceeding	Number of defendants	Sentence imposed	Year sentence imposed
U. S. v. Debs	Labor union	Contempt	4	3 to 6 months	1894
U. S. v. American Naval Stores Co	Business racketeering	Sherman Act [1]	2	3 months	1909
U. S. v. Haines	Labor union	do	5	4 hours	1912
U. S. v. Patterson	Business racketeering	do	27	24 defendants, 1 year; 3 defendants, 9 months.	1913
U. S. v. Boyle	Labor union	do	2	1 year	1917
U. S. v. Rintelen	War spies	do	3	do	1917
U. S. v. Bopp	do	do	5	do	1917
U. S. v. Alexander & Reid Co	Business racketeering	do	4	1 defendant, 2 months; 3 defendants, 4 months.	1921
U. S. v. O'Brien	Labor union	do	5	4 defendants, 8 months; 1 defendant, 30 days.	1922
U. S. v. Powell	do	do	1	10 days	1922
U. S. v. Trenton Potteries Co	Business	do	8	7 defendants, 6 months; 1 defendant, 10 months [2]	1923
U. S. v. Williams	Labor union	do	5	10 months	1923
U. S. v. Reilly	do	do	4	1 year	1924
U. S. v. Krewoski	do	do	1	6 months	1926
U. S. v. Baumgartner	Business racketeering	do	6	3 to 9 months	1929
U. S. v. Greater N. Y. Live Poultry Chamber of Commerce	do	do	20	10 days to 4 months	1929
U. S. v. Mercer	do	do	1	3 months	1931
U. S. v. Weiner	do	Contempt	5	3 months to 3 years	1934
U. S. v. Fish Credit Assn., Inc.	do	Sherman Act	11	6 months to 2 years	1935
U. S. v. Union Pacific Produce Co	do	do	3	2 defendants, 6 months; 1 defendant, 1 year.	1936
U. S. v. Hiram W. Evans, et al	Asphalt	do	1	1 year on each of 2 counts [1]	1942
U. S. v. Beatrice Creamery	Labor union	do	8	Sentenced to 6 months	1942
U. S. v. Produce Exchange of Los Angeles	Business racketeering	do	13	1 year [2]	1942
U. S. v. Evaporated Milk Assn	do	do	2	Sentenced to 1 year [2]	1943
U. S. v. Produce Exchange of Los Angeles	do	do	8	do	1943
U. S. v. Washington Culvert & Pipe	do	do	2	Sentenced to 4 months [2]	1946
U. S. v. Harry F. Stern	Fish	Sherman Act, sec. 1	2	6 months each [3]	1950
U. S. v. Gamewell Co., et al	Fire-alarm equipment	Contempt	2	1 year 1 day each [3]	1951
U. S. v. Las Vegas Merchant Plumbers Assn	Plumbing	Sherman Act, sec. 1	3	6 months each [4]	1951, 1954
U. S. v. Northern Calif. Jt. Council of Int'l Fishermen Allied Workers of America, et al.	Fish	do	7	1 year each [5]	1951
U. S. v. Louisiana Fruit & Vegetable Producers Union, Local 312, et al.	Food: strawberries, cucumbers, beans, peppers.	do	8	6 to 9 months [5]	1953
U. S. v. Gulf Coast Shrimpers and Oystermans Assn., et al	Fish	do	3	9 months [6]	
U. S. v. Cigarette Merchandisers Assn., Inc., et al	Vending machines	do	2	1 defendant, 6 months; [7] 1 defendant, 3 months. [8]	1955

[1] Reversed.
[2] Sentences suspended.
[3] Sentence suspended, 2 years' probation.
[4] 2 employers; 1 was union business agent.
[5] Sentence suspended, 1 year's probation.
[6] Presently on appeal.
[7] Sentence suspended, 6 months' probation.
[8] Sentence suspended, 3 months' probation.

Fines imposed against individuals for criminal violations of the antitrust laws, January 1955 to Mar. 1, 1956

Title	Offense	Number of defendants	Amount of fine	Date imposed
U. S. v. Wm. D. Eldridge, et al	Conspiracy to restrain and monopolize sale of scallops	1	$1,000	Jan. 18, 1955
		1	500	
		1	250	
U. S. v. Akin-Denison Co., et al	Conspiracy to fix price of coal	1	2,500	Mar. 7, 1955
		1	1,000	
		2	[1] 500	
U. S. v. Detroit Sheet Metal and Roofing Contractors Assn., Inc., et al	Conspiracy to restrain trade in the sale of materials for and the installation of built-up roofing.	3	[1] 3,000	Do.
		1	1,500	
		1	1,000	
		1	750	
		13	[1] 500	
U. S. v. Walton Hauling & Warehouse Corp., et al	Conspiracy to restrain and monopolize transporting theatrical equipment and scenery.	4	[1] 500	Apr. 27, 1955
U. S. v. Atlantic Fishermen's Union, et al	Conspiracy to restrain and monopolize marketing and catch of fish and scallops.	1	300	May 9, 1955
U. S. v. Toledo Milk Distributors' Assn., et al	Price fixing of dairy products	5	[1] 1,000	May 19, 1955
U. S. v. Lawrence Fuel Oil Institute, Inc., et al	Price fixing of fuel oil	12	[1] 100	June 21, 1955; Sept. 13, 1955
U. S. v. J. F. Bambas & Co., Inc., et al	Conspiracy to fix price of cigarettes	2	[1] 150	Aug. 10, 1955
U. S. v. The Kansas City Star Co., et al	Attempt to monopolize dissemination of news and advertising	1	2,500	Aug. 5, 1955
U. S. v. Lowell Fuel Oil Dealer Associates, Inc., et al	Price fixing of fuel oil	7	[1] 100	July 1, 1955; Oct. 20, 1955
U. S. v. Cigarette Merchandisers Assn., Inc., et al	Conspiracy to eliminate competition among cigarette vending machine operators.	2	[1] 10,000	Nov. 30, 1955
		2	[1] 2,500	Dec. 13, 1955
		3	[1] 1,500	
		4	[1] 1,500	
U. S. v. Barker's Sons Co., et al	Conspiracy to eliminate competition in sale and distribution of office supplies.	3	[1] 1,000	Dec. 7, 1955
		3	[1] 750	
		1	300	
		1	3,000	
U. S. v. National Electrical Contractors Assn., New Jersey Chapter, Inc., et al.	Conspiracy to eliminate competition in sale and installation of electrical equipment.	3	[1] 1,500	
		4	[1] 1,000	Jan. 20, 1956
		1	500	
		1	300	
U. S. v. Memphis Retail Package Stores Assn., Inc., et al	Conspiracy to fix prices of alcoholic beverages	6	[1] 3,000	
		3	[1] 2,000	Jan. 30, 1956
		3	[1] 1,000	
U. S. v. National Malleable & Steel Casting Co., et al	Conspiracy to eliminate competition in sale of railroad coupler parts	3	[1] 5,000	Feb. 17, 1956

[1] Each.

REORGANIZATION OF SAFETY FUNCTIONS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I renew my request that I be allowed an additional 15 minutes in order to make a statement on a bill I am about to introduce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, after spending many months studying the statistics on Federal work injuries computed by the Bureau of Employees Compensation, and after consulting with Government officials, representatives of Government employees unions, and various safety engineers, I am convinced that our present safety program against occupational accidents in the Federal establishments is woefully inadequate.

To date, the Government's performance in this field is shockingly bad. Yet the situation has existed for a long time and will continue, until practical means are adopted to correct this preventable state of affairs. Every year, accidents to Government employees are causing needless human suffering and mental anguish, not only to our Government workers, but to their friends and families, including innocent children.

Efforts which have already been made to reduce accidents in most Government agencies, Mr. President, have been largely ineffectual. They have failed to arrest a continuing trend of accident frequency and costs which are consistently far out of line with the nationwide accident experience of those industries which report to the National Safety Council.

The monetary waste runs into millions of dollars annually, and in human terms, this huge sum of money represents nothing more than the heartaches and hardships placed on the survivors or on those who are disabled for life.

I am proposing today a practical measure for the elimination of this tragic human and economic waste in the field of Federal accident prevention. This proposal will help reduce to a minimum the Government's accident frequency and severity rates. Such a reduction would mean the saving of millions of dollars which today are dispensed annually by the Government in investigations, compensation, sick leave pay, and millions of man-days in lost production time. Under the circumstances, legislation is essential if we are to improve the Government's safety performance.

Mr. President, I have sought bipartisan support for this legislation, because I am sure there are as many Republicans being disabled as there are Democrats. I want to acknowledge the pioneering work done by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] in previous sessions of Congress. At the same time, I believe that the proposal I offer today is a distinct improvement over its predecessors in the safety field. I am asking my good Republican friends to join in cosponsoring this humanitarian piece of legislation. To allow further time for such cosponsorship, Mr. President, I request that this bill be held at the desk until Wednesday of next week, March 28.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Why, Mr. President, is new legislation necessary? Let us look at the record.

President Eisenhower sent a letter to the heads of all departments and independent agencies on October 11, 1954, which reads in part, as follows:

> I am very much concerned with the problem of injuries to Federal workers. The suffering and the wastage of both human and financial resources caused by accidents in the Government service constitute an urgent challenge. This administration is determined to do everything possible to reduce the rate of such accidents.
>
> While some agencies and departments have shown improvement in their accident record, the President's letter continues, "a greater effort in this respect is essential to efficient operation. I am, therefore, requesting the head of each Government department and agency to review the accident experiences and the safety program of his organization and to take all necessary steps to reduce accidents.

What response did the President receive from the Department heads whom he urged to take all necessary steps to reduce accidents? The answer has been an overall reduction in frequency of 1.3, which is almost nil, since consideration must be given to the fact that there were approximately 100,000 fewer employees in 1954, the last reported year, than in 1953. I realize the frequency rate is figured on the number of disabling injuries and man-hours worked, but I also realize that it was the laborer, the carpenter, the machinist, the fellow who works with his hands and who is most likely to have accidents who was the one caught in the reduction, not those at staff level who are less likely to be injured on the job.

Let me be specific. I ask the Postmaster General why he tolerates a frequency rate of 61.4 in the vehicle service of his Department, a figure which is 9 times higher than the average frequency rate of all Government.

I ask the Acting Secretary of the Interior to study the high frequency rates in his various services, like the Office of

Territories, 37.8; National Park Service, 23.7; Fish and Wildlife, 14.9; and Bureau of Reclamation, 13.9. I ask the Acting Secretary to compare these figures with those of private industry or with the navy yards. After this study, I sincerely hope he will take the necessary steps to improve this deplorable safety performance of his Department during his predecessor's tenure.

I am also very much concerned with the apathy existing in the numerous veterans' hospitals scattered throughout the United States from Maine to California.

Some of our bedridden veterans are housed in non-fire-resistive buildings. Yet, there is absolutely no explanation for this deplorable condition as Public Law 868, 71st Congress of March 4, 1931, gives the officials of the Veterans' Administration the necessary powers to deal with non-fire-resistive buildings. At the present time, approximately 25 percent of the veterans' hospitals are inadequately protected. It seems to me that the officials who have been delegated the responsibility of administrating in the interests of the safety of our veterans have had more than ample time to initiate the necessary action. One hundred percent of all veterans' hospitals should be adequately protected against fire hazards, either by sprinkler systems or by replacing the old buildings with fire resistive structures.

I ask the VA Administrator why he has only six safety and fire prevention engineers in the field. Their duties are vastly important. It is their responsibility to make hospital inspections, to protect the lives of our veteran patients, to protect the thousands of visitors who annually visit the hospitals, and to protect the life and limb of the 179,632 Veterans' Administration workers. At the current ratio, there is only one safety engineer for every 29,938 Veterans' Administration workers. I ask the VA Administrator to study the records of hospital inspection made by the field safety engineers. I believe he will find that the best record achieved by the engineers is 79 percent of hospitals inspected in a period of 1 year in that particular area. I believe that the Administrator will also find that in some areas only 65 percent of our veterans' hospitals are given an annual safety and fire inspection.

I recommend to the Administrator that the field safety and fire prevention engineer force be at least tripled in number so that adequate protection may be given to our veterans' hospitals, to the visitors, and to the Government employees. Work injuries sustained during calendar year 1954 in the Veterans' Administration totaled 5,992 injuries, 3,993 disabilities, and 6 fatalities. The total direct and indirect cost exclusive of fire losses or tort claims was in excess of $11 million. After looking at the record, I believe that anyone will agree that this agency can well afford to employ more accident prevention specialists.

The ratio of accident prevention personnel to number of employees will vary according to the nature of the operations and potential hazards. For example, during the war years the United States Maritime Commission recommended one full-time man in any shipyard with 2,500 employees, with an additional inspector for each 1,500 additional employees. Of course, many of the employees in the Veterans' Administration are office workers, but this agency does employ craftsmen too, such as plumbers, painters, carpenters, and electricians, whose daily operations are considered hazardous. Moreover, nurses, internes, and attendants are exposed to industrial diseases such as tuberculosis, and can contract this disease and other diseases in the course of their employment.

Consideration also must be given to the fact that many of the patients in veterans' hospitals are bedridden and disabled. Some are mental patients, and in case of an unexpected catastrophe, unnecessary tragedy could result.

Therefore, I sincerely hope that the VA Administrator will pay heed to my recommendations for it is better to be safe than sorry.

These statistics do prove, however, that some Republican department heads have paid no more heed to President Eisenhower's letter in 1954 than some Democratic department heads did to President Truman's Executive order in 1950. These statistics prove to me that legislation must be passed in order to promote safety in Government.

Agreement is general that waste should be eliminated and expenditures reduced in Government operations, but the development of concrete plans to accomplish these objectives almost always brings forth protests. These protests usually come from a highly articulate category of people, who claim that helpful action cannot be taken without having crippling effects on Government operations, or that it will weaken our defense effort, or that customary procedures will be upset—arguments which are often merely rationalizations justifying the vested bureaucratic positions of the opponents of change.

FEDERAL OCCUPATIONAL ACCIDENT COST FROM 1950–54

According to the Bureau of Employees Compensation records, 427,129 civilian Federal employees were injured in the 5-year period from January 1, 1950, to December 30, 1954. During this period, 199,997 employees were disabled for work, fatal accidents claimed the lives of 1,115 workers with 2,676 dependents, and over 15 million days were lost. The direct and indirect costs for this period were more than $622 million for occupation accidents alone.

(a) Production time lost due to disabling injuries for this period represented a year's loss of the services of nearly 50,000 workers from whom the taxpayers or Government received no production benefits.

(b) Since over 87 million production man-hours were lost, and the average Government hourly rate for this period was $1.83, this monetary waste amounted to more than $159 million.

Reliable cost information is an essential basis for decisions concerning efficiency and profit. This principle applies to accident prevention as it does to other business activities. When figuring the cost of accidents, the additional and so-called "indirect," "incidental," or "hidden cost" must be taken into consideration. This cost has been statistically established through experience to range from 4 to 5 times the direct cost, a ratio accepted by such widely recognized authorities on this subject as the National Safety Council, most insurance companies, and by the Department of the Air Force.

Now, Mr. President, let us look at the frequency record and make a comparison of injury rates in Government and private industry. I fully appreciate the fact that those who have the responsibility of preventing injuries to Government workers do not like to be compared with industries that have organized safety programs. They want to be compared with the unorganized small tool and die shops, the garages or the corner grocery—with those who have no elaborate safety program, no fancy cost-accounting system, and not even a part-time safety engineer. These same Government officials have been fooling the taxpayers for years, have led the people to believe that everything was fine in Government, and have implied that the Government safety record was better than that of industry. These are the same individuals who have had to account to no one in regard to their poor records. I hope that the usual excuses and alibis will no longer be used, for the human toll of our Government workers can no longer be shrugged off as being unavoidable.

Here is the record:

COMPARISON OF GOVERNMENT INJURY RATES WITH PRIVATE INDUSTRY

The Government injury rates have been compiled by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, United States Department of Labor. Private industry rates have been compiled by the National Safety Council and United States Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Industry	National Safety Council rate	Bureau of Labor Statistics rate	Government Department	Rate
Telephone	1.22	1.0	Navy	3.7
Cement	3.81	4.9	Commerce	6.6
Steel	3.90	5.8	Department of the Army	6.8
Automobile	3.39	5.8	Air Force	6.2
Glass	6.96	11.0	Agriculture	9.6
Aircraft	3.58	4.8	Post Office	13.9
Chemical	4.53	9.1	General Services Administration	14.1
Rubber	4.61	8.6	Interior	14.4
Textiles	5.51	8.7	District of Columbia	18.4
Average	4.17	6.6		10.3

The above rates are for the year 1953, the latest year for which the Bureau of Labor Statistics rates are available. The Departments listed represent 79.7 percent of the Government employees. Differences exist in the two sets of industrial rates because each represent the experience of a different group. The National Safety Council rates are based principally on the experience of its members only. Bureau of Labor Statistics rates are based on industry generally.

The above table shows that Federal rates are higher than those of many industries, including industries with operations inherently more hazardous than those of Government. The records of selected companies with excellent accident prevention programs indicate that Federal injury rates can be reduced by as much as 75 percent. According to the Civil Service Commission, the majority of employees in the Government service are office workers, certainly not a hazardous occupation.

Some Government departments, particularly the Navy Department, Atomic Energy Commission, and Government Printing Office have achieved excellent safety records. Special praise must be given to the naval shipyards because their work is considered in the "high risk" category, and year after year they have one of the lowest rates in Government. Their record proves that the job can be done by all Government agencies.

COMPARISON OF REDUCTION IN RATES

(a) The Federal Government's accident frequency rate for 1944–1954 period was reduced 30 percent.

(b) Private industry reduced its accident frequency rate 50.1 percent for the same period.

(c) The Federal Government's accident frequency rate for the 1950–54 period was reduced 10.5 percent.

(d) Private industry reduced its accident frequency rate 22.4 percent for the same period.

WILLIAMS REPORT

Mr. President, 10 years ago, in 1946, Mr. Sidney J. Williams, the assistant to the president of the National Safety Council and one of the foremost authorities in the field of accident prevention, made a survey of the Federal safety programs. The principal findings of his report were as follows:

First. The annual direct and indirect accident cost to the Federal Government was estimated at $40 million.

Second. The experience of a few Federal agencies and of private industry clearly indicated that many substantial reductions in these costs could be effected.

Third. Safety organization in the Federal agencies was only partially complete and effective.

Let us analyze Mr. Williams' report 10 long years after it was submitted to the Chairman of the Federal Interdepartmental Safety Council, on March 19, 1946.

First. Today the estimated annual direct and indirect accident cost to the Federal Government is over $128 million, an increase of $88 millions over 1946. Of course, injury costs have risen since 1946, partly because of increased benefits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act. But the fact remains that there has been more money paid out in compensation cases in the past 6 years than there has been for the past 33 years. What has been done about it? I think Mr. Ned H. Dearborn, president of the National Safety Council, Chicago, Ill., gave the answer when he told a meeting of the Federal Safety Council in Washington in February 1952, that "the administrators of agencies with high accident records stand convicted of both inhumanity and inefficiency, so long as they fail to make their subordinate administrators conscious of the necessity and opportunity to stop accidents in their departments." He also charged that the department heads employing thousands of workers, had an attitude toward safety as callous or unthinking as that of the most backward industrial management two generations ago.

Second. In regard to Mr. Williams' second recommendation, I believe the comparison I made of Government injury rates with private industry and the comparison of reduction in rates indicate again that there is an appalling lag in improving the accident record in Government. To substantiate this statement further, I quote in part the remarks of Mr. Paul E. Gurske, Director of the Bureau of Labor Standards, and Chairman of the Federal Safety Council. During the last Congress—1954—when he appeared before an appropriations subcommittee, he said:

> We have been urging private industry to continue to do a better job and prevent accidents, but the Federal Government has done very little, although a few departments are doing an outstanding job.

No man in government is in a better position to apprase the effectiveness of current government safety programs than is Mr. Gurske, and I am willing to take his word that the Government "has done very little."

Third. Mr. Williams' third recommendation of 9 years ago was based on his finding that "safety organization in the Federal agencies is only partially complete and effective." The same condition exists now as it did then. The 1953 annual report of the Federal Safety Council, page 3, paragraph 3, says: "As a result of surveys and investigations it was determined that active safety organizations had not been established in all Federal agencies."

Why? Was this condition brought to the attention of the Secretary of Labor by members of the Federal Safety Council? It is the current duty of the Council to advise the Secretary of Labor with respect to the development and maintenance of adequate and effective safety organizations and programs in the Federal departments and agencies. If this condition was reported to the Secretary what did he do about it? He certainly has the necessary power to take action under President Truman's Executive Order 10194, establishing the Federal Safety Council. The Executive order says in part:

> The heads of Government departments and agencies are directed to develop, support, and foster organized safety promotion.

Mr. Williams' recommendations have been ignored and they will continue to be ignored, unless we pass legislation that will have teeth in it.

RESPONSIBILITY OF TOP MANAGEMENT

The fact that accidents constitute a needless waste is the driving force behind the organized safety movement in private industry. Accidents waste men, materials, and money. They damage or ruin machinery and equipment. They interfere with production. They cripple or disable valuable men. These are some of the reasons why every well-managed business makes accident prevention an integral part of its operations.

Top level management in private industry watches accident costs as it does all costs. The comptroller reports to top management the cost in dollars and cents covered by failure to have an adequate safety program. Private industry holds operating executives responsible for preventable costs and gives suitable credit for good work in reducing them. This approach is generally accepted as essential to first-rate safety performance.

Likewise top management in Government must take an active and interested part in the development and operation of the safety program. An executive's support can be secured only when he is convinced of the need of such a program. Conviction will come to him only with full understanding of what his accident losses really are, how they affect efficiency, and what safety means in terms of production and personnel relationships.

If the top executive does not see the reasons for a sound accident-prevention program, no one else is likely to see them. The grapevine quickly carries to every employee the idea that only lip service to the safety program is required, or, on the contrary, that accidents must be stopped and that everyone must and is expected to do his part.

WHAT IS THE PRESENT SAFETY ORGANIZATION IN GOVERNMENT?

In 1950 the Federal Safety Council was established by Executive Order 10194. It is composed of one representative and alternate from each of the Federal Government departments and agencies This Council has no full-time director, no technical staff beyond one safety engineer, and only one clerk paid by the Department of Labor.

The Council is an advisory body to the Secretary of Labor, and meets 3 or 4 times a year. I do not know how much advice the Council has given the present and former Secretaries of Labor regarding the maintenance of adequate and effective safety organization. But I do say that 1 of 2 things were wrong: either the Council gave the advice to the Secretaries and they did not pursue the recommendations, or the Council gave no advice to them. Everyone was just rolling along hoping no one would expose this shocking condition. Yet the Council cannot possibly exist on a shoestring and still serve as a clearinghouse on safety problems for 2½ million people. We need a full-time staff of competent safety engineers, headed by a qualified director. The present Council is trying to do business on a hit-or-miss basis by appointing committees to do its work.

For example, it took one committee almost 3 years to write a manual on construction.

Mr. President, the bill I introduce today is designed to promote a realistic safety educational program and a safety inspection procedure designed to reduce the human suffering and financial losses incurred as a result of industrial accidents in the Federal service. The bill would encourage broad employee participation in safety educational programs, and encourage the development of safety-conscious employees.

Section 2 of the bill establishes a separate division in the Department of Labor, to be known as the Federal Safety Division. This Division would be headed by a Director whose salary would be established at the pay level of GS–16, and whose selection would be made from a civil-service register established as a result of a competitive-examination process which would insure the selection of the most qualified individual.

This selection method would provide the Safety Division with a leader who would possess the proper degree of experience and background in industrial safety and education. It would instill the confidence and respect of all agencies in the importance of the Safety Division's objectives and aims. Hence it would also tend to encourage a high degree of cooperation from all Federal agencies.

The bill further authorizes the Director to appoint, subject to civil-service laws and rules, the necessary qualified personnel to carry out the functions and responsibilities of the Safety Division. A minimum of 10 qualified safety engineers would be included. The appointment, selection, classification, and promotion of employees in the Safety Division would be based upon merit and efficiency without any political test or qualification required or given consideration.

The bill lists the responsibilities and functions of the Director of the Federal Safety Division, as follows:

First, to collect and analyze data regarding safety standards and programs presently in operation in the Federal agencies;

Second, to develop and promulgate new minimum standards for the conducting of safety educational programs by the Federal agencies;

Third, to develop and establish the minimum safe working standards to be maintained by the Federal agencies;

Fourth, to provide a clearing-house function in the Division which will gather and make available to the Federal agencies appropriate assistance on all matters relating to employee safety;

Fifth, to promote uniformity by assisting and cooperating with the related health and fire-prevention activities presently pursued by other Federal agencies;

Sixth, to develop programs designed to reduce the number of tort claims against the Federal Government resulting from injuries to private persons and property attributable directly or indirectly to officers and employees of the Federal Government;

Seventh, to inspect periodically the premises and interrogate the personnel of each of the Federal agencies to ascertain if the minimum standards developed and established pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) above are being maintained by such Federal agencies;

Eighth, to prepare for the issuance annually to the Congress by the Secretary of Labor, a report showing the progress made in the field of accident prevention in the Federal agencies through the reduction of the number of accidents and injuries among the officers and employees of such agencies by the elimination of work hazards and health risks; and

Ninth, to recommend to the Secretary of Labor for transmittal to the Bureau of the Budget the amount which should be allocated in the budget of each Federal agency for its use in carrying out the safety educational programs approved by the Federal Safety Division, such amount to be based on the need of each such agency for such a program. This process would insure that the funds would be available—consistent with an expert evaluation of each agency's needs—to finance realistic and adequate safety educational programs.

The bill proposes to establish a noncompensable Federal Safety Advisory Committee in the Department of Labor. The members of said committee will be designated by the Secretary of Labor upon receipt of nominations from each Federal agency, the Public Health Service, and the National and International unions having Federal employee membership.

The functions of the committee would be to advise the Director of the Federal Safety Division in respect to the development of effective safety educational programs and safety standards. The Committee would in effect be an excellent sounding board for the development of new and improved standards and ideas. Employee union participation would enhance the acceptance of safety education and working standards among Federal employees.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Labor to establish Federal Field Safety Advisory Committees, in those geographical areas which are supervised by regional directors. Such committees would give assistance to the field establishments of the Federal agencies in organizing accident prevention programs and strengthening existing programs aimed at reducing the frequency, severity, and cost of accidents in their respective areas of operation. Such committees would implement in the field, the policies of the Federal Safety Division.

The bill also sets forth the method by which the Bureau of Employees' Compensation of the Department of Labor shall arrive at their annual budget estimates for appropriations to the Federal Employees' Compensation Fund. This has been deemed necessary because the Bureau of Employees' Compensation advises that there is no statutory requirement placed upon the Bureau with reference to the method by which the Bureau must arrive at estimates for budgetary requirements for funding of the Employees' Compensation Fund. The Director of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation would henceforth establish the annual budget estimates on the basis of the Federal agency's premium cost of the preceding fiscal year for injuries sustained by the employees of the Federal Government. All appropriations deposited in the Federal Employees' Compensation Fund would remain there until expended for the payment of benefits consistent with the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended.

The special jurisdictional position of the District of Columbia has led to the conclusion that participation of the employees of the District of Columbia, while desirable and expected, should be on an optional basis. This result would be achieved by section 2 (h) which would allow the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to elect to participate in the program as far as they deem feasible for Disrtict of Columbia employees.

Section 3 of the bill would amend section 24 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act by inserting a new subsection, the purpose of which is to impose sanctions for concealing any material fact in relation to injury or death, for making false statements or representations, for using false writings or entries in relation to injury situations, or for inducing or compelling a person to forego the filing of a claim or other paper required to be filed under the act.

In the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, it has been alleged over the years that some individuals have discouraged employees and dependents from filing claims in bona fide injury and death situations, merely to make a showing of an apparently good—though fictitious—safety record. This proposed action is intended to discourage any such actions and to impose sanctions where the forbidden acts are accomplished or attempted.

Section 4 would repeal section 33 (c) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act and would insert in its place the above provisions for the establishment of the Federal Safety Division.

Section 5 would authorize to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

I realize that some of the features of this legislation will be unpopular in some quarters. But my interest is in the welfare of the Federal workers and their families and the taxpayers of our country who are paying very dearly for these needless accidents occurring in the Federal establishments. I have pledged myself to do everything humanly possible to reduce them and I know my colleagues in the Senate and House will do likewise.

Probably one controversial feature of the bill is the one giving the necessary powers to the Director or his designated representatives to investigate and inspect buildings and question employees. Some will say this is infringing on the rights of the department or agency.

Yet, at the present time, the Civil Service Commission inspects agency personnel programs to see that they operate in accordance with requirements of law and

with the Commission's standards. Similarly, General Accounting Office personnel conduct investigations relating to the disbursement and appropriation of public grants, and prescribe and evaluate accounting systems.

Why should not inspections be made of Federal buildings for the purpose of saving life and property damage? Likewise, the Federal Government imposes on private industry certain laws and regulations. For example:

The Interstate Commerce Commission renders assistance in the enforcement of regulations affecting transportation, and surveys are conducted of motor-carrier operating practices to reduce accidents and to promote safety on the public highways.

The Food and Drug Administration enforces laws designed to protect consumers against adulterated and misbranded foods and drugs. Violations are reported to the Department of Justice.

The Bureau of Mines investigates accidents and rescue-work operations. The Bureau's activities are designed to reduce working hazards, safeguard the health of workers, and promote efficiency in the mining industries. Action is taken to require compliance with mandatory provisions.

Why should we not give our Government worker just as good protection as the Government provides for non-Government workers?

CONCLUSION

No attempt has been made, Mr. President, to point out the many inadequacies in the present safety programs of the relatively few Federal departments and agencies which do have them, nor the many cases where no safety program whatever exists—nor the even greater number of cases where complete indifference to these problems is obviously shown by the record, even where programs are in existence.

It is obvious that the time has come to take stock. This proposed legislation will provide the framework for a successful safety venture that will benefit thousands of Government workers and also save millions of dollars to the taxpayers of our country.

Since the task is a formidable one, marking time is not enough. The much-worn phrase, "The Federal Government should lead, not lag, in the important field of employees' safety," can become a reality by adopting the proposed legislation I have outlined.

Industry generally has shown us an embarrassing example. For industry, accident prevention is good business. Industry has found that it costs less to prevent accidents, than it does to have them.

It is high time that we, who make the laws of the land, see to it that our Government follows suit.

It is high time that we had a unified approach to the safety problem, and an agency with adequate funds, adequate personnel, and adequate powers of inspection to plan a coordinated attack on the Government's appalling accident rate.

It is my great hope that hearings will be held soon and legislation passed at this session of Congress, because I believe that this bill can be the means of bringing about a real improvement in the safety record of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3517) to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

REORGANIZATION

SECTION 1. In order to carry out the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government that the Department of Labor should be enlarged to include all of the functions which properly belong to it, and in order to provide a firmer legislative basis for the carrying on of a more complete and efficient safety program for the Federal Government, the functions of the Federal Safety Council, established pursuant to Executive Order No. 10194, dated December 20, 1950, are hereby transferred to the Federal Safety Division of the Department of Labor established pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of this act.

FEDERAL SAFETY DIVISION

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby created in the Department of Labor a Federal Safety Division which, in addition to carrying out the functions transferred to it pursuant to section 1 hereof, shall be responsible for the direction and coordination of all safety educational programs and accident, injury, and related loss-prevention procedures conducted by the Federal agencies in furtherance of the purposes of section 33 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. Such agencies shall keep such records of injuries and accidents to persons covered by such act, whether or not resulting in loss of time or the payment or furnishing of benefits, and make such statistical or other reports and upon such forms as the Secretary of Labor may by regulation prescribe.

(b) The Federal Safety Division shall be under the direction of a Director of Federal Safety (hereafter referred to in this act as the "Director"), who shall be appointed by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the civil service laws and rules, and who shall receive compensation at the rate established for grade 16 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) The Director shall, subject to the civil service laws and rules, appoint not less than 10 qualified safety engineers, technically experienced in the field of accident prevention, regional directors where appropriate, and such other employees as he deems necessary to carry out the functions and duties of his office under this act and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. In the appointment, selection, classification, and promotion of officers and employees of the Federal Safety Division, no political test or qualifications shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of qualifications, merit, and efficiency under the rules of the Civil Service Commission.

(d) It shall be the duty of the Director—

(1) to collect and analyze data regarding safety standards and programs presently in operation in the Federal agencies;

(2) to develop and promulgate new minimum standards for the conducting of safety educational programs by the Federal agencies;

(3) to develop and establish the minimum safe working standards to be maintained by the Federal agencies;

(4) to provide a clearinghouse function in the Division which will gather and make available to the Federal agencies appropriate assistance on all matters relating to employee safety;

(5) to promote uniformity by assisting and cooperating with the related health and fire-prevention activities presently pursued by other Federal agencies;

(6) to develop programs designed to reduce the number of tort claims against the Federal Government resulting from injuries to private persons and property attributable directly or indirectly to officers and employees of the Federal Government;

(7) to inspect periodically the premises and interrogate the personnel of each of the Federal agencies to ascertain if the minimum standards developed and established pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) hereof are being maintained by such Federal agencies;

(8) to prepare for the issuance annually to the Congress by the Secretary of Labor, a report showing the progress made in the field of accident prevention in the Federal agencies through the reduction of the number of accidents and injuries among the officers and employees of such agencies by the elimination of work hazards and health risks;

(9) to recommend to the Secretary of Labor for transmittal to the Bureau of the Budget the amount which should be allocated in the budget of each Federal agency for its use in carrying out the safety educational programs approved by the Federal Safety Division, such amount to be based on the need of each such agency for such a program.

(e) The Director of Federal Safety is hereby authorized to enter and to authorize the entry of appropriate officers of his Division, in order to inspect such places and such records, question employees, and investigate such facts, conditions, practices or matters as he may deem necessary to carry out his duties pursuant to this act.

(f) (1) There is hereby established in the Department of Labor a Federal Safety Advisory Committee (hereinafter referred to in this subsection as the "Committee") to be composed of such qualified representatives of the Federal agencies, and such qualified representatives from national or international Federal Government employee unions and the Public Health Service as shall be appointed from time to time by the Secretary of Labor. The Committee shall be composed of 27 members of which no fewer than 9 members shall be appointed from national

and international Federal Government employee unions. The length of tenure of Committee members shall be determined by the Secretary of Labor. The heads of the Federal agencies shall nominate the representative and alternate of their respective agencies and the heads of national or international unions having Federal employee members shall nominate the union representatives and alternates. The members of the Committee shall serve as such without additional compensation.

(2) It shall be the duty of the Committee to advise the Director of the Federal Safety Division with respect to—

(A) the development and coordination of effective safety educational programs and minimum safety standards in the Federal agencies, and

(B) the carrying out of his duties pursuant to the authority contained in this act.

(3) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to establish, in those geographical areas which are supervised by regional directors, Federal field safety advisory committees which shall give assistance to the field establishment of the Federal agencies in organizing accident prevention programs and strengthening existing programs aimed at reducing the frequency, severity, and cost of accidents in their respective areas of operation. Such committees shall implement in the field, the policies established by the Federal Safety Division of the Department of Labor.

(g) The Bureau of Employees' Compensation of the Department of Labor shall, prior to August 15 of each year, furnish the Secretary of Labor for use in the preparation of the Department's annual budget estimates, the latest statistics showing the pure premium cost for past work injuries sustained by employees of the several Federal agencies and its bureaus, based upon the frequency, severity, and direct incurred loss experience of each agency and its bureaus under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. The Department of Labor shall include in its annual budget estimates a request for an appropriation in an amount equal to such premium cost and shall, as soon as practicable after the beginning of each fiscal year, deposit in the Federal Employees' Compensation Fund of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation such sums as may have been appropriated pursuant to such request, for the payment of benefits from such fund on account of the employees of the Federal agencies. Any sums so deposited shall remain available in such fund until expended.

(h) As used in this act (1) the term "Federal agencies" includes (A) the Executive Departments, (B) the Departments of the Army, Navy, and the Air Force, and (C) the independent establishments and agencies in the executive branch, including Government corporations and instrumentalities of the United States wholly owned by the United States: *Provided* that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may elect to participate in this program to the extent and degree that they deem feasible the participation herein of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; and (2) the term "incurred loss" means the amount of loss, paid and outstanding, for which the Federal employees compensation fund of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation has become liable during the preceding fiscal year.

(i) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget is authorized to establish the amount of funds to be allocated in the annual budget of each Federal agency for the purpose of carrying out its safety educational programs and the minimizing of hazardous work practices and conditions. Such amount shall not be less than the equivalent of 2½ percent of the total amount requested by any such agency in its annual operating budget.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 24 OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT

SEC. 3. Section 24 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately preceding the first sentence thereof, and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States knowingly and wilfully falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device, a material fact in relation to the injury or death of a person compensable under the provisions of this act or any extension or application thereof, or makes any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry, in relation to such an injury or death, or induces or compels any persons to forego the filing of any claim for compensation or other benefits provided under this act or any extension or application thereof, or retains any notice, report, claim, or paper which is required to be filed under this act or any extension or application thereof, or regulations promulgated thereunder, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both."

REPEALER

SEC. 4. Section 33 (c) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act is hereby repealed.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZED

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing Federal employment by States. The table gives the actual census count made by the Civil Service Commission of Federal employees in the respective States.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal employment by States

Alabama	52,100
Arizona	15,300
Colorado	32,600
California	275,000
Connecticut	12,200
Delaware	3,100
Florida	41,500
Georgia	55,700
Illinois	101,500
Idaho	5,800
Indiana	34,700
Iowa	16,200
Kansas	22,700
Kentucky	30,600
Louisiana	23,300
Maine	14,700
Maryland, excluding metropolitan Washington	46,900
Massachusetts	61,100
Michigan	38,800
Minnesota	24,400
Mississippi	17,200
Missouri	48,600
Montana	7,300
Nebraska	18,900
Nevada	5,000
New Hampshire	3,100
New Jersey	49,800
New York	185,000
New Mexico	18,100
North Carolina	28,100
North Dakota	6,100
Ohio	94,200
Oklahoma	41,300
Oregon	18,000
Pennsylvania	136,000
Rhode Island	13,100
South Carolina	22,800
South Dakota	8,400
Tennessee	41,600
Texas	110,400
Utah	26,300
Vermont	3,100
Virginia, excluding metropolitan area	71,800
Washington	54,400
West Virginia	11,000
Wisconsin	20,000
Wyoming	5,100

GREAT LAKES FISHERY ACT OF 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of State, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington, September 10, 1954, and for other purposes. That convention, which went into effect last October, has for its purpose the betterment of our Great Lakes fisheries—a matter of common concern to Canada and the United States—and the eradication, if possible, of the sea lamprey which is wreaking havoc in the lakes fisheries. Unless we can bring the sea lamprey under control, these important fisheries on the Great Lakes may disappear completely.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Hoover, the Acting Secretary of State, analyzing the bill section by section, and vividly describing the alarming situation with respect to the Great Lakes fisheries. I only wish that the Secretary of State could be made to realize the seriousness of the situation confronting our great Pacific fisheries where an important segment of the fishing industry may be wiped out entirely—not because of a natural predator such as the sea lamprey—but because the State Department stands complacently by while the west coast tuna fleet is swamped under a flood of foreign imports.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3524) to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington, September 10, 1954, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1956.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am forwarding a draft of proposed legislation to implement the Great Lakes Fisheries Convention between the United States and Canada signed at Washington, September 10, 1954. The convention, which entered into effect on October 11, 1955, has for its purposes the betterment of the Great Lakes fisheries of common concern to the two countries and the eradication, so far as may be possible, of the parasitic sea lamprey. The detailed statement enclosed in support of this re-

quest sets forth more fully the need for the convention and its purposes.

The proposed legislation is designed to provide means for the United States to meet its obligations under the convention. For this purpose it provides for the appointment of the United States section of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission called for by the convention, and vests in the section certain powers with respect to the operation of the lamprey control program. It establishes a method of appointment of members of the advisory committees to the United States section, one such committee being established for each of the Great Lakes.

Section 2 sets forth definitions.

Section 3 provides for the appointment by the President of 3 United States Commissioners, such Commissioners to serve at the pleasure of the President and without compensation. Of the Commissioners, it is required that 1 shall be an official of the United States Government and that 2 shall be persons residing in Great Lakes States, duly qualified for appointment by reason of knowledge of the fisheries of the Great Lakes. The proposed legislation in this regard is similar to the statutes implementing certain of other fishery conventions; for example, the North Pacific Fisheries Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 698, sec. 3).

Section 4 vests in the United States Section the power to appoint an advisory committee for each of the Great Lakes, upon which committee each State bordering on a lake may be represented by not more than four members. Section 4 also provides that the members of an advisory committee for any lake shall receive no compensation from the United States Government for their services on such committee, and provides further that they shall be invited to attend all nonexecutive meetings of the United States section relating to that lake.

With respect to the Commissioners and the members of the committees, section 5 provides for a degree of exemption from certain conflict-of-interest statutes.

A principal method of eradicating sea lampreys is to prevent their entry into streams for spawning purposes by mechanical and electrical barriers erected across the streams. For the erection and operation of such barriers it will be necessary for the International Commission to undertake work in the territories of the two countries.

Sections 6, 7, and 8 of the proposed bill provide the authority for the acquisition of land and construction and operation of lamprey-control projects. Section 6 empowers the United States Section to acquire real property interests; to construct, operate, and maintain any lamprey-control projects or works; and to enter into contracts and agreements for the construction, operation, or maintenance of any such project or works. Section 7 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the United States Section any lamprey-control projects now existing or under construction and, in addition, to act for the United States Section in the exercise of its powers. Section 8 provides that for the purposes of those provisions of title 28, United States Code, relating to claims against the United States and tort-claims procedures, the United States Section shall be deemed to be an agency of the United States.

Section 9 requires the United States Section to give 30 days' notice to interested States before approving proposals before the Commission to install lamprey-control measures or devices in a stream.

Section 10 requires the Secretary of State to forward to the Governors of the Great Lakes States any recommendations of conservation measures made by the Commission.

Section 11 authorizes any agency of the United States to cooperate with the United States section in the implementation of the research and lamprey control program.

Section 12 reserves State jurisdiction in making and enforcing laws or regulations so far as such laws or regulations do not conflict with the Convention.

Sections 13 and 14 are standard provisions authorizing appropriations and providing for applicability of the balance of the act should any part be held invalid.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that it has no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration. The Department of the Interior strongly supports this action.

It is hoped that the Congress may see fit to enact the proposed legislation before the beginning of fiscal year 1957. As the program now operated by the Fish and Wildlife Service, including the operation of some 70 electrical devices and barrier dams in streams emptying into the lakes, ends June 30, 1956, it will be necessary for the Commission to begin its activities July 1, 1956. Otherwise, a lapse in the operation of the lamprey-control devices will ensue which, however brief, will seriously set back most, if not all, of the preventive work accomplished during the last five years by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

The proposed legislation is, to the best of the Department's knowledge, noncontroversial. With regard to sections 3 and 4, however, it is the Department's understanding that the fishing industry and conservation interests in the Great Lakes States prefer language that would require (a) that one of the two Commissioners residing in the Great Lakes States be a conservation official of one of the Great Lakes States, and (b) that appointments from any State to the advisory committees be made by the Governor of that State. The intent of Sections 3 and 4 as worded in the proposed legislation is to retain in the President and the United States section flexibility in making appointments which experience has proved to be necessary in the administration of Federal programs.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT HOOVER, Jr.,
Acting Secretary.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF REQUEST FOR IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION FOR THE GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 10, 1954 AT WASHINGTON

GREAT LAKES FISHERIES AND THEIR NEEDS

The Great Lakes fisheries are among the most valuable fresh-water fisheries in the world. They currently provide food fish to American commercial fishermen worth more than $10 million per year. They also support a vast and growing sports fishing activity of incalculable economic and recreational value to the United States. They are the only great fishery resource shared by the United States and Canada which remains without the protection of an international conservation treaty between the two countries.

This is not because the lakes fisheries are in good condition. Far from it. They require conservation action in two directions: general fishery research and control of the parastic sea lamprey. Because the waters concerned are international waters with the fish and lamprey freely swimming across the border, there is no adequate way to secure their conservation without international cooperation with Canada. This the Convention is designed to bring about.

RESEARCH

With regard to research, the study and investigation of the lakes' fisheries is and has for years been conducted by eleven separate political entities, that is to say, the Federal Government, eight Great Lakes States, the Federal Government of Canada, and the Province of Ontario. Much valuable work has, without question, been done by the scientists of these separate entities, but there can be little question that a mechanism to coordinate their scientific studies would multiply the beneficial results far beyond any added cost entailed. The need for further research is clear. For example, the commercial catch in the lakes has remained for years at a fairly constant poundage, while the composition of that catch has changed radically, sometimes from year to year. The causes of the changing composition are not known. Two losses have resulted to the American fishing industry: (1) so-called trash fish have in many instances replaced more valuable luxury fish, and (2) the commercial fisherman cannot, with any certainty, plan his operations ahead of time.

LAMPREY CONTROL

The parasitic sea lamprey constitutes a clearly proved menance to some of the more important lakes' fisheries. This eel-like creature, about 18 inches long, is predatory upon the food fish of the upper Lakes. It attacks most readily the more valuable species such as lake trout and white fish. It attaches itself to the fish by the suction-like cup of its mouth and subsists by draining off the blood and body fluids of its host. The cost to American fishermen of this parasite in the upper three Lakes is of the order of $3.5 million a year in lake trout alone. The Lake Huron lake trout fishery was, in the years 1943 to 1951, reduced from an annual catch of 1.7 million pounds to less than 50 pounds. In Lake Michigan, the 4-million-pound catch of lake trout dropped by 1952 to 3,000 pounds. The lamprey has now advanced into Lake Superior, and is exhibiting this same destructive capacity in the Superior trout fisheries as it showed in Lakes Huron and Michigan. Lake Superior trout fisheries alone have, in recent years, been worth to the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan, 1⅓ million dollars. Unless the lamprey can be controlled, this Lake Superior industry faces great losses and possibly disappearance.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE ACTIVITIES

The Congress recognized this serious lamprey problem as early as 1949 when it authorized the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake investigation of the lamprey menace. Since that time it has provided the Service with funds to the extent of $1.7 million for lamprey work. Investigations show that the lamprey population can be controlled. The Service's experiments conducted since 1950 indicate that mechanical and electrical barriers placed in potential spawning streams can prevent the movement upstream of would-be spawners which then perish without spawning.

Unlike salmon, the lamprey spawns in any stream offering suitable conditions. Control work in streams on the American side of the lakes only would therefore be ineffectual since the lamprey could move into Canadian streams and produce future generations in astronomical numbers.

THE GREAT LAKES FISHERY COMMISSION

In order to meet these problems the convention provides for an International Commission to be composed of not more than three members appointed by the United States and Canada respectively. Each country has one vote in the Commission. All decisions and actions of the Commission require unanimous vote.

The Commission has, under the convention, the following duties:

"(1) To formulate and coordinate research programs to determine the type of measures, if any, required to make possible the maximum sustained productivity of any stock of Great Lakes fish which is of common concern to the United States and Canada;

"(2) To recommend appropriate measures to the parties on the basis of the findings of such research programs; and

"(3) To formulate and implement a comprehensive program to abate the sea lamprey populations in the lakes."

It is to be noted that the Commission has no regulatory power over fishing operations.

URGENT NEED FOR PASSAGE OF BILL

The Fish and Wildlife Service is now operating a lamprey program involving some 70 control devices installed in various streams entering the lakes. The authority of the Service in this regard ends June 30, 1956. If the devices are to continue in operation July 1, 1956, the proposed legislation must be enacted before that time. As one female lamprey carries on the average 61,500 eggs, even a brief lapse in operation of the devices would wipe out to a considerable extent the benefits already achieved under the Service's program. The proposed legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the United States section (i. e., the three United States Commissioners) this existent program.

EMPLOYMENT SECURITY JUDICIAL REVIEW ACT OF 1956

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for judicial review of administrative findings of the Secretary of Labor under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and chapter 23—Federal Unemployment Tax Act—of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, in explanation of the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3528) to provide for judicial review of administrative findings of the Secretary of Labor under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and chapter 23—Federal Unemployment Tax Act—of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, introduced by Mr. KNOWLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. KNOWLAND is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KNOWLAND

This bill provides for judicial review of administrative findings made by the Secretary of Labor under the provisions of title III of the Social Security Act and under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act. There is, at present, no statutory provision for judicial review of the Secretary's findings even though these findings may involve a direct conflict between a decision by the supreme court of a State on one hand, and an administrative interpretation by the Secretary of Labor on the other.

Under title III of the Social Security Act, the Secretary may make a finding which will cut off the administrative funds of a State employment security agency charged with the administration of the State's unemployment insurance and employment service law. This finding is made with respect to a State's failure, in the Secretary's opinion, to measure up to certain Federal standards required to be met by States in the operation of the joint State-Federal employment security program.

Under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, the Secretary is empowered to make a finding with respect to a State's compliance with and conformity to certain other Federal standards which will deprive the unemployment taxpayers in the affected State of the entire 90-percent credit against the Federal tax to which they are entitled when they pay the State tax.

This bill provides that a State may seek judicial review of these findings in a Federal circuit court of appeals.

EXPLANATION OF THE SECTIONS OF THE BILL

The first section provides that the bill may be cited as the "Employment Security Judicial Review Act of 1956."

Section 2 of the bill amends section 303 of title III of the Social Security Act to require that prior to making a finding, the Secretary must afford the affected State an opportunity to be heard at a hearing conducted by the Secretary within the State.

Section 3 of the bill provides that an affected State may obtain independent judicial review of any adverse finding which the Secretary makes. The State's petition for judicial review may be filed either in the United States court of appeals for the circuit wherein the State lies or in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. The review action must be brought within 60 days after the date of the Secretary's notification to the State of his adverse finding. The court is empowered to affirm, modify, or set aside the finding in whole or in part. Its decision is to be on the merits and on the basis of the entire record, including any State court record involved. The court may remand the matter to the Secretary for further proceedings, and the Supreme Court may review the lower court's decision by certiorari or certification.

Section 3 of the bill likewise provides that the effect of the Secretary's finding is postponed until 90 days after the completion of the judicial review proceedings; that is, the State agency is permitted to continue its administration of the State's employment-security program during litigation.

Sections 4, 5, and 6 of the bill make the same provisions with respect to findings of the Secretary under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act which are made by section 3 of the bill with respect to his findings under title III of the Social Security Act, with the result that the taxpayers of the affected State continue to receive tax offset credit while the judicial review is pending. If the ultimate court decision supports the Secretary's finding, tax credit for the year in which the court decision is rendered may be obtained by the State taxpayers only if, within 90 days after the court decision, the State takes such action as is necessary to meet the Federal tax standards as interpreted by the Secretary.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, AND SECTIONS 3303 AND 3304 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, RELATING TO JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN FINDINGS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for judicial review of the findings of the Secretary of Labor under section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, and sections 3303 and 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared for me, in explanation of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed for the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3529) to provide for judicial review of the findings of the Secretary of Labor under section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, and sections 3303 and 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KNOWLAND (by request) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. KNOWLAND is as follows:

This bill would provide for the judicial review of the findings of the Secretary of Labor on State conformity and compliance questions under the employment security program. The legislation would make clear that the States are entitled to judicial review of these findings and would provide the exact procedure for obtaining it.

The proposal embodied in the bill is a part of the legislative program of the Department of Labor and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to its presentation for the consideration of the Congress.

EFFECT OF THE SECRETARY'S FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS

A finding by the Secretary of Labor that a State is not certifiable to the Secretary of the Treasury under section 302 of the Social Security Act means that the State will not thereafter be certified for grants from the Federal Government for the administration of its employment security program. This would very seriously impair the operation of the employment security program of the State.

A finding by the Secretary of Labor that a State law is not certifiable under sections 3303 (b) (1) or 3303 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 means that employers in the State will not be allowed additional credit against their Federal unemployment tax. Similarly, a finding by the Secretary that a State is not certifiable under section 3304 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 means that employers in the State will not, after the effective date of the finding as required by this section, be allowed normal tax credit against their Federal unemployment tax. These actions, likewise, would very seriously impair the operation of the State's employment security program.

THE SECRETARY'S FINDINGS SHOULD BE SUBJECT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW

The administrative findings of the Secretary of Labor under the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code involve the construction of Federal statutes. As pointed out above, they are of vital concern to the States in the operation of their State unemployment insurance programs. Since the interests affected are of such magnitude and the issues raised are appropriate for judicial consideration, it would appear advisable to make clear that the States are entitled to judicial review of these findings.

Generally speaking, judicial review strengthens rather than weakens the administrative process. Experience has shown that, as a general rule, judicial review impairs an administrative program only when it involves undue substitution of judicial for administrative judgment on problems within the special competence of administrative agencies or where it does not contain proper safeguards to ensure against litigation instituted primarily for the purposes of impeding the effective operation of the administrative program.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The draft bill would amend section 303 to provide that a State may obtain judicial review of a finding by the Secretary under section 303 by filing in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, within 60 days after the State has been notified of the finding, a petition request-

ing that the Secretary's finding be set aside in whole or in part. The court would have jurisdiction to affirm or set aside the Secretary's finding in whole or in part, but no issue could be considered by the court unless such issue had been urged before the Secretary or unless there were reasonable grounds for failure to do so. In addition, under appropriate circumstances, the court could order that additional evidence be taken before the Secretary, who could modify his previous finding or make a new finding by reason of the additional evidence. The new or modified finding, if any, would then be filed with the court. Review by the court would be limited to questions of law, and the Secretary's findings of fact would be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

A similar amendment to the Internal Revenue Code would redesignate section 3308 as section 3309 and add a new section 3308 providing for judicial review of the Secretary's finding under sections 3303 and 3304 of the Code.

Finally, the draft bill would require that the distributive shares under section 903 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, of a State seeking judicial review under the bill be computed as though the State were eligible for such shares. These shares would be credited to the account of the State if, under the final judicial determination, the State was eligible during such period for such shares.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

Statement regarding resolution of Inter-American Council of Jurists, Organization of American States, with relation to claims of several Latin-American Republics to territorial waters.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, March 25 marks the 135th anniversary of the independence of Greece. I am indeed pleased to join my fellow citizens of Greek descent in commemoration of this historic event.

Greece continues as one of our firmest allies in the free world's resistance to Communist aggression. Her people have remained devoted to the Greek heritage of liberty and the dignity of freemen.

The bonds of friendship between the United States and Greece are solid and enduring. This has been demonstrated by our Nation's concern over the situation on the island of Cyprus. I am indeed hopeful that the resolution I have consponsored calling for self-determination by the people of Cyprus will receive the early consideration of the Congress.

At this time of commemoration of Greek Independence Day, I am assured that the ties which bind the two countries will continue as strong as ever.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for approximately 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, March 25, which this year falls on a Sunday, is being observed throughout the world, as it has been for many years, as the anniversary of the independence of modern Greece. The Greek struggle for independence began in 1821, 135 years ago. The proclamation of revolt of the great patriot, Hypsilanti, set off a long, bloody, and heroic conflict which lasted more than a decade and resulted, finally, in the liberation of all Greece and recognition of Greece as an independent nation by all the powers of the world.

This struggle evoked the interest and stirred the sympathies of all freedom-loving men throughout the earth. Men of every land who loved liberty flocked to Greece to enlist under the banners of the forces of revolt. In every land the Greek struggle for independence became a cause fervently supported and advocated by the liberal forward-looking elements. The struggle for Greek independence became synonymous with the struggle for freedom throughout the world.

Nowhere did the heroic endeavors of the Greek patriots arouse more sympathy and support than in the United States, then a young and fledgling Republic. Daniel Webster and Henry Clay, who were then among the dominating figures in Congress, spoke eloquently and repeatedly in advocating the Greek cause. President James Monroe threw the full influence of our Government into the world scale in behalf of Greek freedom, sending a special message to Congress in which he paid fervent tribute to the Greek revolutionary forces.

In the end, of course, the Greeks won their independence. The Greek nation was restored as a member of the family of nations. The world rejoiced at that time to have the glorious shades of ancient Greece take on modern form and flesh, and the world rejoices today in observing this anniversary of Greek independence.

In the years since Greece achieved her independence from Turkey, the people of Greece have three times been required to withstand alien assaults upon their independence. Twice the territory of Greece has been violated by alien foes. The third and most recent threat to Greek freedom was managed by the Kremlin in the pattern that has become so familiar to the world today.

The Greek people have suffered much. They have endured much. But they have survived. It has been one of the privileges of the United States of America to have come repeatedly to the aid of Greece and of the Greek people in their many hours of need. It was my own privilege, as Director General of UNRRA, to supervise one of these programs of assistance. For a time I maintained my headquarters in Athens and I grew to know and to love the Greek people and to appreciate, at first hand, their tremendous devotion to the cause of freedom. I will never forget my impression of the courage and determination of the Greeks to reconstruct and build anew their beloved homeland. Again in the last few years that drama has been repeated

The unyielding determination of the Greek people to maintain and fight for freedom has marked the centuries-long history of this nation. Now, today, again Greece is at the very center of the world stage. People of Greek descent, language, and culture struggle for freedom on the island of Cyprus. They fight also for the right of political self-determination.

I have been moved to give my support to the people of Cyprus in the form of a resolution expressing the sentiment of the Senate that the principle of self-determination should be applied in the case of Cyprus, consistent with America's historic support of that great principle.

I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the RECORD, the resolution which I, along with 22 other Members of the United States Senate, introduced on March 13.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the overwhelming majority of the people of the island of Cyprus are in ferment with regard to their political status and are demanding an end to their present colonial position in the British Empire; and

Whereas tension is building up in the eastern Mediterranean area over Cyprus between our ally Britain, which has legitimate security interests in this area, and our ally Greece, which has close ties of kinship and culture with the people of Cyprus; and

Whereas the United States fought a great world war under the banner of the principle of self-determination: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that—

(a) The British Government should be urged by our Government to see the wisdom of seeking to maintain its influence in this area by the exercise of leadership in the cause of freedom rather than by the use of force for the sake of repression; and

(b) Free world security considerations and the legitimate security interests of Britain should be given due weight but should not be used as an excuse for the frustration of the legitimate aspirations of the people of Cyprus; and

(c) The people of Cyprus should be consulted concerning their future political status consistent with that principle of self-determination to which the United States has historically subscribed.

Mr. LEHMAN. In marking this observance of Greek Independence Day, I wish to pay tribute to the heroic role which the Greek Orthodox Church has played, not only in the spiritual, but also in the political life of the Greek people. The Greek Orthodox Church and its leaders have been tireless fighters for the freedom of the Greek people.

The traditions of freedom are part of the Greek classic tradition. Today, in observing this Independence Day, we pay tribute also to the greatness that was Greece, is Greece, and, I trust, will always be Greece.

There is much that the United States Government can and should do to help our Greek friends, not only in the matter of Cyprus, but also in the field of immigration reform, to permit a greater number of Greeks to emigrate to this country. I hope that by the time the next Greek Independence Day comes around, we will have made meaningful progress in this direction.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared in reference to the anniversary of Greek Independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREEK INDEPENDENCE

(Statement by Senator HUMPHREY)

Mr. President, March 25 is the anniversary of Greek freedom. On March 25, 1821, the Greek War of Independence against Ottoman rule began when the archbishop of Petras unfurled the national flag of Greece. The Greek people fought valiantly, but the struggle lasted over many years. It was not until 1832 that Greece finally obtained complete recognition of its independence.

During those years of conflict, the United States as well as other nations gave encouragement to the Greek patriots. President Monroe, in a message to Congress, paid tribute to the revolutionaries. Our own young Nation felt ties of sympathy with the Greek patriots who were seeking to gain their independence just as we Americans had a short time before.

People from Greece who came to the United States had this same heritage of the struggle for freedom. That is why they became such good American citizens. It is why Americans of Greek descent have proved themselves such patriots in every war in which they have fought.

Recently the United States again gave expression to that bond of friendship that has long bound our people by aiding Greece in its struggle against the new tyranny. In helping the Greek people in their war against the Communists, the United States was reaffirming our stanch support for Greek independence.

Now the Greek people on the island of Cyprus are seeking self-determination. While we must recognize the strategic importance of Cyprus in the struggle to keep the Middle East free of Communist domination, the United States should always support those who legitimately seek self-determination. The aspirations of the Cypriot people for self-rule cannot be repressed by force.

As we celebrate Greek Independence Day let us reaffirm once again that friendship between the Greek and American people that has its roots in our common heritage of the struggle for independence.

HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, my colleague the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] had prepared a statement on Hungarian Independence Day which he had intended to have printed in the RECORD today. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Statement by Senator HRUSKA)

Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to another of the anniversaries that marks the march of peoples everywhere toward freedom and democracy.

March 15 is the anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution of 1848. On that day, young Hungarians in Budapest revolted against the tyrannical rule of the Emperor and succeeded in forcing him to accept their demands and appoint the first Cabinet responsible to the Diet.

A leader of this movement was a young poet, Alexander Petofi, whose writings helped incite young Hungarians to revolt against the authoritarian rule of the Emperor.

This bloodless revolution soon became embroiled in European power politics. Austrian armies invaded Hungary in the fall of 1848. When driven out by the Hungarians, they appealed to the Russian Czar, who ordered his armies against the Hungarians. In this battle the young poet, Petofi, then 26 years old, was killed.

These events give Hungary one of the longest histories of a fight for freedom and self-determination in Eastern Europe. This anniversary is marked to remind every Hungarian of its rich democratic history and of its never-ending battle to achieve freedom for all of its peoples.

March 15 is particularly significant to Hungarians now subjected to the rule of one of the most vicious tyrannies in history. March 15 is another reminder to the free world that although tyranny may conquer lands and peoples, it can never conquer the minds of freedom-loving men.

Hungary has been the scene of many valiant resistances to the iron yoke of communism—episodes which have become legends to free peoples all over the world.

Examples of valiant resistance to oppression are those of Cardinal Mindszenty; Bishop William Apor of Gyor, who was shot down by Russian soldiers in 1945; and the Hungarians arrested at Pocspetri as they tried to resist the nationalization of their schools.

Americans of Hungarian descent may be assured that March 15 still lives in the minds of their enslaved countrymen as a shining symbol of the future when Hungarian Independence Day will be celebrated in peace and freedom.

SURPLUS OR RESERVE?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last Sunday Gov. Orville Freeman, of Minnesota, made a statement relative to the status of surpluses at the time the present administration took office. This statement by the Governor was made over the nationwide television program Face the Nation.

In view of the interest aroused by the broadcast, I ask that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Surplus or Reserve?" from the Boston Post of March 21, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURPLUS OR RESERVE?

Defense of the administration's farm policies has been in an almost inarticulate state of indignation since Gov. Orville Freeman, of Minnesota, charged that there weren't any surpluses at all when President Eisenhower went into office, implying that farmers got only hard luck from the present administration.

The facts on surpluses bear out what Governor Freeman claims. Here are the figures on surplus stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation in June of 6 years ending June 1955, with the figures in billions of dollars: 1951, $2,600,000,000; 1952, $1,500,000,000; 1953, $2,300,000,000; 1954, $3,700,000,000; and 1955, $5 billion. The stocks thus rose from a low of $1,500,000,000 in 1952 to a high of $5 billion in 1955.

All CCC stocks are not surplus, however. What Governor Freeman is talking about is that the 1952 stocks held by CCC are in effect a reserve supply of farm commodities and not a surplus, and that surpluses didn't begin to pile up until after the end of the Korean war in 1953, and from that point on increased at an alarming rate.

These figures are official Government figures, which can be modified only by a purely capricious interpretation of what part is surplus and what part is reserve supply. But, another factor must be considered as well and that is the erosion of the value of the surplus stocks due to storage costs and spoilage. Governor Freeman has posed a solid question for the administration's farm policies.

BILL DAWSON—AMERICAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the New York Times on Sunday, March 18, there appeared a news story headed "DAWSON Lauded for Leadership." Because of the interesting information contained in this article, I am calling it to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate.

BILL DAWSON and I came to the House of Representatives in the same year. He has been an able colleague during the entire period ensuing. He has shown understanding and tolerance, and he has earned the respect of all those who had the privilege of serving with him. BILL DAWSON is the type of individual who always considers issues on their merits, and acts accordingly. He always places his country first and foremost. His record in behalf of the United States of America is not only distinguished by his outstanding legislative service, but also by the fact that he served his country with great distinction in the First World War, in which he was both gassed and wounded.

Representative DAWSON has made few speeches in the House of Representatives; however, every time he does speak, he has something worthwhile to say, and he has the undivided attention of his colleagues while he says it.

As chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, he has made a magnificent record; and he has received, during his tenure in that position, the wholehearted support of his colleagues from all sections of the country.

Mr. President, it gives me a great deal of personal pleasure and pride to call to the attention of the Senate the accomplishments of a man whom I admire and respect, a man who I hope will be with us, representing his district, his State, and our country, for many years to come. This man is BILL DAWSON—American.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article from the New York Times printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAWSON LAUDED FOR LEADERSHIP—ILLINOIS REPRESENTATIVE, 70, IS ESTEEMED FOR ROLE IN HELPING RACE RELATIONS

WASHINGTON, March 12.—Because of the flow of headlines he creates, many people over the country have the idea that Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., must be the most important and influential Negro in Congress. The Manhattan Democrat is not. The contest is far from close.

That honor belongs to Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Democrat, of Illinois, whose successful career on Capitol Hill seemingly ought to be more of an example nationally than it is in the matter of promoting good race relations.

Representative DAWSON, who will be 70 years old April 26, probably has more political power than any other member of his race in the United States. He is the first Negro chairman of a major committee of the Congress since Reconstruction days. He heads the House Committee on Government Operations. He is vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee. He is undisputed political boss of the five Chicago South Side wards that make up his congressional district. He is a respected and popular Member of the House.

The Illinois Representative is as strong in his support of civil-rights bills that come before the House as nearly all southern Members of the House are strong in opposing them. But more than most northern and big city Representatives, Mr. DAWSON understands his colleagues from the South, and he keeps whatever differences there are in their views and interests on a high, impersonal level.

He never questions the motives of those opposed to civil-rights bills or issues angry challenges and demands that the Congress or the White House do this or that, or else. Mr. DAWSON is too much of a gentleman to criticize his two Negro colleagues—Mr. POWELL and Representative CHARLES C. DIGGS, Democrat of Michigan—for their heated remarks on the floor.

But his distaste for the intolerant, negative approach in speechmaking is clear in his explanation: "I use speeches only as an artisan does his stones—to build something. I don't talk just to show off."

When Mr. DAWSON does speak, his colleagues listen. More than any other one man, he was responsible for the defeat in 1951 of a draft-law provision that would have allowed inductees to choose whether they would serve in a segregated unit. Reminding the House that he had been gassed and wounded in World War I, Mr. DAWSON said, "If there is one place in America where there should not be segregation, that place is in the armed services, among those who fight for this country."

STICKS TO THE MERITS

Mr. DAWSON does not often argue or plead his case as a Negro. He sticks to the merits and assumes that his contentions will be considered on a man-to-man or person-to-person basis. He stands up for his rights, but is not belligerent about it. He does not ridicule or abuse those who disagree with him.

Such respect and regard for his colleagues, naturally, has resulted in widespread respect and regard for Representative DAWSON. Some of his stanchest friends in the House are from the South. A nonsouthern Representative found this out the hard way back in 1949.

When the Democrats took control of the 81st Congress in 1948, Representative DAWSON was by seniority in line to become chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. A jealous colleague tried to enlist the backing of southerners on the committee in a move to bypass Mr. DAWSON. The southerners to a man rejected the suggestion. They felt not only that Mr. DAWSON was entitled to the chairmanship, but that he also was better qualified for leadership than the man who had tried to incite racial prejudice for self-advantage. Mr. DAWSON'S record as chairman has justified this confidence.

SOUTH'S FAVORITE SON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the March 17 issue of the Daily Missoulian, of Missoula, Mont., there appeared an editorial entitled "South's Favorite Son." This editorial, written before the Minnesota election, is worth the consideration of the Senate if for no other reason than that it indicates there is no lack of possible candidates for the Democratic Presidential nomination.

In this respect, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a statement which I made in the fall of 1955, when President Eisenhower was stricken with a heart ailment:

The fact he (President Eisenhower) has had a coronary ailment should not by itself remove him from the picture, because the Democrats also have a potential presidential candidate in the person of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON (Democrat, of Texas) who has had a similar illness.

We expect JOHNSON, Senate majority leader, to take full charge of the Senate in January. And, we expect him to be an active candidate for President on the Democratic ticket.

These two men have much to offer to our country. They should be encouraged to continue in office and should not be counted out at this time.

It is encouraging to note that Speaker SAM RAYBURN, the mentor of Senator JOHNSON and so many of us who now serve in the Senate, has asked Senator JOHNSON to be Texas' favorite-son candidate for President. I am aware of the fact that Senator JOHNSON is not a candidate for any office, and that his family is opposed to his giving serious consideration to a possible presidential nomination. I do know, though, that Senator JOHNSON is the great leader of the Democratic team in the Senate; and I know, further, that he has done much to decrease the divisions among our party and, in so doing, to achieve a degree of unity unknown to the Democrats for many years.

I know, furthermore, that he believes the Democratic Party will select the best man available, and that Senator JOHNSON will, in his own words, "support that man."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the editorial from the Missoulian.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH'S FAVORITE SON

It is not so far from the national conventions to venture a guess at the possible outcome at least of the Democratic meeting that will choose that party's ticket bearers for the November test with President Eisenhower and his running mate.

Despite Adlai E. Stevenson's commanding lead in the popularity polls and among political leaders, it is increasingly apparent that the Democratic nomination will not go to him by default. It is just as obvious that the only candidate contesting the primaries with Stevenson, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, is as much out of the running as when he stormed into the 1952 convention with a lead painfully gathered on the primary road.

Many dopesters hold that the nomination will go to a dark horse, passing not only Stevenson and Kefauver but also the third avowed candidate, Gov. Averell Harriman, of New York, who disclaims his candidacy while his political lieutenants and sponsors are out beating the bushes for delegates.

Three dark horses loom on the Democratic radarscope. Gov. Frank Lausche, of Ohio, a pivotal State, thinks so little of his chances for the presidential nomination that he has filed for the senatorial nomination in his State. He commands the respect of middle-of-the-roaders. Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, has nourished presidential ambitions since he left the Truman Cabinet to seek elective office. He is from a border State that gave the Democrats their last President and has the respect of political leaders.

The man who is gaining fast is Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who will be Texas' favorite son, and may carry the colors of the South into the convention. At 47, he is 18 years younger than President Eisenhower. Like Eisenhower, he is a recovered heart patient and must guard his health. His candidacy would diminish if not remove the part-time President issue. His appeal extends beyond the South. As Senate leader, he has had marked success in welding an effective party out of a slender majority. He is an odds-on favorite in the end-of-winter book, because he has demonstrated his skill at leadership in politics—which he regards as the science of the possible. That makes him political kin to Franklin D. Roosevelt, who parlayed his mastery of the science into four terms in the White House.

MISSION 66 FOR UTAH'S NATIONAL PARKS AND MONUMENTS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, and Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, should have the commendation not only of Congress but also of every citizen of the United States for their forward-looking statesmanship in preparing mission 66, a 10-year program to make the wonders and beauties of our national parks and monuments conveniently available and accessible to the 50 million Americans who visited them in 1955, and to the 80 million who will visit them in 1966.

Praise also must go to the unsung and devoted Park Service career personnel who have labored so diligently on the mission 66 program to make our parks and monuments the national shrines which they deservedly should be.

I have received copies of the mission 66 objectives and program for each of the national parks and monuments which are either wholly or partly in the State of Utah. Because these reports are of national significance, and because they are prototypes of the work which will be done in the national parks located in the other States, I wish to call them to the attention of Congress.

This exceptionally fine program will be a boon to all of the people of the United States, for the majestic and awe-inspiring beauties of Utah's parks and monuments, many of which are now virtually inaccessible to the public, will be available to them in all of their grandeur.

I am pleased to have been able to work with Director Wirth and other national park officials on many of the specific developments planned for Utah, some of which are already included in this year's Interior Department appropriation bill. I am in general accord with, and heartily endorse, the overall program for Utah, although some specific items may have to be modified. But this possibility is recognized and allowed for in the tentative nature of the reports.

The mission 66 program will begin in July of this year; and the recommended appropriation for construction alone in the parks will be increased by nearly

$10 million over last year's allocation of $5.2 million, making a total for construction of $15 million. This will mean that construction in Utah's parks will be increased from last year's $105,000 to $805,000.

I know that the people of Utah and the people of the entire Nation will join me in urging Congress to support the vision of this carefully planned and ably conceived mission 66 program, so that our neglected national parks and monuments will be a source of national pride in 1966, the 50th anniversary of the National Park Service.

Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD the detailed statement supplied to me by the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, regarding the program for the Utah parks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF MISSION 66 OBJECTIVES AND PROGRAM FOR ARCHES NATIONAL MONUMENT

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Arches National Monument lies in the heart of the famed red rock country of southeastern Utah, north across the Colorado River from the picturesque old Mormon pioneer town of Moab. This monument, a colorful wonderland of vermilion sandstone, has probably the most fantastic and varied display of natural arches, windows, towers, needles, spires, and balanced rocks to be found in the United States. The name "Arches" stems from the many natural windows, enlarged and smoothed by weathering, in hundreds of vertical slabs cut by erosion from a 300-foot layer of sedimentary rock called the Entrada Sandstone. Included in Arches National Monument are some of the largest and most impressive natural-stone arches known in the world.

Mission 66 program

The National Park Service has started a development program designed to furnish maximum visitor enjoyment of the values present in the national park system consistent with maximum protection. This program is known as mission 66. The proposals for Arches National Monument and all other areas administered by the National Park Service will be integrated into this program over a 10-year period.

As it is necessary to meet the most critical problems within the entire national park system first, not all of the areas will receive project moneys in the beginning years of the program.

The golden anniversary of the National Park Service has been set as the target date for completion of the program.

Mission 66 proposals for Arches National Monument

Proceeding on the basis that mission 66 will accomplish the necessary facilities and services within the 10-year program, mission 66 proposals for Arches National Monument are:

1. A visitor center will be constructed to house museum exhibits and provide visitor orientation facilities and administrative offices.

2. A campground designed to meet visitor usage will be developed. One picnic area is proposed.

3. Interpretive facilities in the form of a campfire circle and wayside orientation exhibits are planned.

4. Considerable improvement will be made to existing roads in addition to the development of new roads.

5. Trails to significant monument features will be improved or constructed.

6. Utility and residential structures are proposed to meet maintenance and protection needs.

7. Utility systems necessary to meet visitor and area demands are to be constructed.

8. A boundary fence will be constructed.

9. Staff increases will meet protection, interpretation, and maintenance requirements of the monument.

Pending completion of more detailed surveys and firm development plans covering the 10-year period, the total expenditure for this area is estimated at approximately $1,972,000 for roads and trails and $437,000 for buildings and utilities.

SUMMARY OF MISSION 66 OBJECTIVES AND PROGRAM FOR BRYCE CANYON NATIONAL PARK

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Bryce Canyon National Park includes some of the most interesting exposures of the Pink Cliffs formation, whose rocks are among the most colorful of any forming the earth's crust. Here nature has produced architectural rock forms with a variety of shapes, delicacy, intricacy, and vivid display of blended color tones not found elsewhere in the national park system.

As the Grand Canyon of the Colorado in Grand Canyon National Park is the best known record of ancient geologic history so is Bryce Canyon important in the modern geologic history that it reveals. Thus, the spectacular illustrations of erosion at Bryce Canyon National Park provide additional emphasis to the rich color prevalent in its broad amphitheaters.

Mission 66 program

The National Park Service has started a development program designed to furnish maximum visitor enjoyment of the values present in the national park system consistent with maximum protection. This program is known as mission 66. The proposals for Bryce Canyon National Park and all other areas administered by the National Park Service will be integrated into this program over a 10-year period.

As it is necessary to meet the most critical problems within the entire national park system first, not all of the areas will receive project moneys in the beginning years of the program.

The golden anniversary of the National Park Service has been set as the target date for the completion of the program.

Mission 66 proposals for Bryce Canyon National Park

Proceeding on the basis that mission 66 will accomplish the necessary facilities and services within the 10-year program, mission 66 proposals for Bryce Canyon National Park are:

1. Campground expansion and completion; picnic facilities in noncritical areas strategically located to permit maximum enjoyment of the park.

2. Concession facility improvements to provide adequate visitor accommodations consistent with the protection of park values.

3. Visitor center to provide interpretive and public comfort facilities and administrative offices for park management; the facilities for visitors to include exhibits, orientation and information space, lecture hall, study and reading rooms.

4. Trailside and roadside exhibits, observation stations, shelter houses, and nature trails for interpretation.

5. Improvement of existing roads, parking areas, and overlook areas at features of interest to permit travelers stopping safely for views and picture taking.

6. Trails through the scenic area with emphasis on the provision of interpretive facilities and safety.

7. Staff sufficient to efficiently utilize all above-mentioned facilities and developments in the provision of service to the visitors to Bryce Canyon.

8. Forest protection, particularly control of forest insects and diseases, to protect park values and development of facilities.

9. Water system acquisition and development to permit proposed needed expansion of physical facilities.

Pending completion of more detailed surveys and firm development plans covering the 10-year period, the total expenditure for this area is estimated at approximately $1,134,000 for roads and trails and $744,000 for buildings and utilities.

The foregoing estimates are exclusive of concession facilities which are expected to be provided by private capital as is done in all areas of the National Park System when extent of need and suitable location for required facilities have been determined.

SUMMARY OF MISSION 66 OBJECTIVES AND PROGRAM FOR CAPITOL REEF NATIONAL MONUMENT

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Capitol Reef is the dominating topographic feature of the Colorado Plateau in eastern Utah. An area intricately dissected by deep gorges in brilliant sedimentary rocks, it is the continuation of the well-known geological water pocket fold or flexure as it ends at Thousand Lake Mountain. The reef is a great uplift, the west slope rising sharply out of the desert with the eastern decline less noticeable.

The striking gorges and terraces, the result of stream cutting during the uplight, contain natural bridges, arches, water pockets, caves, and niches in various strata, give the area a significance primarily geologic. Well preserved Basket Maker and Pueblo type ruins and artifacts, with many pictographs of unique form and spectacular size are evidence of great archeologic interest. The monument is an important means to full understanding of other nearby national park and monument areas.

Mission 66 program

The National Park Service has started a development program designed to furnish maximum visitor enjoyment of the values present in the national park system consistent with maximum protection. This program is known as mission 66. The proposals for Capitol Reef National Monument and all other areas administered by the National Park Service will be integrated into this program over a 10-year period.

As it is necessary to meet the most critical problems within the entire national park system first, not all of the areas will receive project moneys in the beginning years of the program.

The golden anniversary of the National Park Service has been set as the target date for completion of the program.

Mission 66 proposals for Capitol Reef National Monument

Proceeding on the basis that mission 66 will accomplish the necessary facilities and services within the 10-year program, mission 66 proposals for Capitol Reef National Monument are:

1. A visitor center building to contain museum exhibits, visitor orientation space, and administrative offices.

2. A campground sufficient to meet public usage.

3. Interpretive facilities, including informational signs and campfire circle.

4. Acquire privately owned lands within the monument for efficient protection and administration.

5. Extension and improvement of roads, parking areas, and trails.

6. Increases in staff are sufficient to meet interpretation, protection, and maintenance needs.

7. Utility and residential structures, together with expanded utility systems.

Pending completion of more detailed surveys and firm development plans covering

the 10-year period, the total expenditure for this area is estimated at approximately $1,279,000 for roads and trails and $372,000 for buildings and utilities.

SUMMARY OF MISSION 66 OBJECTIVES AND PROGRAM FOR CEDAR BREAKS NATIONAL MONUMENT

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Situated high on the Markagunt Plateau in southwest Utah at elevations reaching 10,700 feet, Cedar Breaks National Monument contains a gigantic multicolored natural amphitheater. Here the 2,000-foot westward-facing escarpment of eroded limestone is even more brilliantly colored than the formation at Bryce Canyon or the towering walls of Zion.

Remarkable floral displays in the mountain meadows and associated fauna everywhere show evidence of adaptation to the severity of climate and weather at this elevation and provide a striking transition from the nearby desert. All facets of the Cedar Breaks picture combine to make this area one of the great scenic wonders of this country.

Mission 66 program

The National Park Service has started a development program designed to furnish maximum visitor enjoyment of the values present in the national park system consistent with maximum protection. This program is known as mission 66. The proposals for Cedar Breaks National Monument and all other areas administered by the national park service will be integrated into this program over a 10-year period.

As it is necessary to meet the most critical problems within the entire national park system first, not all of the areas will receive project moneys in the beginning years of the program.

The golden anniversary of the National Park Service has been set as the target date for completion of the program.

Mission 66 proposals for Cedar Breaks National Monument

Proceeding on the basis that mission 66 will accomplish the necessary facilities and services within the 10-year program, mission 66 proposals for Cedar Breaks National Monument are:

1. Improvements to the existing visitor center are proposed which will allow space for museum exhibits, administrative offices, visitor information, and orientation.

2. The existing campground will be converted to a picnic area. This will be scheduled only when camping in the surrounding Dixie National Forest is improved.

3. Improvements will be made to the approach roads and the existing rim drive from the south to the north entrance of the monument. Trails will be brought up to standard with limited extensions.

4. Staff increases are proposed to meet interpretation, protection, and maintenance demands.

5. Utility and residential buildings are scheduled consistent with requirements for protection and maintenance. Utility systems will be extended and improved.

6. Portions of the monument boundary are to be fenced.

Pending completion of more detailed surveys and firm development plans covering the 10-year period, the total expenditure for this area is estimated at approximately $1,120,000 for roads and trails and $234,000 for buildings and utilities.

The foregoing estimates are exclusive of concession facilities which are expected to be provided by private capital as is done in all areas of the National Park System when extent of need and suitable location for required facilities have been determined.

SUMMARY OF MISSION 66 OBJECTIVES AND PROGRAM FOR DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

In Dinosaur National Monument is a vast area little changed by man. Its principal scenic features were formed by the dynamic process of river erosion producing a colorful, rugged wilderness of deep canyons, dissected erosional benches, and bold promontories. Through centuries of erosive action the Green and Yampa Rivers have been fashioning their spectacular canyons resulting in one of the best histories of major streams whose courses have been superposed in formations completely at variance to those in which courses were once fixed. Within its boundaries also is the Nation's richest deposit of dinosaur fossils of 100 million years ago. The national significance of the area lies in its intimate blending of features of natural science, scenery, and an atmosphere of wildness.

Mission 66 program

The National Park Service has started a development program designed to furnish maximum visitor enjoyment of the values present in the National Park System consistent with maximum protection. This program is known as mission 66. The proposals for Dinosaur National Monument and all other areas administered by the National Park Service will be integrated into this program over a 10-year period.

As it is necessary to meet the most critical problems within the entire National Park System first, not all of the areas will receive project moneys in the beginning years of the program.

The golden anniversary of the National Park Service has been set as the target date for completion of the program.

Mission 66 for Dinosaur National Monument envisions development of the dinosaur quarry area as an outstanding scientific exhibit. The scenic canyon section is planned for development in the manner of a national park.

Mission 66 proposals for Dinosaur National Monument

Proceeding on the basis that Mission 66 will accomplish the necessary facilities and services within the 10-year program, Mission 66 proposals for Dinosaur National Monument are:

1. Visitor use center (and museum) at the Dinosaur Quarry will be constructed to meet visitor interpretive needs. Ample parking facilities will be provided. Other visitor centers will be constructed at the major development areas.

2. Facilities for food, lodging, and other visitor needs at the quarry area are to be provided in nearby communities, or at places outside of the area. Certain types of concession facilities for visitor needs will be planned for the canyon section of the monument when surveys and plans have become more firm and a definite need for such facilities has been demonstrated.

3. Interpretive facilities—signs, markers, and exhibits—are to be included in the construction of parking overlooks, trails, campgrounds, and at selected places along the roads.

4. The circulation system for the area contemplates access roads, improvement of selected portions of existing roads and trails, and additional new roads and trails to certain of the more significant scenic spots. Location of proposed new roads will be determined after reconnaissance surveys have been completed. It is expected that the Bureau of Public Roads will get started on the surveys in the near future.

5. Additional campgrounds and improvements to existing campgrounds will be provided along with boating facilities, launching ramps).

6. A study will be made of the present boundaries of the area to determine what adjustments or revisions are needed to facilitate the public use and protection goals of mission 66.

7. Utility and residential structures are planned to meet public use, maintenance, and protection requirements.

8. Assignment of staff sufficient to meet protective, interpretive, and maintenance needs.

Pending completion of more detailed surveys and firm development plans covering the 10-year period, the total expenditure for this area is estimated at approximately $2,433,000 for roads and trails, and $1,746,000 for buildings and utilities.

The foregoing estimates are exclusive of concession facilities which are expected to be provided by private capital as is done in all areas of the National Parks System when extent of need and suitable location for required facilities have been determined.

SUMMARY OF MISSION 66 OBJECTIVES AND PROGRAM FOR HOVENWEEP NATIONAL MONUMENT

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Hovenweep National Monument was established to preserve five notable groups of single- and multiple-chambered towers and associated pueblo structures built on the rimrock and talus slopes of boxed-in canyon heads. While culturally related to the pueblos and cliff dwellings of Mesa Verde, they present certain variations that enhance scientific and visitor interest.

Mission 66 program

The National Park Service has started a development program designed to furnish maximum visitor enjoyment of the values present in the national park system consistent with maximum protection. This program is know as mission 66. The proposals for Hovenweep National Monument and all other areas administered by the National Park Service will be integrated into this program over a 10-year period.

As it is necessary to meet the most critical problems within the entire national park system first, not all of the areas will receive project moneys in the beginning years of the program.

The golden anniversary of the National Park Service has been set as the target date for completion of the program.

Mission 66 proposals for Hovenweep National Monument

Proceeding on the basis that mission 66 will accomplish the necessary facilities and services within the 10-year program, mission 66 proposals for Hovenweep National Monument are:

1. A visitor center is proposed to provide housing for museum exhibits, orientation facilities, and public comfort facilities.

2. No concessioner units are planned in the monument since such service can be developed outside the monument boundaries.

3. Trailside exhibits will be provided to meet the interpretive needs of the movement.

4. Limited road and parking area construction is proposed in conjunction with self-guiding trail development.

5. Utility and residential buildings will be constructed consistent with maintenance and protection requirements.

6. Utility systems necessary to meet the needs of new facilities will be developed.

7. In order to provide adequate protection to certain ruins it is planned to erect fencing at Goodman Point and Cutthroat Castle.

8. A staff of one permanent ranger assisted by seasonal personnel is anticipated as sufficient to meet protection, interpretation, and maintenance needs.

Pending completion of more detailed surveys and firm development plans covering the 10-year period, the total expenditure for

this area is estimated at approximately $22,000 for roads and trails and $62,000 for buildings and utilities.

SUMMARY OF MISSION 66 OBJECTIVES AND PROGRAM FOR NATURAL BRIDGES NATIONAL MONUMENT

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

From a geological standpoint, Natural Bridges National Monument is an area of outstanding importance in that it contains three gigantic natural bridges of sandstone. Of the known natural bridges, they are exceeded in size only by Rainbow Bridge, located 60 miles to the southwest in Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

Carved in the cross-bedded Cedar Mesa sandstone by the action of running water and other agents of erosion and weathering, these bridges lie in the vicinity of the Four Corners region in Utah. Amid the magnificent canyons and mesas of this region Natural Bridges National Monument is an area of outstanding scenic interest.

Mission 66 program

The National Park Service has started a development program designed to furnish maximum visitor enjoyment of the value present in the national park system consistent with maximum protection. This program is known as mission 66. The proposals for Natural Bridges National Monument and all other areas administered by the National Park Service will be integrated into this program over a 10-year period.

As it is necessary to meet the most critical problems within the entire national park system first, not all of the areas will receive project moneys in the beginning years of the program.

The golden anniversary of the National Park Service has been set as the target date for completion of the program.

Mission 66 proposals for Natural Bridges National Monument

Proceeding on the basis that mission 66 will accomplish the necessary facilities and services within the 10-year program, mission 66 proposals for Natural Bridges National Monument are:

1. Roads and trails will be developed to make the features at the monument more accessible but at the same time guarding against the destruction of the area's primary values.
2. A visitor center will be constructed to house museum exhibits, visitor orientation facilities, and administrative offices.
3. A lunch ground will be developed.
4. Additional land will be required in order to proceed with certain road projects.
5. Utility and residential structures will be built in accordance with maintenance and protection requirements.
6. Utility systems, particularly water, must be developed for the proposed facilities.
7. Staff increases will be made consistent with protection, interpretation, and maintenance needs.

Pending completion of more detailed surveys and firm development plans covering the 10-year period, the total expenditure for this area is estimated at approximately $675,000 for roads and trails and $300,000 for buildings and utilities.

SUMMARY OF MISSION 66 OBJECTIVES AND PROGRAM FOR RAINBOW BRIDGE NATIONAL MONUMENT

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Rainbow Natural Bridge, sculptured by nature from the red sandstone of rugged southeastern Utah, is the most stupendous of its kind and one of the wonders of the world. The delicate balance, graceful sweep and symmetry, the beauty of color and setting, and the utter perfection of the whole, instill the visitor with a feeling of awe and reverence for the unfathomable workings of the Infinite.

Mission 66 program

The National Park Service has started a development program designed to furnish maximum visitor enjoyment of the values present in the national park system consistent with maximum protection. This program is known as mission 66. The proposals for Rainbow Bridge National Monument and all other areas administered by the National Park Service will be integrated into this program over a 10-year period.

As it is necessary to meet the most critical problems within the entire national park system first, not all of the areas will receive project moneys in the beginning years of the program.

The golden anniversary of the National Park Service has been set as the target date for completion of the program.

Mission 66 proposals for Rainbow Bridge National Monument

At present, Rainbow Bridge National Monument is a completely undeveloped area, with nothing in the way of facilities or services for the public. Through mission 66, the following facilities and services within the 10-year period are proposed for Rainbow Bridge National Monument:

1. The monument boundary should be enlarged in order to provide room for a campground and picnic area.
2. No concession facilities are proposed for the monument.
3. Existing trails will be improved and legislation should be enacted to permit the maintenance of the trail from Navaho Trading Post to Rainbow Bridge.
4. Utility and residential buildings are planned consistent with needs for maintenance and protection.
5. Utility systems must be developed to serve the proposed facilities.
6. A small staff will be assigned to provide protection and interpretive service.

Pending completion of more detailed surveys and firm development plans covering the 10-year period, the total expenditure for this area is estimated at approximately $10,000 for roads and trails and $161,000 for buildings and utilities.

SUMMARY OF MISSION 66 OBJECTIVES AND PROGRAM FOR TIMPANOGOS CAVE NATIONAL MONUMENT

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The three caves comprising Timpanogos Cave National Monument are unique because of the beauty and delicacy of the decorations. Probably no other cave in the United States exhibits so many types of cave decoration in such a small space.

Located along a faulted and broken zone of rock, the caves contain extraordinary formations, the strangest of which are the numerous helictites which seem to defy the laws of gravity by growing in all shapes and decorations, forming grotesque masses of gnarled and many-limbed stalactites. The beauty of the cave is intensified by the many pools of water which reflect and multiply the sparkle of the formations above.

Development and operation problems

The development of Timpanogos Cave National Monument will be based upon the dual objectives of protection of the delicate and fragile cave features representing the primary values of the monument, and the provision of visitor service to enhance the controlled use and enjoyment of the monument.

Emphasis will be placed upon the use of Timpanogos Cave as a day-use area. The focus of the mission 66 program will be improvement and expansion of those services related directly to the use and interpretation of the cave itself. Other uses of the monument will be deemphasized. Access to the cave will be improved only sufficiently to insure the safety and comfort of the visitors and protection of the monument.

Mission 66 program

The National Park Service has started a development program designed to furnish maximum visitor enjoyment of the values present in the National Park System consistent with maximum protection. This program is known as mission 66. The proposals for Timpanogos Cave National Monument and all other areas administered by the National Park Service will be integrated into this program over a 10-year period.

As it is necessary to meet the most critical problems within the entire National Park System first, not all of the areas will receive project moneys in the beginning years of the program.

The golden anniversary of the National Park Service has been set as the target date for completion of the program.

Mission 66 proposals for Timpanogos Cave National Monument

Proceeding on the basis that mission 66 will accomplish the necessary facilities and services within the 10-year program, mission 66 proposals for Timpanogos Cave National Monument are:

1. Visitors center to provide facilities for use of visitors awaiting cave trips or not able to make the rugged trip, and to provide administrative space.
2. Improvement and realinement of the trail to the cave with emphasis on safety and interpretation.
3. Staff sufficient to give adequate visitor service, consisting chiefly of guided cave trips, and protection to the fragile features of the caves.
4. Utility building and other structures to facilitate maintenance and protection of the monument.
5. Residential area development to provide quarters for permanent personnel subject to transfer.
6. Water development accompanied by other necessary utilities to take care of facilities and developments listed above.
7. Pending completion of more detailed surveys and firm development plans covering the 10-year period, the total expenditure for this area is estimated at approximately $18,000 for roads and trails and $215,000 for buildings and utilities.

SUMMARY OF MISSION 66 OBJECTIVES AND PROGRAM FOR ZION NATIONAL PARK

AREA SIGNIFICANCE

Zion National Park contains grandeur of colorful canyon and mesa scenery that ranks high among the superlative scenic areas of the world. Zion National Monument supplements the park scene and brings to the visitors understanding and realization of the mobility of the earth's crust. Here are manifested exhibits of faulting, folding, and volcanism producing an erosional pattern of tremendous proportions. Plants and animals influenced by the geologic processes span life zones from the desert to high mountains.

Development and operation problems

Increased travel to and use of Zion National Park have taxed existing facilities to such a point that full enjoyment of the area by visitors and adequate protection by the National Park Service are seriously affected. Dispersal of use areas is essential, therefore, if the dual objective of optimum enjoyment and effective protection and preservation are to be realized.

Mission 66 program

The National Park Service has started a development program designed to furnish maximum visitor enjoyment of the values present in the national park system consistent with maximum protection. The program is known as mission 66. The proposals for Zion National Park and all other areas administered by the National Park

Service will be integrated into this program over a 10-year period.

As it is necessary to meet the most critical problems within the entire national park system first, not all of the areas will receive project moneys in the beginning years of the program.

The golden anniversary of the National Park Service has been set as the target date for completion of the program.

Mission 66 proposals for Zion National Park

Proceeding on the basis that mission 66 will accomplish the necessary facilities and services within the 10-year program, mission 66 proposals for Zion National Park are:

1. Basic legislation creating a single park out of the present park and Zion National Monument.

2. Acquire private- and State-owned lands needed for efficient protection and administration of the park.

3. Construction of a visitor center in Zion Canyon to provide exhibits, orientation, and information, public comfort facilities, and administration offices.

4. Interpretive facilities, including exhibits at Three Forks and La Verkin Creek, roadside and trailside exhibits throughout the park, interpretive signs, and adequate turnouts and scenic stops on park roads.

5. Road construction in Zion Monument from Taylor Creek to La Verkin Creek developed area with a spur out to Death Point.

6. Road widening and improvement of park road from Virgin River Bridge to Springdale entrance, relocation and improvement of Virgin River Bridge, and improvement of remainder of park road by inclusion of turnouts.

7. Campground improvement and expansion by conversion of Grotto Campground to day use (picnics) only, development of new campground in La Verkin Creek, and expansion of the south campground.

8. Staff sufficient to protect the primary values of the park and to fully utilize the above-mentioned developments and facilities for provision of service to the visitors to the park.

9. Restoration of abused watershed in park by gradual elimination of grazing and an organized soil-and-moisture conservation program.

10. Lookout station and adequate radio facilities to insure protection of the park forest.

11. Elimination of commercial trucking from park highways.

Pending completion of more detailed surveys and firm development plans covering the 10-year period, the total expenditure for this area is estimated at approximately $2,-251,000 for roads and trails, and $1,160,000 for buildings and utilities.

The foregoing estimates are exclusive of concession facilities which are expected to be provided by private capital as is done in all areas of the National Park System when extent of need and suitable location for required facilities have been determined.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, accompanying the statement to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1956.

Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: Thank you for your letter of March 5. I appreciate your support of mission 66 and your interest in the program for the national parks and monuments in Utah.

I am sure you realize that in planning a program as extensive and diversified as mission 66 the first objective is to define in broad terms the elements of the program establishing the overall pattern and setting the direction for the park system as a whole. Similarly, the same must be done for each area assigning to each its proper role in the system. That has now been accomplished and each area is preparing a final prospectus that should be completed about May 1.

The prospectus will, in effect, be a management and development program for an area for the ensuing 10 years. Completion of the prospectus will clear the way for the more detailed planning and scheduling of the work.

We realized that the release of the mission 66 program for the national park system would result in many inquiries as to the program for individual areas. While we recognized there was some danger of misunderstandings developing before all the details could be perfected, such could not be avoided. We hope to alleviate such misunderstandings through the release of a preliminary statement outlining in general terms the scope of the program proposed for each area.

I am pleased to inform you that drafts of the statements for the national parks and monuments in Utah have been completed and I am enclosing an advance copy of each for your information. I would like to emphasize that these are preliminary statements. Some of the proposals are still tentative and subject to change or refinement as our planning advances. The development costs represents our best estimate as of now and are not to be construed as being firm or binding, as in many instances surveys must be made and plans prepared before the cost estimates can be finalized.

I appreciate your concern about concurrent and equivalent development for all the parks and monuments in Utah. We are faced with that same problem for all the areas in the system. There are many factors that have a bearing on the matter. You can be assured that the governing factor in all instances is the urgency of the improvements needed to carry out the purposes of the area and serving the public good.

Within each area we are striving for the right balance between use, preservation, and development. Within the system we are trying to strike the proper balance between areas and the right amount of attention each should receive. There is urgent need for improvements in all the areas but in some the situation is more pressing than in others and those we are trying to remedy first. Also, we are trying to schedule construction work in large units to obtain the most for the money and to shorten the period of inconvenience to the visitor, resulting from the work.

As a consequence, in the early years of the program it may seem that some areas are getting the jump on others and receiving disproportionate attention. In some areas, the development program will be short lived, in others it will extend over a considerable period of time. The purpose of the long-range program is to balance development and permit each area to receive its due share in due course of time.

The development at Dinosaur will not be accomplished at the expense of other areas in Utah, nor is it being scheduled at a pace inconsistent with its needs. Dinosaur has a great visitor potential and we hope we can be prepared in advance to meet it.

I trust I have allayed some of your concern and that the enclosed summaries will be of assistance to you. As soon as firmer information is available, I will be pleased to furnish it to you.

Do not hesitate to call on me if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

CONRAD L. WIRTH,
Director.

THE MOTOR CARRIER INDUSTRY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently there were concluded hearings, directed at competition, regulation, and the public interest in the motor carrier industry, before the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate. At the end of the report of that select committee, under "Recommendations," the paragraph No. 5 reads as follows:

Although your committee was primarily studying the role of the ICC in motor trucking, several witnesses testified and submitted statements alleging that the International Brotherhood of Teamsters was playing a trade-restraining role in the industry. It is recommended that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce review those complaints to determine if more extensive inquiries should be conducted.

It is with that in mind that I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a series of nine articles by Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, of the Cowles publications in Minneapolis and Des Moines, outlining in complete detail the dangers that were pointed out in testimony during the hearings.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BECK'S AID CASTS LONG SHADOW—IS HOFFA TOP MAN IN TEAMSTERS?

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON.—As chairman of the Central States Conference of Teamsters, James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa casts a long shadow over the highway transportation of the Nation.

The influence of the young, dynamic vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America extends from the Atlantic Ocean to the Rocky Mountains.

Although he is only 42, Hoffa has been a labor organizer for more than 25 years. Today his title is ninth vice president of the International Teamsters, but the 5-foot 5-inch teamster official is regarded as the No. 2 man in the Nation's biggest union.

There are some indications that Hoffa would rank above President Dave Beck if he wanted to press his claim with the 1,500,000 rank-and-file members.

The free-wheeling Detroit labor leader is a political independent, who wields his personal influence and the union treasury for favorite candidates in local elections.

He has paid fines of $1,000 and $500 for violating the labor laws but he has bounded back to become even more important in the teamsters union.

The highly critical reports written by congressional committees haven't disturbed him except to bring his shouted threats to take care of those who gave information unfavorable to him.

Hoffa was in a number of joint business enterprises with the group that was awarded the multimillion dollar annual contract for insurance for the Central States Conference of Teamsters.

Hoffa's wife, Josephine, and the wife of Owen Bert Brennan, Hoffa's top aid, drew $65,000 in dividends from a truck-leasing firm set up for them by a large trucking firm that hired members of the teamsters union in Detroit, Mich.

Two years ago, Hoffa told congressional investigators he owed $38,000, in unpaid loans to persons who hired teamsters union members and to business agents of the teamsters union.

Hoffa told the congressional subcommittee he had put up no collateral on those loans and that no notes or other documents were involved in the transaction. It was just his word that he would repay.

Teamster President Beck told a television audience he didn't know about the labor law violations by Hoffa, but declared that he would not criticize any transactions Hoffa has been involved in that he knows about.

A study at Princeton University has ranked Hoffa as having one of the highest I. Q.'s among the Nation's labor leaders, despite the fact that his education was cut off in the eighth grade.

Hoffa's Central States area includes Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, and the Louisville area in Kentucky.

But those 13 States do not end the extent of his influence. As a key figure in the handling of health and welfare plans for the teamsters' union, he has extended his jurisdiction to 12 other States from Texas and Oklahoma and Arkansas east to the Atlantic coast.

Hoffa says he has been directed by Beck to cooperate in managing teamsters' affairs in those areas.

Hoffa had what he considered to be a legitimate reason for moving south. "Trucks from those areas were running into the Central States Conference and they were breaking down our wage scale," Hoffa says.

This was justification for moving in to help jack up the wage scale in the southern areas, he says.

Hoffa was also troubleshooter for the teamsters when there were contract troubles in New Jersey, New York, and the New England area.

Hoffa is likely to show up almost any place in the country from Florida to North Dakota to show local teamsters' union officials how to deal effectively with employers. Hoffa says he acts only on general directions from Beck.

"Beck knows how to delegate authority," Hoffa explains. "That is what I like about Dave. He is a good administrator. He gives you a job to do and lets you do it."

Hoffa's personal fortunes have swelled as he has climbed to a position of dominance in the teamsters' union, but he won't say how much.

"I won't tell the Internal Revenue Service, so I'd be a damned fool to tell you," Hoffa commented.

The records brought out in various congressional committees show his outside business investments include oil leases, a farm, a brewery, a small interest in a race track, and a share of a girls camp at Eagle River, Wis.

In addition, his wife owns a truck-leasing firm that hires no members of the teamsters' union but merely leases the equipment to a firm that hires teamsters' union members.

The last time he went on record before a congressional committee, Hoffa was drawing a salary of $21,000 from local 299 of the teamsters' union in Detroit and from the international union. In addition he had an unlimited expense account on the million-dollar treasury of the Detroit local.

Hoffa was born on St. Valentine's Day in 1913 in Brazil, Ind. He is of Dutch and Irish extraction. When he was 4, his father died, and his mother was left to support four small children. He was next to the youngest.

They moved to Clinton, Ind., and when he was 9 the family moved to Detroit and his mother went to work in a factory.

Family financial problems forced Hoffa to drop out of school at 14 and go to work. He had just finished the eighth grade, but work wasn't new to him. He had worked in a grocery store, sold newspapers, and peddled bills.

He was working in a warehouse for the Kroger Co. in Detroit at 16 when he started working as a labor organizer. His success in the rough and tough struggle to organize an independent union gave Hoffa his first boost. In 1932, when he was only 19, he took his independent union into the International Teamsters. He's been there ever since.

Hoffa works 12 to 16 hours a day on a 6- or 7-day week on affairs of the Teamsters International. He's home only about 2 days a week as he keeps up close contact with local teamsters from Baltimore, Md., to Bismarck, N. D.

He neither smokes nor drinks, and he exercises to keep in shape by swinging an ax in the woods of northern Michigan. Six weeks a year he vacations—2 weeks in Canada, 2 weeks at Iron River, Mich., and 2 weeks in Florida.

EXPENSE ACCOUNT UNLIMITED—HOFFA GAINS POWER IN MICHIGAN POLITICS

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON.—Backed by the million-dollar treasury of local 299 of the Teamsters Union in Detroit, Mich., James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa has become a power in Michigan politics.

The 42-year-old chairman of the Central States Conference of Teamsters calls himself a political independent. The labels of Republican and Democrat mean nothing to him. He backs the people he thinks will be best for Hoffa and Hoffa's boys.

In 1952, Hoffa threw his support to the late Senator Blair Moody, one of the most liberal Democrats in the Senate.

In 1954, Hoffa was lined up with Senator Homer Ferguson, a Republican with a conservative voting record.

In supporting Ferguson, Hoffa passed over the Democratic candidate who had been selected out of labor's ranks. Senator PATRICK MCNAMARA, a former A. F. of L. labor leader, defeated Ferguson despite the fact that Hoffa accompanied Ferguson to numerous meetings, and introduced the Republican as the man he wanted to win.

Hoffa's record of losing with Moody in 1952 and losing with Ferguson in 1954 would not appear to indicate any strength at the polls. However, every time an election comes around, Hoffa gets the local union to pass a motion to allow him to spend whatever moneys he thinks necessary in the forthcoming local elections.

He pours this money into the campaign funds of persons seeking election as judges in Michigan. He knows the value of a friendly judiciary, from experience with judges who were not necessarily sympathetic to his pleas.

Hoffa avoids putting any of the money from the union treasury in the campaign funds of candidates for the United States Senate or for the House of Representatives.

However, Hoffa knows how to raise a political action fund in a hurry. In 1952, Moody needed money and Hoffa ordered his business agents to turn up $100 personal contributions. A fund totaling several thousand dollars was raised in a few days.

Hoffa and his organization also distributed campaign literature for Moody. One of Moody's associates explained that placards and other printed material were given to the teamsters union; and that within a day truckdrivers had blanketed the State with signs.

Ferguson accepted Hoffa's support and personal endorsement in 1954 despite the fact that two committees of the House had written scorching reports on Hoffa and his top aid, Owen Bert Brennan.

"Hoffa is a dominant figure in the teamsters union and virtually a dictator in certain areas, despite the fact that he has been found guilty and convicted of violation of the Michigan State labor law and the Federal antitrust laws," commented the joint subcommittee of the home labor and government operations committees.

The report labeled Hoffa as "the brains between this shakedown (in the jukebox industry) and power grab by (William) Bufalino."

"Bufalino could not have succeeded in gaining monopolistic control of the coin-vending business in Detroit without the cognizance and approval of Hoffa," the report said.

Another House subcommittee report criticized Hoffa's handling of the health and welfare funds of the Central States Teamsters' Conference, and his wife's business connections with persons employing members of the teamsters union.

Hoffa has a reputation for never asking a candidate for anything.

"All Jimmy wants is to be left alone," commented one man who was closely associated with the Moody campaign in 1952.

Hoffa enters into politics to get the most friendly atmosphere possible for his activities.

"We are getting along O. K.," Hoffa explains. "We don't need any help."

Congressional investigators found that on the union income-tax returns for 1948, Hoffa had listed "State political contributions in the amount of $15,487.50." In 1950, the "State political contributions" had totaled $13,410.30.

Hoffa also told the subcommittee that the union had sponsored television shows "for the best interests of trucking concerns and our members, and we used a couple of those shows to introduce some judges that were running for office."

But, when the congressional investigators sought to learn how Hoffa used money allocated to "State political contributions," Hoffa said he couldn't remember any details. He also told the subcommittee that it would be impossible to produce records since he had approved a policy under which the union destroyed its records each year.

All that was left for congressional investigators to examine were the work sheets from which the Federal income tax returns were prepared.

Chief counsel William McKenna read Hoffa the Treasury Department decision 5381 which states:

"The books of record required by this section shall be kept at all times available for inspection by Internal Revenue officers and shall be retained so long as the contents thereof may become material in the administration of any internal revenue law."

"Have you had any advice from the Bureau of Internal Revenue that the contents of those books are not material in the administration of the internal revenue law?" McKenna asked.

"I have not consulted with internal revenue," Hoffa answered. "Neither have they talked to me. I don't know if they have talked to our lawyers or not."

Hoffa told the subcommittee that local 299 of the teamsters has a million-dollar treasury, and that it has been the practice of the members to vote unanimously to let him use whatever funds he feels are necessary for organizational work, for expenses, or for politics.

So far, Hoffa's political influence has been confined to his home State of Michigan even though his influence in the teamsters union extends from the Rocky Mountains to the Atlantic Ocean.

WIFE PUT ON UNION PAYROLL—HOFFA $1,000 NETS 200 PERCENT AND CLAIM ON GOLDEN ERA

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON.—The wife of James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa was on the payroll of the racket-

ridden jukebox local of the Detroit teamsters union at $100 a week, but she never went near the office.

The payment of $3,000 to the wife of the Detroit teamster boss was represented as being repayment of a loan from Hoffa with 200 percent interest.

Eugene C. (Jimmy) James, former head of jukebox union 985, testified the payments were made to Mrs. Hoffa because union rules would have prevented Hoffa from drawing money from the local while he was drawing a salary as the top official of Teamsters Union 299 in Detroit.

James told a one-man grand jury in Detroit that Hoffa, an international vice president of the teamsters, and Owen Beri Brennan, Hoffa's top aid, had each loaned him $1,000 to start the jukebox union.

To repay the $2,000, the wives of Hoffa and Brennan were put on the payroll of the jukebox union at $100 a week each. By the time a one-man grand jury started its operations in 1946, a total of $6,000 had been paid to Mrs. Hoffa and Mrs. Brennan.

Judge George B. Murphy, who was sitting as the one-man grand jury, pointed out that repayment of $6,000 on a $2,000 loan was a repayment by 300 percent.

"That was quite a difference; about $4,000. Did you consider that interest on the loan," Judge Murphy asked James.

"Yes," James answered, and the judge continued:

"Or was it a payoff to them?"

"It was no payoff, judge," James answered. "I gave it to them out of the graciousness of my heart."

"But the money belonged to the union," Judge Murphy commented.

"The union gave me the right to spend it."

"The county gives me $100,000 to spend on this grand jury," Judge Murphy replied. "But, out of the graciousness of my heart I can't be throwing the money around."

"I didn't figure I wasted the money," James said. "I figured it was well spent."

"Why do you figure the money is well spent?" Murphy asked.

"Because they (Hoffa and Brennan) are big men, they could help me a lot."

"Did they ever help you?" the judge asked.

"No, I never had to call on them. Just luck enough I never needed them," James said.

Not long after the grand jury investigation, James left Detroit for Chicago. He continued to receive a salary from the Detroit jukebox union for several years, but his major interest switched to the health and welfare funds of the laundry workers.

Within the last 6 months, a Senate Labor Subcommittee has charged that James and a New Jersey insurance broker embezzled approximately $1 million from the Laundry Workers International health and welfare funds.

Back in 1951, the Kefauver Crime Committee reported "evidence of strong-arm methods in the jukebox distributing business in Chicago, Kansas City, Mo., and Detroit."

That subcommittee said it was "the more refined method of shakedown and extortion" that was found in Detroit.

"Here a union was used as a front by underworld characters to extort money from juke box distributors," it said. "These distributors were forced to join the union as 'honory members' and pay initiation fees and dues or risk having lines thrown around their locations."

In 1953, Phillip Berman, a juke box service man, told the labor subcommittee that he was forced out of business as a juke box operator.

Acid was poured in his juke boxes after he testified before the KEFAUVER crime committee, Berman told the house committee.

When James went to Chicago, William E. Bufalino became president and principal operating official of union 985.

Picket lines, bombing threats and acid plagued those who tried to operate machines that did not carry the union label of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America.

Bufalino and 6 associates were indicted in Wayne County, Mich., on a 7-count indictment charging conspiracy to extort money from juke box operators and to use terrorism and teamster pickets as a weapon.

A house labor racket investigating subcommittee charged that Bufalino was the "principal offender and perpetrator of racketeering, extortion and gangsterism" which involved the juke box union.

"Bufalino and the executive board of union 985 conspired and confederated to obtain this monopoly and used the union not to advance the interest of labor, nor to protect labor in genuine labor disputes, but the interest of a favored few juke box owners and operators at the expense of other owners and union members," the House report stated.

It stated that Bufalino's brother-in-law, Vincent A. Meli, headed Melton Music Co.—a juke box distributor whom witnesses testified received favored treatment.

Union members were forced out of the union by Bufalino, business places were bombed, and union dues of $20 a month per member were characterized as "a tribute" because the union did nothing for the members, the report said.

The House report stated that "Hoffa is a dominant figure in the teamsters union and virtually a dictator" in the Detroit area through his position as president of Teamsters Union 299, president of the teamsters joint council 43, and president of the Michigan conference of teamsters.

Hoffa "has been described as the brain between this shakedown and power grab by Bufalino and his Teamsters Union 985," the report said.

"In any event, Bufalino could not have succeeded in gaining monopolistic control of the coin-vending business in Detroit without the cognizance and approval of Hoffa."

Hoffa's faith in Bufalino and the State courts were rewarded when Bufalino was acquitted. Several of Bufalino's associates had entered pleas of guilty and were fined.

General President Dave Beck, of the International Teamsters Union, contends that the teamsters have jurisdiction over jukeboxes because these machines are hauled on trucks. He states it is ridiculous for electrical workers to claim jurisdiction just because a little plug is put in the wall to operate the machine.

When Hoffa appeared before a House subcommittee the jukebox union had between 400 and 450 members with dues running $20 a month per man.

It was admitted that more than $6,000 a month flowed into the union treasury from dues, but the subcommittee was never able to determine how this money was spent.

Under authority from Hoffa as president of Teamsters Joint Council 43, Bufalino's jukebox union was destroying its records every year "to conserve space."

In the era of automation that is dawning, the jukebox local has great potential for expansion. In the Detroit area, the wash racks and service station organization has been claimed for this union in addition to any automats or other coin-operated machines.

When Jimmy Hoffa made a $1,000 investment in the jukebox local he proved he is a labor leader with a good deal of foresight in claiming teamster jurisdiction in the field of coin-operated devices.

OWNERSHIP CAMOUFLAGED—UNION DRIVERS LOSE PAY, JOBS TO MRS. HOFFA'S FIRM

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON.—Members of the teamsters union lost part of their income when a Detroit trucking firm set up a truck-leasing corporation for the wife of Detroit teamster union boss James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa.

Teamster union members who previously had leased their equipment to Commercial Carrier, Inc., saw their business handled by the new firm of Test Fleet, Inc. They also saw their personal income cut as much as $1,500 to $2,000 a year.

Meanwhile, Mrs. Hoffa and the wife of another Detroit teamster official drew $65,000 from Test Fleet, Inc., in a 4-year period.

Teamster union members in Detroit didn't know that the wives of two teamster officials were receiving the earnings of Test Fleet until a House Labor Subcommittee went into Detroit late in 1953.

Ownership of Test Fleet was well camouflaged. The firm was set up for Mrs. Hoffa and the wife of Owen Bert Brennan, Hoffa's top aid in Detroit. However, the maiden names of Mrs. Hoffa and Mrs. Brennan—Josephine Poszywak and Alice Johnson—were used on the record.

Even these names did not appear when the firm was incorporated in Tennessee by attorney James W. Wrape of Memphis. Wrape and some of his office employees were listed as officers.

Neither Mrs. Hoffa nor Mrs. Brennan took any part in setting up the corporation, or in running it, according to a House subcommittee report.

Test Fleet came into being in 1949 when B. B. Beveridge, one of the owners of Commercial Carriers, called Elliot R. Beidler, vice president of Commercial Carriers, and said:

"I am going to put some friends of mine in business, and I want you to handle the account."

The "friends" turned out to be Mrs. Hoffa and Mrs. Brennan, wives of the teamster officials who negotiate union contracts with Beidler.

Beidler and Wrape handled the details. The $4,000 invested by Mrs. Hoffa and Mrs. Brennan wasn't enough to finance payment on the 10 tractors that Commercial Carriers had purchased for Test Fleet.

Commercial Carriers carried the additional $5,000 on an open account for a month until Test Fleet had made enough from Commercial Carriers to pay it off.

Test Fleet had no employees, and Beidler ran it for Mrs. Hoffa and Mrs. Brennan along with his duties as a vice president of Commercial Carriers.

Periodically, Mrs. Hoffa or Mrs. Brennan would call and ask to have a dividend declared. On at least one occasion no dividend amount was stated and it was suggested that the dividend be as much as the corporation could stand out of its earnings.

In that 4-year period the net earnings were $145,800 which went to pay for the equipment and the $65,000 in dividends.

Two of the teamster union members who lost part of their income appeared before a House subcommittee to testify how the organization of Test Fleet had hurt them.

Paul L. Smith, a veteran Flint, Mich., truck driver with a long accident-free record, said his income was cut from $6,000 a year to about $4,500. Smith had his own equipment and was able to supplement his regular drivers pay before Test Fleet came into existence.

Harold Herbert Cross, Flint, Mich., was another truck driver who lost part of his income when Test Fleet was organized.

Smith and Cross were among drivers who became involved in contract difficulties with Commercial Carriers, and struck contrary to the wishes of Teamster Chief Hoffa, the House report said.

When the strike was over, Cross and Smith were blackballed by the teamsters union.

"He (Cross) lost his equipment because he could not meet the payments, was forced to sell his house, and now finds the work he once did for Commercial Carriers is being done by the Hoffa-Brennan Test Fleet Corp.," the House subcommittee officially reported.

After he lost his equipment, Cross was once more permitted to go to work—this time as a driver at a sharply cut income.

The report of the House Labor Subcommittee stated that Frank Fitzsimmons, another Detroit teamster official under Hoffa's jurisdiction, became a dominant partner and later gained full control of a film-delivery business originally owned by a man with whom the union had recurring labor troubles.

Howard C. Craven, Ann Arbor, Mich., was operating a film-delivery and paper-delivery business that brought in about $30,000 to $40,000 a year gross. It was a prosperous business until teamsters union members started striking. Teamster boss Fitzsimmons said he didn't know why.

As a result of these strikes, a teamsters union steward in Fitzsimmons' union started taking over Craven's paper-hauling operations, Craven testified.

As Craven's income diminished, he was approached by Fitzsimmons who suggested he could get Craven a contract for exclusive rights of hauling the paper in Detroit and suburbs, and all revenue.

"He (Fitzsimmons) was to collect 90 percent of the revenue," Craven testified.

Craven testified he thought his was a good contract for increasing his business, but that he was forced to pay $9,000 to Fitzsimmons in the first year in checks made out to cash.

Not satisfied with the $9,000, Fitzsimmons called him down to the teamsters union offices with the books to make sure he was getting his share, and had insisted that Craven produce another $600 to pay the income tax on the $9,000.

The elderly truckline operator said the payments to Fitzsimmons made him go broke, and he took a job as a school janitor at $50 a week.

House subcommittee investigators said a similar story was related by Gustave E. Leveque who sold his film trucking service firms. His firms were swallowed by a combined firm in which Mrs. Hoffa showed up as one of the directors under the name of Josephine Poszywak.

Hoffa says he would never own a trucking firm that hired members of the teamsters union, because this would be against his principles as a union official.

However, he has allowed his wife to keep her interest in the lucrative Test Fleet Corp. He justifies this arrangement on grounds that it is his wife's business enterprise, that he has no connection with it, and because Test Fleet hires no employees.

"If Test Fleet hired union members I might make her drop it, but it is just an equipment leasing firm that happens to lease to a trucking firm," Hoffa explains.

"It is just an investment," Hoffa declares. "There is nothing wrong with legitimate investments. She has nothing to do with the operations."

The House Labor Subcommittee commented that "we seriously question the ethics of the various business arrangements which we recount here."

"It should be pointed out that your subcommittee does not deny the free right of any American to engage in the business or profession of his choice," the House report states.

"However, we deny the right of anyone to take improper or unfair or unlawful advantage of anyone else. It is in this context that we raise the issue we do now.

"Congress has decreed that employees may be represented by unions in dealing with their employers. The facts of business and economic life are such that through unions, employees enjoy considerable power and can bargain with an authority they could never have as individuals. Congress intended that this be so."

The report stated that if an employer, for good and proper reason, seeks to resist the demands of a union, the law does not prohibit him from doing so.

"But suppose the same union, or its officers, operates a competitor business," the report said. "The employer may well have no choice but to yield to the union's demands. This is obviously not the type of collective bargaining which Federal statutes should compel. It is not the type of collective bargaining that Congress should condone. Yet implicit in this hearing record is the suggestion that such bargaining may soon be commonplace."

CONSPIRACY LEADS TO $1,000 FINE—HOFFA BACKS LAWBREAKING AID

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON.—Two convictions of labor law violations have made James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa tolerant of minor officials of the teamsters union who run afoul of the law.

Hoffa blames his own arrests on "anti-union police" and regards his convictions on Federal and State labor law violations as purely "technical."

The case of Gerald P. Connelly, Minneapolis, is an indication that Hoffa will have a big voice in determining whether persons indicted and convicted of labor racketeering will continue to be influential in the teamsters.

Connelly entered a plea of guilty to violation of the Taft-Hartley law by accepting money from an employer and was ousted from Teamsters Union 548 in Minneapolis.

However, a three-man committee including Hoffa, Einar Mohn, Washington, 10th vice president, and John T. O'Brien, Chicago, 4th vice president, recommended that Connelly be reinstated in local 548.

Hoffa said he considered Connelly's law violation to be "technical," and that he wouldn't let Connelly down because it reminded him of his own "technical" convictions.

It was back in November 1940 that the first so-called "technical" indictment was returned against Hoffa in the Federal district court for the eastern district of Michigan.

Hoffa, his chief aid, Owen Bert Brennan, Teamsters Union 337, and four wastepaper concerns were indicted on charges of having "knowingly engaged in a combination and conspiracy unreasonably to prevent" other firms from selling wastepaper for shipment from Detroit to other States and to Canada.

The indictment set out that the union followed the trucks of other firms, picketed railroads that hauled the wastepaper handled by other firms, and that a bomb was thrown into the home of Charles Ginns, a wholesaler of wastepaper.

Hoffa admitted that he entered a plea of nolo contendere to the charge, paid a $1,000 fine, and had a permanent injunction against continuation of this activity in the wastepaper industry.

Hoffa told a House subcommittee that his plea of nolo contendere amounted to admission of the facts, but that it was not the same as a guilty plea, because he contended he felt the things that were done were legal.

Samuel L. Travis, a former special assistant to the attorney general of Michigan, explained the incident to a House labor-racket investigating subcommittee in 1947.

He said that the teamsters union was only in its swaddling clothes in Detroit at that time, but that it was extremely powerful even then.

At that time, they (Brennan and Hoffa) joined together with a group of wastepaper wholesalers to create a monopoly in Detroit of the wastepaper industry.

No one but employees of the four concerns involved were permitted into union membership. The employees of the companies on the outside were not permitted to join the union, and then because of the fact that these companies were so-called non-union companies and their employees were not members, they were not permitted to do business.

Hoffa's second technical conviction arose out of efforts of the teamsters union to organize more than 6,000 independent grocers and meat dealers in Detroit in 1945.

Hoffa and 17 associates were indicted for violation of the State labor laws. Hoffa entered a plea of nolo contendere and paid a $500 fine.

The Detroit teamster boss explained that the charge was reduced from a felony to a misdemeanor. He said he entered a plea on the advice of his attorneys, and on the theory "You don't go to court for a $25 fine."

"When they reduced it to a misdemeanor, I entered a plea. A lot of big corporations do it. There is no sense in spending a lot of union money fighting under the circumstances even if you might win if you took it all the way to the Supreme Court.

"I would have fought that one, but there were so many involved that we decided it would cause less stink and cost a lot less money if we just entered a plea."

Hoffa said a plea of nolo contendere "is nothing against a man." "Even General Motors has pleaded nolo," he said.

Circuit Judge George B. Murphy, of Michigan, wasn't so charitable about Hoffa's activity when he appeared before a House labor racket investigating subcommittee in 1947 to relate the story of the organizing of the so-called "mamma-and-papa" shops.

Judge Murphy sat as a one-man grand jury to investigate the pattern used by Hoffa's union in organizing these independent grocers and meat dealers.

He explained that Hoffa, as president of the Teamsters Joint Council 43, and Owen Bert Brannan, president of Teamsters Local 299, were the key figures in the organization drive.

"Prior to that the Teamsters union successfully unionized the packers and wholesale meat dealers and distributors," Judge Murphy testified. "An attempt was made to sew up the food industry in Detroit.

"It was contended that more jobs ought to be created for returning soldiers, and more trucks should be put on the road, and that no one should be permitted to pick up his meat (from the wholesaler) unless and until he joined the Teamsters union or bought a permit which would cost $5 and be good for 30 days."

Murphy said that many of the small groceries operated by a husband and wife had made it a practice of picking up their meat in a truck or car.

However, pamphlets were passed out by the teamsters union that no meat was to be delivered by wholesalers of the packing-house unless the teamsters union permit was presented.

A great many paid the $5 a month for a permit under protest prior to the time that the grand jury started operating.

Murphy said the union contended that it was creating more jobs, and that it wanted the meat hauled in sanitary trucks as a health measure.

"However, when some fellow had a broken-down Ford, or even a passenger car, he was permitted to take the meat in that truck regardless of whether it was sanitary or otherwise, provided he had paid the $5 for a permit," Murphy said.

In all from 300 to 400 witnesses were called before the grand jury before indictments were handed down charging Hoffa, Brennan, and their associates with extortion of the $5 on permits, and for attempting to force employers to join a union against their will, Judge Murphy said.

Hoffa said that those indictments were dismissed, and he entered his plea of guilty

to a charge of violating the State labor law by improper organizing activity.

Hoffa said his local union paid his $500 fine "with full and complete acceptance of the membership." Under court order the union also refunded $7,617 collected illegally from the "mama and papa" stores in permit payments.

YOU SHOULDA SEEN OTHER GUYS—BLACK EYE IN STREET FIGHT CAUSES HOFFA TO BOAST

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON.—Two carloads of police broke up a brawl on the streets of Charlotte, N. C., September 3, and James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa was charged with being engaged in an affray.

The 42-year-old chairman of the Central States Conference of Teamsters was 1 of 7 persons arrested.

The fist fighting broke out in a long-standing dispute between members of local 71 of the teamsters union and officials of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America.

"Our men didn't like the way the contract was rammed down our throats," said Sam Ewing, a steward in the local union.

However, Hoffa, Thomas E. Flynn, Bethesda, Md., and Richard Kavner, St. Louis, Mo., regarded the contract as in line with the pattern the international union seeks.

Although Hoffa got the contract approved on a 590 to 40 vote on a head count procedure, this did not end the criticism. Fighting broke out as Hoffa and local union members bickered outside the Fox Theater.

A crowd of several hundred gathered to watch before two carloads of police arrested Hoffa, Flynn, Kavner, and four local truck drivers.

Hoffa, Flynn, and Kavner posted $50 bond each and were released. City Prosecutor James E. Walker stated that they did not appear for the September 20 trial, and forfeited the cash bond. The four truck drivers were found guilty and paid $13 court costs each.

The operation in North Carolina was merely one of a number of cases where Hoffa has been active on the east coast. He's been in New York, New England, and Maryland bringing his talents to contract negotiations.

Hoffa, as chairman of the Central States Conference of Teamsters, rules a 13-State region.

In addition, Hoffa, says that Teamsters General President Dave Beck has given him supervisory authority over the 9-State southern conference of Teamsters which includes Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Florida.

When an investigator for a congressional committee kidded Hoffa about the black eye he received in the fight at Charlotte, Hoffa quipped:

"I took care of myself okay. You should have seen the other guys—two of them went to the hospital."

Police said one of the truckers injured his arm quite badly, and one suffered a bloody nose, but that they had taken none to the hospital.

Hoffa was proud that he had taken care of himself with his fists, but he says he is opposed to using such physical force in settling disputes with other labor officials or with employers.

He blames "antiunion police" for the numerous arrests in connection with assault, and points out that he has only one conviction for assault and battery.

Detroit police department file No. 59,527 shows that Hoffa was arrested for investigation of assault charges three times before his first conviction on February 4, 1938. Hoffa paid a $10 fine on the assault and battery charge.

On March 30, 1938, he was arrested on a charge of disturbing the peace but it was dismissed in April 1938.

In June 1938, a special investigation squad arrested Hoffa but he was discharged the same day.

On February 16, 1939, Hoffa was arrested on a charge of molesting and disturbing workmen at work, but 11 days later this charge was dismissed.

Hoffa was arrested November 2, 1939, on a charge of molesting a truck driver, but was discharged immediately.

On February 10, 1940, Hoffa was arrested in the investigation of a shooting, but he was discharged on a writ of habeas corpus February 13, 1940.

In 1942, Hoffa entered a plea of nolo contendere to a charge of violating the Federal antitrust laws, paid a $1,000 fine, and was put under a permanent injunction.

The indictment and injunction involved the teamsters union agreements with four wastepaper firms which it was contended created a monopoly.

In 1947, Hoffa and 17 associates were indicted on charges of violating the labor laws of Michigan by extorting $5 fees for permits for grocery and meat dealers to use to pick up meat at various packing houses and wholesale establishments.

Again Hoffa entered a plea of nolo contendere, when the charge was reduced to a misdemeanor, and paid a $500 fine.

Hoffa's police record was barren from 1947 until the Charlotte affair.

The troubles between local 71 and the International Teamsters Union had started about a year ago when an election in the local upset the previous leadership. Bud Jenkins defeated A. L. Gunter for president.

The international union removed Jenkins, put the local union in trusteeship, and named Gunter a district trustee with headquarters in Charlotte. Many local union members considered this to be a high-handed action by the international union.

Hoffa went to Charlotte in September to work out details of contracts with employers. The negotiations had taken about 5 weeks, and local union members contended that they were not apprised of contents of the contract until time for a vote.

Union Steward Ewing complained that Hoffa and others "approved the contract without knowing anything about working conditions here."

He also declared that although the membership heard rumors about the contract provisions, it wasn't until the day of the altercation that they learned the details. It was read to them.

Instead of the locals' usual secret ballot, Hoffa, Flynn, and Kavner took a public head count.

In general, the local drivers complained that a one-half cent per mile increase annually for the next 3 years was nullified by contract provisions increasing the layover time from 12 to 13 hours for over-the-road drivers.

Under the previous contract, the employer had to start paying the driver after a 12-hour layover even if he wasn't driving.

The contract negotiated by Hoffa provided increases of 35 cents an hour for dock workers and warehousemen and pickup and delivery drivers with a minimum of 45 hours a week.

This brought the pickup and delivery drivers pay to $1.68 an hour, and the weekly minimum to $75.60. The pay of dock workers and warehousemen was boosted to $1.53 an hour with $68.85 weekly minimum.

International headquarters of the teamsters' union said the altercation was a result of a misunderstanding. Some members of local 71 hadn't understood the contract Hoffa had negotiated for them, it was explained.

HOFFA'S FRIENDS DRAW MILLIONS FROM UNION INSURANCE FUND DEALS

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON.—Teamsters' union insurance premiums of more than $9 million were paid a year ago to an insurance firm operated by friends of James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa, chairman of the Central States Conference of Teamsters.

The teamsters' union official admits that he used his influence to throw the health and welfare insurance for a 22-State area to an insurance firm operated by the wife and son of a Chicago labor leader, Paul (Red) Dorfman.

"I think it was the best insurance we could get," Hoffa said. "I still think so. Our insurance fund is clean—one of the best in the country. None of these investigations has been able to show that one dime is missing."

Two congressional inquiries have been made into the teamsters' health and welfare insurance fund paid to Union Casualty & Life Insurance Co., of Mount Vernon, N. Y.

Some of the employer trustees objected to having the insurance placed with Union Casualty & Life, headed by Dr. Leo Perlman, executive vice president.

However, Hoffa convinced employer representatives the insurance program should be placed with Union Casualty in 1949, and he's kept it there in the face of congressional investigations and criticisms.

In 1953, a House labor subcommittee brought out the fact that Allen Dorfman, then 30, and his mother, Rose Dorfman, had cleaned up more than a million dollars in commissions in the period from 1949 through June 1953.

Investigators testified that $101,000 was missing from the Dorfman insurance agency. Allen Dorfman declined to testify on this missing $101,000 on grounds that he might incriminate himself. Hoffa testified he received none of the missing money.

At present, a Senate labor investigating subcommittee headed by Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, is taking another look at the operations.

There has been no criticism of theft or loss of money from the funds while held by the trustees.

However, there has been considerable criticism of the huge commissions that have flowed to Hoffa's friends. The hearings also pointed out that Hoffa has been engaged in lucrative joint business enterprises with friends who received these huge commissions.

Hoffa contends members of the teamsters' union in the 22 States are getting the best possible coverage at the best price.

Hoffa's friends—Mrs. Dorfman, Allen Dorfman, and Perlman—have drawn millions in profits from the Union Insurance agency in Illinois operated by the Dorfmans, and from Union Casualty & Life.

At the same time, Hoffa has entered into joint business operations with the Dorfmans and Perlman, including oil leases in North Dakota and Jack-o-Lantern Lodge, a camp near Eagle River, Wis.

Hoffa testified his partners in the Jack-o-Lantern Lodge were Allen Dorfman, Rose Dorfman, Owen Bert Brennan, and Phil Goodman, a Chicago lawyer. Brennan is another Detroit Teamsters' Union official and is regarded as Hoffa's top aid in the union.

Hoffa says he is in a partnership with Brennan, Allen Dorfman, Mrs. Dorfman, and Perlman in Northwestern Oil Co., Bismarck, N. Dak. According to Hoffa, each of the partners put up $10,000 for that venture in oil leasing.

The 42-year-old vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America says he finds no conflict of interest in using his influence to place insurance with his business associates and friends.

"I've got a right to make legitimate investments," Hoffa declares. "I've got a right to have these people for my friends. Paul Dorfman was my friend years before this insurance deal came up."

To this date Hoffa has received no criticism from the teamsters general president, Dave Beck, a fellow whose own prive investments have made him a millionaire.

Hoffa points to this lack of criticism from Beck as a sort of endorsement for the way the teamster health and welfare funds are being handled.

Hoffa has been a key figure in bringing together the central State conference of teamster welfare fund with the States of the southern conference of teamsters and steering them to Union Casualty.

The Michigan conference of teamsters operates from a separate fund, but the insurance is placed with the same company.

Under the contract signed for the over-the-road drivers for the period from February 1, 1956, to January 31, 1961, employers must contribute $2.25 a week for each employee. A pension plan has been added in the contract calling for an additional $2 a week contribution for each employee.

Under the Taft-Hartley labor law, these multimillion-dollar funds are jointly administered by an equal number of representatives of labor and of management.

Congressional committees have stated that in practice, the management trustees often disregard their responsibility and try to curry favor with the labor union officials who are trustees.

Hoffa has been a long-time friend of Red Dorfman, head of local 20467 of the AFL Waste Material Handlers Union in Chicago.

Perlman, as operating head of Union Casualty & Life, cultivated labor leaders such as Hoffa, Brennan, Dorfman, and Frank Darling, head of local 1031 of the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in Chicago.

A House committee investigative report states that the direct premium payments to Perlman's firm jumped from $1,460,000 in 1948, to $8,900,000 in 1952. Nearly 77 percent of the 1952 premiums came from the Teamsters' Union and Darling's Electrical Workers.

In the last year, the total premium payments to Perlman's firm have soared to more than $11 million. More than $9 million of this comes from the huge 22-State teamsters bloc dominated by Hoffa. Another $1,500,000 comes from health and welfare insurance premiums for the 35,000 to 37,000 members in Darling's Electrical Workers Union.

Hoffa contends that the contract with Perlman has been mutually beneficial, since it has enabled the Michigan Conference of Teamsters to buy a $250,000 bloc of preferred stock in Union Casualty & Life.

This made the Michigan teamsters the largest holder of preferred stock. With the payment of $40 a share—another $250,000—this stock can be converted to common stock with voting privileges on an option that must be exercised before January 1, 1956.

Congressional investigators have pointed to the problem involved if union ownership in an insurance company is such that union officials have an interest in curbing the claim rate of members of other unions insured by the company.

FEAR OF REPRISALS CITED—HOFFA NEARLY WRECKS CAREER OF TRUCK OFFICIAL

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON.—A number of disputes with James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa have nearly wrecked the career of a Des Moines man as a representative of the trucking industry.

Willis J. McCarthy, an attorney who represented the Midwest Operators Association, told congressional investigators that when he disagreed with Central States teamsters Chief Hoffa, his clients were harassed with labor grievances.

One employer had as many as 60 grievances filed against him in 1 month, with only a few of the grievances justified, McCarthy said.

McCarthy said Hoffa had forced a Des Moines transportation firm to rehire 8 truck drivers, 5 of whom admitted that they had made illegal charges for second story deliveries and were pocketing the money.

Hoffa boasted he would break McCarthy's clients, laughed at him for his futility in fighting the teamsters, and after having defeated McCarthy called him to chide him, McCarthy testified.

McCarthy was one of the employer representatives in 1949 when Hoffa prevailed upon the trustees to place the multimillion-dollar health and welfare insurance policy with Union Casualty and Life, Mount Vernon, N. Y., bringing big commissions to Hoffa's friends.

McCarthy said the employee representatives gave in to avoid "reprisals (by the teamsters) against their companies."

As an example, McCarthy testified that when contract negotiations broke down in a local cartage driver's contract in Kansas City, Mo., the teamsters shut down operations of the trucking concern at such distant points as Denver, Colo., Des Moines, Iowa, Omaha, Nebr., St. Paul, Minn., South Bend, Ind., and Detroit, Mich.

"In these distant cities they had local cartage contracts that were fully in effect and an over-the-road contract that was fully in effect, and that should not be affected by anything that occurred in Kansas City," McCarthy told congressional investigators.

"Did Hoffa ever tell you what would happen to your clients because you were representing them?" asked Chief Counsel William M. McKenna, of the House Labor Investigating Subcommittee.

"Hoffa told me that I should make an effort to get along with him; and if I didn't, that grievances would be filed against the carriers, and they would be struck as a result," McCarthy testified.

McCarthy said that in the case of drivers making extra charges for second-story deliveries the union contended that the charges were tips and that no dishonesty was involved. Forty city drivers and 50 road drivers went on strike, and teamsters' union members in Kansas City, St. Louis, and St. Paul picketed the company.

McCarthy said the firm was faced with "giving up or going broke, so we gave up."

McCarthy related that when a committee met to settle the case there were dissenting votes.

"I asked the committee be polled to get the result of the vote," McCarthy said. "Hoffa said, 'If you want the committee polled, we will shut you down, and you will stay shut down forever. Now, if you want the committee polled, that is your answer.' "

McCarthy said he asked for a recess to consult with the president of the company, and that the company president said:

"I can't afford another strike. If I have another strike, it will mean we are broke."

The eight drivers were put back and were paid somewhere between $3,000 and $4,000 back pay without requesting a poll of the committee, McCarthy said.

McCarthy said Hoffa called him on the telephone to ask, "Do you want to keep on fighting, or do you want to give up?"

Months later, McCarthy was in Washington seeking further congressional inquiry into the actions of Hoffa in the Midwest.

However, he was a cautious man. It was obvious that trucking interests were backing McCarthy, but as he called on Congressmen and investigators he carefully avoided naming his employer. He told Congressmen that he did not want his employer revealed because of the danger of reprisals.

Teamsters President Dave Beck has ignored the request of the New York City anticrime committee that Hoffa be kept out of New York.

Hoffa was the subject of a scathing report by the New York anticrime committee which was presented by Chairman Spruille Braden this year.

Hoffa was characterized as a friend and associate of several major figures in the ranks of gangsterdom, and the public was warned that the regional organization of the teamsters union will facilitate the efforts of racketeers to dominate the trucking industry in this area.

According to Braden's report, even big, tough New York City had reason to tremble at the invasion of the dynamic little labor leader from Detroit.

"His (Hoffa's) activities, though well publicized, have not as yet developed in Beck any visible will to take action," the report said.

Hoffa's invasions of other areas have been accomplished without the handicap of such organized resistance.

Hoffa is president of local 299 of the teamsters in Detroit, president of Joint Teamsters Council 43 in Detroit, president of the Michigan conference of teamsters, chairman of the 12-State central conference of teamsters, and is ninth vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

He has been trustee of a dozen local unions throughout the Midwest, and through arrangements with Beck has had some supervisory authority over the nine-State southern conference of teamsters.

The New York anticrime committee viewed with alarm the fact that the teamsters union is stamping out the autonomy of local unions.

The report stated that until recently the racketeers have not been too successful in getting control of the trucking industry in New York.

"A major barrier has been the virtual autonomy of the locals in the International Brotherhood of Teamsters," the report said. "The result has been that here in New York a few bona fide honest labor leaders have, through the control of their locals, been able to withstand the onslaught of the racketeers and to preserve the hard core of honest trade unionism."

The report stated that at the present time "an intensive effort is being made to break down that autonomy and to gain control over the teamster locals.

"Regional organizations are being used to accomplish this end," the report said. "The resultant centralization of control, in the opinion of experts, will facilitate the efforts of racketeers to dominate the trucking industry in any area, provided they are able to get control of the regional office of that union."

The report pointed out that in recent city-wide strikes in New York "the accepted spokesman for the trucking unions was replaced by order of Hoffa.

"Hoffa put in as spokesman a man who has been a lifelong associate of the worst gangster in this city. The strike was settled on terms dictated by Hoffa."

The report then pointed out that Hoffa was "the same man whose activities in the field of union welfare funds was the subject of disclosures by this committee and later by congressional committees.

"He, himself, is a friend of several major figures in the ranks of gangsterdom," the report said.

The anticrime committee said the rise of Hoffa to a position of prominence in the teamsters union "was due in large measure to the backing of a few nationwide trucking firms who have purposely played into his hands.

"Hoffa's plans for New York City, though not publicized by him, have been uncovered by your committee's investigation," the report stated.

"Any trucking firm desirous of favored treatment can easily get it by retaining one of a few select labor-relations firms and by going along with suggestions as to what insurance agencies will handle the union welfare and insurance funds."

The report warned that "certain leaders in the New York City trucking industry have already been approached with this proposition."

The report stated that there is much indecision in the trucking industry as to whether to go along with Hoffa's plan.

"They are bothered by the realization that one major weapon of Hoffa's is a plan which will ultimately relegate the local trucker to a very minor status in the industry," the report said.

The report stated that other leaders in the trucking industry "have decided to combine their efforts in order to fight Hoffa and his racketeering allies."

"These men, unlike their colleagues, realize the truth of the statement that 'you employ the racketeer on Monday—he is your partner by Wednesday—and your employer by Friday.'"

The grand juries indictments and congressional committees that had criticized Hoffa over the years had never hit him any harder than the New York Anticrime Committee. The crime committee continued to gather information on Hoffa's contacts with Johnny Dio, a convicted extortionist who operates a labor relations firm.

But, as if in defiance to the anticrime group, Hoffa continued to visit New York for the teamsters union. He said it was on authority from General President Beck.

TEAMSTER BOSS EYES BECK POST—HOFFA SYMBOL OF DEFIANCE OF CONGRESSIONAL PROBERS

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON.—James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa stands as a symbol of the teamsters union's successful defiance of congressional investigators in the past few years.

This little Napoleon of the drivers union is a shrewd, fearless, and aggressive warrior in the battles to expand the jurisdiction of the teamsters, to solidify it, and to defend his allies against those who attack them.

He appears to be in no hurry to seize the crown from General President Dave Beck. He is merely moving to make alliances that will put him in line for the top post when Beck bows out.

Throughout the central States conference of teamsters, local teamsters officials have been under the fire of congressional investigators and grand juries.

Hoffa has stood his ground when he has been under fire personally in Michigan. He has consistently backed those in his area who have been scorched by congressional committees, indicted, or convicted.

As chairman of the central States conference of teamsters, the 42-year-old Detroit man has been the bulwark of the teamster defense against congressional committees that have conducted investigations in Minneapolis, Minn., Kansas City and St. Louis, Mo., Chicago, Cleveland and Akron, Ohio, and Detroit, Mich.

Lack of records and lack of access to union records hampered investigators throughout 3 years of investigation. When Hoffa was called to explain the lack of records in his Michigan area, he testified he had approved the destruction of financial records to conserve space.

Congressional committees and grand juries have plagued his career as a labor leader almost from the outset, but Jimmy said he has learned that all these things blow over. There are no indications that Hoffa's policy has hurt him at this stage.

In July 1953, the New York Anticrime Commission was critical of Hoffa as a lifelong associate of the worst gangsters in this city, and Chairman Spruille Braden asked that President Beck keep Hoffa out of New York.

Beck declined to move against Hoffa, and in a nationwide television show asserted that he found nothing in Hoffa's operations to criticize.

The various teamsters union members and officials who gathered in Washington for dedication of the $5 million teamsters building certainly didn't indicate any disenchantment with Hoffa.

Minor officials made him the center of attention with an effusive greeting.

Although he strutted with the carriage of one who expected this as his due, he had the names of all on the tip of his tongue and a quick comment that made it apparent he remembered them.

His table gets a constant stream of minor teamsters officials. Some want to thank him for help in cutting redtape to settle administrative problems, or problems with employers. Others want to ask him to contact the heads of large organizations to iron out difficulties that local officials have found impossible to handle with regular labor-relations representatives of the firm.

Beck can visit the White House and walk with kings, but Jimmy Hoffa is working 14 to 16 hours a day on the contacts that make him the No. 2 power in the 1,500,000-member International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Hoffa has two telephones in his home in Detroit. The number of the upstairs phone is known to business agents and other officials of the teamsters union.

Hoffa says he is available 24 hours a day to hear the problems of any of the teamsters in his 22-State area.

Hoffa also will take up the problems of local labor leaders in New York, New Jersey, Maryland, or North Carolina. Jimmy says this activity is not an encroachment on Thomas E. Flynn, head of the eastern conference of teamsters.

Flynn is not an international vice president of the teamsters union, and Hoffa says that Beck had authorized him to go in and settle problems in those areas.

Hoffa has continued to branch out in the East, and make plans for further organization drives in the Middle West despite the upsetting influence of indictments in the last 2 years of top teamster officials in St. Louis, Kansas City, Detroit, Chicago, and Minneapolis.

Hoffa and his lawyers have listened to the problems of indicted teamster officials with a sympathetic ear. They have then set about giving what they consider to be sound advice for beating the rap, or copping a plea.

When Gerald P. Connelly, former official of local 548 in Minneapolis, copped a plea of guilty to violation of the Taft-Hartley labor law he was acting on the advice of Hoffa.

Hoffa said he listened to the story behind the charge that Connelly had illegally accepted $300 from an employer in violation of the Taft-Hartley law.

In Hoffa's opinion it was a technical violation but there were so many problems involved in trying to beat the case that Hoffa advised Connelly to enter a plea of guilty and was fined $500.

Later, when an effort was made to oust Connelly as a convicted labor racketeer, Hoffa was on the three-man committee that studied the case and recommended to Beck that Connelly be reinstated.

Hoffa is equally critical of the indictments returned against Harold Gibbons, St. Louis teamster official; Orville Ring, teamster boss in Kansas City, and William Presser, Cleveland, chairman of the Ohio conference of teamsters.

Presser paid a $1,500 fine after pleading nolo contendere (no contest) to a charge of conspiracy to create a monopoly in the distribution of candy and tobacco products in Ohio. Neither Gibbons nor Ring was convicted.

Connelly and Hoffa had been friends for 20 years, and Hoffa stuck with a friend while he was in trouble.

In the teamsters union, Hoffa is regarded as a man of his word whether he says he "will back you," or whether he says he "will get you."

In November 1943, Hoffa paced back and forth outside of the door of an eighth-floor courtroom of the Federal Building in Detroit. A congressional hearing was in progress that was aimed at Hoffa. A committee ruling forced Hoffa to stay on the outside.

He was the center of attention as he moved back and forth shouting his dislikes for Chairman WINT SMITH, Republican, of Kansas, and his arch-enemy Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, Republican, of Michigan, who were conducting the hearings.

On one occasion he cursed a personal representative of Teamster President Beck, and accused Beck of intigating the congressional inquiry to get him. The representative of Beck said there was nothing to such reports, but he carefully avoided denouncing Hoffa for making such an accusation.

Hoffa says he likes to run a union so that any member "can come up and tell me I'm wrong."

"I like to be able to sit down across the table and argue things out, and when it is all over with I like to forget it," Hoffa said.

"I've had some tough battles with employers, but I've never seen an employer yet that I couldn't get along with afterwards," Hoffa said. "I can go out right afterwards and have a cup of coffee with them and get along just as if nothing had happened."

Part of the reason that Jimmy can be so cheerful after a battle is that he hasn't lost many.

What is Hoffa's secret of success?

"You gotta use your pressure, and make sure you got everything stopped off," Hoffa explains. "I've turned down a lot of strikes because I knew they (the local union) weren't ready. I won't sanction a strike when I'm not sure they have everything stopped off so they'll win."

Hoffa says that when local officials come in with just a feeling they can win a strike, he sends them back for the facts.

"They have to show me," he said. "It must be done on a scientific basis. When you put the screws on you're sure they'll have to come your way."

Hoffa doesn't try to give the impression that he has never had any abortive attempts to organize, but he has considered those only temporary difficulties.

At present, Hoffa is making big plans to organize the service stations, grease racks, and parking lots all over the area from the Appalachian Mountains to the Rocky Mountains.

Hoffa says he's made some exploratory moves in his home territory around Detroit, and has concluded that it is not yet time for the big move.

The teamster's action in Detroit was in part successful, but some of the big service stations just closed up and went home. The big oil companies then cut gasoline prices on the outskirts of the affected area, and this drew customers enough to keep the total gallonage up, Hoffa said.

"It proved we've got to go at this in a wider area to really make it hurt," Hoffa said. "They think they have us stopped, but we've been doing some planning recently that will set these big oil companies up for a big surprise."

Hoffa asserts that the teamsters should have a right to organize small firms in which a man runs his own business and has no employees outside of his family.

He cites the organization of the independent jukebox owner as essential, and each

of these independent jukebox operators "is a threat to the teamsters, and to organized labor as a whole."

Hoffa cites the case of the unorganized musicians who might work as independent entertainers if it were not for the tight musicians union.

"Look at the way Petrillo has things sewed up," Hoffa says. "There is no reason why the teamsters shouldn't have it the same way."

If Jimmy Hoffa has it his way, he's going to have highway transportation, and everything else in teamsters jurisdiction, sewed up as tight as the musicians union.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for approximately 15 minutes in reference to a special item of proposed legislation with respect to which I have formally notified other Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—I do not like to object—but I should like to familiarize the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] with the request. Perhaps if the Senator from Minnesota were to speak in the morning hour, and then ask for additional time of 4 or 5 minutes, we could keep within the spirit of the agreement with the Senator from South Dakota. I would not want him to feel that I had let him down.

I suggest that the Senator from Minnesota yield to me in order that I may ask for a call of the Executive Calendar, with the understanding that the Senator from Minnesota shall have the floor when the Executive Calendar shall have been disposed of.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Henry Irving Hodes, to be a General in the United States Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SUNDRY NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED FORCES

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry routine nominations in the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota proposed as a substitute for the substitute amendment of the Senator from Texas, for himself and other Senators.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair is prepared to recognize the senior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from South Dakota is prepared to be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, at the conclusion of the session yesterday I was discussing some of the arguments made in support of electoral college reform. This afternoon I should like to resume at the point at which I left off in yesterday's discussion.

For purposes of recapitulation, I may say that yesterday I had concluded the development of two of the arguments why, in my opinion, electoral college reform in this country not only is overdue, but also is of vital significance to the continuation of the American concepts of government and the American way of life.

The first argument I presented was that the electoral college reform as proposed in the compromise amendment would restore the appropriate balance between the voters in the big city areas and the voters in the noncity areas of the Nation. I pointed out that by so doing, although the impact of pressure groups would not be eliminated, nevertheless, pressure groups would be required, if they were to be effective, to operate on a national level and to make a national appeal, rather than a specialized appeal to little segments of Americans in specified sections of the country.

I pointed out, further, that one of the really serious challenges to democracy in this country has been the development of the boss-led political machine of the big city, which is pressure-groupism at its worst; which provides the opportunity for a few selfish people in politics to seek pelf rather than to render public service, and to exert influence in the great metropolitan areas of the Nation to the extent that they can control the entire electoral college vote of a big State. By throwing it en masse and en bloc, through one modification or another, one way or another they can then determine the selection of the President and thereby determine the destiny of America.

I pointed out that the present electoral college system, which was devised before there were any large American cities, not only makes it possible for the big city machines to develop and to exercise undue weight in the determination of our elections, but also, it actually invites the growth of the big city machines and places a premium on their operations.

The second argument I made yesterday was that under the proposed compromise amendment the district voting features provided for in the Mundt-Coudert section of the bill, which provides that the electors shall be elected precisely as Senators and Representatives are elected in the same districts, and by the same constituencies, entirely eliminates—and the Daniel-Kefauver section of the joint resolution modifies and ameliorates to a considerable extent—some very unhappy opportunities for a miscarriage of justice, which exists in the present electoral-college system.

I pointed out, for example, that under the present system political fraud and corruption in a single large election district can actually determine the decisions of Americans as a whole, because if such fraud takes place in a big city, which, in turn, determines the vote cast by a big State, it means that the candidate who is the recipient of the fraudulent activities becomes the successful candidate nationally and actually determines our national destiny.

I pointed out that by selecting electors by districts, or by electing them under the proportional system, the opportunity for cheaters and dishonest persons in a single election district to determine the outcome of an extremely important national election for President will be reduced and perhaps eliminated entirely.

I pointed out, in the second place, that many times the occurrence of bad weather in a certain area of the country or of a State has made it impossible for

voters to go to the polls, thus providing an increased opportunity for the voters in the large cities, who have easy access to the polls, to bring about a result in a State election which is not compatible with the thinking, convictions, and beliefs of the people as a whole.

I pointed out that such disorders or blizzards, floods, or other forms of bad weather, which affect certain segments of the country, actually means that caprices of nature, rather than the convictions of the people, can and sometimes do determine the decision in a large State casting a great block of votes for one candidate or another. As a result, the entire national election is so determined.

I pointed out, thirdly, that quite frequently intense local issues prevailing in some of the large cities in the big States at the time of a national election may do more to determine the direction in which the people will vote for President than all the platform planks and all the speeches, promises, and positions of the Presidential candidates in a national election campaign.

I shall use the city of Philadelphia, Pa., as an example of where there have been in the city hall, unhappily, bad administrations, some of them Republican, some of them Democratic, at different times in history; and how on occasion the vast electoral vote of Pennsylvania has been cast Republican or Democratic, not on the basis of national issues, not on the basis of the merits of the competing candidates for the Presidency, but on the basis of the attitude of the people of Philadelphia toward the political crowd in the city hall.

I said that, in my opinion, that was not a good thing to have happen when the time came for the election of a national administration, charged with the preservation of peace, with the development of wide national prosperity, and with the running of a great, comprehensive country such as is represented by this Republic.

With this short recapitulation of my presentation of yesterday, I now come to the third reason why, in my opinion, it is highly important that the Senate should pass the compromise amendment, and get on the road toward electoral college reform.

My third reason is that our compromise amendment would eliminate from the American election system those features which are completely un-American and, in my opinion, indefensibly immoral at present. These grow out of the fact that the block voting system of casting the votes in the electoral college, whereby a State pools together the votes of the winner and the loser, and casts them with one mighty blow in the direction of the winning candidate, tends to destroy the equality of citizenship which is pledged to citizens of the United States under the Constitution of this great country. I shall illustrate that.

New York State has 45 electoral votes; Delaware has 3; my home State of South Dakota has 4. There is nothing wrong with the fact that a great State like New York should have 45 votes, a small State like Delaware should have only 3, and a rural State like South Dakota should have only 4. There is nothing wrong about the fact that from the area of the country which is represented within the boundary lines of the State of New York, there should be, of course, a much larger vote cast for President than would come from sparsely settled areas or from smaller States.

But herein lies the gross inequity of the situation; herein lies the indefensible immorality which has crept into our election system as our great metropolitan areas have developed, and as, contrary to the expectations, desires, and beliefs of the constitutional forefathers, State after State began to use, until now the practice includes all the States, the block system of casting the electoral votes. That is what that now means: It means that the individual voter in the State of New York actually casts 45 electoral votes every time he puts his individual mark on the ballot, while the citizen of Delaware, who may be equally intelligent, equally prudent, equally patriotic, when he casts his individual vote and marks his ballot for a President, has only 3 electoral votes that he puts into motion. In other words, the vote power, the vote impact, the vote weight of the individual citizen in the State of New York is 15 times as much as the impact of the vote cast by the single voter in the State of Delaware. Or I suppose it could be put another way. The voter in the State of New York, as an individual, when he pulls the lever in a voting machine, or puts a mark on the ballot, exerts 45 pounds of pressure on the measuring device determining who is elected President. The same type of citizen, the same type of individual American, who, by accident of a State line, happens to be pulling the lever on his voting machine, or putting his X on a ballot in the State of Delaware, exerts only 3 pounds of pressure on the same machine determining who is going to be President and who is not going to be President.

I have been a little surprised at some of the opposition to this proposal, and a little surprised as to its source, because I listened to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I listened to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and I listened to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] say that they were not in favor of this effort to bring the election of the President closer to the people and to equalize the voting importance of all American citizens. I have been surprised because I know at least two of those distinguished Senators, and I believe all three, have been in the vanguard of those who have said, "Let us eliminate the poll tax—let us treat all Americans as equal."

Why do they want to eliminate the poll tax? I assume they want to eliminate the poll tax in order to move in the direction of giving all Americans an equal opportunity to vote. I think that is a commendable objective. I am happy I come from a State where we have no religious discrimination, no barriers to voting; where we have no racial discrimination, where we have no color discrimination, where we treat all Americans as equals, as the Constitution says we should, and where every citizen has an equal right to vote. We were among the first to give to that great race known as the American Indian his rightful franchise.

But I cannot reconcile these protestations of these Senators against the poll tax with an attitude of mind that also says they would like to continue to perpetuate a system which gives a citizen in the State of New York 15 times as many votes as a citizen of Delaware gets. Surely such inequality is indefensible.

If there is any basis of logic or reason in eliminating a poll tax, so that a black man, a red man, a yellow man, a white man, and everybody in every section of the country has the same right to vote and the same authority to determine the destiny of his Government by exercising his franchise—if that makes sense, it certainly makes sense to equalize the voting power of those already entitled to the franchise. And that is a serious deficiency which has evolved in our present system. We should eliminate it if we really believe in equality of opportunity in our polling places.

I do not see how any man can consistently argue that he favors giving a vote to some American citizen who does not now have a vote, so that we can have equal citizens, so we will have no second-class citizens in the country, and then in the same Chamber argue that he wants to continue a system which gives people in certain sections of the country 15 votes to 1 vote of another American. They worry about the fact that a man who has a vote today has one more vote than perhaps a colored man in the South who is not entitled to vote. But that would be a discrepancy of just one vote. Yet we find these same Senators trying to keep in the law and the Constitution a situation which has developed which results in the discrepancy of not just 1, but of 45 to 3—a discrepancy of 42 votes.

Mr. President, I have been discussing the discrepancy in voting. I have been discussing the overdue weight which has evolved in our system because of the unit rule, general slate, block system of voting electoral votes en masse a State at a time. I should like to call to the attention of my friends who are interested, and I hope sincerely so and not for political reasons only, in promoting legislation to eliminate the poll tax, and matters of that kind, the fact that this is the most serious discrepancy in the voting power between the people of the United States extant in our American Republic today. There is no comparison between the inequities of this system as compared with the fact that perhaps one man loses his vote in the South and another man has the right to cast a single vote.

I know from a reading of English history that plural voting is something that Anglo-Saxons have engaged in from time to time. There was a time, and it may still be in effect, that a voter selecting members for the House of Commons had three votes at his command if he was lucky. A man had a right to vote because he was a Briton. That entitled him to a vote. But he also got a vote if he happened to have a business in London and a residence in the country. That gave him another vote. For a long time, and it may still be true, he got an

extra vote if he happened to be a graduate of Oxford or Cambridge. So sometimes a privileged citizen in Britain had 3 votes compared to 1 for a coal miner or a stevedore or a taxi driver running his little cab around Picadilly Circus. That was a discrepancy of 3 to 1, but in our country we have developed it to a discrepancy of 15 to 1, when one compares the voting power of the citizen of New York State with the citizen of Delaware, or of Vermont, Wyoming, or Nevada.

I have searched the Constitution very carefully. I find no place in the Constitution of the United States where it says the President shall be elected by the States. I have reread Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. I cannot find any place where the Great Emancipator ever said that in this country we are going to have a government of the States, for the States, and by the States.

Something rings in my mind that this is supposed to be a government of the people, that the people elect the President, that the people mark the ballots. So there has crept into this debate a curious paradox, where some Members would like to continue a function of States to determine which candidate is going to be President, rather than make it a function of the people.

Let me illustrate just how serious this discrepancy is. Let us assume a case of a hypothetical presidential election which is very close. Picture, if you will, Mr. President, a situation in which practically all the people have gone to the polls in the 48 States. Now, assume that by some system of telepathy we are able to read what is in the ballot boxes, so we are able to know what is happening in the course of the campaign—something which very definitely could happen in a real election, namely that the Democratic and Republican candidates for President, respectively, at 30 seconds before the close of the election are tied up even Stephen, 50–50. Each has the same number of popular votes. Each has the same number of electoral votes—241 votes for each, Mr. President. That makes a total of 482 electoral votes, and leaves 49 electoral votes unaccounted for, to make up the total of 531. So at that point the election is completely tied up—241 electoral votes for the Republican candidate, and 241 electoral votes for the Democratic candidate. Thirty seconds before the time when the polls close, two States remain to be heard from, New York State, with 45 electoral votes; and South Dakota, with 4 electoral votes. Those two combined account for the 49 electoral votes which are still to be heard from.

Mr. President, let us suppose that by a system of clairvoyance we discover that the vote in New York State is a tie and that the vote in South Dakota is a tie, as between the Republican candidate and the Democratic candidate; and time keeps running out. Then, 15 seconds before the polls close, a college president in South Dakota, who has spent all day studying the various issues in the campaign, reading the party platforms, reading the speeches of the candidates, and trying to do his conscientious best to determine whether in that specific election it would be better to have a Republican or a Democratic President, enters a polling place, just before it closes, and is in time to vote.

Let us suppose that at the same moment in history a stumble bum from skid row in Battery Park, New York City, rolls off a park bench on which he has been sleeping and, coming to, staggers drunkenly over to a polling place, enters into it by accident, and gets into the polling place in time to vote. Then what do we have, Mr. President? At that point we have a tie, with 241 electoral votes on each side. We have a tie in the popular vote. We have a tie in those two States—New York and South Dakota. We have a college president doing his best to make an intelligent, scholarly, thoughtful, wise decision; and we have a stumble bum from skid row who has staggered into an election booth by accident.

Let us assume that at that moment the college president, after thinking over the matter very carefully indeed, votes Republican. Of course, I am sure that if he were smart enough to be a college president, he would vote Republican. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am not very happy about yielding, but I yield. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I hope the Senator from South Dakota is not making any insinuations about the Republicans and the Democrats.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from South Carolina is exactly correct; I am just trying to illustrate a point in mathematics. [Laughter.] I am just trying to show how silly, how unfair, and how dangerous our present system can be. I am not making any assumptions of any kind. We do not have any skid row in South Dakota, but we do have some colleges there. That is why I suggested that the college president would be in South Dakota. New York has both a skid row and some very wonderful colleges, of one of which I am happy to be a graduate with an advanced degree. So I am not casting any aspersions at New York. At any rate, Mr. President, I assume that the highly intelligent college president votes Republican.

Then I turn our imaginary TV lens from the projection booth toward Battery Park, New York, to see what the stumble bum is doing there in New York City. In the confines of the heated polling place, he cannot see very clearly or think very clearly; but, by gum, he votes. Staggering around to keep from falling, he reaches up and pulls down a lever on a voting machine—he does not know which one or even that he is voting. Then both voters walk out of the polling places. By accident—not because he is drunk—Mr. Stumblebum, from skid row, has pulled the Democratic ticket lever. [Laughter.] What happens? Well, we are totting up the votes. Before those 2 votes were cast, the election was tied up, 50–50, even-Stephen, with 241 electoral votes for the Republican candidate and 241 electoral votes for the Democratic candidate—and the popular vote also standing at a tie.

Well, Mr. President, one who had not studied our election system very carefully would suppose of course that, inasmuch as up to that moment the vote had been a tie, with 241 electoral votes for the Republican candidate and 241 electoral votes for the Democratic candidate, then, after 2 more citizens voted, 1 voting for the Republican candidate and the other voting for the Democratic candidate, the election would still be a tie.

But, Mr. President, that is not the case. Let us see what happens in the case of those last 2 votes. Before those last 2 votes were cast, the election was a tie, with 241 electoral votes for each side. But then what happened? When the college president, after taking so much care and deliberation, voted Republican, he—in effect—cast 4 electoral votes for the Republican candidate. But when the stumble bum from skid row, in his drunken stagger, by accident pulled the Democratic ticket lever, he cast 45 electoral votes for the Democratic candidate. Therefore, Mr. Stumble Bum's choice won the election, because then the Democratic candidate would have 45 additional electoral votes—the 45 electoral votes hanging in the balance whenever anyone in New York States votes, as compared to the 4 electoral votes in the case of South Dakota.

Mr. President, does that make sense to anyone? Are we to suppose that the constitutional forefathers sat through the long, hot summer in Philadelphia, trying to devise a system whereby a stumble bum in New York City could accomplish more, by accident, than could be accomplished through design by a highly intelligent college president in South Dakota?

No, Mr. President. We need a reform. We need a correction of this indefensible immorality which has crept into our system because of the growth of the great metropolitan areas, because of the dislocations of the population, because of the manner in which the electoral college now functions by tradition, although it was not so designed by the constitutional architects, and because the voting system which also has crept into it causes such great inequalities between the voters of the individual States.

But, Mr. President, the situation is much, much worse than that, much worse than the fact that Mr. Stumble Bum's vote gave the Democratic candidate a total of 286 electoral votes, when all the votes were counted, whereas the South Dakota college president's vote increased the Republican candidate's electoral vote to only 245. That would be the situation, because up until the last 30 seconds the vote was tied, with 241 electoral votes for each side; and then the fact that Mr. Stumble Bum in Battery Park voted for the Democratic candidate, resulted in increasing the electoral votes for the Democratic candidate by 45 to total 286, whereas the fact that the intelligent college professor in South Dakota voted for the Re-

publican candidate resulted in increasing the electoral votes for the Republican candidate by 4 to total only 245.

Of course, Mr. President, it could equally well happen that a South Dakota college president or college professor—perhaps of a little less intellectual degree—would vote for the Democratic candidate, and perhaps a stumble bum in Battery Park might stagger into a polling place and hit the lever for the Republican ticket by blind accident, rather than the lever for the Democratic ticket. But the point is that such a system does not make sense and it is grossly inequitable.

The situation actually could be worse than that, Mr. President. Suppose that 15 seconds before the polling places closed, while the drunk from skid row staggered into the polling place in Battery Park, New York City, instead of having one man go into a polling place in South Dakota, 40 men crowded into polling places in that election district, just before the polls closed, and cast their votes. All 40 of those South Dakotans could conceivably have voted Republican, at almost precisely the same moment when one man in New York City, by virtue of his accidental pulling of the Democratic ticket lever, voted Democratic.

Well, Mr. President, certainly a visitor from abroad, in looking at our democratic processes, would say, in commenting on that situation, "That breaks the tie, and the Republican candidate will have 39 votes more than the Democratic candidate." But, Mr. President, would that actually be the case? No, indeed; it would not. The tie would be broken, all right, but it would not be broken in the direction of the popular choice; it would not be broken in the direction of the way the majority of the people of the United States were actually voting. Far from it. Instead, the tie would be broken by a trick mechanism in the electoral college system, which still would give the 45 electoral votes to the candidate for whom the one voter in New York State had, by accident, voted, whereas it would give only 4 additional electoral votes to the candidate for whom the 40 persons in South Dakota voted.

Mr. President, is that what we are trying to do? Is that what our friends would like to perpetuate? Is that what the great opponents of the poll tax now propose—that we perpetuate a system whereby one citizen of the United States in New York State shall, when voting, have more effect than 40 citizens of the United States in another section of the country?

I dare them to find any place, north, south, east, or west, in America where such an inequity is provided by poll-tax legislation, or by any other system of trying to deny people a vote. I am against all these restrictions and inequities. I want the people to have the right to vote. I want their votes to count and to be counted equitably.

It is worse than that, Mr. President—much worse than that. Suppose, when this poor fellow who rolled off the park bench in New York got to the polling place and voted his single vote by accident in New York City, at that same hour in history 400 South Dakotans had gotten into the polling place to break the tie. South Dakotans are pretty smart, but they are not smart enough so that we could expect all 400 to vote Republican. There would be some Democratic votes cast. But let us assume that, in a particularly erudite and intelligent area of South Dakota, all 400 voted Republican.

That ought to break the tie, certainly, in behalf of popular government. If this is government of the people, by the people, and for the people, there is the voice of the people. Four hundred said, "This time we should have a Republican administration"—one drunk by accident had voted Democratic.

The stumblebum from skid row did not know how he voted. He hit the Democratic lever by accident. What happens? Who wins? The Democratic candidate wins, because of the vote of a single individual. Where are the great proponents of equality of citizenship? Where are the great proponents of giving every man an equal vote? Strangely enough, we find them now saying, "We want to perpetuate a system under which a voter in one State shall have more than 400 times the power of a voter in South Dakota." What kind of nonsense is that? What type of inconsistency? I cannot understand it.

Certainly that does not give equality of voting. Are we electing our Presidents by gimmicks, gadgets, and statistical quotas in the State, or are people running the country? Where are the Senators now who believe in government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and who say they do not want any second-class citizenship? Where are the Senators who say they do not want any inequality? They do not want any segregation? They do not want anything now except to perpetuate a system which gives their voters 400 times the voting power of a citizen of South Dakota.

Ah, Mr. President, it is worse than that—much worse than that. Let us analyze this parodoxical situation a little further.

There is still a tie, at 241 electoral votes for each candidate. Everything is tied up in New York and South Dakota. Thirty seconds before the polling places close, we have the down-and outer in New York, the poor unfortunate individual who fell off the park bench, heading for the front door of Alcoholics Anonymous, getting into the polling place by mistake, and pulling a lever on a voting machine by accident, and thus voting Democratic. At that same time, by some strange accident of physics and geography, let us now assume 400,000 South Dakotans went into polling places and voted just before the polls were closed. Four hundred thousand got into the polling places pretty late, but they voted.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Let me finish the story of this vote, and then I shall be glad to yield.

I am sure that 400,000 South Dakotans would not all vote Republican at the same time, but in this case let us assume that they did. I want to find out how much sincerity there is in this business of treating all American voters alike. Let us therefore assume that all 400,000 voted Republican. The stumble bum from skid row voted Democratic by accident—400,000 South Dakotans voted Republican deliberately and by design.

What happened? Certainly, one might assume, we could poll the people of the world and find out who won the American election. People would say, "Things were all tied up. Then 1 man voted Democratic, and 400,000 voted Republican. Certainly the Republicans won in a landslide. America will have a Republican President."

But they did not win. One vote in New York, by accident, gives 45 electoral votes to the Democratic candidate, while 400,000 votes in South Dakota give 4 electoral votes to the other candidate, and we have an election decided upon the basis that 1 man has more than 400,000 times the voting power of another.

Is that what we are trying to perpetuate? Is that what people are talking about when they say, "Let us eliminate the poll tax, so that each man can have an equal right to vote"? Let us be sensible about it. Let us have some consistency. Let us be realistic. Let us be fair. Let us not try to perpetuate a system which tends to give people in the larger cities such an unfair advantage over people in the States with smaller blocks of electoral votes.

I do not want a white man to have an advantage over a black man. Neither do I want a white man in the city of New York to have an advantage of 400,000 times the voting strength of a white man, an Indian, or a black man in South Dakota. If we believe in equality of voting privileges, if we believe in equality of opportunity, if we believe in the things about which we make speeches and with respect to which we write platforms for presidential candidates, let us demonstrate our sincerity when it comes to voting on the compromise amendment.

I am now happy to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, what has the Senator to say with respect to direct voting by the people for President? In previous measures there have been provisions under which a candidate with 40 or 45 percent or more of the vote would be declared the nominee.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is referring to the direct popular vote of the people, is he not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The direct popular vote of the people.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me say to the Senator from South Carolina, whose vote I seek in favor of this amendment, and whose vote I feel confident of winning, that there is a considerable amount of merit in the proposal for direct popular vote of the people for President. However, the political realities of the situation are such that I do not presume the States of the Union—more especially the State of South Carolina—would ever be willing to give up the great bastion of States rights built around the concept of the bicameral legislature, in which every State has two Senators, and equal representation in the Senate.

That principle is inseparably bound up with our electoral college system of

equating the votes and distributing them among the various States. I do not believe it would be within the bounds of practical possibility to induce the States to adopt a constitutional amendment which would tend to move in the direction of a unitary system of government, which would eliminate State lines, and which would move in the direction of having two completely representative branches of Congress, instead of a Senate and a House. That being true, we move in the direction of a popular vote for President as far as we can, while perpetuating the doctrine of States rights, which is dear to the hearts of the people of South Carolina as well as the people of South Dakota. Surely all proponents of a direct popular vote for President should therefore support this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with what the Senator has said. The Senator may recall that in the past we have joined in introducing bills on the same subject.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. One of such bills passed the Senate in 1950. I submitted an amendment which provided that if any person received 40 percent or more of the votes, he should be declared the nominee. What does the Senator have to say on that subject?

Mr. MUNDT. I recall that bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The amendment was agreed to on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It was offered by the majority leader, in 1950.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That bill passed the Senate by the necessary two-thirds vote, and went to the House.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Would the Senator be in favor of adopting such a provision as I have referred to, and setting the figure at 40 or 45 percent?

Mr. MUNDT. In answer to the Senator's question, let me say that in evolving the compromise we devoted a considerable amount of time, study, and analysis to the particular proposal. We did a great deal of hypothetical calculation. For a time the figure we favored was 40 percent, then 45 percent. Finally we settled upon a figure of 50 percent, for this reason:

There is a great body of public opinion in this country—and I think I find myself included in that body—to the effect that, somehow, or other, we would like to have our Presidents elected by a majority vote. We would like to have a majority President. If he can obtain a majority in the electoral college, well and good. If an election goes into the House of Representatives, the vote is upon a different basis but it also requires a majority decision. We live in a country where the majority rules. We understand the concept of majority rule. When there is a tie vote in the Senate and the Vice President breaks a tie, no one complains. That is majority rule. If such a rule could be incorporated in the bill, I should like to have the figure fixed at 50 percent.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As I understand, the bill that was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, after hearings had been held on it, contained the 40 percent provision. Is that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is talking about this year, I assume.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. This year.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. When we worked on it in conference, in order to get a compromise proposal together, we moved the percentage up to 50 percent.

We have been talking about the inequity of having votes cast by State blocs, instead of having them recorded individually, breaking them up by districts or distributing them by proportion.

It would seem to me a simple matter of political morality that our country should recognize in this day and age, when we do not want 2d-class citizens, that we do not want 4th- or 5th- or 15th-class citizens either, in counting the votes. Our proposal will correct it. This will give us an opportunity to function, as it has always been intended the Government should function, as a government of, by, and for the people.

I wish to turn now to the fourth issue. I may say that after developing the fourth issue, and perhaps a fifth issue, I shall answer, if I can, some of the arguments that have been presented by the Senators from Massachusetts, New York, and New Jersey, and then I shall relinquish the floor.

I make that announcement now so that the administrative assistants of those Senators may notify their Senators, and that the page boys may be on due notice with respect to it, in connection with notifying the Senators.

I hope the Senators may be present to defend their position, if it is defensible, or to challenge the arguments I am making, if they are challengeable.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum so that those Senators may get to the floor. What the Senator is saying is of great importance.

Mr. MUNDT. The page boys could notify the Senators.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will say that when the Senator from South Dakota has concluded his speech, I intend to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to have more Senators in the Chamber to hear the Senator's speech. I would suggest that we have a quorum call.

Mr. MUNDT. If we might have a short quorum call, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor, I would be agreeable.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, with the understanding that the Senator from South Dakota will not lose the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, before leaving my third point I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate the States of the Union which have six or fewer electoral votes. I mention it simply to illustrate the voting strength of a voter in those States. For example, in the State of New York a voter has 7 times the voting power, or the equivalent of 7 votes, for every vote cast by a citizen in any of these States: actually, the States which have 6 electoral votes are Oregon, Nebraska, and Colorado.

In other words, a voter in New York State has a voting power of more than seven times the voting power of a vote cast by a citizen in Denver, Omaha, or Portland.

The States with four electoral votes are Utah, South Dakota, Rhode Island, North Dakota, New Mexico, New Hampshire, Montana, Idaho, and Arizona.

A voter in New York State hits 10 keys for a candidate for President every time a citizen of any of these other States hits a single key for a presidential candidate. He is an equally intelligent citizen, an equally able citizen, but because of mechanisms which have crept unwanted into our electoral college machinery, that situation prevails.

I have spoken about citizens of Delaware. The same situation exists in Wyoming. Vermont has only 3 electoral votes; Nevada has only 3; Delaware has only 3.

I wish the Senators from Vermont were on the floor at the moment, because I should like to point out to them how important it is to Vermont that it begin lifting the stature of Vermonters a little higher than one-fifteenth the dimensions of the citizens of New York. Our amendment would correct that situation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. How can the Senator say that the vote of a citizen of Vermont is less than that of a citizen of New York, when, as a matter of fact, Vermont has 2 Senators and New York has 2 Senators?

Mr. MUNDT. May I inquire of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who I know has studied the question very carefully, how many electoral votes the State of New York has?

Mr. KENNEDY. It has 45.

Mr. MUNDT. And Vermont has three. Suppose there is a tie vote; how many electoral votes of the citizens of Vermont are put into action by a voter in Vermont?

Mr. KENNEDY. Three.

Mr. MUNDT. And each citizen of New York puts in 45.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. So a citizen of New York has 15 times the vote power of a citizen of Vermont.

Mr. KENNEDY. How many times greater is the population of the State of New York than that of Vermont?

Mr. MUNDT. Population has nothing to do with it. We are not going to take from New York any of its 45 votes. We wish to get away from the bloc system, this unique system which we have been discussing. It was never the intention that such a system could develop. It never happens in this body. We do not come out of a committee and say that we have a unanimous report. For instance, in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, where 8 Senators brought the farm bill out and 7 Senators voted against it, no one said it was a unanimous report.

Mr. KENNEDY. The only point I am trying to make is that, taking the proportion of voters of the State of New York as compared with the number of people in the State of New York, comparing the population of New York with the population of Vermont, comparing their strength in the electoral college, the Senator knows that a citizen of Vermont has a greater proportion in the electoral college than has a citizen of New York.

Mr. MUNDT. That is not correct, at all. New York has 45 votes——

Mr. KENNEDY. That is because there are so many fewer citizens in Vermont.

Mr. MUNDT. The difficulty which the Senator from Massachusetts has is that he thinks about elections as though a President were elected by States. He is elected by people.

Mr. KENNEDY. The point is that in the electoral college Vermont has one-fifteenth as many votes as has the State of New York; but the Senator knows that there are 15 million people in New York and there are not a million people in Vermont.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not quarreling with the fact that there are 45 electoral votes in the State of New York, but with the fact that the present system votes them into a bloc. That is what is wrong. We take a situation where the winner is entitled to 25 electoral votes and we add 20 votes of the defeated candidate, for instance, to the victor's total and thus we are pulling poor little Vermont down until the voters of Vermont might as well never go to the polls.

Mr. KENNEDY. What about the losing votes? Under the plan suggested by the Senator from South Dakota, those votes in each of the congressional units would be lost.

Mr. MUNDT. They would be lost, but they would not be multiplied or added. That is the difference. A candidate says, "Look what a swell job of campaigning I did. I was elected unanimously"—because we took the other fellows' electoral votes and added them to his.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is based on the number of people in a district. It includes all the people who voted for the loser. Under the Senator's plan the votes are lost.

Mr. MUNDT. They are lost, but not stolen. I do not mean dishonestly stolen; but a thief in the night could not get them any more quickly. Old Robin Hood could not get them any faster or effectively. It is legal, under our present procedure, but that is what we are trying to correct. It is legal but it is not right. It is one of the glaring moral weaknesses which has crept into our system, and the time is long overdue when Congress should begin to take some action with reference to it.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. In New York State, if one party receives one vote more than the other party, all 45 electoral votes in the State go to that one party, do they not?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. That is the serious deficiency which we are trying to correct.

Mr. THURMOND. And if there are only 6 million votes cast and one party receives only 1 vote more than the other, then the other votes less 1 are cast by people whose votes are not represented at all in the electoral college?

Mr. MUNDT. That is exactly correct.

Mr. THURMOND. In 1868, when Grant and Seymour were running, a local fraud which occurred in the State of New York caused the votes of the entire State of New York to turn on that point. It happened that it did not change the election that year, but it could have changed the election of a President in one instance where there was fraud.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. The combination amendment or either facet of the compromise would eliminate that difficulty. It would prevent frauds occurring in a single election district from determining the outcome of a national election.

Mr. THURMOND. Under the compromise amendment, then, a State could choose whether it desired to follow the proportional system or follow the district system.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts spoke of the district plan not revealing a true reflection of the will of the people. In one sense of the word it might not do so on a statewide basis, but on a district basis it would be the same way in which a Representative is elected. Therefore, the will of the people would be more nearly reflected than it is under the present system.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. If a candidate is elected, his vote counts. If he loses, he loses. But we do not take the losing votes and add them to the winning votes.

Mr. THURMOND. Under the compromise system, would the people who live in States where minorities are not acknowledged at all be more encouraged to vote?

Mr. MUNDT. I think there is no question about that, because it would provide an opportunity within a certain district, if we had the district plan, to develop candidates who were well known locally, and to develop attitudes in the party organization in the local area, that would try to attain a two-party system, if it were a one-party State.

Mr. THURMOND. Would there not be more stimulus afforded American citizens to vote if the compromise amendment were adopted? They would know that their votes would be reflected in the electoral vote of their State.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; and much more so for the other reason we were discussing earlier. It would give encouragement to the individual citizen to vote in little Vermont, New Hampshire, or Delaware; the citizen in a little State who now must feel mighty insignificant when he has to stand up on a high chair to vote because he feels so pygmylike in size. He knows he is casting a vote only one-fifteenth the size or importance of that cast by a voter in New York State. Yet he has equal citizenship with other people throughout the country. It is only because of the accident of his residence in a little State of the Union that he has become a 2d-class citizen; actually, a 15th-class citizen when it comes to voting for President.

The proposed amendment will offer every citizen everywhere more incentive to vote. It will be worth his while to climb down off the Green Mountains, even when the snow is on them, to exercise his franchise. He will become just as important as if he lived in New York City, Boston, or Chicago. His vote then will count just as much as will that of the citizen living in any other State of the Union. It will be worth just as much and will be as important as if he lived in the largest State of the Union.

I hear much said about legislation to abolish the poll tax, thus giving every citizen the right to vote. I favor giving every citizen the right to vote, but I want him to have the right to vote with equality. I do not want the fellow living in a little State to have only a small, sniveling one-fifteenth fraction of a vote as compared with a voter who lives in one of the biggest States of the Union.

Mr. THURMOND. It has been said that the proposed compromise amendment would not treat minorities fairly. Would not the compromise amendment give them opportunities which they never had before?

Mr. MUNDT. It would give everyone an opportunity he never had before, whether it be under the district system or the proportional system. Most important, it will give dignity to the individual citizen. There will be 435 electoral districts, equally important, equally powerful, equally significant, with candidates of both parties having an appeal to all the people. It will get away from the silly business which now goes on in the selection of candidates at our conventions. The question is always asked, "Who will appeal most to the voters of New York, those people with the big biceps who, when they pull the lever in the voting booth, cast 45 compelling and conclusive votes in the electoral college? That is the only thing that counts. Why should anything else count?"

In New York State the voter who puts his marker on the ballot or pulls the lever of a voting machine puts 45 markers on the counter. Why should anyone be concerned about the voter in Delaware, Vermont, or South Dakota, who can put only 3 or 4 markers in the electoral college?

There is nothing, including the existence of one-party States, which so much discourages voters from going to the polls as the recognition of the fact that their humble votes do not count in certain areas of the country; do not carry the same weight, same authority, same power, same mathematical importance as the votes which are cast in New York City or Boston or Chicago.

Mr. THURMOND. Under the compromise amendment, is it not true that splinter parties would be discouraged, and that there might not be a situation in this country in the future such as that experienced by France and other foreign nations?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. If the Senator will bear with me, when I come to my fifth and concluding point, I shall deal with the constructive reasons why I think the proposed amendment should be adopted. Point five shows how the present system tends to encourage legalized splinter parties, having a precise purpose, to defeat the will of the people.

Mr. THURMOND. Is it not true that under the proposed amendment only the votes cast for the three highest candidates will be counted?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. Thereby any parties beyond a third party will definitely be discouraged; and even a third party would be discouraged unless its appeal were great enough to be nationwide. It would be futile and impotent if it functioned only in a State or two.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his splendid dissertation and the magnificent presentation he has made upon the compromise amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I was interested in what the Senator from South Carolina said because he is very familiar with the subject. I was surprised in some degree to hear him take a position in favor of the Daniel amendment. The Senator from South Carolina knows that the electoral votes are cast on the basis of the recognition of the 48 States as sovereign units, which is a position which the Senator from South Carolina has taken on many other issues.

It seems to me that when there is a proposal to divide the votes, and carry loose votes outside the State boundaries, not on a State basis, the Senator from South Carolina should be in favor of the direct-election system. But if he is not in favor of that, and is in favor of having the States operate as autonomous units, on an electoral basis, he should be in favor of the present system. I cannot understand why he would accept the Daniel amendment without following the logic all the way and accepting the principle of direct elections.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me to enable me to answer the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina for that purpose.

Mr. THURMOND. My personal thought is that it would be better to retain the electoral college; but in the compromise which was reached by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and myself, we preserve the electoral college in the district system, but the electoral college would not be preserved under the proportional system. I believe it would be better to retain the electors as a buffer between the Federal Government and the States. I think it would be preferable to do that, because the electors are State officers.

I am wary of any system which would provide for direct election of the President, because then the Federal Government might attempt to move in, and the next step might be for the Federal Government to regulate the qualifications of voters and to take other steps to provide for free elections. Under the first part of the proposed system, namely, the proportional system, or the Daniel phase of the amendment, that would not be the case, because the electoral vote would be preserved, and the electoral vote would be cast in direct proportion to the popular vote. That, I think, would express the true will of the people, while at the same time it would preserve an electoral system, rather than establish the direct-voting system, which could cause complications and lead to Federal encroachment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, if I may continue, I should like to add to my discussion by saying that whether the Republican Party or the Democratic Party gains control of the Government, I want that control to be on the basis of the party to present candidates for public office who will best serve the people, and on the basis of the ability of the people voting as individuals to register their determinations and decisions equally at the polls.

I think we should move to correct the glaring deficiency, the indefensible immorality, the crystallization of certain citizens in certain areas as 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, or even 15th class citizens. I think we should move in that direction now. This is an error in our election process which did not develop at the time the Constitution was drafted. I submit that the Founding Fathers did not know that a two-party political system would evolve. Nowhere are political parties mentioned in the Constitution. They have grown up and have served a magnificent purpose in this country. They can serve that purpose better and more equitably when all people are treated equally. Let us consider, therefore, in the interest of prevailing justice, the adoption of an amendment such as has been proposed.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator spoke about Vermont, and suggested that the citizens of Vermont were not given suitable recognition as compared with the citizens of New York. The population of Vermont is 377,000; that of New York is 15 million, which would make the population of Vermont one forty-fifth that of the State of New York. Yet the electoral college of Vermont has one-fifteenth as many votes, which indicates that a popular vote in Vermont is worth three times as much as a popular vote in New York.

Mr. MUNDT. My friend from Massachusetts has difficulty in understanding, or perhaps he disagrees with, the concept in which I so firmly believe, namely, that the election for President should be by the people. Ours is a government of the people, not of the States. I defy the Senator from Massachusetts to find anything in the Constitution which provides that the people will elect a President of the States. The Senator cannot read Lincoln's Gettysburg Address and find anything about a government of the States, for the States, and by the States.

Elections should be expressions of the will of the people. The American Government is a popular government, a representative government. The people are the instrumentalities on which democracy thrives and by which it functions.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator would be quite correct if the elections were decided by direct votes, but the elections are decided by the number of electoral votes in the State, not by the number of people voting. That is recognized by the Constitution, and would be continued under both plans.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct, but we would correct the evils which flow from the present system by retaining for the State of New York its 45 electors but by prohibiting the bloc system of voting them in the electoral college. New Yorkers would still, as a group of people, be able to vote for 45 electors, but we would eliminate their right to steal the votes of the loser to add to the votes of the victor and thus snuff out all the votes of other States. Vermont has three. Adding Nevada to that makes six. Adding Delaware makes nine. Adding Wyoming makes 12. Adding Arizona makes 16. Adding Idaho makes 20. Adding Montana makes 24. Adding New Hampshire makes 28. Adding New Mexico makes 32. Adding North Dakota makes 36. Adding Rhode Island makes 40. Adding South Dakota makes 44. New York snuffs out all of those votes, because New York has 45 electoral votes cast in a solid unit—winner take all. One man could snuff out all those votes as I have shown. A while ago I called him Mr. Stumblebum from skid row, a man who got drunk and stumbled into a booth and pulled a lever by accident. By that undirected, unintelligent, and unpremeditated act he had more impact in the choice of President in a national election than all the people of all the States of Vermont, Nevada, Delaware, Wyoming, Arizona, Idaho, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Rhode Island, and South Dakota voting unanimously for the same candidate and for the same party.

Under that system, one voter in the State of New York could snuff out and defeat and destroy and outweigh the votes of all those States, because the votes are cast en bloc, and because losing votes are stolen and added to the winning votes. It is that condition which I want to eliminate. Our amendment will correct this situation.

Mr. KENNEDY. The population of Nevada is 160,000. The population of New York is 15 million. Dividing 160,000 into 15 million shows that Nevada has about one one-hundred-and-twenty-fifth or one one-hundred-and-thirtieth of the population of New York. Yet in the electoral college, Nevada has one-fifteenth as many votes as New York, which has nearly 100 times the population of Nevada. I am sure the Senator could not successfully maintain that the State of Nevada is being badly treated in the disposition of electoral votes.

Mr. MUNDT. It is very badly treated, because of the gimmick, the gadget, the gouging device which has crept in, not because it was envisioned by the constitutional forefathers, but because the State of New York and other large States, including one which is host to a great cultural community known as Boston, began to realize how they could run the country and making voting very much a hollow hypocrisy in many of the other States of the Union, if they would cast their votes en bloc and if they would take the votes of all the winners and steal the votes of all the losers and pile them together and cast them, with one mighty blow, this way or that way for one candidate or the other.

We propose to take nothing away from Massachusetts or New York except two things to which they are not entitled. One of them is the process of trying to pervert popular government to a concept that we have government by States, and that this is a government in which States instead of people march to the polls. More than that, we take from them a right to which they never should have been entitled, so that when 25 electors are selected in the State of New York, they walk right down Fifth Avenue, in the light of the noonday sun, and steal the other fellow's 20 votes, add them to their 25 votes, and then they have 45 votes knocking out all of the States I have mentioned—almost enough to knock out California and Pennsylvania.

It is a very important point, and one which I think the country should recognize if we are going to retain this great system of free elections and popular government and this great system of the commonwealth of States which we have.

Now I come to point 4.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Every time I come to point 4 someone asks me to yield. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have been interested in the analysis the Senator has given. One question occurs to me. Suppose, under the concept of the Senator from South Dakota, the vote in all the States is 40 to 60—60 percent for one party and 40 percent for the other party. Would the Senator still say it would make no difference if the same 40 percent and the same 60 percent were applied to Nevada, or would the smaller States be benefited? I assume, from what the Senator has said, there could be some stealing of a percentage, whereas it is largely a matter of public opinion as to which way the people vote. The fraction by which the electors would vote would depend upon the fraction by which the public voted. Is that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. Let us consider the factor of 40–60 and go down the line. Would there still not be that factor of stealing?

Mr. MUNDT. There would not be that factor under the Daniel-Kefauver proposal. I used the word "stealing" in quotation marks. Nothing improper was meant, but I referred to the device by which the loser's vote is taken and added to the winner's vote. Under the Daniel-Kefauver approach, that would be eliminated because the votes would be counted on the same sheet. The 60 and the 40 would be added. Under the district proposal it would be eliminated, because there would be the 435 electoral districts, and they would be voted for as the people vote in the senatorial and congressional districts. The winner wins, but he does not steal over and get the other votes from his defeated candidates.

Mr. President, I come now to point 4, and I start out by paying a salute to my colleague from Massachusetts, who has done a great deal of creative work in the committee, of which I am a member, in the direction of clean elections and in the direction of general election reforms.

I should also like to salute the minority leader who is on the floor, for the fine, constructive work he has been doing, along with the majority leader, in jointly sponsoring a bill for clean elections. I am happy to have had conversations with both of them about the proposal and to have joined them as a cosponsor. I am glad the minority leader is coauthor of our proposed amendment, because this moves just as strongly in the direction of clean elections as does the Johnson-Knowland bill, if it should pass.

I honestly believe in fact that the passage of our amendment would do more in the long run to assure honest elections than would the clean-politics bill as now written, with all the helpful amendments which might be added to it.

I shall point out why. The present system inevitably puts a premium on corruption, because it picks out certain spots where corrupt influence or corrupt control of the election procedure or machinery of one area, of one city, of one State, can corrupt and contaminate the entire election.

Eighty-five Members have said they want politically clean elections, that they want elections to give the correct attitude of the people with regard to election of people for public office. We want to try to write as good a bill as we can, but this amendment would prevent certain corrupt things from taking place in certain areas. It could be Toledo, Ohio, or Albany, N. Y., or Pittsburgh, Pa., or any sizable election district, where a bunch of fellows "in the make" could determine to pervert public policy for special profit, by packing an election district, as was done at one time in Missouri, where in one precinct there was a vote of 1,000 to 1. Do that, Mr. President, and you throw into the electoral college counting mechanism the entire electoral vote of a big State—not only the electoral vote won by the candidate for whom the thieves were working, but the electoral vote won by the honest candidate they opposed. After stealing the election, by means of a gimmick that gave them the majority, they would steal the votes received by the loser, and thus would have them all to throw into the electoral college. Thus there is a wide-open opportunity and a glittering invitation to corruption, which we would eliminate completely and permanently by the adoption of our compromise amendment. This amendment is a necessary forerunner to any effective clean-politics bill.

Mr. President, we want clean elections. We want to be sure they are clean and honest. Let us pass at this session an amendment which will cause us to move in the direction toward which we aspire.

Mr. President, I come now to my fifth point. The present electoral college system encourages splinter parties and third parties of an especially nefarious character to develop in our country. In our amendment we provide that a third party can evolve, and that is important; I think that at times it is desirable to have a third party begin to needle the old parties and get them to move in a certain new direction. Furthermore, sometimes third parties develop into major parties.

But the present system encourages, as I have stated, an unusual kind of third party, one with unusually nefarious characteristics—a third party which functions, perhaps in a single election and in a single State, for the purpose of controlling and dominating the destiny of 175 million Americans in a specific presidential election. What am I talking about, Mr. President? I am talking about a former colleague of mine in the House of Representatives, since deceased—Vito Marcantonio, with whom I served for many years in the House—a curious Congressman. But he represented the people of his district, and he was a smart politician. He believed in a type of central government which was rather strong and rather expensive. He believed in a centralization of authority which would be abhorrent to the progressive, public-spirited, independent, two-fisted people of South Dakota. But he believed in it, and so did his constituents. Furthermore, he knew the political mechanism as he knew the Jefferson Manual in the House of Representatives. He was smart and he was energetic, and he was able to organize a political party of his own—one called the American Labor Party. He knew that in New York State in the case of many, many national elections the difference of half a million votes would determine who would win in New York, and that would determine who would win in the entire United States. All Senators have learned that in school. How many times is a President of the United States elected without the votes of the State of New York, Mr. President? It is so seldom that we used to memorize the list of instances as a school lesson. It can happen, but it happens very seldom that a President wins while losing the State of New York. Vito Marcantonio knew that. He had the

capacity to attract well over half a million votes in his State of New York. And the direction in which Marcantonio swung his political power could determine the outcome in New York State; and that, in turn, could determine the outcome in the entire Nation.

Mr. President, it is an awful thing to have in existence and in force a system under which one man or one party in a single State, organized for a specific purpose, has the power to swing sufficient votes to determine the decision of the people in the 47 other States, in the election of their President.

Let us assume that instead of having Marcantonio do that—for whatever purpose he had in mind—we go back a few years to the time when Earl Browder was the leader of communism in America. There was a time in the United States when Earl Browder, the Communist, could, by one device or another, influence well over half a million votes. Suppose the Communists decided to do it in the State of Pennsylvania or in the State of Ohio or in the State of New York, where they have big blocs of votes, and to get into the position of running their third party candidate and swinging the vote in one direction or another—taking the votes away from one candidate and throwing them to another, and operating as an organized clique. Such a mechanism is a dangerous thing to have implanted in our constitutional procedures for electing a President. That is my point. We shall eliminate that mechanism if we succeed in having our compromise amendment adopted by the Senate.

Our compromise amendment would still permit third parties, but it would compel them to operate nationally, which is the way they should operate. In the past, some third parties have tried to operate in that way—for instance, the Prohibition Party. However, it did not succeed. But it had a right to try to operate nationally.

Our compromise amendment would eliminate the effectiveness of a specific type of small party operating in a single area, for the predetermined purpose of controlling the entire national election.

Mr. President, I have listed five reasons why in my opinion an electoral college reform measure should be passed by the Congress at this session, and should be approved by the State legislatures in 1957. There are other reasons which I may discuss in subsequent speeches. But I have mentioned these five, because in my opinion any one of them is so important and so valid and so influential that, as compared with the alternative of doing nothing, it justifies the support of our compromise amendment by the Members of the Senate.

Certainly the five reasons combined are sufficiently significant to warrant the adoption by an overwhelming vote of our compromise amendment, which 54 Senators have joined in sponsoring as an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 31.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. If the Senator from South Dakota is so deeply concerned about splinter parties—and I am, too, when they are sinister in character—why does not he support an amendment I have submitted, which calls for direct election of the President and Vice President by popular vote? That is the democratic way of electing a President. That does not give advantage to New York or to New Jersey or to Texas or to Mississippi or to South Dakota. It simply is responsive to the will of all of the 165 million people of the United States who are of voting age. I wonder why the Senator from South Dakota does not support that amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be happy to answer that question. It was asked me during a previous colloquy, before the Senator from New York came to the floor. But it is a perfectly legitimate question, and I shall be happy to answer it as many times as it may be asked.

What the Senator from New York proposes is a democratic method—not necessarily the democratic method, but certainly it is a democratic method—of electing our President. One of the reasons why I have not supported it is that, being a political realist, I want some reform to take place. I am never very happy about advocating a theory which I know can never be implemented into fact. I am never very happy about pounding the tom-toms for a reform which I know can never be enacted.

In view of the realities of the case—the fact that the States desire to protect and maintain their representation in the electoral college, which, commencing with our bicameral legislative system, is based on the number of votes the respective States have in the legislative branch of our Government—I know that the States will never be willing to take a step in the direction of eliminating that representation on their part. Instead, I prefer to support a proposed reform which I believe to be one which the States will be willing to adopt. I want constructive and positive action.

There are other reasons. The election of the President by direct popular vote would necessarily mean Federal control of our election laws, and that would mean that the Congress would determine who would vote, and at what hours the votes would be cast, and at what ages the citizens would be eligible to vote, and how the counting of the votes should be done, and how the reporting should be done, and perhaps how the election districts would be defined. It would necessarily lead to Federal control of our election machinery, which, in turn, would lead to Federal control of our primary machinery, because the two are associated. There is no use in trying to have Federal control with respect to one, and leaving the other to the control of the States.

Let me illustrate. Suppose that in the great State of North Dakota, a progressive State in the progressive West, the Senator's plan were adopted. I can see how, in North Dakota, next year the State legislature might say, "We are not a very big State. We do not have too many votes in a popular election, but we are pretty progressive. We are going to allow 17-year-olds to vote in our elections. That will give us an advantage." What would happen? Slowly, but surely, we would either reach the point where Federal law would be necessary to establish the age limits, or every State would permit 17-year-olds to vote. Then some State would reduce the age to 15. If that were not sufficient, it would be reduced to 12. If State legislatures out West became really smart, they could reduce the voting age to 10. It would be necessary, under the popular system, to have Federal control of election machinery, and I think that would be repugnant to the people of a great many areas of our country.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The plan I have proposed, which is supported, I believe, by a great many of my colleagues in the Senate, and certainly by a very great number of people throughout the country, is, by admission of the Senator from South Dakota, democratic.

Why does the Senator believe that democracy would be well served under the plan proposed by him and his colleagues, when it has been clearly established that in some of the one-party States—notably in the South—a vote cast in a congressional election is worth 4 or 5 times as much as a vote cast in the State of New York, and in many of the other great States of the Union which have large urban populations?

Mr. MUNDT. I am not sure that I understand the Senator's mathematics. Can he explain to me how a vote in the South is worth 4 or 5 times as much as a vote in New York?

Mr. LEHMAN. I must go back one step.

One of the two alternatives provided by the pending measure is that the vote be taken by congressional districts. In New York State the congressional districts, by law, are of considerably larger size, and larger in number, than the congressional districts in many other parts of the country.

Mr. MUNDT. Some of them are.

Mr. LEHMAN. In addition, we know that in the States of Mississippi, Alabama, and South Carolina, because they are one-party States, the real election is not on election day at all. It is on primary day. The result is that on election day only a relatively small number of the elegible voters of the State go to the polls to vote. The real voting is done on primary day. So, whereas I believe something like 50 percent of the eligible voters in New York State cast their votes on election day, only 13 percent of the eligible voters cast their votes on election day in Mississippi. I believe I am correct. I am quoting from the hearings. Yet the congressional delegation is based upon the population of the States, even though many of their citizens are disenfranchised.

According to the figures, which I believe are obtained from the hearings, the relative weight of a vote in New York

State, as compared with a vote in some of the one-party States, is only one-fourth or one-fifth.

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me the Senator is building up a case to show that the voter in the South has much less influence than the voter in New York State, rather than more. I think the reason voters do not vote in greater numbers in the fall in certain States is, as the Senator has said, that in one-party States, the real vote is in the primaries.

The adoption of the compromise amendment would encourage—although it would not require—the two-party system in every State, because it would give every opportunity for the minority party to grow and to have its votes counted, and occasionally to win a victory. Consequently, the tendency would be to move away from the one-party system, which I believe the Senator will agree is not the best system.

I should like to say something about the arguments advanced by the three Senators who spoke against this measure, namely, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who lives in Boston; the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who lives in Chicago; and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who lives in New York City, and with whom I have just had a colloquy. At various points in the record they have presented certain arguments. I wish to comment upon them briefly at this time.

The first argument raised by the Senator from Massachusetts was with respect to the disenfranchisement-of-voters evil. He alleges that that reason for supporting our amendment, in order to enfranchise the voters at present disenfranchised, is not valid and is not correct. I quote what he said:

> Those who voted for the opponent of any Senator on this floor might just as well have stayed home, too—for, of course, the winner takes all, and those votes are to no avail.

In the colloquy I had with the Senator from Massachusetts this afternoon I pointed out the difference between a candidate for Senator who wins and leaves his opponent and his constituents at home, and a candidate for the electoral college, under the present system, who wins and adds to his total vote strength the votes of all those who voted against him. It seems to me it should be as clear as Main Street in a country town at noontime that there is a vast difference between the situation in which a candidate who runs for office wins and is elected, and the case of the electoral procedure, whereby the winner appropriates the votes of those who voted against him, those who campaigned against him, and those who do not like him. Having won by a fraction of a percentage point, he adds their vote totals to his own, in order to carry greater impact into the electoral college.

The second argument is with respect to what the Senator from Massachusetts calls "the doubtful-State evil." The Senator from Massachusetts says:

> The report alleges that the present system overemphasizes the political importance of the large politically doubtful States, with supposedly two effects—presidential and vice-presidential candidates are more likely to be chosen from those States, and the campaign is more likely to center around them.

The Senator from Massachusetts points out that such candidates are more likely to follow the persuasive appeals of the people living in those areas.

The Senator from Massachusetts says, in effect, in support of that argument—and we believe it to be an argument—"We believe that the present electoral system does discriminate against more than 35 States of the Union by making it almost impossible for their sons, their candidates, their citizens to become candidates for office, or for their candidates to campaign successfully."

The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. That is one of the points which we make. It is not 1 of the 5 which I have just discussed, but it is 1 of the many other points which are valid.

To illuminate that argument, the Senator from Massachusetts says:

> But, like so many rules in politics, the rule of selecting candidates from large States has so many exceptions as to be practically meaningless.

Then he cites some examples. He says:

> Eisenhower, of Kansas; Sparkman, of Alabama; Truman, of Missouri; Barkley, of Kentucky; Willkie, of Indiana; McNary, of Oregon; Wallace, of Iowa; Landon, of Kansas; Hoover, of Iowa; and Curtis, of Kansas—to name but a few from the past six elections—were not spokesmen for any of the larger States.

Let us relate those names to the argument. The argument we make is that it is virtually impossible, under the present system—so that the exception stands out like a wart on a pickle—to nominate a successful candidate for President who does not come from one of the big States.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] points to Eisenhower, of Kansas. No one is talking about the accident of birth, Mr. President. No one is saying that a person cannot be baptized in a small church and move to a city and become a pagan and run for President. No; we are saying a person cannot run successfully for President from home base in a little State.

We might as well say Eisenhower was from Texas. We rather like to say that because we would like to have Texas vote for Eisenhower again. We would like to say "Eisenhower from Texas." Certainly Kansas will vote for him. Eisenhower was from New York and he was from Washington, and he was very much all over America. He is all-American. Certainly he did not primarily run from Kansas. No one will seriously argue that he was elected because of the great array of Kansas sunflowers on his banners. No one will contend that that made Eisenhower a successful candidate. Therefore, it seems to me, we can skip Ike in connection with that argument.

Next we are told to look at SPARKMAN, of Alabama. Mr. President, he is still with us. I am talking about winning. I am not talking about running. He is still a very able and beloved and friendly associate of ours. In addition, he did not run for President. We are talking about running for President, not for the Vice Presidency. Mr. SPARKMAN is still with us in the Senate.

Next the Senator from Massachusetts points to Truman, of Missouri. How did Truman get there? He got there by accident of death. He was nominated for Vice President, after clearance from Sidney and the pressure groups in the big town.

The point I am trying to make is Truman was not nominated for President from Missouri. He got into the Vice Presidency from the United States Senate, in which he had established a commendable record as chairman of a Senate subcommittee. Then by accident of death he became President.

Next we are asked to look at BARKLEY, of Kentucky. We are still privileged to call Senator BARKLEY a colleague of ours. He, too, was not a candidate for President. I am surprised that the Senator from Massachusetts should mention BARKLEY, of Kentucky at all. While I was not at the Democratic convention in Chicago, I assume the Senator from Massachusetts was there. I heard the convention on the radio, and I saw ALBEN BARKLEY try and fail in Chicago to get the nomination for President. He failed because the pressure groups kept him out. The pressure groups kept BARKLEY out because of the bloc system of voting in America. ALBEN BARKLEY would have made a magnificent candidate for President, in my opinion. I have the highest regard for him. He is a distinguished Member of this body. He tried hard at Chicago in the Democratic convention to be nominated President but the pressure groups kept him out.

What did they say? The Senator from Massachusetts must have heard it. He must have been there. I was not there. They said, Mr. President, "Can BARKLEY carry New York?" The answer was "No." BARKLEY did not get to be candidate for President. It was a tear-jerking speech, Mr. President, and I sympathized with ALBEN BARKLEY when he made his withdrawal from the race. Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, also stepped out for the same reason. He is a good soul. He is a good guy. However, he did not get to be President. He did not get to be a presidential candidate because of precisely the situation we are talking about now—the bloc voting in the electoral college.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I thank the Senator for yielding to me at this point. I should like to say that I, too, was not in Chicago at the Democratic Convention. Therefore I do not know why the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] was not chosen. The Senator from South Dakota may be right. However, I suggest that there are other reasons, too.

Mr. MUNDT. Would the Senator from New Jersey care to argue that point?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. No, I would not; but I would suggest that the reason

why the Senator from South Dakota suggests may or may not be the correct reason, and I do point to the fact that at another Democratic convention, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who suffers from a somewhat greater disability than the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] in the regard mentioned by the Senator from South Dakota, was nominated.

Mr. MUNDT. We do not make any point with regard to the Vice Presidency. We can get a vice presidential candidate from anywhere, because different reasons enter into his choice. We are talking about the Presidency.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I am sorry. However, I should like to make a further point.

Mr. MUNDT. Does it relate to the point I am making now?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. It does. No one can deny that we have had a number of presidential candidates who have been prominent in large States. It seems to me that there is a very good reason why that should be so. It is because the experience of being governor, say, of New York or of any other large State, or the experience of being mayor of a large city, is the very kind of experience that qualifies a man for the highest office in the land.

Mr. MUNDT. I must interpose at this point to say that we have now reached a point of total disagreement. I deny that theory and hypothesis absolutely.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I did not expect the Senator from South Dakota to agree with me on that point.

Mr. MUNDT. I could not disagree with the Senator more.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. It seems to me perfectly obvious, and I hope it is a point on which a majority of my colleagues will take the view I suggest, rather than the Senator's opinion.

Not only does such experience qualify a man for higher office—and eminently so—but the very fact that he is governor of a State with eight or ten or twelve million population, gives him a degree of national prominence which in itself is a qualification. That fact cannot be changed. Whether we tamper with the electoral college system or any other provision of the Constitution relating to the election of President, a man's prominence affects his availability, and his ability to handle large public affairs is the best qualification, necessarily, in the eyes of the people, for the office of President.

I believe that in itself is the main explanation of the fact that we have had, as the Senator suggests, many Presidents who had been prominent in public office in large States.

Mr. MUNDT. I am always interested in the Senator's opinion, although on this particular point I cannot change my views at all. However, I am very frank to say that some of the Senator's arguments are much more persuasive to the general public than the one he has just made.

Of course, I agree with him when he says experience is important. Of course, I agree with the Senator from New Jersey when he says that having had experience as governor of a State is important. However, I deny completely that a man will get any better or more experience as Governor of New York State than he would as governor of any other State.

I believe it is a matter of administrative technique. A governor learns to evaluate men and to delegate responsibility, and he gains experience in analyzing problems, and working with people, and dealing with legislatures, and understanding human psychology. Certainly I shall never subscribe to the concept espoused by the Senator from New Jersey, that the bigger the town, the better the man, or the bigger the State, the better the governor. I do not believe that for a moment. Neither do the women of America, because they believe in getting smaller and better, instead of bigger and better. [Laughter.]

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Of course, I know that the Senator from South Dakota did not intend to pervert my argument.

Mr. MUNDT. No; just to extend it to its logical conclusion.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. And to twist it a little, too. I am not suggesting that a man is a better man because he comes from a large city, or that he is a better man merely because he comes from a large city rather than from a small town. I happen to be a smalltown boy myself. The point is obvious, however, that the experience of dealing with large affairs is a better qualification than the experience of dealing with small affairs. It is equally obvious that a man who comes from a large State, and who has had the experience of handling and dealing with large problems brings him into the kind of national prominence which is one of the qualifications that a party seeks in its candidate.

Mr. MUNDT. I interrupt the Senator again to say that of course that is true, but it is because newspaper and radio and television and other forms of communication help to put such a man into national prominence. Therefore, unquestionably candidates will be recruited frequently from large States. I do not object to a candidate coming from a large city. What I object to is to the built-in mechanism in the electoral college that makes that mandatory and necessary. I say we should let the city slicker in the big city run with the same handicap that the country boy has to face.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I do not disagree with that. However, I believe very deeply that the proposal the Senator from South Dakota is sponsoring is one which will not put the "city slicker," as he calls him, on even terms with the sturdy yeoman from the country, but is one which will give every advantage to that sturdy yeoman, even enlarge those which he now has. We will discuss those at another point in the debate. Equality is one thing, and fairness is another, in both of which I believe. But both are quite different with reference to weighting the electoral system in such a way that a few States, and particularly those in the South, will have 3 or 4 times as much weight as large States may have.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Not at the moment.

I must say that I cannot quite follow the argument of the Senator from New Jersey. My proposal would take away the capacity of the big States to put a second row of dissident votes on a layer of favorable votes in order to have a totality of power which virtually snuffs out many Southern States as well as other States all over the country.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. In the 1948 election, if the Daniel-Kefauver proposal had been in effect, the electoral margin given by the State of Georgia alone would have been larger than the combined electoral margin given one party by the eleven most populous States in the country outside the solid South. That is the way it is weighted.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator has related what has happened under a system which we are trying to correct.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. That there will be a change is the hope of the Senator, and I know the Senator entertains it very sincerely; but voting habits are not to be changed quickly just because we change the voting mechanism.

Mr. MUNDT. The people have not had a chance to express themselves and to flourish and to function the way they would if we had 435 electoral districts each with a chance to be won by either party, each with equal authority, and taking away the business of giving the people in 1 State 45 times as many pieces of chalk to mark the ballots as other States which have only 3 pieces of chalk.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the colloquy between the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from New Jersey as to the relative merits of governors of large and small States.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is speaking with authority, I know.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I say, as one who has been Governor for 10 years of the largest State of the Union, a State with a population of more than 16 million people—and I was Governor during all the period of the depression—I disclaim any implication that it requires more commonsense, more intelligence, or more guts to be governor of a large State than governor of a small State.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. LEHMAN. Including the State of South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. But——

Mr. MUNDT. I would rather have the Senator's statement without the "but."

Mr. LEHMAN. But I am wondering whether it is not a fair thing to say that a State with a population of 16 million people would have more influence in an election than would a State with only one-tenth or one-fifteenth as many people. I do not see how we can avoid that or how we should ever want to avoid it.

Mr. MUNDT. I would not want to avoid it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Obviously, both in conventions and in elections themselves, if there is a fair division of the weighted vote, which there is not today, the larger States would have a greater weight by reason of their large populations.

The weighting is not fair. It has been demonstrated that in 1948, in South Carolina an electoral vote represented only 17,000, while in California an electoral vote represented 168,000 people. I think the number in New York would be even larger than in California, but approximately the same. It is not fair weighting, but that is the kind of weighting we would have under the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. The recent reapportionment has tended to equalize a discrepancy caused by the movement of so many people to California.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let us forget California, and take New York, where there has not been that kind of migration. Yet the electoral vote in New York is represented by more than 168,000 people.

Mr. MUNDT. There would be no disposition on the part of any of the cosponsors of this amendment to deprive the people of New York of the rightful importance to which they are entitled as a consequence of having a heavy population. All we want them to do is to function under the American concept that a candidate is entitled to the votes he receives and his opponent is also entitled to his votes, and that we should not take the votes of the defeated candidate and add them to the votes of the victor and use that as a political baseball bat to clobber the rest of the country over the head.

Mr. LEHMAN. We certainly do that under a one-party system, and we shall continue to do that. As a matter of fact, as has been shown in the debate, while I do not believe our electoral system is by any means perfect, which is the reason why I am for a direct vote of the people, we have used it for 180 years, and with very few exceptions was the man elected President not representative of the majority of the voters.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not arguing about the minority votes mentioned by the Senator from Massachusetts. I am glad the Senator from Massachusetts has returned to the floor.

We were discussing the interesting rollcall of the candidates for President and Vice President which the Senator inserted in the RECORD at page 5249, to refute the argument that the present system almost always makes it essential to select candidates for the Presidency—I am not talking about Vice Presidents—from the big metropolitan areas, where the big bags full of votes are found. We have mentioned Eisenhower, who is all-American. We have mentioned the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who ran for Vice President, and is still with us. We mentioned Truman, of Missouri, who was elected Vice President, and by the death of the President became President, and was reelected President.

We come to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who was a candidate for President on the Democratic ticket, but he did not receive the nomination because of the electoral mechanism which we have, and because of the pressure groups which kept him out.

I come next to Willkie, of Indiana. He was a curious fellow. When he was running for the Presidency, the Democrats said he was "the barefoot boy from Wall Street." Now that he is dead, they call him an Indianan. Willkie was not a candidate from Indiana; he came from New York at the time he was running. We are not talking about where a man was born, but where he is domiciled, where he lives, where he makes his home. When Willkie ran, one of the great reasons why he was nominated at Philadelphia was that he was supposed to be able to get the vote of his home State of New York.

That proves the point we make, rather than refutes it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does the Senator have a table which would show what the results of presidential elections would have been over, say, the last 50 years, based upon his plan? There is such a chart based upon the Daniel plan, but I have not seen one under the Senator's plan. Does he have such a chart?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not have such a chart, because I think it would be completely immaterial and irrelevant. It would be about as useful to take the rules of a game which we about to adopt and apply them to a game which has already been played as it would be to ask me if I have any way of telling how the national championship game between the University of Maryland and the University of Oklahoma would have resulted in Florida if the game had been played according to basketball rules. There is no comparison.

The proposed amendment would provide—and would have provided—different players, and it will be a different kind of game. There is no way of making the comparison suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts in the first place, the whole basis of the argument is that if the elections shall be made national, they will be run by the people, instead of by the States. The candidates will come from different areas; the platforms will be different; the campaigns will be different. There is no way in which we can look at the past and say what would have happened then if the game had been played differently under the new rules we now propose.

Mr. KENNEDY. I can understand why the Senator would say that.

Mr. MUNDT. That is a matter of record.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it not true that in 1948, under the Senator's plan, there would have been three States which would have gone for one candidate, although the popular vote in those States went for another candidate? I refer to Ohio, California, and, I believe, Illinois. On the other hand, the votes by Congressional districts, under the Senator's plan, would have meant the election of one candidate, although the overall popular vote in those States was for another candidate.

Mr. MUNDT. There is no way in which we can look into a crystal ball as cloudy as that one and come up with any result at all. There will be different rules and a different game. Again, it is like asking who would have won the football game if it had been played under basketball or cricket rules—Oklahoma or Maryland?

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not think the comparison is valid.

Mr. MUNDT. The game, the rule, the players—everything—will be different.

Mr. KENNEDY. No; I think the Senator's point is not altogether accurate, because I can conceive of a situation in which the results in Mississippi, South Carolina, and perhaps another of the Southern States would have been different. Not only in one-party States, but also in the populous States, it would be very easy to have happen again what happened in 1948.

I said, as an example, that in 1932, candidate for President carried my State by a large margin. Yet if the Senator's plan had been in effect, it would have meant that the Republican candidate would have carried the State by 1 or 2 electoral votes.

Mr. MUNDT. In all those elections?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. In every State?

Mr. KENNEDY. No; in Massachusetts. I am giving Massachusetts as an example because the districts in that State are gerrymandered. We have gone into that and have discussed it.

Mr. MUNDT. There is no way in which such a rule could be applied, even in football. Let us say, for example, that the football rules were changed so that field goals were abolished. It would not be possible to say what would have happened in a previous game, if a player who had kicked a field goal had not kicked it. How could we know what might have happened? He might have thrown a forward pass which would have resulted in a touchdown.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is an interesting analogy. I made a check, case by case, on the way the districts are set up. There is nothing in the Senator's bill on this point. It has some rules; it is not like the Daniel-Kefauver amendment. Under the arrangement proposed by the Senator from South Dakota, there would be districts which would be the same as the congressional districts. The congressional districts are gerrymandered, in many instances. I do not see how that could be prevented.

Mr. MUNDT. If something happened in the field of gerrymandering, Congress would have the power to correct it.

I want to complete the rollcall which the Senator from Massachusetts placed in the RECORD.

The last name I mentioned was that of Willkie. The next one is McNary. McNary did not run for President; he ran for Vice President. When a man is a candidate to be nominated for the Presidency, he is subject to all the pulls, persuasions, and pressures which come to

candidates. But when he has been chosen, the people ask the question, "What kind of man for Vice President do we need in this particular campaign? Do we need a Barkley, a McNary, a Sparkman, a Truman?" Whom do we need to round out the ticket? In that case, we needed McNary, because he was the apostle of a farm program. His selection had nothing whatsoever to do with any of the normal considerations or desiderata which go into the election of a President.

Mr. KENNEDY. When 9 or 10—not more than 10—States in the Union have half the population of the country, in a rather condensed geographical area, it is natural that those States should be selected more on a mathematical basis than should the other 38 States.

But the point I make is that in making up a joint ticket, the Senator once again, in trying to develop his point, simply forgets all about the importance of the Vice President.

Mr. MUNDT. Vice Presidents are not elected on the basis of who will have particular appeal. That is applied to the President. The candidate for Vice President rounds out or balances the ticket. I grant—I do not dispute the fact—that that naturally will happen under the compromise amendment also. Certain persons will become prominent and nationally known, will develop ability, and will achieve importance. They will be selected from the big States, too. But all that is sought to be done is to keep what may happen naturally from having to happen inevitably, as it does now. It almost inevitably happens, as the Senator's rollcall shows. He has been studying the situation for many months and has done a commendable job on it.

In his whole list—Eisenhower, of Kansas; Sparkman, of Alabama; Truman, of Missouri; Barkley, of Kentucky; McNary, of Oregon; Willkie, of Indiana—none of them refutes the argument I have made.

We come to the next name—Wallace, of Iowa. Wallace did not become President. His party wanted to make it so certain that he did not become President that they even withdraw him from the Vice Presidency. Was that because he came from Iowa, a small State? It clearly does not refute the fact that candidates from small States, like Iowa, simply are not nominated for the Presidency.

But there is one to whom we can point. It is Landon of Kansas. The Republican Party in desperation, in 1936, said, "Maybe we can violate the rule. Maybe we can pick someone from the great heartland of America, like Kansas."

The Republicans did their best, but we ran up against the machinery which had been fixed against us. I think we learned our lesson. The Republicans carried Maine and Vermont. But the mechanism was such that the Republicans were clobbered by the bushels of votes which were cast in the big cities.

If anyone is seeking to induce the political parties to violate what has become the national custom of nominating candidates who can carry New York, he will have to offer a more attractive illustration than the experience of Landon of Kansas.

Mr. KENNEDY. What about Eisenhower of Kansas?

Mr. MUNDT. He is Eisenhower of Texas, Washington, New York, London, and Paris. He is an all-American, but was primarily from New York State at the time he ran for the Presidency. We do not count where the candidates were born.

Mr. KENNEDY. General Eisenhower made a famous speech in London about Abilene and London being sisters under the skin. He has built a museum at Abilene, Kans. He went home to Abilene when he returned from Paris.

Mr. MUNDT. I quite agree that many States would be glad to claim Eisenhower—in fact, every State through which he has traveled; and many cities would like to claim him, as does Abilene, Kans.

Next we come to Hoover of Iowa. True, Hoover was born in Iowa; but I think the distinguished Senator from the cultural community of Boston, which is host to the hallowed halls of Harvard, knows that Hoover did not run from Iowa. I do not know whom the Senator was trying to fool with that one. Hoover came to us from the great State of California. He was a candidate from one of the large States, not one of the small States.

Curtis of Kansas was not nominated for the Presidency; he was a candidate for Vice President. That completes the Senator's list.

The Senator's argument falls of its own weight. The only candidate he found was Alf Landon of Kansas, and the degree of success with which Landon met will not urge many persons to violate the big city rule.

I come to the next argument made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, which relates to the one-party State system. His report discusses the situation today, as a result of the one-party-State election system. He finds some fault with that argument. Certainly the one-party State system has been perpetuated by the electoral college. It has done nothing to prevent it. It continues year after year. There are one-party States in the North and the South. The proposed amendment moves in the direction of an open opportunity to all parties to function in every State. It is not a complete corrective, but it is progressive. It does something about it. It does not just recognize the situation and continue with it, as has been the case for so many years under the present system.

The next argument presented by the Senator from Massachusetts was the argument about the pressure-group evil. I shall not repeat my argument on that point, because our arguments hit head on. I devoted many minutes yesterday, and again today, in pointing out how the present electoral system puts a premium on pressure groups, especially the boss-ridden, big-city machines. I shall not detain the Senate by going into greater detail on it.

The next point of the Senator from Massachusetts is as follows:

F. The "landslide psychology" evil: The committee report, while admitting that the present electoral system produces the correct popular winner in all but the rarest of cases, complains that it tends to exaggerate the margin of his victory by giving him a proportion of the electoral vote considerably larger than his share of the popular vote.

That is one of the main arguments against our present system. It gives him not only a larger proportion of the electoral vote, but gives him the whole works. He takes it all. Nothing matters about a candidate for President running in a small State. If he wins by a margin of 1½ percent in a big State like New York, he takes the rest of the votes cast for the loser.

Mr. KENNEDY. The reason for that is that we regard the United States as 48 departmented States.

Mr. MUNDT. I am mighty glad the Senator has mentioned that, because there was a long colloquy engaged in between myself and my distinguished friend from New Jersey and my distinguished friend from New York on that point. I think on that point we have a basic difference in our approach to the American system, or the presidential election system, because the Senator from South Dakota thinks these elections should be determined by the people rather than by the States. Popular government to me means government of the people rather than of the States. We should seek to register, as accurately as we can, the expression of the majority of the people, rather than have it strained through the States and warped through the States to make it reflect only the determination of the States. Maybe we differ on our approach to that question.

Mr. KENNEDY. I would agree with the Senator, if what he were talking about was the popular election of the President which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is advocating. If that were what the Senator were advocating, he would be on sound ground. There would be a clear contrast between a popular election and an electoral election.

The point I was about to make about the landslide psychology point was that in the case of McKinley, under the system advocated by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], McKinley would have been elected by one-tenth of 1 percent of the electoral vote. I think the Senator can understand the difficulties which would have been created for the Presidency, with the possibility of having an attempt made in every electoral district in the country to tear the results down. Therefore, I think it is not too much of a mistake to have such a wide margin in the electoral system; but I am not attaching too much importance to that particular argument.

Mr. MUNDT. With regard to these arguments, there is no use repeating them over and over again. Either it makes sense or it does not make sense to try to dig up statistics from the past and try to determine how the game would have resulted under different rules, just as it would be difficult to determine the

results of a football or a basketball game which would have been played under different rules.

Certainly we do not gain anything by attempting to look into the past and say that there would have been a change if different rules had been in operation. If the Senator undertook to do that, he would have to prove his case, and I would have to prove my case. The proof is not in the record.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the Senator's analogy is going to be used, it indicates what a tremendous change the Senator advocates. I hope the American people will realize that what we are talking about would bring about a radical change in the manner of the election of Presidents and have a great effect on the makeup of the parties and the political history of the country.

Mr. MUNDT. There is no question that it would be a great change, because we would restore the determining vote to the people, and it would be a change from the influence of pressure groups and city machines, and the possibility of fraud and multiple voting which gives to the citizens of New York a vote which can offset 400,000 votes in South Dakota. It certainly is a change, and a good one.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have heard much said about the democratic processes and doing justice to the States. I am in favor of that. As I said before, the only way the will of the people will be expressed is by having a direct vote in a popular way; but we do not have that. We may get it in a short time. I hope the Senator is willing to support an amendment I have prepared.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not going to vote for any amendment which would kill electoral college reform, and the amendment of the Senator from New York would do so, so I shall not vote for it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me speak about the point brought out by the Senator a short time ago. In 1948, in 8 States—California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, New York, and Pennsylvania—the votes exceeded 2 million in each State, and the combined votes of those States equaled the total votes of the other 40 States of the Union. I have just made a calculation. I did it hurriedly, but I think it is correct. Those 8 States have 209 votes in the electoral college out of a total of 531; is that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. That is substantially correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is less than 40 percent. The other States have 60 percent. Yet the Senator from South Dakota is advocating a system which will further cause inequities, and further take away from the more populous States the rights of their people. I wish to point out that a man living in New York is entitled to the same rights—equal rights—as the individual voter in South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Would the Senator from New York be willing to go so far as to say the citizen of New York is entitled to rights equal to those of the citizen of South Dakota, but no more?

Mr. LEHMAN. I would say he is not getting anywhere near equal rights.

Mr. MUNDT. Would the Senator say he is entitled to more rights than the rights of a citizen of South Dakota?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not think anyone is entitled to more rights than another citizen has; but today the citizens in one-party States, notably in the South, and also some States in the Middle West, are entitled to far more rights than are the citizens of New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Illinois, and Pennsylvania. Yet the Senator from South Dakota is advocating a change in the system which will create further inequities, further injustices, and further unfair practices. I cannot understand his reasoning on the question, except that I do realize that if his views and the views of his colleague should prevail—and God forbid that the resolution proposing the constitutional amendment should be passed and approved by the States—it would give a tremendously increased advantage to the small, one party States of this Union, at the expense of the larger States with great populations and very substantial urban centers.

Mr. MUNDT. It could not possibly change the picture one iota under the district system. Let us assume South Dakota is a small, 1-party State. It does not make any difference at all in the total amount, may I say to my friend from New York, whether the 4 electoral votes of South Dakota are cast as the present system provides; or, under the district system, they would go in the same direction, and have the same weight. No change at all would be made, so far as that is concerned. If they should elect to take the Daniel-Kefauver approach, some difference would be made, but it would be made in the direction of weakening the position of South Dakota, as against the position of the big States, and not strengthening it.

Mr. President, the Senator from New York talks about equality of voting opportunity and about equality of voting power; but the argument of the Senator from New York breaks down when he supports a program which gives a single voter in New York State 45 pounds of pressure in an electoral college machine, when the same machine gives to a voter in Vermont, Arizona, or Delaware only 3 pounds of pressure; or while talking about equality of opportunity, the Senator from New York supports a program that gives a citizen of his State 15 times the authority in a political campaign for President of the United States that is had by a citizen living in such a State as Nevada, Vermont, or Delaware. In my opinion, that is a glaring inconsistency which should not be allowed to exist side by side with the theory that all voters should be able to vote, that a poll tax should not keep them away from the polls, that all men are created equal, and that they should have equality of opportunity and equality of privilege as regards exercise of the franchise.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in 1950 the Senator from South Dakota voted against the Lodge-Gossett amendment, did he not?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the only plan or proposal now before the Senate were the Daniel-Kefauver amendment, would the Senator from South Dakota vote for it?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, when the Senator from Massachusetts asks me whether I would support the Daniel-Kefauver amendment if it were the only plan before the Senate, he asks me a joint question, because two plans are interspersed in the same amendment. Whether the Lodge-Gossett plan as originally proposed was wise, I do not know, except that the Senate approved it, although the House rejected it. In my opinion, it had features of which I did not approve. I may say that the new version is much to be preferred.

Personally, I am an advocate of the district plan; I think it is highly superior, and I think it completely equalizes the entire situation.

However, Mr. President, in this business of legislation, we have to compromise. So we have put the two plans together.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the proposed substitute is rejected, with the result that what then is before the Senate is the Kefauver-Daniel amendment, and if that is what the State legislatures will have to vote on, I know the Senator from South Dakota feels that the States will, instead, adopt his plan; and I believe they will, if given the opportunity to do so, as against the Kefauver-Daniel plan. In the judgment of the Senator from South Dakota, if the Daniel-Kefauver plan shall be the only choice we will have, would it be better than the present plan?

Mr. MUNDT. Let me say that if the substitute is rejected, the Daniel-Kefauver amendment will not be the only choice before us, because then I shall have another amendment to propose to the Daniel-Kefauver plan—one which I believe will make it a better plan than it is, although not as good as the district plan.

Mr. KENNEDY. Shall we have a chance to see that plan in advance?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not think so, because I do not anticipate that the Daniel-Kefauver plan will meet with that unhappy fate—I do not think it will be defeated. Instead, I believe it will be adopted.

Mr. President, I am about to yield the floor. In conclusion, let me say that we do not propose this constitutional amendment as a perfect pattern. There is no such thing as utopia on this mundane globe on which we live; but it is a great step forward. The people who have been opposing it have, in the main, now limit their objection to one argument with validity, and that is that it is always possible to gerrymander a congressional district a little. We have been frank on that subject. We do not deny that congressional districts can be gerrymandered under the present constitutional provision, and could be gerrymandered under the new proposal. However, we point out that there are two

built-in mechanisms against that sort of thing.

In the first place, congressional districts are primarily for the purpose of electing Representatives in Congress. In the urban areas they represent national groups, occupational groups, and other groups. In rural areas they represent various types of products. In other areas they represent mining or manufacturing groups. Perhaps there is a coastal area deserving representation. There could be very little capricious playing around with districts by State legislatures, although we grant that such a thing might happen now and then. Compared with the evils, the potential hazards, the gross iniquities, and the indefensible immorality which has crept into our present electoral system, the faint possibility of gerrymandering sinks into political and practical insignificance.

Finally, should such a situation occur, Congress would retain, after the passage of this amendment, the same residual authority it now has to act in order to correct the situation. Under the Constitution there would still remain the supervisory function of Congress, which Congress has exercised at times, to provide certain guide lines and criteria concerning the size of a congressional district, the contiguous territory involved, and the authority to prevent gerrymandering. Congress would retain that power. If once in a while a State legislature should notoriously try to rig up a congressional district purely for the purpose of a presidential election, Congress could and would exercise its power of restraint. I do not believe that such a thing would happen to any serious degree.

The people living in the various congressional districts are sturdy Americans, in other States as well as in the congressional districts of the State of South Dakota. They will not permit a political shyster to rig up a seven-cornered district in order to gain an electoral vote or percentage of a vote. Under a system with 435 separate congressional districts and 435 presidential-election districts, the premium on corruption would be gone. No one could persuade an entire legislature to abandon its responsibility and rig up a jigsaw-puzzle district in order to gain an electoral vote. The complexion of the people cannot be changed.

At one time in North Carolina an effort was made to rig us out of a Republican Representative in Congress. However, the Republicans were all pushed into one congested area, so that a Republican Representative was elected.

By and large, the people will prevail. Very little could be done in the way of gerrymandering.

As against the sole argument of gerrymandering, the only one which, in simple candor, we must admit is a possibility, we believe that any 1 of the 5 major reasons why we believe in electoral college reform so far outweighs that disadvantage as to be sufficient to justify passage of the amendment. In my opinion, the five major reasons, which I have described in detail, together with others which might be added, present a challenge to the Senate not to be afraid of change, not to be tied to the past, but to move forward constructively, and to develop, through this amendment, an election procedure which will place government back in the hands of the people, and eliminate the power of politicians to manipulate what the people want, namely, to give the individual citizen, wherever he lives and however he votes, an equal right to vote for a single elector for the electoral college, and to make his weight felt in connection with the selection of the two electors at large, to correspond with the representation of each State in the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPLY TO ATTACK ON SECRETARY McKAY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, at 11 o'clock this morning I called the office of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and said that I was going to correct the record he made in this Chamber yesterday. His office told me he would be here at 2 o'clock this afternoon. I have been waiting, and now it is 3:15. I do not think there is any obligation to wait any longer. I wish to correct the record which was made yesterday by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I want to allude just briefly to an attack on Secretary of Interior McKay, made yesterday on the Senate floor by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. The junior Senator from Oregon made a number of serious misstatements, which I think, for the record, ought to be corrected.

The gist of the attack made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] was that Secretary McKay had done something improper or immoral because he had allowed Mr. William L. Phillips to hold, simultaneously, the job of administering the affairs of the Klamath Indian Tribe, and also the job of being Mr. McKay's campaign manager.

During the course of the remarks of the junior Senator from Oregon, I stated that Mr. Phillips' appointment had been passed on by the Tribal Council of the Klamath Tribe—and thus that Secretary McKay did not "force" Mr. Phillips on the Klamath Tribe, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] suggested. The junior Senator from Oregon flatly denied this statement.

Since then, I have checked with the Department of Interior, and have found that he was completely wrong. Mr. Glenn Emmons, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, met with the Tribal Council of the Klamath Tribe, and submitted to the Council the names of three men, including that of Mr. Phillips, who has been nominated by Secretary McKay for a committee set up by an act of Congress. The committee's job was to liquidate some of the funds of the Indian tribe, in order to satisfy claims of certain Indians who were leaving the tribe. These three men, including Mr. Phillips, were approved, as I said yesterday, by the tribal council. It was not an action by Mr. McKay, as the junior Senator from Oregon stated. Instead, it was an action by the tribal council. It seems to me that this is something the junior Senator from Oregon might have checked up on before he so positively told the Senate that the tribal council was not involved.

This, of course, is not the heart of the matter. Mr. Phillips is a highly reputable man. There was nothing wrong with Secretary McKay's appointing him, even if the tribal council had not passed on the nomination. But the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] charged that there was breach of ethics and propriety because, he said, Mr. Phillips is simultaneously Mr. McKay's campaign manager and an employee of the Klamath Tribe. The fact of the matter is that Mr. Phillips resigned his post on the committee dealing with the Klamath Tribe affairs on March 16—just a few days after his appointment as campaign manager, and 6 days before the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] made his attack. The junior Senator from Oregon claimed yesterday that he was not aware of Mr. Phillips' resignation. I have checked with the Department of the Interior, and there is no record that the junior Senator from Oregon made any effort whatsoever to ascertain the facts. Moreover, I have been advised that the story of Mr. Phillips' resignation was carried in the Oregon papers several days ago—several days before the junior Senator from Oregon made his speech. Therefore, it is hard for me to believe that the junior Senator from Oregon was not aware that he was misstating the facts.

Mr. President, I think all this adds up to a gratuitous smear of the Secretary of the Interior by the junior Senator from Oregon. Mr. McKay has done a superb job in his present position; and, in my judgment, he is one of the best appointments President Eisenhower has made. I can understand how the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] would like to discredit Mr. McKay for political reasons; but I do not think the objective of winning a political contest justifies the tactics employed on the floor yesterday by the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, let me say that the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] was notified that I was going to talk about this matter. I have waited nearly an hour and a half for him, after his office said he would be here. He has declined to show up and to tell us why he made those misstatements about the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. President, I deeply resent and deplore such irresponsible assassination of the character of the Secretary of the Interior.

RELIEF FROM TAXES ON CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as I have indicated on many occasions on the Senate floor, "man does not live by bread alone," but by things of the spirit, of art and culture and beauty and inspiration.

We have, however, found in the past that Federal excise taxes have, in many instances, tended to hamper certain cultural activities in our country.

We are, of course, keenly aware of the tax needs of the Federal Treasury, in this day of $65 billion national budgets. At the same time, however, I believe that my colleagues should well give sympathetic attention to a plea which has been submitted to us today by various distinguished leaders of organizations associated with the performing arts.

I send to the desk, therefore, the text of a letter transmitted to me by Mr. Patrick Hayes, chairman of the tax committee of the National Association of Concert Managers, on behalf of himself and five other leading representatives of the legitimate theater, and the concert professions.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this letter be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, preceded by a list of the eminent officers and directors of the national association, together with the members of the tax committee, and the names of counsel.

There being no objection, the list of names and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF CONCERT MANAGERS,
East Lansing, Mich., March 22, 1956.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: On behalf of the national memberships of both the Association of Concert Managers and the National Association of the Legitimate Theater, we earnestly urge you to give immediate consideration to the economic plight of our groups and the pressing necessity for legislation which will end the present inequitable and discriminatory excise taxes on the cultural arts.

INEQUITABLE AND DISCRIMINATORY TAXES

As a war-revenue measure in 1944, a 20-percent tax was imposed on admissions. In 1954, this tax was reduced to 10 percent and, at the same time, admissions of 50 cents or less were exempted from taxation. The 10-percent reduction helped the legitimate theater and the concert managers to combat the vicious squeeze caused by increased costs of production and our competitive inability to raise ticket prices. The exemption for admissions below 50 cents was of no assistance to the fine arts because the costs of presenting live productions necessarily dictates a much higher price per ticket. While the 50-cent exemption was of great value to other entertainment media, it heightened the competitive inequity between fine arts productions and those forms of entertainment which by their very nature are able to charge substantially lower admissions.

COMPETITIVE INEQUITY UNDER PRESENT TAX LAW

The members of our groups are taxpaying, self-supporting, unsubsidized small-business men. In order to compete, we must establish and satisfy a demand with the public for living entertainment in competition with commercially sponsored television and radio programs. We have no objection to meeting this competition since we believe the public wants both the free but commercial entertainment and the stimulation gained from the performance of the artists in person. Indeed, the theater and concert stage is the source of most of the artists who grace the media of television, radio, and motion pictures. However, not only must we contest with television and radio for public approval, but we must also contend with tax exempt municipally operated programs and the nonprofit foundations which present cultural programs.

Section 4233 (a) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which created the tax exemption for these groups, had the disastrous effect of dividing the living entertainment world into two factions which are precisely the same in the cultural entertainment offered to the public but which must now compete on a different economic basis—the non-tax-exempt organization must offer the same quality of entertainment at the same price but must do so for a lesser actual monetary return. This inequity is even more serious when it is realized that nearly every other country in the world provides direct aid in the form of generous subsidies to cultural arts programs in addition to freeing them from taxes. The United States, on the other hand, is the only country that imposes discriminatory and burdensome taxes on these fine arts performances. At the same time there can be no question that American assistance to foreign countries has contributed materially in aiding them to support their own cultural programs.

COST TO THE TREASURY

To completely eliminate the 10 percent admissions tax on the living theater and cultural arts, including ballet, concerts, and lectures, would mean only an approximate loss to the Treasury of $7 million annually—a minute portion of 1 percent of the total annual taxes collected by the Treasury. Moreover, such tax relief would not result in the complete loss of the revenue since the concomitant increase in cultural productions would mean that additional employment would result in greater taxes to the Treasury.

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE

Two bills, H. R. 7609 by Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and H. R. 7851 by Mr. CELLER, of New York, have been introduced which provide the essential answer and relief necessary. These bills would eliminate the admissions tax on cultural activities and thereby eradicate present competitive inequities and inject new vitality into the American cultural picture. These bills would eliminate the present situation where the sponsor of the performance rather than the nature of the performance is the criterion for tax exemption.

The time for action in this situation is now, and we respectfully request your serious consideration of the Thompson and Celler bills, or any other legislation which accomplishes this purpose.

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN LEVIN,
President, The National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc.
LAWRENCE LANGNER,
Tax Committee Chairman, The National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc.
JAMES F. REILLY,
Executive Director, The National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc.
ROLAND E. CHESLEY,
President, National Association of Concert Managers.
JULIUS BLOOM,
Secretary, National Association of Concert Managers.
PATRICK HAYES,
Chairman, Tax Committee, National Association of Concert Managers.

MANIFESTO ON INTEGRATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, throughout my service in the Senate I have enjoyed a warm and much appreciated friendship with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. Serving with him on the Banking and Currency Committee I have had an opportunity to become acquainted with his comprehensive knowledge of financial matters, as well as with the zeal and sincerity with which he consistently presents his views on the issues that come before that committee. I am grateful for the fact that the esteem in which we hold each other has in no sense been lessened by those instances in which he and I have differed concerning economic and social problems.

On March 16 the distinguished junior Senator from New York made a speech on the floor of the Senate in which he took severely to task those Southern Senators, including the junior Senator from Virginia, who had publicly reaffirmed their belief in a government of separate powers and the right of States to handle without improper governmental interference certain domestic problems, including the operation of public schools. The junior Senator from New York took some of the sting out of his remarks by saying that he was speaking without rancor or bitterness of any kind. The junior Senator from Virginia accepts that assurance in the spirit in which it was given, and in turn assures the distinguished Senator from New York that it is in exactly the same spirit that he proposes to point out today how inconsistent it is for a distinguished Member of this body to make a strong and determined fight on one phase of States rights, and attempt to deny a similar privilege to others who invoke the same doctrine but on a different issue.

In New York the issue was the 18th amendment and its enforcement statute, the Volstead Act. In Virginia and other Southern States the issue is the decision of the Supreme Court that the operation of separate-but-equal public schools is unconstitutional. In both instances, the fundamental principle of States rights is exactly the same.

On March 12, 1956, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] brought to the attention of the Senate a Declaration of Constitutional Principles subscribed to by 19 Members of this body and by approximately four times that many Members of the House of Representatives.

That declaration specifically referred to the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court in the public-school cases, which the signers felt was unwarranted under the division of powers provided by the Constitution and unwise because of the effect it would have not only on our public-school systems but also because of damage it threatened to our constitutional form of Government.

After reviewing briefly the history of the 14th amendment, on which the Court purported to base its decision, and recalling the many contrary decisions previously made by United States courts, our declaration registered a calm but emphatic protest against substitution of the

personal, political, and social ideas of nine individual men for the established law of the land and against a move for the Government to deprive parents of the right to direct the lives and education of their children in accordance with the long-established mores and customs of their communities.

Although we expressed grave concern because of the explosive and dangerous condition created by this decision, our declaration flatly reaffirmed our reliance on the Constitution. We appealed to the people of our States not to be provoked by agitators and troublemakers, and pledged ourselves to use all lawful means to bring about a reversal of the Court's decision. Then, as an admitted minority in the present Congress, we appealed to the majority of the American people who believe in our dual system of State and Federal Governments to support us in our fight against judicial usurpation.

Four days later, Mr. President, on March 16, the junior Senator from New York made a statement on the floor of the Senate challenging the sincerity of the southern declaration by saying:

> The manifesto calls for the use of all lawful means to overturn the decisions of the Supreme Court. But these words are in support of action in some States to defy the law and to prevent its enforcement. That is not lawful action.

Our distinguished colleague said he asked only that the law be enforced in a lawful manner, and said:

> Those who go about obeying the law, in an orderly and practical manner, are the moderates. Those who defy and resist the law are law violators.

He said the law must be enforced, and called upon the President and the executive branch of the Government to assume the responsibility to see that the laws are faithfully executed.

In his statement the Senator from New York also referred to "a concerted move to defy those decisions and decrees of the Supreme Court and to persist in acts which the Court says are repugnant to the Constitution."

He continued by saying:

> Shall each individual in our Nation have the right to say that he disagrees with the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution and, therefore, will not abide by the supreme law of the land, as laid down by the Supreme Court? Obviously that would be anarchy, and our Nation would collapse in chaos and disorder.
>
> Well, then, shall a particular State government, through its legislature, or its governor, or a particular school board in a particular locality have that right? My colleagues, that is nothing less or nothing different than the advocacy of nullification. * * *
>
> To deny and defy the interpretation of the Constitution by the Supreme Court is to deny and to defy the Federal Government.

Now, Mr. President, to recall a bit of historical background which I feel is pertinent, I am sure the Senator from New York, along with other senior Members of this body, will recall that in August 1917 the Senate, by a vote of 65 to 20, adopted the resolution proposing the 18th amendment to the Constitution, known as the prohibition amendment, and that the House approved the amendment in December of the same year by a vote of 282 to 128. That amendment was ratified in January 1919 when Nebraska became the 36th State to approve it, and immediately thereafter it was proclaimed as a part of the supreme law of our Nation.

When our colleague made his recent statement in the Senate condemning those who said they would work to overturn a Supreme Court decision concerned with the 14th amendment, which was adopted under questionable circumstances at a time when the people of the Southern States were largely disfranchised, I wonder if he recalled that in 1919, the same year in which the 18th amendment was proclaimed as adopted, mass meetings of protest against it were held in New York, 20,000 persons paraded in protest through the streets of Baltimore, and there was a 3-hour demonstration before the Capitol here in Washington in which it was estimated 10,000 persons participated?

I wonder also, Mr. President, if our colleague was thinking of the organization in his own State in 1919 of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment and of the principles for which that organization stood? The founders declared that "the principal business and object of the association shall be to educate its members as to the fundamental provisions, objects, and purposes of the Constitution of the United States," and "to publicly present arguments bearing upon the necessity for keeping the powers of the several States separated from those of the Federal Government."

Along with these objectives, however, as was pointed out on at least one occasion on the floor of the House of Representatives, the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment announced as its two immediate aims:

> 1. To prevent the country from going on a bone-dry basis on the date set by enactment of Congress; and
>
> 2. To make the 18th amendment forever inoperative.

The year after this association was organized, in 1920, the prohibition amendment and the Volstead Act, by which Congress attempted to implement its provisions, were tested in the Supreme Court with such eminent counsel as Elihu Root on one side and Charles E. Hughes on the other arguing the case.

In its decision, styled *Rhode Island* v. *Palmer* (253, U. S. 350), the Court upheld the amendment and said:

> The first section of the amendment, the one embodying the prohibition, is operative throughout the entire territorial limits of the United States, binds all legislative bodies, courts, public officers, and individuals within those limits, and of its own force invalidates every legislative act—whether by Congress, by a State legislature, or by a Territorial assembly—which authorizes or sanctions what the section prohibits.
>
> The second section of the amendment—the one declaring "The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation"—does not enable Congress or the several States to defeat or thwart prohibition, but only to enforce it by appropriate means.

Where did that unequivocal decision of our highest court leave organizations and officials who did not like the amendment, Mr. President? And where, especially, did it leave organizations dedicated to keeping the amendment forever inoperative? Would the Senator from New York condemn them as nullificationists? Or, to be more explicit, did he at the time condemn the association against the prohibition amendment?

The record shows that 3 years after that Supreme Court decision, the State of New York repealed its prohibition enforcement act and the United States district attorney for the southern district of New York declared that this was "the hardest blow the enforcement of the 18th amendment had received."

Other commentators in later years described repeal of the New York enforcement act as "the first great staggering blow to the cause of national prohibition."

And what happened after that in the State and the home city of the distinguished Senator who has deplored the desire of his Southern colleagues to obtain by lawful means reversal of a Supreme Court decision which is repugnant to the people of their States?

In his report to the mayor of New York for 1925–26, Dr. Charles Norris, chief medical examiner, said that "speakeasies greatly outnumber the licensed saloons of former days."

In 1927 there was incorporated in New York the Voluntary Committee of Lawyers, for the purpose of opposing the 18th amendment on the ground that it violated the Bill of Rights and was quite inconsistent with the spirit and purpose of the Constitution. In 1928 the Bar Association of New York adopted resolutions calling for repeal of the amendment and return of the whole liquor question to the States, and in 1929 the Woman's Organization for National Prohibition Reform came into being, headed by Mrs. Charles H. Sabin, wife of a New York banker, who, when she became president of this group, resigned as the first woman member of the Republican National Committee.

While these organizations were presumably using all lawful means to obtain repeal of the 18th amendment, did the people of New York "go about obeying the law, in an orderly and practical manner," which the Senator says, "is the way of moderates"?

We have to judge by the fact that in 1929 New York City police reported that they had counted 32,000 speakeasies. According to the Congressional Directory, the distinguished Senator from New York was elected lieutenant governor of that State in 1928. The report states that the police may have missed a few; and in 1930, F. H. LaGuardia, later a mayor of New York, but then a Member of the House of Representatives estimated that 22,000 speakeasies were operating in his home city and said that to enforce the Volstead Act in New York would require 250,000 policemen and an additional force of 200,000 to police the police.

In that same year Henry H. Curran, who held a number of public offices including that of Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York, was questioned by a Senate committee in his capacity as President of the Association Against the Prohibition Amend-

ment and asked about money the association had spent in Wisconsin and other States.

Curran said:

> When people in a State start a movement to repeal their State enforcement act, we help them, and support the repeal, because it indicates, first, that the people of that State, if the referendum carries, are unwilling to perform the gratuitous act of cooperating with the Federal Government in the enforcement of this Federal statute.

Of course, Mr. President, that was not the first instance in which the good people of Wisconsin had shown unwillingness to cooperate in the enforcement of a Supreme Court decision. In 1859 the State of Wisconsin went on record as being unalterably opposed to the decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott fugitive slave case.

A joint resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Legislature declared the Court had acted without process, or any of the forms recognized by law. It denounced the Court's assumption of power and said the Court's effort "to become a final arbiter" was in direct conflict with the Constitution. It then asserted that "this assumption of jurisdiction by the Federal judiciary in the said case, and without process, is an act of undelegated power, and therefore without authority, void, and of no force."

And, far from condemning the people of Wisconsin for that action, the great Republican President Abraham Lincoln, in his inaugural address of 1861, clearly referring to the Wisconsin nullification of the Dred Scott decision, said:

> If the policy of the Government, upon vital questions affecting the whole people, is to be irrevocably fixed by decision of the Supreme Court the instant they are made, in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned the Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal. Nor is there in this view any assault upon the Court or the judges.

I am sure, Mr. President, that the lawlessness resulting from nullification of the prohibition laws in New York was highly repugnant to the present junior Senator from New York, and I can readily understand why, when, as governor of his State, he acted as temporary chairman of the New York convention which met in June 1933 to ratify the 21st amendment, which repealed the prohibition amendment, he said this was one of the greatest honors and pleasures of his public life.

The record shows that in his opening address at that convention our distinguished colleague said that "it marks the end, so far as this State is concerned, of a 15-year-old struggle carried on by thousands of devoted and patriotic men and women against sumptuary legislation which at no time represented the uncontrolled sentiment of a majority of the people of this country."

But at that same convention, Mr. President, former Governor of New York Alfred E. Smith, who was lauded by the temporary chairman as one of the guiding lights of the repeal movement, referred to the satisfaction the delegates must feel in being allowed to come there and cast their votes after 13 years during which they had been "referred to as nullificationists, as enemies of the Constitution, as people that wanted to destroy organized and properly constituted government."

Our New York colleague, in his 1933 remarks, Mr. President, called the 18th amendment and the related enforcement act "sumptuary" legislation which, according to the dictionary, means law designed to regulate habits primarily on moral or religious grounds by use of the State's police powers. He said repeal of the amendment showed "the force of intelligent, well-considered public opinion, aroused by the abuses and failures of a statute that never commended itself to the reasoned judgment of the people." He spoke also of the fight "to regain that balance between State and Nation which is guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States and to substitute temperance for hypocritical and unenforceable prohibition."

Will the Senator not recognize that the decree demanding that instead of providing separate but equal schools for the races the Southern States must mix them all together is in our eyes "sumptuary" legislation of the worst sort and that such action does not commend itself to the reasoned judgment of the people in our States?

We would welcome his moral support in our efforts "to regain that balance between the State and Nation which is guaranteed by the Constitution," rather than his censure because we are looking for a way to do what his own State led the way in doing when its people felt the Constitution had been violated.

At the New York ratification convention which I have been discussing, Elihu Root was introduced as honorary president and in his remarks he said he hoped the American people soon would have learned "two vital lessons and learned them forever."

One—

Root said—

> is that our constitutional government rests upon two bases, national strength and local self-government, and that both are essential to the continuance of our free democracy * * *.
>
> The other lesson is of higher and broader importance, that human progress, that advance along the long road of civilization from brutish animalism to the conceptions of justice and charity, of kindliness and beauty of this latter century, every step has been made not by compulsion, but by the development of higher standards of conduct and nobler emotions among the people; a lesson that advance in all that is noble and good comes not from without, but from within.

The year before that statement was made Franklin D. Roosevelt, also of New York, had said in one of his Presidential campaign speeches, at Sea Girt, N. J., that however people might differ as to method, all agreed that temperance is a cardinal virtue but that methods adopted for achieving temperance by forcing prohibition had resulted in complete and tragic failure. Roosevelt said:

> This failure has come for this very good reason: we have depended too largely upon the power of governmental action instead of recognizing that the authority of the home and that of the churches in these matters is a fundamental force on which we must build * * *.
>
> The experience of nearly 150 years under the Constitution has shown us that the proper means of regulation is through the States, with control by the Federal Government limited to that which is necessary to protect the States in the exercise of their legitimate powers.

The principles declared in those utterances, Mr. President, are the same ones which are advocated by the signers of the 1956 Declaration of Constitutional Principles. New York and other Northern States objected to national prohibition. The Southern States now object to a prohibition against separate but equal schools. The constitutional principle involved is the same.

We appeal to our colleagues from other parts of the Nation to see the justice of our cause. And, if they are inclined to say it is a hopeless one because we are such a small minority now, may we remind them that there was a time when the author of the 18th amendment, former Senator Morris Sheppard, of Texas, said:

> There is as much chance of repealing the 18th amendment as there is for a hummingbird to fly to the planet Mars with the Washington Monument tied to its tail.

Repeal was accomplished, however, and at the New York ratification convention the present junior Senator from New York hailed this action as evidence that public opinion could do legally what many had claimed could be done only through nullification.

It is before the bar of public opinion that we of the South now hope to make our case.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that my name has been brought into the discussion frequently, may I ask unanimous consent to speak on this subject for about 10 minutes?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to counsel with my friend, the junior Senator from Mississippi. I explained to the Senator from New York that I had agreed to yield to the Senator from Mississippi, and then I intended to yield to the Senator from New York. But in view of the fact that the Senator from New York has become involved in a discussion with the Senator from Virginia, I can tell by a nod of the head of my friend from Mississippi that I am authorized to agree to the request of the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New York, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of my highly respected colleague from Virginia. I appreciate very much the fact that the tone of his remarks was moderate, as was mine when I spoke on March 16. I shall not speak at any great length now.

I admit very freely that I disapproved of the 18th amendment to the Constitution, which imposed prohibition in this country. I saw the effects of prohibition in my State. I was very anxious to have

the amendment removed from the statute books.

I think the great difference between the situation to which the distinguished Senator from Virginia has referred and the situation concerning the 18th amendment was simply this: We in New York, and in other States, undoubtedly, were distressed at the effects of prohibition. We wished that the prohibition amendment could be removed from the laws of the land. At no time, however, do I recall that there was any proposal made to nullify or to defy the prohibition amendment—at least in New York State during the time I was in public life. What we were trying to do—and it was quite different from what has been proposed by the signers of the Declaration of Constitutional Principles—was to have the 18th amendment repealed. If my recollection is correct, the 18th amendment was adopted in 1919, at a time when there were 3 or 4 million young persons in the Armed Forces, most of them overseas, and who had no way of expressing themselves. The amendment had been passed by Congress and then referred to the States, but a large body of public opinion represented by those in the armed services was prevented from expressing itself.

The result was that the amendment was approved, and having been approved by the necessary number of States, it became the supreme law of the land. From thence forward there was a great effort made to secure its repeal by the Congress—not to secure its nullification. Thus our effort was entirely and exclusively an effort to obtain the repeal of the amendment, which we thought was bad, and which I still think was very bad. It took us 15 years to secure its repeal, but when action was taken it was taken by the Congress of the United States, the same body which had originally approved the 19th amendment and submitted it to the States for their consideration.

There is a vast difference between the two situations. I now want to read a very small part from the so-called manifesto which was presented to the Senate by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. It reads, in part, as follows:

> The unwarranted decision of the Supreme Court in the public-school cases is now bearing the fruit always produced when men substitute naked power for established law.
>
> The Founding Fathers gave us a Constitution of checks and balances because they realized the inescapable lesson of history that no man or group of men can be safely entrusted with unlimited power. They framed this Constitution with its provisions for change by amendment in order to secure the fundamentals of government against the dangers of temporary popular passion or the personal predilections of public officeholders.
>
> We regard the decision of the Supreme Court in the school cases as a clear abuse of judicial power. It climaxes a trend in the Federal judiciary undertaking to legislate, in derogation of the authority of Congress, and to encroach upon the reserved rights of the States and the people.

The manifesto reads further:

> We decry the Supreme Court's encroachments on rights reserved to the States and to the people, contrary to established law, and to the Constitution.
>
> We commend the motives of those States which have declared the intention to resist forced integration by any lawful means.
>
> We appeal to the States and people who are not directly affected by these decisions to consider the constitutional principles involved against the time when they, too, on issues vital to them, may be the victims of judicial encroachment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. If the Senator does not mind, I should like to complete my statement. Then I shall be glad to yield.

I point out there is a vast and an overwhelming difference between the 18th amendment and the situation which now obtains. In the days of the 18th amendment we proceeded to secure, through means at our disposal—lawful means, always in the open—a repeal of the amendment. In the case of desegregation in public schools what is urged is defiance of the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court.

There is no proposal to repeal the 14th amendment. If such an amendment were introduced I am confident it would be defeated by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. President, so much for Senator ROBERTSON'S statement with regard to the 19th amendment.

I wish to restate briefly certain views which I feel strongly and which I have expressed frequently in the past.

The manifesto of the 19 Senators was presented to the Senate on March 12. I immediately pointed out my complete disagreement with the position taken by the signers of that manifesto, and the effects it would have on the historic recognition of equal rights for all the people of this country, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin. I felt at that time, as I do now, that the manifesto was unfortunate, and so I answered it in a speech on March 16.

Mr. President, I would not delete a single word from that speech of mine on March 16. I consider my speech on that occasion one of the most important statements of my long public career. I say that I consider it important, but it is not important because the speech was eloquent. It was not eloquent. I consider it important because it stressed what I believe to be an incontrovertible principle and a statement of truth which cannot be denied.

In my speech, I pointed out that, regardless of our personal sentiments—and I want to say that my personal sentiments were, of course, in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Court—the ruling by the Supreme Court on a constitutional question constitutes the supreme law of the land. I emphasized at that time that no one is justified in defying the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the Supreme Court, and that to urge defiance constitutes an effect toward nullification.

Mr. President, there has been much talk about moderation. Mr. President, I am for moderation. I believe that most of us are for moderation. As a matter of fact, the ruling of the Supreme Court itself was moderate in setting forth methods of its implementation.

Mr. President, I repeat—and I am glad to be able to have the opportunity of doing so—that, in my opinion, those who obey the law in an orderly, practical manner are the moderates, and those who deny the ruling of the Court and who defy the sanctity of the law are the extremists in this matter.

Mr. President, President Eisenhower yesterday, at a press conference, stated, in language not quite as forcefully as I and some of my colleagues have stated, and not quite as unreservedly, but, on the whole, very much the same sentiments that I have expressed and shall continue to express, when he said:

> It is incumbent on all the South to show some progress toward racial integration in the public schools. That is what the Supreme Court asked for.

The President repeated the appeal he made a week ago for moderation on the racial issue and understanding of the South's emotion, but he emphasized the need for compliance with the Supreme Court decision barring school segregation. He made a point of saying that the Court's interpretation of the Constitution was the law of the land.

Mr. President, we all want to avoid any extreme measures, but we do want the law, the supreme law of the land, as laid down by the Constitution, to be put into effect, in accordance with the edict of the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I do not think we are asking for anything out of the ordinary. We are not asking for new legislation. We are not asking for new judicial interpretation. All we are requesting is acceptance of and adherence to the supreme law of the land, the Constitution of the United States.

Again I call upon the President of the United States to assume the responsibility of seeing that the laws are faithfully executed.

Mr. President, in my opinion only one fundamental issue is involved, namely, whether we are going to respect and adhere to the Constitution of the United States, or whether we are going to defy it and advocate nullification? That is the only question of major importance in the entire matter before us.

I hope very much that the people of the South will desist in their efforts to urge their own States to defy the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, I have spoken of the law and the issues. Let me say just one more word: I feel deeply about this entire matter because I cannot believe—and I reject the thought—that we in this country will be willing to continue to discriminate against minority groups in our Nation—minority groups who have done so much for the upbuilding of the Nation, and who are lifting themselves, in many cases, by their own bootstraps, and yet are discriminated against, and in many cases are actually disfranchised. They are victims of countless indignities. They are suffering many disabilities, injustices, and cruelties. I simply do not believe that our country will longer tolerate it; and I shall fight against it so long as I have strength, whether I be in the Senate of the United States or not. I hope and pray that all of us shall see

the light, and that there will be no further strong opposition and attempts to nullify the Constitution or to prevent the doing justice to all of our people.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, if I am at liberty to do so.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor, I am willing to yield for a reasonable time. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Then, Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Virginia, to permit him to ask several questions of the Senator from New York.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, in his remarks the distinguished Senator from New York has not, of course, challenged the accuracy of the quotation used by the Senator from Virginia. Therefore the Senator from Virginia wishes to ask his distinguished colleague this frank question, since the Senator from New York said the situation was entirely different, and said that "in New York we were proceeding by legal means to repeal the 18th amendment, but you in the South are engaging in nullification."

My question is this: Was the operation of thousands of speakeasies in the home city of the Senator from New York, and during the period of time when he was in Albany, as lieutenant governor, and subsequently as governor, obeying the law by legal means, or was it nullifying the decision of the Supreme Court on the Volstead Act? That is a very plain question, and shows how simple the real issue is.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is a very plain question, and I am willing to give a very plain answer to it: Unpopular as the 18th amendment was—not only in New York, but in many other parts of the country—I do not think the Federal Government at any time avoided its responsibility of seeking to enforce that unpopular law. I will say that the enforcement by Federal authorities frequently was resented in New York; but, nonetheless, it is a fact that the Federal Government did seek to enforce the law, and succeeded in doing so to at least a very substantial extent.

Furthermore, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Virginia that while I had no power of enforcement of the 18th amendment, except for 2 or 3 months—because I did not become Governor of my State until January 1, 1933—yet during the 10 years when I was Governor of New York, believe me there were a great many laws that I personally did not sympathize with. Yet I felt they had to be enforced, and I enforced them to the best of my ability and with all the vigor that there was at my command, even though I knew they were unpopular with others, as they were unpopular with me.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am perfectly willing to concede that. However, with all due deference I point out that the State and local prohibition laws of New York were repealed. We have to judge by the fact that in 1929, New York City police reported that they had counted 32,000 speakeasies, but might have missed a few; and that in 1930, F. H. La Guardia, later a mayor of New York, but then a Member of the House of Representatives, estimated that 22,000 speakeasies were operating in his home city, and said that to enforce the Volstead Act in New York would require 250,000 policemen and an additional force of 200,000 to police the police.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know about that; that was considerably before the time when I held the office to which the Senator from Virginia has referred.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, Mr. President, I have simply quoted from the record.

Mr. LEHMAN. However, I will say, at least, that the Federal Government tried to enforce the law, unpopular as it was in New York.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me first make a brief statement: I wish to accommodate my colleagues; I do not wish to seem to shut off this discussion. I have certain obligations to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

I also wish to state that last night I left the Senate with the reasonable prediction on the part of the leadership that I would have the floor at about 1 o'clock today. Of course, Mr. President, one can never predict what will happen in the Senate from the standpoint of the length of the speeches which will be made. Copies of my speech, which is 90 pages long, have been provided to the Press Gallery. It is a major speech of mine at this session of Congress, and deals with labor problems. I feel very badly that I shall have to detain the members of the Senate staff and the members of the Press Gallery and others until the speech is delivered; but it will be delivered today.

In my 11 years of service here I have always tried to extend every possible courtesy by way of yielding in the midst of any speech I might be making.

So, Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi has no objection, at this time I shall yield to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], who wishes to ask a question or two of the Senator from New York.

Mr. STENNIS. Certainly.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New York whether he construed the manifesto of the southern Senators as advocating defiance of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. I did and I do.

Mr. THURMOND. Then I challenge the Senator from New York to cite the section of the manifesto that is in defiance of the Constitution.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know whether the Senator from South Carolina was on the floor when I read some of the provisions of the manifesto. Certainly the impression I received from hearing it read in the Senate Chamber by the Senator from Georgia, and also from reading it myself since then on many occasions, and from my perusal of it today, during the debate, is that it urges defiance. That is the expression I think I used—namely, that it urges defiance of the Constitution.

Mr. THURMOND. I do not believe the Senator from New York is a lawyer.

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I am not.

Mr. THURMOND. I am sure that if the Senator from New York would read the manifesto carefully and would ask any good lawyer to construe it, he would not place any such construction upon it. The manifesto uses the words "all legal means." Those words were cautiously used, and do not imply defiance, but mean within the law. I wish to call that fact to the attention of the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very happy to receive the assurance of the Senator that this manifesto does not mean defiance of the law, or any attempt to urge nullification. If that be the case, within a reasonable time we shall have a full acceptance of the decision of the Supreme Court on the constitutional question involved.

Mr. THURMOND. The manifesto referred to "all legal means" of resistance. Under the law, we have the right to follow any legal means of resistance.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who has a brief speech to deliver, and who has been waiting as long as the Senator from Oregon has been waiting this afternoon to deliver his speech. His speech is also in the Press Gallery. It is only fair to him that it should be delivered today. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to him without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish especially to thank the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his very fine courtesies, which are quite characteristic of him.

I shall not repeat the terms of the joint resolution, because at this stage of the debate they have been thoroughly rehearsed.

I wish to commend the authors of this joint resolution, the Judiciary Committee, and the leadership for bringing the important issues involved in Senate Joint Resolution 31 to the attention of the Senate and the American people at this time. Although congressional action on this resolution could not possibly affect the outcome of the elections to be held in November, there is naturally more public interest in the processes of government in an election year.

I have been impressed by the unanimity of opinion that the electoral college never functioned in the manner anticipated by the authors of the Constitution, and that it is an outmoded and unwieldy institution, justly characterized as an "inaccurate rubber stamp."

Development of the strong two-party system obviated the necessity for relying on the judgment of prominent men in the States in selection of the President and Vice President. Modern developments in communication have assured this country of a well-informed electorate.

The corresponding growth and universal acceptance of the general ticket or party slate of electors has precluded the exercise of independent judgment of electors in presidential elections. Under present practices they are merely expected to perform a simple ministerial act to carry out the mandate of the voters.

With the ever-increasing importance of the Presidency of the United States as our country grows and problems of Government become more complex and, so long as we occupy our present position of world leadership, it is proper that we revaluate the methods of effecting the selection of these two most important offices.

In the past, the mere functioning of this electoral college has three times been used to defeat the will of the people as expressed in their popular vote.

In 1824, Andrew Jackson polled 50,000 more votes than his nearest rival, John Quincy Adams, but did not receive a majority. The election was decided by the House of Representatives where Adams was chosen President. In 1876, Tilden received 265,000 more votes than Hayes, but lost through action of the Electoral Commission. In 1888, Cleveland received 275,000 more votes than Harrison, but lost to Harrison through distribution of the votes in the electoral college.

The price which we have paid in this country in three elections I referred to where a candidate was elected with less than a majority of the popular vote is not the only bad result of the present method. There are continuing evils which should be corrected. These evils have been variously characterized, but may be summarized by the general criticism that political and campaign activity is being too heavily concentrated in so-called key States.

National policy is being planned and implemented to attract favorable local reaction in a handful of States. Campaign activity is concentrated in these key States. Of course, concentrated activity and partisan concern will be related to the distribution of population to a certain degree but the rest of the country, the heartland of the Nation, should not be neglected.

So long as the electoral college and its general ticket system remain, we may look to an intensification of this undesirable trend.

Minority and special-interest groups located in these key States have been able to exact tributes from both parties because of the local importance—under the general ticket system—of the mythical bloc vote certain cynical leaders claim to be able to deliver. Thus the political power of these groups is inflated far beyond the mere numbers of their members.

I was a cosponsor of the original Senate Joint Resolution 31 because I felt that the proportional distribution system would have struck at the roots of this situation and would have assured each individual voter that his vote would have a mathematical impact on the outcome of the election. Under the present system, his vote gets lost in the shuffle—except in States where the contest is usually very close.

In supporting Senate Joint Resolution 31, I was not unmindful of the attractive features of Senate Joint Resolution 3 which provides for a district method of selecting electors, with two electors from the State at large. Although the idea of the direct arithmetic effect appealed to me more, I could easily realize that Senate Joint Resolution 3 substituted for the present unsatisfactory method a plan which would be familiar to all voters by its close analogy to the elections of Representatives and Senators. I felt that either would be an improvement.

However, a combination of the best features of Senate Joint Resolution 3 and Senate Joint Resolution 31 will be a tremendous stride forward and at the same time will retain the historic origins of constitutional power by keeping the States as the electoral unit.

By keeping the total vote spread geographically, as in representation in the House and Senate by the individual States, an equitable distribution will result. The States, whose delegated powers created the Union, will remain the nerve center of presidential elections. By giving the States the option to choose the system they will employ, the "better" plan will be the law of the individual State. The people can be trusted to decide which plan they prefer.

Presently we are the victims of a system that can be manipulated by small groups in key States. These groups who can and do concentrate their power for one candidate, thus become the deciding factor in building up State majorities that swing large numbers of electoral votes, thus giving political power to these groups far beyond their numerical strength.

In my opinion, these pressure groups with their bloc voting and other groups organized for ulterior motives are the most serious threat to our form of government that exists today. The electoral college in its present form plays directly into their hands and becomes their instrument. These conditions demand a change and the proposed resolution is a sound and constructive change.

Again I wish to thank the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is always a pleasure to accommodate the Senator from Mississippi.

I understand that my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] has a few brief remarks he wishes to make on another subject matter. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to him without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECRETARY McKAY'S CAMPAIGN MANAGER

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in yesterday's debate about the appointment of Mr. William L. Phillips as campaign manager for Secretary Douglas McKay's race for the Senate, an issue of fact arose as to whether or not it was Secretary McKay or the Klamath Indian Tribe who selected Mr. Phillips as a "management specialist" for the Klamath Reservation, at $1,000 a month plus expenses out of the tribe's funds. In attempting to defend Mr. McKay's action, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] took issue with my statement that it was Secretary McKay who had appointed his former campaign manager, Mr. Phillips—now again to be his campaign manager—to this well-recompensed position of authority over the Klamath people, whose affairs are, of course, a trust of Mr. McKay's Interior Department. The junior Senator from Wisconsin expressed the conviction that it was the Indians themselves who chose Mr. Phillips and the other so-called "management specialists" and set their salaries, rather than the Secretary of the Interior.

The Senator from Wisconsin has now accused me of character assassination on the basis of these circumstances, so it is well that the record be cleared. The thesis of the Senator from Wisconsin, as I understand it, is that the Klamath Tribal Council made the appointment of Mr. Phillips, and that I am being unfair in attributing the appointment to Secretary McKay, who has a close political liaison with Mr. Phillips, which has now been renewed by the fact that Mr. Phillips is managing Mr. McKay's primary campaign for the Republican Party nomination as Senator from Oregon.

In other words, Mr. President, the question of accuracy devolves itself down to one question—did Secretary McKay or did the Klamath Indian Nation Tribal Council name Mr. Phillips to be a so-called management specialist at $1,000 per month, plus expenses? The Senator from Wisconsin has defended Secretary McKay on the basis and claim, now flatly voiced by the Senator from Wisconsin, that not Mr. McKay but the Klamath Council did select Mr. Phillips for this lucrative post, paid for out of tribal funds.

Mr. President, this attempted defense of Secretary McKay's mixing of Indian trust funds and Republican Party politics happens to be wholly contrary to the facts. The junior Senator from Wisconsin may have been misled by prior experiences he has had in the case of the selection of other committees to deal with Indian problems in his own State. I am sure he has found out by now that, in the case of the so-called management specialists for the Klamath Reservation, he was under a definite misapprehension. As I stated in the Senate yesterday, these management specialists were in fact selected by Mr. McKay, and only subsequently introduced to the Indian people whose affairs they were to manage, and from whom they were to collect $1,000 a month each, plus expenses.

Mr. President, I do not want to take much additional time of the Senate today on this aspect of the McKay-Phillips episode, which I think is really beyond further contradiction. For the RECORD, however, I want to introduce several illustrative items of evidence to show that the Secretary of the Interior, now a candidate for the Republican nomination for Senator from Oregon, did select the management specialists, including his former, and now again his present, political manager, Mr. Phillips.

First, Mr. President, I should like to read section 5 (a) of Public Law 587 of the 83d Congress, the Klamath Termination Act. It states:

> The Secretary is authorized and directed to select and retain by contract, at the earliest practicable time after the enactment of this act and after consultation with the tribe at a general meeting called for that purpose, the services of qualified management specialists.

There is no doubt under this section, Mr. President, who makes the decision, who selects the men, who retains them by contract. The tribe is limited to consultation only.

Secondly, Mr. President, there is no doubt that the act was so understood and administered by the Interior Department. Let me quote from the report of Mr. Wallace Turner, an experienced reporter of the Portland Oregonian, who wrote a series of thorough and detailed articles for that newspaper on the progress of the Klamath Indian Tribe under Public Law 587. In the first of these articles, on February 14, 1955—to which I referred yesterday—Mr. Turner reported:

> Under last year's congressional act, there were 3 steps that needed to be taken within the first 6 months. First, the tribal rolls were closed to any babies born after midnight, August 13, 1954. Second, the management specialists, a grand term to describe supervisors, were to be selected by the Secretary of the Interior after consultation with the tribe, and, last, a tribal roll was to be prepared by February 13, 1955.
>
> The second job was really the task of Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, and the tribe had only advisory powers. McKay selected men he has known for years.
>
> The chairman is T. B. Watters, Klamath Falls real-estate operator for many years and mayor during the years of the opening of the Klamath Basin to rail and highway.
>
> Eugene G. Favell, Lakeview, also is in the real-estate business, but his interests have included sale and representation in connection with large blocks of timber, a field in which Watters said he has little knowledge.
>
> W. L. Phillips, Salem, was for many years Car Salesman McKay's principal business competitor. McKay sold Chevrolets, Phillips, Fords. But when McKay ran for governor in 1948, Phillips managed his campaign.
>
> McKay picked the three men for the Klamath Reservation job, then talked them into taking it on. The Indians were consulted and in general council, once voted down the whole thing. But the executive committee approved the three men McKay wanted and the last general council reversed itself.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the entire article appear at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the facts are clearly reported: Mr. McKay selected his campaign manager and two other business friends for these well-paid positions on the payroll of the Klamath Tribe—under his Department of the Interior; the Indians were consulted and voted down the whole thing; Mr. McKay stuck by his appointees and the Indians finally went along.

In other words, to digress, Mr. McKay not only appointed this man, but he crammed him down the throats of the Klamath Indian Tribal Council.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am very much disappointed that the Senator from Oregon did not extend to me the same courtesy I had extended to him this morning, when I told him I would discuss the matter. I waited for him for 3 hours. He did not extend to me the same courtesy of calling my office to tell me that he would answer my argument.

I also wish to call his attention to the fact that yesterday he misquoted the law. He read a part of a paragraph, but left out that part which stated that the appointment shall be made after consultation with the tribal council. That is a part of the law. The Senator had the law before him yesterday. Why he did not read the full sentence yesterday, I do not know. I may say to the Senator that this is the most inexcusable and deliberate smear upon a great public servant that I have heard on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. So far as the observation of the Senator from Wisconsin is concerned, let me say that yesterday, when he questioned my facts, I did not have the law before me. A member of my staff brought a few sentences to me, which he had obtained over the telephone. Yesterday the Senator from Wisconsin, in challenging my facts, said——

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator had——

Mr. NEUBERGER. Please let me finish.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Oregon had the law before him. Whatever he had obtained from an associate, the Senator read from the law before him, and it was an incorrect reading.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Today I have read the law in full. Despite what the Senator from Wisconsin said yesterday—that the Secretary of the Interior did not make the appointment—the law provides:

> The Secretary is authorized and directed to select and retain by contract, at the earliest practical time after the enactment of this act and after consultation with the tribe at a meeting called for that purpose, the services of qualified management specialists.

The Senator from Wisconsin stated yesterday:

> Mr. McCARTHY. I am as certain about this as I can be, that the tribal council initiates the appointments. The Secretary may have the ultimate signing of the papers. But will the Senator agree with me that the tribal council did select the man?
>
> Mr. NEUBERGER. I will not agree, because, to begin with, I know that Mr. McKay made these appointments, and Public Law 587 provides that the Secretary is authorized and directed to select, to retain, or to contract with these men.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator still deny that the tribal council selects the man and that the Secretary merely signs the appointment? The law, as the Senator from Oregon read it today, is different from what he read yesterday. Today the Senator adds that it is only after consultation with the tribal council and after approval of the tribal council that the man is appointed. Does the Senator from Oregon still stick to what he said yesterday?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I still stick exactly to what I said yesterday and to what I am saying today.

I shall again read the law. It reads:

> The Secretary is authorized and directed to select and retain by contract, at the earliest practical time after the enactment of this act and after consultation with the tribe at a general meeting called for that purpose, the services of qualified management specialists.

Let me repeat a part of the law: "The Secretary is authorized and directed to select."

Let me again read the statement of the reputable reporter of the Portland Oregonian, an outstanding newspaper reporter of Republican political allegiance.

> McKay picked the three men for the Klamath reservation job, then talked them into taking it on. The Indians were consulted and in general council, once voted down the whole thing. But the executive committee approved the three men McKay wanted and the last general council reversed itself.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yesterday the Senator from Oregon said that McKay was using a man as his campaign manager who is on the payroll of the Klamath Indians.

The newspapers have carried the story that that man had resigned a number of days ago. Does not the Senator believe he owes an apology to Mr. McKay and should make a correction of the RECORD? Should he not now admit that the statement he made yesterday was untrue, and that Mr. Phillips is not on the payroll of the Klamath Indians, and that the Senator was wrong when he said—I cannot quote the Senator verbatim, but can repeat his words only in substance—that the campaign manager of Mr. McKay was being paid by the Klamath Indians? Does not the Senator believe that he should correct that statement?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I appreciate the Senator's desire to shift the issue from who made the appointment, which he has done so adroitly. Inasmuch as he wishes to raise the second point before I continue with the document, I will say that I stated this on the floor yesterday:

> Even if Mr. Phillips had resigned, the situation would be indefensible. It would display in the crudest way that, far from seeking the best-qualified specialists in the management of Indian properties which

$1,000 a month might get, Secretary McKay had put on the payroll at this very large sum, from Indian tribal funds entrusted to his Department, an old political crony and functionary of his, between political campaigns.

I pointed that out very distinctly on the floor, and as read from the record, I shall continue reading from some documents which will interest the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, the facts are clearly reported. Mr. McKay selected his campaign manager and two other business friends for these well-paid positions on the payroll of the Klamath Tribe—under his Department of the Interior; the Indians were consulted and voted down the whole thing; Mr. McKay stuck by his appointees, and the Indians finally went along.

Third, I would like to refer to the minutes of the meeting of the Klamath Tribe Executive Committee on December 21, 1954, at which Mr. Phillips and the other management specialists were presented to the Indian committee. Mr. Boyd Jackson, of the tribe, acted as the interrogator for the committee. Let me quote only a few of the pertinent questions and answers:

BOYD JACKSON. Who suggested that you take over such a position?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I received a call from Under Secretary of the Interior Davis asking me if I would consider serving on such a committee.

BOYD JACKSON. But you had no other requests?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Since then I received yesterday a letter of confirmation of such telephone call and containing some information regarding the problem. I had a visit with the Secretary of the Interior Sunday at my house. We talked of it some.

Then, a few questions later:

BOYD JACKSON. You had no other discussions other than the telephone call and the personal discussion with the Secretary? That is the extent?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes.

There is much more, Mr. President, to prove that not only did the Klamath Indians not initiate the selection of the management specialists; they did not even know anything about the men selected by Secretary McKay until after he had chosen them. I do not wish to labor the point further, so I ask unanimous consent to have additional excerpts from the minutes of this meeting reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator has not yet answered my question. Here is what he said yesterday:

Mr. President, Secretary McKay has named as his campaign manager for the Oregon Republican primary election, a man who, by appointment of Mr. McKay, is drawing $1,000 a month, plus expenses, out of the tribal funds of the Klamath Indian Tribe, in southeastern Oregon.

I ask the Senator if, when he made the statement, he did not know it was untrue, and if he did not know it yesterday, and now that it has been pointed out as being completely untrue, does he not feel that he owes an apology to the Senate and to the people of Oregon?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I shall be glad to answer the Senator's question. As I said on the floor, in my speech:

Of course, Mr. President, even if Mr. Phillips had resigned, the situation would be indefensible.

The whole situation was completely indefensible, and I still insist that it was indefensible. The Senator from Wisconsin has repeatedly made the point that Mr. McKay did not initiate these appointments.

I wish to go on and read from further documents to show that the Indians did not know anything about this matter at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon answer my question? I asked him whether he knew the statement he made yesterday was false, and if he did not know it then, and now that he knows the statement was false, does he not want to correct the RECORD and make an apology to Mr. McKay? It is a completely unwarranted smear to say that this man was receiving $1,000 from the Klamath Tribe, when the newspapers in the Senator's own State carried the story that he had resigned to take a job as campaign manager.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I will say this to the Senator from Wisconsin, that even if he had resigned it is a demonstration of the political cronyism to which our Indian tribal funds have been subjected. I pointed that out on the floor. The Senator talks about apologies. I have pointed out that a political crony was appointed to administer the funds of the Klamath Indians. Mr. McKay has returned this man to the position of political campaign manager after he was for many months on the payroll of the Klamath Indians. I said yesterday it was indefensible, and I say it today.

Mr. McCARTHY. I asked whether the Senator knew he was deceiving the Senate and the people of Oregon yesterday when he said that Phillips was on the payroll of the Klamath Tribe, and if he made a mistake yesterday, is he prepared to correct it today, now that the Senator knows that when he made the statement Mr. Phillips was not on the payroll of the Klamath Tribe?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The situation is still completely indefensible. It was indefensible yesterday, and it is indefensible today—just as the Senator from Wisconsin—if he wants to use the word "deceived"—deceived the Senate when he said flatly that the appointment was initiated by the Klamath Tribe.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, to permit me to read from the law?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to read from the law which was incorrectly read on the floor of the Senate. I am not saying that it was misquoted deliberately, but here is the correct quotation:

The Secretary is authorized and directed to select and retain by contract, at the earliest practicable time after the enactment of this act and after consultation with the tribe at a general meeting called for that purpose, the services of qualified management specialists.

I am saying that yesterday the Senator misquoted the law, and did not make it clear that it would be only after consultation with the tribal council.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am very glad the Senator has again read the law himself. It says that the Secretary shall select the management specialists. Yesterday the Senator said that so long as Phillips had been selected by the tribal council there was nothing wrong with his working in the campaign. So, on one day the Senator has said the tribal council selected the men, and on another day, when he has voluntarily read the law, he says that the Secretary of the Interior shall select the men.

Mr. President, I should like to read a few more documents. I quote from the management contract between the Secretary of the Interior and the management specialists. It begins:

The contract set forth herein is between Hon. Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, acting pursuant to the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718; U. S. C. 564 et seq.), and Messrs. T. B. Watters, of Klamath Falls, Oreg.; W. L. Phillips, of Salem, Oreg.; and Eugene G. Favell, of Lake View, Oreg.; hereinafter referred to as "managers."

Section 6 (e) reads:

(e) The Secretary may issue additional instructions to the managers governing the procedures to be followed in carrying out the provisions of this section.

Section 7 provides, in part:

(a) Each manager shall be compensated for the services he is required to perform under this contract at the rate of $1,000 for each month.

(b) The managers shall, as soon as practicable after the effective date of this contract and pursuant to such instructions as the Secretary may issue, submit to the Secretary a detailed budget. * * *

(c) Each manager shall be paid all necessary travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence not to exceed the maximum per diem allowance authorized by the Government travel regulations, and where travel is by automobile, payments for transportation expenses shall not exceed the maximum mileage rate authorized by the Government travel regulations.

(d) Advances will be made from funds of the tribe, and not from funds of the United States.

Let me just add section 14, which reads:

14. Consultation with tribe. In performing their functions under this contract, the managers shall, to the maximum extent feasible, consult with the tribe, consider such suggestions the tribe may make, and keep the tribe informed of their plans and progress hereunder. Such consultation will be with such representative body of the tribe as the Secretary may approve.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to quote from page 5331 of yesterday's RECORD, where the Senator from Oregon said:

I did not have a copy of Public Law 587 when I came to the floor this morning, but I am now informed that Public Law 587, of the 83d Congress, provides that the Secretary is authorized and directed to select,

retain, or contract with management specialists.

I wonder if the Senator would not agree to the simple fact—not that it is terribly important, but just to set the record straight—that the Senator was mistaken when he said Phillips was still on the payroll of the tribe.

Mr. NEUBERGER. All I can say to the Senator, again, is that I am very happy that the Senator from Wisconsin said on one day that the Indian tribe selected the men, and on the following day he said the Secretary of the Interior selected them.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator tell the Senate now why he misquoted the law yesterday?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I did not misquote the law.

Mr. McCARTHY. What the Senator said on page 5331 was strictly a misquotation of the law. The Senator misquoted the law and misstated the facts when he said this man was on the tribal payroll. Does not the Senator feel that in common decency he should correct the RECORD and apologize to the Senate for those misstatements?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does not the Senator from Wisconsin think he should apologize to the Senate and to the Klamath Indian Nation for claiming that the Klamath Tribe selected these men and initiated their appointments?

I gather the Senator has not referred to the testimony given before the Senate Committee on Appropriations on March 15, 1956—just a week ago—by Mr. Wade Crawford, of Chiloquin, Oreg. Mr. Crawford is one member of a 3-man tribal committee elected by the Klamath Tribe to act in an advisory capacity in dealing with the Secretary's management specialists.

In the course of the hearing, the distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from Arizona, asked:

Chairman HAYDEN. By whom were these management specialists selected?

Mr. CRAWFORD. They were selected by Secretary McKay. The 3 are Mr. Phillips from Salem, Mr. Favell from Lakeview, and Mr. Waters from Klamath Falls.

Those are the 3 members making up that committee.

I have reason to believe that there is a lot of politics mixed up in this action that caused Secretary Davis to cut off our salary. We have not wholeheartedly agreed with the management specialists.

Senator CHAVEZ. He did not cut out the salary of the management specialists? They still get their $1,000?

Mr. CRAWFORD. They get their $1,000 a month.

Senator CHAVEZ. And the other expenses out of these $123,000, they put them in a lump sum and do not explain them?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is broken down in their budget when it is set up but when they make a report back to the Secretary of Interior, you cannot tell and I have copies of their reports, and you cannot tell just exactly how they did spend that money.

Chairman HAYDEN. Who is the management specialist?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I will give you their full names.

Chairman HAYDEN. Are they local residents of Oregon?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, they all are, and that is one reason I was rather disappointed with the Secretary of Interior when he appointed those 3 fellows, because, at the time, we were discussing the bill and writing the law and Commissioner Emmons assured us that he was going to get top level men that would be free from politics who had years of experience in settling large estates and that was the kind of gentlemen's agreement we had.

Mr. McCARTHY. If I may interrupt the Senator once more—and this will be the last interruption—does the Senator know that Commissioner Emmons met with the tribal council and got their approval of the appointments?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have already read the statement from a reputable reporter. Certainly I know the situation exactly. The Senator from Wisconsin a few moments ago on the floor was saying that the tribal council selected the men. Now that is changed. Now it seems Commissioner Emmons allegedly got the approval of the tribal council. I repeat the statement which I read from the Oregonian:

The Indians were consulted, and in general council once voted down the whole thing. But the executive committee approved the three men McKay wanted and the last general council reversed itself.

I submit that the appointments were crammed down the Indians' throats.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another 10 seconds?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to have the record absolutely clear that Mr. Emmons, of the Department of the Interior, met with the tribal council, and that the council approved and selected Mr. Phillips. There is no question whatsoever about that. That is a fact. I do not understand why the Senator does not admit it. I want to have the record clear on that point. First, it was the tribal council who selected him; second, he is no longer on the payroll.

Mr. NEUBERGER. So far as the obtaining of the approval of the tribal council is concerned, I have read the statements of events as they happened. These men were crammed down the throats of the tribal council.

The Senator from Wisconsin asked if I would agree that the tribal council select these men. Of course I will not do that. The Secretary of the Interior selected them, as the law stipulates, as the leading newspapermen and wire services of my State have pointed out, and as I now reiterate.

I have read the testimony of very distinguished and able Indians who live on the Klamath Reservation, pointing out that they did not know who these men were until they were presented by the Secretary of the Interior, who selected them.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope the able Senator from Oregon will not think I am discourteous, but I shall have to leave the floor of the Senate now; however I shall read the remainder of his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I shall be honored to have the Senator from Wisconsin read them. I thank him for his attendance thus far.

Mr. President, I read further from the statement of Mr. Crawford last week before the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Now we find that Mr. McKay has appointed these three fellows and Mr. Phillips, he was the campaign manager for Secretary McKay when McKay was governor, and I understand now, since McKay has his hat in the ring for the Senate, that the Oregon Journal stated the other day that he is going to be McKay's manager again.

Senator CHAVEZ. What about the Hatch Act?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know. He is on our payroll at $1,000 a month. So there is politics mixed up in this and this fellow Waters, who is a real-estate man in Klamath Falls, he was treasurer of the Republican Party in our county.

They are just old friends and schoolmates of McKay's.

Tom says, "Well, I don't call him Secretary of Interior, I call him Doug." It's a kind of friendly deal here and we are paying the bill.

I am really concerned about it because I know what is involved there. I have an inventory of that entire reservation. I can tell you within 3 percent of the amount of timber that is on that cutover land. I can show you by the official records of all the equipment and the buildings that we have in the inventory on that.

In addition to that, the management specialists came in and hired people under contract to take another inventory, which will cost us another $120,000.

Senator CHAVEZ. You pay that?

Mr. CRAWFORD. We pay everything, Senator. That is one thing we do not do. We do not come down here and we do not ask the Government for 5 cents.

In other words, Mr. President, let me summarize:

I have checked the law, the facts, and all relevant circumstances. The law puts the responsibility directly on the Secretary to name these specialists. Press reports describe McKay as selecting Mr. Phillips. The contract itself specifies that McKay made the appointments. In fact, Mr. McKay actually had to cram the selections down the throat of the tribal council, because the Klamath council at first refused to ratify McKay's appointments of Phillips and two others as management specialists at $1,000 a month apiece, plus expenses.

I have brought this matter to the attention of the Senate because I believe it is wrong to involve in partisan politics the tribal funds of the Indian wards of the American people.

I digress to say that I think this is wrong whether it involves the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, or any other political party. I think it was essentially wrong that the trustees of the Indian wards and of their tribal trust funds were men who were political cronies of Mr. McKay, rather than qualified, experienced specialists in Indian culture, Indian problems, and Indian resources. Mr. McKay should have scrupulously avoided this, but instead he has flagrantly encouraged it.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the RECORD, after the enclosures I have already submitted, articles from the New York Times of June 14, 1955, and July 10, 1955, which are relevant to the developments under the Klamath termination legislation and the management contract.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 3 and 4.)

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Oregonian of February 14, 1955]

(By Wallace Turner)

KLAMATH AGENCY.—It was hot in the tribal council house, even though a partially melted snow was refreezing on the streets outside The air was close, and it was disturbed by the noises of a one-man cowboy band who had taken advantage of a recess in the Klamath tribal council session to perform and advertise his appearance over the weekend in Chiloquin.

This fellow had an act that was a little different. Usually one-man band acts have a horn or reed instrument attached by wires, and they blow it while pounding a drum with one foot and strumming a guitar with their hands.

But he had both feet working.

His left foot was bare, its cowboy boot toppled beside his chair. The foot moved along a little runway, sliding atop a device made out of a roller skate. The toes miraculously manipulated a small keyboard that brought simple chords from a portable electric organ.

BAND FASCINATES KIDS

And his hands strummed an electric guitar, while his right foot stamped out a deep rhythmic note from a bass drum. He had a fascinated group of Indian youngsters gathered in front of his rostrum (a heavy table that had been badly used), and he was playing request numbers for them while their parents ate fried chicken in the dining room.

(The tribe feeds its members noon and evening meals on general council days as an inducement to raise attendance. Even then, hours pass before the necessary quorum of 100 can be attained.)

Came the end of a western ballad that had been brayed over the hall's loudspeakers. What would you-all little children like to hear next?

"Papa Loves Mombo," yelled a little girl who was the only Indian in the house with her hair in braids.

The old cowhand couldn't hear her, probably because he hadn't educated his left toes to chord out the mysteries of Papa Loves Mombo. He began to bray another western ballad.

Now, there is a basis for comparison between the impossibility of compliance with the little girl's request and the position of the Klamath Tribe before the demands of Congress as expressed in Public Law 587.

The thousands of words all boil down to this:

The Klamaths are ordered to get ready to have Federal supervision of their property terminated by August 13, 1958, a date now 3½ years away. This means the Indians must—as a group—suddenly come in for handling an estate of a size and operational complexity such as to stagger the ego of many a successful businessman.

EIGHT HUNDRED THOUSAND ACRES INVOLVED

They have about 800,000 acres. But no Klamath Indian is now remotely able to say how the property should be handled, how much of the timber should be sold, how much should be charged for it, how much should go into sinking funds, into stock dividends, how many acres of grazing land should be leased, how and whether the tribe should have its own sawmill.

Judging from the furor created by matters of minor importance at the recent tribal council meetings, it would appear unlikely that the tribe would be able to agree on any firm operational procedure for a manager. It would seem that any manager would be dependent on the vagaries of tribal politics, and those, friends, are politics that are carried out on a tooth and fang basis that would cause a Tammany tiger to pause and consider.

RUMORS SPRING UP

Under last year's congressional act, there were three steps that needed to be taken within the first 6 months. First, the tribal rolls were closed to any babies born after midnight, August 13, 1954. Second, the management specialists, a grand term to describe supervisors, were to be selected by the Secretary of the Interior after consultation with the tribe, and, last, a tribal roll was to be prepared by February 13, 1955.

The first point was self-executing, but even so it caused some interesting rumors to spread through the tribe. Any person alive and eligible for membership on August 13, 1954, was entitled to enrollment, even if he died subsequently and in that case his heirs would inherit his membership.

A little girl was born in the summer and was not on the rolls—although she was eligible—when they were closed. She died in December, but her name was placed on the final roll by the enrollment committee.

"We hear you're enrolling dead people," one elderly Indian woman yelled at the enrollment committee during the recent tribal council meeting.

You see?

The second job was really the task of Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, and the tribe had only advisory powers. McKay selected men he has known for years.

The chairman is T. B. Watters, Klamath Falls real estate operator for many years and mayor during the years of the opening of the Klamath Basin to rail and highway.

TIMBER EXPERT INCLUDED

Eugene G. Favell, Lakeview, also is in the real-estate business, but his interests have included sale and representation in connection with large blocks of timber, a field in which Watters said he has little knowledge.

W. L. Phillips, Salem, was for many years Car Salesman McKay's principal business competitor. McKay sold Chevrolets; Phillips, Fords. But when McKay ran for governor in 1948, Phillips managed his campaign.

McKay picked the three men for the Klamath Reservation job, then talked them into taking it on. The Indians were consulted and in general council once voted down the whole thing. But the executive committee approved the three men McKay wanted and the last general council reversed itself.

The tribe most recently has toughened up on its former open-handed attitude toward adoption of members who have less than the statutory requirement of one-quarter blood of the Klamath, Modoc, or Yahuskin Tribes.

QUORUM SLOW TO GATHER

About 10 years ago the tribe adopted an amendment to its enrollment ordinance to permit these adoptions to membership, and a great many of the reservation-living full, half, and quarter bloods resent fiercely the tribal memberships of eighth and sixteenth blood city dwellers.

It is when enrollment matters come up in council that the tribal orators make their speeches in the native tongue. The rest of the time they speak in English.

Last week a council was called for 10 a. m. on Thursday. A quorum was raised by 2 p. m., after lunch. The meeting ended after 5 p. m. and resumed again at 1:30 p. m. Friday to run up toward midnight before breaking up.

Most of this time was spent in arguing over the final tribal roll and in the process 18 youngsters were turned down for adoption by a tribe hardened against letting more city dwellers in on a good thing. In the process it turned down a one-eighth child of a reservation family, however.

The approval of the final roll was the lead item on the agenda. It was finally settled about 11 p. m. on the second day. But it will not be finally settled until the Secretary of the Interior has processed all the appeals of persons left off.

When that has been done, the members may then decide individually whether to remain in a tribe or withdraw and demand payment for the portion of the tribe's jointly held property that was theirs.

That will be the crisis point for the Indians, the real Indians to whom the reservation has been a home.

EXHIBIT 2

KLAMATH TRIBAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING, DECEMBER 21, 1954

BOYD JACKSON. Mr. Phillips, you have been listed as one of the members suggested to represent the trustee management concern in creating ways and means that would lead to getting the Klamath Reservation appraised for its various resources. Is that right?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, sir.

BOYD JACKSON. Who suggested that you take over such a position?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I received a call from Under Secretary of the Interior Davis asking me if I would consider serving on such a committee.

BOYD JACKSON. You have had no other request?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Since then I received yesterday a letter of confirmation of such telephone call and containing some information regarding the problem. I had a visit with the Secretary of the Interior Sunday at my house. We talked of it some.

BOYD JACKSON. Was there any plans laid down as to the course you would be required to follow?

Mr. PHILLIPS. None.

BOYD JACKSON. How long ago was this telephone call to you?

Mr. PHILLIPS. A week ago today.

BOYD JACKSON. In turn, you have consented?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I did.

BOYD JACKSON. What is your line of business?

Mr. PHILLIPS. At the present time I am not active in any business. I sold my business in May of this year. Not active at this time.

BOYD JACKSON. What business?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I came to Oregon 42 years ago. Worked as a bank clerk, general merchandise, auditor working out of Portland. Last 33 years an automobile agency in Salem.

* * * * * *

BOYD JACKSON. You had no other discussions other than the telephone call and the personal discussion with the Secretary? That is the extent?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes.

BOYD JACKSON. You said you met with the Secretary and the telephone conversation with the Under Secretary? That is the extent?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Two calls from Mr. Foster.

BOYD JACKSON. Just what was the nature of the "confabs"?

Mr. PHILLIPS. We will start with the Under Secretary. Mr. Davis said that he had a problem in Klamath Falls and a committee would be appointed; a very important committee, and he would like to know if I would serve on it.

BOYD JACKSON. Just how did Mr. Davis know that you lived in Salem?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I met him previously.

BOYD JACKSON. In what respect?

Mr. PHILLIPS. When he was out in Portland on business.

BOYD JACKSON. That was the only time?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I met him once in Washington, D. C.

BOYD JACKSON. You only met him once?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Once in Portland and once in Washington.

BOYD JACKSON. When was the only time you met him in Washington?

Mr. PHILLIPS. During the last Presidential inauguration—going through the office I met him.

BOYD JACKSON. There was no discussion with reference—with reference to Indian problems?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Neither time.

BOYD JACKSON. This matter of asking that you consider this job to act as trustee came as something that he thought of inasfar as he was concerned personally?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I don't know. I didn't ask him.

BOYD JACKSON. What was the nature of your discussion with the Secretary?

Mr. PHILLIPS. He asked me if I had received official notification. He wrote it and left and got to Salem before the letter. He said I am not appointed, I am recommended and the appointment will come later—the letter will so state.

BOYD JACKSON. Was that the extent of your discussion?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No details discussed whatever. It was in a larger group—6 or 7 present. Nothing was discussed.

BOYD JACKSON. What was the nature of your discussions with reference to this matter insofar as Mr. Foster is concerned?

Mr. PHILLIPS. He just wanted to know if I had received the message the first time—fixed a time, then called and said he couldn't make it. Then he called a third time, said the meeting would be today in Klamath Falls. I met him today, this morning.

BOYD JACKSON. According to the information that you have given us there seems—I haven't—there hasn't been very much discussed insofar as the problems concerning the Klamath Indians is concerned. Now you have spent 33 years of your business life as a dealer in cars. How old are you?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Sixty-one.

BOYD JACKSON. Over half your life. At no time have you had any experience with reference to, concerning forestry, or have you?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Directly? No not directly.

BOYD JACKSON. If indirectly, what is the extent of your experience?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Living in Salem where the State forestry is located I have known the State forester, mill owners, interested in some timber, sold trucks to haul logs, haul lumber. One of the biggest industries we have.

BOYD JACKSON. Have you had any experiences with reference to the development of water projects?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No.

BOYD JACKSON. Any experiences with reference to matters involving livestock interests?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No.

BOYD JACKSON. Have you had any interest in the undeveloped resources we have on this reservation?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No.

BOYD JACKSON. You don't have the slightest idea of what you are going to do?

Mr. PHILLIPS. A general idea only.

BOYD JACKSON. And a vague general idea?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is right. I didn't ask for the job. I was asked and inasmuch as I am not working, I thought it would be all right.

* * * * *

BOYD JACKSON. I take it that you are on your own, that you are not obligated in any way to any concern; that you are not involved in any business; stockholder in any concern that insofar as the matter of financial concern or concerns, that is neither here nor there.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have no financial interest in any lumber concern, or irrigation. I am indebted to no one and no one is indebted to me.

BOYD JACKSON. You are in no way involved in politics?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am interested in politics. Definitely.

BOYD JACKSON. The suggestion that you take over the trusteeship wasn't in any way involved in politics?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I don't think so. No sir. Politics is a science of good government, and everybody should be interested. I am not, I have never run for office. I have no political aspirations and don't want any.

BOYD JACKSON. Insofar as politics, you are not indebted to anyone?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Absolutely not.

BOYD JACKSON. You are only interested in seeing good men elected to the jobs. How do you know the qualifications of a good man?

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is very easy, just look for qualifications and when you find them you have the man. * * *

BOYD JACKSON. You feel that when you were suggested to take over this job that they picked you because you were a good man?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I hope so. It certainly wasn't for my faults, which we all have * * * want to get an honest man to begin with.

* * * * *

Mr. PHILLIPS. I don't qualify as a specialist, but the specialists can be had.

Mr. O'NEIL. The Secretary is to enter into contracts with management specialists. It doesn't say what that means. Now they want to interview the people who will be appointed by the Secretary. The matter of compensation has this, is it to be borne by the tribe? Any discussion with you?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Nothing. Someone said you get $9 per day—somebody, I never asked.

Mr. O'NEIL. I might say that I am involved with this matter as well as you. There has been nothing said to you about compensation?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Nothing.

Mr. O'NEIL. No provision for a contract has been made?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Nothing mentioned.

Mr. O'NEIL. Would you be able, if the job required it, to devote your full time to the job. If it would require full time?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I didn't plan on any full time job. Have nothing to do.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the New York Times of June 14, 1955]

OREGON INDIANS SPLIT ON FUTURE—KLAMATH TRIBE VIEWS CHANCE FOR FULL CITIZENSHIP WITH EAGERNESS AND DISMAY

(By Lawrence E. Davies)

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG., June 14.—A long-deferred program for severing Indians from Federal supervision and giving them first-class citizenship is on trial on the 800,000-acre Klamath Reservation.

The Klamath Indians, numbering 2,000 are viewing their prospective independence with eagerness, concern or outright dismay. What happens to them, under congressional action of last year designed to end a 90-year wardship, is sure to have a bearing on future legislation dealing with other tribes having big reservations whose holdings are controlled by the Government.

There is no unanimity of opinion among tribesmen on the vast southern Oregon reservation. The area has rich stands of ponderosa and sugar pine, agricultural and grazing land, and undertermined mineral deposits. Factional strife has existed for years.

WARNING IS VOICED

According to one group, the reservation is to be split up to enable the Klamaths to go their individual ways as full citizens. A rival group warns that as the tribal lands are sold and the funds divided, the withdrawing tribesmen will squander their cash assets or lose their property to satisfy tax demands, and go on relief.

Indian Bureau officials regard the Klamath termination problem as the toughest now facing the bureau. Members of a three-man board of management specialists appointed by Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, to supervise the termination, say they are spending anxious hours trying to figure out the best way to protect the Indians.

Last August 13 Congress enacted Public Law 587 to end Federal controls on the Klamath Indians and their tribal holdings. The law specifies that the program must be carried out within 4 years. It affects what is loosely called the Klamath Tribe, which actually embraces the Klamaths, the Modoc Tribe and the Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians.

TWO THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTEEN ON TRIBAL ROLL

A tribal roll, to which under the termination law no child born after midnight of last August 13 could be added, carries 2,118 names but is subject to revision. About half of these are adults, that is, 18 years or older. About one-third live off the reservation, and of this number half reside outside Oregon.

One of the first essentials, under the law, is to determine through an appraisal the total value of the Klamath tribal assets. Dividing this by the number of names on the roll will give the value of each member's stake. According to preliminary estimates, the pro rata shares may be appraised at $20,000 to $50,000 each.

Once the appraisal is completed, the law says, every adult member of the tribe may elect, for himself and his minor children, whether he wishes to withdraw from the tribe and take his share of assets with him. A tribal management plan would be set up for those who wished to stay in the tribe.

A colorful cast of characters is at odds over how the withdrawals would be accomplished to give those who leave and those who remain an equal share. The rival factions are led by two men who are well known to congressional committees because of frequent appearances in Washington.

CALLS IT GOOD LAW

Wade Crawford, 60 years old, is former superintendent of the reservation. His critics like to say he was kicked out of his job in the thirties. He leads the group that wants quick termination of control and distribution of assets.

"It's a good law," he says. "It's not perfect but it does a lot of essential things that should have been done years ago."

Boyd Jackson, a short, heavyset, moon-faced strategist, opposes early liquidation as economically and socially inadvisable. He is against the law as it stands. He contends a rush of withdrawals by tribesmen would result in their offering for sale of huge blocks of timber to convert into cash their equities in the tribal estate.

He feels this would flood the market, fail to net those resigning from the tribe anywhere near the money they would be entitled to under the appraisal and leave the remaining tribesmen in a weak fiscal position.

Mr. Jackson uses picturesque language in discussing Mr. Crawford's purported shortcomings. Mr. Crawford retorts that Mr. Jackson has had his feet in the tribal trough for 20 years and does not wish to lose out on a good thing.

TRIBE LEADER IN FLIGHT

Seldon E. Kirk is the respected chairman of the tribe's general council and executive committee. The 72-year-old chief marched down Pennsylvania Avenue in 1901 with the Carlisle Indian School's cadet corps, third-place winner behind West Point and Annapolis, at the inauguration of President McKinley.

Born on the reservation, he applied for a carpenter's job at the Klamath agency headquarters 40 years ago to show that an Indian can work. He has been on the job since but plans to retire this year.

Mr. Kirk, his iron-gray hair clipped in a crew cut, becomes misty-eyed as he describes the Klamath Treaty signers during

the Grant administration as uneducated but men of wisdom, more wisdom than we have today. Their bidding was:

"Hold this land as long as the sun sets on the mountains in the West, as long as the rivers flow."

According to the chief, "the Indian Department sold millions of dollars of tribal assets, doled out the money, slaughtered the morale of the Klamath Indians." He asks: "Are those people ready to take over their responsibilities under Public Law 587? Decidedly no."

Mr. Kirk declares he would favor a termination bill "to be presented to Congress through majority consent of the Indians involved."

"The only thing I favor in this whole setup is the section in Public Law 587 that says a tribal management plan shall be prepared 'satisfactory to the tribe and to the Secretary of the Interior for the management of tribal property through a trustee, corporation, or other legal entity,'" he says.

He contends that the tribe has had no opportunity to record its attitude. Even now, he says, an election of a tribal advisory committee to serve during the termination period has been conducted not by the Indians, but by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

His reference to doling out money was based on a reservation custom whereby $2 million worth of timber is sold to lumber companies annually. The costs of reservation administration and upkeep, $300,000 to $400,000 a year, are deducted, and the balance is divided in equal shares among the tribal members.

This has been giving the Klamaths about $800 each. Some try to live on this, plus hunting and fishing. Others farm and raise stock operate businesses off the reservation, or hold jobs and use the $800 to supplement their incomes.

The group to which Secretary McKay has delegated the task of supervising the termination program consists of Thomas B. Watters, real-estate dealer and former mayor of Klamath Falls; Eugene G. Favell, Lakeview real-estate dealer and insurance man; and William L. Phillips, of Salem, a former competitor of Mr. McKay in the automobile business.

Mr. Watters figures it will hardly be possible for the appraisers, whom the management specialists will hire, to complete their work before April 1957.

Mr. Crawford contends the job of appraising the property and terminating Federal supervision could be done in a year.

The Crawford critics call his statements specious and say he is playing into the hands of the big timber interests.

"What would happen to the economy of this area if that much timber were put on the market in less than a year?" they ask.

Mr. Watters says he is thinking of setting up a cooperative or an association, embracing all of the tribal assets, after the appraisal. If each tribal member were entitled to $30,000 on the basis of the appraisal, 300 shares of stock in the association, with a valuation of $100 each, would be issued to everyone in the tribe. Those withdrawing would take cash but would get 20 percent less.

The money to pay off the resigning members would be borrowed from the Federal Government, which would be paid back by the association or corporation as timber was sold in an orderly fashion. Funds would be put in trusteeship for alcoholics.

EXHIBIT 4

[From the New York Times of July 10, 1955]

KLAMATH INDIANS ACT ON FREEDOM—REFERENDUM PICKS COMMITTEE TO DEAL WITH MANAGEMENT ON END OF UNITED STATES CONTROLS

PORTLAND, OREG., July 9.—A confused political situation on the Klamath Indian Reservation was eased considerably last week.

A referendum ordered by Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, resulted in the election of a three-man committee of Indians to act for the tribe. The Indian committee will deal with three management specialists who are supervising the tribe's property during a period of transition as Federal controls are terminated.

The three Indians named to the committee are Seldon E. Kirk, for many years chairman of the Tribal General Counsel; Wade Crawford, one-time superintendent of the reservation and more recently delegate of the tribe to Congress, and Lawrence Witte, a newcomer to tribal politics.

They were selected from a five-man slate. The two defeated candidates were Boyd Jackson, long-time tribal delegate and a leader of the more conservative Indians, and Jesse Lee Kirk, brother of the tribal chairman who successfully campaigned for Mr. Crawford's position as delegate 2 years ago.

The election was ordered by Secretary McKay when his management appointees found it impossible to decide which of two opposing groups of Indians they should treat with. Their decisions are required in appraisal of the 850,000-acre reservation, meeting the conditions of the law that will terminate Federal control in 1958.

One group, headed by Mr. Jackson, had held office for many years and was the duly elected representation of the tribe. The other group, led by Mr. Crawford, traced its authority to a special Tribal General Council held in January while Mr. Jackson's forces attended meetings at Indian Bureau area offices in Portland.

Mr. Crawford's group consisted of himself, Seldon Kirk, and Mr. Witte. It had authority as a special investigating committee that was created to go anywhere and study any matter having to do with the Klamath Tribe's future and property.

The 3 or 4 council meetings held since January were marked by loud arguments between Mr. Jackson's supporters and those of Mr. Crawford. Meantime, the three management specialists have been unable to decide which of conflicting views they should accept.

The management group is made up of T. B. Watters of Klamath Falls, Oreg.; W. L. Phillips of Salem, Oreg., and Eugene Favell of Lakeview, Oreg. Each has signed a contract with the tribe to be paid $1,000 per month for services leading toward termination of Federal controls in August 1958.

METHOD THE ISSUE

Generally, Mr. Jackson and Mr. Crawford are not opposed on the broad question of termination—both support it. However, details of their views are in wide variance.

Mr. Jackson hopes for a method of termination that will leave the reservation intact as a unit that may be operated by the Indians along lines not greatly different from the operation of the Indian Bureau in the last 30 years.

Mr. Crawford, however, hopes for termination under terms that will permit individual Indians the decision whether to withdraw from the tribe and require a section of the reservation sold to satisfy claims of withdrawing individuals.

Seldon Kirk is opposed to termination in any form. Mr. Witte follows Mr. Crawford's lead. Jesse Lee Kirk follows Mr. Jackson.

The results of the referendum which placed Mr. Crawford and Mr. Witte as a majority on the new tribal committee, was taken to indicate a strength of opinion among the Indians for total dismemberment of the reservation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for yielding and for waiting so patiently when he has a major speech awaiting delivery.

Mr. MORSE. I assure my colleague that it was a pleasure to yield to him.

THE CONSTITUTION AND SEGREGATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I turn to the subject matter of my major speech this afternoon, I wish to make a few brief comments with respect to the discussion between the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I associate myself with the position taken by the Senator from New York.

I do not know of anything more incomparable than the manifesto which was read in the Senate some days ago in respect to the decision of the Supreme Court in the integration cases, and the lawful course of action which was taken in respect to the repeal of the 18th amendment. It reminds me very much, to reduce it to the absurd, of asking a livestock judge, after there has been led into the judging ring a horse and a donkey, to proceed to give the award to the animal which is the best cow.

There is nothing comparable between the two situations. The 18th amendment was an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It was ratified January 29, 1919, and became operative, under the terms of the amendment, a year later.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in my remarks a copy of the 18th amendment and the explanatory note that appears in the Senate Rule Book in respect thereto, on page 504.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment and explanation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT XVIII

SECTION 1. After 1 year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation therof into, or the exportation therof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction therof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

SEC. 2. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

The 18th amendment[1] was ratified by the several State legislatures on the following dates: Mississippi, January 8, 1918; Virginia, January 11, 1918; Kentucky, January 14, 1918; North Dakota, January 28, 1918 (date on which approved by governor); South

[1] The 18th amendment was proposed by Congress on December 18, 1917, when it passed the Senate [CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (65th Cong., 2d sess.) 478], having previously passed the House on December 17 [Id. 470]. It appears officially in 40 Stat. 1050. Ratification was completed on January 16, 1919, when the 36th State approved the amendment, there being then 48 States in the Union. On January 29, 1919, Acting Secretary of State Polk certified that this amendment had been adopted by the requisite number of States [140 Stat. 1941]. By its terms this amendment did not become effective until 1 year after ratification.

Carolina, January 29, 1918; Maryland, February 13, 1918; Montana, February 19, 1918; Texas, March 4, 1918; Delaware, March 18, 1918; South Dakota, March 20, 1918; Massachusetts, April 2, 1918; Arizona, May 24, 1918; Georgia, June 26, 1918; Louisiana, August 9, 1918 (date on which approved by governor); Florida, November 27, 1918; Michigan, January 2, 1919; Ohio, January 7, 1919; Oklahoma, January 7, 1919; Idaho, January 8, 1919; Maine, January 8, 1919; West Virginia, January 9, 1919; California, January 13, 1919; Tennessee, January 13, 1919; Washington, January 13, 1919; Arkansas, January 14, 1919; Kansas, January 14, 1919; Illinois, January 14, 1919; Indiana, January 14, 1919; Alabama, January 15, 1919; Colorado, January 15, 1919; Iowa, January 15, 1919; New Hampshire, January 15, 1919; Oregon, January 15, 1919; Nebraska, January 16, 1919; North Carolina, January 16, 1919; Utah, January 16, 1919; Missouri, January 16, 1919; Wyoming, January 16, 1919; Minnesota, January 17, 1919; Wisconsin, January 17, 1919; New Mexico, January 20, 1919; Nevada, January 21, 1919; Pennsylvania, February 25, 1919; Connecticut, May 6, 1919; New Jersey, March 9, 1922; New York, January 29, 1919; Vermont, January 29, 1919.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the 21st amendment is the repealer amendment of the 18th amendment. I ask unanimous consent that it be published at this point in my remarks, with the explanatory note as it appears in the Senate rule book.

There being no objection, the amendment and explanation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT XXI

SECTION 1. The 18th article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

The 21st amendment[2] was ratified by the several State conventions on the following dates: Michigan, April 10, 1933; Wisconsin, April 25, 1933; Rhode Island, May 8, 1933; Wyoming, May 25, 1933; New Jersey, June 1, 1933; Delaware, June 24, 1933; Indiana, June 26, 1933; Massachusetts, June 26, 1933; New York, June 27, 1933; Illinois, July 10, 1933; Iowa, July 10, 1933; Connecticut, July 11, 1933; New Hampshire, July 11, 1933; California, July 24, 1933; West Virginia, July 25, 1933; Arkansas, August 1, 1933; Oregon, August 7, 1933; Alabama, August 8, 1933; Tennessee, August 11, 1933; Missouri, August 29, 1933; Arizona, September 5, 1933; Nevada, September 5, 1933; Vermont, September 23, 1933; Colorado, September 26, 1933; Washington, October 3, 1933; Minnesota, October 10, 1933; Idaho, October 17, 1933; Maryland, October 18, 1933; Virginia, October 25, 1933; New Mexico, November 2, 1933; Florida, November 14, 1933; Texas, November 24, 1933; Kentucky, November 27, 1933; Ohio, December 5, 1933; Pennsylvania, December 5, 1933; Utah, December 5, 1933; Maine, December 6, 1933; Montana, August 6, 1934. The amendment was rejected by a convention in the State of South Carolina, on December 4, 1933. The electorate of the State of North Carolina voted against holding a convention at a general election held on November 7, 1933.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what happened? The 18th amendment was adopted. It became the law of the land. The opponents of the 18th amendment proceeded to see to its repeal by legal procedures. It took some years to do it. They went through lawful procedures, and ultimately the amendment was repealed.

If the signers of the manifesto want to argue with the Senator from New York on a common premise in respect to a comparable fact situation, let them propose a repealer amendment to the 14th amendment of the United States Constitution. That would put them in a comparable position.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the 14th amendment and the explanation thereto as they appear in the Senate rule book.

There being no objection, the amendment and explanation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT XIV

SECTION. 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

SEC. 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.

SEC. 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a Member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

SEC. 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations, and claims shall be held illegal and void.

SEC. 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

The 14th amendment[3] was ratified by the several State legislatures on the following dates: Connecticut, June 30, 1866; New Hampshire, July 7, 1866; Tennessee, July 19, 1866; New Jersey, September 11, 1866 (the New Jersey Legislature on February 20, 1868, "withdrew" its consent to the ratification; the Governor vetoed that bill on March 5, 1868; and it was repassed over his veto on March 24, 1868); Oregon, September 19, 1866 (Oregon "withdrew" its consent on October 15, 1868); Vermont, October 30, 1866; New York, January 10, 1867; Ohio, January 11, 1867 (Ohio "withdrew" its consent on January 15, 1868); Illinois, January 15, 1867; West Virginia, January 16, 1867; Michigan, January 16, 1867; Kansas, January 17, 1867; Minnesota, January 17, 1867; Maine, January 19, 1867; Nevada, January 22, 1867; Indiana, January 23, 1867; Missouri, January 26, 1867 (date on which it was certified by the Missouri secretary of State); Rhode Island, February 7, 1867; Pennsylvania, February 12, 1867; Wisconsin, February 13, 1867 (actually passed February 7, but not signed by legislative officers until February 13); Massachusetts, March 20, 1867; Nebraska, June 15, 1867; Iowa, March 9, 1868; Arkansas, April 6, 1868; Florida, June 9, 1868; North Carolina, July 2, 1868 (after having rejected the amendment on December 13, 1866); Louisiana, July 9, 1868 (after having rejected the amendment on February 6, 1867); South Carolina, July 9, 1868 (after having rejected the amendment on December 20, 1866); Alabama, July 13, 1868 (date on which it was "approved" by the Governor); Georgia, July 21, 1868 (after having rejected the amendment on November 9, 1866—Georgia ratified again on February 2, 1870); Virginia, October 8, 1869 (after having rejected the amendment on January 9, 1867); Mississippi, January 17, 1870; Texas, February 18, 1870 (after having rejected the amendment on October 27, 1866); Delaware, February 12, 1901 (after having rejected the amendment on February 7, 1867). The amendment was rejected (and not subsequently ratified) by Kentucky on January 8, 1867, and by Maryland on March 23, 1867.

---

[2] The 21st amendment was proposed by Congress on February 20, 1933, when it passed the House (76 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (72d Cong., 2d sess.) 4516), having previously passed the Senate on February 16 (Id., 4231). It appears officially in 47 Stat. 1625. Ratification was completed on December 5, 1933, when the 36th State (Utah) approved the amendment, there being then 48 States in the Union. On December 5, 1933, Acting Secretary of State Phillips certified that it had been adopted by the requisite number of States (48 Stat. 1749).

[3] The 14th amendment was proposed by Congress on June 13, 1866, when it passed the House (Congressional Globe (39th Cong., 1st sess.), 3148, 3149), having previously passed the Senate on June 8 (id., 3042). It appears officially in 14 Statutes 358 under date of June 16, 1866. Ratification was probably completed on July 9, 1868, when the legislature of the 28th State (South Carolina or Louisiana) approved the amendment, there being then 37 States in the Union. However, Ohio and New Jersey had prior to that date "withdrawn" their earlier assent to this amendment. Accordingly, Secretary of State Seward on July 20, 1868, certified that the amendment had become a part of the Constitution if the said withdrawals were ineffective (15 Stat. 706–707). Congress at once (July 21, 1868) passed a joint resolution declaring the amendment a part of the Constitution and directing the Secretary to promulgate it as such. On July 28, 1868, Secretary Seward certified without reservation that the amendment was a part of the Constitution. In the interim, two other States, Alabama on July 13 and Georgia on July 21, 1868, had added their ratifications.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the very heart of that amendment, as far as this question is concerned, reads as follows, in section 1:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The Supreme Court of the United States, the supreme authority on the constitutional rights of the American people, has applied the amendment to the rights of all citizens of this country, irrespective of race, color, or creed, including Negro citizens. And if the signers of the manifesto do not want constitutional equality of rights for the blacks of this country, let them propose, by lawful means, a repealer amendment to the 14th amendment of the Constitution of the United States. Then, for the first time, the Senator from Virginia will be talking on a premise comparable with the position taken by the Senator from New York. It is just that simple.

Or I may make another suggestion. If what they want to do is by lawful means, Mr. President, I give them a lawful procedure. I suggested it to them on the floor of the Senate a few days ago. Let them propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States denying to the Negroes of America equal protection of the laws, and denying to the Negroes of America equal rights in the schools of America, and continuing segregation policies that now prevail in some parts of this country.

They have to do it one way or the other, and unless they do it one way or the other, they are subject to the criticism of the Senator from New York that, no matter what phraseology they use in their manifesto, Mr. President, they are aiding and abetting defiance of the law, because that is what has happened.

I say on the floor of the Senate today that I think every Member of the Senate ought to have an opportunity to stand up and be counted by giving him an opportunity to put his John Henry on a manifesto as to whether or not he believes in the supremacy of the Supreme Court, as was laid down by that great Virginian, John Marshall, in Marbury against Madison, as being the supreme tribunal for the determination of the constitutional rights of all Americans, irrespective of race, color, or creed. When we approach it from that standpoint, then we are on a comparable premise.

That is why I associate myself with the Senator from New York, because I think that is the thesis of his argument. It was the thesis of that great statement of statesmanship he made a few days ago on the floor of the Senate, setting forth his view on the manifesto. I am perfectly willing, Mr. President, to leave that challenge to my colleagues from the South who signed the manifesto, and for whom I have nothing but the most sincere affection as colleagues, but, in respect to this issue, with whom I am in complete and total disagreement. I repeat, in closing my remarks on this subject, as I said a few days ago, that, in the last analysis, what the document means is an aiding and abetting and encouragement of the doctrine of interposition, and the doctrine of interposition is nothing more or less than the doctrine of nullification.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business for today, it stand adjourned until next Monday at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERVERSION OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT BY THE EISENHOWER NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—A CALL FOR A CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

Mr. MORSE Mr. President, I now turn my attention to the subject matter which I thought I had an understanding would be under discussion some hours ago. No one is at fault, so far as the leadership of the Senate is concerned, that I am not by this hour almost through this manuscript, instead of just starting it.

Mr. President, in each session of Congress I seek to make a major speech on what I consider to be the major issues involving the legislative responsibilities of that session of Congress which have not, at least up to the point of the making of the speech, been pretty well implemented along their way toward legislative action.

I have been disturbed for a long time, Mr. President, about the administration of the Taft-Hartley law, and about the failure of the Congress to enact amendments to the Taft-Hartley law which would eliminate its vicious antilabor features.

In previous speeches I have pointed out what I think must be in any package proposal for amendments to the Taft-Hartley law before I shall vote for any package. That is why to date I have opposed the proposals of the Eisenhower administration for amendments to the Taft-Hartley law, because the proposals of the administration have not touched a single one of the three essentials for amendments that must be in any package of amendments to the law before I would think of voting for the package approaching the problem.

Briefly, those three essentials are: Complete revision of the Taft-Hartley law in respect to its injunctive provisions. On the floor of the Senate, back in 1947, I warned that, unless we modified the injunctive procedures of the Taft-Hartley law, it would lead to government by injunction, and to antilabor procedures in the States, and that labor would be ground down again by government by injunction. All one has to do is study the injunctive record which has been made under the Taft-Hartley law. The evidence amply supports the position I took in 1947.

Also in 1947, Mr. President, I made an argument against the anti-Federalist features of the Taft-Hartley law. I pleaded with the Senate not to delegate as much authority as the Congress delegated in the Taft-Hartley law to the States over Federal jurisdiction in respect to interstate commerce as it is involved in industrial disputes.

My speeches and the historic debate will show that I forewarned the Senators from certain strong labor sections of the country that have good labor laws that they would play directly into the hands of antilabor sections of the country if they voted to delegate the authority that they did vote to delegate in that law. That has come to pass, too. Not only that, but already there is a great movement to delegate the remaining power of the Federal Government in the field of interstate commerce in respect to industrial disputes.

In the third place, I said during that debate that we should not pass that law with what really amounted to a blanking out of secondary boycotts. What has happened, Mr. President, is that the American people have been fed the propaganda that all secondary boycotts are bad. At the present time, under the Taft-Hartley Act, in case after case by manipulation and maneuvering of factual situations, we find one union after another broken under the secondary boycott provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. In 1947, I warned against that. I pointed out then, as I would point out here tonight, Mr. President, that no self-respecting union man or woman will work on struck goods. Yet there are numerous cases in which unions are maneuvered into a position in which their members either work on struck goods or else the union is subject to damage suits or is confronted with an injunction. I pointed out that no self-respecting union man or woman will walk through a legitimate picket line. Yet, under the administration's operation of the Taft-Hartley Act, it happens in numerous cases that a union is maneuvered into a position in which the facts are interpreted as constituting a secondary boycott situation, and then the union members either go through the picket line or else the union is subject to a damage suit or to an injunction.

Mr. President, as I said in 1947, there are secondary boycotts—as prohibited by the Morse-Ives bill—which cannot be justified, because they do not constitute a legitimate effort on the part of labor, but, instead, as I said then, constitute an unfair labor practice.

Mr. President, I have made reference to my position on the three essentials to any package proposal for amendments to the Taft-Hartley law. Many other factual situations which have developed under the Taft-Hartley law have been leading to great abuses of it. But, Mr. President, those three are doing irreparable damage to free labor in America.

Mr. President, with those remarks by way of introduction, I turn now to my manuscript; and I shall discuss the subject, Perversion of the Taft-Hartley Law

by the Eisenhower National Labor Relations Board—A Call for a Congressional Investigation.

Mr. President, my position on the Taft-Hartley Act is well known. I voted against it in 1947. Since then, I have been consistently supporting efforts to amend that act to make it a genuinely fair and equitable statute. Even President Eisenhower has conceded that the law has union-breaking provisions and should be amended—although I hasten to add that this admission, like the promise of 100 percent parity, was made in the 1952 campaign, and has been contradicted in every way by the Eisenhower administration's actions since it took office.

But I do not rise today to condemn the Taft-Hartley Act or to condemn the Eisenhower administration for failing to make effective recommendations for its improvement—although condemnation on both scores is just and due.

I rise on a far more serious charge—a charge on which I believe responsible Senators on both sides of the aisle should join when they are acquainted with the facts. That charge is that the Taft-Hartley Act has, in fact, been amended in the past 3 years.

Mr. President, inasmuch as I have referred to other Senators, I think the RECORD at this point should show that when it was planned that I would deliver this speech at a much earlier hour today, a group of Senators who are very much interested in the subject matter of the speech, and are very desirous of considering carefully and thoroughly the documentation of this speech, planned to be on the floor to participate in a discussion with me of some of the points of the speech. Among them are the Senators from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]; the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]; my junior colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who now occupies the chair; the two Senators from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS and Mr. SYMINGTON], and other Senators. This afternoon I have talked to most of them or to their assistants. I made clear to them that it looked as if the session would continue far into the night, and that under the circumstances I thought that in fairness to the staff and in fairness to the members of the press I should proceed to read my speech tonight without interruption. I suggested that any comments those Senators might wish to make or any questions they might wish to ask me could be submitted by them the first of next week, after they had an opportunity to study the RECORD. In such instance, that suggestion seemed to be perfectly satisfactory.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am now proceeding on the basis of that course of action. In view of that understanding, I shall not yield the floor during the remainder of my speech. I shall read it in continuity, because I desire to have it available in the RECORD in continuity, for reprint purposes.

Mr. President, as I was saying, the Taft-Hartley Act has been changed, and changed drastically. But the change has not been made by the Congress. It has been made by the Eisenhower appointees to the National Labor Relations Board. Sworn to uphold the law which Congress enacted, it would seem that they have searched it from stem to stern with the purpose of making it a more antilabor statute, and of reversing every possible rule of interpretation and application established in the administration of the act from 1947 through 1952.

Those who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act said that it was two-sided legislation, that it equalized the rights of management and labor, without submerging the rights of either side unfairly. Whatever the merits of that position—and I do not propose to argue it today—I think that there can be little doubt that the changes in the administration of the act since 1953 have been almost exclusively antilabor.

I intend to go into some of these changes, item by item. I intend to document the charge I have made. But before I do I think it important to look at the broad picture, to examine the pattern of change which the Eisenhower Board has wrought.

First, it is clear that almost all of the innumerable changes in doctrine and interpretation which the Eisenhower Board has made have been changes which reduced the protections of labor and increased the rights of management. Reasonable arguments can be made on individual cases. With respect to each charge it can be argued that the new Board is right and the old Board was wrong. But when all of these charges are looked at together and it is discovered that the total result seems to favor management and to hurt labor, is it not reasonable to assume that— whatever the arguments on the individual cases—there is an underlying bias and prejudice against labor organizations?

If the complaints against the Board came only from defeated litigants in cases before the Board who attributed their losses to the agency's bias and prejudice, we should not, perhaps, be so seriously concerned. In every lawsuit one side must win, and the other lose. Lawyers know that all too often the loser is apt to attribute to the bias of the judge rather than to any lack of merit in his case, his failure to pluck the fruit of victory. However, while labor complains bitterly that it is subjected to invidious and discriminatory treatment by the Board and where few, if any, comparable complaints come from the employer side, appearances suggest that there may be some merit in the charge.

Those who would justify the Eisenhower Board say that the Board is fair and has moved in an antilabor direction only because the Truman Board was excessively prolabor, and that the Eisenhower Board is simply correcting the prolabor mistakes of the Truman Board.

Fortunately we have a check point against which to measure these arguments.

When the Taft-Hartley Act was passed in 1947, its sponsors were afraid that it would not be fairly administered. The statute was complex and many of its provisions were so unclear that maladministration could easily defeat Congress purposes. To guard against such maladministration, Congress provided in title V of the act for the creation of a joint committee of both Houses to conduct an investigation in the 2d session of the 80th Congress of the Board's administration of the act. That committee, under the chairmanship of Senator Ball concluded in its report [1] that, in the main, the act was being administered in accordance with its terms and with the intention of the Congress as revealed by the legislative history of the provisions.

So we start with the premise, amply supported, that the Taft-Hartley Act was, on the whole, fairly administered in its early years with neither a prolabor nor a promanagement bias in the Labor Board's decision.

3. NLRB'S ANTILABOR BIAS

But the past 2 years have seen a rising chorus of protest, objection, and complaint that the National Labor Relations Board is biased and prejudiced against labor organization; that it is utilizing its powers to thwart self-organization among employees; that it is assisting employers who desire to thwart unionization both by withholding the act's remedies against violation by employers, and by distorting the terms of the act so as to exclude illegal conduct by employers from the ban of the act. At the same time, it is charged, the Board is narrowing the area of lawful protection which Congress extended to employee activity in the field of self-organization and that it is imposing upon the right to strike restrictions which Congress rejected as inconsistent with the maintenance of free democratic institutions and a system of free collective bargaining. Instance upon instance have been brought to our attention of cases handled by the Board in a manner which can only be described as shockingly unfair.

The Senators all know how important it is in a field as delicate as labor-management relations, where passions and emotions run high, and where the very lives and livelihood of many citizens are at stake, that the agency which we, the Congress, have entrusted with the duty of administering the law of the land should avoid even the appearance of bias and prejudice. The Supreme Court of the United States has called the Board's attention to the fact that time spent to avoid "even the appearance" that a particular litigant is being treated unfairly and unjustly is "time well spent." *Labor Board* v. *Donnelly Corp.* (330 U. S. 219, 237). Recent rulings of the Board show that it is alert, indeed, to this necessity where an employer claims to be the victim of a trial examiner's bias. *In Better Monkey Grip Company* (113 NLRB No. 110, issued in August 29, 1955), the Board remanded a case for new trial because a majority of its members felt that the employer respondent might have regarded the trial examiner as prejudiced because the examiner had indicated incredulity at the corporation president's testimony that he did not know it was illegal to fire a man for joining a union. It refused to remand the case even though, as the dissenters observed, the

[1] Report of the Joint Committee on Labor Management Relations, 80th Cong., 2d sess., Rept. No. 936.

employer's guilt was plain and there was no evidence that the employer had not received a full and fair hearing, or that the trial examiner was in any way prejudiced in the presentation of his case, the Board set aside the entire hearing, and ordered retrial.

Surely, if it is important to the Board, as it clearly is, that it should avoid the appearance of any unfairness in any individual case, it is of much greater importance to the Congress and the Nation that this agency not act in a fashion which might produce a deep-seated feeling that by deliberate design it is unfair to an entire class of litigants.

But the charges of bias, prejudice, maladministration, and distortion of the statute do not come from defeated litigants alone. They have been confirmed by informed students and competent lawyers who specialize in this field of labor-management relations. Prof. Willard Wirtz, of Northwestern University, in a carefully documented study of the Board's free-speech decisions, concluded that the Board has recently emasculated the protection which Congress guaranteed to employees against employer coercion in the exercise of rights to form and join labor organizations by placing upon section 8 (c), the free-speech provision of the amended act, a construction far broader than Congress intended. *Board Policy and Labor Management Relations: Employer Persuasion,* New York University Seventh Annual Conference on Labor, 1954, page 79, et seq. He says:

> The net effect of the present law of employer persuasion appears pretty clearly to be that the employer may do, in some form, the persuasional equivalent of everything he is prohibited from doing in another form—except only that he may not penalize individual employees for their views and may not establish his own union. Stated differently, this conclusion is that an employer today, if he is competently advised as to ways and means, may bring to bear upon his employees' representation decisions whatever economic power he has—again with the two exceptions.
>
> • • • • •
>
> A "political factor" is so obvious here that it would be disingenuous to ignore it. The presence of other considerations does not dim the fact that the new law of employer persuasion traces directly to the results of the national election of 1952 and to the consequent appointment to the Board of a majority more responsive than the predecessor majority to the sentiments, or experience, of employers. The one most reliable factor in predicting what the Board will do now in borderline persuasion cases is its consistent subscription to what may be loosely described as the generally prevailing management point of view.
>
> This "political" element involves more, however, than whether the holdings in particular cases go one way or another. The enforceability of democratic law depends, in the long run, upon whether it is respected. And particularly is this true where law must be enforced against well-organized groups—strong unions, powerful corporations, or any other kinds of large private associations. It is of substantial significance in this connection that the National Labor Relations Board is identified in most people's minds today as a partisan political agency.
>
> That the circumstances and nature of the appointments of the new Board majority were offensive to a great many is only part of the point. It is probably more important that this new majority has wrought its changes of policy less in the fashion of judges bringing new vision into the law of the land than in that of ward politicians sweeping out everything the other scoundrels left behind. There were advance announcements that substantial changes would be made. Weak cases have been seized upon to make good on these promises. There has been needless setting aside of factual determinations made in particular cases by predecessor members, pointless exaggeration of the changes which have been made, and regrettable sneering at established doctrines as being ill-conceived if not indeed dishonest.
>
> • • • • •
>
> Regardless of morals, the serving of notice that the manning of the Federal labor law depends upon which party won the last election will inevitably diminish the influence of this law. It will receive, henceforth, that limited, reluctant, and grudging acceptance which people accord any law when they find that its course is set by no fixed stars of principle but only by the shifting of the political tides. Perhaps this result has been at least unconsciously intended. It may be a good result. Its significance is in any event very real.

Mozart G. Ratner, who, until he resigned to enter private law practice in January 1953, served the Board as Assistant General Counsel in charge of Supreme Court litigation, states that the Board has forsaken its quasi-judicial role and instead embarked upon a deliberate program of amending the Taft-Hartley Act under the guise of interpretation. Ratner charges that the new Board, believing that the Act which Congress passed is not sufficiently antilabor in its impact, has bypassed Congress and usurped its legislative functions. In *Recent Changes in National Labor Relations Board Policies,* New York University Eighth Annual Conference on Labor, 1955, page 143, et seq., Ratner charges that—

> The Board has ridden roughshod over compelling judicial authority; policies which the Board and the courts have followed for years are cavalierly brushed aside. Even the fact that Congress while enacting Taft-Hartley considered and approved the earlier policies gives the new Board members no pause, if, in their opinion, the old policies serve too well to protect collective bargaining rights and self-organization. The legislative history of newly added provisions is disregarded wherever that history would prove embarrassing to an extension of inhibitions upon union activity or functioning. Judicial determination, as in *Conway,* that 'hot cargo' clauses are not illegal is not enough to convince the new Board members that redetermination of the issue must be left to the legislative process.
>
> It is apparent that the Eisenhower-appointed members of the Board are using the powers of their office to substitute for the labor relations policy which Congress enacted in 1947 a new and vicious antilabor policy of their own. The sweeping and crucial character of the policy changes which the Board has made during the past year, taken together, amount to amendment of the statute in a manner far more drastic than anything this administration has proposed to Congress. The antilabor amendments which the new Board has accomplished by "interpretation" exceed, in some respects, even the antilabor proposals of the Ball-Hartley wing of the Republican Party, which Congress in 1947 rejected.
>
> Whether or not the political motivation for the policy changes is frankly confessed, as it was in the case of the jurisdictional standards, their political objective is unmistakable. If the new members had set out to confirm the fears of trade union leaders as to the fate which administration of national labor policy would suffer at Republican hands, they could hardly have done a better job.
>
> • • • • •
>
> That the Board is effectuating the labor relations policy of the National Association of Manufacturers rather than the policy of the act will have consequences serious enough in the short run. Exacerbation of labor disputes and perpetuation of inequality of bargaining power in the most depressed sectors of our economy spell danger to the prosperity of the Nation. Even more serious, however, will be the consequences of public realization that the national labor policy is being administered, not in accordance with principles of law, but in the interest of political expediency, by men who value their prejudices more highly than the judgments of Congress. This is government of men, and not of law. And, in a democratic society, such government spells the doom of law itself.

Because of the fact that throughout this speech I shall quote at very great length from this very scholarly article by Mr. Ratner in the Chicago Law Review, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the article may be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, charges of this import are too serious for this body to ignore. They go to the very heart of our democratic system of government and to the principle of separation of powers between the three great branches of our Government. How can constitutional government survive if the deliberation and judgments of the Congress are deliberately set at naught by the very men who are entrusted with the duty of effectuating Congress' will? Can the Congress permit any administrative agency to thwart by carefully disguised usurpation of legislative powers, the objectives and policies which are the law of the land? Is it not our duty to the Nation carefully and painstakingly to examine these charges and to determine for ourselves whether the Board is faithful to the trust which Congress has placed in it?

Senators are under particularly heavy obligation to do this when the charge of usurpation of legislative function and political motivation is levied at the Board.

In 1947, when Congress amended the National Labor Relations Act by adopting the Taft-Hartley proposals, it established the independent office of General Counsel of the Board and to that office assigned many of the administrative and prosecuting functions which had previously been performed by the Board. The purpose of stripping the Board of these powers was, as the report of the conference committee explained, to limit the Board "to the performance of quasi-judicial functions."

A tribunal upon which we have thus placed the duty to confine itself to a judicial role is under special obligation to act impartially. Such an agency, beyond all others, must, at all costs, eschew

political motivations. Political decisions are the very antithesis of judicial decisions. Congress did not create the Board and vest in it quasi-judicial powers in order to provide an easier avenue for political amendment of the statute than the legislative process. Congress created the Board to administer the act as written, not to rewrite it.

After the Republican administration came to power, however, it soon gave evidence that it intended to turn the Board from a quasi-judicial into a political agency. Each member appointed to the National Labor Relations Board by this administration has been a Republican. The office of General Counsel, which is charged with the duty of determining whether a complaint shall issue on all charges filed with the agency, was filled with a Republican lawyer whose private practice background was exclusively as a representative of employers in the labor-management relations field. By March 1954 the present administration had succeeded in placing a majority of its political appointees on the Board. On March 29, 1955, General Counsel Kammholz took office.

Before turning to the changes in statutory interpretation which the new Board has made, let us look at what these men did to the personnel of the agency. Competent, unbiased, and experienced personnel, as this the Senate body so well knows, is indispensable to sound administration of any law as complicated as the Taft-Hartley Act. When the new Board members and the new General Counsel took office the Board had in its service in virtually all of its top positions in Washington and in the field offices, career employees who had served the agency loyally and faithfully for many years. The personnel records of the agency will show that political factors played no part in the initial appointment of these career employees. Most of them had served under and had been promoted to their positions by General Counsel Robert N. Denham, an outspoken Republican and an intense partisan of rigorous enforcement of the Taft-Hartley Act against labor unions.

Similarly, the positions of legal assistants to the Board members were filled by career employees without regard to political affiliation. These legal assistants perform no policy making function; they simply assist the Board member to whom they are assigned in analyzing the record and the legal issues that are brought to the Board for decision.

What happened? The Republican-appointed Board members ruthlessly discharged a substantial number of legal assistants whose careers at the agency had extended for many years, and chose as their replacements, in the main, politically acceptable novices, or others who, while previously on the Board staff, had been regarded by their superiors as lacking sufficient ability to warrant serious consideration for promotion.

The General Counsel swept with an even broader brush. William O. Murdock, a career employee of many years' standing who had served in high positions under both General Counsels Denham and Bott, was removed as Associate General Counsel in charge of field operations, and forced to resign. In his place was appointed a personable young Republican who first came to the Board in 1954, a man who had less than 4 months' experience with the Board's field operations and whose only experience in the labor-relations field prior to 1954 was in the capacity of attorney for a division of the United States Steel Co. in San Francisco. This is the office which determines more than any other the impact of the Board's policies on actual labor relations day by day. In this office lodges power and responsibility for the supervision of the operation of all of the Board's field offices with their many regional directors, dozens of field examiners, and attorneys who, in their dealing with both labor and management, are to all intents and purposes the Board itself.

Under the office of Associate General Counsel in charge of field operations were several Assistant General Counsels whose responsibility it was directly to supervise the operations of the National Labor Relations Board regional offices. These posts, too, had been staffed with career employees of long service who had achieved their positions by dint of hard, competent, dedicated effort over many years. These men were not policy-makers. Their positions are in the classified civil service and are schedule A positions under the Ramspeck Act, Executive Order 743 of April 15, 1943, and the Lloyd-La Follette Act of 1912, as amended. Their job descriptions clearly show that many years of experience, thorough understanding of the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, and of the decisions of the Board and the courts construing that act are indispensible to proper performance of their task.

What did General Counsel Kammholz and his new associate general counsel, Mr. McGinnis, do to these positions? Under the guise of administrative reorganization they purported to abolish these jobs and immediately recreated them as new and different positions. The encumbents were frankly told that they had the option of accepting downgrading demotions to positions which lack either prestige or authority and which carry far lower pay scales, or of resigning from the agency completely. I need not speak of the heartless cruelty which was displayed in thus severing men whose entire careers had been devoted to the Government service from positions which the civil-service laws protect against political chicanery. I need not speak of the ruthless disregard for human considerations which accompanied the general counsel's bald dismissal for political reasons of William Feldesman, one of the ablest attorneys on the Board's staff, from his role as technical legal adviser to the policies and appeals section of the division of law. It is enough to point out that each one of these men was replaced either by a novice or by one whose competence and experience could not by any standard of merit be deemed remotely the equivalent of his predecessor.

It is common knowledge throughout the ranks of this agency that the plan of reorganization which the general counsel and the associate general counsel instituted for removing from their positions Assistant General Counsels Reynolds and Whittaker was a sham and a subterfuge and that political considerations rather than occupational classifications governed the appointments to these and the other positions from which the encumbents had been removed. Nor was that all. When regional directorships became vacant in Detroit and in St. Louis, General Counsel Kammholz and the Republican majority of the Board appointed to fill those positions men whose background and experience show lack of qualification as judged by the very standards clearly set forth in the civil-service job descriptions. In the one instance an attorney was appointed as regional director in Detroit whose experience in the field of labor relations law was, at best, meager, entirely employer oriented, and who had never before even served with the agency. In the other, an attorney in the St. Louis office who was junior to others in that office and who had never exercised supervisory authority of any kind was for political reasons vested with the office of regional director and the vast powers which the possessor of that office wields.

In addition, the Eisenhower general counsel has denied promotion to competent and qualified lawyers on his staff both in Washington and in the field offices on the excuse that the Board's budget is inadequate. However, at the very same time the general counsel has hired, to fill positions at higher salary scales than those to which he denied promotion, outsiders who lacked not only experience with the agency, but any experience in the field of labor law at all.

As might be expected, the consequence of this wholesale jettisoning of and discrimination against career servants of long standing and their political replacement by novices or less competent personnel has driven the morale of the agency to a frighteningly low level. From top to bottom employees of the National Labor Relations Board are scared. They cannot work efficiently for fear that next the ax may fall on them. Instead of performing their duties conscientiously and impartially they now must seek to curry favor with the new administration. Output suffers. In this field, where speed in processing and handling cases is one of the most important elements of successful administration, hesitancy, vacillation, and delay, particularly where it is a labor organization or employees whose rights are at stake, has become the order of the day.

Some may ask, are not the Republicans entitled to make appointments from their own ranks to governmental positions as important as these? Is not the power to appoint to agencies like the Board one of the prizes of political victory? The answer must be short and sharp. No, Mr. President, not to the National Labor Relations Board. The administration of the Taft-Hartley Act by this agency cannot be political if the area of labor relations is to be governed in this Nation under the law as enacted by Congress rather than the law of the

jungle. We must remember that we are dealing here with an agency which Congress deliberately made quasi-judicial; that the Board was to function as much like a court as was humanly possible. A court and its officers must have but a single goal—to do justice under the law which it administers to the parties who come before it. Only if we lose sight of that central fact can we be misled by the shallow and superficial plea that distortion of this act in the interests of management to the detriment of labor is only a negligible and inevitable consequence of the spoils system. More is at stake here than Republican patronage. The defense of patronage is but a camouflage for something deeper and more malign, namely, let me repeat, is to transform the law which Congress passed into a different and even more vicious instrumentality for subversion of the rights of the working men and women of this country.

Let us look at some of the practical consequences of what some of the new Republican appointees have done.

The general counsel, as you know, has the power to decide which cases shall and which shall not reach the Board for decision. He determines whether the evidence presented in support of a charge is adequate to warrant prosecution. By fragmenting the evidence instead of viewing it as a whole, the clearest case of unfair labor practice can sometimes be reduced to a series of meaningless and trivial incidents. Of course, no fair or rational administration of the act can result from such an approach, and the Supreme Court has specifically so held in *Universal Camera Corp.* v. *NLRB* (340 U. S. 474). Yet this is exactly the approach which General Counsel Kammholz and his Republican assistants have taken where labor organizations or employees file charges alleging that employers have violated the law.

Much of the deliberate distortion in evaluating evidence submitted in support of union charges is hidden in the secret files of the general counsel's office which are not made public. But enough appears even from the brief and uniformative published descriptions of the general counsel's administrative decisions to make perfectly plain the bias, prejudice, and unfairness which characterizes his handling of the cases. For example, in one case, identified by the general counsel only as case No. K 42, he refused to issue a complaint on charges alleging that the company violated sections 8 (a) (1), (3) and (5) of the act because, although five employees who had gone on strike testified, independently of each other, that the company had offered each of them benefits to abandon the strike and return to work, there was no corroboration of their testimony. Mr. President, this is incredible. How could there be corroboration of separate conversations at which only two parties—the employer and the employee—were present? It is not the business of the general counsel, but of the Trial Examiner and the Board, to weigh the evidence and decide whether, if the employer denies making the statements attributed to him he or the employees are telling the truth. But there is something even more shocking here.

The employer did not deny making the statements to the employees. Their testimony stood uncontradicted by any witness to the conversation. What did the general counsel do? He accepted an affidavit of the employer's attorney, who, although not present, denied that the statements were made, as proof that the employer had not actually made them. Even if the burden of proof in these unfair labor practice cases was as heavy as in a criminal case, which it certainly is not, I have no hesitancy in saying that any unbiased prosecutor would have proceeded in this case.

Can anything but bias and prejudice explain Kammholz' refusal to proceed?

Case after case presents the same pattern. I say to Senators, read for yourselves the administrative decisions of the general counsel in the following cases: K2, 25, 32, 41, 45, 56, 66, 71, 102, 106, 110, 117, 135, 148, 150, 159, 171, 178, 185, 192, 196, 203, 216, 231, 261, 262, 272, 282, 284, 289, 297.

Why, Mr. President, long before we get through those cases we shall see the pattern of bias and prejudice which characterized the action of the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board in handling case problems of the type which I have just described.

Now let us turn to the regional offices. Two cases for which Regional Director Kennedy in St. Louis is personally responsible warrant the close attention of this body.

The first case is one involving the J. W. Banta Towing Co., NLRB Case No. 14CB291, in which the trial examiner issued an intermediate report on January 13, 1956. In this case the employees of the company, which is engaged in the business of towing barges on the Mississippi River and other inland waterways, decided that they wanted to exercise their rights under the act to join a union and secure the benefits of collective bargaining. When their craft are not in home port the crew members, of course, live on board the boats. The employees wrote letters to the labor organizations which represent seamen and asked them to organize the crew. The labor organizations replied by returning authorization cards to the crew which the employees were to sign if they were interested in being represented by the union. A majority of the employees signed these cards and one of the crew members sent them to the union's headquarters in St. Louis requesting that union representatives come on board and talk with the crew. In response to this invitation union representatives came on board during the crew's free time, and began to confer in the galley with those employees who had invited them and who wanted to discuss unionization. A few minutes later one of the captains, Captain Burt, entered the galley and, upon discovering that the men were union organizers and were discussing unionization of the crew, unceremoniously ordered the organizers off the boat. At this moment another of the union representatives entered the galley. The captain uttered an obscene oath and struck him over the head with a flashlight. At the invitation of the crew members the union representatives remained on board for approximately 30 or 40 minutes thereafter.

Captain Burt threatened to get his gun from the pilothouse and shoot the "whole shebang." When he observed one of the organizers poke his head out of the galley, Captain Burt, in his own words "grabbed a meat cleaver and made a break at the organizer." Outraged at the captain's treatment of the organizers and his refusal to recognize them as the men's representative, the crew determined to leave the boat, which was moored to the dock, and go on strike. Upon leaving, the men set up picket lines on the dock.

The captain then attempted, in violation of Coast Guard regulations, to release the boat from the dock and take it into the river all by himself. When one of the representatives attempted to interfere with the captain's illegal action, Captain Burt threatened to "stick this knife into you." A few minutes later the captain picked up an iron bar about 18 or 24 inches long and ¾ to 1½ inches thick, an instrument used to tighten ratchets, and called a "toothpick," and threw it at Organizer Knapp.

Shortly afterward the company imported from other States relatives of the owners and others, who came, armed with guns and ammunition, to take the place of the striking crew members. These men manned the boats in battle array, and, on orders of the captain fired a volley of shots at the pickets who were standing on the dock. One of the organizers, at whom the captain had deliberately ordered fire to be directed, was hit and severely wounded.

On these facts the union and the company filed charges against each other, alleging violations of the act. The union charged that the company had unlawfully interfered with the employees' right of self organization. The company charged that the union had unlawfully intimidated the employees into joining the union and going on strike by trespassing on the boats against the company's wishes and by carrying "toothpicks" when they picketed on the docks.

The facts which I have given are not the union's version. They are the facts found by a trial examiner for the Board. They are shocking enough. But the really shocking aspect of the case is that these facts were found as a result of Regional Director Kennedy's action in issuing a complaint against the union. Exercising his responsibility to determine whether, and against whom, a complaint should issue, he decided that a complaint should issue against the union, but that no action should be taken on the union's charge against the company.

And in presenting the case against the union to the Board's trial examiner, Kennedy's attorney had the gall to contend that the trial examiner was even precluded from deciding that the company had instigated and provoked the violence and must be bound by Kennedy's own decision, arrived at without notice or hearing, that, because no violence would have occurred if the union repre-

sentatives had not heeded the call of the crew and honored their request to discuss organization with them in their own quarters on board the boat, it must be conclusively held that the union and not the company was responsible for the violence.

The bias of a man who can conclude that it is the employees and their representatives who are responsible for unfair labor practices in a situation such as this, can only be appreciated fully by reading the trial examiner's report in this case. The trial examiner leaves no doubt that impartial administration would have compelled the regional director to do just the opposite of what Kennedy did. A complaint should have issued against the company on the union's charges, and no complaint should have issued against the union on the company's charges at all. Indeed, the examiner makes it perfectly plain that only the requirements of due process precluded him from condemning as the vicious unfair labor practices they are, the company's resort to industrial warfare to defeat the honest and peaceful attempts of the company's employees to exercise their right to collective bargaining.

Almost equally shocking is the action of Regional Director Kennedy in issuing a complaint at the behest of Coca-Cola Bottling Co., of St. Louis, which charged local 688 of the teamsters' union with violating section 8 (b) (4) (c) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

This story begins in 1951, when the teamsters' union undertook to organize the nonunion driver-salesmen of the Coca-Cola Bottling Co., of St. Louis. The company operates out of headquarters in St. Louis, but also maintains warehouses in various small communities nearby, out of which certain of its drivers work. The union was successful in efforts to organize the teamsters to act as their collective-bargaining representative. The National Labor Relations Board was then asked to conduct an election so that the drivers could express their desire by secret ballot. The company, however, refused to consent to an election, contending that the union was seeking an inappropriate unit of employees for collective bargaining purposes in that the union sought only to represent the drivers working out of the St. Louis facility. Company attorneys urged the Labor Board to deny the election requested on the ground that the drivers working out of the outlying warehouses were improperly being excluded from the bargaining unit. The Labor Board held a formal hearing in the case, and many weeks later directed the holding of an election in the manner first requested by the union—excluding the drivers working in the outlying warehouses—94th NLRB, page 33. That decision directing the election, however, required a waiting period of many weeks.

During the waiting period, the company undertook an active and vicious campaign against the teamsters' union and illegally coerced and restrained its driver-employees in the exercise of their right freely to select their own representative. Seven drivers were fired simply because they wanted the teamsters' union to represent them. One driver was forced to resign from the teamsters' union. Wage increases were promised as an inducement to the drivers to withdraw from the teamsters' union. Employees were questioned concerning union activities. Employees were warned to drop out of the union. Employees were told of the possible damage flowing from union membership. Employees were threatened and coerced into withdrawing from the teamsters' union, and other acts of interference were engaged in. The National Labor Relations Board found the company guilty of all of those things—95 NLRB, page 45.

As guilty as the company was, the fact remains, nevertheless, that its undertaking accomplished the desired result, for when the Labor Board finally conducted the election, such fear had been implanted in the minds of the drivers that a majority of them voted against the teamsters' union.

It was not very long after the teamsters lost the NLRB election that the Coca-Cola drivers formed an independent association or union—one whose membership was restricted solely to Coca-Cola drivers and which was not affiliated with either the AFL or the CIO. Although the company has always denied that it had anything to do with the formation of that association, its president, according to one driver, stated that he understood the association was to be a social club and it seemed to be having too many meetings. The association called itself the Coca-Cola Bottling Co. Salesmen's Association and as such signed a contract with the company providing for the wages, hours, and working conditions of the Cola-Cola drivers. That contract became effective on July 13, 1953, and expired on November 1, 1955.

Before that contract was signed, the National Labor Relations Board held an election and certified the association as the sole collective-bargaining representative for the Coca-Cola drivers.

During the 2 years between 1953 and 1955, the Coca-Cola drivers became dissatisfied with the independent association which they had previously formed, and they started a movement to select the teamsters' union as their bargaining representative. That movement had to go underground, and an attempt was made to keep the knowledge thereof from the company. The drivers held secret meetings at night in out-of-the-way places for fear that the Coca-Cola Bottling Co. would do again what it did in 1951. A majority of the Coca-Cola drivers decided to withdraw from their independent association and to be represented in the future by the teamsters' union. A substantial number of the drivers evidenced their desire and intention in that connection by signing authorization cards designating the teamsters' union as their collective bargaining representative.

On September 2, 1955, the teamsters' union filed those authorization cards with the National Labor Relations Board and requested that an election be held so that the drivers could express their desire by secret ballot. The teamsters requested an election among the same bargaining unit of drivers which the National Labor Relations Board certified in 1953 and which was described in the contract between the company and the independent association. The case is known on the Board's records as No. 14–RC–2861.

At that point, the movement was brought out in the open and the company then began an active campaign of delays and dilatory tactics in an effort to block the holding of an election.

The Board scheduled a hearing on the petition which the teamsters' union had filed on September 2, for the morning of September 29. Prior to the 29th, the attorney for the company, Nelson W. Hartman, requested that the case be continued until a later date because of his inability to be present on that date. A continuance was granted upon the basis of the assurances of Mr. Hartman to the regional director of the Labor Board that the company would be ready for trial at the next sitting date. The case was then scheduled for hearing for October 12, 1955.

Prior to the hearing on October 12, a new and additional attorney entered the picture on behalf of the company. He turned out to be Mr. V. Lee McMahon, Mr. Kennedy's predecessor as regional director of the Labor Board in St Louis. Mr. McMahon then requested a further continuance of the case, notwithstanding the assurances previously given, stating that he had just been retained as cocounsel by the company and could not be ready for trial by October 12. His request for a continuance was denied and the Labor Board hearing was to start on October 12. It did not proceed, however, until November 8, 1955, because the company refused to supply data as to its interstate operations.

On October 24, the driver-salesmen who constituted the independent association held a meeting of the association and voted to dissolve it. Two hundred driver-salesmen—the total membership of the association—attended. The vote to dissolve was unanimous. When the Board hearing resumed on November 8, the attorney who had represented the independent association from which the drivers withdrew in a body on October 24 informed the Labor Board that the independent association wanted to withdraw from the case as a result of the decision taken at the October 24 meeting. That attorney informed the Labor Board that the independent union was no longer in existence.

The attorneys for the company seized upon this statement as a basis for seeking a further delay. They pleaded surprise and stated that they would have to have a further continuance so that they could prepare new defenses to the teamsters' union request for an election. In order to avoid the possibility of a further continuance, the attorney for the independent association withdrew his motion. Since then, however, and after the hearing in the case had been concluded, the attorney for the independent association filed a written

motion with the National Labor Relations Board in Washington, asking that the independent association be permitted to withdraw from the proceedings and that its name not be placed on any ballot in any election.

The company made further efforts to block an election. It asked the Labor Board to make an administrative investigation of the validity of the authorization cards filed by the teamsters' union, contending that the cards had been obtained by coercion, a plainly frivolous accusation.

The company also urged the Board to dismiss the proceeding on the equally frivolous theory that the company drivers were stockholders in the company, and were therefore not employees within the meaning of the act.

Although the company did produce commerce data at the November 8 hearing, it refused to concede that its activities affect interstate commerce, and has taken the position in its brief, as well as at the hearing, that the Labor Board has no jurisdiction in this case.

The drivers of the Coca-Cola Co. were present during most of the times when the dilatory tactics of the company were employed, and many of them were present at the Labor Board hearing on November 8. Those drivers became so incensed with the dilatory tactics of the company that, on the evening of November 8, 1955, they voted to strike and picket in protest.

After the drivers struck and picketed, attorneys for the company filed unfair labor practice charges with the Labor Board, contending that section 8 (b) (4) (C) had been violated because the teamsters union was striking to force the company to recognize it when another union, the independent association, was certified by the Labor Board in 1953.

This was the charge on which Regional Director Kennedy issued a complaint against local 688. A more shocking distortion of the plain objectives of Congress in enacting section 8 (b) (4) (C) than issuance of a complaint against local 688 under these circumstances would be difficult to imagine. Section 8 (b) (4) (C) was one of the few provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act as to the soundness of which virtually every member of this body, and also the President of the United States, were agreed. As the President stated in his veto message: [2]

> The National Labor Relations Act provides procedure for determining which union represents the employees of a particular employer. In some jurisdictional disputes, however, minority unions strike to compel employers to deal with them despite a legal duty to bargain with the majority union. Strikes to compel an employer to violate the law are inexcusable. Legislation to prevent such strikes is clearly desirable.

In my comments on the bill which became the Taft-Hartley Act I criticized section 8 (b) (4) in many respects, but I agreed that these provisions of section 8 (b) (4) which dealt with jurisdictional strikes and the provisions of subsection 8 (b) (4) (C) were sound. I said:

> Another objective for which it will be illegal to strike or engage in a boycott is one designed to compel any employer to disregard a certification issued by the Board. Under the present law, an employer who is under a duty to recognize and bargain with one union by reason of a Board election and certification can obtain no relief from the Board or the courts if the union which lost the election chooses to strike or boycott in an effort to have the employer disregard the obligation placed upon him by reason of the Board certification.

No one doubted, when the act was passed, that section 8 (b) (4) (C) went no further than prohibiting strikes which had as their objective to force an employer to disregard a legal obligation which rested upon him by reason of a valid Board certification which had been outstanding for 1 year or less. Under familiar doctrine, certifications impose an absolute legal duty on the employer to recognize the certified union for only 1 year. In the Coca-Cola case the certification of the independent union was not only subject to challenge, having been in effect for a period of over 2 years, but the employer was under no legal obligation whatever to bargain with the independent union at the time local 688 struck. The reasons are obvious.

Whatever duty may have been imposed on Coca-Cola by the certification was lifted when local 688 filed its representation petition supported by an adequate number of authorization cards. Even the regional director agreed that local 688 had thereby raised a question concerning representation and, under the law, then, at least, the certification no longer bound Coca-Cola to anything. The law is clear that an employer is under no obligation to bargain with any union, whether previously certified or not, where a question concerning representation has been raised by a rival union. Second, the company itself had stopped bargaining with the certified union before the strike occurred. The company could not claim that it was being forced by the strike to discontinue doing something that it was not doing anyway. Third, at the time the strike occurred the employer could not have bargained with the certified union. It was no longer in existence. Finally, local 688 represented all of the former members of the previously certified union.

Nothing in the language or in the reasons which led to adoption of section 8 (b) (4) (C) could conceivably have suggested to anyone that, even if local 688 was striking to secure recognition from the company, its action in doing so was prohibited in these circumstances by section (b) (4) (C). And so, indeed, United States District Judge Moore, of the Eastern District of Missouri, held when Regional Director Kennedy asked him to issue an injunction prohibiting local 688's strike on the ground that he, Kennedy, had reasonable cause to believe that, by striking, local 688 had violated section 8 (b) (4) (C). Judge Moore denied the injunction, and in his opinion said:

> Because the association had, by November 9, 1955, when the association's certification was more than 1 year old, lost the support of a majority of the employees in the bargaining unit, and the company had at least a bona fide doubt that the association retained the support of a majority, the company was then no longer required by law to bargain collectively with the association, but was free to "refuse to bargain further with it." (*Brooks* v. *National Labor Relations Board* (348 U. S. 96, 104, 35 LRRM 2158); *Celanese Corp.* (96 NLRB 644).) An object of respondent's conduct, therefore, was * * * not to require the company to violate its duty to bargain with the certified union.
>
> 6. Section 8 (b) (4) (C) of the act proscribes strikes "having as their purpose forcing any employer to disregard his obligation to recognize and bargain with a certified union and in lieu thereof to bargain with or recognize another union." (House Conference Report No. 510, 80th Cong., 1st sess.; see also S. Rept No. 105, 80th Cong., 1st sess.; 93 daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 7686; id. at 1910–12, 3954.) That section does not, as the Board contends, proscribe strikes directed toward compelling the employer to violate his duty of neutrality between two competing unions, nor does it proscribe strikes to gain an object (recognition) which could alternatively be gained, eventually, by means of the peaceful processes of the Board's election procedures, for it is not written in those terms, and there is no rational relation between these circumstances and the criterion established by the act: whether "another labor organization has been certified as the representative of (the) employees under the provisions of section 9." A strike is not rendered unlawful by the presence of such circumstances. See, e. g. *Perry Norvell Co.* (80 NLRB 225, 23 LRRM 1061); *Tungsten Mining Corp.* (106 NLRB 903, 909, 32 LRRM 1576); address of former General Counsel Bott, May 13, 1954 (34 LRRM 78, 79; cf. S. Rept. No. 105, 80th Cong., 1st sess., p. 22); House Conference Report No. 510, 80th Cong., 1st sess., 43, 44, 98 daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4557, 4562–4563. Accordingly section 8 (b) (4) (C) does not proscribe the conduct of respondent in this case.
>
> 7. The fact that repondent's representation petition was already pending at the time of the strike does not render respondent's conduct unlawful, because this circumstance has no bearing upon the terms of section 8 (b) (4) (C), and a contrary rule would discourage, rather than encourage, resort by the union to the peaceful election procedures of the Board.
>
> 8. Any intimidating tactics that may have been employed by respondent in acquiring or insuring the support of some of the employees are irrelevant, for before any such tactics were used respondent had gained the support of a clear majority of the employees in the unit.
>
> 9. Petitioner does not have reasonable cause to believe that respondent has engaged or is not engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8 (b) (4) (C) of the act.
>
> 10. The petition for an injunction should therefore be denied (37 LRRM 2496, 2499).

Amazingly enough, however, despite this clearly correct decision, Regional Director Kennedy continued to press his complaint against Local 688, with the result that a trial examiner of the Board, apparently catching the spirit of the Eisenhower Board's perversion of the policies and objectives of the statute, has within the past 10 days handed down a report in which he finds that local 688 did indeed violate section 8 (b) (4) (C). Upon what does this trial examiner rely to support this shocking conclusion? Apparently the decision of Judge Moore was not good enough for him. Mr. President, incredible as it may seem, his

[2] Legislative History of Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, vol. 2, p. 1012.

principal reliance is the report of the House committee issued in support of the provisions of the Hartley bill, which were infinitely broader and entirely differently conceived than section 8 (b) (4) (C); a provision which the Senate deliberately voted down and which the Congress never enacted. The provisions of the House bill, to the support of which the language which the examiner quotes was addressed, would have outlawed "picketing an object of which is to compel an employer to recognize for collective bargaining a representative not certified under section 9 as the representative of the employees." [3]

The Supreme Court of Kansas, in a recent case in which an employer sought to enjoin a labor organization from picketing for the purpose of securing recognition while a representation proceeding was pending before the Board, took occasion specifically to note that the legality of such union conduct was placed beyond dispute by the fact that Congress voted down the provisions of the House bill which I have thus quoted. Yet the trial examiner in the latest document which has come from the National Labor Relations Board relies upon the very section of the Hartley bill that was repudiated by the Senate of the United States and never was enacted into law, a section which the Supreme Court of the United States made very clear never became a part of the Taft-Hartley law. That shows how far the National Labor Relations Board is going with its perversion of the Taft-Hartley law. Apparently the Board has made up its mind that it simply will stop local 688 from organizing workers at the Coca-Cola Co. in St. Louis, no matter how much the Board have to pervert the law in order to accomplish its purpose.

Mr. President, I think the Senate should see about that. I think the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should get to work on this matter—and not alone on this case, but on a legion of others, too. The Senate should investigate this whole pattern of perverting the intent and purpose of Congress in passing that law.

In *Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen Local 576* v. *Johnson* (286 P. 2d 182), the court said:

> It is convincing that the Senate amended the bill so that as it finally passed the Senate neither of the above provisions was in it. In the conference committee they were both omitted, so as the bill was finally enacted into law neither of them was in it, nor was there any provision of similar import.

Mr. President, section 8 (b) (4) (C) was entirely differently conceived, and had a far narrower objective than did the provisions of the House bill which the Senate rejected. The Senate bill which became law prohibited recognition picketing only where recognition could be achieved only at the expense of compelling the employer to violate the legal duty to bargain with another union imposed upon him by a certification which was at that time not subject to challenge. Congress rejected the view that recognition picketing should be barred merely because the union had available to it the representation procedures of section 9 of the act for securing recognition. Equally clearly it rejected the view that unions should be prohibited from striking to secure recognition merely because, at the time they demanded recognition, they did not represent a majority of the employees and the employer could not legally grant to them exclusive recognition. The reasons for this approach, may I remind the Senate, were fully explored in the extensive debates which occurred on the Ball amendment which would have authorized employers to resort directly to the courts to obtain injunctive relief against all "illegal strikes, picketing and boycotts."

I recall, as thought it were yesterday, standing over there in the second row from the rear and carrying on a debate in opposition to the proposed Ball amendment. I pointed out very clearly, as I recall, that what the employers ought to be protected from was a picket line or a strike which was stretched or called in order to force an employer to deal with another union, even though that employer, at that very time, was legally bound to deal with a certified union. I said, in effect, "That kind of labor practice is an unfair labor practice, and that kind of labor practice ought to be declared illegal. But we should not put into this law a proposal which would prevent the calling of a strike or the stretching of a picket line by a union at a time when the employer was not legally bound to deal with another union."

In opposing the Ball amendment, which as Senators will remember, was decisively defeated, I said—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 4, page 4840, Second Legislative History, Labor-Management Relations Act, pages 1359–1360:

> I think one of the primary effects of the Ball amendment will be that it will destroy the right to strike for recognition purposes.
>
> • • • • •
>
> While, as indicated by my support of the committee bill, I feel that there are instances where we should and can properly place some restraint upon use of this power, I feel strongly that the strike for recognition is not one of them. It frequently happens that when a union has just begun its organizing efforts, an employer undertakes retaliatory action. The discharge of one or two of the most active union members is a sharp warning to others who have joined the union that they will be the next to go, and any courageous person, justifiably incensed by this invasion of the rights of the group by the employer, might well feel it necessary to take steps in self-defense particularly by way of withdrawing the economic power of those who remain in order to meet the challenge laid down by the employer. To deny this weapon is to force men to wait in abject fashion for such further attacks as the employer may care to make upon their most fundamental rights.
>
> But, say the sponsors of this measure, under the National Labor Relations Act, these men now have an alternative in that they may receive protection from the Board. It is well that they do, and the steady falling off in the last 10 years of strikes for recognition indicates that in a vast majority of cases employees do resort to the processes of the Board rather than engaging in strike action. But the remedy provided by the National Labor Relations Act is slow and time-consuming, running in litigated cases to a period of about 3 years. The hazards of the law are always there, and even a meritorious claim may fail for lack of proof or on a technicality. It is a particularly unhappy answer when the appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board are inadequate to enable it even to begin to do its job. Insofar as the remedy is effective, employees will, of course, use it as an alternative to striking; and every self-interest will encourage them to do so. Further, the National Labor Relations Act by no means covers all provocative action by an employer which may induce employees to engage in a strike for recognition. There may be grievous infractions of other Federal or State laws, there may be a deliberate incitement to such strikes by the employer through an "agent provocateur" or other means. To deny employees under these circumstances their right of self-help is to award a bonus to those employers who engage in the most outrageous antisocial conduct. While I do not welcome strikes for recognition—or, indeed, any type of strike—I have no slightest question that this is an instrument which should properly be left in the hands of employees where the circumstances are so outrageous as to induce them to resort to it.

We beat the Ball amendment, let me say for the benefit of this trial examiner. We did not put it into the law. We did not bring over from the House the provision of the Hartley bill; and the provision of the Hartley bill involved in the instant issue was not included in the final bill. It did not come out of the conference. It was eliminated in conference. And yet this trial examiner seeks, in effect—because that is what it amounts to—to overrule Judge Moore by resorting to the new dilatory tactic of referring to this rejected section of the Hartley bill in the House.

In 1948, after observing a year of Taft-Hartley operation, the Joint Committee on Labor Management Relations, appointed pursuant to the provisions of title IV of the act, and containing leading congressional advocates of the act, issued its report. In that report the committee devoted specific and careful attention to the status of strikes and picketing for recognition under the Taft-Hartley Act, and to proposals for amendment of the act to make such strikes and picketing illegal. The committee said—report of the Joint Committee on Labor Management Relations, 80th Congress, 2d session, Report No. 986, part 3, pages 70–71:

> Both the bill passed by the House of Representatives in 1947 and early committee versions of the Senate bill contained some form of prohibition against a strike for a purpose for which the act provided an administrative remedy. Such a provision would have prohibited a strike for recognition, since the labor organization has available the certification processes of the Board. The Taft-Hartley law's only limitation upon such strikes is that provided by section 8 (b) (4) (C). The right to strike for recognition is only foreclosed when another labor organization has been certified as the bargaining representative.

Upon what else does this examiner rely to support his novel and oppressive conclusion? He relies, incredibly enough, on the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in Brooks against NLRB.

[3] Section 12 (a) (3) (C) (1) of H. R. 3020. 1 Leg. Hist. L. M. R. A. p. 205.

But the Brooks decision on its face shows that the Supreme Court did not hold that the obligation of an employer to deal with a certified union extends beyond a reasonable time, at most, 1 year. Certainly the Court refused to hold that the only thing an employer can lawfully do when a rival union claims to represent his employees after the expiration of a year from the issuance of the certificate is to continue to bargain exclusively with the certified union. The Brooks opinion does not even remotely imply that once a certification has been issued to a labor organization, no matter how many years have elapsed, the employees may change their bargaining agent and strike to compel their employer to deal with their new representatives only if the Board, after protracted formal proceedings, has certified their new representative. There is not the slightest implication in the decision to that effect.

The consequence of administrative distortion of the plain terms and legislative history of section 8 (b) (4) (C) in this case has been to bar local 688 from access to the act's representation machinery. Regional Director Kennedy utilized his issuance of the complaint in this case as an excuse for holding up the representation proceeding. He thus has deprived local 688 of an opportunity to demonstrate in an election that it is the freely chosen bargaining representative of the Coca-Cola employees. The very administrative machinery which the trial examiner holds must be utilized by the union as its route to securing recognition is barred to it.

I cannot believe that any Member of this body can sanction a result which so transforms this statute—a measure enacted to remove the need for, and to facilitate termination of, strikes by compelling employers to recognize and bargain with the representative chosen by employees—into an instrumentality for assuring that industrial strife must inevitably continue and be prolonged. Regional Director Kennedy has wiped out, so far as these 200 driver-salesmen are concerned, the National Labor Relations Act's guaranties of self-organization and the procedures which Congress provided for implementing those guaranties. This strike today is in its 19th week. How much longer are these men to be compelled to suffer the consequences of perversion of the act by Kennedy and the Board?

We find that the proemployer bias at the regional level is not confined to the St. Louis regional office or to Regional Director Kennedy alone, but appears to dominate the policy of many regional offices throughout the country. We have seen that in the Coca-Cola case the company employed dilatory tactics by seeking postponements of hearings, by refusals to furnish interstate commerce data, claims of surprise, et cetera, extensions in the filing of briefs, which brought about a delay of over 14 weeks from the time of filing of the petition for an election. No penalties were imposed on the company for these delaying tactics.

Mr. President, when I was working on the analysis, I made inquiry about the Coca-Cola case, and I secured information from H. J. Gibbons, secretary-treasurer, Teamsters' Local Union, No. 688, who submitted material to me in a letter dated March 10, 1956. With the letter he enclosed material entitled "The Case of Teamsters' Local 688 Against the National Labor Relations Board."

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the material be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks following the material previously inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 2.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in another case, in the third region, when the union was charged with employing delaying tactics the regional director and the Board had no qualms in penalizing it, even though in doing so the Board denied the union a right the existence of which the Board has expressly recognized only a short time before. The case is *Spirella Company, Inc.* (3–RC–1636). The union involved had filed a petition for an election. The union originally asked for a 5-week postponement for the initial conference in the case but at the urging of the regional office agreed to a mere 1-week postponement. At the conference the parties agreed on all the terms of a consent election except the site of the election. The union, however, would not consent to holding the election within the plant because the plant was the headquarters of an "inside" union.

After requesting and receiving the written views of the parties on this issue, the regional director, without further notice to the parties, dismissed the petition because "the course of action pursued by the petitioner has indicated that it is not prepared for an election and is unwilling that this office hold an election at this time." The Board sustained the dismissal and denied the union's subsequent motion for reconsideration on two grounds: First, petitioner "sought to delay the processing of its petition"; second, petitioner "refused to agree to a consent election on employer's premises."

The Board, of course, had a right to overrule the union's contention that the election should not be held on the company's premises. But the union surely had a right to make the contention and a right to have the board rule on it. The appropriate action in the case, therefore, would have been to dismiss the petition unless the union agreed to the election in the plant. The union indicated to the Board, in its motion for reconsideration, that if the Board so ruled it would consent. But the Board did not issue such an order. It issued a final order affirming the regional director's flat dismissal. The union could not file another petition because, after the regional director dismissed the petition, the "inside" union signed a 3-year contract with an independent union which would bar an election for 3 years.

The result is that because the union wanted to exercise its right to appeal to the Board on the question of where the election should be held—a right which the Board has said it has—it was deprived of an election, on or off the plant premises, for 3 years.

Another example of the double standard by the regional offices of the Board applied in the day-to-day administration of the act is the discriminatory treatment afforded the union in the *Missouri Transit Co.* case (17–CA–841), by the 17th regional office at Kansas City, Mo., and the General Counsel's office in Washington. This case clearly demonstrates that the regional director had one standard when the employer is the charging party and another when the union files unfair labor practice charges. In that case, Teamsters Local No. 864 at Jefferson City, Mo., filed unfair labor practice charges against Missouri Transit Co., Inc., on August 31, 1954. And the same time, on July 23, 1954, an unfair labor practice charge was filed against this union in the case of Andrew Patton, No. 14–CB–255. In the Patton case the complaint was issued August 26, 1954, or just a little more than a month after the charge was filed and the clause set down for hearing on September 20, 1954, and the complaint has long since been disposed of. However, in the Missouri Transit Co. case, in which the same union filed a charge against the employer, in spite of repeated letters written both to the regional office, 17th region at Kansas City and to the General Counsel's office at Washington, no complaint was issued until December 28, 1955, or almost a year and a half after the complaint had been filed. The hearing was finally had on January 31, 1956, and the hearing officer's intermediate report was issued March 1, 1956, in which he found that every charge contained in the complaint against this employer was substantiated. These charges included unlawful discharge of 11 employees, interrogating employees concerning their membership in the union, threats of discharge, documentary evidence in which supervisors were instructed to get rid of union members prior to a representation hearing and discontinuing a portion of the bus line for the purposes of seeking to avoid bargaining with the union. One can only wonder whether the act is being impartially administered when a complaint is issued on a charge against a union within approximately 30 days but when a charge is filed against an employer by that same union, the General Counsel's office takes almost a year and a half to issue a complaint, particularly where, from the evidence disclosed in the case and the hearing officer's report, is is clear that the grossest sort of unfair labor practices have been committed by the employer.

Complaints have been received from various parts of the country concerning the tactics used by field examiners in the investigation of charges brought by employers and unions. I have before me the case of Lloyd Fry Roofing Co., where a union was engaged in organizational picketing and the company had failed on two separate occasions to get injunctive relief in the State courts. However, by filing charges with the National Labor Relations Board he found an able ally in the person of the field examiner who used the prestige of his office in advocating that the union with-

draw its picket lines. On December 20, 1955, Field Examiner Bernard Samoff communicated with Bill Englander, business agent for the union, and pointed out that he thought that the unfair labor charges of the union were without merit and that there was considerable merit to the company charges. He further pointed out that even if the union's legal points were correct the union would be faced with legal difficulties far beyond any value the organization would have. He added that under the act, the injunction would be issued first and only later would the union be able to proceed. He reminded the business agent that there have already been many cases in which the charged party had ultimately proved to the Board its innocence of a secondary boycott violation while suffering an injunction all during the period of litigation.

When the field examiner was told that the cases supported the legal rights of the union in organizational picketing, in requesting the employees of secondary employers to respect their picket lines at the primary situs, he reminded the business agent that "the new general counsel of the Board has taken the position that in all cases of doubt, relating to possible new unfair labor charges were not to be dismissed by regional directors but instead were to be brought to his attention for possible decision in favor of issuing complaints in circumstances that had not heretofore been regarded as unfair labor practices."

Thus, by threats of using the injunctive power of the Board in a fact situation where there was little likelihood of illegality, and by impressing upon the union the new policy of the General Counsel of filing unfair labor practice charges against unions wherever possible, the Board agent succeeded where the employer had failed in the State courts, in getting the union to remove its picket line.

The Eisenhower Board says that its action in limiting the number of cases over which it will exercise jurisdiction is based upon the administrative necessity created by the limitations of budget and personnel. That this is not entirely the Board's motivation is made clear enough in other ways. It would perhaps help in throwing light upon this situation, however, to see how the regional office in Atlanta, Ga., uses its budget and personnel in the cases over which it does have jurisdiction—if the case happens to be one against a union.

There is a little company in Birmingham, Ala., called Metal Fabricators and Finishers, Inc. In January 1955 the Steelworkers won an election there and were certified as the collective bargaining agency. They were unable to obtain agreement from the company on any increase in wages, or other benefits, even though the minimum wage paid by the company was 80 cents an hour. A strike was called. The company tried to break the strike. It was successful. The plant opened and the jobs of all the strikers were filled by strikebreakers.

The workers who had been displaced reacted violently—too violently. Some members of the union, in violation of their instructions, participated in threatening violence and in throwing rocks. The company responded by unfair labor practice charges against the union and one of the strikebreakers also filed charges against the union.

I do not excuse or condone this violence of the strikers. Nor did the striking union. The union quickly realized that it was in an impossible position and it proceeded to settle the strike and the litigation growing out of the strike. It made a settlement on terms of complete and total defeat. No collective bargaining agreement was made. Not one striker was reemployed by the company. The union agreed that it would abandon the strike and would not attempt in any way to represent the employees during the rest of the certification year. In return for the union's disclaimer of any further interest in the matter, the displacement of every single striker and the termination of the controversy, the employer withdrew his charges before the NLRB, as did the single employeee who had filed a charge. In view of the administrative necessity of serving its budget and personnel one would have thought that the Labor Board would be satisfied. Not so.

The regional director for the Board insisted in going ahead with a hearing before a trial examiner on the question of whether the union should be ordered to cease and desist from engaging in further coercion in connection with its now extinct strike. The union said that it would gladly take any action required by the Board. It would post notices. It would agree in any form requested that neither it nor any of its agents would engage in any coercive action at the company because it had disclaimed any further interest in the company.

This was not enough for the Board's regional director. He refused to withdraw the complaint. He proceeded with a hearing—at which the union representative simply refused to defend. The trial examiner found the union guilty and recommended that an order issue against it. The union complied with the proposed order, as it had offered to do before the hearing.

Still the regional director was not satisfied. The trial examiner had not made findings on each of the instances of violence, although the same order would issue, irrespective of the number of instances. The regional director spent precious time and money in having exceptions and a brief prepared urging that the examiner should have found all the instances of violence. The Board, of course, disregarded the exceptions as merely cumulative and issued the recommended order, with which the union had already complied.

In this case, the regional director did not destroy a union—the local organization had already sunk without a trace. But he demonstrated again that in the exercise of vindictiveness and harassment against unions, there is no apparent limit to the resources of Board personnel.

Before leaving the subject of maladministration of the act, as such, and turning to the Board's abuse of its quasi-judicial function in the decisional process, I should call attention to another way in which the Eisenhower-appointed Board members and his new General Counsel are abusing their official positions. The Congress has always recognized, and the Board has told us time and time again that effective administration of the act requires speedy case handling at all stages—at the enforcement stage after the Board's decision in unfair-labor cases has been rendered, as well as at all other stages. When General Counsel Bott left office in December 1954, there was a backlog of only eight unassigned cases in the Enforcement Section of the General Counsel's office. One year later, under General Counsel Kammholz, the backlog of unassigned cases pending in enforcement was 32. Yet despite the growth of this backlog, General Counsel Kammholz, since he assumed office, reportedly has spent less than 50 percent of his time at his desk in Washington. Instead of tending to business, and seeking to expedite the handling of cases, Kammholz has devoted too much time to speechmaking before various employer groups throughout the length and breadth of the land.

Congress did not establish the office of General Counsel of the Board to serve as a propaganda arm of the Republican Party. So intensive a program of speechmaking, occupying so large a part of the time which should be devoted to case handling, suggests that the present incumbent misconceives both the nature of his office and the obligations of public service.

The making of these speeches not only deprives the agency of its responsible administrative officer; it casts a heavy burden on already overworked employees on the enforcement staff. It is not secret that the General Counsel's speeches are ghost written by highly skilled civil-service employees whose job descriptions show that they are paid by the Government to write briefs to appellate courts in support of Board decisions, not to write political speeches for the General Counsel to deliver.

Speechmaking is a plague which seems to have infected some of the Republican-appointed Board members as well. Member Rodgers, particularly, has engaged in an inordinate amount of traveling about the country, proclaiming and defending and seeking to vindicate the transformation which the Eisenhower Board has wrought in Congress' labor-relations policy. I, for one, should like to know whether the expenses of these trips are being charged to the United States Treasury, and, if so, on what possible theory such special pleading to selected groups can be thought to be the legitimate governmental activity of a quasi-judicial officer.

Mr. President, I now turn to another important topic in this speech, The Nature of the Board's Quasi-Judicial Function, and I shall proceed to show how the Board has abused its quasi-judicial function.

One of the most able and scholarly analyses of recent changes in the National Labor Relations Board's policies is set forth in an article written by Mozart G. Ratner, member of the Chicago bar and formerly Assistant General Counsel in charge of Supreme Court

litigation of the National Labor Relations Board. This article, published in the University of Chicago Law Review, volume 23, No. 1, autumn 1955, was first presented by Mr. Ratner to the eighth annual conference on labor of New York University in 1955.

I have drawn heavily upon Mr. Ratner's article throughout this speech because Mr. Ratner's experiences as Assistant General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, prior to his return to the private practice of law, highly qualify him as my witness in support of many of the charges I make in this speech.

In his article Mr. Ratner points out that "in evaluating the changes which the Eisenhower Board has made in the operation of the act through the decisional process, we must be clear about the nature of the policymaking role which Congress assigned to the Board. Of course, Board members are not expected to be automatons. Nor is any judge. Precedents established in one case, or in many, need not automatically be applied to another when the facts are so materially different that the reasons for the decisions in earlier cases lose their force. Nor does the principle of stare decisis weigh as heavily upon a quasi-judicial tribunal as on a court."

Mr. Ratner goes on to point out:

We are told authoritatively that "The constant process of trial and error, on a wider and fuller scale than a single adversary litigation permits, differentiates perhaps more than anything else the administrative from the judicial process." And so, for example, the Board may put to work, in fashioning remedies to effectuate the policies of the act, understanding and insight which it gains from cumulative experience, even though its conclusions can be neither supported nor validated objectively by the particular record before it.[4]

Again, there is perhaps wider latitude for policymaking than the courts possess in the area of reconciling competing and apparently inconsistent congressional objectives, where one goal cannot be fully attained without overriding completely another, and equally important goal. This was the nature of the problem which the Board faced in interpreting the sweeping and literally unqualified prohibitions of section 8 (b) (4) (A) in the light of Congress' manifest intention, expressed in sections 7 and 13, to preserve and not prohibit the utilization by labor organizations of traditional weapons of economic conflict in primary disputes. The same kind of a problem was met by the Board in reconciling the apparently unqualified guarantee of the right to organize with employer interests in maintaining plant discipline and effective production. Commending the Board's solution in both cases—the primary-secondary distinction, in one; freedom to solicit membership on company property, but only during nonworking hours, in the other—the Supreme Court emphasized that the Board's evaluation of such competing interests and its policy resolution as to which interest would, in particular circumstances, prevail is "entitled to weight."[5]

But the scope of the Board's policymaking discretion is not unlimited. The basic outlines of national labor policy have been laid down by Congress in the statute, and it is that policy, and no other, which the Board is authorized to enforce and to effectuate. It is true today, as it was under the Wagner Act,[6] that Congress' policy, as expressed in the statute "cannot be defeated by the Board's policy"; the Board is not permitted "under the guise of administration to put limitations in the statute not placed there by Congress." In short, the Board may not reform the act "to conform to the Board's idea of correct policy."

That is exactly what is wrong with this Board, Mr. President. The Eisenhower members have turned themselves into a superlegislature. They are going to determine what the legislative policy is. I am calling for an investigation because I think such usurpation of legislative policy must be stopped.

Mr. Ratner continues:

The provision for judicial determination, first by the court of appeals and then by the Supreme Court of the United States, whether policies adopted by the Board conform to the statutory policy, establishes a superstructure of limitation within which the Board must confine its discretion. It is true, of course, that in deciding whether particular policies adopted by the Board conform to the statute's objectives courts "must guard against the danger of sliding unconsciously from the narrow confines of law into the more spacious domain of policy."[7] And it therefore follows that in not every instance in which the Board's policy is upheld by the court is the Board thereafter precluded by judicial approval from altering its policy. Where, however, judicial approval of Board policy is based upon the court's appraisal of the terms of the statute; where the court holds, in effect, that the Boards' policy is the only one consistent with effectuation of the act's objectives, the Board is no longer free to adopt a contrary policy, just as it is not free after the Supreme Court has held a particular Board policy inconsistent with the language or purposes of the act to continue to apply that policy.

Mr. Ratner discusses this matter further in his excellent article by stating:

Within the framework of these limitations changes of Board policy are inevitable. Judicial disapproval of the Board's interpretation of particular provisions of the act; the administrative process, which invites the Board to review the effects of its policies in the light of its "cumulative experience"; and shift in Board member personnel, each contributes a share to that end. Changes so motivated were plentiful during both Wagner and Taft-Hartley days, prior to the time when a majority of the Board became composed of appointees of the Republican administration. Of the many examples available, a few must suffice. When the Supreme Court refused to review the decision of the second circuit in *NLRB* v. *American Tube Bending Co.*, the Board bowed and changed its policy of condemning as illegal interference antiunion speeches made by an employer for the purpose of influencing the outcome of an election.

But that, Mr. President, was before the Eisenhower Board was appointed. The record of the old Board is a record of a Board which bowed to the supremacy of the court decisions which overruled the Board.

I continue to read from Mr. Ratner's article:

Adoption of the Woolworth formula[8] for computing back pay on a quarterly instead of a total period basis, reflected the Board's observation of the cumulative effects of its former policy in defeating offers of reinstatement. The gyrations of Board policy on the question of bargaining rights for foremen, from *Union Collieries* (41 NLRB 961), to *Maryland Drydock* (49 NLRB 733), to *Packard Motor Car Co* (64 NLRB 1212), may fairly be deemed to have reflected the preponderance, at varying times, of a majority of members who held one view or the other on this close policy issue.

But a quasi-judicial agency is no more free than a court to discard precedent, established policies, and interpretations, for personal or political reasons or to accomplish objectives other than those which Congress sought by its legislation to achieve. Wholesale discarding of precedent—for the sake of impugning prior administration of the act, or of altering the legal rights and duties of the opposing forces, as this Board has done, is not quasi-judicial administration in the Anglo-American tradition of government of law—it is anarchy.

10. EISENHOWER BOARD OVERRULES CONGRESS

This would be bad enough if Congress had not, when it enacted Taft-Hartley in 1947, itself carefully canvassed the Board's interpretation of those provisions of the Wagner Act which were retained in Taft-Hartley. But Congress did exactly that.

Thus Mr. Ratner points out in his article:

When it passed Taft-Hartley, Congress did far more than add to the existing provisions of the Wagner Act new provisions defining union unfair labor practices and other regulations which had no counterpart in the earlier law. As the Supreme Court said in *Gullett Gin Co.* v. *NLRB* (340 U. S. 361, 366): "In the course of adopting the 1947 amendments Congress considered in great detail the provisions of the earlier legislation as they had been applied by the Board." In a footnote to this statement the Court said: "Ample evidence of this may be found in the committee reports accompanying the bills which were the basis of the comprehensive 1947 act. (See H. R. Rept. No. 245, 80th Cong., 1st sess.; S. Rept. No 105, 80th Cong., 1st sess.)" In many instances Congress disapproved the Board's prior policy and amended the act to change it. For example, the elimination of "supervisors" from the definition of "employee" in section 2 (3); the "free speech" guaranty embodied in section 8 (c); the requirement, incorporated in section 10 (c), that the Board accord uniform treatment to affiliated and unaffiliated labor organizations, and limitation of the "extent of organization" concept, written into section 9 (b), reflected Congress' judgment that prior Board policy was unsound and should be altered. Congress, after examination, also approved dozens of Board policies and practices and evidenced its approval by reenacting without change the statutory language on which they rested. Particularly was congressional approval manifest where a Board practice or policy had been followed for a considerable period prior to 1947, and where the policy or practice had received judicial sanction. Thus, in the Gullett Gin case, supra, the Supreme Court noted that the Board's policy of refusing to deduct unemployment compensa-

[4] *NLRB* v. *Seven Up Bottling Co.* (344 U. S. 344, 349).

[5] *N. L. R. B.* v. *Denver Bldg & Construction Trades Council* (341 U. S. 675, 692); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Republic Aviation Corp.* (324 U. S. 793, 797–798).

[6] *Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co.* v. *N. L. R. B.* (338 U. S. 355, 363), decided in 1949, reversing a Board decision under the Wagner Act.

[7] *Phelps Dodge Corp.* v. *NLRB* (313 U. S. 177, 194).

[8] *F. W. Woolworth Co.* (92 NLRB 1622, 1640).

tion benefits from back pay awards issued under section 10 (b) had been followed for many years and had twice been approved by the courts. "Under these circumstances," said the Court, "it is a fair assumption that by reenacting without pertinent modification the provision with which we here deal, Congress accepted the construction placed thereon by the Board and approved by the courts." There is authority for the view that when Congress so examines and adopts an administrative policy as its own, Congress gives to it "the force of law" (*E. R. Squibb & Sons* v. *Helvering*, 98 F. 2d 69, 70 (2d Cir.)), and the administrative agency thereby loses whatever discretion it may previously have had to alter or depart from it.[9] But even if naked power to alter should remain,[10] after such congressional approval, an administrative agency should change its policy only upon a concrete showing that supervening events have reduced or impaired its effectiveness.

Certainly, when it adopted Taft-Hartley, Congress took from the Board a large measure of the policy-making discretion in this area which it theretofore may have possessed.

Later in his article Mr. Ratner states:

Official announcements proclaim that the new Board recognizes the limitations upon its policy-making function. Speaking for his colleagues, as well as himself, Chairman Farmer stated: "We are not authorized to make labor policy; we enforce a specific statute, and that is all." In the same speech [11] Chairman Farmer stressed that it was the Board's intention "to administer the law as written and as intended by Congress."

Even Member Rodgers, in a speech delivered at Chicago, Ill., on February 15, 1956, before the Midwinter Personnel Conference of the American Management Association, said, at page 6:

The Board is essentially a court. Its functions are primarily judicial in character. * * * The Board may be considered a court of law in which the rights and obligations of parties subject to the Taft-Hartley Act are decided and enforced.

Judged by its performance since it was successfully packed by the Eisenhower administration, only these pious self-serving declarations can be taken to suggest that the Board recognizes that the role Congress gave it is to administer the law as Congress wrote it, not to change the law so as to make it conform even more closely to the notions of the most reactionary elements of the Republican Party.

What the Board actually does in its decisions speaks more loudly than what its Republican-appointed members say it does. Let us examine the evidence.

11. THE NEW JURISDICTIONAL STANDARDS

Mr. Ratner gives us the evidence in this language:

Quantitatively, the most significant change accomplished by the new Board was its revision of jurisdictional policy standards, announced in July 1954 and explicated, several months later, in *Breeding Transfer Co.* (110 NLRB No. 64). Superficially, the new standards bear striking resemblance to the old; with relatively minor exceptions the changes were accomplished by revising upward the dollar volume of interstate commerce which must be affected before the Board will assert jurisdiction. But the resemblance is superficial only. What distinguishes the new policy from the old is the motivation which produced it.

Prior to July 1954, the Board declined to exercise jurisdiction over certain classes of relatively local enterprises which were subject to the act because limitations of budget, available personnel, and time precluded it from processing and deciding all of the cases which were presented to it. As a practical matter, since the Board could not handle all the cases, it was compelled to decline to exercise jurisdiction over some. Reasonably, it concluded that rather than declining jurisdiction haphazardly, it should decline jurisdiction by category of enterprise affected, and it selected as a class those enterprises which least affected the economy of the Nation as a whole.

But, in making that choice, and in formulating the 1950 standards, the Board was fully conscious that in the Taft-Hartley Act Congress had not restricted the act's coverage so as to leave out enterprises of a local nature. Taft-Hartley, like Wagner, is a classic example of Congress' exercise of the fullest scope of the commerce power. It contrasts sharply with the wage-hour law, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and others, in which Congress chose not to extend the reach of the Federal law to the constitutional boundary. Since Congress intended the National Labor Relations Act to apply to all enterprises and all employees who were subject to Federal power under the commerce clause,[12] the Board recognized that its obligation was to administer the act to the widest possible extent, refraining only where practical necessity compelled it to do so.

Mr. Ratner points out that Members Murdock and Petersen—

In their dissents in the Breeding case, and the majority does not even challenge their statement, that application of the 1950 standards had not resulted, by July 1954, in any serious backlog of cases either in Washington or the field. The Board members were suffering no dearth of time in which to consider important cases. No budget cut or sudden rise in caseload suggested that it would be unduly difficult in the future to handle inflow based upon the old standards.

Incidentally, it should be said for the record that Board Members Murdock and Petersen are not Eisenhower appointees. In many of their decisions, and particularly in some of their great dissenting opinions, they have held fast to the original intent and purpose of the Congress as to the meaning of various sections of the Taft-Hartley law. Thus, in connection with the point under discussion, Ratner suggests that some light on the reasons for changes in Board policy can be gleaned from Board Member Murdock's penetrating dissenting opinion in the Breeding case. In that dissenting opinion Board Member Murdock stated:

The slash in jurisdiction now consummated has been frequently promised and predicted in public speeches of the members of the majority during the past year in keeping with an announced belief in the philosophy of returning a greater share of Federal authority to State and local governments.

Typical of such utterances are the following:

The one thing this Nation needs more than anything else to maintain its vigor and strength is a revival of interest by local government in tackling and solving the problems of their local people. That is why I strongly advocate a gradual but nevertheless marked withdrawal of the hand of the NLRB from strictly local disputes. (Address of NLRB Chairman Guy Farmer before the joint conference of the industrial relations committees of the Edison Electric Institute, the Southeastern Electric Exchange, and the Southwestern Personnel Group, New Orleans, La., January 21, 1954.)

Regardless of the legal scope of the commerce clause, the Federal agencies should, as a matter of self-restraint, impose limits on their own power and thus provide the opportunity for local problems to be settled on a local basis by the citizens of the community in which those problems arise. (Chairman Farmer before the National Conference of Business Paper Editors, Washington, D. C., October 21, 1953, after noting that the jurisdiction of the Board was to be reexamined.)

The first of these actions which should be taken by the new members is to limit the jurisdiction of the Board—to free it from the consideration of hundreds, if not thousands, of cases which are markedly local in nature and in impact. Such cases should, in keeping with our American system of constitutional government, be dealt with by the localities and the States. (Member Rodgers before the American Bar Association, Atlanta, Ga., March 15, 1954.)

This is, after all, a Federal State, and it is the underlying philosophy of our Government, and I might add of our President, that the States and communities not only should, but must, assume and discharge the responsibility of local affairs. I believe that this agency must use sound restraint in the exercise of its jurisdiction. I believe that this agency should assist this administration in pulling back the outer reaches of Federal bureaucracy, and thus encourage rather than impede the development of our communities and our States. (Members Rodgers before the National Retail Dry Goods Association, New York, N. Y., January 12, 1954, in noting that: "Probably the most pressing administrative problem confronting the Board at this time is the problem of jurisdiction.")

Mr. Ratner goes on to state in his article about this problem:

On the other hand, we are assured by the majority in the Breeding case that "desire to establish broader State jurisdiction is in no wise a factor in our decision." Taking the majority at its word, does this mean that the new policy is not the product of purely political considerations, of a desire to "assist this administration in pulling back the outer reaches of Federal bureaucracy"? Not at all. It serves merely to indicate that the new majority is conscious that section 10 (a), which prohibits cession of jurisdiction where State law is inconsistent with the national act, prevents the Board from transferring regulatory power to the States by the simple device of declining to exercise its own jurisdiction.[13]

Since State power is not enhanced by the Board's increased abstention, the principal result of the change is to increase substantially the number of persons from whom

---

[9] *Helvering* v. *R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.* (306 U. S. 110, 116).

[10] Cf. *Helvering* v. *Reynolds* (313 U. S. 428).

[11] Before the 14th Annual Law Institute, University of Tennessee College of Law, November 6, 1953.

[12] *Amalgamated Association* v. *Wisconsin Board* (340 U. S. 383, 391).

[13] *Retail Clerks and Amalgamated Meat Cutters* v. *Your Food Stores of Santa Fe* (225 F. 2d 659 (CA 10)); *New York State Labor Relations Board* v. *Wags Transportation System* (130 N. Y. 2d 731, aff. 134 N. Y. S. 2d 603); *Universal Car Co.* v. *International Association of Machinists* (Cir. Ct. Mich., 35 LRRM 2098).

legal remedies for infringement of their statutory rights and peaceful processes for resolution of their representation disputes are withheld. To square a policy which has that result with the announced objectives of the statute would take a feat of legerdemain. Congress established the Board to remedy unfair labor practices and to resolve questions concerning representation, not deliberately to leave them unremedied and unresolved. The policy of the Congress which passed the Taft-Hartley Act, if not the policy of the present Republican administration in whose interests the new Board members purport to speak, is to regulate labor relations in all enterprises, great or small, which come within Federal power, and to make that regulation effective to the outer limits of the Board's capacity.

If the present administration desires to change that statutory policy, it is at liberty to submit its proposals to Congress; it is not free, under our system of government, to accomplish the same result by the simpler expedient of appointing to a majority of seats on the Board faithful followers of its political line.

Thus, Ratner says:

There seems little, if any, room for doubt that the Board's new jurisdictional standards are designed to increase the pressure on Congress to amend section 10 (a) so as to facilitate the exercise of State jurisdiction in areas in which the Board declines to act.

As my author witness Ratner points out, we should remember that the restrictive cession clause of section 10 (a) was virtually the only provision of the entire act that both supporters and opponents of Taft-Hartley favored.[14] Thus, he writes:

The reasons for excluding State regulation of labor relations inconsistent with Taft-Hartley's policies are as valid today as they were in 1947, and they apply, today, as then, with equal vigor to local as to nationwide establishments.

It seems perfectly plain that an administrative policy, such as the Board's new restrictive standards on jurisdiction, which finds its genesis in a purely political program; which is designed to evoke amendment of the act, not enforcement of the statutory policy as it stands; and which subverts, rather than effectuates, the act's patent objectives, is a usurpation of Congress' province, not the performance of administratively responsibility.

I wish to say for the record that in the preparation of this speech, I conferred at great length with Mr. Mozart G. Ratner about the issues under discussion. I obtained from him an authorization both to quote extensively from his speech and to paraphrase it in support of the charges which I make against the Board. Mr. Ratner completely agrees with me that what the Eisenhower members of the National Labor Relations Board have been doing through administrative policy and decisions has been in effect to amend the Taft-Hartley law in many respects. Mr. President, I wish to say they have amended the Taft-Hartley law in many respects in a manner in which they could not have succeeded in having it amended here on the floor of the Senate, if the administration had tried to have that done. So I think it becomes incumbent upon the Senate, through its Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to proceed with a course of investigation action which will stop this usurpation of legislative power on the part of the Eisenhower-appointed members of the National Labor Relations Board.

It may be, Mr. President, that despite the plainly political motivation of these jurisdictional policy standards, the Board can escape judicial condemnation of its conduct, for the scope of judicial review in this area of case handling is narrow indeed, and the courts are loath to interfere where declination of jurisdiction can, however dishonestly, be said to flow from budgetary considerations. But the Congress cannot permit itself so to be imposed upon by any administrative agency. We cannot sit idly by, Mr. President, and permit the Board to undermine constitutional processes and flout the authority of Congress.

When we pass from consideration of the political motivation for the Board's adoption of its restrictive jurisdictional policy standards to the manner of their application, we find the results shockingly at variance with the most elementary considerations of equity and justice. Consider, for example, *Modern Linen and Laundry Service* (114 N. L. R. B. No. 41). In that case the Board dismissed a complaint filed by an employee who had alleged that he had been discharged by his employer for testifying under subpena at a prior Board hearing in a manner which his employer disliked. If true, of course, this charges the most flagrant possible violation of the National Labor Relations Act. Congress specifically wrote section 8 (a) (4) to protect employees who testify in Board proceedings against this very kind of employer reprisal. Did the Board keep Congress' promise to this employee that if he testified in the Board proceeding the Government of the United States would protect him against discharge arising out of his testimony therein? It did not. Incredible though it may seem, the Board, having exercised jurisdiction in the prior case, and having compelled this employee to appear before it as a witness, then turned around and washed its hands of the whole affair on the ground that the Board had in the meantime changed its jurisdictional policy standards, and that it would no longer, as an original matter, assert jurisdiction over unfair labor practices involving this employer. In my judgment, the rules of the playground—the rules of just plain fairness and sportsmanship—compel the Board to see that case through, and not drop it simply because between the time when it began the case and the time when the testimony of the witness was taken the Board had changed its policy in regard to jurisdiction standards.

Mr. President, the Board conceivably may escape judicial reversal for that perversion of the act and for the injustice which it thus perpetrates on the employee involved in that case. The case is now before the second circuit for review. We must remember that the scope of judicial review by that court is limited. But I, for one, cannot believe that a single judge or any Senator could in equity and good conscience sanction or approve the injustice which the Board has deliberately perpetrated here. Let me quote from Board Member Murdock's dissenting opinion, in which he points out very clearly the unreasonableness of the majority in this matter:

In my view the question whether respondent's operations fall within or without the Board's recently announced jurisdictional standards is to a degree, an irrelevant consideration. There is no question but that the Board has legal jurisdiction in this matter. The Board did in fact assert is jurisdiction over respondent in a prior case, in which a hearing was conducted by a trial examiner designated by the Board. The Board did subpena complainant to testify, and complainant testified against the interests of respondent. Complainant was discharged by respondent less than 2 weeks after his testimony in the prior case was taken. The trial examiner found, and for the purpose of considering complainant's motion, it must be accepted as a correct finding, that respondent discharged complainant in violation of section 8 (a) (4) of the act because of his testimony in the prior proceeding before this agency.

It is obvious that if this agency had not asserted its jurisdiction and had not compelled complainant to testify, he would not have been discharged by respondent. Having placed complainant in the position of opposing the interests of his employer, the Board cannot in good conscience leave him to the ungentle mercy of that employer merely because in the interim the Board has changed its jurisdictional policies so as to exclude the respondent. To do so is to hold that complainant should have foreseen the change in jurisdictional policy, and having failed to foresee such change, must accept the consequences. Had he foreseen the change in jurisdictional policy, and accordingly refused to honor the Board's subpena the Board, not itself gifted with such prescience, may well have brought proceedings against complainant to enforce its subpena. To place complainant and other witnesses in such an impossible situation where they are compelled to aid the Board in effectuating the public interest but are denied protection against unlawful discharge after doing so is unjust and intolerable. In my view complainant was entitled to assume that the Board's action in asserting jurisdiction over respondent and in subpenaing him to testify was notice to all parties concerned that the provisions of section 8 (a) (4) would protect him from and discrimination directed against him by his employer because of his testimony.

Considerations of fairness and equity which move the Board in the assertion or nonassertion of jurisdiction in other special situations dictate assertion here. Thus when the Board broadens its jurisdictional policies, it thereafter refuses to process complaints against employers which meet the new jurisdictional test but did not meet the old test at the time of the commission of the alleged unfair labor practices. This salutary policy is based on the equitable grounds that it would be unfair to penalize employers for actions taken at a time when they were in receipt of advice and notice that the Board as a matter of policy would not assert jurisdiction over them.[15] The same considera-

[14] S. Rept. No. 105, 80th Cong., 1st sess. 26 (1947). See minority views, id., pt. 2, 38, agreeing as to this feature of the legislation.

[15] *The Baltimore Transit Company* (47 NLRB 109) enforced in *Baltimore Transit Company* v. *NLRB* ((C. A. 4) 140 F. 2d) 51); *NLRB* v. *Guy Atkinson Co.* (195 F. 2d 141 (C. A. 9)); *Screw Machine Products Co.* (94 NLRB 1609); *Almeida Bus Lines, Inc.* (99 NLRB 498).

tions of fairness and equity dictate that the Board should assert jurisdiction herein to protect complaints who testified in a Board proceeding in which the Board had asserted jurisdiction over his employer, even if it requires a waiver of its current jurisdictional policy. Moreover, the Board waives its jurisdictional policy to assert jurisdiction over employers whose operations do not meet the Board's present jurisdictional policies in far less compelling circumstances.

In the Coca-Cola Bottling Co. case[16] the Board announced that it would waive its jurisdictional standards and assert jurisdiction over employers whose operations did not meet the current jurisdictional standards where in unfair labor practice cases decided prior to the issuance of the current standards the Board had found the employers guilty of violating section 8 (a) (2) of the act by recognizing and dealing with an employer assisted union and had ordered the employers to cease recognizing said unions until certified by the Board.

Pursuant to this policy the Board asserted jurisdiction in Richland Laundry[17] in order to process a petition to enable the 8 (2) union to obtain a certificate. If it is necessary or desirable for the Board to waive its jurisdictional standards in order to afford parties who have been adjudged guilty of or a beneficiary of a violation of the act, the use of the Board's machinery, it would seem an a fortiori case to likewise waive the Board's jurisdictional policy in order that an employee, innocent of any wrongdoing, be not required to suffer an unremedied discharge resulting from this Board's action in asserting jurisdiction over his employer and compelling him to testify, prior to the change in the Board's jurisdictional policies.

An orderly and responsible administration of the act requires that the Board protect complainants and other witnesses appearing before it, to the limit of its powers. To do less undermines the authority of the Board and will result in difficulty in getting witnesses to testify in the future with the inevitable result that the Board will be hampered in its efforts to effectuate the policies of the act. I can only view the Board's failure to assert jurisdiction herein as an abdication of its responsibilities under the act.

Moreover, as Senator Murdock goes on to observe, whether this employer could be regarded as outside the scope of the Board's new jurisdiction policy standards, was itself a question not free from doubt. The particular company involved here was but part of an integrated series of companies, all owned or controlled by the same man. In *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Stowe Spinning Corp.* (336 U. S. 226, 227), the Supreme Court held that where the regulation of labor relations is concerned, interlocking directorates, family ties, common ownership, or control of ostensible separate companies, warrant piercing of the fiction of separate corporate identities.

The Court said that although the four cotton mills involved in that case were indeed separate corporations, "interlocking directorates and family ties make the four equal one for our purposes." Had the Board heeded the Supreme Court's adjuration, and adopted its sensible and practical view that whatever other legitimate purpose may be served under these circumstances by the fiction of separate corporate identities, they have no relevance to labor relations, it need not even have faced the problem of denying relief to an employee so clearly entitled to it under the laws of the United States.

But, Mr. President, it is not in this one case alone that the Board has utilized fictional separation of corporate entities to withhold assertion of its jurisdiction over integrated enterprises which, realistically viewed, exert an enormous impact on the flow of commerce between the States. In the woodworking industry, for example, I am told by my constituents in Oregon there are many cases in which employers have succeeded in escaping completely the obligations of the statute, by assigning to separate corporations, commonly controlled, various aspects of the single integrated process of logging. See, for example, *Robert Tuttle Logging Co.* (19–RC–1584); *George Secor Logging Co.* (19–RM–149); *Mast Lumber Co., Inc.* (20–CA–944). The result of this process of permitting employers to fragmentize their operations, and subjecting each fragment separately to scrutiny for compliance with the present jurisdictional policy standards, has led Mr. Claude Ballard, international vice president of International Woodworkers of America, to conclude:

> It would seem to us that the administrative procedure of the Board has changed the existing National Labor Relations Act to their convenience to the point, in the lumber industry at least, that it will be difficult to establish bargaining rights without the weapon of the strike in the near future. This will be the case in the large part of the industry with the exception of very few major operations which represent and constitute only a fraction of the total industry.

Mr. President, in addition to all of this, the more the Board proceeds in the application of its jurisdictional policy standards, the more apparent becomes the fact that the standards themselves are shot through with inconsistencies and absurdities, the creation of which is not the result of any legal compulsion, but is solely due to the Board's deciding to substitute for Congress' standard for determining whether interstate commerce is affected by particular industrial operations, a different and opposite standard, long ago repudiated by the Supreme Court of the United States. The rejected standard which the Board uses is the identical one which the reactionary rightwing of the Republican Party has held for the past century.

C. ACTIVITES DIRECTLY AFFECTIING COMMERCE

What are these jurisdictional policy standards all about? The Board admits that the standards have no relationship whatever to the scope which Congress decided to accord to this act. In its recent decision in East Newark Realty Corp., where it refused to assert jurisdiction, the Eisenhower Board proudly proclaimed:

> Of course, the statutory test for legal jurisdiction under the act which we administer is different (from the jurisdictional policy test applied by the Board). This distinction apart, there can be no question but that this employer's operations affect commerce within the meaning of the act.

What the Board had said, Mr. President, is, that although Congress repudiated the outmoded view which the Supreme Court held prior to 1936, namely, that Congress' power to regulate labor relations depends on whether the enterprise involved, viewed apart from the effect of its operations on interstate commerce, is local, the Eisenhower Board intends to achieve the same results which would have been achieved if Congress had adopted that test in enacting the National Labor Relations Act. And that is how it comes about that in cases like *East Newark Realty Corporation* (115 NLRB No. 175), *New York Stock Exchange* (58 NLRB 911), and *McKinney Ave. Realty Co.* (110 NLRB 547), the Board refused to assert jurisdiction over companies which not only own and operate commercial office buildings, but which own and lease industrial properties to tenants who are engaged in interstate commerce, and even where these companies furnish to their tenants and others utilities which are indispensable to the continued operation of their tenants' businesses. Says the Board—viewed in isolation, the operation of a building is an entirely local matter. The building, of course, does not move from State to State. Therefore, says the Board, we shall not assert jurisdiction over industrial disputes which might result in curtailing the functions which are carried on there. By the same test the Board could as logically exempt from the reach of this act every production facility in the United States. The only thing that it would be left for the NLRB to do would be to regulate instrumentalities of interstate commerce themselves. A steel mill is no more ambulatory than an office building. Is that any reason for finding, under this act, that employees of steel mills should not enjoy the rights that Congress guaranteed to them?

The Supreme Court made it clear in *Kirschbaum* v. *Walling* (316 U. S. 517) that the operation of industrial properties and the lease of such properties to tenants who are engaged in the production of goods for commerce not only has a close and immediate tie with the processes of production for commerce, but is an essential part of it. To exempt facilities such as these from the scope and reach of the act is no less absurd and no less contrary to Congress' desire to regulate labor disputes in the interests of the free flow of interstate commerce than it would be to deny jurisdiction over industrial disputes involving employees who service the trucks of an interstate hauler on the ground that the mechanics who perform that work themselves do not drive the trucks across State lines and that the work that they perform is local.

This example indeed, is not farfetched. For in *Midwest Car Association* (114 NLRB No. 110), the Board actually did refuse under its new standards to assert jurisdiction over a company which was engaged in unloading from freight cars and delivering to between 350 and 400 employers in the city of Denver, Colo., freight which had been shipped by rail to Denver from other States. The Eisenhower members achieve this fantastic result by a process of legal hairsplitting so fine and so irrelevant that we are entitled to wonder whether they are not mere rationalizations designed to dress up a preconceived

[16] *Coca-Cola Bottling Company of Stockton* (110 NLRB 840).

[17] *Richland Laundry and Dry Cleaners* (112 N. L. R. B. No. 58).

result. For example, the Board says that the freight charges which this company collects from the member corporations who use it to deliver their freight is not to be viewed as income to the company, since that money must be turned over to the interstate carriers. Dissenting Member Murdock wrote a devastating dissenting opinion. The reasoning of that dissent is a complete answer to the rationalizations of the Eisenhower Board members. He says of this reasoning in his dissent:

Considerations of agency, title to funds, etc., are all very absorbing matters for legal speculation and hairsplitting but it is obvious that they have absolutely nothing to do with appraising the impact on the stream of interstate commerce of a work stoppage of this employer's employees. Either the present standards should be given a sufficiently liberal construction to assert jurisdiction over this employer or the inadequacies of the standards should be recognized and they should be revised at the very least to a point which would permit the facilities of the Board to be utilized to protect the free flow of interstate commerce of the magnitude here involved.

Before leaving the subject of jurisdiction, I should call attention to the unreasonable distinction that the Board draws in the application of its standards between retail chains which operate exclusively in a single State and those which operate interstate. One would suppose that where an employer operated stores in several States the interstate aspect of the enterprise would be so obvious that far smaller quantitative shipment of goods in interstate commerce would be required by the Board than in the cases where an employer operates stores in a single State alone. Unbelievable though it sounds, the Board's standards produce exactly the opposite result. Thus, in the *Hogue and Knott* case (110 NLRB 543), the Board held that where an employer operates several stores in only one State, the Board will total the amounts of goods shipped directly and indirectly to the stores in interstate commerce, but that where the company operates stores in several States the Board will not total the amount of goods shipped to all the stores directly and indirectly through interstate commerce in order to determine whether total volume of interstate business meets the figure arbitrarily fixed by the Board for the assertion of jurisdiction. Member Murdock's special concurring opinion in the recent *B. G. Wholesale* case (114 NLRB 224), points out both the absurdities inherent in these standards and the manner in which their application results in hopelessly confusing and delaying adjudication and the exercise of rights which the statute guarantees. This is the story as Senator Murdock tells it:

The history of the instant case and a companion case involving another interstate retail chain more recently issued—Greenberg Mercantile Co.[18] provides a graphic picture of the delays and predicted confusion resulting from the Board's substitution and application of new and ill-conceived standards for retail stores last year in place of the simple and comprehensive standards applicable under the 1950 jurisdictional plan. In fact it seems safe to say that it is now impossible to tell just what is the Board's standard for interstate retail chains.

The hearing in the Greenberg case was held on April 29, 1954, after which it was pending before the Board for decision for more than 1 year. The hearing in the instant case was held on May 26, 1954, and it too has been pending before the Board for decision for over 1 year. Under the 1950 standards in effect when both these cases were originally transferred to the Board for decision, jurisdiction would have been asserted and a direction of election might quickly have issued as there were no serious issues on the merits. The cases were not disposed of, however, before the adoption of new standards for retail stores announced in the July 15, 1954, press release. Under the standard laid down in the press release it was not possible to total inflow or outflow of stores in either an intrastate chain or an interstate chain—the release stated that "a chain of stores operating entirely within one State will not come within the Board's jurisdiction unless the store involved in the case has" the requisite inflow or outflow.

However, by the time the standard was laid down in a decision in Hogue and Knott on October 26, 1954, it had been altered to permit this totaling [19] for intrastate chains only. Under that revised standard laid down in Hogue and Knott, both the instant case and the Greenberg case would properly have been dismissed long months ago as neither chain met the $10 million gross sales test; and although the inflow figures of the stores could have been totaled to meet that test had they been intrastate chains, as they were interstate chains it could not be done. But the majority members who adopted the Houge and Knott standard apparently were unwilling to give a concrete demonstration of the inconsistency involved in the standard by applying it to dismiss a case involving an interstate chain over which jurisdiction would have been taken had the same stores been located in a single State, and these cases continued to gather dust. The dilemma was solved in the Greenberg Mercantile case, which issued in May of this year by the expedient of not applying the interstate test to an interstate chain, but using the intrastate standard instead, despite the clear conflict with Hogue and Knott which specifies different tests for interstate and intrastate retail chains. The Greenberg decision said in substance that since part of the interstate chain was located in one State, and the total inflow figures of the stores in that State met the required total for an intrastate chain, the Board would apply the intrastate test to that part of the intersate chain to take jurisdiction of the single Illinois store involved. That this rationale could not be embraced as a permanent Board policy seems evident from the fact that a majority of the members who signed the Greenberg Mercantile decision have now apparently abandoned the decision. It seems to be recognized as only a temporary expedient which permitted getting rid of an ancient case without dismissal which would have given a concrete demonstration of the inconsistent treatment of interstate chains in the Hogue and Knott standard had it been applied. I would certainly not deem it a sound basis for asserting jurisdiction herein.

Now, the instant case, which might have been disposed of in different ways during its 18 months' sojourn before the Board, depending on whether the action was taken while the 1950 plan was still in effect, while the Hogue and Knott standard was in full effect, or during the brief period that Greenberg Mercantile Corp., was apparently the rule, is finally being disposed of because three Board members are in agreement to assert jurisdiction though not for the same reason.

It is apparent from this recitation of the subsequent history of the Hogue and Knott standard, that it is impossible for anyone to tell today exactly what is the state of the law on the jurisdictional standard governing interstate retail chains. It is obvious that there is not a majority of the Board who are willing to reaffirm unqualifiedly the Hogue and Knott standard with its anomalous treatment of interstate retail chains as compared with less restrictive treatment of intrastate chains; nor to remove the anomaly by permitting totaling inflow and outflow figures for the former as well as the latter; nor to reaffirm the Greenberg Mercantile decision. In this state of uncertainty I believe I am free to vote to assert jurisdiction on my basic conviction that it effectuate the purposes of the act to assert jurisdiction over all multistate enterprises, which was the clear and simple rule under the 1950 jurisdictional plan.

I would also note that there is something patently wrong with jurisdictional standards which do not result in the quick resolution of questions concerning representation.

The Eisenhower Board has not only established its new jurisdictional standard for political reasons, it has manipulated them in an antiunion way.

Suppose a union organized the employees of company A, which did not quite meet the Board's new standards. The employer is free to ignore the union his employees have chosen. He need not bargain with it, even if every single employee has joined the union. Suppose the union strikes for recognition. Suppose the same union has organized the employees of company B, which also does not meet the Board's standards, but the union is strong enough to compel the employer to deal with it. Now suppose, in an effort to get employer A to recognize the union, the employees of the second employer refuse to handle the products of the first employer.

Section 8 (b) (4) (B) says that it is an unfair labor practice for a union to take action against one employer if the object is to force another employer to recognize a union which is not certified by the Board.

In the case I have put, the union is not certified by the Board as the representative of A's employees because the Board will not take jurisdiction. One would think that, at the very least, the Board would not take jurisdiction over a complaint against the secondary action against employer B, particularly since employer B does not meet the Board's jurisdictional standards either.

But the Eisenhower Board knows no limits. It says that in such a case it will lump together the interstate business done by both employer A and employer B and proceed against the union.

We have, then, this fantastic result. The union cannot get certified as representative of the employees of employer A because of the Board's new standards. But if it attempts to exert pressure through the employees of B to obtain recognition from A, the Board will take jurisdiction. It will hold that the action

[18] 112 NLRB No. 99.

[19] As to interstate chains of retail stores and service establishments, we shall continue the practice of totaling direct inflow, indirect inflow, or direct outflow of all stores in the chain to determine whether any one of these standards is me.

is unlawful, under section 8 (b) (4) (B), for the very reason that the union has not been certified as the representative of A's employees.

The case I have given is not hypothetical. It was decided in just those terms by the Eisenhower Board in *McAllister Transfer Inc.* (110 NLRB 1769), and in other cases. In the McAllister case, the union was found guilty of violating the act, even though it had a contract with the second employer which permitted the employees to refuse to handle struck work—a subject which I will return to later.

13. CHANGES IN SUBSTANTIVE LAW AND POLICY

A. INTRODUCTION

I turn now to documentation of the charge that the Eisenhower Board has rewritten the substantive provisions and policies which Congress embodied in the act under the guise of reinterpretation. Let me repeat. There are certain parts of the Taft-Hartley Act which are unclear—which leave room for interpretation—and with respect to which conflicting interpretations could be thought by reasonable men equally consistent with Congress' objectives. Where the Eisenhower Board has overruled the prior interpretations in this area—even though the new interpretations almost exclusively serve employer interests and undermine the interests of employees and labor organizations—the Board may escape judicial condemnation. Moreover, it might be difficult, if each of these instances were viewed in isolation, to prove that the Eisenhower Board was motivated in making the changes by hostility to labor and bias in favor of antiunion employers.

But the Eisenhower Board has not limited its revolutionizing of the act to those unclear areas where either 1 of 2 opposite policies—if adopted for honest reasons—may be equally consistent with the statute. The new Board has gone far beyond that. It has deliberately distorted and misconstrued the statutory language to narrow the rights which Congress vested in labor organizations and to increase the scope of the prohibitions on union activity which the act imposed. It has overruled prior Board policies which had not only received judicial approval, but the approval of Congress as well. It has sometimes discarded stare decisis without setting forth any reasons for making a change—and sometimes without even acknowledging that a change is being made.

Changes of this type—which are indefensible under any proper standard of quasi-judicial performance—have been made not in 1 section of the act, or 2 or 3; they have been made in virtually every section of the act. I cannot begin to cover them all. But I shall touch on a sufficient number of examples to persuade every Senator, I believe, that the Eisenhower Board has embarked on a program of revising and overhauling the law from stem to stern. There is only one explanation, in my opinion, for such sweeping revisions of a law by political appointees in administrative positions. The Republican administration thinks this law is not sufficiently antilabor. It fears, however, that it would be politically unwise openly to advocate that Congress amend the law to accomplish the changes it desires. Moreover, it knows that this body would not, on consideration of these changes on the merits, adopt them. Taft-Hartley, as President Eisenhower proclaimed in 1952, was too antilabor a measure as it then stood—before the Republicans were appointed to it. Even Eisenhower said he recognized that the law needed amending to remove many of its antilabor inequities. Labor is entitled to more protection under the law, not less.

But while this is the avowed position of the President and of the Republican Party—it is not their actual position. What they really believe our national labor policy should be is written in the decisions of the men they have appointed to the Board. And they have appointed them to the Board for the precise purpose of making antilabor amendments to the statute by a means and in a guise which, they hope, Congress and the people will not penetrate.

They hope that no one in Congress will do the detailed work involved in making the kind of analysis I am presenting to the Senate. That is what they hope. They hope that we will be so busy with the multitude of duties that press on us from day to day that we will not do our book work.

Mr. President, it so happens that it is one of our responsibilities as Senators, when evidence is presented to us that an administrative agency is violating its trust, to proceed with the research necessary to ascertain what the facts are and to present the evidence to the Senate.

This has not been an easy task. It has been a hard task. I have had the assistance of very able staff members. I have had the assistance of such scholars and authorities as Mr. Ratner, and I have made heavy use of the writings and findings of Professor Wirtz. In my judgment it is a service that needed to be rendered.

I was satisfied that the Eisenhower Board thought no one would go into its decisions and into its administrative policies and walk on the floor of the Senate and make a record of what the Board is up to. I have done the work. I hope that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will take up the work from here and will proceed to put the members of its professional staff to work on an even much more detailed analysis of the policies of the Board, to the end that, if necessary, we will pass some legislation which will make it impossible for the Board to continue to usurp the legislative functions of Congress.

B. EROSION OF EMPLOYEE RIGHTS UNDER SECTION 7—THE B. V. D. CASE

First comes section 7. That section is basic to the entire statute for it contains the guaranties to workers of the right to organize and form unions, to engage in collective bargaining, and peaceful concerted activities like strikes and picketing for mutual aid and protection. The language of section 7 came from the Wagner Act. In passing Taft-Hartley, Congress did not alter the words of that guaranty one jot or tittle.

As a result of a series of decisions the Board has, in effect, amended section 7 of the act. Let us document the record to a few of those decisions starting with the *B. V. D. case* (110 NLRB 1412). Mr. Ratner, in his article, frequently cited in this speech, states that in the B. V. D. case—

> The Board denied reinstatement and back pay to unfair labor practice strikers who continued peacefully to picket after acts of violence had been committed against the employer's property by unidentified third parties. The Board conceded that the strikers neither instigated, participated in, or authorized the acts of violence. It found no conspiracy between the strikers and others to commit illegal acts. It admitted that the strikers neither had nor exercised any control over the unidentified guilty parties. Nevertheless, the Board held that those strikers who continued to picket after the acts of violence had been committed must be deemed to have approved and ratified the acts of violence. To avoid forfeiture of the right to picket after the acts of violence were committed, the Board held, the strikers were required by "admonishment, denunciation, or public pronouncement" to dissociate themselves from the violence. For having failed to comply with this previously nonexistent condition, those strikers who continued to picket were denied redress.

That is an astonishing doctrine. The board completely exonerates the strikers from having taken any part whatever in the violations and from being in any way connected with the violations. Yet it places an affirmative duty on the strikers to proceed, to use the board's language, by "admonishment, denunciation or public pronouncement" to dissociate themselves from the violence.

There is no basis for that in the law. There is no basis for that in section 7. The result is what? The result is to deny to a union which complied with the law its rights under the law.

Mr. President, a couple of citizens may get into a dispute or, to use a more understandable example, Mr. and Mrs. X may get into a dispute, and a third party, not fully appreciative of the old saying, "Stay out of family disputes," gets involved.

Are we to require, in order to protect the wife in my hypothetical situation, and to protect her rights of legal action against the third party, to require her husband to completely repudiate the intercession of a third party? That would not make sense.

The strikers in this case had nothing to do with the third parties who committed the acts of violence. The Board admits that. But because they did not proceed to take an affirmative position in regard to the people who had committed acts of violence, the Board denies the strikers their rights under the statute.

Mr. President, there is no such provision in the statute.

> The new Board's policy of denying relief to strikers who are themselves innocent of wrongdoing, because others engaged in reprehensible and unlawful conduct during the course of the strike, flies in the face of an unbroken line of court decisions holding such denial improper.[20]

[20] Preamendment decisions: *Republic Steel Corp.* v. *N. L. R. B.* (107 Fd 2d 472, 479 (3d Cir.)); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Stackpole Carbon Co.* (105 F. 2d 167, 176 (3d Cir.)); *Stewart Die Casting Corp.* v. *N. L. R. B.* (114 F. 2d 849, 856 (7th Cir.), cert. denied, 312 U. S. 680)); *N. L.*

The courts have held that misconduct of some persons during a strike or on a picket line is not to be attributed to others in the absence of proof identifying such others as participants in the misconduct. Since these cases bar attribution to strikers of the guilty deeds of other strikers, they demonstrate how drastic a change the new Board made, when, in B. V. D., it attributed to innocent strikers the misdeeds of unidentified parties, who, for all the strikers or the Board knew, may well have been agents provocateurs.

The Board's pronouncement that to retain their statutory remedies after the unauthorized misconduct occurred, the strikers would have had to abandon the picket line, demeans and limits the right to strike, and its concomitant, the right to picket, which Congress in the act so carefully preserved.[21] Particularly with reference to disputes generated by unfair labor practices, Congress deliberately preserved the right to strike and picket, in addition to, and not in lieu of, the administrative remedies which it provided through the Board.[22] To compel employees to forego their right peacefully to picket merely because unauthorized and unidentified third parties have engaged in acts of violence, is to graft limitations and qualifications upon the right to strike which are nowhere expressed or implied in the act itself—and that flies in the face of the express language of section 13.

What objective is it that the Board by its new policy seeks to promote? Ostensibly, so the majority opinon says, the Board desires to discourage strike-connected misconduct. But we are not told how "admonishment, denunciation or public pronouncement" by strikers of the acts of unidentified outsiders over whom the strikers have no control could possibly be efficacious to that end. There is an even deeper flaw. Even if the Board's new policy could curb strike-connected violence, it would still be beyond the Board's province to adopt it. The Board was not commissioned by Congress to put an end to strike-connected misconduct, regardless of its source. Assuming the stated objective to be proper, still the Board "is not free to set up any system of penalties which it would deem adequate" to achieve it. (*Republic Steel Corp.* v. *NLRB* (311 U. S. 7, 12).)

In section 2 (13) of the act Congress enjoined the Board to impute guilt only under common law agency principles. Summing up those principles the Supreme Court has said: "Guilt with us remains individual and personal. * * * It is not a matter of mass application." [23] As far as the new Board is concerned, however, if any misconduct occurs in connection with a strike the strikers are now guilty en masse until proved innocent. Moreover, strikers can safely establish their innocence only by foregoing the exercise of those very rights which the statute was enacted to preserve and protect. The third circuit predicted in the *Republic Steel* case (107 F. 2d 472, 479), that to adopt such a policy as the Board has now adopted would make the "rights afforded to employees by the act * * * indeed illusory." The real purpose behind its adoption now seems to be just that.

Another noteworthy inroad upon the settled area of protection of employee concerted activities was made by the new Board in *Terry Poultry Co.*, (109 NLRB 1097). In that case, two employees left their work, without notifying their foreman, for the purpose of presenting to the plant superintendent a grievance arising over their foreman's mishandling of their complaint about certain working conditions. For this, they were discharged. Acknowledging that the concerted presentation of grievances is activity protected by section 7, the new Board members nevertheless sustained the discharge on the ground that the employees thereby violated a company rule prohibiting employees from leaving work without notifying their foreman. The company's right to enforce its rule, the Board held, took precedence over the employees' right to present grievances during working hours.

"The new policy, to accord greater weight to the right of the employer to make and enforce plant rules than to the statutory right of employees to engage in concerted activities, repudiates a substantial body of judicial precedent which dictates precisely the contrary evaluation.[24] The courts, like the Board in earlier days, have always recognized that to the extent that section 7 permits concerted activity, such as presentation of grievances, or strikes, to proceed during working hours, the employer cannot be permitted to restrict, curtail, or limit those activities by plant rule or otherwise.[25] If plant rules and the right to enforce them were decisive, employers could deprive the right to strike of all statutory sanction by the simple expedient of adopting a rule prohibiting concerted employee refusal to perform regular duties during working hours. As Member Murdock and Peterson stated in their dissent (109 NLRB at 1102):

"In giving controlling effect to the plant rule as justifying discharge, our majority colleagues are simply refusing to recognize established judicial doctrine. Were the law to the contrary, little would be left of the employees' statutory right to engage in a temporary work stoppage for mutual aid and protection. The majority's attempt to justify the restriction on the employees' exercise of this statutory right ignores the fact that leaving the job is as much a part of the concerted activity as the actual presentation of the grievance to management as the Board and court decisions plainly establish. Although there may be some interference with production resulting from such a temporary work stoppage, it is purely incidental as it is in the case of a strike and may not afford a legal basis for denying the employees protection from discharge."

The significance of this reversal of policy can hardly be overemphasized. Does the new Board really believe that Congress' policy of minimizing industrial conflict by fostering the prompt presentation of grievances will be better effectuated by compelling dissatisfied employees to remain at their work stations until their employer sees fit to release them? Is not such a policy, as the third circuit observed in *NLRB* v. *Kennametal, Inc.* (182 F. 2d 817, 819), apt to transform minor grievances, easily adjusted, into full-fledged strikes? Or, can it be that the new Board is concerned, not with the impact of its policy upon the mitigation of industrial strife, but upon revising the relative rights and privileges of employer and employee to the end that employers may escape the burden which the exercise of statutory rights by their employees entails?

Another flagrant example of the Eisenhower Board's attempt to rewrite the law to impose on unions new legal duties is the Personal Products case. The Board in that case found that the act meant just the opposite of what the Supreme Court of the United States had already said it meant.

Personal Products Co. is a subsidiary of Johnson & Johnson, which has a plant located in a privately owned industrial district in Chicago. The union involved was the Textile Workers Union of America. It had a contract which expired in October 1952. Before the contract expired the union met and negotiated with the company in an effort to reach a new agreement. But no agreement was reached. One of the reasons was that although the company admitted that it could afford to increase wages and although other companies across the Nation were granting wage increases, this company refused to offer any general increase at all.

R. B. v. *Quality & Service Laundry Co.* (131 F. 2d 182, 183 (4th Cir.), enforcing, 39 N. L. R. B. 970, n. 20)); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Ohio Calcium Co.* (133 F. 2d 721, 726 (6th Cir.)); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Mt. Clemens Pottery Co.* (147 F. 2d 262, 268 (6th Cir.)).

Postamendment decisions: *N. L. R. B.* v. *Marshall Car Wheel & Foundry Co.* (218 F. 2d 409, 417, 418 (5th Cir.)); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Deena Artware, Inc* (198 F. 8d 645, 652 (6th Cir.), cert denied, 345 U. S. 906); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Wallick and Schwalm* (198 F. 2d 477, 485 n. 10 (3d Cir.)); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Crowley's Milk Co.* (208 F. 2d 444, 446 (3d Cir.)).

The Supreme Court has recognized that it is "necessary to identify individual employees" * * * and to recognize that their discharges were for causes which were separable from "the protected activity of others"; at the same time, it held, it is "equally important to identify employees * * * who participated in simultaneous concerted activities" with others "but who refrained from joining the others in separable acts of insubordination, disobedience or disloyalty." (*N. L. R. B.* v. *Local Union No. 1229* (346 U. S. 464, 474, 475, affirming in this respect the rule stated by the Board at 94 N. L. R. B. 1507, 1512, 1513).)

The rule requiring actual personal participation in wrongdoing is likewise shown by the holdings that an employee who has not engaged in strike misconduct, but to whom the employer has denied reinstatement in reliance on the employer's honest but mistaken belief that he had, must be put back to his job with compensation for lost time. (*N. L. R. B.* v. *Industrial Cotton Mills* (208 F. 2d 87, 89, 93 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 347 U. S. 935); *Cusano* v. *N. L. R. B.* (190 F. 2d 898, 902 (3d Cir.)); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Cambria Clay Products Co.* (215 F. 2d 48, 53 (6th Cir.)). The first two cases were cited with approval in *Radio Officers' Union* v. *N. L. R. B.* (347 U. S. 17, 45 n. 53).

[21] *UAW* v. *O'Brien* (339 U. S. 454, 456, 457); *Amalgamated Association* v. *WERB* (340 U. S. 383, 389); *NLRB* v. *International Rice Milling Co.* (341 U. S. 665, 672, n. 6).

[22] Congress voted down the provision of the House bill, section 12 (a) (3) (c) (ii) of H. R. 3020, which would have prohibited strikes "to remedy practices for which an administrative remedy is available under this act."

[23] *Kotteakos* v. *United States* (328 U. S. 750, 772).

[24] *NLRB* v. *Southern Silk Mills, Inc.* (209 F. 2d 155 (6th Cir.), cert. denied 347 US 976) (spontaneous walkouts and temporary work stoppages to protest excessive heat); *Modern Motors, Inc.* v. *NLRB* (198 F. 2d 925 (8th Cir.)), (stopping work and concertedly presenting a grievance concerning a Christmas bonus grievance); *NLRB* v. *J. I. Case Company, Bettendorf Works* (198 F. 2d 919 (8th Cir.), cert. denied, 345 U. S. 917) (walking off the job without permission and attempt to incite plant walkout in protest against discharge of a union steward); *Kitty Clover, Inc.* v. *NLRB* (208 F. 2d 212 (8th Cir.)) (leaving work en masse to seek interview with employer concerning a grievance); *NLRB* v. *Globe Wireless, Ltd.* (193 F. 2d 748 (9th Cir.)) (leaving job to protest discharge of fellow employee); *NLRB* v. *Kennametal, Inc.* (182 F. 2d 817 (3d Cir.)) (engaging in work stoppage to secure higher wages); *Gullett Gin Company, Inc.* v. *NLRB* (179 F. 2d 499 (5th Cir.)) (discussion of wage grievances during working hours).

[25] See, e. g., Modern Motors, Inc., and J. I. Case, supra.

When the contract expired the union did not strike. It continued negotiations, month after month after month. One of the reasons was the plant was located in a privately owned industrial district which would have made peaceful picketing illegal and the company refused permission for such picketing if a strike should occur. The other reason, probably, was that the union was weak and afraid to strike.

Finally, when the negotiations failed to produce any agreement the union attempted some action. It persuaded the employees to refuse to work overtime, it organized a slowdown and conducted several short work stoppages.

These tactics may seem, to some, to be unfair. But it must be remembered, first, that these partial strike tactics involved direct losses to the employees.

This is clearest with respect to the refusal to work overtime. The employees who did this lost not just straight time but overtime pay. The short walkouts and extended rest periods each involved, for their duration, the same effects as a strike—the employer received no work and the employees received no pay during their occurrence. The same is true with respect to the slowdowns, since almost all of the employees, including those in the shipping and receiving departments, were paid on an incentive basis. The net of all these factors is that we had here, instead of a full strike, with no production and no pay, a partial strike with partial production and partial pay.

Secondly, the union had a right to strike. Indeed, a strike 3 months after the expiration of the contract would have been protected activity under section 7 of the act. And if the partial strike tactics used by the union were more damaging than a strike, the employer could have simply shut his plant and converted the situation into a strike.

The fact that the employer chose not to shut down demonstrates that he preferred operating that way to having a strike, and therefore was in a better economic position than if he had been struck. Furthermore, he could have taken other action. He could have replaced employees who refused to work on his terms and conditions, treating them precisely as if they were economic strikers. Again, the fact that he did not do so shows plainly that he preferred some work by these employees to none at all.

The company did none of these things. Instead, it filed a charge with the Eisenhower Board.

Now if there is one thing that is clear in the act it is that a slowdown is not a violation of the act. Many of us feared when Taft-Hartley was passed that it would be interpreted to limit the right to strike even in cases not specifically forbidden by the act. So, section 13 of the act says, in explicit terms, that—

> Nothing in this act, except as specifically provided for herein, shall be construed so as either to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike.

A slowdown is a strike. We specifically said so in section 501 of the act, which says that—

> When used in this act (2) the term "strike" includes * * * any concerted slowdown or other concerted interruption of operations by employees.

These explicit words would seem to be enough to make the conclusion clear. But, on top of that, there was a decision of the Supreme Court squarely on point. In *United Automobile Workers* v. *Wisconsin E. R. B.* (336 U. S. 245), the question was whether a State could enjoin slowdowns and similar strike tactics. The Supreme Court said "Yes." Why? Because, the Court said, the Taft-Hartley Act did not either forbid or protect such tactics and left them open for State regulation.

Counsel for the union, in his brief filed in the Personal Products Co. case, discussed this problem in these words:

> The reason for this is plain, even if it is conceded that slowdowns and similar tactics are unfair. The fact is that Congress, in 1947, did decide to prohibit certain kinds of economic pressure. It outlawed the secondary boycott and the jurisdictional strike. It made it an unfair labor practice for one union to strike where another was certified. But it clearly did not give the Labor Board the power to write new unfair labor practices. It required both unions and employers to bargain in good faith, but it did not attempt to assure that one party or the other would not have an advantage in the economic struggle which may take place if bargaining does not produce agreement.
>
> There are situations in which a union's financial position is poor, where there is a surplus of labor in the available market, where the employer's economic situation is such that he can afford to do without production for a period of time. In such situations, the union's economic position is weak and the employer's economic position is strong. But the act does not require that, for that reason, the employer cannot insist on as favorable terms as he believes are appropriate, so long as his purpose is not to destroy the union.
>
> Equally, there are situations in which unions are strong, where labor is in short supply, where the union has a substantial treasury, and where the demand for the employer's product is rising. The act does not limit the economic demands which the union may make or the economic tactics which may be used in support of its demands, so long as its purpose is not to destroy the employer and the specific weapons outlawed by Congress are not used.
>
> The reason for this is plain. The question of fairness in each situation must depend not only on the particular tactics used but on the whole economic complex in which a particular dispute arises. If the Board is to condemn a particular tactic because of its supposed unfairness, it must also consider the other factors involved: Whether, as the union claimed in this case, the plant was so located as to make picketing in support of a full strike impossible, whether slowdowns and intermittent stoppages were the only effective economic weapons available to the union, whether the employer's resistance to the union's demands was based on reason or simply the possession of sufficient economic power to resist.
>
> But if the Board must—in order to determine whether to forbid the particular actions—weigh the economic strength of the parties and make a judgment as to the equity of their economic positions, it then becomes a board of compulsory arbitration, engaged in resolving the merits of the bargaining contentions of labor and management. And it is too plain for argument that the statutory scheme does not contemplate its playing such a role.

I respectfully submit that the foregoing observations and arguments, taken from the union's brief in the Personal Products Co. case, are cogent and sound. All of the considerations mentioned are plain on the face of the Taft-Hartley Act. And, even if they were not, the Supreme Court had made them plain in the AFL Auto Workers case in which it flatly said that such conduct "is not forbidden by this act and no proceeding is authorized by which the Federal Board may deal with it in any manner"—336th United States Statutes at Large, page 253.

But did this stop the Eisenhower Board? Of course not. A complaint was issued against the Textile Workers Union and the Board ultimately found that it had violated the act. Despite the express language of the act, despite the express language of the Supreme Court, the Board said that the use of a slowdown was refusal to bargain in good faith and thus violated section 8 (b) (3), and it issued an order not only forbidding the union to organize slowdowns, but forbidding the individual employees who were respondents in the case from refusing to work overtime.

It was perfectly plain that the union had bargained for months in good faith. But, the Board said, "we think that these tactics are unfair. Therefore, if you use them in support of your bargaining position, then we will conclude that you have not bargained in good faith."

The story might end there. The effect of the Board's interference was substantially to destroy the union in this plant. And, while the case was pending the company signed a contract with a different union.

But the Textile Workers Union felt that a matter of principle was involved and, despite the loss of the plant, took the case to court. And the court, of course, reversed the Board.

There is nothing inconsistent, the court said, between bargaining in good faith for an agreement and using economic pressure to get the kind of agreement one wants. Besides, the Supreme Court had already decided the question. Therefore, the Board's order was set aside—*Textile Workers Union* v. *NLRB* (227 F. 2d 409).

Not every union thus proceeded against by the Eisenhower Board can afford the time and the money to appeal to the courts, as the Textile Workers Union did in this case. The fact that the Board was reversed is not enough. Congress has a duty to ask why the Board itself is not obedient to the mandate of the statute and the Supreme Court.

The Board ought to be able to read. The act specifically, as I have quoted from the act, legalized the so-called slowdown as a strike weapon.

E. UNWARRANTED EXPANSION OF SECONDARY BOYCOTT PROVISIONS

Mr. President, I shall now discuss the curtailment of the legal rights and the economic power of labor organizations by the Eisenhower members of the Board.

Proof positive that the Eisenhower Board has set out deliberately to curtail the right of labor organizations to

strike, so as to decrease their economic power to compete successfully with employers in disputes over wages, hours, working conditions, and unionization, is the distortion and misconstruction of section 8 (b) (4) (a) which started shortly after the new Board members took office. In support of this charge I shall draw heavily again on the Chicago Law Review article written by Mozart G. Ratner and previously cited and referred to many times in this speech. In fact, because I have quoted from and paraphrased so much the language of the Ratner article throughout the speech, I have previously asked unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the article printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as exhibit 1 immediately following my speech. I desire to do that, Mr. President, because in dictating certain sections of this speech I frequently followed so closely Mr. Ratner's language that I want to make certain I have given full credit to Mr. Ratner as the authoritative source for many of the points I have made in this speech.

In recent months, three United States courts of appeals—the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, the latter in two cases—have condemned the new Board's attempt to stretch section 8 (b) (4) (a) into a far more vicious union-busting provision than it is—*NLRB* v. *General Drivers, etc.* (225 F. 2d 205 (CA 5), certiorari denied, December 6, 1955); *Douds* v. *ILA* (224 F. 2d 455 (CA 2)); *Sales Drivers* v. *NLRB* (37 LRRM 2166 (CADC)), and *NLRB* v. *Electrical Workers* (37 LRRM 2219 (CA)).

Briefly, what happened was this: Shortly after the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act, the Board as then constituted recognized that if section 8 (b) (4) (a) was read in a vacuum, without regard to the presence in the statute of sections 7 and 13, which guarantee the right to strike, and if the legislative history which showed that Congress intended in section 8 (b) (4) (a) to outlaw only secondary boycotts and to leave primary strikes and other traditional primary tactics of economic competition intact was disregarded, section 8 (b) (4) (a) would emerge as an instrument for depriving unions of rights which Congress intended that they should continue to enjoy. Realizing that the right to engage in strikes, peaceful primary picketing, and primary boycotts was indispenable to the survival of the trade-union movement, the Board formulated a carefully worked out series of criteria for determining whether particular union tactics which were charged to violate section 8 (b) (4) (a) constituted a prohibited secondary boycott on the one hand or legal and protected primary activity on the other. These criteria the Board spelled out in detail in the *Moore Drydock case* (92 NLRB 547, 549). When the Supreme Court undertook to review the Board's interpretation of section 8 (b) (4) (a) in a series of cases in 1950, the Court went out of its way to commend the Board for the sound, objective, and intelligent approach which it had adopted toward fulfilling Congress' purposes. Remember, Mr. President, at this point we are not talking about the Eisenhower Board. We are talking about the old Board. The Supreme Court, in the cases I have cited, commended the old Board for clearly following and carrying out the congressional intention—see *NLRB* v. *Denver Building and Construction Trades Council* (341 U. S. 675, 686); *NLRB* v. *International Rice Milling Co.* (341 U. S. 665). The Supreme Court pointed out that section 8 (b) (4) (a) could not and should not be construed to encroach upon the right to engage in primary strikes and other primary activities such as picketing and boycotts because Congress in sections 7 and 13 had made clear its intention to preserve to the unions these fundamental rights.

In the context of specific applications the standards established by the Board in its Moore Dry Dock decision were approved by a large number of courts of appeals.[36] What did the Eisenhower Board do with these standards? It cut them to ribbons. First, it overruled the prior holdings that a union was free in the course of its dispute with a primary employer to follow that employer's trucks to the place where they were making deliveries and picket with signs publicizing the primary dispute wherever the trucks stopped to make deliveries.[37]

According to the Eisenhower Board, a union is allowed to do this only if the primary employer does not have a permanent place of business at which the union can picket. The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in *Sales Drivers* v. *NLRB*, decided December 8, 1955 (37 LRRM 2166), promptly reversed this attempt by the Board to outlaw lawful primary picketing. The rigid rule which the new Board imposed, said the court, would "unduly invade the application of section 13 which preserves the right to strike 'except as specifically provided' in other provisions of the act. It is not specifically provided that picketing at a common site, with an incidental effect upon employees of a neutral employer, is unlawful in every case where picketing could be conducted against the primary employer at another of its places of business."

Second, the Eisenhower Board attempted to deprive labor organizations and employees of the right to picket at other business establishments owned by their own employer in any case where the particular picketed establishment was not involved directly in the labor dispute. The Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit promptly held illegal this unprecedented and insupportable invasion of the right to strike and to picket in a primary dispute.

Mr. President, if you have any doubt that this is not a union-busting Eisenhower board, read these decisions, because the courts pointed out in these decisions what the effect of the attempt on the part of the Eisenhower Board to prevent primary picketing would be.

In *NLRB* v. *General Drivers* (225 F. 2d 205), the Court of Appeals branded the Board's attempt to restrict peaceful picketing of the employer involved in the dispute to only the particular business establishment where the employees were on strike an attempt by the Board—mark this, Mr. President—an attempt by the Board to substitute its own judgment "as to the propriety and adequacy of the means employed in a labor dispute, for the sole statutory test of unlawfulness of the end or objective sought, contrary to the Supreme Court's pronouncements that it is 'the objective of the unions' secondary activities and not the quality of the means employed to accomplish that objective, which was the dominant factor motivating Congress in enacting that provision."

Mr. President, if we had a Board running into that kind of difficulty with the courts only now and then, it would not be so bad. But here we have a whole line of decisions which show the attempt of the Eisenhower Board to participate in this sort of union-busting, antilabor activities.

Third, the new Board attempted to transform the meaning of section 8 (b) (4) (a) by substituting a conclusive presumption of union guilt for the necessity of proving by evidence that the union's object is one which section 8 (b) (4) (a) outlaws. Section 8 (b) (4) (a) prohibits a union from engaging in a strike or inducing employees of a neutral employer to engage in a strike where it is an object of the union to force the neutral employer to cease doing business with some other employer. What the new Board did was to say that if any activities in which a union engages, in the course of a strike against a primary employer, have the effect of terminating business dealings between a neutral employer and a primary employer, as a result of action by the neutral's employees, the union will conclusively be presumed to have violated section 8 (b) (4) (a).

That makes their work easy, particularly when their object obviously is to break the union. They just lay down a conclusive presumption or standard, instead of doing what the act clearly intends that they must do as a quasi-judicial tribunal, and let the evidence determine the objective. But, you see, Mr. President, they could not do that. They could not follow the standards of the act and succeed with their anti-union purposes. See what happened to their conclusive presumption.

In the ILA and the Electrical Workers cases, cited previously, the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit pointed out that the Board's attempt to superimpose an arbitrary presumption for proof in this fashion would devastate the rights of labor organizations in a manner which Congress clearly never intended.

That is what the court said. The court read the statute. The court obviously read the legislative history of the statute. Let me say, most respectfully, Mr. President, the Board also was well aware of the language of the statute and

[36] *NLRB* v. *Service Trade Chauffeurs, etc.* (2 Cir., 191 F. 2d 65, 68); *Piezonki* v. *NLRB* (4 Cir., 219 F. 2d 879, 863); *NLRB* v. *Chauffeurs, Teamsters, etc.* (7 Cir., 212 F. 2d 216, 219); *NLRB* v. *Local Union No. 55* (10 Cir., 218 F. 2d 226, 231).

[37] *Washington Coca Cola* (107 NLRB 299).

the legislative history. But I will tell you what this adds up to. This adds up to an attempt on the part of the Eisenhower administration, through its Board members, to weaken the power of American unions, in the hope that at least some of the devices of the Board may not get thrown out of court or may not be noted by the Congress.

So I say, Mr. President, can it be that all of these misconstructions and misinterpretations, all designed to narrow the statutory protection which Congress gave to the right to strike and all designed to increase the immunity of employers who are involved in labor disputes to lawful economic pressure, are mere errors of legal judgment?

Yet even these examples by no means tell the whole story. In the *Swift case* (36 LRRM 1307, 113 NLRB No. 31), the Board embarked upon a complete and thoroughgoing revision of section 8 (b) (4) (a), misconstruing virtually every word of the section and reaching a result which is patently absurd, as Ratner and others have pointed out. In that case, the local union induced certain buyers for independent retail markets to patronize salesmen employed by other meatpacking companies, rather than salesmen employed by Swift, with whom the union was engaged in a labor dispute. The facts were that, in the regular course of business, Swift's salesmen, like the salesmen of other packing companies, solicited the buyers' business at the retail markets. The Board held that the union violated the act when its representatives came into the markets and asked the buyers not to patronize the salesmen, although the Board admitted that when the union made the same appeal to the buyers at meetings of the union, its conduct did not violate the act. Moreover, the Board was forced to admit that if the pattern in the industry was such that the buyers made their purchases by going to see the salesmen at the packing plants, instead of having the salesmen come to the buyers at the stores, the union would not have engaged in an unlawful secondary boycott by doing exactly what it did at the retail markets in that case. This absurd attempt to restrict the primary situs of a labor dispute to a single place is exactly what the courts of appeals have condemned as distortion of the law which Congress passed. That is not the only absurdity and inequity in the Swift case. The Board found that the union had violated section 8 (b) (4) (a) by inducement of the buyers, who were authorized and vested with discretion by their employers, to purchase meat for the markets. However, in later, as well as in earlier, decisions the Board recognized that the function of making purchases for an employer is not an employee, but a management function, and that employees who perform that function, to that extent at least, are to be treated as agents of the employer and not as employees, either for the purpose of obtaining the benefits or being subjected to the restrictions of the act. Indeed, in a case decided just the other day involving, oddly enough, exactly the same parties, the Board held that procurement drivers employed by Swift, who have virtually no discretion, are not employees under the act at all, because they spend a substantial part of their time making routine purchases for their employer—*Swift & Co.* (115 NLRB 105). Section 8 (b) (4) (a), of course, prohibits a union only from inducing employees to strike. Yet, in the Swift case, the Board held local 88 guilty of a secondary boycott, because it induced persons to perform a function, in their capacity as agents of the employer, which the Board admits is the function of the employer and not of employees.

There is even more than that to it. In the Swift case, the Board admitted that the market owners, who were the employers of the buyers, approved of and acquiesced in the buyers' cessation of purchases from Swift's salesmen at the union's request. It admitted also, as the trial examiner found, that the union specifically told the buyers that they were to cease purchasing from Swift only if their own employers approved their doing so. It could not possibly be said, therefore, that local 88 induced the buyers to engage in any kind of strike action against the market owners, who were the only neutral employers involved. Yet the legislative history, as well as the language of section 8 (b) (4) (a), make it plain as day that the only limitation which Congress imposed upon the right of labor organizations to seek support from others, including employees of neutral employers, in their disputes against a primary employer was to prohibit them from inducing the employees of neutral employers to engage in strike action against their own employees. The second circuit specifically so held in *Rabouin* v. *NLRB* (195 F. 2d 906), upholding the Board's decision in *Conway's Express* (87 NLRB 972). But the new Board does not hesitate to reverse the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit when it serves its anti-union purposes to do so.

The question in Conway, as Ratner has pointed out, was whether section 8 (b) (4) (a) of the Taft-Hartley Act outlawed hot cargo clauses, freely negotiated and agreed to by employers and unions. Under such clauses, the union and the employer agree that cargo will not be handled by the employees if it originates with a company which is on strike. The old Board, recognized, as did the court, in the Conway case, that section 8 (b) (4) (a) left employers free to refuse to do business with other employers who became involved in labor disputes. Therefore, it certainly was entirely lawful for an employer to enter into a contract with a labor union in which he agreed that he would not compel his employees to handle goods coming from a plant at which the employees were on strike. The Board consequently held that section 8 (b) (4) (a) was not violated where a labor organization asked the employees of an employer who was party to such a contract not to handle goods which came from a struck plant. In *McAllister Transfer* (110 NLRB 1769), the Eisenhower Board members voted to reverse the Conway decision.

In discussing this matter Ratner writes:

> They held, in short, that hot cargo contracts were contrary to public policy; that secondary employers could not, by contract, waive immunity against refusals by their employees to handle unfair goods; and that, since the contracts were contrary to public policy, they could not be relied upon as defenses to unfair labor practice charges.
>
> Chairman Farmer revolted. He observed that his newly appointed colleagues, in their freewheeling divination of public policy were glossing over the plain language of the statute. The language shows, said the chairman, that Congress deliberately left secondary employers free to boycott primary employers. "I suppose," he said, "that what an employer may do he may also agree in advance to do." The chairman reminded his colleagues that the Board is not "the guardian of the public welfare, except to the extent we are charged with responsibility for administering a particular statute." So far did his colleagues depart from the accepted norm of administrative policy making that the chairman found it necessary to say: "Judges must resist the temptation to devise legal precepts to accommodate their moral judgments that this conduct or that is either laudable or indefensible."

It is clear, Mr. President, how sweeping a departure the new Board members made from the policies which Congress enacted into law. As Ratner states:

> For example, the two Board members who would reverse Conway deny that a labor organization may bargain collectively to exclude from the course of employment, as that term is used in section 8 (b) (4), the handling of unfair goods. "Course of employment," say these members, includes, as a matter of law, all action taken by employees, qua employees, and excludes only action taken by employees as ultimate consumers. But definition and limitation of the course of employment is one of the oldest and most fundamental of the objectives of collective bargaining. Delimitation of the kind of work which may be assigned to particular employees and classifications of employees is standard in the vast majority of collective bargaining contracts obtained by industrial, as well as by craft, unions. If Congress intended in Taft-Hartley to make so serious an inroad upon historical collective bargaining practice as to outlaw bargaining about the course and scope of employment, one would reasonably suppose that in the course of the hearings, debates, and reports on the act, someone would have thought to mention the subject. But the legislative history is completely silent on the point. Manifestly, Congress did not intend to affect the right of unions to bargain for restrictions upon the scope and course of employment.
>
> Confirmation lies in the fact that, admittedly, Congress left employers free to exclude the handling of unfair goods from the course of their employees' employment. If Congress did not preclude employers from doing that unilaterally, it would take specific statutory language to warrant the conclusion that Congress precluded employers from contracting with a labor organization to do it. That the new Board members do not like the results of such a contract does not empower them, as the Supreme Court emphasized in *Colgate-Palmolive-Peet* (338 U. S. 355, 363), to reform the contract to "conform to their ideas of correct policy."
>
> In permitting employers who have bound themselves to "hot goods" clauses to renege on their agreements and thereby brand union reliance upon their contract rights an unfair labor practice, the Board also departs from other principles rooted deeply in the law and in Board policy. For example, in *Briggs-Indiana Corp.* (63 N. L. R. B. 1270), the Board refused to lend its sanction to a union which sought to secure representation rights for a group of employees whom it had, by contract with the employer,

agreed not to organize or represent. Although the union's contractual undertaking clearly foreclosed the employees involved from effective exercise of their statutory right to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and although the employees were not parties to the contract, the board refused to "facilitate" the union's avoidance of its contractual commitment. To lend its sanction to contract breaking, said the Board, "is not the business of the Government of the United States." And, it may be asked, if that was not the proper business of Government under the Wagner Act, before Congress had provided specific remedies for enforcement of collective-bargaining agreements, how much less is it the Government's business under Taft-Hartley, in which Congress made adherence to and enforcement of collective-bargaining contracts a cornerstone of national labor policy?

None of the three members who voted to sustain the complaint in McAllister purport to repudiate Briggs-Indiana. Wherein lies the distinction between the two cases? Can it be that the difference is that the statutory policy affected by the contract in Briggs-Indiana is the freedom of employees to bargain collectively, whereas the policy promoted by the majority in McAllister is the lessening of strike pressure on primary employers? McAllister, surely, is a bold departure from the maxim that "what is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander."

Mr. President, only the other day in *American Iron and Machine Works* (cases Nos. 16–CC–47 and 16–CC–48), the Eisenhower Board members, now firmly in the saddle, readopted their colleagues position in the McAllister case, and stretched it to even further lengths—all this, may I remind the Senate, in the teeth of a decision of the Second Court of Appeals of the United States, which holds squarely that the very union action which the new Board members condemn is proper and lawful under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. Ratner continues:

Just as the new Board members are misusing section 8 (b) (4) to impose novel and unwarranted curbs upon the power of unions to engage in economic conflict, so they are distorting section 8 (b) (2) to diminish the prestige of unions and reduce their influence in establishing and maintaining conditions of employment. Perhaps the clearest example of this is *Pacific Intermountain Express* (107 NLRB 837), in which the new Board retroactively overruled[28] the rule established by the pre-Eisenhower Board in *Firestone Tire and Rubber Co.* (93 NLRB 981). In the Pacific Intermountain case, a collective bargaining contract provided that the union was to have exclusive authority to resolve all disputes over seniority, and the union bound itself in that contract not to base any seniority decision on the union membership or nonmembership of any employee in the bargaining unit. The Board, however, was not satisfied with the bona fides of the union's promise. It observed that the records in the employer's files would be more reliable than any information the union might have available to it with respect to seniority. It then concluded:

"It is to be presumed, we believe, that such delegation [of power to the union to settle seniority disputes] is intended to and in fact will be used by the union to encourage membership in the union."

On the face of it, this is far worse even than holding that the union is guilty until proved innocent. The Board denies the union the right to act at all, merely because the Board presumes that it will not act innocently. Where did the Board suddenly acquire the power to indulge that kind of a presumption of future guilt? The elaborate procedural structure established by Congress for the trial of charges of unfair labor practice becomes a farce if the Board can disregard the absence of past violations and predicate an order to desist from a proposed course of lawful conduct on its mere presumption that future violations will develop. It is precisely for this reason that the courts long ago held that the Board was not empowered to enter "cautionary" orders against future violations in the absence of a finding, sustained by evidence, that similar violations had occurred in the past.[29]

Denial to the union of its contractually won privilege of settling seniority disputes, on the ground that the union may utilize that privilege to discriminate, is the precise equivalent of depriving an employer of the right to bargain for unilateral control over, for example, merit increases. It is as reasonable to presume that an employer will use his power to grant merit increases discriminatorily to undermine the union as to presume that the union would exercise its power to settle seniority disputes discriminatorily to strengthen its position. One can perhaps visualize the storm of protest from employers and from the bar were the Board to attempt so to trench on employer prerogatives.

The Board's determination that unions should not be permitted to bargain for unilateral control over the resolution of seniority disputes is another attempt to substitute for Congress' policy a contrary policy which the new Board members prefer. In *NLRB* v. *American National Insurance Co.* (342 U. S. 395), the Supreme Court held that section 8 (d) permitted each party to bargain for unilateral control of subjects in the field of wages, hours, and conditions of employment. Seniority rights are, of course, such a subject. Indisputably, the employer is free to bargain for unilaterial control over resolution of seniority disputes. Yet the Board precludes the union from doing likewise.

The Board's rationale, that the employer is in better position than the union to determine seniority disputes on their merits, does precisely what the Supreme Court in the American National Insurance case enjoined the Board not to do; namely, substitute its views as to what substantive terms of collective bargaining contracts are reasonable and proper for the views of the parties. And the Board's assumption, that the union could desire unilaterally to control resolution of seniority disputes only for the purpose of discriminating, betrays either a woeful ignorance of the significance in industrial life of the union's role under union shop contracts as arbiter of disputes between members or a malicious purpose to strip unions of power to function in this area and thereby to diminish their prestige.

When one observes that in the proviso to section 8 (b) (1) (A) Congress removed internal union affairs completely from the Board's reach, it becomes apparent how far this policy of the new Board strays from the avowed objective, "effectuation of the policies of the act."

Mr. President, one of the most inequitable features of the Taft-Hartley Act is its prohibition of hiring practices with respect to skilled craftsmen which have worked for generations to the mutual satisfaction of both employers and unions. The usual practice—before the Taft-Hartley Act—in the construction industry was for a contractor and the union representing the skilled journeymen of the particular craft to agree that the union would supply the qualified skilled artisans required by the contractor, and he in turn would agree to hire only the craftsmen referred by the union. Under such agreements, the union could see to it that the available work was evenly distributed among the journeymen in the crafts, and the contractor was assured of qualified personnel.

Sections 8 (a) (3) and 8 (b) (2) of the Taft-Hartley Act outlawed these healthy and mutually satisfactory arrangements. But the statute did not decree that any union which entered into such an arrangement should be bankrupted and broken and forced to pay out every cent of dues and assessments lawfully paid to it by its loyal members. The act did not do that. But the Eisenhower Labor Board has done it.

The case in point was decided only a few weeks ago by Chairman Leedom and Member Rodgers, with Member Petersen registering a futile dissent—*United Association of Journeymen of Plumbing Industry, Local 231 (J. S. Brown-E. F. Olds Plumbing Corp.)* (115 N. L. R. B. No. 90, decided February 1956). In making its decision the Board overruled its own trial examiner as to the facts—deciding that witnesses who the examiner who heard the case said were lying spoke the truth, and that those who he thought spoke truthfully were lying. But, passing this, these are the facts as found by the Eisenhower Board:

The Brown-Olds Plumbing & Heating Corp., by contract, performs all maintenance and repair services on certain equipment of the Standard Oil Co. in El Paso. It is a big contract, costing annually more than $200,000. Brown-Olds has a contract with the plumbers' union.

In December 1954 a welder named Bryant went out to the job site where Brown-Olds were doing some work for Standard Oil. He asked whether a job was available. It turned out that two men were needed. A call was placed to the local union, to see whether they objected to hiring Bryant. The union did—but not because Bryant was not a union member. He was a member of a

[28] The union involved in the Pacific Intermountain case attacked the retroactive effect of the Board's action in overruling its prior rule in the courts, and was successful. *NLRB* v. *Teamsters Union* (225 F. 2d 343 (8th Cir., 1955)). Unfortunately, the union did not argue that the Board's new rule was itself invalid and, in the absence of such a contention, the court enforced the Board's order in its prospective effect. To the same effect, see *NLRB* v. *Dallas General Drivers* (228 F. 2d 702 (5th Cir., 1956)), enforcing in part *North East Texas Motor Lines* (109 NLRB 1147), which followed the new Pacific Intermountain rule. Insofar as these cases uphold the Eisenhower Board's new rule, they rely on the supposedly expert and unbiased character of the Board—a supposition which we, as the Congress, are surely entitled to question.

[29] *NLRB* v. *Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. of Alabama* (129 F. 2d 661, 667–668 (5th Cir.)); *Reliance Mfg. Co.* v. *NLRB* (125 F. 2d 311, 316–317, 321 (7th Cir.)); *NLRB* v. *Arma Corporation* (122 F. 2d 153, 156–157 (2d Cir.)); *NLRB* v. *Superior Tanning Co.* (117 F. 2d 881, 891 (7th Cir.)); *NLRB* v. *West Kentucky Co.* (116 F. 2d 816, 821–822 (6th Cir.)).

different local of the plumbers' union whom the El Paso local had cleared. But in El Paso there were seven men who had been laid off longer than Bryant who the union thought should get the work. So the company did not hire Bryant. It took the two men sent by the union.

Bryant filed a charge with the Labor Board. After the above facts were found by the Board, it had no difficulty in finding that because the company had hired the men sent by the union in proper order, instead of Byrant, the union had violated the act. It had no difficulty in ordering the union to pay Bryant all the wages he would have received if he had been hired.

That was only the beginning. Next, it declared illegal the contract between the union and the company which said that the company would hire through the union. That, too, perhaps was all right, even though the evidence showed that the contract was not enforced and nonunion plumbers had in fact been hired. But the Board went further. The local union, it said, also had similar contracts with a number of other companies. Those companies were not parties to the case; they were given no notice and no hearing. The Board did not even know whether it could take jurisdiction over those companies. No matter—an order was issued directing the union to cease and desist from executing, maintaining, or enforcing its agreements with those other companies and a footnote was added that this would not apply if investigation showed that those companies were not subject to the act.

Having thus made a decision affecting contracts with employers who were not parties to the case, the Board turned its attention to the treasury of the local union. It found that in the union's contract with Brown-Olds there was a provision that the bylaws, working rules and regulations of the local should be considered part of the contract. Turning to the bylaws, it found that dues were calculated in the following way: First, there was a flat monthly payment of $3 for all journeymen, whether working or not; second, there was an additional payment, for members working at the trade, of 2 percent of their net wages. The second payment was called an assessment; but it was uniform in its application, and payable monthly.

Section 8 (a) (3) of the act forbids an employer having a union shop to discharge anyone except for nonpayment of the periodic dues uniformly required of all members. The provision in the union's bylaws was really a dues provision based on earnings—a permissible arrangement. But it was called an assessment. It was incorporated in the contract with Brown-Olds, which called for the employment of only members of the union in good standing. Therefore, the Board said, it was in violation of section 8 (a) (3).

There was no evidence that anyone had been discharged by Brown-Olds for not paying these so-called assessments. To the contrary, it was clear that Brown-Olds had ignored its contract with the union, and had hired nonunion plumbers and welders. And Bryant, the only man who, on the record, ever had been hurt by the contract, was a member of the union. But, no matter—the contract was found to be illegal on its face; and, because it was illegal, the union must pay.

First, the Board said, the union must pay back to all of the employees of Brown-Olds all of the so-called assessments. For how far back? Well, the act has a statute of limitations. The Board cannot act on a charge filed 6 months after the act complained of. So, in this case, the Board ordered the union to pay back to all of the employees all of the assessments collected since 6 months prior to the day Bryant filed his charge—a period running back from February 1956 to September 1954.

That still was not enough. Usually when a trial examiner does not believe back pay should be ordered but the Board reverses him, it exempts the period from the date of his report to the date of the Board's decision. The reason is that during that period the respondent has no reason to know he will be liable and is entitled to rely on the trial examiner's recommendation. In this case, the trial examiner did say the assessment provision was unlawful as a condition of employment, but in the absence of a complaint from the other employees, or any showing that they would have been fired if they did not pay, he did not order the reimbursement of the assessments. But, when the Board reversed him, it did not exempt the 7 months between his decision and the Board's action.

One would think this was enough. The General Counsel for the Board thought that it was enough. He got everything he had asked for and won on every single issue that had been litigated.

But even this did not satisfy the Eisenhower Board. The union had also collected the flat dues of $3 per month during the long period from 6 months Bryant filed his charge up till February 1956. Why not make the union pay all that money out?

Of course, there is nothing illegal about the provision for dues of $3 a month in the union's bylaws. But the contract with Brown-Olds said that union members would be hired. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, this is illegal. It can only be provided that employees must become members of the union 30 days after they are hired. Therefore, the bylaws plus the contract made the dues illegal.

Of course the union employees had been hired long before September 1954. The 30-day grace period required by Taft-Hartley had therefore long since expired. And Taft-Hartley does not make it illegal to join a union before the 30 days are up. Nor does it make it illegal for workers to join a union voluntarily, and pay dues, even before they are hired on a particular job.

And, above all, no one in this case had claimed that the dues provision was illegal or had asked that dues be refunded.

None of these considerations mattered to the Eisenhower Board. It ordered all of the dues money returned—all of the dues paid all of the employees of Brown-Olds back as far as the Board legally could go—back to September 1954.

Why was this done? Because it was a union, and because the Eisenhower Board appears to be against unions. That is the only possible explanation I can give for this unreasonable decision. Certainly the Board's decision gives no other clue. This whole case arose because of the union's simple effort to obtain employment for its laid-off members instead of a man who tried to muscle-in ahead of them. That is all that happened, according to the Board's own record. But because of that one incident, and the Eisenhower Board's thirst for blood, the order which I have described was issued.

Ratner writes further:

Another example of the new Board's tendency to intervene in the internal affairs of labor unions and to impose upon union operations burdensome restrictions which the statute neither contemplates nor sanctions is *Metal Ware Corp.*[30] In that case the new Board overruled *Chrisholm-Ryder.*[31] The *Chrisholm-Ryder* case held that once an employee had been expelled from membership in the contracting union, and his discharge requested for failure to tender periodic dues uniformly required under a valid union shop contract, the employee could not thereafter acquire immunity to discharge by making a belated tender. The decision on its face showed a careful evaluation by the Board of the terms of sections 8 (a) (3) and 8 (b) (2) and of the legislative history of both sections, all of which led inevitably to the conclusion that, at least where suspension or expulsion preceded the union's request for discharge, the date of the request was controlling. The Board said:

"To hold, as the General Counsel urges, that provision (B) to section 8 (a) (3) and section 8 (b) (2) permit employee-members subject to a valid union-shop agreement to disregard with impunity the union's uniform requirements respecting the time for payment of periodic dues as a condition of retaining membership, would be distortion of the manifest sense of these sections. Moreover, such an interpretation would materially detract from the substance of union-security agreements which Congress vouchsafed to unions and would leave individual employees free to ignore an important condition of membership, which unions are permitted to impose." [32]

In contrast, the Metal Ware decision does not even refer to the language of the statute or to the legislative history. On ipse dixit alone, the new Board now declares that:

"A full and unqualified tender made any time prior to actual discharge and without regard as to when the request for discharge may have been made, is a proper tender and a subsequent discharge based upon the request is unlawful." [33]

Manifestly, this decision permits employees to make a mockery of union rules governing the time by which periodic dues must be paid. By one stroke of the pen the Board declares those rules, no matter how fair, and how uniformly applied, unenforcible. Can this decision be squared with the policy of Congress as expressed in the proviso to section 8 (b) (1) (A) and with the legislative history? And what are the practical consequences of this decision from the employer's point of view? Now the employer cannot rely upon the employee's delinquency which resulted in his expulsion; he must now satisfy himself, before making the

[30] 112 N. L. R. B. No. 80, 36 L. R. R. M. 1077 (1955).
[31] 94 N. L. R. B. 508 (1951).
[32] 94 N. L. R. B. 508, 510 (1951).
[33] 112 N. L. R. B. No. 80, 36 L. R. R. M. 1077, 1078 (1955).

discharge, that the employee has not tendered dues up until the very last minute before the discharge becomes effective. The additional complication and annoyance which this entails for the employer, to say nothing of the additional risk which it imposes, may prove a substantial deterrent to the execution and enforcement of valid union security agreements. If the Board, like anyone else, is presumed to intend the normal consequences of its acts, one may well conclude that discouragement of enforcement of union security agreements is precisely the objective which the Metal Ware decision seeks to achieve.

K. THE BOARD OVERRULES THE SUPREME COURT—THE MONSANTO CHEMICAL CASE

Section 9 (f) of the Taft-Hartley Act requires unions to file certain financial and constitutional information with the Secretary of Labor and to distribute the financial data among its members. No complaint can be issued by the Board on a charge made by a union or any investigation conducted of a representation petition filed by a union unless section 9 (f) is complied with.

Section 9 (g) requires the union to file annual reports, and distribute them to its members, so as to keep the initial information up to date. Section 9 (g) says that no certification shall issue to any union that does not comply with its provisions.

The purpose of section 9 (f) and (g) is wholesome. Unions should disclose their financial operations, but practical compliance to the letter is often difficult, particularly for small local unions which do not have adequate accounting facilities or which hold infrequent meetings.

Until recently, the Labor Board construed sections 9 (f) and (g) so as to accomplish the purposes of the act without visiting harsh penalties upon unions which inadvertently fall our of compliance. Its action in so construing the act is fully justified by the language of the act, and has been approved completely by the Supreme Court. As the Supreme Court said in *N. L. R. B.* v. *Dant and Russell* (344 U. S. 375):

> As a practical matter, elections of new officers, changes in organizational structures, difficulties and delays in auditing financial statements or in obtaining information with respect to the numerous details which section 9 (f) and (g) requires, make compliance at a given moment, or continuous compliance, a matter of happenstance. * * * Such normal noncompliance at the time of filing a charge should not work to frustrate the act's purposes (with respect to) unions which do have leadership willing to comply. (344 U. S. at 383-384).

Under the Supreme Court decision in the Dant and Russell case, a union which inadvertently had let its compliance status lapse was not penalized if it corrected its error and came into compliance at the times actually required by the act.

In an unfair labor practice case the time specified in the act is the time when the Board issues a complaint. "No complaint shall be issued," the act says, unless the union which filed the charge is in compliance. Therefore, the Board said—and the Supreme Court agreed—if the union had fallen out of compliance when it filed its charge, still the Board could and should proceed if the union corrected the situation before the Board issued its complaint.

The Board came to the same result in election cases. Section 9 (g) says that no certification shall issue unless the union has filed its annual financial and other reports with the Secretary of Labor. A union which filed a petition may fall out of compliance while the case is pending. The Board, following the principle of the Dant and Russell case and the language of the act, said that the union could cure this if it reacquired its compliance status before the certification issued. (*Fawcett-Dearing Printing Co.* (106 NLRB 1249 (1953)).) That was the policy under the old Board. The old Board followed the act. It followed the Court decisions.

All this has now been changed by the Eisenhower Board. Only last week, the Board overruled the Fawcett-Dearing case and, indeed, the Supreme Court of the United States, and established a new and highly vindictive rule. This new rule was announced in the *Monsanto Chemical Co.* case (115 NLRB No. 102).

The case itself is a remarkable one. The union filed an election petition in January 1955. At that time it was in full compliance with sections 9 (f) and (g). The Regional Director dismissed the petition. On appeal, the Board reversed him. Various postponements occurred and, finally, a hearing was held in June of 1955 and the case went to the Board for decision.

All during this period the union was in full compliance. But while the Board delayed and delayed, the union's fiscal year expired on September 30. The Board allows a union 90 days after the end of its fiscal year to file its financial reports with the Secretary of Labor and to publicize them among the members. The union compiled and filed its report within the 90 days but, before the 90 days were up, it informed the Regional Director that it could not make the necessary publication within that time because its bylaws required that the financial data be publicized at a regular union meeting, and the next regular union meeting was not scheduled until 3 weeks after the 90-day period had elapsed.

Nothing happened. A 3-week period of noncompliance followed, until January 1956. The union then made the necessary publication in accordance with its bylaws.

Still no decision came from the Board. Under its established rule, the fact that the union had fallen out of compliance for 3 weeks while the case was pending would have made no difference. The act requires compliance with 9 (g) only when certification issues. But, as in so many other instances, what the Taft-Hartley Act says is enough for the Eisenhower board. It announced a new policy. It decided on some new legislation of its own. It decided that if any union should fall out of compliance, then, immediately, the privilege of using the Board's processes will be denied and, indeed, any action already taken on behalf of the union will be immediately withdraw or revoked. And so the petition in the Monsanto case was dismissed in March 1956, months after it was filed because, for 3 weeks during that period, the union was out of compliance because its bylaws required distribution of financial data at a regular meeting.

Presumably this vindictive rule applies in both unfair labor practice cases and representation cases. Clearly it flies in the face of both the law and the Supreme Court.

I concede that, in these cases, a union may be, in a sense, at fault. It should comply. It should, in the 90 days after the end of its fiscal year, be able to make the necessary audits and file and distribute the results. But surely we did not, when we passed sections 9 (f) and (g) mean to visit the kind of punishment meted out by the Board for involuntary noncompliance. Our object was to get the information on file and have it distributed, not to punish unions for making mistakes on technical and complicated details.

This is no small matter. The 6 months' statute of limitations in the act means that once a charge has been dismissed, under this new rule, usually a new one cannot be filed—and the employer goes scot-free even if he has violated the act in the most flagrant manner. And, in representation cases, a contract may be executed while a petition is pending. If the petition is thrown out, the contract becomes a bar and the petitioning union may be denied a right to an election for as long as 5 years.

And the filing requirements of sections 9 (f), (g), and (h) are such that it is almost impossible to avoid inadvertent noncompliance. The Board itself, in the Dant and Russell case told the Supreme Court that, as of January 31, 1952, the number of local unions which were in compliance, was 9,220, while the number which had complied, but had lapsed from compliance, was 13,825. Relying on the Board, the Supreme Court issued its Dant and Russell decision, applying the act as written by Congress. It remained for the Eisenhower Board to emasculate both the statute and the Supreme Court's ruling.

L. "FREE SPEECH"—THE BOARD LICENSES EMPLOYER COERCION

The right of free speech is a precious one. Like all great rights, however, it is sometimes falsely invoked. The Eisenhower Board has achieved the perhaps unique distinction of stretching the right of free speech to include plain coercion by the employer and, at the same time invoking it to justify his actions in forbidding his employees to exercise their right of free speech.

Section 8 (c) of the Taft-Hartley Act specifically says that the expression of views shall not be an unfair labor practice so long as it does not contain a threat of reprisal or promise of benefit. What the Eisenhower Board has done is to ignore the qualifications in this section. It is impossible to set forth fully all of the instances in which, on one pretext or another, the Board has ignored plain threats of reprisals and promises of benefit. A few examples will suffice.

Professor Willard Wirtz of Northwestern University, in his previously cited study of the Board's free-speech deci-

sions,[34] points out that the extent to which the Eisenhower Board has gone in this matter is well illustrated by the *Morganton Full Fashioned Hosiery Co.* case (107 NLRB No. 312 (1954)). He points out that in that case the Board majority found no substantial significance in the statements by 2 supervisors to 2 employees that the plant would be closed if the union won the election. In this case there was a context of a series of strong anti-union statements cited by Wirtz.[35] Wirtz calls attention to the fact that Board member Murdock's suggestion that the effect of such coercive statements to two employees would undoubtedly spread among others, particularly in such a context, was rejected by the Board majority with the statement that—

An employee mandate cannot lightly be set aside merely because the normal and expected plant discussion happens to include a few isolated threats by overzealous minor supervisory personnel.

Wirtz continues:

Again, in National Furniture Mfg. Co. the Board majority found unexceptionable the employer statement in two letters distributed to employees shortly before the election that the company would have to shut down and move out of the city if forced to meet the union demands. Still blunter employer statements, in *Chicopee Mfg. Corp.* (107 N. L. R. B. No. 31 (1953)), that "if the union (wins we will) be forced to move the plant" were found by the Board majority to amount only to "predictions of the possible impact of wage demands upon the employer's business." I only say they ought to be required to put on overalls and work for a year in such a plant. Then they might have a little better understanding of a worker's interpretation of such an employer threat. There appears to be still broader license in the further statement in this case that "A prophecy that unionization might ultimately lead to loss of employment is not coercive where there is no threat that the employer will use its economic power to make its prophecy come true."

Why did they make the threat? They made it because they wanted them to vote against unionization. They cannot be excused—these Eisenhower Board members—of being naive. On the contrary, we can take judicial notice of the fact that they know exactly what they are up to. In this instance they wanted to save an obviously antiunion employer.

Subsequent cases[36] suggest strongly that these predictions and prophecies of unpleasant eventualities may be cast safely in terms which at least the timid might conceivably misinterpret as threats.

Another example is the Eisenhower Board's reversal of the old rule that a statement that the employer will refuse to bargain even if the union wins the election is a violation of the act. Here again I turn to Professor Wirtz for authority: In *Esquire, Inc.* (107 N. L. R. B. 260 (1954)), Murdock dissenting, the Board approved a pattern of employer preelection words and action which could have had only the effect of persuading the employees that even if the union won the election—which it did not—the subsequent attempt at collective bargaining would be a lesson in frustration. The employer stated to the employees in a series of three letters that if the union won the election the company would refuse to bargain until ordered to do so by the courts, that the court processing would take several years, that "we will always be willing to pay as high wages voluntarily as we will be willing to pay through a union contract," and that "we also do not intend to lose production for a single day because of any strikes which the (union) may be planning for us and for you." The Board found here no threat of reprisal and no interference with the employees' freedom of choice, but only an "expression of the employer's legal position."

How ridiculous and absurd.

The action of the Eisenhower Board in licensing almost any kind of employer speech is paralleled by its use of section 8 (c) to justify the discriminatory enforcement of rules aganst speech by employees. Section 8 (c) of the Taft-Hartley Act does more than protect the right of free speech. The legislative history makes it clear that the majority in 1947 intended to overrule the Wagner Act Board's captive-audience doctrine.

The captive-audience device is a simple one. The employer wants to urge his workers not to vote for a union in an NLRB election. He wants to make sure that everyone listens to what he has to say. So he does not simply write letters or have leaflets distributed. He closes up his plant or store and orders all of the workers to assemble, during working hours and on time for which the employer pays, so that they must listen to his antiunion speech.

The Board, in 1946, decided that this was an unfair labor practice. The unfair labor practice, the Board said, was not in making an antiunion speech. The employer had the right to do that. The unfair labor practice was making the speech on company time and on company property and compelling the workers to listen to him.

Whether rightly or wrongly—and I think, wrongly—Congress in 1947 overruled this Board decision. But, in 1951, the Board was faced with a new problem in the *Bonwit-Teller* case (96 NLRB 608). In that case the employer used the captive audience device. But, in that case, something more was involved. The company was a department store. And, as a department store, the Board permitted the company to establish a rule which other employers are forbidden to establish: it permitted the employer to enforce a rule against employee solicitation on the union question on company property, whether or not this solicitaton took place on working time. The company, in the Bonwit-Teller case had imposed just such a rule.

In other words, what happened in the Bonwit-Teller case was that the company not only made speeches against the union on company time and on company property but it compelled the employees to listen. This it had a right to do under the Board's interpretation of section 8 (c) of the Taft-Hartley Act. But it went further. It established a ruling preventing the workers from exercising their right of free speech on company property, whether on company time or not. The company's position in Bonwit-Teller, in other words, was that it had a right to talk to the employees against the union on company time and on company property, but the employees had no right to talk in favor of the union.

In the Bonwit-Teller case there was one further factor. After the company made its captive-audience speech the union organizer asked the company to assemble the employees again in a similar fashion to listen to the union's arguments. The employer refused.

Looking at this whole situation, the Board decided that it was an unfair labor practice for the employer under these circumstances to refuse to grant the union's request. The Board conceded that he had a right to speak and to use the captive audience device, but the Board said, if he did, he had to grant the union's request to give equal opportunity.

The Board's decision in the Bonwit-Teller case was taken to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals. The second circuit refused to enforce the Board's order. It said that nothing in the act required the kind of eye-for-an-eye or tooth-for-a-tooth result which the Board insisted on. The fact that the employer chose to exercise his right to speak through the use of the capitive audience device did not mean the court said that he had to supply a captive audience for the union.

But, the court said, the employer had violated the act. The violation was not the refusal to provide a captive audience for the union. The violation lay in the fact that, by using this device, he was violating his own rule preventing discussion of the union question on company property. This, the court said, was plainly discrimination. If solicitation on the union question was forbidden on company premises, it should be forbidden both to the employer and to the employees. This did not mean, the court said, that the employer had to supply an audience for the union. It only meant that he had to either stop using the premises for antiunion speeches or permit the employees to use the premises for prounion speeches or permit the employees to use the premises for prounion speech among themselves.

There the matter stood until, after the elections of 1952, the personnel of the Board changed. As a result of this

---

[34] Board Policy and Labor Management Relations: Employer Persuasion, New York University Seventh Annual Conference on Labor (1954), p. 79, et seq.

[35] One letter from the employer to all employees; three letters from a petitioner for decertification containing statements which the union asked the employer, without results, to disavow.

[36] *Deming Co.* (107 N. L. R. B. No. 233 (1954)); *Sparkletts Drinking Water Corp.* (107 N. L. R. B. No. 293 (1954)) (in which the new Board rejected the older Board's findings (100 N. L. R. B. 1296) on the same set of facts, explaining that the old Board had not had the full text of the speech before it); *Morganton Full-Fashioned Hosiery Co.* (107 N. L. R. B. No. 312 (1954)) (employer statement "reminded" employees that the union "cost many of you almost 8 months of employment," and then added: "It could happen again"); but cf. *Cooper's, Inc.* (107 N. L. R. B. No. 206 (1954)).

change there came the decision of the Board in the *Livingston Shirt* case (107 NLRB 400 (1953)). At the time the Livingston Shirt case was decided, two members of the Board had been appointed by President Eisenhower: Chairman Farmer and Member Rodgers. Two members of the Board still remained from the prior administration: Member Peterson and Member Murdock. There was one vacancy.

The facts of the Livingston Shirt case were just like the Bonwit-Teller case except for one thing. The company did not have a broad nonsolicitation rule, preventing solicitation among the employees during nonworking time. Therefore, under the decision of the second circuit in the Bonwit-Teller case, there was no unfair labor practice when the employer used the captive audience device and refused to provide a captive audience for the union. The Board could have decided the case simply by following the judicial decision of the second circuit. And this is what Member Peterson in fact did.

Simply following the judicial precedent, however, without castigating the prior administration of the act, however, was not enough for Chairman Farmer and Member Rodgers. They were not content simply to say that because the earlier decisions of the Board had not been supported in the courts, they would not follow those earlier decisions. Instead, they engaged in a denunciation of the entire Bonwit-Teller doctrine and said that the free speech provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act required them to hold, in the name of free speech, that no unfair labor practice could possibly be predicated upon the exercise of free speech by the employer, irrespective of his denial of free speech to the employees.

That this was not just idle language on the part of the Eisenhower appointees was demonstrated in the *NuTone* case (112 NLRB No. 143). In that case, there was no question about providing a captive audience for the union. The question was discrimination in the application of plant rules, pure and simple. The United Steelworkers of America engaged in a vigorous organizational campaign among the employees of the NuTone company. While this campaign was on, the company established a rule prohibiting any distribution of literature of any kind on the union question within the plant.

There is no doubt that an employer has the right to establish such a rule in the interests of keeping the plant clean and preventing litter, if he applies the rule fairly. But the company in this case did not apply its rule fairly. On the very day that it promulgated its rule against distribution of literature by the employees, it itself began an anti-union campaign by distributing antiunion literature within the plant. The foremen were given lengthy diatribes against the union and ordered to distribute them to all employees while they were at work.

By use of this device the company managed to defeat the union in the election. And then, having accomplished this purpose, the company promptly sponsored a company union and, still in violation of its own rules, mimeographed the company union's literature and had the foremen distribute it within the plant.

The union complained to the Board. The Board agreed that the company had violated the act by sponsoring the company union. But it refused to find that the employer violated the act by simultaneously preventing the employees from distributing literature for the union while itself distributing antiunion literature.

The question, the Board said, was the same as in the Livingston Shirt case and must be decided on the basis of the opinion of the two Eisenhower appointees in the Livingston Shirt case.

That is, the employer had the right of free speech and therefore nothing he did in the way of communication of his arguments could be an unfair labor practice, even though he violated his own rules forbidding employees from communicating with each other. In so doing, the Board, with Member Murdock dissenting, delivered itself of this telling statement as to its view on the subject of management's rights as against labor:

> Management prerogative certainly extends far enough so as to permit an employer to make rules that do not bind himself. Otherwise an employer can only enforce a rule he promulgates so long as he conducts himself according to the rule.

RECESS

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a 5-minute recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, at 8 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m. the Senate took a recess until 8 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.

Upon the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled and was called to order by the Presiding Officer.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what the Board said in the NuTone case is that the employer has the right under the act to prevent his employees from communicating among each other by the means of distribution of prounion literature in the plant, but that he can simultaneously himself engage in the distribution of the most extreme kind of antiunion literature.

It is possible to argue both for and against the free-speech provision in the Taft-Hartley Act. It is possible to argue that the action of Congress in passing this provision prevents the Board from prohibiting the use of the captive audience device or other devices to persuade the employees not to join a union. But it defies reason to say, as the Eisenhower members of the Board said, in the NuTone case, that the meaning of the free-speech provision is that an employer has a license to establish rules against the exercise of free speech by his employees which he does not fairly enforce.

Certainly nothing in the decisions of the Board or of the courts prior to the NuTone case justified the plainly antilabor decision in that case. Indeed, almost the same question has been decided by the courts contrary to the Board's position. In *American Furnace Co.* (158 F. 2d 376), a company had forbidden a union to distribute literature within the plant, but, at the same time, had permitted the local businessmen of the community to distribute antiunion literature. The Court of Appeals of the Seventh Circuit in an opinion by Judge Minton, who is now a member of the Supreme Court, made it perfectly clear that this kind of discriminatory action was a violation of the act.

Even the decision of the second circuit in the Bonwit-Teller case clearly says, citing the American Furnace case, that although the employer does not have to provide an audience for the union, it cannot discriminatorily enforce its rules against solicitation or distribution on company property. As the court said, if the company "chose to avail itself of that privilege" it "was, in our opinion, required to abstain from campaigning against the union on the same premises to which the union was denied access; if it should be otherwise, the practical advantage to the employer who was opposed to unionization, would constitute a serious interference with the right of his employees to organize."

The NuTone case has been taken to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. I do not know how that case will result. It may be that the Board will be sustained in its position. But even if it were, that should not end the question, because, when the Board goes to the courts, its opinions as an expert body are given great respect. Decisions which the court itself would not make, as an original matter, may be affirmed because they are made by an expert and supposedly unbiased body. The NuTone case, and the whole history of the Bonwit-Teller doctrine, makes it clear that the very premise upon which the courts review the decisions of the Eisenhower Board is erroneous. That Board is neither expert nor unbiased. And its arrogant statement about management rights in the NuTone case is proof of that conclusion, irrespective of any decision which the courts may make.

14. CONCLUSION

Mr. President, I opened this speech by charging that the Eisenhower Board has rewritten the Taft-Hartley Act to make it more intensely antilabor, and that it has perverted the act's administrative machinery for the same purpose. The cases and examples I have given amply support this charge and they only scratch the surface. For every case I have cited there are additional ones.

Also, there are many cases which the Board may have decided unfairly and unjustly by abusing its enormous fact-finding powers. In biased hands, fact-finding can be a weapon of injustice. Every lawyer knows the cliche: "Let me find the facts and I care not what the law may be. I will achieve whatever results I please."

For every instance of administrative unfairness in the day-to-day handling of cases by the General Counsel and by the field offices which I have been able to cite, I suggest there are many unknown and unreported similar instances which only an investigation could reveal.

What I have given, however, is enough to show the pattern. It is enough, I believe, to make it clear that a thorough investigation of the policies of the General Counsel's office and of the Board should be made by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I call for a complete investigation by Congress in defense of its own prerogatives which I am satisfied are presently being invaded by the Board's and General Counsel's usurpation of legislative power.

Mr. President, in closing, I would be less than appreciative and grateful if I did not extend to the Presiding Officer, who has listened to me throughout the speech, my very sincere thanks for his kindly attention, and for the service he has rendered to the Senate in presiding during the past few hours.

I may say to him, since he is a new Member of the Senate, that this is only what we might call a warm-up to a really long speech. It is merely an example, if it should become necessary before this session is over to move into a longer session, of getting into trim for a possible longer session.

I also wish to say to the staff members of the Senate, those who sit at the desk, that I realize the inconvenience I have caused them by the long session tonight, which was not of my making, in that I had hoped, as I said, to have the speech delivered by 5 or 6 o'clock.

To the official reporters of debates, to whom the Senate is always greatly indebted, I offer my thanks for the courtesy and the devotion to duty which they have extended to the Senate as I have spoken tonight.

EXHIBIT 1

POLICYMAKING BY THE NEW "QUASI-JUDICIAL" NLRB

(This paper is an expended version of an address delivered at the New York University eighth annual conference on labor, June 8, 1955)

(By Mozart G. Ratner, member of the firm of Jacobs, Kamin and Ratner, Chicago, Ill.; until January 1953, Assistant General Counsel in Charge of Supreme Court Litigation, NLRB)

In 1947, when Congress amended the National Labor Relations Act by adopting the Taft-Hartley proposals, it established the independent office of General Counsel of the Board and to that office assigned many of the administrative and prosecuting functions which had previously been performed by the Board. The purpose of stripping the Board of these powers was, as the report of the conference committee explained, to limit the Board "to the performance of quasi-judicial functions."[1] At the same time, Congress increased the membership of the Board from 3 to 5. By March 1954, as a result of resignations and expirations of Board members' terms of office, the Republican administration elected in 1952 had filled a majority of the seats with its own appointees. Since that time, many changes in NLRB policy have been effectuated through the decisional process. It is the purpose of this paper to examine some of these changes and, through them, to evaluate the new Board's performance of its statutory function.

I

Evaluation of recent changes in NLRB policy begins with consideration of the nature of the policymaking role which Congress assigned to the Board. No one doubts that in exercising its quasi-judicial functions the Board possesses a latitude of policymaking discretion greater than that which is vested in the courts. We are told authoritatively that "the constant process of trial and error, on a wider and fuller scale than a single adversary litigation permits, differentiates perhaps more than anything else the administrative from the judicial process."[2] And so, for example, the Board may put to work, in fashioning remedies "to effectuate a policy of the act," understanding and insight which it gains from cumulative experience, even though its conclusions can be neither supported nor validated objectively by the particular record before it.[3]

Again, there is perhaps wider latitude for policymaking than the courts possess in the area of reconciling competing and apparently inconsistent congressional objectives, where one goal cannot be fully attained without overriding completely another, and equally important, goal. This was the nature of the problem which the Board faced in interpreting the sweeping and literally unqualified prohibitions of section 8 (b) (4) (A) of the Taft-Hartley Act[4] in the light of Congress manifest intention, expressed in sections 7[5] and 13,[6] to preserve and not prohibit the utilization by labor organizations of traditional weapons of economic conflict in primary disputes. The same kind of problem was met by the Board in reconciling the apparently unqualified guaranty of the right to organize with employer interests in maintaining plant discipline and effective production. Commending the Board's solution in both cases—the primary-secondary distinction in one; freedom to solicit membership on company property, but only during nonworking hours, in the other—the Supreme Court emphasized that the Board's evaluation of such competing interests and its policy resolution as to which interest should, in particular circumstances, prevail, is entitled to weight.[7]

But the scope of the Board's policymaking discretion is not unlimited. The basic outlines of national labor policy have been laid down by Congress in the statute, and it is that policy, and no other, which the Board is authorized to enforce and to effectuate. It is true today, as it was under the Wagner Act, that Congress policy, as expressed in the statute, "cannot be defeated by the Board's policy"; the Board is not permitted "under the guise of administration to put limitations in the statute not placed there by Congress." In short, the Board may not reform the act "to conform to the Board's idea of correct policy."[8]

The provision for judicial determination, first by the Court of Appeals and then by the Supreme Court of the United States, whether policies adopted by the Board conform to the statutory policy, establishes a superstructure of limitation within which the Board must confine its discretion. It is true, of course, that in deciding whether particular policies adopted by the Board conform to the statute's objectives courts "must guard against the danger of sliding unconsciously from the narrow confines of law into the more spacious domain of policy."[9] And it therefore follows that in not every instance in which the Board's policy is upheld by the Court is the Board thereafter precluded by judicial approval alone from altering its policy. Where, however, judicial approval of Board policy is based upon the Court's appraisal of the terms of the statute where the Court holds, in effect, that the Board's policy is the only one consistent with effectuation of the act's objectives the Board is no longer free to adopt a contrary policy, just as it is not free after the Supreme Court has held a particular Board policy inconsistent with the language or purposes of the act to continue to apply that policy.

Within the framework of these limitations changes of Board policy are inevitable. Judicial disapproval of the Board's interpretation of particular provisions of the act; the administrative process, which invites the Board to review the effects of its policies in the light of its cumulative experience; and the shifts in Board member personnel, each contribute a share to that end. Changes so motivated were plentiful during both Wagner and Taft-Hartley days, prior to the time when a majority of the Board became composed of appointees of the present administration. Of the many examples available, a few must suffice. When the Supreme Court refused to review the decision of the second circuit in *NLRB* v. *American Tube Bending Co.*,[10] the Board bowed and changed its policy of condemning, as illegal interference, antiunion speeches made by an employer for the purpose of influencing the outcome of an election. Adoption of the Woolworth formula,[11] for computing back pay on a quar-

[1] H. R. Rept. No. 510, on H. R. 3020, p. 38, 80th Cong., 1st sess. (1947).

[2] *NLRB* v. *Seven-Up Bottling Co.*, 344 U. S. 344, 349 (1953).

[3] Ibid.

[4] "It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer to engage in, a strike or concerted refusal in the course of their employment to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, materials, or commodities or to perform any services, where an object thereof is * * * forcing or requiring any employer or self-employed person to join any labor or employer organization or any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person" (61 Stat. 141 (1947), 29 U. S. C. A., sec. 158 (b) (4) (A) (Supp., 1954)).

[5] "Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, and shall also have the right to refrain from any or all of such activities except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment as authorized in sec. 158 (a) (3) of this title" (61 Stat. 140 (1947), 29 U. S. C. A., sec. 157 (Supp., 1954)).

[6] "Nothing in this subchapter, except as specifically provided for herein, shall be construed so as to either to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike, or to affect the limitations or qualifications on that right" (61 Stat. 151 (1947), 29 U. S. C. A., sec. 163 (Supp., 1954)).

[7] *NLRB* v. *Denver Bldg. & Construction Trades Council* (341 U. S. 675, 692 (1951)); *Republic Aviation Corp.* v. *NLRB* (324 U. S. 793, 799–800 (1945)).

[8] *Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co.* v. *NLRB* (338 U. S. 355, 363 (1949)), reversing a Board decision under the Wagner Act.

[9] *Phelps Dodge Corp.* v. *NLRB* (313 U. S. 177, 194 (1941)).

[10] 134 F. 2d 993 (C. A. 2d, 1943), cert. denied 320 U. S. 768 (1943).

[11] *F. W. Woolworth Co.* (90 N. L. R. B. 289 (1950)). Prior to Woolworth, the Board totaled the losses incurred by employees who were found to have been discriminatorily discharged during the entire period from the date of their discharge until the date they were offered reinstatement. Against this total of wage losses the Board credited all earnings obtained by the employee during

terly instead of a total period basis, reflected the Board's observation of the cumulative effects of its former policy in defeating offers of reinstatement. The gyrations of Board policy on the question of bargaining rights for foremen, from Union Collieries,[12] to Maryland Drydock,[13] to Packard Motor Car Co.,[14] may fairly be deemed to have reflected the preponderance, at varying times, of a majority of members who held one view or the other on this close policy issue.

It should be emphasized, however, that in 1947, Congress took from the Board a large measure of the policymaking discretion which the Board had theretofore possessed. When it passed Taft-Hartley, Congress did far more than add to the existing provisions of the Wagner Act new provisions defining union unfair labor practices and other regulations which had no counterpart in the earlier law. As the Supreme Court said in *Gullett Gin Co.* v. *NLRB*, "In the course of adopting the 1947 amendments Congress considered in great detail the provisions of the earlier legislation as they had been applied by the Board." [15] In a footnote to this statement the Court said: "Ample evidence of this may be found in the committee reports accompanying the bills which were the basis of the comprehensive 1947 act." [16] In many instances Congress disapproved the Board's prior policy and amended the act to change it. For example, the elimination of "supervisors" from the definition of "employee" in section 2 (3); [17] the "free speech" guarantee embodied in section 8 (c); [18] the requirement, incorporated in section 10 (c),[19] that the Board accord uniform treatment to affiliated and unaffiliated labor organizations, and limitation of the "extend of organization" concept, written into section 9 (b),[20] reflected Congress' judgment that prior Board policy was unsound and should be altered. By the same token, however, Congress after examination approved dozens of Board policies and practices and evidenced its approval by reenacting without change the statutory language on which they rested. Particularly was congressional approval manifest where a Board practice or policy had been followed for a considerable period prior to 1947, and where the policy or practice had received judicial sanction. Thus, in the Gullett Gin case, the Supreme Court noted that the Board's policy of refusing to deduct unemployment compensation benefits from back pay awards issued under section 10 (b) [21] had been followed for many years and had twice been approved by the courts. "Under these circumstances," said the Court, "it is a fair assumption that by reenacting without pertinent modification the provision with which we here deal, Congress accepted the construction placed thereon by the Board and approved by the courts." [22] There is authority for the view that when Congress so examines and adopts an administrative policy as its own, Congress gives to it "the force of law" [23] and the administrative agency thereby loses whatever discretion it may previously have had to alter or depart from it.[24] But even if naked power to alter should remain,[25] it would seem that after such congressional approval, an administrative agency should change its policy only upon a concrete showing that supervening events have reduced or impaired its effectiveness.

II

It is in this background that the changes in Board policy which have been accomplished over the past year, largely by the Eisenhower appointed members of the Board, must be judged. Viewed in proper context, it becomes apparent that some of the changes which have been most bitterly criticized by spokesmen for both labor and employer groups reflect not reversal of policy by the Board in an area where it possesses discretion, but rather recognition that judicial condemnation of past policy compels its abandonment. For example, the decision in *Blue Flash*,[26] overruling the doctrine that employer interrogation is per se an unfair labor practice, was preceded by decisions of at least six circuits which had refused to enforce orders predicated on the *Standard-Coosa-Thatcher* principle.[27] When the Supreme Court denied the Board's petition for certiorari in *NLRB* v. *Winer*,[28] there would seem to have been little left for the Board but gracefully to retreat. So, too, the Board's renunciation of its prior policy against retaliatory employer association lockouts was virtually dictated by the condemnation of that policy in decisions of the Seventh and Ninth Circuits in *Morand Bros. Beverage Co.* v. *NLRB* [29] and *Leonard* v. *NLRB*.[30] Nor can the Board be fairly charged with changing policy when it holds now, reversing earlier cases, that an employee does not enjoy the protection of section 7 [31] when, in the course of his employment, he refuses to cross a picket line at the premises of an employer other than his own, and there is no provision in the collective bargaining contract covering his own employment which vouchsafes that privilege to him.[32] The Supreme Court in *NLRB* v. *Rockaway News Supply Co.*[33] so held and, whatever the personal views of its members might be as to the correctness of that decision, the Board could do nothing but follow.

Limitation, in *Livingston Shirt Corp.*,[34] of the *Bonwit Teller* doctrine,[35] that an employer who makes a preelection speech to a massed assembly of employees on company time and property must give the union an equal opportunity to reply, may likewise be considered a reflection of judicial restrictions, rather than an independent evaluation of policy. For in reviewing the *Bonwit Teller* decision, the Second Circuit, the very court upon whose decision in *NLRB* v. *Clark Bros.*[36] the *Bonwit Teller* policy was based, indicated disapproval of the doctrine except insofar as

---

the entire period. Frequently, when economic conditions improved, employees who had suffered a period of total unemployment later obtained jobs paying more than those from which they had been discriminatorily discharged. The excess earnings in such cases diminished and sometimes wiped out altogether the back-pay obligation which had accrued during the period of unemployment. The result, the Board found, was to provide an incentive to employers to delay offers of reinstatement and to induce employees to waive reinstatement and thereby terminate the back-pay period. It was to avoid these consequences that the Board decided to divide the back-pay period into 3-month terms, thereby diminishing the impact of future employment developments on the back-pay obligations. The Woolworth formula was sustained by the Supreme Court in *NLRB* v. *Seven-Up Bottling Co.*, (344 U. S. 344 (1953)).

[12] 41 N. L. R. B. 961 (1942).

[13] 49 N. L. R. B. 733 (1943).

[14] 64 N. L. R. B. 1212 (1945). In Union Collieries, the Board found that bargaining units composed of supervisory employees were appropriate for purposes of collective bargaining and certified a labor organization as bargaining agent of such a unit. In Maryland Drydocks, the Board found that supervisors could not constitute an appropriate unit. In Packard, the Board reverted to the Union Collieries rule.

[15] 340 U. S. 361, 366 (1951).

[16] See H. Rept. No. 245, 80th Cong., 1st sess. (1947); S. Rept. No. 105, 80th Cong., 1st sess. (1947).

[17] "The term 'employee' * * * shall not include * * * any individual employed as a supervisor. * * *" 61 Stat. 137–38 (1947), 29 U. S. C. A. sec. 152 (3) (Supp., 1954). "The term 'supervisor' means any individual having authority, in the interest of the employer, to hire, transfer, suspend, lay off, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward, or discipline other employees, or responsibility to direct them, or to adjust their grievances, or effectively to recommend such action, if in connection with the foregoing the exercise of such authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but requires the use of independent judgment" (61 Stat. 138 (1947), 29 U. S. C. A. sec. 152 (11) (Supp., 1954)).

[18] "The expressing of any views argument, or opinion, or the dissemination thereof, whether in written, printed, graphic, or visual form, shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice under any of the provisions of this subchapter, if such expression contains no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit" (61 Stat. 142 (1947), 29 U. S. C. sec. 158 (c) (Supp., 1954)).

[19] "[I]n determining whether a complaint shall issue alleging a violation of subsection (a) (1) or (a) (2) of section 158 of this title, and in deciding such cases, the same regulations and rules of decision shall apply irrespective of whether or not the labor organization affected is affiliated with a labor organization national or international in scope" (61 Stat. 147 (1947), 29 U. S. C. A. sec. 160 (c) (Supp., 1954)).

[20] "[T]he Board shall not * * * (2) decide that any craft unit is inappropriate for * * * purposes [of collective bargaining] on the ground that a different unit has been established by a prior Board determination, unless a majority of the employees in the proposed craft unit vote against separate representation" (61 Stat. 143 (1947), 29 U. S. C. A. sec. 159 (b) (Supp., 1954)).

[21] 61 Stat. 146 (1947), 29 U. S. C. A. sec. 160 (b) (Supp., 1954).

[22] 340 U. S. 361, 366 (1951).

[23] *Helvering* v. *R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.* (306 U. S. 110, 116 (1939)).

[24] *Squibb & Sons* v. *Helvering* (98 F. 2d 69, 70 (C. A. 2d, 1938)).

[25] Cf. *Helvering* v. *Reynolds* (313 U. S. 428 (1941)).

[26] N. L. R. B. 591 (1954).

[27] *NLRB* v. *Associated Dry Goods Corp.* (209 F. 2d 593 (C. A. 2d., 1954)); *Wayside Press, Inc.* v. *NLRB* (206 F. 2d 862 (C. A. 9th, 1953)); *NLRB* v. *England Bros., Inc.* (201 F. 2d 395 (C. A. 1st 1953)); *NLRB* v. *Arthur Winer, Inc.* (194 F. 2d 370 (C. A. 7th, 1952)); *NLRB* v. *Montgomery Ward & Co.* (192 F. 2d 160 (C. A. 2d, 1951)); *NLRB* v. *Tenn. Coach Co.* (191 F. 2d 546 (C. A. 6th, 1951)); *Sax* v. *NLRB* (171 F. 2d 769 (C. A. 7th, 1948)); *Jacksonville Paper Co.* v. *NLRB* (137 F. 2d 148 (C. A. 5th, 1943)). See Standard-Coosa-Thatcher (85 N. L. R. B. 1358 (1949)).

[28] 194 F. 2d 370 (C. A. 7th, 1952), cert. denied (344 U. S. 819 (1952)).

[29] 190 F. 2d 576 (C. A. 7th, 1951).

[30] 197 F. 2d 435 (C. A. 9th, 1952).

[31] Statute quoted note 5 supra.

[32] Auto Parts Co. (107 N. L. R. B. 242 (1953)).

[33] 345 U. S. 71 (1953).

[34] 107 N. L. R. B. 400 (1953).

[35] 96 N. L. R. B. 608 (1951). The Bonwit Teller case enunciated, as an alternative ground for decision, the rule that an employer who makes a preelection speech on company time and property to his employees must, if the union involved so requests, afford the union an opportunity to address the employees under comparable conditions. The Livingston case rejected the doctrine, as thus broadly phrased, and limited its application to instances in which the employer who gave such a speech also had in effect an illegally broad rule barring union solicitation on his premises.

[36] 163 F. 2d 373 (C. A. 2d, 1947).

it reflected discriminatory application of a no-solicitation rule.[37]

By the same token, however, the one case which is frequently pointed to for the purpose of demonstrating that the policy changes effected by the reconstituted Board are not exclusively antilabor justifies no such claim. It is true that in Whitin Machine Works,[38] the Board phrased the duty of the employer to supply to the union information pertinent to collective bargaining in somewhat broader terms than had earlier Board cases. And in so doing the Board reversed at least one decision in which the duty had been subjected to restrictive qualifications.[39] But the duty itself had been held to flow from the statute in an unbroken line of court decisions handed down before Whitin.[40] The rationale for enforcement of the Board order in those cases implied, at least, that the duty was as broad as Whitin's subsequent statement of it. The alacrity with which the courts of appeals have enforced Whitin,[41] and subsequent decisions based upon the test therein enunciated,[42] adds weight to the view that, to the extent Whitin marked a change in Board policy, it was a change dictated not so much by the individual opinions of the Board members as by the dictates of judicial authority.

Another group of policy changes, including a number of cases which have been most widely commented upon during the past year, appear to reflect little more than reappraisal and adjustment of prior policies in an effort better to effectuate objectives which, themselves, are indisputably those adopted by Congress. In this class fall such cases as American Potash & Chemical Corp.,[43] altering, to some degree, the prior rules for craft and departmental severance, and Pacific Intermountain Express Co.,[44] and Mendon Co., [45] altering the method of tallying ballots in Globe elections [46] so as to give to voters in the Globe units an opportunity, if they so choose, to influence the outcome in the production and maintenance unit. In this category, too, fall such decisions as Peerless Plywood,[47] establishing a 24-hour moratorium on preelection speeches to employees on company time and property. The wisdom and efficacy of the Peerless policy may be debatable, but few will deny that its objective—to safeguard employee voters against undue pressures—is firmly anchored in the statute.

III

Official announcements proclaim that the new Board recognizes the limitations upon its policymaking function. Speaking for his colleagues, as well as himself, Chairman Farmer stated: "We are not authorized to make labor policy; we enforce a specific statute, and that is all."[48] In the same speech, Chairman Farmer stressed that it was the Board's intention "to administer the law as written and as intended by Congress."

In the past 18 months, however, there have been a considerable number of changes in Board policy which appear to be inexplicable either as reflections of judicial compulsion or as products of appraisal based on cumulative experience of the effect of prior policy upon the effectuation of statutory objectives. These policy changes can be attributed to the change in composition of the Board. For that reason they constitute a true barometer of the direction in which Board policy is moving. Since they mirror the significantly different views of the new members, they disclose the nature of the objectives which the Board, as reconstituted, now seeks to promote; and they provide opportunity to appraise the real views of the new majority as the nature of the function which is theirs to perform.

Refusal to assert jurisdiction

Quantitatively, the most significant change effected by the new Board was the revision of jurisdictional policy standards, announced in July 1954 and explicated, several months later, in *Breeding Transfer Co.*[49] Superficially, the new standards bear striking resemblance to the old; with relatively minor exceptions the changes were accomplished by revising upward the dollar volume of interstate commerce which must be affected before the Board will assert jurisdiction. But the resemblance is superficial only. What distinguishes the new policy from the old is the motivation which produced it.

Prior to July 1954 the Board declined to exercise jurisdiction over certain classes of relatively local enterprises which were subject to the act, because limitations of budget, available personnel, and time precluded it from processing and deciding all of the cases which were presented to it. As a practical matter, since the Board could not handle all the cases, it was compelled to decline to exercise jurisdiction over some. Reasonably, it concluded that rather than declining jurisdiction haphazardly, it should decline jurisdiction by category of enterprise affected, and selected as a class those enterprises which least affected the economy of the Nation as a whole.

But, in making that choice, and in formulating the 1950 standards, the Board was fully conscious that in the Taft-Hartley Act, Congress had not restricted the act's coverage so as to leave out enterprises of a local nature. Taft-Hartley, like Wagner, is a classic example of Congress' exercise of the fullest scope of the commerce power. It contrasts sharply with the wage-hour law, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and others, in which Congress chose not to extend the reach of the Federal law to the constitutional boundary. Since Congress intended the National Labor Relations Act to apply to all enterprises and all employees who were subject to Federal power under the commerce clause,[50] the Board recognized that its obligation was to administer the act to the widest possible extent, refraining only where practical necessity compelled it to do so.

We are told authoritatively by Members Murdock and Peterson, in their dissents in the Breeding case, and the majority does not even challenge their statement, that application of the 1950 standards had not resulted, by July 1954, in any serious backlog of cases either in Washington or the field. The Board members were suffering no dearth of time in which to consider important cases. No budget cut or sudden rise in caseload suggested that it would be unduly difficult in the future to handle inflow based upon the old standards.

Why, then, the change? We quote from Member Murdock's dissenting opinion:

"The slash in jurisdiction now consummated has been frequently promised and predicted in public speeches of members of the majority during the past year in keeping with an announced belief in the philosophy of returning a greater share of Federal authority to State and local governments. Typical of such utterances are the following:

" 'The one thing this Nation needs more than anything else to maintain its vigor and strength is a revival of interest by local government in tackling and solving the problems of their local people. That is why I strongly advocate a gradual but nevertheless marked withdrawal of the hand of the NLRB from strictly local disputes.' " (Address of Chairman Guy Farmer, NLRB, before the Joint Conference of the Industrial Relations Committees of the Edison Electric Institute, the Southeastern Electric Exchange, and the Southwestern Personnel Group, New Orleans, La., January 21, 1954.)

" 'Regardless of the legal scope of the commerce clause, the Federal agencies should, as a matter of self-restraint, impose limits on their own power and thus provide the opportunity for local problems to be settled on a local basis by the citizens of the community in which those problems arise.' (Chairman Farmer before the National Conference of Business Paper Editors, Washington, D. C., October 21, 1953, after noting that the jurisdiction of the Board was to be reexamined.)

" 'The first of these actions (which should be taken by the new members) is to limit the jurisdiction of the Board—to free it from the consideration of hundreds, if not thousands, of cases which are markedly local in nature and in impact. Such cases should, in keeping with our American system of constitutional government, be dealt with by the localities and the States.' (Member Rodgers before the American Bar Association, Atlanta, Ga., March 15, 1954.)

" 'This is, after all, a Federal state, and it is the underlying philosophy of our Government, and I might add of our President, that the States and communities not only should, but must, assume and discharge the responsibility of local affairs. I believe that this agency must use sound restraint in the exercise of its jurisdiction. I believe that this agency should assist this administration in pulling back the outer reaches of Federal bureaucracy, and thus encourage rather than impede the development of our communities and our states.' (Member Rodgers before the National Retail Dry Goods Association, New York, N. Y., January 12, 1954, in noting that 'Probably the most pressing administrative problem confronting the

---

[37] Compare *NLRB* v. *Bonwit Teller, Inc.* (197 F. 2d 640 (C. A. 2d, 1952)) with *NLRB* v. *F. W. Woolworth Co.* (214 F. 2d 78 (C. A. 6th, 1954)).

[38] 108 NLRB 1537 (1954).

[39] *Crompton-Highlands Mills* (70 NLRB 206 (1946)).

[40] *Leland-Gifford Co.* (95 NLRB 1306 (1951)), enforced in *NLRB* v. *Leland-Gifford Co.* (200 F. 2d 620 (C. A. 1st, 1952)); *NLRB* v. *Jacobs Mfg. Co.* (196 F. 2d 680 (C. A. 2d 1952)); *Union Mfg. Co.* v. *NLRB* (179 F. 2d 511 (C. A. 5th, 1950)); *NLRB* v. *J. J. Allison & Co.* (165 F. 2d 766) (C. A. 6th, 1948), citing *J. I. Case Co.* v. *NLRB* (321 U. S. 332 (1944)) and *May Department Stores Co.* v. *NLRB* (326 U. S. 376, 1945)); *Aluminum Ore Co.* v. *NLRB* (131 F. 2d 485 (C. A. 7th 1942)); *Heart Corp.* (102 NLRB 637 (1953)); *Boston Herald-Traveler Corp.* (102 NLRB 627 (1953)); *Hekman Furniture Co.* (101 NLRB 631 (1952)), enforced *NLRB* v. *Hekman Furniture Co.* (207 F. 2d 561 (C. A. 6th, 1953)); *Montgomery Ward & Co.* (90 NLRB 1244 (1950)); *Electric Auto-Lite Co.* (89 NLRB 1192 (1950)); *B. F. Goodrich Co.* (89 NLRB 1151 (1950)).

[41] *NLRB* v. *Whitin Machine Works* (217 F. 2d 593 (C. A. 4th, 1954)), cert. denied (349 U. S. 905 (1955)).

[42] *NLRB* v. *Item Co.* (220 F. 2d 956 (C. A. 5th, 1955)), cert. denied (24 U. S. L. Week 3094 (Oct. 10, 1955)); *Truitt Mfg. Co.* (110 NLRB 856 (1954)); *Boston Herald-Traveler Corp.* (110 NLRB 2097 (1954)).

[43] 107 NLRB 1418 (1954).

[44] 105 NLRB 480 (1953).

[45] 108 NLRB 310 (1954), as amended by 108 NLRB 309 (1954).

[46] So called because the first such election was conducted in *The Globe Machine and Stamping Co.* (3 NLRB 294 (1937)).

[47] 107 NLRB 427 (1953).

[48] Before the 14th Annual Law Institute, University of Tennessee College of Law, Nov. 6, 1953.

[49] 110 NLRB 493 (1954).

[50] *Amalgamated Association* v. *Wisconsin Employment Relations Board* (340 U. S. 383, 391 (1951)).

Board at this time is the problem of jurisdiction.' "[51]

On the other hand, we are assured by the majority in the Breeding case that "desire to establish broader State jurisdiction is in no wise a factor in our decision."[52] Taking the majority at its word, does this mean that the new policy is not the product of purely political considerations, of a desire to "assist this administration in pulling back the outer reaches of Federal bureaucracy?" Not at all. It serves merely to indicate that the new majority is conscious that section 10 (a),[53] which authorizes the Board to cede its jurisdiction over local enterprises to the States but which prohibits cession where State law is inconsistent with the national act, prevents the Board from transferring regulatory power to the States by the simpler device of declining to exercise its own jurisdiction.[54]

Since State power is not enhanced by the Board's increased abstention, the principal result of the change is to increase substantially the number of persons from whom legal remedies for infringement of their statutory rights and peaceful processes for resolution of their representation disputes are withheld. To square a policy which has that result with the announced objectives of the statute would take a feat of legerdemain. Congress established the Board to remedy unfair labor practices and to resolve questions concerning representation, not deliberately to leave them unremedied and unresolved. The policy of the Congress which passed the Taft-Hartley Act is to regulate labor relations in all enterprises, great or small, which come within Federal power, and to make that regulation effective to the outerlimits of the Board's capacity. If a change in statutory policy is desired, that may be accomplished by submitting appropriate proposals to Congress.

There seems little room for doubt that the Board's new jurisdictional standards are designed to increase the pressure on Congress to amend section 10 (a) so as to facilitate the exercise of State jurisdiction in areas in which the Board declines to act. It is of course, impossible to predict the outcome. But it may be well to bear in mind that the restrictive cession clause of section 10 (a) was virtually the only provision of the entire act that both supporters and opponents of Taft-Hartley favored.[55] The reasons for excluding State regulation of labor relations inconsistent with Taft-Hartley's policies are as valid today as they were in 1947, and they apply, today, as then, with equal vigor to local as to nationwide establishments. In any event, the act has not yet been amended.

Erosion of employee rights guaranteed by section 7

We turn now to a group of cases, of critical importance because they deal with the scope of section 7's protection of concerted activity,[56] in which the new Board has made major changes in policy. In contrast to the cases earlier discussed, these changes cannot be justified on the ground that the courts had disapproved the earlier Board policy. Nor can they be related to any congressional changes in statutory language or policy. These changes were made despite the fact that Congress reenacted the relevant statutory language in haec verba and the fact that the courts had unanimously and consistently, both before and after the Taft-Hartley amendments, supported the very resolutions which the new Board rejects.

In the *B. V. D.* case,[57] the Board denied reinstatement and back pay to unfair labor practices strikes who continued peacefully to picket after acts of violence had been committed against the employer's property by unidentified third parties. The Board conceded that the strikers neither instigated, participated in, nor authorized the acts of violence. It found no conspiracy between the strikers and others to commit illegal acts. It admitted that the strikers neither had nor exercised any control over the unidentified guilty parties. Nevertheless, the Board held that those strikers who continued to picket after the acts of violence had been committed must be deemed to have approved and ratified the acts of violence. To avoid forfeiture of the right to picket after the acts of violence were committed, the Board held, the strikers were required by admonishment, denunciation or public pronouncement to dissociate themselves from the violence. For having failed to comply with this previously non-existent condition, those strikers who continued to picket were denied redress.

The new Board's policy of denying relief to strikers who are themselves innocent of wrongdoing, because others engaged in reprehensible and unlawful conduct during the course of the strike, flies in the face of an unbroken line of court decisions holding such denial improper.[58]

The courts have held that misconduct of some persons during a strike or on a picket line is not to be attributed to others in the absence of proof identifying such others as participants in the misconduct. Since these cases bar attribution to strikers of the guilty deeds of other strikers, they demonstrate how drastic a change the new Board made, when, in *B. V. D.*, it attributed to innocent strikers the misdeeds of unidentified parties, who, for all the strikers or the Board knew, may well have been agents provocateurs.

The Boards pronouncement that, to retain their statutory remedies after the unauthorized misconduct occurred, the strikers would have had to abandon the picket line demeans and limits the right to strike, and its concomitant, the right to picket, which Congress in the act so carefully preserved.[59] Particularly with reference to disputes generated by unfair labor practices, Congress deliberately preserved the right to strike and picket, in addition to, and not in lieu of, the administrative remedies which it provided through the Board.[60] To compel employees to forego their right to picket peacefully merely because unauthorized and unidentified third parties have engaged in acts of violence is to attach limitations and qualifications upon the right to strike which are nowhere expressed or implied in the act itself, and that flies in the face of the express language of section 13.[61]

What objectives is it that the Board by its new policy seeks to promote? Ostensibly, so the majority opinion says, the Board desires to discourage strike-connected misconduct. But we are not told how "admonishment, denunciation, or public pronouncement" by strikers of the acts of unidentified outsiders over whom the strikers have no control could possibly be efficacious of that end. There is an even deeper flaw. Even if the Board's new policy could curb strike-connected violence, it would still be beyond the Board's province to adopt it.

---

[51] 110 N. L. R. B. 493 (502–503 (1954)).

[52] Ibid, at 497.

[53] "The Board is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unfair labor practice * * * affecting commerce. This power shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, law or otherwise: *Provided*, That the Board is empowered by agreement with any agency of any State or Territory to cede to such agency jurisdiction over any cases in any industry (other than mining, manufacturing, communications, and transportation except where predominantly local in character) even though such cases may involve labor disputes affecting commerce, unless the provision of the State or Territorial statute applicable to the determination of such cases by such agency is inconsistent with the corresponding provision of this subchapter or has received a construction inconsistent therewith" (61 Stat. 146 (1947), 29 U. S. C. A. sec. 160 (Supp., 1954)).

[54] *Retail Clerks* v. *Your Food Stores* (225 F. 2d 659 (C. A. 10th, 1955)); *New York State Labor Relations Board* v. *Wags Transportation System* (130 N. Y. S. 2d 731 (1954), aff'd 134 N. Y. S. 2d 603 (1954)); *Universal Car Co.* v. *International Association of Machinists* (35 L. R. R. M. 2087 (1954)). It should be noted, however, that the Supreme Court has recently twice reserved the question whether the States are empowered to regulate in areas where the N. L. R. B. declines to assert jurisdiction. *Garner* v. *Teamsters Union* (346 U. S. 485 (1953)); *Bldg. & Construction Trades Council* v. *Kinard Construction Co.* (346 U. S. 933 (1954)).

[55] S. Rept. No. 105, 80th Cong., 1st sess. 26 (1947). See minority views, ibid., pt. 2, 38, agreeing as to this feature of the legislation.

[56] Statute quoted note 5 supra.

[57] 110 N. L. R. B. 1412 (1954).

[58] Preamendment decisions: *Republic Steel Co.* v. *N. L. R. B.* (107 F. 2d 472, 479 (C. A. 3d, 1939)); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Stackpole Carbon Co.* (105 F. 2d 167, 176 (C. A. 3d, 1939)); *Stewart Die Casting Co.* v. *N. L. R. B.* (114 F. 2d 849, 856 (C. A. 7th, 1940), cert. denied 312 U. S. 680 (1941)); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Quality & Service Laundry Co.* (131 F. 2d 182, 183 (C. A. 4th, 1942, enforcing 39 N. L. R. B. 970, 988 (1942)); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Ohio Calcium Co.* (133 F. 2d 721, 726 (C. A. 6th, 1943)); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Mt. Clemens Pottery Co.* (147 F. 2d 262, 268 (C. A. 6th, 1945)).

Postamendment decisions: *N. L. R. B.* v. *Marshall Car Wheel & Foundry Co.* (218 F. 2d 409, 417, 418 (C. A. 5th, 1955)); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Deena Artware Inc.* (198 F. 2d 645, 652 (C. A. 6th, 1952), cert. denied 345 U. S. 906 (1952)); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Wallick* (198 F. 2d 477, 485 n. 10 (C. A. 3d, 1952)); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Crowley's Milk Co.* (208 F. 2d 444, 446 (C. A. 3d, 1953)).

The Supreme Court has recognized that it is "necessary to identify individual employees * * * and to recognize that their discharges were for causes which were separable from 'the concerted activity' of others"; at the same time, it held, it is "equally important to identify employees * * * who participated in simultaneous concerted activities" with others "but who refrained from joining the others in separable acts of insubordination, disobedience, or disloyalty" (*N. L. R. B.* v. *Local Union No. 1229* (346 U. S. 464, 474, 475 (1953)), affirming in this respect the rule stated by the Board at 94 N. L. R. B. 1507, 1512, 1513 (1951)).

The rule requiring actual personal participation in wrongdoing is likewise shown by the holdings that an employee who has not engaged in strike misconduct, but to whom the employer has denied reinstatement in reliance on the employers honest but mistaken belief that he had, must be put back to his job with compensation for lost time. *N. L. R. B.* v. *Industrial Cotton Mills* (208 F. 2d 87, 89, 93 (C. A. 4th, 1953), cert. denied 347 U. S. 935 (1954)); *Cusano* v. *N. L. R. B.* (190 F. 2d 898, 902 (C. A. 3d 1951)); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Cambria Clay Products Co.* (215 F. 2d 48, 53 (C. A. 6th, 1954)). The first two cases were cited with approval in *Radio Officers Union* v. *N. L. R. B.* (347 U. S. 17, 45 n. 53 (1954)).

[59] *UAW* v. *O'Brien* (339 U. S. 454, 456, 457 (1950)); *Amalgamated Ass'n* v. *Wisconsin Employment Relations Board* (340 U. S. 383, 389 (1951)); *N. L. R. B.* v. *International Rice Milling Co.* (341 U. S. 665, 672 n. 6 (1951)).

[60] Congress voted down the provision of the House bill, section 12 (a) (3) (c) (ii) of H. R. 3020 (1947), which would have prohibited strikes "to remedy practices for which an administrative remedy is available under this act."

[61] Statute quoted note 6 supra.

The Board was not commissioned by Congress to put an end to strike-connected misconduct, regardless of its source. Assuming the stated objective to be proper, still the Board "is not free to set up any system of penalties which it would deem adequate" to achieve it.[62]

In section 2 (13) of the act, Congress enjoined the Board to impute guilt only under common law agency principles. Summing up those principles the Supreme Court has said: "Guilt with us remains individual and personal * * *. It is not a matter of mass application." [63] As far as the new Board is concerned, however, if any misconduct occurs in connection with a strike, the strikers are now guilty en masse until proven innocent. Moreover, strikers can safely establish their innocence only by foregoing the exercise of those very rights which the statute was enacted to preserve and protect. The third circuit predicted in *Republic Steel Corp.* v. *N. L. R. B.*[64] that to adopt such a policy as the Board has now adopted would make the "rights afforded to employees by the act * * * indeed illusory." The real purpose behind its adoption seems to be just that.

Another noteworthy inroad upon the settled area of protection of employee concerted activities was made by the new Board in *Terry Poultry Co.*[65] In this case, two employees left their work without notifying their foreman, for the purpose of presenting to the plant superintendent a grievance arising over their foreman's mishandling of their complaint about certain working conditions. For this, they were discharged. Acknowledging that the concerted presentation of grievances is activity protected by section 7, the new Board members nevertheless sustained the discharge on the ground that the employees thereby violated a company rule prohibiting employees from leaving work without notifying their foreman. The company's right to enforce its rule, the Board held, took precedence over the employees' right to present grievances during working hours.

The new policy, to accord greater weight to the right of the employer to make and enforce plant rules than to the statutory rights of employees to engage in concerted activities, repudiates a substantial body of judicial precedent which dictates precisely the contrary evaluation.[66] The courts, like the Board in earlier days, have always recognized that to the extent that section 7 permits concerted activity, such as presentation of grievances, or strikes, to proceed during working hours, the employer cannot be permitted to restrict, curtail, or limit those activities by plant rule or otherwise. If plant rules and the right to enforce them were decisive, employers could deprive the right to strike of all statutory sanction by the simple expedient of adopting a rule prohibiting employee refusal to perform regular duties during working hours. As members Murdock and Peterson stated in their dissent:

"In giving controlling effect to the plant rule as justifying discharge, our majority colleagues are simply refusing to recognize established judicial doctrine. Were the law to the contrary, little would be left of the employees' statutory right to engage in a temporary work stoppage for mutual aid and protection. The majority's attempt to justify the restriction on the employees' exercise of this statutory right ignores the fact that leaving the job is as much a part of the concerted activity as the actual presentation of the grievance to management, as the Board and court decisions plainly establish. Although there may be some interference with production resulting from such a temporary work stoppage, it is purely incidental as it is in the case of a strike and may not afford a legal basis for denying the employees protection from discharge." [67]

The significance of this reversal of policy can hardly be over-emphasized. Does the new Board really believe that Congress' policy of minimizing industrial conflict by fostering the prompt presentation of grievances will be better effectuated by compelling dissatisfied employees to remain at their work stations until their employer sees fit to release them? Is not such a policy, as the third circuit observed in *NLRB* v. *Kennametal, Inc.*,[68] apt to transform minor grievances, easily adjusted, into full-fledged strikes? Or, can it be that the new Board is concerned, not with the impact of its policy upon the mitigation of industrial strife, but upon revising the relative rights and privileges of employer and employee to the end that employers may escape the burden which the exercise of statutory rights by their employees entails?

Curtailment of the economic power of labor organizations

The advent of the new majority has brought a significant trend toward treating as secondary, and prohibited by section 8 (b) (4), strike tactics of labor organizations which previous policy treated as primary and protected. Restriction of the "roving situs" [69] doctrine to cases in which the primary employer does not have a permanent place of business which can be picketed,[70] the new qualifications on picketing where employees of secondary employers are present at the primary situs,[71] and many others,[72] all tend to strengthen the hand of the primary employer in resisting union demands, and, in turn, weaken the power of the union to bring effective pressure upon the employer who is its adversary in the dispute.

But the most important of the policy reversals accomplished by the new majority in this area is the decision in McAllister Transfer, Inc.[73] As two of the new, and the two dissenting, members of the Board saw it, the issue in McAllister was identical with the issue which had earlier been decided in *Conway's Express*,[74] namely, whether a "hot cargo" clause [75] in a collective bargaining contract between the union and a secondary employer removed nonhandling of the primary employer's goods from the scope of the section 8 (b) (4) (A) prohibition. In Conway, and again in Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., [76] the Board had held that it did, and the second circuit had expressly approved that construction of the act in affirming the Board's order in Conway. In McAllister, however, two of the new appointees voted to reverse Conway. They held, in short, that "hot cargo" contracts were contrary to public policy; that secondary employers could not, by contract, waive immunity against refusals by their employees to handle unfair goods, and that, since the contracts were contrary to public policy, they could not be relied upon as defenses to unfair labor practice charges.

Chairman Farmer revolted. He observed that his newly appointed colleagues, in their freewheeling divination of public policy, were glossing over the plain language of the statute.[77] The language shows, said the Chairman, that Congress deliberately left secondary employers free to boycott primary employers. "I suppose," said the Chairman, "that what an employer may do he may also agree in advance to do." [78] The Chairman reminded his colleagues that the Board is not "the guardian of the public welfare, except to the extent we are charged with responsibility for administering a particular statute." [79] So far did his colleagues depart from the accepted norm of administrative policymaking that the Chairman found it necessary to say: "Judges must resist the temptation to devise legal precepts to accommodate their moral judgments that this conduct or that is either laudable or indefensible." [80]

Neither space nor the subject matter permits detailed analysis here of the McAllister opinions. But certain observations are pertinent, for they disclose how sweeping a departure the new Board members have made from the policies which Congress enacted into law. For example, the two Board members who would reverse Conway deny that a labor organization may bargain collectively to exclude from the course of employment, as that term is used in section 8 (b) (4), the handling of unfair goods. "Course of employment," say these members, includes, as a matter of law, all action taken by employees, qua employees, and excludes only action taken by employees as ultimate consumers. But definition and limitation of the course of employment is one of the oldest and most fundamental of the objectives

---

[62] *Republic Steel Corp.* v. *N. L. R. B.* (311 U. S. 7, 12 (1940)).

[63] *Kotteakos* v. *United States* (328 U. S. 750, 772 (1946)).

[64] 107 F. 2d 472, 479 (C. A. 3d, 1939).

[65] 109 N. L. R. B. 1097 (1954).

[66] *NLRB* v. *Southern Silk Mills, Inc.* (209 F. 2d 155 (C. A. 6th, 1953), cert. denied 347 U. S. 976 (1954)) (spontaneous walkouts and temporary work stoppages to protest excessive heat); *Modern Motors, Inc.*, v. *NLRB* (198 F. 2d 925 (C. A. 8th, 1952)) (stopping work and concertedly presenting a grievance concerning a Christmas bonus grievance); *NLRB* v. *J. I. Case Co., Bettendorf Works* (198 F. 2d 919 (C. A. 8th, 1952), cert. denied 345 U. S. 917 (1953)) (walking off the job without permission and attempting to incite plant walkout in protest against discharge of a union steward); *Kitty Clover, Inc.*, v. *NLRB* (208 F. 2d 212 (C. A. 8th, 1953)) (leaving work in mass to seek interview with employer concerning a grievance); *NLRB* v. *Globe Wireless, Ltd.* (193 F. 2d 748 (C. A. 9th, 1951)) (leaving job to protest discharge of fellow employee); *NLRB* v. *Kennametal, Inc.* (182 F. 2d 817 (C. A. 3d, 1950)) (engaging in work stoppage to secure higher wages); *Gullett Gin Co., Inc.*, v. *NLRB* (179 F. 2d 499 (C. A. 5th, 1950)) (discussion of wage grievances during working hours).

[67] 109 NLRB 1097, 1102 (1954).

[68] 182 F. 2d 817, 819 (C. A. 3d, 1950).

[69] The roving situs doctrine allows picketing of the instrumentalities of an employer which are not stationary. Common examples are trucks, buses, ships, etc. Reference to the doctrine can be found in *Schultz Refrigerated Service, Inc.* (87 N. L. R. B. 502 (1949)); *Moore Dry Dock Co.* (92 N. L. R. B. 547 (1950)); *Crowley's Milk Co.* (102 N. L. R. B. 996 (1953)), enforced 208 F. 2d 444 (C. A. 3d, 1954)). See also 19th Annual Report, NLRB, p. 106 et se.q (1954).

[70] *Washington Coca-Cola Bottling Works* (107 N. L. R. B. 299 (1953)).

[71] *Professional and Business Men's Life Ins. Co.* (108 N. L. R. B. 363 (1954)).

[72] E. g., *Royal Typewriter Co.* (111 N. L. R. B. No. 57, 35 L. R. R. M. 1474 (1955)); *Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.* (110 N. L. R. B. 455 (1954)); *Columbia-Southern Chemical Corp.* (110 N. L. R. B. 206 (1954)); *Independent Lumber Corp.* (108 N. L. R. B. 1323 (1954)); *Climax Molybdenum Co.* (108 N. L. R. B. 318 (1954)).

[73] 110 N. L. R. B. 1769 (1954).

[74] 87 N. L. R. B. 972 (1949), enforced 195 F. 2d 906 (C. A. 2d, 1952).

[75] A hot cargo clause is an agreement between a union and an employer (or group of employers) by which the employer agrees in advance that he will not subsequently handle, during the contract period, any shipment of goods which had been shipped by struck employers. See *Rabouin* v. *NLRB* (195 F. 2d 906, 912 (C. A. 2d, 1952)).

[76] 105 N. L. R. B. 740 (1953).

[77] *McAllister Transfer, Inc.* (110 N. L. R. B. 1769, 1788 (1054)).

[78] Ibid., at 1789.

[79] Ibid., at 1788.

[80] Ibid.

of collective bargaining. To prescribe the kind of work which may be assigned to particular employees and classifications of employees is standard practice in the vast majority of collective bargaining contracts obtained by industrial as well as by craft unions. If Congress intended in Taft-Hartley to make so serious an inroad upon historical collective-bargaining practice as to outlaw bargaining about the course and scope of employment, one would reasonably suppose that in the course of the hearings, debates, and reports on the act, someone would have thought to mention the subject. But the legislative history is completely silent on the point. Manifestly, Congress did not intend to affect the right of unions to bargain for restrictions upon the scope and course of employment.

Confirmation lies in the fact that, admittedly, Congress left employers free to exclude the handling of unfair goods from the course of their employees' employment. If Congress did not preclude employers from doing that unilaterally, it would take specific statutory language to warrant the conclusion that Congress precluded employers from contracting with a labor organization to do it. That the new Board members do not like the results of such a contract does not empower them, as the Supreme Court emphasized in *Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co.* v. *N. L. R. B.*,[81] to "reform" the contract to "conform to the Board's idea of correct policy."

In permitting employers who have bound themselves to "hot goods" clauses to renege on their agreements and thereby brand union reliance upon their contract rights an unfair labor practice, Chairman Farmer's opinion also departs from principles rooted deeply in the law and in Board policy. For example, in *Briggs-Indiana Corp.*[82] the Board refused to lend its sanction to a union which sought to secure representation rights for a group of employees whom it had, by contract with the employer, agreed not to organize or represent. Although the union's contractual undertaking clearly foreclosed the employees from effective exercise of their statutory right to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and although the employees were not parties to the contract, the Board refused to facilitate the union's avoidance of its contractual commitment. To lend its sanction to contract breaking, said the Board, "is not the business of the Government of the United States." And, it may be asked, if that was not the proper business of Government under the Wagner Act, before Congress had provided specific remedies for enforcement of collective-bargaining agreements, how much less is it the Government's business under Taft-Hartley, in which Congress made adherence to and enforcement of collective-bargaining contracts a cornerstone of national labor policy?

None of the three members who voted to sustain the complaint in McAllister purport to repudiate Briggs-Indiana. Wherein lies the distinction between the two cases? Can it be that the difference is that the statutory policy affected by the contract in Briggs-Indiana is the freedom of employees to bargain collectively, whereas the policy promoted by the majority in McAllister is the lessening of strike pressure on primary employers? McAllister, surely, is a bold departure from the maxim that what is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander.

Just as the new Board members are misusing section 8 (b) (4) to impose novel and unwarranted curbs upon the power of unions to engage in economic conflict, so they are distorting section 8 (b) (2)[83] to diminish the prestige of unions and reduce their influence in establishing and maintaining conditions of employment. Perhaps the clearest example of this is Pacific Intermountain Express,[84] followed in North East Texas Motor Lines, Inc.[85] In that case a collective bargaining contract provided that the union was to have exclusive authority to resolve all disputes over seniority, and the union bound itself in that contract not to base any seniority decision on the union membership or nonmembership of any employee in the bargaining unit. The Board, however, was not satisfied with the bona fides of the union's promise. It observed that the records in the employer's files would be more reliable than any information the union might have available to it with respect to seniority. It then concluded:

"It is to be presumed, we believe, that such delegation [of power to the union to settle seniority disputes] is intended to and in fact will be used by the union to encourage membership in the union."[86]

On the face of it, this is far worse even than holding that the union is guilty until proven innocent. The Board denies the union the right to act at all merely because the Board presumes that it will not act innocently. Where did the Board suddenly acquire the power to indulge that kind of presumption of future guilt? The elaborate procedural structure established by Congress for the trial of charges of unfair labor practice becomes a farce if the Board can disregard the absence of past violations and predicate an order to desist from a proposed course of lawful conduct on its mere presumption that future violations may develop. It is precisely for this reason that the courts long ago held that the Board was not empowered to enter cautionary orders against future violations in the absence of a finding, sustained by evidence, that similar violations had occurred in the past.[87]

Denial to the union of its contractually won privilege of settling seniority disputes on the ground that the union may utilize that privilege to discriminate is the precise equivalent of depriving an employer of the right to bargain for unilateral control over, for example, merit increases. It is as reasonable to presume that an employer will use his power to grant merit increases discriminatorily to undermine the union as to presume that the union would exercise its power to settle seniority disputes discriminatorily to strengthen its position. One can perhaps visualize the storm of protest from employers and from the bar were the Board to attempt so to trench on employer prerogatives.

The Board's determination that unions should not be permitted to bargain for unilateral control over the resolution of seniority disputes is another attempt to substitute for Congress' policy a contrary policy which the new Board members prefer. In *NLRB* v. *American National Insurance Co.*,[88] the Supreme Court held that section 8 (d) permitted each party to bargain for unilateral control of subjects in the field of wages, hours, and conditions of employment. Seniority rights are, of course, such a subject. Indisputably, the employer is free to bargain for unilateral control over resolution of seniority disputes. Yet the Board precludes the union from doing likewise.

The Board's rationale, that the employer is in a better position than the union to determine seniority disputes on their merits, does precisely what the Supreme Court in the *American National Insurance* case enjoined the Board not to do; namely, substitute its views as to what substantive terms of collective bargaining contracts are reasonable and proper, for the views of the parties. And the Board's assumption, that the union could desire unilaterally to control resolution of seniority disputes only for the purpose of discriminating, betrays either a woeful ignorance of the significance in industrial life of the union's role under union shop contracts as arbiter of disputes between members, or a malicious purpose to strip unions of power to function in this area and thereby to diminish their prestige. When one observes that in the proviso to section 8 (b) (1) (A)[89] Congress removed internal union affairs completely from the Board's reach, it becomes apparent how far this policy of the new Board strays from the avowed objective, "effectuation of the policies of the act."

Another example of the new Board's tendency to intervene in the internal affairs of

---

[81] 338 U. S. 355, 363 (1949).

[82] 63 N. L. R. B. 1270 (1945).

[83] "It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents * * * to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee in violation of subsection (a) (3) of this section or to discriminate against an employee with respect to whom membership in such organization has been denied or terminated on some ground other than his failure to tender the periodic dues and the initiation fees uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership" (61 Stat. 141 (1947), 29 U. S. C. A. § 158 (b) (2) (Supp., 1954)). Subsection (a) (3) reads as follows:

"It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer * * * by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization: *Provided*, That nothing in this subchapter or in any other statute of the United States, shall preclude an employer from making an agreement with a labor organization * * * to require as a condition of employment membership therein on or after the 30th day following the beginning of such employment or the effective date of such agreement, whichever is the later * * * *Provided further*, That no employer shall justify any discrimination again an employee for nonmembership in a labor organization (A) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that such membership was not available to the employee on the same terms and conditions generally applicable to other members, or (B) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that membership was denied or terminated for reasons other than the failure of the employee to tender the periodic dues and the initiation fees uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership" (61 Stat. 140, 141 (1947), 29 U. S. C. A. § 158 (a) (3) (Supp., 1954)).

[84] 107 N. L. R. B. 837 (1954).

[85] 109 N. L. R. B. 1147 (1954).

[86] 107 N. L. R. B. 837, 845 (1954).

[87] *NLRB* v. *Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. of Alabama* (129 F. 2d 661, 667–68 (C. A. 5th, 1942)); *Reliance Mfg. Co.* v. *NLRB* (125 F. 2d 311, 316–17, 321 (C. A. 7th, 1942)); *NLRB* v. *Arma Corp.* (122 F. 2d 153, 156–57 (C. A. 2d, 1941)); *NLRB* v. *Superior Tanning Co.* (117 F. 2d 881, 891 (C. A. 7th, 1940)); *NLRB* v. *West Kentucky Coal Co.* (116 F. 2d 816, 821–22 (C. A. 6th, 1940)).

[88] 343 U. S. 395 (1952).

[89] "It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents * * * to restrain or coerce (A) employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 157 of this title: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not impair the right of a labor organization to prescribe its own rules with respect to the acquisition or retention of membership therein" (61 Stat. 141 (1947), 29 U. S. C. A. sec. 158 (b) (1) (A)).

labor unions and to impose upon union operations burdensome restrictions which the statute neither contemplates nor sanctions is *Metal Ware Corp.*[90] In that case the new Board overruled *Chrisholm-Ryders*[91] The *Chrisholm-Ryder* case held that once an employee had been expelled from membership in the contracting union, and his discharge requested for failure to tender periodic dues uniformly required under a valid union shop contract, the employee could not thereafter acquire immunity to discharge by making a belated tender. The decision on its face showed a careful evaluation by the Board of the terms of sections 8 (a) (3) and 8 (b) (2)[92] and of the legislative history of both sections, all of which led inevitably to the conclusion that, at least where suspension or expulsion preceded the union's request for discharge, the date of the request was controlling. The Board said:

"To hold, as the General Counsel urges, that proviso (B) to section 8 (a) (3) and section 8 (b) (2) permit employee-members subject to a valid union-shop agreement to disregard with impunity the union's uniform requirements respecting the time for payment of periodic dues as a condition of retaining membership, would be a distortion of the manifest sense of these sections. Moreover, such an interpretation would materially detract from the substance of union-security agreements which Congress vouchsafed to unions and would leave individual employees free to ignore an important condition of membership, which unions are permitted to impose."[93]

In contrast, the Metal Ware decision does not even refer to the language of the statute or to the legislative history. On ipse dixit alone, the new Board now declares that: "A full and unqualified tender made any time prior to actual discharge and without regard as to when the request for discharge may have been made, is a proper tender and a subsequent discharge based upon the request is unlawful."[94]

Manifestly, this decision permits employees to make a mockery of union rules governing the time by which periodic dues must be paid. By one stroke of the pen the Board declares those rules, no matter how fair, and how uniformly applied, unenforcible. Can this decision be squared with the policy of Congress as expressed in the proviso to section 8 (b) (1) (A)[95] and with the legislative history? And what are the practical consequences of this decision from the employer's point of view? Now the employer cannot rely upon the employee's delinquency which resulted in his expulsion; he must now satisfy himself, before making the discharge, that the employee has not tendered dues up until the very last minute before the discharge becomes effective. The additional complication and annoyance which this entails for the employer, to say nothing of the additional risk which it imposes, may prove a substantial deterrent to the execution and enforcement of valid union security agreements. If the Board, like any one else, is presumed to intend the normal consequences of its acts, one may well conclude that discouragement of enforcement of union security agreements is precisely the objective which the *Metal Ware* decision seeks to achieve.

[90] 112 N. L. R. B. No. 80, 36 L. R. R. M. 1077 (1955).

[91] 94 N. L. R. B. 508 (1951).

[92] Statutes quoted note 83 supra.

[93] 94 N. L. R. B. 508, 510 (1951).

[94] 112 N. L. R. B. No. 80, 36 L. R. R. M. 1077, 1078 (1955).

[95] Statute quoted note 89 supra.

CII——345

Attenuation of statutory restrictions on employer opposition to unionization

This paper must, of necessity, pass lightly over the new Board's policy of drawing those teeth which Congress left in sections 8 (a) (1) and (3) when it adopted section 8 (c).[96] Suffice it to say that Congress reaffirmed, in the clearest possible statutory language, that promises of benefit and threats of reprisal, designed to defeat unionization, are outlawed by the act. Under the new Board's policy, applied in a host of cases, the rule has become a ghost, "a promise to the ear to be broken to the hope, a teasing illusion like a munificent bequest in a pauper's will."[97] As Professor Wirtz has demonstrated,[98] employer language which in the past was found unmistakably to promise benefits is now characterized as innocuous "prophecy" or "prediction";[99] threats of reprisal, clear to the least sophisticated of employees, are now passed off as privileged statements of legal position; and even the clearest of threats are excused, wherever feasible, under the "isolated instance" rubric.[1]

It is significant, too, that the new Board in section 8 (a) (3) cases appears to be more willing to reverse trial examiner fact-findings where the examiner concludes that the employer's motive was discriminatory than when the examiner finds the employer's motive pure. During the past year and a half the Board 11 times reversed trial examiners who had found discharges discriminatory.[2] In only four cases, however, during the same period, did it reverse where the examiner failed to find discrimination.[3] Of course, these results alone are not conclusive, but, viewed in context of the significant policy changes in other areas, they tend to suggest that the decisions in discriminatory discharge cases are now colored by an unarticulated premise that the employer's control over his labor force should not be impeded by too careful or penetrating an analysis of his motives in instances of alleged discrimination.

IV

The recent major policy decisions reveal a total disregard for the fact that in section 1 of the Taft-Hartley Act, as in section 1 of the Wagner Act, Congress declared it to be the policy of the United States to encourage unionization for the purpose of "restoring equality of bargaining power between employers and employees,"[4] to eliminate employer imposed obstacles to self-organization and collective bargaining which "lead to strikes and other forms of industrial strife or unrest, which have the * * * necessary effect of burdening or obstructing commerce,"[5] and to eliminate obstructions to commerce * * * "by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection."[6] Today, as under the Wagner Act, "the right of employees to organize for mutual aid without employer interference * * * is the principle of labor relations which the Board is to foster."[7]

To say the least, self-organization is not promoted by decisions which sanction employer interference with unionization by all but the most blatant and stupidly phrased of promises and threats. That these decisions make it infinitely easier for employers to defeat employee efforts to organize for collective bargaining itself shows them to be incompatible with the declared objective of the act. But they have other consequences additionally destructive of Congress' purposes. Congress provided the election machinery of section 9 in the hope that its availability would induce labor organizations to resort to the administrative process to establish bargaining rights. When, however, the beginning of an organizational campaign or the filing of a petition with the Board becomes an invitation to the employer to interfere with his employee's choice, resort to the administrative process becomes a futility. The more employees and labor organizations come to realize that by skillfully utilizing their new won license employers can virtually insure the union's defeat at the polls, the more will they resort to organizational picketing and recognition strikes to establish collective bargaining. Such strikes and picketing the Board cannot end by conducting elections on employer petitions. Congres made it perfectly clear that the administrative processes of section 9 were established to supplement, and not supersede, the right of employees and labor organizations to strike and picket for organizational and recognition purposes. As the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations reported:

"The right to strike for recognition is only foreclosed when another labor organization has been certified as the bargaining representative.

"A labor organization may lose an election in which it was the only union on the ballot and the next day call a legal strike to force the employer to recognize it as the bargaining agent for those employees who have just rejected it."[8]

The result is that instead of assisting in the accomplishment of Congress' purpose—to reduce strikes and picketing provoked by employer opposition to unionization—the new Board's policies proliferate such disputes and frustrate Congress' purpose.

[96] Statute quoted note 18 supra.

[97] *Edwards* v. *California*, 314 U. S. 160, 186 (1941).

[98] The New National Labor Relations Board; Herein of Employer Persuasion, 49 Nw. U. L. Rev. 594 (1954); Board Policy and Labor-Management Relations: "Employer Persuasion," NYU Seventh Annual Conference on Labor, p. 79 (1954).

[99] *National Furniture Mfg. Co.* (106 N. L. R. B. 1300 (1953)); *Chicopee Mfg. Corp.* (107 N. L. R. B. 106 (1953)); *Deming Co.* (107 N. L. R. B. 1100 (1954)); *Sparkletts Drinking Water Corp.* (107 N. L. R. B. 1462 (1954)).

[1] *Esquire, Inc.* (107 N. L. R. B. 1238 (1954)).

[2] *Morganton Full Fashioned Hosiery Co.* (107 NLRB 1534 (1954)); *Leisure Lads, Inc.* (112 NLRB No. 38, 36 L. R. R. M. 1017 (1955)); *Union News Co.* (112 NLRB No. 57, 36 L. R. R. M. 1045 (1955)); *Tropix-Togs, Inc.* (111 NLRB No. 157, 35 L. R. R. M. 1622 (1955)); *Florida Builders, Inc.* (111 NLRB No. 130, 35 L. R. R. M. 1575 (1955)); *School-Time Frocks, Inc.* (110 NLRB 1659 (1954)); *Diaper Jean Mfg. Co.* (109 NLRB 1045 (1954)); *Petroleum Carriers, Inc.* (109 NLRB 495 (1954)); *Mills-Morris Co.* (108 NLRB 1241 (1954)); *East Texas Steel Castings Co.* (108 NLRB 1078 (1954)); *Price Electric Corp.* (107 NLRB 1474 (1954)); *Braswell Motor Freight Lines* (107 NLRB 790 (1954)).

[3] *Pyne Moulding Corp.* (110 NLRB 1700 (1954)); *Colonial Fashions, Inc.* (110 NLRB 1197 (1954)); *Wagner Transportation Co.* (110 NLRB 1179 (1954)); *Texas Independent Oil Co.* (108 NLRB 617 (1954)).

[4] 61 Stat. 136 (1947), 29 U. S. C. A. § 151 (supp., 1954).

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

[7] *Republic Aviation Corp.* v. *NLRB* (324 U. S. 793, 798 (1945)).

[8] S. Rept. No. 986, pt. 3, p. 71, 80th Cong., 2d sess. (1948).

The same consequence results from the new jurisdictional policy which compels resort to strikes by barring access to the act's administrative remedies. It is true, of course, in the short run, that the effect of that policy is to bar employer resort to the Board to remedy union unfair labor practices, as well as to bar union resort against employer unfair practices. But that is merely additional evidence of the incompatibility of the Board's policy with Congress' policy. Moreover, if, as it would appear, the real objective of the new policy is to induce Congress to turn over to the States the regulation of labor relations in those industries which the Board eschews, then the jurisdictional policy is part and parcel of a scheme to deny to employees and labor organizations the rights which they are entitled to enjoy under Federal law.

The pitfalls and restrictions which the new Board has imposed upon the right of employees to engage in strikes and other concerted activities for mutual aid and protection are incompatible with Congress' recognition that the right to strike is the only means through which workers can make effective the collective-bargaining power which the act assures them. To impute to innocent strikers, as the Board now does, responsibility for the acts of unidentified third parties, and to have that imputation result in denial of reinstatement, is to make the right to strike so hazardous as seriously to impede its exercise. These changes, like the projected outlawry of "hot goods" clauses, the prohibition of union resolution of seniority disputes, and the prohibition upon enforcement of uniform union rules governing the time for payment of periodic dues, all tend to weaken the bargaining power of employees vis-a-vis the employer, and to diminish union prestige and influence.

The sweeping and crucial character of the policy changes which the Board has made during the past 18 months, taken together, amount to amendment of the statute in a manner far more drastic than anything this administration has proposed to Congress. To accomplish its objective the Board has cast aside compelling judicial authority. Judicial determination, as in Conway, that "hot cargo" clauses are not illegal seems inadequate to convince the new Board members that redetermination of the issue must be left to the legislative process. The fact that Congress, while enacting Taft-Hartley, considered and approved the earlier policies has given the Board members no pause in making changes, and even the legislative history of newly added provisions has in some cases been disregarded. It is ironic that such a development should occur at this stage, after Congress took special care, in the 1947 amendments, to adopt provisions which "effectively limit * * * the Board to the performance of quasi-judicial functions."[9]

EXHIBIT 2

LOCAL NO. 688,
WAREHOUSE AND DISTRIBUTION WORKERS' UNION,
St. Louis, Mo., March 1, 1956.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The enclosed story of the case of *Teamster's Local 688* v. *The National Labor Relations Board,* documents charges of Board delay, abuse of administrative discretion, and frustration of the basic purposes of the Taft-Hartley Act by Board policies.

The chronology of events enclosed herewith graphically presents the tortuous and circuitous route this case has taken. It is a dramatic illustration of bureaucratic redtape depriving employees of their basic rights to an election.

The United States district court found that a clear majority of the employees of Coca-Cola are members of the teamsters union. The transcript of record before the Board clearly shows that the independent union was dissolved by the unanimous vote of the members and that all 200 drivers joined the teamsters union. In the injunction proceeding brought by the Board against the union, only 1 employee testified for the company, and all of the rest of the 200 employees were in the courtroom prepared to testify for the teamsters union.

Despite this clear-cut demonstration of the wishes of the employees, the Labor Board has succumbed to the pressure of the Coca-Cola Bottling Co., of St. Louis, and has enmeshed the proceedings in a series of postponements, redtape, and policies which have made it impossible for these employees to vote for the bargaining agent of their own choice.

The extraordinary delays in this case are responsible for a strike of 200 driver-salesmen, currently in its 17th week. This is not a strike for recognition, but simply a protest against the dilatory tactics of the company and the unjustified delays allowed by the Board.

The recent denial by the Board of an election on the ground that its policy calls for withholding of an election while unwaived unfair labor practice charges are pending calls for a reexamination of this policy in order to determine whether this policy contravenes the basic purposes of the Taft-Hartley Act—namely, the promotion of industrial peace.

The purpose of the Board's policy is to guarantee the employees freedom from coercion or interference in selecting a bargaining agent. If the unfair labor practice charge does not relate to a violation of a section of the act pertaining to the freedom of choice of the employee, but rather to protecting an interest of the employer or of a third person, it should not be a bar to an election.

In this case, the Labor Board denied the Union an election although 2 of the 3 alleged violations dealt with issues unrelated to the freedom of the individual employee's choice. The third charge was not filed until January 27—over 5 months after the petition for election was filed.

The General Counsel has accepted as true the complaints filed by the company despite its long history of union busting as found by the Board itself in a prior case. He has also filed a complaint on one of the charges in direct contravention of the legislative history of the act, rulings of the General Counsel, and policies laid down by the Board. He has filed these charges despite a long history of delaying tactics in this case, where 3 postponements were granted before a hearing was held, and 2 extensions were granted for the filing of a very simple brief. These delays covered a period of 14 weeks. The delays due to the policy of the Board has covered a period of over 5 months, and if the General Counsel is prone to continue to accept charges filed by the company, there is no end in sight and an election may be postponed indefinitely.

The Board has withdrawn the election machinery without examining the merits of the unfair labor practice charge, relying entirely on the findings of the General Counsel. Although the first charge was filed on November 9, and the Board sought a Federal court injunction to restrain the alleged violation pending a determination by the Board, after almost 4 months there has been no determination of the validity of these charges. This illustrates the tremendous power the Board's policy places in the hands of the General Counsel.

The General Counsel has absolute power to delay an election for an indefinite period of time by accepting the charges of the company as true. The Board's refusal to examine the validity of these charges as regards the application of this policy leaves no recourse to the union but to revert to a test of economic strength. Because time is of the essence in labor disputes, especially when a union-busting company uses delays as a weapon, administrative delay by the Board becomes a powerful ally of the company in its campaign to break the spirit of the employees.

We have sought answers, but have received none, to the following questions:

1. Did the General Counsel abuse his discretion in finding that the strike of the Coca-Cola drivers was for recognition when in fact it was against the dilatory tactics of the company?

2. Did the General Counsel abuse his discretion in finding that there was an outstanding certification, when the record clearly shows that the independent union was dissolved on October 24, 1955, by the unanimous vote of all 200 drivers, and that the drivers had voted to affiliate with the teamsters union?

3. Did the General Counsel in fact contravene the intent of Congress, the rulings of the General Counsel, and the policies of the Board in filing a complaint alleging an 8 (b) (4) (C) violation when the certified union had dissolved by unanimous consent of the members and therefore was no longer in existence?

4. Did the General Counsel violate Board policy in failing to consider the long history of union busting by the company in determining the bona fide nature of the charges?

5. Did the General Counsel consider the dilatory tactics of the company in seeking postponements, refusing to provide interstate commerce information, as a weapon to gain extra time, claiming surprise when the independent union withdrew as an intervenor, when in fact the company knew of its dissolution—as evidence of bad faith? Should he not have considered all of these factors in determining whether the unfair labor practice charges were part and parcel of this overall strategy of delay?

6. Did not the Board fail in its responsibility to hold free elections in refusing to investigate or evaluate these charges?

7. Is not the suspension of the employee's rights to a free election under these circumstances tantamount to a delegation of the Board's responsibility for holding elections to the General Counsel?

8. Why did the Labor Board suspend the employee's rights to a free election while the charge of the union's violation of section 8 (b) (4) (C) was pending?

9. Did this pending charge have any relation to the conduct of a free election?

10. What policy of the act was served by a suspension of an election under these circumstances?

11. Is there any justification for extending the Board's policy of suspending election where a pending unfair labor practice interfered with the freedom of individual choice to a situation where this pending unfair labor practice charge relates to the rights of an employer as in the 8 (b) (4) (C) situation, or the rights of a third person as in the 8 (b) (4) (A) situation?

12. Is not this extension of policy covering all unfair labor practice charges punitive in effect—depriving the employees of a free election as punishment for the violation of one of the provisions of the act?

13. If additional penalties are to be imposed for violation of the act, is not this the responsibility of Congress and not the NLRB?

14. Did the Board act arbitrarily in denying the union's request for an argument be-

[9] H. Rept. No. 510, on H. R. 3020, p. 38, 80th Cong., 1st sess. (1947).

fore the Board in the light of these circumstances?

15. To what degree have the policies of the Board been abandoned in the granting of postponements, of hearings, and extensions in the filing of briefs?

16. If there has been a deviation of Board policy—what extenuating circumstances in this case led to a departure from this policy?

We will appreciate any assistance you can give us in getting answers to these questions from the Chairman of the Board and the General Counsel.

I remain,

Sincerely yours,

H. J. GIBBONS,
Secretary-Treasurer, Teamsters Local Union No. 688.

THE CASE OF TEAMSTERS' LOCAL 688 AGAINST THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD (COCA COLA BOTTLING CO. OF ST. LOUIS 14–RC–2861)

I. INTRODUCTION

A. The series of company inspired delays sanctioned by official acts of the Board has resulted in a strike of 200 Coca-Cola driver-salesmen currently in its 17th week. This is not a strike for recognition, as claimed by the company and the Board, but simply the last resort of employees who are protesting the delays which have deprived them of their basic right to an election as provided for by the Taft-Hartley Act.

B. The question has arisen—on what basis does the Board justify its denial of the election machinery to the employees in this case? The answer is found in a Board policy of denying the election machinery to the employees wherever the General Counsel finds that an unfair labor practice has been committed and this charge is pending. This policy was invoked by the Board on November 9, 1955. The following chronology of events will demonstrate the following:

1. Dilatory tactics by the company and Board collaboration with the company in permitting 3 postponements of a hearing and 2 extensions in the filing of briefs—totaling a period of 14 weeks from the date of filing for an election.

2. Filing of unfair labor practice charges by the General Counsel against the union in contravention of the legislative history of the act, the rulings of the General Counsel's office in 1951 and 1952, and policies of the Board itself.

3. The Board denying the employees the election machinery provided for by the act pending the determination of these charges.

4. The Board has failed to examine the merits of any of these charges prior to the suspending of the employees rights to an election.

5. The Board has refused to consider the long history of union busting by the company; although, this has been a policy of the Board in ascertaining the bona fide nature of the charges.

6. Two of the three charges have no bearing on the question of a free election since they deal with sections of the act designed to protect the employer and third persons exclusively. The third charge was not filed until January 18, over 5 months after the petition for election was filed and 3 months after the representation hearing.

7. The finding of the Federal court that the teamsters union represents a clear majority of the employees, that there was no evidence of intimidation of the employees prior to the date the majority was established, and that there is no reasonable basis for the finding of any unfair labor practice in this case—has been completely ignored by the Labor Board.

8. The unfair labor practice charge for a violation of section 8 (b) (4) (C) of the act was filed although the certification of the independent union was over 2 years old. This union had been dissolved by a unanimous vote of the membership; its attorney had requested withdrawal of its name from the ballot, and all 200 members had joined the teamsters union. On the basis of this record, the United States district court denied the Board's petition for a temporary injunction.

9. Administrative remedies have been exhausted. Petition for reconsideration of the Board's denial of an election has been filed, and oral argument before the Board requested. Conferences have been held with the General Counsel and the regional director to no avail. The regional director has taken several inconsistent positions in his offers of settlement. There has been a shuffling of responsibility between the regional and Washington offices of the Board. The Board's policy on the conduct of elections hinges on the findings of the General Counsel, and the General Counsel has shuffled the ultimate responsibility to the regional director. The regional director has responded to the pressure of the company. The employees have been caught in the web of the circuitous process of redtape and buck-passing.

The basic question remains: Whether these policies and procedures of the Board are responsible for the frustration of the fundamental policy of the Taft-Hartley Act—namely, the promotion of industrial peace.

II. CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

September 2, 1955: Teamsters Local Union, No. 688, petitioned for election, presenting authorization cards for a substantial majority of Coca-Cola driver-salesmen. Labor Board subsequently scheduled hearing for September 29.

September 28: Company counsel requests postponement, which is granted. Hearing rescheduled for October 12.

October 12: Company again requests additional time to permit new counsel, former Regional Board Director Lee McMahon, to prepare for the case. Request denied. However, company pressures Board into granting continuance by refusing to provide interstate commerce data at this hearing. Hearing rescheduled for November 8.

October 22: Bottlers strike over a grievance dispute unrelated to this case. Driver-salesmen, under auspices of independent union, respect picket line.

October 23: Company fires all 200 driver-salesmen for failure to cross picket line. Striking bottlers are not fired.

October 24: Approximately 200 driver-salesmen meet and unanimously decide to dissolve independent union and affiliate with teamsters local 688. Shortly thereafter, company's attorney learned of this in conference with teamsters representative.

October 26: Bottlers go back to work. Company rehires all of the 200 driver-salesmen.

November 8: Board proceeds with representation hearing. Independent union requests to withdraw as intervenor. Company pleads surprise and requests further continuance of case. In order to defeat this company play for further delay, independent union drops motion to withdraw. Subsequently it formally petitions Board to strike its name from the ballot. Company requests extension to November 29 for filing of briefs. Hearing officer grants request. Driver-salesmen meet that evening and vote to strike in protest against dilatory tactics of the company in attempting to block election.

November 9: Company files complaint of unfair labor practice charging union with violation of section 8 (b) (4) (C) of the act. General Counsel files complaint against union, despite fact that independent union notified Board of its dissolution and 100 percent membership affiliation with the teamsters.

November 29: Company petitions Board for a second extension of time in filing of briefs. Board grants extension to December 7.

December 7: Company files brief of 11 pages double space. The simple nature of the brief makes difficult to understand need for extensions of 30 days from conclusion of hearing.

December 8: Union receives subpena to appear in United States district court as a defendant in an action brought by the General Counsel of the Board seeking to enjoin the union's picketline pending the determination by the Board of the section (b) (4) (C) charge.

December 19: The Board's petition for a temporary injunction was tried in (Case No. 10534 (1)) the United States district court for the eastern division of the eastern judicial district of Missouri. Almost all of the 200 drivers were in court prepared to testify for the union. Only one employee testified for the company, and he was the son of the company superintendent.

December 21: Court hearing concluded.

January 18, 1956: Company filed a complaint of a violation of section 8 (b) (1) (A) alleging the use of coercive and unlawful tactics by the teamsters union in gaining support of the Coca-Cola drivers. A complaint was filed shortly thereafter by the General Counsel of the Board.

January 27: The United States district court denied the Board's petition for an injunction finding that "petitioner does not have reasonable cause to believe respondent (local 688) has engaged or is now engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8 (b) (4) (C) of the act."

January 27: Company filed a complaint charging the union with a violation of section 8 (b) (4) (A) of the act alleging "inducement and encouragement of employee work stoppages at retail establishments which handle Coca-Cola products." A complaint was filed shortly thereafter by the General Counsel of the Board.

February 13: General Counsel of the Board filed an injunction suit in the United States district court seeking a restraining order in the matter of the alleged violations.

February 13: Executive Secretary of the Board notified the union that "the Board will withhold action on your petition for certification in this case because of the various unfair labor-practice charges pending." He further stated the "Board has a general policy of not proceeding in any representation case where charges of unfair labor practices are concurrently pending unless waived by the charging parties."

February 16: Union's attorney petitions Board for reconsideration of its decision denying election while unfair labor practice charge is pending.

February 17: Union's attorney petitions Board for oral argument.

February 20: Union's representative is denied right to meet with Board members to discuss policy questions involved.

February 20: Union's representative meets with General Counsel to discuss problem of unresolved unfair labor practice charge pending before Board.

February 24: Board's petition for temporary injunction heard in United States district court seeking a restraining order for alleged violation of section 8 (b) (1) (A) and 8 (b) (4) (A).

February 27: Board denies union's petition for reconsideration and oral argument before Board.

III. DISCUSSION

A. There is no justification in holding up an election unless the alleged unfair labor practice charges would affect the freedom of choice of the employee in selecting a bargaining representative.

1. On the face of it, it is clear that in the instance of two charges, there is no relation between the alleged violations and the rights of employees to a free election. In regard to the third charge of intimidation and coercion, the record is clear and the Federal court

has found that there is no evidence of any intimidation prior to the date the teamsters "had gained the support of a clear majority of the employees in the unit."

(a) Regarding the section 8 (b) (4) (C) charge, the alleged violation deals with the invasion of a right of the employer to be protected from the pressure of a noncertified union where there is a certified bargaining representative in the unit.

(b) The alleged violation of section 8 (b) (4) (A) deals with the interference with the rights of third persons affected by a secondary boycott.

B. The aforementioned policy of the Board, as applied in this case, negates the basic policies of the act designed to promote industrial peace.

1. This policy of withholding the employees rights to an election so long as the General Counsel finds that there is a prima facie case for unfair labor practice, prolongs ad infinitum the dispute between the company and the union and suspends the orderly procedures of the law. With the election machinery not available, the parties are then compelled to battle out their differences through a test of economic strength.

2. In the instant case, the dilatory tactics of the company, and the cooperation of the Board in this approach to the problem, has resulted in a strike of 200 employees now in its 16th week.

C. The Labor Board has arbitrarily applied this policy in this without considering the merits of the alleged unfair labor practice charges.

1. The Board cannot hide behind the skirts of the General Counsel in this case because the General Counsel has jurisdiction over the matter of bringing complaints of unfair labor practices.

2. The Board has the responsibility of investigating the merits of the charges in conjunction with the administration of its policy regarding the granting of an election in the representation proceedings. If it fails to examine the merits of the charges, it has in effect delegated one of its prime functions in conjunction with the holding of an election to the General Counsel.

3. In the instant case, the Board has conceded that it has not investigated the merits of the charges. How can it possibly judge whether the charges are legitimate in fact or in law, insofar as they might affect the freedom of the employee in choosing a collective bargaining representative?

4. A well-established policy of the Board has been to consider the labor history of the company as a factor in determining the legitimacy of the charges. In this case, no such consideration has been given by the Board, despite the fact that the company has a long history of union busting, and the record of the Board includes the issuance of a cease-and-desist order directed against the company in 1951 (95 N. L. R. B. 45).

5. Why has the Board refused to take judicial notice of the findings of the United States district court that the teamsters represented a clear-cut majority of the employees in the unit in question?

6. Why has not the Board granted the request of counsel for an oral argument before the Board as a whole in effort to resolve the issues of this case, and to bring some order out of the chaos resulting from the dual jurisdiction of the General Counsel and the Board?

D. The General Counsel has filed unfair labor practice charges in this case in complete disregard of the legislative history, the rulings of the General Counsel of the Board in 1951 and 1952, and of the Board itself with reference to section 8 (b) (4) (C) of the act.

1. Aside from the foregoing, the unfair labor practice charges filed by the company must necessarily be predicated upon the theory that there are two unions involved, one competing against the other. It is perfectly true, of course, that Congress intended to preserve the sanctity of a certification issued to a union, to prevent another union from interfering therewith, and to prevent another union from interfering with the duty of the company to bargain with the certified union. There are, however, several reasons why that sound proposition of law has no application in this case.

(a) First, there are not two unions in this situation competing against one another. There is, on the contrary, simply one body of men who, although previously members of the independent association, are now members of the teamsters union. Whether the Coca-Cola drivers call themselves an independent association or members of the teamsters union, they are still but one body of the same men and cannot reasonably be accused of competing against themselves.

(b) Of even greater importance is the fact that the Labor Board has consistently held that the sanctity and stability to be placed upon the certification of a union only exists where there is an effective certification outstanding and where there is a certified union in existence. The legal obligation of an employer to bargain with the certified union cannot possibly exist if a certified union is not in existence or if the employees who were members of the certified union have since affiliated with a different union. The prime objective of the Taft-Hartley law is to guarantee the freedom of employees to select their collective bargaining representatives, and to change their representatives from time to time as they desire.

(c) When President Truman gave his message to Congress on the proposed Taft-Hartley Act he stated (legislative history of Labor Management Relations Act 1947, vol. II, p. 1012):

"The National Labor Relations Act provides procedure for determining which union represents the employees of a particular employer. In some jurisdictional disputes, however, minority unions strike to compel employers to deal with them despite a legal duty to bargain with the majority union. Strikes to compel an employer to violate the law are inexcusable. Legislation to prevent such strikes is clearly desirable."

Thus, President Truman called the attention of Congress to what he considered the evil of striking by a minority union to compel an employer to deal with it despite a legal duty to bargain with the majority union.

(d) Congress acceded to the President's wishes, and adopted what is now section 8 (b) (4) (C) of the act, the section involved in the unfair labor practice charges filed against the teamsters union by the company. The legislative history of the Senate debates contains the statement of Senator MORSE making it plain that the purpose of the section was to outlaw strikes by a minority union which had lost an NLRB election when the purpose of the strike was to force an employer to disregard the obligations imposed upon it by the election. In speaking of the changes subsection (c) would make, Senator MORSE said (p. 981, 982):

"Under the present law an employer who is under a duty to recognize and bargain with one union by reason of a Board election and certification can obtain no relief from the Board or the courts if the union which lost the election chooses to strike or boycott in an effort to have the employer disregard the obligation placed upon him by reason of the Board certification."

(e) It is, therefore, plain that this section of the law was only intended to apply when a strike was undertaken to force an employer to disregard its legal duty to bargain with the certified union.

The General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board has made it crystal clear that there cannot be a violation of the law in circumstances where 40 of 47 employees had withdrawn from the certified union and no longer desired it to represent them. In an administrative ruling on the point in case 181, August 31, 1951, the General Counsel for the Labor Board specifically held in that case that "the normal presumption as to the continued status of the certified union could not be made". In finding that the certified union had ceased to exist, the General Counsel ruled that there could be no possible violation of the act. The same result was reached in Administrative Rule 539 in 1952.

(f) The decisions of the Labor Board likewise make this proposition clear. See, for example, *Celanese Corporation of America* (95 N. L. R. B. 83); *Henry Heide, Inc.* (107 N. L. R. B. 258); *Public Service Electric & Gas Company* (59 N. L. R. B. 325); and *WTOP, Inc.* (114 N. L. R. B. 194).

Notwithstanding the clear purpose and intent of the law as expressed by Congress, the General Counsel for the Labor Board, and the Labor Board itself, the Labor Board has elected to issue a complaint against the striking Coca-Cola drivers and the teamsters union upon the theory that their activity is illegal in that it seeks to force the company to recognize the teamsters union when a different union has been certified.

2. The General Counsel has filed complaints for violations of sections 8 (b) (1) (A) and 8 (b) (4) (A) of the act in complete disregard of the evidence in the case and the findings of the United States district court in the matter of intimidation and coercion.

(a) The charge in violation of section 8 (b) (4) (A) alleges that the union violated the act "by inducement and encouragement of employee work stoppages at retail establishments which handle Coca-Cola products." The union did nothing more than appeal to customers of the Coca-Cola Bottling Co. to refuse to purchase soft drinks during the pendency of the strike. This type of activity does not violate section 8 (b) (4) (A) of the act.

(b) Regarding the alleged violations of section 8 (b) (1) (A), the issue of coercion and intimidations were tried in the petition for an injunction and dismissed by the United States district court.

3. The filing of these charges are all the more questionable in the light of the anti-labor history of the company and its dilatory tactics in this case.

E. The record in this case in which the numerous company requests for delays have been granted by the Board, the General Counsel's willingness to file company complaints, even though they hold little or no validity, and the Labor Board's arbitrary application of its policy on withholding the right to an election without examining the merits of the charges, gives rise to the question of outside political influence. A congressional investigation should scrutinize the possibility of political pressure due to the following factors:

1. The personal relationship between Willard Cox, president of the Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of St. Louis, and President Eisenhower;

2. The role played by Willard Cox in securing the appointment of the Regional Director of the Labor Board in St. Louis; and

3. The possible influence of former regional director of the Labor Board, presently acting as counsel for the company in this case.

IV. SUMMATION

A. An investigation should concern itself with the following:

1. Did the General Counsel abuse his discretion in finding that the strike of the Coca-Cola drivers was for recognition when in fact it was against the dilatory tactics of the company?

2. Did the General Counsel abuse his discretion in finding that there was an outstanding certification, when the record clearly shows that the independent union was dis-

solved on October 24, 1955, by the unanimous vote of all 200 drivers, and that the drivers had voted to affiliate with the teamsters union?

3. Did the General Counsel in fact contravene the intent of Congress, the rulings of the General Counsel, and the policies of the Board in filing a complaint alleging an 8 (b) (4) (C) violation when the certified union had dissolved by unanimous consent of the members and therefore was no longer in existence?

4. Did the General Counsel violate Board policy in failing to consider the long history of union busting by the company in determining the bona fide nature of the charges?

5. Did the General Counsel consider the dilatory tactics of the company in seeking postponements, refusing to provide interstate commerce information, as a weapon to gain extra time, claiming surprise when the Independent Union withdrew as an intervenor, when in fact the company knew of its dissolution, as evidence of bad faith?

Should he not have considered all of these factors in determining whether the unfair labor practice charge were part and parcel of this overall strategy of delay?

6. Did not the Board fail in its responsibility to hold free elections in refusing to investigate or evaluate these charges?

7. Is not the suspension of the employee's right to an election under these circumstances tantamount to a delegation of the Board's responsibility for holding elections to the General Counsel?

8. Why did the Labor Board suspend the employee's rights to a free election while the charge of the union's violation of section 8 (b) (4) (C) was pending?

9. Did this pending charge have any relation to the conduct of a free election?

10. What policy of the act was served by a suspension of an election under these circumstances?

11. Is there any justification for extending the Board's policy of suspending election where a pending unfair labor practice interfered with the freedom of individual choice to a situation where this pending unfair labor practice charge relates to the rights of an employer as in the 8 (b) (4) (C) situation, or the rights of a third person as in the 8 (b) (4) (A) situation?

12. Is not this extension of policy covering all unfair labor practice charges punitive in effect—depriving the employees of a free election as punishment for the violation of one of the provisions of the act?

13. If additional penalties are to be imposed for violation of the act, is not this the responsibility of Congress and not the NLRB?

14. Did the Board act arbitrarily in denying the union's request for an argument before the Board in the light of these circumstances?

15. To what degree have the policies of the Board been abandoned in the granting of postponements, of hearings, and extensions in the filing of briefs?

16. If there has been a deviation of Board policy—what extenuating circumstances in this case led to a departure from this policy?

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, March 26, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 23 (legislative day of March 19), 1956:

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named persons to be judges of the Tax Court of the United States for terms of 12 years from June 2, 1956:

J. Edgar Murdock, of Pennsylvania.
Stephen E. Rice, of Florida.
Morton P. Fisher, of Maryland.
John Edward Mulroney, of Iowa.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commisisoned ensign

Herman H. Druebert, effective March 26, 1956.

James C. Sainsbury.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 23 (legislative day of March 19), 1956:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Henry Irving Hodes, O12845, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), in the rank of general.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations of Merwin Eugene Richards and 395 other officers to be first lieutenants in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on March 9, 1956, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Merwin Eugene Richards, which is shown on page 4440, and ending with the name of Jean Anne Corrigan, which occurs on page 4441.

IN THE NAVY AND THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Loyde W. Hales and 807 other officers for appointment in the Navy and in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on March 9, 1956, and appear in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Loyde W. Hales, which is shown on page 4441, and ending with the name of Merlin D. Woodward, which appears on page 4443.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Claims of Certain Latin American Republics to Territorial Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement with reference to a resolution of far-reaching implications relative to the extensive, and I think unreasonable, claims of several Latin American Republics to territorial waters, which resolution was adopted by the Inter-American Council of Jurists, Organization of American States, in Mexico City in February of this year.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the concluding session of the Inter-American Council of Jurists, Organization of American States, held in Mexico City in January and February 1956, a resolution of far-reaching international implications was jammed through with practically no analysis, study, or debate. The procedure, to say the least, was questionable. I refer to a resolution titled "System of Territorial Waters and Related Questions."

The effect of this resolution was to place on the agenda of the Organization of American States, now meeting in Ciudad Trujillo, the question of extension of the territorial waters of some of our neighbor countries to the south, several of which have indicated their belief that their territorial boundaries should extend 200 miles seaward. The resolution is completely oblivious of the interests and rights of states other than the adjacent coastal states in the conservation and utilization of marine resources and of the recognized need for international cooperation for the effective accomplishment of that common objective.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 28, 1956, at page 3518, one of my colleagues in the House, Congressman D. R. MATTHEWS, very ably stated the problem which this unfortunate resolution, if adopted by the Organization of American States, would pose for the United States fishing industry in southern waters. It could have the effect of driving our Florida fishermen off their traditional fishing grounds in the Gulf of Mexico. Also it will be a serious blow to the good diplomatic relations which have been established, not easily by the shrimp and red-snapper fishermen of both Mexico and the United States over a period of many years.

Rightfully the able representative of our Government on the Council of Jurists objected to the adoption of this resolution at Mexico City and filed a formal reservation of action thereon on behalf of the United States for consideration by the Organization of American States in Ciudad Trujillo.

While Florida's interest in this matter stems from the drastic effect adoption of this resolution would have on our shrimp and red-snapper fishermen who work in the Gulf of Mexico, the implication is much greater than that. The fishing industry of all Gulf Coast States as well as that of States on the Pacific coast which fishes in the waters off the coasts of several Central and South American countries would be dealt a terrific blow.

Consequently, I feel that our Government should do everything within the bounds of propriety to uphold the hands of our delegation at Ciudad Trujillo toward the end that action on this resolution is taken in full equity and recognition of international law.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 26, 1956

Dr. Oswald C. J. Hoffmann, director of public relations of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, New York, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as we begin this week of commemoration of the suffering and death of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, we pray Thee for grace to receive Thy mercy and forgiveness with thankful hearts.

Hold Thy merciful and protecting hand over our Nation, that the blessings of peace and happiness, truth and justice, faith and godly living may be established among us.

Defend our liberties, preserve our unity. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion, from pr.de and arrogance, and from every evil way.

Grant wisdom, we pray, to all those entrusted with the responsibility of government, that there may be peace here at home, and that as a Nation we may speak with authority in the councils of the world.

We pray Thee especially for the Members of the Senate, that Thou wilt give them a devout sense of Thy kindness, and that Thou wilt constantly renew within them a spirit of true devotion to the welfare of our country, and to the well-being of the world.

Thou art our defense, O God. Without Thee we have no defense. Be Thou near all who dwell in this favored land. Right what is wrong, that iniquity may not be our ruin. Above all, enfold our people and all the peoples of the world in the arms of Thy love, which Thou hast set forth once and for all in the Cross of Thy Son, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. For His sake we ask this. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 23, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On March 21, 1956:

S. 3091. An act to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 1207 at Louisville, Ky.

On March 24, 1956:

S. 1529. An act to revise the boundaries of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Stanley C. Allyn, of Ohio, to be the representative to the 11th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL BILL TO BE CONSIDERED ON CALL OF THE CALENDAR TODAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1613, S. 1411, a bill for the relief of Marion Drucker, be included in the call of the calendar ordered for today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made during the morning hour be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs;

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations;

The Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency;

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 108)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, in the amount of $48,500, for the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO AN APPROPRIATION FOR THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION (S. DOC. NO. 107)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the fiscal year 1956 for the General Services Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended, so as to provide punishment for fraudulent acceptance of benefits thereunder (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

KANSAS OR KAW TRIBE OF INDIANS, ET AL., V. THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings in the case of *Kansas or Kaw Tribe of Indians, et al.*, v. *The United States* have been finally concluded (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

WALTER C. JORDAN AND ELTON W. JOHNSON

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Walter C. Jordan and Elton W. Johnson (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Su Jan Lee from a report transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON LONG RANGE PLANNING PHASE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES SURVEY

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report of the Long Range Planning Phase—School Facilities Survey" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1954, RELATING TO NONOCCUPATIONAL GROUP MAJOR MEDICAL EXPENSE INSURANCE

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, to provide nonoccupational group major medical expense insurance for Federal employees and their dependents and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 26

"Concurrent resolution congratulating Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND upon his election to the chairmanship of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, and commending the Senate for its action in electing him to this position of high honor

"Whereas the Senate of the United States, by an overwhelming vote, has elevated to the chairmanship of the Committee on the Ju-

diciary Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND, senior Senator from the State of Mississippi; and

"Whereas in so doing, that illustrious body has not only signally honored Senator EASTLAND, but has placed its emphatic stamp of approval upon his loyalty, ability, patriotism, zeal, integrity, and unswerving devotion to duty; and

"Whereas in so honoring this able statesman, the senior Senator from Mississippi, the Senate of the United States has also cast luster upon the State of Mississippi and placed Senator EASTLAND where he rightfully belongs with that immortal galaxy of great Mississippians who have preceded him in the Senate of the United States and who so nobly served Mississippi and the Nation in the years that have passed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein), That:

"This legislature extend to Senator EASTLAND our sincere congratulations upon his elevation to the chairmanship of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, and commend the Senate for its action in elevating him to this position of high honor;

"This legislature commend Senator EASTLAND for the strong, able, and courageous leadership he has given the United States Senate and the Nation, and for the statesmanship he has displayed in his outstanding fight to protect the reserved powers of all the States of the Union against the unlawful invasion and usurpation thereof by the Supreme Court and other branches of the Federal Government;

"We commend him for his firm stand against those who would repeal or modify the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act and throw down the bars of restriction against immigration into the United States of Communists and other subversive aliens who would flood this country with hired agents and spies bent on destroying our form of government and setting up in its stead a communistic-socialistic dictatorship;

"We commend him for his firm stand and aggressive leadership in support of segregation in the public schools, colleges, and other public institutions and activities, and his militant fight against integration in any form;

"We commend him for his able and aggressive leadership in exposing to the public the affiliation of some of the top NAACP leadership with communistic and subversive fronts and organizations;

"We commend and endorse the valiant efforts and the courageous fight he is making to protect this Government from the onslaughts being made against it by enemies within, to the end that this Nation of free people shall never perish, but shall live on forever; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States Senate, to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, and to the press.

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 12, 1956.

"WALTER SIEVERS,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Adopted by the senate March 13, 1956.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"*President of the Senate.*"

A letter, in the nature of a memorial, from the Kaweah River Property Owners Association, Three Rivers, Calif., signed by Darrell Hall, remonstrating against enactment of legislation to provide funds for the construction of the Terminus Dam, in California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Resolutions adopted by the Hubbs & Miner Ditch Co., and the Poplar Irrigation Co., both of Porterville, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation providing sufficient funds for the construction of Success Dam, on the Tule River, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Resolutions adopted by Greater Chicago Post, 866, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at Chicago, Ill., relating to pensions for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Mrs. Carl F. Kortepeter, of Southport, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to adopt the Hoover Commission's recommendations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by Joan of Arc Council 1992, Knights of Columbus, Port Jefferson, Long Island, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Anthony Sfounis, and sundry other citizens of South Gate, Calif., relating to the admission into the United States of certain aliens under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Metropolitan Transportation Engineering Board, Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of House bill 8836, providing for construction or improvement of the national system of interstate and defense highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of House bill 8836, providing for the construction or improvement of the national system of interstate and defense highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Memorial 1

"Memorial requesting the United States Department of the Interior and the Arizona congressional delegation, consisting of Senators CARL HAYDEN and BARRY M. GOLDWATER and Representatives JOHN J. RHODES and STEWART L. UDALL, to consider the construction of a dam on Burro Creek

"*To the United States Department of the Interior, Senators Carl Hayden and Barry M. Goldwater, and Representatives John J. Rhodes and Stewart L. Udall:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The construction of a dam on Burro Creek at the point it crosses State Highway 93 would be of invaluable assistance to the Federal Government and the State of Arizona. Burro Creek, although a relatively small waterway, does run throughout the year and the high-water mark is estimated to reach 20 feet during flood stage. When in such flood stage, it is a source of danger to the dam and installations at Parker.

"The construction of a dam at this site would create other beneficial values. The top of the dam could be used as a trafficway and, furthermore, this area would be provided with excellent recreational facilities where none now exist.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the senate of the State of Arizona, prays:

"That the United States Department of the Interior and Senators CARL HAYDEN and BARRY GOLDWATER and Representatives JOHN J. RHODES and STEWART L. UDALL instigate a study of stream gaging to determine the amount of flow over a period of time, and to estimate the cost, as against the advantages of the construction of a dual purpose dam at this location.

"It is believed that such a project will be of mutual benefit to the United States Government and the State of Arizona."

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; ordered to lie on the table:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact suitable legislation to assist the small farmer under the acreage-allotment program

"Whereas the avowed purpose of the tobacco and cotton acreage allotment program is to provide a demand for the supply of these commodities so that a farmer can make an adequate living from the growing of tobacco and cotton; and

"Whereas the tobacco and cotton acreage allotments have been successively reduced until the allotment available to some farmers is so small that the utmost effort and the best husbandry do not avail to wrest subsistence therefrom; and

"Whereas this state of affairs has caused hardship to many owners of the smaller farms and has resulted in the sale of some of these farms to a larger landowner so that combined allotments can be worked to more profit; and

"Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina views with alarm the loss of these small farmers who are the backbone of this Nation in its current fight to maintain independence and freedom: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), that the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact, without delay, suitable legislation to assist the small farmer under the acreage allotment program."

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to provide cotton acreage allotments to assist South Carolina cotton farmers

"Whereas South Carolina farmers see the need for, and do support a reasonable and sensible cotton acreage program, and have taken acreage reductions up to and even in excess of the national average of 28 percent; and

"Whereas these reductions have brought about numerous cases of individual hardships and immediate relief is mandatory if South Carolina cotton farmers are to avoid disastrous results effecting the entire State's economy; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States is considering bills to freeze cotton acreage pending long-range farm legislation; and

"Whereas the proposed farm legislation now being considered by Congress shows no indication of needed relief to a historically cotton-planting State; and

"Whereas the reductions imposed upon the individual South Carolina farmer should not exceed the national average reduction based upon normal free planting year: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the South Carolina delegation in the United States Congress be urged to exert their efforts in behalf of cotton-acreage allotments which will allow our South Carolina cotton farmers to exist on a reasonable and sound economic basis in the continued production of cotton; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Clerk of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and each Member of the United States Senate and each Member of the United States House of Representatives from South Carolina."

ENDORSEMENT OF 100 PERCENT OF PARITY—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Republican Party of Logan County, N. Dak. I call particular attention to the fact that that organization is unanimously in favor of 100 percent of parity.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Whereas we, the Republican delegation assembled here today, March 17, 1956, do hereby go on record for a 100 percent of parity for all farm commodities. Being it further resolved that copies of said resolution be submitted to our national delegation in Washington, D. C., Senator ELLENDER, and Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson.

2. Whereas we further recommend that Congress should do something about our wheat prices as we are all aware that our wheat in the State of North Dakota is of much better milling quality than that in the southern States. As for illustration, the State of Kansas produces much more wheat per acre but it is of poor milling quality.: Be it further

Resolved, That it has been brought to our attention that the State institution at Grafton is overcrowded. We, therefore recommend that the State legislature consider enlarging this institution.

RESOLUTION COMMITTEE,
PIUS M. REIS, *Chairman*.
FRED WOLF.
R. R. BENDER.

RESOLUTION OF DEVILS LAKE TRIBE OF SIOUX INDIANS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Tribal Executive Committee of the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of Indians, relating to the establishment of a court of Indian offenses on their reservation.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas this unincorporated tribe is an Indian organization as defined by the provisions of the act of May 7, 1948 (Public Law 516, 80th Cong.) and the regulations issued pursuant thereto by the Secretary of the Interior, and under its constitution and bylaws has full power and authority to consider all business matters pertaining to the tribe, and to execute such tribal powers as may be presented for action by the superintendent, including such instruments which by law require tribal action; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of North Dakota over a year ago announced that the State courts had no jurisdiction on Indian reservations; and

Whereas thereupon the Bureau of Indian Affairs created a temporary emergency organization to preserve law and order upon the Devils Lake Sioux Reservation, including a court of Indian offenses; and

Whereas the temporary emergency organization is not functioning to the satisfaction of the Indian citizens affected and the jurisdiction of the temporary court is questionable; and

Whereas the regulations (25 CFR 161) of the Department required the organization of courts of Indian offenses and law-enforcement agencies in consultation with tribal councils: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Tribal Executive Committee of the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe, That the Department of the Interior be urged to cause a court of Indian offenses and law-enforcement agency to be established upon a permanent basis in consultation with such tribal executive committee.

FLOOD PROTECTION WORKS FOR SALINA, KANS.—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the chamber of commerce of Salina, Kans., regarding flood protection works for the city of Salina.

The city of Salina has met the requirements of the Federal Government by assuring the Corps of Army Engineers and the Government of its intention to provide funds and do the necessary financing for the acquisition of right-of-way, providing for changes in highways, construction of street and road bridges and such other requirements as are needed to carry into effect its part of a flood control program for the city.

The Corps of Army Engineers has submitted plans and I am urging the Senate to vote such funds as are necessary for the commencement of this program.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE SALINA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC., SALINA, KANS.

A RESOLUTION PERTAINING TO THE PROPOSED FLOOD PROTECTION WORKS FOR THE CITY OF SALINA, KANS., WITH PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has duly adopted Public Law 566, the same being expressive of proposed public works; and

Whereas said document includes and approves flood protection works for the city of Salina, Kans.; and

Whereas the United States Army Corps of Engineers has instituted a program for a study of river and stream bank stabilization as part of its system of flood control, which program is particularly favored by the board of directors of the Salina Chamber of Commerce, Inc.; and

Whereas before such approved plan can be implemented it will be necessary for the Congress of the United States of America to provide for such implementation by appropriation of moneys; and

Whereas the city of Salina, Kans., has expressed and reaffirmed by resolution, in compliance with and by authority of G. S. 1955, Supp., 12–635 et seq., its intention to provide funds and do the necessary financing for the acquisition of right-of-way, providing for changes in highways, construction of street and road bridges, revise and relocate utilities if necessary, operate and maintain the completed works and pay all other costs that might acrue to it under the plan; and

Whereas the board of directors of the Salina Chamber of Commerce, Inc., deems it in the public interest that said flood protection works be constructed and said flood protection plan be carried out in all details; and so, now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Salina Chamber of Commerce, Inc., That it earnestly solicits the Congress of the United States of America to appropriate sufficient funds and moneys and make the same available to the Corps of Engineers in order that such agency may proceed with the construction of such works and do all things necessary and incidental thereto, and so that the city of Salina, Kans., may be advised therefrom, the nature and extent of its duties in order to facilitate the implementation of such construction.

That the manager of the Salina Chamber of Commerce, Inc., be authorized and he is hereby directed, to forward a copy of this resolution to the Honorable ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, the Honorable FRANK CARLSON, the Honorable WINT SMITH, the Director of the Budget and Maj. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis of the Corps of Engineers, aforesaid.

Introduced and adopted March 14, 1956.

DON MCPHAIL,
President.

Attest:

J. M. CRANOR,
Manager.

FARM PROBLEMS IN THOMAS COUNTY, KANS.—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the policy committee of the Thomas County Kansas Farm Bureau has just sent me a copy of the resolutions which were adopted at its meeting on March 6, regarding some of the immediate farm problems in that county.

I would call these suggestions to the attention of the Senate, and ask that they printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOMAS COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Colby, Kans., March 16, 1956.

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CARLSON: At a policy execution committee meeting of the Thomas County Farm Bureau on March 6, 1956, in Colby, Kans., the following resolutions were adopted:

No. 1: "That the incentive payment be increased to prevent soil erosion."

No. 2: "That there be more participation by the Government in the watershed program.

No. 3: "That in the summer fallow areas, the practice of summer fallow be taken into consideration in setting acreage quotas."

We urge that you use your influence to get these resolutions adopted.

Respectfully,
THOMAS COUNTY FARM BUREAU ASSOCIATION,
ROY H. HARPER,
Chairman, Policy Execution Committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3530. A bill for the relief of Ursula Perganje and her two minor children, Nathan Perganje and Roswitha Perganje; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3531. A bill to amend sections 657 and 1006 of title 18 of the United States Code to include within the purview of such sections certain State savings and loan associations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 3532. A bill providing for the acceptance by the United States of a conveyance by the town of Hammon, Oreg., of the military cemetery formerly comprising a part of the Fort Stevens Military Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 3533. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. David Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3534. A bill to provide for payments in lieu of taxes to State tax authorities with respect to certain real property subject at the time of its acquisition by the United States to real property tax committed to the discharge of bonded indebtedness for any public improvement; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution for the establishment of a Commission on Nursing Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

FORT STEVENS POST CEMETERY, HAMMOND, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, about 7 years ago, the United States acting through the Secretary of the Army quitclaimed to the town of Hammond, Oreg., a small tract of land comprising the post cemetery which was formerly a part of the Fort Stevens Military Reservation, Oreg. At the time the quitclaim deed was delivered, officials of the town of Hammond assumed that they would be permitted to operate the cemetery as a public burial ground for people residing in the town of Hammond and vicinity. Later, but after the transaction was completed, they learned that no burials would be permitted, not even those of deceased veterans of our Armed Forces. The net result of the transfer, therefore, is that the town of Hammond has assumed a burden without any prospect for commensurate benefits in the operation of the cemetery.

The Honorable Robert J. Fox, mayor of Hammond, has written to Senator NEUBERGER and myself, expressing the concern of officials and residents of Hammond over the situation now existing with respect to this cemetery. The people of the Hammond community wish to maintain the cemetery in accordance with the high standards prescribed by the Corps of Engineers, but the town simply cannot afford the upkeep of the cemetery unless it obtains revenue through the operation of the cemetery as a public burial ground.

According to the information received by my office, the receipt of such revenues appears to be an impossiblity under the existing law. The most sensible solution to this problem seems to be found in legislation authorizing a reconveyance of the cemetery to the United States with a provision for suitable care and maintenance by the Government.

To that end, Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize acceptance by the United States of a conveyance by the town of Hammond, Oreg., of the military cemetery formerly comprising a part of the Fort Stevens Military Reservation.

The people of the Hammond community would like to have the Fort Stevens military cemetery maintained in excellent condition because they take great pride in the patriotism and heroism of the servicemen and officers whose remains lie at rest in this cemetery. They are proud of the historical significance of Fort Stevens and they regard the cemetery as a monument to a military installation that has played such an important part in the military history of our State and Nation for many years past.

Mr. President, I urge that the committee to which this bill is referred take favorable and prompt action on this proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3532) providing for the acceptance by the United States of a conveyance by the town of Hammond, Oreg., of the military cemetery formerly comprising a part of the Fort Stevens Military Reservation, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed, within 1 year afer the date of enactment of this act, to accept, without consideration therefor, any quitclaim deed conveying to the United States all right, title, and interest of the town of Hammon, Oreg., in and to the lands comprising the military cemetery or burial plot formerly comprising a part of the Fort Stevens Military Reservation, Oreg., together with the graves and monuments contained therein, and the approach road and appurtenances thereto; such lands having been conveyed to such town by the United States, without consideration therefor, by quitclaim deed executed March 2, 1948 (as corrected by the deed executed August 6, 1948), pursuant to the act entitled "An act to preserve historic graveyards in abandoned military posts," approved July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 234).

SEC. 2. Upon the acceptance by the Secretary of the Army of the conveyance of the military cemetery pursuant to the first section of this act, the Secretary of the Army shall establish such military cemetery as a national cemetery and shall provide for the suitable care and maintenance of such cemetery. The Secretary shall not, for a period of at least 25 years from the date of acceptance of such conveyance, remove any of the remains interred in such cemetery.

COMMISSION ON NURSING SERVICES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, last year I introduced the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 56), a companion to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 171) introduced by Representative FRANCIS P. BOLTON of Ohio, establishing a national commission to study the subject of nursing services.

On January 25 of this year, Mrs. BOLTON introduced a new joint resolution in the House which makes certain changes in last year's draft with respect to the purpose and composition of the proposed commission.

These changes would bring the commission completely in line with the position of the executive branch.

In the hope that I may help to stimulate congressional consideration of this important subject, I am today introducing a new joint resolution which is identical to the new draft introduced in the House last January by Mrs. BOLTON, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the new resolution and a pamphlet entitled "The Urgent Need For More Nurses," which explains the reasons for establishing a Commission on Nursing Services, be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and pamphlet will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 158) for the establishment of a Commission on Nursing Services, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas public confidence in the medical profession, including hospitals and nursing services, has been augmented by the increasing longevity of the people which is the result of such services; and

Whereas it is generally recognized that the consequent demand for nursing services is increasing faster than the supply which is available for the health services of the people; and

Whereas the combined efforts of the recognized representatives of the medical and nursing professions and associations of hospital and public health agencies have not been successful over the past decade in supplying that demand; and

Whereas the economic status of nursing, the professional skills required, and the existing personnel shortage demand study in the light of the need of the public for nursing services; and

Whereas many segmental and unilateral studies of health service problems have been made, but none takes an overall multidisciplinary view of the situation on behalf of the patient; and

Whereas existing reports, studies, and knowledge could be utilized by a central task force organized to study the demand for nursing services in relation to the overall health of the Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote the health of the American people by assisting them in securing improved nursing services. It is the purpose of this joint resolution to implement that policy by providing for the establishment of a Commission which shall gather by scientific methods authoritative data relating to the needs for services rendered by all types of nursing personnel (including professional and practical nurses, nursing aides, and nursing administrators, supervisors, and teachers) and shall make such recommendations to the President with respect thereto as it deems advisable in the interest of improving patient care.

(b) Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed as authorizing or intending any interference with the programs of study and improvement of patient care which are being carried forward by the professional nurses' organizations, or by public or private endeavor, but rather this joint resolution shall be construed as an effort to augment such programs through the marshaling of

resources for a multidisciplinary approach to the problem on behalf of the patient and in the public interest.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON NURSING SERVICES

SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purpose of this joint resolution there is hereby established a Commission on Nursing Services (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C., sec. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Number and appointment: The Commission shall be composed of 15 members appointed by the President. Included among such members shall be individuals from the nursing and medical professions, persons experienced in the administration of hospitals and of public health agencies providing nursing services, and recognized authorities in the field of social science, education, accounting, and business management, to the end that the Commission will be qualified and dedicated to accomplish constructive results in the public interest.

(b) Vacancies: Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) Members from private life: The members of the Commission appointed from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

(b) Members of Congress: Members of Congress, if appointed as members of the Commission, shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from the executive branch: Persons who are in the executive branch of the Government, if appointed as members of the Commission, shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, may—

(1) secure data from agencies, organizations, and individuals and pay therefor in advance or by way of reimbursement; and

(2) procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as it authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U. S. C., sec. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9 (a) The Commission shall gather by scientific methods authoritative data relating to problems of the patient and the public in securing adequate nursing services, and shall make recommendations to the President with respect to ways and means for solving such problems.

(b) Report: The Commission shall submit to the President interim reports at such time or times as he deems necessary and shall submit to the President its final report not later than 2 years from the date of the enactment of this joint resolution. The Commission shall cease to exist on the day on which it submits its final report.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) Hearings and sessions: The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable.

(b) Obtaining official data: The Commission is authorized to request from any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this joint resolution, and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized to cooperate with the Commission and, to the extent provided by law, to furnish such information to the Commission upon request made by the Chairman or by the Vice Chairman when acting as Chairman.

The pamphlet, presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, is as follows:

THE URGENT NEED FOR MORE NURSES—REASONS FOR ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON NURSING SERVICES

There is a serious and growing need for more nurses throughout the United States.

Hospitals, nursing schools, nurses' associations, and Government agencies have striven earnestly to remedy this situation. But their combined efforts have been unable to cope with the accelerating demand for nursing services arising from growth in population and increasing longevity, improvement in standards of care of the sick, new scientific and technical advances, increasing care of veterans and expanding Government, State, and city institutional requirements.

Because of the urgency of the problem and its imperative need of solution, the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, Congresswoman from Ohio, has introduced in the House of Representatives a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 485) providing for a National Commission on Nursing Services.

She originally proposed, in a previous bill introduced in January of 1955 (H. J. Res. 171), a commission composed of 12 members, 2 from the Senate, 2 from the House, 2 from the executive branch of Government, and 6 from private life, among which would be included representatives of the nursing, medical, and hospital administration professions.

It was suggested, however, that Congressmen and Senators might be too busy to serve on such a commission, and also that its membership should be composed of a larger proportion of people who are experts in the field under discussion, with a smaller representation from Government.

Mrs. BOLTON, therefore, introduced this January a new bill which provides that the Commission shall be composed of 15 members appointed by the President, and that included among such members shall be individuals from the nursing and medical professions, persons experienced in the administration of hospitals and of public-health agencies providing nursing services, and recognized authorities in the fields of social science, education, accounting, and business management.

The functions of the Commission (which would operate along lines similar to the Hoover Commission) would be to determine the causes for the present nursing situation, and make recommendations to the President as to what should be done about it. In Mrs. BOLTON'S bill, the duties of the Commission are defined as follows:

"The Commission shall gather by scientific methods authoritative data relating to problems of the patient and the public in securing adequate nursing services, and shall make recommendations to the President with respect to ways and means for solving such problems."

WHY A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON NURSING SERVICES?

The conclusion that a national commission is required to solve the nursing dilemma was reached by Mrs. BOLTON as a result of a life-long interest in, and study of, the nursing profession; and contacts with, and opinions expressed by, literally thousands of people engaged in the nursing, hospital, medical and related fields.

For years Mrs. BOLTON has been troubled by the increasing difficulty of obtaining enough nurses for proper care of the sick. There is every evidence that the situation has become worse instead of better. She decided to secure, from authoritative sources, opinions as to the reasons for the growing need and the steps required to meet it.

For this purpose she sent a questionnaire to more than 10,000 representative nurses and nursing associations, doctors, hospital administrators, nursing schools, educators, laymen, State governors, Federal and State health authorities, and others. Of these, more than 4,000 replied.

The main substance of the replies can be summed up in these two sentences:

Everybody agreed that there was need for more nurses.

But there was absolutely no agreement, within or among the related professional groups, as to what should be done to provide them.

Mrs. BOLTON concluded that if nurses, doctors, teachers, hospital staffs, and others directly connected with the nursing profession were unable to agree upon a solution, the constructive course of action would be to submit the problem to an impartial agency such as a national commission.

PATTERN OF DISAGREEMENT

Seldom has a survey of authoritative sources of opinion revealed such complete disagreement as that on the subject of the reasons for the shortage of nurses, made last year by Mrs. BOLTON.

In response to the question, "Is there a nursing shortage?," practically everyone said "Yes"—but nevertheless even on this point there were some disquieting replies. Thus one educator said:

"We have more nurses now than we ever had before. The inadequacies of patient care are due more to the methods used in educating professional nurses, and using their services in institutions and agencies, than they are due to nurse shortages."

In short, the questions of nursing education and utilization of skills of existing personnel were raised at the very outset.

The shortage was considered most critical, in numbers available, in the field of general and private duty nurses; next, in the area of teaching; and third, in the field of supervision and of administration. It is for care of the patient, said most of the respondents, that more nurses are most immediately needed.

A large share of the people replying to the questionnaire emphasized the need for better teaching, and aid to nursing schools of all categories. Others stressed the fact that if we had more nurses skilled in hospital supervisory and administrative functions, better use could be made of "practical" nurses under their direction. So although the majority agreed that the nursing shortage was most keenly felt at the actual bedside of the patient, there was a divergence of opinion as to whether the main underlying problems lay in the number of practicing nurses, the system of education for nursing, or the system of supervising and administering nursing services.

On one point all were in agreement—sick people are not getting the nursing attention which they should have.

REASONS FOR THE SHORTAGE

It was the second item on the questionnaire, however, which disclosed underlying complex and conflicting difficulties which are basic contributing causes to the shortage of nurses.

This question was simply, "What are the causes of the nursing shortage, in order of importance?"

Each person who replied naturally placed, in first order of importance, the factor which applied to his particular individual situation. The result was a miscellany of answers which were almost impossible to classify, but which tell the story of the various predicaments in which nurses find themselves today. In spite of the fact that more nurses are on duty today than ever before, the demand is so great that the factor of discouragement to entering the profession must be seriously taken into account.

The economic factor was paramount. Why remain in nursing, if you can get better pay for less hours and less exacting work someplace else? Industrial, institutional and Government jobs are tempting nurses to leave their chosen field. One nurse wrote:

"When the pay of the average general duty nurse is commensurate with what is expected of her, then and only then will nursing again become the high calling it has been. Within the past 6 months I met two nurses working as saleswomen. They said they had to leave nursing in order to get work which will enable them to earn enough to provide for their old age."

On the other hand, the director of a hospital said:

"Given enough time and rope, the private duty nurse will price herself out of nursing."

There are many married nurses who would like to work part time; but how can schedules of housekeeping and hospitals be correlated? Placing married nurses on day shifts would impose on the unmarried nurses a disproportionate share of night duty.

Varying State laws and regulations come in for criticism. For example, in one State it is reported that because of restrictions imposed by the nurses' board, the "registered nurses have dominated the licensed practical nurses." In another State a married nurse complains that she is ruled "unfit to practice" because she has not been on anyone's payroll for 8 years.

New fields directly related to nursing care are absorbing a larger proportion of the qualified personnel. Among these are jobs in doctors' offices and industrial health departments, and positions as skilled technicians now open as the result of advances in specialized medical fields. This means opportunity to nurses—but it shortens the supply available to sick people who need immediate "patient-side" care.

Repeatedly reflected in the replies were tensions among nurses, doctors, and hospital administrators stemming from disagreements as to fields of responsibility. Lack of definition concerning the functions of the varied members of the nursing team, and lack of appreciation of the good work done by individual nursing groups, have created rivalries and resentments. The practical nurse feels that her function is not being given proper recognition, and the head nurse complains that she is overwhelmed with details concerning records, equipment, and organization.

CONFLICTING VIEWS AS TO EDUCATION

Should more nurses be trained, by a longer and more thorough course of higher education, to be professional practitioners? Or should more nurses be trained by a briefer and more rudimentary technical course, to be bedside nurses? Opinions are expressed vehemently on both sides.

This raised the basic issue as to what type of educational institutions should properly asssume the responsibility of teaching nurses. Hospital nursing schools? Public high schools? Denominational schools? Universities and colleges? Government? Here is an assortment of opinions on this subject:

"Nursing education, both at the practical and professional level, should move into primary educational institutions.

"Practical nurse education should be in vocational schools and junior colleges, and professional nurse education in private and public colleges and universities.

"We need more hospital trained nurses, with less emphasis on academic subjects and more on bedside care.

"What is needed is better teaching and administration in colleges and universities conducting graduate nurse education programs.

"The nursing shortage is primarily centered around the needless restrictions placed upon hospital schools of nursing.

"Hospitals should not be permitted to operate schools of nursing any more than they are permitted to operate schools for doctors, dentists, or pharmacists.

"We need hospital short-time training courses, from 11 to 18 months, for high-school graduates interested in special fields of nursing.

"We need more rural hospital training schools for nurses.

"Government trains its soldiers and sailors; why not its nurses?

"Why should the education of nurses be considered a Federal function, while general education is considered a local function?"

DIVERGENT VIEWS AS TO FINANCIAL AID

In view of such divergent opinions it is not surprising that opinions regarding financial aid to the nursing problem should be even more divergent.

The questionnaire asked whether financial aid would help; where it was most needed; and how it should be administered.

The general feeling was that Federal financial aid would definitely help, with a system of State administered Federal-State matching funds receiving the greatest approval. But about 17 percent of those replying stated that they were categorically opposed to Federal aid; and a very large share of those replying regarded Federal aid as an immediate need in an urgent situation, but did not visualize it as a far-reaching solution to the problem. The attitude semed to be, "Yes, do it, but don't expect any miracles from it unless much else is done."

Varied comments on the subject of financial aid follows:

"Federal financial aid is not the answer. The greatest good can be done in the training of good teaching and administrative personnel, and this can best be stimulated by scholarships to qualified individuals arranged through voluntary channels.

"Scholarships to schools of nursing have gone begging so finances have not been a deterrent to education.

"The student nurse should pay a portion of the training cost, the patient should pay a portion, and some portion should be borne in taxes by citizens of the community.

"Financial assistance for practical nursing would improve the situation only if the educational program is standardized under a practical national basis.

"Financial aid which will perpetuate the present system is not good.

"Have the Federal Government assist the degree course schools and let the local communities train their own hospital nurses.

"Use Federal aid to improve nurses' salaries.

"Federal funds should be available in the form of scholarships for postgraduate work.

"Funds should be directed toward student loans.

"Use Federal aid to help graduate nurses prepare themselves for higher level positions.

"Give aid to approved schools of nursing to enlarge their faculties and expand their curriculum.

"Federal aid should be used for financing research in nursing techniques, procedure and hospital management.

"Federal aid should be used to help support nursing courses in colleges and universities.

"Give Federal aid to schools for practical nursing."

To sum up, those favoring financial aid—

Were divided on the issue as to whether it should be administered on the national or local level, with the majority favoring State participation.

Were divided on the issue as to whether the aid should go to the schools, or go directly to the students.

Were divided on the issue as to whether aid to schools should be directed chiefly toward better courses for highly skilled professional nurses, or shorter courses for practical nurses.

NEED FOR A NURSING COMMISSION

The multiplicity and complexity of difficulties described, and problems posed, by the replies to the questionnaire, raise immediately the question of Federal aid; but from the long-term standpoint they present a situation which requires more than a grant of Federal funds to solve.

The questions involved include methods of education, methods of training, levels of compensation, hospital techniques, utilization of personnel, State regulatory laws, rivalries and antagonisms within the nursing field, jurisdictional disputes between nurses, doctors, and hospital authorities, the relationship between nursing costs and the ability of patients to pay, and the impact of new medical techniques.

It is obvious from the replies to the questionnaire that each respondent viewed the picture through his own glasses, so to say, with the field of vision limited to personal environment. What is required is a medium which, as Mrs. BOLTON explained to the House of Representatives, can fulfill the following functions:

"Evaluate what the changing health needs of the public are.

"Appraise the resources in money, manpower, and skills necessary to deal with these health needs.

"Study the kind of nurse education and training necessary to meet these needs.

"Study the relationship between the economic status of nurses, the professional skills required, and the existing personnel shortage.

"Analyze the various techniques and arts of nursing, including all successful new

methods or devices, and indicate where they may best be applied."

For this purpose, Mrs. BOLTON proposes the establishment of a National Commission on Nursing Services.

WHAT IS A "COMMISSION"?

Simply a group of people, from public and private life, brought together in the public interest under the authority of Congress to gather facts, draw conclusions from those facts, and make recommendations.

The group specified by Mrs. BOLTON's bill should certainly be well qualified to do this.

The nursing, hospital administration, and medical professions would be represented, thereby giving each an opportunity to present its point of view.

Since the Commission would focus its attention directly upon nursing, it would give nurses an opportunity, such as they have never had before, to explain nursing problems to a national body specifically set up for the purpose of taking an interest in this subject.

Since nurses' pay, one of the major factors in relationship to the continuing supply of nursing services, is an ever-present problem in hospital administration, the Commission would give the hospital administrators an opportunity, such as they have never had before, to air the whole problem of hospital financing and to get sympathetic public support for the difficulties which they face.

Similarly, the Commission would provide an opportunity for the doctors to attempt to clarify their relationship with the nursing profession, particularly with respect to the use and application of new technical equipment, which has become a field requiring immediate attention.

Note that Mrs. BOLTON's bill specifies that, in addition to representatives of the nursing, medical, and hospital administration professions, the personnel of the Commission should include "recognized authorities in the fields of social science, education, accounting, and business management."

Note that the bill also provides that public health agencies providing nursing services may be represented on the Commission; and Members of the Congress may be appointed to the Commission, if the President should so decide.

The Commission may hold hearings, employ the services of experts in its field of investigation, and secure any facts it desires from governmental departments and agencies. It shall be granted a budget sufficient for its operations.

It shall submit interim reports to the President, and not later than 2 years from the time of its appointment it shall give the President its final report.

RESULTS

The findings of a national Commission, arrived at on an impartial, factfinding basis, should carry great weight with the public and indicate constructive courses of action in legislation, in education, and in hospital administration.

The need for nurses grows more acute each year. Unless this trend is reversed, the outcome will be disastrous.

Only too often, in our country, we have dodged basic difficulties by stopgap measures. We cannot afford to do this where the lives of our citizens are involved.

The situation demands remedies which take a long view of the situation, and these, to be soundly based, must be founded upon a study and analysis of causes. This would be the job of the proposed Commission on Nursing Services.

REVISION OF FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS—AMENDMENT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am about to submit an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, which I intend to propose to the Federal Elections Act, S. 636, when that bill or a substitute is taken up by the Senate, and I ask that it be printed. I also ask unanimous consent that it be set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. . The Comptroller General shall establish in the General Accounting Office an Office of Election Campaign Expenditures. It shall be the function of that Office, under regulations to be promulgated by the Comptroller General, to make from time to time through audits and field investigations with respect to election campaign contributions and expenditures to which this Act is applicable, to statements filed under the provisions of this Act, and to alleged failure to file statements required under the provisions of this Act. On the request of the Comptroller General, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with the consent of the Attorney General, is authorized to render such assistance as the Comptroller General may require in any instance to carry out an audit or investigation under this subsection in the most complete and effective manner. The Comptroller General shall from time to time make reports, which shall be public, concerning audits and investigations under this subsection to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House, and, in instances of possible violation of this Act, to the Attorney General.

Mr. President, my amendment is a simple provision to assure enforcement of the limitations on campaign financing, and the reporting of campaign contributions and expenditures, which are the main provisions of the legislation before the Senate. A provision such as the one I propose should already be a part of the Corrupt Practices Act now on the statute books. S. 636 and S. 3308—the bills which have been introduced during the present session—seek to extend considerably the legal controls of methods of campaign financing. The enactment of such legislation, in whatever form, makes more important than before that there be in the law a provision which establishes the affirmative responsibility within the Government for supervising compliance with, and if necessary, for making possible the enforcement of, the new and stricter limitations and reporting requirements.

The establishment of such affirmative responsibility becomes more important as the statutory controls on campaign financing become more comprehensive. Under the present law, it is so easy to make uncontrolled expenditures and contributions while remaining well within the realm of complete legality; it is so easy and so customary to finance campaigns in a manner which requires no Federal reporting, that there is relatively little for a Federal enforcement agency to enforce. I might digress at this point to observe that, for example, according to present reporting requirements, in the 1954 senatorial campaign in Oregon more money was expended than in the senatorial races simultaneously held in many of the most populous and wealthiest States of the Union.

Oregon has only about 1 percent of the national population. As I told the Senate last month, in introducing my Theodore Roosevelt bill, S. 3242, I reported expenditures by campaign committees on my behalf of a little more than $103,000. My opponent's committees reported total expenditures of $142,000, or almost 40 percent more. I made this report both to the secretary of state of Oregon, under Oregon law, and to the Secretary of the Senate. Subsequently, it developed that—if the reporting made under our present system was to be taken at face value—the senatorial race in Oregon was one of the most costly in the whole Nation.

Of course, Mr. President, we know that this is not so. We know that, naturally, an election in one of the more populous States, with the necessity of reaching many millions of people with the opposing candidates' statements and programs, is necessarily more costly than a campaign in a State with only 1 percent of the national population. Yet, under our present system, there is actually no legal provision which brings to the surface, for public information and control, the actual facts about the financing of the political campaigns in our country.

REPORTING LAWS MUST BE ENFORCED BY AUDITS AND INVESTIGATIONS

As I have stated, both S. 636 and S. 3308 include much more rigorous provisions than present Federal law to require disclosure of the amounts and sources of campaign expenditures and contributions. These are, of course, worthwhile provisions; although I have said before that limitations and reporting provisions will not solve the problem of campaign financing as long as the necessity remains for financing the extremely heavy costs of modern election campaigns from privately collected political donations.

Still, disclosure is a valuable step. The people in every State should have the facts about the financing of their election campaigns. Let us assure, however, that they do get the facts. I have been concerned that the enactment of new reporting provisions, without provisions for thorough-going supervision and control, would merely spotlight to public view the one-seventh of the iceberg of campaign financing which shows above the surface, leaving the other six-sevenths still submerged.

In his state of the Union message on December 3, 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt said that:

It is well * * * to provide for the publication of both contributions and expenditures. There is, however, always danger in laws of this kind, which from their very nature are difficult of enforcement; the danger being lest they be obeyed only by the honest, and disobeyed by the unscrupulous, so as to act only as a penalty upon honest men.

Mr. President, it is to avoid having the valuable improvements of S. 636 or S. 3308 "act only as a penalty upon honest men" that I am introducing my amend-

ment today. The amendment is self-explanatory. I only want to point out the reason for selecting the General Accounting Office as the agency within which to set up the proposed Office of Election Campaign Expenditures. The reason is that any executive agency, whether the Department of Justice or any other, would never be free from charges of politics, both in the investigations it might undertake and in those which it did not undertake—no matter how good a job the agency might do and how uninformed the charges might be. It seems to me that the Comptroller General is the officer of the Government who is most likely to be able to carry out the supervisory and investigative functions which are necessary, without being suspected of partisan motivation.

Secondly, I also point out that under my amendment, the new Office of Election Campaign Expenditures would have the affirmative responsibility for collecting data on all election campaigns to which the Federal election laws apply, on its own initiative—not only to investigate complaints of violation of those laws.

This amendment would not supersede section 208 of S. 636, which provides for supervision by the appropriate congressional committees of the operation of the Federal Elections Act. It is not only consistent with section 208; I believe the amendment is essential to make the congressional supervision contemplated by that act really effective.

VOLUNTARY INCOME-TAX REPORTING WOULD NOT WORK WITHOUT ENFORCEMENT MACHINERY

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me emphasize once more that voluntary reporting provisions and spending limitations are only as good as the potential of investigation and enforcement which stands behind them. The United States has what is probably the best income-tax system in the world, based upon a procedure of self-assessment and voluntary reporting. Under this system, perhaps close to 60 million individual returns are filed every year. Relatively speaking, only a handful of these are audited or otherwise investigated. Yet, if it were not for the knowledge that there is in existence efficient and effective machinery for auditing and investigating these returns, and for enforcing our tax laws, how long would this structure of voluntary compliance be able to stand? Without such machinery in the proposed new elections law, the well-meant reporting requirements and spending limitations in that law will be no more effective than the income-tax laws of countries such as France or Italy, in which taxpayers can assume enforcement to be virtually nonexistent. Then these laws will indeed, as Theodore Roosevelt said, become only a penalty upon honest men.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, lie on the table, and be printed.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment proposed by Mr. DANIEL (for himself and other Senators) to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REPORT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE ON HIS RECENT ASIAN TOUR

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as we all know, the Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, reported to the Nation on Friday evening, March 23, through a nationwide hookup on both television and radio. Inasmuch as this was an important summary of conditions in Southeast Asia, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of his address be published in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT TO THE NATION BY THE HONORABLE JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE, ON HIS RECENT ASIAN TOUR

I

I have just returned from a 19-day trip which took me to 10 countries of Asia. It gave me the chance to talk intimately with the leaders of each of these 10 countries. That is a great aid to good international relations. We can, of course, write each other notes. But talking face to face is the best way yet invented for enabling men to understand each other.

I also took part in the annual meeting, held this year at Tokyo, of the heads of our 14 United States missions in the Far East area. I discussed our policies with them and answered their questions and received their suggestions.

The particular reason why I took this trip at this time was that the Council of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—SEATO—was meeting in Pakistan. That treaty, you may recall, was made at Manila in 1954 to deter Communist aggression which was then threatening ominously in Southeast Asia. We have a Council meeting each year, attended by the Foreign Ministers of the eight member countries. Last year our Ministerial Council met at Bangkok. This year we met in Pakistan.

We had a good meeting. It further developed the Organization and gave it increased stature. We feel confident that our combined strength and vigilance will safeguard the treaty area against open armed aggression. We also believe that this shield will make it more possible for the member countries to develop, individually and collectively, their economic and social welfare.

After 4 days in Pakistan, I went on to visit India, Ceylon, Indonesia, Thailand, Vietnam, the Philippines, Formosa (Taiwan), Korea, and Japan. These 10 countries I visited have a total population of over 700 million people, or almost one-third of the total population of the earth. More than 600 million of these people were colonial people until as recently as the close of World War II. Now they are independent nations.

Several of them are only now completing their new political institutions. For example, while we were in Pakistan that country adopted its first constitution. In Indonesia the first government based on national elections was in process of formation. On the day I left Vietnam, a popularly elected constituent assembly was meeting to frame a constitution.

This building and testing of new political processes is the outstanding and exciting characteristic of the area I visited.

Another characteristic is the determination to develop the economic potentials of the area. So far, productivity is low. The average income amounts to about $100 a year. The people expect their new governments to improve their living conditions.

There are some who doubt the determination or ability of these free Asian nations to preserve and develop their political independence, and also to make that independence serve to improve social and economic conditions. I do not share that doubt. But I do come back with the strengthened conviction that the United States can help the Asian countries to achieve both of these goals. Also, I feel sure that it is in our own interest to provide that help.

I wish that I had time to give you a country-by-country report. But there isn't time for that. So I shall give some general conclusions.

II

Let me speak first of the problem of political independence in Asia. We need to be aware of how proud the peoples of Asia are to be free of foreign domination and how sensitive they are to any hint of encroachments from without. Also, let us remember that while we think first of the danger that stems from international communism, many of them think first of possible encroachments from the West, for that is the rule they have actually known at first hand.

But I found that the leaders are quite aware of the danger of penetration by international communism, and of the fact that Soviet and Chinese Communist economic lures generally go with a hook and line that leads to Moscow or Peiping. Some take more effective precautions than others to avoid being caught. But none of the leaders is blind to this danger.

They all desire help which will in fact preserve their independence and develop their free institutions. But they want to be very sure that that help does not subtract from their sovereignty, or retard their development by involving them in controversies that do not directly concern them.

The United States is able sympathetically to understand that attitude. We ourselves were once a colony. Our struggle for independence is the first chapter of history that is learned by every American boy and girl. Also, in our early days we, too, saw our first task as that of internal development and only changed conditions have made it apparent that international security is best assured by collective efforts.

That story of America is well known in Asia. George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln are honored names, and it is significant that the President of Indonesia, in his opening address to the Bandung Conference, invoked the memory of Paul Revere and the principles of the American Revolution.

All of this creates a bond of sympathy and helps to make possible a good understanding between us and them. Our historical experience is an asset of priceless value in Asia.

Many of the countries of Asia feel that their independence is better assured if they participate with us in arrangements for mutual security. Then we help them develop their national forces and they share the deterrent of our mobile military power. There are such arrangements—bilateral or multilateral—with 7 of the 10 countries I visited—Pakistan, Thailand, Vietnam, the Philippines, free China, Japan, and Korea. Three of the countries I visited—India, Ceylon, and Indonesia—have preferred not to join regional security arrangements. That choice also we respect. The United States does not seek ties of mutual defense with

any country whatsoever, unless that country believes that this application of the principle of collective security will better assure its independence.

III

Let me turn now from the problem of political independence to the problem of economic and social development. Here, too, the conduct and example of the United States provide an inspiration and a responsibility.

The United States has itself realized an economic miracle. Our population of about 165 million produces nearly half of all the goods that are produced in the world.

When contrasted with our example, the production of forced labor pales into relative insignificance.

There is, of course, no magic formula for reproducing elsewhere economic productivity like ours. It is not to be had merely for the wanting, or merely by the installation of machines. It is a product of widespread education; of an ingrained spirit of enterprise; and of savings which provide more efficient tools for labor.

I did not find that the Asian leaders expect that either they, or we, or all of us in combination, will be able to change their economies overnight. But I did find in Asia a natural and powerful urge to get on a path which surely, even though slowly leads upward to better economic and social conditions.

If we wish to see the free world preserved and enlarged, we must help, or forces of despotism will take control. The day is past when the peoples of Asia will tolerate leadership which keeps them on a dead center economically and socially, and when each generation merely ekes out a bare subsistence, with a brief life expectancy, and passes on to the next generation only the same bleak prospect.

The United States has already come to see that its own self-interest is served by helping others improve their economic condition. Our Nation provides this help in many ways, public and private, throughout the free world. For 10 years now, we have had mutual security programs, and for the last 3 years, and following the completion of the Marshall plan for Europe, much attention has been given to Asia.

One component of our mutual security program is technical assistance. It helps others to develop new techniques. This is a good program manned by loyal and competent persons. But it is a program which could be enlarged and improved.

For example, I found a widespread desire in Asia to learn the English language. This knowledge is eagerly sought for as opening the door to a valued literature in both cultural and technical fields.

The Soviet Union has been specializing for many years on training technicians. These technicians are at the same time thoroughly indoctrinated in communism so that they can serve also as political agents. All of these technicians are at the command of the Soviet Government which can direct them to go wherever it wills. It is trying to insinuate them into key posts in lands which they hope to dominate.

In the case of the United States the Government can appeal, but it cannot command. Also it cannot match the financial rewards of private business. The answer, it seems to me, must be found in a greater recognition on the part of our people of the inner or spiritual satisfactions to be gained by public service and aiding in the cause of human welfare.

In the past missionaries, doctors, and educators in large numbers carried our faith and our knowledge to other people under conditions involving great hardship and sacrifice. There are many Americans today who are doing that very thing. In the 38 countries which I have visited since becoming Secretary of State, I have almost always talked with gatherings of the Americans of our Foreign Service and related services. I have often found them serving under conditions of hardship. But also I have found that they derive satisfactions which are not readily to be found under conditions of greater ease and material prosperity at home.

It is my earnest hope that more of our young men and women, who are specially qualified to help others to help themselves, will engage in this great adventure.

In addition to technical assistance, we have economic programs of other sorts. We have programs which help our allies to bear the cost of their defense establishments which vitally supplement our own.

Then we have surplus commodity programs, which under proper conditions can do much good. It is necessary to avoid unfair competition with countries which historically depend upon the sales abroad of their own agricultural surplus. But I was impressed with the fact that, subject to this qualification, our surpluses can do much to bring a better life to Asian people. For example, we have just concluded an agreement with Indonesia for delivery of surplus commodities of a value of some $95 million, and we are just beginning a milk program for the children of Ceylon.

These programs involving military support, technical assistance, and surplus commodities are of great importance and contribute to preserving and developing the Asian economies. But by themselves they are not sufficient to enable the free Asian countries to make their economies more diversified or lessen their dependence on others for manufactured goods. The present lack of diversification and industrialization is the weakness which Asian leaders above all want to cure. That aspect of the matter requires more emphasis. Japan should be able to help in this respect as one Asian nation, indeed, the only Asian nation, which has found the way to industrialization.

President Eisenhower has just sent to the Congress his message on the mutual security program, including economic assistance. On the basis of my trip, I am more than ever convinced of the vital importance of this program. It can be improved in ways the President has suggested. There is need for greater flexibility in the use of the funds appropriated. In addition, the United States should be able to back long-range projects requiring several years for completion. This will importantly strengthen our program.

To meet defense costs and dietary needs is important. The one preserves independence; the other preserves life. But also there is need for more water, more fuel and electric power, more development of mineral resources, and more industrial plants so that, hereafter, the people can, by their own efforts, raise their own living standards.

To share with others our own blessings accords with the best and most deeply rooted of American traditions. George Washington, in his Farewell Address, said, "It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt that in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it?"

Our mutual security plan conforms to Washington's prescription. Even though, to use Washington's phrases, it loses us some temporary advantages, the fruits of that plan will, in the course of time, richly repay us. That plan provides the margin of difference between a world environment which is friendly and healthy, and one which is corroded by massive discontents dangerous both to us and to the discontented.

Throughout most of the countries I visited there is a profound desire for peace. In the case of the the Republic of Korea and the Republic of China the leaders and the people would be willing to make almost any sacrifice to restore freedom to their countries as a whole. However, even there the will to sacrifice is tempered by knowledge that modern war creates such widespread devastation and so many evils that it provides no clear solution to any problem.

Communist propaganda has sought diligently to create the impression that the United States seeks war and that its collective security arrangements are aggressive in purpose.

I had no opportunity to judge the impact of that propaganda upon the people generally. But so far as concerns the leaders with whom I talked I found no evidence whatsoever that they believe that the United States wants war.

The spot in the Far East where, at the moment, conflict most threatens is the Taiwan (Formosa) area. I reported to our Asian friends how, at our Geneva talks with the Chinese Communists, we were patiently but persistently striving for a reciprocal renunciation of force with particular relation to this Taiwan area.

I found in India some fear lest our arms supplied to Pakistan, which feels endangered from the north, might be turned against India.

I received the most categorical and convincing assurances from the highest authorities of Pakistan that they have no belligerent intentions whatsoever as against India. In India I publicly called attention to the fact that the Southeast Asia Security Pact expressly prohibits any use of force, except in defense against aggression. Also the agreements under which we are supplying arms to Pakistan explicitly provide that these arms shall not be used for any aggressive purpose. I expressed my conviction that Pakistan would scrupulously observe these solemn engagements.

I found uniformly that the Asian leaders with whom I talked desire the United States to be strong and that that strength should continue to be a sort of protective umbrella over other free nations. That was the clearest single impression that I received. Repeatedly I was asked whether it was our purpose to maintain that protective cover, affording new freedoms the opportunity to sink deep their roots, and grow strong. Each time my reply was emphatically affirmative. And this reply was received with profound satisfaction.

There is of course a great desire for disarmament, particularly since it is felt that armament limitation would release funds which, in part, would inure to the benefit of the less economically developed countries of the world. President Eisenhower's letter to Chairman Bulganin of March 1, discussing disarmament, was made public while I was on my trip. It gave much satisfaction as evidence of our purpose to seek limitation of armament which could be verified and controlled. I found no one who wanted unilateral disarmament by the United States, or disarmament which might in fact turn out to be unilateral because of evasions by others.

I believe that there is general realization of our ardent dedication to peace as well as respect for our determination to have the strength to insure that no one need feel that peace has to be bought by surrendering freedom to despotism.

V

There is throughout the Asian peoples a desire for western recognition of their dignity.

We need to remember that althought we have developed more rapidly than Asians in some directions, notably in industrialization, they have preceded us in finding

many of the ways to make life richer. Their culture and art long antedate our own, and in many respects have not yet been equalled by own own. Their handicraft is outstanding. They have an exceptional love and appreciation of beauty. They possess in full measure those human qualities which all admire—devotion to family and to country, courage, and willingness to sacrifice. They possess unusual qualities of patience, reflection, and repose.

Therefore, let us not forget that while we have material and technical things to give, they also have things to give. And if we are wise enough to perceive and to take what Asia has to offer, the balance struck between us will not be onesided by any true measure of values.

VI

I come back from this trip encouraged. Of course, Soviet and Chinese economic tactics are a danger. Of even greater danger are their tactics of stirring up hatred as between free nations. But I feel that conditions which we wish for will prevail in the area I visited, if only we play worthily our part.

What is it that we seek? It is not conquest or domination. If that were our goal, I would have to conclude that it is doomed to failure. Our desire is a world in which peoples who want political independence shall possess it whenever they are capable of sustaining it and discharging its responsibilities in accordance with the accepted standards of civilized nations. That condition of independence is developing throughout non-Communist Asia, and I believe that it will continue to develop as against assault from any quarter.

But we also realize that political independence is not enough. It is a means to certain ends. One of these ends is the infusing of men with reasonable hope that if they strive, they can build a better world for their children and their children's children. That reasonable hope we can help to provide without any encroachment whatsoever on the political independence of others. Under those conditions help will be welcome. Under reverse conditions, it would, I am glad to say, be rejected.

Also, there is need for a new attitude toward the diversity that Asians provide. Differences of race and of culture are not measures of superiority or inferiority. Indeed, uniformity and conformity are conditions to be abhorred. The great richness of our universe is due above all to its diversity. We may take honorable pride in our own distinctive accomplishments. But we should equally be aware that the accomplishments of others are a proper subject for their pride and our appreciation.

The future belongs to independence, not domination; to freedom, not servitude; to diversity, not conformity. Acceptance of that fact will create between the Asians and ourselves a solid basis for fellowship. It will enable us, as mutual friends and helpers, to pursue hopefully the destiny that we share in common.

Thank you and goodnight.

EIGHTY-FIRST BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SYNGMAN RHEE, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to an important landmark today in the history of the free world. I refer to the 81st birthday of the venerable statesman, the distinguished President of the Republic of Korea, our good friend, Dr. Syngman Rhee.

I know that I speak for my colleagues in conveying the warmest personal greetings of Members of the Senate and House to this outstanding leader as he passes his 81st milestone of achievement and service. We wish for Dr. Rhee a great many more years of continued fruitful endeavor for his nation and the cause of the free world.

We of the United States have always rightly counted on Dr. Rhee as one of our stanchest and most courageous allies in the East. It is small wonder that he has so great and warm a regard for us, because, after all, he came to know our country and our people on the closest and most understanding of terms in the course of his long period here from 1904 to 1945. As he himself has always graciously acknowledged, no country in the world has done more for the Republic of Korea than has the United States of America. And Korea in turn has reciprocated by the warmest possible esteem for us.

We can, however, well appreciate the feelings of Dr. Rhee today, as he confronts the continued unhappy division of his land, and as he notes, with each passing day, the continued outrageous violations on the part of the Communists to the north of the letter and the spirit of the Korean truce terms.

In Seoul, the capital ravaged by the Reds, Dr. Rhee's government is today but 18 miles away from the barbed-wire frontier. He and his government are less than 8 minutes flying time away from the closest Red airfields, airfields which have been rebuilt, which have been jammed with new MIG fighters in direct violation of the truce, not to mention such similar violations by the Communist forces as the brazen shipment into North Korea of powerful new ground material and equipment. While Korea and the United States are faithfully abiding by the truce terms, the Reds are doing exactly the opposite.

These, then, are the facts which may at times account for some discouragement on the part of even so great a statesman, with so powerful a faith, as Dr. Rhee. And yet we know that his faith—a true Christian faith—will prevail, and that the unity of a free, democratic Korea will indeed come to pass.

In the meanwhile, Korea has not been, and will not be, forgotten by the United Nations and the rest of the world. I was pleased to note, for example, only a week ago Tuesday, that Sweden, Norway, and Denmark had agreed to help provide a new international medical center in Seoul, at a cost of $11.9 million. The Scandanavian countries will contribute $9.5 millions, the United Nations Korean Agency will contribute $2.4 millions.

This is the type of practical, enlightened aid which helps to fulfill the world's debt to the gallant people which braved the worst terrors of the Red onslaught—yes, which took on the aggressor even before there was any assurance that the rest of the free world would come to Korea's support.

Meanwhile here, in our own country, the people of the United States, through a wide variety of means, particularly through the splendid instrumentality of the American-Korean Foundation, are contributing to necessary Korean relief and rehabilitation. Church groups, including of course, the fine Christian Children's Fund, women's clubs, fraternal groups, labor, business, and others have evidenced their continued deep friendship for the Korean people, for their homeless and orphaned multitudes, for their wounded and disabled, as well as for the general population.

It is fortunate that Korea is so ably represented here by his excellency, Dr. You Chan Yang, who, like his President, shares so warm and long-standing an intimate friendship with and understanding of the people of the United States.

I understand that Ambassador Yang and his wife will, as a matter of fact, journey next month on a tour of the 21 Latin American Republics. There they will be in a position at first hand eloquently to convey the Korean story, the North American story, to the friendly Republics to the South.

The President of Korea, the Korean Ambassador, the Korean people know what communism really is and what it does. The enormous casualties suffered by this brave people, the enormous number of their people who were grabbed by retreating Red forces and kidnapped behind the Red border, the enormous number of orphaned children left behind speak for themselves on what Korea has suffered at the hands of international communism, whether it be called Stalinist communism or any other brand.

May the lessons of Korea's suffering never be forgotten, and may the valor of Korea never be forgotten. And so I should like to salute Dr. Rhee and wish him and his good wife continued long life and health and service.

At times, we and Dr. Rhee have obviously had some differences. But after all, what good is friendship, if a proven friend cannot speak frankly to another proven friend from one's innermost heart, as Dr. Rhee has frankly spoken to us.

Such differences as we may have had on some few occasions fade into insignificance in the light of the common bonds between us, particularly the unbreakable links forged by the fighting sons of America and valiant ROK troops, under his inspired leadership. Those troops fought, bled, and died, side by side with other free boys beneath the United Nations banner against the savage Communist tide.

Our Secretary of State Dulles last week returned from a visit with Dr. Rhee and other Asian leaders. I know that in Seoul, Secretary Dulles renewed our warm ties with Korea's first man, its greatest citizen and most stalwart champion.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to join with my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], in paying tribute to a great leader and a famous statesman, Dr. Syngman Rhee, who today is celebrating his 81st birthday.

The story of Dr. Rhee's long and colorful life is an exciting one, full of both tragedy and triumph. It is a life which has always been directly related to the fight for freedom and independence for his beloved land, Korea.

In the late 1890's, Dr. Rhee began his great crusade for a free and democratic Korea. In 1895, he organized student demonstrations against the Japanese, who controlled the Korean Government. Later, he led demonstrations demanding more democracy in the government and more reforms. This time he was arrested and tortured for his courage, and was sentenced to life in prison. Even in jail, he continued the fight for liberty and democracy, and he also became converted to Christianity.

Dr. Rhee was freed in 1904, and soon after came to the United States. By 1910 his country had been entirely taken over by the Japanese. By then, Dr. Rhee had obtained degrees from George Washington, Harvard, and Princeton Universities.

In 1919, with the great spiritual support of President Wilson's 14 points to back him up, Dr. Rhee helped launch a new independence movement in Korea. A free government in exile was formed, and Dr. Rhee was elected President. This exiled government continued until 1945, when its members returned to a freed Korea—at least, a free South Korea.

The history of that brave republic since 1945 is familiar to all of us.

All his life Dr. Rhee has been a symbol of freedom to his people.

It has been a great privilege for Mrs. Smith and me to have made a number of trips to Korea, and to have visited Dr. Rhee and his charming wife in their home there. Not only have we enjoyed the inspiration of his intense devotion to the cause in which he believes so sincerely, but we have also enjoyed his bubbling sense of humor and his warm friendship.

Today we pay honor and respect to this brave man, and wish him many more years of life and happiness. Above all, we join him in hoping that the day is not too far off when his dream of a free, independent, and unified Korea will come true.

REFUSAL OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD TO ASSUME JURISDICTION IN FLORIDA HOTEL WORKERS STRIKE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Friday, March 23, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] delivered on the floor of the Senate a powerful and constructive speech in which he was highly critical of the operations of the National Labor Relations Board. The Senator from Oregon requested a congressional investigation of the perversion of the Taft-Hartley Act by the National Labor Relations Board.

One of the acts of which the senior Senator from Oregon was highly critical was the refusal of the National Labor Relations Board to take jurisdiction in the pending strike of hotel employees in Miami, Fla.

On February 9, George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, addressed nearly 19,000 persons at Bayfront Park, Miami. The occasion was the largest labor rally in the history of Florida. At that time, Mr. Meany pledged the full support of the organized labor movement to the striking hotel workers of that city.

Mr. President, that strike has now continued for nearly 11 months. Yet, in spite of the length and bitterness of the dispute, and the critical disruption and dislocation of the hotel business and of the lives of the striking hotel employees, the NLRB has persistently refused to assume jurisdiction in this dispute. Since the State of Florida has failed to provide the necessary machinery for the determination of a bargaining representative, the result of the Board's decision has been the frustration of our national labor policy.

Mr. Meany's speech emphasizes the extreme hardship which has resulted from the Board's decision. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is my purpose tonight to speak to you plainly and directly about the problems confronting the working men and women of this community and the Nation as a whole.

As you know, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations is currently holding its midwinter meeting here. It is the first opportunity we have had, since the labor movement was united last December, of charting plans and policies for future action.

The AFL-CIO is an American organization. It is our determination to defend and protect, not to destroy, the traditional freedoms which are the bedrock of the American way of life. We believe in law and order. But as free American citizens, we insist on exercising our right to protest against any law or any order which we are convinced is unjust.

Of course, the basic mission of our trade movement is to improve the standards of the wage earners of this country. Simply stated, our method of accomplishing this objective is to encourage workers to organize into unions and to bargain collectively with their employers.

Over the years, we have made considerable progress in this direction. The AFL-CIO now has over 15 million members. These workers have won through collective bargaining the highest standards enjoyed in any nation on earth. But union members have not been the only ones to benefit. Unorganized workers also have shared in the gains. Business is able to prosper and expand, because the workers earn enough to buy the products of industry. The farmers also are better off when the great mass of our population has enough income to eat well.

Thus we are justified in concluding that the trade-union movement has made an important contribution to building a stronger America. We want to make it still stronger. We want to bring the benefits of trade unionism to millions of workers as yet unorganized.

Plans to organize the unorganized are going to be shaped at this meeting of the executive council. We are well aware that we will encounter considerable opposition when we try to put these plans into effect. There are still many employers in this country, although fortunately not as many as there used to be, who will go to any lengths to fight unions. There are still laws on the statute books of the Nation and a number of the States which hamper and handicap union efforts to organize.

But let me tell you something—the opposition we face today, severe as it may appear to us, is not nearly as formidable as that which the founders of our movement had to contend against years ago. Just remember that in the early days of this country the courts held that any union was a criminal conspiracy. Remember the evidence put into the official records of the Senate by the La Follette committee—evidence of company thugs and spies, of industry-wide employer combinations to blacklist union members and to boycott union-made products. Our predecessors had to struggle against terrific odds. If we are half the men they were, we will not fail.

There has been a lot of speculation in the public prints about where the United Labor movement will launch its big organizing campaigns. Some of those on the sidelines have been picking targets for us. Actually, there is no mystery to it at all. The truth is we will organize wherever we find unorganized workers who want to get ahead by joining unions.

There is also a well-financed propaganda campaign to make the public believe that the unions are setting out to organize more members merely for the sake of gaining greater power. According to some of these propagandists, the big corporations are defending the right of workers to join a union and the unions are just power hungry for more dues.

Well, if there are any workers in this country who prefer to pay $3 a day dues to their employers in the form of substandard wages to $3 a month dues to a union which can help them attain high standards, they are not intelligent enough to qualify as good union members, in my opinion.

Here in the Miami area you have a perfect illustration of the kind of workers the trade-union movement is trying to help. For years the employees of the luxury hotels here and in Miami Beach have begged and besought us to start an organizing campaign to help them reach a decent level of wages and working conditions. In hotels charging their patrons anywhere from $20 to $50 a day per room the workers were receiving as little as $10 a week for working 10 or 12 hours a day 7 days a week. Working conditions were so bad that they were almost unbelieveable.

Now there was no compulsion upon the Hotel and Restaurant Workers' Union to try to organize these workers. The union knew it faced bitter opposition. It knew the hotel association would fight tooth and nail to keep the union out. It knew that the State law was weighted against workers and in favor of employers. There were many other organizing opportunities in other places where the going was much easier. But the Hotel and Restaurant Workers' Union felt that it could not in good conscience ignore the appeals of the downtrodden hotel workers in this area. And so it decided just about a year ago to tackle the job.

From the very outset the response of the hotel workers to this organizing campaign has been highly encouraging. They didn't need much convincing to sign authorization cards. They flocked to the union's organizing headquarters of their own volition, anxious to join. Within a comparatively short time the union had gathered enough support from the workers to begin negotiations with the employers.

At this point, the trouble began. Some of the employers refused pointblank to talk to the union representatives. Others, according to official court findings, said they would negotiate but proceeded to use every stalling device in the book to avoid sitting down at the bargaining table. After patiently exploring every possible avenue of approach and receiving nothing but rebuffs, the union finally and reluctantly called a strike last spring against a group of hotels.

That strike has now been in progress more than 10 months. In the interim, the union has succeeded in denying the united front and signing contracts with a few hotels.

I am very happy to be able to announce that the DiLido Hotel signed a contract this

afternoon. This is an especially important victory because the DiLido was an active members of the Hotel Association. But the great majority of them, as you know, are still holding out with the help of strikebreakers and court injuctions against picketing, issued under a State law which makes a mockery of justice.

It is not a light matter to denounce a law. One of the fundamental principles of our free way of life is equal justice under law. Generally, the law is supposed to be a key that opens the door to justice. But sometimes the key works the other way. Sometimes the law locks the door to justice. That is the way the Florida right-to-work law is operating right now.

The State courts have ruled that under the law strikes cannot be held legal unless the union proves it represents a majority of the workers. Yet the law provides no way of obtaining that proof through an election. The governor of this State has said that he has no power under the law to call an election to determine whether the Hotel and Restaurant Workers Union is authorized by a majority of the workers in this case to represent them for the purpose of collective bargaining.

Seeking a way out of this legal blind alley, the union appealed to the National Labor Relations Board to call an election. That agency three times has refused to take jurisdiction.

Now it is a tradition in the labor movement for the strong to help the weak. We have been able to build up our organization to its present stature because in time of trouble those in a position to help have rallied to the support of a union encountering difficulty. In line with this tradition, established unions in this vicinity undertook plans to assist the striking hotel workers. Before these plans could get under way, a court injunction was issued restraining the Dade County Central Labor Union and any local union affiliated with it from rendering any aid or assistance to the strikers.

This injunction was issued under the same State law to which I referred earlier. As law-abiding citizens, the leaders of the local trade-union movement will not knowingly and deliberately defy such a court order. Nor do I intend to criticize the judge who issued the injunction. Perhaps, under the terms of the State law, he had no other recourse. But as the president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations and as a free American citizen I cannot and will not refrain from stating my opinion that this injunction represents a challenge to the entire labor movement.

No longer is the Miami hotel strike a local affair. This injunction makes it a national issue. The freedom of our unions to act in concert in pursuance of a lawful and praiseworthy objective, has been invaded and restricted.

This challenge strikes at the very heart of our trade union movement. We must meet it. We will meet it.

There have been great crises in the history of the labor movement. We have had laws even more vicious than the Florida law which oppresses us now. We have challenged and upset injunctions even more sweeping than the one which at present ties the hands of the Dade County Central Labor Union and its affiliates. At this stage in our forward progress, we will not be deterred nor dismayed by any impediments such as these. As long as the workers maintain a solid front, we know we will win in the end.

I am not given to issuing rash promises. It is not my purpose to make light of the very serious situation that confronts the labor movement here. There is a great deal of hard work ahead of us before we can win this fight. It will probably cost a considerable amount of money as well as effort.

But I can promise you this. The AFL-CIO will use every legal means at its command to help you. We will carry the legal fight to the highest court in the land to seek justice. We will back up your efforts to obtain amendment or repeal of the oppressive State law which is being employed against you and for the benefit of the hotel owners. We will urge the proper authorities in the United States Senate to investigate the refusal of the National Labor Relations Board to act in this case and to require it to call an election, even if we have to get that job done by amending the Taft-Hartley Act.

All of this may take time. But we cannot count on any quick or easy way out. We must dig in and fight on the way the founders of our movement were forced to do in similar circumstances. Of one thing you can rest assured—and it is the really important thing—the labor movement of this Nation is in this fight with you and will stay in it until you win.

MASS ASPIRATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS—EXCERPTS FROM LECTURE BY DR. GRAYSON KIRK

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on March 10 the Honorable Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University, delivered at the Brookings Institution a lecture which I believe to be one of the outstanding statements of recent years on our foreign policy.

President Kirk has recently studied at first hand the conditions in the Far East. He brought to his task powerful intellect, fortified by years of study and contemplation. The result of his analysis is, I believe, a statement which, if followed by our country, can well make the difference between the success or the failure of our foreign policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, excerpts from the lecture by Dr. Kirk, which I strongly recommend to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the lecture were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASS ASPIRATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

(Lecture given by Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University, at the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C., March 10, 1956, as part of the spring 1956 program of Brookings Institution lectures on the general subject of The Changing Environment of International Relations)

A few weeks ago when President Calkins cabled me an invitation to participate in this program tonight, I was happy to accept, not merely because I may have been suffering from the blithe optimism of a man who has been too long away from his office, and not even because of my high regard for the Brookings Institution and its work. I accepted because the proposed subject was one of such significance that I welcomed an opportunity to attempt even a small and inadequate contribution to its study.

An analysis of mass aspirations and international relations is not merely a matter of interest to scholars. It bears directly upon the making of foreign policy in this country—and in others—at the present time. The first principle of wise policymaking in foreign affairs is that the end product ought to represent a judgment as to the proper evaluation of two forces. One of these is vision—which is what one would like to accomplish if all obstacles were removed and one could operate under ideal circumstances. The other is a realistic estimate of the roadblocks which are certain to prevent one from reaching any ideal objective. A statesman can make such a calculation only if he has the capacity for dispassionate and searching analysis, a ready familiarity with historical evidence, and an almost intuitive ability to identify and to estimate trends.

This last quality is the true measure of statecraft. No one can be certain that he can look into the seeds of time and predict which will grow and what will be produced. But the statesman must make the effort because the penalty for failure to try may be as great as the penalty for wrong guessing. The statesman who is oblivious to changing circumstances is as much of a danger to his country as the man who is unable to resist the temptation to tell his people what he thinks will please them.

Today is a peculiarly difficult time in which to estimate the changing trends which affect foreign policy. There are times in history when the current of affairs moves, as it were, slowly and sluggishly across an open plain. There are other times when the stream seems to be fed by rushing and unexplored tributaries and when its course is quickly hidden from view. Today, we struggle with a situation of unprecedented complexity, and yet we know that we dare not pay the penalty of drift because then we would really be—if I may use the word—at the brink.

If we undertake to compare our situation today with that of even the fairly recent past, we are impressed immediately by the change in what we might call the geographic framework of foreign policy. Until perhaps the time of the First World War, our Secretaries of State could virtually ignore developments in a large part of the world. They were required to maintain a close watch over Western Europe and they kept a wary eye upon happenings in this hemisphere. Elsewhere, the imperial domination of Western Europe and the lack of any important national interests of our own combined to reduce our concerns to the bare minimum of servicing the needs of international commerce and protecting the rights under international law of American citizens.

Today our national interests are bounded by the round world itself. Names and places, once remote and exotic, are now commonplace. Is there any place in the world of today in which political, social, and economic trends may not have some bearing upon our own national welfare? Even the wastelands of Antarctica and the strategic importance of the stratosphere command our attention.

A century and a half ago one of the most respected of our Columbia professors spoke at a meeting of the New York Historical Society and he offered a toast "To the Speedy Termination of our Foreign Relations." Today some of his spiritual descendants still exist though I doubt if any of them are at Columbia, and they are sometimes elected to Congress, but they are a vanishing race. We now know, all of us, that what is done in this city affects every part of the world, and we know that the relationship is reciprocal.

But the problem of the new foreign policy is not merely one of geographic dimensions. It applies also to the substance and the instruments of policy. With respect to each country the range of our policy concerns is vastly greater than in the past. The tendencies of the press, the trends in the educational system, the formation of new political parties, discovery of raw materials, industrial development, popular attitudes toward other countries—all these matters enter into the content of policy and must be weighed. Even more pronounced is the new impact of our own domestic pressures upon the determination of policy. About this, I need not comment in the city of Washington.

As policy concerns have multiplied, so have the instruments. All of our departments,

and many of the independent agencies, have direct interests in foreign affairs and they seek a hand in policy. Trade policy, financial policy, agricultural policy, mass propaganda policy—all are instruments which somehow must be coordinated lest they work at cross-purposes. At times we speak abroad with so many voices that we can only hope that our opponents are as confused as we are as to which is the authentic voice of official America. Victory in diplomacy is not likely to come to the negotiator who shares his innermost thoughts and plans with everyone before he sits down with his friends and his adversaries.

This is not a requirement of democracy; it is an invitation to disaster.

Tonight I have been asked to draw your attention particularly to a third foreign policy consideration of growing significance throughout the world. This is the emergence of mass attitudes as an important factor in international affairs. In some respects it is one of the most striking phenomena of our time. In the earliest days of the State system, foreign affairs were the exclusive prerogative of the sovereign, and an ambassador was no more than his personal agent. As absolutism retreated, rulers accepted the obligation to consult with representatives of the people before reaching major policy decisions. Even so, the masses generally accepted the view that foreign relations should be managed by experts who brought to their task education, training, and experience. The people did not demand the right to participate directly in policymaking.

Today, throughout large parts of the world, this situation no longer obtains. Governments are now confronted with a demand for the widest possible popular consultation before policy is made. No official of a government is offered half as much advice, and by as many citizens, as the Foreign Minister. In this respect, his position is rather like that of a university president. The reasons for this are obvious. The first is literacy, or, rather, literacy and communications. Hundreds of millions of people now know more about the outside world than their fathers did. Their knowledge may be less than full or accurate, but there is more of it. Through motion pictures, the radio, books, cheap magazines, and even television the world has been brought into their homes; vicariously at least, distant lands are no longer so distant.

The second reason is a new awareness of the relationship of the outside world to the individual. People know that their taxes are high because of the need to pay for past wars and current defense programs. They know that, no matter where they live, they are exposed to the dangers of mass destruction launched from distant bases. They know that, even if they are spared the rigors of war, their welfare is affected increasingly by the flow of international trade and investment.

In these circumstances, it is not surprising that the people have begun to demand with a new insistence that they have some direct voice in the shaping of policies. Spurred on by all the pundits of press, radio, and television, the people hold over the heads of their foreign ministers the constant threat of massive retaliation for mistakes or blunders. They know that their well-being, and even their lives, may be at stake.

It would be wrong to conclude that this transformation has taken place only in the more advanced democratic societies. Outside the Iron Curtain it is in varying degrees a universal phenomenon. The virtual liquidation of colonialism has given to uncounted millions of persons a new sense of civic participation and responsibility. These peoples may be illiterate but they vote, and their attitudes and aspirations can no longer be ignored with impunity by their leaders.

Perhaps the most significant consequence of the great colonial revolution of our times is this changing attitude of the masses. The level of their expectations has been raised and it moves constantly higher. Being free politically, they are now determined to gain, and to gain quickly, a substantial improvement in material well-being. Because of increased mobility and modern communications, men of the present generation know, as their ancestors never did, how badly off they are, in terms of standards of living, by comparison with many other peoples of the earth. One has the impression, in meeting their leaders and administrators, of great vitality, great devotion, and great industry. They are determined to move their peoples quickly into the modern world. It is an inspiring experience to talk with them and to sense their drive and their dedication as they grapple with problems of staggering magnitude. These peoples, as well as their leaders, have a sense of being on the march. They have a grim determination to build a welfare state and they will reject leaders who fail to move them forward quickly into the new era. They are far less concerned about ideological labels than about human welfare. They have mass determinations as well as mass aspirations.

This changing position of the masses of people in Asia and Africa has created a new dimension, and a new set of problems, for the foreign policies of the western states. The change has come about quickly and dramatically. If there is a thesis in my remarks this evening it is that many of our present perplexities in foreign affairs stem from our failure to reexamine our foreign policy in order to make it more in tune with the mass aspirations of the non-Western World.

All nations must cope with the geographical expansion of their interests and with the multitude of new forces which affect foreign relations. In this respect the problem is much the same in Washington as in Moscow. But if we are becoming alarmed about the retreat of western influences in Asia and the sturdy growth of Soviet encroachment, we could do worse than to seek an explanation in terms of the degree to which Soviet and Western policies respectively may be in tune with these aspirations of the Asian peoples.

You may believe, of course, that Western influence in Asia is wholly satisfactory. You may believe—and some people do—that we are successfully frustrating the designs of Soviet imperialism. You may believe that time is certain to be on our side. You may believe these and any other fairy stories which commend themselves to your imagination. But I have not come here tonight to entertain you. I have come to talk about the world as I believe it is and not the world as I would like it to be. And the facts are both grim and disturbing.

With your permission I would like to devote a little time to this problem of Western relations with Asia. If we probe into it, we will realize that it throws much light upon the central problem of mass aspirations and international relations which we are asked to consider this evening. It illustrates the new dimensions which foreign policy must have if it is to be successful. Equally, it points out the unwisdom of relying overly much upon traditional attitudes and techniques. It is not a comforting exploration but it is useful.

Today the heavy hand of the past hangs over western relations with most of the peoples of southern Asia, the Middle East, and many portions of Africa. Psychologically speaking, the evils of colonialism have lived after it and much of its good has been interred with its bones. In dealing with these newly independent peoples the men of the West have not yet cast aside their traditional and ingrained attitudes of superiority and paternalism. For too long the leaders of the West have had contempt for the East because of its lack of technical progress, its differing religious beliefs, and the squalid poverty of its masses. All too frequently, even the ablest colonial administrators have failed because they could not rid themselves of the corroding assumptions of racial, technical, and national superiority.

The eastern peoples also bring into the modern world an unhappy legacy from the past. The spiritual refuge which they once found by denouncing the so-called materialism of the West now is no longer needed but it will not be discarded for a long time to come. In their struggles for political emancipation, eastern leaders found comfort and justification in forgetting the welfare features of colonial rule and in stressing policies of economic exploitation and social discrimination. So rigidly conditioned is this attitude that current western policies and practices, such as technical assistance, can be denounced—to the tune of widespread popular approval—by Communists who charge that these are merely new manifestations of western exploitation thinly disguished by western hypocrisy.

The influence of this heritage of the past is sharpened by that abnormal sensitivity and belligerent assertiveness common to all newly independent peoples. If Americans become overly impatient with these attitudes—and we are an impatient people—we would do well to recall the history of American attitudes toward Europe a hundred and fifty years ago. To do so ought to give us more understanding of characteristics which are deeply rooted in all human nature.

These comments are pointed to the rather obvious conclusion that the normal nation-to-nation, give-and-take relationships which exist today between countries such as the United States and Great Britain will be difficult to develop in western relations with the new Asian powers. Many Asian leaders have a far better understanding of the West than western leaders have of Asia. But the legacy of the past weighs on East and West alike and only time, expedited by intelligence, can improve the climate for our political relations.

It is this situation which the Soviet Union Union has undertaken to exploit for its own advantage. During their recent trip to India and Burma, the Russian leaders repeatedly attempted to identify all the Western Powers, including the United States, with colonialism and exploitation. The West was portrayed as being interested only in profits and callously indifferent to human suffering and mass aspirations for improved welfare. Comrade Khruschev told the press, while in the Burmese Shan states, "in the past the peasants were bred to be impressed into service and were told that only people chosen by God could rule. Simple peasants could not rise to any such position. But now in our state any man or woman, provided he has received a certain education, can participate in the Government. * * * I am going to say that the English were sitting here on your necks and were robbing your people, and * * * it was done not for your benefit or raising your standard of living, but in order to bring their civilization into backward countries. * * * But we say differently. They were sitting in these countries to rob the last piece of bread from the people * * *. We Soviet people are glad you have thrown off colonial oppression. We are ready to do anything in our power to help you so that there is no return of colonialism. We could be working for you, creating new lives for yourselves and your children, to be free and to possess new industries. This is our ambition * * *. You are living by your own labor and so are we. We can help each other. You help us and we will help you."—The Nation, Rangoon, December 5, 1955.

To the peoples of southern Asia, the Soviet Union thus identifies itself as the benevolent leader of the Asian peoples against the West. Carefully omitting reference to any distinctions between socialism and communism, the Soviet leaders place themselves in the posi-

tion of the big brother who has emancipated himself earlier from capitalist exploitation, who has grown to great strength under the new and beneficent system and who seeks to help his Asian neighbors achieve the same progress. It is clever propaganda because it feeds upon the aftermath of the past and the mass aspirations of the present. It is well received because it is addressed to peoples already committed to socialism rather than to free enterprise.

Russian policy also is clever because it is designed to appeal to the aspirations of different groups in the populations. The simple appeal to Asian brotherhood, the promise of help to achieve a better life free from all the alleged shackles of the past, is good enough for the masses. And it does reach the masses. The Russians realize, as western leaders apparently do not, that the only way to make effective contact with the unlettered masses is to go to them and to talk to them. Making many speeches each day to vast crowds, the Russian leaders spent a fortnight in India, traveled for thousands of miles, and preached everywhere the doctrine of neighborly assistance. The West has made no such effort to make direct contact with the Indian masses. All too often the West seems to have acted as if it believed that all Indians could read the London or the New York Times.

To lure the elite groups, the Russians have a different bag of tricks. Top leaders are bombarded with friendliness and flattery. They are given lavish presents and I do not mean a 4–H Club pin. They receive promises of economic aid in those instances, as in the case of Burmese rice exports, where they are most urgently needed.

The intellectuals are equally the objects of subtle flattery. Groups are taken to Russia and China for extensive tours where they are treated as honored guests of the state. They are invited to make speeches, they are tendered lavish banquets, and they return impressed with the recognition which they have received. Lest they seem naive in their appreciation of what they saw, it must be remembered that they did not take a western viewpoint with them when they entered the Communist paradise. Many things which would distress a westerner would not affect an Indian scholar simply because his political and cultural heritage is so different.

Against this formidable onslaught, the program of the West is far from successful. Economic and technical assistance is important and must be continued. But it is, at best, a clumsy instrument with which to achieve political results. It assumes that improvement in material well-being will cause people to reject Communist advances. It assumes that people will be willing to adopt desired political attitudes because of gratitude for favors given. Finally, it assumes that the slow-appearing political effects of economic improvement will have plenty of time in which to grow to healthy stature.

Actually, all these assumptions are questionable. There is no historical evidence to show that peoples ever have been politically influenced by gratitude. There is no guaranty that the degree of economic improvement which can be achieved in the foreseeable future can be sufficient to frustrate the effects of Communist propaganda among the Indian masses. We must face the possibility that we could spend millions of dollars in these aid programs without the slightest political results. Since I have already said that I would not stop such aid, I must hasten to add that I believe we will find success only by coupling these programs with other types of activity designed to have more mass appeal. I will return to this problem in a few moments.

Another western difficulty, much exploited by the Soviet propagandists, is our failure, as the Indians see it, to take a clear-cut and definite stand on matters involving moral principle. Our ambivalent stand on colonialism is frequently cited. So, too, is our failure to make a sweeping condemnation of South African racialism. It may seem odd to us that the Soviet Union, forever ready to use any and all means to accomplish a desired end, should be regarded by anyone as setting an example in matters involving moral principles. But however strange it may seem, such is the case and the Soviet Union has exploited its international positions on matters dear to the hearts of the Asian peoples with great skill.

Although we are filled with righteous wrath over this effort to exploit our difficulties and dilemmas, we have not succeeded in bringing to the masses the effective answers which we frequently have. We point out to our own peoples, who know it already, the credit side of our ledger but we do not reach those whom the Soviet propaganda was designed to influence.

Many people have commented in the past upon the inability of the West to state its ideological case simply, understandably, appealingly and affirmatively. Constantly placed on the defensive by Soviet attack, the West has been inarticulate in terms meaningful to the masses. We allow free enterprise to be denounced as a cloak for exploitation. Our political democracy is too far removed from the experience or the aspirations of the people. Our standards of living are admired but regarded as unattainable in such crowded lands. Freedom and dignity for the individual—these also are claimed by the Soviet system and we have not been effective in making the Asian masses understand the difference between Soviet theory and Soviet practice in this respect.

Finally, the West is at a disadvantage in competing with the U. S. S. R. because of certain obstacles created by mass attitudes at home. Let us assume, for the sake of illustration, the hypothesis that the present administration in Washington had reached the decision that it would be desirable, as a means of influencing Asian opinion, to support the admission of Red China to the United Nations. Such a decision could not be carried out without a political explosion of thermonuclear proportions. In a similar situation, the Soviet Government could use its control over all media of communication, blame the earlier position on Beria, and calmly announce the new policy. As an actual illustration, consider our long delay and the wrangling in Congress over the Indian request for wheat to combat the starvation caused by the Bengal famine. By contrast, when the Indian Government made a similar appeal to the Soviet Union the affirmative response was almost instantaneous. The Soviet Union could reverse its position and make a deal in 1939 with Hitler. When Sir Samuel Hoare ran counter to British public opinion by his agreement with Monsieur Laval over Ethiopia he failed to weather the storm and had to resign.

This, to be sure, is merely one of the inescapable consequences of political democracy and a free press. Though we would not have it otherwise, we would be less than frank if we did not admit that it is occasionally a handicap when we are contending with a government which is not responsive to such mass pressures from its own citizens. But we do have a right to demand of our own officials that they refuse to sacrifice obvious and long-range national interests merely because they find it easier to give in to a vociferous minority or because they expect to derive partisan popularity from the decision.

It should be clear from these comments that I have no great feeling of satisfaction or optimism over our efforts to date to check the infiltration of Soviet influence into Southern Asia. Present leadership in this region is able, devoted to public welfare, and determined to bring progress without communism. But I am alarmed, as I look ahead, to see how little we have done, by comparison with our opponents, to place ourselves en rapport either with the leaders or the masses.

The Soviet approach, on the other hand, is to assure the Asian leaders that they can count on Soviet sympathy and assistance in their great struggle toward national improvement. Meanwhile, the masses are being cultivated with great care. To the degree that the leaders establish close rapport with the Russians, they lose their ability to take strong measures to restrict and combat the activities of local Communist parties. If, for example, the Indian-Soviet rapproachement becomes closer, how can Congress Party candidates say to the voters, "vote for me and not for my opponent because he is a Communist"? To the degree that the masses identify their aspirations with close Indo-Soviet ties, the way is being prepared for the election of future leaders who may be less wary of Soviet enticements than the present generation. Obviously, the Russians do not believe that a Nehru or an U Nu will become Communist or that they will be unseated, either through ballots or bullets, by Communists. But the Russian tactics look ahead to a time when other, and perhaps more tractable, men will be at the helm. It is for this reason that the Russians have been most careful to avoid any criticism of Asian neutralism.

Our own policies have been guided with less foresight. We have been bitterly critical of Asian neutralism and our general attitude has been that other states are either with us or against us. The Indian rejoinder is simple and unequivocal. They say, "we will not accept your thesis that if we are to be your friends, we must regard as our enemies those whom you regard as your enemies. We wish to be friendly with all nations, including our Asian neighbors, as well as the Western Powers."

Our opposition to neutralism overlooks the fact that even if the Asian leaders had wished to do so, they would have had enormous difficulty in persuading their peoples to accept any alinement with the West. This would not have been because the alinement was anti-Communist, but because it was pro-Western. Coming so soon after emancipation from western domination, such an alinement would have been interpreted as a submission to a new form of Western influence. There has been much resentment in India over our failure to grasp this point.

Our opposition to neutralism also overlooks the Indian determination to bend all efforts toward national development. Leaders believe that any participation in what they call power blocs would divert national energies away from the immediate and primary tasks of social and economic improvement. They are quick to point out that in this respect they are following the example set by the United States for many decades after it became independent.

If I have dwelt unduly long upon some of the current problems in Indian relations with the East and the West, it is because they offer such a pertinent case-study of present-day influences of mass attitudes and aspirations upon international relations. They illustrate the folly of attempting to develop foreign policies which do not take these newly important forces into account. They indicate, at least to me, the dismal conclusion that our democracies of the West have been less skillful in this respect than our ruthless and totalitarian opponents. We will wear badly the mantle of Western leadership if we cling to a false sense of security, adopt slogans rather than policies, and persist in the notion that all other peoples must look upon us as we look upon ourselves. Above all, we will fail if we continue to assume that we can either patronize the East or deal with it just as we deal with other states of the West. In a world in which all these new forces so greatly affect relations among states, what are the prospects for world order? Such a question can

be approached only by attempting to point out some of the problems which must find at least partial solution before we can begin to think or talk intelligently about any kind of a world order.

Let me say at the outset that I am not greatly interested in the mechanics of a world order. Schemes for international federation will continue to be hatched as long as there are men whose idealism is untarnished by familiarity with the lessons of history. Such schemes provide interesting intellectual exercise and a modern outlet for missionary zeal, but that is all. At our stage in the history of the state system, confronted by these great changes in international affairs, changes brought on by the effects of the new technology, the new clash of warring ideologies, and the new level of mass aspirations, the only proper concern of sensible men is with the study of conditions which must be precedent to an improvement in international relations. We ought to be concerned, not with the requirements of a world order, but with the circumstances which will bring a détente, a relaxation of tension, a lessening of fear. No world order can grow in our present climate. If we have a more favorable climate, the problem of a world order will take care of itself.

Obviously, the first, and an ideal, requirement would be that all peoples live under a government which is freely of their own choosing, and that all governments refrain from ideological crusades or from the use of ideologies as a means of imperialist expansion. To say this is about as revealing as to hear a candidate for political office say that he stands on a platform of honesty and prosperity.

Ultimately, however, there must be some kind of mutual understanding among the nations as to the terms of coexistence. It may be implicit and unrecognized in any document which can be filed in the archives, but the sense of it must be mutually understood. Undoubtedly, it will not be wholly to our liking, because our first preference would be for the disappearance of communism and our second preference would be for a Russia restricted to her pre-Communist frontiers. Undoubtedly, it will not be to Russia's full liking, because her ideological creed is based upon the worldwide triumph of communism. But we must assume that both sides will shrink from a gigantic test of strength in order to make their most cherished aims prevail. Therefore, unless they drift into such a major conflict as a result of Russia's probing techniques in uncommitted countries, there must gradually develop some kind of mutual understanding between the Eastern and the Western worlds.

Any such trend has been greatly impeded by the legacies of the last war, notably the division of Germany, the dangerous tension in the Middle East, and the southern Asian ferment among the masses which could not fail to invite Soviet attention. Progress toward such an understanding has been aided by the stabilization of Western Europe, the continued prosperity of the United States, and a developing military situation which has reduced the likelihood of direct conflict. On balance, therefore, there seems little prospect of much mutual understanding between the two great clusters of opponents in the near future. Indeed, it will never come as long as the social and political instability in Asia and Africa remain such a lodestone for Soviet imperialism. But until it does come it is futile to talk of world order.

The second requisite is better mutual understanding between the West and the non-Western peoples outside the Iron Curtain. We must learn to understand and accept the principle of Asian neutralism, and, instead of trying to coerce or persuade these peoples into close association with us, we must do what we can to strengthen them in their chosen position so that they will not be drawn gradually into the Soviet orbit.

We will succeed in accomplishing this objective only if we can build a more satisfactory cultural relationship with the peoples concerned. We must come to understand that there is no room in the modern world for western feelings of superiority over the East or for eastern superiority over the West. We must come to have a man-to-man and a nation-to-nation relationship as equals, laboring together in the endless task of enabling all men to gain for themselves the best life which human society is capable of providing. Brought up as we are in the tradition of education oriented toward Western Europe and our cultural heritage from Europe, we must now learn more of the East and its ancient culture. We know so little of these lands where men lived and wrote and built temples and speculated about the universe at a time when our lands were still savage and primitive.

It is my own feeling that we can do more to stem the Soviet advance in Asia through cultural collaboration and the fostering of mutual understanding than through economic and technical assistance. The one can be reciprocal and it builds a sense of mutality and obligation. The other becomes too easily a donor-recepient relationship.

This is another way of saying that the foundations of any future world order are to be found in the minds of men, not merely the minds of their leaders, but of the masses as well. These foundations will not be laid down by force because today the weaker nations are in some ways stronger than their strong neighbors. They can be courted by both antogonists and their charms do not diminish with the passage of time. The foundations will not be laid down by money except insofar as its intelligent use will cause men to be more rational and less desperate in their choices. The foundations will begin to appear when, and only when, the men of different nations learn what the men of great democratic societies have already learned about each other, which is that their differences must be made less meaningful than their similarities, and that none can be safe or proper except as all are safe and prosperous. This is the lesson of the shrunken globe. It is the lesson of the Sermon on the Mount. It is not a pious exhortation but a categorical imperative. It is the price, not of contentment but of survival.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, 135 years ago yesterday, Sunday, March 25, Greece declared her independence from the Turkish Empire.

The people of America have a very special place in their hearts for the people of Greece. Our traditions, culture, language, and political institutions have to a large degree come from Greece's fabulous civilization. One can say, I think, with considerable justification, that the birthplace of liberty and democracy—a word which stems from the Greek language—is Greece. So we owe much to our friends and allies in Greece.

In our turn, we have in the more recent past demonstrated through our assistance program, our loyalty to and friendship for the freedom-loving Greek people.

Mr. President, I join today with my colleagues in honoring and paying my respects to the wonderful Greek people, and I hope their glorious tradition of freedom, which was commemorated on Sunday, will continue to flourish.

We in America hope the people of Greece will have many more centuries of peace and freedom.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I prepared in connection with the 135th anniversary of Greek independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREEK HERITAGE IN AMERICA: A TRIBUTE ON THE 135TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

Many of us have never given much thought to the origins of our democracy. Jefferson, John Locke, and our English heritage have been given their due credit for their great contributions to American constitutional theory. But we oftentimes forget the long and imposing tradition of democracy whose roots lie deep in the soil of ancient Greece.

On this 135th anniversary of Greek independence, it is fitting, therefore, to pay tribute to this nation and its people. It is fitting also to recount the great legacy to our American civilization that stems from that small nation in the eastern Mediterranean.

Next to the Roman civilization, the Greek civilization has greater meaning for us than any other civilization. At the basis of our Western World, and, in fact, at the basis of what we call "the American way of life" lies this Greek civilization with all its richness and with its grandeur.

Culturally, the Greek legacy to us is so universal that its impression upon us is seen virtually everywhere we turn. Our buildings here in the Nation's Capital as well as in other cities throughout the country are by and large constructed along the same lines as those in Greek antiquity. It is no accident that we have used Greek architecture; for in this architecture is structural beauty at its finest. To be sure the lines of Greek architecture are simple; but there is a purity, a grandeur, a type of perfection about it that defies time itself.

Sculpturing, too, as well as our modern theater have their origins largely in the great works of the ancient Greeks. A tribute to the durability of the Greek drama is their continued performances upon the stages of the West. It goes without saying that the Greeks have made substantial contributions to our language and our literature. Without the Greek language and without Greek literature as a source of higher inspiration, our language would have lost the elegance and clarity that it now has.

In the realm of political philosophy, we Americans are probably more conscious of the Greek heritage than in other fields; for now we stand, like the Greeks of antiquity, the foremost protagonists of democracy of our time. Could not Pericles have spoken for American democracy when at the end of the first year of the Peloponnesian War he exclaimed:

"Because in the administration it hath respect not to the few but to the multitude, our form of government is called a democracy. Wherein there is not only an equality amongst all men in point of law for their private controversies, but in election to public offices we consider neither class nor rank, but each man is preferred according to his virtue or to the esteem in which he is held for some special excellence; nor is anyone put back even through poverty, because of the obscurity of his person, so long as he can do good service to the commonwealth."

The similarities in concepts of Greek democracy and American democracy are many. Undoubtedly, the main reason for that is the great and overpowering influence of the works of Aristotle. Probably more than any other ancient figure Aristotle influenced American democracy. It would not be too much to say that many of his ideas form its

very foundations. Certainly all the great principles inherent in our democratic system had their origin largely in his philosophic inspirations.

For this great legacy from ancient Greece the gratitude of America has never been wanting. When the Greeks fought for their independence over 135 years ago, America hailed with unabated enthusiasm the Greek cause and supported it with all the moral fervor at the Nation's command. In Congress one Member made a moving plea for aid to the beleaguered Greeks and during their fight for independence. Commenting upon the "deep and universal" feeling of sympathy throughout America, he declared:

"We have seen with great pain * * * the bloody contests that have desolated the regions of the other hemisphere, and we have rejoiced at every success of the Grecian arms. * * *"

One year later President James Monroe, whose personal feeling for the cause of Greece was far more intense than the following restrained sentiments, declared in his memorable message to Congress in December 1823:

"There is good cause to believe * * * that Greece will become again an independent nation. That she may obtain that rank is the object of our most ardent wishes."

And another year later Daniel Webster, surely one of the greatest of American statesmen in the 19th century, said:

"There are some things which, tc be well done, must be promptly done. If we even determine to do the thing that is now proposed, we may do it too late. Sir, I am not one of those who are for withholding aid when it is most urgently needed, and when the stress is past, and the aid no longer necessary, overwhelming the sufferer with caresses. I will not stand by and see my fellow men drowning without stretching out a hand to help him, till he has by his own efforts and presence of mind reached the shore in safety, and then encumber him with aid. With suffering Greece, now is the crisis of her fate—her great, it may be her last, struggle. Sir, while we sit here deliberating, her destiny may be decided."

During those trying years when Greece was desperately trying to establish her independence, America was only a small nation. We could give no great aid to the Greek cause. Our resources were meager. We were thousands of miles from the center of conflict; but if we could give no material aid, we gave abundantly of our hopes and prayers—our spiritual and moral aid—that Greece would win in its great struggle for survival.

In the decades that followed America became a great and mighty Nation. Our democratic institutions, strong and vigorous, became the center of attention of all oppressed peoples throughout the world; and upon our shores came thousands of Greek people who sought a new life in this New World. In the spirit of the Ancient Greeks, who built a great civilization out of a hard and barren soil, these new citizens brought to America the same spirit and injected it into the mainstream of American civilization. So whatever greatness there is in America today, it is due in part to the great heritage of ancient Greece and to the legacy of her sons and daughters who came to America.

Not until the close of World War II was America able to repay in a small measure the great debt of gratitude she owes to Greece. World communism was on the march in the immediate postwar period. Greece was a focal point of attack. British power was dangerously declining in the eastern Mediterranean, and indigenous Greek Communists spurred on by Soviet Russia and the other Communists in the Balkans set out to conquer Greece. The struggle became desperate; but the United States responded to the great challenge by sending aid—material and spirtual aid—to the Greeks. We gave them guns; we gave them the material aid to begin a new life in a war-stricken nation; but we also gave them our hopes and prayers that they would succeed, and succeed they did. With America's aid, Greece was able to turn back the tide of communism and thus was able to hold claim to the title of being the only real democracy in the Balkans.

Since those days of desperation America continued her aid to Greece so that in less than a decade Greece has marched far along the road from peril to national recovery. Economic prosperity came to Greece, and with it political stability and general happiness for all the Greek people.

Greek-American friendship has been long enduring. It has been so, partly because of the ancient ties between American democracy and ancient Greece, partly because of the Americans of Greek origin, and partly because the welfare of Greece as a democratic nation has always been held in special regard by all Americans. We are now entering again into a period of trial. The Middle East is aflame. Soviet Russia has intervened, and is now trying to stir up all the forces of violence and discontent that have long been rising to the surface. It is not out of the question that events of the future especially in the eastern Mediterranean area might well inspire differing attitudes in the Western Alliance system. Be that as it may, I feel sure American interests, will be in conformity with our high regard for the interests of Greece.

Understanding, moderation, and friendship have fortified the historic ties between America and Greece in the past. I have no doubt, that they shall continue to bind these nations firmly together and lead them both to a harmonious and bright future.

On this anniversary of Greek independence, it is fitting therefore, that every American call to mind the grand and precious legacies of ancient Greece which have formed so significant a part of our American civilization. It is also fitting that once again on the celebrated occasion that both America and Greece renew their lasting friendship and proclaim their firm dedication not only to the cause of democracy, freedom and independence, but also to the cause of universal peace.

THE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it is becoming quite obvious that the stickum that has held together the two widely divergent wings of the Democratic Party is beginning to lose its adhesive qualities. An adhesive of a more gummy potential is needed. Where to find it is a problem which I know is bothering the ADA and the other northern liberal groups. They know that the only way the Democratic Party can become one again is by getting back to the ways of Jefferson, but that is not about to happen, with control resting in the North.

Mr. President, I have suggested often in the past months that Harry Truman be the Democratic candidate; and now the eminent columnist, David Lawrence, recognizes that in that suggestion there may be just the glue that is needed to stick back together the two segments of the opposition party. I am afraid, however, that the thinking members of that party realize that taking Harry Truman on as their candidate would also stick them with another loser.

I do not mean by these remarks to detract from the potential of our good friend the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], whose victory I prophesied last December; but he is such a good friend that I would not want the TV spectacle of the last Democratic convention repeated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the excellent article entitled "Truman May Be Forced To Run," written by David Lawrence, and published in the Washington Star of March 22.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN MAY BE FORCED TO RUN—MINNESOTA OUTCOME POINTS UP BAD SPLIT IN DEMOCRATIC RANKS

Maybe Harry Truman will have to run for the Democrats as a last resort. Certainly the Minnesota primary shows the Democrats to be badly split as between Senator KEFAUVER and Adlai Stevenson. Mr. Truman is cocksure that he can unite them and beat President Eisenhower.

What happened in the Minnesota primary cannot be taken, however, as conclusive evidence that Stevenson is on the way out. The votes in presidential primaries, after all, mean very little to the bosses of a national convention. The Democratic Party bosses and organizations in most of the big cities have been for Stevenson, and they can bring about his nomination if they so desire. They did so in 1952, when Stevenson didn't enter a single primary, while KEFAUVER campaigned actively in several State primaries and was generally victorious.

There is, however, a natural prejudice among the voters against anyone who has been defeated before in a presidential election. Grover Cleveland, Democrat, is about the only man who ever made a comeback. He was elected President in 1884, defeated in 1888, but elected in 1892. William Jennings Bryan got the Democratic nomination in 1896, 1900, and 1904, but was defeated each time. Thomas Dewey, Republican, was nominated twice—in 1944 and 1948—but defeated both times.

Adlai Stevenson might qualify for the vice presidential nomination this year. His grandfather, a Democrat, was Vice President under Grover Cleveland. There has been a lot of solicitude expressed recently by Democratic Party spokesmen about the quality of the Republican vice presidential nominee. Symposiums and radio forums have been conducted in the last few months to emphasize the need for a first rate candidate for the vice presidency. Most of this effort has come from the so-called liberals who don't like Vice President NIXON, but now they have an opportunity to provide a first-rate liberal for the Democratic vice presidential nomination, as the radicals interpret the word liberal.

Sometimes a single presidential primary in a key State is decisive. Wendell Willkie, Republican, who was the party nominee for President in 1940, found the tide running against him in his first big primary contest—in Wisconsin—in 1944 and threw in the sponge. He accepted the political tradition that once beaten it is hard to win favor again with the voters.

Mr. Stevenson says his defeat in Minnesota will not change his plans. But already there are hints that Governor Harriman, of New York, will step in with the Tammany organization behind him to woo the Stevenson vote. A Harriman-Stevenson ticket might be offered as a bait to the former Illinois Governor.

Primaries do not usually tell much about the relative strength of the parties. But it is significant that the Democrats polled a much larger total vote than did the Republicans in Minnesota. President Eisenhower, of course, was for all practical purposes, unopposed. There was no contest

and no reason for Republicans to vote on the presidency except to compliment Mr. Eisenhower.

There are widely current reports that in Minnesota many Republican voted in the Democratic primaries and that Senator KEFAUVER benefited by such a shift. There could hardly have been a plot by the Republican leaders to bring this about. In the first place, such a drive is hard to organize and, in the second place, it is of doubtful value because the lessened total vote of the Republicans is already being interpreted as a farm revolt of Republican voters. And that's not the kind of publicity the Republicans would seek.

Unquestionably there will be a big defection of Republican votes in Minnesota this year due to the farm issue. Minnesota is one of the States that the Republicans are very much worried about. The primary result there this week gives the Republicans little comfort.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago I listened to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] suggest that the Democratic Party nominate Mr. Truman as their candidate. May I remind that an opposing political party does not nominate the candidate for the other party.

Lest the people of the United States forget it, I should like to call attention to the fact that the Republicans also have an ex-President, namely, Herbert Hoover. It is well known and remembered how the great engineer fixed the United States when he was President.

So I may suggest that the Republican Party nominate Mr. Hoover on their ticket. I just thought it well to call to the attention of the Senate and the country that both parties have a living ex-President, and that if Mr. Hoover would run, I think the Democratic Party would certainly be satisfied to have him as the opposing Republican nominee for President of the United States.

COMMEMORATION OF THE ANNIVERSARY OF SOUTH CAROLINA STATE LEGISLATURE, THE FIRST STATE LEGISLATURE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, today is noteworthy in the legislative annals of our Nation. It is most significant to South Carolinians. While historians and history books obscure the fact generally, it is of great importance to those of us who still recollect and have faith in our representative democracy.

South Carolina has the honor and distinction to have been the first State in this Union to declare, in 1776, her sovereign independence from England. I am proud and yet humble to represent this State which, now as then, charts a steady course and steadfastly pursues it. I honor and revere my forebears for their perseverance, struggles, and sacrifices. This day in my State's history is a proud one, and I am privileged to record here just a few things we intend shall not be forgotten.

On this day of March 26, 1776, the General Assembly or State Legislature of South Carolina was born. The legislature succeeded to the provincial congress which had been formed in 1775. Delegates had been elected from every district in the Colony. A State constitution had already been adopted.

The representatives having been in session since February 1, 1776, recessed their meeting on the morning of March 26, 1776, until 4 o'clock that afternoon. Upon reconvening by formal resolution, the legislature declared itself free and no longer subject to the allegiance to the King. That declaration was that South Carolina "was now, by her own act, a free and independent State."

By this action South Carolina became the first Colony to assert her freedom by legislative act in establishing her own legislative assembly and disavowing all allegiance to any legislative assembly under the control of England.

In the stress and strain of current problems, all do well at times to pause and reflect. Whence have we come as a great nation? Whither are we going? I am a great believer in the principle that the history and experience of the past afford us the truest light and guide for our future.

I believe, as did Abbie Farwell Brown, when she said:

> No matter what my birth may be,
> No matter where my lot is cast,
> I am the heir in equity
> Of all the precious past.

John Rutledge was the president or governor as this term later was used of the First General Assembly and Legislature of South Carolina in 1776, 180 years ago. This was the first free legislative assembly in the United States. The vice president or lieutenant governor was none other than the distinguished Henry Laurens.

Who was John Rutledge of South Carolina? The Nation remembers him best as the president of the Stamp Act Congress meeting in New York in 1765.

Laurens and Rutledge had been representatives in the Commons House Assembly of South Carolina along with Lynch, Pinckney, Gadsden, and others from 1757 to the formation of the first State legislature with its upper and lower houses. They were men of eminence, foresight and ability. The commons house assembly became the finest training school in statecraft. These men became deeply grounded in constitutional liberty, self-government, States rights, and personal choice of liberties. Schooled in the Commons Assemblies of South Carolina, little wonder there is that they became leaders in the Continental Congress, under the Articles of Confederation, and later at the Constitutional Convention.

Mr. President, you will recall that Henry Laurens of South Carolina was the second President of the Continental Congress of the United States. He succeeded John Hancock. He was the President of the Continental Congress during Washington's encampment at Valley Forge. John Adams, with only a month's acquaintance in the Continental Congress, in writing his wife, said of Laurens:

> I feel a strong affection for South Carolina for several reasons:
>
> I think them as stanch patriots as any in America; I think them as brave. They are the only people in America who have maintained a post and defended a fort. They have sent us a new delegate whom I greatly admire, Mr. Henry Laurens, their lieutenant-governor, a gentleman of great fortune, great abilities, modesty and integrity, and great experience, too. If all the States would send us such men, it would be a pleasure to be here.

One historian of note, in impressing the importance of local rights embodied in the Constitution approved by the Legislature of South Carolina on March 26, 1776, said:

> Probably in no colony did the struggle for local rights merge more perfectly into the struggle for general American rights than in South Carolina; and but for the real and substantial character of the former, the latter would have been deprived of much of the momentum which carried it to success.

A tribute to Laurens in the service he rendered to the colonies and made possible by his earlier experiences as a legislator in South Carolina is found in the little-noted fact in history that his release from prison in the Tower of London was effected by his exchange for Lord Cornwallis, who was captured at Yorktown. Edmund Burke, the great English statesman, counseling for the exchange of these two noted prisoners of war, remarked that Cornwallis was held prisoner of war by Henry Laurens' son, Col. John Laurens, while he, Henry Laurens, was held prisoner by Lord Cornwallis who was the official constable of the Tower of London.

I pay tribute to these men and I recall these interesting episodes of less than 200 years ago because of the very present need to remember them. They did so much to establish our legislative councils. Our State legislatures are the source of our strength today. I belong to the old school who feel that the people are the source of our power. The people express themselves and exercise their freedoms through their legislatures.

The sovereignty of the people find expression in their State legislatures. They do not look to us as the sole guarantors of their individual rights and freedoms. If ever our Nation is imperiled it will be when we lose sight of the fact our people must possess all basic sovereign power. The sovereign power of the United States is limited by the terms of the Constitution taken as a whole and not as directed by isolated portions of it.

The Supreme Court has said—and I thoroughly agree:

> We have already had occasion to remark at this term, that "the people of each State, having its own government, are endowed with all functions essential to separate and independent existence" and that "without the States in Union, there could be no such political body as the United States."
>
> Not only, therefore, can there be no loss of separate and independent autonomy to the States, through their Union under the Constitution, but it may be not unreasonably said that the preservation of the States and the maintenance of their governments are as much within the design and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the Union and the maintenance of the National Government. The Constitution in all its provisions looks to an indestructible Union, composed of indestructible States.

Mr. President, I have often said, and our courts formerly said, with pride, that the policy of a State is set by its legislature. Congress must continue to be the

policymaking branch of our Federal Government. When the State legislatures and the Congress legislate within the competence of their ability as limited by their constitutions, the policies of each sovereign jurisdiction are declared and formed. When the executive or the judicial branches of our Government attempt to fix policy rather than execute or interpret it, they violate their responsibilities. Excess leads to abuse. Abuse leads to further wrongdoing. Wrongdoing can lead to destruction.

So today I salute all our State legislatures. I remind them of the birthday of the first free legislature in the Union of our 48 States, the birthday of the South Carolina State Legislature. More than this reminder, I hope and pray that our legislators will remember their proud heritage; that they will carry on the traditions of their past; that the accumulated wisdom of our forebears born of such painful sufferings and experiences will ever afford strength of mind and character for the solutions of the problems of today and the tomorrows yet to come.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10:30 TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 10:30 tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like the RECORD to show that we shall begin our session early tomorrow because several amendments and several substitutes are pending to the measure under consideration. I should like to give notice to the Senate that we may be in session until a late hour tomorrow evening.

PROGRAM FOLLOWING DISPOSITION OF UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I previously announced that at the conclusion of action upon the unfinished business, there was a possibility of bringing up several bills. One of those bills is Calendar No. 1107, Senate bill 2577, introduced by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], for himself and other Senators, a bill to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests. I have assured some of my colleagues, in response to many inquiries, that I do not expect that bill to be brought up before the Easter recess; and it will not be brought up before the Easter recess on motion of the leadership.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered. Is there further morning business? If there is no further morning business, under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered, the Senate will proceed to the call of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand, under the order previously entered, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1691, but including Calendar Nos. 1613, 1617, and 1690.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that when Calendar No. 1735, H. R. 9166, is called on the calendar, I shall ask that it go over, for the purpose of bringing it up on motion at the conclusion of the calendar call. It was reported from the Committee on Finance, headed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and provides for 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise rates. It is a House bill, and was reported from the committee without amendment. Because of its importance, when it is reached I shall ask that it be passed over temporarily, and then I shall make a motion for its consideration immediately after the conclusion of the calendar call. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to do so after the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair would like to inquire of the majority leader whether the three bills previously mentioned by him should be called before or after the first order on the calendar of bills to be called today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is agreeable with me if we start with the lowest number Calendar No. 1613.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the first order.

MARION DRUCKER

The bill (S. 1411) for the relief of Marion Drucker was announced as first in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 11, after the word "available", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marion Drucker shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LAWRENCE F. KRAMER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2016) for the relief of Lawrence F. Kramer, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Lawrence F. Kramer, of 354 East 42d Street, Paterson, N. J., in the manner hereinafter provided by this act.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act, the said Lawrence F. Kramer (hereinafter referred to as "the claimant") shall establish to the satisfaction of the Court of Claims the following: (1) That the claimant furnish the United States with information in 1935 regarding a fraudulent conspiracy, collusive bidding, and bribery in connection with certain sand and stone supply contracts, awarded or to have been awarded by the Works Progress Administration, in New Jersey; and (2) that the claimant collaborated with and assisted United States investigators and furnished them with leads which made more possible the Government's success in criminal prosecution No. 8516b, United States District Court, District of New Jersey (1938), and civil action No. 1956 which was filed on January 5, 1942, United States District Court, District of New Jersey, and in which the United States entered an appearance on March 11, 1944, and which was settled by way of compromise to the pecuniary benefit of the United States on March 4, 1952.

SEC. 3. The Court of Claims shall accept as a basis for determining the services referred to in section 2 hereof the following: (1) all papers (or duly authenticated copies thereof), including transcripts of court proceedings, depositions, records, pleadings, orders, and exhibits filed in the criminal and civil causes referred to in section 2 hereof; and (2) the findings of fact and conclusions of law and opinion of the court in United States ex rel. *Bayarsky* v. *Brooks et al.* (110 F. Supp 175).

SEC. 4. Upon determination by the Court of Claims that the claimant has complied with section 2 hereof, the claimant shall be deemed to have instituted a qui tam action and to be legally and equitably entitled to a judgment as hereinafter provided under the appropriate provisions of the False Claims Act which were in force at the time claimant's cause of action thereunder arose, namely, section 3490 to 3494, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., 1940 edition, secs. 231–235). In computing the amount of such judgment, the provisions of section 3493 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., 1940 edition, sec. 234), entitling the claimant to one-half of the costs and the recovery which was obtained by the Government in civil action No. 1956, United States District Court, District of New Jersey, shall not apply but,

instead, the claimant shall be entitled to recover only 30 percent of the amount recovered in the said civil action No. 1956, exclusive of the usual costs and expenses, by the United States on March 4, 1952.

SEC. 5. Suit under this act shall be instituted within 6 months after enactment hereof, and the judgment by the Court of Claims shall be final, and shall not be subject to review. Payment of such judgment shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction as provided by law, and shall constitute full and complete settlement of all claims or demands of any nature whatsoever arising out of the litigation referred to in this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Lawrence F. Kramer."

CULTURAL AND ATHLETIC EXCHANGES AND PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL FAIRS AND FESTIVALS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3116) to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments, on page 4, line 21, after the word "under", to strike out "title VII of"; at the beginning of line 23, to insert "as amended"; in line 25, after the numeral "(2)", to strike out "advise and assist" and insert "advise, assist, and cooperate with"; on page 5, line 1, after the word "of", to strike out "its"; at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "financed by the President's Emergency Fund for International Affairs," and insert "authorized by and financed under this act,"; in line 7, after the numerals "1948", to insert "as amended"; in line 8, after the word "advise", to strike out "and assist"; in line 12, after the word "considers", to strike out "such assistance" and insert "it"; on page 6, line 3, after the word "be", to strike out "reimbursed for travel expenses actually incurred" and insert "paid actual transportation expenses"; in line 5, after the word "established", to strike out "under the Travel Expense Act of 1949" and insert "pursuant to section 5 of the Administrative Expense Act of 1946, as amended (5 U. S. C. 73b–2)"; on page 7, line 3, after the word "cultural", to strike out "exchange"; in line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "shall include" and insert "should include, to the greatest extent possible"; in line 5, after the word "in", to strike out "each of the following seven major art fields" and insert "such major art fields as"; and in line 9, after the word "historic", to strike out "preservation," and insert "preservation;", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956."

SEC. 2. The purpose of this act is to strengthen the ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the cultural interests, developments, and achievements of the people of the United States, and the contributions being made by the United States economic and social system toward a peaceful and more fruitful life for its own people and other people throughout the world; and thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic, and peaceful relations between the United States and the other countries of the world.

SEC. 3. The President is authorized to provide for—

(1) tours in countries abroad by creative and performing artists and athletes from the United States, individually and in groups, representing any field of the arts, sports, or any other form of cultural attainment;

(2) United States representation in artistic, dramatic, musical, sports, and other cultural festivals, competitions, and like exhibitions abroad;

(3) United States participation in international trade and industrial fairs and other like public or private expositions and demonstrations in other countries; and

(4) publicity and promotion (including representation) abroad of activities of the type provided for herein.

SEC. 4. To the maximum extent feasible (1) private individuals, firms, associations, agencies, and other groups shall be encouraged to make contributions of funds, property, and services (which shall be available to carry out this act) and otherwise to participate in carrying out this act, and (2) funds appropriated pursuant to section 5 shall be used to contribute toward meeting the expenses of activities carried out through normal private channels and by private means.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act.

SEC. 6. In carrying out this act the provisions of title VIII of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 may be utilized to the extent the President deems necessary.

SEC. 7. The President is authorized to provide for all necessary expenditures involved in the selection, purchase, rental, construction, or other acquisition of exhibits and materials and equipment therefor, and the actual display thereof, including but not limited to costs of transportation, insurance, installation, safekeeping, and storage, maintenance and operation, rental of space, and dismantling.

SEC. 8. Whenever the President determines it to be in furtherance of this act, the functions authorized hereunder may be performed without regard to such provisions of law or limitations of authority regulating or relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts, the acquisition and disposition of property, and the expenditure of Government funds, as he may specify.

SEC. 9. The President shall transmit to the Congress reports covering each 6 months of operations under this act.

SEC. 10. (a) There is hereby created an Advisory Committee on the Arts (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Committee"), consisting of a Chairman selected by the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange from among its membership and nine other members appointed by the Secretary of State. In making such appointments the Secretary of State shall give due consideration to the recommendations for nomination submitted by leading national organizations in the major art fields.

(b) The members of the Committee shall be individuals whose knowledge of or experience in, or whose profound interest in, one or more of the arts will enable them to assist the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, the President, and the Secretary of State in performing the functions described in subsection (c) of this section.

(c) The Committee shall—

(1) advise and assist the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange in the discharge of its responsibilities in the field of international educational exchange under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, with special reference to the role of the arts in such field;

(2) advise, assist, and cooperate with such Commission in the discharge of its responsibilities under the cultural presentations program authorized by and financed under this act, insofar as such program contributes directly or indirectly to the objectives of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended;

(3) advise the President in the discharge of his responsibilities under the cultural exchange program authorized by and financed under this act;

(4) advise the Secretary of State concerning cultural activities whenever the Secretary considers it necessary to enable him to formulate policies for carrying out the purposes of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, coordinating the exercise of its functions under this paragraph with the exercise of its functions under paragraph (1) of this subsection; and

(5) provide such other advice and assistance in carrying out this act as may be necessary or appropriate.

(d) The term of office of each of the members of the Committee appointed by the Secretary of State shall be 2 years; except that the term of office of 4 of the members first appointed shall be 1 year.

(e) No member of the Committee shall receive any compensation for his services as such; but each such member shall be paid actual transportation expenses and paid in lieu of subsistence the per diem rates prescribed or established pursuant to section 5 of the Administrative Expense Act of 1946, as amended (5 U. S. C. 73b–2), while away from home in attendance at meetings of the Committee or in consultation with officials of the Government in carrying out the duties of the Committee.

(f) Staff and secretarial services for the Committee shall be provided by the departmental staff of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, with the assistance of the International Educational Exchange Service.

SEC. 11. The President is authorized to create such interagency committees as in his judgment may be of assistance in carrying out the purpose of this act. Such committees shall include individuals having special knowledge and experience in the field of the cultural arts as well as individuals whose knowledge and experience in other fields will assist in carrying out the program established by this act. The provisions of section 214 of the act of May 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 134; 31 U. S. C., sec. 691), shall be applicable to any interagency committee created pursuant to this section.

SEC. 12. The cultural program authorized by this act should include, to the greatest extent possible, presentations and other activities in such major art fields as: music, drama, poetry, and dance; new writing and literature; architecture, landscape architecture, city and regional planning, civic art and design, historic preservation; housing, interior design and decoration, and urban renewal and redevelopment; painting, sculpture, graphic arts, and, hand arts and crafts; motion pictures and photography; and radio and television.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SEALS FOR BUREAUS AND OFFICES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The bill (S. 2909) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe seals for bureaus and offices of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to prescribe or modify individual seals for the constituent organization units of the Department of Commerce. Each seal so prescribed shall contain such device as the Secretary of Commerce may select. Each seal shall remain in the custody of any officer or employee of the constituent unit whom the Secretary of Commerce may designate and, in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary of Commerce, may be affixed in lieu of the seal of the Department of Commerce to any certificate or attestation that may be required from such organization unit. Judicial notice shall be taken of any seal prescribed in accordance with this authority, a facsimile of which has been published in the Federal Register together with the regulation prescribing such seal and the affixation thereof. Nothing herein contained shall be construed as affecting or modifying existing legislation authorizing seals for specfic bureaus or offices of the Department of Commerce.

PROVISION FOR TRANSPORTATION ON CANADIAN VESSELS BETWEEN PORTS IN ALASKA

The bill (S. 3269) to provide transportation on Canadian vessels, between ports in southeastern Alaska and between Hyder and other points in southeastern Alaska was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, until June 30, 1957, notwithstanding the provisions of law of the United States restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from any port in the United States to another port of the United States, passengers may be transported on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and passengers and merchandise may be transported on Canadian vessels between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE TOWN OF SAVANNAH BEACH, TYBEE ISLAND, GA.

The bill (H. R. 5889) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the town of Savannah Beach, Tybee Island, Ga., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 6574) to amend section 2 of title IV of the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia and for other purposes approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 680)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the purpose of the legislation is to amend the act of August 17, 1937, so as to reestablish the former fee of $1 for the transfer of motor-vehicle registration plates from one vehicle to another during the course of a registration year in the District of Columbia. Such a transfer fee was provided for in the act of August 17, 1937; however, the Public Works Act of 1954, among other things, provided for a new system of flat fees for registering motor vehicles in lieu of the system of taxing such vehicles as personal property, in addition to registration fees. The then existing fee of $1 for the transfer of a registration when a vehicle owner sold his vehicle and acquired another during the registration year, was also eliminated.

Under present law the new registration fees are now $22 for vehicles weighing less than 3,500 pounds and $32 for vehicles weighing over 3,500 pounds. Provision is also made for a midyear reduction of 50 percent.

For example, during March 1955, an owner registers in the District of Columbia a vehicle weighing 3,400 pounds for the registration year beginning April 1, 1955, and pays the prescribed registration fee of $22. Thereafter, on June 15, 1955, the same owner sells his car and buys a new one weighing 3,600 pounds. In transferring his registration plates to the new car, he finds that under present law, just 2 months later, he must pay another full fee of $32.

An examination of State laws discloses that nominal fees, 25 cents to $1.50 are charged for the transfer of motor-vehicle registration plates in 37 States.

Mr. President, I would say to the distinguished minority leader that the purpose of the bill is to bring the District of Columbia motor vehicle transfer law into line with laws in other States. It hardly seems fair that a person should be required to pay 2 license fees in 1 calendar year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARION G. DENTON

The resolution (S. Res. 233) for the relief of Marion G. Denton was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 98) entitled, "A bill for the relief of Marion G. Denton," now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same, in accordance with the provisions of said sections, and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

JOHN SOUDAS

The bill (S. 648) for the relief of John Soudas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Soudas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ESTATE OF SUSIE LEE SPENCER

The bill (S. 2152) for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Susie Lee Spencer, of Spartanburg, S. C., the sum of $7,500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Susie Lee Spencer sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Navy locomotive at the Norfolk naval shipyard, Norfolk, Va., on December 11, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ALBINO BRAIUCA

The bill (S. 2291) for the relief of Albino Braiuca was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Albino Braiuca shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MANUEL VILAR SOLER

The bill (S. 2422) for the relief of Manuel Vilar Soler was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act,

Manuel Vilar Soler shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

LIN TSAI

The bill (S. 2423) for the relief of Lin Tsai was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lin Tsai shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

WAN NGO LIM

The bill (S. 2594) for the relief of Wan Ngo Lim was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wan Ngo Lim shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

RENZA MARSALE BARTLETT

The bill (S. 2596) for the relief of Renza Marsale Bartlett was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Renza Marsale Bartlett may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

JOYCE SOONHWE KIM

The bill (S. 2665) for the relief of Joyce Soonhwe Kim was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Joyce Soonhwe Kim shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

HISAKAZU HOZAKI

The bill (S. 2701) for the relief of Hisakazu Hozaki was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hisakazu Hozaki shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

URSULA JADWIGA MILARSKI GOODMAN

The bill (S. 2721) for the relief of Ursula Jadwiga Milarski Goodman was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Usula Jadwiga Milarski Goodman may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to a ground for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

GEORGINA FEHER

The bill (S. 2724) for the relief of Georgina Feher was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Georgina Feher shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DR. LU HO TUNG AND HIS WIFE

The bill (H. R. 1892) for the relief of Dr. Lu Ho Tung and his wife, Ching-hsi (nee Tsao) Tung was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLIGHT TO AVOID PROSECUTION FOR ARSON

The bill (H. R. 3233) to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to make it a criminal offense to move or travel in interstate commerce with intent to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for arson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I am highly gratified that the United States Senate has just passed H. R. 3233. It is a most important piece of legislation. The proposed bill will marshal Federal law-enforcement officers alongside local police and fire officials in their fight against arson.

I am pleased to have helped to expediate this measure in my capacity as senior Republican of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which reviewed and reported it.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared on this subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMBATTING ARSONOUS AND OTHER FIRE LOSSES

One of the serious problems in combatting the spread of arson is the ease with which a perpetrator of this dastardly crime can slip across State lines and disappear.

The present corrective legislation will amend title 18, section 1073, commonly known as the Fugitive Felon Act, so as to make it a criminal offense to cross State lines with intent to avoid prosecution or custody or confinement after conviction for arson punishable as a felony.

This bill recognizes that arson is so serious a crime as to warrant inclusion among the other major crimes of murder, kidnaping, burglary, and robbery. These crimes were already covered by the Fugitive Felon Act.

Arson is one of the ghastliest crimes and takes an unduly large annual toll of lives and valuable property.

SAMPLE LETTER URGES ANTIARSON ACTION

H. R. 3233 has the support of fire chiefs, police chiefs, and insurance investigators, as well as of the public generally. A letter which I received Saturday morning described their reaction as follows:

"The crime of arson is a most dastardly crime and involves so much including the lives of so many each year, that we feel it necessary for you to enact the requested legislation. We feel that anything that can be done to make this crime recognized as being the serious crime which it is, is obviously a step in the right path."

Now that the Congress has made flight from arson a Federal crime (an action for which I offer my heartiest thanks and congratulations) I fervently urge that substantial appropriations be voted in due course, if they prove necessary, for helping to stamp out the heinous crime of arson through implementation of this bill.

CUTTING DOWN ON LOSSES DUE TO ACCIDENTAL FIRES

Arson does not, however, represent the only loss through fire. I should like therefore to submit some comments about the tremendous losses of life and property from accidental fire and the necessity of concentrating all possible efforts toward reducing these losses.

The National Safety Council and State groups throughout the Nation, such as the splendid Wisconsin Council of Safety (which I have been pleased to commend here in the Senate previously) are very active in promoting efforts to reduce fires. The Wisconsin Council of Safety is particularly active in the field of minimizing industrial fire loss. Supporting the campaign are the fire chiefs of Wisconsin and our entire country.

TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN FIRE FIGHTERS

We owe a deep debt of gratitude to the devotion and daring of the Nation's firemen

who labor long hours at any time of the day or night, sometimes in freezing weather or among other adverse conditions, fighting searing flames so as to protect our homes, our businesses and our lives, and those of our dear ones, from destruction by fire.

WISCONSIN'S ACTIVE INTEREST

The National Fire Protection Association, the International Association of Fire Chiefs and the International Association of Arson Investigators, as well as the National Board of Fire Underwriters, are doing all they can to promote safety from fire.

The fire marshal of the State of Wisconsin, Marshal Paul J. Rogan and deputy fire marshals are to be commended for their active interest in this direction. The fire chiefs of Wisconsin—from our largest city—Milwaukee, to our smallest communities, with their volunteer fire fighters have been active participants in this fight against fire. I commend them all and I'm glad that the passage of this bill may help make their work a bit easier.

We, of Wisconsin, take pride in our forests. In this connection, I might point out that during 1954 in Wisconsin, of the 1,025 forest fires on Federal, State, and private properties, 87 were recorded as of incendiary origin, according to the Office of State and Private Cooperation of the United States Forest Service.

MY PREVIOUS SERVICE ON CRIME COMMITTEE

As a former member of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee (the Kefauver committee), I am naturally, of course, interested in all phases of anticrime activity.

In that connection, I have had occasion to be in contact with the Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, published at Northwestern University, which includes a vital section on combating arson.

And I am glad to say that the International Association of Chiefs of Police, through its Committee on Arson, has ranged itself effectively alongside the fire fighters in the fire-prevention campaign.

AMERICA'S HUGE FIRE LOSSES

Fire losses in the United States are tremendous. President Eisenhower emphasized the fact that over the 5 years ending in 1954 the average yearly loss of life in the United States from fire was a ghastly figure of 11,000 persons per year. And he added that the loss of personal property reached annual proportions of nearly $1 billion per year, having increased from $320 million in 1919.

In dwellings alone there were 294,000 fires in 1953. And every year, approximately 4,000 fires break out in our school buildings, thereby endangering the lives of our precious youth.

According to the National Board of Fire Underwriters, major causes of fire, in addition to arson, are the following: matches and smoking cause more than one-fourth of the fires; faulty stoves, chimneys and furnaces cause approximately 18 percent; misuse of flammable fluids (such as soils, tars, and petroleum products), 16 percent; and misuse of electricity, about 12 percent.

On the basis of facts such as those I've cited, it has been well said that, in addition to the "cold war," the United States has a major "hot war" on its hands, i. e. the war against destructive fire.

If one adds, to the dollar loss from fire, the dollar cost of maintaining fire suppression forces, the war against fire may actually cost the Nation about $2 billion a year. Moreover, the number of fires has been increasing. In towns of more than 2,500 people, there are about 900,000 fires per year. And, during the cold war which stretches for years ahead of us, we can never forget that part of our self-protection, through civil defense agencies and at home, consists in maintaining conditions in which fires are hard to start. If a bomb should fall near your city, your home might be safer if it were free of all flammable accumulations which might readily ignite.

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT OF ARSON COMMITTEE OF IACP

The report of the Arson Committee of the International Association of Chiefs of Police in October 1955 stated among other things that "the annual report of the National Board of Fire Underwriters, made public in June of 1955, shows that 619 arrests for incendiarism were made in 1954, an increase of 15 over the previous year. In addition, convictions were increased from 334 to 339."

"For the last several years one of the most important problems faced by fire and police officials has been an increase in the number of fires set by juveniles. Again in this field, nationwide reports would indicate that there has not been any substantial increase in this type of case in the last year. The problem has not been eliminated, but it would appear that we are making headway toward a solution of the problem. In this connection this committee believes that much can be done in this line through activities of special youth organizations."

Speaking personally, as a member of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee to Study Juvenile Delinquency, I am particularly interested in forwarding whatever can be done along this line.

NINE RECOMMENDATIONS OF ARSON COMMITTEE

I append as the final item of this statement the nine recommendations of the arson committee of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, made before the 62d annual conference of that association last October. You will note that recommendation No. 7 is the one we are fulfilling today by enactment of H. R. 3233:

"This committee makes the following nine recommendations:

"1. The continued cooperation manifested between police and fire officials.

"2. Specialized training in arson detection for members of responsible investigative agencies.

"3. Inclusions of courses and lectures that relate to arson detection and investigation in the curriculum of police schools.

"4. More recognition of the juvenile delinquency problem as it relates to juvenile fire setting.

"5. The taking of definite action by juvenile authorities in all cases in which juveniles are involved on arson charges, and the placing of proper restraint to prevent their recurrence.

"6. Notification to responsible authorities of the release of persons committed to jail or mental institutions for the crime of arson.

"7. Continuation of efforts to have the fugitive felon law, title 18 of the United States Code, extended in scope to include the crime of arson.

"8. The institution of immediate investigation of questionable fires in an effort to reduce the large number of unknown and undetermined causes, and the increase of adequately trained personnel to effect it.

"9. The continuation of the activities of the arson committee of the International Association of Chiefs of Police for the year 1956.

"Respectfully submitted.

"Herbert C. Watson, Chairman Special Agent, National Board of Fire Underwriters, Denver, Colo.; A. Bruce Bielaski, Assistant General Manager, National Board of Fire Underwriters, New York, N. Y.; Glen D. Bennett, Detective Lieutenant, City of Detroit Fire Department, Detroit, Mich.; Thomas P. Boustead, Chief of Police, Rockford, Ill.; Sidney S. Bowman, State Fire Marshal, New Orleans, La.; James English, Captain of Inspectors, San Francisco Police Department, San Francisco, Calif.; Prof. Shelby Gallien, Director of Public Safety Institute, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.; Walter Johnson, Chief of Police, Denver, Colo.; Joseph L. Lingo, Director of Traffic Safety, Indianapolis, Ind.; Martin Scott, Chief Fire Marshal, Bureau of Investigation, New York, N. Y.; Richard G. Steinmetz, Chief Special Agent, Mutual Investigation Bureau, Chicago, Ill.; Howard M. Travis, Special Agent, National Board of Fire Underwriters, Rochester, N. Y."

ROY COWAN AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 6421) for the relief of Roy Cowan and others was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KATINA R. LANDRUM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2355) for the relief of Katina R. Landrum, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Katina R. Landrum may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if otherwise eligible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of Justice or the Department of State has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE HENRY MACDONALD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2595) for the relief of George Henry MacDonald (formerly Frederick William Arthur), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after the word "fee", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Henry MacDonald (formerly Frederick William Arthur) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELEPHANT BUTTE DAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 220) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims arising as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande, which had been reported from the Committee

on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 3, line 3, after the word "property", to strike out "as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande" and insert "in the flooding of lands in the Rio Grande Valley in the vicinity of San Marcial, N. Mex., in 1929, which flooding allegedly resulted from the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande"; in line 11, after the word "within", to strike out "six" and insert "three"; and in line 19, after the word "Government", to insert "Any claims approved for payment under the provisions of this act shall be liabilities of the United States Government and shall not be charged against irrigation districts located on the Rio Grande project (New Mexico-Texas)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time or any limitation upon the jurisdiction of the United States district courts to hear, determine, and render judgment on claims against the United States, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Max T. Martinez, Antonio Gonzales, Epigmenio Ramirez, Triunfo Silva, Felix Vallejos, Octaviano Trujeque, Margarite Torres y Gallegos, Eugenio Torres, Emileo Torres, Benito Silva, Juan Saavedra, Santiago Romero, Gernimo Romero, Monico Rivas, Benito M. Pargas, Mrs. Pablo M. Padilla, Jose Padilla, Jose P. Lopez, Casimro Martinez, Frank Martinez, Manuel Martinez, Mrs. C. C. Montoya, Joseph W. Milligan, Tom Olguin, Ruben Gutierrez, Espiridion Gutirrez, Mrs. Pat Gonzales, Salomon Anaya, G. E. Baca, Paul G. Baca, Herminio Baldonado, Mariana O. Gallegos, Vicente Chavez, Mrs. Altagracia Carreaga, David Benavides, Delfino Gonzales, Vidal S. Chavez, Fortunato Gallegos, Damariz Romero, S. Gray Hanna, Pablo Alderete, Charles M. Crossman, Alta Carreaga, Andres Mora, Patricino Trujeque, Conrado Trujeque, Epitacio Torres, Estanislado Torres, Climaco M. Springer, Feliciano Serna, Frank Saavedra, Luz Romero, Celedon Romero, Jr., Dionicia Pargas, Pablo, Padilla, Jose M. Padilla, Antonio Lopez, Juanite P. Lopez, Dan Martinez, Juan A. Martinez, Pedro Martinez, Louis Mora, Charles H. Nattress, Sr., Doloritas R. Padilla, Jose A. Gutierrez, Mrs. Refugia B. Gonzales, Jose Maria Gonzalez, Alfredo Armijo, Librada Baca, Frank Barela, Damacia Gonzales Barreras, Charles Eaton, Aurora O. Dreyfus, James Carmody, Veronica Gallegos, Jose Gonzales, Rumaldita Gallegos, Jose Herrera, and Trinidad Trujillo against the United States for compensation for the taking of or for damage to real or personal property in the flooding of lands in the Rio Grande Valley in the vicinity of San Marcial, N. Mex., in 1929, which flooding allegedly resulted from the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande.

SEC. 2. Suit upon any such claim may be instituted by the owner of the property with respect to which the claim is made or by his heirs at any time within 3 years after the date of enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of any such claim and review thereof and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in accordance with the provisions of law applicable in the case of the taking by the United States of private property for public use, but nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government. Any claims approved for payment under the provisions of this act shall be liabilities of the United States Government and shall not be charged against irrigation districts located on the Rio Grande project (New Mexico-Texas).

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANTONIO RUBI MENDIOLA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2650) for the relief of Antonio Rubi Mendiola, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, in line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "paragraph" and insert "paragraphs (17) and"; in line 9, after the word "to", to strike out "a ground" and insert "grounds"; and, in the same line, after the word "such", to strike out "paragraph" and insert "paragraphs", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (17) and (19) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Rubi Mendiola may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraphs known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT GEOFFREY HUNT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2652) for the relief of Robert Geoffrey Hunt, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "act", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of Justice or the Department of State has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act, and *Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Robert Geoffrey Hunt may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of Justice or the Department of State has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act, and *Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SHAKEEB BAKOUR

The Senate proceed to consider the bill (S. 2674) for the relief of Shakeeb Bakour, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the name "Shakeeb", to strike out "Bakour" and insert "Dakour", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Shakeeb Dakour shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Shakeeb Dakour."

LEOPOLD RIEDL AND OTHERS

The Senate proceed to consider the bill (S. 2698) for the relief of Leopold Riedl and his wife, Bozena Riedl, and their daughter, Rostinslova Bericochea (nee Riedl), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 2, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rostislava Bericochea (nee Riedl) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the puropses of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Leopold Riedl and his wife, Bozena Riedl, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this section, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Leopold Riedl and his wife, Bozena Riedl."

PROTECTION AND ASSURANCE OF PRIVACY OF GRAND AND PETIT JURIES

The bill (S. 2887) to further protect and assure the privacy of grand or petit juries in the courts of the United States while such juries are deliberating or voting was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill? I think I know what brought it about, but I believe it is sufficiently important to require an explanation.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to protect and assure the privacy of grand or petit juries in the courts of the United States while such juries are deliberating

or voting. The bill adds a new section to chapter 73 of title 18 of the United States Code, imposing a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or both, for the recording of, listening to, or observing the proceedings of grand or petit juries while such juries are deliberating or voting.

At the present time there is no Federal rule or statute which specifically prohibits eavesdropping upon the proceedings or deliberations of Federal juries, and to assure against any further intrusion upon the privacy of jury deliberations, legislation along this line, in the view of the committee, should be enacted.

As a result of the activities of a research project financed by a grant from the Ford Foundation, there were tape recordings taken on six actual jury deliberations in the Middle West in 1955. The purpose of the project was to find out how juries received judge's instructions, and so forth, with the view in mind of possible improvement of the jury system. The Internal Security Subcommittee, as a result of the publicity received by this project, held hearings on the matter on October 12 and 13, 1955, and reached the conclusion that such recordings of actual jury deliberations was not in the best interest of justice, from any standpoint.

The Department of Justice, in regard to this subject, stated:

> We in the Department of Justice are unequivocally opposed to any recording or eavesdropping on the deliberations of a jury under any conditions regardless of the purpose. Such practices, however well intentioned, obviously and inevitably stifle the discussion and free exchange of ideas among jurors. They tend to destroy the very basis for common judgment among the jurors, upon which the institution of trial by jury is based, and are inconsistent with the purposes of the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which requires that trial by jury shall be preserved.

The committee is heartily in accord with the views expressed by the Department of Justice and has recommended the bill, S. 2887, to the favorable consideration of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2887), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, line 8, after the word "than", to insert "$1,000," and on line 9, after the word "than", to strike out the word "years" and to insert "one year", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 73 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1508. Recording, listening to, or observing proceedings of grand or petit juries while deliberating or voting

"Whoever knowingly and willfully, by any means or device whatsoever—

"(a) records, or attempts to record, the proceedings of any grand or petit jury in any court of the United States while such jury is deliberating or voting; or

"(b) listens to or observes, or attempts to listen to or observe, the proceedings of any grand or petit jury of which he is not a member in any court of the United States while such jury is deliberating or voting—

"Shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"Nothing in paragraph (a) of this section shall be construed to prohibit the taking of notes by a grand or petit juror in any court of the United States in connection with and solely for the purpose of assisting him in the performance of his duties as such juror."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 73 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1508. Recording, listening to, or observing proceedings of grand or petit juries while deliberating or voting."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSPORTATION BY RAILROAD OF DISABLED INDIVIDUAL AND ATTENDANT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1777) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to authorize common carriers by railroad to carry a disabled individual requiring an attendant at the usual fare charged for one person, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "disabled", to strike out "individual" and insert "person"; and on page 2, line 1, after the word "such", to strike out "individual" and insert "person", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by inserting after "or other guide dog specially trained and educated for that purpose" a comma and "or from carrying a disabled person accompanied by an attendant if such person is disabled to the extent of requiring such attendant,".

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to authorize common carriers to carry a disabled person requiring an attendant and such attendant at the usual fare charged for one person."

AMENDMENT OF HAWAIIAN ORGANIC ACT

The bill (H. R. 6461) to amend sec. 73 (i) of the Hawaiian Organic Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RATIFICATION AND CONFIRMATION OF REVISED LAWS OF HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 6463) to ratify and confirm sec. 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, sec. 1 (b), act 12, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, and the sales of public lands consummated pursuant to the terms of said statutes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN PATENTS OF GOVERNMENT LANDS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 6807) to authorize the amendment of certain patents of Government lands containing restrictions as to use of such lands in the Territory of Hawaii was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 73 (I) OF THE HAWAIIAN ORGANIC ACT

The bill (H. R. 6808) to amend section 73 (i) of the Hawaiian Organic Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF RESTRICTED COVENANT ON LAND PATENT NO. 10410, COUNTY OF HAWAII, T. H.

The bill (H. R. 6824) to authorize the amendment of the restrictive covenant on land patent No. 10410 issued to Keoshi Matsunaga, his heirs or assigns on July 20, 1936, and covering lots situated in the county of Hawaii, T. H., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CITY OF WALL, S. DAK.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2246) to authorize the sale of certain lands to the city of Wall, S. Dak., which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after word "numbered", to strike out "5209" and insert "5299", and on page 2, line 10, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to insert "said lot 3, 150 feet to the east boundary line of block A as platted and according to plat on file, thence south 0 degrees 1 minute west 47.35 feet to the southeast corner of said block A, thence west 483.06 feet to the east boundary line of the public highway as now established, thence on a curve southwesterly 1,600 feet along the southeasterly boundary line of said," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Wall, S. Dak., all right, title, and interest of the United States to the following described lands situated in Pennington County, S. Dak., upon payment therefor of an amount equal to the fair market value of such lands as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture after appraisal of such lands: Tract No. 5299, being a portion of outlot 1 of the south half of the northeast quarter of section 6, township 1 south, range 16 east, Black Hills meridian, more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at a point 15 feet due west of the northwest corner of lot 1 in block 2 of Mackrill's addition to the town of Wall, thence due west 250 feet to the northeast corner of lot 1 of the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of such section 6, thence south 150 feet to the southeast corner of lot 3 of the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of such section 6, thence west along the south boundary line of the said lot 3, 150 feet to the east boundary line of block "A" as platted and according to plat on file, thence south 0 degrees 1 minute west 47.35 feet to the southeast corner of

said block "A", thence west 483.06 feet to the east boundary line of the public highway as now established, thence on a curve southwesterly 1,600 feet along the southeasterly boundary line of said public highway to the west boundary of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of such section 6, thence south 130 feet to the center of such section 6, thence east 2,068 feet along the south boundary line of the south half of the northeast quarter of such section 6, thence north 1,290 feet to the place of beginning, according to the official plat thereof filed in the office of register of deeds of Pennington County, S. Dak., in plat book No. 3 at page 75, and containing 39 acres more or less, except a plot extending 150 feet west and 300 feet south from the northeast corner of such tract and also excluding such part of such tract as may be required for the planned State highway and the spur to connect such highway with Main Street, Wall, S. Dak.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL SEED ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1688) to amend section 406 of the Federal Seed Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "amended", to strike out "(1) by inserting '(a)' after the section number; (2) by inserting the word 'knowingly' before the word 'violates', and (3) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection" and insert "to read"; after line 7, to insert:

"(a) Any person who knowingly, or as a result either of gross negligence or of a failure to make a reasonable effort to inform himself of the pertinent facts, violates any provision of this act or the rules and regulations made and promulgated thereunder shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall pay a fine of not more than $1,000, for the first offense, and upon conviction for each subsequent offense not more than $2,000."

On page 2, after line 10, to insert:

SEC. 2. Section 204 of the Federal Seed Act (7 U. S. C. 1574) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. The use of a disclaimer or nonwarranty clause in any invoice, advertising, labeling, or written, printed, or graphic matter, pertaining to any seed shall not constitute a defense, or be used as a defense in any way, in any prosecution or other proceeding brought under the provisions of this act, or the rules and regulations made and promulgated thereunder."

On page 3, after line 19, to insert:

SEC. 3. Section 412 of the Federal Seed Act (7 U. S. C. 1602) as amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 412. The institution of any one of the proceedings provided for in sections 405, 406, 409, 410, and 411 shall not bar institution of any of the others, except that action shall not be instituted under both subsections 406 (a) and (b) for the same cause of action. Nothing in this act shall be construed as requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to recommend prosecution, or institution of civil penalty proceedings, libel proceedings, cease-and-desist proceedings, or proceedings for the enforcement of a cease-and-desist order, for minor violations of this act or the rules and regulations made and promulgated thereunder whenever he believes that the public interest will be adequately served by suitable written notice or warning."

And on page 3, after line 9, to insert:

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall be applicable only with respect to violations occurring after the enactment of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 406 of the Federal Seed Act (7 U. S. C. 1956) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Any person who knowingly, or as a result either of gross negligence or of a failure to make a reasonable effort to inform himself of the pertinent facts, violates any provision of this act or the rules and regulations made and promulgated thereunder shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall pay a fine of not more than $1,000, for the first offense, and upon conviction for each subsequent offense not more than $2,000.

"(b) Any person who violates any provision of this act or the rules and regulations made and promulgated thereunder shall forfeit to the United States a sum, not less than $25 or more than $500, for each such violation, which forfeiture shall be recoverable in a civil suit brought in the name of the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 204 of the Federal Seed Act (7 U. S. C. 1574) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. The use of a disclaimer or nonwarranty clause in any invoice, advertising, labeling, or written, printed, or graphic matter, pertaining to any seed, shall not constitute a defense, or be used as a defense in any way, in any prosecution or other proceeding brought under the provisions of this act, or the rules and regulations made and promulgated thereunder."

SEC. 3. Section 412 of the Federal Seed Act (7 U. S. C. 1602) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 412. The institution of any one of the proceedings provided for in sections 405, 406, 409, 410, and 411 shall not bar institution of any of the others, except that action shall not be instituted under both subsections 406 (a) and (b) for the same cause of action. Nothing in this act shall be construed as requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to recommend prosecution, or institution of civil penalty proceedings, libel proceedings, cease-and-desist proceedings, or proceedings for the enforcement of a cease-and-desist order, for minor violations of this act or the rules and regulations made and promulgated thereunder whenever he believes that the public interest will be adequately served by suitable written notice or warning."

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall be applicable only with respect to violations occurring after the enactment of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act."

CLARIFICATION OF OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN THE STANISLAUS NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 374) to authorize the adjustment and clarification of ownership of certain lands within the Stanislaus National Forest, Tuolumne County, Calif., and for other purposes.

HOW PUBLIC FUNDS WERE EXPENDED UNDER "ORAL GUIDELINES"

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to take advantage of the presentation of the bill to invite the attention of the Senate to a committee print of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the subject of relief of unemployment in coal-mining areas and the manner in which public funds were expended under oral guidelines laid down by Mr. Harold Stassen.

Early this year it became my duty, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Oil, Gas, and Coal of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to make an investigation of what had been done by foreign aid, now the ICA, with respect to the expenditure of funds appropriated for foreign aid by the Congress and which at the time was under the administration of Mr. Harold Stassen.

The story began in September 1954. On the 21st day of September, 1954, Mr. Stassen announced, in Denver, that a program seeking to relieve unemployment in distressed coal fields in the United States by the expenditure of foreign-aid funds had been approved by the President. This story was printed in the New York Times of September 22, 1954. It appears on page 15 of the committee print of the report, from which I quote this statement:

The coal program, Mr. Stassen said at the Lowry Air Force base headquarters of the President, was an example of the President's directive of "fitting together the needs overseas with the economic situation at home." He estimated that 75 percent of the $3.5 billion his agency would use in the present fiscal year would be spent inside the United States.

Then the story continued:

The coal purchases will be made as follows—

This, of course, was information given out by Mr. Stassen—

From Kentucky, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania, 2 million tons each; from Illinois, 1,500,000 tons; and 2,500,000 tons generally distributed through other coal producing regions.

Mr. President, nothing like that amount of coal was purchased.

The record shows that less than 2 million tons, as a whole, were purchased. I have no complaint about the economy of the expenditure, but I have a very serious complaint with respect to the redress and disorderly manner in which the program of coal purchases was carried on. It was represented by Mr. Stassen and his organization that the program was being conducted under a directive by the President. Through the Committee on Foreign Relations, I made a search of the directives and found that no directive at all was issued by the President with respect to the purchase of coal for unemployment purposes.

A directive was issued in December 1954, after the election, for the purchase of coal for foreign use in Korea and elsewhere. Nevertheless, it seems to me that with the evidence showing that there had been correspondence between Mr. Stassen and the Secretary of Labor, and that the country had been led to

believe that expenditures would be made in the coal regions, which were in a sad situation with respect to unemployment, we should find out how and under what sort of rules and regulations former Governor Stassen undertook the expenditure of this fund. It was charged unemployment was not a factor in deciding where the purchases were to be made.

It is with the greatest difficulty that I was able to persuade anyone in the executive branch of the Government to express any views about the matter or to give the Senate any information. Finally, I wrote a letter to Mr. D. A. FitzGerald, Acting Director of the International Cooperation Administration, under date of November 18, 1955. I received no response to that letter—probably because Mr. Hollister was not in the city—until January 10, 1956.

In the course of the letter, in response to the principal question which I submitted to Mr. FitzGerald in November, this was the answer that Mr. Hollister gave me:

After discussion with his staff, Governor Stassen issued oral guidelines for this program. It is my understanding that these instructions provided that—

1. Such action as is feasible, consistent with the provisions of the Mutual Security Act and related legislation, will be taken to increase the export of coal to friendly countries.

2. In view of fund limitations, and in order to avoid diversion of funds from other essential purposes, this should be accomplished through increasing commercial exports using the minimum of agency funds.

3. For planning purposes, the projected rate of export of 14 million tons is to be increased by 10 million tons per annum.

4. Purchases are to be made from these coal mining areas by the Secretary of Labor.

5. Agency-financed purchases are to be authorized in such a manner as to permit the foreign user to receive the type and quality of coal of his choosing.

These five paragraphs are only the interpretation of Mr. Hollister in 1956 of oral instructions given by Mr. Stassen in 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the document entitled "Relief of Unemployment in Coal Mining Areas" may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELIEF OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN COAL-MINING AREAS

FOREWORD

Acting upon the receipt of numerous letters and complaints with respect to the administration of what had been announced by the Honorable Harold E. Stassen, Director of FOA, on September 21, 1954, as a broad-scale program to relieve critical unemployment in the coal-mining areas of the United States by the purchase of 10 million tons of coal at an estimated cost of $150 million the undersigned, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Oil, Gas, and Coal, with cooperation of committee staff members, undertook to obtain detailed information with respect to the initiation and administration of the program. There is submitted herewith the essential information gathered by our committee indicating that, although the program was announced by Director Stassen at the Lowry Field, Denver, headquarters of President Eisenhower on September 21, 1954, no specific directive was issued by the President at any time. It is true that on December 9, 1954, in a classified directive under the Mutual Security Act, the President did authorize the expenditure of funds for the purchase of coal for export, but nothing was said with respect to the purchase of this coal for the relief of unemployment.

At the expiration of the fiscal year on June 30, 1955, there had been purchased for export only 1,130,080 tons, and not the 10 million tons announced by Director Stassen, and there had been expended $34.2 million. The information afforded with respect to the purchase and shipment of coal indicated that not unemployment but export to foreign countries, as outlined in the President's directive, was the only criterion for the program which, according to the formal letter of Mr. John B. Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration, which has succeeded FOA, were the oral guidelines established by Mr. Stassen, and not any specific directive. Expenditures preceding the Presidential directive of December 9, 1954, for the export of coal amounted to $4.5 million, while the expenditures thereafter amounted to $29.7 million.

The original announcement of Director Stassen, as published in the New York Times of September 22, 1954, together with the correspondence and material pertinent to the study, is presented herewith in the following order:

1. Letter dated February 3, 1956, from Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY to John B. Hollister, Director, ICA.

2. Letter dated January 10, 1956, from John B. Hollister, Director, ICA, to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

3. Letter dated November 18, 1955, from Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY to D. A. FitzGerald, Acting Director, ICA.

4. Letter dated October 27, 1955, from D. A. FitzGerald, Acting Director, ICA, to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

5. Letter dated October 27, 1955, from D. A. FitzGerald, Acting Director, ICA, to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY.

6: Letter dated September 30, 1955, from Senator JAMES E. MURRAY to Mr. Charles G. McNaron, Chief, Coal and Steel Branch, ICA.

7. Program announcement published in the September 22, 1954, issue of the New York Times.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Oil, Gas, and Coal.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
February 3, 1956.

Mr. JOHN B. HOLLISTER,
Director, International Cooperation Administration,
815 Connecticut Avenue,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOLLISTER: The close attention which I have been obliged to give to other matters during the past months has prevented me from acknowledging your letter of January 10, 1956, and its enclosures. This correspondence was in response to my letter of November 18, 1955, with respect to the coal purchase program undertaken by FOA for the relief of unemployment in distressed coalfields, and it dealt with the manner in which the program was initiated and carried on.

I wrote to Dr. D. A. FitzGerald, Director of ICA in your absence, because it had theretofore been impossible for members of the staff of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which has jurisdiction of mining, to secure adequate information from your agency.

The response accompanying your letter, I regret to say, seems to be equally inadequate. In view of the request which the State Department is now making of Congress for authority to make 10-year commitments for foreign aid, I am sure upon reexamination you will find that the correspondence with this committee and the information furnished us still falls far below the standard which should be expected of cooperation between the legislative and executive branches and the standard of responsibility to be followed by the executive agencies in administering appropriations of the character under which the coal purchasing program, such as it was, was carried out. I call your attention particularly to the provisions of section 501 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, authorizing the transfer of funds from one objective to another. If the Congress finds the same difficulty in securing a report upon expenditures that I have found in connection with the coal program, it is clear that the operation of foreign aid will be essentially a closed book to the elected representatives of the people from whom the funds must be secured.

The record before us now briefly is as follows: On Wednesday, September 22, 1954, the New York Times published a special story, filed in Denver, Colo., the previous day, reporting that Mr. Harold E. Stassen, Director of FOA, "after a conference with the President," had announced that "the United States would start immediately to purchase 10 million tons of American coal that he estimated would cost some $150 million:" Then he proceeded to say, according to the New York Times story, that "under the President's direction, the coal is to come from the most critical unemployment areas." Mr. Stassen, speaking at the Lowry Air Force Base headquarters of the President, according to the New York Times, said that "the coal program was an example of the President's directive of 'fitting together the needs overseas with the economic situation at home.'" Then the Times gave the precise amounts of coal to be purchased from each State, as follows: "From Kentucky, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania, 2 million tons each; from Illinois, 1,500,000 tons, and 2,500,000 tons generally distributed through other coal-producing regions."

We are advised that the United States Navy Fuel Office was the agent of FOA for the purchase of coal and that these purchases, starting on October 14, 1954, and ending on June 24, 1955, totaled only 1,230,000 tons, at a total cost of $34.2 million. The list of States in which these purchases were made was provided by you to Congressman ROBERT MOLLOHAN, of West Virginia, in a letter dated September 22, 1955. Instead of the 2 million tons Mr. Stassen said were to be purchased from Kentucky, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania, the purchases in these States combined amounted to only 425,600 tons. Illinois supplied 179,200 tons, instead of 1,500,000 as predicted by Mr. Stassen and, instead of 2,500,000 to be generally distributed through other coal-producing regions, as estimated by Mr. Stassen, if the New York Times story was accurate, as is usually the case with that paper, only 525,280 tons were purchased in coal-producing areas outside of Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Illinois.

When I sought to obtain a copy of the Presidential directive establishing the program which Mr. Stassen had announced on September 21, nothing was made available to me or to the staff of the Interior Committee except a reference to the Stassen announcement as quoted in the New York Times until, in your letter of January 10, in the first of your enclosures, you told me that "the directive dated December 9, 1954, which formally launched this program is a classified document." Thus it appears that

purchases under this program were launched by the Navy at the direction of FOA almost 2 months before the directive was signed by the President. In justice to you personally, I must point out, of course, that you were not sworn in as head of the agency until July 1, 1955, so that you had no personal responsibility for the publicity announcements under Mr. Stassen's regime.

You did not furnish this committee with a copy of the directive but said that it was a classified document which had previously been furnished to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Upon inquiry of the Senate Comittee on Foreign Relations, I find that the document in question was a document labeled "secret," dated December 9, 1954, and dealing with the transfer and use of funds under section 501 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, to which I have above alluded, and section 401. The only matter contained in this directive having anything to do with coal does not appear to be a transfer dedicated to the relief of distressed regions in the United States, as Mr. Stassen announced, but rather for the exportation of coal under the mutual security program.

The special fund established by section 401 of the Mutual Security Act appears to be dedicated by law only in the furtherance of the purposes of the Mutual Security Act or any other act for which funds are authorized by the Mutual Security Act. I find no authorization in the Mutual Security Act for the appropriation of funds for the purposes designated in Mr. Stassen's press announcement of September 21, 1954.

It is not surprising to me, therefore, that in the material which you have sent to me under date of January 10, 1956, in reference to the first question in my letter of November 18, 1955, to Dr. FitzGerald, it is stated that after discussion with his staff, Governor Stassen issued oral guidelines for this program. Certainly it must be clear that a program for the expenditure of foreign aid funds, which is governed only by oral guidelines issued by the head of the spending agency and a Presidential directive issued 6 or 7 weeks after the program has been launched, such as you have described to me, is not one calculated to inspire Members of Congress with confidence in the administration of funds to be made available for foreign aid.

Surely something more than oral guidelines are required to regulate the expenditure of huge funds made available for mutual security. If the method of spending described by your agency in connection with the coal-purchasing program for the relief of unemployment is characteristic of the methods used in the expenditure of other funds, a far-reaching check on ICA spending would be highly desirable.

In response to my question No. 2, intended to obtain specific information as to the criteria used by the ICA in determining the most critical unemployment areas, to which Mr. Stassen referred in Denver on September 21 after conference with the President, you provide the following illuminating information:

"The criteria on which the program was based were the directive from the President and a decision by Governor Stassen that the objective should be achieved with a minimum expenditure of agency funds."

I marvel at the amazing foresight of an agency which can foresee the criteria set forth in a Presidential directive not yet composed and follow these criteria, although it develops weeks after the program has been launched that the Presidential directive contains no criteria at all.

If you have any doubt of the accuracy of this statement I refer you to the second paragraph of your reply to my question No. 2. You say:

"It was intended that purchases would be related to the areas of highest relative unemployment as determined by the Secretary of Labor."

This information you gave me under date of January 10, 1956, but the Secretary of Labor, Hon. James P. Mitchell, in his letter of October 29, 1954, to Hon. Harold E. Stassen, Director of FOA, not only fails to name any areas of unemployment but, on the contrary, stated specifically:

"The Department of Labor is not in a position to provide labor market information on every area where coal is mined. Accordingly, I do not think the information collected is suitable to be used as a basis for discriminating between prospective coal suppliers under the FOA purchase program."

If you will refer again to Secretary Mitchell's letter of October 29 to Mr. Stassen 4 days before the election, you will find that he referred to the 10 million ton coal purchase program. This was the magnitude of the program announced by Director Stassen. The total number of net tons purchased, however, from the beginning on October 14, 1954, to the end of June 24, 1955, was only 1,130,080 tons. It would also appear that in West Virginia where, according to the Bureau of Mines, unemployment was high, only 44,800 net tons were purchased, whereas in Kentucky 224,000 tons were purchased, although employment had not decreased in that State as it had in West Virginia.

I must frankly say to you, Mr. Hollister, that on the basis of the information which you have supplied to me in your letter of January 10, and of that which I have received from other offices of the Government, the program which former Governor Stassen announced in Denver on September 21 for the purchase of coal in the most critical unemployment areas was never actually undertaken at all.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Fuels.

MR. HOLLISTER'S REPLY TO QUESTIONS IN LETTER OF NOVEMBER 18, 1955, TO MR. D. A. FITZGERALD

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1956.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Fuels, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Reference is made to your November 18, 1955, letter and to discussions between staff members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and members of the ICA staff, concerning fiscal year 1955 coal program; and my decision not to have a special coal program during fiscal year 1956.

Attached for your information is a comprehensive reply to each of the numbered paragraphs in your letter which has been prepared by the ICA staff. Should additional information be required by the committee, I will, subject to security, be glad to provide any information available to the agency.

Yours very sincerely,

JOHN B. HOLLISTER.

REFERENCE NUMBERED PARAGRAPH 1

This directive, dated December 9, 1954, which formally launched this program is a classified document. This document was previously furnished to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and it is assumed that this committee will make it available to you.

After discussion with this staff, Governor Stassen issued oral guidelines for this program. It is my understanding that these instructions provided that—

1. Such action as is feasible, consistent with the provisions of the Mutual Security Act and related legislation, will be taken to increase the export of coal to friendly countries.

2. In view of fund limitations, and in order to avoid diversion of funds from other essential purposes, this should be accomplished through increasing commercial exports using the minimum of agency funds.

3. For planning purposes, the projected rate of export of 14 million tons is to be increased by 10 million tons per annum.

4. Purchases are to be made from these coal mining areas in the United States designated as distress labor areas by the Secretary of Labor.

5. Agency-financed purchases are to be authorized in such a manner as to permit the foreign user to receive the type and quality of coal of his choosing.

REFERENCE NUMBERED PARAGRAPH 2

It is our understanding that Governor Stassen was extemporaneously replying to questions from reporters at a press conference. There is no record in the agency as to the exact statements made by the Governor which would substantiate the exact wording in the article which appeared in the New York Times on September 22, 1954, under a dateline of September 21 from Denver, Colo. The criteria on which the program was based were the directive from the President and a decision by Governor Stassen that the objective should be achieved with a minimum expenditure of agency funds.

It was intended that purchases would be related to the areas of highest relative unemployment as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

Enclosure 1 is a copy of an October 29, 1954, letter from the Secretary of Labor which states that the information collected by the Department is not suitable to be used as a basis for discrimination between the prospective coal suppliers under the FOA purchase program and stating that with relatively few exceptions the entire bituminous industry is in an unhealthy condition. Statistics of the Department were, however, used on a general basis for the purpose of evaluating the availability of other employment in an area.

In addition, such information as was available from the Department of the Interior with respect to employment and unemployment, as well as information that the agency was able to secure from the United Mine Workers and other sources, was used in evaluating the unemployment situation. A major factor considered, however, was the type and quality of coal required. In no instance did the agency attempt to take an action which would require foreign users of coal to receive a type and quality of coal which was not suited for the intended purpose.

Due to the unemployment in distress coal mining areas, there were discussions at Cabinet level in the spring of 1954 for the purpose of determining what action might be appropriately taken by the executive branch of the Government. In these discussions it was agreed that some action might be taken through the FOA to increase the export of coal. As a result of this decision, the Chief of the FOA Coal and Steel Branch visited most of the major coal-consuming areas of the free world for the purpose of evaluating the export market.

A preliminary report prepared in late July resulted in Governor Stassen's August 4, 1954, statements to the press concerning the possibility of a coal export program as part of the FOA operation. As a result of the information assembled, it was determined that there would probably be an unsatisfied demand for coal in friendly countries of the world amounting to approximately 19 million tons during the fiscal year 1955. Taking into account the opinion of American coal producers and exporters and best information available to the agency and other elements of the Government as to foreign exchange possibilities, etc., it was

determined that a target consisting of a 10 million ton increase in export was reasonable. It was further agreed in advance of the September 21, 1954, announcement that it would be detrimental rather than helpful to the American coal industry if coal were shipped to foreign users which was not suitable to the end use for which intended.

REFERENCE NUMBERED PARAGRAPH 3

There was no overall directive with respect to Navy purchases of coal under the select area procurement program. Enclosed are copies of the purchase requests forwarded to the Department of the Navy which resulted in their purchase of approximately 1 million tons of coal from select areas.

The Navy Solid Fuels Procurement Division is the agency designated to procure coal for the United States Government. Only that portion of the program designated as "select area purchases" was handled by the Navy Department's Solid Fuels Procurement Division. The major portion of the select area program was the purchase of coal for Korea. It was the judgment of agency officials that the potential Korean importers did not have sufficient experience and background in purchasing American coal to permit purchase through commercial channels and that this portion of the program could best be executed by using the United States Government channels. This agency customarily has its purchasing done by the department designated to procure specific items.

REFERENCE NUMBERED PARAGRAPH 4

The term "prevailing wages" has special significance in that it is defined by the Walsh-Healey Act and, under the terms of this act, the Secretary of Labor, after having complied with the provisions of this act, can establish a prevailing wage rate. On investigating this subject with the Office of the Secretary of Labor at the time the program was initiated, it was determined that there was no established prevailing wages for the coal industry. Preliminary action toward the establishment of prevailing wage rates was initiated in the fall of 1954 and was concluded by issuance of a press release in early August 1955 which stated that the established prevailing wage rates were to take effect 30 days after August 6. As there were no established prevailing wages at the time the purchases were made, we question the United Mine Workers' charges that 90 percent of the purchases were from mines paying below the prevailing wages.

REFERENCE NUMBERED PARAGRAPH 5

The statement to Congressman MOLLOHAN in the September 23, 1955, letter was premised in the main on production as versus employment. Enclosure 2 is a tabulation which compares production by State for the month of August 1954 with production for August 1955. With the exception of Montana and Kansas, there was substantial recovery in coal production in every State. The staff endeavored to secure employment statistics in early September 1955, but were advised by the United Mine Workers Union, the Office of the Secretary of Labor, and the Department of the Interior that current accurate and reliable employment statistics were not available. We were fully aware that increased mechanization and other factors had adversely influenced employment but were unable to assess the offsetting impact of these factors.

The statement to Congressman MOLLOHAN concerning the purchase of 1,130,000 tons of coal was in reply to a question as to the tonnage of coal purchased on a select area basis. The Congressman had previously been advised as to the amount of total purchases.

Attached as enclosure 3 is a tabulation showing the procurement authorized by the FOA during the fiscal year 1955. The information contained in this document was made available to members of the committee staff and an explanation of the method of purchase was presented orally. We explained to the committee staff members that the Mutual Security Act and related legislation specify that normal commercial purchase channels rather than United States Government purchase be used wherever feasible.

It was fully recognized by this agency that West Virginia and certain other normal commercial sources for export coal were in serious distress condition with respect to employment. However, because of their fortunate location with respect to ship transportation and the fact that the types of coal available from these areas were the type required by potential purchasers in Western Europe, Japan, and South America, it was judged here that these areas would naturally be able to secure a large share of any increased commercial purchases. Our best information now indicates as a matter of fact that approximately 85 percent of the commercial purchases were made from West Virginia.

Paragraph 1, Select Area Purchases, was that portion of the program designed to cause purchase of coal for export from sources other than the normal source of supply for export coal. It was necessary to take extraordinary action if any coal was to be purchased from these areas.

In presenting the justification for the fiscal year 1955 program, it was stated that 1,300,000 tons of coal might be financed with agency funds from the United States. This coal was to be furnished as 500,000 tons to Spain, 500,000 tons to Yugoslavia, 200,000 tons to Greece, 100,000 tons for other areas. As the amount of funds requested was reduced by the Congress and Senate, the quantity of coal to be purchased, along with other commodities, probably would have been reduced. We could not, therefore, state the exact amount of coal which would have been purchased had there been no special program.

In the execution of the program there was never any separation as between what the Senator terms "the coal unemployment relief program" and "the overall foreign-aid program." As was stated in the letters to Senator MURRAY and Congressman PERKINS, to which reference is made, the intent of the program was to utilize United States mined coal for export in the implementation of the fiscal year 1955 mutual-security program to the maximum extent feasible, consistent with the Mutual Security Act and other relevant policies of the administration. At the time the program was initiated, it was felt that this could best be accomplished by taking action which could maximize the movement of commercially procured coal using a minimum of agency funds. It is felt that an action of this nature was consistent with the provisions of the Mutual Security Act and other relevant policies of the administration, a major policy of the administration being to minimize Government expenditures while at the same time accomplishing objectives. The FOA and Department of State and other elements of the executive branch of the Government, working together with representatives of the American coal industry, undertook to increase the commercial export of coal by causing relaxation of trade and financial restrictions imposed by foreign governments in order to permit coal to move freely from the United States to free world sources which had unsatisfied demand for coal. Germany, France, Belgium, and United Kingdom had virtual embargoes on the import of American coal and there were restrictions in other areas. Through supplying coal to Germany under the program and through strong presentation to the Germans through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, we were successfully getting coal to move to Germany on a comparatively free basis. It was necessary to let Germany have a small amount of coal under the program in order to achieve this purpose. Once the restriction was lifted, coal has continued to flow to Germany in large quantities on a commercial basis.

Italy, due in part to pressure from European groups, was restricting the import of American coal to approximately 200,000 tons per month. We were successful in negotiating agreements with Italy to supply a small amount of coal, 224,000 tons, under the program, and as a result of these negotiations, we were successful in causing Italy to relax its restrictions on the import with a result that its purchases of American coal through commercial channels immediately jumped from less than 200,000 tons to an average of approximately 500,000 tons per month. We were also successful in getting the British Government to import large quantities of coal, partly as a result of the one authorization which was issued to the British. The same type of negotiation was carried on with other European countries with similar results. As I have previously stated, the near-record high level of coal exports which now attains 3,904,254 tons during the month of October of this year is an indication of the relaxation of trade restrictions against American coal. This high rate of export of approximately 48 million tons per annum as compared to the rate of 14 million tons per annum rate at the time the program was initiated has, in our opinion, materially assisted coal miners along the eastern seaboard, including those in West Virginia.

REFERENCE NUMBERED PARAGRAPH 6

With respect to the Senator's comments on abandonment of the buy-American policy, it is the policy of this agency to finance the procurement of commodities, equipment, and materials furnished under the mutual-security program at the lowest price obtainable from free-world sources, including the United States, due allowance being given to quality, availability, and other relevant factors. Until fiscal year 1955, with respect to coal, this in fact resulted in purchases from the United States because United States aid was largely directed to closing the dollar gap in the foreign-exchange position of European countries. The decision to purchase coal offshore, when purchased as part of the normal United States aid program, resulted from the desirability of bringing the purchase of coal in line with procurement policy for all commodities, and the fact that certain types of coal needed for countries in Asia can be bought more cheaply from offshore sources. This policy is consistent with the congressional mandate that the maximum quantity of aid be furnished with the taxpayers' dollar.

We are fully aware of the February 26, 1955, report on energy supplies and resources policy, paragraph 10d of which states: "Where United States coal can be supplied competitively with other available coal the Government should use its best efforts to enlarge the participation of United States coal in the foreign-aid program."

The action not to have a special coal program of the type carried on by the Foreign Operations Administration during fiscal year 1956 appears to be totally consistent with this paragraph of the report which is the only portion of this report which makes specific reference to the agency's program. This recommendation specifically implies that American coal producers should be in competition with foreign producers.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., October 29, 1954.

Hon. HAROLD E. STASSEN,
Director, Foreign Operations Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STASSEN: In accordance with a recent request, the Bureau of Employment

Security supplied members of your staff with certain labor market information which they indicated was for use in the 10-million-ton coal-purchase program.

I would like to stress that the labor market information which the Department regularly collects is designed to analyze labor market conditions in the principal industrial areas in the country. The coal-mining industry is found mainly in nonurban areas and, therefore, the information collected on a regular basis is very incomplete with respect to labor-market conditions in coal-mining localities. The Department of Labor is not in a position to provide labor-market information on every area where coal is mined. Accordingly, I do not think the information collected is suitable to be used as a basis for discriminating between prospective coal suppliers under the FOA purchase program.

As you know, the entire coal-mining industry has been seriously affected by its loss of markets to competing fuels over many years. With relatively few exceptions it can be said that the entire bituminous industry is in an unhealthy condition. I recognize the difficulty of selecting one coal mine and excluding another in your purchase program and hope that you will keep the above facts in mind.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. MITCHELL,
Secretary of Labor.

Bituminous coal production

[Thousand tons]

State	August 1954	August 1955	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Accumulative, January through August— 1954	Accumulative, January through August— 1955	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	State	August 1954	August 1955	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Accumulative, January through August— 1954	Accumulative, January through August— 1955	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
			Percent			Percent				Percent			Percent
Alabama	814	1,098	+34.9	6,420	7,731	+20.4	Ohio	2,839	3,335	+17.4	19,669	23,243	+18.2
Arkansas	41	58	+41.4	319	420	+31.7	Oklahoma	163	188	+15.3	1,032	1,301	+26.0
Colorado	239	295	+23.4	1,571	2,000	+17.3	Pennsylvania	5,988	7,995	+33.5	46,190	55,596	+20.4
Illinois	3,225	3,694	+14.5	25,700	29,192	+13.5	Tennessee	579	906	+56.5	4,274	5,089	+19.0
Indiana	852	1,208	+41.8	8,228	10,015	+21.7	Utah	484	666	+37.6	3,241	4,370	+34.8
Iowa	84	103	+22.6	795	834	+4.9	Virginia	1,669	2,339	+40.0	10,937	14,959	+36.8
Kansas	119	113	−5.0	889	963	+8.3	Washington	53	63	+18.8	397	405	+2.0
Kentucky	5,373	7,255	+35.0	36,370	43,632	+20.0	West Virginia	10,520	13,260	+26.0	73,690	92,555	+25.6
Maryland	14	49	+250.0	242	305	+26.0	Wyoming	214	252	+17.7	1,496	1,551	+3.7
Missouri	180	191	+6.1	1,356	1,451	+7.0							
Montana	147	85	−42.1	965	755	−21.8	Total, all States	33,655	43,427	+29.0	245,739	298,642	+21.5
New Mexico	16	24	+50.0	126	150	+19.0	Export	1,311	3,736	+285.0	9,230	20,432	+221.0
North Dakota	191	167	−12.5	1,572	1,604	+2.0							

FOA solid fuels procurement authorized, fiscal 1955

Destination	Origin	Net tons	Dollars	Destination	Origin	Net tons	Dollars
1. Select area purchases from the United States:				2. Commercial procurement from the United States—Continued			
Korea	Colorado	22,400		Spain		598,080	
Do	Kentucky	224,000		Greece		80,864	
Do	Alabama	67,200		France		548,800	
Do	Illinois	179,200		United Kingdom		280,000	
Do	Washington	66,080		Italy		224,000	
Do	Utah	67,200		Finland		168,000	
Do	West Virginia	44,800		Israel		4,480	
Do	Indiana	112,000					
Do	Oklahoma	44,800		Subtotal		3,201,184	[1] 42,739,173
Do	New Mexico	11,200		3. U. S. Government purchase, United States competitive:			
Do	Pittsburgh Seam	134,400		Korea		67,200	1,709,015
Indochina	Pennsylvania	33,600					
Greece	do	67,200		4. Procurement from the United States		4,398,464	73,986,173
Yugoslavia	do	56,000					
Subtotal		1,130,080	29,537,985	5. Worldwide competitive:			
				Korea		221,760	
2. Commercial procurement from the United States:				Indochina		33,600	
Austria		224,000		Subtotal		255,360	3,095,000
Germany		131,400					
Denmark		280,000		Grand total		4,653,824	77,081,173
Yugoslavia		658,560					

[1] Revolving funds, $19,172,173; program funds, $23,567,000.

NOVEMBER 18, 1955.

Mr. D. A. FITZGERALD,
Acting Director, International Cooperation Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FITZGERALD: I have your letter of October 27 in response to the request made by committee staff members on my behalf for information on the purchase program to relieve unemployment in the distressed coalfields of the United States. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Fuels, I also have copies of your letters of the same date to Congressman PERKINS, of Kentucky, and to our committee chairman, Senator MURRAY, on the same subject.

It has been impossible to obtain adequate information with respect to the manner in which the program for relief of the unemployed in the coal-producing States has been carried out. True, we are advised by the ICA that 1,130,000 tons were purchased during fiscal year 1955. However, the purchase of 224,000 tons from Kentucky, which is 5 times greater than the 44,800-ton purchase from West Virginia, where production is more than twice that of Kentucky and where the employment problem is greater, seems illogical.

All of your letters lump the coal unemployment relief program with the overall foreign-aid program, despite efforts to obtain specific replies to specific questions respecting the former. On behalf of the subcommittee I desire now to submit the following queries to which I hope to obtain responsive replies.

1. In your letters to Senator MURRAY and to Congressman PERKINS you state:

"On September 21, 1954, the President directed that the FOA undertake to utilize United States mined coal for export in the implementation of the fiscal year 1955 mutual security program (ending June 30, 1955) to the maximum extent feasible, consistent with the Mutual Security Act and other relevant policies of the administration."

Inasmuch as this sentence refers unspecifically to a formal directive which launched the program, the subcommittee requests a copy. If, in fact, there was no such formal directive, the subcommittee would appreciate a copy of any order by which Director Stassen established or modified the program.

2. The New York Times of September 22, 1954, under a dateline of September 21 from Denver, Colo., stated:

"Mr. Stassen said the United States would start immediately to purchase 10 million tons of American coal that he estimated would cost some $150 million. Under the President's direction, the coal is to come from the most critical unemployment areas."

The subcommittee requests specific information as to the criteria used by the ICA in determining those "most critical unemployment areas." It is to be assumed that the reports of the Department of Labor were used as source material to determine the areas in which unemployment was most critical. We would appreciate also knowing whether statistics of the Bureau of Mines were used in making these determinations.

Incidentally, it should be noted that your letters to Senator MURRAY and Congressman PERKINS state that "a target consisting of an increase of 10 million tons of export was suggested as reasonable." Mr. Stassen's an-

nouncement of what you refer to as the President's directive stated categorically that 10 million tons would be purchased at an estimated cost of $150 million and proceeded to list the areas and the specific amounts to be purchased in each. It would be appreciated if you would amplify this statement by advising us who "suggested" the "reasonableness" of this "target" and in what manner it was done.

3. The subcommittee staff members were informed that the Navy made the actual purchases of the 1,130,000 tons. Why, in a program designed for unemployment relief, was the Navy brought in to do the purchasing? Please supply us with a copy of ICA's directive or request to the Navy for such services.

4. The Washington representatives of the United Mine Workers have charged that some 90 percent of the purchases were from mines paying wages below the "prevailing wages" specified in the Navy's invitations to bid. Do you have any comments on this charge?

5. In his letter to Congressman MOLLOHAN, of West Virginia, dated September 23, 1955, Director Hollister stated, in substance, that the program was not being continued because of the "substantial recovery" in the coal industry during the year. Yet statistics supplied by the Bureau of Mines showed a drop of 33,800 in employment in the coal industry for the period January to July 1955 as compared to the same period in 1954. Since this program was for the specific purpose of relieving unemployment distress in coal-producing areas, the subcommittee requests the figures used by ICA in arriving at its determination that "improvement" warranted abandonment of the President's program. It should be noted that this program was only approximately 12½ percent complete at the time of its abandonment with 1,130,000 tons procured out of the announced 10-million-ton goal.

6. Laying aside for the moment the distress purchase program, I turn now to the overall ICA program which you have been so eager to discuss in your previous correspondence. In your letter to me, you confirmed the abandonment of the buy-American policy with respect to coal purchased with American taxpayers' funds. I call to your attention the following recommendation of the President's Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy, issued February 26, 1955, by the White House:

"8. UNEMPLOYMENT AND BUSINESS DISTRESS IN THE COAL INDUSTRY

"We recognize that serious unemployment and business distress exist in the coal industry and recommend that the Interdepartmental Committee on the Soft Coal Industry be continued for the purpose of developing for Cabinet consideration specific action programs to alleviate these conditions."

Did the ICA take cognizance of this policy recommendation by the President's Cabinet Committee in arriving at its decision to put American producers in competition with foreign producers? May we have a copy of the agency directive under which this major policy change was made?

In view of the increasing distress in coal mining areas, a public hearing on the abandonment of the relief purchase program and on the change in the Buy American policy may be necessary. Therefore, as prompt compliance as possible with the foregoing requests of the subcommittee is in the public interest.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Fuels.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., October 27, 1955.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: This is in response to Mr. Stewart French's request to Mr. John Murphy for information as to the source and destination of coal under the ICA fiscal year 1956 program.

Since we have not yet approved firm commodity programs for the entire 1956 fiscal year, we are not in a position to supply detailed information on the source and destination of all coal to be financed by ICA from fiscal year 1956 funds. So far we have not authorized any procurement of coal from fiscal year 1956 funds.

In view of the fact that we are no longer providing economic aid to most of the large coal-importing countries, we do not expect to finance large shipments of coal this year. On the other hand, most of these countries are now in a position to finance and are financing near record imports of United States coal with their own dollar resources. United States coal exports in August and September (excluding those to Canada) exceeded 3.7 million tons monthly and were nearly three times as large as in the corresponding months of 1953 and 1954.

As to the source of any coal financed by ICA, this is difficult to predict in advance. All authorizations will include, but not be limited to, the United States as a source, and purchases will normally be made from the most economical sources. It is probable that Korea will find offers from Japan or Formosa the more attractive, particularly in view of the substantial increases in ocean freight rates during the last 12 months. Any European countries to which authorizations may be issued will probably find the United States coal exporters making the most economical offers.

If we can furnish any additional information of value to Mr. French, we shall be happy to do so.

Sincerely yours,

D. A. FITZGERALD,
Acting Director.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., October 27, 1955.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I have your letter of September 30, 1955, addressed to Mr. Charles G. McNaron, concerning the fiscal year 1955 coal program as it pertained to the operations of the FOA for that fiscal year. As there seems to have been some contradiction in several quarters as to the method of implementation and the end results of the program in question, I would like to take this occasion to review the exact chronology, figures, and facts of the operation in order to clarify the situation.

On September 21, 1954, the President directed that the FOA undertake to utilize United States-mined coal for export in the implementation of the fiscal year 1955 mutual-security program (ending June 30, 1955) to the maximum extent feasible, consistent with the Mutual Security Act and other relevant policies of the administration. A target consisting of an increase of 10 million tons of export coal was suggested as reasonable. It was further directed that, insofar as practicable, this increased export tonnage should be divided between the major types of coal and the major coalfields, endeavoring to relate the purchases to the areas of highest relative unemployment.

Under the authority vested in him under section 401 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, the President also authorized the establishment of a $20-million revolving fund for fiscal year 1955 ending June 30, this in addition to the use of funds for this operation allotted to aid-receiving countries by FOA.

In part, because of the stimulus of this program, United States coal exports increased 15 million tons from the 1953–54 average of 14 million tons annually to 29,272,000 tons for the 12 months ending September 30, 1955. Of these increased exports, FOA financed from fiscal year 1955 funds approximately 4,400,000 tons, including both normal aid procurement and the procurement under the $20-million revolving fund for a total expenditure of $74 million. The near-record high level of coal exports, which in August and September of this year were at the rate of 3,770,000 tons per month, is an indication of the relaxation of trade restrictions against American coal, the ability of foreign governments, having in many instances achieved successful rehabilitation, to provide the dollars to purchase coal, and the continuing high demand for coal in free-world areas outside the United States. The limiting factor, if any, in the months immediately ahead will be availability of ocean shipping, rather than lack of dollar financing.

There will be some requirements for coal in the fiscal year 1956 International Cooperation Administration's program. Because the overall conditions in the coal industry that led to the emergency fiscal year 1955 purchase program have improved substantially and because methods other than purchases out of foreign-aid funds are better designed to deal with the basic causes of local economic distress, the International Cooperation Administration believes that purchases required for the fiscal year 1956 program should be carried out in the usual manner on the free-world market in line with the basic concept established by the Congress in the Mutual Security Act and in order to minimize the expense to our taxpayers. At the same time the competitive opportunity of American industry to participate, if the occasion warrants, is available through the wide publicity given to ICA-financed procurement as well as our insistence on adequate and comparable quality standards.

Sincerely yours,

D. A. FITZGERALD,
Acting Director.

SEPTEMBER 30, 1955.

Mr. CHARLES G. MCNARON,
Chief, Coal and Steel Branch, International Cooperation Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCNARON: I am informed that it is the announced policy of ICA that for this year, at least, purchases of coal under agency-financed transactions will be from the most economical free-world source.

It occurs to me to wonder what became of the program, presumedly set up by White House directive, to purchase 10 million tons of coal from distressed domestic areas. Kindly inform me how much has been purchased to date under this program, from what areas, and why the new policy which, apparently, nullifies the previous one.

I feel very strongly that coal purchased for export by ICA funds should be purchased in the American market from distressed areas.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

[From the New York Times of September 22, 1954]

FEDERAL BUYING OF COAL APPROVED—RELIEF OF DISTRESSED REGIONS IS AIM OF PLAN LINKED TO AID OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES

DENVER, September 21.—A program seeking to relieve unemployment in distressed coalfields in the United States while aiding underdeveloped foreign countries was approved today by President Eisenhower.

After a conference with the President, Harold E. Stassen, Director of the Foreign Operations Administration, outlined the program.

Mr. Stassen said the United States would start immediately to purchase 10 million tons of American coal that he estimated would cost some $150 million. Under the President's direction, the coal is to come from the most critical unemployment areas.

The coal will be shipped to coal-importing countries in exchange for products that may be transferred to underdeveloped countries or in exchange for local currencies to be plowed back into the countries for various economic or military projects.

The coal program, Mr. Stassen said at the Lowry Air Force Base headquarters of the President, was an example of the President's directive of "fitting together the needs overseas with the economic situation at home." He estimated that 75 percent of the $3.5 billion his agency would use in the present fiscal year would be spent inside the United States.

The coal purchases will be made as follows:

From Kentucky, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania, 2 million tons each; from Illinois, 1.5 million tons; and 2.5 million tons generally distributed through other coal-producing regions.

As an example of how the coal would be used, Mr. Stassen said some coal would be shipped to Spain where it could be used for part of the costs of American airbases there. This would be an arrangement similar to that worked out for food surpluses.

In addition, the United States might obtain Spanish products, such as citrus fruit for the Near East, or some minerals needed in north Africa or in other friendly countries.

CLARIFICATION OF OWNERSHIP TO CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN THE STANISLAUS NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 374) to authorize the adjustment and clarification of ownership to certain lands within the Stanislaus National Forest, Tuolumne County, Calif., and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SIMPLIFICATION OF WORK OF THE FOREST SERVICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1855) to amend the act approved April 24, 1950, entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes."

WRITTEN REGULATION ESSENTIAL TO PREVENT WASTE OF PUBLIC MONEY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall take the opportunity, while H. R. 1855 is the unfinished business, to remark that when the head of a great agency like the Foreign Aid Administration, now the ICA, undertakes to spend by "oral guidelines" the money which Congress has appropriated for foreign aid, the time has come for Congress to put a much firmer control upon the expenditure of public funds by the executive branch of the Government. Waste is unavoidable when there are no written regulations for public expenditure.

I have heard many wild tales in the past about reckless expenditures in previous administrations; but never before have I heard a prominent member of the executive branch confess that his predecessor had expended hundreds of thousands of dollars under oral guidelines, and oral guidelines alone.

I call this matter now to the attention of the Senate and of the country because we are about to consider the huge foreign-aid program requested by the President, a program which authorizes, or would ask the Congress to authorize, a 10-year program of expenditures for projects of various kinds throughout the world.

If oral guidelines can be laid down by former Governor Stassen under the ICA program, then oral guidelines can be laid down under the 10-year program. It is essential that Congress, in the protection of the money of the people of the United States, should be certain that there shall be no more mere "oral guidelines," but that the rules and regulations shall be explicit and shall be made public, or at least shall be presented to Congress.

SIMPLIFICATION OF WORK OF THE FOREST SERVICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1855) to amend the act approved April 24, 1950, entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WATER CONSERVATION PRACTICES

The bill (H. R. 7236) to amend section 8 (B) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to water conservation practices was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill simply would permit payments to be made under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for water-conservation practices in the humid areas as well as the arid and semiarid areas. After studies which were made, the Department of Agriculture reached certain conclusions, as follows:

At the time the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act was adopted by Congress, water problems and the desirability of water-conservation measures were presumed to be limited to the arid and semiarid States lying generally west of the 100th meridian. In recent years it has become increasingly obvious that water conservation is the concern not only of the Western States but of the whole United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6712) to amend section 1237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "business", to insert "and only in the case of property described in the last sentence of subsection (b) (3))", and on page 2, to strike out lines 1 and 2, and in lieu thereof, to insert:

(a) In subparagraph (A) strike out "water or sewer facilities" and insert: "water,, sewer, or drainage facilities".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS FROM UNCLAIMED PAYMENTS ON UNITED STATES SAVINGS BONDS

The bill (S. 3422) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain amounts from unclaimed payments on United States savings bonds to the fund created for the payment of Government losses in shipment was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Government Losses in Shipment Act, as amended (50 Stat. 479; 5 U. S. C. 134a), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer on the books of the Department of the Treasury to the account of the fund an amount not to exceed $500,000 from the account on such books entitled 'Unclaimed Partial Payments on United States Savings Bonds'."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following the passage of Calendar No. 1731, S. 3422, a statement in explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

The Government has a losses in shipment fund which was established on the books of the Treasury on July 8, 1937, in accordance with the Government Losses in Shipment Act, whereby the Government assumed the risk in its shipment of valuables, including money, bullion, and securities. By the act of April 12, 1943, this fund was made available for the replacement of any losses resulting from payments made in connection with the redemption of savings bonds. As of December 31, 1955, the balance of the fund was $178,000. Since the fund, under the act of April 12, 1943, is made liable for losses in connection with the purchase of savings bonds, and it is estimated there will be $106,000 of such losses as a charge to the fund, the balance in the fund will amount to $72,000. However, since there are in the account "Unclaimed partial payments on United States savings bonds" about

$700,000, representing payments by employees of private corporations under the payroll-savings plan, the bill authorizes the Secretary to transfer $500,000 from this account to the Government losses in shipment-recovery fund. This will make it unnecessary for the Treasury to seek an appropriation from Congress to replenish this fund and will still leave $200,000 in the account "Unclaimed partial payments on United States savings bonds," which is more than sufficient to meet all anticipated claims in that account.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the report on the bill just passed, as printed, contains an error in a date. I ask unanimous consent that the corrected report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the corrected report, Report No. 1706, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT (TO ACCOMPANY S. 3422)

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3422) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain amounts from unclaimed payments on United States savings bonds to the fund created for the payment of Government losses in shipment, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill will authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer, not to exceed $500,000, from the account "Unclaimed partial payments on United States savings bonds" to the Government losses in shipment revolving fund.

The Government losses in shipment revolving fund was established on the books of the Treasury on July 8, 1937, in accordance with the provisions of the Government Losses in Shipment Act (5 U. S. C. 134–134h), whereby the Government assumed the risk on its shipments of valuables, including, money, bullion, and securities. This act authorized an initial appropriation of $500,000 and annual appropriations of $200,000 for each of the fiscal years 1939 to 1948, inclusive, making a total of authorized appropriations of $2,500,000. Actual appropriations to the fund have amounted to only $802,000. The balance of the fund as of December 31, 1955, was $178,000. Additional appropriations will be required in the future unless other means of obtaining funds are provided.

By the act of April 12, 1943 (31 U. S. C. 757c (i)), the fund was made available for the replacement of any losses resulting from payments made in connection with the redemption of savings bonds. From October 1, 1944 to September 30, 1955, paying agents paid 1,269 million savings bonds aggregating $55,177 million. There were only 65,237 bonds aggregating $2,983,000 erroneously paid, in most cases, due to forgeries of the signatures of the owners of such bonds. Of this amount $2,136,000 has been recovered from owners, paying agents, forgers, and others. Of the remaining $847,000 the Government losses in shipment fund has been charged with $494,000 and the amount of $353,000 is in process of collection. Based on past experience, about 70 percent, or $247,000, of the amount in process of collection will be recovered, which would leave the remainder, or about $106,000, as a possible charge to the fund.

Funds in the account "Unclaimed partial payments on United States savings bonds" represents unclaimed partial payments on the purchase price of savings bonds made by employees of private corporations under the payroll savings plan. The Treasury agreed to accept these funds at the request of private corporations to enable the corporations to close these small accounts on their books. Since 1944 about $746,000 has been received for credit to this account, representing about 148,000 individual accounts. This is an average of about $5 for each account, and includes over 46,000 accounts of less than $1 aggregating over $17,000 which has been credited to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. To date claims paid from the fund have amounted to less than $29,000. In the last 5 years claims have amounted to less than $1,000 each year. There would remain a balance in this account of about $200,000, after the transfer requested by this proposed legislation, which is considered sufficient to meet all anticipated claims.

NECESSITY FOR LEGISLATION

As indicated, the balance in the Government losses in shipment revolving fund as of December 31, 1955 was $178,000. Since this fund was made available for the replacement of any losses in connection with redemption of savings bonds, it appears that there will now be $106,000 as a possible charge to the fund, leaving a balance in the fund of $72,000. Since there is on the account "Unclaimed partial payments on United States savings bonds" about $700,000, the Secretary of the Treasury desires authority to transfer $500,000 of this amount to the Government losses in shipment revolving fund, leaving in the account "Unclaimed partial payments on United States savings bonds" a balance of about $200,000, which is considered sufficient to meet all anticipated claims. This bill was requested by the Treasury Department.

The transfer of funds to the Government losses in shipment revolving fund from the account "Unclaimed partial payments on United States savings bonds" will make it unnecessary for the Treasury to request an appropriation by the Congress to replenish the Government losses in shipment fund to offset the charges to that fund covering erroneously redeemed savings bonds.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, S. 3422, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman).

GOVERNMENT LOSSES IN SHIPMENT ACT (50 STAT. 479)

Section 2 of the Government Losses in Shipment Act, approved July 8, 1937 (50 Stat. 479; 5 U. S. C. 134a)

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500,000 to be used, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, for the replacement of valuables, or the value thereof, lost, destroyed, or damaged in the course of shipment effected pursuant to the regulations prescribed under section 1. There is hereby further authorized to be appropriated annually, beginning with the fiscal year 1939 and ending with the fiscal year 1948, inclusive, the sum of $200,000 for the said purposes, and from time to time such additional sums as may be necessary for the said purposes. There shall be in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund, to be known as the fund for the payment of Government losses in shipment (hereinafter referred to as "the fund"), to be constituted of the said sum of $500,000 and the sums hereafter appropriated for the said purposes, together with all recoveries and repayments credited to the fund as hereinafter provided. There is hereby further authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000, for expenditures under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, to be used for the payment of administrative expenses, including personal services, necessary to carry out the provisions of this act for the fiscal year 1938. *The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer on the books of the Treasury to the fund not to exceed $500,000 from the account entitled "Unclaimed Partial Payments on United States Savings Bonds."*

RELEASE OF REVERSIONARY RIGHT TO CERTAIN LAND IN ORANGEBURG COUNTY, S. C.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) to release reversionary right to improvements on a 3-acre tract in Orangeburg County, S. C., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following the passage of the joint resolution a statement in explanation thereof.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONVEYANCE TO SOUTH CAROLINA SCHOOL DISTRICT

(Statement by Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina)

This joint resolution directs the Secretary of Agriculture to release a reversionary interest in certain improvements to the Orangeburg School District. The improvements consist of a community building and a water-distribution system which were placed on the land by the United States under a contract with the Jamison School District, which has now been consolidated with the Orangeburg School District. Subsequent to their construction the Secretary conveyed the building and improvements to the Jamison School District for educational and other community purposes.

The salvage value of the reversionary interest is estimated to be $50 of which 61.4 percent is held for the South Carolina Rural Rehabilitation Corporation and 38.6 percent is held by the United States in its own right.

The Department of Agriculture approves this conveyance and doubts that the reversionary right could be exercised.

LOAN OF TWO SUBMARINES TO THE GOVERNMENT OF BRAZIL

The bill (H. R. 8100) to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of Brazil was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF ARMED FORCES RESERVE ACT OF 1952

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8107) to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 1, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 2. The Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, is amended by inserting immediately after section 263 thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 264. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person called or ordered to

perform a period of active duty for training in excess of 30 days under authority of subsections 233 (d) or 262 (c) of this act, shall during such period be deemed to have been called or ordered into active naval or military service by the Federal Government for extended naval or military service in excess of 30 days for the purpose of determining eligibility for any benefit prescribed under Public Law 108, 81st Congress (63 Stat. 201)."

And on page 2, after line 6, to insert:

SEC. 3. This act shall be effective from August 9, 1955: *Provided*, That no additional basic pay shall be paid to any member by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the first day of the calendar month in which this act is approved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF CORPORATE NORMAL TAX RATE AND CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 9166) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader has requested that Calender No. 1735, H. R. 9166, go over. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may I inquire, relative to the bill which was just passed over, what the plans are with respect to its consideration?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is planned to call up the bill by motion later today. It was not desired to have it taken up on the call of the calendar.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it expected that the bill will be considered as the first business following the call of the calendar?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF ARTICLES FOR EXHIBITION PURPOSES

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 464) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fifth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECOGNITION OF HIGH PUBLIC SERVICE RENDERED BY MAJ. WALTER REED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2438) to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, at the top of page 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall take effect on the first of the month following the date of its enactment.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1409), is amended by striking out "$125 per month" and inserting in lieu thereof "$200 per month."

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall take effect on the first of the month following the date of its enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Over. I do not think that is a bill to be taken up on a call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

That completes the call of the calendar.

APPOINTMENT OF HOUSE CONFEREES ON THE FARM BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am delighted to say to the Senate that the House has acted to appoint conferees on the farm bill. I am informed that they will meet this afternoon at 2 o'clock. I am hopeful they will meet early and late and that, if it is at all possible, they will report back to both bodies, before they reach the Easter recess, a conference report on the farm bill.

EXTENSION OF CORPORATE NORMAL-TAX RATE AND CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the unanimous consent previously given, the Senate will return to the consideration of Calendar No. 1735, H. R. 9166, to provide a 1-year extension of existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates.

I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Oregon whether, if the Senate could take up Calendar No. 1738, H. R. 9770, to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, later in the afternoon, he is prepared with his amendments, and if it would be convenient to offer them now.

Mr. MORSE. If it is later in the afternoon, I shall have my amendments ready.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know how long the Senate will take on the other bill. If it is agreeable, the District revenue bill can be called up; otherwise, we shall wait until sometime when it is agreeable.

Mr. MORSE. I think it would be preferable to do it today. I shall get my amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 9770, TO PROVIDE REVENUE FOR THE DISTICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order later in the afternoon to consider Calendar No. 1738, H. R. 9770, the District of Columbia revenue bill, after I have worked out arrangements with the appropriate persons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF CORPORATE NORMAL-TAX RATE AND CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9166) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, H. R. 9166 provides for a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and certain excise tax rates. It has the unanimous approval of the Senate Committee on Finance.

The increased rates of these taxes were adopted on account of the Korean war. They were extended last year until April 1, 1956. This bill continues these increases in effect until April 1, 1957. The increases extended under the bill are as follows:

CORPORATE RATES

The normal tax rate of 30 percent on corporations is continued until April 1, 1957. If it were not for this extension, the normal tax rate would revert to 25 percent. If this should happen, the present overall corporate rate will drop from 52 percent to 47 percent, since the present surtax rate on corporations is 22 percent. Thus, without this bill the present corporate rate on all corporations will be reduced by 5 percentage points.

EXCISE TAX RATES

Under the pending bill the increases in excise tax rates which, under existing law, will expire on April 1, 1956, are also extended until April 1, 1957. These increases relate to alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, gasoline, automobiles, trucks and buses, automobile parts and accessories, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a table showing the excise tax rates extended under this bill until April 1, 1957:

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Excise tax rates extended until Apr. 1, 1957 [1]

	Unit of tax	Rate extended for period from Apr. 1, 1956, to Mar. 31, 1957	Rate to become effective Apr. 1, 1957 [1]
Liquor taxes:			
Distilled spirits	Per proof gallon	$10.50	$9.
Beer	Per barrel	$9	$8.
Wine:			
Still wine:			
Containing less than 14 percent alcohol	Per wine gallon	17 cents	15 cents.
Containing 14 to 21 percent alcohol	do	67 cents	60 cents.
Containing 21 to 24 percent alcohol	do	$2.25	$2.
Containing more than 24 percent alcohol	do	$10.50	$9.
Sparkling wines, liqueurs, cordials, etc.:			
Champagne or sparkling wine	do	$3.40	$3.
Liqueurs, cordials, etc	do	$1.92	$1.60.
Artificially carbonated wines	do	$2.40	$2.
Tobacco taxes: Cigarettes	Per 1,000	$4	$3.50.
Manufacturer's excises:			
Gasoline	Per gallon	2 cents	1½ cents.
Passenger cars	Manufacturers' sale price.	10 percent	7 percent.
Trucks, buses, truck trailers	do	8 percent	5 percent.
Auto parts and accessories	do	do	Do.
Retailers' excises: Diesel and special motor fuel	Per gallon	2 cents	1½ cents.

[1] These rates were increased by the Revenue Act of 1951 and the increases were scheduled to terminate on Apr. 1 1954. The Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954 extended these rate increases to Apr. 1, 1955, and the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1955 extended these rate increases to Apr. 1, 1956.

Source: Prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I intrude only because I must leave the floor for a moment. I understand the bill has to be signed by the 31st of this month.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So the time for passage is very short.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Enactment of the pending bill would not preclude some subsequent effort to move as to certain other excise taxes, like the cabaret tax, the gas incinerator tax, the tax on ironers, and other such taxes.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There will be an opportunity at a later date to develop that situation.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

I regret that it is necessary to again extend these tax increases for another year. However, these increases were taken into account in arriving at the estimated receipts shown in the January 1957 budget. In fact, in that budget the necessity of continuing the corporate income- and excise-tax rates at present levels was declared essential to accomplish a balanced budget in the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. If the rates in question were not continued until April 1, 1957, the Federal receipts for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 would be greatly reduced. For the fiscal year 1956 the Government would lose $204 million in Federal receipts, and for the fiscal year 1957 would lose $2.1 billion in revenue. In a fiscal year in which the increases are fully effective the estimated loss in letting such increases expire on April 1, 1956, will amount to $3.2 billion, consisting of a $2 billion loss in corporate income taxes and a $1.2 billion loss in excise taxes. In addition, the Government would also sustain a $200 million loss on account of floor stock refunds which are required to be made to dealers with respect to their floor stocks when these rates are reduced.

It is important that the bill be passed promptly by the Senate. It was not referred to the Senate Finance Committee until March 14. Because of the necessity of acting on the bill promptly, and because of the fact that the farm bill was before the Senate until March 19, our committee took up the bill on Wednesday and reported it to the Senate on Friday, March 23, 1956. Since excise taxes cannot, under the Constitution, be made retroactive; if this bill does not become law by April 1 there will be a substantial loss in excise taxes which cannot be recovered. The Government will lose approximately $3 million for each day after March 31, 1956, and about $22 million a week for each week after March 31, 1956, if this bill is not passed promptly. If any amendments to the bill are adopted, this measure will have to go to the House, conferees will have to be appointed, a conference will have to be held between the two Houses, both Houses then will have to meet and approve the conference report, and then the bill will have to go to the President. It must be signed before April 1, 1956. Including today, there are only 6 days remaining in March. After today, there will be only 5 days remaining. So if there is any delay, there will be little time left for the President to sign the bill. It is important, therefore, that the Senate act without delay on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on February 3, 1956, I introduced two bills—S. 3128 and S. 3129—designed to provide equitable readjustment of income-tax rates in behalf of small corporations. These bills were introduced in behalf of myself and Senators SPARKMAN, CAPEHART, KENNEDY, FREAR, BEALL, DUFF, MORSE, SMATHERS, LEHMAN, DOUGLAS, and HUMPHREY. Subsequently, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] announced his desire to be listed as a cosponsor. At the time of introducing these bills, I announced it was my intention to offer them as amendments to H. R. 9166, the bill now before the Senate.

On Wednesday, March 21, 1956, I appeared before the Committee on Finance and testified in behalf of the amendments. At that time the chairman, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], pointed out that to open this bill to amendment might result in the delay of its passage beyond March 31, the expiration date of the present corporate and excise tax rates. This would result in loss of considerable revenue to the Government, because although corporate tax rates can be made retroactive, excise taxes cannot.

Also, as I had previously indicated to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], it was my opinion that my amendments should be the subject of hearings at which opposition witnesses could be afforded an opportunity to testify. The chairman concurred in this view. He indicated that at a later date, complete hearings on these proposals would be held, at which time proponents and opponents would be given an opportunity to testify.

On this understanding, I shall not offer either of my amendments at this time. However, I do want it understood that I shall offer one or both of them later during this session, and I shall press for enactment with all the determination at my command.

I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point a copy of the statement I presented to the Senate Finance Committee on March 21.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT ON AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 9166, TAX REDUCTION FOR LOW-INCOME CORPORATIONS, BEFORE THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, on February 3, I introduced two bills, S. 3128, cosponsored by Senators SPARKMAN, CAPEHART, KENNEDY, FREAR, BEALL, DUFF, MORSE, SMATHERS, LEHMAN, DOUGLAS, and HUMPHREY, and S. 3129, cosponsored by Senators SPARKMAN, CAPEHART, HUMPHREY, KENNEDY, BEALL, DUFF, MORSE, SMATHERS, LEHMAN, and DOUGLAS. Both of these bills would reduce the impact of Federal income taxes on low-income corporations. On March 13, the House of Representatives passed a bill, H. R. 9166, which would extend present corporate tax rates for an additional year. The extension of these rates was recommended by the President in his Economic Report to the Congress. On March 15, I submitted two alternative amendments to H. R. 9166, which amendments adopt the proposals contained in S. 3128 and S. 3129, and in which I was joined by the same cosponsors. I am here to request your endorsement of one of these amendments.

Under present law, which the President wishes to continue, corporations generally are subject to a normal tax rate on net earnings of 30 percent, plus a surtax rate of 22 percent on net earnings in excess of $25,000. The amendment (3–15–56–C) patterned after S. 3129, which appears to be more compatible with current estimates of revenue requirements, provides a normal tax rate of 22 percent and a surtax rate of 31 percent. According to the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, this would result in an estimated increase in revenue of approximately $20 million.

The distribution of the benefits, or increased liabilities, under this proposal are shown in Exhibit 1, which is attached to this statement. The effects can be illustrated by these examples taken from the table. Corporations with incomes of $25,000 and less would have their tax burden reduced by 26.7 percent. A corporation with income of $100,000 would be given tax relief of 2.7 percent. Corporations with incomes of $500,000 and over would have increased tax liabilities of from 1.1 percent, in the case of a corporation with that income, to 1.9 percent for a corporation with income of $100 million.

The break-even point under this amendment occurs at the $225,000 income level—all firms earning less than $225,000 would receive a tax reduction and all firms earning more than $225,000 would receive a tax increase. Obviously this redistribution of the impact of corporate taxes would benefit the low income corporations. While the tax relief afforded would be modest, I believe it would have a significant beneficial effect on the smaller businesses of the Nation.

Now, if it should be determined that a revenue loss is feasible, the committee could adopt my other amendment (3–15–56–B) which is patterned after S. 3128. This amendment would merely reverse the present tax rates by providing for a 22-percent normal tax upon net earnings and a 30-percent surtax on all earnings in excess of $25,000. The staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation advises me that the revenue loss from this proposal would be somewhere between $300 million and $400 million. Your committee must consider whether the budget outlook is such that the revenue loss can be afforded. The effect of this alternative amendment upon the various income levels is shown by the table which appears in exhibit 2 to this statement.

Mr. Chairman, a healthy community of small businesses is essential to national growth, national prosperity, and political health. We must prevent the development of an economic no-man's land for small business. This means that some form of encouragement must be devised for the modest-sized enterprise to enable it to grow and to remain strong.

As I see it, the chief competitive handicaps of the small business are: (1) Great difficulty and expense in obtaining equity capital, (2) high interest rates upon borrowed money, and (3) insufficient funds for management personnel. Our tax structure emphasizes and compounds these discriminations against small business.

The small businesses have three principal sources for funds with which to maintain and expand production: First, new capital investment; second, borrowing; and third, business earnings.

Small business has difficulty in obtaining equity capital because it does not have the large financial resources which will guarantee stockholders against severe loss on their investment. A small businessman who needs equity capital usually is told that the expense of raising up to $300,000 in the securities market averages almost 20 percent and may reach 25 or 30 percent. He may ask, "Why?" and point to the recent Ford or General Motors issues where the expense was a small fraction of 1 percent. But he must face the uncomfortable fact that it will cost him 40 or 50 times as much to tap the capital markets as it costs the larger corporations.

Because of the difficulty in obtaining equity financing, the small-business man usually must borrow money for a short term from a bank or other lender to realize his capital needs. Long-term borrowings in the securities markets would be subject to the same difficulties as equity financing. Interest rates are commonly established at 6 percent or even higher for the small-business man. The large corporations may either float a debt issue of securities or borrow money at interest rates of 3½ percent or 4 percent for long terms. This gives larger corporations a competitive advantage which reduces their costs and, therefore, could result in lower prices to customers or higher returns on their stockholders' investments.

In this connection, however, it is interesting to note that the lower costs made possible by these competitive advantages are not necessarily passed on to consumers. The FTC–SEC quarterly financial report for the second quarter of 1955 shows that corporate profits as a percentage of sales rise in proportion to the asset size of the corporation. For example, the smallest corporations (assets under $250,000) earned only 1.1 cents per dollar of sales, while the largest corporations ($100 million and over) were earning 7.4 cents per dollar of sales. This disparity in profits occurs while the largest manufacturing corporations increased their sales volume by 19 percent between the third quarter of 1954 and the third quarter of 1955, in contrast to a mere 3-percent increase in sales volume of the smallest manufacturing corporations. Thus, the small manufacturer is losing out in both volume of sales and percent of profit per dollar of sales.

The difficulties which the smaller corporation has in obtaining equity capital from stock issues or borrowings makes it much more dependent on retained earnings than are larger companies. Hence, unless its profits are greater, or its tax burden is less, the small company finds itself in a position of relative weakness compared to larger companies with which it must often compete.

In terms of profits upon investment we find that corporations in the smallest category, as reported by the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission—those with under $250,000 in assets—sustained a net loss in the fourth quarter of 1954, returned 3.6 percent upon their equity in the first quarter of 1955, returned 5.3 percent upon their equity in the second quarter of 1955, and returned 10.4 percent upon their equity in the fourth quarter of 1955. Contrast this record with that of corporations with $100 million or over. During every quarter of the last year, they returned more than 13.5 percent upon the equity investment of their stockholders. During the second quarter of 1955 the return reached 15 percent. Furthermore, total corporate profits after taxes in 1955 have been exceeded only by profits in 1950. However, as shown by the statistics above, the profit ratios of the largest corporations greatly exceed the ratios of their smaller brothers.

By nature, the small-business corporation involves more risk, less diversification of product, and a smaller financial cushion against initial reverses. This is illustrated most dramatically by the business failure statistics based on companies listed with Dun & Bradstreet. Very few, if any, failures are recorded for large corporations; but the rise in these dismal statistics for small businesses has been alarming in recent years. In 1945 there were only 809 failures. In 1953 there were approximately 8,862. In 1954 there were 11,086. The latest reports for 1955 indicate that there were almost as many, 10,969, in that boom year as there were in 1954.

Either one of my amendments will not only permit the retention of more capital in the small business, so that less high-cost financing is necessary, but this retained income will also serve as a countervailing pressure against mergers and consolidations. The more favorable tax treatment for small corporations will enable many of them to survive, whereas they might otherwise end up among the failure statistics.

In addition to failures, statistics of the Federal Trade Commission show the following trend in the number of manufacturing and mining concerns acquired or merged during the last 30 years. Beginning in 1922, the number of mergers rose steadily from 297 to a peak of 1,216 in 1929. Thereafter the number of mergers leveled off at less than 200 in 1932 and varied within a range from 87 to 419 throughout the forties. However, mergers rose rapidly in 1951, reached 822 in 1952, and stayed at a high level in 1953 and 1954.

While I do not pretend to be an expert on tax matters, it is very obvious to me that the ability to carry over business losses from one year to offset profits in another year is a strong factor in this merger movement. It is very difficult for the small corporation, suffering losses caused in many instances by its smallness alone, to resist the eager embrace of the profitable giant seeking a dowry of tax advantages to be derived from the prior losses of the unfortunate bride to be.

I do not have a solution to this problem. But until some solution is found we must do whatever we can to strengthen small companies and thus make them less attractive to the rich suitor with a loss carryover gleam in his eye. My amendments will reduce the taxes on small companies and the income retained thereby will contribute directly to this strength.

Mr. Chairman, there are many others in this country who believe that the corporate-tax structure favors the growth of large businesses as against small businesses. For instance, last December, when testifying before the Subcommittee on Tax Policy of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, Mr. Dexter M. Keezer, vice president and director of the economics department of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., made the following statement:

"I think we have at the present time a high and satisfactory level of business investment. * * * But simply in terms of maintaining an adequate level of investment, I would not say that the present is an occasion to reduce the corporate-tax rate. Except, may I give this qualification? Maintaining this rate means that you are going to have larger and larger corporate units at the expense of smaller units. This seems to be a matter of great social, political, and economic significance. Over a period with which we are concerned, the smaller corporations, as you well know, have not had the same rate of growth and capital acquisition."

Mr. Chairman, that is exactly my position. Unless some action is taken to reverse the present trend, the growth of small businesses will continue to lag and their relative position in our economy will continue to worsen. And while on the general subject of growth, we should expect that as population grows and as business activity expands, there should be an expansion of business opportunity and an increase in the number of business firms. But look at the record as shown on page 231 of the President's economic report. While there was an annual increase of almost 55,000 firms during the period between 1948 and 1952, the number of new operating firms increased by only 28,300 from June 1954 to June 1955. And this latter period has been characterized as a booming economy. If this is what happens in a boom, I submit that the small businesses of this country might be better off without it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out some specific and significant advantages which large corporations have under our

present Federal tax laws. One example of existing big-business bias in our corporate tax laws involves the accelerated depreciation of new machinery, while similar treatment is not available for used machinery. It is well known that small businesses are the principal purchasers of used machinery. Thus, the very significant benefit of the accelerated depreciation tax provisions are not available to many smaller corporations.

Now, some people advocate including secondhand machinery under the accelerated depreciation provisions, but I think that this action alone would merely accentuate the problem. For example, under present law a large corporation can, in a relatively short time, depreciate new machinery to a figure below its market value. The large corporation can then sell this machinery for more than its depreciated value and treat the income as a capital gain. If secondhand machinery had the benefit of accelerated depreciation, small businesses would be more eager to buy secondhand equipment. Then the giant corporations would realize even greater profits from the sales and greater capital gain windfalls.

The way to treat small businesses fairly would be to permit accelerated depreciation of both old and new machinery, and to tax income derived from the sale of depreciated machinery at the regular rates for corporate income. But until such changes are made, this is one more factor contributing to the financial dilemma of small businesses.

Another advantage for large corporations is their ability to attract and hold highly skilled management and technical personnel by deferred compensation plans. These plans reduce the impact of individual income tax rates and give a higher real income to such employees. For instance, a special bonus is given large corporations by those provisions of the tax laws which deal with stock options. All salaried employees must pay taxes upon their incomes at the regular income-tax rates. The fortunate recipient of a stock option, however, pays no tax, in most instances, when he receives the option; pays no tax when he exercises the option; and pays only a capital gains tax upon any profit he makes when he sells the stock.

To qualify for this preferred treatment, the corporation must be able to value its stock by some acceptable reference to market value at the time the option is granted. The small corporation, which is closely held, has great difficulty in meeting this requirement. As a result, it is the large publicly held corporations which benefit. Almost half the corporations listed on the New York Stock Exchange have such plans. The revenue loss to the Government cannot be estimated, but it is very substantial.

By this and similar devices, big business is able to attract and to hold the most able technical and executive talent. A small corporation must pay much higher salaries, if its employees who do not have stock options, are to be able to keep, after taxes, as much as the employees of the large corporation which does have a stock option plan in force. Naturally, in a competitive labor market, the most valuable employees will tend to enter the employ of the corporations paying them the highest net salaries, after taxes.

Even the owner of the small corporation may believe that he himself can find refuge against business risk, attain relative security, and provide a fund for his retirement by giving up his small business and going to work for a large corporation. The tax laws foster this trend by such provisions as restricted stock options.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the amendments I have offered will serve to relieve, to some extent, the constant drain of management personnel from small business. A growing, expanding enterprise presents a challenge to management, and good management will stay with the business so long as they can participate in its growth. If our tax policies militate against growth, there is little incentive to the personnel. In addition, higher retained earnings would enable the business to pay higher salaries and this, too, would serve to keep good management from accepting positions with larger companies.

Still another advantage of the large corporations is their ability to adjust to tax rates with little effect upon their rates of earnings after taxes. This is possible because large corporations can, to a considerable extent, shift a large portion of their taxes to consumers in the form of higher prices. This is especially the case in industries which are dominated by one or a few corporate giants, and where competition does not operate to hold prices down.

Small corporations can rarely set prices to absorb taxes. There are too many of them and generally no single one is in a position to exert substantial control over prices in its industry.

Actually, the small corporation gets hit from both sides under the present corporate tax structure. His raw materials tend to be produced by giant concerns which can pass on a large share of their taxes to him. Thus, corporate taxes, for the small corporation, will generally result in higher costs. At the same time, he does not have the economic power to set prices to absorb his own taxes.

And finally, some very wise provisions in the tax law, designed to encourage research and experimental programs by industry, operate to the primary benefit of big business. These provisions offer favorable tax treatment of expenditures made for research. While these provisions have considerable merit, I think we should frankly admit that the benefits inure almost exclusively to big businesses.

Furthermore, the defense needs of the Nation require direct Federal expenditures for research for weapons and other items of military necessity. The size of these Federal expenditures amounts to over a billion dollars every year, and the contracts go primarily to our huge industrial corporations. It would seem that the law has compounded the advantage of big business in the field of research—or, as I have heard it said more colloquially—"them as has gits."

This is just one more set of circumstances illustrating an economic bias in favor of big business. Tax relief for small businesses is the best way to offset some of this bias, and I think that such relief must be granted.

And while on the subject of Federal expenditures for the output of industrial concerns, we should remember that a very substantial part of the total business in this country is associated with the national defense. Defense contracts awarded in 1955 totaled over $15 billion. And in spite of congressional efforts to divert some of this spending to small firms, the major portion has gone to a few giant corporations.

The Senate Armed Services Committee recently reported that from June 1950 through June 1953, over 63 percent of the value of all defense contracts went to the 100 largest defense contractors. During the period of July 1953 through December 1954, this percentage rose to over 68 percent. It is no answer to pretend that such conditions are inevitable. The ability to accumulate capital and grow through more equitable corporate tax rates would be a very important factor in reversing this trend of defense buying from the largest corporations.

Mr. President, since the introduction of my bills, S. 3128 and S. 3129, I have been admonished that I should not forget those small businesses which are proprietorships or partnerships, and which do not choose to file a corporate tax return as permitted under the 1954 Revenue Act. I assure you that I have not forgotten these businesses, and I urge the committees of Congress who study and draft our tax laws not to forget them. Some way should be found to relieve the tax burden of all those with low and middle incomes, whether their incomes are derived from wages, farms, professional services, proprietorships, or partnerships. However, it should be noted that any corporate income which is saved by my amendments, and which is not retained for corporate growth, will be taxed as individual income of the stockholders receiving it.

Although I could recommend other changes in the tax laws, including changes in the individual tax rates, I am forced to view the situation realistically and recognize that Rome wasn't built in a day. Frankly, here is the situation. The House of Representatives has passed a bill which will continue the corporate tax rate and certain excise tax rates at their present levels. While diverse amendments on diverse subjects could be offered on such a bill, the practical approach and courteous approach to the committees of Congress is to limit amendments to the subject matter treated in the bill.

Under the circumstances, I think amendments should relate only to changes in the corporate tax structure. However, I respectfully urge your committee to give early and earnest consideration to a revision of the individual income-tax rates in the interest of all our low- and middle-income taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to show that small businesses are in a bad way in this country. This is shown by business failures, by business merger, and by profit ratios and sales volume of different size classes of corporations. I believe that conditions exist in our general economy as well as in the tax law itself which contributes to and aggravates this situation. In considering a bill to extend the present corporate tax rates, you have an opportunity to offset in a real way some of the disadvantages faced by the small-business man.

The present rate structure seems to have contributed to the decline in the relative importance of small business in recent years. To the extent that our tax laws foster larger and larger business units, our political democracy is weakened. I am sure that we all recognize the relationship between the survival of many thriving business units and the survival of our political democracy.

These amendments will assist those companies in the formative or development stage to overcome initial capital difficulties, and will assure a continuing supply of capital when it is needed to maintain the competitive position of the small-business enterprise. I can think of no action more vital to the maintenance of our system of free enterprise than the encouragement and development of small businesses. They are the very foundation of our national economy.

EXHIBIT 1

Effect of a normal tax rate of 22 percent and a surtax rate of 31 percent (proposal in S. 3291)

Income subject to normal tax and surtax	Present tax liability (normal rate 30 percent, surtax rate 22 percent)	Proposed tax liability (normal rate 22 percent, surtax rate 31 percent)	Change	
			Amount	Percent
$5,000	$1,500	$1,100	−$400	−26.7
$10,000	3,000	2,200	−800	−26.7
$15,000	4,500	3,300	−1,200	−26.7
$20,000	6,000	4,400	−1,600	−26.7
$25,000	7,500	5,500	−2,000	−26.7
$50,000	20,500	18,750	−1,750	−8.5
$100,000	46,500	45,250	−1,250	−2.7
$225,000	111,500	111,500	(1)	(1)
$500,000	254,500	257,250	+2,750	+1.1
$1,000,000	514,500	522,250	+7,750	+1.5
$10,000,000	5,194,500	5,292,250	+97,750	+1.9
$100,000,000	51,994,500	52,992,250	+997,750	+1.9

[1] No change.

EXHIBIT 2

Effect of a normal tax rate of 22 percent and a surtax rate of thirty percent proposal in S. 3128)

Income subject to normal tax and surtax	Present tax liability (normal rate 30 percent, surtax rate 22 percent)	Proposed tax liability (normal rate 22 percent, surtax rate 31 percent)	Change	
			Amount	Percent
$5,000	$1,500	$1,100	−$400	−26.7
$10,000	3,000	2,200	−800	−26.7
$15,000	4,500	3,300	−1,200	−26.7
$20,000	6,000	4,400	−1,600	−26.7
$25,000	7,500	5,500	−2,000	−26.7
$50,000	20,500	18,500	−2,000	−9.8
$100,000	46,500	44,500	−2,000	−4.3
$225,000	111,500	109,500	−2,000	−1.8
$500,000	254,500	252,500	−2,000	−0.8
$1,000,000	514,500	512,500	−2,000	−.4
$10,000,000	5,194,500	5,192,500	−2,000	−.04
$100,000,000	51,994,500	51,992,500	−2,000	−0.004

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] in urging the prompt enactment of this bill. As the Senator from Virginia has stated, the bill must be passed and signed by the President before March 31 to avoid a substantial loss in revenue.

I recognize that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has an amendment to propose to the bill. I, too, have an amendment which I had hoped to submit to the bill. However, I think we are in complete agreement that this is not the time to have any amendments considered, based on their merits, because the bill must be promptly passed by the Senate and signed by the President.

Mr. President, the budget receipts of the United States for fiscal 1956 are estimated at $66,300,000,000; and the estimated expenditures amount to $65,900,000,000, leaving an estimated surplus of $400 million. If the pending bill is not passed, the resultant loss in revenue during the current fiscal year will be $2,300,000,000. That would result in a deficit, instead of a surplus, this year; there will be a deficit of $1,900,000,000 if we do not promptly enact the pending measure.

The bill provides for an extension of the corporate taxes at 52 percent, rather than allowing those taxes to be dropped back to the proposed 47 percent. The latter proposal would involve a loss of $2,020,000,000.

Also involved are $222 million of excise taxes on alcohol, $194 million in excise taxes on tobacco, $250 million in taxes on gasoline, $375 million in excise taxes on passenger cars, $118 million in excise taxes on trucks and automobile parts, and $7 million in excise taxes on diesel fuels—or, in total, excise taxes of $1,166,000,000.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that at the present time the budget is barely on an even keel, I feel that the Congress has no alternative but to extend both the corporate-tax and the excise-tax rates, as proposed by the President and as recommended by the Finance Committee.

At a later date I will offer to another bill the amendment sponsored by myself and three other Senators wherein we propose to cut the depletion allowance for oil and gas from the existing rate of 27½ to 15 percent. This amendment is being withheld at this time in the interest of obtaining prompt passage of the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 9166) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar 1738, House bill 9770, providing revenue for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I direct my remarks particularly to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], because I know of his interest in this bill.

This is the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1956. The committee hearings on the bill extended over the past 3 months. There were extended hearings with the staffs of the Senate and House District Committees. Likewise, there were extended hearings with the Commissioners and their staffs. The result is the bill which is now before the Senate.

The purpose is to provide additional revenue needed for financing the District Government's activities, including police, health, welfare, education, the courts, and various other general governmental functions, which account for approximately 79 percent of the District's total budget.

There were sufficient revenues for the parking, water supply, and sewerage programs, which represent the remaining part of the District's annual budget.

The largest measure of increase in the District's budget for 1956 came about because of the pay increases for officers and employees of the District Government, which were granted by Congress in 1955; also as a result of the appropriation of $18 million as the Federal share, rather than the $20 million appropriation which had been authorized in the revenue measure. but was not fully appropriated. This left something in the neighborhood of $10 million a year to be raised through this particular revenue measure.

The bill before the Senate would provide $11,737,000 for the fiscal year 1957, and $13,737,000 for the fiscal year 1958. The items making up these two totals, for the fiscal year 1957 and the fiscal year 1958, are composed of a number of different items on which I shall make some comment.

The individual income tax was changed so as to reduce the personal exemptions from $4,000 to $1,000. Tax rates were increased, and provision was made for legislative withholding, in order to raise this amount of money. It is estimated that in 1957 the individual income tax to be raised will be $3,400,000; and in 1958 and thereafter, $5,300,000.

The second item used for raising the tax revenues was a broadening of the provision with respect to the rental of personal property, so as to impose a 2-percent sales and use tax on the rental of tangible personal property, omitting only rental of films, records, or any type of sound transcribing by theaters or radio and television stations, and the rental of textiles, the essential part of which rental includes the service of laundering or cleaning thereof.

The next amendment was an amendment to title II, the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act. It provides that the present exemption on meals shall be lowered from 50 cents to 14 cents. It is calculated by the Commissioners and by the staff members that the amount to be raised in 1957 from this item will be $900,000, and a like amount in 1958.

The fourth item is an increase in taxes upon wines, first, imposing a new tax of 15 cents on table wines, increasing the tax from 20 cents to 33 cents on fortified wines, and increasing the tax from 30 to 45 cents on champagnes and sparkling wines.

The gallonage tax on liquors was increased from $1 to $1.25 a gallon. It is estimated that this increase will bring in revenue of $980,000 in this fiscal year, and a like amount in the next fiscal year.

The tax on beer was increased from its present tax of $1.25 a barrel to $1.50 a barrel, an increase of 25 cents. The request of the city commissioners on this item was an increase to $2.50 a barrel, instead of the present $1.25 a barrel. The committee felt that a 25-cent increase was justified in connection with the increases on wines and liquors. It is estimated that the increase of 25 cents a barrel will bring in a total additional revenue of $132,000.

The committee likewise imposed a license fee of $25 a year on unsalaried persons engaged in unincorporated businesses who are exempt from the unincorporated business tax. It is a $25 tax on doctors, lawyers, architects, engineers, and other professions. It contains a specific exemption for nurses. It is estimated to bring in a total revenue of $175,000 in each of two fiscal years.

The committee reported to the Senate a suggested increase in the Federal payment of $4 million a year as the Federal share of its contribution to the District of Columbia's governmental activities. This is an increase from the original figure of $2 million. The committee felt that it was fully justified, because of the great amount of land in the District which is no longer subject to taxation. It felt that the Government's share should be considerably greater.

The remaining item is an increase in the real estate tax of 10 cents from $2.20 to $2.30 a hundred dollars. The provision requires no additional legislation action, and was considered in arriving at

figures which will provide a total revenue to the District of Columbia this year of $11,737,000, and a total revenue in 1958 and thereafter of $13,737,000 a year.

That is a rather brief statement of the components that make up the tax revenue measure now before the Senate. I see on the floor the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], a member of the committee on the District of Columbia and the Subcommittee Fiscal Affairs. He worked long hours and very diligently in attempting to arrive at a fair and equitable tax revenue bill for the District of Columbia.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], as chairman of the subcommittee and as a member of the full committee, has given a very concise and full statement in explanation of the pending bill. I do not wish to add anything, except that I certainly should like to say that the Senator worked very hard in committee, first in arriving at agreements in the joint committee deliberations on the bill and then when the bill was considered by the subcommittee and the full committee of the Senate. In committee we accepted several amendments to the bill. I am hopeful that we will not change the bill further, because both the proponents and the opponents of the legislation worked very hard in trying to arrive at what we think and what we hope is a fair conclusion for an equitable tax bill.

It must be remembered that some of the increases were brought about by reason of the fact that Congress increased the salaries of some of the employees of the District of Columbia. I refer to policemen and teachers, whose salaries were increased by Congress last year. Those increases are one of the chief reasons why the additional revenue is necessary. I do hope the Senate will pass the bill as approved by the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in discussing the pending bill, I wish to pay a very deserved compliment to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. They, in behalf of all of us in the Senate, spent a great many hours during recent weeks in legislative drudgery—that is what it really was—that should not have to be performed by anyone in the Senate. The service which those two Senators performed for the Senate is deserving of our very deep thanks. The fact that I take exception to some of the recommendations of the committee as set forth in the bill is in no way to be interpreted as any reflection whatever on either the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] or the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. We have some honest differences of opinion. However, those two Senators did a very good job, indeed, under a procedural arrangement which, in my judgment, is totally bad.

In fact, if anyone wishes to see a good example of how unwise and undesirable and bad our whole procedure in handling District of Columbia affairs is, all he need do is to look at the Senate at this minute. Judging by the attendance on the floor now, the Senate has just about as much interest in this subject as in whether the wild animals of Timbuktu have ticks on them.

That is understandable, Mr. President, because we are now going through a procedure in the Senate that we should not even be asked to touch. Those procedures have to do with the consideration of the problems of running a municipal government, and problems confronting the people of this city. Instead, we ought to set up true home rule for the District of Columbia.

The working out of a budget for the District ought to be left entirely to a city government, not the Senate of the United States, which is sitting here almost in absentia this afternoon, in trying to function as a city council for the District of Columbia. I do not know of any better argument that anyone can use in support of the need for true home rule than what is going on in the Senate at this minute.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. Is it not correct to say that the Senate did pass such a home rule bill last year? I am sure the Senator from Oregon was very active in behalf of that bill. What he is saying now represents my views also. This is an example of why the District of Columbia should have self-rule and self-government. However, we did pass such a bill last year. It was passed in the Senate by an overwhelming vote, as I remember.

Mr. MORSE. We passed a home rule bill. It did not go nearly as far as it should have gone. However, we thought it was the best bill that could be passed under all the circumstances, or that would be considered by the House. We know what happened to it in the House, of course. No action has been taken on it at all. My point is that as we come now to take up the fiscal destiny of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia—and I might say that we will be through with the consideration of this bill in less than an hour—we will dispose of the fiscal destiny of the people of the District of Columbia with an attendance in the Senate of 10 or 15 Members, at the very most. We will do that within the next hour, and what we do will be done with the understanding of not more than the chairman and the other members of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

I wish to make this point at the very beginning before I offer any amendments to the bill, because I believe it illustrates again the great need for Congress to relinquish its function as the city council of the District of Columbia. But so long as we have the duty still vested in us, we have to do the best we can.

I think the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Maryland have done the best that could be done under the procedures which limited them.

I wish to say something about those procedures, because we ran into the situation in the committee the other day. These two Senators are, of course, not responsible for it. I wish the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Nevada would correct me if I do not properly describe the procedure.

Subcommittees of the 2 District of Columbia Committees hold joint hearings on budgetary matters. Witnesses are brought before 1 committee, and, after those witnesses are heard, including District of Columbia officials, we have the procedure that members of the joint committee get together and work out a proposed budgetary report. It is a sort of a conference committee in advance, where House representatives and Senate representatives sit down together and really work out what amounts to conference recommendations on the budget in advance.

I think it is very bad procedure, Mr. President. As a member of the District of Columbia Committee, I wish to say that if another opportunity comes for working out the budget I shall do what I can to prevent that procedure, because in my opinion it places our own representatives on the conference in a very difficult position. We found that out a few mornings ago when we came to mark up the bill. They cannot sit down with House conferees and work out a budget like the District budget, and then come to our committee and very easily differ from the understandings they reached in the conference with the House of Representatives. I think it is a very undesirable procedure. What we should do is to have our own budget hearings on these matters, reach our own conclusions, pass what the Senate thinks the bill should be, and at that point go into conference with the House for the first time.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. This was not an innovation. It has been customary for years to meet with the House committee. It does result in the committee hearing one group of witnesses, and we can discuss the issues without repetition. We can meet as a group, and that practice has been followed for some time. The House committee has nine members on the subcommittee. They were present or represented, and practically all of them voted on every issue. I am sure the Senator from Nevada will agree with me that the chairman of the full committee would let any Member come in and sit with us, if he cared to do so. We would have been delighted to have him. We welcome that procedure, particularly in reference to taxation for this nonvoting community. I think that if the matter is checked back, it will be found that this procedure has been followed in the Congress for a number of years.

Mr. MORSE. I am not disputing that it has been the procedure of the Committee on the District of Columbia. We have conducted fiscal affairs of the District differently from the way we proceed in the matter of appropriations in the Senate for other branches of the Government, and it is not producing proper results.

So, Mr. President, I hope that another year we shall have our own independent hearings so that the members of our committee shall in no way be put into the position of so-called prejudgment on these matters when we come to mark up the bill in committee. Each one of us leans over backward—and why should we not do so—to favor the members of the committee. We support the Senator

from Nevada and the Senator from Maryland, because, after all, they have been representing our committee. It has amounted to a preconference with the House, and all the presumptions are in favor of supporting our own committee members. The proposals for making changes in the joint report that comes back from the joint committee are placed at a great disadvantage. I protest, and hope that another year we shall follow the same procedure policies in connection with the District of Columbia fiscal affairs that we follow in the Senate in connection with fiscal affairs involving other governmental bodies.

Now, Mr. President, I come to the matter of my major objection to House bill 9770, and that is that under that bill as it came to us the other morning in the District Committee there is provision for a $2 million increase in the Federal payment for the District of Columbia. I said in the committee, and repeat it here, that that is a policy of parsimony. We do not begin to appropriate a fair share of the cost of operating the District of Columbia out of the Treasury of the United States. In my judgment, we place too great a burden upon the residents of the District of Columbia, and not a large enough burden upon the Treasury of the United States. I said in committee the other day, and I repeat here, that the residents of the District of Columbia are placed at a great disadvantage because of the fact that they do not have voting representatives in the Congress. They do not have men in the House and in the Senate who are politically representative of them and responsible to them. They have to rely upon Members of the Congress elected by voters in other States.

I think that as the result of that situation, Mr. President, as well as of not giving the people of the District home rule, we get just the kind of inequity and injustice that I am protesting this afternoon; a result of a failure on the part of Congress to appropriate a proper amount of money out of the Federal Treasury for the operation of the District of Columbia.

I should now like to have the attention of our staff members on the District of Columbia Committee to the figures I am about to give, because, if they are not accurate, I shall make the correction in the transcript. There was a time when it was provided, as I recall the testimony before the committee at previous hearings, that the Federal Government contributed 40 percent, and the District of Columbia contributed 60 percent, of the cost of operating the District of Columbia government. The ratio was 40 to 60, and it lasted for a great many years. The committee had information on this subject submitted to us in a report, and it was discussed at some length.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a table showing the District of Columbia appropriations payable from the general revenues of the District of Columbia for the fiscal years 1924–57, exclusive, in each case of appropriations payable from the highway fund, the water fund, sanitary sewage works fund, the motor-vehicle parking fund, and trust funds, and the apportionment of appropriations between the District of Columbia and the United States.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

District of Columbia appropriations payable from the general revenues of the District of Columbia for the fiscal years 1924–1957, exclusive in each case of appropriations payable from the highway fund, the water fund, the sanitary sewage works fund, the motor vehicle parking fund, and trust funds, and the apportionment of appropriations between the District of Columbia and the United States.

Fiscal year	Total appropriations	District of Columbia share	United States share	Percentage of United States share
1924	$23,903,754	$14,463,330	$9,440,425	[1] 39.49
1925	31,175,672	22,030,317	9,145,355	29.33
1926	31,139,730	22,139,638	9,000,092	28.90
1927	33,951,478	24,950,987	9,000,491	26.51
1928	34,894,148	25,892,358	9,001,790	25.79
1929	35,957,970	26,957,753	9,000,217	25.03
1930	40,694,306	31,694,306	9,000,000	22.12
1931	45,625,286	36,125,252	9,500,034	20.82
1932	43,840,022	34,339,911	9,500,111	21.67
1933	39,626,998	31,851,847	7,775,151	19.62
1934	29,700,737	24,000,708	5,700,029	19.19
1935	34,620,004	30,080,709	4,539,295	13.11
1936	38,295,952	32,588,424	5,707,529	14.90
1937	40,182,768	35,177,768	5,005,000	12.46
1938	41,143,818	36,118,792	5,025,026	12.21
1939	40,494,451	35,494,451	5,000,000	12.35
1940	41,777,885	35,777,768	6,000,117	14.36
1941	43,136,909	37,136,909	6,000,000	13.91
1942	47,401,269	41,401,269	6,000,000	12.66
1943	49,422,932	43,422,932	6,000,000	12.14
1944	54,642,247	48,642,247	6,000,000	10.98
1945	62,599,125	56,599,125	6,000,000	9.58
1946	64,728,423	58,728,423	6,000,000	9.27
1947	72,584,314	64,584,314	8,000,000	11.02
1948	81,744,086	70,744,086	11,000,000	13.46
1949	86,017,985	75,017,985	11,000,000	12.79
1950	98,331,275	87,331,275	11,000,000	11.19
1951	103,924,822	94,124,822	9,800,000	9.43
1952	121,265,978	110,865,978	10,400,000	8.58
1953	113,589,327	103,589,327	10,000,000	8.80
1954	129,111,304	118,111,304	11,000,000	8.52
1955	139,578,760	119,578,760	20,000,000	14.33
1956 [2]	143,365,868	125,365,868	18,000,000	12.56
1957 [2]	152,475,391	130,475,391	22,000,000	14.43

[1] Prior to 1923 the percentage of the United States share was set at 50 percent.

[2] Estimates: Items for 1957 include estimates of $13,215,500 proposed for later transmission and a proposed increase in Federal payment of $2 million.

NOTE.—The restoration of the $2 million reduction in Federal payment, made in 1956, will increase the percentage for fiscal year 1956 to 13.95 percent.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it will be seen from the table that as recently as 1924 the Federal Government contributed 39.49 percent. But since 1924, the Federal contribution has dwindled until finally, in 1946, we find that the Federal Government contributed 9.27 percent, with the residents of the District of Columbia raising the rest of the revenue.

In 1947 the Federal contribution went up to 11.02 percent; in 1948 it was 13.46 percent. In 1949 it dropped to 12.79 percent; in 1950, to 11.19 percent; in 1951, to 9.43 percent; in 1952, to 8.58 percent.

In 1953 it rose slightly, to 8.80 percent; in 1954 it dropped to 8.52 percent.

In 1955 Congress increased the Federal contribution to 14.33 percent.

Mr. President, the injustice of this cannot be seen unless one serves on the Committee on the District of Columbia, and realizes the burden which is placed on the people who live in this city, and also realizes that a great many services do not receive adequate appropriations, the people of the District thereby being denied the kind of service they ought to receive. That can be seen very clearly in the welfare fund.

So I am making a plea this afternoon, not, I hope, completely in vian, because I know it will not be possible to accomplish much this year, but a record has to be made, for a greater recognition on the part of Congress of the need of an increased Federal payment for the District of Columbia, so that we will come at least somewhat closer to the original understanding and obligation which the Federal Government undertook, namely, a ratio of 40 to 60. At least, I hope it will be possible to return to a percentage such as was paid in 1924 when, in round numbers, the Federal Government contributed about 40 percent. I wish to stress that point. I do not think we can justify, in equity, fairness, and justice to the District of Columbia, contributing a percentage less than 40 percent of the cost of operating the government of the District of Columbia.

Let me point out what is happening. A course of action is being followed, so the testimony before the committee in past hearings has indicated, which is driving many people out of the District. Great metropolitan areas are being created in Maryland and Virginia. When we begin to consider tax structures for the District of Columbia as a result of the course of action taken by Congress, it is necessary to compare them always with Maryland and Virginia, if we are to deal justly and fairly with the people of the District of Columbia.

I point out that the people of the District of Columbia simply are not free to develop the kind of city they might want to develop from the standpoint of economic advantage. They are not free to develop a smokestack city. They are not free to industrialize the District of Columbia. They are not free, even, to build the kind of buildings they might want to build, because the business of the District of Columbia is primarily the business of the Federal Government, in carrying out the various functions of the Federal Government in the various departments of the Government which exist here.

So Congress always has exercised great control over the District of Columbia, in determining the kind of city the National Capital should be. I do not quarrel with that. Congress should maintain a model and beautiful city, a nonindustrialized city. We should maintain a city which offers very decent living conditions and places of work for the tens of thousand of people who serve the Federal Government as Federal employees.

But we should not ask the natives or the residents of the District of Columbia to pay a bill out of proportion to what ought to be paid by all the taxpayers of the United States across the Nation to maintain that kind of capital city.

The difficulty with an argument such as the one I am making—and we hear it in the cloakrooms—is, Why fight for the District of Columbia? It does not help us back home; it does not get us votes back home; it is not to our political advantage back home.

I speak respectfully when I say that the lackadaisical attitude which I think has characterized the Congress for many years in regard to District of Columbia affairs is that, by and large, the Members of Congress have very little interest in the government of the District of Columbia.

But Congress ought to take an interest in the District of Columbia government if we are going to assume the Federal responsibility of being the city council of the District, until such time, at least, as we turn the city council functions over to those to whom they belong—the people of the District of Columbia themselves.

It is necessary to adopt what might be called rules of thumb in order to decide questions of equity as to what would be a fair partition. I have adopted, somewhat by rule of thumb, the figure of 40 percent, because as I have studied the past contributions of the Federal Government to the District of Columbia and the history of the tax pattern in the District, I think a Federal payment of 40 percent is about right.

We are a long way from that in the bill before us, and we will still be a long way from it with the proposed increase which the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia agreed upon the other morning. But when the matter reached the committee the other day, I protested the proposed increase of only $2 million. I proposed that the increase be at least $4 million.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] were very cooperative in the matter. They said quite frankly that the matter which confronted them was the difficulty of selling such a proposal to the House. They thought the principle was right as a matter of public policy; but they expressed some doubt as to whether the House could be sold on the idea, because the House had already gone a little in the upward direction by agreeing to the $2 million increase.

But I am proud to report today that after a discussion the other day in the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, we adopted a committee amendment which is in the bill which the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Maryland have reported, which increases the Federal contribution from $2 million to $4 million. That amount is still too small. I do not have distinctly in mind the percentage increase from 1955 in which this will result, and I should like to have the counsel for the committee check my figures for me. I think the percentage in 1955 was 14.33 percent. If Congress increased its contribution by $4 million instead of $2 million, the percentage of the Federal contribution probably would be raised.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1240) for the relief of Imre de Cholnoky.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1005) for the relief of Alice Duckett.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4039) for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Jaime, Dennis, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. POAGE, Mr. GATHINGS, Mr. HOPE, and Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. I direct the request to my good friend from Illinois, who is to be recognized on the unfinished business.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to have done what he requests, but I hope my colleagues will be reasonably brief in the discussion of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I say to my friend from Illinois I appreciate his cooperation. I shall be reasonably brief, for me, but somebody, I respectfully say, has got to make a record here today, and it will be a brief record, and will be a record for the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I say to my good friend from Oregon, for whom, as he knows, I have the greatest affection, I hope he is not using the term "brief" in a Pickwickian sense.

Mr. MORSE. No; just in a Morse sense.

REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the increase provided for will raise by a percentage or two the Federal contribution over and above what it was last year, to somewhere between 15 and 16 percent. That is far below the 40 percent I think the Federal Government ought to be contributing, but it is some indication that some of us at least think a larger contribution should be made to the District of Columbia.

I see present the junior Senator from the State of Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and I hope he can be of some assistance in this problem, because, when he served on the District of Columbia Committee, he did yeoman service for the people of the District in regard to the matter of the Federal contribution. That is what we are dealing with here today. I am delighted he is present, and any assistance he can give to me in this discussion I shall appreciate very much.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. I call to the attention of the Senator from Oregon the fact that the last Congress provided for an increase of $2 million. I certainly agree with the Senator from Oregon that the Federal Government should make a far larger contribution than at present. I shall not take time now to go into the question, but I agree that the Federal Government should make a much larger contribution.

However, I cannot refrain from pointing out what has happened in the past. Two years ago we succeeded in passing a bill providing for a Federal contribution of $20 million. The House seems to think the increase for this year should be $2 million. I was very glad to go along with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and the rest of the committee for a $4 million increase. I shall try to persuade the House to keep the increase at $4 million, because I think it would be a fair contribution. It is not all we should do, but it is certainly a step in the right direction. I think the Senator from Oregon is right in advocating a larger contribution. In my 14 years' experience on the District of Columbia Committees in the two Houses, each year we come up against the problem of a meeting of the minds. I hope we can keep in the bill the $4 million increase proposed.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for his remarks. As I told him in committee last week, I appreciated the fact that he and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], who were on a form of conference, were willing to increase the amount from $2 million to $4 million. I sincerely hope the $4 million increase can be retained in the final conference. Just because history has shown that we have problems with the House in this matter is no reason for not continuing the struggle against an injustice, and it is a great injustice to the people of the District of Columbia.

In line with my promise to the Senator from Illinois, I want to proceed very quickly to the few amendments I wish to offer. In offering them, I wish to show what happens when Congress does not make the contribution it ought to make to the District of Columbia, and what happens when it retains governmental control over the District of Columbia which I think the people ought to exercise for themselves. We get the kind of economic waste which is characterized by the bridge policies for the District of Columbia.

What do Senators believe would have happened in their local communities, in any one of the States represented by Senators now present on the floor of the Senate, if there had been in effect in those States the kind of bridge policy which exists for the District of Columbia, with the exaggerated false economy which is characterized by the "do-nothing" record of the Congress of the United States with respect to the providing of money for the building of bridges for the District of Columbia? We have not been able to get complete information on the subject as yet.

Last year in committee, as the clerk of the committee, who is now on the floor, will recall, I raised the point that if we could figure out the dollars that had been lost to the people in the last 20 years through the loss of man-hours, because of the inconvenience and the delay caused in getting into the District of Columbia each morning or getting out each night, the cost would have paid for a half dozen bridges, in my judgment.

As a result of the costly inefficiency which results from our failure to properly handle traffic in the District of Columbia, because of the inadequate number of bridges to enable people to get in and out of the District, we have wasted the cost of the necessary bridges in the last 20 years. If we take a parsimonious attitude, if we fail to do for the District of Columbia what we would not fail to do for our own States, if we had in our cities a major bridge problem, eventually we are going to waste Federal funds in getting bridges across the Potomac.

I do not know whether it does any good to stand up and make a record on this question, but I am going to make it this afternoon by saying that I hope that before Congress adjourns this year it will appropriate the necessary amount to build at least one bridge across the Potomac. Everyone knows we ought to have a minimum of two bridges. Fortunately, I do not have to go through that congestion every morning. I live, in effect, at the end of the freeway. I have a nice, easy way into the Capitol. But once in a while I find myself in the Maryland or Virginia traffic hour in the morning, and I get some little idea what Government workers have to face morning after morning and night after night because of the failure of the Congress of the United States to appropriate money for bridges. Yet we, as a Congress, will not relinquish in its entirety this bewhiskered and outmoded congressional control of governmental affairs in the District of Columbia. Well, it is not to our credit. We have too many other major things we ought to be doing rather than devoting ourselves to the District of Columbia's fiscal policies.

Not only that, but when we follow the course of action we have followed with regard to the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia, we become responsible for the adoption of very regressive tax policies. A regressive tax policy is one that is based not on ability to pay, but based on many other considerations—usually, ability to catch taxpayers; usually based upon a principle that if they are before the authorities the tax can be corrected very easily, so soak them. We have got to watch out for regressive taxation in America.

I do not like certain features of the pending bill, Mr. President, because I do not like to see the extension of excise and sales taxes, because excise taxes and sales taxes are, by and large, very regressive taxes. They are not progressive taxes. In many, many instances they are not based upon ability to pay. Instead, they are based upon ability to collect the tax easily. Certainly that is no justification for levying a tax.

I am very much pleased that this budget bill increases the income tax in the District of Columbia, because I think such a tax comes the closest to taxing based on ability to pay. In my judgment it is the most progressive of our taxes, and it is a sound tax. The other day in committee I commended the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] for it, and I commend them now. I repeat, I am not sure that we went far enough. But at least this bill constitutes a step in the right direction.

The report shows that by means of these "hikes" in the income tax, we are proposing to increase the tax by 1958 and thereafter almost $2 million, in round numbers, over the amount which will be collected in 1957. I think that is sound. Senators will recall that when we discussed the matter in committee, the other day, we compared the new income-tax structure in the District of Columbia with the corresponding situations in Maryland and in Virginia; and we found that the new District of Columbia tax is reasonably comparable.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. First, let me say that I appreciate the comments of my colleague, the Senator from Oregon, regarding my work on the Committee on the District of Columbia, along with the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and other Senators who were members of the committee at that time.

I wish to ask if it is not correct that 2 years ago, I believe, when a revenue measure affecting the District of Columbia was before this body, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] joined me—or vice versa; I forget exactly which way it was—in an effort to have the exemption in connection with the income tax in the District of Columbia decreased, and also to remove the sales tax on food for home consumption. Unfortunately, we were not able to get very far with that attempt at that particular time. I am rather sure that other members of the committee joined with us at the time in trying to have that approach adopted by the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Maine is correct; we joined with the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. It was he who made the proposal.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] joined with us at the time, as I recall—as he always has done, in cooperating fully in regard to the handling of this problem. However, year after year he has found himself faced with the necessity—in connection with conference reports on such bills—of agreeing to go along with what he decided was the best that could be obtained from the House Members.

Let me say that the Senator from Maine is correct; we did join with him. This year we are making some progress toward achieving the goal and objective the Senator from Maine had in mind 2 years ago. As I have said, the measure now before us will substantially increase the income in the District of Columbia from the income tax.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield once more to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. I wish to say that I think all Members of the Senate—I know all members of the committee do—know of the very great amount of work the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] has done over the years in connection with measures before the Committee on the District of Columbia; that has been his record in both the House of Representatives and in the Senate. I wish to say that all Members of the Senate are to be highly congratulated for the recognition which now is being given toward having the Federal Government, as such, provide a proper amount of support to the Government of the District of Columbia. That step is long overdue; and I hope the effort does not stop where it is at the present time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine is very kind to all of us. I know I speak for the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia when I say that not only do we appreciate what the Senator from Maine has said today, but we also appreciate the great help he has been to the committee during the entire period of his service on it; and we also appreciate his entire willingness to come to the floor of the Senate at any time to be of help when District of Columbia matters were under consideration.

Mr. President, earlier, I spoke of what would be the percentage of Federal contribution to the District of Columbia budget if the increase from $2 million to $4 million in the Federal contribution were finally authorized. It would mean that then the Federal Government would contribute 15.7 percent, as compared with 12.56 percent in 1956.

So much for an affirmative and complimentary statement in regard to the bill dealing with increasing the District of Columbia income tax.

Now, Mr. President, we come to the rental of personal property. The bill imposes a 2 percent sales and use tax on the rental of tangible personal property, but omits films, records, and so forth, rented by theaters or radio or television stations.

In connection with title II the committee proposed, as I recall, another committee amendment, which would eliminate the proposed tax for so-called rental services connected with linens, uniforms, and babies' diapers, wherever textiles are owned by a rental

service and are rented out. The committee has eliminated the proposal for a tax, after some of us in the committee led the fight at the committee hearing the other day against that tax. I hope that if my amendment is not adopted, Mr. President, at least the committee amendment will be adopted.

My first amendment, which I now send to the desk, proposes to strike out all of title II, which provides for a tax on rental services. I ask that my amendment be stated at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments are generally the first to be considered.

Mr. MORSE. Very well.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendments be stated at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first committee amendment was, on page 36, line 9, after the word "sale", to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That the gross proceeds from the rental of textiles, the essential part of which rental includes recurring service of laundering or cleaning thereof, shall not be considered a retail sale."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 38, line 7, after the word "sale", to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That the gross proceeds from the rental of textiles, the essential part of which rental includes recurring service of laundering or cleaning thereof, shall not be considered a retail sale."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was on page 44, in line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "$11,000,000" and insert "$13,000,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 44, in line 12, after the word "and", to strike out $15,000,000" and insert "$17,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

The amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon will now be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 35, in line 17, it is proposed to strike out all of title II, through line 13, on page 38.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad that the committee amendment on page 36 was agreed to, if this title is to remain in the bill. The committee amendment eliminates the tax on the so-called rental of linens. It eliminates the tax on the rental of uniforms, babies' diaper service, and so forth. That is a very discriminatory tax, working to the great disadvantage of the rental services, as compared with commercial laundries. However, I am opposed to the entire tax.

Consider the tax on the rental of an apartment. What happens? It is passed on to the tenant. Under the provisions of this bill there will be a rental tax on every apartment. We are "soaking" the tenant. In most cases the tenants are already paying high taxes.

In the District of Columbia there is a situation in which the real property tax is entirely too low. The committee instructed its staff to write into the committee report—and it is in the committee report—a paragraph which makes it very clear that we want the District officials to proceed to do something next year about the matter of low real property taxes in the District of Columbia. The real property tax structure is entirely too low. That tax comes nearer to representing ability to pay than do sales taxes on rentals, which are highly regressive taxes. But there are some easy victims whose pockets can be picked, so we propose to pick them, to the tune of $75,000. I think it is a bad tax precedent for us to establish. I fear it as a possible foundation for a Federal sales tax. My eyes and ears are always on the alert for a movement in the direction of a Federal sales tax, by increasing excise taxes. I am against the entire proposal in title II, and I propose that it be eliminated.

Let us not forget that when we eliminate title II we take care of not only the sales tax on rentals, but the sales tax on meals. Do Senators realize how far this bill goes? Every meal costing more than 13 cents is to be taxed. One of the arguments is that many transients come to the District of Columbia, so it is easy to collect the tax. Is not that a fine basis on which to tax people? Food is just as much of a necessity, whether they are transients or whether they are residents. We ought to be encouraging them to come here anyway, as a part of our great governmental educational program. School children ought to be encouraged to come here by the thousands each year to observe their Government in action. I think this tax represents a new low in regressive taxation, when the Congress imposes a sales tax on the very food people must eat to sustain themselves. There is to be a tax on every meal costing more than 13 cents.

In the committee the other day I said that that tax meant that even the organizations which try to help the down-and-outers and supply them with meals at as near cost as possible would find that, with prices what they are today, they could not give a down-and-outer much of a meal for less than 20 cents. For want of a better term, I said that even the client of the "flophouse" restaurant will have to pay a tax on his meal, because most of such meals cost more than 13 cents. I do not know why the figure was fixed at 13 cents. It might as well have been reduced to nothing.

This kind of regressive tax is not necessary to do justice to the District of Columbia. It is necessary only if we in Congress fail to make the Federal contribution we ought to make. I am against it, and I ask that my amendment be adopted.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon was very carefully considered by the committee. The committee adopted the proviso excluding the sales tax upon linen-rental services. That was felt to be a tax upon services rather than upon rentals. As to the remainder of the section, it was very definitely felt that certain types of personal property should be subjected to taxes in order to avoid the loophole which has heretofore existed.

Under our present law, property rentals which constitute continuous possession are not subject to a sales tax. Many kinds of property, such as construction machinery, motor vehicles, chairs, scaffolding, and so forth, are continuously rented, and are in the continuous possession of those who rent them, but they are not subject to a sales tax.

Recently the State of Maryland tightened its law on the subject and closed that particular loophole, so such property is taxable in Maryland. The committee therefore rejected the amendment which is now before the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in reply I say only that I do not believe in a sales tax on necessities. It is bad enough to have a sales tax on nonnecessities; but when we come to taxing the food which people take into their mouths, by way of a sales tax, I think we are following a regressive tax policy which is not in the public interest.

I submit the amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, directing my attention further to the tax on sales of food for human consumption on the premises, I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table entitled "Sales of Food for Human Consumption on the Premises," indicating the manner in which various States which have sales taxes handle this particular problem.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sales of food for human consumption on the premises

State	Taxable	Exempt	Remarks—Tax bracket starts at—
Alabama	T		11 cents.
Arizona	T		No bracket.
Arkansas	T		13 cents.
California	T		15 cents.
Colorado	T		19 cents.
Connecticut	T	Less than $1	
District of Columbia	T	50 cents or less	
Florida	T		11 cents.
Georgia	T		No bracket.
Illinois	T		Do.
Iowa	T		15 cents.
Kansas	T		Do.
Louisiana	T		25 cents.
Maine	T		Do.
Maryland		All meals	
Michigan	T		No bracket.
Mississippi	T		Do.
Missouri	T		15 cents.
New Mexico	T		No bracket.
New York City	T	99 cents or less	
North Carolina	T		10 cents.
North Dakota	T		25 cents.
Ohio	T	39 cents or less	
Oklahoma	T		No bracket.
Pennsylvania	T	50 cents or less	
Rhode Island	T		25 cents.
South Carolina	T		11 cents.
South Dakota	T		15 cents.
Tennessee	T		Do.
Utah	T		20 cents.
Washington	T		No bracket.
West Virginia	T		6 cents.
Wyoming	T		No bracket.

NOTE.—"No bracket" generally means no exemption at all and tax is computed at retail sales price times the tax rate.

Mr. BIBLE. It was not easy for the committee to lower the exemption from 50 cents to 14 cents, but we were faced with the realistic problem of raising 10 or

11 million dollars to keep our schools and governmental functions going. Significantly enough, a close examination of the table which I have just had printed in the RECORD will show that this provision follows very generally the pattern of sales taxes in other jurisdictions.

The committee was opposed to the amendment, and I hope it will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me make two points very quickly. I have scanned again the table which the Senator from Nevada has submitted. I am very proud to report that the State of Oregon is not listed on it. We have beaten the sales tax in our State three times, and we will beat it again if it is proposed next fall, as has been promised.

Some other States have stayed away from these penalizing regressive taxes. If my amendment is adopted, there will still be a tax on meals costing 50 cents or more. However, I submit that when we lower the exemption to 14 cents, we reach a new low in regressive taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. This is my last amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 43, line 7, it is proposed to strike out the numerals "$1.50" and insert in lieu thereof "$1.375."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, so far as speaking from experience is concerned, I am not an expert witness on the subject of what the cost of beverages should be.

By taste, I happen to be a dry. However, in my opinion, that has little to do with the question of whether it is fair to impose a regressive tax. The evidence that has been submitted to me is to the effect that if we continue to raise the tax on beer, which many call the poor man's drink—in fact, it was said in our committee discussions the other day that many people consider it a very important food item, although I would not know about that—we will reach a point where we will play right into the hands of not only professional bootleggers, but also home bootleggers; that beer happens to be one beverage in which the tax bears a very close relationship to being causative of bootlegging.

Last year we increased the tax on beer from $1 a barrel to $1.25 a barrel. Now it is proposed that we increase it from $1.25 to $1.50 a barrel. As I listened to the discussion of the subject I felt that we had gone too far. Although I would prefer no increase at all, I have decided to split the proposal in two, and I therefore offer my amendment for a 12½-cent increase.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the committee considered the amendment to increase the tax by 25 cents. The matter was very carefully gone into by the committee. The recommendation of the city commissioners was to increase the tax to $3.00, I believe.

The committee also placed a tax on wines and on liquors. We felt we are placing a very nominal tax on beer. In fact, the increase of 25 cents is a very nominal increase. In Virginia the tax per barrel is $3.10. In Maryland it is 93 cents. The range throughout the country is much higher than those figures. It seems to us that the proposal was an equitable one. I urge that the proposed amendment be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading on the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I voted against the House bill which provides for an allegedly 2-percent sales tax on meals above 13 cents. I stated at that time, Mr. President, that I thought it was an inexcusable injustice. I rancor over injustices. I respectfully say that I think the Senate of the United States has made a tremendous mistake this afternoon.

Since making my speech this afternoon I have received a letter from A. E. Smith, of George Washington University, and I wish to read the letter.

Mr. Smith says in his letter:

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: After reading the newspapers for some weeks relative to the proposed new District of Columbia taxes, I congratulate you in speaking out emphatically against the vicious tax on restaurant meals costing over 13 cents, a tax alleged to be a 2-percent sales tax.

A tax of 1 cent on a 14-cent purchase in a restaurant or drugstore, or wherever food is eaten, is not mathematically a 2-percent tax but a 7-percent tax.

That is what we voted for, Mr. President. We voted for a 7-percent tax. There are persons in the District who buy 14-cent meals.

Mr. Smith states further:

If the lawmakers feel they must have a 2-percent sales tax on the most important necessity of life, at least let them be honest about it and make the exemption such that the tax is 2 percent and not 7 percent.

This tax on meals costing over 13 cents is purportedly designed to raise funds for the District of Columbia government. The sales-tax law requires that the restaurant operator remit 2 percent of taxable sales to the District of Columbia tax collector. However, on the sale of 7 food items costing 14 cents each, the restaurant collects 7 cents tax but is required by law to remit only 2 cents to the District of Columbia tax collector. Does this bneefit the District of Columbia Government or does it create a legal public subsidy for the small restaurant operators?

It is my judgment, Mr. President, that what Mr. Smith meant in the paragraph I have just read is that the District collects 7 percent rather than a 7-cent tax on which the restaurant is required to submit 2 cents to the District tax collector. I am sure that we can take notice that what he meant was what I have just suggested.

I quote further from Mr. Smith's letter:

The large restaurants and hotels will not be affected materially by this law as they have nothing costing so little as 14 cents. They are already paying about as much tax as they will under the new law.

Imagine, Mr. President, walking into the Statler, the Mayflower, the Carlton, or any of the other larger hotels, and ordering a 14-cent meal. The people are going to pay under the new law which we passed today the same tax they paid under the old law with approximately a 50-cent exemption. What we did today was really to hit the pocketbooks of the class of people in our citizenry who have the least amount of money in their pocketbooks, not the class who walk into the dining room of the Mayflower or the Carlton or the Statler. They walk into cheap restaurants and buy cheap meals.

Listen to this, Mr. President:

The people who will suffer by this proposed tax are the 120,000 local schoolchildren.

Mr. President, we have struck at the kids of the District of Columbia. That is what we have done. We have placed this 2-percent tax on 14-cent meals, and we take the money out of the pockets of the kids of the District of Columbia. We ought to be proud of that, Mr. President.

We simply ought to stick out our chests and boast to the Nation what great lawmakers we are. I consider that we have committed an inexcusable injustice on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. Smith goes on to say:

The semidestitute will be the victims, as you pointed out in the Evening Star of March 22, 1956.

The persons of limited means who are already existing on small budgets will have this burden added to their greatly increased income-tax burden.

Maryland made the mistake some years ago of taxing meals, but quickly abolished it after overwhelming public sentiment.

When a sales tax on military commissaries was voted some weeks ago, the powerful military heads complained and had it removed the following day.

The helpless, voteless citizens of the District of Columbia must rely on fair-minded persons to protect them from confiscatory taxation.

At present, Maryland and Virginia, our two bordering tax jurisdictions, have no tax on groceries or meals. If they can get along without it, why can't the District? Even New York City, with its great need for taxes, has an exemption of 97 cents on meals.

Originally, taxation was based on the ability of the individual to pay; with your assistance, the Senate can help to keep it that way.

Respectfully yours,

A. E. SMITH.

I am sorry to have to admit to Mr. Smith that my assistance was of no avail this afternoon, because the Senate passed a tax on the semidestitute persons and the children of the District. I go home tonight pretty sad about it, because I simply cannot get it out of my head that the action we took this afternoon—I do not care by what standard we want to test it—simply cannot be justified. It goes to show what can be expected from Congress so long as Congress has placed upon it the responsibility of administering the Government of the District of Columbia, when Congress, in fact, has no political checks and controls placed upon it by the people of the District.

I am satisfied that if the people of the District of Columbia could only vote tonight on what the United States Senate did this afternoon, and if we were dependent upon the citizens of the District of Columbia for our seats here, there would be a good many empty seats in the Senate after the District of Columbia citizens had a chance to vote.

I think the Senate has passed a bill imposing a shockingly inexcusable tax upon the semidestitute persons and the children of the District of Columbia. I think we will look in vain for a sales tax worse than the one the Senate voted this afternoon on the very food which the semidestitute persons and the children of the District of Columbia have to take into their mouths in order to sustain themselves.

I am sorry, Mr. President, to take the time to discuss what I think are the shortcomings of the Senate in regard to the work it is doing in the administration of the District of Columbia Government; but I do not hesitate to say what the action of the Senate this afternoon convinced me of even more—that we are going to have to fight harder to get the people of the District of Columbia out from under the arbitrary and capricious role of Congress.

In this land of ours, where we find government officials who are not responsible to the people they govern, we have a duty within our framework of government to adopt a reform which will make government officials responsive to the will of the people.

When we go so far as we went this afternoon, and impose a 2-percent tax upon 14-cent meals, although in fact it is a 7-percent tax, I think we have much to answer for.

I suppose there is nothing we can do about it at this late hour. But I make these remarks with the hope that never dies within me that, upon reflection, perhaps we can in some way, somehow, before we adjourn this year, correct the mistake we have made.

Our last chance on the bill, of course, is in conference. I do not know what hope there will be in conference. I am not a conferee. But in view of the information which is contained in the letter I have read—I have asked the counsel for the Committee on the District of Columbia to check it for accuracy, and he advises me that on the very low purchases the tax does, in effect, amount to a 7-percent tax—I hope the conferees will come back from conference with a bill which at least will correct gross injustice, and that Congress will restore an exemption on meal taxes of at least the amount in the old law; namely, 50 cents.

I shall continue in the Committee on the District of Columbia to see what can be done to do fiscal justice to the taxpayers of the District of Columbia. I recognize that, after all, we have to take enough time out from our busy duties in the Senate, so long as we maintain this jurisdiction, to get the facts; and I respectfully say that I simply do not think the Senate did that this afternoon.

I do not need to tell Senators that the action of the Senate this afternoon was in large measure pro-forma action. I dare say that probably only 1 out of 10 Senators realizes that the Senate voted a 7-percent tax on 14-cent meals. I dare say that there is probably only 1 out of 10 Senators who realizes, as Mr. Smith points out, that what the Senate really did was to tax schoolchildren and semidestitute persons with an unreasonable burden. I am satisfied that probably only 1 out of 10 Senators realizes, as Mr. Smith has pointed out in his letter, that what the Senate did amounts really to a handout to the operators of the so-called low-price restaurants.

That was not contemplated by the committee, especially by those on the committee who favored the tax, although I vigorously opposed it in committee, as I did on the floor of the Senate.

I close by saying, Mr. President, that I think every citizen of the District of Columbia has cause to resent what the Senate did this afternoon.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, today we passed approximately 50 bills on the call of the calendar. There are now fewer than 25 bills remaining on the calendar. We plan to have the Senate recess on Thursday afternoon. It is hoped that we may be able to have the conference report on the farm bill acted on before the Easter recess. If we conclude consideration of the unfinished business in time, we may take up prior to Thursday the trip-leasing bill or the election reform bill, or some other bill which the policy committee has previously cleared.

I wish to urge all committee chairmen and all members of committees to report to the Senate as early as they possibly can all legislation that may be cleared in committee.

Our calendar is at a very minimum. We are quite current in our work. We cannot act on appropriation bills until they are passed by the House. There is now pending in the House the new roads bill, which was passed by the Senate last year, and other measures as well.

I am hopeful that we will be able to act on a supplemental appropriation bill before the Easter recess; if not, then immediately after the recess.

I am informed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], that he expects to have his committee report the social-security bill shortly after the Easter recess. Therefore, I should like to have all Senators be on notice, and particularly do I desire to have all chairmen of committees to be on notice, that if they will report bills to the calendar we will proceed to their consideration as soon as possible after April 9.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 31.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me for a few minutes to make a very brief statement on the pending bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, an hour and 15 minutes ago I yielded to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], in order that the District of Columbia tax bill might be considered by the Senate. The Senator from Nevada assured me that it would not take more than 10 or 15 minutes to dispose of the bill. Therefore, I very gladly yielded to him.

At 2 o'clock I yielded a further extension of time, with the hope that the discussion might be brief. It is now 2:35 p. m. The Senator from New Jersey now wishes me to yield to him.

Having been a soft touch all my life, I suppose I should continue to be one. This is no time to change one's character. Having turned one cheek, I suppose I should turn the other. Therefore, I will yield to the Senator from New Jersey, with the hope, however, that he will not stretch out his time in quite the same fashion that the District of Columbia tax bill debate was extended. I yield with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for his kindness. As I told him, I have only a few remarks to make on the pending measure. I appreciate very much his yielding to me so that I may make them.

For some years now, I have been actively interested in revision and reform of the electoral college. In 1950 I was a cosponsor of the Lodge-Gossett amendment and voted for it when it passed the Senate. Therefore, When Senators DANIEL, THURMOND, and MUNDT devised the substitute compromise amendment, I agreed to be a cosponsor in the belief that perhaps such a compromise would lead to the accomplishment of electoral reform during this session of Congress.

COMPROMISE AMENDMENT

However, since I agreed to cosponsor the present compromise amendment, I have undertaken a serious reevaluation of the changes which it would make and the possible consequences which would ensue from its adoption. I have regretfully come to the conclusion that the

dangers and potentialities of the proposed compromise outweigh the possible advantages. I feel that it compounds the problems which either the Daniel-Kefauver or the Mundt-Coudert systems would produce separately.

Mr. President, I believe that any system for the election of the President should be uniform throughout the country. The compromise amendment would introduce an element of uncertainty into our presidential elections through the possible existence of two different methods of apportioning the electoral votes within the States. The fact that certain States adopted either one system or the other could be decisive in a close election.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I am disturbed by the prospect of having the State legislatures choose one or the other methods of apportioning electors. Such action by the legislatures may very well depend solely upon which party controls the legislatures, and which system will be most advantageous to that party.

Thus, I find myself unable to support the compromise amendment, regardless of the merits of either the Mundt-Coudert or the Daniel-Kefauver amendments when considered separately. Let me briefly consider these two proposals separately.

MUNDT-COUDERT AMENDMENT

The Mundt-Coudert proposal, it seems to me, has two major defects.

Initially, as has been fully discussed, there is the problem of gerrymandering which exists throughout the States. There are large differences in the population of the various congressional districts in most States. Presidential elections based upon such districts could result in the election of more rather than fewer minority Presidents.

In addition, Mr. President, there is no constitutional requirement that the States provide for the election of Congressmen from single-member districts. States can, and some do, elect their Congressmen at large. Under the Mundt-Coudert amendment, States which elect their Congressmen at large will also elect their presidential electors at large. Therefore, in such States, the general ticket in presidential elections will probably be preserved. As a result, it would not surprise me if more small States switched to at-large congressional elections, in order to gain the advantage that such a change would give them under the Mundt-Coudert system.

I feel that the Mundt-Coudert system would be inequitable and possibly harmful unless there were concurrently adopted a workable provision to prevent gerrymandering and require congressional election, and thereby election of presidential electors, from single-member districts.

I am, therefore, unable to support the Mundt-Coudert proposal as a separate proposal.

DANIEL-KEFAUVER AMENDMENT

Mr. President, as the Daniel-Kefauver amendment is substantially the Lodge-Gossett amendment which I supported, I naturally look upon it with some favor. However, I believe that it would be inadvisable to adopt it at the present time.

Under present conditions, I believe that the Daniel-Kefauver system would place a disproportionate degree of power and influence in our one-party States.

I would probably support the amendment if I thought it held forth the prospect of developing the Southern States, or any other one-party States, into bona fide two-party States. However, with the advantage which will accrue to the one-party States under the proportionate system of electoral voting, I will have to oppose it until such time as reasonable assurance can be had that the southern Negro will enjoy unencumbered suffrage. I can see nothing in the Daniel-Kefauver amendment which would provide such disenfranchised persons with equal access to the polls, and unfortunately I fear that intimidation would be intensified under the amendment.

On final analysis, Mr. President, I do not feel justified in supporting any change which cannot be conclusively shown to possess less potential inequity than the present system. In my opinion, neither of these proposed plans, nor the combination of the two, under present conditions, fulfills such a requirement.

I thank the Senator from Illinois for permitting me to make my statement.

LEGISLATION DISPOSED OF BY THE SENATE IN THE PRESENT SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that thus far in this session we have passed 126 Senate bills, 142 House bills, 7 Senate joint resolutions, 9 House joint resolutions, 11 Senate concurrent resolutions, 3 House concurrent resolutions, and 60 Senate resolutions. That was through Friday evening, Mr. President. It does not include the 56 measures on which the Senate acted today.

COMMUNIST EFFORTS TO CREATE DISORDER AND DISRUPT HARMONIOUS RELATIONS BETWEEN THE WHITE AND NEGRO RACES IN THE SOUTH

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a brief statement?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am not glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina but I shall yield to him, because I have been sitting here thinking of the Sermon on the Mount in which our good Lord commanded us to turn the other cheek not only twice, but 99 times. So I am glad to turn my cheek for the third time, and I shall wait with expectation to see how long the brief remarks of the Senator from South Carolina actually take.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an article by the Associated Press, published in the State, of Columbia, S. C., March 25, and in other newspapers throughout the country. The headline on the story says: "Red Drive Against Dixie Is On in Ohio."

This article is direct evidence that the Communists want to create disorder and to disrupt the harmonious relations which have existed for generations between the white and Negro races in the South.

The office of the attorney general of Ohio is quoted as saying that a Communist-inspired drive is on in Ohio to enlist members of the Labor Youth League in a campaign for Federal intervention in the racial segregation issue which has been thrust upon the South. The Labor Youth League is described as the Communist Party's "youth arm."

Objective of the drive is to mobilize members and friends to bring maximum pressure on President Eisenhower and the Federal Government to intervene in the South to force integration of the races.

Mr. President, this is a concrete example of the effort of the agitators to create trouble in this country between persons who normally would be living harmoniously. Their approach through the youth of Ohio will be noted because it is easier to sway youth into making wrong decisions than it is to mislead more mature minds.

This is a vicious attack upon the people of the South and the people of this entire Nation who believe in constitutional government. It is a serious matter and the attorney general of Ohio is to be commended for alerting the Nation to this subtle new danger which has been conceived by the Communists. It is evidence of their avowed purpose of creating trouble by infiltration and by the planting of un-American ideas in the minds of our youth.

Mr. President, I hope this will serve as a Red stoplight to persons who have agitated for integration. They should be forewarned by this information from Ohio that such agitation serves the will of the Communists. It breaks down constitutional government, just as the Communists wish, instead of strengthening constitutional methods.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED DRIVE AGAINST DIXIE IS ON IN OHIO

COLUMBUS, OHIO, March 24.—The Ohio attorney general's office today said a Communist-inspired drive is on to enlist Ohio youth in a campaign for Federal intervention in Dixie's racial segregation issue.

The office's internal security division said it has intercepted secret directives that call the plan operation constitutional rights.

This is what they said about the campaign:

The Ohio drive is part of a nationwide move for students and working youth to help pressure the Eisenhower administration into intervention.

Vehicle for the campaign is the Labor Youth League, described by officials as the Communist Party's youth arm. They said the league replaced the wartime American Youth for Democracy group that stemmed from the Young Communist League.

"The objective of this operation," the directives said, "is to mobilize every single member of the league, together with friends, neighbors, and fellow workers, to bring maximum pressure on President Eisenhower and the Federal Government to assume their responsibility and intervene against the Dixiecrat terror in the South * * * to uphold the Constitution * * * and to bring law and order to the South."

Official publication of the Labor Youth League is the New Challenge. Records of the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission show that copies of the paper were passed out at Cleveland's John Adams High School in 1952 in the first reported attempt of that nature to recruit pupils.

The attorney general's office said the Ohio drive is two pronged and listed these objectives:

Help obtain 25,000 messages to President Eisenhower within 6 weeks urging segregation intervention.

Get more readers of New Challenge by offering 4,000 half-year subscriptions for 50 cents between mid-April and July.

The campaign would be concentrated on youth, the attorney general's office believes, because the Labor Youth League is regarded as the Communist Party's youth arm and would try to influence persons in the age group of its members.

The Ohio operation of the LYL is centered in Cleveland but has branches in other cities over the State, State officials said.

The league's directive exhibited by the attorney general's office said in part:

"Achieving success in the campaign to get Federal intervention will take the efforts of a large section of the youth and their organization, together with the efforts of the rest of the people's (Communist) movement. * * * This all-out operation constitutional rights can * * * also help the influence of our league and establish it as an important factor in the youth community."

In New York, Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, said:

"The NAACP has no connection of any sort with any move by left-wing groups to do anything whatsoever on the desegregation problem. Along with many other Americans, we have requested the President to use such legitimate means as he has at his disposal to ease the tensions in the South and to bring like-minded people of both races together with a view to making progress on desegregation. Our association has never urged the use of Federal troops or other force except that inherent in lawful and constitutional procedure."

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House.

H. R. 1082. An act for the relief of Golda I. Stegner;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Porter; and

H. R. 2946. An act for the relief of Eugene Dus.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3996) to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LANE, Mr. FORRESTER, and Mr. MILLER of New York were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senate has before it today the substitute to Senate Joint Resolution 31 proposed by Senators DANIEL, MUNDT, and THURMOND.

This proposal is in fact a combination of two separate proposals, neither of which could gain acceptance in its own right. On what grounds two unacceptable proposals become acceptable when combined is something which has not yet been explained to the Senate and to the country.

At the present time we have an electoral system which can be termed a State-unit system. That is to say the popular winner in each State receives all the electoral votes of the State. In 1952, for example, General Eisenhower had a popular majority in Illinois and thereby received all the 27 Illinois electoral votes.

Under the compromise substitute, which is before us, a proportional method of dividing the electoral votes of each State would be in effect unless the State legislature of an individual State chose otherwise. That is to say, if in any State there were 100 electoral votes, and the popular vote was divided between the candidates in the proportion of 55 percent to 45 percent the electoral vote would be divided 55 to 45.

The effect of this proportional system, which is commonly called the Lodge-Gossett system, would be to diminish the importance of the large populous two-party States where the division between the parties is relatively even, and, therefore, increase the importance of the one-party States. In the Democratic Party it would enhance the power of the Southern one-party States, and in the Republican Party it would enhance the power of a few New England and several middle-western Republican-dominated States.

But, under the substitute amendment, a State legislature may, if it so desires, select an alternative method of choosing presidential electors. This alternative is a congressional district unit system, commonly known as the Mundt-Coudert plan. Under it a "winner-take-all" system by congressional districts would be substituted for a "winner-take-all" system by States.

Because the boundary lines of congressional districts in the United States are determined by the State legislatures, the cities and populous areas of the country have a smaller representation in the House of Representatives in proportion to their numbers than do the less populated rural areas. This has been caused by gerrymandering. It particularly discriminates against the city people and makes it extremely difficult for the problems of the city and the issues affecting the people who live there to gain an equitable hearing in the Congress.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the Senator agrees with me that this proposed reform of the electoral college would have the result that no one could look at the election returns and hope to tell who had been elected President unless he were familiar with the laws of all the 48 States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. As I shall show later, there are 282 trillion possible combinations, or 2 raised to the 48th power, and one could never know precisely with which combination he is dealing.

Mr. LONG. Actually, for a person to know who had been elected President in a close race, even though one candidate might have received two or three million more votes than the other, it would be necessary for a person to get the lawbooks off the shelf and to make a study of the laws of all 48 States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct; and then he would have to use a slide rule in order to work out the ratio. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG. Actually, it seems to me that the proposed compromise is no improvement whatsoever upon the existing system.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is worse than the existing system.

Mr. LONG. Although the existing system is bad, the proposed compromise which would mix up the proportionate division of the electoral vote, on the one hand, and the Mundt-Coudert proposal, to figure by districts, and to have the States vote in that way, on the other hand, is the worst that has ever been proposed. No one has ever succeeded in proposing an electoral method which makes less sense than the one now under consideration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the sponsors of the method are to be congratulated in offering positively the worst proposal which could be devised.

Thus, Mr. President, the alternatives have a common denominator, in that both would increase the power of the lightly populated areas of the country at the expense of the heavily populated areas of the country. Both systems would increase the power of the one-party States.

Mr. LONG. Having seen the kind of proposal which has come from the compromise group, which got together to try to resolve their differences, and who brought out a makeshift measure for election reform, I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would agree with me that rather than the proposal which is now before the Senate, it would be preferable to let the candidates draw straws.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the result might be approximately as good as that which would come under the present hydraheaded monster.

Under either system—and this is very important—the centers of power in the Republican and Democratic Parties would be shifted to the right wing of those parties, and would give the lightly populated or one-party areas a much more important voice than they now have, or they deserve to have in terms of the number of people who reside and vote in those areas in the election of a President.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would agree with me that after one studies all the possible proposals for the election of a President and goes over all the possibilities contained

in them, about the only conclusion which makes any sense is that there ought to be the direct popular election of the President; and whichever candidate receives a single vote more than another candidate should be elected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I voted for the Langer amendment when it was last before the Senate; I intend to vote for it again.

In addition, Mr. President, the compromise substitute has in it a provision that if a candidate does not receive a majority of the electoral vote—over 50 percent—the election of a President shall be determined by the Congress from the three candidates receiving the highest number of electoral votes.

Later, I shall develop this point, but I wish to say now that this provision would give control to even a small third party over the presidential election and would promote third parties and encourage dissident factions in either major party to attempt to control the electoral votes in their State or region. I will show later, Mr. President, that under the proportional or Lodge-Gossett method, 8 of the last 19 elections would have been decided by the Congress.

It is argued by the proponents of the substitute amendment that the electoral procedures for electing a President of the United States should be changed. They argue that under the present State-unit system, a few large populous States with large electoral votes, States such as New York, Pennsylvania, California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Ohio, Texas, and the like, can determine the outcome of an election and they argue even beyond that various minority groups—voting en bloc—can determine the outcome in several of the individual populous States and thereby determine who is to be President of the United States. I shall show later, Mr. President, that there are numerous flaws in this argument taken by itself but, Mr. President, it is true because of the present system that the large, populous, two-party States are of crucial importance to presidential candidates if they are to win in the election. But, Mr. President, they are crucial because so many people live in them. I look upon this, in general, as not a bad thing. For, it is in these large, populous States where the bulk of our citizens live and it is in the urban districts of those States where Americans of various races, colors, religions, and economic interests have come to understand each other and to live with one another in peace and harmony, thus promoting tolerance and friendship among diverse groups. This has led to greatness in America and earned us the title of "The Melting Pot of the World." The large cities have also been centers of culture in our land where some of the great art treasures of the world may be viewed; where great literature and great art is available to all, bringing pleasure, beauty, and broader understanding into the lives of countless Americans, who live not only in the cities, but also outside the cities.

Even if it were true, Mr. President, that the minority groups in the large cities voted en bloc—as the proponents of this measure claim—that would not, of itself, be a reason for changing our present electoral system, and it most certainly would not be a reason for changing the system to that which is now proposed to us. For, at the present time, it is only at the presidential election when the legitimate interests of the groups which make up our large cities are given the weight in our politics which they deserve. Therefore, in deciding what kind of electoral system we desire, and one which is just and equitable, it is not enough to look only at the presidential election system. In deciding this matter, we must look at our political system as a whole. When we do that, it becomes ever more clear that to deprive our cities, our minority groups, and our large populous States of what little power they exercise in a presidential election, would be to make their voices almost completely unheard in our political system. As the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has already pointed out in his very able speech of last week, our political system is like the solar system and must be viewed as a whole.

We know that because of constitutional provisions, the Senate of the United States is made up of two Senators from each State, thereby giving each State an equal voice in the Senate, regardless of its population. We know that the State legislatures are dominated by the less populous, rural regions of our country. We know, also, that these State legislatures apportion the congressional districts and that they, too, are heavily biased against the cities.

In addition to all this, it should be noted that the system of separation of powers under which we operate divides power among three coequal institutions; the Presidency, the Congress, and the judiciary. Each can check and balance the other. Thus, to successfully pass and put into effect progressive measures, each of the three coequal divisions of our Government, and, in the case of the Congress, each of the coequal branches, must approve of, or at least not oppose, the legislation.

Owing to the unrepresentative nature of Congress, which comes about because of the constitutional makeup of the Senate, and because of the gerrymandering of House seats, and also because of the seniority system which puts great power in the hands of those who represent one-party areas, it is extremely difficult and, in fact, almost impossible, for such legislation as civil rights, pro-labor laws, and other social legislation to gain passage except when there are political landslides like that of the 1930's.

Thus, when our system is viewed as a whole, or in the language of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], as a solar system, it is seen that our great urban population, their legitimate interests, and the disproportionate number of representatives who represent them, have very little power in the political system.

To take from our great urban population and the great two-party States that last vestige of power, namely, the slight advantage they may now have in determining who shall be elected President of the United States—and this advantage, I may say, simply comes from the fact that there are large numbers of people living in those States—is something which in justice cannot and should not be condoned.

II.–1. UNDERREPRESENTATION OF BIG STATES AND BIG CITIES IN THE SENATE

One of the basic facts of American political life is the gross underrepresentation of the big States, and hence of the big cities in the United States Senate. It is well known how this came about. In the Constitutional Convention of 1787, there was a bitter tug of war between the large States such as Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, which wanted the seats in the National Legislature to be apportioned among the States according to their relative population, and the small States which wanted each State, regardless of size, to be given equal representation in the national legislature and hence, as in the Confederation, to cast an equal vote.

It was this struggle between the large and small States which, as Irving Brant, the biographer of Madison has pointed out, deadlocked the Constitutional Convention for months. At one time it seemed it would result in a dissolution of the convention and a failure to create a new union. As is also well known, this deadlock was broken by the so-called Connecticut Compromise proposed by Roger Sherman of that State. This provided for two houses in the legislative branch. In one, the Senate, the States, regardless of their size were to have equal representation, namely two Senators apiece. In the other, or the House of Representatives, the States were to be represented according to their populations.

Then the smaller States, in order to rivet down forever their equality of representation in the Senate, succeeded in adding a clause to article V, which provides for the amending process, that "no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate." And I have quoted from article 5. This placed the equal representation of the numerically small States forever beyond the reach of the amending process. And this equality of representation in the Senate is therefore the one provision in the Constitution which cannot be changed. It is riveted in forever.

We of the large States can therefore do nothing about our under-representation in the Senate. We are forever doomed to suffer under it without possibility or hope of change. We have loyally abided by this decision, and we shall continue to do so. We accept our under-representation in the Senate and the chains which are forever imposed upon us. It is probably the price we had to pay for union, and there is nothing we can do about it.

But the nature of our sacrifice should not be callously taken for granted, nor treated with indifference. It is real, and it should be fully realized, as we consider the question as to whether we should still further decrease the political power of the big States and the big cities.

COMPARISON OF LARGEST AND SMALLEST STATES

Now let us look at the practical effect of all this. We all know that Nevada, with a population in 1950 of 160,000, has two Senators, or the same number as

New York, with its population of 14.8 million people. A voter in Nevada has, therefore, between 92 and 93 times as much influence in selecting a United States Senator as does a voter in New York. He has 66 times the influence of a voter in the adjoining State of California, 65 times that of Pennsylvania voter, and 54 times that of a voter in my own State of Illinois. I once represented a ward in the Chicago City Council, in 1940, and at that time my ward had a larger population than had the State of Nevada. May I also point out it takes 51 people in New York to have as much influence in electing a Senator as one person possesses in Wyoming. And it takes 47 New York people to equal 1 in Delaware.

COMPARISON OF EIGHT LARGEST AND EIGHT SMALLEST STATES

So much for individual instances. Now let us see how the small States, and hence a minority of the population, control the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks a table showing the population of the 8 largest and 8 smallest States be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of population and representation of the 8 largest and 8 smallest States

8 LARGEST STATES

	1950 population
1. New York	14,800,000
2. California	10,600,000
3. Pennsylvania	10,500,000
4. Illinois	8,700,000
5. Ohio	7,900,000
6. Texas	7,700,000
7. Michigan	6,300,000
8. New Jersey	4,800,000
Total	71,300,000

8 SMALLEST STATES

	1950 population
1. Nevada	160,083
2. Wyoming	290,529
3. Delaware	318,085
4. Vermont	377,747
5. New Hampshire	533,242
6. Idaho	588,637
7. Montana	591,024
8. North Dakota	619,636
Total	3,478,983

Total United States population 1950, 150,697,361 equals 100 percent.

Eight largest States 1950 [1] 71,300,000 equals 47.3 percent.

Eight smallest States 1950, 3,478,983 equals 2.3 percent.

	Number	Percent
Total Senate representation	96	100
8 largest States	16	16.6
8 smallest States	16	16.6

[1] Massachusetts, with a population of 4.7 million in 1950, is the ninth largest State. This would bring the total to 76 million, within or over 50 percent of the population in the 9 largest States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if we take the 8 largest States in the Union—that is, New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Texas, Michigan, and New Jersey—as is done in the table, we find that as of 1950 they contained 71.3 million people, almost half of the total population of 150.7 million in the country as a whole. If we include the ninth largest State, Massachusetts, the total population of this group would be 76 million people, or slightly over 50 percent of the population.

These 8 States have 16 Senators, or, with Massachusetts included, 18. The 8 smallest States—Nevada, Wyoming, Delaware, Vermont, New Hampshire, Idaho, Montana, North Dakota—with a total population of only 3.5 million, also have 16 Senators, and if we include South Dakota, the smallest 9 States, with a population of 4.1 million, have 18 Senators. This means that one-half of the people in the United States have only about one-sixth of the total representation in the Senate, while only a little over 2 percent of the population—that is 2.3 percent—also have a sixth of the total representation. Think of that, my friends—a mere 2 percent of our population elect one-sixth of our Senators, or the same number as the half of our population which lives in our 8 largest States. Each man or woman in the 8 small States has therefore nearly 25 times the voice in the United States Senate as those of us who live in the 8 or 9 largest States.

COMPARISON OF POPULATION AND REPRESENTATION OF 12 LARGEST AND 12 SMALLEST STATES

If we take the 12 largest States, we find that as of 1950 they had 88.1 million people, or 58.5 percent of the population, or almost 60 percent of the population of the country. These 12 largest States have 24 Senators, or 25 percent of the total number. The 12 smallest States, with a population of 6.2 million or 4.1 percent of the total population, also had 24 Senators or 25 percent of their number.

This means that almost 60 percent of the people of the country have the same representation in the Senate as do 4.1 percent of the population of the country.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks a table comparing the population and representation of the 12 largest and 12 smallest States be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of population and representation of the 12 largest and 12 smallest States

12 LARGEST STATES

	1950 population
1. New York	14,830,192
2. California	10,586,223
3. Pennsylvania	10,498,012
4. Illinois	8,712,176
5. Ohio	7,946,627
6. Texas	7,711,194
7. Michigan	6,371,766
8. New Jersey	4,835,329
9. Massachusetts	4,690,514
10. North Carolina	4,061,929
11. Missouri	3,954,653
12. Indiana	3,934,224
Total	88,132,839

12 SMALLEST STATES

	1950 population
1. Nevada	160,083
2. Wyoming	290,529
3. Delaware	318,085
4. Vermont	377,747
5. New Hampshire	533,242
6. Idaho	588,637
7. Montana	591,024
8. North Dakota	619,636
9. South Dakota	652,740
10. New Mexico	681,187
11. Utah	688,862
12. Arizona	749,587
Total	6,251,359

	Population		Senate representation	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
12 largest States	88,132,839	58.5	24	25
12 smallest States	6,251,359	4.1	24	25

COMPARISON OF THE 24 SMALLEST AND 24 LARGEST STATES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, now let us take the 24 smallest States who have one-half of the votes in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the population of the 24 smallest States be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1950 population of 24 smallest States with 50 percent of the representation in the U. S. Senate

Rank in size	Rank in inverse order of size	State	1950 population
48	1	Nevada	160,083
47	2	Wyoming	290,529
46	3	Delaware	318,085
45	4	Vermont	377,747
44	5	New Hampshire	533,242
43	6	Idaho	588,637
42	7	Montana	591,024
41	8	North Dakota	619,636
40	9	South Dakota	652,740
39	10	New Mexico	681,187
38	11	Utah	688,862
37	12	Arizona	749,587
36	13	Rhode Island	791,896
35	14	Maine	913,774
34	15	Colorado	1,325,089
33	16	Nebraska	1,325,510
32	17	Oregon	1,521,341
31	18	Kansas	1,905,299
30	19	Arkansas	1,909,511
29	20	West Virginia	2,005,552
28	21	Connecticut	2,007,280
27	22	South Carolina	2,117,027
26	23	Mississippi	2,178,914
25	24	Oklahoma	2,233,351
		Total	26,485,903

	Number	Percent of total
Population, 24 smallest States	26,485,903	17.6
Population, 24 largest States (and District of Columbia)	124,211,458	82.4

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as the table shows, the 24 smallest States have a population of only 26.5 million, or but 17.6 percent of the population.

One-sixth of the population therefore have half of the Senators and one-half of the population have one-sixth of the Senators. That shows how disenfranchised the people of the large States are, so far as representation in the Senate is concerned. In the Senate, the small

States are certainly in the saddle. They are booted and spurred and we of the large States are saddled and bridled.

SENATORS FROM 17 STATES CAN PREVENT CLOTURE

This tendency is greatly intensified by the virtual impossibility of bringing any proposal to a vote to which a third of the Senators take basic and intense objection. For now under the rules of the Senate, as put into effect by the Wherry amendment in 1949, discussion can only be terminated and the previous question moved by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Senate, or a total of 64. Thirty-three Senators by either voting "no" on a cloture motion or abstaining from voting can therefore prevent cloture and permit a measure to be filibustered to death. This restriction has since 1949 been riveted into the rules of the Senate by rule 22, which now forbids any cloture at all from being applied to motions to change the rules.

It is therefore theoretically possible for the Senators from the 17 smallest States, with a total population of only 12.1 million, or only 8 percent of the population, to exercise a veto over legislation desired by the other 92 percent of the population. I ask unanimous consent that a table, listing the 17 smallest States and their populations, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

17 smallest States and their 1950 population

Rank in inverse order of size	Rank	State	Population
1	48	Nevada	160,083
2	47	Wyoming	290,529
3	46	Delaware	318,085
4	45	Vermont	377,747
5	44	New Hampshire	533,242
6	43	Idaho	588,637
7	42	Montana	591,024
8	41	North Dakota	619,636
9	40	South Dakota	652,540
10	39	New Mexico	681,187
11	38	Utah	688,862
12	37	Arizona	749,587
13	36	Rhode Island	791,896
14	35	Maine	913,774
15	34	Colorado	1,325,089
16	33	Nebraska	1,325,510
17	32	Oregon	1,521,341
		Total	12,128,969
United States population, 1950			150,697,361
Population, 17 smallest States, 1950			12,128,969
Percent of United States population in 17 smallest States			8

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if it be objected that these 17 States would not in practice be the ones to prevent cloture, let it be observed that the so-called 11 Southern States and the 6 border States—Oklahoma, Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland, West Virginia, and Delaware—which, with few exceptions, have a strong and perhaps intense fellow feeling for each other, comprise 50 million people, or 33 percent of the population. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks a table showing the 1950 population and vote participation in the 1952 presidential election of the 17 Southern and border States be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1950 population of 17 Southern and border States and voter turnout in 1952 presidential election

State	Population	Voter turnout in 1952 presidential election [1]
1. Texas	7,711,194	43
2. North Carolina	4,061,929	52
3. Missouri	3,954,653	71
4. Georgia	3,444,578	31
5. Virginia	3,318,680	31
6. Tennessee	3,291,718	46
7. Alabama	3,061,743	25
8. Kentucky	2,944,806	60
9. Florida	2,771,305	50
10. Louisiana	2,683,516	40
11. Maryland	2,343,001	58
12. Oklahoma	2,233,351	69
13. Mississippi	2,178,914	24
14. South Carolina	2,117,027	31
15. West Virginia	2,005,552	73
16. Arkansas	1,909,511	38
17. Delaware	318,085	79
Total	50,349,563	
United States population, 1950	150,697,361	
Population, 17 Southern and border States, 1950	50,349,563	
Percent of United States population, in 17 Southern and border States, 1950	33	

[1] Number of voters per 100 citizens of voting age.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But, Mr. President, we know that in the presidential election of 1952—in which there was an extremely large vote—in the 11 Southern States only 39.1 percent of the citizens of voting age—and I emphasize voting age, rather than population—actually voted. Of course, in the 1952 presidential election, an unusually large proportion of people voted in the South, compared with previous elections. In the 1950 congressional election, for example, only 12.4 percent of the citizens of voting age actually voted. I shall place in the RECORD at a later point more detailed statistics on this subject.

In the Northern States of the country something like 70 percent of the citizens of voting age actually voted in the 1952 election; and over 50 percent of the citizens of voting age actually voted in the 1950 congressional elections—or in 1952 the proportion voting in the North was almost twice—although not quite twice—the proportion voting in the South; and in 1950 it was approximately 4 times as much. Thus, because of restrictions on voting in the Southern States, in practice those elected by a relatively small number of people form a bloc of States which in Congress can tie up vital proposals which the rest of the country desires. In truth, we all know that it is this very fact which prevents us from passing vital civil-rights measures which, on the whole, the majority of the country desires.

As I have said, in elections prior to 1952 a much smaller proportion of the adults actually voted in the South.

Thus, despite all that has happened in the last century, despite the great struggle from 1861 to 1865, the political theory of John C. Calhoun that no vital act should be passed unless concurred in by every significant sectional group in the country has triumphed. The theory of concurrent majority, or the right of one section to veto the will of the rest of the country, has triumphed. O, rigid believer in slavery and inequality, thou has conquered. From your seat in the political Valhalla, you must smile grimly at the way your successors have snatched victory from defeat, and have imbedded your theories deep into the rules and practices of the Senate.

Mr. President, I have shown that the large States and, hence, the large cities, are grossly underrepresented in the Senate. I shall show that they are also grossly underrepresented in the national House of Representatives. But the underrepresentation in the national House of Representatives occurs because they are underrepresented in the State legislatures which lay out the congressional districts, and hence largely determine the composition of the national House of Representatives.

It is the question of urban underrepresentation in State legislatures to which I now turn.

II–2. URBAN UNDERREPRESENTATION IN STATE LEGISLATURES

That the urban areas of the States are underrepresented in the State legislatures is a notorious fact. In almost every State in the United States, the cities are lacking in fair representation in at least one house of the legislature. Unfortunately, there has not been enough thorough and systematic analysis of the extent of urban underrepresentation. We all know it to be a fact of political life. We do not know as much as we should about the extent of it.

In 1937, a Mr. Henry Stoner analyzed all of the State legislatures in the United States. He did this by adding the populations of the smallest districts electing representatives to each house in order to determine what was the smallest proportion of the total population which elected a majority of the representatives in that house.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing Mr. Stoner's computations be inserted in the RECORD at this point. The figures given under each house of the State legislatures indicate the percentage of the total population whose representatives constitute a majority of that chamber.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Percent of total population represented by a majority of seats in State legislatures (1937)

State	House	Senate
Connecticut	8.67	44.9
Rhode Island	22.3	8.86
California	47.6	12.5
New Jersey	46.7	15.4
Maryland	33.6	18.1
United States	43.4	18.2
Nevada	18.6	26.6
Idaho	37.2	21.5
Delaware	32.9	21.7
Montana	49.5	23.2
Florida	23.5	26.1

Percent of total population represented by a majority of seats in State legislatures (1937)—Continued

State	House	Senate
Kansas	26.5	37.6
Georgia	31.8	28.5
Michigan	28.8	34.1
Arizona	45.3	28.9
Missouri	29.4	35.4
South Carolina	45.4	30.6
Oregon	39.5	31.5
Ohio	31.8	46.2
Kentucky	32.3	39.7
Alabama	35.8	33.2
Iowa	33.7	35.3
North Carolina	33.9	49.4
Oklahoma	39.7	34.4
Wyoming	39.2	34.6
Tennessee	35.1	41.4
New Mexico	41.9	35.4
Illinois	35.4	35.4
Mississippi	35.5	39.8
Vermont	35.5	47.3
West Virginia	44.0	35.6
Indiana	37.7	42.8
Texas	41.7	38.0
Minnesota	38.5	42.3
Louisiana	41.2	38.8
Pennsylvania	44.4	38.8
North Dakota	44.1	39.9
Arkansas	40.3	46.1
South Dakota	40.3	42.3
Virginia	40.6	44.0
Wisconsin	40.9	44.1
Utah	41.8	42.6
Washington	42.3	45.6
Colorado	42.7	42.5
Maine	48.6	42.9
New York	51.9	43.9
Nebraska (unicameral)	46.8	
Massachusetts	48.5	48.0
New Hampshire	50.2	50.6

Source: Gus Tyler, The Majority Don't Count, New Republic Aug. 22, 1955, p. 14.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, what these figures mean is that in Connecticut, a majority of the delegates in the lower house were elected from districts populated by only 8.67 percent of the total population of the State. In New Jersey, a majority of the senate represented only 15.4 percent of the people of that State; in California, a majority of the senate represented only 12.5 percent of the people; and so on.

Thirty-six of the States, then, had legislatures in which a majority of at least one house spoke for less than 40 percent of the people of that State, and 45 States had 1 house in which a majority represented less than 44 percent of the people. In 18 States, a majority of both houses represented less than 40 percent of the State's population.

SITUATION HAS WORSENED IN LAST 18 YEARS

What has happened in the intervening 18 years, Mr President? In 1955, two political scientists from the University of Florida brought these figures up to date. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table for 1955.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Percent of total population represented by a majority of seats in State legislatures (1955)

State	House	Senate
Connecticut	9.59	36.50
California	44.70	11.88
Nevada	28.82	12.36
Vermont	12.58	45.67
Rhode Island	34.17	13.53
Maryland	27.57	15.52

Percent of total population represented by a majority of seats in State legislatures (1955)—Continued

State	House	Senate
New Jersey	43.95	17.01
Florida	17.19	17.67
Montana	40.80	18.40
Idaho	41.53	19.05
Arizona	(1)	19.30
Delaware	19.40	22.70
New Mexico	35.67	20.07
Ohio	29.19	20.68
Kansas	22.59	33.67
Missouri	23.71	47.37
Georgia	26.30	26.89
South Carolina	46.72	26.57
Utah	38.99	26.75
Alabama	27.15	28.26
Wyoming	39.92	28.77
Iowa	29.34	33.94
Illinois [2]	46.02	29.42
Oklahoma	33.38	29.45
Tennessee	30.13	33.26
North Carolina	30.16	40.09
Minnesota	31.56	35.93
Louisiana	31.94	36.00
Michigan	42.29	32.34
Mississippi	32.67	34.59
Washington	33.87	35.44
Colorado	34.67	36.12
North Dakota	39.02	35.36
Pennsylvania	41.63	35.44
Texas	39.85	36.80
Indiana	36.95	39.25
New York	37.06	40.91
New Hampshire	37.40	44.75
Arkansas	37.52	46.95
Kentucky	37.59	45.19
South Dakota	38.73	40.85
West Virginia	38.87	45.68
Wisconsin	38.87	47.53
Maine	39.12	39.71
Nebraska (unicameral)	41.88	
Massachusetts	42.15	48.76
Oregon	45.42	42.18
Virginia	43.69	43.93

Source: Manning J. Dauer and Robert G. Kelsay, Unrepresentative States, National Municipal Review, December 1955, pp. 572, 574.

[1] Not available.
[2] Based on reapportionment effective 1957.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In 1955, 44 State legislatures had one house in which a majority of delegates represented less than 40 percent of the States' population instead of 36 States in 1937. In 1955, 26 States had State legislatures in which both houses represented less than 40 percent of the population, as compared with 18 States in 1937. The situation is, therefore, getting much worse and not better, Mr. President.

Let us look further at the current figures. Thirty-two States have State legislatures in which a majority of 1 house represents less than 35 percent of the population; in 24 States, a majority of 1 house represents less than 30 percent of the people; and in 12 States, a majority of 1 house of the State legislature represents less than 20 percent of the people of those States.

SOME INDIVIDUAL STATES

What is the situation with respect to some of the individual States? In the Connecticut lower house, a majority represents only 9.59 percent of the people, while in its upper house, only 36.5 percent of the people are represented by the majority of the delegates.

In California, 11.88 percent of the people are represented by a majority in the upper house. In Rhode Island, it is 13.53 percent of the population which has the majority in the upper house—more than the remaining 87 percent. In Maryland, the figure is 15.52 percent for the upper house and 27.57 for the lower house. In New Jersey, only 17 percent of the people are represented by the majority of the State senate.

In Florida, a majority of both houses represents less than 18 percent of the population. In Delaware, it is 19.4 percent in 1 house and 22.7 percent in the other house. In Ohio, the figures are 21 percent and 29 percent; and in Kansas, 23 percent and 33 percent.

In my own State of Illinois, only 29 percent of the people now elect a majority of the upper house, and in Pennsylvania, 42 percent of the people elect a majority of the lower house, and 35 percent control the upper house. In New York the comparable figures are 37 percent and 41 percent.

Of the States I have mentioned, all except Rhode Island—and it still ranks as the fifth poorest State in providing equality of representation—have become worse since 1937. Only 3 or 4 States have improved at all since 1937.

GREAT DISPARITY BETWEEN LARGEST AND SMALLEST DISTRICTS IN EACH STATE

My son, John Douglas, made another analysis of State legislatures based on the census figures for 1940. He made two computations for each house of every State. First, he computed the average deviation of district from the number of people who would have been represented if each district had been the same size. That is, if there had been an average of 10,000 people per representative in the chamber and the average deviation had been 40 percent, it would mean that the average districts contained not 10,000 persons but a number either 40 percent more or 40 percent less than that figure. His second computation is the ratio between the largest and smallest district in each State. This figure is very simple—if the ratio is 5, it means that the largest district contained a population 5 times as great as that of the smallest district. If, as was the case with Connecticut House, the ratio is 539.6, it means that the largest district contained 539.6 times the population of the smallest district.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	House		Senate	
	Percent of average deviation	Ratio between largest and smallest district	Percent of average deviation	Ratio between largest and smallest district
Alabama	40.2	4.9	41.0	29.4
Arizona	16.0	4.1	62.8	10.8
Arkansas	22.0	3.5	12.5	1.9
California	11.2	3.6	101.6	280.7
Colorado	18.0	4.9	17.6	2.1
Connecticut	111.2	539.6	14.6	4.6
Delaware	71.7	29.9	60.9	11.2
Florida	94.1	36.0	78.3	28.5
Georgia	43.6	35.1	46.4	22.9
Idaho	29.5	15.6	67.3	50.1
Illinois	49.6	5.4	49.6	16.2
Indiana	10.2	2.3	21.9	3.1
Iowa	41.9	9.6	34.3	8.0
Kansas	61.0	51.0	28.7	15.7
Kentucky	23.2	3.4	8.9	1.6
Louisiana	28.6	6.9	22.6	4.6

	House		Senate	
	Percent of average deviation	Ratio between largest and smallest district	Percent of average deviation	Ratio between largest and smallest district
Maine	27.1	7.0	20.8	1.9
Maryland	43.0	4.9	72.2	14.9
Massachusetts	27.8	7.7	7.0	1.4
Michigan	48.4	8.9	50.6	7.3
Minnesota	34.5	8.9	27.3	7.3
Mississippi	37.9	9.5	29.8	4.6
Missouri	37.9	14.7	9.7	1.6
Montana	24.1	9.6	67.0	49.1
Nebraska	10.8	1.5	(1)	(1)
Nevada	24.7	3.0	79.3	26.7
New Hampshire	20.5	137.0	74.6	2.5
New Jersey	11.3	3.2	78.2	28.9
New Mexico	35.6	6.6	44.5	10.7
New York	27.0	9.5	24.0	2.4
North Carolina	39.2	10.7	19.7	2.6
North Dakota	24.9	4.6	22.6	4.2
Ohio	40.2	6.8	3.8	1.4
Oklahoma	18.2	9.5	39.6	7.9
Oregon	28.2	6.6	35.9	8.9
Pennsylvania	14.6	13.8	25.9	4.9
Rhode Island	33.5	23.1	89.6	96.4
South Carolina	8.8	1.9	50.4	13.2
South Dakota	25.4	5.7	19.1	2.9
Tennessee	37.8	14.7	36.2	4.4
Texas	37.9	8.7	34.6	5.5
Utah	26.6	27.9	26.1	2.2
Vermont	91.7	132.6	16.1	4.4
Virginia	20.0	2.8	18.9	3.2
Washington	15.3	2.9	15.9	2.8
West Virginia	18.7	4.9	17.0	2.1
Wisconsin	25.3	4.2	13.2	2.5
Wyoming	14.0	2.3	36.8	6.6

Source: John Douglas, unpublished manuscript.

[1] Unicameral.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have a similar table which ranks each of the houses of the State legislatures on the basis of the ratio between the largest district and the smallest district. This table is current. I ask unanimous consent to have this table printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State legislatures—Ratio between largest and smallest districts [1]

State and chambers: [2]	Ratio between largest and smallest district
Arkansas, S	1.5
Missouri, S	1.7
Illinois, LH	1.7
Massachusetts, S	1.8
Wisconsin, S	1.8
Nebraska, Unicameral	1.9
Kentucky, S	2.0
New York, S	2.3
Virginia, S	2.4
South Carolina, LH	2.4
Oregon, S	2.6
Maine, S	2.6
New Hampshire, S	2.9
Michigan, LH	2.9
Indiana, S	3.1
Wyoming, LH	3.2
South Dakota, S	3.4
Texas, LH	3.5
Colorado, S	3.7
Oregon, LH	3.8
West Virginia, S	3.9
North Carolina, S	3.9
New Jersey, LH	3.9
Wisconsin, LH	3.9
Connecticut, S	4.1
Indiana, LH	4.4
Maine, LH	4.7

State legislatures—Ratio between largest and smallest districts [1]—Continued

State and chambers: [2]	Ratio between largest and smallest district
Tennessee, S	4.8
Utah, S	4.8
Vermont, S	5.0
North Dakota, LH	5.2
Mississippi, S	5.4
Montana, S	5.4
Arkansas, LH	5.5
Pennsylvania, S	5.7
Virginia, LH	5.8
Texas, S	5.9
South Dakota, LH	6.3
Michigan, S	6.5
Iowa, LH	6.5
Washington, S	6.9
Washington, LH	6.9
Maryland, LH	7.3
West Virginia, LH	7.3
North Dakota, S	7.4
Colorado, LH	7.4
Louisiana, S	7.9
Kentucky, LH	8.1
Minnesota, S	9.1
Ohio, LH	9.3
Wyoming, S	9.6
Nevada, LH	9.8
Alabama, LH	9.9
Missouri, LH	10.0
Montana, LH	10.0
Massachusetts, LH	10.0
Oklahoma, LH	10.1
Iowa, S	10.7
Mississippi, LH	11.6
Kansas, S	11.8
New York, LH	11.8
North Carolina, LH	14.1
New Mexico, LH	14.5
Minnesota, LH	14.7
Pennsylvania, LH	15.6
Oklahoma, S	15.8
Idaho, LH	15.9
Delaware, S	16.4
South Carolina, S	17.6
Tennessee, LH	19.0
Rhode Island, LH	20.2
Maryland, S	21.9
Illinois, S	22.5
New Jersey, S	26.3
Ohio, S	26.5
Delaware, LH	27.0
Louisiana, LH	28.3
Georgia, S	29.2
Alabama, S	31.0
Arizona, S	38.9
Kansas, LH	41.7
Utah, LH	46.1
Florida, S	47.5
New Mexico, S	48.3
Georgia, LH	63.3
Florida, LH	75.0
Rhode Island, S	75.2
Idaho, S	77.0
Nevada, S	81.8
New Hampshire, LH	136.2
California, S	296.3
Vermont, LH	676.6
Connecticut, LH	682.3

Figures not available for lower houses in Arizona or California.

Source: Gus Tyler, manuscript in process of publication.

[1] In certain instances, "largest district" figure used in this computation represents average population of districts in most underrepresented country.

[2] S indicates senate; LH indicates lower house.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will merely say that in Connecticut the ratio between the largest and smallest districts is now 682.3 to 1; in Vermont, 676.6 tc 1; in California, 296.3 to 1; in New Hampshire, 136.2 to 1; in Nevada, 81.8 to 1; in Idaho, 77 to 1; in Rhode Island, 75.2 to 1; in Florida, 75 to 1; in Georgia, 63.3 to 1; in New Mexico, 48.3 to 1; in Florida, 47.5 to 1; in Utah, 46.1 to 1; in Kansas, 41.7 to 1; in Louisiana, 29.2 to 1; in Delaware, 27.01 to 1; in Ohio, 26.5 to 1; in New Jersey 26.3 to 1; in Illinois, 22.5 to 1; in Maryland, 21.9 to 1; in Rhode Island, 20.2 to 1; in Tennessee, 19 to 1; in South Carolina, 17.6 to 1. A number of others show extraordinary disproportions.

In the Connecticut house, the ratio is no longer 539.6; the largest district is now 682.3 times as big as the smallest district. And, in Vermont, the ratio for lower house districts has grown from 132 to 676. More important than these extreme examples, however, is the situation in the vast majority of the States, including the ones with the largest urban populations. In California's senate, the largest district has 296 times the population of the smallest. In the New Jersey senate, the ratio is 26.3. In the Pennsylvania lower house, it is 15.6. In the Illinois senate, the largest district is 22.5 times the size of the smallest. In the lower house of the State of New York, the largest district has 11.8 times as many people as the smallest. In only 14 of the 95 separate houses of State legislatures—Nebraska having the unicameral system—does the largest district contain less than 3 times the population of the smallest.

UNDERREPRESENTATION OF THE LARGEST CITIES IN EACH STATE

John Douglas also compared the percentage of the population of the State living in the largest city or cities in each State with the percentage of the city's seats in each house of the State legislature.

I ask unanimous consent that this table also be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Representation of metropolitan centers in American State legislatures (1940)

State and city	City's population percent of State total	City's House seats percent of State total	City's Senate seats percent of State total
Alabama: Birmingham	16.2	6.6	2.9
Arkansas: Little Rock	7.9	7.0	5.7
California: Los Angeles	40.3	40.0	2.5
Colorado: Denver	28.7	23.1	22.9
Connecticut: Hartford	9.7	.7	8.3
Delaware: Wilmington	42.2	14.3	11.8
Florida: Miami	14.0	3.2	2.6
Georgia: Atlanta	12.6	1.5	1.9
Idaho: Boise	9.6	6.8	2.3
Illinois: Chicago	51.5	37.3	37.3
Indiana: Indianapolis	13.4	12.0	10.0
Iowa: Des Moines	7.7	1.9	2.0
Kansas: Wichita	11.3	2.4	2.5
Kentucky: Louisville	13.6	11.0	13.2
Louisiana: New Orleans	21.0	19.0	18.2
Maine: Portland	9.4	4.6	(1)
Maryland: Baltimore	47.2	29.3	20.7
Massachusetts: Boston	17.8	17.0	16.8
Michigan: Detroit	38.3	21.0	15.6
Minnesota:			
Minneapolis	17.6	12.2	11.9
St. Paul	11.1	9.2	9.0
Mississippi: Jackson	4.9	2.1	4.1

Representation of metropolitan centers in American State legislatures (1940)—Con.

State and city	City's population percent of State total	City's House seats percent of State total	City's Senate seats percent of State total
Missouri:			
St. Louis	21.6	12.7	20.6
Kansas City	12.6	6.7	11.8
Montana: Butte	9.5	8.9	1.8
Nebraska: Omaha	18.8	14.2	[2]
Nevada: Reno	29.5	22.0	5.9
New Hampshire: Manchester	15.8	11.7	14.8
New Jersey:			
Newark	20.1	20.0	4.8
Jersey City	15.7	15.0	4.8
New York: New York	55.2	44.7	44.6
North Carolina: Charlotte	4.3	3.3	2.0
North Dakota: Fargo	8.3	8.0	6.1
Ohio:			
Cleveland	17.6	12.7	17.9
Cincinnati	9.0	6.5	8.9
Oklahoma:			
Oklahoma City	10.4	5.9	4.5
Tulsa	8.3	5.9	2.2
Oregon: Portland	32.6	23.1	22.7
Pennsylvania:			
Philadelphia	19.5	19.7	16.0
Pittsburgh	14.3	13.0	12.0
Rhode Island: Providence	35.6	25.0	11.4
South Carolina: Charleston	6.4	6.5	2.2
South Dakota: Sioux Falls	10.2	8.0	5.7
Tennessee:			
Memphis	12.3	7.8	8.9
Nashville	8.8	6.8	6.0
Utah: Salt Lake City	38.4	31.7	30.4
Vermont: Burlington	7.7	.4	1.7
Virginia: Richmond	7.6	7.0	7.5
Washington: Seattle	28.5	24.5	26.0
West Virginia: Charles Town	10.3	8.5	6.3
Wisconsin: Milwaukee	24.1	20.0	21.8
Wyoming: Cheyenne	13.2	10.7	7.4

[1] Indeterminate.
[2] Unicameral.

Source: John Douglas, unpublished manuscript.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is instructive to look at this table. Birmingham, Ala., had 16.2 percent of the State's population, but only 2.9 percent of the seats in the State's senate, and only 6.6 percent of the house seats. Atlanta, Ga., with 12.6 percent of the population, had 1.9 percent and 1.5 percent respectively in the senate and the house.

Georgia is tied up with the county unit system, which binds the cities, and particularly Atlanta, in the selection of Representatives, and also in the selection of a governor and in the nomination of a United States Senator. These county unit provisions, it is true, apply to the primary in Georgia, but in the past the primary has always been equivalent to election, which indicates the subordinate position to which Atlanta, Augusta, Columbus, Savannah, Macon, and other Georgia cities are reduced. Not only has this had a great effect upon the past political history of Georgia, but it will have a great effect in the future.

Wichita, Kans., had 11.3 percent of the population, but 2.5 percent and 2.4 percent of the seats in the two houses of the State legislature. Los Angeles has 40 percent of the population, but only 2.5 percent of the State senators. Denver has 23 percent of the representation in each house of the legislature, but almost 30 percent of the people of Colorado live there; 42 percent of the people of the State of Delaware live in Wilmington, but they are represented by 14 percent of the delegates in one house and by 12 percent of the delegates in the other. Miami, Fla., with 14 percent of the population, has only about 3 percent of the representation in each house.

Almost 8 percent of the people of Iowa live in Des Moines, but in neither house do they have more than 2 percent of the delegates. Baltimore has about one-half the population of Maryland, yet is limited to less than one-third of the members of the lower house, and one-fifth the members of the upper house. Detroit has almost 40 percent of the State's population, but only one-fifth of the members of one house and less than one-sixth of the members of the other.

Newark and Jersey City have more than a third of New Jersey's people, but less than one-tenth of the State senators. St. Louis and Kansas City, Mo., each have about one-half of their just representation in the lower house. The pattern is similar in almost all States. The large cities are greatly underrepresented in their State legislatures—in one house in virtually all States in both houses in many of the States.

URBAN AREAS ARE STILL UNDER-REPRESENTED

I also have two other tables which show similar but current data. The first shows the percent of population and representation of the most populous county in each State. The second was made by Mr. Gordon Baker, and was published in 1955. He makes the same kind of computation with respect to the major urban areas of each State. He groups the States in terms of the degree of urban underrepresentation, ranging from severe underrepresentation to equal representation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, the two tables I have mentioned.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Representation of most populous county in each State

State	County	Largest city in county	Percent of State population in county	County's percent of Senate seats	County's percent of seats in lower house
Rhode Island	Providence	Providence	72.6	47.7	68.0
Delaware	New Castle	Wilmington	68.6	41.2	42.9
New York	5 counties of New York City.[1]		52.7	43.1	43.3
Illinois	Cook	Chicago	51.8	41.4	50.8
Arizona	Maricopa	Phoenix	44.3	7.1	46.2
Utah	Salt Lake	Salt Lake City	41.1	30.4	31.7
Maryland	Baltimore City		40.5	20.7	29.3
California	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	39.2	2.5	38.8
Michigan	Wayne	Detroit	38.2	26.5	34.5
Colorado	Denver	Denver	31.4	22.9	23.1
Nevada	Washoe	Reno	31.4	5.9	6.4
Oregon	Multnomah	Portland	31.0	26.7	28.3
Washington	King	Seattle	30.8	17.4	16.2
New Hampshire	Hillsborough	Manchester	29.4	29.2	28.6
Connecticut	New Haven	New Haven	27.2	27.8	15.7
Wisconsin	Milwaukee	Milwaukee	25.4	21.2	24.0
Massachusetts	Middlesex	Cambridge	22.7	[2] 22.5	22.5
Minnesota	Hennepin	Minneapolis	22.7	13.4	13.7
New Mexico	Bernalillo	Albuquerque	21.4	3.2	13.6
Louisiana	Orleans Parish	New Orleans	21.3	20.5	20.8
Nebraska	Douglas	Omaha	21.2	16.3	[3]
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	19.7	16.0	18.6
New Jersey	Essex	Newark	18.7	4.8	20.0
Maine	Cumberland	Portland	18.5	12.1	15.9
Alabama	Jefferson	Birmingham	18.3	2.9	6.6
Florida	Dade	Miami	17.9	2.6	3.4
Ohio	Cuyahoga	Cleveland	17.5	18.2	12.2
Vermont	Chittenden	Burlington	16.6	13.3	6.6
Kentucky	Jefferson	Louisville	16.5	13.2	11.0
Wyoming	Laramie	Cheyenne	16.4	7.4	10.7
Tennessee	Shelby	Memphis	14.7	[2] 9.1	8.1
Oklahoma	Oklahoma	Oklahoma City	14.6	[2] 2.3	5.8
Indiana	Marion	Indianapolis	14.0	[2] 10.0	[2] 12.0
Georgia	Fulton	Atlanta	13.7	1.9	1.5
Idaho	Ada	Boise	12.0	1.7	6.8
West Virginia	Kanawha	Charleston	11.9	6.3	11.0
Kansas	Sedgwick	Wichita	11.7	2.5	2.4
South Dakota	Minnehaha	Sioux Falls	10.9	5.7	10.7
Texas	Harris	Houston	10.5	3.1	5.3
Missouri	St. Louis City		10.3	20.6	11.5
Arkansas	Pulaski	Little Rock	10.3	8.6	8.0
North Dakota	Cass	Fargo	9.5	8.0	6.1
Montana	Yellowstone	Billings	9.5	1.8	8.5
Iowa	Polk	Des Moines	8.6	2.0	2.0
South Carolina	Greenville	Greenville	7.9	2.2	8.1
Virginia	Richmond City		6.9	7.5	7.0
Mississippi	Hinds	Jackson	6.5		
North Carolina	Mecklenburg	Charlotte	4.9	2.0	3.3

[1] Figure includes Bronx, Kings, New York, Queens, and Richmond Counties. Largest single county is Kings, which has 18.5 percent of State population, 15.5 percent of seats in senate, 14.7 percent of seats in lower house.
[2] These counties share some or all of their representation with other counties. The figures indicate percentage of the seats held by persons representing any portion of the county, though the districts may extend into other counties.
[3] Unicameral.

NOTE.—Figures not obtainable for Mississippi.

Source: Gus Tyler, manuscript in process of publication.

Representation of principal urban areas

States	Selected urban areas	Percent of State population	Percent of lower house	Percent of senate
GROUP I, SEVERE				
Georgia	6 largest urban counties	32	9	7
Florida	9 most urban counties	60	23	24
Delaware	Wilmington urbanized area	59	23	24
Maryland	Baltimore and 3 largest urban counties.	67	44	31
Connecticut	10 largest cities	46	7	[1] 46
Rhode Island	do	77	67	34
New Jersey	8 largest urban counties	75	73	38
California	4 largest urban counties	59	59	10
GROUP II				
New York	New York City	53	43	43
Kansas	3 largest urban counties	26	7	8
Alabama	do	30	13	9
Iowa	5 largest urban counties	24	10	10
Oklahoma	2 largest urban counties	26	12	6
Texas	4 largest urban counties	29	19	13
Minnesota	2 largest urban counties	35	23	22
New Mexico	Largest urban county	21	11	3
Tennessee	4 largest urban counties	38	22	20
Arizona	2 largest urban counties	62	62	7
Nevada	do	62	40	12
Michigan	Wayne County	38	35	21
Missouri	St. Louis and 2 largest urban counties.	45	25	41
Illinois	Chicago	42	39	31
Ohio	8 largest urban counties	54	39	54
South Carolina	3 largest urban counties	22	22	7
Vermont	Entire urban population	36	6	[1] 36
Idaho	4 largest urban counties	28	19	9
North Dakota	4 largest cities	17	12	10
GROUP II—cont.				
Montana	5 largest urban counties	37	32	9
North Carolina	4 largest counties	22	16	[1] 16
Mississippi	2 largest urban counties	10	4	4
GROUP III				
Utah	3 largest urban counties	64	48	48
Indiana	6 largest urban counties	46	32	34
Washington	3 largest urban counties	52	44	48
Colorado	Denver City	31	26	23
Oregon	Largest urban county	31	27	23
Nebraska	2 largest urban counties	30	.....	23
Kentucky	3 largest urban counties	23	17	18
Louisiana	3 largest urban parishes	34	26	26
Maine	8 largest cities	27	19	[1] 27
GROUP IV, MODERATE				
Pennsylvania	2 largest urban counties	34	32	28
Virginia	8 largest cities and 4 largest urban counties.	34	28	33
West Virginia	3 largest urban counties	21	19	12
Wyoming	5 most urban counties	48	41	33
South Dakota	6 largest urban counties	30	28	23
Arkansas	3 largest urban counties	16	12	14
New Hampshire	3 largest cities	27	25	29
GROUP V, EQUAL REPRESENTATION				
Wisconsin	3 largest urban counties	33	32	33
Massachusetts	All cities over 50,000 population	50	50	[1] 50

[1] Approximate.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded to nearest percentage.

Source: Gordon E. Baker, Rural Versus Urban Political Power (New York: Doubleday, 1955), pp. 16-17.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, all these figures show the same pattern. The cities of the United States do not have their just and fair representation in the State legislatures. In only two States, Wisconsin and Massachusetts, do the largest cities have equal representation. On the other hand, New York, Philadelphia, New Haven, Providence, Minneapolis, Newark, Chicago, Los Angeles, Atlanta, Salt Lake City, Birmingham and many others of our great centers of population are underrepresented in one or both houses of their State legislatures.

WHAT UNDERREPRESENTATION MEANS

For example, the eight largest urban counties in New Jersey have 75 percent of the population in the State, but only 38 percent of the representation in the senate. In California, the four largest urban counties have 59 percent of the population, but only 10 percent of the senate's representation. New York City has 53 percent of the people of the State, but is represented by only 43 percent of the delegates in each house. Wayne County—Detroit—has 38 percent of Michigan's population, but only 21 perment of the State Senators. Chicago is inhabited by 42 percent of the people who live in Illinois but is only permitted to send 31 percent of the delegates to the State senate. And so on.

What do these statistics mean in terms of the people who live in the areas which are grossly underrepresented or overrepresented? They mean that Los Angeles County, with a 1950 population of 4,151,687, has 1 senator in the State legislature, and that Inyo and Mono counties, with a combined population of 13,773, also have 1 senator.

Fulton County, Ga., which includes Atlanta, has about one-eighth of the population of Georgia and pays about one-fourth of the State's taxes, but is only permitted 3 representatives of the 205 in the lower house of the State legislature.

Or take Hartford, Conn., in which 177,000 people choose to live. It has two representatives in the lower house of the State legislature—but so does the town of Colebrook—which a mere 600 people have chosen as their home.

Bridgeport has only two. New Haven has only two. Danbury has only two. The big Connecticut cities are each limited to two. However, communities with 600 to 700, 800, or 1,000 population also have two.

Let us consider Oklahoma City, with a population of about 244,000. It has 7 representatives as compared with 11 for 11 rural counties with a total population of 83,000.

In Alabama, Lowndes County with a population of 18,000—of whom only a few hundred white persons usually vote—has equal representation in the upper house with Birmingham which has a population of over one-half million persons.

THE COUNTY UNIT SYSTEM IN PRIMARIES

Not only are the cities underrepresented in their legislatures, but in some States they are further discriminated against in the process of nominating candidates. In particular, Maryland and Georgia both use the county-unit system in primary elections so that even a few of the rural counties are able to outvote the urban centers which contain the bulk of the population of those States. This is the Mundt-Coudert formula at the State level. It completely freezes the cities out of their State governments.

CHANGES IN THE LAST 20 YEARS

There have been only two significant changes in the last 20 years with respect to the pattern of urban representation in the State legislatures. First, the urban population has continued to grow relative to the nonurban population, increasing the imbalance. Second, there has been a reapportionment in a number of States, but in almost every State in which reapportionment has been undertaken it has been done on the basis of reapportioning one house to achieve better balance, but at the price of freezing the discriminatory pattern in the other house. In other words the cities, in order to achieve justice in representation in one house of the legislature, have been forced to agree to permanent inequality in the other house. And so the pattern of urban underrepresentation is perpetuated.

RESULTS OF UNDERREPRESENTATION

One of the results of this pattern is that these legislatures perpetuate the pattern in the apportionment of Representatives to the House of Representatives of the United States Congress. I shall discuss this problem in detail later.

Another result is to send the cities to Washington for solutions to their problems. They run up against a stone wall in their State legislatures where they are unable to get an understanding hearing for their needs. They lack home rule. The rural-dominated State legislatures will not give them home rule. Lacking home rule, the cities are unable to get an understanding hearing for their needs. Lacking home rule, the cities must go to the State legislatures with transit problems; with all tax matters; for permission to undertake urban renewal; with housing problems; with health, welfare, and relief measures; in short the cities

must go to State legislatures for a solution to almost every problem of city government. Without permission from the State legislature, the mayor of a city frequently can make few decisions more important than when shall he go out for lunch. And the State legislatures generally turn a deaf ear to the requests of the cities. Consequently they are driven to the Federal Government where their representation, although less than fair, is more equitable than in the States, or where, sometimes, they find a friend in the President of the United States. A considerable expansion in the services of the Federal Government has resulted from the failures of the State legislatures to meet the needs of the urban populations of their States.

It is very interesting that those who complain most about Federal encroachment in the affairs of the States are most often the very ones who deny to the urban majorities in their States the opportunity to solve their problems through State action. Until the State legislatures have been reformed, the plea for Federal action will remain strong and just.

In presidential elections, the voice of the cities is heard. I repeat, it is heard to the degree that cities have populations, and therefore voters. It is the only place in the American electoral system where it is heard to the extent that it deserves to be. The proponents of this amendment would take away even this representation for them by diminishing their role in even the presidential elections.

REPUBLICANS HAVE THE ADVANTAGE IN STATE LEGISLATURES

A third result of urban underrepresentation is that the State legislatures are more Republican in character than the popular vote in those States would justify. This is fundamentally because the cities are underrepresented and the nonurban areas are overrepresented; and inasmuch as the Democratic strength is greater in the cities than it is in the nonurban areas and the Republican strength is greater in the country than in the cities, it follows that there is produced a lack of balance between the parties, and operates in favor of the Republicans.

In 1953 there were 29 Republican governors, and 19 Democratic governors, a high point for the Republican Party. The legislatures were divided about the same: 28 houses with Republican majorities and 28 Republican senates; 18 houses with Democratic majorities and 18 Democratic senates. There were two nonpartisan legislatures.

In 1954 the Democrats won 8 gubernatorial races, changing the balance in their favor to 27 governors for the Democrats, 21 for the Republicans. But the State legislatures are rigged so that the Democrats, in spite of winning 8 statewide races, were able only to pick up a majority in 6 houses, and were able only to gain majorities in 2 State senates. Further, the more Democratic governors elected the greater would be the disparity between the party of the governor and the party of the legislatures. Furthermore, the composite figures do not indicate the important States like New York and Illinois in which one house of the State legislature has been given what is virtually a permanent Republican majority which has been made unshakable—not by the affection of the voters for the Republican Party, but by apportioning the representation so that Democratic areas cannot achieve a majority no matter how great a majority they may achieve in statewide elections.

In New Jersey, for example, the governorship changes hands more or less regularly, but the State senate goes on the same—it is always Republican. Connecticut, another State where there is a two-party system with respect to the governor, has not had a lower house controlled by the Democrats since 1876.

Much the same is true in Rhode Island.

In 21 of the 35 years since 1920 there has been a Democratic governor in the State house in Albany, N. Y. But the Democrats have had a majority in the senate only 7 of those years, and had a majority in the assembly in only one of those years. The senate has been redistricted to try and prevent a repetition of even this meager representation.

Illinois has had a Democratic governor for 12 of the 35 years since 1920. But there has been a Democratic house for only 8 of those years, and there has been a Democratic senate for only 8 years of that period.

These are only examples. In Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and many other States the same situation prevails.

In Michigan the people have elected a Democratic governor each biennial election since 1948, but never has there been Democratic control of the legislature.

REASONS FOR URBAN UNDERREPRESENTATION

The underrepresentation of urban areas in State legislatures has been the result of several factors. One has been the rapid growth of the cities relative to the rural areas of the country. This growth has been so rapid that it has outstripped the normally slow-moving processes of government. But that alone is not enough to explain the failure of State governments to make a greater effort to adjust the pattern of representation in the direction of greater equality. Another very important reason for the failure of the States has been the understandable, but none-the-less unjustifiable, reluctance of rural areas and the representatives to surrender any of the power which remained in their hands. Furthermore, and this is very significant, their reluctance was reinforced by financial and corporate interests of the big cities which found the State governments easier to control for their purposes if the State legislatures were stacked against the cities, and against social reform measures.

URBAN UNDERREPRESENTATION SHOULD NOT BE EXTENDED TO THE PRESIDENCY

I think I have shown that the rural areas and the economic interests which support and control them have a stranglehold on most of the State legislatures. We must not extend that stranglehold to the election of the President of the United States.

Furthermore, adoption of this amendment would offer greater inducement to the States to increase the degree of urban underrepresentation. We cannot invite the State legislatures, in this vital matter of how we elect our Presidents, to gerrymander the congressional districts even more than they now are, to aid the regime in power in the statehouse to distort the people's will in electing a President. The present method achieves a very rough measure of justice, although it too is weighted in favor of the States with smaller populations, weighted in favor of the South. Let us not tamper with the system without careful consideration and a conclusive showing that there will be a genuine improvement.

II–3. URBAN UNDERREPRESENTATION IN THE NATIONAL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Although the national House of Representatives was intended by the framers of the Constitution to be the House in which the people received approximately equal representation, the unrepresentative State legislatures have frustrated this objective to a considerable extent. Since Congress has abdicated its constitutional authority to regulate the manner of electing the House of Representatives, and permitted the States to apportion their congressional seats in any way they see fit, it is not surprising that there has been a tendency to reproduce the unrepresentative character of State legislatures at the national level. Congressional districts are drawn so as to benefit the party in power in the State legislature. The result is that the urban areas of the country are underrepresented in the House of Representatives, although the injustice is not so great as in many of the State legislatures.

GREAT VARIATIONS IN THE SIZE OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

An average seat in the House should represent about 350,000 persons. Allowing for a margin of 15 percent to take care of geographic, county, and other reasonable factors, each congressional district should contain between 300,000 and 400,000 people.

In the present House only 256 Members come from districts having populations between those figures, while 177 Congressmen represent districts which are either over or underrepresented. The population ranges and number of districts in that range follow:

Population in thousands (1950):	*Number of districts*
150–200	4
200–250	26
250–300	63
300–350	147
350–400	109
400–450	52
450–500	14
500–550	8
550–600	2
600–650 (2 North Dakota, at-large)	4
650–700 (2 New Mexico, at-large)	2
800–850	1
2,000–2,500 (1 Connecticut, at-large; 1 Washington, at-large)	2
7,700–8,000 (Texas, at-large)	1

Of the 27 districts, not including Congressmen at large, with populations of

over 450,000, all but 1 are urban districts, and almost all of the 52 districts with populations between 400,000 and 500,000 are urban districts. In other words, almost all districts which are over the reasonable range of from 300,000 to 400,000 population are urban districts. The 13 largest districts take in the following cities: Houston, Dallas, and San Antonio, Tex.; Atlanta, Ga.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Birmingham, Ala.; Columbus and Dayton, Ohio; Detroit, Mich.; Miami, Fla.; Hartford, Conn.; the Bridgeport area in Connecticut; and Seattle, Wash.

VARIATION IN EACH STATE

Mr. President, I have a table showing the percentage variation from the average population for the State of each congressional district in the country. Also included are comparisons between the average population of urban congressional districts and the average population of nonurban districts. I ask unanimous consent to have this table printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Percentage variation of population of congressional districts (1955)

This table indicates the percentage variation in the population of each congressional district in each State, from the State average. A minus before the number indicates that the district has fewer people than the average-sized district in the State. Other numbers indicate districts having more people than the average district.

The number in parentheses following the name of the State indicates the average-size of a district. This number is obtained by dividing the number of Congressmen, excluding those elected at-large, into the total population of the State.

Below each State is indicated the average size of urban congressional districts—defined here as those wholly or partially within cities having populations of 100,000 or more. Also indicated is the average size of all other districts—that is, of those not classified as urban. An asterisk (*) next to the number of the district indicates an "urban" district.

The letters "D", "R", and "C", indicate, in that order, congressional districts which elected Democrats in 1952 and 1954, those which elected Republicans in 1952 and 1954, and those which elected a Congressman of one party in 1952 and of the other party in 1954.

Alabama (340,194)		
District 1*	9.1	D
District 2*	8.9	D
District 3	−10.8	D
District 4	−11.3	D
District 5	−8.7	D
District 6	−26.3	D
District 7	−19.7	D
District 8	−5.5	D
District 9*	64.3	D
Urban average: 433,479.		
Others: 293,551.		
Arizona (374,794)		
District 1*	−11.5	R
District 2	11.5	D
Urban average: 331,770.		
Others: 417,817.		
Arkansas (318,252)		
District 1	28.0	D
District 2	−29.5	D
District 3	1.8	D
District 4	5.9	D
District 5*	−10.9	D
District 6	4.6	D
Urban average: 283,437.		
Others: 325,215.		
California (352,874)		
District 1	3.5	R
District 2	−6.7	D
District 3*	12.1	D
District 4*	2.8	R
District 5*	16.9	D
District 6	14.4	C
District 7*	−7.4	R
District 8*	17.2	D
District 9	−33.2	R
District 10	5.3	R
District 11	−7.1	R
District 12	8.6	C
District 13	11.9	R
District 14	20.3	D
District 15*	2.1	R
District 16*	−36.6	R
District 17*	22.2	D
District 18*	−18.8	R
District 19*	28.6	D
California—Continued		
District 20*	−35.8	R
District 21*	10.8	R
District 22*	−37.9	R
District 23*	19.5	D
District 24*	−18.6	R
District 25	4.8	R
District 26*	36.3	D
District 27	−20.2	D
District 28	−1.7	R
District 29	−34.0	R
District 30*	20.8	R
Urban average: 359,955.		
Others: 343,614.		
Colorado (331,272)		
District 1*	25.5	D
District 2	21.1	R
District 3	1.1	R
District 4	−47.7	D
Urban average: 415,789.		
Others: 303,100.		
Connecticut (401,456)		
District 1*	34.4	D
District 2	−20.6	R
District 3*	−7.7	R
District 4*	25.6	R
District 5*	−31.7	R
Urban average: 422,165.		
Others: 318,621.		
Delaware (no districts)		
Florida (346,413)		
District 1*	26.0	C
District 2*	−8.1	D
District 3	16.9	D
District 4*	51.6	D
District 5	7.2	D
District 6	−17.9	D
District 7	−36.4	D
District 8	−39.3	D
Urban average: 426,586.		
Others: 298,309.		
Georgia (344,458)		
District 1*	1.6	D
District 2	−17.1	D
District 3	11.2	D
District 4	−13.4	D
District 5*	79.5	D
District 6	−10.6	D
District 7	6.7	D
District 8	−22.5	D
District 9	−28.5	D
District 10	−7.0	D
Urban average: 484,241.		
Others: 309,512		
Idaho (294,319)		
District 1	−17.1	D
District 2	17.1	R
No urban districts.		
Illinois (348,485)		
District 1*	−7.2	D
District 2*	1.8	D
District 3*	.2	C
District 4*	26.8	R
District 5*	−4.7	D
District 6*	−3.4	D
District 7*	14.3	D
District 8*	−12.1	D
District 9*	−2.8	D
District 10*	6.7	R
District 11*	−9.6	R
District 12*	1.6	C
District 13	33.7	R
District 14	2.1	R
District 15	−7.0	R
District 16	1.5	R
District 17	−1.1	R
District 18*	−9.7	R
District 19	−6.5	R
District 20	−19.2	R
District 21	−.9	D
District 22	−3.4	R
District 23	−8.6	R
District 24	11.4	D
District 25	−3.8	C
Urban average: 348,965.		
Others: 347,966.		
Indiana (357,657)		
District 1*	2.9	D
District 2	−14.9	R
District 3*	10.7	R
District 4*	−8.3	R
District 5	9.5	R
District 6	−17.2	R
District 7	−16.5	R
District 8*	10.0	C
District 9	−27.7	R
District 10	−2.8	R
District 11*	54.3	R
Urban average: 407,467.		
Others: 316,148.		
Iowa (327,634)		
District 1	13.7	R
District 2	26.5	R
District 3	12.1	R
District 4	−22.8	R
District 5*	7.1	R
District 6	−8.3	R
District 7	−18.7	R
District 8	−9.5	R
Urban average: 350,784.		
Others: 324,327.		
Kansas (317,550)		
District 1	.6	C
District 2*	13.2	R
District 3	−28.4	R
District 4*	41.2	R
District 5	−2.0	R
District 6	−24.6	R
Urban average: 403,954.		
Others: 274,348.		
Kentucky (368,101)		
District 1	−17.1	D
District 2	−10.9	D
District 3*	31.7	R
District 4	−11.1	D
District 5	1.1	D
District 6	−1.3	D
District 7	−5.6	D
District 8	13.3	R
Urban average: 484,615.		
Others: 351,456.		
Louisiana (335,440)		
District 1*	4.4	D
District 2*	17.1	D
District 3	−10.6	D
District 4*	−.7	D
District 5	−3.4	D
District 6*	24.6	D
District 7	−5.8	D
District 8	−25.5	D
Urban average: 373,542.		
Others: 297,337.		
Maine (304,591)		
District 1	7.6	R
District 2	−2.9	R
District 3	−4.7	R
No urban districts.		
Maryland (334,914)		
District 1	−37.1	R
District 2	9.6	R
District 3*	−10.8	D
District 4*	−6.5	D
District 5*	27.4	C
District 6	24.4	R
District 7*	−7.1	D
Urban average: 337,257.		
Others: 331,325.		
Massachusetts (335,037)		
District 1	−10.6	R
District 2*	2.4	D
District 3	−5.0	D
District 4*	5.2	D
District 5	9.2	R
District 6	−10.0	R
District 7	−16.0	D
District 8*	−1.8	C
District 9*	2.9	R
District 10*	16.7	R
District 11*	−.1	D
District 12*	−.7	D
District 13*	5.9	R
District 14*	1.7	R
Urban average: 346,966.		
Others: 313,565.		
Michigan (353,987)		
District 1*	7.5	D
District 2	8.1	R
District 3	−1.2	R
District 4	−17.6	R
District 5*	2.3	R
District 6*	33.0	C
District 7	17.1	R
District 8	−5.9	R
District 9	−22.3	R
District 10	−28.0	R
District 11	−35.6	R
District 12	−49.6	R
District 13*	−2.4	D
District 14*	31.8	D
District 15*	8.5	D
District 16*	48.4	D
District 17*	−5.8	C
District 18	11.9	R
Urban average: 408,488.		
Others: 310,386.		
Minnesota (331,387)		
District 1	1.9	R
District 2	−3.0	R
District 3*	30.9	D
District 4*	7.2	D
District 5*	1.9	R
District 6	−1.5	D
District 7	−7.8	R
District 8*	−12.0	D
District 9	−17.6	C
Urban average: 354,596.		
Others: 312,820.		
Mississippi (363,152)		
District 1	.6	D
District 2	−22.6	D
District 3	13.6	D
District 4	17.4	D
District 5	−14.3	D
District 6	5.3	D
No urban districts.		
Missouri (359,514)		
District 1*	19.0	D
District 2*	13.8	R
District 3*	18.5	D
District 4*	−10.0	C
District 5*	−1.1	D
District 6	−6.5	C

Percentage variation of population of congressional districts (1955)—Continued

Missouri—Continued

District 7	11.9	R
District 8	−23.1	D
District 9	−1.6	D
District 10	−7.5	D
District 11	−13.6	D

Urban average: 388,487.
Others: 335,370.

Montana (295,512)

District 1	−14.8	D
District 2	14.8	R

No urban districts.

Nebraska (331,378)

District 1	11.6	R
District 2*	3.1	R
District 3	−10.0	R
District 4	−4.7	R

Urban average: 341,641.
Others: 327,956.

Nevada (no districts)

New Hampshire (266,621)

District 1	3.9	R
District 2	−3.9	R

No urban districts.

New Jersey (345,381)

District 1*	28.0	R
District 2	−25.3	R
District 3	13.0	R
District 4*	5.9	D
District 5	21.6	R
District 6*	15.3	C
District 7	7.5	R
District 8*	−4.0	R
District 9	1.9	R
District 10*	−9.6	D
District 11*	−10.0	D
District 12*	−2.0	R
District 13*	−21.9	D
District 14*	−20.4	D

Urban average: 338,195.
Others: 358,314.

New Mexico (no districts)

New York (344,888)

District 1	−8.9	R
District 2	−8.0	R
District 3	−8.0	R
District 4*	2.9	R
District 5*	8.1	R
District 6	11.9	D
District 7*	11.2	D
District 8*	11.0	D
District 9*	10.5	D
District 10*	12.6	D
District 11*	10.6	D
District 12*	−7.9	R
District 13*	6.5	D
District 14*	11.2	D
District 15*	10.6	R
District 16*	−2.4	D
District 17*	−8.3	R
District 18*	−7.9	D
District 19*	−2.5	D
District 20*	−2.5	D
District 21*	−8.0	C
District 22*	5.2	D
District 23*	5.2	D
District 24*	5.2	D
District 25*	5.2	R
District 26	−7.1	R
District 27*	−5.5	R
District 28	−5.3	R
District 29	−6.0	R
District 30*	−12.4	D
District 31	−7.3	R
District 32	−4.6	R
District 33	−4.6	R
District 34*	−4.2	R
District 35*	−.9	R
District 36	−5.3	R
District 37	14.0	R
District 38*	−.6	R
District 39*	−9.4	R
District 40*	5.8	R
District 41*	5.8	R
District 42*	4.2	R
District 43	−13.8	R

Urban average: 352,791.
Others: 324,471.

North Carolina (338,495)

District 1	−26.8	D
District 2	−9.3	D
District 3	−8.9	D
District 4	18.7	D
District 5	4.9	D
District 6	17.7	D
District 7	16.5	D
District 8	9.1	D
District 9	.1	D
District 10*	6.4	R
District 11	−12.6	D
District 12	−15.9	D

Urban average: 360,318.
Others: 336,510.

Percentage variation of population of congressional districts (1955)—Continued

North Dakota (no districts)

Ohio (345,506)

District 1*	3.3	R
District 2*	6.3	R
District 3*	57.9	R
District 4	−11.5	R
District 5	−25.8	R
District 6	−8.3	D
District 7	−2.8	R
District 8	−27.2	R
District 9*	14.5	D [1]
District 10	−26.7	R
District 11	−.1	R
District 12*	45.7	R
District 13	−17.2	R
District 14	30.4	R
District 15	−34.5	C
District 16*	19.3	R
District 17	−10.1	R
District 18	−7.0	D
District 19*	−8.4	D
District 20*	19.7	D
District 21*	24.6	D
District 22*	−11.6	R
District 23	−30.5	R

Urban average: 371,360.
Others: 321,809.

Oklahoma (372,225)

District 1*	18.1	R
District 2	6.1	D
District 3	−28.2	D
District 4	−20.9	D
District 5*	17.3	D
District 6	7.7	D

Urban average: 438,069.
Others: 341,553.

Oregon (380,335)

District 1	14.2	R
District 2	−35.0	R
District 3*	24.0	C
District 4	−3.2	R

Urban average: 471,537.
Others: 349,935.

Pennsylvania (349,934)

District 1*	−11.4	D
District 2*	7.7	D
District 3*	−2.2	D
District 4*	−2.8	D
District 5*	6.4	D
District 6*	−5.7	R
District 7	18.4	R
District 8*	−2.0	R
District 9	12.6	R
District 10*	None	R
District 11	12.1	C
District 12	−9.2	R
District 13	.9	R
District 14*	−26.9	D
District 15	−21.0	D
District 16	−8.7	R
District 17	−9.0	R
District 18	−3.0	R
District 19	−2.4	C
District 20	−16.7	R
District 21	−10.5	D
District 22	5.0	R
District 23	−16.7	R
District 24*	17.2	R
District 25	7.9	C
District 26	27.1	D
District 27*	7.8	R
District 28*	6.0	D
District 29*	7.5	R
District 30*	11.7	D

Urban average: 353,249.
Others: 347,033.

Rhode Island (395,948)

District 1*	−5.2	D
District 2*	5.2	D

Urban districts only.

South Carolina (352,838)

District 1	−2.0	D
District 2	17.9	D
District 3	−12.8	D
District 4	12.5	D
District 5	−24.5	D
District 6	8.9	D

No urban districts.

South Dakota (326,370)

District 1	53.1	R
District 2	−53.1	R

No urban districts.

Tennessee (365,746)

District 1	18.7	R
District 2*	28.0	R
District 3*	4.1	D
District 4	6.7	D
District 5*	−12.0	D
District 6	−12.9	D
District 7	−32.2	D
District 8	−32.2	D
District 9*	31.9	D

Urban average: 413,215.
Others: 327,772.

[1] Independent in 1952.

Percentage variation of population of congressional districts (1955)—Continued

Texas (367,200)

District 1	−24.6	D
District 2	9.2	D
District 3	−26.2	D
District 4	−38.0	D
District 5*	67.4	C
District 6	−37.9	D
District 7	−32.4	D
District 8*	119.7	D
District 9	10.7	D
District 10*	−14.4	D
District 11	−23.1	D
District 12*	14.9	D
District 13	−20.5	D
District 14*	24.5	D
District 15	24.0	D
District 16*	−4.2	D
District 17	−38.3	D
District 18	−21.2	D
District 19	.6	D
District 20*	36.3	D
District 21	−26.8	D

Urban average: 495,347.
Others: 303,126.

Utah (344,431)

District 1	−16.8	R
District 2*	16.8	R

Urban average: 402,310.
Others: 286,552.

Vermont (no districts)

Virginia (331,868)

District 1	−7.4	D
District 2*	21.7	D
District 3*	.7	D
District 4	2.0	D
District 5	−4.6	D
District 6	1.8	R
District 7	−12.7	D
District 8	−10.5	D
District 9	17.6	C
District 10	−8.6	R

Urban average: 369,025.
Others: 322,579.

Washington (396,494)

District 1*	33.1	R
District 2	−5.6	R
District 3	−19.0	R
District 4	−9.9	R
District 5*	−13.8	R
District 6*	15.2	R

Urban average: 442,097.
Others: 350,891.

West Virginia (334,259)

District 1	−16.2	D
District 2	−9.6	D
District 3	−5.6	D
District 4	−1.0	C
District 5	−1.1	D
District 6	33.6	D

No urban districts.

Wisconsin (343,458)

District 1	None	R
District 2	13.5	R
District 3	−12.6	R
District 4*	27.5	D
District 5*	26.1	C
District 6	−8.1	R
District 7	−11.7	R
District 8	5.0	R
District 9	−12.4	C
District 10	−27.3	R

Urban average 435,524.
Others: 320,421.

Wyoming (no districts)

Source: Gus Tyler, Manuscript in process of publication.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I now come to a discussion of congressional districts in typical States.

Only three states, Arizona, Arkansas, and New Jersey, have urban districts which have average populations which are smaller for the urban districts than for nonurban districts. All other States have urban districts which are larger than nonurban districts or, in a few cases, have no urban districts. Many of the disparities are very substantial. For example, the average population of urban districts in Alabama is 433,479, but the average for other districts is 293,551. In Florida, urban districts average 426,586 as compared with 298,309 for the nonurban districts. Indiana has an average of 407,467 for urban districts, and only

316,148 for nonurban districts. Michigan averages 408,488 people in its urban districts, but only 310,386 in the others. For Wisconsin the figures are 435,524 for urban, and 320,421 for nonurban districts.

TEXAS IS WORST STATE

The State which discriminates against its cities the most flagrantly is Texas. Its at-large Congressman has the largest constituency in the country. But let us look at some of its other districts. The Fifth Congressional District, Dallas, has a population of 614,799. The 20th, San Antonio, has a population of 500,460. And the Eighth District, Houston, has a population of 806,701 which makes it the most populous congressional district in the Nation. All 3 districts are among the 12 largest districts in the country. On the other hand, Texas has 10 of its 21 districts with populations of under 300,000 and 4 districts with populations of under 250,000. Its average urban district has a population of 495,347; its average nonurban district contains only 303,126 people. It seeems to me that the people of Texas would gain more from a redistricting of its congressional districts than from a constitutional amendment which gives even greater political weight to those small nonurban districts.

GREAT DISPARITY BETWEEN THE LARGEST AND SMALLEST DISTRICT IN EACH STATE

Mr. President, I have another table which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD. It shows the population of the smallest and the largest congressional district in each State for the years 1897, 1928, 1946, and 1954.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Disparities in apportionment, showing districts in each State having largest and smallest populations

State	1954		1946		1928		1897	
	District	Population	District	Population	District	Population	District	Population
Alabama	9th	558,928	9th	459,930	9th	310,054	2d	188,214
	6th	250,726	6th	251,757	6th	170,188	7th	130,451
Arizona	2d	417,817	[1]		[2]		[2]	
	1st	331,770						
Arkansas	1st	407,480	1st	423,152	1st	330,292	1st	220,261
	2d	224,278	3d	177,476	3d	180,348	4th	147,806
California	26th	480,827	3d	409,404	10th	516,283	5th	228,717
	22d	219,018	21st	194,199	2d	129,357	4th	147,642
Colorado	1st	415,786	1st	322,412	3d	281,170	2d	207,539
	4th	173,298	4th	172,847	4th	140,532	1st	204,659
Connecticut	1st	539,661	1st	450,189	1st	336,027	2d	248,582
	5th	274,300	5th	247,601	5th	224,426	3d	121,792
Delaware	[2]		[2]		[2]		[2]	
Florida	4th	525,041	1st	439,895	4th	315,292	2d	202,792
	8th	210,428	6th	186,831	2d	187,474	1st	188,630
Georgia	5th	618,431	5th	487,552	5th	308,364	2d	180,300
	9th	246,227	9th	235,420	3d	205,343	11th	155,948
Idaho	2d	344,660	2d	300,357	2d	253,542	[3]	
	1st	243,977	1st	224,516	1st	178,324		
Illinois	13th	466,064	7th	914,053	7th	560,434	13th	184,027
	8th	305,202	5th	112,116	5th	158,092	22d	159,186
Indiana	11th	551,777	11th	460,926	7th	348,061	7th	191,472
	9th	258,441	9th	241,323	4th	179,737	6th	139,359
Iowa	2d	414,421	2d	392,052	11th	295,449	11th	203,470
	4th	252,926	4th	268,900	1st	156,594	1st	153,712
Kansas	4th	448,435	4th	382,546	3d	280,045	7th	278,208
	6th	239,541	3d	249,574	4th	152,378	1st	167,314
Kentucky	3d	484,615	9th	413,690	11th	289,766	4th	192,055
	1st	304,978	5th	225,426	8th	168,067	7th	141,461
Louisiana	6th	417,898	6th	333,295	6th	255,372	3d	214,785
	8th	249,776	8th	240,166	7th	204,909	2d	152,025
Maine	1st	327,874	1st	290,335	1st	195,072	4th	183,070
	3d	290,146	2d	276,695	2d	188,563	1st	153,778
Maryland	5th	426,371	2d	534,568	2d	311,413	2d	208,165
	1st	210,623	1st	195,427	1st	194,568	5th	153,912
Massachusetts	10th	390,896	10th	346,623	8th	259,954	5th	174,866
	7th	281,589	1st	278,459	15th	217,307	6th	169,418
Michigan	16th	525,334	17th	419,007	6th	533,748	2d	191,841
	12th	178,251	12th	200,265	10th	198,679	9th	148,626
Minnesota	3d	433,942	6th	334,781	5th	275,645	2d	188,480
	9th	237,125	9th	283,845	9th	112,235	6th	184,848
Mississippi	4th	426,396	7th	470,781	3d	349,662	5th	224,618
	2d	281,207	4th	201,316	8th	177,185	1st	143,315
Missouri	1st	427,856	12th	503,738	10th	521,587	14th	230,478
	8th	276,499	9th	214,787	8th	138,807	9th	152,442
Montana	2d	339,247	2d	323,597	2d	333,476	[2]	
	1st	251,777	1st	235,859	1st	215,413		
Nebraska	1st	369,970	1st	369,190	6th	288,090	4th	195,434
	3d	298,104	2d	305,961	1st	173,458	3d	163,674
Nevada	[3]		[3]		[3]		[3]	
New Hampshire	1st	276,954	2d	247,033	1st	224,842	1st	190,532
	2d	256,297	1st	244,491	2d	218,241	2d	185,998
New Jersey	1st	441,978	1st	370,220	8th	290,610	7th	256,093
	2d	258,127	2d	226,169	11th	228,615	8th	125,793
New Mexico	[1]		[1]		[1]		[2]	
New York	37th	393,130	25th	365,918	23d	391,620	14th	227,978
	43d	297,131	45th	235,913	12th	151,605	7th	114,766
North Carolina	4th	401,913	4th	358,573	5th	408,139	6th	204,686
	1st	247,894	1st	239,040	3d	202,760	3d	160,288
North Dakota	[1]		[1]		2d	220,700	[2]	
					3d	210,203		
Ohio	3d	545,644	22d	698,650	14th	439,013	2d	205,293
	15th	226,341	5th	163,561	11th	167,217	12th	158,026
Oklahoma	1st	439,518	1st	416,863	3d	325,680	[3]	
	3d	266,995	7th	189,547	7th	189,472		
Oregon	3d	471,537	3d	355,099	1st	346,989	2d	158,205
	2d	247,383	2d	210,991	2d	160,502	1st	155,562
Pennsylvania	26th	444,921	11th	441,518	12th	390,991	4th	309,986
	14th	255,740	14th	212,979	15th	136,283	3d	129,764
Rhode Island	2d	416,605	2d	374,463	3d	210,201	1st	180,548
	1st	375,291	1st	338,883	2d	193,186	2d	164,958
South Carolina	2d	415,893	2d	361,933	7th	266,956	4th	200,000
	5th	266,559	5th	251,137	2d	203,418	5th	141,750
South Dakota	1st	493,641	1st	485,829	2d	251,405	[2]	
	2d	159,099	2d	157,132	3d	138,031		
Tennessee	9th	482,393	2d	388,938	3d	296,396	3d	199,972
	7th	247,912	5th	225,918	5th	145,403	5th	153,773
Texas	8th	806,701	8th	528,961	2d	349,859	6th	210,907
	17th	226,739	17th	230,010	7th	211,032	1st	102,827
Utah	2d	402,310	2d	293,922	1st	229,907	[2]	
	1st	286,552	1st	256,388	2d	219,489		
Vermont	[3]		[3]		2d	176,596	1st	169,940
					1st	175,832	2d	162,482
Virginia	2d	403,923	9th	360,679	2d	312,458	9th	187,467
	7th	289,598	4th	243,165	7th	167,588	2d	145,536
Washington	1st	527,768	1st	412,689	1st	348,474	[3]	
	3d	321,162	4th	244,908	4th	200,258		
West Virginia	6th	446,466	6th	378,630	6th	279,072	3d	202,289
	1st	279,954	1st	281,330	4th	214,930	1st	177,840
Wisconsin	4th	438,041	5th	391,467	5th	276,503	6th	187,001
	10th	249,654	10th	263,088	6th	214,206	10th	149,845
Wyoming	[2]		[2]		[2]		[2]	

[1] 2 Representatives elected at large.
[2] 1 Representative elected at large.
[3] Not yet admitted.

Source: Gus Tyler, manuscript in process of publication.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this table shows that in virtually every State the disparity between the smallest and largest congressional district has grown since 1897. In some States there seems to be no reason for the disparity. South Dakota, for example, the State whose senior Senator [Mr. MUNDT] is a cosponsor of the measure, has only 2 districts, 1 district having a population of 159,099, the other one having a population of 493,641.

I was somewhat amused in reading the RECORD of the debate on Friday to find that the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] seemed to think of gerrymandering as a rare and seldom-used practice; and that, if it occurred, it could be easily corrected by Congress. I wish my good friend from South Dakota were here, because, if he were, I would urge him to look at the figures for his own State, where one district has three times the population of the other. That situation has not been remedied by the South Dakota Legislature; neither has it been remedied by the Congress.

Furthermore, in most States the situation has gotten worse since 1946. Many States have not redistricted for many years, and this is a major reason for the widening disparity between the smallest and the largest districts. I have some examples, including the date of last redistricting, as follows:

Outdated districting

Selected districts:	Populations
Alabama (1931):	
9 (Birmingham)	558,928
6 (West-central Alabama)	250,726
Connecticut (1931):	
1 (Hartford)	539,661
4 (Bridgeport)	504,342
5 (Northwest Connecticut)	274,300
(1 Congressman at large)	

Outdated districting—Continued

Selected districts:	Populations
Georgia (1931):	
5 (Atlanta)	618,431
9 (North Georgia)	246,227
Indiana (1941):	
11 (Indianapolis)	551,777
9 (Southern Indiana)	258,441
Iowa (1941):	
2 (Des Moines)	414,421
4 (Southern Iowa)	252,926
Kansas (1941):	
4 (Wichita)	448,435
3 (Southeast Kansas)	227,270
Louisiana (1912):	
6 (Baton Rouge)	417,898
8 (West Louisiana)	249,776
Minnesota (1933):	
3 (Minneapolis)	433,942
9 (Northwest Minnesota)	273,125
Oregon (1941):	
3 (Portland)	468,571
1 (Northwest Oregon)	432,448
2 (East Oregon)	245,976

Outdated districting—Continued

Selected districts:	Populations
Texas (1933):	
8 (Houston)	806,701
5 (Dallas)	614,799
20 (San Antonio)	500,460
17 (North-central Texas) (1 Congressman at large)	226,739
Washington (1931):	
1 (Seattle)	527,768
6 (Tacoma)	456,653
3 (Southwest Washington) (1 Congressman at large)	321,162
Wisconsin (1931):	
4 (Milwaukee)	438,041
5 (Milwaukee)	433,006
10 (Northern Wisconsin)	249,654

(Source: Baker, Rural Versus Urban Political Power, p. 44.)

AN URBAN VOTE IS WORTH LESS THAN A RURAL VOTE

What all these figures mean, Mr. President, is that in almost all States a nonurban vote for Congress is worth more than an urban vote in terms of the representation received. For example, I have prepared a ranking for all States in terms of the weight of 1 vote in the smallest district compared with 1 vote in the largest district.

States listed in order of disparity of congressional districts

(Figure indicates power of each vote in smallest district in proportion to one vote in largest district.)

Texas	3.6
South Dakota	3.1
Michigan	2.9
Florida, Georgia	2.5
Colorado	2.4
Ohio	2.3
Alabama, California	2.2
Indiana	2.1
Connecticut, Kansas, Maryland	2.0
Oregon, Tennessee	1.9

The eastern Oregon district has a relatively small population as compared with the Portland district.

Arkansas, Wisconsin	1.8
Illinois, Louisiana, New Jersey, Pennsylvania	1.7
Iowa, Kentucky, Minnesota, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Washington, West Virginia	1.6
Mississippi, Missouri	1.5
Idaho, Utah, Virginia	1.4
Arizona, Massachusetts, Montana, New York	1.3
Nebraska	1.2
Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island	1.1

No apportionment: Delaware, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming.

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS ARE GERRYMANDERED BY STATE LEGISLATURES

Nor is there always equality within the cities.

Up to now, I have been speaking about the disparities in the sizes of congressional districts. This is not, strictly speaking, gerrymandering. Gerrymandering is the practice by which a State legislature so arranges a district that the party which is in the minority in the State legislature has its majorities cooped up in a few districts, while the majority in the State legislature has its votes scattered over a number of districts, thus maintaining a smaller margin in each district, but getting more districts.

This also operates against the cities; and, as I shall show, it operates also against the Democratic Party. We all know, or should know, of the extraordinary district which the New York Legislature carved out in Brooklyn. The legislature went all over Brooklyn to find areas where Republican majorities existed, so that one Republican district could be created in Brooklyn. Apparently, there had not been such a district for some time; but the New York Legislature accomplished that job.

There are similar cases of gerrymandering.

Districts are frequently gerrymandered by the State legislatures to produce benefits to the party in power or, in the one-party States, one faction of the party. Gerrymandering is practiced by both parties. A more or less typical example is to be found in the redistricting of Los Angeles County in 1951. Of the 12 congressional districts, 3 had populations reasonably close to the average. Of the other 9, 4 were underrepresented, and 5 were overrepresented, as follows:

Overrepresented

District:	Population
16 (Jackson)	223,703
18 (Hosmer)	286,505
20 (Hinshaw)	226,679
22 (Holt)	219,018
24 (Lipscomb)	287,325
Total	1,243,230

Underrepresented

District:	Poulation
17 (King)	431,254
19 (Holifield)	453,942
23 (Doyle)	421,623
26 (Roosevelt)	480,827
Total	1,787,646

In 1952 and 1954 all 5 overrepresented districts went Republican, all 4 underrepresented districts went Democratic; the 4 Democratic districts represent almost 50 percent more people than do the 5 Republican districts. The result is that a Republican vote in the 5 Los Angeles districts is worth almost twice as much as a Democratic vote in the 4 districts in terms of representation in the House of Representatives. There are many other similar examples. In Buffalo, normally 50–50 between the parties, gerrymandering enables the Republicans to hold all three of its Representatives. Rochester has a somewhat similar situation.

REDISTRICTING CONTINUES INEQUALITY

After the census of 1950, 9 States lost representatives and 7 States gained Congressmen. Consequently there have been a number of States which have been redistricted since 1951. A look at the results of this redistricting should give us an idea if there is any intention on the part of State legislatures to redress the balance. The following table lists all the States which redistricted between 1951 and 1954 and compares the populations of the largest and the smallest districts.

Congressional redistricting, 1951–54

Selected districts:	Populations
Arkansas:	
1 (Little Rock)	407,480
2 (North-central Arkansas)	224,278

Congressional redistricting, 1951–54—Con.

Selected districts:	Populations
California:	
26 (Los Angeles)	480,827
22 (Los Angeles)	219,018
Florida:	
4 (Miami)	525,051
8 (North Florida)	210,428
Illinois:	
13 (Chicago)	466,064
20 (West-central Illinois)	281,468
Kentucky:	
3 (Louisville)	484,615
1 (West Kentucky)	304,978
Maryland:	
5 (suburban)	426,371
1 (Eastern shore)	210,623
Michigan:	
16 (Detroit, Dearborn)	525,334
6 (Flint, Lansing)	470,629
14 (Detroit)	466,448
12 (Upper Peninsula)	178,251
Mississippi:	
4 (Jackson, Vicksburg)	426,396
2 (Northern Mississippi)	281,287
Missouri:	
1 (St. Louis)	427,856
3 (St. Louis)	426,088
8 (Southern Missouri)	276,499
New Jersey:	
1 (Camden)	441,978
2 (South Jersey)	258,127
New York:	
37 (South-central New York)	393,130
43 (Southwest New York)	297,131
Ohio:	
3 (Dayton)	545,644
12 (Columbus)	503,410
15 (South-east Ohio)	226,341
Oklahoma:	
1 (Tulsa)	439,518
5 (Oklahoma City)	436,620
3 (Southeast Oklahoma)	266,995
Pennsylvania:	
26 (Southwest Pennsylvania)	444,921
14 (Reading)	255,740
Tennessee:	
9 (Memphis)	482,393
7 (Western Tennessee)	247,912
Virginia:	
2 (Norfolk, Portsmouth)	403,923
7 (Western Virginia)	289,498
West Virginia:	
6 (Charleston)	446,466
1 (Northwest West Virginia)	279,954

Source: Baker, Rural Versus Urban Political Power, p. 43.

It is to be noted that most of the largest districts are urban. While the disparity between the largest and the smallest districts in each State is not as large as in some of the States which have not redistricted for many years, there is little hope for the urban dweller to be found in this record of redistricting in the last few years. He still finds that his vote for Congressman counts for much less than that of his country cousin.

GERRYMANDERING DISTORTS THE POPULAR VOTE

The gerrymandering of congressional districts by State legislatures has seriously distorted the effect of the popular vote for Congress, and its application to presidential elections would introduce distortions of the popular vote which would be infinitely greater than the distortions in the present winner-take-all system within the States.

The rural areas of the country enjoy a tremendous advantage in the State legislatures. And, as I have shown, that advantage is transferred by the State legislatures to the Congress of the United States.

The present system of electing the President is weighted in one way somewhat in favor of the big States—the States with the urban populations—but again, I repeat, only to the degree that they have large populations. It is weighted in their favor because of the strategic importance of their large blocs of electoral votes. But the present system of electing a President is also weighted in favor of the small States, in that they receive a greater weight in the outcome of the election than their populations would justify; namely, each State is given two electoral votes because of its two seats in the Senate.

The present system of electing a President is also weighted somewhat in favor of the South, in that its bloc of electoral votes is based upon such a small voting population.

However, these distortions within the presidential system tend to cancel each other out, and tend to produce a rough measure of equality. In this case, apparently three wrongs make a right. In the Presidency there is represented an approximate balance of the major groups. It is the only place in the American political system where the people who live in cities get their due—not more than their due, but the consideration to which they are entitled.

They do not get that consideration in the State legislatures. They are in chains there. They do not get that consideration in the House of Representatives. They are in chains there. They do not get that consideration in the Senate. They are in chains there. They are loaded down with chains. Only one hand is free; that is, in the election of the President. They get consideration in the Presidency, as do the groups which dominate the State legislatures and Congress. Now the authors of the amendment would put chains on that office, and deliver the cities, bound hand and foot, into the power of the rural sections of the country.

The Presidency is the only office in the American political system as to which there is anything like equality of representation.

But what would happen under the proposed changes, Mr. President? Both would end any weighting in favor of the big States—in fact, they would go further and virtually eliminate the influence of the big States. And both would further weight the system in favor of the small States and the South, although they would do so in different fashion. What we then would have would not be a system in which three wrongs make a right, but a system in which 2 greater wrongs make a monstrous wrong, for then the urban areas would not be adequately represented anywhere in the political system, from bottom to top. Apparently the proponents of this amendment believe that everybody is equal, but some should be a lot more equal than others.

A NATIONAL GERRYMANDER

Mr. President, if you exclude those congressional districts in the South in which the Republicans traditionally make no contest, this was the result of the 1954 congressional elections, both in popular vote and in congressional seats won:

	Popular vote	Percent of total vote	Seats won	Margin of seats
Republican	19,785,410	49.7	199	58
Democratic	[1] 19,839,790	49.8	141	
Other	185,279	.5		

[1] Includes votes cast for Democratic candidates on Liberal Party ballot.

Mr. President, although the Democrats received more popular votes than the Republicans, the Republicans obtained 58 more seats than did the Democrats—a ratio of better than 4 to 3.

Mr. President, we have had computed some very interesting figures on the congressional elections of 1954. We have taken those districts in which there was a contest, and have excluded the one-party areas of the South in which there was no contest, taking only those districts where the two parties had rival candidates.

The popular vote of the Republicans and the Democrats was virtually equal in that election. The Republicans received 19,785,410 votes. The Democrats received 19,839,790 votes, a difference of only about 50,000 votes. The Republicans received 49.7 of the total vote. The Democrats received 49.8 percent.

One would expect, therefore, that for the representation in the House, numbering 340, they would be divided equally. But not at all. The Republicans won 199 of those seats. The Democrats won only 141 of the seats. The Republicans received a margin of 58 seats. Yet the popular vote for the Republicans was slightly less than that for the Democrats. We see here what the State legislatures are doing to the National House of Representatives.

Mr. President, in my judgment, the urban districts in the House are probably underrepresented by at least 30 seats. The rural districts overrepresented by 30 seats. The Democrats, in the main, lose 30 seats. The Republicans gain 30 seats. It means there has to be a terrific landslide, outside of the South, for the Democrats to get a majority of the Representatives in the non-Southern States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that the eight largest States in the Union, with the great urban centers, cast, in 1952, about half of all the votes that were cast in this country?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not correct that as many votes were cast in those 8 States as were cast in the remaining 40 States of the Union?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. But at the same time the electoral votes of those eight States, because of their underepresentation, numbered only 209 votes out of 531, or less than 40 percent?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is completely correct. That is caused both by the underrepresentation of the cities in the House of Representatives, and the underrepresentation of the big States in the Senate. That is correct. The Senator is completely correct.

Mr. President, what we have in the pattern of districting for the House of Representatives is a national gerrymander. And what we are being asked to do is to extend the gerrymander to the election of the President of the United States. We are being asked to give away the political birthright of the Americans who live in cities. They now enjoy their fair share of political representation only in the Presidency. We must not take that away from them.

II–4. LACK OF VOTER PARTICIPATION IN THE SOUTH

I should now like to deal with the question of the lack of voter participation in the South. I think this is important, Mr. President, because the proponents of this measure argue that under the present electoral system minority groups voting en bloc can have a decisive influence on the presidential vote in the large Northern States with big electoral votes, and thus have a disproportionate effect on the outcome of presidential elections.

There are, of course, many flaws in that argument. In the first place, people do not always vote as blocs. The various ethnic groups are composed of individual human beings, who cast their votes as individual human beings. We know, too, that leaders of ethnic groups, farm organizations, labor organizations, and political parties have never been able to control their membership in presidential elections or other elections, as some would have us believe.

Further, Mr. President, almost all of us are members of some minority group, or, in fact, of several minority groups. The farmer is a minority, the Presbyterians are a minority, the Elks and Moose are minorities, just as much as the Negroes, the Polish Americans, and other ethnic, economic, and social groups. For the proponents of this measure to argue that one minority group does or can control the outcome of an election is to assume an insight into human motives and human behavior that few can really assume in certainty.

But even if the argument were true, the proposals before us would not cure the evils. We know that under them much greater weight in the electoral vote would be given to the one-party States, and particularly to the South. There, as we all know, a very small proportion of people vote at all. Those who do vote are in most cases the native white middle- and upper-class minorities in the areas. For proponents of this measure to argue that they wish to solve what they call the problem of minority control of presidential elections by offering proposals which would give even smaller minorities in crucial one-party areas the control over presidential elections, is at best to jump from the frying pan into the fire.

If the proponents of this measure really desire to do away with minority control of elections, they will give the ballot to the great mass of people in the Southern States who for one reason or another do not now exercise the vote.

Let us look at some of the figures on voter participation in the South and the rest of the country.

The 11 Southern States of the United States had a population of 1950 of 36.5 million, or 24.3 percent of the total United States population. They also had 128 electoral votes, or 24.1 percent of the total of 531 electoral votes. Yet, in the 1952 election they cast only 8.6 million votes of 61.6 million votes cast in the United States for the office of President of the United States. This was only 12.3 percent of the total. Thus, those States with 24.1 percent of the electoral vote cast only 12.3 percent of the popular vote in the presidential election of 1952. I ask for unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a table showing the population in 1950, and the electoral and popular vote in the 1952 election of the 11 Southern States.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Population	Electoral votes	1952 presidential vote
Texas	7,711,194	24	2,076,000
North Carolina	4,061,929	14	1,211,000
Georgia	3,444,578	12	656,000
Virginia	3,318,680	12	620,000
Tennessee	3,291,718	11	893,000
Alabama	3,061,743	11	426,000
Florida	2,771,305	10	989,000
Louisiana	2,683,516	10	652,000
Mississippi	2,178,914	8	286,000
South Carolina	2,117,027	8	341,000
Arkansas	1,909,511	8	405,000
Total	36,550,115	128	8,555,000
United States, total	150,697,361	531	61,552,000
Percent of 11 Southern States to United States total	24.3	24.1	12.3

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now, I ask the question, Mr. President, what minorities are the proponents of this measure so concerned about? Should they not be equally concerned about the minorities which control elections in the South?

Mr. President, in the hearings, on page 304, there is a table which shows voter participation in the 1952 presidential election. It gives the extent of popular participation in the 1952 presidential election, based on the 1950 population figures, in State by State.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that in the 1948 campaign the vote of 1 elector in South Carolina represented only 17,000 people, whereas in the States of New York, California, and I assume Illinois, an elector represented a population of 160,000 or more?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator referring to population, or voters?

Mr. LEHMAN. Voters. In the voting, as far as the voters are concerned, I am sure the Senator from Illinois is familiar with these figures, that in the 1952 election about 50 percent of the eligible voters in New York State cast their votes, whereas in Mississippi only 13 percent of the eligible voters cast their votes. Thus, a vote in New York State had only one-fourth or one-fifth as much value as a vote in Mississippi.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall introduce into the RECORD evidence on that point, by means of the following table:

	Percent of population participating
Mississippi	13.1
Alabama	13.9
South Carolina	16.1
Virginia	18.7
Georgia	19.0
Arkansas	21.2
Louisiana	24.3
Texas	26.9
Tennessee	27.1
North Carolina	29.8
Kentucky	33.7
Arizona	34.8
New Mexico	35.0
Florida	35.7
Maine	38.5
Maryland	38.5
Vermont	40.6
Oklahoma	42.5
North Dakota	43.6
Pennsylvania	43.6
Michigan	43.9
Wyoming	44.5
West Virginia	44.6
Montana	44.8
South Dakota	45.1
Oregon	45.7
Nebraska	46.0
Minnesota	46.3
Washington	46.4
Ohio	46.6
Wisconsin	46.8
Idaho	46.9
Kansas	47.0
Colorado	47.6
Utah	47.8
Missouri	47.8
New York	48.1
Iowa	48.4
California	48.7
Indiana	49.7
New Jersey	50.0
Massachusetts	50.8
New Hampshire	51.2
Nevada	51.3
Illinois	51.4
Rhode Island	52.3
Connecticut	54.6
Delaware	54.7
United States	41.1

Ten of these 11 Southern States had the lowest voter participation of any State in the country. In these, participation ranged from 13 percent in Mississippi to 29.8 percent in North Carolina.

How does this compare with the large, populous Northern States? The voter participation was 43.6 percent in Pennsylvania, 43.9 percent in Michigan, 46.5 percent in Ohio, 46.8 percent in Wisconsin, 48.1 percent in New York, 48.6 percent in California, 50.8 percent in Massachusetts, and 51.4 percent in Illinois.

Thus, in these States, voter participation was anywhere from 2 to 4 times that of 1 or several of these 10 Southern States. In the one-party States of the North, and where I suppose one would include, until recently, Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, South Dakota, North Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas; and, until 1954, also Oregon—voter participation was much greater than in the one-party States of the South.

Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent that a table comparing the voter participation and the average number of votes per congressional district in the 1952 presidential election, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of voter participation and average number of votes per congressional district in 1952 presidential election

States ranked in order of size	1950 population	State rank in order of voter participation		Presidential vote by State, 1952	Electoral votes	Congressional seats	Average number of votes per congressional district
		Rank	Percent participation of total population				
1. New York	14,830,192	12	48.1	7,128,000	45	43	165,790
2. California	10,586,223	10	48.7	5,142,000	32	30	171,400
3. Pennsylvania	10,498,012	29	43.6	4,581,000	32	30	152,700
4. Illinois	8,712,176	4	51.4	4,481,000	27	25	179,240
5. Ohio	7,946,627	19	46.6	3,701,000	25	23	160,913
6. Texas	7,711,194	41	26.9	2,076,000	24	[1]22	98,857
7. Michigan	6,371,766	28	43.9	2,799,000	20	18	155,500
8. New Jersey	4,835,329	8	50	2,420,000	16	14	172,857
9. Massachusetts	4,690,514	7	50.8	2,383,000	16	14	170,214
10. North Carolina	4,061,929	39	29.8	1,211,000	14	12	100,917
11. Missouri	3,954,653	13	47.8	1,892,000	13	11	172,000
12. Indiana	3,934,224	9	49.7	1,955,000	13	11	177,727
13. Georgia	3,444,578	44	19.	656,000	12	10	65,600
14. Wisconsin	3,434,575	18	46.8	1,607,000	12	10	160,700
15. Virginia	3,318,680	45	18.7	620,000	12	10	62,000
16. Tennessee	3,291,718	40	27.1	893,000	11	9	99,222
17. Alabama	3,061,743	47	13.9	426,000	11	9	47,333
18. Minnesota	2,982,483	21	46.3	1,379,000	11	9	153,222
19. Kentucky	2,944,806	38	33.7	993,000	10	8	124,125

[1] 1 at large.

Comparison of voter participation and average number of votes per congressional district in 1952 presidential election—Continued

States ranked in order of size	1950 population	State rank in order of voter participation: Rank	State rank in order of voter participation: Percent participation of total population	Presidential vote by State, 1952	Electoral votes	Congressional seats	Average number of votes per congressional district
20. Florida	2,771,305	35	35.7	989,000	10	8	109,809
21. Louisiana	2,683,516	42	24.3	652,000	10	8	81,500
22. Iowa	2,621,073	11	48.4	1,260,000	10	8	158,625
23. Washington	2,378,963	20	46.4	1,103,000	9	[1] 7	183,833
24. Maryland	2,343,001	33	38.5	902,000	9	7	128,857
25. Oklahoma	2,233,351	31	42.5	949,000	8	6	158,167
26. Mississippi	2,178,914	48	13.1	286,000	8	6	47,667
27. South Carolina	2,117,027	46	16.1	341,000	8	6	56,833
28. Connecticut	2,007,280	2	54.6	1,097,000	8	[1] 6	219,400
29. West Virginia	2,005,552	26	44.6	874,000	8	6	145,667
30. Arkansas	1,909,511	43	21.2	405,000	8	6	67,500
31. Kansas	1,905,299	16	47.0	896,000	8	6	149,333
32. Oregon	1,521,341	23	45.7	695,000	6	4	173,750
33. Nebraska	1,325,510	22	46.0	610,000	6	4	152,500
34. Colorado	1,325,089	15	47.6	630,000	6	4	157,500
35. Maine	913,774	34	38.5	352,000	5	3	117,333
36. Rhode Island	791,896	3	52.3	414,000	4	2	207,000
37. Arizona	749,587	37	34.8	261,000	4	2	130,500
38. Utah	688,862	14	47.8	330,000	4	2	165,000
39. New Mexico	681,187	36	35.0	239,000	4	[2] 2	119,500
40. South Dakota	652,740	24	45.1	294,000	4	2	147,000
41. North Dakota	619,636	30	43.6	270,000	4	[2] 2	135,000
42. Montana	591,024	25	44.8	265,000	4	2	132,500
43. Idaho	588,637	17	46.9	276,000	4	2	138,000
44. New Hampshire	533,242	6	51.2	273,000	4	2	136,500
45. Vermont	377,747	32	40.6	154,000	3	[2] 1	154,000
46. Delaware	318,085	1	54.7	174,000	3	1	174,000
47. Wyoming	290,529	27	44.5	129,000	3	[2] 1	129,000
48. Nevada	160,083	5	51.3	82,000	3	1	82,000

[1] 1 at large
[2] At large.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, representation in the House of Representatives is based on the principle of equal representation. Of course, it is not possible to apportion the seats so that all districts are exactly the same size. Yet, there should be some rough equality from district to district. Of course, even this is not true. Yet we have before us a plan which would allow the State legislatures to use the Mundt-Coudert system of giving one electoral vote for each congressional district.

In the table I have just inserted in the RECORD, the unfairness of this plan can easily be seen.

In my own State of Illinois, the average number of votes per congressional district in the 1952 election was 175,000. In Texas, it was 99,000. In Georgia, it was 66,000. In Virginia, it was 62,000. In Tennessee, it was 99,000. In Alabama, it was over 47,000. In Louisiana, it was 82,000. In Mississippi, it was 48,000. In South Carolina, it was 59,000. In Arkansas, it was 68,000. In North Carolina, it was 101,000. In Florida, it was 110,000.

Thus, Mr. President, in Alabama and Mississippi, based on the congressional-district method of apportioning presidential electoral votes, the individual voter would have a vote equal to almost four votes of the voter in Illinois. In South Carolina, 1 vote would be worth over 3 votes in Illinois. In Virginia, 1 vote would be worth just under 3 votes in Illinois. In Arkansas and Georgia, 1 vote would be worth about 2½ votes in Illinois; and in Louisiana, 1 vote would be worth over 2 votes in Illinois, under the Mundt-Coudert plan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD tables showing voter turnout for national elections, based on the percent of actual voters compared with the citizens of voting age in various elections.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Voting turnout for national elections

	Citizens of voting age	Actual voters	Voting turnout in percent
1950 CONGRESSIONAL			
11 Southern States	21,629,084	2,676,443	12.4
5 border States	8,394,704	3,582,323	42.7
32 Northern States	64,950,672	34,170,790	52.6
1952 PRESIDENTIAL			
11 Southern States	21,852,000	8,553,729	39.1
5 border States	8,444,000	5,609,816	66.4
32 Northern States	67,548,000	47,388,374	70.2
1954 CONGRESSIONAL			
11 Southern States	22,179,000	3,679,594	15.6
5 border States	8,349,000	3,631,457	42.4
32 Northern States	69,880,000	35,584,598	53.7

The 11 Southern States were those ranking 38–48 in the table below. The 5 border States are West Virginia (14th), Missouri (21st), Oklahoma (26th), Kentucky (35th), and Maryland (36th).

Voting turnout for the 1952 Presidential election

Rank	State	Number of voters per 100 citizens of voting age
1	Utah	80
2	Delaware	79
3	Idaho	79
4	Rhode Island	78
5	New Hampshire	78
[1] 6	North Dakota	77
7	Connecticut	76
8	Iowa	75
9	Illinois	75
10	Indiana	75
11	Massachusetts	74
[1] 12	South Dakota	74
13	Minnesota	74
14	West Virginia	73
15	Montana	73
16	Wyoming	72
17	Colorado	72
18	Nevada	72
19	Washington	72
20	Wisconsin	71
21	Missouri	71
[1] 22	Kansas	70
23	California	70
24	New Jersey	70
25	Ohio	69
26	Oklahoma	69
[1] 27	Nebraska	69
28	New York	69
29	Oregon	67
[1] 30	Vermont	67
31	Michigan	66
32	Pennsylvania	65
[1] 33	Maine	65
34	New Mexico	64
35	Kentucky	60
36	Maryland	58
37	Arizona	53
38	North Carolina	52
39	Florida	50
40	Tennessee	46
41	Texas	43
42	Louisiana	40
43	Arkansas	38
44	Virginia	31
45	Georgia	31
46	South Carolina	31
47	Alabama	25
48	Mississippi	24
	United States	63

[1] These are essentially one-party States outside the South. One will note the higher voter participation in the northern one-party States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this table shows that in the 1950 congressional election, the voter turnout was 12.4 percent in the 11 Southern States, 42.7 percent in the 5 border States, and

52.6 percent in the 32 Northern States. In the 1952 presidential election the figures were 39.1 percent in the 11 Southern States, 66.4 percent in the 5 border States, and 70.2 percent in the 32 Northern States. In the 1954 congressional election, the figures were 15.6 in the 11 Southern States, 42.4 in the 5 border States, and 53.7 in the 32 Northern States.

The table shows, also, that the 11 Southern States had the lowest turnout, without exception, in the 1952 presidential election. In those States the percentage of voter participation in the 11 Southern States ranged from 24 percent in Mississippi to 50 percent in Florida. This compared with a national average of 63 percent.

Mr. President, it is often argued by those from the Solid South and in other one-party States that the really high voter participation in their elections comes in the primary elections where there is often opposition between factions. It is argued that because of this, it is unfair to give figures for the general elections.

I have had prepared, however, a table which compares the vote in the 1952 primaries for the office receiving the highest statewide vote with the presidential vote in 1952, to see how much validity there is in the assertion that it is in the primaries where the real voter participation lies in these one-party States.

For this purpose, I have taken the primaries in eleven 1-party States of the Solid South and five 1-party States in the North. Let it be remembered that I have taken the vote only for the single office receiving the highest statewide primary vote in these States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a table in regard to this matter printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Primaries and general elections in the solid States, 1952

State	Total vote for single office receiving highest statewide primary vote in 1952			Presidential vote, 1952	Number of votes cast in primary per 100 votes for President
	Office	Primary	General election		
Alabama	Public service commissioner	287,620	318,027	426,120	67
Arkansas	Governor	376,500	391,584	404,800	93
Florida	do	764,423	834,412	989,337	77
Georgia	Appellate judge	463,569	547,787	655,803	71
Louisiana	Governor	785,045	123,681	651,952	120
Mississippi	United States Senator	214,182	233,919	285,532	75
North Carolina	Governor	564,505	1,179,635	1,210,910	47
South Carolina	do	[1] 346,329	[1] 50,642	341,087	102
Tennessee	do	647,117	806,677	892,553	73
Texas	do	1,356,395	1,881,202	2,075,946	65
Virginia	United States Senator	345,309	543,516	619,689	56
Maine	do	156,165	237,164	351,786	44
Vermont	Governor	73,253	150,862	153,539	48
Nebraska	do	414,105	595,714	609,660	68
North Dakota	United States Senator	199,147	237,995	270,127	74
South Dakota	do	[1] 134,185	[1] 251,362	294,283	46

[1] No statewide primary in 1952. Figures are for 1950 primary and election.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In brief, Mr. President, in Alabama about one-third more votes were cast in the presidential election than in the primary; in Alabama, 139,000 more votes were cast in the presidential election than in the primary; in Arkansas, approximately 28,000 more votes were cast in the presidential election than in the primary; in Florida, 225,000 more votes were cast in the presidential election than in the primary. In Georgia, almost 200,000 more votes were cast in the presidential election than in the primary. Louisiana is an exception in this case; a larger vote was cast in the primary than in the presidential election.

But in Mississippi, more votes were cast in the presidential election than in the primary. The same was true in North Carolina where twice as many votes were cast in the presidential election as in the primary. It was not quite true in the case of South Carolina. But the same was true in the case of Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Maine, Vermont, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

These figures show the highest vote cast for any office in the 1952 primary as a percentage of the vote cast in that State in the 1952 presidential election.

In Alabama, the figure was 67 percent; in Arkansas, 93 percent; in Florida, 77 percent; in Georgia, 71 percent; in Louisiana, 120 percent; in Mississippi, 75 percent; in North Carolina, 47 percent; in South Carolina, 102 percent; in Tennessee, 73 percent; in Texas, 65 percent; and in Virginia, 56 percent.

In the five Northern, one-party States, the figures were as follows: In Maine, 44 percent; in Vermont, 48 percent; in Nebraska, 68 percent; in North Dakota, 74 percent; and in South Dakota, 46 percent.

Thus, Mr. President, I think the evidence indicates that the figures I have given on voter participation in the South are not unfair. And it cannot be argued that one must look at the primary votes in those States which would show greater voter participation, because it is clear that, with only two exceptions, the vote in the presidential election was greater than the vote cast for the office which received the highest vote in the primaries in those States in 1952.

Mr. President, I say with all kindness that if our Southern friends, therefore, really want to enable more adults to have an influence on the election of a President, the remedy is close at hand: Abolish the polltax and other restrictions, and let the Negroes and the poor whites vote.

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Let me touch now upon a somewhat different, but extremely important subject, namely, the allocation of congressional committee chairmen, who have great influence on legislation in both the House and Senate.

Let us look at the committee chairmen in the House and Senate to see to what extent the one-party States, or the 11 Southern States have control, and to what extent the large populous States have Representatives or Senators in influential positions.

At the present time, of the 15 standing committees of the Senate, the chairmen of 9 come from the 11 States of the Deep South. The chairman of one comes from a border State. The chairman of only 1 of the 15 committees comes from even a moderately sized Northern State, Washington.

But not 1 single chairman of a Senate committee at this time is from 1 of the large Northern States.

Let it not be inferred that I am now complaining. I am not arguing the merits of the seniority system today. The seniority system is not ideal, but it is difficult to devise another system which would operate any better. I have been giving some thought to this subject and I may have more to say about it at a later date. However, I point out that in the two-party States which are large States, and States in which the vote is rather evenly divided, the political life of a Senator tends to be somewhat abbreviated. It is pretty difficult to pile up seniority if a Senator comes from one of the large States of the North. The way to pile up seniority is to be a Senator from one of the one-party States of the South, or one of the small States. It therefore follows that committee chairmanships tend to gravitate into the hands of Members from one-party States.

Mr. President, I have pointed out that at present not a single chairman of a Senate committee is from one of the large Northern States.

In the House, the situation is not quite so biased against the large Northern States. There, 12 of the 19 standing committees are chaired by Members from the 11 States of the Deep South. Two more chairmen come from the border States of Missouri and Kentucky, and 5 of the committee chairmen come from the 4 large Northern States of Illinois, California, Pennsylvania, and New York—New York having 2 chairmen.

Thus, of the 34 chairmen of standing committees in the House and Senate, 21 come from the 11 States of the Deep South; 3 more come from the border States; only 5 come from the large Northern States; and of the remaining 5, 4 are from very small States and 1 comes from a medium-sized Northern State.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have listened to the figures which have just been stated by the Senator from Illinois. I think there is another matter, however, in which he may be very greatly interested, although in all probability it has already come to his attention.

The Senator from Illinois has spoken about the chairmanships of the different committees, headed, of course, in this instance, by the Democrats, because the Democratic Party has the majority in the Senate. But I wonder whether the Senator has given close study to this fact:

In each party there is a policy committee. The policy committee of the Democratic Party, with which I am, of course, much more familiar than I am with the policy committee of the Republican Party, consists of 9 or 10 Senators. Those 9 or 10 Senators represent States having a total population of less than 30 million out of a total population through the entire country of 165 million.

On that committee, with the exception of Texas, which is represented by the majority leader, not one of the 7 or 8 largest States in the Union is represented. It is true that some of the large States do not have Democratic Senators; but at least 5 large States do have Democratic Senators—States having populations of from 16,500,000 down to 4 million or 5 million. Among those States are New York, Illinois, Massachusetts, Ohio, Minnesota, California, and Pennsylvania. Not one of those great States is today represented on the policy committee of the Democratic Party in the United States Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois was aware of what the Senator from New York has said, but he did not wish to bring it up, lest he open wounds. But now that the Senator from New York has raised the point, it is, of course, true that the big States almost always get left out, for one reason or another. They are really the conquered provinces.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I think the criticism which has been made by the Senator from Illinois is absolutely unfair. Why does the Senator from Illinois find himself in this situation? It is because he inveigled and enticed the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to leave the Republican Party and join the Democratic Party. If Senator MORSE had remained in the Republican column, the distinguished Senator from Illinois knows that the committees would have had very fine chairmen, and chairmen who came from the various parts of the country. The reason for the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] being chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] being chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is that the senior Senator from Illinois inveigled the senior Senator from Oregon to joint the Democratic Party.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We hope to inveigle the senior Senator from North Dakota to join our party.

Mr. LANGER. The senior Senator from North Dakota is very unpredictable. No one can tell what he is likely to do at any time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We know that.

Mr. LANGER. I sat here as a Republican and listened to the complaint of the Senator from Illinois. The Senator from Illinois knows that only a few days ago the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] were complaining about the new chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. Yet the Senator from Oregon, by moving into the Democratic column, was responsible for the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] becoming chairman of that committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oregon found the bonds of the Republican Party too heavy to bear, and finally came over to the Democratic Party. I would say to the Senator from North Dakota what George Fox said to William Penn. William Penn was the son of an admiral. He used to go to court wearing a sword. He had qualms as to whether he should wear a sword, so he consulted with George Fox as to whether or not he should wear a sword.

Fox said, "Wear the sword as long as thou canst."

The senior Senator from Oregon wore the sword of Republicanism as long as he could; and when he could wear it no longer; he took it off.

The Senator from North Dakota has worn that sword for a great many years, although I know he has been very restive under it. We are not going to tempt the Senator from North Dakota; but the incongruity of the Senator from North Dakota's being on the other side of the aisle has undoubtedly impressed the Senator from North Dakota very frequently.

So although we will not entice or inveigle or improperly tempt the Senator from North Dakota, our arms are open. His spiritual home is over here. We hope that in a few months he may do in 1956 what the senior Senator from Oregon did in 1954.

Mr. LANGER. I think my distinguished friend, with his usual cleverness, is entirely evading the question. He has complained about the chairmen of the committees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, I am not now complaining about them; I am pointing out that the Northern States are underrepresented. I am not now complaining about the individual chairmen. I am frank to say that at the moment I do not know precisely how to get a better system than the seniority system, poor as it is. However, I may have more to say about this at a later date.

I am saying merely that Senators from the 1-party States tend to be assured of reelection, and Senators from 2-party States lead very dangerous lives. They get their heads chopped off, and the places that knew them shall know them no more. They go, politically, where the woodbine twineth. Therefore, they are not able to gain great seniority, and failing to gain great senority, they do not get chairmanships. I was not now complaining; I was merely pointing to the facts.

Mr. LANGER. My friend from Illinois wants to eat his cake and still have it. I think we all agree that the Senator from Oregon is one of the most brilliant men we have. After the Democratic side got him, the Northern States had to pay a price for getting him, and that price was that the chairmanships went to the majority Members of the South. It distresses me to hear my good friend complaining about it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not complaining; I am merely mentioning it.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is mentioning it and arguing it on the floor of the Senate. He is distressed. I am not so sure that the other side did not make a good deal in getting the Senator from Oregon over on the Democratic side. I am not complaining about that, understand, but it seems to me incongruous to hear the Senator mentioning that fact.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As the Senator from North Dakota knows, many of those who have been his greatest supporters in the past are moving over from the Republican Party to the Democratic Party in North Dakota. It is going to be interesting to see whether the Senator from North Dakota follows them, goes against them, or leads the procession.

It is going to be a subject of great interest to me. The Senator from Illinois is going to keep quiet. He is not going to try to entice or inveigle the Senator from North Dakota, but he is aware of the water currents moving in North Dakota, and he is curious about how the Senator from North Dakota will respond to this shift, which is proceeding very rapidly in that State.

Mr. LANGER. I might add that North Dakota is a very progressive State. It has taken the place of the great State of Wisconsin during the last 20 or 25 years. The citizenry there is very independent in its vote. It is a State which voted for Franklin D. Roosevelt twice and which voted for Woodrow Wilson. In most of the elections for President there has been a very close vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The State has gone for the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota 3 times.

Mr. LANGER. Yes. I am very proud of that record. I rose only to mention the fact that, after all, the Senator should not be complaining about the northern States losing their chairmanships.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We had nothing to lose; we never had them.

Mr. LANGER. They had them under the Republican administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I well know the love of the Senator from North Dakota to create mischievous comments on the floor. He has been at his best these last few moments, and I appreciate the humor of it. I know the Senator from North Dakota will want me to get on with my speech.

Mr. LANGER. Surely. I want to thank the Senator for yielding to me.

II–6. THE AMENDING PROCESS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Another area in which the smaller and less populous States have an advantage over the large populous States is in the amending process. Under article V of the Constitution, "the Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or other mode or ratification may be proposed by the Congress."

Of the 2 alternatives for proposing a constitutional amendment, as a practical matter only, Congress initiates them by a two-thirds vote. This means that in the Senate the votes of 64 Senators representing the 32 smallest States are the minimum number required to pass a proposed constitutional amendment, and, as the requirement is two-thirds of those present and voting, a smaller number is ordinarily needed.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks a table listing the 36 smallest States and their 1950 population, and which shows as a substitute the population of the 32 smallest States, be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1950 population of 36 smallest States

Smallest States ranked in inverse order of size	Rank in size	1950 population
1. Nevada	48	160,083
2. Wyoming	47	290,529
3. Delaware	46	318,085
4. Vermont	45	377,747
5. New Hampshire	44	533,242
6. Idaho	43	588,637
7. Montana	42	591,024
8. North Dakota	41	619,636
9. South Dakota	40	652,740
10. New Mexico	39	681,187
11. Utah	38	688,862
12. Arizona	37	749,587
13. Rhode Island	36	791,896
14. Maine	35	913,774
15. Colorado	34	1,325,089
16. Nebraska	33	1,325,510
17. Oregon	32	1,521,341
18. Kansas	31	1,905,299
19. Arkansas	30	1,909,511
20. West Virginia	29	2,005,552
21. Connecticut	28	2,007,280
22. South Carolina	27	2,117,027
23. Mississippi	26	2,178,914
24. Oklahoma	25	2,233,351
25. Maryland	24	2,343,001
26. Washington	23	2,378,963
27. Iowa	22	2,621,073
28. Louisiana	21	2,683,516
29. Florida	20	2,771,305
30. Kentucky	19	2,944,806
31. Minnesota	18	2,982,483
32. Alabama	17	3,061,743
Subtotal, 32 smallest States		[1] 48,272,793
33. Tennessee	16	3,291,718
34. Virginia	15	3,318,680
35. Wisconsin	14	3,434,575
36. Georgia	13	3,444,578
Total, 36 smallest States		61,762,344

[1] 32 percent of United States population.

	Percent
Total United States population, 1950, 150,697,361	100
36 smallest States, 1950, 61,762,344	41
12 largest States, 88.1 million	58.5
District of Columbia, 800,000	.5
Total	100

Representation in U. S. Senate

	Percent of population	Number of seats
36 smallest States	41	72
12 largest States	58.5	24

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the table indicates that the 32 smallest States, with a population in 1950 of 48.3 million, or 32 percent of the total, had 64 Senators, or two-thirds of the number of Senators, while the remaining 16 largest States contained 102.4 million people, or 67.5 percent of the population, but had only 32 Senators, or one-third of their number. In the House, of course, the situation is more equitable. The large populous States there are more equally represented and, except that the less populous areas are favored because of the gerrymandering of congressional districts, the individual States do have representation in proportion to their numbers.

In the ratification process the large populous States are again at a disadvantage. Three-fourths, or 36 States, are needed to ratify a constitutional amendment.

In 1950 the 36 smallest States had a population of 61.8 million people, or 41 percent of the total population, while the remaining 12 States, including the District of Columbia, contained 89 million people, or 59 percent of the total. So 41 percent of the people of the States could ratify a constitutional amendment.

When one also considers that the alternative most often used to ratify a constitutional amendment is by action of the State legislatures, and the method of ratifying amendments by State conventions was used only in the case of the repeal of the 18th amendment, the large populous areas are even more unrepresented than these figures show. This is true because, we all know, and I have given the evidence in some detail, the State legislatures are even more unrepresentative of the cities and the urban population in the States than in the congressional districts.

Therefore, in 2 of the 3 major avenues where constitutional amendments are proposed and ratified, namely, the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the State legislatures, the large populous areas are overwhelmingly discriminated against, and in the one area, namely, the House of Representatives, the gerrymandering of congressional districts also discriminates against the urban and populous areas of the country.

This is merely another reason, Mr. President, why, when viewed in the context of our total political system, the argument that the electoral system should be changed because of the power of the populous States does not follow. The amendment before us would not serve justice and equity if passed, but would give the smaller States, the one-party areas, and the less populous regions, total control of the major institutions of our Government.

If there is any group of States in the country which is underrepresented and has little political power in the National Government, it is the group of large, populous States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator name a President who was elected in the last 50 years who did not come from a large State?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Calvin Coolidge. He came from Massachusetts, did he not?

Mr. LANGER. Of course. He became President by being nominated for Vice President, and he became President following the death of the President. Take the Democratic or Republican conventions. As a rule, is it not an exception when a man from a small State is nominated?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it is true that nominees for the Presidency who come from large States tend to be nominated, but the point I am trying to make is that that is the only place in the American political system where the large States and the large cities have some influence.

Up to now I have been pointing out the degree to which the large States and the large cities are relatively underrepresented in the National Government, and the degree to which the large cities are underrepresented in the State governments. Now I want to turn to the faults of the amendment which is now before us, and I wish to start off with an introduction, and then consider the Mundt-Coudert plan, containing the district unit plan, and then the Lodge-Gossett system of proportional distribution of the electoral vote within the States.

THE FAULTS OF THE LODGE-GOSSETT PROPORTIONAL SYSTEM AND THE DISTRICT UNIT SYSTEM

III–1. INTRODUCTION

Mr. President, the measure before us is a two-headed hydra; the one head is know as the Lodge-Gossett plan, and the other head carries the label of Mundt-Coudert.

The eyes in both heads are looking for a change in our electoral system which would make it unnecessary for either party to bid for the support of liberal voters in presidential elections. In recent years, the present electoral college system has compelled both parties to nominate presidential candidates who advocate policies which will win the votes of ethnic, religious, and economic groups in metropolitan centers, where these minorities often hold a balance of power in populous States controlling large blocks of electoral votes. Consequently, all recent presidential candidates of both parties have supported

social security, collective bargaining, and civil-rights legislation. A bipartisan coalition now seeks to devise an electoral system which will make it possible to ignore the legitimate demands of those urban voters who have pressed for this 20th-century legislation. In short, the conservative spirits who animate the movement for so-called electoral reform seek a system which they hope will enable them to repeal the 20th century with all its reforms, lock, stock, and barrel. In addition, the southern conservations back this reform in an attempt to block civil-rights legislation.

As evidence of the truth of what I say, let me read from the testimony of former Congressman Gossett before the House Committee on the Judiciary on April 20, 1951. I shall quote Mr. Gossett, starting on page 263 of the hearings. This is a quotation from one of the principal sponsors of the Lodge-Gossett plan:

The electoral college permits and invites irresponsible control and domination by small organized minority groups, within the large pivotal States. It aggravates and accentuates the building up and solidification within these States of religious, economic, and racial blocs. Small, definable, minority groups, organized along religious or economic or racial lines, by voting together, can and do hold a balance of power within these pivotal States. As a result, the political strategists in both parties make special appeals to these various groups as such. These groups have become more and more politically conscious. They know their power. In many instances, they have no political alinements or philosophy as such, but are simply up for sale to the highest bidder. * * *

At the danger of stepping on some toes, let's get down to specific cases. Let's take a look at the political platforms of both major parties in the presidential campaigns of 1944 and 1948 and see how they were built and designed to appeal to minority groups and blocs in the large, pivotal States. First, both parties wrote the FEPC into their platforms. The platform makers of both parties will tell you frankly, off the record of course, that this was done as a bid for the Negro vote. There are enough Negroes in New York City, when voting en bloc, to determine often how the entire electoral vote of the State of New York is cast; enough in Philadelphia if cast en bloc to probably determine the result of an election in the State of Pennsylvania; enough in Detroit to perhaps decide the vote of the State of Michigan; enough in Chicago to carry the State of Illinois. Hence, a dangerous and radical proposal in which a majority of neither party believes was written into both platforms as political bait for a minority vote within the large pivotal States.

A second minority group that was wooed by the platform makers of both parties was the radical wing of organized labor. In the large pivotal States above mentioned, the votes controlled by the political-action committee of the CIO was a tremendous, potential, political threat. The votes allegedly controlled by this organization in the large pivotal States, if cast en bloc, would be sufficient to swing the votes of such States and perhaps elect a President. Hence, both parties generally speaking wrote platitudinous provisions into their platforms concerning industrial-management relations. Both parties pussyfooted on the labor question because of organized labor's power through the electoral college.

Now, with all due deference to our many fine Jewish citizens, they constitute a third group, to whom a specific overt appeal was made in the platforms of both major parties. There are 2½ million Jews in the city of New York alone. When they vote even substantially en bloc, it means the balance of power in our largest State. The candidate for whom they vote carries New York State and probably the Presidency. What did the platform makers of 1944 do? Both of them wrote into their platforms specifically and without equivocation the so-called Palestine resolution, calling upon Great Britain to immediately open Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration. Regardless of the merits of the Zionists' cause in Palestine, this was political demagoguery and dangerous meddling with British foreign policy in the Holy Land. As a result of platform endorsements by both major parties, we passed a resolution through the 79th Congress calling upon England to open up Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration. Within a few weeks after this resolution was passed, England asked us if we were ready and willing to back up our request with the Army and Navy if she got into war. We stuck our noses into British foreign policy for purely political reasons and to the detriment of all of our citizens, Jewish and otherwise.

Then there are numerous other minority pressure groups within these large pivotal States to whom continuous political overtures are made by the strategists of both parties. There are more than 1 million Italians in New York City. There are 2 million Irish, many of whom are still politically conscious where Ireland is concerned. There are 500,000 Poles and other large racial groups. It is largely within these big cities that the racial, religious, and economic blocs are found, and in which they operate.

Now, please, understand, I have no objection to the Negro in Harlem voting and to his vote being counted, but I do resent the fact that both parties will spend a hundred times as much money to get his vote, and that his vote is worth a hundred times as much in the scale of national politics as is the vote of a white man in Texas. I have no objection to a million folks who cannot speak English voting, or to their votes being counted, but I do resent the fact that because they happen to live in Chicago, or Detroit, or New York, their vote is worth a hundred times as much as mine because I happen to live in Texas. Is it fair, is it honest, is it democratic, is it to the best interest of anyone, in fact, to place such a premium on a few thousand labor votes, or Italian votes, or Irish votes, or Negro votes, or Jewish votes, or Polish votes, or Communist votes, or big-city-machine votes, simply because they happen to be located in 2 or 3 large, industrial pivotal States?

Mr. President, Mr. Gossett has told us in no uncertain language why many conservative southerners, nativist northerners, and antilabor groups are supporting this proposed constitutional amendment although not all of those who support this amendment fall into these categories. Let us turn more specifically to the provisions of the amendment, and spell out precisely how adoption of the amendment would accomplish the purposes of these so-called conservatives.

The amendment before us allows each State legislature to select one of two systems. Both would abolish the general ticket system by which the presidential candidate with a popular plurality in a State is awarded all of that State's electoral votes. Instead, the State legislature would be compelled to select either the Mundt-Coudert or Lodge-Gossett system. Let us look at each of these systems.

First, I shall take up the Mundt-Coudert plan, because last week the Lodge-Gossett plan was analyzed in great detail and with great ability by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

III–2. EVILS OF THE MUNDT-COUDERT PLAN

The Mundt-Coudert plan provides that one presidential elector shall be chosen in each congressional district and the remainder in the State at large. In 1952, for example, Adlai Stevenson carried 6 congressional districts in California and, consequently, would have garnered 6 of California's 32 electoral votes; President Eisenhower won a popular plurality in the other 24 districts and, therefore, would have received 24 electoral votes plus 2 additional ones for carrying the State.

It is popularly believed that the proposal before us would abolish the electoral-college system. Senator MUNDT's plan would do nothing of the kind. Rather than abolish our 48 electoral colleges, it would create 430 more electoral colleges—1 in each congressional district. It would not abolish the winner-take-all rule. The presidential candidate with the popular plurality in a district would receive 100 percent of that district's electoral vote. The winner would take all in the congressional district. In short, the Mundt-Coudert plan would extend the evils of the Georgia county-unit system to presidential elections, the only difference being that the congressional district rather than the county would be the basic unit. In short, this proposal does not do the things it is purported to do:

First. It does not abolish our electoral colleges. It simply multiplies their number.

Second. It does not abolish the so-called winner-take-all rule. It simply transfers the application of this rule from the State to the congressional district.

Third. It does nothing to correct the disparity caused by allocating electoral votes among the States on the basis of representation in the Senate and House of Representatives. Each State would continue to have a number of presidential electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State is entitled. Today, the 9 States having over half of the population cast 18 of the 96 electoral votes based on senatorial seats, while the other 78 are controlled by the 39 States having less than half of the population. The proposal before us does not change this situation.

Fourth. The Mundt-Coudert plan does not correct the discrepancy between the popular and electoral vote, which is caused by the great variation in voter participation between the States, to which I have already referred. In my home State of Illinois in 1952, for example, 1 electoral vote represented 165,965 popular votes in contract to 1 of Mississippi's which represented only 35,692 popular votes. Enforcement of the sec-

ond section of the 14th amendment, not the Mundt-Coudert or Lodge-Gossett plan, is the remedy for this situation.

Fifth. The Mundt-Coudert plan would not have changed the outcome of a single election since 1916. In every case, the Mundt-Coudert plan would have given the necessary 266 electoral votes to the candidate with the popular plurality.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table headed "Comparison of the Mundt-Coudert System With the Present Electoral System in the Presidential Elections, 1916–52."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of the Mundt-Coudert system with the present electoral system in the presidential elections, 1916–52

Year	Electoral votes won under present system			Distribution of electoral votes under Mundt-Coudert plan			
	Republican	Democratic	Other	Republican	Democratic	Other	Uncertain [1]
1952	442	89	0	375	156	0	0
1948	189	303	39	193	299	39	0
1944	99	432	0	166	292	0	73
1940	82	449	0	135	321	0	75
1936	8	523	0	41	412	0	78
1932	59	472	0	85	363	0	83
1928	444	87	0	349	104	0	78
1924	382	136	13	291	145	15	80
1920	404	127	0	311	129	0	91
1916	254	277	0	175	267	0	89

[1] The reason for listing some electoral votes as "uncertain" is that a tabulation of the presidential vote in these congressional districts has never been made. These "uncertain" electoral votes are almost entirely in big-city districts, where it is most difficult to tabulate the popular vote by congressional districts because the city and even some wards and precincts are divided between several congressional districts.

Source: Hearings on S. J. Res. 3, 84th Cong., 2d sess., p. 339.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Having looked at the things the Mundt-Coudert plan would not do, let us now look at some of the things it would do—at some of the evils it would cause:

First. Adoption of the Mundt-Coudert plan would deprive the bulk of our people of the political education which a presidential campaign affords. Advocates of this resolution argue that its adoption would spread the campaign to every corner of the Nation. But would it? There are rarely more than 100 marginal congressional districts. This means that the presidential campaign would be confined to less than 100 districts. Do the advocates of this plan seriously contend that presidential candidates would actually campaign in the congressional districts of Alabama or Vermont?

Second. The Mundt-Coudert plan would enhance the power of the South in national politics by placing the South in a balance-of-power position. Under the present system, the 11 Southern States held a balance of power in only 2 of the past 10 elections—in 1916 and 1948. Under the Mundt plan, however, southern electoral votes would have been necessary for victory in 3, 4, or 5 of these last 10 elections—in 1916, 1944, 1948, and perhaps in 1932 and 1940 as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table headed "Electoral Vote Margin of Winner."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Electoral vote margin

[Electoral votes in excess of the 266 necessary for victory]

Year	Present system		Mundt-Coudert plan	
	National margin of winner	Southern electoral votes for winner	National margin of winner [1]	Southern electoral votes for winner
1952	176	57	109	48
1948	37	88	33	81
1944	166	127	18–102	125
1940	183	124	145–230	123
1936	257	124	146–224	123
1932	206	124	97–180	122
1928	178	62	83–161	48
1924	116	0	25–105	2
1920	138	12	45–136	9
1916	11	126	1–90	123

[1] Because the popular vote for President has not been tabulated in a number of congressional districts, the margin under the Mundt-Coudert plan can be given only in terms of a maximum and a minimum. In 1944, for example, Roosevelt would have had an electoral vote margin of at least 18 and no more than 102 under the Mundt-Coudert plan.

Source: Hearings, op. cit., p. 340.

Mr. DOUGLAS. These figures explain precisely why some southerners are pushing for a change in our electoral system. In the past four Congresses, a number of southern Senators and Representatives have frankly stated that electoral change is favored in the South because it would make unnecessary the solicitation of minority votes in northern cities and, thereby, increase the voice of the South in the Democratic Party. Their views were neatly summarized in the Macon [Ga.] News—which, incidentally, is an extremely good newspaper—which spoke editorially as follows:

> Dividing a State's electoral vote on the basis of its popular vote would take from Walter White [of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People] his ability to manipulate the votes of the mere 3 million Negroes living outside the South for a boasted control of 17 States and the Presidency.

The Vernon [Tex.] Times told its readers:

> If the Republican Party succeeds in having the Gossett-Lodge resolution adopted * * * that will put an end to the bipartisan contest for Negro votes in pivotal States and eliminate the so-called civil rights issue from national politics.

Now, I have a special word for the Republicans supporting this measure. A number of them are probably thinking that it would enable a Republican presidential candidate to gain some electoral votes in the South. I suggest that this measure would put the South in a position so that it could mold the Democratic Party in its own image. Naturally, we northern Democrats do not relish this prospect. But I want to tell my Republican friends that, if the South could dominate the Democratic Party, the Republican presidential candidate would lose rather than gain southern votes.

One thing is certain: Adoption of this formula would shift the balance of power within each of our political parties. In the Democratic Party, the South would have the controlling voice. I think this would likely mean at least three parties, namely, a Southern Democratic Party, a Northern Liberal Democratic Party, and a Republican Party. In the Republican Party, the conservatives would likely gain a stronger voice because of the decreased importance of the large States and big cities where liberal Republicanism is now largely found.

I wish to make an exception of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who, on domestic matters, I believe, possesses one of the finest voting records in the Senate. However, he realizes that he has been, so to speak, a lonely figure in the past few years. Republican progressivism in the Western States, which was so strong 30 years ago, has greatly decreased. On domestic matters, the big States have a much more liberal attitude within the Republican Party than the States west of the Mississippi, or perhaps west of the Allegheny. The third party is likely to consist of liberal Democrats and Republicans in the North. This would mean a breakdown of our two-party system—two conservative parties and one liberal party. If this developed and three presidential candidates were in the race, no candidate would receive a majority of the electoral vote, and, under this proposal, the election would be thrown into the Congress, where no one party would have a majority. Imagine the strategic position of Southern Representatives in Congress trying to make deals with the two other parties.

There is still another, but I think a less likely, possibility. A Democratic Party under greater southern domination would lose considerable northern support, which would probably be channeled into the third party I've already mentioned. The Republicans, however, might find it necessary and expedient to bid for this northern support, a contingency which would likely strengthen the voice of liberal forces in the Republican Party. I cannot believe that the authors of the Mundt-Coudert plan want us to adopt a system which might force a political realinement, which in turn might strengthen the liberal elements in their own party.

I suggest that adoption of this proposed constitutional amendment would promote a political realinement of some sort. I am not sure, however, that it would promote a political realinement of the sort the conservatives desire. As I shall show, I think probably it would. In any case, if political realinement is the real purpose of electoral change, let us debate the merits of a political realinement rather than sneak realinement in under the cloak of "electoral reform."

Third. The Mundt-Coudert system would decrease the voice of the large States in presidential elections. I have

already indicated the disadvantages under which the large States now operate in our Federal system. Their voice is small in the Senate; they are underrepresented in the electoral college to the extent that electoral votes are based on senatorial seats; their voice in the constitutional amendment process is small; and so forth. The general ticket system is the one device which gives these States some voice in national politics. A presidential candidate will seek the votes of the people living in the large States, because they control a large bloc of electoral votes. President Eisenhower campaigned in Texas in 1952, because a popular plurality in that State meant 24 electoral votes in the Republican column. This was a prize worth seeking. If the Mundt-Coudert plan had been effective in 1952, however, Eisenhower's electoral vote margin in Texas would have amounted to 8 rather than 24. I suggest that presidential candidates would have paid less heed to the desires of Texas if they had known that their net gain in that State would be less than 10 instead of 24 electoral votes.

In 1952, the 9 States having over half the population—50.6 percent—contributed 237 electoral votes to the victorious presidential candidate. This was the prize which made it worthwhile for the presidential candidates to heed the voices of the voters in the large States. If the Mundt-Coudert plan had been operative in 1952, however, Eisenhower's electoral vote margin in these 9 States would have been reduced from 237 to 117. In other words, the victorious candidate's net electoral vote gain in these 9 States would have been reduced 50 percent; the prize would have been worth only half as much. This is why adoption of the Mundt-Coudert plan would reduce the importance, and hence the voice, of our most populated States in presidential elections.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table I have prepared be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Electoral votes of 9 States containing more than half of the total population of the United States

State	Electoral vote margin in 1952		
	Present system	Lodge-Gossett	Mundt-Coudert plan
1. New York	45	5.355	17
2. California	32	4.352	20
3. Pennsylvania	32	1.856	12
4. Illinois	27	2.673	13
5. Ohio	25	3.400	17
6. Texas	24	1.536	8
7. Michigan	20	2.280	12
8. New Jersey	16	2.368	10
9. Massachusetts	16	1.392	8
Total	237	25.212	117

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in 1952, the 39 States having less than half of the population controlled 294 electoral votes. Under the general ticket system, this represented a margin of 294. If the Mundt-Coudert plan had been operative in 1952, the margin of 294 would have been reduced by less than 25 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table I have prepared be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Electoral votes of 39 States containing less than half of the total population of the United States

State	Electoral vote margin in 1952		
	Present system	Lodge-Gossett plan	Mundt-Coudert plan
1. Alabama	11	3.256	11
2. Arizona	4	.664	4
3. Arkansas	8	.968	6
4. Colorado	6	1.278	6
5. Connecticut	8	.944	8
5. Delaware	3	.117	3
7. Florida	10	1.000	4
8. Georgia	12	4.728	12
9. Idaho	4	1.540	4
10. Indiana	13	2.223	11
11. Iowa	10	2.820	10
12. Kansas	8	3.064	8
13. Kentucky	10	.010	4
14. Louisiana	10	.580	8
15. Maine	5	1.610	5
16. Maryland	9	1.044	7
17. Minneapolis	11	2.232	7
18. Mississippi	8	1.664	6
19. Missouri	13	.208	5
20. Montana	4	.772	4
21. Nebraska	6	2.304	6
22. Nevada	3	.684	3
23. New Hampshire	4	.872	4
24. New Mexico	4	.444	4
25. North Carolina	14	1.092	6
26. North Dakota	4	1.704	4
27. Oklahoma	8	.736	6
28. Oregon	6	1.296	6
29. Rhode Island	4	.076	2
30. South Carolina	8	.112	2
31. South Dakota	4	1.544	4
32. Tennessee	11	.053	1
33. Utah	4	.712	4
34. Vermont	3	1.299	3
35. Virginia	12	1.548	8
36. Washington	9	.864	9
37. West Virginia	8	.304	4
38. Wisconsin	12	2.676	10
39. Wyoming	3	.768	3
Total	294	49.810	222

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a fourth evil of the Mundt-Coudert plan is that it would reduce the voice of the large cities in presidential elections. This is especially true if the State legislatures continue to gerrymander the States to the disadvantage of the metropolitan areas. Let me take my own State, for example. Under the present system, every popular vote in Illinois has equal value in determining the presidential race in our State. If the Mundt-Coudert plan became operative, however, a popular vote in Chicago's 13th Congressional District would have only about half the weight of one popular vote in the 20th District downstate. The 13th and the 20th Districts would each be entitled to one district electoral vote under the Mundt-Coudert plan; but 466,064 people live in Chicago's 13th District, whereas only 281,468 live in the 20th District downstate.

According to the 1950 census, there are 14 cities outside the South each having more than a half million inhabitants. From 1932 through 1948 the Republicans were often able to roll up a plurality or even a majority outside the big cities; but their margin was often insufficient to offset the large Democratic margin in the big cities. In 1948, for example, Dewey won a popular margin of 167,224 in downstate Illinois. But Truman's margin of 200,836 in Cook County gave him all of Illinois' 28 electoral votes under the present system. Thus, these 28 electoral votes were determined by the big-city margin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table I have prepared be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Electoral votes determined by large-city vote margins in presidential elections, 1932–52

Year	11 States' electoral vote [1]	Electoral votes determined by big-city margins
1952	242	None.
1948	241	Democratic, 78; Republican, 0.
1944	241	Democratic, 152; Republican, 0.
1940	242	Democratic, 124; Republican, 0.
1936	242	Democratic, 47; Republican, 0.
1932	242	Democratic, 64; Republican, 0.

[1] The 11 States and 14 cities are: Los Angeles and San Francisco, Calif.; Chicago, Ill.; Baltimore, Md.; Boston, Mass.; Detroit, Mich.; Minneapolis, Minn.; St. Louis, Mo.; New York City and Buffalo, N. Y.; Cleveland, Ohio; Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, Pa.; and Milwaukee, Wis.

Source: Hearings, op. cit., p. 340.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Mundt-Coudert plan is devised to take the big city out of this strategic position. The party which failed to carry the large cities would usually gain more electoral votes in the big-city States under the Mundt plan than under the present system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table I have prepared be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Distribution of electoral votes in 11 northern and border States [1] having a central city of one-half million or more inhabitants

[Votes under Mundt-Coudert plan in parentheses; others are votes under present system]

Year	Republican	Democratic	Other	Uncertain
1952	242 (185)	0 (57)		
1948	109 (116)	132 (125)		
1944	37 (92)	204 (89)		(60)
1940	19 (72)	223 (106)		(64)
1936	0 (27)	242 (146)		(69)
1932	36 (53)	206 (115)		(74)
1928	215 (145)	18 (22)		(66)
1924	220 (147)	0 (5)	13 (13)	(68)
1920	233 (152)	0 (2)		(79)
1916	170 (101)	63 (53)		(79)

[1] The 11 States are: California (Los Angeles and San Francisco), Illinois (Chicago), Maryland (Baltimore), Massachusetts (Boston), Michigan (Detroit), Minnesota (Minneapolis), Missouri (St. Louis), New York (New York City and Buffalo), Ohio (Cleveland), Pennsylvania (Philadelphia and Pittsburgh), and Wisconsin (Milwaukee).

Source: Hearings, op. cit., p. 341.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this balance of power position held by certain large cities, which in the past has enabled these cities to help to determine from 47 to 152 electoral votes, gave them an important voice in national politics. It helped to compensate for the cities' under-representation in our national and State legislative bodies. It forced

presidential candidates at least to pay some attention to the needs and problems of metropolitan populations, whose needs and interests are all too often ignored by Congress and the State legislatures.

A number of Republicans have doubtless been attracted to the Mundt-Coudert plan on the mere assumption that a Republican presidential candidate would benefit from reducing the electoral power of the large cities, which have usually turned in Democratic pluralities during the past 24 years. I would like to point out to my Republican friends, however, that big-city margins did not deprive Eisenhower of a single electoral vote in 1952. Moreover, voting patterns change. In general, Republican gains over the past 15 years have been greater in cities and urban areas than in rural areas. This is partially shown by 2 tables which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP percentage of the major-party vote in the 14 cities having at least one-half million inhabitants

	President				Congress 1954
	1940	1944	1948 [1]	1952	
Los Angeles	38.9	40.4	43.1	52.1	51.0
San Francisco	39.7	39.1	45.8	53.5	[2] 38.8
Remainder of California	43.2	44.8	48.9	58.4	47.6
Chicago	41.5	38.6	41.4	45.6	40.0
Remainder of Illinois	54.0	56.3	56.7	61.5	59.4
Baltimore City	36.0	40.8	43.9	48.2	[3] 34.5
Remainder of Maryland	46.0	54.2	54.3	60.5	52.0
Boston	36.7	37.7	27.7	40.4	[4] 29.3
Remainder of Massachusetts	48.6	49.0	47.1	56.9	50.7
Detroit	37.0	35.0	36.7	39.5	33.7
Remainder of Michigan	53.4	54.3	55.8	62.4	57.2
Minneapolis	44.1	41.8	41.2	50.8	49.7
Remainder of Minnesota	49.0	37.6	39.9	56.7	45.9
St. Louis City	41.9	39.6	35.2	38.0	40.9
Remainder of Missouri	49.2	51.0	43.3	54.0	45.2
New York City	38.8	38.3	35.4	44.6	[5] 34.6
Buffalo	45.5	44.4	40.7	50.4	60.8
Remainder of New York	59.3	59.0	59.3	67.5	62.9
Cleveland	30.1	32.1	34.0	40.1	45.2
Remainder of Ohio	50.1	52.5	51.0	58.6	56.6
Philadelphia	40.0	41.1	48.4	41.6	42.7
Pittsburgh	38.4	39.2	38.3	43.9	47.6
Remainder of Pennsylvania	49.4	51.9	53.6	57.0	51.9
Milwaukee	35.9	38.3	37.9	48.5	38.6
Remainder of Wisconsin	52.1	54.0	49.0	64.1	57.2

[1] Henry Wallace considered 3d major-party candidate in 1948.
[2] No Republican candidate in 1 of 2 San Francisco districts.
[3] No Republican candidate in 1 or 3 Baltimore districts.
[4] No Republican candidate in 1 of 3 Boston districts.
[5] No Republican candidate in 1 of 22 New York City districts.

See also Gallup's Political Almanac, 1952, pp. 26–38.

Republican percentage of major-party vote in presidential elections

Year	New England	Mid-Atlantic	East Central	West Central	Mountain	Pacific	South	United States
1896	71.7	60.5	54.1	52.7	18.3	51.4	39.5	52.7
1900	61.5	57.5	54.5	55.8	45.7	56.9	39.2	53.2
1904	63.0	61.0	64.5	66.7	62.2	73.1	34.9	60.0
1908	63.9	58.3	56.2	56.0	53.6	63.1	37.8	54.5
1912 [1]	33.6	26.7	27.0	26.5	30.2	11.1	18.7	25.1
1916	52.5	54.2	51.9	49.7	40.0	49.6	31.5	48.3
1920	68.9	68.3	66.3	69.5	61.9	71.6	41.7	63.9
1924 [1]	63.5	58.9	61.0	50.2	49.9	56.0	34.5	54.3

Year	New England		Mid-Atlantic		East Central		West Central		Mountain		Pacific		South	United States
	Cities [2]	Outside cities [3]	Cities [2]	Outside cities [3]	Cities [2]	Outside cities [3]	Cities [2]	Outside cities [3]	Cities [2]	Outside cities [3]	Cities [2]	Outside cities [3]		
1928	40.1	59.1					53.5	61.4					51.6	58.8
1932	38.3	54.0	37.2	53.3	43.0	46.5	36.2	37.4	42.5		38.2		23.7	40.9
1936	33.5	51.0	30.2	47.9	34.4	45.5	30.0	41.0	31.8		30.1		24.3	37.5
1940	37.6	50.7	39.6	53.0	41.5	53.3	41.7	53.6	43.3	44.6	40.6	43.4	27.1	45.0
1944	38.0	51.2	39.6	54.8	39.9	55.9	41.6	54.8	45.6	47.8	41.2	45.4	30.8	46.2
1948 [1]	34.1	51.7	39.0	56.0	41.8	54.6	39.2	48.2	46.2	45.4	45.1	48.4	29.7	45.3
1952	44.5	60.5	45.3	61.5	46.5	61.6	47.6	63.7	58.0	60.7	54.0	58.7	49.0	55.4

[1] Republican percentage of 3-party vote. In 1948, Wallace's Progressive Party was considered a 3d major party outside the South and the States Rights Party was considered a 3d major party in the South.
[2] Cities with 100,000 or more inhabitants in 1950. There were 13 such cities in New England, 21 in the Middle Atlantic, 18 in the East Central, 10 in the West Central, 3 in the Mountain, and 12 in the Pacific States, totaling 77 outside of the South. There are 29 in the Southern States, totaling 106 in the 48 States.
[3] Area outside the cities mentioned in the above note:
New England: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.
Middle Atlantic: Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.
East Central: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio.
West Central: Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.
Mountain: Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.
Pacific: California, Oregon, and Washington.
South: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.
Source: Hearings, op. cit., p. 346.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Republicans' big-city gains would show up even more clearly in the two above tables I have inserted if it had been possible to compile the statistics on the basis of the standard metropolitan area rather than on the basis of the central city. For the Republican Party has gained heavily in the suburban areas around the central city, such as Westchester, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties in New York.

In my own State there are suburbs west of Chicago and north of Chicago and in the quasi-suburban counties of Du Page and Lake, where the same appears to be true.

In contrast, Republican strength has been declining in a number of rural areas. These declines have been especially significant in the dairy and less prosperous farm regions of the Middle West. In short, an electoral system which might have enlarged the Republican electoral vote in 1932, 1936, 1940, 1944, and 1948—all elections which the GOP would have lost in any case—might very well make the Republican presidential candidate its victim in the next five presidential elections.

I believe, Mr. President, that reduction of the large cities' voice in presidential elections would be a real evil for a number of reasons.

CRITICISM OF CITIES NOT WHOLLY JUSTIFIED

A great deal of unfavorable publicity has been put forth with regard to the big cities. Much of it is unjustified. In the first place, we should judge not the absolute amount of crime or juvenile delinquency which takes place in a city, but the relative amount, in proportion to population. If we take the relative amount, we find that the cities do not do badly at all. In fact, they do better than some areas in the countryside. Mere size itself seems to be unesthetic, and evils which are ignored in the countryside are reprobated in the city.

When I was a member of the City Council of Chicago, as a part of my duties I specialized in the disposition of waste and garbage. The amount of garbage per person is not greater in the city than it is in the small town. However, since there are only a few people in the small town, the garbage can be disposed

of without bringing esthetic blemishes upon the countryside. However, the disposal of the garbage of three and a half million or eight million people creates a very difficult problem, and is one which exposes a city to condemnation, which is not fair.

If I may indulge in a literary aside, that is the very fact why I have never thought Rabelais a particularly humorous writer, because the functions which he described on the part of a giant are to me extremely repulsive, even though for a child that would not be the case.

CITIES AN INFLUENCE FOR TOLERANCE

In our big cities, Americans of various races, religions, and ethnic origins all live side by side as close neighbors, and worship together. It is true that in the beginning there is a certain amount of hostility, but the hostility soon changes to acceptance, then to toleration, then to understanding, and finally to cooperation and to fellowship. The broadmindedness and tolerance which emanates from our cities is a leaven in each of our political parties. To deprive our two great parties of the broadminded and tolerant influence of the cities would be a severe blow to our national progress. Moreover, the general ticket system forces both major parties to recognize the legitimate interests of the minority groups which are concentrated in our metropolitan areas. I am not arguing that minority groups in pivotal States should have undue influence in national party councils. I am simply arguing that consideration of their legitimate interests incorporates these groups into the national community and makes our two-party system possible. This means that most members of the group are willing to compromise with other conflicting groups within a major party. Most members of such a group do not at present feel the need to form special interest parties to protect their interests. This means that the so-called radical elements are forced to moderate their extreme demands and seek terms of accommodation with other groups inside one or the other of our two major parties. In this way, we have avoided the creation of numerous political parties to represent the many different racial, religious, economic, and other minority groups in the Nation. Through our two broad-based political parties we have been able to incorporate the members of these minority groups into our national life. Under the proposal before us, the major parties would tend to give less attention to the legitimate interest of these minority groups; and this in turn would weaken our two-party system. Minority groups in pivotal States do not now have undue influence in presidential elections or on national policy. The fact is that neither major party can afford to yield to the extreme demands of a minority lest it lose its broad support throughout the Nation. I am afraid that some of those who advocate this constitutional amendment do so, not because they wish to free the major parties from giving undue consideration to minority groups, but because they wish the two major parties almost completely to ignore these groups.

Let me quote from the Wichita Daily Times of November 28, 1948:

> Southerners in Congress, laying plans for quieting the loud voices of racial and labor minorities in the Democratic Party, have high hopes of putting the Gossett-Lodge constitutional amendment through Congress. * * * Southerners were the first to rally in large numbers behind the amendment following President Truman's civil-rights recommendations. They argued that if the President had not felt he needed the Negro vote in Harlem, Chicago, and Philadelphia to win the huge electoral votes of New York, Illinois, and Pennsylvania, the message would have never been written.

Our two-party system will surely break down if our two major parties do not represent the various economic, racial, religious, social, sectional, and other groups in the Nation. Today, neither major party closes its doors to any significant element in our population. Both major parties recognize and protect the legitimate interests of such groups. We are a heterogeneous people and must adjust the conflicting interests of our people. These adjustments are made within each of our major parties. This system has made liberty, democracy, and domestic order possible, because Americans know that neither party is a serious threat to the interests of any group.

This proposed constitutional amendment is pushed by those who object to compromising with other interests within their own party. Conservative rural Republicans hope to devise an electoral system which will free them from having to compromise with liberal Republicans from urban industrial areas inside the Republican Party. Southern Democrats hope to devise an electoral system which will free them from the necessity of compromising with the liberal northern Democrats inside the Democratic Party. These conservatives are so sure they are right, and I do not question their sincerity, that they are ready to turn their backs on the democratic process of compromise. They want to free themselves from the necessity of forming majorities by compromise between minorities. They are looking for an electoral system which will enable them to force their policies on the rest of the Nation.

At this point, I should like to call attention to a quotation of Judge Learned Hand, one of the noblest of Americans, to the effect that the spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure it is right. Any change in our electoral system, which would make our two major parties less sensitive to the vital interests of any important segment of our population, will undermine the two-party system. Any change in our electoral system, which will free even a majority from the obligation of compromising with other groups within the party will undermine our system of free government based on popular consent.

AMENDMENT COULD LEAD TO FURTHER RESTRICTIONS OF THE FRANCHISE

A fifth evil which will arise from adoption of the constitutional amendment proposed here is that it would probably lead to additional restrictions on the franchise in the "safe States."

A popular vote in a "safe" State is, on the average, worth approximately three popular votes in the larger States. In some cases, the disparity is even greater than 3 to 1. I have already placed in the RECORD tables showing voter participation in previous elections. In 1952, for example, one electoral vote in Illinois stood for 165,965 popular votes in contrast to one of Mississippi's, which represented only 35,692 popular votes.

This inequity is roughly compensated for under our present system, which gives the large State's entire electoral vote to the candidate receiving a plurality of the popular vote in that State. The Mundt-Coudert plan would eliminate this compensating factor by dividing the State's electoral votes. In this way, the relative importance of the "safe" States would be increased and the relative importance of the two-party States would be diminished. The incentive of the dominant party in such a State to keep that State "safe" would be tremendous.

The dominant party in such a State would do everything in its power to preserve its advantage. This is especially true in the Southern States, where the franchise is already severely restricted by statute and extra-legal practices. We know that the dominant party would not voluntarily lift these restrictions and thereby extend the franchise to those who might use the vote to threaten the power of those now in control. On the contrary, the dominant party would probably use its present power to guarantee its continued dominance through further restriction of the franchise.

Proponents of this measure claim that adoption of the plan would enlarge the vote in the Southern States. They argue that presidential elections would become real contests in the South if a Southern State's electoral vote could be divided between the two major candidates. Republicans would come to the polls, the argument continues, because their votes would no longer be futile, and Democrats would come to the polls because their votes would no longer be superfluous. This, I believe, was former Senator Lodge's argument back in 1950. But what are the facts? The voting pattern of the South has been remarkably uniform ever since the end of reconstruction. Popular participation in elections in the South is lower than elsewhere in the Nation. Even if one compares the primary vote in the South to the general election vote in the other 37 States, the number of Southerners going to the polls is relatively low. As a matter of fact, in the South as a whole participation in a presidential election is usually greater than participation in the largest primaries. I have introduced material to that effect, showing figures for 1952. For example, the 1942 primaries were supposed to have turned out the largest primary vote in the South in many years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at

this point figures showing that the primary vote was smaller than was the presidential vote.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State	For single office receiving highest statewide vote in 1942 primaries		Total vote for presidential electors	
	Office	Total votes	1940	1944
Alabama	Governor	279,454	294,219	244,743
Arkansas	Attorney General	228,414	200,743	212,954
Florida	United States Representative	258,668	485,492	482,592
Georgia	Governor	301,686	312,539	328,111
Louisiana	United States Senator	321,041	372,305	349,383
Mississippi	do	133,449	175,824	180,080
North Carolina	do	320,755	822,648	790,554
South Carolina	do	234,942	99,830	103,375
Tennessee	Governor	297,197	522,823	510,792
Texas	United States Senator	983,512	1,041,168	1,150,330
Virginia	United States Representative	41,318	346,607	388,485
Total		3,400,436	4,674,198	4,741,399

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States 1943, pp. 234, 237; Ibid., 1944-45, pp. 251, 257, and 44 American Political Science Review 98 (March 1950).

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, Mr. President; advocates of this electoral change tell us that more southerners would vote in the presidential elections if this change were adopted. In support of this statement, they tell us that more southern voters participate in primaries, where the ballot really counts, than in general elections which are a foregone conclusion. But I have already put into the RECORD facts from the 1952 election which show conclusively that this is not true.

These figures indicate that having one's vote count is not so effective in bringing southerners to the polls. Moreover, comparing voter participation in the South with voter participation in the so-called one-party States outside the South would indicate that mere political apathy in a one-party State is not the only cause for low popular participation in southern elections.

I suggest that restricted franchise is an important factor in explaining why so few southerners vote in presidential elections. If a proposal were adopted so that a State's electoral vote could be divided, southern Democratic legislatures would almost surely tighten suffrage qualifications to guarantee continued control by those southerners who are now in the saddle. Remember that democracy met the agrarian and Populist challenge with a program of systematic disfranchisement through literacy tests and cumulative poll taxes.

I have gone into the question rather thoroughly, and I find that after the Populist movement was started, bringing in poor farmers and poor Negroes and creating an alternative party, we found expansion of the poll tax, the literacy test, the grandfather clause, and all these other measures that tend to restrict the franchise so as to perpetuate one-party control.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that at one time the Populist Party was very strong in the South?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, indeed. Tom Watson was once a Senator from Georgia and the leader of the Populist Party in the South. The Populist Party was strong in Georgia, Texas, North Carolina, and South Carolina. At one time it looked as though it would be the second party in the South.

Mr. LANGER. But the people got rid of it, just as the distinguished Senator said a few moments ago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have stated one of the ways.

THE POSSIBILITY OF UNPLEDGED ELECTORS

A sixth evil which will arise from adoption of the Mundt-Coudert plan is that it would open the door to the possibility of unpledged electors. Under this measure, an elector would be freed from casting his electoral vote for the presidential candidate selected by the voters unless that elector were specifically pledged to that presidential candidate. Some advocates of the Mundt-Coudert plan have said that adoption of the district system would mean abolition of the presidential short ballot, that the names of the candidates for district elector rather than the names of the presidential candidates would appear on the ballot in the popular election, that a presidential elector would be thought of as a lawful public officer and as a candidate in his own right rather than a symbol of his party's presidential candidate, and that the electoral college would become a deliberative body which would elect the President. Mr. President, at least some of the advocates of the Mundt-Coudert plan envisage that their plan would take election of the President out of the hands of our people. They argue that the district system would put an end to popular election of the President. They want to reverse 165 years of democratization in the process by which the President is elected.

Lines 11 to 13 on page 4 of the substitute amendment say:

> Any candidate for elector who before the [popular?] election has pledged his vote for President or Vice President to a specific person shall, if elected, cast his vote for such person.

This language might be held to repeal the custom by which an elector is bound to vote for the candidate on whose ticket he was elected. There have been only 2 exceptions to this rule:

First. One elector in New Hampshire in 1824—See volume 42, American Political Science Review, pages 527 to 528, note 24.

Second. One elector in Tennessee in 1948. But this elector was pledged to Thurmond, ran on both the Truman and Thurmond tickets, was elected on the Truman ticket, and cast his ballot for Thurmond in conformity with his pledge—volume 44, American Political Science Review, pages 86–87.

It might be argued that this amendment would repeal the binding custom by specifically stating that "pledged" electors are bound. It is silent as to other electors. This could be said to mean that other electors are not bound. The pertinent rule or guide to statutory construction is that in case of an enumeration in a constitution or statute, all things not enumerated are excluded. (Expressio unius est exclusio alterius.) Since pledged electors are enumerated, unpledged electors may be said to be excluded. Citations for this rule: J. D. Sutherland, Statutory Construction (1943), volume II, section 4915, page 412; Earl P. Crawford, The Construction of Statutes (1940), section 195, page 334.

Unless the proposed amendment is clarified and strengthened on this point, the adoption of it might well weaken the existing practice and binding custom which, as the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has pointed out, has so effectively resulted in over 12,000 electors following the will of the voters of their States.

In order to really understand the possibilities, which I hope and believe to be wrong, of the Mundt-Coudert plan, every one of us should read a book published in 1953, The American Electoral College—Caldwell, Idaho; Caxton Printers—written by Roger Lea MacBride, who advocates adoption of the Mundt plan precisely to end the popular election of the President. On pages 78–79, MacBride says that adoption of the district system would be the first step toward restoring the electoral college as a deliberative body. He advocates that, once this step is taken, party nominating conventions be prohibited, and that the duly chosen electors meet in convention for the nomination of presidential candidates, after which the electors would return to their States and cast their electoral votes. Mr. MacBride says:

> Any revival of the electoral college as a body to choose a President, influenced but not governed by the desires of the qualified voters, will await a general recognition of the desirability of such an institution. Adoption of the district system may increase the probability of such a development, and it is with this possibility in mind that I became fully and firmly convinced that the district system should and will be adopted into the Constitution.

Mr. President, if adoption of the Mundt-Coudert plan means that we would revive the electoral college as a deliberative body and take the right to elect a President away from the people, let us debate the real issue: Are we ready

to turn the clock of democratic progress back 165 years?

Are we ready to repeal not only the 20th century, but the 19th century, as well, and go back into the womb of the 18th century?

PLAN WOULD PROMOTE GERRYMANDERING

A seventh evil which would arise from adoption of the Mundt-Coudert plan is that it would promote further gerrymandering. The gerrymandering problem is even now a serious one although a few States have equalized congressional districts during the past 20 years.

Let us look at a few examples from the 84th Congress. In Texas, as we have pointed out, the largest district has a population of 806,701 and the smallest only 227,735; in Georgia, the figures are 618,431 and 246,227; Michigan, 525,334 against 178,251; Illinois, 466,064 and 281,468; South Dakota, 493,641 and 159,099; Ohio, 545,644 and 226,341; New York, 393,130 and 297,131.

Let us examine this problem of gerrymandering in relation to the Mundt-Coudert plan. Advocates of the plan have said that gerrymandering can be easily remedied and that, therefore, the district system should not be rejected on this ground. Past experience and political realism indicate that the contrary is true. Robert G. Dixon, professor of political science at the University of Maryland, and an expert on this subject, says:

The problem of gerrymandering is serious and virtually insurmountable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the testimony given by Professor Dixon in the hearings on the bill, beginning on page 197, may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the portion of the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It may be conceded that under article I, section 4, of the Constitution—

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Congress has power to regulate congressional districting by the States, and perhaps to draw the district lines itself. On this point the Supreme Court said in *Smiley* v. *Holm* (285 U. S. 355, 366–367 (1932)):

"In exercising this power, the Congress may supplement these State regulations or may substitute its own. It may impose additional penalties for the violations of the State laws or provide independent sanctions. It has a general supervisory power over the whole subject."

Presumably the Congress would have a similar regulatory or plenary power over the districts in which presidential electors were to be chosen, and if there were any doubt on this score it could be resolved by definite constitutional provision.

Past experience indicates, however, that the fundamental problem is not one of power to correct gerrymandering but rather of willingness to exercise that power and to back it up with effective sanctions.

From the census of 1870 to the census of 1910 the Federal reapportionment acts require the State legislatures to devise districts of equal population and contiguous territory, and after the census of 1900 the requirement of compactness was added. And yet, during this period, even though it preceded the big wave of urbanism, there were important disparities of population between districts inside many of the States. That the disparities were not greater than they were is to be attributed not so much to an attempt to abide by the equality requirement as to the fact that urbanism had not reached full flower.

Examples of population disparities between districts under the 1910 census as given in Schmeckebier's Congressional Apportionment (Washington, D. C., Brookings Institution, 1941) are the following: Colorado, largest district, 228,444 and smallest district, 134,469; Connecticut, 250,182 and 190,403; Illinois, 349,883 and 167,634; Louisiana, 234,382 and 165,563; New York, 300,000 and 194,708; Ohio, 264,297 and 164,474. A list covering all the States for the year 1897 is found in appendix I to Justice Frankfurter's opinion in Colegrove v. Green (328 U. S. 549, 557–559 (1946)).

One method of compelling compliance with congressional regulations in this field would be for the House of Representatives to refuse to seat Congressmen from improperly devised districts. The House has never done this, although as Schmeckebier notes, the matter at least was discussed on 3 occasions: 1843, when 4 States did not use districts at all; 1901, a Kentucky district, and 1910, a Virginia district. In view of the interminable wrangles and interstate reprisals which would flow from a serious attempt of the House of Representatives to police a districting formula, this sanction appears inadvisable. The vital task of legislating might suffer.

Can the Federal courts be looked to for help in enforcing statutory or constitutional formulas for districting? Under present precedents the answer appears to be in the negative. In 1932 two Federal district courts invalidated State districting laws in Mississippi and Kentucky for noncompliance with the standards fixed in the congressional statute of 1911. But the Supreme Court reversed. The majority placed the decision on the ground that the 1911 law had expired, thus leaving open the question of whether the Federal courts would enforce congressional standards for districting. But four members of the Court, Justices Brandeis, Stone, Roberts, and Cardozo, would have dismissed the suit for want of equity (*Wood* v. *Broom* (287, U. S. 1 (1932)); *Mahan* v. *Hume* (287, U. S. 8 (1932))). The question left open by *Wood* v. *Broom* now appears to be settled by the later cases of *Colegrove* v. *Green* (328 U. S. 549 (1946)) and *South* v. *Peters* (339 U. S. 276 (1950)).

For discussions of *Colegrove* v. *Green* see Burdette, the Illinois Congressional Redistricting Case, the American Political Science Review, volume 40 (October 1946), pages 958–962; note, Constitutional Right to Congressional Districts of Equal Population, Yale Law Journal, volume 56 (1946), pages 127–139.

Colegrove v. *Green* was a suit in Federal district court for a declaratory judgment that Illinois congressional districts were in violation of the Federal Reapportionment Act of 1911 and the Federal Constitution, and for an order restraining the holding of the 1946 congressional election on the basis of these districts.

The district court dismissed on authority of *Wood* v. *Broom*. The Supreme Court affirmed in a 4 to 3 decision. Three members of the majority, speaking through Justice Frankfurter, placed the affirmance on the broader ground of nonjusticiability; that is, resorted to the doctrine of political questions. Justice Frankfurter said that this issue was of a peculiarly political nature and therefore not mete for judicial determination (p. 552).

Further, he said:

"Nothing is clearer than that this controversy concerns matters that bring courts into immediate and active relations with party contests. From the determination of such issues this Court has traditionally held aloof. It is hostile to a democratic system to involve the judiciary in the politics of the people. And it is not less pernicious if such judicial intervention in an essentially political contest be dressed up in the abstract phrases of the law" (pp. 553–554).

South v. *Peters* involved a challenge of the Georgia county unit system under the 14th and 17th amendments. In a per curiam rejection of the challenge the Supreme Court said:

"Federal courts consistently refuse to exercise their equity powers in cases posing political issues arising from a State's geographic distribution of electoral strength among its political subdivisions" (p. 277).

It is also axiomatic that a court will not issue a mandamus or an injunction compelling a legislature to act or to desist. *Fergus* v. *Marks* (321 Ill. 510, 152 N. E. 557 (1926)); *McChord* v. *Louisville & N. R. Co.* (183 U. S. 483 (1902)). On the general doctrine of political questions in the Federal courts see Post, the Supreme Court and Political Questions (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1936). Also in point are Harris, The Judicial Power of the United States (Louisiana State University Press, 1940) and my own The Doctrine of Separation of Powers and Federal Immunity Statutes, to appear this spring in the April and June issues of the George Washington Law Review. * * * I feel that the district system should be postponed—perhaps forever. The problem of gerrymandering, and by this I include of course the so-called silent gerrymander, i. e., that slow strangulation of metropolital political strength by simple failure to redistrict, is a virtually insoluble problem. The Federal judiciary will not, and probably should not, interfere even to enforce constitutional mandates.

The legislatures have the power, indeed, have always had the power. But the power of the rural and small-city legislative majorities naturally has not been modified by a desire for political immolation. It would be quixotic to expect otherwise, now or in the future. Likewise, it is unlikely that the problem of the gerrymander will be solved by mass population movement within the foreseeable future.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In summary, Mr. President, as Professor Dixon has said, Congress has never enforced effectively, and probably never will enforce penalties in an effective way. Moreover, we cannot look to the courts for relief, because the Supreme Court has ruled in Colegrove against Green that the gerrymander question is political and, therefore, non justiciable. This alone is a sufficient reason for rejecting the Mundt-Coudert plan.

IT WOULD HANDICAP REPUBLICANS

An eighth evil which would arise from operation of the Mundt-Coudert plan is that it creates all sorts of anomalies. First of all, the plan would tend to favor the party which failed to carry the State in the popular election. In 1952 for example, Eisenhower carried Tennessee, but he would have received only 5 electoral votes to Stevenson's 6. In 1948 Mr. Truman carried California and Ohio; but Mr. Dewey would have captured a majority of electoral votes in each of these States. Application of the Mundt-Coudert formula to the statistics for the last 10 elections produces dozens of anomalies similar to these examples.

The Mundt-Coudert plan, like the Lodge-Gossett plan, would make presidential elections closer contests by enlarging the electoral vote of the candidate who was defeated in the popular election.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table of statistics which I have prepared on the electoral vote margin.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Electoral vote margin

Year	Present system	Mundt-Coudert plan	
		Minimum	Maximum
1952	353	219	219
1948	114	106	106
1944	333	61	199
1940	367	111	261
1936	515	293	449
1932	413	195	361
1928	357	167	323
1924	246	66	226
1920	277	91	273
1916	23	3	181

NOTE.—Because the popular vote for President has not been tabulated in a number of congressional districts, the electoral vote margin under the Mundt plan can be given only in terms of a minimum and maximum. In 1944, for example, Roosevelt would have had at least 37 and perhaps as many as 205 more electoral votes than Dewey would have had.

Source: Hearings, op. cit., p. 341.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at best, this situation would merely enlarge the electoral vote consolation prize of the defeated candidate. At worst, it would enlarge the electoral vote of the candidate defeated in the popular election to the point that he could snatch electoral victory from the jaws of popular defeat. Perhaps, equally as bad, it would enlarge the electoral vote of the popularly defeated candidate sufficiently to throw the election into the Congress.

In speaking about the eighth evil of the Mundt-Coudert plan, let me say a word about how the plan might operate to the advantage of one party and the disadvantage of the other. In general, I think the plan would benefit almost nobody except the South. In Democratic years, we would trade large blocs of electoral votes for nothing. In Republican years, the Republican candidate would trade large blocs of northern electoral votes for a mere handful in the South. In 1952, for example, Eisenhower would have lost 58 northern and 9 southern electoral votes. In 1924, Mr. Coolidge would have traded somewhere between 95 and 177 northern electoral votes for 3 or 4 southern electoral votes.

This all brings me to a point about which I have heard much, namely, that the amendment before us would greatly handicap the Republican Party in years when the GOP polls a national plurality in the popular election. I am not here to promote the interests of the Republican Party. But I am here to defend our two-party system, and the Republican Party is a vital part of that system. I think there is a very real possibility that this plan would deprive the Republican Party of the presidency in years of Republican popular victory, because they would trade such large blocs of electoral votes in the North for so few in the South. The Lodge-Gossett plan is likely to be more unfair than the Mundt plan in this respect. I think, however, that the Mundt plan would also handicap the Republican candidate in this respect even though a majority of Northern States have Republican legislatures which could further gerrymander the Northern States in favor of the Republican Party.

THIRD-PARTY COMPLICATIONS

Let us look at this formula if a third-party complicated the situation. If a third-party candidate drew popular votes mainly from the Democratic candidate, such as Wallace did in 1948, the Republican could win more electoral votes under the present system than under either the Mundt-Coudert or Lodge-Gossett plans. For the present system allows the Republican to garner all of a State's electoral votes by polling a mere plurality of the popular vote. In 1948, for example, Dewey's 46.3 percent of the popular vote in New York gave him all 47 of that State's electoral votes. Under the Mundt-Coudert plan, however, Dewey would have received only 24 to Truman's 23 electoral votes. Under the Lodge-Gossett plan, he would have had a margin of only four-tenths of an electoral vote—21.6 to Truman's 21.2 and Wallace's 3.9.

Conversely, if there were a third-party candidate who drew a sufficient number of popular votes from the Republican candidate in normally Republican areas to reduce the Republican to second or third place, as La Follette did in some areas in 1924, the Republican would likely gain more electoral votes under the proposed amendment than under the present system. The Lodge-Gossett plan would benefit the Republican most if the third-party candidate's strength were spread throughout the State so that the Republican could carry only a few of any congressional districts. In Wisconsin, for example, in 1924, Coolidge was able to win a popular plurality in probably no more than 1 and certainly no more than 3 congressional districts. Consequently, he would have received 1, 2, or 3 electoral votes under the Mundt plan but would have received 4.9 electoral votes under the Lodge-Gossett plan and actually received none under the present system.

If a third-party candidate's strength were concentrated in only certain congressional districts in a normally Republican State, however, the Mundt plan would give the Republican more electoral votes than would the Lodge-Gossett plan. The result in Minnesota in 1924 gives an example. La Follette carried at least 2 and no more than 4 congressional districts and, consequently, would have received 2–4 electoral votes to Coolidge's 8–10. But Coolidge's 8–10 electoral votes under the Mundt plan would have been cut to 6.2 votes, and La Follette would have received 5.0 electoral votes under the Lodge-Gossett plan.

In considering the Mundt-Coudert plan, we are actually operating in the dark. The presidential vote has never been completely tabulated by congressional districts except for the two most recent elections.

On this point, let me quote from the testimony of Dr. Ruth Silva, professor of political science at the Pennsylvania State University. Professor Silva is the most skilled expert on the whole subject. I am quoting from the hearings, starting on page 342:

It is actually impossible to tell exactly how the Mundt plan might work, how it might affect party alinement in general, or how it might affect the fate of either major party until a more thorough statistical analysis has been made. This, in turn, will require a tabulation of the popular vote cast for each presidential candidate in each congressional district. It will also require making a statistical analysis of other elections. We need to know how the plan would operate if the South were not solid. Therefore, we should apply the Mundt-Coudert formula to the elections of 1864, 1868, 1872, and 1876. We should know exactly what would happen under the Mundt-Coudert plan if there developed a third-party which drew on Republican strength. Therefore, we should apply the Mundt formula to the elections of 1912 and 1924. Certainly, we ought to know how the Mundt formula would operate if there were a third-party candidate who drew votes from the Democratic candidate in nonmetropolitan areas. Therefore, the formula should be applied to the election of 1892. Perhaps we should also know how the Mundt formula would have operated in the election of 1824.

If the Mundt-Coudert plan should be adopted without first applying the formula to a sufficient number of past elections to get some idea how the plan would work under various conditions, we are likely to find that we have opened a political Pandora's box. We have been told, however, that it is not necessary to tabulate the popular vote cast for each presidential candidate in each congressional district in order to apply the Mundt formula to past elections. For, one witness has said, we may safely assume that each political party would have elected one presidential elector for each House seat won. As a matter of fact, elaborate tabulations of electoral votes under the Mundt plan have been made on the basis of this assumption. In the following table is reprinted a part of such a tabulation:

Year	Republican	Democratic	Other	Total
1952	299 (375)	231 (156)	1 (0)	531
1948	203 (193)	289 (299)	39 (39)	531
1944	214	315	2	531
1940	182	344	5	531
1936	92	426	13	531
1932	128	398	5	531
1928	349	181	1	531
1924	317	207	7	531
1920	375	155	1	531
1916	251	273	7	531

NOTE.—Electors assumed elected where parties' Representatives were elected and States were carried by presidential candidates. (Congressional Directories and World Almanacs, 1935 and 1945 editions, the New York Times on 1948 election. Hearings on S. J. Res. 8, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 83d Cong., 1st sess., p. 217.

The figures for 1952 and those in parentheses were supplied by Ruth C. Silva. The figures in parentheses are electoral votes won under Mundt-Coudert plan on the basis of tabulations of the actual popular vote for President in congressional districts.

It is submitted that tabulations such as the ones presented in the above table are not a satisfactory substitute for tabulating the actual vote cast for each presidential candidate in each congressional district. The weakness of assigning electoral votes on the basis of House seats won is shown in the assignment of electoral votes to third-party

presidential candidates. In 1948, Thurmond would have received only 8 electoral votes for carrying 4 States according to the method used in the table. Yet 39 electoral votes were assigned to Thurmond in the table for no reason consistent with the method. This method of assigning electoral votes on the basis of House seats won means the assigning of electoral votes to third parties which had no presidential candidates. It means the assigning of electoral votes to third parties which actually endorsed a major party's presidential candidate. Such electoral votes, it seems, should be assigned to the major party endorsed.

The fallacy of assigning electoral votes on the basis of congressional seats won is clear in 1952, when the presidential and congressional candidates of different parties carried 84 congressional districts. Thus, there would have been 84 errors in assigning electoral votes on the basis of House seats won. Some of these errors cancelled each other out, however, so that only 76 errors remained in the 1952 total given in the table. In 1948, the presidential and congressional candidates of different parties carried 100 congressional districts.

In defense of tabulating the electoral vote under the Mundt formula for past elections on the basis of House seats won, it has been said: "The assumption regarding district presidential electors is based on the fact that in New York and some other States the name of the party's candidate for district elector would appear on the voting machines right next to that of the party's candidate for Representative in Congress, the offices being arranged on the party's row on the voting machine in descending order from the statewide to the smallest constituency. * * *

"At first blush it may seem that the * * * (tabulations) should be based on the popular vote for President in congressional districts. However, reflection from common knowledge will support the view that such a basis would be a distortion due to the mere mechanics of ballot and voting-machine arrangements of candidates."

The mere mechanics of ballot and voting-machine arrangements of candidates will not insure that a party's candidate for Representative in Congress and its candidate for district elector will run together like siamese twins if the Mundt plan were adopted for the following six reasons:

1. Actually, 27 States controlling 363 electoral votes use the so-called presidential short ballot. In these 27 States the only change the Mundt plan would make would be that a popular vote for a presidential candidate would be tabulated as a vote for his party's candidate for district elector and its two or more candidates for electors at large instead of being tabulated as a vote for each of his party's candidates for elector in the entire State. If there is anything in the Mundt-Coudert plan which would require abolition of the presidential short ballot, adoption of the plan would reduce rather than increase the democratic character of presidential elections.

2. In 18 States controlling 252 electoral votes, candidates are arranged on the ballot according to the offices they seek rather than according to party affiliation. In all of these States except Pennsylvania, the voter would have to select his party's candidate for Congress and its candidate for district presidential elector from two separate groupings on the ballot. In Pennsylvania, the voter may vote a straight-party ticket by marking a single X in the party square or circle. Therefore, we cannot safely tabulate the electoral vote for past elections under the Mundt plan on the basis of House seats won.

3. All ballots are not arranged to encourage straight-party voting. In 17 States using the office-block type of ballot plus 5 States using the party-column or party-row ballot, there is no party square or circle on the ballot or party lever on the voting machine to encourage or facilitate straight-party voting. These 22 States control 256 electoral votes. This fact too shows the fallacy in tabulating electoral votes on the basis of congressional seats won.

4. At least one State (Michigan) facilitates splitting the ticket between the presidential candidate and the congressional-State ticket by providing the voter with a separate presidential ballot or a separate presidential lever on voting machines.

5. In New York, the name of the party's candidate for district elector probably would not appear on the voting machine right next to the party's candidate for Representative in Congress. The State legislature would probably continue to consider the presidential candidate as the leader of the statewide ticket and not merely as a candidate in the congressional district. As a matter of fact, many State officials doubtless hope to slide into office on the coattails of a popular presidential candidate. Consequently, the State law would probably continue to place the presidential candidate at the top of the ticket before the other statewide candidates and would not move his name down on the ballot to the district level.

6. Under the Mundt-Coudert plan, the voter would be voting for at least 3 candidates for presidential elector—1 in his congressional district and at least 2 in the State at large. Therefore, even under the New York State law mentioned above, it is likely that the courts would decide that the statewide electors were controlling and thus that the presidential candidate should be placed at the head of the ticket rather than next to the district congressional candidate.

These six points are quite irrelevant, of course, if adoption of the Mundt-Coudert plan meant abolition of the presidential short ballot and if it meant that the presidential elector were thought of as a lawful public officer and a candidate in his own right rather than a symbol for the presidential candidate. (See a recent Ohio ruling to this effect, 150 Ohio St. 127). Some advocates of the Mundt plan have said that adoption of the Mundt plan would mean these things. In fact, one advocate of the Mundt plan wrote a book supporting adoption of the district system for choosing presidential electors and making the electoral college a deliberative body which would elect the President. (Roger Lea MacBride, the American Electoral College (Caldwell, Idaho, Caxton Printers, 1953).)

Professor Silva has presented a sufficient amount of data to prove to me that we have no idea what we are playing with when we consider adoption of the Mundt-Coudert plan. Indeed, I agree with Representative JOE MARTIN and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] that we would be opening a political Pandora's box.

III–3. EVILS OF THE LODGE-GOSSETT PLAN

The other head of the two-headed hydra is the Lodge-Gossett plan. This plan would divide a State's electoral vote among the presidential candidates in proportion to their popular vote in that State. In 1952, for example, President Eisenhower in Pennsylvania polled 52.738 percent of the popular vote and won all 32 of Pennsylvania's electoral votes. Under the Lodge-Gossett formula, Eisenhower would have received only 52.738 percent, or 16.876 of Pennsylvania's electoral vote. This plan sounds reasonable on the face of it—so reasonable that I voted for this plan myself back in 1950. More careful study of the Lodge-Gossett plan, however, shows that it is full of snares and gimmicks—evil snares and gimmicks.

The Lodge-Gossett plan has many of the evils of the Mundt-Coudert plan:

First. It decreases the power of the large States. The electoral votes margin in New York, for example, would be reduced from 45 to something between one one-thousandth and 3 electoral votes.

Second. It would reduce the voice of urban areas in presidential elections and, consequently, in national politics.

Third. It would stack the cards against the Republican candidate, in my judgment. In translating popular votes into electoral votes, it would consistently magnify the Democratic vote and minimize the Republican vote.

Fourth. It would enhance the importance of the South in presidential elections and, consequently, in national politics.

Fifth. It would encourage further restriction of the franchise in the solid States.

Sixth. It would encourage disputed elections.

Now, I want to spell out these last four evils of the Lodge-Gossett plan—that it would handicap the Republican Party, put the South in the saddle, encourage restriction of the franchise, and promote election disputes.

It is true that there is now a disparity between the popular and electoral vote under the present system. In 1952, for example, President Eisenhower polled 55 percent of the popular vote, but carried 39 States and received 83 percent of the electoral vote. This exaggeration of the electoral vote is by no means an evil; in these troubled times, I think there is great psychological value in the electoral system which represents a fairly close victory as decisive. We Americans pride ourselves on accepting the result of a democratic election. That is, in part, a consequence of our electoral college system which magnifies the difference between the winner and the loser in the popular election—I think that is a good argument, although I personally favor a direct, popular election of the President. But the disparity between the electoral vote and the popular vote is caused by at least three factors in our present electoral system.

First is the allocation of electoral votes among the States on the basis of congressional representation. This magnifies the power of the small States. Today, the 9 most populous States, which have 51 percent of the population, have only 18 of the 96 electoral votes based on representation in the Senate. The other 39 States have the remaining 78 of these electoral votes. In 1948, for example, 1 electoral vote in California represented 395,040 people, in contrast to 1 of Nevada's electoral votes, which represented only 46,667 people. The Mundt-Coudert, Lodge-Gossett resolution does nothing to correct the anomalies caused by allocating electoral votes abong the States on the basis of congressional representation. New York, with a population of more than 81½ times that of Nevada, would continue to have only 15 times as many

electoral votes as Nevada has—Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1955, page 15.

The second cause for discrepancy between the popular and electoral vote is the assignment of electoral votes to the States without regard to the popular vote. In 1952, for example, 1 electoral vote in Illinois represented 166,000 popular votes, whereas 1 electoral vote in Mississippi represented only 36,000 popular votes.

Therefore, 1 vote in Mississippi was worth 4.6 as much as 1 vote in Illinois; in Alabama, 4.3 times as much as 1 vote in Illinois; in South Carolina, 3.9; in Arkansas, 3.3; in Virginia, 3.2; in Georgia, 3.0; in Louisiana, 2.5; in Tennessee, 2.0; in Texas and North Carolina, 1.9; and in Florida, each vote was worth 1.7 times as much as a vote in Illinois. In the South as a whole, 1 vote in the 1952 presidential election was worth 2.5 times the value of 1 vote in Illinois.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the number of popular votes per electoral vote in 1952.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Number of popular votes per electoral vote in 1952

11 Southern States:	
Average	66,863
Alabama	38,727
Arkansas	50,625
Florida	93,900
Georgia	54,667
Louisiana	65,200
Mississippi	35,692
North Carolina	86,500
South Carolina	42,625
Tennessee	81,182
Texas	86,500
Virginia	51,667
5 Border States:	
Average	116,875
Kentucky	99,300
Maryland	100,222
Missouri	145,538
Oklahoma	118,625
West Virginia	109,250
32 Northern States:	
Average	133,490
California	160,688
Connecticut	137,125
Idaho	69,000
Indiana	150,385
Kansas	112,000
Massachusetts	148,938
Minnesota	125,364
Nebraska	101,667
New Hampshire	68,250
New Mexico	59,750
North Dakota	67,500
Oregon	115,833
Rhode Island	103,500
Utah	82,500
Washington	122,556
Wyoming	43,000
Arizona	65,250
Colorado	105,000
Delaware	58,000
Illinois	165,965
Iowa	126,900
Maine	70,400
Michigan	139,950
Montana	66,250
Nevada	27,333
New Jersey	151,250
New York	158,400
Ohio	148,040

Number of popular votes per electoral vote in 1952—Continued

32 Northern States—*Continued*	
Pennsylvania	143,156
South Dakota	73,500
Vermont	51,333
Wisconsin	133,917
United States	115,917

Tabulated from data in Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1955, pp. 332 and 334.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment before us would do nothing to remedy this cause for disparity between the popular and electoral vote. An electoral vote in the 32 Northern States would continue to represent twice as many popular votes as a Southern electoral vote.

The third cause for the discrepancy between the popular and electoral vote is the present general ticket system, whereby the candidate with the popular plurality in a State receives all of that State's electoral vote. This third cause for disparity would be changed by the Mundt-Coudert, Lodge-Gossett plan. Now, under the Lodge-Gossett plan, the Democrats could win more electoral votes per million popular votes than could the Republicans. When the Republicans poll enough votes in the North to obtain a national plurality in the popular election, the present system allows the GOP to acquire large blocs of Northern electoral votes to offset the Democratic advantage in the South. The point is that, with our sectional pattern of politics and our 48 different sets of suffrage qualifications, the general ticket system in Republican years corrects the disparity caused by magnifying the electoral power of the South. By abolishing the general ticket system, the Lodge-Gossett plan would correct that part of the disparity between the popular and electoral vote which favors the Republicans when they win the popular election, without correcting that part of the disparity which favors the Democrats. Although I am not here to further the interests of the Republican Party, I do not want to adopt a system which would deny them the presidency when they poll a majority of the popular vote. I want to play under fair rules. I do not want the Democrats to win the game with loaded dice, nor the Republicans, nor States Righters, nor any group or faction. Advocates of the Mundt-Coudert, Lodge-Gossett plan say a great deal about how the general ticket system denied the presidency to the candidate with the most popular votes in 1824, 1876, and 1888. These three cases, and a number of others, require examination.

Critics of the present electoral college system claim that the general ticket system defeated Andrew Jackson, the people's choice in 1824, and gave victory to John Quincy Adams in the electoral college. The answers to this are three:

One. We do not know that Jackson was the people's choice in 1824 for the following reasons:

There was a 4-way split in the popular vote, and Jackson polled only 43 percent of that vote.

And in six States, which contained one-fourth of the population of the United States, the legislature appointed the electors, and no popular votes were cast.

In North Carolina, approximately 5,000 votes which were probably pro-Adams were cast for the Jackson-Adams fusion ticket and are incorrectly credited to Jackson.

Furthermore, a very small proportion of the adult population voted in the 18 States where popular elections were held.

Also, Adams ran against Jackson in only 11 of the 18 States where popular elections were held. We have no way of knowing what the popular election returns might have been if Jackson had run against Adams in a 2-way contest in all 24 States.

Two. Jackson did better in the 18 States where popular elections were held under the system used than he would have under the Lodge-Gossett formula. Jackson's electoral vote margin in these 18 States would have been only 11.6 under the Lodge-Gossett plan instead of 36 under the system used. Thus, Jackson would have been worse off by 24.4 electoral votes if the Lodge-Gossett plan had been used in 1824.

Three. Adams was elected in the House of Representatives, not in the electoral college. There were at least five factors other than the general ticket system which contributed to Jackson's defeat in 1824:

The Constitution requires that a candidate receive a majority of the electoral vote in order to win the presidency but Jackson received only 38 percent of the electoral vote.

Another factor which contributed to Jackson's defeat was the constitutional provision for election by a "lame duck" House of Representatives in which voting was by States. Moreover, even if the Members of the House had voted as individuals rather than by States, Adams would still have had a plurality—but not a majority—in the House.

A third factor which may have helped Adams win the Presidency was the political maneuvering in the House. On the other hand, one might well argue that this maneuvering redounded to Jackson's advantage.

Still a fourth factor which contributed to Jackson's defeat was the fact that Clay threw his support in the House to Adams.

Finally, the electors chosen by districts and those appointed by the State legislatures favored Adams over Jackson, a fact which suggests that the Mundt-Coudert plan would have defeated Jackson more decisively.

These five factors, rather than the general ticket system, defeated Jackson in 1824. In summary, Jackson would have had less than a majority of the electoral votes under the present proposal and the election would have been thrown into Congress. The votes in the House were 87 for Adams, 71 for Jackson, and 54 for Clay. It is mere optimistic speculation to assume that the 54 votes for Clay and the 48 senatorial votes would have been cast so as to have given Jackson the requisite 131 votes.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a

table showing the popular vote, the electoral vote, and the vote in the House in the election of 1824.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Election of 1824

Candidate	Popular vote	Electoral vote					Vote in House	
		GT	D	L	Total	L-G plan	Members	States
Adams	114,023	37	11	36	84	62,399	87	13
Jackson	152,901	75	9	15	99	73,984	71	7
Crawford	46,979	24	1	16	41	31,997	54	4
Clay	47,217	16	17	4	37	21,792		
Uncertain						71,000		
Total	361,120	152	38	71	261	261,172	212	24

GT—Electors chosen by general ticket system.
D—Electors chosen in districts.
L—Electors appointed by State legislatures.
L-G—Electoral vote under Lodge-Gossett formula.

Sources: Edward Stanwood, A History of the Presidency (Boston, 1904), pp. 133-140; Historical Statistics of the United States (Washington, 1949), p. 288.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, critics of the present electoral college system claim that the general ticket system defeated Samuel J. Tilden, the people's choice at the polls, and gave victory in the electoral college to Rutherford B. Hayes in 1876.

The general ticket system seems to have had little to do with the election of 1876. Fraud and violence attended the popular voting in both North and South. The methods by which Tilden won his popular plurality are not above reproach. Hayes probably would have won a free popular election, but an honest count of the votes actually cast would have given the Presidency to Tilden. Actually, nobody knows how Tilden would have fared under the Mundt-Coudert plan, since the presidential vote in 1876 has never been tabulated by congressional districts. Probably the most that can be said for the Lodge-Gossett plan in connection with 1876 is that it would have permitted Tilden's spurious plurality to have won the Presidency for him.

There are at least seven factors other than the general ticket system which contributed to Tilden's defeat in 1876.

First, the failure of the Democrats in their efforts to bribe a Hayes elector to vote for Tilden.

Second, two electoral colleges met in Oregon because the Democratic Governor used highhanded methods against the Republican electors chosen at the popular election.

Third, in South Carolina, the Democrats complained because the Army of Reconstruction was stationed near the polls. The Democrats refused to recognize the choice of Republican electors, saying there had been no free election. Therefore, two electoral colleges met in this State as well.

Fourth. In Florida, the number of legal votes cast for electors was in dispute. There were two sets of election returns and allegations of fraud and manipulation of returns on both sides.

Fifth. In Louisiana, there was anarchy—2 Governors, 2 returning boards, 2 sets of returns showing different results, and 2 electoral colleges.

Sixth. The carpetbaggers, scalawags, and Union Army seemed to have perpetrated fraud and intimidation for the Republicans, while Dixie Democrats used Ku Klux Klan methods to intimidate Republican voters.

Seventh. The Electoral Commission, consisting of 8 Republicans and 7 Democrats, gave the Presidency to Hayes by a vote of 8 to 7.

In summary, Tilden was defeated, not by the general ticket system, but by disputed election returns and by a Republican majority on the Electoral Commission which settled the disputed returns. Although nobody knows how the Mundt-Coudert plan would have operated in 1876, one thing is sure: The Lodge-Gossett plan is no guaranty against disputed election returns. Indeed, the operation of the Lodge-Gossett formula is likely to increase the possibility of contested returns. For elections would become closer contests as a result of dividing the electoral votes in each State. In 1900, for example, there would have been a margin of only one-tenth of an electoral vote. Thus, a few hundred popular votes, properly distributed, could determine the outcome. Such a situation is quite likely to give rise to election disputes, recounts, fraud, and precisely the sort of thing that confused the picture in 1876—Haworth, The Hayes-Tilden Disputed Election of 1876, Cleveland, 1906; United States Electoral Commission, The Electoral Count of 1877, Washington, 1877.

Critics of the general ticket system are on a little firmer ground when they point to the election of 1888. If the Lodge-Gossett plan had been in effect and if its operation had not altered the popular vote, Grover Cleveland's popular margin of 95,713 would have put him in the White House. Remember, however, that Cleveland did not poll a majority of the popular vote, only 48.678 percent; and his popular margin was less than 1 percent. Moreover, application of the Lodge-Gossett formula to the popular vote in 1880, 1892, 1896, 1900, 1908, 1912, 1924, and 1948 would have given no candidate a majority of the electoral votes; and the election would have been thrown into Congress. In two of these elections, 1880 and 1896, the Republican, who won the popular plurality, would have received fewer electoral votes than would his Democratic rival. In four of these elections—1896, 1900, 1908, and 1924—the Republican candidate polled not merely a popular plurality but an absolute majority of the popular vote.

A few simple calculations show that the Lodge-Gossett plan will handicap the Republicans as long as the South remains comparatively solid and southern suffrage continues to be restricted. The difference between each major party's percentage of the popular vote and its percentage of the electoral vote under the Lodge formula is revealing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table relating to this question.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Year	Lodge-Gossett plan, electoral vote	Popular vote	Difference
	Percent	*Percent*	
DEMOCRATIC PARTY			
1880	49.295	48.225	+1.070
1884	50.000	48.842	+1.158
1888	50.599	48.658	+1.941
1892	45.653	46.119	−.466
1896	49.508	46.824	+2.684
1900	48.591	45.530	+3.061
1904	37.605	37.597	+.008
1908	46.977	43.051	+3.926
1912	46.460	41.821	+4.639
1916	53.540	49.265	+4.275
1920	40.038	34.666	+5.372
1924	36.045	28.828	+7.217
1928	43.616	40.793	+2.823
1932	61.695	57.411	+4.284
1936	64.087	60.194	+3.893
1940	58.380	53.847	+4.533
1944	55.499	51.644	+3.855
1948	49.190	49.363	−.173
1952	45.469	44.377	+1.092
REPUBLICAN PARTY			
1880	47.453	48.308	−0.855
1884	47.307	48.215	−.098
1888	46.334	47.817	−1.483
1892	41.937	43.100	−1.163
1896	48.166	50.934	−2.768
1900	48.613	51.699	−3.086
1904	56.408	56.412	−.004
1908	47.785	51.581	−3.796
1912	21.450	23.178	−1.728
1916	41.827	46.058	−4.231
1920	56.478	61.237	−4.759
1924	48.738	54.054	−5.316
1928	54.972	58.110	−3.138
1932	35.706	39.651	−3.945
1936	33.070	36.539	−3.469
1940	40.414	44.770	−4.356
1944	42.147	45.869	−3.722
1948	41.902	44.988	−3.086
1952	54.531	54.879	−.348

LODGE-GOSSETT FAVORS DEMOCRATS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as I look at these Lodge-Gossett figures for the last 19 elections, I notice that, in 17 of the 19 elections, the Democratic candidate would have received a larger electoral vote under the Lodge-Gossett plan than he was entitled to by his percentage of the popular vote. Conversely, the Republican's portion of the electoral vote would have been smaller than his portion of the popular vote in all 19 elections.

The Lodge-Gossett formula would handicap the Republicans because the Democrats could secure large blocs of electoral votes in the South, where relatively few popular votes will capture an electoral vote. In contrast, the Republicans would have to win the bulk of their electoral votes in the North, where more popular votes are required to gain an electoral vote. As shown in this table,

which I shall ask to have inserted in the RECORD, Democratic leverage under the plan varies directly with southern solidarity and/or inversely with southern participation in the popular election. In other words, the more solid the South is and the fewer the southerners who vote in the popular election, the more the Lodge-Gossett formula will magnify Democratic strength.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Year	Democratic advantage taken from the previous table	Southern solidarity (in percentage)[1]	Comparative southern popular participation [2]
1880	+1.070	59.75	75.74
1884	+1.158	61.41	73.92
1888	+1.941	63.45	69.33
1892	−.466	61.47	70.31
1896	+2.684	66.33	65.58
1900	+3.061	66.27	53.76
1904	+.008	70.33	40.43
1908	+3.926	68.02	42.88
1912	+4.639	70.94	43.19
1916	+4.275	74.73	42.54
1920	+5.372	67.55	41.22
1924	+7.217	70.36	36.63
1928	+2.823	57.18	38.62
1932	+4.284	83.27	40.66
1936	+3.893	83.07	39.18
1940	+4.533	80.44	40.18
1944	+3.855	73.66	41.28
1948	−.173	45.03	43.91
1952	+1.092	53.16	57.65

[1] "Southern solidarity" is an average percentage of the popular vote polled by Democrats in the Southern States, weighting each State according to its electoral vote. This method must be used because it makes a great difference whether the Democrats poll 95 percent of the popular vote in a State with 3 or 23 electoral votes. The rank difference coefficient of correlation between southern solidarity and Democratic advantage under the Lodge Gossett plan is 0.588. The 11 Southern States are Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

[2] Popular participation in the South compared to that in other States is a relation between the percent of the national popular vote polled in the South and the percent of the total electoral vote cast by the South. Popular participation in the South for 1924, for example, was measured as 36.63 percent, which means that, if the election had been determined by the nationwide popular vote regardless of State lines, the South would have had only 36.63 percent of the power she actually had in choosing the President. The rank difference coefficient of correlation between Democratic advantage under the Lodge-Gossett plan and popular participation in the South is negative 0.568; the coefficient of multiple correlation between Democratic advantage, Southern solidarity, and comparative Southern popular participation (R1.23) is 0.684 (hearings, p. 336).

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Republican disadvantage under the Lodge-Gossett formula is not due to the magnified electoral power of the small States which results from giving the constant two electoral votes to all of the States and from giving one additional elector to Delaware, Nevada, and Wyoming, which do not always have the population quota requisite for the election of one Representative in all other States. Actually, the small States' electoral vote is usually rather evenly divided between our two major parties. If the magnified electoral power of the small States were the cause of the Republican handicap under the Lodge plan, we could expect the Democratic advantage to increase in proportion to the number of States carried under the Lodge formula. Actually, the correlation is so small as to indicate neither a direct nor inverse relation between the Democratic advantage and the number of States carried under the Lodge plan. Professor Ruth Silva found the rank difference coefficient of correlation for the Republicans to be only negative 0.063 and only positive 0.114 for the Democrats—volume 44, American Political Science Review, page 94, note.

It is revealing to compare electoral-vote percentages under the Lodge formula with popular-vote percentages for a period when the South was not so solid.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a table on that matter.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Year	Percent of electoral vote under Lodge plan	Percent of popular vote	Deviation
1864	44.292	44.940	−0.648
1868	45.986	47.332	−1.346
1872	43.470	43.823	−.353
1876	50.976(?)	50.933(?)	+.043

REPUBLICAN PARTY

1864	55.708	55.060	+0.648
1868	54.014	52.668	+1.346
1872	56.011	55.621	+.390
1876	47.995(?)	47.951(?)	+.044

Silva, 44 American Political Science Review 96.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, to the elections of 1864, 1868, 1872, and 1876, we may add two others. The Democrats would have suffered a disadvantage under the Lodge formula in 1892, when the Populists polled a sizable part of a relatively large popular vote in the South, and in 1948, when the States Rights Party invaded southern democracy.

The reason for the Republican handicap under the Lodge-Gossett plan can be seen in the 1952 election. President Eisenhower received more popular votes than did any presidential candidate in American history. Although he would have been elected under the Lodge-Gossett plan—288.457 electoral votes to Stevenson's 240.241—the Lodge formula would have defeated him in spite of his popular majority, if the South had continued its customary voting habits in 1952. The average number of electoral votes given to the Republican candidate by the 11 Southern States under the Lodge formula in 8 previous elections, 1916 to 1948, was 27.9. In 1952, however, Eisenhower would have received 59.8 electoral votes in the 11 Southern States. Thus, Eisenhower's share of the southern electoral votes was 32 more than the average of previous Republican candidates. If 26 of these 32 electoral votes had gone to Stevenson, in conformity with tradition, Stevenson would have been elected with 266.241 electoral votes to Eisenhower's 262.457. In 1952, one southern electoral vote represented 66,863 popular votes. Therefore, Stevenson could have won an additional 26 southern electoral votes by polling approximately 1,738,000 more popular votes in that area. The Lodge-Gossett plan would have allowed such a shift of 1,738,000 popular votes from Eisenhower to Stevenson in the South to have elected Stevenson, although Eisenhower still would have had a nationwide popular margin of nearly 3 million. In other words, the Lodge-Gossett formula would have defeated Eisenhower, the candidate who had an absolute majority of the popular vote.

One of the authors of this plan, former Senator Lodge, has said that the plan would not harm the Republican Party, because it would have given Thomas E. Dewey more electoral votes in 1948 than he actually received. Yes, it would have enlarged Dewey's electoral-vote consolation prize; but he would have lost the election nevertheless. Actually, the Lodge formula would also have given the Republican candidates more electoral votes in 1884, 1892, 1912, 1932, 1936, 1940, and 1944—all elections which they would have lost in any case. The same would be true for the Democrat in those elections in which the Democrat met popular defeat—Hearings on House Joint Resolution 2, 81st Congress, 1st session, page 99. In general, it would enlarge the vote of the losing candidate; and in the case of a popularly defeated Democrat, it would enlarge his electoral vote sufficiently to endanger a Republican electoral victory in spite of the Republican popular victory.

LODGE-GOSSETT WOULD NOT PROMOTE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM IN THE SOUTH

Sponsors of this resolution have objected to applying the Lodge-Gossett or Mundt-Coudert formula to the statistics of past elections. "The candidates, the issues, and the popular vote would have been different," they say, "if our proposal had been in operation." This may be true: there might have been 3, rather than 2, major party candidates; the problems of the large States and big cities might have been ignored; and at least 2 of the candidates might have been more conservative—1 might even have been a South Carolinian. I am not willing to agree, however, that the Lodge-Gossett plan would produce a Republican-Democratic-two-party system in the South.

The Republicans have no power in southern legislatures to enfranchise the Negroes and poor whites. As a matter of fact, I believe that those who now control southern legislatures would tighten up suffrage qualifications if they were threatened with a split in a State's electoral vote. Surely, those in control of southern legislatures would not extend the franchise to people who would use the vote to threaten their supremacy. In any case, as I said before, southern legislatures met the agrarian and populist challenge with a program of systematic disfranchisement.

Sponsors of this resolution claim that more southerners would vote in presidential elections because operation of the Lodge-Gossett plan would miraculously create real contests in the South. In other words, they argue that there are a number of southern Republicans who just do not bother to vote under the present system but who would vote in huge numbers if the Lodge plan were adopted. Well, first of all, I think

southern legislatures would adopt the Mundt plan, rather than the Lodge plan, for reasons which I shall explain later.

Moreover, where would Republican votes come from in the South? I suppose the Republican Party might appeal to the southern racist who may not bother to vote now. That, however, would endanger the GOP's liberal and Negro support in the rest of the Nation. Can you not just imagine, Mr. President, what would happen to the Republican Party in the North if its presidential candidate approved racial segregation in order to woo southern voters. The other possibility is that the Republican Party might appeal to southern Negroes and poor whites. The trouble is that most of these people cannot vote. Furthermore, appeal to southern Negroes and liberals would alienate the conservatives to whom Republican economic and fiscal policy is most likely to appeal. Would not the Democratic South have trapped the Republican Party in a real box? Really, does it not sound foolish to speculate about where the Republicans can win more votes in the South? I think it does, because all of us are political realists enough to know that adoption of the Lodge plan will not produce southern Republicans.

During hearings on the Lodge-Gossett plan in the last four Congresses, several southerners said that adoption of the Lodge plan would not enlarge the Republican percentage of the southern vote. If this is true, as I believe it is, and if southern participation in popular elections remains limited, as I believe it will, then the Republican Party would be almost forced to try to decrease the South's voice in the electoral college, through enforcement of the second section of the 14th amendment. I think the Republican Party would be forced to this as a matter of sheer self defense.

In the absence of action to reduce the southern electoral vote, adoption of the Lodge-Gossett plan would increase the importance of the South in national politics. I have before me some figures showing the southern electoral vote and the margin of electoral victory in the past 19 elections. I ask unanimous consent that this table be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The southern electoral vote and the margin of victory in presidential elections, 1880–1952

Year	Present system			Lodge-Gossett plan			Year	Present system			Lodge-Gossett plan		
	Winner	Electoral votes in excess of majority	Southern votes for winner	Winner	Electoral votes in excess of majority	Southern votes for winner		Winner	Electoral votes in excess of majority	Southern votes for winner	Winner	Electoral votes in excess of majority	Southern votes for winner
1880	Republican	29	0	(1)	−9.4	56.8	1920	Republican	138	12	Republican	34.4	40.0
1884	Democrat	18	107	Democrat	0	65.7	1924	do	116	0	(1)	−6.7	31.1
1888	Republican	32	0	do	2.4	67.9	1928	do	178	62	Republican	26.4	53.4
1892	Democrat	54	112	(1)	−19.3	68.9	1932	Democrat	206	124	Democrat	$62.1	103.3
1896	Republican	47	0	(1)	−2.2	74.3	1936	do	257	124	do	74.8	103.0
1900	do	68	0	(1)	−6.2	34.6	1940	do	183	124	do	44.5	99.7
1904	do	4	0	Republican	30.5	29.5	1944	do	166	127	do	29.2	93.5
1908	do	79	0	(1)	−10.7	33.1	1948	do	37	88	(1)	−4.3	57.2
1912	Democrat	169	126	(1)	−18.8	89.4	1952	Republican	176	57	Republican	23.0	59.8
1916	do	11	126	Democrat	18.8	94.2							

[1] Election by Congress: 1880, 1892, 1896, 1900, 1908, 1912, 1924, and 1948. This table was taken from p. 338 of the hearings but adapted to fit the Mundt-Lodge-Gossett substitute, which requires a majority of the electoral vote in order to be elected. The 11 Southern States are: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, Tennessee, and Virginia.

DANIEL PROPOSAL INCREASES POWER OF SOUTH

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, these statistics show that, under the present system, the 11 Southern States held a balance of power in only 4 of the last 19 presidential elections—only in 1884, 1892, 1916, and 1948. In contrast, the Daniel version of the Lodge-Gossett plan, with the majority electoral-vote requirement, would have made Southern electoral votes absolutely necessary for victory in every election except the one in 1904. In all the other elections, the withholding of southern electoral votes from the popular victor would have meant his certain defeat in the electoral college.

This would give to a minority—southern whites—an influence in presidential elections which would far exceed the influence of any metropolitan minority today. The fact is that Republicans and northern Democrats would be at the mercy of the South in national politics.

THE LOST-VOTE FALLACY

Sponsors of the Mundt-Lodge-Gossett resolution make a great deal out of what they call "lost votes" or votes "counted for the opposition." The argument runs something like this: Stevenson polled 90,000 votes in South Dakota, but all of South Dakota's electoral votes were cast for Eisenhower. Therefore, they argue that Stevenson's 90,000 votes were lost or counted for Eisenhower. Under their resolution, however, Eisenhower's 55 percent of the popular vote in the Nation might well have been lost if the Lodge formula had been used in the 39 Eisenhower States and the Mundt formula had been applied in the 9 Stevenson States, with Congress deciding who should be the President. What of the defeated majority with 55 percent of the popular vote?

I cannot be disturbed over this argument of lost votes. I think it is naive and without reason or logic. In every election, where there can be only a single winner, all votes cast for the losing candidate can be labelled either "lost" or "counted for the winner." The Mundt-Coudert plan would merely transfer the winner-take-all rule from the State level to the congressional district. The votes cast for the candidate who failed to carry the congressional district could be called either "lost" or "counted for the candidate" who did carry the district. The Lodge-Gossett plan would merely transfer these so-called lost votes from the State to the national level. As former Senator Homer Ferguson has said, "the truth is that no votes are lost when validly cast in an election. They are actually counted toward the final decision; and, if insufficient for victory, they have simply exhausted their power as votes."

III–4. FIFTY PERCENT OF ELECTORAL VOTE NEEDED TO ELECT

In the substitute Daniel-Mundt-Kefauver amendment, Mr. President there is one provision which is perhaps the most dangerous proposal to our electoral system which has been seriously offered in many years. That is the proposal that if any candidate fails to receive a majority of the electoral vote, the Congress will meet to decide the issue. The language of the proposal reads as follows:

> The person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be the President, and the person having the greatest number of votes for Vice President shall be the Vice President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electoral votes."

UNDER PRESENT PROPOSAL ALMOST HALF OF ELECTIONS SINCE 1880 WOULD HAVE BEEN DECIDED BY CONGRESS

Mr. President, I believe the method by which this amendment proposes to settle the election of a President, once it is thrown into Congress for decision, is an improvement over the present system in which each State is given one vote in the House. What the proponents of the proposal have overlooked—or perhaps some of them have not overlooked it—is that almost half the elections since 1880 would have been thrown into Congress for decision, if the Lodge-Gossett amendment had been operating. Furthermore, Mr. President, had the plan been in operation in these years, third parties would have been in a much stronger strategic position than at the present time, and one can only be led to the belief that all or almost all of the elections would have been decided by the Congress.

Mr. President, this on the face of it is such a ridiculous proposal that this fact alone should lead the Senate at least to

recommit the proposal until the Committee has had time to study its full implications.

Now for the proof.

First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table which shows the total popular vote and the actual electoral vote by number and percentage for the Democrats and Republicans from the election of 1880 to that of 1952.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Popular vote and electoral vote of presidential candidates, 1880–1952

Year	Popular vote				Actual electoral vote					
	Republican		Democratic		Republican		Democratic		Other	
	Number (1000)	Percent	Number (1000)	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1880	4,454	48.3	4,445	48.2	214	58.0	155	42.0		
1884	4,852	48.3	4,874	48.5	182	45.4	219	54.6		
1888	5,444	47.8	5,540	48.7	233	58.1	168	41.9		
1892	5,191	43.1	5,554	46.1	145	32.7	277	62.6	22	5.0
1896	7,036	50.9	6,468	46.8	271	60.6	176	39.4		
1900	7,220	51.7	6,358	45.5	292	65.3	155	34.7		
1904	7,629	56.4	5,084	37.6	336	70.6	140	29.4		
1908	7,679	51.6	6,409	43.1	321	66.5	162	33.5		
1912	3,484	23.2	6,286	41.8	8	1.5	435	81.9	88	16.6
1916	8,534	46.1	9,128	49.3	254	47.9	277	52.1		
1920	16,147	60.2	9,141	34.1	404	76.1	127	23.9		
1924	15,725	54.1	8,387	28.8	382	71.9	136	25.6	13	2.5
1928	21,391	58.1	15,016	40.8	444	83.6	87	16.4		
1932	15,762	39.7	22,822	57.4	59	11.1	472	88.9		
1936	16,680	36.5	27,477	60.2	8	1.5	523	98.5		
1940	22,304	44.8	26,827	53.8	82	15.4	449	84.6		
1944	22,006	45.9	24,777	51.6	99	18.6	432	81.4		
1948	21,969	45.0	24,106	49.4	189	35.6	303	57.1	39	7.3
1952	33,779	54.9	27,315	44.4	442	83.2	89	16.8		

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we should note that in the elections of 1880, 1884, 1888, 1892, 1912, 1916, and 1948 the Presidents were elected with less than a majority of the popular votes cast for all candidates. Because of the existing electoral system, however, less than a majority of the popular vote, nevertheless, produced a sizable majority in the electoral vote.

Thus Garfield, in 1880, with 48.3 percent of the popular vote to 48.2 percent for Hancock, won by an electoral margin of 214 to 155, or by 58 percent to 42 percent in the electoral college. In 1884 Cleveland received 48.5 percent of the popular vote to Blaine's 48.3 percent; but Cleveland had an electoral margin of 219 to 182, or 54.6 percent to 45.4 percent. In 1888, of course, Harrison, with fewer popular votes than Cleveland—he received 47.8 percent to Cleveland's 48.7 percent—nonetheless, received 233 electoral votes to Cleveland's 168, or 58.1 percent to 41.9 percent of the electoral vote. In 1892 Cleveland received 46.1 percent of the popular vote to 43.1 for Benjamin Harrison and won by 277 to 145 in the electoral college, or by 62.6 percent of the electoral votes, to 32.7 percent of the electoral votes for Harrison. James P. Weaver, the Populist candidate, received over 1 million votes, about one-ninth of the total, but got only 22 electoral votes, or one-half of 1 percent.

Further, in 1912, Woodrow Wilson won only 41.8 percent of the popular vote, but 81.9 percent of the electoral vote, because of the Taft-Roosevelt split in the Republican Party. In 1916 Wilson got less than 50 percent of the popular vote, 49.3 percent; and Hughes received 46.1 percent. Wilson won the election with 277 electoral votes to 254 for Hughes, or by a 52 to 48 percent margin in the electoral college.

Finally, in 1948, President Truman got only 49.4 percent of the popular vote to Dewey's 45 percent; yet President Truman won in the electoral college by 303 to 189, with another 39 votes going to Thurmond. Truman's electoral percent was 57.1 to 35.6 for Dewey and 7.3 percent for Thurmond.

PRESENT SYSTEM PRODUCES DECISIVE RESULTS

The point of these figures, Mr. President, is this—and I do not rise to blame the system, but to praise it—that without the present electoral system, which produces decisive electoral victories with only small popular victories, the office and power and prestige of the Presidency would suffer irremedial harm. Our people would be less willing to accept electoral decisions. The President would be in a weak position. The country would be divided and there would be constant and continuous bickering over the results. I believe it is a healthy thing to have the winner receive an electoral vote larger than his popular majority or plurality. I believe this is good; and without it there would have been great division in the country in almost all the elections in which the popular vote was close or in which the winner received only a plurality rather than a majority.

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the very able Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DUFF. Is not one of the great difficulties of this proposal that at a time when decisiveness is necessary in a critical world situation, we might very well have a critical world situation and also a lack of decision in the United States, when decision is vital to the welfare of the free world?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Pennsylvania is exactly correct. Even if the election were not thrown into the Congress, if the vote were close, the prestige of the incoming administration would be damaged. If the election were thrown into the Congress, particularly if there were a third party, no one would be able to state what would happen, and the Government would be greatly weakened. The Senator from Pennsylvania is completely correct.

I rise to point this out, Mr. President, because of what I believe is an irremedial flaw in the plan produced by the Senators from Texas, South Dakota, and South Carolina. When we have opposed this plan on grounds that the Mundt-Coudert half of it, based on the unit vote in congressional districts, would introduce into the presidential electroal system the same unfair and unrepresentative features which already exist in the way in which congressional districts are apportioned, we have been told that the Mundt-Coudert portion of it probably would not be accepted by many States. Thus, it is claimed that the Lodge-Gossett or proportional system would be almost the universal choice of the individual States.

Personally, I do not agree with that point, inasmuch as I believe that the States would choose the plan most advantageous to each of them, and that States would in fact, shift back and forth to further the designs of the party or regime in control in each of the States. Although as a matter of fact, later I hope to demonstrate that probably the pressures which would be applied would be such that a majority of the States would choose the Mundt-Coudert system, nevertheless suppose we accept the verdict that the Senator from Texas has advanced, namely, that the Lodge-Gossett or proportional system would be used by almost all States. I do not think that would happen, but let us assume that it did happen. In that event, I believe it would bring even more devastating results than thoses which would be brought about by the Mundt-Coudert system, as now proposed.

LODGE-GOSSETT METHOD UNWORKABLE

First, all of us know that under the Lodge-Gossett system the electoral vote, at least for the two large parties, would parallel the popular vote more closely than would occur under the present system. For example, in 1952 the popular vote was divided 54.879 percent for Eisenhower, and 44.377 percent for Mr. Stevenson. Under the Lodge-Gossett proportional method of dividing the electoral vote, Eisenhower would have received 54.531 percent of the electoral vote, and Stevenson 45.467 percent of the electoral vote. Actually, Candidate Eisenhower received 442 electoral votes to 89 for Governor Stevenson, or 83 percent of their number.

Therefore, under the Lodge-Gossett system, the electoral vote parallels rather closely the popular vote. Since 1880, under the Lodge-Gossett plan, the greatest deviation of the electoral vote from the actual popular vote for the Democrats would have been plus 7.2 percent in 1924; and for the Republicans, minus 5.3 percent in the same year. In

most elections, however, the deviation of electoral vote percentage from the popular vote percentage under the Lodge-Gossett method would have been only 1 to 2 to 3 percent.

In the hearings on page 335, in the very brilliant testimony of Dr. Ruth Silva, there is a table which applies the Lodge-Gossett method to all the presidential elections beginning with the one in 1880. The table applies the Lodge-Gossett system to our past elections. I ask unanimous consent that the table be inserted at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Year	Democratic Party			Republican Party		
	Lodge-Gossett plan electoral vote percent	Popular vote percent	Difference	Lodge-Gossett plan electoral vote percent	Popular vote percent	Difference
1880	49.295	48.225	+1.070	47.453	48.308	−0.855
1884	50.000	48.842	+1.158	47.307	48.215	−.908
1888	50.599	48.658	+1.941	46.334	47.817	−1.483
1892	45.653	46.119	−.466	41.937	43.100	−1.163
1896	49.508	46.824	+2.684	48.166	50.934	−2.768
1900	48.591	45.530	+3.061	48.613	51.699	−3.086
1904	37.605	37.597	+.008	56.408	56.412	−.004
1908	46.977	43.051	+3.926	47.785	51.581	−3.796
1912	46.460	41.821	+4.639	21.450	23.178	−1.728
1916	53.540	49.265	+4.275	41.827	46.058	−4.231
1920	40.038	34.666	+5.372	56.478	61.237	−4.759
1924	36.045	28.828	+7.217	48.738	54.054	−5.316
1928	43.616	40.793	+2.823	54.972	58.110	−3.138
1932	61.695	57.411	+4.284	35.706	39.561	−3.945
1936	64.087	60.194	+3.893	33.070	36.539	−3.469
1940	58.380	53.847	+4.533	40.414	44.770	−4.356
1944	55.499	51.644	+3.855	42.147	45.869	−3.722
1948	49.190	49.363	−.173	41.902	44.988	−3.086
1952	45.469	44.377	+1.092	54.531	54.879	−.348

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in her testimony on the same page, however, Dr. Silva points out that in 17 of the 19 elections since that date, the Democratic Party candidates would have received a greater electoral vote than the one they were entitled to by the percentage of the popular vote. She says also that—

> In contrast, the formula would have consistently given the Republicans a smaller electoral vote than they were entitled to by their percentage of the popular vote.

Mr. President, after Senate Joint Resolution 31 has been reported, we have now been offered, in its stead, a new formula. It includes, among other new provisions, the language that if no candidate receives a majority—not a plurality, but a majority—of the electoral vote, the election will be decided by the Congress.

Under the original Lodge-Gossett proposal, as amended by my former colleague from Illinois, Senator Lucas, the figure was 40 percent, but such strenuous objections were made that, since third parties under the plan would receive a close approximation of electoral votes to popular votes, the plan would promote third parties and splinter parties, that this new provision of a clear majority—50 percent or more of the electoral vote—was substituted for the 40 percent provision.

Mr. President, if we apply this 50 percent formula—which now is a part of the Daniel-Mundt-Thurmond substitute—it is clear from the facts which were placed before the Judiciary Committee, and from the table on page 335 of the hearings, that at least 8, and possibly 9, of the last 19 presidential elections would have been thrown into the Congress for decision. That, I submit, Mr. President, would be an intolerable situation. It is clear, too, that knowing that this would so easily be possible, third parties would be more powerful, and would hold the balance of power in almost all our elections.

But I wish to give the proof of the fact that 8 and possibly 9, of 19 elections since 1880 would have been decided by the Congress under the present proposal, before I point out the disastrous consequences of such a system.

Under the Lodge-Gossett plan, with the provision that a candidate must receive one-half of the electoral vote, or else the decision will be thrown into the Congress, stalemated elections would have been produced in 8 elections since 1880. In those elections, under the Lodge-Gassett formula the following percentages of the electoral vote would have been received by the candidates of each party:

Year	Democratic candidate electoral vote percent	Republican candidate electoral vote percent
1880	49.295	47.453
1892	45.653	41.937
1896	49.508	48.166
1900	48.591	48.613
1908	46.977	47.785
1912	46.460	21.450
1924	36.045	48.738
1948	49.190	41.902

Source: Hearings, p. 335.

In 1884, the Democratic candidate, President Cleveland, would have received a bare 50 percent of the electoral vote, under the Lodge-Gossett system, to 48.21 percent for Blaine, his Republican opponent. It is not clear whether 50 is a majority; and perhaps this election, too, would have been thrown into the Congress for decision.

EVEN WITH A POPULAR MAJORITY FOR A PRESIDENT, FOUR ELECTIONS WOULD HAVE BEEN THROWN INTO THE CONGRESS

In 4 of those elections—those of 1896, 1900, 1908, and 1924—the Republican candidate received more than half the popular vote; the percentages were 50.9, 51.7, 51.6, and 54.1. But, first, because the Lodge-Gossett system would make the electoral vote percentage very close to the popular vote percentage, rather than to exaggerate the electoral vote, as at present; and, second, because it would consistently give the Republican Party a somewhat smaller electoral vote than its percentage of the popular vote, those four elections would have been thrown into the Congress under the provision in this substitute that will happen unless a candidate receives an electoral-vote majority. And, of course, that is in addition to the other 4 elections since 1886 which would have been thrown into the Congress for decision—elections in which the winning candidate did not receive a majority of the popular vote, and would not have received a majority of the electoral vote under the Lodge-Gossett plan.

I repeat, Mr. President, that under the Lodge-Gossett system, as now proposed, 8 elections, and possibly 9, would have been decided by the Congress since the election of 1880.

The proponents will say that we are not to use history if it helps us to show what a ridiculous and senseless proposal we have before us, although I must say that the proponents have not hesitated to call upon the past when discussing what they regard as the faults in the present election system. What is sauce for the goose is certainly sauce for the gander.

PROPOSED SYSTEM A BOON TO THIRD PARTY

But I would say that if this system had been in effect, and knowing that any candidate would have had difficulty in getting a majority of the electoral vote, and knowing especially that the Republican vote would consistently be underrepresented by the Lodge-Gossett method, there would have been a field day for third party or States-rights parties or States-righters running under a Democratic label in the South. This effect of the 50 percent proposal may, in fact, be the reason why some have insisted upon raising the requirement from 40 percent to 50 percent. It would give a third party, especially in one-party States and States where a very small electorate has disproportionate power, the opportunity to throw almost any presidential election into Congress for decision.

When this compromise was brought forward, one of two things happened: either, the full implications of this 50 percent provision were not realized by its proponents—in which case the Senate should vote overwhelmingly to reject this dangerous and ridiculous substitute amendment; or the advocates of this amendment knew full well the implication of this provision in their substitute, in which case the substitute should be defeated overwhelmingly by the Senate as unworkable, unreasonable, and a greater threat to our presidential election system than any which has yet occurred in the history of our Republic.

PROPOSAL WOULD PROMOTE UNPLEDGED ELECTORS

There is yet another provision of the substitute amendment which should be

examined closely. It is the provision which states that—

> Any candidate for elector who before the election has pledged his vote for President or Vice President to a specific person shall, if elected, cast his vote for such person.

On first reading, Mr. President, this provision appears to be an improvement over our present system, under which, as we know, electors can, and have, failed to vote for the presidential candidate of their party, although that has happened on only rare occasions.

However, when reviewed in the context of the Lodge-Gossett, Mundt-Coudert arrangement, this is, in fact a very dangerous provision.

Third parties and regional parties, under the substitute proposal, would have a controlling influence in every election. Knowing this, there is nothing in this language to prevent—and indeed the substitute amendment would encourage—electors running unpledged. This would give them an influence over the electoral vote which unpledged delegations now have in closely contested national party conventions, with which I think the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is somewhat familiar.

I think we should not suppress, as Senators, what as men we know to be true; namely, if either Democratic or Republican Party platforms or party candidates, took stands on issues such as civil rights, labor legislation, or progressive social legislation, groups in both parties who disagree with such issues not only could, but probably would, keep electors in their States unpledged, thus giving them controlling influence over an election and throwing it into the Congress.

This would also be true, but somewhat less true, of dissident groups on the left as well as on the right. I say this because the Lodge-Gossett or proportional system gives much greater influence to third parties in one-party States than to third parties in the large two-party States. For example, even though the proponents of Lodge-Gossett claim that it would fairly distribute the electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote, this is not true. In 1948, the two third-party candidates received almost precisely the same popular vote. Thurmond got 1,169,021 votes and Wallace got 1,157,172 votes. In that election Thurmond received 39 electoral votes and Wallace none. Under the Lodge-Gossett proportional method, which is supposed to remedy such situations, Thurmond would have received 38.6 electoral votes, or 7.3 percent of the total number, and Wallace 9.4 electoral votes or 1.8 percent of the total. Thus, even this proportional system gives much greater weight to a third party in one-party States than to third parties in large two-party States. Of course this is true, also of the vote of the two major parties—i. e., the one-party States would have the whip-hand.

PROPOSAL WOULD PROMOTE PARLIAMENTARY SYSTEM

There is yet another consequence which follows from the Lodge-Gossett proposal. I have shown that 8 and possibly 9 of the last 19 presidential elections would have been decided by Congress under its 50 percent provision. This means that congressional candidates would be running not only as representatives of their districts, but as presidential electors. In this respect this provision would change, completely, the American system and make it far more like the parliamentary system where the personalities of the local candidates and the local issues they represent, are much less important than the national party label. This might be good or bad, depending on one's point of view, but it would be a logical consequence of the substitutes now before us.

Now, Mr. President, if we are going to have a parliamentary system, let us debate that and decide that on its merits, but let us not drag it in by the back door as it would be dragged in under the provisions of this substitute amendment.

PROPOSAL RISKS DISASTER

Let us look further as to the consequences of throwing almost all elections into Congress for decision.

First of all, the will of the people would be frustrated. Many, and in fact most, of the presidential candidates who received a majority of the popular vote, would find that notwithstanding their popular majority Congress itself would have to determine the election. That is a much greater evil than any supposed evil which now exists in the electoral system.

Second, there would always be an 8 weeks delay before the public knew the outcome of our presidential elections—that is from the election date in November until the Congress met in January. This type of delay and uncertainty, which would occur every 4 years, would strain our presidential election system beyond the breaking point. The budget would be delayed, there would be no time for the candidates to determine the personnel they desired to serve with them, there would be trades and bargains for every conceivable post, position, and benefit desired by this or that powerful group in Congress, and all three candidates would be operating in a vacuum, not knowing whether they or their opponents were to be the President. We would have a Hayes-Tilden circus in every election. This general indecisiveness could bring down the system.

Third, it is quite clear that in any election, the man with the third highest popular vote would continue to remain in a strong position even after his clear defeat at the polls. With stalemates between the two front runners, the third party candidate would be in a position not unlike that now held in party conventions by the dark horse candidate when the two front runners are deadlocked. If not chosen as President, he would dictate who would be President.

Fourth, and perhaps the most dangerous implication is that this process would, as the Senator from Pennsylvania has observed, weaken the presidential leadership which is imperative at this stage in our history. In almost any election, the winning candidate would be dependent on Congress for his election. Think of the concessions he would have to make to group after group. Think what effect this would have on the general concept of division of power between three equal institutions—the Presidency, the Congress, and the judiciary. Congress would dominate. The President would be in its control and power. And given the groups and regions which would have the decisive and controlling influence in the Congress, this could only mean a weakening of the progress at home and a return to isolationism abroad.

Mr. President, under this amendment and its clear implications and consequences, our Nation would be courting internal disaster in a time of external peril, if we were to be so foolish as to pass it with a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. DUFF. In effect, is it not true that what we would be doing would be borrowing the uncertainties which have paralyzed the French Government in times of great crises?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We would be copying some of that uncertainty. Of course, that is the tendency of a multiparty system.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. We sometimes hear it said that it makes no difference what is said in a speech in the Senate, that votes in the Senate are already frozen before the debate starts on an issue. I have always denied that, because in my personal experience I know that many times my vote in the Senate has been changed by either an unanswerable argument in the committee report or by speeches on the floor of the Senate.

As the Senator knows, I feel that there should be some changes in our electoral college system, although, as he also knows, I happen to favor the direct election of President in the States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As does the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MORSE. When the pending proposal first came before the Senate, after giving it only a cursory reading, I thought it was an improvement. I went along as one of the cosponsors, reserving to myself the right to vote for amendments, or to vote against the entire proposal if debate convinced me that such should be my vote.

I wish to say that the contributions to this debate by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and other Senators have convinced me that the proposal certainly should not be voted for in its present form.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I intend tomorrow to vote for certain amendments, to see if

we cannot obtain some satisfactory amendments. If not, I shall vote against the entire proposal.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is very refreshing news.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have another item to discuss when the Senator finishes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall finish very shortly. I have only a few more pages.

III–5. WHICH SYSTEM WOULD THE INDIVIDUAL STATES CHOOSE?

Thus far, we have been examining the Lodge-Gossett and Mundt-Coudert plans separately. In fact, of course, they are combined in the substitute amendment. We are faced with the situation that, if passed and ratified, the States could choose the method they desired to use. This brings almost limitless complications, and this fact alone should cause us to reject this two-headed monster or recommit it until the Judiciary Committee can study it and give some clear information as to its consequences.

Because of the combination we are laboring under unusual and unique handicaps.

In the first place, there are no official public statistics of the actual votes for President by congressional districts in previous elections. Further, such figures were not presented to us by the committee, although a tabulation was given by one witness based on the best available evidence. Even this left great uncertainty for the elections prior to that of 1948. We have, however, found that the Congressional Quarterly did publish such unofficial figures for the 1952 election in January of this year. By going to the experts and by making calculations, I believe we are now able to present accurate figures, but only for 1952.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain tables from the Congressional Quarterly Almanac, which I am using by permission. I am deeply indebted to the Congressional Quarterly Almanac for its willingness to allow this material to be reproduced and who gave permission to me to use it on the floor of the Senate.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House election percentages, 1950–54—Percentage of Eisenhower vote by districts, 1952

This exclusive Congressional Quarterly chart shows the election patterns for the 82d, 83d, and 84th Congresses, and also the percentages of the vote which President Eisenhower chalked up in each congressional district in 1952. Districts consistently won by over 60 percent of the total vote seldom change politically. Districts in the 55 to 60 percent bracket are key districts, but most of them stay in the same party. Districts which normally elect Representatives by less than 55 percent of the total vote are usually doubtful and can go either way. Figures under the appropriate year columns pertain to winning candidate in each election, not necessarily to present holder of seat.

	1954	1952	1950	1952 Ike percent
Alabama:				
3 Andrews (D)	X	X	X	(27.8)
1 Boykin (D)	X	X	X	(42.2)

House election percentages, 1950–54—Percentage of Eisenhower vote by districts, 1952—Continued

	1954	1952	1950	1952 Ike percent
Alabama—Con.				
7 Elliot (D)	(78.9)	(72.5)	X	(57.4)
2 Grant (D)	X	X	X	(56.8)
9 Huddleston (D)	X	X	X	(45.8)
8 Jones (D)	(91.6)	(87.3)	X	(20.4)
5 Rains (D)	X	X	X	(27.5)
4 Roberts (D)	X	X	(93.7)	(55.9)
6 Selden (D)	X	X	X	(58.7)
Arizona:				
1 Rhodes (R)	53.1	54.0	(60.6)	(60.6)
2 Udall (D)	(62.1)	(56.9)	(69.1)	(56.2)
Arkansas:				
1 Gathings (D)	X	X	------	(59.2)
4 Harris (D)	X	X	------	(56.5)
5 Hays (D)	X	(78.8)	------	(47.8)
2 Mills (D)	X	X	------	(58.8)
6 Norrell (D)	X	X	------	(59.5)
3 Trimble (D)	X	(56.0)	------	(57.2)
California:				
7 Allen (R)	53.0	X	55.3	(52.7)
6 Baldwin (R)	50.9	(50.6)	------	(47.5)
2 Engle (D)	X	X	------	(57.8)
10 Gubser (R)	61.2	59.2	------	(60.8)
14 Hagen (D)	(65.1)	(51.0)	------	(54.8)
11 Johnson (R)	52.6	X	------	(55.5)
4 Mailliard (R)	61.2	55.0	------	(61.7)
8 Miller (D)	(65.4)	X	------	(51.8)
3 Moss (D)	(65.3)	(50.8)	------	(51.4)
29 Phillips (R)	57.9	X	------	(64.7)
1 Scudder (R)	59.1	X	------	(63.9)
5 Shelley (D)	X	X	------	(42.1)
27 Sheppard (D)	(64.8)	(55.0)	------	(57.0)
12 Sisk (D)	(53.8)	X	------	(49.2)
13 Teague (R)	52.5	51.0	52.1	(61.0)
28 Utt (R)	66.2	63.0	------	(69.1)
30 Wilson (R)	60.4	59.6	------	(62.0)
9 Younger (R)	54.5	53.1	------	(63.1)
Los Angeles County:				
23 Doyle (D)	(70.9)	X	------	(44.8)
21 Hiestand (R)	58.7	53.6	------	(63.3)
25 Hillings (R)	65.2	64.3	60.1	(65.8)
20 Hinshaw (R)	71.2	X	------	(71.5)
19 Holifield (D)	(74.8)	X	------	(58.6)
22 Holt (R)	58.2	60.4	------	(63.2)
18 Hosmer (R)	55.0	55.5	------	(58.8)
16 Jackson (R)	60.8	59.7	------	(64.6)
17 King (D)	(60.1)	(54.6)	------	(51.8)
24 Lipscomb (R)	56.9	X	------	(60.1)
15 McDonough (R)	56.9	X	------	(57.2)
26 Roosevelt (D)	(60.1)	X	------	(59.8)
Colorado:				
3 Aspinall (D)	(53.5)	(50.0)	(57.3)	(64.3)
3 Chenoweth (R)	53.0	57.7	51.6	(59.0)
2 Hill (R)	55.3	63.1	57.5	(65.6)
1 Rogers (D)	(55.6)	(50.8)	(50.3)	(56.5)
Connecticut:				
3 Cretella (R)	52.7	52.8	52.1	(55.8)
1 Dodd (D)	(57.0)	(54.0)	(58.2)	(50.6)
4 Morano (R)	57.6	60.1	55.8	(61.1)
5 Patterson (R)	32.8	56.7	53.7	(60.9)
AL Sadlak (R)	50.9	55.0	50.4	(55.7)
2 Seely-Brown (R)	50.7	55.5	50.8	(56.0)
Delaware:				
AL McDowell (D)	(54.9)	51.9	56.7	(51.8)
Florida:				
2 Bennett (D)	X	X	------	(48.5)
1 Cramer (R)	50.7	(50.7)	------	(61.9)
4 Fascell (D)	X	(66.0)	------	(56.1)
7 Haley (D)	(55.5)	(56.3)	------	(56.7)
5 Herlong (D)	X	X	------	(63.0)
8 Matthews (D)	X	X	------	(42.3)
6 Rogers (D) [1]	X	(60.8)	------	(65.5)
3 Sikes (D)	X	X	X	(26.7)
Georgia:				
8 Blitch (D)	X	X	X	(26.7)
10 Brown (D)	X	X	X	(28.6)
5 Davis (D)	(64.4)	X	X	(49.5)
4 Flynt (D)	X	X	X	(17.4)
3 Forrester (D)	X	X	X	(27.4)
9 Landrum (D)	X	X	X	(29.5)
7 Lanham (D)	X	X	X	(30.8)
2 Pilcher (D)	X	X	X	(25.9)
1 Preston (D)	(83.7)	X	X	(37.7)
6 Vinson (D)	X	X	X	(26.0)
Idaho:				
2 Budge (R)	60.8	66.2	57.1	(68.6)
1 Pfost (D)	(54.9)	(50.3)	50.5	(60.9)
Illinois:				
16 Allen (R)	X	66.5	67.3	(66.5)
17 Arends (R)	65.0	63.6	------	(64.8)
19 Chiperfield (R)	56.5	60.8	59.0	(61.2)
25 Gray (D)	(52.6)	56.2	------	(55.6)
21 Mack (D)	(54.8)	(52.4)	------	(55.3)
15 Mason (R)	62.8	63.6	63.3	(62.5)
24 Price (D)	(69.2)	(64.8)	(64.9)	(40.6)
14 Reed (R)	72.4	71.5	74.2	(72.7)
20 Simpson (R)	62.9	61.8	------	(60.9)
22 Springer (R)	62.0	63.0	------	(61.1)
18 Velde (R)	57.4	55.2	61.6	(60.5)
23 Vursell (R)	52.9	58.1	------	(59.1)

[1] Dwight L. Rogers died Dec. 1, 1954; Paul G. Rogers elected Jan. 11, 1955.

House election percentages, 1950–54—Percentage of Eisenhower vote by districts, 1952—Continued

	1954	1952	1950	1952 Ike percent
Chicago-Cook County:				
7 Bowler (D)	(78.4)	(70.0)	------	(51.2)
12 Boyle (D)	(54.1)	55.7	------	(55.2)
13 Church (R)	69.6	70.6	------	(70.4)
1 Dawson (D)	(75.3)	(73.5)	------	(25.4)
8 Gordon (D)	(68.4)	(59.0)	------	(41.9)
10 Hoffman (R)	57.3	65.0	66.5	(64.8)
5 Kluczynski (D)	(73.2)	(64.5)	------	(38.6)
4 McVey (R)	52.1	56.6	------	(55.9)
3 Murray (D)	(53.8)	54.5	------	(55.0)
6 O'Brien (D)	(71.7)	(63.1)	------	(38.9)
2 O'Hara (D)	(61.6)	(51.4)	------	(49.1)
11 Sheehan (R)	50.9	59.4	56.7	(58.0)
9 Yates (D)	(60.3)	(52.4)	------	(51.3)
Indiana:				
4 Adair (R)	59.8	63.7	56.2	(64.9)
5 Beamer (R)	53.1	56.9	54.1	(57.6)
7 Bray (R)	55.4	56.1	50.0	(56.6)
11 Brownson (R)	54.9	59.3	56.5	(60.5)
3 Crumpacker (R)	50.4	54.5	52.8	(55.9)
8 Denton (D)	(52.1)	52.6	(51.0)	(55.3)
2 Halleck (R)	59.8	59.3	57.2	(67.3)
6 Harden (R)	52.5	55.7	52.4	(58.5)
10 Harvey (R)	55.9	59.9	58.7	(60.4)
1 Madden (D)	(61.4)	(56.4)	(52.6)	(44.7)
9 Wilson (R)	51.7	56.4	54.9	(58.5)
Iowa:				
5 Cunningham (R)	55.6	58.8	56.9	(58.7)
6 Dolliver (R)	60.3	68.7	64.6	(65.3)
3 Gross (R)	62.1	65.8	64.0	(66.4)
8 Hoeven (R)	63.8	X	64.1	(68.8)
7 Jensen (R)	60.4	67.3	62.0	(67.4)
4 LeCompte (R)	55.6	61.9	56.7	(59.7)
1 Schwengel (R)	57.0	62.8	61.7	(63.5)
2 Talle (R)	55.4	62.2	58.8	(63.1)
Kansas:				
1 Avery	54.3	(51.5)	66.5	(71.5)
3 George (R)	55.4	59.5	54.7	(64.5)
5 Hope (R)	64.9	70.9	61.8	(71.5)
4 Rees (R)	56.2	59.4	58.9	(71.5)
2 Scrivner (R)	54.7	57.3	52.2	(61.3)
6 Smith (R)	53.3	62.5	59.5	(76.4)
Kentucky:				
4 Chelf (D)	X	(55.9)	------	(47.7)
1 Gregory (D)	X	(65.8)	------	(38.6)
2 Natcher (D)	X	(54.4)	------	(47.4)
7 Perkins (D)	(60.4)	(58.2)	------	(42.9)
3 Robsion (R)	50.2	54.0	55.5	(54.6)
8 Siler (R)	63.4	68.8	------	(66.4)
5 Spence (D)	(61.0)	(55.4)	------	(50.2)
6 Watts (D)	(60.9)	(56.3)	------	(45.4)
Louisiana:				
2 Boggs (D)	X	(66.4)	X	(48.5)
4 Brooks (D)	X	X	X	(59.8)
1 Hébert (D)	(82.3)	X	X	(48.5)
8 Long (D)	X	X	X	(40.7)
6 Morrison (D)	X	X	X	(41.3)
5 Passman (D)	X	X	X	(46.1)
7 Thompson (D)	X	X	X	(42.9)
3 Willis (D)	X	X	X	(48.0)
Maine:				
1 Hale (R)	52.1	61.6	54.0	(64.7)
3 McIntire (R)	60.5	76.2	62.9	(70.4)
2 Nelson (R)	54.0	66.3	57.7	(64.7)
Maryland:				
2 Devereux (R)	56.1	61.4	------	(63.2)
4 Fallon (D)	(57.2)	(54.7)	------	(53.7)
7 Friedel (D)	(54.5)	(51.4)	------	(51.3)
3 Garmatz (D)	X	(70.9)	(65.7)	(58.2)
6 Hyde (R)	51.4	57.8	61.9	(61.1)
5 Lankford (D)	(53.7)	50.4	------	(57.1)
1 Miller (R)	55.5	61.1	57.0	(57.2)
Massachusetts:				
6 Bates (R)	71.2	X	71.4	(61.7)
2 Boland (D)	(59.6)	(61.8)	(53.7)	(53.8)
10 Curtis (R)	50.7	54.3	54.2	(56.2)
4 Donohue (D)	(57.1)	(54.4)	(55.0)	(57.1)
1 Heselton (R)	55.6	67.1	66.2	(57.7)
7 Lane (D)	X	(74.7)	(74.2)	(41.3)
8 Macdonald (D)	(53.2)	50.9	51.2	(58.3)
14 Martin (R)	62.0	63.2	61.8	(58.3)
12 McCormack (D)	X	(82.2)	(77.5)	(34.4)
9 Nicholson (R)	56.7	59.1	55.2	(63.2)
11 O'Neill (D)	(78.2)	(69.3)	(75.1)	(37.2)
3 Philbin (D)	X	(67.3)	(69.1)	(49.1)
5 Rogers (R)	X	75.9	74.0	(59.7)
13 Wigglesworth (R)	58.0	60.6	59.9	(61.8)
Michigan:				
12 Bennett (R)	55.9	58.2	61.7	(53.8)
8 Bentley (R)	62.7	66.6	60.5	(69.3)
10 Cederberg (R)	61.4	67.5	66.2	(69.4)
18 Dondero (R)	53.9	56.2	------	(61.0)
5 Ford (R)	63.3	66.3	66.7	(64.9)
6 Hayworth (D)	(51.1)	52.6	52.8	(59.5)
4 Hoffman (R)	62.3	66.6	68.6	(68.5)
3 Johnson (R)	59.4	62.0	61.4	(67.5)
11 Knox (R)	54.9	59.3	56.5	(63.3)
2 Meader (R)	59.8	63.4	60.4	(66.7)
9 Thompson (R)	55.7	59.5	54.5	(62.8)
7 Wolcott (R)	52.8	60.3	63.0	(64.5)
Detroit-Wayne County:				
13 Diggs (D)	(65.8)	(64.8)	(61.4)	(37.2)
15 Dingell (D)	(72.7)	(66.7)	(64.1)	(37.2)

House election percentages, 1950–54—Percentage of Eisenhower vote by districts, 1952—Continued

	1954	1952	1950	1952 Ike percent
Detroit-Wayne County —Con.				
17 Griffiths (D)	(52.2)	52.9	------	(57.6)
16 Lesinski (D)	(67.9)	(60.7)	------	(43.3)
1 Machrowicz (D)	(88.3)	(84.2)	(82.2)	(19.1)
14 Rabaut (D)	(58.2)	(53.0)	------	(51.0)
Minnesota:				
7 Andersen (R)	52.6	62.6	61.7	(60.9)
1 Andresen (R)	60.9	69.4	67.1	(65.9)
8 Blatnik (D)	(71.8)	(62.6)	(62.9)	(38.5)
5 Judd (R)	55.8	59.2	58.7	(56.5)
9 Knutson (D)	(51.2)	(60.5)	(61.9)	(57.0)
6 Marshall (D)	(61.9)	(52.6)	(56.2)	(61.5)
4 McCarthy (D)	(63.0)	(61.7)	(60.4)	(44.4)
2 O'Hara (R)	57.9	67.7	59.9	(66.8)
3 Wier (D)	(54.4)	(52.2)	(51.7)	(50.7)
Mississippi:				
1 Abernethy (D)	X	X	------	(32.7)
6 Colmer (D)	X	X	(87.9)	(41.5)
3 Smith (D)	X	(87.2)	X	(49.9)
2 Whitten (D)	X	X	------	(28.0)
4 Williams (D)	X	X	------	(51.2)
5 Winstead (D)	X	(94.1)	------	(31.7)
Missouri:				
5 Bolling (D)	(58.9)	(56.0)	------	(46.6)
9 Cannon (D)	(59.0)	(54.7)	------	(52.2)
8 Carnahan (D)	(57.2)	(52.8)	------	(50.6)
4 Christopher (D)	(52.0)	53.3	------	(54.9)
2 Curtis (R)	54.7	56.9	------	(56.3)
6 Hull (D)	(53.6)	52.4	------	(55.8)
10 Jones (D)	(63.9)	(60.7)	------	(45.4)
1 Karsten (D)	(66.3)	(64.2)	------	(40.1)
11 Moulder (D)	(55.3)	(50.4)	------	(55.2)
7 Short (R)	53.6	61.7	------	(64.9)
3 Sullivan (D)	(71.0)	(64.8)	------	(34.4)
Montana:				
2 Fjare (R)	50.6	62.0	54.1	(61.0)
1 Metcalf (D)	(56.0)	(50.3)	(60.2)	(57.2)
Nebraska:				
2 Chase (R)	52.9	56.1	63.5	(58.3)
3 Harrison (R)	65.2	71.9	66.9	(73.3)
4 Miller (R)	70.4	73.3	65.8	(73.9)
1 Weaver (R)	58.6	72.0	54.5	(71.6)
Nevada:				
AL Young (R)	54.5	50.5	(52.8)	(61.4)
New Hampshire:				
2 Bass (R)	60.4	66.4	64.5	(63.4)
1 Merrow (R)	50.2	60.2	57.5	(58.7)
New Jersey:				
11 Addonizio (D)	(56.3)	(52.2)	(51.6)	(52.2)
3 Auchincloss (R)	57.6	64.4	62.4	(62.4)
8 Canfield (R)	54.8	62.6	63.6	(54.3)
5 Frelinghuysen (R)	59.3	62.2	61.6	(62.0)
2 Hand (R)	63.6	63.4	54.3	(58.4)
12 Kean (R)	53.1	54.8	53.1	(54.5)
9 Osmers (R)	60.2	66.2	57.8	(67.2)
10 Rodino (D)	(63.4)	(56.9)	(61.0)	(53.3)
13 Sieminski (D)	(60.8)	(55.1)	(51.9)	(43.4)
4 Thompson (D)	(58.4)	(54.7)	(52.2)	(49.0)
14 Tumulty (D)	(62.4)	(51.5)	(59.2)	(50.5)
7 Widnall (R)	(62.2)	68.3	69.7	(68.3)
6 Williams (D)	(56.1)	63.9	62.2	(60.5)
1 Wolverton (R)	54.3	55.0	56.7	(48.9)
New Mexico:				
AL Dempsey (D)	(59.3)	(52.0)	(58.6)	(55.4)
AL Fernandez (D)	(58.7)	(52.3)	(56.4)	(55.4)
New York:				
3 Becker (R)	58.3	65.4	------	(68.3)
37 Cole (R)	71.7	69.4	------	(71.9)
2 Derounian (R)	63.7	68.8	------	(71.1)
26 Gamble (R)	64.0	67.3	------	(67.6)
27 Gwinn (R)	57.2	58.5	------	(67.3)
32 Kearney (R)	61.5	67.4	64.1	(67.8)
38 Keating (R)	71.9	69.3	------	(60.8)
33 Kilburn (R)	68.1	69.0	------	(69.2)
40 Miller (R)	60.9	59.6	------	(59.2)
30 O'Brien (D)	(61.2)	(53.7)	------	(54.5)
39 Ostertag (R)	64.8	65.8	------	(64.6)
42 Pillion (R)	57.6	55.2	------	(56.8)
41 Radwan (R)	63.1	55.9	------	(54.8)
43 Reed (R)	64.8	66.2	------	(68.6)
35 Riehlman (R)	63.5	63.2	61.9	(65.0)
28 St. George (R)	64.9	65.6	61.8	(69.6)
36 Taber (R)	68.4	69.9	------	(73.4)
31 Taylor (R)	66.2	70.6	------	(72.3)
1 Wainwright (R)	63.1	60.4	------	(74.3)
29 Wharton (R)	66.5	69.8	65.8	(71.4)
34 Williams (R)	59.3	58.8	------	(63.7)
New York City:				
8 Anfuso (D)	(77.7)	(65.3)	------	(38.2)
5 Bosch (R)	51.7	53.5	------	(61.3)
24 Buckley (D)	(57.6)	(46.5)	------	(36.5)
11 Celler (D)	(83.5)	(73.8)	------	(25.4)
17 Coudert (R)	50.2	57.0	------	(57.6)
20 Davidson (D)	(67.2)	(60.2)	------	(40.3)
7 Delaney (D)	(59.0)	(51.0)	------	(56.3)
23 Dollinger (D)	(75.6)	(63.8)	------	(22.3)
18 Donovan (D)	X	X	------	(43.0)
12 Dorn (R)	51.3	52.7	------	(54.8)
22 Fine (D)	(67.8)	(58.0)	------	(28.5)
25 Fino (R)	50.4	50.1	------	(57.5)
6 Holtzman (D)	(54.5)	(49.2)	------	(51.1)

House election percentages, 1950–54—Percentage of Eisenhower vote by districts, 1952—Continued

	1954	1952	1950	1952 Ike percent
New York City—Con.				
10 Kelly (D)	(76.8)	(71.2)	------	(31.6)
9 Keogh (D)	(71.1)	(61.1)	------	(40.5)
19 Klein (D)	(74.6)	(66.0)	------	(33.7)
4 Latham (R)	54.2	62.6	------	(63.0)
13 Multer (D)	(78.8)	(68.3)	------	(30.9)
16 Powell (D)	(77.6)	(73.9)	------	(17.0)
15 Ray (R)	51.6	57.9	------	(67.5)
14 Rooney (D)	(73.1)	(64.2)	------	(41.6)
21 Zelenko (D)	(67.8)	63.4	------	(37.0)
North Carolina:				
9 Alexander (D)	(52.2)	(51.5)	(61.1)	(58.1)
3 Barden (D)	(77.3)	(76.1)	X	(35.9)
1 Bonner (D)	(92.5)	X	(92.8)	(23.7)
7 Carlyle (D)	(81.2)	X	(84.0)	(39.9)
5 Chatham (D)	(66.2)	X	X	(44.1)
4 Cooley (D)	X	(75.3)	(72.8)	(37.9)
8 Deane (D)	(59.1)	(59.9)	(59.6)	(48.9)
6 Durham (D)	(74.2)	(69.5)	(75.4)	(47.4)
2 Fountain (D)	X	(94.8)	X	(18.8)
10 Jonas (R)	57.5	57.4	(52.3)	(59.0)
11 Jones (D)	(67.5)	(63.0)	(68.9)	(50.0)
12 Shuford (D)	(61.5)	(56.9)	(63.7)	(51.5)
North Dakota:				
Al Burdick (R)	71.7	78.4	77.0	(71.0)
Al Krueger (R)	62.4	X	65.6	(71.0)
Ohio:				
9 Ashley (D) [2]	(36.4)	(40.9)	------	(51.7)
14 Ayres (R)	54.6	58.5	------	(50.5)
13 Baumhart (R)	59.1	58.8	------	(62.8)
8 Betts (R)	63.0	68.7	------	(68.5)
22 Bolton, F. P. (R)	58.3	58.8	------	(56.0)
11 Bolton, O. P. (R)	65.3	58.8	------	(57.8)
16 Bow (R)	58.3	54.4	------	(58.3)
7 Brown (R)	62.2	X	------	(62.6)
5 Clevenger (R)	59.5	63.2	------	(62.2)
20 Feighan (D)	(67.7)	(65.2)	------	(47.3)
18 Hays (D)	(57.3)	(55.8)	(50.8)	(49.0)
15 Henderson (R)	54.0	(64.3)	------	(62.3)
2 Hess (R)	58.4	56.6	------	(58.5)
10 Jenkins (R)	61.7	64.0	------	(60.6)
19 Kirwan (D)	(67.5)	(66.3)	------	(44.2)
4 McCulloch (R)	67.6	68.3	------	(64.9)
17 McGregor (R)	64.6	68.2	------	(65.9)
23 Minshall (R)	67.5	64.6	------	(69.4)
6 Polk (D)	(52.2)	(50.1)	------	(56.9)
3 Schenck (R)	52.6	51.1	------	(53.6)
1 Scherer (R)	64.3	61.6	------	(60.7)
21 Vanik (D)	(76.0)	(68.6)	------	(32.7)
12 Vorys (R)	61.5	62.3	64.1	(60.3)
Oklahoma:				
3 Albert (D)	(83.3)	(77.9)	------	(37.1)
1 Belcher (R)	58.8	58.6	------	(65.2)
2 Edmondson (D)	(64.7)	(59.2)	------	(51.4)
5 Jarman (D)	(66.0)	(62.4)	------	(56.5)
4 Steed (D)	X	(58.7)	------	(62.1)
6 Wickersham (D)	(69.3)	(63.3)	------	(53.7)
Oregon:				
2 Coon (R)	52.6	58.5	55.4	(62.1)
4 Ellsworth (R)	55.9	66.3	59.5	(63.9)
3 Green (D)	(52.4)	54.0	50.7	(55.0)
1 Norblad (R)	63.0	68.0	66.5	(63.9)
Pennsylvania:				
30 Buchanan (D)	(69.0)	(63.6)	------	(33.3)
17 Bush (R)	56.5	61.1	------	(65.8)
10 Carrigg (R)	50.5	53.6	------	(55.5)
25 Clark (D)	(53.5)	50.4	52.4	(51.6)
29 Corbett (R)	60.6	61.7	------	(58.8)
9 Dague (R)	62.6	66.2	67.2	(67.5)
28 Eberharter (D)	(65.1)	(58.7)	------	(42.2)
12 Fenton (R)	55.5	60.7	56.8	(60.2)
11 Flood (D)	(50.9)	50.2	(54.4)	(54.8)
27 Fulton (R)	62.8	62.6	------	(56.1)
23 Gavin (R)	61.9	67.8	------	(68.1)
7 James (R)	60.9	61.7	62.7	(61.6)
24 Kearns (R)	52.0	57.1	57.0	(58.0)
21 Kelley (D)	(61.1)	(52.9)	(57.1)	(42.2)
8 King (R)	51.2	59.3	58.2	(59.7)
13 McConnell (R)	64.3	66.4	66.2	(66.6)
26 Morgan (D)	(65.3)	(59.1)	------	(38.9)
16 Mumma (R)	59.8	61.7	------	(66.0)
19 Quigley (D)	(51.0)	52.3	------	(58.5)
14 Rhodes (D)	(62.0)	(49.7)	(49.8)	(52.4)
22 Saylor (R)	51.9	52.4	52.5	(48.9)
18 Simpson (R)	55.9	63.5	------	(64.8)
20 Van Zandt (R)	56.3	62.8	59.5	(62.3)
15 Walter (D)	(61.6)	(54.8)	(58.3)	(53.0)
Philadelphia:				
1 Barrett (D)	(51.5)	(68.2)	(53.8)	(35.5)
3 Byrne (D)	(55.4)	(58.4)	(50.3)	(42.7)
4 Chudoff (D)	(65.7)	(69.9)	(57.5)	(30.5)
2 Granahan (D)	(61.2)	(61.8)	(57.0)	(39.0)
5 Green (D)	(55.0)	(54.2)	(55.5)	(46.6)
6 Scott (R)	50.6	51.7	50.0	(51.9)
Rhode Island:				
2 Fogarty (D)	(60.4)	(53.4)	(60.6)	(51.8)
1 Forand (D)	(59.2)	(54.9)	(63.2)	(49.9)
South Carolina:				
4 Ashmore (D)	X	X	X	(39.4)
3 Dorn (D)	X	(93.9)	X	(34.2)

[2] Low election percentage due to 3-way contest in 1954.

House election percentages, 1950–54—Percentage of Eisenhower vote by districts, 1952—Continued

	1954	1952	1950	1952 Ike percent
South Carolina—Con.				
6 McMillan (D) [3]	X	X	X	(49.6)
5 Richards (D)	X	(93.9)	X	(35.3)
2 Riley (D)	X	X	X	(57.4)
1 Rivers (D)	X	X	X	(62.1)
South Dakota:				
2 Berry (R)	62.7	69.0	60.3	(70.3)
1 Lovre (R)	58.0	68.5	60.8	(69.0)
Tennessee:				
2 Baker (R)	58.0	68.9	52.2	(62.8)
6 Bass (D)	X	X	------	(33.0)
8 Cooper (D)	X	X	X	(33.5)
9 Davis (D)	(83.5)	X	X	(47.5)
4 Evins (D)	X	X	------	(39.3)
3 Frazier (D)	(59.2)	(70.0)	------	(54.3)
7 Murray (D)	X	X	X	(47.1)
5 Priest (D)	(90.8)	(67.5)	X	(41.0)
1 Reece (R)	62.5	65.9	46.5	(69.5)
Texas:				
5 Alger (R)	52.9	X	X	(65.0)
14 Bell (D)	(93.8)	X	X	(51.2)
2 Brooks (D)	X	(79.0)	X	(43.7)
17 Burleson (D)	X	X	X	(54.3)
AL Dies (D)	(88.0)	X	------	(55.2)
7 Dowdy (D)	X	X	X	(45.5)
21 Fisher (D)	X	X	X	(61.6)
3 Gentry (D)	X	X	(91.1)	(50.7)
13 Ikard (D)	X	X	X	(48.4)
20 Kilday (D)	X	X	X	(56.5)
15 Kilgore (D)	X	X	X	(55.5)
19 Mahon (D)	X	X	(93.9)	(50.2)
1 Patman (D)	X	X	X	(40.5)
11 Poage (D)	X	X	X	(42.6)
4 Rayburn (D)	X	X	X	(42.3)
18 Rogers (D)	(64.9)	X	(52.5)	(59.1)
16 Rutherford (D)	X	X	X	(59.4)
6 Teague (D)	X	X	X	(39.0)
8 Thomas (D)	(62.1)	X	(77.8)	(57.7)
9 Thompson (D)	X	X	X	(54.0)
10 Thornberry (D)	X	X	X	(49.2)
12 Wright (D)	X	X	(80.6)	(56.5)
Utah:				
2 Dawson (R)	57.2	52.5	(53.4)	(58.2)
1 Dixon (R)	53.4	60.5	(51.1)	(60.1)
Vermont:				
AL Prouty (R)	61.4	71.8	73.4	(71.5)
Virginia:				
4 Abbitt (D)	X	X	X	(46.5)
10 Broyhill (R)	53.7	50.2	------	(60.3)
3 Gary (D)	(58.0)	(57.7)	X	(61.0)
2 Hardy (D)	(74.4)	X	X	(47.2)
7 Harrison (D)	(74.2)	(79.1)	(69.4)	(64.4)
9 Jennings (D)	(50.5)	51.7	(58.4)	(53.0)
6 Poff (R)	62.3	51.5	X	(62.8)
1 Robeson (D)	X	X	(81.0)	(52.2)
8 Smith (D)	(66.6)	X	------	(57.6)
5 Tuck (D)	X	X	X	(53.6)
Washington:				
4 Holmes (R)	61.0	67.5	64.3	(61.4)
5 Horan (R)	58.6	56.0	54.8	(56.2)
3 Mack (R)	64.9	53.3	52.9	(53.4)
AL Magnuson (D)	(57.6)	(50.5)	------	(54.5)
1 Pelly (R)	52.6	51.4	(51.4)	(52.5)
6 Tollefson (R)	55.2	59.8	60.5	(50.5)
2 Westland (R)	52.4	54.2	61.2	(54.5)
West Virginia:				
3 Bailey (D)	(58.9)	(53.4)	(54.4)	(48.5)
4 Burnside (D)	(50.2)	53.3	(51.6)	(55.6)
6 Byrd (D)	(62.7)	(55.6)	(61.6)	(44.5)
5 Kee (D)	(67.5)	(63.8)	(65.7)	(39.9)
1 Mollohan (D)	(52.7)	(52.9)	(51.7)	(48.2)
2 Staggers (D)	(55.0)	(51.5)	(54.3)	(52.0)
Wisconsin:				
8 Byrnes (R)	62.0	73.6	62.0	(68.2)
2 Davis (R)	54.0	62.9	57.6	(60.7)
9 Johnson (D)	(55.4)	65.2	70.8	(64.4)
7 Laird (R)	59.1	72.3	68.3	(67.5)
10 O'Konski (R)	59.7	67.4	57.0	(57.6)
5 Reuss (D)	(52.2)	51.6	51.6	(54.8)
1 Smith (R)	54.4	59.4	57.2	(59.6)
6 Van Pelt (R)	62.5	71.7	65.0	(68.4)
3 Withrow (R)	62.1	75.1	58.8	(68.9)
4 Zablocki (D)	(71.1)	(64.3)	(60.9)	(48.0)
Wyoming:				
AL Thomson (R)	56.2	60.1	54.5	(62.7)

[3] Eisenhower carried 6th District although his percentage was less than 50 percent on independent ticket.

KEY

Democratic percentages of the total vote, roman figures in parentheses.
Republican percentages, lightface figures.
Independent percentages, lightface italic figures.
Eisenhower percentages, italic figures in parentheses.
X, no major party opposition.
Blank space in 1950 column indicates redistricting.

Compiled from data from the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, the Democratic National Committee, and official State returns.

State by State electoral vote by congressional district (Mundt-Coudert) method, 1952 election, and comparative figures

(1) State	(2) Eisenhower percentage of popular vote, 1952	(3) Congressional districts carried, 1952 A By Eisenhower	(3) B By Stevenson	(4) Electoral vote by congressional district (Mundt-Coudert) method, 1952 A Eisenhower	(4) B Stevenson	(5) Republican congressional candidates' percentage of popular vote, 1952	(6) Congressional seats won, 1952 A By Republicans	(6) B By Democrats	(7) State legislature control, Dec. 1, 1954 A Senate	(7) B Assembly
Alabama	35.0	0	9	0	11	5.4	0	9	D	D
Arizona	58.3	2	0	4	0	48.5	1	1	D	D
Arkansas	43.8	1	5	1	7	14.3	0	6	D	D
California	56.3	24	6	26	6	52.2	19	11	R	R
Colorado	60.3	4	0	6	0	55.3	2	2	R	R
Connecticut	55.7	6	0	8	0	53.7	5	1	D	R
Delaware	51.8	1	0	3	0	51.9	1	0	D	D
Florida	55.0	5	3	7	3	25.9	0	8	D	D
Georgia	30.3	0	10	0	12	----------	0	10	D	D
Idaho	65.4	2	0	4	0	59.4	1	1	R	R
Illinois	54.8	18	7	20	7	54.0	16	9	R	R
Indiana	58.1	10	1	12	1	56.5	10	1	R	R
Iowa	63.8	8	0	10	0	66.7	8	0	R	R
Kansas	68.8	6	0	8	0	59.4	5	1	R	R
Kentucky	49.8	3	5	3	7	47.8	2	6	D	D
Louisiana	47.1	1	7	1	9	8.7	0	8	D	D
Maine	66.0	3	0	5	0	66.9	3	0	R	R
Maryland	55.4	6	1	8	1	51.8	4	3	D	D
Massachusetts	54.2	10	4	12	4	52.9	8	6	R	D
Michigan	55.4	14	4	16	4	52.4	13	5	R	R
Minnesota	55.3	7	2	9	2	54.0	5	4	(1)	(1)
Mississippi	39.6	1	5	1	7	2.5	0	6	D	D
Missouri	50.7	7	4	9	4	47.8	4	7	D	D
Montana	59.4	2	0	4	0	56.4	1	1	R	D
Nebraska	69.2	4	0	6	0	68.2	4	0	(1)	(1)
Nevada	61.4	1	0	3	0	50.5	1	0	R	D
New Hampshire	60.9	2	0	4	0	63.1	2	0	R	R
New Jersey	56.8	11	3	13	3	56.9	9	5	R	R
New Mexico	55.4	2	0	4	0	48.0	0	2	D	D
New York	55.5	29	14	31	14	52.4	27	16	R	R
North Carolina	46.1	4	8	4	10	82.0	1	11	D	D
North Dakota	71.0	2	0	4	0	78.4	2	0	R	R
Ohio	56.8	19	4	21	4	54.3	(2) 16	(2) 6	R	R
Oklahoma	54.6	5	1	7	1	41.1	1	5	D	D
Oregon	60.5	4	0	6	0	61.3	4	0	R	R
Pennsylvania	52.7	20	10	22	10	52.3	19	11	R	D
Rhode Island	50.9	1	1	3	1	45.9	0	2	(3)	D
South Carolina	49.3	3	3	3	5	2.0	0	6	D	D
South Dakota	69.3	2	0	4	0	68.6	2	0	R	R
Tennessee	50.0	3	6	5	6	29.1	2	7	D	D
Texas	53.1	14	8	16	8	1.3	0	22	D	D
Utah	58.9	2	0	4	0	55.6	2	0	R	R
Vermont	71.5	1	0	3	0	71.8	1	0	R	R
Virginia	56.3	8	2	10	2	31.0	3	7	D	D
Washington	54.3	7	0	9	0	56.5	6	1	R	D
West Virginia	48.1	2	4	2	6	46.1	1	5	D	D
Wisconsin	61.0	9	1	11	1	11.6	9	1	R	R
Wyoming	62.7	1	0	3	0	60.1	1	0	R	R
Total	55.1	297	138	[4] 375	[5] 156	----------	221	213	--------	--------

[1] Nonpartisan.
[2] Independent.
[3] Tied.
[4] 70.6 percent.
[5] 29.4 percent.

Sources: Columns 2, 5, Congressional Quarterly Almanac, vol. IX, p. 618 (1953); column 3, Congressional Quarterly Almanac, vol. XI, p. 716–17 (1955); column 7, Congressional Quarterly Almanac, vol. XI, p. 713 (1955).
Symbols: R = Republican; D = Democratic.

ALMOST LIMITLESS COMBINATIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the second place the combinations which are possible under this dual system are almost limitless. We have 48 States. Each State can select one or another alternative. Thus, the number of combinations which are possible under this amendment are at least two to the 48th power—2^{48}. This means that there are 281,474,976,710,656 different combinations of electoral votes which could be produced in any election under this hybrid monstrosity.

Thus, in almost any election, except a huge popular landslide, with the same number of votes in exactly the same States, districts, counties, towns, wards, and precincts, a range of results stretching from a Republican landslide to stalemate to a Democratic landslide could happen, depending on which alternative the individual States selected.

I repeat, this is both possible and probable, and could happen without changing a single vote.

Thus, although we can apply the Lodge-Gossett system to previous election statistics, and can say with certainty what the outcome would have been—and if we had the precise figures for presidential voting by congressional districts for all past elections, we could apply the Mundt-Coudert formula to past election results and could say with certainty what the outcome would have been—with this hybrid system, we get a range of possible results which number 281,474,976,710,656 or 2 to the 48th power.

This is true, Mr. President. It is ridiculous, Mr. President. And it could happen without changing a single vote in a single precinct.

Let me give some examples, Mr. President. First, let us take the 1948 election. I now ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a tabulation showing how the result of the 1948 election, by combining the formulas in this amendment, would have given Dewey the most electoral votes and which, under the 50-percent provision of the amendment before us, would have thrown the election into the Congress.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1948 election: Dewey with most electoral votes by State—Choice of system most favorable to Dewey

State	Formula used	Total electoral vote	Dewey	Truman
Alabama	L–G	11	2.0	0.0
Arizona	L–G	4	1.8	2.1
Arkansas	L–G	9	1.9	5.6
California	M–C	25	13.0	12.0
Colorado	L–G	6	2.8	3.1
Connecticut	M–C	8	6.0	2.0
Delaware	M–C	3	3.0	0
Florida	L–G	8	2.7	3.9
Georgia	L–G	12	2.2	7.3
Idaho	L–G	4	1.9	2.0
Illinois	M–C	28	18.0	10.0
Indiana	M–C	13	8.0	5.0
Iowa	L–G	10	4.8	5.0
Kansas	M–C	8	7.0	1.0
Kentucky	L–G	11	4.6	6.2
Louisiana	L–G	10	1.7	3.3
Maine	M–C	5	5.0	0
Maryland	L–G	8	4.0	3.8
Massachusetts	L–G	16	6.9	8.8
Michigan	M–C	19	13.0	6.0
Minnesota	L–G	11	4.4	6.3
Mississippi	L–G	9	.2	.9
Missouri	L–G	15	6.2	8.7
Montana	L–G	4	1.7	2.1
Nebraska	M–C	6	6.0	0
Nevada	L–G	3	1.4	1.5
New Hampshire	M–C	4	4.0	0
New Jersey	M–C	16	10.0	6.0
New Mexico	L–G	4	1.7	2.2
New York	M–C	47	24.0	23.0
North Carolina	L–G	14	4.6	8.1
North Dakota	M–C	4	4.0	0
Ohio	M–C	25	13.0	12.0
Oklahoma	L–G	10	3.7	6.3
Oregon	M–C	6	4.0	2.0
Pennsylvania	M–C	35	22.0	13.0
Rhode Island	L–G	4	1.7	2.3
South Carolina	L–G	8	.3	1.9
South Dakota	M–C	4	4.0	0
Tennessee	L–G	12	4.4	5.9
Texas	L–G	23	5.7	15.0
Utah	L–G	4	1.8	2.2
Vermont	M–C	3	3.0	0
Virginia	L–G	11	4.5	5.3
Washington	L–G	8	3.4	4.2
West Virginia	L–G	8	3.4	4.6
Wisconsin	L–G	12	5.6	6.1
Wyoming	L–G	3	1.4	1.5
Total	--------	531	260.4	228.2

Symbols: L–G = Lodge-Gossett. M–C = Mundt-Coudert.

Sources: For the Lodge-Gossett formula, Senator Taft's tables, Congressional Record, volume 96, part 1, pages 1271–1272; for Mundt-Coudert formula, Dr. Ruth Silva's tables on pp. 274–275 of hearings on H. J. Res. 11, 82d Cong., 1st sess.
There may be minus and fractional discrepancies for the effect of votes for 3d, 4th, and even 5th party candidates is not clear in every case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, by using the alternative most favorable to Dewey in each of the 48 States, the electoral result would have been 260.4 electoral votes for Dewey and 228.2 electoral votes for Truman.

This result would have happened without the shift of a single vote in the country if the individual States had been operating under the formula most advantageous to Dewey in each State.

In the second example I have produced an overwhelming Truman victory, with exactly the same vote in the same places as actually happened in 1948. By assuming that the States would use that formula most advantageous to Truman, the result would have been 334.7 electoral votes for Truman and 156.2 electoral votes for Dewey.

I ask unanimous consent that this table be reproduced in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1948 elections: Overwhelming Truman victory by assuming States operated under plan most favorable to Truman

State	Formula used	Total electoral vote	Dewey	Truman
Alabama	M-C	11	0.0	0.0
Arizona	M-C	4	0	4.0
Arkansas	M-C	9	0	9.0
California	L-G	25	11.8	11.9
Colorado	M-C	6	1.0	5.0
Connecticut	L-G	8	4.0	3.8
Delaware	L-G	3	1.5	1.5
Florida	M-C	8	1.0	7.0
Georgia	M-C	12	0	12.0
Idaho	M-C	4	0	4.0
Illinois	L-G	28	13.8	14.0
Indiana	L-G	13	6.4	6.3
Iowa	M-C [1]	10	3.0	7.0
Kansas	L-G	8	4.3	3.6
Kentucky	M-C	11	1.0	10.0
Louisiana	L-G [1]	10	1.7	3.3
Maine	L-G	5	2.8	2.1
Maryland	M-C	8	4.0	4.0
Massachusetts	M-C [1]	16	4.0	12.0
Michigan	L-G	19	9.3	9.0
Minnesota	M-C	11	0	11.0
Mississippi	L-G [1]	9	.2	.9
Missouri	M-C	15	1.0	14.0
Montana	M-C	4	0	4.0
Nebraska	L-G	6	3.3	2.7
Nevada	M-C	3	0	3.0
New Hampshire	L-G	4	2.1	1.9
New Jersey	L-G	16	8.0	7.3
New Mexico	M-C	4	0	4.0
New York	L-G	47	21.6	21.2
North Carolina	M-C	14	1.0	13.0
North Dakota	L-G	4	2.1	1.7
Ohio	L-G	25	12.3	12.4
Oklahoma	M-C	10	1.0	9.0
Oregon	L-G	6	3.0	2.8
Pennsylvania	L-G	35	17.8	16.4
Rhode Island	M-C	4	0	4.0
South Carolina	[1] L-G	8	.3	1.9
South Dakota	L-G	4	2.1	1.9
Tennessee	M-C	12	2.0	9.0
Texas	M-C	23	0	23.0
Utah	M-C	4	0	4.0
Vermont	L-G	3	1.8	1.1
Virginia	M-C	11	3.0	8.0
Washington	M-C	8	0	8.0
West Virginia	M-C	8	0	8.0
Wisconsin	M-C	12	4.0	8.0
Wyoming	M-C	3	0	3.0
Total		531	156.2	334.7

[1] Thurmond got bulk of the electoral vote.

There may be minor and fractional discrepancies for the effect of votes for 3d, 4th, and even 5th party candidates is not known in each case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now, Mr. President, let us apply the two-headed system to the 1952 election. Let us assume that the votes actually cast in that election in the actual places they were cast, were distributed according to the electoral vote method in the amendmnt before us which was most favorable to Mr. Stevenson. By this method, Eisenhower would have received 264.9 electoral votes and Stevenson 263.9 electoral votes and since Eisenhower did not have a majority of the electoral vote Congress would have had to determine the final result.

I ask that a table be inserted in the RECORD at this point, showing how, by each State choosing the formula in the Daniel substitute most favorable to Mr. Stevenson, this result could have been produced.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1952 election: Stalemated election by States, choosing formula most favorable to Stevenson

State	Formula used	Total electoral vote	Republican	Democratic
Alabama	M-C	11		11.000
Arizona	L-G	4	2.332	1.668
Arkansas	M-C	8	1.000	7.000
California	L-G	32	18.016	13.664
Colorado	L-G	6	3.618	2.340
Connecticut	L-G	8	4.456	3.512
Delaware	L-G	3	1.554	1.437
Florida	L-G	10	5.500	4.500
Georgia	M-C	12		12.000
Idaho	L-G	4	2.616	1.376
Illinois	L-G	27	14.796	12.123
Indiana	L-G	13	7.553	5.330
Iowa	L-G	10	6.380	3.560
Kansas	L-G	8	5.504	2.440
Kentucky	M-C	10	3.000	7.000
Louisiana	M-C	10	1.000	9.000
Maine	L-G	5	3.300	1.690
Maryland	L-G	9	4.986	3.942
Massachusetts	L-G	16	8.672	7.280
Michigan	L-G	20	11.080	8.800
Minnesota	L-G	11	6.083	4.851
Mississippi	M-C	8	1.000	7.000
Missouri	L-G	13	6.591	6.383
Montana	L-G	4	2.376	1.604
Nebraska	L-G	6	4.152	1.848
Nevada	L-G	3	1.842	1.158
New Hampshire	L-G	4	2.436	1.564
New Jersey	L-G	16	9.088	6.720
New Mexico	L-G	4	2.216	1.772
New York	L-G	45	24.975	19.620
North Carolina	M-C	14	4.000	10.000
North Dakota	L-G	4	2.840	1.136
Ohio	L-G	25	14.200	10.800
Oklahoma	L-G	8	4.368	3.632
Oregon	L-G	6	3.630	2.334
Pennsylvania	L-G	32	16.864	15.008
Rhode Island	L-G	4	2.036	1.960
South Carolina	M-C	8	3.000	5.000
South Dakota	L-G	4	2.772	1.228
Tennessee	M-C	11	5.000	6.000
Texas	L-G	24	12.744	11.208
Utah	L-G	4	2.356	1.644
Vermont	L-G	3	2.145	0.846
Virginia	L-G	12	6.756	5.208
Washington	L-G	9	4.887	4.023
West Virginia	M-C	8	2.000	6.000
Wisconsin	L-G	12	7.320	4.644
Wyoming	L-G	3	1.881	1.113
Total		531	264.921	263.966

There may be minor and fractional discrepancies for the effect of votes for 3d, 4th, and even 5th party candidates is not known in every case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, an electoral system which is as capricious as the one we are asked to accept, and which, depending on the formula used in each State, could produce a range of results, should most certainly be rejected by the Senate.

To accept it would be to introduce chaos into our system. It would bring charges every 4 years of "rigged" elections. It would tempt the States to shift back and forth from one system to another. If such a system existed, at this time of the year before a presidential election, Mr. Hall, of the Republican National Committee, and Mr. Butler, of the Democratic National Committee, would be touring the State legislatures of the country, urging and cajoling them to adopt the system each thought most favorable to his candidate.

Although I do not believe it would happen, it is certainly possible that State legislatures could wait until after an election to determine by which method their electoral vote would be cast. Certainly they would choose that method better designed to promote the fortunes of the party or faction in power at the time of the election.

Now that we have looked at the various mathematical possibilities under the Daniel substitute, with its alternative choice of methods, let us ask the question, Which system would each State be more likely to choose?

One can make at least two generalizations about this question.

The first is that the one-party States would probably choose the Mundt-Coudert or district unit system of casting their electoral vote. The reason for this is that the one-party States would ordinarily have their two Senators and all of their Representatives from one party. Thus, under the Mundt-Coudert system, all of their electoral votes would go to one party, whereas under the Lodge-Gossett formula the electoral vote would be divided in the proportion which the popular vote each of the three top candidates received was to the total popular vote. Thus, under Lodge-Gossett, even the minority candidate would receive some of the electoral vote whereas under Mundt-Coudert all of the electoral vote would go to the top candidate in these one-party States.

The Mundt-Coudert method would thus give the one-party State a huge prize and a larger margin with which to bargain than would the Lodge-Gossett method.

Second, it is clear that in those large populous two-party States where the popular vote is ordinarily about equally divided but where the State legislature is controlled by one party—as is ordinarily the case in States like New York, Ohio, Illinois, and California, to name only a few—the Mundt-Coudert system would also be selected. The reason is simple. Under the Lodge-Gossett method, the electoral vote in these States would ordinarily be about evenly divided. The margin would be 1 or less, or at most 2 or 3 electoral votes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. In States such as Massachusetts where the House is controlled by the Democrats and the Senate is in control of the Republicans, and the Governor is a Republican, what compromise or what gyrations would be gone through to work out which plan was to be established? That is true with respect to many other States, I may say to the Senator from Illinois, particularly States like New York.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Except that in New York the Democrats seldom control either house.

Mr. KENNEDY. But the Governor is a Democrat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. However, the Governor probably would not have any choice in the matter. I do not believe he would have a voice in the selection of the method. The method is to be selected by the legislature, as I understand.

Mr. KENNEDY. But the Governor would have the veto power; would he not? I understand that the plan that

would be used would be a matter of legislative determination. I understand that the acceptance of the amendment would depend entirely upon legislative action in the various States. However, deciding which plan would be used would be subject to veto by the governor; would it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I understand, they would have to use the Lodge-Gossett method unless the legislature provided that the Mundt-Coudert method was to be used.

The proposal refers to legislative process, not legislature. Therefore, although I am not an expert on the subject, in my opinion, the governor would have no voice in the matter. It would be a matter of agreement between the two houses of the legislature. However, the possibility of conflict between the two houses in those States where one party is in control of one house and the other party is in control of the other house would be great indeed.

Mr. KENNEDY. What decision has the Senator come to on the question of the governor's veto power?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was referring to section 3.

Mr. KENNEDY. As I read it, the governor would not have the power of veto.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. As I read it, the governor does not have the power of veto. Frankly, in this respect the Democratic Party would lose in the States in which the legislatures tend to be Republican more than Democratic.

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. DUFF. Is there any time limit specified during which the General Assembly is obliged to exercise its discretion with respect to when the legislation is to be used?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I see nothing in the proposal to that effect.

Mr. DUFF. Therefore, would it not be possible for a legislature to exercise the power after the vote had been cast?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. That is a point I tried to make earlier in my speech. The legislature could do it after the election, and they could switch back and forth between elections.

I was referring to the margin of division of the electoral vote under the two systems, and said the margin would be 1 or less, or at the most 2 or 3 electoral votes. The size of margin is not a large enough prize to be of great importance in a national election. Therefore, to enhance their bargaining position, and because of the gerrymanding of congressional districts, these two-party States could become important prizes by using the Mundt-Coudert plan and insure the party controlling the legislature a greater electoral vote than otherwise would have been the case.

In fact, in those Northern two-party States which are really one-party States so far as State legislatures are concerned, the Mundt-Coudert system would most certainly be selected. And in these circumstances, the Mundt-Coudert system would be a one-way street. For once selected at a time when say, the Republicans in New York controlled both the governorship and the legislature, it could rarely be undone for even though the Democrats so often take the governorship in New York, it is seldom that they control both the State house and Senate at the same time because of State district gerrymandering.

Mr. President, there is another consideration, also. I have given the political consideration, but there is an arithmetical consideration, namely, the Mundt-Coudert system produces a greater difference between the vote of the two parties in the two-party States than does the proportional system, and, therefore, a State wishing to magnify its importance in the electoral process and also in the nominating process would tend to choose the Mundt-Coudert system because it would become more of a prize for the victorious party and, hence, that State would have more influence in the selection of a candidate. That is the reason why it would be selected if this measure passed, just as it is the reason why States do not use it now because the present system gives a bigger prize than the district unit system.

Thus, Mr. President, because the Mundt-Coudert system would enlarge the electoral prize, it is quite clear that it would be chosen—

First, in the completely one-party States.

Second, in those two-party States where one party controls the machinery of the State government. This would be a great advantage to the Republican Party.

As one of these two situations is true in the vast majority of our States, I believe that the Mundt-Coudert system would be chosen much more often by the States than the Lodge-Gossett formula. Certainly if a State knew its own best interests it would be chosen, and I believe that in general, States are aware of their own interests.

Mr. President, since the Lodge-Gossett plan in itself is unsatifactory, since the Mundt-Coudert plan itself is unsatisfactory, since the two of them together are even more unsatisfactory, I do not see the justification of adopting this constitutional amendment. I hope, Mr. President, it will be defeated by a resounding vote so that it may be buried for a long time to come.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Illinois on what I think is one of the most outstanding speeches I have heard. I think it analyzes the pending proposal in the most detailed manner, and makes a point, which cannot be made too often, that if we are considering a radical shift in the balance of power in the United States, it should not be undertaken lightly; and, in my opinion, it should not be undertaken at this time.

I am sending to the desk an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 31 in the nature of a substitute, and I ask that it lie on the table and be printed. It is my intention to call up this amendment at an appropriate time as a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 31 or the Daniel-Mundt compromise substitute.

Basically the amendment contains, noncontroversial but worthwhile changes in the Constitution—both of which are also included in Senate Joint Resolution 31. It accomplishes these changes, however, without at the same time drastically altering our constitutional system and endangering our political stability.

First, this amendment abolishes the electoral college and the office of elector, while retaining the system of electoral votes, the present allocation of such votes to each State, and, unlike Senate Joint Resolution 31, the present method of counting all the electoral votes of each State for the candidate who receives the greatest number of votes. The electoral college is an unnecessary, confusing and potentially harmful anachronism. My amendment differs from Senate Joint Resolution 31 in this regard by the insertion of a provision preventing the election of a President and Vice President from different parties; and by retention of the present provision discouraging the nomination of Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates from the same State.

Secondly, the amendment adopts the language of Senate Joint Resolution 31 in providing that elections thrown into the Congress shall be determined by a joint meeting of all Senators and Representatives voting as individuals but not as States. This is obviously more democratic and less difficult to carry out. The amendment provides, as Senate Joint Resolution 31 does not, that such balloting will be public; and it retains, as Senate Joint Resolution 31 does not, the present language about who shall be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of New Jersey in the chair). The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

MEASURES PASSED BY SENATE THROUGH CALL OF CALENDAR ON MARCH 26, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement showing measures passed by the Senate through the call of the calendar today, together with a statement showing the most important bills passed by the Senate in the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Measures passed by Senate through call of calendar on Mar. 26, 1956

Senate bills	155
House bills	158
Senate joint resolutions	7
House joint resolutions	11
Senate concurrent resolutions	11
House concurrent resolutions	3
Senate resolutions	61
Total	406

Of the total of 331 Senate and House bills and Senate and House joint resolutions, 111 were general legislation and 220 have been private bills. An attached list sets forth 25 of the more important bills passed by the Senate so far this year.

TWENTY-FIVE MOST IMPORTANT BILLS PASSED BY THE SENATE, 2D SESSION, 84TH CONGRESS

1. H. R. 12, the farm bill: A bill to provide an improved farm program, and including a soil-bank provision.

2. H. R. 8780, the farm-gasoline bill: Relieves farmers from paying excise taxes on gasoline and fuels used on the farm, and directs a refund of taxes paid on such gasoline in 1956.

3. H. J. Res. 471, home-disaster relief: Permits the FHA to provide title I repair assistance to new homes damaged by major disasters.

4. H. R. 7871, disaster loans: Increases to $375 million the funds available to the Small Business Administration for disaster loans.

5. S. 2861, emergency highway funds: Authorizes an increase from $10 to $30 million in emergency relief highway funds for fiscal year 1956, as a result of flood and hurricane damage.

6. H. R. 6645, natural-gas bill: Freed independent natural-gas producers from direct Federal (FPC) price control.

7. H. R. 7930, Russian River project: Authorizes completion of the initial stage of development at Russian River Basin, Calif., a flood-control and irrigation project.

8. S. 3116, cultural and athletic exchanges: Provides a permanent program for United States participation in international cultural, athletic, and industrial fairs.

9. H. R. 2552, Great Lakes channels: Authorizes the modification of existing connecting channels above Lake Erie, to provide deeper channels on several tributaries.

10. H. R. 6309, Mississippi-Gulf Outlet: Provides for a new channel between the gulf and the Mississippi waterway system, for deep-draught shipping.

11. H. R. 7036, limitation on retirement income: Increases from $900 to $1,200 the amount a person under 72 can earn before his over-65 retirement credit must be reduced.

12. S. 2990, polio vaccine: Extends to June 30, 1957, authority to make grants to the States for their free provision of Salk vaccine to children and expectant mothers.

13. H. R. 1855, forest research: Authorizes a permanent program of United States contribution to specialized forest, range, and watershed research.

14. H. R. 7236, soil conservation: Authorizes Federal assistance in soil-conservation programs to farmers in all areas, not merely arid sections of the United States.

15. S. 2887, security of juries: Makes a criminal offense the tapping, recording, or unauthorized observance of grand and petit jury deliberations.

16. H. R. 3233, fleeting arson prosecution: Makes it a Federal offense to move across State lines to avoid prosecution or custody for arson.

17. H. R. 7201, life-insurance company tax: Re-forms tax laws on investments by life-insurance companies, and amends the law regarding new insurance companies.

18. H. R. 5614, FCC complaints: Allows the FCC to demur to protests against the authorization of grants, and to dismiss insubstantial protests, after oral argument, without hearings.

19. S. 1456, FCC procedure: Permits the FCC to dispense with certain duplicatory procedures relating to reports and hearings, where communications carriers are jointly owned or where consolidations are desired.

20. S. 1135, Civil Air Patrol: Extends the benefits of the Federal Employees Compensation Act to senior CAP members.

21. Executive Q, 83 Congress, 1st session, treaty, commercial samples: Ratified the international convention to facilitate importation of commercial advertising samples.

22. H. R. 8100, submarines to Brazil: Authorizes the loan of 2 reserve submarines to Brazil for 5 years and authorizes MDAP payment of outfitting costs.

23. H. R. 6712, tax revision: Amends section 1237 of the Code to afford capital-gains treatment to corporations or individuals holding foreclosed land for 10 years, subdividing and selling, unless as part of a real-estate trading business.

24. H. R. 1726, Federal Seed Act: Provides a civil action for violation of the analysis and labeling provisions of the act.

25. H. R. 8107, Reserve Act amendment: Equalizes the pay scales of reservists called to 6-month training duty with those of National Guard members, and provides increased medical and disability benefits.

CONDITIONS IN THE PHILADELPHIA OFFICE OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, recently much has been said about the deplorable conditions found to exist in the Philadelphia regional area of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and how it has been discovered that many prominent individuals have not been filing their tax returns.

Today I wish to discuss a situation which while probably having nothing to do with these previously announced cases certainly explains the low state of morals which were condoned by high officials in that area.

Today a man still holds a high position in the Philadelphia regional office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue notwithstanding the fact that in the Treasury Department files is rather conclusive evidence that during the past 7 years he wilfully condoned and protected from exposure two embezzlers.

One of these embezzlers was allowed to remain on the payroll for 6 months, the second embezzler for nearly 5 years, after their discrepancies were discovered, before they were reported, during which time they continued their defalcations. The second man was only removed after being exposed from the outside. By that time the statute of limitations protected the embezzler from prosecution.

This official to whom I refer as having condoned these two embezzlements is Mr. Thomas Ainsworth, who for the past 3 years has held the position of Inspector of Interior Audit in the Philadelphia office.

In my opinion Mr. Ainsworth was grossly negligent in discharging his responsibilities as a public official by not promptly reporting these embezzlements, and by this failure he became a part of the conspiracy to cover up the defalcations. This cannot be condoned in any Government agency, and certainly not in the agency charged with the responsibility of collecting our taxes.

Since there were two embezzlements involved I shall discuss each one separately.

The first embezzlement dates back to 1946. At that time Mr. Ainsworth held the position as Assistant Collector in the Wilmington regional office.

On September 17, 1946, and again on October 26, 1946, in letters signed by a taxpayer in the Wilmington area the Collector of Internal Revenue's attention was called to the fact that this taxpayer had cancelled checks showing that payments had been made on the account upon which he had just received an invoice from the Bureau.

On November 15, 1946, as the result of an internal audit, a memorandum was prepared and submitted to the collector—now deceased—and his assistant, Mr. Ainsworth, calling their attention to the fact that while this taxpayer had produced his receipts it was found that his account had not been credited. The memorandum also outlined cases involving two other taxpayers who likewise had been billed for accounts upon which they had receipts and upon which no credit had been given.

This memorandum of November 15, 1946, clearly put both the collector—now deceased—and his assistant (Mr. Ainsworth) on notice that their cashier had been mishandling funds and that his accounts could not be reconciled.

Subsequent developments showed that in each of the three cases referred to in the memorandum the reason the taxpayers' accounts had not been credited was that their payments had been embezzled.

The memorandum outlining this embezzlement was submitted to the collector and his assistant on November 15, 1946; however, it was not until May 28, 1947, that they notified the proper authorities that there was a shortage in their office accounts.

During this 6-month interval the cashier was allowed to continue his regular duties, and as it later was disclosed, during this interval he continued his embezzlements without being disturbed by his superiors.

When the case was officially reported on May 28, 1947, even then both the collector and Mr. Ainsworth tried to persuade the examining agent to work out a formula whereby the embezzler would be permitted to retain his job and make restitution of the funds stolen.

Mr. J. E. McNamee, the Supervisor of Accounts and Collections in Charge, to whom the case was reported and who investigated the charges, wrote a strong reprimand of the manner in which these two officials had handled this case.

I now read Mr. McNamee's letter:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
ACCOUNTS AND COLLECTIONS,
Philadelphia, Pa., November 13, 1947.

Mr. PAUL A. HANKINS,
Deputy Commissioner, Accounts and Collections Unit, Internal Revenue Bureau, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HANKINS: Transmitted herewith is report of the examination of the Office of Collector of Internal Revenue, Wilmington, Del., for the period July 2, 1940, to June 3, 1947, inclusive.

In this connection, it is well to note that during the period November 1946, when the collector was first notified by the assistant cashier of an apparent discrepancy in the accounts, the cashier, Mr. Flynn, was left in complete control of his duties by the collector and no satisfactory explanation has been forthcoming from the Collector as to why this situation was allowed to exist.

The efforts of the collector and assistant collector to hide or hush up this affair has been, to my way of thinking, presumptuous, to say the least. The fact that the assistant collector spent several months as a supervisor of accounts and collections prior to his present appointment should have instilled in him a certain esprit de corps which, I am sorry to say, is entirely lacking. He failed to acquaint the supervisors, or the Bureau, with his knowledge of this irregularity for 6 months after he found it out, during which period the cashier carried on his defalcations. As indicated by the report a total of $2,939.26 was embezzled during the period November 1946 to May 28, 1947.

This amount, in my opinion, should be charged to the collector and his assistant to be paid out of their personal funds.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. McNAMEE,
Supervisor of Accounts and Collections in Charge.

Mr. President, I read that letter dated November 13, 1947, signed by Mr. McNamee, the examining agent, and addressed to Mr. Paul A. Hankins, Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Washington, D. C., which accompanied the agent's report and in which charges are made against both the deceased collector and his assistant, Mr. Ainsworth.

It is worth noting that the examining agent in this instance was so critical of Mr. Ainsworth's and the collector's neglect in handling this case that he even went so far as to recommend that the collector and Mr. Ainsworth should be held personally liable for payment of the funds embezzled during the 6-month interval in which the evidence was surpressed.

This letter containing these charges against Mr. Ainsworth and his superior was forwarded to the Bureau of Internal Revenue in Washington, accompanied by the detailed report of the embezzlement, under date of November 13, 1947.

Within 60 days after these serious charges had been filed against Mr. Ainsworth the record shows that he was recommended for and given an increase in grade from CAF–12 to CAF–13, which promotion carried an increase in salary in the amount of $958 per annum.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD the report dated November 13, 1947, referred to above, in which the embezzlements were outlined.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
ACCOUNTS AND COLLECTIONS,
Philadelphia, Pa., November 13, 1947.

Mr. PAUL A. HANKINS,
Deputy Commissioner, Accounts and Collections Unit, Internal Revenue Bureau, Washington, D. C.

My DEAR Mr. HANKINS: The following is a report of the examination of the office of collector of internal revenue, Wilmington, Del., for the period July 2, 1940, to June 3, 1947, inclusive.

On May 28, 1947, Mr. Norman Collison, collector of internal revenue, Wilmington, Del., called me and asked if I could come to his office that day. I arrived at the Wilmington office about noontime and was informed by the collector and his assistant, Mr. Ainsworth, that there was an apparent shortage in the snuff stamps in the Wilmington office. I immediately made a count of the internal revenue stamps in the vault which revealed a shortage of snuff stamps of $8,572.50, which shortage still exists.

The cashier was called in and admitted this shortage. The collector then stated that the cashier was over about $700 in the cash account and that he (the cashier) was prepared to make good this evident shortage of $7,800 and insisted that this was the total amount of the shortage. He further asked if I would accept this arrangement and forget the incident. I replied that my only reaction was to notify the Bureau immediately and ask for the suspension of the cashier. The collector demurred to this, pointing out that Mr. Flynn was married and had two sons. Upon my insistence that the Bureau be notified, the collector asked if he could accompany me to the Bureau. I acquiesced and, because of previous engagments, the trip was put off to June 3, 1947. Later that day, I found other discrepancies totaling $22,500. The cashier was called to the collector's office and, when informed of these discrepancies, admitted same and said he could make full restitution if given 4 or 5 days. When asked why he did not admit these discrepancies during our first interview, he replied "my bosses did not open their mouth so why should I tell on myself."

Upon our visit to the Bureau on June 3, 1947, Mr. Flynn was suspended immediately. On June 4, 1947, the Supervisors instituted a day-by-day check of the Cashier's records from June 3, 1947, back through January 1940, which revealed a gross shortage of $38,018.25. A duplicate credit in the amount of $7,500 to the 1944 Eastimated Income Tax account of Robert W. Rea under date of December 29, 1944 (which erroneous credit still stands), and various penalty and interest items totaling $84.27 credited to taxpayers on documents filed on time but journalized as delinquent, reduce the gross shortage to a net of $30,433.98.

The authorized destruction of various records, such as cashier's work sheets and cashier's journals, handicapped the supervisors' investigation as it progressed. The destruction of the various order forms for stamps for 1940 and prior years made it impossible to identify purchasers of Documentary and/or Stock Transfer stamps. "Orders for Stamps—Fermented Malt Liquor" were reconstructed from brewery records.

On July 2, 1940, orders for Documentary Stamps and Stock Transfer stamps in the amount of $1,297.90 were journalized covered by misapplied checks. Since this was the entire balance of the shortage yet to be identified (except one check for $8.44 deposited April 17, 1943) and neither the names of the purchasers of the stamps nor whether the original transactions were by cash or check could be ascertained, and since the comparison of remittance registers and document registers back through January 1940, revealed no discrepancies, in which misapplication of funds was apparently involved, it was decided that further efforts to identify the balance of $1,297.90 would be useless.

The defalcations set up a fairly regular pattern as revealed by the schedule of discrepancies in deposits. Documents showing taxes originally paid in cash were journalized under cover of other taxpayers' checks. Sometimes the penciled "cash" was partially erased. On bills such as Forms 17 or 19, an entirely new form was often prepared in pencil with no blue pencil notation and no "received" stamp. A general laxness in the use of the "received" stamp in the office, particularly on orders for stamps, contributed to the situation. The documents from which checks had been taken were subsequently put through with still other taxpayers' checks. However, several times taxpayers' checks were used as described above and the document journalized later as a cash transaction. Cash was also used many times to cover the difference between misapplied checks and documents being journalized. On seventeen occasions, Mr. Flynn used his personal checks for this purpose. These personal checks ranged in amounts from 32 cents to $153.16. These were verified by the records of the Farmers Bank and Trust Co., Wilmington, Del.

A study of "received" dates, when available, on "cash" documents, journalized under cover of checks indicated that "unidentified cash deposited in the operations described in the preceding paragraph came from such documents and not from the cashier's personal funds.

Prior to 1946, the only document not journalized for which the check was deposited was a miscellaneous tax return, Form 727, in the amount of $8.91 filed by Walter Holliger. A check for $17.08 was forwarded by mail with form 727 for May and June 1944. That check was deposited August 11, 1944, but only the Form 727 for June in the amount of $8.17 was abstracted. This discrepancy, as well as several small excess collections which were not credited to taxpayers, apparently resulted from adding "kited" documents and checks to the document registers and remittance registers respectively without having first balanced the registers.

In six different cases documents were altered to bring the document register into balance with remittance registers, to bring the stamp control into balance with the stamp inventory, or to bring the kited documents into exact agreement with the kited checks. With one exception these were minor alterations. On June 26, 1942, however, the cash order of the Diamond State Brewery Co. for fermented-malt liquor stamps in the amount of $780 was not journalized and a fictitious order for fermented-malt liquor stamps in the amount of $180 was journalized in its stead. In addition, a fictitious order in the name of Delmarva Brewing Co. for fermented-malt liquor stamps in the amount of $120 was journalized the same day. The two orders were in the same handwriting and neither the taxpayers' records nor bank statements reveal any such payments. The fictitious order of the Diamond State Brewery Co. differs from the taxpayer's copy and records only in that an order for 4 25-barrel stamps at $150 each had been removed. The fictitious order in the name of the Delmarva Brewing Co. is for 4 5-barrel stamps at $30 each. Apparently an inventory of fermented malt liquor stamps revealed an overage of 4 25-barrel stamps and a shortage of 4 5-barrel stamps and this device was utilized to bring the accounts into balance. It also apparently was used to embezzle $480. The Diamond State Brewery Co. was not aware that 5 barrel stamps had been delivered instead of 25 barrel stamps. The records of the Diamond State Brewery Co. indicated that a stamp order in the amount of $780 paid by cash, on that date, while the Delmarva Brewing Co. had no record of $120 on that date. Inasmuch as all orders of the Delmarva Brewing Co. were paid by check and this order for $120 was covered by cash, it is clearly evident that this order was fictitious.

In addition to checks for $8,572.50, $5,000, $500, and $8.91 mentioned heretofore, the related documents for which were never journalized, checks in the amounts of $15,000 and $7,500 were submitted by John J. Williams to cover 1946 estimated income taxes of himself and his wife respectively. These checks were deposited June 4, 1946, to cover the 1946 estimated income tax of Anthony P. Columbo and Rose M. in the amount of $2,500 and F. A. Wardenberg in the amount of $20,000. The documents with which Mr. Williams' checks were related have been journalized.

On May 13, 1947, a check in the amount of $605.20 drawn by the Wilmington Country Club in payment of tax on admissions for April 1947, was deposited to cover orders on documentary stamps that are marked "cash." A duplicate return was filed by the taxpayer at the request of the Collector's Office and was assessed on the October 1947 Spl. No. 1 list, account No. 53160, and is outstanding.

Six cash payments, the documents for which were never journalized, have been definitely established. More may come to light eventually. Howard A. Gifford holds a cash receipt, Form 1, dated April 9, 1946, in the amount of $185.20 covering the balance of his 1945 income tax. There is no record of this payment in the collector's office. Four taxpayers have submitted affidavits of filing forms 11 with cash payments for various special tax stamps in total value of

$159.50. The exact amount of the items claimed appear on the teller's cash sheet of the assistant cashier as payments for stamps and are included in the daily recapitulation of cash tallied as on hand at the close of business May 27, 1947, by the cashier. A comparison of the teller's stamp sheets with forms 11 and other stamp records, leaves these items unreconciled.

It had not been the custom of the cashier's office to give a receipt for cash payments for stamps which could not be issued immediately. Now, a form 1 receipt marked: "in lieu of stamp to be issued" is given to taxpayers in all such cases.

In the schedule of discrepancies, under the heading "Net Cash," there appear 91 items which represent payments by the cashier from his cash reserves. Seventeen of these items marked "*" are his personal checks; the balance are cash payments. These payments total $10,329.47. It was necessary for the cashier to deposit these amounts to balance the various days' work. It is entirely possible that part of these payments represent cash payments by taxpayers whose returns were destroyed and owing to the volume of unfinished work of checking the unmatched documents received from the processing division and the migration of many war workers, it will be impossible to complete this part of the investigation. It is also possible that additional discrepancies will be uncovered when the revenue agents check the 1945 and 1946 income tax returns (Bureau) and make comparison with the credit documents attached to the return with the amount of credit taken by the taxpayer on his return.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. McNAMEE,
Supervisor of Accounts and Collections in Charge.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, 2 years later another embezzlement was discovered in the same office, and as before, Mr. Ainsworth and his superior followed this same procedure of coverup.

The details of the second embezzlement, which took place in the period around 1950 was not exposed to the public until November 21, 1955, at which time the employee involved was removed.

The following is a chronological record of the second embezzlement:

On October 3, 1950, the collector for the district of South Carolina advised the then collector for the district of Delaware, now deceased, of certain alleged irregularities on the part of an agent in the Delaware office. The allegation was that Agent G. E. Donoho had not given the proper receipts in the collection of admission taxes on performances given by the Rogers Rodeo when in Wilmington, Del., on August 26, 27, and 28, 1950, and that presumably he had not turned in the funds. Photostats of three forms No. 729 were enclosed with this letter indicating his having given receipts for taxes paid as follows:

August 1926: Tax due $423.15, marked "Paid August 27, 1950, G. E. Donoho, D. C."

August 1927: Tax due $267.42, marked "Paid August 27, 1950, G. E. Donoho, D. C."

August 1928, Tax due $104.35, marked "Paid August 28, 1950, G. E. Donoho, D. C."

Upon examination it was found that of this amount only the latter item, namely, $104.35, representing tax for August 28, had been recorded on the books of the office, the other 2 items not having been turned in. When confronted with this charge at that time, Mr. Donoho explained he had placed the money for safekeeping in a shoe at home in a closet, and upon subsequent investigation the money was found as indicated.

The fact that the agent still had this money, which belonged to the United States Government and which he had collected from the taxpayer, hidden at home in a shoe 6 weeks after it had been collected, apparently did not disturb his superiors, one of whom was Mr. Ainsworth, in the least.

Both Mr. Ainsworth and his superior at that time were fully aware of this situation and that not only a shortage existed in their office but also the taxpayer had never been given any credit on the books of the Government as having paid his taxes.

This was a clear case of mishandling of Government funds, yet it was covered up, the case was not reported to the appropriate authorities as was required under the law, nor was any disciplinary action taken against the employee involved.

The embezzler was allowed to remain on his job for 5 years after this was discovered, and he was only removed last November following my reporting of the case to the Washington office.

During this interval Mr. Ainsworth not only protected this second embezzler from exposure but also recommended him for routine promotions.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a letter dated January 11, 1956, signed by Mr. O. Gordon Delk, the Deputy Commissioner in which the allegations concerning this second embezzlement are confirmed.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER
OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, January 11, 1956.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In your letter of August 23, 1955, acknowledged by us on September 1, 1955, with assurance that a full investigation would be made, you furnished the following information:

"It is my understanding that on October 3, 1950, the collector for the district of South Carolina advised the then collector for the district of Delaware, Mr. Norman Collison, of certain alleged irregularities on the part of an agent in the Delaware office, Mr. G. E. Donoho, in the collection of admission taxes on performances given by the Rogers Rodeo in Wilmington, Del., on August 26, 27, and 28, 1950. Allegedly photostats of three forms (No. 729) were enclosed with this letter indicating his having given receipts for taxes paid as follows:

"August 26: Tax due $423.15, marked 'Paid, August 27, 1950, G. E. Donoho, D. C.'

"August 27: Tax due $267.42, marked 'Paid, August 27, 1950, G. E. Donoho, D. C.'

"August 28: Tax due $104.35, marked 'Paid, August 28, 1950, G. E. Donoho, D. C.'

"Allegedly of this amount only the latter item; namely, $104.35 representing tax for August 28, was recorded on the books of the office, the other two items not being turned in. Presumably upon being confronted with this charge Mr. Donoho claimed to have placed the money for safe keeping in a shoe at home in a closet, and upon subsequent investigation the money was found as indicated."

A preliminary investigation disclosed the information furnished by you to be substantially correct. Consequently, a thorough investigation of Donoho's activities in connection with the collection of admission taxes was made. It has been established that during the year 1950 Donoho collected in cash other amounts of admission taxes, giving receipted tax returns as receipts, and those payments are not of record in the director's office in Wilmington. Donoho was separated from the Internal Revenue Service effective November 21, 1955, on charges of embezzlement and failure to give official receipts for cash tax collections. Further, current consideration is being given to Donoho's collection activities for subsequent years.

The letter also furnished the following allegations:

"Allegedly the top officials in both the Wilmington and Philadelphia areas were advised of this discrepancy. Some of the officials who handled the case were later promoted. The allegation is that instead of taking action on this case it was pigeonholed and the man promoted. In fact, it is alleged that the same officials who pigeonholed the case at that time were the same ones who recommended Mr. Donoho very recently for a major promotion, which promotion was only stopped when I joined the present collector, Mr. Brown, in suggesting that it be rejected.

"It is my understanding that Mr. Brown, the present collector, was not in a position to be aware of this allegation, and therefore the questions raised are in no way a reflection on him, but I would appreciate receiving a complete report as to the results of the investigation in 1950 along with a report as to whether or not the same group has been trying to engineer promotions in this connection."

The investigation has established that initially 2 supervisory officials, neither 1 of which was Mr. Brown, the present Director, were advised of Donoho's irregular handling of admission tax payments. Although action was taken by them to obtain those payments from Donoho, no action was taken at that time to initiate an investigation of Donoho's other collection activities in order to establish whether his failure to promptly submit those payments was an isolated and unintentional oversight or one of a series of defalcations.

Subsequently, other supervisory officials gained knowledge of the matter and were aware of the fact that an appropriate investigation of Donoho's collection activities had not been initiated. However, none of them took action to initiate such an investigation.

In 1954, Donoho received a one-grade promotion. Subsequently, he and other employees were given consideration for a position involving another one-grade promotion. It appears that only slight consideration was given to Donoho as a candidate for the latter position, and that such consideration was based on his length of service in collection work. Donoho's irregular handling of the tax payments was considered at that time and was a factor in the decision reached that Donoho was not suited for the position. However, prior to the date of your letter, no action was taken by any of the officials aware of the irregularities to initiate an investigation of Donoho's collection activities.

The investigative reports concerning those supervisory officials who had knowledge of this matter are now receiving administrative consideration to determine the extent of their responsibility in this situation. In addition, the facts and circumstances have been discussed with a representative of the United States attorney at Wilmington, Del., and copies of the reports will be furnished to the Department of Justice for their information and consideration.

You may be sure that every effort has been made by this Service to determine the full facts with respect to the information furnished by you. We sincerely appreciate your having brought this matter to our attention.

Very truly yours,

O. GORDON DELK,
Deputy Commissioner.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it should be noted that according to Mr. Delk's letter, this agent had also embezzled other funds following the case referred to above; however, when it was finally exposed last year the statute of limitations had expired.

The first embezzler was prosecuted and has paid his debt to society. The second embezzler has been removed, and with the statute of limitations having run apparently no further action can be taken in this instance.

One of the officials responsible for this cover-up is since deceased; however, we still have on the payroll of the United States Government in a high supervisory position over the collection of taxes Mr. Thomas Ainsworth, who, based upon the Treasury Department's own records, has during the past 5 years covered up and protected these two embezzlers.

To avoid any misunderstanding it should be emphasized that the attempted cover-up of the defalcations on the part of the two former employees all took place prior to the appointment of the present director in the Wilmington office, Mr. Leland Brown. The criticism here today is of the former officials and is in no way a reflection on the present administration of that office. I have checked this statement clearing the present director with the Treasury Department, and they concur therein.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the distingushed Senator why he did not propose a general investigation of the entire matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would remind the Seantor that I did propose such an investigation, first, in 1952. I proposed it again in 1953, but it was rejected by the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Did the Senator take it up with the committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and I also brought the situation to the floor of the Senate, and the only reason why an investigation was not had was that there were not enough votes in favor of it.

PRACTICE OF SAUDI ARABIAN GOVERNMENT IN REQUIRING UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT TO REFRAIN FROM SENDING JEWISH SOLDIERS TO AMERICAN BASES IN SAUDI ARABIA

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have had several occasions in recent months to speak out—on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere—about the practice of the Saudi Arabian Government in requiring our Government to refrain from sending American soldiers who happen to be of the Jewish faith to American bases in Saudi Arabia. I have also spoken against the practice of the Saudi Arabian Government in forbidding Saudi Arabian businessmen from dealing with American firms which are owned in part by Americans of Jewish faith. I think this attitude on the part of the Saudi Arabian Government is intolerable. Even more intolerable is the acquiescence by the United States Government to these practices. I bridle especially at our Government's acknowledged practice of forbidding American GI's, American citizens in American uniform, who happen to be of the Jewish faith, from being assigned to duty on American bases which happen to be within Saudi Arabian territory.

Mr. President, in remarks which I have made on this subject in the past I have referred to the fact that in the first decade of this century the United States Government, in the administration of William Howard Taft, broke off commercial relations with Russia because of the insistence of the Russian Government upon discrimination against Americans of Jewish faith, by refusing to honor American passports issued to Americans of Jewish faith.

This practice by the Russian Government aroused great indignation in the United States, just as the analogous and even worse practice on the part of the Saudi Arabian Government is arousing resentment today. Apparently, however, not very much resentment is aroused at the State Department, for the State Department is doing nothing about the situation.

Lately I have come across a statement made by the late great Woodrow Wilson, a speech entitled "The Rights of the Jews," delivered by him at Carnegie Hall in New York on December 6, 1911.

In this speech, the then Governor Wilson addressed himself to precisely the subject of the discrimination which the Russian Government was practicing against Americans of Jewish faith. What Woodrow Wilson said in 1911 is brilliantly pertinent today. Let me quote just a few sentences of what he said in that speech:

> Russia cannot respect us when she sees us * * * preferring our interests to our rights.

And President Wilson concluded his speech on that occasion by saying:

> An intolerable situation will be remedied just as soon as Russia is convinced that for us it is indeed intolerable.

This is a memorable speech which should be read in the light of today's events. It states moral principles which should be restated again and again, and which certainly should be borne in mind by our State Department today. Unfortunately, it is not.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this speech by Woodrow Wilson, which is excerpted from his public papers, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address by Woodrow Wilson was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson, vol. I, College and State Educational, Literary, and Political Papers (1875–1913) by Woodrow Wilson, edited by Ray Stannard Baker and William E. Dodd, Harper & Bros., publishers]

THE RIGHTS OF THE JEWS

(Address at Carnegie Hall, New York, December 6, 1911. From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 62d Cong., 2d sess., vol. XLVIII, Appendix, pp. 497–498)

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the object of this meeting is not agitation, it is the statement of a plain case in such terms as may serve to arrest the attention of the Nation with regard to a matter which is of no mere local importance, which does not merely affect the rights and essential privileges of our Jewish fellow citizens as freemen and Americans, but which touches the dignity of our Government and the maintenance of those rights of manhood which the Government was set up to vindicate.

The facts are these: For some 80 years a treaty has existed between this country and Russia in which it is explicitly covenanted and agreed that the inhabitants of the two nations shall have the liberty of entering any part of the territory of either that is open to foreign commerce; that they shall be at liberty to sojourn and reside in all parts whatsoever of the territory thus opened to commerce; in order to attend to their affairs; and that they shall enjoy the same security and protection as inhabitants of the country in which they are sojourning, on condition, of course, that they submit to the laws and ordinances there prevailing, and particularly to the regulations there in force concerning commerce. For some 40 years the obligations of this treaty have been disregarded by Russia in respect to our Jewish fellow citizens. Our Government has protested, but has never gone beyond protest. After 40 years of more correspondence the Russian Government naturally does not expect the matter to be carried beyond protest to action, and so continues to act as it pleases in this matter, in the confidence that our Government does not seriously mean to include our Jewish fellow citizens among those upon whose rights it will insist.

It is not necessary to conjecture the reasons. The treaty thus disregarded by Russia is a treaty of commerce and navigation. Its main object is trade, the sort of economic intercourse between the two nations that will promote the material interests of both. Important commercial and industrial relations have been established under it. Large American undertakings, we are informed, would be put in serious peril were those relations broken off. We must concede something, even at the expense of a certain number of our fellow citizens, in order not to risk a loss greater than the object which it would seem to justify.

I for one do not fear any loss. The economic relations of two great nations are not based upon sentiment; they are based upon interest. It is safe to say that in this instance they are not based upon mutual respect, for Russia cannot respect us when she sees us for 40 years together preferring our interests to our rights. Whatever our feeling may be with regard to Russia, whatever our respect for her statesmen or our sympathy with the great future in store for her people, she would certainly be justified in acting upon the expectation that we would follow our calculations of expediency rather than our convictions of right and justice. Only once or twice, it would seem, has she ever thought our Government in earnest.

Should she ever deem it in earnest, respect would take the place of covert indifference and the treaty would be lived up to. If it was ever advantageous to her, it is doubly and trebly advantageous now, and her advantage would be her guide, as has been ours, in the maintenance of a treaty of trade and navigation.

If the Russian Government has felt through all these years that it could ignore the protest of American ministers and Secretaries of State, it has been because the American Government spoke for special interests or from some special point of view and not for the American people. It is the fact that the attention of the American people has now been drawn to this matter that is altering the whole aspect of it.

We are a practical people. Like the rest of the world we establish our trade relations upon grounds of interest, not sentiment. The feeling of the American people toward the people of Russia has always been one of deep sympathy, and I believe of ready comprehension, and we have dealt with their Government in frankness and honor, wherever it appears that the interests of both nations could be served. We have not held off from cordial intercourse or withheld our respect because her political policy was so sharply contrasted with ours. Our desire is to be her friend and to make our relations with her closer and closer.

But there lies a principle back of our life. America is not a mere body of traders; it is a body of freedom. Our greatness is built upon our freedom—is moral, not material. We have a great ardor for gain; but we have a deep passion for the rights of man. Principles lie back of our action. America would be inconceivable without them. These principles are not incompatible with great material prosperity. On the contrary, unless we are deeply mistaken, they are indispensable to it. We are not willing to have prosperity, however, if our fellow-citizens must suffer contempt for it, or lose the rights that belong to every American in order that we may enjoy it. The price is too great.

Here is a great body of our Jewish fellow citizens, from whom have sprung men of genius in every walk of our varied life, men who have become part of the very stuff of America, who have conceived its ideals with singular clearness and led its enterprise with spirit and sagacity. They are playing a particularly conspicuous part in building up the very prosperity of which our Government has so great a stake in its dealings with the Russian Government with regard to the rights of men. They are not Jews in America; they are American citizens. In this great matter with which we deal tonight, we speak for them as for representatives and champions of principles which underlie the very structure of our Government. They have suddenly become representatives of us all. By our action for them shall be tested our sincerity, our genuineness, the reality of principle among us.

I am glad this question has been thus brought into the open. There is here a greater stake than any other upon which we could set our hearts. Here is the final test of our ability to square our politics with our principles. We may now enjoy the exhilaration of matching our professions with handsome performance. We are not here to express our sympathy with our Jewish fellow citizens, but to make evident our sense of identity with them. This is not their cause; it is America's. It is the cause of all who love justice and do right.

The means by which the wrongs we complain of may be set right are plain. There is no hostility in what we do toward the Russian Government. No man who takes counsel of principle will have in his thought anything but purposes of peace. There need be for us in this great matter no touch of anger. But the conquests of peace are based upon mutual respect. The plain fact of the matter is that for some 40 years we have observed the obligations of our treaty with Russia and she has not. That can go on no longer. So soon as Russia fully understands that it can go on no longer, that we must, with whatever regret, break off the intercourse between our people and our merchants, unless the agreements upon which it is based can be observed in letter and in spirit, the air will clear. There is every reason why our intercourse should be maintained and extended, but it cannot be upon such terms as at present. If the explicit provisions of our present agreement cannot be maintained, we must reconsider the matter in the light of the altered circumstances and see upon what terms, if any, of mutual honor our intercourse may be reestablished. We have advantages to offer her merchants, her mine owners, her manufacturers, which her Government will not despise. We are not suppliants. We come with gifts in our hands. Her statesmen see as clearly as ours. An intolerable situation will be remedied just as soon as Russia is convinced that for us it is, indeed, intolerable.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from New York for bringing this matter so forcefully to the attention of the Senate. The Senator from New York has done many, many fine things in the years during which he has been a Member of this body, but I know nothing which, in my opinion, is finer or greater than his calling to the attention of the Senate the discrimination against the Jewish people.

I might add, Mr. President, that it is a source of great pleasure to me to have the Senator from New York so forcefully, brilliantly and completely bring this subject to the attention of the Senate. I sincerely hope the Senate will take action, through the proper committee, to see that the situation is remedied.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that this is nothing new. I have heard of the discriminations for some time. I brought them to the attention of the State Department in several communications. I wrote to them, and I have their acknowledgments; but nothing has happened. I have received in reply to my communications polite notes, expressing interest in general terms, but also making it perfectly clear that the State Department was not going to do anything at all.

Also, I brought the matter to the attention of the Senate within the last 2 or 3 weeks. Again, nothing has happened. So I was very glad indeed to recall it to the attention of both the Senate and the State Department here today, in the hope that something would be done to restore the dignity and the rights of this country and its citizens. I think the speech delivered by Woodrow Wilson in 1911 is a great document. It is just as important today as it was 45 years ago. I sincerely hope that every Member of Congress, and also many of the American public, will read, ponder, and study that speech.

I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. If the distinguished Senator from New York will introduce a resolution, I shall be glad to co-sponsor it; and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I shall be glad to bring to the attention of the committee the correspondence which the Senator from New York has had with the State Department. In other words, I shall do anything which the Senator from New York may suggest, in order to get the action which undoubtedly is needed to make certain that this condition is remedied.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from North Dakota, and I shall certainly be very glad to consult with him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I join with both the Senator from New York and the Senator from North Dakota in advocating this policy?

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

RECESS UNTIL 10:30 A. M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10:30 a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 27, 1956, at 10:30 'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 26, 1956:

UNITED NATIONS

Stanley C. Allyn, of Ohio, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 11th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 26, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father George P. Gallos, Greek Orthodox Church of the Annunciation, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

God of our Father, to Thee, author of liberty, to Thee we pray. On this occasion of the 135th anniversary of Greek independence, we ask Thee, Lord, to bless the Greek people. Keep alive in them the love of liiberty for which they bravely fought and sacrificed. Grant that the Greek Nation ever may be on the side of justice, democracy, and freedom.

Lord God of Hosts, we pray for America, this land of ours, on which Thou hast bestowed so many rich blessings.

Make us worthy of our inheritance. Let not Thy wrath descend upon us. Save us from new ordeals and tribulations, for wars and rumors of wars are shaking the equilibrium of the earth and heavy clouds are invading the tranquil heavens of peace.

O Ruler of the Universe, preserve in harmony those who govern us. Make them vigilant and keep them from falling into the spirit of sloth, faintheartedness, lust for power, and idle talk. Grant them, rather, strength to do Thy will, wisdom to govern well, and make them worthy laborers of Thy kingdom, a kingdom of love, goodness, justice, mercy, and peace.

Lord of Love, who didst command the disciples to pray for their enemies and who didst pray for those who crucified Thee, grant that we, too, may forgive those who hate us and show brotherly love to those who maltreat us. Enlighten us, through the light of Thy truth, O Lord, and guide us in the paths of Thy precepts. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 22, 1956, was read and approved.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, today the House and Senate conferees begin the job of harmonizing differences between the farm bills, H. R. 12, which passed the House May 5, 1955, and S. 3183, which passed the Senate March 19, 1956. Let us hope that our conferees will bring back to both Houses a farm bill which will be most effective in bringing needed solutions to our pressing farm problems.

It is in connection with the work of these conferees that I bring to the attention of the House at this time the need for writing into the new farm law specific language directing the Secretary of Agriculture to make provision for adjusting previous acreage yields for abnormal weather conditions in computing the basis for production under the proposed soil-bank plan. Under the soil-bank plan, if the proposed rental rate for price-supported commodities removed from production is to be based on average production over the years 1950–55, counties in those States which have been hit by hurricanes, abnormal freezes, drought, and other abnormal weather conditions during the past 4 or 5 years will be put at a serious disadvantage.

For the purpose of the record, I would like to give an example of how abnormal weather conditions have reduced cotton production per acre in one of the counties of my congressional district. This county is Scotland County, N. C., and I cite the following tables to show cotton production per acre in that county for the period 1944–49 as compared with the period 1950–55:

Cotton acreage production, Scotland County, N. C.

Year:	Pounds lint per acre	
1944	536	
1945	413	
1946	347	
1947	307	
1948	378	
Average	396	
Average at 15 cents per pound equals		$59.40
1950	210	
1951	349	
1952	266	
1953	220	
1954	289	
Average	267	
Average at 15 cents per pound equals		40.05
Difference	129	
Difference at 15 cents per pound equals		19.35

I am advised that in S. 3183 there is a provision under section 205 (a) and under section 207 (a) granting the Secretary of Agriculture permission to set the rates of annual compensation for payment under the soil-bank plan and authorizing him to determine the basis on which this compensation will be made for participation in the soil-bank plan. Mr. Speaker, I fervently hope that the conferees will include in the new farm bill a directive to the Secretary of Agriculture stating that in determining the basis of compensation for participating in the soil-bank plan, low acreage yields due to abnormal weather conditions in any given county or area will be taken into full consideration. Unless such a provision is included in the new farm bill, the Secretary of Agriculture could pay scant attention to the real handicap of farmers in these stricken areas. I see no reason to penalize farmers in these stricken areas. We now have an opportunity to assist these people in catching up with their rightful economic position in the farm picture.

In the matter of computing a basis for compensation under the soil-bank plan, I respectfully urge the conferees on the farm bill to take into full consideration the abnormal weather conditions of farmers in stricken areas during the past 5 years.

IMRE DE CHOLNOKY

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1240) for the relief of Imre de Cholnoky.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Imre de Cholnoky shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALICE DUCKETT

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1005) for the relief of Alice Duckett, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 6, strike out all after "act" down to and including "available" in line 11.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JULIAN LIZARDO AND OTHERS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4039) for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Jaime, Dennis, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 3, 4, and 5.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time so that we may ascertain from the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Tomorrow we will call up House Resolution 357, a resolution giving the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce certain powers of investigation into traffic accidents. Following that will be the adjournment resolution to be brought up tomorrow, a resolution adjourning over the Easter recess.

Mr. MARTIN. One of my colleagues from Pennsylvania wants to know when he might expect the rule to be brought up which has been granted for a study of the coal industry.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the gentleman has not asked me. I assume that in matters of that kind Members who are interested in it would at least extend the courtesy to the leader of asking him about it.

Mr. MARTIN. I am sure it is not any intended discourtesy on his part.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, I did not say "discourtesy," because the question of discourtesy would be on my part, and I would not permit anybody to think that I would consider their act as a discourtesy.

Mr. MARTIN. The Committee on Rules has granted a rule, and he was wondering when it would be brought up.

Mr. McCORMACK. All he had to do was to come and speak to me. He did not have to bother my good friend from Massachusetts. I have not heard from him. But, in the light of the situation, I think it will come up after the Easter recess. But all he had to do was to manifest a little interest that he wanted the bill brought up, as I have stated.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, he probably thought that when the Committee on Rules granted a rule that was an indication that it would soon be brought up, and he was anxious to know when.

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend from Massachusetts knows that that does not automatically follow. I might say that some of my Democratic friends from Pennsylvania also have spoken to me about it. I shall program it right after Easter.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very happy to do it. I did not know what the gentleman's own commitments were. Sometimes a Member's commitments are such that he does not want a bill brought up immediately. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] appreciates the situation, as he is the leader when his party is in control; sometimes a Member does not want a bill brought up at a certain particular time.

Mr. MARTIN. This gentleman does want it brought up, and as early as possible.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very happy to bring it up right after Easter.

Mr. MARTIN. May I ask the gentleman whether he intends to ask the House to go over from Tuesday to Thursday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very glad to discuss that with the gentleman from Massachusetts. We can arrange that in a matter of a few seconds.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I should like to ask a question about the farm bill. Will that be before us by the Easter recess or is that something that will have to wait?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a very interesting inquiry. Does the gentleman want me to make a speech on that? There are 38 amendments to the farm bill. Who knows what the farm bill is? Is the gentleman prepared to vote on the bill as it passed the Senate?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am just wondering if conferees will be appointed before the Easter recess or after?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will answer that; they will be.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] may make his inquiry, but those matters will be taken care of.

Mr. MARTIN. The Speaker has already given assurances that the bill will promptly be sent to conference.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will answer the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], who is the leader of the gentleman's party.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The Speaker has already given assurances that conferees will be appointed. I thank the gentleman very much.

COMPETITIVE LEADERSHIP OF UNITED STATES AIRLINES

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the House an outstanding tribute to the initiative and competitive leadership of the airlines of the United States by Sir William Hildred, director general of the International Air Transport Association with headquarters in Montreal. IATA, as it is called for short, is the trade organization of all of the world's certificated lines, with membership open to any airline certificated by its own country. Sir William was a witness before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on March 15. In the course of explaining the functions of his organization, Sir William pointed out that there had been a steady decline in international air fares in the 10 years since the close of World War II. At page 748 of the transcript he said:

> And I ascribe the decline shown of fares which I put to you largely to the initiative of the American carriers who occasionally had to be extremely persuasive with some of their European colleagues who were less equipped and less venturesome.

And again, in discussing the excellent low-fare services offered by the United States domestic airlines, Sir William declared:

> I am not surprised, sir, that you get this service. It is a magical development in the States. There is nothing like it anywhere (transcript, p. 762).

And finally, Sir William, in discussing the leadership of the United States airlines in the world, added:

> They lead because they have got first-class men and they are progressive, but they do not try to dominate (transcript, p. 762).

Mr. Speaker, those remarks coming from an Englishman of Sir William Hildred's stature are, I submit, the highest sort of praise for our United States scheduled air carriers. In my opinion, we can be justly proud of the leading role which our United States airlines are playing on the stage of world aviation. They ought to have our commendation for keeping fares low in a period when prices and wages are rising. They ought to have our praise for their part in developing the most modern type of transport planes.

We, in Congress, can take some justifiable pride in the sound regulatory pattern which we enacted in 1938 and which has resulted in the intense competition among the airlines which has brought such tremendous benefits to our people.

NO EASTER RECESS UNLESS ACTION IS HAD ON FARM BILL

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to demand that there be no congressional Easter recess unless and until the farm bill has been approved by both Houses of Congress and has been sent to the President.

There is nothing to come before Congress this session that is as important to the economy of the entire Nation as the immediate passage of this legislation. By fast action, the differences between the two Houses could be resolved prior to the Easter recess. If, however, these differences are not resolved, there should be no congressional recess.

Spring planting time is rapidly creeping up on the farmers all the way across the Nation. Time is tremendously important. So far as I am concerned, I, too, would appreciate a 10-day "breather" from our labors here on Capitol Hill, but I want no part of any vacation until the farm bill is passed and signed by the President.

The continued high level of the economy of this Nation rests upon the foundation of a thriving agricultural economy. If the national economy is to remain at its present level, then farm income and the farm economy must be improved.

There are features of the farm bill as passed by the Senate that need correcting, but we will never correct them by taking off for Florida or going to our home States. The only way to work out these differences is by tightening our belts and settling down to hard, solid work.

The economic future of agriculture is far too important a matter to be used as a political football. For the good of the Nation, for the good of agriculture, it must be kept on a nonpolitical, nonsectional basis. The economic future of

agriculture is also far too important to be rated second to a congressional recess.

Mr. Speaker, I demand that the House and Senate withhold any plans for an Easter recess until the farm bill is passed.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marked the 135th anniversary of the beginning of the struggle by Greece for independence from Ottoman tyranny. On that day, Greeks all over the world pay tribute to the heroes of the past who fought for freedom and reaffirm their determination to retain their hard-won independence. It is also an opportunity for all of us to honor this great nation which has made such a significant contribution to our civilization as we know it today and which proudly carries on that heritage.

Shelley once said:

> We are all Greeks. Our laws, our literature, our religion, our art, all have their roots in Greece.

He was right. So long as men pay tribute to the altars of learning, culture, and civilization, names like Solon and Lycurgus, Plato and Aristotle, Pindar and Homer, Demosthenes and Aeschylus—Greeks all—will be held high.

The torch of liberty leapt into flame in Athens. From that time on the Hellenic tradition has taught us the blessings of freedom and the dignity only the free can enjoy. It is fitting, therefore, that America and Greece should have welded strong bonds of mutual understanding and friendship.

We may well recall that the success of the American Revolution gave great encouragement to those who sought freedom and independence in other parts of the world. Greek patriots took heart from our example and turned to us for help in the 1820's when their struggle for independence came out into the open. Greeks remember with pride the words of President Madison in his message to Congress in 1822:

> The name of Greece fills the mind and heart with the greatest and noblest sentiments. * * * It was * * * natural for * * * this people * * * to arouse enthusiasm and sympathy everywhere in the United States.

With our encouragement and under the leadership of men like Archbishop Germanos, Alexander Ipsilanti, and Rigas Fereos, Greece finally gained the independence for which she had begun to fight in 1821. She then rebuilt the nation based on the principles of democracy that had first found expression in ancient Greece. As our own Declaration of Independence acknowledges the dependence of this country upon God, so the memorable Greek document voices these inspiring words:

> In the name of the Holy and Indivisible Trinity, the Greek nation, wearied by the dreadful weight of Ottoman oppression, and resolved to break its yoke, though at the price of the greatest sacrifice, proclaims today before God and man, by the organ of its lawful representatives, met in national assembly, its independence.

Mr. Speaker, many sons and daughters of Greece have contributed to the greatness of our Nation. We are proud of these American citizens of Greek ancestry who have transplanted their affections to our shores and who, in adopting the American way of life, have added to it the rich heritage of Hellenic ideals and culture.

The durability of the Greek spirit of independence was never subjected to a more rigid test than during the trying days of World War II. The tenacity with which the Greeks resisted the German invasion was not wiped out with defeat. Rather, through numerous guerrilla bands and other means of resistance, they continued to harass the invaders.

With the end of the occupation, and aided by a helping hand from the United States, Greece began a new life. The rapid progress made by Greece in the last decade is a source of pride and admiration to the people of the civilized world. The place of Greece in the community of free nations is now secure. Greece stands today as 1 nation, 1 language, 1 people, 1 history, 1 greatness.

The principles of the Greek people have inspired mankind through the centuries. They continue to do so today. While paying tribute to the contributions of the Greeks to our present way of life, let us also rejoice that the bonds of friendship between the United States and Greece are strong and enduring. And let us work constantly to keep them so.

At the same time let us remember that there are other countries less fortunate than the United States and Greece. There are still those who are not free. Today, as in the days when the people of Greece were fighting for their freedom, it is clear that to deprive one people of freedom is to threaten the freedom of all people. Greek Independence Day should serve to remind us that the battle for freedom must be carried on unceasingly.

Mr. Speaker, a great heritage imposes stern responsibilities. I am sure that Greeks everywhere do not wish to rest upon the laurels of a rich and full past. They have a solemn and inspiring trust. It is a proud consciousness of a wonderful past and a grave challenge to help build for a greater tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the morning paper tells us that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], the head of the Committee on Agriculture, says that he is not going to ask Mr. Benson to come up here before the Agriculture Committee and talk about the farm bill because he says Mr. Benson might make a speech and get out a little effective propaganda. In view of the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture had his picture taken with Mr. Walter Reuther, published in a 36-page pamphlet—which was circulated at the expense of the CIO, with pictures and all—I am wondering whether the gentleman intends to ask Mr. Reuther, the farmer and farm expert, to come up here instead of the Secretary as he does not have time for the Secretary of Agriculture. Sure ask the head of the CIO–UAW to come up and tell us what the farmer needs—one thing certain, the farmer is not in favor of permitting Reuther to charge him monthly dues for the right to work in his own fields. Some of our Detroit friends may be able to tell us. Of course, I understand the committee chairman can get more explicit political orders out of Reuther than he can out of Benson. But that is no reason why Mr. Benson should not have the right of petition. Must be that there is some fear the Secretary might convince not only some members of the public but some committee members as well.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time, not to irritate anyone with reference to the farm bill, but I do have engraved upon my memory the fact that a sugar bill was passed by this House last year, and by the other body in February, and conferees were not appointed until just a few days ago. Now I understand the conferees have permanently adjourned. It looks as if the men who plant sugar beets and cane for sugar will have to go along without any program.

It is the responsibility of the majority party, that controls the Congress, to appoint conferees. I did have some apprehension about when conferees would be appointed for the agricultural bill, for it is an important piece of legislation. I hope they work long and hard. A good farm bill is a must.

I plan that tomorrow, unless I can get some assurance that the conferees will act, to object to the Easter recess and ask that a rollcall be held upon an Easter recess. The conferees may complete their work and we can get some action on the farm bill. If it is apparent they are not going to be able to get together within the 8 or 10 days that we may be

absent from Washington, I might reconsider, but my present intention would be to ask for a rollcall upon the question of whether we should have a recess. I presume the chairman of the Agriculture Committee can give us some idea as to how soon a conference can be arranged. There should be no delay such as we have experienced in the sugar bill.

LABOR AND THE FARM PROBLEM

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I cannot sit here and listen to the gentleman from Michigan make an attack on Mr. Reuther. It is a fact that Mr. Reuther heads a large labor organization. He has been elected by the membership of that organization. For the information of the gentleman from Michigan, may I say that Mr. Reuther is just as interested in the farm problem, if not more so, than Mr. Benson.

Labor realizes that the greatest customer it has is the farmer. Labor is cooperating to better the condition of the farmers. I think it might be well for Mr. Benson to talk to Mr. Reuther a little bit more. Maybe he will learn a little more about the economics of America and how labor is trying to do all it possibly can to help the farmers of America.

ROLLCALL VOTE ON EASTER RECESS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to propound a question to the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK]. Is there any agreement of any nature which would preclude a rollcall vote tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend knows that it is impossible for any Member to make an agreement that would preclude a rollcall. Members can always get a rollcall if one-fifth of the Members present support such a request.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not my understanding that a rollcall would be precluded today?

Mr. McCORMACK. On what?

Mr. GROSS. On any legislation that came up; for reasons of a religious observance.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa refreshing my mind. It is a religious holiday of those of the Jewish faith. That does not apply to tomorrow. I get the gentleman's point. He is asking if there is any understanding that would apply such as in the case of a religious holiday or a primary or anything of that kind. No; there is nothing like that for tomorrow.

EAT MORE MEAT

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a letter from radio station KMA at Shenandoah, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, radio station KMA of Shenandoah, Iowa, has millions of regular listeners all over the breadbasket of the United States of America. KMA is telling their listeners many times each day about the value of eating meat and eggs, and of drinking milk and I am sure it will have good effect out there. Now the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is sent to many thousands of newspapers, radio and television stations all over America, and they could render no better service to their audiences than to follow KMA's lead, to acquaint their audiences with the benefits of eating and enjoying these most delicious health-giving foods. I shall insert here a sample of KMA's spot announcements with my compliments.

The letter and radio announcements are as follows:

KMA,
Shenandoah, Iowa, March 15, 1956.

Congressman BEN JENSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENSEN: In an effort to do something about declining prices of farm products, radio station KMA has initiated a campaign of its own to promote increased consumption of meats, eggs, poultry, milk, etc.

On February 7 KMA began an announcement campaign at every stationbreak to promote meat eating and milk drinking on the theory that as consumption rises, prices will be improved. And as consumption rises, health also improves.

Between February 7 and March 7 radio KMA aired a total of 819 short promotion announcements, an average of almost 27 per day (see attached sample). This promotion is continuing as a public service to our agriculture industry. For your information, the population within KMA's one-half millivolt primary coverage area is 2,859,300.

You are recognized as a leader in the promotion of farm products. To help us in determining our future plans, we would be very pleased if you would take a minute to make a special effort to let us know how you evaluate our promotion.

Sincerely,
MAY BROADCASTING CO.,
ANTHONY J. KOELKER,
Station Manager.

COPY FOR CHAINBREAK RADIO SPOTS

To insure your good health—eat more meat.

A good health insurance tip—eat more meat.

Keep your children happy with a glass of health-giving milk at each meal.

Enjoy ham and eggs for breakfast, and wear a smile all day.

Meat is nutritious—eat an extra pork chop today.

Start the day right—eat bacon with your breakfast.

For a happy disposition—eat a steak for dinner tonight.

Enjoy a breakfast delight with fresh delicious eggs produced in KMAland.

Roast beef is wonderful—fix your family a luscious roast tonight.

Nothing beats pork chops for those hungry school-going children—try some today.

Milk not only makes the kids healthy—it's good for adults, too.

Try lamb chops and mint sauce for dinner tonight.

Bacon and eggs—ham and eggs—that's just the ticket for these chilly mornings.

Meat is your best value in nutrition—stock up today.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOULDER. Can the gentleman tell me why in view of the surplus wheat and corn, bread is never served in the House restaurants without specially ordering it?

Mr. JENSEN. Well I wish some one could give a better reason than I have heard. I am told that some fellow got in the habit of coming to the restaurant and eating an awful lot of bread free gratis. They tell me he would buy a cup of coffee and a cup of our famous bean soup for 20 cents, and then with it he would eat a loaf or more of bread. I am told that is why we now must pay for the bread we eat here with our meals. That is the only answer I have ever heard to your question. Now, if you had a better answer I will be glad to listen.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OWNED PROPERTY

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to a very important report which has been released by the Committee on Government Operations. This report is an inventory and an appraisal of all properties owned by the United States Government. It is the result of an investigation which was conducted by the committee in pursuant to a resolution introduced by me on January 5, 1955. The committee will now continue its investigation to determine the present reasonable market value of all holdings of the United States Government. I have this day introduced a bill requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to include in the statement of the financial condition of our Government as assets the total investments in personalty and realty. When the Government Operations Committee completes its appraisal of the reasonable market value of the personalty and realty owned by our Government we will have an accurate and clear picture of the financial condition of our Government. My bill also requires the Secretary of the Treasury to appraise the reasonable market value of such property so that he can substitute

this value for the total investment figure in the financial statements issued by the Treasury. Those investments would approximate $208 billion. The present market value of all our holdings may exceed that amount.

I believe that the Government of the United States, just like any corporation or private concern, should include in its financial statements the assets of the Government.

I am also introducing a resolution calling upon the Government Operations Committee to investigate the loss in tax revenue suffered by States and local units because of the tremendous holdings of the Federal Government and to determine a long-range policy of reimbursements. It seems to be that if we want to preserve and protect States and local sovereignty, we must do something to prevent the drying up of their sources of revenue.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District day. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] is recognized.

EXTEND TIME FOR REPORT ON CIVIC AUDITORIUM IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 8957) to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia, and to provide that such Commission shall continue in existence until the construction of such auditorium has been completed, and ask uanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of the first section of the act entitled "An act creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center," approved July 1, 1955 (Public Law 128, 84th Cong.), is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (3) and by striking out paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(4) make a report to the President and to the Congress, together with its recommendations, by May 1, 1956; and

"(5) after the submission of its report and recommendations, continue in existence until the construction of the auditorium has been completed and render such assistance in the establishment thereof as it deems advisable."

SEC. 2. Subsections (a) and (c) (1) of the first section of such act are each amended by striking out "civic auditorium" and inserting in lieu thereof "national civic auditorium."

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of such act approved July 1, 1955, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of such act.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to extend the date within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations to the Congress of the United States.

Under Public Law 128 of the 84th Congress, the Commission was required to make a report and recommendations to the Congress on February 1, 1956. The Commission is not now prepared to file this report, and it is believed that the time for this report should be extended to December 31, 1956, in order that the Commission may have adequate time to prepare adequate recommendations and reports in accordance with Public Law 128 of the 84th Congress.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 6, strike out "May 1, 1956" and insert "December 31, 1956;".

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK to the committee amendment:

Strike out the words "December 31, 1956" and insert in lieu thereof "January 31, 1957"; and

Strike out paragraph 5, page 2, from line 8 to line 11, inclusive.

Mr. McMILLAN. The committee accepts the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of last week the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I am chairman, approved a report on several bills dealing with matters in the Interior Department. On that day I asked unanimous consent to have until midnight to file the report.

The reason for the delay in filing the report was so that we could get a letter from the Secretary of the Interior signed by him agreeing to certain matters in the report.

On Thursday morning I had my staff call the Assistant Solicitor, Mr. Chaney, of the Department of the Interior, pertaining to this letter. We were advised that Mr. Chaney was at the Capitol. We asked where we could contact him at the Capitol. We were advised that he was having a conference with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. On that day Mr. HOFFMAN addressed himself to the report.

Mr. Speaker, earlier that day the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] made certain remarks on the floor concerning a story which appeared in the Washington Post and Times-Herald concerning the report that was signed unanimously by the members of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It is not my intention to engage in any extended debate at this time concerning the matters set forth in this report. Suffice it to say that the report was based upon extremely comprehensive public hearings before the full committee during the months of January and February. Invitations were sent to every possible individual or association both in and out of Government that might have facts bearing on the subject before the committee.

Our principal interest revolved about the merits of several bills which had been introduced that would require the Department of the Interior to come before the Congress and ask for special legislation each time any wildlife refuge or part thereof was to be disposed of.

First, let me say that the story in the Washington Post was not entirely correct in several respects. For example, it is not true, as the story says, that the committee exacted a promise from the Secretary of the Interior to give the committee a 60-day notice in connection with future disposals. The facts are that subsequent to the hearings Secretary McKay met with the ranking members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, both Republicans and Democrats. The hearings had clearly demonstrated the need for some legislative control over the authority to impair the value of wildlife refuges, particularly in the granting of oil and gas leases.

There were three possible alternative methods of exercising that control. The first was that encompassed in the bills under consideration, namely, requiring special legislation each time. The second was to enact legislation requiring committee approval of each disposal, a procedure now in effect with respect to acquisition and disposal of lands by the armed services. The third was an informal arrangement or understanding between the Secretary and the committee whereby opportunity to review and express its approval or disapproval of disposal action would be given the committee by the Secretary.

Secretary McKay himself enthusiastically adopted the latter suggestion and indicated he thought such a procedure might be of benefit to all concerned, including the Department of the Interior. As to the number of leases granted from 1920 to August 1953, as compared to the increased number granted since that time, neither the figures given in the Post story or those given by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] are entirely correct. For a complete discussion of this phase of the matter, I most sincerely recommend a reading of the report itself.

However, very briefly, 11 leases were granted on wildlife refuges between 1920 and August 1953 as against 60 between the period of August 1953 and December of 1955. While these figures relate to wildlife refuge lands, there are other lands administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service which are available for wildlife-conservation purposes. On these lands 281 leases were granted between 1920 and 1953 as against 214 leases granted between 1953 and 1955.

The gentleman from Michigan has alleged that certain actions of the committee have been taken without proper authority.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. I must remind the gentleman that under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 it is not only proper but obligatory upon the committee to carefully scrutinize administrative actions by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. Then again, under House Resolution 118 of the 84th Congress the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee was authorized to conduct investigations into the operation of this agency. Under these authorities can it be argued with any logic whatsoever that it is not proper for the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to request a department to withhold action on a questionable transaction until the committee has had an opportunity to review the matter? Or is the committee to be forever placed in the hopeless position of criticizing after the fact and trying to lock the door after the horse has been stolen?

The gentleman from Michigan also seems to think that the criticism directed at the Secretary of the Interior in the committee report was influenced in some way by political considerations. Let me assure the gentleman and Members of this body that politics had absolutely nothing to do with this report or with the conclusions contained therein. In support of that statement, Mr. Speaker, I refer to the fact that this report was approved by 23 members on both sides of the aisle on my committee without a dissenting vote; in fact, it was unanimously accepted and approved by all those attending the committee on that day.

I have referred to the report as being critical of the Secretary of the Interior. It is critical; there is no denying that. I will say, however, that there are many administrative deficiencies and almost unbelievable situations contained in the hearings which are not referred to in the report. I recommend, therefore, to each and every Member of this House that he read the hearings and judge for himself the sufficiency and justification for the action we have taken.

If the Members of this House will read this report, they will soon learn that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was most charitable to the Secretary of the Interior, the Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as to the entire Department of the Interior, because the report will absolutely show that there was chaos existing in the Fish and Wildlife Service. Administrative matters were being passed from the Secretary of the Department out into the field without the Director knowing anything about it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949 AS AMENDED

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and, of course, I am not going to object, because I think this bill should have been in conference long before today, and I am glad indeed that it is finally going to conference. With spring planting at hand, time has been, and is of the essence. There seems to me to have been unnecessary delay, as well as questionable maneuvering in connection with this all-important legislation.

I should like to ask a question of the gentleman from North Carolina; that is, if he feels there is any possibility of his conference committee bringing back a report this week.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say to the gentleman that we have had our committee in session all morning. As you know, this bill is very broad and comprehensive, very complex and controversial. I have requested the subcommittees, of which we have many, dealing with the various commodities, to meet throughout the afternoon and tonight if need be, and through tomorrow. We are going to conference at 2:30 this afternoon with the representatives of the other body in an effort to compose differences.

I do not want to be optimistic enough to say that there is even a possibility of bringing in a conference report to the House before the recess. But I will say that each member of our committee has agreed to forego everything else, and has cancelled all other engagements and will remain here if necessary through the entire Easter recess in order to have a bill ready when we reconvene after the Easter recess.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have that information. Permit me to make another statement concerning something about which I express some fear. With respect to the conference committee on the part of the House, there is one category in which many of us are interested, namely, the basic commodity of corn. I am wondering if somehow there could be additional and pointed interest manifested in the corn problem when the conferees meet. As I read the Senate bill, and try to interpret some of the amendments to the bill that have been adopted, it seems to me that of all the commodities corn sticks out like a sore thumb, almost without any of the consideration to which it is entitled. Certainly those of us on both sides of the aisle who are not in any way partisan are interested in real consideration being given to what can be done to benefit corn as well as cotton, as well as wheat, as well as peanuts, and other commodities affected by amendments inserted in the other body. I should like to make this very sincere suggestion, following along the lines of the Hickenlooper amendment, that the basic acreage of corn be put up to 56 million acres. If that can be done I think a large part of our difficulties might be alleviated. The so-called Daniels amendment which is on the basis of the feed grain support at 95 percent of the basic price should be summarily rejected.

I appreciate that these matters are troublesome. It seems to me that the approach to the problem in the other body has been too much on the basis of sectionalism and to some extent, perhaps, on the basis of politics. That attitude or approach should not prevail in the conference between House and Senate conferees. I trust that the gentleman from North Carolina as well as the other conferees will give sincere consideration to what can be done to help the corn farmer.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to reply further, if the gentleman will yield further. As I have repeated this many, many times on the floor of this House. I have constantly tried to keep partisan politics out of our deliberations. I know that my beloved friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the former distinguished chairman of this committee, has tried to do the same thing. I can say further that there has been not even the slightest indication that politics will play any part in our deliberations with regard to this important matter. I will say further that I know of the gentleman's great interest in agriculture and of his intense efforts in behalf of the corn producers of America. At my suggestion, the subcommittee on corn, of our committee, will work through the afternoon. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY], and others who are likewise intensely interested in corn will be working through the afternoon, today and tomorrow. I am sure we will do our dead-level best to bring out a program acceptable to the gentleman and his constituents.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement made by the gentleman, especially with regard setting aside political considerations. I am convinced that agriculture, regardless of any political implications or possible consequences, imaginary or real, is entitled to the best consideration that Congress can give it. It is far above the question of whether you or I or anyone else comes back to the Congress. It is an economic question concerning the farmers today, and it should be so treated.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think

it is commendable that we are going to work on the bill quite promptly. The gentleman knows of my interest in sugar legislation and the bill that was passed last year. The Senate conferees were appointed in February. I think just a few days ago the conferees of the House were appointed. I hear from the grapevine that they had 1 or 2 meetings and they agreed to disagree. I am wondering what will happen to that, and if the agricultural bill might come to the same fate.

Mr. COOLEY. I know of the gentleman's great interest in the sugar legislation and of his interest generally in the welfare of agriculture. I think the gentleman has always been very friendly to the farmers of America.

We had a conference scheduled for today on sugar, but because of the great and general interest in it and the apparent urgency for overall farm legislation we did call off the sugar conference which was scheduled for today. We are going into conference on the overall farm bill, H. R. 12, and the very minute that we have an opportunity to confer on sugar we will. I doubt very much if it would be possible before immediately after the recess.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman feel that the conferences on both the agricultural bill and the sugar legislation might be completed by the 1st or 2d of April? Is the gentleman that optimistic?

Mr. COOLEY. I am always optimistic, as the gentleman knows, but I would not say we could complete both these major tasks in that short time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Before the gentleman came into the Chamber there was some question about the program for this week. The resolution for the Easter recess is coming up tomorrow. I said I was going to resist, if possible by a rollcall, any adjournment or recess if there was in the foreseeable future any possibility that we might have an agricultural bill before us before we come back on April 9.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows, I am sure, that the sugar legislation does not expire until December of this year, so it actually is not as urgent as this program because if this program is going to do anything for the farmers of America this year we must act as promptly and as expeditiously as circumstances will permit. As soon as the general legislation is out of the way, I assure the gentleman, we will start promptly with the sugar conference.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. After the Easter recess it is possible we might have a bill before us, early in April?

Mr. COOLEY. I am intensely interested in these two programs, but I do not think I would be successful in resisting the wishes of the leadership of this House.

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman say we cannot have a conference report before the House next week?

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman could see the analysis which has been prepared at my request by the people in the Department of Agriculture he will realize that it looks like a Sears, Roebuck catalog. That bill was actually written on the floor of the other body. It was not written in the normal fashion in the committee room.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that perfectly.

Mr. COOLEY. I am quite sure that even the Congressmen from the corn-growing area have not had an opportunity to give the matter consideration, as they will this afternoon. It is the same in respect to wheat, cotton, and other commodities. I am not saying we will not have a conference report but I promise the gentleman that I will do everything within my power to agree upon a workable bill just as soon as possible.

Mr. GROSS. If you did have a conference report before the House next week, the House would not be in session to consider it. Time is of the essence out our way. I am sure the gentleman knows that.

Mr. COOLEY. I know that the State from which the gentleman comes is intensely interested in corn. I congratulate the gentleman on his great and vital and constant interest in the welfare of the corn producers and other farmers of the country. We are working with all the speed that we can possibly move. Our committee has not delayed this legislation 1 hour.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw by reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and, of course, I shall not object, I desire to answer the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from Iowa who have expressed some apprehension that these matters may be delayed. I would like to say that a bill of this importance and a bill as intricate as this must receive a great deal of consideration in conference. You cannot get together in 2 or 3 days and work out the details of a bill such as the one we have before us. This is a very difficult bill. It has many complex provisions. It is one which the conferees will have to have some idea of how it is going to be interpreted by those who will administer it. We will do well if we take 10 days or 2 weeks on this bill rather than 2 or 3 days in trying to arrive at an agreement.

One more thing, Mr. Speaker, that I want to mention while I have the floor. There was an article in the Washington Post this morning relative to the nonappearance of the Secretary of Agriculture before the Committee on Agriculture tomorrow as had been contemplated. That article was so written that it implied, to the casual reader at least that I had been critical of the Secretary—which is certainly not the case. The distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from North Carolina, yesterday asked me if I would have any objection to withdrawing the invitation to the Secretary to appear tomorrow so that we could proceed more rapidly with the conference. I told him I did not have any objection, but by that I certainly did not mean any criticism of the Secretary or to express any displeasure at having the Secretary appear before the committee. So far as I am concerned, I am always glad to have him appear before the committee. I think we know pretty well what the Secretary's position is, and I am sure it will expedite the consideration of this bill if we can use that day in working in conference instead of having the Secretary before the committee.

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad my friend, the gentleman from Kansas, mentioned that. I want to say to the House, and I am sure the gentleman will agree, that when I read that article this morning I called the matter to the attention of the committee and I discussed it at great length and explained to the committee why I had made the decision that I did make with regard to the Secretary's appearance. He had planned to come tomorrow. The Senators had been insisting that when we go into conference we remain in conference. So I asked the Secretary to send up to us his recommendations in writing and to send along with those recommendations a man of his own choosing and we could then review the Secretary's recommendations; I have indicated my willingness to have the Secretary's representative actually come in and sit with the conference committee. I did see in the paper that the Secretary had indicated that when he came before our committee tomorrow he would be able to carry on a little more missionary work. I think we have reached the time when it is a little late for missionary work on the part of Mr. Benson who has been extending his activities throughout the country. I do not think we need any more missionary work. I think that the intelligent Members—and all of the Members on our committee are intelligent—know what the facts are. I am sure we will all apply ourselves diligently, constantly, and faithfully to the work before us. I did not insist upon the Secretary coming tomorrow for the reason that I thought, and my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas, agreed with me, that we could more profitably spend our time conferring in formal conference with the Members of the other body tomorrow.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I might say that it is never too late to save a soul, if a soul is available—I do not know.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, all of our souls have already been saved.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] sets the proper tone. We must realize that the bill as it passed the Senate is an entirely different bill than the one that passed the House in the last session. There are at least 38 amendments which were adopted in the Senate, far-reaching amendments of tremendous import to our agricultural community and to the whole Nation, because our agricultural community is a very important part not only of our national economy, but also of the political—and I use the word "political" not in a party sense but in a national sense, and as part of the social setup of our country. One of the outstanding commentators, John Harriman, terms the bill as follows:

> It is probably the worst constructed piece of legislation since mankind hatched its laws dressed in skins huddled around a cave fire.

We must also keep in mind that this far-reaching bill that passed the Senate is going to constitute new organic law for the agricultural community of our country, yet we in this body are not going to have an opportunity to offer an amendment to it, a very significant thing. We have got to rely more upon the good judgment of our conferees.

Everyone admits that the Senate bill is in such shape that no one knows what it constitutes. Everyone is dissatisfied with it.

The bill is going to be written in conference. The stability of the House conferees is something on which we have got to rely.

When a conference report has been written and the bill comes back to the House, this far-reaching bill, this body is not going to have an opportunity to debate it and consider it under the regular rules of the House where amendments could be offered; so we have got to keep that in mind.

I think the gentleman from Kansas properly approaches this matter from the angle not only of the best interests of the country: calm consideration, profound consideration, but also from the angle of the best interests of our agricultural community, because this bill is not going to have the effective consideration of the committee of the House and Members of the House; it is really going to emanate from the conference committee; and it imposes upon the House conferees probably one of the greatest responsibilities that any conferees have had to assume.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I do appreciate his observations, realizing that all the gentleman has said is accurate, that the Members of the House will not have an opportunity to vote upon these matters of such tremendous importance. That is the reason I called my committee together this morning—and we have a 37-man committee, including the 3 delegates—so as to give them an opportunity to express their views to us and to act in an advisory capacity.

It will be my purpose as chairman of the committee and chairman of the managers on the part of the House to keep in touch with the members of this great committee in an effort to bring out a bill that we can hope will not be vetoed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman said that the bill as it came back from the Senate was like a Sears-Roebuck catalog.

Mr. COOLEY. It is so large.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There are a lot of good things in the Sears-Roebuck catalog, a lot of bargains. Are there any bargains in this bill?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes and no.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman says "Yes" and "No." Which is it, "Yes" or "No?"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOLEY, POAGE, GATHINGS, HOPE, and AUGUST H. ANDRESEN.

EXTEND TIME FOR REPORT ON CIVIC AUDITORIUM IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. Now the gentleman from Michigan may speak on his amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina had considerable to say about the action of his committee and also about what was said by the Member from Michigan, your servant, last week. So that there may be no misunderstanding, I am not finding any particular fault with his committee. I have plenty to do if I attend to my own committee and to my own committee work.

What I was commenting on last week was the fact that in the Washington Post there was an article dealing with what the committee report showed, and if I am not correct I hope the gentleman will correct me. My understanding was that a report had been brought before this committee. The minority members found some fault with it and it was subsequently rewritten. Am I right?

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman is a very versatile Member of this House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Am I right about that?

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman speaks on all subjects.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Never mind that. I asked the gentleman a question. If he wants to answer it, all right.

Mr. BONNER. Did you ever hear of a report brought before a committee that was not revised to some extent?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, yes; I have heard that. I have known several reports to be adopted as written. I am not critical. All I am asking is if there was a report brought before the committee and if it was subsequently rewritten?

Mr. BONNER. The report was slightly changed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right.

Mr. BONNER. It was not rewritten.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. Let me tell the gentleman something.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman just used 10 minutes on this subject. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes?

The SPEAKER. When the gentleman's time has expired he may offer that unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I withdraw it and I withdraw recognition of anyone else.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; I cannot if I cannot have 5 minutes additional.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Michigan be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman from North Carolina will answer my question I will appreciate it. I do not want to yield so that he can go into another talk until I have spoken.

Mr. BONNER. Does the gentleman want me to answer it?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This is my understanding: A report was written by the staff and was brought before the committee. Some minority members objected to some phases of it, and later it was revised. Is that correct?

Mr. BONNER. The report was revised. Let me go this far.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I only have 8 minutes.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman is a good fellow. Let me tell him this. If he will read the hearings and this report he will see that I tried to be as fair and impartial in this matter as I could.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not questioning your fairness; I am not questioning your accuracy; just your reasoning.

Mr. BONNER. But sometimes gentlemen like the gentleman from Michigan would raise a question of politics, put a political issue in it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Somebody did?

Mr. BONNER. I offered to the minority the staff of the committee to write such report if they cared to write a minority report.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has some national committeemen on that staff? Our own committee had I am advised.

Mr. BONNER. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thought you did.

Mr. BONNER. The Republicans appointed a member of the staff, the Democrats appointed a member of the staff. The balance of the staff is a carryover from the last Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. I thank the gentleman.

What happened is this: My comments were based upon an article in the Washington Post which was written before your report came out, and a comparison of the report will show this, on the first report that came in from the committee staff.

Mr. BONNER. That is not correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right.

Mr. BONNER. That is not correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. I accept the gentleman's statement. But this I know—when the Thursday morning's paper came out carrying Unna's story on the committee report, I called the committee and was advised, by the individual who answered for the committee, that the report was not available, that it had not been adopted.

Now, if I am in error, if I was wrongly advised, if I misunderstood, I stand

corrected, but I will venture this statement—that the report as adopted did not carry the figures given in the newspaper report, which purported to carry the figures in what I am pleased to term the first report which came to the committee, and which the gentleman has now said was later revised.

The gentleman from North Carolina himself says, if I understood him correctly, that the figures carried in the newspaper story on the report were not correct.

Where did the reporter get them, if he did not get them from a document which was submitted to the committee?

The gentleman said himself the newspaper figures were not right, then he said mine were not right. I will tell you how the difference comes about. They took into consideration different tracts of land on which the leases were issued. Some used one group of lands, some used another. Nobody is accusing the chairman of anything though he seems to think a defense of something is required. Does the gentleman remember when he got housing for my boy when he was in the Navy? That was a wonderful thing. I have not forgotten that kind act: I love the gentleman, but every once in a while they go off on a tangent, not the committee but the Washington Post. That is what I have been talking about over the years. That is what I was talking about last Thursday—see the RECORD, page 5379—that and the committee's apparent assumption that it might formulate policy for the Department.

Mr. BONNER. If the gentleman is speaking about the Washington Post, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Post had the figures all wrong, that is all. Some of the witnesses, and I hate to say this because it is a Republican administration, of the Department of the Interior did not know what they were talking about. One group was talking about one thing and another group about something else. The gentleman you referred to was in my office, but he was not there about that report. Do you know what he was there for? I will tell you. Another committee, one of the subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations of which I am a member, on its political witch hunt had taken the Department of the Interior to task. I had the gentleman drop in when he was on the Hill to tell me about something—what was alleged to have occurred in the Department.

May I not have a little information once in a while even if the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will not hear the Secretary of Agriculture? I think I may call on an underling, if you can call him that, for a little information just now and then—just once in a long, long time. And, if they are kind enough to come in when they are up here to see some of the majority Members, I do not see why they should not see me. That is all there was to that.

The gentleman from North Carolina is critical because last Thursday I suggested that none of the congressional committees had any authority to exact from any of the executive departments a promise as to what that department would or would not do in the future. Perhaps my point was not made clear.

Beyond question, the authority to follow the Federal dollar to ascertain whether it is wasted or efficiently spent, whether the Federal laws are adequate to implement congressional intentions, is vested in the committees of the House. There is no dispute about that. The point I was trying to make, the point I thought I made, the point I again call to the attention of the House, is this—that, if congressional committees as a group are to impose upon the executive departments, their agencies and administrators, the duties of first submitting to a congressional committee what the administrator, the agency, or the department intends to do with reference to a particular function, then surely we will be getting the cart before the horse.

Certainly the gentleman does not mean that a congressional committee is either charged with the duty or has the authority to outline a system of administrative acts to be performed by those in the executive departments. The gentleman argued that any other course than the exercise by a congressional committee of the right to insist that the excutive departments and their agencies tell just what they intend to do would be but locking the stable door after the horse was stolen.

That illustration has some semblance of logic, but if an executive department or the administrator of such a department is at the mercy of congressional committees and cannot function until they have advised some committee as to just what action is contemplated and received its approval or disapproval, then surely Congressional committees might just as well attempt to take over the functions of the executive departments.

Certainly the Congress can enact legislation prohibiting the executive departments from doing this, that, or the other, but a congressional committee has no power to legislate, nor has it, in my judgment, any power to insist that any branch of the executive department first consult it before performing an administrative act.

No such authority is carried in the Reorganization Act cited by the gentleman, nor, so far as I know, in any other statute.

Sure, the Washington Post was wrong. It did not state the facts. Now, I am sorry if the gentleman is disgruntled or displeased. Of course, the majority Members approved of the report. They would approve anything that they could, conscientiously, and we may assume that the report, as revised, as the gentleman put it, was acceptable to the minority.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How much time have I now? I only have 4 minutes. Yet, but make it brief please.

Mr. DINGELL. Did the gentleman read over the report or the hearings of the committee?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No. Why should I?

Mr. DINGELL. I think the gentleman should read those things before he proceeds further.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was not talking about the report last Wednesday. The committee spokesman advised me, when I inquired Thursday morning, that the report had not been approved, was not available. I was quoting and talking about the newspaper story. And, I welcome your advice. It is good, and if I talk about the report, which I do not intend to do, I will read it. I have not the slightest doubt but what I would be a great deal better Member of the House if I just listened to some on your side, but my folks back home do not approve of all you say. They say, "Don't listen to those birds. They will lead you astray." I told you I was basing my remarks on the Washington Post article, and the gentleman says he has no great objection to a little criticism of the Post.

Now, as to the charge that there is politics in some committee investigations—far be it from me to make such a charge any more clearly than I have repeatedly, ever since the CHUDOFF committee started out. But, let me read from the Democratic National Committee's letter of March 16, 1956, a letter written to a Member of the other body:

I am fearful that our party and its nominees for President, Vice President, the Senate and the House next fall may be in a very weak position in the area of natural resources—

See, no politics—just the country's welfare—but now we are getting back to the Department of the Interior—

unless some action is taken to bolster our legislative record in this session of Congress.

That is from the Democratic National Committee chairman. Of course, he is not talking politics. Or is it anything but politics?

The Democratic record on Dixon-Yates—

And here is the time for applause from the Democratic side—

and the upper Colorado project is deserving of special commendation to our Democratic leadership and our Senators and Representatives.

That is all right. That applause is welcome. But, listen what you have to do, gentlemen:

But if we are to be in a position to go to the people with a record of conservation of our natural resources that will gain votes in one key State and district after another, it is apparent that a few important measures should be considered in this session.

I strongly believe that the public interest will be served by the earliest possible consideration of the following four matters:

I will read just one. Time will not permit reading the others:

1. Niagara: This is S. 1823 which has been reported out of the Senate Public Works Committee. The passage of this bill is of tremendous importance in the reelection of—

Under the rules I am not permitted to read the name of the Member from the other body—

and in the congressional elections in many districts in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, where there are 40 REA cooperatives

and 144 municipalities located within economical transmission distance of the Niagara project.

Anything political when the chairman of the Democratic National Committee writes to a Member of the other body and to a Member of this body urging that legislation be adopted because unless it is, Members of Congress who are Democrats, may be defeated. Anything political about that? "Get busy over there," says your national committeeman. And, I notice the gentleman at the leader's table with a paper. He is not reading a copy of the letter I have, I know. Mine is on shorter paper, dated March 16.

Yes, there is another bill reported here, Hells Canyon. There are some more matters here that I will read on another occasion, but I am sure your leadership has advised you as to the action you should take.

This one about Hells Canyon and the pending bills is a dilly. The chairman of your national committee, Paul M. Butler, referring to them in his letter of March 16, writes:

> They are now pending before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees in both Houses. Our campaign attack on the administration giveaway at Hells Canyon is meaningless if the Democratic Congress has not moved in the 84th Congress to stop it. This action is vital in the election of Democratic Senators and Representatives in the four Columbia Basin States (Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Idaho) and will be an effective issue in other sections of the country. The attorney general in Oregon is about to prosecute criminally Idaho Power Co., the administration's licensee, because it has commenced construction of 1 of its 3 small dams at Hells Canyon without having obtained an Oregon water permit. This issue is hot in Oregon and will be a vital factor in the reelection of ——— and Representative EDITH GREEN.

The truth of the matter is that ever since last March—not this March, March of a year ago—individuals who have resigned from the Department or who have been discharged have been placed on committee staffs, congressional committees, and then gone out, especially in the Northwest, attacking the Department of the Interior on the administration's power policy, the granting of mining leases, of oil leases, leases on Government lands. A casual look at the record will show that day after day there is a political charge made against some executive department—regardless of the facts and apparently the sole purpose is to defeat some Republican, elect a Democrat, or a candidate using that label at the moment.

And as was stated last week, why should Federal tax dollars be used by congressional committees to make political propaganda?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute for the committee amendment.

The substitute for the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXEMPTING FROM TAXATION CERTAIN PROPERTY OF THE GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 8493) to exempt from taxation certain property of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the real estate described as lots numbered 825 and 837, in square numbered 159 (excluding therefrom that part of lot numbered 825 lying south of a line from the southernmost portion of the main building running west to the wall), situated in the city of Washington, D. C., owned by the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., is hereby exempt from all taxation so long as the same is owned and occupied by the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., and is not used for commercial purposes, subject to the provisions of sections 2, 3, and 5 of the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1091; D. C. Code, secs. 47–801b, 47–801c, and 47–801e).

Mr. McMILLAN. The purpose of this bill is to exempt from taxation certain property of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia, so long as such property is not used for commercial purposes, and is subject to the provisions of sections 2, 3, and 5 of the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia."

The federation was incorporated on March 3, 1901, under an act of Congress entitled "An act granting a charter to the General Federation of Women's Clubs." At the present time the federation owns two buildings in the District of Columbia. One is located at 1734 N Street NW., the other at 1736 N Street NW.

The loss in revenue by exempting 1734 N Street NW., would be $1,110.04; the loss in revenue by exempting 1738 N Street NW. would be $245.72 or a total loss in revenue to the District of Columbia of $1,355.76.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING THAT MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MAY BE REMOVED FOR CAUSE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 9312) to provide that members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia may be removed for cause, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I rise to ask the purpose of the bill. Do I understand that it is to permit the judges to remove members of the Board of Education for cause?

Mr. McMILLAN. The Federal judges here appoint members of the School Board but they do not have authority to discharge members of the Board. This bill will give them that authority.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This bill gives District judges who appoint the Board the right to remove any member of the School Board for cause?

Mr. McMILLAN. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906 (D. C. Code, sec 31–101), is amended by inserting immediately after the second sentence the following new sentence: "The judges of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have power to remove any member of the Board of Education at any time for adequate cause affecting his character and efficiency as a member."

Mr. McMILLAN. The purpose of this legislation is to provide the judges of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia with power to remove any member of the Board of Education at any time for adequate cause affecting his character and efficiency as a member.

Under existing law the judges of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia have the powers of appointment of the members of the Board of Education with all of the responsibilities attached thereto and it is felt that since the responsibility of appointment rests with the members of this court the power of removal should also be vested in the same body.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE DELAYED REPORTING OF BIRTHS WITHIN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 9582) to provide for the delayed reporting of births within the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide for the better registration of births in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. 1010, sec. 6–301, D. C. Code), is amended by inserting "(a)" at the beginning thereof after the word "That," and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The birth of any person born in the District of Columbia whose birth was not reported in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section may be reported by filing with the health officer of the District a certificate signed by any person who has definite knowledge of the facts concerning the birth of such person. Such certificate shall be in such form and provide such data as the Commissioners of the District shall prescribe, and shall be accompanied by an affidavit attesting to the correctness of the data given therein. Reports of birth filed under this subsection shall be evidence of birth to the same extent as are reports of birth filed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1 strike out lines 10 and 11 and on page 2 strike lines 1 through 11 and insert the following:

"(b) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and empowered to adopt rules and regulations governing the filing of reports of births and the issuance of delayed birth registration certificates, in those cases where certificates of birth have not been recorded pursuant to subsection (a) of this section."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to provide for the delayed registration of births.

Births in the District of Columbia are required to be registered by the act approved March 1, 1907—Thirty-fourth Statutes at Large 1010, title 6, chapter 3, District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition. Under this act, a birth must be registered by some person in attendance—a physician or midwife, or in their absence, "any person whosoever who performs any of the offices usually rendered by such." A birth must be registered by such person not later than the Saturday first ensuing after the expiration of 3 secular days immediately following the date of the birth, and although a penalty may be imposed for failure to register a birth within the prescribed time, the late report of a birth may not be used as evidence against the person filing such late report. In point of fact, the Director of Public Health, who administers the act of March 1, 1907, has construed it to permit the filing of a report of a birth years after the date of such birth, providing such report is filed by the person in attendance at such birth.

Existing law does not, however, make provision for a person whose birth has not been reported to establish his parentage and the date and place of his birth by means of baptismal, school, census, physician's, family, insurance, marriage, military, employment, hospital, voting, or other records, or by affidavits of persons having known such person since his birth. As a result, persons who were born in the District more than 47 years ago, prior to the enactment of the act of March 1, 1907, requiring the reporting of births, may not have had their births reported.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, this bill deals with delayed birth certificates?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The District of Columbia has been laboring under a rather antiquated law. I might say to my colleagues, 15 years ago when I was director of health in the State of Nebraska, we adopted a model delayed birth certificate law which permits people who were born many years ago, before birth certificates were registered or a procedure was set up to register them, to get a birth certificate. I hope the District officials when they adopt a method of getting a delayed birth certificate, because of peculiar conditions within the District, will adopt the model law as recommended by the Public Health Service.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that every State in the Union has a similar law. The District of Columbia is the only place where they do not have it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING TITLE IX OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1937

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3693) to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as added to by the act of May 16, 1938, and as amended by the act of July 10, 1952, and as added to and as amended is mended by striking out in the first paragraph thereof the words "for term of 4 years" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "for the term of 10 years"; and is further amended by adding thereto the following new paragraph:

"The judge of the District of Columbia Tax Court may hereafter retire—

"(1) after having served as a judge of such court for a period or periods aggregating 20 years or more, whether continuously or not;

"(2) after having served as a judge of such court for a period or periods aggregating 10 years or more, whether continuously or not, having attained the age of 70 years; or

"(3) after having become permanently disabled from performing his duties, regardless of age or length of service.

Such judge may retire for disability by furnishing to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia a certificate of disability signed by the chief judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. The judge who retires under this section shall receive annually in monthly installments, during the remainder of his life, a sum equal to such proportion of the salary received by such judge at the time of such retirement as a total of his aggregate years of service bears to the period of 30 years, the same to be paid in the same manner as the salary of such judge. In no event shall the sum received by such judge hereunder be in excess of the salary of such judge at the time of such retirement. In computing the years of service under this section, service in the Board of Tax Appeals of the District of Columbia, as heretofore constituted, shall be included whether or not such service be continuous.

"(a) The term 'retire' as used in this section shall mean and include retirement, resignation, or failure of reappointment upon the expiration of the the term of office of incumbent.

"(b) Any judge receiving retirement salary other than for disability under the provisions of this section may be called upon by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to perform such judicial duties as may be requested of him in said court, but in any event no such retired judge shall be required to render such service for more than 90 days in any calendar year after such retirement. In case of illness or disability precluding the rendering of such service such retired judge shall be fully relieved of any such duty during such illness or disability."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to increase the term of the judges of the District of Columbia tax court from 4 years to 10 years.

The bill also sets forth retirement provisions for the judge of the District of Columbia tax court, first, after having served as a judge of such court for a period or periods aggregating 20 years or more, whether continuously or not; second, after having served as a judge of such court for a period or periods aggregating 10 years or more, whether continuously or not, and having attained the age of 70 years; or third, after having become permanently disabled from performing his duties, regardless of age or length of service.

The bill also provides for retirement because of disability of the judge of the District of Columbia tax court, a provision which is not now extended to members of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, the municipal court of appeals of the District of Columbia, nor to the juvenile court judges of the District of Columbia.

The bill also provides that any judge, who is retired for any reasons under this bill, other than disability, may be called upon by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to perform such judicial duties as may be requested of him

in said court. In no event shall such retired judge be required to render services for more than 90 days in any calendar year after retirement.

In case of illness or disability precluding the rendering of such service such retired judge shall be fully relieved of any such duty during such illness or disability.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the history of the District of Columbia and of the city of Washington is enriched by a significant and historical event that took place on yesterday, for the ceremonies of the blessing, dedication, and laying of the cornerstone of the new Providence Hospital took place, a very important event in the present and future life of the Capital City and of its people.

For this new hospital, modern in every respect, under the guidance of the same order of Sisters, the Sisters of Charity—founded by Mother Seton, is a continuation of Providence Hospital which was first established in 1861.

It was in the throes of the War between the States when the good Sisters from Emmitsburg first offered their services to the War Department, and at a time when the hospital facilities of Washington were completely inadequate to serve the wounded and dying soldiers, both Union and Confederate. They served everyone without regard to the color of the uniform, and without regard to race, color or creed.

With the wonderful record and reputation for efficiency, as well as the magnificent work already established in the field of medical, nursing and social work from their experience in Baltimore, the Sisters of Charity came to Washington in 1861.

While the War Department did not see fit to accept their generous and Godlike offer, private physicians urged and encouraged them to establish a civilian hospital in Washington, particularly for the treatment of the poor.

Since there was no institution of this type in Washington at that time, the suggestion was favorably acted upon, and the Sisters took up their residence in the old Carroll Estate on Capitol Hill. The main civilian aim and purpose was quickly forgotten in the urgency of war, and soon wounded Union and Confederate soldiers crowded the limited facilities and tents surrounded the main building.

As the theater of war moved gradually below the Potomac, more civilians were admitted to Providence Hospital, and with the approach of peace, a movement was started in the House of Representatives for an appropriation of funds by the Congress of the United States. This movement was in order that Providence Hospital could more adequately serve the people of Washington, and more quickly achieve its humanitarian purposes.

The first record of congressional support for Providence Hospital was coincidental with the peace at Appomatox, when $19,000 was appropriated for medical and surgical treatment of 95 indigent patients a day, or 54 cents a day per patient.

Providence Hospital was also incorporated by an act of Congress on April 8, 1864, and was administered by Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul of the eastern province of the United States.

One of the most consistent supporters of Providence Hospital in the early days was the Honorable Thaddeus Stevens, of the then House of Representatives. I am humbly proud to have served in much later Congresses, introducing the amendment of the Hospital Center Act, which evolved legislative plans whereby one-half the cost of the hospital construction will be borne by the Federal Government as a service to the people. In addition to Providence Hospital, there are several other hospitals in Washington that can benefit from the present law, and one or two have already benefited.

The new modern Providence Hospital is of vital importance to the people of the District of Columbia and of nearby Maryland and Virginia. For over 90 years, old Providence Hospital played its important part, and now the new modern hospital will serve the people in this district for countless of decades to come.

We will all agree, I am sure, that neither congressional appropriations nor personal philanthropy can match in size or magnificence the contributions of loving care, devoted attention, and personal service so willingly given by the generations of the Sisters of Charity who have so nobly performed God's work in this institution and in this community.

With the record of valiant service throughout the Civil War and the Spanish-American War, Providence Hospital had the unique distinction of being the first large general hospital placed entirely at the service of the United States Government for war purposes during World War I. From the dread days when cholera was a common disease, through the influenza epidemic of 1918, and down to the present age of wonder drugs, Providence Hospital and the Sisters of Charity have served without stint or reservation the Nation and the community.

Its excellence in the medical and surgical fields, its provisions for opportunities to further the advance of medical science, its early establishment of facilities for research, its foundation of a training school for nurses, its pioneer work in the field of medical social services, its opening of a mental clinic and child guidance department, and, most of all, its consistent adherence over the years to its charitable work, all mark Providence Hospital as a safe and secure haven for the afflicted. Unless, however, its institutional walls were filled with the Christ-like spirit which animates the order of nuns which operate it, it would be but another building, and the assuaging of pain for suffering humanity would be deprived of that one quality which makes it a spiritual ministration rather than a physical treatment.

Providence Hospital and the Sisters of Charity begin a new phase of their institutional careers. The aims, basic purposes, and the principal objectives, however, have not changed.

The sick and afflicted have merely the benefit of the finest and most modern of surgical and medical facilities.

The moral and spiritual values which accompany their ministration, however, remain the same. All within the area of its splendid community service expect Providence Hospital, under the sterling administration of the Sisters of Charity, to continue without diminution or surcease the principal and primary purpose for its existence—the Christ-like mission of healing the sick with the compassion that characterized His ministry on earth.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. I want to thank my distinguished majority leader for his remarks. I may say that he appeared before our committee when we were considering legislation several years ago to assist in building this new hospital, and his remarks were influential in securing the passage of that legislation.

The distinguished majority leader deserves much credit for the city of Washington having this fine new hospital.

He gave his valuable time and succeeded in proving to every member of the committee that the District of Columbia needed a new and modern hospital to replace the old Providence Hospital.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, the following are the remarks I made yesterday on the occasion of the dedicatory exercises:

Mr. Chairman, your excellency, most reverend apostolic delegate; your excellency, most reverend archbishop of Washington; your excellencies, most reverend bishops; right reverend, very reverend, and reverend fathers; reverend provincial superior; reverend sisters; my dear Mrs. McCormack; distinguished and invited guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am highly honored from a personal and official angle in being permitted to participate in these significant and historic dedicatory exercises.

What we do here today has its causes in the past and its effects will be in the future. For this very important act today links up decades of years gone by with the action of other years ahead. While we today dedicate new Providence Hospital in the service of God and mankind, this dedication in fact has its origin in the past history of the Sisters of Charity, and of this region and the people it cradled, and in the historical record of their achievements as well as in the faith and principles by which they lived, faith in God and faith in mankind.

We are all aware of the history of the Sisters of Charity and of the magnificent work which they have done.

The good sisters of yesterday, whose memories will always live, served the wounded and the sick without regard to the color of the uniform, or to race, color or creed. Truly indeed, they made the corporal works of mercy a code of daily living and yet they never departed from the high purpose of their spiritual foundation.

Unless Providence Hospital's institutional walls were filled with the Christlike spirit which animates the order of sisters who operate it, it would be but another building.

In connection with this building of God, the Congress of the United States played an important part and I might say that one of the greatest treasures that I shall always possess is the part that I played in introducing and with the support of other Members obtaining the passage of appropriate legislation.

In conclusion, I pay a tribute to the vision, foresight, and wisdom, as well as leadership of His Excellency, Archbishop Patrick A.

O'Boyle. As the spiritual father of the archdiocese of Washington I am confident that Archbishop O'Boyle's sense of gratification today with the existence of the new Providence Hospital is exceeded only by his humble realization that he has aided in the advancement of God's work in his archdiocese.

I am indeed privileged to bring to your excellency, to the Sisters of Charity, and to the host of friends here and elsewhere of Providence Hospital, my official congratulations, and also the personal congratulations of Mrs. McCormack and myself, for the magnificent accomplishment represented by what can be truly termed "God's hospital."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING PICKETING IN THE IMMEDIATE VICINITY OF THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 4922) to prohibit picketing in the immediate vicinity of the White House, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful (1) to parade, stand, or move in processions or assemblages, on any of the sidewalks or streets described in section 2 of this act for the purpose of influencing the actions of any court, officer, or agency of the United States, or (2) to display any flag, banner, or device on any of such sidewalks for such purpose.

SEC. 2. The sidewalks referred to in the first section of this act are the following: (1) The east and west sidewalks of East Executive Avenue and West Executive Avenue, between Pennsylvania Avenue and South Executive Avenue, and (2) any of the sidewalks which border on Pennsylvania Avenue or South Executive Avenue, between East Executive Avenue and West Executive Avenue. The streets referred to in the first section of this act are the sections of Pennsylvania Avenue, East Executive Avenue, West Executive Avenue, and South Executive Avenue, which border on the sidewalks described in clauses (1) and (2) of the preceding sentence.

SEC. 3. Whoever knowingly violates any provision of this act shall be fined not more than $100 or imprisoned not more than 60 days, or both, prosecution for such offenses to be had in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, upon information by the United States attorney or any of his assistants.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to prohibit picketing in the immediate vicinity of the White House.

Under existing law the Embassies, the Capitol Grounds, and the Supreme Court are protected from picketing, and regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior, prohibit parades and public gatherings in certain specified areas within the District of Columbia.

The language used in this legislation is the same as that applicable to the Capitol Grounds, the Supreme Court Building, the Embassies and certain other public buildings in the District of Columbia.

The members of the committee felt that the President of the United States and the people who visit the White House should not be subjected to the indignities which have existed on certain occasions. The White House and its occupants should be afforded the same protection as the Embassies, the Capitol Grounds, the Supreme Court Building and many other public buildings in the District of Columbia.

This legislation has the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the United States attorney.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL BRIDGE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], chairman of the Police, Firemen, Streets, and Traffic Subcommittee.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 8130) to designate the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac river in the vicinity of Jones Point, Va., as the "Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge," and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the naming of this bridge as the "Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge," but I am opposed to the proposed method of financing this bridge out of the United States Treasury. As far as I am concerned, there will be no bridge to name if I have anything to do with it unless it is paid for by the States of Maryland and Virginia. I do suggest that the bridge might be called the Virginia-Maryland Taxpayers' Delight.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. May I say at this point that this bill is endorsed by Mr. Russell H. McCain, the chairman of the Maryland State Roads Commission, and by Mr. J. A. Anderson, commissioner of the Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Highways.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River from a point at or near Jones Point, Va., across a certain portion of the District of Columbia, to a point in Maryland, under the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An Act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 961; Public Law 704, 83d Cong.), shall be known and designated hereafter as the "Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge" in honor of Woodrow Wilson, the 28th President of the United States. Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such bridge is referred to shall be held to refer to such bridge as the "Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JONES POINT BRIDGE, POTOMAC RIVER

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 7228) to amend title II of the act of August 30, 1954, entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes," and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is part of the legislation that enables the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River between the States of Virginia and Maryland at a cost, as I understand, of some $13 million to the taxpayers of the United States. This bill deserves more consideration than it can be given by considering it in the House under the circumstances that prevail this afternoon. Therefore, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects to its being considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the gentleman from Georgia withdraw his request. It appears that there may be some controversy over this bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker.

AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT OF 1953

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 7380) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 to correct certain inequities, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 201 (b) (2) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 4–815 (b) (2)), is amended to read as follows:

"(2) $208, while he is assigned to duty as a regular first driver-operator or tillerman of a fire department hose wagon, pumper, aerial ladder truck, rescue squad, or fire department ambulance."

SEC. 2. Section 201 (b) of such Salary Act of 1953 is amended by (1) striking out "and"

at the end of paragraph (3), (2) striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", and", and (3) by adding at the end of such section 201 (b) the following new paragraph:

"(5) $208, while he is assigned to duty as acting sergeant."

SEC. 3. Section 202 (f) of such Salary Act of 1953 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In computing service in the grade of inspector for the purpose of determining longevity increases, service in excess of 3 years rendered prior to the effective date of this act in the grade of private, when the individual was assigned to duty as a fire inspector or assistant marine engineer shall be considered service in the grade of inspector.".

SEC. 4. Title II of such Salary Act of 1953 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 203. Not less than 15 privates of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who have passed all examinations required for promotion to sergeant, shall at all times be assigned to duty as acting sergeants. Privates shall be selected for such assignment in the order in which they are scheduled for promotion to the grade of sergeant."

SEC. 5. Paragraph (2) of section 404 (a) of such Salary Act of 1953 is amended by inserting immediately before the colon at the end thereof the following: ", and the first and second provisos of section 5 of such act (D. C. Code, sec. 4–802)."

SEC. 6. The amendments made by this act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia which begins after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike the figure "$208" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$224".

On page 2, line 5, strike the figure "$208" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$420".

On page 3, line 1, strike the word "colon" and insert in lieu thereof the word "semicolon".

On page 3, line 4, after the word "section," strike the number "5" and insert in lieu thereof the number "4".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZED STRENGTH OF POLICE FORCE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 9078) to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police Force of the District of Columbia shall be not less than 2,500 officers and members, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, as to what the additional cost of this bill is because some of us have had a great deal of worry about raising enough money to balance the budget of this District.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I am glad to furnish the information to the distinguished gentleman. The cost for the first year of these additional men would be $1,065,000 plus the sum of $91,000 for uniforms and equipment. That would go up during the next 3 years as a result of the annual increase in pay until the fourth year when the additional cost would be $1,267,000.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I assume the gentleman realizes that that would be another problem of raising this additional amount of money if these additional men are put on the force; is that not true?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Of course, the additional amount of money would have to be paid. May I say for the information of the distinguished gentleman the only objection to this bill, and the only witness who appeared in opposition to it, was Commissioner Spencer who stated in his testimony that he recognized the need for the additional men and that his only objection was the money required to finance it. I read in the local press some 10 days or 2 weeks after he appeared before our subcommittee that he had stated to another subcommittee of Congress that he could raise the money to finance this bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Of course, the gentleman knows that last year we passed the overtime pay bill for policemen which made the cost of our police protection a great deal higher. That overtime pay bill will apply, of course, to these additional policemen.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Of course, they would come on the force subject to all the existing laws and regulations.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. So the estimate of cost is based on the straight base salary and not on any additional salary cost as the result of overtime; is that not correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to call to the attention of the gentleman, however, that the Metropolitan Police perform many thousands of hours of overtime work for which they do not receive any overtime pay. At the hearings which we had, that question was gone into. I can give the gentleman the figures as to the amount of overtime, if he would care to have them. They serve many many thousands of hours overtime every year without pay.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Did the overtime pay bill not take care of a very substantial amount of overtime that was worked? I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the transit strike last year they worked thousands of hours overtime for which they did not receive any pay.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I do not want to belabor the point, let me say to my colleague. I am very proud of the police force of the District of Columbia and its executive officer, Chief Murray; but my concern is directed to the additional cost of these extra policemen and the problem that will face us of raising additional funds to meet that cost. I do not doubt but what we need additional policemen; I suppose we could use 3,000 if we could get the money to pay for them. As I say, my chief concern is the problem we have faced over the last several years of raising sufficient revenue to meet these added costs.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. If the gentleman will permit me, I do not think the overtime of these additional members of the police force would add any substantial burden to the expenses of the District.

I told the gentleman I would give him a breakdown of the number of hours worked by the members of the police force last year. They put in a total of 62,897 hours attending court alone. Of that number 35,177 hours were worked by men who were supposed to be off duty—in other words, overtime; but they did not draw a dollar in overtime pay for it. And then, as I have mentioned, they spent many thousands of hours here of overtime work during the transit strike for which they did not draw one penny of pay.

I do not think the addition of these extra men would add any substantial burden because of overtime.

Mr. O'HARA. I thank the gentleman for the information he has given me. The gentleman appreciates that I am not a member of this subcommittee and therefore do not have an opportunity to know all the details with which he is acquainted.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I know the gentleman is not a member of that particular subcommittee. I know also, however that he is a very hard-working and conscientious member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and particularly on the Judiciary Subcommittee; and I know there is no Member who devotes more thought, time, and effort to the welfare of the District than the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. As a member of the subcommittee I want to compliment the chairman and members for going into this matter very thoroughly. I think we were all very much in accord with the testimony of the chief of police. He laid the facts before us. He is responsible for law and order in the Nation's Capital.

I feel that the legislation that is reported out of the gentleman's subcommittee is most sound, and I know the Members will be glad to support it.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point letters and resolutions as follows:

Southwest Citizens' Association, dated February 12, 1956, signed by Katharine Pagan, corresponding secretary.

One from the Coordinating Committee of Anacostia and Vicinity, signed by Charles E. Qualls, general chairman.

One from the Capitol Hill Southeast Citizens Association, signed by Elizabeth Draper, secretary.

One by the Northeast Businessmen's Association, Inc., dated March 14, signed by August R. Terneak, secretary.

One from the Policemen's Association, dated March 1, 1956, and signed by Kenneth P. Folsom, recording secretary.

One from the Northeast Council of Citizens Associations, signed by Thea

Reachmack, recording secretary, dated March 7.

One from the Kalorama Citizens Association, dated March 8, and signed by G. M. Koockogey, president.

One from the Lincoln Park Citizens Association dated February 23, 1956, signed by J. W. Flannagan, president.

One from the Women's City Club, dated February 28, 1956, and signed by Anna Keeton Wiley, chairman.

One from the Progressive Citizens Association of Georgetown, dated March 9, 1956, signed by Elizabeth Draper, secretary.

A letter from Evelyn Hemsley, president, District of Columbia State Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

A letter from Laurette G. Hupman, chairman, public affairs, Business and Professional Women's Club of the District of Columbia.

Also a letter from Mr. Raymond H. Brown, dated March 23, 1956.

A splendid article by Miriam Ottenberg, appearing in the Sunday Star of March 25, 1956, entitled "District of Columbia Women Demand After Dark Protection—Fear Street Thugs, Want More Police."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

SOUTHWEST CITIZENS' ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1956.

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: The Southwest Citizens' Association, at its regular meeting on February 6, 1956, resolved to endorse your bill to do away with the veterans' preference now given to members of the police department where such members have been dropped from the force by action of the Police Trial Board and the District of Columbia Commissioners for reasons of conduct, and the association further resolved to endorse your bill which calls for an increase in the present police force of 225 men to make a total force of 2,500 men. Copies of this resolution were sent to the Board of Commissioners, the Federation of Citizens' Associations, and the chairmen of the District Senate and House Comittees.

Sincerely,

KATHARINE PAGAN,
Corresponding Secretary.

THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE
OF ANACOSTIA AND VICINITY,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1956.

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
House Subcommittee for District of Columbia,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the hearing March 8, I representing this committee, was not able to testify due to length of other testimony concerning the increase of the District Police to 2,500 men. This committee is in favor of the increase.

On December 6, 1955, we wrote Chief Murray asking more police for our area, No. 11 Precinct, particularly from 22d Street SE., on north to Alabama Avenue on east, the Naval Air Station on west, and to St. Elizabeths Hospital ground, south.

The points mentioned were:

1. The lack of foot policemen to patrol area.

2. Business area not fully patrolled.

3. Vandalism of school property (in 1 night 22 windows were smashed and interior wrecked in a new school).

4. School crossings need more protection.

5. This area is large and parked cars with men from nearby Maryland molest girls and women.

We, therefore, recommend that the Metropolitan Police force for the District of Columbia be increased to 2,500 men to fully protect our streets, business, and women and children.

Yours truly,

CHARLES E. QUALLS,
General Chairman, The Coordinating Committee of Anascostia and Vicinity.

CAPITOL HILL SOUTHEAST CITIZENS
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1956.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS of Georgia,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: For the past 3 years, the Capitol Hill Southeast Citizens Association has been trying to have the number of police on the force increased to 2,500 men.

At its regular meeting, held Thursday, March 8, 1956, it once more, unanimously, reiterated its request for the additional police to be added to the force and money appropriated for these additional positions.

Residents on Capitol Hill Southeast are afraid to go out after dark to meetings or for social occasions.

In addition, public housing units numbering 612 are on the plans and will soon be erected; already over 600 units are occupied in Carrollsburg and Ellen Wilson low-cost housing units. With a ghetto of over 1,200 units to be established and occupied within the next 2 years, it is imperative that additional police be provided and assigned to No. 5 precinct.

Every time an event takes place at the Armory, men are assigned from No. 5 to detail in and around the Armory which means that fewer police are on the streets of Old Capitol Hill, Southeast. When occasions like the recent week's event during which the Home Show was open for 5 days or more, police had to be taken from No. 5 day after day and night after night. No adjustment is made.

The Capitol Hill Southeast Citizens Association urges that this letter be placed in the hearings you recently held, and it petitions you to recommend that additional police be assigned to the fifth precinct so that the area may be considered a safer residential one. It is on the most famous hill in the United States and should be adequately policed for protection.

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH DRAPER,
Secretary.

NORTHEAST BUSINESS MEN'S
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1956.

Representative JAMES C. DAVIS,
State of Georgia,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Northeast Business Men's Association desires to thank you for your introduction of a bill to increase the authorized strength of the police force.

This is at present a dire necessity, and your interest in our behalf is surely inspiring.

Our association at its last meeting, by unanimous resolution, strongly endorses your bill and do hope that it is enacted into law.

Again may we thank you for your interest in our present problem.

Respectfully,

AUGUST R. TERNEAK,
Secretary.

POLICEMEN'S ASSOCIATION
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1956.

The Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a regular meeting of the Policemen's Association of the District of Columbia on February 28, 1956, the members present voted unanimous approval of the bill, H. R. 9078, to increase the strength of the Metropolitan Police Department, Washington, D. C., to 2,500 members.

This statement is respectfully forwarded for your information.

Yours truly,

KENNETH P. FOLSOM,
Recording Secretary.

NORTHEAST COUNCIL OF
CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1956.

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS, *Member of Congress,*
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAVIS: At a meeting of the Northeast Council of Citizens Associations last Thursday evening, March 1, it was called to our attention that you had introduced H. R. 9078, a bill authorizing the increasing of the Metropolitan Police Department to 2,500 men.

This is to advise you that the council went on record endorsing this bill, and the secretary was instructed to write you congratulating you upon your interest in the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Sincerely yours,

THEA REACHMACK,
(Mrs. John Reachmack)
Recording Secretary.

KALORAMA CITIZENS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1956.

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
Chairman, Police and Fire Subcommittee, District of Columbia Committee.

DEAR JUDGE DAVIS: I regret that I was unable to attend the hearing this morning on your bill (H. R. 9078) to increase the District Police force to a limit of 2,500 men.

The Kalorama Citizens Association has long been in favor of an increase that would enable Chief Murray to put more men on the street, believing that the war against crime cannot be fought successfully without foot patrolmen, any more than future wars can be fought without infantry.

The Capital City has more police problems than an ordinary city, and we believe they are doing a good job with the men they now have. But many more are needed if our streets are to be made safe after dark.

Many of our members tell us that they do not go out after dark. I asked a friend to join another organization in which I am interested and was given the same answer. I, myself, had a narrow escape a little over a year ago.

How many more Congressmen will have to be yoked within a stone's throw of Union Station before something is done about it?

Respectfully,

G. M. KOOCKOGEY,
President.

LINCOLN PARK CITIZENS'
ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON, D. C.,
February 23, 1956.

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
United States Representative from the State of Georgia,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAVIS: At the regular monthly meeting of the Lincoln Park Citizens' Association, held February 20, 1956, it was voted to send you a letter thanking you for your interest in the residents of our city

and to in every way possible support the bill you have just introduced in the Congress which would increase the authorized strength of our Police Department to 2,500 men.

We hope this bill will pass and be enacted into law. The number of assaults and robberies has created such a fear to many of our residents that they feel it is dangerous to go on our streets, especially at night. We believe the additional police are necessary to maintain law and order and to protect our citizens.

Yours respectfully,

J. W. FLANNAGAN,
President.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 28, 1956.*

The Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DAVIS: The members of the Women's City Club of Washington, situated at 1733 I Street, Northwest, are glad that you have introduced bill H. R. 9078, "to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall not be less than 2,500 officers and members."

The Women's City Club of Washington, D. C., during the year 1955, just passed, issued two resolutions asking for the strength of the police force, advocated by yourself, and sent these two resolutions to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The first resolution was passed on March 2, 1955, and on April 6 of that year 23 new policemen were sworn in, much to our satisfaction. But no further increase has been made since then.

The second resolution was passed on September 27, 1955, but nothing came of it. We sincerely hope that your bill may be duly passed and that the needed money for its enactment may be appropriated by the Congress.

On November 4, 1955, I received a letter from Chief Robert V. Murray, who is without doubt the finest police chief in the United States. We had had him as a speaker at the club.

"DEAR MRS. WILEY: In compliance with the request in your letter of November 3, I am enclosing a copy of the material used in my talk before your group.

"Past experience has emphasized the correlation between police strength and crime rates. Statistics compiled by this department over the past several years tend to prove this connection—during 1952 and 1953, when there were reductions in available police manpower, crime began to increase; on the other hand, during 1954 and 1955, when the available strength increased, crime was reduced to a new low.

"Even though crime rates for the fiscal year 1955 represented an all-time low in crime since inception of the present reporting system, trends for the past several months give definite indication that offenses are at the lowest point possible without additional crime prevention personnel and facilities.

"It is the contention of this department that, even discounting the possibility of an increase in crime, further efforts must be made to protect the citizens of the District of Columbia.

"During the period January through June 1955, when crime was at an all time low in this city, there was a criminal homicide every eighth day, 2 robberies, 11 aggravated assaults, 10 housebreakings, 23 larcenies and 4 auto thefts every day.

"By comparison, Boston, Mass., a city which in 1950 had a population of 801,000—only slightly less than the 802,000 population of Washington, during the same period had only 1 criminal homicide every 14th day, 1 aggravated assault every 2d day, 1 robbery, 4 housebreakings, 11 larcenies, and 7 auto thefts each day.

* * * * *

"Sincerely yours.

"ROBERT V. MURRAY,
"Chief of Police."

I might add that Chief Murray told us the night he spoke at our club that Boston has 700 more policemen than Washington and that Baltimore, a city of similar size to ours, has 400 more. I believe that your bill calls for about 222 more policemen for this city.

Our first resolution of March 2 was passed immediately after a robbery occurred at the club. The incident took place during a motion-picture exhibition. Our members and guests were seated in the large assemblyroom, darkened for the occasion, the doors to the hall were shut and during the lecture a sneak thief entered the building and stole three coats from the rack, so that three persons had to go home without coats.

Wishing you all success with your important measure for the protection of the women and children of the Nation's Capital City, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ANNA KEETON WILEY,
(Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley)
Chairman, Legislation.

(Enclosed, two resolutions passed by the Women's City Club of Washington, D. C.)

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE WOMEN'S CITY CLUB, SEPTEMBER 27, 1955

Whereas according to Police Chief Murray, as reported in the Washington Post of Monday, September 26, serious crime throughout the Nation—on the upgrade since 1947—declined seven-tenths of a percent for the first 6 months of 1955, as compared with the same period in 1954; but

Whereas during the same period major crimes in Washington, D. C.—on the downgrade since 1953—did a turnabout and serious crime in the Capital City, which in 1954 declined 15.2 percent while the Nation's rate climbed by 5 percent, showed a 1.6 percent increase for the first half of 1955.

Whereas according to the Washington Post serious crimes in the Capital climbed from 9,017 in the first half of 1954 to 9,136—a jump of 146 this year: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Women's City Club, at its regular board meeting, held October 27, at the club house, heartily endorses Chief Murray's recommendation for an increase of sufficient policemen on the beats to make a total of 2,500 officers for the entire city.

Respectfully submitted.

KATHRYN PAINTER WARD,
President, Women's City Club.

(Resolution was sent to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.)

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE WOMEN'S CITY CLUB, MARCH 2, 1955

Whereas the women of Washington, D. C., are in constant danger from violent assault, as witnessed by the cruel attack on Miss Potbury, house manager of the YWCA, at 17th and K Streets NW., on Friday, February 18, 1955:

Whereas our homes are no longer safe from invasion, as witnessed by the still unsolved murder of Miss Alma Preinkert in February 1954;

Whereas our property is no longer safe from robbery, as witnessed by the theft of three coats from the Women's City Club during the course of a meeting, on January 29, 1955;

Whereas these repeated threats to life, limb, and property are recurrent and are increasing in number: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Women's City Club appeal to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to the chairmen of the Senate and House District Committees in the Congress, to immediately take decisive steps to protect the men, women, and children, and the homes and property of its citizens, so that normal safety will be returned to the residents of the Nation's Capital.

Respectfully,

KATHRYN PAINTER WARD,
President, Women's City Club.

(Copies sent to the Commissioners and to the Honorable Matthew M. Neely and the Honorable JOHN L. MCMILLAN on the evening of the meeting, March 2, 1955.)

PROGRESSIVE CITIZENS ASSOCIATION OF GEORGETOWN,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1956.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS OF GEORGIA,
House District Subcommittee, United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: For the past 3 years, the Progressive Citizens Association of Georgetown has tried to secure an increase of the number of police up to 2,500 men.

Police protection in the city of Washington is totally inadequate to handle the large number of teenagers who are dropping out of school unprepared to work or support themselves and the large number drifting in from other States.

Nearly all of the precincts are undermanned, and until men can be trained, this organization approves of Police Chief's plan to use volunteers from the experienced police already on the force, to work extra days with pay.

With so many upper-income bracket families moving into the suburbs and so many indigent families moving into the area called the center of the city, the problem of adequately policing the Nation's Capital is increasing each day. Conditions cannot possibly improve at this time, and until matters are satisfactorily adjusted years hence, an efficient police force ready for emergencies at any time must be maintained.

Several years ago, a group of property owners from this organization held a private hearing with Mr. TABER and urged him to increase the number of police on the Metropolitan Police Force to 2,500. The need still is urgent.

Please place this letter in the hearing held March 8, 1956, record. The Progressive Citizens Association for the third time, at its meeting recently held, unanimously passed a resolution asking that the strength of the force be increased to 2,500 men.

Thank you for your courtesy. The organization appreciates your efficient method of handling the emergency with a real hearing on a separate bill.

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH DRAPER,
Secretary.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STATE FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS,
Washington, D. C., March 19, 1956.

The Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DAVIS: The membership of the District of Columbia State Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, approximately 1,350 women, very much appreciates your interest in our welfare as evidenced by your efforts to increase the police force in Washington to 2,500 men. Our clubs feel very strongly about this matter since several of our members have just recently been the subject of attacks, three of which were extremely serious.

We believe that residents of the District of Columbia are willing and able to assume their share of the additional tax burden which would result, but we also feel that since a large portion of the police work in

the District is concerned with the National Government, that an additional appropriation should also come from the Congress for this purpose.

In our various and sundry activities as business and professional women we are forced to travel in the city both before and after dark, both alone and in groups of 2 or 3. We are vitally concerned therefore with this problem of safety. Surely the cost of prosecuting the dozens of cases that come before our courts would far exceed the cost of the additional police protection necessary to correct this condition.

Again let me thank you for your action and assure you of the support of our membership.

Very sincerely yours,

EVELYN HEMSLEY,
President.

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUB OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, INC.,
Washington, D. C. March 19, 1956.

The Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS,
Chairman, District of Columbia, Subcommittee, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DAVIS: The Business and Professional Women's Club of the District of Columbia, representing over 1,000 Washington women, highly commends you for your interest in our welfare as shown by your measure to increase the District Police force to 2,500 men.

We feel strongly on this matter, since we are perhaps those who suffer most from inadequate police protection. Many of our members have been molested or assaulted in recent years, and some have been critically injured. This is increasing at an alarming rate, the most recent being the vicious knifing of Miss Ena Thomas, 1616 16th Street NW., who was attacked as she parked her car at that address, less than 1 month ago.

Chief Murray demonstrated what can be done with an adequate force last summer during the transit strike, and his able administration should not be hampered by lack of men and money. We take the position that it is a false economy to try to run the department with 4 or 5 foot patrolmen in a precinct bristling with every breed of criminal. We feel that the expenses of administering justice to those committing serious offenses every 28 minutes far exceeds the cost of increasing the force to 2,500 men, and that such an increase would materially reduce costs in many areas.

We also take the position that costs be met by additional Federal appropriations, since District police are used so extensively in such as official parades, Embassy affairs, and so forth, these being Federal rather than District of Columbia affairs.

We appeal to you to continue your efforts to correct this unsatisfactory, indeed deplorable situation in the Capital.

Very truly yours,

LAURETTA G. HUPMAN,
Chairman, Public Affairs.

ASTOR MEN'S SHOP, INC.,
Washington, D. C., March 23, 1956.

Hon. JIM DAVIS,
United States Congressman,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAVIS: I am writing you in reference to a bill that you have introduced to Congress regarding a 2,500-man police force in Washington, D. C.

In this letter I will give you my viewpoint as a businessman regarding the conditions in No. 9 precinct, headed by Captain Peters.

We have had a store on H Street NE., for the past 4 years. During the last 2 years we have had a loss of $10,000, due mostly to shoplifting. If in the next couple of months our store on H Street does not show a profit or break even, we will be forced to close the store.

I put the blame of this condition to the lack of adequate police protection.

Captain Peters of the No. 9 precinct and I had a talk regarding the juveniles in his precinct, plus the overall picture. Captain Peters tell me that he has 107 policemen to cover approximately 5 square miles. These 107 policemen, as I understand it, are broken down into 3 shifts, leaving around 36 men on duty on any 1 shift, less days off, leave, sickness, or station duty. I would venture to say that Captain Peters does not have more than 10 to 12 footmen on the street at any time.

The juvenile situation is getting to the point that it cannot be handled. It is only a matter of time that these kids will graduate from shoplifting, purse snatching, and mugging to the higher crimes of armed robbery, deadly assault, and murder.

If this letter can be used to help increase the number of policemen in Washington please use it. If my services can be used please call on me.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND H. BROWN.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of Sunday, March 25, 1956]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WOMEN DEMANDING MORE POLICE PROTECTION—FEAR STREET THUGS, WANT MORE POLICE

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Spurred by fear of venturing out after dark, women's organizations of Washington are demanding more police protection.

Statistics back up their fears. In a city where women are used to going about alone at nights to civic meetings, concerts and other community activities, nearly 500 were the victims of street robberies last year.

More than 300 of these involved purse-snatchings. In more than 50 cases, the women were beaten with fists, knocked to the ground or kicked. Some were hospitalized with broken bones or severe cuts.

A Star survey of the most vicious cases showed that in almost every instance, the women victims were within a block or two of their homes when attacked.

PROTECTION DEMAND GROWS

Telephone operators and nurses reporting for night work, elderly women returning from church, women laden with packages and Government workers on their way home from evening meetings were among the victims.

Their experience lies behind the demands of their friends and neighbors for more protection. The demands are taking the form of resolutions, letters and visits to Members of Congress.

Since the legislation was introduced for a police force of not less than 2,500 men, the women's groups have focused on that bill. Several spokesmen for women's clubs said they planned to be in the House gallery tomorrow to see what happens when the bill comes up for action on the House floor.

A survey by the Star showed that the women's groups acted individually in calling for more police protection and were not aware that other groups were doing the same thing.

NIGHT MEETINGS CURTAILED

Some of the resolutions passed by women's clubs over the past few months refer to members of their own groups attacked on the street or victimized by purse snatchers. Some club officials told the Star they had to abandon night meetings because the women were afraid to go out alone at night.

The women's groups known to be demanding more protection and calling for a larger police force include the Women's City Club, the Business and Professional Women's Club of Washington, the District Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, the District Federation of Women's Clubs, Zonta Club of Washington, Soroptimist International of Washington, and the Pro Bonata Club.

A Star survey of the statistics behind the fears showed:

The majority of purse snatchers are juveniles, frequently working in pairs.

Women represent a higher proportion of the victims in robberies than in any other serious crime classification but rape. The victims in 491 of the 1,144 robberies and attempted robberies last year were women. Purse snatchings or attempts were involved in 309 of these cases.

PURSE SNATCHING INCREASES

While other types of crimes have decreased here, purse snatchings—often accompanied by force—are on the increase.

Purse snatchers don't stop with one victim but continue until they are caught, as evidenced by one offender after another identified in as many as a dozen different cases.

Purse snatchers have become more vicious and more daring about daylight snatches.

The hours from 8 p. m. to 10 p. m. are the most dangerous for women to be on the street. There were 63 purse snatchings from 8 p. m. to 9 p. m. during last year and 75 from 9 p. m. to 10 p. m. While the majority of purse snatchings occurred after dark, there were 13 purse snatchings between 2 p. m. and 3 p. m. and 14 between 3 p. m. and 4 p. m.

While every precinct reported purse snatchings, the residential 10th precinct with 66 cases was the 2d worst in the city. The second precinct, which tops the list for most types of crime, had 82 purse-snatching cases.

SATURDAY NIGHTS WORST

The most frequent victims were middle-aged white women and the worst night on the street was Saturday.

Most frequent locales for street bandits to operate were the side streets just off main thoroughfares. The women were attacked as they walked the short distance to their homes from bus stops while they were waiting at bus stops, or as they got out of their cars. One was attacked as she put the key in her front door.

Clubwomen said their members were most afraid of being injured. Their fears began crystallizing a year ago when Mrs. Annie R. Potbury, 77-year-old housekeeper at the Strong residence hall of the YWCA was attacked by two yoke robbers at Farragut Square as she was returning from a National Geographic lecture. In the struggle for her purse, the yoke robbers threw her to the ground, fracturing her pelvis and breaking an elbow.

The Business and Professional Women's Club had two recent cases among its membership. Miss Ena Thomas was slashed in the face as she parked her car in front of her home at 1616 16th Street and a 70-year-old past president of the club, Miss Mae R. Murray, had her purse snatched in broad daylight at 19th and Columbia Road NW.

OTHER CASES LISTED

These are some of the other cases that have roused the women to action:

An 83-year-old woman on her way home from church at 5 p. m. on October 23 was knocked to the ground by a teen-ager when she was only a few feet from her home in the 1500 block of Monroe Street NW. Struggling to her feet, she beat him off with her cane.

A 40-year-old nurse waiting at the bus stop just east of Wisconsin Avenue on Yuma Street NW. at 10:40 p. m. on November 7, 1955, was knocked to the ground by a heavy-set 6-footer who grabbed her bag and ran.

A 59-year-old woman walking behind the Old House Office Building at 9 p. m. was attacked from behind and her bag, containing $100 in bills, was yanked from her hand. She cut her head as she fell against the building railing.

A 41-year old Pentagon employee, walking within a block of her home in the 900 block of Randolph Street, on December 15, 1955, was grabbed by a teen-ager who warned: "Don't scream or I'll kill you. I've got a gun." He beat her to the ground and made off with her purse.

ATTACKED BY THREE BOYS

A 38-year-old woman with her arms full of bundles was walking around Scott Circle to her apartment at 1 Scott Circle at 8:10 p. m. on December 8, 1955, when three boys approached her. One smacked her in the face. As she reeled, the second snatched her purse from her arm. The boys made off on bicycles parked near the scene.

A 32-year-old Air Force employee was getting out of her car, parked in the 4100 block of Massachusetts Avenue, at 9:15 p. m. on August 17, 1955, when a man grabbed her around the neck, dragged her into the woods nearby and attempted to rape her. She fought him off but he took her purse when he ran from the scene.

A 60-year-old woman, walking a block from home at Sixth Street and Independence Avenue SE., at 8:40 p. m. on a Sunday in January 1956 was dragged all the way across the street by a robber trying to get her purse. She was taken to Casualty Hospital for treatment of a sprained left shoulder and was so dazed by the experience she could give no description of her assailant.

A 65-year-old woman walking in the 1800 block of Wyoming Avenue NW., at 7:05 p. m. on January 16, 1956, was knocked to the sidewalk by a man who grabbed her bag and ran. She was admitted to Garfield Hospital with a fractured arm and shoulder bruises.

Police Chief Robert V. Murray has been asked to address one women's group after another as the purse-snatching alarm has spread. Under their questioning, he has expressed his concern at the rising number of street crimes but told the women he needed more policemen on the street to meet their demands for more protection.

"I am constantly being asked to provide more protection in the areas where these women live and work," he said yesterday. "There's not a week that goes by that a citizens' association from some section of the city doesn't write to ask that more police be assigned to their particular precinct. In many letters, they cite the dangers to women. Most of their requests are fully justified. We should have the men.

ADEQUATE FORCE URGED

"We have proved time and again that the best possible way to reduce and prevent crime is to have an adequate uniformed force on the street. When we use the recruit training classes to supplement the regular patrol force on weekends, there has been less crime in the areas where they are assigned. They have also been successful in apprehending both yokers and housebreakers in the act. We've got to have the men out there to catch them. If we don't they'll go on until we do."

He said that any increase in the police department would go to the patrol forces. Although the force is theoretically 2,278 men, it actually is about 40 short of that because vacancies must be maintained to take care of expenses not figured in the appropriations.

Chief Murray said if the force actually numbered 2,500 men, he could virtually double the number of men walking beats on each shift.

GROUPS SEEK ACTION

Here's how the women's groups have reacted to the fears of their membership and Chief Murray's explanations:

In December, the Business and Professional Women's Club of the District began bombarding Congressmen on appropriations and District committees with letters calling for a 2,500-man force and urging that the costs of the increase be covered by an increase in the Federal payment.

In February, the State Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs with more than 1,200 members in 6 clubs wrote the chairmen of the House and Senate District Committees and appropriations committees handling the District budget:

"We believe very strongly that more police protection is needed here. Several of our members only recently have been attacked on our streets, one of whom was very seriously injured just a few days ago. Realizing the precarious fiscal position of the District of Columbia, we also wish to go on record as favoring the speedy passage of any additional revenue measure which may be necessary. * * * Any favorable consideration that you may be able to give this request for additional protection will be sincerely appreciated."

FREQUENT RESOLUTIONS PASSED

The local business and professional group followed up their original resolution last week in a letter to Representative DAVIS, Democrat of Georgia, author of the 2,500-man police bill, saying: "We take the position that it is false economy to try to run the department with 4 or 5 foot patrolmen in a precinct bristling with every breed of criminal."

The District Federation of Women's Clubs, with more than 7,000 members in 33 clubs, followed up earlier resolutions for an increased police force with one on February 27 specifically urging Congress to approve a 2,500-man force.

The Women's City Club passed a resolution in March, 1955, appealing to the Commissioners and to the chairmen of the Senate and House District Committees "to immediately take decisive steps to protect the men, homes and property of its citizens so that normal safety will be returned to the residents of the Nation's Capital."

DAVIS BILL SUPPORTED

In September, 1955, the Women's City Club passed another resolution specifically calling for a 2,500-man force. In February, the club wrote Mr. DAVIS supporting his bill and followed it up by having Mrs. Harvey Wiley testify at hearings on the measure this month.

Last week, the Zonta Club of Washington went on record endorsing expansion of the police force "for more adequate protection of its residents."

Immediately after the 2,500-man force bill was approved by the House when it came up last week, the Soroptimist International of Washington wrote Committee Chairman MCMILLAN strongly endorsing the bill and urging him to do everything possible to get the bill through the House when it comes up for floor action tomorrow.

A message calling for a larger force also went to the Capitol from the Pro Bonata Club.

The question is on the engrossment and reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the District of Columbia business.

GOLDA I. STEGNER

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1082) for the relief of Golda I. Stegner, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH J. PORTER

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1495) for the relief of Joseph J. Porter, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUGENE DUS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2946) for the relief of Eugene Dus, with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT OF 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3996) to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LANE, FORRESTER, and MILLER of New York.

GENERAL DRO: ARMENIAN PATRIOT

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 8 the cause of universal freedom lost a stanch fighter with the passing of that great Armenian patriot, Gen. Dro Kanayan. Born Drastmot Kanayan, in Armenia, in 1884, he joined the ranks of fighters against oppression very early in his life, and came to be known as General Dro.

As a member of the House Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression, I had the honor to serve as chairman of a special subcommittee to investigate the Communist takeover and occupation of the non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R. General Dro appeared before that subcommittee and gave eye witness testimony to the Russian conquest of the once free and independent Armenian nation, as well as the never-ending struggle of the Armenian people to regain their national sovereignty. In every respect he was an expert on these questions because he fought against Russian tyranny as early as 1904. In the best sense of the word, General Dro was a revolutionary who devoted his life so that all mankind would have a better and a brighter future. From his early youth he was a leader in the Armenian revolutionary federation, known popularly as the Dashnag Party. In 1908 he was convicted of revolutionary activity against the Russian empire before a special tribunal of the Czarist Russian Senate.

During the First World War General Dro fought the Germano-Turks on the Anatolian front where the forces he commended were never known to retreat. The resounding victory won by General Dro and the forces he commanded at Bash Abaran in May of 1918 opened the way for the establishment of the independent Republic of Armenia which was proclaimed on May 28, 1918. That independent Republic of Armenia was formally recognized by the United States Government on April 23, 1920. The passage of time has tended to dim that highly significant fact, but for the Armenian people everywhere in the world it still remains as a testament to American honor in the conduct of its foreign affairs.

Toward the fall of 1920 Kemalist Turkey and the Russian Communists initiated a joint attack on Armenia. This conspiracy was the outcome of a strategy evolved by Lenin and Stalin. Russian armies were set in motion on Armenia's northern frontier while the Turkish forces moved up from the south. General Dro again commanded his troops against this joint attack. At this critical time, the Armenian Government appointed him Minister of Defense and General Dro fought against overwhelming odds on two fronts.

Supplementing their use of brute force with treachery, the Communists then signed a treaty with the Armenian Government, undertaking to respect the independence of Armenia as well as its frontiers and solemnly promising not to persecute those leaders of the Armenian nation who had opposed and resisted communism. This treaty will, to this day, be found in a collection which Moscow qualifies as valid.

Needless to say, only a few days after the signing of the treaty, the Communists trampled underfoot everyone of its provisions. General Dro was taken to Moscow. Aware of the unparalleled popularity which General Dro enjoyed with all the Armenian people, the Communists resorted to the ruse of organizing his trip in a special train, with every outward honor being extended, whereas in fact, he was being taken into exile.

It was not until 1923 that General Dro was able to leave Moscow to exile in the free world. He then rededicated himself to the struggle for the liberation of Armenia and the triumph of freedom as well as the restoration of national independence.

The testimony given Congress by General Dro during the New York hearings of 1954 had a very telling effect on the leaders of the conspiracy of communism. The Communist press in Russian occupied Armenia viciously attacked those hearings and in particular, sought to smear the character of General Dro. This provided some evidence of how the truth hurts the Communist cause. During the meeting of the so-called 20th congress of the Communist Party which concluded only a few weeks ago in Moscow, the hearings of the House Select Committee on the matter of the non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R. was again brought under vicious attack. In a speech before that so-called congress, the first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party, S. Tavmassian, made extensive reference to the congressional hearings in which General Dro participated, and sought to discredit the historic facts given under oath and inscribed for all time in the official records of the United States Government.

All freedom-loving people who come to know the great contribution to humanity made by General Dro, will mourn his passing. Armenians throughout the world will rededicate themselves to the great spirit represented by General Dro and will take new courage in their age-long efforts for a free and independent Armenia. For my part, I wish the free world had more leaders like General Dro who refuse to compromise on matters of principle and who possess the political acumen to understand that the enslavement of one nation shall always constitute a danger of enslavement to all nations. I believe the testimony given by General Dro to the House Select Committee carries a very timely lesson in view of the present Russian efforts to woo all free nations into the treacherous traps which have always been the stock in trade of the tyrants who occupy the Kremlin.

By unanimous consent, I insert the testimony of Gen. Dro Kanayan:

TESTIMONY OF GEN. DRO KANAYAN, THROUGH THE INTERPRETER, BEGLAR NAVASSARDIAN

Mr. MCTIGUE. Where were you born, General, and when?

General DRO. In 1884, in the city of Igdir, May 30, 1884.

Mr. MCTIGUE. What is your present residence, General?

General DRO. My family resides at Watertown, Mass., and I live in Beirut, Lebanon.

Mr. MCTIGUE. Do you happen to be visiting in the United States at the present time?

General DRO. Yes, sir; I visit the United States approximately once every year.

Mr. MCTIGUE. Your family is permanently residing in Watertown, Mass., and you are permanently residing in Beirut, Lebanon?

General DRO. Yes.

Mr. MCTIGUE. Were you Minister of Defense and commanding general of the armies of the independent Republic of Armenia, General?

General DRO. During the latter part of the independent Republic I was Minister of Defense and commander in chief of the military forces.

Mr. MCTIGUE. When? What was the date? I want two dates, first, commanding general of the armies, and second, when you were Minister of Defense, please.

General DRO. From the establishment of the Republic in May 1918, to the summer of 1920, I was in military command in various posts, and toward the end of 1920, commander in chief of the military forces. I was Defense Minister for a short period toward the end of November 1920.

Mr. MCTIGUE. General, we have had some testimony here this morning concerning the Soviet threat to the Republic of Armenia, and the Soviet troop movements in May of 1920 against the Republic of Armenia. Can you tell us briefly what strategy of what tactics the Soviet employed at that time, that is, in May of 1920, when the Soviet threatened Armenia?

General DRO. The Soviet military pressure began in May of 1920, when the Soviet armies were carrying out probing actions and jabbing actions on the eastern frontier of Armenia, in the region of Karabagh, and as the months advanced they began to carry out military movements and again jabbing actions further to the north.

Beginning with May 1920, the Bolshevik strategy was as follows: It instigated the Turkish Armies to the south to attack the Armenian Republic.

Mr. FEIGHAN. The Russians did?

General DRO. The Russians did. They had an understanding with General Karabekir who was the leader of the Turkish Army, the commander. They instigated this army to attack Armenia from the south. The Soviet Russian Armies attacked at two points from the northeast and the north. By the end of September, the Turks had already entered the city of Alexandropol, and the population was being decimated.

Simultaneously, Russian forces had entered the northern frontiers of Armenia and Legran, who was by that time in Erivan, submitted an ultimatum to the Armenian Government that unless it accepted the conditions the Soviets were putting, the country and the land would face total destruction.

Mr. MCTIGUE. And then what happened, General, after the issuance of this ultimatum? And what was the date of the ultimatum?

General DRO. I am not positive what the exact date of the ultimatum is. It is between November 28 and 29 of 1920.

The ultimatum at first was that as the Soviets and the Turkish Armies had already occupied certain parts of Armenia, there should be a total surrender by the Armenian Government, which we refused. At that point, they agreed to carry out further negotiation and establish a treaty which both parties would sign. The treaty was signed on December 2, 1920, with the following fundamental points:

1. That Armenia was to remain an independent Government, not under the political control of Communist Moscow.

2. That there would be no persecution of Dashnags, officers of the Armenian Army that had fought the Communists, or members of the former Government.

3. That the territorial integrity of Armenia would be kept through temporary help from the Russian military forces.

This was signed on December 2, 1920, by me, and Silian, representing the Russian side.

Mr. FEIGHAN. General Dro, did the Russians live up to the terms of the treaty which they agreed to and which you signed with them, along with other Armenian representatives, on December 2, 1920?

General DRO. They trampled everything under foot. Almost immediately after the signing of the treaty, about 1,200 officers of the Armenian Army were forced into a death march through the Caucasian Mountains toward the north. All the former leaders of the Government, like Dr. Darbinian, who testified a while ago, and scores of others, were imprisoned and the slaughtering—they actually used an ax—the slaughtering of these intellectuals was started in the prison.

The territorial integrity of Armenia was not respected and Armenia became a vassal, a country in the bondage of Moscow.

Mr. FEIGHAN. General, according to that treaty of December 2, 1920, were you supposed to retain the high command of the Armenian Army, and did you, and what happened thereafter with reference to your position?

General DRO. They respected it only until Jnauray 5, 1921. Under the terms of the agreement, I was to assume complete command of Armenia for a transitory period. But on January 5 I was given an ultimatum to leave the country in a special train that had been brought from Moscow, and both I and my military staff were taken in this train to Moscow.

Mr. FEIGHAN. What did you do in Moscow, General Dro?

General DRO. In Moscow I had several interviews with Stalin and Chichernin, who was Foreign Commissar at that time, and I presented the Armenian case to them, pointed out that an official treaty had been signed, but that each provision of the treaty had been trampled underfoot by the Communists.

Mr. FEIGHAN. To whom did you address those remarks, both to Stalin and Chichernin, or to whom?

General DRO. I protested both to Stalin and to Chichernin. Stalin was Commissar for Nationalities and Chichernin was Commissar for Foreign Affairs.

Mr. FEIGHAN. What reaction did they give to your protest, General?

General DRO. Although they made several formal promises, that the wrongs that had been committed would be rectified, that the brutality and barbarism in Armenia would be brought to an end—but the fact remained that in effect in Armenia itself nothing, no reforms were carried out and the same treatment was continued.

Mr. FEIGHAN. General, you stated that on January 5, 1921, you were given an ultimatum, which was in violation by the Russians of the terms of the treaty of December 2, 1920, that you had to go to Moscow. What was the import of that ultimatum? Did that mean that you were to be exiled from Armenia and never again set foot on your native land?

General DRO. It so happens that I was a man of the people. I was brought with the people, and primarily with the military. My word carried weight with the people and the military, and they felt that by exiling me out of the country they would morally break down the people by eliminating the one man whom they trusted as the last remnant of the republic.

Mr. FEIGHAN. General, you were actually put into exile, that is, were you free, too, or were you not free to return to Armenia?

General DRO. This was complete exile, because I did not have the right to move beyond the radius of 100 kilometers in Moscow.

Mr. FEIGHAN. General Dro, when you were in Moscow did Stalin give a dinner in your honor?

General DRO. As they do with all people, Stalin gave a luncheon in my honor, and at the luncheon, several promises were made that not only would conditions be rectified in Armenia, but that an understanding even might be reached with the Dashnag party which as you know, was the strongest anti-Communist party, and that justice and democracy would be reestablished in Armenia.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Well, at that luncheon, did Stalin admit that there had been violations of the treaty and that terror and brutalities were inflicted by the Russians on the Armenians subsequent to the treaty?

General DRO. In the presence of Stalin, Orzhonikidze, who was the military commander of the Caucasus, confessed—the political leader of all military forces of the Caucasus—confessed that very brutality and persecution had been committed by the Communists themselves, making the revolt of the Armenian people inevitable.

Orzhonikidze's statement was part of the reason why the entire structure of the secret police, the Cheka, was later changed in Armenia.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Just why, General, do you feel that Stalin gave that luncheon in your honor?

General DRO. There were two reasons. The first was that we had been friends from the earliest days of the revolution, in the period of 1905–6, when we had fought against the Czarist regime and Czarish tyranny. And the second reason was because they hoped to deceive the Armenian people by showing that they were kind to us.

Of course, the fact that we had fought side by side against the Russian tyranny of the Czarist period, that we had known each other personally for a long time, could not but play a part in the general attitude they adopted.

Mr. FEIGHAN. At the luncheon, General Dro, you stated that the Russian Orzhonikidze, who was in charge of the Russian Army in the Caucusus, stated that because of the brutal treatment and presecution by the Communists in the Caucusus, the revolution was bound to come. Did an uprising subsequently follow?

General DRO. After they took over Armenia, with a brutality and persecution characteristic of the Middle Ages, the clergymen of Armenia, the intellectuals, the Dashnags, the former members of the Government were thrown into prison by the Communists, where the slaughtering of these people was started.

The officers were driven out of the country in death marches and the people, feeling that this was the last straw to their patience, even though they had to find the arms hidden by them and they were not as well armed as the Communist forces, the people rose and from Febraury 16 to April 2 succeeded in freeing the total complete area of Armenia from Communist rule.

Mr. FEIGHAN. General Dro, you mentioned that the Russian Soviets made the officer corps of the Armenian Army march in a death march in the snows of the Caucusus Mountains. Would you elaborate just a little on that?

General DRO. This officer corps consisted of the elite of the Armenian Army, led by 3 of the most prominent generals—Nazerbekian, Silikian, and Hakhverdian. One of the generals on the way, unable to continue with the torture and the degradation he was being inflicted, grabbed at the opportunity to kill himself by throwing himself before a train, on the rails of a train, while scores of others—of course, I cannot remember the names, but scores of others died through torture and impossible conditions throughout the long march.

Mr. FEIGHAN. And that, of course, was in direct violation of the terms of the treaty of December 2, 1920?

General DRO. Just as all the other provisions, that specific provision that the officers would not be persecuted was completely trampled underfoot.

Mr. FEIGHAN. General, how long did that march take?

General DRO. Approximately between 5 or 6 months of marching. The march was broken up. The first leg of the trip was from Erivan to Akhstafa, which is about 150 miles, but which is constantly mountainous, and it is snow covered.

Then, from Akhstafa to Baku, about 200 miles, and from Baku to Kazan. Of course, there were stops during this march. It wasn't one long incessant march. There were stops during the period, but the whole thing from Erivan to Akhstafa, from Akhstafa to Baku and from Baku to Kazan required 5 months.

Mr. MCTIGUE. Altogether, how many miles were involved from the starting point in the capital to the ultimate finishing point in Kazan—and that is in Soviet Russia?

General DRO. That is right.

Mr. MCTIGUE. What part of Russia is it in? Is it east of the Ural Mountains?

General DRO. It is in the central part of the U. S. S. R.

Mr. MCTIGUE. Now, how many miles altogether were involved?

General DRO. About 2,000 miles counting the trips in boxcars and the marching.

Mr. MCTIGUE. Was most of it marching?

General DRO. Most of it was in boxcars which were used for cattle, where the men would be squeezed in like sardines.

Mr. MCTIGUE. Part of the journey was on foot?

General DRO. On foot.

Mr. MCTIGUE. Part of the journey was in cattle cars?

General DRO. The main part that was on foot was through the mountains of the Caucasus in the snows, where many of the men died.

Mr. MCTIGUE. How many officers and men of the Armenian Army were in this march?

General DRO. 1,200.

Mr. MCTIGUE. How many perished, died, out of the 1,200 which originally started the march? How many survived at the ultimate destination?

General DRO. I cannot tell you exactly, but many score died on the way.

Mr. MCTIGUE. What happened to the others, then? They were taken into Soviet Russia?

General DRO. Part of this officers corps was sent to concentration camps and prisons, and they took about 500 whom they tried to brainwash and train into their own system, with the purpose of eventually sending them back to Armenia. But the true elite of this officer corps was sent to Siberia, and put in concentration camps and exile.

Mr. MCTIGUE. General, how do you know about this march and the fate of these officers?

General DRO. I was in Moscow up until 1924, where all this information was available, and I had it from Soviet sources themselves that most of these people had been exiled to concentration camps and we even heard about them, that is, several who had been shot in the camps.

Mr. MCTIGUE. So it was the Soviet authorities themselves who told you about this march, this death march through the Caucasian Mountains?

General DRO. Specifically, Armenian Communists, like Kabinian, who was Prime Minister of Soviet Armenia, who were friends of mine, people like that, would give me the information.

Mr. MCTIGUE. General Dro, when did you leave Moscow?

General DRO. In December of 1924.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Did the Cheka oppose your leaving?

General DRO. The Cheka, both the central office in Moscow and the Cheka in the Caucasus, was definitely opposed to my leaving, but what made it possible was my personal friendship with some of these leaders from the days of 1905–06.

Mr. FEIGHAN. General, will you, for the purposes of the record, just briefly describe what the Cheka were and tell us whether they were influential, both in the Caucasus and in Moscow?

General DRO. The Cheka used in broad outline three principal means. In every nation, in every one of the non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R., they would exile, kill, or imprison all the intellectual leaders and all of the clergy.

Second, they had the right to judge anybody, arrest anybody, and pass judgment against this person, with three peope sitting in on passing the decision, without any jury or hearing or defense.

And finally, they carried a great deal of weight, because within the Politbureau several members who were the most authoritative of the Politbureau were those who organized the Cheka and were the leading figures of the Cheka.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. MACHROWICZ?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. No questions.

Mr. FEIGHAN. General Dro, were there any Armenians fighting in the Russian Soviet Army against the Armenians in Armenia?

General DRO. The army was purely Russian, and if there were any Armenians, we didn't know of any being there. It was a purely Russian Army.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. MACHROWICZ?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. No questions.

Mr. MCTIGUE. Where did you go after you left Moscow, General?

General DRO. From Moscow, I arrived in Paris, and from there left for Rumania, where I established myself. I lived for 20 years in Rumania.

Mr. MCTIGUE. And what was the year again, for the record, that you left Moscow and went to Paris?

General DRO. In 1924, the end of December, I left Moscow. On January 1, I was already in Berlin.

Mr. MCTIGUE. I may have been out of the room, Mr. Chairman, when this testimony was taken, but can you tell me the first time, General, that you had a meeting or contact with Stalin?

General DRO. The beginning of February 1921, when I arrived in Moscow, the third day after my arrival, I was received by Stalin, and my main statement to him was my protest that the country was under military occupation, and that the people——

Mr. MCTIGUE. No, I wanted to go back. I wanted to know when you first met Stalin. What was your first meeting?

General DRO. In the period of 1905–06, where we met several times.

Mr. MCTIGUE. What was Stalin doing at that time? What occasion did you have to meet with Stalin? What was the nature of the meetings, a social occasion?

General DRO. Stalin at that time in 1905–06 was a propagandist for the Bolshevik Party, and since there was general fighting against the Czarist tyranny, there would even be cases where in a strike, for instance, or in a demonstration, the various anti-Czarist forces would be working together, and that is the time when I had occasion to meet Stalin, who was then a Bolshevik propagandist.

There would be cases when all the political parties that were against the Czarist tyranny, the Social Democrats, the Social Revolutionaries, the Dashnags, would on certain occasions work together against Czarist tyranny.

Mr. MCTIGUE. I have no further questions.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. No further questions.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Thank you, General Dro. Our committee appreciates very much this firsthand testimony from you who have fought so vigorously for the freedom and independence of Armenia. We are glad to have you as an eyewitness to the signing of the treaty which was so flagrantly violated by Russia.

Thank you, again, for the committee.

THE ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House of Representatives an outstanding public service which was rendered by one of the great St. Louis newspapers, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat recently received the 1955 National Headliners Club award for its story on the underpowered Navy jets. The story touched off a congressional inquiry into the jet-procurement program and the matter was subject to an intensive investigation by the Government Operations Subcommittee on Military Operations. The committee report, which was issued a short time ago, should go a long way toward preventing a recurrence of such a costly mistake in the future.

The judges, in announcing the award, said that Theodore Schafers' stories on the jet plane fiasco exemplified especially the standard of public service by the Globe-Democrat which earned it the award. Mr. Schafers will receive the Headliners' silver medallion during ceremonies at Atlantic City early next month.

In order to bring to the attention of the House the role played by this outstanding newspaper, I include as a part of my remarks the following articles from the March 17 issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

GLOBE-DEMOCRAT WINS 1955 HEADLINERS AWARD ON JET SERIES—SCHAFER'S STORIES ON ENGINE FIASCO TAKE PRIZE FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

The Globe-Democrat has won the 1955 National Headliners Club award for outstanding public service by a newspaper, it was announced in Atlantic City yesterday.

Theodore Schafers' stories on the Westinghouse-Navy-McDonnell Aircraft jet plane fiasco "exemplified especially" the standard of public service by the Globe-Democrat which earned it the award, the judges said.

Schafers will go to Atlantic City April 6–8 to receive the Headliner silver medallion at the award ceremony, and to be an honor guest at the various dinners and events in the annual 3-day Headliner frolics.

The National Headliners Club, started in 1935 by the Press Club of Atlantic City, salutes those who have distinguished themselves in news coverage.

NINE JUDGES

A total of 1,500 entries from all news media, including foreign and domestic news reporting, radio, television, photography, editorial pages, sports and news magazines, was studied by the 9 judges who selected the 23 winners in various fields.

Only one annual award for outstanding public service by a newspaper is offered by the club, the one which was conferred upon the Globe-Democrat in the 1955 competition.

The Globe-Democrat's jet plane exposé was a story of an amazing military aircraft flop which cost taxpayers at least $122,200,000. This newspaper disclosed, in a series of stories which began last September, that McDonnell had delivered to the Navy 47 jet fighters which were grounded. The planes, each costing about $2,600,000 eventually were carried out of St. Louis by river barges.

ALL CRITICIZED

The failure resulted from use of Westinghouse engines which were not powerful enough for the planes. A congressional subcommittee, investigating after the Globe published the story, criticized McDonnell and the Navy for accepting the engines, knowing that they "were below performance specifications for the airframe."

Westinghouse also was censured for not delivering the kind of engine it had promised.

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, a California Democrat and chairman of the House Military Operations Subcommittee which conducted the inquiry, said the Globe-Democrat "did a service to the Nation" in bringing the costly blunder to national attention.

Schafers was curious last year when he saw a large group of the planes parked by the McDonnell Aircraft plant, at Lambert-St. Louis Municipal Airport. He observed, during periodic visits to the area, that the planes apparently were never moved.

DUG FOR FACTS

He started asking questions, and as his prodding increased logical information sources began to dry up. The lack of cooperation by these sources increased Schafers' suspicions and he kept digging for the facts. He pinned down enough data from his contacts in industrial circles to warrant a Navy explanation on the grounded planes and what would be done with them.

But when Marsh Clark, a member of the Globe-Democrat's Washington bureau, began to press the Navy for this information, he, too, was met with evasive tactics. Meanwhile, in St. Louis, staff writer Carl Major joined with Schafers in running down additional phases of the story.

The persistent efforts of the trio finally yielded the facts which caused the congressional investigation that assessed the taxpayers' losses and fixed the responsibility for what the legislators called a debacle.

Schafers, 41, became a Globe-Democrat copyboy when he was 14, and he has worked continuously for this newspapers for the last 27 years. While still going to school he held various jobs on the paper and learned the newspaper business from the staff members. He was added to the staff in 1938.

Schafers was assigned in 1940 to the Criminal Courts Building, and started a 15-year period of crime story coverage, which was interrupted by a 2 years' service with the Army.

His many news beats included the exclusive interview of John Hager, the taxi driver who tipped police on the Greenlease baby kidnap murderers. He got the story during the early morning hours, too late for the Globe's last edition. He knew that rival newsmen were searching for Hager, as was the Teamsters' Union, which wanted to put the cab driver on a national television show.

HID CAB DRIVER

To protect his exclusive interview, Schafers talked Hager into hiding in a hotel until the Globe-Democrat could "break" the story the following night.

Other major stories by Schafers included the series with Globe Staffer Edwin D. Krell on the Missouri State Penitentiary scandal, which caused many major reforms and a multi-million-dollar rehabilitation program; and disclosure of a city jail racket in which

big-shot labor racketeers were paying bribes to get special privileges.

Schafers is married and the father of five children. The Schafers live at 6735 Mathew Street, Northwoods. The newsman is a member of Sigma Delta Chi, the national professional journalism fraternity, and of the American Newspaper Guild.

Tom Duffy, editor of the East St. Louis Journal, also is a 1955 Headliner award winner. He was cited for "consistently outstanding" feature columns for his daily feature, On the Home Front.

Other Headliner awards include:

Michael J. O'Neill, United Press, for outstanding coverage of a major domestic news story, in his articles on Salk polio vaccine.

Andrew Tully, Scripps Howard Newspaper Alliance, for outstanding coverage of major foreign news, and especially for his series, Inside Russia.

Charles E. Shutt, Telenews and INS, for exclusive interviews with Russian leaders, including Malenkov and Bulganin.

Sports Illustrated, best news series in a magazine for its exposé Boxing's Dirty Business.

Eric Sevareid, CBS, for consistently outstanding news broadcasting in his The World Tonight.

Movietone News and Georges Chassignes, cameraman, for outstanding newsreel coverage of a news event, the Algerian revolt.

"OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVICE"

We would be less than honest if we did not say how tremendously proud we are that the Globe-Democrat has won the Headliners' Award for the outstanding public service by a newspaper as exemplified by Ted Schafers' jet-plane fiasco disclosures involving the Navy, McDonnell and Westinghouse.

The work that Ted Schafers did was in the best tradition of American journalism. He spent weeks digging through the jumble of governmental redtape, double-talk, and just plain concealment of the facts.

His story, which touched off a congressional inquiry, was termed "a great public service" last week by Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD of California, chairman of the Military Operations Subcommittee, and by many other Congressmen and Senators on both sides of the aisle.

It was for the same reasons symbolized in the Headliners' Award that the Globe-Democrat, some weeks ago, changed the slogan in its masthead from "104 Years Old," a slogan which, inferentially at least, implied that age was our greatest virtue, to "104 Years of Public Service," a slogan which we think more properly typifies the new spirit of this newspaper.

We are proud, indeed, to have been selected for the Headliners' Award for Public Service. We pledge ourselves to continue to serve this community and the Nation in the same high tradition for which this newspaper and Ted Schafers were honored today.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DORN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, with the celebration on March 25, 1956, of Greek Independence Day, it is altogether fitting that we say a few words on the present situation in Cyprus and its relation to Greece and American foreign policy.

The modern Greek nation which arose out of revolt in 1829 from 300 years of Turkish rule has traditionally and consistently been our staunch ally.

President Monroe in December, 1823, in his annual message to the Congress spoke of the revolution in Greece and on December 8, 1823, Daniel Webster submitted the following resolution in the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That provision ought to be made by law, for defraying the expense incident to the appointment of an Agent or Commissioner to Greece, whenever the President shall deem it expedient to make such appointment.[1]

Our Nation, and particularly this House of Representatives, can take great pride in the fact that these official expressions by our Government were the first by any nation in support of the struggle of the Greek people for freedom and independence.

On January 19, 1824, this House of Representatives took the above resolution into consideration and Daniel Webster, in one of his great speeches, spoke on the Greek War of Independence and many of his remarks are pertinent today in relation to the Cyprus question. Webster's interest concerned not the glories of ancient Greece but rather American self-interest. He said:

What I have to say of Greece, therefore, concerns the modern, not the ancient; the living, and not the dead. It regards her, not as she exists in history, triumphant over time, and tyranny, and ignorance; but as she now is, contending, against fearful odds, for being, and for the common privileges of human nature.

* * * We are called upon, by considerations of great weight and moment, to express our opinions upon it. These considerations, I think, spring from a sense of our own duty, our character, and our own interest. * * * Let this be, then * * * purely an American discussion; but let it embrace, nevertheless, everything that fairly concerns America. Let it comprehend, not merely her present advantage, but her permanent interest, her elevated character as one of the free states of the world, and her duty towards those great principles which have hitherto maintained the relative independence of nations, and which have, more especially, made her what she is.[2]

The American self-interest in the Greek fight for freedom is similar to that of our own age—the contest between absolute government and government by consent. At that time the European powers were upholding the "divine right of kings" theory and advocating a forcible maintenance of the status quo which included denouncements of the Greek revolt against Turkish tyranny.

Today in Cyprus the use of force by the British, designed to stifle the demand of the Cypriot people for freedom and self-determination, can only be looked upon with grave misgivings by our Nation. We fought two world wars for the principle of government by consent and over 35,000 Cypriots themselves fought in the British Army in the Second World War for that same principle.

[1] The works of Daniel Webster, vol. III (1869), p. 60.

[2] Ibid., pp. 62–63.

In fact, the British put up posters all over the island after Greece was invaded by the Nazis asking for volunteers to "Fight for Greece and liberty." The present use by the British of strong-arm measures of the most repressive nature, similar to those used by the Nazis and Communists, is repulsive to American traditions and can only lead to further violence and the possible alienation of our NATO ally, Greece.

The British state that Cyprus is strategically important to them and to NATO and the free world which includes Greece and that they cannot abandon their control over the island. Upon examination of the military situation it becomes quite clear that the contention that Cyprus is strategic argues strongly for immediate self-determination for the people of Cyprus rather than for continued colonial rule. The reasoning is quite simple and clear cut. It was pointed out in debates in the House of Commons but Conservative Party policymakers would not listen.

Assume, for the sake of argument, that Cyprus is strategic. First, as previous experience has shown, a base in the midst of a hostile population is a beleaguered bastion. As General Van Fleet has stated in relation to Cyprus, no military base is of much use if it stands "as an island surrounded by a hostile sea"—Time, January 9, 1956, page 26. Put that same base in the midst of a friendly and cooperative people and its strength and efficiency are greatly increased. In this connection it is important to note from the point of view of American interest that Greece and the Greek Cypriots have for years publicly and repeatedly offered Britain bases both in Cyprus and Greece.

Secondly, if the people of Cyprus were given their freedom, the NATO alliance and the free world would have another source of manpower. After Greece was invaded in World War II over 35,000 Greek Cypriots volunteered and fought throughout the world with the British alongside our own troops. This is an important factor which the British simply cannot answer.

The history of modern Greece is the story of the gradual liberation of Greek-inhabited territories. The Ionian Islands, after a long period of struggle, were ceded by Great Britain to Greece in 1863; Crete was liberated from Turkish rule in 1913 after repeated uprisings and the Aegean Islands in 1923. After World War II Italy ceded the Dodecanese. The current struggles of the Cypriots date back to the Turkish occupation. Webster, in his speech, actually commented on the Turkish massacres in Cyprus—The Works of Daniel Webster, volume III, page 84—in which the ranking members of the Greek community were executed on the charge of conspiring with the insurgents in Greece.

American-Greek relations from the birth of the Greek Nation to the present time have been of the highest order. Our official statements of support in 1823 have brought us great dividends. Greece's defeat of Mussolini's troops in the winter of 1940–41 and her famous "No" to Hitler thereby forcing him to

send in his panzer divisions to subdue the Greeks fired the imagination of the free world and is cited by many military analysts as the key to the eventual defeat of the Axis. In the present struggle against communism, Greece, with American aid, defeated the Communist aggressors in a bitter war and dealt tyranny and governments based on absolute power a severe blow. It should be noted that this was the first and only time the Communists have been completely defeated by force of arms.

Today the United States has a continuing interest in the future of Greece. As a military bastion of NATO and as a member of the Balkan Alliance, Greece is our one tried and true ally in the eastern Mediterranean. Having defeated the Communists by force of arms, she stands on Russia's doorstep as a symbol of freedom and determination.

The Greek Cypriots, a mature, highly civilized people, have been petitioning Britain for their freedom from the very first day she occupied the island in 1878. A combination of British inertia, pride, and economic advantage prevents the island from contributing her fighting strength to NATO and keeps the British troops more concerned with controlling the Greek islanders than being prepared for trouble elsewhere. In the case of Cyprus military expediency and political morality combine. The interests of the United States are best served by a policy designed to make the British accept the compromise offer of bases for Britain and self-determination for the people of Cyprus.

FARMERS URGE LEGISLATION TO STRENGTHEN THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives is composed of approximately 5,000 agricultural cooperatives, which carry on cooperatively run business affairs for almost 3 million farm families. This great organization is a powerful and tireless force against monopoly, which is depriving the farmer of his fair share of the national income.

As is to be expected, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives has called for legislation to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act. This organization was one of the first to call for such legislation which has been introduced in H. R. 11.

Last November, when your Small Business Committee was holding hearings on the Robinson-Patman Act, Mr. Homer L. Brinkley, executive vice president of the national council, sent us a statement pointing out at its annual meeting on January 14, 1954, delegate body of the council adopted a resolution calling for legislation to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act.

Farmers know as well as anyone else how monopolies are built. One of the principal weapons of monopoly is price discrimination. By this method the big corporation destroys its local competitors by an unfair means. The method is an abuse of power which destroys the local competitor without respect to efficiency. By this method the national chain buyers coerce small suppliers into granting them discriminatory favors which are not allowed to the competing merchants. The result is destruction of small businesses of all kinds and a centralization of business into the hands of a few corporation giants.

I hope that as many as 218 Members of the House will sign the discharge petition on the Clerk's desk, so that we can call up H. R. 11 and pass it. If we can do this we can give small business some protection against unfair and unwarranted price discriminations.

I am sure that all of the Members will be interested in reading a statement of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives submitted last November. It is as follows:

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES SUBMITTED FOR HEARINGS ON THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT AND RELATED PROBLEMS BEFORE THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, NOVEMBER 4, 1955

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives appreciates the opportunity to present briefly its position and views on the Robinson-Patman Act and related problems to the House Small Business Committee for the special reason that agricultural cooperatives are composed of and serve perhaps the most numerous group of small-business men in America; farmers.

The council is composed of business associations of farmers working together in an effort to obtain a reasonable return for the food and fiber they produce and to procure necessary farm production supplies of good quality at reasonable prices. Almost 3 million small-business men on our farms are striving to protect their economic interests and arrest their dwindling income through the marketing and supply services offered by the approximately 5,000 agricultural cooperatives represented in the council's membership.

The council is strongly committed to the preservation of a competitive economy under private ownership and management, with the minimum of Government control and regulation necessary to protect the public interest. In fact, cooperatives are a form of business organization developed by farmers for the purpose of enabling them to operate on their own all departments of their farm business enterprises, to have an opportunity to compete on equitable terms with other businesses, and to combat the forces of monopoly which in times past, and still today, are depriving the farmer of his fair share of our national income.

Holding to these basic economic tenets and recognizing the dangerous trends toward monopoly and discriminatory practices affecting the economic welfare of farmers, the delegate body of the council at its annual meeting on January 14, 1954, declared its position as to the farmers' interest in the Robinson-Patman Act in the following resolution:

"A number of bills have been introduced in Congress which tend to weaken and even destroy the Robinson-Patman Act and have as their purpose the legalizing of discriminatory practices.

"The Robinson-Patman Act fosters and protects a competitive economy by preserving equality of opportunity for every business to the benefit of all segments of our Nation, including the consuming public.

"Special price concessions and allowances and other discriminatory practices of all kinds are detrimental to our economy.

"The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives is unqualifiedly opposed to any legislation which will in any manner weaken the present Robinson-Patman Act, and strongly urges the adoption of legislation which will prohibit any harmful discriminatory practices."

The council and the farmer are not interested in the legal treatises and involved technical arguments being advanced today with respect to the Robinson-Patman Act. They only becloud and confuse the issue. The farmer is primarily interested in seeing that rules of fair play are observed in the market place and that concentrations of monopolistic power are not permitted to be built up, at his expense, through special deals to a favored few.

The abuse might be in the form of a demand by the large buyer for a special cut in price to be called a brokerage allowance without an actual brokerage service being rendered, or it might be in the form of pretense that the discriminatory discount was for the purpose of meeting competition. The Robinson-Patman Act was enacted to prevent abuses and irregular practices and to guarantee to all businessmen, large and small, agricultural and industrial, an equal opportunity to compete in the sale of their products, goods, and wares.

Some of the destructive competitive practices of which the farmer was the victim in the years preceding the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act contributed to a significant degree to the need for its enactment. It might well be asked whether today the farmers' economic difficulties in an otherwise generally favorable business climate are not accentuated by enforcement or compliance failures with respect to the competitive rules established by the Robinson-Patman Act. An affirmative answer is self-evident.

It is important to note, as far as agriculture is concerned, the similarity between some of the conditions existing today and conditions in the years just prior to the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act on June 19, 1936. In the years between 1931 and 1935, the farmer's share of the consumer's food-dollar ranged between 32 and 39 percent. From a high of 53 cents in 1945, the farmer's share of the dollar spent by consumers for food has dwindled to the dangerous low of 40 cents—almost to the level of his share in the depression years of the thirties. This means that whereas there are many more dollars being spent for food today, someone else along the line, other than the producer of the food, is getting the major share—60 percent—of the more dollars which the consumers are spending.

Today, in the presence of large surpluses of many farm products, any weakening of the Robinson-Patman Act by statute or administration is bound to have an adverse impact on farm prices through resultant increase in the buying pressure from large buying units for special price reductions. In the days before the Robinson-Patman Act, a large buyer would often demoralize the market by demanding an unearned and unjustified allowance not accorded buyers of like quantities and refusing to buy unless he could get a special discount. Prices of agricultural products can never be stabilized at a reasonable level in such a competitive environment. Those responsible to the farmer for marketing his products and making an accounting to him know the aggravating and harmful impact upon agricultural prices and the net returns to farmers resulting from the destructive practice of driving the market down by demanding special price concessions without legal or economic justification. Any further weakening of the rules of fair competition provided by the Robinson-Patman Act, either by legislation or administration, can only result in further intensifying the serious cost-price squeeze in which the farmer is caught today. Farmers are selling, and have to sell, their prod-

ucts in a market in which the competitive forces of supply and demand operate with maximum freedom; they have to buy their production supplies and necessities of life in a highly inflexible market characterized by rigid wage structures and other rigid price-making factors.

It is a strange paradox that the earnings of 9 of the largest farm equipment companies as reported in the New York Times of October 23, 1955, showed their profits up 29 percent for the first 6 months of 1955 compared with the same period of 1954 while farmers' realized net income declined 9 percent from the 1954 to the 1955 periods.

Agricultural prices and income have declined seriously since the spring of 1952, and have little prospect for significant improvement in the foreseeable future.

The parity ratio—the index of prices received divided by the index of prices paid by farmers—stood at 100 in 1952. In June of 1955 it was down to 86, the lowest level in 14 or 15 years; and since then it has gone down still further. Gross farm income declined by $3 billion, or by 8 percent, in the past 3 years. In the same period production expenses dropped but slightly so that farm operators' realized net income was reduced by almost $3 billion, or close to 20 percent.

In 1951 the per capita income for the farm population from all sources was $970 a year, compared with $1,735 for the nonfarm population. By 1954 the per capita farm income from all sources had dropped to $907, while the nonfarm income rose to $1,831 a year.

Between 1940 and 1954 net farm income increased only 178 percent while nonfarm income increased 263 percent. In the same period the farm income proportion of the national income decreased 23.5 percent.

It is ironical that in the presence of such facts, some members, unidentified, of the Attorney-General's Antitrust Committee, advocate subjecting farmer cooperatives, which means the farmers who compose and are served by them, to additional antitrust coverage while seeking to have the law's antitrust restraints relaxed with respect to other types of business organizations in our economy. Do they not know that a matter of major national concern today is the continued downward trend of the price of farm products?

We certainly would not contend or imply that the Robinson-Patman Act, or any of our antitrust laws, can supply a complete answer for the problems of agriculture. We do believe, however, that discounts which discriminate against the farmer in the products he has to sell and the supplies he must buy can only serve to aggravate his serious economic plight. For that reason alone, any weakening by legislation or administration of the Robinson-Patman Act, whose objective is to prohibit discriminatory discounts, and promote fair competition, would certainly be contrary to the interest of agriculture and the public generally.

CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, after a wait for leadership and assistance from the White House the Congress has finally had to act on civil-rights legislation. Members of this House, I am happy to say, are now acting vigorously. A resolution has been introduced by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] which directs the Rules Committee to discharge the Judiciary Committee from the consideration of the omnibus civil-rights bill, H. R. 627, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. That bill does much to help see to it that all citizens get the full rights which the Constitution says are theirs. It guarantees protection of citizens from violence on account of race or color, it outlines and prohibits discriminatory practices in employment, housing, education, and other fields. H. R. 627 guarantees the right of citizens to vote, and establishes a Commission on Civil Rights, a thing the President advocates.

As soon as the requisite seven legislative days have elapsed, a discharge petition will be filed by my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] to discharge the Rules Committee from the consideration of his resolution, and, of course, to bring the principal measure, H. R. 627, to the floor of the House for consideration.

"I am one of the sponsors of that bill, and of other civil rights legislation, and I rejoice that action is finally being taken to protect the rights of American citizens wherever they may be and whatever may be their circumstances. Too long has this action waited, and too long have our people waited to claim the full rights which the Constitution grants. It is regrettable that the only action taken to date by the White House on the grave problem of guaranteeing the rights of all our citizens, was a promise in the State of the Union message that later in the year the White House would come forward with a request for legislation establishing a commission to study the general question of civil rights.

"While there is some slight validity to the President's assumption that such a commission alone will be of help to the citizens of this country in solving the problems which exist, nevertheless, government by study commission is but government of delay. It is axiomatic here in Washington that when you do not want to do something which the people want that you appoint a commission to study the problem. By the time the commission completes its study and makes its report the public clamor has probably long since died down. Also, if the commission does come forward with unpopular recommendations they do not reflect on any one but the commission. Furthermore, the whole matter of civil rights has been the subject of many very thorough studies. Any number of organizations, universities, and commissions have available any information the President might wish. We know the problem, and we know the cure.

Moreover, the White House must take its legitimate, vigorous part in this action. It may not sit back while citizens, churches, Congress, and the Supreme Court grapple with the problem.

There are a number of bills pending which will properly go a long way toward solving the problem. Along with many others, I am the sponsor of antilynch legislation, antipoll-tax legislation, legislation to establish a code of compulsory Federal fair-employment practices and, of course, the bill which we are preparing to bring to the floor of the House.

We were assured early in January that specific recommendations would be forthcoming from the White House on this most critical subject. Yet to date a long violent 2½ months later nothing has been accomplished. The delay has caused us to reach a point where unless action is taken now, nothing will come out of this session of Congress because of filibuster by opponents of civil-rights legislation.

In a news conference last week, the President called for moderation with progress. I am a moderate. I want progress, and I am willing to act to see to it that progress is made in this subject by concrete legislative action, and I expect others to behave in the same manner. Further, I propose to see to it that the Congress gets started on the subject now.

The President's position seems to be to wait, to let individual citizens, the churches, the Congress, and the Supreme Court struggle with these difficult problems facing the people of this country. The position of the President seems to be much like that of one who stands sympathetically by as an interested spectator while a husband and wife fight a bloody intra-family battle.

I for one would welcome the help of the President in this fight to guarantee to all Americans the rights which we regard as inalienable. I renew my call upon the President to furnish the leadership which we need in this fight. However, it appears that it is not his disposition to lead, nor worse yet, even to follow.

These bills which are before the Congress are adequate to meet the legislative needs of the problem. As we all know, there are a multitude of other aspects of the problem which will take longer to solve. Those other things we can work on now and when the legislation which we know is needed is passed.

I have outlined what I regard as an adequate approach to the problem of civil rights.

I call upon the President to give to the country that vigorous leadership which only a strong President can give. Nay, I demand that he give that leadership, and that he cease relying upon the actions of others, the Supreme Court, the Congress, and citizens to carry out unassisted what is properly and constitutionally also a function of the Chief Executive.

As a basis for that action I urge the following program upon the President.

First. That he order the Department of Justice to immediately commence vigorous enforcement of existing civil rights laws such as sections 241, 242, and 594 of title 18 of the United States Code. These laws will give substantial protection to Negro citizens in their effort to exercise their just rights to vote, and a limited measure of security from violence.

Second. That he immediately summon to Washington all United States attorneys for a conference to establish and outline a uniform program of enforcement of these statutes, title 18, United States Code, sections 241, 242,

and 594, in all parts of the land, north and south alike. At that conference the various United States attorneys should be advised that existing civil rights laws are not being uniformly enforced to the satisfaction of the White House, and that a policy be established and announced to those United States attorneys at that time regarding proper enforcement of laws pertaining to violence which stems from race discord and the full protection of the right of citizens to vote.

Third. That the President forthwith shall endorse H. R. 627 and other bills pending, which guarantee protection of the citizens' basic rights and the objectives of the group of Members of the House who are seeking passage of this legislation. To immediately throw the entire prestige of the White House behind the bill, H. R. 627, and to use his position as head of the Republican Party to secure fullest cooperation of all Repulbican Members in this endeavor.

Fourth. To call a White House Conference on Civil Rights to be made up of members of all groups, among them, political, labor, and business of all shades of belief on this most pressing issue to explore the problems of the present situation and to determine methods of dealing with this tense and explosive situation.

Fifth. To immediately throw the full power of his high office behind an effort to limit debate in the Senate so that such a bill as this has a chance to pass not only the House, but the Senate, and so to become law.

Sixth. To stop by administrative action the flow of Federal funds into areas where it is used to support segregation in schools and other discriminatory and unconstitutional practices. He should announce that no Federal funds will be sent into areas where such practices are carried out, in disregard of the Constitution and in open defiance of the Supreme Court.

In conclusion I say this: Many of our citizens of all races have recognized that America in her role as leader of the free world dare not be guilty of practices which it condemns in the slave world. The Supreme Court, to its eternal credit, has acted. Members of the Congress are beginning to act and will act more strongly I hope. I pray that it will be said that the executive has joined strongly in a great and victorious battle against this great wrong to our citizens who have no fault other than color or racial origin.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 15 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN and to include extraneous matter which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $240.

Mr. FORRESTER and to include an article appearing in Look magazine and an editorial by James Gray.

Mr. JENKINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts on Greek Independence Day.

Mr. WILLIS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matters.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 27, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1664. A letter from the president, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting the sixth annual report of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, pursuant to section 7 of the act of March 16, 1950, as amended by Public Law 272, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 366); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1665. A letter from the Chief Scout Executive, National Council Boy Scouts of America, transmitting the 46th annual report of the Boy Scouts of America for the year 1955, pursuant to the act of June 15, 1916, entitled "An act to incorporate the Boy Scouts of America and for other purposes" (H. Doc. No. 367); to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1666. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration relative to reporting a violation occurring at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Cleveland, Ohio, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1667. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Dorothy E. Green and Thelma L. Alley"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1668. A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the Eighth Annual Report of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1669. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the report of the long-range planning phase of the school-facilities survery, pursuant to Public Law 815, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1670. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics); transmitting the annual report relative to the disposal of foreign excess property for calendar year 1955, pursuant to section 404 (d), title IV, of Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1671. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, and a general schedule covering records proposed for disposal by the Government agency indicated, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380) as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1672. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380) as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1673. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Sam B. Davis, Jr., which, when executed by the Superintendent, Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, will authorize him to conduct pack- and saddle-horse operations in the Cedar Grove area, Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., during a 5-year period beginning January 1, 1956, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1674. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the following claim: *Kansas or Kaw Tribe of Indians, et al., Plaintiffs*, v. *The United States of America, Defendant* (Docket No. 38), pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U. S. C. 70); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1675. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional information relative to the case of Henoch Woloch (Wologh) A-7988113, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1676. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional information relative to the case of Su Jan Lee, A-8015062, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1677. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, to provide nonoccupational group major medical expense insurance for Federal employees and their dependents, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1678. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting the Cost ascertainment report for the fiscal year 1955; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1679. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a reduction in the amount of $13 million and drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to appropriations for the fiscal year 1957 for the Department of Commerce, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 365); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1680. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill for the relief of Walter C. Jordan and Elton W. Johnson"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9838. A bill to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1945). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5478. A bill to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1946). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5274. A bill extending to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1948). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1949. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports on committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 513. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built cargo vessels and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1947). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 10157. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 10158. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 10159. A bill to provide reimbursement for certain intangible business losses suffered by owners and tenants of land acquired for navigation, flood control, or related water development projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 10160. A bill to remove certain restrictions with respect to those educational institutions which an Indian student can attend at the expense of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 10161. A bill to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 10162. A bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIES:

H. R. 10163. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to include assets of United States Government in daily statements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 10164. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 10165. A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10166. A bill to protect the civil rights of individuals by establishing a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government, a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, and a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, to strengthen the criminal laws protecting the civil rights of individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10167. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10168. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10169. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 10170. A bill to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 10171. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that no penalty shall be imposed for failure to deposit certain taxes in Government depositaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10172. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to evaluate and to waive collection of certain financial assistance loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 10173. A bill to clarify the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the definitions of sale price and price readjustment for purposes of the manufacturers and retailers excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 10174. A bill to clarify the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the definitions of sale price and price readjustment for purposes of the manufacturers and retailers excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 10175. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 10176. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 10177. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing may be imported into the United States free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 10178. A bill amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 10179. A bill to require the furnishing of a medical history to individuals who have served in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 10180. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to authorize the suspension of certain real-estate brokers from the loan-guaranty program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 10181. A bill to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 10182. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102), as amended, for the purpose of extending the time in which payments are to be made to members of the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10183. A bill to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 10184. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey property to the county of Pierce, Wash.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 10185. A bill to amend section 6 of the Safety Appliance Act of March 2, 1893, as amended, so as to increase the penalty for violations of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 10186. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of Federal funds payable thereunder to States which have approved plans for old-age assistance and which maintain their expenditures for such assistance at or above the 1955 level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 10187. A bill to include certain lands of the United States within the Nevada National Forest, Nev., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 10188. A bill to provide for payments by the United States to local educational agencies from the proceeds of sales of federally owned land; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIES:

H. Res. 445. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies and investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting enactment of long-range legislation which will correct the individual inequities which do now exist in great numbers in this State, which will allow our Alabama cotton farmers to exist at least on a reasonable and sound economic basis in the continued production of cotton, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 10189. A bill for the relief of the Far Eastern Broadcasting Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 10190. A bill for the relief of Michael S. Tilimon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 10191. A bill for the relief of Comdr. Cook Cleland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 10192. A bill for the relief of Orville G. Everett and Mrs. Agnes H. Everett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 10193. A bill for relief of Mary Arce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 10194. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz Puzianowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10195. A bill for the relief of Franciszek Matte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 10196. A bill for the relief of Estela Marina Ries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 10197. A bill for the relief of Vartuhi Parsejian de Carpenter (also known as Rosa Carpenter); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 10198. A bill for the relief of Maria Baricelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 10199. A bill for the relief of A. O. Nissen and Don Nissen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 10200. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Olga Juliana Liepins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 10201. A bill for the relief of Gilbert B. Mar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 10202. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Capaldo (or Capaldi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 10203. A bill for the relief of Miss Etus Ziga, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 10204. A bill authorizing the Commandant of the Coast Guard to transfer certain land to Richard M. Tinney and John T. O'Connor, Jr.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 10205. A bill for the relief of Antonio Contreras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

746. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Tioga Point Council No. 206, Daughters of America, Athens, Pa., opposing any change in the Walter-McCarran Immigration Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

747. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 28 members of Enright Schrader Unit No. 73, American Legion Auxiliary, Tama, Iowa, urging that favorable consideration be given to H. R. 7886, to liberalize veterans' pensions for non-service connected permanent and total disability; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

748. Also, petition of 11 members of Plainfield, Iowa, Unit No. 472, American Legion Auxiliary, urging that favorable consideration be given to H. R. 7886, to liberalize veterans' pensions for non-service-connected permanent and total disability; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

749. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of the V. F. W. post of Centerville, Iowa, urging the enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for the veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

750. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of R. C. Byers and other citizens of Lawrence County, Mo., urging the immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

751. Also, petition of Dallas L. Williams and others urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

752. Also, petition of S. H. Johnson, et al, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

753. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by the American Academy of General Practice at its Eighth Annual Scientific Assembly in Washington, opposing H. R. 7225, and urging Congress to consider and enact health and welfare legislation only after careful consideration of all medical and social aspects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

754. Also, letter from the city clerk of Kenosha, Wis., advising that on March 19, 1956 the Kenosha City Council voted unanimously to express their desire to have everything possible done to increase the benefits of old age pensioners due to the fact that their compensations are set, and causes an undue hardship in meeting the rising cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

755. By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana: Petition of veterans of World War I urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

756. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Hubbs and Miner Ditch Co., Porterville, Calif., requesting immediate appropriation of the initial funds necessary for the commencement of construction of Success Dam, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

757. Also, petition of the secretary, Poplar Irrigation Co., Porterville, Calif., requesting immediate appropriation of the initial funds necessary for the commencement of the construction of Success Dam, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

758. Also, petition of the grand knight, Joan of Arc Council, No. 1992, Knights of Columbus, Port Jefferson, Long Island, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing their support of House Joint Resolution 309 and Senate Joint Resolution 94; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

759. Also, petition of the president, Honolulu Business and Professional Women's Club, Honolulu, T. H., relative to requesting the amendment of the Hawaiian Organic Act so as to provide for reapportionment of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

760. Also, petition of the assistant city clerk, Los Angeles, Calif., urging passage of H. R. 8836, providing for the construction or improvement of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, etc.; to the Committee on Public Works.

761. Also, petition of the chairman, Metropolitan Transportation Engineering Board, Los Angeles, Calif., urging passage of H. R. 8836, providing for the construction or improvement of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Great Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, there is located in southern Ohio, on the edge of my congressional district, a gigantic atomic-energy plant. I was very much interested in the decision of the Government in deciding to locate this enormous plant in our section of the State.

It took several months to build this great plant. At one time during the building of the plant there were about 25,000 workers employed. They finished the plant sooner than they expected, and thereby saved the Government more than $400 million. This was such an unusual matter that it was commented on in the papers very extensively.

One of the principal reasons was that there were no strikes called at any time during the construction. The friendly relations that existed at all times between the contractors and the workers led these two groups to decide to have a big celebration. This was done, and there were hundreds of people at the celebration, which was addressed by the Secretary of Labor. In other words, fair dealing brought faithful work from those employed, and the Government saved more than $400 million.

I was proud of the fact that I had something to do with encouraging and planning for this big celebration.

I am glad to report that from all indications there is a fine spirit prevailing in that section that will continue for a long time.

REA's Rural Telephone Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, in the storied Evangeline country of Louisiana where most of our French speaking population are direct descendants of the Acadians, we are adding a new sign of progress to our landscape. My constituents in St. Martin Parish are getting modern dial telephone service on their farms through loan funds furnished the Breaux Bridge Telephone Co. by the Rural Electrification Administration. Mr. Earl J. Conrad is president and manager of the telephone company. In that connection I quote from a letter I received from Mr. Conrad:

I want to comment on my decision to seek financing through the REA program. Contrary to the feeling on the part of some who sought such financing, I never had any misgivings about the financing through a Government agency.

I purchased this company in 1942 at which time we had 250 subscribers. Most of these were in the town of Breaux Bridge. We had a multiparty circuit running from Breaux Bridge to Cecilia and one such circuit to Parks. At Arnaudville we had a small dial exchange serving some 32 subscribers there. I might say that at that time the Breaux Bridge exchange consisted of an outmoded magneto board.

I have always been an advocate of electric and telephone service to the people who live in rural areas. However, I soon found that my lifetime savings, revenues of the company, a $50,000 loan at 5 percent from suppliers of equipment on a 5-year basis, a $50,000 loan from individual sources, all were insufficient to completely do the job. I further found that rates granted to an independent telephone company are not consistent with short-term high-interest financing. Therefore, I turned to REA for financing.

The Rural Electrification Administration has certain policies, such as equity requirements, engineering, minimum construction requirements, and area coverage. I subscribe wholeheartedly with all of them. These requirements are for the best interest of my company and have caused me no trouble.

We cut over the new system on February 25, 1956, with some 1,450 subscribers, 300 of which were rural and had never had telephone service before. With funds available we plan to serve another 400 rural subscribers out of Breaux Bridge, Cecilia, Parks, and Arnaudville Exchanges.

The use of REA loan funds to make the farm a better place on which to live is nothing new to the farmers of St. Martin Parish. For a long time, they have been getting their electricity from the Southwest Louisiana Electric Membership Corp. which is described as the country's largest rural electric association.

The Breaux Bridge Telephone Co. is 1 of the 17 independent telephone companies in Louisiana which has borrowed money from REA to put modern telephones on the farm.

One cannot help but be a little amazed that in an age of atoms, electronics, jet planes, and other scientific miracles, that something so fundamental as effective telephone conversation has so long been delayed in reaching all the farms of America. Not to be able to have clear and quick communications with relatives and neighbors and market centers is to have an artificial wall around our farms. Many of our farmers with radio and television are in the position of hearing the world talk to them without being able to talk back.

It is a matter of great pride to me that the independent telephone companies of Louisiana have recognized that REA loan funds offer a great opportunity to modernize our links of communication. Town and country are to be tied closer together in both our languages.

The 17 Louisiana companies now using REA loan funds have set out to remedy the telephone situation for more than 21,000 farmers. As of now, they have borrowed a little over $9.5 million from REA to improve and extend rural service. Rural people in approximately 25 parishes in the State will be affected. Line construction and the installation of new dial exchanges will provide employment for hundreds of our working people. In many instances Main Street and the parish farm will be able to talk business with each other for the first time.

What is happening in Louisiana is happening in 43 other States and Alaska. REA has allocated close to $276 million to 419 rural telephone borrowers. The borrowers represent independent, cooperative, and mutual telephone organizations. The loan funds mean improved or first-time telephone service to more than 600,000 rural residents. It means the construction of more than 164,000 miles of new telephone line.

Despite the good start that has been made in REA's rural telephone program, a great deal yet remains to be accomplished. The 1954 Census of Agriculture, released around the first of the year, shows that only 48.8 percent of the farms in the United States have telephones. And we have no way of determining how many of those with phones have adequate service. The telephone figure contrasts sharply with that for rural electrification. Around 94 percent of our farms now have central station electric service.

The percentage of farms with telephones increased by 10 percent between 1950 and 1954. In Louisiana the increase was from 11 to nearly 26 percent. In five other States, the percentage also doubled.

REA's telephone-loan program stems from an amendment to the REA Act in 1949. Loans are made at the rate of 2 percent interest over a period of 35 years. Borrowers are required to put up sufficient equity capital of their own. The purpose of this is to help secure the Government loan to make sure that the owners of the telephone system will have a real interest in competent management and operation.

During 1955 REA made 188 loans to telephone borrowers in the amount of $66,808,000. Borrowers using REA financing for the first time numbered 99. The loan activity during the calendar year meant extension and improvement of telephone service to some 135,000 farms and rural establishments.

The future of rural telephony appears to be brighter each year. I count myself and my neighbors as being most fortunate to have a progressive organization like the Breaux Bridge Telephone Co. to provide our farms with modern dial telephone service.

Peaceful Coexistence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Communist propaganda maneuver of peaceful coexistence has been pretty well exposed in recent months. Communist Party boss Khrushchev in a 6-hour directive to the 20th so-called congress meeting of the Communist Party in the Kremlin, removed any doubts that may have remained concerning the Russian trickery involved in their campaign of peaceful coexistence. Khrushchev defined the tactic of peaceful coexistence as a vastly stepped up Communist propaganda, economic, political, and cultural offensive against all of civilization. He directed that the usual Communist methods of violence be used only in those countries where the resistance to communism is strong, and that in the neutralist nations, Communist agents use the deception of the popular front and the misuse of parliamentary methods in order to take over control. Khrushchev made it crystal clear that the United States is marked for violent internal treatment by the Communist conspiracy rather than the conciliatory and friendly approach the Kremlin leaders have been claiming to have for the people of the United States.

I should like to take this occasion to remind my colleagues and the American people that only a relatively few weeks ago some American leaders were suggesting that we extend the friendly hand to the Communist proposal of peaceful coexistence and that we could not possibly lose by giving it a try. I trust such unsupported hopes have now vanished against Communist Party boss Khrushchev's reading his ultimatum to the world.

Early last fall I was asked a number of questions by a European publication put out by the anti-Bolshevik bloc of nations. These questions had to do with peaceful coexistence. These same questions were put to President Singman Rhee, of Korea, Lord Robert Vansittart,

Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller, Mr. John F. Stewart, and President Ku Cheng-kang.

The answers to these questions were printed in the October edition of the A. B. N. Bulletin and I believe they are most pertinent today in view of what Communist Party boss Krushchev had to say about the realities of peaceful coexistence with the Russian Communists.

I, therefore, under unanimous consent, ask to have these answers printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

OUR INTERVIEWS: COEXISTENCE OR A POLICY OF LIBERATION?—PRESIDENT SYNGMAN RHEE, LORD ROBERT VANSITTART, MAJ. GEN. J. F. C. FULLER, MR. JOHN F. STEWART, CONGRESSMAN MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, AND PRESIDENT KU CHENG-KANG EXPRESS THEIR OPINION ON THE BURNING QUESTIONS OF THE DAY

As was to be expected, the Geneva Conference failed to clear up the present confusion in the international political situation. The unfortunate and erroneous opinion which is held by various Western statesmen on the subject of the coexistence policy prompts us to discuss the most interesting problems connected with the change in Soviet tactics, in the columns of our A. B. N. Correspondence. Accordingly, we addressed ourselves to various prominent personalities in the free world and asked them to give us their opinion, in the form of an interview, on the burning political questions of the day. They most kindly complied with our request, and we are now, therefore, in a position to start this series of interviews, as planned, and have pleasure in publishing the six interviews to reach us, which come from well-known personalities in all the world.

These interviews are published in the order in which we have received them.

QUESTIONS PUT IN THE INTERVIEWS

Question 1: What is your opinion of the Geneva Conference and the aims of the Soviets in connection with this Conference?

Question 2: Do you share the opinion of the majority of responsible politicians in the West, that the Soviets have abandoned their plans to rule the whole world?

Question 3: Do you think that the coexistence policy is an effective means of preventing an atomic war?

Question 4: Do you consider that the conception of the A. B. N. is right in maintaining that national revolutions in the Soviet sphere of influence would be the way to avert an atomic war?

Question 5: Which policy would you suggest to the statesmen of the Western World, in order to check the advance of Russian imperialism, that is to say to confine it within Russian ethnographical boundaries, and to bring about the liberation of all the nations that have been subjugated by Russia?

Question 6: Do you think that the October conference of the Foreign Ministers is likely to lead to any positive results in this respect?

Question 7: What is your opinion of the military and political situation in the U. S. S. R.?

Question 8: Do you think the assumption correct, that the Soviets have resorted to their coexistence policy under pressure of the national fight for freedom of the subjugated nations and under pressure of the economic crisis and the unsettled conditions in the Kremlin, and in order to put a stop to the resistance movements and to overrun the Western World, once they have managed to gain a breathing space?

Question 9: What is your opinion of the present situation in Asia in view of the Russo-Chinese coexistence policy and the hireling role of Nehru's India?

Question 10: What is your opinion of the significance of the national liberation movements behind the Iron Curtain, in the world fight against Bolshevism?

Question 11: In view of the present international political situation what tasks would you assign to the A. B. N. in the free world?

THE FREE WORLD MUST BE READY AND WILLING TO FIGHT

(By Syngman Rhee, President of the Republic of Korea)

1. In my opinion the Geneva conference was successful for the Communists in that they succeeded in selling the free world the idea of a bogus soft peace. They are making great propaganda use of photographs and newsreel footage showing "Summit" figures smiling together in friendly relationship, thus leading captive populations of satellites and their own brain-chained people to believe that the democracies have made peace with communism and have abandoned intentions of liberating them. To counteract this widely accepted belief, President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon have publicly declared that the United States will not accept a status quo peace, but will insist that Germany and Korea must be reunified under governments of their own choosing. I regard any negotiations with the Communists as simply opportunities to make concessions to them and to sign agreements which they have no intention of keeping.

The Foreign Ministers' Conference cannot inspire much hope of success with the alternative course already ruled out before it convenes. I believe it is essentially wrong to approach the problems with a preliminary announcement of a determination to be friendly and an absolute renunciation of force, no matter what happens.

Russia and Red China have blood on their hands. They have murdered millions of innocent persons. They have broken solemn promises. They hold people prisoner and occupy stolen territory with the arrogance of the ruthless and powerful. They have not repudiated their goal of world conquest. Action, not words, is called for.

2. I do not believe that free world statesmen honestly believe the Communists have changed their spots. The Reds have added 800 million captives to their empire in the last decade and have bluffed the United States and the United Nations into negotiating an unsatisfactory truce in Korea and surrendering millions of Indochinese into Communist hands. Perhaps when things are going badly an aggressor might lower his aims, but it is the free world that is on the defensive and that is talking compromise and appeasement.

3. Coexistence could prevent an atomic war. So could outright surrender, but it would be too obvious. Yet coexistence would be only a slower route to the same end.

4. Before answering this question, let me say I dislike use of the terms East and West. We of the Far East are used to these terms in connection with races and do not stress their differences. We do not regard Soviet Russia as East and we do consider ourselves allied with what would be called West. We prefer free world and the Communist bloc or other applicable designations.

The free world must be ready and willing to fight for its own and for the freedom of enslaved peoples; the stage has been passed where words can have any effect. The major problem is how to reestablish this conviction worldwide and harden Allied determination.

I advocate that (1) those countries which are willing should join in a proclamation that areas held unjustly and in violation of treaties are to be liberated by whatever means are required; (2) that an absolute embargo be imposed on all commercial and financial dealings with Communist nations until they keep promises they already have made; (3) that the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission, which allows Poles and Czechs to operate as spies in South Korea to prepare the Republic for Communist conquest, be eliminated; (4) that the Communists be warned that no further territorial aggression will be permitted, anywhere; (5) that withdrawal of Communist forces from areas south of the 38th parallel in Korea be ordered, to forestall building up of aggressive bases and interference with Han River navigation; (6) that the Bamboo and Iron Curtains be lifted and restrictions on communications be ended; (7) that Communist aims for world domination be openly renounced in word and deed; and (8) that no further conferences be held with the Communist powers other than to confirm agreements already found to be practicable through informal understanding.

5. I would suggest that each government in the still-free world take the issue of freedom or slavery to the people in secret ballot and those countries voting for freedom be willing to fight for it if necessary; in any event they should stand together behind an ultimatum to the Communists as outlined in the reply to the preceding question. I have faith in the people and blame the hesitancy of some free-world leaders on their lack of trust in the people's wisdom and courage.

6. No answer.

7. Like everyone else, I hope that Soviet Russia's political situation is precarious and near total collapse, that a new era—with the people in free, secret elections choosing their government from independent candidates—is imminent. Of course, since Stalin's death there have been changes, but from this distance facts are difficult to weed out from rumors. However, it appears obvious the ruling clique are dyed-in-the-wool followers of the party line; therefore, their personal rivalries are of little importance internationally.

Militarily, great publicity has been given to the announced reduction of Russia's army, effective by the end of this year, of 640,000 men, though nothing was said of the size of the force still mobilized. Intelligence reports reveal Soviet Russia's army still is larger than Britain's and the United States' combined. Further, top United States militarists say Russia's active navy is larger than Britain's and her air force is close to America's strength and constantly growing. Her pile of atomic weapons is sufficient: This in a country that professes to be peace-loving while causing tensions at a dozen scattered points simultaneously.

8. The Russian program of concentrating on heavy industries for the war chest has prevented production of daily necessities, and the public's need might have been an influence in the about-face. However, if by feigned friendliness Russia can obtain imports of things she has not been "wasting" materials and labor on, and at the same time allays free world suspicions to permit a subsequent surprise attack, it would be logical. I would not want enslaved peoples to expose themselves to execution by premature rebellion—as happened more than once—and thus prolong the tyrants in power. But from what I have learned from ex-captives of the Communist in Korea, there is deep unrest everywhere behind the Iron Curtain, smoldering under suspicion and fear of detection through the insidious secret police and informer upheaval. More confidence must be built up in the necessary help of the free world powers, and such confidence is dependent upon their determination.

9. I expect the crisis in the world situation to be reached in Asia, not Europe. I hope the United States will awaken to the dangers of coexistence and I feel that some of her allies are responsible for what concessions she has made to date. It now appears that pressure to get Red China a seat in the United Nations has abated and no effort will be made to do so for another year. This smacks of a secret agreement, in that Chinese Communists'

hands are still dripping blood and the free world would not consent to admitting an aggressor before he takes time to change his clothes. Further, if through coexistence the Communists can obtain control of the countries they desire peaceably, why should they undertake to fight? Certainly the status quo will not last, nor can we expect a real peace until we repulse and punish the aggressors.

THE SOVIETS HAVE ABANDONED NOTHING

(By Lord Robert Vansittart, P. C., G. C. M. G., G. C. B., M. V. O.)

1. The Geneva Conference was a success for the Russians.

2. The Soviets have abandoned nothing, neither their aims nor doctrines.

3. There is no present danger of an atomic war. The Communist propaganda about peaceful coexistence is a soporific rather than a preventive.

4. There could be no greater mistake than to stimulate revolutions without the means of supporting them.

5. The Soviets are now in difficulties. I believe that communism is so inhuman and also in the long run so impracticable that it will ultimately break down. This is the best hope for the liberation of the subjugated nations.

6. Unless there is a complete change in the Russian attitude the conference of Foreign Ministers is unlikely to lead to any appreciable result because—among other reasons—the Russians have already declared that the key topic, Germany, is not "ripe" for discussion.

7. The U. S. S. R. is undergoing a severe crisis of manpower.

8. Owing to this crisis the Soviets are in no position to wage a war and are therefore playing for time.

9. The Chinese Communists are no more sincere than the Russian Communists in their talk about peaceful coexistence, though the doctrine suits them well for the present. The absence of sincerity is well illustrated by the fact that they have now been talking for nearly 3 weeks with the Americans about the liberation of prisoners—a question which could easily have been settled in a day.

10. I am not in a position to judge with sufficient knowledge and authority.

11. Continue the process of enlightenment. There is nothing else to be done at present.

THE COEXISTENCE OF VIOLENT INCOMPATIBLES IS THE FATHER OF WAR

(By Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller, C. B., C. B. E., D. S. O.)

1. The factor which governed the Geneva Conference was the H-bomb. Now that both sides have it, neither dares to use it unless its national survival is directly threatened. This means that the H-bomb is not a deterrent of all types of war, but only of one type—the war for which it is made. Therefore, in another war, as long as the national survival of one or other of the groups of belligerents is not challenged, there is nothing to prevent the recurrence of conventional warfare. According to the policy recently made public by the Kremlin, the Russian aim is clearly defined. It is the withdrawal of the NATO forces from Western Germany; and it may be assumed that in the intimate conversations it was argued that, faced as these forces would be by atomic war, their value was highly problematical. Further, that were Russia to invade Western Germany, she would at once be faced with the H-bomb. But would she? For the snag in this argument is that such a move, which in all probability would be made by proxy, as it was in Korea, would not appear to the popular mind of the western democracies to be a threat to their national survival, and therefore not worth the risk of an atomic war. The complete somersault performed by the Kremlin, which has been acclaimed in the West with such puerile enthusiasm, is nothing more than a repetition of Lenin's famous maxim—"1 step back to gain 2 steps forward."

2. On the contrary, my opinion is that Moscow is attempting to fortify and not abandon her plan of world revolution, and though her tactics have changed, her strategy remains constant. We are back to the days when Stalin disbanded the Comintern. Having failed to keep Western Germany unarmed by bluster and threat, the Kremlin has now turned to wooing and cooing. Nevertheless, whether scratching or purring, a cat remains a cat.

3. The coexistence of violent incompatibles is the father of war, whether atomic or otherwise. As Abraham Lincoln said in 1854: "A house divided against itself cannot stand, it cannot endure half slave and half free * * * it will become all one thing or all the other." And this is as applicable to the world in general as to a nation in particular. Further, it is supported by Lenin's prediction of the inevitable clash between the Bourgeois States and the Soviet Union.

4. The problem is not atomic war, it is the Russian dominion of the world either by war or by subversion, and the direct way to avert it is the policy of the A.B.N.—namely to liberate the subjugated and satellite peoples, and thereby annihilate the Muscovite Imperium.

5. The policy I should suggest is: (I) Fix upon the annihilation of the Muscovite Imperium as the long term political aim. (II) Enter into close collaboration with the A. B. N. (III) Create an anti-Communist ccalition of Free Peoples, under a joint political and economic council to coordinate their military requirements and economic needs. Its most important tasks should be: (1) To assess military potentials within the financial means of each nation, and (2) to develop new world markets and so avoid a scramble for trade by individual nations with Russia and her satellites.

6. No. In all probability it will lead to another conference and yet another. "If you do not wish a man to do a thing," once wrote Thomas Carlyle, "you had better get him to talk about it, for the more men talk, the more likely are they to do nothing else." The Russians are adepts in delaying a problem indefinitely by confusing arguments, by verbal acrobatics and double-talk. What they risk losing on the diplomatic swings they make certain of gaining on the propaganda turnabouts.

7. As long as half the personnel of the Russian Army is recruited from the subjugated peoples, Russia's military strength is extremely fragile. And as long as this remains so, the political situation within the U. S. S. R. will be precarious. The strength of a fortress does not only lie in its walls, but above all in the determination and loyalty of its garrison. The Kremlin is not blind to this, hence the constant deviations in its political tactics.

8. Yes. I have nothing to add to this clear summary of the Soviet position.

9. For some time to come China will be dependent on Russia for military and economic support. But as she becomes more and more industrialized, the present coexistence of compatible political systems will give way to friction between ever-increasing incompatibles. It therefore behoves the western nations to elaborate a long-term policy toward China. Western policy should aim at detaching China from Russia. At present the short-sighted American support of Chiang-kai Shek bedevils the issue. As to Nehru, little attention should be paid to him, he is no more than a slippery oriental eel wriggling on a volcano—the ever-increasing over-population of India.

10. The significance of these movements is that they are the main weapons the West should sharpen in order to overthrow the Bolshevik imperium.

11. I should first create a western psychological warfare general staff as the military instrument of the joint political and economic council (see answer 5). Secondly, I should rope in the A. B. N. as a section of its intelligence and operational staffs. Its task would be to collect all possible information on conditions behind the Iron Curtain, and suggest plans of how to stimulate opposition in the occupied and subjugated countries, as well as elaborate schemes for the day when the time is ripe for open revolt.

COEXISTENCE BETWEEN COMMUNISM AND CIVILIZATION IS IMPOSSIBLE

(By John F. Stewart, chairman of the Scottish League for European Freedom)

1. My opinion of the Geneva Conference is that it was a social event, a glorified picnic at the expense of the taxpayers of the various countries. The reason that the Russians attended was to gain more time—their usual need. They also wanted to demonstrate to the subjugated peoples the extreme friendliness and support of the western nations for themselves. As far as my information goes, the unrest in the non-Russian peoples of the U. S. S. R. and the satellite countries was getting beyond the power of the MVD to crush. Nothing could have helped Moscow more than adding to the depression and loss of hope of these peoples than the show of western friendliness; it makes it much easier for the MVD to cope with the unrest. The Russians knew they wanted that and they maneuvered the West into supplying the weapon. Sir Anthony Eden added strength to the weapon by proposing his pact of security, thus enabling Russia to hold on to all her plunder and making the West an accomplice in the oppression.

2. I am quite certain that Moscow has never abandoned for a moment the intention to conquer the world, and I doubt if many "responsible politicians believe it. But none has the courage to speak out, but obediently obeys the party whip. The friendly attitude of Sir Anthony Eden to the most atrocious power this world has known is beyond my ability to explain.

3. I do not believe coexistence is possible or that the Russians intend it. Coexistence between communism and civilization is impossible, for one would perish. The phrase was invented by Lenin with the usual Russian objective of gaining time for some subjugating plan he had in mind, and was not quite ready for. In any case, no atom or any other policy will prevent war—it never has. Each nation is feverishly trying to provide more and more effective weapons than any other, showing that, in reality, none trusts Russia. And, as far as I have ever read, there has never been an arms race in history which has not ended in war.

4. I have always held the opinion that disintegration from within the U. S. S. R. is the only way to avoid a world war, and the only way to accomplish this is by national revolutions within the Soviet Union; these revolutions must take place within all the countries dominated by Moscow, whether formally within the union or not. I believe that, with a sane and firm western policy, they would succeed.

5. Russia professes to be horrified at the policy of other powers of colonialism. The civilized powers should insist on Russia applying this policy of anticolonialism to themselves. In past days, colonialism by the white powers meant taking control of immeasurably inferior races, and, as far as my long experience goes, and I have had much, it was for the uplifting of these races. In the case of the Soviet Union, they apply the policy, in a brutal form, to races far in advance of themselves in civilization, culture, and all that is human, and try to bring all down to a level never before thought of.

The western powers should see that Russia gives the only possible test of sincerity by at once and completely evacuating every Russian soldier and civilian from every non-Russian country it dominates and leaves it completely free and independent. The Russians should be confined to their own large ethnographic country and turn their attention to developing it. Till then they should be outside the pale—not accepted in the family of civilized nations. There is no other way of bringing peace to the world.

6. The meeting in October of the foreign ministers will have no result other than gaining more time for Russia or the West making another disastrous surrender to Moscow. Personally I believe there will be nothing but further procrastination.

7. I am not an expert in military affairs. But my opinion, for what it is worth, is that Russia is not at the moment strong, although she professes to be. She is quite aware of the internal weakness by the non-Russians and the fact that the non-Russians in the Red Army will not fight for Moscow if their countries are assured of independence, and in this the West can help by even moral support. Pilsudski, who knew the Russians if anyone did, said "When the Russians say they are strong, they are weak; when they say they are weak, they are strong." Politically, the U. S. S. R. is weak internally.

8. I think the assumption stated is absolutely correct. To my mind there cannot be a doubt that the present gracious policy of Moscow is caused by the national fight for freedom inside the U. S. S. R. and under pressure of the economic crisis, and, I believe, a struggle in the Kremlin for sole power. And also to weaken the resistance movements. The present gracious and conciliatory showing of the Russians is as clearly as possible Lenin's "one step backward to gain two steps forward." The theatrical proceedings at Geneva were the one step backward, and it is difficult to believe that grown men could be so deluded.

9. I am afraid my opinion on the situation in Asia would not be of great value. I believe that Nehru is, at the very best, a dangerous demagog of great value to Moscow. I sympathize with Dr. Syngman Rhee and his South Korea, which has been deserted by the West, while the North Koreans, that is, the Russians, are building up strength for an attack on the South. China has been betrayed by the West to the Communists. I do not know China, but I have many friends who have spent a lifetime there in business or missionary work, and all agree that the Chinaman is the reverse of a Communist, and that the great population of the Chinese peasants has been subjugated by an insignificant number of Communists supported from Moscow.

10. If there is any sincere desire among western politicians to conquer communism, which I doubt, the national liberation movement behind the Iron Curtain is the key, and the only key, to accomplish that end. All other talk is mere drivel.

11. Beside the modest Scottish League, A. B. N. is the only organization in the world, as far as I know, on the right lines to bring freedom and peace to the world. It has many enemies, some of them professing to work for similar objects. I do not see it can improve the lines on which it works unless it were able to put an end to the insane jealousies which, unfortunately, exist within every single nationality in exile. This is ruinous and defeats the struggle for freedom. If A. B. N. could induce all nationalities to cooperate for the one object—the restoration of independence to all—it would accomplish half its undoubted aim. After they had independence, they could form their different parties, but surely the one single object just now is independence. I am sure that if all would unite it would make a tremendous impression on the Western World and would be difficult to oppose. Disunion on comparative trifles is one of the best weapons in the Soviet arsenal.

THE A. B. N. SHALL CONTINUE THE ADVOCACY OF THE NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE MOVEMENT

(By Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN)

I feel these are good questions because they go right to the basic issues which we Members of Congress must face up to in the dispatch of our duties toward our constituents and our Nation. In every sense of the word, I consider that your questions have created the basis for an interview and therefore the answers to them are in the attachment to this letter.

Permit me to take this occasion to wish you and your colleagues every success in your efforts to expose and to destroy the menace of communism and to bring to the suffering people of all the Communist occupied nations the blessings of individual liberty and governments representative of the will of the people expressed by the secret ballot and through the multiple party system.

1. Before the convening of the Geneva Conference on June 5, 1955, I made my views public on the floor of Congress as to what I thought the aims of the Russian Communists would be at that Conference and what position I felt the United States representatives should therefore take. My statement in this matter is as follows—

First, we must regard such a conference as nothing more than an opportunity for us to spell out for the entire world what we stand for and what we stand against. In this connection, we should make it clear that we stand for the rights of all nations, large and small, to national self-determination, and the natural rights of all people to the basic freedoms. We should make it equally clear that we stand unqualifiedly against any form of colonialism or imperialism and in particular, we will never acquiesce to the new Russian colonialism which is being carried out under the camouflage of Communist imperialism.

Second, as a logical followup to this first condition, we must demand that the Communist-enslaved non-Russian nations be permitted to determine their own destiny by the use of free elections, including multiple political parties, the secret ballot, together with international supervision to guard these basic requirements. If we fail to do otherwise, the good people of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Turkestan, Idel-Ural, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, and Russia will look upon any United States participation in a conference at the so-called summit as the failure of the last great hope of mankind and a sellout of all those moral and political principles which the United States has stood for during the 179 years of our national existence.

Third, the Russians must agree to dismantling and completely removing the Iron Curtain which they have constructed from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean. They must remove the minefields, the barbed wire, the vicious dogs, the special squads of machine-gunners, and all other unnatural barriers which the Russians have concocted in order to divide the world into separate parts. The Russians must agree without reservation that the Iron Curtain is the basic obstacle to true peace and freedom.

Fourth, we must abide by the proven principle of open covenants openly arrived at. There can be no secret understandings reached at such a conference. To insure against this possibility, the administration should avoid being party to any joint communique being issued from such a conference, because the constant Russian demand for unanimity would mean that any joint communique would serve primarily the Kremlin interests. President Eisenhower would be wise to issue his own communique, on a day-to-day basis, covering developments and any successes or failures that might come out of such a conference.

Since the end of the Geneva conference, it is all the more apparent that the Russian Communists sought to use this conference as a means of putting the free world to sleep to gain badly needed time, in order to cope with its most serious internal problems and to cause the free nations to relax their defense efforts—particularly the dismantling of NATO and delaying disarmament of free Germany. In summary, therefore, it is now more clear than ever that the Communists are seeking to lull the free people of the world into a deep slumber because they are now in the weakest position they have ever been in since the days of World War II when the German wehrmacht stood at the gates of Moscow, Stalingrad, etc.

2. There can be no doubt that the Communists have not and will not change their central objective of world domination, nor will they in any way weaken the conspiratorial apparatus which they use to destroy and occupy the non-Russian nations of the Geneva Conference. I disagree with you that the majority of responsible politicians in the West believe that the Communists have abandoned their plans to rule the whole world. Speaking only for responsible political leaders in the United States, I can assure you that we have not in the least been fooled by this latest Communist maneuver. I also recognize that irresponsible politicians and other opportunists in the United States may hold the personal opinion that the Communists have abandoned their plans to rule the whole world. I assure you that such people constitute but a very small percent of the American people and in no way do they represent the opinion of the average man on the street in the United States. Responsible political leaders in the other free nations of the West can best speak for themselves and the opinions of their people.

In this connection I should like to point out that the latest maneuvers of the Russian Communists in the international arena follow strictly the tactical line laid down by Malenkov in his speech to the 19th congress of the Communist Party. A review of that lengthy and crude discourse will show that the Russians have a critical need for time and that there is grave fear the free nations might be stirred up to a point where they would demand justice and liberty for their enslaved fellow men. Moreover, Malenkov called for peaceful coexistence and then defined it as a drug to cause nations to destroy their national independence and integrity. There can now be no doubt but that this policy line of the Politburo, laid down at the 19th party congress, is more active than ever before.

3. I firmly believe that if the West is lulled into an era of peaceful coexistence with the Russian Communist conspiracy, the dangers of an atomic war will thereby be multiplied a hundredfold. It is my opinion that while the Communists are now pleading a policy of peaceful coexistence, they will carry out a sneak attack against the United States and other free nations just as soon as they feel they have a 50-50 chance of winning an all-out atomic war. It is also my opinion that the only practical way to prevent an atomic war is for the United States and the other free nations to engage in an all-out political offensive against the conspiracy of communism. Such a political offensive would expose the many vulernabilities of the Russian Communist empire, utilize all the assets which are the gifts of freemen, and thereby bring about the complete downfall of the international Communist conspiracy. That

is the only course which gives hope of preventing world war III and at the same time preserving our civilization.

4. I have long maintained that the heroic struggle of the captive non-Russian nations of the Communist empire for national independence was the greatest asset we have toward attaining our never-changing goal of peace and freedom for all the people of the world. It naturally follows that all-out support for the national revolutionary movements within the Russian Communist empire is the most dynamic method for prevention of atomic war. The only ones who could possibly want an atomic war are those who wish to further colonial and imperialist aims against other nations and people. We Americans who want only to establish a world in which all nations have sovereign rights and all individuals possess liberties and freedoms demanded by their human dignity, obviously do not need an atomic war to advance our objectives. It follows that when the United States has attained these stated objectives, the fear of atomic warfare will have been eliminated.

5. I feel that the most effective program to eliminate Russian imperialism is to secure the national independence of Russia. The Russian people have been too long denied their national independence by chauvinistic and super-racist intellectual thought and action which has been the dominant characteristic of Moscow life for more than 300 years. The Russian people have been the exploited victims of these antidemocratic forces. When the Russians have been given their full and unqualified national independence, it will naturally follow that the enslaved non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union, as well as the other non-Russian nations enslaved by Russian Communist imperialism during and after World War II, will then enjoy an equal sovereignty and national independence.

6. It is difficult to speculate at this date on the outcome of the October conference of the foreign ministers, because sufficient time has not elapsed to permit some of the slow-thinking and politically inept people who participated in the Geneva conference to understand the full implications of the Russian maneuvers. I should like, however, in this connection to point out that I shall continue to urge the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to use every means at their disposal to advocate the rights of all nations, large and small, to national self-determination, and to demand that the Russian Communists dismantle the Iron Curtain which now divides humanity and to require the Russians not only to destroy their world conspiratorial apparatus, but to provide the leaders of all free nations with the names of their spies, saboteurs, and other covert agents so that appropriate criminal proceedings can be taken against them.

7. I believe the political situation within the U. S. S. R. is now at a critical boiling point. While there is a great deal of talk about "rule by committee" within the Soviet Union, and claims that the present heads of the conspiracy are becoming more tolerant in their approach to the people, we must never lose sight of the fact that political tensions within the Russian Communist empire are responsible for any and all concessions that may have been made by the regime. The masters of the Kremlin have not been able to destroy the drive for national independence in any of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union or in any of the non-Russian nations added to the empire during and since World War II. The hard, cold facts are that national tensions within the Russian Communist empire present the most overriding problem confronting the masters of the Kremlin, and that the much advertised crisis in the fields of agriculture and industry are nothing more than reflections of those national tensions. With respect to the military situation within the U. S. S. R., I am convinced beyond doubt that the Red army is still completely under the control of the Russian Communist Party. This control is exercised by political commissars over whom Voroshilov presides, as he did during the World War II years. It is interesting to me to note that the Kremlin no longer permits "national elements" within the Red army as existed before World War II, but that emphasis has been on the "multinational elements" all of which have Russian officers at their command. Also of interest to me is the fact that the Red army garrisons along the Iron Curtain are over 90 percent ethnic Russians, whereas the Red army garrisons in the Far East show a majority of non-Russians, but still controlled by a Russian officer corps. The political and military within the U. S. S. R. are so closely linked that discussions of any real differences between them must be considered as a game for the theorists and academicians.

8. The facts of history and the developments of most current events confirm the asumption that the Russian Communists have been compelled to adopt a policy of peaceful coexistence because of the increasing pressure of the non-Russian nations in their fight for national independence. Moreover, I believe that the economic crisis in the field of agriculture and industry is primarily a reflection of the resurgence of nationalism. The seeds of destruction for the Communist regime which Beria unwittingly nurtured when he sought to attain total power through the support of the national elements within the non-Russian nations are now beginning to bloom all over the Russian Communist empire. It is, of course, obvious that the Kremlin is seeking a breathing spell in order to increase its efforts to destroy the resistance elements within the empire, just as it is equally obvious that the Russians will step-up their drive for world conquest as soon as it is again opportune for them to do so.

9. With respect to the Russo-Chinese coexistence policy, I should like to point out that the Russian Communists exercise an exacting control over the Peiping regime. While the front men for the conspiracy in China are ethnic Chinese, the facts are that the vast majority of them are Soviet citizens. Moreover, Russian Communists sitting as "advisers" in Peiping, are the real politburo of the Chinese Communist regime. It is clear therefore that Moscow will continue to cause trouble in Asia by using their Chinese stooges while at the same time they are beaming sweetness and light in Europe. With respect to Nehru, who has made a significant contribution to the Russian Communist maneuver in Asia, he unfortunately, is more to be pitied than censored. Nehru is a sick man who is incapable of leading the people of India toward the goal of a permanent and flourishing national independence. Notwithstanding Nehru and his many faults, the national independence movement which is sweeping all of Asia will eventually turn its full force against the long-standing colonial and imperial policies of Moscow.

10. The national liberation movements active behind the Iron Curtain, enjoying as they do the support of the overwhelming majority of the people, have forced the Kremlin to plead for time and to readjust its schedule of the plan for world conquest. These same movements will eventually lead the way in pulling down the house of cards which we know as the Russian Communist empire.

11. In view of the present international political situation, I would urge that the A. B. N. continue its all-out advocacy of the national independence movements within the Russian Communist empire and for the establishment of governments representative of the will of the people—expressed through the secret ballot and a multiple party system. The support of those objectives is in keeping with the natural law and surely is consonant with the age-long struggle of mankind for justice, individual liberty, and peace.

THE POLICY OF COEXISTENCE WILL LEAD THE WORLD TO AN ATOMIC WAR

(By Ku Chang-kang, president of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League, Republic China, Taiwan)

1. Since we have the United Nations we don't see any need for a high level conference to solve international problems. This is a sign of power politics and secret diplomacy and is therefore detrimental to the interests of the people of the world. The Soviet Russians always use conferences as a booby trap to sell their intrigue of peace offensive, which is necessary for them to gain more time to prepare for war and undermine the free world's solidarity. We must indicate the very fact that the intrigue played by Bulganin and Khrushchev is less skillful than that by Stalin and is explored clearly before the eyes of the free world. Thus I believe the leaders of the free world will not be trapped.

2. To believe that Soviet Russia will abandon her plans to rule the whole world is just the same as to believe that a fox will do no harm to chicks. Recently the Soviet imperialists are making gestures for peace and saying many high sounding words of peace. However, when we examine their plans for the sovietization of the Chinese mainland and the preparation for war on the mainland, we can see clearly that the Soviet imperialists want to unite the Communist strength in Europe and Asia for the domination of the whole world. Therefore, the Soviets did not abandon their original imperialistic designs, but on the contrary, by gaining time, they are still marching toward their goal of world domination.

3. On the contrary, the policy of coexistence will only lead the world to an atomic war, because Soviet Russia will be able to increase atomic stock for a surprise attack.

4. We agree. However we would like to make clear that the internal trouble in the Soviet sphere of influence will also include a struggle for freedom and subsistence. If this struggle could have the full support of the West, the Soviet regime would be crushed without the necessity of a world war.

5. Speaking of the situation of Asia, we have been saying that the most effective measure of relieving the whole of Asia from the menace of communism is to render full support to Free China's plans to return to the mainland. Speaking of the situation of the world, we regret that the American policy of liberation of the Iron Curtain has not been effectively put into action. The United States was successful in pressing Soviet Russia to remove the Iron Curtain at the summit conference at Geneva. More steps forward in the direction of liberation are expected.

6. Impossible. In the forthcoming Conference of foreign Ministers the questions of German unification, disarmament and prohibiting atomic weapons will remain deadlocked as before. The deadlock as such is of course what the Communists want. Time is favorable to Soviet Russia in the sense that they will be able to suppress the internal crisis and to create more menace to the free world. It is doubtful whether the western statesmen will see clearly the intrigue of Soviet Russia and adopt appropriate measures against it.

7. Because of a deficiency in economical war potential as well as atomic weapons, Soviet Russia can hardly launch an all-out war. But a surprise attack is very possible. The latest development of Russia's air force may well indicate this. The weak point is in the political side. Plural leadership under Krushchev and Bulganin and others can't last long. The showdown will probably be

around the 20th plenary meeting of the Communist Party. Judging from this another big purge is almost in sight.

8. I am in full agreement with this statement. One more reason for the Soviet delay in launching war is its unpreparedness for it, militarily as well as economically.

9. The idea of coexistence and neutralism, by which some Asian people are fascinated, cannot fool the majority who are victims of the Communist aggression. The formation of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League is a big step forward in this direction. If the western leaders will do no more things which eventually undermine anti-Communist power over the Asian peoples, the whole picture of the anti-Communist movement in Asia could be brighter. The resist-tyranny cases in evidence more and more on the Chinese mainland may be explained as one of the signs.

10. The anti-Communist struggles inside and outside the Iron Curtain are indivisible. Of course we should do our utmost to tear down the Iron Curtain from within so that a new peak of the anti-Communist campaign can be expected.

One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Anniversary of Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, March 25, marked the 135th anniversary of Greek Independence Day. It is fitting that the House of Representatives should take time today to honor those brave patriots who gave their lives for the cause of Greek independence 135 years ago. Yet we could not celebrate Greek independence without paying homage to the many generations of these remarkable people who cradled western civilization and gave first life to the ideas of freedom, liberty, and independence which they practiced more than 2,000 years ago.

The Greeks were among the first of the ancients to appreciate the real worth of these ideas and to fight bravely for their realization. When the Romans overran Greece, Greek concepts of political life and philosophy took firm root in European thought. In the 15th century when Greece fell to the Turks, she continued her struggle, lasting more than 400 years, for the freedom and national independence which she had mothered for the world. Finally, on March 25, 1821, the yoke was thrown off when Greece won her long-sought independence.

It is well for all Americans, and all who cherish freedom throughout the world, to pause today in remembrance of this brave and gallant people who, with unsurpassed courage, have fought every form of tyranny and oppression which has challenged freedom and individual dignity.

We in the United States are fortunate indeed that the attributes of ancient and modern Greece—upon which western civilization is based—have been brought directly to this country by our Greek-American citizens. Their contribution to every phase of our society and culture is beyond measure.

So it is doubly fitting that we commemorate today the significant victory which Greece won 135 years ago—for this was a victory in which countless millions have shared in every part of the world. It was and will continue to be a victory for free people everywhere.

Retirement of Gen. J. Lawton Collins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 31 Gen. J. Lawton Collins ends his 39 years of active duty as an officer in the United States Army. He will retire with the knowledge that he has served his country well.

The future corps commander and Chief of Staff was born in New Orleans, La., on May 7, 1896, the 10th of the 11 children of the owner of a country store. Lieutenant Collins graduated from West Point in April 1917, just 2 weeks after our declaration of war in Germany, but was disappointed in his hopes for battle action. Only after the war had ended did he go overseas, in 1919, to command a battalion of occupation troops in Coblenz, Germany. While on occupation duty he met and married Miss Gladys Esterbrook, daughter of an Army chaplain. General and Mrs. Collins have two daughters and a son, the latter also an Army officer.

In the years between the First and Second World Wars, Captain Collins was assigned as either student or teacher to a variety of Army schools. He taught at the United States Military Academy and the Infantry School. Later he attended the Command and General Staff School and the Army War College.

During the Second World War General Collins was to acquire in full measure the combat experience earlier denied him. His name became feared by the enemy in both the Pacific and European theaters.

Immediately after Pearl Harbor, as Chief of Staff to Gen. Delos E. Emmons, Brigadier General Collins reorganized the defenses of the Hawaiian Islands. In May 1942 he was assigned a divisional command, the 25th Infantry, and attained the rank of major general. Tropic Lightning, they called the division, and its commander, Lightning Joe. The 25th Infantry spearheaded the attacks which drove the Japanese forces off Guadalcanal and captured New Georgia.

In December 1943 General Collins was transferred to the European Theater and assigned command of the VII Corps. General Collins led his men all the way from the beaches of Normandy to the Elbe River in eastern Germany, where he made junction with the Russian forces from the east. The VII Corps took Cherbourg, led the breakthrough east of St. Lô and the sweep across France, turned north into Belgium, stopped the German counterattack in the Battle of the Bulge, crossed the River Rhine at Reimagen, and drove straight east across Germany to the River Elbe.

During the entire campaign Collins was to be found with his troops in the front lines, causing his friend and commanding officer, Gen. Omar Bradley, to exclaim: "Collins is a good man, but I am afraid I am going to lose him. He crowds the front too much."

The war over, General Collins, with a distinguished combat record and long experience, was an obvious choice for the Army's highest administrative posts. In July 1947 General Collins was made Deputy Chief of Staff, and in August, 1949, Chief of Staff, United States Army.

As Chief of Staff, General Collins supervised the growth of the new Army that had to be recruited and trained to fight the Korean war and to serve as a deterrent to other outside aggression. During General Collins' tenure as Chief of Staff, the Army's manpower went up from half a million to a million five hundred thousand men, its divisional strength from ten to twenty combat divisions.

General Collins completed his 4-year tour as Chief of Staff in August 1953. Since then he has served as the United States representative to the Military Committee and the standing group of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. These bodies are charged with overall direction of NATO's military commands. From November 1954 to May 1955 General Collins was appointed as special representative of the United States in Vietnam with the personal rank of Ambassador. His duties were to coordinate the work of all United States agencies in Vietnam.

The hero of Ernest Hemingway's novel, Across the River and Into the Trees, an Army colonel, commenting on Allied generals, singled out General Collins for special praise:

> Give you Lightning Joe as a good one. Very good, very sound. Rapid. Accurate.

Our country may be grateful it has soldiers like J. Lawton Collins. We wish him a happy retirement.

An Open Letter to Look Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, last week's issue of Look magazine devoted 18 pages to the race issue and, as usual, gave a distorted picture of conditions in the South.

That magazine featured a Negro soldier, Pvt. Joe Foster, who was born and reared in Albany, Ga., a fine little city located 11 miles from where I reside.

The people of Albany feel, however, that under the circumstances, Private Foster conducted himself very well during the examination given him by the Look reporters. Even that magazine admits that Private Foster said that he loves Albany and expects for Albany to be his permanent home. The people of Albany feel that Private Foster was subjected to a rigorous examination by his inquisitors, and when his mental qualifications are considered, that actually he was trying to show in his own way, as best he could, that he appreciates Albany and its people.

Mr. Speaker, in 1947, Maj. James H. Gray, after 4 years of service with the 82d Airborne Division, and a paratrooper with several months of real fighting in World War II with the 82d Airborne, came to Albany, Ga., and purchased the Albany Herald. He is affectionately known as Jimmy. Jimmy was born and reared in Springfield, Mass., graduated from Dartmouth College, and lived with all of the traditions and sentiments of his native State until he came to Albany.

Jimmy is a perfect example of the fact that we all react alike under similar circumstances. Jimmy is thoroughly devoted to south Georgia and, indeed, to the South. In the short period that he has lived there, he has become a part of us in every respect, and we love Jimmy Gray.

We appreciate Massachusetts sending us a man like Jimmy, and if they have any more like him, we would be most happy to have them make their homes with us. In the past few years, we have had many outstanding men from the North and East come and make their homes with us, and invariably after being with us for a little while become as southern in their viewpoint as we are.

Jimmy is a man of extraordinary abilities, and certainly a writer with remarkable talents and courage.

Jimmy sorely felt that Look magazine had done Private Foster, Albany, and the South a grave injustice. Consequently, he wrote an editorial in the Albany Herald this week, entitled "An Open Letter To Look Magazine." That editorial is so well written and so completely true, that I quote it in full as follows:

GARDNER COWLES,
Editor, Look Magazine.

DEAR SIR: We have read with mixed emotions the story, Private Foster, United States Army, in your April 3 issue. Plainly, you have little respect for Albany's social habits and customs which represent those of the Deep South. That is your privilege, of course.

But you will pardon us if we enter a strong dissent. For the sake of the record, Albany is not "cut in half by fear, ignorance, and the last remains of a dead civilization." The last time that we looked around our schools were full, our churches were thriving, our population was up some 300 percent in the last two decades, our civic clubs were markedly active in community endeavors and, incidentally, numerous industries from your neck of the woods were making inquiries about how they could come down and join us. If this is decadence, we can use more of it.

Contrary to your impressions, Albany is not psychopathic about the racial question. And this applies to our colored citizenry as well as our white. We have not locked the issue away in the closet like a family skeleton, nor do we spend every hour in the day beating it with a stock like a mangy cur. It is but part of our social and economic fabric, and we treat it as such—with common sense.

Like you, we are American citizens, living in accord with our best conceptions of what constitutes a decent, moral social system. America, thank God, is still a land of diversity, despite obvious political pressures to make it something else. You do not have to live as we do, and we do not have to live as you do. And we think that is healthy; we think that is American.

Private Foster can make his way in Albany, successfully, within the framework of an established society. There is none here who does not wish him well. So why do not you, who pose piously as his friend, give him a break? You do not help Private Foster by indicting the morals of his community. And we think that your good instincts tell you that. What makes for circulation on Madison Avenue, New York, can impair a life in Albany, Ga.

In our opinion, it is articles such as yours that permit no reasonable solution of the racial issue. They inflame; they incite, but they solve nothing. The NAACP may well applaud your condemnation of Albany, Ga., but as for the people of this community, their reaction is contemptuous and wholly negative.

And, after all, it is we not you who must live and work to solve this problem—not academically but in practical human relationships.

Sincerely,

Mr. JAMES H. GRAY,
Editor and Publisher.

Golden Years on the Golden Coast: The Story of Intracoastal Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a most interesting booklet on a most interesting subject. It is entitled: "Golden Years on the Golden Coast" and it is the story of the Intracoastal Canal, that waterway which has been called the most remarkable transportation facility in America and which is certainly the Nation's most beneficial waterway. For the Corps of Engineers, conducting a study for Congress, found that this protected inland channel, now transporting approximately 40 million tons of commerce a distance of nearly 7½ billion ton-miles a year, has achieved the phenomenally high ratio of benefits to costs of 14.8 to 1. This means that the savings in transportation costs accruing to users of this vital project amount to $14.80 for every dollar expended by the Federal Government in the entire cost of construction, maintenance and operation of the waterway. Since the study also disclosed that the benefit-costs ratio for all of the country's inland waterways amounted to an average 3.17 to 1, and the ratio for 12 major waterways with which the canal was compared amounted to an average of 7 to 1, the beneficial ratio of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway is more than four and one-half times as great as the average for all the waterways of the Nation, and more than twice as great as the average for the major facilities. Specifically, the figures show that the annual savings in transportation costs resulting from the canal amount to $83 million—more in a single year than all the funds appropriated by the Government for construction of this waterway during all the years of its existence.

Back of this unprecedented achievement is the inspiring record of faith and determination on the part of those who had the vision, courage, and determination to carry on to success. When the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas was born more than 50 years ago, the coast of these two States was a sparsely settled, even primitive land. The circumstances and the realization of the task, however, did not lessen the enthusiasm displayed at the first meeting and as interest grew with each subsequent assembly, more and more leaders from public and private life joined forces in selfless devotion to the cause. The roster of those with long and faithful service in this connection is a lengthy one. Yet the story of the intracoastal canal is largely the personal history of two men—Clarence Holland, from Victoria, Tex., and Roy Miller, from Corpus Christi, each of whom gave four decades of his life to the objective of enriching the economy of the gulf coast through water transportation. Their deaths, which occurred a year apart in 1945 and 1946, brought to a close an intimate association of 40 years in mutual dedication to a common task, a dedication forged in friendship and enriched by the highest ideals of unselfish service.

As president of the Business Men's Association of Victoria, it was Mr. Holland who issued the call in the summer of 1905 for an intracoastal canal convention. This stated, in part:

> The object of this convention is for the purpose of discussing the feasibility, plans, and final construction of an intracoastal canal * * * and for the especial purpose of organizing an intracoastal canal league. * * *
>
> This canal will give all the section of country adjacent to same the advantage of direct communication by water with all our deepwater ports, and in addition thereto will extend the same advantages to the tributaries of the canal (in Texas) * * * and all the rivers and bayous in Louisiana, and also the great Mississippi River and all its tributaries, which spread over the country like a great hand laid over the face of the United States.
>
> It means cheap fuel and transportation. It is a necessary adjunct to the rapid development of the greatest country in the world.

The second meeting, held at Lake Charles, La., actually brought Louisianians into active participation for the first time, since their plans to attend the Victoria convention had been thwarted by a quarantine imposed by a yellow fever epidemic. It was at the third meeting, held the following year at Houston, Tex., that Mr. Miller joined Mr. Holland in what was destined to be such a long and eventful association.

The progress of the canal from those first days is thus vividly traced in the publication's section, Through the Years:

> The association's program was prosecuted vigorously from its inception, with annual

meetings alternating between the sister States. Survey authorizations were obtained from Congress, the efficient Corps of Engineers expedited its reports, and it was not long before certain segments of the waterway had been constructed, initially at a depth of 5 feet and a bottom width of 40. Within less than 10 years from the date of its organization, the Interstate Inland Waterway League had made substantial strides toward the attainment of its first objectives.

As the years went on, however, it became apparent that the disconnected segments of the waterway in Louisiana and Texas provided facilities only for local traffic and afforded no opportunity for through transportation. During those years association leaders experienced considerable difficulty in persuading Congress to appraise the program from the broad perspective of its relation to a national inland waterway system. Congress maintained that each segment of the waterway should be evaluated strictly on its own rather circumscribed merits, while our association insisted that the canal should be considered in its entirety as an integral part of the Nation's developing system of navigable waterways.

With that end clearly in view, the organization changed its name in 1920 to the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas to conform more nearly to the official designation of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway project, and in 1922, at the convention in Houma, La., the association embarked on an expanded program. The services of the best consulting engineers were obtained, the energetic assistance of congressional leaders from both States was enlisted, and the combined efforts of association leaders and their representatives in public life resulted in the authorization, in the River and Harbor Act of 1925 and 1927, of an Intracoastal Canal, 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide, from Mississippi to Corpus Christi. Thus, for the first time, the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway was authorized as an integrated facility to provide through transportation.

Then began the long and arduous task of bringing to realization the objectives which had been authorized. Rights-of-way for distances of hundreds of miles had to be obtained free of cost under the auspices of the association; changes of route were frequently necessary to accommodate local conditions; appropriations by Congress were not always forthcoming, and when they were the funds were often inadequate. It is impossible to delineate the numerous difficulties which were encountered, the formidable obstacles which had to be surmounted, but as the years went on the authorized waterway, 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the Mississippi to Corpus Christi, became an accomplished fact.

Long before this project was constructed, however, it became evident that it would succeed to a degree far in excess of the predictions of its supporters. It was authorized by Congress on the expectation that it would develop approximately 5 million tons of commerce a year, but that figure had been exceeded even before through transportation became possible for the first time, and when the canal eventually reached its terminus at Corpus Christi, near the outbreak of World War II, it was carrying in excess of 17 million tons of commerce a year.

Though the Intracoastal Canal had already established its value to the country's peacetime economy, it was during the Second World War that it made its greatest contribution to the welfare of the Nation. While scores of tankers and freighters were being sunk by enemy submarines, not only along the Atlantic coast but in the Gulf of Mexico as well, millions of tons of petroleum, sulfur, and other vital war materials were moving in complete safety in a protected inland waterway virtually within sight of the catastrophes at sea. With ocean shipping constantly in peril, and railroad rolling stock in dangerous short supply, the Intracoastal Canal and the inland waterway system generally made a contribution of incalculable value to the winning of the war and the preservation of our way of life.

The war was scarcely 6 months old when Congress passed the Mansfield bill, which authorized increasing the depth of the Intracoastal Canal to 12 feet and its bottom width to 125 feet, and extending it beyond Corpus Christi to the Rio Grande. This work went forward during and after the war, and on June 18, 1949—a memorable date in the annals of water transportation—the main channel of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway was completed to the Mexican border. More than 28 million tons of commerce were moving over the waterway by that time—and that tonnage continued to grow.

Meanwhile, construction on the canal extended eastward from New Orleans through coastal areas of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and western Florida. The Mississippi River crossroads soon became congested with barge traffic, and the association moved promptly to develop new projects to accommodate the growing commerce. The new Algiers lock was designed to relieve the overburdened Harvey lock at New Orleans, and is now nearing completion. And an improved direct route from Morgan City to Port Allen—a multi-million-dollar project which will shorten distances for through traffic by 160 miles—is now under construction, with a modern lock opposite Baton Rouge to provide new access to the Mississippi. Thus, the Intracoastal Canal system, extending and expanding to keep pace with the concomitant rapid development of the gulf coast, remains responsive to the needs of the dynamic region it serves.

It is particularly significant that when the Intracoastal Canal Association was organized in 1905, there was scarcely a seaport worthy of the name between the Mississippi and the Rio Grande, while today 9 of the Nation's 15 largest seaports are directly served by the canal. It is also of special interest to note that the growth of the petroleum industry, which has contributed so much to the great industrial and economic progress of the gulf coast of Louisiana and Texas, has been paralleled by the growth of the Intracoastal Canal, since more than two-thirds of the tonnage now moving over the canal each year consists of petroleum and petroleum products. In addition, giant chemical industries, aluminum plants, shipyards, and a host of other installations have been established along the route of the canal.

Under Goals of the Future are listed:

Deepening and widening of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and its connecting channels to accommodate the growing commerce.

Development of tributary streams to extend the benefits of water transportation inland and to open new areas for industrial expansion, and development of further channels outward to the gulf.

Construction of bypass channels and short routes to achieve still greater savings in transportation costs.

Assistance to industry in the location of sites for development and in the efficient and economical use of the waterway.

Extension of the canal southward down the west coast of Florida, and construction of the cross-Florida barge canal.

Encouragement to Mexico in efforts to extend the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway southward from the Rio Grande to Tampico and Veracruz.

Continued cooperation with navigation districts and port authorities in the improvement of port facilities and services.

Constant and vigorous effort to preserve the free waterway policy of the Nation, and to resist all proposed legislation to impose tolls or user charges or otherwise to vitiate the public benefits of low-cost water transportation.

Headquarters of the Intracoastal Canal Association are located at Houston. Officers are J. W. Fulbright, Beaumont, Tex., president; Dale Miller, Washington, D. C., executive vice president; Munger T. Ball, Port Arthur, Tex., Bailey T. DeBardeleben, New Orleans, La., and Hal C. Leonard, Baton Rouge, La., vice presidents.

The executive committee is headed by Guy C. Jackson, of Anahuac, Tex., and other members are Mr. Ball, Mr. DeBardeleben, W. H. Bauer, Port Lavaca, Tex.; J. Omer Hebert, Plaquemine, La.; Frank E. Bourgeois, New Orleans; Mr. Leonard; Carlton Crawford, Palacios, Tex.; and William R. Parker, Houston.

Those on the advisory council include Chairman E. O. Taulbee, Bay City, Tex.; L. A. Borne, Raceland, La.; Richard King, Corpus Christi; E. W. Brown, Jr., Orange, Tex.; Robert J. Kleberg, Jr., Kingsville, Tex.; Oscar C. Dancy, Brownsville, Tex.; Mayor de Lesseps S. Morrison, of New Orleans; John N. Garner, Uvalde, Tex.; Frank A. Godchaux, Sr., Abbeville, La.; DeWitt L. Pyburn, Baton Rouge; Lon C. Hill, Corpus Christi; and Col. J. Lester White, Baton Rouge.

Congressman Brooks Hays, of Arkansas, Ambassador of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, we all realize that our esteemed and beloved colleague, Congressman BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas, is indeed a Christian gentleman and we like to call him our lay preacher. Appearing in the March 1956 issue of the Bible Society Record there is a very interesting article of a personal experience by our colleague while on a mission of goodwill in Europe. This article proves again that BROOKS HAYS is an ambassador of goodwill, a Christian gentleman, and a promoter of world peace. It is a story which should be read by all and is worthy of being repeated both in the pulpit and on the platform.

The article, entitled "It Belongs to All Men," follows:

IT BELONGS TO ALL MEN
(By BROOKS HAYS, Member of Congress from Arkansas)

In 1944 I went with a group of Congressmen to the European war theater. We got as far as General Eisenhower's headquarters and were with him on September 23 in the last year of that fateful struggle. In the course of the conversation he remarked that we ought to see the place where the first fighting for the possession of Normandy, one of history's decisive battles, took place. He sent one of his engineers to show us the scenes. That night we slept in the spacious guest house at Cherbourg which had been the headquarters of a German military staff. I slept in the room that had apparently been occupied by a German chaplain, for I found

some books printed in the German language in a corner of the room the next morning. I remembered enough of my college German to recognize it as Biblical literature. One book was the Bible itself, and the other a personal book. I could translate the little inscription in the personal book, "Presented to our beloved chaplain, the Reverend Alvin Ahlborg, by the Ladies' Aid Society of Duesseldorf."

With military permission I brought the two books back to America, put them on a shelf in my Washington office and thought very little about them, but occasionally read some of the familiar lines.

Three years later, in 1947, a German churchman dropped in to visit with me. As he was leaving I thought of the two books. I said, "Here are some books that ought to be returned to their owner. I have made no effort to locate him. I wonder if you can help me."

"Alvin Ahlborg!" he exclaimed, as he looked at the name. "Why, he is my good friend, and he is still preaching in Duesseldorf."

"When you get back to Germany," I asked, "will you please tell him I have his Bible and another book of his?"

A SYMBOL OF HOPE

In a few weeks I had a letter from Mr. Ahlborg saying that he was thrilled to learn that I had found his books at Cherbourg. He wrote, "I want you to keep them as a symbol of the hope that we of Germany have for a Christian occupation policy and the rebuilding of our world on Christian foundations." In reply I said that I did not think it fair for me to keep both the books. I suggested that I return the gift of the Duesseldorf ladies and that he keep the Bible as a symbol of the hope that we of America maintain for him as a German churchman, and for all the German people. His book had crossed the Atlantic twice when it reached his library in Duesseldorf.

In 1951 I was again sent with a congressional committee to the European area, this time on a mission of peace to meet with Chancellor Adenauer to discuss occupation policies. At Frankfort a dinner was given in my honor. The chairman asked if there was anyone I should like to invite. I said, "I know no one in this great city, but there is a pastor in Duesseldorf that I would be delighted to have here." We had written each other, you see, in the intervening years and had become good friends, though we had never seen each other. My hosts invited him to come. When we sat down at dinner at 6:30 that evening, I did not even know whether Pastor Ahlborg had gotten the message. (I learned later that he had traveled 5 hours on a bus to get there.)

"YOUR PREACHER IS HERE"

I was making my speech when Alvin Ahlborg walked into the room. Because I was speaking on foreign policy, I thought the newspapermen would put my address on the front pages of the Frankfort papers the next morning. They were not, however, interested in my political views; they were interested only in the story of my friendship with Alvin Ahlborg, so they tugged at my coattails as they said, "Your preacher friend is here." Just then he came forward, and you can imagine how fine it was to meet him.

I was surprised to find Pastor Ahlborg a young man, just a little older than my own boy. Here I was, a veteran of the First World War, greeting a veteran of World War II. We represented countries that had fought bitterly twice in one generation.

With a twinkle in his eye Ahlborg said, "I wonder if Mr. Hays has read my Bible." I was ready for this question. I said, "As proof that I have, you will find in one of the Psalms these words: 'Gutes und Barmherzigkeit werden mir folgen mein Leben lang, und ich werde bleiben im Hause des Herrn immerdar.'" Pastor Ahlborg was delighted and translated for those of the audience who could not understand German, "What Mr. Hays has said is this: 'Goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.'"

What I have tried to say with this little story is that the Bible, with its wonderful good news, is something that overleaps the barriers of ocean, nationality, and language. It belongs to all men and must be proclaimed to all.

One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Celebration of the Independence of Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, from the time when we were children and studied the early history of our country, there is a thought which lingers with us and seems to ring through our minds whenever we think of freedom. We are thrilled with that memorable day many years ago on the 19th of April, 1775, when the embattled farmers met the British at Lexington Common and fired the shot heard around the world. This was the beginning of the struggle for freedom, and it stirred the hearts of mankind throughout the world.

Over the next 46 years, the people of a very courageous and brave Greek nation followed in the steps of the embattled farmers at Lexington and won independence for Greece from the Ottoman Empire on March 25, 1821. This is the 135th celebration of the day when Greek independence was achieved. It is indeed an honor for me to have this opportunity to mark this great occasion in the history of freedom. It is not only an honor but it is very fitting because I have the high and noble privilege of representing in the Congress Lexington, Concord, Bedford, Woburn, and all of this hallowed area of soil where the surrounding farmers banded themselves together in 1775 and gave notice that from thenceforth they intended to be free men and fired that shot heard round the world.

One hundred thirty-five years is a long time, but in every one of these 135 years, the Greek people have thanked God for their freedom. America is a vast country. Greece is a small country, geographically speaking. For the inspiration of freedom which the Greeks received on Lexington Common and at Concord Bridge they have endowed America over the years with their centuries of culture. Without the greatness of Greece the world would be a hollow place in art, literature, philosophy, and learning in general. In all of our American cities, it is easy to see the influence of the art and learning of Greece.

These 135 years have not been easy and they have not been without struggle. Just as in ancient times when the great conquerors of those days considered Greece a choice prize, Greece has had to fight long and hard to maintain her freedom. In June 1917, Greece entered World War I, fighting on the side of America as one of the Allied Powers. In World War II, it might be said that in all of her brilliant history, Greece reached her finest hours, for it was in World War II that the courageous Greek people stalled for a long time the great military forces of the Fascisti-Nazi powers. Finally, Greece was occupied by the Nazi forces of Germany, and the destruction was enormous.

In 1944, when Greece was liberated, primarily through the might of American power, its ports were in ruins, three quarters of its merchant fleet destroyed, the vital Corinth Canal was wrecked, major railroad lines were torn to pieces, highways were useless, hundreds of bridges shattered, and the Greek farmland was unproductive. But what is more, over 1,500 villages and towns were destroyed and the Greek people by the thousands and thousands were homeless. Living standards reached a dangerously low level. For this tremendous sacrifice, Greece earned the respect of America and of the entire free world.

But the struggle was not over. It was at this moment of weakness that the Communists chose, as they always do, to strike. By blocking all efforts to rehabilitate and rebuild Greece, the Communists believed they could force a shattered Greece and a weary nation of people to accept orders from henceforth from the Kremlin. The Communists, however, failed to take into consideration, as they always do, the strength and courage and determination that dwells in the hearts of free men. On this occasion, free men joined hands and worked together—the free men of America with the free men of Greece. America joined in helping to revitalize the Greek Army. America joined in revitalizing Greek economy. America joined in the rebuilding of Greece. Although the cost of this reconstruction has been great, America is amply repaid in the knowledge that today there stands once again the great free nation of Greece, and America is proud of the fact that in Greece our great American Nation has a great and trusted friend.

In the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea, Greece stands today as the fortress of freedom. Greece and the United States are partners and share the great defense responsibilities of NATO. America, in joining with Greece in helping her to again stand independently as free men, not only has saved the cradle of western civilization but has cemented a friendship with a dependable and courageous people. Today, on this 135th celebration of the independence of Greece, Greece is in control of all of her territories including the Ionian Islands, Crete, and the Aegean Islands, and the Dodecanese Islands. There remains Cyprus.

Today, Cyprus represents the only Greek island under foreign domination. In view of the fact that four-fifths of the population of Cyprus is represented by Greek people, and in view of the long history reaching way back into ancient times, the Island of Cyprus is a natural part of the nation of Greece. It is my view that only time separates the people of Cyprus from achieving their freedom

and joining with Greece. People everywhere should have the right to determine their government and their future welfare. Certainly this doctrine applies to the people of Cyprus. In view of the fact Greece stands in friendship with America and all of the allied nations in NATO, certainly there is no reason at all for any fear in Cyprus once again being a part of the great nation of Greece.

In my historic congressional district, where freedom was born and throughout the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, there is a large population of Americans of Greek descent. They are among our finest citizens. They have made great contributions as Americans to our national life. They are among my finest friends. On this eminent occasion, I say to them, "You have so much to be proud of in your Greek heritage. You have so much to be proud of for the great contributions your ancestry has given to the world, and you have so much to be proud of as American citizens in helping to build this great Nation of ours and in cementing its friendship with your ancient homeland. I am proud to know so many of you and to have you as friends.

As we face the future, we know that the strength and courage that is Greece and the strength and courage that is America will carry us through, and we know that together we will always stand as free men in the defense of a peaceful world.

Impact of the Central Valley Project, Calif., on Our National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions I have pointed out that, in my opinion, the relatively small Federal expenditures in our reclamation program constitute the Nation's wisest investment. Not only are the moneys returned to the Federal Treasury but new areas are developed and new wealth is created which strengthen materially the economy of the project area and the Nation.

Much information has been made available on the tangible effects of reclamation developments; however, very little has been said or published on the intangible effects—such as the impact of these developments on the local and national economy. In order to obtain more specific information along these lines, I requested the Commissioner of Reclamation to select a few representative projects and furnish the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee information indicating the contributions which these projects are making to the maintenance of our present high economic level. Several of these project studies have been completed and furnished to the committee.

One of these studies relates to the Central Valley project in California. The report which gives the results of this study shows the tremendous impact of this project on the economy of the Central Valley and the Nation, with particular reference to the year 1953. I believe my colleagues will be interested in the results of the study and I should like to call to their attention just a few of the significant facts brought out in the report.

First, however, I should point out that although the initial features of the Central Valley project have been completed for some years, the area which will ultimately be served is not yet fully developed. In 1953, the year which is the basis for the facts and figures developed in this study, the initial features were supplying only 52 percent of the water they will ultimately serve in the valley. Keeping this in mind, the significant facts which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues follow:

First. The project, in 1953, provided over a million and a half acre-feet of water to irrigate almost 720,000 acres of land.

Second. Cash farm income received from crops, livestock and their products, in 1953, was $152 million.

Third. This production provided employment for an estimated maximum of 39,500 workers on project farms and associated processing, packing and transportation activities and about 50,000 persons engaged in serving them in local communities of the project area.

Fourth. The combined purchasing power from wages of the employees on the farms and in collateral industries benefiting from the project, in 1953, reached an estimated $55 million and an additional $35 million of net income received by project farmers swelled the 1-year total to $90 million.

Fifth. It is estimated that this income received by the project beneficiaries provided a market, among other things, for $40 million in automobiles, $10 million in farm implements, $25 million for gasoline, $13 million for apparel and $15 million in furniture, household equipment and home appliances. The railroads hauled 21,800 carloads of agricultural commodities attributable to project water to the rest of the Nation and 12,000 carloads of merchandise from the rest of the Nation to the farmers and others benefiting from the project for which they received an estimated $20 million in revenues.

Sixth. Project farmers and their employees paid, in 1953, an estimated $7,300,000 in Federal personal income taxes, or three times the amount they paid for water. They also paid over $1,806,000 in State retail sales and personal income taxes and paid $2 million more in property taxes to the counties than they would have paid without the project.

Seventh. About 500,000 acres of irrigated land, which would have reverted to dry-farmed land or native pasture without project water, retained a market value of $212,750,000 more than the value of these lands would have been without project water, and over $60 million have been added to the value of dry land that has been irrigated with project water since 1944.

Eighth. Over $400 million was spent to plan and construct the project by the end of 1953. Of this, $150 million went for contractors' payrolls which was largely spent in the towns where construction took place and, therefore, benefited local merchants and their national suppliers. About $280 million was spent for materials and equipment by the Federal Government and the contractors. Of the Federal Government's expenditures for cement, generators, turbines, pumps, and other materials, over $43,300,000 was spent, for the most part, in the Middle Atlantic and Great Lakes regions. Over two-thirds of the contractors' expenditures for machinery and equipment and other materials, or about $100 million, was spent in these regions and other Eastern and Southern States. These expenditures provided employment for thousands of factory, mine, and mill workers all over the Nation.

Ninth. Three new towns near Shasta Dam and one at Friant Dam in Fresno County were born and are still thriving as a result of the project.

Mr. Speaker, those who are interested in the complete study may obtain a copy from the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, March 26, 1956)

The Senate met at 10:30 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God within the shadows, in these tumultuous days of world tension, as again the eternal Christ climbs new calvaries with the cross that ne'er turns back, by the dire needs of our anxious hearts we are driven to that strange man lifted up from the earth. And now, as so soon we join the jubilant multitudes around the world in the glow and glory of earth's gladdest day, in our own risen lives seeking those things that are above, enable us to challenge with the conquering truth of Easter all tyrants who, denying it, deal in strife and hatred and death and chains, and who suppress, exploit, and degrade the holy temple of human personality. Steady our hearts and steel our wills to pay the costly price for the coming of the kingdom of the risen Christ, knowing that there is no way to dawn except by dark, no way to light except by night, no way to Easter except by Calvary. Whatever the future holds, may we face it calm and confident in the assurance that there lives the beauty that man cannot kill. May we hold that faith and hold it fast. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 26, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3693. An act to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended;

H. R. 4922. An act to prohibit picketing in the immediate vicinity of the White House;

H. R. 7380. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 to correct certain inequities;

H. R. 8130. An act to designate the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Jones Point, Va., as the "Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge";

H. R. 8493. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 8957. An act to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9078. An act to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall be not less than 2,500 officers and members;

H. R. 9312. An act to provide that members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia may be removed for cause; and

H. R. 9582. An act to provide for the delayed reporting of births within the District of Columbia.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 3693. An act to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended;

H. R. 4922. An act to prohibit picketing in the immediate vicinity of the White House;

H. R. 7380. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 to correct certain inequities;

H. R. 8130. An act to designate the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Jones Point, Va., as the "Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge";

H. R. 8493. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the General Federation of Womens Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 8957. An act to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9078. An act to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall be not less than 2,500 officers and members;

H. R. 9312. An act to provide that members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia may be removed for cause; and

H. R. 9582. An act to provide for the delayed reporting of births within the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

The Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations;

The Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency; and

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

On request of Mr. NEELY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we have the customary morning hour, subject to the usual 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR STROM THURMOND, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] enclosing a copy of a letter addressed to the governor of that State, tendering his resignation as a Senator, effective on April 4, 1956, which, with the accompanying letter, will be printed in the RECORD and placed on file.

The letters are as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., March 23, 1956.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is to inform you officially of my resignation as a Senator from South Carolina, effective April 4, 1956.

Enclosed herewith is a copy of a letter I submitted to the Honorable George Bell Timmerman, Jr., Governor of South Carolina, on March 3, 1956, in which I stated my reason for resigning. The Governor accepted my resignation, effective April 4, the same day I submitted it to him. This is for the purpose of making the official records clear as to my action.

Sincerely yours,

STROM THURMOND,
United States Senator from South Carolina.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D.C., March 3, 1956.

Hon. GEORGE BELL TIMMERMAN, Jr.,
Governor of South Carolina,
The State House, Columbia, S. C.

DEAR GOVERNOR TIMMERMAN: In keeping with the pledge which I made to the people of South Carolina during the 1954 campaign, and in order that the State Democratic Convention can place the office in this summer's primary, I hereby resign as United States Senator effective on and as of April 4, 1956, and I respectfully request that you accept this resignation effective on that date.

Sincerely yours,

STROM THURMOND.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the stockpiling program, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Service, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REVISION OF CERTAIN LAW ADMINISTERED BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise and modernize certain laws administered by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a petition signed by P. E. Thompson, and sundry other members of a committee representing the various railroad craft organizations, praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 9065) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, relating to increased annuities for retired railroad workers, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS IN THE STATE OF KANSAS—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have received a resolution signed by John P. Crown, mayor, and H. C. Fisher, city clerk of Lawrence, Kans., urging early action on the part of Congress for the completion of authorized projects on the Kansas River.

In addition to completion of authorized projects, they also urge that Congress vote sufficient funds for continuous surveying and planning and bank protection facilities for the city of Lawrence.

I am personally familiar with this situation and sincerely hope every effort will be made to protect the citizens of this fine Kansas community.

I present the resolution, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the city of Lawrence and its citizens have suffered severe hardships and great financial losses from both floods and droughts during recent years; and

Whereas the Appropriations Committees of both branches of Congress have under consideration the allocation of funds for flood-control projects and planning in Kansas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and the Board of Commissioners of the City of Lawrence, Kans., That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to take the necessary action to assure the completion of all recommended and authorized projects in the State of Kansas and assure an adequate amount of money for continuous surveying and planning and bank protection facilities for the city of Lawrence; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to Mr. John Harris for transmittal to all Members of the Kansas delegation in the House and Senate and the chairman of the Appropriations Committees of both branches of Congress.

Adopted by the mayor and the Board of Commissioners of the City of Lawrence, Kans., this 21st day of March 1956.

JOHN P. CROWN.

Attest:

H. C. FISHER,
City Clerk.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 3386. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955; without amendment (Rept. No. 1714).

REPORT ENTITLED "ORGANIZATION OF FEDERAL EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES" (S. REPT. NO. 1715)

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, submitted a report entitled "Organization of Federal Executive Departments and Agencies," which was ordered to be printed.

THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I submit a report on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements, and I submit a report (No. 1716) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the individual views of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, together with the individual views of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Stephen Sibley Bean, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board;

Thomas M. Healy, of Georgia, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board;

T. Keith Glennan, of Ohio, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, vice Chester L. Bernard;

Leonard Andrew Scheele, of Michigan, to be Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service;

Anibal R. Valle, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

John K. Irion, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William L. Longshore, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Alabama, vice Frank M. Johnson, Jr., elevated;

Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be judge of the second circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice William B. Brown, resigned;

Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be chief justice of the supreme court, Territory of Hawaii, for a term of 4 years, vice Edward A. Towse; and

R. Lockwood Jones, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, vice David J. Coddaire, resigned.

By Mr. BRICKER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Paul C. Weick, of Ohio, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio, vice Emerich B. Freed, deceased.

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Francis Adams Cherry, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Warren E. Burger, of Minnesota, to be United States circuit judge, District of Columbia circuit, vice Harold M. Stephens, deceased; and

C. William Kraft, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. NEELY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Leo A. Rover, of the District of Columbia, to be chief judge of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, vice Nathan Cayton, retiring.

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Stanley C. Allyn, of Ohio, to be the representative to the 11th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations;

Sheldon T. Mills, of Oregon, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Afghanistan, vice Angus Ward, resigned;

Jefferson Patterson, of Ohio, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Uruguay; and

Dempster McIntosh, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Venezuela.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3535. A bill to provide for two highway bridges across the Illinois Waterway at Joliet, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 3536. A bill for the relief of James F. Walsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 3537. A bill for the relief of Manuel Souza Novo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 3538. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel, Kleanthi, and Giancula Manos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. BEALL):

S. 3539. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act so as specifically to authorize the organization of Federal central credit unions and to authorize Federal credit unions to invest in the shares of, and become members of, central credit unions organized under such act or other laws; and

S. 3540. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act with reference to procedure as to making loans by Federal credit unions and to provide authorization for loan officers of Federal credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT, RELATING TO INVESTMENTS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act so as specifically to authorize the organization of Federal central credit unions and to authorize Federal credit unions to invest in the shares of, and become members of, central credit unions organized under such act or other laws. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, in explanation of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3539) to amend the Federal Credit Union Act so as specifically to authorize the organization of Federal central credit unions and to authorize Federal credit unions to invest in the shares of, and become members of, central credit unions organized under such act or other laws, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. BEALL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. SPARKMAN is as follows:

SUMMARY OF CENTRAL CREDIT UNION BILL

A Federal credit union is defined as follows in section 2 of the Federal Credit Union Act, first sentence: "A Federal credit union is defined as a cooperative association organized in accordance with the provisions of this chapter for the purpose of promoting thrift among its members and creating a source of credit for provident and productive purposes."

The first section of this bill defines a Federal central credit union as "A central organization of credit unions organized in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, whose field of membership shall include Federal credit unions and credit unions organized in accordance with the provisions of law of any State or territory of the United States of America, Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia." It specifies that the directors and members of the supervisory and credit committees of such credit unions may also belong to a Federal central credit union. At this time no Federal credit union is included in the field of membership of another Federal credit union.

The investment privileges of Federal credit unions, as set forth in section 7, paragraph (7) of the Federal Credit Union Act, are now limited to:

"(a) in loans exclusively to members; (b) in obligations of the United States of America, or securities fully guaranteed as to principal and interest thereby; (c) in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Director, in loans to other credit unions in the total amount not exceeding 25 percent of its paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus; (d) or in shares or accounts of Federal savings and loan associations, and in shares or accounts of any other institution, the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation."

The proposed legislation would add authority to invest in shares of central credit unions organized in compliance with the provisions of the Federal Credit Union Act or laws of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

Central credit unions now exist in a majority of States. In some of them, the credit unions formed under the respective State law may have membership in and invest in the shares of their central credit union. However, federally chartered credit unions do not have that privilege. The proposed legislation would give them such. Also, in States which do not yet have central credit unions, or which may have limited ones that are not favorably amended, there would be an opportunity to organize such under the Federal Credit Union Act so as to include in their field of membership other credit unions.

The purposes of central credit unions are to offer members an opportunity to invest funds, and to make loans to other credit unions, and to directors and committee members of them who are not permitted to borrow from their credit union in excess of their share-holdings therein. All Federal credit unions have the latter limitation, as do those under some other laws. The central credit union affords the facility for other credit unions to use their surplus funds to provide further credit union service by making loans to credit unions and to officials of them. This is a practical way for credit unions to utilize the money not otherwise invested at times, and to employ such within their field of operation.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT, RELATING TO LOAN OFFICERS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act with reference to procedure as to making loans by Federal credit unions and to provide authorization for loan officers of Federal credit unions. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3540) to amend the Federal Credit Union Act with reference to procedure as to making loans by Federal credit unions and to provide authorization for loan officers of Federal credit unions, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. BEALL), was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. SPARKMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT RELATIVE TO CREDIT UNION LOAN OFFICER BILL

Following amendment of the Federal Credit Union Act as proposed, the sections referred to would read, through the amended parts, as follows (bracketed portions being the additions):

"Section 7 (5), Federal Credit Union Act (12 U. S. C., section 1757 (5)). To make loans with maturities not exceeding 3 years to its members for provident or productive purposes upon such terms and conditions as this chapter and the bylaws provide and as the credit committee [except as provided in section 11 (d) of this chapter] may approve, at rates of interest not exceeding 1 percent per month on unpaid balances (inclusive of all charges incident to making the loan): *Provided*, That no loans to a director, officer, or member of a committee shall exceed the amount of his holdings in the Federal credit union as represented by shares thereof. * * *

"Section 11 (d), Federal Credit Union Act (12 U. S. C., section 1761 (d)). The credit committee shall hold such meetings as the business of the Federal credit union may require and not less frequently than once a month (of which meetings due notice shall be given to members of the committee) to consider applications for loans. No loan shall be made unless approved by a majority of the entire committee and by all the members of the committee who are present at the meeting at which the application is considered: [*Provided, however*, (1) the credit committee may delegate to the treasurer or assistant treasurer authority to approve a loan to a member of a Federal credit union which is secured in its entirety by an assignment of shares in such Federal credit union owned by such member which are not impaired by pledge or assignment as security on any other loan to such member or others, and (2) the credit committee may appoint one or more loan officers, who may be the treasurer or assistant treasurer, and delegate to him (them) power to approve or disapprove loans within limitations authorized by the committee on any such loan officer. The applicant for a loan may appeal from the decision of the loan officer to the credit committee. No loan officer, including the treasurer or assistant treasurer, if appointed as such, shall have authority to disburse funds of the Federal credit union for any loan which has been approved by him except as to loans secured in accordance with subdivision (1) of this subsection. No more than one member of the credit committee may be appointed as a loan officer. A loan officer may be compensated to the extent authorized by the board of directors. All loans approved by treasurer, assistant treasurer, or a loan officer shall be reviewed by the credit committee at its next regular meeting.]"

There are two purposes in the proposed legislation. The first is to permit the credit committee of a Federal credit union to delegate to the treasurer or assistant treasurer authority to approve a loan which is fully secured by the member's shares in the credit union, and to disburse funds therefor. In this respect, if the treasurer or assistant treasurer has authority to approve and disburse a loan secured by shares it might prevent the member withdrawing them to meet his needs, particularly if he must have funds immediately. Members usually prefer to borrow than to withdraw savings.

The second purpose is to give the credit committee the right to appoint one or more loan officers and delegate to him (them) power to approve or disapprove loans within limitations determined by the committee, with the applicant having the right to appeal from the decision of the loan officer to the credit committee. No loan officer would have authority to disburse funds for any loan which he has approved as a loan officer, if he is also a disbursing officer of the credit union, except as to loans fully secured by the borrowing member's shares.

The credit committee will have the responsibility of appointing the loan officer, and all loans made in accordance with either of the foregoing provisions must be reviewed by the committee at its next regular meeting.

The enactment of these amendments to the Federal Credit Union Act would enable federally chartered credit unions to render more prompt and efficient service to their borrowing members.

REVISION OF FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS—AMENDMENT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am about to submit an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that I might speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on February 20, 1956, I introduced on behalf of myself and other Senators, the bill (S. 3242) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes. This bill would make available equally to the major political parties, from public funds, a substantial proportion of the large sums needed to defray the increasingly heavy costs of modern election campaigns in this country. The major premise of this bill—which I call the Teddy Roosevelt bill, because it was first suggested to the Congress in a message by President Theodore Roosevelt half a cenutry ago—is that the great and unavoidable need for campaign funds, more than any bribery or other corruption, stands in the way of effective limitations on the role of private campaign spending in our democratic processes.

I am convinced that this premise is sound, and that, as the costs of modern election campaigns visibly continue to mount, it will become universally recognized. On February 14, 1956, the Providence Journal commented editorially:

In a country as big as the United States, where running for office in any sizable constituency is enormously expensive, it may be questioned whether any tightening of the law governing political financing from private funds will really prevent candidates from feeling beholden to special interests. The case of Senator CASE, although it may be unusual in its seeming transparency,

seems to us to suggest the need for a change in the system of campaign financing itself.

For this reason, we hope the proposed investigation will consider the various proposals that have been made for providing campaign funds from public moneys. That such an arrangement would itself be difficult to set up and administer fairly and efficiently, we are well aware. That it is a radical reform unlikely to be adopted overnight is self-evident. But in principle, we do believe that financing political contests out of the Public Treasury would be a long step toward the prevention of oligarchy and the preservation of American democracy.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the entire editorial printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have been gratified by the recognition which this important premise has already received since the introduction of my proposal, even by commentators who have doubts about specific details of my bill. However, Mr. President, it now appears that if a new election law is to be passed at the present session of the Congress, it will be in the form of legislation designed primarily to modernize and to tighten the laws limiting political contributions and expenditures, and requiring public reports thereof. This is needed. But as I have stated before, I believe that such legislation, valuable as it may be, will not come to grips with the real problem of our modern political processes. That problem is the immense cost of the modern media of communication, which makes the collection and expenditure of unprecedentedly large campaign funds a necessity.

Over the decades, since Theodore Roosevelt told the Congress that only public funds could finance an expensive presidential election campaign without strings attached, every element of political campaigns has become more expensive than President Roosevelt could have dreamed. In recent years, radio and particularly television have introduced a dimension into political campaigning, the costs of which are completely out of proportion to anything experienced before. I would not venture to guess how many millions of dollars will be spent on these crucial media of public information by all candidates for Federal elective office during the 1956 campaign, but the sum will run into many millions of dollars.

VOTERS ARE DEPRIVED OF CHOICE IF ONLY ONE CANDIDATE GETS FINANCIAL SUPPORT

The candidates, their campaign committees and the political parties they represent must do the best they can to collect the funds to pay these enormous sums. To the extent that the committees of one candidate or another fail in this task, the voters may be deprived of an essential element in making a meaningful choice between alternative candidates to represent them in public office. Most of them may never see the face or hear the voice of one candidate—they may hear only the one who has the benefit of extensive political donations. If a candidate is not assured of adequate funds to finance radio and television broadcasts, he may have to decide that he cannot even enter the race against what would be hopeless odds. The collection of campaign funds for this essential purpose may, in many cases, itself become the greatest objective of the efforts and energy of the candidate and his friends and supporters.

When the selection of the American people's representatives in public office begins to take on these forms, our democracy is seriously endangered. Access by the public to information about their candidates for elective office, their personalities, and their views on public issues is essential to the functioning of the democratic process, and democratic principles demand that this access be as nearly equal as possible. But under the conditions of the 1950's, the costs of adequate communication between candidates and electorate may be prohibitive in many cases. To face this practical problem of the costs of communicating political campaigns over radio and television is as important as any proposal for tightening the laws which govern campaign contributions and expenditures and the reporting of campaign financing.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD PAY FOR MODEST PROPORTION OF BROADCAST TIME

We should make an effort to come to grips with this problem now, even on a modest scale, and at least establish the principle of public responsibility for bringing our democratic election campaigns to the men and women whose decision is sought. I propose that Congress enact this year, in time for the elections of next fall, a simple bill authorizing governmental payment for radio and television broadcast time for the presidential and vice presidential candidates of our major national parties, up to an amount of $1 million for each party. I send to the desk an amendment to this effect which I propose to offer to the Federal elections bill, S. 636.

Mr. President, my amendment is extremely simple. It requires no explanation, except for the method of dealing with the problem of minor political parties—a problem which is often raised as an objection to legislation designed to assist our political candidates in presenting their case to the public.

My proposal is to make Federal financing of broadcast time available equally to the national candidates of the major political parties. However, equity and constitutional principles of political equality require that other political candidates and their supporters also have access to federally paid broadcast time on a fair basis. My amendment defines a "major political party" as one whose candidates received 10 percent or more of the total popular vote in the last previous Federal election. My proposal, incorporated in the amendment, is that minor political parties be entitled to draw upon Federal funds for broadcast time on the condition that they post a bond for one-half of the amount of the Federal payment they request, which will be forfeited to the Government if the candidates of the party do not receive 10 percent of the total national popular vote for President. I believe that this provision will discourage any substantial abuse, by insignificant splinter groups, of the purpose of my amendment—which is to give the public better access to candidates among whom the really significant choice is to be made—while nevertheless offering participation in the program to any political group whose candidates represent the viewpoint of a really substantial segment of the Nation. Any such serious third or fourth ticket, in addition to our present two major parties, would probably be able to finance the required bond for some, if not all, of the federally paid broadcast time under my amendment. This federally paid time would cost them nothing if their candidates succeed in obtaining 10 percent of the total vote; and even if they do not, they will have received the broadcast time at 50 percent of its present cost, which is now wholly prohibitive to minor party candidates.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will give serious study to this aspect of the problem of campaign spending in connection with the pending elections bills, and that this modest beginning can be made this year on the essential process of removing our present reliance on vast private campaign funds for the essential communications of our democratic election campaigns.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed, lie on the table, and be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, lie on the table, and be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment is as follows:

At the proper place insert the following:

"SEC. — (a) Upon application made to the Secretary of the Treasury by the national chairman and treasurer of any major political party, accompanied by duly authenticated bills, the Secretary is authorized to pay to licensees under the Communications Act of 1934 amounts in which the party is obligated for the use of radio and television broadcast time afforded by the licensees to presidential and vice presidential candidates of the party, not in excess of $1 million in broadcast time to candidates of any political party during any election campaign.

"(b) Any other political party shall be entitled to payments on its behalf as provided in subsection (a) if at the time of application its chairman and treasurer, on behalf of the party, file a bond in an amount equal to half the amount for which application is made, payable to the United States and conditioned upon the candidates of the party for the presidency polling at least 10 percent of the total popular vote in the next presidential election.

"(c) As used in this section the term "major political party" means any political party whose candidate for the Presidency in the election next preceding polled at least 10 percent of the total popular vote, or whose candidates for Senator, Representative, or Delegate to Congress polled at least 10 percent of the total popular vote for all of those offices in such election.

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

The editorial presented by Mr. NEUBERGER is as follows:

[From the Providence Journal of February 14, 1956]

THE COST OF POLITICS SHOULD BE BORNE BY ALL

Demands for a broader inquiry into all the lobbying that surrounded the recent passage of the natural gas bill are doubtless well based. There seems every reason to believe that other expenditures might bear at least as close public scrutiny as has been focused on the $2,500 in cash offered to the campaign fund of Senator FRANCIS CASE (Republican, South Dakota) by an interested oil company executive.

But if the proposed investigation hopes to do more than provide information about the extent of lobbying in this particular instance, it will quickly find itself in some very deep and very muddy waters. For the case of Senator CASE seems to point to the need for revision of legislation in an area that has repeatedly defied efforts at reform—the financing of election campaigns for Federal office.

The $2,500 which Senator CASE refused to accept was ostensibly offered to his campaign fund "with no strings attached." Even if the senatorial investigators accept this version of the transaction, passing over the source and timing of the offer and other evidence which might suggest an effort to influence Senator CASE's vote on the natural gas bill specifically, the question inevitably arises of whether elected Federal officials are not frequently put under obligation by their need to rely on private contributors to finance their campaigns.

The principal Federal legislation designed to preserve the independence of elected officials and legislators, in the face of the fact that it costs a lot of money to get elected, is the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925. Although some improvements in this law have been made, and more are possible, the basic fabric seems to contain more holes than cloth.

Efforts either to hold down campaign spending or to provide more effective publicity concerning it—the latter is now generally considered the more useful approach—repeatedly run up against two major difficulties: One is that any number of separate organizations can be formed to support a candidate's campaign; the other is that limitations or outright prohibitions upon donations from big contributors, notably corporations and labor organizations, do not prevent dispersal of funds through individuals associated with such groups, and even through members of their families. Both these legal dodges tend not only to evade the unrealistic restrictions that have been placed upon campaign spending, but to confuse the public accounting candidates are supposed to give of where they get their campaign funds and how they spend them.

In a country as big as the United States, where running for office in any sizable constituency is enormously expensive, it may be questioned whether any tightening of the law governing political financing from private funds will really prevent candidates from feeling beholden to special interests. The case of Senator CASE, although it may be unusual in its seeming transparency, seems to us to suggest the need for a change in the system of campaign financing itself.

For this reason we hope the proposed investigation will consider the various proposals that have been made for providing campaign funds from public monies. That such an arrangement would itself be difficult to set up and administer fairly and efficiently we are well aware. That it is a radical reform unlikely to be adopted overnight is self-evident. But in principle we do believe that financing political contests out of the Public Treasury would be a long step toward the prevention of oligarchy and the preservation of American democracy.

FIGHT AGAINST MENTAL ILLNESS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 22, 1956,

The name of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] was added as an additional cosponsor to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 73) relative to fight against mental illness and to observe National Mental Health Week, submitted by Mr. SMATHERS on March 22, 1956.

INCREASED CONSUMPTION OF MILK—RELEASES BY MILK INDUSTRY FOUNDATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from Col. Benjamin F. Castle, executive vice president of the Milk Industry Foundation, two important releases from that fine organization emphasizing the importance of increased voluntary consumption by the American people of fluid milk.

There is, for example, included a vital reference to the fact that, if we Americans drank but 2 ounces of milk more per day, we would consume our total annual production of milk. Right now, America is only 13th among nations of the world in our per capita consumption of milk and other dairy products.

I send to the desk the text of these two helpful releases and ask unanimous consent that they be reprinted in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILK INDUSTRY LEADER URGES MORE ADVERTISING TO SELL MILK SURPLUS

FRENCH LICK, IND., March 15.—A leader of America's fluid milk industry today called upon milk dealers throughout the Nation to concentrate unprecedented advertising and merchandising efforts in the next 3 months to assist dairy farmers and Government as the annual springtime upsurge in milk production takes place.

"In this period of high production, when farm prices for milk are dropping, the farmer will be appreciative of our efforts to sell more fluid milk because that will help to support his price by the best price-support device ever invented—market demand," said C. Raymond Brock, of New Haven, Conn., president of the Milk Industry Foundation, an international association of fluid milk processors and distributors. He spoke at the 38th annual meeting here of the Indiana Dairy Products Association.

"We stand at the threshold of the annual upsurge in milk production that historically occurs in the spring and summer months," Brock stated. "Yet, while the milk supply is increasing by leaps and bounds, the demand for milk and dairy products remains relatively constant. Much of this additional milk is destined to be turned into butter, cheese, and dry milk, and to be purchased by Government under price-support programs for these three commodities. The months of top milk production also are months in which Government outlays for price-support purposes are high.

"Every quart of this milk that we dealers can sell in addition to our present volume will reduce the amount of milk that has to be made into butter, cheese, and powder purchased by the Government. This will provide direct benefits to the Government and to taxpayers.

"But it will mean a great deal more also. Because of the nature of the classified price system by which the farmer is paid for his milk, it will mean more money for the dairy farmers. Dairy farmers receive a higher price for the milk that is consumed as fluid milk than they do for the milk that is purchased for manufacturing purposes.

"On the basis of the preliminary figures for 1955, we would have to increase per capita milk consumption in the United States by less than 2 ounces per day to consume our total annual production of milk. This goal is within our reach, if we properly organize and orient our merchandising efforts.

"I urge milk dealers, in this period of increasing production, to increase the ratio of their advertising expenditures at the local level, in order to test the effectiveness of this medium for resolving our underconsumption problem. I urge local groups of dealers to unite their efforts and advertise cooperatively in local newspapers and over local radio and television stations. The impact of such collective efforts can be many times that of individual efforts, in a special program of this kind."

Noting that "Americans are not drinking as much milk as sound dietary considerations require," Mr. Brock stated that "It is time to stop talking about a milk surplus and talk about and do something about underconsumption of milk."

DAIRY FARMERS PRAISED FOR GAINS IN EFFICIENCY

PULLMAN, WASH., March 15.—Dairy farmers today are learning to produce more efficiently and so to provide milk at lower cost to their city cousins, Ernest B. Kellogg today reported in a talk at the Institute of Dairying held at the State College of Washington.

Mr. Kellogg, secretary of the Milk Industry Foundation of Washington, D. C., was discussing surplus milk problems facing the dairy industry and took as his subject Whither the Dairy Dither.

"The United States farm population in 1956 is only about 13 percent of the total population—in 1940, the farm population was 23 percent of the total—but the 13 percent is creating a surplus of farm products. This is phenomenal in the history of mankind," Mr. Kellogg told the dairy group.

"The family-sized dairy farm in prewar years had about 20 cows in the milking string" the speaker said. "We can expect the future family-sized dairy farm to have 40 to 50 cows, and the farmer to do the chores in the same amount of time as today.

"What is the solution to this production problem? Lower prices will not help because we as a nation are eating better than ever before—too well for many of us. It has been estimated that a 10-percent drop in milk price increases consumption by ony 2 percent. This is too costly an increase. Through advertising and promotion we are changing the American diet—reducing the starches and increasing the proteins. Milk is benefitting from this change.

"Interesting things are going on in distribution," Mr. Kellogg pointed out. "In many ways, we are reducing labor hours. Three-day-a-week home deliveries of milk have paralleled expansion of labor-saving self-service grocery stores. Processing operations have been streamlined. Wage rates have risen. More interestingly, many services have been added.

"Our most important job is to provide the customer a product she wants at a price she can and will pay. She is buying milk at current prices in larger quantities than in prewar days and in larger quantities than last year.

"The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that, at today's wages, the average workingman works 7 minutes to earn the price of a quart of milk. In 1954 he worked 8 minutes. In 1947 it took 10 minutes of work. And in that prosperous year of 1929 he labored 15 minutes to earn the 14 cents it required to buy a quart of milk. Have we made progress?"

Mr. Kellogg said that the dairy farmer wants and deserves a price for his milk that will enable his standard of living to rise along with that of his city customers, but the price should not be so high as to discourage consumption, encourage substitution of competitive foods or discourage the development of more efficiency in production and distribution.

"The consumer has many interests in this picture," he said. "She wants a bargain and needs to be told what a bargain she is now getting, and why."

EAST-WEST TRADE CONTROLS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, it is becoming more and more apparent that some Democratic leaders are endeavoring to make an issue of the manner in which the United States deals with 14 of its allies in controlling or decontrolling various items which are essential so far as Soviet Russia is concerned. Under the circumstances, I feel very strongly that the country should have the benefit, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of the statements made yesterday by Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks and Under Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., before the subcommittee of which I am a member.

All of us will recall that during the last World War Soviet Russia received from the United States, under lend-lease, more than $11 billion worth of supplies—airplanes, trucks, guns, lathes, and other kinds of equipment—which were made a part of the Soviet enterprise in the war. Not only did we give Soviet Russia $11 billion worth of material and supplies, but we made an enemy of Soviet Russia in the bargain.

The American people were not made aware of all the lend-lease supplies which were given to Soviet Russia. That information is held by the Departments of the Government to be classified. At various times I have requested the information, but I have been told that it is not available because it is classified.

The work which is being carried on today by a committee of the United States Government jointly with representatives of 14 other nations is the work of a voluntary organization. The United States is attempting to control the shipment of as many items as possible, in order to keep them from going to Soviet Russia. We have succeeded in controlling about 200 items, and approximately 200 other items have been decontrolled. Obviously, these efforts are being used as an argument to end any foreign aid.

Under the circumstances, I believe the people of the Nation will want to know how this voluntary organization operates. I think they will have a very good understanding of the agreements when they have read the two statements to which I have referred.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two statements may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. SINCLAIR WEEKS, SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, BEFORE THE SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, MONDAY, MARCH 26, 1956

At the outset I desire to make it absolutely clear to the public that your inquiry on East-West trade controls has no relationship whatsoever to the United States export controls on goods shipped from the United States. We have our own controls and they are not in question. Your inquiry relates solely to the things which our allies ship in East-West trade. It relates to the voluntary multinational controls set up by our allies in agreement with us. There is no power on earth to maintain these international controls on a single item except the power of persuasion.

I desire to make another thing clear at the very outset. It has been stated by members of this subcommittee and reported in the press that the administration has placed a veil of secrecy over these international controls and has refused to give the facts to the Congress and the public.

Nothing could be further from the fact. We have given to the subcommittee in public session the items which were wholly deleted from the international list in 1954, and a great deal of additional material as hereinafter related.

We have also offered to provide to the subcommittee in executive session, closed to Communist ears, the whole picture of the 1954 international trade control revisions. This includes the Battle Act list, the items which were added to our upgraded or downgraded, or deleted in part from the international list and the final international list itself, and the reasons why these actions were taken.

The subcommittee has declined to proceed in this manner despite the fact that this material is classified for national security reasons and despite the fact that some of this very same material has already been transmitted to six committees of the Congress on a classified basis and accepted by them on that basis, in accordance with customary and traditional procedures with respect to security information.

You have further requested that the executive branch supply to your subcommittee the working papers of the Joint Operating Committee, a subordinate interagency working advisory group, and/or its recommendations to higher authority in the executive branch.

The responsible heads of the interested agencies of the executive branch, the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, and the International Cooperation Administration, have carefully considered this matter, and we have determined that the release of this information and these documents would be contrary to the public interest, not only because the information is classified for the purpose of withholding it from the Soviet bloc but also because these internal operations of the executive branch are protected from invasion by the historic doctrine of separation of powers.

I am sure that your subcommittee fully appreciates that the entire subject of multinational trade controls involves the foreign relations of the United States. Every step we take—from the initial research of subordinate technicians to the final determination of policy and action by the responsible heads of the executive branch agencies—is designed to further our foreign relations. And foreign relations are a means by which this Government safeguards our own welfare by strengthening free world unity and defense and advancing toward a just and enduring peace.

The Joint Operating Committee was set up in 1954 by the interested departments of the Government to conduct research and develop facts and recommendations with regard to the international negotiations which would thereafter be conducted between the representatives of the Allied nations in Paris in 1954. Representatives of the State Department, the Defense Department, the Commerce Department, the Foreign Operations Administration (now the International Cooperation Administration), and other departments or agencies having knowledge or intelligence on the subject, such as the Central Intelligence Agency, appointed employees to sit on this Committee.

The end product of the Joint Operating Committee with respect to any item under consideration for control was to make a recommendation to higher authority in the United States Government. It operated under close policy guidance and criteria laid down in advance by higher authority in the United States Government.

Specifically, the Joint Operating Committee recommendations went to the Deputy Battle Act Administrator in the Foreign Operations Administration, who was the Chairman of a higher level policy group, the Economic Defense Advisory Committee, comprised of officials from these interested departments and agencies. These matters were under further review at still higher levels in the Government, by the Battle Act Administrator and the National Security Council. When finally determined, the position which the United States would take on a particular commodity or group of commodities, as a minimum position, would be placed in line for negotiation at a subsequent meeting of the international conference then in session abroad, normally through regular State Department channels customarily employed in such international negotiations. Literally, there was no list of JOC recommendations, as this was, and is, a matter of continuing review by item or group of items.

Now, in respect to your investigation, I am sure that you will agree with me that, insofar as possible, we should not give the Communists even a scrap of information which would be of significant value to them in the cold war, any more than we should let them have commodities of strategic significance.

If closely guarded information is publicized in open hearing the entire proceedings can be observed by agents of hostile powers and the entire public record can be reported abroad by representatives of the Communist press.

Because we do not intend to give to potential enemies information which they could use to our detriment, we are constrained to classify certain trade control information for national security reasons.

This classified information includes the international list as finally negotiated in 1954. It includes the Battle Act list. It includes the recommendations and working papers of the Joint Operating Committee. These recommendations and working papers are classified for national security reasons. They contain the strategic reasons for control or decontrol, intelligence data derived from the Central Intelligence Agency and other sources, top secret higher policy papers by which the Joint Operating Committee was guided in its work and studies, evaluations and recommendations embodying materials of this character. Additional reasons and illustrations could doubtless be provided in executive session.

Now if these working papers and recommendations, or their contents, were made public, we would bare to the Communist

nations some of our secret knowledge of their needs and deficiencies and those of our allies and ourselves.

We would tell them our own strategic and short supply reasons for control or decontrol.

We would advise them of the things which a subordinate working group in the United States Government, guided by closely guarded high policy directives, thought our allies should jointly control and the degree of control.

To some extent we would impart to the Soviets the exact status and description of controlled items, the amounts of quotas where quotas were involved, the items which should be placed on the so-called watch list for intelligence reasons.

We would publicize for the benefit of potential enemies the thoughts, recommendations, advices, and working papers of subordinates who worked for those in the executive branch who held and exercised action responsibility.

Furthermore, with respect to the recommendations of the Joint Operating Committee and other similar advisory materials, discussions, and working papers of subordinates in the executive branch of the Government there are additional reasons why the release of such materials would be contrary to the public interest, apart from the fact that these materials are also classified for national security reasons.

These communications are the confidential internal communications of the executive branch of the Government, its internal working papers protected by the historic separation of powers in our Government, one of the constitutional foundation stones of this Republic.

At every level of the executive branch of the Government issues are vigorously debated and it is human nature that there will be sharp differences of opinion. The same thing I am sure happens in the executive sessions of this committee. It happens in the internal deliberations of the Supreme Court. Does the Congress or the Court offer such discussion to public scrutiny?

Among such operations are preliminary research, undigested data subject to later appraisal, early drafts of memorandum as yet unchecked for errors, incomplete surveys which give only a fractional part of the final report, and other initial thinking and recommendations which must later be revised and perfected or overruled because of new facts or circumstances. Revelation of such embryonic data ripped from context would give an utterly false picture of a situation.

All of us want the unbiased and candid advice of our staffs and subordinates. No organization, no government, no military commander could operate efficiently if all the scraps of paper and advices and recommendations of staffs and subordinates were to be cast in the public view. If this were done it would no longer be possible for those charged with action to obtain candid and energetic expressions of opinion at advisory levels in the Government. Rather it might create among subordinates a yes-man complex or a fear of standing by one's own sincere convictions.

This matter has been well stated in a recent court decision (appeal of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, 226 Fed. 2d at p. 519) as follows:

"Mr. Justice Clark, when Attorney General, stated in his manual on the Administrative Procedure Act that the internal operation of a governmental agency is not a matter of official record, nor are intraagency reports of investigations such, reflecting as they do research and analysis preliminary to official action; and that, in view of their nature, they must commonly be kept confidential.

"Mr. Justice Jackson, when Attorney General, in one of his opinions (40 Op. Atty. Gen. 45), declared that the courts have held repeatedly that they will not and cannot require the executive branch of Government to produce papers which, in the opinion of the Executive, would be contrary to the public interest to produce; and that this determination is for the Executive and not for the courts. He cited numerous cases, beginning with *Marbury* v. *Madison* (1 Cranch 137, 169 2 L. Ed. 60), and including *Boske* v. *Comingore, supra.*"

Certainly the JOC recommendations and material supporting them are interagency papers, certainly confidential in every aspect of their reasoning and development of a final particular recommendation—an interagency working paper.

This doctrine of the constitutional separation of powers of the three branches of our Government has been upheld by every administration since Washington's time. The words of President Tyler are particularly pertinent to the matter at hand:

"In the courts of that country from which we derive our great principle of individual liberty and the rules of evidence, it is well settled, and the doctrine has been fully recognized in this country, that a minister of the Crown or the head of a department can not be compelled to produce any papers, or to disclose any transactions relating to the executive functions of the Government which he declares are confidential, or such as the public interest requires should not be divulged; and the persons who have been the channels of communication to officers of the State are in like manner protected from the disclosure of their names. Other instances of privileged communications might be enumerated, if it were deemed necessary. These principles are as applicable to evidence sought by a legislature as to that required by court."

This is only one of the many cases on record in which the Executive Department of the Government has used the constitutional power to uphold the public interest.

In recent years the Congress itself has recognized and upheld the separation of powers doctrine and has refused, in accordance with historic practice, to comply with a District Court subpoena requesting that it produce in Court its internal records, interoffice communications and other material, including records of the executive sessions of committees. For a recent illustration of this, I refer you to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 1, page 565, in which reference is made to a resolution on this subject adopted by the House in 1946, as follows:

"*Resolved,* That by the privilege of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate or process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission."

After further review of these precedents and after serious study and consideration of the internal documents and discussions in question, including also the question of security classification, the executive departments concerned have determined that their release and publication would be contrary to the public interest.

This determination also underlies the departmental orders of March 5, 1956, and the letter from Acting Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., to this committee dated February 20, 1956, and concurred in by the interested agencies of the executive branch.

I have tried to make clear that our unwillingness to lay bare security information and executive confidences to a watching enemy does not stem from unworthy impulses or petty differences.

I believe that the full record of our cooperation with this committee will convince the Congress and the public that the departments have given you already the facts of this Government's policy and action on East-West international trade controls.

Let me refresh your memory with a few tangible assurances of our continuous desire to cooperate with your committee, consistent with our national interest and our constitutional duty. As concrete evidence I cite that:

1. Numerous Government witnesses have appeared before your subcommittee in open and in executive session, many of them repeatedly.

2. There have been innumerable interviews by your staffs of personnel in the executive branch in person or by telephone.

3. A large volume of material has been sent to your subcommittee—trade statistics both of the United States and our allies vis-a-vis the Soviet bloc, and a host of other pertinent matters.

4. A large number of top Government officials have appeared before your subcommittee to inform it of these events to the extent they could in public session—besides myself, Assistant Secretary of Commerce McClellan, former Assistant Secretary of Commerce Anderson, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce Smith, Acting Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., Deputy Under Secretary of State Kalijarvi, Assistant Secretary of Defense Gray, Director of International Cooperation Administration Hollister, Harold E. Stassen, Battle Act Administrator in 1954, and others.

5. We have given to the subcommittee in open session a list of the items wholly deleted from the international lists in 1954, and have offered to give the subcommittee through responsible officials in executive session and on a classified basis those items which were added to the list or which were upgraded or downgraded in degree of control, or which were deleted as a result of redefinition, in the 1954 negotiations, and the international list itself. These offers have never been taken up.

Let me say with all due respect and candor, it seems very inconsistent for the subcommittee, in one breath to accuse the departments of withholding proper information and, in the next breath, to refuse to permit us to give full details—including classified data—in executive session.

It is our considered opinion that the executive departments have cooperated with this subcommittee to the very fullest extent consistent with our constitutional duties, the national security, and the public interest.

STATEMENT BY UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE HERBERT HOOVER, JR., BEFORE THE SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS, MONDAY, MARCH 26, 1956

Mr. Chairman, you have asked me to appear today to give information on the matter of East-West trade.

At the outset there should be a clear understanding of the type of East-West trade with which we are here concerned. We do not refer to trade between the United States and the Communist bloc, for controls on our trade with the Communists are not in question.

What we are dealing with here is trade between our allies and the Communist countries. The only effective way in which we can control that trade is through the power of persuasion.

We have offered to give your subcommittee, and we repeat our offer, all necessary and appropriate information about such trade. The issue between us seems to be that the subcommittee insists that all of this information be given in public session. We, on the contrary, feel that certain portions only be given to the Congress on a classified basis. To make this information public would violate our agreements with our allies, and would be prejudicial to our national security interests.

In any consideration of our system of international controls it is essential to remember that these controls depend entirely upon a system of voluntary cooperation among the free nations of the West. Thus, the 1954 revision of the International Control List had to be negotiated and agreement reached with all 14 of our allies.

In those negotiations neither the United States nor any of the other participants got everything they wanted. The State Department, as well as the other interested Departments, was not happy to see many items deleted from the control list. By the same token, some of our allies were not happy to see some items retained. We did succeed in retaining on the list highly strategic items which could not be controlled successfully without international agreement. We also succeeded in achieving our other major objective, the setting up of a more effective enforcement system. Without agreement among all 15 nations, it would not have been possible to have any international control list at all.

Thus all the responsible agencies are in full support of Governor Stassen's statement that the 1954 negotiations achieved a net security advantage for the United States, under all the circumstances then prevailing, and that the results were in the best interests of the United States.

Some criticism has been directed during the course of these hearings at our allies for the position taken by them with regard to East-West trade controls. They, as well as we, were seeking to achieve a balance between the beneficial effects of peaceful trade and the dangers of unrestricted trade in strategic items. Sometimes we disagreed, as free nations often do, as to where to strike that balance. Our negotiations in 1954 were on the whole a successful effort to resolve this problem.

It has been suggested that we might have been more successful if we had used more than the power of persuasion. President Eisenhower answered that contention on December 2, 1953, as follows:

"The easiest thing to do with great power is to abuse it, to use it to excess. This most powerful of the free nations must not permit itself to grow weary of the processes of negotiation and adjustment that are fundamental to freedom. If it should turn impatiently to coercion of other free nations, our brand of coercion, so far as our friends are concerned, would be a mark of the imperialist rather than of the leader."

During the course of this investigation, complaints have been made that the executive branch has withheld information about the 1954 negotiations which the Congress has a right to know. I do not think the record will sustain that point.

On February 14 I appeared before your subcommittee in executive session. I offered full cooperation to the subcommittee, and explained that much of the information sought could only be given in executive session in order to protect our national security. The subcommittee did not respond to that offer, but instead proceeded with open hearings.

Therefore, on February 20 a letter was sent to the chairman on behalf of the Departments of State, Defense, and Commerce, and the International Cooperation Administration. That letter is in the record of these hearings. It pointed out that most of the documents involved in these international negotiations were classified and highly sensitive, and that they involved our relations with our governments. It was further stated that in many instances we had given a specific commitment to keep the participation of a particular nation in this program secret. The letter concluded that, for these reasons, the international list could not be made public, but full information as to items on the list could be offered to the subcommittees in executive session and on a classified basis.

In a further effort to clarify our position, a letter was addressed to the chairman on March 23, pointing out that the information already offered would give the subcommittee, on a classified basis, every item on the international list. I would like to enter that letter into the record at this time. It stated we were ready to give the subcommittee the list itself on a classified basis and to discuss the 1954 revisions of that list with the subcommittee in executive session.

Our request is not unusual. We are only asking to follow the same procedure followed by the other committees of the Congress. In matters involving foreign relations, officials from the responsible departments meet in executive session on frequent occasions with the appropriate congressional committees to testify on classified matters that affect the national interest. That is all that is being requested in this instance.

We believe that this position is essential if a system of international trade controls is to be maintained. That system rests on a voluntary agreement among ourselves and 14 of our allies. When the agreement was negotiated in 1954, it was decided by the 15 negotiating countries that the international list and the negotiations which established it were to be classified. Some of our allies would only consent to participate in the negotiations on the basis of a specific commitment to that effect. Pursuant to that agreement, and under security regulations issued by the Secretary of State, the international list and the documents on which that list were based were classified.

I have personally examined the documents involved, and it is my considered judgment that to declassify the material would not only be a breach of faith which would be prejudicial to our foreign relations, but that it could seriously risk destroying the entire agreement upon which our system of controls now rests. Furthermore, it would jeopardize our ability to conduct further negotiations on this or any other subject in the future. For these reasons, the executive branch must respectfully decline to declassify the international list. It is, however, as stated previously available to the subcommittee on a classified basis.

In arriving at this conclusion a number of other factors had to be considered. Our allies know that they must trade if they are going to survive. Many of them have had a substantial trade pattern with countries now within the Communist bloc, extending back over a period of a century or more. They are under constant pressure from their parliaments, trade unions, and industrial interests to expand their trade. They regard trade-control lists as an obstacle to such expansion. That attitude is reflected in their negotiations with us. We have done our best to resist those pressures. Our task would be made far more difficult if the international list were published at this time.

Another factor has to do with Communist propaganda. East-West trade controls are a major target area today for Red propaganda. The Communists are seeking every opportunity to divide the free nations on this issue. Were the international list to be published, it would become a target for attack by Communists and left-wing groups within the participating countries. The combination of parliamentary, trade union, and business pressures, spurred on by subversive groups directed by the Communists, could, in our judgment, jeopardize the entire international system of controls.

It has been claimed that the international list is already public and known to the Soviets. What is known to the Soviets is, of course, a matter of speculation. No doubt they do have some information as to items which are controlled. That does not seem to be a valid reason why they should be given all the information.

It has also been contended that the British Board of Trade List is identical to the international list. That contention is not correct. The items on the British list vary in significant details from those on the international list. The British list does not include the surveillance list nor the amounts of the quantitative control list. National lists are published by a number of other countries, among them, the Italians, the Canadians, and ourselves. None of these lists are the same, and none of them are the international list.

There is one other aspect of this problem that should be mentioned. It is referred to in our letter of March 23. The working papers of the Joint Operating Committee are internal communications and working papers of an advisory nature which are historically retained within the executive branch. These files and working papers we are not in a position to make available to the subcommittee. The Secretary of Commerce is prepared to discuss this aspect of the matter later in the hearing.

We regret that the balance of the information now being requested by your subcommittee can only be furnished on a classified basis. To declassify it would jeopardize our foreign relations and be prejudicial to the national interest. There is no effort on our part to withhold from the Congress any information which it should rightfully have. Our only interest is to see to it that the information is made available in such a way as to protect the best interests of the United States.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may we repeat that we desire to cooperate with your committee, to the fullest extent possible, in your consideration of this important subject.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I notice that the Senator said the United States gave $11 billion worth of material to Soviet Russia. As a matter of fact, was not the amount nearer $12 billion?

Mr. BENDER. Perhaps it was nearer $12 billion than $11 billion. If so, I made an understatement; but it is better to understate than to overstate.

At any rate, the United States bought for itself an enemy which has been making war on us constantly.

Our country is not now doing business with Russia. We regret that some of our allies are. All we can do and are doing is to use every means possible to persuade them to mend their ways.

THE DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT IN THE SCHOOL CASES—DECLARATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for nct to exceed 7 minutes on a matter which I feel is of some importance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, about two weeks ago many of us were greatly concerned to hear a distinguished colleague of ours present to the Senate the so-called manifesto that had been prepared and signed by a large number of members of the House and Senate from our Southern States. This manifesto related to segregation in the

schools, and especially the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954. I have been giving this manifesto careful study ever since.

Mr. President, I believe firmly in our form of government and the separation of powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial arms of the Government. I believe, also, that the Supreme Court of the United States is charged with the responsibility of interpreting the Constitution. I believe, therefore, that the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on May 17, 1954, determining that segregation in our schools was unconstitutional under the 14th amendment of the Constitution, is the latest word on this subject, and should be respected by all law abiding citizens.

In making the foregoing statement I am not unmindful of the difficulties involved in the problem. I commend the signers of the manifesto for the moderation of the language they used in questioning the validity of the Supreme Court decision and in urging a quiet, unemotional approach to the solving of the problem which troubles them. There is no evidence in this document of rebellion; there is no evidence of any intention to divide our country. The spirit of the manifesto is moderate and is respected by all of us, even those of us who completely disagree with its substance and purpose. We can be truly thankful that the violence and bloodshed of a century ago are not present in the controversy as it faces us today.

Mr. President, to me the issue really is not primarily one of law and its interpretation, nor is it one of preserving traditions in the South that may have been controlling over many generations. The real issue involved is our conception of mankind in these modern times; our recognition that our Government was conceived and brought into being for the safety and protection of the individual human beings who compose our population; and our conviction that individual human beings are not meant to be pawns of the State, nor are they meant to be exploited by the strong simply because they are weak and cannot resist.

Mr. President, we are presented with the question of whether citizenship, which is guaranteed to all our people by the 14th amendment, can be divided so as to result in first- and second-class citizens. Can we say today that any man should be superior to his fellows in his enjoyment of rights under the Constitution? Can we say that anyone should properly be denied equality of opportunity in this great land of ours?

I do not overlook the fact that during the last century the Negroes in our population, since the Emancipation Proclamation, have advanced steadily upwards towards the enjoyment of their rights as citizens. Real progress has been made and we all now feel the justice and the inevitability of equality of opportunity. We realize, however, that because of the lack of equitable opportunities in the past, the Negroes in our population have not had the same chances as the rest of us for social and economic advancement. Therefore, they have found themselves in situations of social and economic inferiority with the consequent discriminations which inevitably follow.

But, as I have said, the Supreme Court has decided that segregation in public schools is unconstitutional under the equal protection provisions of the 14th amendment, and, therefore, we are challenged to find ways and means to establish equality of educational opportunity on a firm footing without rancor, bitterness, or denial of the principles of equality.

In States like my own—New Jersey—where there is little or no discrimination and where there is no segregation in education, I have never heard any complaints that integration in the schools had been detrimental to any student, or a cause of serious objection by either parents or children. Where we have applied integration in our Armed Forces, or in our occupations generally the experiments appear to have been successful.

If we have a faith, as I have, that all human beings are equal in the sight of Almighty God, we have a real challenge to see whether in an understanding way and without recourse to force we can find a reasonable solution to this problem.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, and one who has traveled widely abroad, especially in the Far East, where dark-skinned people are in overwhelming majority, I feel the problem which is before us in America may well have an important bearing on our future foreign relations and ultimately on the whole problem of lasting peace.

The question then arises, Is there not then a human approach to this problem, an approach having nothing to do with law or southern social traditions?

I suggest the following step might be taken immediately, namely, the designation by the President of a special commission of outstanding citizens, representing both sides of the controversy, to consider unemotionally and objectively the implications of the present conflict and the practical difficulties involved in the Supreme Court decision. This would lay the foundation for a more understanding atmosphere.

Mr. President, it is my conviction that America must be united in finding the answer to this explosive problem.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Are we still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. We are still in the morning hour.

Is there further morning business?

DANGEROUS INFLATION

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, inflation is one of the most dangerous things confronting our free enterprise system in the United States. Easy money is often advocated by those who probably want to help the little fellow. But what they propose would really hurt him. Every inflationary action damages those with fixed incomes or those whose earnings are from daily toil.

Peacetime inflation must be kept under control. A dollar earned 10 years ago purchases only 70 percent of what it would buy at that time.

In the annual report of the United States Steel Corp. there is a very sound discussion of this subject. The company is performing a fine service, giving the benefit of its knowledge to the stockholders and its employees, the great percentage of whom are seriously hurt by the inflationary trend in our country.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this phase of the report be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSTITUTIONALIZED INFLATION

Of great importance to industry and hence to United States Steel is the development of what appears to be a permanent and alarming peacetime trend of cost and price inflation. During the war period, 1940–45, United States Steel's employment costs per employee hour increased at a rapid rate, as may be observed in the chart on this page. But in the 10 years since 1945 there has been an uninterrupted and even greater rate of inflation in this cost. Over the whole period, 1940–55, the average annual increase is 8.0 percent compounded.

A parelleling employment cost inflation has been general throughout industry and Government. This has been reflected in greater taxes and mounting prices of things purchased by United States Steel. Thus United States Steel's costs other than employment costs have risen in step with its employment cost inflation. During the 15 years since 1940 United States Steel's total of all costs per employee hour has increased an average of 8.7 percent per annum compounded.

Since it is impossible for output per employee hour to be increased at anything like these rates it has been necessary from time to time—as competition permitted—to raise steel prices and thereby pass on to buyers of steel part of the underlying cost inflation. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics the prices of steel mill products increased from 1940 to 1955 by 119 percent. None of that increase has resulted in widening the percentage spread between costs and sales prices since United States Steel's income as a percent of sales was less in 1955 than in 1940, despite 1955's higher operating rate.

Wartime inflation is characteristic of American history. Continuous peacetime inflation is not. In each of the decades immediately following the War of 1812, the Civil War and World War I, wholesale prices, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, receded to 46, 59 and 74 percent, respectively, of the inflated level they averaged in the last war year. But in 1955 such wholesale

prices had risen to 161 percent of their average level in 1945. Prices in the tenth year after the War of 1812 were 68 percent of those prevailing just before that war. The percentages for the Civil War and World War I were, respectively, 128 and 142. But prices in 1955 averaged 217 percent of their 1939–40 average. Something new has appeared in the American economy.

Two basic roots of the inflationary tendency are discernible. The first one is the institution of industrywide labor unions, headed by leaders who, with power to bring about industrywide strikes, seek always to outdo each other in elevating employment costs in their respective industries. The legislative and social framework within which they function compels them to compete in elevating this basic cost.

The other root is the Government's "full employment" policy under which the money supply must be inflated fast enough to accommodate the inflating employment cost, lest that mounting cost bring about its natural result of pricing some people out of their jobs, even though only temporarily. It takes ever more dollars to cover ever rising costs and prices if industry's full output is to be purchased. The money supply—people's bank deposits subject to check plus their pocket currency—was in 1955, on a per capita basis, 2.7 times what it was in 1940. This is equivalent to 6.8 percent per annum compounded.

The abuse of labor monopoly privilege and the monetary policy that transfers to the public in higher prices the penalty of that abuse appear to be the main elements of institutionalized inflation. It would be most helpful in this regard if those responsible for determining wage costs and fiscal policies were constantly aware of the inflationary potentials of their decisions.

The possibility of steady cost-price inflation creates many complex problems of corporate adaptation thereto. But overriding them is the recurring tendency of the inflation to become speculatively explosive. The checking of inflation by the monetary means available can and has resulted in business readjustment. If permitted to go unchecked, the eventual readjustment would no doubt be even more severe. Readjustment, as previously noted, has a multiplied impact on United States Steel. In mid-1953 United States Steel was operating at full capacity. By the summer of 1954 the rate had fallen below 65 percent. By the end of 1955 operations were again near capacity. Thus capacity is made alternately to seem either excessive or inadequate. This is not an efficient long-time use by the Nation of its capital invested in the tools of production. Hence great interest and importance attach to restraint of inflation which may be accomplished in part through monetary controls.

MONETARY CONTROLS

Monetary controls rest primarily with the Federal Reserve System, which includes the 12 regional Federal Reserve banks and the Board of Governors in Washington. The member banks that serve the public are required by law to keep reserves on deposit with their respective Reserve banks equal to a designated percentage of their own deposits. Through purchase or sale of Government securities (so-called open-market operations), the Reserve banks have power to increase or decrease member-bank reserves—to create "easy" or "tight" money conditions. When member-bank reserves are increased beyond those required, the member banks are under pressure to use these excess reserves in loans, if possible, or in the purchase of securities. Such actions generally result in lower interest rates and an increase in member-bank deposits. Since people's bank deposits constitute the principal part of the money supply, an increase therein is the process of inflating the money supply.

Conversely, the Reserve banks, by the reverse open-market operation, may reduce the reserves of the member banks to the point where they are required to borrow from and pay an interest rate to the Reserve banks in order to maintain their reserves at the legal requirement. Under this tight-money circumstance, pressure on the member banks to increase deposits through loan and investment expansion is replaced by the reverse pressure. This is the process of checking inflation or compelling deflation of the money supply.

CONFLICTING OBJECTIVES

The Reserve System's task of continuously maintaining money and credit conditions that will meet the needs of agriculture, commerce, and industry without developing inflationary "boom" and reactionary "bust" is most difficult. The handicaps under which the System operates deserve more understanding than they are generally accorded. In wartime this general purpose, like other purposes, must be subordinated to the overriding "win the war" purpose. Money must be made "easy" so that the Government can sell great quantities of low-interest bonds to cover expenditures. This runs the risk of a dangerously inflated monetary and credit structure at the end of the war.

In peacetime, as previously noted, the general purpose is now partially subordinated to the policy of accommodating employment cost inflation. Moreover, there are many self-styled "liberals" who constantly, if shortsightedly, endorse "easy" money and protest any safeguarding tightening of money. It is a curious attitude because it is the little folk on fixed salary or pension and with savings deposits or bonds and life insurance who get "hurt" by decreasing buying power of the dollar. Thus $100 so invested 10 years ago and cashed in today will buy less than 70 percent of what it would have bought when it was invested.

In view of these handicaps the achievements of the Reserve System in recent years have been notable. By tightening money in 1952–53 the post-Korea inflation that then threatened was checked. By easing money in mid-1953 the inventory readjustment was eased. By tightening money once again some months ago the prespect of renewed inflation was moderated. Although wholesale and consumer price indexes have been generally stable since 1953, there were inflationary advances in employment cost, construction cost, some industrial prices and security prices in 1955.

The hope that serious inflation and reactionary collapse may be avoided in the future lies in a widening public understanding of the new institutionalized cost inflation and in public endorsement of the monetary restraints needed to keep it from becoming explosive. It is in those same developments that United States Steel's hope lies of more steadily and hence more economically utilizing its facilities and manpower in the enduring service of the Nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING CONFERENCE REPORT ON TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on March 15 the Senate sent to conference House bill 9064, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1957. It is my understanding that the conferees have agreed upon a report. The House will act first on the report; but I should like to have the Senate be on notice that as soon as the House acts on the conference report, we plan to have it taken up here in the Senate; and we hope we shall be able to do so prior to the Easter recess.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], for himself and certain other Senators, to the substitute amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], for himself and certain other Senators.

On this question, 1 hour of debate is permitted, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I wonder whether the distinguished minority leader will yield me 5 minutes from the time available to Senators who are in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, Mr. President; I yield 5 minutes for that purpose to the distinguished Senator from New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the current debate on the floor of the Senate on Senate Joint Resolution 31 has been most constructive. It has again focused the Nation's attention on the need for abolishing the archaic electoral college, and substituting the direct popular vote of the people as the method of electing the President and Vice President of the United States. The debate likewise again has shown the inherent dangers involved in drafting proposed constitutional amendments on the Senate floor.

In 1950, I cosponsored and supported the so-called Lodge-Gossett amendment which passed the Senate by an overwhelming vote, but met defeat in the House of Representatives. I cosponsored Senate Joint Resolution 31, when it was introduced in January 1955, because of my previous support of the similar Lodge-Gossett amendment. However, my continued study of this important constitutional question has convinced me that no halfway measure will solve the problem. Either we should decide to substitute a direct vote of all the people in the United States in a general election without regard to boundaries of the several States, or we should continue under the electoral-college system until such time as we are willing to make a complete transition.

Senate Joint Resolution 31 would go far toward the goal of the direct popular election of the President and the Vice President of the United States. However, it would continue the use of electoral votes, and merely would abolish the electoral college, as such. The proposed

substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 31, which I also originally cosponsored, would create an alternative method by which the States could apportion their electoral votes; and this, of course, would result in a dual system for the election of the President and Vice President. The several States would select whichever system best fitted their particular political needs. It is, indeed, difficult, if not impossible, to determine what ultimate effect such a dual approach would have upon the election of the President and Vice President, as well as upon our major political parties. I suspect that this proposed system would greatly benefit the South and the Midwest at the expense of the more highly populated areas of the country. In any event, I do not believe that it would improve the Constitution of the United States to substitute a selective system for electing the President and Vice President for a uniform system which has conflicted with the popular vote of the people on only three occasions in our history.

Other substitutes have been proposed, but only one that I have seen squarely meets the issue by abolishing not only the electoral college, but also the apportionment of electoral votes to the States for determining the election of the President and Vice President. I would support an amendment of this nature. If it is not adopted, I am hopeful that the Senate in its wisdom will return this entire matter to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary for further study. Constitutional amendments should not be treated lightly, and every compromise proposal before the Senate might well lead to greater difficulties than those we have encouraged under the present provision in the Constitution itself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], for himself and certain other Senators, to the substitute amendment submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], for himself and certain other Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not know what Senator controls the time available to those who favor the pending substitute. The minority leader yielded time in opposition to it. I believe that under the unanimous-consent agreement the majority leader is to control the time in opposition.

Mr. President, if there is to be no further discussion of the pending substitute amendment, I suggest that the remaining time be yielded back, and that there then be a quorum call.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] are the cosponsors of the pending substitute for the so-called Daniel substitute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is in the Chamber, and I understand that he is prepared to yield back the time available to those who favor the pending substitute. If he will yield back the time available to the proponents, I shall yield back the remainder of the time available to the opponents.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am very glad indeed to yield back the time available to the proponents.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I yield back the remaining time available to the opponents.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time remaining on the pending question has been yielded back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the yeas and nays will not be asked for on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for himself and other Senators, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] for himself and other Senators.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr DANIEL] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be printed in the RECORD, unless the Senator desires to have it read.

Mr. LANGER. I think it would be advisable to have it read. It is not very long.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota to the substitute amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be nominated and elected as hereinafter provided.

"SEC. 2. The official candidates of political parties for President and Vice President shall be nominated at a primary election by direct vote. Voters in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for voters of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, but, in the primary election each voter shall be eligible to vote only in the primary of the party of his registered affiliation. The time of such primary election shall be the same throughout the United States, and, unless the Congress shall by law appoint a different day, such primary election shall be held on the first Tuesday, after the first Monday in June in the year preceding the expiration of the regular term of President and Vice President. No person shall be a candidate for nomination for President or Vice President except in the primary of the party of his registered affiliation, and his name shall be on that party's ballot in all the States if he shall have filed a petition in the seat of the Government of the United States with the Secretary of State, which petition shall be valid only if filed at least 60 days prior to the day of the primary election and if signed by qualified voters in any or all of the several States, equal in number to at least 1 percent of the total number of popular votes cast throughout the United States for all candidates for President (or, in the case of the primary election first held after the ratification of this article, for electors of President and Vice President) in the most recent previous presidential election.

"SEC. 3. For the purposes of this article a political party shall be recognized as such if at any time within 4 years next preceding a primary election it has had registered as members thereof more than 5 percent of the total registered voters in the United States.

"SEC. 4. Within 30 days after such primary election, the chief executive of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons of each political party, for whom votes were cast, and the number of votes for each such person, which lists shall be signed, certified, and transmitted under the seal of such State to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the Secretary of State, who shall open all certificates and count the votes. The person receiving the greatest aggregate number of popular votes of the party of his registered affiliation for President shall be the official candidate for President of such party throughout the United States; and the person receiving the greatest aggregate number of popular votes of the party of his registered affiliation for Vice President shall be the official candidate for Vice President of such party throughout the United States.

"SEC. 5. In the event of the death or resignation of the official candidate of any political party for President, the person nominated by such political party for Vice President shall be the official candidate of such party for President. In the event of the deaths or resignations of the official candidates of any political party for President and Vice President, or in the event of the death or resignation of the official candidate of any political party for Vice President, a national committee of such party shall designate such candidate or candidates, who shall then be deemed the official candidate or candidates of such party, but in choosing such candidate or candidates the vote shall be taken by States, the delegation from each State having one vote. A quorum for such purposes shall consist of a delegate or delegates from two-thirds of the States, and a majority of all States shall be necessary to a choice.

"SEC. 6. The electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. The President and Vice President of the United States shall be elected at a general election by the people of the several States by direct popular vote of the qualified voters in each State who shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The time of such election shall be the same throughout the United States, and unless the Congress shall by law appoint a different day, such election shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November in the year preceding the expiration of the regular term of the President and Vice President. Only the names of candidates officially nominated in primaries as herein provided shall appear

upon the official ballot in every State for the offices of President and Vice President.

"SEC. 7. Within 30 days after such election, the chief executive of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons receiving votes for President and all persons receiving votes for Vice President, and the number of votes cast in such State for each, which lists shall be signed, certified, and transmitted under the seal of such State to the seat of the Government of the United States directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, on the 6th day of January, or if such day shall fall on Sunday, on the 7th day of January, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted. The person having the greatest aggregate number of popular votes for President shall be President, and the person having the greatest aggregate number of popular votes for Vice President shall be Vice President. No person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"SEC. 8. In the event that it is shown by such certificates that the two persons receiving the greatest number of votes for President have received an equal number of such votes, the House of Representatives, by ballot, shall choose the President from the two persons receiving the greatest number of votes for President. In choosing the President the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two-thirds of the States, and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to the choice. If the House of Representatives shall not choose a President whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, before the 20th day of January next following, then the Vice President shall act as President, as in the case of death or other constitutional disability of the President. In the event that it is shown by such certificates that the two persons receiving the greatest number of votes for Vice President have received an equal number of such votes, the Senate, by ballot, shall choose the Vice President from the two persons having the greatest number of votes for Vice President. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice.

"SEC. 9. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 10. The Congress shall have power to provide by appropriate legislation for methods of determining any dispute or controversy that may arise in the counting and canvassing of the votes for President and Vice President in any such primary or general election. The places and manner of holding such primary or general election shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations.

"SEC. 11. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

It is proposed to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, and for election of such candidates by popular vote."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement which I have prepared be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator state for the RECORD the reason for his request, which he has stated to me.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am still laboring under the same difficulty under which I suffered some weeks ago. On a previous occasion I obtained unanimous consent to have a statement read. I am under the care of eye doctors. My condition is improving somewhat, but it is still very difficult for me to read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk may read the statement.

The Chief Clerk read the statement, as follows:

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, when I came to the Senate in 1940, my office was next to that of Senator George Norris of Nebraska, who for years had been attempting to get a constitutional amendment through providing for direct election of President by popular vote. Being closely associated with Senater Norris, I took up this bill upon his death and regularly I have been introducing bills every 2 years providing for a constitutional amendment which would provide that the people can vote directly for whomever they want for President. On the first day of February 1950, after debating this matter upon the floor of the Senate, I secured 32 votes in favor of it, and Senator RUSSELL LONG, of Louisiana, paired in its favor. In other words, one-third of the Senate voted in favor of this measure. Before a constitutional amendment can be submitted to the people, it requires a two-thirds vote.

This year, a determined effort is being made by a large group of Senators to submit a constitutional amendment to revise the election laws. The proposed amendments are entirely unsatisfactory because they do not abolish the convention method of selecting candidates for President and Vice President. In other words, the old system of the politicians meeting in smoke-filled rooms and handpicking these candidates will continue unless my substitute is adopted.

Frankly, there is no reason why the people should not have the right in primary election to select their candidates on the Republican and Democratic tickets, just as they now vote in primary election for United States Senators, Congressmen, governors, and other State officials. Most of the listeners in 1952 on television saw how in both the Republican and Democratic Conventions the politicians selected the candidates, and the universal feeling of disgust that emanated from actually seeing these conventions in operation has mounted during the last 3 years. Many of you are familiar with the Republican Convention in Philadelphia several years ago where counterfeit tickets of admission were paid by men and women who filled the galleries and shouted "We want Willkie, we want Willkie," and how a large advertising firm had been hired to send in thousands of telegrams to the delegates. Some of you are likely familiar, too, with the book written by Delegate Sparks, mayor of Akron, Ohio, who charged that the delegates from Arizona were offered $75,000 just to yield their place to another State, although Arizona is at the top of the list next to Alabama. And the oldtimers will remember how when the Republican Convention was held in Chicago in the contest between Leonard Wood and Frank O. Louden the sum in excess of $100,000 was offered to 3 delegates to bribe them for their votes. And more recently some of you will remember how when the Democratic Convention was held in Chicago the late Mayor Kelly arranged for a loudspeaker in what was known as the sewer of the basement of the building and to have that loudspeaker play something which blazoned forth, "We want Roosevelt, we want Roosevelt."

At the time that this country was organized, governors were not even elected, they were appointed; and in some of the States they had to own a certain amount of property before they could even be appointed. Since that time, we have made progress by having many States elect their courts on independent tickets, the feeling being that the courts should be neither Democratic nor Republican. Also, we have nonpartisan elections for county officials and candidates for State office including governors where the people select their candidates in the primary. And, of course, the late Senator George Norris succeeded in getting a constitutional amendment which provided that United States Senators could no longer be elected by the legislatures but that the people themselves by going to the polls could choose by majority vote the men whom they wanted as Republicans or Democrats to be their candidates.

Had my substitute amendment been in effect in 1952, Mr. Taft, Mr. Dewey, Mr. Eisenhower, or any other leading Republican could have been a candidate merely by submitting a petition signed by 1 percent of those who voted in the prior presidential primary, and the people would have selected the man they wanted to head the ticket at a general election. And the Democrats could have shown whether they wanted Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Barkley, Governor Williams, of Michigan, Governor Harriman, of New York, or any one of the many candidates who at that time were vying with each other to be the Democratic nominee.

Certainly the people can be trusted to select the man that they want to be their nominee at a primary election just, as I said before, they select their Members of Congress, governors, and State officials.

If my substitute providing for direct election of President, which is cosponsored by other Senators, is adopted, a reform which is so badly needed in this country will result in the 49 percent of the people who did not go to the polls in the last presidential election getting out and voting. In Germany at the last election, 95 percent of the people voted, and in Japan almost that same percentage voted; while in the United States only 51 percent of the people voted, and in some

of the Southern States where they have the one-party system, less than 1 percent of the people voted in some of the most important elections within their States.

Many people believe that they actually voted for Mr. Eisenhower or Mr. Stevenson in the last election, when as a matter of fact they did not. Instead, they voted for a group of delegates from their particular State or Territory. The result is that a small group met in a smoke-filled room, selected the man they wanted to be the Democratic nominee or the Republican nominee, and the only choice the people had was to vote for one or the other. In other words, the politicians may pick out two bad men and then say to the people, "Here the two fellows are—take your pick." It is no wonder when that kind of system exists that approximately one-half of the people do not take the trouble to go to the polls. In many States, particularly in the South, the Republicans will not vote because they know they are in the minority and so why go and vote. But under the direct election of President by popular vote, hundreds of thousands of Republicans down South would know that a vote in South Carolina or Mississippi would count just as much as a vote in Maine, North Dakota, California, or New York.

In making this appeal to the people, I hope I may arouse sufficient interest of the people who want to preserve our Republic to get in touch with their Senators and Congressmen and ask them to support this substitute amendment to the Constitution, so that in this great country of ours the common people and not a group of politicians may select the candidates. In other words, if this substitute amendment is adopted, it will mean that there will be a primary election in each State in June. The candidates on the Democratic and the Republican ticket who receive the highest votes will fight it out in November.

It is just plain commonsense that in this Nation the people should choose their President and Vice President, rather than have an electoral college made up of politicians and officeholders who time after time after time have, in direct violation of the will of the people, nominated candidates whom the rank and file of the people did not want.

I now quote from a speech on this subject made on the floor of the Senate by the late Senator George Norris:

> The amendment which I have proposed to the Constitution abolishes the electoral college and provides for the election of President and Vice President by direct vote of the people.
>
> When our forefathers adopted the Constitution they were afraid to put too much power directly in the hands of the people, and so they provided for the election of the Chief Magistrate by an electoral college. The members of this electoral college, the Constitution provides, shall be chosen in such manner as the legislatures of the several States shall provide. Thus the election of the Chief Executive of the Nation was placed 2 steps beyond the reach of the voter. It was intended that these presidential electors should exercise a discretion in the selection of a President and Vice President, but as time went on and the people became anxious for a greater voice in their own government, they provided for a method of instructing the presidential electors through the instrumentality of party conventions. This has taken away from the presidential elector the discretion which the law in fact gives him, but it has not by any means placed the selection of President and Vice President in the hands of the people themselves.
>
> In order to be elected President of the United States it is necessary to be nominated by some political party. There is no other practical way of electing a President so long as our antiquated electoral college system remains a part of the Constitution. The practical result is that any man or set of men who are able, through any means whatever, to control presidential conventions, do in fact, through such means, select the President and Vice President of our country. The only voice that the voter has in the entire transaction is to register a choice between the nominees of the different political conventions.
>
> It is common knowledge that the people have very little, if anything, to say in regard to the nomination of presidential candidates by political parties. Nominations for President are in fact made, as everybody knows, by a few so-called leaders, who through various and devious ways known only to the politician control and handle the misled and worn-out party convention delegate in accordance with the wishes and the decrees of political bosses. On election day the people find that the voter has nothing left to decide except to choose between two evils, and there is no way by which he can properly protest against such arbitrary control of nominations. He is as helpless on election day as though he were entirely disfranchised.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, Mr. C. Nelson Sparks was a delegate to the convention which selected Wendell Willkie, and he has written an article which I should like to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The article will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the article, as follows:

THE PHILADELPHIA STORY

Willkie's friends and Willkie's foes agree that he "blitzed" the Philadelphia Republican convention of 1940. "Blitz" is not a pretty word and has an unfortunate enemy-alien origin, but used in connection with Wendell Willkie, it is inevitably used in the most complimentary sense. Some of his most violent political opponents secretly admire him for what he was able to accomplish. Nothing, in short, succeeds like success.

He went into the convention with 105 delegates and a prayer, and he came out of it the nominee.

How did he do it?

It is idle nonsense to say that because the galleries were packed that the galleries wholly dictated the choice of the convention. A gallery of archangels, equipped with rubber lungs and united behind the candidacy of St. Michael, couldn't altogether swing a national convention of voting delegates. Delegates from South Dakota, for instance, are not afraid of galleryites who live in Pennsylvania and adjacent States. However, a noisy gallery, in this radio age, packed to cheer for one candidate, is bound to make its influence felt to a certain extent.

Only the incredibly naive can believe that a national convention of Republicans went all out for Willkie out of sheer exuberant fascination over the man's haircut and striking personality and the cheering of the packed gallery.

The Philadelphia story of Wendell Willkie can be understood and appreciated only when one understands that a national political convention is not always an instrument of democracy in accord with the highest principles of the American Republic.

It should be. Sometimes it is. Doubtless many people believe it always is—but it isn't—always. Many people believe a convention is what it should be—a gathering of high-minded representative citizens who will express the wishes of the folks back home in the matter of choosing a presidential candidate and writing a platform.

Many sincere and honest people attend conventions as delegates or alternates and come home at the end of the week wondering exactly what happened to their colleagues—and to themselves.

A national political convention cannot only be manipulated—or blitzed—but there never has yet been one at which at least somebody didn't try manipulation. It is not, however, proper to say that manipulation means something necessarily unpleasant, or wrong, or alien to proper democratic principles. A bit of manipulation can be a healthy thing. A few hundred shouting, whooping delegates, turned into good-time Charlies—no two delegates agreeing on anything—take a bit of manipulating if the job is to be done in proper time. A few sober heads have to convene in a hotel room and lay out a program. There is nothing fundamentally wrong with that. The regrettable thing, however, is that abuses arise and the manipulations are conducted—successfully, too—for other than businesslike, time-saving purposes.

The foundations of a national political convention are in themselves only semi-democratic. Only 16 States hold direct primary elections for convention delegates. In the other 32 States, delegates are either elected at State conventions or selected by State central committees. Naturally, the State's party organization dominates the State convention in the selection of delegates or hand picks the candidates who will run at the presidential primaries. Under our political system, there is, of course, nothing objectionable about this—up to this point.

But certain qualifications for a delegate prevail, regardless of party or State. They are, the delegate must agree to the wishes of his State party organization by either going uninstructed to the convention or going with instructions handed to him by the State party organization, and he must be financially able to pay his own expenses to, at, and from the convention.

A man in moderate circumstances, indeed, cannot afford to be a delegate unless somebody pays his way.

There, perhaps, is the essential weakness of the convention system. It is, at least, the opening wedge for manipulation of one sort or another.

There is no record that the Willkie backers ever paid the expenses of a single delegate.

The Willkie campaign, however, was richly financed and made no bones about it. Its preconvention activities were substantially as effective as its operations in Philadelphia.

The Willkie managers employed two efficient methods of putting pressure on delegates, tricks which are accepted as legitimate in some political circles. Both methods were fashioned after the ancient flood of telegrams system so often used by professional lobbies upon Members of Congress and State legislatures to influence them for or against certain legislation.

Uncounted thousands of telegrams flowed into Philadelphia, and many of them were not self-inspired. The little Western Union branch office in the Ben Franklin hotel received 12,000 in 1 day. In innumerable larger cities and towns in the country, a few days before the Philadelphia convention opened, and up to the time balloting started, pleasant female voices were calling prominent citizens everywhere and saying: "This is Western Union calling. Would you let us send the following telegram to your delegates at the convention in Philadelphia in behalf of Wendell Willkie?"

The people called were prominent, financially, but not politically sagacious or even politically minded. They were flattered, in many cases, at the thought of mixing up, even in a small way, with stirring political events. They didn't know, of course, in most cases, whether their delegates had been sent to the convention pledged to Willkie or not.

Neither did they know they were paying for the telegrams.

But they found them later on, on their telephone bills.

Another effective pressure method was to shower on a delegate telegrams from his clients or customers back home. By way of example, a delegate from a leading city in a Rocky Mountain State, a large and successful automobile dealer, who had gone to the convention pledged to vote for another candidate received a telegram advocating Willkie's nomination from almost every man or woman to whom he had sold a Packard automobile.

On the fourth floor in the Franklin Hotel in Philadelphia there were registered and residing more than 100 delegates. Over a period of 4 days prior to the convention, they received more than 2,500 telegrams urging, and some of them demanding, that they vote for Willkie.

The natural question is: "Why shouldn't people who wanted Willkie nominated wire their delegates saying so?"

The answer is they should have, but it happens that thousands of telegrams were unauthorized and unsent by the persons whose names were signed to them. A few delegate kept the wires they received and checked up when they went home. Some of them still have them.

As the campaign manager for Frank E. Gannett, New York State publisher, who was also a candidate for the Presidential nomination, I had a ringside seat from which to watch the inner workings of the Willkie "blitz" and like many others felt the irresistible force of its blows.

I say without fear of successful contradiction that Willkie managers sought to influence delegates by having their mortgage holders or bankers to whom they owed money call them in behalf of Willkie.

A Georgia farmer delegate, to name one of many, was called long distance by a miller in his home town who had annually advanced him money and seed on his season's crops. The miller, a Democrat, urged and finally demanded that the delegate vote for Willkie. Later in the same day, the delegate's banker who held the mortgage on his farm, called with the same demand.

Harrassed and worried, this man told me the spot he was in. I asked him if he could imagine who would go to the trouble of having either the miller or the banker call him long distance, and his reply was:

"Yes, a certain gentleman connected with the Georgia Power Co."

The Georgia Power Co. is a subsidiary of the Commonwealth & Southern Corp. of which Mr. Willkie had been president.

This delegate voted for his own candidate on the first ballot, but on the second ballot he voted for Willkie—because he had to.

I have often been asked the question—"How much money was spent to nominate Mr. Willkie and by whom was it spent?"

I do not know the answers, but as a result of my travels and contacts with individuals and political organizations of the Nation during those preconvention days I know that the Willkie crowd spent too much and more by far than all the other candidates combined. I am free to confess as one campaign manager I spent more money than I should have for my candidate or than I should have been permitted by law had there been a law restricting such expenditures in behalf of a candidate for a presidential nomination. I believe that the Congress should seriously consider an amendment to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act limiting expenditures for presidential nomination candidates as it now limits the amount of money that can be spent in behalf of candidates for Congress and other offices.

Harold L. Ickes, the Secretary of the Interior, could not be expected to say anything even remotely good about Wendell Willkie, but in the course of the 1940 campaign, he made a national broadcast wherein striking reference to the Philadelphia convention occurs and which has never been challenged. If not true, it should have been challenged by Willkie or his men. If true, it commands attention. It reads, in Icke's own words:

"Now I will tell you a significant story about the Philadelphia convention. A gentleman by the name of Al Blinn, president of the Ohio Edison Co., utility bond-brother of Mr. Willkie, the president of a huge Morgan holding company, was in attendance there. Just how persuasive Mr. Blinn was, I am not informed. But this I do know of him. Throughout the convention, or at least most of it, he sat with the South Carolina delegation. Upon the lapel of his coat, he proudly displayed a South Carolina alternate's badge, and he possessed an alternate's ticket. I ask you, just what was Mr. Blinn, utility tycoon from the State of Ohio, doing with the South Carolina delegation, of which he was not a member? This delegation had gone to Philadelphia pledged to Dewey but it landed in the Willkie net."

Checkup reveals that South Carolina sent two opposing delegates to the convention, and into the hands of the credentials committee fell the job of saying who should sit and who should not. The day prior to the hearing of this contest before the credentials committee which had full power to act, a delegate of one of the opposing factions, claiming to speak for his delegation, came to me and asked that I use all possible influence to help his delegation to be seated. He said his delegation was pledged to cast its first vote for Tom Dewey, but if seated they would cast their second ballot for my candidate, Mr. Gannett.

My organization did what it could to help the delegation and the committee's decision was favorable.

Half an hour later, the leader of the successful delegation walked in on me in the Franklin Hotel.

"Now let's talk turkey," he said, in substance. "I've been offered $19,000 for expenses, etc., for the delegation's vote on the second ballot and from there on until released, and I am offering your candidate our votes under the same conditions and for the same money, half to be paid down today and the balance after the second ballot is cast."

This conversation was carried on in the presence of one of my chief assistants.

Shocked and sparring for time, I said that I would "give the idea consideration," but the offer was not open for consideration. It had to be accepted immediately or not at all.

On the opening day of the convention, June 26, I walked back to where the alternates were seated, and there, as an alternate in this same delegation, sat a president of one of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation's largest subsidiaries. I knew him well, and we talked for a few minutes. I asked him how he had gotten past the convention police to a seat reserved for alternates, and he answered my question by producing an alternate badge and a ticket of the same delegation whose representative had demanded of me $19,000 for his delegation's vote.

Then there was the case of the Arizona delegation. This group was pledged to Gannett, and cast its first ballot for him. A few minutes afterward, I was called off the convention floor to a telephone. On the other end of the wire was a prominent attorney from a Midwestern State whom I knew personally.

This man, in an excited voice, said: "Nelson, I am talking from Willkie's headquarters in the Walton Hotel, and have just been advised that you have the Arizona delegation sewed up for your candidate. Your candidate hasn't a chance to be nominated, and I'm asking you to name your price for releasing the Arizona delegation to Willkie on the second ballot."

I replied that I couldn't hear him very well, and I suggested that we talk later when I returned to the Franklin Hotel during the recess hour.

On my return to the hotel after the second ballot had been cast, I put a Washington newspaperman on one phone extension and a former newspaperman from Minnesota on another and then called Willkie headquarters and asked for the attorney who had previously called me.

After apologizing for having had to cut him short at the convention hall, I asked him to repeat his proposal. He again said that my candidate did not have a chance to be nominated, and that it would be worth a lot of money to Mr. Willkie to have the Arizona delegation break for him on the next ballot because of its high position on the rollcall.

I replied: "What do you mean by a lot of money?"

He said: "You name your own price, because we have a roomful of money."

I told him that there wasn't enough for me to sell out my candidate, and I wasn't at all complimented with the offer, and further that I believed that if Mr. Willkie were to be nominated, the Republican Party would be overwhelmingly repudiated by the American people. Then I hung up the receiver.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator desire the reading clerk to stop? There is a note in the brochure from which the clerk is reading.

Mr. LANGER. Some Senators desired to ask me questions. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to inquire concerning the period around 1940. Did I understand correctly that the offer was $19,000 cash on the barrel for the South Carolina delegation at the Republican Convention?

Mr. LANGER. It was more than that for the Arizona delegation. The Senator heard what the clerk just read; $75,000 was offered for the Arizona delegation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. For the Arizona delegation?

Mr. LANGER. For the Arizona delegation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was that in cash?

Mr. LANGER. The party did not say whether it was cash. I should think it was. He did not accept it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If these facts are correct, is it not a rather shocking thing that a candidate for President could be nominated by bribery?

Mr. LANGER. It happened in Chicago in 1920, with reference to the candidacy of Governor Lowden or General Wood. Money was offered. The result was that neither Governor Lowden nor General Wood was nominated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from North Dakota is proposing a direct primary as a means of creating greater popular control over nominations. Is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. Under a direct primary there is not any possible chance for bribing or bulldozing anybody. The same thing would happen that happens

when the Senator from Illinois decides to run for United States Senator. He submits his case to the people. The people would decide, under the constitutional amendment, in June, whom they wanted to run for President. Anyone could run if he got the votes of 1 percent of the people who voted in the last election, through a petition.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That would be done on a uniform day?

Mr. LANGER. It would be a certain day in June. The constitutional amendment would fix it as the first Tuesday after the first Monday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then the Senator proposes a direct election of the President, whereby each voter, wherever he lives, would have an equal voice and an equal say in the final election of the President. Is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct. The people in the respective States would vote for the most popular candidate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota that I have studied the proposal, which was first advanced by Senator Norris, and now by the Senator from North Dakota, for many years, and I have come to the conclusion that it is the best and the fairest way to elect a President.

Mr. LANGER. I promised to yield next to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have at the desk a proposed amendment to the Daniel amendment, calling for direct election by popular vote of the President and Vice President of the United States. I have postponed, for the time being, calling up the amendment, because I wish to support the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from North Dakota.

Mr. President, I have long been in favor of electing Presidents and Vice Presidents by direct popular vote. I am in favor of reforming our present system of electing the President of the United States, because I am aware of the so-called dangers which have been pointed out by political scientists of electing a so-called minority President, although I do want to emphasize that that situation has occurred in only a very few instances in the last 180 years.

I am in favor of the direct popular election of the President of the United States by the direct vote of the people, just as we elect Senators and Members of the House of Representatives. Sixteen million people in New York State can be trusted to elect a United States Senator. One hundred and sixty-five million people can be trusted to elect a President of the United States. The use of television and facilities of the press have made the United States one community, having extensive and comprehensive communications. Direct election of a President is the only democratic way to elect a President, in my opinion. I am very confident that we shall come to it in good time. Of that I am very, very sure, even if a constitutional amendment to that effect should not be adopted this year. I am certain it will be adopted eventually, since it is the only logical way to elect a President.

Now there is before the Senate the proposal of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and other associates of theirs. If I may call it so, it is a political hodgepodge, but it is seriously advocated as a means of electing a President of the United States. The sponsors of the amendment and of the substitute to the amendment would have us elect a President in a way which would permit State legislatures to gerrymander congressional districts in an unparalleled way. Their proposal would permit 36,000 voters in Mississippi to have as much influence and as much weight as 200,000 voters in New York State. I mention New York State because I am more familiar with it than I am with any other State. Substantially the same proportionate imbalance would be noted in many of the other larger States of the Union.

Mr. President, the proposal would permit a low-vote, one-party State to have more influence in the election of a President than would the great States where elections are carried out under conditions of the keenest competiton, and where candidates must prove themselves or inevitably lose.

The President is the only officer in the United States who represents all of the people of the country. I think it is essential that he should and must be elected in the most democratic method possible, by the closest approach we can make to a democracy. I repeat that I am confident this method of election will be adopted in due course. I favor the amendment of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, because I think it is really the only way of bringing the democratic will of the people to bear on the election of their chief executives, the President and the Vice President of the United States. I think any other way is simply a poor makeshift and may lead to more difficulties than would the system which we have been following for 180 years. I am somewhat troubled by the system we have been following, because I think it needs correction in the way of making the election of our President and Vice President truly democratic.

But instead of adopting the proposal made by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and their associates, I would much prefer to continue the system we have been following for the last 180 years. The present system has not been perfect. It has not been wholly fair. It does not commend itself to those who believe in true democracy. But it has not caused any particular damage, because, as I have already pointed out, in very few instances has the Nation had a President who did not represent the will of a majority of the people.

I feel so very strongly that we should not make any change until we adopt the vital change of electing the President and Vice President by direct, popular vote, that, insofar as I am concerned, I shall vote against any proposal which thus far has been made, because I believe that the adoption of a new system of the character now proposed, which is unjust, unfair, inequitable, and certainly does not increase the adherence to the democratic will of the 165 million people of the United States, would further complicate the situation. It would lead to further confusion, and it would lessen our chances of adopting the system of direct, popular vote for the President and Vice President. I repeat that, in my opinion, that a direct popular vote is the only really democratic way of proceeding.

So I shall vote against the proposal made by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and their associates, because I believe it is unfair, unjust, undemocratic.

As a matter of fact, at this time I shall vote against any kind of amendment which would lessen the chances of our adopting in due course a constitutional amendment which would insure the direct, popular election of the President and Vice President. I think nothing should interfere with that. I believe that adoption of the pending amendment and similar amendments which may be proposed would simply delay the time when we can have direct election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I believe the Senator from North Dakota already knows that I share very much with him the feeling that the President and Vice President of the United States should be elected by popular vote. As I had occasion to say the other day on the floor of the Senate, we believe in the concept that this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people; and we believe that most of our people believe they elect their President and Vice President on election day—although that is not exactly the case.

I agree with the Senator from New York, who said that the most effective, democratic way for election of the President and Vice President of the United States is to have them elected by popular vote, so that at the close of the polls, when the ballots are counted on election day, the people will know they have elected a certain person as President and a certain person as Vice President.

I go along with the objective of the Senator from North Dakota, namely, to elect the President and Vice President by popular vote. That is covered in section 6 of his amendment.

This morning is the first opportunity I have had to read his amendment. Accordingly, any comment I may make on it will be in only cursory fashion, because I have not had an opportunity to give his amendment deep study.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say that the amendment has been on the desk for 4 or 5 weeks.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that. But the Senator from North Dakota also realizes that we do not get an opportunity to read every amendment, for the simple reason that we have other chores of an official nature to perform here, in accordance with our duties and functions as Members of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. I understand; I simply wanted the RECORD to show that the amendment has been on the desk for some weeks.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that, and I was not making any criticism as to when the Senator from North Dakota submitted his amendment. I was merely stating the fact about my opportunity to read it.

I wish to ask some questions in regard to section 2, section 6, and section 9 of his amendment.

The first question I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota is this: Who will pay for the expense of the primary that is called for in his amendment?

Mr. LANGER. Each candidate will have to pay it himself.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator from North Dakota mean that each candidate in a State will have to pay the State for the expense of setting up the machinery for holding the primary?

Mr. LANGER. Either he or his friends will have to pay for it; that is certain. That is one reason why I joined in sponsoring the amendment which was submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]; I refer to the amendment providing that the Federal Government shall pay that expense.

Mr. PASTORE. In connection with holding a popular election, would there be, as a result of such expenses; opportunity for only multimillionaires to be candidates for election as President or Vice President of the United States? Does the Senator from North Dakota mean that the candidate would have to pay for the expenses of the primary throughout the Nation?

Mr. LANGER. That would be handled just as in the case of an election for a Senator from Rhode Island, where the candidate would call upon his friends to see whether they would file a petition with the Secreary of State of Rhode Island. A candidate in the primary would have to rely upon his friends in each State.

Mr. PASTORE. But who would pay for moving the voting machines from the warehouse to the voting place; and who would pay for supervising the procedure at the voting place; and who would pay for registering the Democrats and the Republican? Will those expenses be paid by the United States Government, or by the State governments?

Mr. LANGER. By the State governments.

Mr. PASTORE. By the State governments?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly.

Mr. PASTORE. If a State government has not already set up the machinery for a primary, would it have to pass laws on that subject, in order to do so?

Mr. LANGER. It certainly would have to.

Mr. PASTORE. In my State the voters do not register as Republicans or Democrats. Of course, I am glad they do not, because I get some Republican votes to send me here. Under the Senator's amendment, what would our situation be in that respect?

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Rhode Island will notice that section 2 of the amendment provides that the petition will be valid only—"if signed by qualified voters in any or all of the several States, equal in number to at least 1 percent of the total number of popular votes cast throughout the United States for all candidates for President" and so forth.

The amendment does not refer to either Republicans or Democrats.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that and I am not critical of the objective of the Senator from North Dakota. I believe in it. I understand his reason for proposing to do away with national conventions, if he feels that such conventions have led to corruption. So I understand the purpose of the Senator from North Dakota in proposing that the proceedings be managed on the basis of primaries. I have no objection to that. But I object to the incompleteness of his amendment.

Mr. LANGER. I shall be delighted to have the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island offer to my amendment any amendment he wishes to offer to it.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course, Mr. President, I do not think we should amend the Constitution of the United States here on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. I may point out that the amendment was drawn up by the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that. But I am pointing out certain objectives which must be met. In my State the voters do not register as Republicans or Democrats. In Rhode Island, the only qualification we have is that within a period of 26 months—for the reason that we have biennial elections—a person cannot vote in a caucus or in a primary of a different party. That covers the 24-month period that means that one cannot be a Republican within the same biennium and also be a Democrat within the same biennium. Instead, a voter must make up his mind one way or the other. But the voters do not have to register as Democrats or Republicans. If I vote for this amendment, I am telling the people of the State of Rhode Island that they must register either as Republicans or Democrats.

Mr. LANGER. The amendment does not so provide.

Mr. PASTORE. Oh, yes. I repeat that my examination is only cursory, but the Senator says, in line 6 of section 2, if I read it correctly:

> Voters in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for voters of the most numerous branch of the State legislature—

I find no fault with that—

> but, in the primary election each voter shall be eligible to vote only in the primary of the party of his registered affiliation.

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. What is to be done in a State where voters are not required to register either as Republicans or Democrats?

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator will read the entire amendment, he will see that it provides that Congress may enact any legislation necessary to see to it that they do register.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is now referring to section 9 of the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Section 9 reads as follows:

> Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

What does the Senator mean by that—enforce what?

Mr. LANGER. It simply provides for registering Republicans as Republicans, and Democrats as Democrats.

Mr. PASTORE. I would like to be in favor of the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota. I should like to have the opportunity of voting for popular election of the President, but I do not see how I can vote to levy this burden on the taxpayers of the State of Rhode Island and compel them to set up machinery which is absolutely strange to them. The people would be required to register as voters of one party or the other, when, by habit and custom, they have not been obligated to do so. To me, that is a substantial defect in the amendment. I like the Senator's idea of a primary, but he is spelling out the machinery. Why not have a simple amendment providing that the vote shall be by primary, and that the Congress shall enact laws to carry out the spirit of the constitutional amendment?

Mr. LANGER. I should be perfectly delighted to have the Senator offer any amendments he may wish to offer. We took the measure which George Norris drafted and followed it. He was chairman of the Judiciary Committee. The committee went over the amendment very thoroughly, and this seemed to be the best we could agree upon. If the distinguished Senator has any amendments to offer, I shall be delighted to have him offer them.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to do so. However, the only trouble is that between now and 1:30 or 1 o'clock, when the Senate will vote upon this amendment, the Senator from Rhode Island cannot sit down and write an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with which he himself would be satisfied. Nor does he believe other Members of the Senate would be satisfied if he had only an hour in which to write the amendment.

That is the observation which I make upon the Senator's amendment. I should like to go along with it, but so long as section 2 remains in the amendment, I question whether I could, in full conscience, go along with section 2. I would go along with a simple amendment providing, as does section 6, for doing away with the electoral college, and providing for popular election of the President and Vice President. I say that sincerely.

Mr. LANGER. My distinguished friend would not have to worry much on that score. If the joint resolution is passed by the Senate, it will go to the House, and then presumably to conference. Certainly a provision could be drafted which would make the proposed procedure feasible.

Mr. PASTORE. That may be an expedient. However, the Senator from Rhode Island would like to feel that, in good conscience, he could answer for

every vote he casts on the floor of the Senate. I have raised certain questions with respect to section 2. I had hoped I could obtain definitive answers to them before voting.

Mr. LANGER. We do not want the spectacle of Democrats voting in a Republican primary and nominating a Republican candidate, or Republicans voting in a Democratic primary and nominating a Democratic candidate.

Mr. PASTORE. On the other hand, we do not wish to say to a State which does not register voters as Republicans or Democrats, "You must do it, and pay for it with your own money, because we in the Congress feel that that is the way to elect a President of the United States." If we believe it is a national responsibility, I think the money ought to be appropriated by the Congress of the United States to hold these primaries, especially in States which do not already have provision for them. I believe it would be unfair for the Congress to say, "We will enforce the law, but you, in your own State, will raise the money to carry out the directions which we in the Congress give you."

Mr. LANGER. That is the reason I joined in supporting the Neuberger amendment. That is the way politics have operated.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for yielding to me.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Might it not meet the objection of the Senator from Rhode Island, if, on page 2, line 9, after the word "election", there were inserted the words "a State may require that", so as to read:

> Voters in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for voters of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, but in the primary election a State may require that each voter shall be eligible to vote only in the primary of the party of his registered affiliation.

Might it not meet the Senator's objection to make it optional, and thus provide that a State may require the voter to vote only in the primary of the party with which he is registered, leaving it permissible, so that States such as Rhode Island, which do not require registration by party, could permit a person to vote in either primary?

Mr. PASTORE. That would be a step in the right direction, but basically it violates the entire spirit of the amendment, because the amendment gives exclusive authority to the Congress of the United States to determine the question. As I say, I have given the amendment only a cursory reading. I find nothing in the amendment which grants any discretion or alternative to a State. It is a mandate by the Congress, telling a State what it must do, regardless of what it has ever done before. It requires a State to change its entire custom and habit with respect to registration, even though it may never have previously required registration by a party. It strikes me that we could have an amendment to carry out the objective of voting in a primary if we wish to do away with the national convention, without throwing the burden upon the taxpayers of individual States. The procedure could be properly policed, properly enforced, and properly supported with Federal money, if we wish to have a primary.

This amendment really involves two primaries. It would not eliminate the primaries which are customary in the States today with relation to choosing candidates for Congress and for State offices. This involves a second primary, which has to do exclusively with the nomination of candidates for the presidency and vice presidency of the United States. Am I correct?

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. So it involves two primaries, one to be held whenever the laws of the State require it to be held, for nominations for Senators and Representatives and State officers; and the other, to be held in June——

Mr. LANGER. No. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. PASTORE. I will point it out to the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. The theory is that there would be a primary on the second Tuesday in June. That would be a nationwide primary.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. There is no objection to a State's having its primary on the same day.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that; but the point is that the State primary is a State function, which the State has the right to control. The only enforcement provided for in this amendment is on the part of Congress, under section 9 of the amendment. It might be that the State primaries could be held in June; but I ask the Senator from Louisiana if his State would want to hold State primaries in June. At their primaries they actually elect their candidates.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. It seems to me that the answer is obvious. We would call the nationwide primary for candidates to be nominated for the Presidency, the primary to occur throughout the country at the same time. If States wished to avoid having two separate primaries, one for nominations of Senators and Representatives and State officers, and the other for nominations for the Presidency and the Vice Presidency, there would be no reason why State laws could not be amended. The Senator from Rhode Island has said that he did not want to require the States to do certain things. The States would not be compelled to hold their primaries at the same time. If they wanted to hold primaries for Senators and Representatives at a different time, that would be their privilege.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Rhode Island did not say that he did not want to require the States to do anything. I merely said that the spirit of the amendment was to retain in the Congress the right to enforce the provisions of the constitutional amendment. Section 9 reads to that effect. All the Senator from Rhode Island is saying is this: In certain States voters are not required to register for one party or the other. There is no such requirement in Rhode Island. In Rhode Island no man has to tell anyone whether he is a Republican or Democrat. We believe in that system. We think it is good. The only requirement in Rhode Island is that a voter is not permitted to vote at both Republican and Democratic primaries, because, of course, that would not be fair. The Senator can understand that.

The moment the substitute became a constitutional amendment, it would require voters in Rhode Island to register as either Republicans or Democrats. That would be the case whether Rhode Island approved of the plan or not. I say in that way the concept of popular elections would be taken from the people, because there are many people in the country who do not want to stand up and say to which party they belong. They claim they are independents, and they want to vote freely for their candidate after the candidates have been nominated for President and Vice President.

The proposal, in an effort to do away with one evil, I am afraid would bring in another evil, which would deny freedom to people to remain independent.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator from Rhode Island agree that the Republicans should nominate their candidate and that the Democrats should nominate their candidates in the primaries?

Mr. PASTORE. That is the way it is done now.

Mr. LANGER. In a general election a voter can vote for either candidate.

Mr. PASTORE. But in Rhode Island it is not necessary for a voter to declare whether he is a Democrat or a Republican when he votes in the primaries.

Mr. LANGER. Why should they be permitted to do so? The proposal does not change the present system.

Mr. PASTORE. That is why I will not vote for it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am sure that the Senator from Rhode Island would have no objection to a simple amendment which would require the addition of only a few words to the proposed substitute, by which voters would not be required to designate their party affiliation, but which would permit them to vote in whichever primary they wanted to vote.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator from Louisiana can draw up that kind of modification, I shall certainly look at the proposal in a different light. I would be in favor of a proposal which would state that an individual who was qualified to participate in any primary of his State may participate in a Federal primary. I would agree to such a proposal. However, I do not want any new encroachment on a voter's right, or any new burdens placed on a voter or in any way to restrict the right of a Rhode Island voter so far as the primaries are concerned.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Rhode Island will look at page

2 of the proposed substitute, he will notice that the language there says:

Voters in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for voters of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

I interpret that language as preserving in the State the right to determine the qualifications of its voters.

Mr. LANGER. That is the purpose of that language.

Mr. LONG. The language continues:

but, in the primary election—

At that point I would insert the words "a State may require that." Then the language would continue:

each voter shall be eligible to vote—

And so on.

Mr. PASTORE. It would be necessary to omit "registered." In Rhode Island we do not register at the primaries.

Mr. LONG. My proposed language would not require a voter to register. There would not necessarily have to be any compulsion. In other words, under my language it would not be necessary for a State to require that a voter register. Perhaps that would meet the Senator's objection.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not care whether the proposal is put in the negative or positive or alternative. However, there must be added a provision that any person who is eligible under existing State law to participate in a party primary may participate in the Federal primary. I do not know the exact words which would be necessary to carry out that thought or requirement, but if such provision were added, I would be inclined to accept it.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is an able attorney, a very able Senator, and a good legislator. He has also done some very fine service as Governor of his State. I am certain, if he cares to vote for this amendment, he will find language that will carry out his purpose in section 2 of the pending substitute. I believe the appropriate place for such an amendment would be in the second sentence, to which I have referred.

Mr. PASTORE. I wish to say again that the Senator from Rhode Island does not feel he must sit down at this time and write an amendment to a constitutional amendment on the spur of the moment. We have legislative counsel who can draw up such language. If the Senator from North Dakota feels there is merit in the suggestion I have made, he may wish to have someone draw up proper language that will perpetuate in clear simple language the basic fact on which we can all agree, namely, in the everlasting and perpetual Constitution of the United States. If he does that, I shall vote for the proposal.

Mr. LANGER. As I told my distinguished friend from Rhode Island, I would certainly object to having Democrats go into a primary and vote for a Republican candidate, or to have Republicans vote for a Democrat in the primary.

Mr. PASTORE. Under the proposal before the Senate a voter must register and he must indicate his party affiliation. There are some States in which that is not required. I believe that even in North Dakota there would be some difficulty with regard to that provision.

Mr. LANGER. In North Dakota we have an arrangement under which an Independent can vote in the primary.

Mr. PASTORE. I say again, that in Rhode Island it is not necessary to register in order to vote in a primary. Under the provision sponsored by the Senator from North Dakota it would be necessary to register.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I intend to vote for the substitute offered by the Senator from North Dakota. It does seem to me that once we depart from the electoral college system and undertake to modify it, objections can be raised to any proposed arrangement that retains the electoral college based on the belief that it would permit the election of a minority President.

I believe the people of the United States are sufficiently accustomed to the system of majority rule—certainly at all local and State levels—that they would approve of that principle being applied at the Federal level. They would approve of a system which would make certain that the candidate who received the most votes should be elected President. Is there anything in the proposed amendment which would relate to a runoff in the event that one man did not receive a majority of the votes cast?

Mr. LANGER. There is nothing like that in the proposal at all.

Mr. LONG. The Senator does not believe that the proposal should include such a provision?

Mr. LANGER. No; I do not.

Mr. LONG. Suppose the high man received 34 percent of the vote, would the Senator believe that he should nevertheless be elected President?

Mr. LANGER. If he gets a majority of the vote in a primary, he would be the top man.

Mr. LONG. I am not speaking about the primary. I am speaking about the general election. Let us assume that the candidate of the Democratic Party received 33⅓ percent of the total vote cast, and that the next candidate received perhaps 32 percent. Does the Senator feel that the candidate who received 33⅓ percent of the vote cast should be elected President?

Mr. LANGER. There would be only 1 man running on the Democratic ballot and only 1 Republican on the Republican ballot.

Mr. LONG. However, there is nothing to prohibit a third or fourth or fifth party from offering candidates.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, the idea is to make it very difficult to do that. The proposal provides that the petitions must be signed by 5 percent of the voters. It would be possible for three men to run in an election, but the one who got the highest vote, would be elected President.

Mr. LONG. The Senator feels that that arrangement would be preferable to a run-off?

Mr. LANGER. I do believe so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the marked portion of the article entitled "The Philadelphia Story" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At this point it seems pertinent to report, without comment, an astounding incident that came under my personal observation during the final preballoting days of the convention.

A well-known publisher of a large midwestern city, who was also the chairman of the convention delegates from his State, came to me and related what would have been an unbelievable story had it not been supported by documentary evidence. The story had to do with Mr. Willkie's official connection with the Alabama Power Co., and its sale in 1934 of certain transmission lines to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The publisher believed sincerely, as a good citizen, that the facts concerning the deal should be laid bare before, rather than after the possible nomination of a candidate whose integrity and ethical conduct were involved.

It should be reported that the story had been related to a number of the outstanding party leaders who deplored the facts but lacked the courage to precipitate the inevitably disagreeable consequences of cleaning party linen in public.

The simple facts are these: In 1934 the Alabama Power Co., a subsidiary of the Commonwealth & Southern Corp., of which Mr. Willkie was the head, entered into a contract to sell certain transmission lines to TVA. The trustees of the Edison Electric Institute, a trade organization of which Mr. Willkie's company was a supporting member and Mr. Willkie a trustee, called a meeting and protested the sale on the ground that it was unconstitutional and the first step toward public ownership.

At the meeting Mr. Willkie was present and encouraged the trustees to appropriate $50,000 to fight the case through the courts although Mr. Willkie himself had signed the sales contract. On the 14th day of December following, Mr. Willkie met President Roosevelt in the White House and assured him that the contract would be carried out, and a White House statement to that effect was sent out to the newspapers of the country.

Following the White House meeting Mr. Willkie returned to New York and called the trustees into session and asked that the minutes of the previous meeting at which $50,000 had been appropriated to fight the sale be expunged from the record, or at least that his presence be ignored. One of the trustees, a lawyer in a Far Western State and the head of a public utility company, revolted at the idea and resigned his membership, carrying with him enough of the record to show what the real facts were. Correspondence between the mutinous member and Thomas H. McCarter, president of the Institute who had presided, and Mr. Willkie was carried on and became a part of the former trustee's file.

When the trustee became aware through newspaper and radio reports that Mr. Willkie was sneaking up on the Republican nomination, he felt that in all fairness to the people and to his own conscience in the matter, that the facts concerning the questionable transaction should be made known. He consequently sent his complete file, including all correspondence carrying Mr. Willkie's signature, to the only one who came to his mind—his friend, the newspaper publisher who, as he knew, was going to the convention as a delegate and delegation chairman.

The publisher-delegate immediately got in touch with party leaders who bemoaned the situation and agreed that something should be done but were unwilling to take the initiative. Hearing of the publisher's activities, Mr. Willkie sent for him to come to New York where, through many hours, Mr. Willkie attempted to prove by producing the records

that allegedly had been changed, to convince the publisher that he, Willkie, had not been present at the meetings in question.

Efforts on the part of Mr. Willkie and his supporters to prevent the exposé continued up to the early preconvention days, when other meetings were held between the publisher, Mr. Willkie, and his campaign manager, Mr. Russell Davenport. On Saturday night, before the convention opened, in a 90-minute interview with the publisher, Mr. Willkie again denied that he had attended the meeting of the Edison Institute, and stated that he was with David Lilienthal, a director of the TVA, at the Hotel Roosevelt in New York City.

However, Mr. Willkie did say that it was possible that he had arrived at the end of the institute board meeting but emphatically denied that he had argued for the resolution to appropriate a defense fund.

He insisted on more than one occasion to the publisher that publication of the story would ruin his chances for the nomination.

At the final interview with Mr. Willkie, he offered to get together the next day the trustees of the institute in refutation of the whole matter. To this the publisher agreed and specifically requested the presence of three certain trustees. This Mr. Willkie agreed to do by Sunday afternoon or Monday. The publisher waited in vain for word from Willkie headquarters that the meeting had been arranged, and so proceeded, to ease his own conscience, to publish the facts of the case in his own newspaper. At the publisher's request I loaned him my own secretary who helped him with the mechanics of his story late into Sunday night when he put it on the wire to his home city. This, however, was too late to have any influence with the delegates.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Are there any Senators who desire to speak in opposition to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to speak for about 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator desire to speak in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, this amendment not only provides for a direct popular vote in the election of a President and Vice President, but, as I understand, it provides for a nationwide primary for the selection of a candidate for President and Vice President.

Mr. President, the portion of the proposal to which I would direct my remarks is that which provides for a direct vote for President and Vice President. Other objections have been pointed out, such as the necessity, at least, for additional provisions if we are to have a national primary. But as to the portion of the amendment relating to the election of President and Vice President, I should simply like to invite the Senate's attention to the fact that the amendment would leave the voting qualifications up to the various States, and this would bring about an inequality because of the fact that some States provide that persons who are 18 years of age can vote. That applies, at least, in one State—Georgia. Other States require voters to be 21 years of age before they can vote. There are various qualifications for voting within the different States which make it impossible, it seems to me, for us to have a nationwide popular election which would be fair to each State. But the main reason, Mr. President, why I would oppose the amendment, is that we now have a system of electing the President and Vice President by electoral votes, which are divided among the States in accordance with the number of representatives in the Congress.

When this Union was formed, Mr. President, it was understood that each State would have two Senators. That is one portion of our Constitution which cannot be amended. It was understood that 2 electoral votes for President would go for the 2 Senators to each State.

So, Mr. President, there are 30 or 31 States which have an electoral vote on the basis of their 2 Senators, plus their Representatives in the Congress, giving them a little more than the proportional amount of votes they would have in a nationwide election.

In my opinion, an amendment of this nature would never be approved by a sufficient number of legislatures throughout the country to be adopted as part of the Constitution of the United States.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has stated that, according to his poll of the electorate in his State, the people would be willing to give up the advantage they have today in the present division of our electoral votes. But I am sure there are many smaller States of the Union which would not be willing to give up the proportionate part of the electoral vote they have today, which is larger than it would be with a direct election, because of the fact that we begin with two Senators, and therefore have two electoral votes for those two Senators.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Has the Senator any proof positive that small States feel that way? I come from a very small State; as a matter of fact, it is the smallest State in the Union. I believe in popular elections. I believe the President represents all the people, that he is not the President of the States, but is the President of the people of the United States. I have never heard anyone in a small State lament the fact that, if we had popular elections, they would lose power. I do not think it is a question of power; it is a question of democratic principle. If we are going to elect a President of the United States by the people of the United States, then why should not the popular way of doing it prevail, as we elect a Governor in Texas or in Rhode Island? Why should we not elect the President and Vice President of the United States the same way? Why talk about loss of power and the reluctance of the small States to yield this power? Rhode Island has no power in the election of a President. There are 800,000 people who express their choice on election day. Those 800,000 people join with the rest of the people who make up the voters of the United States of America in deciding who the President is to be.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator recognizes, of course, that 800,000 people among the 160 million people——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 10 more minutes to the junior Senator from Texas, Mr. President.

Mr. DANIEL. They would have a much less proportionate say in the election of a President than they have with the present number of electoral votes.

Mr. PASTORE. We have 2 Representatives, we have 2 Senators, and we have 4 electoral votes.

Mr. DANIEL. Has the Senator figured the votes by percentage of the voters of Rhode Island under a general popular election, as compared with the way it is today?

Mr. PASTORE. No. I have never done that, because I do not think it is at all important. We believe in the dignity of each independent voter.

Mr. DANIEL. If the Senator will do that, I am sure he will find that all members of the legislature of his State will not be as unselfish in this matter as he is, because of the fact that there are not many States in the Union which are going to give up their two Senators or their electoral votes to which they are entitled from the very beginning by reason of the fact that they are separate sovereign States. In other words, this Nation is still a Federation of States. It is a Republic. There are still some rights, though some people would like to wipe the lines out completely, which accrue to each State because of the fact that it is a sovereign State. One of the rights given to the States which no amendment to the Constitution can take away is the right of each State to have 2 Members in this body; and, by the same token, the right of each State to have 2 electoral votes toward the election of a President, regardless of how many people reside in the State.

So, as a practical matter, it would be impossible to find very many of the legislatures in this country as unselfish as are the Senators from Rhode Island and North Dakota. I do not think they should give up their present division by States. The Senator knows that I feel that we should get as near to a direct vote as we possibly can without giving up the separate electoral strength of each State, and without wiping out the State entity in the electoral machinery.

Mr. PASTORE. I respect the Senator's position, and I think he argues well when he takes the position that his version of the pending measure is possibly getting away from a very archaic system and taking a step in the right direction, but what I question is the fact that we are willing to abandon the old but we are not actually ready and willing to recognize the new.

The Senator takes the position that the people in the State of Rhode Island may not feel quite as does the Senator from Rhode Island about the proposition. There, again, we are getting into difficulty. I have been a member of the

Legislature of the State of Rhode Island; I have been lieutenant governor of the State of Rhode Island; I have been governor of the State of Rhode Island; but I have never heard anyone in Rhode Island talk about the power to elect a President of the United States and the power which would be abandoned if we went to popular elections. But I have heard people say, "Is it not a shame that the man who gets the most votes might lose the election?" Is not that just awful, I ask the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DANIEL. We are certainly in agreement on that, and I have been trying to see that the individual voters will have an expression in the total electoral vote for President of the United States.

But again I say, in all deference to the Senator from Rhode Island that I believe we shall never be able to go to a direct popular vote for President of the United States. The nearest we can approach it is to have the votes divided by States, have each State's electoral votes determined as they are today, and divided in accordance with the popular vote of each State.

There is no use in going into the history of it any further. It has been sufficiently covered. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] covered it, although he is opposed to the pending amendment. He went into this particular point in detail, and stated why it would be unfair to ask the States to give up the present percentage of the vote they have toward the election of a President of the United States.

To get right down to it, as a practical matter, I do not think the amendment would have any chance of being approved by the State legislatures, even if it should pass the House of Representatives. I believe the nearest we can come to the people themselves having their votes tallied and counted toward the election of a President is by using the proportional system which I have advocated, by dividing each State's present electoral vote according to the popular vote as it is cast by States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield 5 minutes to me in order to discuss his amendment?

Mr. LANGER. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the proposal now before the Senate is one which I believe all Senators can subscribe to in principle and conscience. It simply provides that the candidate who receives the most votes shall be declared the elected President. That, I believe, is what the average American wants. I should be willing to say that, in my judgment, a poll taken of the voters in all walks of life, in all 48 States, would disclose that they think the law ought to provide that whoever gets the most votes wins.

The present system is archaic; it is behind the times. It was adopted 169 years ago by persons whose attitude was that the vote for President should be by States. That system was devised long before the people of the Nation had the confidence the people today have in the popular election of national officials. Today in America we have far greater confidence in the wisdom of the majority. I am certainly willing to depend upon the wisdom of the majority of the American people in electing the President of the United States.

I believe that large States and small States alike should be willing to give up all unreasonable advantages as they might possess, either in any respect, in favor of the overall public welfare and in favor of electing the candidates whom the people, in their discretion, prefer.

If we do not accept the principle of the popular election of the President, then from that point forward we shall depart from a principle which appeals to the people of the United States.

If we shall adopt the Mundt-Coudert proposal or the Daniel proposal, what will we find? We will find that we have compromised with principle, to the point that although the present system will have been changed, it will still be possible to elect a President who received a minority of the votes, while the candidate who received a clear majority of the votes of the American people would not be elected President.

Why should a large State ratify the Daniel proposal? Why should it ratify the so-called Mundt-Coudert proposal? Why should the House of Representatives, whose membership is, after all, based upon the population of the Congressional districts in the various States, ratify a proposal which originated in the United States Senate, whose Members are chosen without regard to population, so long as the majority rule concept is compromised against the interests of the large States who have the majority of the Members of the House?

Why should a large State like New York give up its advantage in casting all the votes of New York in one block? There is an argument in favor of such a change if it be said that the people will choose the method of the direct election of the President.

While the larger States under some of the proposals would be asked to give up many of their advantages, why should not the smaller States also give up some of the advantages they hold under the antiquated, archaic system which now exists? For example, why should Nevada cast one-half of 1 percent of all the electoral votes, when Nevada has only one-tenth of 1 percent of the entire population? To be fair, the small States also should be willing to give up some of the unreasonable advantages they hold.

The point was made that some States permit a higher percentage of their citizens to vote than do other States. The argument does not particularly appeal to me that some States have poll taxes and other States have educational qualifications, and other limitations, which prevent a large number of the people from voting, while those States insist on the advantage of casting as great an electoral vote as though those people whom the States disqualify by their laws had been permitted to vote. Any State can remove the poll tax if it wants to do so. Having done so, that State will find there will be a greater number of persons who will be able to vote.

If it wants to do so, a State can establish voting qualifications that will permit more of its citizens to vote. Nobody would object to the votes of additional persons being cast in a national election. The tendency would be for the States to enfranchise as many voters as could qualify under any reasonable rule of interpretation, thus letting the largest possible number of voters cast their votes.

If the vote shall be in favor of the Langer substitute, we will have voted for a method which appeals to the intelligence and the conscience of the American people. We will have provided a method for the election of President which the people of the Nation would like to have.

To me, the Langer proposal is the only one which makes sense. In the last analysis it is the only one which can be adopted.

I do not believe there is a single major State, such as New York, Illinois, Ohio, or Massachusetts, whose House Members would vote to propose the Daniel substitute. Those States would not find that proposal to their advantage. Nor will the Representatives from those States vote for the old Lodge-Gossett version, because they see no reason to give up the advantage which they have, while the small States are allowed to retain the unreasonable advantages they also have.

On the other hand, as the Senator from Rhode Island has suggested, I believe that the large States and the small States alike could join together in supporting a proposal to elect the President by a popular vote, letting the candidates who receive the majority of the votes of the people be elected President of the United States.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will yield back the remainder of his time, I shall be glad to yield back the remainder of my time, and to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McCarthy
Allott	George	McClellan
Anderson	Goldwater	McNamara
Barrett	Gore	Millikin
Beall	Green	Morse
Bender	Hayden	Mundt
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Byrd	Ives	Potter
Carlson	Jackson	Purtell
Case, N. J.	Jenner	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Clements	Kennedy	Scott
Cotton	Kerr	Smathers
Curtis	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Laird	Sparkman
Douglas	Langer	Stennis
Duff	Lehman	Symington
Dworshak	Long	Thurmond
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Flanders	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Frear	Martin, Pa.	Young

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] as a substitute for the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] for himself and other Senators.

All time having been yielded back, and the yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SPARKMAN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Br. BARKLEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay" and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 69, as follows:

YEAS—13

Chavez	Lehman	Neuberger
Douglas	Long	O'Mahoney
Jackson	Mansfield	Smith, Maine
Laird	Morse	
Langer	Neely	

NAYS—69

Aiken	Ellender	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Flanders	McCarthy
Anderson	Frear	McClellan
Barrett	Fulbright	McNamara
Beall	George	Millikin
Bender	Goldwater	Mundt
Bennett	Gore	Pastore
Bible	Green	Payne
Bricker	Hayden	Potter
Bridges	Hennings	Purtell
Bush	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Byrd	Hill	Saltonstall
Carlson	Holland	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Hruska	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Ives	Smathers
Clements	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Johnson, Tex.	Stennis
Curtis	Kennedy	Symington
Daniel	Kerr	Thurmond
Dirksen	Knowland	Watkins
Duff	Kuchel	Wiley
Dworshak	Malone	Williams
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Young

NOT VOTING—14

Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Butler	Kefauver	Sparkman
Capehart	Magnuson	Thye
Ervin	Monroney	Welker
Humphrey	Murray	

So Mr. LANGER'S amendment to the amendment of Mr. DANIEL was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1240) for the relief of Imre de Cholnoky, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 27, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1240) for the relief of Imre de Cholnoky.

ADDITIONAL BILLS TO BE CONSIDERED BEFORE EASTER RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to announce the possibility that the following measures will be considered before the Easter recess:

Calendar No. 1287, Senate bill 898, which is the so-called trip-leasing bill.

Calendar No. 1629, H. R. 5265, to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons.

Calendar No. 1665, H. R. 6625, to provide for the transfer of title to certain land the improvements thereon to the pueblo of San Lorenzo (pueblo of Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 1677, S. 1161, to abolish the Fossil Cycad National Monument, S. Dak., and for other purposes.

All these bills, in addition to the measures I have previously announced, may be considered before the Senate begins the Easter recess. I should like all Senators to be on notice to this effect.

PRINTING OF "INVENTORY REPORT ON CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY OWNED BY UNITED STATES" (S. DOC. NO. 109)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, at a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations on March 21, it was recommended that a committee print of the Inventory Report on Real Property Owned by the United States in United States Territories and Possessions and in Foreign Countries as of June 30, 1955, compiled by the General Services Administration at the request of the committee, be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

This inventory is a companion report to the summary issued as Senate Document No. 100 on February 14 covering Federal domestic real property, and together these reports compile for the first time in history essential information on the worldwide real property holdings of the United States.

I present the committee print, and ask that it be so printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the correspondence relating to the report, together with a press release giving detailed facts connected with the inventory, be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1956.

Re Federal real property inventory report.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are pleased to submit the attached report covering the inventory of real property owned by the United States in its Territories and possessions and in foreign countries, as of June 30, 1955.

This inventory report was prepared pursuant to the committee's request in Report No. 411, dated June 2, 1955, that "an additional report to cover federally owned properties outside of the continental United States, including specifically the properties in the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands, and including foreign properties as far as security limitations will allow."

This report summarizes for the first time in history, all real property holdings of the civilian agencies in United States Territories

and possessions and in foreign countries. It contains only certain summary data as reported by the Department of Defense.

In addition to the summary inventory report, detailed listings for civilian agencies are being submitted to you, under separate cover, which provide detailed information, in support of the report, by agency, bureau, and installation, within each country and city.

This report and its companion report on properties in the United States, which was published as Senate Document No. 100, furnish a presentation of all worldwide real property holdings of the United States.

The total cost of real properties outside the United States is $5.5 billion. As indicated in Senate Document No. 100, the cost of Federal real property in the United States is $32.5 billion. This makes a total cost of $38 billion for all real properties owned by the United States, as of June 30, 1955.

Every effort has been made to achieve maximum accuracy. However, this is the first time an inventory of real property outside the continental United States has been reported. Accordingly, it would be improper to assume that there are no discrepancies. Additional work is needed to refine the data and the records of the holding agencies from which the data are obtained.

As requested by the committee, we shall continue to prepare annual real property inventory reports as of the close of each fiscal year.

We again wish to express our appreciation for the cooperation received from Mr. Earl Cooper of the committee's staff, the participating agencies, and the Bureau of the Census.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN G. FLOETE,
Administrator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
March 16, 1956.

The Honorable FRANKLIN G. FLOETE,
Administrator of General Services,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLOETE: The committee is in receipt of the inventory report on real property owned by the United States in its Territories and possessions and in foreign countries as of June 30, 1955, prepared by your Administration pursuant to the committee's request. This report is supplemental to the inventory report on Federal real property in the United States as of June 30, 1955, the summary of which was issued as Senate Document No. 100 on February 14, 1956.

It is interesting to note that in these two reports we have now available for the first time in history, a summary presentation of all worldwide real property holdings of the United States, showing a total cost of $38 billion.

The summary report of this additional inventory, with supporting charts and tables, is also being issued as a Senate document and made available to all Federal agencies as well as the public generally. We recommend that a set of the electric accounting machine detail data sheets be furnished to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees and Government Operations Committees and to the reporting agency, and that file and working copies of these sheets will be available also in your Administration for reference.

The committee is confident that the inventory information on the worldwide real property holdings of the United States will prove to be as useful to the many agencies of the Government as has already been proven to be the case with the inventory information on real property in the United States. As such uses of the information increase, we believe the benefits and savings resulting will become even more apparent.

Yours very sincerely,

CARL HAYDEN, *Chairman.*
STYLES BRIDGES.

For the first time the Federal Government has complete tallies of its real property, at home and abroad.

Sum totals in United States realty holdings were revealed today when Senator CARL HAYDEN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, announced that the committee has received the first complete inventory of federally owned real property in foreign countries and United States Territories and possessions.

The inventory, prepared by General Services Administration at the committee's request, supplements the GSA domestic inventory which the committee received and announced last month. Senator HAYDEN also announced that GSA hereafter will bring both inventories up to date annually so that the Government will have a running account of all its realty.

The findings from the overseas inventory are summarized in a new Senate document, "Inventory Report on Real Property Owned by the United States in United States Territories and Possessions and in Foreign Countries, as of June 30, 1955," which the committee authorized for publication. The summary report is a companion to Senate Document No. 100 which sums up the domestic holdings. As both detailed inventories are huge compilations running to thousands of pages, they have not been published although master copies of both, except for security installations, are open to inspection on request at GSA.

Franklin G. Floete, Administrator of General Services, transmitted the report and the inventory to the committee with a letter pointing out:

"Every effort has been made to achieve maximum accuracy. However, this is the first time an inventory of real property outside the continental United States has been reported. Accordingly, it would be improper to assume that there are no discrepancies. Additional work is needed to refine the data and the records of the holding agencies from which the data are obtained."

The new inventory figures show holdings of 345.6 million acres of land and facilities in 108 foreign countries and 8 United States Territories and possessions. The acquisition cost, exclusive of the public domain, totaled $5½ billion.

Added to continental property costing $32.5 billion, the Federal Government now has worldwide ownership of real property acquired at a cost of $38 billion, excluding domain lands at home and in the Territories. The total acreage amounts to 753.5 million and is equal to an area comprising all States east of the Mississippi River, plus Texas and Louisiana.

GSA's tabulations show holdings are distributed around the world, in such widely dispersed places as the Canton and Enderbury Islands in the South Pacific, Mozambique in Africa, Switzerland in Central Europe, Malaya in southeast Asia, and Surinam in South America.

In addition to the military installations, which have not been reported in detail the report shows that the civilian agencies have 1,049 installations outside the continental United States, ranging from 1 for the International Boundary and Water Commission to 355 for the Treasury Department, mostly Coast Guard installations.

The preponderant balance of the offshore holdings, 343.8 million acres, are in the Territories and possessions, principally Alaska and the Canal Zone. A total of 1.8 million acres are located in foreign countries.

Of the total acreage in foreign lands, 99.7 percent is owned by the Department of Defense. The balance is distributed among civilian agencies, principally the Department of State with over 195 installations in 105 countries.

Also in the total are holdings in Iron Curtain countries—in Albania, Bulgaria, and Red China—with which we do not maintain diplomatic relations. Realty there is being cared for by third-party nations with diplomatic offices on the scene. The United States owns no realty in the Soviet Union.

Despite the world-wide range of holdings, nearly all of the 345.6 million acres outside the continental United States is in Alaskan public domain lands, which total 343.1 million acres. Thus, 92 percent of the offshore holdings, in Territories and possessions as well as foreign lands, from the standpoint of acreage, is controlled by the Department of the Interior. The Department's large share reflects the substantial public domain holdings in Alaska.

The next largest single parcel of offshore property is the 358,278 acres making up the Panama Canal Zone.

The inventory figures also include land in which the Government has a "life interest" instead of titled ownership. A "life interest" is defined to cover any real property which has been acquired by the United States by treaty or long-term lease (99 years, in perpetuity, etc.). The Panama Canal Zone is in the "life interest" category.

In addition to the worldwide acreage figure, the Government holds in trust 55.3 million acres of land. The trust properties are principally Indian reservations, all within the continental United States, except for 100,000 acres in Alaska.

Land acreage owned by the Government in the Territories, possessions, and foreign nations is employed in six major categories: Forest and wildlife preserves, Alaska oil and gas reserves, parks and historic sites, military functions, the Alaska Native Reserve, and grazing lands.

The predominant usages of buildings and facilities in the same areas are housing, office space, service areas, storage facilities, hospitals, schools, industrial facilities, prisons, and other institutions.

The General Services Administration said it will continue to keep the inventory up to date on an annual basis.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I move to recommit——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The Chair states that, due to a prior understanding, the Senator from West Virginia will be recognized.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The matter being brought before the Senate by the Senator from West Virginia is a privileged matter.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1956

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. NEELY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BIBLE, Mr. FREAR, and Mr. BEALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 3–26–56–C, and ask unanimous consent that the names of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] be added as cosponsors of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, lines 14 to 16, inclusive, it is proposed to strike out the words "a majority" wherever they appear therein and insert in lieu thereof the words "at least 45 percent."

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut will state it.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I was recognized, and I yielded to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] to make his motion on a privileged matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Chair recognized the Senator from Connecticut because the Chair thought the Senator from Connecticut was objecting to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] was recognized because he had a privileged matter before the Senate.

Mr. BUSH. I stated the purpose of my rising, and I believe I stated it before the Senator from South Carolina was recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut was not recognized by the Chair for that purpose.

Mr. BUSH. I do not wish to press the point unduly, but I believe the Presiding Officer called my name when I was on my feet, and I yielded to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. I make one more appeal to the Chair to rule whether I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The amendment is on page 5, lines 14 through 16, to strike out the words "a majority" and insert in lieu thereof the words "at least 45 per centum." It is my belief the amendment would make the Daniel substitute a much better proposal, and I am sure it would gain some votes in the Senate. I believe at the same time it would do justice to people in a case where 45 percent of the voters cast their ballots in favor of a certain person, and would prevent the throwing of the election into the House of Representatives. I believe the Senator from Texas has agreed to accept the amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. The purpose of the amendment is merely to make certain that we would not be throwing too many elections into Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. It has been pointed out in the debate on the floor, and in certain articles in the press, that if we were to apply the rules in the proposed substitute to past elections, 5 or 6 elections in the past might have been thrown into Congress; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct. I should also like to say that the Senate adopted such an amendment on the floor of the Senate in 1950, but at that time the percentage requirement was 40 percent, instead of 45 percent. The constitutional amendment we approved in the Senate carried a percentage requirement of 40 percent.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator is correct. In 1950 a 40 percent requirement was added to the joint resolution that was passed by the Senate. We have figures for elections back to 1864. By using those figures and applying the 45 percent requirement, no election since that time would have been thrown into Congress. Therefore I believe the Senator from South Carolina is offering a fair compromise on that point. So far as I am concerned, the amendment is acceptable to me.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk a brief statement on the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In 1950 I authored Senate Joint Resolution 2 which would have placed before the people of the various States an election reforms amendment to the Constitution.

This amendment, which essentially would have accomplished the same reform that is sought in the amendment under debate here today, was passed in the Senate and would have gone before the people had it not been killed in the House.

My amendment, which passed the Senate, contained a 45 percent provision. The bill before the Senate now contains a 50 percent provision.

To many Members the 50 percent provision is unrealistic and therefore they have expressed themselves as being for the bill but in a position of having to vote against the bill because the percentage factor is too high.

Frankly, I am in favor of this elections amendment to the Constitution. I want to see it pass. But I realistically see that it has slim chance of getting through the Senate with the 50 percent formula. I sincerely believe that by amending this formula down to 45 percent that a majority in the Senate will feel able to go along with the bill and that we will then succeed in its passage.

I have, therefore, offered my amendment and earnestly hope that its compromising tone will enable us all to go along with the amendment when thus amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is modifying his substitute in accordance with the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina. He so modifies his amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "3–21–56–B."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Has the Senate disposed of the Johnston amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair just announced that the Senator from Texas had the right to modify his substitute by accepting the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Carolina, and he has so modified it.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut was not on his feet seeking recognition when the Chair recognized the Senator from New York and the Chair had no alternative other than to recognize the Senator from New York.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to know for what purpose the Senator from New York rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator stated that he wanted to call up an amendment which the clerk has at the desk.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I shall be glad to waive the reading of the amendment by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, lines 10 and 11, strike out the words "as provided in this Constitution", and insert in lieu thereof the words "by votes cast by the people of the several States."

Beginning with the words "East State" in line 19, page 2, strike out all to and including line 3, page 3.

Beginning with line 7, page 3, strike out all to and including line 18, page 3.

Beginning with the comma in line 4, page 4, strike out all to and including the word "entitled" in line 5, page 4.

Beginning with line 6, page 4, strike out all to and including line 4, page 5.

On page 5, line 5, strike out the section number "4" and insert in lieu thereof the section number "2."

On page 5, line 14, strike out the comma and insert in lieu thereof a period.

Beginning with the words "if such number" in line 14, page 5, strike out all to and including line 23, page 5.

On page 5, line 24, strike out the section number "5" and insert in lieu thereof the section number "3."

Beginning with line 25, page 5, strike out all to and including the words "and for the case" in line 3, page 6.

On page 6, line 5, strike out the word "majority" and insert in lieu thereof the word "plurality."

On page 6, line 5, strike out the word "electoral."

On page 6, line 7, strike out the section number "6" and insert in lieu thereof the section number "4."

On page 6, line 12, strike out the section number "7" and insert in lieu thereof the section number "5."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. It differs from the one proposed by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] in that it calls for direct election of the President and Vice President by popular vote, but only in general elections.

It does not include the proposal made by the Senator from North Dakota to cover the choice of persons running in the primaries. It simply provides for the direct election of candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, and the ending of the electoral college. It is as simple as that Mr. President. It is a democratic proposal which I think should have been in effect for many years and which I think must unquestionably come in this country. It does away with all the questions which have arisen, such as the question of whether a President might be elected, as has been the case in a few instances, by minority vote. It does away with the question raised by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] which would permit a vote gerrymandering within a State, or the creation and encouragement, through an alternative proposition, of splinter parties. I think it is a very, very simple and overdue amendment. I believe it will meet the wishes and views of a vast majority of the people of this country, and I strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for two minutes?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to yield whatever time the Senator from Rhode Island may require.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I concur in everything said by the distinguished Senator from New York, who is the proponent of this amendment. I regretted that I could not support the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, because of some of the cumbersome provisions with reference to the holding of primaries. I feel that the amendment offered by the Senator from New York is a clear and simple one. All it does is to effect a popular vote on the part of the people of the United States for President and Vice President. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield time to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, which is a little difficult to understand because of the deletion of certain words, the only difference between his amendment and that of the Senator from North Dakota is that it provides for direct vote for President rather than to include a direct vote in the primaries. Is that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct. I think the Senator from South Dakota has very clearly described the purpose of my amendment. It is about as simple, clear, and direct as any amendment or piece of legislation could be. It simply calls for the elimination of the electoral college, which has served its purpose for a great many years, and which was set up through the wisdom of the Founding Fathers, but which is no longer needed and is no longer responsive to the will of the people of this country.

My amendment simply calls for the direct election of President and Vice President in exactly the same manner as that in which every Member of this body has been elected—by direct vote of the people. It calls for direct election in the same way every Member of the House of Representatives has been elected. I believe it calls for substantially the same system as that under which the majors and most of the minor officers of our great cities have been elected. It is the democratic way of proceeding, Mr. President, and I very much hope that the Senate will vote in favor of my amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the acting majority leader opposed to the amendment?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, Mr. President. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York. It eliminates one objection to the Langer amendment, because it does not, in and of itself, provide for a direct vote in the primaries. However, I invite attention to the fact that it does do certain other things which do violence to our constitutional concepts of government in the United States and it ought to be defeated.

In the first place, it is completely impossible to have a national election of President on the popular-vote basis without at one and the same time providing for national control of presidential elections through all the rules and all the regulations required to operate such elections.

It is completely impossible to provide for fairly and equitably electing a President by popular vote and retain the present concept whereby each State establishes its own voting hours, voting places, voting conditions, voting ages, and all the other machinery and mechanics of voting. That was clearly disclosed in the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota, on which the Senator from Rhode Island made some very pertinent and persuasive objections. The Senator from North Dakota was correct in trying to put both primary and general elections together if the popular-vote formula is to be used, but he was incorrect in the efficiency of the machinery which he would establish and to which the Senator from Rhode Island called attention.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I understood that all the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York would do would be to provide for the counting of the votes. It has nothing to do with when a poll shall open and when it shall close. It has nothing to do with the opening or closing of the polls. All we are saying is that upon the close of the polls on election day, when we begin to count the votes, the man who receives the most votes cast by the people of the United States shall be their President. It is just as simple as all that.

Mr. MUNDT. There is no question about it; but suppose one State of the Nation—let us take Illinois—should elect to say, "We are not going to close our polls until midnight, when the returns have pretty well come in from all the other States." Does the Senator from Rhode Island believe the rest of the States should permit that to occur?

Mr. PASTORE. May I ask a question in answer to the Senator's question?

Mr. MUNDT. Surely.

Mr. PASTORE. Cannot that be done today under the existing system?

Mr. MUNDT. It can be done today, but because the vote is not a direct vote, it cannot so easily be correlated with the result of the vote, as the Senator from Rhode Island pointed out in his main speech.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not think correlation has anything to do with it. It is merely a question of counting the votes, the same as is done in the election of a governor or in the election of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. The votes are counted. Once the polls have been closed, the votes are counted, and the candidate who receives the most votes is elected President.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be glad to give the Senator from Rhode Island another example indicating why such a popular vote proposal will necessitate Federal control of a national election.

Let us assume the State of South Dakota desires to make the greatest possible impact on a national election, in which only the popular votes are counted; where nothing counts but X's and marks and the pulling of levers on the voting machines. Let us assume further that South Dakota reduces its voting age to 17. Does the Senator believe that that would be equitable to other States, which might have approximately the same population, but where the voting age is 21?

Mr. PASTORE. It would be just as equitable as what is proposed in the Senator's amendment. What the Senator is talking about is the qualification of voters. That is a State function. That is provided for in the existing law and will not be changed, no matter which amendment shall be adopted today. We are not talking about that now, under the amendment sponsored by the distinguished junior Senator from New York. We are talking only about how it will be possible to determine the final result. We are not talking about who shall be qualified to vote in an election. That is not being changed by any amendment which is before the Senate today.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Rhode Island is in error, for the good reason that, under our substitute amendment, it does not make any difference what the qualifications for voting are, because the number of electoral votes is geared to the population of a State, and is geared to its number of Senators and Representatives. That will not be altered by a change in the qualifications or the ages of the voters. But if only the number of persons who vote are counted, then anything the State can do to increase the

number of people who will vote within its boundaries, will result in an increase in the impact which that State will have on the national election. It is as simple as that.

If the age of voting is reduced to 17 years, there will be tens of thousands of additional voters in a small State like South Dakota, which would expand the influence of South Daktota in the national election. As a consequence, Congress would have to say that the voting age was limited to 21, 18, or 17, in order to make the adjustment between the States equitable and honest and to prevent their competing with each other to increase their total votes.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator from South Dakota arguing, in effect, the principle that the purpose of the creation of the electoral college was to maintain a certain amount of restriction over the various States, as to how far the States should go in establishing the qualifications of the voters?

Mr. MUNDT. One of the functions of the electoral college is to preserve to the State the right to establish the qualifications of voters; that is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. That is not my understanding of the purpose of its creation at all. As I understand, the reason for the creation of the electoral college was that it was felt that it was not advisable to have the election of the President by a direct vote of the people because the people were not qualified to determine who the President should be; and that that determination should be restricted or confined to the small group of delegates to the electoral college. That is the history of the United States of America.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Rhode Island is talking about the reasons for the creation of the electoral college. I am talking about its function. I am talking about the functions of the electoral college as it operates in the field of practical politics. That is not where the matter ends.

Let us say we have the system of direct voting for President. South Dakota being a comparatively small State, it can exercise its influence in the direction of a candidate, let us say, who favors the kind of farm program that we in South Dakota want. Let us assume that South Dakota then reduces the voting age to 17. But suppose that New York, or Rhode Island, perhaps, being interested in a particular point of view which is different from that of South Dakota, says, "You cannot do that to us. We are going to reduce our voting age limit to 16"—which they would have a right to do; and which, under the direct vote for President, would automatically expand the size of their vote.

The legislature of South Dakota might then say, "At the age of 12 a boy is old enough to become a Boy Scout. A Boy Scout is smart enough to vote, so we will reduce the voting age limit to 12, and bring in another 50,000 voters." What will Rhode Island do? It may reduce the voting age limit in that State to 10, 8, or 9?

I use this illustration to point out that there cannot be a direct popular vote for President unless a State is willing to relinquish complete control over the electoral machinery of the State and give it to the Congress of the United States, which would have to establish rules which were fair, honest, and equitable, and the Federal Government would have to provide an umpire to enforce them.

Consequently, in a commonwealth of States like the United States, where we recognize the fact that the States as such have some rights and functions, it seems to me we are talking about a proposition which is completely inconsistent, unless we are willing to take the step which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was willing to take, namely, to provide that all the electoral power shall reside in Congress.

If that were to be done, what would happen in 1960 or 1964? I will tell Senators what could happen. The same seductive argument would be used to bolster the question. Why should there be a United States Senate? Small States like Rhode Island and South Dakota have 2 votes; a mighty State like New York has only 2 votes. If it makes sense to count only noses when electing a President, it might make sense to some also to count only noses in electing United States Senators. The first thing we know, there will be another constitutional amendment proposed to elect the membership of the Senate on the basis of the election of the House of Representatives; and the representatives of a State in the United States Senate will be elected on the basis of the popular vote.

What will be left of the rights of the States? What will be left of the doctrine of State's rights? Whatever will be left of the original constitutional concept will go down the drain. We shall be moving in the direction of compelling Congress, by the voting processes, to establish election machinery to govern the entire country.

Mr. PASTORE. May I respectfully ask the Senator one question?

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly.

Mr. PASTORE. Why change the system at all?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be happy to answer that question. It should be changed because by the compromise amendment we go as far in the direction of the popular vote for President as we can go and still maintain the concept of this Republic being a commonwealth of States. We retain all the values and virtues which the Constitution provides by having a bicameral legislature, with the Senate representing the States and the House of Representatives representing the people. We retain that method and go as far as we can in the commendable direction of having the people vote for President, without having to abolish the sacred framework provided in the Constitution.

Mr. PASTORE. Under the present system, and under the Senator's own amendment, could it not very well happen that the candidate who received the largest popular vote would finish by possibly not becoming President of the United States?

Mr. MUNDT. I think history shows that has happened.

Mr. PASTORE. It is possible, is it not?

Mr. MUNDT. It is possible.

Mr. PASTORE. Therefore, it could well be that in counting the electoral votes, the four electoral votes from Rhode Island could be the crucial votes in determining the winner, even as against the popular vote. Am I not correct?

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator from Rhode Island would have to have a more lively imagination than has the Senator from South Dakota to accept such a possibility.

Mr. PASTORE. But I am asking if there would not be that possibility.

Mr. MUNDT. I would say it is not in the realm of reality.

Mr. PASTORE. It could be very effectively in the realm of reality when the votes of the electoral college were counted. The result could turn on four votes, could it not? The ultimate decision could turn on four votes.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator is talking about a mathematical possibility instead of actual reality, the answer would be "Yes." So far as reality is concerned, I should say the answer would be "No."

Mr. PASTORE. Therefore, if Rhode Island lowered its voting age to 12 years, which it would have a right to do, it could well be that the 12-year limit of Rhode Island would determine the result, even in the Senator's case.

Mr. MUNDT. The 12-year-old voters——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. May I have 10 minutes more?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 10 additional minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I submit to the Senator from Rhode Island that even if the voting age in Rhode Island were such that the voters went to the polling places in swaddling clothes, that would not make any difference under our present system. Rhode Island would still have only four electoral votes. And so would South Dakota. Under the compromise amendment, the total impact of Rhode Island would not be increased in the total count by changing or reducing voting ages.

Mr. PASTORE. But the impact of Rhode Island could be crucial in the counting of the votes.

Mr. MUNDT. So what?

Mr. PASTORE. So what? It would mean that the crucial vote would be determined by the children in swaddling clothes. [Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. MUNDT. I am not complaining about the age of the voters. I am perfectly willing to admit the boys of Boy Scout age in South Dakota have more intelligence to vote than do some persons in some other States. The point I am trying to make is that we must not put a premium on skulduggery or chicanery by tempting States to reduce the voting age in order to have a bigger impact upon the election of the President.

Everybody in Rhode Island could vote under our present system, but Rhode Island would still have only 4 electoral votes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Insofar as abilities and capacities to vote is concerned, that is a matter of private opinion. All I am saying to the distinguished Senator is that he gave us a comparative case, whereby States could lower the age requirement for voting in order to make an impact on the popular vote.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. All I am doing is taking the very argument of the Senator himself, to show that no matter how it is done, whether in the electoral college or not, if the voting age were lowered, the States which lowered the age could be crucial insofar as the final determination is concerned.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator begs the whole argument. The Senator does not meet the issue. By lowering the age requirement, the impact of the State under our present system would not be changed. Under the popular vote for President situation, however every time there was an additional voter in a State, the total number of that State's votes would be increased. It is that argument which the Senator from Rhode Island runs away from.

Mr. PASTORE. No; I do not run away from it. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Of course.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator use the word "impact" as analogous to the word "result"?

Mr. MUNDT. I use the word "impact" on the basis that the importance of the State of Rhode Island would be increased every time the voting age limit were reduced, if the amendment of the Senator from New York were adopted; but it would not have any effect at all on the impact or result, insofar as the importance of Rhode Island is concerned, under the compromise amendment or the present system.

Mr. PASTORE. If the 4 votes of Rhode Island happened to be crucial votes in determining the result, and Rhode Island had lowered the voting age, that would not have an impact on the result?

Mr. MUNDT. No. The vote of the people of Rhode Island in total would have the impact of just four electoral votes.

Mr. PASTORE. But it determines the result, does it not, because the man who received the popular vote was elected.

Mr. MUNDT. How many electoral votes does the State of Rhode Island have?

Mr. PASTORE. Four. How many does the State of South Dakota have?

Mr. MUNDT. Four.

Mr. PASTORE. That makes us even. [Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. MUNDT. Let us find where we wind up, in the Senator's judgment. We start out with four apiece. I want to keep us even. No matter how many people in the States vote, we each have four votes. Is that right?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. We shall adopt, for discussion purposes only, the amendment of the Senator from New York. We shall assume that the population of each State is around 700,000. Is that fair enough?

Mr. PASTORE. That is fair enough.

Mr. MUNDT. The voting citizens among the 700,000 in each State cast their votes, and each State has 4 electoral votes.

Mr. PASTORE. That is right.

Mr. MUNDT. Adopting the amendment of the Senator from New York, let us assume that the voting age in South Dakota is lowered to the age of 12. So South Dakota would have 1 million voters, and Rhode Island would have only 700,000 voters.

Mr. PASTORE. What difference does it make?

Mr. MUNDT. It makes a difference of 300,000. If 700,000 are subtracted from 1 million, there is a difference of 300,000, which means that South Dakota would have 300,000 more votes than Rhode Island in the popular election for President. Consequently Congress would have to step in to make it fair.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Let us assume there is a close election, and Candidate A gets a majority of the votes, as against Candidate B, but in determining the electoral college votes, B has more votes than A. If it is a close election, it could well be that any State which lowered the voting age would be the determining factor in the counting of the votes, and in preventing the man who received the popular votes from becoming President or Vice President.

Mr. MUNDT. It would not have any impact on the end result.

Mr. PASTORE. It would not have any impact; it would have the result.

Mr. MUNDT. Under the present system, the voting age in South Dakota could be lowered to the age of 1, and South Dakota would still have only 4 electoral votes. If there were a direct popular vote for President, however, then it would make a tremendous difference what the voting age in the various States was lowered to, because it would make a difference in the total number of people voting. Assuming there are now 700,000 votes in Rhode Island and 700,000 votes in South Dakota, if we in South Dakota lowered the voting age so that there would be 1 million votes in South Dakota, what would happen as a result of casting 300,000 extra votes in South Dakota in a close election? We would get our man elected, because we would have lowered the age for voters, so that we would have 300,000 more votes than Rhode Island. So South Dakota would succeed in electing the President it wanted to. Would the Senator like that?

Mr. PASTORE. I might not like that; but I say, Why does the Senator adopt the philosophy or the logic that we must go to a popular election if he does not believe in it?

Mr. MUNDT. I do believe in it.

Mr. PASTORE. Why does the Senator say his amendment brings us closer to a popular determination when the Senator is saying that the real impact should be the number of delegates on the part of each State? Why change the present system at all? Whom are we kidding?

Mr. MUNDT. As I answered the question before I had to correct the Senator's arithmetic, I said we are moving as far as we can move, or as we dare go, in the direction of having a popular vote for the President. We are moving as far as we can move in the direction of equalizing the voting power of individual citizens. To go the full route would be to break through the whole constitutional framework of States' rights and bicameral legislatures, and the whole concept under which we operate. We move as far as we can go without giving the States the right to manipulate the voting machinery so as to increase their voting power. When that is done, it necessitates Federal control of elections, which would not be in the public interest.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator think it would be in the public interest to have an election of a President of the United States who happened not to receive most of the votes, in order to preserve the State impact? Does the Senator think it is in the public interest and in the interest of the American people to have selected as President a man who receives a lesser number of votes, because he receives more votes as a result of the impact of States' rights?

Mr. MUNDT. I think it is not in the public interest, and for that reason our amendment decreases materially the likelihood of that kind of thing occurring, as against the present system.

Mr. PASTORE. It happened once. It could happen again.

Mr. MUNDT. It could happen, but the amendment makes it more difficult to happen and less likely to happen.

Mr. PASTORE. But it could happen.

Mr. MUNDT. It is not very likely.

Mr. PASTORE. But it could happen.

Mr. MUNDT. It conceivably could happen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I have 10 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 10 additional minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Under the present electoral system, we have seen it happen three times that a President has been elected without receiving a plurality of the votes. Is that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not true that one of the main purposes of the proposed amendment now before the Senate is to prevent that from happening in the future, or at least lessen the likelihood of that happening?

Mr. MUNDT. It certainly would decrease the likelihood of that happening.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I had about 20 minutes, and I have used about 2 minutes of that time.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEHMAN. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has 26 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to reiterate my opposition to the direct vote for President, so that I can get my remarks in a consecutive place in the RECORD. First, it would automatically necessitate Federal control of elections in order to insure fair, honest, and equitable national elections.

In the second place, it moves in the direction of eliminating the whole basis of our bicameral legislation, because every argument which can be advanced in the direction of electing a President by direct vote can also be advanced toward eliminating the concept that each State is entitled to two Senators, regardless of population. Consequently, it moves sharply in the whole direction of obliterating State boundary lines in this country, which situation has served this country so well under the 10th amendment of the Constitution. I do not think we are about to start amending out the Bill of Rights at this time, when it is demonstrated so often and so eloquently that the 10th amendment is just as important as is any other in the Bill of Rights.

Mr. President, our proposed amendment has many supporters. I should like to introduce, and ask unanimous consent to have printed, in the RECORD a resolution passed by the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPORT OF MUNDT-COUDERT BILL

Whereas the present method of selecting presidential electors has narrowed the effective political foundation of the President to a few large, doubtful, and pivotal States whose electoral votes are vital to victory, and puts a high premium on the power of organized pressure groups; and

Whereas United States Senator KARL E. MUNDT and Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., have proposed in Congress an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that electors for the President and Vice President be elected in exactly the same manner as Senator and Representatives are elected, that is, 1 in each congressional district and 2 at large; or statewide in each State: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States of America urges wholehearted support for the proposed Mundt-Coudert amendment which provides for the election of 435 representative electors in congressional districts and the election of each State's 2 senatorial electors by statewide popular vote as United States Senators are elected.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to introduce into the RECORD, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed, a resolution supporting the proposed amendment, which was adopted by the 30th Women's Patriotic Conference, meeting in Washington, D. C., on February 16, 17, and 18, 1956.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Resolved, That the 30th Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., endorses the principles of the following proposed constitutional amendments:

"Mundt-Coudert amendment, to reform the electoral college by choosing electors by congressional districts plus 2 at large to correspond with each State's 2 United States Senators. This amendment is designed to take away the excessive power now exercised by the minority groups in larger cities under the present electoral college system."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Many Senators Voice Support—Electoral Reform Vote Seen," written by Charles Lucey, and published in the Washington Daily News of March 19. Mr. Lucey himself has given a great deal of careful study to this proposal, and in the article he quotes a number of our colleagues in the Senate as to why they believe this reform is necessary, and, in fact, is overdue.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reform of the outmoded electoral college system of choosing a President was advocated by many Senators today as the time neared for Senate debate on a proposed constitutional amendment providing this change.

Sponsors of legislation aimed at wiping out the present winner-take-all system of apportioning each State's electoral votes agreed last week on a compromise measure. More than 50 Senators have signed it as coauthors.

A two-thirds vote in the Senate and House and subsequent ratification by three-fourths of the 48 States is required to change the Constitution.

The compromise sponsored by Senators PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas; ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee; STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, and KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, woud enable States to choose 1 of the 2 methods of selecting presidential electors.

One plan would provide for division of each State's electoral votes among presidential candidates in exact mathematical ratio to the popular vote. The other would allow choice of presidential electors in the same manner as Members of the Senate and House are now chosen.

ANDERSON

"The electoral college under the present system has outlived its usefulness," Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico said today. "The Daniel-Mundt plan will make the election of a President more responsive to popular will and still maintain our Federal system."

BIBLE

Senator ALAN BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, said he believed the sponsors "now have a bill that is in satisfactory form, and I'm going to vote for it."

FULBRIGHT

From Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, came an assertion that the proposed change is the "best means of encouraging a true two-party system that I know of."

"It will enhance the prestige and standing of the minority party in any particular State," he said. "It will encourage development of the Democratic Party in Maine or New Hampshire and of the Republican Party in Alabama or Georgia. And it will minimize the power of swing and fragment groups claiming the strength to swing the populous States."

MARTIN

Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN, Republican, of Iowa, said: "We do need revision of the present electoral college system and I believe there is much merit in the compromise that has been reached. I am on the bill as cosponsor and as it stands now I'll vote for it."

KUCHEL

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California, had a reservation:

"The electoral college provisions of the Constitution do result in disfranchisement of many voting citizens. I have looked forward to casting my vote in favor of a sound proposed amendment. The question next week will be whether the two different methods of choosing electors, when tied together, should be adopted."

SALTONSTALL

Another in the "study" class is Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, who said he had favored the former Lodge-Gossett plan, but had not yet reached a conclusion on the compromise.

MONRONEY

Senator MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, said he preferred the Daniel-Kefauver approach which would divide the electoral vote in exact conformity with the popular vote, but added: "I consider the compromise plan superior to our present system because more voters' votes will have actual weight in the presidential electoral count."

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, Democrat, Florida: "I was one of the sponsors of the former Lodge-Gossett bill and I think the present measure is a good piece of legislation—one long needed in the enlightened democracy ours is. It is unfair when the Republicans may win New York State by 100,000 votes and get the State's entire electoral vote. It may be turnabout with the parties in the South or Midwest. People are thus disfranchised."

HAYDEN

Senator CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, Arizona, observed that he always reserves the right to change his mind at the last minute but "this proposal looks all right to me. I voted for the constitutional amendment when it it was proposed before."

ERVIN

Senator SAM J. ERVIN, Democrat, North Carolina, said he favored the measure because it "will come nearer to reflecting the will of the voters. It will mean also that electoral votes of States cannot be determined by a handful of people claiming to hold the balance of power in a close election."

The electoral reform bill has been cleared to the Senate floor by the Democratic Policy Committee and is expected to come up after the farm bill. The amendment would not affect the 1956 presidential election.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "They Are People, Too," which was published in the Pittsburgh Press of March 23. The editorial indicates why our compromise amendment is important.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered the be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In some respects, the argument in the Senate over constitutional reform of the electoral college is becoming pretty academic. But there is some point in that.

Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, an opponent of the plan, fears that any system which would count all the votes cast for President would deprive the so-called pivotal States of influence and rebound to the benefit of the so-called one-party States.

Examples of pivotal States include Massachusetts. Because Massachusetts is a swing State. Both major parties are strong, so that

the State now goes Republican, now Democratic. Currently, it has one Senator from each party.

Examples of one-party States include Georgia, which consistently casts its electoral college vote for a Democratic candidate for President. And Vermont, which always goes Republican.

"The point I make," says Senator KENNEDY (a Democrat, by the way), "is that in the case of the States with the largest population, their influence would be almost nil, and that it would make the influence of the Democratic Party in the South far greater than it is."

How so?

The constitutional amendment which would reform the electoral college is concerned with people, not merely States.

If the amendment is adopted, it will be the people who elect Presidents, not States. And not States on a basis which disfranchises people by the millions.

Senator KENNEDY uses 1944 as an example. Let's take it.

Twelve Southern States all went for F. D. R. But 1,511,783 voters in those States favored Governor Dewey. The electoral college vote in those States went 100 percent for F. D. R. The more than a million and a half Dewey voters were ignored. Their votes didn't count.

In the 5 most populous States of that year—all pivotal—3 went for F. D. R., 2 for Mr. Dewey. F. D. R. got all the electoral college votes from California, Illinois, and Pennsylvania; Mr Dewey, all from New York and Ohio. In California, Illinois, and Pennsylvania, 5,063,636 Dewey voters were disfranchised. In New York and Ohio, 4,049,073 Roosevelt voters were disfranchised.

So in the South, which Mr. KENNEDY seems to fear, there were more than one and a half million voters whose votes didn't count. In the pivotal States, which Mr. KENNEDY presumes to defend, there were more than nine million voters who votes didn't count.

In either case, all were legitimate voters, entitled to a voice in the selection of a President. They didn't get it.

That's why the constitutional amendment now before the Senate ought to pass, so the ballots of all voters will count.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "DANIEL Hails New Reform Support," which was published in the Washington Daily News of March 26. The article advocates our compromise amendment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Charles Lucey)

The big roundup for votes was on today after the week-long Senate battle over reform of the electoral college system of choosing a President.

A change in the Constitution which has been advocated for a century is expected to come to a vote tomorrow or Wednesday. A two-thirds majority is needed for adoption, and the measure's foes, led by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democat, of Massachusetts, able to offset two votes with every adherent they gain, were claiming enough to stop it.

But Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas, and KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, hailed new support. They said there was no question that more than two-thirds of the Senate favor revision of the antiquated electoral system—the problem, they agreed, is to present a draft which can muster the necessary support.

STATEMENT

In a statement, Senator DANIEL noted support which had come for electoral reform from the Washington Star, the New York Times, and the Scripps-Howard newspapers, and a new nationwide Gallup poll showing more than 2 to 1 backing for change in the way a President is elected.

"I am certain," said DANIEL, "that more than two-thirds of the Senate recognize that electoral reform is far overdue. Studies have shown that the public generally favors change. We should discharge our responsibility at this time. I am hopeful that we can find a formula which will send this long-needed revision on its way to the House and subsequently to the American people for a vote."

Senator MUNDT wrote personally to all 95 of his Senate colleagues, presenting a vigorous 5-point case for adoption of the amendment.

GOAL

The goal of reform is to wipe out the winner-take-all system by which a presidential candidate receiving a plurality of the vote in a State wins all of that State's electoral votes. Often States are swung by a mere handful of popular votes and the effect, sponsors of change say, is to disfranchise millions whose vote goes uncounted for the candidate of their choice.

Under a compromise now before the Senate, States could chose between apportioning their electoral votes strickly according to statewide popular vote or a system based on selection of electors just as Members of Congress are chosen.

Leaders of 14 organizations today urge defeat of the electoral college change, calling it "a vote against civil rights" in telegrams to Democratic Senate Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, Texas, and Republican Senate Leader WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, California.

Among signers were Walter Reuther, United Auto Workers' president; Joseph Rauh, Jr., chairman of the Americans for Democratic Action; Roy Wilkins, executive secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Rabbi Israel Goldstein, American Jewish Congress; and James Carey, president, International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, since many of my colleagues have suggested that it would be desirable to have the compromise amendment itself incorporated in the body of the RECORD, so that those who read the RECORD will know exactly what is being proposed by means of the amendment and who is joined in its cosponsorship, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD our compromise amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 31, as that amendment has been submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], on behalf of himself and 53 other Members of the Senate; and I ask unanimous consent that the names of all the sponsors of the amendment be printed, together with the text of the amendment.

There being no objection, the amendment proposed by Mr. DANIEL (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILEY, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. JENNER, Mr. IVES, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD,, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. HILL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. WELKER, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. KERR, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. THYE, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. FREAR, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. BEALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. WATKINS) to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during a term of 4 years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution. No person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"'The Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of the President is to begin. Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress. The electoral votes cast by each State may be cast in the manner provided by section 2 or, if the legislature of such State so provides, in the manner provided by section 3 of this article.

"'The voters in each State in any such election shall have the qualifications requisite for persons voting for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

"'SEC. 2. Except in any State in which electors are chosen under the provisions of section 3, votes for President and Vice President shall be cast by the people of each State, and the electoral vote to which such State is entitled shall be apportioned among the 3 persons receiving the greatest number of votes of the voters of such State for each office in the same ratio as the number of votes received by each such person bears to the total number of votes received by such three persons. In making the apportionment, any fractional portion of an electoral vote to which a person is entitled shall be disregarded if it is less than one one-thousandth.

"'Within 45 days after the election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, the official custodian of the election returns of such State shall prepare, sign, certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate, a list of all persons for whom votes were cast for President and a separate list of all persons for whom votes were cast for Vice President. Upon each such list there shall be entered the number of votes cast for each person whose name appears thereon, the total number of votes cast for all such persons, and the number of electoral votes of such State to which each such person is entitled.

"'SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of this article, the legislature of any State may provide for the election of a number of electors equal to the number of electoral votes to which the State may be entitled in the same manner in which its

Senators and Representatives are chosen. Any candidate for elector who before the election has pledged his vote for President or Vice President to a specific person shall, if elected, cast his vote for such person. No Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be chosen elector.

" 'Within 45 days after the election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, the electors so chosen shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot as pledged for President and Vice President, at least one of whom shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves. They shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice President; and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President and of all persons voted for as Vice President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate.

" 'SEC. 4. On the 6th day of January following the election, unless the Congress by law appoints a different day not earlier than the 4th day of January and not later than the 10th day of January, the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the vote shall then be counted. The person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be the President, and the person having the greatest number of votes for Vice President shall be the Vice President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electoral votes. If no person has a majority of the whole number of electoral votes for President or Vice President, then from the persons having the 3 highest numbers of electoral votes for such office the Senate and the House of Representatives sitting in joint session shall choose such officer immediately, by ballot. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of three-fourths of the whole number of the Senators and Representatives, and the person receiving the greatest number of votes shall be chosen.

" 'SEC. 5. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a President or a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any person who, except for his death, would have been entitled to receive a majority of the electoral votes for President or for Vice President.

" 'SEC. 6. The 1st, 2nd, and 3d paragraphs of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, the 12th article of amendment to the Constitution, and section 4 of the 20th article of amendment to the Constitution, are hereby repealed.

" 'SEC. 7. This article shall take effect on the 10th day of February following its ratification, but shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress'."

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Has the Senator from South Dakota introduced, for printing in the RECORD, the Gallup poll which appeared in the Sunday newspapers, showing that by a majority of 2 to 1, the people are in favor of electoral reforms?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; I placed it in the RECORD on yesterday.

Mr. DANIEL. Let me inquire whether the editorial on this subject, published in the New York Times on Sunday, has also been placed in the RECORD. I ask this question because I do not wish to submit duplicate editorials or articles for printing in the RECORD.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Texas submit that editorial for printing in the RECORD, if he cares to do so.

Mr. DANIEL. Very well.

Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial on this subject, published in the New York Times of March 25; and also an editorial from the Washington Daily News of March 26; and an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 24.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 25, 1956]

HOW TO ELECT A PRESIDENT

The electoral college, devised by the Constitutional Convention of 1787 in a thoughtful attempt to minimize the effect of public passions in the choice of the President and Vice President of the United States, never suited everybody and has increasingly failed to suit most of us as time has gone by. More than 120 futile efforts have been made to amend this part of the Constitution, plus the 12th amendment which actually did eliminate the ridiculous plan of making the runner-up in a national election Vice President. Now a new attempt is being made in this election year to simplify and democratize the presidential election system.

Three proposed amendments are actually before the Senate. One of them, sponsored by Senator PRICE DANIEL, of Texas, and 53 other Senators, would distribute a State's electoral votes among the 3 top contenders in accordance with their statewide popular vote. Or, if the State legislature preferred, the electors could be chosen as Senators and Representatives are now chosen—two of them by statewide vote and the rest by congressional districts.

Another plan, introduced by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, would divide 435 electoral votes in proportion to the total national vote received by each candidate and allocate 2 electoral votes in each State to the candidate who had the plurality in such State. Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, would wipe out the electoral-vote system entirely in favor of direct popular election of the President and Vice President.

Under certain circumstances any reform of this sort might affect the outcome of an election. Yet we have had very few presidential elections in this country in which the machinery of voting could have changed the historic outcome. No plan now under consideration would have altered the result of the 1952 vote, when General Eisenhower received 33,666,000 votes and Governor Stevenson 27,314,000. Mr. Eisenhower was the man the voting public wanted and the man they got.

The electoral college as such is of course a pure anachronism. Except for 1 or 2 cases in which the electors voted contrary to their pledges, members of the electoral college during the last century and a half never have debated or deliberated. Nobody but their relatives even remembers who they are or were. They could be replaced by an adding machine to the benefit of all concerned.

The essential purpose of any reform in this field is, of course, to get closer to the popular will. We cannot, however, make any change at all without affecting some conditions and situations not compromised in this simple formula. Some honest but possibly illogical persons, such as the gifted junior Senator from Massachusetts, JOHN F. KENNEDY, fear that the Daniel proposal would "abolish State lines for the purpose of presidential elections," that it would give more influence to the one-party States of the South and that it would weaken the two-party States of the North.

There is, however, an answer to this argument. If the minority vote in what is now the one-party States were actually effective in the national election, such a vote might be stimulated and political health might be improved by the growth of two-party States.

It is hardly probable that the Senate will this year roll up the two-thirds majority necessary to pass an electoral-reform amendment. If such a proposal were to pass the Senate it would still have to pass the House, and if it passed both chambers it would still have to be ratified by three-fourths of the States. But this is a year to think about the project, even though it is not a year in which it can be formally acted upon. The present way of choosing a President and Vice President will be with us until November 6.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 26, 1956]

THEY AGREE ON NEED

After a week's Senate debate on the electoral college, this fact stands out:

More than two-thirds of the Senators agreed on the need for a modern system of electing Presidents and Vice Presidents. They agree the present method is archaic. They agree it deprives millions of Americans of a direct voice in the choice of the country's leaders.

They agree on what ought to be done. They disagree merely over how to do it.

There are four proposals before the Senate. Each has some support.

All four proposals aim at the same result—to correct a system which does not reflect the judgment of the people.

The Senators should be able to agree on which is the better method of reforming the Presidential election. All they need do is be reasonable with each other. Any one of the plans would be an immense improvement over what we have.

Reasonable men can reach a reasonable agreement whenever they choose to be reasonable. The Senators never had a better opportunity to promote a reform which will stimulate self-government on a realistic basis.

Their own historic debate has made that clear.

Self-government achieves its purpose in direct relation to the proportion of citizens who participate in it—by using the ballot.

Self-government is diminished when millions of Americans stay away from the polls—simply because they know their votes will not count in the final result.

For instance, in the 1948 presidential election, Louisiana cast only 416,000 votes for the presidential electors. But in the governorship primary that year, the State cast 643,000 votes. More than 200,000 stayed home in the fall because Louisiana traditionally is a one-party State and it is assumed in advance all its electoral college votes will go to the Democratic candidate.

Republicans in the South do not vote because they think their votes won't count. Likewise many Democrats don't vote—because their votes are not needed.

A minority vote in any State, no matter if it comes within one ballot of being a majority, is wholly disregarded in the electoral college. Not only is the minority vote not counted for the candidate it favors; it is counted for the candidate it opposes, regardless of how small his majority is.

The present system of choosing Presidents and Vice Presidents is not representative government. It long since became obsolete.

Its reform, by any reasonable method, would strengthen the democratic process because it would make every man's vote effective. It would stimulate the two-party system in so-called one-party States. It would reduce the power of bloc votes where the two parties are closely balanced.

A current Gallup poll shows, once again, that the people favor reform of the electoral college—by more than 2 to 1.

The Senators agree on the need of reform. Let them choose their method—and submit it to the people.

[From The Evening Star of March 24, 1956]

TIME FOR A CHANGE

William Gladstone once described the Constitution of the United States as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." For almost 170 years it has stood, remarkably resilient, through the machine age and into the atomic age with only infrequent need for amendment.

For some years, however, there has been recognition of the need to revise the machinery for presidential elections. The present winner-take-all system gives 100 percent of the electoral college votes of any State to the candidate who wins one more popular vote in that State than any other candidate.

Once again, agitation for arranging a more equitable distribution of electoral votes is strong. The Senate now has before it a proposal by Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas, cosponsored by 53 other Senators, which in its main provision, would apportion a State's electoral votes among the 3 top contenders in the same ratio as their popular vote. Should no candidate have a majority of all electoral votes, the House and Senate would choose the President, with each Senator and Representative having 1 vote.

This latter provision would correct a weakness that has not generally been recognized. Under the present system, which permits the House to select a President when there is no electoral college majority, each State delegation is entitled to one vote. The machinery makes possible a deadlock in the House with no further provision for naming a President. The possibility of this happening is not so slight as to permit ignoring it. For instance, in 1948 a relatively minor shift in the voting for President Truman in two States would have thrown the election into the House, where the party lineup of State delegations was such that a deadlock would have been almost assured.

The Daniel amendment's provisions for equitably apportioning the electoral vote would mean simply that no voter's ballot would be wasted, whether he be a Republican in Georgia or a Democrat in Nebraska. The plan would give just as much weight to a vote cast in the smallest village as to one cast in New York City.

One objection to the plan, which seems to have impressed a number of Northern States Republicans, has been raised by Senator CASE, Republican of New Jersey. Senator CASE fears that his party would be put at a disadvantage in the Democratic strongholds of the South. Senator CASE reminded his colleagues that the same fear was expressed by the late Senator Taft in 1950. In 1950, however, it might have been difficult to convince Senator Taft that, in 2 years, the Republicans would carry 4 Southern States in a presidential election and win 7 southern House seats.

The Daniel plan removes most of the other objections which have been raised against previous proposals for streamlining our antiquated electoral machinery. The amendment should be approved by Congress and promptly submitted to the States, preferably in this election year when interest in such long-needed reform is high.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me, so that I may direct a question to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; if I am able to obtain further time for that purpose. Let me inquire whether the Senator from New York will yield 3 additional minutes to me, so that I may yield in accordance with the request of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, now that 3 additional minutes have been yielded to me, I believe I have a total of 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Texas inserted, for printing in the RECORD, the Gallup poll.

Mr. DANIEL. No; I simply asked whether it had already been inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. PASTORE. I see.

In the connection with the 2-to-1 vote, as recorded in that poll, were the people who participated in the poll specifically asked whether they preferred the Daniel-Mundt amendment, as amended, or the Lehman amendment?

Mr. DANIEL. No; I do not think so.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not true that they were asked only whether they want a reform? Is that not correct?

Mr. DANIEL. I think that is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. That reform could well be by means of providing for popular vote; could it not?

Mr. DANIEL. The poll will speak for itself.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; but could not a popular vote be what those people wanted?

Mr. DANIEL. I do not think the question was put to them in that way. If the Senator from Rhode Island would like the record to be clear in regard to that matter, I shall read the question which was put to those who participated in the poll. It was as follows:

Today, the presidential candidate who gets the most popular votes in a State takes all the electoral votes of that State. Do you think this should or should not be changed so that each of the candidates would receive the same proportion of electoral votes that he gets in the popular vote?

It would seem to me that the question which was asked is in line with the amendment I am offering—namely, that the electoral votes should be divided in proportion to the votes received by each candidate within each State.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in resuming and concluding my statement in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], let me say that, in addition to the reasons I have already stated as to why I oppose that amendment for the direct popular vote for President, I oppose it also because it does nothing to alleviate the major problems which we seek to correct by means of electoral college reform.

For example, the amendment of the Senator from New York does not alleviate—if anything, it tends to magnify, instead—the problem which arises because the present system places a premium on a big-city machine, if in its operation it causes great masses of the people to vote in one direction or another, because the amendment of the Senator from New York would give a big-city machine which had obtained control of the votes in a large metropolitan area, a chance to color and have a controlling effect on the result of the voting by the people in all 48 States of the Union. That situation is bad enough now. It is serious now, because if such a situation develops, such a machine can cast its weight by controlling the block-electoral vote in its State on the voting in all 48 of the States of the Union, as that voting affects the electoral votes. By that means the outcome would be definitely affected as a result of the activities of men of ill repute who might be connected with such a big-city machine So the amendment of the Senator from New York would make it possible, as a result of such a situation, for such big-city machines to affect the total result of the popular vote.

On the contrary, one of the great values of the compromise amendment arises from the fact that it provides for 435 electoral districts, and thus it would restrict the effect of the evildoers and the cheaters and the cheats in such a way that the most they could influence would be a single electoral district or the few districts which they might be able to control as the result of their evil activities; and thus our compromise amendment would restrict such fraud to a single electoral vote in a single election district plus the two electors, selected at large.

Furthermore, the amendment of the Senator from New York would have the effect of placing more power in the hands of such big-city machines, instead of alleviating the evil which now flows from that fact when a caprice of nature occurring in a certain area or part of a State could keep certain types of voters at home, and thus could make it possible for other types of voters to reach the polls and to influence in a controlling way the result of the election. Such a caprice of nature could affect the result far more than it would be affected by variations in the desires and wishes of the people who plan to go to the polls. If we were to adopt the amendment of the Senator from New York, so that the basis he advocates would go into effect, the result would be that a typhoon or a blizzard in one part of the country could deprive a whole section of the country of the opportunity to vote; and in that way, such a blizzard or other caprice of nature would have a marked effect on the result of a national election since it would reduce the size of the total popular vote in the affected area.

On the other hand, our compromise amendment would operate against that contingency, because under our amendment a caprice of nature, which would

operate in a restricted area, would affect alike the votes of Democrats, Republicans, and independents in that specific area.

Let us assume that the plan of the Senator from New York for popular vote were in effect, and let us assume that under those circumstances a great blizzard swept through the entire middle part of America—which might very well happen—and kept tens of millions of people who live in the area between the Appalachians, on the east, and the Rocky Mountains, on the west—people who live in the whole northern tier of States—from reaching the polls and voting. Thus, by a caprice of nature, there would be placed in the hands of certain voters—those in the large eastern cities—the power to determine the outcome of the presidential election, because those who live in large cities find it easy to reach the polls despite severe weather. In other words, they are able to use subways or trolley cars, or simply to walk around the corner to a polling place. They are not confronted with the problems which have to be dealt with by those who live on the prairies—those who might have to drive many miles across the open prairies in the bad weather to reach the polls.

So, instead of alleviating some of the evils which exist because of the present election machinery, the amendment of the Senator from New York, providing for popular vote, would tend to aggravate those evils and to make them more serious and more likely to occur, and would place a larger premium or larger bonus on the activities of those who might tend to corrupt an election or to cheat or to engage in cheating in connection with either the counting or the conduct of an election.

Furthermore, one of the problems which has developed arises from the fact that in many cases local issues tend to outweigh national issues or the platforms presented by the major parties. Under the present system, that effect is at least confined to a single State. But under our compromise amendment, it would be limited to a single district or series of districts. However, under the amendment of the Senator from New York, such a development would have even greater opportunity to pervert, corrupt, distort, and control all election districts in the United States, as a result of the existence of such an issue of local nature, which would bring additional voters to the polls, and would cause them to vote for or against "the crowd in the city hall"; and that vote would tend to snuff out and discount and eliminate and outvote the votes of hundreds of thousands of conscientious citizens living in other areas and trying to bring their best judgment to bear on the question of how to vote in the election of the President of the United States.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. We have heard the Senator from South Dakota speak a great deal about corruption and chicanery and cheating on the part of those in the big cities. Let me ask whether that condition does not also exist and is not also prevalent today in South Dakota, insofar as the election of a Governor of South Dakota is concerned.

Mr. MUNDT. I never heard of it.

Mr. PASTORE. Do those in South Dakota who vote for the Governor not also vote for the President of the United States? Do those who wish to vote for the Governor of South Dakota not reach the polls?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, again we are right back where we were before, when the Senator from Rhode Island was having trouble with the multiplication table.

Mr. PASTORE. No, Mr. President; I have no trouble with the multiplication table.

Mr. MUNDT. Indeed he is. The point the Senator from Rhode Island has made makes no difference at all in the case of South Dakota, because South Dakota has at present only 4 electoral votes in any case, regardless of the number of South Dakota voters who participate in the election. It makes no difference whether 2 or 200,000 citizens in South Dakota vote. In any case, South Dakota, under the present system or under our compromise amendment, will have only 4 electoral votes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from South Dakota has referred to the situation in the big cities, and has referred to evil and corrupt conditions in that connection. However, certainly there must be some big cities in South Dakota as well as in other parts of the country. Therefore, the argument of the Senator from South Dakota would apply equally well to corrupt political machines in South Dakota cities, and the effect of such machines, as compared to the effect of the votes cast by the honest farmers.

Mr. MUNDT. I am pointing out——

Mr. PASTORE. The corrupt politicians in city hall get to the polls to elect a Governor of South Dakota; do they not? Why ascribe all the evil, all the stealing, and all the corruption to the popular side of Government?

Mr. MUNDT. I simply point out that the bigger the city the bigger the vote——

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator mean the bigger the city the bigger the crooks?

Mr. MUNDT. Oh, no. I will not deny it, but I was not saying that. I point out that that factor increases the impact of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Does the Senator from New York wish to yield any of his time?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to yield in a few minutes. I wish to reply to what the Senator from South Dakota has said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield himself time?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from South Dakota has set up a strawman in order to knock him down. It does not seem to me that any of the arguments he has used are at all responsive to the question, or have any force in consideration of the question.

I have run for the United States Senate three times. The office of United States Senator is an office which is Federal in character. The salary is paid by the Federal Government. The rules are laid down by the Federal Government. The qualifications are set out in the Constitution. But I have never seen a single instance of even an attempt by the Federal Government to influence or direct the election of any candidate for the office of United States Senator.

I can speak with some authority on that question, because I was in charge of the executive branch of the State of New York for a period of 10 years while I was Governor, and I would have known about it had there been any such attempt whatever on the part of the Federal Government.

The Senator from South Dakota has spoken about the difference in the hours of voting. How ineffective that argument is. How completely inapplicable it is. Of course, there are differences in the hours of voting, but there always have been differences in the hours of voting. In one State the polls close at 6 o'clock; in another at 7; in another at 9; and in still another at 10 o'clock. The polls in California close at 6 o'clock, which is 9 o'clock in New York. Even in the State of New York—and I am sure this is true in most of the other States—there is frequently a change in the hours of voting between elections. I recall that when I first became Governor the hours of voting in New York were from 6 a. m. to 6 p. m. Today, in a presidential election, or in a gubernatorial election, the hours are not from 6 to 6, but from 6 a. m. to 9 p. m.

Of course, under no circumstances could the qualifications be changed. The qualifications of the President and Vice President are set out in the Constitution of the United States, as are the qualifications of Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives.

The Senator from North Dakota refers to divergencies in the laws of the various States with regard to voting. Of course, there are divergencies. We have always had them. We know that they exist. There is a difference in the voting age. The Senator from South Dakota—and I should like to have his attention—emphasized the divergence in the voting age. In New York the voting age is 21. I have no doubt that that is the voting age in South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am told that in the State of Georgia the voting age is 18. No doubt it is below 21 in certain other States. What difference does it make?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I cannot yield just now.

Mr. MUNDT. I am giving the Senator my attention, as he requested.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MUNDT. I am pretty sure that the Senator from New York will not disagree with my statement that the Senator's amendment, whatever else might be its virtue, would put a premium on the State's reducing its voting, because that would increase its vote. Is that not correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I do not think so at all. I think that could easily be done at present. What difference does it make whether a boy of 18 or a boy of 21 votes in a direct vote for President, or votes for electors who are pledged to a certain candidate? The same situation prevails.

Mr. MUNDT. I am just beginning to realize for the first time why Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle have so much difficulty in balancing the budget. I do not think they have studied enough arithmetic. I pointed out very clearly that if we increase the vote in South Dakota by 300, as against the State of Rhode Island, that is to our advantage, under our system.

Mr. LEHMAN. What the Senator from South Dakota is trying to do is to make 36,000 votes in Mississippi the equivalent of 200,000 votes in New York State. I am against it. I think it is unfair. Even today there is underrepresentation given to the large States. The only way to correct it is through a direct popular vote for President and Vice President.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to yield for a question.

Mr. PASTORE. Much is being made of the point that a State might deliberately lower the voting age. We are separating the election of President and Vice President from the election of State officers, such as governor and lieutenant governor. Under the Constitution every State has the right to establish its own qualification; but once it does so——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not true that once a State lowers the voting age, or raises the age, or establishes the age, that is the age which affects the votes for every elective office? Most of us have sufficient confidence in the integrity of the citizens of the various States to rely upon their maintaining the qualifications of voters on a reasonable basis, for the sake of their own governor, their own lieutenant governor, and their own municipal officers. I cannot agree with the argument that the big-city politicians would deliberately manipulate the voting age, in the case of the election of President and Vice President. They would be cutting off their noses to spite their faces.

Mr. LEHMAN. I point out that there are great divergencies in the laws of the various States. I point out to the Senator from South Dakota, and to my colleagues generally, that in some States there are poll taxes. In other States there are no poll taxes. Of course, the poll tax reduces the number of people voting. That is only one of the many divergencies which have occurred, and will continue to occur within the States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has again expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The Senator from South Dakota and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] have emphasized, for the past week or 10 days, the evil of having a so-called "minority" President. I should not like to see that. I wish to avoid it. But the only possible way to avoid it with any degree of respect for the democratic principles of this country and the traditions which have been built up in this country, is to have a straight-out, honest, fair, simple, direct popular vote for the Presidency and the Vice Presidency.

Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I do not wish to belabor this issue, because I think we have heard almost every possible argument that could be made on this question.

Certain arguments have been made which might show the result going one way or the other. However, to me this question represents a fundamental issue of principle. If the attempt which is now being made is to face us in the direction of making our elections more popular, then, I ask, why not recognize the principle in its entirety, and say, once and for all, that if this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, the people should determine, in their full individual dignity and prestige, who shall be elected to be President of the United States? The minute we begin to recognize the possibility that a man who receives a lesser number of votes may become the President of the people of the United States, I believe that then and there we recognize the fact that we are defeating the very principle of a democratic process.

Mr. President, I am not interested in results. I am not interested in the power of the State of Rhode Island in the selection of a President. I say if all the evils that are being mentioned and which are now being infiltrated into the selection of a President of the United States are prevalent today insofar as the election of a governor is concerned, and if the city bosses can get to the polls and influence the election of a President, which is much harder to do than it would be to influence the selection of the chief executive of a State, then why are we so much concerned with the effect those influences will have upon the selection of a President, if we are not at the same time concerned with what influence those evils will have on the selection of a governor?

Naturally it is true that a State can lower its age requirement from 21 to 18 years, and that it can lower it to 17, if it wishes to do so. However, the minute the legislature assumes the responsibility, and the minute the governor of a State signs that kind of statute, is he not, in fact, determining how he himself will be elected, and is he not determining how the mayor of a city will be elected? Is he not concerned with the local situation?

Does any Senator mean to tell me that he is going to say, "Let us do this, because we in Rhode Island will control the election of the President of the United States"?

The minute he gets himself into setting up such reckless and callous qualifications, he destroys the efficacy and the effectiveness and the dignity of his own local government.

I am not ready and willing to admit this afternoon that I have no faith and no confidence in the 48 States of the Union. In 48 States governors are sitting in the 48 capitals of the country. They are all honorable and decent men. They do not want to have themselves elected by children in swaddling clothes. They want themselves elected by people of dignity and reason and understanding. Therefore, what is so wrong about having our Presidents elected in the same way?

The minute we recognize the fact that a man who receives most of the vote may not be President of the United States, we disenfranchise the people of this great country. The President is the President of all the people, not the President of the States. He is the President of the people of the United States. The sooner we recognize that fact the sooner will we recognize the principle of popular elections in its fullness, not in the half-way measures we are trying to pass upon today.

The minute we recognize the fact that the popularly-elected candidate may not be the President, then and there we must recognize also the fact that there is a deficiency in our election process.

All that the Senator from New York is trying to do—whether it will mean more or less for his State, whether it may mean more or less power for the State of Rhode Island, or whether it means more or less power for South Dakota—is to provide that the President of the United States shall be the President of all the people. He is the President of the large States and the small States, of the North, the South, the East, and the West.

When the people rise up in their individual dignity and elect the President of the United States, those who want their man and have the most votes in making their selection should choose the President of the United States. As soon as we recognize that fact as a Nation, we will continue to be a Nation. Let us elect the President under the same democratic process under which we now select our boys for the armed services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for yielding me some time on this subject. I am pleased to be able to rise in support of the Lehman amendment. In my opinion, Mr. President, this is the time to make a change in the manner of electing the President of the United States, and to do away with the electoral college, which in many respects is nothing more than a Rube Goldberg gadget. It is also my

opinion that some of the proposals which are being advanced on the floor today would make the electoral college system even more of a Rube Goldberg gadget.

I have the honor to help represent in the Senate the State which was the first State in the Nation to bring about the direct election of United States Senators. We must remember that Senators have been elected directly by the people for only about 40 years. Forty years ago and previous to that, all United States Senators were chosen by the State legislatures. Certainly we are just as much justified now in bringing about the direct election of the President of the United States by the people at the polls, as we were justified 40 years ago in bringing about the election of United States Senators by the people of the individual States.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] spoke about allowing the great historic bodies, the States, to determine the votes in the election of the President of the United States.

However, at the same time, the Senator from South Dakota is sponsoring an amendment to the Constitution which would turn that power over to congressional districts. There is nothing historic about congressional districts. They are subject to change every 10 years. A congressional district is not sovereign. A State may be and is sovereign, but there is nothing sovereign about a congressional district. We might as well have the President selected by counties as to have him selected by congressional districts.

Reference was made to large masses of people, and to the alleged evil influence of the big city machines. There are no extremely large cities in my State, and I therefore would not know anything about that subject. However, if the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is right in his grave warnings, he should do something about the election of Senators and Representatives who come from big cities. There are in the Senate Senators who come from Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Chicago. They are members of both political parties and represent many points of view. In my judgment, they are all qualified and very high type gentlemen, and we are fortunate indeed in having them with us in the Senate.

If the Senator from South Dakota is right in his warning, however, that the big cities bring about such an evil in the selection of the President of the United States, why does he not do something about the election of the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives?

I do not believe that there is anything better about a rural person or anything worse about a rural person than is the case with a city dweller. A rural person is an American who lives outside the city. I happen to live in a city. My wife's family lives outside the city and operates a dairy farm. They are quite similar to us. I do not know anything different about them. They share our ideas and views.

I remember when the present Chief Justice of the United States was Governor of California and he welcomed migrants to California at a time when there was some sentiment in California against admitting new people. He said, "California has many resources, but the greatest resource of California is the people." He was right then and, if he were to say it now, he would be right again.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I believe the Lehman amendment is a democratic way to elect a President of the United States. The process he proposes is as justified now as the direct election of Senators was justified when that reform was adopted in 1912 by my State of Oregon and later by all the other States of the Union.

The Senator from South Dakota discussed the difference in hours of voting in the various States and in the various communities. The greatest difference in the hours of voting occurs because of the different time zones. If the Senator from South Dakota wishes to abolish that difference, he will have to take it up with the Creator of Heaven and earth, not with any mere human beings in the Senate or in the House.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEHMAN. I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MUNDT. Reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire how much time we have on my side, which is under the control of a Senator who at the moment seems not to be on my side.

Mr. PASTORE. I am perfectly willing——

Mr. LEHMAN. I know what the Senator from South Dakota has in mind. I have 4 minutes remaining. I am willing to share that time with the Senator from South Dakota, provided we have a quorum call with the time not charged to either side.

Mr. PASTORE. I was going to suggest that we ask unanimous consent to have an additional 4 minutes yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opposition to the amendment has used all of its time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, with the understanding referred to by the Senator from New York, I have no objection to his suggestion.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time taken in the quorum call be not charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There are 4 minutes left, 2 minutes on each side.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to my colleagues of the Senate that this amendment is simple, direct, and, I believe, meets the views of the vast majority of the people of this country. It does not apply to primaries in any way. It provides for a straightout, direct vote for the election of President and Vice President, by popular vote of the 165 million people of this Nation.

Mr. President, as I have pointed out, the only officer of the United States who represents all the people of the country is the President, and he should and must be elected in the most democratic manner possible, by the closest of votes we can have, to insure democracy. I am, therefore, in favor of a direct popular election of a President and Vice President of the United States by the direct vote of the people in exactly the same way in which we elect Senators and Members of the House of Representatives. If 16 millon people in New York State can be trusted to elect a United States Senator, certainly 165 million people of the country can be trusted to elect a President of the United States.

Mr. President, I very much hope that the amendment which I have submitted to the Senate will be adopted.

I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and welcome this opportunity to repeat the reasons why I think its adoption would be a very unwise move.

As I have stated, if there were provision for a direct popular vote for the Presidency, it would necessitate Federal control of the election machinery of every State in the Union.

The Senator from New York has already pointed out that Georgia has reduced the voting age to 18 years. That would automatically require every other State to reduce the voting age to 18 years in order to establish equity with the State of Georgia. It would provide the temptation in not only 1 State but in a whole area of States to reduce the voting age to 15 or 16 years, to increase the number of votes which could be rolled up in the total count of the popular vote.

It would be a step away from the bicameral system. It would be a recognition that popular votes are the things that count, that mass population counts and States as such no longer count.

It would increase the likelihood of another constitutional amendment providing that Senators be elected on a population basis instead of by States. It would be a fatal blow to the 10th amendment.

Pass this amendment, Mr. President, and we shall kiss goodbye the idea of rights of States, of State autonomies, because as soon as we give the Federal Government the right to control the election machinery we shall place every State under the control and domination of the Federal Government.

The fourth reason why I am against the amendment is that it will create problems far more serious than those which it proposes to solve. It will aggravate our present difficulties instead of alleviating them.

The fifth reason for my opposition is that the amendment would once and for all make the large States, which contain the big cities, the pivotal power spots

and determining influences in every national election.

Under the Lehman amendment, every candidate for President, from whatever party, will say, "I can carry the vast, teeming millions of New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia."

Who will pay any attention to the 10 or 15 States in the Middle West, the Northeast, or the South? The candidates will realize that if they can capture a whole area having a big population, they can pretty well forget the point of view existing in the other States.

So I urge the rejection of the amendment, and urge the acceptance of the compromise proposal, which is as far as we can go in the direction of popular elections and still maintain our concept of a Republic comprised of a commonwealth of States working together as a family of States, under the 10th amendment of the Constitution, and bound together as a Republic by the central Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY SIR ROY WELENSKY, M. P., DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER OF THE CONFEDERATION OF RHODESIA, NYASALAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, there is in the Senate Chamber an outstanding representative of a foreign country, whom my senior colleague, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], would like to introduce.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I desire to present to my colleagues a distinguished visitor, Sir Roy Welensky, M. P., Deputy Prime Minister of the Confederation of Rhodesia, Nyasaland.

I ask our guest to rise and be welcomed by the Senate. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is happy to welcome our distinguished guest to the Senate.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut will state it.

Mr. BUSH. Is it now in order to move to recommit the pending measure and all amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it in order at this time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. Would a motion to recommit the unfinished business not include the recommital of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All amendments would be included in the motion to recommit the joint resolution.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, my understanding is that my motion is to recommit the pending measure and all amendments thereto, including the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to enable me to ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit?

Mr. BUSH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to repeat my motion. I move to recommit the pending measure and all amendments thereto for further study by the committee. I yield myself 5 minutes.

About an hour ago I sought recognition on this motion, and I thought I had received recognition, but I was mistaken. I make this comment now only to indicate that I am not making my motion at present simply to forestall action on the amendment of the Senator from New York, because I had intended to make my motion to recommit before the Senator from New York offered his amendment, and I had no knowledge that he intended to offer it.

I have discussed the situation with a number of Senators on both sides of the aisle. I make my motion because I think the whole situation has become very confused indeed, so confused that I believe a matter of the importance of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States should be returned to the committee for further study in the light of the evidence we have obtained from the debate which has taken place in the last week or 10 days.

On our desks every day is a copy of the committee report on Senate Joint Resolution 31. What is the date of it? May 19, 1955. Mr. President, a lot of water has gone over the dam since then. The resolution on which the Senate is asked to vote now, which is a combination of the resolutions offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], is very, very different from the measure which was considered in the report of 1955, which appears on our desks every day.

The fact that the Senate has been debating this matter on the floor for the past 10 days without arousing any public opinion whatsoever that one could notice, at least in the office of one Senator, is rather surprising. We are debating a very basic amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Yet I think other Senators, like myself, can testify that we have received virtually no communications from the voters of our States, from the people who would be most affected by the amendment. Interest in the proposal is at a very low ebb, indeed. I think that is very significant, because, as I have said, we are debating a very important amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Only yesterday the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] offered an amendment which I thought was a very good one. If that amendment could come to a vote, I would support it. But I think his amendment, along with the others, and also the resolution itself, should be returned to the committee for careful and deliberate consideration in the light of the testimony which has been adduced and the debate which has taken place in the Senate during the last week or 10 days.

I take the opportunity to compliment the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] for the manner in which they have analyzed the amendments which have been called up, one by one, and also the entire proposal. I think both Senators have made important contributions to the thinking of Senators and the people of the United States on the important question of an amendment to the Constitution which would affect the election of a President.

I do not think we need to be in a great hurry about the matter. The present system has worked pretty well. Nothing in the debate has indicated that the people of the United States have suffered any unfairness or injustice from the operation of the present system, which has been in operation for many years.

Senators will recall that in 1950 a joint resolution pertaining to the same subject was considered and was passed by the Senate. I recall reading recently the remarks of the late Senator Taft, in which he strongly opposed the amendment at that time. I was very much impressed by the reasons which he gave. I believe, frankly, those reasons are still valid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. BUSH. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Even now, the Senate is in disagreement, after many days of debate, as to what might be the effect of the changes which are proposed by the joint resolution. I cite as the most recent evidence of that the colloquy between the distinguished Senators from South Dakota and Rhode Island.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I rise to oppose the motion to recommit at this stage of the parliamentary situation. So far as the constitutional amendment is concerned, it is not a new subject to the Senate. In 1950, by an overwhelming majority, far more than the necessary two-thirds, the Senate passed the so-called Lodge-Gossett amendment. The Senate has before it today an amendment in different form. It has been proposed by the Committee on the Judiciary after long, extensive, and complete hearings.

The Senate has now been debating the matter for several days. It seems to me there are still several questions which have not even been submitted to the Senate, on which we might get a general consensus, and thus enable the Senate to determine ultimately, in its judgment, whether to recommit the joint resolu-

tion. For that reason, I hope that prior to the vote on the so-called Lehman amendment and prior to the vote on the Daniel-Mundt substitute, the motion to recommit will not prevail.

I think the discussion which has taken place has been beneficial to the Senate and has brought the issue before the country. While it may be that there is no single amendment which has as yet been proposed that could secure the necessary two-thirds vote, I think the debate and the discussion on both sides of the aisle have indicated that there are far more than two-thirds of the total membership of the Senate who believe there should be some change in the present outmoded system of electing, through the electoral college, the President of the United States.

The difficulty is that there are apparently two or three different approaches to that problem, but even if ultimately the Judiciary Committee is again to gain jurisdiction, by adoption of a motion to recommit, or by the offering of a new proposed constitutional amendment, I think it would be helpful to the committee first to have a vote on some of the key questions which have not been acted on by the Senate as a whole.

For that reason, I believe, at this time in the parliamentary procedure, a motion to recommit would be a mistake.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUSH. When I said I yielded back the balance of the time, I meant the balance of the 2 minutes which I had yielded to myself. Is that understood by the timekeeper?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding.

Mr. BUSH. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, first I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Connecticut for the kind remarks he made about me. I have been interested in this subject for a long time, dating back to the time when it was actively considered by Congress in 1950. At that time I was a Member of the House and the House Judiciary Committee, and a member of the subcommittee before which the matter came when it was first introduced.

As a result of my study of the question then, I was convinced that the measure, the so-called Lodge-Gossett amendment, or, as it was reported to this body by the Committee on the Judiciary, the Daniel-Kefauver amendment, was a most undesirable proposition, in that it would, quite contrary to the expectations, and, I know, the desires of the sponsors, make even less representative the procedure for the selection of President of the United States than that procedure under which we have been operating since the Constitution was adopted.

It seemed to me very clear that nobody, on a moment's consideration, could believe that the results which were claimed for the proposal by its sponsors would actually occur. It seemed clear to me the amendment would be harmful, for the indefinite future, to the prospects of the Republican Party's registering the actual votes which it has among the people of the country, and that the Republican Party would become a permanent minority, contrary to the wishes of the people of the country.

It seemed clear to me that, insofar as the Democratic Party was concerned, the balance of power in that party would swing irrevocably to its southern conservative wing; that the results would be injurious to those who believed in extending the franchise and broadening civil rights in this country; that the cause of civil rights would be set back irrevocably and that the restrictions which exist in certain parts of the country would not be relaxed, but, rather, increased.

It seemed to me that our two-party system would cease to function as it has over the years, the most marvelous instrumentality that I believe has ever been devised for the accomplishment of a government of a great State by consent of the governed; that each of our two parties would cease to be what they are now, great parties, each representative of all reasonable elements in the country, that they would become sectional and regional and special-interest parties.

I believed that inevitably we would be driven, if this proposal were adopted, to a situation in which splinter parties and fractional groups would be born and would become strong, and it would be impossible for us to restore the situation which has so very well characterized the management of the affairs of this country for so long a time. And so I opposed the proposal then.

It passed the Senate, but it failed to get a majority of the votes of the House, let alone the two-thirds necessary for a proposed constitutional amendment.

I hoped the matter would be dropped, but it has been revived again this year.

The Committee on the Judiciary, in its wisdom, reported the same proposal voted on before. Many sponsors on both sides of the aisle have since that time agreed on a substitute, which would give the State legislatures the choice between selecting the proportional method of counting the electoral votes or determining the electoral votes in each State based upon the same system that is used for the election of Senators and Representatives of Congress, the latter being the proposal of my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

It seems to me quite clear that, in general, the same objections to the first proposal apply to the second. There would be a great overweighting of the rural vote in its effect upon national elections, and particularly in the South, where the franchise, as everyone knows, is highly restricted.

It is necessary to look at results in recent congressional elections, comparing the votes in the States of the South, the North, the Midwest, and the western parts of the country. We find, for example, that in 1952 the total votes cast in congressional districts in Mississippi averaged something in the nature of 35,000, as compared with 175,000 to 200,000 in States in the North. This is a typical difference.

To apply the same procedure to the election of the President of the United States would be further to restrict the operation of democratic rule in this country, and further to restrict the rights of people whose rights to the franchise are restricted in those areas, and further to set back the cause of civil liberties.

I think not only is each element of the proposal bad in itself, but, in combination, presents a most incongruous method, for the selection of a President, to be put into the Constitution of a great country.

It is inconceivable that we should seriously consider giving the State legislatures of the several States the right to decide how the electoral votes should be counted, after the vote has been taken. The whims of the legislatures, to say nothing of possible fraud, and all the rest that goes with it, would enter into the situation. The proposal is ridiculous, and not deserving of serious consideration.

It had been my intention, if the motion to recommit had not been made, and it is my intention if the motion shall not be carried, to propose an amendment to the pending resolution under which the electoral vote of a State, or a congressional district if the determination should be by congressional districts, as under the system proposed by the Senator from South Dakota, would be reduced in proportion to the measure by which that State or congressional district restricts the vote of its people for President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BUSH. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I shall offer that amendment if the pending motion does not carry. It would greatly eliminate many of my objections to the proposal, but my original feeling is that so many different considerations have been introduced, so many suggested possibilities of difficulty and speculative results have been pointed out which would be introduced into our electoral system and our constitutional system and our system of government by the proposal, that it would be better to recommit the matter and take no action at all.

It is my hope that at this session of Congress we shall make two changes in our electoral system which I think everyone agrees are needed. One is to eliminate the electoral college, so that the votes will be registered automatically, and secondly, to provide that if no one candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes, the matter would be thrown into the Congress, both Houses sitting, with one vote for every Member, Senator and Representative, instead of the present system, under which only the House of Representatives votes, and the vote there is counted on the basis of States and not individuals.

That amendment has already been proposed by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who has made such a great contribution to this particular debate. I hope it will be possible for the Congress at this session to propose such an amendment to the

Constitution to the States. It would relieve the difficulty that existed in certain cases, and eliminate some of the dangers which we faced in some of our elections in the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield an additional minute to me?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for an additional minute.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, in any event I do not think we should attempt to amend on the floor of the Senate a joint resolution providing for a constitutional amendment of this much importance.

So, Mr. President, for the reasons I have stated, I urge all Members of the Senate to support the motion to recommit, which has been made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, throughout the debate it has become evident that only a very few Members of the Senate are opposed to changing our present outmoded system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States. I believe that only 2 or 3 Senators have indicated during the debate that they prefer to have the present system continued.

For many years we have been trying to arrive at a way to make the casting and counting of the electoral votes more in accord with the way the individual voters express their will at the polls.

The pending amendment is simply a compromise which includes all of the proposals studied by the Judiciary Committee, and reported by it to the Senate, plus the alternative to the effect that any State which desires to do so, may elect its electors by congressional districts, in the same way that it elects its Members of Congress—in other words, two at large, and the others by congressional districts. That is nothing new, because today the States have that right, under our present Constitution, in connection with their congressional representation.

As a matter of fact, that seems to be the system which was originally intended by the Founding Fathers. Eleven States have used what is now called the Mundt-Coudert system of naming electors; in other words, 11 States name them in precisely the same way that they name their Members of Congress. So that alternative is nothing new.

The bulk of the pending amendment, however, is composed of what was formerly known as the Lodge-Gossett amendment. It provides that in the States using that system, the electoral votes shall be divided in accordance with the popular vote.

Inasmuch as more than two-thirds of the Members of this body believe there should be a change in our electoral system, I sincerely hope the Senate does not vote to recommit the joint resolution. Certainly that should not be done until the Senate has had an opportunity at least to vote on the proposed compromise amendment, and possibly on other amendments, because it is entirely possible that here on the floor of the Senate we may be able to arrive at a measure, which will gain a two-thirds vote. Now that the Judiciary Committee has discharged its duty, after having considered all these proposals, it is possible that on the floor of the Senate we may be able to arrive at such a measure.

After a test vote is had, if it is evident that the Senate cannot reach a measure which will be supported by a two-thirds' vote, I would not wish to delay the Senate any longer, by requesting that the Senate work further on the matter. But thus far there has not been a test vote on the substitute amendment, which is sponsored by 54 Members. Also, the Senate has not had an opportunity to vote on certain other amendments which may be offered.

So I urge the Members of the Senate at least to consider some of the proposals now ready for our consideration. I urge that the Senate take test votes, to determine whether it can arrive at a measure which will secure a two-thirds' vote. If no such measure can be developed, it seems to me then it will be time to recommit the joint resolution. Certainly I hope such a time will not come. But I wish to say in all sincerity and frankness that after we have had several test votes, if it appears that the Senate will not be able to develop, here on the floor, a measure which will obtain a two-thirds' vote, then I shall not attempt to delay the Senate longer; and I feel sure that the other cosponsors of the amendment will take the same attitude.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will vote against the motion to recommit.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I do not believe the Senate wishes to recommit the joint resolution. No piece of proposed legislation is of greater importance to the people of the United States today.

There is no question that the compromise amendment reflects the will of the people in the case of national elections, whereas that is not true at the present time, under the present system.

For instance, in the great State of New York, where 7 million people vote, if 1 party gets 1, 2, or a mere handful of votes more than the other party gets, all 45 of New York's electoral votes go to the party obtaining the slightly larger number. In the great State of New Jersey where 2 million citizens vote, a similar situation exists and in that case, all 16 of New Jersey's electoral votes will go to the party which obtains only a very small majority.

I believe the time has come when the American people no longer want "the winner to take all." I believe the time has come when the true sentiments of the American people should be reflected in our elections. Simply because one major party receives 1 or 2 more votes than the other major party receives, is no reason why the entire electoral vote of the State should go to the party receiving so small a majority.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it is my feeling that if the proposal we endorse shall be enacted into law, greater participation in voting will be encouraged. Today, in some parts of the United States a great many persons do not vote, because they say there is no use in their voting. That is especially true in one-party States. Our proposal will encourage all the people of a State to participate in the elections—which will be a wholesome thing for the Nation.

Then, too, Mr. President, our compromise amendment will discourage bloc voting and machine control—the kind of bloc voting and machine control which occurred in New York City in 1868, in the election when Grant was running against Seymour, and when there was an election fraud, and, because of that election fraud, the vote of the city of New York determined the vote of the entire State of New York. It happened that in that case the result in New York did not determine the result nationwide, and thus defeat the will of the people of the Nation as a whole. But if that election had been a close one, that could easily have been the result.

Furthermore, Mr. President, our compromise amendment will, if enacted into law, discourage splinter parties. We know what is happening today in many countries, especially in France, where various splinter parties are developing. Under the provisions of the compromise amendment, the votes for only the three highest candidates will be counted.

Mr. President, all these proposals have been worked on and have been studied carefully, and a great deal of time has been spent in considering them. Our compromise amendment is not a haphazard proposal. Instead, it has been studied by experts in various of the Government departments, who have worked very hard in attempting to make it possible for us to bring before the Senate a measure which will receive a two-thirds majority. We believe that the compromise amendment is such a measure.

Certainly we believe that the joint resolution should not be recommitted, thus preventing further consideration of the compromise amendment and of other amendments which various Senators may wish to submit.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from South Carolina thinks it is fair that in his own State of South Carolina an elector represents approximately 17,000 voters, whereas in the State of California, in the State of New York, and in the State of Illinois, an

elector represents anywhere from 150,000 to 170,000 voters.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, when our Government was founded, it was founded on the theory of a Nation composed of States; and that principle has been embodied in our Constitution and in our present form of Government, and has resulted in the great progress which has been achieved thus far in the United States.

Certainly, an electoral vote in a large city represents a greater number of votes than does an electoral vote in a rural area.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In reply to the question of the Senator from New York, is it not true that the reason we have such a low vote is that South Carolina is a one-party State? This proposal would encourage more voting.

Mr. THURMOND. That is true. It would encourage more voting.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, may I reply to that observation?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I understand perfectly well that the reason for that situation is that South Carolina is a one-party State. There is no indication that that situation would change in any foreseeable time in the future. Because South Carolina is a one-party State, most of the votes are cast not at the general election, but at the primary. The influence and power of the State in relation to its population is far greater than the influence and weight of the great States with large urban centers, such as Illinois, New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. That is the point over which I am quarreling, and have been quarreling during the progress of the debate for the past week or 10 days. The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], with the help of the Senator from South Carolina, gives an undue and unfair advantage to the small, one-party States, as compared with the larger States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I ask the Senator from New York, if he proceeds on that theory, whether or not he objects to the State of South Carolina and other States smaller than New York having two United States Senators?

Mr. LEHMAN. There is no thought on my part of objecting to that. That is one part of the Constitution which we could not possibly change, even if we desired to do so. That was the compromise made at the time the United States became a Nation, rather than merely a federation of colonies.

Mr. THURMOND. That is the theory on which this great country was built. It was built upon a foundation of States. Ours is really a republican form of government, rather than a democratic form of government. That is the theory on which we have made so much progress, and under which this country has become the greatest in the world. The 48 States of the Nation have rights under the Constitution. They are represented. Under that system our country has made wonderful progress, and has outstripped other nations of the world.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no desire or disposition to subtract anything from the rights of the various States. What I am trying to make clear, and what I hoped I had made clear in the amendment I have offered, is that I want John Smith, who lives in New York State, to have exactly the same influence by casting his vote as does John Smith who lives in South Carolina—no more, and no less. I want them both to be exactly on the same basis, and I want their votes to be of equal weight.

Mr. THURMOND. The great State of New York has the same electoral vote in the electoral college, in proportion to population, as have other States. The number of Representatives in Congress is based upon population. They, together with the two Senators from each State, constitute the total electoral vote. New York State has 45. South Carolina has only six. We think that is a fair system, and that it should remain in effect.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, how much time have we left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remain 15 minutes on each side.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of my motion to recommit be deferred until after a vote shall have been taken upon the Lehman amendment, which was the preceding question; and that after that amendment is disposed of, the Senate revert to my motion to recommit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] to recommit the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a motion is out of order until all time on the motion expires or is yielded back.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

This is by no means a new subject to come before Members of the United States Senate. We have had it before us in previous sessions. It has been carefully considered by the Committee on the Judiciary. It has been debated at great length. A great amount of editorial comment has been made upon it over the country, and a great many citizens are interested in 1 or more aspects of the problem.

I believe that after spending a number of days in a busy session debating the joint resolution, and bringing it up to the point of voting, without even going into the basic ingredients represented by the compromise amendment, we should not now vote to recommit the joint resolution.

There are valid reasons why the compromise amendment should be agreed to by the Senate. It could be sent to the House in the hope that it might adopt it, so that State legislatures meeting next year could consider it and in the following year. If action were taken promptly, the amendment could be adopted in time so that the presidential election in 1960 could be conducted under the new system.

There would be several direct advantages flowing from the compromise amendment. The first would be to restore the proper balance as between rural and city areas in the conduct of a national campaign. The proper relative weight as between those two groups would be restored, thus eliminating the present temptation for pressure groups, selfish interests, and political machines in the large cities to exert, in one direction or the other, the impact of a unit vote in the electoral college. Once we compel pressure groups and city machines to operate on a national basis, across the length and breadth of the land, we eliminate their present advantage of organizing them for the specific purpose of determining a presidential election.

In the second place, our proposal would provide protection against having unusual events of nature or unusual local events determine a national election. It would eliminate the possibility of ugly weather in one area of a great State determining a national election by depriving the people of one area of that State of their proper vote in determining the way in which that State's particular bloc of votes should be cast in the electoral college. It would eliminate the possibility of fraud in 1 or 2 election districts having a determining impact throughout the Nation in deciding the presidential choice.

As I stated earlier, it would eliminate the possibility of intense local issues resulting in ramifications which might determine the national result. Under the present policy and procedure, intense local issues can and do swing the entire electoral vote of a great State in one direction or another in presidential campaigns without regard to the comparable merits of the opposing presidential candidates.

In the third place, our proposal would provide equality of votes among citizens. I cannot understand our opponent's position with respect to the poll tax and curtailment of franchise. I cannot understand why anyone should wish to perpetuate a situation which, in every election and every condition, gives a citizen of New York State 15 times as much voting power as a citizen of Delaware.

Unusual circumstances may produce unusual results. Let us assume a tie vote in the electoral college, with only New York and California outstanding, and the votes in these 2 States tied up 50–50. Let us assume that 1 voter in New York State votes Republican, and that 1 million voters in California, at the same time, vote Democratic. Under the present system the 1 vote in New York State outweighs 1 million votes cast in the

State of California on the opposite side of the question, because the 1 vote in New York State triggers off and puts into action in the electoral count 45 electoral votes. In California the electoral vote is 32, and so the entire 1 million voters influence only those 32 electoral votes.

Do we wish to perpetuate that kind of system? Is that the kind of equality we are talking about? Is that equality of franchise? Is that a way in which we could have a better election? The proposal we offer moves in the direction of popular elections, as far as we can go without vitiating entirely our concept of States' rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The fourth point is that our compromise amendment provides a built-in safeguard for clean and fair elections, because it eliminates the temptation for people to engage in some kind of dishonest political practice or dishonest counting or dishonest reporting in any of the big electoral areas of the country. The temptation and the premium for cheating disappears when all a person can get for his vile efforts is 1 electoral vote, plus a little help on acquiring 2 more statewide electoral votes. The temptation to cheat gets pretty big, as American history shows, when we permit the cheater who wins to get 45 or 28 or 32 electoral votes.

If we propose to pass a clean election bill at this session of Congress—and I hope we do—we can do nothing that is more important than to adopt the proposed amendment, in order to perpetuate and guarantee clean elections at the presidential level in future years.

The fifth point is that the adoption of the compromise amendment will discourage the growth of splinter parties. It would discourage the operation of splinter parties specifically designed and devised to operate in certain areas of the countries so as to swing the electoral votes of the big States in one direction or another. The compromise would permit third parties to grow, but only on a national basis. It would eliminate the bonus we now provide for little selfish groups with specific goals in mind to organize and swing the electoral vote of a State in one direction or another through the formation of a splinter party.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question as to his last statement?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is that not precisely what a popular election would do; namely, obviate the chance that 1 vote would carry 45 electoral votes?

Mr. MUNDT. It would eliminate that evil, but it would inculcate into the system many new evils of the kind we described in our earlier colloquy. However, the Senator is right in his comment on his particular point. This compromise moves in the direction of popular voting as far as we can go unless we want to eliminate State lines in this country.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I need only 1 minute. At the appropriate time I shall offer a motion to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Connecticut to recommit the joint resolution. I shall do it so as to permit a vote to be had on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. The yeas and nays have been ordered on that amendment, and I believe the amendment should be voted on by the Senate. It received 30 votes in 1950, and I believe it is important enough for the Senate to vote on it. I shall make that motion, even though I am personally against the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, because I believe it should be voted on by the Senate. After the amendment has been disposed of, in one way or the other, if the Senator from Connecticut wishes to renew his motion to recommit the joint resolution to the committee, I shall support his motion, because I believe the joint resolution should be recommitted. However, in fairness to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, and because of its importance, in that it provides for direct elections, which proposal is supported also by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the amendment should be voted on by the Senate.

It is my understanding that that is also the wish of the Senator from Connecticut, but he is unable to have that done without unanimous consent on the part of the Senate. Unanimous consent not being granted, the only way it can be done at this time is to offer a motion to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MUNDT. Would not the Senator also agree with me, in following out his line of reasoning, that it would make a lot of sense that a vote should also be had on an amendment that is important enough to be sponsored by 54 Senators, and that a vote on that amendment should also be had before a motion to recommit is made?

Mr. KENNEDY. I would have no control over whether the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] or any other Senator would wish to make such a motion after a vote is had on the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. My own feeling is that it would be desirable to vote on both amendments. However, inasmuch as the yeas and nays have been ordered, we have the primary obligation to dispose of the amendment of the Senator from New York. That is my feeling, even though I am not in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. BUSH. I am in sympathy with what the Senator from Massachusetts has stated. I renew my request, Mr. President, for unanimous consent that the vote on my motion to recommit be postponed until after a yea-and-nay vote has been had on the Lehman amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. PASTORE. I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I wish to join in the motion of the Senator from Connecticut. I agree fully with the suggestion that has been made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared relative to the proposed electoral college reform amendments be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

The present system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States has operated with a considerable degree of success for more than 160 years. It has not, however, worked in the way envisaged by the Founding Fathers when they devised the elaborate system of an electoral college which as it has evolved over the years has resulted in the so-called winner-take-all method of bloc voting by the electors in a State. At the time of the Constitutional Convention, it was widely believed that a variety of favorite son candidates would necessitate throwing the election into the House of Representatives—"10 times out of 20" as James Madison put it. History seemed destined to bear him out until after 1825, when the two-party system began to take firm root.

From that time on, with a few exceptions, presidential elections in the United States have been contests between two candidates, each representing a national political party. Thus, the very nature and certainly the intent of the electoral college has been strikingly modified by the growth of political parties which have, in effect, amended the electoral provisions of the Constitution.

But we still use the form of the electoral college—as cumbersome and unwieldy as it may be. And we still use the winner-take-all device, which, at first glance, hardly seems to be a democratic method of electing a President, who represents all the American people. There are now before the Senate several amendments which would modify the method of electing the President and Vice President. Proponents of each of these amendments express the belief that one particular amendment or another will have the effect of infallibly expressing the true will of the majority of Americans in the election of the President and Vice President. These various amendments would allegedly insure the United States against the possibility of the election of a candidate who has received a smaller share of the popular vote than his opponent.

Let me say at this point that I am in complete sympathy with this purpose. It would be deplorable if we were to witness a recurrence of the Cleveland-Harrison election of 1888, when Cleveland, who received a majority of the popular vote, was defeated by Harrison who won a majority of the vote in the electoral college.

It may just be circumstance that we have not witnessed a repetition of the Harrison-Cleveland election. Or it may be that the system devised at the Constitutional Convention, though on the surface cumbersome

and undemocratic, for all practical purposes is in reality a sound system, which in the final analysis reflects the will of the majority. I do not intend to underestimate or play down the possibility of a repetition of the Harrison-Cleveland election, but it does seem to me to be significant that in 160 years of operation there has been only one instance, in which it can be definitely stated that the system resulted in the election of the candidate who was definitely not the choice of the people.

It would be a remarkable contribution to the evolution of the democratic process, if this body could at this time, adopt an amendment which would eliminate, once and for all this potential inequity, and at the same time preserve the fundamental structure of federalism in the election of the President and Vice President. The several amendments now before us, with the exception of the Langer amendment, which would eliminate the Federal character of the election of the Chief Executive, all claim to do just that.

The Daniel-Kefauver amendment, which was previously known as the Lodge-Gossett amendment, would divide the electoral votes within each State in proportion to the popular vote cast for each candidate. The electoral vote would be retained, as a counting device, but, the bloc system of winner-take-all would be abolished. According to its proponents, this system would insure against the possibility of a candidate losing the Presidency with a majority of the popular vote. And yet when this system of counting is applied to elections in the past, as has been done with telling effect by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], it is shown that the results of the electoral count would have been quite different than the direct reflection of the will of the people. Yet we are told the effect of the amendment in future elections would preclude the election of a candidate who failed to receive the largest popular vote. To my mind it is extremely significant that President McKinley, who received nearly 5 percent more of the popular vote than his opponent Bryan in 1896, would have lost the electoral vote had the Daniel-Kefauver amendment been in effect during the election. The late and distinguished Senator Robert A Taft, who put a great deal of thought into this proposal in the 81st Congress, demonstrated quite convincingly that, because of the Democratic strength in the 1-party States in the South and because of the improbability of 2-party growth in those States, the Republican candidate would have to poll 53 percent of the total popular vote to win the election. As the junior Senator from Massachusetts has indicated, the Daniel-Kefauver amendment would for all practical purposes preclude the election of a Republican candidate to the Presidency and would, in effect, relegate the Republican Party to the position of a permanent minority party.

Although there has been some criticism of the statistical application of the Kefauver amendment to past elections, on the basis that the votes cast in these elections might have been more numerous or cast differently, and although this criticism may have some validity, the basic charge that the Daniel-Kefauver amendment will produce distorted electoral results to the permanent injury of one of the major political parties has not been effectively answered in this debate. Because this possibility of dangerous distortion and fundamental detriment to the two-party system exists, I will vote to recommit the Daniel-Kefauver amendment to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary for further study, and, failing that, will vote against it.

The Mundt-Coudert amendment, which is being considered both separately and as an adjunct to the Daniel-Kefauver amendment in the combination proposal known as the Daniel-Mundt amendment, would retain the electoral college, but would have the electors distributed within a State according to congressional districts and two electors chosen at large. Each elector would stand separately and the result would be a breakup within each State of the block of electors. The arguments in favor of this amendment are much the same as those in favor of the Daniel-Kefauver amendment. The method proposed for proportioning the electors is the significant difference between the two proposals. To my mind the principal argument against it is that the cure is worse than the ailment. Gerrymandering has been an often-practiced method of securing and holding political power, through the drawing of both local districts and congressional districts. By realining districts, incumbent political parties, particularly in two-party States, have been able to extend and perpetuate their control out of all proportion to their actual numerical strength. What is to prevent State legislatures from gerrymandering congressional districts to the permanent advantage of one political party in the presidential elections, if the Mundt-Coudert amendment is adopted? Proponents of the bill argue that the Congress now has the power to prevent gerrymandering of congressional districts. It is, however, no secret that Congress has failed to exercise that power. And it is certainly highly speculative to suppose that the Congress could or would take effective action to prevent the same kind of gerrymandering devised to keep an incumbent political party in power in the executive branch.

The Daniel-Mundt substitute, which combines both methods of apportioning electoral votes and leaves the choice up to the States to individually decide which method each State will adopt, mixes and compounds the worst features of both amendments, and considerably weakens the merit which the Daniel-Kefauver amendment possessed in its separate form. The combination of these 2 amendments seems to be ill-considered and ill-advised. It is also noteworthy that the Daniel-Mundt proposal would give the States the authority to choose between these two systems, a privilege which the States have possessed under the present provisions of the Constitution since 1793. The fact that no State has adopted any proportional method of distributing its electoral votes would seem to indicate that the States are intent upon preserving their strongest unit influence as it is exercised in the bloc winner-take-all system. Should this amendment or the Mundt-Coudert amendment come to a vote, it is my intention to vote against them. Again I would recommend that Senate Joint Resolution 31 be recommitted to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary for reconsideration and further study.

The Langer amendment, which provides for the direct election of the President and Vice President, is the only one which is not potentially more of a threat than the present system which these proposals would replace. However, the direct election of the President and Vice President would symbolize a basic change in our theory of constitutional government. Just as the States as units were to have equal representation in one House of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, so it was intended that they should have a distinct voice in the election of the President and Vice President. Geographic and minority interests have always played an important and legitimate role in the formation of our national policy, and they do today. The President of the United States is the representative of the American people both as individual citizens and as citizens of their respective States. This dualism of the citizen's role as a member of a State community and of a national community was carefully established in the Constitution. To prevent the interest of the individual citizen as a member of the State community from being completely overriden by the majority interest of the citizens acting as individual members of the national community, the Founding Fathers provided for the Senate in the legislative branch, giving the citizens of the smaller States representation in the Federal legislature beyond their numerical importance. This has meant that the citizens of a small State such as Maine can still be heard and their interests taken into account in the councils of the Federal Government.

The intention to preserve the role of the small and thinly populated States in the executive branch of the Federal Government was embodied in the formation of the electoral college. No matter how small a State is, it has at least three electoral votes. In the least populous States this gives the voice of its citizens what proponents of the Langer amendment would call an undue influence in the election of the President and Vice President. But is this influence undue? Is not protection for the smallest members of the national community and the proposition that sectional interests have a legitimate place in the Federal make-up, principles unchallenged in the legislative branch, applicable to the executive branch as well? It is my feeling that we should not amend the Constitution in such a way as to change the very character of the Federal Government without considerably more attention to the meaning of this change than it will be possible to give in the course of the debate on the proposed Langer amendment.

The Langer amendment, as it is now worded, specifies that in the event of a tie, which would admittedly be rare indeed under a system of direct election, the House of Representatives is to break the tie using the same method that is now used—each State having one vote in choosing between the deadlocked candidates. Thus the Langer amendment, at one and the same time, would abolish the structure of the State vote in the electoral college and reaffirm it by giving each State an equal vote in the House of Representatives in the event of a tie.

One provision of the Langer amendment, which has particular popular appeal, would establish a nationwide presidential preference primary for the nomination of party candidates. The nationwide primary would be held in June preceding the November election. Voters registered in a political party would be eligible to choose between announced candidates on their party's ballot. The winner of this preferential primary would be his party's official candidate in the November election. The merit in this proposal would be in the elimination of the nominating convention, where the voice of the voter is sometimes either unexpressed or ignored. In a nationwide primary, as envisaged in the Langer amendment, the national candidates of the poltical party would be chosen by the majority of the party membership and not by a combination of delegates selected in primaries and delegates chosen by party machines. Although I favor this proposal in principle, the details of the plan should be given much more thorough study than is possible here on the Senate floor during this debate. I shall therefore, reluctantly vote against this provision of the Langer amendment.

From the other amendments proposing various revisions of the electoral college, there emerge two provisions which have, to my mind, been clearly established as both desirable and necessary at this time. One of these provisions would bind the electors to the candidate receiving the majority of the votes within the State he represents in the electoral college. The second is a proposal to change the procedure by which the

House of Representatives selects the President in the event that no one has received the required 266 electoral votes for election. Under the new proposal, each Member of the House of Representatives would cast one vote, rather than each State casting one vote. In this manner, the election of President by the House of Representatives would more directly reflect the will of the people who have chosen individual Members of the House and not State blocs. If a clarifying amendment is proposed, embodying these two provisions which will correct the most obvious and most clearly defined faults of the electoral process, such an amendment will receive my full support.

Proponents of a drastic overhauling of the electoral process assert that their amendments would purify our democracy. Their intent is highly praiseworthy, but to my mind the proposals they have submitted contain dangers which could readily have a contrary effect. In the absence of a clear-cut demonstration that any of the proposals would make the process of electing a President and Vice President more democratic, without drastically changing the basic structure of our Federal form of government, I am opposing all the amendments now before the Senate. However, it is my hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will continue to study this problem, and after the most thorough and careful analysis of all possible reforms, will recommend an amendment which will in fact preserve the desirable features of the present electoral system and modify those features which are demonstrably undesirable.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, if no Senators wish to speak on our side, I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Rhode Island willing to yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. PASTORE. I am willing to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] feels there is good reason when the Senate should vote on the substitute amendment which is proposed by approximately 54 Senators, I wonder whether the Senator from Connecticut would not be prepared to withhold his motion to recommit until after a vote is had on the Lehman amendment and on the Mundt amendment.

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to modify my unanimous consent request to that end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and a modification is not in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that that be done, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Counecticut I understand that it may be done by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A request for unanimous consent has been made to withdraw the motion. Is that the Senator's request?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to create a parliamentary situation under which the votes on the two amendments referred to by the Senator from California may take place before a vote is had on the motion to recommit which I have made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANIEL. Could not the same result be accomplished by the Senator from Connecticut withdrawing his motion to recommit, and then making it later in the proceedings?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the Senator's motion to recommit. Therefore, he cannot withdraw his motion without unanimous consent.

Mr. DANIEL. Do I understand that the Senator at this time is asking unanimous consent to withdraw his motion to recommit?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has asked unanimous consent to postpone a vote on his motion until a vote has been taken on the two amendments referred to by the Senator from California.

Mr. DANIEL. Under those circumstances, I will have to object. I would not object to a unanimous-consent request to withdraw his motion to recommit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator from Connecticut withdraws his motion, may he later renew it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After some other business has intervened and if the Senator from Connecticut gets the floor, and if there has been some change in the joint resolution, the Senator from Connecticut may then renew his motion.

Mr. PASTORE. Would not a vote on the Lehman amendment be considered additional business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It might result in a difference in the language of the joint resolution. A mere vote on the amendment would not change it, necessarily.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is my understanding that even though the substitute may not have been changed by the Lehman amendment, if time elapsed, such as in a roll call, or in connection with some other matter, the Chair could entertain a motion if the Chair felt the Senator making it had not been dilatory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After a reasonable time had elapsed, a motion could again be in order even though the resolution were in the same form.

Mr. KENNEDY. Even though the substitute had not been changed, the motion of the Senator from Connecticut, after a reasonable time had elapsed, would still be in order. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the reasonableness of the time be determined by the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be determined by the Chair, subject to the parliamentary situation.

Mr. PASTORE. I have confidence in the judgment of the Chair.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I now renew my unanimous-consent request that the vote on my motion to recommit be deferred until after the votes on the Lehman resolution and the other resolution mentioned by the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It there objection?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would have no objection to the Senator withdrawing his motion and renewing it at a later time, but so far as postponing it to a time certain is concerned, I would be forced to object to that, and I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, is there objection to my unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection to it.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion to recommit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the Senator from Connecticut what is in his mind from the standpoint of whether he intends to offer his motion again, and, if he does, whether he intends to offer it prior to the time of the consideration——

Mr. BUSH. My purpose in making the request was to accede to the suggestion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] that we proceed to vote on the Lehman amendment and the other amendment which the Senator mentioned. It would be my intention, if I am granted consent to withdraw my motion, to reoffer it after those amendments have been acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, on which all time has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York withhold his request a moment?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that all time has evaporated? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we have a quorum call without charging it to the time of either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not necessary, in view of the fact that all time has expired.

Does the Senator from Rhode Island suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. PASTORE. I do, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	McNamara
Allott	Goldwater	Millikin
Anderson	Gore	Morse
Barrett	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Neely
Bender	Hennings	Neuberger
Bennett	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bible	Hill	Pastore
Bricker	Holland	Payne
Bridges	Hruska	Potter
Bush	Ives	Purtell
Byrd	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Jenner	Russell
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kennedy	Scott
Clements	Kerr	Smathers
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Laird	Sparkman
Dirksen	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lehman	Symington
Duff	Long	Thurmond
Dworshak	Malone	Watkins
Eastland	Mansfield	Wiley
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Young
Frear	McCarthy	
Fulbright	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. If he were present and voting, he woud vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay" and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

I also announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 66, as follows:

YEAS—17

Chavez	Laird	Morse
Douglas	Langer	Neely
Gore	Lehman	Neuberger
Hayden	Long	O'Mahoney
Hennings	Mansfield	Pastore
Jackson	McNamara	

NAYS—66

Aiken	Ellender	McCarthy
Allott	Ervin	McClellan
Anderson	Frear	Millikin
Barrett	Fulbright	Mundt
Beall	George	Payne
Bender	Goldwater	Potter
Bennett	Green	Purtell
Bible	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bricker	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Holland	Saltonstall
Bush	Hruska	Schoeppel
Byrd	Ives	Scott
Carlson	Jenner	Smathers
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Kennedy	Stennis
Curtis	Kerr	Symington
Daniel	Knowland	Thurmond
Dirksen	Kuchel	Watkins
Duff	Malone	Wiley
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Eastland	Martin, Pa.	Young

NOT VOTING—13

Barkley	Humphrey	Sparkman
Butler	Kefauver	Thye
Capehart	Magnuson	Welker
Clements	Monroney	
Flanders	Murray	

So Mr. LEHMAN's amendment to Mr. DANIEL's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I wish to offer to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment intended to be offered by the Senator from New Jersey will be in order when the Senator from New Jersey can gain recognition.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What is the business which is pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment, as modified, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the amendment which the Senate is now considering is the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which would enact what is known as the Gossett-Lodge proposal of 1950, with this alternative: That any States which desire to do so might elect their electors as they elect Members of Congress.

More than two-thirds of the Members of the Senate have indicated that they feel some change is necessary in the outmoded electoral college system. The Senate now has before it a measure which the Committee on the Judiciary considered was the closest we could ever come to a direct vote by the people themselves for President and Vice President, and still retain the present electoral vote by States, by dividing the electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote.

The popular vote cast would be divided only among the highest three candidates, in an effort to prevent splinter parties.

An amendment was adopted earlier today which provides that a candidate would have to receive at least 45 percent of the electoral vote in order to be elected.

In addition, as I have pointed out, it is provided in the alternative that any State which desires to do so may elect its electors and send in its electoral vote in the same manner as Members of Congress are elected. That is nothing new. It has been done by 11 States in the past. States could do it today, under our Constitution.

That has been the only change made in the amendment which is pending in the nature of a substitute.

I sincerely hope the Members of the Senate will give their consideration to the substitute, in order that we may get a two-thirds vote for the amendment, so that it may go to the House for further consideration.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Is it in order at this time to offer an amendment to the substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such an amendment would not be in order unless time on the pending proposal is relinquished, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I do not wish to interfere with the plans of other Senators, but, if it is in order, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment to the substitute may be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to have his amendment to the substitute considered by the Senate at this time. Is there objection?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. What happens to the time which has already been allotted on the so-called Daniel amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time which has been utilized would be deducted from the total time controlled by the Senator from Texas when the

Senate returns to the consideration of the substitute, in the event consent is granted to the request of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. PASTORE. The time would still be preserved on the substitute of the Senator from Texas?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, identified as "3–20–56–C."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated by the clerk, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 2, line 20, immediately after the word "a", to insert the word "nominal."

On page 2, line 22, immediately after the word "Congress", to insert a comma and the following: "and in any such election shall cast the number of actual electoral votes to which it is entitled under section 2 or section 3."

On page 3, line 10, immediately after the words "and the", to insert the following: "actual number of electoral votes which each State may cast in any such election shall bear to the nominal number of electoral votes to which such State is entitled the same ratio as the number of votes cast in such election bears to the total number of citizens of such State of voting age according to the last preceding decennial census. The actual."

On page 3, line 10, to strike out the words "to which such State is entitled", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "cast by each State."

On page 4, line 4, to strike out the word "and."

On page 4, line 5, immediately after the word "entitled", to insert a comma and the following: "and the total actual number of electoral votes cast by such State."

On page 4, line 8, immediately after the word "the", to insert the word "nominal."

On page 4, line 21, immediately after the period, to insert the following: "Each such elector shall cast a fraction of a single electoral vote equal to a fraction the numerator of which is the number of votes of the people cast for such elector in the election by which he was chosen, and the denominator of which is the total number of citizens of voting age who are inhabitants of the congressional district or State, as the case may be, from which he was chosen, according to the last preceding decennial census. In determining the fraction of an electoral vote which any elector is entitled to cast, any fraction less than one one-thousandth shall be disregarded."

On page 5, line 4, immediately after the period, to insert the following: "The lists so transmitted by the electors of any State shall disclose the number of votes of the people received by each elector, and the fraction of an electoral vote cast by each such elector."

On page 5, line 15, to strike out the words "electoral votes" and insert in lieu thereof the words "actual electoral votes cast by all States."

On page 5, line 16, to strike out the word "the" and insert in lieu thereof the word "such."

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, during the earlier discussion this afternoon I outlined briefly why I thought an amendment would be necessary if we are seriously to consider the substitute offered by the Senator from Texas and the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, my major objection to the substitute, as well as to the resolution as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, is that its effect would be contrary to that suggested by the proponents of the resolution, and that it would inevitably have the result, rather than to increase the franchise throughout the Nation, further to restrict it. It would tend to strengthen the grip of the dominant parties in the solid States.

The sponsors of the resolution, both the original resolution and the substitution, urge that in the solid or safe States there is no inducement for a minority party to campaign, or for members of that party to vote in presidential elections, since there is at present no possibility that any of the States' electoral votes will be cast for that party's candidates. It is claimed that if the electoral votes of such States were divided in proportion to the popular votes, the possibility of obtaining a part, however small, of the electoral votes of such States would stimulate campaigning by minority parties and increased participation in presidential elections by the members of such parties.

To the extent that the proposed amendment had this result, its effect would be beneficial. But any such beneficial result would be far outweighed by the additional restrictions on the franchise in the safe States to which a proportional division of electoral votes would inevitably lead.

Individual voters in the safe States have, on the average, approximately three times as great a voice in presidential elections as do individual voters in larger States. This imbalance is now compensated for, in a rough way, under the unit rule, by which the entire electoral vote in the larger States goes to the candidate receiving a majority of the popular votes in those States.

Under either of the proposals, this compensating factor would be eliminated. The relative importance of the safe States would be greatly enhanced. The incentive to the dominant party in such States to keep them safe would be enormous.

It would be naive to suppose that in such States the dominant party would not do everything in its power to preserve its advantage, especially in those States, where, by statute, and by extralegal practices, the franchise is already severely restricted and great numbers of citizens are now in effect disenfranchised.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. As I interpret the Senator's amendment, it relates only to the so-called Daniel-Kefauver amendment, and not to the Mundt-Coudert amendment, with the districting section.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. No. My amendment goes to the substitute which the Senator from South Dakota and many other Senators have proposed, and which has been joined to the Daniel proposal.

Mr. MUNDT. It does not refer to the districting section, does it?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Yes. My amendment relates to both sections.

Mr. President, it is too much to expect that the dominant party would voluntarily lift these restrictions and extend the franchise to those who might use it to threaten the political power of those now in control. On the contrary, there is every reason to expect that the dominant party would use its present power to insure the continuation of its control through legislation further restricting the franchise, and that extralegal restrictive practices would become more, rather than less, severe.

Nor would the possibility of increased activity by minority parties be helpful in this situation. It is scarcely conceivable, for example, that the Republican Party could gain any substantial support among those persons who now have the privilege of the franchise in States of the solid South by a campaign urging the liberalization of the franchise, and, in general, the extension of civil rights in that area. On the few occasions when the Republican candidates for President have carried one or more Southern States, it was not on the basis of such an appeal. For the foreseeable future, the only possible basis on which any outside party could hope to attract more than a negligible number of votes in the States where the franchise is now restricted would be to support, at least as strongly as the dominant party now supports, such restrictive laws and practices.

Under the Constitution as it now stands, each State has a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives it is entitled to have in the Congress. Under the proposed resolution, each State would continue to have that number of electoral votes. Each State has, of course, two Senators, and the number of its Representatives is based upon its total population, excluding Indians not taxed.

Congress has never exercised its power, under the 14th amendment, to reduce the representation of a State in the House of Representatives because of its denial of the franchise to its citizens, and there is no prospect it will do so in the indefinite future. Accordingly, no matter how many citizens in a State are prevented, by law or practice, from voting in presidential elections, the State now suffers

and would suffer no reduction in its electoral vote in such elections.

My amendment is a very simple one. It would automatically reduce each State's nominal electoral vote—that being the number which is equal to the number of Senators and Representatives—in the proportion that that State restricts the franchise of its people; and it provides that each State's electoral vote actually counted shall be that proportion of its nominal electoral vote that the number of citizens actual voting in that State bears to the total number of votes.

I can see no argument, in justice, in constitutional theory, or for any reason whatever, why the amendment should not be adopted. It is sound on its own base, and it is absolutely essential if the very damaging effects of the proposed resolution upon our constitutional processes are to be avoided.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I have been trying to follow the Senator's amendment. It seems to be very, very complicated, in terms of the counting mechanism it would establish.

Earlier, I asked the Senator from New Jersey whether his amendment would apply to the district system by which we do not fractionate the electoral vote, but by means of which each congressional district selects an elector; and the Senator from New Jersey said he intended his amendment to encompass that situation. I wonder how his amendment would operate in conjunction with the mechanism we have established under the district plan.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the question asked by the Senator from South Dakota is a very proper one, and I shall be very glad to attempt to answer it.

As I said earlier, in answer to another question asked by the Senator from South Dakota, my amendment would operate on both sections of the proposed substitute amendment. In respect to the part of the amendment under which, if the State so directed, its electoral vote would be cast and counted in the way that its votes for Members of Congress are cast and counted, my amendment would operate in this way: The State's electoral votes would be reduced in the same proportion as that which the total vote cast in the State would bear to the total number of persons of voting age in the State. That would be true both in regard to the electors for the State at large and the electors for each congressional district. In that way, an elector might cast a fractional electoral vote; and, as under the amendment proposed originally and reported by the committee, and likewise under the substitute supported by the Senator from South Dakota, fractions of less than 1,000 would be omitted.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me see if I can understand the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey. Let us consider South Dakota as an example. It has 4 electoral votes, because it has 2 Senators and 2 Members of the House of Representatives. Do I correctly understand that under the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, some possible development might result in depriving South Dakota of the 4 electoral votes it has under the present system?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. This amendment would operate equally on all the States. South Dakota would start as all the other States would start, namely, with a nominal electoral vote equal to the number of its Senators and the number of its Members in the House of Representatives—which, in the case of South Dakota, is four.

Mr. MUNDT. Very well. Under the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, how could South Dakota lose any of those electoral votes?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Every State—South Dakota included—would have its nominal electoral vote—in the case of South Dakota, four—reduced in accordance with the proportion which the number of its citizens actually voting in the election would bear to its population of voting age.

Mr. MUNDT. Let us use a very practical example. In elections in South Dakota, frequently far less than 50 percent of the eligible voters of the State will vote, although normally South Dakota ranks among the top 3 or 4 States in the Union, as regards the percentage of voters who participate in elections. But because of the inclemency of the weather in South Dakota at times in November, very frequently when snow storms or blizzards have occurred it is impossible for a great many of the people to reach the polls—due to the slippery roads. As a result, less than half of the people of the State have been able to vote on some occasions.

Under the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, would such a development—namely, bad weather, including snow storms—cause our State to lose several of the electoral votes it now has?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The answer to the question of the Senator from South Dakota is obvious, on its face: to the extent that the electorate of South Dakota did not vote—for whatever reasons—South Dakota's electoral vote would be reduced.

Mr. MUNDT. Despite the fact that South Dakota has no voting restrictions of any kind, and was one of the first States of the Union to permit the American Indian to vote—as certainly he always has had a right to vote, and always should have been able to vote in all of the States of the Union? Does the Senator from New Jersey mean that his plan would permit a caprice of nature virtually to disfranchise many of the voters of a State—because of the occurrence of a typhoon in one part of the country, or because of the occurrence of a blizzard in the Northwest part of the country, or because of a raging fire which occurred in another part of the country?

I am sure the Senator from New Jersey is not seriously suggesting that the weight given the votes of a particular State be determined on the basis of the convolutions of an unpredictable nature.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Obviously, Mr. President, I am proposing exactly what I am proposing——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes allotted to himself by the Senator from New Jersey have expired.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, how much time remains under my control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty minutes more.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Then, Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, this amendment would reduce a State's electoral vote to the extent that its people did not vote in an election—for whatever reason. It would do that, Mr. President. The result would be just the same as, for instance, in an election for governor in the State of South Dakota or in my own State: namely, the people who do not vote do not have their votes counted.

Mr. MUNDT. But under the Senator's amendment there would be a difference, because in voting for governor, bad weather or a fire affects equally both political parties and all the candidates. But if bad weather develops in New England, and if the people there are unable to reach the polls, why should the existence of that bad weather result in depriving the New England States of the present very insignificant number of votes they now have under the electoral system?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I understand the objection; but I suggest that, although it is not put forward frivolously, it is not to be given much weight.

If the Senator from South Dakota would like to have the election of the President held at some other time of the year, rather than in early November—on the ground that ordinarily the people in his State are not able to vote at that time—I shall be glad to join in supporting that suggestion.

Mr. MUNDT. Not ordinarily, Mr. President; I do not want the Senator from New Jersey to disparage the good weather in South Dakota. But on some rare occasions in South Dakota the sun ceases to shine and the bananas cease to grow, in November. On those infrequent occasions, I do not want Old Man Winter to be able to deprive South Dakota of its four electoral votes.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I understand the point the Senator from South Dakota has in mind; but I think he has spun far more out of it than there is substance in it.

In any event, the suggestion the Senator from South Dakota has made is perfectly accurate: a State's electoral

vote would be reduced to the extent that its popular vote was less than the total number of its people of voting age. That rule would apply to all the States.

Mr. President, it seems to me there is no other way by which we shall be able to accomplish what, as I suggested earlier, should have been accomplished long ago, namely, to penalize States, in the case of the weight they shall carry in the election of our President, to the extent that they restrict the exercise of the franchise by their citizens.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I can quite understand the object the Senator from New Jersey has. However, let me ask whether he has taken into consideration the fact that his amendment would also penalize States which are predominantly one-party States, even though such States have never discouraged, and do not now discourage, voting, but, on the contrary, actually encourage voting? Does he realize that his amendment would penalize such States because of the very fact that they are predominantly one-party States, where the vote in an election is inclined to be lighter, for very obvious reasons.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I think my amendment would have exactly the reverse effect. It is intended to encourage, and it would encourage, people to vote, whereas they now feel no reason to vote—as in the one-party States. My amendment would have a very encouraging effect on voting, because it would be to the advantage of everyone in every State to vote, and it would be to the advantage of both parties in every State to encourage all people of voting age to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, all the various proposals which have been submitted to us seem to me to demonstrate clearly the existence of one fact, namely, that on such an occasion as this, the Senate of the United States is not prepared—because of a lack of unanimity of opinion—to adopt any form of amendment.

In the vote which was just taken I voted against the Lehman amendment because I was not willing to preside over the dissolution of the Federal system of our Government. Upon the present question, the main question, and also upon the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], which I propose to support, I have had prepared in my office a series of charts and a statement on this subject, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT

My analysis of the various proposals for revising the procedures of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is based on the following hypotheses:

I. That any solution must recognize that this Nation is both a democracy and a federation of States, and that consequently we must recognize both the States and the individual voter to some extent.

II. That any procedure for selection of the Nation's Chief Executive should tend to award the Presidency to that candidate whom a majority prefer over his leading opponent.

III. That the presidential election should not be thrown into Congress except under extraordinary circumstances.

IV. That an election which is handled by Congress should be conducted on the basis of the basic constitutional compromise.

V. That a two-party system has worked well for the Nation as a whole and should be continued and encouraged as much as possible.

VI. That all States should be able to exercise their proportional strength and influence in the selection of the President and Vice President and conversely that no minority group whether economic, social, religious, political, or racial should be able to exercise an influence disproportionate to its size.

VII. That a procedure more simple and sure than the present would be desirable.

VIII. That statesmen from all geographic areas should be in practice as well as theory, potential Presidents.

Upon these tenets, to which there is substantial agreement from all sides, most of the many electoral reform proposals over the years have been based. Unfortunately, a program for improving the present electoral method in all these various respects has not yet been devised, nor is it likely that the substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 31 would do so. Each provision which at first glance seems to improve the procedure in one direction appears on further study to represent a step backward from another standpoint.

Insofar as the substitute Senate Joint Resolution 31 eliminates the anachronistic electoral college, it constitutes a desirable advance, and I can support that feature without reservation. Thus, the always futile and potentially chaotic process of an intermediate electorate, which has served no useful purpose since 1820, would be fittingly put to rest.

To the extent that the substitute Senate Joint Resolution 31 provides a more representative fairer and more certain method of resolving the extraordinary election which is placed in the hands of the Congress, it is to be commended, and likewise receives my wholehearted support. Neither of these changes solves any of the basic problems existing in the present election procedure, but as unquestionable improvements they should be approved forthwith to avoid the hazardous pitfalls which might befall under the present techniques.

TABLE A.—*1952 presidential election*

State	Electors	Votes cast	Proportion of total votes		Electoral votes under Daniel-Kefauver amendment		Net electoral votes under amendment
			Republican	Democrat	Republican	Democrat	
Ohio	25 Republicans	3,700,758	0.568	0.432	14.200	10.800	3.400 Republicans.
New York	45 Republicans	7,128,241	.554	.436	24.930	19.620	5.310 Republicans.
Illinois	27 Republicans	4,481,058	.548	.449	14.796	12.123	2.673 Republicans.
California	32 Republicans	5,141,849	.563	.427	18.016	13.664	4.352 Republicans.
West Virginia	8 Democrats	873,548	.481	.519	3.848	4.152	.304 Democrats.
Colorado	6 Republicans	630,103	.603	.390	3.618	2.340	1.278 Republicans.
Georgia	12 Democrats	655,803	.303	.697	3.636	8.364	4.728 Democrats.
Alabama	11 Democrats	426,120	.350	.646	3.850	7.106	3.256 Democrats.
Vermont	3 Republicans	153,539	.715	.282	2.145	.846	1.299 Republicans.

TABLE B.—*1952 presidential election*

3 STATES WITH WIDEST MARGIN FOR EACH CANDIDATE

State	Number votes cast	Percent of votes cast		Electors present system		Net electoral vote, Daniels-Kefauver amendment	
		Eisenhower	Stevenson	Eisenhower	Stevenson	Eisenhower	Stevenson
Vermont	153,539	71.46	28.24	3		1.299	
North Dakota	270,127	70.97	28.39	4		1.704	
South Dakota	294,283	69.27	30.73	4		1.544	
Georgia	655,803	30.34	69.66		12		4.728
Alabama	426,120	35.02	64.65		11		3.256
Mississippi	285,532	39.56	60.64		8		1.664

3 STATES WITH NARROWEST MARGIN FOR EACH CANDIDATE

Tennessee	892,533	49.98	49.71	11		0.030	
Rhode Island	414,498	50.89	49.05	4		.074	
Missouri	1,892,062	50.71	49.14	13		.204	
Kentucky	993,148	49.84	49.91		10		0.007
South Carolina	341,086	49.28	50.72		8		.116
West Virginia	873,548	48.08	51.92		8		.308

In an attempt to rectify the existing inequities in apportionment of presidential votes within the States and nationally, my colleagues, Senators DANIEL, KEFAUVER, GOLDWATER, CASE of New Jersey, THURMOND, DIRKSEN, MUNDT, HUMPHREY, LANGER, H. A. SMITH, KENNEDY, and many others, together with our friends in the House and all our predecessors, are deserving of the gratitude of the entire Nation. Unfortunately, the result, Senate Joint Resolution 31 is not on par with the diligence, hope, and sincerity which went into their deliberations. I am certain that the very basic difficulties which beset the original Senate Joint Resolution 31 (Daniel-Kefauver, formerly Lodge-Gossett, amendment) are made worse when combined as an alternative to Senate Joint Resolution 3 (Mundt-Coudert amendment), because of the confusion and lack of uniformity which it would make possible, if for no other reason. It has already been pointed out that there are fantastic arithmetical combinations which could result. In such event, the effect cannot be estimated accurately. But there are other reasons why I must oppose any attempt to introduce the principle of proportional representation. The primary ones are that (1) it would reduce the importance of the States as units for electoral purposes; (2) it might well lead to the introduction of proportional representation in the election of the Congress with all the deleterious effects we have seen in France and other European countries; (3) it would occasion more frequently disputed elections, which disputes would be more difficult to resolve, since a gain or loss in one district would be respectively a gain or loss throughout the country; (4) it would in itself encourage splinter parties, who, at least in a close election, might be able to throw the election into Congress where their influence would be strongly felt; (5) it would make the election of Republican Presidents less likely; and (6) it would increase the influence and effect in a presidential election of the so-called one-party States as opposed to those where the two great parties are strongly competitive. This last problem I should like to examine more closely.

It seems obvious that proportional representation is unthinkable in terms of a national plebiscite for this would eliminate the part of the States entirely, in direct contravention of the fundamental and altogether desirable principles on which this Nation was founded and has so fabulously prospered. To superimpose the same principle on a framework of State electors would have one clearly undesirable effect; namely to cancel out the effect of the States where the election is closely contested and conversely to exaggerate the importance of those States where one candidate is overwhelmingly favored. Since there are approximately 15 southern 1-party States, and by the furthest stretch of the imagination only 4 such States in the North, the ordinary effect would be a distinct heightening of the power of the Solid South. Moreover, since these same Southern States already enjoy an extraordinary electoral representation in terms of the ratio between the number of electors and the number of voters, an unbalanced situation would become completely overbalanced.

From table A, above, representing selected facts derived from the 1952 presidential returns it may be seen, for example, that Georgia with approximately 656,000 voters would have had 15 times as many net electoral votes (4.728) as West Virginia with her 874,000 voters. Similarly, Colorado with nearly 50 percent more people voting would have cast a net electoral vote of only 39 percent of that of Alabama.

Leaving the traditional one-party States as such, let us look specifically to those States which in actual fact had the widest and narrowest margins respectively. This was a most unusual year in that one party had a candidate of extraordinary popularity and international distinction. The 3 States which gave Mr. Eisenhower the largest proportion and the 3 States which gave him the smallest are presented in table B. Also represented are the three States which gave each candidate the smallest proportion of their votes. It can readily be seen that Vermont with approximately 154,000 votes would have given Mr. Eisenhower almost twice as much net support (1.299 electors) as the combined States of Kentucky, South Carolina, and West Virginia (0.431 electors) would have given to Mr. Stevenson had the Daniel-Kefauver amendment been effective. On the other side of the coin, the combined States of Tenessee, Rhode Island, and Missouri with a total of 3,200,000 votes cast would have furthered Mr. Eisenhower's cause by only one-fifteenth the number of electors that Georgia would have proffered to Mr. Stevenson.

TABLE C.—*1948 presidential election*

3 STATES WITH WIDEST MARGIN FOR EACH CANDIDATE

States	Number votes cast	Percent votes cast for —		Electors present system		Net electors under S. J. Res. 31	
		Dewey	Truman	Dewey	Truman	Dewey	Truman
Maine	262,150	56.74	42.27	5	----------	0.723	----------
Nebraska	488,939	54.15	45.85	6	----------	.498	----------
Vermont	121,373	61.55	36.93	3	----------	.739	----------
Arkansas	200,618	21.02	61.72	----------	9	3.663	----------
Oklahoma	721,599	37.25	62.75	----------	10	2.450	----------
Texas	1,032,940	24.60	65.44	----------	23	9.393	----------

3 STATES WITH NARROWEST MARGIN FOR EACH CANDIDATE

Delaware	137,424	50.04	48.76	3	----------	0.038	----------
Indiana	1,628,912	49.58	48.78	13	----------	.104	----------
New York	5,621,367	45.99	45.01	47	----------	.460	----------
Ohio	3,808,403	49.24	49.43	----------	25	.060	----------
California	3,955,818	47.14	47.58	----------	28	.110	----------
Illinois	2,898,475	49.24	50.09	----------	25	.237	----------

Table C presents the same statistics as table B for the 1948 election using the more traditional States in the role of most and least influential. Note that Ohio, California, and Illinois together, with voters numbering 10½ million, would have cast substantially fewer electoral votes for Mr. Truman than Maine's one-quarter million voters would have cast for Mr. Dewey. Delaware, Indiana, and New York, representing 7⅓ million voters, would have provided a total net electoral vote of only six-tenths of an elector whereas Arkansas alone with its one-fifth million voters would have given 3.7 net electoral votes to Mr. Truman. In other words Arkansas would have had six times as much effect in the 1948 presidential election as the combined States of New York, Delaware, and Indiana, had the Daniel-Kefauver amendment been previously adopted.

TABLE D.—*1944 Election*

Rank	States	Votes	Dewey	Roosevelt	Miscell's	Net votes	Rank	Rank	States	Votes	Dewey	Roosevelt	Miscell's	Net votes	Rank
1	New York	47	22.231	24.586	0.188	2.355	13	25	Connecticut	8	3.755	4.184	0.061	0.429	31
2	Pennsylvania	35	16.926	17.899	.179	.973	19	25	Florida	8	2.174	5.826	----------	3.652	8
3	Illinois	28	13.454	14.426	.118	.972	20	25	Kansas	8	4.820	3.134	.046	1.686	14
4	California	25	10.748	14.128	.125	3.380	10	25	Maryland	8	3.852	4.148	----------	.296	36
4	Ohio	25	12.545	12.455	----------	.090	47	25	South Carolina	8	.357	7.011	.631	6.654	5
6	Texas	23	3.827	16.427	2.744	12.600	1	25	Washington	8	3.379	4.547	.074	1.168	15
7	Michigan	19	9.344	9.536	.120	.192	44	25	West Virginia	8	3.609	4.391	----------	.782	23
8	Massachusetts	16	7.520	8.450	.030	.930	21	32	Colorado	6	3.193	2.784	.023	.409	33
8	New Jersey	16	7.832	8.050	.119	.218	42	32	Nebraska	6	3.515	2.485	----------	1.030	17
10	Missouri	15	7.265	7.706	.029	.441	30	32	Oregon	6	2.816	3.107	.077	.291	37
11	North Carolina	14	4.661	9.339	----------	4.678	7	35	Maine	5	2.622	2.373	.006	.249	41
12	Indiana	13	6.809	6.075	.114	.734	24	36	Arizona	4	1.636	2.352	.012	.716	25
13	Georgia	12	2.190	9.809	----------	7.619	3	36	Idaho	4	1.923	2.062	.015	.139	46
13	Tennessee	12	4.706	7.254	.040	2.548	12	36	Montana	4	1.797	2.171	.032	.374	34
13	Wisconsin	12	6.044	5.828	.128	.216	43	36	New Hampshire	4	1.915	2.084	.001	.169	45
16	Alabama	11	2.002	8.941	.058	6.939	4	36	New Mexico	4	1.858	2.139	.004	.281	38
16	Kentucky	11	4.974	5.990	.036	1.016	18	36	North Dakota	4	2.154	1.819	.027	.335	35
16	Minnesota	11	5.155	5.765	.080	.610	28	36	Rhode Island	4	1.650	2.344	.006	.694	26
16	Virginia	11	4.113	6.860	.082	2.747	11	36	South Dakota	4	2.333	1.667	----------	.666	27
20	Iowa	10	5.199	4.749	.052	.450	29	36	Utah	4	1.577	2.418	.006	.841	22
20	Louisiana	10	1.940	8.060	----------	6.120	6	45	Delaware	3	1.358	1.631	.011	.273	40
20	Oklahoma	10	4.420	5.557	.023	1.137	16	45	Nevada	3	1.361	1.639	----------	.278	39
23	Arkansas	9	2.686	6.296	.019	3.610	9	45	Vermont	3	1.712	1.288	----------	.424	32
23	Mississippi	9	.580	8.420	----------	7.840	2	45	Wyoming	3	1.537	1.463	----------	.074	48

TABLE E.—*1944 election under Daniel-Kefauver*

Rank	States	Net votes
1	Texas	12.600
2	Mississippi	7.840
3	Georgia	7.619
4	Alabama	6.939
5	South Carolina	6.654
6	Louisiana	6.120
7	North Carolina	4.678
8	Florida	3.652
9	Arkansas	3.610
10	California	3.380
11	Virginia	2.747
12	Tennessee	2.548
13	New York	2.355
14	Kansas	1.686
15	Washington	1.168
16	Oklahoma	1.137
17	Nebraska	1.030
18	Kentucky	1.016
19	Pennsylvania	.973
20	Illinois	.972
21	Massachusetts	.930
22	Utah	.841
23	West Virginia	.782
24	Indiana	.734
25	Arizona	.716
26	Rhode Island	.694
27	South Dakota	.666
28	Minnesota	.610
29	Iowa	.450
30	Missouri	.441
31	Connecticut	.429
32	Vermont	.424
33	Colorado	.409
34	Montana	.374
35	North Dakota	.335
36	Maryland	.296
37	Oregon	.291
38	New Mexico	.281
39	Nevada	.278
40	Delaware	.273
41	Maine	.249
42	New Jersey	.218
43	Wisconsin	.216
44	Michigan	.192
45	New Hampshire	.169
46	Idaho	.139
47	Ohio	.090
48	Wyoming	.074

Table D lists the States in order of their importance in presidential elections under the present system. Table E shows how the various States would have ranked in terms of their net importance in the presidential election of 1944, if the Daniel-Kefauver amendment had been in effect. The 1944 election was selected because it was the last one in which there was no significant third party or independent movement. The contrast indicates an alarming picture. New York which is justifiably the most important State under the present electoral method becomes 13th in terms of impact under the Daniel-Kefauver plan. My State of Colorado, interestingly enough, changes only from 32d to 33d rank. But Ohio, which now has the 4th most electors to cast for a presidential candidate would in 1944 have been 47th ranked in importance with its net effect of 0.09 of an elector. The traditional one party States of Texas, Mississippi, Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina, Louisiana, North Carolina, Florida, and Arkansas move up from far down the line in table D to become the nine most important States in table E.

Further review establishes only what is already apparent, that the swing States would become less significant while the predominantly one party States would become all powerful. Moreover, those privileged to vote in the States where substantial numbers of citizens are disenfranchised, would increase their presently inequitable and disproportionate representation in the Government of these United States.

For similar reasons the foregoing statistics and conclusions apply, although to a lesser degree, to the district electoral method as provided in the Mundt-Coudert proposal and as modified by the amendment offered by Senator SMITH of New Jersey.

Without attempting to cover all the possible effects and countereffects of the various proposals, it seems clear that both the proposal known as the Mundt-Coudert and the Daniel-Kefauver plans contain fatal defects. The difficulties of each are by no means eliminated by the magic of combination together with the proposal by my friend from South Carolina. Rather, additional defects are added by injecting the possibility of confusion and the worst sort of localistic political maneuvering. Hurried combinations and exchanges are bad enough when employed in the process of enacting statutes. They are infinitely more dangerous as an approach to the drafting of constitutional amendments. Some of the paramount objections to the proposals now being considered would be eliminated by the adoption of the amendment offered by Senator CASE of New Jersey which would have the effect of revising the electoral strength of the various States more realistically. Either of the previously discussed revisions would become much more desirable if such an amendment were included.

The principle of a national popular plebiscite, which seems to have almost no support among my colleagues, appears to be the only method of accomplishing the desirable effect of making each person's vote count on an equal basis with another's. Aside from the fact that one of the reasons this approach is unsaleable is because it would tend to decrease the importance of certain geographic areas, there is another reason why the American people have not yet indicated any significant approval of this extreme approach. This is also the reason why the junior Senator from Colorado did not support it; namely, that it would completely reject the great compromise which has served this Nation so well for these 167 years. How else could this country, with all its numerous economic, geographic, racial, social, and religious groups, have withstood the strains of the years. No one has clearly shown that a completely nationalized popular election would be an improvement over the present method which recognizes both the individual citizen and the individual State as important in a national election not only of the Congress but of the President and Vice President.

The dilemma is simply this. All of the proposals which retain our Federal Republic form of democracy, as currently proposed, would seriously unbalance the delicately balanced geographic, and so forth, relationships within the country. While the proposals to adopt a direct, national, popular election need yet to be proven. These would seem to fall within the category of medicines that leave the patient sicker after taking them than before. The ideal of making each person's vote count on an equal basis is commendable. But is it so precious as to necessitate revolutionizing our entire form of Government? Is the present method that bad?

Unless and until someone develops a revision that commends itself to all segments of our great country without the necessity for strange and basically opposed combinations we had better retain the proven system. I am sorry that I have not produced a solution which would meet all these objections, for our current approach has decided limitations. But the unkindest cut of all would be to create chaos in the name of progress.

I therefore can lend my support only to those aspects of Senate Joint Resolution 31 which would—

1. Substitute an automatic electoral counting technique for the outmoded electoral college (sec. 1); and

2. Provide a fairer method of handling the election of President and Vice President when the decision devolves upon the Congress (secs. 4 and 5).

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, what the Senator from New Jersey is emphasizing is something which I am sure we all recognize, namely, that there is a good portion of the population of the United States, in some 12 or 15 States, who are left at home. For example, in my statement there is a tabulation which shows that in the 1952 presidential returns, 1 State of the South, with 656,000 voters, would have had 15 times as many net electoral votes, under the substitute now proposed, as West Virginia, with her 874,000 voters. Similarly, my own State, with nearly 50 percent more people voting, would have cast a net electoral vote of only 39 percent of that of the State of Alabama. These projections and examples could be continued almost indefinitely, from the figures which have been made available in the findings and in the hearings.

I should like to answer the question of the Senator from South Dakota. It is true that his State, in the particular instance which he mentioned, might suffer. I can recall only one instance, the winter of 1946, when the weather would have affected the vote of my State. However, it seems to me that if we are to consider the substitute which has been offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and other Senators, we must also, if we are to have any kind of fair compromise, adopt either the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey or one similar to it.

I was one of the original sponsors of the amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 31 now known as the Daniel amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, how much time remains to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I am glad to yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr ALLOTT. Although I was one of the original sponsors of the so-called Daniel amendment, a further study has shown me that either course under the proposed modification would result in gross inequity to the people in other parts of the United States, making a bad situation worse. Therefore, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, and oppose Senate Joint Resolution 31 unless such amendment is agreed to.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I reserve, for the moment, the remainder of my time, if the opposition wishes to take time on the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, is there any Senator who desires to speak in opposition?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I should like to have 1 minute.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Texas.

Mr DANIEL. I think it is quite evident that this amendment is so complicated that it fits the earlier objection its author, the Senator from New Jersey, that we should not write an amendment of this nature into the joint reso-

lution on the floor of the Senate. It would reduce the electoral vote of every State in the Nation by reducing in accordance with the vote actually cast, something which I do not believe the Senators would ever wish to do.

I urge Senators to vote against the Case amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to have 4 minutes in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have already brought out, in the colloquy with the Senator from New Jersey, what seems to me to be a glaring deficiency in his amendment. It would largely turn over to an accident of nature, a riot, a blazing fire in a certain community, or a flood, typhoon, or hurricane, the determination of the election. I cannot believe that he offers it seriously, complicated as it is, expecting it to be approved.

I am intrigued by the sequence of speakers on this amendment. The first one said, "I offer the amendment." The second said, "I think it is so complicated that we ought to recommit the entire subject to the committee."

I agree that an amendment of this kind should be submitted to a committee—a committee of mathematicians, statisticians, and, above all, weather prophets. It seems to me, if we are to adopt the system proposed by Senator CASE of New Jersey that the most important person at a convention would not be the keynoter or any of the delegates, but the best weather prophet who could be found, the one with the best almanac. It would be desirable to find out in what section of the country there appeared to be the best prospects for good voting weather, and select a candidate who would appeal to the people of that part of the country.

States like South Dakota and North Dakota say to their voters, "Come one, come all. We want you all to vote." But suppose, because of some accident of weather or local circumstances, they do not get to the polls. The Senator from New Jersey says that, regardless of the reason why they do not get to the polls, we should cut down their constitutional right to vote for President and reduce their electoral votes.

If I correctly understand the amendment, I wonder if it would not operate, generally speaking, similar to the Russian veto in the United Nations. I wonder if it would not operate as a veto power in all our elections. I am not sure that I understand the amendment, but if I do, it would operate in this manner.

The State of South Dakota goes Republican most of the time, I am happy to say. However, about 30 or 40 percent of its people are Democrats. I am wondering if the smartest thing for the Democrats to do, under the provisions of the Senator's amendment, would not be to stay at home. They would not win anyway. South Dakota now has 4 votes to cast in the electoral college. If the Democrats in our State were to remain at home, would our electoral vote, under the proposed system not be reduced by 30 percent? Is this not a new way of electing Presidents, by abstention? Is this not what is done occasionally by the splinter parties of Europe? They abstain from voting. We would have American citizens running around crying "Nyet, Nyet," as the Russians do in the United Nations. They would refuse to vote so as to reduce the vote impact of the party in the State usually polling a majority.

Under the proposed system, the Democrats of South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas, for example, would be more effective by refraining from voting than they would if they were to vote. If they were to vote they would lose; but if they were to refrain from voting, they would curtail the power of the majority and reduce the electoral vote.

I do not believe our friend thought this amendment through as clearly as he should, before offering it as an amendment to the Constitution. With all the unpredictable elements and all the imported ideas involved, I am sure that this proposal would not work on American soil.

The Senator from New Jersey had some constructive things to say about this legislation. Some of them, I am happy to report, were against the present system. I hope that Senators will not rush in from the cloakrooms and, merely out of respect for our distinguished friend from New Jersey, vote for this amendment, and then find themselves compelled to operate with a kind of electoral nightmare.

When we take into consideration the weather, and other unpredictable elements, under the proposed system Zodiac experts, soothsayers, and crystal-ball gazers would be the most important people in our national conventions. The most effective thing for a Democrat living in South Dakota to do would be to stay at home, because the Democrats win only once in 20 years anyway. If he were to vote, he would lose; but if he were to remain at home, he would curtail the power of the majority. We should defeat the Case amendment to avert such a bizarre procedure.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute to comment on 1 or 2 remarks by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

The Senator from South Dakota has done his very best to blow up a molehill into a mountain. To suggest that there are glaring defects in the amendment because he can imagine circumstances under which a natural catastrophe would keep hundreds of thousands of people away from the polls is merely to indicate that we are always subject to natural disasters.

A defect of the kind described by the Senator from South Dakota would have no more impact if my amendment were adopted than would be the case otherwise. That tiny speck of defect, if it be one, must be considered in relation to the evils of the present system and in the light of the fact that it would be compounded if the Daniel proposal were to be adopted by way of an actual restriction on the vote of millions of people in this country, whose votes are counted for the purpose of determining the electoral votes of the State in which they reside, but who would never have a chance to cast them.

I should like to say again that this is not a complicated amendment. Every Senator understands fully exactly what it would do. It would operate very simply to give each State that part of its normal electoral vote which the people actually voting in that State bear to the total population of the State or to the congressional district, if the so-called Mundt part of the substitute were adopted.

Mr. President, I have no desire to take further time. If the opposition is willing to yield back the remainder of its time, I shall be glad to do likewise.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. Then I shall yield back the remainder of my time.

I regret that I must oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey. I believe it would be a great mistake to adopt an amendment dealing with such a complicated subject, with so many ramifications to it, without first having the Committee on the Judiciary give it full consideration.

I understand the objective of the Senator from New Jersey, and I sympathize with it in many ways. However, as I have based my opposition to the Daniel amendment on the ground that the State is a unit and that the State shall have the right to decide how its electoral votes should go, I cannot in good faith support the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey. Therefore, I shall have to vote against it. I hope it will be defeated. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The Senator from Massachusetts yields back the remainder of his time. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] would vote "yea."

I further announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has a pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay" and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 66, as follows:

YEAS—20

Allott	Jackson	Neuberger
Bender	Kuchel	Pastore
Bush	Lehman	Potter
Case, N. J.	Magnuson	Purtell
Douglas	Mansfield	Smith, N. J.
Hennings	Morse	Wiley
Ives	Neely	

NAYS—66

Aiken	Frear	Martin, Pa.
Anderson	Fulbright	McCarthy
Barrett	George	McClellan
Beall	Goldwater	McNamara
Bennett	Gore	Millikin
Bible	Green	Mundt
Bricker	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Payne
Byrd	Hill	Robertson
Carlson	Holland	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Hruska	Saltonstall
Chavez	Jenner	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Cotton	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Curtis	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kerr	Sparkman
Dirksen	Knowland	Stennis
Duff	Laird	Symington
Dworshak	Langer	Thurmond
Eastland	Long	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Williams
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Young

NOT VOTING—10

Barkley	Humphrey	Thye
Butler	Kefauver	Welker
Capehart	Monroney	
Flanders	Murray	

So the amendment of Mr. CASE of New Jersey to the Daniel amendment was rejected.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, does each side have an hour and a half on the Daniel amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 1 hour and 25 minutes remaining; the Senator from Massachusetts has 1 hour and 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to Senate joint resolutions proposing a constitutional amendment to alter the manner in which the President and Vice President of the United States shall be elected.

When this matter was considered by the full Committee on the Judiciary I voted against the joint resolution. I was 1 of the 3 Senators who opposed the amendment at the time. I am still opposed to it.

I have not spoken previously during the debate on the various proposals to change the manner of electing the Presiden and Vice President, not because I have not had decided views on the various proposals, but primarily because I have been engaged in extensive preparations for discussion of the "honest elections bill," which I trust the Senate will soon consider, and the preparation of separate views in opposition to another radical proposal to amend the Constitution—the Dirksen amendment to change the power of the President to make treaties and other international agreements.

I have followed the debate very carefully, and the able Senators who have spoken on both sides of these questions have presented very forceful arguments for their respective positions. There are some very basic considerations which moved me to oppose this amendment originally. Under the proposal to divide the electoral vote of each State proportionately in accordance with the popular vote cast in that State, the result would be to increase even further the disproportionate influence that small one-party States in the South, the Northwest, and in New England already have in choosing the President and Vice President of the United States. Under the proposal to divide the electoral vote of each State in accordance with the plurality vote cast in congressional district, the result would in some instances be similar to the present system, except that the unit would be a congressional district rather than a State. In other situations, the result would not vary from the present practice. Under the compromise amendment which is being offered as a substitute, State legislatures would be permitted to choose the manner of apportioning the electoral votes of a State. This compounds the bad features of both proposals, neither of which taken alone would be as bad as the compromise.

So far as I know, no one has contended that the present system is perfect. We all know that the present practice works far differently than the original ideas of the Founding Fathers when they created the electoral college under the Constitution. The fact that the present constitutional arrangement for the election of the President and Vice President is imperfect and should be changed to bring it into closer conformity with democratic processes by no means argues that the Senate should pass the present amendments.

Senators have said that the present system is unfair because under it the States having large populations, and therefore larger electoral votes, become pivotal in determining the election of a President. This is true, but it is in these States, as well as in all States where the elections are closely contested and a two-party system of government really prevails, that our American democracy functions in the manner which we point to with pride. Fortunately most of our States, and most of the people living in the United States, enjoy the checks and balances of two-party rule. I might say to my colleagues that if one-party rule were generally in vogue throughout the country, even though with different parties in different States, our Government would be unstable and chaotic. We should do what we can to establish a two-party system of government in every State. The proposed amendments move in the opposite direction. It is quite clear when the proposals are examined carefully that the results would be that small one-party States in both the North and the South would increase their power and influence in the election of the President and in the councils of the Nation. Under our present constitutional system, these States probably already have more power than they should have in a country founded essentially on democratic principles. The able senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] yesterday, by means of his statistical tables, showed quite convincingly that a voter in South Dakota, under our present system, has many times the presidential voting strength of a voter in New York or California or Texas.

No, Mr. President, let us not retrogress; let us move in such a direction that a voter in New York or California or South Carolina or Maine will have the same influence on the election of the President as will the voter in any of the other States. The solution of this problem, if we wish to move in a direction of national unity and democratic equality, is to elect the President and Vice President by popular vote. Under that system every vote would be equal. There would be equality under one nation. But the Senate has already rejected the amendments providing for direct elections of the President and Vice President. This reform will have to abide the future.

In the past I have again and again expressed my great reluctance to any altering of the Constitution of the United States without the most extensive study of the proposed item of possible improvement. I also am reluctant to alter it in the absence of any widespread public demand. Written by some of the ablest men ever gathered together in any legislative assembly for the unique and revolutionary purpose of assuring, above all else, the liberties of our people, this document has worked well.

As I have already indicated, I am inclined to believe that the direct election of the President of the United States and the Vice President by popular vote is the one change in our basic election law which is most in keeping with the spirit of our times and the democratic temper of our people. This method, which is the method by which we Americans elect our mayors, our State legislatures, our governors, and our national Representatives and Senators, appears to be the most democratic and, therefore, the fairest and best method of all that have so far been laid before us of electing the Nation's President and Vice President.

But in coming to this conclusion I am very conscious of the drastic and radical nature of this proposal. It is, indeed, a long step toward pure democracy, and a long step away from those ideas of a republican form of government of limited powers, organized through a Fed-

eral union of States, which were held by those men who framed our Constitution. It is traveling a great distance from that idea of a Federal union, because of which the Senate is in existence, with its idea of equality of two votes for every State, regardless of size or population.

Whether the people of the smaller States, who now have a greater power in the election of a President than they would have in any national election by the votes of individual citizens, would be willing to surrender their powers to the people of the larger States remains to be seen. Their representatives in the Senate have today said "No," but if the direct election of the President by popular vote might seem to militate against their interests, so also the alternative methods which are being proposed now would, as has been ably pointed out by the able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] certainly militate against the interests of other segments of the Nation's people. Some of these proposals would even nullify the power of great urban populations to influence the election of a President, elevate and magnify the power of small sparsely settled States beyond all reason.

There is no absolutely perfect method of assuring the people's will in government under any election system within this country. The direct poll, which tallies majorities, pluralities, and minorities by counting the votes, may certainly produce a minority victor. The people's vote itself, so long as the people wish to retain a constitutional government, to protect the rights of minorities, and thereby to assure liberty for all, is only a partial expression of all the people's will on any single occasion. Our Government is really designed to be one of popular self-government, coupled with popular self-restraint, and therefore has to move by a series of compromises, which sometimes may seem to be illogical.

The three general proposals that have been put forward in the Senate would all leave the smaller States overrepresented in the electoral vote as they are today, and would give the Democratic Party an advantage until a real Republican Party was organized in the Solid South. These proposals would reverse the existing pattern of presidential campaigns, so that each party would concentrate its efforts on building up its vote total in States where it has an assured majority, rather than fighting for a smaller advantage in the larger and more populous States. While they would reduce the power of splinter parties that rise occasionally in the larger States, by forcing them to operate on a national scale, they would give some advantage to splinter parties organized by regional grouping, like the States Rights Party of 1948.

Now, I happen to be a member of the Democratic Party. Yet I cannot believe it to be to the advantage of my country as a whole that additional weight in the entire governmental process of the United States should be given to the Democratic Party, beyond that which it now possesses as a party because of one-party rule in a few of our States.

I do not share the distrust of the citizens of our large communities which has been voiced here by several of my most respected colleagues. I have always had a profound admiration for a great American statesman named Thomas Jefferson, who was willing to trust the people as a whole.

As for this particular amendment which has come to be known as the Daniel-Mundt-Thurmond amendment, I must agree with my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that it is an attempt at national gerrymandering on a wholesale scale, the like of which has never before been seen in this country. It would deprive city voters of any fair share in the presidential election. It seems to me a move by thinly populated, one-party States in the South and West and New England to dominate presidential elections. If it is adopted, more elections would be thrown into Congress than this Nation ever has seen before. By offering States alternative methods of electing a President, it opens the door to all kinds of political skulduggery.

Take the election of 1800, for instance. The Federalist candidates for President and Vice President were John Adams, of Massachusetts, and Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, of South Carolina. The Democratic-Republican candidates for President and Vice President were Thomas Jefferson, of Virginia, and Aaron Burr, of New York. When the ballots were counted on February 11, 1801, in the electoral college, it was shown that Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr had each received 73 votes. Sixty-five had been cast for Adams; 64 were cast for Pinckney, and there was 1 for John Jay. Therefore, the election was thrown into the Federalist-dominated House of Representatives. A deadlock followed. A Federalist caucus decided to back Aaron Burr. Hamilton, however, regarded Jefferson as the lesser evil and used his influence to break the deadlock. It has been supposed that Jefferson made certain commitments to the Federalists, but there is no reliable evidence supporting this view. On the 36th ballot, Jefferson was chosen President by 10 States, each State having 1 vote. Burr was elected Vice President.

The election demonstrated the inadequacy of the machinery provided by the Constitution for selecting the President. To prevent a similar situation in the electoral college, the 12th amendment was proposed by Congress in 1803, and ratified in 1804. It provided for separate balloting for President and Vice President.

Yet this reform was not sufficient to assure to the country that a presidential candidate receiving the highest number of votes would be elected to that high office.

Another disputed election occurred in 1876. In this election, Tilden received a popular vote margin of 250,000. He carried New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Indiana, and apparently the South; but Republican headquarters refused to concede his election on the ground that the returns were in dispute in Florida, Louisiana, South Carolina, and Oregon. Without these electoral votes, Tilden, with 184, would be one short of the necessary majority. On December 6, 1876, two sets of electoral returns were reported from the 4 disputed States. In 3 Southern States, Republican election boards threw out sufficient Tilden votes, on the ground of irregularities, to certify his Republican opponent, Rutherford B. Hayes. In Oregon, which the Republicans had unquestionably carried, the Democratic governor, violating Oregon law, disqualified one Republican elector and certified a Democrat in his place.

The Constitution offered no clear guide for this disputed election in 1876. Therefore, to break the alarming deadlock, Congress set up an Electoral Commission consisting of 5 Members of the House and 5 of the Senate and 5 Justices of the Supreme Court. Four of the Justices were designated in the bill: 2 Republicans and 2 Democrats. The House selected 3 Democrats and 2 Republicans. The Senate picked 3 Republicans and 2 Democrats. The 15th member, the 5th Justice, was to be selected by the other 4 Justices, with the tacit understanding that Justice David Davis, an Independent, would be chosen. But, owing to his election by the Illinois State Legislature to the United States Senate, Davis was replaced by Justice Bradley, a Republican. Under pressure from Republican politicians, Justice Bradley, who had first written an opinion favoring Tilden, switched to the Hayes' side. Deciding by a vote of 8 to 7, along straight party lines, not to go behind the lines and investigate the count in each disputed State, the Commission awarded the vote in Florida to Hayes, and later gave similar decisions for the 3 remaining States. Hayes was therefore declared elected.

The support of southern Democrats for the Electoral Commission's decision was the result of Republican promises to appoint at least one southerner to the Cabinet; to withdraw Federal troops from the South; and to make substantial appropriations for southern internal improvements. In other words, the election of Hayes to the Presidency was the result of a political deal, rather than the result of a national election.

But, to turn again to the bill now before the Senate, one outstanding evil remains in it. The residents of our growing American cities, under-represented everywhere in the legislative processes of government, would lose their last remaining influence—that of a weighted power to make their force felt in the election of a President and Vice President.

As one commentator well pointed out, this is electoral reform in reverse and "turns a sensible and needed reform into a mishmash." The country would have no uniform way of counting electoral votes. Legislatures could be expected to shift from one method to another from time to time, as political exigencies might dictate.

Mr. President, may I return briefly to my reluctant decision to advocate direct election of the President and Vice President by the people of this country, in

spite of my reverence for the Constitution and my belief in the value of a Federal Union, with a national government of limited powers. I do not hold that all human wisdom died with the Founders of this Republic. But I find great inspiration occasionally in reading the words of some of those great men who wrote the fundamental charter of all our liberties. This tells me what they were trying to do under the conditions in which they lived, and sometimes tells me what I might better do in my own time, many years later, under different conditions.

I find a common purpose in that mighty work to which those Founding Forefathers of ours dedicated their lives, their fortunes, and their honor. They were absorbed by the conquest of tyranny. They were dedicated to the cause of freedom, as they saw it. I hope we all may be so absorbed and so dedicated. It was because of that scholarly dedication of theirs that they set up the complicated system of checks and balances, unique to the Constitution of this country, so that the people within it might be free from tyrannies, and live as equal citizens concerning their rights under law. That great task which they began has not yet been accomplished.

These great men were practical men of politics, as well as philosophers and statesmen. As they drafted the Constitution, they were fully aware that it had to be ratified by 13 States, then sovereign, if there was to be any national Government. It is generally agreed, I believe, that James Madison is the greatest authority on the way they went about constructing this Government, devoted to freedom.

In his Federalist paper, No. 39, Mr. Madison wrote as follows:

In order to ascertain the real character of the Government, it may be considered in relation to the foundations on which it is to be established; to the sources from which its ordinary powers are to be drawn; to the operation of those powers, to the extent of them; and to the authority by which future changes in the Government are to be introduced. * * * [These were to include constitutional amendments] * * * The Constitution is to be founded on the assent and ratification of the people. * * * Not as individuals composing one entire Nation, but as composing the independent States to which they belong. * * * The act, therefore, establishing the Constitution will not be a national, but a Federal act * * * it is to result neither from a majority of the people of the Union, nor from that of a majority of the States. It must result from the unanimous assent of the several States that are parties to it. Were the people regarded in this transaction as forming one Nation, the will of the majority of the whole people of the United States would bind the minority. * * * Each State, in ratifying the Constitution, is considered as a sovereign body. * * * In this relation, then, the new Constitution will, if established, be a Federal, and not a national Constitution. * * * The House of Representatives will derive its powers from the people of America; and the people will be represented in the same proportion, and on the same principle, as they are in the legislature of a particular State. So far the Government is national, not Federal.

The Senate, on the other hand, will derive its powers from the States, as political and coequal societies; and these will be represented on the principle of equality in the Senate, as they now are in the existing Congress. So far, the Government is Federal, not national. The executive power will be derived from a very compound source. The immediate election of the President (by electors) is to be made by the States in their political characters. The votes allotted to them are in a compound ratio, which considers them partly as distinct coequal societies, partly as unequal members of the same society. From this aspect of the Government, it appears to be of a mixed character, presenting at least as many Federal as national features. * * * As it relates to the operation of government * * * the Constitution * * * falls under the national, not the Federal, character * * * the operation of the Government on the people, in their individual capacities, in its ordinary and most essential proceedings, may, on the whole, designate it, in this relation, a national government.

* * * It changes its aspect again * * * in relation to the extent of its powers. The idea of a national government involved in it * * * an indefinite supremacy over all persons and things, so far as they are objects of lawful government. Among a people consolidated into one nation, this supremacy is completely vested in the national legislature * * *. In this relation, then, the proposed government cannot be deemed a national one; since its jurisdiction extends to certain enumerated objects only, and leaves to the several States a residuary and inviolable sovereignty over all other objects.

This Government of ours, then, as Mr. Madison saw it, was to be a combination of a national government and a Federal union of sovereign States. It is as such a government that it has long survived. The question of the electoral process which we are discussing is one of balance of powers.

The application of the Federal principle of equal representation of coequal States—both large and small—still stands in this Senate. I hope it may stand for a long time to come. I believe that in any reform in our electoral process in the matter of the President and the Vice President, we should increasingly trust the people of the Nation as a whole, and let their election be by the simplest and most direct way possible. I do not know whether we can achieve this result at this time. But I would be against any such constitutional amendment as would move away from that goal toward greater representation in the presidential election by States with small population.

At this juncture, I hold that one circumstance is most fortunate. There is no overwhelming popular demand that we act in this matter at all. Sometimes in the absence of such popular demand it may be better to be guilty of inaction than of rushing into some half-baked solution of a national problem which will leave us in a worse condition than we were in before the solution. On the whole, our people have been able to elect majority Presidents, or at least plurality Presidents, even under our antiquated and obviously faulty system of the electoral college. If I could have the opportunity of voting for an amendment providing for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States, as the Senate did a short time ago, I would vote for it, as I did; but I propose to vote against any other proposed solution to this exceedingly difficult problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed following my remarks an article written by Mr. Walter Lippmann, from the Washington Post and Times Herald of today, styled Invitation to Confusion.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is at present strong support in Congress for a variety of constitutional reforms, all of which have to do with the Presidency. The Senate will be voting this week on several amendments dealing with the electoral college and how the popular vote for President should be counted. There is in the background the revised version of the old Bricker amendment to limit the treaty-making powers of the National Government. And there are in the works a number of bills to clear up the unsettled questions of what happens if the President is disabled.

Of these three subjects, it may fairly be said that only on the last one is it both desirable and urgent to act now. The Bricker amendment is not only not needed, but might well prove extremely embarrassing to the President. As for the reform of the electoral college system, the fact is that though a theoretical case can be made for reform, there is no agreement among the reformers on what the reform should be.

The leading proposal now before the Senate, the so-called Daniel-Mundt amendment, proves on its face that Congress is not ready to deal with the question. This amendment would not institute a new system of voting for President. It only sounds as if it might if one does not look at it carefully. All that it really does is to invite each of the 48 State legislatures to do what those legislatures have now, and have always had, the right and power to do. The Daniel-Mundt amendment is not in fact what it purports to be—a new and better system of electing the President.

It offers each State legislature a choice of systems. Senator DANIEL, in section 2, offers each State legislature the right—which it already possesses—to order the electoral vote divided among the three leading candidates in proportion to the popular vote. Senator MUNDT, in section 3, offers each State legislature the right—which it has always had, and has in fact at times used—to let the electors be chosen like Senators and Representatives—two at large and the rest by congressional districts. Senator MUNDT also offers the State legislatures—though nothing is said about it—the right to keep the general ticket system provided they also elect their Representatives at large.

So far as I can make out, as to how the popular vote shall be counted, the one and only thing the amendment changes is to prohibit a State from electing its representatives by districts and its electors on a general ticket. If the State wanted to have the general ticket system for electors it would—like New Mexico and North Dakota today—have to elect its Congressmen on a general ticket. The temptation to do just that would be strong, especially in the smaller States, because with all the electoral votes counted as a unit, the State has a greater impact on the choice of a President. The best proof of this is that for more than a century all the States have voluntarily adhered to the general ticket system. The reason they have adhered to it is that this system gives them their greatest political weight.

Whatever may be said in favor of the Daniel reform, the Mundt reform, or any of the other proposed reforms, nothing can be said in favor of a constitutional amendment

to invite each State legislature to consider before each presidential election how it will have the popular vote in its State counted. That, however, is what the Daniel-Mundt amendment really does. It decides nothing. It merely invites and incites the majority party in each State legislature to tinker with the system in order to help shape the result of the election.

Thus the system of electing Presidents, which is now stable and uniform by general consent throughout the Nation, would become variable and unsettled. A close national election could come to depend on whether a particular State legislature had for that election picked one system rather than another.

Congress is quite evidently not ready to propose a reform of the electoral system. For what is now before it in the Daniel-Mundt amendment is in fact an elaborate pretense. It covers what is simply a passing of the buck to the 48 State legislatures.

Mr. KENNEDY. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Missouri for a very fine statement. I think he has clarified greatly the debate on the question. His statement was highly regarded by all of us.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts very much for his complimentary remarks, undeserved as they are, and coming from one who has borne the burden of the battle, as he and the senior Senator from Illinois have. We are all indebted to both of those Senators and to other Senators for bringing this matter to the attention of the country, and for having kept the debate statesmanlike and at a very high level.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Missouri. I share his view of the contribution which has been made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. Anyone who reads in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech delivered on yesterday by the Senator from Illinois, and who studies the tables the Senator from Illinois submitted at that time, will learn more about political life in America than he could ever learn from reading any book I know. I think the speech of the Senator from Illinois was wonderfully comprehensive, and gave great illumination not only to this problem but also to all related political problems.

Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] desires to speak at this time.

Mr. DANIEL. A little later I shall be glad to have a few minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Very well.

Mr. President, I wish to support what has been said about the inadvisability of having the Senate adopt the proposed substitute. It combines two plans, each of which I think is completely unacceptable, at heart, to the supporters of the other plan.

The Daniel-Mundt substitute, which includes the Mundt district system, the system which I believe would be the plan that most of the States would accept, would in my opinion bring about a denial of the popular will. For example, if the States had accepted the Mundt district system, in 1952, although Eisenhower carried the State of Tennessee, the Democrats would have received a majority of Tennessee's electoral votes. In 1948, although the Democrats carried California, Ohio, and Illinois, the Republicans would have won a majority of the electoral votes of those States. In 1924, the Republicans carried Kentucky; but under the Mundt district system, the Democrats would have won a majority of Kentucky's electoral votes.

In the final results of the 1954 congressional election in States outside of the South, the Democrats won over the Republicans, in the popular vote. But the Republicans obtained 58 more congressional seats than did the Democrats. If that election had been a presidential election, under the Mundt plan the Democrats' popular margin in the North would have resulted in a tremendous electoral deficit. In the 12 States with a majority of the electoral votes, a Republican presidential candidate who received the same votes as those received in those States by the congressional candidates in 1954 would have failed to win the popular vote, but would have been able to win a clear majority of the electoral votes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. It seems to me that the States would be forced to turn to the Mundt proposal, when we see what could have happened as recently as the last presidential election. If the State of South Dakota had used the Mundt proposal, all its electoral votes would have gone to Eisenhower. Then Louisiana in self-defense would have felt compelled to adopt the Mundt proposal as well. So, instead of dividing the Louisiana electoral votes 52 percent for Mr. Stevenson to 48 percent for Mr. Eisenhower, the votes would have probably been about 8 for Mr. Stevenson and 2 for Mr. Eisenhower.

Mr. KENNEDY. Exactly. In all the so-called one-party States, the State legislature, which is controlled by that party, would have arranged the congressional districts in such a way that the votes for the other party would be scattered throughout the State, and thus would be a minority in each district. The same result would occur in a presidential election, insofar as voting is concerned.

So I do not think the proposed arrangement would permit a minority to have a stronger vote than minorities have today.

We realize the gerrymandering which occurs in the State of Georgia and the State of Texas and the State of Massachusetts. For example, in the State of Texas there is one district—that in Harris County—which has one-sixth of the State population, even though there are 22 congressional districts in all. In other words, it would be possible to have one candidate win the popular vote; but under the Mundt district plan a majority of the electoral vote would be won by another candidate.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. So I think that would happen consistently, and I do not think that would really be an improvement over the present system.

Insofar as the Daniel proportional voting system is concerned—which I think perhaps would be more satisfactory, but still not sufficiently satisfactory—in 1948, under that system, although Dewey carried New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Ohio, and Indiana, the electoral votes he received for carrying those six States would not have been as great as Mr. Truman's electoral votes for carrying the State of Georgia, even though as among those seven States combined, Mr. Dewey had a clear majority of the popular vote.

If we apply the Mundt system to all past presidential elections, we find that one minority President, Harrison, in 1888—would not have been elected; but 3 minority Presidents would have been elected, instead of the 3 majority Presidents who in those years took office.

I think both of these plans would throw a large share of the elections into Congress—which I think would constitute a further step away from direct popular elections. In 9 of the past 19 presidential elections, if these plans had been in effect, no candidate would have received more than 50 percent of the electoral vote. In four of those elections, the Republican candidate would have received a majority, but the election would have been thrown into Congress anyway.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. First, let me say that I was just referring to the situation under the Daniel amendment calling for 50 percent.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from Massachusetts realize that the amendment as adopted provides for 45 percent?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. I would say to the Senator from Texas that it has been difficult for me to keep up with the changes in his amendment; I have been able to do so only as the result of considerable effort. The amendment, as reported, called for 40 percent. Then the Senator from Texas modified it, so as to provide for 50 percent. Then, a few hours ago, the Senator from South Carolina moved the figure back to 45 percent. It seems to me that those who wrote the Constitution gave a little more time to the constitutional provisions than Senators today have, in determining what the correct figure should be.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from Massachusetts realize that the amendment now before the Senate provides for 45 percent?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes; I realize that.

Mr. DANIEL. That is the important thing; is it not?

Mr. KENNEDY. No; I think the important thing is for us to determine what was in the mind of the able Senator from Texas when he first preferred 40 percent, and when he subsequently preferred 50 percent, and when later he preferred 45 percent. In all fairness, I think the Senator from Texas should explain what led to those varying decisions, so we can judge which is best.

Mr. DANIEL. I shall be very happy to explain that. I submitted, first, the so-called Lodge-Gossett amendment; and, as then submitted, it was exactly in the same form as it was passed by the Senate by a two-thirds vote in 1950.

In 1950, on the floor of the Senate, the 40-percent requirement was placed in the amendment, instead of a majority-vote requirement. In our committee, it was shown that it was not necessary to reduce the requirement so low after we amended the resolution to provide that the votes for only the highest three candidates would be counted. We felt we could go back to the majority system, and that would protect us against throwing elections into the Congress.

However, upon further study and upon hearing the very able arguments of the Senator from Massachusetts and other able arguments which were made on the floor of the Senate, we conceded that probably we would be making a mistake if we did not require at least 45 percent, instead of a majority. As was explained earlier today, since 1860—even under the proportional method of counting the votes—no election would have been thrown into the Congress, if 45 percent, instead of a majority, had been required.

So I hope the Senator from Massachusetts feels that those were good and sufficient reasons for finally arriving at the Johnston amendment which was agreed upon on the floor of the Senate today.

Mr. KENNEDY. I simply say to the Senator from Texas that I think that what he has done is to take a major step away from a plan which has been in the Constitution from the beginning—namely, that of requiring a majority to elect a President. Under the program and plan the Senator from Texas suggests, I am afraid it probably is wise to reduce the percentage to 45—although first the amendment called for 40 percent, and subsequently for 50 percent, and finally for 45 percent. Mr. President, in the case of a matter as important as the election of the President of the United States, I think such variations in the percentage figure suggests that perhaps the entire matter should be returned to the committee for further consideration, particularly inasmuch as I understand that the measure as reported from the committee called for 40 percent.

Mr. DANIEL. It was reported from the committee exactly in the form in which it was passed by the Senate in 1950. No great study was given to that particular provision. Later, when we tried to arrive at a provision which would be acceptable to others who had different ideas about the matter, we felt it would be safe to return to 50 percent, when we limited the counting of the votes to the highest 3 candidates.

But I think the whole objection the Senator from Massachusetts has stated was answered today when we included in the measure the provision requiring 45 percent for election.

Mr. KENNEDY. I will say to the Senator that with the possibility of votes for a third party being counted separately in every State under the proposal of the Senator, I am not sure that it would be possible to reach the percentage of 45 with any degree of regularity.

Mr. DANIEL. In all elections since 1860, and in every election in our entire history with one exception, every successful candidate has received more than 45 percent, if we apply the proportionate system back to those elections.

Mr. KENNEDY. As the Senator has frequently pointed out, one trouble with applying the system to past elections is that we do not know what differences would have existed if we gave third parties separate electoral votes in each State. It might well have been difficult to reach the 45 percent figure. I agree that 45 percent is preferable for this system, but I suggest that it introduces an entirely new note into the election of Presidents when we say that a President does not have to receive the majority of the votes. Under the Senator's plan, if it is to be accepted, that idea would go into effect.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for calling attention to the fact that the committee itself did not consider the figure of 45 or 50 percent. The very fact that the figure has been changed on the floor is, in my opinion, a very good reason why the joint resolution should be sent back to the committee.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think it should. I thank the Senator.

Does the Senator from South Dakota plan to use some of his time at this point?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I plan to use some time during the final consideration of the compromise amendment. May I inquire if there are other amendments to be presented?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no other amendment pending. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has submitted an amendment which has been printed, and which lies on the table.

The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the Daniel-Thurmond-Mundt substitute for the original joint resolution.

Mr. MUNDT. Is the only printed amendment on the desk one submitted by the Senator from Masschusetts?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. However, it is not now before the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts plan to offer that amendment?

Mr. KENNEDY. At the present time I do not.

Mr. MUNDT. Unless the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] desires to take some time at this time, I am prepared to speak.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator from South Dakota wish to speak at this time?

Mr. MUNDT. Not if the Senator from Texas prefers to speak.

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the problem of discussing the proposed constitutional amendment at this time presents the same picture of futility with which we have been presented during so much of the debate. I think the proposed constitutional amendment is exceedingly important. It is unfortunate that we have been unable to secure the attendance of more than 20 or 25 Senators in the Chamber at any one time to hear the discussion.

I am not sure how fruitful it will be to spend additional time now reviewing the very important reasons which I think should impel the Senate to vote for this very important change in the method by which we elect our Presidents and Vice Presidents. This proposition is of vital significance to the future of America.

Therefore, I wish to take a few minutes at this time to make a statement or two with reference to the statement just made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who has been very diligent in his attendance during the debate, and very energetic in his opposition to the proposals which we are trying to have accepted. He has made a careful study of the question, and has pointed to the one weakness in our compromise amendment which we wish we could say we have been able to correct, but which we have not been able completely to correct. I shall refer to it a little later in its proper perspective. I allude to the matter of gerrymandering.

As I stated in earlier discussions with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the statistics by which he attempts to relate what might have happened in the past to the rules of the future, had they been applicable in the past, in my opinion, have no relevancy or weight, because had the new rules been in effect at that time, the entire machinery for nominating candidates would have operated differently. The convention machinery in connection with writing platforms to appeal to the electorate would have operated differently. The appeals would have had to be made to a national constituency, instead of to selected constituencies in strategic large cities in the big States. So I see no value whatever in trying to relate what happened to what might have happened under different rules of the game, because we do not know who might have been the candidates. We do not know what might have been the platforms. We do not know who might have been the vice presidential candidates. We do not know what might have been the campaign strategy of the competing parties; and obviously we do not know what might have been the results.

On the main argument in this entire approach, however, from the standpoint of those of us who would like to see the old electoral college machinery modernized, brought up to date, and streamlined, the better to reflect the wishes of the people and more directly to record the popular votes which they cast, we come down to the basic argument which, at this late date, no Member of the opposition has risen to respond to, to reject, to modify, or to refute.

Under the present mechanism, we have built into our election system the fact that the votes of voters in the larger States of the Union, as individual voters, carry 15 times the weight of the votes of

individual voters who are equally intelligent, voting in one of the smaller States of the Union.

It is to that particular deficiency, that particular evil, that particular inequity, that both the approaches, whether it be the Daniel-Kefauver approach, or the Mundt-Coudert approach, direct their attention; and either of them operating singly, or both of them operating concurrently, would completely eliminate that basic and fundamental evil.

I pointed out in earlier talks how those inequities could be magnified, under potential circumstances which are completely realistic and entirely probable. I pointed out, for example, that in the instance of a tie vote, in the popular vote or the electoral college vote, as between my own State and the State of New York, in the examples which I used on Friday, as the only two examples with votes outstanding which would represent 241 votes for one party and 241 votes for the other party, with the votes uncounted.

At that stage of the election process, with everything tied up I showed on Friday last how a single voter in the State of New York would carry more weight than 1 voter, 10 voters, 40 voters, 400 voters, 4,000, or 400,000 voters in South Dakota voting at the same time, in a completely opposite direction, and voting unanimously.

I cannot believe that the Senate, in its good judgment, wishes to continue in operation a system as unreasonable, as unrealistic, and as unfair as that one, when we have at hand, in the compromise amendment, the machinery for curing it.

Perhaps it would be more impressive with some of my colleagues if I were to point out that this is not merely a discrepancy existing between the very large States and the very small States. I point out that in an election which is all tied up, and in which the votes of only Illinois and New York are outstanding, one voter in New York State, voting 1 second before the polls close, for party A, would carry more weight than 1 million voters voting in the State of Illinois at the same time for party B.

Do we really want to preserve and perpetuate a situation in which one American has more authority in determining the election of a President than a million other Americans voting in the opposite direction, the only difference being that the preferential individual voter in New York State with his 1 vote clocks up 45 electoral votes, in contrast with the fewer number of votes that a million people voting for a different candidate for President clock up in the State of Illinois? Or it could be the State of Pennsylvania versus the State of New York. Or it could be the State of California versus the State of New York.

For another example, one individual voter in the State of New York, voting in a certain direction, has more influence in determining the electoral college count and in the election of our President than a unanimous vote cast by all the people voting in the opposite direction in the States of Vermont, Nevada, Delaware, Wyoming, Arizona, Idaho, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, and South Dakota all voting in unison.

Do we really want to continue that kind of a system? Do we expect that if we continue it we will develop a pattern of politics in this country designed to reflect the national interest and designed to appeal to people nationally wherever they live and designed to give balance and substance and sense to the manner in which we conduct our elections and shape our national politics? Is it on that basis we must always nominate our candidates for President and write our national political platforms?

I believe we should adopt the compromise amendment and send it to the House, for its good judgment, and for hearings before the House Committee on the Judiciary, in the hope and with the conviction that they will bring out a constitutional amendment which could be presented to the States for their independent action, in the hope that by 1960 the basic cause for some of the unusual campaign activities and antics and promises and programs which have taken place in this country will be eliminated.

I am interested by the fact that at this late hour, so far as I know, only one major organization stands in active opposition, and that is the Americans for Democratic Action. That fact supports and underscores the argument we have made.

The Americans for Democratic Action are in the nature of a splinter party and in the nature of a pressure group. That group has wired to the leaders of the Senate and the House its opposition to the proposal. They have associated with them some other organizations, but the Americans for Democratic Action is the spearhead of the opposition. Their president has been campaigning against this proposal up and down the country. That organization, of course, does not wish to reduce its effectiveness in influencing the American pattern of politics by using its swing power in our two-party system through playing exclusively to block voters in States with great blocks of electoral votes.

Such splinter groups should be compelled to make a national appeal or to have their influence reduced. It is not in the general interest, in my opinion, to make it possible for a pressure group of that type to operate solely in metropolitan areas of the country, and in only a few of them, for the purpose of swinging the whole national election by determining what is to be done with a formidable block of 45 electoral votes.

I conclude my statement this evening with a reference to the argument that has been made based on gerrymandering. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has made much of the argument of gerrymandering. It is the one point he has made which has a degree of validity in it, because it could avert and will avert and has averted, of course, a complete equality of numbers of people in a congressional district. It is something over which the States have concurrent jurisdiction with Congress. Congress can correct it with its constitutional authority at any time it desires to do so, should the situation become serious.

Mr. President, I point out that when a voter in New York State votes for a Senator or a Representatives in the House of Representatives, he packs exactly the same wallop and carries the same weight that is carried by an individual voter who votes for a Representative or Senator in Delaware. A Delaware voter votes for one Senator and for one Representative. A voter in New York votes for one Senator and for one Representative. However, when it comes to voting for President, instead of the two citizens in the two States I have referred to voting as equals, as they do when they vote for Governor or for a State legislator, or for a Senator or a Representative in Washington, the vote of the voter in New York State is at once magnified and multiplied in importance by 15 times that of the other voter in Delaware. The vote of the voter in New York for President is ballooned up until, by comparison, the voter in New York makes Paul Bunyan in Minnesota look like a pygmy. The power of the voter in New York is ballooned by 15 times merely because he is voting for President. What sense does that make, Mr. President?

Is that a condition the Senate wants to perpetuate? Does the Senate want to give one State the power and authority of a dozen other States, merely because in the argument on gerrymandering it is being said that some congressional districts may a little larger than others?

I submit that the most evil system of gerrymandering in America exists today under our present system. The biggest gerrymandering district in the country is in New York, where 45 electoral votes are gerrymandered into a single Statewide election district. It is that kind of evil gerrymandering, that kind of serious and colossal gerrymandering, which the adoption of our proposed amendment would correct. The amendment would correct the kind of gerrymandering which collects votes in great big blocks, a State at a time, to be swung from right to left or from one party to another party. That is what we would correct.

Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of the compromise amendment.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes, and then I shall yield back the remainder of my time, unless the opposition intends to retain more time; is that satisfactory?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is satisfactory.

Mr. MUNDT. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the amendment?

Mr. KENNEDY. They have not.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, in closing this part of the debate on the substitute I merely wish to say, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, which has heard all the evidence on the proposal, that the system we now have in our country is so archaic and outmoded that the Senate and the House ought to do something about correcting it.

We have labored diligently in an effort to bring before the Senate the resolution which was reported by the Judiciary

Committee, plus one compromise with those who still want the right to elect by congressional districts, because we felt that was the only hope of getting a two-thirds vote in the Senate or in the House.

As I said before, that was no real concession to those who believe that the so-called Mundt-Coudert proposal is the best, because what they propose can be done under the present constitutional provision. Eleven States have followed that system.

The basic part of Senate Joint Resolution 31, which is still contained in the substitute, and which would be applicable to all States except those which elected to follow the alternative plan, would divide the electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote in each State. It would be a means of counting the expressions of the individual voters in this country, instead of, as now, counting all the electoral votes of each State in accordance with whichever candidate gets the plurality of the popular vote in that State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared with relation to the substitute be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DANIEL

In the course of this debate on Senate Joint Resolution 31 and the substitute proposed by myself and other Senators, the present electoral system has found few defenders.

Of those who have risen for the purpose of defeating either the compromise proposal or the resolution as reported by the Judiciary Committee, only one, Senator KENNEDY, has admitted frankly that he favors retention of the present system. One of the Senators who opposes the compromise and aparently also opposes the measure as it was reported from the Judiciary Committee, has agreed that the present system is archaic. It seems to me that since the present electoral system has found so few defenders the argument is not that we should not have electoral reform at all but, rather, what form the electoral reform should take. If we could by some magic obtain agreement between all those who support some type of electoral reform, it is clear that such a proposal would pass the Senate overwhelmingly.

When the hearings on electoral reform were held by the standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, there were three basic proposals pending before the subcommittee. The first was the division of the electoral vote in accordance with the popular vote cast for each candidate in each State; the second was the selection of electors on the basis of congressional districts with two being chosen at large in each State. The third was the direct popular election of President.

Each of these proposals has something to recommend it. Perhaps, each of them has defects. I am confident, however, that 2 out of the 3 basic proposals before the subcommittee, if adopted, would constitute a better system than that under which we now elect our President and Vice President. I eliminate the proposal for the direct popular election of President and Vice President in this enumeration because it seems to me that such a proposal represents a basic violation of the Federal-State principle upon which the Constitution rests and under which we have operated for all the years of this Nations existence. I do not seek to question the motive of those who propose the direct popular election of President and Vice President. Undoubtedly, they are sincere in their conviction that this would be the best method of electing the President and Vice President. However, such a proposal would completely ignore State boundaries. It would lead at an early date, in my judgment, to demands for uniform qualifications for electors in all of the several States. It would permit the translation of fraudulent votes in any one State directly without any diminution in its value. Fraud in our election system is not something remote and fanciful, but is a contingency with which we must deal in any plan which the Congress chooses to present to the States for ratification. Consequently, I cannot support the direct popular election of President and Vice President.

In addition, even if it were to be approved by the required two-thirds vote of both the House and Senate and submitted to the States for ratification, I do not believe it would receive the concurrence of three-fourths of the State legislatures, for it would mean the surrender of the small influence which small States now have on the election of President and Vice President. Consequently, while I do not question the motive of those who propose the direct election of President and Vice President, I ask whether they realize that since it has little chance of adoption they are in effect upholding an archaic system which several of them have said is not to their liking. Those who would defeat electoral reform, either directly or by advocacy of a system which has little or no change of adoption, relegate the voters of this Nation to a system which is full of inequality and fraught with danger.

There can be little question, Mr. President, that the present system, if it has not actually spawned pressure groups has greatly contributed to their influence. The principal pressure group to which I refer is the so-called city machine. The ability of a tightly knit organization in a large city in a large State possessing many electoral votes to determine the manner in which the whole electoral vote of a State may be cast, is easily demonstrable. I would call to Senators' attention the election of 1868 in which Boss Tweed of New York was successful in causing the entire electoral vote of New York State to be cast for the Democratic candidate, Mr. Seymour, by the use of fraudulent votes largely cast in New York City. Fortunately, for the United States, the electoral vote was not so close as to allow this chicanery and fraud to influence the final outcome. Since the days of Boss Tweed, we have had a succession of city bosses who existed because of their ability to deliver large numbers of votes within cities. I do not know that it can be said that bossism and city machines were actually created by our present electoral system, but I do say that their influence has been increased by it. Let me say that neither of our major parties has been free from the influence of such machines.

If the electoral vote is divided in accordance with the popular vote cast for each candidate in each State, any fraud in any State cannot be used to deprive the other candidate of his fair share of electoral votes. If the district system is used, any fraud is limited in its application to the electors chosen at large and the single elector chosen in each congressional district. I hope that Senators considering electoral reform will weigh this problem carefully for though some may say, as the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. CASE, said on the floor on Thursday, that he believes the day of the city machine is gone, I do not believe that such is the case. Bossism and the city machines have been with us for a long time. For a few years now they may have been in a temporary eclipse, but they have not yet vanished from our view.

It is significant to me, Mr. President, that one of the chief attacks upon Senate Joint Resolution 31 and the substitute proposal, has been that it would decrease the influence of the large cities upon the selection and election of a President and Vice President. The Senator from Massachusetts at one point in the debate acknowledged to me under questioning that the influence of such cities and such States was at present disproportionate. Yet, there are those who seek, by the retention of the present system, or failure to unite in agreement on electoral reform, to perpetuate this disproportionate influence. When attempt is made to equalize the influence of the voters of this Nation, whether they spring from the city or from the rural areas, these proposals are immediately attacked.

I think it should be clear, Mr. President, that the supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 31, as well as the supporters of the substitute amendment, do not seek inequality of influence between urban and rural areas, but rather, seek to inject into the system some equality; and, I would remind and point out to my friends from the large pivotal States that it is not the ordinary voter in the city who determines how the vote of his State shall be cast, but rather, the blocs of people which can be manipulated by the city machines who deliver a large number of votes to the candidate who has bid highest for their support. This thought is not original with me but has been expressed by many, including the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, Mr. LANGER, who has been foremost in sponsoring a proposal for the election of President and Vice President. Senator LANGER has repeatedly decried the smoke-filled room and the selection of candidates from the large States for the office of President and Vice President, and yet, I point out to the Senator from North Dakota that it is the present system, with its inequalities and its opportunity for fraud, which requires the selection of a candidate who can deliver or have delivered for him the vote of the large pivotal States. If the Senator from North Dakota desires, as I am sure he does, the selection of candidates on the basis of ability and not the area of their birth or residence, then I would urge him to consider a real desirable effect to be gained by the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 31 or the substitute, namely, the selection of candidates on the basis of ability and not geographical area. The Senator from North Dakota can rest assured that if the large pivotal States are permitted to continue their disproportionate—and I emphasize disproportionate influence under the present system, no candidate for President or Vice President will be chosen from the State of North Dakota nor any other small State.

One of the arguments which has been advanced against the so-called Lodge-Gossett proposal, which is Senate Joint Resolution 31 as reported by the committee, is that it would have an adverse effect upon the Republican Party. Principally, this argument is predicated on the figures given to the committee by one Dr. Ruth Silva, of Pennsylvania State College. The subcommittee attempted to have Dr. Silva appear in person, but a mutually satisfactory date and time could not be arranged. Consequently, and I do not in anywise reflect on Dr. Silva in saying this, the assertions which she made were not subjected to questioning by the members of the subcommittee, including myself. However, I think it is important to point out that her argument is largely predicated on the matter of voter participation and the argument that a certain number of voters are required to secure one electoral vote is an argument which applies to the present system as well as to the proposed changes.

Even so, I would point out to the Members of the Senate that other witnesses and other persons who submitted material to the subcommittee drew a different conclusion regarding the effect of Senate Joint Resolution 31. I would point out to the Members of the Senate, for instance, that the witness who testified for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People alleged that instead of the Republican Party losing by the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 31 the Democratic Party would suffer. His argument appears on page 179 of the hearings. I also would call the attention of the Senators to page 141 of the hearings, where another witness, after reviewing in detail the figures for the presidential elections over the past several years, comes to this conclusion: "It will be noticed that the fear sometimes expressed that the Republican Party would stand to lose in the exchange of votes between the North and the South is not confirmed by these figures." The gentleman was at that time discussing the proportional division of the electoral votes.

If we are going to decide whether we will or will not secure electoral reform on the basis of supposed advantage or disadvantage of any political party, I want to challenge the validity of the assertion that the proportional division of the electoral vote would result in the demise or permanent injury of either political party. It will cause more participation in each party and much larger voting turnouts in the general election.

Some Senators in detailing their opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 31 and the proposed substitute have chosen to take figures from the committee report and the hearings and apply them to past elections. I have attempted to point out on previous occasions that the committee included in its report 2 tables—1 dealing with the 1948 election and the other dealing with the 1952 election—simply to show the mechanical operation of the plan. These figures have been used without any attention being paid to the admonition in the committee report which preceded such tables. Let me quote from page 23 of the report:

"It cannot be too strongly emphasized that while it is, of course, easy to apply the amendment retroactively—by adjusting the new rules to the old figures—it is useful to do so only as a means of illustrating how it would have operated mechanically. One cannot assume—as some have, erroneously—that citizens would have voted identically or in the same volume under this new system as they actually did vote under the existing procedure."

As the report further points out, it is illogical to take the pending amendment, apply it to past elections, and presume that the election results would have lent themselves to the precise mechanical accuracy relied upon by the opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 31. In the debate in 195J on the Gossett-Lodge proposal, and in the current debate, the proponents of electoral reform have repeatedly insisted that if the amendment had been in effect in the past, the whole composition of the popular vote would have been different. We assert that the candidates might have been different. As I have already pointed out under these proposals, it would be possible for the nominating conventions to choose a candidate without respect to the geographical area from which he springs. In addition, the issues would have been different. The importance of sectional and local appeals for votes would have been eliminated. The susceptibility of the party platforms to manipulation of the city machines would have been eliminated. Campaigning would have been carried out throughout the United States instead of being concentrated in a few key pivotal States. Interest in elections would have been generated in so-called one-party States. The interest in elections would have been increased so that there would have been a larger vote cast throughout the United States. All these things point out the impracticability of the utilization of applying a new formula to past elections. These matters with which we are dealing, involving as they do many people in all parts of the country, do not lend themselves to the laboratory method by which we may test each theory without adopting it. But, we can, Mr. President, see the undesirable aspects of the present system and we can move to correct those undesirable aspects as we, who support Senate Joint Resolution 31 and the substitute, have done.

It is easy to criticize but it is difficult to formulate. If the energy which has been put forth here on the floor of the Senate had been applied in an effort to agree on a desirable proposal, I have no doubt that much could have been accomplished. However, we reach the inevitable alternative—is election reform to be adopted, or do we trust our luck further by retaining the present system? Those who vote "no" on this amendment, Mr. President, must satisfy themselves that they are willing to live with the inequities which we know from experience are a part of the present system. Let me review again for some who may not have read the committee report or heard the previous discussion of the evils of the present system.

Most of the undesirable aspects of our electoral system spring from an invention which was not really a part of the system framed by our Founding Fathers. In a letter of August 23, 1823, James Madison wrote: "The district mode was mostly, if not exclusively, in view when the Constitution was framed and adopted and was exchanged for the general ticket and the legislative election as the only expedient for baffling the policy of the particular States which had set the example."

Thomas Jefferson, in a letter to James Monroe, on January 12, 1800, wrote: "On the subject of an election by a general ticket or by districts most persons seem to have made up their minds. All agree that an election by districts would be best if it could be general, but while 10 States choose either by their legislatures or by a general ticket, it is folly or worse than folly for the other six not to do it."

Let me digress for a moment and point out that in addition to these distinguished supporters the eminent Daniel Webster cast his ballot in favor of the adoption of the district system. (Dougherty, electoral system of the United States, p. 297.)

But the point that I seek to make, Mr. President, is that the present system of casting votes en bloc was not the one which the Founding Fathers had in mind when the Constitution was adopted.

After some States began to utilize the bloc or unit method of casting electoral votes, it soon became apparent that as a matter of preservation of their influence on the ultimate election, other States had to follow. It is important to recall, however, that they followed not because they admired the system, but because they had to protect themselves from the diminution of what little effect they had on the election of President and Vice President. With the increased importance of the office of the Presidency over the years, those who sought to influence the selection of a candidate for President were aware of the tremendous advantage which this bloc system of voting conferred upon those who could, by either withholding their approval or giving their assent, decide the fate of a large mass of electoral votes. This unit rule method of counting electoral votes permits a candidate to secure all of a State's electoral vote though he may well not have been the choice of a majority of the people of that State. A very recent example is that of New York State in 1948 in which Mr. Dewey received all of New York State's 45 electoral votes although he received 2.8 million votes, while the Democrat Party candidate, Mr. Truman and the Progressive Party candidate, Mr. Wallace, received a combined total of nearly 3.3 million. This particular facet of our election machinery has resulted in the election of candidates for President with less than a majority of the popular vote in 14 of the 32 elections for President between 1824 and 1948 inclusive.

At three times in our history—once in 1824, again in 1876, and again in 1888, Presidents were elected who did not even receive a plurality of the popular vote. The election of 1824 has been challenged as a pertinent example because of the incompleteness of the figures of the popular vote tally. However, from the figures available, it certainly would appear that Mr. Adams had less votes than his next major opponent in 1824. Opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 31 also challenge the illustration of 1876 as a year in which a candidate was elected with less votes than his opponent. The opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 31 challenge this illustration by asserting that this election was determined by an electoral commission, but the thing that the opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 31 forget to say is that the difficulties in the election of 1876 arose as a result of the present system. For example, one of the disputes in that election dealt with the right of an Oregon elector to cast his vote for President. The Constitution forbids Federal officeholders to be electors and yet, a postmaster in Oregon had been designated by the Republican voters as an elector. Ultimately, the Republican elector involved resigned both his post as elector and as postmaster, and was thereafter selected by the two remaining electors to cast the remaining ballot. This somewhat tainted vote of a single elector determined the Hayes-Tilden election of 1876.

The unit rule method of counting electoral votes has also encouraged what has become known as the one-party State. As long as the opponents of a political party believe that they have no opportunity to have their vote registered effectively in the outcome of a presidential election, they often choose to express their disapproval by withholding their vote. This, however, often permits the unit vote of a State to be cast for a candidate with a relatively small number of voters registered in his favor. I doubt if anyone in the Senate would argue that it is not desirable to have increased voter participation in our presidential elections, and yet, the continued maintenance of the present system fosters just that.

These are real fears but they are not the only fears. Let me point out, Mr. President, that real harm may result from the choosing of 531 relatively obscure individuals who, though largely functioning as rubber stamps, may be called upon, in the event of the death of a successful candidate prior to the meeting of the electoral college, to choose a President and Vice President of the United States. Under our present system, in at least 27 States the names of those electors would not even have been appeared on the ballot. Yet, they would be trusted with the tremendously important job of selecting the President of the United States. We have been fortunate, Mr. President, that thus far the electors have not been required to choose a President of the United States, but we are alerted by the recollection that one candidate in 1872, Horace Greeley, died shortly after the November elections. Since the electoral votes attributable to him were in the minority, the precise problem here presented did not occur, but a substantial controversy arose as to whether the electors were required to vote for Mr. Greeley and whether those who did should have their votes counted in the final tally. The Senate and the House of Representatives could not agree

on this latter question. But, Mr. President, we should not be required to wait until some future time when 531 unknown persons are required to elect a President of the United States.

As has been pointed out before, at least five electors in the course of our history have disregarded the mandate of the voters and cast their ballot contrary to the will of the people who elected them. In the disputed election of 1876, when the vote of a single elector could have decided the election, the pressure to disregard commitments was tremendous. In volume I of his two-volume work, "A History of the Presidency," Edward Stanwood illustrates the temper of the times in the following language:

"Then began the most extraordinary contest that ever took place in the country. The only hope of the Republicans was in the perfect defense of their position. The loss of a single vote would be fatal. An adequate history of the 4 months between the popular election and the inauguration of Mr. Hayes would fill volumes. Space can be given here for a bare reference only to some of the most important events. Neither party was overscrupulous, and no doubt the acts of some members of each party were grossly illegal and corrupt. Attempts were even made to find a Republican elector who would vote for Mr. Tilden in consideration of a large sum of money as a bribe. The funds were provided, and mysterious correspondence by telegraph was held between men who were connected with Democratic political committees and for a venal elector. The whole scandal came to light afterward when the key to the famous 'cipher dispatches' was discovered."

I would not advocate electoral reform unless I believe that I had something to offer which was a betterment of the present system. When I speak of the desirable results to be gained by adoption of the proposed system of casting and counting electoral votes, I do not rely upon my own supposition alone. The subcommittee which took testimony on the three basic plans involving the election of President and Vice President heard from many witnesses and I would like to point out the benefits which those witnesses attributed to the proposed amendment and with which I agree. The chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee, Mr. KEFAUVER, introduced into the RECORD a letter from Mr. V. O. Key, Jr., at that time in the department of political science of Johns Hopkins University. Mr. Key pointed out that among the desirable effects would be the development of machinery for fighting presidential campaigns in one-party States. Also in the records of the hearings, at page 373, is a letter addressed to the chairman of the subcommittee from an associate professor of political science at the University of Illinois, who wrote that the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 31 would most likely have the following impact upon our politics: "The adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 31, or 30, would most likely have the following impact upon our politics; reduce the danger that the system would break down; insure that the popular will be translated accurately; widen the party's choice of candidates, since it would no longer be so essential that the candidate come from a key balanced State; extend the area of campaigning; decrease the significance of minorities in strategic locations, and also cut down their voice in nominating conventions; tend to expand size of electorate. Looking backward, it would not seem that the outcome of presidential elections during the last century would have been altered if electoral votes were distributed according to popular vote. But a different method of counting electoral votes might have resulted in different candidates who might have campaigned differently, so that we cannot say with assurances what the impact of such altered procedures would have been."

Another person expressed himself as believing that unquestionably if some system of proportional division of the electoral vote had been in effect during the past elections, the Republican vote in the South would have been much larger because it would have been counted toward the election of a President. As this witness explained it, and these comments appear on pages 139 and 140 of the hearings, the stay-at-home Democratic vote, faced with a definite penalty for not voting, would be urged to go to the polls.

It seemed to me at one point in this debate the opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 31 were arguing that the disproportionate influence of the pressure groups and political machines in the urban areas ought to be retained because of the equality of representation of each State in the United States Senate. Mr. President, this sounds to me very much like an attack upon the bicameral system, the adoption of which made possible a Constitution for the United States. Senators know that the equality of representation in the Senate of the United States is one fundamental which cannot be denied even by constitutional amendment. I was surprised to hear these attacks on our bicameral system. Mr. President, I fail to see the logic of an argument which says that certain areas and certain groups must have unfair advantage in the national political arena because it is asserted that they do not have an even advantage elsewhere.

Another thing, Mr. President, during this debate, the present compromise proposal has been attacked because it does not provide a uniform system for choosing a president. Those who use such an argument usually blithely ignore the fact that there is no uniform system in the present Constitution by which to choose a President and Vice President. As I have previously pointed out, at various times in our national history different systems of choosing electors were used in the various States—some used the general ticket system, some used the district system, and some legislatures were permitted to choose electors. But, if lack of uniformity is the best argument that opponents can dredge up against this amendment, I cannot see that such an argument should deter Senators from approving the proposal which would correct so many defects in the present system.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I have before me a telegram, copies of which have been sent to various Members of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 23, 1956.*

We urge that you vote against Senate Joint Resolution 31 and the newly-introduced Daniel-Mundt-Thurmond substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 31 which would revise the means by which the President and Vice President of the United States are elected. They are not a step toward more democratic procedures in our election processes.

While we would not deny that there are valid objections to the present electoral college system, the defects of this system are among the least of the disabilities on effective exercise of the franchise, and in any event will not be corrected by Senate Joint Resolution 31 or the Daniel-Mundt-Thurmond substitute. It is particularly unseemly for the Senate to be considering measures which may further penalize already largely disenfranchised groups of citizens. From the point of democratic principles we would urge that this is not one of the areas which requires the urgent attention of the Congress at this time. There are many deprivations of civil rights, including the right to vote, for which remedies are clearly defined and waiting action in the Congress.

The adoption of these proposals would place greater electoral strength in the one-party low-vote States and penalize those States which have benefited from vigorous two-party competition. A vote for Senate Joint Resolution 31 or the Daniel-Mundt-Thurmond substitute is a vote against civil rights.

Respectfully yours,

Richard Atkinson, President, National Bar Association; Marian H. Bluitt, Supreme Basileus Phi Delta Kappa Sorority; James B. Carey, President, International Union of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO; James B. Cobb, President, National Alliance of Postal Employees; Rabbi Israel Goldstein, President, American Jewish Congress; Adolph Held, Chairman, Jewish Labor Committee; Reuben Kaminsky, National Comander, Jewish War Veterans of the USA; Mickey Levine, National Chairman, American Veterans Committee; Nancy Bullock McGhee, President, American Council on Human Rights; A. Philip Randolph, President, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, AFL-CIO; Joseph L. Rauh, National Chairman, Americans for Democratic Action; Walter P. Reuther, President, United Automobile Workers; Willard S. Townsend, President, United Transport Services Employees, AFL-CIO; Roy Wilkins, Executive Secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President the telegram is in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 31 and to the substitute. It is signed by a number of national organizations, including the Americans for Democratic Action, the United Automobile Workers, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. I have introduced it into the RECORD simply for the purpose of quoting this sentence:

A vote for Senate Joint Resolution 31 or the Daniel-Mundt-Thurmond substitute is a vote against civil rights.

In concluding the debate, Mr. President, I merely wish to say that statement is as far from the truth as any statement that has ever been sent to Members of Congress.

The hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary and the report of the committee show that we have tried in every way to present something which would cause the individual voter to have a greater say in the election of a President. His vote should be reflected in the final electoral vote. The purpose is to give the voters an opportunity to be heard, even the minorities in each State, whether it be a State in the North with a Republican majority or a State in the South with a Democratic majority.

This telegram certainly does not represent or reflect the intention of the Senate Judiciary Committee, or of the authors of the resolution or the substitute.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes, and then I shall yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. President, I think it would be a great mistake to accept this amendment. I think, in many ways, the two plans it contains are contradictions. I think the Senator from Texas accepted the Mundt-Coudert plan because that was the only way he could hope to get two-thirds. But I think the amendments are incompatible with each other. The Senator from South Dakota did not vote for the Lodge-Gossett amendment when it was up in 1950. Two contradictory amendments have been offered and joined together in order to get two-thirds of the votes. The result will be that most of the State legislatures in the various States, controlled by one party or the other, will accept the plan of the Senator from South Dakota with all of the gerrymandering it introduces. I think we will be in worse shape then than has been described in all the arguments against the present amendment. To join the two together in order to get a two-thirds vote is not a sound way to amend the Constitution.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator realizes that under our present system the States may use various methods including the method which the Senator from South Dakota advocates?

The KENNEDY. The fact that they all use the general ticket system is the answer to that question.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator will admit that the present system is unfair, will he not?

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the present system is fairer than the other two proposed today. I think there is perhaps something wrong with the present system, but I think it would be compounded by the adoption of this strange hybrid on which we are about to vote.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator does not concede that there should be a change in the electoral college system?

Mr. KENNEDY. Not the change recommended here. Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I inquire whether a majority vote is needed to agree to the amendment now before the Senate, or is it a two-thirds vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that it requires only a majority vote on any of the amendments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On final passage a two-thirds vote is required. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. It requires a two-thirds vote on final passage.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] for himself and other Senators. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—48

Anderson	Ervin	Martin, Iowa
Barrett	Frear	McCarthy
Bennett	Fulbright	McClellan
Bible	George	Millikin
Bricker	Goldwater	Mundt
Bridges	Gore	Robertson
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Russell
Carlson	Hill	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Holland	Scott
Chavez	Hruska	Smathers
Clements	Jenner	Sparkman
Curtis	Johnson, Tex.	Stennis
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Thurmond
Dirksen	Kerr	Wiley
Dworshak	Knowland	Williams
Eastland	Mansfield	Young

NAYS—37

Aiken	Ives	Neuberger
Allott	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Beall	Kennedy	Pastore
Bender	Kuchel	Payne
Bush	Laird	Potter
Case, N. J.	Langer	Purtell
Cotton	Lehman	Saltonstall
Douglas	Long	Smith, Maine
Duff	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Symington
Green	McNamara	Watkins
Hayden	Morse	
Hennings	Neely	

NOT VOTING—11

Barkley	Humphrey	Murray
Butler	Kefauver	Thye
Capehart	Malone	Welker
Flanders	Monroney	

So the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. DANIEL, for himself and other Senators, was agreed to, as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"'ARTICLE—

"'SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during a term of 4 years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution. No person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"'The Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of the President is to begin. Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress. The electoral votes cast by each State may be cast in the manner provided by section 2 or, if the legislature of such State so provides, in the manner provided by section 3 of this article.

"'The voters in each State in any such election shall have the qualifications requisite for persons voting for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

"'SEC. 2. Except in any State in which electors are chosen under the provisions of section 3, votes for President and Vice President shall be cast by the people of each State, and the electoral vote to which such State is entitled shall be apportioned among the three persons receiving the greatest number of votes of the voters of such State for each office in the same ratio as the number of votes received by each such person bears to the total number of votes received by such three persons. In making the apportionment, any fractional portion of an electoral vote to which a person is entitled shall be disregarded if it is less than one one-thousandth.

"'Within 45 days after the election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, the official custodian of the election returns of such State shall prepare, sign, certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate, a list of all persons for whom votes were cast for President and a separate list of all persons for whom votes were cast for Vice President. Upon each such list there shall be entered the number of votes cast for each person whose name appears thereon, the total number of votes cast for all such persons, and the number of electoral votes of such State to which each such person is entitled.

"'SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of this article, the legislature of any State may provide for the election of a number of electors equal to the number of electoral votes to which the State may be entitled in the same manner in which its Senators and Representatives are chosen. Any candidate for elector who before the election has pledged his vote for President or Vice President to a specific person shall, if elected, cast his vote for such person. No Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be chosen elector.

"'Within 45 days after the election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, the

electors so chosen shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot as pledged for President and Vice President, at least one of whom shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves. They shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice President; and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President and of all persons voted for as Vice President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate.

" 'SEC. 4. On the 6th day of January following the election, unless the Congress by law appoints a different day not earlier than the 4th day of January and not later than the 10th day of January, the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the vote shall then be counted. The person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be the President, and the person having the greatest number of votes for Vice President shall be the Vice President, if such number be at least 45 percent of the whole number of electoral votes. If no person has at least 45 percent of the whole number of electoral votes for President or Vice President, then from the persons having the three highest numbers of electoral votes for such office the Senate and the House of Representatives sitting in joint session shall choose such officer immediately, by ballot. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of three-fourths of the whole number of the Senators and Representatives, and the person receiving the greatest number of votes shall be chosen.

" 'SEC. 5. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a President or a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any person who, except for his death, would have been entitled to receive a majority of the electoral votes for President or for Vice President.

" 'SEC. 6. The first, second, and third paragraphs of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, the twelth article of amendment to the Constitution, and section 4 of the twentieth article of amendment to the Constitution, are hereby repealed.

" 'SEC. 7. This article shall take effect on the 10th day of February following its ratification, but shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.' "

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, it is apparent, from the vote just taken, that although two-thirds of the Members of Senate might favor electoral reform, we do not have before the Senate a draft which can be agreed upon by two-thirds of the Senators. In order that the work which has been done on this matter last year and during this year will not go for naught, but that we may give it further consideration, and possibly come out with a draft which can meet the approval of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, I move, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary.

On that motion 30 minutes are allowed to each side.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are the Senators who are in control of the time willing to yield back their time?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Texas to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion to recommit was agreed to.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL FOREIGN TRAVEL FROM TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1629, H. R. 5265.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5265) to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment.

TAXES ON GASOLINE AND SPECIAL FUELS USED ON FARMS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before Senators leave, I should like to announce, for their information, that the Senate is going to take up the conference report on H. R. 8780, a bill to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on a farm for farming purposes. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance is prepared to present a conference report at this point.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill, H. R. 8780, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8780) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2 and 3, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(A) by the owner, tenant, or operator of a farm, in connection with cultivating the soil, or in connection with raising or harvesting any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife, on a farm of which he is the owner, tenant, or operator; except that if such use is by any person other than the owner, tenant, or operator of such farm, then (i) for purposes of this subparagraph, in applying subsection (a) to this subparagraph, and for purposes of section 6416 (b) (2) (C) (ii) (buy not for purposes of section 4041), the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm on which gasoline or a liquid taxable under section 4041 is used shall be treated as the user and ultimate purchaser of such gasoline or liquid, and (ii) for purposes of applying section 6416 (b) (2) (C) (ii), any tax paid under section 4041 in respect of a liquid used on a farm for farming purposes (within the meaning of this subparagraph) shall be treated as having been paid by the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm on which such liquid is used."; and the Senate agree to the same.

HARRY F. BYRD,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
By HARRY F. BYRD,
ROBERT S. KERR,
EDWARD MARTIN,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JERE COOPER,
W. D. MILLS,
NOBLE J. GREGORY,
DANIEL A. REED,
By T. A. JENKINS,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there is only one substantive difference between the House and Senate versions of H. R. 8780.

Under the House bill, a custom operator who used gasoline for cultivating the soil or raising or harvesting crops was entitled to the gasoline refund himself. Under the Senate amendment, this custom operator was not allowed a refund, although provision was made for refunds where farmers exchanged work.

The conferees have resolved this difference by providing that a refund of the gasoline tax is to be available in all cases where gasoline is used for cultivating the soil or raising or harvesting crops. However, the refund will be payable only to the farmer on whose farm the gasoline is used and not to the custom operator.

There also were two clerical amendments made by the Senate, to which the House conferees agreed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

REGULATION OF USE BY MOTOR CARRIERS OF CERTAIN MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have conferred with the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and he prefers that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1287, S. 898, the truck tripleasing bill. Therefore, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 898) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce there will be no further business transacted tonight. I shall yield for routine requests.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada, so that he may present a privileged matter.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1956—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2 and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: $12,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: $16,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

ALAN BIBLE,
J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
J. GLENN BEALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HOWARD W. SMITH,
OREN J. HARRIS,
JOS. P. O'HARA,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from Nevada be permitted to make a statement.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of the report.

In connection with the District of Columbia Revenue Act, there were two elements of disagreement between the conferees of the two Houses. The House conferees receded from the first element of disagreement—concerning the 2 percent tax on linen rental services.

The second element of disagreement was the Senate amendment calling for a total increase of $4 million in the Federal payment to the District of Columbia, whereas the item as approved by the House called for an increase of $2 million. In the report we recommend an increase of $3 million in the Federal payment.

Mr. President, I recommend that the report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SAFETY AWARD TO THE COLUMBIA-GENEVA STEEL DIVISION IN UTAH

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, recently the National Safety Council for the fourth consecutive year declared the safest major steel plant in America to be that of the Columbia-Geneva Steel Division, in my home State of Utah.

I think we can better visualize this record from the statement that an average employee at the Geneva works has an expectancy of more than 1,000 years, without exposure to a lost-time record. Or to put it another way, there the spiritual admonition regarding being our "brother's keeper" has been put to still another practical test, and that counsel has proved again its marvelous worth.

This fine safety record, this heartwarming cooperation of the individual laborer and his management, is worthy of brief study and long thought by us all. While I certainly wish to commend Superintendent L. F. Black, of Geneva, and his able staff, I also want to thank cordially every man at Geneva who has made this policy so effective.

Making and handling steel is a difficult and dangerous process. But the Geneva Division again teaches that it can be done safely and with efficiency, if all work together and think of the other fellow.

I want all Members of the Senate to have an opportunity to read this heartwarming industrial story; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which was published in the Provo Herald of March 13.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Provo (Utah) Herald of March 13, 1956]

SAFEST MAJOR STEEL PLANT IN AMERICA—GENEVA PLANT WINS TOP NATIONAL SAFETY AWARD FOR FOURTH STRAIGHT YEAR

The National Safety Council Award of Honor Flag was raised over the safest major steel plant in America today for the fourth consecutive year. The honor flag carried four green stars for the top safety awards which Utah's biggest industrial plant—the Geneva Works of United States Steel's Columbia-Geneva Steel Division—has won for outstanding work in safety performance.

The newest star to be added to the big green and white flag represents Geneva's record-breaking mark of 0.45 frequency of lost-time accidents per million man-hours worked during 1955. This means an average employee has an expectancy of more than 1,000 years without exposure to a lost-time accident. This mark not only topped all other United States Steel operations, but all other large steel mill safety performance in the United States of America.

PERSONAL VICTORY

The 4-year record represents a personal victory for Geneva's general superintendent, L. F. Black, who has made safety in and out of the big plant every employee's crusade.

Led by Mr. Black, every top official at Geneva makes safety his personal business. This led to a recordbreaking number of 7,237 safety meetings with 301,789 personal safety contacts during 1955.

While the safety program at Geneva has been built around the United States Steel Corp. overall single objective safety program, it has refined also the corporation's three "C's" of safety—comprehension, contact, and control—into the safety effort. The overall program at Geneva is called "Safety Through Objective Analysis."

COMPETITIVE SPIRIT

Under this program, a strong competitive spirit in safety performance can be seen throughout the plant, with every department displaying large bulletin boards recording records, kind and type of accidents, and other safety messages. Many departments have their own special safety programs, such as the "brother's keeper" idea, which is used by the central maintenance and utilities division, Geneva's largest employer. This idea revolves around two employees teaming up to look after each other to develop an awareness of any unsafe working practice. And it works well. This division operated over

5 million man-hours last year with only 3 lost-time accidents, or at a frequency of 0.58 per million man-hours worked.

The safety department, which operates as a part of the works industrial-relations department, is headed by Blaine Cropper, who has worked in the various operating departments at Geneva and Ironton. Under Cropper, special safety inspectors work on assignment to each of the operating departments. These men work with the supervisors of each unit of their division in around-the-clock activity to spot and correct unsafe working conditions and practices by other employees.

AMBITIOUS PROGRAM

At the present time these inspectors have started an ambitious program of evaluating every job in the big mill for safe working practices.

Every tool in the field of communication is used in the program at Geneva and new ideas continue to come in through employee suggestions. As an example, 10 full-sized outdoor advertising signboards will soon be erected throughout the plant, with plans to change the messages every month.

Another new phase of the program which will be effected shortly will be the presentation of individual safety awards to those employees who have worked for periods of 3, 5, and 10 accident-free years.

HALF OF FORCE

In the first group to be honored, 907 steelworkers will receive 3-year pins and 1,369 will receive 5-year awards. The total of these 2 groups represent almost half of the work force at Geneva Works.

Statistics show it is the employee who fails to think who gets hurt in a plant as safety conscious as Geneva. During 1955 only five lost-time accidents occurred there. None of these was caused through the failure of equipment, but came as a result of human error.

Although the plant safety record is outstanding, Superintendent Black and other officials say they will never be satisfied until all accidents are eliminated.

"We're working for the perfect record of no lost-time accidents and a .00 frequency rate," says Mr. Black.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 28, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and goodness, who hast bestowed upon our beloved country so many material blessings, may we show forth our gratitude by a resurgence of faith in Thee and a glad obedience to Thy holy will.

Help us to feel that our national greatness cannot survive and continue to occupy a commanding place among the nations of the earth if we allow it to become eclipsed by a decline in moral and spiritual idealism.

May our Republic be inspired to fulfill its responsibilities for the welfare and happiness of all mankind and strive to make a distinct and worthy contribution to the wealth of human aspirations and achievements.

Grant that our leaders and chosen representatives may daily be blessed with a sense of divine guidance in their arduous task of finding the right solution to our difficult national and international problems.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 374. An act to authorize the adjustment and clarification of ownership to certain lands within the Stanislaus National Forest, Tuolumne County, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 1855. An act to amend the act approved April 24, 1950, entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes";

H. R. 1892. An act for the relief of Dr. Lu Ho Tung and his wife, Ching-hsi (nee Tsao) Tung;

H. R. 3233. An act to amend title of the United States Code, so as to make it a criminal offense to move or travel in interstate commerce with intent to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for arson;

H. R. 5889. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the town of Savannah Beach, Tybee Island, Ga.;

H. R. 6421. An act for the relief of Roy Cowan and others;

H. R. 6461. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 6463. An act to ratify and confirm section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, section 1 (b), act 12, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, and the sales of public lands consummated pursuant to the terms of said statutes;

H. R. 6574. An act to amend section 2 of title IV of the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 680), as amended;

H. R. 6807. An act to authorize the amendment of certain patents of Government lands containing restrictions as to use of such lands in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6808. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 6824. An act to authorize the amendment of the restrictive covenant on land patent No. 10,410, issued to Keoshi Matsunaga, his heirs or assigns, on July 20, 1936, and covering lot 48 of Ponahawai house lots, situated in the county of Hawaii, T. H.;

H. R. 7236. An act to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to water-conservation practices;

H. R. 8100. An act to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of Brazil;

H. R. 9166. An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates;

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to release reversionary right to improvements on a 3-acre tract in Orangeburg County, S. C.; and

H. J. Res. 464. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fifth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6712. An act to amend section 1237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H. R. 8107. An act to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended; and

H. R. 9770. An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 220. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims arising as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande;

S. 648. An act for the relief of John Soud's;

S. 1411. An act for the relief of Marion Drucker;

S. 1688. An act to amend the Federal Seed Act;

S. 1777. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to authorize common carriers to carry a disabled person requiring an attendant and such attendant at the usual fare charged for one person;

S. 2016. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Lawrence F. Kramer;

S. 2152. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

S. 2246. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands to the city of Wall, S. Dak.;

S. 2291. An act for the relief of Albino Braiuca;

S. 2355. An act for the relief of Katina R. Landrum;

S. 2422. An act for the relief of Manuel Vilar Soler;

S. 2423. An act for the relief of Lin Tsai;

S. 2438. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever";

S. 2594. An act for the relief of Wan Ngo Lim;

S. 2595. An act for the relief of George Henry MacDonald (formerly Frederick William Arthur);

S. 2596. An act for the relief of Renza Marsale Bartlett;

S. 2650. An act for the relief of Antonio Rubi Mendiola;

S. 2652. An act for the relief of Robert Geoffrey Hunt;

S. 2665. An act for the relief of Joyce Soonhwe Kim;

S. 2674. An act for the relief of Shakeeb Dakour;

S. 2698. An act for the relief of Leopold Riedl and his wife, Bozena Riedl;

S. 2701. An act for the relief of Hisakazu Hozaki;

S. 2721. An act for the relief of Ursula Jadwiga Milarski Goodman;

S. 2724. An act for the relief of Georgina Feher;

S. 2887. An act to further protect and assure the privacy of grand or petit juries in

the courts of the United States while such juries are deliberating or voting;

S. 2909. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe seals for bureaus and offices of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 3116. An act to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals;

S. 3269. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; and

S. 3422. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain amounts from unclaimed payments on United States savings bonds to the fund created for the payment of Government losses in shipments.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the reports of the Archivist of the United States numbered 56–9 and 56–10.

REFUND OF GASOLINE TAXES FOR FARMERS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House on the bill (H. R. 8780) to provide for the refund of the gasoline tax for farmers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on that bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ILLUMINATING MARINE CORPS WAR MEMORIAL AT NIGHT

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide that the Marine Corps War Memorial at the northern end of Arlington National Cemetery shall be illuminated at night and that the flag shall be flown at such memorial 24 hours a day.

The suggestion arises from a young friend, some 15 years of age, who was on a visit to the Capital last week. He arrived at night. His desire was to see the Marine Memorial. He saw Lincoln's Memorial which was illuminated. He saw the Capitol. It, too, was illuminated. He saw many illuminated things. The Marine Corps Memorial was not visible. It was blacked out. I suggest that the Marine Corps Memorial be made visible round the clock.

Before listing below the wording of the bill as it is introduced, I should like to thank Jimmy Sieminski, son of my cousin, Ramon, for his observation. I am sure that Jimmy's classmates at the Salisbury School, in Connecticut, will be pleased that one of their number made the suggestion which I pass on to the House. I believe the bill has merit and that others do too:

H. R. 10239

A bill to provide that the Marine Corps War Memorial at the northern end of the Arlington National Cemetery shall be illuminated at night and that the flag shall be flown at such memorial for 24 hours a day

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to provide for the illumination of the Marine Corps War Memorial at the northern end of Arlington National Cemetery during the hours of darkness.

(b) Notwithstanding any rule or custom pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America as set forth in the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America," approved June 22, 1942, as amended (36 U. S. C., sec. 170 et seq.), the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to fly the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day on the flagpole constituting a part of the Marine Corps War Memorial at the northern end of Arlington National Cemetery.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit and hold hearings this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Education and Labor is now conducting hearings to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, pertaining to school legislation in areas affected by Federal activities. Hearings are being held in room 429, Old House Office Building. Any Members who desire to appear before the committee will be heard either this afternoon or tomorrow.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. ENGLE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

ADMINISTRATION DID NOT INHERIT LARGE DAIRY PRODUCTS SURPLUS

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the last 3 years I have read a number of newspaper stories and editorials to the effect that the present administration inherited huge and unwieldy stocks of agricultural surpluses. I do not know if these stories were the product of some reporter's imagination, or if they were inspired and planted for political purposes.

In any event, I suspect that the general public accepts this thesis as a partial explanation for agriculture's difficulties during the last 3 years.

For a time—until I made my own study of Commodity Credit Corporation—I took these news stories more or less at face value. Finally, I decided to make a study of CCC holdings with reference to dairy products surpluses. As a result of this study, I learned some interesting facts about CCC's dairy products holdings.

Before I comment on CCC holdings of dairy products, I wish to make this general observation on the total Commodity Credit Corporation holdings as of December 31, 1952. On this date, which was 20 days before the present administration took office, CCC had an inventory $1,053,429,000 worth of agricultural surpluses. In addition to inventory, CCC had pledged for loans another $1,398,773,000. Thus, CCC on December 31, 1952 had in inventory and pledges for loans a total $2,452,202,000.

In a speech before the American Dairy Association on March 23, 1953, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson said:

Over a billion dollars worth of farm products were owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation when we took office.

Now, let us look at the CCC report for 3 years later—that is for December 31, 1955. On December 31, 1955, Commodity Credit Corporation had in inventory surpluses valued at $6,082,180,000. In addition to this, CCC had pledged for loans a total of $2,584,129,000. This adds up to a total of $8,666,309,000 in CCC inventory and pledges for loans.

The December 31, 1955, CCC holdings are 3½ times larger than Commodity Credit Corporation's inventory and pledges for loans on December 31, 1952.

As I stated earlier in these remarks, my main reason for making a survey of CCC holdings was to ascertain the facts with respect to dairy products. The facts, I find, show that the administration did not inherit huge and unwieldy surpluses of dairy products.

On January 19, 1953, which was the last day in office of the previous administration, CCC had in inventory a total of $34,627,000 worth of dairy products. Yes, the total of CCC dairy products surpluses was $34,627,000.

The latest figures that I was able to secure show that CCC had in inventory a

total of $95,610,000 in dairy products on March 7, 1956. In addition to this, CCC also had about $18 million worth of cheese and butter for processing. Thus, the total value of CCC dairy surpluses on March 7, 1956, was $113,610,000.

The March 7, 1956, holdings are slightly more than three times as large as the value of dairy surpluses inherited by the present administration on January 19, 1953. Again, I reiterate that the present administration did not inherit huge and unwieldy surpluses of dairy products.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week news reports related to us that the Housing and Home Finance Agency was conducting a letter-writing contest among housewives, offering as a prize an all-expense trip to Washington to attend a conference, the announced purpose of which is to determine what women desire in a home. This is a ridiculous waste of taxpayers' money, for the Federal Government does not build houses; and I suspect that the average builder, who competes in a free market, has a pretty good idea of what women want in a home and, furthermore, I suspect the average builder makes every effort to keep abreast of these desires.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the appropriate committees will attempt to find out under what authorization the Housing and Home Finance Agency is planning to spend this money; and, if money Congress authorized for some other purpose is to be used, I would like to know whether there are other instances of misuse of public funds.

We are all concerned with the problem of adequate housing for American families. I am deeply concerned with the problem, and have supported and will continue to support any and all legislation designed for this purpose. Today the problem in homebuilding is economic; there is grave danger that builders may be priced out of the mass-building market. The rising cost of land is an acute problem. Now, if Administrator Cole wants to make a real contribution, he might very well call a conference of builders to determine ways and means of providing the American family with more home for less money.

CYPRUS INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 25, 1956, I attended a banquet in the city of East Chicago, Ind., commemorating the 135th anniversary of free and independent Greece.

It was the unanimous wish of the great gathering that Congress take immediate action to urge the British Government to revise its aggressive policy toward the people of Cyprus and give its citizens freedom to act by plebiscite on the question of its returning as part of the Greek Nation. The arrest and banishing of Archbishop Makarios was denounced as tyrannical and an act that will foment bitterness and impede the cause of peace in Europe and the Middle East. The policy of England in the Greek controversy is unfortunate, provincial and dictatorial.

Our country is spending billions to win the minds of the people of Asian and African countries. The British policy toward Greece is giving the Communists fertile propaganda to use against the Western Democracies.

Today, I have introduced a resolution urging the Congress to assert itself regarding the injustice being done to the Greek nation by Great Britain in this crisis. I hope this resolution can be expedited and considered by Congress at an early date.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on Small Business be permitted to sit during general debate while the House is in session tomorrow afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Select Committee on Small Business has received many complaints from small-business men regarding the harmful economic effects of smog on their businesses and asking if there are any means by which the Federal Government can take more effective action.

In connection with this subject I would like to read the following letter addressed to me by Mr. S. Smith Griswold, air pollution control officer for the Air Pollution Control District, county of Los Angeles:

MARCH 7, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: I am transmitting herewith for your consideration a copy of the district's request to the Federal Government for a financial allocation to be devoted to air-pollution research of national interest. Attached also is a copy of a resolution adopted by the board of supervisors at their Tuesday meeting.

As you may recall, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had originally requested an appropriation of $3 million to finance the Federal air-pollution-research program for the next fiscal year. Upon an examination of that program, however, we felt that an increased appropriation should be sought in order to finance several projects necessary to the resolution of our own smog problem, but which were of national rather than of purely local significance. We, therefore, had several discussions with Federal officials and with the Los Angeles County delegation in Congress.

As a result of these discussions a comprehensive conference between representatives of the Federal Government, the State of California, and local public and private air-pollution agencies in California was held at Berkeley last month. Resulting from that conference was a request that the Air Pollution Control District submit details on several research projects which the conference had concluded should properly be performed by the Federal Government. This list of projects, requiring expenditures of more than $700,000, was prepared and forwarded to Dr. Malcolm Merrill on March 1, 1956, for his transmittal to the Federal Government.

Since submitting this letter, however, Senator THOMAS KUCHEL has informed us that the House of Representatives has given passage to the Federal air-pollution appropriation bill and has cut the originally requested amount of $3 million by $260,000. Since the original request of $3 million was considered inadequate, the present allowance, after the House cut, will fall short by about $1 million of being a sufficient amount to carry on the most important and urgent research projects.

In view of these factors, I felt that you would like to be informed of this situation and that you might wish to take such corrective action as is required in Congress in order to increase the Federal appropriations for the next fiscal year.

I cannot emphasize too strongly our belief that the taxpayers of California and of Los Angeles County should not be expected to bear the full financial responsibility for projects which are more properly of national interest and importance.

As a result of the foregoing information, and as chairman of Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Select Committee on Small Business, I conferred with the Honorable J. PERCY PRIEST, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who is in full accord and agreement with the members of Subcommittee No. 5 that the air pollution or smog hearings in Los Angeles will be very helpful to his committee in determining what remedial Federal legislation will be most effective to combat the serious air pollution programs in Los Angeles and other cities throughout the Nation. Therefore, Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Select Committee on Small Business will hold smog hearings in Los Angeles next May 18 and 19.

AMENDMENT OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced two bills to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended. The first amendment I offered is to eliminate the requirement that governments grant to aliens seeking admission under the act, certificates of readmission before they may be considered for a visa. I have offered this amendment because during an extended inspection trip of the Far East last fall, I found that the requirement in the present law in this respect was seriously retarding the successful administration of the act and greatly reducing good will in the Far East which will surely come if the benefits of the Refugee Relief Act are successfully administered. I found that most of the governments in the Far East, many of which have but recently acquired their national independence, are extremely sensitive to all things which appear to infringe upon their national sovereignty. Many of them consider it an infringement upon that sovereignty if they were to issue such certificates of readmission because that would give a foreign government the right to return an immigrant at any time, under any circumstances, and without prior discussion with or consideration by the concerned government. Moreover, this requirement has prevented the United States from admitting some very talented and high type refugees from communism simply because governments of the countries where they now reside feared to enter into an agreement guaranteeing certificates of readmission.

The second amendment I have offered eases the present strange, inflexible, and in many respects impractical requirement for assurances as outlined in section 7 (a) of the act. It is the purpose of this amendment to give full and proper recognition to the facts that American voluntary agencies accredited by the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act, are completely dependable and in every sense competent to prevent aliens in whom they have taken an interest from becoming a public charge when admitted to the United States. These American voluntary agencies have established a fine record in assisting our Government in the carrying out of refugee programs in the past. That record shows the best guaranty the Government can have against an immigrant becoming a public charge is to have one of these voluntary agencies take an interest in the alien's case and to lay out a plan for the rapid and complete integration of that alien into the American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, there are several pending amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, including a major one introduced by the chairman of the subcommittee. I am hopeful, therefore, that the chairman of the subcommittee will schedule early hearings on all bills seeking to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended. I feel that if the great purposes of this legislation, as outlined by President Eisenhower, are to be attained, early and favorable action should be taken on these two bills, H. R. 10206, and H. R. 10207.

PROVIDING REVENUE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SMITH of Virginia, HARRIS, and O'HARA of Minnesota.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have a leave of absence for 3 or 4 days because of critical illness in the family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

THURSDAY SESSION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am getting a bit confused about the order of business for the rest of this week. This morning we have on our side anyway—I do not know what is doing over there—a statement from the minority whip that we ought to be here Thursday because the farm bill may come out for a vote. That I doubt. Well, I asked the minority leader. He did not seem to know. Does anybody know about it? Are there any volunteers with information which will guide us through Friday? If there are none, I would like to ask the minority whip what you mean by that notice? Do you want us here Thursday and Friday or do you not? Perhaps later the majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will oblige.

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. It is a case of a plain possibility. It may be possible. That is all I can say to the gentleman. From the rumors I have heard, it is a possibility, and I say that so that everyone may be alerted.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DIES. It was reported in the press this morning——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Which paper? Was it the Washington Post? I do not want to take anything they say as a guide.

Mr. DIES. I think it was the Washington Post; but they quoted certain Senators and others as saying that they were going to have a farm bill before we recessed on Friday. That is what the paper said.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the bill comes out it will be a surprise to most of the Members. I do not believe the paper. Do you?

Mr. DIES. Not all of it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can I get the information from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE UNITED STATES NAVY: DEFENDER OF AMERICAN FREEDOM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 162 years ago today, on March 27, 1794, the Congress passed, and President George Washington approved, an act to provide a naval armament. The Barbary pirates—corsairs from Morocco, Algiers, and Tripoli—were capturing and pillaging American merchant ships, robbing and kidnaping their crews. Our infant Nation had to construct and send warships to the distant Mediterranean for the safety of our citizens and the protection of our commerce. The 6 frigates—one of them the *Constitution* or "Old Ironsides"—authorized by that act of March 1794, were the beginnings of our permanent Navy, now the largest and most powerful fleet afloat.

The early growth of our Navy was a slow one. As late as 1886 the United States Navy was in 12th place among the navies of the world. But already it could look back on a past bright with accomplishment both solid and dramatic. Consider, for example, the opening up of Japan to western influence. An American naval officer, Commodore Matthew C. Perry, commanded the four American men-of-war which sailed up Tokyo Bay on a tranquil summer day in July 1853. The development of Japan as a modern nation dates directly from this unexpected contact with Western military technology.

It was in the last years of the 19th century that the great growth of our Navy occurred. The worldwide realization of the importance of seapower that took place in the 1890's was due in large part to the writings of a United States naval officer, Adm. Alfred T. Mahan.

Mahan emphasized the combat role of whole fleets of ships. The conception of a naval task force is one we owe to Mahan.

In 1907 our Navy was second only to the British. During the Spanish-American War it had captured the Philippine Islands. During the First World War our Navy transported over 2 million soldiers to battlefields in France, guarded our merchant marine and that of our allies, and successfully defeated the submarine menace in the Atlantic.

Our Navy performed these same functions magnificently during the Second World War. But in addition, in the Pacific, under the overall command of Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, the United States Navy spearheaded the capture of an entire series of enemy-held islands along the seemingly endless chain leading to Japan itself. The defeat of the Japanese at Midway—the first decisive defeat suffered by its navy in 350 years—is one of the most glorious chapters in the history of the United States Navy. The Japanese treaty of surrender was signed in Tokyo Bay on an American battleship, the U. S. S. *Missouri*. Once again the United States Navy had come to Tokyo.

The Navy has a glorious tradition to look back on, but it looks forward, not back. The Navy of March 27, 1956, is the world's most modern as well as the world's largest naval force. Its 2,753 ships include atomic-powered submarines, aircraft carriers, and a guided-missile cruiser. Its 17,079 aircraft, many of them jet-propelled, are eloquent witness to the enthusiasm with which the Navy has adapted to the age of airpower. Even a jet seaplane is in production.

Today the Navy maintains two great operational fleets: the Seventh Fleet, off the China coast, and the Sixth Fleet, in the Mediterranean, both of them powerful deterrents to aggression. In 1794, because of our weakness, we were for a time forced to pay tribute to the Barbary pirates. Now we no longer choose to pay tribute to aggressors. Be it in the Mediterranean or off the China coast, in the Atlantic or in the Pacific, our Navy steams proudly forth, in defense of our freedom.

CAUSES OF LARGE INCREASE IN TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 357, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the large increase in traffic accidents on the streets and highways of the United States during recent years, in order to determine (1) the extent to which excessive speed, intoxication, lack of adequate safety inspection of vehicles, insufficiently strict State and local laws, poor condition of highways, and other factors have been responsible for such increase and for the resulting deaths, personal injuries, and economic losses, and (2) the measures which may be taken by the Federal Government to assist in eliminating such accidents or reducing their frequency and severity.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "authorized", strike out "and directed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the reading of the resolution declares its purpose. It is simply broadening the base of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce temporarily so that they may investigate the traffic situation.

I know of no opposition to the rule. There was no opposition to it in our committee.

I now yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, spring is here again, and with its arrival comes the annual flood of inquiries from students of colleges and high schools requesting all kinds of information relative to the life of a Congressman. One particular question prompted me to sit up and take notice—"What is the average Congressman like?"

Now, I thought, who is a good example? Surely, he is not the man who creates newspaper headlines, or gets the most attention on TV or radio. He is the Congressman who goes about his work day by day, diligently and conscientiously striving to fulfill his duty to his people. He is the man who comes to Congress committed to represent approximately 300,000 men and women of his State whose trust and faith he must merit and retain.

"Such a man," I said to myself, "is my colleague HARLEY O. STAGGERS, from the Second District of West Virginia. I'll tell the students about him."

Then I thought why should I restrict my reply to the students, why not direct it to all who wish to read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

So, men and women, let me present an outstanding Congressman—HARLEY O. STAGGERS—a hardworking, determined, and courageous man who has the respect of every Member of the House of Representatives.

When he has a project to develop, he begins at the bottom, follows it through from subcommittee to full committee, and to the floor of the House. When he thinks it is necessary he will contact every individual member of the House in behalf of his project. Congressman HARLEY STAGGERS is a go-getter and directs a course of hard labor and perseverance to a goal worthy of a statesman.

Congressman STAGGERS came to Washington in 1949. He made friends. He studied and learned. It was not long until he began to act. The Second District of West Virginia soon began to realize here was a man of action.

Now, let us review his record.

ALLEGANY BALLISTICS LABORATORY

Because security requirements have heretofore largely prevented publicity of the work being done at the Allegany Ballistics Laboratory in Mineral County, W. Va., little is known about this plant.

Now the story can be told about the struggle to keep open and going one of the most important research laboratories in America—the Allegany Ballistics Laboratory. Many hours of hard work have been devoted to this plant with practically no recognition.

When some of the employees received notice that their services were no longer needed and funds were being curtailed for the continuation of this laboratory, HARLEY STAGGERS went to work and exerted every effort toward correcting this condition. He helped obtain the necessary appropriation and through his efforts the plant received a number of vitally important work assignments that otherwise would have been given to some other laboratory.

For instance, here are some of the projects that have been developed to a great extent at this plant and which are now guarding the ramparts of America, protecting you and me night and day from enemy attack: the Nike guided missile, the Army Honest John missile, the Terrier guided missile, and the Deacon rocket.

In addition to these, the laboratory is busy on classified developments of comparable scope and importance to the defense of our Nation.

Greatly through Congressman HARLEY STAGGERS' efforts Federal money has been appropriated to relocate the road which presently runs through the middle of the property and close to the plant. A contract has been let for $438,152 for this relocation and the work is now approximately 15 percent completed. It will add to the safety and increase security measures which will make possible future expansion.

During these explosive times we thank God for such laboratories that develop protection for all the people.

HOSPITALS

One of the most important veterans hospitals in America is the Baker Veterans' Administration Center located at Martinsburg, W. Va. In 1950, this hospital was slated to be closed by the Veterans' Administration which would have represented a loss of many millions of dollars to the Government and the elimination of hundreds of beds for patients. Congressman STAGGERS immediately presented facts and figures to the officials showing the need for this facility and obtained cancellation of the closing

order at a saving to the United States Government.

For the fiscal year of 1956 the operating budget for Baker VA Center is $5,307,626 which would have been sorely missed by the Martinsburg area.

As a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Congressman STAGGERS helped pass legislation providing for hospital survey and construction. Under this act, Mr. STAGGERS has been able to bring to the hospitals of his district much needed improvements which could only be made by participation of Federal funds. Knowing of the dire need of medical centers in his district, he realized they could not become a reality without a contribution from the Federal Government.

To the Denmar Sanitarium in Pocahontas County, 100 beds were added—a nurses' home and doctors' quarters were built releasing additional beds for patients. The allocation of $176,000 of Federal money gave much needed aid to this important tuberculosis sanitarium.

In Webster County, W. Va., the residents were in dire need of a hospital. The Second District Congressman immediately started the wheels rolling whereby the Federal Government contributed $332,356 of the total cost to construct the Webster County Memorial Hospital.

Congressman STAGGERS has also by his work and vote, along with the other Members who believe in this program, made available Federal funds which enabled the Broaddus Hospital in Philippi to obtain $960,332; the Preston Memorial Hospital in Kingwood $833,006, and the Monongalia General Hospital in Morgantown $160,735.

HARPERS FERRY NATIONAL MONUMENT

Shortly after coming to Congress, one of the first ambitions of Congressman STAGGERS was to inject new life into the dying plan to develop and popularize the Harpers Ferry National Monument and Park near Harpers Ferry, W. Va., where nature in all her glory blessed the countryside. HARLEY STAGGERS could see the potentialities of this park becoming a mecca for thousands of visitors, not only from West Virginia and neighboring States, but from all parts of the Nation.

He took his case to the National Park Service, to the citizens of the community, to the Governor of West Virginia, and to the Congress of the United States.

Today, this beautiful and historical land is open to thousands to see and enjoy and promises for greater development and improvement are assured by an operating budget of $141,305 for the fiscal year, and an estimated future expenditure of $1,200,000 for rehabilitation and construction.

Truly, Congressman STAGGERS has helped greatly to bring the majestic hills of West Virginia to all America.

THE BUREAU OF MINES EXPERIMENT STATION

One of the notable fights the Second District Congressman won was to obtain authorization of Congress for the Bureau of Mines Experiment Station in Morgantown. This was a prize that several States were vying for. Almost singlehandedly, Congressman STAGGERS finally had this important research center located in his district.

This laboratory was established at a cost of $2,600,000 and is one of the finest of its kind in the world. His efforts today are paying off not only in its usefulness in our economic development but in our national defense for the future.

I remember this legislative fight very well because Speaker RAYBURN and I, at the request of Congressman STAGGERS, and because of our deep respect for him individually and as legislators, actively supported him in his successful efforts. Congressman STAGGERS enjoys the confidence of the Democratic leadership.

LOCKS AND DAMS

Congressman STAGGERS has worked for and helped in obtaining an authorization of money to complete the work of the Morgantown locks and dam. He has consistently worked for the construction of the Hildebrand lock and dam. After 8 years of efforts, he has been rewarded by an appropriation of $1 million to start work during this current fiscal year. Two million dollars is programed for the fiscal year 1957, but Congressman STAGGERS has asked the committee to increase the appropriation to $4 million. This would save the Federal Government time and money if allocated now. The overall cost of this project will be around $14 million. It will be of unestimable value to the industry of the Monongahela Valley.

AIRPORTS

Being a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, Congressman STAGGERS has had the privilege of working for the improvements of airports throughout our country and especially for those in West Virginia. This has been a personal satisfaction to him with the development in the field of aeronautics at such a high level and the need for airport facilities.

Having learned to fly prior to World War II and serving actively in the Navy Air Corps during the war, HARLEY STAGGERS has a great personal interest in advancing aviation, especially in the development of the safety factors.

Congressman STAGGERS has been exceptionally successful in making available Federal funds, particularly for airports at Elkins, Martinsburg, Morgantown, and Petersburg.

At the present time $23,726 is programed for work at the million-dollar Elkins Airport. Three hundred thousand dollars has been programed in 1956 for Morgantown. There are a number of programs involved for the years ahead and Congressman STAGGERS is prepared to follow through on each of them.

NATIONAL FORESTS

The Second Congressional District is blessed with two national forests. Headquarters for the Monongahela National Forest is located at Elkins, W. Va., It is a tribute to the distinguished gentleman of West Virginia to have obtained a half-million dollars to met extended obligations of the Forest Service in those portions of the Monongahela National Forest and the George Washington National Forest. This half-million dollars, or $521,000 for fiscal year 1956 is an increase of approximately $100,000 over 1955 and Congressman STAGGERS is hoping to have this increased another $100,000 for the fiscal year 1957.

Fifty-one thousand eight hundred and thirty-four dollars has been earmarked for the Fearnow Experimental Forest at Parsons, W. Va. Congressman STAGGERS has also asked for an even larger appropriation for this important work for next year.

Starting a one-man fight in 1949, Congressman STAGGERS obtained an appropriation of $22,000 to construct the recreation hall at Camp Horse Shoe near Parsons. Against great odds, he was able to get the money to build this hall which has benefitted thousands of children and adults not only in his State of West Virginia but it has been used by the surrounding States of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. The YMCA uses this as a recreational camp for crippled and underprivileged children.

MORGANTOWN ORDNANCE WORKS

One of Congressman STAGGERS' crusades of which he is very proud is the culmination of his efforts to bring employment to Morgantown by the leasing of the Morgantown Ordnance Works to the Mathieson Chemical Co.

This plant was closed at the conclusion of World War II and was to be completely abandoned by the Government. It covered more than 825 acres and represented an investment of some $75 million, yet it was valueless as far as the economy of Morgantown was concerned. HARLEY STAGGERS entered with energy and enthusiasm in the face of what appeared to be a hopeless situation in opposing the abandoning of this plant.

Taking his problem to the head of the Departments of Defense and Agriculture and to the President of the United States, he presented his pleas which were finally answered and the plant is now being run for the Government by the Mathieson Chemical Corp., which today employs at least 1,000 persons and whose opportunities for the future are unlimited.

LEETOWN

At Leetown, Jefferson County, there is located a Federal laboratory and fish hatchery. Eighty-eight thousand dollars were appropriated for the operation for the current fiscal year. The territory served by this station is extensive and the demands for trout and warm-water fishes are enormous. In addition, this laboratory does research work on diseases of hatchery trout.

The station is not fully developed to meet requirements of its extensive program and much is to be done in the future in replacing wornout facilities. It is estimated that $325,000 will be needed to replace buildings, ponds, and expanded research work.

Congressman STAGGERS has already initiated a program which he hopes will eventually make this work possible.

FLOOD CONTROL

When Congressman STAGGERS first came to Congress, the Savage River Reservoir Dam project had been stopped and abandoned. Through his efforts

and those of his Maryland colleague this project was revised and completed. As a result, it has helped in flood protection and the development of industry along the north branch of the Potomac River.

Congressman STAGGERS has worked and helped obtain an appropriation of around $6 million for the completion of the Cumberland-Ridgeley flood-control project. This past year, he had a resolution passed in the House authorizing survey work on the north branch of the Potomac River above Ridgeley and Cumberland, Md. He has obtained an appropriation to carry on this work, which is to start in the very near future. Plans are being made for the flood protection of Keyser, Piedmont, Blaine, and Bayard.

Another resolution which the Congressman has proposed calls for a complete survey of the whole Potomac River, seeking flood protection for that entire area.

During the disastrous flood of 1950, which did so much damage in the South Branch Valley of the Potomac River of his State of West Virginia, Congressman STAGGERS personally visited the Corps of Engineers and the President of the United States and obtained emergency funds which were allocated to rehabilitate this distress area which included Grant, Hardy, Pendleton, and Hampshire Counties.

The Congressman now has a bill pending in the Public Works Committee to authorize the construction of a dam in the Rowlesburg area.

He has intervened with the district Army engineers asking for help for the protection of the people in Pocahontas County from the floods caused by the overflow of Knapps Creek and the Greenbrier River. He is hoping that in the very near future some aid can be given to this area.

The Parsons area is also included under study at this time for possible flood-control protection authorized by resolution drawn up by Congressman STAGGERS and passed by the appropriate committee of Congress in 1955.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND RURAL TELEPHONE SERVICE

Being rural born, Congressman STAGGERS was well aware of the need for rural electrification and rural telephone service. He was an ardent backer of this program in his district as he felt that the people who live in the rural communities were entitled to this service as well as their city cousins.

The Rural Telephone Service of Hardy County participated in the program obtaining $353,000 from this appropriation that was made available to some extent through the Congressman's efforts. Other applications are pending for future improvements of this service in his district.

RADIO ASTRONOMY CENTER

If plans that are now drawn up are carried out, the first research radio observatory in the United States will be established in the Second Congressional District of West Virginia. The total cost of this laboratory will run around $25 million. Three and a half million dollars has already been appropriated for the initial cost. This project will be of immeasurable value not only to the Second Congressional District but to the State of West Virginia and all America.

Congressman STAGGERS is cooperating with the National Science Foundation and Associated Universities, Inc., and has been practically assured that this project will be located in his district since the area meets all the specifications.

THE C. & O. PARKWAY

Congressman STAGGERS helped to obtain authorization for the scenic parkway to be built along the historic C. & O. Canal. The overall program will preserve the beautiful and historic attractions along the canal and bring many benefits to the people of Morgan County.

The foregoing has been a detailed account of specific accomplishments of Congressman STAGGERS, but by no means does it complete his roster of interests and activities.

The small farmer, not only of the Second District of West Virginia but of the whole Nation, has had Congressman STAGGERS' special interest. He was reared on a small farm in Mineral County and as a youth and as a man had firsthand contacts with the problems of agriculture. Today, as a small farmer himself near Keyser, he comes face to face with agriculture headaches. The little farmer, the poultry raiser, the livestock producer, and the fruitgrower, all can look to Congressman STAGGERS for his support.

Along with the small farmer, the small-business man shares the active interest of HARLEY STAGGERS. He is always on the alert to protect his constituents. To counteract the controversal gas bill, he introduced his own bill to protect the consumer. He fought and voted against the gas bill knowing its harmful features to the consumers of his district.

Being a Navy veteran of 4 years, he has personal knowledge of the anxieties and needs of the men and women who fought for this country. While a member of the House Veterans' Committee, Congressman STAGGERS was actively interested in legislation beneficial to the veterans and their dependents. He introduced and fought for legislation that promoted the welfare of the men and women who served their country.

The railroader has a true friend in Congressman STAGGERS. He remembers his railroading days and buddies and their problems. When railroad legislation is before the House, Congressman STAGGERS is right in there pitching.

Congressman STAGGERS was one of the leaders in the fight to expand social-security benefits to State and municipal workers and to schoolteachers. Having been a former State road worker and a former teacher in West Virginia, he knows from experience the hardships and enigmas of the State employees and members of the teaching profession.

And now, my friends, I am happy to tell you that the good works of my colleague HARLEY O. STAGGERS have not gone unnoticed. Among the thousands of individual requests for assistance and advice received in his office annually, there are a goodly number of letters of thanks and praise. These are cherished as worthwhile fruits of unselfish labor rendered in the true sense of brotherhood.

In addition to the widow's "Thank you, Mr. STAGGERS," or the veteran's "Thanks, Harley," other expressions of gratitude come to mind. There are two in particular that I recall—both from the American Legion.

One citation is from the officers and members of Air Service Post 501, which directs its gratitude thus:

To the Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS, who, with unfailing courage and devotion to the causes of freedom, rendered most valuable services to the United States of America in the Armed Forces and who today in the Congress is advancing the cause of airpower.

And the other is forcibly written by the members of Housing Post, No. 66, as late as March 13, 1956:

To a distinguished Legionnaire, the Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS, Representative of the Second Congressional District of West Virginia, for his outstanding legislative accomplishments for the interest and benefit of fellow veterans while serving as a Member of Congress since 1949.

While these two citations, couched in figurative language, are welcomed and valued by HARLEY STAGGERS, they in no sense outdo the plain and simple "Thank you, Harley" from you and me.

Yes, I say, "Thank you, Harley, for the 8 years of unselfish and devoted service you have given here in the Halls of Congress for the welfare of your country, the State of West Virginia, and particularly the people of your district. You can be proud of your excellent attendance record to rollcalls of the House."

Harley is a champion of flood control, conservation, good roads, rural electrification, new industry, better schools, national defense, and clean government.

As a closing reflection, I believe my colleague is a man of genuine Christian principles, living and working toward the betterment of all mankind.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, we have each been aware of the very serious record of traffic accidents on our highways and the need for a great deal of careful study to ascertain what remedial legislation is needed and what action can be taken. I feel that this resolution introduced by my distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] is a very worthwhile resolution, that it is a very necessary project that our committee should undertake, and that the resolution should be passed unanimously.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], simply gives to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House authority, which the Rules Committee I am sure believes they already have basically, to investigate highway traffic matters. The real result of the adoption of this resolution would simply be to authorize that committee to obtain records, papers, make reports, and so forth in

connection with its investigation of traffic matters.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the resolution we are considering here today, sponsored by my good friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], House Resolution 357, directs the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the factors responsible for the increase in traffic accidents on the streets and highways of the United States and the measures which may be taken by the Federal Government to assist in eliminating such accidents or reducing their frequency and severity.

There is no question in my mind about the compelling need for the Congress to take some steps in an effort to halt the alarming and appalling accident rate and death toll—with the consequent economic losses—which occurs on our Nation's streets and highways.

Last year alone, there were nearly 10 million traffic accidents in our country. Every 25 seconds someone was injured; over 36,000 people were killed, over 1,250,000 were disabled beyond the day of the accident. Last year, traffic accidents alone cost over $4.4 billion; the losses in wages came to a towering $1.2 billion; the medical expense hit $100 million. The economic loss is truly staggering. Economic loss, however great, is secondary to loss of life and limb. A human life lost can never be replaced. Surgery and medicine, with all of their miracles and wonders, cannot make whole again the maimed and the crippled. The protection and safety of human beings should be our first concern.

It was for this reason I introduced House Resolution 349 calling for a creation of a select committee of 5 members, to be appointed by the Speaker. This committee would then conduct an investigation and study, looking toward the exercise of Federal authority to promote street and highway safety. This committee would be charged with the formulation of appropriate legislation to promote traffic safety on the streets and highways of the United States.

My reason for calling for a select committee was due to the many ramifications this type of legislation would entail and to insure that the measure would in no way overlap jurisdiction of various committees in the House. I gave considerable thought and study to recommending that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee be given jurisdiction over the problem; however, was fearful this may tend to interfere with the activities of the other standing committees of the House.

In proposing this type of legislation, there are many issues we must consider; we must be very careful we do not interfere with States' rights, we cannot regulate speed laws of various States, we cannot tell States what minimum lighting to have on their roads, which is the cause of many deaths.

In introducing my bill, I had in mind the creation of a National Highway Act or model bill applicable to Federal highways and interstate commerce, which proving successful would lead the way to adoption of similar measures by each State legislature. I am confident that many States would follow our example, as they did when the Federal Pure Food and Drug Act was enacted.

I believe that House Resolution 349 that I introduced is much broader in scope because it opens the door for all recommendations and suggestions to promote street and highway safety. However, if House Resolution 357 will result in our mutual aim, it is insignificant which bill is enacted as long as we can accomplish our objective of saving lives on our Nation's streets and highways. I intend to support House Resolution 357 and urge that all of you do the same.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on the legislation now pending before this body, House Resolution 357, which, if adopted, provides that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce investigate the number of traffic deaths, now increasing at a shocking rate, and the causes for these accidents.

I cannot overemphasize to this House, the need for this resolution to be adopted. The tragic losses the United States is sustaining from traffic deaths and casualties is beyond the scope of our imagination. I can vividly recall the Nation's grief, which we all felt, over our great casualties suffered during World War I and World War II and this legislative body still devotes time from each session to consider veterans' legislation of some type. Yet do you realize that in 1 year, I repeat in 1 year, this Nation suffers as many traffic casualties as it has suffered in all of the wars it has ever participated in—from the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, Spanish-American War, World War I, right down to World War II. This is a terrifying situation. More casualties in 1 year from traffic accidents than from all the wars.

In deaths, the Nation's annual traffic total now hovers around 40,000. Forty-thousand deaths, and nearly 2 million persons injured. In World War II we sustained approximately 980,000 casualties. A shocking comparison. What is additionally frightening is to witness that this number is increasing. Our mechanical technology enables us better to injure ourselves. In the period from 1941 to 1954, traffic injuries rose from 1,488,000 to 1,960,000 per year. An increase of 32 percent. I am happy to say that fortunately, while the number of accidents increased in this period, the ratio of deaths per registered vehicles decreased. I am sure that this decrease in deaths is in great part due to our excellent medical profession and their unceasing efforts to save human lives.

How do we as a mature nation celebrate the joyous Christmas season? How do we demonstrate our love of mankind during the Yuletide? Traffic statistics indicate that we kill him if we can. In 1952 during a 4-day Christmas holiday, 556 persons were killed—an average of 139 persons killed each day. The following year, during the 1953 Christmas season, the tempo increased and 174 persons were killed each day. In 1954 the average shot up to 196 persons slaughtered each day of the Christmas holidays. In 1955 the American public indulged in mass slaughter, killing 609 people on a 3-day weekend, over 200 persons a day.

Aside from the tragic personal loss suffered by the families of these individuals so killed or maimed, the United States suffers a loss in manpower, talent, and income. Where is this mass slaughter to stop? Other than talk, what is being done to protect the Nation's drivers of our more than 58 million registered vehicles? The engineering talent of our great country each year presents the American public with new style automobiles with more luxury, more horsepower, and, unfortunately, more ability to kill its new owner. Except for power brakes and the automobile safety belt, little has been done to prevent the unsuspecting consumer from killing himself and others as he whizzes along the highways at phenomenal speeds. It reminds me a little of giving a child a loaded revolver and telling him to play safely.

It may be that the automobile as presently designed is totally safe, and it is only man's misuse of this power that makes it dangerous. I do not know. It may be that more rigid enforcement of more stringent traffic laws is what is necessary. Approximately 46 percent of the Nation's traffic accidents are caused by excessive speeding. Approximately 38 percent of all pedestrians involved in accidents were guilty of crossing between intersections. What are the solutions to these problems? I do not know, and I do not believe that the solutions are known at this time. It is for this reason that I feel such an investigation, as provided for in House Resolution 357 can be extremely helpful to the entire Nation.

Publicity campaigns to prevent traffic accidents have been conducted by many fine organizations but these apparently do little to prevent accidents. By Presidential decree, even a nationwide Safe Driving Day was set aside with the much-publicized, hoped for goal of no casualties. When the day's score was tallied, however, it indicated little difference from any other normal day of driving.

Are we going to continue to allow the public to murder itself upon the public highways or are we going to make an effort to determine the cause of these accidents so that we can remove, or at

least reduce, some of the hazards? I personally feel very strongly that an investigation, such as proposed in House Resolution 357 can help save lives in the future and it is for this reason that I am here today asking the House to approve this resolution.

The general purpose of House Resolution 357 is to help eliminate traffic accidents and deaths. Specifically, the resolution provides that this investigation first determine the causes, going into such matters as excessive speeding, intoxication, lack of adequate safety inspection of vehicles, insufficiently strict State and local laws, poor condition of highways, and other factors affecting accidents. Secondly, the investigation shall determine what measures may be taken by the Federal Government in eliminating such accidents or reducing their frequency and severity. I am aware that several States are making strenuous efforts to reduce traffic accidents within their boundaries. Undoubtedly these States could be helped by information compiled by an investigation on a nationwide basis.

I should also like to point out at this time, as a firm believer in the independence of our States, I do not believe that any member need fear this resolution will mean Federal interference or control. The sole purpose of this resolution is to help prevent traffic accidents and deaths now being suffered by all the Nation's citizens. It is my personal intention that this legislation can be beneficial in helping States draft new, or revise their present, safety programs by discovering new information determining the causes and means for preventing or reducing accidents.

House Resolution 357 provides that this investigation be conducted by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which does have full authority and jurisdiction to go into the matter of traffic safety. The safety of railroad, airplane, and public motor-carrier passengers are presently under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Committee. I have been advised by the chairman of this committee, that it is expected that the traffic investigation proposed in House Resolution 357 can be conducted out of existing committee funds and that no additional appropriation is anticipated.

I urge the Members of this House to adopt House Resolution 357 in order to help prevent the great waste in human life now being suffered by nearly 2½ million persons each year. We should not wait any longer while the magnitude of this waste continues to grow. I sincerely believe that the adoption of House Resolution 357 today can help save lives for tomorrow.

ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES FOR POST OFFICE AND DOORKEEPER

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 446 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective April 1, 1956, until otherwise provided by law, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House compensation at the basic rate of $2,100 each per annum for the employment of four additional mail clerks, office of the postmaster; compensation at the basic rate of $1,900 each per annum for the employment of six additional doormen, office of the doorkeeper; additional compensation at the basic rate of $270 per annum for cloakroom attendant No. 3, and additional compensation at the basic rate of $240 per annum for laborer No. 2 (cloakroom), office of the doorkeeper.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, would our colleague explain this resolution?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This resolution provides for 4 additional men in the post office, 6 additional doorkeepers, and corrects the salaries of certain present clerks.

The resolution comes to the House with the unanimous recommendation of the committee.

Mr. SCHENCK. I merely want to substantiate what our colleague from Maryland says, the resolution comes with the unanimous report of the committee.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from California whether or not this is the conference report which was just brought in and ordered printed?

Mr. ENGLE. It is. It is a conference report unanimously agreed to.

Mr. BOW. The membership of the House has had no opportunity to read the conference report or to know what is in the conference report. The committee members are not here today.

Mr. ENGLE. The conference report is in effect the House bill and is a unanimous report signed by the conferees of both House and Senate. The assumption is, of course, that the House will agree to its own bill.

Mr. BOW. Have all of the Members had an opportunity to read the conference report and to know what is in it?

Mr. ENGLE. I would assume that the Members of the House have not had a chance to read it inasmuch as it has not been printed. However, I assure the gentleman that the conference report is in effect the bill the House passed. I asked unanimous consent to bring it up because we want to get it disposed of before the Easter recess. Of course, the gentleman can object.

Mr. BOW. Is there any change at all from the House bill?

Mr. ENGLE. There are some changes, but they are largely technical with reference to language and not with reference to general import.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE]?

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 9064) appropriating funds for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 9770.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I see the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and also chairman of the House conferees on the farm bill, is present. May I ask the gentleman if he can give the House any information as to the status and the probabilities of the conference on the farm bill? Before the gentleman answers that question may I say that, in my opinion, the gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and chairman of the House conferees, as well as the rest of the conferees, have one of the most important tasks resting upon them that any conference committee, in my opinion, has ever had.

As I said yesterday, the House is in the situation where a bill which passed the other body, organic in its nature, changes the organic law in many important respects relating to our agricultural economy. We cannot take that up under the rules of the House, where debate is thorough and the Members have an opportunity to offer amendments, such as was the case in the other body. Under the rules of both branches, when the conference report comes back it will be more or less a question of voting it up or down.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, the conferees could report back to the House for instructions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that is so, but it is rather unusual, and I think probably in this case there will be a lot of hesitation about doing that.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Of course, you could proceed in the normal, natural way and report the conference report to the House first, when there would be an opportunity to make amendments. That could be done if it was the desire of the conferees.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not quite get my friend's observation.

Mr. MARTIN. Maybe the gentleman from North Carolina can enlighten me. I understand normally the conference report would come to the House first. I understand there is going to be an agreement between the conferees to have the Senate act first. Can the gentleman give me any information about that?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I do not think we will have any such agreement. I think under the parliamentary procedure it will come to the House first, because we asked for the conference.

Mr. MARTIN. That is the normal way, but it was reported the bill would be called just in the Senate and that would prevent a recommitment with an amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. No, I do not think we will have any such agreement as that. I will be glad to give the House the benefit of any information I have about it at the moment.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman will. But, I am pursuing the observation of my friend from Massachusetts. With the House acting first, as I understand, if there is an agreed conference report, it would not be subject to amendment except a motion to recommit.

Mr. MARTIN. With instructions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, that is very limited, of course.

Mr. MARTIN. One motion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. We are faced with the situation where the membership of the House on an important bill cannot attempt to carry out the will of the House by individual Members offering amendments, the same as if the bill came out of the House committee and came before us under an open rule for instructions and debate and amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct, but by bringing it to the House first we could at least have one vote that might make it possible to have our legislation passed, where if we were precluded from that vote, the bill might fail.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true.

Mr. MARTIN. But the gentleman from North Carolina cleared that up very well.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the fact remains that the conferees, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, have a grave responsibility in the conference to try and bring forth a bill that will fairly represent the will of the House without the ability of the House to express its will in the ordinary way. The gentleman from North Carolina has been diligently addressing himself to the consideration of the bill in conference and also in his committee under the limited conditions that he could. I might say that there is no more important man in the Congress to our agricultural community—and I am not placing anybody else in a secondary position—to our agricultural community and to our people as a whole, particularly in connection with this bill, than the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. And, we all entertain the deepest respect for him and profound confidence in the gentleman, recognizing him not only as an authority on agricultural legislation but one of the outstanding Members of the House. The gentleman is devoting his entire time, willing to forego the Easter recess, in order to continue the conference, if the conferees do not agree before Thursday, and it is in connection with trying to get the information of the gentleman from North Carolina as to the probabilities that I asked him the question so he could advise the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I will be glad, Mr. Speaker, to answer the gentleman's inquiry and to give all the information I have concerning our very fortunate situation, and I say it is unfortunate because we are facing this Easter holiday. Not only that, but spring is here and planting time is upon us. If this bill is going to be of any value to the American farmer it will be necessary for us to act as expeditiously as we possibly can. I do know that we have a great, a gigantic task. It is unfortunate the bill is in the situation it is in; and it is unfortunate that Members of this House will not be given an opportunity to express themselves on the separate controversial issues that are presented by this legislation.

Yesterday I referred to the size of the analysis. It is a tremendous task. We acted as promptly as circumstances would permit. We even went into conference before conferees were actually appointed. We are in conference at the moment, in the committee room of the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

Every conferee there has agreed to work long hours, night and day if necessary, and to forego the entire Easter holiday, and stay here.

Some people entertain the hope—I think it is a remote possibility—that we might reach an agreement between now and tomorrow night or between now and the time we adjourn on Thursday. I do not think it is humanly possible to do so. There are too many controversial matters in the bill, too many matters in the bill that are new, that have never even been considered by members of the House Committee on Agriculture. To familiarize the members of our committee with provisions of the Senate bill we went into session yesterday morning and worked hard, diligently trying to understand these complex and controversial questions which are proposed, some of them for the first time on the floor of the Senate. In the committee room we had full attendance yesterday morning. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] who has indicated that he is going to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to yield, was there, as he always is.

We have involved in this matter not only the price-support level and the dual-parity proposition, the limitation upon payments, the soil-bank provisions; but in addition to that we have proposed changes in all of the commodity provisions, in all of the law dealing with the several commodities—wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, and dairy products.

I want to say to the House that my colleagues on the committee, and on the subcommittees dealing with these separate commodities, have been working yesterday and today; they will work tomorrow and will continue their efforts. But even if we reached an agreement on the matters involved in which there is general interest, I cannot see the possibility of our being able to agree on all of these controversial questions. I have particular reference to the dairy provisions and the corn provisions, and many other provisions.

I do want to say that I am grateful to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], for his very kind and generous remarks. I should like to say the same things concerning my distinguished and beloved colleague, the gentleman from Kansas, CLIFF HOPE, a former distinguished chairman of our committee. Both he and I would like to go home, but both of us will stay here. I think if he were here now he would agree with me that it is almost unreasonable to expect us to do the task which was given to us just yesterday, in this limited time.

Mr. MARTIN. And besides, as the gentleman has already said, it would be a very considerable task merely to write up the bill after conferees had reached an agreement.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. Then there is always the possibility that was mentioned a moment ago by the gentleman from Nebraska, Dr. MILLER, of either one House or the other being called upon for instructions, or their conferees going back for instructions. In that event, all of us know that we would have to stay here and everyone would have to forego the Easter recess. In effect, even if we were to forego the Easter recess, I doubt that we would have the bill out before the latter part of the Easter recess, or perhaps about the 8th or 9th of April.

That is the situation. If there are any other questions I should be glad to answer them as best I can.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not have authority to speak for the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. HOPE, the ranking member on our side of the committee, but I did want to express my commendation to all of the conferees for their willingness to forego the Easter

vaction in order to expedite this very important bill.

As the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. COOLEY, has said, all of the segments of agriculture have been attempting in a very speedy fashion in the last 2 or 3 days to determine exactly what the provisions of the bill are and thereby enable us to interpret them.

I noted just yesterday when one question was put to three of the experts of the Department as to what one section of this bill meant no 2 of the 3 could agree on what the terminology of the bill meant. I cite that only as one illustration as to the complexity of the bill, as our majority leader has said, and the necessity for careful consideration.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, everyone wants to get this farm legislation completed as soon as possible. I do not have a farm in my district but I have always voted to support farm legislation down through the years. But with this far-reaching legislation before us, with the situation facing the House being such as it is, and with every member of the conference committee realizing the grave responsibility they bear not only to the farmers but to each Member of the House, my thought is that the important thing is care rather than haste. Does the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. HARVEY. Yes, I would agree to that. I would say to the majority leader that in this particular instance the bill contained many amendments as it came from the other body. Not only is the problem most difficult in attempting to determine how far those amendments go but there are many conflicting portions and provisions in each of these amendments which have to be ironed out.

Mr. COOLEY. May I say to the majority leader that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], who is next in line to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], is here. I do not see Mr. HOPE of the floor. I should like the House to hear from Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN as to what he thinks we might be able to accomplish.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding to me.

It is quite obvious that if we are to secure a good farm bill it will take time on the part of the conferees. I am one of the conferees. I can assure the gentleman there are a great many disagreements between the House and the Senate bill which we must discuss. I am foregoing any Easter vacation, like my chairman, so that we can be here to sit down and try to work out a good, sound farm bill that will receive the approval of the Congress. I may not agree to everything that is agreed to in the committee of conference; nevertheless, I feel that we must have a farm bill at the present time. The time is short, so I am going to stay here to work on the committee and get a bill out of the conference, in the hope that we can vote on it when the recess is over.

Mr. COOLEY. I should like to know whether the gentleman agrees with me in the statement I made a minute ago. Although we have worked faithfully and diligently and long hours, does the gentleman think it is even humanly possible for us to reach an agreement, prepare a bill, prepare a conference report, and have it back here before the Easter recess?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am in accord with the chairman, because I do not think that with all the knowledge we have here we could sit down and analyze every Senate amendment and be able to explain it to the House unless we have ample time to do it.

Mr. COOLEY. One other thing: In addition to conferring with our colleagues from the Senate in the committee of conference of necessity we will have to confer with the members of our subcommittees who are now dealing with the different commodities.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. May I ask the chairman of the committee if this is not a pretty good summation of what he wants the House to know: If you are going to do a good job on this conference report you will have to have time. In other words, you may preclude yourselves from doing as good a job as should be done for the benefit of agriculture if you try to bring it in here by Thursday.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct. It would be very unfortunate if we did anything other than a good job.

Mr. ARENDS. We do not want to make any mistakes in the job we do this time.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. I want to propound this inquiry to the gentleman from North Carolina. I realize that the gentleman has a colossal job and I hope you do it thoroughly. I know it cannot be done hurriedly. That is just one thing that is absolutely certain because with 38 amendments and with deep differences between many of the conferees, it would seem to me that it would be a practical impossibility to even come to an agreement this week even if the conferees sat until Saturday. Then, also, with a complicated bill like this, the staff of the committee must go to work and seek to bring in a report explaining the bill so that the House can understand it. Does the gentleman not think that even that would take several days.

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly agree with the Speaker. It would take several days. I think it would be very unfortunate if we should agree upon a conference report and bring it before the House before the Members of the House had an opportunity to understand it and to know just what was in the bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does the gentleman not think, just using his sound judgment, and I am sure the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] feels the same way, and I would like to hear from the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] on this question before this discussion is over, that if the conferees worked as hard as they could and came to an agreement this week or early next week that it would in all probability take all of next week to get the bill ready for consideration in the House in the following week?

Mr. COOLEY. I think if we are to go about our task in an intelligent manner the gentleman is exactly right. We could bring a conference report back to the House which nobody would understand and have a vote on it, but I do not think that that is what should be done.

Mr. RAYBURN. And, if you were to act hastily, you might bring in a bill which would be harmful to agriculture instead of being helpful to agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. If we acted hurriedly and did it in a rush that could possibly be the result.

Mr. RAYBURN. I know very little about the mechanics of this bill, but I do hope that before the House is called upon to vote on the conference report that the members of the conference committee know enough about it to be able to come in and explain it to us. I am sure that there is not a member of the House conference committee with the information that he has now could come in and explain to the House of Representatives what is in the Senate bill.

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct. There are many complicated provisions in the bill which the conferees themselves do not understand.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. The bill that is now being considered by the conferees is an amended bill, amending the bill which the House passed during the last session; is that not correct?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, the gentleman is correct. The House passed the bill last year.

Mr. JENSEN. The bill which the House passed provided, I think, for 90 percent of parity and for some other benefits to the farmers; did it not?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. And that bill died in the Senate committee?

Mr. COOLEY. Well, it was not considered.

Mr. JENSEN. It was not considered. It did not see the light of day out of that committee. Had the other body acted on that bill, then the conferees today would not have as great a problem before them as they do have since there is a considerable disagreement about the parity formula as to the 90 percent provision and the flexibility provisions; is that not correct?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct, yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Therefore, the House of Representatives should not be held responsible for a lot of the delay that is now taking place.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him—I will say the House of Representatives cannot properly be charged with any delay. We have acted as the gentleman has indicated, promptly. Last year we presented the bill and the House passed it

and sent it to the other body where it was not considered.

Had the Senate considered my bill last year, we would not now be under such great pressure, but the Senate is the "other body" over which unfortunately we have no control.

Before we adjourned last year, I asked the Secretary or one of his assistants if the Department of Agriculture had any further recommendations to submit, and the answer was "No." The Department had no further recommendations to submit. On October 31 I advised the Secretary of Agriculture that the House had authorized me to hold hearings during the recess and that if he had recommendations to submit, I would be glad to call a meeting of our committee at such time as would meet his convenience, to receive, to consider and to act upon such recommendations as he desired to make. No recommendations were forthcoming and I was advised by the Secretary that such recommendations as he might have to make would be submitted in the traditional fashion by the President when Congress convened in January.

January came. The President made his speech. He talked about his 9-point program. There was not a single new thought in any one of the 9 points. No executive communication was sent by the Secretary to the Speaker of the House transmitting a bill setting forth the President's program. Even though we did not have the draft of the administration's bill, we held hearings and we heard the representatives of farm organizations, individual farmers, and officials of the Department including the great Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, himself, but, believe it or not, when Mr. Benson appeared, he had no bill to present. My recollection is that he appeared on February 21 and he presented the administration's program of platitudes and pious pronouncements but unfortunately he did not present the draft of a legislative measure which he was then and there prepared to recommend. I called upon the Secretary to have prepared a draft of a bill containing all of his recommendations and to have it ready for the committee not later than the following Monday. The Secretary agreed to my suggestion and on the 27th day of February he left with my committee the finished product of all his thinking and there the bill has remained from that day until this. On the very next day, after I had directed that the draft be made in the form of a committee print; by a unanimous vote of our committee, I was directed to extend to the Secretary an invitation to appear before the committee in support of the bill he had submitted. I was advised by the Secretary that because of a very heavy schedule, which he could not possibly rearrange, he could not appear in behalf of his bill for 2 weeks.

When this unfortunate and tragic situation presented itself, I called the matter to the attention of the committee. After a very lengthy discussion, the only thing left for us to do was to postpone the hearings and that is just what we did. After waiting for 2 weeks, during which time the bill was being debated in the Senate, I renewed the invitation and again invited the Secretary to appear in behalf of his bill. I requested him to appear last Thursday and he advised me that he was not prepared to appear at that time. He advised me that he would appear on Tuesday, which is today. Events have moved rapidly. We have already been in informal conferences and I concluded that we could not delay the conferences for the purpose of providing the Secretary with a forum in which to do further missionary work.

The bill the Secretary left with us has not yet been introduced. The Secretary has not been able to prevail upon any Member of this House, either Republican or Democrat, to introduce the bill which he proposed. So the little orphan which he left on the doorsteps of our committee does not even now have a putative father who is willing to adopt the little orphan.

Even before the Secretary appeared, we had held hearings and when it was not convenient for him to appear, we concluded the hearings. During the course of the hearings, everybody was afforded an opportunity to be heard. We heard farmers and farm leaders. We heard the representatives of farm organizations and we heard officials of the Department of Agriculture. All of this we did last year and again this year.

Even with nothing officially before us, even though the Department of Agriculture had not presented a bill, we held hearings day in and day out and afforded everyone an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to thank the gentleman for his courtesy to me in appearing before his committee.

Mr. COOLEY. And I want to thank the gentleman for his great interest in the work of our committee and his great interest in the welfare of the farmers of his State and the Nation.

Mr. JENSEN. Just one thing more, then I am through. I believe I heard the gentleman say that the conferees were willing to stay in session during the recess in the hope that they can iron out the differences and get this bill in shape to bring it to the floor of the House and the Senate shortly after the recess is concluded.

Mr. COOLEY. Every conferee has indicated that he has canceled all engagements and will forego all holidays and will remain in conference as long as it is necessary, to finish this work. I said I thought we would probably do well to have the entire job done by the time we come back at the end of the recess.

Mr. JENSEN. Have the members of the Senate conferees also agreed to remain?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, they have. They have agreed to stay with us and work with us as long as it is necessary, to do the job.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course I come from a part of the country that is very deeply interested in this bill. It is not going to be long until the seeding time and planting time is upon the people of the whole Nation, as far as the farmers are concerned. Naturally we are interested in seeing this bill come out just as soon as possible.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course the gentleman realizes that the House could not possibly have acted upon this measure until the Senate concluded consideration, which was just a short time ago.

Mr. JENSEN. That is absolutely right. That is the point I wanted to bring out.

Mr. McCORMACK. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In view of what has been said this morning about the necessity of considering the bill in conference and the task that it will be, can it now be truthfully and accurately said that if we do take a recess that will not in any way cause any one party to charge that this is a "do-nothing Congress," because we will be working all the time? Is that agreed on now? Everybody wants to take a recess, as I understand it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and all the other Members who have spoken. To me it is very important that the conferees be not stampeded into hasty action, because the legislation involves millions of Americans who live upon the soil. I think it is of paramount importance that the conferees in this unusual position exercise sound judgment, and agree, because when the report comes back there is no opportunity going to be afforded to the membership of the House to amend this far-reaching bill.

It is a monumental task for the conferees, especially the conferees on the part of the House. I want to congratulate the chairman of the House conference committee and to state that the people of his district can well be proud of the outstanding service he is rendering in this body.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. I wish to endorse what the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, has said. I have had the honor and privilege of serving under the able leadership of HAROLD COOLEY, as chairman. He has done a marvelous job for American agriculture. He has directed various committees to look into the bill's provisions affecting the commodities. All of them have held meetings and studied the Senate amendments. These reports are due in this afternoon. He is expediting the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

MANGANESE

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill similar in purpose and effect of the bill H. R. 10131 recently introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. From a comparison of the two measures, it will appear,

however, that my bill is not quite as broad in its substantive parts as Mr. MILLS' bill. The underlying policy and the ultimate objective of both are nevertheless the same. Briefly, my bill would provide for:

First. A 3-year extension of the high-grade and low-grade manganese purchase programs to expire on June 30, 1961;

Second. An increase from 19 million to 40 million long dry ton units of high-grade manganese under the carload program;

Third. The elimination of the present 10,000 long dry tons limitation and substitution of another limitation formula based on 1954 production records;

Fourth. Authorization of a new purchase program and the establishment of a new purchase depot for low-grade manganese in the southern Appalachian region and the Ozark-Cushman region within 90 days after the effective date of the act;

Fifth. An increase from 18 million to 50 million long-ton units of low-grade manganese, with quotas of 10 million units to each of the two new depots authorized by the act and to each of the western depots at Wenden, Deming, and Butte-Philipsburg;

Sixth. A continuance of the same ore specifications and prices adopted under the old purchase programs;

Seventh. Authorization for the administrative officer or agency to relax ore specifications, to extend termination dates and to increase authorized quantity limitations; and

Eighth. A requirement that the administrative officer or agency publish quarterly reports of the amounts of ores purchased during the preceding quarter and the total amounts currently purchased under both the high-grade and low-grade programs.

Because of cheap foreign labor, cheap water transportation and low tariff rates, the United States has filled most of its manganese stockpiles from foreign sources, either through direct purchase or barter of agricultural commodities. In fact, about 90 percent of the manganese in our stockpiles came from foreign producers. While this policy may have resulted in some temporary economy, its long-range effect has been to jeopardize the defensive posture of the United States. Foreign purchases have closed down many domestic mines and have almost completely curtailed domestic exploration. It takes several months to activate a known deposit of manganese and sometimes several years to locate new deposits for future activation. In the event of war, with coast lines blockaded, sea lanes closed and naval tonnage pressed into military transportation, these foreign sources would no longer be available. At that point, it would be too late to embark upon a program to encourage domestic exploration and production.

Such a program must be started in peacetime and maintained in peacetime so long as international tension creates a war-threat climate. The only possible incentive for domestic exploration and production is a ready market and a guaranty that the ready market will continue to exist for a period sufficient to protect the necessary capital outlay of private enterprise.

It has been estimated that domestic producers today supply 10 percent of America's annual consumptive needs, which currently run about 2 million tons of manganese a year. It is believed that with a proper incentive program and the new ore bodies which would be found and developed thereby, domestic producers could supply up to 50 percent of our needs. Even in such case, we would still be dependent upon foreign sources unless our stockpiles during peacetime are made sufficiently large to carry us through a protracted emergency. If we are to err, let it be on the side of abundance instead of scarcity. A war cannot be waged without steel; steel cannot be made without manganese.

While we in Virginia, being the second largest high-grade manganese producers in the continental United States, are vitally concerned about the high-grade program, we are no less concerned about the low-grade program. Unlike the high-grade producer, the low-grade producer must pay the freight from point of production to one of the western depots. These freight costs render low-grade production in the East economically impractical. Accordingly, the low-grade ores which result as a byproduct of the high-grade mining process and the low-grade wad deposits which lie in such abundance in the southern Appalachian region and which would do so much to relieve America of her dependence on foreign ores, cannot be exploited.

Because of the establishment of the low-grade purchase depots at Wenden, Deming, and Butte-Philipsburg, low-grade producers in the West have been unable to market their products without extensive freight costs. Low-grade producers in the East have simply had no market. Unless legislation of this nature is enacted promptly enough to enable low-grade producers to project mining operations over the next 5 years, even those low-grade producers in the West will have to close down their mines and liquidate their capital investment.

WHOLESALE GROCERS REMEMBER WHEN A. & P. COLLECTED DUMMY BROKERAGE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, no group of small-business men have a greater stake in the passage of H. R. 11 than do the independent wholesale grocers of the country. The wholesale grocers all over the United States are writing to me urging the passage of H. R. 11. Their letters also tell me that they are likewise writing to their Representatives and Senators urging immediate passage of this bill.

A. & P. GOT $8 MILLION A YEAR IN UNFAIR ADVANTAGES

Col. R. H. Rowe, who is vice president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocers Association, can and does speak with more authority on the actual injury and destruction that small business has suffered through monopolistic price discrimination than any man I know. Colonel Rowe was leading the fight on behalf of the Wholesale Grocers Association for the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act back in 1935 and 1936. He had long had practical experience with this problem and over the years had seen hundreds of efficient, vigorous competitors in the wholesale grocery business destroyed through this practice. He remembers very keenly the conditions that prevailed in the grocery business prior to passage of the Robinson-Patman Act. And he also recalls most of the facts and figures revealed by the investigations which led up to the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Last November, Colonel Rowe testified before your Small Business Committee and reviewed the history of the investigations and findings made in those years. Colonel Rowe pointed out that as a result of the weaknesses in the anti-price-discrimination law prior to the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act, the A. & P. Tea Co. was the main beneficiary of unjustified price discriminations. Prior to 1935, A. & P. received discriminatory advantages over its independent competitors amounting to $8 million a year. Referring to the hearings of the special committee of the House which was appointed to investigate discriminatory practices, Colonel Rowe said:

"The record of the hearings of that committee on July 9, 1935, showed that the A. & P. Tea Co. on an annual basis received from manufacturer suppliers $6 million in extra quantity discounts and advertising allowances and $2 million in brokerage fees.

ANTITRUST LAWS SHOULD BENEFIT COMPETITION, NOT A. & P.

The A. & P. Tea Co. naturally likes price discrimination, and it naturally likes a weak law such as we now have. This is only human; when you are the biggest frog in the pond and you are going to receive the unearned benefits of a particular practice, naturally you do not want that practice stopped. But we cannot have weak antitrust laws just for the special benefit of A. & P. in the grocery business, and for the special benefit of the giant corporations in other lines of business. The Supreme Court put a big loophole in the Robinson-Patman Act and very seriously weakened this act by its majority opinion in the Standard Oil of Indiana decison. I thnk that Congress will want to be fair and restore to small business some protection against unwarranted destruction through big business abuse of power. H. R. 11 will restore that protection and give small business a chance. It will give small business a chance for the simple reason that under this bill the most efficient firms will survive the competitive process, and not just the biggest firms. This means that since small firms will become a real competitive factor, wth equal opportunity of competing, competition will be much keener and consumers will benefit. I hope that there are enough Members of the House who want to be fair to small business that we can call up H. R. 11 and pass it.

I do not mean to imply that the A. & P. Co. is the only company in the food distribution business that receives special advantages when the law against discriminatory pricing is weak, as it is now.

IGA ALSO GOT UNEARNED ADVANTAGES

Colonel Rowe also pointed out to your Small Business Committee that the Independent Grocers' Alliance also received discriminatory advantages through the guise of brokerage fees which it collected on its own purchases. The Independent Grocers' Alliance is an organization serving, as I understand it, approximately 6,000 retail grocers. Colonel Rowe has refreshed our memory that the record of the hearing on February 24, 1936, contained a list of 1,046 manufacturers from whom the Independent Grocers' Alliance was receiving discriminatory favors, either in the form of brokerage fees paid to IGA for purchases on its own account, in advertising or promotional allowances, or in quantity discounts.

ADVANTAGES SHOULD BE LIMITED TO THOSE JUSTIFIED BY EFFICIENCY

The Robinson-Patman Act was intended to stop such unjustified discriminations in price as A. & P. and IGA were receiving, and thus give small sellers competitive equality with big sellers, and small buyers competitive equality with big buyers. This law was intended to give small business competitive equality to the extent, and only to the extent, that small business is equally as efficient as big business. We wrote this law so that A. & P.—and any other big buyer—could have the full benefit of any cost saving which the seller could make as a result of supplying the big buyer. But we tried to protect small business from discriminations which go beyond an amount justified by the seller's cost differences.

This protection which we tried to give small business has been greatly weakened by the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil of Indiana case. This opinion, as Colonel Rowe has said, "is to the effect that the meeting in good faith, as defined by the Court, of a competitor's lower price is a complete defense to the charge of price discrimination, regardless of the injury that may be inflicted on other buyers competing with the favored buyer."

WHOLESALE GROCERS BELIEVE CONGRESS WILL PASS H. R. 11

The United States Wholesale Grocers Association is vigorously urging passage of H. R. 11. The wholesale grocers do not believe, moreover, that Congress will be willing to deny this necessary step to close the loophole in antidiscrimination law. Colonel Rowe stated to your Small Business Committee:

> I do not believe the Congress would be willing to deliver food distribution into the hands of a few organizations.
>
> I do not believe Congress will vote to make a money advantage available to the big organizations, chain or voluntary, which in practice can be legally denied to their smaller competitors. I think that that is really not in the legislative cards.
>
> I believe that Congress still wants the individual merchant, wholesale and retail, to have a chance for survival and for success.
>
> A strong Robinson-Patman Act, strongly enforced, would go a long way to achieve that end.

FARM RESEARCH FOR INDUSTRIAL USE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, American agriculture is at the fork of the road. Whether its turning is to be for better or worse, is a matter of concern to millions. Surely it is a responsibility that we in the legislative branch of Government cannot shirk. In times of gravest emergency—and by that I mean the prosecution of war—we have never hesitated to call upon the American farmer for a maximum contribution. We have demanded of him the most that sweat and machinery could wrest from the soil—food and fiber without which the valor of warriors and the production of factories would have been in vain.

I arise today, Mr. Speaker, to speak at greater length on H. R. 10125. This is the proposal introduced last week by myself and several colleagues on behalf of the Indiana Republican delegation in Congress. We acted then in bringing before the House this proposal as a companion to a measure introduced a few hours earlier in the other Chamber. The introduction there was made by our senior Senator, the Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART, acting for himself and others in the Senate.

Again and more emphatically today, I wish to make clear that this proposal, providing for an appropriation to step up farm research for industrial uses, has no relationship to H. R. 12, the omnibus farm bill now in House-Senate conference. It does not compete with that bill in any way. It, instead, is offered and urged as a wholly new approach to a partial solution of agriculture's most challenging problem—the disposal of surpluses.

For the present there are two points I should like to make in connection with the proposal that awaits consideration by the appropriate committees of both the House and Senate. One is the fact that this measure concerns itself with the increased consumption of our farm output; the other the fact that no responsible groups of citizens, including those identified with our large farm organizations, have ever underrated the potential benefits of greater research into the use of farm commodities. Our one failing, and this the proposal would correct, has been a reluctance to insist upon more and more research to determine the possibilities of creating new and profitable uses for our traditional farm produce.

Agriculture today is so productive that its bumper yields must be restricted and even then its surplus sent to storage. To meet this challenging reality, many proposals have been offered, but none of them patently sound, fair, and workable. The magnitude and conflicts of what we call the farm problem are indeed so formidable that most authorities arrive together at only one conclusion—namely, the futility of hoping to find a simple solution to a problem so diffused.

This brings us to the realization that the most beneficial undertaking for farmers might well be that of creating new outlets and new demands for all they produce. Should such discoveries of utilization prove feasible, no matter how revolutionary some in their practical application might be, certainly the opening up of new markets would prove worthwhile to our economy as a whole. New uses for the crops of our farms would in turn mean new jobs, new factories and income, and inevitably a whole train of like benefits flowing to all segments of our national economy.

This new proposal, it should be noted, is modest in concept. It provides for the appropriation of $100 million, roughly the money that today Uncle Sam pays out for 3 months' storing of farm surpluses. Yet this proposal, by shifting emphasis from the production of more to the industrial use of more, may prove that the laboratories of science can do for agriculture precisely what they do for medicine and industry—open up new vistas of usefulness and progress in man's endless quest of the good life.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Does the gentleman agree then that, among other things, this proposed legislation, if enacted, would stimulate a great deal of research so that our surplus agricultural products could be used for the general good?

Mr. HARVEY. The gentleman is entirely correct. Not only that but it is my hope that by bringing great pressure to bear upon the research facilities we have available a more intensive application will be made of the research knowledge we already have.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, having in mind the traditional willingness of the American people to study new ways and mans of doing things and of using our surplus products, it seems to me this is a very worthy proposal and one which ought to be supported. It seems reasonable that if proper research is undertaken it will make for much better utilization of our surplus commodities.

Mr. HARVEY. If I might add to the gentleman's statement, I may say that during the past few months I have had an opportunity to confer with the leaders of many of our great industrial corporations who have expressed great interest in this and a willingness to share and participate. They have pointed out, however, the importance and necessity for the Government to act as a leader and coordinator in bringing all their efforts to bear upon the problem.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Legislation of this type is very important and very badly needed. We have great capabilities of resarch in the United States. In recent years those capabilities have been directed to raising more and better crops and livestock, which is all very fine, but our research in the matter of production has greatly exceeded our research in the matter of utilizing this production. We do need this research in the matter of using this bountiful harvest. Perhaps if we can emulate the example of George Washington Carver and his experimentation on the uses of peanuts and apply that theory to our agricultural products in the

midwest we will accomplish a great deal. I have been very much impressed with this legislation, having myself introduced a similar bill. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. The only regret I have is that we have not started on it sooner.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. May I say to the gentleman that I am extremely interested in the proposition which the gentleman is outlining to the House at this time. It is very timely and, as has already been said, perhaps it may be later than we wish, but we should get under way with this program of utilization of farm commodities by industrial use. I should be most interested in joining with the gentleman in active support of this legislation.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman.

FEDERAL PERSONNEL PRACTICES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill having to do with personnel practices in the Federal Government. I think we all clearly realize that our Government operation depends upon the individual skills and morale of the Government workers. Practically all of the people who work in Government in the various departments and agencies have been qualified for such work on exactly the same basis. Their skills on entrance into the service are very much alike. In planning Government operations, we should be able to draw from the individual and collective skills of all of these people.

My bill defines the right of organizations to meet with the heads of departments and agencies to discuss policies affecting working conditions, safety, in-service training, labor-management cooperation, methods of adjusting grievances, transfers, appeals, granting of leave, promotions, demotions, rates of pay, and reductions in force.

In the event of any serious disagreement, the bill provides that the dispute can be referred to an impartial board composed of 1 representative of the department or agency, 1 representative of the employees, and 1 representative appointed by the Secretary of Labor.

In my opinion, this legislation would result in greatly improved morale and more efficient Government operations.

WHERE IS THE "REIGN OF TERROR"?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES of Missouri). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include statistical data and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, since the Black Monday decisions which sought to amend the Constitution by judicial fiat, the people of America have been subjected to the most vicious brainwashing campaign in the history of the world.

Newspapers, magazines, radio, and television, as well as Government agencies, have been continuously engaged in an unceasing barrage of malicious and misleading propaganda, assaulting the integrity, character, customs, and mores of the people of the Southern States. Those who are farthest removed from the segregation problem are the first to come forward with solutions to it, none of which suggest that those who must live with the problem should be consulted. None have sampled the opinion of the southern Negroes, who desire—as do the southern whites—to be left alone to work out their own destinies.

Opposition to integration by white and Negro citizens can be measured in direct ratio to the proportion of Negroes in the population. There is little, if any, support for segregation, for instance, in Vermont or Minnesota or Idaho, where the ratio of Negroes to whites in the population is merely a fraction of 1 percent. In Mississippi, by contrast, where the Negro population is almost equal to the white population, almost unanimous support for continued segregation prevails among members of both races.

The agitation for racial integration did not originate with southern Negroes, the alleged "victims" of the system, nor have southern Negroes generally supported such agitation. Southern Negroes know that their race is being exploited by the radical and pink-fringed NAACP, its sister organizations and captive politicians, and they resent as deeply as their white neighbors these efforts to destroy the identity of their race.

In the unceasing propaganda campaign being leveled against the Southern States, facts are being deliberately concealed and distorted. This propaganda would have Americans believe that the only difference between the races is in skin pigment, and that segregation is the root of all evil in human relations. They would have Americans believe that society should recognize no differences among people, no matter how pronounced those differences may be in actual fact, or how obvious such differences may be. In this, they are doing a distinct disservice to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, these bleeding-heart professional troublemakers weep buckets of tears over what they call second-class citizenship.

I am not going to deny what is a fact: That we do have a second-class citizenship, in the North as well as in the South. However, we might be equally as honest with ourselves and admit another very obvious truth: There will always be a second-class citizenship so long as there are second-class citizens. By the same token, there will be second-class citizens so long as there are citizens who refuse or neglect to discharge the duties, responsibilities, and obligations that must be given in return for the enjoyment of first-class citizenship.

First-class citizenship is not a commodity that can be handed gratuitously to a person or a people like a can of sardines handed across a counter. It is a status that will be conferred automatically when it has been earned, and not before.

The time has come for the light of truth to penetrate the iron curtain that has been thrown around the facts regarding racial differences and distinctions.

The big lie campaign touched off by the sociological fiat of the Supreme Court has reached such magnitude that the time has come to set the record straight.

Let us look at the facts for a moment.

Was Lincoln right when, in commenting on the white and Negro races in his debate with Douglas, he said:

> There is a physical difference between the two, which, in my judgment, will forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality.

Was Lincoln right when he spoke to a Negro gathering in Washington, on August 14, 1862, when he told them:

> It is better for us both, therefore, to be separated.

Has the Negro race reached the same, or a comparable level of mental development to that of the white race since the birth of his civilization some 93 years ago?

Do Negroes observe the same moral standards as whites, or does a double standard of morals exist as between whites and Negroes?

What is the real effect of segregation with respect to the Negro crime rate? Does the Negro commit more crimes in integrated or segregated States?

Is the Negro better treated in the integrated States, or does he actually fare better in the segregated States, current Government and press propaganda to the contrary?

Where is the real reign of terror against Negro citizens, if such prevails? Is it in Mississippi and the South, as the bleeding-heart liberals contend, or is it in the integrated States?

The facts and figures which I shall use later in this dissertation are authentic. They are compiled from official records of the United States Government and agencies of the several States. These figures have not been altered or changed in any way, but they speak more eloquently than all the words in Webster's Dictionary of the real differences that exist between the races. These will be facts and figures that will not be found in the propaganda being disseminated by South hating agitators, and undoubtedly will not be quoted by the left-wing press, though I challenge them to dis-

pute their authenticity or try to explain away their significance.

First, it might be well to take a look at State prison statistics by race, compiled from official records of the United States Department of Justice:

State	Negro population, 1950 census	Negroes admitted to prison on felony charges, 1950	Rate of Negro felony prisoners per 100,000, 1950	White population, 1950 census	Whites admitted to prison on felony charges, 1950	Rate of white felony prisoners per 100,000, 1950	Percent of population, Negro, 1950	Percent of felony prisoners Negro, 1950	Negro rate over white rate
									Percent
California	462,172	596	129	9,915,173	2,472	25	4	19	516
District of Columbia	280,803	444	158	517,865	136	26	35	80	608
Illinois	645,980	639	99	8,046,058	1,225	15	7	32	660
Indiana	174,168	189	108	3,758,512	944	25	4	17	432
Kentucky	201,921	277	132	2,742,090	1,088	39	7	21	338
Maryland	385,972	1,484	386	1,954,975	993	51	16	60	757
Missouri	297,088	413	139	3,655,593	1,133	31	8	27	448
New Jersey	318,565	478	150	4,511,585	888	19	7	35	789
New York	918,191	1,051	114	13,872,095	1,818	13	6	37	877
Ohio	513,072	922	179	7,428,222	1,729	23	6	35	778
Oklahoma	145,503	208	143	2,032,526	892	44	7	19	325
Pennsylvania	638,485	493	77	9,853,848	933	9	6	35	855
West Virginia	114,867	93	81	1,890,282	609	32	6	13	253
Total	5,096,787	7,287	143	70,178,824	14,860	21	6.7	33	681
Alabama	979,617	790	80	2,079,591	719	35	32	52	229
Arkansas	426,639	282	66	1,481,507	403	27	22	41	244
Florida	603,101	620	102	2,166,051	895	41	22	41	249
Louisiana	882,428	642	72	1,796,683	515	29	33	55	248
Mississippi	986,494	530	53	1,188,632	222	19	45	70	279
North Carolina	1,047,353	622	59	2,983,121	633	21	26	50	281
South Carolina	822,077	183	22	1,293,405	420	32	39	30	[1] 145
Tennessee	530,603	334	63	2,760,257	691	25	16	32	252
Texas	977,458	867	88	6,726,534	2,125	32	13	30	275
Virginia	734,211	941	128	2,581,555	800	35	22	54	366
Total	7,989,981	5,811	72	25,057,302	7,423	29	24	44	248

[1] White over Negro.

Note: The States of Michigan and Georgia are omitted from the above table, inasmuch as those States did not submit prison reports to the Department of Justice for the year 1950.

An analysis of the above table is most enlightening.

The top portion of the table lists the 13 States of the Union which have more than 100,000 Negro population, with the exception of Michigan. The bottom portion of the table consists of the segregated Southern States, with the exception of Georgia.

It should be noted that the integrated States show a substantially higher incidence of Negro crime in proportion to Negro population than the segregated States. In fact, this table reveals that the per capita crime rate among Negroes in the integrated States is 199 percent—or double—the rate in the segregated States. The cases enumerated in the foregoing table are convicted felony cases, and the figures do not reflect arrests or misdemeanor convictions.

These figures must prove conclusively 1 or 2 premises: Either that Negroes are more law abiding in a segregated society, or southern courts are far more lenient with Negro defendants. This, in my opinion, puts the lie to the left-wing and NAACP propaganda to the effect that a "reign of terror" against Negroes prevails in the South.

Much of the propaganda assault made against the Southern people originates in the State of New York. To those from that State who would criticize the South, I suggest a look at the record.

In 1950, New York courts sent more Negroes to the penitentiary than the courts of Arkansas, Mississippi, and South Carolina combined, in spite of the fact that the total Negro population of those three States exceeds that of New York by 1,317,019.

According to the 1950 census, Mississippi's Negro population exceeds New York's Negro population by 68,303. Yet official Justice Department figures show that New York sent twice as many Negroes to prison in 1950 than Mississippi.

Where is the reign of terror, if such exists?

Integrated Ohio sent more Negroes to prison in 1950 than did the segregated States of Arkansas, Tennessee, and South Carolina combined. Those three Southern States, according to the 1950 census, have a Negro population that exceeds that of Ohio by 1,266,247.

Again; where is the reign of terror, if such exists?

The foregoing table will show the startling fact that the integrated States sent more Negroes to the penitentiary in proportion to their overall Negro population than the segregated States. Per 100,000 Negro population, this rate ranges, in the Northern States, from 77 in Pennsylvania to 386 in Maryland. By contrast, the rate in the segregated Southern States ranges from 22 in South Carolina to 128 in Virginia.

The foregoing table, summarized, will also show the following comparison between the segregated Southern States and the integrated Northern States cited therein:

Negro prison rate per 100,000 population

	0 to 50	51 to 100	101 to 150	151 to 200	Over 200
Integrated States		3	7	2	1
Segregated States	1	7	2		

It should be noted that the white prison rate per 100,000 white population is practically the same in all the States reported, being 21 in the integrated States and 29 in the segregated States.

These 1950 figures further analyzed show the following:

On a per capita basis, New York sent 9 times as many Negroes to the penitentiary as whites; Pennsylvania sent 8½ times as many Negroes to prison as whites.

New Jersey's population is 7 percent Negro, but 35 percent of their felony convictions were Negro. In other words, 7 percent of their population was responsible for 35 percent of their major crimes.

The same pattern holds true practically throughout the integrated States.

Among the Southern States, South Carolina actually sent more whites than Negroes to prison on a per capita basis. On the basis of 100,000 population by race, South Carolina sent 145 percent more whites than Negroes to prison. This is the only State in the Union, according to available statistics, where this condition prevailed. In Mississippi, on a per capita basis, less than three times as many Negroes than whites were sent to prison. The same rate in New York is three times that of Mississippi.

Where is the so-called reign of terror?

In a range distribution, note the following breakdown, showing the percentage of the per capita Negro crime rate to that of the white crime rate:

Negro rate (percentage) over white rate, per 100,000 population

	0 to 100	101 to 200	201 to 300	301 to 400	401 to 500	Over 500
Integrated States			1	2	2	8
Segregated States	1		8	1		

The foregoing table will show that the Negro crime rate is 681 percent of the white crime rate in the integrated States. The Negro crime rate in the segregated States, by contrast, is only 248 percent of the white crime rate.

Where is the reign of terror?

Where is the Negro a better citizen: in an integrated society, or in a segregated society?

Each of the following States has less than 100,000 Negro population: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Delaware, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington—a total of 24 States. For this reason, these States—along with Michigan and Georgia—were not included in the foregoing table. Again, Michigan and Georgia were excluded because no reports had been made available to the Justice Department.

In the 24 States with less than 100,000 Negro population, the 1950 census shows a combined Negro population of 450,460. Justice Department records show that in 1950, those States sent a total of 898 Negroes to prison on felony convictions, making a rate—for those States—of 197 per 100,000 Negro population. It should be noted that this rate is substantially higher than the average of the other States with larger Negro populations. Even in States with the lowest percentage of Negro population, the Negro crime rate is almost triple the rate in the Southern States.

The following table, again compiled from official records of the United States Department of Justice, shows a breakdown of offenses, by race, for which the aforementioned convictions and imprisonments followed:

Male felony prisoners received from court, Federal and State institutions (except Georgia and Michigan), 1950

Offense	White	Negro	Other races	Percent Negro
Murder	734	865	20	53.0
Manslaughter	510	676	17	56.0
Robbery	3,563	1,918	25	35.0
Aggravated assault	1,167	1,402	44	53.0
Burglary	8,054	3,504	129	30.0
Larceny, except auto theft	5,478	2,553	108	31.0
Auto theft	3,608	630	76	14.0
Embezzlement and fraud	1,539	230	16	13.0
Stolen property	276	103	4	27.0
Forgery	4,949	1,127	82	18.0
Rape	1,259	427	34	25.0
Commercialized vice	190	48	1	16.0
Other sex offenses	987	165	14	14.0
Drug laws	1,049	940	50	46.0
Carrying and possessing weapons	162	116	3	41.0
Nonsupport or neglect	755	268	14	26.0
Liquor laws	1,140	660	5	36.0
Immigration and naturalization laws	945	12	4	1.0
Traffic laws	154	36	8	18.0
National-defense laws	85	10	2	10.0
Other	1,469	421	27	22.0
Military courts-martial	607	145	6	20.0
Total	38,680	16,256	689	29.2

Note: The 1950 census shows the population of the United States to be distributed percentagewise as follows: White, 89.5 percent; Negro, 10 percent; other races, .5 percent.

These figures—except for the percentages shown in the last column—are taken from the Annual Report of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, issued by the Department of Justice, Mr. Herbert Brownell, Attorney General, in 1954.

Negroes comprise 10 percent of the total population of the United States. Yet, as the above table shows, Negroes committed more than half the homicides, both murder and manslaughter, in our country in 1950. This 10 percent of our population is also responsible as this table shows, for a disproportionate share of the crimes committed.

This is but another reason why the Southern people intend to retain their segregated institutions.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, a great deal of the current anti-South and anti-Mississippi propaganda is coming from the State of New York, and New York City in particular. For that reason, and in order to reveal to New Yorkers what they probably don't know about themselves in this respect, I offer the following comparative analysis of prison populations, as between my State of Mississippi and New York State:

	New York	Mississippi
Total Negro population (1950 census)	918,191	986,494
Negroes in prison	[1] 7,585	[2] 1,432
Negro prisoners per 100,000 population	843	147
White prisoners per 100,000 population	80	44

[1] 1952.
[2] 1954.

NOTE.—These are the latest available prison population figures available for the 2 States.

These figures show that New York has five times more Negroes per capita in prison than Mississippi. Where is the reign of terror?

Several weeks ago, I reported to the House a breakdown of murders in Mississippi during 1954. During that year, 8 white persons were killed by Negroes; 6 Negroes were killed by white persons; and 182 Negroes killed members of their own race.

Mr. Speaker, the President, the NAACP, and the left-wing press hail the District of Columbia as the ideal example of integration. Some have gone so far as to call the District a utopia of integration. The facts just do not support these allegations.

The Census Bureau reported in 1950 that the population of the District of Columbia was about 65 percent white and 35 percent Negro. What the ratio may be today is anyone's guess, as there has been a general exodus of white people away from the District in the integrated years that have followed, into the segregated areas of nearby Virginia and Maryland.

The following tables, except for the percentage column, are official reports of arrests on felony charges, by sex and race, in the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1955, taken from the 1955 annual report of the Metropolitan Police Department, Washington, D. C.

Arrests by sex, color, and nativity, District of Columbia, fiscal year 1955

Offense	Total both sexes	Total persons charged		Native white		Foreign-born white		Negro		All others		Percent, Negro
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
1. Criminal homicide:												
(a) Murder	49	42	7	5	2			37	4		1	84
(b) Manslaughter	4	4		2				2				50
(c) Negligent homicide	20	19	1	6	1			13				65
2. Rape	165	165		20				145				90
(a) Attempted rape	40	40		9				31				77
3. Robbery	908	836	72	121	5			715	67			86
(a) Attempted robbery	79	77	2	12				65	2			85
4. Aggravated assault	3,597	2,661	936	305	71	19	2	2,337	863			90
5. Housebreaking	2,426	2,323	103	474	15	11		1,838	88			79
(a) Attempted housebreaking	116	112	4	19				93	4			83
6. Larceny-theft:												
(a) $100 and over	470	433	37	105	15	4	1	324	21			73
(b) Under $100	2,575	2,222	353	498	98	3	25	1,719	230	2		76
7. Auto theft	623	617	6	163	1	4		450	5			73
Total	11,072	9,551	1,521	1,739	208	41	28	7,769	1,284	2	1	82

Arrests on felony charges, District of Columbia, fiscal year 1955

Offense	Adult and juvenile		Juvenile age 17 and under		Percent Negro juvenile	Offense	Adult and juvenile		Juvenile age 17 and under		Percent Negro juvenile
	White	Negro	Negro	White			White	Negro	Negro	White	
Murder	7	42	3	0	100	Embezzlement and fraud	84	43	1	0	100
Manslaughter	2	2	0	0	--------	Stolen property	7	17	4	1	80
Rape	20	145	33	0	100	Weapons	12	24	0	0	--------
Attempted rape	9	31	6	1	86	Prostitution	9	15	0	0	--------
Robbery	126	782	261	9	97	Other sex offenses	58	76	14	3	82
Attempted robbery	12	67	30	0	100	Drug laws	299	365	6	0	100
Aggravated assault	397	3,200	84	12	88	Liquor laws	1	137	1	0	100
Housebreaking	500	1,926	715	207	77	Gambling	117	417	1	0	100
Larceny—theft	125	345	48	4	92	All other offenses	122	156	11	12	48
Auto theft	168	455	204	121	90						
Other assaults	67	141	13	5	61	Total	2,427	8,466	1,438	376	79
Forgery and counterfeiting	285	80	3	1	75						

It should be noted that the above tables dealing with arrests on felony charges are broken down by race, and by adult and juvenile categories.

Mr. Speaker, these facts speak for themselves and require no explanation on the part of anyone. The people of the District of Columbia are entitled to this information.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other reasons why the people of the South, who know the problems involved, will never submit to integration in their public schools, the Supreme Court's fiat notwithstanding.

Mr. Speaker, are there differences between the races with respect to moral standards: do the two races really apply a double standard of morals? Why do so many white people object to sending their children to integrated schools, even in the enlightened District of Columbia?

I think it well that all should know the facts, and as amazing and distasteful as they are, I submit the following, which is an official report of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health:

Gonorrhea reported by all sources by sex and color, school age and under, fiscal year 1955

Age	Grand total			White			Colored		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Total	854	270	584	20	7	13	834	263	571
Under 6	11	1	10	1	1	--------	10	--------	10
6	3	--------	3	--------	--------	--------	3	--------	3
7	1	--------	1	--------	--------	--------	1	--------	1
8	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
9	1	--------	1	--------	--------	--------	1	--------	1
10	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
11	2	--------	2	--------	--------	--------	2	--------	2
12	6	--------	6	--------	--------	--------	6	--------	6
13	23	4	19	1	--------	1	22	4	18
14	66	11	55	5	1	4	61	10	51
15	127	22	105	4	--------	4	123	22	101
16	241	80	161	4	2	2	237	78	159
17	373	152	221	5	3	2	368	149	219

Source: Preventable and Chronic Diseases Division, Venereal Disease Section, District of Columbia Department of Public Health.

An analysis of this table shows that, of 854 cases of gonorrhea among school-age children reported in 1955, 834—or 97.8 percent—were Negro.

This is but another reason why Southern States will never submit to integrated public schools.

The adult pattern of venereal disease is no different. In the Nation's Capital, Negroes account for 95 percent of the venereal disease cases reported. The following, also taken from an official report of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health, shows conditions with respect to adult venereal disease:

Number of cases of venereal diseases reported,[1] by color and diagnosis, fiscal year 1955

Diagnosis	White		Colored	
	January–June	July–December	January–June	July–December
Syphilis:				
Total early	11	16	190	256
Primary and secondary	(1)	(6)	(24)	(20)
Early latent	(10)	(10)	(166)	(236)
Late latent and other late	158	174	740	948
Congenital [2]	7	2	30	31
Total syphilis	176	192	960	1,235
Gonorrhea	128	143	4,734	5,509
Chancroid	2	2	36	55
Lymphogranuloma venereum	1	2	38	30
Granuloma inguinale	--------	--------	13	11
Total venereal diseases	307	339	5,781	6,840

[1] Includes new cases previously treated and untreated. No correction made for nonresidents.

[2] Cases under 1 year of age reported by clinics: 1 colored male; 2 colored females.

Source: Monthly Morbidity Reports (form 8958–B), Division of Preventable and Chronic Diseases, Venereal Disease Section, District of Columbia Department of Public Health.

Mr. Speaker, there is even another reason which causes southerners to reject integration. This is not a pleasant subject, but it is true, nevertheless. It is a fact that the Negro rate of illegitimate births is about 11 times greater than the white race, and that a substantial number of Negro schoolchildren are illegitimate.

At this point, I include two tables. The first table was prepared by the District of Columbia Department of Public Health, and is one of their official publications. The second was taken from a book by Mr. W. E. Debnam, a North Carolina writer, and appears in his book, Then My Old Kentucky Home, Goodnight. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the figures in the second table, but believe them to be substantially true:

Reported illegitimate live births, by race: District of Columbia, 1945–54

Year	All births			Illegitimate births				Percent nonwhite births that are illegitimate
	Total	White	Nonwhite	Total	White	Nonwhite	Percent nonwhite	
1945	22,954	17,125	5,829	1,954	483	1,471	75	25
1946	25,929	18,897	7,032	2,192	563	1,629	74	23
1947	28,622	20,285	8,337	2,249	523	1,717	77	21
1948	27,867	18,919	8,948	2,628	525	2,103	80	23
1949	27,382	18,261	9,121	2,424	417	2,007	81	22
1950	28,926	19,090	9,836	2,801	505	2,296	82	23
1951	30,460	20,077	10,383	3,068	552	2,516	82	24
1952	31,898	20,952	10,946	3,395	591	2,804	83	26
1953	31,936	20,420	11,516	3,669	620	3,049	83	26.5
1954	32,346	20,441	11,905	3,745	617	3,128	84	26

Source: District of Columbia Dept. of Public Health, Biostatics and Health, Education Division, Mar. 8, 1956.

State	Illegitimacy percentage of total white births	Illegitimacy percentage of total Negro births
Alabama	1.33	21.07
Delaware	1.92	28.99
Florida	1.88	24.02
Georgia	1.44	20.39
Illinois	1.51	20.98
Indiana	1.54	14.07
Iowa	1.49	13.02
Kansas	1.24	12.34
Kentucky	2.30	18.34
Louisiana	1.19	17.92
Maine	2.74	23.53
Michigan	1.57	13.02
Minnesota	1.58	17.94
Mississippi	.92	18.10
Missouri	1.48	21.68
Montana	1.26	13.92
Nevada	1.25	11.64
New Jersey	1.10	13.54
North Carolina	2.18	20.07
North Dakota	1.88	13.76
Ohio	1.69	14.60
Oregon	1.21	13.19
Pennsylvania	1.89	18.77
Rhode Island	1.58	14.23
South Carolina	1.73	18.11
South Dakota	1.28	16.26
Tennessee	2.22	21.13
Texas	1.12	16.98
Utah	.95	2.16
Virginia	2.24	20.62
Washington	1.34	9.19
West Virginia	3.85	17.19
Wisconsin	1.53	12.00
Wyoming	.87	7.20

On December 28, 1955, Mr. Gerard M. Shea, Director of Public Welfare for the District of Columbia, furnished my office with the following information regarding welfare recipients:

1. The number of colored recipients of welfare (all phases) in the District of Columbia is 13,800.

2. The number of white recipients of welfare (all phases) in the District of Columbia is 4,700.

3. The number of colored illegitimate children receiving aid from the Department is 2,750.

4. The number of white illegitimate children receiving aid from the Department is 150.

Mr. Speaker, it has not been my purpose in presenting the foregoing to establish one race as a super race, or to present the other as a race of degenerates. I do not hold to either of these beliefs.

Perhaps some of the facts in the foregoing dissertation may appear to be cruel, but they are no less cruel than the lies that have been spread about my people and my State. At least, the figures I have presented are based on factual studies by impartial agencies, and are taken from official Government files.

I have presented this information with the hope that the truth may open the eyes of those who have been blinded by leftwing propaganda and brainwashed by a biased press.

The foregoing is unvarnished truth. It might be well to mull over the old adage:

There are none so blind as those who will not see.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. The gentleman has done a masterful job in accumulating these statistics for the purpose that everyone who does not know already may have the opportunity of discovering the truth. I was much interested in the statistics the gentleman gave relating to homicide. I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows that as a matter of fact down in our southland 8 white people are killed by Negroes to every 1 Negro killed by a white person.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I did not know those facts to be completely accurate. Of course, as I said a moment ago, my Governor reported that in 1954 the condition in Mississippi was that 8 white men were killed by Negroes and 1 Negro killed by a white man and 182 Negroes killed each other. The situation may be somewhat different in Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. I want to tell the gentleman that I think he will find over the South just about the ratio. I was just wondering if some people elsewhere wanted that ratio to become greater so far as whites who are killed by Negroes is concerned. Then I wanted to ask the gentleman did he note the Associated Press article coming out of Ohio to the effect that the Ohio attorney general said he had discovered and he had undisputable proof that the Communist Party was agitating the youth of Ohio and asking them to join in a movement to request the President to send troops down into our section of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I did not see the article, but I do know the first plank in the Communist Party platform includes the passage of all of this civil rights legislation that is now pending in both bodies of the Congress.

Mr. FORRESTER. Of course the gentleman cannot see everything published these days, and he has done a wonderful thing in accumulating evidence such as he has related here today. However, I did see it, and I placed it in the RECORD today, and anyone who wants to see that statement will find it available in the RECORD tomorrow.

I certainly thank the gentleman for giving the facts which he did. He is to be highly complimented.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am grateful to the gentleman for his comments.

BATAAN DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on April 9, Bataan Day will be commemorated. Fourteen years ago the world saw an Asian nation fighting side by side with a Western nation in defense of democracy and freedom. We need must highlight that fact today—that in Asia, the people of the Orient, believing in the same principles that we do in the United States, fought to the death side by side with us against an oriental enemy that sought to conquer the world.

How important it is that we recall that epic struggle in the beleaguered peninsula of Bataan in the midst of the ideological warfare in which we as a nation are engaged today. For it is in Asia where Communist propaganda has misrepresented us and it is precisely in Asia where the Filipino people stood loyally by us because we won their friendship and good will when we proved to them that we believe in respecting the dignity of the human soul.

It was with the lesson of Bataan in my mind that at the last session of Congress I thought it imperative to introduce my resolution making it crystal clear that it is the sacrosanct policy of the Government of the United States to support and endorse the aspiration to freedom of all non-self-governing peoples. The Filipino people were loyal to us in our darkest hour in the Pacific because we helped them achieve their independence and we respected their human rights.

America's foreign policy must continue to be geared to such a truly American norm of national conduct. Political expediency or power politics must not be allowed to make us depart from it. We must not permit even military necessity to deviate us from such a noble course. American and Filipino soldiers fought side by side in Bataan; Filipino civilians protected American lives at the risk of their own; the American flag was defended by the Filipinos because there was mutual respect between the two nations, because both understood the meaning of freedom, because both were welded together by the democratic ideal of equality and justice.

What better asset do we have in Asia today than the friendship of a national leader such as President Ramon Magsaysay, of the Philippines? During the Second World War, while American and Filipino troops were fighting in Bataan against the hordes of fascism and totalitarianism, Ramon Magsaysay was a guerrilla leader harassing the enemy in his Province of Zambales. Here is a man who could have chosen the line of least resistance and could have, as others did, refused to risk his life. He preferred to fight. No wonder with such a record of loyalty to democracy he caught the popular imagination of this country. No wonder he is held all over the United States in the highest esteem and regard. Has anyone fought communism with more vigor and with more success? We are grateful to him for his consistent friendship for our people and I know he can always count on our unstinted support and cooperation.

Has democracy a more stalwart champion in the United Nations than our former colleague in the House, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Ambassador of the Philippines to the United States, who rose from the rank of major to brigadier general on the strength of his record in Bataan which, in the words of General MacArthur, "is that of a soldier who fought with unsurpassed courage and devotion." Did freedom and human dignity have a more uncompromising defender in Bandung last year?

Can we point to a people anywhere in the world with a record of loyalty to democratic deals as the Filipinos showed in Bataan, in Leyte, in Korea, wherever and whenever democracy was in danger and needed defense?

This year Bataan Day takes on an added significance. In the Philippines it was declared a special public holiday in a proclamation issued by President Magsaysay, as follows:

Whereas the 9th day of April, 1956, which marks the 14th anniversary of the fall of Bataan, has become a shining symbol of courage and heroism to all freedom-loving peoples of the world;

Whereas Bataan Day has strengthened the everlasting bonds of friendship and cooperation between the Philippines and the United States;

Whereas the commemoration of the fall of Bataan is a fitting homage to the heroism of Filipino and American forces who fought side by side against the overwhelming odds in the epic struggle for democracy and freedom;

Now, therefore, I, Ramon Magsaysay, President of the Philippines, by virtue of the powers vested in me by law, do hereby proclaim Monday, April 9, 1956, as Bataan Day and declare it as a special public holiday throughout the Philippines. I call upon all public officials and citizens of the Philippines and invite all American nationals residing in this country to observe the day with a 1-minute silence at 4:30 o'clock in the afternoon of that day, and to hold appropriate rites in honor of the heroic defenders of Bataan.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the Republic of the Philippines to be affixed.

Done in the city of Manila, this 22d day of March in the year of our Lord 1956, and of the independence of the Philippines, the 10th.

RAMON MAGSAYSAY,
President of the Philippines.

Mr. Speaker, let us pay tribute to the Americans and Filipinos who fought that unequal battle in Bataan, an epic struggle which history has recorded as a saga of courage and heroism. And in commemorating Bataan Day let us pledge ourselves to uphold freedom against its present-day enemies, giving them no quarter and sacrificing our treasure and our lives, if need be, to insure for ourselves and for the world the permanence of the democratic way of life.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to Mr. BAILEY, on Tuesday, April 10, at the conclusion of other business, for 40 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. KEOGH in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MCVEY and to include an editorial from the Chicago Daily News.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. TABER and include a letter.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. HOSMER).

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 220. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims arising as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 648. An act for the relief of John Soudas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1411. An act for the relief of Marion Drucker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1688. An act to amend the Federal Seed Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1777. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to authorize common carriers to carry a disabled person requiring an attendant and such attendant at the usual fare charged for one person; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2016. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Lawrence F. Kramer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2152. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2246. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands to the city of Wall, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2291. An act for the relief of Albino Braiuca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2355. An act for the relief of Katina R. Landrum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2422. An act for the relief of Manuel Vilar Soler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2423. An act for the relief of Lin Tsai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2594. An act for the relief of Wan Ngo Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2595. An act for the relief of George Henry MacDonald (formerly Frederick William Arthur); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2596. An act for the relief of Renza Marsale Bartlett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2650. An act for the relief of Antonio Rubi Mendiola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2652. An act for the relief of Robert Geoffrey Hunt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2665. An act for the relief of Joyce Soonhwe Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2674. An act for the relief of Shakeeb Dakour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2698. An act for the relief of Leopold Riedl and his wife, Bozena Riedl, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2701. An act for the relief of Hisakazu Hozaki, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2721. An act for the relief of Ursula Jadwiga Milarski Goodman, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2724. An act for the relief of Georgina Feher, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2887. An act to further protect and assure the privacy of grand or petit juries in the courts of the United States while such juries are deliberating or voting, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2909. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe seals for bureaus and offices of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3116. An act to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 3422. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain amounts from unclaimed payments on United States savings bonds to the fund created for the payment of Government losses in shipments, to the Committee on Government Operations.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1240. An act for the relief of Imre de Cholnoky.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 22, 1956,

present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2347. An act for the relief of Heinrich Wolfgang;

H. R. 3963. An act for the relief of Ashot Mnatzakanian and Ophelia Mnatzakanian;

H. R. 5876. An act to amend the copyright law to permit, in certain classes of works, the deposit of photographs or other identifying reproductions in lieu of copies of published works;

H. R. 6022. An act to provide for the relocation of the Trenton Massacre Canyon Monument presently located near Trenton, Nebr.;

H. R. 6904. An act to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument; and

H. R. 8320. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school-milk program, the veterans and Armed Forces milk programs, and the brucellosis-eradication program.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adojurn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 28, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1681. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended, so as to provide punishment for fraudulent acceptance of benefits thereunder"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1682. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semi-annual report on the stockpiling program for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1683. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to revise and modernize certain laws administered by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee of Conference. S. 500. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects (Rept. No. 1950). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7952. A bill to require the inspection and certification of certain mechanically propelled vessels carrying passengers; with amendment (Rept. No. 1951). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 446. Resolution providing for additional personnel, offices of the Postmaster and Doorkeeper, House of Representatives, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1952). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. KLEIN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Interim report pertaining to a newsprint study and newsprint outlook for 1956 (Rept. No. 1953). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 8404. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner of war camp near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No 1954). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 8634. A bill to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1955). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARY: Committee of conference. H. R. 9064. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Courts of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1956). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOPER: Committee of conference. H. R. 8780. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes (Rept. No. 1957). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee of conference. H. R. 9770. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1958). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 10206. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 to eliminate the requirement that an alien, to be admissible thereunder, must present a certificate guaranteeing his readmission under certain circumstances to the country in which he obtained his visa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10207. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 to provide that the usual assurances of employment, support, and housing shall not be required of aliens who are sponsored by certain American voluntary agencies or who demonstrate that they will not become public charges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 10208. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 10209. A bill to amend the act of August 30, 1954, entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 10210. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10211. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 10212. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to allow credit for certain service for purpose of pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 10213. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the taxability of the proceeds from stock sold by individuals in order that they may enter Government service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 10214. A bill to exempt from tax admissions to certain amateur and semiprofessional football, basketball, and soccer games; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 10215. A bill to amend the public-assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to revise the formula for Federal matching of payments to the Virgin Islands, to permit payments of aid to relatives with whom dependent children are living in the Virgin Islands, and to increase the maximum amount of Federal public-assistance payments to the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 10216. A bill to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 10217. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the use of broadcasting stations by presidential and vice presidential candidates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. R. 10218. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 10219. A bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 10220. A bill to provide housing for the elderly; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 10221. A bill to provide for the segregation of certain funds of the Fort Berthold Indians on the basis of a membership roll prepared for such purpose; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10222. A bill to authorize enrolled members of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., to acquire trust interests in tribal lands of the reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 10223. A bill to readjust postal classification on certain educational materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY of Illinois:

H. R. 10224. A bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 10225. A bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 10226. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the payment of certain minimum wages to crews of certain non-United States flag vessels carrying certain equipment, materials, or commodities; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 10227. A bill to extend for 2 years the program of financial assistance in the construction of school facilities and for local educational agencies in areas affected by Fed-

eral activities under the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to make certain other changes in such provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 10228. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by adding thereto new provisions relating to civil aviation medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 10229. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the transfer of certain surplus property of the United States on Red Fish Point, Tyndall Air Force Reservation, Bay County, Fla., to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 10230. A bill to amend sections 3526 and 3528 of the Revised Statutes relating to the coinage of subsidiary silver coins and minor coins of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 10231. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the former Wilmington engineer suboffice project No. C–631 to the State of Delaware, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 10232. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of October 30, 1951, to extend special third-class rates of postage to matter mailed by National Guard organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 10233. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10234. A bill to provide a basis for awarding compensation to members of the National Guard for disability incurred in line of duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10235. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the State of Delaware by and through its State highway department to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Delaware River near Wilmington, Del.," approved July 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 10236. A bill to recognize the Ryan-Hemet Airport as a public airport for the purposes of the Federal Airport Act, and to provide for reimbursement for damage to such airport in accordance with such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10237. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 10238. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to accept certain land in Buncombe County, N. C., for cemetery purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 10239. A bill to provide that the Marine Corps War Memorial at the northern end of Arlington National Cemetery shall be illuminated at night and that the flag shall be flown at such memorial for 24 hours a day; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 10240. A bill to provide for payment of certain defaulted joint-stock land bank bonds, receiver's certificates, receiver's receipts for certificates given in lieu of such bonds, or receiver's receipts given for such bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 10241. A bill to provide for payment of certain defaulted joint-stock land bank bonds, receiver's certificates, receiver's receipts for certificates given in lieu of such bonds, or receiver's receipts given for such bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. J. Res. 593. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 594. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal memorial commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 225. Concurrent resolution to commemorate the quadricentennial anniversary of the establishment of the first settlement in Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. Res. 447. Resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives to the Serbian people on the death of Bishop Nicholai; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 448. Resolution providing for the employment of 15 additional privates, Capitol Police Force, office of the Sergeant at Arms; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. Res. 449. Resolution to provide for the broadcasting by radio and television of committee hearings of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 450. Resolution to provide equal access for all news media before proceedings of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Res. 451. Resolution relative to Cyprus independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide cotton acreage allotments to assist South Carolina cotton farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact suitable legislation to assist the small farmer under the acreage-allotment program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 10242. A bill for the relief of Antonio Crivici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 10243. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Costa Monroe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GENTRY:

H. R. 10244. A bill for the relief of Patrick Lee Frederick and Michael Terry Frederick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 10245. A bill for the relief of Cecil Laing Kerr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 10246. A bill for the relief of Saveria Velona Gangemi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 10247. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katharina Wieland; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 10248. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Jansen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XX, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

762. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Ira Barger and other veterans of Williamsport and Lycoming County, Pa., urging the immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

763. Also, petition of Louis J. Bamberger and other veterans of Williamsport and Lycoming County, Pa., urging the immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

764. Also, petition of William T. Hamilton and other veterans of Lock Haven and Clinton County, Pa., in support of and urging the immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

765. By Mr. CANFIELD: Memorandum submitted by Alexander Nychka, chairman of Ukrainian Congress, Committee of America, Branch of Passaic, N. J., regarding religious persecution in the Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

766. By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition of David Hosler, of Elkhart, Ind., and 40 other residents of Elkhart County and St. Joseph County, Ind., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

767. By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska: Petition of Christina Ekstrom and other citizens of Wakefield, Emerson, and Allen, Nebr., urging the passage of H. R. 8000, a bill to provide that no air carrier shall serve alcoholic beverages while in flight within the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

768. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Mrs. A. W. Rudeen and 99 other residents of Spokane, Wash., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

769. Also, petition of Max Helm and other veterans of Newport, Wash., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

770. Also, petition of Horatio Jenkins and other veterans of Spokane, Wash., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

771. Also, petition of Monson Thorpe and other veterans of Spokane, Wash., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

772. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Mrs. Howard P. Johnson and 38 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging the passage of

the Siler bill, H. R. 6427, and the Langer bill, S. 923, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

773. Also, petition of Jennings F. Thomsen and 44 other citizens of the State of Oregon urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

774. By Mr. POLK: Petition of James A Rideout, Portsmouth, Ohio, and 46 other citizens of Scioto County, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

775. Also, petition of Ellsworth Rowan, Chillicothe, Ohio, and 44 other citizens of Ross County, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

776. Also, petition of Charles W. Cox, Lynx, Ohio, and 43 other citizens of Adams County, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

777. Also, petition of Harold Gilmore, New Boston, Ohio, and 44 other citizens of Scioto County, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

778. Also, petition of Ora Slark, New Boston, Ohio, and 44 other citizens of Scioto County, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

779. Also, petition of Winfield S. Barnhart, Chillicothe, Ohio, and 45 citizens of Ross County, the Sixth Ohio District, and others, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

780. By Mr. REED: Petition of 45 residents of Livingston County, N. J., urging that favorable consideration be given to H. R. 4627, the Siler bill, to bar alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

781. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Dr. H. S. Ferrell and other citizens of Lawrence and Stone Counties, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

782. Also, petition of J. E. Wilson and other citizens of Jasper County, Mo., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

783. Also, petition of John E. Easley and other citizens of Ozark County, Mo., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

784. By Mr. SILER: Petition of Mrs. Estella Sharpe and 1,331 other residents of Bay Springs, Biloxi, Jackson, Meridian, Laurel, and Grenada, Miss., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Introduction of Legislation Amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to provide payment of certain minimum wages to crews of certain non-United States-flag vessels carrying federally financed or owned cargoes.

Under the so-called Davis-Bacon provision Congress has provided that on federally financed construction contractors employing low-wage labor cannot undercut the prevailing wages and living conditions of American labor. When the operators of American ships have sought to undercut standard American wages in the shipping industry by registering their vessels under foreign nationalities and employing foreign low-wage crews, it seemed that in some way it should be possible to protect the American ship owner who paid standard wages against such competition. Accordingly I have introduced H. R. 10226, which simply provides that if foreign ships are to carry government-owned cargoes than the wages and living conditions of the crews must be comparable to prevailing wages and living conditions on American-flag ships. Thus the Federal Government would be removed as a party which discriminates against the personnel on American-flag ships. American ship operators are fully capable and qualified to hold their own in the shipping lanes of the world under reasonable competitive conditions. The American merchant marine does not ask nor does it expect anything more than competing on a fair and equitable basis.

I urge the Members to consider the plight of the sailors and other personnel who have been driven to the beaches by low-wage foreign competition. The purpose of this bill is to lend Federal encouragement to the maintenance of a privately owned commercial United States merchant marine.

Farmer Bulletin-Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, every other year, since I have been a Member of Congress I have sent out a farmers bulletin list to the folks in my district, generally enclosing a short questionnaire, which is as follows:

DEAR FRIEND: If you desire some of the bulletins on the enclosed list, check not more than five and return the list with your full name and address to me.

A few of the problems facing Congress are listed below in the form of questions. Would you care to express your opinion on these? If you need additional space in replying to the questions, return a letter along with the bulletin.

1. In what order should these come: Cut debt _____, reduce income taxes _____, balance budget _____.

2. Should postal rates meet expenses? Yes ☐, no ☐.

3. Do you favor Federal aid to education? Yes ☐, no ☐.

4. Do you favor 90 percent of parity on farm prices: _____, 100 percent _____, or flexible support? _____

5. If eligible, would you participate in the soil bank? Yes ☐, no ☐.

6. Should there be support prices on livestock? Yes ☐, no ☐.

7. Your choice of President: _____

Name _____
Address _____
Occupation _____

Remarks:

A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress, Fourth District, Nebraska, 1025 House Office Building.

Civil Aviation Medical Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for research and training in civil aviation medicine and to set up machinery for the development of medical requirements and evaluation of airman physical fitness.

This legislation would define and broaden the medical responsibility of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics so as to include the development, promulgation and administration of rules and regulations pertaining to medical matters. It would establish an Office of Civil Aviation Medicine within the framework of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. This bill calls for the creation and equipment of a Civil Aeronautics Medical Research Laboratory in order to organize a counterpart in medicine to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. It would establish an equivalent in the field of civil aviation of the medical research and developmental facilities of the Armed Forces, for the development of technical

medical information essential to aviation safety.

For a long time there has been a growing feeling that perhaps civil aviation medicine has not had the Federal support needed for it to keep pace with aeronautical and engineering progress. Civil aviation medicine should keep abreast of new technical improvements in the design and operation of aircraft. Despite the mushroomlike growth of aviation during the past three decades, our civilian pilots are being selected by physical standards which I am told have undergone but little change since they were originally promulgated in 1928. Except for sporadic projects there has been no research conducted to determine the human requirements in civil aviation.

We have provided liberally for military aviation in all its facets—the development of physical standards appropriate to the mission to be performed, extensive training of their flight surgeons both in clinical and research medicine, and research into the human requirements that would be productive of the most effective, though not always economical, operation in a military mission. But we have neglected the civilian pilots who in the final analysis form our reserve pool in times of national emergency, and who in both peace and war have become the backbone of our essential air transportation. There is a feeling that this neglect may perhaps be due in part to the false premise that civil aviation medical research and training needs are being provided for by military services.

At the present time it would appear that the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics does not have clearly defined duties and responsibilities with respect to the effective medical certification of civil airmen. The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, requires the Civil Aeronautics Board to exercise its functions of rulemaking, including the prescription of rules, regulations and standards, adjudication and investigation independent of the Department of Commerce. My bill will open up for discussion the adequacy of present procedures. It is a field that should be explored.

The Good Neighbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, in August 1955, severe flood conditions existed in the State of Connecticut which destroyed lives and property. Towns, cities, and countryside were inundated. The flood started during the night of Thursday, August 18, 1955, and continued at its crest until the following day.

As is usually the case in times of great disaster, it sometimes requires several days for the general public to become aware of the terrible hardships and suffering caused by such disasters. Of the many public-spirited citizens in Connecticut who came to the aid of the stricken areas, the name of Tad Jones, of New Haven, must be mentioned. With the same alertness and alacrity which he used in directing the famous Yale football teams, he started his organizations, the Tad Jones Co. and the New Haven Terminal, in furnishing aid to the stricken areas. Mr. Jones remained in his office day and night watching with great concern the progress of the flood and all it meant to the people and businesses in its path. Before the water started to recede, he was on the telephone, offering his services and the facilities of his entire organizations in any manner in which such services could be utilized. His first move was to have the New Haven Terminal sterilize and make immediately available nine large tank trucks, fill them with drinking water, and supply the Naugatuck Valley with drinking water. The cost and expense involved did not concern Mr. Jones, he was interested only in rendering aid and assistance to the suffering people.

Tank trucks—containing drinking water—began moving Friday, August 19, and continued for the greater part of 3 weeks.

In addition to the tank trucks of the New Haven Terminal, additional tanks, as well as empty milk cans were secured. All were steamed, sterilized, cleaned, filled with drinking water and loaded on trailers and sent into the disaster areas.

Through the cooperation of the Red Cross and civilian defense, drinking water was furnished to critical areas. This work was further supervised by civilian defense authorities. The days following the flood were extremely hot. This made the cleanup task much more difficult and the need for pure water more acute. Water was supplied to each area until the authorities notified Mr. Jones that they no longer needed the equipment.

The important fact remains that Mr. Jones did not wait to be called, but upon seeing the need for assistance, he went quietly to work with no other thought in mind than to render every possible assistance in order to relieve personal suffering and to help the Naugatuck Valley neighbors to get back on their feet. And now, the Naugatuck Valley neighbors say, "A work well done. Thank you, Tad Jones."

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, we shall soon have before us the Mutual Security Agency appropriation, which in more understandable terms to the public means our foreign aid spending program. The amount of aid extended to foreign countries, since the inception of this program 16 years ago, has reached staggering proportions. The total is much larger than many people realize.

The latest statistics I have been able to obtain carries this program down to June 30, 1955. A summary of aid extended up to that date follows:

Lend-Lease:	
I. (a) July 1, 1940–June 30, 1945	$46,728,287,000
I. (b) July 1, 1945–June 30, 1955	2,039,490,000
Total	48,767,777,000
Grant-in-aid:	
II. (a) July 1, 1940–June 30, 1945	1,400,010,000
II. (b) July 1, 1945–June 30, 1955	42,059,148,000
Total	43,459,158,000
Net Authorized Loans:	
III. July 1, 1940–June 30, 1955	16,620,844,000
Summary total	108,847,779,000

The above totals do not include United States capital investments in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—$635 million—and the International Monetary Fund—$2,750 million—although these programs add to our foreign commitments. It is estimated that our foreign-aid programs, together with interest charges for which the American taxpayer is liable, amount to almost half of our Federal debt.

The arguments, put forth by proponents of this program to the effect that we are buying good will with our dollars, are certainly dispelled by the ravaging of our consulates in the various parts of the world and the disdain that many foreign peoples have for the word "American." Certainly if one needs a pointed example of this situation he need only to refer to China. The records show that we have given to China in lend-lease and grants-in-aid a total of $2,861,376,000. There is probably no country today more antagonistic to American principles of democracy than that of China.

We hear it said today that we must counter Russian economic assistance with an increased program of our own. The formula seems to be when Russia makes loans, we must see that we counter with a greater amount of grants-in-aid. Why not counter the Russian program of loans with a similar program of our own? Why is ours a giveaway program? The American taxpayer is interested in finding the answer to some of these questions.

The Chicago daily newspaper, noted throughout the years for its intelligent stand on the subject of foreign aid, has given us some outstanding thinking on this subject in an editorial under date of March 20, 1956. The reader of these remarks would do well to ponder carefully the editorial of the Daily News, which follows:

GIVEAWAY RACE

President Eisenhower asked for $4.9 billion in foreign-aid funds to meet Russia's new departures in foreign policy. Back in January, before these new departures had appeared, he wanted this sum to meet the old departures.

We had the Marshall plan to put Europe back on its feet so that, we were told, we

wouldn't have to pour in billions for rehabilitation. Then we tossed in more billions for economic aid, so that the free-world nations would be strong enough to defend themselves without a gigantic arms-aid program.

Then we sent and still send gigantic sums for military aid.

When the Russians were pursuing a policy of economic isolation, we were urged to take advantage of the opportunity to cement friendships with the underdeveloped countries by assisting their industrial growth. Now that the Russians are doing likewise, we are told that we must increase our own contributions.

The Russians, however, are making loans and barter deals, getting a ruble's worth for every one they put out. According to the theory prevailing in Washington, under Republican or Democratic administration, this is the sure way to make enemies. But we seem not really to believe it, for we aren't content merely to watch the Russians make enemies. We must, says the President, match their loans with gifts, and for every tractor they promise, we must deliver two.

India is expecting aid totaling nearly $2 billion for her 5-year plan. That is one reason the President wants authority to make commitments for periods up to 10 years. India is embarking on a Socialist experiment. Without foreign help, it won't work. So our cue, apparently, is to prove that socialism really can be made to work.

All this is in the face of a study of communism recently made by the Senate Internal Security Committee. The findings were that it wasn't poverty and hunger that made Communists, but a thirst for power among demagogs and a deluded idealism among intellectuals.

There is something craven in the spectacle of a rich and powerful nation which thinks it must scatter candy around the world lest it find itself alone and friendless. The facts seem to be that our largess bought no friends and earned us more resentment than good will. But we still fear to change the formula.

American capital is willing and even eager to seek investment abroad, and under private management it would produce results. But in very few places is there any reasonable assurance that such investment would be secure against confiscation, or nationalization, in the name of Socialist progress. So it is not made.

It is certainly true that a shortage of capital is the great handicap to industrial development in the countries on our aid list. But we don't know why it can't be obtained on the same terms that America obtained the funds that developed this country. Are we selling democratic capitalism or socialism?

Democratic Women's Role in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. EDNA F. KELLY, at the Democratic Women's eastern regional conference in Atlantic City:

I consider it a privilege to address the Democratic Women's Eastern Regional Conference here in Atlantic City. I am glad for all of us that we are meeting in such a beautiful place because I like to think that women not only appreciate beauty in their surroundings but also work hard to bring it about.

Women, as a whole, are new in the field of government. It was many years before they were recognized in the political orbit. Actually, we were always there. (This statement might not be acceptable to those women whose efforts led the fight for actual political participation, and who pioneered in the political field as career women.) But no one can deny that every successful man in public life had, as his inspiration and partner, a politically minded woman with commonsense.

Now, life calls to all women in proportion to their own stations, to exert their influence in this confusion-torn world. Far be it from me to suggest in doing this that you neglect your home—the most precious pillar and foundation of society. However, there is always that spare time which each of us can use for the benefit of the community. This contribution to society will be, in turn, statewide and nationwide. We are partners with men in the home. Now, we must become partners in politics for the sake of the community, and ultimately, for the free world. This we must do for the achievement of our common goal—a better world—a world where peace is a reality and not a word tossed about without any basis in mutual concord which is its true meaning. This must be our contribution to society.

A common interest has brought us to this conference. We are Democrats, and, as such, are proud of our membership in that party because we believe in the principles to which it is pledged. We have faith in our leaders. We want to protect the laws of our Republic as instituted by our Founding Fathers. They established on this continent, this Nation dedicated to the recognition of the dignity of the human being, and respect for his civil, his social, and his spiritual rights. The Democratic Party is protecting these rights and liberties. The Democratic Party always will protect these rights and liberties.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, I view every act of legislation in the light of its contribution to the goal of world peace. World events may be described as forming a pattern. Let us unravel the pattern and find the threads that make the design. These threads are symbolic of our national and international policies. But, destroying our pattern with ugly, discordant notes, are the prominent red threads which represent the intertwining stronghold that Russia has upon the world body politic. No longer is Russia a threat on the horizon. For all her mouthings of peace talk, she is an actual force which endangers all of us—not one race or color—but all of us who believe in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Russia alone under the Soviet regime represents godless, materialistic man. The leaders of the Kremlin have seized power and have enslaved nations and peoples. They rule and liquidate with no regard for moral justice.

When world events forced upon the world the knowledge that the Soviet Union is the implacable enemy of all that the free world stands for, the Democratic Party, under the courageous leadership of President Harry S. Truman, created a bipartisan foreign policy, put the Marshall plan into effect, built up the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, foiled the Berlin blockade, and met the Korean invasion with instant action—with the full knowledge that, and I quote from Mr. Truman's memoirs, "if this were allowed to go unchallenged it would mean a third world war."

What Mr. Truman's place will be in the long perspective of history, we do not know, but all of us who watched the "man of decision" discharge one overwhelming responsibility after another, were impressed and inspired to follow his leadership. President Truman called upon experts in every field regardless of party affiliations, but he always made the final decision himself, for under the Constitution of the United States, that was his responsibility. What is most important to recall, he faced the world unflinchingly, giving intensive study to its problems and shouldering the heavy burden of his high office with the dedication of the great American we know him to be. Thus he bore the brunt of the responsibility along with the criticism of his policies attendant upon his elected office, the Presidency of the United States.

And this is exactly what I had expected President Eisenhower would do when he assumed office in 1953, and it is what I hope he will do now in the remaining months of his term; namely, to bear the responsibility of the issues of his administration both at home and abroad. I strongly resent such statements as were made in an article in the New York Times of Sunday, March 4, written by William S. White, and entitled "Congress Tightens Party Lines." This is a quotation from the article: "The majority Democrats are now on equally clear notice that, barring some unforeseen domestic, economic, or foreign crisis, the principal Democratic issue for 1956 will be not the congressional story but the health of President Eisenhower."

Naturally, the President's health will be discussed. But I say the discussion will emanate from the White House where it always did. I say further, that those who are putting words into the mouths of Democrats are doing so to confuse the issues or at least to evade a discussion of the important measures of legislation. The true issue is not the President's physical condition. It is the more vital issue of the powers of the Presidency that will be delegated to subordinates. Are matters of great domestic import or those of worldwide concern to be held in abeyance while we fight it out on the home front over a matter that has been decided once and for all by the one most concerned?

Much time has been lost in the past 6 frustrating months. United States policies both in the domestic field and in the foreign field field have been dormant—dormant during a period of unrivaled crises. For that reason I am glad that the big decision has been made and I am thankful that the President has recovered. I hope President Eisenhower will exert leadership and face these unfortunate realities, that he will guide positive legislation through Congress to meet these grave matters.

You may ask what has ushered in these critical days in a world which is supposedly at peace. Why is America foundering in her role of leader of the free world? My answer is the erroneous leadership of the Republican Party. But before I continue my answer, let me review very, very briefly, some facts of political history.

In 1952, Dwight Eisenhower, as the standard bearer of the Republican Party, was elected President of the United States.

The Democratic Party, rejected by the American people, was labeled by members of the Republican Party, with names of vile derivation, and was charged by the Republicans with lack of administration, with communistic leanings, and with lack of policy including the lack of a dynamic foreign policy. Four years have elapsed and the Republican Party must defend its administration under the leadership of President Eisenhower.

This is a political year in the United States. I realize that discussion of many problems is "touchy." I realize that many want issues removed from political discussion lest we Americans be misunderstood abroad. I ask you why is it that the Democrats are requested to do this? Why did not President Eisenhower as the leader of the Republican administration admit in 1953, on television,

on radio, and in the press after 1 year spent in investigation of every phase of Democratic administration that—

1. The Democratic Party had a good foreign policy based on collective security which the Republican administration would attempt to continue but with a New Look?

2. That they would not abrogate the Yalta agreements after the House Foreign Affairs Committee had weeks of hearings?

3. That the huge unexpended balances with which they were saddled were worthy and necessary appropriations for worthy objectives; that they found dire need for these "overhang" authorizations. As an aside, it is only natural that some of these had to be revised and renegotiated. Advances in science alone demanded this.

4. That the budget was difficult to balance due to high security costs of long lead items against Communist aggression and subversion. The Republicans soft pedal the fact that they have increased the national debt annually.

5. That they found little waste in administrative cost of the Federal Government?

6. Why do they not admit when they are wrong? Social security was originally condemned as socialistic. Now, it is not socialistic since the Republicans claim it is their program.

We Democrats are willing to agree on crucial issues. On the other hand, the Republicans distort the truth concerning Democratic Party policies and then ask us to remove them from discussion. I want a complete discussion of the issues and I am sure the Democratic candidate will give it to us.

Thus I say that through erroneous leadership we find the United States in one of the most critical periods of its history. We entered the year 1955 with a comparative vantage of strength which existed up to the time President Eisenhower represented the United States at the Geneva summit meeting. I do not mean that we should never negotiate with the leaders of the Kremlin. We should have hope, but we should warn the American people and the peoples of the free world against false optimism.

The Geneva Conferences (both the summit meeting and the Foreign Ministers' meeting) were failures. They were more than failures, because they opened wide the door for the unprecedented success of Soviet encroachment.

As the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee's study mission to Europe I spent 2 months overseas last fall, and I stopped in at the Geneva Conference. I was convinced when I left Geneva that nothing would be accomplished at the meeting. This was confirmed by the conviction on the part of the European government leaders which was stated in my study mission report:

"While all of the foreign officials talked to were sufficiently restrained as to avoid direct statements to this effect, there were frequent implications that statements of United States leaders last summer had been too optimistic and that the opinion of their own people toward Russia tended to be influenced."

A further quotation from this report tells us:

"Allied unity, the NATO alliance, and the pacts in Europe have been weakened to such a degree by the Geneva atmosphere that bold, new, dynamic programs must be devised on a crash basis to overcome the gains made by the Soviet during this period. The U. S. S. R., encouraged by the acceptance of their smiles, of their new approach, and their new look, again abrogated the trust of the free world, and in this environment established a foothold in the Middle East to further obstruct and divide the free world by igniting historical issues which were at the stage when solution was in sight."

The position of the West has deteriorated in the strategic Middle East. The administration must adopt and follow policies for coping with the increasingly dangerous Arab-Israeli conflict, resurgent Arab nationalism, and Moscow's intrusion into the area. Unfortunately, the truth of these statements has been brought home to all of us in the developments of recent weeks and more recent days.

In the Far East we do not find peace. What do we find? What is the status? Hostilities in Korea ceased in July 1953 under an armistice agreement between the U. N. command and the communistic commander of North Korea and the so-called Chinese Peoples Volunteers. No final peace settlement has been achieved, and the country is still divided. The negotiators returned. The status is a stalemate.

I am revealing no secret when I tell you that during this period there had been a vast buildup of Red forces and war potential in North Korea and on the China coast facing Formosa to which we have committed United States defense. We find uncertainty over defense of Quemoy and Matsu. We find that during the so-called truce, little Vietnam, a most anti-Communist country, was partitioned and 11 million people, mostly Roman Catholic, were placed behind the Iron Curtain. Had it not been for the quick action of a few members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I was one, the whole nation would have been swallowed into the Soviet maelstrom.

Threat of Red Chinese aggression, with strengthened, reorganized forces in Asia exists, and subversion is rampant. Neutralism is spreading in the area because of the uncertainty of the type and the amount of help which the West will give. This rise in neutralism can be directly attributed to the spell cast by the Geneva atmosphere.

This breathing spell has been just the right atmosphere to permit the spread of Communist influence and to strengthen its program of infiltration. The Communist strength was aided when the Republican administration agreed to the removal and to changes in the restrictions on exports of strategic materials under the Mutual Security Control Act (the Battle Act). Thus, Russia has secured materials in short supply which increases her war potential. In his press conference on March 7, President Eisenhower defended United States participation in a 1954 agreement that resulted in this broader East-West trade agreement.

In line with this policy, Secretary of Agriculture Benson, in an exclusive interview with Marguerite Higgins, of the New York Herald Tribune, on January 29, 1956, stated he wants Congress to permit the sale of our agricultural surpluses to Iron Curtain countries. It was my amendment that placed the words "friendly nations" in Public Law 480. If these countries need our surpluses, let us be realistic. Give them to them on the condition that we distribute them.

We on the Foreign Affairs Committee await the recommendations of the President's foreign-aid program. It is up to him to recommend its size, scope, and destination.

We now hear little of the huge unexpended balance left over by the previous administration. Now that it has been expended, we hear we will have at least a $1 billion increased recommendation.

On the homefront many important projects are in need of direction—civil rights, housing, education, health, highway construction, broadening of social security, and farm legislation. Other programs need vast revision—the Reserve program, defense plans, and the ever-present treaty-power question being challenged along with the Status of Forces Agreement.

All of these and many more Congress must act on and the President must demand legislation before the 84th Congress adjourns.

We have a challenge of worldwide import to meet. Let us as Democrats carry on and continue our record for all the people. Let us ask the communication services to bring to the American people both sides of all issues.

I should like to make a strong personal appeal to you Democratic women to do all in your power to elect a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress. You have a stake in the future of America and, beyond that, in the future of the free world.

Some of the Tennessee Valley Authority's Concealed Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, in response to my request for information as to the commitments made by the Tennessee Valley Authority for new steam electric generating units, the Comptroller General has today furnished me with an astounding report on recent actions of the TVA.

This report discloses the utter disregard the Tennessee Valley Authority holds for the Congress of the United States. It exposes the deliberate withholding from the Congress by TVA of important information on the actions of TVA that are essential to the Congress if it is to properly perform its duties.

This action of TVA appears to be a calculated attempt to deceive the Appropriations Committee of the House at a time when important decisions on TVA appropriations were being reviewed by that committee.

On March 1, 1956, the Tennessee Valley Authority witnesses appeared before the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. Testimony was given with respect to construction of an additional steam electric generating unit at the John Sevier plant, and of the issuance of letters of intent for acquisition of major equipment for this unit.

It was also testified that two additional units were desired for the Johnsonville plant of TVA. The budget message indicated that the financing of these two units was expected through the issuance of revenue bonds under measures now being considered by congressional legislative committees.

The Comptroller General's report to me shows that on January 17, 1956, the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority authorized letters of intent for 6 additional generating units which with the John Sevier unit would make 7 additional units, totaling 1,170,000 kilowatts at an estimated total cost of $178 million worth of units without advising the Congress and asking for a review and approval of such tremendous additions to the TVA system.

The 1,170,000-kilowatt capacity of these 7 units is equal to more than half the total capacity of all the TVA generating plants in 1948, and will be capable

of producing 75 percent as much energy as the TVA system produced in fiscal year 1948.

The Comptroller General's report to me illustrates vividly that current laws, and their peculiar, and to me, erroneous interpretation by TVA counsel and TVA proponents, do not give effective control of TVA operations.

TVA present annual gross revenue is nearly $190 million, or $40 million more than the $150 million Congress was told that the entire TVA development would cost when the TVA Act was passed. Over $100 million of this gross revenue comes out of sales to the Federal Government agencies, and therefore, out of the taxpayer's pocket.

Present net revenue available for plant expansion by TVA without congressional approval, if we are to accept TVA interpretation of the law, amounts to around $100 million annually for the next 2 years.

In view of this utter disregard of the Congress by TVA, the time is long overdue to review and revise the TVA Act, so that there is no question as to congressional control of its activities.

The following is the Comptroller General's report to me:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 26, 1956.

Hon. JOHN TABER,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. TABER: Reference is made to your letter of March 21, 1956, enclosing a copy of the reports of the Appropriations Committee in connection with H. R. 10004, and directing our attention to the language concerning the Tennessee Valley Authority in both the majority and minority reports. You also request specific information pertaining to TVA's commitments of funds for power projects or parts of projects, the amounts of TVA's revenues in recent years, and the portion of such revenues that resulted from the sale of electricity to the United States Government.

A considerable portion of the language to which you directed our attention, as well as much of the record of the TVA hearings held March 1, 1956, before the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, involves the basic questions of whether TVA has the statutory authority to use its power revenues to install additional generating units at existing powerplants without specific and prior approval of the Congress. The part of the law in question is the following language contained in title II of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948:

"None of the power revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for the construction of new power-producing projects (except for replacement purposes) unless and until approved by act of Congress" (61 Stat. 577).

This letter is not addressed to the question of TVA's statutory authority, which has been the subject of considerable discussion and disagreement, except to recommend that the present law be amended to clearly state the intent of the Congress with respect to its control over TVA's capital expenditures for power facilities. We believe such legislation is necessary at this time because, in our opinion, (1) the present law is not clear in this respect, (2) there has been a substantial change in the nature of TVA's capital expenditures for power facilities between 1948 and 1955, and (3) the present law, as currently applied, does not give the Congress effective control over TVA's expenditures of public funds for power facilities. It is our view that the Congress can most effectively control expenditures of this character through appropriations; however, if the Congress wishes TVA to use its power revenues, or funds obtained from other sources, to construct or acquire power facilities, it should require TVA to obtain specific and prior authorization from the Congress for such facilities.

There follows the specific information that you requested, as well as some comments on the significant change in the nature of TVA's power facilities between 1948 and 1955.

1. TVA's budget program for fiscal year 1957 was transmitted to the Bureau of the Budget on September 28, 1955, and provided for the use of TVA corporate income to start the installation of 5 additional generating units at 3 existing steam plants. These generating units are:

John Sevier, unit 4.
Johnsonville, units 7 and 8.
Gallatin, units 3 and 4.

Prior to the date of the budget transmittal, TVA had issued letters of intent covering the acquisition of major equipment for unit No. 4 at the John Sevier steam plant. These letters of intent provide for cancellation only upon payment of stipulated costs which are currently accruing against TVA. On September 22, 1955, the TVA Board of Directors, by a 2 to 1 vote, approved the awarding of these letters of intent based on the advice of the TVA General Counsel that such action was authorized by law.

The Bureau of the Budget did not approve TVA's use of corporate funds to start these 5 units; however, the Bureau did make the following provision in the President's budget, dated January 16, 1956, for TVA expansion:

John Sevier, unit 4 (by supplemental appropriation for 1956 and by issuance of revenue bonds under proposed legislation).

Johnsonville, units 7 and 8 (by issuance of revenue bonds under proposed legislation).

On January 17, 1956, the TVA Board of Directors, by 2 affirmative votes (1 director abstaining), authorized the awarding of letters of intent covering the acquisition of major equipment for 6 additional generating units—units 3 and 4 at the Gallatin steam plant and units 7, 8, 9, and 10 at the Johnsonville steam plant.

The total cost of the equipment covered by the letters of intent that have been authorized for all 7 units is approximately $30 million. Other pertinent information pertaining to these seven units is summarized.

Plant	Unit	Capacity (kw's)	Estimated cost
John Sevier	4	180,000	$28,000,000
Johnsonville	7 and 8	270,000	44,000,000
Johnsonville	9 and 10	270,000	39,000,000
Gallatin	3 and 4	450,000	67,000,000
Total		1,170,000	178,000,000

In effect, the TVA Board of Directors has authorized the initiation of a major expansion program which will add 1,170,000 kilowatts of installed capacity to its system and will cost an estimated $178 million. The expansion program has not been reviewed or approved by the Congress, and further, it includes 4 units which have not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

2. As noted above there has been a significant change in the nature of TVA's power facilities. Prior to 1948 TVA was essentially a hydroelectric power system, and additional generating units were of the size of 10,000 kilowatts to 70,000 kilowatts each. Since 1948, however, TVA has added 7 large modern steam plants, and current additional generating units are of the size of from 112,500 kilowatts to 225,000 kilowatts each. The future addition of a number of steam-electric generating units of this size, or larger, represents a substantial increase in generating capacity. At June 30, 1948, the TVA power system was 17 percent steam-electric and 83 percent hydroelectric; after completion of generating units under construction at June 30, 1955, the TVA power system will be 63 percent steam-electric and 37 percent hydroelectric (these percentages, of course, do not include the 7 steam-electric units discussed above).

Further, a single steam-electric generating unit today is very large (the Gallatin units are 225,000 kilowatts each). A single steam-electric generating unit of 225,000 kilowatts is larger than most present-day hydroelectric power plants or most steam-electric power plants in 1948. In 1948 the TVA system had only 2 powerplants with an installed capacity as large as 225,000 kilowatts. As of June 30, 1955, excluding TVA's 7 modern steam plants, the TVA system consisted of 44 hydroelectric powerplants and 8 steam-electric powerplants; however, only 3 hydroelectric plants and 1 steam-electric plant have an installed capacity of over 225,000 kilowatts. The average installed capacity of the 44 hydroelectric plants is 80,000 kilowatts and of the 8 smaller steam-electric plants is 55,000 kilowatts. It is significant to note that technical advancements are still being made rapidly in the size of generators, as shown in the March 15, 1956, issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly, which reports:

"The electric utilities now have 5 generators with name plate ratings of 300,000 kilowatts or over on order; Consolidated Edison has ordered two 335,000-kilowatt units for installation in 1958–59."

At June 30, 1948, the TVA system had an installed capacity of 2,567,402 kilowatts and during fiscal year 1948 average gross generation was 65 percent of installed capacity. The 7 additional units involving the letters of intent discussed above have an installed capacity of 1,170,000 kilowatts, and, being steam-electric units, are sometimes capable of an average gross generation of over 100 percent of installed capacity (during fiscal year 1955, Johnsonville, Shawnee, and Widows Creek all had an average gross generation of over 100 percent of installed capacity). Therefore, the present expansion program of 7 additional units, which has not been reviewed by the Congress, involves installed capacity equal to 45 percent of the entire TVA system at June 30, 1948.

3. It is clear that the language of the 1948 Appropriations Act quoted above prohibits TVA from building a new steam-electric plant at a new location without prior congressional approval; however, it should be realized that TVA has the potentiality for expansion at some of its existing steam plants. The largest potentiality is probably at its Gallatin steam plant which at present is a 2-unit plant with an installed capacity of 450,000 kilowatts, but which could be expanded to a 10-unit plant. The following information pertaining to the Gallatin plant is contained in TVA's annual report for fiscal year 1954 (page 16):

"TVA gave special consideration to the design of the main control and instrument switchboard, since it could ultimately become the centralized control board for a 2,500,000-kilowatt station (the present 1,440,000 installed capacity planned at Kingston makes it the largest station in the world at present)."

4. The final point is a discussion of the financial significance of TVA's power revenues. The TVA system is the largest single integrated electrical system in the country, and it follows that its power revenues are substantial. In the last 5 years, during which period steam generation has become an important factor, there has been a tremendous expansion in TVA's power system—primarily to supply the power needs of the

Atomic Energy Commission. The following tabulation summarizes this growth:

Year	System installed capacity June 30 (kw's)	Power revenues fiscal year		
		Total	Federal agencies	All other
1951	3,181,000	$70,329,580	$8,162,812	$62,166,768
1952	3,859,910	95,004,390	25,230,407	69,773,983
1953	5,102,985	104,877,869	31,505,622	73,372,247
1954	6,075,685	133,947,808	54,368,480	79,579,328
1955	7,809,985	188,162,989	102,962,859	85,200,130

In addition to the rapid growth in TVA's power revenues, as shown above, TVA estimates that its power revenues will continue to increase and that in fiscal year 1957 they will be $231,550,000.

It is significant to note the increase in TVA power revenues that has resulted from the sale of electricity to Government agencies ($8,162,812 in 1951 and $102,962,859 in 1955). During fiscal year 1955 such revenues represented 55 percent of TVA's total power revenues.

Based on estimated figures in TVA's statement of source and disposition of power income appearing in TVA's budget program for 1957 submitted to the Congress, TVA's net power proceeds for fiscal years 1956 and 1957 will be approximately $100 million each year. Such amounts are available for the construction and acquisition of power assets and for the repayment of the Government's investment in the power program. The budget program contemplates that TVA will repay to the Government $59 million in 1956 and $75 million in 1957 out of power revenues; however, it should be realized that the actual amount that will be repaid to the Government will be determined by the TVA Board of Directors and will be the amount of money which in the judgment of the TVA board will not be needed in the conduct of the TVA power operation. As of June 30, 1955, TVA was several years ahead of the minimum-repayment schedule required by the law and was 1 year ahead of an average repayment schedule based on a 40-year amortization period.

A copy of this letter is being sent to Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, Chairman of the TVA Board of Directors.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

The Legislative Reference Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, may I take a few minutes of the time of the House to say publicly what I know many of you have said privately, and that is to acknowledge the remarkable aid rendered us by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I am doing this in part because it is quite possible that a number of you may not realize how many different facilities are open to us in that very fine body.

I do know that everyone of us personally or through our staff has made some use of the Service within the past year. In many instances this has only been to obtain assistance in securing information or material to answer some one of the innumerable letters which we receive. Even this service, humble though it is, I know is tremendously appreciated by our hard-working office staff even more than by ourselves. It is important for all of us and for our constituents that the facilities of the Library of Congress are available in this fashion to assist in obtaining information of importance to them. In a very real sense this makes our library also the library of our constituents.

However, it is not particularly of this work of which I wish to speak. What is far more important to me is that we have in the Legislative Reference Service at least one place to which we can go for research, information, or a report on any subject of public interest and know that the agency will have done everything humanly possible to make its reply accurate and unbiased.

It is small wonder that the Service has grown tremendously. In 1930 it handled only a little over 2,000 inquiries in the entire year. The latest figure, that for 1955, is 56,666. In 1940, the number during the year was slightly over 10,000, and in 1950 it had reached 41,602. The Service answers such questions without reference to our political party or point of view. The use by our two parties is approximately the same anyway you measure it. Since 1941, the number of inquiries handled by the individual researcher has grown from 157 to 286. This shows an efficient management of the Service, and the hard work of its staff.

Many of its findings have been remarkable. For example, it was the Service which discovered and proved that the margin by which the economic strength of the West exceeded that of the Soviet bloc has been increasing rather than narrowing during recent years. Incidentally this study was published by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report about a year ago.

We know that our committees have excellent professional staffs, but as individual Members we frequently have no place to turn for our own information and research. It is all the more gratifying to know that the Legislative Reference Service by direction of our Committee on House Administration treats inquiries from us as individual Members on a par with those which it receives from the committees. I believe we are the only national legislative body in the world, with the possible exception of Japan, that has any such facility open to the ordinary individual legislator. The start of a similar agency in Japan was itself the direct result of visits of Japanese legislators to the Library of Congress and their study there of what is available to us. It was the feeling of the Japanese that they as representatives of the people had a better chance of being free from the domination of their bureaucracy with such an independent factfinding source at their disposal. Already representatives from at least 15 other nations have visited our Legislative Reference Service to examine its feasibility in their own government.

I would like to close by inserting into the RECORD, under unanimous consent of the House, the list of services which the Legislative Reference Service is in a position to render. This list was furnished me, at my request, by the Service and I am inserting it here with the thought that it might be useful to many of you to have such a list available. Surely here is one agency that deserves all the support we can give it.

SERVICES FURNISHED TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND COMMITTEES BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

(NOTE.—Members should, in making a request, indicate the form in which the reply is desired—e. g., written report, preliminary speech draft, oral discussion, telephone message, a selection of books, or other marked material. Where the deadline and other circumstances permit, the reply will be in the form requested.)

I. RESEARCH AND INFORMATION

1. Thorough analysis of a problem facing Congress, typically including background history, the various proposals for solution with indications of supporters and opponents, the arguments pro and con, factual information on key points in controversy.

2. Reports limited to any desired aspect of a problem, as e. g., the pros and cons, a survey of press or expert opinion, history of action in other countries, etc.

3. Legal reports, such as surveys of Federal or State legislation on a subject, legislative history of a given measure, arguments on the constitutionality of a bill, analysis of court decisions, etc.; the law in foreign countries on a given subject.

4. Evaluations of reports or documents or recommendations originating in Government agencies or outside organizations. (Recommendations are avoided, but points in question are noted, together with indications of the views of experts, etc.)

5. Locating specific information: Searches of newspapers, congressional records, or other documents, identification of quotations, biographies, identification and description of organizations, citations to Federal or State law, rollcall votes, or the voting record of an individual Member (this last will be done only for the Member concerned, or with his permission).

II. STATEMENTS FOR USE BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

On particular request of a Member, statements will be prepared for specific use in connection with remarks on the floor or elsewhere, releases of a historical or commemorative nature, etc. These may be in the form of general or detailed outlines, or suggested drafts. In any case, instructions should be as detailed as possible to insure a report to meet the Member's exact needs. Any statement concerning political issues will avoid partisan comment, although one side only of a particular question may be developed, if this is the Member's wish.

III. MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES

1. Consultation on any subject within the special competence of the Legislative Reference Service staff experts, at either a Member's office or the Library.

2. Assistance in organizing hearings; suggestions as to witnesses, order of business, subjects to be explored.

3. Congressional reading room: Members, their staff and families have use of this room. A desk may be reserved, if desired; staff assistance is available. A browsing collection is maintained of current books, from which Members may also borrow. Current periodicals for reading on the premises are available. Hours: Monday-Friday, 9 a. m. to 10 p. m.; Saturdays, 9 a. m. to 6 p. m.; Sundays, 2 p. m. to 6 p. m.

4. Translations for official use: From the more frequently met foreign languages.

5. Photostating:

a. For official use, photocopying is available without charge—within certain necessary financial limitations.

b. For unofficial use, or for work beyond the limitations noted, photocopying is supplied at stated rates.

6. Charts, graphs, and maps: Consultation and/or preparation according to specifications in various media.

7. Indexing of committee hearings or other documents. Extensive indexing projects can be undertaken only on a reimbursable basis.

8. Procurement of information from other Government agencies when Members of Congress prefer not to make direct contact.

9. Bibliographies.

IV. SERVICES FOR CONSTITUENTS IN RESPONSE TO OFFICAL MAIL

(NOTE.—Extensive research or translations cannot be undertaken for constituents. It is also helpful if the original letter accompanies the office request. It will be returned with the reply.)

1. Miscellaneous information is supplied, especially when constitutents do not have local facilities for research or have exhausted same.

2. Material on various subjects can frequently be supplied from a small stock of surplus bulletins, reprints, clippings, etc.

3. Selected references on particular subjects.

V. GENERAL NOTE

Services are rendered on request only and usually in order of receipt of the inquiry. Especially when Congress is in session the workload is frequently such in particular fields that prompt service is difficult, if not impossible, except at the sacrifice of quality.

Max Abelman Honored by Philippine Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 4, 1956, there was presented to Max Abelman, of Brooklyn, a special diploma of honor from Dr. M. V. De Los Santos, president of the University of Manila. The presentation was made by His Excellency, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, and was held in the Nurses Residence Hall of the Jewish Hospital, of Brooklyn. Surrogate Maximilian Moss, chairman of the executive committee of the hospital, presided. Following are the addresses made on this occasion:

Chairman Moss. His Excellency the Ambassador General Carlos P. Romulo, His Excellency the Ambassador Felixberto Serrano, other guests of great distinction, Chaplain Goldberg, doctors, nurses, ladies and gentlemen: American hospitals are playing a very vital role in creating better understanding and good will between foreign governments and the United States through their intern and resident medical training programs.

Thousands of doctors of foreign lands, graduates of recognized medical schools, are trained each year in this country. When they return to their countries upon completion of their work here, they serve as ambassadors of good will. Just as Max Abelman serves as an ambassador of good will for Brooklyn. They not only bring with them the latest American medical techniques, but also our attitude of friendship and democratic traditions. The combination is invaluable for America and the world.

The Jewish Hospital has trained more than 50 Philippine interns and residents since 1942 and will continue in close cooperation with that nation's great government.

I should like to read a letter from the President of the Philippines:

MALACANANG,
Manila, February 21, 1956.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MR. ABELMAN: It has gratified me to learn that you will be the recipient of a Special Diplomat of Honor to be conferred upon you by the University of Manila for your humanitarian activities. I still remember the excerpts from the issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated January 11, and 13, 1955, wherein your charitable and civic activities were commended by Representatives FRANCES P. BOLTON and EUGENE J. KEOGH of the United States Congress. Surely the conferment of this latest award on your good self is a fitting recognition of your devoted work.

Please accept my sincerest congratulations and best wishes.

Cordially yours,

RAMON MAGSAYSAY,
President of the Philippines.

Chairman Moss (continuing). President Magsaysay refers to one of our Brooklyn Congressmen, who is sitting in the front row here today. He flew in from Washington purposely to meet General Romulo and to pay his respects to Max Abelman.

Gene, I couldn't present you any better than to read a letter from the President of the Philippines mentioning you. Congressman KEOGH.

Congressman KEOGH. Your Honor, Judge Moss, Your Excellencies, Dr. Goldberg, our very distinguished and genial friend, Max Abelman, and ladies and gentlemen: I had expected that I would just be one of those like you sitting here quietly, but sincerely showing our deep and abiding respect to a great Brooklynite and a great American; but, being a Member of Congress, you know, prompts one always to be ready to talk, especially on as pleasurable an occasion as this, for it affords me an opportunity in Brooklyn to greet His Excellency, General Romulo, with whom I recall having served while he was his country's representative in the United States Congress—and I am sure I am not telling secrets when I tell you that "once a member, always a member." We have followed him with great pride and great interest in the tremendous work that he has done and is doing in the cause of freedom and democracy.

I also welcome the opportunity to pay my respects, too, to his country's representative in the United Nations and to welcome him to Brooklyn. I wish to compliment them on the selection of the honor today and to extend my sincere congratulations to Brooklyn's ambassador of good will at large, who I know, has always been interested in advancing and promoting the common and beneficial interest of these two great countries. I therefore join with you, Mr. Chairman, in extending to Max Abelman our very sincere congratulations. With them go our prayers and hopes that he will be spared to serve with us for many, many years to come in the great and good and elevating work that he has dedicated himself to.

It is indeed, therefore, Mr. Chairman, a pleasure that I shall long remember that I should have been privileged to be with you today and, on my own behalf and on behalf of the congressional delegation from the great country of Brooklyn [laughter] to extend our best wishes to the great sister republic of the Philippines and to the great American who has brought these two countries even closer together, Max Abelman.

Chairman Moss. Dr. Ferreol mentioned Dr. Cotui and I should like very much if he would say a word. Dr. Cotui!

Dr. COTUI. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Abelman, Ambassador Romulo, Ambassador Serrano, distinguished guests: I have been assigned a job by the Chairman, and it may sound ridiculous in the face of all the sublime things we have heard, and that is to propose that we change the name of this hospital to the Philippine Hospital of Brooklyn. [Laughter and applause.]

Chairman Moss. We Americans should take a lesson from Dr. Cotui. He can say some very powerful things in one sentence.

There are several letters that I know you would want me to tell you of after you hear the names of the persons who wrote them. There is a letter from Harry S. Truman. There is a letter from Henry A. Wallace. There is a very long letter and a very intimate one, speaking of many activities together in Middlesex Medical College and otherwise, from Abe Stark. There is a letter from Governor Dewey. There is a letter from Mayor Wagner. And there is a letter from Jim Farley which refers to Max as "nature's nobleman."

I am shortening the session by not reading the letters.

There is the last letter in this portfolio from Ed Silver, our district attorney, and I think he actually speaks the same sentiments of all the letters when he says the following: "It is most fitting that a man who has spent so many years as you have"—meaning Max—"on behalf of humanity should receive it at the hands of another great humanitarian, General Romulo.

"If all the people you have helped could attend the function, you would have to hire Madison Square Garden and it would be crowded at that."

We have many distinguished personages here today and our time is very limited. The general must leave for Washington, and we must, of necessity, limit the speeches, but I am sure we all want to hear from His Excellency Ambassador Felixberto Serrano, permanent delegate to the United Nations from the Philippines. Ambassador Serrano.

Ambassador SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Abelman, my beloved General Romulo, and my American friends, when Mr. Abelman called me up by telephone at my office about 2 weeks ago, asking me if I could be present on this occasion, I answered him without hesitation "Yes," because I had acquired previous knowledge of the fact that General Romulo had been selected to confer upon him this award, and so I said to myself there could be no occasion more pleasurable than that in which one of the few greatest friends of the Philippines and the Filipinos shall be honored through one of the few greatest friends of America and the Philippines. I am referring to Max Abelman. The award to Mr. Abelman, in my opinion, has a dual significance. It is a recognition of his continuing dedication to humanity; and, on the other hand, it has the larger significance of being a symbol of the friendship between your people and mine.

For 48 years we have forged these relationships; and, even if our political ties have been severed, we remain, as we were before, friends of yours in peaceful collaboration and perhaps, shall I say, in a noble comradeship.

Few things ever last in this world. It is my hope and my prayer that the services of Mr. Abelman and the recognition accorded to those services by my country and by one of the greatest institutions in my country, and what is more important, the bonds of friendship between your country and mine, shall never be forgotten and will last as long

as the world shall be a place where we want to live in peace and happiness.

Chairman Moss. Thank you, Ambassador Serrano.

We are fortunate in having with us the Senior Chaplain of the United States Navy, who is here in a dual capacity. He is a warm friend of General Romulo's of many years' standing. He is a warm friend of Max Abelman's of many years' standing.

And with that, Chaplain Goldberg, would you honor us with your remarks, sir?

Rabbi JOSHUA GOLDBERG. Your Max's Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: These two are also titles—"Your Max's"—because Maximilian Moss, as you know, is one of our outstanding Jewish leaders and an outstanding jurist, and Max Abelman is entitled to every possible honor as far as I am concerned for a very personal reason.

When I came back, having served in World War I and hardly speaking English, upon returning to the United States of America I was teaching Hebrew at the time in a religious school, and it occurred to some people to recommend me to Max Abelman, who was at that time the executive director of the Brooklyn Federation of Jewish Charities, as a possible candidate for assistant executive and in his wisdom he decided that I would not do, so for that alone he is entitled to a diploma of honor for whatever I have become across the years. Across those same years I have ever watched the ever-growing influence of good will which came from his personality and it is a pleasure to be here this afternoon to witness the conferring of this award.

I would like to say one more word, and that is to General Romulo in the presence of the permanent delegate to the United Nations from the Philippines. It is something to remember. It was before the police action in Korea, before other people awoke to the possibility of the invasion of Communist ideology into the major portion of Asia. I recall him speaking bluntly, articulately and to the point on the necessity for the free nations of the world to understand that the danger is not only European but the possibility is that it may veer altogether and in a cataclysmic way with all its force descend upon Asia.

In those days his voice was a voice in the wilderness. Alas and alack, the vision of the statesmen at that time was blurred by other interests and right now we are reaping the fruits of our blindness and the folly of our thinking in those days.

He is a man who is a true statesman, who sees things ahead and does not have the perspicacity of looking behind him.

His smiling face breaks through all the strains and stresses of the present revolutionary forces that operate in Asia. Asia is of the future. The teeming masses of mankind in Asia are looking for self-expression and for the place in the sun to which they have always been fully entitled. From there came wisdom, and wisdom and great ideas will yet flourish and come from that part of the world, but they can only flourish and wisdom can only be brought about and widen its horizon if it grows in a climate of freedom and liberty, and to this General Romulo has dedicated his smiling face and his stout heart. He has become almost an organic part of America, and, what is more, an organic part as a world statesman in the field of the search and the thirst for liberty.

Finally, it is pleasant to see this thing happening in a hospital. This is the common denominator of mankind. Pain and suffering make us all brothers under the skin regardless of the wisdom that may come from Mississippi or other places, wherever they might be. This is the place in which there is unity of that greater force in which the brotherhood of man is truly expressed through the love of men by reaching God. It is beautiful and it is good that it happens here. My congratulations and thanks.

Chairman Moss. Mr. Isidor Leviton, president of the hospital, wishes me to present personally greetings and the expression of his warm admiration and affection for General Romulo and his deep appreciation to Max Abelman for his long record of communal achievements.

Mr. Leviton also wants to submit his regrets to the general in not having been able to be present today as he was unable to return in time from out of the State, and on that note, with this message from the president of the hospital, we now move to the occasion that really brought all of us here today.

We are greatly honored to have present His Excellency the Ambassador to the United States from the Philippines, General Carlos P. Romulo, who in 1949 was the fourth President of the United Nations General Assembly. He has been Foreign Minister of the Philippines and chairman of the Philippine delegation to practically every session of the United Nations General Assembly.

About 10 days ago he was honored in Miami when he received the World Brotherhood Pioneer medallion for distinguished world statesmanship.

As recently as a few days ago, he again was honored by Robbins College in Florida, receiving the medal of distinction for his work for world peace.

In 1946 General Romulo received from the same college an honorary degree.

Today we are privileged and honored to have General Romulo with us. He is here by request of Dr. Mariana De Los Santos, president of the University of Manila, and the university's board of trustees, so that His Excellency the Ambassador might present the "Special Diploma of Honor" to our dear friend Max Abelman in recognition of his humanitarian activities.

I therefore have the great privilege, great pleasure and honor now to present to you Gen. Carlos P. Romulo.

Ambassador ROMULO. Mr. Chairman, my good friend and worthy colleague, Ambassador Serrano; my good friend Max; ladies and gentlemen and friends: I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your very generous words of introduction. I thank my longstanding friend there [indicating Rabbi Goldberg] for his quite fulsome praise—undeserved—which reminds me of an incident in 1950 when I happened to be in Peoria, Ill. I was in a hotel lobby trying to buy a newspaper when I observed that a man was watching me very closely. Finally, overcome by his curiosity, he approached me and he said, "You are General Romulo, aren't you?"

I said, "Yes; I am."

He said, "You are Foreign Minister of the Philippines?"

I said, "Yes; I am."

"You are president of the United Nations General Assembly?"

I said, "Yes; I am."

"You were aide-de-camp to General MacArthur?"

I said, "Yes; I was."

He scratched his head, looked at me from head to foot—and that didn't take much time [laughter]—and then he said, "I'll be doggoned." [Laughter.]

So whenever I listen to good friends like the chairman here and the chaplain, and I want to be deflated, I recall that incident. [Laughter.]

At lunch today I told them the story of the widow who was in a seance and she asked for the spirit of her departed husband and the one in charge of the seance said, "Well, Mrs. Smith, your husband is here now."

So she said, "Harry, are you there?"

Harry answered, "Yes, darling. I am here."

"Are you happy there, Harry?" she asked.

And he answered, "Very happy, darling."

Again she asked, "Tell me, happier than when you were with me?"

And he answered, "Much happier, I must confess, darling."

So she said, "Then," she said, "heaven must be a wonderful thing."

And Harry answered, "I ain't there."

I also told them at lunch this noon that when I was in Wichita, Kans., several months ago, I found myself in a hotel, and naturally they have a Bible, a Gideons' Bible, in all those rooms. I usually relax by reading the Bible, so I opened the Bible and I happened to open at Psalm XXIV, and at the end of Psalm XXIV it said, "If you are still lonely, turn to Psalm CXX. And at the end of Psalm CXX there was a note: "If you are still lonely, call Mabel."

I must confess at the end of reading Psalm CXX I was no longer lonely and so—for the purposes of Mrs. Romulo, who is here today—I did not call Mabel.

I am very happy indeed to be with you this afternoon. I am not a stranger to this hospital. This is, I think, the third time that I speak from this rostrum here. Away back in 1949 I came, as president of the United Nations. Then in 1950 I signed my name on a wall here, in one of the wards in this hospital——

Mr. ABELMAN. The children's ward.

Ambassador ROMULO (continuing). The children's ward; yes. And then it was away back in 1948 and 1949 when Max Abelman and I met each other for the first time and we discussed how we could convince the trustees of this hospital to allow Filipino doctors to come here as internes and Max Abelman introduced me to the trustees of this hospital, and that has been a friendship that I have cherished all these years. That Max Abelman should be the recipient of this particular distinction by an institution of learning in the Philippines is but a pale token of the gratitude that my people feel toward this humble man—sometimes a persistent cuss when he wants to accomplish something—but really in his modesty and his humility he is a credit not only to this foreign country known as Brooklyn, but to the United States as a whole.

And indeed, how apropos that in a country like the Philippines one of its institutions of learning should think of expressing its gratitude to a private citizen such as Max Abelman for his efforts in our behalf. Generally it is the high officials of a government who are given recognition. Generally it is the men in the high places who are recognized, but in my country we take a special pleasure in recognizing those who have served us in any capacity, in whatever sphere and no matter how humble.

Max Abelman has rendered service not only to the Philippines but also to the United States, and in Brooklyn you may take him as an ordinary citizen, an average Tom, Dick, or Harry—"A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country"—in his own section we take him for granted. It is Max—it is Tom, it's Dick, it's Harry—but it is the average Tom, Dick, and Harry who represent your country in the eyes of those abroad, and you are judged—and I am referring to the American people—by the deportment and the conduct of the average Tom, Dick, and Harry. And in these days when we are engaged in a life-and-death global struggle the implications of which and the significance of which are far-reaching, a global struggle the like of which mankind has not seen in recorded history, it is important that the average American Tom, Dick, and Harry should be appreciated abroad, as this token that I will soon present to Max Abelman shows that Max Abelman's efforts are appreciated in the far-away Philippines.

I am glad that the chaplain here spoke of Asia, how important Asia is to you, to your national security, to the safety of your lives. I remember it was in Harvard University that the chaplain was referring to, when I was given an honorary degree there

in June 1950, and I then said that I was afraid the cold war was about to explode into a shooting war and that shooting war was to take place in Asia, and I added, "possibly Korea." And 1 week later the North Koreans attacked South Korea.

And it is because I had watched the trend of events very closely in Asia and I knew what was coming, as I am watching—and it is in the nature of our duty to watch—what is happening in the world today.

That Max Abelman should have taken this interest in Filipinos is a very encouraging sign of the times in the United States, because if you visualize your geography, your American perimeter of defense lies from the Aleutians away up north, through Japan, Korea, Okinawa, Formosa, Guam and the Philippines, and that Pacific chain of defense can only be as strong as its weakest link, and if any of the links in that chain falls under communism, your national security in Brooklyn is seriously threatened, because, don't forget, the Pacific Ocean no longer affords to you the protection that it gave you 10 years ago.

The Pacific Ocean has been annihilated by modern technology, so that while you may think that in terms of mileage that Pacific chain of defense is 10,000 miles away from Brooklyn, in terms of guided missiles, in terms of supersonic planes, in terms of snorkel submarines, in terms of the atom bomb, that Pacific chain of defense is your next door neighbor. So that it is paramount that America should take a more active interest in Asia, and tokens of your interest in Asia such as welcoming these Filipino doctors here in this hospital are not only an empty gesture of friendship, but it really helps to safeguard your national security, because you cannot allow any of those links in that chain to fall under communism.

That is why President Eisenhower announced to the world that the United States will defend Formosa to the last. Why? Because Formosa is an important link in that chain, and if Formosa falls under communism, that whole chain can snap, and if that chain snaps, your national security here in Brooklyn is gravely menaced.

That is why you fought in Korea, because you could not allow that link in that chain to fall under communism; so that the American boy who fought and died in Korea really fought and died for the safety of his sweetheart here in Brooklyn; the American boy who fought and died in Korea really fought and died for the safety of his relatives in Boston, Mass.; the American boy who fought and died in Korea really fought and died for the security of his friends and his dear ones in Tallahassee, Fla.

So don't forget that the welcoming of these Filipino doctors here in this hospital will, I hope, serve to show the peoples in Asia that there is a bond of friendship that the Americans want to cultivate and to strengthen with our fellow Asians, and how imperative it is for us to realize that in the midst of our abundance, in the midst of our contentment brought about by the superlative American standard of living, in this global struggle in which we are engaged, let us not forget that no one nation, no matter how rich or no matter how powerful, can win this war alone. We must have friends and allies, precisely because of the atom bomb—and you know, the guided missiles, the intercontinental ballistics missiles, which 2 years ago they told me in Washington could reach the United States and U. S. S. R. in 20 minutes—in 20 minutes—and the atom bomb which can raze cities and entire populations, and, we know, soon, entire countries—and America unfortunately no longer has a monopoly of these terrible weapons. I say "unfortunately" advisedly, because the other side that has them, too, does not have the restraints of either ethics or religion, and since we know that these terrible weapons can destroy entire cities and soon entire countries, even when they are used against us—God forbid it—that is precisely the time when we need other countries, other peoples, and other populations to rise to our defense, and that is why I say no one country, no matter how powerful or how rich, can win this global struggle alone.

And so, when I present this diploma of honor that I have been charged by the president of the University of Manila to hand to our good friend, Max Abelman, I do so conscious of the fact that Max Abelman is a representative of the average Tom, Dick, and Harry of the United States, who in turn represents that clean, wholesome, honest American conscience that is deaf to the tinkle of the gold dollar and blind to the allurements of power, that clean, wholesome, honest American conscience that always asserts itself in cases of emergency on the right side of truth and freedom and democracy; that this is a symbol, modest though it be, of the appreciation of a people for the services of this symbolical Tom, Dick, and Harry of the United States, that my people do not forget favors extended to them, that they appreciate such favors, that they hold such favors in grateful remembrance, and that Max Abelman, having gone through the stages of anticipation and realization and appreciation through which every human being goes in the course of his life in this mortal world of ours, now stands on that stage of appreciation where his efforts are appreciated, recognized, and cherished, and since he is about to enter the stage of recollection, may he, when he sits on his rockingchair and looks back toward a fruitful, maybe a hectic, career, in his mind's eye he can see in the dim and distant far-away Philippines a vision of these doctors that he has helped and of the suffering humanity that these doctors have helped to relieve and that here in the Jewish Hospital, here where pain and suffering are the levelers of humanity, he has exerted an influence that will be as abiding as it is appreciated.

And so, Max, it is my pleasure, in behalf of the University of Manila—and this morning when I talked to President Magsaysay over the phone at the Waldorf—he called me up and I told him that I was here to present this diploma to you—he asks me to congratulate you in his name and to tell you that he hopes some day you can visit the Philippines where not only the University of Manila but all these recipients of the generosity of the Jewish Hospital can show you how deeply they appreciate your efforts in their behalf.